

432 Class 09 Slides

thomaseLove.github.io/432

2022-02-08

Today's Agenda

Fitting and evaluating logistic regression models with `lrm`

- The framingham example
 - Outcome: `chd10` = Developed coronary heart disease in next 10 years?
 - Creating “complete case” data: `fram_cc`
 - Single Imputation of Missing Values: `fram_sh`
- Use `lrm` to predict `chd10` using `glucose`, `smoker`, `sbp` and `educ`
 - on the complete cases (`fram_cc`)
 - accounting for missingness via single imputation (`fram_sh`)
 - accounting for missingness via multiple imputation
- Consider adding non-linear terms, refit and re-evaluate

Setup

```
library(magrittr); library(janitor)
library(here); library(knitr)
library(naniar); library(simputation)
library(ROCR)           # one way to draw ROC curves
library(rms)
library(tidyverse)

theme_set(theme_bw())
```

Today's Data

```
fram_raw <- read_csv(here("data/framingham.csv")) %>%
  clean_names()
```

See <https://www.framinghamheartstudy.org/> for more details. This particular data set has been used by lots of people, in varied settings, with variations all over the net. I don't know who the originators were.

Managing the Framingham Data

Data Cleanup

```
fram <- fram_raw %>%
  mutate(educ =
    fct_recode(factor(education),
      "Some HS" = "1",
      "HS grad" = "2",
      "Some Coll" = "3",
      "Coll grad" = "4")) %>%
  rename(smoker = "current_smoker",
    cigs = "cigs_per_day",
    stroke = "prevalent_stroke",
    highbp = "prevalent_hyp",
    chol = "tot_chol",
    sbp = "sys_bp", dbp = "dia_bp",
    hrate = "heart_rate",
    chd10 = "ten_year_chd") %>%
  select(subj_id, chd10, educ, glucose, sbp, smoker,
    everything()) %>% select(-education)
```

Data Descriptions (Main Variables Today)

The variables describe $n = 4238$ adults examined at baseline, then followed for 10 years to see if they developed incident coronary heart disease.

The main variables we'll use today in developing outcome models are:

Variable	Description
<code>subj_id</code>	identifying code added by Dr. Love
<code>chd10</code>	1 = coronary heart disease in next 10 years
<code>educ</code>	four-level factor: educational attainment
<code>glucose</code>	blood glucose level in mg/dl
<code>sbp</code>	systolic blood pressure (mm Hg)
<code>smoker</code>	1 = current smoker at time of examination, else 0

Data Descriptions (Other 11 variables)

Here are the other 11 variables in the fram data.

Variable	Description
male	1 = subject is male, else 0
age	in years (range is 32 to 70)
cigs	number of cigarettes smoked per day
bp_meds	1 = using anti-hypertensive medication at time of exam
stroke	1 = history of stroke, else 0
highbp	1 = under treatment for hypertension, else 0
diabetes	1 = history of diabetes, else 0
chol	total cholesterol (mg/dl)
dbp	diastolic blood pressure (mm Hg)
bmi	body mass index in kg/m^2
hrate	heart rate in beats per minute

Missing Data?

Our outcome chd10 has no missing values.

```
fram %>% tabyl(chd10) %>% adorn_pct_formatting(digits = 1)
```

chd10	n	percent
0	3594	84.8%
1	644	15.2%

- 3656 (86.3%) of the 4238 subjects in the fram data are complete.
- The remaining 582 observations have something missing.

```
n_case_complete(fram); pct_complete_case(fram)
```


```
[1] 3656
```

```
[1] 86.26711
```


Which variables are missing data?

```
gg_miss_var(fram)
```

Warning: It is deprecated to specify ``guide = FALSE`` to remove a guide. Please use ``guide = "none"`` instead.



Counts of Missing Data, by Variable

```
miss_var_summary(fram) %>%  
  filter(n_miss > 0)
```

```
# A tibble: 7 x 3  
  variable n_miss pct_miss  
  <chr>     <int>     <dbl>  
1 glucose    388     9.16  
2 educ       105     2.48  
3 bp_meds     53     1.25  
4 chol        50     1.18  
5 cigs        29     0.684  
6 bmi         19     0.448  
7 hrate        1     0.0236
```

Single Imputation

We will impute:

- 5 quantitative variables (glucose, bmi, cigs, chol and hrate)
- 1 binary variable (bp_meds), and
- 1 multi-categorical variable (educ)

```
fram_sh <- bind_shadow(fram)
```

```
fram_sh <- fram_sh %>%  
  data.frame() %>%  
  impute_pmm(., bp_meds ~ highbp + sbp + dbp) %>%  
  impute_cart(., educ ~ age + smoker + male) %>%  
  impute_pmm(., cigs ~ smoker) %>%  
  impute_rylm(., glucose + chol + hrate + bmi ~  
    sbp + diabetes + age + highbp + stroke) %>%  
  tibble()
```

Check multi-categorical single imputation?

```
fram_sh %>% count(educ_NA, educ)
```

```
# A tibble: 6 x 3
```

	educ_NA	educ	n
	<fct>	<fct>	<int>
1	!NA	Some HS	1720
2	!NA	HS grad	1253
3	!NA	Some Coll	687
4	!NA	Coll grad	473
5	NA	Some HS	80
6	NA	HS grad	25

Do the values seem reasonable?

Data Sets for the rest of our work

```
fram_start <- fram %>%  
  select(subj_id, chd10, glucose, smoker, sbp, educ)  
  
fram_cc <- fram_start %>%  
  drop_na()  
  
fram_sh <- fram_sh %>%  
  select(subj_id, chd10, glucose, smoker, sbp, educ,  
         glucose_NA, educ_NA)
```

- `fram_start` includes all 4238 rows and the 6 columns we'll use, including 388 rows missing glucose and 105 missing educ.
- `fram_cc` includes only the 3753 complete rows on the 6 columns.
- `fram_sh` uses single imputation to get 4238 complete rows, on 8 columns, including the useful missingness indicators.

Modeling Plan

Use `lrm` to fit a four-predictor logistic regression model to predict `chd10` using `glucose`, `smoker`, `sbp` and `educ`

- 1 Using the complete cases (`fram_cc`)
- 2 Accounting for missingness via single imputation (`fram_sh`)
- 3 Accounting for missingness via multiple imputation

Then, we'll consider adding several non-linear terms to the “four-predictor” models, and refit.

Fitting a Four-Predictor Model using Complete Cases

A “Four Predictor” model

First, we'll use the `fram_cc` data to perform a complete-case analysis and fix ideas.

```
d <- datadist(fram_cc)
options(datadist = "d")

mod_cc <- lrm(chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,
              data = fram_cc, x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```


Main Output for mod_cc

mod_cc

Logistic Regression Model

```
lrm(formula = chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ, data = fram_cc,  
     x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

		Model Likelihood	Discrimination	Rank Discrim.
		Ratio Test	Indexes	Indexes
Obs	3753	LR chi2	R2	C
0	3174	d.f.	g	Dxy
1	579	Pr(> chi2)	gr	gamma
max deriv	2e-11		gp	tau-a
			Brier	

	Coef	S.E.	Wald Z	Pr(> Z)
Intercept	-5.5622	0.3217	-17.29	<0.0001
glucose	0.0081	0.0016	4.93	<0.0001
smoker	0.3126	0.0955	3.27	0.0011
sbp	0.0237	0.0020	12.05	<0.0001
educ=HS grad	-0.4674	0.1157	-4.04	<0.0001
educ=Some Coll	-0.3924	0.1423	-2.76	0.0058
educ=Coll grad	-0.1356	0.1549	-0.88	0.3815

- We'll walk through these summaries in the next few slides.
- Notes Section 12.14 provides additional details.

Deconstructing the `mod_cc` summaries (1/5)

```
Obs      3753
0        3174
1         579
max |deriv| 2e-11
```

- `Obs` = The number of observations used to fit the model, with 0 = the number of zeros and 1 = the number of ones in our outcome, `chd10`.
- Also specified is the maximum absolute value of the derivative at the point where the maximum likelihood function was estimated.

All you're likely to care about is whether the iterative function-fitting process converged, and R will warn you in other ways if it doesn't.

Deconstructing the mod_cc summaries (2/5)

```
Model Likelihood  
Ratio Test  
LR chi2      223.29  
d.f.         6  
Pr(> chi2) <0.0001
```

- This is a global likelihood ratio test (drop in deviance test.)
- Likelihood Ratio χ^2 statistic = null deviance - residual deviance
 - d.f. = null degrees of freedom - residual degrees of freedom
- $\text{Pr}(> \chi^2)$ is a p value obtained from comparison to a χ^2 distribution with appropriate d.f.

It's not saying much to suggest that some part of this logistic regression model has some detectable predictive value.

- The null hypothesis here (that the model has no predictive value at all) is rarely interesting in practical work.


Deconstructing the mod_cc summaries (3/4)

	Coef	S.E.	Wald Z	Pr(> Z)
Intercept	-5.5622	0.3217	-17.29	<0.0001
glucose	0.0081	0.0016	4.93	<0.0001
smoker	0.3126	0.0955	3.27	0.0011
sbp	0.0237	0.0020	12.05	<0.0001
educ=HS grad	-0.4674	0.1157	-4.04	<0.0001
educ=Some coll	-0.3924	0.1423	-2.76	0.0058
educ=Coll grad	-0.1356	0.1549	-0.88	0.3815

- How does each predictor appear to relate to 10-year risk?
 - Which is the baseline educ category?
 - Remember that these estimates are on the logit scale.
 - See the effect size discussion linked in today's README.

Plot of Effects using mod_cc

```
plot(summary(mod_cc))
```




Effect Size Summary for mod_cc

```
summary(mod_cc)
```

Effects		Response : chd10						
Factor	Low	High	Diff.	Effect	S.E.	Lower 0.95	Upper 0.95	
glucose	71	87	16	0.12912	0.026171	0.077828	0.18041	
Odds Ratio	71	87	16	1.13780	NA	1.080900	1.19770	
smoker	0	1	1	0.31259	0.095453	0.125510	0.49968	
Odds Ratio	0	1	1	1.36700	NA	1.133700	1.64820	
sbp	117	144	27	0.63907	0.053053	0.535080	0.74305	
Odds Ratio	117	144	27	1.89470	NA	1.707600	2.10230	
educ - HS grad:Some HS	1	2	NA	-0.46740	0.115720	-0.694220	-0.24059	
Odds Ratio	1	2	NA	0.62663	NA	0.499470	0.78616	
educ - Some Coll:Some HS	1	3	NA	-0.39238	0.142310	-0.671310	-0.11346	
Odds Ratio	1	3	NA	0.67544	NA	0.511040	0.89274	
educ - Coll grad:Some HS	1	4	NA	-0.13556	0.154910	-0.439180	0.16806	
Odds Ratio	1	4	NA	0.87323	NA	0.644570	1.18300	

Predict results for mod_cc

```
ggplot(Predict(mod_cc, fun = plogis))
```



Deconstructing the mod_cc summaries (4/4)

Discrimination		Rank Discrim.	
	Indexes		Indexes
R2	0.100	C	0.682
g	0.689	Dxy	0.363
gr	1.992	gamma	0.364
gp	0.092	tau-a	0.095
Brier	0.122		

The key indexes for our purposes are:

- Nagelkerke R^2 , symbolized R2 here.
- The Brier score, symbolized Brier.
- The area under the ROC curve, or C statistic, shown as C.
- Somers' d statistic, symbolized Dxy here.

Let's walk through each of those, in turn.

Key Indexes (Nagelkerke R^2)

- In our model, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.100$

There are at least three ways to think about R^2 in linear regression, but when you move to a categorical outcome, not all of those ways can be expressed in the same statistic. See our Course Notes Section 10 for details.

The Nagelkerke R^2 :

- reaches 1 if the fitted model shows as much improvement as possible over the null model (which just predicts the mean response on the 0-1 scale for all subjects).
- is 0 for the null model
- is larger (closer to 1) as the fitted model improves, although it's been criticized for being misleadingly high,
- AND a value of 0.100 no longer means 10% of anything.

A value of 0.100 indicates a model of pretty poor quality.

An Alternative: McFadden's R^2

Consider the McFadden R-square, which can be defined as 1 minus the ratio of (the model deviance over the deviance for the intercept-only model.)

To obtain this for our `mod_cc` run with `lrm`, we can use:

```
1 - (mod_cc$deviance[2] / mod_cc$deviance[1])
```

```
[1] 0.069174
```

This McFadden R^2 corresponds well to the proportionate reduction in error interpretation of an R^2 , but some people don't like it as well.

Key Indexes (Brier Score = 0.122)

- The lower the Brier score, the better the predictions are calibrated.
- The maximum (worst) score is 1, the best is 0.

From Wikipedia: Suppose you're forecasting the probability P that it will rain on a given day.

- If the forecast is $P = 1$ (100%) and it rains, the Brier Score is 0.
- If the forecast is $P = 1$ (100%) and it doesn't rain, the Brier Score is 1.
- If the forecast is $P = 0.7$ and it rains, $\text{Brier} = (0.70 - 1)^2 = 0.09$.
- If the forecast is $P = 0.3$ and it rains, $\text{Brier} = (0.30 - 1)^2 = 0.49$.
- If the forecast is $P = 0.5$, the Brier score is $(0.50 - 1)^2 = 0.25$ regardless of whether it rains.

The Brier score can also be decomposed to assess calibration and discrimination separately.

Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve Analysis

One way to assess the predictive accuracy within the model development sample in a logistic regression is to consider analyses based on the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. ROC curves are commonly used in assessing diagnoses in medical settings, and in signal detection applications.

The accuracy of a test can be evaluated by considering two types of errors: false positives and false negatives.

See Section 12.9 of our Course Notes for more details.

The C statistic (area under ROC curve) = 0.682

The C statistic and Somers' d (D_{xy}) are connected:

$$C = 0.5 + \frac{d}{2}, d = 2(C - .5)$$


The C statistic ranges from 0 to 1.

- $C = 0.5$ describes a prediction that is exactly as good as random guessing
- $C = 1$ indicates a perfect prediction model, one that guesses “yes” for all patients with $\text{chd10} = 1$ and which guesses “no” for all patients with $\text{chd10} = 0$.
- Most of the time, the closer to 1, the happier we are:
 - $C \geq 0.8$ usually indicates a moderately strong model (good discrimination)
 - $C \geq 0.9$ indicates a very strong model (excellent discrimination)

So 0.682 isn't good.

ROC Curve for our mod_cc

mod_cc: ROC Curve w/ AUC=0.682



Code for Previous Slide


```
## requires ROCR package
prob <- predict(mod_cc, type="fitted")
pred <- prediction(prob, fram_cc$chd10)
perf <- performance(pred, measure = "tpr", x.measure = "fpr")
auc <- performance(pred, measure="auc")

auc <- round(auc@y.values[[1]],3)
roc.data <- data.frame(fpr=unlist(perf@x.values),
                      tpr=unlist(perf@y.values),
                      model="GLM")

ggplot(roc.data, aes(x=fpr, ymin=0, ymax=tpr)) +
  geom_ribbon(alpha=0.2, fill = "blue") +
  geom_line(aes(y=tpr), col = "blue") +
  geom_abline(intercept = 0, slope = 1, lty = "dashed") +
  labs(title = paste0("Model A: ROC Curve w/ AUC=", auc))
```

ROC Curve for a Simple Model (glucose only)

glucose only Model: ROC Curve w/ AUC=0.542



Validate Summary Statistics for mod_cc

- Usual approach (as in `ols`) to correcting for over-optimism through bootstrap validation, now using 50 bootstrap resamples instead of 40.

```
set.seed(432)
validate(mod_cc, B = 50)
```

	index.orig	training	test	optimism	index.corrected	n
Dxy	0.3634	0.3655	0.3583	0.0072	0.3562	50
R2	0.1001	0.1007	0.0977	0.0029	0.0972	50
Intercept	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0196	0.0196	-0.0196	50
Slope	1.0000	1.0000	0.9873	0.0127	0.9873	50
Emax	0.0000	0.0000	0.0064	0.0064	0.0064	50
D	0.0592	0.0596	0.0578	0.0018	0.0574	50
U	-0.0005	-0.0005	0.0000	-0.0006	0.0000	50
Q	0.0598	0.0601	0.0577	0.0024	0.0574	50
B	0.1216	0.1215	0.1219	-0.0004	0.1220	50
g	0.6892	0.6933	0.6829	0.0105	0.6787	50
gp	0.0917	0.0918	0.0907	0.0011	0.0906	50

- Summaries we'll focus on here are Dxy, R2 and B
- Remember that $C = 0.5 + \frac{D_{xy}}{2}$, so our validated C statistic would be $0.5 + (0.3562/2) = 0.6781$

ANOVA for mod_cc

Model mod_cc uses 6 degrees of freedom.

```
anova(mod_cc)
```


Wald Statistics

Response: chd10

Factor	Chi-Square	d.f.	P
glucose	24.34	1	<.0001
smoker	10.72	1	0.0011
sbp	145.10	1	<.0001
educ	19.45	3	0.0002
TOTAL	208.87	6	<.0001


ANOVA for Model `mod_cc`

```
plot(anova(mod_cc))
```



Nomogram for mod_cc

```
plot(nomogram(mod_cc, fun = plogis,  
             funlabel = "Pr(CHD)"))
```



Using the Singly Imputed Data to fit the 4-predictor Model

Fit mod_si which is mod_cc after single imputation

```
d <- datadist(fram_sh)
options(datadist = "d")

mod_si <- lrm(chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,
              data = fram_sh, x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

Model mod_si with single imputation

mod_si

Logistic Regression Model

```
lrm(formula = chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ, data = fram_sh,  
     x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

		Model Likelihood	Discrimination	Rank Discrim.
		Ratio Test	Indexes	Indexes
Obs	4238	LR chi2 238.36	R2 0.095	C 0.677
0	3594	d.f. 6	g 0.673	Dxy 0.354
1	644	Pr(> chi2) <0.0001	gr 1.961	gamma 0.354
max deriv	4e-12		gp 0.089	tau-a 0.091
			Brier 0.121	

	Coef	S.E.	Wald Z	Pr(> Z)
Intercept	-5.5649	0.3068	-18.14	<0.0001
glucose	0.0086	0.0016	5.32	<0.0001
smoker	0.3205	0.0901	3.56	0.0004
sbp	0.0231	0.0019	12.40	<0.0001
educ=HS grad	-0.4707	0.1098	-4.29	<0.0001
educ=Some Coll	-0.3055	0.1336	-2.29	0.0222
educ=Coll grad	-0.0816	0.1470	-0.56	0.5787

Comparing the Coefficients (exponentiated)

- Comparing the slopes as odds ratios

```
round_half_up(exp(mod_cc$coefficients),3)
```

Intercept	glucose	smoker	sbp
0.004	1.008	1.367	1.024
educ=HS grad	educ=Some Coll	educ=Coll grad	
0.627	0.675	0.873	

```
round_half_up(exp(mod_si$coefficients),3)
```

Intercept	glucose	smoker	sbp
0.004	1.009	1.378	1.023
educ=HS grad	educ=Some Coll	educ=Coll grad	
0.625	0.737	0.922	

Edited Summaries Comparing The Models

Summary	mod_si value	mod_cc value
Obs	4238	3753
0	3594	3174
1	644	579
Nagelkerke R^2	0.095	0.100
Brier Score	0.121	0.122
C	0.677	0.682
Dxy	0.354	0.363

- All of these results came from

```
mod_cc  
mod_si
```

Validate mod_si Summary Statistics


```
set.seed(432)
validate(mod_si, B = 50)
```

	index.orig	training	test	optimism	index.corrected	n
Dxy	0.3538	0.3555	0.3496	0.0058	0.3480	50
R2	0.0954	0.0966	0.0933	0.0033	0.0921	50
Intercept	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0256	0.0256	-0.0256	50
Slope	1.0000	1.0000	0.9860	0.0140	0.9860	50
E _{max}	0.0000	0.0000	0.0079	0.0079	0.0079	50
D	0.0560	0.0568	0.0548	0.0021	0.0539	50
U	-0.0005	-0.0005	0.0000	-0.0005	0.0000	50
Q	0.0565	0.0573	0.0548	0.0026	0.0539	50
B	0.1206	0.1207	0.1208	-0.0001	0.1207	50

- Again, $C = 0.5 + \frac{D_{xy}}{2}$, so the corrected C statistic estimate will be $0.5 + (0.348/2) = 0.674$


Plot of Effects using mod_si

```
plot(summary(mod_si))
```




Predict results for mod_si

```
ggplot(Predict(mod_si, fun = plogis))
```



Nomogram for mod_si

```
plot(nomogram(mod_si, fun = plogis,  
             fun.at = c(0.05, seq(0.1, 0.9, by = 0.1), 0.95),  
             funlabel = "Pr(CHD)"))
```



Using Multiple Imputation: The 4-predictor Model

Fit the Imputation Model first

We'll use `aregImpute` here, and create 30 imputed sets.

```
set.seed(432)
dd <- datadist(fram)
options(datadist = "dd")

fit_imp <-
  aregImpute(~ chd10 + glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,
             nk = c(0, 3:5), tlinear = FALSE, data = fram,
             B = 10, n.impute = 30)
```

Iteration 1 Iteration 2 Iteration 3 Iteration 4 Iteration 5 It

Imputation Results (abbreviated output)

```
fit_imp
```

```
Multiple Imputation using Bootstrap and PMM
```

```
aregImpute(formula = ~chd10 + glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,  
            data = fram, n.impute = 30, nk = c(0, 3:5), tlinear = FALSE,  
            B = 10)
```

```
n: 4238          p: 5    Imputations: 30          nk: 0
```



```
Number of NAs:
```

chd10	glucose	smoker	sbp	educ
0	388	0	0	105

```
R-squares for Predicting Non-Missing Values for Each Variable  
Using Last Imputations of Predictors
```

glucose	educ
0.046	0.024

Multiply Imputed Values, via `plot(fit_imp)`



What do we need to do our multiple imputation?

- Imputation Model

```
fit_imp <-  
  aregImpute(~ chd10 + glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,  
             nk = c(0, 3:5), tlinear = FALSE, data = fram,  
             B = 10, n.impute = 30)
```

- Outcome Model will be of the following form...

```
lrm(chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,  
    x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

Fitting mod_mi (mod_cc with multiple imputation)

```
mod_mi <-  
  fit.mult.impute(chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,  
                  fitter = lrm, xtrans = fit_imp,  
                  data = fram_start, x = TRUE, y = TRUE,  
                  pr = FALSE)
```

- data = fram_start (which includes NA values)
- xtrans = fit_imp (results from multiple imputation)
- fitter = lrm (we could actually use glm too)
- pr = FALSE avoids a long printout we don't need

Model mod_mi with multiple imputation

mod_mi

Logistic Regression Model

```
fit.mult.impute(formula = chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,  
  fitter = lrm, xtrans = fit_imp, data = fram_start, pr = FALSE,  
  x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

		Model Likelihood Ratio Test	Discrimination Indexes	Rank Discrim. Indexes
Obs	4238	LR chi2 237.84	R2 0.095	C 0.677
0	3594	d.f. 6	g 0.670	Dxy 0.354
1	644	Pr(> chi2) <0.0001	gr 1.955	gamma 0.354
max deriv	2e-11		gp 0.088	tau-a 0.091
			Brier 0.121	

	Coef	S.E.	Wald Z	Pr(> Z)
Intercept	-5.5542	0.3083	-18.02	<0.0001
glucose	0.0083	0.0016	5.12	<0.0001
smoker	0.3188	0.0902	3.54	0.0004
sbp	0.0232	0.0019	12.40	<0.0001
educ=HS grad	-0.4551	0.1120	-4.06	<0.0001
educ=Some Coll	-0.3002	0.1340	-2.24	0.0251
educ=Coll grad	-0.0845	0.1478	-0.57	0.5674

Comparing the Coefficients (exponentiated)

- I'll just compare the two models using imputation...

```
round_half_up(exp(mod_mi$coefficients),3)
```


Intercept	glucose	smoker	sbp
0.004	1.008	1.376	1.023
educ=HS grad	educ=Some Coll	educ=Coll grad	
0.634	0.741	0.919	

```
round_half_up(exp(mod_si$coefficients),3)
```

Intercept	glucose	smoker	sbp
0.004	1.009	1.378	1.023
educ=HS grad	educ=Some Coll	educ=Coll grad	
0.625	0.737	0.922	

Plot of Effects using mod_mi

```
plot(summary(mod_mi))
```



Edited Summaries Comparing Our 3 Models

Summary	mod_mi value	mod_si value	mod_cc value
Obs	4238	4238	3753
0	3594	3594	3174
1	644	644	579
Nagelkerke R^2	0.095	0.095	0.100
Brier Score	0.121	0.121	0.122
C	0.677	0.677	0.682
Dxy	0.354	0.354	0.363

- It's just a coincidence that the mod_mi and mod_si values are identical to the level of precision provided in this table.
- What might cause the values to look meaningfully different?

Validate mod_mi Summary Statistics


```
set.seed(432)
validate(mod_mi, B = 50)
```

	index.orig	training	test	optimism	index.corrected	n
Dxy	0.3535	0.3551	0.3493	0.0058	0.3477	50
R2	0.0952	0.0958	0.0925	0.0033	0.0919	50
Intercept	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0259	0.0259	-0.0259	50
Slope	1.0000	1.0000	0.9858	0.0142	0.9858	50
Emax	0.0000	0.0000	0.0080	0.0080	0.0080	50
D	0.0559	0.0564	0.0543	0.0021	0.0538	50
U	-0.0005	-0.0005	0.0000	-0.0005	0.0000	50
Q	0.0564	0.0569	0.0543	0.0026	0.0538	50
B	0.1207	0.1208	0.1209	-0.0001	0.1208	50

- Optimism-corrected C statistic estimate is $0.5 + (0.3477/2) = 0.674$


Predict results for mod_mi

```
ggplot(Predict(mod_mi, fun = plogis))
```



Nomogram for mod_mi


```
plot(nomogram(mod_mi, fun = plogis,  
             funlabel = "Pr(CHD)"))
```



Considering Non-Linear Terms

Spearman ρ^2 Plot

```
plot(spearman2(chd10 ~ glucose + smoker + sbp + educ,  
              data = fram_sh))
```



Adding some non-linear terms

- We'll add a restricted cubic spline with 5 knots in `sbp`
- and an interaction between the `educ` factor and the linear effect of `sbp`,
- and a quadratic polynomial in `glucose`

to our main effects model, just to show how to do them...

- I'll just show the results including the multiple imputation, since if you can get those, you should have little difficulty instead applying the single imputation or the complete case analysis.

mod_big incorporating multiple imputation

Our mod_big will incorporate several non-linear terms.

```
mod_big <-  
  fit.mult.impute(  
    chd10 ~ rcs(sbp, 5) + pol(glucose, 2) +  
      smoker + educ + educ %ia% sbp,  
    fitter = lrm, xtrans = fit_imp,  
    data = fram_start, x = TRUE, y = TRUE,  
    pr = FALSE)
```

The mod_big model with non-linear terms

Logistic Regression Model

```
fit.mult.impute(formula = chd10 ~ rcs(sbp, 5) + pol(glucose,
  2) + smoker + educ + educ %ia% sbp, fitter = lrm, xtrans = fit_imp,
  data = fram_start, pr = FALSE, x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

		Model Likelihood Ratio Test	Discrimination Indexes	Rank Discrim. Indexes
Obs	4238	LR chi2 245.28	R2 0.098	C 0.679
0	3594	d.f. 13	g 0.710	Dxy 0.357
1	644	Pr(> chi2) <0.0001	gr 2.034	gamma 0.357
max deriv	0.02		gp 0.092	tau-a 0.092
			Brier 0.120	


	Coef	S.E.	Wald Z	Pr(> Z)
Intercept	-3.2646	2.1123	-1.55	0.1222
sbp	0.0034	0.0190	0.18	0.8565
sbp'	0.1756	0.1837	0.96	0.3390
sbp''	-0.5056	0.6402	-0.79	0.4296
sbp'''	0.3651	0.6492	0.56	0.5738
glucose	0.0061	0.0054	1.12	0.2612
glucose^2	0.0000	0.0000	0.45	0.6495
smoker	0.3218	0.0903	3.56	0.0004
educ=HS grad	-0.4033	0.6438	-0.63	0.5310
educ=Some Coll	-1.4405	0.8055	-1.79	0.0737
educ=Coll grad	-1.1027	0.9379	-1.18	0.2397
educ=HS grad * sbp	-0.0004	0.0045	-0.09	0.9246
educ=Some Coll * sbp	0.0083	0.0057	1.44	0.1485
educ=Coll grad * sbp	0.0075	0.0068	1.10	0.2697

mod_big vs. mod_mi comparison

Summary	mod_big	mod_mi
Obs	4238	4238
0	3594	3594
1	644	644
Nagelkerke R^2	0.098	0.095
Brier Score	0.120	0.121
C	0.679	0.677
Dxy	0.357	0.354

ROC Curve for mod_big

Big Model: ROC Curve w/ AUC=0.68




What does ANOVA suggest about the fit?

```
anova(mod_big)
```

Wald Statistics		Response: chd10		
Factor		Chi-Square	d.f.	P
sbp (Factor+Higher Order Factors)		160.07	7	<.0001
All Interactions		3.24	3	0.3557
Nonlinear		3.03	3	0.3869
glucose		25.92	2	<.0001
Nonlinear		0.21	1	0.6495
smoker		12.71	1	0.0004
educ (Factor+Higher Order Factors)		21.68	6	0.0014
All Interactions		3.24	3	0.3557
educ * sbp (Factor+Higher Order Factors)		3.24	3	0.3557
TOTAL NONLINEAR		3.18	4	0.5280
TOTAL NONLINEAR + INTERACTION		7.14	7	0.4145
TOTAL		222.84	13	<.0001

`plot(anova(mod_big))` (model includes 13 df)



Validate mod_big Summary Statistics


```
set.seed(432)
validate(mod_big, B = 50)
```

	index.orig	training	test	optimism	index.corrected	n
Dxy	0.3577	0.3650	0.3507	0.0143	0.3434	50
R2	0.0980	0.1022	0.0922	0.0100	0.0880	50
Intercept	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0911	0.0911	-0.0911	50
Slope	1.0000	1.0000	0.9456	0.0544	0.9456	50
Emax	0.0000	0.0000	0.0296	0.0296	0.0296	50
D	0.0576	0.0603	0.0541	0.0062	0.0515	50
U	-0.0005	-0.0005	0.0003	-0.0007	0.0003	50
Q	0.0581	0.0607	0.0538	0.0069	0.0512	50
B	0.1204	0.1202	0.1209	-0.0007	0.1211	50

- Optimism-Corrected $C = 0.5 + (.3434/2) = .672$

Plot of Effects using mod_big





```
plot(summary(mod_big))
```



Adjusted to: sbp=128 educ=Some HS


Predict results for mod_big

```
ggplot(Predict(mod_big, fun = plogis))
```



Nomogram for mod_big

```
plot(nomogram(mod_big, fun = plogis, funlabel = "Pr(CHD)"))
```



What's Next?

- Using the `tidymodels` framework to fit linear and logistic regression models