

Estimating and Interpreting Effect Sizes: A Note for 432

Thomas E. Love

Revised: 2021-03-11

A Sample Data Set

Consider the `small.csv` data available on our site, which is modeled on the public Framingham data set available from BIOLINCC¹. From the BIOLINCC documentation:

The Framingham Heart Study is a long term prospective study of the etiology of cardiovascular disease among a population of free living subjects in the community of Framingham, Massachusetts. The Framingham Heart Study was a landmark study in epidemiology in that it was the first prospective study of cardiovascular disease and identified the concept of risk factors and their joint effects.

¹ The Framingham data from this source are not appropriate for publication or project use because they have been anonymized by permuting the results of individual subjects.

Available Variables

```
smalldat <- read_csv(here("data/small.csv"))
```

The `smalldat` data contains 150 observations on the following variables²:

Variable	Description
<i>subject</i>	Subject identification code
<i>smoker</i>	1 = current smoker, 0 = not current smoker
<i>totchol</i>	total cholesterol, in mg/dl
<i>age</i>	age in years
<i>sex</i>	subject's sex (M or F)
<i>educ</i>	subject's educational attainment (4 levels)

² The *educ* levels are: 1_Low, 2_Middle, 3_High and 4_VHigh, which stands for Very High




Figure 1: Histogram of totchol values

Effect Interpretation in A Linear Regression Model

```
m1 <- lm(totchol ~ age + sex + factor(educ),  
         data = smalldat)
```

```
kable(tidy(m1, conf.int = TRUE), digits = 3)
```

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
(Intercept)	171.197	20.201	8.475	0.000	131.268	211.126
age	1.202	0.367	3.270	0.001	0.475	1.928

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
sexM	3.612	6.441	0.561	0.576	-9.119	16.343
factor(educ)2_Middle	11.044	7.702	1.434	0.154	-4.180	26.268
factor(educ)3_High	-2.459	9.390	-0.262	0.794	-21.019	16.101
factor(educ)4_VHigh	10.927	9.780	1.117	0.266	-8.405	30.258

1. What is the effect of *age* on *totchol* in Model m1?

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
age	1.202	0.367	3.27	0.001	0.475	1.928

The coefficient of the *age* effect on *totchol* is 1.202. Suppose we have two subjects, Doris and Emily, who are the same sex and have the same level of education, but Doris is one year older than Emily. Our model predicts that Doris' total cholesterol will be 1.202 mg/dl higher than Emily's.

The 95% confidence interval for this estimated *age* coefficient is (0.475, 1.928), so holding everything else constant, it seems that older *age* is associated with higher *totchol* in this model.

2. What is the effect of *sex* on *totchol* in Model m1?

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
sexM	3.612	6.441	0.561	0.576	-9.119	16.343

The model is parametrized to incorporate the *sex* information with an indicator (and factor) variable called *sexM* which is interpreted as taking the value 1 when *sex* = M, and 0 otherwise. The coefficient of the *sexM* effect on *totchol* is 3.612. Suppose we have two subjects, David and Emily, who are the same age, have the same level of education, but David is male and Emily is female. Our model predicts that David's total cholesterol will be 3.612 mg/dl higher than Emily's.

The 95% confidence interval for this estimated *sexM* coefficient is (-9.119, 16.343), which suggests that the effect of *sex* on *totchol* could be quite small, and that the data are consistent with a wide range of estimates for the *sexM* effect, some of which are negative.

3. What is the effect of *educ* on *totchol* in Model m1?

The *educ* variable splits the subjects into four categories. In this model the "1_Low" category is used as the baseline, and we have

estimates for “2_Middle” (as compared to “1_Low”), for “3_High” (as compared to “1_Low”) and for “4_VHigh” (as compared to “1_Low”).

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
factor(educ)2_Middle	11.044	7.702	1.434	0.154	-4.180	26.268
factor(educ)3_High	-2.459	9.390	-0.262	0.794	-21.019	16.101
factor(educ)4_VHigh	10.927	9.780	1.117	0.266	-8.405	30.258

The coefficient of the *educ* effect comparing the “2_Middle” group to the baseline “1_Low” group on *totchol* is 11.044.

Note that none of the *educ* levels show especially large differences from the baseline group, and each of their 95% confidence intervals contains zero.

- Suppose we have two subjects, Lola and Mina, who are the same age, and the same sex, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Mina is in the “2_Middle” education group.
- Our model predicts that Mina’s total cholesterol will be 11.044 mg/dl higher than Lola’s.

The coefficient of the *educ* effect comparing the “3_High” group to the baseline “1_Low” group on *totchol* is -2.459.

- Suppose we have two subjects, Lola and Heidi, who are the same age, and the same sex, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Heidi is in the “3_High” education group.
- Our model predicts that Heidi’s total cholesterol will be 2.459 mg/dl **lower** than Lola’s.

Finally, the coefficient of the *educ* effect comparing the “4_VHigh” group to the baseline “1_Low” group on *totchol* is 10.927.

- Suppose we have two subjects, Lola and Vera, who are the same age, and the same sex, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Vera is in the “4_VHigh” education group.
- Our model predicts that Vera’s total cholesterol will be 10.927 mg/dl higher than Lola’s.

What if we include a Spline or an Interaction?

Suppose we fit a new model to predict *totchol* using a five-knot spline in *age* and the interaction of sex and educational attainment. How does that change our interpretation of the effect sizes?

None of these coefficients show particularly large effects, and zero is contained in each of the 95% confidence intervals provided in the table summarizing model m2.

```
d <- datadist(smалldat); options(datadist = "d")
```

```
m2 <- ols(totchol ~ rcs(age, 5) + sex*catg(educ),
          data = smалldat, x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```


```
kable(summary(m2), digits = 2)
```

	Low	High	Diff.	Effect	S.E.	Lower 0.95	Upper 0.95	Type
age	42	57	15	9.99	9.40	-8.59	28.57	1
sex - M:F	1	2	NA	9.11	9.87	-10.41	28.64	1
educ - 2_Middle:1_Low	1	2	NA	11.36	9.81	-8.04	30.76	1
educ - 3_High:1_Low	1	3	NA	7.80	12.41	-16.73	32.34	1
educ - 4_VHigh:1_Low	1	4	NA	16.17	14.63	-12.75	45.10	1

The kable approach I used in these notes hides the adjusted values specified at the bottom of the summary table for this ols model, but they are Adjusted to: sex=F educ=1_Low.

Now, how do we interpret these model m2 results?

- The **age** interpretation is that if we have two subjects, Al and Bob, who are the same sex and have the same education level, but Al is age 42 and Bob is age 57, then model m2 projects that Bob's *totchol* will be 9.993 mg/dl higher than will Al's.
- Because of the interaction between *sex* and *educ* in our model m2, we must select an *educ* level in order to cleanly interpret the effect of *sex* on *totchol*. The **sex - M:F** interpretation compares M(ale) to F(emale) *sex* while requiring³ that *educ* = 1_Low. The result is that if we have two subjects, Carl and Diane, who are the same age and *each is in the low education group*, but Carl is Male and Diane is Female, then model m2 predicts that Carl's *totchol* will be 9.115 mg/dl higher than will Diane's.
- Because of the interaction between *sex* and *educ* in our model m2, we must select a *sex* in order to cleanly interpret the effect of *educ* on *totchol*. The **educ - 2_Middle:1_Low** term, for instance, compares "2_Middle" education to "1_Low" education while requiring that *sex* is Female⁴. The result is that if we have two subjects, Lola and Mina, who are the same age and *each is Female*, but Lola is in the "1_Low" education group and Mina is in the "2_Middle" education group, then model m2 predicts that Mina's *totchol* will be 11.363 mg/dl higher than will Lola's.




Adjusted to: sex=F educ=1_Low

Figure 2: Summary plot of model m2

³ We know this because of the Adjusted to: sex = F, educ=1_Low note at the bottom of the summary output for the ols model.

⁴ Again, we know this because of the Adjusted to: sex = F, educ=1_Low note.

Here is a nomogram of model m2.



Effect Estimates in A Logistic Regression fit with *glm*

In a binary **logistic** model, where we predict the log odds of smoking (*smoker* = 1), we will exponentiate so as to interpret the odds ratio estimates associated with each coefficient.

```
m3 <- glm(smoker ~ age + sex + factor(educ),
           data = smalldat, family = binomial)

kable(tidy(m3, exponentiate = TRUE, conf.int = TRUE),
       digits = 3)
```

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
(Intercept)	19.054	1.152	2.557	0.011	2.082	195.209
age	0.943	0.021	-2.782	0.005	0.903	0.982
sexM	1.795	0.356	1.643	0.100	0.897	3.637
factor(educ)2_Middle	0.690	0.428	-0.866	0.386	0.295	1.589
factor(educ)3_High	0.725	0.519	-0.619	0.536	0.258	2.005

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
factor(educ)4_VHigh	0.339	0.571	-1.895	0.058	0.105	1.008

1. What is the effect of *age* on the odds of being a *smoker* in Model m3?

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
age	0.943	0.021	-2.782	0.005	0.903	0.982

The estimated odds ratio for the *age* effect on *smoker* is 0.943. Suppose we have two subjects, Doris and Emily, who are the same sex and have the same level of education, but Doris is one year older than Emily. Our model predicts that Doris' odds of smoking will be 0.943 times as high as Emily's. Another way to write this would be that Doris' odds of smoking are estimated to be 94.3% of Emily's. Yet another way would be to state that Doris' odds of smoking are estimated to be 5.7% smaller than Emily's odds.

The 95% confidence interval for this estimated odds ratio for the *age* effect on being a *smoker* is (0.903, 0.982). This confidence interval for the odds ratio does not include one, and again we see that holding everything else constant, older *age* is associated with detectably lower odds of being a *smoker* in this model.

2. What is the effect of *sex* on the odds of being a *smoker* in Model m3?

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
sexM	1.795	0.356	1.643	0.1	0.897	3.637

The model incorporates the *sex* information with an indicator (and factor) variable called *sexM* which is interpreted as taking the value 1 when *sex* = M, and 0 otherwise. The estimated odds ratio describing the *sexM* effect on being a *smoker* is 1.795. Suppose we have two subjects, David and Emily, who are the same age, have the same level of education, but David is male and Emily is female. Our model predicts that David's odds of being a *smoker* are 1.795 times the odds that Emily is a *smoker*, or equivalently, that David's odds are 179.5% of Emily's odds. Another equivalent statement would be that David's odds are 79.5% larger than Emily's odds.

The 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio estimate of the effect of *sexM* on being a *smoker* is (0.897, 3.637). The effect of *sex* on

the odds of being a *smoker* appears modest, and 1 is included in the confidence interval.

3. What is the effect of *educ* on the odds of being a *smoker* in Model m3?

Again, the *educ* variable splits the subjects into four categories. In this model the “1_Low” category is used as the baseline, and we have estimates for “2_Middle” (as compared to “1_Low”), for “3_High” (as compared to “1_Low”) and for “4_VHigh” (as compared to “1_Low”).

term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
factor(educ)2_Middle	0.690	0.428	-0.866	0.386	0.295	1.589
factor(educ)3_High	0.725	0.519	-0.619	0.536	0.258	2.005
factor(educ)4_VHigh	0.339	0.571	-1.895	0.058	0.105	1.008

The estimated odds ratio describing the effect of *educ* being “2_Middle” instead of the baseline “1_Low” on the odds of being a *smoker* is 0.69, for people of the same age and sex.

No *educ* levels show meaningful differences from the baseline group, and their 95% confidence intervals all include 1, although the comparison of 4_VHigh to 1_Low only barely includes 1.

- Suppose we have two subjects, Lola and Mina, who are the same age, and the same sex, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Mina is in the “2_Middle” education group.
- Our model predicts that Mina’s odds of being a smoker will be 0.69 times the odds of Lola being a smoker.

The estimated odds ratio comparing the *educ* = “3_High” group to the baseline *educ* = “1_Low” group on *smoker* is 0.725.

- Suppose we have two subjects, Lola and Heidi, who are the same age, and the same sex, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Heidi is in the “3_High” education group.
- Our model predicts that Heidi’s odds of being a *smoker* will be 0.725 times the odds of Lola being a smoker.

Finally, The estimated odds ratio comparing the *educ* = “4_VHigh” group to the baseline *educ* = “1_Low” group on *smoker* is 0.339.

- Suppose we have two subjects, Lola and Vera, who are the same age, and the same sex, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Vera is in the “4_VHigh” education group.
- Our model predicts that Vera’s odds of being a *smoker* will be 0.339 times the odds of Lola being a smoker.

Estimates in The Same Logistic Regression fit with *lrm*

When we fit the same model as *m3* using *lrm*, we get identical results as we get from the *glm* fit for the categorical predictors, but there's a change in how the odds ratio for the quantitative predictor (*age*) is presented.

```
d <- datadist(smалldat); options(datadist = "d")
```

```
m3.lrm <- lrm(smoker ~ age + sex + educ,  
             data = smалldat, x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
```

```
kable(summary(m3.lrm), digits = 3)
```

	Low	High	Diff.	Effect	S.E.	Lower 0.95	Upper 0.95	Type
age	42	57	15	-0.885	0.318	-1.508	-0.261	1
Odds Ratio	42	57	15	0.413	NA	0.221	0.770	2
sex - M:F	1	2	NA	0.585	0.356	-0.113	1.283	1
Odds Ratio	1	2	NA	1.795	NA	0.893	3.607	2
educ - 2_Middle:1_Low	1	2	NA	-0.370	0.428	-1.209	0.468	1
Odds Ratio	1	2	NA	0.690	NA	0.299	1.596	2
educ - 3_High:1_Low	1	3	NA	-0.321	0.519	-1.338	0.696	1
Odds Ratio	1	3	NA	0.725	NA	0.262	2.005	2
educ - 4_VHigh:1_Low	1	4	NA	-1.082	0.571	-2.201	0.037	1
Odds Ratio	1	4	NA	0.339	NA	0.111	1.038	2

Note that the odds ratio effect sizes and confidence intervals are identical to what we saw in the *glm* fit for the *sex* and *educ* variables here, but the *age* result is presented differently.

- The **age** interpretation is that if we have two subjects, Al and Bob, who are the same sex and have the same education level, but Al is age 42 and Bob is age 57, then model *m3* projects that Bob's odds of being a *smoker* will be 0.413 times Al's odds of being a smoker. Bob's odds are 41.3% as large as Al's, equivalently.
- After adjustment for *sex* and *educ*, increasing age appears to be associated with decreasing odds of smoking. Note, too, that the effect of *age* on the odds of being a *smoker* has a confidence interval for the odds ratio entirely below 1.




Figure 3: Summary plot of model *m3.lrm*

Estimates in A New Logistic Regression fit with `lrm`

Now, suppose we fit a new model to predict the log odds of being a *smoker* using a five-knot spline in *age* and the interaction of sex and educational attainment. How does that change our interpretation of the effect sizes?

```
d <- datadist(smалldat); options(datadist = "d")

m4 <- lrm(smoker ~ rcs(age,5) + sex * catg(educ),
          data = smалldat, x = TRUE, y = TRUE)


kable(summary(m4), digits = 3)
```

	Low	High	Diff.	Effect	S.E.	Lower 0.95	Upper 0.95	Type
age	42	57	15	-0.817	0.538	-1.872	0.237	1
Odds Ratio	42	57	15	0.442	NA	0.154	1.268	2
sex - M:F	1	2	NA	1.487	0.583	0.345	2.629	1
Odds Ratio	1	2	NA	4.422	NA	1.412	13.853	2
educ - 2_Middle:1_Low	1	2	NA	0.668	0.546	-0.402	1.739	1
Odds Ratio	1	2	NA	1.951	NA	0.669	5.690	2
educ - 3_High:1_Low	1	3	NA	0.019	0.699	-1.351	1.389	1
Odds Ratio	1	3	NA	1.019	NA	0.259	4.011	2
educ - 4_VHigh:1_Low	1	4	NA	-1.541	1.159	-3.813	0.731	1
Odds Ratio	1	4	NA	0.214	NA	0.022	2.078	2

Again, the kable approach I used in these notes hides the adjusted values specified at the bottom of the summary table for this `lrm` model (model m4), but they are Adjusted to: sex=F educ=1_Low.

Now, how do we interpret these model m4 results?

- The **age** interpretation is that if we have two subjects, Al and Bob, who are the same sex and have the same education level, but Al is age 42 and Bob is age 57, then model m4 projects that Bob's odds of being a smoker will be 0.442 times Al's odds of being a smoker. Equivalently, Bob's odds are 44.2% as large as Al's.
- Because of the interaction between *sex* and *educ* in our model m4, we must select an *educ* level in order to cleanly interpret the effect of *sex* on *smoker*. The **sex - M:F** interpretation compares M(ale) to F(emale) *sex* while requiring⁵ that *educ* = 1_Low. The result is that if we have two subjects, Carl and Diane, who are the same age and *each is in the low education group*, but Carl is Male and Diane is Female, then model m4 predicts that Carl's odds of being a *smoker* will be 4.422 times the odds for Diane.



Adjusted to:sex=F educ=1_Low

Figure 4: Summary plot of model m4

⁵ We know this because of the Adjusted to: sex = F, educ=1_Low note at the bottom of the summary output.

- Because of the interaction between *sex* and *educ* in our model `m4`, we must select a *sex* in order to cleanly interpret the effect of *educ* on *totchol*. The **`educ - 2_Middle:1_Low`** term, for instance, compares “2_Middle” education to “1_Low” education while requiring that *sex* is Female⁶. The result is that if we have two subjects, Lola and Mina, who are the same age and *each is Female*, but Lola is in the “1_Low” education group and Mina is in the “2_Middle” education group, then model `m4` predicts that Mina’s odds of being a *smoker* will be 1.951 times Lola’s odds, or, equivalently, that Mina will have 95.1% higher odds than Lola.

⁶ Adjusted to: *sex* = F, *educ*=1_Low tells us this.

It should be easy to see that one is contained in each of the 95% confidence intervals summarizing model `m4` except for the one for the main effect of *sex*, but we might also consider the impact of the interaction term, as described by the *anova* result for model `m4`.

`anova(m4)`

Wald Statistics		Response: smoker		
Factor		Chi-Square	d.f.	P
age		8.34	4	0.0799
Nonlinear		1.78	3	0.6196
sex (Factor+Higher Order Factors)		12.64	4	0.0132
All Interactions		10.48	3	0.0149
educ (Factor+Higher Order Factors)		12.43	6	0.0531
All Interactions		10.48	3	0.0149
sex * educ (Factor+Higher Order Factors)		10.48	3	0.0149
TOTAL NONLINEAR + INTERACTION		12.60	6	0.0498
TOTAL		21.69	11	0.0269

Finally, here is a nomogram of model m4.

