BDA Project

Arthur Aspelin, Jannica Savander, Christian Segercrantz

12/2021

Contents

1. Introduction **2**

2. Description of the data **3**

3. Description of the models **6**

4. Priors **7**

5. Stan code **7**

Nonhierarchical model 7

Hierarchical model 7

6. Running the Stan model **8**

Nonhierarchical model 8

Hierarchical model 9

7. Convergence diagnostics **10**

8. Posterior predictive checks **14**

9. Model comparison with LOO-CV **14**

10. Predictive performance assesment **24**

11. Sensitivity analysis **24**

12. Discussion **25**

13. Conclusion **25**

14. Self-reflection **25**

References **25**

1. Introduction

The motivation for this project is to estimate the parameters for blood pressure data with the help of Bayesian methods. High blood pressure corresponds with different diseases, such as diabetes and heart diseases. This means that it is essential to predict distribution of blood pressure and its parameters in an accurate way.

Solving the problem, firstly, we want to estimate what type of distribution can describe blood pressure. Then with different Bayesian models estimate the parameters for the distribution. We will also investigate how the parameters differ when dividing the data into different age groups. Higher blood pressure could correspond with higher age.

Main modeling idea is to test with different Bayesian models how to get accurate estimates of the parameters that could describe blood pressure. This answers the research question of whether older and younger people have different models describing their blood pressure, and therefore have different blood pressures.

Figure 1: Damage that can be caused from high blood pressure

2. Description of the data

We used blood pressure data combined with age data from the Diabetes Dataset from Kaggle. According to the data description, the dataset is originally from the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, and one data point corresponds to a female patient of Pima Indian heritage. All patients are at least 21 years old.

The dataset has more columns than we used, for example number of pregnancies, BMI and diabetes classification. We only used the columns BloodPressure, describing the diastolic blood pressure, and Age, describing the age of the patient in years. The diastolic blood pressure is the pressure the heart applies on the walls of the arteries between the beats (Mayo Clinic Staff (2021)). The unit for the diastolic blood pressure is mmHg, and a normal value is usually below 80. Higher values might indicate hypertension, which increases with age in Western countries (Gurven et al. (2012)).

We separated the data in two parts based on age group. Using the cutoff value 30 for age, we got an younger and an older group with 394 and 338 patients respectively. The groups will from here be referred to as "young group" and "old group." The code and the plot for the groups separately can be seen below.

```
data <- data %>%
  filter(BloodPressure > 0) %>%
  select(BloodPressure, Age) %>%
  mutate(AgeGroup = case_when(
  Age <= 30       ~ "Young",
  Age > 30        ~ "Old")
  )
knitr::kable(head(data),
             caption = "The first rows of the dataset, with the additinal 'AgeGroup' column.")
```

Table 1: The first rows of the dataset, with the additinal 'Age-Group' column.

BloodPressure	Age	AgeGroup
72	50	Old
66	31	Old
64	32	Old
66	21	Young
40	33	Old
74	30	Young

Figure 2: A histogram of the complete data set for the blood pressure. A density approximation plot and a mean line is included as well.

```
means <- data %>%
  group_by(AgeGroup) %>%
  summarise(mean = mean(BloodPressure), n = n())

ggplot(data, aes(x=BloodPressure, fill=AgeGroup)) +
  geom_histogram(aes(y=..density..), binwidth = 5, colour="black",position = "identity", alpha = 0.4) +
  geom_vline(data = means, aes(xintercept=mean, color = AgeGroup), linetype="dashed", size=1) +
  geom_density(alpha=.2)
```

Figure 3: Histograms with density approximations and mean lines for both age groups.

3. Description of the models

We used two models, one hierarchical and one nonhierarchical, and ran each model two times (once per age group). Therefore we got four fits: hierarchical for the old group, nonhierarchical for the old group, hierarchical for the young group, and nonhierarchical for the young group. The data looks normally distributed (which is very natural in its biological context), so we base our models on the normal distribution.

The nonhierarchical model can be mathematically summarized as

$y_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \sigma_j)$

$\mu_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{prior}, \sigma_{prior})$

$\sigma_j \sim \text{Inv-}\chi^2(Var_{prior})$.

Using the same notation we get the following hierarchical model:

$y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma)$

$\mu_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \tau)$

$\mu \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{prior}, \sigma_{prior})$

$\tau \sim \text{Inv-}\chi^2(Var_{prior})$

$\sigma \sim \text{Inv-}\chi^2(\tau)$.

4. Priors

We use weekly informative priors for parameters μ, σ and Var. They are chosen based on the blood pressure data that we get from the data set. From the plotted data we choose priors that possibly could describe a normal distribution describing the blood pressure. μ, σ and Var for the distribution of our two different age groups:

- For $Age \leq 30 : \mu_{prior} = 65$, $\sigma_{prior} = 10$, $Var_{prior} = 20$. Our prior μ is slightly lower here than for the older age group. Other priors stay the same.
- For $Age > 30 : \mu_{prior} = 75$, $\sigma_{prior} = 10$, $Var_{prior} = 20$. Here the prior μ is higher, because it can be seen from the plot that the mean is higher, but other priors stay the same.

5. Stan code

Below the Stan code for the two models (nonhierarchical and hierarchical) can be seen.

Nonhierarchical model

```
data {
  int<lower=0> N;                  //Amount of data points
  vector[N] y;                     //Data points
  real mean_mu_prior;              //Expected value of the mean prior
  real<lower=0> mean_sigma_prior;  //variance of the mean prior
  real<lower=0> var_prior;         //Variance of the variance prior
}

parameters {
  real mu;
  real<lower=0> sigma;
}

model {
  //prior
  mu ~ normal(mean_mu_prior, mean_sigma_prior);
  sigma ~ inv_chi_square(var_prior);
 //likelihoods
  y ~ normal(mu, sigma);
}

generated quantities {
  real ypred;
  vector[N] log_lik;
  ypred = normal_rng(mu, sigma);
  for (n in 1:(N)){
    log_lik[n] = normal_lpdf(y[n] | mu, sigma);
  }
}
```

Hierarchical model

```
data {
```

```
  int<lower=0> N;                  //Amount of data points
  vector[N] y;                     //
  real mean_mu_prior;              //
  real<lower=0> mean_sigma_prior;  //
  real<lower=0> var_prior;         //
}

parameters {
  real mu;
  real<lower=0> sigma;
  real mu_hypo;
  real<lower=0> tau;
}

model {
  //hyperpriors
  mu_hypo ~ normal(mean_mu_prior, mean_sigma_prior);
  tau ~ inv_chi_square(var_prior);
  //prior
  mu ~ normal(mu_hypo, tau);
  sigma ~ inv_chi_square(var_prior);
 //likelihoods
  y ~ normal(mu, sigma);
}

generated quantities {
  real ypred;
  vector[N] log_lik;
  ypred = normal_rng(mu, sigma);
  for (n in 1:(N)){
    log_lik[n] = normal_lpdf(y[n] | mu, sigma);
  }
}
```

6. Running the Stan model

We will need to run both of the models twice to get a model both for the young group and the old group. Therefore, we repeat almost the same process four times. The code is not included for all models for this reason. All models are ran with 4 chains and 2000 chains, of which one half (1000 iterations) are warmup.

Nonhierarchical model

The nonhierarchical model uses $\mu_{old} = 75$, $\mu_{young} = 65$, $\sigma_{prior} = 10$, $\text{Var}_{prior} = 20$. The data used is the blood pressure data from the dataset for the age group respectively.

Old group

```r
data_old <- data %>%
  filter(AgeGroup == "Old")
```

```r
mean_mu_prior_old = 75
mean_sigma_prior_old = 10
var_prior_old = 20
data_nonhiera_old <- list(
  y = data_old$BloodPressure,
  N = length(data_old$BloodPressure),
  mean_mu_prior = mean_mu_prior_old,
  mean_sigma_prior = mean_sigma_prior_old,
  var_prior = var_prior_old
)
```

```r
fit_nonhiera_old = sampling(nonhieramodel,
  data = data_nonhiera_old,            # named list of data
  chains = 4,             # number of Markov chains
  warmup = 1000,          # number of warmup iterations per chain
  iter = 2000,            # total number of iterations per chain
  cores = 4,              # number of cores (could use one per chain)
  refresh = 0             # no progress shown
  )
```

Young group

```r
data_young <- data %>%
  filter(AgeGroup == "Young")

mean_mu_prior_young = 65
mean_sigma_prior_young = 10
var_prior_young = 20
data_nonhiera_young <- list(
  y = data_young$BloodPressure,
  N = length(data_young$BloodPressure),
  mean_mu_prior = mean_mu_prior_young,
  mean_sigma_prior = mean_sigma_prior_young,
  var_prior = var_prior_young
)
```

```r
fit_nonhiera_young = sampling(nonhieramodel,
  data = data_nonhiera_young,            # named list of data
  chains = 4,             # number of Markov chains
  warmup = 1000,          # number of warmup iterations per chain
  iter = 2000,            # total number of iterations per chain
  cores = 4,              # number of cores (could use one per chain)
  refresh = 0             # no progress shown
  )
```

Hierarchical model

The nonhierarchical model uses $\mu = 70$ (same for both groups). All other parameters are the same as in the nonhierarchical model.

Old group

```
mean_mu_prior = 70
mean_sigma_prior = 10
var_prior = 20
data_hiera_old <- list(
  y = data_old$BloodPressure,
  N = length(data_old$BloodPressure),
  mean_mu_prior = mean_mu_prior,
  mean_sigma_prior = mean_sigma_prior_old,
  var_prior = var_prior
)
```

```
fit_hiera_old = sampling(hieramodel,
  data = data_hiera_old,            # named list of data
  chains = 4,             # number of Markov chains
  warmup = 1000,          # number of warmup iterations per chain
  iter = 2000,            # total number of iterations per chain
  cores = 4,              # number of cores (could use one per chain)
  refresh = 0             # no progress shown
  )
```

Young group

```
mean_mu_prior = 70
mean_sigma_prior = 10
var_prior = 20
data_hiera_young <- list(
  y = data_young$BloodPressure,
  N = length(data_young$BloodPressure),
  mean_mu_prior = mean_mu_prior,
  mean_sigma_prior = mean_sigma_prior,
  var_prior = var_prior
)
```

```
fit_hiera_young = sampling(hieramodel,
  data = data_hiera_young,            # named list of data
  chains = 4,             # number of Markov chains
  warmup = 1000,          # number of warmup iterations per chain
  iter = 2000,            # total number of iterations per chain
  cores = 4,              # number of cores (could use one per chain)
  refresh = 0             # no progress shown
  )
```

7. Convergence diagnostics

We compute the convergence diagnostics for all models. All models have a $\widehat{R}$ value of <1.05, indicating that the chains have mixed well. The effective sample sizes (ESS) are all over 100, and can be considered good. When plotting the chains we can also see that they are converging well, and there is no need to edit the model or the priors.

```r
current_monitor <- monitor(fit_nonhiera_old, print = FALSE)
diagnostics_names <- c(colnames(current_monitor)[1:10],"Bulk_ESS","Tail_ESS")
diag_nonhiera_old <- current_monitor %>%
  as_tibble(rownames = NA) %>%
  rownames_to_column() %>%
  select(diagnostics_names) %>%
  top_n(3)
knitr::kable(diag_nonhiera_old,
             caption = "The diagnostics of the nonhierarcical model for the old age group.")
```

Table 2: The diagnostics of the nonhierarcical model for the old age group.

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
76.18	0.185	11.743	52.85	68.43	76.12	84.1	98.76	4022	1	4032	3793
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712
-3.63	0.001	0.044	-3.72	-3.66	-3.63	-3.6	-3.54	3339	1	3405	2712

```r
current_monitor <- monitor(fit_nonhiera_young, print = FALSE)
diagnostics_names <- c(colnames(current_monitor)[1:10],"Bulk_ESS","Tail_ESS")
diag_nonhiera_old <- current_monitor %>%
  as_tibble() %>%
  select(diagnostics_names) %>%
  top_n(3)
knitr::kable(diag_nonhiera_old,
             caption = "The diagnostics of the nonhierarcical model for the young age group.")
```

Table 3: The diagnostics of the nonhierarcical model for the young age group.

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
68.61	0.186	11.848	45.57	60.66	68.46	76.77	91.92	4007	1	4028	3962
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-8.78	0.006	0.374	-9.53	-9.03	-8.76	-8.52	-8.08	3316	1	3357	2815
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781
-3.49	0.001	0.035	-3.56	-3.51	-3.49	-3.46	-3.42	3294	1	3393	2781

```
current_monitor <- monitor(fit_hiera_old, print = FALSE)
diagnostics_names <- c(colnames(current_monitor)[1:10],"Bulk_ESS","Tail_ESS")
diag_nonhiera_old <- current_monitor %>%
  as_tibble() %>%
  select(diagnostics_names) %>%
  top_n(3)
knitr::kable(diag_nonhiera_old,
             caption = "The diagnostics of the hierarcical model for the old age group.")
```

Table 4: The diagnostics of the hierarcical model for the old age group.

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
76.5	0.173	11.386	53.90	68.70	76.7	84.16	98.61	4300	1	4321	4014
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312
-3.4	0.001	0.039	-3.48	-3.43	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2183	1	2232	2312

```
current_monitor <- monitor(fit_hiera_young, print = FALSE)
diagnostics_names <- c(colnames(current_monitor)[1:10],"Bulk_ESS","Tail_ESS")
diag_nonhiera_old <- current_monitor %>%
  as_tibble() %>%
  select(diagnostics_names) %>%
  top_n(3)
knitr::kable(diag_nonhiera_old,
             caption = "The diagnostics of the hierarcical model for the young age group.")
```

Table 5: The diagnostics of the hierarcical model for the young age group.

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
11.9	0.008	0.419	11.11	11.60	11.9	12.18	12.76	2531	1	2549	2282
69.0	0.189	11.873	46.42	61.07	68.9	76.81	92.65	3933	1	3950	3664
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272

mean	se_mean	sd	2.5%	25%	50%	75%	97.5%	n_eff	Rhat	Bulk_ESS	Tail_ESS
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272
-3.4	0.001	0.035	-3.47	-3.42	-3.4	-3.38	-3.33	2446	1	2476	2272

8. Posterior predictive checks

We compare the posterior distribution with the original distribution visually. We can see that the posterior distribution is similar to the original distribution in all cases, indicating that the model is working as it should.

```
extract_hiera_old <- data.frame(extract(fit_hiera_old))
extract_nonhiera_old <- data.frame(extract(fit_nonhiera_old))
extract_hiera_young <- data.frame(extract(fit_hiera_young))
extract_nonhiera_young <- data.frame(extract(fit_nonhiera_young))
```

9. Model comparison with LOO-CV

Next, we compare the nonhierarchical and the hierarchical model with LOO-CV. We can see that both models are equally good for the age groups.

Figure 4: The trace plot of the nonhierarcical model for the old age group.

Figure 5: The trace plot of the nonhierarcical model for the young age group.

Figure 6: The trace plot of the hierarcical model for the old age group.

Figure 7: The trace plot of the hierarcical model for the young age group.

Figure 8: Hierarical posterior predictive vs original data for the old age group.

Figure 9: Hierarical posterior predictive vs original data for the old age group.

Figure 10: Posterior predictive distributions of the hierarcical versus non-hierarcical data for the old age group.

Figure 11: Posterior predictive distributions of the non hierarcical models for the old versus the young age group

```r
loo_nonhiera_old <- loo(fit_nonhiera_old, pars="log_lik")
loo_nonhiera_old
```

```
##
## Computed from 4000 by 338 log-likelihood matrix
##
##          Estimate   SE
## elpd_loo  -1309.2 17.4
## p_loo         2.8  0.6
## looic      2618.4 34.9
## ------
## Monte Carlo SE of elpd_loo is 0.0.
##
## All Pareto k estimates are good (k < 0.5).
## See help('pareto-k-diagnostic') for details.
```

```r
loo_nonhiera_young <- loo(fit_nonhiera_young, pars="log_lik")
loo_nonhiera_young
```

```
##
## Computed from 4000 by 395 log-likelihood matrix
##
##          Estimate   SE
## elpd_loo  -1544.6 18.2
## p_loo         2.6  0.6
## looic      3089.3 36.4
## ------
## Monte Carlo SE of elpd_loo is 0.0.
##
## All Pareto k estimates are good (k < 0.5).
## See help('pareto-k-diagnostic') for details.
```

```r
loo_hiera_old <- loo(fit_nonhiera_old, pars="log_lik")
loo_hiera_old
```

```
##
## Computed from 4000 by 338 log-likelihood matrix
##
##          Estimate   SE
## elpd_loo  -1309.2 17.4
## p_loo         2.8  0.6
## looic      2618.4 34.9
## ------
## Monte Carlo SE of elpd_loo is 0.0.
##
## All Pareto k estimates are good (k < 0.5).
## See help('pareto-k-diagnostic') for details.
```

```r
loo_hiera_young <- loo(fit_nonhiera_young, pars="log_lik")
loo_hiera_young
```

```
##
## Computed from 4000 by 395 log-likelihood matrix
##
##          Estimate   SE
## elpd_loo  -1544.6 18.2
## p_loo         2.6  0.6
## looic      3089.3 36.4
## ------
## Monte Carlo SE of elpd_loo is 0.0.
##
## All Pareto k estimates are good (k < 0.5).
## See help('pareto-k-diagnostic') for details.
```

```
print("The model for the old:")
```

```
## [1] "The model for the old:"
```

```
loo_compare(loo_nonhiera_old, loo_hiera_old)
```

```
##        elpd_diff se_diff
## model1 0.0       0.0
## model2 0.0       0.0
```

```
print("The model for the young:")
```

```
## [1] "The model for the young:"
```

```
loo_compare(loo_nonhiera_young, loo_hiera_young)
```

```
##        elpd_diff se_diff
## model1 0.0       0.0
## model2 0.0       0.0
```

10. Predictive performance assesment

We do not use our model to make predictions. Instead, we try to describe the blood pressure among the population and the effect of higher age on blood pressure. The predictive performance is not relevant as we do not predict anything with the current model.

11. Sensitivity analysis

To perform sensitivity analysis, we try a number of different priors to see if they change the posterior in a notable way. We try different combinations of the prior parameters, with μ values 0, 50, 100 and 1000, and σ and Var values 1, 10, 100 and 1000. When we then plot the chains we can see that there are no large differences between how the posteriors behave, regardless of the priors. This indicates that the likelihood as a stronger influence than the prior, resulting in that the values of the prior parameters does not change the posterior.

```r
mean_mu_prior_sensitivity = c(0, 50, 100, 1000)
mean_sigma_prior_sensitivity = c(1, 10, 100, 1000)
var_prior_old_sensitivity = c(1, 10, 100, 1000)
fit_sensitivity = c()
for (i in 1:length(mean_mu_prior_sensitivity)){
  for (j in 1:length(mean_sigma_prior_sensitivity)){
  data_sensitivity <- list(
    y = data_old$BloodPressure,
    N = length(data_old$BloodPressure),
    mean_mu_prior = mean_mu_prior_sensitivity[i],
    mean_sigma_prior = mean_sigma_prior_sensitivity[j],
    var_prior = var_prior_old_sensitivity[j]
  )

  fit_sensitivity = c(fit_sensitivity,sampling(nonhieramodel,
    data = data_nonhiera_old,            # named list of data
    chains = 4,             # number of Markov chains
    warmup = 1000,          # number of warmup iterations per chain
    iter = 2000,            # total number of iterations per chain
    cores = 4,              # number of cores (could use one per chain)
    refresh = 0             # no progress shown
    ))
  }
}
```

12. Discussion

13. Conclusion

14. Self-reflection

References

Gurven, Michael, Aaron D. Blackwell, Daniel Eid Rodríguez, Jonathan Stieglitz, and Hillard Kaplan. 2012. "Does Blood Pressure Inevitably Rise with Age?" *Hypertension* 60 (1): 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1161/hypertensionaha.111.189100.

Mayo Clinic Staff. 2021. "Blood Pressure Chart: What Your Reading Means." 2021. https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/high-blood-pressure/in-depth/blood-pressure/art-20050982.

Figure 12: The complete chains, including warmup, of the sixteen combinations of prior values ploted.