2020 BIOSTAT 555

Statistical Methods for Spatial Epidemiology Assignment 3

To be submitted to the canvas site by the start of class on Monday 24th February, 2020.

Hand in your R code as an appendix.

1. In this question we will smooth the SMRs for the Ohio lung cancer data using the disease mapping Poisson-Lognormal-Spatial model:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y_i | \beta_0, S_i, \epsilon_i & \underset{\mathsf{ind}}{\sim} & \mathsf{Poisson}(E_i \mathbf{e}^{\beta_0} \mathbf{e}^{S_i + \epsilon_i}) \\ & \epsilon_i | \sigma_\epsilon^2 & \underset{\mathsf{iid}}{\sim} & \mathsf{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2) \\ S_1, \dots, S_n | \sigma_s^2 & \sim & \mathsf{ICAR}(\sigma_s^2) \end{array}$$

for i, i = 1, ..., n.

(a) Using the inla function in R fit this model using the bym2 model, with the default prior for β_0 and the following prior specification for the spatial and non-spatial random effects:

```
f(Region, model="bym2", graph="ohio_map.graph", scale.model=T, constr=T,
hyper=list(phi=list(prior="pc", param=c(0.5, 0.5), initial=1),
prec=list(prior="pc.prec", param=c(0.3,0.01), initial=5)))
```

These choices correspond to the prior belief that there is a 1% chance that the total residual standard deviation is greater than 0.3, and a 50% chance that the proportion of the variance that is spatial is bigger than 0.5. Report both the posterior medians and 95% intervals for β_0 , the total variance of the random effects, and the proportion of the total variance attributed to the spatial random effect.

- (b) Extract the relative risk estimates and provide a map of these. Compare these estimates with the SMRs and with those obtained from the Poisson-Lognormal model (i.e., the model with IID random effects only) that you fit in Assignment 2.
- 2. Using the SUMMER package, carry out small area estimation for the outcome smoking for Health Reporting Areas (HRAs).

(a) Calculate:

- i. Simple proportion of smokers in each area (i.e., as if we had a binomial sampling model).
- ii. Combine a binomial sampling model with the BYM2 smoothing model, and obtain posterior median estimates of the smoking proportion in each HRA.
- iii. Weighted (direct) estimates for each area.
- iv. Smoothed direct estimates (again take the posterior medians).
- (b) Plot the point estimates against each other and comment.
- (c) Plot the standard errors (for (i) and (iii)) and the posterior standard deviations (for (ii) and (iv)) against each other and comment.
- (d) Summarize this analysis, in terms of the most appropriate model, and describing the variation in smoking prevalence across HRAs in King County.