# Applied Epidemiology I: Tables and interpreting results

Enoch Yi-Tung Chen

Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Insitutet

November 26, 2020

# Acknowledgements

This course material is based on my learning from Anastasia Lam's teachings in last year's Applied Epidemiology I lab sessions, and readings from *Epidemiology* by Gordis [1], *A First Course in Probability and Statistics* by Goldsman and Goldsman [2], *Principles of Biostatistics* by Pagano and Gauvreau [3], and *Biostatistics I* by Gabriel and Frumento [4]. I especially want to thank Marlene Stratmann for reviewing the slides and Prof. Paul Dickman for providing me with suggestions to improving the teaching.

### Outline

- Tables
  - One-way tables Two by two tables Stata tool for Epidemiology
- Basic Epidemiology terms
  Rate vs. proportion
  Risk, risk difference, risk ratio
  Odds, odds ratio
- Interpreting results  $\begin{array}{c} \text{Principles} \\ \text{Ratio} > \text{or} < 1 \\ \text{More examples} \end{array}$

- Calculate ratios using Stata Risk ratio
   Odds ratio
   Incidence rate ratio
- 6 References

We use cancer data still.
 sysuse cancer, clear
 keep if drug == 1 | drug == 2

- We use cancer data still.
   sysuse cancer, clear
   keep if drug == 1 | drug == 2
- One-way table of frequencies with mean and sd of age
   table died, contents(freq mean age sd age)

- One-way table of frequencies
  - . tabulate died

1 if   patient			
died	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0	9	26.47	26.47
1	25	73.53	100.00
Total	34	100.00	

- One-way tables of frequencies each variable specified
  - . tab1 died drug
  - -> tabulation of died

1 if   patient   died	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0   1	9 25	26.47 73.53	26.47 100.00
Total	34	100.00	

-> tabulation of drug

Drug type   (1=placebo)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0   1	14 20	41.18 58.82	41.18 100.00
Total	34	100.00	

- Create table I of baseline characteristics using table1\_mc
- This command is useful. Play it on your own!
- See help table1\_mc
- ssc install table1\_mc, replace
- . table1\_mc, vars(age conts)

```
Total |
|------|
| N=34 |
|------|
| Patient's age at start of exp. 56 (51-61) |
```

Data are presented as median (IQR).

 2 by 2 table for drug and died with relative frequency by column or row

. tabulate died drug, col row

1 : £ |

1 11	I		
patient	Drug type	(1=placebo)	
died	1 0	1	Total
	+		+
0	1 8	1	9
	88.89	11.11	100.00
	57.14	5.00	26.47
	+		+
1	1 6	19	J 25
	1 24.00	76.00	100.00
	42.86	95.00	73.53
	+		+
Total	l 14	20	l 34
	41.18	58.82	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

• 2 by 2 table with chi-square test and fisher's exact test

```
. tabulate died drug, col row chi2 exact
    1 if |
  patient | Drug type (1=placebo)
                                  Total
              88.89 11.11 |
                               100.00
              57.14
                       5.00 l
       1 I
                        19 I
              24.00 76.00 |
                              100.00
              42.86
                       95.00 I
                                 73.53
              14 20 |
   Total |
                                     34
              41.18 58.82 I
                              100.00
             100.00 100.00 |
                               100.00
        Pearson chi2(1) = 11.5039 Pr = 0.001
         Fisher's exact =
                                     0.001
```

 2 by 2 table with chi-square test and fisher's exact test How to interpret the results?

•	1 if					
	patient	Drug ty	pe (1=	placebo)		
	died	I	0	1	Tota	1
	0	i	8	1	İ	9
		88.	39	11.11	100.0	10
		57.	14	5.00	26.4	7
	1	i	6	19	•	:5
		1 24.	00	76.00	100.0	10
		42.	36	95.00	73.5	3
	Total	 	 14	20	I 3	4
		41.	18	58.82	100.0	10
		100.	00	100.00	100.0	10
	1	Pearson ch Fisher's				0.001 0.001

tabulate died drug cel rou chi? evact

• 2 by 2 table with chi-square test and fisher's exact test

```
. tabulate died drug, col row chi2 exact
     1 if |
  patient | Drug type (1=placebo)
              88.89 11.11 |
                                100.00
                       5.00 I
       1 I
                         19 I
              24.00 76.00 I
                                  100.00
              42.86
                        95.00 I
                                  73.53
    Total |
              14 20 |
                                      34
              41.18 58.82 I
                               100.00
             100.00
                    100.00 I
                                100.00
        Pearson chi2(1) = 11.5039 Pr = 0.001
         Fisher's exact =
                                       0.001
```

- How to interpret the results?
- Chi-square test: testing the association between two binary variables.

 2 by 2 table with chi-square test and fisher's exact test

```
. tabulate died drug, col row chi2 exact
     1 if |
  patient | Drug type (1=placebo)
              88.89 11.11 |
                                  100.00
                        5.00 I
       1 I
                         19 I
              24.00 76.00 I
                                  100.00
              42.86
                        95.00 I
                                  73.53
    Total |
              14 20 I
                                      34
              41.18 58.82 I
                               100.00
                    100.00 I
              100.00
                                 100.00
        Pearson chi2(1) = 11.5039 Pr = 0.001
         Fisher's exact =
                                       0.001
```

- How to interpret the results?
- Chi-square test: testing the association between two binary variables.
- Using placebo has association with that the patients died or not.

### • 2 by 2 tables straitified by sex

. bysort sex: tab died drug, col row chi2

 $\rightarrow$  sex = 0

1 if patient died	Drug type	(1=placebo)	Total
0	6	1	7
	85.71	14.29	100.00
	75.00	9.09	36.84
1	2	10	12
	16.67	83.33	100.00
	25.00	90.91	63.16
Total	8	11	19
	42.11	57.89	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Pearson chi2(1) = 8.6466 Pr = 0.003

-> sex = 1 1 if patient died	Drug type	(1=placebo) 1	Total
0	l 2	0	2
	100.00	0.00	100.00
	33.33	0.00	13.33
	+	+	
1	1 4	9	13
	30.77	69.23	100.00
	66.67	100.00	86.67
	+		
Total	1 6	9	15
	40.00	60.00	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00
Pe	earson chi2	(1) = 3.4615	Pr = 0.06

## Tables: Stata tool for Epidemiology

 How to use Stata to generate risk ratios (relative risk) and odds ratios?

# Tables: Stata tool for Epidemiology

- How to use Stata to generate risk ratios (relative risk) and odds ratios?
- A useful tool in Stata's default function can be found at
- Statistics Epidemiology and related Tables for epidemiologists

Stata/IC 16.1 File Edit View Data Graphics Statistics User Window Help

# Tables: Stata tool for Epidemiology

- How to use Stata to generate risk ratios (relative risk) and odds ratios?
- A useful tool in Stata's default function can be found at
- Statistics Epidemiology and related Tables for epidemiologists
   Stata/IC 16.1 File Edit View Data Graphics Statistics User Window Help
- But before demonstrating how this works, a recapture on basic epi terms!

Rate

**Proportion** 

#### Rate

• Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time

### Proportion

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate):  $\frac{\text{no. of deaths}}{\text{total person-time}}$

### Proportion

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
- Hazard (rate): in survival analysis, hazard is often defined as mortality rate.

### Proportion

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
- Hazard (rate): in survival analysis, hazard is often defined as mortality rate.

### **Proportion**

• Cumulative incidence: **over a time period**, no. of new cases of the disease no. of initially disease-free persons

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
- Hazard (rate): in survival analysis, hazard is often defined as mortality rate.

### **Proportion**

- Cumulative incidence: over a time period, no. of new cases of the disease no. of initially disease-free persons
- Fatality: **over a time period**, no. of deaths of the disease no. of persons with the disease

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
- Hazard (rate): in survival analysis, hazard is often defined as mortality rate.

### Proportion

- Cumulative incidence: over a time period, no. of new cases of the disease no. of initially disease-free persons
- Fatality: **over a time period**, no. of deaths of the disease no. of persons with the disease
- Point prevalence: at a specified time, no. of diseased no. of persons
- Period prevalence: over a time period, no. of diseased no. of persons

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
- Hazard (rate): in survival analysis, hazard is often defined as mortality rate.

### Proportion

- Cumulative incidence: over a time period, no. of new cases of the disease no. of initially disease-free persons
- Fatality: **over a time period**, no. of deaths of the disease no. of persons with the disease
- Point prevalence: at a specified time, no. of diseased no. of persons
- Period prevalence: over a time period, no. of diseased no. of persons
- Survival (proportion/probability) rate:

no. of alive persons (since diagnosis)
no. of initially disease-free persons (since diagnosis)

#### Rate

- Incidence (rate): no. of diseased total person-time
- Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
- Hazard (rate): in survival analysis, hazard is often defined as mortality rate.

### Proportion

- Cumulative incidence: over a time period, no. of new cases of the disease no. of initially disease-free persons
- Fatality: **over a time period**, no. of deaths of the disease no. of persons with the disease
- Point prevalence: at a specified time, no. of diseased no. of persons
- Period prevalence: over a time period, no. of diseased no. of persons
- Survival (proportion/probability) rate:

no. of alive persons (since diagnosis)
no. of initially disease-free persons (since diagnosis)

#### Risk

• Is risk a rate or a proportion?

### Quizs

1. What is the key difference between rate and proportion?

- 1. What is the key difference between rate and proportion?
  - TIME!
  - Rate: person-time
  - Proportion: specify a period/point of time

- 1. What is the key difference between rate and proportion?
  - TIME!
  - Rate: person-time
  - Proportion: specify a period/point of time
- 2. Mortality vs. fatality?

- 1. What is the key difference between rate and proportion?
  - TIME!
  - Rate: person-time
  - Proportion: specify a period/point of time
- 2. Mortality vs. fatality?
  - Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
  - Fatality: over a time period, no. of deaths of the disease no. of persons with the disease

- 1. What is the key difference between rate and proportion?
  - TIME!
  - Rate: person-time
  - Proportion: specify a period/point of time
- 2. Mortality vs. fatality?
  - Mortality (rate): no. of deaths total person-time
  - Fatality: over a time period, no. of deaths of the disease no. of persons with the disease
- 3. Is risk a rate or a proportion?

**Risk**: the proportion (probability) of an event, e.g., death.

**Risk**: the proportion (probability) of an event, e.g., death.

Estimates of risk: cumulative incidence, cumulative hazard

**Risk**: the proportion (probability) of an event, e.g., death.

- Estimates of risk: cumulative incidence, cumulative hazard
- E.g., in survival analysis,

 $\label{eq:Cumulative hazard} \mbox{Cumulative probability of death} \\ \mbox{Cumulative probability of death} \\$ 

$$F(t) = 1 - S(t) = P(T \le t)$$

**Risk**: the proportion (probability) of an event, e.g., death.

- Estimates of risk: cumulative incidence, cumulative hazard
- E.g., in survival analysis,

 $\label{eq:cumulative hazard} \mbox{Cumulative hazard} = 1 - \mbox{Survival proportion} = \mbox{Cumulative probability of death}$ 

$$F(t) = 1 - S(t) = P(T \le t)$$

• Risk difference: the difference of the probabilities of an event between the exposed group and non-exposed group

**Risk**: the proportion (probability) of an event, e.g., death.

- Estimates of risk: cumulative incidence, cumulative hazard
- E.g., in survival analysis,

 $\label{eq:Cumulative hazard} \mbox{Cumulative hazard} = 1 - \mbox{Survival proportion} = \mbox{Cumulative probability of death}$ 

$$F(t) = 1 - S(t) = P(T \le t)$$

- Risk difference: the difference of the probabilities of an event between the exposed group and non-exposed group
- Risk ratio: the ratio of the probabilities of an event between the exposed group and non-exposed group

**Risk**: the proportion (probability) of an event, e.g., death.

- Estimates of risk: cumulative incidence, cumulative hazard
- E.g., in survival analysis,

 $\label{eq:Cumulative hazard} \mbox{Cumulative hazard} = 1 - \mbox{Survival proportion} = \mbox{Cumulative probability of death}$ 

$$F(t) = 1 - S(t) = P(T \le t)$$

- Risk difference: the difference of the probabilities of an event between the exposed group and non-exposed group
- Risk ratio: the ratio of the probabilities of an event between the exposed group and non-exposed group
- Caution! Relative risk could be either risk ratio or rate ratio!

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig	2	1	3
(Noncase) Total	4	3	7

Epidemiologists love two by two tables!

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig (Noncase)	2	1	3
Total	4	3	7

Epidemiologists love two by two tables!

- Risk difference between females having shiba and males having shiba =  $\widehat{p_F} \widehat{p_M} = 2/4 2/3 = -0.16667$
- Interpretation: Females have 16.67 % lower risk of having shiba than males.

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig (Noncase)	2	1	3
Total	4	3	7

Epidemiologists love two by two tables!

- Risk difference between females having shiba and males having shiba =  $\widehat{p_F} \widehat{p_M} = 2/4 2/3 = -0.16667$
- Interpretation: Females have 16.67 % lower risk of having shiba than males.
- Risk ratio between females having shiba and males having shiba

$$=\widehat{p_F}\div\widehat{p_M}=2/4\div2/3=0.75.$$

 Interpretation: The RR of females having shiba is 0.75 times than males having shiba.

**Odds**: the ratio between those having and not having an outcome.

$$Odds = \frac{p}{1 - p}$$

**Odds**: the ratio between those having and not having an outcome.

$$Odds = \frac{p}{1 - p}$$

 Odds ratio measures the association between an exposure and an outcome.

Odds ratio (OR) = 
$$\frac{Odds_{exposed}}{Odds_{unexposed}}$$

**Odds**: the ratio between those having and not having an outcome.

$$Odds = \frac{p}{1 - p}$$

Odds ratio measures the association between an exposure and an outcome.

Odds ratio (OR) = 
$$\frac{Odds_{exposed}}{Odds_{unexposed}}$$

 E.g., the OR is 0.5, which indicates that there is a 50% decrease in the odds of having an outcome among the exposed compared to the unexposed.

**Odds**: the ratio between those having and not having an outcome.

$$Odds = \frac{p}{1 - p}$$

Odds ratio measures the association between an exposure and an outcome.

$$Odds \ ratio \ (OR) = \frac{Odds_{exposed}}{Odds_{unexposed}}$$

- E.g., the OR is 0.5, which indicates that there is a 50% decrease in the odds of having an outcome among the exposed compared to the unexposed.
- Why there is no odds difference?

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig (Noncase)	2	1	3
Total	4	3	7

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig	2	1	3
(Noncase) Total	4	3	7

 The odds of having shiba among females is

$$\widehat{odds_F} = \frac{p(\text{having shiba}|\text{female})}{p(\text{having guinea pig}|\text{female})}$$

$$= \frac{(2/4)}{(2/4)} = 1$$

 The odds of having shiba among males is 2 (calculation ignored).

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig (Noncase)	2	1	3
Total	4	3	7

- OR of having shiba (females to males)
- OR =  $\frac{Odds_f}{Odds_m} = \frac{1}{2}$

 The odds of having shiba among females is

$$\widehat{odds_F} = \frac{p(\text{having shiba}|\text{female})}{p(\text{having guinea pig}|\text{female})}$$

$$= \frac{(2/4)}{(2/4)} = 1$$

 The odds of having shiba among males is 2 (calculation ignored).

	Female (Exposed)	Male (Unexposed)	Total
shiba (Case)	2	2	4
guinea pig (Noncase)	2	1	3
Total	4	3	7

 The odds of having shiba among females is

$$\widehat{odds_F} = \frac{p(\text{having shiba}|\text{female})}{p(\text{having guinea pig}|\text{female})}$$
$$= \frac{(2/4)}{(2/4)} = 1$$

 The odds of having shiba among males is 2 (calculation ignored).

- OR of having shiba (females to males)
- OR =  $\frac{Odds_f}{Odds_m} = \frac{1}{2}$
- Interpretation: there is a 50% decrease in the odds of having shiba among females compared to males. Higher odds of shiba ownership among males than females!
- It seems that females instead love guinea pigs more.

#### Interpreting results: Principles

- When describing a ratio, it can ideally be illustrated by
  - 1. Exposed group
  - 2. Ratio (exact value, higher or lower percentage)
  - 3. Outcome
  - 4. Unexposed

#### Interpreting results: Principles

- When describing a ratio, it can ideally be illustrated by
  - 1. Exposed group
  - 2. Ratio (exact value, higher or lower percentage)
  - 3. Outcome
  - 4. Unexposed
- Example:
  - 1. Females have a RR of 0.75 having shiba compared to males.

#### Interpreting results: Principles

- When describing a ratio, it can ideally be illustrated by
  - 1. Exposed group
  - 2. Ratio (exact value, higher or lower percentage)
  - 3. Outcome
  - 4. Unexposed
- Example:
  - 1. Females have a RR of 0.75 having shiba compared to males.
  - 2. Females have a 50% decrease in the odds of having shiba compared to males.

#### Interpreting results: Ratio > or < 1

Ratio

#### Interpreting results: Ratio > or < 1

#### Ratio

- As ratio < 1,
  - $(1 RR/OR) \times 100\%$
  - E.g., RR = 0.75,  $(1 0.75) \times 100\% = 25\%$
  - 25% lower risk

### Interpreting results: Ratio > or < 1

#### Ratio

- As ratio < 1.
  - $(1 RR/OR) \times 100\%$
  - E.g., RR = 0.75,  $(1-0.75) \times 100\% = 25\%$
  - 25% lower risk
- As ratio > 1,
  - $(RR/OR 1) \times 100\%$
  - E.g., OR = 2.05,  $(2.05 1) \times 100\% = 105\%$
  - The odds is 2 times higher.
  - Twice the odds

# Diabetes Is a Risk Factor for Pulmonary Tuberculosis: A Case-Control Study from Mwanza, Tanzania (Faurholt-Jepsen, 2011)

	OR (95% C.I.)
	Model 2
	sex, y <sup>2</sup> Model 1 + AGP <sup>3</sup>
V negative (n = 770)	
Glucose intolerance status <sup>1</sup>	
normal glucose tolerance	ref.
IFG/IGT	2.65 (1.00;7.06)
diabetes	4.23 (1.54;11.57)
Glucose intolerance status <sup>1</sup> normal glucose tolerance IFG/IGT	2.65 (1.00;7.06)

Diabetes Is a Risk Factor for Pulmonary Tuberculosis: A Case-Control Study from Mwanza, Tanzania (Faurholt-Jepsen, 2011)

OR (95% C.I.)	OR (95% C.I.)  Model 1  Adjusted for age, sex, socio-demography <sup>2</sup>	OR (95% C.I.)	
		Model 2	
Unadjusted		Model 1 + AGP <sup>3</sup>	
ref.	ref.	ref.	
2.26 (1.50;3.41)	2.34 (1.52;3.61)	2.65 (1.00;7.06)	
2.15 (1.35;3.42)	2.14 (1.32;3.46)	4.23 (1.54;11.57)	
	Unadjusted  ref. 2.26 (1.50;3.41)	Model 1   Adjusted for age, sex, socio-demography 2   ref.   ref.   2.26 (1.50;3.41)   2.34 (1.52;3.61)	

1. People with diabetes had a higher odds of TB (OR 2.15, 95% CI: 1.35-3.42) relative to people without diabetes.

Diabetes Is a Risk Factor for Pulmonary Tuberculosis: A Case-Control Study from Mwanza, Tanzania (Faurholt-Jepsen, 2011)

	OR (95% C.I.)	OR (95% C.I.)	OR (95% C.I.)
		Model 1	Model 2
	Unadjusted	Adjusted for age, sex, socio-demography <sup>2</sup>	Model 1 + AGP <sup>3</sup>
HIV negative (n = 770)			
Glucose intolerance status <sup>1</sup>			
normal glucose tolerance	ref.	ref.	ref.
IFG/IGT	2.26 (1.50;3.41)	2.34 (1.52;3.61)	2.65 (1.00;7.06)
diabetes	2.15 (1.35;3.42)	2.14 (1.32;3.46)	4.23 (1.54;11.57)

- 1. People with diabetes had a higher odds of TB (OR 2.15, 95% CI: 1.35-3.42) relative to people without diabetes.
- Having diabetes was associated with more than a
   2-fold increase (OR: 2.15, 95% CI: 1.35; 3.42) in the odds of TB compared to not having diabetes.

Bidirectional association between physical activity and symptoms of anxiety and depression: the Whitehall II study (Azevedo Da Silva, 2012)

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Table 3} Cross-sectional associations between physical activity at recommended levels and anxiety and/or depression symptoms at phase 1 (1985–1988) (N = 9,309) \\ \end{tabular}$ 

	OR (CI 95 %)	P value
Anxiety symptoms		
Model 1		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.71 (0.54, 0.91)	0.01
No	1 (reference)	
Model 2		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.71 (0.55, 0.93)	0.01
No	1 (reference)	
Depression symptoms		
Model 1		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.63 (0.48, 0.81)	< 0.001
No	1 (reference)	
Model 2		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.63 (0.49, 0.82)	0.001
No	1 (reference)	

# Bidirectional association between physical activity and symptoms of anxiety and depression: the Whitehall II study (Azevedo Da Silva, 2012)

**Table 3** Cross-sectional associations between physical activity at recommended levels and anxiety and/or depression symptoms at phase 1 (1985–1988) (N = 9,309)

	OR (CI 95 %)	P value
Anxiety symptoms		
Model 1		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.71 (0.54, 0.91)	0.01
No	1 (reference)	
Model 2		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.71 (0.55, 0.93)	0.01
No	1 (reference)	
Depression symptoms		
Model 1		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.63 (0.48, 0.81)	< 0.001
No	1 (reference)	
Model 2		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.63 (0.49, 0.82)	0.001
No	1 (reference)	

1. Patients who conducted recommended levels of physical activity had a 29% lower odds of anxiety (OR: 0.71, 95% CI: 0.54-0.91) and a 37% lower odds of depression (OR: 0.63, 95% CI: 0.48-0.81) relative to those who did not.

# Bidirectional association between physical activity and symptoms of anxiety and depression: the Whitehall II study (Azevedo Da Silva, 2012)

**Table 3** Cross-sectional associations between physical activity at recommended levels and anxiety and/or depression symptoms at phase 1 (1985–1988) (N = 9,309)

	OR (CI 95 %)	P value
Anxiety symptoms		
Model 1		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.71 (0.54, 0.91)	0.01
No	1 (reference)	
Model 2		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.71 (0.55, 0.93)	0.01
No	1 (reference)	
Depression symptoms		
Model 1		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.63 (0.48, 0.81)	< 0.001
No	1 (reference)	
Model 2		
Physical activity		
Yes	0.63 (0.49, 0.82)	0.001
No	1 (reference)	

1. Patients who conducted recommended levels of physical activity had a 29% lower odds of anxiety (OR: 0.71, 95% CI: 0.54-0.91) and a 37% lower odds of depression (OR: 0.63, 95% CI: 0.48-0.81) relative to those who did not.

Our results showed that individuals who practiced recommended levels of physical activity were less likely to have anxiety
 (OR: 0.71, 95% CI: 0.54-0.91) and depression
 (OR: 0.63, 95% CI: 0.48-0.81) in

comparison with those who did not.

# Calculate ratios using Stata: Risk ratio

• Finally we come back to Stata again!

### Calculate ratios using Stata: Risk ratio

- Finally we come back to Stata again!
- cs case exposed
  - . cs died drug

	Drug type [ Exposed	1=placebo] Unexposed	   Tot	al:	
Cases Noncases		6 8	   	25 9	
Total	20	14	 	34	
Risk	.95	.4285714	.73529	941	
	Point   	estimate	[95% +	Conf.	Interval]
Risk difference Risk ratio Attr. frac. ex. Attr. frac. pop	.5488722		1.200	5166 0631 1043	.7976911 4.092525 .7556521
		chi2(1) =	11.50 F	r>chi2	= 0.0007

## Calculate ratios using Stata: Odds ratio

cs case exposed, orcs died drug, or

		[1=placebo] Unexposed	   Tota	11 	
Cases Noncases	•	6 8	•	 25 9	
Total	+	14	- <del>+</del>	- <b>-</b> 34	
Risk	.95	.4285714	   .735294	<b>l</b> 1	
	Point	estimate	   [95% C	Conf. Interval	1]
Risk difference	.5	214286	.2451	.79769	11
Risk ratio	1 2.	216667	1.200€	331 4.09252	25
Attr. frac. ex.	1 .5	488722	1 .16710	.755652	21
Attr. frac. pop	1 .4	171429	1		
Odds ratio	l 25	.33333	3.1897	793	. (Cornfield
	+	chi2(1) =	11.50 Pr	r>chi2 = 0.000	 07

#### Calculate ratios using Stata: Incidence rate ratio

#### ir case exposed studytime

. ir died drug studytime Incidence-rate comparison

includince rate con	Drug type [	1=placebo]	1		
	Exposed	Unexposed	Total		
1 if patient die	19	6	25		
Months to death	•				
	+ 				
Incidence rate	.1055556	.0287081	.0642674		
			   [95% Co:	nf. Interval]	
Inc. rate diff.	ı		•	2 .1295766	
Inc. rate ratio	3.6	3.676852		2 11.24864	(exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.72	.7280282		1 .9111003	(exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.55	.5533014			
W. 1 1			1: 6.6		

Mid p-values for tests of incidence-rate difference:

Adj Pr(Exposed 1 if patient die <= 19) = 0.9985 (lower one-sided)

Adj Pr(Exposed 1 if patient die >= 19) = 0.0015 (upper one-sided)

Two-sided p-value = 0.0031

Applied Epi I: Interpreting results

#### References<sup>1</sup>

- 1. Gordis L. *Epidemiology*. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier/Saunders, 2014. ISBN 9781455737338.
- David Goldsman PG. A First Course in Probability and Statistics. Georgia Institute of Technology, 2020.
- Marcello Pagano KG. Principles of Biostatistics. Cengage Learning, Inc, 2000. ISBN 0534229026.
- 4. Erin Gabriel PF. Epidemiology PhD program, Karolinska Institutet, 2020.