

Obs	SEX	RANDID	TOTCHOL	AGE	SYSBP	DIABP	CURSMOKE	CIGPDAY	BMI
1	2	6238	237	58	108	66	0	0	28.5
2	1	14367	280	64	168	100	0	0	25.72
3	1	16365	211	55	173	123	0	0	29.11
4	1	82425	226	67	157	95	0	0	29.86
5	1	101990	230	49	142	90.5	1	35	24.33
6	2	123622	241	51	145	85	1	20	25.66
7	1	147250	229	68	145	77	1	20	23.09

Obs	DIABETES	BPMEDS	HEARTRTE	GLUCOSE	PREVCHD	PREVAP	PREVMI
1	0	0	80	71	0	0	0
2	0	0	92	82	0	0	0
3	0	1	75	85	0	0	0
4	0	0	88	99	0	0	0
5	0	0	70	61	0	0	0
6	0	0	96	102	0	0	0
7	0	0	72	83	0	0	0

Obs	PREVSTRK	PREVHYP	PERIOD	HDL	LDL	BMIGROUP	HBP
1	0	0	3	54	141	3	0
2	0	1	3	44	236	3	1
3	0	1	3	48	163	3	1
4	0	1	3	61	165	3	1
5	0	1	3	30	200	2	1
6	0	0	3	68	173	3	1
7	0	0	3	39	170	2	1

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	625.023
SC	688.106	633.428
-2 Log L	681.903	621.023

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	60.8803	1	<.0001
Score	58.7136	1	<.0001
Wald	54.0266	1	<.0001

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-5.4506	0.7277	56.0984	<.0001
AGE	1	0.0877	0.0119	54.0266	<.0001

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
AGE	1.092	1.066	1.118

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	67.9	Somers' D	0.390
Percent Discordant	29.0	Gamma	0.402
Percent Tied	3.1	Tau-a	0.194
Pairs	60648	c	0.695

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	678.029
SC	688.106	686.434
-2 Log L	681.903	674.029

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	7.8744	1	0.0050
Score	7.8323	1	0.0051
Wald	7.7077	1	0.0055

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-2.0949	0.7054	8.8191	0.0030
BMI	1	0.0745	0.0268	7.7077	0.0055

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
BMI	1.077	1.022	1.136

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	56.7	Somers' D	0.141
Percent Discordant	42.5	Gamma	0.143
Percent Tied	0.8	Tau-a	0.070
Pairs	60648	c	0.571

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Class Level Information			
Class	Value	Design Variables	
BMIGROUP	2	0	0
	3	1	0
	4	0	1

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	678.345
SC	688.106	690.952
-2 Log L	681.903	672.345

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	9.5587	2	0.0084
Score	9.5029	2	0.0086
Wald	9.4260	2	0.0090

Type 3 Analysis of Effects			
Effect	DF	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
BMIGROUP	2	9.4260	0.0090

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept		1	-0.4875	0.1439	11.4827	0.0007
BMIGROUP	3	1	0.5323	0.1966	7.3334	0.0068
BMIGROUP	4	1	0.6698	0.2860	5.4840	0.0192

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
BMIGROUP 3 vs 2	1.703	1.158	2.503
BMIGROUP 4 vs 2	1.954	1.115	3.423

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	37.9	Somers' D	0.144
Percent Discordant	23.5	Gamma	0.234
Percent Tied	38.6	Tau-a	0.072
Pairs	60648	c	0.572

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	685.738
SC	688.106	694.143
-2 Log L	681.903	681.738

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	0.1651	1	0.6845
Score	0.1651	1	0.6845
Wald	0.1651	1	0.6845

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-0.0382	0.2990	0.0163	0.8983
SEX	1	-0.0740	0.1821	0.1651	0.6845

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
SEX	0.929	0.650	1.327

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	25.5	Somers' D	0.018
Percent Discordant	23.7	Gamma	0.037
Percent Tied	50.9	Tau-a	0.009
Pairs	60648	c	0.509

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	646.219
SC	688.106	654.624
-2 Log L	681.903	642.219

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	39.6841	1	<.0001
Score	38.2875	1	<.0001
Wald	33.0049	1	<.0001

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-0.3995	0.1000	15.9502	<.0001
BPMEDS	1	1.6771	0.2919	33.0049	<.0001

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
BPMEDS	5.350	3.019	9.481

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	25.0	Somers' D	0.204
Percent Discordant	4.7	Gamma	0.685
Percent Tied	70.3	Tau-a	0.101
Pairs	60648	c	0.602

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	669.943
SC	688.106	678.348
-2 Log L	681.903	665.943

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	15.9609	1	<.0001
Score	13.8556	1	0.0002
Wald	7.5368	1	0.0060

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-0.2138	0.0919	5.4094	0.0200
PREVSTRK	1	2.8526	1.0391	7.5368	0.0060

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
PREVSTRK	17.332	2.262	132.832

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	6.1	Somers' D	0.058
Percent Discordant	0.4	Gamma	0.891
Percent Tied	93.5	Tau-a	0.029
Pairs	60648	c	0.529

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Class Level Information		
Class	Value	Design Variables
BPMEDS	0	0
	1	1

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	640.563
SC	688.106	657.373
-2 Log L	681.903	632.563

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	49.3403	3	<.0001
Score	46.9814	3	<.0001
Wald	39.6163	3	<.0001

Type 3 Analysis of Effects			
Effect	DF	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
BMI	1	7.3009	0.0069
BPMEDS	1	7.5207	0.0061
intBMI_BPMEDS	1	4.8141	0.0282

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept		1	-2.4486	0.7671	10.1885	0.0014
BMI		1	0.0791	0.0293	7.3009	0.0069
BPMEDS	1	1	7.4604	2.7204	7.5207	0.0061
intBMI_BPMEDS		1	-0.2158	0.0984	4.8141	0.0282

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
BMI	1.082	1.022	1.146
BPMEDS 1 vs 0	>999.999	8.402	>999.999
intBMI_BPMEDS	0.806	0.665	0.977

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	65.3	Somers' D	0.311
Percent Discordant	34.2	Gamma	0.313
Percent Tied	0.6	Tau-a	0.155
Pairs	60648	c	0.655

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Information	
Data Set	WORK.DAT2
Response Variable	HBP
Number of Response Levels	2
Model	binary logit
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring

Number of Observations Read	494
Number of Observations Used	494

Response Profile		
Ordered Value	HBP	Total Frequency
1	0	266
2	1	228

Probability modeled is HBP=1.

Class Level Information		
Class	Value	Design Variables
BPMEDS	0	0
	1	1
SEX	1	0
	2	1
PREVSTRK	0	0
	1	1

Model Convergence Status
Convergence criterion (GCONV=1E-8) satisfied.

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Model Fit Statistics		
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	683.903	582.454
SC	688.106	611.872
-2 Log L	681.903	568.454

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	113.4495	6	<.0001
Score	100.9107	6	<.0001
Wald	79.2805	6	<.0001

Type 3 Analysis of Effects			
Effect	DF	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
AGE	1	47.0424	<.0001
SEX	1	0.4085	0.5227
PREVSTRK	1	3.1959	0.0738
BMI	1	12.0083	0.0005
BPMEDS	1	9.2868	0.0023
intBMI_BPMEDS	1	6.4735	0.0109

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter		DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept		1	-8.5994	1.2702	45.8354	<.0001
AGE		1	0.0884	0.0129	47.0424	<.0001
SEX	2	1	-0.1323	0.2070	0.4085	0.5227
PREVSTRK	1	1	1.9337	1.0817	3.1959	0.0738
BMI		1	0.1124	0.0324	12.0083	0.0005
BPMEDS	1	1	8.1861	2.6862	9.2868	0.0023
intBMI_BPMEDS		1	-0.2479	0.0974	6.4735	0.0109

The LOGISTIC Procedure

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
AGE	1.092	1.065	1.120
SEX 2 vs 1	0.876	0.584	1.314
PREVSTRK 1 vs 0	6.915	0.830	57.610
BMI	1.119	1.050	1.192
BPMEDS 1 vs 0	>999.999	18.563	>999.999
intBMI_BPMEDS	0.780	0.645	0.945

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	75.2	Somers' D	0.506
Percent Discordant	24.6	Gamma	0.507
Percent Tied	0.2	Tau-a	0.252
Pairs	60648	c	0.753