P8106 Midterm - Report

Group 2: Kate Colvin (KAC2301), Jeong Yun (Lizy) Choi (JC6452), and Flora Pang (FP2513)

Introduction

In this project, our team explored the dataset collected from a study on evaluating antibody responses to a newly authorized vaccine. The primary outcome of interest is the log-transformed antibody level measured via dried blood spots. The dataset includes a range of demographic and clinical predictors such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, smoking status, BMI, chronic conditions, and time since vaccination.

Our goal is to develop a predictive model that characterizes how these factors influence antibody responses and asses how well this model generalizes to a new independent dataset collected at a later time point. By doing so, we hope to identify key predictors of antibody levels and evaluate the robustness/generalizability of our model across different dataset.

Exploratory Analysis

notes

for hist - more recent vaccines = higher antibody level ?

for scatter plots - testing slopes more flat?

Model Training

In this analysis, we trained three different models: Multiple Linear Regression (MLR), LASSO Regression, and Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS). We ultimately selected MARS as the final model, after fine-tuning it using cross-validation. The following sections provide a detailed account of each step in the model training process, from pre-processing to final model selection.

Data Pre-processing

Before modeling, the data underwent the following pre-processing steps:

- Handling Missing Values: We ensured that there were no missing values in the training data. Any missing data would be imputed or removed as appropriate.
- Feature Engineering: Continuous variables were used as they were, while categorical variables were converted to factor types (such as race, gender, smoking).
- Log Transformation: The response variable, log antibody, was log-transformed to normalize its distribution and reduce skewness.
- Also transformed the data

Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) Model

We started by fitting a MLR model with all available predictors in the dataset and the model was fit using ordinary least squares regression (OLS).

The model was trained using the lm() function and the training process involved fitting the model to the data, estimating the regression coefficients for each predictor, and computing the residuals. The code below was used:

The residuals showed a reasonable fit with no large deviations. Key predictors such as age, gender, bmi, and smoking status showed statistically significant effects, while others, such as race and diabetes, did not appear significant based on p-values.

The coefficients were estimated through OLS regression, and the residuals were checked for normality. The model was trained on the entire training dataset, and no regularization was applied.

The training outcome included the estimated coefficients for each feature in the dataset, with significance levels for each predictor.

Overall, the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) was 0.544.

LASSO Model

To address potential multi-collinearity and perform feature selection, we used LASSO Regression, applying L1 regularization to shrink the coefficients of less important features to zero.

In terms of model selection, the best lambda (penalty term) was selected based on cross-validation, which helps to balance model fit and complexity. The model with the lowest cross-validation error was used for evaluation.

The Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) for LASSO was calculated as 0.544, similar to MLR, indicating comparable predictive performance.

Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS) Model

Non-linear regression MARS model automatically selects the best interactions and non-linear transformations of predictors.

We first trained the MARS model without tuning. This resulted in a complex model of about 13 terms and multiple interactions selected. While it provided a reasonable fit, we sought to prune the model to avoid overfitting.

We fine-tuned the MARS model using cross-validation to determine the optimal number of terms and the degree of interactions. The best parameters were selected as follows:

- nprune = 10: The final model had 10 terms, which were selected based on the lowest Generalized Cross Validation (GCV) score.
- degree = 1: The degree of interaction was set to 1, which considers only pairwise interactions between features.

We then fit the final MARS model with those tuned parameters. The RMSE for the tuned MARS model was 0.528, which was slightly better than the MLR and LASSO models. This suggests that the MARS model, after tuning, offers improved predictive performance while avoiding over-fitting.

Based on the RMSE and the results of model selection, MARS was chosen as the final model due to its superior performance and ability to capture complex non-linear relationships between the predictors and the antibody levels. The final MARS model with 10 terms and degree 1 interactions was retained for further evaluation.

Results

```
## The following errors were returned during `as_gt()`:
## x For variable `age` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx" (>=
##   0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `bmi` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx" (>=
##   0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `days_vaccinated` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package
##   "cardx" (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `diabetes` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx"
##   (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `gender` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx"
##   (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `height` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx"
##   (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `hypertension` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package
##   "cardx" (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `ldl` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx" (>=
##   0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `log_antibody` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package
##   "cardx" (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `race` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx" (>=
##   0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `sbp` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx" (>=
##   0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `smoking` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx"
##   (>= 0.2.3) is required.
## x For variable `weight` (`set`) and "p.value" statistic: The package "cardx"
##   (>= 0.2.3) is required.
```

Table 1: Summary of Patient Testing and Training Data (N=6000)

Characteristic	**Overall** N = 6,000[1]	**Testing Data** N = 1,000[1]	**Training Data** N = 5,000[1]	**p-value**
Age	60.0 (57.0, 63.0)	60.0 (57.0, 63.0)	60.0 (57.0, 63.0)	
Gender				
Female	3,082 (51%)	509 (51%)	2,573 (51%)	
Male	2,918 (49%)	491 (49%)	2,427 (49%)	
Race				
Asian	333 (5.6%)	55 (5.5%)	278 (5.6%)	
Black	1,235 (21%)	199 (20%)	1,036 (21%)	
Hispanic	548 (9.1%)	83 (8.3%)	465 (9.3%)	
White	3,884 (65%)	663 (66%)	3,221 (64%)	
Smoking				
Current	589 (9.8%)	103 (10%)	486 (9.7%)	
Former	1,800 (30%)	296 (30%)	1,504 (30%)	
Never	3,611 (60%)	601 (60%)	3,010 (60%)	
Height (cm)	170.1 (166.1, 174.2)	170.2 (166.1, 174.2)	170.1 (166.1, 174.3)	
Weight (kg)	80 (75, 85)	80 (75, 84)	80 (75, 85)	
BMI	27.60 (25.80, 29.50)	27.60 (25.80, 29.60)	27.60 (25.80, 29.50)	
Diabetes	929 (15%)	157 (16%)	772 (15%)	
Hypertension	2,754 (46%)	456 (46%)	2,298 (46%)	
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	130 (124, 135)	130 (124, 135)	130 (124, 135)	
LDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)	110 (96, 124)	112 (96, 124)	110 (96, 124)	
Time Since Vaccinated (days)	116 (82, 152)	171 (140, 205)	106 (76, 138)	
Log-Transformed Antibody Level	10.06 (9.65, 10.45)	9.93 (9.50, 10.32)	10.09 (9.68, 10.48)	

[1] Median (Q1, Q3); n (%)

Figure 1: Distribution of Log−Transformed Antibody Level, by Data Set



Figure 2: Distribution of Days Since Vaccination, by Data Set



Figure 3: Distribution of Log−Transformed Antibody Level, by Gender



Figure 4: Distribution of Log−Transformed Antibody Level, by Race



Figure 5: Distribution of Log−Transformed Antibody Level, by Smoking



Table 2: Log-Transformed Antibody Level, by Gender

Characteristic	**Female** N = 3,082[1]	**Male** N = 2,918[1]	**p-value**
log_antibody	10.20 (9.79, 10.58)	9.93 (9.51, 10.30)	

[1] Median (Q1, Q3)

Table 3: Log-Transformed Antibody Level, by Race

Characteristic	**Asian** N = 333[1]	**Black** N = 1,235[1]	**Hispanic** N = 548[1]	**White** N = 3,884[1]	**p-value**
log_antibody	10.06 (9.62, 10.44)	10.08 (9.65, 10.44)	10.03 (9.61, 10.42)	10.06 (9.65, 10.46)	

[1] Median (Q1, Q3)

Table 4: Log-Transformed Antibody Level, by Smoking Status

Characteristic	**Current** N = 589[1]	**Former** N = 1,800[1]	**Never** N = 3,611[1]	**p-value**
log_antibody	9.91 (9.46, 10.28)	10.10 (9.66, 10.48)	10.07 (9.68, 10.46)	

[1] Median (Q1, Q3)

```
## The following errors were returned during `as_gt()`:
## x For variable `log_antibody` (`gender`) and "p.value" statistic: The package
##   "cardx" (>= 0.2.3) is required.

## The following errors were returned during `as_gt()`:
## x For variable `log_antibody` (`race`) and "p.value" statistic: The package
##   "cardx" (>= 0.2.3) is required.

## The following errors were returned during `as_gt()`:
## x For variable `log_antibody` (`smoking`) and "p.value" statistic: The package
##   "cardx" (>= 0.2.3) is required.
```

Figure 6: Correlation Matrix of Numerical Variables



Figure 7: Log−Transformed Antibody Level vs. BMI



Figure 8: Log−Transformed Antibody Level vs. Weight



Figure 9: Log−Transformed Antibody Level vs. Age


Log−Transformed Antibody Level
Age
set
Testing Data
Training Data