

```

---
title: "Conditional Probability"
author: "Brian Caffo, Jeff Leek, Roger Peng"
highlighter: highlight.js
output: html_document
job: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
logo: bloomberg_shield.png
mode: selfcontained
hitheme: tomorrow
subtitle: Statistical Inference
framework: io2012
url:
  assets: ../../assets
  lib: ../../librariesNew
widgets: mathjax
---

```

Conditional probability, motivation

- The probability of getting a one when rolling a (standard) die is usually assumed to be one sixth
- Suppose you were given the extra information that the die roll was an odd number (hence 1, 3 or 5)
- *conditional on this new information*, the probability of a one is now one third

Conditional probability, definition

- Let B be an event so that $P(B) > 0$
- Then the conditional probability of an event A given that B has occurred is

$$P(A | B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$$

- Notice that if A and B are independent, then

$$P(A | B) = \frac{P(A) P(B)}{P(B)} = P(A)$$

Example

- Consider our die roll example
- $B = \{1, 3, 5\}$
- $A = \{1\}$

```


$$P(A | B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)} = \frac{P(\{1\} \cap \{1, 3, 5\})}{P(\{1, 3, 5\})} = \frac{P(\{1\})}{P(\{1, 3, 5\})} = \frac{1/6}{3/6} = \frac{1}{3}$$


```

```

P(\mbox{one given that roll is odd}) & = & P(A ~|~ B) \\ \\
& = & \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)} \\ \\
& = & \frac{P(A)}{P(B)} \\ \\
& = & \frac{1/6}{3/6} = \frac{1}{3}
\end{eqnarray*}
$$

```

Bayes' rule

```

$$
P(B ~|~ A) = \frac{P(A ~|~ B) P(B)}{P(A ~|~ B) P(B) + P(A ~|~
B^c)P(B^c)}.
$$

```

Diagnostic tests

- Let $+$$ and $-$ be the events that the result of a diagnostic test is positive or negative respectively
- Let D and D^c be the event that the subject of the test has or does not have the disease respectively
- The **sensitivity** is the probability that the test is positive given that the subject actually has the disease, $P(+ ~|~ D)$
- The **specificity** is the probability that the test is negative given that the subject does not have the disease, $P(- ~|~ D^c)$

More definitions

- The **positive predictive value** is the probability that the subject has the disease given that the test is positive, $P(D ~|~ +)$
- The **negative predictive value** is the probability that the subject does not have the disease given that the test is negative, $P(D^c ~|~ -)$
- The **prevalence of the disease** is the marginal probability of disease, $P(D)$

More definitions

- The **diagnostic likelihood ratio of a positive test**, labeled DLR_+ , is $P(+ ~|~ D) / P(+ ~|~ D^c)$, which is the $\frac{\text{sensitivity}}{1 - \text{specificity}}$

- The **diagnostic likelihood ratio of a negative test**, labeled DLR_{-} , is $P(- \sim | \sim D) / P(- \sim | \sim D^c)$, which is the $(1 - \text{sensitivity}) / \text{specificity}$

Example

- A study comparing the efficacy of HIV tests, reports on an experiment which concluded that HIV antibody tests have a sensitivity of 99.7% and a specificity of 98.5%

- Suppose that a subject, from a population with a .1% prevalence of HIV, receives a positive test result. What is the probability that this subject has HIV?

- Mathematically, we want $P(D \sim | \sim +)$ given the sensitivity, $P(+ \sim | \sim D) = .997$, the specificity, $P(- \sim | \sim D^c) = .985$, and the prevalence $P(D) = .001$

Using Bayes' formula

```


$$P(D \sim | \sim +) = \frac{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D)}{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D) + P(+ \sim | \sim D^c)P(D^c)}$$


$$= \frac{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D)}{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D) + \{1 - P(- \sim | \sim D^c)\}\{1 - P(D)\}}$$


$$= \frac{.997 \times .001}{.997 \times .001 + .015 \times .999}$$


$$= .062$$


```

- In this population a positive test result only suggests a 6% probability that the subject has the disease

- (The positive predictive value is 6% for this test)

More on this example

- The low positive predictive value is due to low prevalence of disease and the somewhat modest specificity

- Suppose it was known that the subject was an intravenous drug user and routinely had intercourse with an HIV infected partner

- Notice that the evidence implied by a positive test result does not change because of the prevalence of disease in the subject's population, only our interpretation of that evidence changes

Likelihood ratios

- Using Bayes rule, we have

\$\$

$$P(D \sim | \sim +) = \frac{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D)}{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D) + P(+ \sim | \sim D^c)P(D^c)}$$

\$\$

and

\$\$

$$P(D^c \sim | \sim +) = \frac{P(+ \sim | \sim D^c)P(D^c)}{P(+ \sim | \sim D)P(D) + P(+ \sim | \sim D^c)P(D^c)}.$$

\$\$

Likelihood ratios

- Therefore

\$\$

$$\frac{P(D \sim | \sim +)}{P(D^c \sim | \sim +)} = \frac{P(+ \sim | \sim D)}{P(+ \sim | \sim D^c)} \times \frac{P(D)}{P(D^c)}$$

\$\$

ie

\$\$

$$\text{\mbox{post-test odds of }D} = \text{DLR}_+ \times \text{\mbox{pre-test odds of }D}$$

\$\$

- Similarly, DLR_- relates the decrease in the odds of the disease after a negative test result to the odds of disease prior to the test.

HIV example revisited

- Suppose a subject has a positive HIV test

- $\text{DLR}_+ = .997 / (1 - .985) \approx 66$

- The result of the positive test is that the odds of disease is now 66 times the pretest odds

- Or, equivalently, the hypothesis of disease is 66 times more supported by the data than the hypothesis of no disease

HIV example revisited

- Suppose that a subject has a negative test result

- $\text{DLR}_- = (1 - .997) / .985 \approx .003$

- Therefore, the post-test odds of disease is now $.3\%$ of the pretest odds given the negative test.

- Or, the hypothesis of disease is supported $.003$ times that of the hypothesis of absence of disease given the negative test result

