

Longitudinal Data Fall 2015

Chapter 7, part 3

Mixed, Random Effects, Random Coefficients, Multilevel, ... Models

<u>Instructors</u>

Nick Jewell (jewell@berkeley.edu)



Robin Mejia (mejia@nasw.org)



General Mixed Model for Logistic Regression - Theoretically

- Similar to linear model, can be generally described as a model with the logit of the probability of the outcome conditional on covariates and the specific unit (and possibly sub-unit).
- Consists of parameters (β) *covariates $(X_{ijk...})$ and random variables (U_i) *covariates $(Z_{ijk...})$, where usually $Z_{ijk...}$ is a subset of $X_{ijk...}$.

$$\log it \left[P(Y_{ijk\dots} = 1 \mid \vec{X}_{ijk\dots}\vec{U}_i, \vec{Z}_{ijk\dots}) \right] = \vec{X}^T_{ijk\dots}\vec{\beta} + \vec{Z}^T_{ijk\dots}\vec{U}_i$$

General Mixed Model for Logistic Regression - Theoretically

- Assumption is typically $U_i \sim MVN(0, \Sigma)$.
- Solve using MLE -

$$L_{\beta,\Sigma}(\vec{Y}_{i.} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}) = \int_{\vec{U}_{i}} P(Y_{i} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}, \mathbf{Z}_{i}, \vec{U}_{i}) dP(\vec{U}_{i})$$

General Mixed Model for Logistic Regression - Practically

Like linear mixed models, one can use these models to:

- Introduce complicated correlation structures to account for repeated measures structures.
- 2. Model source of variation at different hierarchical levels.
- Get estimates of within unit associations as opposed as population average associations (from GEE models).
- 4. Predict random effects.
- Use xtmelogit in STATA.

Random Effects Model for Teenage Sex and Drug-Use

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})] = \log \left(\frac{P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}{P(Y_{ij} = 0 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}\right) = \beta_0^* + \beta_{0i} + \beta_1^* x_{ij}$$

- Assume that the repeated observations for the ith teenager are independent of one another given β_{i0} and X_{ij} .
- Must assume parametric distribution for the β_{i0} , usually $\beta_{i0} \sim N(0,\tau^2)$.
- exp(β₁*) is odds ratio for having sex infection when subject i reports drug-use relative to when same subject does not report drug-use.

Teenage Sex and Drug-Use

Number of observations per teen tab cattot if cnt==1 Total # Obs | per teen | Freq. Percent Cum. 1-10 | 35 31.82 31.82 11-20 | 22 20.00 51.82 21-30 | 48 43.64 95.45 >31 | 5 4.55 100.00 Total | 110 100.00

Proportion of days with Sexual Activity by						
teen	a	total on	servations	obs	Number of	
					m - 1 - 3 - 11 - 1	
					Total #	
			sx2		Obs per	
		yes			teen	
166					1-10	
		40.96				
		100				
					11-20	
		30.77				
		291				
		23.87				
	·			·		
199		43	156	1	>31	
100.00		21.61	78.39			
	-+-			-+		
1,909		502	1,407	1	Total	
100.00		26.30	73.70	1		

Proportion of days with Drug/Alcohol use by Number of observations total on a teen

Total #	I		
Obs per	drga	alcoh	
	no		
1-10	88 56.41	68 43.59	156 100.00
11-20	205	112 35.33	317 100.00
21-30	840 76.64	256 23.36	1,096
>31		21 15.11	139 100.00
	1,251	457 26.76	1,708

. cs sx24hrs drgalcoh, or

```
| drgalcoh |
            | Exposed Unexposed | Total
       Cases | 171 320 | 491
     Noncases | 286 931 | 1217
       Total | 457 1251 | 1708
       Risk | .3741794 .2557954 | .2874707
            | Point estimate | [95% Conf. Interval]
Risk difference | .1183841 | .0678575 .1689107
                  1.462808 | 1.256995 1.702318
   Risk ratio |
                  .3163832 | .2044521 .4125659
Attr. frac. ex. |
                  .1101864
Attr. frac. pop |
                  1.739521 | 1.385047 2.184751 (Cornfield)
    Odds ratio |
                     chi2(1) = 22.90 Pr>chi2 = 0.0000
```

Random effects for teenage sex vs drug use

. xtmelogit sx24hrs drgalcoh || eid:, stddeviations sx24hrs | Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval] ______ drgalcoh | .3882629 .1552394 2.50 0.012 .0839993 .6925264 cons | -1.08007 .1537975 -7.02 0.000 -1.381507 -.778632 Random-effects Parameters | Estimate Std. Err. [95% Conf. Interval] ______ eid: Identity sd(cons) | 1.274216 .1424908 1.023426 1.586462 LR test vs. logistic regression: chibar2(01) = 183.36 Prob>=chibar2 = 0.0000 . lincom drgalcoh, or sx24hrs | Odds Ratio Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]

Random effects for teenage sex vs drug use

. estat ic

Akaike's information criterion and Bayesian information criterion								
	Obs	ll(null)	ll(mod	el) df	AIC	BIC		
					1849.593			
	Note:	N=Obs used	in calcula	ating BIC;	see [R] BIC	note		
. estat icc Residual intraclass correlation								
		Level	ICC	Std. Err	. [95% Co	nf. Interval]		
		·			.241488			

Re-do to get Robust SE's with Clustered Bootstrap

should be newid

```
. bootstrap, cluster(eid) idcluster(newid) group(eid) reps(50): xtmelogit sx24hrs drgalcoh ||
eid:, stddeviations
```

Should be reps(1000)

(running xtmelogit on estimation sample)

Bootstrap replications (50)

sx24hrs	Observed	Bootstrap		P> z		-based
+					-	
drgalcoh	.3882629	.1674896	2.32	0.020	.0599893	.7165364
_cons	-1.08007	.1493861	-7.23	0.000	-1.372861	7872783

Random-effects	,	Observed Estimate	Bootstrap Std. Err.	Normal	Interval]
eid: Identity	sd(_cons)		.2016843	.9343594	1.737689

LR test vs. logistic regression: chibar2(01) = 183.36 Prob>=chibar2 = 0.0000

Random coefficients model for teenage sex vs drug use

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})] = \log \left(\frac{P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}{1 - P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}\right) = (\beta_0 + \beta_{0i}) + (\beta_1 + \beta_{1i})x_{ij}$$

```
. xtmelogit sx24hrs drgalcoh || eid: drgalcoh, stddeviations cov(unstruct)

sx24hrs | Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]

drgalcoh | .3287796 .1913386 1.72 0.086 -.0462372 .7037965

_cons | -1.077791 .1437309 -7.50 0.000 -1.359498 -.7960831
```

Random coefficients model for teenage sex vs drug use

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})] = \log \left(\frac{P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}{1 - P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}\right) = (\beta_0 + \beta_{0i}) + (\beta_1 + \beta_{1i})x_{ij}$$

Random-effects Parameters	·			-	-
eid: Unstructured					
sd(drgalcoh))	.7279197	.299680	8 .3248241	1.631243
sd(_cons)	1.16517	.154480	5 .8985357	1.510926
corr(drgalcoh,_cons)	.4527734	.399989	64604965	.900396
LR test vs. logistic regres:	sion:	chi2	(3) = 18	7.82 Prob > ch	i2 = 0.0000
. lincom drgalcoh, or					
sx24hrs Odds Ratio	Std.	Frr	. D.\ I	- I [05° Conf	
		HII.	Z P/	2 [93% CONT	. Interval]

estat ic

Akaike's information criterion and Bayesian information criterion

Note: N=Obs used in calculating BIC; see [R] BIC note

. estat icc
Conditional intraclass correlation

Level | ICC Std. Err. [95% Conf. Interval]
----eid | .2921193 .0548321 .1970516 .4096525

Note: ICC is conditional on zero values of random-effects covariates.

Model	Parameter	Estimate	SE(Naïve)
	β ₀	-1.08	0.15
Simple Random Effects	β_1	0.39	0.15
Cimple Random Enecto	OR	1.47	0.23
	$SD(\beta_{0i})$	1.27	0.14
	ICC	0.33	0.049
Fit Statistic	AIC	1849.6	
	β ₀	-1.08	0.14
Random Coefficients	β_1	0.33	0.19
	OR	1.38	0.27
	$SD(\beta_{0i})$	1.16	0.15
	SD(β _{1i})	0.73	0.30
	ICC	0.29	0.055
	$Cor(\beta_{0i,}\beta_{2i})$	0.45	0.40
Fit Statistic	AIC	1849.1	

Range of Impacts (defined by odds ratio) of drug/alcohol use on sexual activity

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})] = \log \left(\frac{P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}{1 - P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}\right) = (\beta_0 + \beta_{0i}) + (\beta_1 + \beta_{1i})x_{ij}$$

• The estimated IQR of the odds ratios in popⁿ is

$$(\exp{\{\hat{\beta}_1 - Z_{0.75} * \hat{\sigma}_{\beta_{1i}}\}}, \exp{\{\hat{\beta}_1 + Z_{0.75} * \hat{\sigma}_{\beta_{1i}}\}}) = (\exp{\{0.33 - 0.67 * 0.73\}}, \exp{\{0.33 + 0.67 * 0.73\}})$$

(.85027557 , 2.2699413)

Random coefficients model adjusting for *history of sexual* activity

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij}=1 \mid \beta_{0i},\beta_{1i},X_{ij}=x_{ij},\overline{Y}_{i,j-1})] = (\beta_0+\beta_{0i}) + (\beta_1+\beta_{1i})x_{ij} + \beta_2\overline{Y}_{i,j-1}$$

```
*** Creating "cumulative average"
sort eid time
capture drop cumsum
gen cumsum = 0
replace cumsum = sx24hrs if cnt==1
by eid: replace cumsum = cumsum[_n-1]+sx24hrs if cnt > 1
gen cumprop = cumsum/cnt
by eid: gen cumlag = cumprop[ n-1] if cnt > 1
```

Random coefficients model adjusting for *history of sexual* activity

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, \beta_{1i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij}, \overline{Y}_{i,j-1})] = (\beta_0 + \beta_{0i}) + (\beta_1 + \beta_{1i})x_{ij} + \beta_2 \overline{Y}_{i,j-1}$$

```
xtmelogit sx24hrs drgalcoh cumlag || eid: drgalcoh, stddeviations
cov(unstruct)
    sx24hrs | Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]
   drgalcoh | .3158968 .2025083 1.56 0.119 -.0810122 .7128059
    cumlag | -.6029536 .5978829 -1.01 0.313 -1.774783 .5688754
     _cons | -.8357194 .2291452 -3.65 0.000 -1.284836 -.386603
lincom drgalcoh, or
    sx24hrs | Odds Ratio Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]
       (1) | 1.371489 .2777379 1.56 0.119 .9221824 2.039706
```

Random Effects Model for Diarrhea Study in Children

$$\log\left(\frac{P(Y_{ijk} = 1)}{1 - P(Y_{ijk} = 1)}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_{0i} + \beta_{0ij}$$

- Measurements made at children (k) within households (j) within villages (i).
- Want to know the greatest sources of variation:
 - households $var(\beta_{0ii})$ or
 - villages $var(\beta_{0i})$
- Assumes children in same household have same probability of diarrhea.
 - Use xtmelogit in STATA

Random Effects Model for Diarrhea Study in Children

xtmelogit diarrhea || vilid: || hhid:, intpoints(5)

Mixed-effects lo	gistic regr	ession		Number of o	bs =	30371
Group Variable	Groups	Minimum	Average		_	
vilid	12	610	2530.9	5452 7 672		5 5
Log likelihood =	-8614.8567			Wald chi2(0 Prob > chi2		
diarrhea				P> z [Interval]
'				0.000 -2		-2.321536

Random Effects Model for Diarrhea Study in Children Variance of Random Effects

Cluster correlation coefficient (based on latent response model) – not as simple for logistic mixed models as it is for linear

$$\hat{\rho}_{house} = \frac{\text{vâr}(\beta_{0ij})}{\text{vâr}(\beta_{0ij}) + \text{vâr}(\beta_{0i}) + \pi^2/3} = \frac{0.76^2}{0.76^2 + 0.0001^2 + 3.29} = 0.15$$

$$\hat{\rho}_{village} = \frac{\text{vâr}(\beta_{0i})}{\text{vâr}(\beta_{0ij}) + \text{vâr}(\beta_{0i}) + \pi^2/3} = \frac{0.0001^2}{0.76^2 + 0.0001^2 + 3.29} = 0.00$$

Using conditional logistic regression for estimating within unit OR in logistic regression models

Treat Individual as a stratification variable for Teen Sex and Drugs

For the teen sex and drugs example, we can represent the data on each individual, i, as a simple 2x2 table:

■ Can get the OR for every subject: $\hat{O}R_i = \frac{a_i d_i}{b_i c_i}$

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})] = \log \left(\frac{P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}{P(Y_{ij} = 0 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}\right) = \beta_0^* + \beta_{0i} + \beta_1^* x_{ij}$$

assumes every person has the same OR, so one can average each estimated OR to get the estimate.

Mantel-Haenszel Average of Stratified OR's

Then the MH estimate is:

$$\hat{O}R_{MH} = \exp(\hat{\beta}_{1}^{*}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_{i} \hat{O}R_{i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_{i}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}d_{i})/n_{i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} (b_{i}c_{i})/n_{i}}$$

Note, that for any subject who has identical exposure (drug use) or outcomes (sex) for all observations, the OR is undefined and that person does not contribute to the estimate (their 2x2 table are dropped).

$$\log it[P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})] = \log \left(\frac{P(Y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}{P(Y_{ij} = 0 \mid \beta_{0i}, X_{ij} = x_{ij})}\right) = \beta_0^* + \beta_{0i} + \beta_1^* x_{ij}$$

- To illustrate, use the teenage sex and drugs example, assume just two observation for a person, and that one had the outcome $(Y_{i1}=1)$ with drugs $(X_{i1}=1)$ one observation had neither $(Y_{i2}=0, X_{i2}=0)$.
- Then, the conditional likelihood contribution for this observation is:

$$CondLik_{i} = \frac{P(Y_{i1} = 1 \mid X_{i1} = 1)P(Y_{i2} = 0 \mid X_{i2} = 0)}{P(Y_{i1} = 1 \mid X_{i1} = 1)P(Y_{i2} = 0 \mid X_{i2} = 0) + P(Y_{i1} = 1 \mid X_{i1} = 0)P(Y_{i2} = 0 \mid X_{i2} = 1)}$$

After plugging in the model for $Y_{ij:}$ and doing some algebra, one gets:

$$CondLik_{i} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\beta_{1}^{*}(X_{i2} - X_{i1}))}$$

 Notice, the individual level intercept (whether random or not) drops out.

- What it means is that the estimate of the within subject OR no longer depends on assumptions on the distribution of the random effect.
- Can only use this to estimate the association of time-varying covariates.
- Subjects with identical outcomes will be dropped from analysis.
- For those covariates that do not change in a subject, they will not contribute to estimation of the OR for that covariate.

- More generally, you might want to estimate the within subject OR for several variables simultaneously and/or the OR for a unit change in a continuous variable.
- Can still do so by using the conditional likelihood a method used to estimated OR's for matched case-control studies.
- The conditional likelihood (in example of a cohort) is the probability of observing that the cases have covariates they have and the controls have their observed covariates, given the distribution of covariates observed over all the repeated measurements.
- To define the likelihood, one normalizes the probability of observing the outcomes conditional on the covariates by the summed probabilities over all possible combinations of covariates and outcomes.

Teenage Sex and Drug-Use Using M-H summary OR.

. cs sx24hrs drgalcoh, by(eid) or

	eid 	OR [95%	Conf. Inte	rval] M-H W	Weight
1				0	(Cornfield)
2	0	0	10.56942	.3478261	(Cornfield)
3		0	•	0	(Cornfield)
4		•	•	0	(Cornfield)
5		•	•	0	(Cornfield)
6	1.333333	.2058078	8.53481	.8823529	(Cornfield)
7		•	•	0	(Cornfield)
8		0	•	0	(Cornfield)
9	1.5	.1778039	12.91562	.5714286	(Cornfield)
10		0	•	0	(Cornfield)
105				0	(Cornfield)
106	0	0	•	.6363636	(Cornfield)
107	.8	.1388054	4.9008	1.2	(Cornfield)
108	0	0	•	.125	(Cornfield)
109		•	•	0	(Cornfield)
110	1	0	•	0	(Cornfield)
MH Combined	1.33 	15498 .958 	4698 1.80	 5519 	

29

Conditional Logistic Estimate

```
. clogit sx24hrs drgalcoh, or group(eid)
         note: multiple positive outcomes within groups encountered.
          note: 23 groups (161 obs) dropped due to all positive or
                              all negative outcomes.
                Iteration 0: \log \text{ likelihood} = -664.37829
                Iteration 1: \log \text{ likelihood} = -663.20668
                Iteration 2: \log \text{ likelihood} = -663.20668
Conditional (fixed-effects) logistic regression
                                                Number of obs = 1547
                                                LR chi2(1) = 2.93
Prob > chi2 = 0.0867
                                                Pseudo R2 = 0.0022
Log likelihood = -663.20668
sx24hrs | Odds Ratio Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]
   drgalcoh | 1.323141 .2158621 1.72 0.086 .9610325 1.821689
```