

Assignment2
 STAT229
 Name: Zihao Huang
 Date: 1/30/2017

1.

. tab sta inf

STA	INF		Total
	0	1	
0	100	60	160
1	16	24	40
Total	116	84	200

The log-odds is $(100 \times 24) / (60 \times 16) = 2.5$

. logistic sta inf

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	200
	LR chi2(1)	=	6.58
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0103
Log likelihood = -96.792669	Pseudo R2	=	0.0329

sta	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
inf	2.5	.9042723	2.53	0.011	1.230418	5.079573
_cons	.16	.0430813	-6.81	0.000	.0943902	.2712146

The log-odds is 2.5

. logit sta inf

Iteration 0: log likelihood = **-100.08048**
 Iteration 1: log likelihood = **-96.853843**
 Iteration 2: log likelihood = **-96.792686**
 Iteration 3: log likelihood = **-96.792669**
 Iteration 4: log likelihood = **-96.792669**

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	200
	LR chi2(1)	=	6.58
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0103
Log likelihood = -96.792669	Pseudo R2	=	0.0329

sta	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
inf	.9162908	.3617089	2.53	0.011	.2073543	1.625227
_cons	-1.832582	.2692582	-6.81	0.000	-2.360318	-1.304845

The slope coefficient of INF is $e^{0.9163} = 2.500$ and Std is 0.3617

Also,

$$SD = [\text{sqrt}(1/100 + 1/16 + 1/24 + 1/60)] = 0.3617$$

And the 95% confident interval of OR of INF is ($e^{0.2074}$, $e^{1.6252}$)

$$1.23 \leq OR \leq 5.08$$

2.

LOW	RACE			Total
	1	2	3	
0	73	15	42	130
1	23	11	25	59
Total	96	26	67	189

For race=1 is reference group,

The OR for race=1 and race=2 is $(73 \times 11) / (15 \times 23) = 2.3275$ ($e^{0.8448}$)

The OR for race=1 and race=3 is $(73 \times 25) / (23 \times 42) = 1.8892$ ($e^{0.6362}$)

. logistic low i.race

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	189
	LR chi2(2)	=	5.01
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0817
Log likelihood = -114.83082	Pseudo R2	=	0.0214

low	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
race						
2	2.327536	1.078613	1.82	0.068	.9385072	5.772385
3	1.889234	.6571342	1.83	0.067	.9554577	3.735597
_cons	.3150685	.0753382	-4.83	0.000	.1971825	.503433

```
. logit low i.race, level(90)
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood =  -117.336
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -114.84273
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -114.83082
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -114.83082
```

```
Logistic regression                                Number of obs   =       189
                                                    LR chi2(2)      =        5.01
                                                    Prob > chi2     =       0.0817
Log likelihood = -114.83082                        Pseudo R2      =       0.0214
```

low	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[90% Conf. Interval]	
race						
2	.8448103	.4634141	1.82	0.068	.0825619	1.607059
3	.6361714	.347831	1.83	0.067	.0640403	1.208303
_cons	-1.154965	.2391169	-4.83	0.000	-1.548278	-.7616529

The log-odds of low by race2 is $e^{0.8448} = 2.3275$

The 95% confident interval of OR for race2 is ($e^{0.0826}$, $e^{1.6071}$), that is (1.0861, 4.9883)

The log-odds of low by race3 is $e^{0.6362} = 1.8893$.

The 95% confident interval of OR for race3 is ($e^{0.0640}$, $e^{1.2083}$), that is (1.0661, 3.3478)

In 90% confidence (because the p-value is smaller than 0.10 but larger than 0.05),

```
Covariance matrix of coefficients of logistic model
```

e(V)	low	
	race	_cons
low		
race	.02937799	
_cons	-.05714275	.13626626

3.

. logit sta crn

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -100.08048
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -97.599816
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -97.368391
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -97.368374
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -97.368374
```

```
logistic regression              Number of obs   =       200
                                LR chi2(1)       =        5.42
                                Prob > chi2       =       0.0199
Log likelihood = -97.368374      Pseudo R2     =       0.0271
```

sta	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
crn	1.219757	.5038556	2.42	0.015	.2322177	2.207296
_cons	-1.53821	.1948369	-7.89	0.000	-1.920084	-1.156337

. logit sta crn age

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -100.08048
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -94.672038
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -94.3031
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -94.302294
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -94.302294
```

```
Logistic regression              Number of obs   =       200
                                LR chi2(2)       =       11.56
                                Prob > chi2       =       0.0031
Log likelihood = -94.302294      Pseudo R2     =       0.0577
```

sta	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
crn	1.019856	.5149244	1.98	0.048	.0106231	2.02909
age	.0249915	.0107234	2.33	0.020	.003974	.046009
_cons	-3.029875	.7000292	-4.33	0.000	-4.401907	-1.657843

```
. logit sta age crn i.crn#c.age
```

```
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -100.08048
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -94.160869
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -93.683315
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -93.681076
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -93.681076
```

```
Logistic regression                               Number of obs   =       200
                                                    LR chi2(3)      =       12.80
                                                    Prob > chi2     =       0.0051
Log likelihood = -93.681076                       Pseudo R2      =       0.0639
```

sta	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	.029242	.011725	2.49	0.013	.0062613	.0522226
crn	3.573101	2.322261	1.54	0.124	-.978447	8.124649
crn#c.age						
1	-.0380925	.0340579	-1.12	0.263	-.1048447	.0286598
_cons	-3.297927	.7705345	-4.28	0.000	-4.808147	-1.787707

From these three models: STA explained by CRN, STA explained by CRN and AGE, STA explained by CRN and AGE and interaction of CRN and AGE, for model 1 and model 2, $G = -2 \times (-93.681076 - (-94.302294))$, is larger than p-value for chi-square 0.05, means there is no difference between model1 and model 2. And the difference of CRN is $(1.219757 - 1.019856) / 1.019856 = 0.1960 = 19.6\%$, which means the change is nearly 20%, it needs adjustment. It can be seen that AGE make CRN's p-value larger which means it may be a confounder. And from the statistical interaction, we knew that the p-value of interaction between AGE and CRN is 0.263, which is large and it shows that in 95% confidence it is not significant in this model. So, there is no statistical interaction between these two variables.

4.

(a)

. logit death inh_inj

Iteration 0: log likelihood = **-422.70909**
 Iteration 1: log likelihood = **-369.7569**
 Iteration 2: log likelihood = **-352.08759**
 Iteration 3: log likelihood = **-345.83117**
 Iteration 4: log likelihood = **-345.8305**
 Iteration 5: log likelihood = **-345.8305**

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	1,000
	LR chi2(1)	=	153.76
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -345.8305	Pseudo R2	=	0.1819

death	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
inh_inj	2.692546	.2189964	12.29	0.000	2.263321	3.121771
_cons	-2.327903	.1186192	-19.63	0.000	-2.560392	-2.095414

. logit death inh_inj age

Iteration 0: log likelihood = **-422.70909**
 Iteration 1: log likelihood = **-301.37879**
 Iteration 2: log likelihood = **-269.42894**
 Iteration 3: log likelihood = **-266.7758**
 Iteration 4: log likelihood = **-266.77**
 Iteration 5: log likelihood = **-266.77**

Logistic regression	Number of obs	=	1,000
	LR chi2(2)	=	311.88
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -266.77	Pseudo R2	=	0.3689

death	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
inh_inj	2.923704	.2686788	10.88	0.000	2.397104	3.450305
age	.0587824	.0055477	10.60	0.000	.0479091	.0696557
_cons	-5.002426	.338955	-14.76	0.000	-5.666765	-4.338086

From these two models: death explained by inh_inj ,and death explained by inh_inj and age, Both inh_inj and age in these two models are significant, the percentage of inh_inj from model 1 to model 2 is $(2.6925-2.9237)/2.9237 = -0.0791 = 7.91\%$, and for these two model, $G = -2 * (-266.77 - (-345.8305))$, which is much smaller than chi-square (1)'s p-value 0.001, thus, these two models are significant.