

## Checking Predictive Power

2/24/22

$$\text{Response: } \Psi = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{Prediction: } \hat{\Psi} = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$$

Model gives us  $\hat{\pi} \in [0, 1]$ .

Cut-off value:  $\hat{\Psi} = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$   $\hat{\pi} \rightarrow \pi_0$   
 $\hat{\pi} \leq \pi_0$

For some chosen  $\pi_0$ . Common choices:

- $\pi_0 = 0.5$
- $\pi_0 = \text{Sample proportion of } \Psi=1$

Classification Table:

		Predicted	
		$\hat{\Psi} = 1$	$\hat{\Psi} = 0$
Observed	$\Psi = 1$	a	b
	$\Psi = 0$	c	d

Sensitivity:  $P(\hat{\Psi} = 1 \mid \Psi = 1)$

Estimate:  $\frac{a}{a+b}$

Specificity:  $P(\hat{\Psi} = 0 \mid \Psi = 0)$

Estimate:  $\frac{d}{c+d}$

Better - Split data

① Training  $\rightarrow$  Fit model

② Testing  $\rightarrow$  Classification above

Warning:

- Fit the model on the same data we're trying to predict

$\rightarrow$  Not fair assessment of predictive power.

- Limitations :
- ① Sensitive to our choice of  $\hat{\pi}_0$ .
  - ② Sensitive to the relative times that  $\hat{Y}=1 \leftarrow \hat{Y}=0$  in the data.
  - ③ Loss of information classifying a probability,  $\hat{\pi}$  to  $0, 1$ .

ROC - Receiver operating curves (characteristic)

- Calculate sensitivity & specificity for all  $\hat{\pi}_0 \in [0, 1]$

$$P(\hat{Y}=1 | Y=1)$$

Sensitivity  
= true  
positive rate  
(want high)



$$\therefore (1, 1) \rightarrow \hat{\pi}_0 = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Y} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \hat{\pi} > 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\pi} \leq 0 \end{cases} \\ \Rightarrow \hat{Y} &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_0 &\xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \Rightarrow \hat{Y} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \hat{\pi} > 1 \\ 0 & \hat{\pi} \leq 1 \end{cases} \\ \Rightarrow \hat{Y} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \text{Specificity} &= P(\hat{Y}=1 | Y=0) \\ &= \text{false positive rate} \\ &\quad (\text{want low}) \end{aligned}$$

$C$  = "concordance index" = area under ROC curve  
- estimates  $P(\text{prediction} \leftarrow \text{outcome}$   
are "concordant")

Higher  $C \Rightarrow$

More "concordant"  
= good  
Predictive power

larger  $\hat{\pi} \rightsquigarrow$  "larger"  $y$

Framingham Example - Two predictors - Sbp, sex

Fitted additive model:

quantitative  
binary

$$\log\left(\frac{\hat{P}}{1-\hat{P}}\right) = -2.765 + 0.018x_1 - 0.783x_2$$

$x_1$  = systolic blood pressure (mmHg)

$$x_2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{female} \\ 0 & \text{male} \end{cases}$$

Interpretations in R code -

Males:  $\log\left(\frac{\hat{P}}{1-\hat{P}}\right) = -2.765 + 0.018\tilde{x}_1$

Females:  $\log\left(\frac{\hat{P}}{1-\hat{P}}\right) = -2.765 - 0.783 + 0.018\tilde{x}_1$

Females - Males :  $-0.783$

Fitted interaction model:

$$\log\left(\frac{\hat{P}}{1-\hat{P}}\right) = -2.089 + 0.0128x_1 - 1.867x_2 + 0.0080x_1x_2$$

Males ( $x_2=0$ ):  $-2.089 + 0.0128\tilde{x}_1$

Females ( $x_2=1$ ):  $(-2.089 - 1.867) + (0.0128 + 0.0080)\tilde{x}_1$

Females - Males :  $-1.867 + 0.008\tilde{x}_1$

$\log \left( \frac{\text{odds CHD Female}}{\text{odds CHD Male}} \mid x_1 \right)$

How to interpret the interaction coef itself?

Multiplicative

- = effect on an effect
- = change in odds ratio

effect of sex on  
the effect of sbp on CVD

$$\frac{\text{odds of CVD sbp } x+1}{\text{odds of CVD sbp } x}$$

effect of sbp  
on the effect  
of sex on CVD

$$\frac{\text{odds CVD Female}}{\text{odds CVD Males}}$$