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## Outline

| 8:30-9:00 | Review: proportions, exposure vs <br> outcome, risk ratio, odds ratio, chi- <br> squared test |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9:15-9:30 | Demonstration in R | Lab notes for today: <br> (under $R$ Lab and Code tab) |
| Practice | Practice (exercise 1, 2) | Categorical data analysis |
| Link to $R$ Lab and Code |  |  |

## Categorical data analysis

So far: we have compared 2 groups, continuous measurements (t-test)
What if the data is in categories: smoker or not, low birth weight or not

Test whether a proportion equals a certain value (z-test)
Different measures of proportions, exposure and outcome (risk ratio, odds ratio)
Strength of association between exposure and outcome (chi-squared test)

## Proportion (one group)

## Example 15.3 KS

In September 2001 a survey of smoking habits was conducted in a sample of 1000 teenagers aged 15-16, selected at random from all 15-16 year-olds living in Birmingham, UK.

A total of 123 reported that they were smokers.
What is the proportion of smokers? What is the 95\% confidence interval?

Sample proportion $\quad p=\frac{123}{1000}=0.123=12.3 \%$

Confidence interval for (sample) proportion
$\mathrm{Cl}=\left(p-z^{\prime} \times \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}, p+z^{\prime} \times \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}\right)$
Can also do hypothesis test:
HO: $\mathrm{p}=0.5$
$\mathrm{H} 1: \mathrm{p}!=0.5$ (not equal)
(Similar to t.test(), doing a z-test in R returns confidence interval)
\# in R:
prop.test(x $=123, \mathrm{n}=1000, \mathrm{p}=0.5)$

## Proportion (two groups)

Outcome: getting a disease or not, whether a drug is effective or not

Exposure: how we define the two groups: exposed / unexposed to $X$
(changing outcome should NOT change exposure! )

## X: 'risk factor'

- sex (men, women)
- drug (treatment, placebo)
- age groups (below 65, above 65)

Risk factor can be continuous too; today we focus on cateogorical (2 categories)

|  | Experienced outcome? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No |  |
| Exposure | D (disease) | H (healthy) |  |
| Group 1 (exposed) | $\mathbf{d 1}$ | $\mathbf{h 1}$ | n 1 |
| Group 0 (unexposed) | $\mathbf{d 0}$ | h0 | n 0 |
| Total | d | h | n |

## Proportion (two groups)

## (Example 2 in categorical lab notes) <br> Lung data (PEFH98-english)

## High value of pefmean versus gender

We want to investigate the association between having a high value of pefmean (in 2 categories), with gender

Note: for this variable, we have the continuous (numeric) measurements, so we do not have to use categorical analysis.

The purpose of this example is to show you how to split a continuous variable in 2 categories.

| * | age | gender | height | weight | pefsit1 | pefsit2 | pefsit3 | pefsta1 | pefsta2 | pefsta3 | pefsitm | pefstam | pefmean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 20 | female | 165 | 50 | 400 | 400 | 410 | 410 | 410 | 400 | 403.3333 | 406.6667 | 405.0000 |
| 2 | 20 | male | 185 | 75 | 480 | 460 | 510 | 520 | 500 | 480 | 483.3333 | 500.0000 | 491.6667 |
| 3 | 21 | male | 178 | 70 | 490 | 540 | 560 | 470 | 500 | 470 | 530.0000 | 480.0000 | 505.0000 |
| 4 | 21 | male | 179 | 74 | 520 | 530 | 540 | 480 | 510 | 500 | 530.0000 | 496.6667 | 513.3333 |
| 5 | 20 | male | 196 | 95 | 740 | 750 | 750 | 700 | 710 | 700 | 746.6667 | 703.3333 | 725.0000 |
| 6 | 20 | male | 189 | 83 | 600 | 575 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 640 | 591.6667 | 613.3333 | 602.5000 |
| 7 | 32 | male | 173 | 65 | 740 | 760 | 720 | 705 | 690 | 680 | 740.0000 | 691.6667 | 715.8333 |
| 8 | 22 | male | 196 | 94 | 720 | 720 | 700 | 700 | 730 | 800 | 713.3333 | 743.3333 | 728.3333 |
| 9 | 21 | female | 173 | 66 | 480 | 530 | 540 | 520 | 520 | 530 | 516.6667 | 523.3333 | 520.0000 |
| 10 | 23 | female | 173 | 65 | 400 | 430 | 420 | 430 | 430 | 430 | 416.6667 | 430.0000 | 423.3333 |
| 11 | 22 | female | 169 | 65 | 500 | 510 | 540 | 520 | 580 | 530 | 516.6667 | 543.3333 | 530.0000 |
| 12 | 23 | male | 185 | 75 | 730 | 630 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 710 | 686.6667 | 703.3333 | 695.0000 |
| 13 | 21 | male | 194 | 84 | 630 | 690 | 670 | 680 | 700 | 690 | 663.3333 | 690.0000 | 676.6667 |
| 14 |  | female | 170 | 55 | 360 | 360 | 370 | 370 | 360 | 360 | 363.3333 | 363.3333 | 363.3333 |

## Proportion (two groups)

(Example 2 in categorical lab notes)
Lung data (PEFH98-english)

High value of pefmean versus gender We want to investigate the association between having a high value of pefmean (in 2 categories), with gender

We assume pefmean > 500 is high; otherwise not.

Step 1: understand your data
What is "high value of pefmean"? Where does the threshold (500) place in the data distribution?

Histogram of lung_data\$pefmean

(This red line is the threshold to divide pefmean into 2 groups, NOT sample mean from yesterday!)

## Proportion (two groups)

(Example 2 in categorical lab notes)
Lung data (PEFH98-english)

High value of pefmean versus gender We want to investigate the association between having a high value of pefmean (in 2 categories), with gender

We assume pefmean > 500 is high; otherwise not.

Step 2: split pefmean into 2 groups, higher than 500; not higher than 500

If we have a new variable called "high pef", the values would be Yes or No.


Visually, it looks like half people have high pef; half do not have high pef

We can count how many exactly from the data (Yes: 51; No: 54)

## Proportion (two groups)

(Example 2 in categorical lab notes)
Lung data (PEFH98-english)

High value of pefmean versus gender
We want to investigate the association between having a high value of pefmean (in 2 categories), with gender

We assume pefmean > 500 is high; otherwise not.

Step 3: what is exposure, what is outcome?
In this case, we can consider high pef is the outcome, gender as exposure.

Why? (Would having high pef affect gender?)

Step 4: cross tabulation
Count: how many in each of the 4 cells

|  | High pef yes | High pef no |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male <br> (exposed) | 46 | 6 |
| Female <br> (unexposed) | $\mathbf{5}$ | 48 |

## Proportion (two groups)

## Risk ratio

Risk $($ male $)=46 /(46+6)=0.885$
Risk $($ female $)=5 /(5+48)=0.094$
Risk ratio $=0.885 / 0.094=9.37$
Males have 9.37 times the "risk" (or probability) of having high pef.

## Odds ratio

Odds $($ male $)=46 / 6=7.667$
Odds $($ female $)=5 / 48=0.104$
Odds ratio $=7.667 / 0.104=73.6$
The odds of having high pef among males is 73.6 times that of females

|  | High pef yes | High pef no |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male <br> (exposed) | 46 | 6 |
| Female <br> (unexposed) | 5 | 48 |

Risk ratio is easier to interpret than odds ratio;
Odds ratio is used in logistic regression
$R R, O R>1$ means association is positive: being exposed to the risk factor increases the risk of having the outcome (e.g. disease)

## Strength of association

We carry out a chi-squared test to assess the strength of association.

It compares the observed numbers, and expected numbers (under the null hypothesis that there is no association between exposure and outcome)

Test statistic: 62.49
Compare test statistic with chi-squared distribution of degress of freedom 1, gives a p-value $<0.001$

Very strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis (of no association)

Conclude that there is strong association between gender and having high pef.

| Observed / <br> expected | High pef yes | High pef no |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male <br> (exposed) | $\mathbf{4 6 ( 2 5 . 2 6 )}$ | $6(26.74)$ |
| Female <br> (unexposed) | $5(26.74)$ | $48(27.25)$ |

Caution: chi-squared test does not account for what is exposure and what is outcome.
(Why? It computes the difference for all cells, no matter how you arrange it)

Report risk ratio and/or odds ratio, plus p-val from chisquared test

