

## Poisson regression:

- Different exposure
- Explanatory variables: factors and covariates

## Log-linear models

- Same exposure (e.g. not relevant)
- Explanatory variables: A few factors  
⇒ contingency tables.

Response:  $Y_i \sim Po(\mu_i)$ ,  $\mu_i = n_i\theta_i$

Link:  $\eta_i = \log(\mu_i) = \log(n_i) + \log(\theta_i)$

Linear component:  $\eta_i = \log(n_i) + x_i^T \beta$

Tumor type and site for 400 patients.

|        | Head & neck | Trunk | Extremities | Total |
|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| Type 1 | 22          | 2     | 10          | 34    |
| Type 2 | 16          | 54    | 155         | 185   |
| Type 3 | 19          | 33    | 73          | 125   |
| Type 4 | 11          | 17    | 28          | 56    |
| Total  | 68          | 106   | 226         | 400   |

- Any association between tumor type and site?

# Randomized control trail of influenza vaccine (Ch 9.3.2)

- Patients randomly chosen to a group; vaccine or placebo.
- Response: Levels { Small, Moderate, Large } of antibody found six weeks later.

|         | Small | Moderate | Large | Total |
|---------|-------|----------|-------|-------|
| Placebo | 25    | 8        | 5     | 38    |
| Vaccine | 6     | 18       | 11    | 35    |

- Does the response patter differ between the groups?

# Case control study ulcer type and aspirin use (Ch 9.3.3.)

**Case:** Ulcer patients

**Control:** Without known ulcer, and similar to case group wrt age, sex, etc

|                       | No aspirin | Aspirin | Total |
|-----------------------|------------|---------|-------|
| <b>Gastric ulcer</b>  |            |         |       |
| Control               | 62         | 6       | 68    |
| Cases                 | 39         | 25      | 64    |
| <b>Duodenal ulcer</b> |            |         |       |
| Control               | 53         | 8       | 61    |
| Cases                 | 49         | 8       | 57    |

- 1 Gastric ulcer associated with aspirin use?
- 2 Duodenal ulcer associated with aspirin use?
- 3 Any association same for the two ulcer sites?

# Probability models for contingency tables

$y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$ , frequency's in  $N$  cells.

## Poisson

- No constraints on  $Y$ s
- $Y_i \sim Po(\mu_i)$ ,  $\eta_i = \log(\mu_i)$

## Multinomial, ex skin cancer

- Constraint:  $\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i = n$
- $Y \sim m(n, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$ ,  $\eta_i = \log(n) + \log(\theta_i)$

## Product multinomial, ex ulcer

- Constraint:  $\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^K Y_{jkl} = n_{jk}$
- $Y_{jk} \sim m(n_{jk}, \theta_{jk1}, \dots, \theta_{jkL})$ ,  $\eta_{jk} = \log(n_{jk}) + \log(\theta_{jk})$

# Overdispersion

Response:

- $Y_i \sim Po(\mu_i), \Rightarrow E(Y_i) = \mu_i$  and  $Var(Y_i) = \mu_i$
- $Y_i \sim Bin(n_i, p_i) \Rightarrow E(Y_i) = n_i p_i$  and  $Var(Y_i) = n_i p_i (1 - p_i)$

We fit  $E(Y_i)$ , which gives variance.

Overdispersion:  $Var(Y_i) > E(Y_i)$

Possible reasons:

- Relevant explanatory variables omitted.
- Dependent observations (know why? use GLMMs, Chp 11)

Possible solution:

Include extra parameter, **overdispersion parameter**:

$$Var(Y_i) = \phi E(Y_i)$$

- $Y_i \sim Bin()$  use *quasi binomial*
- $Y_i \sim Po()$  use *negative binomial*