

MEDIAN REGRESSION MODELS FOR LONGITUDINAL DATA WITH MISSING OBSERVATIONS

Grace Yi

Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo

OUTLINE

- * GEE AND WEIGHTED GEE
- * MODEL FORMULATION
- * ESTIMATION PROCEDURES

GEE AND WEIGHTED GEE

LONGITUDINAL DATA

- Y_{ij} : response for subject i at time point j

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \hline & | & | & | & | & | \\ Y_{i1} & Y_{i2} & Y_{i3} & Y_{i4} & Y_{i5} & Y_{i6} \end{array}$$

- $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}, Y_{i3}, Y_{i4}, Y_{i5}, Y_{i6})'$

MEAN MODEL OF INTEREST

- $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i = E(\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i)$ - mean vector
- GEE (Liang and Zeger 1986):

$$\sum_i \mathbf{D}_i \cdot \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i = \mathbf{0}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i = (Y_{i1} - \mu_{i1}, \dots, Y_{im} - \mu_{im})'$

MEDIAN MODEL OF INTEREST

- $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j$ = median of \mathbf{Y}_i , given \mathbf{x}_i
- GEE (Jung 1996; Godambe 2001).

INCOMPLETE LONGITUDINAL DATA

- Y_{ij} : response for subject i at time point j

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & \text{-----} & & & & \\ Y_{i1} & Y_{i2} & \textcircled{Y_{i3}} & Y_{i4} & \textcircled{Y_{i5}} & Y_{i6} \end{array}$$

- $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}, \underline{Y_{i3}}, Y_{i4}, \underline{Y_{i5}}, Y_{i6})' = (\mathbf{Y}_i^{obs'}, \mathbf{Y}_i^{mis'})'$
- $R_{ij} = I(Y_{ij} \text{ is observed})$

SELECTION MODELS (Little and Rubin 1987; Little 1995)

MISSING DATA MECHANISMS (Little and Rubin 2002)

- Missing Completely At Random (MCAR)

$$f(\mathbf{r}_i | \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = f(\mathbf{r}_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

- Missing At Random (MAR)

$$f(\mathbf{r}_i | \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = f(\mathbf{r}_i | \mathbf{y}_i^{obs}, \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

- Not Missing At Random (NMAR)

$$f(\mathbf{r}_i | \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \neq f(\mathbf{r}_i | \mathbf{y}_i^{obs}, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i^{mis}; \boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

WEIGHTED GEE FOR INCOMPLETE LONGITUDINAL DATA

- Weighted GEE for Mean Model (Robins, Rotnitzky, and Zhao 1995)

– GEE: with MCAR: $\sum_i \mathbf{D}_i^{obs} \cdot (\mathbf{V}_i^{obs})^{-1} \cdot (\mathbf{Y}_i^{obs} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^{obs}) = \mathbf{0}$

$$E_{(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{R}_i)}(U_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) = E_{\mathbf{Y}_i}\{\sum_{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{D}_i^{obs} (\mathbf{V}_i^{obs})^{-1} (\mathbf{Y}_i^{obs} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^{obs}) \cdot P(\mathbf{R}_i = \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{Y}_i)\}$$

– WGEE: with MAR: $\sum_i \mathbf{D}_i \cdot \mathbf{V}_i^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_i \cdot (\mathbf{Y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i) = \mathbf{0}$

- Weighted GEE for Median Model

Lipsitz et al. (1997)

- serial correlation is not accounted for
- asymptotic properties are not established

MODEL FORMULATION

MEDIAN REGRESSION MODEL

- Notation: n subjects are followed up longitudinally at m occasions

Y_{ij} : continuous response; $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}, \dots, Y_{im})'$

\mathbf{x}_{ij} : covariate vector; $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{x}'_{i1}, \mathbf{x}'_{i2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_{im})'$

μ_{ij} : median of Y_{ij} , given \mathbf{x}_i ; $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i = (\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}, \dots, \mu_{im})'$

$f(\mu_{ij})$: pdf of Y_{ij} at μ_{ij}

- Regression Model

$$g(\mu_{ij}) = \mathbf{x}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta}$$

MODEL FOR THE MISSING DATA PROCESS

- Notation:

$M_i = \sum_{j=1}^m R_{ij} + 1$: the drop-out time

monotone missing data patterns: $R_{ij} = 0 \Rightarrow R_{ik} = 0$ for $k > j$

conditional probability: $\lambda_{ij} = P(R_{ij} = 1 | R_{i,j-1} = 1, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$

- Regression Model (MAR):

$$\text{logit} \lambda_{ij} = \mathbf{u}_{ij}' \boldsymbol{\alpha}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ = parameters for the missing data process

ESTIMATION PROCEDURES

WEIGHTED GEE FOR β

$$U_i(\beta, \alpha) = D_i \Gamma_i V_i^{-1} \cdot \Delta_i(\alpha) \cdot \epsilon_i$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n U_i(\beta, \hat{\alpha}) = \mathbf{0}$$

where $D_i = \partial \mu'_i / \partial \beta$; $\Gamma_i = \text{diag}(f(\mu_{ij}), j = 1, 2, \dots, m)$

$$\epsilon_{ij} = I(Y_{ij} \geq \mu_{ij}) - 1/2; \quad \epsilon_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \epsilon_{i2}, \dots, \epsilon_{im})'$$

CONSTRUCTION OF WEIGHTS

- $\Delta_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \text{diag}(I(R_{ij} = 1)/\pi_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq m)$

where $\pi_{ij} = P(R_{ij} = 1 | \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = \prod_{t=2}^j \lambda_{it}$

ESTIMATING EQUATIONS FOR $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$

- Likelihood: $L_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \prod_{t=1}^{m_i-1} \lambda_{it} \cdot (1 - \lambda_{im_i})$
- score: $\mathbf{S}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}$

ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES

THEOREM: Under some regularity conditions, we have, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

1. $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{p} \beta$
2. $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{P}^{-1}\Sigma[\mathbf{P}^{-1}]')$

where

$$\mathbf{P} = E [\partial \mathbf{U}_i(\beta, \alpha) / \partial \beta']$$

$$\Sigma = E \{ \mathbf{Q}_i(\beta, \alpha) \mathbf{Q}_i'(\beta, \alpha) \}$$

APPLICATION

DATA (Davis 1991)

83 individuals: 43 treated and 40 in placebo group

6 scheduled assessments: 30 minutes apart

amount of pain: measured on a 100mm line

0= no pain; 100= extreme pain

59% of women have missing values: monotone missing data patterns

1	2	3	4	5	6
5.0	1.0	1.0	0	5.0	.

RESPONSE MODEL

$$\mu_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2j} + \beta_3 x_{i1} x_{i2j}$$

where $x_{i1} = 0$ if subject i received treatment, and 1 otherwise

$x_{i2j} = j$ indexes the assessment time for subject i

MISSING DATA MODEL

$$\text{logit } \lambda_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 y_{i,j-1} + \alpha_2 x_{i1}$$

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

- Missing Data Process:
 - MAR mechanism appears reasonable (p-value= 0.046 for $H_o : \alpha_1 = 0$).
- Response Process:
 - Patients in the treatment group do not suffer increasing pain as time goes by (p-value= 0.273 for $H_o : \beta_2 = 0$).
 - The degree of pain in the control group would increase as time elapses (p-value ≈ 0 for $H_o : \beta_1 = 0$).

SIMULATION STUDY

MODELS

- $\mathbf{Y}_i \sim MVN(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \mathbf{V})$; $\mathbf{V} = \sigma^2[v_{st}]_{m \times m}$ with $v_{ss} = 1$ and $v_{st} = \rho$ for $s \neq t$
- Response and Missing Data Models: same as before
- Setting: $m = 6$, $n = 1000$, 200 simulations

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = (6.0, -5.0, 1.0, 15.0)'; \quad \sigma = 1.0$$

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1.0, 0.1, -0.5)': \text{ about 20\% missing values}$$

ANALYSES

SUMMARY

- Finite sample biases for Method 1 are smaller than those of Method 2; As ρ increases, biases for Method 1 tend to reduce, while biases for Method 2 do not change much.
- The standard errors for both Methods 1 and 2 seem to vary on the same scale.
- The coverage rates for Method 1 agree reasonably well with the nominal