

# R-exercise for Friday 12 Dec 2014

---

December 2014

<http://BendixCarstensen.com/Epi>

Version 5

Compiled Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2014, 19:25  
from: C:/Bendix/undervis/SPE/Intro/R-intro-SDC.tex

Bendix Carstensen   Steno Diabetes Center, Gentofte, Denmark  
& Department of Biostatistics, University of Copenhagen  
bxc@steno.dk  
[www.pubhealth.ku.dk/~bxc](http://www.pubhealth.ku.dk/~bxc)

Edition 2014 by   Bendix Carstensen

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Epidemiological calculations</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Diagnostic criteria in the NDR . . . . .	1
1.1.1	Blood glucose criteria in NDR . . . . .	2

# Chapter 1

## Epidemiological calculations

### 1.1 Diagnostic criteria in the NDR

This exercise is based on the Danish National Diabetes Register (NDR) — or to be precise a 10% bogus sample. The term "bogus" refers to the fact that the database we shall use is a 10% sample of the NDR, where all dates have been changed randomly by a quantity in the range from  $-7$  to  $7$  days, so no person is identifiable, but we still have a database that behaves as the NDR in terms of incidence, mortality etc.

1. First load the Epi-package, and then get the 10% sample of the NDR from the web — the variable names are as in the original NDR, but all dates have been altered. Note that you *must* include the web-address in a `url()`-command, moreover the web-address is case-sensitive:

```
> library( Epi )
> clear()
> load( file=url("http://BendixCarstensen.com/DMreg/data/NDR2011-bogus.Rda") )
> lls()
```

2. Now take a look at the data frame, and convince yourself that the missingness-pattern is ok:

```
> str( ndr )
> summary( ndr )
```

3. Note that all the dates are factors, which is a bit impractical, so we convert them to fractional years by `cal.yr`. This is most easily done in a loop over all the date variables. R is so friendly that you can use the variable names in commands too; the date variables are those that start with `D_`; and `grep` is the function that searches for a particular string in a character vector; try:

```
> names( ndr )
> grep( "D_", names(ndr) )
```

This is a way to get the *position number* of the date variables, so conversion is dead-easy now:

```
> wh <- grep( "D_", names(nder) )
> for( i in wh ) nder[,i] <- cal.yr( nder[,i] )
> head( nder )
```

We can use `cal.yr` without further arguments because the dates are in standard ISO-format (YYYY-MM-DD), otherwise we would need the `format` argument.

4. It is a bit annoying with upper-case names and with the underscores, so we can just change the variable names by removing the first two letters and putting the rest to lower case (the 10 is just to cut the names short for convenience). And then we save the groomed register

```
> names( nder ) <- tolower( substr(names(nder),3,10) )
> names( nder )
> save( nder, file="nder.Rda" )
```

### 1.1.1 Blood glucose criteria in NDR

It has been debated whether the blood glucose criteria should be used at all, and we therefore create a new version of the register by computing a new date of inclusion and a new inclusion criterion, *as if* the two glucose criteria were omitted:

5. Now create two new variables, `new.aars` and `new.dto`, based only on LPR, foot therapy and medication:

```
> load( file="nder.Rda" )
> nder$new.dto <- with( nder, pmin( fodt, lpr, oad, ins, na.rm=TRUE ) )
> # Assigning levels is a bit more tricky
> nder$new.aars <- NA
> nder$new.aars[nder$new.dto==nder$fodt] <- "fodt"
> nder$new.aars[nder$new.dto==nder$oad] <- "oad"
> nder$new.aars[nder$new.dto==nder$ins] <- "ins"
> nder$new.aars[nder$new.dto==nder$lpr] <- "lpr"
> summary( nder )
```

6. Now make a table of changes:

```
> addmargins( with( nder, table( inklaars, new.aars, useNA="ifany" ) ) )
```

Why have some non-glucose inclusions changed?

7. The question of real interest is another: How does the exclusion from the register depend on age and date. This is just a logistic regression:

```
> nder <- transform( nder, A = inkldto-foddto )
> mF <- glm( is.na(new.aars) ~ A + I(A^2) + I(A^3),
+           family = binomial,
+           data = subset( nder, sex=="K" ) )
> summary( mF )
```

We don't get much wiser from that.

8. Instead, predict the probability as a function of A, that we put in a *prediction data frame* — it must contain variables with the same names as the *explanatory* variables in the model:

```
> nd <- data.frame( A=5:90 )
> pr.F <- predict( mF, newdata=nd, type="response" )
> plot( nd$A, pr.F, type="l" )
```

9. But we would like to make it a bit more flexible, so we put in a natural spline of age instead:

```
> library( splines )
> a.kn <- c(10,20,25,30,35,4:9*10)
> mF <- glm( is.na(new.aars) ~ Ns( A, knots=a.kn ),
+           family = binomial,
+           data = subset( ndr, sex=="K" ) )
> summary( mF )
> pr.F <- predict( mF, newdata=nd, type="response" )
> plot( nd$A, pr.F, type="l" )
```

10. But we would also like to see if it depends on time, so we include the data of diagnosis, *inkldto*, in the model too:

```
> p.kn <- seq(1996,2010,,4)
> mF <- glm( is.na(new.aars) ~ Ns( A, knots=a.kn ) +
+           Ns( inkldto, knots=p.kn ),
+           family = binomial,
+           data = subset( ndr, sex=="K" ) )
> summary( mF )
> nd <- data.frame( A=5:90, inkldto=2000 )
> pr.F <- predict( mF, newdata=nd, type="response" )
> plot( nd$A, pr.F, type="l" )
```

11. But this only gives the prediction for the year 2000, we would like to see it for all years. In order to use *matplot*, we would like to have the predictions of the age-specific probabilities next to each other in a matrix. We use *cbind* for that:

```
> pr.F <- NULL
> for( p in 1996:2011 )
+ {
+   nd <- data.frame( A=5:90, inkldto=p )
+   pr.F <- cbind( pr.F, predict( mF, newdata=nd, type="response" ) )
+ }
> matplot( nd$A, pr.F,
+         type="l", lty=1, lwd=1:2, col=heat.colors(25)[1:16] )
> text( c(80,80), c(55,60)/100, c(1996,2011),
+       col=heat.colors(25)[c(1,16)], font=2 )
```

12. But this is a model that assumes that the age effects is the same in all years, so we explore an interaction model:

```
> iF <- glm( is.na(new.aars) ~ Ns( A, knots=a.kn ) * Ns( inkldto, knots=p.kn ),
+           family = binomial,
+           data = subset( ndr, sex=="K" ) )
> summary( iF )
> anova( mF, iF, test="Chisq" )
```

The nice thing here is that the prediction machinery is exactly the same:

```
> pr.F <- NULL
> for( p in 1996:2011 )
+   {
+     nd <- data.frame( A=5:90, inltdto=p )
+     pr.F <- cbind( pr.F, predict( iF, newdata=nd, type="response" ) )
+   }
> matplot( nd$A, pr.F,
+           type="l", lty=1, lwd=1:2, col=heat.colors(25)[1:16] )
> text( c(80,80), c(55,60)/100, c(1996,2011),
+       col=heat.colors(25)[c(1,16)], font=2 )
```

The graph now really indicates that there is an interaction!