Fitting Cox Regression Models

James H. Steiger

Department of Psychology and Human Development Vanderbilt University

$\mathrm{GCM},\,2010$

James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

A B A B A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A

Fitting Cox Regression Models

Introduction

- 2 Toward a Model for Continuous-Time Hazard
- 3 A Log Hazard Model
- I Fitting the Cox Regression Model to Data
 - Introduction
 - The Partial Likelihood Method
 - Implications and Consequences of the Cox Approach
- Interpreting Results from a Cox Regression
 - Introduction
 - Interpreting Parameter Estimates
 - Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit
 - Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors
 - Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores
- 8 Nonparametric Strategies for Displaying Results
 - Introduction
 - Recovered Baseline Functions
 - Graphing the Predicted Functions

→ Ξ →

Introduction

Toward a Model for Continuous-Time Hazard A Log Hazard Model Fitting the Cox Regression Model to Data Interpreting Results from a Cox Regression Nonparametric Strategies for Displaying Results

Introduction

In this module, we discuss the Cox proportional hazards model and how to fit it.

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

A Model for Continuous-Time Hazard

The basic form of the model is that log-hazard is predicted as a baseline function plus a linear combination of predictors. We illustrate the model with data from a recidivism study by Henning and Frueh (1996). We begin by examining the effect of a single 0-1 predictor, *PERSONAL*, which indicates whether the crime the person was incarcerated for was person-related.

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト

Survivor Function Plot

Here is code for an exploratory survivor function plot, using the Kaplan-Meier estimates.

```
> rearrest<-read.table("rearrest.csv", sep=",", header=T)</pre>
> rearrest0 <- subset(rearrest, personal == 0)</pre>
> rearrest1 <- subset(rearrest, personal == 1)</pre>
> f14.1.0 <- summary(survfit(Surv(rearrest0$months,</pre>
+ abs(rearrest0$censor - 1))~1))
> f14.1.1 <- summary(survfit(Surv(rearrest1$months,</pre>
+ abs(rearrest1$censor - 1))~1))
> s.hat.0 <- f14.1.0[1][[1]]</pre>
> time.0 <- f14.1.0[2][[1]]
> s.hat.1 <- f14.1.1[1][[1]]</pre>
> time.1 <- f14.1.1[2][[1]]</pre>
> s.hat.steps.0 <- stepfun(time.0, c(1, s.hat.0))</pre>
> s.hat.steps.1 <- stepfun(time.1, c(1, s.hat.1))</pre>
> plot(s.hat.steps.0, do.points = FALSE,
+ x \lim = c(0, 36), v \lim = c(0, 1),
  vlab = "Estimated Survival".
    xlab = "Months after release", main = "")
+
> lines(s.hat.steps.1, do.points = FALSE,
+ x \lim = c(0, 36), lty = 2)
> legend("bottomleft", c("Personal = 0",
+ "Personal = 1"), ltv = c(1, 2))
```

・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト

Survivor Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

A B A B A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 B
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A

-

Cumulative Hazard Function Plot

Here is code for a cumulative hazard function plot, using the estimates based on the negative-log survivor function.

```
> h.hat.0 <- -log(s.hat.0)
> h.hat.1 <- -log(s.hat.1)
> h.hat.steps.0 <- stepfun(time.0, c(0, h.hat.0))</pre>
> h.hat.steps.1 <- stepfun(time.1, c(0, h.hat.1))</pre>
> plot(h.hat.steps.0, do.points = FALSE,
+ xlim = c(0, 36), ylim = c(0, 1.4),
+ ylab = "Estimated Cumulative Hazard",
+
    xlab = "Months after release", main = "")
> lines(h.hat.steps.1, do.points = FALSE,
+ x \lim = c(0, 36), lty = 2)
> legend("bottomright", c("Personal = 0",
+ "Personal = 1"), lty = c(1, 2))
                                            - ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下
```

Cumulative Hazard Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

Image: A mathematical states and a mathem

Hazard Function Plot

Here is code for a hazard function plot, using the kernel smoothed estimates.

```
> smooth<- function(width, time, survive){</pre>
   n=length(time)
   lo=time[1] + width
   hi=time[n] - width
   npt=50
+
÷
   inc=(hi-lo)/npt
   s=lo+t(c(1:npt))*inc
+
   slag = c(1, survive[1:n-1])
+
   h=1-survive/slag
+
   x1 = as.vector(rep(1, npt))%*%(t(time))
+
   x2 = t(s) %*%as.vector(rep(1,n))
÷
   x = (x1 - x2) / width
÷
   k=.75*(1-x*x)*(abs(x)<=1)
÷
   lambda=(k%*%h)/width
   smoothed = list(x = s, y = lambda)
   return(smoothed)
+
+ }
> bw1.0 <- smooth(8, time.0, s.hat.0)
> bw1.1 <- smooth(8, time.1, s.hat.1)
> plot(bw1.0x, bw1.0y, type = "1", xlim = c(0, 36), ylim = c(0, .08),
+ xlab = "Months after release",
   vlab = "Smoothed hazard")
+
> points(bw1.1$x, bw1.1$y, type = "1", 1ty = 2)
> legend("bottomright", c("Personal = 0", "Personal = 1"), lty = c(1, 2))
```

Hazard Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

-

A Model for Log Cumulative Hazard

We will find it mathematically convenient to develop a model for the log cumulative hazard, which is also equal to $\log(-\log S(t))$. Let's look at some graphs.

A Model for Log Cumulative Hazard

Here is some R code for generating a graph of the log cumulative hazard function.

```
> 1.hat.0 <- log(h.hat.0)
> 1.hat.1 <- log(h.hat.1)
> log.h.steps.0<- stepfun(time.0, c(l.hat.0[1], l.hat.0))</pre>
> log.h.steps.1<- stepfun(time.1, c(l.hat.1[1], l.hat.1))</pre>
> par(mfrow=c(1,1))
> plot(log.h.steps.0, do.points = FALSE,
+ x \lim = c(0, 36), y \lim = c(-6.0, 1),
  ylab = "Log(Cumulative Hazard)",
+
+
  xlab = "Months after release", main = "")
> lines(log.h.steps.1, do.points = FALSE,
+ x \lim = c(0, 36), lty = 2)
> points(c(-5, 36), c(0,0), type = "1")
> legend("bottomright", c("Personal = 0",
+ "Personal = 1"), lty = c(1, 2))
```

イロト イ伺ト イヨト イヨト

Log Cumulative Hazard Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

Image: A matrix

Log Cumulative Hazard Plot with Data

Here is some R code for generating a graph of the fitted log cumulative hazard function, with the data points superimposed.

```
> attach(rearrest)
> f14.2 <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~personal,
+ method = "efron")
> personal.0 <- data.frame(personal=0)</pre>
> personal.1 <- data.frame(personal=1)</pre>
> s.base <- survfit(f14.2, newdata = personal.0,
+ type = "kaplan-meier")
> s.personal <- survfit(f14.2, newdata = personal.1,</pre>
+ type = "kaplan-meier")
> h.base <- -log(s.base$surv)</pre>
> h.personal <- -log(s.personal$surv)</pre>
> l.h.base <- log(h.base)</pre>
> l.h.personal <- log(h.personal)</pre>
> plot(s.base$time, l.h.base, type = "1", lty = 1,
+ ylim = c(-6, 1),
+
   xlab = "Months after release".
   ylab = "Log Cumulative Hazard")
+
> points(s.personal$time, l.h.personal, type = "1",
+ 1ty = 2
> points(time.0, 1.hat.0, pch = 3)
> points(time.1, l.hat.1, pch = 4)
> legend("bottomright", c("Personal = 0", "Personal = 1"),
+ ltv = c(1, 2))
```

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

Log Cumulative Hazard Function Plot with Data



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

Cumulative Hazard Plot with Data

Compare that to the graph of the raw cumulative hazard, produced by the following code.

```
> plot(s.base$time, h.base, type = "l",
+  lty = 1, ylim = c(0,1.5),
+ xlab = "Months after release",
   ylab = "Cumulative Hazard")
+
> points(s.personal$time, h.personal,
+ type = "1", lty = 2)
> points(time.0, h.hat.0, pch = 3)
> points(time.1, h.hat.1, pch = 4)
> legend("bottomright", c("Personal = 0",
+ "Personal = 1"), lty = c(1, 2))
                                      - ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下
```

Cumulative Hazard Function Plot with Data



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

Implications of the Graphs for Modeling

We can see that the log cumulative hazard plots are almost parallel. So a reasonable model is of the form

$$\log H(t_{ij}) = \log H_0(t_j) + \beta_1 PERSONAL_i \tag{1}$$

Exponentiating both sides gives us

$$H(t_{ij}) = H_0(t_j) \exp(\beta_1 PERSONAL_i)$$
(2)

An immediate implication is that, if we take the ratio of the two hazard functions H_1 (when PERSONAL = 1) and H_0 (when PERSONAL = 1), we get

$$H_1/H_0 = \exp(\beta_1) \tag{3}$$

- ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下

A Log Hazard Model

The way the mathematics works out, the preceding model remains essentially of the same form when log hazard is modeled instead of log cumulative hazard. That is, for P predictors, we have

$$\log h(t_{ij}) = \log h_0(t_j) + \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^P \beta_k X_{kij}\right)$$
(4)

This implies that the difference in the $\log h$ and $\log h_0$ curves is the same as the difference between the $\log H$ and $\log H_0$ curves for any set of predictor values. This is a surprising result, but a useful one.

・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト

Introduction

Introduction The Partial Likelihood Method Implications and Consequences of the Cox Approach

- ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下

The Cox regression model approach to survival analysis is based on the use of a partial likelihood approach. This function is constructed by "conditioning" on the observed event times and computing a conditional probability that individual iexperienced the event, given that someone did.

Introduction **The Partial Likelihood Method** Implications and Consequences of the Cox Approach

・ロト ・聞ト ・ヨト ・ヨトー

The Partial Likelihood Method

Suppose that k of the survival times from n individuals are uncensored and distinct, and n - k are right-censored. Let $t_{(1)} < t_{(2)} < \cdots < t_{(k)}$ be the ordered k distinct failure times with corresponding covariates $\boldsymbol{x}_{(1)}, \boldsymbol{x}_{(2)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{(k)}$. Let $\boldsymbol{R}(t_{(i)})$ be the risk set at time $t_{(i)}$. $\boldsymbol{R}(t_{(i)})$ consists of all persons whose survival times are at least $t_{(i)}$. The total partial likelihood is the product of all the individual partial likelihoods, and the log partial likelihood can be shown (e.g., Lee & Wang, 2003, pp. 301-302) to be equal to

$$\log L(\boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\{ \boldsymbol{b'x}_{(i)} - \log \left[\sum_{l \in \boldsymbol{R}(t_{(i)})} \exp \boldsymbol{b'x}_{l} \right] \right\}$$
(5)

Introduction The Partial Likelihood Method Implications and Consequences of the Cox Approach

- ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下

Implications and Consequences

The result of Equation 5 has several implications:

- The shape of the baseline hazard is irrelevant—it is nowhere to be seen in the log likelihood calculation
- **2** The precise event times are irrelevant as well
- Ties substantially complicate calculations, in which case an exact method is available, but often it is impractical, and one of several approximations can be tried (the textbook recommends Efron's 1977 method)

Introduction

Introduction

Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

・ロト ・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

The focus of a Cox regression is the relative hazard over and above the baseline associated with the predictors.

By exponentiating a β attached to a particular predictor, we can evaluate the *hazard ratio* associated with a 1-point increase in the predictor.

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

- ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下

Interpreting Parameter Estimates

Models A, B, C, systematically add *PERSONAL*, *PROPERTY*, and (centered) *AGE* as individual predictors.

Model D adds all 3.

In the following slides, we show the results of fitting the 4 models.

Model A

> tab14.1A <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~personal)</pre> > summary(tab14.1A) Call: coxph(formula = Surv(months, abs(censor - 1)) ~ personal) n= 194 coef exp(coef) se(coef) z Pr(>|z|)personal 0.479 1.614 0.202 2.36 0.018 * Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1 exp(coef) exp(-coef) lower .95 upper .95 1.61 0.62 1.09 2.4 personal Rsquare= 0.027 (max possible= 0.994) Likelihood ratio test= 5.32 on 1 df. p=0.0210 Wald test = 5.59 on 1 df, p=0.0181 Score (logrank) test = 5.69 on 1 df. p=0.017 ・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨトー

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Error Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Erro Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

Model B

```
> tab14.1B <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~property)</pre>
> summary(tab14.1B)
Call:
coxph(formula = Surv(months, abs(censor - 1)) ~ property)
 n= 194
         coef exp(coef) se(coef) z Pr(>|z|)
property 1.195
                  3.302 0.349 3.42 0.00063 ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
        exp(coef) exp(-coef) lower .95 upper .95
                       0.303
                                  1.67
                                           6.55
property
              3.3
Rsquare= 0.08 (max possible= 0.994)
Likelihood ratio test= 16.2 on 1 df.
                                      p=5.68e-05
Wald test
                    = 11.7 on 1 df,
                                      p=0.000626
Score (logrank) test = 13.1 on 1 df.
                                      p=0.000290
                                                       ・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨトー
```

Model C

> tab14.1C <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~cage)</pre> > summary(tab14.1C) Call: coxph(formula = Surv(months, abs(censor - 1)) ~ cage) n= 194 coef exp(coef) se(coef) z Pr(>|z|) cage -0.0681 0.9341 0.0156 -4.36 1.3e-05 *** Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1 exp(coef) exp(-coef) lower .95 upper .95 0.934 1.07 0.906 0.963 cage Rsquare= 0.112 (max possible= 0.994) Likelihood ratio test= 23.0 on 1 df, p=1.65e-06 Wald test = 19 on 1 df, p=1.31e-05 Score (logrank) test = 19.2 on 1 df, p=1.19e-05 ・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨトー

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Erro Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errc Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

Model D

```
> tab14.1D <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~personal + property + cage)</pre>
> summary(tab14.1D)
Call.
coxph(formula = Surv(months, abs(censor - 1)) ~ personal + property +
    cage)
  n= 194
           coef exp(coef) se(coef)
                                       z Pr(>|z|)
personal 0.5691
                   1.7667 0.2052 2.77
                                          0.0055 **
property 0.9358
                   2.5492 0.3509 2.67
                                           0.0077 **
cage
        -0.0667
                   0.9355
                            0.0168 -3.98
                                          7e-05 ***
Signif, codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
        exp(coef) exp(-coef) lower .95 upper .95
personal
            1.767
                       0.566
                                 1.182
                                           2.641
property
            2.549
                       0.392
                                 1.282
                                           5.071
cage
            0.935
                       1.069
                                 0.905
                                           0.967
Rsquare= 0.182 (max possible= 0.994 )
Likelihood ratio test= 39.0 on 3 df,
                                       p=1.77e-08
Wald test
                    = 29 on 3 df, p=2.21e-06
Score (logrank) test = 30.3 on 3 df. p=1.20e-06
                                                                    <ロト < 団ト < 巨ト < 巨ト
```

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates **Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit** Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨトー

Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit

Although Cox regression output does not, strictly speaking, produce a "deviance" statistic, it matters little to us in practice. Standard software output includes a likelihood ratio chi-square statistic that compares the fitted model to a model with no predictors, and a -2LL statistic.

This statistic allows one to test the overall significance of the set of predictors included in the fitted model. Moreover, by constructing and fitting a sequence of nested models, one may, by subtraction, obtain chi-square difference statistics in essentially the same way as before.

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates **Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit** Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

- ロト - (四下 - (日下 - (日下

Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit

Example (Chi-Square Difference Test)

The output for Model D, with all 3 predictors included, shows -2LL = 950.44 with 3 parameters, while Model C shows -2LL = 966.43 with 1 parameter.

This shows that adding PROPERTY and PERSONAL to AGE yields a chi-square of 15.99 with 2 degrees of freedom, which is significant beyond the .01 level.

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨトー

3

Wald Tests via Estimated Standard Errors

James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

Using Risk Scores

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

<ロト <問ト < 回ト < 回

Risk scores for an individual utilize that individual's predictor values in conjunction with the β estimates to produce a hazard ratio estimate for that person relative to the baseline. Let's look at an example to see how risk scores work.

Suppose an individual in the recidivism study is 4 years below the mean age at the time of release, and consequently has an AGE = -4, and has PERSONAL = 1 and PROPERTY = 1. Then the log hazard ratio is

 $-4 \times -.0667 + 1 \times .5691 + 1 \times .9358 = 1.7717$. So the hazard ratio, or "risk score" for the individual is exp 1.7717, or 5.8805. In other words, this individual is almost 6 times as likely to recidivate as the person who is of average age, with scores of 0 on the *PERSONAL* and *PROPERTY* variables.

Keep in mind that this risk score is an estimate of a population quantity, and itself has a standard error.

(Question: What kind of information would we need to construct a standard error for the risk score? C.P.)

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

Computing Risk Scores

Here is code, a modified version of the code on the UCLA site, for constructing functions that can create a table of risk scores for any list of IDs. Note that this function is highly customized, but you could, with some effort, create a much more general function that would require a list of the predictors to be used in creating the risk score.

> make.a.row <- function(ID.num)

```
+ {
```

- + ##grab data for the individual
- + temp <- subset(rearrest, id==ID.num)
- + ##compute the log score and exponentiate it
- + log.score <- tab14.1D\$coef[1]*temp\$personal +
- + tab14.1D\$coef[2]*temp\$property +
- + tab14.1D\$coef[3]*temp\$cage
- + score <- exp(log.score)</pre>
- + ## convert to a day metric
- + day <- temp\$months * (365/12)</p>
- + ## construct a row in the table
- + table.row <- cbind(temp\$id, temp\$personal,
- + temp\$property, temp\$cage, score, day,
- temp\$months, temp\$censor)
- + colnames(table.row) <- c("ID", "personal",</pre>
- + "property", "centered.age", "risk.score", "day",

```
+ "months", "censor")
```

```
+ rownames(table.row) <- c()</pre>
```

- return(table.row)
- + }

```
> make.table <- function(list.of.ids)</pre>
```

+ {

```
+ the.table <- c()
```

```
+ for(i in 1:length(list.of.ids))
```

+ {

```
+ next.row <- make.a.row(list.of.ids[i])</pre>
```

```
+ the.table <- rbind(the.table,next.row)</pre>
```

```
+ }
```

```
+ return(the.table)
```

+ }

Computing Risk Scores

Here is the table.

> make.table(c(22,8,187,26,5,130,106,33))

	ID	personal	property	centered.age	risk.score	day	months	censor
[1,]	22	0	0	0.2577	0.9830	51.964	1.7084	1
[2,]	8	1	1	22.4507	1.0072	18.987	0.6242	1
[3,]	187	1	0	-7.2002	2.8562	1095.000	36.0000	1
[4,]	26	0	1	-7.3015	4.1491	71.951	2.3655	0
[5,]	5	1	1	-7.1646	7.2638	8.994	0.2957	0
[6,]	130	0	1	22.3905	0.5724	485.667	15.9671	1
[7,]	106	0	0	16.2030	0.3393	355.756	11.6961	0
[8,]	33	1	0	27.0613	0.2905	84.942	2.7926	1

Introduction Interpreting Parameter Estimates Evaluating Overall Goodness-of-Fit Drawing Inference using Estimated Standard Errors Summarizing Findings Using Risk Scores

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Survival Function Plot

```
> tab14.1D <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~personal +</pre>
```

```
+ property + cage)
```

```
> base <- data.frame(personal=0, property=0, cage=0)</pre>
```

```
> ss <- survfit(tab14.1D)</pre>
```

```
> ss.base <- survfit(tab14.1D, newdata = base)</pre>
```

```
> avg <- data.frame(personal=mean(personal),</pre>
```

```
+ property=mean(property), cage=0)
```

```
> ss.avg <- survfit(tab14.1D, newdata = avg)</pre>
```

```
> par(mfrow=c(1,2))
```

```
> plot(ss.base$time, ss.base$surv, type = "1",
```

```
+ ylim = c(0,1),
```

```
+ xlab = "Months after release",
```

```
+ ylab = "Estimated Survival")
```

```
> points(ss.base$time, ss.base$surv, pch = 20)
```

```
> plot(ss.avg$time, ss.avg$surv, type = "1",
```

```
+ ylim = c(0,1),
```

```
+ xlab = "Months after release",
```

```
+ ylab = "Estimated Survival")
```

```
> points(ss.avg$time, ss.avg$surv, pch = 20)
```

イロト イヨト イヨト

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Survival Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

∃ ⊳

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Cumulative Hazard Function Plot

> plot(ss.base\$time, -log(ss.base\$surv), + type = "l", ylim = c(0,1.5), + xlab = "Months after release", + ylab = "Estimated Cumulative Hazard") > points(ss.base\$time, -log(ss.base\$surv), pch = 20) > plot(ss.avg\$time, -log(ss.avg\$surv), type = "l", + ylim = c(0,1.5), xlab = "Months after release", + ylab = "Estimated Cumulative Hazard") > points(ss.avg\$time, -log(ss.avg\$surv), pch = 20)

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Survival Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

-

Hazard Function Plot

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

> smooth.base <- smooth(8, ss.base\$time, ss.base\$surv)</pre> smooth.avg<- smooth(8, ss.avg\$time, ss.avg\$surv)</pre> > > plot(smooth.base\$x, smooth.base\$y, type = "1", + xlim = c(0, 36), ylim = c(0, .08),+ xlab = "Months after release", ylab = "Smoothed hazard") + > plot(smooth.avg\$x, smooth.avg\$y, type = "1", xlim = c(0, 36), ylim = c(0, .08),+ xlab = "Months after release", + + vlab = "Smoothed hazard")

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 二日

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Survival Function Plot



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

-

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Survivor Function Code

```
> tab14.1D <- coxph(Surv(months, abs(censor - 1))~personal + property + cage)</pre>
> base <- data.frame(personal=0, property=0, cage=0)</pre>
> personal.only <- data.frame(personal=1, property=0, cage=0)</pre>
> property.only <- data.frame(personal=0, property=1, cage=0)</pre>
> both <- data.frame(personal=1, property=1, cage=0)</pre>
> s.base <- survfit(tab14.1D, newdata = base)</pre>
> s.personal <- survfit(tab14.1D, newdata = personal.only)</pre>
> s.property <- survfit(tab14.1D, newdata = property.only)</pre>
> s.both <- survfit(tab14.1D, newdata = both)</pre>
> par(mfrow=c(1,1))
> plot(s.base$time, s.base$surv, type = "l", lty = 1, ylim = c(0,1),
   xlab = "Months after release", ylab = "Estimated Survival")
> points(s.personal$time, s.personal$surv, type = "1", lty = 2)
> points(s.property$time, s.property$surv, type = "1", lty = 3)
> points(s.both$time, s.both$surv, type = "1", lty = 4)
> legend("bottomleft", c("Personal = 0, Property = 0",
+ "Personal = 1, Property = 0",
+ "Personal = 0, Property = 1", "Personal = 1, Property = 1"),
+ lty = c(1, 2, 3, 4))
```

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Survivor Function



James H. Steiger Fitting Cox Regression Models

→

크

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Cumulative Hazard Function Code

- > h.base <- -log(s.base\$surv)</pre>
- > h.personal <- -log(s.personal\$surv)</pre>
- > h.property <- -log(s.property\$surv)</pre>
- > h.both <- -log(s.both\$surv)</pre>
- > plot(s.base\$time, h.base, type = "l", lty = 1, ylim = c(0,2),
- + xlab = "Months after release",
- + ylab = "Estimated Cumulative Hazard")
- > points(s.personal\$time, h.personal, type = "1", lty = 2)
- > points(s.property\$time, h.property, type = "1", lty = 3)
- > points(s.both\$time, h.both, type = "l", lty = 4)
- > legend("topleft", c("Personal = 0, Property = 0",
- + "Personal = 1, Property = 0",
- + "Personal = 0, Property = 1", "Personal = 1, Property = 1"),
- + lty = c(1, 2, 3, 4))

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● の Q @

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Cumulative Hazard Function



Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Log Cumulative Hazard Function Code

```
> l.h.base <- log(h.base)</pre>
> l.h.personal <- log(h.personal)</pre>
> l.h.property <- log(h.property)</pre>
> l.h.both <- log(h.both)</pre>
> plot(s.base$time, l.h.base, type = "l", lty = 1,
+
  ylim = c(-7, 1),
+
  xlab = "Months after release",
+
   vlab = "Log(Cumulative Hazard)")
> points(s.personal$time, l.h.personal, type = "1", lty = 2)
> points(s.property$time, l.h.property, type = "1", lty = 3)
> points(s.both$time, l.h.both, type = "l", lty = 4)
> legend("bottomright", c("Personal = 0, Property = 0",
+ "Personal = 1, Property = 0",
+ "Personal = 0, Property = 1", "Personal = 1, Property = 1"),
+ 1ty = c(1, 2, 3, 4))
```

(日)

Recovered Baseline Functions Graphing the Predicted Functions

Log Cumulative Hazard Function



-