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## Notation

| Problem: | Analysis of ordinal longitudinal data |
| :--- | :--- |
| Units: | Subjects, objects, $(i=1, \cdots, N)$ |
| Outcome: | Ordinal variable $Y$ with $K$ levels |
| Measurement: | Measurements at $T$ occasions, $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i}}=\left(Y_{i 1}, \cdots, Y_{i T}\right)^{\prime}$ |
| Covariates: | $T \times p$ covariates matrix $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{i}}=\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathbf{i}}, \cdots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathbf{i T}}\right)^{\prime}$ <br> Time, gender, age $\ldots$ |
| Domains: | Medicine, psychology, social science, $\ldots$ |

## Motivating example - Quality of life

## Dataset

- 247 patients with malignant brain cancer treated by RT+CT or RT
- Assessment of the quality of life at 8 occasions Baseline, End RT, End RT + (3,6,9)months, End RT + (1, 1.5, 2)years
- EORTC QLQC30 questionnaire - Appetite loss scale Have you lacked appetite? ('Not at all', 'A little', 'Quite a bit', 'Very much')
- Covariates: Time, Treatment (RT+CT vs RT), Tumor cell (pure vs mixed)
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## Dataset

- 247 patients with malignant brain cancer treated by RT+CT or RT
- Assessment of the quality of life at 8 occasions Baseline, End RT, End RT + (3,6,9)months, End RT + (1, 1.5, 2)years
- EORTC QLQC30 questionnaire - Appetite loss scale Have you lacked appetite? ('Not at all', 'A little', 'Quite a bit', 'Very much')
- Covariates: Time, Treatment (RT+CT vs RT), Tumor cell (pure vs mixed)

Summary of the data
$N=247, T=8, K=4$
Questions of interest

- Treatment effect
- Tumor cell effect
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## Proportional odds model

Aim is to find a model that takes into account

- the ordinal nature of the outcome under study
- the correlation between repeated observations
- the unavoidable presence of missing data

Proportional odds model

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \log i t\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\theta_{k}+\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\prime} \beta \quad, \quad i=1, \cdots, N ; \quad j=1, \cdots, T \\
&, \quad k=1, \cdots, K-1
\end{aligned}
$$

Properties: invariant when reversing the order of categories deleting/collapsing some categories

Assumption : relationship between $Y$ and $X$ is the same for all categories of $Y$

## Testing the proportional odds model

Tests for assessing proportionality when the outcomes are uncorrelated were extended to longitudinal data (Stiger, 1999).

What if the proportional odds assumption is violated?

- Fitting a more general model
- Dichotomize the ordinal variable and fit separate binary logistic regression models (Bender, 1998).

Our solution

- Fitting a model that allows relaxing the proportional odds assumption when necessary


## The partial proportional odds model

The partial proportional odds model (Peterson and Harrel, 1990) allows non-proportional odds for all or a subset $q$ of the $p$ explanatory covariates.

In univariate case,

$$
\operatorname{logit}[\operatorname{Pr}(Y \leq k)]=\theta_{k}+\mathbf{x}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\mathbf{z}^{\prime} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} \quad, k=1, \cdots, K-1
$$

where $\mathbf{z}$ is a $q$-dimensional vector $(q \leq p)$ of the explanatory variables for which the proportional odds assumption does not hold and $\gamma_{\mathrm{k}}$ is the $(q \times 1)$ corresponding vector of coefficients and $\gamma_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{0}$. When $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}=\mathbf{0}$ for all $k$, the model reduces to the proportional odds model

## Extension of the partial proportional odds model to longitudinal data (Donneau et al., 2010)

In a longitudinal setting,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\theta_{k}+\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i j}}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{i j}}^{\prime} \gamma_{\mathrm{k}} \quad, \quad i=1, \cdots, N ; \quad j=1, \cdots, T \\
&, \quad k=1, \cdots, K-1
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\left(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{i} 1}, \cdots, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{i T}}\right)^{\prime}$ is a $(T \times q)$ matrix, $q \leq p$, of a subset of $q$-explanatory variables for which the proportional odds assumption does not apply and $\gamma_{\mathrm{k}}$ is the $(q \times 1)$ corresponding vector of regression parameters with $\gamma_{1}=\mathbf{0}$.

As an example ( $\mathrm{p}=2$ and $\mathrm{q}=1$ ), assume that the proportional odds assumption holds for $X_{1}$ and not for $X_{2}$, then

$$
\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\theta_{k}+\beta_{1} X_{1}+\left(\beta_{2}+\gamma_{k, 2}\right) X_{2}
$$

## Estimation

Estimation of the regression parameters

- GEE - extension of GLM to longitudinal data (Liang and Zegger, 1986)
- Define of a $(K-1)$ expanded vector of binary responses $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\left(Y_{i j, 1}, \ldots, Y_{i j,(K-1)}\right)^{\prime}$ where $Y_{i j k}=1$ if $Y_{i j} \leq k$ and 0 otherwise
- $\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j k}=1\right)\right] \rightarrow$ member of GLM family

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\prime}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i}}-\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)=0
$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i}}=\left(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i} 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i} \mathbf{T}}\right)^{\prime}, \pi_{\mathbf{i}}=E\left(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)$ and $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{i}}=\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\mathbf{1 / 2}} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}^{1 / 2}$ with $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}$ the diagonal matrix of the variance of the element of $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{i}}$. The matrix $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}$ is the 'working' correlation matrix that expresses the dependence among repeated observations over the subjects.

## Missingness

Missing data patterns

- Drop out / attrition
- Non-monotone missingness

Missing data mechanism (Little and Rubin, 1987)

- MCAR: Missing completely at random
- MAR: Missing at random
- MNAR: Missing not at random


## Example : Appetite loss - (1) Treatment effect

Model

- Consider the model:

$$
\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\theta_{k}+\left(\beta_{1}+\gamma_{\mathbf{k} 1}\right) t_{i j}+\left(\beta_{2}+\gamma_{\mathbf{k} \mathbf{2}}\right) \text { Treat }_{i}+\left(\beta_{3}+\gamma_{\mathbf{k} 3}\right) t_{i j} \times \text { Treat }_{i}
$$

- $k=1,2,3$
- $t_{i j}$ : $j^{\text {th }}$ time of measurement on subject $i$
- Treat $_{i}$ : treatment group $(1=\mathrm{RT}+\mathrm{CT}$ vs $0=\mathrm{RT})$


## Assumption

- Missing data mechanism is MCAR (GEE)
- Proportional odds assumption is verified for $t$, Treat and $t \times$ Treat.
$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{t}}=\mathbf{0} \quad(p=0.86)$
$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \text { Treat }}=\mathbf{0} \quad(p=0.21)$
$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{t} \times \text { Treat }}=\mathbf{0} \quad(p=0.17)$


## Example : Appetite loss - (1) Treatment effect

## Model becomes

$$
\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\theta_{k}+\beta_{1} t_{i j}+\beta_{2} \text { Treat }_{i}+\beta_{3}\left(t_{i j} \times \text { Treat }_{i}\right) \quad, k=1,2,3
$$

## Estimation

Table1: GEE parameter estimates for the appetite
loss scale - Proportional odds model

| Covariates | Estimate | SE | $p$-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\theta_{1}$ | 1.21 | 0.14 |  |
| $\theta_{2}$ | 2.48 | 0.16 |  |
| $\theta_{3}$ | 3.81 | 0.21 |  |
| $t_{i j}$ | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.033 |
| Treat $_{i}$ | -0.39 | 0.19 | 0.034 |
| $t_{i j} \times$ Treat $_{i}$ | -0.12 | 0.05 | 0.009 |

A significant difference between treatment arms was found in favor of the RT alone treatment.

## Example: Appetite loss - (2) Tumor cell effect

Model

- Consider the model:

$$
\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq k\right)\right]=\theta_{k}+\left(\beta_{1}+\gamma_{\mathbf{k} 1}\right) t_{i j}+\left(\beta_{2}+\gamma_{\mathbf{k} \mathbf{2}}\right) \text { Tumor }_{i}+\left(\beta_{3}+\gamma_{\mathbf{k} 3}\right) t_{i j} \times \text { Tumor }_{i}
$$

- $k=1,2,3$
- $t_{i j}$ : $j^{\text {th }}$ time of measurement on subject $i$
- Tumor $_{i}$ : type of diagnosed tumor $(1=$ pure vs $0=$ mixed $)$


## Assumption

- Missing data mechanism is MCAR (GEE)
- Proportional odds assumption is not met for $t$, Tumor and $t \times$ Tumor.
$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{t}}=\mathbf{0} \quad(p=0.015)$
$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \text { Tumor }}=\mathbf{0} \quad(p=0.044)$
$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{t} \times \text { Tumor }}=\mathbf{0} \quad(p=0.008)$


## Example : Appetite loss - (2) Tumor cell effect

Estimations
Table2: GEE parameter estimates for the appetite loss scale - Partial proportional odds model

| Covariates | k | Estimate | SE | $p$-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\theta_{1}$ | 1 | -0.75 | 0.25 |  |
| $\theta_{2}$ | 2 | 1.58 | 0.41 |  |
| $\theta_{3}$ | 3 | 1.93 | 0.78 |  |
| $t_{i j}$ | 1 | 0.49 | 0.06 | $<0.0001$ |
| $t_{i j}$ | 2 | -0.10 | 0.12 | 0.39 |
| $t_{i j}$ | 3 | 0.53 | 0.22 | 0.015 |
| Tumor $_{j}$ | 1 | 1.30 | 0.20 | $<0.0001$ |
| Tumor $_{j}$ | 2 | 0.45 | 0.33 | 0.18 |
| Tumor $_{j}$ | 3 | 1.14 | 0.65 | 0.079 |
| $t_{i j} \times$ Tumor $_{j}$ | 1 | -0.34 | 0.04 | $<0.0001$ |
| $t_{i j} \times$ Tumor $_{j}$ | 2 | 0.092 | 0.097 | 0.34 |
| $t_{i j} \times$ Tumor $_{j}$ | 3 | -0.32 | 0.16 | 0.04 |

## Example: Appetite loss - (2) Tumor cell effect

$\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq 1\right)\right]=-0.75+0.49 t_{i j}+1.30$ Tumor $_{j}-0.34 t_{i j} \times$ Tumor $_{j}$
$\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq 2\right)\right]=1.58-0.10 t_{i j}+0.45$ Tumor $_{j}+0.092 t_{i j} \times$ Tumor $_{j}$
$\operatorname{logit}\left[\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i j} \leq 3\right)\right]=1.93+0.53 t_{i j}+1.14$ Tumor $_{j}-0.32 t_{i j} \times$ Tumor $_{j}$
where $1=$ "Not at all', $2=$ 'A little', $3=$ 'Quite a bit', $4=$ 'Very much'

## Interpretation

- At baseline, pure cell tumor patients have $e^{1.30}=3.7$ time higher odds of having no appetite loss than mixed cells tumor patients.
- At baseline, pure cell tumor patients have $e^{0.45}=1.6$ time higher odds of having at most little appetite loss than mixed cells tumor patients.
- At baseline, pure cell tumor patients have $e^{1.14}=3.1$ time higher odds of having at most quite a bite appetite loss than mixed cells tumor patients.


## Conclusion

We have explored the extension of the partial proportional odds model to the case of longitudinal data

- Estimation mechanism (GEE)
- Testing for the proportional odds assumption for each covariate
- Final model that
takes into account the ordinal nature of the variable under study takes into account the correlation between repeated observations allows relaxing the proportional odds assumption (when necessary)
- Missing data to be first investigated (GEE, WGEE, Mi-GEE)
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