



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

Workshop on Composite Likelihood Methods

Composite Likelihood Analysis of Mixed Autoregressive Probit Models with Application to Pain Severity Diaries

Cristiano Varin

Ca' Foscari University, Venice

joint with Claudia Czado, Munich

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

Outline

- Pain severity diaries;
- data from some migraine sufferers living in Toronto;
- mixed autoregressive probit models for ordinal responses;
- composite likelihood inference and model selection;
- simulations and analysis of the migraine data.



Pain severity diaries

- Longitudinal study of chronic and recurrent pain conditions, as migraine, back pain, ...
- patients record pain severity in a diary over a time period;
- rating scale of symptoms severity;
- electronic data collection (palmtop computers): data frequency can be very high;
- poor statistical analysis in medical journals...
- need for statistical methods to adequately deal with “large” longitudinal ordinal data.



Headache and weather in Toronto?

- Longitudinal study conducted by psychologist Kostecki-Dillon during years 1993-1996;
- four daily ratings of the headache intensity recorded from 133 Canadian (Toronto) patients;
- weather conditions collected from the closest weather station;
- measurement periods varied in length from one day up to seven months.



Headache and weather?

(Prince et al., *Headache* 2004)

- Forty-five million Americans seek medical attention for headaches yearly causing an estimated labor cost of \$13 billions;
- Prince et al. found that about half (!?) of their migraine patients are sensitive to weather;
- other studies investigating the relationship between weather conditions and headache have been negative or inconclusive, e.g. Cooke et al. (*Headache*, 2000).



Headache data

- Headache sufferers classified in three categories:
 - a) **migraine without aura**,
 - b) **migraine with aura**,
 - c) **mixed migraine/tension headache**;
- omitted patients with **very large** number of missing observations in subsequent measurements or less than one day of measurements;
- final data set comprises 119 patients with a total of **16,366** measurements, 1,157 of which are missing.



Headache data

- 119 patients;
- number of observations per patients range from 16 (four days) to 1,352 (338 days), mean value 137.53 (34.38 days)
- number of observations per measurement period range from 4 (one day) to 852 (213 days), mean value 61.53 (15.38 days)
- unfortunately, all the weather conditions covariates are missing when responses are missing...



Headache scale

intensity	freq.	condition
0	9210	no headache
1	2455	mild headache: aware of it only when attending.
2	1685	moderate headache: could be ignored at times.
3	1156	painful headache: continuously aware of it, but able to start or continue daily activities as usual.
4	526	severe headache: continuously aware of it, able to perform only undemanding tasks.
5	177	intense headache: continuously aware of it, incapacitating. Unable to start or continue activity.



Covariates

- **Personal**: age, sex, education, work, marital status, smoke, ...
- **clinical**: assumption of analgesics, years suffering, comorbid illness, neuroticism, ...
- **calendar**: day, week, month, season;
- **weather conditions** from the closest weather station: sunshine, humidity, wind direction and speed, windchill, pressure, air quality, ...
- total number of covariates: **54!**



Modelling the migraine data

Components of a candidate model:



Modelling the migraine data

Components of a candidate model:

- response on **ordinal scale**;



Modelling the migraine data

Components of a candidate model:

- response on **ordinal scale**;
- **regression term**;



Modelling the migraine data

Components of a candidate model:

- response on **ordinal scale**;
- **regression term**;
- allow for **patients' heterogeneity**;



Modelling the migraine data

Components of a candidate model:

- response on **ordinal scale**;
- **regression term**;
- allow for **patients' heterogeneity**;
- allow for **different pain-memory patterns** in distinct groups of patients, e.g. females vs males, patients taking medicaments or not, patients with different kind of headache;



Latent modelling of migraine data

Ordinal rate for t -th records in the j -th measurement period of the i -th subject seen as censored continuous observation

$$Y_{ijt} = k \leftrightarrow c_{k-1} < Y_{ijt}^* \leq c_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 6,$$

for suitable cut-points, $-\infty = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_6 = \infty$.



Latent modelling of migraine data

Ordinal rate for t -th records in the j -th measurement period of the i -th subject seen as censored continuous observation

$$Y_{ijt} = k \leftrightarrow c_{k-1} < Y_{ijt}^* \leq c_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 6,$$

for suitable cut-points, $-\infty = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_6 = \infty$.

The hidden process has baseline

$$Y_{ij1}^* = u_i + x'_{ij1}\beta + \epsilon_{ij1}$$

Latent modelling of migraine data

Ordinal rate for t -th records in the j -th measurement period of the i -th subject seen as censored continuous observation

$$Y_{ijt} = k \leftrightarrow c_{k-1} < Y_{ijt}^* \leq c_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 6,$$

for suitable cut-points, $-\infty = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_6 = \infty$.

The hidden process has baseline patient-specific random effect

$$Y_{ij1}^* = u_i + x'_{ij1}\beta + \epsilon_{ij1}$$

Latent modelling of migraine data

Ordinal rate for t -th records in the j -th measurement period of the i -th subject seen as censored continuous observation

$$Y_{ijt} = k \leftrightarrow c_{k-1} < Y_{ijt}^* \leq c_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 6,$$

for suitable cut-points, $-\infty = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_6 = \infty$.

The hidden process has baseline patient-specific random effect

$$Y_{ij1}^* = u_i + x'_{ij1}\beta + \epsilon_{ij1}$$

and subsequent (hidden) observations evolving as ($t \geq 2$)

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i}\eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}.$$

Latent modelling of migraine data

Ordinal rate for t -th records in the j -th measurement period of the i -th subject seen as censored continuous observation

$$Y_{ijt} = k \leftrightarrow c_{k-1} < Y_{ijt}^* \leq c_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 6,$$

for suitable cut-points, $-\infty = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_6 = \infty$.

The hidden process has baseline patient-specific random effect

$$Y_{ij1}^* = u_i + x'_{ij1}\beta + \epsilon_{ij1}$$

and subsequent (hidden) observations evolving as ($t \geq 2$)

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i} \eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}.$$

different autocorrelations for distinct groups of patients

Mixed autoregressive probit models

- Latent model:

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i} \eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}.$$



Mixed autoregressive probit models

- Latent model:

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i}\eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}.$$

- Probabilistic assumptions:



Mixed autoregressive probit models

- Latent model:

$$Y_{ijt}^* = (u_i) + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i}\eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}.$$

- Probabilistic assumptions:

a) Gaussian random effects, $u_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

Mixed autoregressive probit models

- Latent model:

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i}\eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}$$

- Probabilistic assumptions:

a) Gaussian random effects, $u_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

b) Gaussian (hidden) innovations, $\epsilon_{ijt} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon)$

Mixed autoregressive probit models

- Latent model:

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i}\eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt}$$

- Probabilistic assumptions:

a) Gaussian random effects, $u_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

b) Gaussian (hidden) innovations, $\epsilon_{ijt} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon)$



mixed autoregressive probit model

Mixed autoregressive probit models

- Latent model:

$$Y_{ijt}^* = u_i + x'_{ijt}\beta + \eta_{ijt},$$

$$\eta_{ijt} = \gamma_{z_i}\eta_{ijt-1} + \epsilon_{ijt},$$

- Probabilistic assumptions:

a) Gaussian random effects, $u_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

b) Gaussian (hidden) innovations, $\epsilon_{ijt} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon)$



mixed autoregressive probit model

- Identifiability: fix scale and position of Y_{ijt}^* , e.g.

a) first cut-point, $c_1 = 0$,

b) variance innovation, $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 1$.

Likelihood inference?

- Likelihood function involves 119 (= number of patients) intractable integrals;
- each of the integrals has dimension equal to the number of obs per patients, here ranging from 16 (four days) to 1,352 (338 days)!
- Model obtained by categorizing a Gaussian state space model;
- ...but Kalman filter is not directly applicable!
- Monte Carlo methods as in Durbin and Koopman (2001) appear too costly, at least with actual technologies.
- Robustness issue (?) inference based on high-dimensional distributional assumptions...



Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$



Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

patients

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$

Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$

patients
measurement
periods

Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$

patients
measurement
periods

$$\sum_{t=m+1}^{n_{ij}} \sum_{l=1}^{m \wedge (t-1)} \log P_{\theta}(Y_{ijt} = y_{ijt}, Y_{ijt-l} = y_{ijt-l}) k_{ijt} k_{ijt-l}$$

Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$

patients $\rightarrow N$
 measurement periods $\rightarrow n_i$
 obs per period $\rightarrow n_{ij}$
 $m \wedge (t-1)$
 $\sum_{t=m+1} \sum_{l=1} \log P_{\theta} (Y_{ij t} = y_{ij t}, Y_{ij t-l} = y_{ij t-l}) k_{ij t} k_{ij t-l}$

Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$

patients $\rightarrow N$
 measurement periods $\rightarrow n_i$
 obs per period $\rightarrow n_{ij}$
 $m \wedge (t-1)$
 $\sum_{t=m+1} \sum_{l=1} \log P_{\theta} (Y_{ij t} = y_{ij t}, Y_{ij t-l} = y_{ij t-l}) k_{ij t} k_{ij t-l}$

w_{ij} period-specific weights,

Pairwise likelihood of order m

Pseudolikelihood constructed from pairs apart not more than m units

$$cl^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$$

$\sum_{t=m+1}^{n_{ij}} \sum_{l=1}^{m \wedge (t-1)} \log P_{\theta}(Y_{ijt} = y_{ijt}, Y_{ijt-l} = y_{ijt-l}) k_{ijt} k_{ijt-l}$

Diagram annotations:
 - "patients" points to N
 - "measurement periods" points to n_i
 - "obs per period" points to n_{ij}
 - A dashed box encloses $w_{ij} pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$
 - A dashed arrow points from the dashed box to $pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$
 - A dashed arrow points from $pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y_{ij})$ to $k_{ijt} k_{ijt-l}$

w_{ij} period-specific weights,
 k_{ijt} missing value indicator.

Pairwise terms

Probability of a pair of obs separated by l lags

$$P_{\theta}(Y_{ijt} = a, Y_{ijt-l} = b) = \int_{c_{a-1}}^{c_a} \int_{c_{b-1}}^{c_b} f_{\theta}(y_{ijt}^*, y_{ijt-l}^*) dy_{ijt}^* dy_{ijt-l}^*$$

Pairwise terms

Probability of a pair of obs separated by l lags

$$P_{\theta}(Y_{ijt} = a, Y_{ijt-l} = b) = \int_{c_{a-1}}^{c_a} \int_{c_{b-1}}^{c_b} f_{\theta}(y_{ijt}^*, y_{ijt-l}^*) dy_{ijt}^* dy_{ijt-l}^*$$

$$\phi_2 \left(\frac{y_{ijt}^* - x'_{ijt}\beta}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}}}, \frac{y_{ijt-l}^* - x'_{ijt-l}\beta}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}}}, \frac{\sigma^2 + \gamma_{z_i}^l (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}}{\sigma^2 + (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}} \right)$$

Pairwise terms

Probability of a pair of obs separated by l lags

$$P_{\theta}(Y_{ijt} = a, Y_{ijt-l} = b) = \int_{c_{a-1}}^{c_a} \int_{c_{b-1}}^{c_b} f_{\theta}(y_{ijt}^*, y_{ijt-l}^*) dy_{ijt}^* dy_{ijt-l}^*$$

$$\phi_2 \left(\frac{y_{ijt}^* - x'_{ijt}\beta}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}}}, \frac{y_{ijt-l}^* - x'_{ijt-l}\beta}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}}}, \frac{\sigma^2 + \gamma_{z_i}^l (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}}{\sigma^2 + (1 - \gamma_{z_i}^2)^{-1}} \right)$$

approximation based on stationary assumption

Period-specific weights

- Optimal weights difficult to be derived;
- comparison between:
 - a) unweighed pairwise likelihood of order m , versus
 - b) weighted version constructed under the extreme scenario of perfect dependence, *i.e.*

$$w_{ij} = \left(\sum_{t=m+1}^{n_{ij}} \sum_{l=1}^{m \wedge (t-1)} k_{ijt} k_{ijt-l} \right)^{-1}$$

number of pairs per period

with this choice, pairwise likelihood equals the ordinary likelihood in case of perfect dependence.

Period-specific weights

- Optimal weights difficult to be derived;
- comparison between:
 - a) unweighed pairwise likelihood of order m , versus
 - b) weighted version constructed under the extreme scenario of perfect dependence, *i.e.*

$$w_{ij} = \left(\sum_{t=m+1}^{n_{ij}} \sum_{l=1}^{m \wedge (t-1)} k_{ijt} k_{ijt-l} \right)^{-1}$$

number of pairs per period

with this choice, pairwise likelihood equals the ordinary likelihood in case of perfect dependence.

but after H. Joe's talk, I understood that this is not the best comparison...

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

$$H^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

$$H^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

(but Hessians may be avoided)

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

$$H^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

(but Hessians may be avoided)

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla pl_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

$$H^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

(but Hessians may be avoided)

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla p l_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

$$H^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

(but Hessians may be avoided)

$$J^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)'$$

Godambe information

The maximum pairwise likelihood estimator solves the composite likelihood score

$$u^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\theta; y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} \nabla p l_{ij}^{(m)}(\theta; y) \right)$$

Standard errors may be estimated from the observed Godambe information

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) = \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1} \hat{J}^{(m)}(y) \left\{ \hat{H}^{(m)}(y) \right\}^{-1}$$

$$H^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

(but Hessians may be avoided)

$$J^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) u_i^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y)'$$



One-step jackknife



One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;



One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;
- **jackknife**: simple, although rough, bias-correction;



One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;
- **jackknife**: simple, although rough, bias-correction;
- **one-step jackknife** for computational convenience:



One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;
- **jackknife**: simple, although rough, bias-correction;
- **one-step jackknife** for computational convenience:

$$\hat{\theta}_{-i} = \hat{\theta} + \left[\mathbf{H}_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y) \right]^{-1} u_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$



One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;
- **jackknife**: simple, although rough, bias-correction;
- **one-step jackknife** for computational convenience:

$$\hat{\theta}_{-i} = \hat{\theta} + \left[\mathbf{H}_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y) \right]^{-1} u_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = N\theta - (N - 1)\hat{\theta}_{-i} \quad \text{Tukey's pseudovalues}$$

One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;
- **jackknife**: simple, although rough, bias-correction;
- **one-step jackknife** for computational convenience:

$$\hat{\theta}_{-i} = \hat{\theta} + \left[H_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y) \right]^{-1} u_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = N\theta - (N - 1)\hat{\theta}_{-i} \quad \text{Tukey's pseudovalues}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_J = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\theta}_i \quad \text{one-step jackknife estimator}$$

One-step jackknife

- Maximum pairwise likelihood estimators for the variance components prone of severe downward bias;
- **jackknife**: simple, although rough, bias-correction;
- **one-step jackknife** for computational convenience:

$$\hat{\theta}_{-i} = \hat{\theta} + \left[H_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y) \right]^{-1} u_{-i}(\hat{\theta}; y)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = N\theta - (N - 1)\hat{\theta}_{-i} \quad \text{Tukey's pseudovalues}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_J = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\theta}_i \quad \text{one-step jackknife estimator}$$

- Tukey's pseudovalues may be used to obtain standard errors estimates somehow more robust than the sandwich estimate.

Model selection

Two model selection problems...

a) identifying the pairwise likelihood order:

$$m = \operatorname{argmin}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_+} \left[\operatorname{tr} \left\{ \hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) \right\} \right]$$

b) given the order, selecting the model by minimising the **composite likelihood information criterion**

$$\text{CLIC}^{(m)} = -2 c\ell^{(m)}(\hat{\theta}; y) + 2 \operatorname{tr} \left\{ H^{(m)}(y) \hat{\Sigma}^{(m)}(y) \right\}$$

Need to iterate between order identification and model selection.

A single model selection procedure would be preferable...



Code

- **maop**: R package for binary and ordinal probit models with or without random effects and autocorrelations;
- calls to C for more demanding operations;
- bivariate Gaussian integrals approximated by Fortran 77 routine written by A. Genz (1996, JCGS);
- starting values from MASS function `polr` (Venables and Ripley, 2002) assuming absence of the random effect and null autocorrelation;
- plan to make the package public available through CRAN.



Simulation studies

- Data generated mimicking the migraine data structure in terms of patients, measurement periods and missing responses;
- assumed model:
 - a) **regression**: 12 regressors most of them categorical, included also time-varying (weather) covariates. Total no. of mean parameters is 25 + 4 cut-points;
 - b) **association**: random effect, different autocorrelation for patients who take prophylactic medication and those who do not;
- 500 simulated data sets with parameter values set at MPLE of order 4;
- data fitted by MPLE of order from 1 to 10.

21

Warwick, 17 April 2008



	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalgY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097

22

Warwick, 17 April 2008



	true	WMCL		jack-WMCL		jack-MCL	
		bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.	bias	st.err.
c_2	0.774	0.002	0.026	0.002	0.029	0.001	0.018
c_3	1.466	0.005	0.039	0.003	0.044	0.001	0.026
c_4	2.209	0.010	0.054	0.005	0.061	0.000	0.035
c_5	3.131	0.021	0.082	0.010	0.098	0.003	0.062
intercept	-0.991	-0.001	0.316	0.012	0.357	0.015	0.366
edlev2	-0.423	-0.001	0.277	0.010	0.297	0.010	0.308
edlev3	-0.236	-0.004	0.229	-0.010	0.261	0.006	0.236
edlev4	-0.322	-0.023	0.315	-0.014	0.400	0.005	0.358
working2	0.562	0.000	0.278	0.007	0.312	-0.041	0.316
working3	0.280	-0.005	0.222	-0.008	0.248	0.008	0.197
sexM	-0.207	-0.002	0.236	0.006	0.276	0.009	0.480
married2	0.458	-0.015	0.178	-0.013	0.203	-0.006	0.218
married3	0.531	0.009	0.250	0.016	0.281	0.009	0.333
hatype2	0.125	0.014	0.198	0.018	0.251	-0.013	0.221
hatype4	0.460	0.011	0.313	0.011	0.378	-0.015	0.311
medanalY	1.030	0.009	0.228	0.004	0.273	-0.009	0.231
medprophY	0.511	0.001	0.191	0.006	0.213	-0.017	0.215
cophysY	-0.286	0.003	0.159	-0.003	0.175	0.015	0.221
bed	-0.101	-0.002	0.035	0.000	0.038	0.001	0.021
wc	-0.020	-0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.013	0.000	0.013
neo2	-0.353	0.006	0.264	0.009	0.290	0.002	0.377
neo3	-0.476	0.001	0.267	-0.001	0.299	0.022	0.278
neo4	0.060	0.002	0.249	0.000	0.275	0.012	0.282
neo5	-0.036	-0.003	0.339	0.004	0.411	0.026	0.427
wdir.nwY	0.263	0.000	0.072	-0.004	0.080	-0.002	0.055
wc:neo2	0.000	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.022	-0.002	0.017
wc:neo3	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.020
wc:neo4	0.036	0.000	0.019	-0.001	0.021	0.001	0.021
wc:neo5	0.033	0.001	0.016	0.001	0.018	-0.001	0.019
γ_{no}	0.614	0.016	0.052	0.011	0.069	-0.009	0.047
γ_{yes}	0.243	-0.019	0.100	-0.002	0.137	0.080	0.144
σ	0.761	-0.139	0.089	0.013	0.107	0.034	0.097



Simulations

- Regressor parameters very similarly estimated with any choice of the pairwise likelihood order;
- association parameters instead quite badly estimated with pairwise likelihood of order 1;
- also one-step jackknife estimators somehow numerically unstable with pairwise lik of order 1;
- difficulties fixed by using order 2 or more;
- very small differences from order 2 to 10...

order	1	2	3	...	10
$\text{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(m)})$	2.064	1.718	1.754	...	1.713



Migraine data analysis

- Models fitted by pairwise likelihood of order 4;
- one-step jackknife for bias-correction and standard errors estimate;
- models selected in a hierarchical way:
 - a) person-specific covariates;
 - b) measurement time covariates;
 - c) weather covariates;
 - d) iterations;
- all models include patient-specific random effects;
- different autocorrelation for distinct groups of patients.



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions worse for part-time or not working



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions worse for part-time or not working
- marital status



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions worse for part-time or not working
- marital status worse for singles



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime **less severe at bedtime**



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime **less severe at bedtime**
- **windchill** and its interaction with neuroticism



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime **less severe at bedtime**
- **windchill** and its interaction with neuroticism
more neurotic benefits from cold wind



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime **less severe at bedtime**
- **windchill** and its interaction with neuroticism
more neurotic benefits from cold wind
- patient-specific **random effect**



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime **less severe at bedtime**
- **windchill** and its interaction with neuroticism
more neurotic benefits from cold wind
- patient-specific **random effect**
- different autocorrelation for males and females



Migraine data analysis

The “final model” includes:

- working conditions **worse for part-time or not working**
- marital status **worse for singles**
- assumption of analgesics
- prophylactic headache medication
- comorbid physical illnesses
- bedtime **less severe at bedtime**
- **windchill** and its interaction with neuroticism
more neurotic benefits from cold wind
- patient-specific **random effect**
- different autocorrelation for males and females
more persistence of symptoms for females but...



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.		
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F 0.518	0.054	9.555
				M 0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416	0.833	0.079	10.528



	constant autocorr.			sex autocorr.			
	est.	st.err.	t-value	est.	st.err.	t-value	
c_2	0.765	0.040	18.917	0.767	0.040	18.953	
c_3	1.445	0.062	23.377	1.447	0.062	23.162	
c_4	2.184	0.078	28.053	2.187	0.079	27.543	
c_5	3.094	0.109	28.286	3.101	0.112	27.810	
intercept	-1.213	0.189	6.409	-1.205	0.190	6.336	
working2	0.514	0.228	2.256	0.500	0.230	2.171	
working3	0.336	0.172	1.952	0.345	0.175	1.975	
married2	0.467	0.158	2.952	0.457	0.158	2.891	
married3	0.385	0.224	1.715	0.391	0.218	1.795	
medanalgY	0.955	0.194	4.925	0.949	0.196	4.848	
medprophY	0.507	0.202	2.510	0.513	0.204	2.518	
bed	-0.102	0.053	1.935	-0.101	0.052	1.930	
cophysY	-0.330	0.146	2.268	-0.328	0.145	2.265	
neo2	0.061	0.134	0.458	0.060	0.132	0.456	
wc	-0.019	0.008	2.262	-0.019	0.008	2.270	
neo2:wc	0.034	0.011	3.072	0.033	0.011	2.973	
γ	0.451	0.034	13.170	F	0.518	0.054	9.555
				M	0.256	0.145	1.766
σ	0.869	0.076	11.416		0.833	0.079	10.528



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Migraine data analysis

autocorr.	$cl(\hat{\theta}; y)$	CLIC
sex	-646.889	1309.688
constant	-647.129	1309.746
neuroticism	-646.953	1310.103
analgesic	-647.082	1310.218
prophylactic	-646.910	1310.505
hatype	-646.881	1310.773



Sexual differences?

- The models with constant and sex-based autocorrelation have very similar estimates of the regressors and the random effect;
- **CLIC** suggests a slightly better fit for the “sex model”;
- this is in contrasts with the **Wald test**:

$$\hat{\gamma}_F - \hat{\gamma}_M = 0.262 \text{ with standard error } 0.186;$$

- but Wald test may be quite inexact...
- either CLIC may be imprecise because of the numerical difficulties associated with the penalty...



Parametric bootstrap

- Testing the hypothesis

$$\begin{cases} H_0 : \gamma_F = \gamma_M \\ H_1 : \gamma_F \neq \gamma_M \end{cases}$$

by the **composite likelihood ratio** $W(y)$.

- Overcome difficulties of the nonstandard asymptotic distribution of $W(y)$ by simple parametric bootstrap:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{I}_{\{W(y_b^*) \geq W(y)\}}}{1 + B}$$

Parametric bootstrap

- Testing the hypothesis

$$\begin{cases} H_0 : \gamma_F = \gamma_M \\ H_1 : \gamma_F \neq \gamma_M \end{cases}$$

by the **composite likelihood ratio** $W(y)$.

- Overcome difficulties of the nonstandard asymptotic distribution of $W(y)$ by simple parametric bootstrap:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \overset{\text{simulated data under } H_0}{I\{W(y_b^*) \geq W(y)\}}}{1 + B}$$

Parametric bootstrap

- Testing the hypothesis

$$\begin{cases} H_0 : \gamma_F = \gamma_M \\ H_1 : \gamma_F \neq \gamma_M \end{cases}$$

by the **composite likelihood ratio** $W(y)$.

- Overcome difficulties of the nonstandard asymptotic distribution of $W(y)$ by simple parametric bootstrap:

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1 + \sum_{b=1}^B \overset{\text{simulated data under } H_0}{I\{W(y_b^*) \geq W(y)\}}}{1 + B}$$

- Migraine data: estimated p-value using 500 bootstrap samples equals to 0.243: no sexual differences.



Conclusions

- Numerical difficulties with approximating the variance of the gradient suggest care with Wald-type and CLIC-statistics;
- some kind of model-averaging? compromise estimators as in Hjort and Claeskens (2003, JASA)?
- optimal cluster-specific weights? Joe and Lee's work...
- improving the one-step jackknife? yes, but care to be paid on the computational complexity!
- extending the model to deal with time-irregular data by replacing the autoregressive residuals with variogram-type models.



Reference

Varin, C. and Czado, C. (2008). A mixed probit model for the analysis of pain severity data. (submitted)

Available at my home page:

www.dst.unive.it/~sammy



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia



Thanks for your attention!