Mood Changes Associated with Smoking in Adolescents: Applications of Mixed-Effects Location Scale Models for Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) Data

> Donald Hedeker & Robin Mermelstein Institute for Health Research and Policy University of Illinois at Chicago

> > hedeker@uic.edu www.uic.edu/~hedeker

Joint Meeting of the Royal Statistical Society Avon local group and LEMMA node of the National Centre for Research Methods

Supported by National Cancer Institute grants 5PO1 CA98262 (Mermelstein, PI) and R21 CA140696 (Hedeker).

Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) data aka experience sampling and diary methods

- Subjects provide frequent reports on events and experiences of their daily lives (*e.g.*, 30-40 responses per subject collected over the course of a week or so)
 - electronic diaries: palm pilots, personal digital assistants (PDAs), smart phones
- Capture particulars of experience in a way not possible with more traditional designs
 e.g., allow investigation of phenomena as they happen over time
- Reports could be time-based, following a fixed-schedule, randomly triggered, event-triggered

Data are rich and offer many modeling possibilities!

- person-level and occasion-level determinants of occasion-level responses \Rightarrow potential influence of context and/or environment e.g., subject response might vary when alone vs with others
- allows examination of why subjects differ in variability rather than just mean level
 - between-subjects variance
 - e.g., subject heterogeneity could vary by gender or age
 - within-subjects variance
 - e.g., subject degree of stability could vary by gender or age

Multilevel (mixed-effects regression) model for measurement y of subject i (i = 1, 2, ..., N) on occasion j($j = 1, 2, ..., n_i$)

$$y_{ij} = \boldsymbol{x}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta} + v_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

 $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij} = p \times 1$ vector of regressors (including a column of ones) $\boldsymbol{\beta} = p \times 1$ vector of regression coefficients $v_i \sim N(0, \sigma_v^2)$ BS variance $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ WS variance

Log-linear models for variances

BS variance
$$\sigma_{v_{ij}}^2 = \exp(\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}'\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$
 or $\log(\sigma_{v_{ij}}^2) = \boldsymbol{u}_{ij}'\boldsymbol{\alpha}$

WS variance
$$\sigma_{\epsilon_{ij}}^2 = \exp(\boldsymbol{w}_{ij}'\boldsymbol{\tau})$$
 or $\log(\sigma_{\epsilon_{ij}}^2) = \boldsymbol{w}_{ij}'\boldsymbol{\tau}$

- \boldsymbol{u}_{ij} and \boldsymbol{w}_{ij} include covariates (and 1)
- exp function ensures a positive multiplicative factor, and so resulting variances are positive

WS variance varies across subjects

$$\sigma_{\epsilon_{ij}}^2 = \exp(\boldsymbol{w}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau} + \omega_i) \quad \text{where} \quad \omega_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{\omega}^2)$$

$$\log(\sigma_{\epsilon_{ij}}^2) = \boldsymbol{w}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau} + \omega_i$$

- ω_i are log-normal subject-specific perturbations of WS variance
- ω_i are "scale" random effects how does a subject differ in terms of the variation in their data
- v_i are "location" random effects how does a subject differ in terms of the mean of their data



Model allows covariates to influence

- mean: level of solid line
- BS variance: dispersion of dotted lines
- WS variance: dispersion of points

additional random subject effects on: mean and WS variance

Standardize the random effects via the Cholesky factorization

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_i \\ \omega_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{v_{ij}} & 0 \\ \sigma_{v\omega}/\sigma_{v_{ij}} & \sqrt{\sigma_{\omega}^2 - \sigma_{v\omega}^2/\sigma_{v_{ij}}^2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{1i} \\ \theta_{2i} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s_{1ij} & 0 \\ s_{2ij} & s_{3ij} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{1i} \\ \theta_{2i} \end{bmatrix}$$

The model is now, with $\theta_{1i}, \theta_{2i}, e_{ij}$ all N(0, 1)

$$y_{ij} = \boldsymbol{x}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \sigma_{v_{ij}}\theta_{1i} + \sigma_{\epsilon_{ij}}e_{ij}$$

BS std dev
$$\sigma_{v_{ij}} = s_{1ij} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{u}'_{ij} \boldsymbol{\alpha}\right)$$

WS std dev
$$\sigma_{\epsilon_{ij}} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[\boldsymbol{w}_{ij}^{\prime}\boldsymbol{\tau} + s_{2ij}\theta_{1i} + s_{3ij}\theta_{2i}\right]\right)$$

•
$$E(y_{ij}) = \boldsymbol{x}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta}$$

•
$$V(y_{ij}) = \exp(\boldsymbol{u}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + \exp\left(\boldsymbol{w}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\omega}^2\right)$$

BS variance WS variance

•
$$C(y_{ij}, y_{ij'}) = \sigma_{v_{ij}}^2 = \exp(\boldsymbol{u}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$
 for $j \neq j'$

•
$$r_{ij} = \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{u}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\exp(\boldsymbol{u}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + \exp(\boldsymbol{w}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\omega}^2)}$$

 \Rightarrow ICC varies as a function of BS covariates ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}$), WS covariates ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$), and variance of random scale effects (σ_{ω}^2)

Estimation

Model for the $n_i \times 1$ vector of responses, \boldsymbol{y}_i , of subject *i*

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{i} = \boldsymbol{X}_{i}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{1}_{i}\boldsymbol{s}_{1i}\theta_{1i} + \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[\boldsymbol{W}_{i}\boldsymbol{\tau} + \boldsymbol{1}_{i}\boldsymbol{s}_{2i}\theta_{1i} + \boldsymbol{1}_{i}\boldsymbol{s}_{3i}\theta_{2i}\right]\right)\boldsymbol{e}_{i}$$

The marginal density of \boldsymbol{y}_i in the population

$$h(\boldsymbol{y}_i) = \int_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} f(\boldsymbol{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}$$

The marginal log-likelihood from the sample of N subjects

$$\log L = \sum_{i}^{N} \log h(\boldsymbol{y}_{i})$$

- SAS PROC NLMIXED (slow and must provide starting values)
- MIXREGLS freeware (faster and no starting values); also DLL is accessible via R

Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) Study of Adolescent Smokers (Mermelstein)

- 461 adolescents (9th and 10th graders); former and current smoking experimenters, and regular smokers
- Carry PDA for a week, answer questions when prompted average = 30 answered prompts (range = 7 to 71)
- $\Sigma_i^N n_i = 14,105$ total number of observations

Outcomes: positive and negative affect

Interest: characterizing determinants of affect level, as well as BS and WS affect heterogeneity

Dependent Variables

- Positive Affect mood scale (mean=6.797 and sd=1.935)
 - Before signal: I felt Happy
 - Before signal: I felt Relaxed
 - Before signal: I felt Cheerful
 - Before signal: I felt Confident
 - Before signal: I felt Accepted by Others
- Negative Affect mood scale (mean=3.455 and sd=2.253)
 - Before signal: I felt Sad
 - Before signal: I felt Stressed
 - Before signal: I felt Angry
 - Before signal: I felt Frustrated
 - Before signal: I felt Irritable
- \Rightarrow items rated on 1 (not al all) to 10 (very much) scale





Subject-level Independent Variables

	mean	std dev	\min	max
Smoker	.508	.500	0	1
Male	.449	.498	0	1

- Smoker: gave at least one report of a smoking event in the week of EMA measurement (about half of the subjects)
- Male: a bit more females than males in this sample

What about smoking?

- Smoker does not consider smoking level (just whether or not a subject provided at least one smoking event)
- 234 with smoking events: average=5, median=3, range = 1 to 42
- Perhaps, smoking level needs to be considered
- **PropSmk** = proportion of occasions (both random prompts and smoking events) that were smoking events

 $PropSmk = n_smk / (n_smk + n_random)$

Model with Smoker and Psmk

 $PropSmk = n_smk / (n_smk + n_random)$

N=234 with $n_smk > 0$ (and Smoker = 1)

 $\min = .014, 25\%$ quartile = .05, median = .08, 75\% quartile = .18

Psmk = PropSmk - min(PropSmk)

Model: Mood_{ij} = $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ Smoker + β_2 Psmk + ... + $v_i + \epsilon_{ij}$

subject	Smoker	Psmk	mean (with other covariates $= 0$)
non-smoker	0	0	eta_0
min smoker	1	0	$\beta_0 + \beta_1$
light smoker	1	.05	$\beta_0 + \beta_1 + .036\beta_2$
medium smoker	1	.08	$\beta_0 + \beta_1 + .066\beta_2$
high smoker	1	.18	$\beta_0 + \beta_1 + .166\beta_2$

 \Rightarrow Piecewise linear mean model; same for BS & WS variance models

	Positive Affect		Negative Affect		et		
parameter	estimate	se	p <	estimate	se	p <	
Mean							
Intercept β_0	6.740	.094	.001	3.607	.117	.001	
Male eta_1	.299	.114	.01	599	.135	.001	
Smoker eta_2	192	.141	.18	.462	.168	.007	
$\texttt{PSmk}\ \beta_3$.018	.742	.98	-1.530	.791	.054	
<u>WS variance</u>							
Intercept τ_0	.704	.059	.001	.820	.077	.001	
Male $ au_1$	272	.071	.001	444	.092	.001	
Smoker $ au_2$.157	.086	.07	.407	.112	.001	
$\texttt{Psmk} \ \tau_3$	693	.430	.11	-1.446	.554	.01	
<u>BS variance</u>							
Intercept α_0	.293	.102	.004	.800	.100	.001	
Male $lpha_1$	115	.123	.35	319	.115	.006	
Smoker $lpha_2$.157	.149	.30	.183	.135	.18	
$\texttt{Psmk} \ \alpha_3$.370	.812	.65	657	.653	.31	
Scale							
BS variance of scale σ_{ω}^2	.503	.038	.001	.893	.064	.001	
covariance $\sigma_{\upsilon\omega}$	356	.047	.001	.647	.071	.001	

- Analysis focused on one measurement wave and the effect of smoking level on mood variance from random prompts (between-subjects or cross-sectional effect)
- What about as subjects change their own level of smoking? (within-subjects or longitudinal effect)
- What about smoking-attributable change in mood? (mood responses from smoking events)

EMA Study of Adolescents (Mermelstein, NCI)

- 461 adolescents (9th and 10th graders; 55% female); former and current smoking experimenters, and regular smokers
- Carry PDA for a week, answer questions when randomly prompted, or event-record when smoking (mutually exclusive)
- baseline, 6-month, 15-month, 2-year, and 5-year follow-ups

Interest: characterizing determinants of change in positive and negative affect associated with smoking events, especially across time

 \Rightarrow analysis of 158 subjects with two or more waves, where at each wave subject had two or more smoking events

158 subjects with two or more waves at each wave subject had two or more smoking events

- total of 4,727 smoking events
- 65, 30, 33, 30 subjects had data at two, three, four and five waves
- number of subjects across waves: 126 (baseline), 93 (6 mo), 95 (15 mo), 101 (2 yr), and 87 (5 yr)
- average number of smoking events across waves:

6.90 (range = 2 to 42) 7.53 (2 to 32) 9.74 (2 to 43) 10.14 (2 to 49) 13.90 (2 to 64) **Dependent Variables** - mood reports for smoking events

- Positive Affect (PA) mood scale (5 items)
 - Before smoking I felt: Happy, Relaxed, Cheerful, Confident, Accepted by Others
- Negative Affect (NA) mood scale (5 items)
 - Before smoking I felt: Sad, Stressed, Angry, Frustrated, Irritable
- items rated on 1 (not al all) to 10 (very much) scale
- also rated for "Now after smoking: I feel"
- difference (now-before) is measure of reported mood change associated with smoking
- PA mood change averages = .75, .54, .34, .41, .41 across waves
- NA mood change averages = -.46, -.45, -.33, -.44, -.32 across waves

3-level Mixed Model for the mood change y_{ijk} of

- subject $i \ (i = 1, 2, \dots, N \text{ subjects})$
- wave $j \ (j = 1, 2, ..., n_i)$
- occasion $k \ (k = 1, 2, \dots, n_{ij} \text{ smoking events})$

$$\begin{split} y_{ijk} &= (\beta_0 + \upsilon_{0i} + \upsilon_{0ij}) + (\beta_1 + \upsilon_{1i}) \texttt{Wave}_j + \beta_2 \texttt{Male}_i \\ &+ \beta_3 \texttt{AvgRate}_i + \beta_4 \texttt{DevRate}_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk} \end{split}$$

- \bullet Wave $_j$ (0=baseline, .5=6 mos, 1.25=15 mos, 2=2yrs, 5=5yrs)
- Male_i (0=female, 1=male)
- Smoking level
 - * SmkRate_{ij} = per wave daily smoking rate (ln units)
 - * BS version $AvgRate_i = subject$ average of $SmkRate_{ij}$
 - * WS version $\texttt{DevRate}_{ij} = (\texttt{SmkRate}_{ij} \texttt{AvgRate}_i)$
 - = per wave deviation in the daily smoking rate

Error variance model $\epsilon_{ijk} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\epsilon}^2)$ WS variance

$$\log(\sigma_{\epsilon_{ijk}}^2) = \tau_0 + \tau_1 \texttt{Wave}_j + \tau_2 \texttt{Male}_i + \tau_3 \texttt{AvgRate}_i + \tau_4 \texttt{DevRate}_{ij} + \omega_i$$

log-linear model of within-subject variance, with subject-specific perturbation $\omega_i \sim N(0,\sigma_\omega^2)$

- WS variance follow a log-normal distribution at the subject level
- skewed nonnegative nature of log-normal makes it a reasonable choice for representing variances
- random scale effect ω_i allowed to be correlated with random intercept v_{0i} and trend v_{1i}



- population intercept and trend (solid line)
- random intercept and trend for 2 subjects (dotted lines)
- error variance varies across time and subjects (random scale)

3-level PROC NLMIXED code (thanks to Dale McLerran) PROC NLMIXED GCONV=1e-12; PARMS b0=.25 bWave=.5 t0=1 tWave=0 vu0=1 vu1=.5 vs0=.05 vwave=.1 cu0u1=0 cu0s0=0 cu1s0=0; z = (b0 + u0) + (bWave + u1)*Wave+ d1*w1 + d2*w2 + d3*w3 + d4*w4 + d5*w5; vare = EXP(t0 + tWave*Wave + s0);MODEL y \sim NORMAL(z,vare); RANDOM u0 u1 s0 d1 d2 d3 d4 d5 \sim NORMAL([0,0,0,0,0,0,0], [vu0,cu0u1,vu1,cu0s0,cu1s0,vs0, 0, 0, 0, vwave, 0, 0, 0, 0, vwave, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, vwave, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, vwave, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, vwave]) SUBJECT=id;

where w1, w2, w3, w4, w5 are indicator variables (0,1) of the five waves

Random effect model comparisons

Subject	Wave		Positive .	Affect	Negative	e Affect
level	level	parms	Deviance	AIC	Deviance	AIC
Int, Wave		3	15916	15942	16526	16552
Int, Wave, Scale		6	14913	14945	15100	15132
Int	Int	2	15906	15930	16504	16528
Int, Wave	Int	4	15895	15923	Wave var	goes to 0
Int, Scale	Int	4	14900	14928	15090	15118
Int, Wave, Scale	Int	7		Wave var	r goes to 0	

regressors = Wave, Male, AvgRate, DevRate in mean and error variance models

3-level Model of Smoking-related Positive and Negative Affect Change; estimates, standard errors (se), and *p*-values

	Posit	ive A	ffect	Negat	tive A	ffect
Mean Model	est	se	p <	est	se	p <
Intercept β_0	.708	.106	.001	447	.091	.001
Wave β_1	020	.016	.22	.002	.013	.90
Male β_2	.119	.082	.15	057	.069	.41
AvgRate β_3	174	.059	.004	.083	.050	.10
DevRate β_4	081	.052	.12	.071	.039	.08
Error Var Model	est	se	p <	est	se	p <
Intercept τ_0	.893	.174	.001	1.048	.211	.001
Wave τ_1	158	.017	.001	117	.018	.001
Male τ_2	.218	.156	.16	.235	.193	.22
AvgRate $ au_3$	229	.107	.034	361	.132	.007
DevRate $ au_4$	314	.049	.001	321	.055	.001

3-level Model of Smoking-related Positive and Negative Affect Change; estimates, standard errors (se), and *p*-values

$Random \ effect$	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	
(co)variances	est se $p <$	est se $p <$	
Subject level			
Intercept $\sigma^2_{v_{(3)}}$.130 .031 .001	.084 .023 .001	
Scale σ_{ω}^2	.780 .106 .001	1.28 .166 .001	
Int, Scale $\sigma_{\mathcal{U}_{(3)}\omega}$.186 .040 .001	189 .041 .001	
	(r = .59)	(r =58)	
Wave level			

Intercept $\sigma^2_{\mathcal{U}_{(2)}}$.090 .021 .001 .028 .012 .022

Summary

• More applications where interest is on modeling variance

Hedeker D., Mermelstein R.J., & Demirtas H. (2008). An application of a mixed-effects location scale model for analysis of Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) data. *Biometrics*, 64, 627-634.

Hedeker D., Mermelstein R.J., & Demirtas H. (2012). Modeling between- and within-subject variance in EMA data using mixed-effects location scale models. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31, 3328-3336.

Hedeker D. & Mermelstein R.J. (2012). Mood changes associated with smoking in adolescents: An application of a mixed-effects location scale model for longitudinal EMA data. In G. R. Hancock & J. Harring (Eds.), Advances in Longitudinal Methods in the Social and Behavioral Sciences (pp. 59-79). Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC.

Hedeker D. (in press). MIXREGLS: A program for mixed-effects location scale analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*.

Li X. & Hedeker D. (2012). A three-level mixed-effects location scale model with an application to Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) data. *Statistics in Medicine*, *31*, 3192-3210.

• Other kinds of outcomes, especially ordinal

Hedeker D., Demirtas H., & Mermelstein R.J. (2009). A mixed ordinal location scale model for analysis of Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) data. *Statistics and Its Interface, 2*, 391-402.

Hedeker D. & Mermelstein R.J. (2013). A location scale Item Response Theory (IRT) model for analysis of ordinal questionnaire data. Annual meeting of the Eastern North American Region (ENAR) of the International Biometric Society, Orlando, FL.

• Need a fair amount of BS and WS data, but modern data collection procedures are good for this