

Simultaneous Mean and Covariance Modeling of Chronic Kidney Disease

Xiaoyue Niu

Department of Statistics, Penn State University

Peter D. Hoff

Department of Statistics, University of Washington

August 13, 2022

Abstract

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a serious health condition that is associated with premature mortality and decreased quality of life. Most of the existing population-level CKD studies focus on either the prevalence of CKD or the associations of CKD with other health problems. Very few studies have examined these quantities jointly, or have examined how the associations between CKD and other health problems vary by demographic characteristics. In this article, we propose a joint mean and covariance regression model to statistically describe how the quantitative measurement of CKD and associations between CKD and other health problems vary according to demographic predictors. We apply the methodology to the NHANES 2010 data and discuss guidelines for model selection and evaluation using standard criteria such as AIC in conjunction with posterior predictive goodness of fit plots. With the fitted results from the model, we are able to identify sub-populations that are at high risk of developing CKD, as well as those for which CKD is likely to co-occur with other health problems.

Keywords: covariance regression, heteroscedasticity, model selection, NHANES.

1 Introduction

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a serious health condition in which the kidneys are damaged and can not filter blood as well as needed (?). This damage can cause wastes to build up in the body and lead to other health problems, including cardiovascular disease (?, ?), anemia, and bone disease (?). As a consequence, CKD is associated with premature mortality (?, ?, ?), and decreased quality of life (?).

Early detection of CKD can only be done through blood and urine screening tests. CKD is usually an irreversible and progressive disease. If detected early, CKD can be treated through medication to slow down the disease progression and delay the onset of kidney failure. If left untreated, CKD can result in kidney failure, which is also called End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) and lead to dialysis or kidney transplantation. There are two quantitative measurements to define CKD. One is the estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) being less than $60 \text{ ml/min/1.73 m}^2$. The estimation is based on serum creatinine level, age, sex, and race and assumes that the creatinine level is stable over days. Therefore, a spot estimation is subject to errors. Another definition is the urine albumin/creatinine ratio (ACR) being 30 mg/g or higher. ACR detects the presence of protein in the urine and is a more direct measure of the kidney damage. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates, in 2010, more than 10% of the U.S. population aged over 20 years have CKD, estimated by the presence of either spot $\text{eGFR} < 60$ or spot $\text{ACR} \geq 30$ (?).

Most of the existing population-level CKD studies focus on one of two estimation problems. The first of these is estimating the prevalence of CKD. Researchers have found that the prevalence (defined by the presence of either spot $\text{eGFR} < 60$ or spot $\text{ACR} \geq 30$) varies across different sub-populations (Figure 1, ?). For example, CKD is more common among women than men. It is also more common in people of 60 years and older than in younger age groups. The second estimation problem focuses on the co-occurrence of CKD with other health conditions. Various studies have shown that CKD is associated with obesity, hypertension, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease (?, ?, ?, ?, ?). Figure 1 shows that the prevalence of CKD within each of the above risk factor groups is higher than the overall population level.

Just as the prevalence of CKD depends on the demographic characteristics, the associations between CKD and its risk factors might also vary across different sub-populations. However, the heteroscedasticity of these associations are usually ignored. One exception is




Figure 1: Prevalence of CKD (defined by the presence of either spot eGFR < 60 or spot ACR ≥ 30) among adult U.S. population (NHANES 2005-2010) by age, sex, race/ethnicity, and risk factor categories (?). Horizontal dotted line indicates the population prevalence.

the study in ?, that demonstrated socio-economic heterogeneity in the associations among cardiovascular disease (CVD) and CKD. They examined the association by constraining on the sub-population of CKD stage 3 patients and fitted separate logistic regression model for each CVD risk factor (such as smoking and diabetes) with socio-economic status and education. Their method is hard to be generalized to evaluating the heterogeneity among several health related variables across multiple demographic variables. One approach to statistically evaluating heterogeneity in the relationship between CKD and its risk factors is with a statistical model in which both the mean and covariance are functions of the demographic variables. Joint modeling of the mean and covariance are beneficial for several reasons, including the following: First, a proper covariance model can provide more efficient inference on the mean model, such as better confidence interval estimates and more reliable hypothesis testing results, which in turn yield more accurate predictive intervals (?, ?, ?). Moreover, ? showed that ignoring the covariance structure of the data will lead to misleading estimates of the mean model. Third, for applications involving several health outcome variables, evaluating the heterogeneity of the covariance across demographic variables may itself be of scientific interest. Figure 2 indicates that one of the quantitative measurements of CKD, ACR, varies with different demographic characteristics. Figure 3 and Figure 4 show that the variance of ACR and the correlations among ACR and other health outcome measurements also vary with demographics. Investigating the heteroscedasticity of these associations will help us

more accurately estimate the prevalence, better understand the relationships between CKD and other associated health conditions, as well as identify the most-at-risk groups and lead to efficient screening of sub-populations.




Figure 2: Mean and 95% confidence interval estimates of the four health measurements, albumin creatinine ratio (ACR), diastolic blood pressure (BP), body mass index (BMI), and Glucose, in their log scale, within gender, age, race, and education categories. The dotted green line indicates the population average.

Joint regression models for means and covariances have mostly been developed in the context of longitudinal and repeated-measure studies. ? and ? use generalized estimating equations (GEE) to simultaneously estimate the parameters in the mean and covariance, which improves the efficiency of the mean estimate substantially. When the heteroscedasticity is temporal in nature, multivariate autoregressive conditionally heteroscedastic (ARCH) models are well-studied in the econometric literature (?, ?). The approach proposed by ? utilizes the Cholesky decomposition to parameterize the class of positive definite covariance




Figure 3: Variance with 95% confidence interval estimates of the four health measurements, albumin creatinine ratio (ACR), diastolic blood pressure (BP), body mass index (BMI), and Glucose, in their log scale, within gender, age, race, and education categories. The dotted green line indicates the population average.

matrices by expressing the unconstrained parameters through generalized linear models. However, this model is not invariant to reorderings of the response, and its appropriateness outside the domain of longitudinal or spatial data is not clear. ? propose to model the logarithm of the covariance as linear functions of the explanatory variables, although it is somewhat difficult to interpret the parameters in the model. For a more comprehensive literature review on different covariance estimation models, see ?. More recently, ? proposes a covariance regression model that directly models the covariance matrix as a function of the explanatory variables. It is a natural extension to the mean regression model and the parameters can be interpreted in a similar manner as those in a mean regression. However, the focus in ? is on continuous explanatory variables. In this article, we extend the ap-




Figure 4: Correlation with 95% confidence interval estimates of the four health measurements, albumin creatinine ratio (ACR), diastolic blood pressure (BP), body mass index (BMI), and Glucose, in their log scale, within gender, age, race, and education categories. The dotted green line indicates the population average.

plication of the covariance regression model of ? to accommodate categorical demographic predictor variables. With this methodology, we jointly model the mean and covariance of several health outcome variables related to CKD as a function of a variety of categorical demographic variables. Such a model will allow us to describe how associations among these outcome variables vary across demographic subpopulations, and give us a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between CKD and other health conditions. In the next section, we describe the data set (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey) used in our analysis. In Section 3, we will introduce the statistical methodology that is proposed to accomplish the joint modeling task, and discuss model selection. Our main findings from the NHANES data are presented in Section 4. In Section 5 we conduct a sensitivity analysis

to ascertain robustness of the modeling procedure to model misspecification. A discussion follows in Section 6.

2 Data description

The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) is a national survey designed to assess the health and nutritional status of adults and children in the United States. It collects data through interviews in participants' home and medical examinations conducted in a mobile examination center. It is conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), which is part of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The data contain the participants' demographic, socio-economic, and dietary information, physical measurements, blood and urine lab tests, as well as an activity and behavioral questionnaire. The main purpose of this survey is to determine the prevalence of the major diseases and risk factors for the U.S. population (?). The data are released in 2-year increments. We use the most recently released 2009-2010 data. With the motivation and main focus being CKD study, we view other health outcomes as risk factors of CKD, even though we will model them jointly. Instead of modeling the prevalence of CKD directly, we model one of the quantitative measurements of CKD that we have discussed in the previous section, the albumin creatinine ratio (ACR), to represent the participant's CKD status (?). We select three other health conditions, obesity, hypertension, and diabetes, as risk factors based on past literature. We use body mass index (BMI), diastolic blood pressure (BP), and fasting glucose level (GLU) as the quantitative measurements of those health conditions. Based on previous studies, we select relevant demographic characteristics including gender, age, and race/ethnicity. We also include education as a proxy for socio-economic status. The total number of participants for the 2009-2010 survey is 10,537. The number of participants who have all the above exams is 2,613.

Due to the right skewness of the health outcomes, ACR, BMI, BP, and GLU, we analyze these variables on the log scale. Table 1 summarizes the mean and standard deviation (in parentheses) of the transformed health measurements within each demographic subgroup. Figure 2 presents the mean and the corresponding 95% confidence interval of the health measurements by demographic groups. Consistent with previous findings, the mean of the health outcomes varies greatly across different subpopulation. Moreover, Figure 3 and Figure 4 show that the variances of and correlations among the health measurements also vary across different subpopulations. All of the above exploratory findings indicate that the relationships between CKD and its associated risk factors are heterogeneous across different

subpopulation, in terms of both mean and association. An appropriate statistical analysis should allow for the possibility that both the mean and covariance matrix of these four variables may vary across demographic groups.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of NHANES 2009-2010 data, means and standard deviations (in parenthesis) by demographic groups (with sample size in parentheses)

Demographic Group (n)	ACR	BP	BMI	GLU
GENDER				
Male (1225)	1.99 (1.15)	4.25 (0.18)	3.34 (0.20)	1.79 (0.22)
Female (1388)	2.13 (0.98)	4.18 (0.18)	3.35 (0.24)	1.72 (0.21)
AGE				
20-39 (855)	1.84 (0.89)	4.19 (0.18)	3.32 (0.24)	1.68 (0.19)
40-59 (907)	1.96 (0.95)	4.27 (0.15)	3.36 (0.22)	1.75 (0.21)
60-79 (690)	2.31 (1.22)	4.19 (0.18)	3.38 (0.21)	1.83 (0.24)
80+ (161)	2.79 (1.27)	4.05 (0.23)	3.27 (0.17)	1.81 (0.21)
RACE				
Non-Hispanic White (1244)	2.02 (1.01)	4.20 (0.18)	3.33 (0.23)	1.74 (0.19)
Mexican American (517)	2.25 (1.14)	4.21 (0.19)	3.38 (0.19)	1.78 (0.25)
Non-Hispanic Black (422)	1.96 (1.09)	4.26 (0.19)	3.39 (0.23)	1.75 (0.22)
Other Hispanic (292)	1.99 (1.02)	4.20 (0.18)	3.34 (0.20)	1.76 (0.25)
Other (138)	2.20 (1.23)	4.24 (0.17)	3.25 (0.22)	1.74 (0.21)
EDUCATION				
<9th Grade (348)	2.36 (1.28)	4.20 (0.17)	3.36 (0.18)	1.81 (0.26)
9-11th Grade (404)	2.13 (1.10)	4.20 (0.19)	3.38 (0.23)	1.78 (0.24)
High school graduate (596)	2.11 (1.10)	4.22 (0.19)	3.36 (0.22)	1.76 (0.21)
Some College or AA (727)	1.98 (0.97)	4.21 (0.19)	3.35 (0.23)	1.73 (0.21)
College Graduate (538)	1.88 (0.91)	4.22 (0.16)	3.30 (0.22)	1.71 (0.18)

3 Statistical models

3.1 The covariance regression model

Our goal is to describe and estimate mean and covariance heterogeneity for the cross-classified groups defined by the demographic characteristics gender, age, ethnicity, and education, that is, to estimate $E[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}] = \boldsymbol{\mu}_x$ and $\text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}] = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ simultaneously. For the NHANES data, the total sample size is 2,613. For each marginal group defined by one level of one predictor, such as male, the sample sizes are all above 100 (Table 1). However, for the two-way cross-classified groups, the sample sizes are much smaller. For example, there are only 4 people in

the sample who are 80 years and older with a college degree. Going finer, the median sample size for the 4-way cross-classified groups is 7 and the 3rd quantile is only 17. The small number of observations for each combination of explanatory variables makes it impractical to estimate a separate covariance matrix for each group, Σ_x , based only in data from that group. On the other hand, we do not want to assume a common covariance for all groups. It is well known that assuming a constant covariance for all groups will misrepresent the relationship among those health conditions and will also result in loss of efficiency of the mean parameters (?). Many authors have developed models for pooling information across a collection of covariance matrices. ? and ? assume (some) common principal components of the covariance (correlation) matrix. ? proposes shrinking towards a common eigenvector structure and allows the shrinkage to vary across different principal components. ? shows the efficiency gain of the mean regression parameters with a carefully selected covariance model. See ? for a more comprehensive review of different pooling methods.

An alternative way of pooling across groups is with a regression model as a parsimonious representation of the heteroscedasticity across groups. ? propose a covariance regression model which serves this purpose. The proposed model parameterizes the mean and covariance of a multivariate response vector as parsimonious functions of explanatory variables. It allows simultaneous modeling of the mean and covariance structure. To be more specific, let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a random multivariate response vector and $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{q_1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{q_2}$ be vectors of explanatory variables. Denote the mean of \mathbf{y} as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x = E[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}]$ and the $p \times p$ covariance matrix of \mathbf{y} as $\Sigma_x = \text{Cov}[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}]$. The covariance regression model has the following form:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_x = \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x}_1^T, \tag{1}$$

$$\Sigma_x = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{x}_2^T \mathbf{B}_2^T, \tag{2}$$

where \mathbf{B}_1 is a $p \times q_1$ matrix, \mathbf{A} is a $p \times p$ positive-definite matrix and \mathbf{B}_2 is a $p \times q$ matrix. Equation (1) is the regular multivariate mean regression. The resulting covariance function in Equation (2) is positive definite for all \mathbf{x}_2 , and expresses the covariance as equal to a “baseline” covariance matrix \mathbf{A} plus a rank-1, $p \times p$ positive definite matrix that varies with \mathbf{x}_2 .

The covariance regression model can also be interpreted as a special random effects model.

Assume the observed data $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ has the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_i &= \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_i} + \gamma_i \times \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \\ \mathbf{E}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i] &= \mathbf{0}, \text{Cov}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i] = \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{E}[\gamma_i] &= 0, \text{Var}[\gamma_i] = 1, \mathbf{E}[\gamma_i \times \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i] = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We can interpret γ_i as describing additional unit-level variability beyond that represented by $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$. The vectors $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_p\}$ describe how this additional variability is manifested across the p different response variables.

In model 2, the difference between $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ and the baseline matrix \mathbf{A} is restricted to be a rank-one matrix. This rank-1 model essentially requires that extreme residuals for one element of \mathbf{y} co-occur with extreme residuals of the other elements. This restriction can be relaxed to allow higher ranks with greater flexibility. For the random effects representation given by Equation 3, it can be extended as the following:

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_i} + \gamma_i \times \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}_i + \psi_i \times \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i, \tag{4}$$

where γ_i and ψ_i are mean-zero variance-one random variables, uncorrelated with each other and with $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$. Under this model, the covariance of \mathbf{y}_i is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{B}^T + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{C}^T.$$

This model allows the deviation of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ from the baseline \mathbf{A} to be of rank 2. Additionally, we can interpret the second random effect ψ as allowing an additional, independent source of heteroscedasticity for the set of the p response variables. The rank-2 model allows for more flexibility, and can allow for heteroscedasticity across all elements of \mathbf{y} without requiring extreme residuals for all or none of the elements. Further flexibility can be gained by adding additional random effects, allowing the difference between $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x$ and the baseline \mathbf{A} to be of any desired rank.

If one can assume normal distributions for all error terms, this model can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{normal}(0, 1) \\ \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{multivariate normal}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}) \\ \mathbf{y}_i &= \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_i} + \gamma_i \times \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Parameters of this normal covariance regression model can be estimated either by maximum likelihood via EM algorithm or by Bayesian estimation via MCMC. In this article, we focus on Bayesian estimation.

The results in ? mainly focus on continuous predictors, such as age. However, one of the advantages of the covariance regression model is that it can accommodate all types of variables, including categorical variables. In this paper, we utilize and extend the covariance regression model proposed in ? to simultaneously estimate the mean and covariance structure of a large number of groups defined by the cross-classification of several categorical variables. We fit the above model for the NHANES data allowing different sets of predictors for the mean and covariance. In the next section, we discuss the details of model selection and present the fitted results.

3.2 Model selection and evaluation

Similar to any regression model, the covariance regression model requires a procedure for variable selection. In the longitudinal setting, several variable selection methods have been studied. ? and ? use the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and BIC-based method for the model proposed by ?. For the covariance regression model, the model selection contains three components: mean model selection, covariance variable selection, and covariance rank selection. As noted in ?, due to the non-identifiability of some of the parameters in the higher rank model, the criterion based methods such as AIC or BIC are not appropriate when comparing models with different ranks. For the NHANES data, we include 4 predictors with at most 2-way interactions in both the mean and covariance model. The maximum possible rank for a 4-dimensional response is 4. If we consider a simultaneous model selection with the above choice, it requires $2^6 \times 2^6 \times 4$ evaluations of the model, which is infeasible.

Instead of implementing a complicated model selection procedure and trying to search for the universally best model, we propose the following model selection and evaluation procedure that tries to find the most parsimonious model that does not show obvious lack of fit. We first outline the procedure and elaborate the details later. First, we simplify this situation by separating the mean and covariance model selection, due to the fact that under multivariate normality, the maximum likelihood estimator of the mean parameters will be consistent under mis-specification of the covariance structure (?). For the mean model selection, we assume a homogeneous covariance model and select the mean model based on standard variable selection criterion. Next we fix the mean model and fit the simplest covariance model, which is rank 1 with only main effects of the four predictors. Then we assess the goodness of fit for the fitted model. If the simplest model generally fits well with

moderate lack of fit, we consider a forward selection by adding one pair of interaction term between the predictors at a time until we find one model that is acceptable. If the simplest model displays serious lack of fit, we first increase the rank by 1 and then implement the forward selection for the rank 2 model until we find an acceptable one. If necessary we repeat the above steps to higher ranks. We use the posterior predictive distribution, which was first suggested by ? and ?, to assess the goodness of fit in each step.

Following the above outline, we first assume a constant covariance model and use AIC (?) to select the set of predictors for the mean model. The best mean model under AIC includes the main effect of gender, age, race, and education, as well as the two-way interaction between gender and age, gender and race, gender and education, and age and race, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_x = & \text{GENDER} + \text{AGE} + \text{RACE} + \text{EDU} + \text{GENDER*AGE} \\ & + \text{GENDER*RACE} + \text{GENDER*EDU} + \text{AGE*RACE}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Then we fix the mean model as in Equation (6) and select the explanatory variables in the covariance model. In order to assess the model, we need to construct a meaningful statistic to represent lack of fit of the data. We would like to make sure that the model we select generates predictive datasets $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}$ that resemble the observed dataset in terms of features that are of interest. In the case of the covariance regression model selection, the key idea behind the model is that the population is not homogeneous and the covariance matrices are different across different subpopulations. Based on this feature, we construct a model diagnostic statistic that describes the heterogeneity of the covariance matrices across different subpopulations. We choose the subpopulation to be the two-way marginal subpopulation, such as all the white females, since we barely have enough samples to estimate all the two-way cross-classified sample covariance matrices. Based on the above argument, the posterior check statistic $t_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ is defined as

$$t_{ij}(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{x_i, x_j} \text{tr}(S_0^{-1} S_{x_i, x_j}) - \log |S_0^{-1} S_{x_i, x_j}|,$$

where S_{x_i, x_j} is the sample covariance matrix of the two-way marginal group of $X_i = x_i$ and $X_j = x_j$, for $i \neq j = \text{gender, age, race, and education}$, and S_0 is the pooled sample covariance matrix of the population. $t_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ is the sum of the Wishart kernel of the sample covariance matrices S_{x_i, x_j} for all possible values of x_i and x_j . If the population is homogeneous, the pooled sample covariance matrix S_0 would be a good estimate of all the S_{x_i, x_j} 's. The statistic $t_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ describes the discrepancy between S_0 and all the S_{x_i, x_j} 's, representing the heterogene-

ity of the covariance matrices in the population. For each model, at each iteration of the MCMC, we sample a posterior predictive dataset $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{\mathbf{X}} \sim N_p(0, \Sigma_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^{(s)}, \mathbf{B}^{(s)}))$, and calculate $t_{ij}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}})$, for $i \neq j = \text{gender, age, race, and education}$. For each two-way group (ij pair), we then compare the distribution of $t_{ij}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}})$ with the observed $t_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$. If the observed $t_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ lies on the extreme tail of the distribution of $t_{ij}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}})$, it indicates that the model we fit does not represent this feature of the data we observe.

After defining the goodness of fit statistic, we first fit a covariance regression model with the mean model as in Equation (6) and a rank 1 covariance model with main effects of the four predictors. We examine the posterior predictive distributions and find that it shows general lack of fit. Then we increase the rank of the covariance model to 2 and fit a model with the mean model as in Equation (6) and a rank 2 covariance model with main effects of the four predictors. We plot the distribution of the generated statistics together with the observed ones in Figure 5. From the plots we can see that three out of the six two-way groups are represented well. Moreover, we find that the three groups that show lack of fit contain gender and/or race. Therefore, we add the interaction term between gender and race to the rank 2 covariance model and present the goodness of fit diagnostics in Figure 6. We can see that the new model generally improves the goodness of fit from the rank 2 model with only main effects and appropriately captures the heterogeneity in most of the 2-way cross-classified groups. From our point of view, this is a relatively parsimonious model without obvious lack of fit. Therefore, we will use this model as our final model, which is restated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_x &= \text{GENDER+AGE+RACE+EDU} \\
&+ \text{GENDER*AGE+GENDER*RACE+GENDER*EDU+AGE*RACE,} \\
\Sigma_x &= \text{GENDER+AGE+RACE+EDU+GENDER*RACE.}
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$




Figure 5: Posterior predictive diagnostics, main effects model, rank 2. Each histogram is constructed by posterior predictive samples, with the red vertical line being the goodness of fit statistic calculated from the data.




Figure 6: Posterior predictive diagnostics, main effects with gender and race interaction model, rank 2. Each histogram is constructed by posterior predictive samples, with the red vertical line being the goodness of fit statistic calculated from the data.

4 NHANES data results

In this section, we present the data analysis results of the NHANES data using the covariance regression model. Bayesian estimates from the final model in Equation (7) for the means, variances and correlations together with their 95% credible intervals of all the cross-classified groups are plotted in Figure A.1, A.2 and A.3 in the Appendix. The group labels are colored from dark to bright, according to their levels of each demographic variables. With this representation, it is easier to spot some pattern out of the large amount of mean and covariance parameters. For example, if we see a cluster of the same color in the row of race of a variance plot, we can tell that the corresponding race group has an impact on the variance. Or if we see the color of age is getting lighter along a correlation plot, that indicates as people getting older, the correlation becomes higher. The levels and corresponding group labels can be found in Table A.1.

We summarize some selected findings from the three plots as follows:

- Mean:
 - On average females have a higher level of ACR than males. Black males of 80 years and older with low education level have the highest level of ACR among all the subpopulations.
 - Mexican American males of 40-59 years old have the highest blood pressure.
 - Mexican American females of 60-79 years old with moderate level of education have the highest BMI.
 - Mexican American of age 80 years and older have the highest GLU.
- Variance:
 - The ACR level of the groups of black males of 60 years and older with low education has the greatest variability.
 - The blood pressure level of the groups of males of 80 years and older has the greatest variability.
 - The glucose level of the groups of black males of 60 years and older has the greatest variability.
- Correlation:
 - The correlation between ACR and BP is on average higher among males than females. For most of the groups, this correlation is positive. However, all the groups that have negative correlations consist of people of age 60-79.

- The correlation between ACR and GLU is the highest among other Hispanic males with some college education.
- The correlation between BP and GLU is higher among younger people than older people.

To highlight the heterogeneity of correlations across demographic subpopulations, we also plot the estimated correlation (posterior median together with 95% posterior bounds) as a function of age for different demographic groups. We present two of such correlation plots in Figure 7 and Figure 8. We can see from the plots that different demographic groups display very different patterns of how the correlations change with age. For example, in Figure 7, for the group of male Mexican Americans with less than 9 years of school, the correlation between ACR and BP decreases monotonically with age. However, for white males with college degrees this correlation fluctuates with age with a peak at age 40-59. For the other correlations, we also find largely different patterns. This alternative graphical representation once again shows that there is great heterogeneity of the correlations across demographic groups.




Figure 7: Correlation of ACR and BP as a function of age, for 2 groups with different gender, race, and education levels, represented by different line types. For each line type, the middle line is the posterior median, and the top and bottom lines are 95% posterior bounds.

One advantage of the covariance regression model is that the parameters are relatively easy to interpret as regression coefficients. For the mean model, the parameters are regular regression coefficients. We present the posterior intervals of all the mean regression




Figure 8: Correlation of ACR and GLU as a function of age, for 2 groups with different gender, race, and education levels, represented by different line types. For each line type, the middle line is the posterior median, and the top and bottom lines are 95% posterior bounds.

parameters in Figure 9 without much interpretation. For the covariance parameters, since the regression function is essentially a quadratic function, we can make the analogy that the squared length of a coefficient vector serves as a variance regression coefficient. We can compare the length of the vector $\mathbf{b}_{j_0} + \mathbf{b}_{j_k}$ with the length of the vector \mathbf{b}_{j_0} to see the effects of being in the k^{th} demographic group compared to the baseline group on the variance of the j^{th} response, where $j = 1, 2, 3$, and 4 , $k = 1, 2, \dots, q$, and \mathbf{b}_{j_k} is a r -vector with r being the rank of the model. We plot the posterior intervals of all the variance coefficients in Figure 10, with the reference line being the squared length of \mathbf{b}_{j_0} . Similarly, the inner product of two vectors $(\mathbf{b}_{j_1 0} + \mathbf{b}_{j_1 k})^T (\mathbf{b}_{j_2 0} + \mathbf{b}_{j_2 k})$ is the effect of being in the k^{th} group compared to the baseline group on the covariance of the j_1^{th} and j_2^{th} components of the response, which serves the role of a covariance coefficient. We plot the posterior intervals of all the covariance coefficients in Figure 11. From Figure 10 and Figure 11, we can interpret the coefficients as well as confirming the findings from Figure A.2 and Figure A.3. For example, in Figure 10 top panel, we see the ACR variance coefficients of age 60-79 and age 80+ are significantly higher than the baseline group, which indicates the variance of ACR for those two groups of people is higher than the other groups. This finding is consistent with our summary of findings. For another example, in Figure 11, in the covariance coefficient of ACR and BP plot, being age 60-79 has a negative effect, which indicates that the age group 60-79 will have a smaller correlation compared to the baseline group. This is also consistent with our previous

findings. For both the mean and covariance regression, we code the baseline group as the group of white males of age 20-39 with less than 9 years of school. All of the contrasts are comparing other groups with this particular baseline group. Other contrasts can be easily constructed.




Figure 9: 95% credible intervals of the mean regression coefficients. Each line segment corresponds to a regression coefficient with the corresponding group variable label on the x-axis.

With the above findings, we are able to narrow down the general population at risk of developing CKD to specific subgroups at higher risk. Moreover, we identify subgroups at higher risk of co-morbidity. Physicians should pay more attention to screen those identified groups with higher risks.




Figure 10: 95% credible intervals of the variance coefficients. Each line segment corresponds to the squared vector length a regression coefficient with the corresponding group variable label on the x-axis. The grey line represents coefficient vector length of the baseline group, white male of age 20-39 with less than 9 years of school.




Figure 11: 95% credible intervals of the covariance coefficients. Each line segment corresponds to the inner product of two coefficient vectors with the corresponding group variable label on the x-axis. The grey line represents coefficient vector length of the baseline group, white male of age 20-39 with less than 9 years of school.

5 Sensitivity Analysis

A common practice in statistical modeling is to evaluate the proposed model's performance under model mis-specification. A desired property of a statistical model is its robustness. We would like the proposed model not to be sensitive to the assumptions and even when the assumptions do not hold, the model still provides estimates that represent the population characteristics. One approach to evaluate the robustness of a model is via simulation studies. The basic idea is to generate data for which we know the true distribution and the distribution does not follow our model assumptions. Then we fit the assumed model to the generated data and compare the fitted results with the truth.

In order to evaluate the robustness of the covariance regression model, we want to generate datasets that are similar to the observed NHANES data, but not exactly from the covariance regression model. Thus we can evaluate the performance of the covariance regression model in a similar setting to the real data with the model being mis-specified. We do this with the following procedure:

1. For each subpopulation with demographic characteristics \mathbf{x} , take the MLE $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}$ from our final model and generate a new covariance matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}$ from an inverse Wishart $(\nu, (\nu - p - 1)\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}})$, such that $E[\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}] = \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Note that the truth does not follow the covariance regression model.
2. Generate $n_{\mathbf{x}}$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{\mathbf{x}} \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}})$, where $n_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the number of observations with $(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_4 = x_4)$ in the original dataset.
3. Fit the covariance regression model with the generated dataset and get the MLE $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}$.
4. Fit a separate estimate of each group, $\check{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}} \sim$ inverse Wishart $(N + p + 2, S_{\mathbf{x}} + S_0)$, where $S_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the sample covariance matrix of group with $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ and $S_0 = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{Y})$ is the pooled covariance matrix. This is the separate estimates with the pooled sample covariance matrix as the prior.
5. Compute the errors of both estimators for each group. $\hat{\Delta}_{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}$, and $\check{\Delta}_{\mathbf{x}} = \check{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}} - \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Plot the errors against the group sizes.

We generate three sets of $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}$ with $\nu = 10, 20,$ and 50 . A $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}}$ generated from a larger ν is closer to the mean $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}}$, which indicates that the true covariance is close to following the covariance regression model. We plot $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}}$ against its mean $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}}$ in Figure A.4, A.6, and A.8 as a reference to check how much deviation there is from the assumed model. We can see that when $\nu = 10$, $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}}$ has very weak correlation to $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}}$, and as ν gets larger, the correlation gets stronger. We plot $\hat{\Delta}_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\check{\Delta}_{\mathbf{X}}$ along with each other against the group sizes in Figure A.5, A.7, and A.9.

We find that for $\nu = 10$, when the covariance regression model is far from the true model that generates the data, the separate estimates with the pooled sample covariance matrix as the prior are better than the covariance regression estimates, especially for the groups with small sample sizes. For groups with medium to large sample sizes, these two estimates are comparable. For $\nu = 20$, the generated variances are closer to the means, but the correlations are not close to the means. In this situation, the covariance regression estimates for the variances are better than the separate estimates, and the correlation estimates from the covariance regression model are slightly better than the ones from the separate model. Finally, for $\nu = 50$, the generated covariances and their means have strong correlations which indicates the covariance regression model is close to the true model that generates the data. Not surprisingly, the covariance regression model out performs the separate estimates. Note that, even in this case, the data are not generated from the model we fit. There is still model mis-specification in the setting. The above three scenarios tell us the covariance regression model is robust under moderate model mis-specification. If we believe that the covariance of a real dataset contains features such as people with similar demographic characteristics having similar covariance structure, the covariance regression model would be a reasonable model that provides reliable estimates. For the NHANES data we use, from the empirical evidence in the data section and goodness-of-fit check in the model selection section, together with the robustness study, we have reasonable confidence in the results we present.

6 Discussion

Motivated by the high prevalence of CKD and lack of studies on the heterogeneities of the associations among major health conditions, this article has used the NHANES data to study the quantitative measurements of CKD and associations among four major health conditions, CKD, hypertension, obesity, and diabetes. We have applied and extended the covariance regression model proposed by ? to allow categorical predictors. We select four highly relevant demographic and socio-economic factors to classify the population into sub-

groups and utilize the covariance regression model to estimate the mean and covariance parsimoniously for each subpopulation. We have discussed guidelines for model selection and evaluation using standard criteria such as AIC in conjunction with posterior predictive goodness of fit plots. We have discovered that the associates among those four health outcomes vary greatly across subgroups. With the covariance regression model, we are able to identify specific subpopulations that are at higher risk of developing each condition as well as co-morbidity.

In this article we have only selected categorical predictors to classify the population. Other relevant factors of continuous type can be easily added as done in ?. The covariance regression model is flexible enough to allow mixed types of predictors in both the mean and covariance structure.

The method used here is a regression type of model. The model evaluation procedure we propose here is data-driven and subjective. In order to develop a systematic model selection scheme that tries to find the universally best model, one possible approach might be to explicitly formulate a prior distribution to shrink some of the coefficients towards zero, similar to the idea in ?.

The method proposed here can possibly be applied to non-normally distributed variables. One way to extend the model to allow non-normal responses is through the generalized linear model framework as in ?. The other possibility is via semi-parametric copula models as proposed by ?.

Even though the motivation of this article arises from the study of CKD, we model the four health outcomes jointly thus the other three health conditions, hypertension, obesity, and diabetes play the same role as CKD. Therefore, the quantitative measurements of and associations among all these health outcomes as well as the risk of co-morbidity are studied by the method proposed here. Similar analysis can be applied to a wide variety of other health measurements too.

A Tables and Figures

Table A.1: Label numbers and corresponding group names

	1	2	3	4	5
Gender	M	F	x	x	x
Age	20-39	40-59	60-79	> 80	x
Race	non-Hispanic white	non-Hispanic black	Mexican American	other Hispanic	other
Education	< 9 th grade	9 th – 11 th grade	high school	associate degree	college degree and over




Figure A.1: 95% credible intervals of mean estimates. On the top panel, each line segment represents the posterior 95% credible limits of one group. The dots are the posterior median estimates of that group. The bottom panel displays the corresponding group labels.




Figure A.2: 95% credible intervals of variance estimates. On the top panel, each line segment represents the posterior 95% credible limits of one group. The dots are the posterior median estimates of that group. The bottom panel displays the corresponding group labels.




Figure A.3: 95% credible intervals of correlation estimates. On the top panel, each line segment represents the posterior 95% credible limits of one group. The dots are the posterior median estimates of that group. The bottom panel displays the corresponding group labels.




Figure A.4: $\nu = 10$. Generated covariance matrices against their mean matrices. The left four plots are variances, and the right six plots are correlations.




Figure A.5: $\nu = 10$. Difference between model fit and true covariance matrices. The black dots are from the separate estimates and the red dots are from the covariance regression estimates. The left four plots are variances, and the right six plots are correlations.




Figure A.6: $\nu = 20$. Generated covariance matrices against their mean matrices. The left four plots are variances, and the right six plots are correlations.




Figure A.7: $\nu = 20$. Difference between model fit and true covariance matrices. The black dots are from the separate estimates and the red dots are from the covariance regression estimates. The left four plots are variances, and the right six plots are correlations.




Figure A.8: $\nu = 50$. Generated covariance matrices against their mean matrices. The left four plots are variances, and the right six plots are correlations.




Figure A.9: $\nu = 50$. Difference between model fit and true covariance matrices. The black dots are from the separate estimates and the red dots are from the covariance regression estimates. The left four plots are variances, and the right six plots are correlations.