Analysis of dental caries using generalized linear and count regression models
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Abstract

Generalized linear models (GLM) are generalization of linear regression models, which allow fitting regression models to response data in all the sciences especially medical and dental sciences that follow a general exponential family. These are flexible and widely used class of such models that can accommodate response variables. Count data are frequently characterized by overdispersion and excess zeros. Zero-inflated count models provide a parsimonious yet powerful way to model this type of situation. Such models assume that the data are a mixture of two separate data generation processes: one generates only zeros, and the other is either a Poisson or a negative binomial data-generating process. Zero inflated count regression models such as the zero-inflated Poisson (ZIP), zero-inflated negative binomial (ZINB) regression models have been used to handle dental caries count data with many zeros. We present an evaluation framework to the suitability of applying the GLM, Poisson, NB, ZIP and ZINB to dental caries data set where the count data may exhibit evidence of many zeros and over-dispersion. Estimation of the model parameters using the method of maximum likelihood is provided. Based on the Vuong test statistic and the goodness of fit measure for dental caries data, the NB and ZINB regression models perform better than other count regression models.
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Introduction

Distinguishing characteristic studies of epidemiology of dental caries data set invariably use the DMFT index (decayed (D), missing due to caries (M)
and filled (F)) permanent teeth (Klein et al 1938) to measures the degree of caries experience of a subject or population. It is the sum of simple count of the number of Decayed Teeth (DT), Missing Teeth (MT) due to caries and Filled Teeth (FT), which represents the cumulative severity of dental caries experience. In such studies, the mean DMFT has been commonly quoted for the total sample and used as a measure to compare the caries experience between subgroups. This comprised of data measuring subjects with caries (DMFT>0) and subjects without caries (DMFT=0), counts of DMFT or discrete population densities.

In dental epidemiology, one often wishes to explore the relationship between the expected response of an individual and a number of factors that are likely to influence the response simultaneously. The studies related to such relationships fall into criteria of linear regression and logistic regression models, which describes both quantitative and qualitative factors that are present. Moreover, these can be studied together as a special case of a unified theory. In these cases, where the response can be assumed to be approximately normally distributed, the mean response itself is modelled to depend linearly on the influences of the factors resulting in the unified theory of Linear Models. The ideas of the theory of Linear Models can be extended to the case where the response has distribution which belongs to the regular exponential family. In this case an appropriate link function of the mean response is modelled linearly on the influences of the factors resulting in the theory of Generalized Linear Models. The earlier studies reported in the literature, suggested that DMFT index data usually fulfilled the normality assumption. Hence, multiple linear regression (MLR) models were commonly used to estimate the influence of covariates. In a vast majority of the studies, the caries data are analyzed by using traditional multiple linear regression techniques which assume that dental caries indices follow normality assumption (Dummer et al.1990, Angellio et al. 1990, Vénobbergen et al. 2001, Javali et al. 2001, 2003, 2004; Javali and Pandit, 2007).

It has been observed that the worldwide prevalence of dental caries, especially in the developed and developing countries (Downer, 1998) has declined rapidly during the last 20 years. Thus, the data of DMFT index has become highly positively skewed (Spencer, 1997) due to effect of high proportion of zeros. Various investigators have proposed some techniques to transform data making the normality assumption more approximate either untransformed or in any transformed state. However, numerous models have been described by various authors to describe the nature of distribution of DMFT index data. Grainger and Ried (1954) suggested that the negative binomial distribution is the better and satisfactory model for dental caries; Turlot et al. (1984) proposed a model based on a Poisson distribution; Pandit and Javali (2007) used GLM’s with different built in link functions and Fabien et al. (1999) initiated the generalized linear models with Poisson distribution to compare the caries indices.
The tendency of DMFT index data contains an excess zeros (Figure 1), it does not perfectly fit the some standard distributions (e.g. Normal, Poisson, Binomial, Negative Binomial etc.) and referred to as zero inflated (Heilbron, 1994, Tu, 2002) because of number of extra zeros caused by the real effect on caries distribution of interest and it is a special case of overdispersion (McCullagh and Nelder, 1989; Hinde and Demetrio, 1998; Poortema, 1999). It creates problem while making a sound statistical inference by violating the basic assumptions implicit in the utilization of the standard distributions and misinterpretations of the variance-mean relationship of the error structure (Berry and Welsh, 2002). In overcoming the problem of overdispersion, several researchers Lawless (1987), Famoye (1993), and Lawsey et al. (2007) employed NB and GP regression models instead of Poisson regression model; Pandit and Javali (2007) suggested both GLM’s and ZI models for modelling dental caries count data. Overdispersion has the tendency to increase the proportion of zeros and whenever there are many zeros relative to Poisson assumption, NB and Generalized Poisson (GP) regression models tend to improve the fit (İknur and Felix, 2007). If there are many zero counts in the distribution of DMFT data set, two states may be assumed to better reflect the situation. One of the states is the zero state (zero DMFT count) and others state is the non-zero state (non-zero DMFT count or counts greater than zero). The probability of the zero state and the mean number of the event counts in the non-zero state may depend on the covariates.

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in using the applications of ZI model to fit count data in order to allow for the presence of many zeros and over dispersion in a discipline like Medicine (Campbell et al. 1991, Ghahramani et al. 2001, Chaung 2002) and countable number of studies were found with zero inflated models in public health scenario by Yip (1991), Johnson et al. (1992), Fong and Yip (1993), BÖhning et al. (1999) and Lewsey & Thomson (2004). In this article, the Generalized Linear models, Poisson, Negative Binomial, ZIP and ZINB regression models used to model DMFT count data set and results of these models were compared.

**Study area, Population, Sampling procedure and Clinical examination**

The present study was carried out in Dharwad, Karnataka, India, which is one of the famous educational centers in North Karnataka, South India. Systematic random samples of 1760 permanent dentition aged between 18-40 years were selected. The mean age of the study subjects was 34.26±7.28. The dental caries examinations were conducted by two well qualified dentists with standardized and widely accepted procedure recommended by the WHO.
report on oral health (WHO, 1990). Before actual study, a pilot study was conducted on a convenient sample of 100 individuals for assessment of inter examiner reliability and it was found to be 0.9865. Besides the data on DMFT index, the data are also collected on various characteristics (i.e. Age (in years), Socio Economic Status, Food habits, Frequency of sweet consumption, Frequency of brushing, Methods of brushing, Rinsing habit, Smoking habit, Chewing habit and Alcohol habit).

Count Regression Models and Parameter Estimation

As can be seen in Figure 1, the distribution of DMFT index markedly skewed with the majority of the subjects having a low score and a minority with high scores. About 52.50% of subjects presented without any sign of caries experience. Hence, we are more away from the traditional multiple linear models, but these characteristics fit the various generalized linear models. We initiated the generalized linear model for dichotomized (DMFT=0 and DMFT≠0) as a response on a set of covariates.

The random variable Y with observations y_i (i=1,…,n), where y_i>0, and repressors x_i and the Poisson regression model is given by

\[ P(Y = y_i) = \frac{e^{-\lambda_i} \lambda_i^{y_i}}{y_i!} \]

where y_i=0,1,… and \( \lambda_i = \beta'x_i \). In Poisson model, the mean of the distribution is equal to the variance i.e. \( E(Y_i) = Var(Y_i) = \lambda_i \). The details of the Poisson regression model are given in Frome et al. (1973) and Frome (1983). The Poisson regression model is usually restrictive for count data, leading to alternative model like the NB regression model. One way this restriction manifests itself is that in many applications a Poisson density predicts the probability of a zero count to be considerably less than is actually observed in the data. This is termed excess zeros problem, as there are more zeros in the data than the Poisson predicts. More obvious way that the Poisson is deficient is that for a count data, the variance usually exceeds the mean, a feature called over-dispersion. If there is significant over-dispersion in the distribution of the count, the estimates from the Poisson regression model will be consistent, but inefficient. The standard errors in the Poisson regression model will be biased downward. This situation could lead the investigator to make incorrect statistical inferences about the significance of the covariates. The NB regression model provides an alternative to the Poisson regression model. The NB regression model has been used to deal with only overdispersion (Lawless, 1987). Therefore, a statistical test of overdispersion is highly popular after fitting a Poisson regression model.
The standard form of the NB distribution used in regression applications specifies that \( l_i = l_i(x_i) \). The standard form includes the dispersion parameter \( \alpha \) and the conditional variance function, which is quadratic in the mean. The NB regression model with the mean \( E(Y_i) = l_i \) and variance \( \text{Var}(Y_i) = l_i(1 + \alpha l_i) \) is given by Lawless (1987) as

\[
P(\lambda_i, \alpha, y_i) = \frac{\Gamma(y_i + \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_i})}{\Gamma(y_i)\Gamma(\alpha)} \left( \frac{\alpha l_i}{1 + \alpha l_i} \right)^{y_i} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \alpha l_i} \right)^{\alpha}, y_i = 0, 1, ..., \]

where \( \Gamma(\cdot) \) denotes the gamma function and the dispersion parameter \( \alpha \) is unknown. In the limit as \( \alpha \) goes to 0, \( P(\lambda_i, \alpha, y_i) \) yields the Poisson regression model. When \( \alpha > 0 \), there is overdispersion.

Sometimes there are many zeros in the count dependent variable than are predicted by the Poisson regression model, resulting in an overall poor fit of the model to the data. Zero-inflated count (ZIP and ZINB) regression models address this problem of excess zeros. For count data with more zeros than expected, several models have been proposed, for example the hurdle model (Mullahy, 1986), the ZIP regression model (Lambert, 1992), the two-part model (Heilbron, 1994), the semi-parametric model (Gurmu, 1997). Details of these models are also given in Ridout et al. (1998). The ZINB regression model has been proposed by Heilbron (1994) and Ridout et al. (2001).

If \( Y_i \) are independent random variables having a zero-inflated count distribution, the zeros are assumed to arise in two ways corresponding to distinct underlying states. The first state occurs with probability \( p_i \) and produces only zeros, while the second state occurs with probability \( (1 - p_i) \) and leads to the Poisson, NB count with mean \( l_i \). In general, the zeros from the first state are called zeros and those from the second state are called non-zeros. Consider discrete nonnegative random variable \( Y_i \) with a zero-inflated count distribution, where \( p_i \) and \( l_i \) denote respectively the proportion of zeros and the mean in the Poisson and NB distribution. The distribution of \( Y_i \) is given as

\[
P(Y_i = y_i) = p_i + (1 - p_i)P(Y_i = 0), \quad \text{if} \quad y_i = 0
\]

\[
= (1 - p_i)P(Y_i = y_i), \quad \text{if} \quad y_i > 0
\]

The overall probability of zero count is a combination of probabilities of zeros from each state, weighted by the probability of being in that state, i.e. \( p_i + (1 - p_i)P(Y_i = 0) \), where \( P(Y_i = 0) \) is a Poisson or NB probability with zero event that occurs by chance. On the other hand, the probability of positive counts is given by \( p_i + (1 - p_i)P(Y_i = y_i) \), where \( P(Y_i = y_i) \) is the
Poisson or NB probability with positive counts. Therefore, combining these probabilities of zeros from each state, called zero inflated count regression models. The Probability functions; mean and variance of the ZIP and ZINB regression models are explained and given by İkknur Ö. and Felix F (2007).

In the count regression model, the response variable had a nonnegative integers follows a Poisson or NB distribution. Parameters in the count regression models are estimated by ML method starts from the construction of log-likelihood functions (L). The parameter estimates in Poisson NB and Zero Inflated regression models by using method of ML explained by Frome (1983) and Famoye (1993). We used the STATA (2006) count outcomes “zip and zinb” to obtain the ML estimates of the parameters.

The goodness of fit of the count regression models for model selection can be based on the log-likelihood chi-square statistic. We use this to measure the goodness of fit of the regression models. The regression model with the smallest value of the statistic, among the regression models considered, is usually taken as the best model for fitting the data. The NB regression model reduce to the Poisson regression model when \( \alpha = 0 \). To assess the significance of the dispersion parameter, we test the hypothesis \( H_0: \alpha = 0 \) against \( H_1: \alpha \neq 0 \). Whenever \( H_0 \) is rejected, it is recommended to use the NB regression model in place of the Poisson regression model. The Vuong test is available for testing the validity of the ZIP model against the alternative or standard model (Vuong, 1989). More precisely, the Vuong statistic for testing the Zero Inflated models against the standard models. Choose a critical value from the standard normal distribution that corresponds to the desired level of significance. If Vuong statistic i.e. \( v \) is greater than 1.96, then the ZIP (ZINB) model is accepted. If Vuong statistic i.e. \( v \) is smaller than -1.96, then the Poisson (NB) model is accepted. A statistical significance was set at 5% level of significance (\( p<0.05 \))

**Comparisons of Models**

In this section, the DMFT count data set is analyzed. To understand how the different regression count models fit to the DMFT counts. The results of comparisons interms of parameter estimates are carried out for generalized linear model, Poisson, NB, ZIP and ZINB regression models are presented in Table 1.

First, we consider the GLM for the dichotomous DMFT counts. Based on the Log likelihood chi-square (Table 1), the GLM model does not provide an adequate fit to the DMFT count data. Secondly, the Poisson and Negative Binomial models fitted to the data, the negative binomial model displays
The smallest LL chi-square and provides an adequate better fit compared to GLM and Poisson model to the DMFT count data set. The observed proportion of zeros is 52.50% for the data, but Poisson model predicts a proportion of zeros as 29.94%, which is an under estimation of the observed proportion of zeros. In such a situation, it would be appropriate to estimate the ZIP and ZINB regression models. We apply the Vuong test to checkout the ZI regression models statistically preferred over the Poisson and NB regression models. To test for zero inflation, the value of the Vuong statistic of ZIP model over standard Poisson model is calculated as 19.7900. This value is significant at 5% level of significance when compared to the \( Z_{0.05} =1.9600 \). It means that, the Vuong statistic provides evidence that many zeros are observed for the Poisson distribution. Although ZIP model appear to offer substantial improvement in fit and does better in predicting the zeros over standard Poisson model. However, the ZINB regression model is a significant improvement in fit over NB regression model. The value of the Vuong statistic is calculated as 11.5000. This value is significant at 0.05 level when compared to the \( Z_{0.05} =1.9600 \). Although the ZINB regression model appear to offer substantial improvement in fit and does better in predicting the zeros over standard NB model (Table 1). The ZIP and ZINB regression coefficients are also quite similar in magnitude, but different from GLM, Poisson and NB regression coefficients; the standard errors for the ZIP and ZINB regression coefficients tend to be smaller than those obtained from GLM, Poisson and NB regression coefficients.

The LL chi-square for the GLM, Poisson, NB, ZIP and ZINB regression models are, respectively, 828.1681, 615.3800, 172.3200, 224.8600 and 188.8400, which also indicate that modeling overdispersed data using NB and ZINB regression models are better than the GLM, Poisson and ZIP regression models.

Further, there is a significant negative impact of socio economic status, frequency of brushing, rinsing habit on DMFT counts in GLM, Poisson and NB regression models. It means that, these covariates are supporting to increase the zero DMFT counts. But, the positive and significant influence of frequency of sweet consumption and alcohol habit was observed on DMFT counts in the same models. It means that, these covariates are decreases the zero DMFT counts. When zero inflation, the covariates like age (in years), frequency of sweet consumption, alcohol habit have negative and significant relationship with DMFT counts. However, the covariates such as socio economic statuses, frequency of brushing and rinsing habit have significant and positive relationship with DMFT counts in the ZIP and ZINB regression models. But the covariate like methods of brushing had a significant and positive relationship with DMFT counts in Poisson and NB regression models.
Conclusions and Discussions

While misleading the results of single model fit to the data summarizes can sometimes or single model fit summarizes can sometimes be misleading. Indeed for the dental caries as an application presented in this article. Hence, the application used in this paper involves the estimation of GLM, Poisson, NB, ZIP and ZINB regression models to predict the dental caries. Since count data frequently exhibit overdispersion in addition to possible zero inflation, an obvious methodology is to use a model that can accommodate over dispersion and zero-inflation. Unlike the seeming excess of zeroes, given the covariates, wrong conclusions can be reached and different models (ZIP, ZINB) should be considered in terms of both zero inflation and overdispersion situation alternatives to the standard models (Poisson and NB). The ZINB model is a competitor to the ZIP regression model when there is both overdispersion and zero inflation. For this reason, we apply the ZINB regression model for modeling overdispersed DMFT data with many zeros. Although the DMFT data has about 52.50% observed proportion of zeros, our results in section showed that the GLM, Poisson and ZIP regression models are not appropriate for fitting it. However, the NB and ZINB models provide a better fit. Thus, overdispersion in the DMFT counts can be a result of unobserved heterogeneity. Based on the findings shown, the NB and ZINB regression models seem to perform better than the GLM, Poisson and ZIP regression models.

![Figure 1: The DMFT distribution of study subjects](image-url)
### Results of fitting GLM, Poisson, NB, ZIP and ZINB regression models

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Generalized Linear regression</th>
<th>Poisson Regression</th>
<th>NB Regression</th>
<th>ZIP Regression</th>
<th>ZINB Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-8.4372 (0.5569)</td>
<td>-1.0789 (0.3385)*</td>
<td>-1.0879 (0.5410)*</td>
<td>-0.2814 (0.8384)</td>
<td>-0.2184 (0.5250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>0.0036 (0.0022)</td>
<td>0.0072 (0.0011)*</td>
<td>0.0072 (0.0022)</td>
<td>-0.0072 (0.0036)*</td>
<td>-0.0044 (0.0022)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Status</td>
<td>-0.0833 (0.0246)*</td>
<td>-0.0630 (0.0131)*</td>
<td>-0.0471 (0.0252)*</td>
<td>0.2230 (0.0418)*</td>
<td>0.1409 (0.0259)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food habits</td>
<td>0.0393 (0.0559)</td>
<td>0.1453 (0.0293)*</td>
<td>0.1628 (0.0570)*</td>
<td>-0.0429 (0.0867)</td>
<td>-0.0236 (0.0542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of sweet consumption</td>
<td>0.0925 (0.0241)*</td>
<td>0.0779 (0.0131)*</td>
<td>0.1221 (0.0277)*</td>
<td>-0.2491 (0.0457)*</td>
<td>-0.1502 (0.0276)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of brushing</td>
<td>-0.1934 (0.0876)*</td>
<td>-0.3183 (0.0471)*</td>
<td>-0.3534 (0.0907)*</td>
<td>0.3638 (0.1294)*</td>
<td>0.2294 (0.0812)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of brushing</td>
<td>-0.0515 (0.0600)</td>
<td>-0.1243 (0.0300)*</td>
<td>-0.1141 (0.0655)*</td>
<td>0.0790 (0.0918)</td>
<td>0.0493 (0.0569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinsing habit</td>
<td>-0.0625 (0.0229)*</td>
<td>-0.1548 (0.0118)*</td>
<td>-0.1603 (0.0248)*</td>
<td>0.1345 (0.0381)*</td>
<td>0.0811 (0.0235)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking habit</td>
<td>0.0649 (0.0818)</td>
<td>0.3172 (0.0453)*</td>
<td>0.3375 (0.0864)*</td>
<td>-0.0427 (0.1365)</td>
<td>-0.0232 (0.0850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewing habit</td>
<td>0.0853 (0.1558)</td>
<td>0.3347 (0.0984)*</td>
<td>0.2298 (0.1558)</td>
<td>-0.0692 (0.2295)</td>
<td>-0.0426 (0.1444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol habit</td>
<td>0.3448 (0.1548)*</td>
<td>0.8961 (0.0973)*</td>
<td>0.8675 (0.1540)*</td>
<td>-0.5087 (0.2310)*</td>
<td>-0.3110 (0.1452)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated dispersion parameter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3638 (0.0872)</td>
<td>0.0216 (0.0170)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-1487.8138 (-3697.7482)</td>
<td>-3128.1390 (-2909.0390)</td>
<td>-2909.0390 (-2908.4030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood chi-square</td>
<td>828.1681</td>
<td>615.3800</td>
<td>172.3200</td>
<td>224.8600</td>
<td>188.8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuong statistic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.7900</td>
<td>11.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05% level. Standard errors of estimates are presented in parenthesis.
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