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## Introduction



- Life varies by region in both measurable and immeasurable ways
- We want to improve existing mortality models by accounting for spatiotemporal trends


## The Data

- Characteristics of every death in the United States from 2000-2017
- Used data from the US decennial census and the American Community Surveys from intercensus years for population exposures
- Census estimates are binned by gender and 18 five-year age groups from 0 to 85 years old


## The Data

- Used data from the contiguous United States to maintain spatial relationships
- Combined counties with extremely low populations and to account for boundary changes, leading to 3,092 total counties for study
- 22,590,587 Female Deaths
- 22,446,212 Male Deaths


## Exploratory Data Analysis

1000 Times the Empirical Death Rate for Females Ages 55-59 in Year 2010

[ 0.00 to 2.52)
[2.52 to 3.85)
[3.85 to 4.85)
[4.85 to 5.88)
[5.88 to 7.08)
[7.08 to 9.19)
[9.19 to 62.50]

## Exploratory Data Analysis

1000 Times the Empirical Death Rate for Females Ages 85+ in 2010


## Exploratory Data Analysis



Figure 1: Average mortality rate by gender, age group, and year (for older ages)

## Exploratory Data Analysis



Figure 2: Average mortality rate by gender, age group, and year (for younger ages)

## The Data

- Considered several demographic and economic statistics as explanatory variables
- We preferred complete data for every county and year
- Used unemployment rate estimates as provided by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics
- We hope to obtain additional explanatory variables in the future


## Exploratory Data Analysis

Unemployment Rate by County in 2010
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## Exploratory Data Analysis



Figure 3: Average unemployment rate, weighted by county population in 2000-2017

## Bayesian CAR Models

- Model with a prior such that the every space/time point only depends on direct neighbors and adjacent time points
- Special case of a Markov random field
- Often used to analyze areal data


## Bayesian Binomial Hierarchical Model

$$
\begin{gather*}
y_{k t} \sim \operatorname{Binomial}\left(n_{k t}, \theta_{k t}\right)  \tag{1}\\
\log \left(\theta_{k t} /\left(1-\theta_{k t}\right)\right)=x_{k t}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\psi_{k t} \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

- $n_{k t}$ is the total population and $\theta_{k t}$ is the probability of death.
- $x_{k t}^{\prime}$ represents the covariate information for the $k^{\text {th }}$ location at time $t$
- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a vector of coefficients
- $\psi_{k t}$ collects all the spatial and temporal random effects that create the spatio-temporal dependence


## Conditional Autoregressive Priors

$$
\begin{align*}
y_{i} \mid y_{(i)} & \sim N\left(\rho \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{N_{i}} W_{i j} y_{j}, \tau^{2}\right)  \tag{3}\\
Y & \sim N\left(0, \tau^{2}(D-\rho W)^{-1}\right) \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

- $y_{(i)}$ represents all locations excluding location $i$ and $N_{i}$ is the total number of neighbors for location $i$
- $\rho$ represents the degree of dependence between neighbors
- $W$ is a location matrix such that if $W_{i j}$ equals 1 if and only if $i$ and $j$ are direct neighbors and 0 otherwise
- $D=\operatorname{diag}\left(N_{1}, \ldots, N_{n}\right)$ is a diagonal matrix collecting the number of neighbors for each location.


## CAR Linear Model

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{k t}=\phi_{k}+\left(\alpha+\delta_{k}\right) \frac{t-\bar{t}}{T} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

- Assumes a linear trend in the random effect over time with a slope equal to $\frac{\alpha+\delta_{k}}{T}$
- $\phi_{k}$ and $\delta_{k}$ are given CAR priors according to Equation 4


## CAR Linear Model

- The other parameters are given standard priors.

$$
\begin{align*}
\phi & \sim N\left(0, \tau_{s}^{2}\left(D-\rho_{s} W\right)^{-1}\right)  \tag{6}\\
\delta & \sim N\left(0, \tau_{t}^{2}\left(D-\rho_{t} W\right)^{-1}\right)  \tag{7}\\
\tau_{s}^{2}, \tau_{t}^{2} & \sim \operatorname{IG}(1,0.01)  \tag{8}\\
\rho_{s}, \rho_{t} & \sim \operatorname{Uniform}(0,1)  \tag{9}\\
\beta_{0}, \beta_{1} & \sim N(0,1) \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

## Computational Technique

- We used the CARBayesST package in R to perform MCMC sampling from the posterior
- We ran separate models for each age group and gender combination for a total of 36 models
- $\boldsymbol{\beta}, \phi_{k}$, and $\delta_{k}$ are updated using the Metropolis algorithm with a normal proposal distribution
- $\tau_{S}^{2}, \tau_{T}^{2}$ are updated using conjugacy principles and Gibbs sampling
- $\rho_{S}, \rho_{T}$ are updated using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with a truncated normal proposal distribution
- Trace plots and Geweke diagnostics were used to assess convergence


## Results



Figure 4: Estimates and $95 \%$ credible intervals for $\beta_{0}$ (intercept) for each age group and gender combination.

## Results

Coefficient for Unemployment Rate


Figure 5: Estimates and $95 \%$ credible intervals for $\beta_{1}$ (coefficient for unemployment rate) for each age group and gender combination.

## Results



Figure 6: Estimates and 95\% credible intervals for $\alpha$ (country-wide time trend) for each age group and gender combination.

## Results

$\alpha+\delta_{k}$ for Females Ages 55-59


Figure 7: Estimates for $\alpha+\delta_{k}$ (total time trend) by county for Females ages 55-59

## Results

1000 Times the Fitted Mortality Rates for Females Ages 55-59 in Year 2010


## Results

1000 Times the Fitted Mortality Rates for Females Ages 85+ in Year 2010


## Model 2

To further understand the spatial relationships of mortality rates, we built a slightly more complicated model to examine state-specific covariate effects.
We again start with a binomial distribution as the top level of the hierarchy.

$$
y_{a k t} \mid \pi_{a k t} \sim \operatorname{Binomial}\left(n_{a k t}, \pi_{a k t}\right)
$$

for each age group a in county $k$ during year $t$.

## Model 2

We can then relate $\pi_{a k t}$ to the desired effects using the logit link function:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\ln \left(\frac{\pi_{a k t}}{1-\pi_{a k t}}\right)=\beta_{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{3} F_{i}\left(x_{k}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{3} G_{i s}\left(x_{k t}\right)+ \\
\phi_{k}+\delta_{t}+\psi_{a}+\gamma_{a k t}
\end{gathered}
$$

where

- $\beta_{0}$ is the intercept.
- Each $F_{i}$ and $G_{i s}$ is a nonlinear covariate effect modeled by a Gaussian process with Matérn correlation function.
- $\phi_{k}=u_{k}+v_{k}$, where $u_{k}$ is the structured (CAR) and $v_{k}$ is the unstructured spatial effect.
- $\delta_{t}$ is the temporal effect, $\psi_{a}$ is the age group effect, and $\gamma_{a k t}$ is the error term.


## Model 2 Computation

We use integrated nested Laplace approximations (INLA) to fit our model making it computationally feasible.

## Model Selection

We compared three different models using DIC to make sure the added complication was worthwhile.

| Model | DIC (Female) | DIC (Male) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full Model | $3,817,853$ | $4,266,276$ |
| Only Countrywide | $3,818,372$ | $4,266,666$ |
| No Covariates | $3,819,075$ | $4,266,790$ |

Table 1: Deviance Information Criterion (DIC) for the three different model versions that were fit to both the male and female data.

## Model 2 Overall Female Spatial Effect

Combined Spatial Effect


| $\square$ |
| :--- |
| $[-0.7913$ to -0.1437$)$ |
| $[-0.1437$ to -0.0712$)$ |
| $[-0.0712$ to -0.0177$)$ |
| $[-0.0177$ to 0.0308$)$ |
| $[0.0308$ to 0.0816$)$ |
| $[0.0816$ to 0.1474$)$ |
| $[0.1474$ to 0.4670$]$ |

## Model 2 Overall Male Spatial Effect

Combined Spatial Effect


| $\square$ |
| :--- |
| $[-0.8105$ to -0.1688$)$ |
| $[-0.1688$ to -0.0848$)$ |
| $[-0.0848$ to -0.0267$)$ |
| $[-0.0267$ to 0.0339$)$ |
| $[0.0339$ to 0.0972$)$ |
| $[0.0972$ to 0.1759$)$ |
| $[0.1759$ to 0.7728$]$ |

## Combined Time Effect

## Combined Time Effect



Figure 8: Posterior mean and $95 \%$ credible interval of the temporal effects $\left(\delta_{t}\right)$. Male values are in blue and female values are in red.

## Combined Age Effect

## Combined Age Effect



Figure 9: Posterior mean and $95 \%$ credible interval of the age group effects $\left(\psi_{t}\right)$. Male values are in blue and female values are in red.

## State-specific Unemployment Effect



Figure 10: Posterior mean and $95 \%$ credible interval of the unemployment effects $\left(G_{1 s}\left(x_{k t}\right)\right)$ for selected states for the model fit to the female data.

## Conclusions and Future Work

- Incorporating spatial correlation into mortality modeling can help us better understand mortality rates
- The spatial dependence parameters helps us draw on information from neighboring counties
- In the future we would like to incorporate additional covariates
- We also want to compare other models and techniques
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