source("Bangladesh_As_adjusted_LR_test_GRM.r")

LRtest <- function(model0, model1, cluster) {</pre>

```
****
# Compares restricted and extended models that have been fitted to the same
# set of clustered data using an "independence" loglikelihood. The comparison
# is done using an adjusted likelihood ratio test, as described in
# Chandler & Bate (Biometrika, 2007) but using the *vertical* scaling of the
# log-likelihood as in their equation (25), rather than the horizontal
# scaling that is studied in detail elsewhere in the paper (the two
# procedures are asymptotically equivalent, but vertical scaling is
# computationally cheaper). Note that with vertical scaling, the numerator
# of the scaling factor in equation (25) cancels with the denominator of the
# secondary adjustment in equation (20) - the whole thing can therefore be
# done at one stroke.
*****
# Arguments:
#
          A model object corresponding to the restricted model
# model0
# model1
          Ditto, extended model
# cluster
           A vector of variables defining clusters for each case
#
           in the database used for model (required if the model
           objects are of class lm, glm, or survreg)
#
********
if (!identical(class(model0), class(model1))) {
 stop("model0 and model1 have different classes!")
 }
if (any(class(model0) %in% c("lm","glm","survreg"))) {
#
# Check same response variable in each model (code lifted from
# anova.lm)
 responses <- as.character(lapply(list(model0, model1),</pre>
                                function(x) deparse(x$terms[[2]])))
 if (!all(responses == responses[1])) {
 stop("Models have different responses")
 }
#
# Check that models are nested, and determine the constraints
# for the restricted one.
#
 theta0 <- coef(model0); theta1 <- coef(model1)</pre>
 if (!all(names(theta0) %in% names(theta1))) {
  stop("model0 is not nested within model1")
 p0 <- length(theta0); p1 <- length(theta1)</pre>
#
#
       For survreg objects, the scale parameter is also included
#
       in the ML fit. Although this isn't included in all models ...
       to find out whether or not to include it, nick some code
#
       from getS3method("summary", "survreg"). Also take the
#
       opportunity to check that the survreg fit contains both
#
#
       naive and robust covariance matrix estimates
 if (class(model1)[1] == "survreg") {
```

if (is.null(modell\$naive.var)) stop("no clusters defined in model1")

```
p.all <- nrow(model0$var)</pre>
   if (p.all > p0) {
   theta0 <- c(theta0, log(model0$scale))</pre>
   if (p.all - p0 == 1) {
    names(theta0) <- c(names(model0$coefficients), "Log(scale)")</pre>
    } else {
    names(theta0) <- c(names(model0$coefficients), names(model0$scale))</pre>
    }
   p0 <- p.all
   }
   p.all <- nrow(model1$var)</pre>
   if (p.all > p1) {
   theta1 <- c(theta1, log(model1$scale))</pre>
   if (p.all - p1 == 1) {
    names(theta1) <- c(names(model1$coefficients), "Log(scale)")</pre>
    } else {
    names(theta1) <- c(names(model1$coefficients), names(model1$scale))</pre>
   }
   p1 <- p.all
   }
  }
 kept.pars <- match(names(theta0), names(theta1))</pre>
 theta.tmp <- round(theta1 - theta1)  # To copy the coefficient names
 theta.tmp[kept.pars] <- theta0</pre>
 theta0 <- theta.tmp
 zero.pos <- (1:p1)[-kept.pars]</pre>
*********
# Covariance matrix calculations, and log-likelihoods. For linear and
# generalised linear models the latter are derived from the deviances /
# residual sums of squares, converted back to the log-likelihood scale,
# because it isn't clear that the logLik function gives the right thing.
# Actually, in the case of an unknown dispersion parameter we do *not*
# use full ML fits of both models - rather, we take the moment estimate from
# the larger model as fixed. This is OK, because the estimate will differ
# from the *true* dispersion parameter by an amount that is O(k^{-0.5}) in
# probability and the computed (naive) likelihood ratio statistic is
# calculated as (D0-D1) / \hat{phi} = [(D0-D1)/phi] * [1 + O(k^-0.5)]
# which is asymptotically equivalent to the chi-squared statistic you'd get
# if phi were known. The reason for proceeding this way is to ensure
# compatibility with (e.g.) quasi-Wald statistics, which just use dispersion
# estimates from the extended model. If you *don't* do this, then the ML
# estimate of the dispersion parameter in the restricted model can `hide'
# much of the lack of fit and reduce the significance of extra terms
# (or, at least, indicate that they're not necessary because the extra
# variation can be explained via increased dispersion). That seems a bit
# heuristic - need to understand this a bit better! NB can't use the normal
# F ratio to cope with the unknown dispersion, because the residual deviance
# doesn't have the same chi-squared distribution as in the independence case.
**********
 n <- p1 + model1$df.residual</pre>
 if (class(model1)[1] == "lm") {
   summ1 <- lm.clus.sum(model1, cluster=cluster)</pre>
  sigsq <- summ1$sigma^2</pre>
  logL1 <- -model1$df.residual</pre>
  RSS0 <- (n-p0) * summary(model0)$sigma^2
  logL0 <- -RSS0/sigsq
  R <- summ1$cov.scaled; N <- summ1$cov.unscaled</pre>
  } else if (class(model1)[1] == "glm") {
  if (!identical(model0$family[1:2],model1$family[1:2])) {
   stop("model0 and model1 have different 'family' attributes")
   }
   summ0 <- summary(model0)</pre>
   summ1 <- glm.clus.sum(model1, cluster=cluster)</pre>
```

```
dispersion <- summ1$dispersion
   logL0 <- -summ0$deviance / (2*dispersion)</pre>
   logL1 <- -summ1$deviance / (2*dispersion)</pre>
  R <- summlcov.scaled; N <- summlcov.unscaled
  } else if (class(model1)[1] == "survreg") {
  logL0 <- model0$loglik[2]</pre>
  logL1 <- model1$loglik[2]</pre>
  R <- model1$var; N <- model1$naive.var</pre>
  }
 }
#
# OK: here's the scaling factor.
#
thetadiff <- theta1 - theta0; psidiff <- theta1[zero.pos]</pre>
H <- -solve(N); H.adj <- -solve(R)</pre>
R.psi.inv <- -solve(R[zero.pos, zero.pos])
scalfac <- (t(psidiff) %*% R.psi.inv %*% psidiff) /</pre>
                   (t(thetadiff) %*% H %*% thetadiff)
df <- p1-p0
LR.naive <- 2*(logL1-logL0)
pval.naive <- pchisq(LR.naive, df=df, lower.tail=FALSE)</pre>
LR.adj <- LR.naive*scalfac
pval.adj <- pchisq(LR.adj,df=df,lower.tail=FALSE)</pre>
data.frame(Lambda=c(LR.naive,LR.adj),
            P.value=c(pval.naive, pval.adj),
            row.names=c("Naive", "Adjusted"))
}
```

end of the script written by Richard Chandler, Professor of Statistics at # the Department of Statistical Science at University College London. # E-mail: r.chandler@ucl.ac.uk