

## Regression Models for Risks(Proportions) and Rates

### Proportions

#### E.g. [Changes in] Sex Ratio: Canadian Births in last 60 years

Parameter of Interest:             $\pi(\text{male})$     ... just above 0.5  
    or  $\pi(\text{male})/\pi(\text{female})$  ... "ODDS" ... just above 1.0  
    or      $\log [\pi(\text{male})]$  ... just above  $\ln[0.5]=-0.699$

FIRST ANALYSIS : Assuming    is not changing over time

```
data canada;
infile 'Macintosh HD:work:626:sex_can.dat'; /* variables = #in that gender_province */
input
year
fc fnf fpei fns fnb fq fo fm fs fa fbc
mc mnf mpei mns mnb mq mo mm ms ma mbc ; mfc = mc+fc; ratio=mc/fc;

proc means n min max mean sum ; var mc fc mfc;

proc genmod ; model mc/mfc = / /* if don't put x's in model, "null" model is fitted */
LINK = identity dist = binomial; /* "safe" here:- proportions all far from 0 and 1 */

proc genmod ; model mc/mfc = /
LINK = logit dist = binomial; /* canonical link: always "safe" */

proc genmod ; model mc/mfc = /
LINK = log dist = binomial; /* "safe" here:- proportions all well inside (0,1) */

run;
```

	Var	N	Min	Max	Mean	Sum
Males (Canada)	MC	60	116 731	246 073	184 449.87	11 066 992
Females (Canada)	FC	60	110 642	233 202	174 623.97	10 477 438
Males&Females (Canada)	MFC	60	227 575	479 275	359 073.83	21 544 430

The GENMOD Procedure

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	BINOMIAL
Link Function	<u>IDENTITY</u>
Dependent Variable	MC
Dependent Variable	MFC
Observations Used	60
Number Of Events	11066992
Number Of Trials	21544430

Model Information

Value
BINOMIAL
<u>LOGIT</u>
MC
MFC
60
11066992
21544430

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	59	80.2519	1.3602
Scaled Deviance	59	80.2519	1.3602
Pearson Chi-Square	59	80.2510	1.3602
Scaled Pearson X2	59	80.2510	1.3602
Log Likelihood	.	-14925393.46	.

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	59	80.2519	1.3602
Scaled Deviance	59	80.2519	1.3602
Pearson Chi-Square	59	80.2510	1.3602
Scaled Pearson X2	59	80.2510	1.3602
Log Likelihood	.	-14925393.46	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	<u>0.5137</u>	<u>0.0001</u>	22756720.9	0.0001
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

Check: 11066992/21544430 = 0.5137 ; SE

$$= \sqrt{p(1-p)/n} = \sqrt{0.5137 \times 0.4863 / \{21.5 \times 10^6\}}$$

$$= 0.0001$$

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	<u>0.0547</u>	<u>0.0004</u>	16128.7400	0.0001
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

Check: SEXRATIO = 11.07/10.48 = 1.0563  
ln SEXRATIO = 0.0547

$$SE[ \underline{0.0547} ] = \sqrt{1/\#m + 1/\#f} =$$

$$\sqrt{1/\{11.07 \times 10^6\} + 1/\{10.48 \times 10^6\}} = 0.0004$$

Not advocating log LINK... out of interest...

Distribution BINOMIAL  
 Link Function LOG  
 Dependent Variable MC  
 Dependent Variable MFC  
 Observations Used 60  
 Number Of Events 11066992  
 Number Of Trials 21544430

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	59	80.2519	1.3602
Scaled Deviance	59	80.2519	1.3602
Pearson Chi-Square	59	80.2510	1.3602
Scaled Pearson X2	59	80.2510	1.3602
Log Likelihood	.	-14925393.46	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err
ChiSquare	Pr>Chi		
INTERCEPT	1	-0.6662	0.0002
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

Notes...

- Sample Sizes are very large, and is close to 0.5, so the Central Limit Theorem holds in all scales!!
- Check that if transform CI's in one scale to those in another, will get practically same CI's as if worked in the target scale to begin with...

CI[ ] = "Inverse Logit" of CI[logit ] etc..

- Notice that the Log likelihood is the same for all 3 models, since we have simply re-parametrized the 1 parameter ( ).
- Do not confuse the SEXRatio with ODDSRATIO

**The SEXRATIO is an ODDS**

If we wish to compare the SexRatio in say the 1930's with the SexRatio in the 1980's then we might wish to work in the ODDSRatio scale

$$\text{i.e. } \frac{\text{male 1980's}}{\text{female 1980's}} / \frac{\text{male 1930's}}{\text{female 1930's}}$$

or...

We might want to model a smooth temporal evolution in  $\pi$  or in  $\log[\pi(1-\pi)]$ .

- With very little evolution over X = calendar year, expect very similar regression fits using identity, logit and log links. Try the identity and logit links and see.
- SexRatio 1+  $\Leftrightarrow$  = (1+ )/(2+ ) 0.5 + /4;

Log[1 + ]

## Regression Models for Risks(Proportions) and Rates

### Rates

#### E.g. 1 [Changes in] Frequency: U.S. Hurricanes in last 110 years

Parameter of Interest: RATE = expected no. of # storms / unit of "country-time"

PROC MEANS;

```
proc genmod ; model n_H_HIT = /
  LINK = identity dist = Poisson; /* Counts have Poisson variation around mean */
```

```
proc genmod ; model n_H_HIT = /
  LINK = identity dist = Normal; /* Allowing variance of counts to be independent of mean */
```

```
proc genmod ; model n_H_HIT = /
  LINK = log dist = Poisson; /* Change from estimating mean to estimating log[mean] */
```

```
proc genmod ; model n_H_HIT = /
  LINK = log dist = Normal; /* counts have Gaussian variation around exp[ 0] */
```

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
YEAR	110	1940.50	31.90	1886	1995
N_STORMS	110	8.52	3.69	1	21
N_CAT	110	1.80	1.43	0	7
N_HS_HIT	110	3.34	1.81	0	8
N_HR_1_9	110	1.74	1.43	0	7
N_HR_1_5	110	1.43	1.32	0	6
N_W1	110	0.53	0.73	0	3
N_W2	110	0.33	0.57	0	3
N_W3	110	0.40	0.66	0	3
N_W4	110	0.13	0.37	0	2
N_W5	110	0.01	0.13	0	1
<b>=&gt; N_H_HIT</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
N_HR	110	4.95	2.48	0	12
N_TS	110	3.31	1.99	0	9
N_SS	110	0.16	0.56	0	4

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Data Set	WORK.A
Distribution	<u>POISSON</u>
Link Function	<u>IDENTITY</u>
Dependent Variable	N_H_HIT
Observations Used	110

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	109	149.9483	1.3757
Scaled Deviance	109	149.9483	1.3757
Pearson Chi-Square	109	133.0127	1.2203
Scaled Pearson X2	109	133.0127	1.2203
Log Likelihood	.	-100.7859	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	1.4364	0.1143	158.0000	0.0001
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

CHECK:

$$\bar{y} = 1.4364;$$

$$SE[\bar{y}] = \text{"Poisson\_SD"} / \sqrt{110}$$

$$= \sqrt{1.4364} / \sqrt{110} = 0.1143$$

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Value
WORK.A
<u>NORMAL</u>
<u>IDENTITY</u>
N_H_HIT
110

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	109	191.0545	1.7528
Scaled Deviance	109	110.0000	1.0092
Pearson Chi-Square	109	191.0545	1.7528
Scaled Pearson X2	109	110.0000	1.0092
Log Likelihood	.	-186.4476	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	1.4364	0.1257	130.6643	0.0001
<u>SCALE</u>	1	<u>1.3179</u>	0.0889	.	.

Scale estimated by maximum likelihood.

CHECK:

$$\bar{y} = 1.4364;$$

$$SE[\bar{y}] = \text{"Gaussian\_SD"} / \sqrt{110}$$

$$= \underline{1.3179} / \sqrt{110} = 0.1257$$

SCALE estimate of SD(counts)

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Data Set	WORK.A
Distribution	<u>POISSON</u>
Link Function	<u>LOG</u>
Dependent Variable	N_H_HIT
Observations Used	110

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	109	149.9483	1.3757
Scaled Deviance	109	149.9483	1.3757
Pearson Chi-Square	109	133.0127	1.2203
Scaled Pearson X2	109	133.0127	1.2203
Log Likelihood	.	-100.7859	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	0.3621	0.0796	20.7181	0.0001
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

INTERCEPT = estimate of  $\log[\mu]$ , so

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{count}} = \exp[0.3621] = 1.4363.$$

SCALE=1 => SD(y) not estimated separately.

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Value
WORK.A
<u>NORMAL</u>
<u>LOG</u>
N_H_HIT
110

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	109	191.0545	1.7528
Scaled Deviance	109	110.0000	1.0092
Pearson Chi-Square	109	191.0545	1.7528
Scaled Pearson X2	109	110.0000	1.0092
Log Likelihood	.	-186.4476	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	0.3621	0.0875	17.1336	0.0001
SCALE	1	1.3179	0.0889	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was estimated by maximum likelihood.

SE of 0.0875 for estimate of  $\log[\mu]$  is greater than SE of 0.0796, since Gaussian-based estimate of SD(counts) is slightly larger than Poisson-based one.

## Regression Models for Risks(Proportions) and Rates

### Rates

#### E.g. 2 Accident Rates before/after Time Change

Parameter of Interest:      RATE DIFFERENCE (RD)

                                    RATE RATIO (RR)

```
DATA accident;
```

```
INPUT     week accidnts    p_t;
```

```
LINES;
```

```
          0     2575     40000000
```

```
          1     2800     40000000
```

```
;
```

```
proc genmod ; model accidnts = week /     /* additive model=> difference in average COUNT */  
    LINK = identity dist = Poisson;
```

```
proc genmod ; model accidnts = week /     /* additive model=> difference in average COUNT */  
    LINK = identity dist = Normal;        /* but asking that SD's be estimated separately */
```

```
proc genmod ; model accidnts = week /     /* multiplicative model= ratio of average COUNTS */  
    LINK = log            dist = Poisson;
```

```
proc genmod ; model accidnts = week /     /* multiplicative model=> ratio of average COUNTS */  
    LINK = log            dist = Normal;    /* but asking that SD's be estimated separately */
```

The GENMOD Procedure

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	POISSON
Link Function	IDENTITY
Dependent Variable	ACCIDNTS
Observations Used	2

Model Information

Value
<b>NORMAL</b>
<b>IDENTITY</b>
ACCIDNTS
2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	37072.6815	.

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	-1.8379	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	2575.0000	50.7445	2575.0000	0.0001
WEEK	1	225.0000	73.3144	9.4186	0.0021
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

NOTE: Fitting saturated model. Scale will not be estimated.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

$\hat{\text{ for "week" = } c1 - c0 = 2800 - 2575 = 225;$

$$\begin{aligned} SE(\text{diff}) &= \sqrt{\text{var}(c1) + \text{var}(c0)} \\ &= \sqrt{2575 + 2800} = \sqrt{5375} = 73.31 \end{aligned}$$

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	2575.0000	1.0000	6630625.00	0.0001
WEEK	1	225.0000	1.4142	25312.5000	0.0001
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

NOTE: Fitting saturated model. Scale will not be estimated.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

$$SE(\text{diff}) = \sqrt{\text{var}(c1) + \text{var}(c0)} = \sqrt{1 + 1} = 1.4142!!$$

GENMOD GOT CONFUSED : 0 df to estimate SD(Y|X)!



The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	POISSON
Link Function	LOG
Dependent Variable	ACCIDNTS
Observations Used	2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	37072.6815	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	7.8536	0.0197	158823.705	0.0001
WEEK	1	0.0838	0.0273	9.4131	0.0022
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

NOTE: Fitting saturated model. Scale will not be estimated.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

0.0838 = estimate of  $\log[\mu_1] - \log[\mu_0]$

=> estimate of  $\mu_1/\mu_0 = \exp[0.0838] = 1.09$

$$SE[\text{est of log RR}] = \sqrt{1/c1 + 1/c0}$$

$$= \sqrt{1/2575 + 1/2800} = 0.0273$$

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Value
NORMAL
LOG
ACCIDNTS
2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	-1.8379	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	7.8536	0.0004	408971039	0.0001
WEEK	1	0.0838	0.0005	25209.1997	0.0001
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

NOTE: Fitting saturated model. Scale will not be estimated.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

"SE" = 0.0005: GENMOD GOT CONFUSED again :  
0 df for SD(Y|X)! it used SD(Y|X) = 1.

## Regression Models for Risks(Proportions) and Rates

### Rates

#### E.g. 2 Accident Rates before/after Time Change ... continued

Parameter of Interest: RATE DIFFERENCE (RD)

RATE RATIO (RR)

The above analyses modeled the average counts & differences/ratios in average counts;  
we need to refine these to estimate RATES and difference/ratio of RATES

*Key :*

$\mu$  = average (or expected) count = RATE x Denominator

*or , other way around ...*

**RATE =  $\mu_{\text{count}}$  / Denominator = function of regressor variables**

## Examples...

1. RATE =  $\mu_{\text{count}} / \text{Denominator} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$  *(additive model)*

--> average(count) =  $\{ \beta_0 + \beta_1 X \} \text{Denominator} = \beta_0 \text{Denominator} + \beta_1 \{X \times \text{Denominator}\}$

--> Fit count as "Y" variable, with IDENTITY LINK, to the regression equation

$$\beta_0 Z_0 + \beta_1 Z_1,$$

where  $Z_0 = \text{Denominator}$ ,  $Z_1 = X \times \text{Denominator}$

i.e. MODEL Y = Z<sub>0</sub> Z<sub>1</sub> / LINK = IDENTITY DIST = POISSON NOINT; (no intercept)

2. RATE =  $\mu_{\text{count}} / \text{Denominator} = \exp [ \beta_0 + \beta_1 X ]$  *(multiplicative model)*

--> average(count) =  $\{ \exp [ \beta_0 + \beta_1 X ] \} \times \text{Denominator}$   
=  $\exp [ \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + 1. \log[\text{Denominator}] ]$  {bringing Denominator inside the exp}

--> Fit count as "Y" variable, with LOG LINK, to the regression equation

$$\beta_0 + \beta_1 X + 1. \log[\text{Denominator}]$$

i.e. MODEL Y = X / LINK = LOG DIST = POISSON OFFSET = Z ;

Z =  $\log[\text{Denominator}]$  must be defined in dataset (doesn't have to be called Z)

An "OFFSET" in a generalized linear model is a term whose accompanying regression coefficient is not estimated, but rather is forced to be 1.

```

DATA accident;

INPUT week accidnts p_t;

p_t = p_t/1000000; /* p_t unit = 1 million person days */

z0 = p_t; z1 = week*p_t;

z = log(p_t);

LINES;
      0  2575    40000000
      1  2800    40000000
;

proc genmod ; model accidnts = z0 z1 /
  LINK = identity dist = Poisson NOINT;

      /* additive model to estimate rate difference */

proc genmod ; model accidnts = week /
  LINK = log      dist = Poisson  OFFSET = Z;

/* multiplicative model to estimate rate ratio */

run;

```

The GENMOD Procedure

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	POISSON
Link Function	IDENTITY ->Rate diff (RD)
Dependent Variable	ACCIDNTS
Observations Used	2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	-0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	-0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	37072.6815	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSquare	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	0	0.0000	0.0000	.	.
Z0	1	64.3750	1.2686	2575.0000	0.0001
Z1	1	5.6250	1.8329	9.4186	0.0021
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

NB Rates (and rate diffs) are per million person\_days.

i.e. 64.37 =2575/40 million p\_d and  
5.6250 =rate diff = 225/40 million p\_d

(If the p\_t is measured as person days, the coefficients have too may leading zeroes)

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	POISSON
Link Function	LOG -> RR
Dependent Variable	ACCIDNTS
Offset Variable	Z
Observations Used	2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	37072.6815	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	4.1647	0.0197	44663.2136	0.0001
WEEK	1	0.0838	0.0273	9.4131	0.0022
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

0.0838 is the log of the estimated RATE RATIO, as above,

so estimated RATERATIO = exp[0.0838] = 1.09.

...

## Regression Models for Risks(Proportions) and Rates

### Rates

E.g. 3: Cancer Rates in Exposed and Unexposed Cohorts

$c_1 = 41$  in  $n_1 = 28,010$  person years vs.  $c_0 = 15$  in  $n_0 = 19,017$  person years

(Rothman & Boice e.g. )

Denominators (Person years) are *different* in Exposed and Unexposed Cohorts

Parameters of Interest:      RATE DIFFERENCE (RD)

   RATE RATIO (RR)

*Again :*

$\mu$  = average (or expected) count = RATE x Denominator

*or , other way around ...*

RATE =  $\mu_{\text{count}} / \text{Denominator}$  = function of regressor variables

```

DATA R_and_B; /* Rothman and Boice data */

INPUT exposure cases p_t;

z0 = p_t; z1 = exposure*p_t;

z = log(p_t);

LINES;
      1      41      28010
      0      15      19017
;

proc genmod ; model cases = z0 z1 /
  LINK = identity dist = Poisson NOINT;

      /* additive model to estimate rate difference */

proc genmod ; model cases = exposure /
  LINK = log      dist = Poisson  OFFSET = Z;

      /* multiplicative model to estimate rate ratio */

run;

```

The GENMOD Procedure

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	POISSON
Link Function	IDENTITY ->Rate diff (RD)
Dependent Variable	CASES
Observations Used	2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	136.8772	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	0	0.0000	0.0000	.	.
Z0	1	0.0008	0.0002	15.0000	0.0001
Z1	1	0.0007	0.0003	4.8607	0.0275
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

The coefficient  $b_1 = 0.0007$  accompanying Z1 is the estimated RATE DIFFERENCE.

Check:  $41/28010 - 15/19017 = 0.00067$  or an excess of 67 cases per 100000 p\_y.

Check also that the SE of 0.0003 lines up with

$SE(41/28010 - 15/19017)$

$= \sqrt{41/28010^2 + 15/19017^2}$  in earlier exercise.

Model Information

Description	Value
Distribution	POISSON
Link Function	LOG -> RATERATIO
Dependent Variable	CASES
Offset Variable	Z
Observations Used	2

Criteria For Assessing Goodness Of Fit

Criterion	DF	Value	Value/DF
Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Deviance	0	0.0000	.
Pearson Chi-Square	0	0.0000	.
Scaled Pearson X2	0	0.0000	.
Log Likelihood	.	136.8772	.

Analysis Of Parameter Estimates

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Std Err	ChiSq	Pr>Chi
INTERCEPT	1	-7.1450	0.2582	765.7736	0.0001
EXPOSURE	1	0.6183	0.3018	4.1983	0.0405
SCALE	0	1.0000	0.0000	.	.

NOTE: The scale parameter was held fixed.

0.6183 is the log of the estimated RATE RATIO, so estimated RATERATIO =  $\exp[0.6183] = 1.86$ .

Check:  $RR = (41/28010 / (15/19017)) = 1.85$

Also check that SE = 0.3018 agrees with

$\sqrt{1/41 + 1/15}$  for the log of an estimate of a rate ratio