Mixed models: getting the best use of parasitological data
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Statistical analysis of parasitological data provides a powerful method for understanding the biological processes underlying parasite infection. However, robust and reliable analysis of parasitological data from natural and experimental infections is often difficult where: (1) the distribution of parasites between hosts is aggregated; (2) multiple measurements are made on the same individual host in longitudinal studies; or (3) data are from ‘noisy’ natural systems. Mixed models, which allow multiple error terms, provide an excellent opportunity to overcome these problems, and their application to the analysis of various types of parasitological data are reviewed here.

Statistical models provide powerful tools to investigate the biological processes underlying parasite infection and disease, including exposure and susceptibility of hosts, and infectivity and virulence of parasites [1–5].

Statistical models in parasitology

Statistical models in parasitology generally have two objectives: (1) to test hypotheses regarding the significance of different biological factors on the duration, intensity or prevalence of a parasitic infection; and (2) to quantify the effect of these biological factors on a parasitic infection. For example, does treatment with drug A significantly reduce the duration or intensity of a parasitic infection relative to untreated controls and, if so, by how much? Is the presence of host species B associated with higher parasite burdens in host species A and, if so, by how much?

A common problem with parasitological data (and biological data in general) is pseudoreplication (see Glossary), where observations are correlated either in space or through time [6–8]. These correlations arise, for example, if samples are taken from the same geographical location or are taken at repeated time points from the same individual. Because these observations are not independent of each other, testing the significance of treatment effects or quantifying the size of these effects is confounded by the difficulty in separating treatment effects from spatial or temporal correlations [6,9]. Thus, a group of observations associated with repeated measures on an individual or with multiple samples from the same site may be consistently higher or lower than other such groups of observations owing to innate differences between individuals or sites [7,8,10]. In addition, observations within a group might exhibit autocorrelation, i.e. the degree of correlation between a pair of observations might be higher if closely related in space or time [8,9]. For example, in a longitudinal study, one observation might depend on the previous observation.

How then should pseudoreplication in parasitological data be dealt with? One approach is to design the experiment or sampling regime such that only independent data are analysed [9]. Suppose, for example, one wants to follow the progress of a parasitic infection through time by inoculating hosts with parasites and monitoring the infection at successive time points. By only using different hosts at each time point, one can avoid pseudoreplication entirely. For some types of observation, such as gut counts of helminths, this will be the natural design of the experiment if only destructive sampling can be used. Analogously, it may be possible to design sampling regimes such that only a single sample is taken from each site. In some studies, one may take several measures from

Glossary

Blocks: similar observations can be assigned to blocks, where blocks are assumed to vary randomly from each other.

Error term: random departure of the response variable from that predicted by either the fixed or random effects.

Fixed effects: the mean predicted value of the response variable over hypothetical repetitions, independent of the group sampled.

Geometric decrease: a progression that decreases proportionally towards an asymptote of zero (e.g. 1, 1/2, 1/4, 1/8, etc).

GLM (generalized linear model): a common type of statistical model used to analyse independent data with a non-normal error distribution.

GLMM (generalized linear mixed model): an extension of a GLM that allows random effects to be modelled.

Linear model: a basic regression model specification appropriate for independent data with a normal distribution.

Mixed model: a model that incorporates random effects between groups of observations.

Normal distribution: a symmetrical distribution (‘a bell curve’) widely applicable to describe the probability distribution of continuous variables.

Poisson distribution: where the variance of the response variable is greater than expected for a particular distribution; for example, for count data, one predicts the variance should be equal to the mean but the variance of the observed distribution of helminths between hosts often exceeds the mean.

Pseudoreplication: non-independence of data arising from spatial or temporal correlations between observations.

Random effects: the consistent departure of the response variable for a group of observations from that predicted from the fixed effects and are drawn from a random distribution.

REML (restricted estimate maximum likelihood, also sometimes called residual maximum likelihood): a computer algorithm often used to fit the parameters of mixed models.
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an individual or a sampling site but only be interested in one general feature of this group of observations, such as peak parasitaemia in an individual or prevalence of infection in a village. Using a single measure per group of observations ensures that measures are independent of each other and so can be analysed by standard methods such as linear models, t tests, non-parametric tests and so on [8,9].

An alternative approach to deal with pseudoreplication is to use nested analysis of variance (ANOVA) [9,11]. This method is derived from agricultural experiments where fields are divided into smaller blocks and the crop within each block is given the same treatment combination, while at the same time it is assumed that there is some innate variability between blocks. By extension to parasitology, observations from individuals or samples that are similar to each other and that receive the same treatment combination can be assigned to the same block. Nested ANOVAs include an extra error term to describe the innate variation between blocks before determining whether there is a significant effect of treatment, thereby separating treatment effects from block effects. A major consideration of nested ANOVAs is that, in general, for these tests to be carried out the data must be both orthogonal and balanced (i.e. all treatment combinations must be present and all treatment combinations must have equal numbers of observations). These restrictions can sometimes be relaxed, for example by randomly removing data or by bootstrapping data, but usually at the expense of inflated standard errors [11]. Nested ANOVAs are therefore ideal in many types of experimental design, prospective studies or in certain sampling regimes. For many other situations, where the researcher has less control over the form of the data to be analysed, regression methods might be more appropriate in dealing with unbalanced, non-orthogonal data.

The remainder of this review will concentrate on mixed regression models as a general approach to deal with spatial and temporal correlations in parasitological data. This is not to imply that they represent a priori a better method to deal with all forms of parasitological data, but these models certainly provide powerful tools to analyse many types of data for which the methods above are inappropriate.

**Mixed models of parasite infection**

**Mixed models** are a group of models designed to analyse observations structured into groups. These models are defined by fixed effects, which are common to any group of observations one could make, and random effects, which are specific to a particular group of observations (Box 1). These random effects are coefficients drawn from a random distribution, generally a normal distribution [8]. Parameter estimation in these models involves fitting coefficients for the fixed terms and for the variance component describing the distribution of the random effects. Mixed models can therefore be usefully applied to some types of parasitological data and can help to overcome problems of pseudoreplication. Where groups of observations are made, either on a single individual through time or on a group of samples from the same site, random effects are assigned to each group of observations. In the simplest case, a single random term is used to describe consistent deviations between groups of observations, for example due to innate differences between the susceptibility of individuals in a longitudinal study or innate differences in rates of exposure at different sampling sites. Fitting such deviations between groups of observations as random effects has the advantage that relatively few parameters are required to describe the variance of the distribution from which the random effects are drawn, which loses relatively few degrees of freedom from the model regardless of the number of different groups of observations in the analysis. More-complex formulations are also possible, with more than one random effect assigned to each group of observations or to have random effects interacting with each other or be nested within each other.

The final part of a mixed model is the error term, which defines the deviation of the response variable from that predicted by either the fixed or random effects. In the simplest case, the error term associated with each observation is simply drawn from a normal distribution implying that the correlations present within the data are accounted for by the inclusion of random effects. However, spatial and temporal data can also generate autocorrelations between observations within groups, for example where one observation depends on the last, or observations exhibit correlations that depend on their temporal or spatial proximity. Given a group of observations, and where the errors within groups are correlated to each other, these error terms can be drawn from a multivariate normal distribution, with covariances that specify the correlation between the errors associated with pairs of observations. Some common forms of error structure include: equicorrelated errors, where the measures within a group are correlated equally to each other; autoregressive errors in longitudinal data, where an error term associated with an observation may be correlated to that of the previous observation; and Markov errors, where the correlations between errors show a geometric decrease with time or space (Box 1).

Another use of the random terms in mixed models, which is of particular use in field data, is to ‘clean up’ noisy data. Field data tends to have a large amount of random noise associated with it, which can cloud the true effects of fixed model terms. In the example of a study that uses a large number of sites with multiple samples taken from each site, fitting random effects for the sampling sites controls for pseudoreplication within these sites and, in doing so, cleans up the noise associated with variation between these sites and allows the significance of factors such as geographic location, climate, and so on, to be tested within the fixed component of the model [12]. Similarly, in a long-term study, the year of sampling could cause variation over and above known seasonal effects, accounted for in the fixed model. Moreover, including these terms as random effects, rather than as fixed effects, uses only a single degree of freedom. In our field example, if we had 20 years, fitting the year in the fixed model might have accounted for the variation but would have used 19 degrees of freedom instead of one; thus, accounting for
random variance in this manner provides the model with more explanatory power [6].

A common feature of parasitological data is that they seldom exhibit a normal distribution (e.g. proportion data from parasitaemia measures in malaria or aggregated distributions of helminths between hosts) [13,14]. A common method to deal with such data is provided by generalized linear models (GLMs), which are extensions of standard linear models and which can accommodate various non-normal error distributions (reviewed in Ref. [1]). However, GLMs assume that the data are independent and so, as discussed previously, are not suitable for all types of parasitological data. Box 1 shows how non-normal distributions can be handled in mixed models using generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs), which are analogous to GLMs but incorporate random terms [15,16]. GLMMs therefore provide a powerful method to analyse parasitological data that do not conform to a normal distribution and, at the same time, controls for correlations between measures that arise from grouped observations. For example, Diggle et al. [12] have recently used this approach to model the prevalence of malaria in children sampled from 65 villages in the Gambia. They found a large amount of variation between villages, which they were able to control for before testing the significance of various fixed effects. This confirmed the importance of age and bednet use for malaria prevalence within villages but did not indicate support for satellite-based measures, such as the greenness of surrounding vegetation, to predict malaria prevalence between villages. Further analysis of the error component of the model showed that variation in prevalence between

Box 1. A pocket guide to mixed models

### Linear models (LMs) versus linear mixed models (LMMs)

Consider a linear model having a regression equation:

$$y_i = X_i \beta + b_i + e_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn I)

where $y_i$ is an observation (i.e. the response variable) on the $i$th of $n$ individual hosts, $X_i$ is a row vector of $q$ explanatory variables, $\beta$ is a column vector of $q$ coefficients and $e_i$ is the error component associated with the $i$th individual. A mixed model is a straightforward extension of a linear model to include random terms associated with groups of observation [8]. For example, if $p_i$ observations are made on the $i$th individual host to give a vector of observations $y_i = (y_{i1}, ..., y_{ip_i})^T$, a linear mixed model has the regression equation:

$$y_i = X_i \beta + Z_i b_i + e_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn II)

where the fixed component is defined by $X_i[p_i \times q]$, which is a matrix of $q$ explanatory variables for each observation and $\beta$, which is a column vector of $q$ fitted coefficients for these explanatory variables as before. The random component of the model is defined by $Z_i[p_i \times r]$ which is a matrix of $r$ explanatory variables for each observation and $b_i$, which is a column vector of $r$ coefficients for these explanatory variables specific to each group of observations. $b_i$ has a multivariate normal distribution, $b_i \sim N_p(0, B)$, where $B(r \times r)$ is the covariance matrix of $b_i$ over the population of $n$ individuals. In the simplest case, only the mean value of each explanatory variable is assumed to vary as a random effect with variance $\sigma^2_b$ over the population of individual hosts, $b_i \sim N_p(0, \sigma^2_b)$. In more complex cases, $b_i$ can be constructed to be dependent on time or other variables.

$e_i[p_i \times 1]$ denotes the errors remaining after fitting the fixed and random components to the model. In the simplest case, these will be distributed according to a normal distribution with variance $\sigma_e^2$, $e_i \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$. However, other error structures are also possible. In particular, errors might be autocorrelated through time, such that an observation at time $t_i$ is correlated to the observation at time $t_j$. The most obvious treatment is to give the errors a Markov correlation structure, $e_i \sim N_p(0, E)$, which decreases geometrically through time such that $E_{ij} = \sigma_e^2 p^{j-i}$, with $0 \leq p \leq 1$. (Eqn III)

The correlations $p^{j-i}$ clearly decrease (geometrically) as the separation $|t_i - t_j|$ increases. The major hurdle to using mixed models is the difficulty in parameter estimation. Reformulating Eqsns I and II illustrates the problem. A linear model can be given by:

$$y_i \sim N(x_i \beta, \sigma_e^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn IV)

where $\sigma_e^2$ is the variance of $y_i$ around the fixed component. A mixed model is given by:

$$y_i \sim N(x_i \beta, B \lambda)$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn V)

$$V_i = Z_i B \lambda + E_i$$

where $V_i$ is the covariance matrix of $y_i$ around the fixed component. Thus, estimation of $\lambda$ in Eqn IV is a straightforward estimation of a single parameter. However, estimation of $V_i$, in Eqn V can involve simultaneous estimation of many parameters in both $B$ and $E_i$. Elegant, analytical methods to estimate these parameters are not always available and so brute force, computer-intensive methods such as restricted maximum likelihood (REML), simplex algorithms and Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) are often used instead [15,34,35].

### Generalized linear models (GLMs) versus generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs)

GLMs are used to model data that are not necessarily normally distributed and take the general form:

$$E[y_i] = \mu_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn VI)

$$g(\mu_i) = x_i \beta$$

where $g(.)$ is a link function used to relate a vector of explanatory variables, $X_i$, associated with observation $y_i$ to the expected value of $y_i$, $\mu_i$. Random effects can be added to GLMs to give the analogous mixed models, GLMMs [15,16]:

$$E[y_i|b_i] = \mu_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn VII)

$$g(\mu_i) = x_i \beta + z_i b$$

### Mixed models of aggregation

Its worth noting the properties of a mixed model with Poisson-distributed errors. Here, the standard GLM has the properties [36]:

$$E[y_i] = \mu_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn VIII)

$$\text{var}(y_i) = E(\mu_i)$$

Note that the variance is equal to the mean. The analogous GLMM has the properties [15]:

$$E[y_i|b_i] = \mu_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn IX)

$$\text{var}(y_i) = E(\mu_i) + \text{var}(\mu_i)$$

In this case the variance is greater than the mean, a characteristic of aggregated parasite distributions. Note that as the variation between hosts in $\mu_i$ increases so too does the level of aggregation. Where the $\mu_i$ are distributed according to a gamma distribution with mean $\mu = E(\mu_i)$ and index $k$, the $y_i$ will be distributed according to a negative binomial distribution [36] with:

$$\text{var}(y_i) = \mu_i + \mu_i^2/k$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eqn X)

where $k$ is the overdispersion parameter and is inversely related to the degree of aggregation [1].
can be described by a stochastic, POISSON PROCESS, the hosts pick up infections at the same rate, and if infection analysing the rate at which parasites infect hosts. If all sites. One can model the causes of this aggregation by considering a population of hosts infected with macroparasites and showing an aggregated distribution of parasite characteristic aggregated distribution [13,17–20]. Epidemiological patterns of aggregation in field studies. For example, villages was spatially structured, possibly owing to some, as-yet unidentified, environmental variable. As this example shows, the flexibility of GLMMs allows several hypotheses to be tested within one class of analysis.

Learning from your errors
It would be wrong to think that the only reason for using a mixed model is to overcome the nuisance of pseudoreplication. It is true that including an extra error term in the model allows unbiased estimates of the magnitude and significance of the fixed effects to be made. However, the random and error terms (i.e. the variation between repeated measures or between individuals) are intrinsically interesting themselves. An important application is in macroparasite infections, which often show a characteristic aggregated distribution [2,13,18,23]; for example, if infection rate is proportional to parasite fecundity or larval survival [18]. Since mixed models allow the variation between hosts to be modelled explicitly, the relative contribution of different factors to this variation can also be tested. For example, Elston et al. [25] used this approach to model the factors affecting the aggregation of ticks (Ixodes ricinus) in red grouse chicks (Lagopus lagopus scoticus). Using a GLMM with Poisson errors [15], they analysed the variation in tick infection intensity between individuals and between broods, and found that more than a half of the variation between randomly selected individuals could be explained using random terms corresponding to temporal (year) and spatial (altitude and location) effects.

Another area where the variation between hosts is of particular interest is in animal breeding. Here, one wishes to know how much of the variation between hosts is due to genetic effects (e.g. variation in resistance) and environmental effects (e.g. variation in exposure) [26]. Relatives, which share some proportion of their genes, will be correlated with each other for a particular trait, such as parasite resistance. Incorporating different error terms allows variation between hosts in their parasite burden to be partitioned into genetic and environmental components of variation [27]. For example, this approach has been used to analyse Teladorsagia circumcincta infection in lambs and shows that host genetics appears to have little detectable effect on the number of nematodes in the gut but a very strong effect on the size and fecundity of these worms [28–30]. In related work, these analyses also show a strong effect of host genetics on immunological measures associated with reduced worm length and fecundity, such as eosinophilia and IgA [31,32]. This approach highlights the potential for mixed models as a tool to quantify the genetic basis of different immunological pathways underlying resistance to parasite infection and to understand the linkages between these pathways.

Applying mixed models
It is crucial that the high quality of data generated by modern parasitological research is coupled with appropriate statistical analysis. Unfortunately, this is often not the case and statistical methods are used that either do not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Mixed model methods</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>SAS Institute Inc. (Cary, NC) <a href="http://www.sas.com">http://www.sas.com</a></td>
<td>Nested ANOVA, LMM, GLMM</td>
<td>Widely used statistics package with plenty of support and add-in modules</td>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-plus</td>
<td>Insightful Inc. (Seattle, WA) <a href="http://www.insightful.com">http://www.insightful.com</a></td>
<td>Nested ANOVA, LMM, GLMM</td>
<td>Widely used statistics package with plenty of support and add-in modules; powerful object-orientated programming</td>
<td>Expensive, fitting of GLMMs is often slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenStat</td>
<td>VSN International Ltd (Oxford, UK) <a href="http://www.vsn-intl.com/genstat/">http://www.vsn-intl.com/genstat/</a></td>
<td>Nested ANOVA, LMM, GLMM</td>
<td>Widely used statistics package with plenty of support and add-in modules; fast and robust fitting of GLMMs</td>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td><a href="http://www.r-project.org/">http://www.r-project.org/</a></td>
<td>Nested ANOVA, LMM, GLMM</td>
<td>Free, uses most of the functions in S-plus</td>
<td>Command-driven and difficult to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stata</td>
<td><a href="http://www">http://www</a> stata.com</td>
<td>Nested ANOVA, LMM, GLMM</td>
<td>Relatively cheap and easy to use</td>
<td>No GLMM methods as yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUGS</td>
<td>MRC Biostatistics Unit (Cambridge, UK) <a href="http://www.mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk/bugs/">http://www.mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk/bugs/</a></td>
<td>Nested ANOVA, LMM, GLMM</td>
<td>Free, graphical construction of models; virtually unlimited model specification allowed</td>
<td>Very difficult to compare models and select a minimal model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: ANOVA, analysis of variance; GLMM, generalized linear mixed model; LMM, linear mixed model.*
make full use of available data or that are inappropriate. A
literature survey of papers over a 12-month period in the
International Journal of Parasitology (October 2001 to
September 2002) shows the degree to which (in our view)
the appropriate statistics were used: 10% of all papers
published presented no statistics at all but in our view
should have done so; 4% of papers used GLMs but a further
25% would have benefited from their use; 2% of papers
used mixed models and a further 12% would have
benefited from their use. (We note that these findings
are finding their way into widely available computer
models might vary according to the precise procedures
estimation of a large number of variables in complex
model, should not be required for most applications.

such as how the computer derives the parameters of this
Box 1, is probably unavoidable, but more complex topics,
consider carefully whether the statistical techniques that
they use make the best of their data.

How easy is it then for a parasitologist to apply mixed
models to their data? Three points are relevant to
answering this question. First, you need to know what
are you modelling before you can think about how to model
it [6]. In this, there is no substitute for a good biological
knowledge of the system being modelled. For example,
what are the factors within the host or the external
environment that are likely to influence the observed
patterns of parasite abundance or prevalence? From these
questions, defined hypotheses can be made and an
appropriate statistical model constructed to test these
hypotheses. Second, understanding how to apply a mixed
model requires an understanding of its structure and how
it relates to the hypothesis being tested. Spending the
effort to understand the basic algebra, such as outlined in
Box 1, is probably unavoidable, but more complex topics,
such as how the computer derives the parameters of this
model, should not be required for most applications.
However, one does need to be aware that parameter
estimation of a large number of variables in complex
models might vary according to the precise procedures
used by different computer packages. Third, mixed models
are finding their way into widely available computer
packages (Table 1), making them more accessible to
labatory and field parasitologists and less a preserve of
the dedicated statistician.

Given these points, applying mixed models remains
challenging but is now an achievable task for a scientist
trained in biology rather than one trained in statistics.
Hopefully, the application of mixed models will continue to
become easier as more biologists become familiar with
their use and as computer packages become more user
friendly.

Parasitologists have a good record in being among the
first to use new techniques in genetics, immunology and
biochemistry to help to explore the interaction between
hosts and parasites. Techniques in statistics, such as
mixed models, should be seen in this light and it is hoped
that they will bring significant advances in understanding
a wide range of micro- and macroparasite infections.
Mixed models offer a particularly promising method of
understanding the causes and consequences of variability
between hosts in their susceptibility or exposure to
infection. New statistical techniques that help to under-
stand these processes of parasite infection should form an
integral part of our attempts to understand and control the
diseases that parasites cause.
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### Books on all types of parasites

#### Diseases and Disorders of Finfish in Cage Culture
£85.00 (hbk) (384 pages) ISBN 0 85199 443 1

This is an authoritative book covering infectious and non-infectious diseases and disorder of finfish in cage culture.

#### Plant Resistance to Parasitic Nematodes
Edited by J.L. Starr, R. Cook and J. Bridge, CABI Publishing, 2002
£49.95 (hbk) (288 pages) ISBN 0 85199 466 0

A timely book examining the important topic of host plant resistance to nematodes.

#### The Parasites of Homo sapiens
US$80.00 (hbk) (136 pages) ISBN 0 41527 688 8

This comprehensive book lists all the animals that are parasitic in or on the human body.