

expoisson — Exact Poisson regression
[Syntax](#)[Remarks and examples](#)[Also see](#)[Menu](#)[Stored results](#)[Description](#)[Methods and formulas](#)[Options](#)[References](#)

Syntax

```
expoisson devar indepvars [if] [in] [weight] [, options]
```

options

Description

Model

condvars(*varlist*)condition on variables in *varlist*group(*varname*)groups/strata are stratified by unique values of *varname*exposure(*varname_e*)include $\ln(\text{varname}_e)$ in model with coefficient constrained to 1offset(*varname_o*)include *varname_o* in model with coefficient constrained to 1

Options

memory(#[*b*|*k*|*m*|*g*])set limit on memory usage; default is `memory(25m)`saving(*filename*)save the joint conditional distribution to *filename*

Reporting

level(#)set confidence level; default is `level(95)`irr

report incidence-rate ratios

test(*testopt*)

report significance of observed sufficient statistic, conditional scores test, or conditional probabilities test

mue(*varlist*)compute the median unbiased estimates for *varlist*midpuse the mid-*p*-value rulenolog

do not display the enumeration log

by, *statsby*, and *xi* are allowed; see [\[U\] 11.1.10 Prefix commands](#).

fweights are allowed; see [\[U\] 11.1.6 weight](#).

See [\[U\] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands](#) for more capabilities of estimation commands.

Menu

Statistics > Exact statistics > Exact Poisson regression

Description

`expoisson` fits an exact Poisson regression model of *devar* on *indepvars*. Exact Poisson regression is an alternative to standard maximum-likelihood-based Poisson regression (see [\[R\] poisson](#)) that offers more accurate inference in small samples because it does not depend on asymptotic results. For stratified data, `expoisson` is an alternative to fixed-effects Poisson regression (see `xtpoisson`, `fe` in [\[XT\] xtpoisson](#)); like fixed-effects Poisson regression, exact Poisson regression conditions on the number of events in each stratum.

Exact Poisson regression is computationally intensive, so if you have regressors whose parameter estimates are not of interest (that is, nuisance parameters), you should specify those variables in the `condvars()` option instead of in `indepvars`.

Options

Model

`condvars(varlist)` specifies variables whose parameter estimates are not of interest to you. You can save substantial computer time and memory by moving such variables from `indepvars` to `condvars()`. Understand that you will get the same results for `x1` and `x3` whether you type

```
. expoission y x1 x2 x3 x4
```

or

```
. expoission y x1 x3, condvars(x2 x4)
```

`group(varname)` specifies the variable defining the strata, if any. A constant term is assumed for each stratum identified in `varname`, and the sufficient statistics for `indepvars` are conditioned on the observed number of successes within each group (as well as other variables in the model). The group variable must be integer valued.

`exposure(varnamee)`, `offset(varnameo)`; see [\[R\] estimation options](#).

Options

`memory(#[b|k|m|g])` sets a limit on the amount of memory `expoission` can use when computing the conditional distribution of the parameter sufficient statistics. The default is `memory(25m)`, where `m` stands for megabyte, or 1,048,576 bytes. The following are also available: `b` stands for byte; `k` stands for kilobyte, which is equal to 1,024 bytes; and `g` stands for gigabyte, which is equal to 1,024 megabytes. The minimum setting allowed is `1m` and the maximum is `2048m` or `2g`, but do not attempt to use more memory than is available on your computer. Also see the first [technical note](#) under example 3 on counting the conditional distribution.

`saving(filename [, replace])` saves the joint conditional distribution for each independent variable specified in `indepvars`. There is one file for each variable, and it is named using the prefix `filename` with the variable name appended. For example, `saving(mydata)` with an independent variable named `X` would generate a data file named `mydata_X.dta`. Use `replace` to replace an existing file. Each file contains the conditional distribution for one of the independent variables specified in `indepvars` conditioned on all other `indepvars` and those variables specified in `condvars()`. There are two variables in each data file: the feasible sufficient statistics for the variable's parameter and their associated weights. The weights variable is named `_w_`.

Reporting

`level(#)`; see [\[R\] estimation options](#). The `level(#)` option will not work on replay because confidence intervals are based on estimator-specific enumerations. To change the confidence level, you must refit the model.

`irr` reports estimated coefficients transformed to incidence-rate ratios, that is, $\exp(\beta)$ rather than β . Standard errors and confidence intervals are similarly transformed. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated or stored. `irr` may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.

`test(sufficient|score|probability)` reports the significance level of the observed sufficient statistic, the conditional scores test, or the conditional probabilities test. The default is `test(sufficient)`. All the statistics are computed at estimation time, and each statistic may be displayed postestimation; see [\[R\] expoission postestimation](#).

`mue(varlist)` specifies that median unbiased estimates (MUEs) be reported for the variables in *varlist*.

By default, the conditional maximum likelihood estimates (CMLEs) are reported, except for those parameters for which the CMLEs are infinite. Specify `mue(_all)` if you want MUEs for all the *indepvars*.

`midp` instructs `exppoisson` to use the mid-*p*-value rule when computing the MUEs, significance levels, and confidence intervals. This adjustment is for the discreteness of the distribution by halving the value of the discrete probability of the observed statistic before adding it to the *p*-value. The mid-*p*-value rule cannot be MUEs whose corresponding parameter CMLE is infinite.

`nolog` prevents the display of the enumeration log. By default, the enumeration log is displayed, showing the progress of computing the conditional distribution of the sufficient statistics.

Remarks and examples

[stata.com](http://www.stata.com)

Exact Poisson regression estimates the model parameters by using the conditional distributions of the parameters' sufficient statistics, and the resulting parameter estimates are known as CMLEs. Exact Poisson regression is a small-sample alternative to the maximum-likelihood ML Poisson model. See [R] [poisson](#) and [XT] [xtpoisson](#) to obtain maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs) for the Poisson model and the fixed-effects Poisson model.

Let Y_i denote a Poisson random variable where we observe the outcome $Y_i = y_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Associated with each independent observation is a $1 \times p$ vector of covariates, \mathbf{x}_i . We will denote $\mu_i = E[Y_i | \mathbf{x}_i]$ and use the log linear model to model the relationship between Y_i and \mathbf{x}_i ,

$$\log(\mu_i) = \theta + \mathbf{x}_i\beta$$

where the constant term, θ , and the $p \times 1$ vector of regression parameters, β , are unknown. The probability of observing $Y_i = y_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is

$$\Pr(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu_i^{y_i} e^{-\mu_i}}{y_i!}$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. The MLEs for θ and β maximize the log of this function.

The sufficient statistics for θ and β_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$, are $M = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ and $T_j = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i x_{ij}$, respectively, and we observe $M = m$ and $T_j = t_j$. `exppoisson` tallies the conditional distribution for each T_j , given the other sufficient statistics $T_l = t_l$, $l \neq j$ and $M = m$. Denote one of these values to be $t_j^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, with weight w_k that accounts for all the generated \mathbf{Y} vectors that give rise to $t_j^{(k)}$. The conditional probability of observing $T_j = t_j$ has the form

$$\Pr(T_j = t_j \mid T_l = t_l, l \neq j, M = m) = \frac{w e^{t_j \beta_j}}{\sum_k w_k e^{t_j^{(k)} \beta_j}} \tag{1}$$

where the sum is over the subset of \mathbf{T} vectors such that $(T_1^{(k)} = t_1, \dots, T_j^{(k)} = t_j^{(k)}, \dots, T_p^{(k)} = t_p)$ and w is the weight associated with the observed \mathbf{t} . The CMLE for β_j maximizes the log of this function.

Specifying nuisance variables in `condvars()` prevents `exppoisson` from estimating their associated regression coefficients. These variables are still conditional variables when tallying the conditional distribution for the variables in *indepvars*.

Inferences from MLEs rely on asymptotics, and if your sample size is small, these inferences may not be valid. On the other hand, inferences from the CMLEs are exact in that they use the conditional distribution of the sufficient statistics outlined above.

For small datasets, the dependent variable can be completely determined by the data. Here the MLEs and the CMLEs are unbounded. When this occurs, `expoisson` will compute the MUE, the regression estimate that places the observed sufficient statistic at the median of the conditional distribution.

See [R] [xlogistic](#) for a more thorough discussion of exact estimation and related statistics.

▷ Example 1

[Armitage, Berry, and Matthews \(2002, 499–501\)](#) fit a log-linear model to data containing the number of cerebrovascular accidents experienced by 41 men during a fixed period, each of whom had recovered from a previous cerebrovascular accident and was hypertensive. Sixteen men received treatment, and in the original data, there are three age groups (40–49, 50–59, ≥ 60), but we pool the first two age groups to simplify the example. [Armitage, Berry, and Matthews](#) point out that this was not a controlled trial, but the data are useful to inquire whether there is evidence of fewer accidents for the treatment group and if age may be an important factor. The dependent variable `count` contains the number of accidents, variable `treat` is an indicator for the treatment group (1 = treatment, 0 = control), and variable `age` is an indicator for the age group (0 = 40–59; 1 = ≥ 60).

First, we load the data, list it, and tabulate the cerebrovascular accident counts by treatment and age group.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r13/cerebacc
(cerebrovascular accidents in hypotensive-treated and control groups)
. list
```

	treat	count	age
1.	control	0	40/59
2.	control	0	>=60
3.	control	1	40/59
4.	control	1	>=60
5.	control	2	40/59
(output omitted)			
35.	treatment	0	40/59
36.	treatment	0	40/59
37.	treatment	0	40/59
38.	treatment	0	40/59
39.	treatment	1	40/59
40.	treatment	1	40/59
41.	treatment	1	40/59

```
. tabulate treat age [fw=count]
```

hypotensive drug treatment	age group		Total
	40/59	>=60	
control	15	10	25
treatment	4	0	4
Total	19	10	29

Next we estimate the CMLE with `expoisson` and, for comparison, the MLE with `poisson`.

```
. expoisson count treat age
Estimating: treat
Enumerating sample-space combinations:
observation 1: enumerations = 11
observation 2: enumerations = 11
observation 3: enumerations = 11
(output omitted)
observation 39: enumerations = 410
observation 40: enumerations = 410
observation 41: enumerations = 30
Estimating: age
Enumerating sample-space combinations:
observation 1: enumerations = 5
observation 2: enumerations = 15
observation 3: enumerations = 15
(output omitted)
observation 39: enumerations = 455
observation 40: enumerations = 455
observation 41: enumerations = 30
Exact Poisson regression
```

Number of obs = 41

count	Coef.	Suff.	2*Pr(Suff.)	[95% Conf. Interval]	
treat	-1.594306	4	0.0026	-3.005089	-.4701708
age	-.5112067	10	0.2794	-1.416179	.3429232

```
. poisson count treat age, nolog
Poisson regression
Log likelihood = -38.97981
Number of obs = 41
LR chi2(2) = 10.64
Prob > chi2 = 0.0049
Pseudo R2 = 0.1201
```

count	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
treat	-1.594306	.5573614	-2.86	0.004	-2.686714	-.5018975
age	-.5112067	.4043525	-1.26	0.206	-1.303723	.2813096
_cons	.233344	.2556594	0.91	0.361	-.2677391	.7344271

`expoisson` generates an enumeration log for each independent variable in *indepvars*. The conditional distribution of the parameter sufficient statistic is tallied for each independent variable. The conditional distribution for `treat`, for example, has 30 records containing the weights, w_k , and feasible sufficient statistics, $t_{\text{treat}}^{(k)}$. In essence, the set of points $(w_k, t_{\text{treat}}^{(k)})$, $k = 1, \dots, 30$, tallied by `expoisson` now become the data to estimate the regression coefficient for `treat`, using (1) as the likelihood. Remember that one of the 30 $(w_k, t_{\text{treat}}^{(k)})$ must contain the observed sufficient statistic, $t_{\text{treat}} = \sum_{i=1}^{41} \text{treat}_i \times \text{count}_i = 4$, and its relative position in the sorted set of points (sorted by $t_{\text{treat}}^{(k)}$) is how the sufficient-statistic significance is computed. This algorithm is repeated for the `age` variable.

The regression coefficients for `treat` and `age` are numerically identical for both Poisson models. Both models indicate that the treatment is significant at reducing the rate of cerebrovascular accidents, $\approx e^{-1.59} \approx 0.204$, or a reduction of about 80%. There is no significant age effect.

The p -value for the treatment regression-coefficient sufficient statistic indicates that the treatment effect is a bit more significant than for the corresponding asymptotic Z statistic from `poisson`. However, the exact confidence intervals are wider than their asymptotic counterparts.

◀

▷ Example 2

Agresti (2013, 129) used the data from Laird and Olivier (1981) to demonstrate the Poisson model for modeling rates. The data consist of patient survival after heart valve replacement operations. The sample consists of 109 patients that are classified by type of heart valve (aortic, mitral) and by age (<55 , ≥ 55). Follow-up observations cover lengths from 3 to 97 months, and the time at risk, or exposure, is stored in the variable `TAR`. The response is whether the subject died. First, we take a look at the data and then estimate the incidence rates (IRs) with `expoisson` and `poisson`.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r13/heartvalve
(heart valve replacement data)
. list
```

	age	valve	deaths	TAR
1.	< 55	aortic	4	1259
2.	< 55	mitral	1	2082
3.	≥ 55	aortic	7	1417
4.	≥ 55	mitral	9	1647

The `age` variable is coded 0 for age <55 and 1 for age ≥ 55 , and the `valve` variable is coded 0 for the aortic valve and 1 for the mitral valve. The total number of deaths, $M = 21$, is small enough that enumerating the conditional distributions for age and valve type is feasible and asymptotic inferences associated with standard ML Poisson regression may be questionable.

```
. expoisson deaths age valve, exposure(TAR) irr
```

```
Estimating: age
Enumerating sample-space combinations:
observation 1: enumerations = 11
observation 2: enumerations = 11
observation 3: enumerations = 132
observation 4: enumerations = 22

Estimating: valve
Enumerating sample-space combinations:
observation 1: enumerations = 17
observation 2: enumerations = 17
observation 3: enumerations = 102
observation 4: enumerations = 22
```

```
Exact Poisson regression
```

Number of obs = 4

deaths	IRR	Suff.	2*Pr(Suff.)	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	3.390401	16	0.0194	1.182297	11.86935
valve	.7190197	10	0.5889	.2729881	1.870068
ln(TAR)	1	(exposure)			

```
. poisson deaths age valve, exposure(TAR) irr nolog
Poisson regression                Number of obs   =           4
                                LR chi2(2)       =           7.62
                                Prob > chi2      =           0.0222
Log likelihood = -8.1747285       Pseudo R2    =           0.3178
```

deaths	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	3.390401	1.741967	2.38	0.017	1.238537	9.280965
valve	.7190197	.3150492	-0.75	0.452	.3046311	1.6971
_cons	.0018142	.0009191	-12.46	0.000	.0006722	.0048968
ln(TAR)	1	(exposure)				

The CMLE and the MLE are numerically identical. The death rate for the older age group is about 3.4 times higher than the younger age group, and this difference is significant at the 5% level. This means that for every death in the younger group each month, we would expect about three deaths in the older group. The IR estimate for valve type is approximately 0.72, but it is not significantly different from one. The exact Poisson confidence intervals are a bit wider than the asymptotic CIs.

You can use `ir` (see [ST] [epitab](#)) to estimate IRs and exact CIs for one covariate, and we compare these CIs with those from `expoisson`, where we estimate the incidence rate by using age only.

```
. ir deaths age TAR
```

	age of patient		Total
	Exposed	Unexposed	
number of deaths	16	5	21
time at risk	3064	3341	6405
Incidence rate	.0052219	.0014966	.0032787
	Point estimate		[95% Conf. Interval]
Inc. rate diff.	.0037254		.00085 .0066007
Inc. rate ratio	3.489295		1.221441 12.17875 (exact)
Attr. frac. ex.	.7134092		.1812948 .9178898 (exact)
Attr. frac. pop	.5435498		
	(midp) Pr(k>=16) =		0.0049 (exact)
	(midp) 2*Pr(k>=16) =		0.0099 (exact)

```
. expoission deaths age, exposure(TAR) irr midp nolog
```

```
Exact Poisson regression
```

deaths	IRR	Suff.	2*Pr(Suff.)	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	3.489295	16	0.0099	1.324926	10.64922
ln(TAR)	1	(exposure)			

mid-p-value computed for the probabilities and CIs

Both `ir` and `expoission` give identical IRs and p -values. Both report the two-sided exact significance by using the mid- p -value rule that accounts for the discreteness in the distribution by subtracting $p_{1/2} = \Pr(T = t)/2$ from $p_l = \Pr(T \leq t)$ and $p_g = \Pr(T \geq t)$, computing $2 \times \min(p_l - p_{1/2}, p_g - p_{1/2})$. By default, `expoission` will not use the mid- p -value rule (when you exclude the `midp` option), and here the two-sided exact significance would be $2 \times \min(p_l, p_g) = 0.0158$. The confidence intervals differ because `expoission` uses the mid- p -value rule when computing the confidence intervals, yet

`ir` does not. You can verify this by executing `expoisson` without the `midp` option for this example; you will get the same CIs as `ir`.

You can replay `expoisson` to view the conditional scores test or the conditional probabilities test by using the `test()` option.

```
. expoissn, test(score) irr
Exact Poisson regression
```

Number of obs = 4					
deaths	IRR	Score	Pr>=Score	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	3.489295	6.76528	0.0113	1.324926	10.64922
ln(TAR)	1	(exposure)			

mid-p-value computed for the probabilities and CIs

All the statistics for `expoisson` are defined in *Methods and formulas* of [R] `exlogistic`. Apart from enumerating the conditional distributions for the logistic and Poisson sufficient statistics, computationally, the primary difference between `exlogistic` and `expoisson` is the weighting values in the likelihood for the parameter sufficient statistics. ↵

▷ Example 3

In this example, we fabricate data that will demonstrate the difference between the CMLE and the MUE when the CMLE is not infinite. A difference in these estimates will be more pronounced when the probability of the coefficient sufficient statistic is skewed when plotted as a function of the regression coefficient.

```
. clear
. input y x
      y      x
1. 0 2
2. 1 1
3. 1 0
4. 0 0
5. 0 .5
6. 1 .5
7. 2 .01
8. 3 .001
9. 4 .0001
10. end

. expoissn y x, test(score)
Enumerating sample-space combinations:
observation 1: enumerations = 13
observation 2: enumerations = 91
observation 3: enumerations = 169
observation 4: enumerations = 169
observation 5: enumerations = 313
observation 6: enumerations = 313
observation 7: enumerations = 1469
observation 8: enumerations = 5525
observation 9: enumerations = 5479

Exact Poisson regression
```

Number of obs = 9					
y	Coef.	Score	Pr>=Score	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x	-1.534468	2.955316	0.0810	-3.761718	.0485548


```
. expoissn y x, test(score) mue(x) nolog
```

Exact Poisson regression


Number of obs = 9

y	Coef.	Score	Pr>=Score	[95% Conf. Interval]
x	-1.309268*	2.955316	0.0810	-3.761718 .0485548

(*) median unbiased estimates (MUE)

We observe (x_i, y_i) , $i = 1, \dots, 9$. If we condition on $m = \sum_{i=1}^9 y_i = 12$, the conditional distribution of $T_x = \sum_i Y_i x_i$ has a size of 5,479 elements. For each entry in this enumeration, a realization of $Y_i = y_i^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, 5,479$, is generated such that $\sum_i y_i^{(k)} = 12$. One of these realizations produces the observed $t_x = \sum_i y_i x_i \approx 1.5234$.

Below is a graphical display comparing the CMLE with the MUE. We plot $\Pr(T_x = t_x \mid M = 12, \beta_x)$ versus β_x , $-6 \leq \beta_x \leq 1$, in the upper panel and the cumulative probabilities, $\Pr(T_x \leq t_x \mid M = 12, \beta_x)$ and $\Pr(T_x \geq t_x \mid M = 12, \beta_x)$, in the lower panel.



The location of the CMLE, indicated by the dashed line, is at the mode of the probability profile, and the MUE, indicated by the dotted line, is to the right of the mode. If we solve for the $\beta_x^{(u)}$ and $\beta_x^{(l)}$ such that $\Pr(T_x \leq t_x \mid M = 12, \beta_x^{(u)}) = 1/2$ and $\Pr(T_x \geq t_x \mid M = 12, \beta_x^{(l)}) = 1/2$, the MUE is $(\beta_x^{(u)} + \beta_x^{(l)})/2$. As you can see in the lower panel, the MUE cuts through the intersection of these cumulative probability profiles.

□ Technical note

The `memory(#)` option limits the amount of memory that `expoisson` will consume when computing the conditional distribution of the parameter sufficient statistics. `memory()` is independent of the data maximum memory setting (see `set max_memory` in [D] [memory](#)), and it is possible for `expoisson` to exceed the memory limit specified in `set max_memory` without terminating. By default, a log is provided that displays the number of enumerations (the size of the conditional distribution) after processing each observation. Typically, you will see the number of enumerations increase, and then at some point they will decrease as the multivariate shift algorithm (Hirji, Mehta, and Patel 1987) determines that some of the enumerations cannot achieve the observed sufficient statistics of the conditioning variables. When the algorithm is complete, however, it is necessary to store the conditional distribution of the parameter sufficient statistics as a dataset. It is possible, therefore, to get a memory error when the algorithm has completed if there is not enough memory to store the conditional distribution. □

□ Technical note

Computing the conditional distributions and reported statistics requires data sorting and numerical comparisons. If there is at least one single-precision variable specified in the model, `expoisson` will make comparisons with a relative precision of 2^{-5} . Otherwise, a relative precision of 2^{-11} is used. Be careful if you use `recast` to promote a single-precision variable to double precision (see [D] [recast](#)). You might try listing the data in full precision (maybe `%20.15g`; see [D] [format](#)) to make sure that this is really what you want. See [D] [data types](#) for information on precision of numeric storage types. □

Stored results

`expoisson` stores the following in `e()`:

Scalars

<code>e(N)</code>	number of observations
<code>e(k_groups)</code>	number of groups
<code>e(relative_weight)</code>	relative weight for the observed <code>e(sufficient)</code> and <code>e(condvars)</code>
<code>e(sum_y)</code>	sum of <i>devar</i>
<code>e(k_indvars)</code>	number of independent variables
<code>e(k_condvars)</code>	number of conditioning variables
<code>e(midp)</code>	mid- <i>p</i> -value rule indicator
<code>e(eps)</code>	relative difference tolerance

Macros

<code>e(cmd)</code>	<code>expoisson</code>
<code>e(cmdline)</code>	command as typed
<code>e(title)</code>	title in estimation output
<code>e(depvar)</code>	name of dependent variable
<code>e(indvars)</code>	independent variables
<code>e(condvars)</code>	conditional variables
<code>e(groupvar)</code>	group variable
<code>e(exposure)</code>	exposure variable
<code>e(offset)</code>	linear offset variable
<code>e(level)</code>	confidence level
<code>e(wtype)</code>	weight type
<code>e(wexp)</code>	weight expression
<code>e(datasignature)</code>	the checksum
<code>e(datasignaturevars)</code>	variables used in calculation of checksum
<code>e(properties)</code>	<code>b V</code>
<code>e(estat_cmd)</code>	program used to implement <code>estat</code>
<code>e(marginsnotok)</code>	predictions disallowed by <code>margins</code>

Matrices

$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{b})$	coefficient vector
$\mathbf{e}(\text{mue_indicators})$	indicator for elements of $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{b})$ estimated using MUE instead of CMLE
$\mathbf{e}(\text{se})$	$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{b})$ standard errors (CMLEs only)
$\mathbf{e}(\text{ci})$	matrix of $\mathbf{e}(\text{level})$ confidence intervals for $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{b})$
$\mathbf{e}(\text{sum_y_groups})$	sum of $\mathbf{e}(\text{devar})$ for each group
$\mathbf{e}(\text{N_g})$	number of observations in each group
$\mathbf{e}(\text{sufficient})$	sufficient statistics for $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{b})$
$\mathbf{e}(\text{p_sufficient})$	p -value for $\mathbf{e}(\text{sufficient})$
$\mathbf{e}(\text{scoretest})$	conditional scores tests for <i>indevars</i>
$\mathbf{e}(\text{p_scoretest})$	p -values for $\mathbf{e}(\text{scoretest})$
$\mathbf{e}(\text{probttest})$	conditional probability tests for <i>indevars</i>
$\mathbf{e}(\text{p_probttest})$	p -value for $\mathbf{e}(\text{probttest})$

Functions

$\mathbf{e}(\text{sample})$	marks estimation sample
-----------------------------	-------------------------

Methods and formulas

Let $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n\}$ be a set of n independent Poisson random variables. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, we observe $Y_i = y_i \geq 0$, and associated with each observation is the covariate row vector of length p , $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})$. Denote $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^T$ to be the column vector of regression parameters and θ to be the constant. The sufficient statistic for β_j is $T_j = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i x_{ij}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, and for θ is $M = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$. We observe $T_j = t_j$, $t_j = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_{ij}$, and $M = m$, $m = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$. Let κ_i be the exposure for the i th observation. Then the probability of observing $(Y_1 = y_1, Y_2 = y_2, \dots, Y_n = y_n)$ is

$$\Pr(Y_1 = y_1, \dots, Y_n = y_n \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \frac{\exp(m\theta + \mathbf{t}\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\exp\{\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i \exp(\theta + \mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta})\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^{y_i}}{y_i!}$$

where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_p)$, $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T)^T$, and $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n)^T$.

The joint distribution of the sufficient statistics (\mathbf{T}, M) is obtained by summing over all possible sequences $Y_1 \geq 0, \dots, Y_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{t}$ and $M = m$. This probability function is

$$\Pr(T_1 = t_1, \dots, T_p = t_p, M = m \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \frac{\exp(m\theta + \mathbf{t}\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\exp\{\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i \exp(\theta + \mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta})\}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{u}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^{u_i}}{u_i!} \right)$$

where the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{u}}$ is over all nonnegative vectors \mathbf{u} of length n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i = m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{t}$.

Conditional distribution

Without loss of generality, we will restrict our discussion to the conditional distribution of the sufficient statistic for β_1 , T_1 . If we condition on observing $M = m$ and $T_2 = t_2, \dots, T_p = t_p$, the probability function of $(T_1 \mid \beta_1, T_2 = t_2, \dots, T_p = t_p, M = m)$ is

$$\Pr(T_1 = t_1 \mid \beta_1, T_2 = t_2, \dots, T_p = t_p, M = m) = \frac{\left(\sum_{\mathbf{u}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^{u_i}}{u_i!} \right) e^{t_1 \beta_1}}{\sum_{\mathbf{v}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^{v_i}}{v_i!} \right) e^{\beta_1 \sum_i v_i x_{i1}}} \quad (2)$$

where the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{u}}$ is over all nonnegative vectors \mathbf{u} of length n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i = m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{t}$, and the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{v}}$ is over all nonnegative vectors \mathbf{v} of length n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = m$, $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_{i2} = t_2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_{ip} = t_p$. The CMLE for β_1 is the value that maximizes the log of (1). This optimization task is carried out by `ml` (see [R] `ml`), using the conditional distribution of $(T_1 \mid T_2 = t_2, \dots, T_p = t_p, M = m)$ as a dataset. This dataset consists of the feasible values and weights for T_1 ,

$$\left\{ \left(s_1, \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^{v_i}}{v_i!} \right) : \sum_{i=1}^n v_i = m, \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_{i1} = s_1, \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_{i2} = t_2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_{ip} = t_p \right\}$$

Computing the CMLE, MUE, confidence intervals, conditional hypothesis tests, and sufficient statistic p -values is discussed in *Methods and formulas* of [R] `exlogistic`. The only difference between the two techniques is the use of the weights; that is, the weights for exact logistic are the combinatorial coefficients, $c(\mathbf{t}, m)$, in (1) of *Methods and formulas* in [R] `exlogistic`. `expoisson` and `exlogistic` use the same `ml` likelihood evaluator to compute the CMLEs as well as the same ado-programs and Mata functions to compute the MUEs and estimate statistics.

References

- Agresti, A. 2013. *Categorical Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Armitage, P., G. Berry, and J. N. S. Matthews. 2002. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*. 4th ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cox, D. R., and E. J. Snell. 1989. *Analysis of Binary Data*. 2nd ed. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Hirji, K. F., C. R. Mehta, and N. R. Patel. 1987. Computing distributions for exact logistic regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 82: 1110–1117.
- Laird, N. M., and D. Olivier. 1981. Covariance analysis of censored survival data using log-linear analysis techniques. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 76: 231–240.

Also see

- [R] `expoisson postestimation` — Postestimation tools for `expoisson`
- [R] `poisson` — Poisson regression
- [XT] `xtpoisson` — Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models
- [U] **20 Estimation and postestimation commands**