

**poisson postestimation** — Postestimation tools for poisson

Postestimation commands  
 estat  
 Reference

predict  
 Remarks and examples  
 Also see

margins  
 Methods and formulas

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation command is of special interest after `poisson`:

Command	Description
<code>estat gof</code>	goodness-of-fit test

`estat gof` is not appropriate after the `svy` prefix.

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:

Command	Description
<code>contrast</code>	contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates
<code>estat ic</code>	Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC)
<code>estat summarize</code>	summary statistics for the estimation sample
<code>estat vce</code>	variance–covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE)
<code>estat (svy)</code>	postestimation statistics for survey data
<code>estimates</code>	cataloging estimation results
* <code>forecast</code>	dynamic forecasts and simulations
* <code>hausman</code>	Hausman's specification test
<code>lincom</code>	point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients
<code>linktest</code>	link test for model specification
* <code>lrtest</code>	likelihood-ratio test
<code>margins</code>	marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects
<code>marginsplot</code>	graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.)
<code>nlcom</code>	point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations of coefficients
<code>predict</code>	predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures
<code>predictnl</code>	point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions
<code>pwcompare</code>	pairwise comparisons of estimates
<code>suest</code>	seemingly unrelated estimation
<code>test</code>	Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses
<code>testnl</code>	Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses

\* `forecast`, `hausman`, and `lrtest` are not appropriate with `svy` estimation results. `forecast` is also not appropriate with `mi` estimation results.

## predict

### Description for predict

`predict` creates a new variable containing predictions such as numbers of events, incidence rates, probabilities, linear predictions, standard errors, and equation-level scores.

### Menu for predict

Statistics > Postestimation

### Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```

<i>statistic</i>	Description
------------------	-------------

Main

<code>n</code>	number of events; the default
<code>ir</code>	incidence rate
<code>pr(<i>n</i>)</code>	probability $\Pr(y_j = n)$
<code>pr(<i>a</i>,<i>b</i>)</code>	probability $\Pr(a \leq y_j \leq b)$
<code>xb</code>	linear prediction
<code>stdp</code>	standard error of the linear prediction
<code>score</code>	first derivative of the log likelihood with respect to $\mathbf{x}_j\beta$

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type `predict ... if e(sample) ...` if wanted only for the estimation sample.

### Options for predict

Main

`n`, the default, calculates the predicted number of events, which is  $\exp(\mathbf{x}_j\beta)$  if neither `offset()` nor `exposure()` was specified when the model was fit;  $\exp(\mathbf{x}_j\beta + \text{offset}_j)$  if `offset()` was specified; or  $\exp(\mathbf{x}_j\beta) \times \text{exposure}_j$  if `exposure()` was specified.

`ir` calculates the incidence rate  $\exp(\mathbf{x}_j\beta)$ , which is the predicted number of events when exposure is 1. Specifying `ir` is equivalent to specifying `n` when neither `offset()` nor `exposure()` was specified when the model was fit.

`pr(n)` calculates the probability  $\Pr(y_j = n)$ , where *n* is a nonnegative integer that may be specified as a number or a variable.

`pr(a,b)` calculates the probability  $\Pr(a \leq y_j \leq b)$ , where *a* and *b* are nonnegative integers that may be specified as numbers or variables;

*b* missing (*b* ≥ .) means  $+\infty$ ;

`pr(20, .)` calculates  $\Pr(y_j \geq 20)$ ;

`pr(20,b)` calculates  $\Pr(y_j \geq 20)$  in observations for which *b* ≥ . and calculates  $\Pr(20 \leq y_j \leq b)$  elsewhere.

`pr(.,b)` produces a syntax error. A missing value in an observation of the variable  $a$  causes a missing value in that observation for `pr(a,b)`.

`xb` calculates the linear prediction, which is  $\mathbf{x}_j\beta$  if neither `offset()` nor `exposure()` was specified;  $\mathbf{x}_j\beta + \text{offset}_j$  if `offset()` was specified; or  $\mathbf{x}_j\beta + \ln(\text{exposure}_j)$  if `exposure()` was specified; see `nooffset` below.

`stdp` calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.

`score` calculates the equation-level score,  $\partial \ln L / \partial (\mathbf{x}_j\beta)$ .

`nooffset` is relevant only if you specified `offset()` or `exposure()` when you fit the model. It modifies the calculations made by `predict` so that they ignore the offset or exposure variable; the linear prediction is treated as  $\mathbf{x}_j\beta$  rather than as  $\mathbf{x}_j\beta + \text{offset}_j$  or  $\mathbf{x}_j\beta + \ln(\text{exposure}_j)$ . Specifying `predict ... , nooffset` is equivalent to specifying `predict ... , ir`.

## margins

### Description for margins

`margins` estimates margins of response for numbers of events, incidence rates, probabilities, and linear predictions.

### Menu for margins

Statistics > Postestimation

### Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
```

```
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

<i>statistic</i>	Description
<code>n</code>	number of events; the default
<code>ir</code>	incidence rate
<code>pr(n)</code>	probability $\Pr(y_j = n)$
<code>pr(a,b)</code>	probability $\Pr(a \leq y_j \leq b)$
<code>xb</code>	linear prediction
<code>stdp</code>	not allowed with <code>margins</code>
<code>score</code>	not allowed with <code>margins</code>

Statistics not allowed with `margins` are functions of stochastic quantities other than  $e(b)$ .

For the full syntax, see [R] [margins](#).

## estat

### Description for estat

`estat gof` performs a goodness-of-fit test of the model. Both the deviance statistic and the Pearson statistic are reported. If the tests are significant, the Poisson regression model is inappropriate. Then you could try a negative binomial model; see [R] [nbgreg](#).

### Menu for estat

Statistics > Postestimation

### Syntax for estat

```
estat gof
```

### Remarks and examples

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

#### ▶ Example 1

Continuing with [example 2](#) of [R] [poisson](#), we use `estat gof` to determine whether the model fits the data well.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/dollhill13
. poisson deaths smokes i.agecat, exp(pyears) irr
  (output omitted)
. estat gof
      Deviance goodness-of-fit = 12.13237
      Prob > chi2(4)          = 0.0164
      Pearson goodness-of-fit = 11.15533
      Prob > chi2(4)          = 0.0249
```

The deviance goodness-of-fit test tells us that, given the model, we can reject the hypothesis that these data are Poisson distributed at the 1.64% significance level. The Pearson goodness-of-fit test tells us that we can reject the hypothesis at the 2.49% significance level.

So let us now back up and be more careful. We can most easily obtain the incidence-rate ratios within age categories by using `ir`; see [R] [epitab](#):

```
. ir deaths smokes pyears, by(agecat) nohet
```

age category	IRR	[95% Conf. Interval]	M-H Weight
35-44	5.736638	1.463557 49.40468	1.472169 (exact)
45-54	2.138812	1.173714 4.272545	9.624747 (exact)
55-64	1.46824	.9863624 2.264107	23.34176 (exact)
65-74	1.35606	.9081925 2.096412	23.25315 (exact)
75-84	.9047304	.6000757 1.399687	24.31435 (exact)
Crude	1.719823	1.391992 2.14353	(exact)
M-H combined	1.424682	1.154703 1.757784	

We find that the mortality incidence ratios are greatly different within age category, being highest for the youngest categories and actually dropping below 1 for the oldest. (In the last case, we might argue that those who smoke and who have not died by age 75 are self-selected to be particularly robust.)

Seeing this, we will now parameterize the smoking effects separately for each category, although we will begin by constraining the smoking effects on third and fourth age categories to be equivalent:

```
. constraint 1 smokes#3.agecat = smokes#4.agecat
. poisson deaths c.smokes#agecat i.agecat, exposure(pyyears) irr constraints(1)
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -31.95424
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -27.796801
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -27.574177
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -27.572645
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -27.572645
Poisson regression                               Number of obs   =          10
                                                    Wald chi2(8)    =        632.14
Log likelihood = -27.572645                       Prob > chi2     =          0.0000
( 1) [deaths]3.agecat#c.smokes - [deaths]4.agecat#c.smokes = 0
```

deaths	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
agecat#c.smokes						
35-44	5.736637	4.181256	2.40	0.017	1.374811	23.93711
45-54	2.138812	.6520701	2.49	0.013	1.176691	3.887609
55-64	1.412229	.2017485	2.42	0.016	1.067343	1.868557
65-74	1.412229	.2017485	2.42	0.016	1.067343	1.868557
75-84	.9047304	.1855513	-0.49	0.625	.6052658	1.35236
agecat						
45-54	10.5631	8.067701	3.09	0.002	2.364153	47.19623
55-64	47.671	34.37409	5.36	0.000	11.60056	195.8978
65-74	98.22765	70.85012	6.36	0.000	23.89324	403.8244
75-84	199.2099	145.3356	7.26	0.000	47.67693	832.3648
_cons						
ln(pyyears)	.0001064	.0000753	-12.94	0.000	.0000266	.0004256
	1	(exposure)				

```
. estat gof
Deviance goodness-of-fit = .0773491
Prob > chi2(1)          = 0.7809
Pearson goodness-of-fit = .0773885
Prob > chi2(1)          = 0.7809
```

The goodness-of-fit is now small; we are no longer running roughshod over the data. Let us now consider simplifying the model. The point estimate of the incidence-rate ratio for smoking in age category 1 is much larger than that for smoking in age category 2, but the confidence interval for `smokes#1.agecat` is similarly wide. Is the difference real?

```
. test smokes#1.agecat = smokes#2.agecat
( 1) [deaths]1b.agecat#c.smokes - [deaths]2.agecat#c.smokes = 0
      chi2( 1) = 1.56
      Prob > chi2 = 0.2117
```

The point estimates of the incidence-rate ratio for smoking in the 35–44 age category is much larger than that for smoking in the 45–54 age category, but there is insufficient data, and we may be observing random differences. With that success, might we also combine the smokers in the third and fourth categories with those in the first and second categories?

```
. test smokes#2.agecat = smokes#3.agecat, accum
( 1) [deaths]1b.agecat#c.smokes - [deaths]2.agecat#c.smokes = 0
( 2) [deaths]2.agecat#c.smokes - [deaths]3.agecat#c.smokes = 0
      chi2( 2) =      4.73
      Prob > chi2 =    0.0938
```

Combining the first four categories may be overdoing it—the 9.38% significance level is enough to stop us, although others may disagree.

Thus we now fit our final model:

```
. constraint 2 smokes#1.agecat = smokes#2.agecat
. poisson deaths c.smokes#agecat i.agecat, exposure(pyears) irr constraints(1/2)
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -31.550722
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -28.525057
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -28.514535
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -28.514535
Poisson regression              Number of obs   =          10
                                Wald chi2(7)       =        642.25
Log likelihood = -28.514535      Prob > chi2    =         0.0000
( 1) [deaths]3.agecat#c.smokes - [deaths]4.agecat#c.smokes = 0
( 2) [deaths]1b.agecat#c.smokes - [deaths]2.agecat#c.smokes = 0
```

deaths	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
agecat#c.smokes						
35-44	2.636259	.7408403	3.45	0.001	1.519791	4.572907
45-54	2.636259	.7408403	3.45	0.001	1.519791	4.572907
55-64	1.412229	.2017485	2.42	0.016	1.067343	1.868557
65-74	1.412229	.2017485	2.42	0.016	1.067343	1.868557
75-84	.9047304	.1855513	-0.49	0.625	.6052658	1.35236
agecat						
45-54	4.294559	.8385329	7.46	0.000	2.928987	6.296797
55-64	23.42263	7.787716	9.49	0.000	12.20738	44.94164
65-74	48.26309	16.06939	11.64	0.000	25.13068	92.68856
75-84	97.87965	34.30881	13.08	0.000	49.24123	194.561
_cons	.0002166	.0000652	-28.03	0.000	.0001201	.0003908
ln(pyears)	1	(exposure)				

The above strikes us as a fair representation of the data. The probabilities of observing the deaths seen in these data are estimated using the following `predict` command:

```
. predict p, pr(0, deaths)
. list deaths p
```

	deaths	p
1.	32	.6891766
2.	104	.4456625
3.	206	.5455328
4.	186	.4910622
5.	102	.5263011
6.	2	.227953
7.	12	.7981917
8.	28	.4772961
9.	28	.6227565
10.	31	.5475718

The probability  $\Pr(y \leq \text{deaths})$  ranges from 0.23 to 0.80.

◀

## Methods and formulas

In the following, we use the [same notation](#) as in [\[R\] poisson](#).

The equation-level scores are given by

$$\text{score}(\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta})_j = y_j - e^{\xi_j}$$

The deviance (D) and Pearson (P) goodness-of-fit statistics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ln L_{\max} &= \sum_{j=1}^n w_j [-y_j \{ \ln(y_j) - 1 \} - \ln(y_j!)] \\ \chi_D^2 &= -2 \{ \ln L - \ln L_{\max} \} \\ \chi_P^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j (y_j - e^{\xi_j})^2}{e^{\xi_j}} \end{aligned}$$

## Reference

Manjón, M., and O. Martínez. 2014. [The chi-squared goodness-of-fit test for count-data models](#). *Stata Journal* 14: 798–816.

## Also see

[\[R\] poisson](#) — Poisson regression

[\[U\] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands](#)