

1 **bootComb - An R Package to Derive Confidence Intervals for** 2 **Combinations of Independent Parameter Estimates**

3 Marc Y. R. Henrion^{1,2}

4 ¹ Malawi - Liverpool - Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Programme, Blantyre, Malawi

5 ² Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

6 **Word count**

7 **Abstract:** 149 words

8 **Main text** (excluding abstract, key features, references): 1,992 words

9

10 **Abstract**

11 **Motivation** The epidemiologist sometimes needs to combine several independent
12 parameter estimates: e.g. (i) adjust an incidence rate for healthcare utilisation, (ii) derive a
13 disease prevalence from the conditional prevalence on another condition and the
14 prevalence of that condition, (iii) adjust a seroprevalence for test sensitivity and specificity.
15 While obtaining the combined parameter estimate is usually straightforward, deriving a
16 corresponding confidence interval often is not. `bootComb` is an R package using parametric
17 bootstrap sampling to derive such confidence intervals.

18 **Implementation** `bootComb` is a package for the statistical computation environment R.

19 **General features** As well as a function that returns confidence intervals for parameters
20 combined from several independent estimates, `bootComb` provides auxiliary functions for 6
21 common distributions (beta, normal, exponential, gamma, Poisson and negative binomial)
22 to derive best-fit distributions (and their sampling functions) for parameters given their
23 reported confidence intervals.

24 **Availability** `bootComb` is available from the Comprehensive R Archive Network
25 (<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bootComb>).

26

27 Key Features

- 28 • bootComb derives confidence intervals with the required coverage for parameters that
29 are computed from independent parameter estimates for which confidence intervals
30 are reported.
- 31 • Includes auxilliary functions for 6 common distributions (beta, normal, exponential,
32 gamma, Poisson and negative binomial) to derive best-fit distributions (and their
33 sampling functions) for parameters given their reported confidence intervals.
- 34 • R package: open-source, easy-to-use, platform independent.
- 35 • Stable version hosted on CRAN: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bootComb>
- 36 • Latest development version available from GitHub:
37 <https://github.com/gitMarch/bootComb>

38

39 Introduction

40 Motivation

41 The development of bootComb was motivated by two very practical examples:

- 42 1. Obtaining a 95% confidence interval (CI) for hepatitis D virus (HDV) prevalence in a
43 general population from the reported estimates and 95% CIs for the conditional
44 prevalence of hepatitis D among hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg) positive patients
45 and the prevalence of HBsAg.¹
- 46 2. Adjusting the seroprevalence estimate obtained from a novel antibody test for SARS-
47 CoV-2 for the estimated sensitivity and specificity of this antibody test.²

48 In each case, 2 or 3 parameters had been estimated from independent samples and a
49 functional form for how to combine the parameter estimates was available. However, it
50 was not evident how to derive a 95% CI.

51 In order to obtain CIs that correctly propagate uncertainty from all estimates, the author
52 implemented the algorithm detailed below. While in both examples above all parameters
53 are probability / proportion parameters, the algorithm is in fact quite general: it can be
54 used for arbitrarily complex functions to combine an arbitrary number of parameters, each
55 with an arbitrary distribution function (provided it can be sampled from).

56 Context relative to previously existing software

57 For some situations, e.g. the sum of two parameters each approximately normally
58 distributed, exact solutions exist.

59 There are software implementations for the example of adjusting a prevalence estimate for
60 the sensitivity and specificity of the diagnostic test (e.g. *Reiczigel et al*,³ or
61 <https://larremorelab.github.io/covid-calculator2>⁴). The former of these assumes that
62 sensitivity and specificity are known exactly.

63 For specific individual applications, a fully Bayesian model⁵ or non-parametric
64 bootstrapping⁶ will propagate uncertainty from all input parameters but implementation of
65 such approaches requires substantial statistical programming expertise by the user.

66 Crucially, all of the above are tailored to specific applications and the author is not aware of
67 a software implementation for the general problem of propagating uncertainty to derive
68 CIs for arbitrary functions of an arbitrary number of parameter estimates each with an
69 arbitrary probability distribution.

70 **Implementation**

71 `bootComb` is a package for the statistical computation environment R⁷ and its source code
72 has been written entirely in R. `bootComb` is available from the Comprehensive R Archive
73 Network (CRAN; <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bootComb>) and can be easily
74 installed from within R by simply typing the following at the R console:

```
75 install.packages("bootComb")
```

76 Source code as well as the latest development version are available from GitHub
77 (<https://github.com/gitMarch/bootComb>), from where `bootComb` can also be installed, but
78 this requires the `devtools` package.⁸

```
79  install.packages("devtools")  
80  devtools::install_github("gitMarch/bootComb")
```

81 To compute highest density intervals bootComb makes use of the R package HDInterval.⁹ If
82 this package is not installed, bootComb falls back on the percentile method.

83 The algorithm

84 To state the problem in all generality, assume that a parameter of interest ϕ is computed
85 from $k = 2, 3, \dots$ parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)$ using a function g :

$$\phi = g(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)$$

86 Now assume that for each parameter $\theta_j, j = 1, \dots, k$, an estimate $\hat{\theta}_j$ with an $(1 - \alpha) \cdot 100\%$
87 CI $[\hat{\theta}_{l,j}, \hat{\theta}_{u,j}]$ is reported.

88 An estimate for ϕ can be obtained by computing $\hat{\phi} = g(\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_k)$, but it is less obvious
89 how to derive a CI for $\hat{\phi}$ with correct coverage $(1 - \alpha) \cdot 100\%$. For example, for
90 independent parameter estimates, the naively computed interval
91 $[g(\hat{\theta}_{l,1}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{l,k}), g(\hat{\theta}_{u,1}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{u,k})]$ will often be far too wide.

92 However, writing θ_j for the estimator for parameter θ_j , and assuming $\theta_j \sim F_j$, where F_j is
93 some parametric distribution, for each parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_j, j = 1, \dots, k$, we can estimate a
94 probability distribution \hat{F}_j from the reported CI $[\hat{\theta}_{l,j}, \hat{\theta}_{u,j}]$. We can then use parametric
95 bootstrap sampling to obtain an approximate CI for $\hat{\phi}$ with the required coverage.

96 The general algorithm is given below:

97 1. For $j = 1, \dots, k$, estimate a distribution function \hat{F}_j for the estimate θ_j from $[\hat{\theta}_{l,j}, \hat{\theta}_{u,j}]$.

- 98 2. Assuming that the parameters $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ (and their estimates $\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_k$) are
99 independent, obtain B bootstrap samples $\hat{\theta}^{(b)}$, $b = 1, \dots, B$, for $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_k)$ by
100 sampling $\hat{\theta}_j^{(b)} \sim \hat{F}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$ independently.
- 101 3. For each bootstrap sample b , compute $\hat{\phi}^{(b)} = g(\hat{\theta}_1^{(b)}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_k^{(b)})$, $b = 1, \dots, B$.
- 102 4. Obtain a $(1 - \alpha) \cdot 100\%$ CI $[\hat{\phi}_l, \hat{\phi}_u]$, using either the percentile¹⁰ or the highest density
103 interval¹¹ methods on the empirical distribution for $\hat{\phi}$ given by the sample
104 $\{\hat{\phi}^{(b)}\}_{b=1, \dots, B}$.

105 **Method for deriving CIs from a sample**

106 Borrowing from Bayesian statistics, an alternative to the common percentile method,¹⁰ and
107 which would be particularly appropriate for skewed distributions, the highest density
108 interval¹¹ can be used to derive the required CI. The advantage is that this would be the
109 narrowest possible interval with the desired coverage and that the probability density
110 estimated from the bootstrap sample is always higher or equal inside the interval
111 compared to outside it. There is one caveat though: the highest density interval may not be
112 a single interval but a set of intervals if the density is severely multimodal. In this case the
113 single interval returned by bootComb may be too wide.

114 The user needs to inspect the histogram of the sample of combined parameter values to
115 check that the distribution of values is not severely multimodal when using bootComb with
116 the option `method="hdi"`. The default is `method="quantile"` which implements the
117 percentile method.

118 Use

119 This section contains worked examples for the two applications presented in the
120 introduction section. The main computational routine, `bootComb()` is quite general and not
121 limited to probability parameters as is the case in these two examples, where the beta
122 distribution, natural candidate to use for probability parameters, was used.

123 1. HDV prevalence in the general population

124 A pre-condition for becoming infected with HDV is to be infected with hepatitis B virus
125 (HBV). To assess HBV prevalence, one can test participants for the presence of surface
126 antigen of the hepatitis B virus (HBsAg). To assess HDV prevalence, one can test for the
127 presence HDV specific immunoglobulin G antibodies (anti-HDV).

128 HDV is rare and since it is conditional on HBV, most studies report the prevalence of anti-
129 HDV among HBsAg positive patients. To derive a estimate of the global anti-HDV
130 prevalence \hat{p}_{aHDV} , *Stockdale et al*¹ conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis, to
131 estimate the global conditional prevalence $\hat{p}_{aHDV|HBsAg}$ and, using estimates of HBsAg
132 prevalence \hat{p}_{HBsAg} reported by the World Health Organisation (WHO), to derive \hat{p}_{aHDV} :

$$\hat{p}_{aHDV} = \hat{p}_{aHDV|HBsAg} \cdot \hat{p}_{HBsAg}$$

133 To obtain a 95% CI for \hat{p}_{aHDV} , the author implemented the algorithm described in this
134 paper and which has now been generalised for the R package `bootComb`. The CI for \hat{p}_{aHDV}
135 for the global population, reported in Table 2 in *Stockdale et al*¹ can be derived using
136 `bootComb`:

- 137 • $\hat{p}_{HBsAg} = 3.5\%$ with 95% CI (2.7%, 5.0%).
- 138 • $\hat{p}_{aHDV|HBsAg} = 4.5\%$ with 95% CI (3.6%, 5.7%).

```
139 library(bootComb) # if not previously loaded
140
141 # find best-fit beta distribution for the reported confidence intervals
142 dist1<-getBetaFromCI(qLow=0.027,qUpp=0.050,alpha=0.05) # p_HBsAg
143 dist2<-getBetaFromCI(qLow=0.036,qUpp=0.057,alpha=0.05) # p_aHDV|HBsAg
144 distList<-list(dist1$r,dist2$r)
145
146 # the combination function
147 combFun<-function(pars){pars[[1]]*pars[[2]]} # combination function; just a
148 product
149
150 # compute the point estimate of the combined parameter
151 p_aHDV<-combFun(c(0.035,0.045))
152 print(p_aHDV)
153 ## [1] 0.001575
154 # derive the 95% CI
155 ci<-bootComb(distList=distList,combFun=combFun)$conf.int
156 print(ci)
157 ##          2.5%          97.5%
158 ## 0.001144280 0.002468875
```

159 We obtain the estimate $\hat{p}_{aHDV} = 0.16\%$ with 95% CI (0.11%, 0.25%).¹

160 The estimated beta distributions for the two input prevalences in this example have

161 parameters $\alpha = 39.62, \beta = 1012.19$ and $\alpha = 69.60, \beta = 1445.16$. This means that these

162 prevalences can be interpreted as having been estimated from samples of sizes

163 approximately $40 + 1012 = 1052$ and $70 + 1445 = 1515$, respectively. This can be used to

164 check the coverage of the CI obtained via simulation using the `bootComb` function

165 `simScenProductTwoPrevs`. Running

166 `simScenProductTwoPrevs(B=1000, p1=0.035, p2=0.045, nExp1=1052, nExp2=1515, alpha=0`

167 `.05)` shows that the 95% CI obtained for the product of two prevalences has 95.1% coverage,

168 with a 95% CI of (93.6%, 96.4%) from $N=1000$ simulations.

169 2. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence adjusted for test sensitivity and specificity

170 *Chibwana et al*² report the surprisingly high SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and associated

171 low morbidity in health workers in Blantyre, Malawi. Writing π for the seroprevalence of

172 SARS-CoV-2, out of 500 study participants, 84 tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies,

173 $\hat{\pi}_{raw} = 16.8\%$ with exact binomial 95% CI (13.6%, 20.4%).

174 However the immunological assay used in the study was novel and had been assessed in a

175 limited number of samples with the following laboratory validation data:¹²

176 • sensitivity: 238 out of 270 known positive samples tested positive $\hat{p}_{sens} = 88.1\%$, 95%

177 CI (83.7%, 91.8%).

178 • specificity: 82 out of 88 known negative samples tested negative $\hat{p}_{spec} = 93.2\%$, 95%

179 CI (85.7%, 97.5%).

180 Writing $p_{sens} = P(T|D)$ and $p_{spec} = P(T|\bar{D})$ where T is the event of testing positive, D is
181 the event of being seropositive, and \bar{T}, \bar{D} are the complement events of T, D , the measured
182 seroprevalence $\hat{\pi}_{raw}$ is related to the estimate of the actual seroprevalence $\hat{\pi}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\pi}_{raw} = \hat{\pi} \cdot P(T|D) + (1 - \hat{\pi}) \cdot P(T|\bar{D})$$

183 From this we can drive an equation to adjust the measured seroprevalence for the assay's
184 sensitivity and specificity:

$$\hat{\pi} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_{raw} - P(T|\bar{D})}{P(T|D) - P(T|\bar{D})} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_{raw} + \hat{p}_{spec} - 1}{\hat{p}_{sens} + \hat{p}_{spec} - 1}$$

185 where we have substituted the estimated sensitivity and specificity in the expression on
186 the far right-hand side.


187 To summarise, we have 3 parameter estimates ($\hat{\pi}_{raw}, \hat{p}_{sens}, \hat{p}_{spec}$), their 95% CIs and a
188 functional form to derive the actual parameter of interest ($\hat{\pi}$). With this we can use
189 bootComb, which includes a dedicated function, `adjPrevSensSpecCI`, for this problem:

```
190 library(bootComb) # if not previously loaded
191
192 adjPrevSensSpecCI(
193     prevCI=binom.test(x=84,n=500)$conf.int, # 95% CI for the observed
194     prevalence
195     sensCI=binom.test(x=238,n=270)$conf.int, # 95% CI for the observed
196     sensitivity
197     specCI=binom.test(x=82,n=88)$conf.int, # 95% CI for the observed
198     specificity
```

```
199     method="hdi",
200     prev=84/500, # observed prevalence point estimate
201     sens=238/270, # observed sensitivity point estimate
202     spec=82/88) # observed specificity point estimate

203 ## $estimate
204 ## [1] 0.1227324
205 ##
206 ## $conf.int
207 ##      lower      upper
208 ## 0.03926495 0.19013038
209 ## attr(,"credMass")
210 ## [1] 0.95
```

211 This yields the estimate $\hat{\pi} = 12.3\%$ with 95% CI (3.9%, 19.0%). Had the uncertainty in the
212 sensitivity and specificity been ignored, the 95% CI would have been (8.4%, 16.7%)
213 instead. Figure @ref(fig:Fig1) illustrates this example. In fact, the `bootComb` package
214 provides a function, `simScenPrevSensSpec`, for running simulations for this particular
215 application. This allows estimating the actual coverage of the CIs by running
216 `simScenPrevSensSpec(p=0.1227, sens=0.881, spec=0.932, nExp=500, nExpSens=270,`
217 `nExpSpec=88, B=1000)`. The `bootComb` 95% CI has estimated 95.3% coverage, with 95% CI
218 (93.8%,96.5%), whereas ignoring the uncertainty in sensitivity and specificity yields only
219 75.7% coverage, 95% CI (72.9%,78.3%) (both CIs obtained from N=1000 simulations;
220 `bootComb` also computes coverage for the latter interval if the argument
221 `assumeSensSpecExact = TRUE` is passed to the function `simScenPrevSensSpec`).



222

223 **Figure 1:** (a) Best-fit beta distributions for the unadjusted seroprevalence, sensitivity and
224 specificity from their 95% CIs. (b) Histogram of the adjusted prevalence values obtained from
225 the bootstrapped values for prevalence, sensitivity and specificity.

226 Discussion

227 This paper presents bootComb, an R package to derive CIs for arbitrary functions of an
228 arbitrary number of estimated parameters, where each parameter estimate is distributed
229 according to an arbitrary distribution function. bootComb samples from the empirical
230 distributions of the input parameter estimates and uses either the percentile method or the
231 highest density interval to obtain a CI for the parameter of interest.

232 The applicability of this R package is wide, but there is one important limitation, notably
233 that in its current version, bootComb assumes that all parameter estimates are independent.

234 Where this is not the case, the CIs computed by `bootComb` could have incorrect coverage. In
235 the adjusted seroprevalence example, the three parameters that are combined are, in fact,
236 not independent, even though the parameters were estimated from independent samples.
237 This is apparent in a small number of adjusted prevalences $\hat{\pi} < 0$ that were obtained. In
238 most applications, especially where large sample sizes are involved, this error is likely to be
239 negligible; in the example in this paper this is confirmed by the correct coverage of the CI.
240 Nevertheless, future versions of the package will aim to support a limited number of joint
241 distributions and/or copula functions.

242 `bootComb` provides an easy-to-use tool to the applied epidemiologist faced with the need to
243 combine several independent parameter estimates.

244 At the time of publication, the most recent version of `bootComb` was 1.0.0. R version 4.0.2
245 and `HDInterval` version 0.2.2 were used for computations in this paper.

246 **Acknowledgements**

247 The author was supported by a Wellcome Trust strategic award to Malawi - Liverpool -
248 Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Programme (grant: 206545/Z/17/Z).

249 The author wishes to thank his co-authors from *Stockdale et al*¹ and *Chibwana et al*² to
250 permit the use of examples from these works as use cases of the `bootComb` software.

251 **References**

252 1. Stockdale AJ, Kreuels B, Henrion MYR, et al. The global prevalence of hepatitis D virus
253 infection: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Hepatology* [Internet]. 2020 Apr

- 254 [cited 2020 Jul 10];S0168827820302208. Available from:
255 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0168827820302208>
- 256 2. Chibwana MG, Jere KC, Kamng'ona R, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in health
257 care workers but relatively low numbers of deaths in urban Malawi. *Wellcome Open Res*
258 [Internet]. 2020 Aug 25 [cited 2020 Aug 30];**5**:199. Available from:
259 <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/articles/5-199/v1>
- 260 3. Reiczigel J, Földi J, Ózsvári L. Exact confidence limits for prevalence of a disease with an
261 imperfect diagnostic test. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2010 Nov [cited 2020 Sep
262 11];**138**(11):1674–1678. Available from:
263 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0950268810000385/type/journal>
264 [_article](#)
- 265 4. Larremore DB, Fosdick BK, Zhang S, Grad YH. Jointly modeling prevalence, sensitivity
266 and specificity for optimal sample allocation [Internet]. *Immunology*; 2020 May. Available
267 from: <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.23.112649>
- 268 5. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
269 antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *The Lancet*
270 [Internet]. 2020 Aug [cited 2020 Sep 11];**396**(10247):313–319. Available from:
271 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673620313040>
- 272 6. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in
273 the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA Intern Med* [Internet]. 2020 Jul 21 [cited

- 274 2020 Sep 11]; Available from:
- 275 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/2768834>
- 276 7. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. Vienna,
277 Asutria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020. Available from: [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
278 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)
- 279 8. Wickham H, Hester J, Chang W. devtools: Tools to Make Developing R Packages Easier
280 [Internet]. 2020. Available from: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=devtools>
- 281 9. Meredith M, Kruschke J. HDInterval: Highest (Posterior) Density Intervals [Internet].
282 2020. Available from: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=HDInterval>
- 283 10. Davison AC, Hinkley DV. Bootstrap Methods and their Application [Internet]. 1st ed.
284 Cambridge University Press; 1997 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from:
285 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/9780511802843/type/book>
- 286 11. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DB, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. Bayesian data analysis.
287 Third edition. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2014.
- 288 12. Adams ER, Augustin Y, Byrne RL, et al. Rapid development of COVID-19 rapid
289 diagnostics for low resource settings: accelerating delivery through transparency,
290 responsiveness, and open collaboration [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS);
291 2020 May. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.29.20082099>