

Supplementary Materials 4: Further estimation details for models presented in main manuscript

NB this supplementary data is from: Richard M.A. Parker, George Leckie, Harvey Goldstein, Laura D. Howe, Jon Heron, Alun D. Hughes, David M. Phillippo, Kate Tilling. “Joint modelling of individual trajectories, within-individual variability and a later outcome: systolic blood pressure through childhood and left ventricular mass in early adulthood”

Number of iterations (per chain; 4 chains run for each model)

15 000 iterations, including 5000 warm-up

The chains were run for such a length that the effective sample size for each parameter of interest indicated a reasonable number of independent draws (≥ 400) from the posterior distribution. As such, the length of chain (above) is very generous, but was set for the one or two models with relatively high autocorrelation for certain parameters.

Priors

For the fixed effects in the mean function for the repeatedly-measured outcome, and for the mean function for the individual-level outcome, we used the equivalent – had the variables been standardised – of $\text{Normal}(\mu_{SBP}, \sigma = 10)$ for the intercept and $\text{Normal}(0, \sigma = 2.5)$ for the other predictors, re-scaling as appropriate.¹

Half-Cauchy($x_0 = 0, \gamma = 10$) priors were used for the SDs for the individual-level random effects, and for the occasion-level SD in models in which this was assumed constant, whilst a prior of $\text{LKJcorr}(2)$ was used for the correlation matrices for the random effects at the individual-level.²⁻⁵

For the fixed effects in the within-individual variability function we used Normal priors. For the intercept, the mean of the prior was the estimated within-individual variance (log-transformed) from a simpler (random slope) model, whilst the priors for the covariates had a mean of zero. For the SD of these priors, we used the equivalent – had the variables been standardised – of $\sigma = 2.25$ for both the intercept and covariates. Since a change of ± 2 SDs (around the mean for the prior of the intercept) would have predicted a within-individual SD of between 0.6 and 51.3 (i.e. 4.6% of distribution of prior would predict values above/below this range), this was judged very weakly informative.

1. Gabry J, Goodrich B. Prior Distributions for rstanarm Models. <http://mc-stan.org/rstanarm/articles/priors> Accessed 7th February 2019, 2019.
2. Gelman A. Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models(Comment on an Article by Browne and Draper). *Bayesian Analysis* 2006;**1**(3):515-533.
3. Polson NG, Scott JG. On the Half-Cauchy Prior for a Global Scale Parameter. *Bayesian Analysis* 2012;**7**(4):887-901.
4. Stan Development Team. Stan User's Guide. 2.19.1 ed, 2018.
5. Lewandowski D, Kurowicka D, Joe H. Generating random correlation matrices based on vines and extended onion method. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 2009;**100**(9):1989-2001.