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The Drug Abuse Warning Network

DAWN is a stratified simple random sample of US hospitals used to estimate annual drug-related emergency-room visits and related statistics.

Run by RTI International for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

Stratified by location, size, and ownership (public vs. private).

Oversampled within 13 metropolitan areas, for which domain estimates are published.
There is some sampling and nonresponse within hospitals, but we will treat hospital-level data as complete here.

There are currently three rounds of hospital reweighting:

- Frame adjustments within strata
- Nonresponse adjustments within cells
- Poststratification

The latter two use the same characteristics as in the stratification but can employ updated frame data from the American Hospital Association.
Let $d_k$ be the frame-count-adjusted design weight of a sampled hospital $k$. A good nonresponse-adjusted weight has the form:

$$a_k = d_k \left[ 1 + \exp(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{x}_k) \right]$$

(ADJFACTOR in red)

where $\mathbf{x}_k$ is a vector of the respondent’s characteristics (e.g., size, ownership, location), and $\mathbf{g}$ is determined so that the calibration equation

$$\sum_R a_j x_j = \sum_R d_j \left[ 1 + \exp(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{x}_k) \right] x_j = \sum_S d_j x_j$$

holds.
Unit response is treated as a second phase of random sampling with Poisson (independent) selection.

The value \( p_k = p(g^T x_k) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(g^T x_k)} \) implicitly estimates the probability that \( k \) is a respondent.

Although this is a logistic function, the solution is neither maximum-likelihood nor quasi-maximum likelihood.

When \( x_k \) is composed of class-membership indicators, this is the same as the weighting-class-adjustment estimator.
The Nonresponse Models for DAWN

Separate models for, 1, the combined 13 oversampled metro areas and, 2, the remainder sample.

Determined using SUDAAN’S WTADJUST
Since response is assumed to be Poisson, we ignore the strata and treat sampling as if it were with replacement.

PROC WTADJUST  DESIGN = STRWR; CLASS DOMAIN;
ADJUST = NONRESPONSE ; NEST _ONE_; WEIGHT D;
LOWERBD 1; CENTER = 2;
MODEL RESPONDENT = the x variables (including DOMAIN)

Any CENTER > 1 produces the same nonresponse-adjusted weights.
For metro (x-variables):

DOMAIN
  (effectively dummy variables for each of the 13 metropolitan areas)
dummy for a public hospital
log of the American Hospital Association (AHA) er visits
interaction between dummy for one area and log of AHA er visits
log of the population density within the zipcode
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta Coeff.</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>Lower 95% Limit Beta</th>
<th>Upper 95% Limit Beta</th>
<th>T-Test B=0</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>-4.85</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-8.94</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMAIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.2058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.0716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOG(SIZE)</strong></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.0251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBL × DOM 13</strong></td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOG(DENSITY)</strong></td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wald F for DOMAIN: 2.69  P-value: 0.0017

WTADJUST creates for every respondent:

**ADJFACTOR** which is \( 1 + \exp(g^T x_k) \) here

**WTFINAL** which is \( a_k = d_k [1 + \exp(g^T x_k)] \) here

The former needs to be renamed before proceeding.
Following Kott (2011), we set the final weights at

\[ w_k = a_k \frac{\ell_k (u_k - 1) + u_k (1 - \ell_k) \exp(B_k [a_k - 1] h^T z_k)}{(u_k - 1) + (1 - \ell_k) \exp(B_k [a_k - 1] h^T z_k)} , \]

where \( z_k \) is a vector of the respondent’s characteristics known for the entire frame, and \( h \) is determined so that the calibration equation

\[ \sum_R w_j z_j = \sum_U z_j \]

holds.

\([a_k - 1]z_k\) is an instrumental variable in an instrumental-variable calibration.
This is asymptotically equivalent to pseudo-optimal calibration. The weights were computed using SUDAAN 11’s WTADJX.

We set a **lower bound** of 1 on the weights themselves (with LOWBD $1/A$; $A$ being the nonresponse-adjusted weight);

And an **upper bound** on each hospital’s weighted number of AHA *er* visits (so that $\text{WTFINAL} \times \text{SIZE} \leq \text{MAX}$).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SIZE} &= \text{Number of AHA *er* visits} \\
\text{MAX} &= \text{bound for the weighted number of AHA *er* visits}
\end{align*}
\]
The \textit{z}-vector was chosen by fitting a linear model for drug-related \textit{er} visits using PROC REGRESS and ignoring the strata.

We keyed on \textit{drug-related visits/frame visits} as a function of variables.

\begin{verbatim}
PROC WTADJX DESIGN = STRWR ADJUST = POST ;
   NEST _ONE_; WEIGHT A;
LOWERBD 1/A; CENTER 1 /* the default */ ;  [requires some removing]
UPPERBD U /* U = MAX/(A*SIZE) */ ;
MODEL RESPONDENT = (A-1) \times \textit{the z variables}/NOINT;
CALVARS \textit{the z variables}/NOINT;
POSTWGT \textit{the frame totals for the z variables};
\end{verbatim}
For metro (z-variables – regression variables × size):

size × dummy variables for each of the 13 metropolitan areas
size × dummy for a public hospital
size × dummy for a public hospital × each of two area dummies
size × log of size
size × log of size × each of three area dummies
size × log of zipcode density

1

No intercept.
Variance Estimation

By ignoring the regression-like effect of nonresponse adjustment, this simpler and reasonably good estimator for the variance can be deduced:

$$\tilde{v}(t_y) = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \frac{n_h}{n_h - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{n_h}{\tilde{N}_h} \right) \left[ \sum_{k \in R_h} (w_k e_k)^2 - \left( \frac{\sum_{k \in R_h} w_k e_k}{n_h} \right)^2 \right],$$

where $e_k = y_k - z_k \left( \sum_R a_j [a_j - 1] z_j z_j^T \right)^{-1} \sum_R a_j [a_j - 1] z_j y_j$,

$n_h$ is the original sample size in stratum $h$, and $\tilde{N}_h = n_h \frac{\sum_{R_h} w_k (size_k)^2}{\sum_{R_h} w_k^2 (size_k)^2}$. 
Concluding Remarks

WTADJUST makes complex weight adjustment for nonresponse easy.

The DAWN has many survey variables, not just US-level drug-related visits. This can make the prediction model shakey, especially at the domain level.

That is why we approximate quasi-optimal calibration with the new WTADJX – but we can bound weights without it.

With some work (i.e., after returning the nonrespondents to the data set with their instrument values set to zero) SUDAAN 11 will be able to compute $\tilde{v}(t_y)$. 