

# Health inequities and clustering of fever, acute respiratory infection, diarrhoea and wasting in children under five in low- and middle-income countries: A Demographic and Health Surveys analysis.

## Supplementary Information: Additional methods

### Model details

Group-level coefficients are assumed to be correlated between responses,  $y$ , such that  $\mu_{hj} \sim MVN(0, \Omega_G)$ , where  $MVN$  is a multivariate normal distribution, with covariance matrix  $\Omega_G$ . The model was fitted in a Bayesian framework using the `brms` R package [1], which is built upon Stan MCMC software that uses the No-U-Turn sampler (NUTS) - a dynamic variant of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo [2]. Non-informative normal priors were assigned to the fixed intercepts,  $\beta_0$ , ( $Normal(0, 10)$ ), vector of effect size coefficients,  $\beta$ , ( $Normal(0, 5)$ ) and group-level intercept standard deviations,  $\mu_{hj}$ , ( $Normal(0, 10)$ ). Non-informative normal prior standard deviations were chosen to be suitably large based on preliminary model fitting. The covariance matrix  $\Omega_G$  was decomposed into the product of a correlation matrix  $\Sigma_G$  and a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are scale coefficients  $\tau$ :  $\Omega_G = \tau \Sigma_G \tau$ . The correlation matrix was assigned an LKJ prior ( $\Sigma_G \sim LKJ(1)$ ), representing a uniform distribution over all possible ( $4 \times 4$ ) correlation matrices; each element of the scale vector was assigned independent Student-t priors with mean zero, a scale of 1, and 4 degrees of freedom. The multivariate structure of the model allows correlation coefficients for cluster-level effects to be estimated, while adjusting for other covariates, and also allows for direct comparisons of effect sizes for covariates between outcomes of interest [3].

### Model checking: convergence and goodness of fit

All models were fitted with four chains started from random initial positions within parameter space. Models were run for 4000 iterations after 500 “warm-up” iterations. Convergence was assessed visually as well as quantitatively using the Rhat statistic [4], with model runs with  $Rhat < 1.1$  diagnosed as converged.

Model goodness of fit was assessed with posterior predictive checks (PPCs), which compare the distribution of model predictions and observed data [5]. These were conducted at the response level and disaggregated spatially and by covariates of interest. The Bayes  $p$ -value was used to summarise fit and is defined as,  $Bayes\ p = P(y_{response} > y_{data})$  where values  $0.05 < Bayes\ p < 0.95$  were considered a reasonable fit. Additionally, receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were plotted for each country and response for a range of cut points (which determine the threshold probability where the response flips from 0 to 1). The area under the ROC curve indicates the probability that the model would correctly rank (order the response) a given pair of observations and can be used as a summary statistic of a given model’s discriminatory ability [6]. For outputs see sections under Model fit.

1. Bürkner P-C. Advanced Bayesian Multilevel Modeling with the R Package `brms`. R J [Internet]. 2018;10:395–411. Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.11123>
2. Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, et al. Stan: A Probabilistic Programming Language. J Stat Softw [Internet]. 2017;76. Available from: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v76/i01/>
3. Baldwin SA, Imel ZE, Braithwaite SR, Atkins DC. Analyzing Multiple Outcomes in Clinical Research Using Multivariate Multilevel Models. J Consult Clin Psychol. 2014;82:920–30.
4. Gelman A, Rubin D. Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple Sequences. Stat Sci. 1992;7:457–511.
5. Lambert B. A Student’s Guide to Bayesian Statistics. SAGE Publications Ltd; 2018.

6. Steyerberg EW, Vickers AJ, Cook NR, Gerds T, Gonen M, Obuchowski N, et al. Prediction models: a framework for some traditional and novel measures. *Epidemiology*. 2013;21:128–38.

## Estimating the proportion of children with multiple conditions under the assumption of independence

Assume that the probabilities of fever,  $p_f$ , diarrhoea,  $p_d$ , ARI,  $p_a$  and wasting  $p_w$ , are independent and set at the average probability across all data sets. The probability of a child having a single, double or triple condition is therefore:

$$p(1 \text{ condition} | p_f, p_d, p_a, p_w) = p_f(1 - p_d)(1 - p_a)(1 - p_w) + (1 - p_f)p_d(1 - p_a)(1 - p_w) + (1 - p_f)(1 - p_d)p_a(1 - p_w) + (1 - p_f)(1 - p_d)(1 - p_a)p_w$$

$$p(2 \text{ conditions} | p_f, p_d, p_a, p_w) = p_f p_d (1 - p_a)(1 - p_w) + p_f(1 - p_d)p_a(1 - p_w) + (1 - p_f)p_d p_a(1 - p_w) + p_f(1 - p_d)(1 - p_a)p_w + (1 - p_f)p_d(1 - p_a)p_w + (1 - p_f)(1 - p_d)p_a p_w$$

$$p(3 \text{ conditions} | p_f, p_d, p_a, p_w) = (1 - p_f)p_d p_a p_w + p_f(1 - p_d)p_a p_w + p_f p_d(1 - p_a)p_w + p_f p_d p_w(1 - p_w)$$

$$p(4 \text{ conditions} | p_f p_d p_a p_w) = p_f p_d p_a p_w$$