## Lab 2

## Daniel Dema

2025-05-25

```
{r setup, include=FALSE} knitr::opts_chunk$set(echo = TRUE)
                  # devtools::install github('gmonette/spida2')
library(spida2)
library(p3d)
                  # devtools::install github('gmonette/p3d')
library(car)
library(lattice)
library(latticeExtra)
?Drugs
some( Drugs )
# Which drug seems best to reduce 'neg' symptoms
xyplot( neg ~ year | Subj, Drugs)
dd <- Drugs
gd(3)
dd$id <- reorder( dd$Subj, dd$neg)</pre>
qd(3, cex = .9)
xyplot( neg ~ year | id, dd , groups = drug, auto.key =
list(columns=3))
# OUESTION 1: ----
         Can we perform OLS fits on each cluster?
#
         Note that the data are balanced with respect to time
#
         but not with respect to drugs.
#
         Also note that Clozapine is more frequently given later in
the study
```

## Solution for Ouestion 1:

No, since not all clusters have within-subject variation. For example, F32 is only treated with typical, and M29 is only treated with clozapine. Note that the data is quite unbalanced overall.

```
fit.lm <- lm(neg ~ drug, dd)
summary(fit.lm)
Ld <- Ldiff(fit.lm, 'drug')
wald(fit.lm, Ld)</pre>
```

```
Ld <- Ldiff(fit.lm, 'drug', ref = "Atypical")
wald(fit.lm, Ld)
library(nlme)
fit <- lme( neg ~ drug, dd, random = ~ 1 | id )
summary(fit)
wald(fit, -1)
Ld <- Ldiff (fit, "drug") # hypothesis matrix to test differences
between drugs
Ld
wald( fit, Ld )
Ld <- Ldiff (fit, "drug", ref = "Atypical")
wald( fit, Ld )
fit2 <- update( fit, . ~ . + cvar( drug, id))</pre>
summary( fit2 )
wald( fit2, 'cvar')
head( cbind( dd['id'], getX( fit2) ), 18 )
wald( fit2, -1)
wald( fit , -1)
Ld <- Ldiff( fit2, "drug", ref = "Atypical")
wald( fit2, Ld )
fit2l <- update(fit2, . ~ . + year)</pre>
summary( fit2l )
ww <-wald( fit2l )</pre>
wald( fit2l, 'cvar' )
wald( fit2l, 'drug' )
Ld <- Ldiff( fit2l, "drug", ref = "Atypical")</pre>
wald (fit2l, Ld)
# QUESTION 5: ----
     How do you explain the differences in the estimation of the
Typical - Clozapine
     comparison in the 4 analyses:
lapply(
  list("pooled" = fit.lm, "no ctx" = fit,"ctx"= fit2,"ctx+year" =
  function( fit ) wald( fit , Ldiff( fit, 'drug', ref = "Atypical"))
clist <- lapply(</pre>
```

```
list("pooled" = fit.lm, "no ctx" = fit,"ctx"= fit2,"ctx+year" =
fit2l),
  function( fit ) wald( fit , Ldiff( fit,'drug', ref = "Atypical"))
)
clist
do.call( rbind, lapply(clist, function(x) x[[1]][[2]][3,]))
Solution for Question 5:
```

Pooled is the coefficient from regression on the entire pooled data while the other estimates are within-subject (note that we see Simpson's paradox arise here, with the pooled coefficient being negative.). Estimate 3 takes into account between-subject effects while estimate 2 does not (note that we do this since, as mentioned in Question 1, the data is quite unbalanced). Estimate 4 controls for time.

```
## Taking time into account ----
#
fit.my <- update( fit.m, . ~ . + year)</pre>
summary( fit.my ) # very significant drop with time
# Previous hypothesis matrix
Lm
wald( fit.my )
# We only need to add year to Lm
Lmy <- Lm
Lmy <- lapply( Lm , function( x ) cbind(x, 0) )
# let's use the average year for predicted values
Lmy[[1]][,6] <- 3.5
Lmy
# OUESTION 9:
# Should we do the same thing for the second matrix?
> Lm[1]
$predicted
            Clozapine Typical
Atypical
          1
                    0
                             0 0 0
                    1
Clozapine 1
                             0 0 0
```

0 100 Typical 1 > Lm[2] \$differences [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] Clozapine - Atypical 0 1 Typical - Atypical Typical - Clozapine 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 - 1 0

## Solution for Question 9:

No, since  $\mbox{Lm}[2]$  gives differences which are time invariant, so we shouldn't try to take year into consideration.