Answer for SO Question 50879745

```
library(dplyr)
library(knitr)
library(kableExtra)
opts_chunk$set(echo = FALSE)
```

Build two example tables based on the mtcars data set.

Modify the tables to use the subtable environment and added labels and captions.

Place the tables into the document.

Table 1: Two tables, side-by-side.

(a) This is Table 1 in the example, but now labeled with a (a).

| | mpg | cyl | $_{ m disp}$ |
|-------------------|------|-----|--------------|
| Mazda RX4 | 21.0 | 6 | 160 |
| Mazda RX4 Wag | 21.0 | 6 | 160 |
| Datsun 710 | 22.8 | 4 | 108 |
| Hornet 4 Drive | 21.4 | 6 | 258 |
| Hornet Sportabout | 18.7 | 8 | 360 |
| Valiant | 18.1 | 6 | 225 |

(b) Shorter caption.

| | hp | drat | wt |
|-------------------|-----|------|-------|
| Mazda RX4 | 110 | 3.90 | 2.620 |
| Mazda RX4 Wag | 110 | 3.90 | 2.875 |
| Datsun 710 | 93 | 3.85 | 2.320 |
| Hornet 4 Drive | 110 | 3.08 | 3.215 |
| Hornet Sportabout | 175 | 3.15 | 3.440 |
| Valiant | 105 | 2.76 | 3.460 |

Another example, start by reading in a rds file.

A few modifications to Table~3b will be made so that we can show the table twice in a subtable.

Printing the tables works, see 3, but there is overlap as the tables are too wide. Consider the tabularx package as a solution or an ad hoc approach of changing the font size.

Table 2: Site - ASH

| Question | Prov | Grp | Overall | Rank |
|-----------------------------|------|----------------------|---------|------|
| Instructions (% Excellent) | 100 | 41.0 | 42.0 | 100 |
| Likelihood of Recommending | 10 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 97 |
| Quality (% Excellent) | 100 | 47.0 | 44.3 | 100 |
| Teamwork (% Excellent) | 100 | 43.0 | 44.7 | 100 |
| Understanding (% Excellent) | 100 | 41.0 | 43.9 | 100 |

Table 3: Two tables, side-by-side.

(a) Site - ASH

(b) Site - ASH

| Question | Prov | Grp | OveralQue Rtánik | Prov | Grp | Overall | Rank |
|-----------------------------|------|------|---|------|------|---------|------|
| Instructions (% Excellent) | 100 | 41.0 | 42. Onstrub Oons (% Excellent) | 100 | 41.0 | 42.0 | 100 |
| Likelihood of Recommending | 10 | 7.4 | 7.Likelih@d of Recommending | 10 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 97 |
| Quality (% Excellent) | 100 | 47.0 | 44. Quality 0 (1% Excellent) | 100 | 47.0 | 44.3 | 100 |
| Teamwork (% Excellent) | 100 | 43.0 | 44. Team work (% Excellent) | 100 | 43.0 | 44.7 | 100 |
| Understanding (% Excellent) | 100 | 41.0 | 43. Under 0 and 0 minimum (% Excellent) | 100 | 41.0 | 43.9 | 100 |