

4/19/27 Stats Test Corrections

Problem # 3

- b) Observation 65 and c) Observation 9
d) Observation 53

Problem # 4

- a) Observation 66
b) Observation 65
d) Observation 53

Problem # 5

- a) Holding other predictors constant the model estimates that each drink per day decreases your life span by approximately 3.2656 years.
- b) The average life expectancy for this individual will be roughly $93.68 - 3.27(2.5) = 23.44$ years.
- * c) The average difference in lifespan between smokers and non-smokers is that smokers experience a decrease by approximately 23.4392 years in lifespan when you keep other predictors constant in comparison to non-smokers.

d) There is a statistically significant relationship between life expectancy and smoking status when you control for the amount alcohol consumed. The $Pr(>|b|)$ column displays that the p-value for SmokeYes is $< 2e-16$, which is much smaller than 0.05 and thus shows that smoking status has a statistically significant relationship with life expectancy.

Problem # 6

-d) MVE d' pattern - linear assumption
resid plot more not in mod. \Rightarrow in 11/12

a) I would pick Model 3 because a) domain-wise, a model with an interaction term makes sense because

cars with certain weights predominantly use one transmission type over another, and b) model 3, unlike model 1 and 2, meets the linearity assumption, as you can see on the stud. resid vs. fit. values graph. The same graph for model 2 and 1 shows curvature, which violates the mlr linearity assumption. No curvature for model 3

b) $H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$

$H_a: \beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \neq \beta_3 \neq 0$

Null hypothesis: coefficients for weight, transmission type and the interaction term are all 0.

Alt hypothesis: the predictor terms aren't equal to 0.

The p-value that the summary for model 3 reports is 1.669×10^{-12} , which means that weight, transmission type, and the interaction between the two have a statistically significant relationship with mpg when combined into one model.

Problem # 7

a) ~~the test in 6a and 6b~~

$$H_0: \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$$

H_a : at least β_2 or β_3 or both not equal to 0.

b) The test that is more reliable is the one in 6B, ~~6a~~ 6b is the test of model 3, while 7a is a nested F test of model 1 and model 3.

The residuals vs fits plot of model 1, however, is not favorable, as it gives us a funneling pattern, which violates the linearity assumption of MLR. Therefore it would be best if we just performed the test in 6B. ~~6a~~

(mod 1 - reduced)
(mod 3 - full)

Problem # 8

We could probably add this predictor and perform backward elimination by identifying the term that has the largest P-value and if the P-value is large (e.g. more than 5%), eliminate it and re-fit the new model until all predictors are "significant." Or, we could eliminate predictors that give largest drop in Mallows C_p until C_p doesn't get smaller after predictor removal. On the other hand, we could try forward selection, by starting with a model with no predictors and finding the best predictor (biggest initial R^2). Add the predictor to the model, if p-value small enough (below 5%, e.g.), keep the predictor. If not, drop it. Or, stepwise regression, which starts with forward selection, but uses backward elimination to get rid of predictors that have become redundant.