# $p8131\_hw6\_xy2395$ $_{\textit{Jack Yan}}$

3/31/2019

# Problem 2

# 2.1 Spaghetti Plot

```
# Import data
dental <-
  read.table('HW6-dental.txt', header = TRUE) %>%
  as.tibble() %>% janitor::clean_names() %>%
  mutate(gender = as.factor(gender))
# Spaghetti plot
dental %>%
ggplot(aes(x = age, y = distance, group = child, color = gender)) +
  geom_line() +
  theme_bw()
   32 -
   28
                                                                                    gender
distance
   24
                                                                                     — 0
                                                                                       - 1
   20
   16
                               10
                                                     12
                                                                            14
                                         age
```

### 2.2 Marginal Form

Answer to this question is hand-written above.

#### 2.3 Comparing models with different covariance patterns

For the following 3 models, we assume equal variance across measurements at different ages.

```
# Compound Symmetry covariance
compsym = gls(distance ~ gender + age,
              data = dental,
              correlation = corCompSymm(form = ~1 | child),
              method="REML")
# Exponential covariance
expo = gls(distance ~ gender + age,
           data = dental,
           correlation = corExp(form = ~1 | child),
           method = 'REML')
# Autoregressive covariance
auto1 = gls(distance ~ gender + age,
            data = dental,
            correlation = corAR1(form = ~1 | child),
            method = 'REML')
# Compare coefficient parameter estimates
bind rows(
  compsym$coefficients,
  expo$coefficients,
  auto1$coefficients,
) %>%
  mutate(CovType = c('CompSym', 'Exp', 'Auto')) %>%
  select(CovType, everything()) %>%
  knitr::kable()
```

CovType	(Intercept)	gender1	age
CompSym	15.38569	2.321023	0.6601852
Exp	15.45999	2.418714	0.6529597
Auto	15.45999	2.418714	0.6529597

The coefficient parameter estimates are similar across the 3 covariance patterns.

```
# Compare covariance estiamtes
# Compound Symmetry
compsym$sigma^2 * corMatrix(compsym$modelStruct$corStruct)[[1]]
##
            [,1]
                     [,2]
                              [,3]
                                        [,4]
## [1,] 5.316240 3.266784 3.266784 3.266784
## [2,] 3.266784 5.316240 3.266784 3.266784
## [3,] 3.266784 3.266784 5.316240 3.266784
## [4,] 3.266784 3.266784 3.266784 5.316240
# Exponential covariance
expo$sigma^2 * corMatrix(expo$modelStruct$corStruct)[[1]]
            [,1]
                     [,2]
                              [,3]
## [1,] 5.296881 3.315144 2.074839 1.298574
## [2,] 3.315144 5.296881 3.315144 2.074839
## [3,] 2.074839 3.315144 5.296881 3.315144
## [4,] 1.298574 2.074839 3.315144 5.296881
```

# # Autoregressive covariance

auto1\$sigma^2 \* corMatrix(auto1\$modelStruct\$corStruct)[[1]]

```
## [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4]

## [1,] 5.296881 3.315144 2.074840 1.298574

## [2,] 3.315144 5.296881 3.315144 2.074840

## [3,] 2.074840 3.315144 5.296881 3.315144

## [4,] 1.298574 2.074840 3.315144 5.296881
```

The covariance estiamtes are similar across the 3 covariance patterns.