## 9: Further Methods

## John H Maindonald

March 16, 2018

```
doFigs <- FALSE
```

```
fig9.2A <- function(){</pre>
    if(!exists("eyeAmpM.gam"))
eyeAmpM.gam <- mgcv::gam(amp ~ s(x,y), data=subset(eyeAmp, Sex=="m"))
        if(!exists("eyeAmpF.gam"))
eyeAmpF.gam <- mgcv::gam(amp ~ s(x,y), data=subset(eyeAmp, Sex=="f"))</pre>
lims <- range(c(predict(eyeAmpF.gam), predict(eyeAmpM.gam)))</pre>
mgcv::vis.gam(eyeAmpM.gam, plot.type='contour', color="cm", zlim=lims, main="")
fig9.2B <- function(){</pre>
    if(!exists("eyeAmpM.gam"))
    eyeAmpM.gam <- mgcv::gam(amp ~ s(x,y), data=subset(eyeAmp, Sex=="m"))
    if(!exists("eyeAmpF.gam"))
    eyeAmpF.gam <- mgcv::gam(amp ~ s(x,y), data=subset(eyeAmp, Sex=="f"))
lims <- range(c(predict(eyeAmpF.gam), predict(eyeAmpM.gam)))</pre>
mgcv::vis.gam(eyeAmpF.gam, plot.type='contour', color="cm", zlim=lims, main="")
fig9.2 <- function(){</pre>
print("Run the separate figures fig9.2A() and fig9.2B()")
```

```
fig9.5A <- function(){</pre>
## ---- lagErie ----
## Panel A
lag.plot(Erie, lags=3,
         do.lines=FALSE,
         layout=c(1,3),
         main=" ")
mtext(side=3, line=2, adj=0,
      "A: Lag plots, at lags of 1, 2 and 3")
fig9.5B <- function(){</pre>
## ---- acfErie ----
## Panel B
acf(Erie, main="")
mtext(side=3, line=1, adj=0, cex=1.25,
      "B: Autocorrelation function")
fig9.5 <- function(){
"Run the separate functions fig9.5A() and fig9.5B()."
```

```
fig9.6 <- function(){

## ---- gamErie ----

df <- data.frame(
```

```
library(DAAGviz, quietly = TRUE)
```

```
## ---- bronchit-first3 ----
## ---- bronchit-rp ----
set.seed(47)  # Reproduce tree shown
fig9.13 <- function(){
## ---- treefig ----
opar <- par(mar=rep(1.1,4))
if(!exists('b.rpart'))b.rpart <- rpart(rfac ~ cig+poll, data=bronchit)
plot(b.rpart)
text(b.rpart, xpd=TRUE)
par(opar)
}</pre>
```

```
plot(b.rpart, uniform=TRUE)
  text(b.rpart, xpd=TRUE, cex=1.2)
}
par(opar)
}
```

- Figure 1: Resistance in ohms is plotted against apparent juice content. A smooth curve (in gray) has been added, using the lowess smoother. The width of the smoothing window was the default fraction  $f = \frac{2}{3}$  of the range of values of the x-variable.
- Figure 2: Estimated contours of left eye responses to visual stimulae, projected onto the plane.

```
figset9 <- function(){
    library(MASS)
    library(lattice)
    library(DAAGviz)
    if(!require('DAAG', quietly=TRUE))stop('DAAG must be installed')
    if(!requireNamespace('mgcv', quietly=TRUE))stop('mgcv must be installed')
    if(!requireNamespace('oz', quietly=TRUE))stop('oz must be installed')
    if(!requireNamespace('ggplot2', quietly=TRUE))
    stop('ggplot2 must be installed')
}</pre>
```

```
## ---- getErie ----
Erie <- greatLakes[,"Erie"]</pre>
```

```
library(rpart, quietly=TRUE)
```

Figure 3: Yields from 4 packages of land on each of eight sites on the Caribbean island of Antigua. Data are a summarized version of a subset of data given in Andrews and Herzberg 1985, pp.339-353.

## Figure 4: Level of Lake Erie, in meters.

Figure 5: Panel A plots Lake Erie levels vs levels at lags 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Panel B shows a consistent pattern of decreasing autocorrelation at successive lags.

Figure 6: GAM smoothing term, fitted to the Lake Erie Data. Most of the autocorrelation structure has been removed, leaving residuals that are very nearly independent.

Figure 7: The plots are from repeated simulations of an AR1 process with a lag 1 correlation of 0.85. Smooth curves, assuming independent errors, have been fitted.

Figure 8: Predictions, 15 years into the future, of lake levels (m). The shaded areas give 80% and 95% confidence bounds.

Figure 9: Estimated contributions of the model terms to mdbRain, in a GAM model that is the sum of smooth terms in Year and Rain. The dashed curves show pointwise 2-SE limits, for the fitted curve. Note the downturn in the trend of mdbRain after about 1985,

Figure 10: The top left panel shows the autocorrelation plot of the residuals from the GAM model mdbRain.gam. The five remaining panels show autocorrelation plots for a series of independent random normal numbers.

- Figure 11: Estimated number of events (aircraft crashes) per time interval versus time. In Panel A, the outcome variable was events per day, while in Panel B it was events per week.
- Figure 12: Visual representation of a classification rule, derived using *linear discriminant* analysis, for the forensic glass data. A five-dimensional pattern of separation between the categories has been collapsed down to two dimensions. Some categories may therefore be better distinguished than is evident from this figure.

```
## ---- aupoints ----
aupts <- cmdscale(audists)</pre>
```

Figure 13: Decision tree for predicting whether a miner has bronchitis. Where the condition at a node is satisfied, the left branch is taken. Thus, at the initial node, cig<4.385 takes the branch to the left. In general, unless a random number seed is specified, the tree may be different for each different run of the calculations.

