

Question 2

Joseph Froelicher

4/23/2021

Part A

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{treatment}_{ij} + \beta_2 \text{time}_{ij} + \beta_3 (\text{treatment}_{ij} * \text{time}_{ij}) + b_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

- * $b_i \sim N(0, \sigma_b^2)$
- * $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$
- * $\text{Corr}(\epsilon_{ij}, \epsilon_{ik}) = 0$
- * $\text{Corr}(b_i, \epsilon_{ij}) = 0$

Part B

In the model above, the fixed effects are the treatment, time, and the interaction term of treatment and time, whose coefficients are represented by β_i . The random effects for the model above are the subject ID's, represented by b_i .

Part C

```
model0 = lmer(y ~ (1 | id) + factor(trt) + time + factor(trt) * time , data = data)
output = summary(model0)
fixed = coef(output)

rand = data.frame(
  'variance' = c(10.678, 1.212)
)

rownames(rand) = c('Intercept', 'Residual')

fixed
```

##	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t value	Pr(> t)
## (Intercept)	80.11214904	0.83882705	37.50971	95.504966	2.147974e-46
## factor(trt)2	1.21644032	1.11353140	37.52302	1.092417	2.816144e-01
## time	0.12145189	0.02695975	199.06278	4.504933	1.130501e-05
## factor(trt)2:time	0.03398007	0.03667787	199.15549	0.926446	3.553356e-01

rand

##	variance
## Intercept	10.678
## Residual	1.212

Part D

```
sigma_b = 10.678
sigma = 1.212
icc = sigma_b / (sigma + sigma_b)
```

The estimated variance of the random intercepts is 10.678. The differences between subjects is accounting for 89.81% of variability in strength, relative to the variability within subjects.

Part E

The fixed effect for the second treatment group is not significant ($p > 0.05$). However, the fixed effect for the covariate of interest time, is significant ($p < 0.001$). The average increase in strength for a one day increase is 0.12145. The interaction between linear time measured in days, and treatment group is not significant ($p > 0.05$).

Part F

The random intercept term, when treatment group is 1, was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). The average population-level strength at baseline (time = 0 days) for treatment group 1 was 80.11. This is interpretable, because measurements for baseline were taken at 0 days.

Part G

While it appeared from our plots that there may be a difference between the two treatment groups in strength, nothing in our analysis has suggest a statistically significant difference between the two treatment groups.