

Affect and SM Use - SMASH Study

Melissa Dreier

08/19/2022

Descriptive Statistics

```
## Age
```

```
wide <- data[which(data$day_in_study==1 & data$hour_in_study==1),] # create dataset with 1 row/particip
```

```
mean(wide$Age, na.rm=TRUE)
```

```
## [1] 15.84211
```

```
sd(wide$Age, na.rm=TRUE)
```

```
## [1] 1.014515
```

```
## Race
```

```
table(wide$Race_012)
```

```
##
```

```
## 0 1 2
```

```
## 15 2 2
```

```
table(wide$Gender)
```

```
##
```

```
## 0 1 2
```

```
## 7 11 1
```

```
## Days in Study
```

```
# summarize max days in study
```

```
Max_days <- data %>%
```

```
  group_by(pid) %>%
```

```
  summarise(Max_day = max(day_in_study, na.rm=TRUE))
```

```
# get mean/sd day in study
```

```
mean(Max_days$Max_day, na.rm=TRUE)
```

```
## [1] 30.57895
```

```
sd(Max_days$Max_day, na.rm=TRUE)
```

```
## [1] 5.620555
```

```
## Get Means/SDs of SM time spent
```

```
sm_summary <- day %>%  
  group_by %>%  
  summarise(sm_time = (mean(sum_sm, na.rm=TRUE) * 60), sm_checks = mean(count_sm, na.rm=TRUE))
```

Negative Mood - Bayesian Framework

```
###check utility of random slopes
```

```
model1 <- lmer(Naf_pm_p ~ sum_sm_p + Naf_am_p + sum_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), data = day)  
model2 <- lmer(Naf_pm_p ~ sum_sm_p + Naf_am_p + sum_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (sum_sm_p | pid), data = day)  
  
anova(model1, model2)
```

```
## Data: day
```

```
## Models:
```

```
## model1: Naf_pm_p ~ sum_sm_p + Naf_am_p + sum_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)  
## model2: Naf_pm_p ~ sum_sm_p + Naf_am_p + sum_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (sum_sm_p | pid)  
##      npar    AIC    BIC logLik deviance Chisq Df Pr(>Chisq)  
## model1     7 2466.7 2492.3 -1226.3   2452.7  
## model2     9 2470.7 2503.6 -1226.3   2452.7    0  2          1
```

```
model3 <- lmer(Naf_pm_p ~ count_sm_p + Naf_am_p + count_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), data = day)  
model4 <- lmer(Naf_pm_p ~ count_sm_p + Naf_am_p + count_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (count_sm_p | pid), data = day)  
  
anova(model3, model4)
```

```
## Data: day
```

```
## Models:
```

```
## model3: Naf_pm_p ~ count_sm_p + Naf_am_p + count_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)  
## model4: Naf_pm_p ~ count_sm_p + Naf_am_p + count_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (count_sm_p | pid)  
##      npar    AIC    BIC logLik deviance Chisq Df Pr(>Chisq)  
## model3     7 2462.7 2488.3 -1224.4   2448.7  
## model4     9 2466.7 2499.6 -1224.4   2448.7    0  2          1
```

```
## Negative mood - sumduration
```

```
NA_sm_sum_bayes <- brm(Naf_pm_p ~ sum_sm_p + Naf_am_p + sum_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), prior =
```

```
##
```

```
## SAMPLING FOR MODEL '48186b7868f5edea6c7fb9df0f161535' NOW (CHAIN 1).
```

```
## Chain 1:
```

```
## Chain 1: Gradient evaluation took 0 seconds
```

```

## Chain 1: 1000 transitions using 10 leapfrog steps per transition would take 0 seconds.
## Chain 1: Adjust your expectations accordingly!
## Chain 1:
## Chain 1:
## Chain 1: Iteration:    1 / 2000 [  0%] (Warmup)
## Chain 1: Iteration:   200 / 2000 [ 10%] (Warmup)
## Chain 1: Iteration:   400 / 2000 [ 20%] (Warmup)
## Chain 1: Iteration:   600 / 2000 [ 30%] (Warmup)
## Chain 1: Iteration:   800 / 2000 [ 40%] (Warmup)
## Chain 1: Iteration:  1000 / 2000 [ 50%] (Warmup)
## Chain 1: Iteration: 1001 / 2000 [ 50%] (Sampling)
## Chain 1: Iteration: 1200 / 2000 [ 60%] (Sampling)
## Chain 1: Iteration: 1400 / 2000 [ 70%] (Sampling)
## Chain 1: Iteration: 1600 / 2000 [ 80%] (Sampling)
## Chain 1: Iteration: 1800 / 2000 [ 90%] (Sampling)
## Chain 1: Iteration: 2000 / 2000 [100%] (Sampling)
## Chain 1:
## Chain 1: Elapsed Time: 1.984 seconds (Warm-up)
## Chain 1:                0.35 seconds (Sampling)
## Chain 1:                2.334 seconds (Total)
## Chain 1:
##
## SAMPLING FOR MODEL '48186b7868f5edea6c7fb9df0f161535' NOW (CHAIN 2).
## Chain 2:
## Chain 2: Gradient evaluation took 0 seconds
## Chain 2: 1000 transitions using 10 leapfrog steps per transition would take 0 seconds.
## Chain 2: Adjust your expectations accordingly!
## Chain 2:
## Chain 2:
## Chain 2: Iteration:    1 / 2000 [  0%] (Warmup)
## Chain 2: Iteration:   200 / 2000 [ 10%] (Warmup)
## Chain 2: Iteration:   400 / 2000 [ 20%] (Warmup)
## Chain 2: Iteration:   600 / 2000 [ 30%] (Warmup)
## Chain 2: Iteration:   800 / 2000 [ 40%] (Warmup)
## Chain 2: Iteration:  1000 / 2000 [ 50%] (Warmup)
## Chain 2: Iteration: 1001 / 2000 [ 50%] (Sampling)
## Chain 2: Iteration: 1200 / 2000 [ 60%] (Sampling)
## Chain 2: Iteration: 1400 / 2000 [ 70%] (Sampling)
## Chain 2: Iteration: 1600 / 2000 [ 80%] (Sampling)
## Chain 2: Iteration: 1800 / 2000 [ 90%] (Sampling)
## Chain 2: Iteration: 2000 / 2000 [100%] (Sampling)
## Chain 2:
## Chain 2: Elapsed Time: 1.322 seconds (Warm-up)
## Chain 2:                0.479 seconds (Sampling)
## Chain 2:                1.801 seconds (Total)
## Chain 2:
##
## SAMPLING FOR MODEL '48186b7868f5edea6c7fb9df0f161535' NOW (CHAIN 3).
## Chain 3:
## Chain 3: Gradient evaluation took 0 seconds
## Chain 3: 1000 transitions using 10 leapfrog steps per transition would take 0 seconds.
## Chain 3: Adjust your expectations accordingly!
## Chain 3:
## Chain 3:

```

```

## Chain 3: Iteration:    1 / 2000 [  0%] (Warmup)
## Chain 3: Iteration:   200 / 2000 [ 10%] (Warmup)
## Chain 3: Iteration:   400 / 2000 [ 20%] (Warmup)
## Chain 3: Iteration:   600 / 2000 [ 30%] (Warmup)
## Chain 3: Iteration:   800 / 2000 [ 40%] (Warmup)
## Chain 3: Iteration:  1000 / 2000 [ 50%] (Warmup)
## Chain 3: Iteration: 1001 / 2000 [ 50%] (Sampling)
## Chain 3: Iteration: 1200 / 2000 [ 60%] (Sampling)
## Chain 3: Iteration: 1400 / 2000 [ 70%] (Sampling)
## Chain 3: Iteration: 1600 / 2000 [ 80%] (Sampling)
## Chain 3: Iteration: 1800 / 2000 [ 90%] (Sampling)
## Chain 3: Iteration: 2000 / 2000 [100%] (Sampling)
## Chain 3:
## Chain 3: Elapsed Time: 1.946 seconds (Warm-up)
## Chain 3:                0.464 seconds (Sampling)
## Chain 3:                2.41 seconds (Total)
## Chain 3:
##
## SAMPLING FOR MODEL '48186b7868f5edea6c7fb9df0f161535' NOW (CHAIN 4).
## Chain 4:
## Chain 4: Gradient evaluation took 0 seconds
## Chain 4: 1000 transitions using 10 leapfrog steps per transition would take 0 seconds.
## Chain 4: Adjust your expectations accordingly!
## Chain 4:
## Chain 4:
## Chain 4: Iteration:    1 / 2000 [  0%] (Warmup)
## Chain 4: Iteration:   200 / 2000 [ 10%] (Warmup)
## Chain 4: Iteration:   400 / 2000 [ 20%] (Warmup)
## Chain 4: Iteration:   600 / 2000 [ 30%] (Warmup)
## Chain 4: Iteration:   800 / 2000 [ 40%] (Warmup)
## Chain 4: Iteration:  1000 / 2000 [ 50%] (Warmup)
## Chain 4: Iteration: 1001 / 2000 [ 50%] (Sampling)
## Chain 4: Iteration: 1200 / 2000 [ 60%] (Sampling)
## Chain 4: Iteration: 1400 / 2000 [ 70%] (Sampling)
## Chain 4: Iteration: 1600 / 2000 [ 80%] (Sampling)
## Chain 4: Iteration: 1800 / 2000 [ 90%] (Sampling)
## Chain 4: Iteration: 2000 / 2000 [100%] (Sampling)
## Chain 4:
## Chain 4: Elapsed Time: 1.374 seconds (Warm-up)
## Chain 4:                0.472 seconds (Sampling)
## Chain 4:                1.846 seconds (Total)
## Chain 4:

```

```

# family = "gaussian", data = day, warmup = 2.5e3, iter = 1.5e4, thin = 1,
# chains = 4, cores = 4, seed = "123", control = list(adapt_delta = 0.999, max_treedepth = 10)

```

```

model_parameters(NA_sm_sum_bayes, centrality = "mean")

```

```

## # Fixed effects

```

```

##
## Parameter      |      Mean |      95% CI |      pd | % in ROPE |      Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## (Intercept)    |    -2.15 | [-7.50, 3.30] | 78.77% |    39.54% |    1.000 | 5355.00
## sum_sm_p        | 9.09e-03 | [-0.02, 0.04] | 75.35% |    100% |    1.000 | 5937.00

```

```
## NAf_am_p      |      0.11 | [ 0.01, 0.22] | 98.47% |      100% | 0.999 | 5019.00
## sum_sm_p_c    | 7.69e-05 | [-0.04, 0.04] | 50.15% |      100% | 1.000 | 5336.00
## day_in_study  |      0.11 | [-0.14, 0.35] | 80.53% |      100% | 1.001 | 4526.00
##
## # Fixed effects sigma
##
## Parameter | Mean |          95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## sigma     | 18.07 | [16.63, 19.69] | 100% |          0% | 0.999 | 6099.00
```

```
standard_error(NA_sm_sum_bayes)
```

```
##      Parameter      SE
## 1    b_Intercept 2.72814428
## 2    b_sum_sm_p  0.01332453
## 3    b_NAf_am_p  0.05233454
## 4    b_sum_sm_p_c 0.01852566
## 5 b_day_in_study 0.12438486
## 6          sigma 0.78088042
```

```
## Negative mood - counts
```

```
NA_sm_count_bayes <- brm(NAf_pm_p ~ count_sm_p + NAf_am_p + count_sm_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), p
family = "gaussian", data = day, warmup = 2.5e3, iter = 1.5e4, thin = 1,
chains = 4, cores = 4, seed = "123", control = list(adapt_delta = 0.999, max_treedep
model_parameters(NA_sm_count_bayes, centrality = "mean")
```

```
## # Fixed effects
##
## Parameter | Mean |          95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## (Intercept) | -1.34 | [-6.99, 4.31] | 68.18% | 45.24% | 1.000 | 67825.00
## count_sm_p   |  0.03 | [ 0.00, 0.06] | 97.50% | 100% | 1.000 | 74712.00
## NAf_am_p     |  0.11 | [ 0.01, 0.22] | 98.40% | 100% | 1.000 | 67712.00
## count_sm_p_c | -8.18e-03 | [-0.03, 0.02] | 73.63% | 100% | 1.000 | 64640.00
## day_in_study |  0.12 | [-0.11, 0.36] | 84.72% | 100% | 1.000 | 69651.00
##
## # Fixed effects sigma
##
## Parameter | Mean |          95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## sigma     | 17.95 | [16.54, 19.53] | 100% |          0% | 1.000 | 72278.00
```

```
standard_error(NA_sm_count_bayes)
```

```
##      Parameter      SE
## 1    b_Intercept 2.88429980
## 2    b_count_sm_p 0.01628317
## 3    b_NAf_am_p  0.05360910
## 4 b_count_sm_p_c 0.01291515
## 5 b_day_in_study 0.12152237
## 6          sigma 0.76326959
```

Positive Affect on SM - Within-Day Models Bayesian

```
###check utility of random slopes
model11 <- lmer(sum_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), data = day)
model12 <- lmer(sum_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Pos_p | pid), data = day)

anova(model11, model12)

## Data: day
## Models:
## model11: sum_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)
## model12: sum_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Pos_p | pid)
##      npar      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Df Pr(>Chisq)
## model11    6 4854.2 4878.2 -2421.1  4842.2
## model12    8 4858.2 4890.2 -2421.1  4842.2    0  2          1

model13 <- lmer(count_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), data = day)
model14 <- lmer(count_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Pos_p | pid), data = day)

anova(model13, model14)

## Data: day
## Models:
## model13: count_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)
## model14: count_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Pos_p | pid)
##      npar      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Df Pr(>Chisq)
## model13    6 4538.1 4562.1 -2263.1  4526.1
## model14    8 4542.1 4574.1 -2263.1  4526.1 0.0356  2    0.9824

#-----Pos affect & same day SM-----

## Positive affect & minutes of SM

PA_on_SM_day_bayes <- brm(sum_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), prior = prior1,
  family = "gaussian", data = day, warmup = 2.5e3, iter = 1.5e4, thin = 1,
  chains = 4, cores = 4, seed = "123", control = list(adapt_delta = 0.999, max_treedepth = 5),
  model_check = FALSE)

model_parameters(PA_on_SM_day_bayes, centrality = "mean")

## # Fixed effects
##
## Parameter      | Mean |          95% CI |      pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## (Intercept)    |  2.28 | [-25.85, 30.56] | 56.22% |    53.18% | 1.000 | 80331.00
## SM_Pos_p       |  0.24 | [ -0.31,  0.77] | 80.21% |    100% | 1.000 | 83385.00
## SM_Pos_p_c     |  0.07 | [ -0.32,  0.46] | 64.20% |    100% | 1.000 | 79000.00
## day_in_study   | -0.18 | [ -1.25,  0.90] | 62.34% |    100% | 1.000 | 82131.00
##
## # Fixed effects sigma
##
## Parameter      | Mean |          95% CI |      pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## sigma          | 98.95 | [92.40, 106.11] | 100% |      0% | 1.000 | 80474.00
```

```
standard_error(PA_on_SM_day_bayes)
```

```
##           Parameter           SE
## 1    b_Intercept 14.4081824
## 2    b_SM_Pos_p  0.2767788
## 3    b_SM_Pos_p_c 0.1993240
## 4 b_day_in_study 0.5510825
## 5           sigma 3.4919061
```

```
## Positive affect & SM checks
```

```
PA_on_SM_count_day_bayes <- brm(count_sm_p ~ SM_Pos_p + SM_Pos_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), prior =
                                family = "gaussian", data = day, warmup = 2.5e3, iter = 1.5e4, thin = 1,
                                chains = 4, cores = 4, seed = "123", control = list(adapt_delta = 0.999, max_treedepth = 5))

model_parameters(PA_on_SM_count_day_bayes, centrality = "mean")
```

```
## # Fixed effects
##
## Parameter      | Mean |          95% CI |      pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## (Intercept)    | 2.69 | [-16.54, 21.97] | 60.86% | 52.20% | 1.000 | 77444.00
## SM_Pos_p       | 0.75 | [ 0.39, 1.12] | 100.00% | 100% | 1.000 | 79619.00
## SM_Pos_p_c     | -0.04 | [-0.30, 0.23] | 60.84% | 100% | 1.000 | 75156.00
## day_in_study   | 0.10 | [-0.62, 0.83] | 60.95% | 100% | 1.000 | 77993.00
##
## # Fixed effects sigma
##
## Parameter | Mean |          95% CI |      pd | % in ROPE | Rhat |      ESS
## -----
## sigma     | 66.91 | [62.53, 71.71] | 100% | 0% | 1.000 | 88627.00
```

```
standard_error(PA_on_SM_count_day_bayes)
```

```
##           Parameter           SE
## 1    b_Intercept 9.8469461
## 2    b_SM_Pos_p 0.1876314
## 3    b_SM_Pos_p_c 0.1348922
## 4 b_day_in_study 0.3715356
## 5           sigma 2.3562323
```

Negative Affect on SM

```
###check utility of random slopes
model1 <- lmer(sum_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), data = day)
model2 <- lmer(sum_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Neg_p | pid), data = day)

anova(model1, model2)
```

```

## Data: day
## Models:
## model1: sum_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)
## model2: sum_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Neg_p | pid)
##      npar  AIC    BIC logLik deviance Chisq Df Pr(>Chisq)
## model1    6 3337 3359.1 -1662.5    3325
## model2    8 3341 3370.5 -1662.5    3325      0 2      1

summary(model1)

## Linear mixed model fit by REML. t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [
## lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula: sum_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)
## Data: day
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 3321.5
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -4.2328 -0.4355 -0.0796  0.4284  5.4466
##
## Random effects:
## Groups Name Variance Std.Dev.
## pid (Intercept) 0 0.0
## Residual 4844 69.6
## Number of obs: 294, groups: pid, 18
##
## Fixed effects:
## Estimate Std. Error df t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 12.9225 8.8762 290.0000 1.456 0.147
## SM_Neg_p 0.2475 0.2690 290.0000 0.920 0.358
## SM_Neg_p_c -0.2169 0.3103 290.0000 -0.699 0.485
## day_in_study -0.5678 0.4511 290.0000 -1.259 0.209
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
## (Intr) SM_Ng_ SM_N__
## SM_Neg_p -0.105
## SM_Neg_p_c -0.389 -0.024
## day_in_study -0.725 0.145 -0.164
## optimizer (nloptwrap) convergence code: 0 (OK)
## boundary (singular) fit: see help('isSingular')

model3 <- lmer(count_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), data = day)
model4 <- lmer(count_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Neg_p | pid), data = day)

anova(model3, model4)

## Data: day
## Models:
## model3: count_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)
## model4: count_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (SM_Neg_p | pid)
##      npar  AIC    BIC logLik deviance Chisq Df Pr(>Chisq)
## model3    6 3318.9 3341.0 -1653.5    3306.9
## model4    8 3322.9 3352.4 -1653.5    3306.9      0 2      1

```



```
summary(model3)
```

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML. t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [
## lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula: count_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid)
## Data: day
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 3303.6
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -2.9480 -0.6185 -0.1134  0.3963  4.4539
##
## Random effects:
## Groups Name Variance Std.Dev.
## pid (Intercept) 0 0.00
## Residual 4554 67.49
## Number of obs: 294, groups: pid, 18
##
## Fixed effects:
## Estimate Std. Error df t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 13.08356 8.60699 290.00000 1.520 0.1296
## SM_Neg_p 0.48783 0.26085 290.00000 1.870 0.0625 .
## SM_Neg_p_c 0.09799 0.30094 290.00000 0.326 0.7449
## day_in_study -0.60253 0.43742 290.00000 -1.377 0.1694
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
## (Intr) SM_Ng_ SM_N__
## SM_Neg_p -0.105
## SM_Neg_p_c -0.389 -0.024
## day_in_study -0.725 0.145 -0.164
## optimizer (nloptwrap) convergence code: 0 (OK)
## boundary (singular) fit: see help('isSingular')
```

```
#-----Neg affect & same day SM-----
## Negative affect & minutes of SM
NA_on_SM_day_bayes <- brm(sum_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), prior = prior1,
family = "gaussian", data = day, warmup = 2.5e3, iter = 1.5e4, thin = 1,
chains = 4, cores = 4, seed = "123", control = list(adapt_delta = 0.999, max_treedepth = 5))
model_parameters(NA_on_SM_day_bayes, centrality = "mean")
```

```
## # Fixed effects
##
## Parameter | Mean | 95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat | ESS
## -----
## (Intercept) | 14.74 | [-4.46, 34.73] | 93.38% | 20.11% | 1.000 | 41717.00
## SM_Neg_p | 0.24 | [-0.28, 0.77] | 81.37% | 100% | 1.000 | 67586.00
```

```
## SM_Neg_p_c | -0.29 | [-1.13, 0.48] | 77.07% | 100% | 1.000 | 29861.00
## day_in_study | -0.66 | [-1.57, 0.26] | 91.97% | 100% | 1.000 | 53227.00
##
## # Fixed effects sigma
##
## Parameter | Mean | 95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat | ESS
## -----
## sigma | 69.38 | [63.97, 75.42] | 100% | 0% | 1.000 | 60783.00
```

```
standard_error(NA_on_SM_day_bayes)
```

```
## Parameter SE
## 1 b_Intercept 9.9603126
## 2 b_SM_Neg_p 0.2687266
## 3 b_SM_Neg_p_c 0.4081199
## 4 b_day_in_study 0.4675308
## 5 sigma 2.9305403
```

Negative affect & SM checks

```
NA_on_SM_count_day_bayes <- brm(count_sm_p ~ SM_Neg_p + SM_Neg_p_c + day_in_study + (1 | pid), prior =
  family = "gaussian", data = day, warmup = 2.5e3, iter = 1.5e4, thin = 1,
  chains = 4, cores = 4, seed = "123", control = list(adapt_delta = 0.999, max_treedepth = 5))
model_parameters(NA_on_SM_count_day_bayes, centrality = "mean")
```

```
## # Fixed effects
##
## Parameter | Mean | 95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat | ESS
## -----
## (Intercept) | 12.67 | [-4.60, 30.09] | 92.61% | 23.63% | 1.000 | 69702.00
## SM_Neg_p | 0.49 | [-0.03, 1.00] | 96.73% | 100% | 1.000 | 64540.00
## SM_Neg_p_c | 0.09 | [-0.56, 0.73] | 61.42% | 100% | 1.000 | 55622.00
## day_in_study | -0.62 | [-1.48, 0.24] | 91.90% | 100% | 1.000 | 63927.00
##
## # Fixed effects sigma
##
## Parameter | Mean | 95% CI | pd | % in ROPE | Rhat | ESS
## -----
## sigma | 67.64 | [62.40, 73.37] | 100% | 0% | 1.000 | 71599.00
```

```
standard_error(NA_on_SM_count_day_bayes)
```

```
## Parameter SE
## 1 b_Intercept 8.8099235
## 2 b_SM_Neg_p 0.2613456
## 3 b_SM_Neg_p_c 0.3279461
## 4 b_day_in_study 0.4425889
## 5 sigma 2.8079436
```