

# homework\_\_ch7\_\_JimmyNg

*Jimmy Ng*

*November 1, 2018*

## Question 7.24

- (a) There's a positive relationship (or correlation) between number of calories and amount of carbohydrates (in gram).
- (b) The explanatory (or predicting) variable is number of calories, whereas the response (or predicted) variable is the amount of carbohydrates (in gram).
- (c) We want to fit a regression line to the data because we want to predict amount of carbohydrates (in gram) from the number of calories from Starbucks food menu.
- (d) No, the residual plot (the chart in the middle) shows a pattern - meaning the variance is not equal or we are having an issue of heteroscedasticity.

## Question 7.26

- (a)  $\text{slope} = (9.41 / 10.37) * 0.67$   $\text{point\_slope\_equation} = \text{slope}(x) - \text{slope}(107.2) + 171.14$   $\text{regression\_line} = 0.6079749(x) + 105.9651$
- (b) The slope is positive, i.e. 0.6079749, meaning every single unit (cm) of increase in girth would have approximately associated with 0.61 increase in height (cm) plus 105.9651 (cm).
- (c)  $R\text{-squared} = 0.67^2 = 0.4489$ . That means, the independent variable (girth) is accounting for approximately 45% of the variance in the dependent variable (height).
- (d)  $0.6079749(x) + 105.9651$   $0.6079749(100) + 105.9651 = 166.7626$  The study's height is approximate 166.8cm.
- (e)  $\text{residual} = \text{actual} - \text{predicted}$   $160\text{cm} - 166.8\text{cm} = -6.76\text{cm}$  The negative residual indicates that the prediction model overestimates the student's height by 6.76cm.
- (f) No, because it is out of predicting range. We should not apply the model to data outside of its range (such as 0cm girth which makes no sense at all).

## Question 7.30

- (a)  $\text{regression\_line} = 4.034(x) - 0.357$
- (b) that's the base value where x is equal to 0 (which is impossible). If x is equal to 1, then the formula would have predicted the outcome is equal to  $4.034*(1) - 0.357 = 3.677$
- (c) every single unit increase in body weight (in kg) would have 4.034 times increase in heart weight (in g).
- (d) 64.66% - that's the percent variance in heart weight that is accounted by body weight. Put it this way, 64.66% of the variance found in heart weight can be explained by body weight.
- (e)  $\text{sqrt}(0.6466) = 0.8041144$ . The correlation coefficient, r, is approximately equal to 0.804.

## Question 7.40

- (a)  $y = mx + b$   $3.9983 = m(-0.0883) + 4.010$   $m = (3.9983 - 4.010) / -0.0883$   $m = 0.1325028$
- (b) Yes, the slope is positive - meaning the two variables go in the same positive direction
- (c)

residual plot - checking the variance of residuals, in this case, the plot displays a random pattern and homoscedasticity is assured.

histogram of residuals - checking the nearly-normal-residuals, in this case, it meets the requirement.

qq plot - once again, it's checking the assumption of normal distribution and it is satisfied.

residual plot (order of data collection) - yes it checks out too. There's no dependence/consecutive orders in data collected - unlike something we usually find in time series or markov chain.