

# HW1 Peer Assessment

## Part A. ANOVA

Additional Material: ANOVA tutorial

<https://datascienceplus.com/one-way-anova-in-r/>

Jet lag is a common problem for people traveling across multiple time zones, but people can gradually adjust to the new time zone since the exposure of the shifted light schedule to their eyes can reset the internal circadian rhythm in a process called “phase shift”. Campbell and Murphy (1998) in a highly controversial study reported that the human circadian clock can also be reset by only exposing the back of the knee to light, with some hailing this as a major discovery and others challenging aspects of the experimental design. The table below is taken from a later experiment by Wright and Czeisler (2002) that re-examined the phenomenon. The new experiment measured circadian rhythm through the daily cycle of melatonin production in 22 subjects randomly assigned to one of three light treatments. Subjects were woken from sleep and for three hours were exposed to bright lights applied to the eyes only, to the knees only or to neither (control group). The effects of treatment to the circadian rhythm were measured two days later by the magnitude of phase shift (measured in hours) in each subject’s daily cycle of melatonin production. A negative measurement indicates a delay in melatonin production, a predicted effect of light treatment, while a positive number indicates an advance.

Raw data of phase shift, in hours, for the circadian rhythm experiment

Treatment	Phase Shift (hr)
Control	0.53, 0.36, 0.20, -0.37, -0.60, -0.64, -0.68, -1.27
Knees	0.73, 0.31, 0.03, -0.29, -0.56, -0.96, -1.61
Eyes	-0.78, -0.86, -1.35, -1.48, -1.52, -2.04, -2.83

### Question A1 - 3 pts

Consider the following incomplete R output:

Source	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-statistics	p-value
Treatments	?	?	3.6122	?	0.004
Error	?	9.415	?		
TOTAL	?	?			

Fill in the missing values in the analysis of the variance table.

### Answer A1

```
treatment_shift_data = read.csv("Treatment_Phase_Shift.csv", header = TRUE)
treatment_shift_data

##      Treatment Phase_Shift_hr
## 1      Control          0.53
```


```

## 2 Control 0.36
## 3 Control 0.20
## 4 Control -0.37
## 5 Control -0.60
## 6 Control -0.64
## 7 Control -0.68
## 8 Control -1.27
## 9 Knees 0.73
## 10 Knees 0.31
## 11 Knees 0.03
## 12 Knees -0.29
## 13 Knees -0.56
## 14 Knees -0.96
## 15 Knees -1.61
## 16 Eyes -0.78
## 17 Eyes -0.86
## 18 Eyes -1.35
## 19 Eyes -1.48
## 20 Eyes -1.52
## 21 Eyes -2.04
## 22 Eyes -2.83

library(ggplot2)
ggplot(treatment_shift_data, aes(x=Treatment, y=Phase_Shift_hr),
       xlab = "Treatment",
       ylab = "Phase Shift (hr)") + geom_boxplot() +
  theme(axis.text.x = element_text(angle=90, vjust=0.5))+
  ggtitle("Phase Shift (hr) with Respect to Treatment - ANOVA")

```

## Phase Shift (hr) with Respect to Treatment – ANOVA



```
# apply ANOVA
model = aov(Phase_Shift_hr ~ Treatment, data=treatment_shift_data)

summary(model)

##          Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value    Pr(>F)
## Treatment    2  7.224   3.612    7.289 0.00447 **
## Residuals   19  9.415   0.496
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

model.tables(model, type="means")

## Tables of means
## Grand mean
##
## -0.7127273
##
## Treatment
##      Control    Eyes    Knees
##      -0.3087 -1.551 -0.3357
## rep 8.0000 7.000 7.0000
```

Complete R output:

Source	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-statistics	p-value
Treatments	2	7.224	3.6122	7.289	0.004
Error	19	9.415	0.496		

Source	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-statistics	p-value
TOTAL	21	16.639			

### Question A2 - 3 pts

Use  $\mu_1$ ,  $\mu_2$ , and  $\mu_3$  as notation for the three mean parameters and define these parameters clearly based on the context of the topic above. Find the estimates of these parameters.

### Answer A2

```
aggregate(treatment_shift_data[, 2], list(treatment_shift_data$Treatment), mean)
```

```
##   Group.1      x
## 1 Control -0.3087500
## 2 Eyes   -1.5514286
## 3 Knees   -0.3357143
```

Variable	Definition	Value
$\mu_1$	Mean of Control Group	-0.3087500
$\mu_2$	Mean of Eyes Group	-1.5514286
$\mu_3$	Mean of Knees Group	-0.3357143

### Question A3 - 5 pts

Use the ANOVA table in Question A1 to answer the following questions:

- a. **1 pts** Write the null hypothesis of the ANOVA  $F$ -test,  $H_0$

**Answer :** Null hypothesis means all means are equal -  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_k$ . In this case Mean of Control Group = Mean of Eyes Group = Mean of Knees Group

- b. **1 pts** Write the alternative hypothesis of the ANOVA  $F$ -test,  $H_A$

**Answer :** Alternate Hypothesis means some means are different. Mean of Control group and Knees group appear to be similar but mean of Eyes group is different. This shows atleast Eyes group mean is different from Control and Knees group

- c. **1 pts** Fill in the blanks for the degrees of freedom of the ANOVA  $F$ -test statistic:  $F(\underline{\hspace{2cm}}, \underline{\hspace{2cm}})$

```
nrow(treatment_shift_data)
```

```
## [1] 22
length(unique(treatment_shift_data$Treatment))
```

```
## [1] 3
```

**Answer :**  $F(k - 1, N - k) \rightarrow$  in above example it is  $F(2, 19)$

- d. **1 pts** What is the p-value of the ANOVA  $F$ -test?

```
#treatment_shift_data$Treatment
#treatment_shift_data$Phase_Shift_hr
```

```
model = aov(Phase_Shift_hr ~ Treatment, data=treatment_shift_data)
summary(model)
```

```

##          Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value    Pr(>F)
## Treatment     2  7.224   3.612   7.289 0.00447 ***
## Residuals    19  9.415   0.496
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

```

**Answer - P-Value - 0.00447**

- e. 1 pts According the the results of the ANOVA  $F$ -test, does light treatment affect phase shift? Use an  $\alpha$ -level of 0.05.

```

model.tables(model, type="means")

## Tables of means
## Grand mean
##
## -0.7127273
##
## Treatment
##      Control    Eyes    Knees
##      -0.3087 -1.551 -0.3357
## rep  8.0000  7.000  7.0000

TukeyHSD(model)

## Tukey multiple comparisons of means
## 95% family-wise confidence level
##
## Fit: aov(formula = Phase_Shift_hr ~ Treatment, data = treatement_shift_data)
##
## $Treatment
##            diff      lwr      upr      p adj
## Eyes-Control -1.24267857 -2.1682364 -0.3171207 0.0078656
## Knees-Control -0.02696429 -0.9525222  0.8985936 0.9969851
## Knees-Eyes     1.21571429  0.2598022  2.1716263 0.0116776

```

**Answer** Since the p-values is less than  $\alpha$ -level of 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis that all means are equal. Thus the light treatment does affect Phase shift

## Part B. Simple Linear Regression

We are going to use regression analysis to estimate the performance of CPUs based on the maximum number of channels in the CPU. This data set comes from the UCI Machine Learning Repository.

The data file includes the following columns:

- *vendor*: vendor of the CPU
- *chmax*: maximum channels in the CPU
- *performance*: published relative performance of the CPU

The data is in the file “machine.csv”. To read the data in R, save the file in your working directory (make sure you have changed the directory if different from the R working directory) and read the data using the R function `read.csv()`.

```

# Read in the data
data = read.csv("machine.csv", head = TRUE, sep = ",")
# Show the first few rows of data
head(data, 3)

```

```

##      vendor chmax performance
## 1   adviser    128        198
## 2   amdahl     32        269
## 3   amdahl     32        220

```

### Question B1: Exploratory Data Analysis - 9 pts

- a. **3 pts** Use a scatter plot to describe the relationship between CPU performance and the maximum number of channels. Describe the general trend (direction and form). Include plots and R-code used.


**Answer:**

```

# Your code here...
plot(data$performance, data$chmax,
      main="Scatterplot of CPU performance and the maximum number of channels",
      xlab="CPU performance",
      ylab="maximum number of channels")

```

### Scatterplot of CPU performance and the maximum number of channels



```
#plot(log(data$performance), log(data$chmax))
```

**Comments :** Scatter plot using original data does not show a good trend. Most of the points are clumped together towards the left bottom corner. When plotting the log of data points the graph starts to look a little more linear relationship

- b. **3 pts** What is the value of the correlation coefficient between *performance* and *chmax*? Please interpret the strength of the correlation based on the correlation coefficient.

**Answer:**

```

# Your code here...
cor(data$performance, data$chmax)

```

```
## [1] 0.6052093
```

**Answer** : correlation coefficient of 0.6052093 shows that the correlation is above Moderate and not strong positive relationship

- c. **2 pts** Based on this exploratory analysis, would you recommend a simple linear regression model for the relationship?

**Answer:** Based on the Exploratory data analysis there exists moderate relationship between the variables. I would still recommend Linear Regression for this... as there are a lot of datapoint for lower values of maximum number of channels

- d. **1 pts** Based on the analysis above, would you pursue a transformation of the data? *Do not transform the data.*

**Answer:** Since the data is clumped together in the left bottom corner ... I would pursue data transformation before applying linear Regression to compare the model performance against the one created without transformation

## Question B2: Fitting the Simple Linear Regression Model - 11 pts

Fit a linear regression model, named *model1*, to evaluate the relationship between performance and the maximum number of channels. *Do not transform the data.* The function you should use in R is:

```
# Your code here...
model1 = lm(performance ~ chmax, data)
summary(model1)

##
## Call:
## lm(formula = performance ~ chmax, data = data)
##
## Residuals:
##     Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
## -486.47  -42.20  -22.20   20.31  867.15 
## 
## Coefficients:
##             Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)    
## (Intercept) 37.2252   10.8587   3.428 0.000733 ***
## chmax       3.7441    0.3423  10.938 < 2e-16 ***
## ---      
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## 
## Residual standard error: 128.3 on 207 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.3663, Adjusted R-squared:  0.3632 
## F-statistic: 119.6 on 1 and 207 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16

confint(model1, level = 0.95)

##
##            2.5 %    97.5 %
## (Intercept) 15.817392 58.633048
## chmax       3.069251  4.418926

pt(10.938, 207, lower.tail=FALSE)

## [1] 1.424772e-22
```

a. **3 pts** What are the model parameters and what are their estimates?

**Answer:**  
Model parameters

- i.  $\hat{\beta}_0$  - Intercept - 37.2252
- ii.  $\hat{\beta}_1$  - Max #Channels - 3.7441
- iii.  $\hat{\sigma}$  - Std Error- 128.3

- b. **2 pts** Write down the estimated simple linear regression equation.

**Answer:**  $performance = 37.2252 + 3.7441 \cdot chmax$

- c. **2 pts** Interpret the estimated value of the  $\beta_1$  parameter in the context of the problem.

**Answer:** For every unit of Maximum number of channels increase there is  $\sim 3.7441$  times increase in the CPU performance.

- d. **2 pts** Find a 95% confidence interval for the  $\beta_1$  parameter. Is  $\beta_1$  statistically significant at this level?

**Answer:**

95 % confidence Interval for  $\beta_1$  - 3.069251 - 4.418926

$\beta_1$  is statistically significant as evidenced by p-value of 2e-16

- e. **2 pts** Is  $\beta_1$  statistically significantly positive at an  $\alpha$ -level of 0.01? What is the approximate p-value of this test?

**Answer:**

p-value is 1.424772e-22.. This shows that  $\beta_1$  statistically significantly positive at an  $\alpha$ -level of 0.01


### Question B3: Checking the Assumptions of the Model - 8 pts

Create and interpret the following graphs with respect to the assumptions of the linear regression model. In other words, comment on whether there are any apparent departures from the assumptions of the linear regression model. Make sure that you state the model assumptions and assess each one. Each graph may be used to assess one or more model assumptions.

- a. **2 pts** Scatterplot of the data with  $chmax$  on the x-axis and  $performance$  on the y-axis

```
# Your code here...
plot(data$performance, data$chmax,
      main="Scatterplot of CPU performance and the maximum number of channels",
      xlab="CPU performance",
      ylab="maximum number of channels")
```

## Scatterplot of CPU performance and the maximum number of channels




Model Assumption(s) it checks: Answer : Checks for Linearity Assumption.

Interpretation: Answer : The plot looks to have linear relationship.

b. 3 pts Residual plot - a plot of the residuals,  $\hat{\epsilon}_i$ , versus the fitted values,  $\hat{y}_i$

```
# Your code here...
plot(model1$fitted, model1$residuals)
```



Model Assumption(s) it checks: Answer : Checks for Constant variance

**Interpretation:** The fitted values vs residuals spread around 0 at random so it looks like the data satisfies Constant variance


c. 3 pts Histogram and q-q plot of the residuals

```
# Your code here...
```

```
library(car)
```

```
## Loading required package: carData
```

```
qqPlot(model1$residuals)
```



```
## [1] 10 138
```

**Model Assumption(s) it checks: Answer :** Checks for Normality


**Interpretation:** The data mostly follows normal distribution but is heavy-tailed

### Question B4: Improving the Fit - 10 pts

a. 2 pts Use a Box-Cox transformation (`boxCox()`) to find the optimal  $\lambda$  value rounded to the nearest half integer. What transformation of the response, if any, does it suggest to perform?

```
# Your code here...
```

```
b = boxCox(data$performance ~ data$chmax)
```



```

lambda <- b$x # lambda values
lik <- b$y # log likelihood values for SSE
bc <- cbind(lambda, lik) # combine lambda and lik
sorted_bc <- bc[order(-lik),] # values are sorted to identify the lambda value for the maximum log like
head(sorted_bc, n = 10)

##           lambda      lik
## [1,] -0.10101010 -1378.767
## [2,] -0.14141414 -1378.874
## [3,] -0.06060606 -1379.136
## [4,] -0.18181818 -1379.449
## [5,] -0.02020202 -1379.986
## [6,] -0.22222222 -1380.486
## [7,]  0.02020202 -1381.325
## [8,] -0.26262626 -1381.977
## [9,]  0.06060606 -1383.158
## [10,] -0.30303030 -1383.916

```

**Answer :** the top  $\lambda$  value suggests between -0.06 to -0.01. taking to nearest half integer.. it suggests  $\lambda = 0$

- b. **2 pts** Create a linear regression model, named *model2*, that uses the log transformed *performance* as the response, and the log transformed *chmax* as the predictor. Note: The variable *chmax* has a couple of zero values which will cause problems when taking the natural log. Please add one to the predictor before taking the natural log of it

```

# Your code here...
model2 = lm(log(performance) ~ log(chmax + 1), data)
summary(model2)

```

```

##
## Call:
## lm(formula = log(performance) ~ log(chmax + 1), data = data)
##
## Residuals:

```

```

##      Min      1Q Median      3Q      Max
## -2.22543 -0.59429  0.01065  0.59287  1.85995
##
## Coefficients:
##                 Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)    2.47655   0.14152   17.5 <2e-16 ***
## log(chmax + 1) 0.64819   0.05401   12.0 <2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 0.807 on 207 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.4103, Adjusted R-squared:  0.4074
## F-statistic: 144 on 1 and 207 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
confint(model2, level = 0.95)

##                  2.5 %     97.5 %
## (Intercept)    2.1975363 2.7555568
## log(chmax + 1) 0.5417055 0.7546727

```

- e. **2 pts** Compare the R-squared values of *model1* and *model2*. Did the transformation improve the explanatory power of the model?

```
summary(model1)$r.squared
```

```
## [1] 0.3662783
```

```
summary(model2)$r.squared
```

```
## [1] 0.4102926
```


**Answer :** Model1  $\rightarrow R^2 = 0.3662783$ . Whereas Model2  $\rightarrow R^2 = 0.4102926$

- c. **4 pts** Similar to Question B3, assess and interpret all model assumptions of *model2*. A model is considered a good fit if all assumptions hold. Based on your interpretation of the model assumptions, is *model2* a good fit?

**Model Assumption :** Linearity Assumption.

```
# Your code here...
plot(log(data$performance), log(data$chmax + 1),
     main="Linearity Assumption",
     xlab="CPU performance",
     ylab="maximum number of channels")
```


## Linearity Assumption



Model Assumption : Constant variance.

```
# Your code here...
plot(model2$fitted, model2$residuals, main="Constant Variance")
```


## Constant Variance



Model Assumption : Normality

```
# Your code here...
qqPlot(model2$residuals, main="Check for Normality")
```

### Check for Normality



```
## [1] 138 83
```

### Question B5: Prediction - 3 pts

Suppose we are interested in predicting CPU performance when `chmax = 128`. Please make a prediction using both `model1` and `model2` and provide the 95% prediction interval of each prediction on the original scale of the response, `performance`. What observations can you make about the result in the context of the problem?

```
# Your code here...
# newppp= data.frame(Inflation.difference= c(-0.68))
newppp= data.frame(chmax= c(128))
predict(model1,newppp,interval=c("prediction"), level = 0.95)
```

```
##      fit     lwr      upr
## 1 516.4685 252.2519 780.6851
exp(predict(model2,newppp,interval=c("prediction"), level = 0.95))
```

```
##      fit     lwr      upr
## 1 277.723 55.17907 1397.813
**Answer : **
```

- Model 1 - the predicted value - 516.4685 with confidence interval of 252.2519 & 780.6851. The prediction
- Model 2 - the predicted value - 277.723 with confidence interval of 55.17907 & 1397.813. The prediction

Looking at this .. seems like the Model 2 prediction has a tighter confidence interval and cab be deemed


## Part C. ANOVA - 8 pts

We are going to continue using the CPU data set to analyse various vendors in the data set. There are over 20 vendors in the data set. To simplify the task, we are going to limit our analysis to three vendors, specifically, honeywell, hp, and nas. The code to filter for those vendors is provided below.

```
# Filter for honeywell, hp, and nas  
data2 = data[data$vendor %in% c("honeywell", "hp", "nas"), ]  
data2$vendor = factor(data2$vendor)
```

1. **2 pts** Using `data2`, create a boxplot of *performance* and *vendor*, with *performance* on the vertical axis. Interpret the plots.

```
# Your code here...  
ggplot(data2, aes(x=vendor, y=performance),  
       xlab = "Vendor",  
       ylab = "Performance") +  
  geom_boxplot() +  
  theme(axis.text.x = element_text(angle=90, vjust=0.5)) +  
  ggtitle("Performance with Respect to Vendor")
```



Answer :

- \* honeywell and hp look to have similar mean
- \* as seems to have higher mean than honeywell and hp
- \* even though honeywell has lower mean, there are some higher performance machines that they make

2. **3 pts** Perform an ANOVA F-test on the means of the three vendors. Using an  $\alpha$ -level of 0.05, can we reject the null hypothesis that the means of the three vendors are equal? Please interpret.

```
# Your code here...
amodel = aov (data2$performance ~ data2$vendor)
summary(amodel)

##           Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value    Pr(>F)
## data2$vendor  2 154494   77247   6.027 0.00553 **
## Residuals    36 461443   12818
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

**Answer :** The P-value of 0.00553 suggest that not all means are equal. Thus we reject the Null hypothesis and say that there are some means that are different. The Box Plot also shows the same thing

3. 3 pts Perform a Tukey pairwise comparison between the three vendors. Using an  $\alpha$ -level of 0.05, which means are statistically significantly different from each other?

```
# Your code here...
TukeyHSD(amodel)

## Tukey multiple comparisons of means
## 95% family-wise confidence level
##
## Fit: aov(formula = data2$performance ~ data2$vendor)
##
## $`data2$vendor`
##          diff      lwr      upr     p adj
## hp-honeywell -24.03297 -153.76761 105.7017 0.8934786
## nas-honeywell 116.43320  16.82659 216.0398 0.0188830
## nas-hp        140.46617  18.11095 262.8214 0.0214092
```

**ANSWER :** Based on  $\alpha$ -level of 0.05 1. there are 2 pairs that are different nas-honeywell & nas-hp, 2. but hp-honeywell have similar means. 3. based on this we can conclude that hp and honeywell have same means. 4. but both honeywell and hp have means different for NAS. 5. Also both lower and upper thresholds for nas-honeywell and nas-hp are both positive.. so their means are not same