

Q1

Solutions for Fixed Effects					
Effect	Estimate	Standard Error	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Intercept	3.5687	0.4442	361	8.03	<.0001
time1	-0.3628	0.2708	724	-1.34	0.1808
time2	-0.4316	0.2703	724	-1.60	0.1107
male	-0.3818	0.4429	724	-0.86	0.3889

Covariance Parameter Estimates			
Cov Parm	Subject	Estimate	Standard Error
Intercept	id	9.5543	2.0156

Q1. $\text{logit}\{P[Y=1|X]\} = \mu_i + \beta_t + \gamma x_i ; t=1,2,3.$

$$\hat{\mu}_i = (1 + 0.346 \times 9.5543)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times 3.587 = 1.7198$$

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = (1 + 0.346 \times 9.5543)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times (-0.3628) = -0.1748$$

$$\hat{\beta}_2 = (1 + 0.346 \times 9.5543)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times (-0.4316) = -0.2080$$

$$\hat{\gamma} = (1 + 0.346 \times 9.5543)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times (-0.3818) = -0.1840.$$

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates						
Empirical Standard Error Estimates						
Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Limits		Z	Pr > Z
Intercept	1.6497	0.1859	1.2853	2.0141	8.87	<.0001
time1	-0.1814	0.1451	-0.4659	0.1030	-1.25	0.2112
time2	-0.2154	0.1317	-0.4736	0.0428	-1.64	0.1020
male	-0.1731	0.2180	-0.6004	0.2542	-0.79	0.4271

Compared to our results to the output above, the results are really close to each other.

Q2

Covariance Parameter Estimates			
Cov Parm	Subject	Estimate	Standard Error
Intercept	id	0.4589	0.8318

Solutions for Fixed Effects						
Effect	y	Estimate	Standard Error	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Intercept	1	-0.9809	0.4244	117	-2.31	0.0226
Intercept	2	0.9810	0.4245	117	2.31	0.0226
time		1.9225	0.6612	116	2.91	0.0044
trt		-2.9382	0.5938	116	-4.95	<.0001
time*trt		1.0973	0.7225	116	1.52	0.1316

$$\text{Model: } \logit \{P[Y \leq k | b]\} = a_k + b_i + \overset{\text{time}}{\beta_1 I} + \overset{\text{trt}}{\beta_2 \text{trt}_i} + \overset{\text{time} \times \text{trt}}{\beta_3 I \times \text{trt}_i}$$

which $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, 239$; $j = 1, 2$; $k = 1, 2$. I is $1 (j=2)$.

From the output below, $\hat{\beta}_1 = 1.9225 \therefore e^{\hat{\beta}_1} = e^{1.9225} = 6.8380$.

\therefore The odds ratio of placebo group to the standard (baseline) group is

6.8380 on falling asleep time, and the p-value here is 0.0044

which is smaller than 0.05, so the effect of is significant ($\hat{\beta}_1 \neq 0$).

$\hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_3 = 3.0198 \therefore e^{\hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_3} = 20.4872$ \therefore The odds ^{ratio} of the treated groups

is 20.4872 to the standard (baseline) group on falling asleep shorter time.

Q3

(a)

Parameter		DF	Estimate
Intercept		0	0.0000
id	1	0	0.4000
id	2	0	0.8000
id	3	0	0.2000
id	4	0	0.6000
id	5	0	0.6000
id	6	0	1.0000
id	7	0	0.8000
id	8	0	0.4000
id	9	0	0.6000
id	10	0	0.2000
Scale		0	1.0000

(a)
 From the output above, probability from 1 to 10 is: 0.4, 0.8, 0.2, 0.6,
 0.6, 1.0, 0.8, 0.4, 0.6, 0.2.

(b)

Solutions for Fixed Effects					
Effect	Estimate	Standard Error	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Intercept	0.2589	0.3452	9	0.75	0.4724

Effect	Subject	Estimate
Intercept	id 1	-0.1839
Intercept	id 2	0.2660
Intercept	id 3	-0.4074
Intercept	id 4	0.04000
Intercept	id 5	0.04000
Intercept	id 6	0.4955
Intercept	id 7	0.2660
Intercept	id 8	-0.1839
Intercept	id 9	0.04000
Intercept	id 10	-0.4074

(b). Model: $\text{logit}(\pi_i) = \alpha + \mu_i$; $\mu \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$.

From the output above, $\hat{\alpha} = 0.2589$, $\mu_i \sim \mu_{10}$ is $-0.1839, 0.2660, -0.4074,$
 $0.04, 0.04, 0.4955, 0.2660, -0.1839, 0.04, -0.4074$.

(c)

id	p	pihat
1	0.4	0.51874
2	0.8	0.62830
3	0.2	0.46296
4	0.6	0.57418
5	0.6	0.57418
6	1.0	0.68014
7	0.8	0.62830
8	0.4	0.51874
9	0.6	0.57418
10	0.2	0.46296

(c) From the output above, estimate probability from 1 to 10 is 0.51874, 0.62830, 0.46296, 0.57418, 0.68014, 0.62830, 0.51874, 0.57418, 0.46296, which means the estimate probability of lead.

(d)

(d) The answer from b is better. As we know, the random sample has really unstable used for estimate population when sample size is small. Therefore, if we used the random effect and fixed effect when sample size is small, the estimate accuracy is higher.

(e)

(e)

Part A

$$\text{Average Absolute Distance} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} |0.5 - \pi_i| = 2.2$$

Part C

$$\text{Average Absolute Distance} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} |0.5 - \pi_i| = 0.77084.$$

← *closer from point C*

So as we can see here, the average absolute distance is smaller when we used with part C is smaller compare to the point A. It is because the variance of the estimate is smaller ^{in part C} compared to the data in part A. So the estimate is more close to the true value.

Q4

Q4

(a). From the output from the question. $\hat{\beta}_1 = 4.2227$. $\hat{\beta}_3 = -0.7751$

$$\therefore \hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_3 = 4.9978 \quad \therefore e^{\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_3} = 148.0870.$$

\therefore The odds ratio of cigarettes (Yes) ~~is~~ to marijuana (Yes) is 148.0870.

(b). The value of $\hat{\sigma}^2$ implies the difference between subjects. So the large value indicates a big/huge variance between subjects.

(c). As we know, μ_i follows a normal distribution. so if the value is positive, it indicates a big random effect. If the value is too large, it may over the scope, as an outlier.