

Lagarde HW 5

Lagarde

3/15

- 1) The only conclusions we can draw from this study are associations. It is an observational study, not a controlled one. There are several socio-economic factors that could matter here, such as education level, ZIP code, family wealth, etc.

- 2) Estimate two unknowns to express the test

a) $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4$ (no difference)

$H_A: \mu_1 \neq \mu_4$, wLOG $\mu_1 > \mu_4$

$$S_w^2 = \frac{(n_1-1)s_1^2 + (n_2-1)s_2^2 + (n_3-1)s_3^2 + (n_4-1)s_4^2}{n-k}$$

$$= \frac{72(1.61)^2 + 104(1.43)^2 + 239(1.24)^2 + 1079(1.31)^2}{1498-4}$$

$$= \frac{2618.46}{1494} = 1.75$$

$$S_B^2 = \frac{n_1(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x})^2 + n_2(\bar{x}_2 - \bar{x})^2 + n_3(\bar{x}_3 - \bar{x})^2 + n_4(\bar{x}_4 - \bar{x})^2}{k-1}$$

$\bar{x} = 19.06$, given that

$$\bar{x} = \frac{n_1\bar{x}_1 + n_2\bar{x}_2 + n_3\bar{x}_3 + n_4\bar{x}_4}{1498} = \frac{73(6.22) + 105(5.8) + 24(5.77) + 108(5.4)}{1498}$$

$$\bar{x} = 5.58$$

Then, to calculate out the test itself, we have →

Lagarde

with slopes

- 2) $F_1 = \frac{S_B^2}{S_W^2} = \frac{19.06}{1.75} = 10.89$, w/ $df_1 = 3$, $df_2 = 1494$,
- b) Thus $df(10.89, 3, 1494)$ gives $p = 6.36 \times 10^{-7} < \alpha = .05$, so we reject H_0 and find that there are differences between the mean cholesterol levels of the groups.
- c) that our samples are random, our samples $\sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, and that they are independent within the population.

- d) from R, we have that

$$H_0: \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 - 3\mu_4 = 0$$

$$H_A: \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 - 3\mu_4 \neq 0$$

has: estimate, se, t test, p value
 1.39 .250 5.55 3.32×10^{-8}

Since $3.32 \times 10^{-8} < .05$, reject H_0 . Under Bonferroni:

$\alpha^* \neq p$, we still reject. Using Scheffé,

per lecture notes, we can consider:

$t_{n-k, \frac{\alpha}{2}}$ as a cutoff point. Hence,

$t_{1494, .025} = -1.96$ and since $5.55 > -1.96$, we reject.

Lagarde

e) again, per R we have

estimate, se, t test, p value

5.36	.164	3.27	.0012
			.0012

because $.0012 < .05$, we reject H_0 . Under Bonferroni, we have, again that $\alpha^* = .0083$. Because $\alpha^* > p$, we again reject. Under Scheffé, we see that

$t_{1494, .025} = -1.61$, hence as $-1.61 < 3.27$ we still reject.

3) ~~Bonferroni~~ see pdf - typed

Lagarde

w/H slopes (2)

4)

a) with tox as blocking: $F_{88} = 8.88$, $p < 0.05$

DF	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F-val	Pr(>F)
Sex	1	48	48.25	.367 .546
tox	1	67	66.76	.508 .478
residuals	97	127.58	1.3153	not significant

w/o blocking:

sex	1	48	48.25	.36921 .545
residuals	598.	101.2825	130.87	non-significant
DD.	288.	100.-	100.	non-significant
BP.	100.	100.-	100.-	non-significant
b)	p-value w/H blocking	0.546	non-significant	
	w/o blocking	0.545	non-significant	
H00.	P00.	DD.	PDD.	non-significant

c) yes, in both cases, if the samples have the same variance as what they are being compared to.

FFPF. 22150. non-significant
28000. 21110. P1880. non-significant

5) Lagarde Hw

a)	DF	Sum-Sq	Mean-Sq	F-Val	Pr(>F)	(H)
size	3	.383	.1275	4.705	.00716	
residuals	36	.976	.0271			

because $p < \alpha = .05$, we ftr, concluding that the size of the box affects how long I take to click on it.

b)	HSD	diff	twr	upr	adj
Medium-Large	.0581	.0580	.140	.253	.859
Small-Large	.1367	-.061	.335	.266	
XL-Large	-.1312	-.329	.661	.298	
Small-Medium	.0787	-.119	.277	.710	
XL-Medium	.1892	-.387	.009	.066	
XL-Small	-.2679	-.466	.069	.004	

Pairwise-T: + small f. were std in esp (>)

	Large	Medium	Small	pair
Medium	.43599	-	-	
Small	.07155	.29222	-	
Large	.08319	.01446	.00085	

HW #5, Problem 3 — Paul Lagarde

Pairwise comparisons using t tests with pooled SD

	5	6	7	8
6	1.0000	-	-	-
7	0.0015	4.4e-06	-	-
8	0.0011	2.9e-06	1.0000	-
9	1.0000	0.0625	0.1399	0.1088

P value adjustment method: bonferroni

```
>  
> pairwise.t.test(Ozone, Month, p.adjust.method = "bonferroni")
```

Pairwise comparisons using t tests with pooled SD

data: Ozone and Month

	5	6	7	8
6	0.19069	-	-	-
7	0.00037	2.2e-06	-	-
8	0.00035	2.2e-06	0.92620	-
9	0.19069	0.01251	0.01998	0.01813

P value adjustment method: fdr

```
>  
> airquality$Month<-as.factor(airquality$Month)  
> p<-aov(Ozone~Month,data=airquality)  
> TukeyHSD(p.conf.level = 0.95)  
Tukey multiple comparisons of means  
95% family-wise confidence level
```

Fit: aov(formula = Ozone ~ Month, data = airquality)

\$Month

	diff	lwr	upr	p adj
6-5	-10.9731183	-32.27095900	10.324722	0.6139469
7-5	29.7741935	8.65164668	50.896740	0.0013894
8-5	30.4838710	9.36132410	51.606418	0.0009868
9-5	10.5935484	-10.70429233	31.891389	0.6454439
7-6	40.7473118	19.44947111	62.045153	0.0000044
8-6	41.4569892	20.15914853	62.754830	0.0000029
9-6	21.5666667	0.09496314	43.038370	0.0484120
8-7	0.7096774	-20.41286945	21.832224	0.9999830
9-7	-19.1806452	-40.47848588	2.117196	0.0990957
9-8	-19.8903226	-41.18816330	1.407518	0.0795001

So we see that for

Bonferroni: May and July, May and August, July and September, and August and September have different levels of mean Ozone

Tukey: May and July, May and August, July and September, and August and September

FDR: May and July, May and August, July and September, August and September, June and July, and June and August. |