

MATH501 Coursework - Report

10570155, 10696253, 10701983

26/04/2021

The following report will discuss the results of the MATH501 questions that were asked in two sections of machine learning and statistical analysis.

Machine Learning

Part (a)

Present the data visually using box-and-whisker plots with a distinction for churn. Comment on the data in the context of the problem.

Reading our data into a dataframe:

```
data_path <- "data/churndata.txt"
churn_data <- read.csv(data_path, sep = " ")
churn_data <- na.exclude(churn_data) # removing entries with NA values
# converting classifier to a factor:
churn_data$churn <- as.factor(churn_data$churn)
```


The data includes 4 predictors - 'webget', 'callwait', 'upload' and 'enqcount' and a classifier 'churn' which identifies whether a client has switched to a new operator or not.

```
head(churn_data)
```

```
##   upload webget enqcount callwait churn
## 1    9.2  283.9      5     8.14    no
## 2    7.0  298.4      6    11.59    no
## 3    6.6  163.8      5     8.25    no
## 4   15.0  566.8      2     9.50    no
## 5   11.1  210.3      5     6.96    no
## 6   15.4  857.0      2    10.80   yes
```

Boxplot with average speed of upload against an indicator whether a customer switched to a different provider


```
churn_data %>% ggplot(aes(x = churn, y = upload, color = churn)) +
  geom_boxplot() +
  labs (y = "Speed of upload",
        x = "Switched to a new provider",
        color = "Switched")
```



We can see from the graph above that customers who have not switched to a different operator have lower average upload speeds in comparison with the customers who have switched. In general, having a higher uplink speed is a plus since it improves the internet phone/video call experience and it does no harm to the customers. Hence, increasing uplink speed would appear to not affect the customers' decision to switch to different operators.

Boxplot with the mean time to load a webpage against an indicator whether a customer switched to a different provider


```
churn_data %>% ggplot(aes(x = churn, y = webget, color = churn)) +
  geom_boxplot() +
  labs (y = "Average time to load a webpage",
        x = "Switched to a new provider",
        color = "Switched")
```



We can observe a strong dependency between the time to load a webpage (which directly corresponds to the downlink speed) and an indicator whether customers changed their operators. The average downlink speed was significantly lower for the customers that have switched to a different provider than for those who haven't. We can conclude this as the average time to load a webpage, for those clients who switched, is nearly 200 units longer than of those who didn't.

Boxplot with how long a customer waited on the phone call for a customer service operator against an indicator whether a customer switched to a different provider


```
churn_data %>% ggplot(aes(x = churn, y = callwait, color = churn)) +
  geom_boxplot() +
  labs (y = "Customer service waiting time",
        x = "Switched to a new provider",
        color = "Switched")
```



Even though the average waiting time for a customer service operator is similar in both cases, overall the majority of customers who switched to a different operator had to wait longer than the average and the customers who haven't changed their provider. We can conclude that the time spent by a customer on a call while they're waiting for a customer service operator to attend may impact their decision to switch to another operator although the influence seems to be less significant compared to time to load a webpage.

Boxplot with the number of times a customer contacted the company via a phone call against an indicator whether a customer switched to a different provider

```
churn_data %>% ggplot(aes(x = churn, y = enqcount, color = churn)) +
  geom_boxplot() +
  labs (y = "The number of times a customer contacted the company",
        x = "Switched to a new provider",
        color = "Switched")
```



We can observe that on average the customers that switched to a different operator contacted the company via a phone call at least 1 time more often than others. The biggest number of contact attempts is 2 calls more than of the customers who haven't changed their providers. It can be observed from the data that some of the customers who switched didn't contact the company even once. On the contrary, a minority of the customers who haven't changed their provider also have more than 5 calls to the customer service team. It is safe to conclude that the number of calls impacts the customers' decision to choose a different operator but its importance is smaller the time to load a webpage.

Conclusion

Out of the 4 factors, provided in the dataset, that can influence the 'churn' variable, time to load the webpage (which subsequently leads to the downlink speed) is the most important one. Average call waiting time for customer service doesn't differ drastically but still is higher for customers who chose different provider. Thus, we could conclude that this aspect also plays its part in the customers' decision along with the number of times the customer calls to the company. The most suspicious variable is the upload speed. For those clients who changed their providers, the uplink speed was actually higher but the downlink speed was lower (comparing to the customers who didn't change their provider) while normally the opposite should be the case (unless we're talking about 5G).

Unfortunately, we don't have access to any other data, hence we can only speculate that perhaps there are some other issues with the provider's network.

Part (b)

Create a training set consisting of 350 randomly chosen data points and a test set consisting of the remaining 150 data points

```
set.seed(1) # to make the results reproducible
num_subset <- sample(nrow(churn_data), 350) # randomly choose 350 numbers out of 500
```

Separating the data into predictors (X) and classifier (Y):

```
attach(churn_data)

X <- cbind(upload, webget, enqcount, callwait)

Y <- churn
Y <- as.integer(Y == 'yes')
Y <- as.factor(Y)

detach(churn_data)
```

Dividing the data into training and testing sets:

```
train.X <- X[num_subset, ] # 350 records - Training Set
train.Y <- Y[num_subset]

test.X <- X[-num_subset, ] # 150 records - Test Set
test.Y <- Y[-num_subset]
```

Part (c)

Using the training data set apply the K nearest neighbours method to construct a classifier to predict churn based on the four available predictors

Before actually applying KNN, we need to normalise the dataset because our data has different units and is on a different scale.

Writing a function for normalising our predictors by subtracting mean value and dividing the result by the standard deviation.

```
normalise <- function (inList){
  m <- mean(inList)
  s <- sd(inList)
  inList <- (inList - m)/s
  return(inList)
}
```

Applying this function to each of the columns in our test and training sets:

```
train.X <- apply(train.X, 2, normalise)
test.X <- apply(test.X, 2, normalise)
```

Now our predictors have values in the same range.

```
head(train.X)
```

```
##          upload      webget  enqcount  callwait
## [1,]  0.9790438  1.5490048 -0.6603278 -0.2912318
## [2,] -1.0678586 -0.7647049  1.7222982 -0.7052967
## [3,] -0.9637788 -1.0506624 -0.6603278  0.5692468
## [4,]  0.2851786 -0.6131415 -0.6603278 -0.1391924
## [5,] -1.4841777 -1.2034098 -0.1838026  0.2878121
## [6,]  0.2851786 -0.3704033  0.7692478  1.4167860
```

Find the optimal K using leave-one-out cross-validation for the training data set

Writing a custom function for KNN with leave-one-out cross-validation. Leave-one-out is a special case of k-fold cross validation.

```
leave.KNN <- function(K, train.X, train.Y){
  error <- 0
  n <- nrow(train.X)
  # this function returns an error that is calculated as an average error of KNNs trained
  # using leave-one-out
  for(i in 1:n){
    # subsetting the i-th row from the train predictors and classifiers and using
    # them as temporary training sets (without an i-th row)
    temp.train.X <- train.X[-i,]
    temp.train.Y <- train.Y[-i]

    # using an i-th row as a temporary test set
    temp.test.X <- train.X[i,]
    temp.test.Y <- train.Y[i]

    # the resulting KNN is tested on only 1 entry
    temp.knn <- knn(
      train = temp.train.X,
      test = temp.test.X,
      cl = temp.train.Y, k = K)

    # the error is being calculated on whether a test entry was classified wrongly
    # or not and accumulated as we'll need to find the mean error in the end
    error <- error + mean(temp.knn != temp.test.Y)
    # 1 if the test entry was classified wrongly and 0 if correctly
  }


  return (error/n) #returning the average error
}
```

Now trying to find the optimal K in a range of values between 1 to 30. Running the *leave.KNN* function in a loop and storing the calculated in the function error in an array.

```
errors <- rep(0, 30) #trying with K from 1 to 30
for (j in 1:30) errors[j] <- leave.KNN(j, train.X, train.Y)
```

Plotting our errors.

```
# plotting errors
plot(errors, xlab="K", ylab = "Test error")
```



Finding optimal K as an index of the first smallest error value.

```
optim.K <- which.min(errors)
```

Here we find that the optimal K=1.

Now running KNN with the optimal K.

```
def.knn <- knn(train = train.X, test = test.X, cl = train.Y, k = optim.K)
tab <- table(def.knn, test.Y) # confusion table
```

Calculate the test error for the classification rule obtained for the optimal K

Calculating the error using falsely predicted churn values.

```
error.KNN <- (tab[1,2] + tab[2,1]) / sum(tab)
sprintf("Expected error: %f Test error: %f", min(errors), error.KNN)
```

```
## [1] "Expected error: 0.094286 Test error: 0.086667"
```


Alternative solution

Instead of writing a custom take on leave-one-out approach we can use `knn.cv` function. The issue is that this function doesn't take a test set of predictors as an argument so we can calculate error only on the original training set.

```
alt.KNN <- function(k){  
  res.knn.cv <- knn.cv(train.X, train.Y, k = 1)  
  tab <- table(res.knn.cv, train.Y) # confusion matrix  
  error <- (tab[1,2] + tab[2,1]) / sum(tab)  
  return(error)  
}
```

Finding the optimal K in the same way.

```
errors2 <- rep(0, 30) #trying with K from 1 to 30  
for (j in 1:30) errors2[j] <- alt.KNN(j) # loop to find errors for K = 1:30  
optim.K2 <- which.min(errors2) # finding K with the smallest error
```

We can see that in both cases optimal K=1.

Part (d)

Using the training data set apply the random forest (bagging) method to construct a classifier to predict churn based on the four available predictors

For random forest there's no need to use the created training set as it is due to the specifics of the function syntax (we just need to specify the training subset sequence, although optionally we can use the training subset itself). For us it is more convenient to work with dataframes so we will use the original `churn_data`.

```
testing.X <- churn_data[-num_subset, ] %>% subset(select = -churn)  
testing.Y <- churn_data[-num_subset, ] %>% subset(select = churn)  
testing.Y <- unlist(testing.Y)
```

Constructing a random tree classifier based on 4 predictors. The 'mtry' variable normally can be equal to square root of the original number of predictors, hence `mtry=2`.

```
random.tree <- randomForest(churn ~ ., data = churn_data, subset = num_subset, mtry = 2, importance = T)
```


We could use a different notation and specify the training set directly in `randomForest` function but using our subset sequence instead will save extra variables in global environment so we went for the option above.

Using the obtained random forest, comment on the importance of the four variables for predicting churn

Plotting mean decrease accuracy and mean decrease gini measures to identify the most important variables.

```
varImpPlot(random.tree, main = "Random Forest Variable Importance")
```

Random Forest Variable Importance



The Mean Decrease Accuracy plot expresses how much accuracy the model losses by excluding each variable. The more the accuracy suffers, the more important the variable is for the successful classification. The mean decrease in Gini coefficient is a measure of how each variable contributes to the homogeneity of the nodes and leaves in the resulting random forest. The higher the value of mean decrease accuracy or mean decrease Gini score, the higher the importance of the variable in the model (Martinez-Taboada, F. & Redondo, J.I., 2020). In our case, both MeanDecreaseAccuracy and MeanDecreaseGini measures indicate that 'webget' is ultimately the most important variable. Followed by 'enqcount' (the number of customers enquiry calls to an operator) as the second most important predictor with the least important ones being 'callwait' followed by 'upload'.

Calculate the test error for the obtained random forest

Calculating the test error for random forest classifier based on the confusion matrix produced from correctly and wrongly classified test entries:

```
rf.predict <- predict(random.tree, testing.X, type = "class")
tab <- table(rf.predict, testing.Y) # confusion matrix

error.RandomForest <- (tab[1,2] + tab[2,1]) / sum(tab)
```

Compare it to the test error found for the KNN classifier and provide an appropriate comment

Comparing the KNN and Random Forest errors:

```
## KNN Error: 0.08666667
```

```
## RandomForest Error: 0.02666667
```

Random Forest method is more accurate than KNN with optimal $K=1$ with prediction error much lower than KNN. However, FUN FACT: utilising the parameter 'keep_forest=False' removes the forest of trees from our random forest model. If this parameter is kept then it can heavily influence our prediction error.


Part (e)

Using the entire data set (training set and test set combined), perform Principal Component Analysis for the four variables: upload, webget, enqcount and callwait. Comment on the results.

Separating the predictors from the dataframe to perform the Principal Component Analysis and building a graph to determine the correlation of predictors and the data spread.

```
churn_predictors <- churn_data[, c("upload", "webget", "enqcount", "callwait")]
ggpairs(churn_predictors)
```

```
## plot: [1,1] [==>-----] 6% est: 0s
## plot: [1,2] [====>-----] 12% est: 0s
## plot: [1,3] [=====>-----] 19% est: 1s
## plot: [1,4] [=====>-----] 25% est: 1s
## plot: [2,1] [=====>-----] 31% est: 1s
## plot: [2,2] [=====>-----] 38% est: 1s
## plot: [2,3] [=====>-----] 44% est: 1s
## plot: [2,4] [=====>-----] 50% est: 1s
## plot: [3,1] [=====>-----] 56% est: 0s
## plot: [3,2] [=====>-----] 62% est: 0s
## plot: [3,3] [=====>-----] 69% est: 0s
## plot: [3,4] [=====>-----] 75% est: 0s
## plot: [4,1] [=====>-----] 81% est: 0s
## plot: [4,2] [=====>-----] 88% est: 0s
## plot: [4,3] [=====>-----] 94% est: 0s
## plot: [4,4] [=====] 100% est: 0s
```



CAN BE DISCARDED IF CRITICAL: The 'upload' and 'webget' variables have the biggest correlation coefficient 0.661. Since the number is closer to 1 we can assume that although weak there might be dependency between those 2 variables. The 'upload' data has the majority of records with speed between 7.5 and 12.5 units, while most of 'webget' entries' values rise up to 600 units. 'callwait' and 'enqcount' have second biggest but still a very weak correlation of 0.278. Most of the entries in 'enqcount' variable have at least one call and spread up until 7 calls with the highest number of entries in 2 calls while 'callwait' shows that most of the customers had to wait from 5 to 12.5 units (mins presumably) or on the contrary, we can observe that some of the customers waited for less than 2.5 units of time.

Overall the correlation between predictors is rather weak, 'upload', 'enqcount' and 'callwait' variables have high variation. Correlation between 'upload' and 'webget' predictors is on a stronger side within the current dataset since 0.661 is rather closer to 1.

Performing the PCA.

```
churn_pca <- princomp(churn_predictors, cor = TRUE)
# the first column contains the names of cities so we exclude it.
summary(churn_pca)
```

```
## Importance of components:
##               Comp.1   Comp.2   Comp.3   Comp.4
## Standard deviation  1.2891552 1.1307782 0.8497143 0.58086584
## Proportion of Variance 0.4154803 0.3196648 0.1805036 0.08435128
## Cumulative Proportion 0.4154803 0.7351451 0.9156487 1.00000000
```

New variable Comp.1 holds 41.5% of variance in the data and has the deviation of 1.289, which is the biggest spread of the data. Comp. 2 accounts for 31.9% of the information variance giving a cumulative percentage

of 73.5%. The 2 components contain different information and created by using data from variables with certain weights.


Using principal components, create the “best” two dimensional view of the data set. In this visualisation, use colour coding to indicate the churn.

Let's create a table of new predictors, convert it to a dataframe and add a 'churn' classifier column, this way it is more convenient to plot.

```
new_churn <- churn_pca$scores
new_churn <- data.frame(new_churn)
new_churn <- new_churn %>% mutate(churn = churn_data$churn)
```

In order to create a two-dimensional view of the data we'll use first 2 principal components and 'churn' variable to colour the points.

```
new_churn %>% ggplot(aes(x = Comp.1, y = Comp.2, color = churn)) +
  geom_point() +
  labs(x = "First Principal Component",
       y = "Second Principal Component",
       color = "Switched to a new operator") +
  coord_fixed(ratio = 1)
```




```
new_churn <- new_churn %>% subset(select = c(Comp.1, Comp.2, churn))
pca.test.X <- new_churn[-num_subset, ] %>% subset(select = -churn)
pca.test.Y <- churn_data[-num_subset, ] %>% subset(select = churn)
pca.test.Y <- unlist(pca.test.Y)
```

Training our random forest model. The mtry=1 as square root of 2 (number of predictors in our dataset) is approximately 1.4 hence closer to 1.

```
pca.random.tree <- randomForest(churn ~ ., data = new_churn, subset = num_subset, mtry = 1,
                                importance = TRUE)
```

Calculate the test error for the obtained random forest and comment on it.

Testing our trained model and calculating the test error.

```
pca.rf.predict <- predict(pca.random.tree, pca.test.X, type = "class")
tab <- table(pca.rf.predict, pca.test.Y) # confusion matrix
error.PCA.RandomForest <- (tab[1,2] + tab[2,1]) / sum(tab)
```

Displaying all 3 errors:

```
## KNN Error: 0.08666667
```

```
## RandomForest Error: 0.02666667
```


```
## RandomForest PCA Error: 0.1933333
```

As we can see, the random forest model trained on the data formed from 2 new principal components predicts the 'churn' classifier with 10% bigger error. Our assumption is that this happens because the two components altogether hold only 3/4 of the data variation. Perhaps if we could train our model on all 4 components the results would have been better but then there was no sense in doing principal component analysis in the first place. Since principal component analysis is good for reducing dimensionality by identifying the most important predictors and those that could be got rid of we can logically expect that it will influence the resulting model test error, the question is whether this change was positive or negative. Based solely on the test error we can assume that discarding 2 other principal components wasn't a good idea. One more suggestion on why the PCA didn't work well here is mentioned in the conclusions.

Visualise the resulting classification rule on the scatter plot of the two first principal components.

Visualising the resulting predicted classifiers with two principal components on the scatter plot.

```
pca.test.X %>% ggplot(aes(x = Comp.1, y = Comp.2, color = pca.rf.predict)) +
  geom_point() +
  coord_fixed(ratio = 1) +
  labs(x = "Principal Component 1", y = "Principal Component 2",
       color = "Predicted 'churn' classifier")
```



We can observe that most of the customers who have decided to switch to a different operator have positive values of principal component 1 which focuses on Internet speed factors like ‘upload’ and ‘webget’.

Conclusions and issues with the dataset

The data used in this section was flawed to begin with but not in terms of scale or missing values or even sparsity of the data. The problem lies in the meaning behind the predictors. We’d say that there’s nothing wrong with Principal Component 2: both enqcount and callwait predictors (that contribute to this component) indicate the customer service quality. The bigger their values are, the more negative experience a customer has because no one wants to call to their operator with inquiries often or wait on the line for too long before a support agent answers them.

However, taking a closer look at the Principal Component 1 together with upload and webget predictors, we see that webget indicates the time which it takes for a client to load a webpage, which directly means a downlink speed. The bigger the ‘webget’ value is, the lower the downlink speed is. Thus, higher webget values should logically carry a negative meaning. Now, upload predictor is easier - we have a classic, ‘the more the better’ here since it indicates the uplink speed directly. However, both of those predictors contribute to Principal Component 1 positively, which creates a contradiction. Normally you would want the ‘webget’ to have a negative contribution because the smaller this value is, the better internet speed a customer has (basically the same case with enqcount and callwait for Principal Component 2).

We can’t blame the PCA function here. We can only blame the nature of the provided data because it is as confusing as it can be. Instead, it would be better to have the ‘webget’ predictor converted to the same unit as ‘upload’ predictor. Unfortunately, the units of the predictors were not provided which hopefully didn’t influence our machine learning models, but is crucial for understanding the data and any data scientists should understand the data before actually working with it. Despite that, working with this dataset was a great learning experience.

Statistical Modelling

Load in the data and place in a data frame for use.

```
Patient_group <- c(1,2,3,4) #i
Dose <- c(422,744,948,2069) #di
Number_treated <- c(50,50,50,50) #ni
Number_better <- c(2,13,39,48) #yi

experiment_df <- data.frame(Patient_group, Dose, Number_treated, Number_better)
experiment_df
```

```
## Patient_group Dose Number_treated Number_better
## 1           1  422             50             2
## 2           2  744             50            13
## 3           3  948             50            39
## 4           4 2069             50            48
```

Part (a)

Calculate the proportion of patients who gets better with the new medicine.


Work out the proportion of patients who got better and add it to the dataframe for analysis

```
experiment_df <- experiment_df %>% mutate(Proportion_better = Number_better / Number_treated)
```

Use ggplot2 to visualize these data.

Plot these proportions

```
Plot_A <-
  ggplot(experiment_df, aes(x = Dose, y = Proportion_better))+
  geom_point()+
  geom_hline(yintercept=.25,linetype='dotted',col='blue')+
  geom_hline(yintercept=.75,linetype='dotted',col='blue')+
  labs(x="Dose (mg/mL)",y="% of patients getting better",subtitle="Plot A")+
  scale_y_continuous(breaks=c(0,0.25,0.5,0.75,1),minor_breaks=NULL,limits=c(0,1))
```



What can you conclude from the plot?

A dose of 500mg/ml or less has no real impact on the proportion of patients who get better (less than 4%). There is a reasonable increase at around the 750mg/ml as it reaches over 20% of the patients getting better. However, the best increase is when the dose is increased to 1000mg/ml with nearly 80% of patients getting better.

To increase the proportion of patients to just under 100%, it appears that the dose needs to be more than double to above 2000mg/ml. This is comparable with the current COVID vaccinations, which see a large increase from the first dose and almost complete immunity with a second dose.

With this graph we can also conclude that improving recovery from 80% to near 100% would require twice the dose and most likely then, twice the cost. The cost analysis would therefore become important in determining the dose to provide beyond the 1000mg/ml.

Part (b)

Fit the model in the frequentist framework and report $\hat{\beta}_0$ (intercept) and $\hat{\beta}_1$ (Dose(x))

```
m <- glm(cbind(Number_better,
               Number_treated - Number_better) ~ Dose,
         family = binomial,
         data = experiment_df) # Fitting the binary logistic regression model
```

```
beta_0_hat <- coef(m)[1]
beta_0_hat
```

```
## (Intercept)
## -4.559752
```

```
beta_1_hat <- coef(m)[2]
beta_1_hat
```

```
## Dose
## 0.005271615
```

```
ci <- confint(m) # Confidence intervals for beta_0 and beta_1
ci
```


```
##                2.5 %      97.5 %
## (Intercept) -6.336086850 -3.163180155
## Dose         0.003561412  0.007438245
```

Part (c)

Create a similar plot to that produced in part (a) to visualise $\log(di)$ against the proportion of Covid-19 patients who gets better and compare the two plots.

```
# Work out the log of the dose and add to data frame
experiment_df <- experiment_df %>% mutate(Log_Dose = log(Dose))
```

```
#Log(Dose) plot
Plot_C <-
  ggplot(experiment_df, aes(x = Log_Dose, y = Proportion_better))+
  geom_point()+
  geom_hline(yintercept=.25,linetype='dotted',col='blue')+
  geom_hline(yintercept=.75,linetype='dotted',col='blue')+
  labs(x="Log of Dose (mg/mL)",y="% of patients getting better",subtitle="Plot C")+
  scale_y_continuous(breaks=c(0,0.25,0.5,0.75,1),minor_breaks=NULL,limits=c(0,1))
```



What do you conclude?

Plot A allows us to see the actual dose that relates to each point easily in terms that we understand. Plot C is slightly confusing in this sense that we are unable at a glance to determine what dosage leads to what percentage.

However, Plot C does help to spread the points across the graph, which would be more useful if we had a lot of data points to show. With the current dataset, this isn't really being seen to help and so Plot A would be an easier graph to show to people as most would understand the axis descriptions and meanings.

Overall, we can start to see the curve of improvement as dose increase from the graphs and more so in Plot C.

Fit the logarithmic model in the frequentist framework, report β_0 and β_1

```
m_log <- glm(cbind(Number_better, Number_treated - Number_better) ~ Log_Dose,
             family = binomial,
             data = experiment_df)

beta_0_hat <- coef(m_log)[1]
beta_0_hat
```

```
## (Intercept)
## -32.639
```

```
beta_1_hat <- coef(m_log)[2]
beta_1_hat
```

```
## Log_Dose
## 4.852825
```

Calculate the 95% confidence intervals for β_0 and β_1 .

```
ci <- confint(m_log)
ci
```

```
##              2.5 %      97.5 %
## (Intercept) -44.701647 -23.66464
## Log_Dose      3.515515   6.64896
```

Which of the two frequentist models considered in parts (b) and (c) (the standard or the logarithmic model) do you prefer? Why?

Due to the size of the data set it is difficult to see any difference in the graph as using a log in this case would help with data being compacted and needing to be scaled out in magnitude. As such there is no real benefit to this model. This model does however produce a more confusing graph as the x-axis is in units of Log of Dose which is more confusing than just the standard in graph a of dose as mg/ml. Graph a will be easier to read by many medical professionals as well as general people due to the accessibility of this label. In a time of overwhelming data accessibility is key to helping people understand data and provide information.

Part (d)

Use the logarithmic model implemented in part (c) to predict the probabilities that Covid-19 patients who receive doses of 600, 800 and 1500 mg/mL of the medicine get better. In addition, calculate the 95% confidence intervals for each prediction.

```
## Indirect Method
Dose_new <- c(log(600), log(800), log(1500))

# Estimated value of eta and associated standard error at Dose_new
eta_hat <- predict(m_log,
  newdata = data.frame(Log_Dose = Dose_new),
  se.fit = TRUE) # Extract the standard errors

# Approximate 95% confidence interval for eta
eta_estimate_ci <- c(estimate = eta_hat$fit,
  lower = eta_hat$fit - 2 * eta_hat$se.fit,
  upper = eta_hat$fit + 2 * eta_hat$se.fit)

# Convert to a confidence interval for p
p_estimate_ci_indirect <- exp(eta_estimate_ci) / (1 + exp(eta_estimate_ci))

data.frame(exp(Dose_new), p_estimate_ci_indirect)
```

```
##          exp.Dose_new. p_estimate_ci_indirect
## estimate.1          600          0.16856755
## estimate.2          800          0.45022971
## estimate.3         1500          0.94535927
## lower.1            600          0.09747458
## lower.2            800          0.35451920
## lower.3           1500          0.85999239
## upper.1            600          0.27567417
## upper.2            800          0.54977155
## upper.3           1500          0.97989239
```

What can you conclude from these results?

As the dose increases, the probability of the patient getting better increases.

Compare the predictions and confidence intervals obtained using both the indirect and direct methods.

```
## Direct Method
p_hat_direct <- predict(m_log,
  newdata = data.frame(Log_Dose = Dose_new),
  type = "response", # Prediction of p, not eta
  se.fit = TRUE) # Extract the standard errors

# Confidence interval for p
p_estimate_ci_direct <- c(estimate = p_hat_direct$fit,
  lower = p_hat_direct$fit - 2 * p_hat_direct$se.fit,
  upper = p_hat_direct$fit + 2 * p_hat_direct$se.fit)

data.frame(exp(Dose_new), p_estimate_ci_direct)
```

```
##          exp.Dose_new. p_estimate_ci_direct
## estimate.1          600          0.16856755
## estimate.2          800          0.45022971
## estimate.3         1500          0.94535927
## lower.1            600          0.08030064
## lower.2            800          0.35134670
## lower.3           1500          0.89186736
## upper.1            600          0.25683447
## upper.2            800          0.54911272
## upper.3           1500          0.99885118
```

Which one of the two methods is generally recommended? Why?

It is generally recommended to use the indirect method as it provides more accurate results more regularly than the direct method. This is not evident in the current data set, but this is most likely due to its small size.

Part (e)

Use the logarithmic model implemented in part (c) to produce the plot below, with 95% confidence intervals obtained using the indirect method, and comment on it.

```
Dose_seq_log <- seq(from = min(log(Dose)), to = max(log(Dose)), length = 20)

# Obtain the estimated values of eta and standard errors at a sequence of Dose values
eta_seq_log <- predict(m_log,
                      newdata = data.frame(Log_Dose = Dose_seq_log),
                      se.fit = TRUE) # Extract the standard errors


# Transform estimated values of eta to probabilities
p_seq_log <- exp(eta_seq_log$fit) / (1 + exp(eta_seq_log$fit))

# Confidence intervals for eta, saved in a matrix
eta_seq_log_ci <- cbind(eta_seq_log$fit - 2 * eta_seq_log$se.fit, # Lower limits
                      eta_seq_log$fit + 2 * eta_seq_log$se.fit) # Upper limits

# Convert to confidence intervals for p
p_seq_log_ci <- exp(eta_seq_log_ci) / (1 + exp(eta_seq_log_ci))

# Put all these values into a data frame
predictions_df_log <- data.frame(Dose_seq_log,
                                p_seq_log = p_seq_log, # Estimated values of p
                                p_lower_log = p_seq_log_ci[,1], # Lower confidence limits
                                p_upper_log = p_seq_log_ci[,2]) # Upper confidence limits

# Add to the ggplot
Plot_E <-
  ggplot(experiment_df, aes(x = Log_Dose, y = Proportion_better)) +
  geom_point() +
  geom_hline(yintercept=.25,linetype='dotted',col='blue')+
  geom_hline(yintercept=.75,linetype='dotted',col='blue')+
  # Add the estimated values of p (predictions)
  geom_line(aes(x=Dose_seq_log,y=p_seq_log),data=predictions_df_log,colour="red")+
  # Add the lower confidence limits
  geom_line(aes(x=Dose_seq_log,y=p_lower_log),data=predictions_df_log,colour="red")+
  # Add the upper confidence limits
  geom_line(aes(x=Dose_seq_log,y=p_upper_log),data=predictions_df_log,colour="red")+
  labs(x = "Log of Dose (mg/mL)",y = "% of patients getting better") +
  scale_y_continuous(breaks=c(0,0.25,0.5,0.75,1),minor_breaks=NULL,limits=c(0,1))
```



In addition, perform a suitable statistical test to check whether the logarithmic model is adequate. State your hypotheses and conclusions carefully.

The hypotheses are: * Null hypothesis - H_0 : Model C provides an adequate fit to the data * Alternative hypothesis - H_1 : Model C does not provide an adequate fit to the data.

or

- Null hypothesis - H_0 : The model as it stands is useful.
- Alternative hypothesis - H_1 : The model as it stands is NOT useful.

```
p_value <- pchisq(deviance(m_log), # Specify the model under consideration
                  df.residual(m_log),
                  lower = FALSE)
p_value
```

```
## [1] 0.01389397
```

P-value is less than 0.05 and thus the null hypothesis is rejected signifying that this model is not an adequate fit to the data or in other words is not useful.

Part (f)

Fit the quadratic model in the frequentist framework and report $\hat{\beta}_0$, $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$

```
m_log_log2 <- glm(cbind(Number_better,
                        Number_treated - Number_better) ~ Log_Dose + I(Log_Dose^2),
                  family = binomial,
                  data = experiment_df)

beta_0_hat <- coef(m_log_log2)[1]
beta_0_hat
```

```
## (Intercept)
##      -96.84529
```

```
beta_1_hat <- coef(m_log_log2)[2]
beta_1_hat
```

```
## Log_Dose
##      23.72948
```

```
beta_2_hat <- coef(m_log_log2)[3]
beta_2_hat
```

```
## I(Log_Dose^2)
##      -1.385234
```

Perform a frequentist hypothesis test of size 0.05 of whether β_2 is statistically significant and report your conclusion with justification. State your hypotheses and conclusions carefully.

The hypotheses are:

- Null hypothesis - H_0 : Model F provides an adequate fit to the data
- Alternative hypothesis - H_1 : Model F does not provide an adequate fit to the data.

or

- Null hypothesis - H_0 : The model as it stands is useful.
- Alternative hypothesis - H_1 : The model as it stands is NOT useful.

```
p_value <- pchisq(deviance(m_log_log2), # Specify the model under consideration
                  df.residual(m_log_log2),
                  lower = FALSE)
p_value
```

```
## [1] 0.00754795
```

P-value is less than 0.05 and thus the null hypothesis is rejected signifying that this model is not an adequate fit to the data or in other words is not useful.

In addition, report the 95% confidence interval for β_2 . Does this result confirm the conclusion of the hypothesis test?

```
tail(confint(m_log_log2),1)

## Waiting for profiling to be done...

##                2.5 %    97.5 %
## I(Log_Dose^2) -4.028886 0.9388293
```

Part (g)

Use the analysis of Deviance method to compare the logarithmic model fitted in part (c) with the quadratic model fitted in part (f). State your hypotheses and conclusions carefully.

```
Deviance_c_log <- deviance(m_log)
Deviance_c_log

## [1] 8.552601

Deviance_f_log_log2 <- deviance(m_log_log2)
Deviance_f_log_log2

## [1] 7.13771

# Difference in deviances
Deviance_c_log - Deviance_f_log_log2

## [1] 1.414891
```

The difference between Model C Deviance and Model F Deviance is positive and so we can conclude that it is adequate.

Compare the models

- Null hypothesis - H_0 : Model C is adequate compared to Model F
- Alternative hypothesis - H_1 : Model C is not adequate compared to Model F

```
AnovaTest <- anova(m_log, m_log_log2, test = "Chisq")
AnovaTest[2,5]
```

```
## [1] 0.2342461
```

Here, there p-value is 0.23. As this is greater than 0.05, we do not reject the null hypothesis and so Model C is adequate compared to Model F. In other words $\beta_2 = 0$. Thus, Model C is preferred over Model F.

References

(Martinez-Taboada, F. & Redondo, J.I., 2020) Variable importance plot (mean decrease accuracy and mean decrease Gini) Accessed: 26 April 2021