

PHCM9795 Foundations of Biostatistics

Learning activity solutions: R version

04 July, 2022

Contents

Contents	1
Introduction	3
Module 1: Solutions to Learning Activities	5
Module 1: Full script	15
Module 2: Solutions to Learning Activities	17
Module 2: Full script	35
Module 3: Solutions to Learning Activities	39
Module 3: Full script	45
Module 4: Solutions to Learning Activities	47
Module 4: Full script	53
Module 5: Solutions to Learning Activities	55
Module 5: Full script	65
Module 6: Solutions to Learning Activities	67
Module 6: Full script	75

Introduction

These notes provide R-based solutions to the learning activities in Foundations of Biostatistics. These notes are currently under development, with sections being added and revised as the course progresses.

This is the first year that R has been offered as an option. I am keen to receive feedback about the notes and your experience learning R. Please get in touch if anything is unclear, or you have any questions or suggestions.

Changelog

2022-07-04 [Added]

- Module 6: Initial release

2022-06-21 [Added]

- Module 5: Initial release

2022-06-12 [Added]

- Module 3: Initial release
- Module 4: Initial release

2022-06-06 [Added]

- Module 2: Initial release

[Changed]

- Various typos

2022-05-30

[Added]

- Module 1: Initial release

Module 1: Solutions to Learning Activities

Activity 1.1

25 participants were enrolled in a 3-week weight loss programme. The following data present the weight loss (in grams) of the participants:

255	198	283	312	283
57	85	312	142	113
227	283	255	340	142
113	312	227	85	170
255	198	113	227	255

a) Enter these data into R.


```
weightloss <- c(255, 198, 283, 312, 283, 57, 85, 312, 142, 113,  
                227, 283, 255, 340, 142, 113, 312, 227, 85, 170,  
                255, 198, 113, 227, 255)
```

b) What type of data are these?


These are continuous numeric data.

c) Construct an appropriate graph to display the relative frequency of participants' weight loss. Your graph should start at 50 grams, with weight loss grouped into 50 gram bins. Provide appropriate labels for the axes and give the graph an appropriate title.

```
# Check the default histogram:  
hist(weightloss)
```




```
# The default values look ok, so let's add labels and titles  
hist(weightloss, xlab="Weight loss (g)", main="Weight loss for 25 participants")
```



Note that the question requests **relative frequencies**, so we can use the code in Section 1.12 to amend this graph:

```
h <- hist(weightloss, plot=FALSE)
h$density <- h$counts/sum(h$counts)*100
plot(h, freq=FALSE,
      xlab="Weight loss (g)",
      ylab="Relative frequency (%)",
      main="Fig 1.1: Weight loss for 25 participants")
```

Fig 1.1: Weight loss for 25 participants**Activity 1.2**

Researchers at a maternity hospital in the 1970s conducted a study of low birth weight babies. Low birth weight is classified as a weight of 2,500g or less at birth. Data were collected on age and smoking status of mothers and the birth weight of their babies. The file `Activity_S1.2.rds` contains data on the participants in the study. The file is located on Moodle in the Learning Activities section.

Use R to create a 2 by 2 table to show the proportions of low birth weight babies born to mothers who smoked during pregnancy and those that did not smoke during pregnancy.

```
library(jmv)

babies <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.2.rds")

# Examine the first six rows of data
head(babies)
```

```
##   AGE   AgeGrp  BWT          LOW SMOKE
## 1  14 <20 years 2466   Low birth weight Yes
## 2  14 <20 years 2495   Low birth weight No
## 3  14 <20 years 3941 Normal birth weight No
## 4  15 <20 years 2353   Low birth weight No
## 5  15 <20 years 2381   Low birth weight No
## 6  15 <20 years 2778 Normal birth weight No
```

```
# Create a two-way table showing row percents
contTables(data=babies, rows=SMOKE, cols=LOW, pcRow=TRUE)
```



```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
##      SMOKE                Low birth weight    Normal birth weight    Total
##
##      Yes      Observed              30              44              74
##              % within row          40.54054          59.45946          100.00000
##
##      No      Observed              29              86              115
##              % within row          25.21739          74.78261          100.00000
##
##      Total    Observed              59             130             189
##              % within row          31.21693          68.78307          100.00000
##
##
##
## x^2 Tests
##
##      Value      df      p
##
##      x^2      4.923705      1      0.0264906
##      N          189
##
```

Answer the following questions:

- a) What was the total number of mothers who smoked during pregnancy?

There were 74 mothers who smoked during pregnancy.

- b) What proportion of mothers who smoked gave birth to low birth weight babies? What proportion of non-smoking mothers gave birth to low birth weight babies?

41% of mothers who smoked and 25% of non-smoking mothers gave birth to low birth weight babies.

- c) Use R to construct a stacked bar chart of the data to examine if there a difference in the proportion of babies born with a low birth weight in relation to mother's age? Provide appropriate labels for the axes and give the graph an appropriate title.


We follow the instructions for creating a stacked bar chart in Module 1. First we create a table of low birth weight by mothers' age-group, and create a stacked bar chart (to check that we're on the right track):

```
counts <- table(babies$LOW, babies$AgeGrp)
counts
```

```
##
##      <20 years 20-24 years 25-29 years 30-34 years
##      Low birth weight      15      25      15      4
##      Normal birth weight    36      44      27      18
##
##      35 or more years
##      Low birth weight      0
##      Normal birth weight    5
```

```
barplot(counts,
        main="Fig 1.2: Frequency of low birth weight by mother's age group",
        legend = rownames(counts), beside=FALSE)
```

Fig 1.2: Frequency of low birth weight by mother's age group




We then calculate the *relative frequency* of low-birth weight by mothers' age group

```
percent <- prop.table(counts, margin=2)*100
percent
```

```
##
##           <20 years 20-24 years 25-29 years 30-34 years
## Low birth weight  29.41176  36.23188  35.71429  18.18182
## Normal birth weight 70.58824  63.76812  64.28571  81.81818
##
##           35 or more years
## Low birth weight      0.00000
## Normal birth weight   100.00000
```

and use the `barplot()` command, as per the notes:

```
barplot(percent,
        main="Fig 1.3: Relative frequency of low birth weight by mother's age group",
        legend = rownames(percent), beside=FALSE)
```

Fig 1.3: Relative frequency of low birth weight by mother's age group

- d) Using your answers to the question a) and b), write a brief conclusion about the relationship of low birth weight and mother's age and smoking status.

In the study, the greatest number of babies were born to mothers in the 20-24 years age group, with the number of babies born declining with increasing maternal age for mothers older than 20-24 years (Figure 1.2). A larger proportion of mothers in the <20 years, 20-24 years and 25-29 years age groups gave birth to low birth weight babies compared to mothers aged 30-34 years. No low birth weight babies were born to mothers aged 35 or more (Figure 1.3).

A larger proportion of mothers who smoked during pregnancy gave birth to low birth weight babies compared to mothers who did not smoke during pregnancy.

NB: You will revisit two-way tables in Module 7 where you will conduct statistical tests to determine if the proportions are statistically different to each other.

Note: Coding graphs, particularly clustered and stacked bar graphs can be difficult! The site <https://r-graph-gallery.com/> gives excellent instructions on constructing different types of graphs in R.

Activity 1.3

Using R, estimate the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, range and interquartile range for the data Activity_S1.3.rds, available on Moodle.

```
act1_3 <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.3.rds")
descriptives(act1_3, mode=TRUE, iqr=TRUE, pc=TRUE)
```

```
##
## DESCRIPTIVES
##
## Descriptives
##
##              Lead_concn
##
##      N              15
##      Missing          0
##      Mean            1.500000
##      Median          1.500000
##      Mode            1.900000
##      Standard deviation 0.8434623
##      IQR             1.0000000
##      Minimum         0.1000000
##      Maximum         3.2000000
##      25th percentile 0.9500000
##      50th percentile 1.5000000
##      75th percentile 1.9500000
##
```

We can use the `descriptives()` function to obtain summary statistics. Examining the help entry for `descriptives()` shows we can request the mode using `mode=TRUE`, the interquartile range using `iqr=TRUE` and the percentiles (by default, the quartiles) using `pc=TRUE`. The mean is estimated as 1.50, the median is 1.5 and the mode is 1.9. The standard deviation is estimated as 0.843, the range is from 0.1 to 3.2, and the inter-quartile range is from 1.0 to 2.0 (both rounded to 1 decimal place).

Note: no units were provided for the data used in this question. Summary statistics must be presented with their units where the units are available.

Activity 1.4

Data of diastolic blood pressure (BP) of a sample of study participants are provided in the dataset `Activity_S1.4.rds`. Compute the mean, median, range and SD of diastolic BP.

```
act1_4 <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.4.rds")
descriptives(act1_4)
```

```
##
## DESCRIPTIVES
##
## Descriptives
##
##              diabp
##
##      N              100
##      Missing          0
##      Mean            82.23000
##      Median          83.00000
##      Standard deviation 13.01522
##      Minimum         56.00000
##      Maximum         118.00000
##
```

The mean is 82.2 mmHg and the median is 83.0 mmHg. The range is 56.0 to 118.0 mmHg (62.0 mmHg) and the standard deviation is 13.02 mmHg.

Note that the original data have one decimal place, so we can report the median with one decimal place. Although we are justified in presenting the mean to two decimal places (1 extra than the original data), and the standard deviation with three decimal places (1 more than the mean), there is little to be gained in this level of precision when presenting summary statistics for blood pressure.

Activity 1.5

In a study of 100 participants data were missing for 5 people. The missing data points were coded as '99'. The mean of the data was estimated as 45.0 with a standard deviation of 5.6; the smallest and greatest values are 16 and 65 respectively.

If the researcher analysed the data as if the 99s were real data, would it make the following statistics larger, smaller, or stay the same?

a) Mean

The mean will be larger.

b) Standard Deviation

The standard deviation will be larger.

c) Range

The range will be larger. The smallest value is still 16, but the largest is 99, and so the range is $99 - 16 = 83$.

Activity 1.6

Which of the following statements are true? The more dispersed, or spread out, a set of observations are:

a) The smaller the mean value

This is not true because the mean is not influenced by the spread of the values (if the distribution is symmetrical around the mean value)

b) The larger the standard deviation

This is true. The larger the spread, the larger the deviations from the mean. Hence the standard deviation will be larger.

c) The smaller the variance

This is not true. The variance will be larger if the deviations from the mean are larger.

Activity 1.7

If the variance for a set of scores is equal to 9, what is the standard deviation?

$$SD = \sqrt{\text{variance}} = \sqrt{9} = 3.$$

Module 1: Full script

```
# Author: Timothy Dobbins
# Date: May, 2022
# Purpose: Learning activities for Module 1

library(jmv)

### Activity 1.1

weightloss <- c(255, 198, 283, 312, 283, 57, 85, 312, 142, 113,
               227, 283, 255, 340, 142, 113, 312, 227, 85, 170,
               255, 198, 113, 227, 255)

# Check the default histogram:
hist(weightloss)

# The default values look ok, so let's add labels and titles
hist(weightloss, xlab="Weight loss (g)", main="Weight loss for 25 participants")

# Construct a relative frequency histogram
h <- hist(weightloss, plot=FALSE)
h$density <- h$counts/sum(h$counts)*100
plot(h, freq=FALSE,
     xlab="Weight loss (g)",
     ylab="Relative frequency (%)",
     main="Fig 1.1: Weight loss for 25 participants")

### Activity 1.2

babies <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.2.rds")

# Examine the first six rows of data
head(babies)

# Create a two-way table showing row percents
contTables(data=babies, rows=SMOKE, cols=LOW, pcRow=TRUE)

# Construct bar charts
counts <- table(babies$LOW, babies$AgeGrp)
counts

barplot(counts,
       main="Fig 1.2: Frequency of low birth weight by mother's age group",
       legend = rownames(counts), beside=FALSE)
```

```
percent <- prop.table(counts, margin=2)*100
percent

barplot(percent,
        main="Fig 1.3: Relative frequency of low birth weight by mother's age group",
        legend = rownames(percent), beside=FALSE)

### Activity 1.3

act1_3 <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.3.rds")

descriptives(act1_3, mode=TRUE, iqr=TRUE, pc=TRUE)

### Activity 1.4

act1_4 <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.4.rds")

descriptives(act1_4)
```


Module 2: Solutions to Learning Activities

Activity 2.1

In a Randomised Controlled Trial, the preference of a new drug was tested against an established drug by giving both drugs to each of 90 people. Assume that the two drugs are equally preferred, that is, the probability that a patient prefers either of the drugs is equal (50%). Use one of the binomial functions in R to compute the probability that 60 or more patients would prefer the new drug. In completing this question, determine:

- a) The number of trials (n)

Here, each participant represents a 'trial', so n is 90.

- b) The number of successes we are interested in (k)

We are interested in determining the probability that 60 or more participants prefer the new drug, so k is 60.

- c) The probability of success for each trial (p)

We are told to assume that the two drugs are equally preferred, so p is 0.5.

- d) The form of the R function: `dbinom` or `pbinom`

We need to calculate the probability that 60 or more participants prefer the new drug. The two R functions can be interpreted as follows: - the `dbinom` function gives the probability of observing 60 successes; - the `pbinom` function gives the probability of observing 60 or fewer successes; - the `pbinom` function with `lower.tail=FALSE` gives the probability of observing *more than* 60 successes.

We therefore want to use `pbinom` function with `lower.tail=FALSE` here.

- e) The final probability.

To calculate the probability of obtaining 60 or more successes, we need to calculate the probability of observing *more than* 59 successes. So the function we use is:

```
pbinom(q=59, size=90, prob=0.5, lower.tail = FALSE)
```

```
## [1] 0.001030133
```

Therefore, the probability that 60 or more patients would prefer the new drug is 0.001 or 0.1%.

Activity 2.2

A case of Schistosomiasis is identified by the detection of schistosome ova in a faecal sample. In patients with a low level of infection, a field technique of faecal examination has a probability of 0.35 of detecting ova in any one faecal sample. If five samples are routinely examined for each patient, use R to compute the probability that a patient with a low level of infection:

- a) Will not be identified?

In all of these questions, size is 5 and prob is 0.35. Here we need to calculate the probability of $P(X=0)$, and we can use the `dbinom` function:

```
dbinom(x=0, size=5, prob=0.35)
```

```
## [1] 0.1160291
```

The probability $P(X=0) = 0.116$ or 11.6%.

- b) Will be identified in two of the samples?

The probability $P(X=2) = 0.336$ or 33.6%:

```
dbinom(x=2, size=5, prob=0.35)
```

```
## [1] 0.3364156
```

- c) Will be identified in all the samples?

The probability $P(X=5) = .005$ or 0.5%:

```
dbinom(x=5, size=5, prob=0.35)
```

```
## [1] 0.005252187
```

- d) Will be identified in at most 3 of the samples?

"At most 3 samples" is the same as 3 or fewer samples, so we can use the `pbinom` function. The probability $P(X \leq 3) = .946$ or 94.6%:

```
pbinom(q=3, size=5, prob=0.35)
```

```
## [1] 0.9459775
```

Activity 2.3

If weights of men are Normally distributed with a population mean $\mu = 87$, and a population standard deviation, $\sigma = 8$ kg:

- a) What is the probability that a man will weigh 95 kg or more? Draw a Normal curve of the area represented by this probability in the population (i.e. with $\mu = 87$ kg and $\sigma = 8$ kg).

The curve representing the desired probability is drawn below, with the region above 95kg shaded to represent the probability of interest. Note that this curve was generated by a computer: a hand-drawn figure is completely acceptable. A hand-drawn figure will probably look much less tidy, but the main thing to notice is that the shaded area looks like it would represent less than 50% of the total curve. Therefore, our final probability should be less than 0.5.




Figure 0.1: Probability that a man will weigh 95kg or more

The probability is calculated as:


```
# Probability:  
pnorm(95, mean=87, sd=8, lower.tail=FALSE)
```

```
## [1] 0.1586553
```

Therefore, the probability that a man from this population weighs 95 kg or more is 0.16 or 16%.

- b) What is the probability that a man will weigh more than 75 kg but less than 95 kg? Draw the area represented by this probability on a standardised Normal curve.

The curve to represent this probability is shown below. To obtain the probability represented by the shaded region, we again use the fact that the total area under a Normal curve must add to 1. Let's break the curve into three parts, which we will call A, B and C.



We use that fact that $A+B+C=1$ to derive that $B = 1 - A - C$. We have already calculated C in Part (a) of this question. To calculate A:

```
pnorm(75, mean=87, sd=8, lower.tail=TRUE)
```

```
## [1] 0.0668072
```

$P(\text{Weight} < 75) = 0.0668$.

The region B is calculated as: $1 - 0.1587 - 0.0668 = 0.7745$.

So the probability that a man will weigh more than 75 kg but less than 95 kg is 0.77, or 77%.

Activity 2.4

Using the health survey data described in the R notes of this module, create a new variable, BMI, which is equal to a person's weight (in kg) divided by their height (in metres) squared (i.e. $\text{BMI} = \frac{\text{weight (kg)}}{[\text{height (m)}]^2}$). Categorise BMI using the WHO categories provided in the R notes. Create a two-way table to display the distribution of BMI categories by sex (sex: 1 = respondent identifies as male; 2 = respondent identifies as female). Does there appear to be a difference in categorised BMI between males and females?

```
library(readxl)
library(jmv)

survey <- read_excel("data/examples/health-survey.xlsx")
summary(survey)
```

```
##      sex      height      weight
## Min.   :1.00   Min.   :1.220   Min.    : 22.70
## 1st Qu.:1.00   1st Qu.:1.630   1st Qu.: 68.00
## Median :2.00   Median :1.700   Median : 79.40
## Mean   :1.55   Mean   :1.698   Mean    : 81.19
## 3rd Qu.:2.00   3rd Qu.:1.780   3rd Qu.: 90.70
## Max.   :2.00   Max.   :2.010   Max.    :213.20
```


After reading in the data, we define sex as a factor, and create BMI:

```
survey$sex <- factor(survey$sex, level=c(1,2), labels=c("Male", "Female"))

survey$bmi = survey$weight / (survey$height^2)
```


After creating BMI, we should examine its distribution using a histogram and/or a boxplot:

```
hist(survey$bmi, main="Histogram of BMI", xlab="Body mass index (kg/m2)")
```



```
boxplot(survey$bmi, main="Boxplot of BMI", ylab="Body mass index (kg/m2)")
```

Boxplot of BMI



The boxplot in particular shows that there are some extreme values of BMI. We can examine these records by viewing records with BMI less than, say 15, or greater than 45:

```
subset(survey, bmi<15)
```

```
## # A tibble: 2 x 4
##   sex    height weight  bmi
##   <fct>   <dbl>   <dbl> <dbl>
## 1 Female    1.57    22.7  9.21
## 2 Female    1.65    40.8 15.0
```

```
subset(survey, bmi>45)
```

```
## # A tibble: 16 x 4
##   sex    height weight  bmi
##   <fct>   <dbl>   <dbl> <dbl>
## 1 Female    1.52    105   45.4
## 2 Male      1.85    174   50.8
## 3 Female    1.22     74.8  50.3
## 4 Male      1.93    213   57.2
## 5 Female    1.63    127   47.8
## 6 Female    1.55    115   48.0
## 7 Female    1.65    131   48.2
## 8 Female    1.55    109   45.3
## 9 Male      1.78    143   45.1
## 10 Female   1.65    127   46.6
## 11 Female   1.63    132   49.5
```

```
## 12 Female 1.7 152 52.6
## 13 Female 1.6 127 49.6
## 14 Female 1.5 106. 47.2
## 15 Female 1.73 154. 51.5
## 16 Female 1.6 116. 45.4
```

The smallest BMI of 9.2 kg/m² is very low, with a weight of 22.7 kg. We should check the recorded height and weight values against the original data (paper records, survey responses) if they were available. However, as a weight of 22.7kg is not impossible, this record will not be deleted. An alternative approach would be to analyse the data including the very low BMI and again excluding the very low BMI as a sensitivity analysis. The largest BMI values are based on participants with large weights, and none of these seem biologically implausible. Therefore, no changes will be made to participants with small or large values of BMI.

We can use the `cut()` function to create the BMI categories. The WHO cutpoints are inclusive of the lower-bound, so we use `right=FALSE`. After creating the categories, it is good practice to check the resulting categories using `summary()`:

```
survey$bmi_cat <- cut(survey$bmi, c(0, 18.5, 25, 30, 35, 40, 100), right=FALSE)
summary(survey$bmi_cat)
```

```
## [0,18.5) [18.5,25) [25,30) [30,35) [35,40) [40,100)
##      18      362      411      201      101      47
```

Finally, we can create a two-way table using the `contTables()` function within the `jmv` package. We can define the rows by BMI category, and the columns by sex:

```
contTables(data=survey,
           rows = bmi_cat,
           cols = sex)
```

```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
##      bmi_cat      Male      Female      Total
##
## [0,18.5)          6         12         18
## [18.5,25)       134        228        362
## [25,30)         216        195        411
## [30,35)          95        106        201
## [35,40)          46         55        101
## [40,100)         16         31         47
## Total          513        627       1140
##
##
##
## x2 Tests
##
##      Value      df      p
##
## x2 22.49802      5 0.0004209
## N      1140
##
```

To assess whether there is a difference in BMI between males and females, we should look at the within-sex relative frequencies. In other words, column percents (for this table), by specifying `pcCol = TRUE`:

```
contTables(data=survey,
           rows = bmi_cat,
           cols = sex,
           pcCol = TRUE)
```

```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
##      bmi_cat                Male      Female      Total
##
##      [0,18.5)  Observed           6         12         18
##                % within column    1.16959    1.91388    1.57895
##
##      [18.5,25)  Observed          134        228        362
##                % within column   26.12086   36.36364   31.75439
##
##      [25,30)    Observed          216        195        411
##                % within column   42.10526   31.10048   36.05263
##
##      [30,35)    Observed           95        106        201
##                % within column   18.51852   16.90590   17.63158
##
##      [35,40)    Observed           46         55        101
##                % within column    8.96686    8.77193    8.85965
##
##      [40,100)   Observed           16         31         47
##                % within column    3.11891    4.94418    4.12281
##
##      Total      Observed          513        627       1140
##                % within column  100.00000   100.00000  100.00000
##
##
##
## x2 Tests
##
##      Value      df      p
##
##      x2  22.49802    5    0.0004209
##      N      1140
```

From this health survey, it appears that men are more likely to have BMIs indicating Pre-Obesity (men 42% vs women 31%) and Obesity Class I (men 19% vs women 17%), compared to women who are more likely to have BMIs indicating Normal weight (women 36% vs men 26%).

Activity 2.5


The data in the file `Activity_S2.5.rds` (available on Moodle) has information about birth weight and length of stay collected from 117 babies admitted consecutively to a hospital for surgery. For each variable:

- Create a histogram to inspect the distribution of the variable;


```
babies <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S2.5-LengthOfStay.rds")
summary(babies)
```

```
##          ID          Sex      BirthWt      GestAge      LengthStay
##  Min.   : 25   female:55   Min.   :1500   Min.   :31.00   Min.   : 0.00
## 1st Qu.: 54   male  :62   1st Qu.:2012   1st Qu.:35.75   1st Qu.: 21.00
## Median : 83                Median :2438   Median :36.00   Median : 30.00
## Mean   : 83                Mean   :2451   Mean   :36.56   Mean   : 41.08
## 3rd Qu.:112                3rd Qu.:2830   3rd Qu.:38.00   3rd Qu.: 43.00
## Max.   :141                Max.   :3545   Max.   :41.00   Max.   :244.00
##                                NA's   :1      NA's   :5
```


```
hist(babies$BirthWt, main="Histogram of birth weights",
     xlab="Birth weight (kg)")
```




```
# We can specify our own cutpoints using the breaks command, with the seq() function:
hist(babies$BirthWt, main="Histogram of birth weights",
     xlab="Birth weight (kg)",
     breaks=seq(from=1500, to=4000, by=250))
```



```
hist(babies$LengthStay, main="Histogram of lengths of stay",  
     xlab="Length of stay (days)")
```



```
hist(babies$LengthStay, main="Histogram of lengths of stay",  
     xlab="Length of stay (days)",  
     breaks=seq(from=0, to=250, by=25))
```



The histogram for birthweight shows a roughly symmetric distribution. The histogram for length of stay shows a highly skewed distribution (skewed to the right).

b. Complete the following summary statistics for each variable:

- mean and median;
- standard deviation and interquartile range;
- skewness and kurtosis.

```
descriptives(data = babies,
             vars = c(BirthWt, LengthStay),
             pc = TRUE,
             skew = TRUE,
             kurt = TRUE)
```

```
##
## DESCRIPTIVES
##
## Descriptives
##
##           BirthWt      LengthStay
##
## N                116            117
## Missing              1              0
## Mean             2451.207      41.07692
## Median            2437.500      30.00000
## Standard deviation  504.8221     36.92984
## Minimum            1500.000      0.00000
```

```
##      Maximum      3545.000      244.0000
##      Skewness      0.3548827      3.090351
##      Std. error skewness 0.2245612      0.2236233
##      Kurtosis      -0.7448547      11.56803
##      Std. error kurtosis 0.4455276      0.4436951
##      25th percentile 2012.000      21.00000
##      50th percentile 2437.500      30.00000
##      75th percentile 2830.000      43.00000
##
```

Make a decision about whether each variable is symmetric or not, and which measure of central tendency and variability should be reported.

As birthweight follows a roughly symmetric distribution, we should present the mean and standard deviation as the appropriate measures of central tendency and spread. Notice that the mean and median are similar, which is to be expected for a symmetric distribution.

Length of stay is highly skewed. In this case, the median and interquartile range are the appropriate measures to present. Notice that the mean is higher than the median, which is typical for distributions that are skewed to the right.

Activity 2.6

The data set of hospital stay data for 1323 hypothetical patients is available on Moodle in csv format (Activity2.6.csv). Import this dataset into R There are two variables in this dataset:

- female: female=1; male=0
- los: length of stay in days

- a) Use R to examine the distribution of length of stay: overall; and separately for females and males. Comment on the distributions.

```
hospstay <- read.csv("data/activities/Activity_S2.5.csv")
```

```
summary(hospstay)
```

```
##      female      los
## Min.   :0.0000  Min.   : 0.00
## 1st Qu.:0.0000  1st Qu.: 4.00
## Median :0.0000  Median : 9.00
## Mean   :0.1104  Mean   :12.52
## 3rd Qu.:0.0000  3rd Qu.:17.00
## Max.   :1.0000  Max.   :106.00
```


```
# Define female as a factor
```

```
hospstay$female <- factor(hospstay$female, levels=c(0,1), labels=c("Male", "Female"))
summary(hospstay$female)
```

```
##      Male Female
##      1177    146
```


```
hist(hospstay$los, main="Histogram of hospital stay", xlab="Length of stay (days)")
```

Histogram of hospital stay



```
boxplot(hospstay$los, main="Boxplot of hospital stay", ylab="Length of stay (days)")
```

Boxplot of hospital stay



```


hospstay_males <- subset(hospstay, female=="Male")
hospstay_females <- subset(hospstay, female=="Female")

# Set the graphics parameters to plot 2 rows and 2 columns:
par(mfrow=c(2,2))

# Specify each plot separately
hist(hospstay_males$los, xlab="Length of stay (days)", main="Males")
hist(hospstay_females$los, xlab="Length of stay (days)", main="Females")

boxplot(hospstay_males$los, ylab="Length of stay (days)", main="Males")
boxplot(hospstay_females$los, ylab="Length of stay (days)", main="Females")

```



```

# Reset graphics parameters
par(mfrow=c(1,1))

```

The histograms for overall length of stay and length of stay by gender all show that length of stay is heavily skewed (skewed to the right).

- b) Use R to calculate measures of central tendency for hospital stay to obtain information about the average duration of hospital stay. Which summary statistics should you report and why? Report the appropriate statistics of the spread and measure of central tendency chosen.

```

descriptives(data = hospstay,
             vars = los,
             pc = TRUE,
             skew = TRUE,
             kurt = TRUE)

```

```
##
## DESCRIPTIVES
##
## Descriptives
##
##           los
##
##      N           1323
##      Missing           0
##      Mean          12.51550
##      Median           9
##      Standard deviation 12.59933
##      Minimum           0
##      Maximum          106
##      Skewness         1.947803
##      Std. error skewness 0.06726732
##      Kurtosis          5.166837
##      Std. error kurtosis 0.1344336
##      25th percentile   4.000000
##      50th percentile   9.000000
##      75th percentile  17.00000
##
```

As the distribution of length of stay is highly skewed, the median and interquartile range should be presented. These can be calculated in the usual way, using the `descriptives()` function. The median length of stay is 9 days, with an interquartile range of 4 to 17 days.

- c) Calculate the measures of central tendency for hospital duration separately for males and females. What can you conclude from comparing these measures for males and females?

```
descriptives(data = hospstay,
             vars = los,
             splitBy = female,
             pc = TRUE,
             skew = TRUE,
             kurt = TRUE)
```

```
##
## DESCRIPTIVES
##
## Descriptives
##
##           female    los
##
##      N           Male      1177
##           Female      146
##      Missing       Male      0
##           Female      0
##      Mean          Male      12.75531
##           Female      10.58219
##      Median         Male      9
##           Female      7.500000
##      Standard deviation Male      12.83475
##           Female      10.34625
##
```


##	Minimum	Male	0
##		Female	0
##	Maximum	Male	106
##		Female	53
##	Skewness	Male	1.943967
##		Female	1.697009
##	Std. error skewness	Male	0.07130745
##		Female	0.2006795
##	Kurtosis	Male	5.128450
##		Female	3.067601
##	Std. error kurtosis	Male	0.1424946
##		Female	0.3987670
##	25th percentile	Male	4.000000
##		Female	3.000000
##	50th percentile	Male	9.000000
##		Female	7.500000
##	75th percentile	Male	18.00000
##		Female	14.00000
##			

Lengths of stay are similar for men (median: 9 days, interquartile range: 4 to 18 days) and women (median: 8 days, interquartile range: 3 to 14 days).

Module 2: Full script

```
# Author: Timothy Dobbins
# Date: May, 2022
# Purpose: Learning activities for Module 2

library(jmv)
library(readxl)

### Activity 2.1

pbinom(q=59, size=90, prob=0.5, lower.tail = FALSE)

### Activity 2.2

dbinom(x=0, size=5, prob=0.35)
dbinom(x=2, size=5, prob=0.35)
dbinom(x=5, size=5, prob=0.35)
pbinom(q=3, size=5, prob=0.35)

### Activity 2.3
A <- pnorm(75, mean=87, sd=8, lower.tail=TRUE)
A

C <- pnorm(95, mean=87, sd=8, lower.tail=FALSE)
C

B <- 1 - A - C
B

### Activity 2.4

survey <- read_excel("data/examples/health-survey.xlsx")
summary(survey)

survey$sex <- factor(survey$sex, level=c(1,2), labels=c("Male", "Female"))

survey$bmi = survey$weight / (survey$height^2)
hist(survey$bmi, main="Histogram of BMI", xlab="BMI (kg/m2)")
boxplot(survey$bmi, main="Boxplot of BMI", ylab="BMI (kg/m2)")
```

```

subset(survey, bmi<15)
subset(survey, bmi>45)

survey$bmi_cat <- cut(survey$bmi, c(0, 18.5, 25, 30, 35, 40, 100), right=FALSE)
summary(survey$bmi_cat)

contTables(data=survey,
            rows = bmi_cat,
            cols = sex)

contTables(data=survey,
            rows = bmi_cat,
            cols = sex,
            pcCol = TRUE)

### Activity 2.5
babies <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S2.5-LengthOfStay.rds")
summary(babies)

hist(babies$BirthWt, main="Histogram of birth weights",
     xlab="Birth weight (kg)")

# We can specify our own cutpoints using the breaks command, with the seq() function:
hist(babies$BirthWt, main="Histogram of birth weights",
     xlab="Birth weight (kg)",
     breaks=seq(from=1500, to=4000, by=250))

hist(babies$LengthStay, main="Histogram of lengths of stay",
     xlab="Length of stay (days)")

hist(babies$LengthStay, main="Histogram of lengths of stay",
     xlab="Length of stay (days)",
     breaks=seq(from=0, to=250, by=25))

descriptives(data = babies,
             vars = c(BirthWt, LengthStay),
             pc = TRUE,
             skew = TRUE,
             kurt = TRUE)

hospstay <- read.csv("data/activities/Activity_S2.5.csv")

summary(hospstay)

# Define female as a factor
hospstay$female <- factor(hospstay$female, levels=c(0,1), labels=c("Male", "Female"))
summary(hospstay$female)

hist(hospstay$los, main="Histogram of hospital stay", xlab="Length of stay (days)")
boxplot(hospstay$los, main="Boxplot of hospital stay", ylab="Length of stay (days)")

hospstay_males <- subset(hospstay, female=="Male")
hospstay_females <- subset(hospstay, female=="Female")

```

```
# Set the graphics parameters to plot 2 rows and 2 columns:
par(mfrow=c(2,2))

# Specify each plot separately
hist(hospstay_males$los, xlab="Length of stay (days)", main="Males")
hist(hospstay_females$los, xlab="Length of stay (days)", main="Females")

boxplot(hospstay_males$los, ylab="Length of stay (days)", main="Males")
boxplot(hospstay_females$los, ylab="Length of stay (days)", main="Females")

# Reset graphics parameters
par(mfrow=c(1,1))

descriptives(data = hospstay,
             vars = los,
             pc = TRUE,
             skew = TRUE,
             kurt = TRUE)

descriptives(data = hospstay,
             vars = los,
             splitBy = female,
             pc = TRUE,
             skew = TRUE,
             kurt = TRUE)
```


Module 3: Solutions to Learning Activities

Activity 3.1

An investigator wishes to study people living with agoraphobia (fear of open spaces). The investigator places an advertisement in a newspaper asking for volunteer participants. A total of 100 replies are received of which the investigator randomly selects 30. However, only 15 volunteers turn up for their interview.

1. Which of the following statements is true?
 - a) The final 15 participants are likely to be a representative sample of the population available to the investigator
 - b) The final 15 participants are likely to be a representative sample of the population of people with agoraphobia
 - c) The randomly selected 30 participants are likely to be a representative sample of people with agoraphobia who replied to the newspaper advertisement
 - d) None of the above

ANSWER: C

2. The basic problem confronted by the investigator is that:
 - a) The accessible population might be different from the target population
 - b) The sample has been chosen using an unethical method
 - c) The sample size was too small
 - d) It is difficult to obtain a sample of people with agoraphobia in a scientific way

ANSWER: A

Activity 3.2

A dental epidemiologist wishes to estimate the mean weekly consumption of sweets among children of a given age in her area. After devising a method which enables her to determine the weekly consumption of sweets by a child, she conducted a pilot survey and found that the standard deviation of sweet consumption by the children per week is 85 gm (assuming this is the σ). She considers taking a random sample for the main survey of:

- i) 25 children, or
 - ii) 100 children, or
 - iii) 625 children or
 - iv) 3,000 children.
- a) Estimate the standard error and maximum likely (95% confidence) error of the sample mean for each of these four sample sizes.

```
# i: n=25
n <- 25
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se
```

```
## [1] 17
```

```
mle <- 1.96 * se
mle
```

```
## [1] 33.32
```

- i) The standard error of the mean for a sample of 25 = $85/\sqrt{25} = 17$ gm, and the maximum likely error = $1.96 \times 17 = 33.32$ gm.

```
# ii: n=100
n <- 100
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se
```

```
## [1] 8.5
```

```
mle <- 1.96 * se
mle
```

```
## [1] 16.66
```

- ii) The standard error of the mean for a sample of 100 = $85/\sqrt{100} = 8.5$ gm, and the maximum likely error = $1.96 \times 8.5 = 16.66$ gm.

```
# iii: n=625
n <- 625
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se
```

```
## [1] 3.4
```

```
mle <- 1.96 * se
mle
```

```
## [1] 6.664
```

- iii) The standard error of the mean for a sample of 625 = $85/\sqrt{625} = 3.4$ gm, and the maximum likely error = $1.96 \times 3.4 = 6.66$ gm.

```
# iv: n=3000
n <- 3000
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se
```

```
## [1] 1.551881
```



```
mle <- 1.96 * se  
mle
```

```
## [1] 3.041686
```

iv) The standard error of the mean for a sample of 3,000 = $85/\sqrt{3000} = 1.55$ gm, and the maximum likely error = $1.96 \times 1.551881 = 3.04$ gm.

b) What happens to the standard error as the sample size increases? What can you say about the precision of the sample mean as the sample size increases?

When the sample size increases, the standard error of the mean (and hence the maximum likely error) decreases. Thus, sample means from larger samples are more precise than from smaller samples.


Activity 3.3

The dataset for this activity is the same as the one used in Activity 1.4 in Module 1. The file is Activity1.4.rds on Moodle.

a) Plot a histogram of diastolic BP and describe the distribution.

```
library(jmv)  
  
dbp <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.4.rds")  
  
hist(dbp$diabp,  
     main="Figure 3.1: Distribution of diastolic blood pressure",  
     xlab="Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)")
```

Figure 3.1: Distribution of diastolic blood pressure



The distribution is approximately symmetrical, centered about the mean.

- b) Use R to obtain an estimate of the mean, standard error of the mean and the 95% confidence interval for the mean diastolic blood pressure.

```
descriptives(data=dbp, vars=diabp, se=TRUE)
```

```
##
##  DESCRIPTIVES
##
##  Descriptives
##
##              diabp
##
##      N              100
##      Missing          0
##      Mean            82.23000
##      Std. error mean  1.301522
##      Median          83.00000
##      Standard deviation 13.01522
##      Minimum         56.00000
##      Maximum         118.0000
##
```

```
t.test(dbp$diabp)
```

```
##
##  One Sample t-test
##
## data:  dbp$diabp
## t = 63.18, df = 99, p-value < 2.2e-16
## alternative hypothesis: true mean is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  79.6475 84.8125
## sample estimates:
## mean of x
##      82.23
```

The sample mean is estimated as 82.2 mmHg, and the standard error (SE) of the mean is 1.30 mmHg. The 95% confidence interval is from 79.6 to 84.8 mmHg.

Note that the original data have one decimal place. While we could present the mean to two decimal places when reporting the mean, it seems a bit excessive to present a mean blood pressure to two decimal places. Thus we report the mean and 95% confidence interval for the mean with 1 decimal place.

- c) What can you say about the population mean from these results? (Include in you answer what is meant by the confidence interval of a mean).

We are 95% confident that true mean of the population from which we sampled lies between 79.6 mmHg and 84.8 mmHg.

Activity 3.4

Suppose that a random sample of 81 newborn babies delivered in a hospital located in a poor neighbourhood during the last year had a mean birth weight of 2.7 kg and a standard deviation of 0.9 kg. Calculate the 95% confidence interval for the unknown population mean. Interpret the 95% confidence interval.

This question asks for a confidence interval to be calculated from summarised data. R does not have an in-built function to do this, but we can use the code presented in the R notes to complete this activity.

```
ci_mean <- function(n, mean, sd, width=0.95, digits=3){  
  lcl <- mean - qt(p=(1 - (1-width)/2), df=n-1) * sd/sqrt(n)  
  ucl <- mean + qt(p=(1 - (1-width)/2), df=n-1) * sd/sqrt(n)  
  
  print(paste0(width*100, "%", " CI: ",  
               format(round(lcl, digits=digits), nsmall = digits),  
               " to ", format(round(ucl, digits=digits), nsmall = digits) ))  
}  
  
ci_mean(n=81, mean=2.7, sd=0.9, width=0.95)  
  
## [1] "95% CI: 2.501 to 2.899"
```

We are 95% confident that the true mean birthweight in the hospital located in a poor neighbourhood lies between 2.5 kg and 2.9 kg.

Module 3: Full script

```
# Author: Timothy Dobbins
# Date: June, 2022
# Purpose: Learning activities for Module 3

library(jmv)

# Activity 3.2
# i: n=25
n <- 25
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se

mle <- 1.96 * se
mle

# ii: n=100
n <- 100
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se

mle <- 1.96 * se
mle

# iii: n=625
n <- 625
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se

mle <- 1.96 * se
mle

# iv: n=3000
n <- 3000
se <- 85 / sqrt(n)
se

mle <- 1.96 * se
mle

# Activity 3.3
dbp <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S1.4.rds")
```

```
hist(dbp$diabp,
     main="Figure 3.1: Distribution of diastolic blood pressure",
     xlab="Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)")

descriptives(data=dbp, vars=diabp, se=TRUE)
t.test(dbp$diabp)

# Activity 3.4
ci_mean <- function(n, mean, sd, width=0.95, digits=3){
  lcl <- mean - qt(p=(1 - (1-width)/2), df=n-1) * sd/sqrt(n)
  ucl <- mean + qt(p=(1 - (1-width)/2), df=n-1) * sd/sqrt(n)

  print(paste0(width*100, "%", " CI: ",
               format(round(lcl, digits=digits), nsmall = digits),
               " to ", format(round(ucl, digits=digits), nsmall = digits) ))
}

ci_mean(n=81, mean=2.7, sd=0.9, width=0.95)
```

Module 4: Solutions to Learning Activities

Activity 4.1

In each of the following situations, what decision should be made about the null hypothesis if the researcher indicates that:

- a) $P < 0.01$

There is strong evidence against the null hypothesis.

- b) $P > 0.05$

There is weak or little evidence against the null hypothesis - but the researchers should be advised to provide the actual P-value, not just $P > 0.05$.

- c) 'ns' indicating not significant

Traditionally, 'ns' stands for not significant (for the set level of significance mentioned in the study, usually 0.05). You might still come across this term in some journal articles but this is not best practice for most journals these days. Researchers should always state the P-value (not just whether or not it was significant).

- d) significant differences exist

This would imply that the P-value is less than the set level of significance mentioned in the study (usually, 0.05). As such, we would conclude that there was evidence against the null hypothesis. However, the researchers should be advised to always state the P-value (not just whether or not it was significant).

Activity 4.2

For the following hypothetical situations, formulate the null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis and write a conclusion about the study results:

- a) A study was conducted to investigate whether the mean systolic blood pressure of males aged 40 to 60 years was different to the mean systolic blood pressure of females aged 40 to 60 years. The result of the study was that the mean systolic blood pressure was higher in males by 5.1 mmHg (95% CI 2.4 to 7.6; $P = 0.008$).

H_0 : There is no difference in the mean systolic blood pressure between males aged 40-60 years and females aged 40-60 years.

H_A : There is a difference in the mean systolic blood pressure between males aged 40-60 years and females aged 40 to 60 years.

Conclusion: The mean SBP was 5.1 mmHg (95% CI: 2.4 to 7.6 mmHg) higher in males aged 40-60 years compared to females aged 40-60 years. The P value is 0.008 which provides strong evidence against the null hypothesis. Therefore, we can conclude that there is a difference in the mean SBP of males and females aged 40-60 years.

- b) A case-control study was conducted to investigate the association between obesity and breast cancer. The researchers found an OR of 3.21 (95% CI 1.15 to 8.47; $P = 0.03$).

H_0 : There is no association between obesity and breast cancer. [A more formal way of saying this is that there is no difference in the odds of exposure to obesity among cases of breast cancer and controls i.e. $OR = 1$].

H_A : There is an association between obesity and breast cancer. [A more formal way of saying this is that there is a difference in the odds of exposure to obesity among cases and controls i.e. $OR \neq 1$].

Conclusion: The odds ratio is estimated as 3.21, indicating a positive association between the study factor of obesity and the outcome of breast cancer. The 95% CI is 1.15 to 8.47 and excludes the null value of no association (i.e. $OR = 1$). The P value is 0.03 which provides evidence against the null hypothesis. Therefore, we can conclude that there is a positive association between obesity and breast cancer.

- c) A cohort study investigated the relationship between eating a healthy diet and the incidence of influenza infection among adults aged 20 to 60 years. The results were $RR = 0.88$ (95% CI 0.65 to 1.50; $P = 0.2$).

H_0 : There is no association between influenza infection and a healthy diet among adults aged 20-60 years. [A more formal way of saying this is that there is no difference in the risk of influenza infection among adults aged 20-60 years who have a healthy diet compared to those who do not have a healthy diet. i.e. $RR = 1$].

H_A : There is an association between influenza infection and a healthy diet among adults aged 20-60 years. [A more formal way of saying this is that there is a difference in the risk of influenza infection among adults aged 20-60 years who have a healthy diet compared to those who do not have a healthy diet. i.e. $RR \neq 1$].

Conclusion: The relative risk is estimated as 0.88, indicating a protective association between the study factor of healthy diet and the outcome factor of influenza infection among adults aged 20 to 60 years. However, the 95% confidence interval includes the null value of 1.0 (no association). The P value is 0.2, which means there is no evidence against the null hypothesis. Thus, we can conclude that there is no evidence of an association between a healthy diet and influenza infection among adults aged 20 to 60 years.

Activity 4.3

A pilot study was conducted to compare the mean daily energy intake of women aged 25 to 30 years with the recommended intake of 7750 kJ/day. In this study, the average daily energy intake over 10 days was recorded for 12 healthy women of that age group. The data are in the Excel file Activity_4.3.xls. Import the file into R for this activity.

- a) State the research question

Is the mean daily energy intake of women aged 25-30 years different to the recommended daily intake of 7750 kJ/day?

- b) Formulate the null hypothesis

H_0 : the mean daily energy intake of women aged 25-30 years is the same as the recommended daily intake of 7750 kJ/day.

c) Formulate the alternative hypothesis

H_A : the mean daily energy intake of women aged 25-30 years is not same as the recommended daily intake of 7750 kJ/day.

d) Analyse the data and report your conclusions


```
library(readxl)
library(jmv)

pilot <- read_excel("data/activities/Activity_S4.3.xls")
summary(pilot)
```

```
##      Energy
##  Min.   :5260
## 1st Qu.:6045
##  Median:6674
##   Mean  :6856
## 3rd Qu.:7642
##   Max.  :8770
```

As we are comparing a continuous distribution to a hypothesised mean, we will use a one-sample t-test to conduct this analysis. As the one-sample t-test assumes our data follow a Normal distribution, we should assess this using a histogram.

```
hist(pilot$Energy, main="Daily energy intake of pilot participants", xlab="Energy (kJ)")
```



It is very difficult to assess the shape of a distribution with only 12 observations, but here we can see that the distribution looks roughly symmetric. In this case, we will assume Normality.

The one-sample t-test is conducted as below, to compare the variable Energy to the hypothesised mean of 7750 kJ/day:

```
t.test(pilot$Energy, mu=7750)

##
## One Sample t-test
##
## data: pilot$Energy
## t = -2.7141, df = 11, p-value = 0.02014
## alternative hypothesis: true mean is not equal to 7750
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  6131.023 7580.977
## sample estimates:
## mean of x
##      6856
```

The one-sample t-test output shows that the mean daily energy intake of the 12 women is 6856 kJ (95% CI: 6131 to 7581 kJ). There is evidence ($t = -2.71$ with 11 DF, $P = 0.02$) that the mean daily energy intake of women aged 25-30 years is lower than the recommended daily intake of 7750 kJ/day.

Activity 4.4

Which procedure gives the researcher the better chance of rejecting a null hypothesis?

- a) comparing the data-based p-value with the level of significance at 5%
- b) comparing the 95% CI with a nominated value
- c) neither procedure

Both 'a' and 'b' would give the same chance to reject the null hypothesis. This is because both 'a' and 'b' are giving you the same information in a different way. In 'a' you will get the probability of observing the difference you see in your data by chance and if it is < 0.05 you will reject the null hypothesis at the 5% level. Whereas in 'b' you will see whether the null value (value of no difference) lies within the range which you are 95% confident contains the true value. If the null value falls outside the 95% CI, you would have less than 5% ($100 - 95 = 5\%$) probability seeing the observed difference in your data if there were no difference.

Activity 4.5

Setting the significance level at $P < 0.10$ instead of the more usual $P < 0.05$ increases the likelihood of:

- a) a Type I error
- b) a Type II error
- c) rejecting the null hypothesis
- d) Not rejecting the null hypothesis

Setting the significance level cut-off at 0.10 instead of the more usual 0.05 increases the likelihood of **a. a Type I error** and **c. rejecting the null hypothesis**.

The cut-off of 0.10 increases the chance of a type I error from 5% to 10% (the chance of making a Type I error is the same as the significance level). If the significance level is higher, then there higher probability of rejecting the null hypothesis if there no effect in reality.

Activity 4.6

For a fixed sample size setting the significance level at a very extreme cut-off such as $P < 0.001$ increases the chances of:

- a) obtaining a significant result
- b) rejecting the null hypothesis
- c) a Type I error
- d) a Type II error

Setting the significance level at a very extreme cut-off (such as 0.001) increases the chances of: **d. a Type II error.**

For a given sample, if the significance level is set very small it will make it harder to find evidence against the null hypothesis. In other words, it will be difficult to detect an effect if an effect exists in reality. In other words, the probability of type II error will increase: you will not be able to reject the null hypothesis when a real difference exists.

Module 4: Full script

```
# Author: Timothy Dobbins
# Date: June, 2022
# Purpose: Learning activities for Module 4

library(readxl)
library(jmv)

pilot <- read_excel("data/activities/Activity_S4.3.xls")
hist(pilot$Energy, main="Daily energy intake of pilot participants", xlab="Energy (kJ)")

descriptives(pilot)

t.test(pilot$Energy, mu=7750)
```


Module 5: Solutions to Learning Activities

Activity 5.1

Indicate what type of t-test could be used to analyse the data from the following studies and provide reasons:

- a) A total of 60 university students are randomly assigned to undergo either behaviour therapy or Gestalt therapy. After twenty therapeutic sessions, each student earns a score on a mental health questionnaire.

An independent samples t-test could be used because the two groups (behaviour therapy vs Gestalt therapy) are independent. The mental health scores would need to be normally distributed in each group.

- b) A researcher wishes to determine whether attendance at a day care centre increases the scores of three year old twins on a motor skills test. Random assignment is used to decide which member from each of 30 pairs of twins attends the day care centre and which member stays at home.

This is a twin pair study where one member of a twin is allocated to day care and the other member to stay at home. This is an example of an individually matched study and so a paired t-test is appropriate.

- c) A child psychologist assigns aggression scores to each of 10 children during two 60 minute observation periods separated by an intervening exposure to a series of violent TV cartoons.

The same children are scored twice (before and after the intervention), thus it is a paired design and a paired t-test is appropriate.

- d) A marketing researcher measures 100 doctors' reports of the number of their patients asking them about a particular drug during the month before and the month after a major advertising campaign.

The doctors' reports are paired because they report before and after an intervention. Therefore, a paired t-test is appropriate.

Activity 5.2

A study was conducted to compare haemoglobin levels in the blood of children with and without cystic fibrosis. It is known that haemoglobin levels are normally distributed in children. The study results are given below:

Table 0.1: Table 1: Summary of haemoglobin (g/dL)

Statistic	Children without CF	Children with CF
n	12	15
Mean	19.9	13.9
SD (SE)	5.9 (1.7)	6.2 (1.6)

- a) State the appropriate null hypothesis and alternate hypothesis

The null hypothesis: The mean haemoglobin level of children with cystic fibrosis is the same as the mean haemoglobin level of children without cystic fibrosis.

The alternative hypothesis: The mean haemoglobin level of children with cystic fibrosis is different to the mean haemoglobin level of children without cystic fibrosis.

- b) Use R to conduct an appropriate statistical test to evaluate the null hypothesis. Are the assumptions for the test met for this analysis to be valid?

An independent samples t-test could be carried out to evaluate the study hypothesis because the data have been collected from 2 independent groups of children (children with and children without cystic fibrosis).

The assumption of independence is met. The outcome variable is continuous and the data are approximately normally distributed in the underlying population (as mentioned in the question).

We are provided with summarised data (i.e. means and standard deviations in each group), and not individual data. Therefore, we cannot use the standard `t.test()` function. The BSDA package has the `tsum.test()` function that can perform a t-test using summarised data.

```
# If necessary, install the BSDA package:
# install.packages("BSDA")
library(BSDA)
```

```
## Loading required package: lattice
```

```
##
```

```
## Attaching package: 'BSDA'
```

```
## The following object is masked from 'package:datasets':
```

```
##
```

```
##      Orange
```

```
# Calculate difference in means by hand:
19.9 - 13.9
```

```
## [1] 6
```

```
# t-test assuming equal variance
tsum.test(mean.x=19.9, s.x=5.9, n.x=12,
           mean.y=13.9, s.y=6.2, n.y=15,
           mu=0, alternative="two.sided", var.equal = TRUE)
```



```
##
## Standard Two-Sample t-Test
##
## data: Summarized x and y
## t = 2.5523, df = 25, p-value = 0.01719
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  1.158367 10.841633
## sample estimates:
## mean of x mean of y
##      19.9      13.9
```

As the two standard deviations are similar, we can assume equal variances. There is evidence that the mean haemoglobin level is lower in children with cystic fibrosis (13.9 g/dL) than children without cystic fibrosis (19.9 g/dL; $t=2.55$ with 25 df, $P=0.02$). The difference in means is estimated as 6.0 g/dL (95% CI: 1.2 to 10.8).

Activity 5.3

A randomised controlled trial (RCT) was carried out to investigate the effect of a new tablet supplement in increasing the hematocrit (%) value in anaemic participants. In the study, hematocrit was measured as the proportion of blood that is made up of red blood cells. Hematocrit levels are often lower in anaemic people who do not have sufficient healthy red blood cells. In the RCT, 33 people in the intervention group received the new supplement and 31 people in the control group received standard care (i.e. the usual supplement was given). After 4 weeks, hematocrit values were measured as shown in the R file `ActivityS5.3.rds`. In the community, hematocrit levels are normally distributed.

- a) State the research question and frame it as a null hypothesis.

Research question: Do anaemic patients randomised to take a new supplement have different hematocrit values compared to the anaemic patients randomised to receive the usual care?

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in the mean hematocrit value in patients randomised to take the new supplement and patients randomised to the control group.

- b) Use R to conduct an appropriate statistical test to answer the research question. Before using the test, check the data to see if the assumptions required for the test are met. Obtain a box plot to obtain an estimate of the centre and spread of the data for each group.

The appropriate test is an independent sample t-test. The assumptions for independent sample t-test are:

- The two groups are independent
- The measurements are independent
- The outcome variable must be continuous and must be normally distributed in each group

Based on the study design (RCT with 33 people in the intervention, 31 in the control group and the hematocrit level was measured only once per person) we can say that the first two assumptions are met.

The outcome variable is the proportion of blood that is made up of red blood cells which can be assumed to be continuous.

The histograms and box-plots in Figure 2 (below) show that the data are approximately normally distributed in the intervention group but there is a slight deviation from normality observed in the control group. This is indicated by some deviation from symmetry of the histogram, although there are no influential outliers.

It is mentioned in the question that the outcome variable is normally distributed in the general population. Because the t-test is robust to some degree of non-normality with absence of influential outliers, we could say that the third assumption is also met.

We obtained descriptive statistics for both the intervention and control groups using `descriptives()` function from the `jmv` package. From the descriptive statistics we can see that standard deviation of the intervention group (1.57) is slightly larger than in the control group (0.99). Inspection of Figures 0.2 and 0.3 also indicates more variability in the intervention group. Therefore, it may not be reasonable to assume that the variances are equal. In this case, we will use independent sample t-test based on unequal variance assumption.

```
# Activity 5.3
library(jmv)

anaemia <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S5.3.rds")

descriptives(data=anaemia, vars=hematocrit,
             splitBy = group,
             skew = TRUE)
```

```
##
## DESCRIPTIVES
##
## Descriptives
##
##           group          hematocrit
##
## N           Intervention           33
##           Standard care           31
## Missing      Intervention           0
##           Standard care           0
## Mean         Intervention    32.43636
##           Standard care    31.64516
## Median       Intervention    32.30000
##           Standard care    31.80000
## Standard deviation Intervention    1.570991
##           Standard care    0.9871976
## Minimum      Intervention    29.60000
##           Standard care    29.80000
## Maximum      Intervention    36.10000
##           Standard care    33.20000
## Skewness      Intervention    0.2816846
##           Standard care   -0.1638483
## Std. error skewness Intervention    0.4086354
##           Standard care    0.4205365
##
```

```
# Plotting by group using the method from Module 2:
anaemia_i <- subset(anaemia, group=="Intervention")
anaemia_sc <- subset(anaemia, group=="Standard care")

# Set the graphics parameters to plot 2 rows and 2 columns:
par(mfrow=c(2,2))

# Specify each plot separately
hist(anaemia_i$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention")
hist(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care")

boxplot(anaemia_i$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention")
boxplot(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care")
```




Figure 0.2: Graphical summaries of hematocrit by treatment group

```
# Reset graphics parameters
par(mfrow=c(1,1))
```

Note that the histograms and boxplots use different scales. We can standardise the scale limits using "xlim" and "ylim" by specifying the lower and upper bounds of the x- and y-axis:

```
par(mfrow=c(2,2))
```

```

hist(anaemia_i$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention",
     xlim=c(28, 38))
hist(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care",
     xlim=c(28, 38))

boxplot(anaemia_i$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention",
        ylim=c(28, 38))
boxplot(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care",
        ylim=c(28, 38))

```




Figure 0.3: Graphical summaries of hematocrit by treatment group

```

# Reset graphics parameters
par(mfrow=c(1,1))

```

c) Run your statistical test.

```

# Welch's t-test
ttestIS(data=anaemia, vars=hematocrit, group=group, meanDiff=TRUE, ci=TRUE, welchs=TRUE)

```

```

##
## INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST
##
## Independent Samples T-Test

```

```
##
##               Statistic    df          p          Mean difference    SE difference    Lower
##
## hematocrit  Student's t    2.394370    62.000000    0.0196861        0.7912023        0.3304428    0
##               Welch's t    2.427577    54.31900    0.0185439        0.7912023        0.3259227    0.137
##
```

d) Construct a table to show how you would report your results and write a conclusion.

The results are summarised in Table 2.

Table 0.2: Table 2: Mean hematocrit levels by study group

	Intervention	Standard care	Difference in means (95% CI)	t, df	P value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
Hematocrit level (%)	32.44 (1.57)	31.65 (0.99)	0.79 (0.14, 1.44)	2.43, 55.7df	0.019

Conclusion

The mean haematocrit level among the standard care group is 31.65 and among the intervention group is 32.44. There is evidence that the mean hematocrit level is different for the two study groups ($P = 0.019$, $t = 2.43$ with 55.7 df). The mean difference indicates that the mean hematocrit level was 0.79 units higher (95% CI: 0.14, 1.44) in the intervention group compared to the control group.

Activity 5.4

A total of 41 babies aged 6 months to 2 years with haemangioma (birth mark) were enrolled in a study to test the effect of a new topical medication in reducing the volume of their haemangioma. Parents were asked to apply the medication twice daily. The volume (in mm³) of the haemangioma was measured at enrolment and again after 12 weeks of using the medication.

a) What is the research question in this study? State the null and alternative hypotheses.

The research question is: does a 12 week application of new topical medication change the volume of haemangiomas among children aged 6 months to 2 years compared to the volume at baseline?

Null hypothesis: there is no change in the mean haemangioma volume among children aged 6 months to 2 years at baseline and after 12 weeks treatment with topical medication.

Alternative hypothesis: there is a change in the mean haemangioma volume among children aged 6 months to 2 years at baseline and after 12 weeks treatment with topical medication.


b) Use the data in the R file `ActivityS5.4.rds` to answer the research question. Which statistical test is appropriate to answer the research question and why? Conduct the test in R and write your conclusion.

A paired t-test is appropriate to test the null hypothesis. The measurement of haemangioma volume was made on each baby twice to compare the differences before and after the treatment, therefore, the study has a paired design. Because haemangioma volume is a continuous measurement (mm³), a paired t-test can be considered. The assumptions for a paired t-test are that the outcome variable is continuous, and differences of the measurements are normally distributed.

To check the distribution of the differences between the measurements, we first need to calculate the differences. We then examine the distribution of the differences using a histogram as shown in Figure 3.

```
babies <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S5.4.rds")

babies$diff = babies$week_12 - babies$baseline
hist(babies$diff, xlab="Volume (mm3)", main="Difference in haemangioma volume")
```



As we can see from the histogram, the differences in volume at the beginning and end of the study are reasonably symmetrically distributed. Although the distribution is very peaked, there are no influential outliers and the t-test is robust to the deviation of the normality assumption.

To conduct the paired t-test in R, we use the `t.test()` function, specifying the two columns of haemangioma volume and `paired=TRUE`:

```
# Using ttestPS from jmv
ttestPS(data=babies, pairs=list(list(i1 = 'week_12', i2 = 'baseline')), meanDiff=TRUE, ci=TRUE)
```

```
##
## PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST
##
## Paired Samples T-Test
##
##               statistic    df      p      Mean difference  SE difference    Lower
## week_12 baseline Student's t   -1.959437  40.00000    0.0570564    -0.4021951    0.2052605
##
```

The code for the `ttestPS()` function is quite cumbersome. You may want to use the `t.test()` function:

```
# Using t.test
t.test(babies$week_12, babies$baseline, paired=TRUE)

##
## Paired t-test
##
## data: babies$week_12 and babies$baseline
## t = -1.9594, df = 40, p-value = 0.05706
## alternative hypothesis: true mean difference is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
## -0.81704216 0.01265192
## sample estimates:
## mean difference
## -0.4021951
```

The output shows that the mean volume at week 12 of 1.94 mm³ was lower than the mean of 2.34 mm³ at baseline. The mean decrease is 0.40 mm³ (95% CI -0.01 to 0.82). From the paired t-test results, we can see that $t = -1.96$ with 40 df and $P = 0.057$. This P-value provides only weak evidence that the topical medication has an effect on haemangioma volume among children aged 6 months to 2 years. The P-value of 0.057 is consistent with the 95% CI just crossing the line of no difference (i.e. 0 mm³).

[Note that the estimated difference and its confidence interval (-0.40: 95% CI from -0.82 to 0.01) is presented as if it were an *increase* from baseline to 12-weeks. As the mean difference is negative, we can interpret the estimates as *reductions* by multiplying each value by -1.]

c) What are the limitations of this study?

In a paired design, each subject serves as their own control (here by comparing the change in volume of the haemangioma at baseline and after 12 weeks of treatment). However, the reduction of -0.40 mm³ on average could have been due to the new medication or to the natural history of the condition. A better design would be a randomised controlled trial where subjects are randomised to the new treatment or the usual treatment and compare the volume between the 2 groups. More information on randomised controlled trials and other study designs is given in PHCM9794: Foundations of Epidemiology.

Module 5: Full script

```
# Author: Timothy Dobbins
# Date: June, 2022
# Purpose: Learning activities for Module 5

# If necessary, install the BSDA package:
# install.packages("BSDA")
library(BSDA)
library(jmv)

# Activity 5.2
# Calculate difference in means by hand:
19.9 - 13.9

# t-test assuming equal variance
tsum.test(mean.x=19.9, s.x=5.9, n.x=12,
          mean.y=13.9, s.y=6.2, n.y=15,
          mu=0, alternative="two.sided", var.equal = TRUE)

# Activity 5.3
anaemia <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S5.3.rds")

descriptives(data=anaemia, vars=hematocrit,
             splitBy = group,
             skew = TRUE)

# Plotting by group using the method from Module 2:
anaemia_i <- subset(anaemia, group=="Intervention")
anaemia_sc <- subset(anaemia, group=="Standard care")

# Set the graphics parameters to plot 2 rows and 2 columns:
par(mfrow=c(2,2))

# Specify each plot separately
hist(anaemia_i$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention")
hist(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care")

boxplot(anaemia_i$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention")
boxplot(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care")

# Create plots using common axis limits
hist(anaemia_i$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention",
```

```
xlim=c(28, 38))
hist(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, xlab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care",
     xlim=c(28, 38))

boxplot(anaemia_i$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Intervention",
        ylim=c(28, 38))
boxplot(anaemia_sc$hematocrit, ylab="Hematocrit", main="Standard care",
        ylim=c(28, 38))

# Reset graphics parameters
par(mfrow=c(1,1))

# Welch's t-test
ttestIS(data=anaemia, vars=hematocrit, group=group, meanDiff=TRUE, ci=TRUE, welchs=TRUE)

# Activity 5.4
babies <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S5.4.rds")

babies$diff = babies$week_12 - babies$baseline
hist(babies$diff, xlab="Volume (mm3)", main="Difference in haemangioma volume")

# Using ttestPS from jmv
ttestPS(data=babies, pairs=list(list(i1 = 'week_12', i2 = 'baseline')), meanDiff=TRUE, ci=TRUE)

# Using t.test
t.test(babies$week_12, babies$baseline, paired=TRUE)
```

Module 6: Solutions to Learning Activities

Activity 6.1

In a clinical trial involving a dietary intervention, 150 adult volunteers agreed to participate. The investigator wanted to know whether this sample was representative of the general population. One interesting finding was that 90 of the participants drink alcohol regularly compared to 70% of the general population.

a) State the null hypothesis

Null hypothesis: The proportion of volunteers who consume alcohol regularly is the same as the proportion who consume alcohol regularly in the general population.

b) Calculate the 95% CI for the proportion of regular drinkers in the sample using R.

```
library(DescTools)
```

```
# BinomCI from DescTools calculates a Wilson confidence interval:  
BinomCI(90, n=150, method="wilson")
```

```
##      est    lwr.ci    upr.ci  
## [1,] 0.6 0.5200492 0.6749568
```

```
# The default binom.test calculates a Wald confidence interval  
binom.test(90, n=150, p=0.7)
```

```
##  
## Exact binomial test  
##  
## data: 90 and 150  
## number of successes = 90, number of trials = 150, p-value = 0.009553  
## alternative hypothesis: true probability of success is not equal to 0.7  
## 95 percent confidence interval:  
## 0.5169313 0.6790370  
## sample estimates:  
## probability of success  
## 0.6
```

The proportion of volunteers who drink alcohol regularly is estimated as 60%, with a 95% confidence interval from 52% to 67%. The 95% confidence interval can be interpreted as: we are 95% confident that the true prevalence of alcohol drinkers in the population from where the sample was drawn lies between 52% and 67%. Note that the prevalence of

regular drinkers in the general population is 70%, which does not fall within the 95% CI calculated from the sample. This may be because the participants were not randomly selected from the general population; they volunteered to participate in the study.

- c) Use the R file `Activity_S6.1.rds` to decide if the sample of volunteers is representative of the population.

We have stated the null hypothesis in part (a):

Null hypothesis: The proportion of volunteers who consume alcohol regularly is the same as the proportion who consume alcohol regularly in the general population.

The one-sample proportion test has been calculated with the `binom.test` command in (a). If we only had individual data (i.e. did not have the summary results above), we would need to tabulate the data first:

```
alcohol <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S6.1.rds")
table(alcohol$Drinking_Status)
```

```
##
## Non-drinker      Drinker
##              60          90
```

```
binom.test(90, n=150, p=0.7)
```

```
##
## Exact binomial test
##
## data: 90 and 150
## number of successes = 90, number of trials = 150, p-value = 0.009553
## alternative hypothesis: true probability of success is not equal to 0.7
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  0.5169313 0.6790370
## sample estimates:
## probability of success
##                0.6
```

The R output gives the P-value from a two-sided test of 0.0096. Thus, we can conclude that there is strong evidence that the proportion of drinkers among the sample population of the dietary intervention group (60%) is lower than that (70%) in the general population.

Activity 6.2

A survey was conducted of a random sample of upper primary school children to measure the prevalence of asthma using questionnaires completed by the parents. A total of 514 children were enrolled. Use the R dataset `Activity_S6.2.rds` for this activity.

- a) Calculate the relative risk and odds ratio with 95% confidence interval using Stata for children to have asthma symptoms if they are male? Which risk estimate would be the correct statistic to report?

Before we begin analysing any binary data, we must ensure that the binary variables of interest are coded as factors, with the positive exposure and outcomes ordered first. We can check this using the `summary()` function:

```
library(jmv)
asthma <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S6.2.rds")
```

```
summary(asthma$Asthma)
```

```
## Yes No
## 119 395
```

```
summary(asthma$Gender)
```

```
## Male Female NA's
## 258 242 14
```

Here, Asthma is coded with “Yes” as the first level, as required. Gender is coded with “Male” as the first level, which means that R will produce summaries of male vs female. Note that there are 14 missing values for gender, indicated as NA.

The relative risk of asthma can be calculated using the `contTables()` function within the `jmv` library. The relative risk is calculated using `relRisk = TRUE`, and the proportion of asthma within each sex calculated using `pcRow = TRUE`:

```
contTables(data=asthma, rows=Gender, cols=Asthma,
           pcRow = TRUE, relRisk = TRUE)
```

```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
## Gender Yes No Total
##
## Male Observed 70 188 258
## % within row 27.13178 72.86822 100.00000
##
## Female Observed 46 196 242
## % within row 19.00826 80.99174 100.00000
##
## Total Observed 116 384 500
## % within row 23.20000 76.80000 100.00000
##
##
##
## x2 Tests
##
## Value df p
##
## x2 4.624920 1 0.0315107
## N 500
##
##
##
## Comparative Measures
##
```

```
##           Value      Lower      Upper
##
## Relative risk  1.427368    1.028159    1.981579
##
## Rows compared
```

From the output we can see that the relative risk of Asthma for males compared to females is 1.43 (95% CI: 1.03 to 1.98).

To calculate the odds ratio, we use `odds = TRUE`:

```
contTables(data=asthma, rows=Gender, cols=Asthma,
           odds = TRUE)
```

```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
##   Gender   Yes   No   Total
##
##   Male     70   188   258
##   Female   46   196   242
##   Total   116   384   500
##
##
##
## x² Tests
##
##           Value      df      p
##
## x²      4.624920      1    0.0315107
## N           500
##
##
## Comparative Measures
##
##           Value      Lower      Upper
##
## Odds ratio  1.586494    1.039904    2.420381
##
```

The OR of Asthma 1.59 (95% CI: 1.04 to 2.42) for males compared to females.

The relative risk is the correct risk estimate to use as this a cross-sectional study. The relative risk is a direct comparison of the proportion with asthma symptoms in each exposure group. The odds ratio is only appropriate for a case-control study.

- b) Use the tabulated data on the frequency of cases and exposure you obtained in R output in part a to calculate RR and OR with their 95% confidence interval using R.

This question assumes we are only given the values of the four cells in the cross-tabulation. We can re-write this table as follows to explain the process of entering summarised data:

Gender	Asthma	Number
Male	Yes	70
Male	No	188
Female	Yes	46
Female	No	196

We can enter these data in a dataframe, comprising three vectors, as follows:

```
asthma_summary <- data.frame(
  Gender = c("Male", "Male", "Female", "Female"),
  Asthma = c("Yes", "No", "Yes", "No"),
  Number = c(70, 188, 46, 196))
```

We need to define Gender and Asthma as factors. Here we must define the levels **in the order we want the categories to appear in the table**. Note that as Gender and Asthma are entered as text variables, we can omit labels command when defining the factors, and the factor will be labelled using the text entry:

```
asthma_summary$Gender <- factor(asthma_summary$Gender,
                                levels = c("Male", "Female"))

asthma_summary$Asthma <- factor(asthma_summary$Asthma,
                                levels = c("Yes", "No"))
```

We can calculate the relative risk using the summarised data in the same way done previously. However, we need to include the number of observations in each cell using the counts command:

```
contTables(data=asthma_summary,
            rows = Gender, cols = Asthma,
            counts = Number,
            relRisk = TRUE)
```

```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
##   Gender    Yes    No    Total
##   Male      70    188    258
##   Female    46    196    242
##   Total    116    384    500
##
##
##
## x2 Tests
##
##           Value      df      p
##
## x2    4.624920      1    0.0315107
## N           500
```

```
##
##
##
## Comparative Measures
##
##           Value      Lower      Upper
##
## Relative risk  1.427368    1.028159    1.981579
##
## Rows compared
```

The output from the summarised data is identical to the output of the individual-level data.

Activity 6.3

In a study to determine the cause of mortality, 89 people were followed up for 5 years. The participants are classified into two groups of those who did or did not have a heart attack. At the end of the follow-up 15 people died among them 10 had a heart attack. Among the 74 survivors 35 had a heart attack. Present the data on a 2x2 table and calculate relative risk of death from heart attack with 95% confidence interval using R.

The cross-tabulation of heart attack and mortality is given in Table 6.1.

HeartAttack	Death		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	10	35	45
No	5	39	44
Total	15	74	89

To calculate relative risk using the information from Table 6.1, we enter first enter the summarised data into a new dataframe:

```
mortality <- data.frame(
  HeartAttack = c("Yes", "Yes", "No", "No"),
  Death = c("Yes", "No", "Yes", "No"),
  n = c(10, 35, 5, 39))

mortality$HeartAttack <- factor(mortality$HeartAttack,
                               levels = c("Yes", "No"))

mortality$Death <- factor(mortality$Death,
                          levels = c("Yes", "No"))
```

We then estimate the relative risk using the `contTables()` function:

```
contTables(data = mortality,
           rows = HeartAttack, cols = Death,
           counts = n,
           pcRow = TRUE, relRisk = TRUE)
```



```
##
## CONTINGENCY TABLES
##
## Contingency Tables
##
##      HeartAttack                Yes          No          Total
##
##      Yes      Observed              10          35          45
##              % within row      22.22222      77.77778      100.00000
##
##      No      Observed              5          39          44
##              % within row      11.36364      88.63636      100.00000
##
##      Total    Observed              15          74          89
##              % within row      16.85393      83.14607      100.00000
##
##
##
## x^2 Tests
##
##              Value      df      p
##
##      x^2      1.871883      1      0.1712595
##      N              89
##
##
##
## Comparative Measures
##
##              Value      Lower      Upper
##
##      Relative risk      1.955556      0.7267615      5.261971
##
##      Rows compared
```

From the output we can see that the relative risk of death from heart attack is 1.96 (95% CI: 0.73 to 5.26).

Activity 6.4

A study is conducted to test the hypothesis that the observed frequency of a certain health outcome is 30%. If the results yield a CI around the sample proportion that extends from 23.8 to 30.2, what can you say about the evidence against the null hypothesis?

As the 95% confidence interval includes the hypothesised population proportion, we can infer that the P-value of the study will be greater than 0.05. Hence, this study provides weak to no evidence against the null hypothesis.

Activity 6.5

In an experiment to test the effect of vitamin C on IQ scores, the following confidence intervals were estimated around the percentage of people with improved scores for five different populations:

Population	% with improved IQ	95% confidence interval
1	35.0	32.0 to 38.0
2	29.5	25.0 to 34.0
3	43.5	42.0 to 45.0
4	30.5	20.0 to 41.0
5	24.5	21.0 to 28.0

a) Which CI is the most precise?

Population 3. This has the smallest interval which is 3 (42 - 45).

b) Which CI implies the largest sample size?

Population 3. The larger the sample size, the smaller the standard error and hence narrower the confidence interval. Therefore the largest sample size will have the narrowest confidence interval provided that the frequency is the same.

c) Which CI is the least precise? > Population 4. This has the widest interval which is 21 (41 - 20), thus is less precise than the others.

d) Which CI most strongly supports the conclusion that vitamin C increases IQ score and why?

Population 3. This has the narrowest confidence interval where the lower bound is higher than the upper bound of all others.

e) Which would most likely to stimulate the investigator to conduct an additional experiment using a larger sample size?

Population 4. This estimate is the least precise. By increasing sample size, the estimate of frequency as shown by the 95% CI would become narrower.

Module 6: Full script

```
# Author: Timothy Dobbins
# Date: June, 2022
# Purpose: Learning activities for Module 6

# Activity 6.1

library(DescTools)

# BinomCI from DescTools calculates a Wilson confidence interval:
BinomCI(90, n=150, method="wilson")

# The default binom.test calculates a Wald confidence interval
binom.test(90, n=150, p=0.7)

alcohol <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S6.1.rds")
table(alcohol$Drinking_Status)

binom.test(90, n=150, p=0.7)

# Activity 6.2

library(jmv)
asthma <- readRDS("data/activities/Activity_S6.2.rds")

summary(asthma$Asthma)
summary(asthma$Gender)

contTables(data=asthma, rows=Gender, cols=Asthma,
           pcRow = TRUE, relRisk = TRUE)

contTables(data=asthma, rows=Gender, cols=Asthma,
           odds = TRUE)

asthma_summary <- data.frame(
  Gender = c("Male", "Male", "Female", "Female"),
  Asthma = c("Yes", "No", "Yes", "No"),
  Number = c(70, 188, 46, 196))

asthma_summary$Gender <- factor(asthma_summary$Gender,
                              levels = c("Male", "Female"))

asthma_summary$Asthma <- factor(asthma_summary$Asthma,
```

```
                                levels = c("Yes", "No"))

contTables(data=asthma_summary,
            rows = Gender, cols = Asthma,
            counts = Number,
            relRisk = TRUE)

# Activity 6.3
mortality <- data.frame(
  HeartAttack = c("Yes", "Yes", "No", "No"),
  Death = c("Yes", "No", "Yes", "No"),
  n = c(10, 35, 5, 39))

mortality$HeartAttack <- factor(mortality$HeartAttack,
                                levels = c("Yes", "No"))

mortality$Death <- factor(mortality$Death,
                           levels = c("Yes", "No"))

contTables(data = mortality,
            rows = HeartAttack, cols = Death,
            counts = n,
            pcRow = TRUE, relRisk = TRUE)
```