

## STA 6166 - Project

### Instructions:

- Can work together but the work submitted must be uniquely yours.
- Five (5) pages, with no appendix. Be brief and to the point, each sentence should be 1-2 lines. Five (5) points will be deducted for each page over the limit.
- With each statement/conclusion you make, accompany ONLY the relevant computer output and/or hand calculations.
- Use technically correct methodology, try to avoid “wishy-washy” or “close enough” methods.
- Project needs to be neat, have a flow and easy to follow.
- You are responsible for reading/inputting data into software (from its current format).

### Guidelines:

- Use descriptive statistics or overall tests of fit to first determine if it is worthwhile analyzing the dataset (or parts of it) further.
- **Always check if the assumptions of the methodology you plan to use are valid before you proceed.** (If applicable, double check your results with other methods/tools.)
- For linear models, if only the model fit is not good, first try transforming predictors before you transform the response.
- Justify your methodology and conclusions.
- Try to present your findings with an inclusion of a graphic or figure. Remember journal referees love pretty pictures.
- Pay attention to the units of measurement.

1. A university medical center urology group was interested in modeling prostate-specific antigen (PSA) and a number of prognostic clinical measurements in men with advanced prostate cancer. Data were collected on 97 men who were about to undergo radical prostatectomies.

[http://www.stat.ufl.edu/~athienit/STA6166/assignment3\\_1.txt](http://www.stat.ufl.edu/~athienit/STA6166/assignment3_1.txt)

Each line of the data set has an identification number and provides information on 8 other variables

| Variable Number | Variable Name                | Description   |
|-----------------|------------------------------|---|
| 1               | ID number                    | 1-97  |
| 2               | PSA level                    | Serum prostate-specific antigen level (mg/ml)   |
| 3               | Cancer volume                | Estimate of prostate cancer volume (cc)   |
| 4               | Weight                       | Prostate weight (grams)   |
| 5               | Age                          | Age of patient (years)  |
| 6               | Benign prostatic hyperplasia | Amount of benign prostatic hyperplasia (cm <sup>2</sup> )   |
| 7               | Seminal vesicle invasion     | Presence of seminal vesicle invasion: 1 yes; 0 otherwise  |
| 8               | Capsular penetration         | Degree of capsular penetration (cm)   |
| 9               | Gleason score                | Pathologically determined grade of disease. (Scores were either 6, 7, or 8 with higher scores indicating worse prognosis) |

Develop a “best” model for predicting PSA and interpret. In addition, create a 90% prediction interval for PSA levels for an individual who has the following values.

| Variable Number | Variable Name                | Value  |
|-----------------|------------------------------|--------|
| 3               | Cancer volume                | 4.2633 |
| 4               | Weight                       | 22.783 |
| 5               | Age                          | 68     |
| 6               | Benign prostatic hyperplasia | 1.3500 |
| 7               | Seminal vesicle invasion     | 0      |
| 8               | Capsular penetration         | 0      |
| 9               | Gleason score                | 6      |

2. Three chemical cleaning solvents are a potential hazardous waste. Independent samples of solvents from each type were tested and their sorption rates were recorded as a mole percentage.

| Aromatics |      | Chloroalkanes |      | Esters |      |      |
|-----------|------|---------------|------|--------|------|------|
| 1.06      | 0.95 | 1.58          | 1.12 | 0.29   | 0.43 | 0.06 |
| 0.79      | 0.65 | 1.45          | 0.91 | 0.06   | 0.51 | 0.09 |
| 0.82      | 1.15 | 0.57          | 0.83 | 0.44   | 0.10 | 0.17 |
| 0.89      | 1.12 | 1.16          | 0.43 | 0.55   | 0.53 | 0.17 |
| 1.05      |      |               |      | 0.61   | 0.34 | 0.60 |

Analyze the dataset (using appropriate methodology) and determine if there are differences in the mean sorption rate. If so, what are the differences?