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Mathematica Laboratories for Mathematical Statistics introduces an approach to incorporating technology in the mathematical statistics sequence, with an emphasis on simulation and computer intensive methods. The printed book is a concise introduction to the concepts of probability theory and mathematical statistics. The accompanying electronic materials are a series of in-class and take-home computer laboratory problems designed to reinforce the concepts, and to apply the techniques in real and realistic settings. The original laboratory materials were written for Mathematica Version 5, and have been updated for Version 7. The materials are designed so that students with little or no experience in Mathematica will be able to complete the work.

The materials are written to be used in the mathematical statistics sequence given at most colleges and universities (two courses of four semester hours each or three courses of three semester hours each). Multivariable calculus, and familiarity with the basics of set theory, vectors and matrices, and problem-solving using a computer are assumed. The order of topics generally follows that of a standard sequence. Chapters 1 through 5 cover concepts in probability. Chapters 6 through 10 cover introductory mathematical statistics. Chapters 11 and 12 are on permutation and bootstrap methods; in each case, problems are designed to expand on ideas from previous chapters so that instructors could choose to use some of the problems earlier in the course. Permutation and bootstrap methods also appear in the later chapters. Chapters 13, 14 and 15 are on multiple sample analysis, linear least squares and contingency tables, respectively. References for specialized topics in Chapters 10 through 15 are given at the beginning of each chapter.

Each chapter has a main laboratory notebook containing between five and seven problems, and a series of additional problem notebooks. The problems in the main laboratory notebook are for basic understanding, and can be used for in-class work or assigned for homework. The additional problem notebooks reinforce and/or expand the ideas from the main laboratory notebook and are generally longer and more involved.

This PDF file contains
(I) The main laboratory notebook for Chapter 14 (linear least squares analysis), pages 2-11;
(II) Typical output from the examples in the notebook, pages 12-17; and
(III) Solutions to the problems in the notebook, pages 18-26.
§1. Simple Linear Least Squares

Assume that the response random variable $Y$ can be written as a linear function of the form

$$Y = \alpha + \beta X + \epsilon$$

where

- the predictor $X$ and the error $\epsilon$ are independent random variables,
- The distribution of $\epsilon$ has mean 0 and standard deviation $\sigma$, and
- All parameters ($\alpha, \beta, \sigma$) are unknown.

Then the conditional expectation of $Y$ given $X = x$ is a linear function in $x$

$$E(Y \mid X = x) = \alpha + \beta x$$

and the standard deviation of the conditional distribution does not depend on $x$.

This section focuses on least squares and permutation methods to estimate the parameters in the conditional mean formula using the Fit and SlopeCI functions. Please evaluate the following command before starting your work.

```
Needs["StatTools`Group1`"];
Needs["StatTools`Group2`"];
Needs["StatTools`Group3`"];
Needs["StatTools`Group4`"];
```

The form of the Fit function is as follows:

```
Fit[pairs,{1,x},x]
```

returns the estimated mean formula, where pairs is a list of pairs of real numbers.

Note: The pairs are assumed to be the values of a random sample from the joint $(X, Y)$ distribution or to have been generated independently from conditional distributions at fixed values of $X$.

**Example 1:**

To illustrate the use of the Fit function using simulation, let $X$ be a uniform random variable on the interval $[0, 50]$, $\epsilon$ be a uniform random variable on the interval $[-25, 25]$ and

$$Y = 2 - 3X + \epsilon.$$

1. Evaluate the following command to construct a list of 80 pairs from the joint $(X, Y)$ distribution.

```
nn = 80;
xvals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{0, 50}], nn];
evals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{-25, 25}], nn];
yvals = 2 - 3*xvals + evals;
pairs = Transpose[{xvals, yvals}];
```

The $y$-coordinates ($yvals$) are a linear function of the $x$-coordinates ($xvals$) and a random sample from the error distribution ($evals$).

2. Evaluate the following command to construct a scatter plot of the observations and to display the sample correlation.
There is a strong negative association between X and Y.

(3) Evaluate the following command to define a function, f, whose value at x is the estimated conditional mean.

```
Clear[x]; Remove[f];
f[x_] = Fit[pairs, {1, x}, x]
```

Fit uses the pairs list to find least squares estimates of intercept and slope (the coefficients of 1 and x, respectively) as a function of x. The estimated formula is stored as the value of f(x). The graph of y = f(x) is the gray line in the scatter plot in step (2).

(4) Repeat the commands in steps (1) through (3) several times to see different plots and estimates of the conditional expectation. Then repeat the simulation several times each assuming the error distribution is uniform on the interval [-5, +5] and assuming it is uniform on the interval [-100, +100]. In the first case, the correlations will be very close to -1 and the estimated formulas close to 2-3x. In the second case, the correlations will be close to -0.60 and the estimated formulas will be much more variable.

- Permutation confidence interval for β

Permutation methods can be used to construct 100(1-γ)% confidence intervals for the slope parameter β. A value β0 is in the confidence interval if the two sided test of

\[ H_0: \text{The correlation between X and Y} - \beta_0 X \text{ equals zero} \]

accepts \( H_0 \) at the \( \gamma \) significance level. The SlopeCI function uses simulation to approximate the permutation confidence interval:

```
SlopeCI[pairs, ConfidenceLevel -> 1-\gamma, RandomPermutations -> r]
```

returns an approximate 100(1-γ)% permutation confidence interval for the slope based on \( r \) random permutations, where pairs is a list of pairs of numbers.

Note: If the options are omitted, then SlopeCI returns an approximate 95% permutation confidence interval based on 1000 random permutations.

Example 1, continued:

Evaluate the first command to initialize a list of 80 pairs from the joint (X, Y) distribution defined above. Evaluate the second command to construct an approximate 95% confidence interval for β using 2000 random permutations.

```
nn = 80;
xvals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{0, 50}], nn];
evals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{-25, 25}], nn];
yvals = 2 - 3 * xvals + evals;
pairs = Transpose[{xvals, yvals}];
SlopeCI[pairs, RandomPermutations -> 2000]
```

Repeat the commands several times. The computed interval will contain β = -3 with probability approximately 0.95.
Problem 1: Assume that $X$ and $\epsilon$ are independent uniform random variables, the range of $X$ is $[0, 80]$, and the range of $\epsilon$ is $[-50, +50]$. Let $Y = 2 - 3X + \epsilon$.

(a) Generate a random sample (pairs) of size 100 from the joint $(X, Y)$ distribution. For these data,

- Compute the sample mean and sample standard deviation of the $x$- and $y$-coordinates.
- Construct a scatter plot of the pairs and display the sample correlation.
- Use Fit to estimate the conditional expectation.
- Use SlopeCI to construct an approximate 95% confidence interval for the slope based on 2000 random permutations. Is $-3$ in the interval?

(b) Compute $E(X)$, $SD(X)$, $E(Y)$, $SD(Y)$, and $\rho = Corr(X,Y)$. Are the sample summaries (the sample means, standard deviations, and correlation) from part (a) close to these model summaries?

Example 2:

As part of a study on sleep in mammals, researchers collected information on the average brain and body weights for 43 different species. The graph below compares the common logarithms of average brain weight in grams (vertical axis) and average body weight in kilograms (horizontal axis) for the 43 species. The largest log-average brain weight (the green dot) corresponds to the Asian elephant; the second largest (the red dot) to man. The gray line is the least squares linear fit to the paired data. (Sources: Allison and Cicchetti, 1976; lib.stat.cmu.edu/DASL.)

The lists species, wbody, and wbrain give the species names (listed alphabetically) and corresponding body and brain weights.

- **species, wbody, wbrain** are lists of length 43.

Body weights range from 0.005 kg (0.18 ounces) to 2547.0 kg (5,615.12 pounds). Brain weights range from 0.14 g (0.004 ounces) to 4603.0 g (10.15 pounds). To initialize the data, click on the rightmost bracket of the cell above and evaluate the command.

1. Evaluate the following command to construct the list of pairs displayed above.

   ```math
   pairs = Transpose[{Log[10, wbody], Log[10, wbrain]}];
   ```

   Note that the common logarithm is the logarithm function with base 10.

2. Evaluate the following command to display a table of the paired data along with the species names.

   ```math
   TableForm[pairs,
   TableHeadings -> {species, {"log_{10} (w_b) ", "log_{10} (w_br) "}}
   ```
Problem 2:
(a) Using the paired (log-body weight, log-brain weight) data,
• Use \texttt{Fit} to find the least squares estimate of the conditional expectation of log-brain weight given log-body weight.
• Use \texttt{SlopeCI} to construct an approximate 95% confidence interval for the slope.
• Interpret the estimated slope in the context of the brain-body problem.

(b) One of our mammalian cousins, the gorilla, has been left off the list of species. The gorilla has an average body weight of 207.0 kg (456.35 pounds) and an average brain weight of 406.0 g (14.32 ounces).

Use the least squares formula from part (a) to estimate the gorilla’s average brain weight from its average body weight. Is the estimated average brain weight close to the true average brain weight?

(c) Use the least squares formula from part (a) to define a function \( g \) whose input is an average body weight and whose output is an estimate of the average brain weight. Then evaluate the command below to produce a smoothed scatter plot of \((w_b, w_br)\) pairs with the graph of \( y = g(x) \) superimposed. Comment on the plot.

\[
pairs2 = \text{Transpose}[[\text{wbody}, \text{wbrain}]]; \\
\text{SmoothPlot}[[\text{pairs2}, g], \\
\text{AxesLabel} \to \{"w_b", "w_br"\}] \\
\]

Note: \texttt{SmoothPlot} generalizes \texttt{ScatterPlot} with the \texttt{Correlation→True} option. It is used to visualize non-linear relationships. Evaluate the command \texttt{?SmoothPlot} to obtain information on this function.

\section*{§ 2. Linear Regression Analysis}

Assume that the response random variable \( Y \) can be written as a linear function of the form

\[
Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_{p-1} X_{p-1} + \epsilon
\]

where

• The error random variable, \( \epsilon \), is independent of each predictor, \( X_i \),
• \( \epsilon \) is a normal random variable with mean 0 and standard deviation \( \sigma \), and
• All \( p+1 \) parameters (the \( \beta_i \)’s and \( \sigma \)) are unknown.

Let

\[
X = \{1, X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{p-1}\}
\]

represent the list including the constant 1 and the \( p-1 \) predictors (the \( p \) basis functions).

Then the conditional expectation of \( Y \) given \( X = x \) is a linear function:

\[
E(Y \mid X = x) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \ldots + \beta_{p-1} x_{p-1}
\]

and the conditional distribution is normal with standard deviation \( \sigma \).

This section focuses on using least squares methods to estimate the parameters in the conditional mean formula using the \texttt{Fit} and \texttt{LinearModelFit} functions. The forms of the functions are as follows:

\texttt{Fit[cases, functions, variables]} returns the estimated mean formula, where \( \text{cases} \) is the list of observations, \( \text{functions} \) is the list of \( p \) basis functions, and \( \text{variables} \) is a single variable or a list of variables needed in the formula.
LinearModelFit[cases,functions,variables] returns a fitted linear model whose mean formula is estimated using least squares methods.

Notes:

1. The predictors, \( X \), may be single variables or functions of one or more variables. For numerical stability, the predictors should not be strongly correlated.
2. If there are \( k \) variables, then each case must be a list of \( k+1 \) numbers (\( k \) variables plus response). The \( p \) basis functions must be functions of the \( k \) variables only.
3. The following properties of fitted linear models will be used in the section: ANOVATable, ANOVATableSumsOfSquares, ParameterConfidenceTable, RSquared, EstimatedVariance, StandardizedResiduals. Additional properties will be considered in Section 3.
4. See the Help Browser for additional information about the LinearModelFit function.

Example 3:

To illustrate the analysis using simulation, assume that \( X \) is a uniform random variable on the interval \([0, 20]\), \( \epsilon \) is a normal random variable with mean 0 and standard deviation 8, and \( X \) and \( \epsilon \) are independent. Let

\[ Y = 40 - 15X + 0.60X^2 + \epsilon = -50 - 3(X - 10) + 0.60(X - 10)^2 + \epsilon. \]

(1) Evaluate the following command to construct a list of 100 cases from the joint \((X, Y)\) distribution.

```mathematica
nn = 100;
xvals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{0, 20}], nn];
evals = RandomReal[NormalDistribution[0, 8], nn];
yvals = 40 - 15 xvals + 0.60 xvals^2 + evals;
cases = Transpose[{xvals, yvals}];
```

The \( y \)-coordinates are generated using the first form of the linear equation.

(2) Evaluate the following command to use \texttt{Fit} to estimate the conditional expectation of \( Y \) given \( X = x \) using the predictors for the second form of the linear equation.

```mathematica
Clear[x]; Remove[f];
f[x_] = Fit[cases, {1, x - 10, (x - 10)^2}, x]
```

The estimated formula is stored as the value of \( f(x) \).

(3) Evaluate the following command to construct a scatter plot of the cases list with the estimated conditional expectation superimposed.

```mathematica
SmoothPlot[cases, f]
```

The least squares estimate is likely to approximate the observed pairs quite well. (If the standard deviation of \( \epsilon \) was 28 instead of 8, for example, the fit might not so close.)

Problem 3: Let \( X \) be a uniform random variable on the interval \([0, 20]\). Compute

- The correlation between \( X \) and \( X^2 \).
- The correlation between \((X - 10)\) and \((X - 10)^2\).

Analysis of variance

Let \( N \) be the number of cases, \( p \) be the number of functions,
and \( Y_i (i = 1, 2, . . . , N) \) be the \( N \) observed predictor lists and responses, respectively,

- \( f(X_i) (i = 1, 2, . . . , N) \) be the estimated means (or predicted responses), and

- \( \bar{Y} \) be the mean response.

A test of the null hypothesis that the regression effects are identically zero (or \( \beta_j = 0 \) for \( j > 0 \)) has three sources of variation, as outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SumOfSq</th>
<th>MeanSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>( p - 1 ) ( SS_m = \sum_i (f(X_i) - \bar{Y})^2 )</td>
<td>( MS_m = SS_m / (p - 1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>( N - p ) ( SS_e = \sum_i (Y_i - f(X_i))^2 )</td>
<td>( MS_e = SS_e / (N - p) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>( N - 1 ) ( SS_t = \sum_i (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the null hypothesis is true, then the ratio \( F = \frac{MS_m}{MS_e} \) has an \( F \) ratio distribution with \( p - 1 \) and \( N - p \) degrees of freedom. Large values of \( F \) provide evidence that the proposed predictors have some predictive value.

Example 3, continued

1. Evaluate the following command to initialize a list of 100 cases from the joint \((X, Y)\) distribution above.

   ```math
   \text{nn} = 100;
   xvals = \text{RandomReal[UniformDistribution[\{0, 20\}], nn]};
   evals = \text{RandomReal[NormalDistribution[0, 8], nn]};
   yvals = 40 - 15 \times xvals + 0.60 \times xvals^2 + evals;
   cases = \text{Transpose[\{xvals, yvals\}];}
   ```

2. Evaluate the following two commands to construct a linear model (\textit{lm}) based on this list and to retrieve an extended ANOVA table.

   ```math
   \text{Clear}[x];
   \text{lm} = \text{LinearModelFit[cases, \{1, (x - 10), (x - 10)^2\}, \{x\}];}
   \text{lm["ANOVATable"]}
   ```

   The extended ANOVA table provided by \textit{Mathematica} provides information about each predictor function (the first two lines), but does not provide the overall test we need.

3. Evaluate the following command to retrieve the sums of squares column from the extended ANOVA table. The column consists of the sums of squares for the two predictor functions (\( ss1, ss2 \)), the error sum of squares (\( ss_e \)), and the total sum of squares (\( ss_t \)).

   ```math
   \{ss1, ss2, ss_e, ss_t\} = \text{lm["ANOVATableSumsOfSquares"]}
   ```

   The model sum of squares is the sum of the first two elements of this list.

4. Evaluate the first command to return the \( F \) ratio statistic (\textit{fstatistic}) needed for the analysis. Evaluate the second command to return the \( p \) value for the test of the predictive value of the given predictors.

   ```math
   p = 3;
   ssm = ss1 + ss2;
   \text{fstatistic} = (ssm / (p - 1)) / (ss_e / (nn - p))
   pvalue = 1 - \text{CDF[FRatioDistribution[p - 1, nn - p], fstatistic]}
   ```

   The \( p \) value is likely to be virtually zero.

4. Evaluate the following command to retrieve the coefficient of determination, \( R^2 \).

   ```math
   \text{lm["RSquared"]}
   ```
\( R^2 = SS_m/SS_e \) is the proportion of the total variation explained by the proposed model. Approximately 90% of the total variation is explained by the model in this case. (Note that as \( \sigma \) increases, the value of \( R^2 \) generally decreases.)

- **Parameter estimates and standardized residuals**

We next examine 95% confidence intervals for the \( \beta \) coefficients, compute the pooled estimate of the common standard deviation, and construct an enhanced normal probability plot of estimated standardized residuals.

**Example 3, continued:**

(1) Evaluate the following command to retrieve information about the \( \beta \) parameter estimates:

\[
\text{lm}[[\text{"ParameterConfidenceIntervalTable"}, \text{ConfidenceLevel} \to 0.95]]
\]

The point estimates are likely to be close to -50, -3, and 0.60. The 95% confidence intervals are likely to indicate that each coefficient is significantly different from zero at the 5% significance level.

(2) Evaluate the following command to compute the pooled estimate of the common standard deviation.

\[
\text{Sqrt[\text{lm}[[\text{"EstimatedVariance"}]]]}
\]

The value is likely to be close to 8.

(3) Evaluate the following command to retrieve the list of estimated standardized residuals and to construct an enhanced normal probability plot of standardized residuals.

\[
\text{standardized} = \text{lm}[[\text{"StandardizedResiduals"}]]; \\
\text{ProbabilityPlot}[\text{NormalDistribution}[0, 1], \text{standardized}, \text{SimulationBands} \to \text{True}]
\]

The points should approximate the line \( y = x \).

**Example 4:**

In the study on sleep in mammals (Example 2 and Problem 2), researchers examined the relationship between non-dreaming or slow-wave sleep (SWS) and two variables: the average body weight (\( w_b \)) and an overall danger index. The danger index is a five-point scale where 1 indicates the least danger (from predation, exposure to the elements, and so forth) and 5 indicates the most danger. The indices for the 43 species were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danger = 1</th>
<th>Danger = 2</th>
<th>Danger = 3</th>
<th>Danger = 4</th>
<th>Danger = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big brown bat</td>
<td>European hedgehog</td>
<td>African giant rat</td>
<td>Asian elephant</td>
<td>Cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Galago</td>
<td>Ground squirrel</td>
<td>Baboon</td>
<td>Goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimpanzee</td>
<td>Golden hamster</td>
<td>Mountain beaver</td>
<td>Brazilian tapir</td>
<td>Horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Amer. mole</td>
<td>Owl monkey</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Chinchilla</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray seal</td>
<td>Phanlanger</td>
<td>Musk shrew</td>
<td>Guinea pig</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little brown bat</td>
<td>Rhesus monkey</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>Short tail shrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Rock hyrax (h.b.)</td>
<td>Rock hyrax (p.h.)</td>
<td>Patas monkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole rat</td>
<td>Tenrec</td>
<td>Tree hyrax</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Amer. opossum</td>
<td>Tree shrew</td>
<td>Vervet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine banded armadillo</td>
<td>Tree shrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water opossum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researchers determined that a model of the form

\[
\log_{10}(\text{SWS}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log_{10}(w_b) + \beta_2 \text{danger} + \epsilon,
\]
where ε is a normal random variable with mean 0, approximated the data reasonably well.

The lists danger and sws give the danger indices and the values of slow-wave sleep in hours for the 43 species (in alphabetical order).

danger, sws  are lists of length 43.

To initialize the data, click on the rightmost bracket of the cell above and evaluate the command. If necessary, reinitialize the data in Example 2.

(1) Evaluate the first command to initialize the list of 43 cases. Evaluate the second command to use Fit to compute the estimated conditional expectation.

cases = Transpose[{{Log[10, wbody], danger, Log[10, sws]}}, Clear[x1, x2]; Remove[f]; f[x1_, x2_] = Fit[cases, {1, x1, x2}, {x1, x2}]

Note that each element of the cases list is of the form \(\{x_1, x_2, y\}\), where \(x_1\) corresponds to log-average body weight, \(x_2\) corresponds to the danger index, and \(y\) corresponds to log-SWS.

(2) Evaluate the following command to view the relationship of

- log-SWS adjusted for the effect of danger (vertical axis) against
- log-\(w_b\) (the first variable) adjusted for the effect of danger (horizontal axis)

and to display the partial regression line.

PartialPlot[cases, 1]

The slope of the partial regression line is the estimate of \(\beta_1\) from step (1). Repeat the PartialPlot command using 2 instead of 1 as the second argument to view the partial relationship between log-SWS (adjusted for log-\(w_b\)) and danger (adjusted for log-\(w_b\)).

Note: PartialPlot generalizes ScatterPlot with the Correlation → True option. Evaluate the command ?PartialPlot to obtain more information on this function.

Problem 4:
(a) Use LinearModelFit to analyze the SWS cases data. Report

- the \(p\) value from the analysis of variance \(f\) test,
- the coefficient of determination,
- 95% confidence intervals for the \(\beta\) parameters, and
- the estimated standard deviation of the error distribution.

In addition, construct an enhanced normal probability plot of standardized residuals. Comment on the computations.

(b) Use the least squares fitted formula from step (1) of the example to construct five lists of pairs (pairs1 for animals with danger score 1, pairs2 for animals with danger score 2, and so forth) of elements of the form

\[\{x, sws_x\}, x = -1, 0, 1, 2, 3\]

where sws\(_x\) is an estimate of the number of hours of SWS sleep for an animal with body weight \(10^x\) kg. Construct a scatter plot with the Joined → True option to plot the 5 pairs lists. Comment on the plot.
§ 3. Regression Diagnostics

This section focuses on additional methods for interpreting the results of a linear regression analysis. Specifically, scatter plots of
- (estimated mean, estimated error) pairs, and
- (case number, estimated standardized influence) pairs

will be constructed using the DiagnosticSummary function.

\textbf{DiagnosticSummary[\textit{lm}]} returns diagnostic plots of mean-residual pairs and index-delta pairs. Index-delta pairs falling outside the Belsley-Kuh-Welch interval are highlighted in red.

\textbf{Note} that if \textit{lm} is a fitted model, then \textit{lm["PredictedResponse"]} returns the list of predicted responses, \textit{lm["FitResiduals"]} returns the list of estimated errors, and \textit{lm["FitDifferences"]} returns the list of estimated standardized influences.

\textbf{Example 5:}

To illustrate the plots using simulation, assume that \(X\) is a uniform random variable on the interval \([0, 80]\), \(\epsilon\) is a normal random variable with mean 0 and standard deviation 10, and \(X\) and \(\epsilon\) are independent. Let
\[Y = 2 + 3X + \epsilon.\]

(1) Evaluate the following command to construct a random sample (\textit{pairs}) of size 50 from the joint \((X, Y)\) distribution.
\begin{verbatim}
nn = 50;
xvals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{0, 80}], nn];
evals = RandomReal[NormalDistribution[0, 10], nn];
yvals = 2 + 3 * xvals + evals;
pairs = Transpose[{xvals, yvals}];
\end{verbatim}

(2) Evaluate the following command to replace the first observed pair with the pair \((40, 202)\) and to construct a scatter-plot of the altered pairs list.
\begin{verbatim}
pairs[[1]] = {40, 202};
ScatterPlot[pairs, Correlation -> True]
\end{verbatim}

The plot shows a strong positive association, but there is a point with an unusually large \(y\)-coordinate.

(3) Evaluate the first command to construct a fitted linear model (\textit{lm}) using the adjusted pairs data from above. Evaluate the second command to construct the diagnostic summary.
\begin{verbatim}
Clear[x];
\textit{lm} = LinearModelFit[pairs, \{1, x\}, \{x\}];
\textbf{DiagnosticSummary[\textit{lm}]}\n\end{verbatim}

The plot on the left compares estimated errors (vertical axis) to estimated means (horizontal axis). The plot on the right compares estimated standardized influences (vertical axis) to case numbers (horizontal axis).

Two reports are provided. The first report gives the pairs with the minimum and maximum estimated errors. The error for Case 1 is likely to be the largest. The second report lists the index-delta pairs whose standardized influence values lie outside the interval
\[\left[-2 \sqrt{p/N}, +2 \sqrt{p/N}\right] = \left[-0.40, +0.40\right].\]
Case 1 is likely to be the only point that is highly influential. That is, the only point whose $\delta$ value is very far from the interval $[-0.40, 0.40]$.

(5) Repeat the simulation several times each using $\{40, 202\}$ as the first point, and using $\{40, 42\}$ as the first point, to see different diagnostic plots. To see more unusual plots, try changing the first two points.

Problem 4, continued:
(c) Construct and interpret a DiagnosticSummary using the SWS cases data.

Example 6:
The sleep researchers also compared dreaming or paradoxical sleep (PS) in hours to other ecological and environmental factors, including the average gestation time ($t_g$) in days for the species and the danger index. They determined that a model of the form

$$\log_{10}(PS) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log_{10}(t_g) + \beta_2 \text{danger} + \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon$ is a normal random variable with mean 0, approximated the data reasonably well.

The lists $ps$ and $tgestation$ give the PS values (in hours) and the $t_g$ values (in days) for the 43 species (in alphabetical order).

$ps$, $tgestation$ are lists of length 43.

Click on the rightmost bracket of the cell above and evaluate the command to initialize the data. Re-initialize the data in Examples 2 and 4, if necessary.

Problem 5:
(a) Construct a PS cases list where $x_1$ corresponds to $\log_{10}(t_g)$, $x_2$ corresponds to danger, and $y$ corresponds to $\log_{10}(PS)$. Use Fit to determine estimates of the $\beta$ parameters in the formula above. Use PartialPlot to examine the partial regression plots. Comment on the computations.

(b) Repeat Problem 4(a) and 4(c) using the PS cases list.

(c) Use the least squares estimated formula from part (a) to construct five lists of pairs (pairs1 for animals with danger score 1, pairs2 for animals with danger score 2, and so forth) of elements of the form

$\{x, ps_x\}$, $x = 20, 80, 140, \ldots, 620$

where $ps_x$ is an estimate of the number of hours of PS sleep for a species with average gestation period equal to $x$ days. Construct a scatter plot with the Joined->True option to plot the 5 pairs lists. Comment on the plot.
Part II. Laboratory Examples

Example 1:

$X$ is a uniform random variable on the interval $[0, 50]$, $\epsilon$ is a uniform random variable on the interval $[-25, 25]$ and

$$Y = 2 - 3X + \epsilon.$$

Students are asked to generate and work with 80 pairs from the joint $(X, Y)$ distribution:

```math
nn = 80;
xvals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{0, 50}], nn];
evals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{-25, 25}], nn];
yvals = 2 - 3 * xvals + evals;
pairs = Transpose[{xvals, yvals}];
```

ScatterPlot[pairs, Correlation -> True]

```
Correlation: -0.9532
```

```math
Clear[x]; Remove[f];
f[x_] = Fit[pairs, {1, x}, x]
7.37911 - 3.14828 x
```

Students are asked to repeat the simulations several times each using uniform errors on the intervals

$$[-25, 25], [-5, 5], \text{ and } [-100, 100]$$

and to compare the results.

Example 1, continued:

Students are asked to construct an approximate 95% confidence interval for $\beta$ using 2000 random permutations.

```math
SlopeCI[pairs, RandomPermutations -> 2000]
```

$$[-3.37426, -2.92134]$$
Example 2:

Students are introduced to a study and asked to set up the paired data needed in Problem 2. They can also view the pairs, along with the species names, using a `TableForm` command. (The size has been reduced so that the output fits on this page.)

```plaintext
pairs = Transpose[{Log[10, wbody], Log[10, wbrain]}];

TableForm[pairs,
          TableHeadings -> {species, {"log_{10}(w_{b})", "log_{10}(w_{br})"}}]
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>log_{10}(w_{b})</th>
<th>log_{10}(w_{br})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African giant rat</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.819544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian elephant</td>
<td>3.40603</td>
<td>3.66304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboon</td>
<td>1.02325</td>
<td>2.25406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big brown bat</td>
<td>-1.63827</td>
<td>-0.522879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian tapir</td>
<td>2.20412</td>
<td>2.22789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>0.518514</td>
<td>1.40824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimpanzee</td>
<td>1.71734</td>
<td>2.64345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinchilla</td>
<td>-0.371611</td>
<td>0.80618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>2.66745</td>
<td>2.62634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Amer. mole</td>
<td>-1.12494</td>
<td>0.0791812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European hedgehog</td>
<td>-0.10513</td>
<td>0.544068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galago</td>
<td>-0.69897</td>
<td>0.69897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>1.44185</td>
<td>2.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden hamster</td>
<td>-0.920819</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray seal</td>
<td>1.92942</td>
<td>2.51188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground squirrel</td>
<td>-0.995679</td>
<td>0.62060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea pig</td>
<td>0.0170333</td>
<td>0.740363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>2.71684</td>
<td>2.81624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short tail shrew</td>
<td>-2.30103</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little brown bat</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.69897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>1.79239</td>
<td>3.12057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole rat</td>
<td>-0.91364</td>
<td>0.477121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain beaver</td>
<td>0.130334</td>
<td>0.908485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>-1.63827</td>
<td>-0.39794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musk shrew</td>
<td>-1.31876</td>
<td>-0.522879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Amer. opossum</td>
<td>0.230449</td>
<td>0.799341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine banded armadillo</td>
<td>0.544068</td>
<td>1.03342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl monkey</td>
<td>-0.318759</td>
<td>1.19033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patas monkey</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanlanger</td>
<td>0.209515</td>
<td>1.0569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>2.2833</td>
<td>2.25527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>0.39794</td>
<td>1.08279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>-0.552842</td>
<td>0.278754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fox</td>
<td>0.626853</td>
<td>1.70243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhesus monkey</td>
<td>0.832509</td>
<td>2.25285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock hyrax (h.b.)</td>
<td>-0.124939</td>
<td>1.08991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock hyrax (p.h.)</td>
<td>0.556303</td>
<td>1.32222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1.74429</td>
<td>2.24304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenrec</td>
<td>-0.0457575</td>
<td>0.414973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree hyrax</td>
<td>0.30103</td>
<td>1.08991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree shrew</td>
<td>-0.982967</td>
<td>0.39794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vervet</td>
<td>0.622214</td>
<td>1.76343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water opossum</td>
<td>0.544068</td>
<td>0.591065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 3:

X is a uniform random variable on the interval [0, 20], \( \epsilon \) is a normal random variable with mean \( \mu = 0 \) and \( \sigma = 8 \), \( X \) and \( \epsilon \) are independent, and

\[
Y = 40 - 15X + 0.60X^2 + \epsilon = -50 - 3(X - 10) + 0.60(X - 10)^2 + \epsilon.
\]

Students are asked to generate and work with 100 cases from the joint \((X, Y)\) distribution.

\[
\begin{align*}
nn &= 100; \\
xvals &= \text{RandomReal}[\text{UniformDistribution}[\{0, 20\}], \text{nn}]; \\
evals &= \text{RandomReal}[\text{NormalDistribution}[0, 8], \text{nn}]; \\
yvals &= 40 - 15xvals + 0.60xvals^2 + evals; \\
cases &= \text{Transpose}[[xvals, yvals]]; \\
\text{Clear}[x]; \text{Remove}[f]; \\
f[x_] &= \text{Fit}[\text{cases}, \{1, (x - 10), (x - 10)^2\}, x] \\
&= -51.3511 - 3.00928Hx - 10L + 0.606323Hx - 10L^2 + \epsilon.
\end{align*}
\]

SmoothPlot[[cases, f]]

Example 3, continued

The 100 cases from the joint \((X, Y)\) distribution above can be analyzed using LinearModelFit.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Clear}[x]; \\
\text{lm} &= \text{LinearModelFit}[\text{cases}, \{1, (x - 10), (x - 10)^2\}, \{x\}]; \\
\text{lm}[[\text{"ANOVATable"}]] \\
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{DF} & \text{SS} & \text{MS} & \text{F Statistic} & \text{P-Value} \\
-10 + x & 1 & 20853.8 & 20853.8 & 308.359 & 2.45509 \times 10^{-35} \\
-10 + x^2 & 1 & 31754. & 31754. & 579.173 & 1.0989 \times 10^{-42} \\
\text{Error} & 97 & 5318.16 & 54.8264 & \\
\text{Total} & 99 & 57925.9 & \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\text{ss1}, \text{ss2}, \text{sse}, \text{sst}\} &= \text{lm}[[\text{"ANOVATableSumsOfSquares"}]]; \\
p &= 3; \\
\text{ssm} &= \text{ss1} + \text{ss2}; \\
fstatistic &= (\text{ssm} / (p - 1)) / (\text{sse} / (\text{nn} - p)) \\
&= 479.766 \\
\text{pvalue} &= 1 - \text{CDF}[\text{FRatioDistribution}[p - 1, \text{nn} - p], fstatistic] \\
&= 0.
\end{align*}
\]
Example 3, continued:

Continuing with the regression analysis of the 100 cases from the joint (X, Y) distribution above,

\[
\text{lm}[^\text{"RSquared"}] = 0.90819
\]

\[
\text{Example 4:}
\]

Students are introduced to a study and asked to set up a list of cases for analysis here and in Problem 4.

\[
\text{cases} = \text{Transpose}[[\text{Log10}[, \text{wbody}], \text{danger}, \text{Log10}[, \text{sws}]]];
\]

\[
\text{Clear}[x1, x2]; \text{ Remove}[f]; \text{ f}[x1_, x2_] = \text{Fit}[\text{cases}, \{1, x1, x2\}, \{x1, x2\}]
\]

\[
1.06671 - 0.097165 x1 - 0.0539304 x2
\]
PartialPlot[cases, 1]

Equation of Line: \( y = -0.097165x \)

Students construct a partial regression plot for the second predictor as well.

**Example 5:**

\( X \) is a uniform random variable on the interval \([0, 80]\), \( \epsilon \) is a normal random variable with mean \( \mu = 0 \) and \( \sigma = 10 \), \( X \) and \( \epsilon \) are independent, and

\[ Y = 2 + 3X + \epsilon. \]

Students construct 50 random pairs and change the first pair. A DiagnosticSummary of the fitted linear model identifies the changed point as highly influential.

```mathematica
nn = 50;
xvals = RandomReal[UniformDistribution[{0, 80}], nn];
evals = RandomReal[NormalDistribution[0, 10], nn];
yvals = 2 + 3*xvals + evals;
pairs = Transpose[{xvals, yvals}];
pairs[[1]] = {40, 202};
ScatterPlot[pairs, Correlation -> True]
```
Clear[x];

lm = LinearModelFit[pairs, {1, x}, {x}];

DiagnosticSummary[lm]

(Mean, Residual) Pairs

(Index, Delta) Pairs

Mean-Residual Pairs with Min/Max Residuals:

Minimum (Case 7): \( \hat{y}, e = (175.385, -25.4712) \)

Maximum (Case 1): \( \hat{y}, e = (123.76, 78.2403) \)

Index-Delta Pairs with \(|\delta| > 0.4\):

\((1,1.20229)\)

Students are asked to repeat the simulation several times each using

\((40, 202), (40, 42)\)

as first pair, and to compare the simulation results.

**Example 6:**

Students are introduced to a study and asked to initialize the data needed in Problem 5.
Part III. Laboratory 14 Solutions

Problem 1: \( Y = 2 - 3X + \epsilon \) where \( X \) is uniform on [0,80] and \( \epsilon \) is uniform on [-50,50].

(a) Analyses based on 100 simulated pairs:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nn} &= 100; \\
\text{xvals} &= \text{RandomReal[UniformDistribution[\{0, 80\}], nn]}; \\
\text{evals} &= \text{RandomReal[UniformDistribution[\{-50, 50\}], nn]}; \\
\text{yvals} &= 2 - 3 \times \text{xvals} + \text{evals}; \\
\text{pairs} &= \text{Transpose[\{\text{xvals}, \text{yvals}\}]};
\end{align*}
\]

Sample summaries for the \( X \) and \( Y \) samples are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\text{mx, sdx}\} &= \{\text{Mean[\text{xvals}], StandardDeviation[\text{xvals}]\} \\
&= \{40.57, 22.8826\} \\
\{\text{my, sdy}\} &= \{\text{Mean[\text{yvals}], StandardDeviation[\text{yvals}]\} \\
&= \{-118.334, 74.7375\}
\end{align*}
\]

A scatter plot of pairs and the least squares formula for the conditional mean are shown below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ Correlation: } -0.9205 \\
\text{Clear}[x]; \text{Remove}[f] \\
f[x_] &= \text{Fit[\text{pairs}, \{1, x\}, x]} \\
&= 3.6413 - 3.00654 \times
\end{align*}
\]

The approximate 95% permutation confidence interval (shown below) contains -3.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SlopeCI[\text{pairs, RandomPermutations \rightarrow 2000}] \\
&= \{-3.26915, -2.74907\}
\end{align*}
\]

(b) Model summaries:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{model1} &= \text{UniformDistribution[\{0, 80\}];} \\
\text{model2} &= \text{UniformDistribution[\{-50, 50\}];}
\end{align*}
\]

(1) The mean and standard deviation of \( X \) are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\mu_{\text{x}}, \sigma_{\text{x}}\} &= \text{N[\{\text{Mean[\text{model1}], StandardDeviation[\text{model1}]}, \text{40.}, 23.094\}]
\end{align*}
\]
(2) The mean and standard deviation of \( Y = 2 - 3X + \epsilon \) are

\[
E(Y) = 2 - 3E(X) + E(\epsilon) = -118 \quad \text{and} \quad SD(Y) = \sqrt{9 \text{Var}(X) + \text{Var}(\epsilon)} \approx 75.06
\]

as demonstrated below:

\[
\mu_Y = 2 - 3 \cdot \text{Mean[modell]} + \text{Mean[modell2]}
\]

-118

\[
\sigma_Y = \text{N[Sqrt[9 \cdot \text{Variance[modell]} + \text{Variance[modell2]]]}
\]

75.0555

(3) To compute the correlation, first note that

\[
\text{Cov}(X, Y) = \text{Cov}(X, 2 - 3X + \epsilon) = -3 \text{Var}(X).
\]

Thus, the correlation is as follows:

\[
\rho = \frac{-3 \text{Variance[modell]}}{(\sigma_X \cdot \sigma_Y)}
\]

-0.923077

(4) Comparison of estimates with model values:

\[
\{\mu_x, \sigma_x, \mu_y, \sigma_y, \text{Correlation[xvals, yvals]}\}
\]

\[
\{40.57, 22.8826, -118.334, 74.7375, -0.92052\}
\]

\[
\{\mu_x, \sigma_x, \mu_y, \sigma_y, \rho\}
\]

\[
\{40., 23.094, -118, 75.0555, -0.923077\}
\]

In each case, the estimate is close to the model summary.

Problem 2: Analysis of brain-body data.

- \text{species, wbody, wbrain} \quad \text{are lists of length 43.}

(a) The least squares linear fit formula, and approximate 95% confidence interval for the slope are shown below:

\[
\text{pairs} = \text{Transpose}[[\text{Log[10, wbody]}, \text{Log[10, wbrain]]}];
\quad \text{Clear[x]; Remove[f];}
\quad f[x_] = \text{Fit[pairs, \{1, x\}, x]}
\quad 0.930348 + 0.782263 \cdot x
\]

\[
\text{SlopeCI[pairs, RandomPermutations \rightarrow 2000]}
\]

\[
\{0.70797, 0.859893\}
\]

Since the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero, there is a significant regression effect.

Since slope corresponds to the rate of change of \( y \) with respect to a unit change in \( x \) and we are working on the log scale, the interpretation is as follows: If average body weight increases by a factor of 10, then average brain weight will increase by a factor of about 6.06, as demonstrated below.

\[
10^0.782263 \approx 6.05708
\]
(b) The gorilla's predicted response is 2.74205 log-grams (552.136 grams).

\[
\text{lwb} = \text{Log}[10, 207.0]; \\
\{f'[\text{lwb}], 10^f'[\text{lwb}]\} \\
\{2.74205, 552.136\}
\]

The actual response is 2.60853 log-grams (406 grams), as demonstrated below:

\[
\text{lwr} = \text{Log}[10, 406.0] \\
2.60853
\]

The following computation demonstrates that the predicted response is about 5.1% larger than the actual value.

\[
(f'[\text{lwb}] - \text{lwr}) / \text{lwr} \\
0.0511859
\]

Thus, the values are reasonably close on the log-scale. On the original scale, however, the values are not very close (the error is approximately 36% of the actual value).

(c) The definition of \( g \) and smoothed scatter plot are shown below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Clear}[x]; \text{Remove}[g]; \\
g[x_] &= \text{Simplify}[10^f[\text{Log}[10, x]]] \\
8.51821 x^{0.782263}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{pairs2} = \text{Transpose}[[\text{wbody}, \text{wbrain}]]; \\
\text{SmoothPlot}[[\text{pairs2}, g], \\
\text{AxesLabel} \rightarrow \{"w_b", "w_br"\}]
\]

Average brain weight increases as body weight increases, although the rate of increase decreases with body weight. Body and brain weights for the Asian elephant are very different from those of other species considered in this problem.
Problem 3: \( X \) is a uniform random variable on the interval \([0,20]\).

(1) The correlation between \( X \) and \( X^2 \) is approximately 0.97, as demonstrated below:

- Mean and standard deviation of \( X \):
  \[
  \text{model} = \text{UniformDistribution}\{0, 20\};
  \{\mu_1, \sigma_1\} = \{\text{Mean[\text{model}]}, \text{StandardDeviation[\text{model}]}\}
  = \left\{ 10, \frac{10}{\sqrt{3}} \right\}
  \]

- Mean and standard deviation of \( X^2 \):
  \[
  \mu_2 = \text{Integrate}\{x^2/20, \{x, 0, 20\}\}
  = 400 \quad \frac{3}{3}
  \sigma_2 = \text{Sqrt}\{\text{Integrate}\{(x^2 - \mu_2)^2/20, \{x, 0, 20\}\}\}
  = 160 \quad \frac{\sqrt{5}}{3}
  \]

- Covariance between \( X \) and \( X^2 \):
  \[
  \sigma_{12} = \text{Integrate}\{x^3/20, \{x, 0, 20\}\} - \mu_1 \cdot \mu_2
  = 2000 \quad \frac{3}{3}
  \]

- Correlation between \( X \) and \( X^2 \):
  \[
  \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2} = 0.968246
  \]

(2) Since
\[
\text{Cov}(X - 10, (X - 10)^2) = \text{Cov}(X - 10, X^2 - 20X + 100) = \text{Cov}(X, X^2) - 20 \text{Var}(X) = 0
\]
\[
\sigma_{12} - 20 \sigma_1 \cdot \mu_2
\]
\[
0
\]
the correlation between \( X - 10 \) and \((X - 10)^2\) is also zero.

Problem 4: Analysis of the SWS cases data.

danger, sws are lists of length 43.

\[
\text{cases} = \text{Transpose}\{\{\text{Log[10, wbody]}, \text{danger, Log[10, sws]}\}\};
\text{nn} = \text{Length[\text{cases}]};
\text{Clear[\text{x1, x2}]; \text{Remove[f];}}
\text{f[\{x1\_, x2\_\}] = \text{Fit[\text{cases, \{1, x1, x2\}, \{x1, x2\}\]}]
  = 1.06671 - 0.097165 \times 1 - 0.0539304 \times 2
\]

(a) Regression analysis of the SWS cases list:
Clear[{x1, x2, lm}];

lm = LinearModelFit[cases, {1, x1, x2}, {x1, x2}];

(1) The extended ANOVA table and test of the predictive value of the predictor functions are given below:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& DF & SS & MS & F Statistic & P-Value \\
\hline
x1 & 1 & 1.02527 & 1.02527 & 47.7226 & 2.51808 \times 10^{-8} \\
x2 & 1 & 0.206479 & 0.206479 & 9.61087 & 0.00353556 \\
Error & 40 & 0.859355 & 0.0214839 & & \\
Total & 42 & 2.0911 & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[\{\text{ss1, ss2, sse, sst} = \text{lm}"\text{ANOVATableSumsOfSquares"}\} \]

\[\{1.02527, 0.206479, 0.859355, 2.0911\} \]

\[p = 3;\]
\[\text{ssm = ss1 + ss2;}\]
\[\text{fstatistic} = (\text{ssm} / (p - 1)) / (\text{sse} / (\text{nn} - p))\]
\[28.6667\]

\[\text{pvalue} = 1 - \text{CDF}[\text{FRatioDistribution}[p - 1, \text{nn} - p], \text{fstatistic}]\]
\[1.8878 \times 10^{-8}\]

Since the p value is virtually zero, the predictor functions have some predictive value.

(2) The model explains approximately 58.9% of the variation in the data, as demonstrated below:

\[\text{lm}"\text{RSquared"}\]
\[0.589042\]

(3) 95% confidence intervals for the \(b\)-parameters are as follows:

\[\text{lm}"\text{ParameterConfidenceIntervalTable", ConfidenceLevel \to 0.95}\]

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& \text{Estimate} & \text{Standard Error} & \text{Confidence Interval} \\
\hline
1 & 1.06671 & 0.0500724 & (0.965506, 1.16791) \\
x1 & -0.097165 & 0.0181983 & (-0.133945, -0.060385) \\
x2 & -0.0539304 & 0.0173961 & (-0.0890892, -0.0187715) \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Note that each \(b\) coefficient is significantly different from zero.

(4) The estimated standard deviation of the error distribution is as follows:

\[\text{Sqrt}[\text{lm}"\text{EstimatedVariance"}]]\]
\[0.146574\]

(5) An enhanced normal probability plot of standardized residuals (not displayed) indicates that normal theory methods are reasonable in this case.

(6) Comments:

The analyses suggest that the amount of SWS sleep decreases as body weight increases and as the danger index increases and that each predictor contributes significantly to the model. Normal theory methods seem reasonable in this case.

(b) The definition and plot of pairs lists are given below:

The five lists of pairs are the five elements of \textit{pairslist}. 
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pairslist = Table[
  Table[{x, 10^f[x, j]}, {x, -1, 3}], {j, 1, 5}];
ScatterPlot[pairslist,
  Joined -> True,
  AxesLabel -> {"log_{10}(w_b)", "SWS"},
  ChartLegends -> {"Danger 1", "Danger 2", "Danger 3", "Danger 4", "Danger 5"}]

The plot suggests that the amount of SWS sleep decreases with increasing body weight and with increasing danger index.

(c) The diagnostic summary plot is given below.

DiagnosticSummary[lm]

Mean-Residual Pairs with Min/Max Residuals:

Minimum (Case 10): (\hat{y}, e) = (1.12208, -0.32274)
Maximum (Case 29): (\hat{y}, e) = (0.75382, 0.24618)

Index-Delta Pairs with \(|\delta| > 0.528271|

(2, -0.630684)  (10, -0.658695)  (18, -0.605661)  (19, -0.699289)

From the mean-residual pairs plot, we see that there is no apparent relationship between residuals and predicted responses.

Although 4 species have \(\delta\) values outside the interval \([-0.528, +0.528]\), none of the values are very far from the interval. Note that in each case, the observed response was less than the predicted response.
Problem 5: Analysis of PS cases data.

(a) Initial analyses of the PS cases data:

```math
\text{cases} = \text{Transpose}[\{\text{Log}[10, \text{tgestation}], \text{danger}, \text{Log}[10, \text{ps}]\}];
\text{nn} = \text{Length}[\text{cases}];
\text{Clear}[x_1, x_2]; \text{Remove}[f]
\text{f}[x_1\_, x_2\_] = \text{Fit}[\text{cases}, \{1, x_1, x_2\}, \{x_1, x_2\}]
```

\[1.06246 - 0.300001 x_1 - 0.108528 x_2\]

Partial plots (not shown) indicate that adjusted log-PS values are negatively associated with adjusted \(x_i\) values. In each case, there was one point (the Asian elephant) with an unusually high \(y\)-coordinate.

(b) Regression analyses of the PS cases data:

```math
\text{Clear}[x_1, x_2, \text{lm}];
\text{lm} = \text{LinearModelFit}[\text{cases}, \{1, x_1, x_2\}, \{x_1, x_2\}];
```

(1) The extended ANOVA table and test of the predictive value of the predictor functions are given below:

```math
\text{lm}["ANOVATable"]
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43394</td>
<td>1.43394</td>
<td>45.6721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86259</td>
<td>0.86259</td>
<td>27.4741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.25586</td>
<td>0.0313965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.55239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\([\text{ss1, ss2, sse, sst}] = \text{lm}["ANOVATableSumsOfSquares"]\)

\([1.43394, 0.86259, 1.25586, 3.55239]\)

\(p = 3;\)

\(\text{ssm} = \text{ss1} + \text{ss2};\)

\(\text{fstatistic} = (\text{ssm} / (p - 1)) / (\text{sse} / (\text{nn} - p))\)

\(36.5731\)

\(\text{pvalue} = 1 - \text{CDF}[\text{FRatioDistribution}[p - 1, \text{nn} - p], \text{fstatistic}]\)

\(9.29817 \times 10^{-10}\)

Since the \(p\) value is virtually zero, the predictors have some predictive value.

(2) The model explains approximately 64.6% of the variation in the data, as demonstrated below:

```math
\text{lm}["RSquared"]
```

0.646475

(3) 95% confidence intervals for the \(\beta\) parameters are as follows:

```math
\text{lm}["ParameterConfidenceIntervalTable", \text{ConfidenceLevel} \rightarrow 0.95]
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.118072</td>
<td>(0.823826, 1.30109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>-0.0632294</td>
<td>(-0.427792, -0.17221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>0.0207053</td>
<td>(-0.150375, -0.0666814)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each $\beta$ coefficient is significantly different from zero.

(4) The estimated standard deviation of the error distribution is as follows:

$$\text{Sqrt}[@\text{lm["EstimatedVariance"]}]$$

$$0.177191$$

(5) An enhanced normal probability plot (not shown) suggests that normal theory methods are reasonable in this case.

(6) Comments:

The analyses suggest that the amount of PS sleep decreases as the average gestational time and danger indices increase and that each predictor contributes significantly to the model. Normal theory methods seem reasonable in this case.

(7) Diagnostic summary:

$$\text{DiagnosticSummary[\text{lm}]}$$

Mean-Residual Pairs with Min/Max Residuals:

Minimum (Case 40): $(\hat{y},e)=(0.0465621,-0.347592)$

Maximum (Case 2): $(\hat{y},e)=(-0.210213, 0.465486)$

Index-Delta Pairs with $|\delta|>0.528271$:

$(2,1.13166)$

The mean-residual pairs plot shows no apparent relationship between estimated means and standardized residuals. Note, however, that there is one large outlier, corresponding to the Asian elephant.

$$\text{species[[2]]}$$

Asian elephant

The standardized influence for the Asian elephant (1.132) is unusually high.

(c) The definition and plot of pairs lists are given below:

The five lists of pairs are the five elements of $\text{pairslist}$. 
The plot suggests that the amount of PS sleep decreases with increasing gestational time and with increasing danger index.