

### Medical Stats Practice Final exam ~ Explanations (Q#1-11)

(\*All referenced "Final Reviews" refer to the TA Mark Nessim's final review notes (Parts 1-3))

1. Reference: Lec. 18-19, also make sure to study different examples of scatter plots in this lecture with different  $r$  (corr. coeff.) values...Dr. Douglas said they're easy to know for the final!

-Answer: c

-When correlation coefficient, paired data set. (eg: # states data paired with their cancer mortality rates). Therefore,  $n$  will account for both data sets.  $\rightarrow n = 7$

-Find means for each data set:  $\bar{x} = 8.14, \bar{y} = 8.86$

-Know that correlation coefficient:  $-1 < r < 1$

-Calculate using formula:

$$\text{Correlation coefficient: } r = \frac{\text{cov}(x, y)}{s_x s_y} = \frac{\text{COV}(\text{Data set 1, Data set 2})}{s_1 s_2}$$

$$r = \frac{\sum x_i y_i - n \bar{x} \bar{y}}{\sum x_i^2 - n \bar{x}^2}$$

$$= \frac{(606) - (7)(8.14)(8.86)}{(641) - (7)(8.14)^2}$$

$$= \frac{101.1572}{177.1828}$$

$$r = 0.571$$

(closest to answer c)

$$\text{Need: } \sum x_i y_i = (5)(9) + (7)(14) + (14)(4) = 606$$

$$\sum x_i^2 = (5)^2 + (7)^2 + \dots + 14^2 = 641$$

$$\bar{x} (\text{Data set \#1}) = 8.14$$

$$\bar{y} (\text{Data set \#2}) = 8.86$$

$$n = 7$$

2. Reference: Lec 18-19; Final Review, Part 2, Slide #6

-Answer: b

- "The best line is the one that minimizes the sum of squared vertical differences between the points and the line." (remember, "least squares fit")

3. Reference: Lec 18-19

-Answer: b

-Sample correlation coefficient (*simple linear regression*):

$r = 1$  strong (+) linear relationship

$r = 0$  no linear relationship

$r = -1$  strong (-) linear relationship

-Sample correlation coefficient for this problem (given):  $r = 0.960702626$ ...close to 1.0 so strong (+) linear relationship

4. Reference: Lec 18-19

-Answer: d

-problem asking to test for *positive linear relationship*, so based on above, know that want slope ( $\beta_1$ ) to be positive. Therefore want  $H_0: \beta_1 > 0$ . Only one option  $\rightarrow$  answer d

5. Reference: Lec 18-19; Final Review, Part 2, Slide 10-12, 15-16

-Answer: c

$$\text{Test statistic} = \frac{\hat{\beta} - \beta_0}{S_b} \quad \text{OR} \quad \frac{b_1 - \beta_1}{S_{b_1}} \quad (\text{same thing})$$

$b_1 = \text{coeff. of } x\text{-var (slope)} = 0.0949$  [given in prob.]

$\beta_1 = 0$  (see Q#4's answer)

$S_{b_1} = \text{standard error of } x\text{-var.} = 0.00827$  [given]

$$\boxed{\text{Test stat} = \frac{b_1 - \beta_1}{S_{b_1}}} = \frac{0.0949 - 0}{0.00827} = \boxed{11.475} \quad (\text{closest to answer c})$$

6. Reference: Lec 18-19; Final Review, Part 2, Slide 10-12, 15-16

-Answer: b

-Looking for p-value that is “strictly greater than zero”. Normally calculate p-value for both tails of a bell-shaped curve. However, in this problem, only want it for values greater than 0, so only account for the right half of the curve. Therefore, take  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the given p-value of the X-var. (degrees)  $\rightarrow$  answer b.

7. Reference: Lec 18-19

-Answer: a

-Based on data given  $\rightarrow$  regression line:  $y = 9.445 + 0.0949x$

-slope = 0.0949  $\rightarrow$  (+) value so know that for each 1 unit (in this case, of temperature), y-value should *increase* (“more”)

-Note!: data said that it’s “in thousands of people” SO:

$$(\text{heat exhaustion rate})(1000 \text{ people}) = (0.0949)(1000) = 94.9 \cong 95 \text{ people.}$$

-Given all this, answer a fits that for ever 1 degree rise in temperature, 95 *more* people suffer from heat exhaustion.

8. Reference: Lec 13-14

-Answer: e (none of the above)

-Wrong answers:

a: No, these hypotheses refer to double-sided test. Problem calls for one-sided test “more expensive than”. If it was a double-sided test, it would call for a set value, and the alternate hypothesis would be if the situation was that it was NOT that set value.

b: False. Calculate t-test with pooled variance ( $s_p^2$ ) from the 2 sample variances

c: No, for case of “normal populations with equal variances” (pay attention to initial problem description) with small sample sizes, use t-distribution with  $df = n_1 + n_2 - 2$ .

$$\text{This case: } df = 20 + 20 - 2 = 38$$

d: No. this is what you would want to do (calculate the pooled variance)

9. Reference: Lec 13-14

-Answer: a

-Problem asking for "sample difference in means"  $\rightarrow \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$

-Population 1 (Viagra)  $\bar{X}_1 = 84.11$

Population 2 (Levitra)  $\bar{X}_2 = 99.20$

$$\rightarrow \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = 84.11 - 99.20 = -15.09$$

10. Reference: Lec 13-14

-Answer: d

$$H_0: \bar{X}_2 \text{ (Levitra)} - \bar{X}_1 \text{ (Viagra)} = 10$$

$$H_1: \bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_1 \neq 10$$

$\alpha = 0.10 \rightarrow 2$ -sided test, check for 0.05 on t-table

if  $\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_1 = 10 \rightarrow \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = -10$

$$\text{Test stat} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{S_p^2/n_1 + S_p^2/n_2}} = \frac{-10}{\sqrt{\frac{79.80}{20} + \frac{79.80}{20}}} = \boxed{-3.54}$$

$$t_{0.05, 38} = 2.024$$

$$|-3.54| > 2.024 \therefore \text{Reject } H_0!$$

11. Reference: Final Review, Part 1, Slide #27

-Answer: e (all of the above)

-see referenced slide. Spells it out for each of the different answers (which are all correct characteristics of *Ratio of 2 Variances* test)

Viagra (1)	Levitra (2)
$n_1 = 20$	$n_2 = 20$
$\bar{X}_1 = 84.11$	$\bar{X}_2 = 99.20$
$S_1 = 7.04$	$S_2 = 10.49$

Pooled variance ( $S_p^2$ )

$$S_p^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

$$= \frac{(19)(7.04)^2 + (19)(10.49)^2}{20 + 20 - 2}$$

$$S_p^2 = 79.80$$