Examples: Transformations for ANOVA models

20190930 – Sleuth3 Sections 3.5 and 5.5

Example: Cloud Seeding (Sleuth3 Case Study 3.1.1)

Quote from book: "On each of 52 days that were deemed suitable for cloud seeding, a random mechanism was used to decide whether to seed the target cloud on that day or to leave it unseeded as a control. ... [P]recipitation was measured as the total rain volume falling from the cloud base following the airplane seeding run."

clouds <- read_csv("http://www.evanlray.com/data/sleuth3/case0301_cloud_seeding.csv")
head(clouds, 4)</pre>

A tibble: 4 x 2
Rainfall Treatment
<dbl> <chr>
1 1203. Unseeded
2 830. Unseeded
3 372. Unseeded
4 346. Unseeded

Starting Point

Here are density plots and box plots, separately for each Treatment.



Standard deviations for each group:

```
clouds %>%
  group_by(Treatment) %>%
  summarize(
    sd_rainfall = sd(Rainfall)
  )
## # A tibble: 2 x 2
## Treatment sd_rainfall
## <chr>    <dbl>
## 1 Seeded 651.
```

2 Unseeded 278.

The standard deviations are very different, and the distributions are skewed right, so move down one step on the ladder.

```
Down 1 Step: \sqrt{Rainfall}
```



2 Unseeded 8.24
These distributions are closer to symmetric – probably good enough.

12.5

1 Seeded

The ratio of these standard deviations is less than 2 – often used as a guide for when we're OK.

However, we can make it even better if we go down another step.

Down 2 Steps: log(*Rainfall*)



2 Unseeded 1.64

Good enough! We can conduct our analysis on this scale.

```
Analysis on transformed scale
clouds %>%
  group_by(Treatment) %>%
  summarize(
    mean_log_rainfall = mean(log_rainfall)
  )
## # A tibble: 2 x 2
##
     Treatment mean_log_rainfall
##
     <chr>
                            <dbl>
## 1 Seeded
                             5.13
## 2 Unseeded
                             3.99
rainfall_fit <- lm(log_rainfall ~ Treatment, data = clouds)</pre>
summary(rainfall_fit)
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = log_rainfall ~ Treatment, data = clouds)
##
## Residuals:
##
                1Q Median
                                 ЗQ
       Min
                                        Max
##
  -3.9904 -0.7453 0.1624 1.0187 3.1018
##
## Coefficients:
                     Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
##
                                   0.3179 16.152
## (Intercept)
                       5.1342
                                                    <2e-16 ***
## TreatmentUnseeded -1.1438
                                   0.4495 -2.544
                                                    0.0141 *
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 1.621 on 50 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.1146, Adjusted R-squared: 0.09693
## F-statistic: 6.474 on 1 and 50 DF, p-value: 0.01408
confint(rainfall_fit)
##
                          2.5 %
                                   97.5 %
## (Intercept)
                      4.495729 5.772645
## TreatmentUnseeded -2.046697 -0.240865
library(gmodels)
fit.contrast(rainfall_fit, "Treatment", c(1, -1), conf.int = 0.95)
##
                        Estimate Std. Error t value
                                                        Pr(>|t|) lower CI
## Treatment c=( 1 -1 ) 1.143781 0.4495342 2.544369 0.01408266 0.240865
##
                        upper CI
## Treatment c=( 1 -1 ) 2.046697
## attr(,"class")
## [1] "fit_contrast"
We can interpret these numbers either on the new, transformed, data scale or on the original data scale.
```

1. Interpret the group mean estimates above on the transformed scale (always works!):

2. Interpret the group mean estimates above on the original data scale (works if we got to a place where distributions were approximately symmetric after transformation!):

exp(5.13) ## [1] 169.0171 exp(3.99)

[1] 54.05489

3. Interpret the estimated difference in means above on the transformed scale (always works!):

4. Interpret the estimated difference in means above on the original data scale (works only if the transformation selected was the log transformation and the resulting distribution was approximately symmetric!):

exp(1.143781)
[1] 3.138613
exp(0.240865)
[1] 1.272349
exp(2.046697)

[1] 7.742286