

Horseshoe Crabs Example (cont)

3/22/22

$\hat{\mu}$ = estimated mean # of satellites

$$\log(\hat{\mu}) = \underbrace{3.571}_{\text{color = LM}} - \underbrace{0.0806x}_{\text{color = M}} - \underbrace{6.133 \cdot M}_{\text{color = M}} - \underbrace{8.515 \cdot DM}_{\text{color = M}} - \underbrace{10.543 \cdot D}_{\text{color = M}}$$

color = LM

color = M

$$+ \underbrace{0.219 \cdot M \cdot x}_{\text{color = M}} + 0.300 DM \cdot x + 0.379 D \cdot x$$

x = width (cm)

$M = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{medium color} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$

Helpful: Write out fitted model for each color.

$DM = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{dark medium color} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$

$D = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{dark color} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$

Interpret:

Mx : 0.219 \rightarrow exponentiate: $e^{0.219} = 1.24$

Open 1 - how does color affect the effect of width on est. mean # of satellites?

The estimated change in mean # of satellites for a one cm increase in width is 24% higher for medium colored crabs compared to light medium.

$$e^{-0.08067} \cdot e^{0.21942} = 1.149$$

$$e^{-0.08067} = 0.92$$

For light medium crabs, we estimate the mean # of satellites decreases by about 8% per cm increase in width.

Whereas, for medium crabs, the estimated mean # of satellites increases by 15% per cm increase in width.

Color FP : -10.5435

Int.

Slope width

$\hat{\mu} | D$

LM

3.571

-0.081

$\hat{\mu} | LM$

M

DM

D

3.571 - 10.543

-0.081 + 0.379

For crabs with width equal to zero cm, the estimated mean # of satellites for dark colored crabs is

$e^{-10.543}$ times smaller than for light medium crabs.

Overdispersion = Actual variance $\text{Var}(Y)$
exceeds the specified GLM variance.

① Binomial data: $Y \sim \text{Bin}(n, \pi)$

$$\Rightarrow E(Y) = n\pi = \mu$$

$$\text{Var}(Y) = n\pi(1-\pi) < \underline{\underline{\text{actual variance?}}}$$

② Poisson data: $Y \sim \text{Pois}(\mu)$

$$\Rightarrow E(Y) = \mu$$

$$\text{Var}(Y) = \mu < \text{actual } \text{Var}(Y)$$

Why? ① Haven't accounted for important predictors.

② Correlated data

Signs of overdispersion?

① Compare sample means \times sample variances in grouped data \rightarrow Sample variances $>$ Sample means

② Large residual deviance (goodness of fit) that can't be accounted for by other lack of model fit.

Adjust for overdispersion -

* ① Quasi-likelihood (quasi-binomial or quasi-Poisson)

② Negative binomial regression (two parameters - mean = variance can vary independently)

Quasi-Poisson: Assume $E(Y) = \mu$

- Goal: Estimate ϕ .
 $\text{Var}(Y) = \phi \mu$ for some ϕ
"overdispersion parameter"

Pearson residuals: $e_i = \frac{y_i - \hat{\mu}_i}{\sqrt{\hat{\text{Var}}(y_i)}} = \frac{y_i - \hat{\mu}_i}{\sqrt{\hat{\mu}_i}}$
Gif Poisson

If $\phi = 1$ (no overdispersion),

$$E(e_i^2) \approx 1$$

If $\phi > 1$ (overdispersion), $E(e_i^2) \approx \phi$

→ Plot squared Pearson residuals against $\hat{\mu}_i$ -
is average around 1?

$$\hat{\phi} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2}{n-p}$$

$p = \#$ of covs