ORIGIN := 0

#### Ramdomized Block Designs

prepared by Wm Stein

## **Randomized Block ANOVA Designs**

"Randomized Block" studies are a mixed linear model design in which one variable (variously termed "Treatment" or "Covariate") is considered fixed, and the other variable (termed "Block" or "Subject") is considered random. Within each block, sets of observations may be unique (also called "Two-Way ANOVA Without Replication or "Between Groups ANOVA - see *Biostatistics* Worksheet 300) or replicated (also called "Randomized Block with Replication" or "Repeated Measures with Replication"- see *Biostatistics* Worksheet 301). The purpose of these designs is to use the Block (Subject) as a means to control variance when assessing the effect of the Treatment (Covariate). Unlike Two-Way ANOVA, parameters for individual levels within the Block factor are not estimated since there is little interest in characterizing individual differences between them. Instead, observed Blocks are considered to be a sample from a much larger population of possible Blocks. Assuming this (and centered on the grand mean), variance between Blocks is the only parameter estimated. Shown here are examples of Randomized Blocks Without Replication drawn from Ch. 1 of Pinheiro & Bates (PB) 2004, *Mixed-Effects models in S and S-PLUS*, and from Example 12.4 in Jerrold H. Zar 2010, *Biostatistical Analysis 5th edition*. Inclusion of the latter example is designed to contrast traditional methods of handling this type of study described by Zar with newer methods involving maximum likelihood & REML estimation described by PB and here.

## **Example:**

Ergostool Data from PB Section 1.2 p. 12.

Each "Subject" tested each of four stool "Types" exactly once (without replication). Ease of rising from each Type of stool is recorded in the response variable "effort".

# Loading Data for plotting in R:

confusing. On the other hand, the default plots utilizing

groupedData are very useful.

8 1 8	_ > E	S			
#LMM 02 RANDOMIZED BLOCK DESIGNS	Gro	ouped Da	ta: eff	ort ~ Typ	e   Subject
library/nlma) # (nlma) for lma()		effort	Type Su	bject	
	1	12	T1	1	
library(help=nlme) # prototype for finding package index	2	15	T2	1	
	3	12	T3	1	
#READING DATA IN STANDARD FORMAT	4	10	11.4 m.1	1	
	6	14	т т2	2	
setwd("c:/DAIA/Models")	7	13	т2 т3	2	
ergoStool=read.table("ergostool.txt")	8	12	т4	2	
ergoStool\$Subject=factor(ergoStool\$Subject)	9	7	т1	3	
	10	14	Т2	3	
ergostool	11	13	Т3	3	
	12	9	Т4	3	
#CREATING GROUPED DATA OBJECT:	13	7	Τ1	4	
EC-superior of Deta (offerter Trues   Cubicet deta-supe Ctasl)	14	11	Т2	4	
es=groupedData(enort Type [Subject,data=ergostool)	15	10	ТЗ	4	
ES	16	9	'I'4 m1	4	
	10	8 11	T1 m2	5	
^ PB provide their datasets as part of the R package {nlme} and	19	8	TZ TZ	5	
after being loaded it may be accessed directly using in this case	20	7	т4	5	
the second of the second	21	9	T1	6	
the command:	22	11	Т2	6	
	23	11	тЗ	6	
data(ergoStool)	24	10	т4	6	
	25	8	Τ1	7	
	26	12	т2	7	
Typically in this package data are formed within the	27	12	Т3	7	
"groupedData" data class. This class includes an embedded	28	11	T4	7	
formula that may be utilized as the default formula by (nlma)	29	/	T1 m2	8	
formula that may be utilized as the default formula by {mine}	30 21	11	TZ T 2	8	
functions such as ImList(), Ime() & gls(), etc, as well as quite	32	7	13 T4	8	
useful plot() routines employing Trellis graphics. PB use the	33	9	т <u>т</u>	9	
embedded formula in groupedData as a means of simplifying	34	13	т2	9	
formulas mithin common de bet embre must com is taber	35	10	тЗ	9	
formulas within commands, but unless great care is taken	36	8	Т4	9	
resultant partial formulas are very difficult to read and often					

1



# Linear Fixed Model ANOVA:

 $\Sigma \tau_i = 0, \ \epsilon_{ii} \sim N(0,\sigma^2)$ 

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{Y}_{ij} &= \beta_i + \epsilon_{ij} & < \text{Cell Means model} \\ \mathbf{Y}_{ij} &= \beta + \tau_i + \epsilon_{ij} & < \text{Treatments Effect model} \end{split}$$

horizontal line. Y ~ X where:

^ Observations for each Subject are seen on a separate

effort ~ Type X = fixed treatment factor coded according to some contrast system

where:  $Y_{ij}$  is the response variable effort,  $\beta$  = overall mean (intercept),  $\beta_i$  = cell means in cell means model,  $\tau_i$  = treatment effects for each fixed factor Type,  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  = error, with i as index of the fixed factor, j = is index of all observations within each group i up to  $n_i$ .

```
#SIMPLE LINEAR MODEL - "treatments" CONTRASTS IN R
LM1=Im(effort~Type,data=ergoStool)
summary(LM1)
anova(LM1)
```

```
#SIMPLE LINEAR MODEL - "cell means" CONTRASTS IN R
LM2=Im(effort~Type-1,data=ergoStool)
summary(LM2)
anova(LM2)
```

PB describe the use of different contrasts in coding factors with two or more levels in ANOVA. See also *Biostatistics* worksheet 390.

In R, "treatments" contrasts (the default) results in a summary() command showing "estimates" for a *baseline level* for each factor (otherwise missing from the report) called "intercept" followed by differences between the named levels of the factor and this baseline. The "cell means" contrasts gives means for each level of the factor, and all levels are named. For each line in the report, t-tests give probabilities for a null hypothesis that each "estimate" is zero. These tests are "marginal" tests in the since of comparing models with all other factors and levels still in the model. See *Biostatistics* 360, 400 & 402 for further details.

Call:

0.4087

Tvpe

0.1 1 1

> summary(LM2)

#### > summary(LM1)

#### Call: lm(formula = effort ~ Type, data = ergoStool) lm(formula = effort ~ Type - 1, data = ergoStool) Residuals: Residuals: 10 Median 30 Max 10 Median 30 Min Min Max -2.7778 -1.4444 -0.2222 1.2778 3.4444 -2.7778 -1.4444 -0.2222 1.2778 3.4444 Coefficients: Coefficients: Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|) Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|) TypeT18.5560.57614.856.56e-16\*\*\*TypeT212.4440.57621.60< 2e-16</td>\*\*\* (Intercept) 8.5556 0.5760 14.853 6.56e-16 \*\*\* TypeT2 3.8889 0.8146 4.774 3.83e-05 \*\*\* TypeT3 2.2222 0.8146 2.728 0.0103 \* TypeT3 10.778 0.576 18.71 < 2e-16</th> \*\*\* TypeT4 9.222 0.576 16.01 < 2e-16</td> \*\*\* TypeT4 0.6667 0.8146 0.818 0.4192 Signif. codes: 0 `\*\*\*' 0.001 `\*\*' 0.01 `\*' 0.05 `.' Signif. codes: 0 `\*\*\*' 0.001 `\*\*' 0.01 `\*' 0.05 `.' 0.1 0.1 ' ' 1 **۱**/ ۱ Residual standard error: 1.728 on 32 degrees of freedom Residual standard error: 1.728 on 32 degrees of freedom Multiple R-squared: 0.4594, Adjusted R-squared: Multiple R-squared: 0.9759, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9728 F-statistic: 9.064 on 3 and 32 DF, p-value: 0.0001723 F-statistic: 323.5 on 4 and 32 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16 > anova (LM1) > anova(LM2) Analysis of Variance Table Analysis of Variance Table Response: effort Response: effort Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F) 4 3863.4 965.86 323.45 < 2.2e-16 \*\*\* Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F) 3 81.194 27.0648 9.0636 0.0001723 \*\*\* Tvpe Residuals 32 95.556 2.9861 Residuals 32 95.6 2.99

\'1

Signif. codes: 0 `\*\*\*' 0.001 `\*\*' 0.01 `\*' 0.05 `.' 0.1

The anova() summaries in R provide an F-test of significance of a model combining all levels of a factor. This is a serial or "Type 1" report following the order of the formula in lm(). See *Biostatistics* 400 for further description.

# Linear Mixed Model - Random Block ANOVA:

Signif. codes: 0 `\*\*\*' 0.001 `\*\*' 0.01 `\*' 0.05 `.'

$\mathbf{Y}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_j + \mathbf{b}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{ij}$	where: $Y_{ij}$ is the response variable effort, $\beta_j$ = fixed cell means for different levels j of Treatment, $b_i$ = random deviation from overall
$\boldsymbol{b}_{i} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{b}^{-2}),  \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{ij} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2})$	mean attributable to each Block (Subject), $\varepsilon_{ij}$ = error, with i as index of the Block, and j is index of Treatment levels.
$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{b}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$	< Matrix formulation in terms of each Block i, PB p. 14, with X <sub>i</sub> being
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{ij} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$	the fixed contrasts, $Z_i$ the matrix of random contrasts, and I the Identity matrix.
$\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathbf{X} + (1 \mid \mathbf{B})$	< formula representation with Y the response variable, X the fixed
effort ~ Type + (1   Subject)	Treatment variable coded as contrasts, and random component (1 B) showing Z as a vector of 1, with Block as the "group" variable.

```
#MIXED MODEL - "treatments" CONTRASTS IN R
LMe1=lme(effort~Type,random=~1|Subject, data=ergoStool)
summary(LMe1)
anova(LMe1)
coef(LMe1)
fitted(LMe1)
```

```
#MIXED MODEL - "cell means" CONTRASTS IN R
FMe2=lme(effort~Type-1,random=~1|Subject, data=ergoStool)
summary(FMe2)
anova(LMe)
```

> summary(LMe1) > summary(LMe2) Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML Data: ergoStool Data: ergoStool AIC BIC AIC BIC logLik logLik 133.1308 141.9252 -60.56539 133.1308 141.9252 -60.56539 Random effects: Random effects: Formula: ~1 | Subject Formula: ~1 | Subject (Intercept) Residual (Intercept) Residual StdDev: 1.332465 1.100295 StdDev: 1.332465 1.100295 Fixed effects: effort ~ Type Fixed effects: effort ~ Type - 1 Value Std.Error DF Value Std.Error DF t-value p-value t-value p-value (Intercept) 8.555556 0.5760123 24 14.853079 0.0000 TypeT1 8.555556 0.5760123 24 14.85308 TypeT2 3.888889 0.5186838 24 7.497610 0.0000 ТуреТ2 12.444444 0.5760123 24 21.60448 2.222222 0.5186838 24 4.284348 0.0003 0.666667 0.5186838 24 1.285304 0.2110 ТуреТ3 ТуреТЗ 10.777778 0.5760123 24 18.71102 TypeT4 ТуреТ4 9.222222 0.5760123 24 16.01046 Correlation: Correlation: (Intr) TypeT2 TypeT3 ТуреТ1 ТуреТ2 ТуреТ3 TypeT2 -0.45 TypeT2 0.595 ТуреТЗ -0.45 0.50 ТуреТЗ 0.595 0.595 Турет4 -0.45 0.50 0.50 TypeT4 0.595 0.595 0.595 Standardized Within-Group Residuals: Standardized Within-Group Residuals: Min 01 Med 03 Min 01 Max Max -1.80200345 -0.64316591 0.05783115 0.70099706 -1.80200345 -0.64316591 0.05783115 0.70099706 1.63142054 1.63142054 Number of Observations: 36 Number of Observations: 36 Number of Groups: 9 Number of Groups: 9 > anova(LMe) > anova(LMe2) numDF denDF F-value p-value numDF denDF F-value p-value (Intercept) 1 24 455.0075 <.0001 Type 4 24 130.5186 <.0001 24 22.3556 <.0001 Tvpe 3

**#COMPARISON OF MODELS** anova(LMe1,LM1) GLS1=gls(effort~Type,data=ergoStool) summary(GLS1) anova(GLS1) > anova(LMe1,LM1) anova(GLS1,LMe1) Model df AIC BIC logLik Test L.Ratio p-value LMe1 1 6 133.1308 141.9252 -60.56539 T.M1 2 5 144.6081 151.9367 -67.30403 1 vs 2 13.47728 2e-04

Comparisons of nested models, such as here allows one to determine whether fitting a random component (and therefore a mixed linear model) is desirable, or whether a straightforward linear model will suffice. These tests are handled by R's anova() command. Depending upon the context, either an F-ratio test (see Biostatistics 402) or log-Liklihood test (PB p. 83 & Worksheet LM 05) will be reported. High probability values indicates *failure* to reject the null hypothesis asserting that the *more parsimonious model* (also indicated by smaller AIC value) is sufficient. Here we see strong support for rejection of the null, indicating that the mixed linear model is to be preferred.

Comparisons of the results of Im() with Ime() will work in anova() so long as the Ime() model is specified first in the parenthesis. Alternatively the function gls() provides equivalent results to Im() in this context.

> > anova(GLS1,LMe1) Model df AIC BIC logLik Test L.Ratio p-value GLS1 1 5 144.6081 151.9367 -67.30403 LMe1 2 6 133.1308 141.9252 -60.56539 1 vs 2 13.47728 2e-04

0

0

0

0

03

Med

#### > summary(GLS1)

```
Generalized least squares fit by REML
 Model: effort ~ Type
  Data: ergoStool
      AIC BIC
                     logLik
  144.6081 151.9367 -67.30403
Coefficients:
              Value Std.Error t-value p-value
(Intercept) 8.555556 0.5760123 14.853079 0.0000
TypeT2 3.888889 0.8146043 4.773960 0.0000
ТуреТ3
          2.222222 0.8146043 2.727977 0.0103
TypeT4
         0.666667 0.8146043 0.818393 0.4192
Correlation:
      (Intr) TypeT2 TypeT3
TypeT2 -0.707
ТуреТЗ -0.707 0.500
TypeT4 -0.707 0.500 0.500
Standardized residuals:
                01
                                      Q3
      Min
                           Med
                                                Max
-1.6074761 -0.8358876 -0.1285981 0.7394390 1.9932703
Residual standard error: 1.728037
Degrees of freedom: 36 total; 32 residual
> anova(GLS1)
Denom. DF: 32
          numDF F-value p-value
(Intercept) 1 1266.6140 <.0001
               3 9.0636 2e-04
Type
```

The gls() function in R's {nlme} package is an extension of lm() in {stats} (part of the base installation of R). Coefficient estimates and other values are equivalent to LM1 above. Both are coded with "treatments" contrasts.

## Zar's Example 12.4

#ZAR'S EXAMPLE 12.4 setwd("c:/DATA/Models") Z=read.table("ZarEX12.4R.txt") Z

### Zar Example 12.4:

	time	treatment	block
1	8.25	1	1
2	11	1	2
3	10.25	1	3
4	9.5	1	4
5	8.75	1	5
6	11.25	2	1
7	12.5	2	2
8	12	2	3
9	9.75	2	4
10	11	2	5
11	10.75	3	1
12	11.75	3	2
13	11.25	3	3
14	9	3	4
15	10	3	5

## ZG=groupedData(time~factor(treatment)|factor(block),data=Z) plot(ZG)

^ Note: factors need to be correctly indicated in order for **plot()** to perform correctly.



F P=1-pf(F,2,8) D

F=3.8542/0.3698

## > anova(Im(time~factor(treatment)\*factor(block),data=Z))

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: time

> P

[1] **0.005916856** 

**Results here are identical** to those in *Biostatistics* > Worksheet 300, shown in more detail.

Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value Pr(>F) factor(treatment) 2 7.7083 3.8542 factor(block) 4 11.0667 2.7667 factor(treatment):factor(block) 8 2.9583 0.3698 Residuals 0 0.0000 Warning message: In anova.lm(lm(time ~ factor(treatment) \* factor(block), data = Z)) : ANOVA F-tests on an essentially perfect fit are unreliable > F=3.8542/0.3698 > F [1] 10.42239 > P=1-pf(F,2,8)

< suggests significant treatment effect

6

Results are nearly identical

here...

#LINEAR MIXED MODEL TEST OF TREATMENT EFFECT LMZ=Ime(time~factor(treatment),random=~1|factor(block),data=Z) summary(LMZ) anova(LMZ) > summary(LMZ)

#### Linear mixed-effects model fit by REML Data: Z AIC BIC logLik 44.99489 47.41942 -17.49744 Random effects: Formula: ~1 | factor(block) (Intercept) Residual StdDev: 0.8938448 0.608105 Fixed effects: time ~ factor(treatment) Value Std.Error DF t-value p-value 9.55 0.4834770 8 19.752749 0.0000 (Intercept) factor(treatment)2 1.75 0.3845993 8 4.550190 0.0019 factor(treatment)3 1.00 0.3845993 8 2.600108 0.0316 Correlation: (Intr) fct()2 factor(treatment)2 -0.398 factor(treatment)3 -0.398 0.500 Standardized Within-Group Residuals: Q3 Min Med Max Q1 -1.5916707 -0.3264449 0.1538579 0.3770602 1.4136662 Number of Observations: 15 Number of Groups: 5 > anova(LMZ) numDF denDF F-value p-value (Intercept) 1 8 593.9517 <.0001 factor(treatment) 2 8 10.4225 0.0059