

Impact Analyses (SBDPPS data)

These impact analyses were based on the subset SBDPPS data set (n=491). The analyses controlled for unobserved book effects.

A linear mixed effects model with a book-specific random intercept was used.

In R notation... $y \sim \text{Gel} + \log\text{Ca} + \log\text{K} + \log\text{S} + \log\text{Fe} + \log\text{Al} + (1|\text{book})$

where y is the response variable, which is one of Delta L* or Delta A*.

Results...

#####

Effect on Delta L*...

Covariate	Increment in Covariate	Change in Delta L*	Margin of Error	P-Value
Gel	3.06	1.723202	0.5785996	1.288812e-09
Ca	166.18%	2.15856	0.6019778	3.707385e-13
K	113.62%	-1.754344	0.687418	1.661388e-07
S	169.22%	-0.1153216	1.131557	0.4192439 ns
Fe	45.61%	-1.879017	0.4546646	6.955054e-17

$sd(\Delta L^*) = 6.12$

To make the comparisons fair, all Increments in Covariates correspond to the respective covariate's standard deviation. Because Ca-Fe were entered into the model on the log scale, the increments are multiplicative.

As examples,

Controlling for the effects of all the other covariates and unobserved book effects, a 3.06 unit increase in Gelatin is associated with an estimated 1.72 unit increase in Delta L*. The margin of error is 0.579 and the p-value is < .0001. (Note that the estimate +/- margin of error gives a 95% confidence interval.)

Controlling for the effects of all the other covariates and unobserved book effects, a 166% increase in Calcium is associated with an estimated 2.16 unit increase in Delta L*. The margin of error is 0.602 and the p-value is < .0001.

Note: S and Al are NOT statistically associated with Delta L*, once the other covariates are included in the model--the p-values are 0.419 and 0.071, respectively.

Note: To get an idea of how big the change in Delta L* is, compare it to the standard deviation
 $sd(\Delta L^*) = 6.12$.

A rank ordering of the "impact of covariates" can be based on the absolute magnitudes of the values in the column labeled "Change in Delta L*" and the margin of errors in the column labeled "Margin of Error."

Define the *conservative estimate of impact* as $CEI = \min\{|u|: d - me \leq u \leq d + me\}$, where d is the estimate of the Change in Delta L* (corresponding to a 1 standard deviation in the covariate) and me is the margin of error associated with this estimate.

As an example, suppose that the estimated change in Delta L* is $d = 1.723$, with $me = 0.579$. Then plausible estimates of the actual change in Delta L* include values between 1.144 and 2.302. Thus, a plausible estimate of the change in Delta L* is as close to 0 as 1.144. By the definition of CEI, we have $EEI = 1.144$. (See the 3 number-line graphics below for other examples.)

-----0-----[1.144----1.723---2.302]--- Then $CEI = 1.144$ (plausible estimates as close to 0 as 1.144)
 -----[-0.2---0-----1.2-----2.6]----- Then $CEI = 0$ (0 is a plausible estimate)
 -----[-1.2---- -1.0 ---- -0.8]----0----- Then $CEI = 0.8$ (plausible estimates as close to 0 as -0.8)

Based on CEI, we have the following:

Impact Ranking (Response = Delta L*) ... **Ca > Fe > Gel > K > S**. [Emboldened factors have a positive effect]

Disclaimer: The impacts of the first four of these covariates look very similar. The S effect is not statistically significant.

#####

Effect on Delta A*...

Covariate	Increment in Covariate	Change in Delta A*	Margin of Error	P-Value
Gel	3.06	-0.5965042	0.2003890	1.312632e-09
Ca	166.18%	-0.8281332	0.2082527	9.090742e-16
K	113.62%	0.580289	0.2379181	5.356817e-07
S	169.22%	0.1315281	0.3912467	0.2506792 ns
Fe	45.61%	0.639915	0.1572182	1.968772e-16

$sd(\Delta A^*) = 2.152064$

For example,

Controlling for the effects of all the other covariates and unobserved book effects, a 45.61% increase in Fe is associated with an estimated 0.64 unit increase in Delta A*.

Based on CEI, Impact Ranking (Response= Delta A*) ... **Ca > Fe > Gel > K > S**

The S effect is not statistically significant.