

# Cheat Sheet: linear mixed-effects models

Measurement and Evaluation of HCC Systems

## Scenario

Use linear mixed-effects models if you want to test the effect of several variables `varX1`, `varX2`, ... on a continuous outcome variable `varY`, where the  $Y$  and some of the  $X$ s are repeated measurements on the same unit (e.g. multiple conditions or time points per participant, multiple people per group, etc.). This cheat sheet assumes that `data` is in the long format, with a user `id` to tie together the repeated measures. (if it is not, use the `melt` function in the `reshape2` package to fix that).

## Power analysis

- The power analysis for a linear mixed-effects model is beyond the scope of this course.

## Plotting

- For plotting the effects of within-subjects manipulations, see the Plotting sections of the dependent  $t$  test and repeated and mixed ANOVA cheat sheets.
- For plotting linear effects, see the Plotting section of the regression cheat sheet.

## Pre-testing assumptions

- For between-subjects factors, refer to Pre-testing assumptions in the ANOVA and/or factorial ANOVA cheat sheets.
- For linear effects, refer to Pre-testing assumptions in the regression cheat sheet.
- Note that unlike for repeated and mixed ANOVAs, sphericity is not assumed for linear mixed-effects models.

## (optional) Preparing dummies and/or contrasts

- If one or more of your  $X$ s are nominal variables, you need to create dummy variables or contrasts for them.
- For simple dummies, refer to the regression cheat sheet.
- For contrasts, refer to the ANOVA cheat sheet.

## Running the test

- Start with the simplest possible baseline: the mean:  
`baseline <- gls(varY ~ 1, data=data, method="ML")`
- Then add the random intercept for id:  
`random <- lme(varY ~ 1, random = ~1|id, data=data, method="ML")`
- Test whether the random intercept is needed:  
`anova(baseline, random)`  
If this ANOVA is significant, you indeed need the random intercept. The  $\chi^2$ -value and its  $p$ -value represent the significance of the random intercept.
- Introduce your first  $X$  variable:  
`model1 <- update(random, .~. + varX1)`
- (optional) Introduce another  $X$  variable (add more  $X$ s one by one if needed):  
`model2 <- update(model1, .~. + varX2)`
- (optional) Introduce interaction effects:  
`model3 <- update(model2, .~. + varX1:varX2)`
- Compare all models:  
`anova(random, model1, model2, model3)`
- (optional) Add a random slope for a within-subjects variable (interpretation: is the effect of  $varX1$  different per  $id$ ?):  
`slope1 <- update(model3, random = ~varX1|id)`
- Compare with the previous model to see if this random slope improves the model:  
`anova(model3, slope1)`  
The  $\chi^2$ -value and its  $p$ -value represent the significance of the random slope.
- (optional) Introduce a specific error covariance matrix; e.g. random slopes can be combined with an AR(1) covariance matrix, which makes within-subjects data points that are closer together in time correlate more strongly than data points that are further apart:  
`ARmodel <- update(slope1, correlation = corAR1(0, form= ~varX1|id))`
- Get the summary and confidence intervals of your final model:  
`summary(ARmodel)`  
`intervals(ARmodel)`
- For the correct interpretation of the coefficients, refer to the regression cheat sheet.
- The only additional thing is the random intercept (which has an  $SD$ ), and optionally the random slope (which also has an  $SD$ ) and the correlation between the two. All these measures have a confidence interval as well.

## Post-testing assumptions and inspecting outliers

- For post-testing assumptions and inspecting outliers, refer to the regression cheat sheet.

## Reporting

- For random intercepts and slopes: The relationship between [varY] and [VarX1 and other within-subjects variables] showed significant variance in intercept across participants,  $SD = x.xx$  (95% CI:  $x.xx, x.xx$ ),  $\chi^2(1) = x.xx$ ,  $p = .xxx$ . In addition, the slopes varied across participants,  $SD = x.xx$  ( $x.xx, x.xx$ ),  $\chi^2(2) = 38.87$ ,  $p = .xxx$ , the slopes and intercepts were significantly correlated,  $cor = .xx$  ( $.xx, .xx$ ).
- For reporting further results, refer to the regression cheat sheet. Note that there is no model  $R^2$ , and model comparisons are  $\chi^2$  tests.