Estimating standard errors Bootstrap method

Issues & findings:

Our analysis of adult female Dungeness crabs revealed a noteworthy relationship between their pre- and post-molt carapace sizes. The data showed a strong linear correlation, with a correlation coefficient of 0.9903699 and a highly significant pvalue of less than 0.001, indicating that pre-molt size is a good predictor of post-molt size. These findings provide strong evidence against the null hypothesis, indicating that there is a significant difference between pre-molt size and post-molt size in Dungeness crabs. We used the Bootstrap method to calculate the standard errors of the coefficients B0 and B1, which were found to be 2.734877 and 0.01868114, respectively.

Discussions:

To develop a linear model between pre-molt and post-molt carapace sizes in Dungeness crabs, we treated pre-molt size as the dependent variable and post-molt size as the independent variable. We then derived a linear equation to describe the relationship between the two variables, which was premolt = B0 + B1*postmolt. To estimate the standard errors of the coefficients B0 and B1, we used the Bootstrap method. This involved resampling the data and recalculating the coefficients multiple times to generate a distribution of estimates. From this distribution, we determined the standard errors of B0 and B1 to be 2.734877 and 0.01868114, respectively.

 $premolt = \beta_0 \times postmolt + \beta_1 + \epsilon$

Appendix A: Method

To analyze the relationship between pre-molt and post-molt carapace sizes in Dungeness crabs, we imported the relevant data into R-Studio. We then calculated the correlation coefficient between the two variables and developed a linear model to describe their relationship. We analyzed the summary of the model and found a very low pvalue, indicating that the model is highly accurate.

To estimate the standard errors in coefficients Bo and B1, we used the Bootstrap method. This involved resampling the data and recalculating the coefficients multiple times, generating a distribution of estimates. From this distribution, we determined the standard errors in Bo and B1 to further evaluate the accuracy of our model.

Appendix B: Results

Correlation on coefficient between the variables is 0.9903699.

cor<-cor.test(data\$presize,data\$postsize)
> cor

Pearson's product-moment correlation

0.9903699

Linear model summary

> mod1<-lm(presize~postsize , data= data)
> summary(mod1)
Call:
lm(formula = presize ~ postsize, data = data)

Residuals: Min 1Q Median 3Q Max -6.1557 -1.3052 0.0564 1.3174 14.6750

Coefficients: Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|) (Intercept) -25.21370 1.00089 -25.19 <2e-16 *** postsize 1.07316 0.00692 155.08 <2e-16 *** ---Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 2.199 on 470 degrees of freedom Multiple R-squared: 0.9808, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9808 F-statistic: 2.405e+04 on 1 and 470 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Bootstrap Method

> error1 <- sd(mat[,1])
> error2 <- sd(mat[,2])
> error1
[1] 2.767597
> error2
[1] 0.01892139

```
Appendix C: Code library(readxl)
```

```
file_path <- "C:\\Users\\hari\OneDrive\\Desktop\\crab_molt.xls"
data <- read_excel(file_path, sheet = 1)</pre>
```

correlation <- cor.test(data\$presize, data\$postsize)</pre>

```
model1 <- lm(presize ~ postsize, data = data)
summary(model1)</pre>
```

```
bootstrap <- function(data) {
    bs_sample <- data[sample(nrow(data), replace = TRUE), ]
    model2 <- lm(presize ~ postsize, data = bs_sample)
    coef(model2)
}</pre>
```

```
n_bootstrap <- 1000
bootstrap_matrix <- matrix(nrow = n_bootstrap, ncol = 2)
```

```
for (i in 1:n_bootstrap) {
   bootstrap_matrix[i,] <- bootstrap(data)
}</pre>
```

```
standard_error1 <- sd(bootstrap_matrix[,1])
standard_error2 <- sd(bootstrap_matrix[,2])</pre>
```

 $standard_error1$

standard_error2