

APPENDIX B. CLASSICAL CHANGE POINT ANALYSIS

summary(model.oneslope) (Model 4)

Call:

```
glm(formula = DaysSince2 ~ count, data = LW_00)
```

Deviance Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-328.93	-112.88	-15.83	98.70	299.95

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-3041.774	41.798	-72.77	<2e-16 ***
count	64.675	1.299	49.80	<2e-16 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Null deviance: 59213198 on 54 degrees of freedom
 Residual deviance: 1238754 on 53 degrees of freedom
 AIC: 713.31

summary(model.change) (Model 5)

Call:

```
glm(formula = DaysSince2 ~ 1 + count:as.factor(Rule), data = LW_00)
```

Deviance Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-258.13	-88.46	-29.35	72.82	306.03

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-2998.680	45.336	-66.14	<2e-16 ***
count:as.factor(Rule)0	62.087	1.756	35.36	<2e-16 ***
count:as.factor(Rule)1	65.025	1.269	51.24	<2e-16 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Null deviance: 59213198 on 54 degrees of freedom
 Residual deviance: 1140740 on 52 degrees of freedom
 AIC: 710.78

AICc Comparison --- Confidence set for the best model

Method: raw sum of model probabilities

95% confidence set:

	K	AICc	Delta_AICc	AICcWt
Change After Rule	4	711.58	0.0	0.75
One Slope	3	713.78	2.2	0.25

Conclusion - with an evidence ratio of 3:1, the change point is somewhat preferred, but the estimated difference in rates before and after the Rule (62 vs 65 days between) was small.