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#### Abstract

In this study, Breast Cancer in Al-Sader Medical City was introduced. Regression analysis is used to analyzed the data to get the mathematical model and the effect between all variables. In the results, there exist a positive relationship between Y (tumor levels) and X1 (education) in the years 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. But a negative relationship in the years 2006, 2007, and 2012.
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## INTRODUCTION

Linear multiple regression analysis extends simple linear regression analysis by considering two or more independent variables. In the case of three independent variables, denoted as $X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}$, we use the estimated multiple regression equation $Y_{C}=\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} X_{1}+\beta_{2} X_{2}+\beta_{3} X_{3}$ here, $Y_{C}$, with the subscript C for "computed", denotes values for Y calculated from the estimated regression equation.

This is analogous to the term $\overline{Y_{x}}$ we used before, but $Y_{C}$ is used in dealing with several independent variables because it is too cumbersome to place $X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}$ in subscripts. With three independent variables and one dependent variable, a total of four variables must be considered. The sample data will consist of four values for each sample unit observed. ${ }^{\text {[ Lawrence] }}$.

We taken 900 case from Al-Sader medical city in Al-Najaf in Iraq for the period 2005-2009. This data contain breast cancer divided between Levels of Tumor, Occupation, Marital Status and Education. The main aim of this study are presentation and description all cases of breast cancer and find the significant difference between all years and groups depend on all variables levels of tumor, occupation, marital status and education using SPSS program to get regression models summary, analysis of variance for all variables, and regression coefficients.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Multiple regression may use more than two independent variables. For example three independent variables, denoted by $X_{3}$, would provide the regression equation $Y=\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} X_{1}+\beta_{2} X_{2}+\beta_{3} X_{3}$. In solving for the regression coefficient, additional product sums involving $X_{3}$ must be computed and four normal equations must be solved simultaneously. Ordinarily, the necessary calculations are made with a digital computer rather than by hand.

As in multiple regression with $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$, by including $X_{3}$ we my compute the standard error of the estimate about the regression hyper plane. (including Y , there will now be four variables, so the regression surface cannot be graphed in only three dimensions). The standard error, denoted by the symbol $S_{Y .123}$, is calculated in the same way we calculate $S_{Y .12}$, but with an extra term involving $\beta_{3}$ in the numerator; the denominator will be $n-4=10-4=6$.

The number of degrees of freedom will also be $\mathrm{n}-4$, and we may calculate the prediction intervals as we did before with this reduced value.

When there are m total variables (one dependent and $\mathrm{m}-1$ independent), the number of degrees of freedom will be $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{m}$, which is used as the denominator for computing the standard error and in finding $t_{\alpha}$ when constructing prediction intervals. ${ }^{\text {[Lawrence] }}$.

To find regression analysis, we used SPSS program in the next section to get regression models summary, analysis of variance for all variables, and regression coefficients.

## RESULTS

In this section, we used SPSS program to get regression models summary (Table 1), analysis of variance for all variables (Table 2), and regression coefficients (Table 3) as follows.

Table 1: Regression Model Summary for Education, Occupation, Marital Status and Tumor in 2005-2012

| Model | $\mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Std. Error of <br> the Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | $0.353^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.125 | -0.167 | 1.40631 |
| 2006 | $0.113^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.013 | -0.001 | 1.06362 |
| 2007 | $0.129^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.017 | 0.002 | 0.82895 |
| 2008 | $0.139^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.019 | 0.008 | 0.99985 |
| 2009 | $0.164^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.027 | 0.013 | 0.93343 |
| 2010 | $0.027^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.001 | -0.008 | 1.02533 |
| 2011 | $0.096^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.009 | -0.003 | 1.00707 |
| 2012 | $0.171^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.029 | -0.054 | 1.17459 |

a. Predictors: (constant), Education, Occupation, and Marital Status

Table 2: Analysis of Variance for Education, Occupation, Marital Status and Tumor in 2005-2012

| Years | Model | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | Regression | 1.689 | 2 | 0.845 | 0.427 | $0.671^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 11.866 | 6 | 1.978 |  |  |
|  | Total | 13.556 | 8 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | Regression | 3.126 | 3 | 1.042 | 0.921 | 0.431 |
|  | Residual | 239.832 | 212 | 1.131 |  |  |
|  | Total | 242.958 | 215 |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Regression | 2.411 | 3 | 0.804 | 1.169 | $0.322^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 142.243 | 207 | 0.687 |  |  |
|  | Total | 144.654 | 210 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | Regression | 4.927 | 3 | 1.642 | 1.643 | $0.180^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 249.927 | 250 | 1.000 |  |  |
|  | Total | 254.854 | 253 |  |  |  |
| 2009 | Regression | 4.936 | 3 | 1.645 | 1.888 | $0.133^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 179.488 | 206 | 0.871 |  |  |
|  | Total | 184.424 | 209 |  |  |  |
| 2010 | Regression | 0.260 | 3 | 0.087 | 0.082 | $0.970^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 359.547 | 342 | 1.051 |  |  |
|  | Total | 359.806 | 345 |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Regression | 2.335 | 3 | 0.778 | 0.767 | $0.513^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 251.519 | 248 | 1.014 |  |  |
|  | Total | 253.853 | 251 |  |  |  |
| 2012 | Regression | 1.455 | 3 | 0.485 | 0.352 | $0.788^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Residual | 48.288 | 35 | 1.380 |  |  |
|  | Total | 49.744 | 38 |  |  |  |

a. Predictors: (constant), Education, Occupation, and Marital Status
b. Dependent variable: Tumor

Table 3: Regression Coefficients for Education, Occupation, Marital Status and Tumor in 2005-2012

| Years | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B | Std. Error | Beta |  |  |
| 2005 | Constant | 3.104 | 1.094 | 0.333 | 2.837 | 0.030 |
|  | Education | 0.264 | 0.304 |  | 0.868 | 0.419 |
|  | Occupation | -0.452 | 1.133 | -0.153 | -0.399 | 0.704 |
|  | Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | Constant | 3.428 | 0.207 | -0.078 | 16.551 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | -0.059 | 0.057 |  | -1.042 | 0.299 |
|  | Occupation | 0.697 | 0.483 | 0.108 | 1.443 | 0.151 |
|  | Marital Status | -0.144 | 0.199 | -0.050 | -0.722 | 0.471 |
| 2007 | Constant | 3.651 | 0.137 | -0.081 | 26.580 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | -0.047 | 0.040 |  | -1.176 | 0.241 |
|  | Occupation | -0.227 | 0.216 | -0.073 | -1.050 | 0.295 |
|  | Marital Status | -0.101 | 0.123 | -0.057 | -0.818 | 0.414 |
| 2008 | Constant | 3.005 | 0.152 | 0.107 | 19.769 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | 0.076 | 0.053 |  | 1.424 | 0.156 |
|  | Occupation | -0.192 | 0.227 | -0.064 | -0.844 | 0.399 |
|  | Marital Status | 0.204 | 0.114 | 0.113 | 1.791 | 0.075 |
| 2009 | Constant | 2.888 | 0.167 | 0.124 | 17.346 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | 0.082 | 0.046 |  | 1.781 | 0.076 |
|  | Occupation | 0.309 | 0.178 | 0.124 | 1.741 | 0.083 |
|  | Marital Status | 0.103 | 0.140 | 0.053 | 0.733 | 0.464 |
| 2010 | Constant | 3.223 | 0.129 | 0.013 | 25.055 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | 0.010 | 0.043 |  | 0.231 | 0.818 |
|  | Occupation | 0.026 | 0.266 | 0.005 | 0.099 | 0.921 |
|  | Marital Status | 0.044 | 0.107 | 0.022 | 0.408 | 0.683 |
| 2011 | Constant | 3.172 | 0.173 | 0.082 | 18.330 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | 0.065 | 0.051 |  | 1.290 | 0.198 |
|  | Occupation | -0.317 | 0.386 | -0.052 | -0.821 | 0.413 |
|  | Marital Status | 0.028 | 0.170 | 0.011 | 0.166 | 0.868 |
| 2012 | Constant | 3.555 | 0.616 | -0.050 | 5.774 | 0.000 |
|  | Education | -0.036 | 0.123 |  | -0.296 | 0.769 |
|  | Occupation | -0.650 | 0.862 | -0.127 | -0.755 | 0.456 |
|  | Marital Status | -0.313 | 0.622 | -0.084 | -0.503 | 0.618 |

a. Dependent variable: Tumor

## DISCUSSIONS

In Table 1, we can see from 2005 the $R^{2}=1.3 \%$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is week. In 2006 the $R^{2}=1.3 \%$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is week. Also in 2007 the $R^{2}=1.7 \%$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is week.

From 2008, we can see the $R^{2}=1.9$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is week. And from 2009, we get $R^{2}=2.7$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is week. But in 2010 and 2011, the $R^{2}=0.1$ and $R^{2}=0.9 \%$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is very week. In 2012 the $R^{2}=2.9 \%$, this means that Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is week.

From Table 2, we get analysis of variance for education, occupation, marital status and tumor levels in the period 2005-2012. We can get there is not significant different between all variables (education, occupation, marital status and
tumor) from 2005 to 2012. From Table 3, we see the regression line in 2005 is $\hat{Y}=3.104+0.264 X_{1}-0.452 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), but a negative relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status). In 2006, the regression line is $\hat{Y}=3.428-0.059 X_{1}+0.697 X_{2}-0.144 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a negative relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), and a positive relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) but a negative relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status). In 2007 the regression line is $\hat{Y}=3.651-0.047 X_{1}-0.227 X_{2}-0.101 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a negative relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), and a negative relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) but a negative relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status).

In 2008, the regression line is $\hat{Y}=3.005+0.076 X_{1}-0.192 X_{2}+0.204 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), and a negative relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) but a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status). In 2009, the regression line is $\hat{Y}=2.888+$ $0.082 X_{1}+0.309 X_{2}+0.103 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), and a positive relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) and positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status). In 2010, the regression line is $\hat{Y}=3.223+0.010 X_{1}+0.026 X_{2}+0.044 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), and a positive relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) and positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status).

In 2011, the regression line is $\hat{Y}=3.172+0.065 X_{1}-0.317 X_{2}+0.028 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ (education), and a negative relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) but a positive relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status). Finally in 2012, the regression line is $\hat{Y}=3.555-$ $0.036 X_{1}-0.650 X_{2}-0.313 X_{3}$, this means that, there is a negative relationship between $Y$ (Tumor) and $X_{1}$ (education), and a negative relationship between Y (tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ (occupation) also a negative relationship between Y (Tumor) and $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ (marital status).

## CONCLUSIONS

- Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is a week in the years 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2012. But Education effect, Occupation effect, and Marital Status effect of tumor level is a very week in the years 2010 and 2011.
- There is not significant different between all variables (education, occupation, marital status and tumor) from 2005 to 2012.
- There exist a positive relationship between Y (tumor levels) and $X_{1}$ (education) in the years 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. But a negative relationship in the years 2006, 2007, and 2012.
- There exist a positive relationship between Y (tumor levels) and $X_{2}$ (occupation) in the years 2006, 2009, and 2010. But a negative relationship in the years 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012.
- There exist a positive relationship between Y (tumor levels) and $X_{3}$ (marital status) in the years 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. But a negative relationship in the years 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2012.
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