```
%%% Bootstrap Problem Set
[X,Y]=GetSample(10); % the data provided
%%% (la) bootstrap, two sample comparison
numsims=100000;
                  % simulate many times
d=nan(numsims,1);
for i=1:numsims
    Xboot=X(ceil(N*rand(N,1)));
                                   % the bootstrap / sampling from data w/ replacement
    Yboot=Y(ceil(N*rand(N,1)));
    d(i)=mean(Xboot)-mean(Yboot);
end
figure
hist(d,40);
title('la');
d stdest=std(d)
                        % ex. 0.63
lower CI=prctile(d,5)
                       % ex. -1.74
                       % ex. -0.70
median=prctile(d,50)
upper_CI=prctile(d,95) % ex. 0.34
% Here bootstrap yields a distribution of d that looks relatively wide
% (centered somewhere at -0.7 with a bootstrap std of 0.635)
% Moreover the 95% CI on dcomfortably includes 0, which is poor evidence that d is nonzero.
% Though for formal hypothesis testing, we should use permutation test instead of the
bootstrap.
%%% (1b) (paired samples)
for i=1:numsims
    paired indices=ceil(N*rand(N,1));
    Xboot=X(paired_indices);
    Yboot=Y(paired indices);
    d(i)=mean(Xboot)-mean(Yboot);
end
figure
hist(d,40);
title('1b');
d stdest=std(d)
                        % ex. 0.15
lower CI=prctile(d,5)
                        % ex. -0.95
median=prctile(d,50)
                        % ex. -0.70
upper_CI=prctile(d,95) % ex. -0.4457
% Here bootstrap yields a distribution of d that is considerably narrower
% than in (1a). Now the 95% CI comfortably excludes 0, which suggests that d is nonzero
% and thus that there is a significant difference between the two groups.
%%% (2a) permutation test, two sample comparison (not paired)
% in contrast to re-sampling from each respective sets of samples as in
% problem (1), we'll now be jumbling the sets in each simulation and
% calculating d
d data=mean(X)-mean(Y)
                         % ex. -0.70
dperm=nan(numsims,1);
Z=[X;Y];
```

```
for i=1:numsims
    Zperm=Z(randperm(length(Z)));
    dperm(i)=mean(Zperm(1:length(X)))-mean(Zperm((length(X)+1):length(Z)));
end
figure
hist(dperm, 40);
title('2a');
lower_CI=prctile(dperm,5)
                          % ex. -1.10
median=prctile(dperm,50)
                          % ex. -0.00
upper CI=prctile(dperm,95) % ex. 1.10
% the 95% CI generated by the permutation test contains the difference we
% observe from the data (-0.70) -- thus the difference is not large enough to reject
% the null hypothesis.
%%% (2b) permutation test, paired two sample comparison
%% for paired data, we'll permute the group identity within each pair
d data 2b=mean(X)-mean(Y)
                          % ex. -0.70
dperm=nan(numsims,1);
z=[X Y];
                         % here concatenate into columns to visualize "pairing"
Zperm=[];
for i=1:numsims
                          % flipping columns randomly
    for j=1:10
        if rand>0.5
            Zperm(j,:)=Z(j,:);
        else
            Zperm(j,:)=fliplr(Z(j,:));
        end
    end
    dperm(i)=mean(Zperm(:,1))-mean(Zperm(:,2));
end
figure
hist(dperm, 40);
title('2b');
lower CI=prctile(dperm,5)
                          % ex. -0.46
median=prctile(dperm,50) % ex. 0.00
upper CI=prctile(dperm,95) % ex. 0.44
% with this identical but paired data, the 95% CI generated by the permutation test does not
contain
% the difference we observe from the data (-0.70) -- thus the difference is
% large enough to reject the null hypothesis.
%%% (3) power analysis: unpaired vs. paired permutation tests
numsims=500;
numdatasets=200;
% unpaired
Zperm=[];
N vals=[10 20];
diff vals=[0.12 0.25 0.5 1 2];
power=nan(2,5);
for n=1:2
    for k=1:5
                             %% initialize count
        reject count=0;
```

```
for j=1:numdatasets
            [X,Y]=GetSample(N_vals(n),diff_vals(k));
            Z=[X;Y];
            d=mean(X)-mean(Y);
            dperm=nan(1,numsims);
            for i=1:numsims
                Zperm=Z(randperm(length(Z)));
                dperm(i)=mean(Zperm(1:length(X)))-mean(Zperm((length(X)+1):length(Z)));
            end
            if d<prctile(dperm,5) || d>prctile(dperm,95)
                                                             %% hypothesis test
                reject count=reject count+1;
            end
        end
        power(n,k)=reject_count/numdatasets;
    end
end
figure
hold on
plot(diff vals,power(1,:),'b')
plot(diff_vals,power(2,:),'r')
set(gca, 'FontSize', 14);
h = xlabel('true difference');
set(h, 'FontSize', 16);
h = ylabel('statistical power (beta)');
set(h, 'FontSize', 16);
h = title('unpaired data, permutation test power (red: N=10, blue: N=20)');
set(h, 'FontSize', 16);
% paired
Zperm=[];
N_vals=[10 20];
diff vals=[0.12 0.25 0.5 1 2];
power=nan(2,5);
for n=1:2
    for k=1:5
        reject count=0;
                               %% initialize count
        for j=1:numdatasets
            [X,Y]=GetSample(N_vals(n),diff_vals(k));
            Z=[X Y];
            d=mean(X)-mean(Y);
            dperm=nan(1, numsims);
            for i=1:numsims
                for j=1:10
                                       % for paired test, flipping columns randomly
                    if rand>0.5
                        Zperm(j,:)=Z(j,:);
                    else
                        Zperm(j,:)=fliplr(Z(j,:));
                    end
                end
                dperm(i)=mean(Zperm(:,1))-mean(Zperm(:,2));
            if d<prctile(dperm,5) || d>prctile(dperm,95)
                                                             %% hypothesis test
                reject_count=reject_count+1;
            end
        end
        power(n,k)=reject_count/numdatasets;
    end
end
figure
hold on
plot(diff vals,power(1,:),'b')
plot(diff vals,power(2,:),'r')
```

```
set(gca, 'FontSize', 14);
h = xlabel('true difference');
set(h, 'FontSize', 16);
h = ylabel('statistical power (beta)');
set(h, 'FontSize', 16);
h = title('paired data, permutation test power (red: N=10, blue: N=20)');
set(h, 'FontSize', 16);

%%% The paired test is more powerful. For differences around 0.75 (and smaller0, the
%%% paired test provides practically a significant boost in power. Within
%%% each group, the larger sample size boosts power, though less so for the
%%% paired data. For the unpaired data, the difference in power is from
%%% unlikely (less than 0.5) to likely (more than 0.5) at around a true
%%% difference of 0.8.
```





