
AC9.1 vs E30
cutlow: −0.873
cutup: 0.62
p0: 0
Significant: 202
False: 31
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
−2.5
−1.5
−0.5
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0


AC9.2 vs E30
cutlow: −1.033
cutup: 0.536
p0: 0
Significant: 297
False: 52
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−1.0
−2.0
−2.0
−1.0
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5


AC9.3 vs E30
cutlow: −0.721
cutup: 0.514
p0: 0
Significant: 321
False: 64.5
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
−1.5
−2.0


AC9.1 vs AC9.3
cutlow: −0.521
cutup: 0.662
p0: 0
Significant: 354
False: 61.1
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
−1.5
−1.0
−0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0


AC9.2 vs AC9.3
cutlow: −0.636
cutup: 0.54
p0: 0
Significant: 458
False: 93.45
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
−2.0
−1.0
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0


AC9.1 vs AC9.2
cutlow: −0.542
cutup: 0.71
p0: 0
Significant: 201
False: 41.3
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
−2.0
−1.5
−1.0
−0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5