
AC9.1 vs pPTGE30
cutlow: −0.79
cutup: 0.632
p0: 0
Significant: 175
False: 24.4
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


AC9.2 vs pPTGE30
cutlow: −0.925
cutup: 0.543
p0: 0
Significant: 296
False: 49.1
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


AC9.3 vs pPTGE30
cutlow: −0.649
cutup: 0.452
p0: 0
Significant: 264
False: 59.8
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
−1.5
−1.5
−1.0
−0.5
0.0
0.5
1.0


AC9.1 vs AC9.3
cutlow: −0.455
cutup: 0.596
p0: 0
Significant: 247
False: 59.2
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.5
−2.5


AC9.2 vs AC9.3
cutlow: −0.479
cutup: 0.609
p0: 0
Significant: 318
False: 77.95
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


AC9.1 vs AC9.2
cutlow: −0.558
cutup: 0.637
p0: 0
Significant: 150
False: 35.1
FDR: 0
Observed d(i) values
Expected d(i) values
−2.5
−1.5
−0.5
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0