# Type I error and power simulation

Jesse Gronsbell

08/01/2022

#### Simulation Set-up

$$\begin{bmatrix} Y_i \\ \hat{Y}_i \end{bmatrix} \mid Z_{ik} \sim N\left( \begin{bmatrix} \beta_G G + \beta X_i \\ \alpha X_i \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

- $G \sim Bin(2, maf)$
- $maf = 0.25, X_i \sim N(0, 1)$
- $\alpha = \beta = 0.11, \, \beta_g = 0.11575982$
- missing rate  $\in \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$
- $\rho \in \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$


I do not think these parameters match whats in the simulation file, please confirm.


## Type I error

Table 1: Proportion of test making type I error

mssing	rho	t1e rejection	Chisq
0.00	0.00	0.05	0.97
0.00	0.25	0.05	1.00
0.00	0.50	0.05	0.98
0.00	0.75	0.05	0.98
0.25	0.00	0.05	1.00
0.25	0.25	0.06	1.03
0.25	0.50	0.05	1.02
0.25	0.75	0.05	1.00
0.50	0.00	0.05	1.00
0.50	0.25	0.05	1.00
0.50	0.50	0.05	1.00
0.50	0.75	0.05	1.00
0.75	0.00	0.05	0.99
0.75	0.25	0.05	1.00
0.75	0.50	0.05	1.01
0.75	0.75	0.05	1.01


## Increased Power relative to baseline GWAS





## Power as a function of heritability

## Power of bivariate regression, stratified by percent of missing lables



Unlike the previous plot, SNP heritability plays no role in relative efficiency.

