Notes from Tetyana,

Look at the standard error of the cell proportions and analyze the quality of the cell proportion estimates. Then interpret the results of your models ( 1 , 2, and 3) based on the quality of the cell proportion estimates. The cell proportions that change more in Model 1 or 2 is the better estimate (?)

Results:

The associated between SCZ status and cell type proportions is not influence by blood draw time in our sample. The blood draw time has …. Effect on the EWAS results – compare the hits found in other studies /EWAS of SCZ and show that the association of the hits in our sample did not change when you included the blood draw time as a covariable or not.

Hannon finds cpg xxx

1. Take cpgxxx that I did in Mod1
2. Take cpgxxx from model 2
3. Show that cpgxxx did not change whether blood draw was included as a covariate.

Take mean or median of the standard errors.

I need to make a comparison between cell-type estimations, so I need a single measure per cell type that represents all the samples for this cell type.

Tetyana says – for plots and/or tables for supplementary

Evaluate the error based on the estimate for which it is calculated, not in relation to other errors.

For example, if the error is bigger than the estimate, then the estimate can not be trusted.

Get a sense of how reliable the estimates are, then incorporate that information into the discussion or maybe limitations of the study.

If you find a significant finding, with an unreliable estimate, the finding shall be considered questionable. (jan 27).

Find the plot to show why I lowered the error estimate from 0.08 to 0.06.