Reanalysis of 11-Carlisle

Simon Schwab*

26/08/2020

Contents

Reference	1
Notes from reading methods section	1
Reading data	2
Descriptives Dependant variable	
Main analysis ANCOVA	4
Comparing ANCOVA in original study with reanalysis Independant variable	4 4
Assumptions 1. Homogeneity of variance	5
Additonal analyses	6
Notes	8

Reference

Carlisle, A., Selwood, L., Hinds, L. A., Saunders, N., Habgood, M., Mardon, K., & Weisbecker, V. (2017). Testing hypotheses of developmental constraints on mammalian brain partition evolution, using marsupials. Scientific Reports, 7(1), 4241. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-02726-9

Notes from reading methods section

- Dependent variable: brain partition size of olfactory bulb
- Independent variable: species (3 levels)

^{*}University of Zurich, simon.schwab@uzh.ch

- Macropus eugenii
- Trichosurus vulpecula
- Monodelphis domestica
- Covariate: whole brain volume
- Design: 1-way ANCOVA with species as IV and whole brain volume as covariate

Reading data


Data is loaded, reshaped if necessary, and factors are specified.

Descriptives

Dependant variable


Number of samples and mean (SD) in levels of the independent variables.

```
tab.dv = array(NA, dim=c(nlevels(data$Species.name),3))
tab.dv[,1] = levels(data$Species.name)
tab.dv[,2] = summary(data$Species.name)
tab.dv[,3] = tapply(data$Olfactory_Bulb, data$Species.name,
                  function (x) sprintf("\%0.2f(\%0.2f)", mean(x), sd(x)))
colnames(tab.dv) = c("group", "n", "mean (SD)")
print(tab.dv)
##
                                     mean (SD)
        group
                              "13" "52.84 (86.42)"
## [1,] "Macropus eugenii"
## [2,] "Monodelphis domestica" "11" "26.72 (26.77)"
## [3,] "Trichosurus vulpecula" "11" "61.17 (93.79)"
ggplot(data, aes(y=log(Olfactory_Bulb), x=Species.name, color=Species.name)) +
  geom_boxplot() +
  geom_point(position = position_jitter(width = 0.15, height = 0)) +
  theme minimal() +
  theme(axis.text.x = element blank(), legend.title = element blank()) +
  xlab("species") + ylab("olfactory bulb volume (log)") + ggtitle("Dependent variable")
```



Covariate(s)

```
tab.cv = array(NA, dim=c(nlevels(data$Species.name),3))
tab.cv[,1] = levels(data$Species.name)
tab.cv[,2] = summary(data$Species.name)
tab.cv[,3] = tapply(data$Whole_Brain_Volume, data$Species.name,
                  function (x) sprintf("\%0.2f(\%0.2f)", mean(x), sd(x)))
colnames(tab.cv) = c("group", "n", "mean (SD)")
print(tab.cv)
        group
                                     mean (SD)
##
## [1,] "Macropus eugenii"
                                "13" "2160.14 (3971.33)"
## [2,] "Monodelphis domestica" "11" "329.58 (289.08)"
## [3,] "Trichosurus vulpecula" "11" "2130.30 (3587.35)"
ggplot(data, aes(y=log(Whole_Brain_Volume), x=Species.name, color=Species.name)) +
  geom_boxplot() +
  geom_point(position = position_jitter(width = 0.15, height = 0)) +
  theme_minimal() +
  theme(axis.text.x = element blank(), legend.title = element blank()) +
  xlab("group") + ylab("Whole brain volume (log)") + ggtitle("Covarate")
```



Main analysis ANCOVA

```
# Orthogonal contrasts
contrasts(data$Species.name) = contr.helmert(3)
# The author did not run a classic ancova with IV + COV, but instea an interaction IV*COV similar ro te
# the homogenity of slope assumption
fit.ancova = aov(log(Olfactory_Bulb) ~ log(Whole_Brain_Volume-Olfactory_Bulb)*Species, data = data)
result = Anova(fit.ancova, type=3) # Type III
print(result)
## Anova Table (Type III tests)
##
## Response: log(Olfactory_Bulb)
                                                   Sum Sq Df F value
                                                                         Pr(>F)
## (Intercept)
                                                   20.349 1 190.5605 2.805e-14
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb)
                                                   54.073 1 506.3676 < 2.2e-16
## Species
                                                    1.553 2
                                                               7.2699 0.00276
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb):Species 3.912 2 18.3183 7.181e-06
## Residuals
                                                    3.097 29
##
## (Intercept)
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb)
## Species
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb):Species ***
## Residuals
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Comparing ANCOVA in original study with reanalysis

Independant variable

```
tab.IV = rbind(stats.orig.IV, stats.rep.IV)
rownames(tab.IV) = c("original Study", "reanalysis")
print(t(tab.IV))
           original Study reanalysis
                          "18.32"
## Fvalue NA
                          " 2"
## df1
           NA
## df2
                          "29"
           NA
## pvalue "< 0.0001"
                          "< 0.0001"
           NA
## MD
                          NA
## lowerCI NA
                          NA
## upperCI NA
                          NA
```

Covariate

```
tab.CV = rbind(stats.orig.CV, stats.rep.CV)
rownames(tab.CV) = c("original Study", "reanalysis")
```

print(t(tab.CV))

```
original Study reanalysis
                            "506.37"
## Fvalue
## df1
                            " 1"
           NΑ
                            " 2"
## df2
           NΑ
## pvalue
           NA
                            "< 0.0001"
## MD
           NA
                            NA
## lowerCI NA
                           NA
## upperCI NA
                            NA
```

Assumptions

1. Homogeneity of variance

- ANOVA/ANCOVA is fairly robust in terms of the error rate when sample sizes are equal.
- When groups with larger sample sizes have larger variances than the groups with smaller sample sizes, the resulting F-ratio tends to be conservative. That is, it's more likely to produce a non-significant result when a genuine difference does exist in the population.
- Conversely, when the groups with larger sample sizes have smaller variances than the groups with smaller samples sizes, the resulting F-ratio tends to be liberal and can inflate the false positive rate.

```
tapply(log(data$Olfactory_Bulb), data$Species.name, sd)

## Macropus eugenii Monodelphis domestica Trichosurus vulpecula
## 2.156197 2.565358 1.977223

leveneTest(log(Olfactory_Bulb) ~ Species.name, data = data)

## Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variance (center = median)
## Df F value Pr(>F)
## group 2 0.0086 0.9914
## 32
```

2. Independence between covariate and IV

- When the covariate and the experimental effect (independent variable) are not independent the treatment
 effect is obscured, spurious treatment effects can arise and the interpretation of the ANCOVA is seriously
 compromised.
- We test whether our groups differ on the CV. If the groups do not significantly differ then is appropriate to use the covariate.

```
fit.cv = aov(log(Whole_Brain_Volume-Olfactory_Bulb) ~ Species.name, data = data)
Anova(fit.cv, type=3)

## Anova Table (Type III tests)
##
## Response: log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb)
## Sum Sq Df F value Pr(>F)
## (Intercept) 1170.15 1 336.5831 <2e-16 ***
## Species.name 12.83 2 1.8458 0.1743
## Residuals 111.25 32
## ---</pre>
```


```
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

3. Homogeneity of regression slopes

- We test the interaction between the IV and the CV
- The assumption is not met in this paper, however, the authors' goal was exactly to investigate the different slopes across species (Table 2).

```
fit.hrs = aov(log(Olfactory_Bulb) ~ log(Whole_Brain_Volume-Olfactory_Bulb)*Species.name, data = data)
Anova(fit.hrs, type=3)
```

```
## Anova Table (Type III tests)
##
## Response: log(Olfactory_Bulb)
                                                          Sum Sq Df
                                                                      F value
                                                          59.023
## (Intercept)
                                                                    552.7269
                                                                 1
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb)
                                                         156.487 1 1465.4368
## Species.name
                                                           1.553 2
                                                                       7.2699
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb):Species.name
                                                           3.912 2
                                                                      18.3183
## Residuals
                                                           3.097 29
                                                            Pr(>F)
## (Intercept)
                                                         < 2.2e-16 ***
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb)
                                                         < 2.2e-16 ***
## Species.name
                                                           0.00276 **
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb):Species.name 7.181e-06 ***
## Residuals
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
ggplot(data, aes(y=log(Olfactory_Bulb), x=log(Whole_Brain_Volume-Olfactory_Bulb), color=Species.name, si
 geom_point() +
  geom_smooth(formula = y ~ x,method=lm, se=FALSE, fullrange=TRUE) +
  theme_minimal() +
  theme(legend.title = element_blank()) +
  xlab("whole brain volume") + ylab("olfactory bulb")
```



Additional analyses

```
# Reproducing Figure 4
ggplot(data, aes(x = log(Whole_Brain_Volume), y = log(Olfactory_Bulb))) +
geom_point() + theme_minimal()
```

```
# Reproducing Table 1
fit = lm(log(Olfactory_Bulb)~log(Whole_Brain_Volume-Olfactory_Bulb), data=data)
summary(fit)
##
```

```
## Call:
## lm(formula = log(Olfactory_Bulb) ~ log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb),
##
      data = data)
##
## Residuals:
##
       Min
                 1Q
                      Median
## -1.47470 -0.31060 -0.05929 0.41685 1.13776
## Coefficients:
                                           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)
                                           -3.99436
                                                       0.34643 -11.53 4.08e-13
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb) 1.10161
                                                       0.05657
                                                               19.47 < 2e-16
##
## (Intercept)
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb) ***
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
## Residual standard error: 0.6301 on 33 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.9199, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9175
## F-statistic: 379.2 on 1 and 33 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
fit = lm(log(Olfactory Bulb)~log(Whole Brain Volume-Olfactory Bulb),
        data=subset(data, subset = Species == 1))
summary(fit)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = log(Olfactory_Bulb) ~ log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb),
## data = subset(data, subset = Species == 1))
##
## Residuals:
## Min 1Q Median 3Q Max
```

```
## -0.7233 -0.2690 0.1020 0.2343 0.6669
##
## Coefficients:
                                           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
##
## (Intercept)
                                           -4.49546
                                                       0.39378 -11.42 1.94e-07
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb)
                                           1.12144
                                                       0.06026
                                                                18.61 1.16e-09
## (Intercept)
## log(Whole_Brain_Volume - Olfactory_Bulb) ***
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 0.3951 on 11 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.9692, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9664
## F-statistic: 346.3 on 1 and 11 DF, p-value: 1.156e-09
```

Notes

- First main result reproduced
- Assumptions hold. Homogeneity of regression slopes was part of the research questions.
- · ANCOVA used with interactions term for species and whole brain volume, not to regress covariate
- Log transform of IV and CV was successful
- Lots of models tested, no correction for multiplicity
- Helpful R code was supplied
- Model was clearly specified in the methods section

Data was analyzed according to recommendations by Field, Miles, & Field (2012).