Tables for CR-TND Paper - SUPPLEMENT

Suzanne Dufault

January 30, 2019

1 Table 4 - Supplement

1.1 Outdated Table

December 29, 2017. This table has been updated.

	TestPositiveFraction	OR	GEE	RandomEffects
RR = 1	0.0506	0.0749	0.0000	0.0742
RR = 0.6	0.5258	0.5795	0.0014	0.6222
RR = 0.5	0.7798	0.8238	0.0103	0.8508
RR = 0.4	0.9418	0.9620	0.0805	0.9693
RR = 0.3	0.9965	0.9985	0.4175	0.9990

Table 1: The proportion of simulations that returned significant results for each intervention effect of interest (lambda) as in Table 2 of the paper, but now with 10,000 random intervention allocations of 1,000 cases and 1,000 controls (r=1).

1.2 Updated Table

This is the corrected table. Notice the only change is in the estimated power for GEE.

	TestPositiveFraction	OR	GEE	RandomEffects
RR = 1	0.0506	0.0749	0.0744	0.0742
RR = 0.6	0.5258	0.5795	0.6161	0.6222
RR = 0.5	0.7798	0.8238	0.8446	0.8508
RR = 0.4	0.9418	0.9620	0.9657	0.9693
RR = 0.3	0.9965	0.9985	0.9988	0.9990

Table 2: The proportion of simulations that returned significant results for each intervention effect of interest (lambda) as in Table 2 of the paper, but now with 10,000 random intervention allocations of 1,000 cases and 1,000 controls (r=1).

2 Table 5 - Supplement

2.1 Outdated Table

Relative Risk (λ)	Test-Positive Fraction	Odds Ratio	GEE	Random Effects
1	0.0013	0.0104	0.0000	0.0043
0.6	0.4783	0.6055	0.0000	0.6462
0.5	0.8075	0.8864	0.0007	0.9166
0.4	0.9732	0.9852	0.0241	0.9919
0.3	1.0000	0.9998	0.3462	1.0000

Table 3: The proportion of simulations that returned significant results for each intervention effect of interest (λ) as in Table 2 of the paper, but now with each approach applied to the results of the 247 constrained intervention allocations with 1,000 cases and 4,000 controls ($r = 4$).

2.2 Updated Table

	TestPositiveFraction	OR	GEE	RandomEffects
RR = 1	0.0013	0.0117	0.0779	0.0743
RR = 0.6	0.4786	0.6136	0.5936	0.6144
RR = 0.5	0.8075	0.8866	0.8266	0.8445
RR = 0.4	0.9732	0.9831	0.9603	0.9670
RR = 0.3	1.0000	1.0000	0.9983	0.9988

Table 4: The proportion of simulations that returned significant results for each intervention effect of interest (lambda) as in Table 6 of the supplement for the paper, with 247 constrained intervention allocations of 1,000 cases and 4,000 controls (r=4).

3 Table 6

3.1 Outdated Table

Relative Risk (λ)	Test-Positive Fraction	Odds Ratio	GEE	Random Effects
1	0.0022	0.0104	0.0000	0.0047
0.6	0.5283	0.6055	0.0000	0.6581
0.5	0.8488	0.8864	0.0007	0.9199
0.4	0.9800	0.9852	0.0241	0.9924
0.3	1.0000	0.9998	0.3462	1.0000

Table 5: The proportion of simulations that returned significant results for each intervention effect of interest (λ) as in Supplementary Table 4, but now constrained intervention allocations with 1,000 cases and 1,000 controls ($r = 1$)

3.2 Updated Table

	TestPositiveFraction	OR	GEE	RandomEffects
RR = 1	0.0022	0.0117	0.0058	0.0054
RR = 0.6	0.5283	0.6136	0.6534	0.6601
RR = 0.5	0.8489	0.8866	0.9141	0.9213
RR = 0.4	0.9800	0.9831	0.9906	0.9926
RR = 0.3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

Table 6: The proportion of simulations that returned significant results for each intervention effect of interest (lambda) as in Table 6 of the supplement for the paper, with 247 constrained intervention allocations of 1,000 cases and 1,000 controls (r=1).