

1)A.

$$\text{Estimation of Odds ratio for Birds Vs No Birds Groups} = \frac{\text{Odds of cancer in Birds Group}}{\text{Odds of cancer in no birds group}} = \frac{98 \times 328}{141 \times 101} = 2.257145$$

Odds of getting a cancer in Birds group are estimated to be 2.257145 times higher than the odds of getting cancer in No Birds group.

B)

odds ratio with 95% C.I. estimate	lower	upper
Bird 1.000000	NA	NA
No Bird 2.257145	1.60518	3.173915

95% confidence interval for no birds group is (1.60518, 3.173915). As the CI does not include 1, we can reject the null hypothesis that the probability of cancer for both the Birds and No birds group are the same.

For this, we can conclude with 95% confidence that there is a relationship between bird ownership and lung cancer.

2) A)

Odds ratio of Trt Vs Ctrl for Study 1, $\lambda_1 = 0.19519$

Odds ratio of Trt Vs Ctrl for Study 2, $\lambda_2 = 1.01210$

Odds ratio of Trt Vs Ctrl for Study 3, $\lambda_3 = 0.62391$

B)

Breslow-Day p-value = 0.0001456754 < 0.001, we can conclude that the odds ratio are different across the 3 studies.

C)

After running CMH Test using mantelhaen.test, we get

Common Odds Ratio = 0.9570013, p-value = 0.4663.

Conclusion: As 95% CI includes 1, we can not reject the hypothesis of the average of odds ratio across different studies λ_n equals to 1.

3)A)

Sample mean , $\hat{\mu} = 2.104167$

B)

GOF test statistic = 6.340026

p-value = 0.09618956 > 0.05

Conclusion: No evidence against the poisson assumption.