painpringsm1/

(e) (3pts) Here are the results of the other mixed effect model, what kind of covariance structure are assumed for the three expression measurements per mouse in this model? Compare this model with previous one by a Likelihood Ratio test, write down test statistic, degree of freedom and the distribution of the test statistic when Null hypothesis is correct.

The Mixed Procedure

т	CTASHOU	TOT	XTIOPH	u	Deaphilaga

Fit Statistics				
£248.1	7883.0	0.1251	ε	
7883.0	8836.1	69₽€.1	2	
1251.0	69 4 6.1	8664.2	τ	
C013	COIS	COTI	моя	

3 967	(retted of reffeme) DIS
1.712	(Smaller is better)
€.81₽	(restrant of the sector)
8.404	-2 Res Log Likelihood

Null Model Likelihood Ratio Test

2000.0	12.21	9
Pr > Chisq	Chi-Square	DE

Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects

strain	т	32	23.26	1000.>
tumor	ī	75	72.4	1740.0
	•			
Effect	DE	DŁ	F Value	Pr > F
	TITO AT	TIDA		

$$\frac{2}{2} \sqrt{1.51} = \frac{1}{2}$$

 $\frac{2}{2} \sqrt{1.51} = \frac{1}{2}$

(f) (3pts) Someone ignored the fact that these mouse are not independent and did a fixed effect linear regression. Compared the following results with the results from question (e), explain (i) which assumption of general linear regression is violated, (ii) why we see smaller p-values in the fixed effect linear model? (iii) Give a reasonable guess

measurements of gene expression. brain, and right whole brain. We have altogether (20+20) $^{\ast}3=120$ progression at three tissues of each mouse: left forebrain, left hindand measure the expression of a gene that is important in tumor and 10 from Cast) and 20 mice without tumor (10 B6 + 10 Cast), In a follow-up study, we took 20 mice with tumor (10 from strain B6

expected to be 0? of these 120 observations. How many elements of this matrix are (c) (2pts) Please describe the structure of the 120*120 covariance matrix

ber mouse? covariance structure are assumed for three expression measurements (d) (2pts) Here are the results of one mixed effect model, what kind of

hyprouchs

2 707	•				
421.4	(Yett	ed ai rellam	a) DIA		
4.714	-2 Res Log Likelihood				
Fit Statistics					
2.1015	1889.0	1889.0	ε		
1883.0	2.1015	1889.0	7		
1889.0	1889.0	2.1015	Ţ		
Cº13	COIS	COII	моЯ		
Estimated R Matrix for mouseID 1					

BIC (smaller is better) AICC (smaller is better)

8.424

Pr > Chisq Chi-Square Null Model Likelihood Ratio Test

6000.0

Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects 11.11

1000.> strain 0.0421 tumor E Astue DŁ DŁ Effect aw N