

EPI 513-607 Mid-term exam, May 31, 1990 SOLUTIONS

- Q1 (a) yes, shifts it upwards. (b) no
- Q2 (ii) adding three numbers that are right on the mean leaves the numerator unchanged, but increases the denominator by 3.
- Q3 (i), otherwise, i.e., if (ii) or (iii), the standard deviation would reflect negative distances.
- Q4 Need (a) 1 head and 1 tail, (b) 50 heads and 50 tails [(a) is a 3-point distribution, (b) is a 101-point distribution].
 (a) has more chance of occurring: $2/4$ vs $\binom{100}{50}(1/2)^{100}$ for (b), which is a lot smaller.
- Q5 a. If of women has been increasing then it doesn't satisfy the Binomial assumptions.
 b. Yes c. Yes d. Not binomial; the is certain in some months and very rare in others.
- Q6 $SD(\text{sum}) = n SD(\text{individuals}) = 100 (25) = 250$ lbs. $E(\text{sum}) = n\mu = (100)(150) = 15\,000$
 15 500 is 500 or $2SD(\text{sum})$ above 15 000, i.e., there is a $2^{1/2} \%$ chance of getting $> 15\,500$.
- Q7 $\bar{x} \pm t_{24} SD/ 25 = 299\,789.2 \pm 2.0639 \times 12/5 = (299784.25, 299794.15)$
- Q8 Yes you can: can invoke central limit theorem if n is reasonably large, e.g., binomial with large n and reasonably central value of π is Gaussian enough.
- Q9 $SD(\text{individual}) = 6000$, $SE(\text{mean}) = SD(\text{mean of 225}) = 6000/ \sqrt{225} = 400$
 (a) False. The statement is about individual institutions but uses $2SE(\text{mean})$.
 (b) True.
 (c) True. This is just stating (b) in words, and it views the CI as a procedure whose average correct performance is 95%.
- Q10 H_0 : choosing at random, so $E(\bar{x}) = \mu$.
 H_{alt} : choosing not at random, so possibly $E(\bar{x}) \neq \mu$ [there are several other ways of being non random, e.g., someone could pull out half from the lower quartile and half from the upper quartile and still get $E(\bar{x}) = \mu$]. Here it sounds (post-hoc) like H_{alt} : $E(\bar{x}) > \mu$
 $P(\bar{x} > 33 \mid \mu = 30, \sigma = 5) = P(z > \frac{33 - 30}{5/5}) = P(z > 3) = 0.0013$.
- Q11 (i) Better to say chance alone (there is some chance fluctuation in all variations, even in systematic or clear differences).
- Q12 (i) Paired t-test. Deals only with pre-post differences in the treated group.
 Mean change is 5.3, so 95%CI: $\pm t_{32} SE(\text{average change}) = \pm 3.3$.
 $1 SE = 3.3/ t_{32} = 1.6$. $t = \frac{5.3 - 0}{SE(\text{ave change})} = 5.3/1.6 = 3.31$.
 (ii) $\pm t_{64} SE(\text{difference in average change}) = \pm 1.9977 \sqrt{1.6^2 + 2.2^2} = \pm 5.43$.
- Q13 (i) 1- If test each part separately (not recommended)
 — compute: average(clench) – average(tourniquet) for each person just from data in figure 1 (upper panel) and use paired t-test with $n = 4$, $df = 3$.
 — same for lower panel.
 The problem is the interpretation of 2 significance tests.
 2- Recommended: Compute corresponding difference for the corresponding times in Figure 1 (lower panel), i.e., the “placebo” effect. Then compute the difference of the 2 differences, i.e., subtract “effect” measured in lower panel (very little anyway) from effect in upper panel, to produce 1 single number per subject, and 1 significance test on the $n = 4$ subjects.
- Q14 Sleep-Wake schedules:
 (i) $SE(\text{Mean}) = SD(\text{individual})/ \sqrt{n}$ $SD(\text{individual}) = n SE(\text{Mean})$.
 (ii) Nights within same subject are not independent.
 (iii) Independent samples t-test (mostly different men in the 2 groups, but with small overlap).
 (iv) There probably is some covariance between the 2.
Circadian Phase:
 (i) Paired t-test with $n = 5$.
 (ii) Independent samples t-test with $n = 5$ vs (mostly) another $n = 5$.

