

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). Your use of this material constitutes acceptance of that license and the conditions of use of materials on this site.



Copyright 2008, The Johns Hopkins University and Brian Caffo. All rights reserved. Use of these materials permitted only in accordance with license rights granted. Materials provided "AS IS"; no representations or warranties provided. User assumes all responsibility for use, and all liability related thereto, and must independently review all materials for accuracy and efficacy. May contain materials owned by others. User is responsible for obtaining permissions for use from third parties as needed.

# Lecture 17

Brian Caffo

Department of Biostatistics  
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health  
Johns Hopkins University

December 19, 2007

# Table of contents

- 1 Table of contents
- 2 Outline
- 3 Matched data
- 4 Aside, regression to the mean
- 5 Two independent groups

# Outline

- 1 Paired difference hypothesis tests
- 2 Independent group differences hypothesis tests

# Hypothesis testing for comparing two means

- When comparing groups, first determine whether observations are paired or not
- When dealing a single set of paired data, one strategy is to take the difference between the paired observation and do a one-sample  $t$  test of  $H_0 : \mu_d = 0$  versus  $H_a : \mu_d \neq 0$  (or one of the other two alternatives)
- Test statistic is

$$\frac{\bar{X}_d - \mu_{d0}}{S_d / \sqrt{n_d}}$$

where  $\mu_{d0}$  is the value under the null hypothesis (typically 0); compare this statistic to a  $t_{n_d-1}$  or  $z$  statistic

## Example


- Consider Exam 1 and Exam 2 grades from a previous class
- Is there any evidence that the second exam was easier or harder than the first?
- The same students took both exams with none dropping out in-between
- Summaries for the two exams


```
> summary(test1)
```

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
76.19	82.86	86.67	86.94	91.43	100.00

```
> summary(test2)
```

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
71.00	87.00	90.00	89.82	93.00	100.00







## R Code

```
diff <- test2 - test1
n <- sum(!is.na(diff)) #49
mean(diff) #2.88
sd(diff) #7.61
testStat <- sqrt(n) * mean(diff) / sd(diff) #2.65
# below works out to be 0.01
2 * pt(abs(testStat), n - 1, lower.tail = FALSE)
##uses the R function
t.test(diff)
```

## Discussion of matched data

Table of  
contents

Outline

Matched data


Aside,  
regression to  
the mean

Two  
independent  
groups

- Also to consider, “are ratios more relevant than pair-wise differences?”; if so, try doing the test on the log-observations
- When considering matched pairs data, you often want to plot the first observation by the second
- A more efficient plot displays the average of the observations by the difference or doing this on the log scale
- The previous plot is called a “mean/difference” plot, invented by Tukey (sometimes it is called a “Bland/Altman” plot after researchers who effectively described and used the method for considering measurement error)

# Regression to mediocrity

- Francis Galton was the first to recognize that for matched data, high initial observations tended to be associated with lower second observations and low initial observations tended to be associated with higher second observations
- Example: Sons of very tall fathers tend to be a little shorter (also fathers of very tall sons tend to be shorter)
- Example: Second exams for those who scored very high on a first exam tend to be a little lower



## RTM continued

- To investigate more, we normalize both scales (so that their means are both 0 and standard deviations 1)
- If there was no regression to the mean, the data would scatter about an identity line
- The best fitting line goes through the average and has slope

$$\text{Cor}(Test1, Test2) \frac{SD(Test2)}{SD(\bar{Test1})}$$


and passes through the point

$$\{\text{mean}(Test1), \text{mean}(Test2)\}$$

- .
- Because we normalized the data, our line passes through (0,0) and has slope  $\text{Cor}(Test1, Test2)$  (normalizing doesn't impact the correlation)

## RTM continued

- The best fitting “regression line” has slope  $\text{Cor}(Test1, Test2) < 1$
- This will be shrunk toward a horizontal line, telling us our expected normalized test score for Test 2 will be  $\text{Cor}(Test1, Test2)$  times the normalized Test 1 score
- This line appropriately adjusts for regression to the mean for Test 2 conditioning on Test 1; we could similarly do the same for Test 1 conditioning on Test 2; this line will have slope  $\text{Cor}(Test1, Test2)^{-1}$  if plot with Test 1 on the horizontal axis
- The latter line will be shrunk toward a vertical line; the identity line will fall between the two



# Final comments

- An ideal examiner would have little difference between the identity line and the fitted regression line
- The more unrelated the two exam scores are, the more pronounced the regression to the mean
- If you watch sports you have to wonder how much discussion is over regression to the mean
- Athletes who perform the best will often perform worse the next year; is this regression to the mean or an actual decline in the athlete's ability?



## Two independent groups

- The extension to two independent groups should come as no surprise
- $H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$ , versus  $H_a : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$  (or one of the other two alternatives)
- Assuming a common error variance we have

$$\frac{\bar{X} - \bar{Y}}{S_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_x} + \frac{1}{n_y}}}$$

which will follow a  $t_{n_x+n_y-2}$  distribution under the null hypothesis and the usual assumptions

## Continued

- If the assuming a common error variance is questionable

$$\frac{\bar{X} - \bar{Y}}{\sqrt{\frac{S_x^2}{n_x} + \frac{S_y^2}{n_y}}}$$

follows a standard normal distribution for large  $n_x$  and  $n_y$ . It follows an approximate Students  $T$  distribution if the  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are normally distributed

- The approximate degrees of freedom are

$$\frac{(S_x^2/n_x + S_y^2/n_y)^2}{(S_x^2/n_x)^2/(n_x - 1) + (S_y^2/n_y)^2/(n_y - 1)}$$

- Note the connection between hypothesis testing and confidence intervals still holds; for example, if zero is in your independent group  $T$  interval, you will fail to reject the independent group  $T$  test for equal means
- Don't test for equality of means by comparing separately constructed intervals for the two groups and rejecting the null hypothesis if they do not overlap
- This procedure has lower power than just doing the right test
- Also, it leads to the potential abuse of comparing intervals for paired data

## Example

- Suppose that instead of having repeated data on two consecutive exams, students were randomized to two teaching modules and took the same exam
- We might obtain data like the following

Group	N	Mean Exam	SD Exam
Module 1	50	86.9	6.07
Module 2	50	89.8	6.06

- Pooled standard deviation 6.065<sup>1</sup>
- Test stat

$$\frac{89.8 - 86.9}{6.065 \sqrt{\frac{1}{50} + \frac{1}{50}}}$$

(you do the rest)

---

<sup>1</sup>note this is not obtained by averaging the two standard deviations, it's obtained by averaging the variances then square rooting

- Look over the review notes on formal tests for equality of variances between two groups
- These tests, employing the  $F$  distribution, rely heavily on normality assumptions
- Alternatively, for moderate sample sizes, consider creating a bootstrap confidence interval for the ratio of the two variances
- For smaller sample sizes, consider basing decisions on exploratory data analysis

## Final comments

- Suppose you have equal numbers of observations for two groups (say  $X$  and  $Y$ )
- If the data are truly matched, then the standard error of the difference is estimating

$$\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_y^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma_x^2}{n} - 2\frac{\text{Cov}(X, Y)}{n}}$$

- If you ignore the matching, then the standard error of the difference is estimating

$$\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_y^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma_x^2}{n}}$$

- Since, generally, matched data is positively correlated, by ignoring the matching you are likely (violating assumptions and) inflating your standard error unnecessarily