

2x2 TABLE

INDEPENDENT SAMPLES  $\hat{=}$  BINARY EXPLANATORY VARIABLE  
 BINARY RESPONSE

NOTATION	RESP		
	+	-	
EXPL. VAR.	+	a <sub>1</sub>   b <sub>1</sub>	n <sub>1</sub>
	-	a <sub>2</sub>   b <sub>2</sub>	n <sub>2</sub>
		m <sub>1</sub>   m <sub>2</sub>	N

"COUNT DATA"  
 OBSERVED FREQUENCY  
 "CROSS-TABULATION"

EXAMPLE: RCT OF ESTROGEN, "COMBINED OUTCOME", WHI

	+	-	
+	751	7755	8506
-	623	7479	8102
	1374	15234	16608

$$\hat{p}_1 = \frac{a_1}{n_1} = \frac{751}{8506} = .08829$$

$$\hat{p}_2 = \frac{a_2}{n_2} = \frac{623}{8102} = .07689$$

TEST  $H_0: p_1 = p_2$  VIA  $Z$  TEST  
 $\chi^2$  TEST  
 EXACT TEST }  $\rightarrow$  P-VALUE; WILL DO  $\chi^2$  TESTS NEXT WEEK

Z TEST =  $\chi^2$  TEST AS WILL BE EXPLAINED IN CH 18

BOTH Z &  $\chi^2$  COME IN "UNCORRECTED" & CONTINUITY CORRECTED FORMS

ESTIMATE OF "EFFECT" OF THE EXPOSURE

ABSOLUTE EFFECT  $\rightarrow$  RISK DIFFERENCE  $CC = \hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2$  (§17.2) LAST SEMESTER

RELATIVE EFFECT  $\rightarrow$  RELATIVE RISK =  $\frac{\hat{p}_1}{\hat{p}_2}$  (§17.4)

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE: WHI ESTROGEN TRIAL

$$RR = \frac{.08829}{.07689} = 1.1483 \hat{=} 1.15$$

INTERPRETATION  $\rightarrow$  DISCUSS

CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR RR

$$e^{\ln \widehat{RR} \pm z \cdot SE_{\ln \widehat{RR}}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WHERE } SE_{\ln \widehat{RR}} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{a_1} - \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} - \frac{1}{n_2}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{751} - \frac{1}{8506} + \frac{1}{623} - \frac{1}{8102}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= 0.051920$$

FOR 95% CONFIDENCE USE  $z = 1.96$

$$e^{\ln(1.1483) \pm (1.96)(.051920)} = e^{0.1382 \pm 0.0854}$$

$$= e^{.0528, .2236} = (1.05, 1.25)$$

### SYSTEMATIC ERRORS IN INFERENCE

- EMPHASIZE IMPORTANCE, ESP. IN NON-EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES
- CONFOUNDING  $\rightarrow$  EXTRANEOUS FACTORS EXPLAIN THE ASSOCIATION
- WHY DID THE NON-EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES ON POSTMENOPAUSAL ESTROGEN GET IT WRONG?  $\rightarrow$  BIOJURIS. 2005, 6(4)

INTRODUCE NOTIONS OF INFORMATION BIAS & SELECTION BIAS; HAVE STUDENTS READ TEXT