## Lecture 12 - Decisions and Power

Sta102 / BME 102 March 7th, 2016

Colin Rundel

# Statistical vs. Practical Significance

Suppose  $\bar{X} = 50$ , s = 2, H<sub>0</sub> :  $\mu = 49.5$ , and H<sub>A</sub> :  $\mu > 49.5$ .

Will the p-value be lower if n = 100 or n = 10,000?

Suppose  $\bar{X} = 50$ , s = 2, H<sub>0</sub> :  $\mu = 49.5$ , and H<sub>A</sub> :  $\mu > 49.5$ .

Will the p-value be lower if n = 100 or n = 10,000?

$$T_{n=100} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{\sqrt{100}}} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{10}} = \frac{0.5}{0.2} = 2.5, \quad \text{p-value} = 0.007$$
$$T_{n=10000} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{\sqrt{10000}}} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{100}} = \frac{0.5}{0.02} = 25, \quad \text{p-value} \approx 0$$

Suppose  $\bar{X} = 50$ , s = 2, H<sub>0</sub> :  $\mu = 49.5$ , and H<sub>A</sub> :  $\mu > 49.5$ .

Will the p-value be lower if n = 100 or n = 10,000?

$$T_{n=100} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{\sqrt{100}}} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{10}} = \frac{0.5}{0.2} = 2.5, \quad \text{p-value} = 0.007$$
$$T_{n=10000} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{\sqrt{10000}}} = \frac{50 - 49.5}{\frac{2}{100}} = \frac{0.5}{0.02} = 25, \quad \text{p-value} \approx 0$$

As *n* increases -  $SE \downarrow$ ,  $T \uparrow$ , p-value  $\downarrow$ 

Suppose  $\bar{X} = 50$ , s = 2, H<sub>0</sub> :  $\mu = 49.9$ , and H<sub>A</sub> :  $\mu > 49.9$ .

Will the p-value be lower if n = 100 or n = 10,000?

Suppose  $\bar{X} = 50$ , s = 2, H<sub>0</sub> :  $\mu = 49.9$ , and H<sub>A</sub> :  $\mu > 49.9$ .

Will the p-value be lower if n = 100 or n = 10,000?

$$T_{n=100} = \frac{50 - 49.9}{\frac{2}{10}} = \frac{0.1}{0.2} = 0.5$$
, p-value = 0.309

$$T_{n=10000} = \frac{50 - 49.9}{\frac{2}{100}} = \frac{0.1}{0.02} = 5$$
, p-value =  $2.87 \times 10^{-7}$ 

#### Statistical vs. Practical Significance

- Differences between the point estimate and null value are easier to detect with larger samples
- Large samples can result in statistical significance even for tiny *effect sizes*, even when the difference is not practically significant
- This is particularly important to research: if we conduct a study, we want to focus on finding meaningful results (we want observed differences to be real but also large enough to matter).

"To call in the statistician after the experiment is done may be no more than asking him to perform a post-mortem examination: he may be able to say what the experiment died of." – R.A. Fisher

# **Decisions and Decision Errors**

- Hypothesis Tests and Confidence Intervals both make mistakes.
- In the court system innocent people are sometimes wrongly convicted and the guilty sometimes walk free.
- Similarly, we can make a wrong decision using statistical inference methods as well.
- The difference is that we have the ability to quantify / adjust how often we make errors using statistical inference.

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject H <sub>0</sub>
	H <sub>0</sub> true		
Truth	H <sub>A</sub> true		

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject H <sub>0</sub>
<b>T</b> (1	H <sub>0</sub> true	$\checkmark$	
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true		

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject H <sub>0</sub>
-	H <sub>0</sub> true	$\checkmark$	
Truth	H <sub>A</sub> true		$\checkmark$

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject H <sub>0</sub>
1	H <sub>0</sub> true	$\checkmark$	Type 1 Error
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true		$\checkmark$

• A Type 1 Error is rejecting the null hypothesis when  $H_0$  is true.

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject H <sub>0</sub>
	H <sub>0</sub> true	$\checkmark$	Type 1 Error
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true	Type 2 Error	$\checkmark$

- A Type 1 Error is rejecting the null hypothesis when  $H_0$  is true.
- A Type 2 Error is failing to reject the null hypothesis when  $H_A$  is true.

If we again think of a hypothesis test as a criminal trial then it makes sense to frame the verdict in terms of the null and alternative hypotheses:

- H<sub>0</sub> : Defendant is innocent
- H<sub>A</sub> : Defendant is guilty

Which type of error is being committed in the following cirumstances?

- Declaring the defendant innocent when they are actually guilty
- Declaring the defendant guilty when they are actually innocent

If we again think of a hypothesis test as a criminal trial then it makes sense to frame the verdict in terms of the null and alternative hypotheses:

H<sub>0</sub> : Defendant is innocent

H<sub>A</sub> : Defendant is guilty

Which type of error is being committed in the following cirumstances?

• Declaring the defendant innocent when they are actually guilty

#### Type 2 error

• Declaring the defendant guilty when they are actually innocent

If we again think of a hypothesis test as a criminal trial then it makes sense to frame the verdict in terms of the null and alternative hypotheses:

H<sub>0</sub> : Defendant is innocent

H<sub>A</sub> : Defendant is guilty

Which type of error is being committed in the following cirumstances?

• Declaring the defendant innocent when they are actually guilty

#### Type 2 error

• Declaring the defendant guilty when they are actually innocent

#### Type 1 error

Which error do you think is the worse error to make?

Which error do you think is the worse error to make?

"better that ten guilty persons escape than that one innocent suffer" – William Blackstone Which error do you think is the worse error to make?

"better that ten guilty persons escape than that one innocent suffer" – William Blackstone

Implications for statistical inference:

- Both types of errors are bad and we want to avoid them but there is a trade off.
- Generally, type I errors are considered to be worse so we tune our inference procedures to minimize them.

This means that, for those cases where  $H_0$  is actually true, we will incorrectly reject it at most 5% of the time.

This means that, for those cases where  $H_0$  is actually true, we will incorrectly reject it at most 5% of the time.

 $P(\text{Type 1 error}) = P(\text{Rejecting } H_0 \mid H_0 \text{ is true}) = \alpha$ 

This means that, for those cases where  $H_0$  is actually true, we will incorrectly reject it at most 5% of the time.

 $P(\text{Type 1 error}) = P(\text{Rejecting } H_0 \mid H_0 \text{ is true}) = \alpha$ 

This is why we prefer small values of  $\alpha$  – decreasing  $\alpha$  decreases our Type 1 error rate.

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject $H_0$
<b>-</b>	H <sub>0</sub> true		
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true		

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject $H_0$
	H <sub>0</sub> true		Type 1 Error, $lpha$
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true		

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject $H_0$
	H <sub>0</sub> true		Type 1 Error, $lpha$
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true	Type 2 Error, $eta$	

Type 2 error rate -  $\beta = P(Failing \text{ to reject } H_0 \mid H_A \text{ is true})$ 

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject $H_0$
	H <sub>0</sub> true	1-lpha	Type 1 Error, $lpha$
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true	Type 2 Error, $eta$	

Type 2 error rate -  $\beta = P(Failing \text{ to reject } H_0 \mid H_A \text{ is true})$ 

Power -  $1 - \beta = P(\text{Rejecting } H_0 \mid H_A \text{ is true})$ 

		Decision	
		fail to reject $H_0$	reject $H_0$
1	H <sub>0</sub> true	1-lpha	Type 1 Error, $lpha$
Iruth	H <sub>A</sub> true	Type 2 Error, $eta$	Power, 1 – $\beta$

Type 2 error rate -  $\beta = P(Failing \text{ to reject } H_0 \mid H_A \text{ is true})$ 

Power -  $1 - \beta = P(\text{Rejecting } H_0 \mid H_A \text{ is true})$ 

The type 2 error is defined as

 $\beta = P(Failing to reject H_0 | H_A is true) = ?$ 

The type 2 error is defined as

```
\beta = P(Failing to reject H_0 | H_A is true) = ?
```

How do we calculate this probability (or its complement)? It is not immediately obvious but we can come up with some basic rules:

- If the true population average is very close to the null hypothesis value ( $\delta$  likely to be small), it will be difficult to detect the difference (and reject  $H_0$ ).
- If the true population average is very different from the null hypothesis value ( $\delta$  likely to be large), it will be easy to detect the difference.

Intuitively,  $\beta$  depends on

- +  $\delta$  (effect size)
- $\cdot \alpha$  (significance level)
- *n* (sample size)

Intuitively,  $\beta$  depends on

- +  $\delta$  (effect size)
- $\cdot \alpha$  (significance level)
- *n* (sample size)

to increase power / decrease  $\beta$ :

- increase n,
- $\cdot$  increase  $\delta$ , and/or
- increase  $\alpha$

### Power

Blood pressure oscillates with the beating of the heart, and the systolic pressure is defined as the peak pressure when a person is at rest. The average systolic blood pressure for people in the U.S. is about 130 mmHg with a standard deviation of about 25 mmHg.

We are interested in finding out if the average blood pressure of employees at a certain company is *greater* than the national average, so we collect a random sample of 100 employees and measure their systolic blood pressure. What are the hypotheses? Blood pressure oscillates with the beating of the heart, and the systolic pressure is defined as the peak pressure when a person is at rest. The average systolic blood pressure for people in the U.S. is about 130 mmHg with a standard deviation of about 25 mmHg.

We are interested in finding out if the average blood pressure of employees at a certain company is *greater* than the national average, so we collect a random sample of 100 employees and measure their systolic blood pressure. What are the hypotheses?

> $H_0: \mu = 130$  $H_A: \mu > 130$

Blood pressure oscillates with the beating of the heart, and the systolic pressure is defined as the peak pressure when a person is at rest. The average systolic blood pressure for people in the U.S. is about 130 mmHg with a standard deviation of about 25 mmHg.

We are interested in finding out if the average blood pressure of employees at a certain company is *greater* than the national average, so we collect a random sample of 100 employees and measure their systolic blood pressure. What are the hypotheses?

> $H_0: \mu = 130$  $H_A: \mu > 130$

We'll start with a very specific question – "What is the power of this hypothesis test to correctly detect an *increase* of 2 mmHg in average blood pressure?"

The preceeding question can be rephrased as – How likely is it that this test will reject  $H_0$  when the true average systolic blood pressure for employees at this company is 132 mmHg?

The preceeding question can be rephrased as – How likely is it that this test will reject  $H_0$  when the true average systolic blood pressure for employees at this company is 132 mmHg?

Let's break this down into two simpler problems:

The preceeding question can be rephrased as – How likely is it that this test will reject *H*<sup>0</sup> when the true average systolic blood pressure for employees at this company is 132 mmHg?

Let's break this down into two simpler problems:

1. Problem 1: Which values of  $\bar{x}$  represent sufficient evidence to reject  $H_0$ ?

The preceeding question can be rephrased as – How likely is it that this test will reject  $H_0$  when the true average systolic blood pressure for employees at this company is 132 mmHg?

Let's break this down into two simpler problems:

- 1. Problem 1: Which values of  $\bar{x}$  represent sufficient evidence to reject  $H_0$ ?
- 2. Problem 2: What is the probability that we would reject  $H_0$  if  $\bar{x}$  had come from a distribution with  $\mu = 132$ , i.e. what is the probability that we can obtain such an  $\bar{x}$  from this distribution?

Which values of  $\bar{x}$  represent sufficient evidence to reject  $H_0$ ? (Remember  $H_0: \mu = 130, H_A: \mu > 130$ ) What is the probability that we would reject  $H_0$  if  $\bar{x}$  came from a distribution where  $\mu = 132$ .











#### **Recap - Calculating Power**

- Step 0: Pick a meaningful effect size  $\delta$  and a significance level  $\alpha$
- Step 1: Calculate the range of values for the point estimate beyond which you would reject  $H_0$  at the chosen  $\alpha$  level.
- Step 2: Calculate the probability of observing a value from preceding step if the sample was derived from a population where  $\mu = \mu_{H_0} + \delta$

Going back to the blood pressure example, what would the power be to detect a 4 mmHg increase in average blood pressure for the hypothesis that the population average is different from 130 mmHg at a 95% significance level for a sample of 625 patients?

Going back to the blood pressure example, what would the power be to detect a 4 mmHg increase in average blood pressure for the hypothesis that the population average is different from 130 mmHg at a 95% significance level for a sample of 625 patients?

Step 0:

$$H_0: \mu = 130, \ H_A: \mu \neq 130, \ \alpha = 0.05, \ n = 625, \ \sigma = 25, \ \delta = 4, \ 1 - \beta = ?$$

Step 1:

$$P(T > t \text{ or } T < -t) < 0.05 \implies t > 1.96$$
  
$$\bar{x} > 130 + 1.96 \frac{25}{\sqrt{625}} \text{ or } \bar{x} < 130 - 1.96 \frac{25}{\sqrt{625}}$$
  
$$\bar{x} > 131.96 \text{ or } \bar{x} < 128.04$$

Step 2: Assume  $\mu = \mu_{H_0} + \delta = 134$   $P(\bar{x} > 131.96 \text{ or } \bar{x} < 128.04) = P(T > [131.96 - 134]/1) + P(T < [128.04 - 134]/1)$  = P(T > -2.04) + P(T < -5.96)= 0.979 + 0 = 0.979 Going back to the blood pressure example, how large a sample would you need if you wanted 90% power to detect a 4 mmHg increase in average blood pressure for the hypothesis that the population average is different from 130 mmHg at a 95% significance level? Going back to the blood pressure example, how large a sample would you need if you wanted 90% power to detect a 4 mmHg increase in average blood pressure for the hypothesis that the population average is different from 130 mmHg at a 95% significance level?

Step 0:

$$H_0: \mu = 130, \ H_A: \mu \neq 130, \ \alpha = 0.05, \ \beta = 0.10, \ \sigma = 25, \ \delta = 4, \ n = ?$$

Step 1:

$$P(T > t \text{ or } T < -t) < 0.05 \implies t > 1.96$$
  
$$\bar{x} > 130 + 1.96 \frac{25}{\sqrt{n}} \text{ or } \bar{x} < 130 - 1.96 \frac{25}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Step 2: Assume  $\mu = \mu_{\rm H_0} + \delta = 134$ 

$$P\left(\bar{x} > 130 + 1.96\frac{25}{\sqrt{n}} \text{ or } \bar{x} < 130 - 1.96\frac{25}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = 0.9$$
$$P\left(T > 1.96 - 4\frac{\sqrt{n}}{25} \text{ or } T < -1.96 - 4\frac{\sqrt{n}}{25}\right) = 0.9$$









For n = 410 the power = 0.8996, therefore we need 411 subjects in our sample to achieve the desired level of power for the given circumstance.