Variable: fecund

The summary statistics and normality checks here are the same as those in the output for fruitfly 1 .

$$
\text { line }=\text { NS }
$$

| Basic Statistical Measures |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Location |  | Variability |  |
| Mean | 33.37200 | Std Deviation | 8.94201 |
| Median | 34.40000 | Variance | 79.95960 |
| Mode |  | Range | 36.90000 |
|  |  | Interquartile Range | 9.70000 |


| Tests for Normality |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Test | Statistic |  | p Value |  |
| Shapiro-Wilk | W | 0.983892 | Pr < W | 0.9498 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov | D | 0.11463 | Pr > D | $>0.1500$ |
| Cramer-von Mises | W-Sq | 0.037842 | Pr $>$ W-Sq | $>0.2500$ |
| Anderson-Darling | A-Sq | 0.21906 | Pr $>$ A-Sq | $>0.2500$ |


| Quantiles (Definition 5) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Level | Quantile |
| 100\% Max | 51.8 |
| $99 \%$ | 51.8 |
| $95 \%$ | 47.4 |
| $90 \%$ | 42.4 |
| $75 \%$ Q3 | 37.9 |
| $50 \%$ Median | 34.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ Q1 | 28.2 |
| $10 \%$ | 20.3 |
| $5 \%$ | 19.3 |
| $1 \%$ | 14.9 |
| $0 \%$ Min | 14.9 |


| Extreme Values |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lowest |  | Highest |  |
| Order | Value | Order | Value |
| 1 | 14.9 | 21 | 41.7 |
| 2 | 19.3 | 22 | 41.8 |
| 3 | 20.3 | 23 | 42.4 |
| 4 | 22.6 | 24 | 47.4 |
| 5 | 23.4 | 25 | 51.8 |

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: fecund line $=$ RS

| Basic Statistical Measures |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Location |  | Variability |  |
| Mean | 25.25600 | Std Deviation | 7.77239 |
| Median | 23.60000 | Variance | 60.41007 |
| Mode | 20.30000 | Range | 31.60000 |
|  |  | Interquartile Range | 9.00000 |


| Tests for Normality |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Test | Statistic |  | p Value |  |
| Shapiro-Wilk | W | 0.949559 | Pr < W | 0.2450 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov | D | 0.139336 | Pr > D | $>0.1500$ |
| Cramer-von Mises | W-Sq | 0.076663 | Pr > W-Sq | 0.2253 |
| Anderson-Darling | A-Sq | 0.473402 | Pr > A-Sq | 0.2288 |


| Quantiles (Definition 5) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Level | Quantile |
| 100\% Max | 44.4 |
| $99 \%$ | 44.4 |
| $95 \%$ | 38.7 |
| $90 \%$ | 38.6 |
| $75 \%$ Q3 | 29.3 |
| $50 \%$ Median | 23.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ Q1 | 20.3 |
| $10 \%$ | 14.9 |
| $5 \%$ | 14.8 |
| $1 \%$ | 12.8 |
| $0 \%$ Min | 12.8 |


| Extreme Values |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lowest |  |  | Highest |  |  |
| Order | Value | Freq | Order | Value | Freq |
| 1 | 12.8 | 1 | 20 | 29.6 | 1 |
| 2 | 14.8 | 1 | 21 | 34.6 | 1 |
| 3 | 14.9 | 1 | 22 | 38.6 | 1 |
| 4 | 16.4 | 1 | 23 | 38.7 | 1 |
| 5 | 19.7 | 1 | 24 | 44.4 | 1 |

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: fecund line $=\mathbf{S S}$

| Basic Statistical Measures |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location |  | Variability |  |
| Mean | 23.62800 | Std Deviation | 9.76847 |
| Median | 22.50000 | Variance | 95.42293 |
| Mode |  | Range | 37.70000 |
|  |  | Interquartile Range | 14.20000 |


| Tests for Normality |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Test | Statistic |  | p Value |  |
| Shapiro-Wilk | W | 0.939562 | Pr < W | 0.1446 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov | D | 0.153393 | Pr > D | 0.1312 |
| Cramer-von Mises | W-Sq | 0.070113 | Pr > W-Sq | $>0.2500$ |
| Anderson-Darling | A-Sq | 0.457935 | Pr > A-Sq | 0.2463 |


| Quantiles (Definition 5) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Level | Quantile |
| 100\% Max | 48.5 |
| $99 \%$ | 48.5 |
| $95 \%$ | 39.0 |
| $90 \%$ | 38.4 |
| $75 \%$ Q3 | 30.2 |
| $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ Median | 22.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ Q1 | 16.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | 12.2 |
| $5 \%$ | 11.6 |
| $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | 10.8 |
| $\mathbf{0 \%}$ Min | 10.8 |


| Extreme Values |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lowest |  | Highest |  |
| Order | Value | Order | Value |
| 1 | 10.8 | 21 | 32.9 |
| 2 | 11.6 | 22 | 33.4 |
| 3 | 12.2 | 23 | 38.4 |
| 4 | 12.8 | 24 | 39.0 |
| 5 | 14.6 | 25 | 48.5 |

The UNIVARIATE Procedure


The UNIVARIATE Procedure



ANOVA and model comparison approach to the fruitfly fecundity example.
We begin with the full model with 3 means -- one for each genetic line
We will consider the reduced model obtained by grouping the two selected lines (RS and SS) to give the reduced model with 2 means -- one for NS and one for selected.

The GLM Procedure

| Coefficients for <br> Estimate RS vs SS  <br>  Row 1 <br> Intercept 0 <br> line NS <br> line RS <br> line SS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| contrast coefficients for |
| :--- |
| the model comparison |
| mu_RS - mu_SS |

The GLM Procedure

| Dependent Variable: fecund |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Source DF Sum of <br> Squares Mean Square F Value Pr > F |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 2 | 1362.211467 | 681.105733 | 8.67 | 0.0004 |
| Error | 72 | 5659.022400 | 78.597533 |  |  |
| Corrected Total | 74 | 7021.233867 |  |  |  |


| R-Square | Coeff Var | Root MSE | fecund Mean |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.194013 | 32.33390 | 8.865525 | 27.41867 |


| Source | DF | Type I SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| line | 2 | 1362.211467 | 681.105733 | 8.67 | 0.0004 |


| Source | DF | Type III SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| line | 2 | 1362.211467 | 681.105733 | 8.67 | 0.0004 |


| Contrast | DF | Contrast SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RS vs SS | 1 | 33.12980000 | 33.12980000 | 0.42 | 0.5182 |


| Parameter | Estimate | Standard <br> Error | t Value | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | 95\% Confidence Limits |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RS vs SS | 1.62800000 | 2.50754914 | 0.65 | 0.5182 | -3.37070784 | 6.62670784

the large P -value .5182 indicates that we cannot reject the null hypothesis
H_0: mu_RS=mu_SS
Thus we do not need the full model with three means and the reduced model with 2 means mu_NS and mu_S will suffice.

The GLM Procedure
Dependent Variable: fecund


The GLM Procedure

| Class Level Information |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Class | Levels | Values |
| line2 | 2 | NS S |


| Number of Observations Read | 75 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Observations Used | 75 |

The GLM Procedure

| Dependent Variáie: fecund |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Source DF Sum of <br> Squares Mean Square F Value Pr > F |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 1 | 1329.081667 | 1329.081667 | 17.05 | $<.0001$ |
| Error | 73 | 5692.152200 | 77.974688 |  |  |
| Corrected Total | 74 | 7021.233867 |  |  |  |


| R-Square | Coeff Var | Root MSE | fecund Mean |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.189295 | 32.20553 | 8.830328 | 27.41867 |


| Source | DF | Type I SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| line2 | 1 | 1329.081667 | 1329.081667 | 17.05 | $<.0001$ |


| Source | DF | Type III SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| line2 | 1 | 1329.081667 | 1329.081667 | 17.05 | $<.0001$ |


| Contrast | DF | Contrast SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | NS vs selected | 1 | 1329.081667 | 1329.081667 | 17.05 | $<.0001$ |


| Parameter | Estimate | Standard <br> Error | $\mathbf{t}$ Value | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|\mathbf{t}\|$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| NS vs selected | 8.93000000 | 2.16297972 | 4.13 | $<.0001$ |
| $\boldsymbol{N}$ |  |  |  |  |

The small P-value < . 0001 shows strong evidence that mu_NS is not equal to mu_(selected)
The F and t tests are equivalent with
$F=17.05=(4.13)^{\wedge} 2=t^{\wedge} 2$
On average the mean fecundity for the nonselected (NS) population is 8.93 units larger than the mean fecundity for the combined (selected) population.

The GLM Procedure
Dependent Variable: fecund




| Source | DF | Type I SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| line | 2 | 1362.211467 | 681.105733 | 8.67 | 0.0004 |


| Source | DF | Type III SS | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| line | 2 | 1362.211467 | 681.105733 | 8.67 | 0.0004 |



The GLM Procedure
Dependent Variable: fecund


The GLM Procedure


The GLM Procedure
Scheffe's Test for fecund
Note: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tukey's for all pairwise comparisons.
The pairwise comparisons considered earlier are reconsidered here making adjustments for multiple comparisons.

| Alpha | 0.05 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Error Degrees of Freedom | 72 |
| Error Mean Square | 78.59753 |
| Critical Value of F | 3.12391 |
| Minimum Significant Difference | 6.2678 |

We can be 95\% confident that all of these intervals apply simultaneously!

| Comparisons significant at the 0.05 level are indicated by ***. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| line Comparison | Difference Between Means | Simult 95 Confi |  |  |
| NS - RS | 8.116 | 1.848 | 14.384 | *** |
| NS - SS | 9.744 | 3.476 | 16.012 | *** |
| RS - NS | -8.116 | -14.384 | -1.848 | *** |
| RS - SS | 1.628 | -4.640 | 7.896 |  |
| SS - NS | -9.744 | -16.012 | -3.476 | * |
| SS - RS | -1.628 | -7.896 | 4.640 |  |

the multiplier for the Scheffe intervals

This is the multiplier used to form the simultaneous confidence intervals.
simultaneous Scheffe type intervals

| Obs | differ | estimate | stderr | lowerCL | upperCL |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | RS_SS | 1.628 | 2.50755 | -4.6398 | 7.8958 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | RS_NS | -8.116 | 2.50755 | -14.3838 | -1.8482 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | SS_NS | -9.744 | 2.50755 | -16.0118 | -3.4762 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | NS_other | 8.930 | 2.17160 | 3.5019 | 14.3581 |

The first three intervals here are the same simultaneous intervals for the pairwise differences as above. The last interval is for the contrast mu_NS-(mu_RS+mu_SS)/2.

The 95\% confidence level is for all 4 intervals simultaneously.

