

# **GS01 0163**

## **Analysis of Microarray Data**

Keith Baggerly and Kevin Coombes  
Section of Bioinformatics

Department of Biostatistics and Applied Mathematics  
UT M. D. Anderson Cancer Center

`kabagg@mdanderson.org`

`kcoombes@mdanderson.org`

19 October 2006

# Lecture 15: Comparing Microarray Analysis Methods

- Comparing ALL and MLL
- The ClassComparison Package
- Comparing processing methods
  - Shedden et al.
  - Wilcoxon rank-sum tests
  - Thresholds
  - Cope et al.

## Comparing ALL and MLL

Early in the course (and in the latest homework), we looked at the ALL-MLL-AML data from the paper by Armstrong et al. in *Nature Genetics*, 2002; 30:41-47.


We learned that the AML samples were run on the U95Av2 chip, while the ALL and MLL samples were run on the U95A. We processed all the data in dChip (using a probe mask file to combine the two array types).

To analyze the data, we clustered the samples. We also found 628 differentially expressed genes between ALL and MLL.

We are now going to export the data from dChip and load it into R.

# Exporting all the data from dChip

1. Use menu “Tools” – > “Export Expression Value”.
2. Select “all genes”
3. Press “OK”



# Starting in R

Load the `affy` package.

```
> require(affy)
```

```
Loading required package: affy
```

```
Loading required package: Biobase
```

```
Loading required package: tools
```

```
Welcome to Bioconductor
```

```
Vignettes contain introductory material. To view,  
simply type: openVignette()
```

```
For details on reading vignettes, see  
the openVignette help page.
```

```
Loading required package: reposTools
```

```
[1] TRUE
```

## Load the Sample Information file

```
> # remember where the data lives
> home <- 'g:/ShortCourse'
> # use the same sample info file we made for dChip
> si <- read.table(file.path(home, 'InfoFiles',
+                             'krc-sample-info.xls'),
+                  header=TRUE, sep='\t')
> si[1:5,]
```

	Scan.name	type	Split
ALL01	CL2001011101AA	ALL	Training
ALL02	CL2001011104AA	ALL	Training
ALL03	CL2001011105AA	ALL	Training
ALL04	CL2001011108AA	ALL	Training
ALL05	CL2001011109AA	ALL	Training

## Load dChip's array file

```
> arrays <- read.table(file.path(home, 'Output',  
                               'affyShortCourse arrays.xls'),  
                      header=TRUE, as.is=TRUE, sep='\t')  
+  
> # Fix the column names!  
> dimnames(arrays)[[2]] <-  
+   c(dimnames(arrays)[[2]][2:8], 'x')  
> # Use the sample name as the row name  
> dimnames(arrays)[[1]] <- arrays$Array  
> # Only keep useful columns  
> arrays <- arrays[, 3:6]  
> # Give them sensible names  
> dimnames(arrays)[[2]] <- c('MedianIntensity',  
+   'PercentPresent', 'ArrayOutlier',  
+   'SingleOutlier')
```

## Combine sample information

```
> # Merge sample info with dChip info
> si <- merge(si, arrays, by='row.names',
+           sort=FALSE)
> # Sigh. Fix the row names yet again.
> dimnames(si)[[1]] <- si$Row.names
> # Remove redundant columns
> si <- si[, 2:8]
> rm(arrays) # cleanup
```



## Note that the order has changed!

```
> si[1:5, ]
```

	Scan.name	type	Split	MedianIntensity
ALL01	CL2001011101AA	ALL	Training	1497
ALL24	CL2001011102AA	ALL	Test	1196
ALL02	CL2001011104AA	ALL	Training	1778
ALL03	CL2001011105AA	ALL	Training	1097
ALL04	CL2001011108AA	ALL	Training	1489
	PercentPresent	ArrayOutlier	SingleOutlier	
ALL01	48.2	1.648	0.099	
ALL24	38.3	3.778	0.432	
ALL02	49.5	1.450	0.144	
ALL03	36.8	3.152	0.375	
ALL04	38.7	5.299	0.216	

## Specialized factors

```
> # make a factor to compare ALL vs MLL
> temp <- si$type
> temp[temp=='AML'] <- NA
> si$ALLvMLL <- factor(temp)
>
> temp <- si$type
> temp[temp=='MLL'] <- NA
> si$ALLvAML <- factor(temp)
>
> temp <- si$type
> temp[temp=='ALL'] <- NA
> si$MLLvAML <- factor(temp)
```

```
> temp <- si$type
> temp[temp=='AML'] <- 'Other'
> temp[temp=='MLL'] <- 'Other'
> si$ALLvOther <- factor(temp)
>
> temp <- si$type
> temp[temp=='ALL'] <- 'Other'
> temp[temp=='MLL'] <- 'Other'
> si$AMLvOther <- factor(temp)
>
> temp <- si$type
> temp[temp=='AML'] <- 'Other'
> temp[temp=='ALL'] <- 'Other'
> si$MLLvOther <- factor(temp)
>
> si$type <- factor(si$type)
```

```
> summary(si)
```

Scan.name	type	Split
Length:72	ALL:24	Length:72
Class :character	AML:28	Class :character
Mode :character	MLL:20	Mode :character

MedianIntensity	PercentPresent	ArrayOutlier
Min. : 804	Min. :28.30	Min. : 0.253
1st Qu.:1222	1st Qu.:36.80	1st Qu.: 0.729
Median :1442	Median :41.10	Median : 1.085
Mean :1483	Mean :40.46	Mean : 1.724
3rd Qu.:1727	3rd Qu.:44.83	3rd Qu.: 1.697
Max. :3097	Max. :49.80	Max. :14.337

SingleOutlier	ALLvMLL	ALLvAML	MLLvAML
Min. :0.0440	ALL :24	ALL :24	AML :28
1st Qu.:0.1610	MLL :20	AML :28	MLL :20
Median :0.2405	NA's:28	NA's:20	NA's:24
Mean :0.2741			
3rd Qu.:0.3460			
Max. :0.9520			

ALLvOther	AMLvOther	MLLvOther
ALL :24	AML :28	MLL :20
Other:48	Other:44	Other:52

## Create the phenoData object

```
> pd <- new('phenoData', pData=si, varLabels=list(
+ Scan.name='CEL file name',
+ type='Histological classification',
+ Split='Used as training or test',
+ MedianIntensity='Unnormalized median brightness',
+ PercentPresent='Percentage of present calls',
+ ArrayOutlier='Percentage of Array Outliers',
+ SingleOutlier='Percentage of Single Outliers',
+ ALLvMLL='binary classifier',
+ ALLvAML='binary classifier',
+ MLLvAML='binary classifier',
+ ALLvOtherL='binary classifier',
+ AMLvOther='binary classifier',
+ MLLvOther='binary classifier'))
```

## Create the MIAME object

MIAME = minimum information about a microarray experiment

Some of the BioConductor routines require a MIAME object, even though they will let you submit a character string as a description.

```
> miame <- new('MIAME',  
+             name='SA Armstrong',  
+             lab='Lander-Golub',  
+             title='MLL translocations')
```

## Read in the data from dChip

```
> temp <- read.table(file.path(home, 'Output',  
+ 'affyShortCourse expression.xls'),  
+ header=TRUE, as.is=TRUE, sep='\t',  
+ quote='', comment.char='')  
> # expression data in the later columns  
> data <- as.matrix(temp[, 6:77])  
> # gene identifiers in the first five columns  
> gi <- temp[, 1:5]  
> # Use probe sets as row names  
> dimnames(gi)[[1]] <- gi$probe.set  
> dimnames(data)[[1]] <- gi$probe.set
```



## Check that the order agrees

We noticed that the order of entries in the sample info file had changed when we merged it with the dChip array information. Just to be on the safe side, we should make sure that the order of the data columns matches the sample info rows.

```
> sum(dimnames(si)[[1]] != dimnames(data)[[2]])  
[1] 0  
> sum(dimnames(si)[[1]] == dimnames(data)[[2]])  
[1] 72
```

## Turn the dChip data into an `exprSet`

We can bring the dChip quantifications directly into R and turn them into an `exprSet`. Note that this avoids the memory problems by not bringing in the individual CEL files and not producing an `AffyBatch`.

```
> dchip <- new('exprSet',  
+             exprs=data,  
+             phenoData=pd,  
+             annotation='hgu95av2',  
+             description=miame,  
+             notes='processed by KRC in dChip')  
> rm(temp, data, si) # cleanup
```

## justRMA

Meanwhile, we also loaded the CEL files and processed the data using `just.rma`. Since you will have done that in the homework, I am not going to put the code to do that here. In our analysis, the `exprSet` created by `just.rma` was named `rmaData`.


We are now going to start comparing the results of these two processing methods with respect to finding differentially expressed genes.

# The ClassComparison Package

```
> require(ClassComparison)
Loading required package: ClassComparison
Loading required package: splines
Loading required package: oompaBase
Loading required package: PreProcess
Creating a new generic function for 'plot' in
  'PreProcess'
Creating a new generic function for 'print' in
  'PreProcess'
Creating a new generic function for 'as.data.frame'
  in 'PreProcess'
[1] TRUE
```


# T-test, take one

```
> notAML <- pd@pData$type != 'AML'  
> dchip.t <- MultiTtest(dchip[, notAML], 'ALLvMLL')  
> dchip.b <- Bum(dchip.t@p.values)  
> hist(dchip.b, main='P-values using dChip')
```




## T-test, take two

```
> rma.t <- MultiTtest(rmaData[, notAML], 'ALLvMLL')  
> rma.b <- Bum(rma.t@p.values)  
> hist(rma.b, main='P-values using RMA')
```



## Do the two methods agree?

```
> plot(rma.t@t.statistics, dchip.t@t.statistics)
> abline(0,1, col='blue')
```



## How do we tell if the methods agree?

We have seen that the BUM plots for t-tests when we used different quantifications methods look similar. We have also seen that the t-statistics roughly agree, in the sense that they more or less follow the identity line. The haze around that line is rather “fat”, however, which suggests that the exact lists of genes we get with the two methods may not be quite the same. Here’s one difference:

```
> alpha <- 0.05
> countSignificant(dchip.b, alpha=alpha, by='FDR')
[1] 1520
> countSignificant(rma.b, alpha=alpha, by='FDR')
[1] 2353
```



## Try a smaller FDR

```
> alpha <- 0.01
> countSignificant(dchip.b, alpha=alpha, by='FDR')
[1] 681
> countSignificant(rma.b, alpha=alpha, by='FDR')
[1] 992
```

There certainly appear to be a lot of differentially expressed genes. However, RMA seems to give us more genes than dChip at the same level of the False Discovery Rate. That already tells us something about the processing methods.


## How much do the lists overlap?

```
> # logical vector: what does dChip find?
> dchip.01 <- selectSignificant(dchip.b,
+   alpha=alpha, by='FDR')
> # logical vector: what does RMA find?
> rma.01 <- selectSignificant(rma.b,
+   alpha=alpha, by='FDR')
> # Count the overlap
> sum(dchip.01 & rma.01)
[1] 563
> 563/681
[1] 0.8267254
```

Only 83% of the 681 genes found by dChip are contained in the larger list of genes found by RMA.

# Comparing processing methods

So, the answers are “different”. Can we tell which is “better”?



The screenshot shows the Adobe Reader interface with a PDF document open. The document is a research article from BMC Bioinformatics, hosted on BioMed Central. The article title is "Comparison of seven methods for producing Affymetrix expression scores based on False Discovery Rates in disease profiling data". The authors listed are Kerby Shedden, Wei Chen, Rork Kuick, Debashis Ghosh, James Macdonald, Kathleen R Cho, Thomas J Giordano, Stephen B Gruber, Eric R Fearon, Jeremy MG Taylor, and Samir Hanash. The article is marked as "Open Access". The interface includes a menu bar (File, Edit, View, Document, Tools, Window, Help), a toolbar with various navigation and editing tools, and a sidebar with Bookmarks, Pages, Attachments, and Comments. The status bar at the bottom indicates "1 of 12" pages.

Adobe Reader - [shedden2005.pdf]

File Edit View Document Tools Window Help

Save a Copy Search Select 127% Help Try Acrobat for Free!

**BMC Bioinformatics** BioMed Central

Research article **Open Access**

**Comparison of seven methods for producing Affymetrix expression scores based on False Discovery Rates in disease profiling data**

Kerby Shedden<sup>\*1</sup>, Wei Chen<sup>2</sup>, Rork Kuick<sup>3</sup>, Debashis Ghosh<sup>2</sup>, James Macdonald<sup>4</sup>, Kathleen R Cho<sup>5</sup>, Thomas J Giordano<sup>5</sup>, Stephen B Gruber<sup>6</sup>, Eric R Fearon<sup>6</sup>, Jeremy MG Taylor<sup>2</sup> and Samir Hanash<sup>3</sup>

Address: <sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, <sup>2</sup>Department of Biostatistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, <sup>3</sup>Department of Pediatrics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, <sup>4</sup>Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, <sup>5</sup>Department of Pathology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA and <sup>6</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Email: Kerby Shedden\* - kshedden@umich.edu; Wei Chen - lisachen@umich.edu; Rork Kuick - rork@umich.edu; Debashis Ghosh - ghoshd@umich.edu; James Macdonald - jmacdon@umich.edu; Kathleen R Cho - kathcho@umich.edu; Thomas J Giordano - giordano@umich.edu; Stephen B Gruber - sgruber@umich.edu; Eric R Fearon - fearon@umich.edu; Jeremy MG Taylor - jmgt@umich.edu; Samir Hanash - shanash@umich.edu

\* Corresponding author


1 of 12

## Shedden et al., BMC Bioinformatics 2005; 6:26

They looked at 7 processing methods in two different data sets.

- Methods
  - dChip
  - GCRMA-EB
  - GCRMA-MLE
  - MAS5
  - PDNN
  - RMA
  - trimmed mean (TM)
  
- Data Sets
  - 47 Colon cancer, U133A (40 MSS vs. 7 MSI)
  - 79 Ovarian cancer, U133A (38 endometroid vs. 41 serous)

# Shedden Fig1: Number of probe sets by FDR




## Same idea, ALL-MLL data set

```
> alpha <- seq(0, 0.1, by=0.01)
> f <- function(a, data) {
+   countSignificant(data, alpha=a, by='FDR')
+ }
>
> dchip.counts <- sapply(alpha, f, dchip.b)
> dchip.counts
[1]      0  681  936 1139 1356 1520 1703
[8] 1850 1990 2126 2266
> rma.counts <- sapply(alpha, f, rma.b)
> rma.counts
[1]      0  992 1379 1725 2078 2353 2623
[8] 2890 3112 3383 3618
```

## Making the plot

```
> plot(alpha, rma.counts,  
+       xlab='FDR', ylab='Number of probe sets',  
+       main='ALL t-statistic', type='b',  
+       pch=16, col='blue')  
> lines(alpha, dchip.counts, type='b', pch=16)  
> legend(0, 3500, c('RMA', 'dChip'), lwd=3,  
+       col=c('blue', 'black'))
```

# RMA gives more differences in this data set





## Wilcoxon rank-sum tests





In the Shedden paper, they use a rank-sum statistic to test for differential expression, in addition to the t-statistic. To compute these statistics, we use the `MultiWilcoxonTest` function in the `ClassComparison` package.

```
> dchip.wil <- MultiWilcoxonTest(dchip[, notAML],  
+   'ALLvMLL')  
> rma.wil <- MultiWilcoxonTest(rmaData[, notAML],  
+   'ALLvMLL')
```

## Summary plots from the Wilcoxon empirical Bayes

```
> opar <- par(mai=c(0.5, 0.7, 0.2, 0.2),  
+           mfrow=c(2,2))  
> hist(dchip.wil, main='dChip')  
> plot(dchip.wil, prior=0.725,ylim=c(0,1))  
> abline(h=0)  
> hist(rma.wil, main='RMA')  
> plot(rma.wil, prior=0.56,ylim=c(0,1))  
> abline(h=0)  
> par(opar)
```


# Why is the RMA version skewed?




## Counts as a function of posterior probability

```
> sig <- seq(1.0, 0.9, by=-0.01)
> f2 <- function(s, p, data) {
+   countSignificant(data, prior=p, signif=s)
+ }
> dchip.w.counts <- sapply(sig, f2, p =0.725,
+   data=dchip.wil)
> dchip.w.counts
[1]      0  394  481  562  648  695  756  824
[9]  874  908  971
> rma.w.counts <- sapply(sig, f2, p =0.56,
+   data=rma.wil)
> rma.w.counts
[1]      0  551  707  842  971 1091 1204 1288
[9] 1384 1479 1598
```

# RMA still gives more differences




# Shedden Fig3: Threshold Statistic by FDR




```
> alpha <- seq(0.001, 0.1, by=0.01)
> g <- function(a, data) {
+   pval <- cutoffSignificant(data, alpha=a,
+     by='FDR')
+   qt(1-2*pval, 70)
+ }
> dchip.cut <- sapply(alpha, g, dchip.b)
> rma.cut <- sapply(alpha, g, rma.b)
> plot(alpha, dchip.cut,
+   xlab='FDR', ylab='t-statistic threshold',
+   main='ALL t-statistic', type='b', pch=16,
+   ylim=c(1,4.15))
> lines(alpha, rma.cut, type='b', pch=16,
+   col='blue')
> legend(0.05, 4, c('RMA', 'dChip'), lwd=3,
+   col=c('blue', 'black'))
```

# ALL T-Statistic Thresholds






# ALL Rank-Sum Thresholds: Low



# ALL Rank-Sum Thresholds: High



## Calibration determines sensitivity


Shedden et al. found the same relation between sensitivity (the number of probe sets called different at a given FDR level) and calibration (the threshold needed to call a probe set different at a given FDR level) in their data sets that we see in our data sets.

Namely, methods that provide greater sensitivity do so by lowering the threshold required to call the statistic significant.

In contrast, they found that dChip and TM consistently performed as well or better than other methods on their two data sets. We, of course, found that RMA is “more sensitive”.

They also found (and we agree) that the choice of processing method has a bigger impact on differential expression than the choice of using a parametric t-statistic compared to a non-parametric rank-sum statistic.


# Cope et al., *Bioinformatics*, 2004; 20:323-331



The image shows a screenshot of the Adobe Reader application window. The title bar reads "Adobe Reader - [cope2004.pdf]". The menu bar includes "File", "Edit", "View", "Document", "Tools", "Window", and "Help". The toolbar contains various icons for file operations and navigation, with a "125%" zoom level displayed. A "YAHOO! TOOLBAR" is visible in the top right corner. The main content area displays the journal title "BIOINFORMATICS" in a large, light grey font. To the right, it indicates "Vol. 20 no. 3 2004, pages 323-331" and "DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btg410". The article title "A benchmark for Affymetrix GeneChip expression measures" is prominently displayed in bold black text. Below the title is a graphic of a DNA double helix with binary code (0s and 1s) integrated into it. The authors listed are "Leslie M. Cope<sup>1</sup>, Rafael A. Irizarry<sup>2,\*</sup>, Harris A. Jaffee<sup>2</sup>, Zhijin Wu<sup>2</sup> and Terence P. Speed<sup>3</sup>". Their affiliations are provided: <sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, 104 Whitehead Hall, 3400 North Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA; <sup>2</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Johns Hopkins University, 615 N. Wolfe Street, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA; and <sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, 367 Evans Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. The text "Received on May 9, 2003; revised on July 17, 2003; accepted on August 3, 2003" is located below the affiliations. The abstract section is titled "ABSTRACT" and contains two columns of text. The left column starts with "Motivation: The defining feature of oligonucleotide expression arrays is the use of several probes to assay each targeted transcript. This is a bonanza for the statistical geneticist, who can create probeset summaries with specific characteristics. There are now several methods available for summarizing probe level data from the popular Affymetrix GeneChips, but it is difficult to identify the best method for a given inquiry". The right column continues: "offering great opportunity to create probeset summaries with specific characteristics. On the other hand, the researcher with data in hand and a particular question in mind is not necessarily able to identify the best method. Using a spike-in study prepared by Affymetrix and a dilution study by Gene Logic as benchmark data, we have developed a graphical tool for the evaluation and comparison of expression measures on the Affymetrix GeneChip platform (Lockhart *et al.*, 1996)". The status bar at the bottom shows "1 of 9" pages.

# Benchmarking methods using “calibration” data


An alternative approach to comparing the results of different processing methods relies on standard sets of spike-in experiments. The performance measures described by Cope et al, are available on a web site:




- They use
  - the GeneLogic dilution study that mixed RNA from liver and CNS tissue in different dilutions and proportions
  - the Affymetrix latin-square spike-in study on U95A arrays
  - the Affymetrix latin-square spike-in study on U133A arrays

One should also note that these data sets can be used to evaluate any Affymetrix processing method, by loading the `affycomp` package.

# MPlot of Latin-square data: MAS5




# MPlot of Latin-square data: RMA






# Standard deviation across replicate dilution arrays

This figure shows the results for four different methods.




# Sensitivity to total amount of RNA

For each method, compute the log ratios (fold changes) between lowest ( $1.25 \mu\text{g}$ ) and highest ( $20 \mu\text{g}$ ) concentrations in the dilution experiment.




# Observed expression vs. nominal concentration in Latin-square

This figure shows the results for four different methods.




# Observed vs. Nominal in Dilution

This figure shows the results for four different methods; they fit regressions to intensity as a function of dilution.




# ROC curves: general FC

This figure shows the results for four different methods. In each case, they average the ROC curves for different pairwise comparisons in the Latin-square data.




## ROC curves: FC=2

This figure shows the results for four different methods




# Observed vs. nominal fold change: RMA

This figure shows the results for four different methods



# Observed vs. nominal fold change: RMA, close-up

This figure shows the results for four different methods





# Measures of performance

Adobe Reader - [cope2004.pdf]

File Edit View Document Tools Window Help

Save a Copy Search Select 162% Help

One PDF, many files.

**Table 1. Assessment summary statistics table**

Assessment	Figure	MAS 5.0	dChip	RMA	Not multi-array	Not robust	MM as PM
(1) Median SD	2	0.29	0.089	<b>0.088</b>	0.19	0.092	<b>0.074</b>
(2) R2	2	0.89	0.99	<b>0.99</b>	0.98	0.99	<b>0.99</b>
(3) 1.25v20 corr	3	0.73	0.91	<b>0.94</b>	0.87	<b>0.94</b>	0.93
(4) 2-fold discrepancy	3	1200	40	<b>21</b>	99	12	<b>6</b>
(5) 3-fold discrepancy	3	330	8	<b>0</b>	12	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
(6) Signal detect slope	4a	<b>0.71</b>	0.53	0.63	<b>0.65</b>	0.59	0.55
(7) Signal detect R2	4a	<b>0.86</b>	0.85	0.8	<b>0.81</b>	0.76	0.72
(8) Median slope	4b	0.85	0.77	<b>0.87</b>	0.86	0.79	0.76
(9) AUC (FP < 100)	5a	0.36	0.67	<b>0.82</b>	0.69	0.82	0.81
(10) AFP, call if fc > 2	5a	3100	37	<b>16</b>	220	19	<b>15</b>
(11) ATP, call if fc > 2	5a	<b>13</b>	11	12	<b>12</b>	12	11
(12) FC=2, AUC (FP < 100)	5b	0.065	0.17	<b>0.54</b>	0.12	0.52	<b>0.55</b>
(13) FC=2, AFP, call if fc > 2	5b	1400	12	<b>0.5</b>	18	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>
(14) FC=2, ATP, call if fc > 2	5b	<b>3.7</b>	1.3	1.7	<b>2.3</b>	1.4	1.4
(15) IQR	6	2.7	0.45	<b>0.31</b>	0.67	0.31	<b>0.25</b>
(16) Obs-intended-fc slope	6a	<b>0.69</b>	0.52	0.61	<b>0.64</b>	0.58	0.54
(17) Obs-(low)int-fc slope	6b	<b>0.65</b>	0.32	0.36	<b>0.45</b>	0.34	0.21

The second column denotes the Figure to which the summary statistic relates. Columns 3, 4 and 5 compare MAS 5.0, dChip and RMA. The statistics are described in the text. For each row, the best performing expression measure is denoted with a bold number. Columns 6, 7 and 8 compare RMA to alternatives based on RMA. For each row, if the best performing expression measure is not RMA it is denoted with a bold number.

Pages

Attachments

Comments

5 of 9