MCDS.exe Testing

Laura Marshall

2023-05-03

Things outstanding in mrds

In addition to the notes throughout this document the following also needs further work or investigations:

- Issue 83 in mrds relating to factor ordering differences between mrds and MCDS (https://github.com/DistanceDevelopment/mrds/issues/83)
- Reading in and processing the warnings and / or errors in the log file generated by MCDS What do we do about cases where mcds.exe fits with negative pdf? E.g. https://github.com/DistanceDevelopment/Distance/issues/160
- Do the monotonicity constraints get passed to MCDS correctly?
- Check the passing of parameter starting values to MCDS also potential issues here regarding factor ordering!
- Check the passing of parameter bound to MCDS again potential for factor ordering issues. Note this can only be done via mrds NOT via Distance.

Capercaillie Data

Things that might want further investigation:

• When the R optimiser is selected both the lnl_R and lnl_MCDS values appear to be the same in all cases. (After moving on to other datasets this is not found to be the case.)

Table 1: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for Capercaillie data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-477.9525	-477.9525	mrds (nlminb)	0.61	0.61	182.76	182.76
unif	cos	1	-477.2076	-477.2057	MCDS.exe	0.66	0.66	169.09	169.04
unif	cos	2	-477.0673	-477.0672	MCDS.exe	0.69	0.69	162.03	162.04
unif	\cos	3	-476.9576	-476.9459	MCDS.exe	0.69	0.68	163.20	164.18
$_{ m hn}$	cos	0	-477.9525	-477.9525	mrds (nlminb)	0.61	0.61	182.76	182.76
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-477.2076	-477.2057	MCDS.exe	0.66	0.66	169.09	169.04
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-477.0673	-477.0672	MCDS.exe	0.69	0.69	162.03	162.04
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-477.9525	-477.9525	mrds (nlminb)	0.61	0.61	182.76	182.76
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-477.2173	-477.2162	MCDS.exe	0.67	0.67	166.20	166.15
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-477.2205	-477.2162	MCDS.exe	0.67	0.67	166.04	166.14
hr	poly	0	-477.9525	-477.9525	mrds (nlminb)	0.61	0.61	182.76	182.76
hr	poly	1	-477.6612	-477.6612	mrds (nlminb)	0.64	0.64	175.11	175.12
hr	poly	2	-477.5669	-477.0932	MCDS.exe	0.64	0.68	174.65	164.64

Cue Counting Data

Things that might want further investigation:

- Nhat for the hn herm 1 model is $\sim 14\%$ higher for the MCDS optimised model than the R optimised model
- Why is the lnl R value for the hr poly 2 model negative?

Table 2: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for cue counting data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	$p_{\rm MCDS}$	$Nhat_R$	$Nhat_MCDS$
unif	cos	0	1.916333	1.916332	MCDS.exe	0.24	0.24	167.61	167.61
unif	cos	1	2.109706	2.109790	mrds (nlminb)	0.30	0.30	132.40	132.27
unif	cos	2	2.132097	2.132096	MCDS.exe	0.28	0.28	144.42	144.34
unif	cos	3	2.509622	2.512145	mrds (nlminb)	0.25	0.25	162.05	161.83
$_{ m hn}$	cos	0	1.916333	1.916332	MCDS.exe	0.24	0.24	167.61	167.61
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	2.109706	2.109790	mrds (nlminb)	0.30	0.30	132.40	132.27
$_{ m hn}$	cos	2	2.132097	2.132096	MCDS.exe	0.28	0.28	144.42	144.34
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	1.916333	1.916332	MCDS.exe	0.24	0.24	167.61	167.61
$_{ m hn}$	herm	1	2.016928	1.925329	MCDS.exe	0.28	0.24	145.05	165.77
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	2.016971	3.876089	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	145.04	142.45
hr	poly	0	1.916333	1.916332	MCDS.exe	0.24	0.24	167.61	167.61
hr	poly	1	1.930192	1.930192	MCDS.exe	0.24	0.24	164.59	164.58
hr	poly	2	-7.983148	3.772227	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.32	130.88	126.38

Ducknest Data

Things that might want further investigation:

- Unhelpful error "Error in array(x, c(length(x), 1L), if (!is.null(names(x))) list(names(x), : 'data' must be of a vector type, was 'NULL' Error in t(partial) %*% vcov : requires numeric/complex matrix/vector arguments"
- What should happen when you have a uniform with no adjustments??? Shouldn't P always be 1?
- p_MCDS is 1 for a few of these models and when it is, it is estimating Nhat much lower than the R optimiser.

Table 3: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for Ducknest data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	$p_{\rm MCDS}$	$Nhat_R$	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
unif	cos	1	-12476.04	-12475.87	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	17813.30	17796.84
unif	cos	2	-12458.57	-12458.56	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.37	15798.09	15799.97
unif	cos	3	-12437.63	-12434.56	MCDS.exe	0.34	0.37	17412.16	16068.38
$_{ m hn}$	cos	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-12476.04	-12475.87	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	17813.30	17796.84
$_{ m hn}$	cos	2	-12458.57	-12458.56	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.37	15798.09	15799.97
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-12472.93	-12510.95	mrds (nlminb)	0.34	0.29	17320.90	20043.80
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-12472.49	NA	mrds (nlminb)	0.34	NA	17224.44	NA
hr	poly	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
hr	poly	1	-12506.68	-12506.68	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.30	19709.11	19708.10
hr	poly	2	-12505.64	-12468.78	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.33	19791.86	17927.86

${\bf Duiker Camera Traps}$

Things that might want further investigation: - - Unhelpful error "Error in array(x, c(length(x), 1L), if (!is.null(names(x))) list(names(x), : 'data' must be of a vector type, was 'NULL' Error in t(partial) %*% vcov : requires numeric/complex matrix/vector arguments" - Some of the Nhat values look to differ by around 20% between the two optimisers

Table 4: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for Duiker camera trap data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
unif	\cos	1	-12476.04	-12475.87	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	17813.30	17796.84
unif	\cos	2	-12458.57	-12458.56	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.37	15798.09	15799.97
unif	\cos	3	-12437.63	-12434.56	MCDS.exe	0.34	0.37	17412.16	16068.38
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	1	-12476.04	-12475.87	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	17813.30	17796.84
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-12458.57	-12458.56	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.37	15798.09	15799.97
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-12472.93	-12510.95	mrds (nlminb)	0.34	0.29	17320.90	20043.80
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-12472.49	NA	mrds (nlminb)	0.34	NA	17224.44	NA
hr	poly	0	-12539.80	-12539.80	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	22381.29	22380.94
hr	poly	1	-12506.68	-12506.68	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.30	19709.11	19708.10
hr	poly	2	-12505.64	-12468.78	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.33	19791.86	17927.86

LTExercise Data

Things that might want further investigation: - - Why is is warning about "Warning in process.data(data, meta.data, check = FALSE): no truncation distance specified; using largest observed distance"?

Table 5: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for LTExercise data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	$Nhat_R$	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-317.4681	-317.4681	mrds (nlminb)	0.35	0.35	300.70	300.70
unif	\cos	1	-317.4680	-317.4680	MCDS.exe	0.35	0.35	300.21	300.26
unif	\cos	2	-317.2043	-317.2043	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.37	281.75	281.75
unif	\cos	3	-315.6816	-315.6505	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	319.76	319.21
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-317.4681	-317.4681	mrds (nlminb)	0.35	0.35	300.70	300.70
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-317.4680	-317.4680	MCDS.exe	0.35	0.35	300.21	300.26
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-317.2043	-317.2043	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.37	281.75	281.75
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-317.4681	-317.4681	mrds (nlminb)	0.35	0.35	300.70	300.70
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-317.4610	-317.4610	mrds (nlminb)	0.35	0.35	300.77	300.78
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-315.4484	-315.4070	MCDS.exe	0.34	0.34	311.17	306.79
hr	poly	0	-317.4681	-317.4681	mrds (nlminb)	0.35	0.35	300.70	300.70
hr	poly	1	-317.3553	-317.3553	MCDS.exe	0.34	0.34	304.63	304.63
hr	poly	2	-317.1466	-319.4356	mrds (nlminb)	0.35	0.35	301.95	300.71

PTExercise Data

Things that might want further investigation: - - Why is is warning about "Warning in process.data(data, meta.data, check = FALSE): no truncation distance specified; using largest observed distance"?

Table 6: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for PTExercise data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	$p_{\rm MCDS}$	$Nhat_R$	$Nhat_MCDS$
unif	cos	0	-458.5701	-458.5701	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	875.75	875.75
unif	\cos	1	-457.8850	-457.8850	mrds (nlminb)	0.20	0.20	726.49	726.28
unif	\cos	2	-457.8646	-457.8646	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	700.66	700.37
unif	\cos	3	-457.3805	-457.3805	mrds (nlminb)	0.17	0.17	841.14	840.58
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-458.5701	-458.5701	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	875.75	875.75
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-457.8850	-457.8850	mrds (nlminb)	0.20	0.20	726.49	726.28
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-457.8646	-457.8646	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	700.66	700.37
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-458.5701	-458.5701	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	875.75	875.75
$_{ m hn}$	herm	1	-458.1114	-458.5393	mrds (nlminb)	0.19	0.17	750.89	866.98
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-458.1115	-458.1112	MCDS.exe	0.19	0.19	753.01	750.65
hr	poly	0	-458.5701	-458.5701	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	875.75	875.75
hr	poly	1	-458.5174	-458.5174	mrds (nlminb)	0.17	0.17	861.26	861.19
hr	poly	2	-458.3287	-456.7638	MCDS.exe	0.17	0.19	857.51	750.54

Savannah Sparrow 1980

Everything looks to run fine.

Table 7: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for Savannah sparrow 1980 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-1103.866	-1103.866	mrds (nlminb)	0.15	0.15	1827.90	1827.80
unif	\cos	1	-1103.810	-1103.810	MCDS.exe	0.15	0.15	1886.75	1887.79
unif	\cos	2	-1102.887	-1102.887	MCDS.exe	0.13	0.13	2153.27	2152.34
unif	\cos	3	-1102.863	-1102.863	mrds (nlminb)	0.13	0.13	2198.21	2196.94
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-1103.866	-1103.866	mrds (nlminb)	0.15	0.15	1827.90	1827.80
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-1103.810	-1103.810	MCDS.exe	0.15	0.15	1886.75	1887.79
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-1102.887	-1102.887	MCDS.exe	0.13	0.13	2153.27	2152.34
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-1103.866	-1103.866	mrds (nlminb)	0.15	0.15	1827.90	1827.80
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-1103.864	-1103.864	MCDS.exe	0.15	0.15	1828.57	1828.97
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-1102.912	-1102.593	MCDS.exe	0.16	0.16	1734.66	1694.40
hr	poly	0	-1103.866	-1103.866	mrds (nlminb)	0.15	0.15	1827.90	1827.80
hr	poly	1	-1103.856	-1103.856	mrds (nlminb)	0.15	0.15	1844.13	1843.92
hr	poly	2	-1103.855	-1103.354	MCDS.exe	0.15	0.17	1839.73	1613.36

Savannah Sparrow 1981

Everything looks to run fine.

Table 8: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for Savannah sparrow 1981 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-790.8846	-790.8846	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	1153.99	1153.93
unif	\cos	1	-790.1360	-790.1360	mrds (nlminb)	0.14	0.14	1336.80	1336.55
unif	\cos	2	-788.3169	-788.3169	mrds (nlminb)	0.17	0.17	1083.33	1083.00
unif	\cos	3	-788.3125	-788.3124	MCDS.exe	0.17	0.17	1072.20	1069.79
$_{ m hn}$	cos	0	-790.8846	-790.8846	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	1153.99	1153.93
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	1	-790.1360	-790.1360	mrds (nlminb)	0.14	0.14	1336.80	1336.55
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-788.3169	-788.3169	mrds (nlminb)	0.17	0.17	1083.33	1083.00
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	-790.8846	-790.8846	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	1153.99	1153.93
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-790.8620	-790.8620	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	1154.83	1154.77
hn	herm	2	-788.4557	-788.4557	mrds (nlminb)	0.15	0.15	1258.17	1257.86
hr	poly	0	-790.8846	-790.8846	mrds (nlminb)	0.16	0.16	1153.99	1153.93
hr	poly	1	-790.2692	-790.1383	MCDS.exe	0.16	0.15	1194.24	1225.36
hr	poly	2	-789.8253	-788.4404	MCDS.exe	0.15	0.15	1218.63	1240.13

Sika Deer

Everything looks to run fine.

Table 9: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for sikadeer data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-10117.72	-10117.72	mrds (nlminb)	0.77	0.77	2506.17	2506.17
unif	cos	1	-10104.13	-10104.13	MCDS.exe	0.65	0.65	2939.25	2939.16
unif	\cos	2	-10101.39	-10101.15	MCDS.exe	0.69	0.69	2792.91	2796.22
unif	\cos	3	-10097.53	-10096.31	MCDS.exe	0.64	0.63	3011.35	3048.37
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-10117.72	-10117.72	mrds (nlminb)	0.77	0.77	2506.17	2506.17
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-10104.13	-10104.13	MCDS.exe	0.65	0.65	2939.25	2939.16
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-10101.39	-10101.15	MCDS.exe	0.69	0.69	2792.91	2796.22
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	-10117.72	-10117.72	mrds (nlminb)	0.77	0.77	2506.17	2506.17
$_{ m hn}$	herm	1	-10117.29	-10117.29	MCDS.exe	0.77	0.77	2509.27	2509.21
hn	herm	2	-10096.92	-10096.82	MCDS.exe	0.67	0.66	2887.09	2905.58
hr	poly	0	-10117.72	-10117.72	mrds (nlminb)	0.77	0.77	2506.17	2506.17
hr	poly	1	-10107.26	-10105.23	MCDS.exe	0.73	0.71	2623.99	2695.62
hr	poly	2	-10100.85	-10096.62	MCDS.exe	0.71	0.66	2708.49	2891.20

Wren 5 minute count

This one brings up the warning 'Detection function is less than 0 at some distances' for quite a few of the models. This warning occurred for the last model where there is a substantial difference in abundance estimates.

Table 10: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for wren_5min data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-604.6857	-604.6857	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	524.24	524.22
unif	\cos	1	-600.3846	-600.3704	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.31	428.89	428.51
unif	\cos	2	-597.6245	-597.5602	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.38	360.38	355.28
unif	\cos	3	-597.3345	-597.0976	MCDS.exe	0.36	0.36	374.92	372.17
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-604.6857	-604.6857	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	524.24	524.22
hn	\cos	1	-600.3846	-600.3704	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.31	428.89	428.51
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-597.6245	-597.5602	MCDS.exe	0.37	0.38	360.38	355.28
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-604.6857	-604.6857	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	524.24	524.22
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-600.1696	-603.7420	mrds (nlminb)	0.32	0.27	418.55	493.43
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	2	-600.1204	-600.0568	MCDS.exe	0.32	0.32	418.34	413.04
hr	poly	0	-604.6857	-604.6857	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	524.24	524.22
hr	poly	1	-603.4410	-603.4410	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	485.25	485.24
hr	poly	2	-603.1873	-595.2352	MCDS.exe	0.28	0.36	484.34	372.71

Wren cue counting

This one brings up the warning 'Detection function is less than 0 at some distances' for quite a few of the models. This warning occurred for the last model where there is a substantial difference in abundance estimates.

Table 11: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for wren_cuecount data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-3446.447	-3446.447	mrds (nlminb)	0.13	0.13	5883.48	5883.13
unif	\cos	1	-3415.952	-3415.825	MCDS.exe	0.17	0.17	4512.30	4504.66
unif	\cos	2	-3410.772	-3410.746	MCDS.exe	0.19	0.19	4074.67	4072.11
unif	\cos	3	-3402.460	-3401.425	MCDS.exe	0.20	0.21	3837.94	3742.83
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-3446.447	-3446.447	mrds (nlminb)	0.13	0.13	5883.48	5883.13
hn	\cos	1	-3415.952	-3415.825	MCDS.exe	0.17	0.17	4512.30	4504.66
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-3410.772	-3410.746	MCDS.exe	0.19	0.19	4074.67	4072.11
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	-3446.447	-3446.447	mrds (nlminb)	0.13	0.13	5883.48	5883.13
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-3416.716	-3497.836	mrds (nlminb)	0.17	0.15	4518.43	5224.07
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-3416.781	-3435.901	mrds (nlminb)	0.17	0.15	4507.43	5128.45
hr	poly	0	-3446.447	-3446.447	mrds (nlminb)	0.13	0.13	5883.48	5883.13
hr	poly	1	-3443.161	-3443.161	MCDS.exe	0.14	0.14	5705.77	5703.63
hr	poly	2	-3442.462	-3424.355	MCDS.exe	0.14	0.15	5702.68	5258.93

Wren line transect

Some errors:

```
# Fitting half-normal key function with Hermite(4,6) adjustments
# AIC= 1417.081
# Error in array(x, c(length(x), 1L), if (!is.null(names(x))) list(names(x), :
    'data' must be of a vector type, was 'NULL'
# Error in t(partial) %*% vcov :
   requires numeric/complex matrix/vector arguments
# Fitting half-normal key function with Hermite(4,6) adjustments
# AIC= 1417.081
# Error in array(x, c(length(x), 1L), if (!is.null(names(x))) list(names(x), :
  'data' must be of a vector type, was 'NULL'
# Error in t(partial) %*% vcov :
  requires numeric/complex matrix/vector arguments
data("wren_lt")
model.compare <- test.models(wren_lt,</pre>
                             truncation = max(wren_lt$distance, na.rm = TRUE),
                             transect = "line")
```

Table 12: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for wren_lt data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, $\ln R$ - likelihood value for R optimiser, $\ln R$ - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, R - R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model.

save(model.compare, file = "results/wren_lt.ROBJ")

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-708.0940	-708.0940	mrds (nlminb)	0.69	0.69	227.72	227.73
unif	\cos	1	-706.8055	-706.8016	MCDS.exe	0.72	0.72	216.36	216.31
unif	\cos	2	-705.8964	-705.8591	MCDS.exe	0.76	0.76	206.22	205.41
unif	\cos	3	-705.3362	-705.3220	MCDS.exe	0.78	0.78	201.03	199.28
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-708.0940	-708.0940	mrds (nlminb)	0.69	0.69	227.72	227.73
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	1	-706.8055	-706.8016	MCDS.exe	0.72	0.72	216.36	216.31
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-705.8964	-705.8591	MCDS.exe	0.76	0.76	206.22	205.41
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	-708.0940	-708.0940	mrds (nlminb)	0.69	0.69	227.72	227.73
$_{ m hn}$	herm	1	-706.1314	-706.1162	MCDS.exe	0.73	0.73	213.46	212.84
hn	herm	2	-706.0681	NA	NA	0.73	NA	212.99	NA
hr	poly	0	-708.0940	-708.0940	mrds (nlminb)	0.69	0.69	227.72	227.73
hr	poly	1	-705.3389	-705.3389	mrds (nlminb)	0.76	0.76	206.54	206.56
hr	poly	2	-705.3002	-704.8722	MCDS.exe	0.76	0.75	206.20	207.07

Wren snapshot

Some errors / warnings:

```
# Warning in check.mono(result, n.pts = control$mono.points) :
  Detection function is less than 0 at some distances
# AIC= 2e+24
# Warning in mrds::check.mono(model, n.pts = 20) :
   Detection function is less than 0 at some distances
# Some variance-covariance matrix elements were NA, possible numerical problems; only estimating detect
# ...
# Fitting half-normal key function with Hermite(4,6) adjustments
# AIC= 1069.234
# Error in array(x, c(length(x), 1L), if (!is.null(names(x))) list(names(x), :
  'data' must be of a vector type, was 'NULL'
# Error in t(partial) %*% vcov :
  requires numeric/complex matrix/vector arguments
data("wren_snapshot")
model.compare <- test.models(wren_snapshot,</pre>
                             truncation = max(wren_snapshot$distance, na.rm = TRUE),
                             transect = "point")
save(model.compare, file = "results/wren_snapshot.ROBJ")
```

Table 13: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for wren_snapshot data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-5.339206e+02	-533.9206	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	427.98	427.97
unif	cos	1	-5.304114e+02	-530.4001	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	353.86	353.57
unif	\cos	2	-5.285742e+02	-528.5358	MCDS.exe	0.39	0.40	299.20	296.36
unif	\cos	3	-5.279025e+02	-527.5610	MCDS.exe	0.36	0.36	329.14	327.97
hn	\cos	0	-5.339206e+02	-533.9206	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	427.98	427.97
hn	\cos	1	-5.304114e+02	-530.4001	MCDS.exe	0.33	0.33	353.86	353.57
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-5.285742e+02	-528.5358	MCDS.exe	0.39	0.40	299.20	296.36
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-5.339206e+02	-533.9206	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	427.98	427.97
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-1.000000e + 24	-532.7566	MCDS.exe	0.00	0.30	53499.62	393.40
hn	herm	2	-5.301191e+02	NA	mrds (nlminb)	0.34	NA	343.11	NA
hr	poly	0	-5.339206e+02	-533.9206	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	427.98	427.97
hr	poly	1	-5.324896e+02	-532.4896	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.31	386.28	386.29
hr	poly	2	-5.323749e + 02	-529.5301	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.40	385.89	297.72

Table 14: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for dathr1 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
unif	cos	1	-197.9999	-197.9999	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	215.86	215.80
unif	cos	2	-197.9895	-197.9895	mrds (nlminb)	0.27	0.27	225.83	225.75
unif	cos	3	-196.3096	-196.1618	MCDS.exe	0.16	0.16	368.54	385.80
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	1	-197.9999	-197.9999	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	215.86	215.80
$_{ m hn}$	cos	2	-197.9895	-197.9895	mrds (nlminb)	0.27	0.27	225.83	225.75
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-198.1012	-198.1012	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	191.06	191.06
hn	herm	2	-197.6629	-197.6522	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.29	208.12	206.06
hr	poly	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
hr	poly	1	-197.9458	-197.9361	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.29	202.88	206.83
hr	poly	2	-197.8401	-197.6433	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.30	203.84	198.10

Table 15: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for dathr2 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
unif	cos	1	-197.9999	-197.9999	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	215.86	215.80
unif	cos	2	-197.9895	-197.9895	mrds (nlminb)	0.27	0.27	225.83	225.75
unif	cos	3	-196.3096	-196.1618	MCDS.exe	0.16	0.16	368.54	385.80
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	1	-197.9999	-197.9999	mrds (nlminb)	0.28	0.28	215.86	215.80
$_{ m hn}$	cos	2	-197.9895	-197.9895	mrds (nlminb)	0.27	0.27	225.83	225.75
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-198.1012	-198.1012	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	191.06	191.06
hn	herm	2	-197.6629	-197.6522	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.29	208.12	206.06
hr	poly	0	-198.1089	-198.1089	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	190.77	190.76
hr	poly	1	-197.9458	-197.9361	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.29	202.88	206.83
hr	poly	2	-197.8401	-197.6433	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.30	203.84	198.10

Some errors / warnings:

save(model.compare, file = "results/dathr3.ROBJ")

```
# Fitting half-normal key function with Hermite(4,6) adjustments
# Error in -lt$value : invalid argument to unary operator
# In addition: Warning message:
# In system(pasteO(path.to.MCDS.dot.exe, " O, ", test.file$command.file.name), :
\# running command 'C:/Users/lhm/AppData/Local/R/win-library/4.2/mrds/MCDS.exe 0, C:\Users\lhm\AppData
# Error in if (lt$message == "FALSE CONVERGENCE") { :
  argument is of length zero
#
# All models failed to fit!
# Error in ds(dist.data, truncation = truncation, transect = transect, formula = ~1, :
# No models could be fitted.
# Fitting half-normal key function with Hermite(4,6) adjustments
# Error in -lt$value : invalid argument to unary operator
# In addition: Warning message:
# In system(pasteO(path.to.MCDS.dot.exe, " 0, ", test.file$command.file.name), :
# running command 'C:/Users/lhm/AppData/Local/R/win-library/4.2/mrds/MCDS.exe 0, C:\Users\lhm\AppData
load(file = "data/dathr3.RData")
model.compare <- test.models(dat,</pre>
                             truncation = 30,
                             transect = "point")
```

Table 16: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for dathr3 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	$Nhat_R$	$Nhat_MCDS$
unif	cos	0	-198.4751	-198.4751	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	192.29	192.29
unif	\cos	1	-197.8558	-197.8558	mrds (nlminb)	0.23	0.23	258.19	258.15
unif	\cos	2	-197.8472	-197.8472	mrds (nlminb)	0.24	0.24	249.59	249.52
unif	\cos	3	-197.8323	-197.8323	mrds (nlminb)	0.23	0.23	266.19	266.00
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-198.4751	-198.4751	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	192.29	192.29
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-197.8558	-197.8558	mrds (nlminb)	0.23	0.23	258.19	258.15
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-197.8472	-197.8472	mrds (nlminb)	0.24	0.24	249.59	249.52
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-198.4751	-198.4751	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	192.29	192.29
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-198.4644	-198.4644	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	192.59	192.58
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-197.7853	NA	mrds (nlminb)	0.25	NA	244.31	NA
hr	poly	0	-198.4751	-198.4751	mrds (nlminb)	0.31	0.31	192.29	192.29
hr	poly	1	-198.1751	-198.0700	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.28	204.41	215.30
hr	poly	2	-197.9932	-197.8039	MCDS.exe	0.28	0.25	213.18	238.67

Table 17: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for dathr4 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-195.4085	-195.4085	mrds (nlminb)	0.29	0.29	205.79	205.79
unif	cos	1	-195.4086	-195.4083	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.29	208.55	206.82
unif	cos	2	-195.2546	-195.2546	mrds (nlminb)	0.25	0.25	242.96	242.89
unif	\cos	3	-195.2449	-195.2449	mrds (nlminb)	0.26	0.26	229.47	229.33
$_{ m hn}$	cos	0	-195.4085	-195.4085	mrds (nlminb)	0.29	0.29	205.79	205.79
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-195.4086	-195.4083	MCDS.exe	0.29	0.29	208.55	206.82
$_{ m hn}$	cos	2	-195.2546	-195.2546	mrds (nlminb)	0.25	0.25	242.96	242.89
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	-195.4085	-195.4085	mrds (nlminb)	0.29	0.29	205.79	205.79
$_{ m hn}$	herm	1	-195.3781	-195.3252	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.31	196.85	194.22
$_{ m hn}$	herm	2	-195.3267	-195.3251	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.31	193.86	194.25
hr	poly	0	-195.4085	-195.4085	mrds (nlminb)	0.29	0.29	205.79	205.79
hr	poly	1	-195.3338	-195.3338	MCDS.exe	0.31	0.31	193.12	193.12
hr	poly	2	-195.3027	-195.2179	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.25	198.52	235.76

rocio_dat

Table 18: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for rocio_dat data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-1695.395	-1695.395	mrds (nlminb)	0.38	0.38	1318.76	1318.69
unif	\cos	1	-1679.401	-1679.401	MCDS.exe	0.23	0.23	2196.20	2196.70
unif	\cos	2	-1678.248	-1678.248	MCDS.exe	0.25	0.25	1964.17	1963.41
unif	\cos	3	-1676.808	-1676.808	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	2362.77	2361.44
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	0	-1695.395	-1695.395	mrds (nlminb)	0.38	0.38	1318.76	1318.69
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-1679.401	-1679.401	MCDS.exe	0.23	0.23	2196.20	2196.70
$_{ m hn}$	\cos	2	-1678.248	-1678.248	MCDS.exe	0.25	0.25	1964.17	1963.41
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	0	-1695.395	-1695.395	mrds (nlminb)	0.38	0.38	1318.76	1318.69
$_{ m hn}$	$_{ m herm}$	1	-1695.216	-1695.216	mrds (nlminb)	0.38	0.38	1321.14	1321.11
hn	herm	2	-1676.157	-1676.157	mrds (nlminb)	0.25	0.25	2014.21	2013.56
hr	poly	0	-1695.395	-1695.395	mrds (nlminb)	0.38	0.38	1318.76	1318.69
hr	poly	1	-1690.317	-1688.612	MCDS.exe	0.35	0.34	1412.32	1486.21
hr	poly	2	-1686.672	-1676.828	MCDS.exe	0.34	0.26	1481.87	1897.57

$rocio_dat2$

Table 19: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for rocio_dat2 data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

key	adj	nadj	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	OS optimizer		p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
unif	cos	0	-127.7456	-127.7456	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	201.75	201.74
unif	cos	1	-125.6836	-125.6764	MCDS.exe	0.26	0.26	162.02	161.83
unif	cos	2	-122.3967	-122.0822	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.23	138.45	180.95
unif	cos	3	-122.2946	-120.8187	MCDS.exe	0.25	0.29	166.70	146.77
$_{ m hn}$	cos	0	-127.7456	-127.7456	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	201.75	201.74
$_{ m hn}$	cos	1	-125.6836	-125.6764	MCDS.exe	0.26	0.26	162.02	161.83
$_{ m hn}$	cos	2	-122.3967	-122.0822	MCDS.exe	0.30	0.23	138.45	180.95
$_{ m hn}$	herm	0	-127.7456	-127.7456	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	201.75	201.74
$_{ m hn}$	herm	1	-125.4281	-121.2811	MCDS.exe	0.26	0.27	159.26	157.90
hn	herm	2	-125.3682	-121.1492	MCDS.exe	0.26	0.25	158.70	166.01
hr	poly	0	-127.7456	-127.7456	mrds (nlminb)	0.21	0.21	201.75	201.74
hr	poly	1	-126.3195	-119.2618	MCDS.exe	0.23	0.32	183.31	130.74
hr	poly	2	-185.5514	-118.3607	MCDS.exe	0.06	0.36	755.19	116.78

amakihi

There is a very big difference in estimated abundance for the first model here!

Table 20: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for a makihi data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, Nhat_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, Nhat_MCDS - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

models	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	$p_{\rm MCDS}$	$Nhat_R$	Nhat_MCDS
~as.factor(OBs) + HAS + MAS ~HAS			mrds (nlminb) mrds (nlminb)			3629.41 3559.08	4999.25 3559.57

amakihi

Table 21: Comparison of R and MCDS model fits for akepa data. key - key function, adj - type of adjustment term, nadj - number of adjustments, lnl_R - likelihood value for R optimiser, lnl_MCDS - likelihood value for MCDS optimiser, optimizer - the selected optimiser, p_R the estimated average probability of detection for the R optimised model, p_MCDS the estimated average probability of detection for the MCDS optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from R optimised model, lnl_R - estimated abundance in covered region from MCDS optimised model.

models	lnl_R	lnl_MCDS	optimizer	p_R	p_MCDS	Nhat_R	Nhat_MCDS
\sim as.factor(Obs)	-373.0925	-373.646	mrds (nlminb)	0.72	0.78	128.84	118.85