Ecotoxicology is not normal.

A comparison of statistical approaches for analysis of count and proportion data in ecotoxicology.

Eduard Szöcs, Ralf B. Schäfer

March 23, 2015

Supplement 1 - Additional Figures / Tables

Table 1: Count data simulations - Proportion of models converged. N = sample sizes, μ_C = mean abundance in control, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM_{nb} = negative binomial model, GLM_{qp} = quasi-Poisson model, GLM_p = Poisson model

| | ** | | | | • |
|------|---------|------|------------|------------|---------|
| N | μ_C | LM | GLM_{nb} | GLM_{qp} | GLM_p |
| 3.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 3.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0.53 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 3.00 | 8.00 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 3.00 | 16.00 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 3.00 | 32.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 3.00 | 64.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 3.00 | 128.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 8.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 16.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 32.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 64.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 128.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 8.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 16.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 32.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 64.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 128.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 2: Count data simulations - Power to detect a treatment effect. N = sample sizes, μ_C = mean abundance in control, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM_{nb} = negative binomial model, GLM_{qp} = quasi-Poisson model, GLM_{qp} = Poisson model, np = pairwise Wilcoxon test.

| N | μ_C | LM | GLM_{nb} | GLM_{qp} | GLM_p | np | NA |
|------|---------|------|------------|------------|---------|------|------|
| 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.36 | 0.04 |
| 3.00 | 4.00 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.54 | 0.06 |
| 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.19 | 0.36 | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.78 | 0.09 |
| 3.00 | 16.00 | 0.23 | 0.49 | 0.33 | 0.29 | 0.95 | 0.14 |
| 3.00 | 32.00 | 0.31 | 0.57 | 0.38 | 0.35 | 0.99 | 0.16 |
| 3.00 | 64.00 | 0.32 | 0.58 | 0.38 | 0.34 | 1.00 | 0.18 |
| 3.00 | 128.00 | 0.35 | 0.61 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 0.19 |
| 6.00 | 2.00 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.22 | 0.49 | 0.21 |
| 6.00 | 4.00 | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.78 | 0.32 |
| 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.48 | 0.64 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.94 | 0.44 |
| 6.00 | 16.00 | 0.59 | 0.76 | 0.70 | 0.65 | 0.99 | 0.54 |
| 6.00 | 32.00 | 0.68 | 0.82 | 0.76 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 0.63 |
| 6.00 | 64.00 | 0.72 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.77 | 1.00 | 0.64 |
| 6.00 | 128.00 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 1.00 | 0.63 |
| 9.00 | 2.00 | 0.34 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.35 | 0.64 | 0.31 |
| 9.00 | 4.00 | 0.56 | 0.69 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.91 | 0.54 |
| 9.00 | 8.00 | 0.70 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.98 | 0.68 |
| 9.00 | 16.00 | 0.81 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 0.79 |
| 9.00 | 32.00 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.87 |
| 9.00 | 64.00 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.89 |
| 9.00 | 128.00 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.91 |

Table 3: Count data simulations - Power to detect LOEC. N = sample sizes, μ_C = mean abundance in control, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM_{nb} = negative binomial model, GLM_{qp} = quasi-Poisson model, GLM_p = Poisson model, np = pairwise Wilcoxon test.

| N | μ_C | LM | GLM_{nb} | GLM_{qp} | GLM_p | np |
|------|---------|------|------------|------------|---------|------|
| 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 4.00 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.30 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 16.00 | 0.13 | 0.30 | 0.18 | 0.42 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 32.00 | 0.17 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 0.50 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 64.00 | 0.19 | 0.37 | 0.23 | 0.51 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 128.00 | 0.18 | 0.37 | 0.23 | 0.53 | 0.00 |
| 6.00 | 2.00 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.06 |
| 6.00 | 4.00 | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.30 | 0.12 |
| 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.28 | 0.39 | 0.32 | 0.52 | 0.20 |
| 6.00 | 16.00 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 0.23 |
| 6.00 | 32.00 | 0.40 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.64 | 0.28 |
| 6.00 | 64.00 | 0.44 | 0.56 | 0.48 | 0.61 | 0.29 |
| 6.00 | 128.00 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.49 | 0.56 | 0.29 |
| 9.00 | 2.00 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.26 | 0.13 |
| 9.00 | 4.00 | 0.29 | 0.37 | 0.31 | 0.48 | 0.27 |
| 9.00 | 8.00 | 0.40 | 0.52 | 0.46 | 0.62 | 0.35 |
| 9.00 | 16.00 | 0.51 | 0.63 | 0.57 | 0.70 | 0.45 |
| 9.00 | 32.00 | 0.57 | 0.69 | 0.63 | 0.68 | 0.52 |
| 9.00 | 64.00 | 0.61 | 0.72 | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.53 |
| 9.00 | 128.00 | 0.65 | 0.73 | 0.68 | 0.61 | 0.58 |

Table 4: Count data simulations - Type 1 error to detect a global treatment effect. N = sample sizes, μ_C = mean abundance in control, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM_{nb} = negative binomial model, GLM_{qp} = quasi-Poisson model, GLM_{pb} = negative binomial model with parametric boostrap, GLM_p = Poisson model, np = Kruskal-Wallis test.

| N | μ_C | $_{ m LM}$ | GLM_{nb} | GLM_{qp} | GLM_{pb} | GLM_p | np |
|------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------|------|
| 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.21 | 0.03 |
| 3.00 | 4.00 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.37 | 0.01 |
| 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.58 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 16.00 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.84 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 32.00 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.94 | 0.01 |
| 3.00 | 64.00 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.99 | 0.03 |
| 3.00 | 128.00 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 1.00 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 2.00 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 4.00 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.58 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 16.00 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.80 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 32.00 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.94 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 64.00 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.98 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 128.00 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 1.00 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 2.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 4.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.36 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 8.00 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.58 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 16.00 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.81 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 32.00 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.94 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 64.00 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.99 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 128.00 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 1.00 | 0.04 |

Table 5: Count data simulations - Type 1 error to detect LOEC. N = sample sizes, μ_C = mean abundance in control, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM_{nb} = negative binomial model, GLM_{qp} = quasi-Poisson model, GLM_p = Poisson model, np = pairwise Wilcoxon.

| N | μ_C | $_{ m LM}$ | GLM_{nb} | GLM_{qp} | GLM_p | np |
|------|---------|------------|------------|------------|---------|------|
| 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 4.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 16.00 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.36 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 32.00 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.55 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 64.00 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.61 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 128.00 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.68 | 0.00 |
| 6.00 | 2.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 4.00 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 16.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.37 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 32.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.52 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 64.00 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.61 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 128.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.66 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 2.00 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 4.00 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 8.00 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.27 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 16.00 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.38 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 32.00 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 64.00 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.61 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 128.00 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.67 | 0.04 |

Table 6: Binomial data simulations - Power to detect a global treatment effect. N = sample sizes, p_E = probability in effect treatments, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM = binomial model, np = Kruskal-Wallis test.

| N | p_E | LM | GLM | np |
|------|-------|------|------|------|
| 3.00 | 0.60 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.87 |
| 3.00 | 0.65 | 0.90 | 0.99 | 0.76 |
| 3.00 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.95 | 0.60 |
| 3.00 | 0.75 | 0.60 | 0.84 | 0.41 |
| 3.00 | 0.80 | 0.36 | 0.64 | 0.22 |
| 3.00 | 0.85 | 0.20 | 0.41 | 0.10 |
| 3.00 | 0.90 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.05 |
| 3.00 | 0.95 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 0.65 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 0.70 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 6.00 | 0.75 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.97 |
| 6.00 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.93 | 0.82 |
| 6.00 | 0.85 | 0.53 | 0.62 | 0.48 |
| 6.00 | 0.90 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.15 |
| 6.00 | 0.95 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 0.65 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 0.70 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 0.75 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 9.00 | 0.80 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.97 |
| 9.00 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.73 |
| 9.00 | 0.90 | 0.26 | 0.32 | 0.23 |
| 9.00 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 |

Table 7: Count data simulations - Power to detect LOEC. N = sample sizes, p_E = probability in effect treatments, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM = binomial model, np = pairwise Wilcoxon.

| N | p_E | LM | GLM | np |
|------|-------|------|------|------|
| 3.00 | 0.60 | 0.86 | 0.70 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.57 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.70 | 0.59 | 0.40 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.75 | 0.41 | 0.17 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.80 | 0.23 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.85 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.90 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.95 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6.00 | 0.60 | 0.98 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| 6.00 | 0.65 | 0.97 | 0.93 | 0.91 |
| 6.00 | 0.70 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 0.82 |
| 6.00 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.62 |
| 6.00 | 0.80 | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.36 |
| 6.00 | 0.85 | 0.33 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
| 6.00 | 0.90 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 0.95 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 9.00 | 0.60 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| 9.00 | 0.65 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.98 |
| 9.00 | 0.70 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| 9.00 | 0.75 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.89 |
| 9.00 | 0.80 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.73 |
| 9.00 | 0.85 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 0.35 |
| 9.00 | 0.90 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| 9.00 | 0.95 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 8: Binomial data simulations - Type 1 error to detect a global treatment effect. N = sample sizes, p = probability, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM = binomial model, np = Kruskal-Wallis test.

| N | p | $_{ m LM}$ | GLM | np |
|------|------|------------|------|------|
| 3.00 | 0.60 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 0.65 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 0.70 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 0.80 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 0.85 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| 3.00 | 0.90 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.01 |
| 3.00 | 0.95 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 0.60 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 0.70 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 0.75 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.03 |
| 6.00 | 0.80 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 0.90 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| 6.00 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 0.60 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 0.65 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 0.70 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 0.75 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 0.80 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| 9.00 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 0.90 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 0.95 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.04 |

Table 9: Binomial data simulations - Type 1 error to detect LOEC. N = sample sizes, p= probability, LM = Linear model after transformation, GLM= binomial model, np = pairwise Wilcoxon.

| N | p_E | LM | GLM | np |
|------|-------|------|------|------|
| 3.00 | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.70 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.75 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.80 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.90 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3.00 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 6.00 | 0.60 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 0.65 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| 6.00 | 0.70 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 0.75 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| 6.00 | 0.80 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| 6.00 | 0.85 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| 6.00 | 0.90 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 6.00 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 9.00 | 0.60 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| 9.00 | 0.70 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.05 |
| 9.00 | 0.75 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.02 |
| 9.00 | 0.80 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 0.90 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 9.00 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.01 |