The title

|  |
| --- |
| Cassandra Brown1 |
|  |
| 1 University of Victoria |
| 2 |
|  |

Author note

Complete departmental affiliations for each author (note the indentation, if you start a new paragraph). Enter author note here.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Cassandra Brown, Postal address. E-mail: [clb@uvic.ca](mailto:clb@uvic.ca)

Abstract

Enter abstract here (note the indentation, if you start a new paragraph).

*Keywords:* keywords

Word count: X

The title

getwd()

## [1] "/Users/cassandrabrown/Github/brown-2017-disseration"

Methods

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study.

Participants

Material

Procedure

Data analysis

Results

Table 1 *Descriptive statistics by year*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2004 | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 |
|  | M (SD) | M (SD) | M (SD) | M (SD) | M (SD) | M (SD) |
|  | n = 5531 | n = 5720 | n = 5810 | n = 5698 | n = 5165 | n = 4454 |
| Women (%) | 59.68 | 51.21 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Age | 72.13 (5.82) | 74.07 (5.83) | 76.01 (5.85) | 78.31 (5.77) | 79.62 (5.47) | 81.15 (5.26) |
| Yrs Education | 12.38 (3.1) | 12.38 (3.1) | 12.38 (3.1) | 12.38 (3.1) | 12.38 (3.1) | 12.38 (3.1) |
| Health Conditions | 1.96 (1.19) | 2.13 (1.22) | 2.28 (1.23) | 2.47 (1.25) | 2.53 (1.26) | 2.58 (1.26) |
| Mental status | 8.53 (0.79) | 8.51 (0.81) | 8.44 (0.88) | 8.07 (1.1) | 8.09 (1.16) | 7.97 (1.32) |
| Word recall immediate | 5.45 (1.5) | 5.31 (1.53) | 5.18 (1.54) | 4.86 (1.64) | 4.74 (1.63) | 4.63 (1.65) |
| Word recall delayed | 4.4 (1.84) | 4.23 (1.89) | 4.12 (1.88) | 3.75 (1.95) | 3.61 (1.97) | 3.49 (1.96) |
| Psychosocial Variables | n = 1061 | n = 2787 | n = 2737 | n = 2646 | n = 2235 | n = 2031 |
| Loneliness | 1.35 (0.47) | 1.43 (0.51) | 1.44 (0.51) | 1.43 (0.51) | 1.46 (0.5) | 1.43 (0.51) |
| Social contact | 30.56 (8.37) | 29.6 (8.14) | 29.61 (8.6) | 29.41 (8.49) | 28.99 (8.78) | 28.65 (8.75) |
| Social support | 9.81 (1.53) | 9.58 (1.52) | 9.56 (1.6) | 9.58 (1.56) | 9.61 (1.59) | 9.58 (1.61) |
| Depression | 1.16 (1.72) | 1.23 (1.75) | 1.23 (1.73) | 1.3 (1.78) | 1.34 (1.82) | 1.38 (1.86) |
| Social network | 3.44 (0.76) | 3.41 (0.72) | 3.31 (0.77) | 3.25 (0.79) | 3.12 (0.84) | 3.04 (0.86) |
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## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] 0.005  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0.292  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.004  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 5.438  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] 0.005  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0.292  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] 0.008  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0.281  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] -0.023  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0.025  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] -0.025  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0.087  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] -0.033  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0.082

## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] 0.006  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0.3  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.009  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 4.382  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] 0.006  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0.3  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] 0.016  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0.044  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0.05  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] -0.031  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0.044  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] -0.039  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0.058

Supplemental Material

The results from the univariate models of each cognitive and social process are presented in the supplemental table. For immdiate word recall, the model comparison results show that the autoregressive model has an inadequate fit to the data. The latent growth model (LGM) and the ALT full model have comparable fit indices to the data. However, the LGM nested within the ALT model shows significantly poorer fit according the ∆χ2 statistic. Additional restrictions, constraining the slope variance to 0 (model 5), eliminating the slope term (model 6), and constraining the autoregressive parameters to be the same over time (model 7) resulted in significantly poorer model fit. Thus, the full ALT model (model 4) is retained. Intercept ( = 5.44, *p* = 0). Overall, immediate word recall performance decreased over time ( = 0.00 , *p* = 0.29) with significant variance in the slope ( = 0.00, *p* = 0). The ability of immediate word recall preformance to predict immediate word recall performance two years later, once overall trajectories were taken into account, was small and not significant ( = 0.00, *p* = 0.29; = 0.01, *p* = 0.28; = -0.02, *p* = 0.02; = -0.02, *p* = 0.09; = -0.03, *p* = 0.08) with the exception of immediate recall performance at time three significantly predicting performance at time four ( = -0.02, *p* = 0.02).

Table 2 *Model Fit Indices for Immediate Word Recall*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | df | CM |  | df | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Autoregressive, univariate | 2803.192 | 10 | - | NA | NA | 0.631 | 0.446 | 0.217 | 0.231 |
| LGM | 112.905 | 16 | - | NA | NA | 0.987 | 0.988 | 0.032 | 0.014 |
| LGM, quadratic | 102.364 | 15 | - | NA | NA | 0.988 | 0.988 | 0.031 | 0.014 |
| ALT, full model | 64.897 | 11 | 4 | NaN | 0 | 0.993 | 0.990 | 0.029 | 0.015 |
| LGM, nested in ALT | 112.905 | 16 | 4 | 48.03457 | 5 | 0.987 | 0.988 | 0.032 | 0.014 |
| ALT, no slope variance | 115.864 | 13 | 4 | 49.04157 | 2 | 0.986 | 0.984 | 0.036 | 0.021 |
| ALT, no slope | 646.224 | 14 | 4 | 538.75120 | 3 | 0.916 | 0.910 | 0.087 | 0.058 |
| ALT, fixed regressions | 99.613 | 15 | 4 | 34.66512 | 4 | 0.989 | 0.989 | 0.031 | 0.014 |

Delayed word recall  
For delayed word recall, model results indicate that the autoregressive has an inadequate fit to the data. The latent growth model (LGM) and the ALT full model showed comparable model fit. However, the LGM nested within the ALT showed significantly poorer fit measured by the ∆χ2 statistic. Additional restrictions, constraining the slope variance to 0 (model 5), eliminating the slope term (model 6), and constraining the autoregressive parameters to be the same over time (model 7) resulted in significantly poorer model fit. Thus, the full ALT model (model 4) is retained. Thus, the full ALT model (model 4) is retained. Intercept ( = 4.38, *p* = 0). Overall, immediate word recall performance decreased over time ( = 0.01 , *p* = 0.30) with significant variance in the slope ( = 0.00, *p* = 0). The ability of delayed word recall performance to predict later delayed word recall performance was not significant for the first to second wave ( = 0.01, *p* = 0.30). Previous delayed word recall performance significantly predicted future performance for the next three waves = 0.02, *p* = 0.04; = -0.02, *p* = 0.05; = -0.03, *p* = 0.04) but delayed word recall performance at time 5 (2012) did not significantly predict performance at time 6 (2014) = -0.04, *p* = 0.06 over and above the overall trajectory of change.

## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] 0.057  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.004  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 8.521  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] 0.057  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] 0.107  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] 0.122  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] 0.188  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] 0.231  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0

Mental Status For mental status, model results indicate that the autoregressive has an inadequate fit to the data. The latent growth model (LGM) and the ALT full model showed comparable model fit. However, the LGM nested within the ALT showed significantly poorer fit measured by the ∆χ2 statistic. Additional restrictions, constraining the slope variance to 0 (model 5), eliminating the slope term (model 6), and constraining the autoregressive parameters to be the same over time (model 7) resulted in significantly poorer model fit. Thus, the full ALT model (model 4) is retained. The estimate mental status intercept is high ( = 8.52, *p* = 0). With significant variability. Overall, mental status decreased over time ( = 0.06 , *p* = 0) with significant variance in the slope ( = 0.00, *p* = 0). The ability of earlier mental status to predict later mental status, over and above the overall trajectory of change was consistently significant( = 0.06, *p* = 0; = 0.11, *p* = 0; = 0.12, *p* = 0; = 0.19, *p* = 0; = 0.23, *p* = 0).

Table 3 *Model Fit Indices for Mental Status*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | df | CM |  | df | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Autoregressive, univariate | 1189.141 | 10 | - | NA | NA | 0.811 | 0.717 | 0.141 | 0.181 |
| LGM | 489.443 | 16 | - | NA | NA | 0.924 | 0.929 | 0.071 | 0.037 |
| LGM, quadratic | 401.335 | 15 | - | NA | NA | 0.938 | 0.938 | 0.066 | 0.038 |
| ALT, full model | 92.170 | 11 | 4 | NaN | 0 | 0.987 | 0.982 | 0.035 | 0.029 |
| LGM, nested in ALT | 489.443 | 16 | 4 | 495.56285 | 5 | 0.924 | 0.929 | 0.071 | 0.037 |
| ALT, no slope variance | 156.623 | 13 | 4 | 67.76366 | 2 | 0.977 | 0.973 | 0.043 | 0.034 |
| ALT, no slope | 1132.965 | 14 | 4 | 1006.75320 | 3 | 0.821 | 0.808 | 0.116 | 0.132 |
| ALT, fixed regressions | 330.187 | 15 | 4 | 295.84746 | 4 | 0.950 | 0.950 | 0.059 | 0.037 |

## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] 0.036  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0.001  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.001  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0.003  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 1.378  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] 0.036  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0.001  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] 0.036  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0.001  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] 0.036  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0.001  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] 0.036  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0.001  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] 0.036  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0.001

Loneliness  
For loneliness, the model results indicate that the autoregressive model had inadequate fit to the data. The latent growth model (LGM) and the ALT full model showed comparable model fit. The LGM nested within the ALT showed slightly poorer fit accoreding to the CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR. The ∆χ2 indicated that the full ALT model has significantly better fit than the LGM nested in the ALT. Restricting the slope variance to zero in the ALT model resulted in significantly poorer model fit according the ∆χ2, as did excluding the slope parameter. Constraining the autoregressive parameters to equality across time did not result in significantly poorer model fit according to the ∆χ2 so the ALT model with autoregressive parameters fixed over time was retained as the more parsimonious model. ( = 1.38, *p* = 0). With significant variability. Overall, loneliness increased slightly but significantly over time ( = 0.04 , *p* = ) with significant variance in the slope ( = 0.00, *p* = 0.00). Previous loneliness scores significantly predicted later loneliness, over and above the overall trajectory of loneliness ( = 0.04, *p* = 0.00).

Table 4 *Model Fit Indices for Loneliness*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | df | CM |  | df | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Autoregressive, univariate | 267.307 | 10 | - | NA | NA | 0.880 | 0.819 | 0.066 | 0.254 |
| LGM | 33.187 | 16 | - | NA | NA | 0.992 | 0.992 | 0.013 | 0.172 |
| LGM, quadratic | 29.866 | 15 | - | NA | NA | 0.993 | 0.993 | 0.013 | 0.172 |
| ALT, full model | 12.203 | 11 | 4 | NaN | 0 | 0.999 | 0.999 | 0.004 | 0.115 |
| LGM, nested in ALT | 33.187 | 16 | 4 | 19.188925 | 5 | 0.992 | 0.992 | 0.013 | 0.172 |
| ALT, no slope variance | 30.746 | 13 | 4 | 17.042751 | 2 | 0.992 | 0.990 | 0.015 | 0.182 |
| ALT, no slope | 31.193 | 14 | 4 | 16.025558 | 3 | 0.992 | 0.991 | 0.014 | 0.175 |
| ALT, fixed regressions | 21.152 | 15 | 4 | 8.418258 | 4 | 0.997 | 0.997 | 0.008 | 0.177 |

## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] -0.11  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.178  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0.052  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 30.3  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] -0.11  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] -0.199  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] -0.297  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] -0.405  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] -0.527  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0

Table 5 *Model Fit Indices for Social Contact*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | df | CM |  | df | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Autoregressive, univariate | 248.593 | 10 | - | NA | NA | 0.916 | 0.874 | 0.063 | 0.170 |
| LGM | 34.332 | 16 | - | NA | NA | 0.994 | 0.994 | 0.014 | 0.076 |
| LGM, quadratic | 29.462 | 15 | - | NA | NA | 0.995 | 0.995 | 0.013 | 0.076 |
| ALT, full model | 8.520 | 11 | 4 | NaN | 0 | 1.000 | 1.001 | 0.000 | 0.064 |
| LGM, nested in ALT | 34.332 | 16 | 4 | 24.90614 | 5 | 0.994 | 0.994 | 0.014 | 0.076 |
| ALT, no slope variance | 24.980 | 13 | 4 | 14.01113 | 2 | 0.996 | 0.995 | 0.012 | 0.085 |
| ALT, no slope | 64.647 | 14 | 4 | 49.63123 | 3 | 0.982 | 0.981 | 0.025 | 0.063 |
| ALT, fixed regressions | 34.307 | 15 | 4 | 25.18656 | 4 | 0.993 | 0.993 | 0.015 | 0.075 |

Social Contact  
For social contact, the model results indicate that the autoregressive model had inadequate fit to the data. The LGM showed good model fit but the model fit for the ALT full model was significantly better according according to the ∆χ2. Restricting the slope variance resulting in a small but significant reduction in model fit as did all further model restrictions. Thus, the full ALT model was retained. The estimated intercept was ( = 1.38, *p* = 0) with significant variability. Social contact increased over time ( = -0.11 , *p* = 0) and the variance in the slope was not significant ( = 0.18, *p* = 0). The ability of earlier social contact to predict later mental status, over and above the overall trajectory of change was consistently significant but negative ( = -0.11, *p* = 0; = -0.20, *p* = 0; = -0.30, *p* = 0; = -0.40, *p* = 0; = -0.53, *p* = 0). This should be interpreted with caution given that social measures were only given every four years.

Social Support

## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.009  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 9.777  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0

Social support  
For social support, the model results indicate that the autoregressive model had inadequate fit to the data. The LGM showed adequate fit according to all but the SRMR fit index. Comparing the ALT full model with the nested LGM, the full model fit was significantly better according to the ∆χ2. Models with slope variance restricted to zero and no slope were significantly poorer fit for social support than the full ALT model. However, restricting the autoregressive parameters to equality over time did not result in significantly poorer model fit and so was retained as the more parsimonious model. ( = 9.78, *p* = 0). With significant variability. Social support did not show a significant overall trend over time ( = -0.02 , *p* = 0) but there was significant variance in the slope ( = 0.01, *p* = 0). Previous social support scores significantly predicted later social support, over and above the overall trajectory of social support ( = -0.02, *p* = 0).

Table 6 *Model Fit Indices for Social Support*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | df | CM |  | df | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Autoregressive, univariate | 326.229 | 10 | - | NA | NA | 0.897 | 0.845 | 0.073 | 0.270 |
| LGM | 73.949 | 16 | - | NA | NA | 0.981 | 0.982 | 0.025 | 0.213 |
| LGM, quadratic | 60.922 | 15 | - | NA | NA | 0.985 | 0.985 | 0.023 | 0.213 |
| ALT, full model | 39.097 | 11 | 4 | NaN | 0 | 0.991 | 0.987 | 0.021 | 0.179 |
| LGM, nested in ALT | 73.949 | 16 | 4 | 34.238055 | 5 | 0.981 | 0.982 | 0.025 | 0.213 |
| ALT, no slope variance | 74.973 | 13 | 4 | 35.271477 | 2 | 0.980 | 0.977 | 0.028 | 0.208 |
| ALT, no slope | 72.677 | 14 | 4 | 29.704433 | 3 | 0.981 | 0.979 | 0.027 | 0.201 |
| ALT, fixed regressions | 44.013 | 15 | 4 | 4.992443 | 4 | 0.991 | 0.991 | 0.018 | 0.210 |

## $ALT\_slope  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance  
## [1] 0.009  
##   
## $ALT\_slope\_variance\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept  
## [1] 9.777  
##   
## $ALT\_intercept\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho21\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho32\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho43\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho54\_pval  
## [1] 0  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65  
## [1] -0.021  
##   
## $ALT\_rho65\_pval  
## [1] 0

Social Network For social network, the full ALT model showed better fit than the autoregressive and latent growth model. The full ALT model was also significant improvement in fit, according to the ∆χ2, than the nested LGM. Restricting the slope variance to zero and eliminating the slope parameter both resulted in poorer model fit compared to the full ALT model. However, restricting the autoregressive parameters across time did not significantly decrease model fit so it was retained as the most parsimonious model. ( = 9.78, *p* = 0) with significant variability. Social network size significantly declined over time ( = -0.02 , *p* = 0) and there was significant variance in the slope ( = 0.01, *p* = 0). Previous social network scores significantly predicted later social network size, over and above the overall trajectory of social network ( = -0.02, *p* = 0).

Table 7 *Model Fit Indices for Social Network*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model |  | df | CM |  | df | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Autoregressive, univariate | 140.513 | 10 | - | NA | NA | 0.940 | 0.909 | 0.047 | 0.179 |
| LGM | 56.197 | 16 | - | NA | NA | 0.981 | 0.983 | 0.021 | 0.106 |
| LGM, quadratic | 23.042 | 15 | - | NA | NA | 0.996 | 0.996 | 0.009 | 0.107 |
| ALT, full model | 8.966 | 11 | 4 | NaN | 0 | 1.000 | 1.001 | 0.000 | 0.121 |
| LGM, nested in ALT | 56.197 | 16 | 4 | 46.819821 | 5 | 0.981 | 0.983 | 0.021 | 0.106 |
| ALT, no slope variance | 35.653 | 13 | 4 | 20.765768 | 2 | 0.990 | 0.988 | 0.017 | 0.117 |
| ALT, no slope | 49.113 | 14 | 4 | 32.700896 | 3 | 0.984 | 0.983 | 0.021 | 0.122 |
| ALT, fixed regressions | 18.739 | 15 | 4 | 9.698862 | 4 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.006 | 0.111 |