Look at how much variability there is. Trees were randomly picked. If there was a bunch of variability among trees that impacted rate, because these were randomly chose we should see some variation in rate among the trees. If we did see a lot of variability among trees, we would be concerned we weren’t capturing a sample. We assume there is not a lot of variation and our results are in fact capturing the true values for the trees.

If you see variation in rate estimates among trees, you would be concerned. However, if you see a general pattern among rate estimates that is smaller, you would worry less. We are comparing rates so it matters how much variation there is among trees for a given rate compared for variation between the rates. Because of the comparison, are they effecting the rates the same way, if so this is also not concerning.

Looking at each of the trees for the results, we don’t see large regions of variation among the tree.

On the whole there is not a lot of variation among them. The analyses shows this is not enough to separate the two rates even though descending appears higher than ascending.

We don’t see a pattern suggesting of something concerning when looking at the HPD for ascending and descending rates for each of the trees.

100 trees is a fairly typical number of trees to fix complex models to from a posterior (2 or 3 citations to papers from people recently, who do things not from our own lab, big name people); we looked at several things to assess how much our estimates varied form tree to tree and we found our estimate were generally consistent across tree

What we report in the paper is consistent among trees. No concerning variation among trees for both sets of trees; new script. Github has the script.