\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 1 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{lstlisting}

Calcium concentration 10 has the highest predicted value of

17.8cm ($\pm$0.40cm) and Calcium concentration 20 has the

lowest predicted value of 10.0cm ($\pm$0.40cm).

\end{lstlisting}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 1 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{verbatim}

At the family 5% significance level:

- The two middle concentrations are not significantly different

- Calcium concentration 1 is significantly higher than concentration

20 but significantly lower than concentrations 5 and 10.

- Calcium concentration 20 is significantly lower than all other concentrations

\end{verbatim}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 2 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{lstlisting}

Treatment T3 has the lowest predicted value of 11.2mm ($\pm$0.33mm)

and T1 has the highest predicted value of 17.8mm

($\pm$0.33cm).

\end{lstlisting}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 2 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{verbatim}

At the family 5% significance level:

- T1 and T7 are not significantly different but T1 is significantly higher than

the other treatments

- T2 is not significantly different from T4 or T7

- T3 is not significantly different T5

- T4 is not significantly different T2 or T6

- T6 is not significantly different T4

- T7 is not significantly different from T1 or T2

\end{verbatim}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 3 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{lstlisting}

Parafield has the lowest predicted yield of 1.68t/ha ($\pm$ 0.627t/ha)

and Excell has the highest predicted yield of

4.85t/ha ($\pm$ 0.627t/ha).

\end{lstlisting}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 3 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{verbatim}

At the family 5% significance level:

- Excell and Yarrum are not significantly different (to each other)

but both are significantly higher than Parafield

- Kaspa is not significantly different from any of the other varieties

- Parafield is significantly lower than Excell and Yarrum

\end{verbatim}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 4 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{lstlisting}

S4 has the lowest predicted DM of 1708kg/ha ($\pm$ 62.0kg/ha)

and S3 has the highest predicted DM of 2200kg/ha

($\pm$62.0kg/ha).

\end{lstlisting}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 4 Prediction interpretation]

\begin{verbatim}

At the family 5% significance level:

- S1 and S4 are significantly different

- S2 and S3 are significantly different

- S3 is not significantly different to S1 but significantly different

from both S2 or S4

- S4 is not significantly different to S2 but significantly different

from S3

\end{verbatim}

\end{tcolorbox}

\tcbset {colback = interp!25!white, colframe = interp}

\begin{tcolorbox}[title = Example 5 Output Interpretation]

\begin{verbatim}

Inspection of the residual plots indicates that the model

assumptions are met. Even though there are slight deviations

from a true normal distribution and the Shapiro Wilks

normality test indicates that the residuals are not normally

distributed (p-value < 0.001), the conclusion would be that

the residuals approximately follow a normal distribution.

LMM techniques are robust against departures from normality,

so this would not be considered a serious problem in this

case.

The interaction of Genotype and Fungicide is not significant,

p-value $\ge 0.05$.

\end{verbatim}

\end{tcolorbox}