Data Evaluation Report on the acute toxicity of Penoxsulam metabolite (5-Hydroxy-XDE-638) to aquatic vascular plants *Lemna gibba*

PMRA Submission #:{.....} EPA MRID#: 45831104

Data Requirement:

PMRA Data Code:	{.....}
EPA DP Barcode:	D288160
OECD Data Point:	{.....}
EPA MRID:	45831104
EPA Guideline:	123-2

Test material: Penoxsulam metabolite Purity: 100%
Common name: 5-Hydroxy-XDE-638
Chemical name: IUPAC: Not reported
CAS name: Not reported
CAS No.: Not reported
Synonyms: Not reported

Primary Reviewer: Rebecca Bryan
Staff Scientist, Dynamac Corporation
Signature: Rebecca Bryan
Date: 11/21/03

QC Reviewer: Dana Worcester
Staff Scientist, Dynamac Corporation
Signature: Dana Worcester
Date: 11/21/03

Primary Reviewer: ~~Bill Erickson~~
{EPA/OECD/PMRA} J. GOODYEAR
Date: {.....} Goodyear

Secondary Reviewer(s):{.....}
{EPA/OECD/PMRA}
Date: {.....}

Company Code {.....} [For PMRA]
Active Code {.....} [For PMRA]
EPA PC Code ~~19903~~ 119031
Date Evaluation Completed: {dd-mmm-yyyy}

CITATION: Hoberg, J.R. 2002. 5-Hydroxy-XDE-638 - Toxicity to Duckweed, *Lemna gibba*. Unpublished study performed by Springborn Laboratories, Inc., Wareham, Massachusetts. Laboratory Project Identification No. 12550.6167/Project No. 011234. Study submitted by The Dow Chemical Company for Dow AgroSciences, LLC Midland, Michigan. Experimental start date December 21, 2001 and experimental termination date January 7, 2002. The final report issued February 8, 2002.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In a 14-day acute toxicity study, freshwater aquatic vascular plants Duckweed, *Lemna gibba* G3, were exposed to Penoxsulam metabolite (5-Hydroxy-XDE-638) at mean measured concentrations <0.013-0.016 (<LOQ, negative and solvent controls), 0.081, 0.22, 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L under static conditions. Nominal concentrations were 0 (negative and solvent controls), 0.10, 0.26, 0.64, 1.6, 4.0, and 10 mg/L. After 14 days The percent reductions for frond density were significant in the 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L treatment groups. The most sensitive variable was frond numbers. The percent reductions for growth rate and dry weight were not significant in any treatment group.

The NOAEC was 0.22 mg/L, LOAEC was 0.62 mg/L/L, EC_{05} was 0.095 mg/L, and the EC_{50} >11 mg/L. This toxicity study is scientifically sound and satisfies the guideline §123-2 for an aquatic vascular plant study with *Lemna gibba*. The study is classified as Core.

Results Synopsis

Test Organism: *Lemna gibba* G3
Test Type: Static

Number of fronds:
NOAEC: 0.22 mg/L
LOAEC: 0.62 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: 0.095 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.0014-6.4 mg/L
EC_{50}/IC_{50} : >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: 0.256±0.109

Growth rates (day 7):
NOAEC: 11 mg/L
LOAEC: >11 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
EC_{50}/IC_{50} : >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: N/A

Plant biomass (dry weight):
NOAEC: 11 mg/L
LOAEC: >11 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: could not be determined 95% C.I.: N/A
EC_{50}/IC_{50} : >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: N/A

Endpoint(s) Affected: Frond number

I. MATERIALS AND METHODS

GUIDELINE FOLLOWED: The test protocol was based on the following guidelines: OECD Proposed Guideline 221 and U.S. EPA-FIFRA Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, Subdivision J, Hazard Evaluation: Nontarget Plants Guidelines 122-2 and 123-2. The following deviations from U.S. EPA Guideline 123-2 are noted:

1. The pretest health of the test organism was not reported.
2. The definitive test was conducted under static conditions and the test solution was not renewed as recommended.

These deviations do not affect the acceptability or the validity of the study.

COMPLIANCE: Signed and dated GLP, Quality Assurance and No Data Confidentiality statements were provided.

A. MATERIALS:

1. Test Material Penoxsulam metabolite (5-Hydroxy-XDE-638)

Description: Not reported

Lot No./Batch No. : F0512-129A

Purity: >99% (used as 100%)

Stability of Compound
Under Test Conditions: Day 0 measured concentrations ranged from 96 to 110% of nominal concentrations and day 14 measured concentrations ranged from 56 to 125% of nominal concentrations . The mean measured concentrations were 81 to 110% of nominal.

(OECD requires water solubility, stability in water and light, pKa, Pow, vapor pressure of test compound) OECD requirements were not reported.

Storage conditions of test chemicals: Stored at room temperature in a dark ventilated cabinet.

2. Test organism:

Name: Duckweed, *Lemna gibba* *(EPA requires a vascular species: Lemna gibba.)*
Strain, if provided: G3
Source: Laboratory cultures (original supplier: University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada)
Age of inoculum: 2 days old
Method of cultivation: 20X Algal Assay Procedure (AAP) Medium

B. STUDY DESIGN:

a) Range-finding Study: No range-finding study was conducted.
b) Definitive Study

Table 1 . Experimental Parameters

Parameter	Details	Remarks *Criteria*
Acclimation period: culturing media and conditions: (same as test or not) health: (any toxicity observed)	Continuous culture 20X Algal Assay Procedure (AAP) Medium; same as test. Not reported	
Test system static/static renewal/ renewal rate for static renewal:	Static	*EPA expects the test concentrations to be renewed every 3 to 4 days (one renewal for the 7 day test, 3-4 renewals for the 14 day test).*
Incubation facility	Environmental chamber	
Duration of the test	14 days	*EPA requires a duration of 14 days. Seven day studies will be accepted for review by the Agency.*
Test vessel material: (glass/polystyrene) size: fill volume:	 Sterile crystallizing dishes 270 mL 100 mL	
Details of growth medium name: pH at test initiation: pH at test termination: Chelator used: Carbon source:	 20X Algal Assay Procedure (AAP) Medium 7.6-7.8 (Table 2, p. 23) 8.3-8.9 Yes $NaHCO_3$	*EPA recommend the following culture media:* *Modified hoagland's E+ or 20X-AAP.*
If non-standard nutrient medium was used, detailed composition provided (Yes/No)	Not applicable	
Dilution water source/type: pH: water pretreatment (if any): Total Organic Carbon:	 Sterile deionized water 7.5 ± 0.1 pH adjusted using 0.1 *N* hydrochloric acid 0.47-1.0 mg/L (December 2001 and January 2002 analysis)	*EPA recommends a pH of ~5.0. A solution pH of 7.5 is acceptable if type 20X-AAP nutrient media is used.*

Parameter	Details	Remarks *Criteria*
particulate matter: metals: pesticides: chlorine:	N/A Not detected Not detected N/A	
Indicate how the test material is added to the medium (added directly or used stock solution)	Stock solution	
Aeration or agitation	Not reported.	
Sediment used **(for rooted aquatic vascular plants)** origin: textural classification (% sand, silt and clay): organic carbon (%): geographic location:	Not applicable	
Number of replicates control: solvent control: treatments:	 3 3 3	
Number of plants/replicate	5 plants per replicate	*EPA requires 5 plants.*
Number of fronds/plant	3 fronds per plant (15 total fronds per replicate)	*EPA requires 3 fronds per plant.*
Test concentrations nominal: measured:	 0 (negative and solvent controls), 0.10, 0.26, 0.64, 1.6, 4.0, and 10 mg/L <0.013-0.016 (<LOQ, negative and solvent controls), 0.081, 0.22, 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L	*EPA requires at least 5 test concentrations with a dose range of 2X or 3X progression.*
Solvent (type, percentage, if used)	Dimethylformamide (DMF), 0.10 mL/L	
Method and interval of analytical verification	HPLC; days 0 and 14.	
Test conditions temperature:	 23-24°C	*EPA temperature: 25°C*

Parameter	Details	Remarks *Criteria*
photoperiod: light intensity and quality:	continuous light 6400-6800 lux	*EPA photoperiod: continuous* *EPA light: 5.0 Klux (±15%)*
Reference chemical (if used) name: concentrations:	None	
Other parameters, if any	None	

2. Observations:

Table 2: Observation parameters

Parameters	Details	Remarks/Criteria
Parameters measured (eg: number of fronds, plant dry weight or other toxicity symptoms)	Number of fronds, toxicity symptoms, and terminal dry weights.	
Measurement technique for frond number and other end points	Direct counts and weights.	
Observation intervals	Days 7 and 14.	
Other observations, if any	None	
Indicate whether there was an exponential growth in the control	Yes	
Were raw data included?	Replicate data provided.	

II. RESULTS and DISCUSSION:

A. INHIBITORY EFFECTS:

After 14 days, the mean frond number percent inhibitions compared to the pooled controls were 3, 3, 11, 9, 13, and 11% in the 0.081, 0.22, 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. The percent reductions for frond density were significant in the 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L treatment groups. The mean growth rate percent inhibitions compared to the pooled controls were -2, -2, 0, 2, -2, and 4% in the 0.081, 0.22, 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. The mean dry weight percent inhibitions compared to the pooled controls were 17, -15, -16, -5, -16, and 5% in the 0.081, 0.22, 0.62, 1.6, 4.6, and 11 mg/L treatment groups, respectively. The percent reductions for growth rate and dry weight were not significant in any treatment group.

Table 3: Effect of Penoxsulam metabolite (5-Hydroxy-XDE-638) on frond number and dry weight of Duckweed, *Lemna gibba*

Treatment[1] (estimated measured and nominal concentration) mg/L	Initial frond number/test solution	Mean frond number at			Mean Growth Rate ($days^{-1}$)	Mean Biomass (dry weights, g)
		7 days	14 days	% inhibition at 14 days		
Negative control (dilution water)	15	338	806	---	0.44	0.1049
Solvent control	15	363	812	---	0.45	0.1298
0.081 (0.10)	15	375	781	3	0.46	0.0971
0.22 (0.26)	15	394	786	3	0.46	0.1350
0.62 (0.64)	15	358	720	11*	0.45	0.1364
1.6 (1.6)	15	331	733	9*	0.44	0.1234
4.6 (4.0)	15	376	707	13*	0.46	0.1361
11 (10)	15	305	719	11*	0.43	0.1112
Reference chemical (if used)	Not applicable					

[1] Nominal concentrations are in parentheses.
* Significantly reduced compared to the pooled control (Williams' Test).

Table 4: Statistical endpoint values.

Statistical Endpoint[a]	frond No.	growth rate (day 7)	dry weight
NOAEC or EC_{05} (mg/L)	0.22	4.6	11
LOAEC (mg/L)	0.62	11	>11
EC_{50} (mg/L) (95% C.I.)	>11	>11	>11
EC_{25} (mg/L) (95% C.I.)	>11	Not reported	>11
Reference chemical NOAEC IC_{50}/EC_{50}	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not reported

[a] Statistical data based on measured test concentrations.

B. REPORTED STATISTICS: A t-test was used to compare the dilution water (negative) and solvent controls. The controls were pooled for all statistical analyses. The data was analyzed for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk's Test and homogeneity of variance using Bartlett's Test. The Williams' test was used to compare the treatment groups to the pooled control. The NOAEC and LOAEC were determined from significance data. The EC_{50} was empirically estimated to be greater than the highest concentration tested (no concentrations with >50% inhibition). The reported statistics were based on the mean measured test concentrations..

C. VERIFICATION OF STATISTICAL RESULTS:

Statistical method: Frond number, growth rate, and dry weight data satisfied the assumptions of ANOVA (i.e., normal distribution and variance homogeneity); the NOAEC and LOAEC values were determined using ANOVA (growth rate and dry weight), followed by Bonferroni's test (frond number) via TOXSTAT statistical software. For all endpoints, the solvent control was compared to the negative control using a Student's t-test and no difference was found, so the two were pooled for comparison to treatment. The EC_{05} for frond number was determined using the Probit method via Nuthatch statistical software. The EC_{05} could not be determined for dry weight because the response was not monotonic, so the Probit method could not be used; reductions in growth rate did not exceed 4%, so the EC_{05} for this endpoint was visually determined. Reductions did not exceed 50% for any endpoint, so the EC_{50} could be visually determined for all endpoints.

Number of fronds:
NOAEC: 0.22 mg/L
LOAEC: 0.62 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: 0.095 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.0014-6.4 mg/L
EC_{50}/IC_{50}: >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: 0.256±0.109

Growth rates (day 7):
NOAEC: 11 mg/L
LOAEC: >11 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
EC_{50}/IC_{50}: >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: N/A

Plant biomass (dry weight):
NOAEC: 11 mg/L
LOAEC: >11 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: could not be determined 95% C.I.: N/A
EC_{50}/IC_{50}: >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: N/A

Endpoint(s) Affected: Frond number

D. STUDY DEFICIENCIES:

The deviations did not affect the acceptability or the validity of the study.

E. REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

With the exception of the growth rate NOAEC, the reviewer's conclusions agreed with the study author's; the reviewer's analysis detected no effect on growth rate at any treatment level, while the study author's detected a significant reduction at the highest treatment level. No endpoints were reduced 50%, so the EC_{50} for this study is 11 mg/L. According to the reviewer's analysis, frond number was the only affected endpoint; the reviewer determined the EC_{05} value for this endpoint to be 0.095 mg/L.

The amount of test substance was limited , so further tests to determine EC_{50} were not performed. The study author reported these test results define the toxicity of the metabolite relative to the parent compound.

The test was conducted according to U.S. EPA Good Laboratory Practice Regulations with the following exception: The data for routine water contaminant screening analysis was not collected in accordance to GLP procedures. A GLP statement was provided.

F. CONCLUSIONS: This toxicity study is scientifically sound and satisfies the U.S. EPA Guideline Subdivision J, §123-2 for an aquatic vascular plant study with *Lemna gibba*. As a result, this study is classified as Core.

Number of fronds:
NOAEC: 0.22 mg/L
LOAEC: 0.62 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: 0.095 mg/L 95% C.I.: 0.0014-6.4 mg/L
EC_{50}/IC_{50} : >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: 0.256±0.109

Growth rates (day 7):
NOAEC: 11 mg/L
LOAEC: >11 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
EC_{50}/IC_{50} : >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: N/A

Plant biomass (dry weight):
NOAEC: 11 mg/L
LOAEC: >11 mg/L
EC_{05}/IC_{05}: could not be determined 95% C.I.: N/A
EC_{50}/IC_{50} : >11 mg/L 95% C.I.: N/A
Slope: N/A

Endpoint(s) Affected: Frond number

III. REFERENCES:

ASTM. 2000. Standard practice for conducting acute toxicity tests with fishes, macroinvertebrates, and amphibians. Standard E729-88a, American Society for Testing and Materials, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.

Horning, W.B. and C.I. Weber, 1985. Short-term methods for estimating the chronic toxicity of effluents and receiving waters to freshwater organisms. EPA/600/4-89/014. Environmental Monitoring and Support Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Hillman, W.S. 1961. The Lemnacea, or duckweeds. *Bot. Rev.* 27:221-287.

Miller, W.E., J.C. Green and T. Shiroyama. 1978. The *Selenastrum capricornutum* Printz algal assay bottle test. EPA 600/9-78-018. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Corvallis, Oregon.

OECD. 1997. Good Laboratory Practices as acknowledged in the EEC Council Directive 88/320/EEC of 9 June 1988.

OECD. 2000. OECD Guideline for Testing of Chemicals. *Lemna* sp. Growth Inhibition Test. Proposed Guideline #221. Revised Draft, October 2000.

Sokal, R.R. and F.J. Rohlf. 1981. *Biometry.* 2nd Edition. W.H. Freeman and Co. New York, NY. 859 pp.

U.S. EPA. 1982. *Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, Subdivision J, Hazard Evaluation: Nontarget Plants.* EPA 540/9-82-020, 27 October 1982. U.S. EPA, Washington, D.C.

U.S. EPA. Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA); Good Laboratory Practice Standards; Final Rule (40 CFR, Part 160). Federal Register, 48 (230); 34052-34074. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

Weber, C.I., W.H. Peltier, T.J. Norberg-King, W.B. Horning II, F.A. Kessier, J.R. Menkedick, T.W. Neiheisel, P.A. Lewis, D.J. Kiemm, Q.H. Pickering, E.L. Robinson, J.M. Lazorchak, L.J. Wymer and R.W. Freyberg (eds.). 1989. Short-term methods for estimating the chronic toxicity of effluents and receiving waters to freshwater organisms. 2nd ed. EPA/600/4/89/001. Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH.

Williams, D.A. 1971. A test for differences between treatment means when several dose levels are compared with a zero dose control. *Biometrics* 27: 103-117.

Williams, D.A. 1972. A comparison of several dose levels with a zero control. *Biometrics* 28: 519-531.

APPENDIX I. OUTPUT OF REVIEWER'S STATISTICAL RESULTS:

frond production
File: 1104f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	38167.458	6361.243	4.814
Within (Error)	17	22465.500	1321.500	
Total	23	60632.958		

Critical F value = 2.70 (0.05,6,17)
Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

frond production
File: 1104f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 1 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	809.167	809.167		
2	0.081	781.000	781.000	1.096	

3	0.22	786.000	786.000	0.901
4	0.62	719.667	719.667	3.482 *
5	1.6	732.667	732.667	2.976 *
6	4.6	707.333	707.333	3.962 *
7	11	719.333	719.333	3.495 *

Bonferroni T table value = 2.65 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=17,6)

frond production
File: 1104f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 2 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	6			
2	0.081	3	68.247	8.4	28.167
3	0.22	3	68.247	8.4	23.167
4	0.62	3	68.247	8.4	89.500
5	1.6	3	68.247	8.4	76.500
6	4.6	3	68.247	8.4	101.833
7	11	3	68.247	8.4	89.833

frond production
File: 1104f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	6	809.167	809.167	809.167
2	0.081	3	781.000	781.000	783.500
3	0.22	3	786.000	786.000	783.500
4	0.62	3	719.667	719.667	726.167
5	1.6	3	732.667	732.667	726.167
6	4.6	3	707.333	707.333	713.333
7	11	3	719.333	719.333	713.333

frond production
File: 1104f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM

GRPS 1&2 POOLED	809.167				
0.081	783.500	0.999		1.74	k= 1, v=17
0.22	783.500	0.999		1.82	k= 2, v=17
0.62	726.167	3.229	*	1.85	k= 3, v=17
1.6	726.167	3.229	*	1.87	k= 4, v=17
4.6	713.333	3.728	*	1.87	k= 5, v=17
11	713.333	3.728	*	1.88	k= 6, v=17

s = 36.352
Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bounds Lower	Upper	Std.Err. /Estimate	Lower Bound
EC5	**0.095**	**0.0014**	**6.4**	**0.88**	**0.015**
EC10	2.5	0.26	24.	0.47	0.10
EC25	5.8E+02	5.7	6.0E+04	0.97	0.0097
EC50	2.5E+05	15.	4.1E+09	2.0	6.1E-05

Slope = 0.256 Std.Err. = 0.109

Goodness of fit: p = 0.37 based on DF= 4.0 17.

1104F : frond production

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00	6.00	809.	811.	-1.60	100.	0.00
0.0810	3.00	781.	772.	9.29	95.2	4.82
0.220	3.00	786.	762.	24.2	94.0	6.04
0.620	3.00	720.	750.	-29.9	92.5	7.54
1.60	3.00	733.	736.	-3.82	90.8	9.16
4.60	3.00	707.	720.	-12.2	88.8	11.2
11.0	3.00	719.	704.	15.7	86.8	13.2

!!!Warning: EC25 not bracketed by doses evaluated.

!!!Warning: EC50 not bracketed by doses evaluated.

growth rate
File: 1104g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	0.0026	0.0004	2.000

Within (Error)	17	0.0027	0.0002
Total	23	0.0053	

Critical F value = 2.70 (0.05,6,17)
Since F < Critical F FAIL TO REJECT Ho:All groups equal

growth rate
File: 1104g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 1 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	0.448	0.448		
2	0.081	0.457	0.457	-0.833	
3	0.22	0.467	0.467	-1.833	
4	0.62	0.450	0.450	-0.167	
5	1.6	0.440	0.440	0.833	
6	4.6	0.457	0.457	-0.833	
7	11	0.430	0.430	1.833	

Bonferroni T table value = 2.65 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=17,6)

growth rate
File: 1104g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 2 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	6			
2	0.081	3	0.027	5.9	-0.008
3	0.22	3	0.027	5.9	-0.018
4	0.62	3	0.027	5.9	-0.002
5	1.6	3	0.027	5.9	0.008
6	4.6	3	0.027	5.9	-0.008
7	11	3	0.027	5.9	0.018

growth rate
File: 1104g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	ORIGINAL	TRANSFORMED	ISOTONIZED

	IDENTIFICATION	N	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	6	0.448	0.448	0.455
2	0.081	3	0.457	0.457	0.455
3	0.22	3	0.467	0.467	0.455
4	0.62	3	0.450	0.450	0.450
5	1.6	3	0.440	0.440	0.448
6	4.6	3	0.457	0.457	0.448
7	11	3	0.430	0.430	0.430

growth rate
File: 1104g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
GRPS 1&2 POOLED	0.455				
0.081	0.455	0.745		1.74	k= 1, v=17
0.22	0.455	0.745		1.82	k= 2, v=17
0.62	0.450	0.186		1.85	k= 3, v=17
1.6	0.448	0.000		1.87	k= 4, v=17
4.6	0.448	0.000		1.87	k= 5, v=17
11	0.430	2.050	*	1.88	k= 6, v=17

s = 0.013
Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

dry weight
File: 1104d Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	4066.492	677.749	1.489
Within (Error)	17	7736.922	455.113	
Total	23	11803.413		

Critical F value = 2.70 (0.05,6,17)
Since F < Critical F FAIL TO REJECT Ho:All groups equal

dry weight
File: 1104d Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 1 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	117.350	117.350		
2	0.081	97.100	97.100	1.342	
3	0.22	135.000	135.000	-1.170	
4	0.62	136.367	136.367	-1.261	
5	1.6	123.400	123.400	-0.401	
6	4.6	136.100	136.100	-1.243	
7	11	111.200	111.200	0.408	

Bonferroni T table value = 2.65 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=17,6)

dry weight
File: 1104d Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 2 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	6			
2	0.081	3	40.051	34.1	20.250
3	0.22	3	40.051	34.1	-17.650
4	0.62	3	40.051	34.1	-19.017
5	1.6	3	40.051	34.1	-6.050
6	4.6	3	40.051	34.1	-18.750
7	11	3	40.051	34.1	6.150

dry weight
File: 1104d Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	GRPS 1&2 POOLED	6	117.350	117.350	123.238
2	0.081	3	97.100	97.100	123.238
3	0.22	3	135.000	135.000	123.238
4	0.62	3	136.367	136.367	123.238
5	1.6	3	123.400	123.400	123.238
6	4.6	3	136.100	136.100	123.238
7	11	3	111.200	111.200	111.200

dry weight
File: 1104d Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
GRPS 1&2 POOLED	123.238				
0.081	123.238	0.390		1.74	k= 1, v=17
0.22	123.238	0.390		1.82	k= 2, v=17
0.62	123.238	0.390		1.85	k= 3, v=17
1.6	123.238	0.390		1.87	k= 4, v=17
4.6	123.238	0.390		1.87	k= 5, v=17
11	111.200	0.408		1.88	k= 6, v=17

s = 21.333
Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

EC_{05}
!!!Failure #3: Data not suitable for probit model fit.

Criterion is 3 or more distinct isotone means.