Coffey et al. Statistical details (One-way ANOVA: multiple comparisons)
Fig 1 D

| Number of families | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of comparisons per family | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tukey's multiple comparisons test | Mean Diff. | 95.00\% Cl of diff. | Significant? | Summary | Adjusted P Value |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% EtOH vs. 0.5\% EtOH | 0 | -0.0761 to 0.0761 | No | ns | >0.9999 | A-B |  |  |
| 0\% EtOH vs. 1\% EtOH | 0 | -0.0761 to 0.0761 | No | ns | >0.9999 | A-C |  |  |
| 0\% EtOH vs. $1.5 \%$ EtOH | 0 | -0.0761 to 0.0761 | No | ns | >0.9999 | A-D |  |  |
| 0\% EtOH vs. 2\% EtOH | 0.04348 | -0.03262 to 0.1196 | No | ns | 0.5751 | A-E |  |  |
| 0\% EtOH vs. $2.5 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 0.8841 | 0.808 to 0.9602 | Yes | ...* | <0.0001 | A-F |  |  |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. $1 \%$ EtOH | 0 | -0.0761 to 0.0761 | No | ns | >0.9999 | B-C |  |  |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. 1.5\% EtOH | 0 | -0.0761 to 0.0761 | No | ns | >0.9999 | B-D |  |  |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. $2 \%$ EtOH | 0.04348 | -0.03262 to 0.1196 | No | ns | 0.5751 | B-E |  |  |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. 2.5\% EtOH | 0.8841 | 0.808 to 0.9602 | Yes | *** | <0.0001 | B-F |  |  |
| 1\% EtOH vs. 1.5\% EtOH | 0 | -0.0761 to 0.0761 | No | ns | >0.9999 | C-D |  |  |
| 1\% EtOH vs. 2\% EtOH | 0.04348 | -0.03262 to 0.1196 | No | ns | 0.5751 | C-E |  |  |
| 1\% EtOH vs. 2.5\% EtOH | 0.8841 | 0.808 to 0.9602 | Yes | $\cdots$ | <0.0001 | C-F |  |  |
| 1.5\% EtOH vs. $2 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 0.04348 | -0.03262 to 0.1196 | No | ns | 0.5751 | D-E |  |  |
| 1.5\% EtOH vs. 2.5\% EtOH | 0.8841 | 0.808 to 0.9602 | Yes | ..." | <0.0001 | D-F |  |  |
| 2\% EtOH vs. 2.5\% EtOH | 0.8406 | 0.7645 to 0.9167 | Yes | .... | <0.0001 | E-F |  |  |
| Test details | Mean 1 | Mean 2 | Mean Diff. | SE of diff. | n1 | n2 | q | DF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% EtOH vs. $0.5 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 408 |
| 0\% EtOH vs. 1\% EtOH | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 408 |
| 0\% EtOH vs. $1.5 \%$ EtOH | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 408 |
| 0\% EtOH vs. 2\% Etor | 1 | 0.9565 | 0.04348 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 2.314 | 408 |
| 0\% EtOH vs. $2.5 \%$ EtOH | 1 | 0.1159 | 0.8841 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 47.04 | 408 |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. $1 \%$ EtOH | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 408 |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. 1.5\% EtOH | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 408 |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. $2 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 1 | 0.9565 | 0.04348 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 2.314 | 408 |
| 0.5\% EtOH vs. 2.5\% EtOH | 1 | 0.1159 | 0.8841 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 47.04 | 408 |
| 1\% EtOH vs. $1.5 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 408 |
| 1\% EtOH vs. $2 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 1 | 0.9565 | 0.04348 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 2.314 | 408 |
| 1\% EtOH vs. $2.5 \%$ EtOH | 1 | 0.1159 | 0.8841 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 47.04 | 408 |
| 1.5\% EtOH vs. 2\% EtOH | 1 | 0.9565 | 0.04348 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 2.314 | 408 |
| 1.5\% EtOH vs. $2.5 \%$ EtOH | 1 | 0.1159 | 0.8841 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 47.04 | 408 |
| 2\% EtOH vs. $2.5 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ | 0.9565 | 0.1159 | 0.8406 | 0.02658 | 69 | 69 | 44.73 | 408 |

Fig 1 L
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Fig 1 N

| Number of families | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of comparisons per family | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tukey's multiple comparisons test | Mean Diff. | $95.00 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ of diff. | Significant? | Summary | Adjusted P Value |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 2200 proof | -0.2317 | -0.5109 to 0.04746 | No | ns | 0.1655 | A-B |  |  |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 3200 proof | -0.2647 | -0.567 to 0.03765 | No | ns | 0.1236 | A-C |  |  |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 1190 proof | -0.4386 | -0.7117 to -0.1655 | Yes | $\ldots$ | $<0.0001$ | A-D |  |  |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | -0.2568 | -0.5245 to 0.01093 | No | ns | 0.0684 | A-E |  |  |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.01038 | -0.228 to 0.2488 | No | ns | >0.9999 | A-F |  |  |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 3200 proof | -0.03298 | -0.3747 to 0.3087 | No | ns | 0.9998 | B-C |  |  |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 1190 proof | -0.2069 | -0.5231 to 0.1093 | No | ns | 0.4163 | B-D |  |  |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | -0.02508 | -0.3366 to 0.2864 | No | ns | >0.9999 | B-E |  |  |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.2421 | -0.04466 to 0.5288 | No | ns | 0.1514 | B-F |  |  |
| Trial 3200 proof vs. Trial 1190 proof | -0.1739 | -0.5107 to 0.1629 | No | ns | 0.6744 | C-D |  |  |
| Trial 3200 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | 0.007905 | -0.3245 to 0.3403 | No | ns | >0.9999 | C-E |  |  |
| Trial 3200 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.2751 | -0.03428 to 0.5844 | No | ns | 0.1127 | C-F |  |  |
| Trial 1190 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | 0.1818 | -0.1243 to 0.4879 | No | ns | 0.5281 | D-E |  |  |
| Trial 1190 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.449 | 0.1681 to 0.7298 | Yes | $\cdots$ | 0.0001 | D-F |  |  |
| Trial 2190 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.2672 | -0.008444 to 0.5428 | No | ns | 0.0633 | E-F |  |  |
| Test details | Mean 1 | Mean 2 | Mean Diff. | SE of diff. | n1 | n2 | q | DF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 2200 proof | 0.5614 | 0.7931 | $-0.2317$ | 0.09708 | 57 | 29 | 3.375 | 216 |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 3200 proof | 0.5614 | 0.8261 | $-0.2647$ | 0.1051 | 57 | 23 | 3.56 | 216 |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 1190 proof | 0.5614 | 1 | -0.4386 | 0.09498 | 57 | 31 | 6.53 | 216 |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | 0.5614 | 0.8182 | $-0.2568$ | 0.0931 | 57 | 33 | 3.901 | 216 |
| Trial 1200 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.5614 | 0.551 | 0.01038 | 0.08292 | 57 | 49 | 0.1771 | 216 |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 3200 proof | 0.7931 | 0.8261 | -0.03298 | 0.1188 | 29 | 23 | 0.3925 | 216 |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 1190 proof | 0.7931 | 1 | -0.2069 | 0.11 | 29 | 31 | 2.661 | 216 |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | 0.7931 | 0.8182 | -0.02508 | 0.1083 | 29 | 33 | 0.3274 | 216 |
| Trial 2200 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.7931 | 0.551 | 0.2421 | 0.09972 | 29 | 49 | 3.433 | 216 |
| Trial 3200 proof vs. Trial 1190 proof | 0.8261 | 1 | -0.1739 | 0.1171 | 23 | 31 | 2.1 | 216 |
| Trial 3200 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | 0.8261 | 0.8182 | 0.007905 | 0.1156 | 23 | 33 | 0.0967 | 216 |
| Trial 3200 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 0.8261 | 0.551 | 0.2751 | 0.1076 | 23 | 49 | 3.616 | 216 |
| Trial 1190 proof vs. Trial 2190 proof | 1 | 0.8182 | 0.1818 | 0.1065 | 31 | 33 | 2.415 | 216 |
| Trial 1190 proof vs. Trial 3190 proof | 1 | 0.551 | 0.449 | 0.09768 | 31 | 49 | 6.501 | 216 |
| Trial 0 1an nmmf ve Trial a 100 nmaf | ก 818 | n 551 | ก 2 ¢7\% | ก пагя5 | 22 | 40 | 3 04, | 216 |
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Fig 5 F

| Number of families | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of comparisons per family | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alpha | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tukey's multiple comparisons test | Mean Diff. | 95.00\% Cl of diff. | Significant? | Summary | Adjusted P Value |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AB control 0\% vs. AB control $2 \%$ | -0.2407 | -0.5949 to 0.1134 | No | ns | 0.2928 | A-B |  |  |
| AB control $0 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $0 \%$ | 0 | -0.4531 to 0.4531 | No | ns | >0.9999 | A-C |  |  |
| AB control $0 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $2 \%$ | -0.4717 | -0.8265 to -0.1169 | Yes | * | 0.0040 | A-D |  |  |
| AB control $2 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $0 \%$ | 0.2407 | -0.1134 to 0.5949 | No | ns | 0.2928 | B-C |  |  |
| AB control $2 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $2 \%$ | -0.231 | -0.4455 to - 0.01638 | Yes | - | 0.0296 | B-D |  |  |
| bactin paxillin $0 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $2 \%$ | $-0.4717$ | -0.8265 to -0.1169 | Yes | * | 0.0040 | C-D |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test details | Mean 1 | Mean 2 | Mean Diff. | SE of diff. | n1 | n2 | q | DF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AB control 0\% vs. AB control $2 \%$ | 0 | 0.2407 | -0.2407 | 0.136 | 12 | 54 | 2.503 | 127 |
| AB control $0 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $0 \%$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.174 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 127 |
| AB control $0 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $2 \%$ | 0 | 0.4717 | -0.4717 | 0.1363 | 12 | 53 | 4.895 | 127 |
| AB control $2 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $0 \%$ | 0.2407 | 0 | 0.2407 | 0.136 | 54 | 12 | 2.503 | 127 |
| AB control $2 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $2 \%$ | 0.2407 | 0.4717 | -0.231 | 0.08242 | 54 | 53 | 3.963 | 127 |
| bactin paxillin $0 \%$ vs. bactin paxillin $2 \%$ | 0 | 0.4717 | $-0.4717$ | 0.1363 | 12 | 53 | 4.895 | 127 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

