

One-way ANOVA and Tukey Test (bacteria , fungi, Laccase, E4/E6)

bacteria

One-way ANOVA: 0 versus bacteria

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
bacteria	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
bacteria	2	2600	1300,0	4,33	0,068
Error	6	1800	300,0		
Total	8	4400			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
17,3205	59,09%	45,45%	7,95%

Means

bacteria	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	110,00	10,00	(85,53; 134,47)
D1	3	150,0	20,0	(125,5; 174,5)
D2	3	140,0	20,0	(115,5; 164,5)

Pooled StDev = 17,3205

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

bacteria	N	Mean	Grouping
D1	3	150,0	A
D2	3	140,0	A
D0	3	110,00	A

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 30 versus bacteria

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
bacteria	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
bacteria	2	18278000000	9139000000	4569,50	0,000
Error	6	12000000	2000000		
Total	8	18290000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
1414,21	99,93%	99,91%	99,85%

Means

bacteria	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	129000	1000	(127002; 130998)
D1	3	152000	2000	(150002; 153998)
D2	3	47000	1000	(45002; 48998)

Pooled StDev = 1414,21

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

bacteria	N	Mean	Grouping
D1	3	152000	A
D0	3	129000	B
D2	3	47000	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 60 versus bacteria

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
bacteria	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
bacteria	2	1800	900,0	3,86	0,084
Error	6	1400	233,3		
Total	8	3200			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
15,2753	56,25%	41,67%	1,56%

Means

bacteria	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	100,0	0,0	(78,4; 121,6)
D1	3	130,0	17,3	(108,4; 151,6)
D2	3	130,0	20,0	(108,4; 151,6)

Pooled StDev = 15,2753

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

bacteria	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	130,0	A
D1	3	130,0	A
D0	3	100,0	A

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 90 versus bacteria

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
bacteria	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
bacteria	2	1262000000	631000000	35,06	0,000
Error	6	108000000	18000000		
Total	8	1370000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
4242,64	92,12%	89,49%	82,26%

Means

bacteria	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	72000	2000	(66006; 77994)
D1	3	101000	1000	(95006; 106994)
D2	3	87000	7000	(81006; 92994)

Pooled StDev = 4242,64

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

bacteria	N	Mean	Grouping
D1	3	101000	A
D2	3	87000	B
D0	3	72000	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 120 versus bacteria

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
bacteria	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
bacteria	2	5432000000	2716000000	61,73	0,000
Error	6	264000000	44000000		
Total	8	5696000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
6633,25	95,37%	93,82%	89,57%

Means

bacteria	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	40000	4000	(30629; 49371)
D1	3	66000	4000	(56629; 75371)
D2	3	100000	10000	(90629; 109371)

Pooled StDev = 6633,25

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

bacteria	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	100000	A
D1	3	66000	B
D0	3	40000	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 180 day versus bacteria

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
bacteria	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
bacteria	2	25800000000	12900000000	64,50	0,000
Error	6	1200000000	200000000		
Total	8	27000000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
14142,1	95,56%	94,07%	90,00%

Means

bacteria	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	20000	10000	(21; 39979)
D1	3	150000	10000	(130021; 169979)
D2	3	70000	20000	(50021; 89979)

Pooled StDev = 14142,1

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

bacteria	N	Mean	Grouping
D1	3	150000	A
D2	3	70000	B
D0	3	20000	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

FUNGI

One-way ANOVA: d0 versus FUNGI

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
FUNGI	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
FUNGI	2	71239200	35619600	10,69	0,011
Error	6	20000800	3333467		
Total	8	91240000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
1825,78	78,08%	70,77%	50,68%

Means

FUNGI	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	7000	3000	(4421; 9579)
D1	3	140,0	20,0	(-2439,3; 2719,3)
D2	3	3000	1000	(421; 5579)

Pooled StDev = 1825,78

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

FUNGI	N	Mean	Grouping
D0	3	7000	A
D2	3	3000	A B
D1	3	140,0	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d30 versus FUNGI

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
FUNGI	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
FUNGI	2	338000000	169000000	1,21	0,361
Error	6	836000000	139333333		
Total	8	1174000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
11804,0	28,79%	5,05%	0,00%

Means

FUNGI	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	32000	3000	(15324; 48676)
D1	3	40000	20000	(23324; 56676)
D2	3	47000	3000	(30324; 63676)

Pooled StDev = 11804,0

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

FUNGI	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	47000	A
D1	3	40000	A
D0	3	32000	A

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d60 versus FUNGI

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
FUNGI	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
FUNGI	2	56000000	28000000	9,33	0,014
Error	6	18000000	3000000		
Total	8	74000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
1732,05	75,68%	67,57%	45,27%

Means

FUNGI	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	4000	2000	(1553; 6447)
D1	3	2000	1000	(-447; 4447)
D2	3	8000	2000	(5553; 10447)

Pooled StDev = 1732,05

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

FUNGI	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	8000	A
D0	3	4000	A B
D1	3	2000	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d90 versus FUNGI

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
FUNGI	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
FUNGI	2	422000000	211000000	211,00	0,000
Error	6	6000000	1000000		
Total	8	428000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
1000	98,60%	98,13%	96,85%

Means

FUNGI	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	4000	1000	(2587; 5413)
D1	3	5000	1000	(3587; 6413)
D2	3	19000	1000	(17587; 20413)

Pooled StDev = 1000

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

FUNGI	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	19000	A
D1	3	5000	B
D0	3	4000	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d120 versus FUNGI

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
FUNGI	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
FUNGI	2	679308800	339654400	46,32	0,000
Error	6	44000800	7333467		
Total	8	723309600			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
2708,04	93,92%	91,89%	86,31%

Means

FUNGI	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	120,0	20,0	(-3705,7; 3945,7)
D1	3	7000	1732	(3174; 10826)
D2	3	21000	4359	(17174; 24826)

Pooled StDev = 2708,04

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

FUNGI	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	21000	A
D1	3	7000	B
D0	3	120,0	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 180 d versus FUNGI

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
FUNGI	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
FUNGI	2	878000000	439000000	87,80	0,000
Error	6	30000000	5000000		
Total	8	908000000			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
2236,07	96,70%	95,59%	92,57%

Means

FUNGI	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	30000	2000	(26841; 33159)
D1	3	12000	2646	(8841; 15159)
D2	3	7000	2000	(3841; 10159)

Pooled StDev = 2236,07

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

FUNGI	N	Mean	Grouping
D0	3	30000	A
D1	3	12000	B
D2	3	7000	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

Laccase

One-way ANOVA: d0 versus Laccase

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
Laccase	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
Laccase	2	0,96362	0,481811	175,56	0,000
Error	6	0,01647	0,002744		
Total	8	0,98009			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,0523874	98,32%	97,76%	96,22%

Means

Laccase	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	0,5900	0,0854	(0,5160; 0,6640)
D1	3	0,4200	0,0265	(0,3460; 0,4940)
D2	3	1,18333	0,01528	(1,10932; 1,25734)

Pooled StDev = 0,0523874

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

Laccase	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	1,18333	A
D0	3	0,5900	B
D1	3	0,4200	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d30 versus Laccase

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
Laccase	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
Laccase	2	8,56980	4,28490	6765,63	0,000
Error	6	0,00380	0,00063		
Total	8	8,57360			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,0251661	99,96%	99,94%	99,90%

Means

Laccase	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	0,8967	0,0252	(0,8611; 0,9322)
D1	3	0,8967	0,0252	(0,8611; 0,9322)
D2	3	2,9667	0,0252	(2,9311; 3,0022)

Pooled StDev = 0,0251661

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

Laccase	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	2,9667	A
D1	3	0,8967	B
D0	3	0,8967	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d60 versus Laccase

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
Laccase	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
Laccase	2	0,04536	0,022678	8,07	0,020
Error	6	0,01687	0,002811		
Total	8	0,06222			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,0530199	72,89%	63,86%	39,01%

Means

Laccase	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	0,7600	0,0361	(0,6851; 0,8349)
D1	3	0,7300	0,0700	(0,6551; 0,8049)
D2	3	0,5967	0,0473	(0,5218; 0,6716)

Pooled StDev = 0,0530199

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

Laccase	N	Mean	Grouping
D0	3	0,7600	A
D1	3	0,7300	A
D2	3	0,5967	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d90 versus Laccase

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
Laccase	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
Laccase	2	17,1144	8,55720	1944,82	0,000
Error	6	0,0264	0,00440		
Total	8	17,1408			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,0663325	99,85%	99,79%	99,65%

Means

Laccase	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	0,56000	0,01000	(0,46629; 0,65371)
D1	3	3,9200	0,1058	(3,8263; 4,0137)
D2	3	1,9400	0,0436	(1,8463; 2,0337)

Pooled StDev = 0,0663325

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

Laccase	N	Mean	Grouping
D1	3	3,9200	A
D2	3	1,9400	B
D0	3	0,56000	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d120 versus Laccase

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
Laccase	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
Laccase	2	20,4470	10,2235	399,18	0,000
Error	6	0,1537	0,0256		
Total	8	20,6007			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,160035	99,25%	99,01%	98,32%

Means

Laccase	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	0,85000	0,01000	(0,62391; 1,07609)
D1	3	1,27000	0,01000	(1,04391; 1,49609)
D2	3	4,237	0,277	(4,011; 4,463)

Pooled StDev = 0,160035

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

Laccase	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	4,237	A
D1	3	1,27000	B
D0	3	0,85000	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 180 d versus Laccase

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
Laccase	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
Laccase	2	0,353400	0,176700	147,25	0,000
Error	6	0,007200	0,001200		
Total	8	0,360600			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,0346410	98,00%	97,34%	95,51%

Means

Laccase	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	1,2500	0,0436	(1,2011; 1,2989)
D1	3	0,8400	0,0361	(0,7911; 0,8889)
D2	3	1,2700	0,0200	(1,2211; 1,3189)

Pooled StDev = 0,0346410

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

Laccase	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	1,2700	A
D0	3	1,2500	A
D1	3	0,8400	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

E4/E6

One-way ANOVA: d0 versus E4/E6

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
E4/E6	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
E4/E6	2	19,822	9,9109	34,85	0,000
Error	6	1,706	0,2844		
Total	8	21,528			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,533266	92,07%	89,43%	82,17%

Means

E4/E6	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	0,5337	0,1095	(-0,2197; 1,2870)
D1	3	2,250	0,220	(1,497; 3,003)
D2	3	4,167	0,890	(3,414; 4,920)

Pooled StDev = 0,533266

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

E4/E6	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	4,167	A
D1	3	2,250	B
D0	3	0,5337	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d30 versus E4/E6

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
E4/E6	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
E4/E6	2	201,203	100,601	65,09	0,000
Error	6	9,273	1,545		
Total	8	210,476			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
1,24318	95,59%	94,13%	90,09%

Means

E4/E6	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	1,136	0,341	(-0,620; 2,893)
D1	3	12,60	1,90	(10,84; 14,36)
D2	3	5,440	0,954	(3,684; 7,196)

Pooled StDev = 1,24318

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

E4/E6	N	Mean	Grouping
D1	3	12,60	A
D2	3	5,440	B
D0	3	1,136	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d60 versus E4/E6

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
E4/E6	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
E4/E6	2	206,384	103,192	410,79	0,000
Error	6	1,507	0,251		
Total	8	207,891			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,501201	99,27%	99,03%	98,37%

Means

E4/E6	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	1,182	0,282	(0,474; 1,890)
D1	3	4,857	0,207	(4,149; 5,565)
D2	3	12,667	0,795	(11,959; 13,375)

Pooled StDev = 0,501201

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

E4/E6	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	12,667	A
D1	3	4,857	B
D0	3	1,182	C

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d90 versus E4/E6

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
E4/E6	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
E4/E6	2	45,3892	22,6946	234,02	0,000
Error	6	0,5819	0,0970		
Total	8	45,9710			

Model Summary

	S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,311411	98,73%	98,31%	97,15%	

Means

E4/E6	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	1,1113	0,0969	(0,6714; 1,5513)
D1	3	0,9637	0,1554	(0,5237; 1,4036)
D2	3	5,800	0,507	(5,360; 6,240)

Pooled StDev = 0,311411

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

E4/E6	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	5,800	A
D0	3	1,1113	B
D1	3	0,9637	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: d120 versus E4/E6

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
E4/E6	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
E4/E6	2	129,927	64,9637	847,15	0,000
Error	6	0,460	0,0767		
Total	8	130,388			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,276920	99,65%	99,53%	99,21%

Means

E4/E6	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	1,8177	0,0788	(1,4265; 2,2089)
D1	3	1,412	0,296	(1,020; 1,803)
D2	3	9,667	0,369	(9,276; 10,058)

Pooled StDev = 0,276920

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

E4/E6	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	9,667	A
D0	3	1,8177	B
D1	3	1,412	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.

One-way ANOVA: 180 d versus E4/E6

Method

Null hypothesis All means are equal
Alternative hypothesis At least one mean is different
Significance level $\alpha = 0,05$

Equal variances were assumed for the analysis.

Factor Information

Factor	Levels	Values
E4/E6	3	D0; D1; D2

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Adj SS	Adj MS	F-Value	P-Value
E4/E6	2	28,636	14,3182	33,52	0,001
Error	6	2,563	0,4272		
Total	8	31,200			

Model Summary

S	R-sq	R-sq(adj)	R-sq(pred)
0,653601	91,78%	89,05%	81,52%

Means

E4/E6	N	Mean	StDev	95% CI
D0	3	1,714	0,237	(0,790; 2,637)
D1	3	2,667	0,785	(1,743; 3,590)
D2	3	5,883	0,780	(4,960; 6,806)

Pooled StDev = 0,653601

Tukey Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Information Using the Tukey Method and 95% Confidence

E4/E6	N	Mean	Grouping
D2	3	5,883	A
D1	3	2,667	B
D0	3	1,714	B

Means that do not share a letter are significantly different.