gels

MDPI

Supplementary Materials

Repurposing Lovastatin Cytotoxicity against the Tongue Carcinoma HSC3 Cell Line Using a Eucalyptus Oil-Based Nanoemulgel Carrier

Waleed Y. Rizg [1,2,*], Khaled M. Hosny [1,2], Samar S. Mahmoud [3], Ahmed K. Kammoun [4], Abdulmohsin J. Alamoudi [5], Hossam H. Tayeb [6,7], Haitham A. Bukhary [8], Moutaz Y. Badr [8], Samar S. A. Murshid [9], Eman Alfayez [10], Sarah A. Ali [11], Rayan Y. Mushtaq [12], and Walaa A. Abualsunun [1]

Table S1. Input data on k=5 independent treatments.

Treatment →	A	B	C	D	E
Input Data →	890	400	320	610	55
	894	376	350	600	46
	863	380	365	635	60
	883	376	368	705	59
	639	433	300	756	48
	694	440	280	759	64

One-way ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey HSD Test For Capsase-3enzyme results with Scheffé, Bonferroni and Holm multiple comparison calculation also provided

Table S2. Descriptive statistics of your k=5 independent treatments.

Treatment →	A	B	C	D	E	Pooled Total
observations N	6	6	6	6	6	30
Sum ∑xi	4,863.0000	2,405.0000	1,983.0000	4,065.0000	332.0000	13,648.0000
Mean $\bar{x}$	810.5000	400.8333	330.5000	677.5000	55.3333	454.9333
sum of squares $\sum xi^2$	4,005,751.0000	968,241.0000	661,949.0000	2,779,967.0000	18,622.0000	8,434,530.0000
sample variance s^2	12,857.9000	847.3667	1,313.5000	5,185.9000	50.2667	76,744.8230
sample std. dev. s	113.3927	29.1096	36.2422	72.0132	7.0899	277.0286
std. dev. of mean $SE\bar{x}$	46.2924	11.8839	14.7958	29.3993	2.8944	50.5783

Table S3. One-way ANOVA of your k=5 independent treatments.

source	sum of squares SS	degrees of freedom νν	mean square MS	F statistic	*p*-value
treatment	2,124,325.2000	4	531,081.3000	131.0992	2.2204e-16
error	101,274.6667	25	4,050.9867		
total	2,225,599.8667	29			

Table S4. Scheffé results.

treatments pair	Scheffé TT-statistic	Scheffé p-value	Scheffé inferfence
A vs B	11.1484	2.2708×10^{-9}	p<0.01
A vs C	13.0624	8.0739×10^{-11}	p<0.01
A vs D	3.6194	0.0273414	p<0.05
A vs E	20.5505	2.7756×10^{-15}	p<0.01
B vs C	1.9140	0.4701396	insignificant
B vs D	7.5290	3.6144×10^{-6}	p<0.01
B vs E	9.4022	6.6485×10^{-8}	p<0.01
C vs D	9.4430	6.1203×10^{-8}	p<0.01
C vs E	7.4882	3.9594×10^{-6}	p<0.01
D vs E	16.9312	2.5113×10^{-13}	p<0.01

Table S5. Bonferroni and Holm results: all pairs simultaineously compared.

treatments pair	Bonferroni and Holm TT-statistic	Bonferroni p-value	Bonferroni inferfence	Holm p-value	Holm inferfence
A vs B	11.1484	3.4219×10^{-10}	p<0.01	2.3953×10^{-10}	p<0.01
A vs C	13.0624	1.1413×10^{-11}	p<0.01	9.1305×10^{-12}	p<0.01
A vs D	3.6194	0.0130732	p<0.05	0.0026146	p<0.01
A vs E	20.5505	0.0000	p<0.01	0.000	p<0.01

B vs C	1.9140	0.6713473	insignificant	0.0671347	insignifi-cant
B vs D	7.5290	6.9749×10^{-7}	p<0.01	2.7900×10^{-7}	p<0.01
B vs E	9.4022	1.0960×10^{-8}	p<0.01	5.4800×10^{-9}	p<0.01
C vs D	9.4430	1.0063×10^{-8}	p<0.01	6.0379×10^{-9}	p<0.01
C vs E	7.4882	7.6751×10^{-7}	p<0.01	2.3025×10^{-7}	p<0.01
D vs E	16.9312	3.3307×10^{-14}	p<0.01	2.9976×10^{-14}	p<0.01

Table S6. Bonferroni and Holm results: only pairs relative to a simultaineously compared.

treatments pair	**Bonferroni and Holm TT-statistic**	**Bonferroni p-value**	**Bonfer-roni infer-fence**	**Holm p-value**	**Holm infer-fence**
A vs B	11.1484	1.3687×10^{-10}	p<0.01	6.8437×10^{-10}	p<0.01
A vs C	13.0624	4.5652×10^{-12}	p<0.01	3.4239×10^{-12}	p<0.01
A vs D	3.6194	0.0052293	p<0.01	0.0013073	p<0.01
A vs E	20.5505	0.000	p<0.01	0.000	p<0.01