

# ISO/TS 20281:2006-04 (E)

## Water quality - Guidance on statistical interpretation of ecotoxicity data

---

<b>Contents</b>		<b>Page</b>
Foreword .....		xii
Introduction .....		xiii
<b>1</b>	<b>Scope .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Normative references .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Terms and definitions .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>General statistical principles .....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Different statistical approaches .....	8
4.1.1	General .....	8
4.1.2	Hypothesis-testing methods .....	8
4.1.3	Concentration-response modelling methods .....	10
4.1.4	Biology-based methods .....	11
4.2	Experimental design issues .....	11
4.2.1	General .....	11
4.2.2	NOEC or ECx: Implications for design .....	12
4.2.3	Randomization .....	12
4.2.4	Replication .....	13
4.2.5	Multiple controls included in the experimental design .....	13
4.3	Process of data analysis .....	14
4.3.1	General .....	14
4.3.2	Data inspection and outliers .....	14
4.3.3	Data inspection and assumptions .....	15
4.3.3.1	Scatter .....	15
4.3.3.2	Heterogeneous variances and distribution .....	15
4.3.3.3	Heterogeneous variances and true variation in response .....	16
4.3.3.4	Consequences for the analysis .....	16
4.3.4	Transformation of data .....	16
4.3.5	Parametric and non-parametric methods .....	17
4.3.5.1	General .....	17
4.3.5.2	Parametric methods .....	17
4.3.5.3	Generalized linear models (GLMs) .....	18
4.3.5.4	Non-parametric methods .....	18
4.3.5.5	How to choose? .....	18
4.3.6	Pre-treatment of data .....	19
4.3.7	Model fitting .....	19
4.3.8	Model checking .....	20
4.3.8.1	Analysis of residuals .....	20
4.3.8.2	Validation of fitted dose-response model .....	21
4.3.9	Reporting the results .....	21
<b>5</b>	<b>Hypothesis testing .....</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	21
5.1.1	General .....	21
5.1.2	NOEC: What it is, and what it is not .....	25
5.1.3	Hypothesis used to determine NOEC .....	25
5.1.3.1	Understanding the question to be answered .....	25
5.1.3.2	One-sided hypothesis .....	26
5.1.3.3	Two-sided trend test .....	26

5.1.3.4	Trend or pair-wise test .....	26
5.1.4	Comparisons of single-step (pair-wise comparisons) or step-down trend tests to determine the NOEC .....	28
5.1.4.1	General discussion .....	28
5.1.4.2	Single-step procedures .....	28
5.1.4.3	Step-down procedures .....	29
5.1.4.4	Deciding between the two approaches .....	30
5.1.5	Dose metric in trend tests .....	31
5.1.6	Role of power in toxicity experiments .....	31
5.1.7	Experimental design .....	32
5.1.8	Treatment of covariates and other adjustments to analysis .....	33
5.2	Quantal data (e.g. mortality, survival) .....	34
5.2.1	Hypothesis testing with quantal data to determine NOEC values .....	34
5.2.2	Parametric versus non-parametric tests .....	35
5.2.2.1	Basis .....	35
5.2.2.2	Single-step procedures .....	36
5.2.2.3	Step-down procedures .....	36
5.2.2.3.1	Choice of step-down procedure .....	36
5.2.2.3.2	Test for monotone dose response .....	36
5.2.2.3.3	Analysing the monotonic response for quantal data -- Step-down procedure .....	37
5.2.2.3.4	Possible modifications of the step-down procedure .....	37
5.2.2.4	Alternative procedures .....	37
5.2.2.4.1	Parametric and non-parametric procedures .....	37
5.2.2.4.2	Pair-wise ANOVA-based methods .....	38
5.2.2.4.3	Jonckheere-Terpstra trend test .....	38
5.2.2.4.4	Poisson tests .....	38
5.2.2.5	Assumptions of methods for determining NOEC values .....	38
5.2.3	Additional information .....	39
5.2.4	Statistical items to be included in the study report .....	40
5.3	Hypothesis testing with continuous data (e.g. mass, length, growth rate) to determine NOEC .....	40
5.3.1	General .....	40
5.3.2	Parametric versus non-parametric tests .....	41
5.3.3	Single-step (pair-wise) procedures .....	42
5.3.3.1	General .....	42
5.3.3.2	Dunnett's test .....	42
5.3.3.3	Tamhane-Dunnett test .....	42
5.3.3.4	Dunn's test .....	42
5.3.3.5	Mann-Whitney test .....	43
5.3.4	Step-down trend procedures .....	43
5.3.5	Determining the NOEC using a step-down procedure based on a trend test .....	43
5.3.5.1	General .....	43
5.3.5.2	Preliminaries .....	43
5.3.5.3	Step-down procedure .....	43
5.3.5.3.1	Preferred approach .....	43
5.3.5.3.2	Williams' test .....	44
5.3.5.3.3	Jonckheere-Terpstra test .....	44
5.3.6	Assumptions for methods for determining NOEC values .....	44
5.3.6.1	Small samples -- Massive ties .....	44
5.3.6.2	Normality .....	45
5.3.6.3	Variance homogeneity .....	45
5.3.7	Operational considerations for statistical analyses .....	46
5.3.7.1	Treatment of experimental units .....	46
5.3.7.2	Identification and meaning of outliers .....	46
5.3.7.3	Multiple controls .....	46
5.3.7.4	General .....	47
5.4	Statistical items to be included in the study report .....	47
6	Dose-response modelling .....	48
6.1	Introduction .....	48
6.2	Modelling quantal dose-response data (for a single exposure duration) .....	49
6.2.1	General .....	49

6.2.2	Choice of model .....	50
6.2.2.1	General .....	50
6.2.2.2	Probit model .....	51
6.2.2.3	Logit model .....	53
6.2.2.4	Weibull model .....	54
6.2.2.5	Multi-stage models .....	55
6.2.2.6	Definitions of EC50 and ECx .....	55
6.2.3	Model fitting and estimation of parameters .....	56
6.2.3.1	Software and assumptions .....	56
6.2.3.2	Response in controls .....	56
6.2.3.3	Analysis of data with various observed fractions at each dose group .....	57
6.2.3.4	Analysis of data with one observed fraction at each dose group .....	58
6.2.3.5	Extrapolation and ECx .....	58
6.2.3.6	Confidence intervals .....	58
6.2.4	Assumptions .....	59
6.2.4.1	General .....	59
6.2.4.2	Statistical assumptions .....	59
6.2.4.3	Evaluation of assumptions .....	59
6.2.4.3.1	Evaluation of basic assumptions .....	59
6.2.4.3.2	Evaluation of the additional assumption .....	59
6.2.4.4	Consequences of violating the assumptions .....	60
6.2.4.4.1	Consequences of violating basic assumptions .....	60
6.2.4.4.2	Consequences of violating the additional assumption .....	60
6.3	Dose-response modelling of continuous data (for a single exposure duration) .....	60
6.3.1	Purpose .....	60
6.3.2	Terms and notation .....	60
6.3.3	Choice of model .....	61
6.3.3.1	First distinctions .....	61
6.3.3.2	Linear models .....	62
6.3.3.3	Threshold models .....	62
6.3.3.4	Additive versus multiplicative models .....	63
6.3.3.5	Models based on "quantal" models .....	63
6.3.3.6	Nested non-linear models .....	64
6.3.3.7	Hill model .....	67
6.3.3.8	Non-monotone models .....	67
6.3.4	Model fitting and estimation of parameters .....	68
6.3.4.1	Software and assumptions .....	68
6.3.4.2	Response in controls .....	68
6.3.4.3	Fitting the model assuming normal variation .....	68
6.3.4.4	Fitting the model assuming normal variation after log-transformation .....	68
6.3.4.5	Fitting the model assuming normal variation after other transformations .....	69
6.3.4.6	No individual data available .....	69
6.3.4.7	Fitting the model using GLM .....	69
6.3.4.8	Covariates .....	70
6.3.4.9	Heterogeneity and weighted analysis .....	71
6.3.4.10	Confidence intervals .....	73
6.3.4.11	Extrapolation .....	73
6.3.4.12	Analysis of data with replicated dose group .....	73
6.3.5	Assumptions .....	74
6.3.5.1	General .....	74
6.3.5.2	Statistical assumptions .....	74
6.3.5.3	Additional assumption .....	74
6.3.6	Evaluation of assumptions .....	75
6.3.7	Consequences of violating the assumptions .....	75
6.3.7.1	Basic assumptions .....	75
6.3.7.2	Additional assumption .....	76
6.4	To accept or not accept the fitted model? .....	77
6.4.1	Can the fitted model be accepted and used for its intended purpose? .....	77
6.4.2	Is the model in agreement with the data? .....	77
6.4.3	Do the data provide sufficient information for fixing the model? .....	77
6.5	Design issues .....	81
6.5.1	General .....	81

6.5.2	Location of dose groups .....	81
6.5.3	Number of replicates .....	81
6.5.4	Balanced versus unbalanced designs .....	82
6.6	Exposure duration and time .....	82
6.6.1	General .....	82
6.6.2	Quantal data .....	82
6.6.3	Continuous data .....	83
6.6.3.1	General .....	83
6.6.3.2	Independent observations in time .....	83
6.6.3.3	Dependent observations in time .....	85
6.7	Search algorithms and non-linear regression .....	85
6.8	Reporting statistics .....	86
6.8.1	Quantal data .....	86
6.8.2	Continuous data .....	87
7	Biology-based methods .....	87
7.1	Introduction .....	87
7.1.1	Effects as functions of concentration and exposure time .....	87
7.1.2	Parameter estimation .....	89
7.1.3	Outlook .....	89
7.2	Modules of effect-models .....	90
7.2.1	General .....	90
7.2.2	Toxico-kinetic model .....	91
7.2.3	Physiological targets of toxicants .....	91
7.2.4	Change in target parameter .....	92
7.2.5	Change in endpoint .....	93
7.3	Survival .....	93
7.3.1	Relationship between hazard rate and survival probability .....	93
7.3.2	Assumptions of survival probability at any concentration of test compound .....	94
7.3.3	Summary .....	94
7.4	Body growth .....	97
7.4.1	Routes for affecting body growth .....	97
7.4.2	Assumptions .....	97
7.4.3	Von Bertalanffy growth curve .....	98
7.5	Reproduction .....	99
7.5.1	Routes that affect reproduction .....	99
7.5.2	Assumptions .....	100
7.5.3	Implication .....	100
7.6	Population growth .....	101
7.6.1	General .....	101
7.6.2	Assumptions .....	101
7.7	Parameters of effect models .....	103
7.7.1	General .....	103
7.7.2	Effect parameters .....	103
7.7.2.1	Toxicity and dynamic parameters .....	103
7.7.2.2	Killing rate, bk .....	104
7.7.3	Discussion .....	105
7.7.4	Eco-physiological parameters .....	107
7.8	Recommendations .....	109
7.8.1	Goodness of fit .....	109
7.8.2	Choice of modes of action .....	110
7.8.3	Experimental design .....	110
7.8.4	Building a database for raw data .....	110
7.9	Software support .....	110
7.9.1	General .....	110
7.9.2	DEBtox .....	111
7.9.3	DEBtool .....	111
8	List of existing guidelines with references to the subclauses of this Technical Specification .....	112

<b>Annex A (informative) Analysis of an "acute immobilization of Daphnia magna" data set (OECD GL 202 -- ISO 6341) using the three presented approaches</b> .....	<b>115</b>
<b>A.1 Data set (see Table A.1)</b> .....	<b>115</b>
<b>A.2 Examples of data analysis using hypothesis testing (NOEC determination)</b> .....	<b>115</b>
<b>A.3 Example of data analysis by dose-response modelling</b> .....	<b>120</b>
<b>A.4 Example of data analysis using DEBtox (biological methods)</b> .....	<b>125</b>
<b>Annex B (informative) Analysis of an "algae growth inhibition" data set using the three presented approaches</b> .....	<b>127</b>
<b>B.1 General</b> .....	<b>127</b>
<b>B.2 Examples of data analysis using hypothesis testing (NOEC determination)</b> .....	<b>128</b>
<b>B.3 Example of data analysis by dose-response modelling</b> .....	<b>135</b>
<b>B.4 Examples of data analysis using DEBtox (biological methods)</b> .....	<b>139</b>
<b>Annex C (informative) Analysis of an "Daphnia magna reproduction" data set (OECD GL 211 - ISO 10706) using the three presented approaches</b> .....	<b>142</b>
<b>C.1 Examples of data analysis using hypothesis testing (NOEC determination)</b> .....	<b>143</b>
<b>C.2 Example of data analysis by dose-response modelling</b> .....	<b>148</b>
<b>C.3 Examples of data analysis using DEBtox (biological methods)</b> .....	<b>155</b>
<b>Annex D (informative) Analysis of a "fish growth" data set (OECD GL 204/215 - ISO 10229) using the three presented approaches</b> .....	<b>160</b>
<b>D.1 Data set</b> .....	<b>160</b>
<b>D.2 Examples of data analysis using hypothesis testing (NOEC determination)</b> .....	<b>162</b>
<b>D.3 Example of data analysis by dose-response modelling</b> .....	<b>172</b>
<b>D.4 Examples of data analysis using DEBtox (biological methods)</b> .....	<b>177</b>
<b>Annex E (informative) Description and power of selected tests and methods</b> .....	<b>180</b>
<b>E.1 Description of selected methods for use with quantal data</b> .....	<b>180</b>
<b>E.2 Power of the Cochran-Armitage test</b> .....	<b>189</b>
<b>E.3 Description of selected tests for use with continuous data</b> .....	<b>198</b>
<b>E.4 Power of step-down Jonckheere-Terpstra test</b> .....	<b>218</b>
<b>Annex F (informative) Annex to Clause 7 "Biology-based methods"</b> .....	<b>231</b>
<b>F.1 General</b> .....	<b>231</b>
<b>F.2 Effects on survival</b> .....	<b>231</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>237</b>
<b>Figure 1 -- Conceptual illustration of accuracy and precision</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Figure 2 -- Illustration of a concentration-response relationship and of the estimates of the ECx and NOEC/LOEC</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Figure 3 -- Analysis of quantal data: Methods for determining the NOEC</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Figure 4 -- Analysis of continuous data: Methods for determining the NOEC</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Figure 5 -- Analysis of continuous data: Methods for determining the NOEC (continued)</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Figure 6 -- Flow-chart for dose-response modelling</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>Figure 7 -- Probit model fitted to observed mortality frequencies (triangles) as a function of log-dose</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<b>Figure 8 -- Logit model fitted to mortality dose-response data (triangles)</b> .....	<b>53</b>

Figure 9 -- Weibull model fitted to mortality dose-response data (triangles) .....	54
Figure 10 -- Logit model fitted to mortality dose-response data (triangles), with background mortality .....	57
Figure 11 -- Two members from a nested family of models fitted to the same data set .....	66
Figure 12 -- Cholinesterase inhibition as a function of dose at three exposure durations .....	71
Figure 13 -- Relative liver masses against dose, plotted on log-scale .....	72
Figure 14 -- Dose-response model fitted to the data of Figure 13, showing that the heterogeneous variance was caused by males (triangles) and females (circles) responding differently to the chemical .....	73
Figure 15 -- Model fitted to dose-response data with and without an outlier in the top dose .....	76
Figure 16 -- Two different models (both with four parameters) fitted to the same data set resulting in similar dose-response relationships .....	79
Figure 17 -- Two data sets illustrating that passing a goodness-of-fit test is not sufficient for accepting the model .....	80
Figure 18 -- Observed biomasses (marks) as a function of time, for nine different concentrations of Atrazine .....	84
Figure 19 -- Growth rates as derived from biomasses observed in time (see Figure 18) at nine different concentrations (including zero), with the Hill model fitted to them .....	84
Figure 20 -- Estimated growth rates as a function of (log-)concentration Atrazine .....	85
Figure 21 -- Fluxes of material and energy through an animal, as specified in the DEB model .....	92
Figure 22 -- Time and concentration profiles of the hazard model, together with the data of Figure 27 .....	95
Figure 23 -- Time and concentration profiles for effects on growth of <i>Pimephalus promelas</i> via an increase of specific maintenance costs by sodium pentachlorophenate (data by Ria Hooftman, TNO-Delft) .....	98
Figure 24 -- Time and concentration profiles for effects on growth of <i>Lumbricus rubellus</i> via a decrease of assimilation by copper chloride (data from Klok and de Roos 1996) .....	99
Figure 25 -- Effects of cadmium on the reproduction of <i>Daphnia magna</i> through an increase of the costs per offspring -- Data from the OECD ring-test .....	101
Figure 26 -- Example of application of the DEBtox method .....	102
Figure 27 -- The effect of a mixture of C,N,S-compounds on the growth of <i>Skeletonema costatum</i> via an increase of the costs for growth -- Data from the OECD ring test .....	103
Figure 28 -- A typical table of data that serves as input for the survival model, as can be used in the software package DEBtox (Kooijman and Bedaux 1996) .....	108
Figure 29 -- This profile likelihood function of the NEC (right panel) for the data in Figure 28 results from the software package DEBtox (Kooijman and Bedaux 1996) .....	108
Figure A.1 -- Probit model fitted to mortality response at day 2 -- CED = EC10 .....	122
Figure A.2 -- The Weibull (left panel) and the two-stage LMS model fitted to the mortality data at day 2 .....	123

Figure A.3 -- Probit model fitted to mortality data on day 1 (left panel), and fitted to both day 1 and day 2 simultaneously .....	124
Figure A.4 -- DEBtox example: Parameters and asymptotic standard deviations (ASD) .....	125
Figure A.5 -- Graphical test of model predictions against data .....	125
Figure B.1 -- Exponential growth model fitted to biomass, assuming a constant initial biomass (a), and growth rate (b) dependent on concentration (0, 0,01, 0,02, 0,03, 0,06, 0,1, 0,2, 0,3, 0,6 mg/l) .....	136
Figure B.2 -- Exponential growth model fitted to biomass, assuming a constant initial biomass (a), and growth rate (b) dependent on each individual flask (six for the control group, and 2 for each nonzero concentration) .....	136
Figure B.3 -- Estimated growth rates (from individual flasks, see Figure B.2) as a function of the concentration of Atrazine .....	137
Figure B.4 -- Regression residuals from analysis on log-scale (upper panels) and from analysis without transformation (lower panels) .....	138
Figure B.5 -- Growth rate plots .....	139
Figure B.6 -- DEBtox example: Data for effects of Atrazine in micrograms per litre on the growth of <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i> in cells per millilitre .....	139
Figure B.7 -- DEBtox example: Parameter estimates and asymptotic standard deviations (ASD) .....	139
Figure B.8 -- DEBtox example: Time profile (Population growth, growth model, CAS 1912-24-9) .....	140
Figure B.9 -- DEBtox example: Concentration profile (Population growth, growth model, CAS 1912-24-9) . 140	
Figure B.10 -- DEBtox example: Profile likelihood for NEC estimate (Population growth, growth model, CAS 1912-24-9) .....	141
Figure C.1 -- Number of life young as a function of concentration (on log-scale to improve visibility), counted over the first two weeks (triangles) and over the third week (circles) .	149
Figure C.2 -- Total live young (TLY) in third week plotted against TLY in first two weeks, showing the correlations between these counts .....	149
Figure C.3 -- Exponential model fitted to the number of life young counted over week three .....	151
Figure C.4 -- Plots of regression residuals .....	152
Figure C.5 -- Means of number of young, plotted cumulatively against time .....	153
Figure C.6 -- Estimated ET50 values from Figure C.5, plotted against the concentration, with a fitted dose-response model .....	154
Figure C.7 -- Number of young, plotted cumulatively against time .....	154
Figure C.8 -- ET50s estimated per replicate (see Figure C.7) as a function of the concentration with a fitted dose-response model .....	155
Figure C.9 -- ET50s estimated per replicate (see Figure C.7) as a function of the concentration, with two outliers removed .....	155
Figure C.10 -- DEBtox example: Data for the cumulative number of offspring per female as affected by an unknown compound .....	156
Figure C.11 -- DEBtox example: Parameter estimates and asymptotic standard deviations (ASD) ...	156

Figure C.12 -- DEBtox example: Time profile (reproduction, maintenance model, ISO repro set) ....	157
Figure C.13 -- DEBtox example: Concentration profile (reproduction, maintenance model, ISO repro set) .	157
Figure C.14 -- DEBtox example: Profile likelihood for NEC estimate (reproduction, maintenance model, ISO repro set) .....	158
Figure C.15 -- DEBtox example: Body length at 21 days .....	158
Figure D.1 -- Exponential model, $y = a \exp(bx)$ , fitted to masses at 28 days .....	174
Figure D.2 -- Plots of regression residuals for the analysis of Figure D.1 .....	175
Figure D.3 -- Plots of regression residuals .....	175
Figure D.4 -- Dose-response analysis of the fish masses, but without log-transformation .....	176
Figure D.5 -- Exponential model fitted to the body lengths .....	177
Figure D.6 -- DEBtox example: Parameter estimates and asymptotic standard deviations (ASD) ....	177
Figure D.7 -- DEBtox example: Concentration profile .....	178
Figure D.8 -- DEBtox example: Profile likelihood for NEC estimate .....	179
Figure E.1 -- Cochran-Armitage test: Plot showing that 5 subjects per concentration would give very low power .....	190
Figure E.2 -- Cochran-Armitage test: Design with 20 subjects per concentration .....	191
Figure E.3 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 5 in 5-dose study, with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 20 .....	192
Figure E.4 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 4 in 5-dose study, with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 20 .....	192
Figure E.5 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 3 in 5-dose study, with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 20 .....	193
Figure E.6 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 5 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 40 .....	193
Figure E.7 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 4 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 40 .....	194
Figure E.8 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 3 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 40 .....	194
Figure E.9 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 5 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 60 .....	195
Figure E.10 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 4 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 60 .....	195
Figure E.11 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 3 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 60 .....	196
Figure E.12 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 5 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 80 .....	196
Figure E.13 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 4 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 80 .....	197

Figure E.14 -- Cochran-Armitage power versus maximum rate change: Power at Dose 3 in 5-dose study with trend shape linear, lag = 0, sample size = 80 .....	197
Figure E.15 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 1, N = 10 .....	219
Figure E.16 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 2 versus 5 doses at Step 1, N = 10 .....	220
Figure E.17 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 3 versus 5 doses at Step 2 versus 4 doses at Step 1, N = 10 .....	220
Figure E.18 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 2 versus 5 doses at Step 1, N = 5 .....	221
Figure E.19 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 1, N = 5 .....	221
Figure E.20 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: (Doses,Step) = (6,4) (5,3)(4,2) (3,1), N = 5 .....	222
Figure E.21 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 3 versus 5 doses at Step 2 versus 4 doses at Step 1, N = 5 .....	222
Figure E.22 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 1, N = 10 .....	223
Figure E.23 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 2 versus 5 doses at Step 1, N = 10 .....	223
Figure E.24 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 3 versus 5 doses at Step 2 versus 4 doses at Step 1, N = 10 .....	224
Figure E.25 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: (Doses, Step) = (6,4) (5,3) (4,2) (3,1), N = 10 .....	224
Figure E.26 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 1, N = 20 .....	225
Figure E.27 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 2 versus 5 doses at Step 1, N = 20 .....	225
Figure E.28 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 3 versus 5 doses at Step 2 versus 4 doses at Step 1, N = 20 .....	226
Figure E.29 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: (Doses, Step) = (6,4) (5,3) (4,2) (3,1), N = 20 .....	226
Figure E.30 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 1, N = 40 .....	227
Figure E.31 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 2 versus 5 doses at Step 1, N = 40 .....	227
Figure E.32 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 3 versus 5 doses at Step 2 versus 4 doses at Step 1, N = 40 .....	228
Figure E.33 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: (Doses, Step) = (6,4) (5,3) (4,2) (3,1), N = 40 .....	228
Figure E.34 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 1, N = 80 .....	229
Figure E.35 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 2 versus 5 doses at Step, N = 80 .....	229
Figure E.36 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: 6 doses at Step 3 versus 5 doses at Step 2 versus 4 doses at Step 1, N = 80 .....	230
Figure E.37 -- Power of step-down Jonckheere test: (Doses, Step) = (6,4) (5,3) (4,2) (3,1), N = 80 .....	230