

ISO/TS 20281:2006-04 (E)

Water quality - Guidance on statistical interpretation of ecotoxicity data

Contents		Page
Foreword		xii
Introduction		xiii
1	Scope	1
2	Normative references	1
3	Terms and definitions	1
4	General statistical principles	8
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
5	Hypothesis testing	21
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

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

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