

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

J Biomech Eng. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2008 December 4.

Published in final edited form as:

J Biomech Eng. 2008 December; 130(6): 061019. doi:10.1115/1.2939273.

Field Variable Associations With Scratch Orientation-Dependence of UHMWPE Wear: A Finite Element Analysis

Matthew C. Paul^{†,*,‡}, Liam P. Glennon^{†,*}, Thomas E. Baer[†], and Thomas D. Brown^{†,*}

† Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA

* Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA

Wright Medical Technology, Inc., Arlington, TN

Abstract

Background—Scratches on the metal bearing surface of metal-on-polyethylene total joint replacements have been found to appreciably accelerate abrasive/adhesive wear of polyethylene, and constitute a source of the considerable variability of wear rate seen within clinical cohorts. Scratch orientation with respect to the local direction of relative surface sliding is presumably a factor affecting instantaneous debris liberation during articulation.

Method of Approach—A three-dimensional local finite element model was developed of orientation-specific polyethylene articulation with a scratched metal counterface, to explore continuum-level stress/strain parameters potentially correlating with the orientation dependence of scratch wear in a corresponding physical experiment.

Results—Computed maximum stress values exceeded the yield strength of ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) for all scratch orientations, but did not vary appreciably among scratch orientations. Two continuum-level parameters judged most consistent overall with the direction dependence of experimental wear were: (1) cumulative compressive total normal strain in the direction of loading, and (2) maximum instantaneous compressive total normal strain transverse to the sliding direction.

Conclusions—Such stress/strain metrics could be useful in global computational models of wear acceleration, as surrogates to incorporate anisotropy of local metal surface roughening.

Keywords

wear; wear surrogate; scratch wear; scratch orientation; finite element analysis; arthroplasty; THA; TKA; polyethylene; UHMWPE

INTRODUCTION

Roughening of the metal counterface is responsible for substantial increase of wear rate in metal-on-polyethylene total joint replacements 1-4. This arguably is the cause of much of the variability in wear rates and wear directions seen among individual patients within study cohorts 5-7. Retrieved femoral heads often show scratch damage (burnishing) involving substantial fractions of the head surface area. Determination of a consistent and direct relationship between conventional tribologic mean surface roughness parameters (R_a, R_p, etc.) and ensuing implant wear has proven elusive 8-10. This has prompted several groups to study

Corresponding author: Thomas D. Brown, Ph.D., Orthopaedic Biomechanics Laboratory, 2181 Westlawn, University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242. (319) 335-7528, Fax: (319) 335-7530, Email: tom-brown@uiowa.edu.

scratch patterns, toward a more definitive determinant of wear acceleration propensity 1,9, 11. Scratches are widely regarded as resulting from 3^{rd} body ingress into the bearing surface, the debris responsible being in forms such as bone mineral crystals, bone cement particles, radio-opacifier particles, porous coating particles, or metal frettings 8,9,12-14. It has been argued that even some 3^{rd} body particles that are (moderately) softer than the counterface are capable of causing scratching 14.

Scratch-induced wear of polyethylene (conventional or crosslinked) in total hip arthroplasty (THA) is due to local material failure. It seems reasonable that the direction of scratches on the metal counterface, relative to the direction of local sliding of the opposing polyethylene, would have an effect on the amount of wear produced during articulation. Past research involving scratch wear has presumed that the greatest wear occurs with scratches oriented perpendicular (90°) to the direction of motion 15-22. Plausibly, however, more wear debris might well be liberated at a more acute attack angle, for example, from shearing-off of polyethylene by scratch lip asperities.

Recent developments in whole-joint computational wear simulation have proven helpful for understanding individual prosthesis design parameters ²³, and for understanding the relative criticality of specific roughened regions in terms of accelerating wear ²⁴. To date, however, such models have not addressed scratch directionality. Such anisotropic influence might be implemented at the global analysis level using appropriate continuum surrogates, given formal mappings of scratch topography. Toward that end, a local computational model was developed to phenomenologically survey which stress/strain tensorial component(s), or which metric(s) involving several such components, might show orientation dependence resembling that observed experimentally. Such surrogate(s) could be useful to account for scratch-direction-dependent wear acceleration in global computational models incorporating anisotropic surface damage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The physical experiment to which the (below-described) finite element model was matched involved reciprocal motions of arrays of 550 parallel scratches, diamond-scribed at 150- μ m intervals on lapped (R_a < 100 nm) 316L stainless steel plates. These scratches had nominal lip heights, lip widths and furrow widths of 1.3, 22 and 23 μ m, respectively (Figure 1). The width of inter-scratch spacing and the dimensions of the individual scratches (which resemble typical large scratches found on retrievals ¹⁵) were such as to produce a substantial volume of wear in a relatively short time. This severe degree of damage was not intended to directly replicate an *in situ* articular environment, but rather to generate sufficient wear to facilitate discrimination of the effect of scratch directionality.

Using a Scotch yoke pin-on-plate fixture installed on a biaxial load frame, the scratched counterface plate was driven reciprocally against a simple flat-ended cylindrical 25.4 mm diameter polyethylene pin¹ (Figure 2), while loaded axially by 1269 N (nominal stress = 2.5 MPa). Parametric tests were conducted, in which the plate was moved across the polyethylene pin at angles of 0, 2.5, 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, 45, 60, and 90° relative to the scratch orientation. This was done both for both conventional polyethylene (CPE, HSS Reference, 4150HP, Poly Hi Solidur, Ft. Wayne, IN ²⁵) and for highly crosslinked polyethylene (HXPE, DePuy Marathon^{®2}, Warsaw, IN). The contact surface was kept immersed in 100% fetal bovine serum (treated with 10 mM EDTA and 0.01% sodium azide to prevent microbial growth), with wear periodically assessed gravimetrically. Tests were run to 90,000 cycles at an average (sinusoidal) sliding speed of 72 mm/s, with steady-state behavior typically ensuing at about 60,000 cycles.

A three-dimensional local finite element model (Figures 2,3) of this experiment was developed, to explore continuum-level stress/strain parameters potentially correlating with the direction-dependent interaction observed experimentally. Scratch-angle-specific meshes were generated to replicate the orientations of scratch traverse in the physical wear experiment. A loaded scratch was driven under displacement control across the polyethylene surface (Figure 3), with stress/strain data being registered at fiducial elements on the surface throughout course of scratch approach, over-passage and recession.

Finite element geometries were defined and meshed using PATRAN (r3, MSC.Software Corporation, Santa Ana, CA). These were input to the ABAQUS solver (v 6.4-2, ABAQUS, Inc., Pawtucket, RI), and were post-processed using ABAQUS/Viewer. Additional post-processing was performed using scripts custom-written in MATLAB 6.5.1 (The Mathworks, Inc., Natick, MA).

Although a suitably refined local finite element model for the entire testing interface would have been intractable, the physical system's periodicity allowed isolating a single scratch. This assumed, effectively, that the same local instantaneous stress-strain history would recur over and over at a given point on the polyethylene surface, due to large numbers of over-passages of identical scratches. A provisional assumption was made (subsequently verified computationally) that the inter-scratch-lip distance, scratch lip height, polyethylene material properties, and loading were such that contact occurred only on scratch lips, rather than also on the (flat) inter-scratch regions of the metal surface. Accordingly, the corresponding load per unit scratch lip length (185 N/m for the 1269 N loads used experimentally) was employed in the computational model. Since the polyethylene pin remained entirely within the scratched region of the plate, the total length of scratch lip "line contact" (6.8 m) remained constant throughout the duty cycle. A rectangular polyethylene solid of finite size and appropriate aspect ratio ²⁶ was generated for each specific scratch orientation.

Topographic data from a representative scratch lip profile were captured using a laser scanning microscope (0.01 μ m depth accuracy, 0.3 μ m sampling resolution), and directly transferred to the finite element model (Figure 1). Both the polyethylene surface and inter-scratch areas of the metal plate were modeled as flat.

Constitutively, UHMWPE was modeled using a fourth-order relationship for tangent modulus E as a function of von Mises stress, as reported by Cripton ²⁷. An h-convergence series run for a nominally corresponding Hertzian contact problem ²⁶ established that 0.3334 μ m was an appropriate dimension for the polyethylene elements. A rigid-on-deformable local contact condition was invoked, with a Coulombic friction coefficient of 0.038 ²⁸. The analysis was quasi-static and modeled nonlinear contact geometry. Boundary conditions specified for the respective faces of the polyethylene block were configured so as to have the block approximate an infinite half-space ²⁶.

The provisionally assumed simplification of the counterface topography to a single scratch lip was justified using a 2-D plane strain finite element simulation of sliding contact ²⁶, executed for nonlinear UHMWPE, under the full prescribed service load of 185 N/m. Under these conditions, stress field "disturbances" from neighboring scratches were effectively isolated from each other, as indeed even were those from the two scratch lips on opposing sides of a given scratch furrow. A reference node representing the rigid Bezier surface of the scratch lip was utilized to prescribe the kinematics of the scratch lip.

A metric was formulated to reflect cumulative mechanical stimulus to the polyethylene during an event of scratch approach, over-passage, and recession. Full tensorial stress and strain data were output for five fiducial elements located centrally on the polyethylene, at serial instants (typically, 50) throughout the slide event. The overall putative stimulus Φ delivered to a given

site on the polyethylene during a scratch encounter was indexed as follows. Consider a plausibly physically consequential instantaneous surrogate wear parameter φ . For example, φ might be an individual component of stress or an individual component of strain, or a function derived from some combination thereof (e.g., strain energy density). For a quasi-static sliding event, the cumulative stimulus Φ (Equation 1) can be characterized in terms of the history integral of the instantaneous value of the candidate stimulus parameter, i.e.,

$$\Phi = \int_{t=-\infty}^{t=\infty} \varphi \cdot dt \tag{1}$$

In the context of finite element analysis, where solutions are reported only at discrete times, and where (for tractability) the analysis is restricted only to the immediate "time neighborhood" of appreciable stress disturbance due to scratch encounter, the corresponding discretized expression (Equation (2)) is

$$\Phi = \sum_{i=i_0}^{i=i_{\max}} \varphi_i \Delta t_i \tag{2}$$

Here, i_0 is the first finite element solution increment for which supra-background stress ensues with oncoming scratch approach, i_{max} is the last solution increment for which suprabackground stress persists as the scratch recedes after over-passage, and Δt_i is the time increment between successive FEA solution reports.

The dimensional units of the kernel (φ) and the integrand (Φ) varied, according to the specific composition of the candidate mechanical stimulus. To facilitate commonality of subsequent correlation comparisons of potential surrogates with experimentally observed volumetric wear rates (units of *mm³/million cycles per mm²* of platen area, *A*, engaged), a dimensional compensation term γ was included in the surrogate computational volumetric wear (\vec{V}) prediction expression, Equation (3).

$$V = A * \Phi * \gamma \tag{3}$$

For example, if the candidate kernel parameter ϕ was compressive normal stress σ_{22} , the units

of $A * \Phi$ would be mm^2 (for A)* $\frac{N \cdot \sec}{mm^2}$ (for Φ), i.e. $N \cdot \sec$, in which case γ would need to take

units of $\frac{mm^3}{million \cdot cycles \cdot N \cdot sec}$. Thus, the units for each term in Equation (3) would be

$$\frac{mm^3}{million \cdot cycles} = mm^2 * \frac{N \cdot \sec}{mm^2} * \frac{mm^3}{million \cdot cycles \cdot N \cdot \sec}$$

Four separate registry treatments were considered to implement the Φ summation. The first of these involved summing all incremental kernel values, without segregating by algebraic sense; that is, negative values were combined with positive values, thus admitting the possibility of partial cancellation. In the second treatment, absolute values of each incremental φ were summed. The third and fourth treatments involved summing only the positive and only the negative φ values, respectively. Additionally, four non-summation-based metrics of mechanical stimulus were considered: the maximum peak-to-valley excursion for each kernel parameter φ , and that kernel parameter's algebraic maximum, algebraic minimum, and absolute maximum throughout the scratch passage event.

Wear correlations with plastic strains areas were also considered, prompted by the localized scratch finite element model reported by McNie *et al.*²⁹. For each scratch orientation, a

predetermined set of centrally-located surface/subsurface fiducial elements were interrogated for plastic strains occurring above specific thresholds. The total cross-sectional area (in the plane of the axes of loading and motion) was summed for those elements experiencing suprathreshold strains at any instant during the scratch encounter. The maximum instantaneous area of plastic strain above these specific thresholds was registered, as were the areas for principal plastic strain and maximum plastic shear strain. Again, plastic strain area results were segregated by maximum positive and negative values of strain, respectively, maximum absolute magnitudes of strain, and by residual plastic strain. These plastic strain areas were tabulated for 20 different plastic strain thresholds, spanning two orders of magnitude (0, 0.0005, 0.001–0.01 by increments of 0.001, and 0.01–0.09 by increments of 0.01). Additionally, the scratch angle dependence of the product of maximum instantaneous area of plastic strain thresholds. In total, 1,027 different stimulus variants were considered as possible surrogate metrics of wear, both for conventional and for highly crosslinked polyethylene (2,054 comparisons overall).

For both polyethylene variants, correspondence of the candidate metrics with the experimentally observed scratch direction-dependence of wear was evaluated both by objective measures of goodness-of-fit, and visually for specific qualitative criteria. All candidate metrics were formally ranked according to the average of three goodness-of-fit measures. The first of these measures was the cross-correlation coefficient r, defined ³⁰ as follows:

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i} (\Phi(i) - m_{\Phi}) (\widehat{V}(i) - m_{\overline{V}})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i}^{n_{\theta}} (\Phi(i) - m_{\Phi})^{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i}^{n_{\theta}} (\widehat{V}(i) - m_{\overline{V}})^{2}}}$$
(4)

Here, Φ and \hat{V} represent values of the surrogate metric and the experimental wear for a set of n_{θ} scratch angles, with $m\Phi$ and m_V denoting the respective means. The second goodness-offit measure was the area fraction \hat{A} shared by two respective wear-vs-direction curves, after normalization to ensure equal areas. The third measure of fit was an R² correlative statistic emerging from a random-fixed effects regression model. Briefly (details in Appendix A), analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed both including and not including the computational dataset as a predictor of the experimental dataset. The improvement in variance achieved by adding the computational dataset as a predictor yielded an R² statistic for that computational dataset. For visual assessments, plots of each φ parameter were reviewed manually throughout the individual scratch passage event, as were (normalized) plots of the corresponding Φ values versus angle-dependent experimental wear.

RESULTS

Experimentally, for conventional UHMWPE, a scratch oriented at 15° with respect to the sliding direction produced the greatest wear. The direction of greatest wear for crosslinked UHMWPE was 5°. In the finite element model, maximum stress values did not vary appreciably with scratch orientation. Rather, UHMWPE stresses achieved similarly supra-yield magnitudes for all scratch orientations. Peak normal stresses and principal stresses typically approached 60 MPa during scratch over-passage, while peak shear stresses were typically on the order of 10 MPa.

Two continuum wear surrogates were judged to most reasonably resemble the scratch lip direction-dependence observed experimentally. These two best-performing surrogates were (1) the cumulative compressive total normal strain in the direction of loading, and (2) the

maximum instantaneous compressive total normal strain in the direction transverse to sliding (Figure 4). "Total strain" in this context denotes the sum of elastic plus plastic logarithmic strain.

A truncated list of candidate surrogates demonstrating the best quality of fit to scratchdirection-dependent experimental wear is presented in Table 1. Overall, the various surrogates computed in the finite element simulation did not show an ability to better fit the angledependence of one polyethylene material variant as opposed to the other. The entire qualityof-fit distribution is presented in Figure 5. Illustrative angle-dependencies of fits of candidate metrics are displayed in Figure 6, demonstrating the spectrum of predictive capability. The relative performance of these particular parameters (with respect to the complete set of available candidates) can be appreciated from Figure 5.

Once the complete list of candidate mechanical stimulus parameters was ranked according to quality-of-fit Q, the highest-ranking candidates (those with $Q \ge 0.5$) were further screened visually, to ensure that they met four qualitative criteria. First, because desirable surrogate candidates needed to have a direction-dependent relationship that tended toward a single maximum, candidates presenting multiple discrete maxima of similar magnitude were eliminated from consideration. Similarly, candidates showing a relatively uniform distribution were excluded, as were those that had a global maximum at a scratch angle inconsistent with the experimental relationship. Fourth, since both positive-valued and negative-valued variants were evaluated for most potential surrogates, it seemed reasonable not to place credence in a given candidate (e.g., positive stress in the 2-direction) if its complement (negative stress in the 2-direction) was of far greater magnitude. Therefore, candidate surrogates involving normal stress were eliminated if their complement (reflecting physically distinct behavior in tension versus compression) was two or more orders of magnitude greater. Shear stress/strain components were eliminated if their complements were even nominally greater, since shear is physically similar for positive and negative values. Distribution choppiness (Fig 6a), per se, was not a basis for exclusion, provided that the Q value was high and that none of the above four exclusion criteria were applicable.

Two surrogates emerged as being overall most appropriate. These were (1) cumulative total (elastic + plastic) compressive normal strain in the direction of loading, and (2) maximum instantaneous total compressive normal strain transverse to the sliding direction. Secondary parametric influences (e.g., leading lip versus trailing lip passage, repeated lip passage residual strains) and variants of data normalization and interpolation are reported in detail elsewhere 26.

DISCUSSION

A reciprocal, unidirectional duty cycle was adopted experimentally in the interest of preserving consistent orientation between scratch direction and counterface motion, thereby allowing isolation of the specific effect - scratch directionality - under study. For wear of UHMWPE against polished counterfaces, it is well recognized that such a duty cycle fails to incorporate the crossing-path motions responsible for shearing off striations of polyethylene produced by asperity adhesion/abrasion, and thus tends to underestimate the wear occurring in the actual (*in vivo*) service environment 31,32. In the present experimental embodiment, however, besides achieving the desired effect of isolating the variable of primary interest (scratch directionality), there is a potent (indeed, arguably dominant) crossing-path effect, owing to scratch obliquity.

Computationally, the vast majority of the candidate mechanical parameters that were considered as potential wear surrogates turned out to correlate unremarkably (*i.e.*, 1,984 of the 2,054 considered had Q < 0.5), or indeed even poorly (1,063 had Q < 0.3) with the

experimentally observed scratch direction-dependence of polyethylene wear (Figure 6). The dominant shortcoming in that regard arose from failure to replicate the pronounced wear rate maximum consistently observed experimentally for scratches oriented at low angles $(5-15^{\circ})$ relative to the sliding direction. The local FEA model did not incorporate a formal material failure criterion to directly model abrasive/adhesive wear, but many of the potential wear surrogates considered were parameters that are strongly associated with continuum-level material failure processes (*e.g.*, first principal stress with tensile failure, von Mises stress with shear failure). Thus, one might reasonably infer that, had the local FEA model formally implemented a material failure mode, the scratch angle-dependence of such a failure process (*e.g.*, tensile failure) would have been very highly correlated with the scratch angle-dependence of the failure-associated surrogate measure (*i.e.*, first principal stress).

Given the observed insensitivity of the local stress and strain fields to scratch angle, one would not expect these simple metrics to be good predictors of angle-dependent wear rate. However, for metrics which implicitly incorporate a kinematic effect (e.g., stress or strain components transverse to the sliding direction), or those which explicitly incorporate a cumulative stimulus during scratch overpassage, the opportunities for correlation with physical wear mechanisms would seemingly be better. Although none of the individual surrogate mechanical parameters that were evaluated showed highly precise (Q > 0.9) or strong (Q > 0.7) replication of the experimentally observed relationship between scratch angle and wear rate, a small subset of them showed modest correlation (70 had Q > 0.5). Such surrogates therefore might plausibly be useful for phenomenological prediction of wear in FEA models of local asperities, and/or for making adjustments to global-level FEA wear predictions to possibly account for anisotropic roughening effects. Also, given these best-correlating parameters' associations with specific physical failure mechanisms, one might also reasonably infer the failure mechanism(s) associated with polyethylene wear rate acceleration in the presence of 3rd bodyinduced scratch damage of a metal counterface. In that regard, a "slicing" paradigm suggests itself quite compellingly, rather than the sort of a "plowing" mechanism intuitively associated with scratches oriented nearly perpendicular to the direction of relative surface motion.

Obviously, the stress distributions computed in the present local finite element model were predicated on the numbers, spacing, and lip height of scratches being such that the global contact load was supported entirely by "line contact" with scratch lips, rather than being supported substantially by unscratched surface regions. While this local FEA model was a realistic replication of the corresponding physical testing set-up, the latter had been deliberately designed to generate very large amounts of debris in short periods of time, in order to accentuate possible directional differences. The particular scratch profile utilized experimentally and computationally was representative of typical *in vivo* 3rd body damage, but the numbers/ spacing of such scratches in the model corresponded to a situation far more abusive than would conceivably be tolerable in vivo. (As a point of reference, the absolute wear factor for the present 15° scratch angle experiments for conventional polyethylene averaged $5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mm}^{3/2}$ N-m, whereas typical wear factors for borderline-wear-problematic THA implants are on the order of 1.2–1.9x10⁻⁶ mm³/N-m ^{39,108}.) Nevertheless, even though the great majority of load in clinical THA constructs is presumably supported by polished/ undamaged surface regions rather than by scratch lips, the present data arguably isolate the direction-dependence of wear rate acceleration due to whatever population of scratches happens to be physically present.

The maximum instantaneous area of plastic strain during scratch engagement was found to correlate fairly well with the experimental scratch-direction-dependence of wear, supporting the results of McNie *et al.*'s 2-D FEA work on scratch asperity damage to UHMWPE ^{15,29}. The results of the present study are also consistent with that group's observation that the area (or volume, in the case of the present 3-D formulation) of polyethylene undergoing plastic

strain may more reliably relate to wear volume than does the magnitude of maximum plastic strain *per se*.

High surface and subsurface plastic strains have been associated with the initiation of both surface ripples ³³ and with fatigue micro-cracks on or below the surface ²⁹. The migration of such micro-cracks to the surface is believed to promote formation of polyethylene debris, potentially encouraging liberation of fibers or ridges tens of microns in length ³⁴. In the present study, such large fibers were ubiquitous in particle populations harvested from the lubricant (Figure 7) when a scratched counterface was involved. As a negative control, an otherwise similar non-roughened metal plate (R_a< 100 nm) reciprocating against polyethylene produced particles of submicron or micron size (Figure 7), resembling the predominant volumetric fraction of particles observed to surround total joints *in vivo*.

In summary, a finite element model was used to investigate the sliding articulation of polyethylene with parametrically-oriented scratch lips, surveying field variable histories in an attempt to identify continuum parameters empirically associated with corresponding experimentally-determined wear dependence. All candidate parameters were graphically reviewed manually, and were formally ranked statistically. The best correlating of these surrogates - two variants of compressive total strain - potentially provide a basis by which to account for anisotropic scratch damage in global FEA models of accelerated wear due to articulation against roughened femoral heads.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by grants from the NIH (AR46601, AR47653). Technical assistance was provided by Dr. N. M. Grosland, Dr. S. L. Hillis, Mr. W. D. Lack, Dr. D. R. Pedersen, and Mr. K. J. Stewart.

References

- Cooper JR, Dowson D, Fisher J. Macroscopic and microscopic wear mechanisms in ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene. Wear 1993;162–64:378, 384.(Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Wear of Materials, Apr 13–16 1993)
- Wang A, Polineni VK, Stark C, Dumbleton JH. Effect of femoral head surface roughness on the wear of ultrahigh molecular weight polyethylene acetabular cups. Journal of Arthroplasty 1998;13:615, 20. [PubMed: 9741435]
- McKellop H, Clarke IC, Markolf KL, Amstutz HC. Wear characteristics of UHMW polyethylene: a method for accurately measuring extremely low wear rates. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research 1978;12:895, 927. [PubMed: 739020]
- Muratoglu OK, Burroughs BR, Christensen SD, Lozynsky A, Harris WH. In vitro knee simulator wear of highly crosslinked tibias articulating against explanted rough femoral components. Trans 50th Orth Res Soc 2004:0297.
- Brown TD, Stewart KJ, Nieman JC, Pedersen DR, Callaghan JJ. Local head roughening as a factor contributing to variability of total hip wear: a finite element analysis. Journal of Biomechanical Engineering 2002;124:691, 8. [PubMed: 12596637]
- 6. Schmalzried TP, Dorey F, McClung C, Scott D. The contribution of wear mechanism(s) to variability in wear rates. Trans 45th Orth Res Soc 1999:0287.
- Goldsmith AA, Dowson D, Wroblewski BM, Siney PD, Fleming PA, Lane JM. The effect of activity levels of total hip arthroplasty patients on socket penetration. J Arthroplasty 2001;16:620–7. [PubMed: 11503122]
- Elfick AP, Hall RM, Pinder IM, Unsworth A. The influence of femoral head surface roughness on the wear of ultrahigh molecular weight polyethylene sockets in cementless total hip replacement. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research 1999;48:712, 8. [PubMed: 10490687]
- 9. Sychterz CJ, Engh CA Jr, Swope SW, McNulty DE, Engh CA. Analysis of prosthetic femoral heads retrieved at autopsy. Clin Orthop 1999;358:223–34. [PubMed: 9973995]

- Elfick APD, Hall RM, Pinder IM, Unsworth A. The influence of femoral head surface roughness on the wear of ultrahigh molecular weight polyethylene sockets in cementless total hip replacement. J Biomed Mater Res 1999;48:712–718. [PubMed: 10490687]
- Jasty M, Bragdon CR, Lee K, Hanson A, Harris WH. Surface damage to cobalt-chrome femoral head prostheses. Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - British Volume 1994;76:73, 7. [PubMed: 8300686]
- McKellop HA, Campbell P, Park SH, Schmalzried TP, Grigoris P, Amstutz HC, Sarmiento A. The origin of submicron polyethylene wear debris in total hip arthroplasty. Clinical Orthopaedics & Related Research 1995;311:3–20. [PubMed: 7634588]
- Atkinson JR, Dowson D, Isaac GH, Wroblewski BM. Laboratory wear tests and clinical observations of the penetration of femoral heads into acetabular cups in total replacement hip joints: II. A microscopical study of the surfaces of Charnley polyethylene acetabular sockets. Wear 1985;104:225–244.
- Mirghany M, Jin ZM. Prediction of scratch resistance of cobalt chromium alloy bearing surface, articulating against ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene, due to third-body wear particles. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part H - Journal of Engineering in Medicine 2004;218:41, 50.
- McNie CM, Barton DC, Ingham E, Tipper JL, Fisher J, Stone MH. Prediction of polyethylene wear rate and debris morphology produced by microscopic asperities on femoral heads. Journal of Materials Science: Materials in Medicine 2000;11:163–174. [PubMed: 15348045]
- 16. Endo MM, Barbour PS, Barton DC, Fisher J, Tipper JL, Ingham E, Stone MH. Comparative wear and wear debris under three different counterface conditions of crosslinked and non-crosslinked ultra high molecular weight polyethylene. Bio-Medical Materials & Engineering 2001;11:23–35. [PubMed: 11281576]
- Minakawa H, Stone MH, Wroblewski BM, Lancaster JG, Ingham E, Fisher J. Quantification of thirdbody damage and its effect on UHMWPE wear with different types of femoral head. J Bone Joint Surg Br 1998;80:894–9. [PubMed: 9768905]
- Fisher J, Firkins P, Reeves EA, Hailey JL, Isaac GH. The influence of scratches to metallic counterfaces on the wear of ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene. Proc Inst Mech Eng [H] 1995;209:263–4.
- Dowson D. The role of counterface imperfections in the wear of polyethylene. Wear 1987;119:277– 293.
- Dharmastiti R, Barton DC, Fisher J, Edidin A, Kurtz S. The wear of orie nted UHMWPE under isotropically rough and scratched counterface test conditions. Bio-Medical Materials & Engineering 2001;11:241, 56. [PubMed: 11564907]
- 21. Kamali A, Farrar R, Stone MH, Fisher J. The effects of scratched femoral components on UHMWPE wear in rotating platform mobile bearing TKR. Trans 7th World Congress Biomaterials. 2004
- 22. Turell M, Wang A, Bellare A. Quantification of the effect of cross-path motion on the wear rate of ultra high molecular weight polyethylene. Wear 2003;255:1034–1039.
- Maxian TA, Brown TD, Pedersen DR, Callaghan JJ. The Frank Stinchfield Award. 3-Dimensional sliding/contact computational simulation of total hip wear. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1996 Dec;(333): 41–50. [PubMed: 8981881]
- Lundberg HJ, Stewart KJ, Callaghan JJ, Brown TD. Kinetically-critical sites of femoral head roughening for wear rate acceleration in total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2005;(430):89, 93. [PubMed: 15662308]
- 25. Bennet AP, Wright TM, Li S. Global reference UHMWPE: characterization and comparison to conventional UHMWPE. Trans 42nd Orth Res Soc 1996;21:472.
- 26. Paul, MC. Localized finite element analysis of orientation-specific scratch traverse across UHMWPE. Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Iowa; 2004. M. S. Thesis
- Cripton, PA. Compressive characterization of ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene with applications to contact stress analysis of total knee replacements. Queen's University at Kingston; 1993. M. S. Thesis
- Scifert CF, Brown TD, Pedersen DR, Callaghan JJ. A finite element analysis of factors influencing total hip dislocation. Clin Orthop 1998 Oct;(355):152–62. [PubMed: 9917600]

- 29. McNie C, Barton DC, Stone MH, Fisher J. Prediction of plastic strains in ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene due to microscopic asperity interactions during sliding wear. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part H - Journal of Engineering in Medicine 1998;212:49, 56.
- 30. Image Processing Toolbox User's Guide. Two–dimensional correlation coefficient between two matrices (Function reference corr2). 2004. The Mathworks, Inc., Natick, MA.
- Bragdon CR, O'Connor DO, Lowenstein JD, Jasty M, Biggs SA, Harris WH. A new pin-on-disk wear testing method for simulating wear of polyethylene on cobalt-chrome alloy in total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2001 Aug;16:658–65. [PubMed: 11503127]
- Elfick AP, Hall RM, Pinder IM, Unsworth A. Wear in retrieved acetabular components: effect of femoral head radius and patient parameters. J Arthroplasty 1998 Apr;13(3):291–5. [PubMed: 9590640]
- 33. Wang A, Stark C, Dumbleton JH. Mechanistic and morphological origins of ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene wear debris in total joint replacement prostheses.[comment]. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part H - Journal of Engineering in Medicine 1996;210:141, 55.
- Wang A, Sun DC, Stark C, Dumbleton JH. Wear mechanisms of UHMWPE in total joint replacements. Wear 1995;181–183:241, 249.(Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Wear of Materials, Apr 9–13 1995)

Appendix A

Random/Fixed-Effects Statistical Regression Model M1 mean model with random subject effects:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + s_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

 y_{ij} is the outcome for the

*j*th subject (scratched plate) j = 1, 2, ..., n,

*i*th angle i = 1, 2, ..., t

• n = 3 subjects/plates, t = 10 angles

- $N = nt = 3 \cdot 10 = 30$ total outcomes
- s_i (the subject effects) are normally distributed with mean 0 and variance σ^2
- ε_{ii} (individual observation errors) are normally distributed with mean 0 and variance σ^2

ANOVA table:

SOURCE subject	SS SS(subj) $t \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_{i,i} - y_{i,i})^2$	df n-1
error(residual)	$SS(error) \sum_{i=1}^{J-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (y_{ij} - y_{.j})^2$	<i>N</i> - <i>n</i> -1
	SS(subj) – sum of squares due to subjects	
	SS(error) - sum of squares due to error (or residual)	
	Subscript y.j denotes the average of all angles i, for sub	pject j
	Subscript y denotes the average of all subjects across	all the angles
	From these compute:	

MS(subj)=SS(subj)/(n-1) and

MS(error)=SS(error)/[N-n].

The variance estimates are the following: error variance=MS(error)

subject variance=[MS(subj) - MS(error)]/n.

Note: if subject variance is negative, then it is set equal to 0.

M2 model with predictor and fixed subject effects: $y_{ij}=\beta_0+\beta_1x_{ij}+s_j+\varepsilon_{ij}$

where y_{ij} , s_j , and ε_{ij} are the same as before, and

 x_{ij} is the predicted value for the outcome y_{ij} obtained from the candidate surrogate.

- Note that $x_{ij} = x_i$ (same prediction for each subject)
- Same assumptions on subject and error terms as in M1.

Slope and intercept estimates $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$, using standard formulas for simple linear regression, are:

$$\widehat{\beta}_{1} = \frac{SS_{xy}}{SS_{xx}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})(y_{ij} - \overline{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})^{2}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}y_{ij} - N\overline{xy}}{\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_{ij} - \overline{x})^{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\beta}_{0} = \overline{y} - \widehat{\beta}_{1}\overline{x}$$

Alternatively, if applying MATLAB software, one can also use the matrix formula

 $\widehat{\beta} = (X'X)^{-1}XY_{\sim}$ where X contains a column vector of ones and a column vector with the x values (repeated three times end-to-end), X' denotes the transpose of X, and $\stackrel{Y}{\sim}$ is the outcome column vector of all three random subjects y_{i1} , y_{i2} , and y_{i3} , listed end-to-end.

Then $\widehat{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\beta}_0 \\ \widehat{\beta}_1 \end{bmatrix}$

The predicted value, \hat{y}_{ij} , for each angle on each plate, using fixed subject effects, is: $\widehat{y}_{ij} = \widehat{\beta}_0 + \widehat{\beta}_1 x_{ij} + \widehat{s}_j$ (where $x_{ij} = x_i$)

- we treat subjects as fixed
- $s_i = \bar{y}_{,i} \bar{y}_{,i}$ is the estimate for subject effect, treating subjects as fixed.

ANOVA table:

SOURCE subject	SS <u>n</u>	df n-1
	SS(subj) $t \sum_{\substack{j=1\\j \in I}} (y, j - y)^2$	
error(residual)	$SS(error) \sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{i=1}^{H} (y_{ij} - \hat{y}_{ij})^2$	N-n
	<u>1-1</u> J-1 0 0	

Then, with

MS(subj)=SS(subj)/(n-1) and MS(error)=SS(error)/[N-n-1],

the variance estimates are again: error variance=MS(error) and subject variance =[MS(subj) - MS(error)]/n.

> Then **R** – **squared** is (var1 – Var2)/Var1= [(**M1** subject variance+**M1** residual variance) –(**M2** subject variance+**M2** residual variance)] /(**M1** subject variance+**M1** residual variance)





Figure 1.

(Top) Laser scanning microscopy image of custom scratch profile created on 316L stainless steel. (Note the scale differences, which accentuate the scratch for visual emphasis.) (Bottom) Scratch profile (cross-section) employed as the counterface surface in the FE model.



Figure 2.

(A) Pin-plate articulating couple used in polyethylene-stainless steel reciprocating wear tester. The parallel scratches on surface of the metal platen are spaced 150 μ m apart. (B) The corresponding polyethylene continuum mesh (white) and analytical scratched stainless steel surface (gray) utilized in the finite element model. (C) Enlarged view illustrating the spatial refinement of the polyethylene mesh in the region used for data registry.



Figure 3.

Contour plot of instantaneous longitudinal normal stress during passage of a scratch oriented at 45°. Note the edge effect near the sides of the block. Fiducial nodes for stress registry were therefore located along the block centerline.



Figure 4.

The two surrogate mechanical stimuli judged to best resemble the scratch lip directiondependence of experimental wear. "Total strain" refers to the sum of elastic and plastic strain in the specified component direction.





Figure 5.

Statistical fit distribution for all 2,054 comparisons of surrogate candidates to experimental wear. Selected cases (red dots) are illustrated in Figure 6, in order of decreasing quality of fit. Note: after the worst-fitting candidate listed above (#1310, quality of fit = 0.046), for administrative/procedural reasons, all remaining candidates involved incomplete datasets, and were assigned a quality of fit = 0.





Figure 6.

Selected plots of computational surrogate candidates representing a variety of mechanical stimuli and a range of statistical fit quality. These twelve plots correspond to the respective symbols on the distribution curve in Figure 5.



Figure 7.

UHMWPE debris particles collected from the experimental apparatus following articulation. (a) Particles generated by a scratched surface were typically orders larger than the most biologically reactive submicron debris. Here, a particle of crosslinked UHMWPE is presented, produced by a scratch orientation of 5°. (b) A smooth articulation couple produced debris that were of submicron- or micron-order size, similar to the overwhelming volumetric fraction of particles found in tissues surrounding an implanted total joint *in vivo*. Further details regarding the relationships between local stress fields and sliding parameters are reported elsewhere²⁶.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 1

r, (2) fraction of shared area \hat{A} in normalized plots of the two given datasets, and (3) correlative statistic R^2 from a fixed/random effects ANOVA statistical model (See Appendix A). The complete rank list is provided in Appendix B (page 30). Please refer to the key following Best-performing 2.5% of the fits for the 2,054 mechanical stimulus candidates to experimentally observed UHMWPE wear (1,027 each for conventional and crosslinked UHMWPE). The tabulated quality of fit Q is the average of three measures: (1) 2-D correlation coefficient table for abbreviations.

Mtl	x	>	X	X	Х	Х	X	Х	Х	X	>	>	>	Х	Х	X	>	>	>	>	>	X	>	Х	X	X	Х	X	X	Х	X	Х	Х	X	x
Thrsh	0.002		0.005	0.005			0.006	0.005	0.005		0.0005	0.0005	0.005	0	0	0.005			0.006	0.001	0.002	0.02	0.002	0.03	0	0.007	0.02	0.02	0.006				0.03	0.03	
Rgy	M_{X+}	Mx+	M	Mx-	M	Mx^+		M	Mx+		Mx^{-}	Mx^+	Mx+	M	Mx-		Mx^{-}	ĺ	Mx-	Mx^{-}	Mx^{-}		Mx_+				M	$M_{X^{-}}$		Ĵ	M	Mx+			Ĺ
Cmp	22	23	MnP	MnP	MxP	MxP	"M"	MxP	MxP	Gnl	МхР	MnP	MnP	MnP	MnP	MxS	13	13	22	МхР	МхР	"M"	MnP	MxS	MxS	"E,	MnP	MnP	"E"	22	23	23	"M"	"E,	3rd
61	I		I	I	I	I	Ι	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Ι	I	Η	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Н	I	I	I	I	Н
Stm	APS	TS	APS	APS	TS	TS	APS	APS	APS	PSE	APS	APS	APS	M^*A	M^*A	APS	TS	TS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	M^*A	APS	APS	APS	APS	s	s	S	APS	APS	S
ð	0.525	0.525	0.519	0.519	0.518	0.518	0.518	0.517	0.517	0.517	0.516	0.516	0.516	0.516	0.516	0.514	0.511	0.510	0.508	0.506	0.505	0.504	0.504	0.504	0.503	0.503	0.503	0.503	0.503	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.500	0.500
Rank	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	<u>66</u>	67	68	69	70
Mtl	Λ	×	>	>	×	X	>	×	X	X	x	X	X	x	X	×	>	X	x	x	X	X	x	>	X	x	>	x	x	X	X	>	>	>	>
Thrsh		0.07			0.009	0.009		0.009	0.009	0.009	0.01	0.01			0.05	0.02	0.0005			0		0.03	0.03			0.006		0.007	0.006	0.006		0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001
Rgy	(+)		Mx^{-}	Ĵ	M	Mx-	ΡV		M	Mx+	M	Mx-	M	Mx-			Mx_+	M	Mx-		M	M	Mx^+	(+)			Mx+		M	Mx-	Mx+	M_{X-}	Mx+	Mx+	Mx-
Cmp	23	Е.,	22	22	MnP	MnP	22	MxS	MxP	MxP	MnP	MnP	33	33	"Е,	MxS	=	MnP	MnP	,Е,	23	MxP	MxP	23	MxS	MxS	23	"M,	MnP	MnP	22	12	22	MnP	12
Π	Н	- 1	I	Η	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Ι	I	Ι	I	I	I	I	I	Н	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Stm	PS	APS	TS	TS	APS	APS	TS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	TS	TS	APS	APS	APS	TS	TS	M^*A	TS	APS	APS	TS	TS	APS	PS	APS	APS	APS	s	APS	APS	APS	APS
ð	0.623	0.614	0.597	0.589	0.578	0.578	0.576	0.575	0.573	0.573	0.569	0.569	0.559	0.559	0.556	0.553	0.549	0.548	0.548	0.546	0.546	0.541	0.541	0.539	0.537	0.535	0.531	0.531	0.529	0.529	0.529	0.528	0.528	0.528	0.526
Rank	1	0	б	4	S	9	L	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35

Paul et al.

(Cumulative) History; **Cmp = Component**; 11 = stimulus in the 1-plane, and in the 1-direction; $3^{rd} = 3^{rd}$ Invariant of stress (determinant of the stress tensor); "E" = "Equivalent" (ABAQUS effective

MA = Magnitude of Area of plastic strain; PS = Plastic Strain; PSE = Plastic Strain Energy; TS = Total Strain; TSE = Total Strain Energy; TD = Temporal Designation; I = Instantaneous; H =

values; (-) = Negative values; Mx+ = Max positive; Mx- = Max negative; [M] = Max (instantaneous) absolute magnitude; [m] = max (cumulative) absolute magnitude; PV = max cyclic Peak-to-Valley swing (suggestive of a fatigue measure for failure); Res = Residual (plastic strain); Thrsh = Threshold (of plastic strain, used in computing an area of plastic strain); Mtl = Material; V = conventional Min Principal; MxP = Max Principal; Nml = Normal state; prs = equivalent pressure; Shr = Shear state; Tca = Tresca effective stress; vM = von Mises effective stress; Rgy = Registry; (+) = Positive value for consolidated tensorial components); Gnl = General state (normal state plus shear state); "M" = "Magnitude" (ABAQUS effective magnitude for consolidated tensorial components); MnP =

UHMWPE; X = highly crosslinked UHMWPE.

_	
T	
_	
U	
~	
-	
~	
-	
<u>ں</u>	
\sim	
0	
_	
-	
<	
_	
0)	
~	
-	
<u> </u>	
(0)	
0,	
0	
~	
—	
0	
-	

NIH-PA Author Manuscript		ant wear. Please refer to Table 1 key for abbreviations.
NIH-PA Author Manuscript	Appendix B	all ranked candidate surrogates for scratch angle-depende
NIH-PA Auth		Complete listing of a

7
\leq
=
- E -
~
\rightarrow
\leq
<u> </u>
#
<u>ں</u>
0
-
2
-
<u>ш</u>
5
1
<u> </u>
S
-

Paul et al.

ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.525\\ 0.519\\ 0.519\\ 0.518\\ 0.519\\ 0.518\\ 0.517\\ 0.518\\ 0.516\\ 0.517\\ 0.516\\ 0.517\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.517\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.516\\ 0.502\\ 0.503\\ 0.$	0.482
Mtl	*****	>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.0005
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	M
Cmp	22 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 2	11
Π		I
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS
Rank	$\begin{smallmatrix} & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ & 3 & 3 & 3$	139
ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.623\\ 0.578\\ 0.578\\ 0.578\\ 0.578\\ 0.578\\ 0.577\\ 0.$	0.497
Mtl	>x>>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	X
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.07\\ 0.009\\ 0.009\\ 0.000\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.000\\ 0.0$	
Rgy	(+) WW WW WW WW WW WW WW W	ΡV
Cmp	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	vM
τD	¥==¥======¥===========================	г
Stm	PS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS TS	s
Rank	888888888888888888888888427335333333338687657557552555555555555555555555555555	89

0	0.482 0.482 0.482 0.482 0.481 0.481 0.480	0.480 0.480 0.480 0.479 0.479 0.478 0.477 0.478 0.477 0.477 0.478 0.477 0.477	0.477 0.477 0.476 0.476 0.476 0.476 0.476 0.475 0.475 0.475 0.475 0.475	0.475 0.474 0.454 0.454 0.453 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.452	0.452 0.452 0.452 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.450 0.450 0.449 0.448 0.448 0.448 0.448 0.448
Mtl	*****	·>>>××>×××××××	****	>>××>>>>>>;	>>>×>>×>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	0.004	0.002 0.002 0.004 0.005 0.001 0.001 0.004	0.004 0.006 0.006 0.005	0.03 0.02 0.02 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.0005	0.00 0.000 0.008 0.003 0.01 0.01 0.007 0.007
Rgy	$\begin{array}{c} M_{X+} \\ (-) \\ M_{X-} \\ M_{X-} \end{array}$	$\begin{bmatrix} M \\ M $	$\begin{array}{c} Mx_+\\ M \\ Mx_+\\ Mx_+\\ Mx_+\\ PV\\ PV\end{array}$	M MX +XM MX - MX - MX - MX- MX-	MX+ MX+ MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX-
Cmp	MxS Tca vM 22 Prs 22 MxP MxP	12 MnP MnP Mr Mr Mr Mr Mr	MXP MXP MXP MXP MXP MXP 12 23 23 Nml Nml		333338 <mark>x</mark> 8 33338 ^x 8
D		=		,	
Stm	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS PS APS S S S S S S S S S	TS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	140 141 142 143 144 145 146	14 148 151 151 152 155 155 155 155 155 155	160 164 165 166 166 166 169	221 222 222 222 222 222 222 222 222 222	233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 241 242 241 242 243 244 245 244 245 244 245 244 245 244 245 244 245 246 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247
ð	0.497 0.497 0.497 0.497 0.497 0.497 0.497	0.497 0.497 0.496 0.496 0.496 0.495 0.495 0.495 0.495 0.494 0.494	$\begin{array}{c} 0.494\\ 0.493\\ 0.493\\ 0.493\\ 0.493\\ 0.493\\ 0.492\\ 0.492\\ 0.492\\ 0.492\\ 0.492\\ 0.492\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.492\\ 0.475\\ 0.475\\ 0.475\\ 0.473\\ 0.473\\ 0.471\\ 0.$	0.4.0 0.470 0.469 0.467 0.467 0.465 0.465 0.465 0.465 0.465 0.464 0.464 0.464 0.463 0.464
Mtl	****	· × × > > × × × × × × × × ×	:××>××>××××	x>xxx>x>>>>>:	>>>>>×>>×
Thrsh	0.004	0.005	0.009	0 0008	0.003 0.003 0.001 0.001 0.006 0.006 0.006
Rgy	V V M V C	MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX- MX-	$ \begin{bmatrix} PV \\ MX \\ M$	$\begin{array}{c} M_{X+}^{X}\\ M_{X-}^{X}\\ M_{X-}^{Y}\\ M_{X+}^{Y}\\ M_{X-}^{Y}\\ M_{X-}^{Y}\\$	$\begin{array}{c} [M]\\ MX_{+}\\ MX$
Cmp	3rd MxS 23 23 23 27 22 Gnl 33	MnP MnP MnP 22 33d MnP Nml Nml MnP MnP MnP MnP MnP MnP MnP MnP MnP MnP	333 222 222 222 111 112 222 223 33 223 33 223 33 37 0 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8	MxP 33 33 4 53 53 7 53 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	3rd 3rd 112 112 112 112 112 122 123 124 122 124 122 124 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125
Ω	#				
Stm	S S APS TSE PSE PSE TSE TSE	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	M*A TS PS PS PS PS SS SS SS SS SS SS SS SS SS	S S APS APS APS S S S APS S APS APS S APS
Rank	90 92 97 97	108 108 109 109 109 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	110 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111	120 171 172 173 175 176 177 178 177 178 179 179	182 182 183 184 184 183 184 183 192 191 192 192

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	0.448 0.447 0.447 0.447 0.447 0.447 0.447 0.445 0.445	0.445 0.445 0.445 0.445 0.445 0.445 0.445 0.444 0.445 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444	0.444 0.442 0.427 0.427 0.427 0.426 0.426 0.426 0.426 0.426 0.426	0.425 0.425 0.425 0.425 0.423 0.423 0.423 0.423 0.422 0.422 0.422 0.422 0.422	0.422 0.422 0.422 0.421 0.421 0.421 0.421
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	*>>>*>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	**>>>>>>	<>××>>>×>×>>×	***
Thrsh	0.008 0.001 0.002 0.003 0.003 0.003	0.006 0.006 0.009 0.009	0.02 0.005 0.003 0.003 0.003	0.0005 0.02 0.005 0.005 0.0005 0.0005	0.006 0.004 0.05 0.05
Rgy	MX- MX- MX- MX- MX+ PV PV	PA MW MW MW MW MW MW MW MW MW MW	MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX M	MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX	M_{X+} M_{X+} M_{X-} M_{X-}
Cmp	22 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 3	12 MXP MXP MXP Sbr 13 33 33 23 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33	MxP 22 22 22 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23	, 12 , 12 , 12 , 13 , 13 , 13 , 13 , 14 , 15 , 15 , 15 , 15 , 15 , 15 , 15	23 23 MxP 23 23 MxP 23 23 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25
TD		X_	H_		
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS S S S S S S	TS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS AP	PS APS APS PS PS PS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS APS S S S S S S APS APS	APS S APS S APS APS APS APS
Rank	246 247 248 249 251 251 253 253	255 255 255 255 255 255 261 262 263 264 265 265 265 265 265 265	268 269 321 322 323 323 323 323 323 323 323	330 331 333 333 333 333 333 333 333 333	345 345 346 349 350 351
ð	0.463 0.461 0.461 0.461 0.461 0.460 0.460 0.460	0.460 0.466 0.457 0.457 0.457 0.457 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455	0.454 0.454 0.454 0.440 0.439 0.433 0.437 0.437 0.437 0.437 0.437 0.437	0.436 0.436 0.436 0.436 0.436 0.436 0.435 0.455 0.45	0.434 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433
Mť	*****	>>×>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	*>>>>>	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	->>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	0.01 0.01 0.005 0.0005	0 0.007 0.002 0.005 0.006 0.003 0.006	0.0005 0.001 0.001 0.008 0.008	0.008 0.008 0.007 0.007 0.005 0.005	0.007
Rgy	PV PV MX+ MX+ MX+ +)	MW + XW + XW	$ \begin{array}{c} M_{X+} \\ (-) \\ M_{X+} $	PV PV MX MX MX MX MX MX PV PV PV PV PV	PV Mx- Mx-
Cmp	MxS 833 12 12 12 12 12	233 833 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 333 Winp 10 Winp 1	22222223333232333333333333333333333333	н 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	MXS Tca MXS MnP MnP MnP
D	LTTTTTTT		_ = = =		
Stm	APS S PS APS APS APS S S S	M*A M*A PS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	TS S APS APS APS S S S S S S S S S S S S	TAPS PS PS PS PS PS PS PS PS PS PS PS PS P	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Rank	196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203	204 205 205 209 209 211 212 215 215 215 215 215 215 215 215	218 219 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 277 27	2 280 2 282 2 283 2 291 2 292 2 291 2 291 2 291 2 292 2 20 2 292 2 292 2 2 2	295 295 300 301 301

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

0	$0.421 \\ 0.421$	0.420 0.419	0.419 0.418	0.418 0.418 0.418	0.418	0.418 0.416	0.416 0.416	0.415	0.415	0.415 0.414	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404 0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404 0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404	0.404 0.404	0.404	0.404 0.404	0.404
Mtl	> × (>>;	×>>	>>>	· > ;	× >	××	>>	>>	>>	××	××	××	××	××	×	××	X	× >	××	××	××	××	< ×	X	××	××	X	×	××	X	××	X;	××	××
Thrsh		0.003	0.003	0.006	0.006			0.007	C00.0	0.005	00	0	00	00	0 0.004	0.003	0.003 0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.0005	0.0005	00	0	00	0 0	0	0	0.003	0.002	0.0005	0 0	00	00
Rgy	PV Mx-	PV Mx-	Mx-		Mx-	ΡV	ΡV	M	ΡV	M	Res	Res	Res Res	Res	Res	Σ	M	M	Z	M	M	W	M	M	M	Z	W	Μ	M W	Mx-	Mx-	Mx- Mx-	Mx-	Mx- Mx-	Mx- Mx-
Cmp	Shr 33	11	13 25	12 12 MnP	MnP	MnP	11 22	"M"	13	33 "E"	13 5	MnP	MxP 33	52	11 MnP	MnP	MxP MnP	MxP	22 MaD	MxP	22 MnP	MxP	22	c7 E1	12	MnP	MXF 33	22	II MnD	MnP	MnP	MnP	23	13	MnP MxP
TD	нн	ц ц ,			чщ		I H	ц	1 1	I		- 1	1 -	чц		ц		I		- 1	1 1	I	1		I	_ -		Ι		- 11	I		I,		
Stm	PSE PS	S APS	APS APS	PS APS	APS	S S	TS PS	APS	ST	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS
Rank	352 353	354 355	350 357 250	359 360	361 361	362 363	364 365	366 367	368 368	369 370	421	423	424 425	426	427 428	429	430 431	432	433	435	436 437	438	439	440 441	442	443	445 445	446	447 848	449	450	451 452	453	454 455	456 457
õ	$0.432 \\ 0.432$	0.432 0.432	0.430 0.430 0.430	0.429 0.429 0.429	0.429	0.429 0.429	0.429 0.429	0.428	0.428 0.428	0.428 0.428	0.413	0.413	0.412	0.412	0.412 0.412	0.412	0.411 0.411	0.410	0.410	0.410	0.409	0.409	0.408	0.408	0.407	0.407	0.407	0.407	0.406	0.406	0.406	0.406 0.405	0.405	0.405 0.405	0.405
Mtl	> X	>>;	>>>	>×>	•>;	>>	>>	×>	>>	×>	×>	×	>>	×	>×	:>;	×>	>;	>>	< ×	×>	· >	>;	> ×	>	>>	>>	>	>>	< ×	X	××	X;	××	XX
Thrsh		0.006	0.008	0.001					0.05	0.0005	0.006	0000	0.006	0.003	0.003	0.007	0.008		10.0	10.0					0.003	0.006	0.005	0.005		0.007	0.007	0.007	0.003	0.003 0.002	0.002
Rgy	()	Ν	MX+ MX+	Mx+ PV	N N	-XIM M	Mx- PV	(+)	- VIVI	Mx+	m Mv+	PV	M Wv-	Mx-	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+	MX+	W	Mx-	ΡV	m		M	- XIVI	M		M	Mx-	V Vd	> 1	W	Mx- Mx+	W;	Mx- MI	Mx-
Cmp	23 MxS	"Mn MnP	22 23	13 13 27	222	33	33 13	22	с" "	<u>15</u>	23	13 5	23 73	525	23 MnP	53	53 57	= :	11 "M"	33 M	13 MvS	W,	53 53	3.6	22	MxS "T"	23 E	23	, E	MxS	MnP	MnF 11	23 23	53 53	23 "M"
TD	ΗI	ц ц ,			ч н ,		I	H I	- 1	ΗI	H		1 -			, <u> </u>		I,	_	- 1	H 1	I	I	H	I			Ι		- 1	I,		I,		
Stm	TS PS	S APS	S APS	APS	n vn a	n n	S PS	ST	APS	TS APS	TS APS	s S S	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS M*A	S	S ADC	SA	ST	PS ST	Sd	c S	APS	APS	er APS	APS	S S	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS APS	APS
Rank	302 303	305 305	306 307	309 310	311	312 313	314 315	316 317	318	319 320	371	373	374 375	376	377 378	379	380 381	382	383 201	385	386 387	388	389	391 391	392	393 204	395 395	396	397 308	399	400	401 402	403	404 405	406

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.404\\ 0.$	0.404
Mtl	*****	>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ $	0
Rgy	$\begin{array}{cccc} MX^{-}\\ MX^{+}\\ MX^{$	M_{X+}
Cmp	33 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	22
D		I
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS
Rank	458 458 459 459 450 450 450 450 450 450 450 553 551 552 552 553 553 553 555 555 555 555 555	563
0	$\begin{smallmatrix} 0.405\\ 0.405\\ 0.405\\ 0.406\\ 0.0406\\ 0.040$	0.404
Mtl	>xx>>>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.009\\ 0.001\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.0005\\ 0.0002\\ 0.0$	0.0005
Rgy	MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX M	M
Cmp	23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 2	22
D		Ι
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS
Rank	408 409 411 411 411 411 411 411 411 411 411 41	513

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

õ	$\begin{array}{c} 0.404\\ 0.404\\ 0.403\\ 0.403\\ 0.403\\ 0.403\\ 0.403\\ 0.403\\ 0.403\\ 0.389\\ 0.389\\ 0.388\\ 0.$
Mtl	>**>>*
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0.001\\ 0.004\\ 0.003\\ 0.007\\ 0.007\\ 0.007\\ 0.007\\ 0.002\\$
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} M_{X^+} \\ M_{X^+} $
Cmp	$223_{M_{H_{1}}}^{G}$
D	
Stm	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Rank	 564 565 566 566 567 568 569 569
0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.404\\ 0.404\\ 0.404\\ 0.404\\ 0.404\\ 0.404\\ 0.402\\ 0.402\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.400\\ 0.395\\ 0.396\\ 0.396\\ 0.396\\ 0.396\\ 0.396\\ 0.396\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.392\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.391\\ 0.392\\ 0.$
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{M} \\ \mathbb$
Cmp	23 MuP MuP MuP MuP MuP MuP MuP MuP MuP MuP
D	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	514 515 515 515 515 516 516 516 577 577 577 577 577 577 577 577 577 57

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

o	$\begin{array}{c} 0.378\\ 0.363\\ 0.363\\ 0.366\\ 0.366\\ 0.366\\ 0.366\\ 0.366\\ 0.366\\ 0.357\\ 0.357\\ 0.355\\ 0.$
Mtl	>××××>>×>>×>>×>×>×>×>×>×>×>×>×>×>×>×>×
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.008\\ 0.006\\ 0.004\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.0005\\ 0.0005\\ 0.0005\\ 0.0005\\ 0.0006\\ 0.0005\\ 0.0006\\ 0.0008\\ 0.0006\\ 0.0002\\ 0.0001\\ 0.0002\\ 0.000$
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\overset{W}{\operatorname{M}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\overset{W}{\operatorname{M}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\overset{W}{\operatorname{M}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\overset{W}{\operatorname{M}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\overset{W}{\operatorname{M}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{\underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}} \\ \underset{x \in \mathcal{M}}{x$
Cmp	MxP MxP MxP MxP MxP MxP MxP MxP MxP MxP
TD	
Stm	S APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS AP
Rank	670 7221 7221 7221 7221 7221 7221 7221 72
ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.389\\ 0.378\\ 0.378\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.376\\ 0.377\\ 0.376\\ 0.376\\ 0.376\\ 0.376\\ 0.367\\ 0.367\\ 0.366\\ 0.$
Mť	>xx>>>>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Rgy	$ \overset{W}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}$
Cmp	233333338 ⁴ 2333338 ⁴ 2333338 ⁴ 2333338 ⁴ 233333 ⁴ 233333 ⁴ 233333 ⁴ 23333 ⁴ 23333 ⁴ 2333 ⁴ 2333 ⁴ 2333 ⁴ 2333 ⁴ 2333 ⁴ 233 ⁴ 233 ⁴ 233 ⁴ 233 ⁴ 23 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2 ⁴ 2
τD	
Stm	$ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\mathbf{F}} \\ \mathbf$
1°	

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	0.345 0.345 0.344 0.344 0.344 0.344	0.343 0.343 0.343 0.343	0.342 0.342 0.341 0.341	$0.340 \\ 0.340 \\ 0.339 \\ 0.338 \\ 0.33$	0.337 0.337 0.337	0.336 0.336 0.335 0.335	0.335 0.335 0.335	0.334 0.334 0.334	$0.333 \\ 0.333 \\ 0.333$	$0.333 \\ 0.333 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.332 \\ 0.333 \\ 0.33$	0.332 0.332 0.332 0.332	0.331 0.331 0.331	$0.320 \\ 0.320 \\ 0.320 \\ 0.319$	0.319 0.319 0.319	0.318 0.318 0.318 0.317 0.317
Mtl	×>×××	****	:>x>x	×>>>	<×××;	>>×>:	>××>	<×>>	> X >	>××;	<>×>	×××	>>××	×××	:>>>××
Thrsh	0.007	0.004	$0 \\ 0.004$	0.005 0.003	$\begin{array}{c} 0.002 \\ 0.002 \\ 0 \end{array}$	0 0.06	0.00	0.009 0.006 0.01	0.005	0.003 0.003	0.007	$\begin{array}{c} 0.004 \\ 0.002 \\ 0 \end{array}$	0 0.01 0.002	0.006	0 0 0.006 0
Rgy	Mx+ Mx-	[m] (+) Res	Mx- M Mx-	M_{X+}^{MX+}	MX+ MX+ MX+	(_) MX- MX- MX-	MX+ MX+ MX+	M	M	Mx+ Mx-	Mx- m	Mx+ Mx+ Mx-	Mx+ m	Mx- Mx-	$ \mathbf{M} $ $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{X}+}$ $ \mathbf{M} $ $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{X}+}$
Cmp	MxP 11 12 12 11	MnP	11 11 prs	22 13 23 13 23	nnP MnP MnP MnP	prs 33 23 MxP	5 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	"E", "13.	13 13 M"	23 MnP MxP	,E, 33.33	23 MnP "11	prs 33	MxP 11	MxP MxP 13 13 13
TD	нн н		H	Нцца	=:	H – – – -			I H I	н:	нчн		-	I I H	
Stm	APS PS PSE TSE	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	TS M*A APS S	PS APS APS TS	APS APS M*A	M*A M*A APS	SAPS SAPS Sd	APS APS APS	APS S APS	PS APS APS	SdA Sd Sd Sd	PS APS APS	MrA APS S APS	APS APS S	M*A M*A APS M*A M*A
Rank	826 827 828 828 829 830	832 832 833 834	835 836 837 838	839 840 841	845 845	847 847 848 849	850 851 852 852	855 855 856	857 858 859	860 861 862	864 865 865	867 868 869	8/0 921 923	924 925 926	927 928 929 930 931
ð	0.351 0.351 0.351 0.351 0.351	0.350 0.350 0.350 0.350	0.349 0.349 0.349 0.349	0.349 0.349 0.349 0.349	0.349 0.349 0.348	0.348 0.348 0.348 0.348 0.348	0.348 0.348 0.348	0.347 0.347 0.347	$\begin{array}{c} 0.347 \\ 0.347 \\ 0.347 \end{array}$	0.347 0.347 0.346	0.346 0.346 0.346 0.346	0.346 0.346 0.346	0.346 0.331 0.331 0.330	0.330 0.330 0.330	0.330 0.330 0.330 0.329 0.329
Mtl	×>>>×	***	:××××	××××	<×××;	×××>;	>>×>	< × > ×	××>	×××:	>××>	> X X :	>××>	> x >	*****
Thrsh	0.01 0.04 0.04 0.004 0.002	0.003 0.003 0.005	0.007		0.001		0.003	0.01	0.001		0.001 0.0005 0.003		0.007	0.004	0.003
Rgy	MI MX- MX- MX- MX-	MX+ MX+ Mx-	Mx-	M Mx-	<u>M</u> <u></u>	W		<u>n</u>	Mx+ (-) Mx+	Mx- MI	Mx- Mx- Mx-	MI – MX	MX+ MX+ MX+	PV Mx- Mx-	(+) MX = MX = (+)
Cmp	23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 2	12222	Tca MxS MxS 22	vM 11 11 8,	33 17 F	MnP MxS MnP	MnP 22 22	11 "E" MxP	33 11 13	MxP 11 Shr	33 2 2 2 Gui	11 Shr 13	12 22	12 MxP 33	23 11 MnP 11
TD			нннг	Нццп	:нн ₋ :	нннц.	H -	HIH	I H I	H.		ц Н ц .			нанан
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS Sq	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	S TS ST S S	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	S S S S S	APS APS	STS STS PS	APS TS APS	TS PS TSE	APS APS APS	PS S S EE	PS SA SA SA SA SA SA	TS APS APS	APS S PS PS
Rank	776 777 778 778 779 779	781 782 783 784	785 786 787 788	789 790 791	793 793 795	797 797 799	800 801 802	805 805 806	807 808 809	810 811 812	815 815 816	817 818 819	820 871 872 873	874 875 876	877 878 879 880 881

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

0	0.317 0.317 0.315 0.315 0.315 0.315	0.314 0.314 0.314 0.314 0.314 0.314	0.313 0.313 0.313 0.313 0.313 0.313	0.312 0.312 0.312 0.312	0.312 0.312 0.311 0.311	0.311 0.310 0.310 0.309	0.309 0.308 0.308 0.308	0.308 0.307 0.307 0.307	0.306 0.306 0.306	0.305 0.292 0.292 0.291	0.291	0.289 0.289 0.289 0.288	0.288 0.288 0.287 0.287 0.287	0.287 0.287
Mtl	**>>*	××>>×	××××>	×××>	> X > X :	×>××	>×××	>>>>	• > X X	>××>	×××:	>×>×	×××>>:	> X
Thrsh	0.005 0.005 0.01 0.01 0.01	0.004 0.007 0.007 0.0005	0.02 0.02 0.007	0.03 0.03 0.01	0.008 0.007 0	0 0 0.001	0.02 0.04 0.04	0.007	0.0005	0.07 0.002 0.01	0.0005	0.007 0.007 0.004	0.0005 0.003 0.01 0.01	0.009 0.008
Rgy	MX+ MI MX- MX-	$\begin{array}{c} M \\ Mx_{-} \\ M \\ Mx_{+} \\ Mx_{-} \end{array}$	$(+) \qquad \qquad$	(+) W ^x -	MX+ (+) (+) (+)	Mx- (+) Mx-	$ \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{X}+}$	MX+ MI	MX+ MX- MX-	Mx- Mx- Mx-	MX- MX+ MX	MX+ MX+ MX+	Mx- Res Mx+ M Mx+	M
Cmp	MnP 11 MxP MxP 12 12	33 2 5 5 1 1 7 33 7 5 7 1 7 7 3 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	11 23 MnP 12	11 23 MxS	13 MxP 23 23	1321	"E" 12 13	12 13 Mvd	MxP 11	3225 	82228	33 22 33 33 22 33 7	22 11 2 33 12 2 33	MxS 11
TD			Налан	HIII	H	I I H I	IIIH	H _					,	
Stm	APS APS APS APS M*A M*A	APS APS APS APS APS	PS APS APS S S	TS APS APS APS	APS APS TS M*A	M*A N*A APS	APS APS APS TS	S APS APS	APS APS	APS APS S APS	APS APS APS	APS APS PS	PS APS APS APS APS	APS APS
Rank	932 933 935 935 935	937 938 940 941	942 943 945 946	947 948 949 950	951 952 953	955 956 957 958	959 960 961	963 964 965	969 969	970 1021 1023	1025 1025 1026	1027 1028 1029 1030	1031 1032 1033 1034 1035	1036 1037
0	0.329 0.329 0.329 0.328 0.328	0.328 0.328 0.328 0.327 0.327	0.327 0.327 0.327 0.327 0.327	0.327 0.326 0.325 0.325	0.325 0.325 0.324 0.324	0.324 0.324 0.323 0.323	0.323 0.323 0.322 0.322	0.322 0.322 0.322 0.322	0.321	0.321 0.305 0.305 0.305	0.305	0.304 0.304 0.303 0.303	0.302 0.302 0.302 0.302 0.302	0.301 0.300
Mtl	***>>	>>×>>	>>>××	××××	>>>×:	>>>×	××××	××××	<>>×	>×××	****	<×××	> × > > ×;	××
Thrsh	00	0 0 0.008 0.008	0.008 0.008 0.03	0.03	0.006	0.003 0.007	0.02 0.02 0.001	0.006	0.005 0.005 0.002	0.004 0.04 0.006	0.005	0.006 0.006	0.004 0.002 0.001	0.006
Rgy	M Mx- (+)	Mx- Mx+ Mx+ Mx+	M Mx- M	MX+ HX+	MX + X ()	Mx+ Mx- MI	MX ⁺	- Mx+	MX+ MX+	MX- MX- Mx-	Mx+ Mx+ Mx+	MX+ MM MX+	Mx- M Mx+ Mx+ ,	Mx- Mx-
Cmp	23 23 13 MxS MaD	MnP MnP MxP MxP	MnP MnP MxS MnP 12	11 11 23	12 22 23	13 13 13	1222	MnP 33 33 Nml	32228	12 MnP 11	Hup III	1811	13 33 2 1 2 3 33 2 5 5 3	11 12
TD	H		H-	I H H	IIIE	цппн	H	ц н н н	1 – – –				,	II
Stm	PS PS TS M*A M*A	M*A M8A APS APS APS	APS APS S S APS APS	APS PS S	APS APS S S S	TS APS PS PS	APS APS APS TS	APS TSE TS	APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS	S APS TS	APS APS TS APS	PS APS
ank	882 883 885 885 885 886 886 886 886	887 888 890 891	892 893 895 895	897 898 900	901 902 904	905 906 908	909 910 912	913 914 915	917 918 919	920 971 972	974 975 976	979 979 980	981 982 985 985	986 987

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

o	$\begin{array}{c} 0.286\\ 0.286\\ 0.286\\ 0.286\\ 0.286\\ 0.286\\ 0.286\\ 0.285\\ 0.288\\ 0.$
MtI	***************************************
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} M_{X^+} \\ M_{X^+} $
Cmp	3333333333133111323333213321332133333333
D	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	1038 1041 1042 1044 1044 1044 1044 1044 1044
ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.200\\ 0.209\\ 0.209\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.299\\ 0.277\\ 0.299\\ 0.277\\ 0.$
Mtl	>>>×××>>>>>>××>×>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Rgy	MW + * WW + * WW + * WW + * WW - * * * WW - * * * * WW - * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Cmp	Shine and a second seco
τD	
Stm	PSE APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	988 991 992 993 994 995 999 999 999 999 999 999 999 999

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.244\\ 0.244\\ 0.240\\ 0.240\\ 0.237\\ 0.237\\ 0.237\\ 0.237\\ 0.237\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.236\\ 0.236\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.236\\ 0.236\\ 0.237\\ 0.$	0.158 0.158 0.154
Mtl	*>>>>**	>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.006
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{M}_{X^{-}}^{W_{X^{-}}} \\ \mathbb{M}_{X^{+}}^{W_{X^{-}}} \\ \mathbb{M}_{X^{+}}^{W_{X^{+}}} \\ \mathbb{M}_{X^{+}}^$	
Cmp	%=%=2222222222222222222222222222222222	11 MxP
TD		
Stm	APS S APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS AP	APS TS
Rank	$\begin{smallmatrix} 1.145\\ 1.145\\ 1.145\\ 1.145\\ 1.145\\ 1.155$	1248 1248 1249
0	0.267 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.266 0.261 0.261 0.261 0.262 0.261 0.262 0.261 0.262 0.261 0.261 0.262 0.262 0.261 0.262 0.225 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25	0.209 0.209 0.209
Mtl	>>xxx>xxxxxx>x>>>>>>xxx>>xx>>xxx>>xxx>>xxx>xxxx	> X X
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.02 0.008
Rgy		Mx+ Mx+
Cmp	32333M ^M	33 22 4
đ		4
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS
Rank	1095 1096 1097 1096 1097 1098 1098 1098 1098 1098 1098 1098 1098	1198 1199

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

δ	0.154	0.151	0.151	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.149	0.149	0.149	0.148	0.140	0.147	0.147	0.145	0.144	0.142	0.142	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.050	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059	920.0	0.059	0.059	0.059	920.0	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059	460.0 0.050	0.059	0.059	0.059	0.059	ecu.u 620.0	0.059	0.059	ودט.ט 0.059
Mtl	x	×	×	>;	> >	< ×	>	>;	>;	>>	>>	>>	×	Х	Х	>;	>>	> >	· >	>	Λ	>	> ;	>;	>>	· >	• >	>	>;	> >	· >	^	>:	> >	· >	>	>	>:	> >	· >	>	> ;	>>	>>	>	>;	>>
Thrsh		0.02	0.02	0.008	0.00	0.02	0.008	0.02	0.02		100.0	0.006	0.00	0.01	0.008	0.009	0.05	6000	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	10.0	0.009	0.009	0.009	0000	600.0	0.009	0.009	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007
Rgy	(+)	M	Mx-	N :	MX-	MX+	Mx^{-}	N j	Mx-	(+)	MI.	Mx+	Mx-	Mx-	Mx-	Mx+	M	Mv-	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res Dae	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res Dec	Res	Res	Res	Res Dec	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res Dec	Res	Res	Res	Res Dec	Res	Res	Res	kes Res
Cmp	33	11	11	= :	15	15	13	= :	11	33	= =	= =	13	13	13	MnP	212	12 MvD	"Е,	MxS	MnP	MxP	33	22	ي. يو	MxS	23	MnP	MxP	ж ғ	""	"Е"	MxS	23 MnD	MxP	33	22	, W,	MvS	23 23	MnP	MxP	59 F	"W"	"E,	MxS	25 MnP
ΠD	Н	Ι	I	I,		- 1	I	1,	_ :	Ξ.			- 1	I	I	_ ,	- -		- 1	Π	I	Ι	_	_ ,			- 1	I	I ,		- 1	I	1,		- 11	Ι	Ι			I I	Ī	I		1 I	I	п,	1 1
Stm	PS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	PS • De	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	SAPS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS
Rank	1250	1251	1252	1253	1254	1256	1257	1258	1259	1260	1071	1263	1264	1265	1266	1267	1268	1270	1321	1322	1323	1324	1325	1326	132/	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1335	1336	1337	1338	1340	1341	1342	1343	1344	1346	1347	1348	1349	1351	1352	1353	1355
δ	0.208	0.207	0.206	0.206	0.204	0.203	0.202	0.202	0.201	0.200	0.200	0.199	0.198	0.196	0.196	0.191	0.190	0.190	0.138	0.138	0.137	0.136	0.136	0.135	0.135	0.134	0.132	0.132	0.132	0.130	0.127	0.121	0.120	0.120	0.118	0.117	0.117	0.117	0.117	0.115	0.115	0.114	0.112	0.109	0.106	0.100	0.099 0.099
Md	^	>	Λ	X	X>	· >	>	> ;	>:	> >	> >	< ×	:>	>	>	X	× >	< >	< ×	>	>	2	> :	>;	> >	> >	· >	>	>;	> >	· >	>	X	X >	· >	>	>	>:	> >	· >	>	>;	X>	>>	^	>;	>>
Thrsh				0.009	600.0	0.004		0.007	0	0.004	0000	0.004	0.02	0.007	0.002	0.01	0.005	0.004	0.04	0.007	0.007	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.00	0.008	00000	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.02	0.008		20.07	0.07	0.01				0.02	0.02	0.00	0.01	10.0	0.01		0.04 0.04
Rgy				W;	MX+)W	1	Mx-	N S	MX+	III Me	Mx+	Mx-	Mx-	Mx-	<u>N</u> ;	Mx-	Mv-	VIAT	Res	Mx_+	M	Mx-	Mx-	MX+ Pac	Mx+	Mx+	M	Mx-	M	MX+	Res	Mx+	MX-	MX+	Mx_{+}	Mx-	Mx-	Mx- My+	⊥vivi	Mx^+	Res	Mx+	MX-	Mx-	Mx+	M Mx-
Cmp	13	22	11	33	15	1 1	12	12	=:	= 2	01 02 02	с (52	13	11	33	13	<u>0 6</u>	MxS	11	11	11	Ξ	13	= =	:=	33	11	= :	21 2	52	11	MnP	MXP 1	12	Ξ	13	МхР	77 MnP	13 13	13	Ξ	II MaD	113 13	MxP	MnP	MnP
TD	Н	Η	Н	I,	- 1		Н	_ ,		1 1	Ľ,			I	I	_ ,				П	I	I		_ ,			. –	I	I,		- 1	I	_ ,		- 11	I	I	-		I	Ī	I		I I	I	I	II
Stm	s	TS	PS	APS	S'AP'S	APS	TS	APS	M*A	APS °	S D C	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	S P S P S P S P S P S P S P S P S P S P	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	PS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS	S	S of A	APS	APS	PS	SS 5	2 Z	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	TS	APS APS
Rank	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1171	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1778	1279	1280	1281	1282	1285	1285	1286	1287	1288	1290	1291	1292	1293	1294	1296	1297	1298	1200	1301	1302	1303	1304 1305

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.059\\ 0.055\\ 0.059\\ 0.055\\ 0.035\\ 0.$
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.007\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.006\\ 0.000\\ 0.$
Rgy	$ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbb{R} & \mathbb{R} \\ \mathbb{R}$
Cmp	$ \begin{array}{c} M_{\rm K} \\ M_{\rm M} $
TD	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	1356 1356 1357 1356 1357 1356 1356 1357 1358 1359 1356 1357 1356 1423 1443 1445 1445 1456
ð	$\begin{array}{c} 0.095\\ 0.059\\ 0.$
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.04\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.09\\ 0.005\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.004\\ 0.004\\ 0.004\\ 0.004\\ 0.005\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.004\\ 0.004\\ 0.004\\ 0.002\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.001\\ 0.0002\\ 0.0002\\ 0.0002\\ 0.00$
Rgy	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X
Cmp	MXS WF WF WF WF WF WF WF WF WF WF
Œ	
Stm	APS APS M*A M*A M*A M*A M*A M*A M*A M*A M*A APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS AP
Rank	1306 1307 1308 1307 1308 1310 1311 1311 1311 1311 1311 1311

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

0	0.035 0.035 0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035	CCUU NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN	NaN NaN	NaN NaN	NaN	NaN NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN NaN
Mtl	×××××	××××	××××	××××	×××	×××	<>>	·>>	>>	>>;	>>;	>>;	>>	>>	>>	>>	· > ;	>>	>>	•>;	>>	>:	>>	>>
Thrsh	0.008 0.008 0.008 0.008 0.008	0.007 0.007 0.007 0.007	0.001 0.0005 0.0005 0.0005	0.0005 0.0005 0.0005 0.0005	0.0005 0.02 0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02 0.03	0.03 0.03	0.03 0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04 0.04	0.04 0.04	0.05 0.05	0.05	0.05	c0.0 0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06 0.06	0.06	0.06 0.06	0.06
Rgy	Res Res Res Res Res	Res Res Res	Res Res Res	Res Res Res	Res M Mx-	Mx- Mx+	+xw (_) (]	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+ Mx+	MX+ MX+	MX+ MX+	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+	MX+ MX+		Mx+	Mx+ Mx+	Mx+	MX+ MX+	Mx+
Cmp	MnP MxP 33 22 "M"	E.' MxS 23 MnP	22 "M" MxS	23 MnP 33	22 33 MxP	33 MnP	55 27 27	3 = =	22 33	MnP	3 1 8	33	MxP MnP	13 23	11 22	33 MvP	MnP	13 23	MxS "M"	² = 3	33 22	MxP	MnP 13	23 MxS
D		1 1 1 1			1 1 1		- н п		II	,			II	II	II	1 1	ч н н		п -	ч н ,		I	I	I I
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS	APS	CIA Sd Sd	APS APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS APS	APS APS
Rank	1462 1463 1464 1465	1467 1468 1469 1470	1521 1522 1523 1524	1525 1526 1527 1528	1529 1530 1531	1532	1535 1535 1536	1537 1538	1539 1540	1541 1542	1545	1546	1547 1548	1549 1550	1551 1552	1553	1555	1557	1558	1560	1561 1562	1563	1565 1565	1566 1567
õ	0.059 0.059 0.059 0.059 0.059	$\begin{array}{c} 0.059\\ 0.059\\ 0.059\\ 0.048\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.035\\ 0.035\\ 0.035\\ 0.035\\ 0.035\end{array}$	0.035 0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035 0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035 0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035	0.035 0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035 0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035
Mtl	>>>>>	>>>>	××××	××××	×××	×××	<××	<××	××	××	< × >	××	××	××	××	××	< X :	××	××	(X)	××	X	××	××
Thrsh	0.0005 0.0005 0.0005 0.02 0.02	0.02 0.02 0.07	0.007 0.007 0.006 0.006	0.006 0.006 0.006 0.006	0.006 0.006 0.006	0.005	0.005 200.0	0.005 0.005	0.005 0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	$0.004 \\ 0.003$	0.003 0.003	0.003 0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001
Rgy	Res Res Res MX-	Mx+ Mx+ MX+ M	Res Res Res	Res Res Res	Res Res Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res Res	Res Rec	Res	kes Res	Res	Res	kes Res	Res	kes Res	Res Res
Cmp	MxP 33 33 33 33 MxP	33 MnP 23	MxP 33 "M"	"E" MxS MnP	MxP 33 22	, E, W,	MXS 23 MnP	MxP 33	22 "M"	"E"	MnP	MXP 33	²² , "M"	"E" MxS	23 MnP	MxP 33	22	Ĕ,	MxS	MnP	MxP 33	22	Ë,	MxS 23
D		1 1 1 1		1 1 1 1					II	цц				1 1	II	1 1	ч н н		п -	ч н ,		I	- 1	11
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS	APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS	APS APS	APS	APS APS	APS APS
Rank	1412 1413 1414 1415 1416	1417 1418 1419 1420	1471 1472 1473 1474	1475 1476 1477 1478	1479 1480 1481	1482	1484 1485 1486	1487 1488	1489 1490	1491 1492	1495	1496	1497 1498	1499 1500	1501 1502	1503 1504	1505	1506 1507	1508	1510	1511 1512	1513	1515 1515	1516 1517

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

0	NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.006\\ 0.007\\ 0.006\\ 0.007\\ 0.006\\ 0.$
Rgy	MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX M
Cmp	^w ^W , ^w ^M
TD	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	1568 1569 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1570 1521 1522 1523 1524 1525 1535 1631 1633 1634 1635 1644 1645 1645 1645 1651 1653 1654 1655 1655 1656 1656 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666 1666
0	0 0.035 0 0.030 0 0.000 0 0.030 0 0.0300 0 0.03000 0 0.03000 0 0.03000 0 0.030000000000
Mtl	***>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.001\\ 0.007\\ 0.$
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} Res \\ Res \\ MX+\\ MX+\\ MX+\\ MX+\\ MX+\\ MX+\\ MX+\\ MX$
Cmp	$ \begin{array}{c} M_{nP} \\ M_{n$
ΔT	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	1518 1519 1511 1512 1512 1513 1514 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 1515 15215 15215 15216 15217 15218 15215 15216 15217 15218 15217 15218 15217 15218 15219 15216 15217 15218 15219 16010 16011 16012 16013 16014 1615 1616 1617 1618 1619 1611 1612 1613 1614 161

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	NaN
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 $
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} Res \\ Res $
Cmp	$ \begin{array}{c} M_{nn} P \\ M_{nn} M_{nn} P \\ M_{nn} M_{nn} P \\ M \\ M_{nn} M \\ M $
D	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	1754 1725 1725 1725 1725 1726 1727 1728 1729 1729 1729 1729 1729 1729 1729 1729 1729 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1736 1737 1738 1739 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1744 1745 1744 1745 1745 1756 1757 1758 1758 1758 1756 1756 1756 1756 1757 1758 1758 1756 1764
0	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N
Mtl	>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.07\\ 0.07\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.09\\ 0.09\\ 0.009\\ 0.000$
Rgy	MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM
Cmp	$ \overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W_{n}}}{\overset{W_{n}}}{\overset{W_{n}}{\overset{W}}{\overset{W}}{\overset{W_{n}}}{\overset{W}{\overset{W}}}}{\overset{W}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$
D	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS
Rank	$\begin{array}{c} 1674\\ 1675\\ 1678\\ 1678\\ 1678\\ 1679\\ 1679\\ 1680\\ 1683\\ 1683\\ 1683\\ 1684\\ 1683\\ 1684\\ 1683\\ 1684\\ 1683\\ 1683\\ 1684\\ 1683\\ 1683\\ 1684\\ 1683\\ 1703\\ 1713\\ 1771\\ 1771\\ 1772\\ 1772\\ 1773\\ 1772\\ 1773\\ 1772\\ 1773\\$

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ð	NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN
Mtl	*****
Thrsh	$\begin{smallmatrix} 0.0\\ 0.07\\ 0.09\\ 0.00\\ 0.0$
Rgy	$ \begin{array}{c} & M_{X} \\ & M_{X} \\ & & M_{X} \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & $
Cmp	MuP Map Map Map Map Map Map Map Map Map Map
TD	
Stm	$\begin{array}{c} APS\\ APS\\ APS\\ APS\\ APS\\ APS\\ APS\\ APS\\$
Rank	[[[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []
ð	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N
Mtd Q	V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V
Thrsh Mtl Q	0.08 V Nan 0.09 V Nan 0.010 V Nan 0.02 V Nan 0.03 V Nan 0.04 V Nan 0.05 V Nan 0.06 V Nan 0.06 V Nan
Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	Res 0.08 V Nan Res 0.08 V Nan Res 0.09 V Nan Mix+ 0.03 V Nan
Cmp Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	
TD Cmp Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	
Stm TD Cmp Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

õ	NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN NaN	NaN NaN NaN
Mtl	$\times \times $	<×××
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.07\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.08\\ 0.09\\ 0.09\\ 0.09\\ 0.00\\$	0.08 0.08 0.08
Rgy	MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM	Res Res Res
Cmp	$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & $	12 13 23
D	£	
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS
Rank	1935 1937 1937 1937 1938 1938 1939 1944 1944 1944 1944 1944 1944 1944	2038 2038 2039 2040
0	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	NaN NaN NaN
Mti	\times	<×××
Thrsh	$\begin{array}{c} 0.00\\$	0.03 0.04 0.04
Rgy	MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX M	Res Res Res
Cmp	$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & $	MxS 11 22
TD		
Stm	APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS APS	APS APS APS
Rank	1886 1886 1888 1889 1899 1899 1899 1899	1988 1989 1990

Paul et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

0	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN																
Mtl	××	××	Х	x	x	X	×	X	Х	X	X	X	X																
Thrsh	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09																
Rgy	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res	Res	\mathbf{Res}	Res	Res	Res	Res																
Cmp	MxS "E"	ų, r	11	22	33	MxP	MnP	12	13	23	MxS	Ë,	"W,																
D		- 11	I	Ι	Ι	1	-	I	I	I	I	I	I																
Stm	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS	APS																
Rank	2041	2042 2043	2044	2045	2046	2047	2048	2049	2050	2051	2052	2053	2054																
P	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
Md Q	X NaN V	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN	X NaN
Thrsh Mtl Q	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.04 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.05 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN	0.06 X NaN
Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.04 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.05 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN	Res 0.06 X NaN
Cmp Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	33 Res 0.04 X NaN	MnP Res 0.04 X NaN	12 Res 0.04 X NaN	13 Res 0.04 X NaN	23 Res 0.04 X NaN	MxS Res 0.04 X NaN	"E" Res 0.04 X NaN	"M" Res 0.04 X NaN	11 Res 0.05 X NaN	22 Res 0.05 X NaN	33 Res 0.05 X NaN	MxP Res 0.05 X NaN	MnP Res 0.05 X NaN	12 Res 0.05 X NaN	13 Res 0.05 X NaN	23 Res 0.05 X NaN	MxS Res 0.05 X NaN	"E" Res 0.05 X NaN	"M" Res 0.05 X NaN	11 Res 0.06 X NaN	22 Res 0.06 X NaN	33 Res 0.06 X NaN	MxP Res 0.06 X NaN	MnP Res 0.06 X NaN	12 Res 0.06 X NaN	13 Res 0.06 X NaN	23 Res 0.06 X NaN	MxS Res 0.06 X NaN	"E" Res 0.06 X NaN
TD Cmp Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	I 33 Res 0.04 X NaN I M.D D.C 0.04 V NaN	I MnP Res 0.04 X NaN	I 12 Res 0.04 X NaN	I 13 Res 0.04 X NaN	I 23 Res 0.04 X NaN	I MxS Res 0.04 X NaN	I "E" Res 0.04 X NaN	I "M" Res 0.04 X NaN	I 11 Res 0.05 X NaN	I 22 Res 0.05 X NaN	I 33 Res 0.05 X NaN	I MxP Res 0.05 X NaN	I MnP Res 0.05 X NaN	I 12 Res 0.05 X NaN	I 13 Res 0.05 X NaN	I 23 Res 0.05 X NaN	I MxS Res 0.05 X NaN	I "E" Res 0.05 X NaN	I "M" Res 0.05 X NaN	I 11 Res 0.06 X NaN	I 22 Res 0.06 X NaN	I 33 Res 0.06 X NaN	I MxP Res 0.06 X NaN	I MnP Res 0.06 X NaN	I 12 Res 0.06 X NaN	I 13 Res 0.06 X NaN	I 23 Res 0.06 X NaN	I MxS Res 0.06 X NaN	I "E" Res 0.06 X NaN
Stm TD Cmp Rgy Thrsh Mtl Q	APS I 33 Res 0.04 X NaN ADS I M.D D.C. V. N.S.V.	APS I MAP Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I 12 Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I 13 Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I 23 Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I MxS Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I "E" Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I "M" Res 0.04 X NaN	APS I 11 Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I 22 Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I 33 Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I MXP Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I MnP Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I 12 Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I 13 Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I 23 Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I MxS Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I "E" Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I "M" Res 0.05 X NaN	APS I 11 Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I 22 Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I 33 Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I MXP Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I MnP Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I 12 Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I 13 Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I 23 Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I M _X S Res 0.06 X NaN	APS I "E" Res 0.06 X NaN