## Table S1. Models evaluated

Final model (#5) is shown in bold

Linear models										
Model	Description	OBJ	Intercept (a)	Slope (B)	$\omega^2$ _intercept ( $\eta_{\alpha}$ )		ω²_slope (η <sub>β</sub> )	$Occ \left(\eta_{\alpha}\right)$	σ1 <sup>2</sup> (additive)	σ2 <sup>2</sup> (proportional)
1	Intercept, no slope; IIV additive	8448	3.08 (33%)		57.5 (25%)				81.4 (8%)	
2	Intercept, no slope; IIV additive fixed	9100	3.02 (34%)		0 [fixed]				139 (12%)	
3	Intercept, slope; IIV additive (intercept only)	8216	-0.333 (375%)	0.0011 (14%)	60.3 (23%)				69.5 (8%)	
4	Intercept, slope; IIV additive (intercept & slope)	8088	-0.446 (280%)	0.0012 (15%)	78.3 (21%)		0		59.2 (7%)	
5	Intercept, slope; IIV additive (intercept); IOV additive; residual error additive	7738	-0.783 (139%)	0.0013 (8%)	36.6 (42%)			47.9 (20%)	45.5 (6%)	
6	Intercept, slope; IIV additive (intercept); IOV additive; residual error proportional	7877	12.2 (18%)	0.0008 (18%)	179 (40%)			46.2 (20%)		0.225 (36%)
7	Intercept, slope; IIV additive (intercept); IOV additive; residual error additive + proportional	7737	-0.726 (145%)	0.0013 (8%)	36.7 (42%)			47.8 (20%)	44.7 (7%)	0.0331 (173%)
8	Intercept, slope; IIV additive (intercept & slope); IOV additive intercept; residual error additive	7730	-0.754 (145%)	0.0013 (8%)	36.6 (43%)		0	47.7 (20%)	44.4 (7%)	
E <sub>max</sub> models										
Model	Description	OBJ	E <sub>max</sub>	EC50	Gamma	Eo	ω <sup>2</sup> _EC <sub>50</sub>	ω <sup>2</sup> _Ε <sub>0</sub>	$\omega^2 E_{max}$	σ1 <sup>2</sup> (additive)
9	E <sub>0</sub> , EC <sub>50</sub> , E <sub>max</sub> , Gamma (fixed)	8185	20.3 (13%)	3120 (56%)	1 [fixed]	-3.19 (35%)	8 (34%)	1.13 (43%)	0.283 (47%)	62.1 (7%)
10	E <sub>0</sub> , EC <sub>50</sub> , E <sub>max</sub> , Gamma (fixed)	8392	22.1 (11%)	2500 (56%)	1 [fixed]	-5.97 (78%)	7.02 (28%)			78.3 (8%)

Model fit to the data was evaluated on the following goodness-of-fit criteria: a minimum 3.84 point (p<0.05) decrease in the value of the objective function according to the log-likelihood ratio test; increased precision of estimated parameters; decrease in IIV, and decrease in random residual variability.

Additional criteria were: good agreement between observed and predicted ddQTcF; uniformly scattered weighted residuals versus predicted ddQTcF; visual predictive check and bootstrap analysis.