This Supplement examines some simple statistics that may be useful in providing a quantitative synthesis of the full probability distributions (shown in the main paper) so that different models or weightings can be compared and judged to be similar or be given a measure of their difference. As in the main paper, the case here focusses on the tropical Pacific block (150E-210E, 20S-20N, 0-12 km) for one day in the middle of August. The model key is: A = CAM4-Chem; B = GEOS-Chem; C = GFDL-AM3; D = GISS-E2; E = GMI-CTM; F = UCI-CTM. The reactivities are calculated from the C-runs (standard CCM/CTM simulation). The table numbers in the supplement are keyed to the figure numbers in the main paper and thus are not sequential, but the supplement figures are numbered sequentially.

**1D Probabilities**. The distributions here are evaluated on log of abundance, expressed as mole fraction. The bin spacing is in units of 0.05 for log10 for all probability densities. In the right-hand columns of Tables S6a and S6b, we calculate the 1D probability statistics for the Pacific block for all 6 models for the species [HOOH], {NOx], [H2O], and [O3]. The mean values minus and plus 1 standard deviation are given in the upper part of each model-species cell; those of the 16th-50th-84th percentiles are given immediately underneath to facilitate comparison. In Table S8a we give similar statistics comparing the pacific block with single transects, sampling along single longitudes within the block (150E, 165E, 180E, 195E, 210E). In this case we only show results for 2 models (C & F) and 2 species (HOOH & NOx). Note that results for the block itself in Table S8 are the same as in Table S6a.

For [HOOH], [NOx], and [O3] the Gaussian statistics and the percentiles are almost identical, and thus the central 68% of the species distribution can be readily characterized. For [H2O] the extremely large spread in abundance across 0-12 km altitude range results in the median being consistently larger than the mean by about 0.2 and the percentile spread (16th to 84th %ile) being noticeably narrower than ± σ.

The 1D statistics are useful, for example, in demonstrating that model D has about 2x higher HOOH than other models and this difference applies across the ±σ range. For NOx, all models have similar averages, but models C & F have almost 2x higher NOx at the 16th percentile. Five models have a similar value for the 84th %ile of NOx (1.5 = ~30 ppt), but model E is much lower (~20 ppt). Surprisingly, model A has notably higher O3 across the range: a 50th %ile value of ~45 ppt versus ~25 ppt for the other models. Among the other five models, D and E have a much lower 16th %ile O3 (~13 ppt vs ~17 ppt). Water vapor (H2O) across the 0-12 km altitude range is expected to have a very large spread and indeed the 16th – 84th %ile spread ranges from 40x to 80x. Model C is a climate model with prognostic H2O based on a full convection scheme. It has 2x less H2O than the other models and a much narrower ±σ range matching its 16th – 84th %ile range.

A more complete list of the 1D probability density statistics, based on Figure 5, is presented in Tables S5ab. Six major gases are listed (HOOH, NOx, H2O, O3, CO, HCHO), and the effect of reactivity weighting is clearly seen. CO has a very narrow distribution and the mean does not change with reactivity weighting. What is clear here and better quantified is that model A’s average CO is about 0.12 (log10) less than the other 5 models. For HOOH the pattern provides clues to the model differences. For models ABCEF, the Air and PO3 weighting show similar statistics, but the LO3 and LCH4 weighting show higher average HOOH by about 0.10. This reflects the greater weighting of the lower troposphere (with greater HOOH) in LO3 & LCH4. As noted above in discussing Fig 6, model D has much larger HOOH, but it also has different shifts across the 4 weighting factors. For H2O all models show that the average with PO3 drops about 0.2-0.3 (upper troposphere dominates PO3) and that it increases by about 0.3-0.5 with LO3 & LCH4 weighting. All models except D have similarly weighted averages for LO3 & LCH4, and this points to a dramatically different pattern for these two reactivities in model D. For HCHO, models ABCEF have similar patterns with an average and standard deviation of about 2.2 and 0.3 for both Air & PO3 weighting. This average increase to 2.3-2.4 with LO3 & LCH4 weighting but the standard deviation decreases to 0.2. Model D again stands out with a different response to the weightings and a lower HCHO abundance by 0.3 (factor of 2). For O3, all models show a similar and small shift of the average with the different weightings, and model C is clearly and uniformly across ±σ higher than all other models, as noted in Fig. 6 discussion. NOx has highest ±σ spread (other than H2O) of about 1.0 (factor of 10 in mole fraction). All models agree that PO3 occurs in parcels with much higher NOx (by 0.13 to 0.31) and that LO3 & LCH4 occurs in parcels with lower NOx. Model D again shows that LO3 and LCH4 occur in different parcels. In comparing models C and F, one finds that both have similar amounts of NOx in Air & LO3 & LCH4 weighted parcels, but for PO3 model F has clearly higher NOx by 0.1 across the ±σ range.

**2D Probabilities**. The colored plots of 2D probability density are harder to characterize simply. There are a range of multivariate statistics methods (e.g., Hotelling T2 test) that can test whether two different modeled 2D density plots are demonstrably different, but it is easy to see that if we have enough samples, then almost all of the plots here are statistically different. We need to gather some simple statistics from our 2D plots that are similar to the Gaussian statistics or percentiles of the 1D distributions.

We characterize the 2D densities with a fitted ellipse centered at the mean value (X0, Y0) with semi-major and semi-minor axes defined as the standard deviation in the two orthogonal axes. These axes are rotated until we find an optimum fit with flattest ellipse (i.e., the lowest ratio of semi-minor to semi-major axis). The long axis of the ellipse is defined by a rotation angle counterclockwise from the X axis. Figure S1 shows an example of how such an ellipse appears on top of the 2D colored density distribution (from Fig 6a model B). Generally, about 40-50% of the weighted parcels fall within this ellipse, which is as expected for two independent normal distributions (0.68 x 0.68). The 2D variance (σX2 + σY2), calculated with respect to any (X,Y)-axis located at the mean of the 2D probability distribution, is unchanged by rotation of the axes about the centroid and is defined here as σ2D. All of these quantities, including the rotation angle, are given for the 6 models and the Pacific block in Tables S6a ((X, Y) = (HOOH, NOx)) and S6b ((X, Y) = (H2O, O3)).

Figures S2ab show the fitted ellipses for the 2D densities plotted in Figures 6ab. For (HOOH, NOx), models ABE have similar overlapping ellipses; whereas models CF have distinctly smaller but similarly angled and proportioned ellipses. Model D is distinct in terms of offset to higher HOOH values. For (H2O, O3), all models have similarly shaped and angled ellipses with rotation angles ranging only from 166 to 173 degrees. The difference in ellipse overlap is characterized simply by Y0, with models BCF having Y0 = 4.45±0.01, models DE having Y0 = 4.35±0.01, the previously identified outlier model A having Y0 = 4.64.

Tables 6cd give the area of each ellipse and the %-overlap with the other ellipses. We define overlap here to be symmetric (i.e., the overlapping area divided by the average of the two ellipse areas) so that a smaller ellipse fitting wholly within a larger ellipse does not result in 100% overlap. For (HOOH, NOx) the %-overlap shows clearly what we diagnosed subjectively from Figure S2a: the 3 %-overlap pairs for ABE and the one %-overlap for CF are all about 80%, much higher than for any other pairs, except for the self-overlap of 100%. The average %-overlap against the other 5 models, clearly identifies the outlier as model D. The question of whether the outlier is the more accurate model will await a similar comparison with observations. For (H2O, O3), this diagnostic shows that model A is the clear outlier and identifies the high-overlap pairs seen in the figure.

Figure 8 in the main paper looks at the fundamental uncertainty of representativeness by comparing the 2D densities for (HOOH, NOx) from the over-sampled Pacific block with the smaller samples along five longitudinal transects within the block (150E, 165E, 180E, 195E, 210E). As clearly seen in Figures 8ab for models CF, the single transect sampling is sparser and it is harder to see a clear pattern. The fitted ellipses to these transects in Figures 8cd are able to statistically characterize the distributions and show that the single transects accurately measure the block and that they also clearly distinguish the two models C and F as being similar, but different. The statistics from the Figure 8ab plots are given in Tables S8ab. The %-overlap is a compelling diagnostic: the one transect at 150E is clearly different from all others, and the other 4 transects overlap with modeled block ellipse at the 86% to 94% level. The 150E ellipse is clearly different when plotted (Fig. 8cd) and the %-overlap is only 40-60%, the same overlap between the two models. The 150E transect has the same longitude as Sydney and cuts through Papua New Guinea. This region is directly influenced by deep convection, lightning, and other continental sources, whereas the 165E-210E region looks similar, remote, and presumably representative of much of the Pacific basin. We conclude that fitted ellipses for comparing 2D probability densities is a valuable tool. Perhaps 3D+ distributions could be fitted in a similar manner to ellipsoids for analysis.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Figure S1. Model B (GEOS-Chem) air-mass weighted tropical Pacific distribution of parcels for the NOx vs. HOOH abundance showing the fitted ellipse. The species abundance is sampled in log10 space with a pixel resolution of 0.05 x 0.05. The color density pixels are the same as for model B in Figure 6a. For summary statistics on this distribution see Table S6a. |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Figure S2. Fitted ellipses to the modeled 2D density distributions in (a) Figure 6a (HOOH, NOx) and (b) Figure 6b (H2O, O3). The data defining each ellipse and their %-overlap are given in Table S6ab. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S6a. Indicators derived from the 2D distribution of (HOOH, NOx) shown in Fig 6a. All values are based on units of log10([X, ppt]). | | | | | | |
| model | centroid  (X0,Y0) | σ2D | axes  (major,minor) | rotation angle | HOOH  X: -σ avg +σ  X: 16-50-84 % | NOx  Y: -σ avg +σ  Y: 16-50-84 % |
| A | 2.60, 1.00 | 0.665 | 0.559, 0.361 | 98 | 2.24 2.60 2.97 | 0.44 1.00 1.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.22 2.61 2.95 | 0.35 1.04 1.51 |
| B | 2.63, 0.98 | 0.603 | 0.560, 0.223 | 109 | 2.35 2.63 2.92 | 0.45 0.98 1.51 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.37 2.66 2.86 | 0.35 1.01 1.48 |
| C | 2.75, 1.09 | 0.507 | 0.441, 0.251 | 134 | 2.39 2.75 3.10 | 0.73 1.09 1.46 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.36 2.82 3.06 | 0.68 1.07 1.44 |
| D | 2.96, 0.93 | 0.682 | 0.603, 0.318 | 119 | 2.56 2.96 3.36 | 0.38 0.93 1.48 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.60 2.98 3.30 | 0.37 0.87 1.48 |
| E | 2.59, 0.92 | 0.550 | 0.448, 0.319 | 94 | 2.27 2.59 2.91 | 0.47 0.92 1.37 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.26 2.58 2.89 | 0.40 0.92 1.34 |
| F | 2.70, 1.12 | 0.491 | 0.451, 0.195 | 115 | 2.44 2.70 2.96 | 0.70 1.12 1.54 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.40 2.72 2.92 | 0.62 1.16 1.51 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S6b. Indicators derived from the 2D distribution of (H2O, O3) shown in Fig 6b. All values are based on units of log10([X, ppt]). | | | | | | |
| model | centroid  (X0,Y0) | σ2D | axes  (major,minor) | rotation angle | H2O  X: -σ avg +σ  X: 16-50-84 % | O3  Y: -σ avg +σ  Y: 16-50-84 % |
| A | 3.49, 4.64 | 0.799 | 0.775, 0.149 | 167 | 2.74 3.49 4.25 | 4.42 4.65 4.87 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.58 3.65 4.27 | 4.36 4.67 4.85 |
| B | 3.46, 4.46 | 0.824 | 0.808, 0.162 | 167 | 2.67 3.46 4.25 | 4.22 4.46 4.71 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.50 3.62 4.26 | 4.18 4.47 4.69 |
| C | 3.30, 4.44 | 0.839 | 0.817, 0.144 | 173 | 2.49 3.30 4.11 | 4.27 4.44 4.62 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.34 3.35 4.21 | 4.24 4.43 4.59 |
| D | 3.59, 4.35 | 0.780 | 0.761, 0.171 | 166 | 2.85 3.59 4.33 | 4.11 4.35 4.60 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.74 3.77 4.29 | 4.07 4.34 4.60 |
| E | 3.58, 4.36 | 0.803 | 0.778, 0.200 | 169 | 2.81 3.58 4.34 | 4.12 4.36 4.61 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.68 3.82 4.27 | 4.06 4.34 4.60 |
| F | 3.42, 4.44 | 0.858 | 0.835, 0.149 | 171 | 2.59 3.42 4.24 | 4.24 4.44 4.64 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.39 3.60 4.27 | 4.21 4.43 4.62 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 6c. Overlap percent of SD2 ellipse fit (NOx vs HOOH). | | | | | | | | |
| model | area | x A | x B | x C | x D | x E | x F | x others |
| A | 0.633 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  | 64% |
| B | 0.387 | 74% | 100% |  |  |  |  | 61% |
| C | 0.346 | 59% | 58% | 100% |  |  |  | 62% |
| D | 0.603 | 42% | 35% | 58% | 100% |  |  | 43% |
| E | 0.452 | 83% | 77% | 53% | 34% | 100% |  | 60% |
| F | 0.283 | 62% | 62% | 81% | 48% | 55% | 100% | 62% |
| Overlap % is defined as the overlapping area divided by the average of the two ellipse areas and is thus symmetric. The last column (x others) is the average overlap % against the other 5 models. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 6d. Overlap percent of SD2 ellipse fit (O3 vs H2O). | | | | | | | | |
| model | area | x A | x B | x C | x D | x E | x F | x others |
| A | 0.368 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  | 18% |
| B | 0.407 | 30% | 100% |  |  |  |  | 65% |
| C | 0.361 | 13% | 72% | 100% |  |  |  | 62% |
| D | 0.406 | 9% | 68% | 70% | 100% |  |  | 62% |
| E | 0.490 | 16% | 72% | 70% | 89% | 100% |  | 65% |
| F | 0.396 | 20% | 86% | 86% | 71% | 77% | 100% | 68% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S8a. Indicators derived from the 2D distribution of (HOOH, NOx) as shown in Fig 8, including the SD2 ellipse. All values are based on units of log10([X, ppt]). The Block equals all grid cells 150E-201E, 20S-20N, 0-12 km. Individual longitudes include only a single transect sampled. | | | | | | |
| Model longitude | centroid  (X0,Y0) | σ2D | axes  (major,minor) | rotation angle | HOOH  X: -σ avg +σ  X: 16-50-84 % | NOx  Y: -σ avg +σ  Y: 16-50-84 % |
| C | 2.75, 1.09 | 0.507 | 0.441, 0.251 | 134 | 2.39 2.75 3.10 | 0.73 1.09 1.46 |
| Block |  |  |  |  | 2.36 2.82 3.06 | 0.68 1.07 1.44 |
| C | 2.78, 1.27 | 0.526 | 0.414, 0.324 | 146 | 2.40 2.78 3.17 | 0.91 1.27 1.62 |
| 150E |  |  |  |  | 2.43 2.86 3.09 | 0.89 1.16 1.61 |
| C | 2.77, 1.06 | 0.497 | 0.454, 0.203 | 130 | 2.44 2.77 3.10 | 0.69 1.07 1.44 |
| 165E |  |  |  |  | 2.42 2.81 3.08 | 0.65 1.01 1.42 |
| C | 2.72, 1.10 | 0.502 | 0.436, 0.248 | 130 | 2.39 2.72 3.06 | 0.73 1.10 1.47 |
| 180E |  |  |  |  | 2.35 2.81 3.02 | 0.67 1.08 1.42 |
| C | 2.74, 1.06 | 0.494 | 0.444, 0.217 | 132 | 2.40 2.74 3.07 | 0.70 1.06 1.42 |
| 195E |  |  |  |  | 2.33 2.77 3.07 | 0.63 1.03 1.43 |
| C | 2.75, 1.14 | 0.495 | 0.416, 0.268 | 140 | 2.39 2.75 3.11 | 0.80 1.14 1.48 |
| 210E |  |  |  |  | 2.31 2.81 3.08 | 0.77 1.13 1.45 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| F | 2.70, 1.12 | 0.491 | 0.452, 0.195 | 115 | 2.44 2.70 2.96 | 0.70 1.12 1.54 |
| Block |  |  |  |  | 2.40 2.72 2.92 | 0.62 1.16 1.51 |
| F | 2.68, 1.42 | 0.346 | 0.281, 0.201 | 118 | 2.45 2.68 2.90 | 1.15 1.42 1.68 |
| 150E |  |  |  |  | 2.42 2.68 2.86 | 1.15 1.36 1.69 |
| F | 2.71, 1.07 | 0.508 | 0.470, 0.194 | 105 | 2.49 2.71 2.94 | 0.61 1.07 1.52 |
| 165E |  |  |  |  | 2.44 2.72 2.90 | 0.52 1.09 1.52 |
| F | 2.72, 1.05 | 0.490 | 0.460, 0.168 | 116 | 2.47 2.72 2.96 | 0.63 1.05 1.47 |
| 180E |  |  |  |  | 2.39 2.74 2.94 | 0.52 1.09 1.49 |
| F | 2.69, 1.15 | 0.472 | 0.435, 0.182 | 123 | 2.41 2.69 2.97 | 0.77 1.15 1.53 |
| 195E |  |  |  |  | 2.37 2.73 2.93 | 0.68 1.20 1.50 |
| F | 2.67, 1.15 | 0.504 | 0.466, 0.192 | 127 | 2.35 2.67 2.99 | 0.76 1.15 1.54 |
| 210E |  |  |  |  | 2.32 2.71 2.95 | 0.70 1.17 1.55 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S8b. Overlap % of SD2 ellipse fit (NOx vs HOOH) for tropical Pacific (150E-210E, 20S-20N, 0-12 km) and single longitude transects shown in Fig.8. | | | | | | |
|  | 150E-210E | 150E | 165E | 180E | 195E | 210E |
| Model C | *100%* | 63% | 87% | 94% | 91% | 89% |
| Models C x F | 60% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model F | *100%* | 42% | 88% | 86% | 90% | 86% |
| Overlap % is defined as the overlapping area divided by the average of the two ellipse areas. The Models C x F denotes the overlap % of the two models for the ALL case of 150E-210E. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S5. 1D statistics (mean ± standard deviation) for probability densities shown in Fig 5. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| model | | CO | | | | HOOH | | | | H2O | | | |
| Air | PO3 | LO3 | LCH4 | Air | PO3 | LO3 | LCH4 | Air | PO3 | LO3 | LCH4 |
|  | -1σ | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 2.30 | 2.28 | 2.43 | 2.42 | 2.79 | 2.51 | 3.29 | 3.28 |
| **A** | **avg** | **4.72** | **4.72** | **4.72** | **4.72** | **2.66** | **2.64** | **2.76** | **2.75** | **3.54** | **3.25** | **3.87** | **3.87** |
|  | +1σ | 4.76 | 4.76 | 4.76 | 4.76 | 3.01 | 2.99 | 3.09 | 3.09 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.44 | 4.46 |
|  | -1σ | 4.77 | 4.76 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 2.40 | 2.29 | 2.58 | 2.58 | 2.72 | 2.44 | 3.29 | 3.29 |
| **B** | **avg** | **4.81** | **4.80** | **4.81** | **4.81** | **2.68** | **2.62** | **2.78** | **2.78** | **3.51** | **3.20** | **3.86** | **3.88** |
|  | +1σ | 4.84 | 4.83 | 4.85 | 4.85 | 2.97 | 2.94 | 2.98 | 2.99 | 4.30 | 3.97 | 4.44 | 4.47 |
|  | -1σ | 4.80 | 4.81 | 4.79 | 4.79 | 2.44 | 2.44 | 2.71 | 2.70 | 2.54 | 2.44 | 3.28 | 3.23 |
| **C** | **avg** | **4.86** | **4.86** | **4.85** | **4.85** | **2.80** | **2.78** | **2.97** | **2.96** | **3.35** | **3.23** | **3.88** | **3.86** |
|  | +1σ | 4.92 | 4.92 | 4.90 | 4.90 | 3.15 | 3.12 | 3.22 | 3.22 | 4.16 | 4.02 | 4.48 | 4.49 |
|  | -1σ | 4.80 | 4.79 | 4.80 | 4.79 | 2.61 | 2.44 | 2.84 | 2.70 | 2.90 | 2.56 | 3.44 | 3.04 |
| **D** | **avg** | **4.86** | **4.85** | **4.86** | **4.85** | **3.01** | **2.91** | **3.14** | **3.07** | **3.64** | **3.30** | **3.95** | **3.68** |
|  | +1σ | 4.93 | 4.91 | 4.92 | 4.91 | 3.41 | 3.37 | 3.45 | 3.44 | 4.38 | 4.03 | 4.46 | 4.33 |
|  | -1σ | 4.77 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 2.32 | 2.39 | 2.43 | 2.42 | 2.86 | 2.67 | 3.42 | 3.39 |
| **E** | **avg** | **4.84** | **4.83** | **4.84** | **4.84** | **2.64** | **2.69** | **2.74** | **2.73** | **3.63** | **3.40** | **3.93** | **3.93** |
|  | +1σ | 4.90 | 4.90 | 4.91 | 4.91 | 2.96 | 2.99 | 3.05 | 3.05 | 4.39 | 4.13 | 4.44 | 4.46 |
|  | -1σ | 4.78 | 4.78 | 4.78 | 4.78 | 2.49 | 2.44 | 2.66 | 2.66 | 2.64 | 2.52 | 3.31 | 3.30 |
| **F** | **avg** | **4.86** | **4.86** | **4.84** | **4.84** | **2.75** | **2.70** | **2.86** | **2.85** | **3.47** | **3.29** | **3.88** | **3.88** |
|  | +1σ | 4.93 | 4.95 | 4.90 | 4.89 | 3.01 | 2.97 | 3.05 | 3.05 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.45 | 4.47 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table S5 (continued). | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| model | | HCHO | | | | NOx | | | | O3 | | | |
| Air | PO3 | LO3 | LCH4 | Air | PO3 | LO3 | LCH4 | Air | PO3 | LO3 | LCH4 |
|  | -1σ | 1.87 | 1.85 | 2.07 | 2.06 | 0.49 | 0.89 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 4.47 | 4.60 | 4.44 | 4.43 |
| **A** | **avg** | **2.17** | **2.14** | **2.32** | **2.31** | **1.05** | **1.36** | **0.90** | **0.89** | **4.70** | **4.80** | **4.66** | **4.65** |
|  | +1σ | 2.48 | 2.43 | 2.57 | 2.56 | 1.61 | 1.84 | 1.41 | 1.42 | 4.93 | 4.99 | 4.88 | 4.87 |
|  | -1σ | 1.93 | 1.85 | 2.12 | 2.13 | 0.50 | 0.90 | 0.39 | 0.36 | 4.27 | 4.41 | 4.24 | 4.22 |
| **B** | **avg** | **2.20** | **2.13** | **2.33** | **2.34** | **1.03** | **1.32** | **0.88** | **0.86** | **4.51** | **4.62** | **4.47** | **4.45** |
|  | +1σ | 2.47 | 2.40 | 2.54 | 2.55 | 1.56 | 1.74 | 1.37 | 1.36 | 4.76 | 4.83 | 4.70 | 4.68 |
|  | -1σ | 1.89 | 1.91 | 2.20 | 2.19 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.28 | 4.28 |
| **C** | **avg** | **2.22** | **2.22** | **2.43** | **2.43** | **1.14** | **1.27** | **1.00** | **1.01** | **4.49** | **4.54** | **4.45** | **4.45** |
|  | +1σ | 2.55 | 2.52 | 2.66 | 2.66 | 1.51 | 1.64 | 1.34 | 1.36 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.62 | 4.62 |
|  | -1σ | 1.69 | 1.75 | 1.79 | 1.80 | 0.43 | 0.88 | 0.43 | 0.63 | 4.16 | 4.35 | 4.15 | 4.24 |
| **D** | **avg** | **1.89** | **1.97** | **1.97** | **2.00** | **0.98** | **1.36** | **0.89** | **1.12** | **4.40** | **4.56** | **4.38** | **4.47** |
|  | +1σ | 2.10 | 2.19 | 2.15 | 2.19 | 1.53 | 1.84 | 1.35 | 1.61 | 4.65 | 4.77 | 4.60 | 4.71 |
|  | -1σ | 1.94 | 1.93 | 2.14 | 2.13 | 0.52 | 0.85 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 4.17 | 4.31 | 4.19 | 4.17 |
| **E** | **avg** | **2.21** | **2.19** | **2.34** | **2.34** | **0.97** | **1.22** | **0.92** | **0.90** | **4.41** | **4.53** | **4.42** | **4.41** |
|  | +1σ | 2.47 | 2.45 | 2.54 | 2.54 | 1.42 | 1.59 | 1.36 | 1.35 | 4.66 | 4.76 | 4.66 | 4.65 |
|  | -1σ | 1.89 | 1.84 | 2.14 | 2.13 | 0.75 | 1.02 | 0.65 | 0.63 | 4.29 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.26 |
| **F** | **avg** | **2.21** | **2.15** | **2.37** | **2.37** | **1.17** | **1.37** | **1.03** | **1.02** | **4.49** | **4.54** | **4.46** | **4.44** |
|  | +1σ | 2.52 | 2.46 | 2.60 | 2.60 | 1.59 | 1.73 | 1.41 | 1.41 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.65 | 4.63 |