|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | pure breadth | depth | optimal | linear | power |
| sqrt | $$V\_{126}=9657, $$$$p\_{adj}=1$$ | $$V\_{126}=12670, $$$$p\_{adj}=.007$$ | $$V\_{126}=16059,$$$$p\_{adj}=2.22×10^{-13}$$ | $$V\_{126}=16878,$$$$p\_{adj}=4.80×10^{-17}$$ | $$V\_{126}=19532,$$$$p\_{adj}=5.85×10^{-32}$$ |
| pure breadth |  | $$V\_{126}=10829,$$$$p\_{adj}=1$$ | $$V\_{126}=16996,$$$$p\_{adj}=1.31×10^{-17}$$ | $$V\_{126}=18221,$$$$p\_{adj}=4.26×10^{-24}$$ | $$V\_{126}=19531,$$$$p\_{adj}=5.94×10^{-32}$$ |
| depth |  |  | $$V\_{126}=16421,$$$$p\_{adj}=6.03×10^{-15}$$ | $$V\_{126}=17137,$$$$p\_{adj}=2.78×10^{-18}$$ | $$V\_{126}=19408,$$$$p\_{adj}=3.74×10^{-31}$$ |
| optimal |  |  |  | $$V\_{126}=9909,$$$$p\_{adj}=1$$ | $$V\_{126}=15828,$$$$p\_{adj}=2.00×10^{-12}$$ |
| linear |  |  |  |  | $$V\_{126}=16511,$$$$p\_{adj}=1.99×10^{-29}$$ |

***Table S9***. Summary of the pair-wise comparisons (Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed-Ranks test) of the individual AIC between all six models using Gaussian distributed noise. P-values are adjusted with Bonferroni corrections and significative differences (*p* <.05) are highlighted in bold. Models are ordered from worst (square root) to best (power).