

Simulation models of dengue transmission in Funchal, Madeira Island: influence of seasonality

Donald Salami, César Capinha, Carla Alexandra Sousa, Maria do Rosário Oliveira Martins,
Cynthia Lord

Supporting information

Multi-model inference analysis

We used multi-model inference with *glm* function from the *glmulti* R package [1], to estimate the relative importance of our input variables on our QOIs. Our first analysis considers the main effects of the input variables on the QOIs. Utilizing the default method of the *glmulti* package (exhaustive screening of all candidate models), we built all possible unique models based on the 11 input variables. Thus, the candidate set of models for each QOIs main effect analysis contained a total of 2048 models. We defined the confidence set of models as those models within two Akaike information criterion (AIC) unit difference (ΔAIC) from the best model [2]. However, the *glmulti* function by default returns a confidence set of 100 models and delineates the number of models within $2 \Delta\text{AIC}$ from the best model.

Our second analysis considers the pairwise interactions between our input parameters. We utilized the genetic algorithm approach of the *glmulti* package, to fit a sub-set of all possible unique models (due to the extremely large number of possible candidate models). The genetic algorithm approach randomly explores a subset of all possible models, with a bias towards better models to fit the best fitting model. Our confidence set is as defined above, i.e. within $2 \Delta\text{AIC}$ of the best model. However, due to a large number of possible candidate models, the size of the returned confidence set was increased to 500 models (from the default of 100).


S1- S3 Tables (main effects) and S5 - S7 Tables (pairwise interactions), presents the top five models in the confidence sets for each our QOIs, their log likelihood values, number of fitted parameters (K), Akaike information criterion (AIC), AIC weights, and the goodness of fit (R²).

S1 Fig to S3 Fig (main effects) and S4 Fig to S6 Fig (pairwise interactions), shows the AIC profile of all fitted models.

S1 and S4 Tables, presents the model averaged coefficients and relative-importance weights for the parameters. The definition and description of the parameter symbols are as presented in Table 2 of the main article.

S1 Table. Top five models in the confidence set exploring the main effects of input variables on $MaxI_h$. The confidence set had 8 models within $2 \Delta AIC$ from the best model.


Model Order	Model	K	Log Likelihood	AIC	AIC weight	R2
1	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	8	-578.79	1179.58	0.11	0.53
2	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	7	-579.90	1179.79	0.09	0.52
3	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	7	-580.40	1180.80	0.06	0.52
4	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	6	-581.43	1180.85	0.06	0.52
5	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + q + R_{tot}$	9	-578.44	1180.88	0.05	0.53



S1 Fig. The AIC profile of models exploring the main effects of input variables on $MaxI_h$. AIC values from the best to the worst model from the 100 returned models, horizontal line delineates models that are within 2 Δ AIC from the best model. Best AIC: 1179.58; Worst AIC: 1192.93

S2 Table. Top five models in the confidence set exploring the main effects of input variables on $tmaxI_h$. The confidence set had 5 models within 2 ΔAIC from the best model.


Model Order	Model	K	Log Likelihood	AIC	AIC weight	R2
1	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + q + R_{tot}$	9	-445.25	914.50	0.18	0.76
2	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + q + R_{tot}$	10	-444.32	914.63	0.17	0.76
3	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	8	-446.3935	914.79	0.15	0.76
4	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + R_{tot}$	9	-445.40	914.80	0.15	0.76
5	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + T_{range} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + q + R_{tot}$	10	-445.24	916.48	0.07	0.76



S2 Fig. The AIC profile of models exploring the main effects of input variables on $tmaxI_h$. AIC values from the best to the worst model from the 100 returned models, horizontal line delineates models within $2 \Delta\text{AIC}$ from the best model. Best AIC: 914.50; Worst AIC: 964.93

S3 Table. Top five models in the confidence set exploring main effects of input variables on $cumI_h$. The confidence set had 27 models within 2 ΔAIC from the best model.

Model Order	Model	K	Log Likelihood	AIC	AIC weight	R2
1	$\sim 1 + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + R_{tot}$	6	-696.00	1406.01	0.03	0.08
2	$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + R_{tot}$	7	-695.08	1406.17	0.03	0.08
3	$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	7	-694.15	1406.29	0.03	0.09
4	$\sim 1 + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot}$	6	-695.18	1406.37	0.03	0.08
5	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + R_{tot}$	6	-695.47	1406.95	0.02	0.08



S3 Fig. The AIC profile of models exploring the main effects of input variables on *cumI_h*. AIC values from the best to the worst model from the 100 returned models, horizontal line delineates models that within 2 ΔAIC from the best model. Best AIC: 1406.01; Worst AIC: 1409.72


S4 Table. Model averaged coefficient and relative-importance weights for dengue parameters (from the models in the confidence set). Before model fitting, parameters were centered on zero and scaled to unit variance, to normalize parameters within the same range. Hence coefficient estimates are within the range of 0.0 to 1.0. Relative importance >0.90 appears in bold, an arbitrary cut-off for visualizing most important parameters.

Parameter	<i>MaxI_h</i>		<i>tmaxI_h</i>		<i>cumI_h</i>	
	Coefficient	Relative Importance	Coefficient	Relative Importance	Coefficient	Relative Importance
<i>t_{crit}</i>	-0.36	1.00	-0.17	1.00	0.01	0.29
<i>T_{mean}</i>	-0.19	1.00	0.12	1.00	0.03	0.46
<i>T_{range}</i>	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.27	-0.01	0.32
<i>a</i>	-0.10	0.97	0.22	1.00	-0.12	1.00
<i>β_{h→v}</i>	0.04	0.63	-0.25	1.00	0.11	1.00
<i>β_{v→h}</i>	0.19	1.00	-0.23	1.00	0.10	0.98
<i>μ_v</i>	-0.03	0.52	0.20	1.00	-0.08	0.90
<i>γ_v</i>	0.09	0.92	-0.06	0.89	0.03	0.44
<i>iv</i>	0.00	0.27	0.02	0.49	0.01	0.29
<i>q</i>	-0.01	0.34	0.02	0.53	0.00	0.17
<i>R_{tot}</i>	0.14	1.00	-0.12	1.00	0.10	0.97

S5 Table. Top five models exploring in the confidence set the main effects and pairwise (first order) interactions of input variables on MaxI_h . The confidence set had 93 models within $2 \Delta\text{AIC}$ from the best model.

Model Order	Model	K	Log Likelihood	AIC	AIC weight	R2
1	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:T_{range} + t_{crit}:a + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v +$ $t_{crit}:R_{tot} + T_{mean}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{mean}:q + T_{range}:iv + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} +$ $+ a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:q +$ $\mu_v:R_{tot} + \gamma_v:q$	30	-464.68	1003.35	0.02	0.73
2	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:T_{range} + t_{crit}:a + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v +$ $t_{crit}:R_{tot} + T_{mean}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{range}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{range}:\mu_v +$ $T_{range}:iv + T_{range}:q + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v +$ $a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v +$ $\beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:q + \mu_v:R_{tot} + \gamma_v:q$	34	-463.68	1003.36	0.02	0.74
3	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:T_{range} + t_{crit}:a + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v +$ $t_{crit}:R_{tot} T_{mean}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{mean}:q + T_{range}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} +$ $T_{range}:iv + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:R_{tot} +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q +$ $\beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:R_{tot} + \gamma_v:q$	32	465.72	1003.45	0.01	0.73


	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:T_{range} + t_{crit}:a + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v +$ $t_{crit}:R_{tot} + T_{mean}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{mean}:iv + T_{mean}:q +$ $T_{range}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{range}:\mu_v + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v$	32	-464.80	1003.59	0.01	0.73
4	$+ a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v +$ $\beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:R_{tot} + \gamma_v:q$					
5	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:T_{range} + t_{crit}:a + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v +$ $t_{crit}:R_{tot} + T_{mean}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{mean}:\mu_v + T_{mean}:q + T_{range}:iv +$ $+ a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:q +$ $\mu_v:R_{tot} + \gamma_v:q$	31	-464.82	1003.64	0.01	0.73



S4 Fig. The AIC profile of models exploring the main effects of input variables on $MaxI_h$. AIC values from the best to the worst model from the 500 returned models, horizontal line delineates models that within $2 \Delta AIC$ from the best model. Best AIC: 1003.35; Worst AIC: 1131.43

S6 Table. Top five models in the confidence set exploring the main effects and pairwise (first order) interactions of input variables on $tmaxI_h$. The confidence set had 94 models within 2 ΔAIC from the best model.

Model Order	Model	K	Log Likelihood	AIC	AIC weight	R2
1	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + q + R_{tot} + t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v + t_{crit}:q + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:iv + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \mu_v:q + \gamma_v:iv + \gamma_v:q$	23	-362.72	797.44	0.01	0.83
2	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + q + R_{tot} + t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v + t_{crit}:q + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:iv + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \mu_v:q + \gamma_v:iv$	22	-363.76	797.52	0.01	0.83
3	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + q + R_{tot} + t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v + t_{crit}:q + T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:iv + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \mu_v:q + \gamma_v:q$	22	-363.85	797.70	0.01	0.83
4	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + q + R_{tot} + t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v + t_{crit}:q + T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:iv + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \mu_v:iv + \mu_v:q$	22	-363.87	797.74	0.01	0.83
5	$\sim 1 + t_{crit} + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + q + R_{tot} + t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + t_{crit}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + t_{crit}:\mu_v + t_{crit}:\gamma_v + t_{crit}:q + T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:iv + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:q + \mu_v:q + \gamma_v:iv + \gamma_v:q$	24	-361.87	797.74	0.01	0.83




S5 Fig. The AIC profile of models exploring main effects and pairwise (first order) interactions of input variables on $tmaxI_h$. AIC values from the best to the worst model from the 500 returned models, horizontal line delineates models that within 2 Δ AIC from the best model. Best AIC: 797.44; Worst IC: 949.16

S7 Table. Top five models in the confidence set exploring the main effects and pairwise (first order) interactions of input variables on $cumI_h$. The confidence set had 172 models within $2 \Delta AIC$ from the best model.

Model Order	Model	K	Log Likelihood	AIC	AIC weight	R2
1	$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\mu_v + T_{mean}:\gamma_v +$ $T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:iv +$ $a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:iv +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \mu_v:\gamma_v + \mu_v:R_{tot}$	27	-619.03	1304.07	0.01	0.41
2	$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\mu_v + T_{mean}:\gamma_v +$ $T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:iv +$ $a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:iv +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \mu_v:\gamma_v + \mu_v:R_{tot}$	26	-620.058	1304.12	0.01	0.41
3	$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\mu_v + T_{mean}:\gamma_v +$ $T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:iv +$ $a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:iv +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \mu_v:\gamma_v + \mu_v:R_{tot}$	27	-620.07	1304.14	0.01	0.41
4	$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + T_{mean}:\mu_v +$ $T_{mean}:\gamma_v + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:iv + a:R_{tot} +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:iv + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} +$ $\beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:\gamma_v + \mu_v:R_{tot}$	27	-619.10	1304.20	0.01	0.41

$\sim 1 + T_{mean} + a + \beta_{h \rightarrow v} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \mu_v + \gamma_v + iv + R_{tot} +$ $t_{crit}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + T_{mean}:\mu_v + T_{mean}:\gamma_v +$ $T_{range}:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{h \rightarrow v} + a:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + a:\mu_v + a:\gamma_v + a:iv +$ $a:R_{tot} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\beta_{v \rightarrow h} + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\mu_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:\gamma_v + \beta_{h \rightarrow v}:iv +$ $\beta_{h \rightarrow v}:R_{tot} + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:\mu_v + \beta_{v \rightarrow h}:R_{tot} + \mu_v:\gamma_v + \mu_v:R_{tot}$	28	-618.15	1304.30	0.01	0.42
---	----	---------	---------	------	------



S6 Fig. The AIC profile of models exploring main effects and pairwise (first order) interactions of input variables on $cumI_h$. AIC values from the best to the worst model from the 500 returned models, horizontal line delineates models within $2 \Delta\text{AIC}$ from the best model. Best AIC: 1304.07; Worst AIC: 1363.64

S8 Table. Model averaged coefficient and relative-importance weights for dengue parameters (from the models in the first order interactions confidence set). Before model fitting, parameters were centered on zero and scaled to unit variance, to normalize parameters within the same range. Hence coefficient estimates are within the range of 0.0 to 1.0. Relative importance >0.90 appears in bold, an arbitrary cut-off for visualizing most important parameters.

Parameter	<i>MaxI_h</i>		<i>tmaxI_h</i>		<i>cumI_h</i>	
	Coefficient ¹	Relative Importance	Coefficient ¹	Relative Importance	Coefficient ¹	Relative Importance
<i>t_{crit}</i>	-0.36	1.00	-0.21	1.00	0.00	0.05
<i>t_{crit}: T_{mean}</i>	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01
<i>t_{crit}: T_{range}</i>	-0.06	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02
<i>t_{crit}: a</i>	-0.14	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02
<i>t_{crit}: β_{h→v}</i>	0.00	0.01	-0.08	1.00	-0.09	1.00
<i>t_{crit}: β_{v→h}</i>	0.15	1.00	-0.07	1.00	0.00	0.02
<i>t_{crit}: μ_v</i>	-0.16	1.00	0.14	1.00	0.00	0.04
<i>t_{crit}: γ_v</i>	0.10	1.00	-0.06	0.99	0.00	0.01
<i>t_{crit}: iv</i>	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
<i>t_{crit}: q</i>	0.00	0.11	-0.08	1.00	0.00	0.02
<i>t_{crit}: R_{tot}</i>	0.18	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
<i>T_{mean}</i>	-0.22	1.00	0.11	1.00	0.07	0.98
<i>T_{mean}: T_{range}</i>	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01
<i>T_{mean}: a</i>	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.02
<i>T_{mean}: β_{h→v}</i>	0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.19	-0.08	0.99
<i>T_{mean}: β_{v→h}</i>	-0.06	0.99	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.04
<i>T_{mean}: μ_v</i>	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.10	1.00
<i>T_{mean}: γ_v</i>	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	-0.10	1.00
<i>T_{mean}: iv</i>	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03
<i>T_{mean}: q</i>	0.07	1.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
<i>T_{mean}: R_{tot}</i>	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01

T_{range}	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03
$T_{range}: \alpha$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03
$T_{range}: \beta_{h \rightarrow v}$	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.99	0.09	0.99
$T_{range}: \beta_{v \rightarrow h}$	0.05	0.97	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02
$T_{range}: \mu_v$	0.02	0.46	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
$T_{range}: \gamma_v$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
$T_{range}: iv$	0.08	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03
$T_{range}: q$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01
$T_{range}: R_{tot}$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
α	-0.10	1.00	0.20	1.00	-0.09	1.00
$\alpha: \beta_{h \rightarrow v}$	0.07	0.99	0.00	0.02	0.18	1.00
$\alpha: \beta_{v \rightarrow h}$	0.13	1.00	0.00	0.02	0.18	1.00
$\alpha: \mu_v$	-0.05	0.98	0.00	0.02	-0.14	1.00
$\alpha: \gamma_v$	0.06	0.99	0.00	0.02	0.13	1.00
$\alpha: iv$	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.98	0.08	0.99
$\alpha: q$	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01
$\alpha: R_{tot}$	0.09	1.00	0.00	0.02	0.15	1.00
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}$	0.08	1.00	-0.24	1.00	0.13	1.00
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}: \beta_{v \rightarrow h}$	-0.10	1.00	0.01	0.41	-0.16	1.00
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}: \mu_v$	0.00	0.03	-0.06	1.00	0.14	1.00
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}: \gamma_v$	-0.05	0.97	0.00	0.02	-0.08	0.98
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}: iv$	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.01	-0.09	1.00
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}: q$	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.02
$\beta_{h \rightarrow v}: R_{tot}$	-0.05	0.98	0.00	0.02	-0.15	1.00
$\beta_{v \rightarrow h}$	0.17	1.00	-0.22	1.00	0.09	0.99
$\beta_{v \rightarrow h}: \mu_v$	0.06	0.99	-0.05	0.99	0.12	1.00
$\beta_{v \rightarrow h}: \gamma_v$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.05

$\beta_{v \rightarrow h} : iv$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.14
$\beta_{v \rightarrow h} : q$	0.04	0.97	-0.05	0.99	0.00	0.03
$\beta_{v \rightarrow h} : R_{tot}$	-0.09	1.00	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.32
μ_v	0.00	0.04	0.20	1.00	-0.07	0.96
$\mu_v : \gamma_v$	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.99
$\mu_v : iv$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.02
$\mu_v : q$	-0.04	0.95	0.03	0.91	0.00	0.01
$\mu_v : R_{tot}$	0.08	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.10	1.00
γ_v	0.07	0.99	-0.07	1.00	0.07	0.98
$\gamma_v : iv$	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.60	0.00	0.02
$\gamma_v : q$	0.07	0.99	0.03	0.95	0.00	0.03
$\gamma_v : R_{tot}$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01
iv	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.98	0.03	0.47
$iv : q$	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.13
$iv : R_{tot}$	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02
q	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.99	0.00	0.01
$q : R_{tot}$	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01
R_{tot}	0.10	1.00	-0.12	1.00	0.09	1.00

References

1. Calcagno V, de Mazancourt C. Glmulti: An r package for easy automated model selection with (generalized) linear models. 2010. 2010;34(12):29: J Stat Softw. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v034.i12>.
2. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Model selection and multimodel inference: A practical information-theoretic approach: Springer, New York, NY; 2002.