

IF SURVIVAL MATTERS, SHOULD REGENERATION STUDIES HAVE MORE REPLICATIONS?

David B. South and Curtis L. VanderSchaaf

Abstract—When it comes to testing for differences in seedling survival, researchers sometimes make Type II statistical errors due to the inherent variability associated with survival in tree planting studies. For example, in one trial (with five replications) first-year survival of seedlings planted in October (42 percent) was not significantly different ($\alpha=0.05$) from those planted in December (69 percent). Did planting in a dry October truly have no effect on survival? Authors who make a Type II error might not be aware that as seedling survival decreases (up to an overall average of 50 percent survival), statistical power declines. As a result, the ability to declare an 8 percentage point difference as “significant” is very difficult when survival averages 90 percent or less. We estimate that about half of regeneration trials (average survival of pines <90 percent) cannot declare a 12 percent difference as statistically significant ($\alpha=0.05$). When researchers realize their tree planting trials have low statistical power, they should consider using more replications. Other ways to increase power include: (1) use a 0.1 α value which increases the Type I error (2) use a potentially more powerful contrast test (instead of an overall treatment F-test) and (3) conduct survival trials under a roof. Alternative methods include modeling survival data (instead of applying statistics to separate mean values) and simply estimating the treatment effect size with confidence intervals.

INTRODUCTION

Although researchers often fail to reject the null hypothesis, they should never accept a null hypothesis. Even so, often researchers conclude that various treatments did not affect seedling survival. This may be true when the difference between means is very small. However, in several studies, an examined factor was not significant ($\alpha=0.05$) but the treatment increased survival of pine seedlings by at least 20 percentage points (table 1). Could this type of increase be both biologically significant and statistically insignificant? This certainly can happen when the study design has low statistical power.

There is always a chance that some of our conclusions about treatment effects are wrong. In some trials researchers might conclude the treatment worked, but in reality it didn't (Type I error). More commonly we say the treatment had no effect on seedling survival, but there really was a treatment effect (Type II error). Examples of possible Type II errors are provided in table 1. Because of a combination of limited resources and tradition, the design of most seedling survival trials has insufficient replication to detect a “true” 8 percent difference in survival. This is because most researchers (80 percent) use four replications or less. Installing additional replications will cost more, but it will also improve the power of survival tests (i.e., $1 - \beta$ value).

We have noticed that statistically, it may be relatively easy to declare a 30 cm increase in height as significant, but hard to declare an 8 percent difference in seedling survival as statistically significant. This is partly because when average survival becomes < 90 percent, the standard errors increase. There are various ways to increase the power of our tests (table 2), but many choose to use less than 5 replications and some analyze trials with a simple multiple-range test (see various examples in volumes 1 to 14 of the Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conferences).

We and others have pointed out the importance of replications in both nursery (VanderSchaaf and others 2003) and field trials (Foster 2001, Zedeker and others 1993). In a previous paper, we examined the decline in power as plantations get older and increase in biomass (South and VanderSchaaf 2006). In this paper, we examine the impact of replication on the (a priori) power of establishment trials that report survival. In several cases, the power of the statistical test was so low that it was not able to declare a 20 percent difference as significant. Perhaps one reason authors don't typically report statistical power (Peterman 1990) is because the statistical power is low or because they only care about making Type I statistical errors. This paper examines various ways to increase the power of regeneration trials.

Author information: David B. South, Emeritus Professor, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849-5418; and Curtis L. VanderSchaaf, Assistant Professor, School of Agricultural Sciences and Forestry, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA 71272.

Kirschman, Julia E., comp. 2018. Proceedings of the 19th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. e-Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-234. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 444 p.

Table 1—Examples of regeneration studies published in Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conference Proceedings where the increase in survival exceeded 8 percent but was not statistically significant ($\alpha = 0.05$). A Type II error is likely (see comments) since the power of the test was too low to declare the increase in survival as statistically significant

Treatment	Treatment survival (%)	Treatment increased survival (%)	Comment	Year	Page
Container stock	89	9	10 percent increase was significant at 0.05	1983	129
Shear and pile	82	10	Height and diameter growth increased	1983	43
September herbicide	90	13	Weed control was significant at 0.05	2008	220
High site preparation	71	15	Was significant at 0.05 4 years earlier	1988	166
Lifting in January	80	19	Was significant at 0.01 the previous year	1994	360
March planting-LA	99	20	LSD = 8 percent for Arkansas planting dates	1980	22
Wide spacing	76	21	High stocking increases mortality	2003	434
Nursery #19	56	22	27 percent increase was significant at 0.05	1988	154
December planting	69	27	29 percent increase was significant at 0.05	1984	126
Control	75	32	Fire killed seedlings $P > F = 0.067$	2013	139
Herbicides	58	38	Greatest level of weed control	1988	345

Year = year of meeting; Page = location of treatment means.

Table 2—The probability of correctly rejecting a null hypothesis (when the null hypothesis is false) is influenced by several factors

Factor	Statistical power increases with	Comment	Examples
Number of replications	More replications	Increases error degrees of freedom	Figures 2 and 3
Number of treatments	More treatments	Increases error degrees of freedom	Land and others 2004
Alpha value	A larger alpha value	Increases Type I errors	Xydias 1983
Type of test	A one-tailed test	Test only for a detrimental effect	Paquette and others 2011
Contrast statements	Use of contrast tests statements	Reduces P-values	Blake and South 1991
Variability among plots	Less experimental noise	Use trained hand-planters	Rowan 1987
Difference in means	Larger mean difference	Withhold rainfall to increase mortality	South and others 2012
Blocking on variable sites	Correct blocking	Typically reduces error term	South and Miller 2007

METHODS

Simulation Studies

Computer simulations were created to examine the effects of replication on standard error, standard deviation, least significant difference (LSD) and power. Simulation #1 assumed a completely randomized design (CRD) with two treatments. Plot size for experimental units did not vary (i.e. the experimental area doubled when the number of replications doubled). Simulation #2 involved a randomized complete block design (RCB) with two treatments and a total of 200 seedlings per

treatment. The numbers of replications simulated were 4, 8, 10 and 20, with 50, 25, 20 and 10 seedlings planted per experimental unit, respectively.

Literature Survey

We selected 50 papers that were published in the proceedings of the Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conference (BSSRC). Only papers that involved pine seedlings and detected a significant difference are included in table 3. Papers that did not report either F-test or mean comparison test results

Table 3—Examples of survival means (A:B) reported from 50 selected papers published in various volumes of the proceedings of the Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conferences. The mean separation test detected a significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) difference between A and B. In most of these trials, B-A is slightly larger than a least significant difference (LSD) value.

A	B	B-A (%)	Species	Year	Page	Replications	A	B	B-A (%)	Species	Year	Page	Replications
95	98	3	Loblolly	1999	337	15-RCB	73	84	11	Loblolly	1986	69	3-RCB
79	82	3	Loblolly	2003	415	4-RCB	87	98	11	loblolly	1986	215	5-RCB
95	99	4	Loblolly	2005	137	3-RCB	67	79	12	Longleaf	1986	223	4-RCB
95	99	4	Shortleaf	1992	266	4-RCB	77	89	12	White	1986	246	3-RCB
92	96	4	Shortleaf	2003	421	6-RCB	21	33	12	Loblolly	1990	158	8-RCB
92	96	4	Loblolly	2011	262	4-RCB	69	81	12	Longleaf	2001	107	3-RCB
90	95	5	Shortleaf	1986	362	3-RCB	64	77	13	Loblolly	1988	131	3-RCB
74	79	5	Slash	1984	84	4-RCB	74	87	13	Loblolly	2001	263	4-RCB
91	96	5	Slash	1984	323	3-RCB	64	77	13	Loblolly	1988	131	3-RCB
72	77	5	Loblolly	1994	360	4-RCB	74	88	14	Loblolly	1982	16	3-RCB
83	88	5	Slash	2005	187	4-RCB	65	79	14	Loblolly	1982	21	15-RCB
92	98	6	Loblolly	1990	150	5-RCB	56	70	14	Pit-loblolly	1984	372	4-RCB
91	98	7	Loblolly + Virginia	1982	143	3-RCB	56	70	14	Longleaf	1988	166	4-RCB
88	95	7	Longleaf	2005	96	6-RCB	62	76	14	Loblolly	1984	413	5-RCB
73	80	7	Longleaf	2005	87	3-RCB	22	37	15	Loblolly	1984	264	4-RCB
89	97	8	Loblolly	2001	53	3-RCB	61	77	16	Loblolly	2001	258	3-RCB
92	100	8	Loblolly	2003	334	4-RCB	74	91	17	Loblolly	1988	345	3-RCB
84	92	8	Loblolly	2005	169	3-RCB	42	59	17	Loblolly	1988	143	12-???
66	75	9	Longleaf	1984	398	5-RCB	53	71	18	Longleaf	1982	72	3-CRD
89	98	9	Loblolly	1990	105	4-RCB	78	97	19	Loblolly	1990	42	3-RCB
82	91	9	Loblolly	1994	238	3-RCB	69	89	20	Sand	1982	99	3-RCB
74	84	10	Loblolly	1980	93	3-RCB	43	64	21	Loblolly	2003	434	4-RCB
79	89	10	White	1982	129	6-RCB	63	86	23	Loblolly	2008	220	4-RCB
80	90	10	Loblolly	2005	122	3-strip-block	29	52	23	Loblolly	1988	154	8-RCB
75	86	11	Slash	1986	46	2-RCB	42	71	29	Loblolly	1984	126	5-RCB

Year = year of meeting; Page = location of means A and B; RCB = Randomized complete block; CRD = completely randomized design.

(e.g., Hassan and Silva 1999) were not included in the survey. In cases where multiple pairs of means were declared different, the pair with the smallest difference was selected. Various mean comparison tests were included and in some cases, the type of test used was not reported. In theory, most values listed in table 3 are slightly greater than an LSD value. The difference between the two means (B-A) was plotted on the y-axis and the lower mean (A) was plotted on the x-axis (fig. 1).

RESULTS

Simulations that varied replications revealed contrasting results. The standard error decreased when doubling replications involved doubling the area planted (fig. 2) but the standard error increased when doubling replications resulted in smaller (i.e. fewer seedlings per plot) experimental units (fig. 3).

The BSSRC survey suggests that an 8-percent difference in survival may be declared significant in less than 3 out of 10 trials. More than 1 out of 5 trials cannot detect a 15 percent difference in survival (fig. 1). Due to low statistical power (1-beta), many trials are not able to detect a significant difference in survival, even when the treatment caused a “real” increase in survival.

The survey data also indicate that statistical power declines as seedling mortality increases. When survival (of the lowest mean) is more than 70 percent, an 8 percent increase in survival might be declared significant perhaps 4 out of 10 times. However, the chance is near zero when survival (of the lowest mean) is less than 70 percent survival (fig. 1). The results from the simulated data are similar to those obtained from published results (fig. 4).




Figure 1—The relationship between the smallest significant difference (B-A from table 3) and lower survival value (A from table 3). Detecting a 10 percent difference in survival is likely when average seedling survival is > 90 percent but unlikely when average survival is < 70 percent. For this dataset, the LSD values appear to increase as the survival of the lowest treatment mean decreases.




Figure 2—Simulation #1 used a completely randomized design with two treatment means (85 percent and 90 percent). Each data point in the graph represents the average value from 100 simulations. The size of each experimental unit was the same for each data point. Then average values for the standard error, standard deviation (SD) and least significant difference (LSD) vary with the number of replications. A 15 percent LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) can be expected using four replications while a 10 percent LSD requires seven replications. The star represents an LSD value from a spacing study that contained 22 replications. The standard error of the mean (squares) and standard deviations (diamonds) are also plotted. An *a priori* power line (1-beta) is plotted assuming a constant standard deviation of 7, $\alpha = 0.05$ and an 8 percent survival difference between two means.




Figure 3—Simulation #2 involved randomized complete block design with two treatment means (70 percent and 80 percent). Each data point in the graph represents the average value from 10 simulations. The relationship between the least significant difference (LSD) and number of replications in a simulated study where the size of each experimental unit decreased as the number of replications increased. This simulation involved planting 200 simulated seedlings per treatment, regardless of the number of replications (i.e., a total of 400 seedlings planted). A 14 percent LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) was achieved using four replications (50 seedlings per plot) while a 9 percent LSD requires 20 replications (10 seedlings per plot).




Figure 4—The relationship between the least significant difference (LSD) and seedling survival (for the lowest reported mean out of six treatment means in a randomized complete block design), for stored pine seedlings reported by Jackson and others (2012 - table 5). As survival decreases, the LSD values increased. Each square (dashed line) represents four replications and each dot (solid line) represents 12 replications. There were 30 seedlings per experimental unit.

DISCUSSION

Prior to installing a seedling survival trial, researchers may ask how to design a trial so it might have a chance of detecting an 8 percent difference in survival. The following discusses several options one might consider.

Increasing Power by Increasing Study Area

Sometimes doubling the number of replications will double the study area and hence the number of seedlings planted. Increasing the number of replications (from 4 to 8) will increase power and will decrease the LSD value (fig. 1). The effect of simulated replications is shown in figure 2 and an actual case is illustrated in figure 4. As replication increases, the standard error and LSD values decrease. In contrast, the standard deviations and coefficient of variation increase slightly (from two to seven replications) because more variability is entered into the system as the total number of experimental units increase. In figure 2, a survival difference of 16 percent was detected with four replications while an 8 percent difference was detected with 10 replications.

Reducing the LSD by Reducing the Size of the Experimental Unit

For short-term trials, it is possible to increase the number of replications without increasing the area planted. For example, a study with four blocks and 50 seedlings per experimental unit will require the same number of seedlings as a study with eight blocks and 25 seedlings per experimental unit. The trial with eight replications will have about the same power as one with four replications, but the LSD will likely be smaller (fig. 3).

Do Not Use Pseudoreplication

Pseudoreplication occurs when treatments are not replicated but an analysis of variance (ANOVA) is carried out by assuming sub-samples (or in some cases individual trees) are the same as replication. A major factor that leads to pseudoreplication is an inability (or reluctance) of the author to define the correct experimental unit. Some journal editors do not require ANOVA tables be included in manuscripts. Therefore, one might never know if the error term involved 13 or 2841 degrees of freedom. Reviewers who would normally reject non-replicated trials can be fooled into thinking that a statistical analysis (that involves pseudoreplication) is valid. Although some forestry research involves pseudoreplication (de Souza and others 2016, Dong and Burdett 1986, Kamaluddin and others 2005, Smith 1989), it should not be used as a method to reject a null hypothesis.

Higher Alpha Values Increase Power

A method some silviculturists choose to increase the power of a tree planting test is to raise the alpha value (table 4) and increase the probability of a Type I error. Some wisely use a 0.1 level to reduce the Type II error (Amishev and Fox 2006; Cram and others 2007; Curtis and others 2015; Dean and others 2013; Scott and Stagg 2013; Walker and others 1981, 1985). In some cases an alpha value of 0.15 has been used (Haywood and others 1998, Xydias 1983). Regardless of the alpha value selected, authors should list the actual p-value for treatment effects.

Pre-planned Contrast Tests Increase Power

In most of the studies in table 3, means were compared using a test such as Duncan's multiple range test, Tukey's test and Newman-Keuls test. A few used contrast procedures (Warren 1986) to test for treatment effects. An example of this method is illustrated in a study with 11 nursery treatments and four replications (Blake and South 1991). When survival ranged from 89 percent to 98 percent, an F-test ($p=0.68$) suggested no treatment effect. However, a pre-planned contrast test (comparing only top-pruned treatments) revealed a significant ($\alpha=0.05$) treatment effect.

LSD as an Indication of Statistical Power

Although reporting statistical power is important (Peterman 1990), most BSSRC papers do not provide any indication of the power of the test (i.e., no LSD values and no beta values). However, when comparing studies with the same experimental design, LSD values do provide the reader with some indication of the statistical power (Nemec 1991). In one study (Jackson and others 2012), LSD values were reported when comparing six treatment means. This provided an opportunity to compare published LSD values (fig. 4) with figure 1. As expected, LSD values for pine seedlings (outplanted in sand pits) increased as the percent survival (of the lowest mean) decreased. Increasing the number of replications decreased the LSD values (fig. 4). When the lowest mean was 80 percent, the LSD for four replications was about 18 percent and replicating 12 times reduced this to 14 percent. The predicted LSD values (fig. 2) were similar in magnitude to those in figure 4. We recommend researchers routinely report LSD values when reporting survival means. This will provide the reader with some idea of the power of the test. However, in certain cases, a lower LSD value is not associated with higher statistical power (fig. 3).

Table 4—Effect of alpha value and number of replications on statistical power (1-beta) of experiments with 7 percent standard deviation in survival, (two means of 88 and 80 and standard deviation =7)

ALPHA	4 replications	6 replications	10 replications	15 replications
0.15	0.57	0.70	0.86	0.95
0.1	0.48	0.63	0.81	0.93
0.05	0.36	0.50	0.72	0.87

Table generated using University of British Columbia Web site: <https://www.stat.ubc.ca/~rollin/stats/ssize/n2.html>.

Roofed Survival Trials

When the objective is to test nursery practices or tree planting treatments on first-year survival, then we highly recommend the planting site include a roof that protects seedlings from rainfall. Much time and effort has been wasted designing and installing outdoor studies that end up with adequate rainfall and high survival. For example, in one study (South and others 2012), treatments that received rainfall resulted in a LSD of 5.3 but the difference in survival was only 1 percent (95 percent vs. 96 percent). However, when these seedlings were planted under a roof and exposed to a 4-month drought, the treatment effect was significant ($P = 0.007$; $LSD = 14.6$; means were 28 percent and 74 percent). Approximately one-third of the studies listed in table 3 could have been established in a roofed stress house.

Use figure 1 to Evaluate Your Study

After analyzing a seedling survival trial, researchers may want to evaluate their study design. A simple way is to plot the LSD value ($\alpha = 0.05$) on the Y-axis of figure 1 with the lowest treatment mean on the X-axis. If the point is below the slope-line, your study is above average. However, if the point is above the line, you might need to increase the number of replications in future trials.

CONCLUSIONS

Researchers should establish trials with the knowledge that statistical power is not the same for all response variables. When testing differences in survival, power will decline as average survival decreases (until the average study survival reaches 50 percent). With only four replications, the probability of a Type II error may be high. A treatment that produces a “true” 8 percent increase in survival will likely be declared not significant if the lowest treatment mean is < 80 percent. However, just because a treatment was “non-significant” does not automatically mean the treatment was ineffective. Researchers should remember that they can never “prove” a null hypothesis and therefore it would be unscientific to accept a null hypothesis (even if the experiment had high statistical power). We can only fail to reject the null hypothesis, especially when we establish studies with insufficient replications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors wish to gratefully acknowledge Dr. Paul Jackson who provided the data for figure 4 and to Stanley Zarnoch for providing a helpful review of the manuscript. This paper was published in the journal *Reforesta*.

LITERATURE CITED

- Amishev, D.V.; Fox, T.R. 2006. Impact of weed control and fertilization on growth of four species of pine in the Virginia Piedmont. In: Connor, K.F., ed. Proceedings of the 13th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-92. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 121-123.
- Blake, J.I.; South, D.B. 1991. Effects of plant growth regulators on loblolly pine seedling development and field performance. In: Coleman, S.S.; Neary, D.G., eds. Proceedings of the 6th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-70. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station: 100-107.
- Cram, M.M.; Enebak, S.A.; Fraedrich, S.W. [and others]. 2007. Evaluation of fumigants, EPTC herbicide, and *Paenibacillus macerans* in the production of loblolly pine seedlings. *Forest Science*. 53(1): 73-83.
- Curtis, C.M.; Aust, W.M.; Seiler, J.R.; Strahm, B.D. 2015. Survival and growth of restored Piedmont riparian forests as affected by site preparation, planting stock and planting aids. In: Holley, A.G.; Connor, K.F.; Haywood, J.D., eds. Proceedings of the 17th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-203. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 431-436.
- Dean, T.J.; Scott, A.; Holley, A.G. 2013. Before and after comparisons of tree height in successive loblolly pine plantations with intervening machine, whole-tree harvesting. In: Guldin, J.M., ed. Proceedings of the 15th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-175. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 9-12.
- de Souza, D.P.L.; Gallagher, T.; Mitchell, D. [and others]. 2016. Determining the effects of felling method and season of year on the regeneration of short rotation coppice. *International Journal of Forest Engineering*. 27(1): 53-65.
- Dong, H.; Burdett, A.N. 1986. Chemical root pruning of Chinese pine seedling raised in cupric sulfide impregnated paper containers. *New Forests*. 1(1): 67-73.
- Foster, J.R. 2001. Statistical power in forest monitoring. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 151: 211-222.

- Hassan, A.E.; Silva, C. 1999. Effect of planting date on first-year survival of two pines. In: Haywood, James D., ed. Proceedings of the 10th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-30. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 344-349.
- Haywood, J.D.; Tiarks, A.E.; Elliott-Smith, M.L. 1998. Response of direct seeded *Pinus palustris* and herbaceous vegetation to fertilization, burning, and pine straw harvesting. Biomass and Bioenergy. 14(2): 157-167.
- Jackson, D.P.; Enebak, S.A.; South, D.B. 2012. Survival of southern pine seedlings after inoculations with *Pythium* and cold storage in the presence of peat moss. Forest Pathology. 42: 44-51.
- Kamaluddin, M.; Chang, S.X.; Curran, M.P.; Zwiazek, J.J. 2005. Soil compaction and forest floor removal affect early growth and physiology of lodgepole pine and Douglas-fir in British Columbia. Forest Science. 51(5): 513-521.
- Land, S.B.; Roberts, S.D.; Duzan, H.W. 2004. Genetic and spacing effects on loblolly pine plantation development through age 17. In: Connor, K.F., ed. Proceedings of the 12th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-71. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 413-419.
- Nemec, A.F.L. 1991. Power Analysis Handbook for the Design and Analysis of Forestry Trials. Biometrics Information Handbook 2. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Forests. 26 p.
- Paquette, A.; Girard, J.P.; Walsh, D. 2011. Deep planting has no short- or long-term effect on the survival and growth of white spruce, black spruce, and jack pine. Northern Journal of Applied Forestry. 28(3): 146-151.
- Peterman, R.M. 1990. The importance of reporting statistical power: the forest decline and acidic deposition example. Ecology. 71(5): 2024-2027.
- Rowan, S.J. 1987. Nursery seedling quality affects growth and survival in outplantings. Georgia Forest Research Paper 70. Research Division, Georgia Forestry Commission. 14 p.
- Scott, D.A.; Stagg, D.A. 2013. Plant community responses to soil disturbance and herbicide treatments over 10 years on the Texas LTSP study. In: Guldin, J.M., ed. Proceedings of the 15th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-175. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 21-27.
- Smith, A.E. 1989. Interference with loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) seedling growth by three grass species. Weed Technology. 3(4): 696-698.
- South, D.B.; Jackson, D.P.; Starkey, T.E.; Enebak, S.A. 2012. Planting deep increases early survival and growth of *Pinus echinata* seedlings. The Open Forest Science Journal. 5(1): 33-41.
- South, D.B.; Miller, J.H. 2007. Growth response analysis after early control of woody competition for 14 loblolly pine plantations in the United States. Forest Ecology and Management. 242 (2): 569-577.
- South, D.B.; VanderSchaaf, C.L. 2006. The statistical reason why some researchers say some silvicultural treatments "wash-out" over time. In: Connor, Kristina F., ed. Proceedings of the 13th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-92. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service Southern Research Station: 333-337.
- VanderSchaaf, C.L.; South, D.B.; Doruska, P.F. 2003. The power of statistical tests of herbicide trials in forest nurseries. Proceedings of the Southern Weed Science Society. 56: 202-211.
- Walker, R.F.; West, D.C.; McLaughlin, S.B. 1981. *Pisolithus tinctorius* ectomycorrhizae enhance the survival and growth of *Pinus taeda* on a southern Appalachian Coal spoil. In: Barnett, James D., ed. Proceedings of the first biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SO-34. New Orleans: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 329-333.
- Walker, R.F.; West, D.C.; McLaughlin, S.B.; Amudsen, C.C. 1985. The performance of loblolly, Virginia, and shortleaf pine on a reclaimed surface mine as affected by *Pisolithus tinctorius* ectomycorrhizae and fertilization. In: Shoulders, E., ed. Proceedings of the third biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SO-54. New Orleans: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 410-416.
- Warren, W.G. 1986. On the presentation of statistical analysis: reason or ritual. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 16(6): 1185-1191.
- Xydias, G.K. 1983. Factors influencing survival and early stocking trends in plantation of loblolly pine. In: Barnett, James D., ed. Proceedings of the second biennial southern silvicultural research conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-24. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southeastern Research Station: 101-108.
- Zedaker, S.M.; Gregoire, T.G.; Miller, J.H. 1993. Sample-size needs for forestry herbicide trials. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 23: 2153-2158.