Supplemental Table 4. Statistical Analysis

Behavioral appraisal by implementing a short sequence of stress resolves adaptively changed stress gains

Eun-Hwa Lee, Jin-Young Park, Hye-Jin Kwon, Pyung-Lim Han*

Main Figures

Figures	Groups (animal numbers), data points	Statistical methods	Targets /factors	Filtering values in PCA/ Centroids in *K*-Means clustering	F and *p* Values	Values in comparision groups		
						Groups in comparision	Groups compared in post-hoc test/ % in *K*-Means clustering	*p* value
1b	CON(10) RS5(9) CRST(10) CRST+IMI(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+RS10(10) CRST+RS15(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 62)} = 9.890$, $p < 0.0001$	Target chamber: CON RS5 CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
	CON(10) RS5(9) CRST(10) CRST+IMI(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+RS10(10) CRST+RS15(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 62)} = 9.042$, $p < 0.0001$	Non-target chamber: CON RS5 CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
1c	CON(10) RS5(9) CRST(10) CRST+IMI(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+RS10(10) CRST+RS15(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 62)} = 7.470$, $p < 0.0001$	CON RS5 CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.05$
							RS5 vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
1d	CON(10) RS5(9) CRST(10) CRST+IMI(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+RS10(10) CRST+RS15(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 62)} = 11.00$, $p < 0.0001$	CON RS5 CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
1e	CON(10) RS5(9) CRST(10) CRST+IMI(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+RS10(10) CRST+RS15(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 62)} = 12.22$, $p < 0.0001$	CON RS5 CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$

							RS5 vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
1f,g	CON(10) RS5(9) CRST(10) CRST+IMI(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+RS10(10) CRST+RS15(10)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.5				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p < 0.0001$				
				Communality, 0.813				
				Eigenvalues, -1.6				
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	SIT x SPT x [TST xFST]	Centroid 1: X = 0.56, Y = 0.51, Z = -0.71 Centroid 2: X = -0.77, Y = -0.70, Z = 0.98		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						RS5	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+IMI	90% in cluster 1 vs. 10% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS10	20% in cluster 1 vs. 80% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS15	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
1h	CON(8) CRST(10) CRST+RS5(8) CRST+RS10(8) CRST+RS15(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 37)} = 8.427$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
1i	CON(8) CRST(10) CRST+RS5(8) CRST+RS10(8) CRST+RS15(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 37)} = 34.51$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
1k	CON(11) CSDS(Sus)(17) CSDS(Resil)(11)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 36)} = 12.20$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CSDS(Sus) CSDS(Resil)	CON vs. CSDS(Sus)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CSDS(Resil)	ns
							CSDS(Sus) vs. CSDS(Resil)	$p < 0.01$
1l	CON(11) CSDS(Sus)(8) CSDS(Sus)+RS5(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 25)} = 12.56$, $p = 0.0002$	CON CSDS(Sus) CSDS(Sus)+RS5	CON vs. CSDS(Sus)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	ns
							CSDS(Sus) vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
1m	CON(11) CSDS(Sus)(8) CSDS(Sus)+RS5(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 25)} = 7.416$, $p = 0.0030$	CON CSDS(Sus) CSDS(Sus)+RS5	CON vs. CSDS(Sus)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	ns
							CSDS(Sus) vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
1n	CON(11) CSDS(Sus)(8) CSDS(Sus)+RS5(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 25)} = 11.01$, $p = 0.0004$	CON CSDS(Sus) CSDS(Sus)+RS5	CON vs. CSDS(Sus)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	ns
							CSDS(Sus) vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
1o	CON(11) CSDS(Sus)(8) CSDS(Sus)+RS5(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 25)} = 8.372$, $p = 0.0016$	CON CSDS(Sus) CSDS(Sus)+RS5	CON vs. CSDS(Sus)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	ns
							CSDS(Sus) vs. CSDS(Sus)+RS5	$p < 0.05$
2a	basal(9), 6 data points S5, 0 min(9), 6 data points S5, 10 min(9), 6 data points S5, 30 min(9), 6 data points S15, 0 min(9), 6 data points S15, 10 min(9), 6 data points S15, 30 min(9), 6 data points S60, 0 min(9), 6 data points S120, 0 min(8), 4 data points S120, 30 min(8), 6 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 20)} = 10.07$, $p = 0.0003$	basal S5, 0 min S5, 10 min S5, 30 min	basal vs. S5, 0 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. S5, 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. S5, 30 min	ns
							S5, 0 min vs. S5, 10 min	ns
							S5, 0 min vs. S5, 30 min	$p < 0.05$
							S5, 10 min vs. S5, 30 min	$p < 0.05$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 20)} = 9.775$, $p = 0.0004$	basal S15, 0 min S15, 10 min S15, 30 min	basal vs. S15, 0 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. S5, 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. S15, 30 min	ns
							S15, 0 min vs. S15, 10 min	ns
							S15, 0 min vs. S15, 30 min	$p < 0.05$
							S15, 10 min vs. S15, 30 min	$p < 0.05$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 18)} = 20.70$, $p < 0.0001$	basal S60, 0 min S120, 0 min S120, 30 min	basal vs. S60, 0 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. S120, 0 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. S120, 30 min	$p < 0.01$
							S60, 0 min vs. S120, 0 min	$p < 0.01$
							S120, 0 min vs. S120, 30 min	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(6, 35)} = 7.556$, $p < 0.0001$	S5 group: 0 min, 10 min, 30 min S15 group: 0 min, 10 min, 30 min	0 min: S5 vs. S15	ns
							10 min: S5 vs. S15	ns
							30 min: S5 vs. S15	ns
2c	CON group: basal(7), 4 data points S5, 0 min(8), 6 data points S5, 10 min(8), 6 data points S5, 30 min(8), 6 data points S5, 60 min(8), 4 data points S5, 120 min(8), 4 data points CRST group: basal(8), 4 data points S5, 0 min(8), 6 data points S5, 10 min(8), 6 data points S5, 30 min(8), 6 data points S5, 60 min(8), 4 data points S5, 120 min(7), 4 data points CRST+RS5 group: basal(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(5, 24)} = 4.994$, $p = 0.0028$	CON group: basal S5, 0 min S5, 10 min S5, 30 min S5, 60 min S5, 120 min	basal vs. 0 min	$p < 0.05$
							basal vs. 10 min	$p < 0.05$
							basal vs. 30 min	$p < 0.05$
							basal vs. 60 min	ns
							basal vs. 120 min	ns
							0 min vs. 10 min	ns
							0 min vs. 30 min	ns
							0 min vs. 60 min	ns
							0 min vs. 120 min	ns
							10 min vs. 30 min	ns
							10 min vs. 60 min	ns
							10 min vs. 120 min	$p < 0.05$
							30 min vs. 60 min	ns
							30 min vs. 120 min	ns
							60 min vs. 120 min	ns
	S5, 0 min(8), 6 data points S5, 10 min(8), 6 data points S5, 30 min(8), 6 data points S5, 60 min(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(5, 24)} = 3.404$, $p = 0.0183$	CRST group: basal S5, 0 min S5, 10 min	basal vs. 0 min	ns
							basal vs. 10 min	ns
							basal vs. 30 min	ns

	S5, 120 min(8), 4 data points					S5, 30 min S5, 60 min S5, 120 min	basal vs. 60 min	ns
							basal vs. 120 min	ns
							0 min vs. 10 min	ns
							0 min vs. 30 min	ns
							0 min vs. 60 min	ns
							0 min vs. 120 min	ns
							10 min vs. 30 min	ns
							10 min vs. 60 min	ns
							10 min vs. 120 min	$p < 0.05$
							30 min vs. 60 min	ns
							30 min vs. 120 min	$p < 0.05$
							60 min vs. 120 min	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(5, 24)} = 8.488$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST+RS5 group: basal S5, 0 min S5, 10 min S5, 30 min S5, 60 min S5, 120 min	basal vs. 0 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							basal vs. 30 min	$p < 0.05$
							basal vs. 60 min	ns
							basal vs. 120 min	ns
							0 min vs. 10 min	ns
							0 min vs. 30 min	ns
							0 min vs. 60 min	$p < 0.05$
							0 min vs. 120 min	$p < 0.01$
							10 min vs. 30 min	ns
							10 min vs. 60 min	$p < 0.05$
							10 min vs. 120 min	$p < 0.01$
							30 min vs. 60 min	ns
							30 min vs. 120 min	ns
							60 min vs. 120 min	ns
2c	CON group: basal(7), 4 data points S5, 0 min(8), 6 data points S5, 10 min(8), 6 data points S5, 30 min(8), 6 data points S5, 60 min(8), 4 data points S5, 120 min(8), 4 data points CRST group: basal(8), 4 data points S5, 0 min(8), 6 data points S5, 10 min(8), 6 data points S5, 30 min(8), 6 data points S5, 60 min(8), 4 data points S5, 120 min(7), 4 data points CRST+RS5 group: basal(8), 4 data points S5, 0 min(8), 6 data points S5, 10 min(8), 6 data points S5, 30 min(8), 6 data points S5, 60 min(8), 4 data points S5, 120 min(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 9)} = 29.73$, $p = 0.0001$	basal: CON CRST RST+RS5	basal: CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							basal: CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							basal: CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 1.366$, $p = 0.2852$	0 min: CON CRST RST+RS5	0 min: CON vs. CRST	ns
							0 min: CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							0 min: CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 0.7547$, $p = 0.4872$	10 min: CON CRST RST+RS5	10 min: CON vs. CRST	ns
							10 min: CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							10 min: CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 4.770$, $p = 0.0249$	30 min: CON CRST RST+RS5	30 min: CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.05$
							30 min: CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							30 min: CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 9)} = 14.03$, $p = 0.0017$	60 min: CON CRST RST+RS5	60 min: CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							60 min: CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							60 min: CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 9)} = 4.753$, $p = 0.0390$	120 min: CON CRST RST+RS5	120 min: CON vs. CRST	ns
							120 min:CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							120 min: CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
2d		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 3)} = 117.4$, $p = 0.0014$	CON CRST CRST+RS5	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
2e	CON(7), 4 data points CRST(7), 4 data points CRST+IMI(7), 4 data points CRST+RS5(7), 4 data points CRST+RS10(7), 4 data points CRST+RS15(7), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(5, 18)} = 5.997$, $p = 0.0020$	CON CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. CRST	p < 0.01
							CON vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	p < 0.01
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	p < 0.01
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	p < 0.01
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	p < 0.05
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
2f	CON(7), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+IMI(8), 3 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS10(7), 3 repeats CRST+RS15(7), 3 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CRH		$F_{(5, 36)} = 8.103$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
	CON(7), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+IMI(8), 3 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS10(7), 3 repeats CRST+RS15(7), 3 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	AVP		$F_{(5, 36)} = 12.42$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST CRST+IMI CRST+RS5 CRST+RS10 CRST+RS15	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+IMI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+IMI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS10	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST+IMI vs. CRST+RS15	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS10	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+RS15	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS10 vs. CRST+RS15	ns
2g	Veh(9), 6 data points CORT(0.05) group: 10 min(8), 4 data points 30 min(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 11)} = 2.718$, $p = 0.1098$	Veh CORT(0.05), 10 min CORT(0.05), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(0.05), 10 min	ns
							Veh vs. CORT(0.05), 30 min	ns
							CORT(0.05), 10 min vs. CORT(0.05), 30	ns

	CORT(0.1) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(8), 4 data points CORT(0.5) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points CORT(1.0) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points CORT(1.5) group: 10 min(8), 4 data points 30 min(8), 4 data points CORT(2.0) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points CORT(5.0) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 13)} = 11.56$, $p = 0.0013$	Veh CORT(0.1), 10 min CORT(0.1), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(0.1), 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							Veh vs. CORT(0.1), 30 min	ns
							CORT(0.1), 10 min vs. CORT(0.1), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 15.80$, $p = 0.0002$	Veh CORT(0.5), 10 min CORT(0.5), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(0.5), 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							Veh vs. CORT(0.5), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
							CORT(0.5), 10 min vs. CORT(0.5), 30 min	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 102.8$, $p < 0.0001$	Veh CORT(1.0), 10 min CORT(1.0), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(1.0), 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							Veh vs. CORT(1.0), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
							CORT(1.0), 10 min vs. CORT(1.0), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 11)} = 90.22$, $p < 0.0001$	Veh CORT(1.5), 10 min CORT(1.5), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(1.5), 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							Veh vs. CORT(1.5), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
							CORT(1.5), 10 min vs. CORT(1.5), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 30.91$, $p < 0.0001$	Veh CORT(2.0), 10 min CORT(2.0), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(2.0), 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							Veh vs. CORT(2.0), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
							CORT(2.0), 10 min vs. CORT(2.0), 30 min	$p < 0.05$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(2, 15)} = 155.3$, $p < 0.0001$	Veh CORT(5.0), 10 min CORT(5.0), 30 min	Veh vs. CORT(5.0), 10 min	$p < 0.01$
							Veh vs. CORT(5.0), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
							CORT(5.0), 10 min vs. CORT(5.0), 30 min	$p < 0.01$
2g	Veh(9), 6 data points CORT(0.05) group: 10 min(8), 4 data points 30 min(8), 4 data points CORT(0.1) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(8), 4 data points CORT(0.5) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points CORT(1.0) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points CORT(1.5) group: 10 min(8), 4 data points 30 min(8), 4 data points CORT(2.0) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points CORT(5.0) group: 10 min(9), 6 data points 30 min(9), 6 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(6, 31)} = 178.6$, $p < 0.0001$	10 min: Veh CORT(0.05) CORT(0.1) CORT(0.5) CORT(1.0) CORT(1.5) CORT(2.0) CORT(5.0)	10 min: Veh vs. CORT(0.05)	ns
							10 min: Veh vs. CORT(0.1)	ns
							10 min: Veh vs. CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: Veh vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: Veh vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: Veh vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(0.1)	ns
							10 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(1.0) vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(1.0) vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(1.0) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(1.5) vs. CORT(2.0)	ns
							10 min: CORT(1.5) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							10 min: CORT(2.0) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(6, 29)} = 32.78$, $p < 0.0001$	30 min: Veh CORT(0.05) CORT(0.1) CORT(0.5) CORT(1.0) CORT(1.5) CORT(2.0) CORT(5.0)	30 min: Veh vs. CORT(0.05)	ns
							30 min: Veh vs. CORT(0.1)	ns
							30 min: Veh vs. CORT(1.0)	ns
							30 min: Veh vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: Veh vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: Veh vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(0.1)	ns
							30 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(1.0)	ns
							30 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.05$
							30 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(0.05) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(1.0)	ns
							30 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(1.5)	$p < 0.05$
							30 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(0.1) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(1.0) vs. CORT(1.5)	ns
							30 min: CORT(1.0) vs. CORT(2.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(1.0) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(1.5) vs. CORT(2.0)	ns
							30 min: CORT(1.5) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
							30 min: CORT(2.0) vs. CORT(5.0)	$p < 0.01$
2i	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+CORT(0.1)(10) CRST+CORT(0.5)(10) CRST+CORT(1.0)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 7.034$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
2j	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+CORT(0.1)(10) CRST+CORT(0.5)(10) CRST+CORT(1.0)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 7.004$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
2k	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+CORT(0.1)(10) CRST+CORT(0.5)(10) CRST+CORT(1.0)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 7.071$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$

							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
2l	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+CORT(0.1)(10) CRST+CORT(0.5)(10) CRST+CORT(1.0)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 5.668$, $p = 0.0003$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
2m	CON(8), 4 data points CRST+Veh(8), 4 data points CRST+RS5(8), 4 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(8), 4 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(8), 4 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(5, 18)} = 5.119$, $p = 0.0043$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
2	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+CORT(0.1)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Adrenal gland weight		$F_{(3, 36)} = 10.78$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
2o,p	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5(10) CRST+CORT(0.1)(10)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	SIT x SPT	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p = 0.001$				
				Communality, 0.760				
				Eigenvalues, 1.52				
		Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p = 0.002$				
				Communality, 0.734				
				Eigenvalues, 1.47				
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	AG weight x [SITxSPT] x [TSTxFST]	Centroid 1: X = -0.37, Y = 0.36, Z = -0.33 Centroid 2 : X = 1.5, Y = -1.44, Z = 0.36		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh	20% in cluster 1 vs. 80% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CORT(0.1)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
3b	CON(10), 6 data points CRST+Sham(8), 4 data points CRST+Sham+RS5(7), 4 data points CRST+ADX group: basal(7), 4 data points S5 after 0 min(7), 4 data points S5 after 10 min(7), 4 data points S5 after 30 min(7), 4 data points CRST+ADX+RS5 group: basal(7), 4 data points S5 after 0 min(8), 4 data points S5 after 10 min(7), 4 data points S5 after 30 min(7), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(4, 17)} = 15.41$, $p < 0.0001$	basal: CON CRST+Sham CRST+Sham+RS5 CRST+ADX CRST+ADX+RS5	basal: CON vs. CRST+Sham	$p < 0.01$
							basal: CON vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	ns
							basal: CON vs. CRST+ADX	ns
							basal: CON vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
							basal: CRST+Sham vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							basal: CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							basal: CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							basal: CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX	ns
							basal: CRST+Sham+RS5 vs.	ns
							basal: CRST+ADX vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 12)} = 0.3315$, $p = 0.8028$	CRST+ADX group: basal S5, 0 min S5, 10 min S5, 30 min	basal vs. S5, 0 min	ns
							basal vs. S5, 10 min	ns
							basal vs. S5, 30 min	ns
							S5, 0 min vs. S5, 10 min	ns
							S5, 0 min vs. S5, 30 min	ns
							S5, 10 min vs. S5, 30 min	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 14)} = 0.4586$, $p = 0.7155$	CRST+ADX+RS5 group: basal S5, 0 min S5, 10 min S5, 30 min	basal vs. S5, 0 min	ns
							basal vs. S5, 10 min	ns
							basal vs. S5, 30 min	ns
							S5, 0 min vs. S5, 10 min	ns
							S5, 0 min vs. S5, 30 min	ns
							S5, 10 min vs. S5, 30 min	ns
		One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(7, 26)} = 0.4013$, $p = 0.8928$	CRST ADX group CRST+ADX+RS5 group	basal	ns
							0 min	ns
							10 min	ns
							30 min	ns
3c	CON(9) CRST+Sham(7) CRST+Sham+RS5(7) CRST+ADX(7) CRST+ADX+RS5(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 32)} = 9.430$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Sham CRST+Sham+RS5 CRST+ADX CRST+ADX+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Sham	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX	ns
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+ADX vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
3d	CON(9) CRST+Sham(7) CRST+Sham+RS5(7) CRST+ADX(7) CRST+ADX+RS5(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 32)} = 16.57$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Sham CRST+Sham+RS5 CRST+ADX CRST+ADX+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Sham	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX	ns
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns

							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+ADX vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
3e	CON(9) CRST+Sham(7) CRST+Sham+RS5(7) CRST+ADX(7) CRST+ADX+RS5(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 32)} = 10.80$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Sham CRST+Sham+RS5 CRST+ADX CRST+ADX+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Sham	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX	ns
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+ADX vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
3f	CON(9) CRST+Sham(7) CRST+Sham+RS5(7) CRST+ADX(7) CRST+ADX+RS5(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 32)} = 11.27$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Sham CRST+Sham+RS5 CRST+ADX CRST+ADX+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Sham	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+Sham+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX	ns
							CRST+Sham vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Sham+RS5 vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+ADX vs. CRST+ADX+RS5	ns
3g,h	CON(9) CRST+Sham(7) CRST+Sham+RS5(7) CRST+ADX(7) CRST+ADX+RS5(7)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p < 0.0001$				
				Communality, 0.782				
				Eigenvalues, 1.56				
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	SIT x SPT x [TSTxFST]	Centroid 1: X = 0.80, Y = 0.91, Z = -0.97 Centroid 2: X = -0.61, Y = -0.69, Z = 0.74		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Sham	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Sham+RS5	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+ADX	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+ADX+RS5	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
4b (PL)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 8 data points CRST+S15(4), 8 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 6 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 7 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 30)} = 31.54$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
4b (BLA)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 7 data points CRST+S15(4), 8 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 9 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 7 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 32)} = 16.40$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
4b (NAcc)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 8 data points CRST+S15(4), 8 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 9 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 34)} = 27.43$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
4b (vSub)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 7 data points CRST+S15(4), 8 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 8 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 7 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 31)} = 147.0$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
4b (dBNST)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 8 data points CRST+S15(4), 4 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 12 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 37)} = 19.25$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
4b (vBNST)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 8 data points CRST+S15(4), 8 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 12 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 37)} = 2.461$, $p = 0.0622$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	ns
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
4b (PVN)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+S5(4), 8 data points CRST+S15(4), 8 data points CRST+S5x8d(6), 8 data points CRST+S15x8d(4), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(4, 33)} = 17.12$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+S5 CRST+S15 CRST+S5x8d CRST+S15x8d	CRST vs. CRST+S5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15	ns
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5 vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S5x8d	$p < 0.01$

							CRST+S15 vs. CRST+S15x8d	ns
							CRST+S5x8d vs. CRST+S15x8d	$p < 0.01$
4e-g	CRST+S5x8d(6), 8 data points							
5g	CON(12), 6 repeats CRST(12), 6 repeats CRST+RS5(12), 6 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Nr3c1(GR)		$F_{(3, 40)} = 6.356$, $p = 0.0013$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Nr3c2(MR)		$F_{(3, 28)} = 2.069$, $p = 0.1270$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Fkbp5		$F_{(3, 28)} = 23.67$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Fkbp4		$F_{(3, 28)} = 15.55$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Hsp90aa1		$F_{(3, 28)} = 14.55$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Hsp90ab1		$F_{(3, 28)} = 1.403$, $p = 0.2625$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
5h	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Dusp1		$F_{(3, 28)} = 6.732$, $p = 0.0015$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CaMKIIα		$F_{(3, 28)} = 2.082$, $p = 0.1252$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Mapk3 (ERK1)		$F_{(3, 28)} = 10.19$, $p = 0.0003$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
	CON(8), 4 repeats CRST(8), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(8), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(8), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Mapk1 (ERK2)		$F_{(3, 28)} = 8.845$, $p = 0.0002$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
5j	CON(7), 7 sections, 274 data points CRST(7), 7 sections, 279 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 248 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 309 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Total GR /DAPI		$F_{(3, 1106)} = 163.4$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
5k	CON(7), 7 sections, 274 data points CRST(7), 7 sections, 279 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 248 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 309 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Fkbp5/DAPI		$F_{(3, 1104)} = 270.0$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
5l	CON(7), 7 sections, 274 data points CRST(7), 7 sections, 279 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 248 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 309 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	DAPI		$F_{(3, 1104)} = 2.835$, $p = 0.0372$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
5m,n	CON(7), 7 sections, 274 data points CRST(7), 7 sections, 279 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 248 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 309 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	nuclear GR /DAPI		$F_{(3, 1104)} = 208.2$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	GR/DAPI x Fkbp5/DAPI	Centroid 1: X = 0.382120, Y = -0.389040 Centroid 2 : X = -1.062160, Y = 1.081400	Cluster 1: $F_{(1, 818)} = 5.141$, $p = 0.0236$ Y = 0.04423*X - 0.4059 Cluster 2: $F_{(1, 293)} = 23.01$, $p < 0.0001$ Y = 0.4540*X + 1.564	CON	92% in cluster 1 vs. 8% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh	5% in cluster 1 vs. 95% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5	98% in cluster 1 vs. 2% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CORT(0.1)	99% in cluster 1 vs. 1% in cluster 2	
5p	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siGR(4), 4 repeats	Student's t-test	GR					$p < 0.0001$

5q	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siGR(4), 4 repeats	Student's t-test	Fkbp5					$p < 0.0001$
5r	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siGR(4), 4 repeats	Student's t-test	CRH					$p = 0.0009$
		Student's t-test	AVP					$p < 0.0001$
5s	CRST+siCON(7) CRST+siGR(8)	Student's t-test						$p = 0.0004$
5t	CRST+siCON(7) CRST+siGR(8)	Student's t-test						$p = 0.0022$
6b	CON(6), 4 repeats CRST+Veh(6), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(6), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2,9)} = 8.263$, $p = 0.0092$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
6c	CON(6), 4 repeats CRST+Veh(6), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(6), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2,9)} = 6.556$, $p = 0.00175$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	ns
6e	CON(4) for GLU-4, 4 data points CON(4) for GAD67, 4 data points							
6g,h	CON(6), 6 sections, 377 data points CRST(6), 6 sections, 376 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 345 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 390 data points	K-Means clustering (k=2)	p-CaMKIIα /DAPI x GR/DAPI	Centroid 1: X = -0.426670, Y = 0.37970 Centroid 2 : X = 1.063680, Y = -0.94658	Cluster 1: $F_{(1, 1060)} = 234.6$, $p < 0.0001$ Y = 0.6128*X + 0.6361 Cluster 2: $F_{(1, 424)} = 37.38$, $p < 0.0001$ Y = 0.1701*X - 1.117	CON	90% in cluster 1 vs. 10% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh	2% in cluster 1 vs. 98% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5	96% in cluster 1 vs. 4% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CORT(0.1)	99% in cluster 1 vs. 1% in cluster 2	
6l	CON(6), 6 sections, 377 data points CRST(6), 6 sections, 376 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 345 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 390 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	p-CaMKIIα /DAPI		$F_{(3, 1484)} = 301.0$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
6j	CON(6), 6 sections, 377 data points CRST(6), 6 sections, 376 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 345 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 390 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Total GR /DAPI		$F_{(3, 1484)} = 367.4$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
5k	CON(6), 6 sections, 377 data points CRST(6), 6 sections, 376 data points CRST+RS5(6), 6 sections, 345 data points CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(4), 6 sections, 390 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	DAPI		$F_{(3, 1484)} = 0.8331$, $p = 0.4756$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
6m	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siCaMKIIα, 4 repeats	Student's t-test						$p < 0.0001$
6n	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siERK1(4), 4 repeats	Student's t-test						$p < 0.0001$
6o	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siERK1(4), 4 repeats	Student's t-test						$p < 0.0001$
6p	CON(8), 5 repeats CRST+siCON(8), 3 repeats CRST+siCaMKIIα(4), 5 repeats CRST+siERK1(4), 5 repeats CRST+siERK2(4), 5 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	GR		$F_{(4, 41)} = 27.38$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1 CRST+siERK2	CON vs. CRST+siCON	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	ns
							CON vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK1	ns
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siERK1 vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
	CON(8), 5 repeats CRST+siCON(8), 3 repeats CRST+siCaMKIIα(4), 5 repeats CRST+siERK1(4), 5 repeats CRST+siERK2(4), 5 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	Fkbp5		$F_{(4, 41)} = 13.59$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1 CRST+siERK2	CON vs. CRST+siCON	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	ns
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK1	ns
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK1	ns
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siERK1 vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
6q	CON(9) CRST+siCON(8) CRST+siCaMKIIα(8) CRST+siERK1(7) CRST+siERK2(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 34)} = 6.416$, $p = 0.0006$	CON CRST+siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1 CRST+siERK2	CON vs. CRST+siCON	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	ns
							CON vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK1	ns
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siERK1 vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
6r	CON(9) CRST+siCON(8) CRST+siCaMKIIα(8) CRST+siERK1(7) CRST+siERK2(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 34)} = 17.53$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1 CRST+siERK2	CON vs. CRST+siCON	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	ns
							CON vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK1	ns
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siERK1 vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
6s	CON(9) CRST+siCON(8) CRST+siCaMKIIα(8) CRST+siERK1(7) CRST+siERK2(7)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 34)} = 23.81$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1 CRST+siERK2	CON vs. CRST+siCON	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	ns
							CON vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK1	ns

							CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siCaMKIIα vs. CRST+siERK2	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+siERK1 vs. CRST+siERK2	ns
7a	CON(12), 4 repeats CRST(12), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(12), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(7), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	GABRα1		$F_{(3, 28)} = 17.98$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(12), 4 repeats CRST(12), 4 repeats CRST+RS5(12), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(7), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	GABRβ2		$F_{(3, 28)} = 14.13$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
7d	CRST+RS5+Veh(6), 3 repeats CRST+RS5+PTX(6), 3 repeats	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+PTX	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+PTX	$p = 0.0112$
7e	CRST+RS5+Veh(6), 3 repeats CRST+RS5+PTX(6), 3 repeats	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+PTX	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+PTX	$p = 0.7792$
7f	CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+PTX(8)	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+PTX	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+PTX	$p = 0.0065$
7g	CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+PTX(8)	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+PTX	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+PTX	$p < 0.0001$
7i	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siCaMKIIα, 4 repeats	Student's t-test				CRST+siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα	CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.0001$
7j	CRST+siCON(4), 4 repeats CRST+siERK1(4), 4 repeats	Student's t-test				CRST+siCON CRST+siERK1	CRST+siCON vs. CRST+siERK1	$p < 0.0001$
7k	siCON(8) CRST+siCaMKIIα(8) CRST+siERK1(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 21)} = 3.961$, $p = 0.0347$	siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1	siCON vs. siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.05$
							siCON vs. siERK1	ns
							siCaMKIIα vs. siERK1	$p < 0.05$
7l	siCON(8) CRST+siCaMKIIα(8) CRST+siERK1(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 21)} = 21.48$, $p < 0.0001$	siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1	siCON vs. siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.01$
							siCON vs. siERK1	ns
							siCaMKIIα vs. siERK1	$p < 0.01$
7m	siCON(8) CRST+siCaMKIIα(8) CRST+siERK1(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(2, 21)} = 26.51$, $p < 0.0001$	siCON CRST+siCaMKIIα CRST+siERK1	siCON vs. siCaMKIIα	$p < 0.01$
							siCON vs. siERK1	ns
							siCaMKIIα vs. siERK1	$p < 0.01$
7o	CON(4) for GLU-4, 4 data points CON(4) for GAD67, 4 data points							
7q	CRST+RS5+Veh(7) CRST+RS5+KN-62(7)	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+KN-62	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+KN-62	$p = 0.0410$
7r	CRST+RS5+Veh(7) CRST+RS5+KN-62(7)	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+KN-62	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+KN-62	$p = 0.0115$
7s	CRST+RS5+Veh(7) CRST+RS5+KN-62(7)	Student's t-test				CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+KN-62	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+KN-62	$p = 0.0001$
8d	CRST+RS5+Veh(6), 6 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(4), 8 data points	Student's t-test	*c-Fos*			CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p = 0.0001$
8e	CON(7), 4 data points CRST+Veh(8), 4 data points CRST+RS5+Veh(8), 4 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 12)} = 24.45$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.05$
8f	CON(7) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 5.982$, $p = 0.0028$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
8g	CON(7) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 20.74$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
8h	CON(7) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 25.30$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
8i	CON(7) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(9)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 25.79$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
8j,k	CON(7) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(9)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p < 0.0001$				
				Communality, 0.863				
				Eigenvalues, 1.73				
		K-Means clustering (*k*=2)	SIT x SPT x [TSTxFST]	Centroid 1: X = 0.63, Y = 0.37, Z = -0.87 Centroid 2: X = -0.63, Y = -0.37, Z = 0.87		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5+Veh	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5+CNO	11.11% in cluster 1 vs. 88.89% in cluster 2	
9e	CRST+RS5+Veh(4), 8 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(4), 8 data points	Student's t-test	*c-Fos*			CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p = 0.0002$
9f	CRST+RS5+Veh(4), 12 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(4), 12 data points	Student's t-test	*c-Fos*			CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p = 0.6903$
9g	CON(8), 4 data points CRST+Veh(8), 4 data points CRST+RS5+Veh(8), 4 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(3, 12)} = 16.57$, $p = 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
9h	CON(8)	One-way ANOVA,			$F_{(3, 28)} = 7.227$, $p = 0.0010$	CON	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$

	CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(8)	Newman-Keuls post-hoc test				CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.05$
9i	CON(8) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 14.26$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	*ns*
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
8j	CON(8) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 14.50$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
9k	CON(8) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(3, 28)} = 20.22$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.01$
9l,m	CON(8) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+Veh(8) CRST+RS5+CNO(8)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p < 0.0001$				
				Communality, 0.850				
				Eigenvalues, 1.70				
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	SIT x SPT x [TSTxFST]	Centroid 1: X = 0.64, Y = 0.75, Z = -0.84 Centroid 2: X = -0.64,Y = -0.75, Z = 0.84		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5+Veh	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RS5+CNO	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
9q	CRST+RS5+Veh(3), 6 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(4), 8 data points	Student's t-test	*c-Fos*			CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p < 0.0001$
9s	CRST+RS5+Veh(4), 8 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(3), 6 data points	Student's t-test	*c-Fos*			CRST+RS5+Veh CRST+RS5+CNO	CRST+RS5+Veh vs. CRST+RS5+CNO	$p = 0.0002$
9t	CON(10), 4 data points CRST+Veh(10), 4 data points CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)(10), 4 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)(10), 4 data points CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAc)(10), 4 data points CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAc)(10), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(5, 18)} = 9.890$, $p = 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
9u	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAc)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAc)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 12.80$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
9v	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAc)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAc)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 5.796$, $p = 0.0002$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
9w	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAc)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAc)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 14.88$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns

							CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
9x	CON(10) CRST+Veh(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)(10) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAc)(10) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAc)(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 54)} = 16.35$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-BLA) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	ns
							CRST+RS5+Veh(PL-NAcc) vs. CRST+RS5+CNO(PL-NAcc)	$p < 0.01$

Extended Data Figures

Figures	Groups (animal numbers), data points	Statistical methods	Targets /factors	Filtering values in PCA/ Centroids in *K*-Means clustering	F and *p* Values	Values in comparision groups		
						Groups in comparision	Groups compared in post-hoc test/ % in *K*-Means clustering	*p* value
E1b	CON(10) CRST(10) CRST+S5(x3d)(8) CRST+S5(x5d)(8) CRST+S5(x7d)(8) CRST+S5(x14d)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 46)} = 5.254$, $p = 0.0007$	CON CRST CRST+S5(x3d) CRST+S5(x5d) CRST+S5(x7d) CRST+S5(x14d)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x3d)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x3d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x5d) vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x5d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x7d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
E1c	CON(10) CRST(10) CRST+S5(x3d)(8) CRST+S5(x5d)(8) CRST+S5(x7d)(8) CRST+S5(x14d)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 46)} = 12.84$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST CRST+S5(x3d) CRST+S5(x5d) CRST+S5(x7d) CRST+S5(x14d)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x3d)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x3d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x5d) vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+S5(x5d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x7d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
E1d	CON(10) CRST(10) CRST+S5(x3d)(8) CRST+S5(x5d)(8) CRST+S5(x7d)(8) CRST+S5(x14d)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 46)} = 12.55$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST CRST+S5(x3d) CRST+S5(x5d) CRST+S5(x7d) CRST+S5(x14d)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x3d)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x3d)	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x5d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x3d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+S5(x5d) vs. CRST+S5(x7d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x5d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
							CRST+S5(x7d) vs. CRST+S5(x14d)	ns
E1e,f	CON(10) CRST(10) CRST+S5(x3d)(8) CRST+S5(x5d)(8) CRST+S5(x7d)(8) CRST+S5(x14d)(8)	*K*-Means clustering (*k*=2)	SIT x TST x FST	Centroid 1: X = 0.54, Y = -0.67, Z = -0.62 Centroid 2: X = -0.68, Y = 0.84, Z = 0.78		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+S5(x3d)	12.5% in cluster 1 vs. 87.5% in cluster 2	
						CRST+S5(x5d)	25% in cluster 1 vs. 75% in cluster 2	
						CRST+S5(x7d)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+S5(x14d)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
E2c	CON(N)(10) CRST(N)(10) CRST(N)+RS5(10) CON(MS)(10) CRST(MS)(9) CRST(MS)+RS5(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 53)} = 5.711$, $p = 0.0003$	CON(N) CRST(N) CRST(N)+RS5 CON(MS) CRST(MS) CRST(MS)+RS5	CON(N) vs. CRST(N)	$p < 0.05$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	ns
							CON(N) vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N) vs. CON(MS)	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)	ns
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.05$
E2d	CON(N)(10) CRST(N)(10) CRST(N)+RS5(10) CON(MS)(10) CRST(MS)(9) CRST(MS)+RS5(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 53)} = 8.090$, $p < 0.0001$	CON(N) CRST(N) CRST(N)+RS5 CON(MS) CRST(MS) CRST(MS)+RS5	CON(N) vs. CRST(N)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	ns
							CON(N) vs. CON(MS)	ns
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N) vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$

							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CON(MS)	ns
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.05$
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
E2e	CON(N)(10) CRST(N)(10) CRST(N)+RS5(10) CON(MS)(10) CRST(MS)(9) CRST(MS)+RS5(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 53)} = 11.53$, $p < 0.0001$	CON(N) CRST(N) CRST(N)+RS5 CON(MS) CRST(MS) CRST(MS)+RS5	CON(N) vs. CRST(N)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	ns
							CON(N) vs. CON(MS)	ns
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N) vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CON(MS)	ns
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
E2f	CON(N)(10) CRST(N)(10) CRST(N)+RS5(10) CON(MS)(10) CRST(MS)(9) CRST(MS)+RS5(10)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(5, 53)} = 13.89$, $p < 0.0001$	CON(N) CRST(N) CRST(N)+RS5 CON(MS) CRST(MS) CRST(MS)+RS5	CON(N) vs. CRST(N)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	ns
							CON(N) vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.05$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CON(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(N)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N) vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)	ns
							CRST(N) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CON(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(N)+RS5 vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	ns
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)	ns
							CON(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(MS) vs. CRST(MS)+RS5	$p < 0.01$
E2g,h	CON(N)(10) CRST(N)(10) CRST(N)+RS5(10) CON(MS)(10) CRST(MS)(9) CRST(MS)+RS5(10)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $p < 0.0001$				
				Communality, 0.756				
				Eigenvalues, 1.51				
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	SIT x SPT x [TSTxFST]	Centroid 1: X = 0.51, Y = 0.59, Z = -0.68 Centroid 2: X = -0.65, Y = -0.75, Z = 0.86		CON(N)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST(N)	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST(N)+RS5	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CON(MS)	40% in cluster 1 vs. 60% in cluster 2	
						CRST(MS)	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST(MS)+RS5	90% in cluster 1 vs. 10% in cluster 2	
E3b	CON(8), 4 data points CRST+Veh(8), 4 data points CRST+Veh+RS5(8), 4 data points CRST+NBI(8), 4 data points CRST+NBI+RS5(7), 4 data points CRST+RU(8), 4 data points CRST+RU+RS5(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	CORT		$F_{(6, 21)} = 39.17$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+Veh+RS5 CRST+NBI CRST+NBI+RS5 CRST+RU CRST+RU+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+NBI+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+RU vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
E3c	CON(10) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+Veh+RS5(8) CRST+NBI(8) CRST+NBI+RS5(7) CRST+RU(8) CRST+RU+RS5(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 50)} = 5.952$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+Veh+RS5 CRST+NBI CRST+NBI+RS5 CRST+RU CRST+RU+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+NBI+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+RU vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
E3d	CON(10) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+Veh+RS5(8) CRST+NBI(8) CRST+NBI+RS5(7) CRST+RU(8) CRST+RU+RS5(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 50)} = 5.942$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+Veh+RS5 CRST+NBI CRST+NBI+RS5 CRST+RU CRST+RU+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+NBI	ns
							CON vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns

							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+NBI+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+RU vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
E3e	CON(10) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+Veh+RS5(8) CRST+NBI(8) CRST+NBI+RS5(7) CRST+RU(8) CRST+RU+RS5(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 50)} = 7.938$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+Veh+RS5 CRST+NBI CRST+NBI+RS5 CRST+RU CRST+RU+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+NBI+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+RU vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
E3f	CON(10) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+Veh+RS5(8) CRST+NBI(8) CRST+NBI+RS5(7) CRST+RU(8) CRST+RU+RS5(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(6, 50)} = 11.31$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+Veh+RS5 CRST+NBI CRST+NBI+RS5 CRST+RU CRST+RU+RS5	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+Veh+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+NBI+RS5	ns
							CRST+NBI vs. CRST+RU	ns
							CRST+NBI+RS5 vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
							CRST+RU vs. CRST+RU+RS5	ns
E3g,h	CON(10) CRST+Veh(8) CRST+Veh+RS5(8) CRST+NBI(8) CRST+NBI+RS5(7) CRST+RU(8) CRST+RU+RS5(8)	Principal component anaylsis (PCA)	TST x FST	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, 0.500				
				Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, p <0.0001				
				Communality, 0.744				
				Eigenvalues, 1.49				
		K-Means clustering (k=2)	SIT x SPT x [TSTxFST]	Centroid 1: X = 0.62, Y = 0.67, Z = -0.49 Centroid 2: X = -0.79, Y = -0.86, Z = 0.63		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh	12.5% in cluster 1 vs. 87.5% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh+RS5	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+NBI	37.5% in cluster 1 vs. 62.5% in cluster 2	
						CRST+NBI+RS5	14.3% in cluster 1 vs. 85.7% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RU	75% in cluster 1 vs. 25% in cluster 2	
						CRST+RU+RS5	37.5% in cluster 1 vs. 62.5% in cluster 2	
E4b (PL)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 6 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 24)} = 69.52$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E4b (BLA)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 10 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 28)} = 51.92$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E4b (NAcc)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 10 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 28)} = 89.85$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E4b (vSub)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 9 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 27)} = 82.82$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E4b (dBNST)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 10 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 28)} = 8.583$, $p = 0.0003$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E4b (vBNST)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 10 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 28)} = 2.652$, $p = 0.0681$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E4b (PVN)	CRST(6), 6 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(0.5)(4), 8 data points CRST+CORT(1.0)(5), 10 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 28)} = 3.071$, $p = 0.0439$	CRST CRST+CORT(0.1) CRST+CORT(0.5) CRST+CORT(1.0)	CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST(CON) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(0.5)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.1) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
							CRST+CORT(0.5) vs. CRST+CORT(1.0)	ns
E6a	CON(12), 6 repeats CRST(12), 6 repeats CRST+RS5(12), 5 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(7), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	NR1		$F_{(3, 38)} = 4.895$, $p = 0.0057$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$

							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(12), 6 repeats CRST(12), 6 repeats CRST+RS5(12), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(7), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	NR2A		$F_{(3, 36)} = 11.48$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
	CON(12), 6 repeats CRST(12), 6 repeats CRST+RS5(12), 4 repeats CRST+CORT(0.1 mg/kg)(7), 4 repeats	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	NR2B		$F_{(3, 28)} = 3.719$, $p = 0.0199$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
							CRST vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CRST vs. CRST+C0.1	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+C0.1	ns
E6c	CON(6), 6 sections, 325 data points CRST+Veh(6), 6 sections, 359 data points CRST+RS5(4), 4 sections, 235 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 4 sections, 209 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	NR1/DAPI		$F_{(3, 1124)} = 88.21$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
E6d	CON(6), 6 sections, 325 data points CRST+Veh(6), 6 sections, 359 data points CRST+RS5(4), 4 sections, 235 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 4 sections, 209 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	DAPI		$F_{(3, 1124)} = 0.5776$, $p = 0.6298$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
E6f	CON(6), 6 sections, 328 data points CRST+Veh(6), 6 sections, 402 data points CRST+RS5(4), 4 sections, 235 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 4 sections, 231 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	NR2A/DAPI		$F_{(3, 1192)} = 112.0$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.05$
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
E6g	CON(6), 6 sections, 328 data points CRST+Veh(6), 6 sections, 402 data points CRST+RS5(4), 4 sections, 235 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 4 sections, 231 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	NR2B/DAPI		$F_{(3, 1192)} = 118.1$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
E6h	CON(6), 6 sections, 328 data points CRST+Veh(6), 6 sections, 402 data points CRST+RS5(4), 4 sections, 235 data points CRST+CORT(0.1)(4), 4 sections, 231 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	DAPI		$F_{(3, 1192)} = 1.748$, $p = 0.1554$	CON CRST+Veh CRST+RS5 CRST+CORT(0.1)	CON vs. CRST+Veh	ns
							CON vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+RS5	ns
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
							CRST+RS5 vs. CRST+CORT(0.1)	ns
E7d	CRST+Veh(4), 8 data points CRST+CNO(0.1)(4), 8 data points CRST+CNO(1.0)(4), 8 data points CRST+CNO(3.0)(4), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(3, 28)} = 26.67$, $p < 0.0001$	CRST+Veh CRST+CNO(0.1) CRST+CNO(1.0) CRST+CNO(3.0)	CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CNO(0.1) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+CNO(0.1) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+CNO(1.0) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)	ns
E7f	CRST+Veh(4), 8 data points CRST+CNO(0.1)(3), 6 data points CRST+CNO(1.0)(4), 8 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test	*c-Fos*		$F_{(2, 19)} = 13.59$, $p = 0.0002$	CRST+Veh CRST+CNO(0.1) CRST+CNO(1.0)	CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CNO(0.1) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)	ns
E7g	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(7, 56)} = 9.887$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+Veh(hSyn) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
E7h	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(7, 56)} = 19.20$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+Veh(hSyn) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns

							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
E7i	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(7, 56)} = 19.11$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+Veh(hSyn) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
E7j,k	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8)	*K*-Means clustering (*k*=2)	SIT x TST x FST	Centroid 1: X = -1.11, Y = 1.54, Z = 1.67 Centroid 2: X = 0.28, Y = -0.38, Z = -0.42		CON	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	100% in cluster 1 vs. 0% in cluster 2	
E7l	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(7, 56)} = 12.613$, $p = 0.0209$	CON CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+Veh(hSyn) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
E7m	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(7, 56)} = 3.555$, $p = 0.0031$	CON CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+Veh(hSyn) CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
E7n	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8)	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test		F (7, 56) = 5.681P < 0.0001	$F_{(7, 56)} = 5.681$, $p < 0.0001$	CON CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα) CRST+Veh(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$

	CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)(8)					CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	CON vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs.	ns
							CRST+CNO(0.1)(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(1.0)(hSyn)	ns
E7o,p	CON(8) CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)(8) CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)(8)	*K*-Means clustering (*k*=2)	SIT x TST x FST	Centroid 1: X = 0.28, Y = -0.46, Z = -0.64 Centroid 2: X = -0.34, Y = 0.56, Z = 0.78		CON	87.5% in cluster 1 vs. 12.5% in cluster 2	
						CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	0% in cluster 1 vs. 100% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CNO(0.1)(CaMKIIα)	50% in cluster 1 vs. 50% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CNO(1.0)(CaMKIIα)	62.5% in cluster 1 vs. 37.5% in cluster 2	
						CRST+CNO(3.0)(CaMKIIα)	75% in cluster 1 vs. 25% in cluster 2	
E7q	CON(8), 4 data points CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)(8), 4 data points CRST+CNO(CaMKIIα)(3.0)(8), 4 data points CRST+Veh(hSyn)(8), 4 data points CRST+CNO(hSyn)(1.0)(8), 4 data points	One-way ANOVA, Newman-Keuls post-hoc test			$F_{(4, 15)} = 8.467$, p = 0.0009		CON vs. CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(CaMKIIα)	ns
							CON vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	$p < 0.01$
							CON vs. CRST+CNO(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+CNO(CaMKIIα)	$p < 0.05$
							CRST+Veh(CaMKIIα) vs. CRST+Veh(hSyn)	ns
							CRST+CNO(CaMKIIα) vs.	ns
							CRST+Veh(hSyn) vs. CRST+CNO(hSyn)	ns