**Table 1.** **Weakening fear memory through deconditioning-update training**

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure 1** |
| Figure 1B. Reactivations |
| Omnibus test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Bonferroni) | *P* value |
| Two-way RM ANOVA | InteractionF(3,33) = 5.897TimeF(3,33) = 37.1GroupF(1,11) = 20.24 | 0.870.550.15 | 0.002< 0.00010.0009 | Day 3Day 4Day 5Day 6 | 0.990.990.0010.0001 |
| Figure 1C. Test |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 19.57 | 0.7 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | < 0.00010.160.001 |
| Figure 1D. Renewal |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 33.41 | 0.8 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | < 0.00010.360.0001 |
| Figure 1E. Spontaneous Recovery |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 17.38 | 0.67 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | < 0.00010.20.002 |
| *N per group:*Control = 7; Footshock = 6; No-footshock = 7 |
| Figure 1G. Reactivations |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Bonferroni) | *P* value |
| Two-way RM ANOVA | InteractionF(3,36) = 1.556TimeF(3,36) = 38.52GroupF(1,12) = 3.598 | 0.180.450.90 | 0.22< 0.00010.08 | Day 3Day 4Day 5Day 6 | 0.990.130.120.9 |
| Figure 1H. Test |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 16.82 | 0.66 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | < 0.00010.0090.05 |
| Figure 1I. Renewal |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 43.69 | 0.84 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | 0.00010.0070.0001 |
| Figure 1J. Spontaneous Recovery |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 40.37 | 0.83 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | < 0.00010.02< 0.0001 |
| Figure 1K. Retraining |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 29.02 | 0.77 | < 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | < 0.00010.10.0002 |
| *N per group:*Control = 6; Footshock = 7; No-footshock = 7 |

RM – repeated measures; ANOVA – Analysis of Variance.