**Table 4.** **Deconditioning-update is based on memory destabilization mechanisms.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure 4** |
| Figure 4B. Extinction Sessions |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Bonferroni) | *P* value |
| Two-way RM ANOVA | InteractionF(11,132) = 8.041TimeF(11,132) = 17.16GroupF(1,12) = 19.65 | 0.120.270.26 | < 0.0001< 0.00010.0008 | T1+T2T3+T4T5+T6T7+T8T9+T10T11+T12T13+T14T15+T16T17+T18T19+T20T21+T22T23+T24 | 0.990.990.990.460.370.0002 0.0020.0010.210.00010.00010.0001 |
| Figure 4C. Test |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 46.37 | 0.85 | 0.0001 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | 0.0020.0020.9 |
| Figure 4D. Renewal |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 2.453 | 0.22 | 0.11 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | 0.00010.0170.0004 |
| Figure 4E. Spontaneous Recovery |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| One-way ANOVA | F(2,17) = 5.668 | 0.4 | 0.01 | control vs. footshockcontrol vs. no-footshockfootshock vs. no-footshock | 0.00010.060.001 |
| *N per group:*Control = 6; Footshock = 7; No-footshock = 7 |
| Figure 4G. Reactivations |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Bonferroni) | *P* value |
| Three-way RM ANOVA | TimeF(3,78) = 47.9DrugF(1,26) = 16.46FootshockF(1,25) = 0.1236Time x DrugF(3,78) = 13.36Time x FootshockF(3,78) = 0.2317Drug x FootshockF(1,26) = 1.4313-way InteractionF(3,78) = 1.021 | 0.310.160.0010.090.0020.010.01 | 0.0004< 0.00010.73<0.00010.870.240.39 | Day 3NFS Veh vs. NFS NimoFS Veh vs. FS NimoNFS Veh vs. FS VehNFS Nimo vs. FS NimoDay 4NFS Veh vs. NFS NimoFS Veh vs. FS NimoNFS Veh vs. FS VehNFS Nimo vs. FS NimoDay 5NFS Veh vs. NFS NimoFS Veh vs. FS NimoNFS Veh vs. FS VehNFS Nimo vs. FS NimoDay 6NFS Veh vs. NFS NimoFS Veh vs. FS NimoNFS Veh vs. FS VehNFS Nimo vs. FS Nimo | >0.99>0.99>0.99>0.99>0.990.001>0.99>0.990.490.07>0.99>0.99>0.990.01>0.99>0.99 |
| Figure 4H. Test |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| Two-way RM ANOVA | InteractionF(1,25) = 0.7442DrugF(1,25) = 7.890FootshockF(1,25) = 0.9 | 0.020.230.03 | 0.390.0090.35 | Tukey’s Nimo NFS vs. Nimo FSNimo NFS vs. Veh NFSNimo NFS vs. Veh FSNimo FS vs. Veh NFSNimo FS vs. Veh FSVeh NFS vs. Veh FS | 0.990.530.060.550.060.59 |
| Figure 4I. Renewal |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post-hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| Two-way RM ANOVA | InteractionF(1,25) = 10.34DrugF(1,25) = 19.11GroupF(1,25) = 7.239 | 0.170.310.12 | 0.0030.00020.01 | Tukey’sNimo NFS vs. Nimo FSNimo NFS vs. Veh NFSNimo NFS vs. Veh FSNimo FS vs. Veh NFSNimo FS vs. Veh FSVeh NFS vs. Veh FS | 0.980.850.00030.63< 0.00010.002 |
| Figure 4J. Spontaneous Recovery |
| Omnibus Test | η² | *P* value | Post hoc (Tukey) | *P* value |
| Two-way RM ANOVA | InteractionF(1,25) = 3.525DrugF(1,25) = 9.11GroupF(1,25) = 6.349 | 0.080.210.14 | 0.070.0050.01 | Tukey’sNimo NFS vs. Nimo FSNimo NFS vs. Veh NFSNimo NFS vs. Veh FSNimo FS vs. Veh NFSNimo FS vs. Veh FSVeh NFS vs. Veh FS | 0.970.840.0030.980.0080.02 |
| *N per group:*No-footshock vehicle = 7; No-footshock nimodipine = 7; Footshock vehicle =7; Footshock nimodipine = 8  |

Nimo – nimopidine; NFS – no-footshock; FS – footshock