Statistics

Exact *P* values are provided for those > 0.001.

Fig. 1g, Two-way ANOVA; treatment $F(1, 3479) = 2900.22$, $P < 0.001$; time $F(4, 3479) = 584.57$, $P < 0.001$; interaction $F(4, 3479) = 575.14$, $P < 0.001$.Bonferroni's post-hoc. LPS 1 h vs. NaCl 1 h, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.41,-0.34); LPS 2 h vs. NaCl 2 h, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.73,-0.65); LPS 3 h vs. NaCl 3 h, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.17,-0.10); LPS 4 h vs. NaCl 4 h, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.16,-0.09).
Fig. 1i, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(6, 24) = 233.50$, $P < 0.001$. Tukey's post-hoc. 40 vs 46°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-98.7,-71.3); 40 vs 48°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-102.2,-74.7); 40 vs 50°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-108.7,-81.3); 40 vs 52°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-105.7,-78.2).
Fig. 2a, Two-way ANOVA; treatment $F(1, 4450) = 4222.08$, $P < 0.001$; time $F(9, 4450) = 54.95$, $P < 0.001$; interaction $F(9, 4450) = 81.81$, $P < 0.001$.Bonferroni's post-hoc. Chloroquine vs NaCl 1 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.11,-0.04); Chloroquine vs NaCl 2 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.13,-0.06); Chloroquine vs NaCl 3 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.19,-0.12); Chloroquine vs NaCl 4 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.20,-0.13); Chloroquine vs NaCl 5 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.21,-0.14); Chloroquine vs NaCl 6 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.22,-0.15); Chloroquine vs NaCl 7 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.25,-0.18); Chloroquine vs NaCl 8 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.30,-0.23); Chloroquine vs NaCl 9 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.38,-0.31); Chloroquine vs NaCl 10 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.34,-0.27).
Fig. 2c, Student's t-test (two-tailed), $t(14) = 2.60$, $P = 0.021$, 95% CI (2.91,30.34).
Fig. 2d, Student's t-test (two-tailed), $t(14) = 2.92$, $P = 0.011$, 95% CI (8.57,56.18).
Fig. 2f, Student's t-test (two-tailed), $t(14) = 8.37$, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (14.03,41.22).
Fig. 3f, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(7, 281) = 569.97$, $P < 0.001$. Tukey's post-hoc. No fast vs 0 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.07,0.11); 0 vs 10 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.08,0.12); 20 vs 30 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.04,-0.002); 30 vs 40 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.09,-0.05); 40 vs 50 min, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.17,-0.13).
Fig. 4e, Two-way RM ANOVA; treatment $F(1, 14) = 553.51$, $P < 0.001$; time $F(3, 14) = 46.94$, $P < 0.001$; interaction $F(3, 14) = 5.21$, $P = 0.004$. Bonferroni's post-hoc. Trial 1, GFP vs TetTox, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.41,-0.09); trial 2, GFP vs TetTox, $P = 0.039$, 95% CI (-0.33,-0.004).
Fig. 6c, Two-way RM ANOVA; treatment $F(1, 434) = 277.36$, $P < 0.001$; time $F(29, 434) = 5.09$, $P < 0.001$; interaction $F(29, 434) = 2.84$, $P < 0.001$.
Fig. 6d, Two-way RM ANOVA; treatment $F(1, 434) = 277.64$, $P < 0.001$; time $F(29, 434) = 10.68$, $P < 0.001$; interaction $F(29, 434) = 1.72$, $P = 0.012$.

Extended Data Fig. 1d, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), $t(316) = -28.25$, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.04,-0.04).
Extended Data Fig. 2b, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(6, 285) = 419.25$, Tukey's post-hoc. 40 vs 46°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-3.02,-2.31); 40 vs 48°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-3.06,-2.35); 40 vs 50°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-3.75,-3.04); 40 vs 52°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-4.31,-3.60); 46 vs 50°C, $P <$

0.001, 95% CI (-1.08,-0.37); 46 vs 52°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-1.65,-0.94); 50 vs 52°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.92,-0.21).

Extended Data Fig. 2e, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(110) = -11.58, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.64,-0.46).

Extended Data Fig. 2h, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(4,125) = 2379.77$, $P < 0.001$, Tukey's post-hoc. 40 vs 48°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-2.25,-1.33); 40 vs 52°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-8.81,-7.89); 40 vs 56°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-13.61,-12.68); 48 vs 52°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-7.02,-6.10); 48 vs 556°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-11.82,-10.89); 52 vs 56°C, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-5.26,-4.34).

Extended Data Fig. 3a, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(282) = 29.47, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.08,0.09).

Extended Data Fig. 3b, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(3,281) = 380.61$, $P < 0.001$, Tukey's post-hoc. -2 vs -1 s, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.03,0.04); -1 vs 0 s, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.02,0.03).

Extended Data Fig. 4d, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(246) = -16.99, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.034,-0.027).

Extended Data Fig. 4e, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(243) = -7.95, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.020,-0.012).

Extended Data Fig. 4f, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(253) = 18.64, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.04,0.05).

Extended Data Fig. 4g, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(246) = -26.00, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.041,-0.035).

Extended Data Fig. 4h, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(243) = 12.35, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.015,0.021).

Extended Data Fig. 4i, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(253) = 22.00, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.041,0.048).

Extended Data Fig. 5d, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(219) = -20.90, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.066,-0.055).

Extended Data Fig. 5e, Student's t-test (two-tailed, paired), t(217) = -14.42, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.047,-0.035).

Extended Data Fig. 6a, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(2, 213) = 90.11$, $P < 0.001$, Tukey's post-hoc. Tone trial 1 vs 15, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (1.01,2.21); tone trial 15 vs 30, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (1.20,2.39).

Extended Data Fig. 6b, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(2, 168) = 2.36$, $P = 0.10$

Extended Data Fig. 6d, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(3, 487) = 1428.55$, $P < 0.001$, Tukey's post-hoc. Pre 1 vs Pre 2, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.11,-0.09); Pre 1 vs Post 1, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.17,0.19); Pre 1 vs Post 2, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.27,0.29); Pre 2 vs Post 1, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.05,0.07); Pre 2 vs Post 2, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (0.15,0.17); Post 1 vs Post 2, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.13,-0.11).

Extended Data Fig. 6e, One-way RM ANOVA, $F(3, 487) = 1476.10$, Tukey's post-hoc. Post 1 freezing vs Post 1 not freezing, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.28,-0.26); Post 2 freezing vs Post 2 not freezing, $P < 0.001$, 95% CI (-0.21,-0.18).