Supplementary Table 2

	UNT	TRANSFORMED DATA						TRANSFORMED DATA		1	1	
Figure 2A						Figure 2A	y=log(y)					_
Unpaired t test with Welch's correction						Unpaired t test						_
P value	0.0016	3				P value	0.0001					_
P value summary	**					P value summary	***					_
Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes					Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes					_
One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed					One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed					4
Welch-corrected t, df	t=3.343 df=49.38					t, df	t=3.997 df=84					
								ı		ı	,	
Figure 2C						Figure 2C	y=log(y)					
Ordinary One-Way ANOVA						Ordinary One-Way ANOVA						_
Tukey's multiple comparisons test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value	Tukey's multiple comparisons test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Va	
0.5% DMSO vs. 1uM CLEM	13015140		No	ns		B 0.5% DMSO vs. 1uM CLEM		-0.02369 to 0.514	No	ns		0864 A
0.5% DMSO vs. 5uM CLEM	16217914	4 2103630 to 30332198	Yes	•		-C 0.5% DMSO vs. 5uM CLEM	0.346	0.0655 to 0.6264	Yes	**	0.0	0095 A
0.5% DMSO vs. 10uM CLEM	21799685	7448965 to 36150405	Yes	***	0.0009 A	D 0.5% DMSO vs. 10uM CLEM	0.5622	0.2718 to 0.8526	Yes	****	<0.0001	P
1uM CLEM vs. 5uM CLEM	3202774	-10911510 to 17317057	No	ns	0.9325 B	C 1uM CLEM vs. 5uM CLEM	0.1008	-0.1797 to 0.3813	No	ns	0.7	7799 E
1uM CLEM vs. 10uM CLEM	8784545	-5566176 to 23135265	No	ns	0.3789 B	D 1uM CLEM vs. 10uM CLEM	0.317	0.02665 to 0.6075	Yes	*	0.	.027 E
5uM CLEM vs. 10uM CLEM	5581771	-9321101 to 20484642	No	ns	0.7578 C	-D 5uM CLEM vs. 10uM CLEM	0.2162	-0.08494 to 0.5174	No	ns	0.2	2415 (
								•				
Figure 2E						Figure 2E	y=log(y)					
Kruskal-Wallis test						Kruskal-Wallis test						\neg
Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value		Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.	Significant?	Summarv	Adjusted P Value		7
2		1								, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		\dashv
DMSO wt/het vs. 5uM CLEM wt/het	24.4	4 Yes		0.0352	A-B	DMSO wt/het vs. 5uM CLEM wt/het	24.4	Yes		0.035	2 A-B	\dashv
DMSO MUT irf8 vs. 5uM CLEM MUT irf8	-2.272		ns	>0.0352	C-D	DMSO WUTIER VS. 5uM CLEM WUTIER DMSO MUT irf8 vs. 5uM CLEM MUT irf8	-2.272		ns	>0.9999	C-D	\dashv
SINCO INC. THO VS. OUN OLLIW MOT ING	-2.212	- 1.0	,,,,	0.0000	0.5	DINGO MOT IIIO VS. SUM OLEM MOT IIIO	-2.212	J.10		0.0000	J-D	_
Figure 2G						Figure 2G						\neg
Unpaired t test						N/A						\dashv
P value	0.0006					IVO						-
	0.0006								+			4
P value summary					-				1			+
Significantly different (P < 0.05)? One- or two-tailed P value?	Yes Two-tailed								-			\dashv
t, df	t=3.97 df=22				-				1			+
t, at	t=3.97 dt=22											_
						I						_
Figure 3C			1		-	Figure 3C	y=y/30					—
Kruskal-Wallis test						Kruskal-Wallis test						-
Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value		Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.		Summary	Adjusted P Value		_
WT DMSO vs. WT Clem	-35.05		****	<0.0001	A-B	WT DMSO vs. WT Clem	-35.05		****	<0.0001	A-B	\perp
WT DMSO vs. P2RX7^xt26 DMSO	-8.75		ns	>0.9999	A-C	WT DMSO vs. P2RX7^xt26 DMSO	-8.75		ns	>0.9999	A-C	
WT DMSO vs. P2RX7^xt26 DMSO	-14.4		ns	0.7007		WT DMSO vs. P2RX7^xt26 DMSO	-14.4		ns		7 A-D	
WT Clem vs. P2RX7*xt26 DMSO		Yes	***	0.0004	B-C	WT Clem vs. P2RX7^xt26 DMSO		Yes	***		4 B-C	
WT Clem vs. P2RX7*xt26 DMSO		Yes	*	0.0461		WT Clem vs. P2RX7^xt26 DMSO	20.65		*		1 B-D	
P2RX7*xt26 DMSO vs. P2RX7*xt26 DMSO	-5.654	1 No	ns	>0.9999	C-D	P2RX7*xt26 DMSO vs. P2RX7*xt26 DMSO	-5.654	No	ns	>0.9999	C-D	
Figure 4A						Figure 4A	y=log(y)					
Kruskal-Wallis test						Ordinary One-Way ANOVA						
Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value		Tukey's multiple comparisons test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Significant?		Adjusted P Va	alue
WT DMSO vs. WT CLEM	36.46	Yes	****	<0.0001	A-B	WT DMSO vs. WT CLEM	0.6204	0.3006 to 0.9402	Yes	****	<0.0001	A
WT DMSO vs. p2x7 mutant DMSO	16	No No	ns	0.7862		WT DMSO vs. p2x7 mutant DMSO	0.3088	-0.1204 to 0.7379	No	ns	0.2	2451
WT DMSO vs. p2x7 mutant CLEM	21.38	No No	ns	0.4201		WT DMSO vs. p2x7 mutant CLEM	0.382	-0.09595 to 0.86	No	ns		652 A
WT CLEM vs. p2x7 mutant DMSO	-20.46		ns	0.3208		WT CLEM vs. p2x7 mutant DMSO	-0.3117	-0.7408 to 0.1174	No	ns	0.2	2375
WT CLEM vs. p2x7 mutant CLEM	-15.08		ns	>0.9999	B-D	WT CLEM vs. p2x7 mutant CLEM	-0.2384		No	ns		662 E
p2x7 mutant DMSO vs. p2x7 mutant CLEM	5.383		ns	>0.9999	C-D	p2x7 mutant DMSO vs. p2x7 mutant CLEM		-0.4838 to 0.6303	No	ns		9862
Figure 5A						Figure 5A	y=log(y)					
Kruskal-Wallis test						Ordinary One-Way ANOVA						\neg
Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value		Tukey's multiple comparisons test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Va	alue
Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:WT CLEM		Yes	,		A-B	Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:WT CLEM		0.02344 to 0.5967	Yes	*		0284
Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO		1 Yes	**	0.0044		Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO		0.08659 to 0.6558	Yes	**		0049 A
Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:ΔRD1 CLEM		Yes	**	0.0044		Mm:WT DMSO vs. Mm:ARD1 CLEM	0.3655	0.1034 to 0.6276	Yes	**		0022
Mm:WT CLEM vs. Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO	7.195		ns	>0.9999	B-C	Mm:WT CLEM vs. Mm:ΔRD1 CLEW	0.06113	-0.2213 to 0.3436	No	ns	0.0	
Mm:WT CLEM vs. Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO Mm:WT CLEM vs. Mm:ΔRD1 CLEM	7.195		ns	>0.9999	B-D	Mm:WT CLEM vs. Mm:∆RD1 DMSO Mm:WT CLEM vs. Mm:∆RD1 CLEM	0.05543		No.	ns		.943 B
Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO vs. Mm:ΔRD1 CLEM	0.1776		ns ns	>0.9999	C-D	Mm:ΔRD1 DMSO vs. Mm:ΔRD1 CLEM		-0.2043 to 0.3151 -0.2632 to 0.2518	No No	ns ns	>0.9999	
MIII. EIND I DWGC VS. WIII. ERD I GLEM	0.1776	7110	115	-0.0033	0-0	WIII. LADT DIVISO VS. WIII. ARDT CLEW	-0.005705	-0.2032 to 0.2310	140	110	~U.3399	С
Eiguro ED						Eiguro ED	v=log(v)					
Figure 5B						Figure 5B	y=log(y)					-
Kruskal-Wallis test	Manager 1997	CimpificantC	Comme	Adirected D Value		Ordinary One-Way ANOVA	M D'''	OE 000/ CI -4 .""	CiiC :-	C	Address 1511	- hou
Dunn's multiple comparisons test	Mean rank diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value		Tukey's multiple comparisons test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Va	
DMSO WT/HET vs. CLEM WT/HET		Yes	-	0.0285		DMSO WT/HET vs. CLEM WT/HET		0.03425 to 0.4477	Yes			154
DMSO WT/HET vs. DMSO ASC MUTANT	-16.56		ns	0.3995		DMSO WT/HET vs. DMSO ASC MUTANT	-0.152	-0.3969 to 0.09285	No	ns		3723
DMSO WT/HET vs. CLEM ASC MUTANT	-12.91		ns	>0.9999	A-D	DMSO WT/HET vs. CLEM ASC MUTANT	-0.1423	-0.4329 to 0.1483	No	ns	0.0	5798 A
CLEM WT/HET vs. DMSO ASC MUTANT		Yes Yes	***	0.0001		CLEM WT/HET vs. DMSO ASC MUTANT	-0.393	-0.6358 to -0.1503	Yes	***		0003 E
CLEM WT/HET vs. CLEM ASC MUTANT	-34.43		••	0.0073		CLEM WT/HET vs. CLEM ASC MUTANT	-0.3833	-0.6721 to -0.09447	Yes	**		0042 E
DMSO ASC MUTANT vs. CLEM ASC MUTANT	3.649	No No	ns	>0.9999	C-D	DMSO ASC MUTANT vs. CLEM ASC MUTANT	0.009765	-0.3075 to 0.327	No	ns	0.9	9998 C
Figure 6B						Figure 6B						

Supplementary Table 2

P value summary "" Significantly different (P < 0.05)? Yes Significantly different (P < 0.05)? Yes Significantly different (P < 0.05)? Yes One- or two-tailed P value? Two-tailed P value summary "" Value summa													
## CONTROL OF CONTROL							N/A						4
Figure 10 Figu	inn's multiple comparisons test	Rank sum diff.	Significant? S	Summary									4
STATE 1985		16	Yes **	•	0.0021	A-B							
## CSC No. PST AND CSC NO. PST	T DMSO vs. P2X7 mutant DMSO	6	No n	IS	>0.9999	A-C							
## STORY AND ALTONOMY A 16 (No. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19	T DMSO vs. P2X7 mutant CLEM	10	No n:	IS	0.1521	A-D							
Figure 62	T CLEM vs. P2X7 mutant DMSO	-10	No n	IS	0.1521	B-C							
Figure 46	T CLEM vs. P2X7 mutant CLEM	-6	No n	IS	>0.9999	B-D							
Depart State Depart State als Newfox company 0.000 1.0	X7 mutant DMSO vs. P2X7 mutant CLEM	4	No n	IS	>0.9999	C-D							7
Comment of the arm Notice controls Comment o									•				
Pasks commons Pasks Pasks commons Pask	gure 6C						Figure 6C						Т
Secondary Control Processing Control Processing Control Contro	aired t test				Unpaired t test with Welch's correction		N/A						\top
Secondary Control Processing Control Processing Control Contro	value	0.0253			P value	0.0253							
Supplicating (F x 0.007) Vest		•											\top
Control of Section Control		Yes				Yes							\top
Column						Two-tailed							+
Figure 40													+
Figure 60		(-4.157 di-5			Welch-conected t, ui	1-4.107 UI-3							+
Parent least Pare	inder of pairs	-											
Pare	aure 6D						Figure 6D	v=log(v)					
Parent Lead													
Parent feet								r=0.6966,					
Paules summany Miles Paules Miles summany Miles Paules Miles summany Miles Miles summany Miles Miles summany Miles Miles summany Miles summany Miles Miles summany Miles su	aired t test	p=0.0028											
Significantly effection (P > 0.08)P Yes Significantly effective (P > 0.08)P Significantly effe	value				P value	<0.0001	P value				P value	<0.0001	
City	value summary	••••			P value summary	****	P value summary	****			P value summary	****	
Edit	gnificantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes			Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes	Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes			Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes	
Number of pairs	ne- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed			One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed	One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed			One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed	T
Track one sulfer was excluded. Only 2 colonies grew on the least distled sprew on the least distled	df	t=7.625 df=13			Welch-corrected t, df	t=6.227 df=15.36	t, df	t=9.965 df=13			Welch-corrected t, df	t=6.389 df=20.2	3
Trock on outlier was excluded. Only 2 coloning grew on the least dubted spew on the least dubted prevent the least dubt	umber of pairs	14					Number of pairs	14					
excluded, Only 2 colonies grow on the least diluted plate despite having high bacterial values by fluorescence. It was > 250 bacterial values by fluorescence. It was a subject of values of values fluorescence values of values fluorescence values of values fluorescence values fluorescence v													
excluded, Only 2 colonies grow on the least diluted plate despite having high bacterial values by fluorescence. It was >2 SD bacterial values of values fluorescence values of values fluorescence								•	•		•	•	
Grew on the least diluted plate despite having high plate despite high had high plate despite having high plate despite high plate despite having high plate despite having high plate despite having high plate despite high													
Page 6E Page 6E Page 7E Page 6E Page 7E Page 6E Page 7E Page													
Dacterial values by													
Ruprescence, It was > 2 SD Log(0,8) away from the mean Log(5,23) Figure 6E													
Figure 6E mean Log(5.23)													
Unpaired test with Welch's correction Unpaired test Unpaired Unpaired test Unpaired													
P value summary ns P value summary ns P value summary ns P value summary ** Significantly different (P < 0.05)? No No No No No No No No No N	gure 6E	mean Log(5.23)					Figure 6E	y=log(y)	Log(5.23)				Щ.
P value summary ns Significantly different (P < 0.05)? No One- or two-tailed P value? Veloch-corrected t, df I=1.381 df=4.01 Figure 6E without outlier removed Unpaired t test with Welch's correction P value summary ns Figure 6E without outlier removed Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed Unpaired t test Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed Unpaired t test Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed One- or two-tailed One- or two-tailed Figure 6E without outlier removed Unpaired t test Value One- or two-tailed One- or two-tailed P value? Figure 6E yelogy) Figure 6F Kruskal-Wallis test Ounr's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Outlie AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,76 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21,6 Yes * Outlie AB DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) DAD MSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) DAD MSO (0.5%) vs	paired t test with Welch's correction						Unpaired t test						Щ
Significantly different (P < 0.05)? No Significantly different (P < 0.05)? Yes Significantly different (P <	value	0.2392					P value	0.0037					
One- or two-tailed P value? Two-tailed Invo-tailed P value? Two-tailed Invo-tailed P value? Two-tailed P value? Invo-tailed P value? <td>value summary</td> <td>ns</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>P value summary</td> <td>**</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	value summary	ns					P value summary	**					
Figure 6E without outlier removed	gnificantly different (P < 0.05)?	No					Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	Yes					
Figure 6E without outlier removed	ne- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed					One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed					
Unpaired t test with Welch's correction	elch-corrected t, df	t=1.381 df=4.01					t, df	t=3.877 df=9					T
Unpaired t test with Welch's correction													
P value	gure 6E without outlier removed						Figure 6E without outlier removed						
P value	paired t test with Welch's correction						Unpaired t test						
P value summary ns P value summary ns		0.2366						0.1397					
Significantly different (P < 0.05)?													
One- or two-tailed P value? Two-tailed One- or two-tailed P value? Two-tailed It. df t=1.605 df=10 t=1.605 df=10 It. df t=1.605 df=10 t=1.605		No					Significantly different (P < 0.05)?	No					
Figure 6F Figu													
Figure 6F													
Kruskal-Wallis test Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes 0.011 A-B AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes 0.011 A-B	., .						*						
Kruskal-Wallis test Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes 0.011 A-B AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes 0.011 A-B	aure 6F						Figure 6F	v=log(v)					
Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value Dunn's multiple comparisons test Mean rank diff. Significant? Summary Adjusted P Value AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes 0.011 A-B AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM)								,					+
AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes • 0.011 A-B AB DMSO (0.5%) vs. AB CLEM (5uM) 21.76 Yes • 0.011 A-B		Mean rank diff	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value			Mean rank diff	Significant?	Summary	Adjusted P Value		
						A-B				*		A.B	
				**						***			+
AB DMS0 (0.5%) vs. AB MOX (2ug/mL)+ CLEM (5uM) 49.67 Yes **** <0.0001 A-D AB DMS0 (0.5%) vs. AB MOX (2ug/mL)+ CLEM (5uM) 49.67 Yes **** <0.0001 A-D				***						****			+
AB DIMSO (0.5%) VS. AB MOX (20pmL)+ CLEM (50M) 44.67 (76% "" <0.0007 A-D AB DIMSO (0.5%) VS. AB MOX (20pmL)+ CLEM (50M) 45.67 (76% "" <0.0007 A-D AB DIMSO (0.5%) VS. AB MOX (20pmL)+ CLEM (50M) 6.801 No ns >0.9999 B-C AB CLEM (50M) VS. AB MOX (20pmL)+ CLEM (50M) 6.801 No ns >0.9999 B-C													
AS CLEM (SUM) Vs. AB MOX (20gml.)				**						***			+
AB MOX (2ug/mL) vs. AB MOX (2ug/mL)+ CLEM (5uM) 21.11 Yes * 0.0131 C-D AB MOX (2ug/mL)+ CLEM (5uM) 21.11 Yes * 0.0131 C-D	I MOX (Zug/IIIL) Vs. AB MOX (Zug/ML)+ CLEM (5uM)	21.11	765		0.0131	C-D	AB MOX (20g/mL) VS. AB MOX (20g/mL)+ CLEM (50M)	21.11	res		0.0131	C-D	#
						i		1	l .		<u> </u>	1	

Supplementary Table 2: Summary of p values and statistical tests for Figures 1-6. Statistics performed on transformed data are in yellow and untransformed is in gray. The table is organized by figure number, in chronological order. Statistical tests are listed and transformation equation provided, where applicable. When a paired t-test is performed on paired data, the results of the unpaired t-test are also given. When both paired and unpaired are potentially appropriate (in the case of paired data with ineffective pairing), both test results are given. Statistical test results in *italics* denote tests not presented within the figures.