Supplementary Table 7. Summary of statistics

Figure	Test	Comparison	Sample number	Stat	p-value	Sum mar y
Figure 2a	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 9	t ₁₆ = -8.324	<i>p</i> = 0.000000330	**
Figure 2b	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 8	t ₁₄ = -7.235	<i>p</i> = 0.00000432	**
Figure 2c	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 9	$t_{16} = -6.756$	<i>p</i> = 0.00000462	**
Figure 2d	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 7	$t_{12} = -6.114$	<i>p</i> = 0.0000522	**
Figure 2e	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 5	t ₈ = 8.665	<i>p</i> = 0.0000245	**
Figure 2f	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 8	t14 = 6.096	<i>p</i> = 0.0000276	**
Figure 2g	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 7	t ₁₂ = 2.844	p = 0.0148	*
Figure 2h	independent samples t-test	susceptible left vs. susceptible right	n = 12	$t_{22} = 8.454$	0.000000023	**
Figure 3a	Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance on Ranks	control vs. resilient vs. susceptible	control = 5, resilient = 5, rusceptible = 5	H = 9.620, df = 2	p = 0.008	**
	Turkey test post-hoc			between control and susceptible, *p < 0.05, between control and resilient, p > 0.05. between resilient and susceptible, *p < 0.05,		
Figure 3b	two-way ANOVA	Group: control vs. resilient vs. susceptible	control = 8, resilient = 7, susceptible =7	F(2, 38) = 14.445	ρ < 0.001	**
		Lateraility : Left vs. Right		F(1, 38) = 3.634	p = 0.064	NS
		Group X Laterailty		F(2, 38) = 4.489	p = 0.018	*

	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis		scrambled =	laterality within susceptible **p = 0.002 , laterality within resilient p = 0.357 ; within left mPFC, control and resilient, ** p < 0.001 , control and susceptible, p = 0.120 , resilient and susceptible, * p = 0.016 ; within right mPFC, control and resilient, * p = 0.025 , control and susceptible, ** p < 0.001 , resilient and susceptible, ** p < 0.001 , resilient and susceptible, p = 0.166		
Figure 3d	independent samples t-test	scramble shRNA vs. CTGF shRNA	3, CTGF shRNA = 3	t ₄ = 2.850	p = 0.0464	*
Figure 3e	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 14, stress = 16	F(1, 28) = 1.731	p = 0.199	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 28) = 7.721	p = 0.010	*
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 28) = 5.126	p = 0.032	*
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis			within non-stressed, effect of target, ** p = 0.002; within stressed, effect of target, p = 0.709; within non-target, effect of stress, p = 0.739, within target, effect of stress, * p = 0.019,		
Figure 3f	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 13, stress = 17	F(1, 28) = 2.514	p = 0.124	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 28) = 20.319	p < 0.001	**
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 28) = 4.478	p = 0.043	*

	1	T	1	<u> </u>	ı	
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis			within non-stressed, effect of target, **p < 0.001; within stressed, effect of target, p = 0.080; within non-target, effect of stress, p = 0.949, within target, effect of stress, *p = 0.014		
Figure 3g	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 11, stress = 15	F(1, 24) = 1.968	p = 0.173	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 24) = 58.986	p < 0.001	**
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 24) = 2.480	p = 0.128	NS
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis for main target effect			within non-stressed, effect of target, **p <0.001; within stressed, effect of target, **p <0.001		
Figure 4c left	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 8, stress = 11	F(1, 17) = 4.008	p = 0.061	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 17) = 0.00147	p = 0.970	NS
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 17) = 17.763	p < 0.001	**
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis			within non-stress, effect of target, *p = 0.012, within stress the effect of target, **p = 0.005, within target presence, effect of stress, **p < 0.001		
Figure 4c right	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 10, stress = 11	F(1, 19) = 3.371	p = 0.082	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F (1, 19) = 18.637	p < 0.001	**
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 19) = 3.965	p = 0.061	NS
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis for main target effect			within non-stressed, effect of target $p =$ 0.125, within stressed, effect of target, ** $p <$ 0.001		
Figure 4d left	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: control vs. R-CTGF	control = 8, R-CTGF = 10	F(1, 16) = 1.266	<i>p</i> = 0.277	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 16) = 0.143	ρ = 0.710	NS

	I	Ctross V Torret	1	1		1
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 16) = 8.921	p = 0.009	**
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis			within control, effect of target, *p = 0.038, within R-CTGF, effect of target, p = 0.068, within target presence, the effect of R-CTGF, *p = 0.025		
Figure 4d right	independent samples t-test	Cntrol vs. R-CTGF	control = 8, R-CTGF = 10	t ₁₆ = 3.020	$\rho = 0.00814$	**
Figure 4e left	Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test	Control vs. R-CTGF	control = 5, R-CTGF = 9	T = 54	p = 0.033	*
Figure 4e right	independent samples t-test	Control vs. R-CTGF	control = 5, R-CTGF = 9	t ₁₂ = -2.547	p = 0.0256	*
Figure 5b	independent samples t-test	Control vs. L-CTGF	control = 4, L-CTGF = 4	t ₆ = -6.142	p < 0.01	**
Figure 5c left	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 13, stress = 21	F(1, 32) = 2.517	p = 0.122	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 32) = 29.886	p < 0.001	**
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 32) = 9.537	p = 0.004	**
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis			within non-stressed, the effect of target, **p < 0.001; within stressed, the effect of target, p = 0.063; within target presence, effect of stress, **p = 0.004		
Figure 5c right	two-way RM ANOVA	Group: non-stress vs. stress	non-stress = 14, stress = 15	F(1, 27) = 0.0540	p = 0.818	NS
		Repeated trial: No Target vs. Target		F(1, 27) = 20.560	p < 0.001	**
		Stress X Target interaction		F(1, 27) = 1.293	p = 0.266	NS
	Holm-sidak post-hoc analysis for main target effect			within L-CTGF non- stressed, the effect of target,**p < 0.001; within L- CTGF stressed, the effect of target, *p = 0.021		
Figure 5d left	independent samples t-test	Control vs. L-CTGF	control = 6, L-CTGF = 8	t ₁₂ = 1.728	p = 0.110	NS
Figure 5d right	independent samples t-test	Control vs. L-CTGF	control = 6, L-CTGF = 8	$t_{12} = 0.315$	p = 0.758	NS