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# Statistical Analysis

Standard Repeated measures ANOVA (Drug between groups, stimulation paramaters within subjects). Note that no correction is applied to the simple main effects used to test the follow up main effect of stimulation intensity/pulse number. This is because only 2 tests are conducted (1 vs 2 & 2 vs 3) to avoid linearly dependent contrasts. However, all the follow up tests survive unnecessary correction for multiple comparisons (i.e. assuming 3 tests were conducted).

# Raw Data

## Pre vs Post Drug analysis - Baseline periods

Peak DA decreased from pre- to post-injection (Period , ), however this was not significantly modulated by LY3454740 or Saline (Drug , ; Drug x Period , ).

AUC was not significantly modulated by LY3454740 or Saline (Drug , ; Period , ; Drug x Period , ).

Latency to peak DA was not significantly modulated by LY3454740 or Saline (Drug , ; Period , ; Drug x Period , ).

DA reuptake (as indexed by t50 point) was not significantly modulated by LY3454740 or Saline ( Period , ; Drug x Period , ). Overall, DA reuptake was slower overall in animals asigned to the Saline group, but this failed to reach significance (Drug , ).

## Pre Drug

### Stimulation Intensity Response Curve

Peak DA increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was not modulated by stimulation intensity (Intensity: , , or by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

### Stimulation Pulse Number Response Curve

Peak DA increased with pulse number (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was also modulated by stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

## Post Drug

### Stimulation Intensity Response Curve

Peak DA increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was not modulated by stimulation intensity (Intensity: , , or by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

### Stimulation Pulse Number Response Curve

Peak DA increased with pulse number (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was also modulated by stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

# Percent Baseline Data

## Pre Drug

### Stimulation Intensity Response Curve

Peak DA increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was not modulated by stimulation intensity (Intensity: , , or by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

### Stimulation Pulse Number Response Curve

Peak DA increased with pulse number (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was also modulated by stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

## Post Drug

### Stimulation Intensity Response Curve

Peak DA increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Intensity: , ; 100 vs 200 , , 200 vs 300 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was not modulated by stimulation intensity (Intensity: , , or by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

### Stimulation Pulse Number Response Curve

Peak DA increased with pulse number (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Similarly, AUC increased with stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).

Latency to peak was also modulated by stimulation intensity (Pulses: , ; 12 vs 24 , , 24 vs 36 , ), but was not modulated by drug condition (Drug: , , Drug x Intensity: , ).