

Association of microbiome vs brain in GIMA dataset

Kai Xia

14 January 2019

Warning: package 'knitr' was built under R version 3.5.2

Spaghetti plot of behavior data

Microbiome neo vs brain volume

Warning: package 'survival' was built under R version 3.5.2

Table 1: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166903	2877	58.01	3.51e-28	160978	172828	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-12964	10385	-1.25	2.23e-01	-34353	8424	0.0565

Table 2: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166848	2969	56.1956	7.75e-28	160733	172963	0.00e+00
wunifrac.PC.2	1021	21317	0.0479	9.62e-01	-42881	44924	8.83e-05

Table 3: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166808	2965	56.263	7.52e-28	160701	172914	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.3	5766	24356	0.237	8.15e-01	-44396	55928	0.00215

Table 4: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166357	2895	57.46	4.46e-28	160395	172320	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	37029	28700	1.29	2.09e-01	-22079	96137	0.0602

Table 5: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166986	2857	58.5	2.91e-28	161103	172869	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-26061	18582	-1.4	1.73e-01	-64331	12209	0.0703

Table 6: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166939	2931	56.965	5.53e-28	160904	172975	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	-16703	20975	-0.796	4.33e-01	-59902	26496	0.0238

Table 7: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166929	2869	58.18	3.28e-28	161020	172838	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	27763	21244	1.31	2.03e-01	-15990	71517	0.0616

Table 8: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	166809	2960	56.357	7.21e-28	160713	172905	0.00000
unifrac.PC.4	-10128	30561	-0.331	7.43e-01	-73070	52813	0.00421

Table 9: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	176341.4	9821.8	17.95	8.48e-16	156113	196570	0.0000
chao1	-96.9	95.7	-1.01	3.21e-01	-294	100	0.0379

Table 10: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs observed_otus,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	176844	10014	17.66	1.25e-15	156220	197469	0.0000
observed_otus	-169	162	-1.04	3.07e-01	-503	165	0.0402

Table 11: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	175926	14225	12.368	3.75e-12	146630	205222	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-1877	2875	-0.653	5.20e-01	-7797	4044	0.0161

Table 12: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.WM vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	173987	14764	11.785	1.06e-11	143581	204394	0.0000
shannon	-2583	5229	-0.494	6.26e-01	-13353	8186	0.0093

Table 13: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276741	6869	40.29	2.91e-24	262593	290888	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-43115	24796	-1.74	9.44e-02	-94183	7953	0.104

Table 14: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276524	7282	37.9724	1.25e-23	261526	291522	0.00e+00
wunifrac.PC.2	-1069	52284	-0.0204	9.84e-01	-108750	106612	1.61e-05

Table 15: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276594	7275	38.019	1.21e-23	261610	291577	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.3	-10654	59765	-0.178	8.60e-01	-133742	112433	0.00122

Table 16: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276026	7291	37.857	1.35e-23	261009	291043	0.000
wunifrac.PC.4	38805	72280	0.537	5.96e-01	-110057	187668	0.011

Table 17: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs unfrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276749	7178	38.553	8.60e-24	261964	291533	0.0000
unfrac.PC.1	-38700	46696	-0.829	4.15e-01	-134872	57473	0.0257

Table 18: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs unfrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276904	7062	39.21	5.67e-24	262359	291449	0.0000
unfrac.PC.2	-62952	50547	-1.25	2.25e-01	-167056	41152	0.0563

Table 19: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs unfrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276754	7025	39.40	5.05e-24	262286	291223	0.0000
unfrac.PC.3	69797	52014	1.34	1.92e-01	-37328	176921	0.0648

Table 20: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs unfrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	276503	7273	38.018	1.21e-23	261524	291482	0.000000
unfrac.PC.4	-9559	75094	-0.127	9.00e-01	-164219	145101	0.000623

Table 21: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	289820	24420	11.87	9.10e-12	239525	340114	0.0000
chao1	-136	238	-0.57	5.74e-01	-626	355	0.0123

Table 22: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs observed_otus,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	285037	25027	11.389	2.18e-11	233493	336582	0.00000
observed_otus	-144	405	-0.355	7.26e-01	-978	690	0.00483

Table 23: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	292810	35026	8.360	1.04e-08	220672	364948	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-3362	7079	-0.475	6.39e-01	-17941	11217	0.0086

Table 24: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.GM vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	269091	36355	7.402	9.40e-08	194217	343964	0.00000
shannon	2690	12876	0.209	8.36e-01	-23829	29209	0.00168

Table 25: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65604	3409	19.244	1.67e-16	58583	72625	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-6732	12306	-0.547	5.89e-01	-32077	18612	0.0114

Table 26: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65415	3385	19.326	1.52e-16	58444	72386	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	-20778	24302	-0.855	4.01e-01	-70829	29272	0.0273

Table 27: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65751	3348	19.64	1.04e-16	58856	72646	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	-31155	27503	-1.13	2.68e-01	-87798	25488	0.047

Table 28: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	64881	3289	19.73	9.36e-17	58107	71655	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	52900	32606	1.62	1.17e-01	-14253	120052	0.0919

Table 29: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65701	3357	19.57	1.13e-16	58788	72614	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-23111	21836	-1.06	3.00e-01	-68083	21862	0.0413

Table 30: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65914	3025	21.79	8.89e-18	59684	72145	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	-58000	21652	-2.68	1.29e-02	-102593	-13406	0.216

Table 31: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65566	3429	19.1184	1.95e-16	58503	72629	0.000000
unifrac.PC.3	-1915	25392	-0.0754	9.40e-01	-54211	50381	0.000219

Table 32: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	65387	3232	20.23	5.18e-17	58729	72044	0.000
unifrac.PC.4	-59328	33376	-1.78	8.76e-02	-128066	9411	0.108

Table 33: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	73446.1	11472	6.402	1.06e-06	49819	97073	0.0000
chao1	-80.3	112	-0.719	4.79e-01	-311	150	0.0195

Table 34: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs observed_otus,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	68878.0	11811	5.832	4.42e-06	44553	93203	0.00000
observed_otus	-55.9	191	-0.292	7.72e-01	-449	338	0.00328

Table 35: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs PD_whole_tree,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	67175	16588	4.0497	0.000436	33012	101338	0.000000
PD_whole_tree	-331	3352	-0.0988	0.922089	-7236	6573	0.000375

Table 36: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.CSF vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	49583	16845	2.944	0.00691	14891	84275	0.0000
shannon	5780	5966	0.969	0.34196	-6508	18067	0.0348

Table 37: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	509248	11606	43.9	3.54e-25	485345	533151	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-62812	41895	-1.5	1.46e-01	-149096	23473	0.0796

Table 38: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	508787	12119	41.983	1.05e-24	483828	533747	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	-20826	87009	-0.239	8.13e-01	-200023	158372	0.0022

Table 39: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	509152	12097	42.091	9.88e-25	484239	534065	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.3	-36043	99373	-0.363	7.20e-01	-240706	168619	0.00503

Table 40: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	507264	11938	42.49	7.83e-25	482677	531851	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	128734	118345	1.09	2.87e-01	-115003	372471	0.0435

Table 41: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs unfrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	509436	11818	43.11	5.49e-25	485096	533776	0.0000
unfrac.PC.1	-87871	76876	-1.14	2.64e-01	-246201	70458	0.0478

Table 42: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs unfrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	509757	11499	44.33	2.75e-25	486074	533441	0.0000
unfrac.PC.2	-137655	82305	-1.67	1.07e-01	-307165	31855	0.0971

Table 43: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs unfrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	509249	11840	43.01	5.79e-25	484865	533633	0.0000
unfrac.PC.3	95645	87661	1.09	2.86e-01	-84896	276187	0.0438

Table 44: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs unfrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	508698	12024	42.307	8.71e-25	483934	533462	0.0000
unfrac.PC.4	-79015	124150	-0.636	5.30e-01	-334707	176676	0.0153

Table 45: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	539607	40442	13.343	7.16e-13	456315	622899	0.0000
chao1	-313	394	-0.794	4.35e-01	-1125	499	0.0237

Table 46: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs observed_otus,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	530760	41552	12.773	1.86e-12	445182	616338	0.0000
observed_otus	-369	672	-0.549	5.88e-01	-1753	1016	0.0114

Table 47: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs PD_whole_tree, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	535911	58358	9.183	1.74e-09	415720	656102	0.00000
PD_whole_tree	-5570	11794	-0.472	6.41e-01	-29861	18721	0.00851

Table 48: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.ICV vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	492661	60530	8.139	1.71e-08	367996	617325	0.00000
shannon	5886	21439	0.275	7.86e-01	-38268	50040	0.00289

Table 49: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	879.4	20.6	42.62	7.26e-25	837	921.8	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-94.5	74.5	-1.27	2.16e-01	-248	58.9	0.0583

Table 50: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	878	20.9	41.954	1.07e-24	835	921	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	-146	150.2	-0.972	3.41e-01	-455	163	0.035

Table 51: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	879.0	21.3	41.2622	1.61e-24	835	923	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.3	-16.3	175.0	-0.0932	9.27e-01	-377	344	0.000334

Table 52: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	876	21.1	41.509	1.39e-24	833	920	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	191	209.3	0.914	3.70e-01	-240	622	0.0311

Table 53: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	880	20.7	42.57	7.47e-25	837	922	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-167	134.4	-1.24	2.25e-01	-444	110	0.0562

Table 54: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	880	20.9	42.060	1.01e-24	837	923	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	-144	149.7	-0.964	3.44e-01	-453	164	0.0345

Table 55: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.3, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	880	20.2	43.62	4.09e-25	838.2	921	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	252	149.3	1.69	1.03e-01	-55.1	560	0.0991

Table 56: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.4, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	878.7	21.2	41.353	1.53e-24	835	922	0.00000
unifrac.PC.4	-71.7	219.4	-0.327	7.46e-01	-524	380	0.00409

Table 57: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	947.119	70.503	13.43	6.16e-13	801.91	1092.322	0.000
chao1	-0.696	0.687	-1.01	3.21e-01	-2.11	0.719	0.038

Table 58: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs observed_otus, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	907.204	73.20	12.394	3.58e-12	756.46	1057.95	0.00000
observed_otus	-0.479	1.18	-0.404	6.90e-01	-2.92	1.96	0.00624

Table 59: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	938.5	102.3	9.179	1.76e-09	727.9	1149.1	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-12.3	20.7	-0.596	5.56e-01	-54.9	30.2	0.0135

Table 60: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Hippocampus_LR vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	817.8	105.8	7.733	4.34e-08	600.0	1035.7	0.0000
shannon	22.1	37.5	0.589	5.61e-01	-55.1	99.2	0.0132

Table 61: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	901	22.2	40.59	2.42e-24	855	946.4	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-215	80.1	-2.68	1.28e-02	-380	-49.8	0.217

Table 62: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	899.4	25.2	35.699	5.69e-23	847	951	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.2	-37.8	180.9	-0.209	8.36e-01	-410	335	0.00168

Table 63: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	899.8	25.2	35.7020	5.68e-23	848	952	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.3	-18.3	207.0	-0.0886	9.30e-01	-445	408	0.000302

Table 64: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	900.9	25.3	35.582	6.16e-23	849	953	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.4	-95.1	251.0	-0.379	7.08e-01	-612	422	0.00549

Table 65: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	901	23.6	38.3	1.03e-23	853	949.8	0.000
unifrac.PC.1	-291	153.2	-1.9	6.93e-02	-606	24.8	0.122

Table 66: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	900.0	25.1	35.803	5.30e-23	848	952	0.00000
unifrac.PC.2	-63.2	179.9	-0.351	7.28e-01	-434	307	0.00472

Table 67: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.3, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	901	22.9	39.4	5.15e-24	853.8	948	0.000
unifrac.PC.3	389	169.5	2.3	3.03e-02	40.1	738	0.169

Table 68: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.4, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	899.65	25.2	35.7131	5.63e-23	848	952	0.00e+00
unifrac.PC.4	-3.23	260.1	-0.0124	9.90e-01	-539	532	5.93e-06

Table 69: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1011.95	81.790	12.37	3.72e-12	843.50	1180.398	0.0000
chao1	-1.15	0.797	-1.44	1.63e-01	-2.79	0.496	0.0736

Table 70: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs observed_otus, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	978.24	85.31	11.467	1.89e-11	802.54	1153.93	0.0000
observed_otus	-1.33	1.38	-0.962	3.45e-01	-4.17	1.51	0.0344

Table 71: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1039.6	118.4	8.78	4.15e-09	795.7	1283.5	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-28.9	23.9	-1.21	2.38e-01	-78.2	20.4	0.0531

Table 72: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.Amygdala_LR vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	936.9	125.8	7.450	8.39e-08	678	1195.9	0.00000
shannon	-13.5	44.5	-0.302	7.65e-01	-105	78.3	0.00351

Table 73: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26102	658	39.65	4.30e-24	24746	27458	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-4052	2376	-1.71	1.01e-01	-8945	842	0.101

Table 74: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26081	696	37.4535	1.75e-23	24647	27515	0.00e+00
wunifrac.PC.2	-196	5000	-0.0392	9.69e-01	-10493	10101	5.92e-05

Table 75: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26086	696	37.481	1.72e-23	24652	27519	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.3	-604	5717	-0.106	9.17e-01	-12379	11171	0.000429

Table 76: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26019	694	37.468	1.73e-23	24589	27450	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	4828	6884	0.701	4.90e-01	-9351	19006	0.0186

Table 77: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26112	677	38.58	8.43e-24	24718	27506	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-5260	4402	-1.19	2.43e-01	-14327	3806	0.0521

Table 78: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26119	674	38.8	7.49e-24	24732	27507	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	-6248	4822	-1.3	2.07e-01	-16180	3683	0.0607

Table 79: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26106	665	39.24	5.57e-24	24736	27476	0.000
unifrac.PC.3	7509	4926	1.52	1.40e-01	-2637	17654	0.082

Table 80: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26081	696	37.492	1.71e-23	24648	27513	0.000000
unifrac.PC.4	-560	7182	-0.078	9.38e-01	-15352	14233	0.000234

Table 81: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs chao1, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	27565.6	2329.7	11.832	9.71e-12	22767.5	32363.7	0.0000
chao1	-15.1	22.7	-0.666	5.11e-01	-61.9	31.6	0.0168

Table 82: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs observed_otus,
df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	27532.8	2380.0	11.568	1.57e-11	22631	32434.6	0.0000
observed_otus	-24.5	38.5	-0.637	5.30e-01	-104	54.8	0.0154

Table 83: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs PD_whole_tree, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	28172	3337	8.44	8.70e-09	21299	35045	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-432	674	-0.64	5.28e-01	-1821	957	0.0155

Table 84: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: neo.mPFC vs shannon, df=25

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	26397	3479	7.5877	6.08e-08	19232	33561	0.000000
shannon	-114	1232	-0.0922	9.27e-01	-2651	2424	0.000327

Table 85: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	301810	10435	28.922	1.82e-12	279073	324547	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-18448	40580	-0.455	6.57e-01	-106864	69968	0.0156

Table 86: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	300173	10177	29.496	1.44e-12	278000	322347	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	44823	97264	0.461	6.53e-01	-167097	256743	0.0161

Table 87: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	300393	10147	29.603	1.38e-12	278284	322502	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	50649	114834	0.441	6.67e-01	-199552	300851	0.0147

Table 88: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	299305	10860	27.561	3.21e-12	275643	322966	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	35582	100768	0.353	7.30e-01	-183974	255137	0.0095

Table 89: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	298974	10996	27.190	3.77e-12	275016	322932	0.000
unifrac.PC.1	28386	71400	0.398	6.98e-01	-127181	183952	0.012

Table 90: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	300651	10218	29.4250	1.48e-12	278389	322914	0.00e+00
unifrac.PC.2	1505	62905	0.0239	9.81e-01	-135552	138563	4.41e-05

Table 91: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	302874	9339	32.43	4.67e-13	282525	323223	0.00
unifrac.PC.3	121435	74530	1.63	1.29e-01	-40951	283821	0.17

Table 92: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	300477	10012	30.0	1.17e-12	278663	322291	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	-52770	75336	-0.7	4.97e-01	-216913	111374	0.0364

Table 93: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	268589	31448	8.54	1.91e-06	200071	337108	0.0000
chao1	336	313	1.07	3.04e-01	-346	1018	0.0813

Table 94: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs observed_otus,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	287934	34180	8.42	2.21e-06	213461	362406	0.0000
observed_otus	228	585	0.39	7.03e-01	-1047	1504	0.0116

Table 95: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	313986	50543	6.212	0.000045	203863	424108	0.00000
PD_whole_tree	-2821	10482	-0.269	0.792379	-25659	20016	0.00554

Table 96: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.WM vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	271848	48823	5.568	0.000122	165473	378224	0.0000
shannon	10975	18199	0.603	0.557685	-28676	50627	0.0272

Table 97: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	140280	3878	36.1734	1.28e-13	131830	148729	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.1	-802	15080	-0.0532	9.58e-01	-33660	32055	0.000218

Table 98: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	139669	3447	40.52	3.31e-14	132158	147180	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	51599	32947	1.57	1.43e-01	-20186	123385	0.159

Table 99: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	140655	3161	44.50	1.08e-14	133768	147541	0.00
wunifrac.PC.3	-80520	35769	-2.25	4.39e-02	-158455	-2586	0.28

Table 100: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	141120	3956	35.669	1.51e-13	132500	149740	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	-23367	36711	-0.637	5.36e-01	-103354	56620	0.0302

Table 101: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	137274	3427	40.06	3.79e-14	129807	144741	0.000
unifrac.PC.1	49745	22252	2.24	4.52e-02	1261	98229	0.278

Table 102: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	140395	3529	39.78	4.11e-14	132705	148085	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	-27974	21729	-1.29	2.22e-01	-75318	19369	0.113

Table 103: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	140723	3675	38.291	6.48e-14	132716	148730	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	27067	29328	0.923	3.74e-01	-36832	90967	0.0615

Table 104: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	140122	3573	39.21	4.88e-14	132337	147908	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	-30843	26888	-1.15	2.74e-01	-89426	27740	0.0919

Table 105: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	139252.8	12128	11.4820	7.89e-08	112828	165677	0.000000
chao1	10.2	121	0.0847	9.34e-01	-253	273	0.000552

Table 106: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs observed_otus,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	140387.21	12675	11.076	1.17e-07	112771	168004	0.0e+00
observed_otus	-2.83	217	-0.013	9.90e-01	-476	470	1.3e-05

Table 107: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs
PD_whole_tree, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	153425	18272	8.397	2.28e-06	113614	193237	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-2794	3789	-0.737	4.75e-01	-11050	5462	0.0401

Table 108: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.CSF vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	129273	17974	7.192	0.000011	90112	168434	0.000
shannon	4174	6700	0.623	0.544972	-10424	18771	0.029

Table 109: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	652361	13510	48.288	4.07e-15	622925	681796	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.1	13938	52535	0.265	7.95e-01	-100526	128402	0.00539

Table 110: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	652803	13163	49.592	2.96e-15	624122	681484	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.2	39244	125807	0.312	7.60e-01	-234867	313355	0.00743

Table 111: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	652292	12365	52.75	1.42e-15	625350	679234	0.00
wunifrac.PC.3	177552	139934	1.27	2.29e-01	-127338	482442	0.11

Table 112: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	651022	13937	46.712	6.05e-15	620656	681388	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	57927	129321	0.448	6.62e-01	-223838	339692	0.0152

Table 113: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	654503	14217	46.038	7.2e-15	623528	685478	0.00000
unifrac.PC.1	-21438	92313	-0.232	8.2e-01	-222571	179695	0.00413

Table 114: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	653190	13150	49.6714	2.91e-15	624538	681842	0.000000
unifrac.PC.2	6696	80960	0.0827	9.35e-01	-169699	183092	0.000526

Table 115: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	654729	12949	50.562	2.35e-15	626516	682942	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	82273	103335	0.796	4.41e-01	-142876	307421	0.0465

Table 116: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	653274	13140	49.715	2.88e-15	624644	681905	0.00000
unifrac.PC.4	13002	98876	0.132	8.98e-01	-202430	228435	0.00133

Table 117: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	646140.6	42327	15.266	3.18e-09	553919	738362	0.00000
chao1	74.2	421	0.176	8.63e-01	-844	992	0.00238

Table 118: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs observed_otus,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	675387	43770	15.43	2.81e-09	580020	770755	0.0000
observed_otus	-397	750	-0.53	6.06e-01	-2030	1236	0.0212

Table 119: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	668702	65103	10.271	2.68e-07	526855	810549	0.00000
PD_whole_tree	-3276	13501	-0.243	8.12e-01	-32693	26141	0.00451

Table 120: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.GM vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	629839	63423	9.931	3.86e-07	491651	768027	0.0000
shannon	8910	23641	0.377	7.13e-01	-42600	60420	0.0108

Table 121: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1094450	23988	45.626	8.02e-15	1042186	1146715	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.1	-5312	93281	-0.057	9.56e-01	-208553	197928	0.000249

Table 122: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1092645	23040	47.423	5.05e-15	1042444	1142846	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	135667	220206	0.616	5.49e-01	-344120	615454	0.0284

Table 123: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1093340	23011	47.514	4.94e-15	1043203	1143476	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	147681	260404	0.567	5.81e-01	-419690	715053	0.0241

Table 124: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1091447	24787	44.033	1.22e-14	1037441	1145452	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	70142	229997	0.305	7.66e-01	-430979	571263	0.0071

Table 125: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1090751	25103	43.452	1.44e-14	1036057	1145445	0.00000
unfrac.PC.1	56693	163001	0.348	7.34e-01	-298455	411841	0.00922

Table 126: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1094236	23272	47.018	5.60e-15	1043530	1144942	0.00000
unfrac.PC.2	-19773	143278	-0.138	8.93e-01	-331948	292402	0.00146

Table 127: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1098326	21995	49.94	2.73e-15	1050403	1146249	0.000
unfrac.PC.3	230775	175523	1.31	2.13e-01	-151656	613207	0.117

Table 128: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1093874	23125	47.302	5.21e-15	1043488	1144260	0.0000
unfrac.PC.4	-70610	174011	-0.406	6.92e-01	-449747	308527	0.0125

Table 129: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1053983	74046	14.23	7.07e-09	892651	1215314	0.0000
chao1	420	737	0.57	5.79e-01	-1186	2026	0.0244

Table 130: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs observed_otus,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1103708	78350	14.087	7.95e-09	932997	1274419	0.00000
observed_otus	-172	1342	-0.128	9.00e-01	-3095	2751	0.00126

Table 131: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs PD_whole_tree, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1136113	114892	9.889	4.04e-07	885785	1386441	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-8891	23827	-0.373	7.16e-01	-60805	43023	0.0106

Table 132: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.ICV vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1030961	111416	9.253	8.23e-07	788207	1273714	0.0000
shannon	24059	41530	0.579	5.73e-01	-66428	114545	0.0252

Table 133: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2439.58	70.1	34.78691	2.03e-13	2287	2592	0.00e+00
wunifrac.PC.1	2.17	272.7	0.00794	9.94e-01	-592	596	4.85e-06

Table 134: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2440.5	68.4	35.695	1.49e-13	2292	2589	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	-74.7	653.4	-0.114	9.11e-01	-1498	1349	0.001

Table 135: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2434	61.2	39.73	4.17e-14	2300	2567	0.00
wunifrac.PC.3	1172	693.1	1.69	1.17e-01	-338	2683	0.18

Table 136: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2459	71	34.635	2.14e-13	2304	2614	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	-508	659	-0.771	4.56e-01	-1943	928	0.0437

Table 137: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2455	72.9	33.669	2.99e-13	2296	2613	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-250	473.4	-0.529	6.07e-01	-1282	781	0.0211

Table 138: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2436	59.7	40.77	3.07e-14	2305	2566	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	696	367.8	1.89	8.27e-02	-105	1498	0.216

Table 139: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.3, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2440.5	68.8	35.4974	1.60e-13	2291	2590	0.000000
unifrac.PC.3	43.7	548.7	0.0797	9.38e-01	-1152	1239	0.000489

Table 140: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.4, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2441	67.3	36.262	1.24e-13	2294	2587	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	264	506.4	0.521	6.12e-01	-840	1367	0.0205

Table 141: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2511.880	218.26	11.508	7.70e-08	2036.32	2987.44	0.00000
chao1	-0.756	2.17	-0.348	7.34e-01	-5.49	3.98	0.00922

Table 142: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs observed_otus, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2580.53	225.20	11.459	8.07e-08	2089.9	3071.20	0.0000
observed_otus	-2.53	3.86	-0.655	5.25e-01	-10.9	5.88	0.0319

Table 143: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2686.9	329.8	8.146	3.12e-06	1968	3405.6	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-52.3	68.4	-0.765	4.59e-01	-201	96.7	0.0431

Table 144: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2521	329	7.655	5.88e-06	1804	3239	0.00000
shannon	-31	123	-0.253	8.05e-01	-299	236	0.00489

Table 145: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1999.6	38.5	51.996	1.68e-15	1916	2083	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	89.5	149.5	0.599	5.60e-01	-236	415	0.0268

Table 146: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1997	31.1	64.16	1.36e-16	1929.4	2065	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	726	297.5	2.44	3.12e-02	77.3	1374	0.314

Table 147: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2007	36.8	54.561	9.46e-16	1927	2087	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	-363	416.3	-0.871	4.01e-01	-1270	544	0.0552

Table 148: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2023	37.7	53.72	1.14e-15	1941	2105	0.000
wunifrac.PC.4	-477	349.5	-1.36	1.97e-01	-1238	285	0.125

Table 149: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2010.7	40.8	49.246	3.22e-15	1922	2100	0.00000
unifrac.PC.1	-93.5	265.1	-0.353	7.30e-01	-671	484	0.00948

Table 150: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2004	37.3	53.759	1.13e-15	1923	2086	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	144	229.5	0.627	5.43e-01	-356	644	0.0293

Table 151: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.3, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2010	37	54.391	9.82e-16	1930	2091	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	275	295	0.932	3.70e-01	-368	917	0.0626

Table 152: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.4, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2005.3	37.9	52.979	1.35e-15	1923	2088	0.00000
unifrac.PC.4	36.4	284.8	0.128	9.00e-01	-584	657	0.00125

Table 153: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2.00e+03	122.07	16.3973	1.40e-09	1735.62	2267.54	0.00e+00
chao1	3.73e-02	1.22	0.0307	9.76e-01	-2.61	2.68	7.23e-05

Table 154: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs observed_otus, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2018.766	127.48	15.837	2.09e-09	1741	2296.51	0.000000
observed_otus	-0.244	2.18	-0.112	9.13e-01	-5	4.51	0.000963

Table 155: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2147	183	11.711	6.34e-08	1747	2546.0	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-30	38	-0.788	4.46e-01	-113	52.9	0.0456

Table 156: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2265	167.0	13.56	1.22e-08	1901	2628.9	0.000
shannon	-99	62.2	-1.59	1.38e-01	-235	36.6	0.163

Table 157: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	78876	1988	39.68	4.24e-14	74545	83208	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	12136	7730	1.57	1.42e-01	-4707	28978	0.159

Table 158: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79541	2114	37.633	7.97e-14	74936	84146	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	8422	20201	0.417	6.84e-01	-35591	52436	0.0132

Table 159: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79454	1937	41.01	2.86e-14	75233	83675	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	33854	21925	1.54	1.49e-01	-13916	81624	0.155

Table 160: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79749	2262	35.262	1.73e-13	74821	84676	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.4	-3041	20985	-0.145	8.87e-01	-48765	42682	0.00161

Table 161: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79888	2287	34.93	1.93e-13	74905	84871	0.00000
unifrac.PC.1	-4301	14851	-0.29	7.77e-01	-36658	28057	0.00641

Table 162: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79632.5	2119	37.58420	8.09e-14	75016	84249	0.00e+00
unifrac.PC.2	41.9	13044	0.00322	9.97e-01	-28379	28463	7.95e-07

Table 163: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79562	2136	37.256	8.98e-14	74909	84215	0.00000
unifrac.PC.3	-3867	17042	-0.227	8.24e-01	-40999	33265	0.00395

Table 164: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	79697	1998	39.89	3.98e-14	75344	84049	0.000
unifrac.PC.4	18346	15032	1.22	2.46e-01	-14407	51098	0.103

Table 165: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs chao1, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	74598.8	6653.2	11.212	1.03e-07	60102.6	89095	0.0000
chao1	52.7	66.2	0.796	4.42e-01	-91.6	197	0.0465

Table 166: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs observed_otus, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	77453.6	7102	10.906	1.39e-07	61980	92927	0.00000
observed_otus	39.1	122	0.321	7.53e-01	-226	304	0.00788

Table 167: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs PD_whole_tree, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	72459	10297	7.037	1.36e-05	50023	94895	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	1519	2136	0.711	4.91e-01	-3134	6172	0.0375

Table 168: microbiome_vs_brain_neo: yr1.mPFC vs shannon, df=12

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	75407	10200	7.393	8.36e-06	53182	97631	0.0000
shannon	1610	3802	0.423	6.80e-01	-6674	9894	0.0136

pdf
2

Microbiome yr1 vs brain volume

Table 169: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	299858	10679	28.080	1.37e-11	276355	323362	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.1	4384	25957	0.169	8.69e-01	-52747	61514	0.00237

Table 170: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	299206	10501	28.493	1.17e-11	276094	322319	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	42026	65074	0.646	5.32e-01	-101200	185252	0.0336

Table 171: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	296751	9440	31.44	4.01e-12	275975	317527	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	189312	101764	1.86	8.98e-02	-34669	413293	0.224

Table 172: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	299820	9900	30.28	6.02e-12	278029	321610	0.000
wunifrac.PC.4	141834	106670	1.33	2.11e-01	-92945	376613	0.128

Table 173: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	299721	10664	28.1062	1.35e-11	276250	323192	0.000000
unifrac.PC.1	-5351	67947	-0.0788	9.39e-01	-154902	144199	0.000517

Table 174: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	303809	9945	30.5	5.47e-12	281920	325698	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	116968	73296	1.6	1.39e-01	-44357	278292	0.175

Table 175: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	302378	11125	27.18	1.95e-11	277892	326864	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	61357	88949	0.69	5.05e-01	-134419	257133	0.0381

Table 176: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	298167	10446	28.543	1.15e-11	275175	321159	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	90429	101154	0.894	3.90e-01	-132209	313067	0.0624

Table 177: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	345770	29398	11.76	1.43e-07	281065	410474	0.000
chao1	-179	108	-1.66	1.26e-01	-417	59	0.186

Table 178: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs observed_otus,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	351167	30753	11.42	1.93e-07	283481	418853.0	0.000
observed_otus	-335	191	-1.76	1.07e-01	-755	84.7	0.205

Table 179: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	351094	50478	6.96	2.41e-05	239993	462196	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-5109	4918	-1.04	3.21e-01	-15934	5715	0.0825

Table 180: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.WM vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	383201	51156	7.49	1.21e-05	270607	495794	0.000
shannon	-19418	11692	-1.66	1.25e-01	-45151	6316	0.187

Table 181: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	137585	3418	40.25	2.70e-13	130061	145109	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-11978	8309	-1.44	1.77e-01	-30267	6311	0.148

Table 182: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	137345	2951	46.54	5.52e-14	130850	143841	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	46864	18288	2.56	2.64e-02	6613	87116	0.354

Table 183: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	138425	3669	37.725	5.49e-13	130349	146501	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	-31390	39558	-0.794	4.44e-01	-118456	55677	0.0499

Table 184: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	137951	3613	38.178	4.81e-13	129998	145904	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	31335	38932	0.805	4.38e-01	-54354	117024	0.0512

Table 185: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs unfrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	137938	3715	37.132	6.52e-13	129762	146114	0.00000
unfrac.PC.1	3496	23670	0.148	8.85e-01	-48601	55592	0.00181

Table 186: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs unfrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	138136	3840	35.975	9.21e-13	129685	146587	0.00000
unfrac.PC.2	5883	28300	0.208	8.39e-01	-56404	68170	0.00359

Table 187: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs unfrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	138496	3930	35.239	1.15e-12	129846	147146	0.0000
unfrac.PC.3	13099	31424	0.417	6.85e-01	-56065	82263	0.0143

Table 188: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs unfrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	138510	3625	38.215	4.76e-13	130533	146488	0.0000
unfrac.PC.4	-33480	35098	-0.954	3.61e-01	-110730	43770	0.0705

Table 189: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	151236.8	10639.9	14.21	2.01e-08	127819	174655.0	0.000
chao1	-51.8	39.2	-1.32	2.13e-01	-138	34.4	0.127

Table 190: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs observed_otus,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	152692.6	11194.6	13.64	3.09e-08	128053	177331.9	0.000
observed_otus	-96.2	69.5	-1.39	1.93e-01	-249	56.7	0.138

Table 191: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	147986	18178	8.141	5.53e-06	107977	187996	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-1000	1771	-0.565	5.84e-01	-4898	2898	0.0259

Table 192: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.CSF vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	143723	19864	7.235	1.68e-05	100002	187444	0.00000
shannon	-1347	4540	-0.297	7.72e-01	-11340	8645	0.00729

Table 193: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	655448	13693	47.869	4.05e-14	625311	685586	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-22029	33283	-0.662	5.22e-01	-95286	51227	0.0352

Table 194: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	654752	12971	50.48	2.27e-14	626202	683302	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	106615	80383	1.33	2.12e-01	-70306	283537	0.128

Table 195: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	650236	9581	67.9	8.82e-16	629149	671323	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	371503	103287	3.6	4.19e-03	144170	598836	0.519

Table 196: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	656131	13773	47.638	4.27e-14	625816	686446	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	74097	148399	0.499	6.27e-01	-252528	400721	0.0204

Table 197: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	656151	13840	47.409	4.51e-14	625689	686613	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	33233	88186	0.377	7.13e-01	-160862	227329	0.0117

Table 198: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	660575	13414	49.2	2.97e-14	631051	690099	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	128803	98863	1.3	2.19e-01	-88792	346399	0.124

Table 199: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	661188	14152	46.72	5.29e-14	630040	692335	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	118314	113149	1.05	3.18e-01	-130726	367354	0.0835

Table 200: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	652218	12294	53.05	1.31e-14	625158	679277	0.000
unifrac.PC.4	223548	119049	1.88	8.72e-02	-38477	485573	0.227

Table 201: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	685682	41857	16.382	4.49e-09	593556	777808	0.0000
chao1	-115	154	-0.748	4.70e-01	-454	224	0.0445

Table 202: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs observed_otus,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	689477	44198	15.600	7.54e-09	592198	786755	0.0000
observed_otus	-218	274	-0.794	4.44e-01	-821	386	0.0499

Table 203: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	736834	64447	11.43	1.91e-07	594988	878681	0.00
PD_whole_tree	-8032	6279	-1.28	2.27e-01	-21852	5788	0.12

Table 204: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.GM vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	734561	70720	10.39	5.05e-07	578906	890216	0.0000
shannon	-18256	16163	-1.13	2.83e-01	-53831	17319	0.0961

Table 205: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1092891	24027	45.487	7.09e-14	1040009	1145774	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-29624	58403	-0.507	6.22e-01	-158167	98919	0.021

Table 206: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1091303	22382	48.76	3.31e-14	1042042	1140565	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	195506	138697	1.41	1.86e-01	-109764	500775	0.142

Table 207: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1085412	19648	55.2	8.44e-15	1042167	1128658	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	529426	211821	2.5	2.95e-02	63211	995640	0.342

Table 208: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1093902	23238	47.073	4.87e-14	1042755	1145048	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	247265	250378	0.988	3.45e-01	-303813	798344	0.0752

Table 209: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1093810	24202	45.194	7.61e-14	1040541	1147079	0.00000
unfrac.PC.1	31377	154210	0.203	8.42e-01	-308037	370792	0.00344

Table 210: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1102519	22878	48.19	3.77e-14	1052165	1152874	0.000
unfrac.PC.2	251654	168615	1.49	1.64e-01	-119465	622774	0.157

Table 211: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1102061	24786	44.463	9.10e-14	1047507	1156616	0.0000
unfrac.PC.3	192770	198179	0.973	3.52e-01	-243418	628958	0.0731

Table 212: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs unfrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1088895	22990	47.36	4.55e-14	1038293	1139497	0.000
unfrac.PC.4	280497	222626	1.26	2.34e-01	-209499	770494	0.117

Table 213: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1182688	69101	17.12	2.82e-09	1030598	1334779	0.000
chao1	-346	254	-1.36	2.01e-01	-906	214	0.134

Table 214: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs observed_otus,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1193336	72550	16.45	4.30e-09	1033656	1353017	0.000
observed_otus	-649	450	-1.44	1.77e-01	-1640	342	0.148

Table 215: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1235915	111997	11.0	2.74e-07	989412	1482419	0.000
PD_whole_tree	-14142	10912	-1.3	2.22e-01	-38158	9875	0.123

Table 216: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.ICV vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1261485	119430	10.56	4.27e-07	998620	1524349	0.000
shannon	-39021	27296	-1.43	1.81e-01	-99099	21057	0.146

Table 217: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2461	70.9	34.693	1.37e-12	2304	2617	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-128	172.4	-0.742	4.74e-01	-507	252	0.0439

Table 218: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2467	72.1	34.226	1.59e-12	2308	2625	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	-198	446.6	-0.444	6.66e-01	-1181	785	0.0162

Table 219: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2443	63.4	38.51	4.38e-13	2304	2583	0.00
wunifrac.PC.3	1332	683.9	1.95	7.75e-02	-174	2837	0.24

Table 220: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2464	71.5	34.439	1.48e-12	2307	2622	0.000
wunifrac.PC.4	-418	770.9	-0.543	5.98e-01	-2115	1278	0.024

Table 221: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifracs.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2464.3	72.5	33.9937	1.71e-12	2305	2624	0.000000
unifracs.PC.1	24.6	461.9	0.0532	9.58e-01	-992	1041	0.000236

Table 222: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifracs.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2459	74.7	32.902	2.44e-12	2294	2623	0.00000
unifracs.PC.2	-160	550.8	-0.291	7.77e-01	-1372	1052	0.00699

Table 223: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifracs.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2468.0	77.2	31.982	3.32e-12	2298	2638	0.0000
unifracs.PC.3	85.6	617.0	0.139	8.92e-01	-1272	1444	0.0016

Table 224: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs unifracs.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2449	68.2	35.92	9.36e-13	2299	2599	0.00
unifracs.PC.4	885	660.2	1.34	2.07e-01	-568	2338	0.13

Table 225: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2508.877	222.88	11.257	2.24e-07	2018.32	2999.44	0.00000
chao1	-0.173	0.82	-0.211	8.36e-01	-1.98	1.63	0.00371

Table 226: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2490.230	236.41	10.534	4.39e-07	1969.9	3010.56	0.00000
observed_otus	-0.169	1.47	-0.115	9.10e-01	-3.4	3.06	0.00111

Table 227: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2838.2	340.6	8.33	4.43e-06	2089	3587.9	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-37.2	33.2	-1.12	2.86e-01	-110	35.8	0.0948

Table 228: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Hippocampus_LR vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2656.1	384.4	6.910	2.55e-05	1810	3502	0.0000
shannon	-44.6	87.9	-0.508	6.21e-01	-238	149	0.0211

Table 229: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1987	29.6	67.07	1.00e-15	1922	2053	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-210	72.0	-2.92	1.39e-02	-369	-52	0.416

Table 230: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1993.1	39.5	50.4561	2.28e-14	1906	2080	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.2	20.9	244.8	0.0853	9.34e-01	-518	560	0.000607

Table 231: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1991	39.7	50.156	2.43e-14	1903	2078	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	171	427.9	0.399	6.97e-01	-771	1113	0.0131

Table 232: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1993	36.2	55.00	8.84e-15	1913	2073	0.000
wunifrac.PC.4	-553	390.4	-1.42	1.85e-01	-1412	307	0.143

Table 233: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1993	39.4	50.64	2.19e-14	1907	2080	0.00000
unifrac.PC.1	-35	250.8	-0.14	8.92e-01	-587	517	0.00162

Table 234: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1988	40.2	49.432	2.85e-14	1899	2076	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	-164	296.4	-0.553	5.92e-01	-816	489	0.0248

Table 235: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2010	39.2	51.26	1.92e-14	1924	2097	0.000
unifrac.PC.3	396	313.6	1.26	2.33e-01	-294	1086	0.117

Table 236: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1999	38.6	51.848	1.69e-14	1914	2084	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	-337	373.4	-0.902	3.86e-01	-1159	485	0.0636

Table 237: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1899.097	117.583	16.151	5.22e-09	1640.299	2157.90	0.0000
chao1	0.367	0.433	0.848	4.15e-01	-0.586	1.32	0.0565

Table 238: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1885.613	123.929	15.215	9.81e-09	1612.85	2158.4	0.000
observed_otus	0.703	0.769	0.913	3.81e-01	-0.99	2.4	0.065

Table 239: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1823.9	188.3	9.687	1.02e-06	1409.5	2238.3	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	16.9	18.3	0.919	3.78e-01	-23.5	57.2	0.0658

Table 240: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.Amygdala_LR vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1902.4	209.5	9.082	1.92e-06	1441.4	2363	0.000
shannon	21.2	47.9	0.442	6.67e-01	-84.2	127	0.016

Table 241: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	80613	1926	41.85	1.77e-13	76373	84853	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-6951	4682	-1.48	1.66e-01	-17257	3355	0.155

Table 242: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	80678	2045	39.459	3.36e-13	76178	85178	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	10847	12670	0.856	4.10e-01	-17040	38734	0.0576

Table 243: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	80010	1588	50.37	2.32e-14	76514	83506	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	51073	17125	2.98	1.25e-02	13382	88765	0.426

Table 244: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	80815	2104	38.405	4.51e-13	76184	85447	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.4	2337	22673	0.103	9.20e-01	-47565	52239	0.000884

Table 245: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	80837	2034	39.751	3.10e-13	76361	85313	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	11524	12957	0.889	3.93e-01	-16995	40043	0.0618

Table 246: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	81047	2161	37.50	5.85e-13	76291	85804	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	6691	15928	0.42	6.83e-01	-28365	41748	0.0145

Table 247: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	81766	2082	39.26	3.54e-13	77183	86350	0.000
unifrac.PC.3	22085	16650	1.33	2.12e-01	-14562	58732	0.128

Table 248: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	80455	2035	39.53	3.29e-13	75975	84934	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	20772	19707	1.05	3.14e-01	-22603	64147	0.0847

Table 249: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	84150	6397.7	13.153	4.51e-08	70068.3	98230.7	0.0000
chao1	-13	23.5	-0.551	5.93e-01	-64.8	38.8	0.0247

Table 250: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	83738.6	6806.4	12.303	9.0e-08	68758	98719.5	0.0000
observed_otus	-19.1	42.2	-0.451	6.6e-01	-112	73.9	0.0167

Table 251: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	87588	10230	8.562	3.41e-06	65072	110105	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-674	997	-0.676	5.13e-01	-2868	1520	0.0367

Table 252: microbiome_vs_brain_yr1: yr1.mPFC vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	91691	10788	8.50	3.66e-06	67947	115435	0.0000
shannon	-2530	2466	-1.03	3.27e-01	-7957	2896	0.0807

pdf
2

Microbiome alpha diversity difference (yr1 vs neo) vs brain volume

Table 253: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: WM vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	320845	16345.8	19.63	2.58e-09	284424	357265.7	0.00
chao1	-158	84.6	-1.87	9.16e-02	-347	30.7	0.24

Table 254: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: WM vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	322790	17118	18.86	3.81e-09	284649	360931	0.000
observed_otus	-286	152	-1.88	8.95e-02	-625	53	0.243

Table 255: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: WM vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	324788	26451	12.28	2.35e-07	265851	383724	0.000
PD_whole_tree	-5696	4781	-1.19	2.61e-01	-16349	4957	0.114

Table 256: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: WM vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	321784	16225	19.83	2.33e-09	285633	357935	0.000
shannon	-16725	8593	-1.95	8.02e-02	-35870	2421	0.256

Table 257: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: CSF vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	145183.1	6701.1	21.67	9.80e-10	130252	160114.1	0.00
chao1	-44.5	34.7	-1.28	2.28e-01	-122	32.8	0.13

Table 258: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: CSF vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	146024.1	6979.1	20.92	1.38e-09	130474	161574.4	0.000
observed_otus	-83.8	62.1	-1.35	2.07e-01	-222	54.5	0.142

Table 259: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: CSF vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	143391	10616	13.507	9.53e-08	119737	167044	0.000
PD_whole_tree	-1039	1919	-0.542	6.00e-01	-5315	3236	0.026

Table 260: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: CSF vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	143562	6950	20.656	1.57e-09	128076	159048	0.0000
shannon	-3511	3681	-0.954	3.63e-01	-11713	4690	0.0764

Table 261: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: GM vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	664245.0	25573	25.974	1.65e-10	607264	721226	0.0000
chao1	-74.9	132	-0.565	5.84e-01	-370	220	0.0282

Table 262: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: GM vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	663031	26960	24.593	2.82e-10	602961	723101	0.0000
observed_otus	-113	240	-0.472	6.47e-01	-647	421	0.0199

Table 263: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: GM vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	688344	36679	18.77	4.00e-09	606617	770070	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-7038	6630	-1.06	3.13e-01	-21810	7735	0.0929

Table 264: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: GM vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	670057	25181	26.609	1.30e-10	613950	726165	0.0000
shannon	-11356	13336	-0.851	4.14e-01	-41070	18359	0.0618

Table 265: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: ICV vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1130273	41082	27.5	9.32e-11	1038738	1221808	0.000
chao1	-277	213	-1.3	2.22e-01	-751	197	0.134

Table 266: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: ICV vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1131845	43344	26.11	1.56e-10	1035268	1228422	0.000
observed_otus	-483	385	-1.25	2.39e-01	-1342	376	0.125

Table 267: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: ICV vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1156522	61636	18.76	4.00e-09	1019189	1293856	0.000
PD_whole_tree	-13774	11141	-1.24	2.45e-01	-38597	11050	0.122

Table 268: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: ICV vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1135403	40421	28.09	7.60e-11	1045340	1225467	0.000
shannon	-31591	21407	-1.48	1.71e-01	-79289	16106	0.165

Table 269: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Hippocampus_LR vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2.45e+03	139.700	17.556	7.64e-09	2141.3	2763.84	0.00e+00
chao1	1.23e-02	0.723	0.017	9.87e-01	-1.6	1.62	2.62e-05

Table 270: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Hippocampus_LR vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2432.995	146.4	16.623	1.30e-08	2106.88	2759.11	0.00000
observed_otus	0.227	1.3	0.174	8.65e-01	-2.67	3.13	0.00275

Table 271: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Hippocampus_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2577.0	203.8	12.644	1.78e-07	2123	3031.1	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-23.9	36.8	-0.649	5.31e-01	-106	58.2	0.0368

Table 272: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Hippocampus_LR vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	2482.9	140	17.758	6.84e-09	2171	2794	0.00000
shannon	-18.1	74	-0.245	8.12e-01	-183	147	0.00542

Table 273: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Amygdala_LR vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1963.260	75.093	26.14	1.54e-10	1795.941	2130.58	0.0000
chao1	0.214	0.389	0.55	5.94e-01	-0.652	1.08	0.0268

Table 274: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Amygdala_LR vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1952.80	78.210	24.969	2.43e-10	1778.53	2127.06	0.0000
observed_otus	0.47	0.696	0.676	5.14e-01	-1.08	2.02	0.0399

Table 275: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Amygdala_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1890.8	107.5	17.59	7.52e-09	1651.2	2130.3	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	20.8	19.4	1.07	3.09e-01	-22.5	64.1	0.0945

Table 276: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: Amygdala_LR vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1948.1	74.2	26.268	1.47e-10	1783	2113	0.0000
shannon	31.5	39.3	0.803	4.41e-01	-56	119	0.0554

Table 277: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: mPFC vs chao1, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	81984	3955.7	20.726	1.51e-09	73170.6	90798.3	0.0000
chao1	-10	20.5	-0.489	6.35e-01	-55.7	35.6	0.0213

Table 278: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: mPFC vs observed_otus, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	81453.4	4180.8	19.483	2.77e-09	72138.1	90768.7	0.00000
observed_otus	-11.3	37.2	-0.303	7.68e-01	-94.1	71.6	0.00828

Table 279: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: mPFC vs PD_whole_tree, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	83857	5842	14.354	5.33e-08	70840	96874	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-678	1056	-0.642	5.35e-01	-3031	1675	0.0361

Table 280: div_diff_vs_brain_yr1: mPFC vs shannon, df=10

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	81888	3977	20.591	1.61e-09	73027	90749	0.0000
shannon	-961	2106	-0.456	6.58e-01	-5654	3732	0.0186

pdf
2

Microbiome alpha diversity at neo to predict change of brain volume from neo to yr1

Table 281: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	98957	24912	3.97	0.00219	44126	153789	0.000
chao1	336	246	1.36	0.20008	-206	878	0.134

Table 282: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	111825	27946	4.001	0.00208	50316	173333	0.0000
observed_otus	342	472	0.725	0.48381	-697	1381	0.0419

Table 283: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	141830	42240	3.358	0.00639	48860	234799	0.00000
PD_whole_tree	-2240	8664	-0.259	0.80078	-21310	16830	0.00554

Table 284: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	96749	38826	2.492	0.0299	11294	182205	0.0000
shannon	13124	14476	0.907	0.3840	-18736	44985	0.0641

Table 285: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	131798	8587	15.348	8.95e-09	112897	150699	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	-18922	35741	-0.529	6.07e-01	-97587	59744	0.0228

Table 286: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	130936	8596	15.233	9.69e-09	112017	149855	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.2	23797	79622	0.299	7.71e-01	-151449	199043	0.00739

Table 287: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	131148	8579	15.287	9.33e-09	112265	150030	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.3	24334	96378	0.252	8.05e-01	-187793	236460	0.00528

Table 288: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	131051	9874	13.2726	4.10e-08	109319	152783	0.00e+00
wunifrac.PC.4	1674	93895	0.0178	9.86e-01	-204987	208336	2.65e-05

Table 289: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	129036	8905	14.491	1.64e-08	109437	148635	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	42206	58816	0.718	4.88e-01	-87247	171658	0.0411

Table 290: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	131069	8591	15.257	9.53e-09	112161	149978	0.00000
unifrac.PC.2	11110	50967	0.218	8.31e-01	-101069	123288	0.00394

Table 291: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	132660	8013	16.56	4.02e-09	115024	150296	0.000
unifrac.PC.3	85600	61699	1.39	1.93e-01	-50198	221398	0.138

Table 292: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.WM vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	129421	8207	15.77	6.72e-09	111357	147485	0.000
unifrac.PC.4	-80888	66898	-1.21	2.52e-01	-228130	66354	0.109

Table 293: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	362282	31008	11.683	1.53e-07	294033	430530	0.00000
chao1	106	307	0.347	7.35e-01	-568	781	0.00991

Table 294: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs observed_otus,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	381339	32992	11.558	1.71e-07	308724	453955	0.00000
observed_otus	-157	557	-0.282	7.83e-01	-1384	1070	0.00658

Table 295: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs PD_whole_tree,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	353020	48675	7.253	1.64e-05	245886	460154	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	4073	9984	0.408	6.91e-01	-17902	26049	0.0137

Table 296: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	360192	46437	7.757	8.75e-06	257985	462398	0.00000
shannon	4684	17313	0.271	7.92e-01	-33422	42790	0.00606

Table 297: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	371462	9848	37.718	5.50e-13	349786	393139	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	28734	40989	0.701	4.98e-01	-61483	118951	0.0393

Table 298: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	373254	9519	39.21	3.60e-13	352302	394206	0.000
wunifrac.PC.2	-93096	88178	-1.06	3.14e-01	-287174	100981	0.085

Table 299: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	372512	9512	39.16	3.65e-13	351576	393449	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	109896	106864	1.03	3.26e-01	-125310	345101	0.081

Table 300: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	366888	10903	33.65	1.91e-12	342890	390887	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	108096	103686	1.04	3.20e-01	-120114	336307	0.0831

Table 301: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs unifracs.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	376359	9923	37.93	5.17e-13	354518	398200	0.000
unifracs.PC.1	-78195	65544	-1.19	2.58e-01	-222457	66068	0.106

Table 302: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs unifracs.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	371949	8990	41.37	2.00e-13	352162	391736	0.000
unifracs.PC.2	84616	53335	1.59	1.41e-01	-32774	202006	0.173

Table 303: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs unifracs.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	372145	10029	37.106	6.57e-13	350071	394219	0.00000
unifracs.PC.3	-17999	77224	-0.233	8.20e-01	-187968	151970	0.00451

Table 304: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.GM vs unifracs.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	370801	9686	38.281	4.67e-13	349482	392121	0.000
unifracs.PC.4	-78436	78956	-0.993	3.42e-01	-252217	95345	0.076

Table 305: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	64599	19493	3.314	0.0069	21696	107502	0.0000
chao1	103	193	0.536	0.6028	-321	527	0.0234

Table 306: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	70038.8	20923	3.347	0.00651	23988	116090	0.00000
observed_otus	78.9	353	0.223	0.82744	-699	857	0.00414

Table 307: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	92525	30560	3.028	0.0115	25264	159786	0.0000
PD_whole_tree	-3777	6268	-0.603	0.5590	-17574	10019	0.0294

Table 308: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	89058	29163	3.054	0.011	24870	153245	0.0000
shannon	-5558	10873	-0.511	0.619	-29490	18373	0.0213

Table 309: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	75514	6013	12.56	7.27e-08	62281	88748	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-29246	25025	-1.17	2.67e-01	-84326	25834	0.102

Table 310: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	74331	6296	11.806	1.38e-07	60473	88188	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.2	19203	58320	0.329	7.48e-01	-109159	147564	0.00895

Table 311: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	74481	6258	11.901	1.27e-07	60707	88255	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	-29297	70306	-0.417	6.85e-01	-184039	125445	0.0143

Table 312: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	81266	5922	13.72	2.90e-08	68231	94301	0.000
wunifrac.PC.4	-131265	56319	-2.33	3.98e-02	-255222	-7308	0.312

Table 313: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs unifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	71254	5982	11.91	1.26e-07	58087	84421	0.000
unifrac.PC.1	65064	39513	1.65	1.28e-01	-21903	152032	0.184

Table 314: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	74156	5653	13.12	4.63e-08	61715	86597	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	55247	33535	1.65	1.28e-01	-18563	129057	0.184

Table 315: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs unifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	75510	5961	12.67	6.66e-08	62389	88631	0.000
unifrac.PC.3	57143	45902	1.24	2.39e-01	-43886	158172	0.114

Table 316: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.CSF vs unifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	74669	6397	11.673	1.54e-07	60590	88748	0.0000
unifrac.PC.4	8288	52140	0.159	8.77e-01	-106472	123048	0.0021

Table 317: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	525838	55005	9.56	1.16e-06	404773	646903	0.0000
chao1	545	544	1.00	3.38e-01	-652	1742	0.0773

Table 318: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs observed_otus,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	563203	60846	9.256	1.59e-06	429281	697125	0.00000
observed_otus	264	1028	0.257	8.02e-01	-1999	2526	0.00546

Table 319: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs PD_whole_tree,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	587375	90346	6.501	4.42e-05	388525	786225	0.000000
PD_whole_tree	-1944	18532	-0.105	9.18e-01	-42731	38844	0.000916

Table 320: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	545999	85300	6.401	5.07e-05	358255	733742	0.0000
shannon	12250	31803	0.385	7.07e-01	-57747	82247	0.0122

Table 321: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	578775	18499	31.286	4.22e-12	538058	619492	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.1	-19434	76995	-0.252	8.05e-01	-188899	150031	0.00528

Table 322: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	578521	18340	31.543	3.86e-12	538154	618888	0.00000
wunifrac.PC.2	-50097	169888	-0.295	7.74e-01	-424019	323825	0.00719

Table 323: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	578141	18139	31.873	3.45e-12	538218	618064	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	104932	203773	0.515	6.17e-01	-343569	553433	0.0216

Table 324: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	579205	21055	27.510	1.71e-11	532864	625546	0.000000
wunifrac.PC.4	-21494	200220	-0.107	9.16e-01	-462175	419187	0.000959

Table 325: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs unifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	576649	19392	29.737	7.34e-12	533967	619330	0.00000
unifrac.PC.1	29076	128085	0.227	8.25e-01	-252837	310989	0.00428

Table 326: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs unifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	577174	16689	34.58	1.42e-12	540443	613906	0.000

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
unifrac.PC.2	150973	99009	1.52	1.56e-01	-66943	368889	0.162

Table 327: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs unifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	580315	17875	32.465	2.82e-12	540972	619659	0.0000
unifrac.PC.3	124744	137639	0.906	3.84e-01	-178197	427685	0.0641

Table 328: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.ICV vs unifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	574892	17780	32.33	2.95e-12	535758	614025	0.000
unifrac.PC.4	-151036	144928	-1.04	3.20e-01	-470020	167948	0.083

Table 329: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1579.75	267.51	5.9053	0.000102	990.96	2168.55	0.000000
chao1	-0.26	2.64	-0.0982	0.923569	-6.08	5.56	0.000802

Table 330: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1647.62	282.72	5.828	0.000115	1025.4	2269.88	0.00000
observed_otus	-1.64	4.78	-0.344	0.737328	-12.2	8.87	0.00977

Table 331: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1648.0	420.0	3.924	0.00238	724	2572	0.00000
PD_whole_tree	-19.5	86.2	-0.226	0.82504	-209	170	0.00425

Table 332: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1612.3	400	4.035	0.00196	733	2492	0.0000
shannon	-21.9	149	-0.147	0.88571	-350	306	0.0018

Table 333: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1560	85.8	18.181	1.48e-09	1371	1749	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	-142	357.1	-0.398	6.98e-01	-928	644	0.013

Table 334: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1557	85.2	18.28	1.40e-09	1370	1745	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	-300	789.2	-0.38	7.11e-01	-2037	1437	0.0119

Table 335: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1555	76.6	20.31	4.53e-10	1387	1724	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	1416	860.3	1.65	1.28e-01	-478	3310	0.184

Table 336: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1594	95.1	16.765	3.52e-09	1385	1803	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	-762	904.3	-0.843	4.17e-01	-2752	1228	0.0559

Table 337: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1578	87.9	17.958	1.69e-09	1385	1772	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-474	580.6	-0.817	4.31e-01	-1752	803	0.0527

Table 338: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1549	72.1	21.50	2.45e-10	1390.7	1708	0.000
unifrac.PC.2	907	427.5	2.12	5.73e-02	-33.4	1848	0.273

Table 339: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs unfrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1550	85.6	18.113	1.54e-09	1361	1738	0.0000
unfrac.PC.3	-289	658.8	-0.439	6.69e-01	-1739	1161	0.0158

Table 340: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Hippocampus_LR vs unfrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1554.0	86.8	17.9057	1.74e-09	1363	1745	0.000000
unfrac.PC.4	-42.6	707.4	-0.0602	9.53e-01	-1600	1514	0.000302

Table 341: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1060.820	143.11	7.412	1.34e-05	745.83	1375.81	0.0000
chao1	0.859	1.41	0.607	5.56e-01	-2.26	3.97	0.0298

Table 342: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1050.59	151.72	6.92	2.51e-05	717	1384.52	0.000
observed_otus	1.64	2.56	0.64	5.36e-01	-4	7.28	0.033

Table 343: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1091.3	228.3	4.780	0.000571	588.8	1594	0.00000
PD_whole_tree	10.9	46.8	0.232	0.820914	-92.2	114	0.00446

Table 344: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1277.0	213.5	5.982	9.15e-05	807	1747	0.0000
shannon	-51.1	79.6	-0.642	5.34e-01	-226	124	0.0332

Table 345: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1137	45.2	25.153	4.51e-11	1037	1236	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.1	176	188.1	0.938	3.69e-01	-238	590	0.0683

Table 346: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1139	43.9	25.96	3.21e-11	1042	1236	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	483	406.5	1.19	2.59e-01	-411	1378	0.105

Table 347: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1143	46.3	24.698	5.50e-11	1041	1245	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.3	-158	519.9	-0.303	7.67e-01	-1302	987	0.0076

Table 348: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs wunifrac.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1188	45.5	26.12	3.00e-11	1088	1288.6	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	-878	432.6	-2.03	6.73e-02	-1830	74.2	0.256

Table 349: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1156	47.8	24.20	6.86e-11	1051	1261	0.0000
unifrac.PC.1	-259	315.6	-0.82	4.30e-01	-953	436	0.0531

Table 350: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs unifrac.PC.2, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1142	44.5	25.6	3.66e-11	1044	1240	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	265	264.1	1.0	3.38e-01	-317	846	0.0772

Table 351: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs unifracs.PC.3, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1140	46.4	24.59	5.76e-11	1038	1242	0.0000
unifracs.PC.3	-186	356.9	-0.52	6.13e-01	-971	600	0.0221

Table 352: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.Amygdala_LR vs unifracs.PC.4, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	1142.0	47.1	24.223	6.79e-11	1038	1246	0.00000
unifracs.PC.4	-51.4	384.3	-0.134	8.96e-01	-897	795	0.00149

Table 353: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs chao1, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	46974.8	4009.1	11.72	1.49e-07	38150.9	55799	0.000
chao1	56.6	39.6	1.43	1.81e-01	-30.7	144	0.145

Table 354: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs observed_otus, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	47638.3	4384.3	10.87	3.21e-07	37988.4	57288	0.0000
observed_otus	84.3	74.1	1.14	2.79e-01	-78.7	247	0.0974

Table 355: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs PD_whole_tree, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	39842	5674	7.02	0.000022	27354.7	52329	0.000
PD_whole_tree	2630	1164	2.26	0.045098	68.6	5191	0.299

Table 356: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs shannon, df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	48979	6436	7.610	1.05e-05	34812	63145	0.000
shannon	1304	2400	0.544	5.98e-01	-3977	6586	0.024

Table 357: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	51978	1110	46.83	5.15e-14	49535	54421	0.000
wunifrac.PC.1	11986	4619	2.59	2.49e-02	1820	22153	0.359

Table 358: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	52450	1384	37.909	5.20e-13	49404	55495	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.2	-6262	12816	-0.489	6.35e-01	-34470	21945	0.0195

Table 359: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	52406	1266	41.41	1.98e-13	49620	55192	0.000
wunifrac.PC.3	21787	14218	1.53	1.54e-01	-9508	53081	0.164

Table 360: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs wunifrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	51832	1562	33.185	2.22e-12	48394	55270	0.0000
wunifrac.PC.4	10943	14853	0.737	4.77e-01	-21748	43635	0.0433

Table 361: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.1,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	52959	1383	38.28	4.67e-13	49914	56004	0.000
unifrac.PC.1	-11295	9137	-1.24	2.42e-01	-31406	8815	0.113

Table 362: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs unifrac.PC.2,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	52354	1350	38.77	4.07e-13	49382	55327	0.0000
unifrac.PC.2	6891	8012	0.86	4.08e-01	-10742	24524	0.0581

Table 363: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs unfrac.PC.3,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	52143	1292	40.36	2.62e-13	49299	54986	0.000
unfrac.PC.3	-14267	9947	-1.43	1.79e-01	-36160	7626	0.146

Table 364: neo_div_vs_diff_brain: diff.mPFC vs unfrac.PC.4,
df=11

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)	2.5 %	97.5 %	R2
Intercept	52491	1406	37.333	6.15e-13	49396	55585	0.0000
unfrac.PC.4	4431	11461	0.387	7.06e-01	-20794	29655	0.0123

pdf
2