

2012.12.12

This report describes data from 2012.12.12 experiment (3 days of D and / or T).

## day 1 body weight (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	24.2 (0.278; n = 4)
D	24.1 (0.552; n = 5)
T	23.7 (0.627; n = 5)
C	25.3 (0.361; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.147

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2286
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.148

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1031	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.2068	V < DT

## day 2 body weight (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	24.6 (0.413; n = 4)
D	24.6 (0.38; n = 5)
T	24.8 (0.606; n = 5)
C	26 (0.306; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.128

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.1373
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0558

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.05114	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.06862	V < DT

### day 3 body weight (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	24.7 (0.243; n = 4)
D	24.5 (0.432; n = 5)
T	25 (0.648; n = 5)
C	26.4 (0.284; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0411

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.02249
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0147

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.00949	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.04581	V < DT

### day 4 body weight (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	25 (0.393; n = 4)
D	25 (0.369; n = 5)
T	25.6 (0.628; n = 5)
C	26.2 (0.277; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.173

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.157

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0474

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.04229	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.06301	V < DT

## body weight gain after 1 days (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.4 (0.163; n = 4)
D	0.48 (0.203; n = 5)
T	1.08 (0.111; n = 5)
C	0.72 (0.218; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0423

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.9302
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.03033

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.336

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.9727	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.4588	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.2329	V < DT

## body weight gain after 2 days (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.425 (0.111; n = 4)
D	0.32 (0.132; n = 5)
T	1.26 (0.117; n = 5)
C	1.1 (0.187; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0115

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.07793
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.0541

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0612

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.04125	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1098	V < DT

### body weight gain after 3 days (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.8 (0.147; n = 4)
D	0.84 (0.254; n = 5)
T	1.86 (0.117; n = 5)
C	0.9 (0.253; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0103

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.00835

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.527

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.7946	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.8908	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.3869	V < DT

### body weight gain after 1 days (percent)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	1.63 (0.654; n = 4)
D	2.06 (0.854; n = 5)
T	4.57 (0.515; n = 5)
C	2.88 (0.871; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0458

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.02461

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.504

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.7216	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.9342	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.364	V < DT

## body weight gain after 2 days (percent)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	1.76 (0.473; n = 4)
D	1.37 (0.569; n = 5)
T	5.32 (0.513; n = 5)
C	4.38 (0.763; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0117

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.09795
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.04268

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0648

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.05114	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.09163	V < DT

## body weight gain after 3 days (percent)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.29 (0.581; n = 4)
D	3.56 (1.08; n = 5)
T	7.86 (0.541; n = 5)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
C	3.6 (1; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0103

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.006947

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.491

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6187	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.3594	V < DT

**levator (mg)**

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	52.2 (5.68; n = 4)
D	47.3 (6.48; n = 5)
T	66.7 (3.8; n = 5)
C	62.3 (3.21; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.131

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2755
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.5301

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.221

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6187	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1231	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.6187	V < DT

**tibialis (mg)**

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	49.3 (0.996; n = 4)
D	49 (3.16; n = 5)
T	55.9 (4.88; n = 5)
C	47.7 (2.44; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.44

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.4572

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.867

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.9642	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.9747	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## gastrocnemius (mg)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	135 (6.72; n = 4)
D	113 (5.63; n = 5)
T	130 (8.14; n = 5)
C	125 (5.53; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.122

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.08635
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3091
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0668

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.03692	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.168	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.6806	V > DT

## quadriceps (mg)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	167 (14.2; n = 4)
D	146 (3.65; n = 5)
T	162 (9.65; n = 5)
C	167 (8.84; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.444

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6541
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3876
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.304

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3594	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2264	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## triceps (mg)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	94.4 (1.91; n = 4)
D	92.9 (7.03; n = 5)
T	94.7 (4.26; n = 5)
C	84.1 (2.26; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.214

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.5323
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.143

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.634	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3397	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.07819	V > DT



## levator (permille)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.08 (0.219; n = 4)
D	1.88 (0.239; n = 5)
T	2.6 (0.116; n = 5)
C	2.38 (0.141; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.113

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.5323
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.3542

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.392

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6654	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2604	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.908	V < DT

## tibialis (permille)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	1.97 (0.0314; n = 4)
D	1.96 (0.11; n = 5)
T	2.17 (0.144; n = 5)
C	1.82 (0.088; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.119

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.7139
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6541

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.309

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2604	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.3088	V > DT

## gastrocnemius (permille)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	5.39 (0.253; n = 4)
D	4.54 (0.191; n = 5)
T	5.07 (0.303; n = 5)
C	4.78 (0.166; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.144

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.07302
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0477

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02091	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.4886	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1882	V > DT

## quadriceps (permille)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	6.64 (0.525; n = 4)
D	5.86 (0.127; n = 5)
T	6.33 (0.392; n = 5)
C	6.37 (0.293; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.581

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.5966
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.857
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.277

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1882	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3853	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.9648	V > DT

## triceps (permille)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.77 (0.0513; n = 4)
D	3.71 (0.243; n = 5)
T	3.7 (0.168; n = 5)
C	3.21 (0.076; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0425

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.1128
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0575

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.908	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1045	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.0389	V > DT

## fat mass before (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.46 (0.169; n = 4)
D	3.18 (0.161; n = 5)
T	2.4 (0.27; n = 5)
C	2.56 (0.0699; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0723

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1127
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.191
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0432

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.0323	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.07405	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.984	V < DT

## lean mass before (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	20.6 (0.289; n = 4)
D	19.5 (0.572; n = 5)
T	20.4 (0.445; n = 5)
C	21.5 (0.33; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0684

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6541
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.02479
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0428

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.5313	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.01892	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.2311	V < DT

## total water before (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	17.6 (1.12; n = 4)
D	15.5 (0.972; n = 5)
T	15.6 (0.766; n = 5)
C	16.5 (0.34; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.172

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2481
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.432
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.2776

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.188

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1409	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2264	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## fat mass after (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.1 (0.223; n = 4)
D	4.48 (0.23; n = 5)
T	3.35 (0.264; n = 5)
C	4.09 (0.173; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0123

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01215
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.9353
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0206

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.008166	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3853	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1308	V < DT

## lean mass after (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	20.8 (0.404; n = 4)
D	18.1 (0.562; n = 5)
T	21.1 (0.458; n = 5)
C	20.2 (0.407; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0202

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.05323
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2755
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0356

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01989	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1045	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.6654	V > DT

## total water after (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	16.8 (1.21; n = 4)
D	14.6 (1.33; n = 5)
T	16.5 (0.428; n = 5)
C	15.4 (0.565; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.148

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2278
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.143

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.07819	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3397	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.634	V > DT

## fat mass before (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	10.2 (0.711; n = 4)
D	13.2 (0.819; n = 5)
T	10.1 (0.997; n = 5)
C	10.1 (0.367; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.115

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2278
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.191
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0888

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1079	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.07405	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## lean mass before (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	85 (0.916; n = 4)
D	80.9 (0.635; n = 5)
T	85.8 (0.874; n = 5)
C	85 (1.17; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0263

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.05517
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.1128
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0214

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01711	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.04255	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.9648	V < DT

## total water before (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	72.9 (5.06; n = 4)
D	64.6 (4.91; n = 5)
T	65.6 (1.63; n = 5)
C	65.3 (1.89; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.156

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.07557
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.7832
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.125

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.06335	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3853	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.504	V > DT

## fat mass after (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	12.4 (0.939; n = 4)
D	18 (0.975; n = 5)
T	13.1 (0.87; n = 5)
C	15.6 (0.701; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0116

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01267
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.7832
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0172

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.006542	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2981	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1518	V < DT

## lean mass after (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	82.9 (0.569; n = 4)
D	72.4 (1.41; n = 5)
T	82.6 (0.834; n = 5)
C	77.2 (1.1; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.003

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01117
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.9353
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.00802

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.002901	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2981	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.08841	V > DT



## total water after (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	67.2 (4.42; n = 4)
D	58.3 (4.64; n = 5)
T	64.5 (1.55; n = 5)
C	58.8 (2.11; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.145

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1911
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.122

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.06069	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.5465	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.3489	V > DT

## fat mass gain (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.635 (0.166; n = 4)
D	1.3 (0.0894; n = 5)
T	0.948 (0.372; n = 5)
C	1.53 (0.109; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.03

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1746
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.9353
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.8862

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.013

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1079	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3397	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.004925	V < DT

## lean mass gain (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.142 (0.245; n = 4)
D	-1.45 (0.152; n = 5)
T	0.776 (0.208; n = 5)
C	-1.28 (0.369; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.00257

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.09255
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.9233

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0203

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.009614	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.6745	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.06611	V > DT

## total water gain (g)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	-0.797 (1.23; n = 4)
D	-0.942 (1.72; n = 5)
T	0.892 (0.65; n = 5)
C	-1.09 (0.895; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.473

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.7313

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.958

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## fat mass gain (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.22 (0.644; n = 4)
D	4.74 (0.325; n = 5)
T	2.99 (1.45; n = 5)
C	5.5 (0.365; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0301

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.18
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.013

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1079	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.3397	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.004925	V < DT

## lean mass gain (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	-2.17 (0.6; n = 4)
D	-8.52 (0.856; n = 5)
T	-3.22 (1.21; n = 5)
C	-7.87 (2.08; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0203

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02328
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0463

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02424	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.818	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.09972	V > DT

## total water gain (percent of BW)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	-5.67 (5; n = 4)
D	-6.37 (7.62; n = 5)
T	-1.1 (2.48; n = 5)
C	-6.49 (3.78; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.811

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.958

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## fat mass gain (percent)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	26.2 (6.78; n = 4)
D	41 (1.96; n = 5)
T	45.6 (16.8; n = 5)
C	59.7 (2.98; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0474

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.191
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.327

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.00592

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3925	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.05144	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.002731	V < DT

## lean mass gain (percent)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.683 (1.19; n = 4)
D	-7.4 (0.788; n = 5)
T	3.83 (1.04; n = 5)
C	-5.95 (1.65; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.00241

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.08091
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.9233

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0179

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.007729	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.5465	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.07819	V > DT

## total water gain (percent)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	-3.95 (6.44; n = 4)
D	-4.69 (9.58; n = 5)
T	6.38 (4.18; n = 5)
C	-6.19 (5.3; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.47

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.8148

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.914

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## gastrocnemius proteasome activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	9840 (844; n = 4)
D	14400 (1350; n = 5)
T	17900 (2760; n = 5)
C	16000 (2100; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0428

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1164
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.02829

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0179

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02544	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.01393	V < DT

## quadriceps proteasome activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	23400 (7220; n = 4)
D	27700 (2910; n = 5)
T	30300 (3050; n = 5)
C	21000 (709; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.111

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.481
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.5323
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.1408

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.254

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1574	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.4349	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7993	V > DT

## triceps proteasome activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	6550 (1800; n = 4)
D	13800 (2940; n = 5)
T	12200 (2110; n = 5)
C	9670 (1970; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.208

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1365
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.2776

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.168

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.08841	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.6085	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.4039	V < DT

## gastrocnemius cathepsin activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	27400 (2710; n = 4)
D	22000 (1740; n = 5)
T	32100 (3070; n = 5)
C	22700 (1160; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0397

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.5828
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.9046

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.295

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2234	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.2901	V > DT

## gastrocnemius calpain activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	14900 (1460; n = 4)
D	20100 (1580; n = 5)
T	17800 (2030; n = 5)
C	19000 (1080; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.216

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1164
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6576

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0831

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.04368	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.8683	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1841	V < DT

## quadriceps calpain activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	20100 (3230; n = 4)
D	26500 (1890; n = 5)
T	21300 (2210; n = 4)
C	20300 (1850; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.213

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2688
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2296
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.163

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1748	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1438	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT



## quadriceps cathepsin activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	34700 (1070; n = 4)
D	19200 (1860; n = 5)
T	37200 (2590; n = 5)
C	30000 (1200; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.00248

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01071
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3468
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.00488

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.002011	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.06188	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.2993	V > DT

## triceps cathepsin activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	27900 (979; n = 4)
D	15500 (344; n = 5)
T	30300 (1450; n = 5)
C	18800 (875; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.00123

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01321
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.4802
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.00307

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.001066	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.08817	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1632	V > DT

## triceps calpain activity (rel.u.)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	12800 (913; n = 4)
D	8380 (4480; n = 5)
T	15400 (2390; n = 5)
C	1960 (555; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0162

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6541
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.649
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0339

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2469	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2981	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.01393	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Becn1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.94 (1.88; n = 4)
D	7.23 (0.631; n = 4)
T	5.83 (0.605; n = 4)
C	5.95 (0.165; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.105

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.05245
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2241
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0345

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02134	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.07479	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.9359	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Ctst) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	4.29 (1.22; n = 4)
D	6.25 (0.689; n = 4)
T	6.14 (0.501; n = 4)
C	6.27 (0.371; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.382

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6204
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6204

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.219

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3036	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1433	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Ddit4) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.95 (0.581; n = 3)
D	4.15 (0.652; n = 4)
T	6.11 (0.942; n = 4)
C	3.65 (0.353; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0261

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.06139
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.7545

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0406

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.09116	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.7836	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.02042	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Fbxo32) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.63 (1.42; n = 4)
D	2.51 (0.688; n = 4)
T	3.51 (0.623; n = 5)
C	2.92 (0.235; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.562

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.8679
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.529

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.414	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.6158	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Foxo1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.05 (0.401; n = 3)
D	7.29 (0.725; n = 4)
T	7.16 (0.576; n = 4)
C	7.5 (0.218; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.529

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.493
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.7247

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.328

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2082	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.5907	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7345	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Foxo3) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.33 (0.658; n = 3)
D	8.24 (0.744; n = 4)
T	7.27 (0.495; n = 4)
C	8.33 (0.263; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.477

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6137

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.978

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Foxo4) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	7.8 (0.614; n = 3)
D	8.15 (0.754; n = 4)
T	7.42 (0.585; n = 4)
C	7.66 (0.0886; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.916

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.75

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.7836	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7659	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Igf1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	6.84 (0.302; n = 3)
D	8.85 (0.312; n = 4)
T	6.51 (0.203; n = 4)
C	7.5 (0.182; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0099

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.05041
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.4642
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0198

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01048	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.08251	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.5355	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Igf1r) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	5.72 (0.814; n = 3)
D	7.39 (0.629; n = 4)
T	5.69 (0.59; n = 4)
C	6.58 (0.439; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.278

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.4297
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.385

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2506	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.7836	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.6447	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Insr) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.72 (0.615; n = 3)
D	4.37 (0.773; n = 4)
T	3.46 (0.572; n = 4)
C	3.08 (0.302; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.556

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.4642
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.328

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.7345	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2034	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7345	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Klf15) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	5.24 (0.411; n = 3)
D	4.02 (0.484; n = 4)
T	5.36 (0.439; n = 4)
C	4.89 (0.117; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.248

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3911
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.9122
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.268

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1715	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.4296	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.8306	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Map1lc3b) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.24 (1.69; n = 4)
D	2.73 (0.793; n = 4)
T	0.885 (0.912; n = 4)
C	1.63 (0.59; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.571

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.7043
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.472

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.359	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.5662	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Nr3c1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	4.3 (1.03; n = 4)
D	6.89 (0.604; n = 5)
T	5.37 (0.536; n = 5)
C	6.47 (0.565; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.102

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1453
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.105

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.09205	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.09205	V < DT



## gastrocnemius Ct(Nr3c4) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.96 (0.594; n = 3)
D	5.06 (0.455; n = 4)
T	3.03 (0.764; n = 4)
C	3.45 (0.541; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.113

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1077
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3415
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0616

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.03793	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1321	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7659	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Psma6) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	4.1 (0.618; n = 3)
D	4.83 (0.746; n = 4)
T	3.94 (0.629; n = 4)
C	4.32 (0.616; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.878

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.85

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.891	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Psmb10) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.66 (0.754; n = 3)
D	10.8 (0.7; n = 4)
T	7.92 (0.814; n = 4)
C	9.01 (0.513; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.155

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3064
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3415
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.11

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.09116	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1321	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Psmd4) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	5.05 (0.634; n = 3)
D	4.78 (0.891; n = 4)
T	5.17 (0.753; n = 4)
C	4.58 (0.119; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.81

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.654

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.5355	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.898	V > DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Stk11) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.78 (0.533; n = 3)
D	3.38 (0.587; n = 4)
T	2.79 (0.44; n = 4)
C	3.15 (0.109; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.988

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.92

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## gastrocnemius Ct(Trim63) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	1 (0.356; n = 3)
D	-1.92 (0.679; n = 4)
T	-0.25 (0.726; n = 4)
C	-0.944 (0.416; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0552

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02349
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6137

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0346

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01543	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.5907	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1135	V > DT

## quadriceps Ct(Becn1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	7.04 (0.151; n = 4)
D	6.9 (0.0525; n = 3)
T	7.15 (0.264; n = 4)
C	8.03 (0.46; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.213

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.1809
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.165

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.15	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1647	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Bnip3) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.57 (0.257; n = 4)
D	2.56 (0.215; n = 3)
T	3.88 (0.271; n = 4)
C	3.94 (0.141; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0569

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2369
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.03124
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0406

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.09116	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.02042	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7836	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Ctsl) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	4.92 (0.291; n = 4)
D	4.07 (0.348; n = 3)
T	5.01 (0.222; n = 4)
C	5.56 (0.287; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0646

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.4712
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.02349
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0549

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3353	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.02449	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.3012	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Ddit4) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	9.03 (0.451; n = 4)
D	4.83 (0.148; n = 3)
T	7.83 (0.343; n = 4)
C	5.97 (0.82; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0251

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.0175
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.8051

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0418

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02926	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.864	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.08251	V > DT

## quadriceps Ct(Fbxo32) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.48 (0.277; n = 4)
D	1.37 (0.349; n = 3)
T	3.92 (0.28; n = 4)
C	4.02 (0.428; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0471

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.322
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.03848
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0346

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1135	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.01543	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.5907	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Foxo1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.45 (0.314; n = 4)
D	5.97 (0.193; n = 3)
T	7.94 (0.343; n = 4)
C	7.49 (0.56; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0355

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01293
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.322
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0282

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.01156	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1401	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.4296	V > DT

## quadriceps Ct(Foxo3a) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	9.52 (0.404; n = 4)
D	7.86 (0.147; n = 3)
T	9.66 (0.302; n = 4)
C	9.44 (0.782; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.113

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1363
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3553
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.101

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.05288	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1953	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7836	V > DT

## quadriceps Ct(Foxo4) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	6.88 (0.344; n = 4)
D	6.29 (0.208; n = 3)
T	6.54 (0.337; n = 4)
C	7.49 (0.768; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.447

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.6402
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.4297
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.342

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.395	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2358	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Igf1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.57 (0.292; n = 4)
D	10.1 (0.314; n = 3)
T	8.81 (0.391; n = 4)
C	10.2 (0.438; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0131

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.03592
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0294

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.03193	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.03777	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Igf1r) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	8.52 (0.293; n = 4)
D	8.34 (0.256; n = 3)
T	8.53 (0.159; n = 4)
C	9.82 (0.449; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0472

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.03592
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0418

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.864	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.02926	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.08251	V < DT



## quadriceps Ct(Klf15) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	6.8 (0.307; n = 4)
D	5.81 (0.238; n = 3)
T	7.44 (0.162; n = 4)
C	7.52 (0.347; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0429

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.588
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.0412
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6177

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0404

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2216	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.01696	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.3614	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Map1lc3b) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.36 (0.255; n = 4)
D	1.86 (0.0556; n = 3)
T	2.7 (0.186; n = 4)
C	3.38 (0.257; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0167

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.4297
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.004944
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0163

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.2082	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.006313	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.2034	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Nr3c1) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	3.31 (0.279; n = 4)
D	3.98 (0.179; n = 3)
T	3.75 (0.299; n = 4)
C	5.19 (0.263; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0175

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.5389
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.3911
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0156

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.3743	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1953	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.005999	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Odc) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.42 (0.542; n = 4)
D	1.31 (0.397; n = 3)
T	1.52 (0.379; n = 4)
C	2.49 (0.196; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.165

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.4101
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.1911
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6177

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.184

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1715	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1401	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Stk11) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	5.97 (0.335; n = 4)
D	6.01 (0.15; n = 3)
T	5.87 (0.306; n = 4)
C	7.21 (0.535; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.219

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2913
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.165

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.15	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.1647	V < DT

## quadriceps Ct(Trim63) - Ct(Gapdh)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	5.02 (0.351; n = 4)
D	2.79 (0.398; n = 3)
T	4.8 (0.504; n = 4)
C	5.33 (0.351; n = 4)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0673

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.08432
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.03848
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0455

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.0726	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.02678	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V < DT

## quadriceps Akt protein (normalized to GAPDH)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.47 (0.13; n = 4)
D	0.709 (0.0251; n = 5)
T	0.672 (0.103; n = 5)
C	0.737 (0.0501; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.197

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.4034
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.2088

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0672

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.1212	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.8951	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.03715	V < DT

## quadriceps eEF2 protein (normalized to GAPDH)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.421 (0.0604; n = 4)
D	0.224 (0.0554; n = 5)
T	0.466 (0.0161; n = 5)
C	0.372 (0.0409; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0247

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.06814
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.649
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0845

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.04459	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2264	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.6187	V > DT

## quadriceps phospho-eEF2 protein (normalized to GAPDH)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.858 (0.209; n = 4)
D	1.03 (0.0442; n = 5)
T	1.18 (0.13; n = 5)
C	1.04 (0.0937; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.591

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.5301

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.77

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.8711	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	1	D < DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.7307	V < DT

## quadriceps phospho / total eEF2

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	2.08 (0.413; n = 4)
D	8.33 (2.64; n = 5)
T	2.56 (0.332; n = 5)
C	2.84 (0.402; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.0391

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.02328
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.2755
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.0264

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.0119	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.1445	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.4156	V < DT

## quadriceps phospho-Foxo1/3 protein (normalized to GAPDH)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.34 (0.037; n = 4)
D	0.365 (0.0411; n = 5)
T	0.405 (0.0842; n = 5)
C	0.311 (0.0581; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.504

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	1
<b>2</b>	V vs T	0.6997

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.744

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.9457	V < D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.6745	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	1	V > DT

## quadriceps MuRF1 protein (normalized to GAPDH)

Treatment	Average (SD; n)
V	0.274 (0.0846; n = 4)
D	0.165 (0.0271; n = 5)
T	0.223 (0.0485; n = 5)
C	0.119 (0.0177; n = 5)

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the four-way comparison is 0.218

	contrastsfour	dunns.P.adjusted
<b>1</b>	V vs D	1
<b>5</b>	D vs DT	0.7139
<b>2</b>	V vs T	1

Kruskal-Wallis p value for the three-way comparison is 0.161

	Comparison	P value	Direction
<b>1</b>	V vs D	0.7819	V > D
<b>3</b>	D vs DT	0.2981	D > DT
<b>2</b>	V vs DT	0.09582	V > DT