**Figure 8 – source data 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Figure 8– source data 1 -** two-way repeated measures ANOVA - Fig.8c | | | | | |
| **AOB vs.** |  | **n** | **df** | **F** | ***p*** |
| **MOB** | 5 | 1,4 | 80.92 | <0. 01 |
| **Nacc** | 4 | 1,3 | 9.82 | >0.05 |
| **Pir** | 5 | 1,4 | 31.54 | <0. 01 |
| **LS** | 5 | 1,4 | 21.90 | <0. 01 |
| **MeA** | 5 | 1,4 | 19.89 | <0.05 |
| **MOB vs.** | **Nacc** | 5 | 1,4 | 17.24 | <0.05 |
| **Pir** | 6 | 1,5 | 24.61 | <0. 01 |
| **LS** | 6 | 1,5 | 26.19 | <0. 01 |
| **MeA** | 6 | 1,5 | 7.19 | <0.05 |
| **Nacc vs.** | **Pir** | 5 | 1,4 | 11.72 | <0.05 |
| **LS** | 5 | 1,4 | 6.54 | >0.05 |
| **MeA** | 5 | 1,4 | 26.69 | <0. 01 |
| **Pir vs.** | **LS** | 6 | 1,5 | 24.39 | <0. 01 |
| **MeA** | 6 | 1,5 | 15.58 | <0. 01 |
| **LS vs.** | **MeA** | 6 | 1,5 | 18.52 | <0. 01 |

**Figure 8 – source data 1: Comparison of change in coherence in low and high theta bands between social and fearful stimuli.**

Comparison of the change in coherence between social recognition (SR) and fear conditioning (FC) at high and low theta ranges (right), statistically validated usingtwo-way repeated measures ANOVA (*p* - experiment X theta range interaction). The assumption of normality was assessed by Lilliefors and Shapiro-Wilk tests**.**