

Table S7

Fig ref	Strain / condition	no. of animals	mean lifespan	% lifespan change (vs control)	median lifespan	maximum lifespan	Log Rank Test <i>p</i> value relative to control
5A	N2 + EV control	52	17.5		16	28	
	N2 + <i>daf-16</i> RNAi	57	13.8	21% decrease	14	22	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2 control
	<i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE + EV control	58	31.3	79% increase	30	46	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2 control
	<i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE + <i>daf-16</i> RNAi	58	17.0	23% increase (vs N2 in <i>daf-16</i> RNAi) 46% decrease (vs <i>utx-1</i> OE in <i>daf-16</i> RNAi)	16	24	<0.0001 (****) compared with <i>daf-16</i> RNAi <0.0001 (****) compared with <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE
5A rep	N2 + EV control	54	16.3		16	29	
	N2 + <i>daf-16</i> RNAi	56	13.3	18% decrease	14	17	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2 control
	<i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE + EV control	57	30.0	84% increase	31	47	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2 control
	<i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE + <i>daf-16</i> RNAi	53	14.2	7% increase (vs N2 in <i>daf-16</i> RNAi) 53% decrease (vs <i>utx-1</i> OE in <i>daf-16</i> RNAi)	14	19	0.0005 (***) compared with <i>daf-16</i> RNAi <0.0001 (****) compared with <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE
5B #	N2 + EV control	56	14.5		14	27	
	N2 + <i>utx-1</i> RNAi	56	19	31% increase	19	28	<0.0001 (****)
	<i>daf-2(e1370)</i> + EV control	55	38.9	168% increase (vs N2)	42	61	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2
	<i>daf-2(e1370)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> RNAi	58	39.1	170% increase (vs N2)	42	56	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2 0.45 (ns) compared with <i>daf-2(e1370)</i>
5C	N2	58	17.2		19	28	
	<i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE	56	27.9	62% increase	32	42	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2
	<i>daf-2(e1370)</i>	58	36.1	110% increase (vs N2) 29% increase (vs <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE)	39	53	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2 <0.0001 (****) compared with <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE
	<i>daf-2(e1370)</i> ; <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE	60	40.7	46% increase (vs <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE) 13% increase (vs <i>daf-2(e1370)</i>)	47	61	<0.0001 (****) compared with <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE 0.0023 (**) compared with <i>daf-2(e1370)</i>
5C rep	N2	47	15.7		17	23	
	<i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1</i> OE	46	20.1	28% increase	21	35	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2

<i>daf-2(e1370)</i>	59	33.0	110% increase (vs N2)	32	48	<0.0001 (****) compared with N2
			64% increase (vs <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1OE</i>)			<0.0001 (****) compared with <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1OE</i>
<i>daf-2(e1370); utx-1(tm3118) + utx-1 OE</i>	52	42.0	109% increase (vs <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1OE</i>)	42	62	<0.0001 (****) compared with <i>utx-1(tm3118)</i> + <i>utx-1OE</i>
			27% increase (vs <i>daf-2(e1370)</i>)			<0.0001 (****) compared with <i>daf-2(e1370)</i>

Table S7. Statistical analysis of lifespan data relating to Figure 5

Full statistical analysis of lifespan data from Fig. 5 (****p<0.0001,***p<0.001,**p<0.01,*p<0.05, ns=not significant). #consistent with data reported in [14]. EV = empty vector control. Rep = repeat.