Table 1. Summary Statistics of Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency

	Vehicle			BPA 2.5 (µg/kg)			BPA 8 (µg/kg)			BPA 25 (µg/kg)			BPA 80 (µg/kg)			BPA 260 (µg/kg)			BPA 840 (µg/kg)			BPA 2700 (µg/kg)		
Analysis	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.
Dams with Pups On Study	23	36.9	6.6	26	32.4	1.2	18	32.4	1.0	24	30.8	1.0	24	30.9	0.7	23	33.5	1.0	22	32.8	1.5	25	30.8	1.1
All Dams On Study	24	36.2	6.4	27	32.3	1.2	22	30.6	1.3	26	30.4	1.0	26	30.7	0.8	28	31.3	1.3	24	32.0	1.5	27	30.6	1.1

Table 1. Summary Statistics of Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency

	BPA 100,000 (µg/kg)			BPA 300,000 (µg/kg)			EE_2 0.5 (µg/kg)			EE_2 5.0 (µg/kg)			Naïve Control		
Analysis	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.	N	Mean	S.E.
Dams with Pups On Study	23	30.0	1.1	25	31.4	1.4	20	30.4	1.3	22	28.5	1.0	25	32.2	0.8
All Dams On Study	25	29.9	1.1	30	31.2	1.4	26	29.2	1.1	24	28.8	1.0	28	31.7	0.7

Table 2. ANOCOVA[1] Results for Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency for Dams with Pups On Study

Subgroup	Effect	NumDF	DenDF	FValue	ProbF
Lower BPA	PupCount	1	169	3.847	0.051
	TrtGroup	7	169	0.475	0.852
	PupCount*TrtGroup	7	169	0.706	0.667
High BPA	PupCount	1	65	2.485	0.120
	TrtGroup	2	65	0.127	0.881
	PupCount*TrtGroup	2	65	0.346	0.709
EE2	PupCount	1	59	1.271	0.264
	TrtGroup	2	59	0.310	0.735
	PupCount*TrtGroup	2	59	0.648	0.527
Naïve	PupCount	1	44	1.803	0.186
	TrtGroup	1	44	0.221	0.640
	PupCount*TrtGroup	1	44	0.425	0.518

1 Analyses of subgroups were conducted separately.

Table 3. Lower BPA: Least Square Means and Comparisons of Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency for Dams with Pups On Study

Statistic	Vehicle[1]	BPA 2.5 (µg/kg)	BPA 8 (µg/kg)	BPA 25 (µg/kg)	BPA 80 (µg/kg)	BPA 260 (µg/kg)	BPA 840 (µg/kg)	BPA 2700 (µg/kg)
LSMean ± S.E.	38.9 ± 2.7	32.5 ± 2.4	31.9 ± 3.0	31.2 ± 2.6	30.8 ± 2.5	33.0 ± 2.8	32.7 ± 2.7	30.9 ± 2.5
Dunnett Adjusted P-value		0.325	0.353	0.183	0.145	0.487	0.412	0.143
Unadjusted P-value	0.810	0.077	0.086	0.039 *	0.030 *	0.129	0.104	0.029 *

1 All p-values are relative to the control group, except p-values for the linear trend are presented under the control group

Table 4. High BPA: Least Square Means and Comparisons of Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency for Dams with Pups On Study

Statistic	Vehicle	BPA 100,000 (µg/kg)	BPA 300,000 (µg/kg)
LSMean ± S.E.	39.3 ± 4.2	29.8 ± 3.9	30.5 ± 4.0
Dunnett Adjusted P-value		0.178	0.221
Unadjusted P-value		0.103	0.130

Table 5. EE2: Least Square Means and Comparisons of Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency for Dams with Pups On Study

Statistic	Vehicle	EE_2 0.5 (µg/kg)	EE_2 5.0 (µg/kg)
LSMean ± S.E.	38.3 ± 4.1	30.2 ± 4.4	28.5 ± 4.2
Dunnett Adjusted P-value		0.317	0.177
Unadjusted P-value		0.189	0.101

Table 6. Naive: Least Square Means and Comparisons of Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency for Dams with Pups On Study

Statistic	Vehicle	Naïve Control
LSMean ± S.E.	32.0 ± 4.5	37.6 ± 4.6
Unadjusted P-value		0.385

Table 7. ANOCOVA[1] Results for Gestational Percent Metabolic Efficiency for All Dams On Study

Subgroup	Effect	NumDF	DenDF	FValue	ProbF
Lower BPA	PupCount	1	188	12.267	**0.001**
	TrtGroup	7	188	0.500	0.834
	PupCount*TrtGroup	7	188	0.786	0.600
High BPA	PupCount	1	73	4.796	**0.032**
	TrtGroup	2	73	0.273	0.762
	PupCount*TrtGroup	2	73	0.639	0.531
EE2	PupCount	1	68	2.625	0.110
	TrtGroup	2	68	0.506	0.605
	PupCount*TrtGroup	2	68	1.024	0.365
Naive	PupCount	1	48	2.647	0.110
	TrtGroup	1	48	0.415	0.522
	PupCount*TrtGroup	1	48	0.737	0.395

1 Analyses of subgroups were conducted separately.