

Supplementary Figure S1. Gilthead seabream specimens fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) after 6 weeks of growth.



Supplementary Table S1. Condition index (K 2 – 6), relative growth (RG 2 – 4), relative weight gain (RWG 2 – 4), specific growth rate (SGR 2 – 4) of gilthead seabream (mean $\pm$ SD) fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) during the experiment (0 – 6 weeks).

	K2	K4	K6	RG2	RG4	RG6	RWG2	RWG4	RWG6	SGR2	SGR4	SGR6
C1	1.59 $\pm$ 0.15 ^{a,b}	1.57 $\pm$ 0.1 ^a	1.58 $\pm$ 0.08 ^a	27.07 $\pm$ 3.2 ^a	12.38 $\pm$ 1.1 ^{a,b}	10.84 $\pm$ 2.63	122.64 $\pm$ 32.73 ^a	37.42 $\pm$ 11.43	37.42 $\pm$ 11.43	4.39 $\pm$ 0.86 ^a	2.28 $\pm$ 0.82 ^a	1.5 $\pm$ 0.41
C2	1.58 $\pm$ 0.13 ^{a,b}	1.49 $\pm$ 0.08 ^b	1.46 $\pm$ 0.07 ^c	21.88 $\pm$ 1.65 ^{b,c}	13.32 $\pm$ 1.77 ^a	10.45 $\pm$ 2.76	113.53 $\pm$ 25.36 ^a	32.39 $\pm$ 11.5	32.39 $\pm$ 11.5	4.18 $\pm$ 0.68 ^a	2.1 $\pm$ 0.7 ^a	1.32 $\pm$ 0.42
F1	1.55 $\pm$ 0.09 ^{a,b}	1.49 $\pm$ 0.08 ^b	1.51 $\pm$ 0.07 ^b	22.27 $\pm$ 1.54 ^b	11.63 $\pm$ 1.52 ^b	11.16 $\pm$ 0.98	89.13 $\pm$ 22.7 ^b	39.97 $\pm$ 10.02	39.97 $\pm$ 10.02	3.5 $\pm$ 0.63 ^b	1.92 $\pm$ 0.52 ^a	1.59 $\pm$ 0.34
F2	1.44 $\pm$ 0.11 ^c	1.51 $\pm$ 0.09 ^b	1.5 $\pm$ 0.09 ^{b,c}	25.16 $\pm$ 1.49 ^a	7.91 $\pm$ 1.23 ^c	10.78 $\pm$ 1.47	88 $\pm$ 18.79 ^b	35.78 $\pm$ 14.01	35.78 $\pm$ 14.01	3.48 $\pm$ 0.57 ^b	1.84 $\pm$ 0.61 ^a	1.43 $\pm$ 0.49
Shapiro-Wilk test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.459	0.462	0.198	***	*	***	**	0.751	0.751	0.365	***	0.339
Levene's test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.068	0.220	0.377	***	0.146	***	0.105	0.413	0.413	0.423	*	0.380
Kruskal-Wallis test (<i>p</i> -value)	***	-	-	***	***	0.662	***	-	-	-	*	-
Chi-squared	33.82	-	-	86.40	102.46	1.59	38.01	-	-	-	8.53	-
Epsilon-squared	0.227	-	-	0.58	0.688	0.0106	0.255	-	-	-	0.0572	-
One-Way ANOVA (<i>p</i> -value)	***	**	***	-	-	-	-	0.066	0.066	***	-	0.547

Indices indicate comparisons between separate biometric measurements (2 – comparison between 2 weeks of trial and initial measurement prior to experimental initiation; 4 – comparison between 4 and 2 weeks of trial; 6 – comparison between 6 and 4 weeks of trial), with an exception for K values that represent values for each measurement separately. Data was checked for normality and homogeneity. Data with normal distribution was tested for group (feed type) effects by one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test. The non-parametric data was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test, indicating chi-square and epsilon-square values, and followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for non-parametric data. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ SD and letters in the same column indicate significant differences among groups (C1 and C2, N = 25; F1 and F2, N = 50). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Epsilon-squared values indicate: 0.01 – 0.04 weak difference, 0.16 – 0.36 relatively strong difference, 0.36 – 0.64 strong difference, 0.64 – 1.00 very strong difference.

Supplementary Table S2. Relative growth (RG), relative weight gain (RWG), condition index (K), specific growth rate (SGR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and feed conversion rate (FCR) of gilthead seabream (mean $\pm$ SD) fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) at the end of the experiment (6 weeks).

Group	RG%	RWG%	SGR	K	PER	FCR
C1	58.34 $\pm$ 6.91 ^a	330.85 $\pm$ 76 ^a	3.13 $\pm$ 0.39 ^a	1.58 $\pm$ 0.05 ^a	1.95 $\pm$ 0.56	1.02 $\pm$ 0.3
C2	52.53 $\pm$ 4.53 ^b	286.5 $\pm$ 52.02 ^a	2.83 $\pm$ 0.35 ^b	1.46 $\pm$ 0.06 ^c	1.72 $\pm$ 0.45	1.18 $\pm$ 0.34
F1	51.73 $\pm$ 2.83 ^b	252.09 $\pm$ 39.71 ^b	2.86 $\pm$ 0.35 ^b	1.51 $\pm$ 0.06 ^b	1.72 $\pm$ 0.47	1.19 $\pm$ 0.37
F2	49.63 $\pm$ 3.43 ^c	235.04 $\pm$ 38.72 ^b	2.81 $\pm$ 0.35 ^b	1.5 $\pm$ 0.07 ^b	1.68 $\pm$ 0.42	1.2 $\pm$ 0.36
Shapiro-Wilk test (<i>p</i> -value)	***	***	0.218	0.198	*	***
Levene's test (<i>p</i> -value)	***	***	0.918	0.377	0.792	0.844
Kruskal-Wallis test (<i>p</i> -value)	***	***	-	-	0.313	0.176
Chi-squared	44.25	41.61	-	-	3.56	4.94
Epsilon-squared	0.297	0.279	-	-	0.024	0.033
One-Way ANOVA (<i>p</i> -value)	-	-	**	***	-	-

Indices indicate comparisons between initial (0 weeks) and final measurements (6 weeks). Condition index was evaluated at the end of the experiment. Data was checked for normality and homogeneity. Data with normal distribution was tested for group (feed type) effects by one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test. The non-parametric data was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test, indicating chi-square and epsilon-square values, and followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for non-parametric data. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ SD and letters in the same column indicate significant differences among groups (C1 and C2, N = 25; F1 and F2, N = 50). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Epsilon-squared values indicate: 0.01 – 0.04 weak difference, 0.16 – 0.36 relatively strong difference, 0.36 – 0.64 strong difference, 0.64 – 1.00 very strong difference.

Supplementary Table S3. Dorsal muscle proportion (DM), viscerasomatic index (VSI) and hepatosomatic index (HSI) of gilthead seabream (mean $\pm$ SD) fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) at the end of the experiment (6 weeks).

Group	DM	HSI	VSI
C1	17.03 $\pm$ 1.94	1.19 $\pm$ 0.35 ^b	6.63 $\pm$ 0.57 ^b
C2	19.18 $\pm$ 5.17	1.24 $\pm$ 0.36 ^{a,b}	6.87 $\pm$ 0.74 ^{a,b}
F1	18.39 $\pm$ 4.17	1.61 $\pm$ 0.42 ^{a,b}	7.64 $\pm$ 0.82 ^a
F2	18.8 $\pm$ 2.23	1.63 $\pm$ 0.4 ^{a,b}	7.33 $\pm$ 0.78 ^{a,b}
Shapiro-Wilk test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.181	0.581	*
Levene's test (<i>p</i> -value)	***	0.926	0.673
Kruskal-Wallis test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.522	-	*
Chi-squared	2.25	-	13.446
Epsilon-squared	0.038	-	0.228
One-Way ANOVA (<i>p</i> -value)	-	**	-

Data was checked for normality and homogeneity. Data with normal distribution was tested for group (feed type) effects by one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test. The non-parametric data was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test, indicating chi-square and epsilon-square values, and followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for non-parametric data. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ SD and letters in the same column indicate significant differences among groups (C1 and C2, N = 10; F1 and F2, N = 20). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Epsilon-squared values indicate: 0.01 – 0.04 weak difference, 0.16 – 0.36 relatively strong difference, 0.36 – 0.64 strong difference, 0.64 – 1.00 very strong difference.

Supplementary Table S4. The proximate composition (mean $\pm$ SD) of the dorsal muscle of gilthead seabream fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) at the end of the experiment (6 weeks).

Group	Moisture (%)	Crude protein (%)	Crude fat (%)	Ash (%)
C1	74.78 $\pm$ 0.14	20.37 $\pm$ 0.03 ^{a,b}	3.69 $\pm$ 0.39	1.49 $\pm$ 0.01 ^{a,b}
C2	74.31 $\pm$ 0.12	20.41 $\pm$ 0.05 ^a	4.34 $\pm$ 0.42	1.50 $\pm$ 0.03 ^a
F1	75.30 $\pm$ 0.63	19.95 $\pm$ 0.14 ^{b,c}	4.13 $\pm$ 0.80	1.45 $\pm$ 0.04 ^{a,b}
F2	75.06 $\pm$ 0.42	19.8 $\pm$ 0.22 ^c	3.94 $\pm$ 0.10	1.42 $\pm$ 0.02 ^b
Shapiro-Wilk test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.333	0.461	0.255	0.528
Levene's test (<i>p</i> -value)	***	0.269	***	0.511
Kruskal-Wallis with Monte Carlo (<i>p</i> -value)	0.164	-	0.5.53	-
Chi-squared	5.13	-	2.44	-
Epsilon-squared	0.467	-	0.222	-
One-Way ANOVA (<i>p</i> -value)	-	**	-	*

Data was checked for normality and homogeneity. Data with normal distribution was tested for group (feed type) effects by one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test. The non-parametric data was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test coupled with Monte Carlo permutation test, indicating chi-square and epsilon-square values, and followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for non-parametric data. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ SD and letters in the same column indicate significant differences among groups (C1 and C2, N = 2; F1 and F2, N = 4). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Epsilon-squared values indicate: 0.01 – 0.04 weak difference, 0.16 – 0.36 relatively strong difference, 0.36 – 0.64 strong difference, 0.64 – 1.00 very strong difference.

Supplementary Table S5. Fatty acid profile (mean $\pm$ SD) expressed as % of total fatty acids (TFAs) of diet formulations used for gilthead seabream feeding experiment.

Fatty acid (% TFAs)		Commercial fish feed ¹			Sunflower oil ²	Mussel meal ³
		Perla <1	Crobo 1.5	Crobo 1.9		
SFA	14:0	4.83	4.97	9.23	0.1	2.69 $\pm$ 0
	15:0	-	-	-	-	0.82 $\pm$ 0
	16:0	21.4	17.84	23.09	6.9	21.35 $\pm$ 0.29
	17:0	-	-	-	0	1.31 $\pm$ 0.02
	18:0	4.13	3.29	5.08	3.7	4.67 $\pm$ 0.02
	20:0	0.2	0.44	0.53	0.3	-
	22:0	0.2	0.44	0.13	0.8	0.89 $\pm$ 1.26
	24:0	0.18	0.07	0.07	0.3	-
	Total	30.94	27.05	38.13	12.1	31.73
MUFA	14:1	0.06	0.07	0	-	-
	16:1	4.78	5.26	8.71	-	3.59 $\pm$ 0.04
	18:1	-	-	-	31.3	-
	18:1n-9	15.04	23.68	9.63	-	5.48 $\pm$ 0.25
	18:1n-7	2.87	3.36	2.97	-	-
	20:1	-	-	-	0.2	3.4 $\pm$ 0.01
	20:1n-9	2.86	2.19	1.32	-	-
	22:1n-9	0.31	0.29	0.2	-	-
	24:1n-9	0.42	0.88	0.46	-	-
	Total	26.28	35.75	23.28	31.5	12.47
PUFA	18:2	-	-	0	56.2	-
	18:2n-6	21.91	9.43	7.12	-	-
	18:2n-9	-	-	-	-	3.37 $\pm$ 0.2
	18:3	-	-	-	0.1	-
	18:3n-3	2.3	3.29	1.39	-	2.77 $\pm$ 0.05
	18:4n-3	-	1.83	1.52	-	-
	20:2n-6	0.17	0.58	0.13	-	-
	20:3n-3	0.09	0.15	0.2	-	-
	20:4n-3	-	0.51	0.46	-	-
	20:4n-6	0.74	0.80	1.91	-	2.09 $\pm$ 0.05
	20:5n-3	6.51	8.77	14.51	-	9.72 $\pm$ 0.12
	22:5n-3	0.81	1.54	2.11	-	-

PUFA	22:6n-3	10.21	10.31	9.23	-	24.29±0.44
	Total	42.74	37.21	38.59	56.3	42.24
PUFA/SFA	Total	1.38	1.38	1.01	4.65	1.33

1 – Skretting, Perla 0 (Das et al., 2024); Crobo 1.5 and 1.9 (Cromaris d.d.), 2 – Zvijezda d.d., Sunflower oil (Klinar et al., 2024), 3 – *Mytilus galloprovincialis* (RBI, CMR).

Supplementary Table S6. Fatty acid profile (mean $\pm$ SD) expressed as % of total fatty acids (TFAs) of the dorsal muscle of gilthead seabream fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) at the end of the experiment (6 weeks).

Group	C14:0	C16:0	C16:1	C18:0	C18:1 cis	C18:2 cis	C18:3n3	C20:1	C20:5n3 (EPA)	C22:6n3 (DHA)	ni
C1	4.15 $\pm$ 0.35	20.83 $\pm$ 0.78	6.1 $\pm$ 0.25	3.35 $\pm$ 0.03	34 $\pm$ 0.12	12.47 $\pm$ 0.26 ^b	2.48 $\pm$ 0.02 ^a	1.6 $\pm$ 0.17	3.48 $\pm$ 0.23	9.78 $\pm$ 1.33	1.78 $\pm$ 0
C2	3.31 $\pm$ 0.16	18.26 $\pm$ 0.45	5.12 $\pm$ 0.15	3.2 $\pm$ 0.01	33.39 $\pm$ 0.11	17.99 $\pm$ 0.18 ^{a,b}	2.19 $\pm$ 0.01 ^{a,b}	1.49 $\pm$ 0.13	3.39 $\pm$ 0.26	10.15 $\pm$ 0.64	1.54 $\pm$ 0.01
F1	3.36 $\pm$ 0.13	18.54 $\pm$ 0.39	5.1 $\pm$ 0.18	3.31 $\pm$ 0.12	33.17 $\pm$ 0.45	17.73 $\pm$ 0.24 ^{a,b}	2.18 $\pm$ 0.04 ^{a,b}	1.49 $\pm$ 0.07	3.24 $\pm$ 0.13	10.36 $\pm$ 1.09	1.54 $\pm$ 0.02
F2	3.28 $\pm$ 0.18	18.11 $\pm$ 0.44	5.01 $\pm$ 0.14	3.27 $\pm$ 0.02	32.95 $\pm$ 0.19	18.22 $\pm$ 0.22 ^a	2.14 $\pm$ 0.02 ^b	1.48 $\pm$ 0.09	3.38 $\pm$ 0.17	10.61 $\pm$ 0.63	1.56 $\pm$ 0.04
Shapiro-Wilk test (<i>p</i> -value)	*	*	**	0.357	0.389	***	***	0.106	0.145	0.876	**
Levene's test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.147	0.520	0.666	*	***	0.735	0.086	0.469	0.679	0.341	*
Kruskal-Wallis with Monte Carlo (<i>p</i> -value)	0.175	0.110	0.117	0.149	0.082	**	*	-	-	-	0.128
Chi-squared	4.77	5.83	5.42	5.09	6.00	8.13	7.60	-	-	-	5.42
Epsilon-squared	0.434	0.53	0.493	0.463	0.545	0.74	0.691	-	-	-	0.493
One-Way ANOVA (<i>p</i> -value)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.575	0.473	0.771	-

Data was checked for normality and homogeneity. Data with normal distribution was tested for group (feed type) effects by one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test. The non-parametric data was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test coupled with Monte Carlo permutation test, indicating chi-square and epsilon-square values, and followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for non-parametric data. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ SD and letters in the same column indicate significant differences among groups (C1 and C2, N = 2; F1 and F2, N = 4). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Epsilon-squared values indicate: 0.01 – 0.04 weak difference, 0.16 – 0.36 relatively strong difference, 0.36 – 0.64 strong difference, 0.64 – 1.00 very strong difference. Abbreviations: ni – not identified.

Supplementary Table S7. Fatty acid indices (mean $\pm$ SD) of the dorsal muscle of gilthead seabream fed with different feed formulations (C1, C2, F1, F2) at the end of the experiment (6 weeks).

Group	PI	PUFA/SFA	IT	EPA+DHA	FLQ	UI	Σ SFA	Σ MUFA	Σ PUFA	Σ n-3	DHA/EPA	Σ n-3/ Σ n-6
C1	0.64 $\pm$ 0.1	1 $\pm$ 0.09	0.11 $\pm$ 0.01	13.26 $\pm$ 1.56	13.26 $\pm$ 1.55	150.13 $\pm$ 8.44	28.33 $\pm$ 1.1	41.7 $\pm$ 0.21	28.2 $\pm$ 1.32	15.74 $\pm$ 1.58	2.8 $\pm$ 0.2	1.26 $\pm$ 0.15
C2	0.74 $\pm$ 0.07	1.36 $\pm$ 0.06	0.07 $\pm$ 0	13.53 $\pm$ 0.91	13.53 $\pm$ 0.91	160.31 $\pm$ 4.67	24.77 $\pm$ 0.59	39.99 $\pm$ 0.13	33.7 $\pm$ 0.72	15.72 $\pm$ 0.9	3 $\pm$ 0.04	0.87 $\pm$ 0.06
F1	0.73 $\pm$ 0.08	1.33 $\pm$ 0.06	0.07 $\pm$ 0.01	13.6 $\pm$ 1.21	13.59 $\pm$ 1.21	160.08 $\pm$ 6	25.21 $\pm$ 0.43	39.76 $\pm$ 0.64	33.5 $\pm$ 0.95	15.77 $\pm$ 1.18	3.19 $\pm$ 0.21	0.89 $\pm$ 0.08
F2	0.77 $\pm$ 0.06	1.39 $\pm$ 0.06	0.07 $\pm$ 0	13.99 $\pm$ 0.8	13.99 $\pm$ 0.8	162.86 $\pm$ 4.3	24.66 $\pm$ 0.63	39.44 $\pm$ 0.14	34.35 $\pm$ 0.6	16.13 $\pm$ 0.81	3.14 $\pm$ 0.06	0.89 $\pm$ 0.05
Shapiro-Wilk test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.940	*	**	0.690	0.683	0.544	*	*	**	0.559	0.883	**
Levene's test (<i>p</i> -value)	0.840	0.884	0.127	0.491	0.490	0.555	0.309	***	0.452	0.509	*	0.116
Kruskal-Wallis with Monte Carlo (<i>p</i> -value)	-	0.083	0.092	-	-	-	0.085	0.102	0.058	-	0.071	0.192
Chi-squared	-	5.83	5.44	-	-	-	6.19	5.73	6.50	-	6.35	4.81
Epsilon-squared	-	0.53	0.495	-	-	-	0.563	0.521	0.591	-	0.577	0.437
One-Way ANOVA (<i>p</i> -value)	0.300	-	-	0.875	0.875	0.152	-	-	-	0.951	-	-

Data was checked for normality and homogeneity. Data with normal distribution was tested for group (feed type) effects by one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test. The non-parametric data was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test coupled with Monte Carlo permutation test, indicating chi-square and epsilon-square values, and followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for non-parametric data. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ SD and letters in the same column indicate significant differences among groups (C1 and C2, N = 2; F1 and F2, N = 4). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Epsilon-squared values indicate: 0.01 – 0.04 weak difference, 0.16 – 0.36 relatively strong difference, 0.36 – 0.64 strong difference, 0.64 – 1.00 very strong difference. Abbreviations: polyene index (PI), thrombogenic index (IT), fish lipid quality (FLQ) and unsaturation index (UI).

Supplementary Table S8. Pearson's correlation coefficient for fatty acid content of the dorsal muscle of gilthead seabream fed with different feed formulations at the end of the experiment (6 weeks).

	C14:0	C16:0	C16:1	C18:0	C18:1cis	C18:2cis	C18:3n3	C20:1	C20:5n3	C22:6n3	SFA	MUFA	PUFA
C14:0	-	0.9928	0.9824	0.2173	0.7325	-0.8559	0.8662	0.0602	-0.0809	-0.6420	0.9931	0.8615	-0.9750
	-	***	***	0.498	**	***	***	0.853	0.803	*	***	***	***
C16:0	0.9928	-	0.9875	0.2504	0.7680	-0.8880	0.9034	0.1338	-0.0596	-0.6088	0.9985	0.8905	-0.9889
	***	-	***	0.432	**	***	***	0.678	0.854	*	***	***	***
C16:1	0.9824	0.9875	-	0.1617	0.8271	-0.9034	0.9349	0.2147	0.0184	-0.6110	0.9817	0.9360	-0.9963
	***	***	-	0.616	**	***	***	0.503	0.955	*	***	***	***
C18:0	0.2173	0.2504	0.1617	-	-0.1941	-0.4319	0.2498	0.1284	0.2726	0.4706	0.2949	-0.0058	-0.1932
	0.498	0.432	0.616	-	0.546	0.161	0.434	0.691	0.391	0.123	0.352	0.986	0.547
C18:1 cis	0.7325	0.7680	0.8271	-0.1941	-	-0.7354	0.8674	0.4275	0.0444	-0.6104	0.7376	0.9641	-0.8437
	**	**	**	0.546	-	**	***	0.166	0.891	*	**	***	**
C18:2 cis	-0.8559	-0.8880	-0.9034	-0.4319	-0.7354	-	-0.9700	-0.5027	-0.3719	0.2215	-0.8921	-0.8744	0.9166
	***	***	***	0.161	**	-	***	0.096	0.234	0.489	***	***	***
C18:3n3	0.8662	0.9034	0.9349	0.2498	0.8674	-0.9700	-	0.5010	0.2680	-0.3710	0.8957	0.9572	-0.9490
	***	***	***	0.434	***	***	-	0.097	0.400	0.235	***	***	***
C20:1	0.0602	0.1338	0.2147	0.1284	0.4275	-0.5027	0.5010	-	0.7454	0.3621	0.1209	0.4367	-0.2481
	0.853	0.678	0.503	0.691	0.166	0.096	0.097	-	**	0.247	0.708	0.156	0.437
C20:5n3 (EPA)	-0.0809	-0.0596	0.0184	0.2726	0.0444	-0.3719	0.2680	0.7454	-	0.6408	-0.0487	0.1160	-0.0214
	0.803	0.854	0.955	0.391	0.891	0.234	0.400	**	-	*	0.880	0.720	0.947
C22:6n3 (DHA)	-0.6420	-0.6088	-0.6110	0.4706	-0.6104	0.2215	-0.3710	0.3621	0.6408	-	-0.5822	-0.5698	0.5905
	*	*	*	0.123	*	0.489	0.235	0.247	*	-	*	0.053	*
SFA	0.9931	0.9985	0.9817	0.2949	0.7376	-0.8921	0.8957	0.1209	-0.0487	-0.5822	-	0.8707	-0.9827
	***	***	***	0.352	**	***	***	0.708	0.880	*	-	***	***
MUFA	0.8615	0.8905	0.9360	-0.0058	0.9641	-0.8744	0.9572	0.4367	0.1160	-0.5698	0.8707	-	-0.9465
	***	***	***	0.986	***	***	***	0.156	0.720	0.053	***	-	***
PUFA	-0.9750	-0.9889	-0.9963	-0.1932	-0.8437	0.9166	-0.9490	-0.2481	-0.0214	0.5905	-0.9827	-0.9465	-
	***	***	***	0.547	**	***	***	0.437	0.947	*	***	***	-

Results are presented in two rows and indicate the correlation coefficient (r ; above) and significance level (p ; below) between each variable ($N = 12$). Significance is indicated as follows: not significant – $p > 0.05$, * – $p < 0.05$, ** – $p < 0.01$, *** – $p < 0.001$. Abbreviations: SFA – saturated fatty acids, MUFA – monounsaturated fatty acids, and PUFA – polyunsaturated fatty acids.