

1 *Supplementary Materials:*

2 **The role of streamside native forests on dissolved**
 3 **organic matter in forested and agricultural**
 4 **watersheds in northwestern Patagonia**

5 **Constanza Becerra-Rodas^{1*}, Christian Little^{2,3}, Antonio Lara^{3,4,5}, Jorge Sandoval⁶, Sebastián**
 6 **Osorio^{6,7} and Jorge Nimptsch⁷**

7 ¹ Escuela de Graduados, Facultad de Ciencias Forestales y Recursos Naturales, Universidad Austral de
 8 Chile, Valdivia, Chile;

9 ² Instituto Forestal (INFOR), Sede Los Ríos, Fundo Teja Norte s/n, Valdivia, Chile; clittle@infor.cl

10 ³ Center for Climate and Resilience Research (CR2), Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile;
 11 antoniolaragaugular@gmail.com

12 ⁴ Fundación Centro de los Bosques Nativos FORECOS, Valdivia, Chile


13 ⁵ Facultad de Ciencias Forestales y Recursos Naturales, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.

14 ⁶ Escuela de Graduados, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile;
 15 sandovalramirezj@gmail.com (J.S.)

16 ⁷ Laboratorio de Bioensayos y Limnología Aplicada, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Austral de Chile,
 17 Valdivia, Chile; sb_osorio@hotmail.com (S.O.); jorge.nimptsch@uach.cl, +56 63 2293954 (J.N.)


18 * Correspondence: constanza.becerra.rodas@gmail.com; +56 9 62431088 (C.BR)

19




20

21 **Figure S1.** Streamflow recorded in the ÑaQue River Basin gage, for the hydrologic year in which
 22 the samples were taken. Black squares represent sampling dates (July 23, August 4, 7, 10 and 14
 23 2015)..



24
25
26

Figure S2. EEMs dissolved organic matter fluorescence component results from parallel factor analysis (PARAFAC) split-half validated (100 iterations, 4 component model).



27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Figure S3. Spearman correlation matrices for watersheds dominated by forest plantations and agricultural lands according to the quantity and quality of DOM (DIC, Humic and Protein) and four types of land cover (nf: native forest; mpt: mature forest plantation; young forest plantation; and agr: agricultural land in the entire watershed (w), streamside native forest coverage in 30 m (b30) and 60 m (b60) wide buffer strips. Intensity of the color of the circle indicates degree of correlation (red indicates a negative relationship and blue indicates a positive relationship); Size of the circles indicates statistical significance ($p < 0.05$); White squares indicate that there is no statistical significance ($p > 0.05$).

36 **Table S1.** Areas of four land cover classes: native forest (NF), mature forest plantation (MFP), young forest plantation (YFP) and agricultural land (A) in
 37 the entire watershed and buffer strips of 30 and 60 meter wide in watersheds dominated by native forests or reference (WNF), forest plantation (WFP)
 38 and agricultural lands (WAL).
 39

Drainage area class	<i>Watershed</i>				<i>Buffer strip 30 m</i>				<i>Buffer strip 60 m</i>			
	NF	MFP	IFP	A	NF	MFP	IFP	A	NF	MFP	IFP	A
WNF												
A	99.56	0.01	0.42	0.00	99.57	0.24	0.19	0.00	98.63	0.68	0.70	0.00
B	99.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.10	0.00	0.00	0.90	99.56	0.44	0.00	0.00
C	99.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
D	99.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WFP												
A	48.36	29.55	22.10	0.00	36.46	55.07	8.48	0.00	32.03	27.95	40.02	0.00
B	24.83	56.79	18.36	0.00	47.60	25.54	26.86	0.00	30.39	30.59	39.02	0.00
C	23.29	5.11	71.67	0.00	69.73	11.63	18.64	0.00	43.73	12.78	43.49	0.00
D	53.90	45.71	0.00	0.39	78.00	18.97	0.00	3.02	64.99	27.15	0.00	7.86
WAL												
A	34.44	6.63	26.43	32.49	82.12	0.00	10.57	7.31	59.32	2.50	25.81	12.37
B	50.06	0.21	0.29	49.44	81.47	0.93	0.00	17.61	72.92	0.74	0.00	26.34
C	15.64	23.28	1.22	59.85	75.15	7.17	0.00	17.68	33.15	17.59	0.00	49.26
D	21.82	0.00	0.00	78.18	16.88	0.02	0.00	83.10	18.42	0.85	0.00	80.73

Table S2. Nemenyi Test of multiple comparisons.

Parameters DOM	Nemenyi's test of multiple comparisons for independent samples (tukey)	Mean rank difference	<i>p</i> -value	Significance code *** 0.001, '**' 0.01, '*' 0.05 '!' 0.1
DIC (mg C l ⁻¹)	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-25.14	1.E-03	***
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-11.07	0.04	*
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	14.07	0.01	**
DOC (mg C l ⁻¹)	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-1.07	0.97	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	0.21	1.00	
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	1.29	0.96	
FI	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-7.04	0.72	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	3.98	0.90	
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	11.02	0.45	
HIX	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	14.55	0.25	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-36.89	2.E-04	***
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	-51.45	7.E-08	***
β:α	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-13.73	0.29	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	19.25	0.09	.
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	32.98	1.E-03	***
SUVA254 (m ⁻¹ * mg C l ⁻¹)	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	6.86	0.74	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-5.79	0.80	
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	-12.64	0.35	
C1 Fmax (R.U./DOC)	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-3.11	0.94	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-56.95	2.E-09	***
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	-53.84	1.E-08	***
C2 Fmax (R.U./DOC)	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	48.52	4.E-07	***
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-4.75	0.86	
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	-53.27	2.E-08	***
C3 Fmax (R.U./DOC)	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-33.20	9.E-04	***
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	14.93	0.24	
	FOREST PLANTATION - REFERENCE	48.13	5.E-07	***
C4 Fmax/DOC	REFERENCE-AGRICULTURAL LAND	-7.25	0.71	
	FOREST PLANTATION-AGRICULTURAL LAND	38.16	1.E-04	***

