



Supplement of

El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) event reduces CO_2 uptake of an Indonesian oil palm plantation

Christian Stiegler et al.

Correspondence to: Christian Stiegler (christian.stiegler@biologie.uni-goettingen.de)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.

Supplement



Figure S1: Accumulated precipitation in 2015 and during the reference time period. Shaded areas in red and grey mark the non-haze drought and the haze drought period in 2015, respectively.



Figure S2: Comparison of Multiple Linear Regression Model (*MLRM*) results without (left) and with (right) intercept on 24-hour net ecosystem CO₂ exchange (*NEE*) during the entire study period (2014-2016). Error bars show the standard error.

Table S1: Contribution (\pm standard error) of meteorological parameters (predictors) on net ecosystem CO₂ exchange (*NEE*) derived from multiple linear regression model (*MLRM*) during different time periods (full 2-year study period, non-haze drought, haze drought, and non-haze & non-drought conditions). Negative values indicate CO₂ uptake for 24-hour *NEE* and midday *NEE*, and CO₂ release for night time *NEE*. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 m above the surface.

5

	Predictor [µmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹], full 2-year study period											
	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total			
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR				
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit						
NEE,	-10.50 (±	-	-2.61 (±	1.94 (±	10.54 (±0.01)	0.73 (±	-2.23	-	-2.13 (± 1.18)			
24-hour	0.06)		0.12)	0.54)		0.03)	(±0.44)					
NEE,	-34.48 (±	-	-	6.86 (±	30.30 (± 0.01)	6.87 (±	-2.47 (±	-14.68 (±	-21.32 (± 2.93			
midday	0.12)			1.06)		0.06)	1.67	0.001)				
(10-14 h)												
NEE, night	37.70 (±	-28.37 (±	-1.17 (±	-	-	-0.98 (±	0.51 (±	-	7.69 (± 2.03)			
time (19-	0.29)	0.30)	0.58)			0.10)	0.76)					
5:30 h)												
			Pro	edictor [µmol	m ⁻² s ⁻¹], non-haze	drought						
	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total			
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR				
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit						

NEE,	-10.65 (±	-	-2.96 (±	1.82 (±	10.39 (± 0.01)	0.85 (±	-1.97 (±	-	-2.51 (± 0.96)
24-hour	0.05)		0.11)	0.40)		0.02)	0.39)		
NEE,	-34.40 (±	-	-	-5.50 (±	29.94 (± 0.01)	7.00 (±	-2.26 (±	-15.96 (±	-21.18 (± 2.26)
midday	0.10)			0.65)		0.04)	1.46)	0.001)	
(10-14 h)									
NEE, night	38.48 (±	-28.69 (±	-1.30 (±	-	-	-1.39 (±	0.51 (±	-	7.61 (± 1.45)
time (19-	0.32)	0.32)	0.28)			0.06)	0.47)		
5:30 h)									

	Predictor [µmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹], haze drought										
	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total		
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR			
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit					
NEE,	-10.94 (±	-	-2.39	2.13 (0.19)	10.86 (±	1.09 (±	-1.96 (±	-	-1.20 (± 0.35		
24-hour	0.01)		(0.03)		0.001)	0.004)	0.12)				
NEE,	-36.09 (±	-	-	-9.39 (±	30.95 (± 0.01)	9.20 (±	-2.10 (±	-11.49 (±	-18.92 (± 2.24)		
midday	0.10)			1.13)		0.03)	0.97)	0.0004)			
(10-14 h)											
NEE, night	39.31 (±	-28.44 (±	-1.07 (±	-	-	-1.87 (±	0.51 (±	-	8.44 (± 1.11)		
time (19-	0.23)	0.0.25)	0.35)			0.03)	0.24)				
5:30 h)											

Predictor [µmol m⁻² s⁻¹], non-drought and non-haze conditions

	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR	
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit			
NEE,	-10.38 (±	-	-2.55 (±	1.96 (±	10.57 (±	0.63 (±	-2.42 (±	-	-2.19 (± 1.19)
24-hour	0.05)		0.10)	0.65)	0.003)	0.04)	0.34)		
NEE,	-34.26 (±	-	-	-6.91 (±	30.33 (± 0.01)	6.46 (±	-2.65 (±	-14.76 (±	-21.78 (± 3.21)
midday	0.12)			1.33)		0.08)	1.67)	0.001)	
(10-14 h)									
NEE, night	37.19 (±	-28.25 (±	-1.14 (±	-	-	-0.71 (±	0.51 (±	-	7.60 (± 2.36)
time (19-	0.31)	0.31)	0.69)			0.20)	0.86)		
5:30 h)									

Table S2: Case scenarios (Case 1-Case 5) of different MLRMs and summary of case scenarios with Akaike information criterion

(AIC) score and model goodness of fit.

scale(Tair))									
Coefficients:	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr (>/ <i>t</i> /)					
(Intercept)	-0.112342	0.05100	-2.203	0.028650 *					
scale(VPD)	0.020793	0.086572	0.240	0.810408					
scale(CO2)	0.177867	0.052516	3.387	0.000837 ***					
scale(fdifRad)	0.121650	0.052972	2.296	0.022589 *					
scale (wind)	-0.177130	0.053028	-3.340	0.000983 ***					
scale(Tair)	0.009968	0.088540	0.113	0.910466					

Case 1: $Im(formula = scale(NEF) \sim scale(VPD) + scale(CO2) + scale(fdifRad) + scale(wind) + scale$

Case 2: lm(formula = scale(NEE) ~ scale(CO2) + scale(fdifRad) + scale(wind))

Coefficients:	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr (>/ <i>t</i> /)
(Intercept)	-0.10971	0.04848	-2.263	0.024591 *
scale(CO2)	0.17776	0.05231	3.399	0.000803 ***
scale(fdifRad)	0.11620	0.04873	2.385	0.017930 *
scale (wind)	-0.17344	0.04763	-3.641	0.000338 ***

Case 3: lm(formula = NEE ~ VPD + CO2 + fdifRad + wind + Tair - 1)

Coefficients:	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr (>/ <i>t</i> /)
VPD	0.126540	0.057204	2.212	0.02798 *
<i>CO</i> 2	0.014808	1.753	1.753	0.08095
fdifRad	2.144689	1.297013	1.654	0.09964
wind	-1.635912	0.288365	-5.673	4.37e-08 ***
Tair	-0.313711	0.114494	-2.740	0.00665 **

$e 4: lm(formula = NEE \sim VP)$	D + CO2 + faifRad +	- wind + Tair)		5
Coefficients:	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr (>/t/)
(Intercept)	-19.78924	6.57646	-3.009	0.002926 **
VPD	0.01612	0.06711	0.240	0.810408 10
<i>CO2</i>	0.03960	0.01169	3.387	0.000837 ***
fdifRad	2.99722	1.30513	2.296	0.022589 * 15
wind	-1.11112	0.33264	-3.340	0.000983 ***
Tair	0.01772	0.15742	0.113	0.910466 20

Case 5: $lm(formula = NEE \sim CO2 + fdifRad + wind)$

25 **Coefficients:** Pr (>/t/) Estimate Std. Error t-value 6.01e-05 *** (Intercept) -19.11845 4.67333 -4.091 0.000803 ***³⁰ *CO2* 3.399 0.03958 0.01165 fdifRad 0.017930 * 2.86305 1.20054 2.385 0.000338 ***35 wind -1.08794 0.29880 -3.641

40	AIC score	Insignificant	Goodness of fit	Case number					
		p-values							
	494	Temperature,	0.20	1					
45		VPD [0.8 to 0.9]							
	490	none	021	2					
	808	none	0.74	3					
50	801	Temperature,	0.20	4					
		VPD [0.8 to 0.9]							
	798	none	0.21	5					

55

AIC scores differed substantially between models that used original and scaled data, where the model that used the scaled data had low values of *AIC* score. The model (case 3) that used the original data but excluded the intercept had a relatively high value of goodness of fit when compared with all other cases. Because the *AIC* score didn't change much between cases 3 and 4 and that case 3 had a relatively high goodness of fit value, we chose to use the model in case 3 for this study.

 Table S3: Multiple Linear Regression Model (*MLRM*): Statistics of midday (10-14 h local time), night time (19-5:30 h) and 24-hour

 averaged environmental parameters. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 meter above the surface.

Parameter (midday)	Estimate	SE	t-value	P-value
Incoming PAR	-0.01	0.00	-12.44	< 0.001
Air temperature	-1.15	0.14	-8.50	< 0.001
Vapor pressure deficit	0.56	0.07	7.98	< 0.001
CO ₂ concentration	0.08	0.01	9.09	< 0.001
Fraction of diffuse radiation	-9.98	1.20	-8.29	< 0.001
ET/ET_{pot}	-5.58	1.90	-2.94	< 0.001
Parameter (night time)	Estimate	SE	t-value	P-value
Air temperature	1.50	0.17	8.68	< 0.001
Vapor pressure deficit	-0.35	0.06	-6.07	< 0.001
ET/ET_{pot}	1.65	0.45	3.67	< 0.001
Air temperature (12 m)	-1.14	0.17	-6.52	< 0.001
Wind speed	-0.88	0.34	-2.59	< 0.01
Parameter (24-hour)	Estimate	SE	t-value	P-value
Vapor pressure deficit	0.12	0.06	2.11	0.04
CO ₂ concentration	0.03	0.01	2.80	0.01
Fraction of diffuse radiation	2.18	1.22	1.79	0.08
Wind speed	-1.70	0.27	-6.31	< 0.001
Air temperature	-0.39	0.12	-3.15	< 0.001
ET/ET_{pot}	-4.33	0.99	-4.39	< 0.001

Table S4: Multiple Linear Regression Model (*MLRM*): Correlations of midday (10-14 h local time), night time (19-5:30 h) and 24-hour averaged environmental parameters. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 meter above the surface.

	Incoming	Air	Vapor pressure		Fraction of	
Midday	PAR	temperature	deficit	CO_2 concentration	diffuse radiation	ET/ET _{pot}
Incoming PAR	1.00	0.55	0.56	-0.42	-0.82	-0.28
Air temperature	0.55	1.00	0.89	-0.22	-0.33	-0.52
Vapor pressure deficit	0.56	0.89	1.00	-0.18	-0.30	-0.53
CO ₂ concentration	-0.42	-0.22	-0.18	1.00	0.33	0.14
Fraction of diffuse radiation	-0.82	-0.33	-0.30	0.33	1.00	0.16
ET/ET_{pot}	-0.28	-0.52	-0.53	0.14	0.16	1.00
Nicht time	Air	Vapor pressure	Air	Wind		
Night time	temperature	deficit	temperature (12	2 m) speed	E1/E1 pot	
Air temperature	1.00	0.71	0.76	0	-0.01	
Vapor pressure deficit	0.71	1.00	0.44	0.24	-0.02	
Air temperature (12 m)	0.76	0.44	1.00	0.04	-0.03	
Wind speed	0	0.24	0.04	1.00	-0.06	
ET/ET_{pot}	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03	-0.06	1.00	

24-hour	Vapor pressure	CO, concentration	Fraction of	Wind speed	Air	FT/FT
	deficit		diffuse radiation	wind speed	temperature	E1/E1 pot
Vapor pressure deficit	1.00	0.05	-0.14	0.25	0.76	-0.62
CO ₂ concentration	0.05	1.00	0.29	-0.30	0.09	0.13
Fraction of diffuse radiation	-0.14	0.29	1.00	-0.22	-0.19	0.25
Wind speed	0.25	-0.30	-0.22	1.00	-0.09	-0.14
Air temperature	0.76	0.09	-0.19	-0.09	1.00	-0.69
ET/ET_{pot}	-0.62	0.13	0.25	-0.14	-0.69	1.00

Table S5: Effect of meteorological parameters (predictors, ± standard error) on net ecosystem CO₂ exchange (*NEE*) during non-haze drought conditions derived from multiple linear regression model (*MLRM*). Negative values indicate decrease in CO₂ uptake for 24-hour *NEE* and midday *NEE*, and increase in CO₂ release for nighttime *NEE*. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 m above the surface.

Predictor [µmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]									
	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR	
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit			
NEE,	0.26 (± 0.01)	-	0.41 (±	0.14 (± 0.25)	0.18 (± 0.0002)	-0.22 (±	-0.45 (± 0.04)	-	0.32 (± 0.23)
24-hour			0.01)			0.02)			
NEE, midday	0.14 (± 0.02)	-	-	$-1.40 (\pm 0.68)$	$0.39 (\pm 0.001$	-0.54 (±	-0.39 (± 0.21)	1.20 (±	-0.60 (± 0.95)
						0.0003)		0.0003)	
NEE,	-1.29 (± 0.02)	0.44 (± 0.01)	0.1 (±	-	-	0.68 (±	0 (± 0.39)	-	-0.02 (± 0.91)
nighttime			0.41)			0.14)			

(19-5:30 h)

Table S6: Effect of meteorological parameters (predictors, \pm standard error) on net ecosystem CO₂ exchange (*NEE*) during haze drought conditions derived from multiple linear regression model (*MLRM*). Negative values indicate decrease in CO₂ uptake for 24-hour *NEE* and midday *NEE*, and increase in CO₂ release for nighttime *NEE*. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 m above the surface.

	Predictor [µmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]								
	Air	Air temperature	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total
	temperature	(12 m)	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR	
				radiation		deficit			
NEE,	0.55 (± 0.05)	-	-0.16 (±	-0.17 (± 0.46)	-0.29 (± 0.003)	-0.46 (±	-0.46 (±	-	$-0.99 (\pm 0.84)$
24-hour			0.07)			0.04)	0.22)		
NEE, midday	1.83 (± 0.02)	-	-	2.48 (± 0.20)	-0.62 (± 0.001)	-2.74 (±	-0.55 (±	-3.27 (±	$-2.86 (\pm 0.97)$
						0.05)	0.70)	0.001)	
NEE,	$-2.12 (\pm 0.08)$	0.19 (± 0.06)	-0.07 (v	-	-	1.16 (±	0	-	-0.84 (± 1.25)
nighttime			0.33)			0.17)			

(19-5:30 h)

Table S7: Effect of meteorological parameters (predictors, ± standard error) on net ecosystem CO2 exchange (NEE) during increased non-haze drought (NHD+) scenario derived from multiple linear regression model (MLRM). Negative values indicate decrease in CO2 uptake for 24-hour NEE and midday NEE, and increase in CO2 release for nighttime NEE. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 m above the surface.

Predictor [µmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]									
	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR	
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit			
NEE,	2.39 (± 0.02)	-	0.41 (±	0.50 (± 0.13)	0.18 (± 0.00003)	-0.39 (±	-0.84 (± 0.04)	-	2.25 (± 0.17)
24-hour			0.003)			0.01)			
NEE, midday	7.02 (± 0.16)	-	-	-2.50 (1.71)	0.39 (± 0.001)	-1.94 (±	-0.84 (± 0.17)	4.40 (± 0.001)	6.52 (± 1.80)
						0.08)			
NEE,	-8.99 (± 0.13)	6.18 (± 0.08)	0.15 (±	-	-	0.96 (±	0.10 (± 0.04)	-	-1.59 (± 0.29)
nighttime			0.06)			0.13)			
(19-5:30 h)									

Table S8: Effect of meteorological parameters (predictors, ± standard error) on net ecosystem CO₂ exchange (*NEE*) during increased haze drought (*HD*+) scenario derived from multiple linear regression model (*MLRM*). Negative values indicate decrease in CO₂ uptake for 24-hour *NEE* and midday *NEE*, and increase in CO₂ release for nighttime *NEE*. If not otherwise stated, measurement height is 22 m above the surface.

Predictor [µmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹]										
	Air	Air	Wind	Fraction of	CO ₂	Vapor	ET/ET _{pot}	Incoming	Total	
	temperature	temperature	speed	diffuse	concentration	pressure		PAR		
		(12 m)		radiation		deficit				
NEE,	2.74 (± 0.13)	-	-0.16 (±	-0.60 (±0.28)	-2.46 (± 0.01)	-0.68 (±	$-0.85 (\pm 0.19)$	-	-2.01 (± 0.38)	
24-hour			0.01)			0.03)				
NEE, midday	9.05 (± 0.21)	-	-	4.36 (± 0.87)	-6.80 (± 0.01)	-4.58 (±	$-0.97 (\pm 0.68)$	-5.57 (±	-4.51 (± 0.16)	
						0.23)		0.003)		
NEE,	-9.98 (± 0.76)	$5.88 (\pm 0.36)$	-0.07 (±	-	-	1.54 (±	0.10 (± 0.06)	-	-2.53 (± 0.10)	
nighttime			0.02)			0.26)				

(19-5:30 h)