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Figures S1 a) monthly GPP and b) latent heat flux of full sensitivity analysis grouped by rooting depth
a)


| Efficient xylem | Safe xylem |
| :---: | :---: |
| -*- | -*- P50gs=P50x |
|  | - P50gs=P40x |
| --*-- | --*- P50gs=P30x |
| ----- | .-. P50gs=P20x |
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| Efficient xylem | Safe xylem |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\rightarrow$ - | -*-P50gs=P50x |
|  | P50gs=P40x |
| --*-- | --*- P50gs=P30x |
| ----- | -.. P50gs=P20x |






Figure S2. Mean hourly GPP and Latent Heat flux by month and year of five effective rooting depth scenarios: a) 8 m, b) 6.5 m , c) 5 m, d) 3 m , and e) 1 m .
a) GPP and LH of 8 m rooting depth

c) GPP and LH of 5 m rooting depth

d) GPP and LH of 3 m rooting depth



Latent Heat Flux(2013) - roota, rootb:0.8,1.8


| Efficient <br> xylem |  | Safe <br> xylem |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $-*$ | $-*-$ | P50gs $=\mathrm{P} 50 \mathrm{x}$ |
| - | - | P50gs $=\mathrm{P} 40 \mathrm{x}$ |
| $\cdots \cdots$ | $\cdots *-$ | P50gs $=\mathrm{P} 30 \mathrm{x}$ |
| $\cdots \cdots$ | $\cdots-$ | P50gs $=\mathrm{P} 20 \mathrm{x}$ |

- Observed
e) GPP and LH of 1 m rooting depth


Figure S3 A.) monthly mean stem fraction of conductance (SFCL, K/Kmax) of all cohorts and B.) monthly mean leaf water potential (LWP) of all cohorts
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Figure S4 Seasonal variation of water content for selected layers
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Figure S5. Relation between simulated day time leaf water potential (LWP) and absorbing root water potential (AWP)


Figure S6. Vulnerability curves for two xylem strategies shown in both absolute units (K) as pressure-conductance curve (solid lines) and relative units ( $\mathrm{K} / \mathrm{K}_{\text {max }}$ ) as pressurefraction of conductance (dashed lines). The red dot indicates the intersection point of the absolute pressure-conductance curve. On the right side of the point, efficient xylem has higher conductance at any given pressure but a lower fraction of conductance as compared to the safe xylem.


Figure S7. Estimated vulnerability curve of pine based on xylem vulnerability traits (P12, P50,P88) from TRY database

Fitted curved using P12, P50 and P88 values from TRY database for pine


Fig. S8 Comparison of MACA and flux tower meteorology data: monthly mean of a) precipitation, b) relative humidity c), air temperature, and d) incident solar radiation


