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Differences in hydraulic traits of grapevine rootstocks are not conferred to a common *Vitis vinifera* scion
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Fig. S1. Pot water content (A), stem water potential ($\Psi_{\text{stem}}$; B), and the relationship of pot water content and $\Psi_{\text{stem}}$ (C) of Cabernet Sauvignon grafted on *V. champinii* (Ram\CS; black squares) and *V. riparia* (Rip\CS; white circles) during an eight-day dry down period. For each rootstock\scion combination, days with different means are shown by different letters (Ram\CS = a to e; Rip\CS = x to z).
Fig. S2. Stomatal conductance ($g_s$), photosynthetic rate ($P_n$) and intrinsic water use efficiency ($WUE_i$) of Cabernet Sauvignon grafted on $V.\ champinii$ (Ram’CS; black squares) and $V.\ riparia$ (Rip’CS; white circles) during an eight-day dry down period. For each rootstock’scion combination, days with different means are shown by different letters (Ram’CS = a to c; Rip’CS = x to z).