International Journal of Wildland Fire **2017**, 26, 532–537
doi: 10.1071/WF16211_AC

Supplementary material

High post-fire mortality of resprouting woody plants in Tasmanian Mediterranean-type vegetation

Áine Nicholson[A], *Lynda D. Prior*[A,C], *George L. W. Perry*[B] *and David M. J. S. Bowman*[A]

[A]School of Biological Sciences, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 55, Hobart, Tas. 7001, Australia.

[B]School of Environment, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand.

[C]Corresponding author. Email: lynda.prior@utas.edu.au

doi: 10.1071/WF16211_AC

Table S1. Numbers of stems in our study plots according to species and status (alive, completely dead or resprouting)

For many completely dead stems, it was possible to identify them only to genus level

Species	Alive	Dead	Resprouting	Total
Acacia –unidentified		62		62
Acacia mucronata	1	33	6	40
Acacia sophorae		2	1	3
Acacia verticillata	10	9	3	22
Allocasuarina – unidentified		3	2	5
Allocasuarina littoralis		1		1
Allocasuarina monilifera	2	133	4	139
Allocasuarina verticillata	31	213	38	282
Banksia marginata	3	325	1	329
Bursaria spinosa			1	1
Callitris rhomboidea	3	43		46
Dodonaea viscosa	5	2		7
Eucalyptus – unidentified			1	1
Eucalyptus globulus		16	14	30
Eucalyptus nitida			5	5
Exocarpos – unidentified	2		2	4
Hakea – unidentified		7		7
Hakea nodosa		4		4
Hakea terrifolia	2	40		42
Leptospermum – unidentified		72	2	74
Leptospermum laevigatum	62	351	5	418
Leptospermum scoparium	10	62	3	75
Leptospermum squarrosa		2		2
Leucopogon – unidentified	18	27	7	52
Leucopogon parviflorus	7	39	23	69
Melaleuca – unidentified		30	3	33
Melaleuca armillaris		31	12	43
Melaleuca ericifolia	57	2		59
Melaleuca gibbosa	10	28		38
Melaleuca squarrosa		11	1	12
Myrtaceae – unidentified		2		2
Ozothamnus turbinatus	6			6
Unidentified species 1	6	142	3	151
Unidentified species 2		6	1	7
Unidentified species 3		2		2
Total	235	1700	138	2073

doi: 10.1071/WF16211_AC

Table S2. Comparison of models used to describe resprouting.

Resprouting of all top-killed stems of species with at least 5% resprouting. Based on these results, the *w*+ values are 1.00 for fire severity, 1.00 for vegetation type (veg) and 0.95 for diameter. Fire severity includes a quadratic term (i.e. severity + severity-squared) and diameter was $\log_{10}$-transformed. K is the number of parameters in the model, AICc is the Akaike coefficient for small sample size, Delta AICc is the difference relative to the best model, w_i is the Akaike weight (equivalent to the probability of that model being the best in the candidate model set) and % dev expl is the percent deviance explained relative to the null (intercept only) model

Terms	K	AICc	Delta AICc	w_i	% dev expl
severity + diameter + veg	7	527.6	0.0	0.946	9.7
severity + veg	6	533.4	5.8	0.053	8.3
severity + diameter	4	541.6	13.9	0.001	6.1
severity	3	543.2	15.6	0.000	5.5
diameter + veg	5	548.2	20.6	0.000	5.3
veg	4	551.1	23.5	0.000	4.4
null	1	570.1	42.4	0.000	NA
diameter	2	570.8	43.1	0.000	

doi: 10.1071/WF16211_AC

Table S3. Coefficients and standard errors of the best-supported model of resprouting

Resprouting is expressed on a logit scale. The reference intercept is for heathland vegetation, diameter is in cm and severity is an ordinal score rated on a scale of 1–5. The negative value of the severity-squared term supports a humped relationship, with predicted maximum resprouting at severity of 3.4

Term	Coefficient	s.e.	*z* value
Intercept	–5.73	1.19	–4.82
Severity	2.80	0.71	3.96
Severity-squared	–0.41	0.11	–3.66
Diameter ($\log_{10}$ transformed)	1.19	0.43	2.79
Veg – *Allocasuarina* forest	–1.36	0.31	–4.43
Veg – shrubland	–0.77	0.39	–1.98
Veg – coastal vegetation	–0.85	0.34	–2.51