Supplementary material

Table S1. Probability levels of significance from ANOVA (RCBD design) for several traits measured in aglasshouse experiment (Experiment 1) for 8 Australian turfgrasses (2 cultivars/species \times 4 species)conducted at The University of Queensland in April–May 2007

Traits included cumulative evapotranspiration (ET), cumulative clipping yield (CY), water use efficiency (WUE) and relative water use efficiency (WUE_r). DOT = days of treatment. (Source of variation for blocks was excluded from table). ns indicates not significant at the 0.05 probability level, * indicates significant at the 0.05 probability level and **indicates significant at the 0.01 probability level

| | С | umulative | ET | С | umulative | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-----|------------------|
| Source of variance | 6 DOT | 18 DOT | 30 DOT | 6 DOT | 18 DOT | 30 DOT | WUE | WUE _r |
| Species (S) | ns | * | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | * |
| Genotype within Species | ns | ns | ns | * | * | ** | ** | ** |
| water treatment (WT) | ns | * | ** | ns | ns | ** | ** | |
| S*WT | ns | ns | * | ns | ns | * | * | |

Table S2. Probability levels of significance from ANOVA for several traits measured in a field experiment (Experiment 2) for 8Australian turfgrasses (2 cultivars/species × 4 species) conducted in an open compound at The University of Queensland in January–March 2008

Traits included survival period (SP), cumulative evapotranspiration (ET), cumulative clipping yield (CY), water use efficiency (WUE), canopy temperature, verdure dry weight, total root dry mater (RDM) and RDM below 20 cm of soil profile. DOT = days of treatment. ns indicates significant at the probability level P > 0.05, * indicates significant at the probability level $P \le 0.05$ and ** indicates significant at the probability level $P \le 0.01$

| | | Cumulative ET | | | Cumulative CY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------|-----|--------|--------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| | | Irrigated Drought | | Irrigated Drought | | WUE | | Canopy temperature | | | Dry matter production | | | | | | |
| Source of variance | SP | 12 DOT | 6 DOT | 18 DOT | 31 DOT | SP | 12 DOT | 12 DOT | Irrigated | Drought | WUEr | 0 DOT | 3 DOT | 6 DOT | Verdure | Total RDM | RDM below 20 cm |
| Species (S) | ** | ** | * | ** | * | ns | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ns | ** | ** | ** | ns | * |
| Genotype within Species | * | ** | ** | * | ns | ns | ** | ** | ** | ** | * | * | ** | ns | * | ** | ** |
| Soil Type (ST) | ** | ** | ns | ** | ** | ** | ns | ns | ** | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ** | ** |
| Cutting Height (CH) | ** | ** | ** | ** | ns | ns | ** | ns | ns | ** | ns | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| S*ST | * | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| S*CH | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | * | ns | ns | ns |
| ST*CH | ns | ** | ns | ** | ** | ** | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ** | ns | ns | ns |
| S*ST*CH | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |

Table S3. Correlation between Experiments 1 and 2 for measures of cumulative evapotranspiration (ET), water use efficiency (WUE) and relative water use efficiency (WUE_r) among 8 Australian turfgrasses (2 cultivars/species \times 4 species)

Values given are correlation coefficients (n = 8) among traits measured under the same treatment (sandy soil × 5 cm clipping height) and (a) when similar cumulative ET occurred between the experiments under irrigated condition and (b) when average soil water content was similar between the experiments under drought condition. Correlations for WUE and WUE_r are given in part (c). DOT = days of treatment. ns indicates not significant at the 0.05 probability level, * indicates significant at the 0.05 probability level, * indicates significant at the 0.05 probability level.

| <i>(a)</i> | | Experiment 1 – Irrigated cumulative ET | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|-------------|--------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| | 6 DOT | 12 DOT | 18 DOT | 24 DOT | 30 DOT | | | | |
| Experiment 2 Irrigated cumulative E | T ns | 0.78* | 0.71* | 0.84** | 0.81** | | | | |
| (b) | | Experiment 1 – Drought cumulative ET | | | | | | | |
| | 6 DOT | 12 DOT | 18 DOT | 24 DOT | 30 DOT | | | | |
| Experiment 2 Drought cumulative E | Г ns | 0.78* | 0.78* | 0.72* | 0.71* | | | | |
| (c) | | Experiment 1 – WUE | | | | | | | |
| | | Irrigated WUE | Drought WUE | WUEr | | | | | |
|] | rrigated WUE | 0.28* | ns ns | | | | | | |
| Experiment 2WUE | Drought WUE | ns | 0.78* | ns | | | | | |
| | WUE _r | ns | 0.71* | 0.78* | | | | | |



Fig. S1. Daily solar radiation (a) inside the glasshouse during the period of Experiment 1 (April–May 2007) and (b) in the compound during the period of Experiment 2 (January–March 2008) and daily vapor pressure deficit (VPD) in the period of (c) Experiment 1 and (d) Experiment 2.