Supporting information for

Seasonal impact of phosphate-based fire retardants on soil chemistry following prophylactic treatment of vegetation

Anthony C. Yu[a], Mac Reinhart[b], Rachel Hunter[b], Katie Lu[c], Caitlin L. Maikawa[d], Nishanta Rajakaruna[e,f], Jesse D. Acosta[b], Craig Stubler[b], Chip Appel[b], Eric A. Appel[a,d,g]**

[a] Department of Materials Science & Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford CA 94305, USA. Email: eappel@stanford.edu

[b] Department of Natural Resources Management & Environmental Sciences, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo CA 93407, USA. Email: cappel@calpoly.edu

[c] Department of Earth, Energy and Environmental Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford CA 94305, USA.

[d] Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University, Stanford CA 94305, USA.

[e] Department of Biology, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo CA 93407, USA.

[f] Unit for Environmental Sciences and Management, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa

[g] Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford CA 94305, USA.

Content Summary

Pages: 9

Tables: 7

Figures: 2

Table S1. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 1b.

Centimeters Rain	MVP vs 95A	MVP vs FORT.	95A vs FORT.
0	n.s. (p=0.1786)	n.s. (p=0.2107)	n.s. (p=0.9951)
0.635	n.s. (p=0.1645)	**** (p<0.0001)	** (p=0.0034)
1.27	n.s. (p=0.8920)	*** (p=0.0002)	**** (p<0.0001)
2.54	n.s. (p=0.9841)	**** (p<0.0001)	**** (p<0.0001)
3.81	n.s. (p=0.6802)	**** (p<0.0001)	**** (p<0.0001)
5.08	n.s. (p=0.6878)	**** (p<0.0001)	** (p=0.0011)

Table S2. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 2c.

0.75 cm		P value
C vs. MVP	**	0.0089
C vs. 95A	ns	0.9994
C vs. 1	ns	0.9613
MVP vs. 95A	*	0.0126
MVP vs. 1	*	0.0351
95A vs. 1	ns	0.9822
2.5 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.8736
C vs. 95A	ns	>0.9999
C vs. 1	ns	0.9999
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.8560
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.9026
95A vs. 1	ns	0.9995
11 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	>0.9999
C vs. 95A	ns	0.7534
C vs. 1	ns	0.9996
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.7409
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.9993
95A vs. 1	ns	0.8086
71 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.8793
C vs. 95A	ns	>0.9999
C vs. 1	ns	0.9312
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.8831
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.9990
95A vs. 1	ns	0.9339

Table S3. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 2d.

0.75 cm		P value
C vs. MVP	ns	0.0545
C vs. 95A	ns	0.9853
C vs. 1	ns	0.9747
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.1215
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.1412
95A vs. 1	ns	0.9999
2.5 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.3385
C vs. 95A	ns	0.9273
C vs. 1	ns	0.9821
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.1069
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.5585
95A vs. 1	ns	0.7569
11 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.9800
C vs. 95A	ns	0.3687
C vs. 1	ns	0.9016
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.1905
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.7053
95A vs. 1	ns	0.7829
71 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.9263
C vs. 95A	ns	0.9905
C vs. 1	ns	0.9994
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.9889
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.9597
95A vs. 1	ns	0.9979

Table S4. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 2e.

0.75 cm		P value
C vs. MVP	***	0.0002
C vs. 95A	***	0.0007
C vs. 1	**	0.0094
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.9844
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.6516
95A vs. 1	ns	0.8509
2.5 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.0598
C vs. 95A	***	0.0004
C vs. 1	****	<0.0001
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.3485
MVP vs. 1	***	0.0001
95A vs. 1	*	0.0239
11 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.5226
C vs. 95A	**	0.0055
C vs. 1	***	0.0005
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.1814
MVP vs. 1	*	0.0323
95A vs. 1	ns	0.8755
71 cm		
C vs. MVP	ns	0.7394
C vs. 95A	ns	0.7752
C vs. 1	ns	0.1816
MVP vs. 95A	ns	>0.9999
MVP vs. 1	ns	0.7362
95A vs. 1	ns	0.6988

Table S5. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 3a.

0.75 cm		P value
Control vs. MVP	*	0.0492
Control vs. 95A	**	0.0036
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.4738
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.7207
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.5952
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.1169
2.5 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.8654
Control vs. 95A	ns	0.2668
Control vs. Fortify	**	0.0078
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.7029
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.0514
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.3848
11 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.9058
Control vs. 95A	ns	0.7962
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.6927
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.9949
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.9739
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.9978
71 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	>0.9999
Control vs. 95A	ns	>0.9999
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.9916
MVP vs. 95A	ns	>0.9999
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.9951
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.9927

Table S6. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 3b.

0.75 cm		P value
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.0873
Control vs. 95A	***	0.0003
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.6732
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.1586
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.5563
95A vs. Fortify	**	0.0077
2.5 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.9742
Control vs. 95A	ns	0.1039
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.9640
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.2297
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	>0.9999
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.2510
11 cm		
Control vs. MVP	****	<0.0001
Control vs. 95A	****	<0.0001
Control vs. Fortify	****	<0.0001
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.1748
MVP vs. Fortify	**	0.0010
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.1670
71 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.9937
Control vs. 95A	ns	0.8541
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.7166
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.9489
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.8548
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.9938

Table S7. Tukey's multiple comparisons test of Figure 3c.

0.75 cm		P value
Control vs. MVP	**	0.0012
Control vs. 95A	**	0.0041
Control vs. Fortify	ns	0.1393
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.9663
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.2256
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.4537
2.5 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.4770
Control vs. 95A	ns	0.0510
Control vs. Fortify	***	0.0005
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.6019
MVP vs. Fortify	*	0.0255
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.3151
11 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.1387
Control vs. 95A	**	0.0026
Control vs. Fortify	***	0.0001
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.3616
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.0515
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.7288
71 cm		
Control vs. MVP	ns	0.6385
Control vs. 95A	ns	0.4485
Control vs. Fortify	*	0.0185
MVP vs. 95A	ns	0.9892
MVP vs. Fortify	ns	0.2310
95A vs. Fortify	ns	0.3770



Figure S1. Diagram of research site. Blue squares are roughly 4 m^2 plots and red squares are 1 m^2 treatment replicate quadrants.



Figure S2. Diagram of treatment plot quadrants and sub-quadrants. 3 of 4 quadrants were sampled from during each collection to achieve triplicate samples of each treatment, excluding the SE quadrant in each plot. Samples were obtained from undisturbed sub-quadrants during each collection by avoiding previously sampled sub-quadrants.