

**Appendix S2 for 'Linked disturbance in the temperate forest: Earthworms, deer, and canopy gaps'**

**Journal: Ecology**

**Authors: Samuel P. Reed, Dustin R. Bronson, Jodi A. Forrester, Leah M. Prudent, Anna M. Yang, Austin M. Yantes, Peter B. Reich, Lee E. Frelich**

# Section S1 – Model outputs showing the effect of fencing and canopy gap treatments on MOSS total earthworm density & biomass

	<b>MOSS Total Earthworm Biomass</b>					
	<b>sumsq</b>	<b>meansq</b>	<b>NumDF</b>	<b>DenDF</b>	<b>F-value</b>	<b>p.value</b>
<b>Fence</b>	0.12	0.12	1	63.00	5.54	<b>0.021</b>
<b>Canopy Gap</b>	0.21	0.21	1	61.28	9.36	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Fence x Canopy Gap</b>	0.06	0.06	1	63.00	2.50	0.120

	<b>MOSS Total Earthworm Density</b>		
	<b><math>\chi^2</math></b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p.value</b>
<b>Intercept</b>	17.90	1.00	<b>2.33E-05</b>
<b>Fence</b>	4.58	1.00	<b>0.03</b>
<b>Canopy Gap</b>	0.33	1.00	0.56
<b>Fence x Canopy Gap</b>	0.50	1.00	0.47

# Section S2 – Model outputs showing the effect of fencing and canopy gap treatments on MOSS genera-specific earthworm biomass

				<b>MOSS <i>Dendrobaena</i> Biomass</b>						
				sumsq	meansq	NumDF	DenDF	F-value	p.value	
<b>MOSS <i>Aporrectodea</i> Biomass</b>										
	$\chi^2$	df	p.value							
Intercept	14.53	1	<b>1.38E-04</b>							
Canopy Gap	0.13	1	0.71							
Fence	4.20	1	<b>0.040</b>							
Canopy Gap x Fence	2.00	1	0.16							
				<b>MOSS <i>Lumbricus</i> Biomass</b>						
				sumsq	meansq	NumDF	DenDF	F-value	p.value	
				Canopy Gap	0.20	0.20	1	61.6	7.85	<b>0.006</b>
				Fence	0.16	0.16	1	63	5.99	<b>0.020</b>
				Canopy Gap x Fence	0.05	0.05	1	63	1.86	0.18

# Section S3 – Model outputs showing the effect of fencing and canopy gap treatments on MOSS genera-specific earthworm density

				<b>Dendrobaena Density</b>			
				$\chi^2$	df	p.value	
	<b>Aporrectodea Density</b>			<b>Intercept</b>	8.83	1	<b>0.003</b>
	$\chi^2$	df	p.value	<b>Canopy Gap</b>	1.42	1	0.23
<b>Intercept</b>	0.12	1	0.73	<b>Fence</b>	1.34	1	0.25
<b>Canopy Gap</b>	0.16	1	0.68	<b>Canopy Gap x Fence</b>	0.68	1	0.41
<b>Fence</b>	4.13	1	<b>0.04</b>				
<b>Canopy Gap x Fence</b>	3.69	1	<b>0.05</b>	<b>Lumbricus Density</b>			
				$\chi^2$	df	p.value	
				<b>Intercept</b>	14.44	1	<b>1.40E-03</b>
				<b>Canopy Gap</b>	4.82	1	<b>0.028</b>
				<b>Fence</b>	2.07	1	0.15
				<b>Canopy Gap x Fence</b>	0.33	1	0.55

# Section S4 – Model outputs showing the effect of year, fencing, and canopy gap location on earthworm density from 2006 to 2019 in the FE

## FE Earthworm Density Over 13 Years Under Canopy Gap

	$\chi^2$	df	p.value
<b>(Intercept)</b>	1216.77	1	<b>2E-16</b>
<b>Year</b>	212.32	1	<b>2E-16</b>
<b>Gap Location</b>	7.32	3	0.06
<b>Year x Gap Location</b>	100.46	3	<b>2E-16</b>

## FE Earthworm Density Over 13 Years In Fence

	$\chi^2$	df	p.value
<b>(Intercept)</b>	175.67	1	<b>2E-16</b>
<b>Year</b>	60.83	1	<b>6.22E-15</b>
<b>Fencing</b>	0.15	1	0.7
<b>Fencing x Year</b>	26.03	1	<b>3.30E-07</b>

# Section S5 –Pairwise comparison of earthworm density in gap location by year

gap location	contrast	FE Pairwise Comparison Earthworm Density By Location & Year				
		estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
<i>location = NG</i>	<i>2006/2019</i>	0.15	0.04	64	-0.60	0.55
<i>location = NB</i>	<i>2006/2019</i>	-0.48	0.03	64	-14.57	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
<i>location = NT</i>	<i>2006/2019</i>	-0.32	0.03	64	-9.87	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
<i>location = ST</i>	<i>2006/2019</i>	-0.29	0.04	64	-6.90	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>

# Section S6 – Model outputs showing the effect of fencing and canopy gap location on 2019 earthworm biomass and density in the FE

## FE Total Biomass

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
<b>Fencing</b>	0.09	0.09	1	8	1.89	0.21
<b>Gap Location</b>	0.27	0.07	4	32	1.34	0.27
<b>Fencing x Gap Location</b>	0.17	0.04	4	32	0.86	0.49

## FE Earthworm Density

	$\chi^2$	df	p.value
<b>(Intercept)</b>	93.6	1.00	<b>2E-16</b>
<b>Fencing</b>	10.6	1.00	<b>0.001</b>
<b>Gap Location</b>	17.3	4.00	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Fencing x Gap Location</b>	11.5	4.00	<b>0.02</b>

# Section S7 – Pairwise analysis of earthworm density in fenced and unfenced canopy gap locations

2019 FE Pairwise Comparison of Earthworm Density by Gap Location

Gap Location	Contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
	(In Fence / Outside Fence)					
<i>Center</i>	<i>in-out</i>	-0.83	0.26	39	-3.26	<b>0.002</b>
<i>North Buffer</i>	<i>in-out</i>	-0.11	0.22	39	-0.47	0.64
<i>North Gap</i>	<i>in-out</i>	-0.04	0.23	39	-0.17	0.86
<i>North Transition</i>	<i>in-out</i>	-0.25	0.23	39	-1.10	0.28
<i>South Transition</i>	<i>in-out</i>	-0.15	0.23	39	-0.67	0.51



# Section S8 – Model outputs showing the effect of fencing and canopy gap treatments on FE genera-specific earthworm density

## FE *Aporrectodea* Density

	$\chi^2$	df	p.value
--	----------	----	---------

<b>(Intercept)</b>	0.20	1	0.66
<b>Fencing</b>	3.98	1	<b>0.046</b>
<b>Gap Location</b>	14.24	4	<b>0.0066</b>
<b>Fencing x Gap Location</b>	6.70	4	0.152

## FE *Lumbricus* Density

	$\chi^2$	df	p.value
--	----------	----	---------

<b>(Intercept)</b>	19.52	1	<b>0.00001</b>
<b>Fencing</b>	9.25	1	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Gap Location</b>	11.94	4	<b>0.02</b>
<b>Fencing x Gap Location</b>	14.98	4	<b>0.005</b>

## FE *Dendrobaena* Density

	$\chi^2$	df	p.value
--	----------	----	---------

<b>(Intercept)</b>	1.14	1	0.29
<b>Fencing</b>	0.24	1	0.62
<b>Gap Location</b>	7.46	4	0.11
<b>Fencing x Gap Location</b>	4.55	4	0.34