

Tables with Captions

Table 1: Fixed effects results for the best fit linear mixed effects model of J_s as a function of soil moisture or VPD, species and season. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Best Fit Model	Explanatory variables	Estimate ($\pm$ s.e.)
$J_s \sim \text{soil moisture} * \text{species} * \text{season} + (1 \text{species/season/individual})$	Int., S1: <i>Cannomois</i>	40.5*** (3.4)
	Slope, S1: <i>Cannomois</i>	4.7*** (0.5)
	Int., S1: <i>Erica</i>	-62.0*** (4.6)
	Slope, S1: <i>Erica</i>	7.2*** (0.6)
	Int., S1: <i>Protea</i>	-15.2** (4.4)
	Slope, S1: <i>Protea</i>	2.8*** (0.6)
	Int., S2: <i>Cannomois</i>	7.6 (6.3)
	Slope, S2: <i>Cannomois</i>	-3.4*** (0.6)
	Int., S2: <i>Erica</i>	20.8** (7.9)
	Slope, S2: <i>Erica</i>	-3.7*** (0.8)
	Int., S2: <i>Protea</i>	-13.8 (8.4)
	Slope, S2: <i>Protea</i>	-0.3 (0.8)
$J_s \sim \text{VPD} * \text{species} * \text{season} + (1 \text{species/season/individual})$	Int., S1: <i>Cannomois</i>	36.6*** (4.2)
	Slope, S1: <i>Cannomois</i>	10.5*** (1.2)
	Int., S1: <i>Erica</i>	-5.0 (5.7)
	Slope, S1: <i>Erica</i>	-7.3*** (1.7)
	Int., S1: <i>Protea</i>	-17.0** (5.6)
	Slope, S1: <i>Protea</i>	-7.5*** (1.7)
	Int., S2: <i>Cannomois</i>	-6.9 (7.4)
	Slope, S2: <i>Cannomois</i>	1.4 (2.2)
	Int., S2: <i>Erica</i>	14.9 (9.3)
	Slope, S2: <i>Erica</i>	3.3 (2.8)
	Int., S2: <i>Protea</i>	-5.4 (9.8)
	Slope, S2: <i>Protea</i>	3.5 (2.9)

Table 2: ANOVA table showing main effects results of the linear model of recovery of total daily J_s or G_{sf} (response variables) as a function of species and season including an interaction. Statistically significant effects are indicated in bold.

Response variable	Explanatory variables	D.F.	Sum Sq.	F	P
Total daily J_s	Species	2	2338	9.7	0.001
	Residuals	18	2169		
G_{sf}	Season	1	4998	22.2	0.0001
	Residuals	19	42710		

Table 3: The minimum shoot or culm xylem water potential (Mean $\pm$ s.e.) recorded for each species at the study site during two seasons. Also shown is the P₅₀ (mean $\pm$ s.e.) for stems or culms of the species and the predicted percentage loss of xylem function based on the xylem vulnerability curves and the minimum xylem water potential for each species in each study season. Numbers in round brackets indicate sample sizes for minimum xylem water potential and vulnerability curves. Letters indicate results of Tukey multiple comparisons of means test.

Species	Growth form	Minimum xylem water potential (MPa)		P ₅₀ (MPa)	Predicted loss of xylem function (%)	
		2012/13	2013/14		2012/13	2013/14
<i>Erica monsoniana</i>	Medium-sized, small leaved woody shrub	-4.0 ± 0.1 (5) ^a	-2.13 ± 0.31 (5) ^b	-5.68 ± 0.78 (3) ^b	7.3	0.5
<i>Protea repens</i>	Large overstory woody shrub	-1.5 ± 0.03 (5) ^{b,c}	-1.42 ± 0.03 (5) ^{b,c}	-3.50 ± 0.06 (4) ^a	0	0
<i>Cannomois congesta</i>	Rhizomatous perennial	-1.9 ± 0.26 (5) ^{b,c}	-1.18 ± 0.25 (5) ^c	-2.30 ± 0.12 (3) ^a	1.8	0

