**NutNet Biomass Issue log**

Hi Laura,

I attached two excel files. The first is the pared down data I think you need (comp.pt 2015, marc.ar 2011,2012; live, dead, and total biomass for control plots). If it's easier, you can just plug these into your existing file.

The second is the full comb-by-plot file in case you want to do it yourself or I missed something. One thing to note, the biomass columns are different now, basically split into finer categories (vascular\_live\_mass, nonvascular\_live\_mass, litter\_mass, unsorted\_mass, unsorted\_live\_mass). I think they're pretty self-explanatory, but are designed to force users to consider what they're actually dealing with since sites don't always sort to the asked for categories, particularly in COVID years which wouldn't affect your paper.

Let me know if you have questions or need something more!

Peter

----

On Wed, Jul 27, 2022 at 1:36 PM Laura Dee <Laura.Dee@colorado.edu> wrote:

Hi Peter,

Thank you so much for your time and help here. So, in summary - shps.us and kiny.au are OK to use as is. My version of the data isn’t impacted by the Boulder issue.

These are the main issue:

**SO: I think if you replace comp.pt 2015 data and marc.ar 2012 (and maybe 2011) live mass data, you should be in good shape. Would you like me to output the live mass values for those years? Or what's a helpful next step from me?**

Could you send me the link to the most recent version of the data and I'll replace those years and sites? Do I need to act on comp.pt 2012 too do you think?

HUGE THANKS!

From: Peter Wilfahrt <wilf0020@umn.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 2:07 PM

To: Laura Dee <Laura.Dee@colorado.edu>

Subject: Re: Questions related to NutNet Biomass issue

Hey Laura,

Okay, I had a closer look at the sites in question: some good news, some baddish news.

The good news:

shps.us 2016 looks good. The data Peter sent lines up perfectly with the data you have.

kiny.au looks good across all years. EXCEPT our current 2009 data is ten times higher, but this looks like a mistake in Ashley's correction as this puts Kiny biomass in 2009 about ten times higher than all years. So I think your version is correct but I'm going to email John Morgan to confirm.

The baddish news:

As expected, the 2015 comp.pt and 2011, 2012 marc.ar data is out of whack with your data. You can see in the image below that comp.pt 2015 and marc.ar 2012 are very different, while marc.ar 2011 just jitters off the line a bit.

Chart, line chart
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Also of note, I think we mentioned this, but comp.pt 2012 (not pictured) mass included live and litter as they didn't sort in the first year. So your live mass values in comp.pt 2012 contains litter mass too - it looks like litter mass typically maxes out at about 10% of the live\_mass value in later years. Maria Caldeira said she thought litter would be very low in that year as the site was previously grazed.

SO: I think if you replace comp.pt 2015 data and marc.ar 2012 (and maybe 2011) live mass data, you should be in good shape. Would you like me to output the live mass values for those years? Or what's a helpful next step from me?

Let me know if any of this didn't make sense.

Peter