Results summary

*Bivariate relationship between % foliar and % total soil N*

- 23 sites to compare. 9=herb, 19=woody

-Relationship not significant

*Bivariate relationship between % root and % total soil N*

-22 sites to compare. 9=herb, 18=woody

-Relationship not significant

*Bivariate relationship between % foliar and % inorganic N*

-21 sites to compare. 9=herb,17=woody.

-Relationship not significant

*Bivariate relationship between % root and % inorganic N*

-22 sites to compare. 9=herb,18=woody.

-Relationship is significant:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **rootNPercent** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *CI* | *p* |
| (Intercept) | 0.69 | 0.49 – 0.89 | **<0.001** |
| inorganicN | 0.47 | 0.12 – 0.81 | **0.010** |
| Observations | 27 | | |
| R2 / R2 adjusted | 0.238 / 0.207 | | |

*Mixed effects models of foliar N and inorganic N*

-59 herb observations for 6 herb sites

-235 woody observations for 21 woody sites

-Only significant main effect is inorganic N

-Conditional R-squared=0.68, marginal=0.20

*Mixed effects models of root N and inorganic N*

-28 herb observations for 6 herb sites

-108 woody observations for 22 woody sites

-Only significant effect is inorganic N. Land cover class is slightly significant (0.06)

-conditional R-squared is 0.64, marginal is 0.26

*Bivariate relationship between % litter and inorganic soil N*

-16 sites to compare,14 are woody, 2 are herb

-One outlier removed, and the relationships is significant:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **inorganicN** | | |
| *Predictors* | *Estimates* | *CI* | *p* |
| (Intercept) | 0.06 | -0.13 – 0.25 | 0.506 |
| litterNPercent\_mean | 0.36 | 0.15 – 0.56 | **0.002** |
| Observations | 15 | | |
| R2 / R2 adjusted | 0.530 / 0.494 | | |

*Bivariate relationship between N resportion and inorganic soil N*

-13 sites to compare, 12 are woody 1 is herb

-not significant

Stopped in analysis script on line 356 at mixed effects part for feedback