## Appendix A - Supplementary material



## Initial data set

Initial raw data set of permanent plots located in 39 forest reserves

## Filter 1: Plot size > 0.1 ha

Merged small neighbouring and homogeneous plots and removed small heterogeneous ones

## Filter 2: Extreme biomass values

Exclusion of plots with either too small ( $<100$ $\mathrm{Mg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ ) or to high ( $>1,000 \mathrm{Mg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ ) biomass values due to small plot sizes ( $<0.3 \mathrm{ha}$ )

## Filter 3: High-severity disturbances

Exclusion of plots which experienced highseverity disturbances using two thresholds: 1) Loss of more than $3 \%$ relative annual live biomass or 2 ) change of $>20 \%$ in live biomass between inventories

Figure A1. Flowchart of the three filtering steps followed to select the permanent plots used for this analysis and prepare the NFR dataset. Numbers inside the circles show the number of permanent plots at each step. In total, we excluded 70 plots and used the remaining 224 plots, which were located in 37 reserves.


Figure A2. Pearson correlation matrix for the variables considered in the biomass model. They are time since cessation of management (TSCM), elevation (ele), stand density index in the first inventory (sdi_t1) and tree density (n_ha).

Table A1: The acronyms and meaning of the explanatory variables considered in the biomass change model and used in Figures A2 and A3. More detailed information can be found in Table 2.

|  | Acronyms | Variable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000000000000000000000 | prev_gini | Gini index |
|  | prev_vlt_cat3 | Density of trees with a DBH $>80 \mathrm{~cm}$ |
|  | prev_vlt_cat2 | Density of trees with a DBH $>60 \mathrm{~cm}$ |
|  | prev_vlt_cat1 | Density of trees with a DBH $>40 \mathrm{~cm}$ |
|  | prev_conif | Share of conifers in the total plot biomass |
|  | prev_Ba_ha | Basal area of the plot |
|  | prev_sdi | Stand Density Index |
|  | prev_n_ha | Tree density of the plot |
|  | prev_sp_rich | Richness of species with at least 10 occurrences |
| 00000000000000000000 | prcp_tot_y | Mean annual precipitation |
|  | prcp_tot_gs | Mean growing season precipitation |
|  | WBal_ave_y | Mean annual water balance |
|  | WBal_ave_gs | Mean growing season water balance |
|  | PET_ave_y | Mean annual potential evapotranspiration |
|  | PET_ave_gs | Mean growing season potential evapotranspiration |
|  | DDS_tot_y | Mean annual degree day sum |
|  | DDS_tot_gs | Mean growing season degree day sum |
|  | tave_y | Mean annual temperature |
|  | tave_gs | Mean growing season temperature |
|  | tmax_y | Maximum annual temperature |
|  | tmin_y | Minimum annual temperature |


| beer_asp | Beer's aspect |
| :--- | :--- |
| ele | Elevation |
| slope_deg | Slope in degrees |
| pH | Mean soil pH |
| AWC | Available water capacity |



Figure A3. Pearson correlation matrices for the variables considered in the biomass change model that characterise 1) forest structure, 2) climatic conditions and 3) site conditions. Matrix 1 contains the variables related to the forest structure in the previous inventory. Matrix 2 contains the variables related to the climatic conditions between inventories. Matrix 3 contains the variables related to site conditions.


Figure A4. Pearson correlation matrix for the selected abiotic and biotic variables used in the biomass change model.

Table A2: Coefficients of the biomass model, in which live biomass was the response variable and time since cessation of management (TSCM), elevation (ele), stand density index in the first inventory (SDI) and tree density ( N ) were the explanatory variables. CI represents the $95 \%$ confidence interval, $p$ the significance value and $d f$ the degrees of freedom. The symbol $\sigma$ denotes the standard deviation of the residuals and $\tau$ shows the estimated standard deviation of the random intercept (either for plots nested in reserves as grouping variables or for reserves as grouping variable).

|  | Biomass model |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed effects | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ | $d f$ |
| (Intercept) | -64.90 | $-159.71-29.92$ | 0.179 | 554.33 |
| TSCM [log10] | 165.62 | $114.97-216.27$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 672.67 |
| ele | -0.15 | $-0.23--0.07$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 275.07 |
| SDI | 0.62 | $0.51-0.72$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 643.98 |
| N | -0.14 | $-0.15--0.12$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 446.75 |
| TSCM [log10] $\times$ ele | 0.02 | $-0.02-0.06$ | 0.285 | 382.90 |
| TSCM [log10] $\times$ SDI | -0.08 | $-0.14--0.02$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 7}$ | 676.39 |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma$ | 38.55 |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ plot.reserve | 36.96 |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ reserve | 48.21 |  |  |  |
| Number plots | 34 |  |  |  |
| Number reserves | 37 |  |  |  |
| Observations | 695 |  |  |  |
| Marginal R ${ }^{2} /$ Conditional $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $0.668 / 0.905$ |  |  |  |

Table A3: Coefficients of the alternative model in which we increased the TSCM of Derborence and Scatlè by 2000 years. CI represents the $95 \%$ confidence interval; $p$ shows the significance value and $d f$ the degrees of freedom. The symbol $\sigma$ denotes the standard deviation of the residuals and $\tau$ shows the estimated standard deviation of the random intercept (either for plots nested in reserves as grouping variables or for reserves as grouping variable).

Biomass model alternative I

| Fixed effects | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ | $d f$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | -52.65 | $-141.34-36.05$ | 0.244 | 418.12 |
| TSCM [log10] | 157.36 | $112.61-202.12$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 642.73 |
| ele | -0.08 | $-0.16--0.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 7}$ | 137.28 |
| SDI | 0.54 | $0.45-0.64$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 475.42 |
| N | -0.13 | $-0.15--0.12$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 436.83 |
| TSCM [log10] $\times$ ele | -0.02 | $-0.05-0.02$ | 0.290 | 187.74 |
| TSCM [log10] $\times$ SDI | -0.04 | $-0.09-0.01$ | 0.131 | 535.43 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Random Effects | 39.17 |  |  |  |
| $\sigma$ | 36.63 |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ plotreserve | 50.76 |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ reserve | 34 |  |  |  |
| Number plot | 37 |  |  |  |
| Number reserve | 695 |  |  |  |
| Observations |  |  |  |  |
| Marginal R ${ }^{2} /$ Conditional $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $0.670 / 0.907$ |  |  |  |



Figure A5: Predicted live biomass based on TSCM and elevation for all the plots using the alternative model in which we increased the TSCM of Derborence and Scatlè by 2000 years. The dots represent the observed values corresponding to each plot, and the colour indicates to which elevation class they belong. The dashed line represents predictions for the mean elevation of all plots ( 850 m a.s.l.). These curves were predicted using the mean value of all other variables used in the model. The shaded area shows the $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

Table A4: Coefficients of alternative model in which we exclude plots with a TSCM > 170 years. CI represents the $95 \%$ confidence interval; $p$ shows the significance value and $d f$ the degrees of freedom. The symbol $\sigma$ denotes the standard deviation of the residuals and $\tau$ shows the estimated standard deviation of the random intercept (either for plots nested in reserves as grouping variables or for reserves as grouping variable).

Biomass model alternative II

| Fixed effects | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ | $d f$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | -86.04 | $-182.23-10.15$ | 0.079 | 566.25 |
| TSCM [log10] | 185.28 | $132.25-238.32$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 619.14 |
| ele | -0.17 | $-0.25--0.09$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 333.74 |
| SDI | 0.66 | $0.55-0.77$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 657.05 |
| N | -0.14 | $-0.16--0.12$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 428.55 |
| TSCM [log10] $\times$ ele | 0.04 | $-0.01-0.08$ | 0.087 | 472.48 |
| TSCM [log10] $\times$ SDI | -0.12 | $-0.18--0.06$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 650.76 |
| Random Effects |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma$ | 38.32 |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ plotreserve | 36.20 |  |  |  |
| $\tau_{00}$ reserve | 49.04 |  |  |  |
| Number plot | 34 |  |  |  |
| Number reserve $^{\text {Numbervations }}$ | 35 |  |  |  |
| Observinal ${ }^{2} /$ Conditional $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $0.647 / 0.900$ |  |  |  |



Figure A6: Predicted live biomass based on TSCM and elevation for all the plots using the alternative model in which we excluded plots with a TSCM > 170 years. The dots represent the observed values corresponding to each plot, and the colour indicate to which elevation class they belong. The dashed line represents predictions for the mean elevation of all plots ( 850 m a.s.1.). These curves were predicted using the mean value of all other variables used in the model. The shaded area shows the $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

Table A5: Coefficients of biomass change model. CI represents the $95 \%$ confidence interval; $p$ shows the significance value and $d f$ the degrees of freedom. The symbol $\sigma$ denotes the standard deviation of the residuals and $\tau$ shows the estimated standard deviation of the random intercept (either for plots nested in reserves as grouping variables or for reserves as grouping variable).

|  | Biomass change model |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed effects | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ | $d f$ |
| (Intercept) | 8.42 | $4.68-12.16$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 89.55 |
| DDS tot y [1st degree] | 39.11 | $-9.74-87.96$ | 0.115 | 75.81 |
| DDS tot y [2nd degree] | -56.23 | $-87.61--24.86$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 343.63 |
| prcp tot y | -0.00 | $-0.01--0.00$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 1}$ | 83.17 |
| prev Ba ha [1st degree] | 0.01 | $-5.68-5.70$ | 0.997 | 185.25 |
| prev Ba ha [2nd degree] | 1.02 | $-4.58-6.62$ | 0.720 | 262.03 |
| prev n ha [1st degree] | 13.24 | $6.31-20.18$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 222.12 |
| prev n ha [2nd degree] | -6.66 | $-13.92-0.60$ | 0.072 | 293.78 |
| prev gini | 0.73 | $-2.85-4.30$ | 0.689 | 187.25 |
| slp | -0.03 | $-0.05--0.02$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 145.85 |
| beer asp | -0.02 | $-0.34-0.31$ | 0.923 | 145.41 |
| AWC | -0.00 | $-0.01-0.00$ | 0.183 | 136.12 |
| DDS tot y [1st degree] $\times$ | -0.04 | $-0.08-0.00$ | 0.063 | 111.80 |
| prcp tot y |  |  |  |  |
| DDS tot y [2nd degree] $\times$ | 0.03 | $-0.00-0.05$ | 0.054 | 383.96 |
| prcp tot y |  |  |  |  |
| prev Ba ha [1st degree] $\times$ | 208.15 | $69.72-346.59$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ | 244.23 |
| prev n ha [1st degree] |  |  |  |  |
| prev Ba ha [2nd degree] $\times$ | 36.57 | $-108.90-182.04$ | 0.621 | 311.52 |
| prev n ha [1st degree] |  |  |  |  |


| prev Ba ha [2nd degree] $\times$ <br> prev $n$ ha [2nd degree] | 120.35 | $-96.53-337.22$ | 0.276 | 326.30 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Random Effects

| $\sigma$ | 2.17 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\tau_{00 \text { plotreserve }}$ | 0.40 |
| $\tau_{00 \text { reserve }}$ | 1.33 |
| Number $_{\text {plot }}$ | 34 |
| Number $_{\text {reserve }}$ | 31 |
| Observations | 471 |
| Marginal $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ / Conditional $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $0.276 / 0.485$ |

DHARMa residual


Figure A7: Diagnostic plots of the residuals of the biomass model (Table A2).

DHARMa residual


Figure A8: Diagnostic plots of the residuals of the biomass change model (Table A5).

