

1

2 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

3 The following is a further continuation of the model description
4 presented in the article *The Mycorrhizal Tragedy of the Commons*.

5

6

7 Data, parameter estimation, and model testing

8

9 Competition for N among individual plants

10 Relative difference in N uptake among individual plants in each pot was assumed to be
11 proportional to the relative differences in their measured ¹⁵N values, i.e.

$$12 \dot{N}_{pi} / \overline{\dot{N}_p} = {}^{15}N_{pi} / \text{mean pot } {}^{15}N_{pi} . \quad (5)$$

13

14 C supply to fungi from an individual plant (\dot{C}_{si}) was assumed to be proportional to its root
15 mass (C_{ri}) (Rouhier & Read 1998; Neumann & Matzner 2013) and further reduced by
16 strangling by a factor e_{st} :

17

$$18 \dot{C}_{si} \propto C_{ri} \cdot (1 - e_{st}) \quad (6)$$

19

20 The strangling effect e_{st} and the discrimination parameters d and z (eq. 4) were estimated by
21 inserting eq. 6 in eq. 5 and fitting to measured seedling ¹⁵N uptake using the NLS function in
22 the R software (Table 1). z was estimated to 1.038, and did not significantly differ from 1.

23 Because including z did not increase the $r^2 = 0.58$ for modelled versus measured N
24 competition effect (lhs versus rhs of eq. 4; Fig. 1), z was removed from the model. We also
25 tested a model for \dot{C}_{si} including shading effect but this effect was small and insignificant and
26 was thus excluded from the further analysis.

27

28 Table 1

Parameter	Estimated value	Std. error	t value	P value
-----------	-----------------	------------	---------	---------

e_{st}	0.551	0.0483	11.41	<2e-16
d	0.945	0.0653	14.47	<2e-16

29

30 Stand level C-N exchange

31 We used measured ^{15}N in plant biomass ($^{15}\text{N}_p$) to estimate the “measured” plant N uptake
 32 rate in whole pots (\dot{N}_p) during the experiment based on the assumption that the differences
 33 in $^{15}\text{N}_p$ relative to the control plots reflect differences in N uptake rate: $\dot{N}_p = \dot{N}_p \cdot (N_{up}/$
 34 $^{15}\text{N}_{p_{control}}$, where N uptake in control plants, $N_{up} = (N_{p_{harvest}} - N_{p_{planting}})/\text{experiment duration}$.

35 We assume that \dot{N}_p depends on pot \dot{C}_s according to eq. 3. The effect of strangling on
 36 individual plants (e_{st}) was used to estimate the total strangling effect at the pot level based
 37 on the fraction of root biomass (C_r) in the pot belonging to strangled plants (f_{stR}). We
 38 assumed that there was an additional shading effect (e_{sh}) on \dot{C}_s in shaded pots and an
 39 additional baseline C flux, \dot{C}_{s0} , in all pots, representing C gained or lost by the fungi due to
 40 factors not included in the model, such as plant C export captured by other microbes.

41

$$42 \quad \dot{C}_s = C_r \cdot (1 - e_{st} \cdot f_{stR}) (1 - e_{sh}) + \dot{C}_{s0} \quad (7)$$

43

44 \dot{C}_s (eq. 7) was inserted in the equation for \dot{N}_p (eq. 3) and the unknown parameters, e_{sh} , N_a ,
 45 \dot{C}_{s0} , I_f and C_{fh} were estimated by fitting modeled \dot{N}_p to the estimated \dot{N}_p based on ^{15}N in
 46 plant biomass (Table 2). The parameter e_{sh} was subsequently excluded from the model
 47 because it was small and not significant, and excluding it did not reduce the $r^2 = 0.25$ of
 48 modeled versus measured \dot{N}_p .

49

50 **Table 2**

Parameter	Estimated value	Std. error	t value	P value
N_a	6.97e-4	1.84e-4	3.786	5.6e-4
C_{fh}	0.052	0.0583	0.891	0.379
I_f	2.74e-4	1.66e-4	1.645	0.109
\dot{C}_{s0}	-0.174	0.0359	-4.849	2.38e-5

51

52 While we did not have direct measurements of fungal growth or C supply to mycorrhizal
 53 fungi (\dot{C}_s) to test eq. 7, we used pot respiration measurement to derive indirect estimates of

54 \dot{C}_s based on a C budget method. This analysis showed a strong relationship between \dot{C}_s (eq.
55 7) and estimated mycorrhizal respiration, explaining 39% of its variation among pots
56 (Supplementary information).

57

58

59 **Testing modeled C export to mycorrhiza against respiration measurements**

60 While we did not have direct measurements of mycorrhizal fungi C to test against our model
61 results, as an indirect test we compared measured respiration with modeled respiration,
62 based on a C budget approach.

63

64 To measure dark respiration, pots were enclosed in a sealed black chamber (chamber
65 volume = 22 liters) containing axial fans and an infrared gas analyzer, IRGA (Vaisala
66 CARBOCAP[®], Vaisala Oyj, Helsinki, Finland), for 15 minutes. Throughout incubation, internal
67 chamber CO₂ concentration was logged every minute. The respiration measurements were
68 repeated on three occasions (pre-treatment, 1 week after treatment, and 3 weeks after
69 treatment, fig. S1, S2).

70

71 We assumed that three sources contributed to the total respiration measured in each pot
72 (R_{tot}): autotrophic respiration by the plants (R_a), heterotrophic respiration from the added pot
73 soil independent of the plants and mycorrhiza (R_s), and respiration by mycorrhiza fungi
74 fueled by the plants (R_f). $R_{tot} = R_a + R_s + R_f$. R_a was assumed proportional to measured plant
75 growth rate (G) based on plant biomasses at the start and end of the experiment and a
76 factor 0.7 based on a reasonable value of C use efficiency for plant seedlings (Manzoni *et al.*
77 2018), i.e. $R_a = 0.7 \cdot G$. R_s was assumed equal for all pots and to decline exponentially with
78 time (t) as substrate is consumed $R_s = R_{s0} \cdot e^{-r_s t}$. Respiration by mycorrhizal fungi was
79 assumed to be proportional to our previous estimates of C export to mycorrhiza for each pot
80 (\dot{C}_s , eq. s8), i.e. $R_f = r_f \dot{C}_s$. The full model is:

81

$$82 \quad R_{tot} = R_{s0} \cdot e^{-r_s t} + 0.7 \cdot G + r_f \dot{C}_s \quad (s1)$$

83

84 The parameters of the model (eq. s1) were determined by fitting the model to measured
 85 values of pot respiration (R_{tot}) measured twice, once before and once during the treatments,
 86 using the NLS function in the R Software (Table S1, Fig. S4). Based on the results we
 87 calculated the contributions of each source to total respiration, which were $R_f = 31\%$, $R_a =$
 88 36% , $R_s = 33\%$ during the treatment period. Compared to a null-model with a common mean
 89 R_f for all pots, our model improved r^2 for modeled versus measured R_{tot} from 0.48 to 0.60, i.e.
 90 by 12%. Given that R_f contributed 31% of R_{tot} this suggest that our model of C export to
 91 mycorrhizal fungi (\dot{C}_s , eq. 7) explains $12/31 = 39\%$ of the variation in R_f among pots.

92

93 **Table S1**

Parameter	Estimated value	Std. error	t value	P value
R_{s0}	0.32	0.17	1.797	0.076
r_s	0.029	0.076	3.84	2.5e-4
r_f	0.0074	0.0021	3.53	7.1e-4

94

95

96

97

- 98 Manzoni, S., Čapek, P., Porada, P., Thurner, M., Winterdahl, M., Beer, C., *et al.* (2018).
 99 Reviews and syntheses: Carbon use efficiency from organisms to ecosystems –
 100 definitions, theories, and empirical evidence. *Biogeosciences*, 15, 5929–5949.
 101 Neumann, J. & Matzner, E. (2013). Biomass of extramatrical ectomycorrhizal mycelium and
 102 fine roots in a young Norway spruce stand — a study using ingrowth bags with
 103 different substrates. *Plant and Soil*, 371, 435–446.
 104 Rouhier, H. & Read, D.J. (1998). Plant and fungal responses to elevated atmospheric carbon
 105 dioxide in mycorrhizal seedlings of *Pinus sylvestris*, 10.
 106