SUPPLEMENTARY DATA
Baggett, J. P., Habibsadeh, S., Toups, H. S., Cochetel, N., Ghan, R., Robinson, M., Barrios-Masias, F. H., & Cramer, G. R. (2021).
Is foliar Cl- concentration the cause of photosynthetic decline in grapevine during mild salinity? *OENO One, 55*(4)
https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2020.54.1.2458

Supplementary datas

Supplementary Table 1. ANOVA tables from figures.

Figure 1A

Two-way ANOVA	Ordinary				
Alpha	0.05				
Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?	
Interaction	1.171	0.7602	ns	No	
Genotype	19.81	0.001	***	Yes	
Salt	38.72	< 0.0001	****	Yes	
ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	795.9	3	265.3	F (3, 41) = 0.3908	P = 0.7602
Genotype	13468	3	4489	F (3, 41) = 6.613	P = 0.0010
Salt	26318	1	26318	F (1, 41) = 38.77	P < 0.0001
Residual	27832	41	678.8		
Number of missing values	15				

Figure 1B

Three-way ANOVA	Ordinary			
Alpha	0.05			
Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?
Genotype	14.97	<0.0001	****	Yes
Salt	42.38	<0.0001	****	Yes
Time	1.116	0.0083	**	Yes
Genotype x Salt	4.012	<0.0001	****	Yes

Genotype x Time	9.554	<0.0001	****	Yes
Salt x Time	4.162	<0.0001	****	Yes
Genotype x Salt x Time	1.336	0.0393	*	Yes

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Genotype	61212	3	20404	F (3, 144) = 32.00	P<0.0001
Salt	173269	1	173269	F (1, 144) = 271.7	P<0.0001
Time	4564	1	4564	F (1, 144) = 7.157	P=0.0083
Genotype x Salt	16402	3	5467	F (3, 144) = 8.574	P<0.0001
Genotype x Time	39058	3	13019	F (3, 144) = 20.42	P<0.0001
Salt x Time	17016	1	17016	F (1, 144) = 26.68	P<0.0001
Genotype x Salt x Time	5461	3	1820	F (3, 144) = 2.855	P=0.0393
Residual	91823	144	637.7		

Figure 2

Two-way ANOVA	Ordinary
Alpha	0.05

Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?
Interaction	4.656	0.2621	ns	No
Graft Type	33.5	< 0.0001	****	Yes
Year	14.83	< 0.0001	****	Yes

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	3742	10	374.2	F (10, 124) = 1.257	P = 0.2621

Graft Type	26926	5	5385	F (5, 124) = 18.09	P < 0.0001
Year	11916	2	5958	F (2, 124) = 20.02	P < 0.0001
Residual	36908	124	297.6		
Number of missing values	74				

Figure 3A

Three-way RM ANOVA

Effect	**DFn**	**DFd**	**F**	**p**	**p<.05**	**ges**
Genotype	3	12	13.881	0.00033	*	0.612
Salt	1	4	8.57	0.043	*	0.12
Time	7	28	7.918	0.0000266	*	0.025
Genotype:Salt	3	12	1.398	0.291		0.06
Genotype:Time	21	84	4.363	0.000000636	*	0.073
Salt:Time	7	28	1.141	0.367		0.006
Genotype:Salt:Time	21	84	0.911	0.578		0.014

Genotype	**Effect**	**DFn**	**DFd**	**F**	**p**	**p<.05**	**ges**
CS	Salt	1	4	9.044	0.04	*	0.448
CS	time	7	28	4.505	0.002	*	0.087
CS	Salt:time	7	28	0.594	0.755		0.015
RA	Salt	1	4	0.031	0.87		0.003
RA	time	7	28	5.34	0.000578	*	0.134
RA	Salt:time	7	28	0.904	0.517		0.021
RI	Salt	1	4	3.655	0.128		0.123
RI	time	7	28	2.71	0.028	*	0.024
RI	Salt:time	7	28	1.183	0.344		0.019
SC	Salt	1	4	4.625	0.098		0.158
SC	time	7	28	6.357	0.000159	*	0.339
SC	Salt:time	7	28	1.121	0.378		0.036

Figure 3B

Two-way ANOVA	Ordinary			
Alpha	0.05			
Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?
Interaction	0.8165	0.7607	ns	No

Salt	5.958	0.0063	**	Yes	
Genotype	70.92	< 0.0001	****	Yes	
ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	32.31	3	10.77	F (3, 32) = 0.3904	P = 0.7607
Salt	235.8	1	235.8	F (1, 32) = 8.547	P = 0.0063
Genotype	2806	3	935.4	F (3, 32) = 33.91	P < 0.0001
Residual	882.7	32	27.59		
Number of missing values	0				

Figure 4A

Two-way RM ANOVA	Matching: Stacked				
Alpha	0.05				
Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?	
Interaction	7.834	0.0032	**	Yes	
Time	21.09	< 0.0001	****	Yes	
Salt	22.44	0.2732	ns	No	
Subjects (matching)	38.37	< 0.0001	****	Yes	
ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	52.24	36	1.451	F (36, 96) = 2.036	P = 0.0032
Time	140.7	12	11.72	F (12, 96) = 16.45	P < 0.0001
Salt	149.6	3	49.88	F (3, 8) = 1.559	P = 0.2732
Subjects (matching)	255.9	8	31.99	F (8, 96) = 44.88	P < 0.0001
Residual	68.42	96	0.7127		

Number of missing values	0

Supplementary Figure 2A

Three-way RM ANOVA

Effect	DFn	DFd	F	p	p<.05	ges
Genotype	3	12	14.679	0.000256	*	0.569
Salt	1	4	6.087	0.069		0.067
Time	7	28	13.606	0.000000159	*	0.063
Genotype:Salt	3	12	0.327	0.806		0.011
Genotype:Time	21	84	2.311	0.004	*	0.07
Salt:Time	7	28	0.725	0.652		0.008
Genotype:Salt:Time	21	84	0.562	0.932		0.015

Genotype	Effect	DFn	DFd	F	p	p<.05	ges
CS	Salt	1	4	11.611	0.027	*	0.41
CS	time	7	28	1.21	0.33		0.029
CS	Salt:time	7	28	0.724	0.653		0.024
RA	Salt	1	4	0.194	0.683		0.012
RA	time	7	28	2.991	0.018	*	0.15
RA	Salt:time	7	28	0.756	0.628		0.021
RI	Salt	1	4	1.329	0.313		0.046
RI	time	7	28	2.61	0.033	*	0.039
RI	Salt:time	7	28	0.885	0.531		0.021
SC	Salt	1	4	2.62	0.181		0.087
SC	time	7	28	6.126	0.00021	*	0.321
SC	Salt:time	7	28	0.286	0.954		0.028

Supplementary Figure 2B

Three-way RM ANOVA

Effect	DFn	DFd	F	p	p<.05	ges
Genotype	3	6	2.676	0.141		0.178
Salt	1	2	0.165	0.724		0.004
Time	7	14	13.756	0.0000268	*	0.208
Genotype:Salt	3	6	0.223	0.877		0.04
Genotype:Time	21	42	1.989	0.029	*	0.048
Salt:Time	7	14	0.172	0.987		0.005
Genotype:Salt:Time	21	42	0.469	0.968		0.017

Genotype	Effect	DFn	DFd	F	p	p<.05	ges
CS	Salt	1	4	0.902	0.396		0.025
CS	time	7	28	8.828	0.00001 03	*	0.331
CS	Salt:time	7	28	0.554	0.786		0.021
RA	Salt	1	4	0.000237	0.988		0.000008 44
RA	time	7	28	11.929	6.02E-07	*	0.184
RA	Salt:time	7	28	1.365	0.259		0.009
RI	Salt	1	4	0.502	0.518		0.052
RI	time	7	28	7.086	0.00006 73	*	0.15
RI	Salt:time	7	28	0.258	0.965		0.014
SC	Salt	1	2	0.09	0.793		0.009
SC	time	7	14	6.86	0.001	*	0.157
SC	Salt:time	7	14	0.506	0.815		0.01

Supplementary Figure 2D

Two-way ANOVA	Ordinary
Alpha	0.05

Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?
Interaction	36.84	0.0069	**	Yes
Salt	9.474	0.0499	*	Yes
Genotype	20	0.0532	ns	No

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	0.000146	3	4.9E-05	F (3, 16) = 5.833	P = 0.0069
Salt	3.75E-05	1	3.8E-05	F (1, 16) = 4.500	P = 0.0499
Genotype	7.92E-05	3	2.6E-05	F (3, 16) = 3.167	P = 0.0532
Residual	0.000133	16	8.3E-06		

Number of missing values	0

Supplementary Figure 3A

Two-way RM ANOVA	Matching: Stacked
Alpha	0.05

Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?
Interaction	6.579	0.0309	*	Yes
Time	17.78	< 0.0001	****	Yes
Salt	20.11	0.371	ns	No
Subjects (matching)	44.79	< 0.0001	****	Yes

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	0.03373	36	0.00094	F (36, 96) = 1.632	P = 0.0309
Time	0.09117	12	0.0076	F (12, 96) = 13.23	P < 0.0001
Salt	0.1031	3	0.03436	F (3, 8) = 1.197	P = 0.3710
Subjects (matching)	0.2296	8	0.02871	F (8, 96) = 50.01	P < 0.0001
Residual	0.05511	96	0.00057		

Number of missing values	0

Supplementary Figure 3B

Two-way RM ANOVA	Matching: Stacked
Alpha	0.05

Source of Variation	% of total variation	P value	P value summary	Significant?
Interaction	1.514	0.8795	ns	No
Time	0.89	0.3977	ns	No
Salt	57.95	0.0358	*	Yes
Subjects (matching)	32.95	< 0.0001	****	Yes

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Interaction	120.4	18	6.686	F (18, 48) = 0.6028	P = 0.8795

Time	70.74	6	11.79	F (6, 48) = 1.063	P = 0.3977
Salt	4606	3	1535	F (3, 8) = 4.690	P = 0.0358
Subjects (matching)	2619	8	327.4	F (8, 48) = 29.52	P < 0.0001
Residual	532.4	48	11.09		
Number of missing values	0				

Supplementary Figure 4A

ANOVA summary	
F	7.167
P value	0.0118
P value summary	*
Are differences among means statistically significant? (P < 0.05)	Yes
R square	0.7288
Brown-Forsythe test	
F (DFn, DFd)	0.6667 (3, 8)
P value	0.5957
P value summary	ns
Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)	No
Bartlett's test	
Bartlett's statistic (corrected)	
P value	
P value summary	

Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)					
ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Salt (between columns)	0.000358	3	0.00012	F (3, 8) = 7.167	P = 0.0118
Residual (within columns)	0.000133	8	1.7E-05		
Total	0.000492	11			
Data summary					
Number of Salts (columns)	4				
Number of values (total)	12				

Supplementary Figure 4B

ANOVA summary	
F	22.71
P value	0.0003
P value summary	***
Are differences among means statistically significant? (P < 0.05)	Yes
R square	0.8949
Brown-Forsythe test	
F (DFn, DFd)	0.7542 (3, 8)
P value	0.5502
P value summary	ns
Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)	No

Bartlett's test					
Bartlett's statistic (corrected)					
P value					
P value summary					
Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)					
ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Salt (between columns)	3.807	3	1.269	F (3, 8) = 22.71	P = 0.0003
Residual (within columns)	0.4469	8	0.05587		
Total	4.254	11			
Data summary					
Number of Salts (columns)	4				
Number of values (total)	12				

Supplementary Figure 4C

ANOVA summary	
F	7.834
P value	0.0091
P value summary	**
Are differences among means statistically significant? (P < 0.05)	Yes
R square	0.746
Brown-Forsythe test	
F (DFn, DFd)	1.711 (3, 8)
P value	0.2416
P value summary	ns

Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)	No
Bartlett's test	
Bartlett's statistic (corrected)	
P value	
P value summary	
Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)	

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Salt (between columns)	79857	3	26619	F (3, 8) = 7.834	P = 0.0091
Residual (within columns)	27184	8	3398		
Total	107040	11			

Data summary	
Number of Salts (columns)	4
Number of values (total)	12

Supplementary Figure 4D

ANOVA summary	
F	3.787
P value	0.0586
P value summary	ns
Are differences among means statistically significant? (P < 0.05)	No
R square	0.5868

Brown-Forsythe test	
F (DFn, DFd)	1.805 (3, 8)
P value	0.2241
P value summary	ns
Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)	No
Bartlett's test	
Bartlett's statistic (corrected)	
P value	
P value summary	
Significantly different standard deviations? (P < 0.05)	

ANOVA table	SS	DF	MS	F (DFn, DFd)	P value
Salt (between columns)	4209	3	1403	F (3, 8) = 3.787	P = 0.0586
Residual (within columns)	2964	8	370.5		
Total	7173	11			

Data summary	
Number of Salts (columns)	4
Number of values (total)	12

The ANOVA tables from figures using this method of statistical analysis. Each figure's ANOVA table is presented separately and in order of presentation in the manuscript.

Supplementary Table 2. Statistical tests and results of figures.

Figure	Comparison					
Figure 1A	**Data**	**Control (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		ns	ns	ns
		RA			ns	ns
		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Salt (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		*	ns	*
		RA			ns	ns
		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control vs. Salt (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	**			
		RA		*		
		RI			**	
		SC				ns
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Sidak's post hoc				
Figure 1B	**Data**	**Control Week 1 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		ns	**	ns
		RA			****	ns
		RI				***
		SC				
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control Week 2 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		**	ns	**
		RA			ns	ns
		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control Week 1 vs. Week 2 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC

		CS	ns			
		RA		ns		
		RI			ns	
		SC				ns
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Salt Week 1 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		ns	**	ns
		RA			***	ns
		RI				****
		SC				
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Salt Week 2 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		ns	****	****
		RA			ns	***
		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Salt Week 1 vs. Week 2 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	****			
		RA		**		
		RI			ns	
		SC				ns
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control vs. Salt Week 1 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	**			
		RA		****		
		RI			**	
		SC				ns
	Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control vs. Salt Week 2 (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	****			
		RA		****		
		RI			**	
		SC				****

Figure 2

Test	Three-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2017 (SY Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	SY	RA	RI
	SY		**	ns
	RA			ns
	RI			
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2018 (SY Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	SY	RA	RI
	SY		****	***
	RA			ns
	RI			
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2019 (SY Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	SY	RA	RI
	SY		***	**
	RA			ns
	RI			
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2017 (CO Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	CO	RA	RI
	CO		**	ns
	RA			ns
	RI			
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2018 (CO Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	CO	RA	RI
	CO		ns	ns
	RA			ns
	RI			
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2019 (CO Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	CO	RA	RI
	CO		ns	ns
	RA			ns
	RI			

Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2017 vs. 2018 (SY Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	SY	RA	RI
	SY	ns		
	RA		ns	
	RI			*
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2017 vs. 2019 (SY Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	SY	RA	RI
	SY	ns		
	RA		ns	
	RI			*
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2018 vs. 2019 (SY Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	SY	RA	RI
	SY	ns		
	RA		ns	
	RI			ns
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2017 vs. 2018 (CO Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	CO	RA	RI
	CO	**		
	RA		ns	
	RI			**
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2017 vs. 2019 (CO Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	CO	RA	RI
	CO	***		
	RA		ns	
	RI			**
Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc			
Data	**2018 vs. 2019 (CO Scion)**			
Results	Rootstock	CO	RA	RI
	CO	ns		
	RA		ns	

		RI				ns
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
Figure 3A	**Data**	**Control vs. Salt (Photosynthesis)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	*			
		RA		ns		
		RI			ns	
		SC				ns
	Test	Two-way ANOVA simple main effect comparison following repeated measures three-way ANOVA (day 2-16)				
Figure 3B	**Data**	**Control (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		***	***	****
		RA			ns	ns
		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Salt (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		****	****	****
		RA			ns	ns
		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control vs. Salt (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	ns			
		RA		ns		
		RI			ns	
		SC				ns
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Sidak's post hoc				
Figure 4A	**Data**	**Control vs. Treatment (Photosynthesis)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		*	*	**
		NaCl			ns	ns
		KCl				ns
		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	Repeated measures two-way ANOVA multiple comparisons with a Tukey's post hoc test (day 2-26) and displayed as final day (26) significance against control				

Figure 4B

Data	**Treatment vs. Treatment (Lateral Shoot Length)**				
Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
	Control (Y = 30.51*X + 241.8, r^2=0.6899)		*	ns	****
	NaCl (Y = 23.22*X + 280.6, r^2= 0.763)			*	****
	KCl (Y = 28.93*X + 301.5, r^2= 0.8373)				****
	$NaNO_3$ (Y = 12.57*X + 234.7, r^2= 0.5808)				
Test	Linear regression comparing slopes (day -3-27)				

Supplementary Figure 2A

Data	**Control vs. Salt (Stomatal Conductance)**				
Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
	CS	*			
	RA		ns		
	RI			ns	
	SC				ns
Test	Two-way ANOVA simple main effect comparison following repeated measures three-way ANOVA (day 2-16)				

Supplementary Figure 2B

Data	**Control vs. Salt (Growth Rate)**				
Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
	CS	ns			
	RA		ns		
	RI			ns	
	SC				ns
Test	Two-way ANOVA simple main effect comparison following repeated measures three-way ANOVA (day 1-15)				

Supplementary Figure 2C

Data	**Control vs. Salt (Lateral Shoot Length)**				
Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
	CS (Control: Y = 56.26*X + 231.2, r^2= 0.7675) (Salt: Y = 52.31*X + 285.1, r^2= 0.7383)	ns			
	RA (Control: Y = 45.26*X + 191.7, r^2= 0.5301) (Salt: Y = 45.94*X + 176.0, r^2=0.607)		ns		
	RI (Control: Y = 57.86*X + 218.5, r^2= 0.6479) (Salt: Y = 49.88*X + 198.4, r^2= 0.6665)			ns	
	SC (Control: Y = 34.94*X + 226.7, r^2= 0.7929) (Salt: Y = 34.07*X + 208.8, r^2= 0.5653)				ns
Test	Linear regression comparing slopes (day -3-15)				

Supplementary Figure 2D

Data	**Control (Na^+)**				
Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
	CS		ns	ns	ns
	RA			ns	ns

		RI				ns
		SC				
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Salt (Na^+)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS		ns	ns	**
		RA			ns	ns
		RI				**
		SC				
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Tukey's post hoc				
	Data	**Control vs. Salt (Na^+)**				
	Results	Genotype	CS	RA	RI	SC
		CS	ns			
		RA		ns		
		RI			ns	
		SC				**
	Test	Two-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Sidak's post hoc				
Supplementary Figure 3A	**Data**	**Control vs. Salt (Stomatal Conductance)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		ns	ns	
		NaCl			ns	ns
		KCl				ns
		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	Repeated measures two-way ANOVA multiple comparisons with Tukey's post hoc (day 2-26) and displayed as final day (26) significance				
Supplementary Figure 3B	**Data**	**Control vs. Salt (Growth Rate)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		ns	ns	*
		NaCl			ns	ns
		KCl				ns
		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	Repeated measures two-way ANOVA multiple comparisons with Tukey's post hoc (day 15-27) displayed as significance against control treatment on final day (27)				
Supplementary Figure 4A	**Data**	**Control vs. Treatment (Na^+)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		ns	ns	*
		NaCl			ns	ns
		KCl				*

		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	One-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Tukey's post hoc				
Supplementary Figure 4B	**Data**	**Control vs. Treatment (K^+)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		ns	***	*
		NaCl			***	ns
		KCl				*
		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	One-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Tukey's post hoc				
Supplementary Figure 4C	**Data**	**Control vs. Treatment (Cl^-)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		ns	**	ns
		NaCl			ns	ns
		KCl				*
		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	One-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Tukey's post hoc				
Supplementary Figure 4D	**Data**	**Control vs. Treatment (NO_3^-)**				
	Results	Treatment	Control	NaCl	KCl	$NaNO_3$
		Control		ns	ns	ns
		NaCl			ns	ns
		KCl				ns
		$NaNO_3$				
	Test	One-way ANOVA with multiple comparison and Tukey's post hoc				


All results from statistical tests for each figure are presented. Statistical test run and post hoc analysis are presented below the results of the test by genotype, treatment, or timepoint.

Supplementary Table 3. Soil analysis of field site location.

Sample	SAR	ESP	Na meq • L^{-1}	Ca meq • L^{-1}	Mg meq • L^{-1}	pH	CO_3 meq • L^{-1}	HCO_3 meq • L^{-1}	E.C. dS • m^{-1}	Cl meq • L^{-1}	B ppm	Saturation %
Las Vegas Field Site Side 1	2.9	2.9	17.3	38.8	33.6	7.4	0	4.5	7.7	19.5	0.7	54.8
Las Vegas Field Site Side 2	8.7	10.4	51	28.4	40.6	7.8	0	5.2	11.4	26.3	0.6	43
Las Vegas Field Site Side 3	1.7	1.2	8.6	29.2	24.3	7.4	0	5.1	5.3	7.5	0.7	46.9
Las Vegas Field Site Side 4	1.7	1.2	7.3	20	16.4	7.7	0	4.2	3.5	3.2	1.2	54.1
Average	3.8	3.9	21.1	29.1	28.7	7.6	0.0	4.8	7.0	14.1	0.8	49.7


Data presented from soil salinity analysis of four samplings taken from the four sides of an “L” shaped vineyard. Each sample is comprised of ten sub-samplings taken from even spacings throughout a single side of the vineyard.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA
Baggett, J. P., Habibsadeh, S., Toups, H. S., Cochetel, N., Ghan, R., Robinson, M., Barrios-Masias, F. H., & Cramer, G. R. (2021).
Is foliar Cl- concentration the cause of photosynthetic decline in grapevine during mild salinity? *OENO One, 55*(4)
https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2020.54.1.2458




Supplementary Figure 1. PCA and Venn diagrams of DEGs from the transcriptomic analysis.

Principal component analysis (PCA) and differential expression analysis (DEA) of salinity treatment transcriptomic data set. PCA **A**), **B**), **E**), and **F**) and DEA Venn diagrams **C**), **D**), **G**), and **H**) of root tissue and leaf tissue. Collections were performed after one **A**), **B**), **C**), and **D**) and two weeks **E**), **F**), **G**), and **H**) for control (circles) and salt-treated (triangles) individual small potted vines. *n*=2-5




Supplementary Figure 2. Physiology and foliar ionic concentration data from big pot photosynthesis experiment.

Data presented are: **A**) stomatal conductance, **B**) growth rate, **C**) lateral shoot length, and **D**) foliar Na^+ concentration. **A-C**) The solid lines correspond to the control treatment (Cramer's solution) and the dash to the salinity treatment (Cramer's solution + 20 mM NaCl). **A-C**) Day 0 is when treatment was started, prior to day 0 all groups were irrigated with Cramer's solution. Significance calculated by **A** and **B**) three-way ANOVA using repeated measures multiple comparisons followed by a simple main effect comparison **A**) days 2-16 or **B**) days 1-15 and displayed as significance between salt and control treatment in respective genotype, **C**) slopes determined by linear regression from day -3-15 or **D**) two-way ANOVA multiple comparisons with a Tukey's post hoc test displayed **C** and **D**) using letters identifying significant differences of $P \leq 0.05$ within respective figure. Data are means ± SE, **A**) n=5, **B** and **C**) n= 4-5 **D**) n=3 from individual big potted vines.



Supplementary Figure 3. Stomatal conductance and lateral shoot growth rate during multiple salt (NaCl, KCl, and $NaNO_3$) photosynthesis experiment. A) Stomatal conductance and **B**) lateral shoot growth rates were measured alternatively every other day of treatment. Day 0 is when treatment was started, prior to day 0 all groups were irrigated with Cramer's solution. Significance calculated by two-way ANOVA using repeat measures multiple comparisons with a Tukey's post hoc test from **A**) days 2-26 and displayed as final day (26) significance or **B**) days 15-27 and displayed as significance on final day (27). Significance displayed using letters denoting $P \leq 0.05$ within respective figure. Data are means ± SE, *n*=3 individual small potted vines.



Supplementary Figure 4. Foliar ionic concentrations from endpoint harvest of multiple salt (NaCl, KCl, and $NaNO_3$) photosynthesis experiment.

Foliar **A**) Na^+, **B**) K^+, **C**) Cl^-, and **D**) NO_3^- were quantified at the conclusion of the experiment. Significance calculated by one-way ANOVA multiple comparisons with a Tukey's post hoc test and presented as significance within respective figure using letters denoting $P \leq 0.05$. Data are means ± SE, n=3 individual small potted vines.