SUPPLEMENTARY DATA



Figure S1. Canopy architecture of the two pruning systems: both pruning systems (up); a VSP in hand pruning (down left); an unfolded canopy in hedge pruning (down right).

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA
Botelho, M., Ribeiro, H., Cruz, A., Rogado, B., Mourato, C., Borges da Silva, E., … Ricardo da Silva, J. M. Unraveling the impact of the application of Municipal Solid Waste Compost in mechanically pruned vineyards. Effects on vegetative and reproductive growth and grape and wine quality of Sauvignon from Lisbon Wine Region. *OENO One*.
https://oeno-one.eu/article/view/9737

Table S1. Effect of the pruning system and the MSWC doses on the exposed leaf area, the carbon balance, and on photosynthetic active radiation intercepted at vegetative level.

Treatment	ELA (m^2/vine)				Carbon balance				PAR (µmol/m^2/s)			
	2018	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2018**	**2019**	**202**	**2021**
MAN	1.99	2.80	2.33	3.18	1.99	2.80	2.33	3.18	196	212	206	201
MEC	2.20	2.65	2.43	3.54	2.20	2.65	2.43	3.54	497	509	502	503
Sig.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	*	*	*	n.s.	*
M0	2.05	2.90	2.59	3.49	2.05	2.90	2.59	3.49	318	338	321	318
M1	2.13	2.81	2.54	3.24	2.13	2.81	2.54	3.24	328	358	340	343
M2	2.23	2.81	2.19	3.54	2.23	2.81	2.19	3.54	401	365	405	398
M3	1.97	2.37	2.21	3.18	1.97	2.37	2.21	3.18	337	346	351	349
Sig.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s	n.s
Interaction	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s	n.s

*Statistical significance of the effects of pruning system. MSWC doses and their interactions: n.s. = not significant 5 % level by F test; *, **, *** significant at $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.001$ respectively. Within each column and for each factor mean values followed by a different letter are significantly different at $p < 0.05$ by Tukey's test.*

Pruning system: hand pruning (MAN) and mechanical pruning (MEC). Organic amendments: control (M0), 5 t/ha/year of MSWC (M1), 10 t/ha/year of MSWC (M2), 20 t/ha/year of MSWC (M3). ELA: Exposed Leaf Area; PAR: Photosynthetic Active Radiation assessed at vegetative level.

Table S2. Effect of the MSWC doses on soil organic matter content, pH, phosphorus, potassium, calcium, and magnesium content.

Treatment	Organic matter (%)	pH	P (mg/kg)	K (mg/kg)	Ca (mg/kg)	Mg (mg/kg)
M0	1.32 b	8.57	70.5 c	167.8 c	4185.8	120.4 b
M1	1.49 ab	8.58	106.2 c	167.9 bc	4511.4	139.0 ab
M2	1.78 a	8.53	199.1 b	199.7 ab	4089.7	147.7 ab
M3	1.65 b	8.53	253.5 a	227.5 a	3814.6	155.5 a
Sig.	*	n.s.	***	**	n.s.	**

*Statistical significance of the effects of pruning system. MSWC doses and their interactions: n.s. = not significant 5 % level by F test; *, **, *** significant at $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.001$ respectively. Within each column and for each factor mean values followed by a different letter are significantly different at $p < 0.05$ by Tukey's test.*

Organic amendments: control (M0), 5 t/ha/year of MSWC (M1), 10 t/ha/year of MSWC (M2), 20 t/ha/year of MSWC (M3).