

Supplementary Table S1 The material information of Figure 3

Study	Species	a	b	Conduit diameter	Conduit density	Wood density	CV
Alla et al. 2022	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	0.01345	1.603			0.77	
Bush et al. 2010	<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>		1.65	125.67		0.48	
Bush et al. 2010	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>		1.4	178.11		0.69	
Bush et al. 2010	<i>Quercus gambelii</i>		1.88	30.93		0.63	
Bush et al. 2010	<i>Sophora japonica</i>		1.24				
Bush et al. 2010	<i>Tilia cordata</i>	0.0119	1.231	22.10		0.45	
Cabibel et al. 1991	<i>Malus domestica</i> , <i>Quercus sp.</i> , <i>Castanea sativa</i>	0.02272	0.7694	117.11	181.18	0.58	
Fuchs et al. 2017	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i> , <i>Tilia cordata</i> , <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> , <i>Acer campestre</i> , <i>Populus nigra</i>	0.01597	1.329	37.51	400.63	0.55	
Fujime et al. 2021	<i>Cryptomeria japonica</i>	0.00273	0.371	14.92		0.36	
Granier 1985	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> , <i>Pinus nigra</i> , <i>Quercus pedunculata</i>	0.0119	1.231	20.01		0.54	
Gutiérrez and Santiago. 2006	<i>Hyeronima alchorneoides</i>	0.012257	1.231			0.58	
Hadiwijaya et al. Forests	<i>Abies balsamea</i>	0.015276944	1.204	22.05		0.45	-34
Herbst et al. 2007	<i>Crataegus monogina</i>		1.387	17.65	990.59	0.51	
Herbst et al. 2007	<i>Acer campestre</i>			26.82	669.64	0.57	
Hu et al. 2022	<i>Pinus bungeana</i>	0.0264	0.738			0.43	-67
Hu et al. 2022	<i>Salix matsudana</i>	0.0722	1.113				-60
Hubbard et al. 2010	<i>Eucalyptus grandis x urophylla</i>	0.084555556	1.606	181.69			
Hultine et al. 2010	<i>Diorhabda carinulata</i> ,	0.024	1.16	134.52			-50

	<i>Tamarix spp.</i>						
Iida et al. 2022	<i>Cryptomeria japonica</i>	0.044010278	1.449	14.92		0.36	-61.4
Liu et al. 2022	<i>Populus tomentosa</i>	0.0287	1.236			0.45	-60.96
Liu et al. 2022	<i>Salix babylonica</i>	0.0145	0.852			0.46	-63.37
Lu 2002	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	0.01244383			5.00	0.56	
Lu 2002	<i>Garcinia mangostana</i>	0.0165172				0.81	
Ma et al. 2017	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	0.051	1.118	149.36	9.33	0.72	
Niu et al., 2015	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>	0.0134	1.6			0.24	17.3
Ouyang et al., 2018	<i>Cunninghamia lanceolata</i>	0.0253	1.2259	15.43		0.32	-54
Pasqualotto et al., 2019	<i>Corylus avellana</i>	0.0385	1.45	23.31	788.17	0.57	
Paudel et al. 2013	<i>Malus domestica, Peltophorum dubium, Prunus persica</i>	0.0135	1.157	57.17	77.00	0.66	
Peters et al. 2018	<i>Larix decidua, Picea abies</i>	0.007287778		11.80		0.54	-37
Renninger et al., 2010	<i>Iriartea deltoidea</i>	0.01923	1.3			0.29	
Rubilar et al. 2017	<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>	0.038194444	1.245	115.00	10.67	0.74	
Schmidt-walter et al. 2014	<i>Populus sp</i>	0.03521	1.552	52.92	45.00	0.39	
Sérvulo et al. 2017	<i>Khaya ivorensis</i>	0.026825	1.231	136.67	13.00	0.46	
Shinohara et al. 2022	<i>Cryptomeria japonica, Chamaecyparis obtusa</i>	0.01197	0.737			0.43	
Siddiq et al. 2019	<i>Tectona grandis</i>	0.104129	1.127	285.00	7.67	0.60	
Song et al. 2022	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	0.0151	1.128	14.00	3490.76	0.54	
Steppe et al. 2010	<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>	0.023	0.9519	47.99		0.62	-60
Sun et al. 2012	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	0.0124	1.151	34.20	338.38	0.55	-23
Sun et al. 2012	<i>Populus deltoides</i>	0.0121	1.141	117.53	63.00	0.42	-34
Sun et al. 2012	<i>Quercus alba</i>	0.0128	1.47	136.81	269.24	0.65	-15

Sun et al. 2012	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	0.0272	2.572	75.90	160.00	0.49	-9
Sun et al. 2012	<i>Pinus echinata</i>	0.0101	1.303	12.46		0.51	-14
Sun et al. 2012	<i>Pinus taeda</i>	0.0097	1.336	38.50		0.49	55
Vellame et al. 2009	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	0.017	1.231	111.17	5.00	0.56	
Xie et al. 2018	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	0.112	1.68	215.00	7.00	0.72	
Xie et al. 2018	<i>Platanus orientalis</i>	0.02	1.3	57.67	78.00	0.56	
Xie et al. 2018	<i>Quercus variabilis</i>	0.026	1.09	94.33	7.67	0.61	
Xie et al. 2018	<i>Populus tomentosa</i>	0.02	1.29	72.33	28.00	0.45	
Xie et al. 2018	<i>Platycladus orientalis</i>	0.014	1.2	14.67	99.67	0.54	
Xie et al. 2018	<i>Pinus bungeana</i>	0.013	1.2	16.67	294.33	0.43	
Zeng et al. 2021	<i>Toona sinensis</i>	0.05667	1.213			0.45	
Zeng et al. 2021	<i>Populus adenopoda</i>	0.075715	1.865			0.42	
Zeng et al. 2022	<i>Pyrus pyrifolia</i>	0.066745	1.66		191.00		-55.6
Zhang et al. 2017	<i>Bambusa chungii</i>	0.01776	1.2				-36
This study	<i>Paliurus ramosissimus</i>	0.0047	0.5882	30.85	34.47	0.75	86.80589
This study	<i>Pyracantha fortuneana</i>	0.0065	1.4802	14.20	193.26	0.71	113.5268
This study	<i>Triadica sebifera</i>	0.0076	1.6654	42.51	31.92	0.48	51.63288
This study	<i>Xylosma congesta</i>	0.0141	1.5697	12.93	244.20	0.62	20.1423
This study	<i>Sageretia thea</i>	0.0198	1.8844	24.09	41.49	0.67	-21.151
This study	<i>Celtis sinensis</i>	0.03	1.9821	39.70	38.61	0.72	-18.6893
This study	<i>Phanera championii</i>	0.0509	3.0391	56.27	13.03	0.47	-76.9122

References

1. Alla, F.; Jdaini, K.; M'hamdi, H.; Mechchate, H.; AlZain, M.N.; Alzamel, N.M.; Noman, O.; Mimouni, J.; Elhoumaizi, M.A. Calibration of Thermal Dissipation Probes for Date Palm (*Phoenix dactylifera* L.). *Horticulturae* **2022**, *8*, 107. <https://doi.org/10.3390/horticulturae8020107>
2. Bush, S.E.; Hultine, K.R.; Sperry, J.S.; Ehleringer, J.R. Calibration of thermal dissipation sap flow probes for ring-and diffuse-porous trees. *Tree physiol.* **2010**, *30*, 1545-1554. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpq096>
3. Cabibel, B.; Do, F.; Horoyan, J. Mesures thermiques des flux de sève dans les troncs et les racines et fonctionnement hydrique des arbres. I. Analyse théorique des erreurs sur la mesure des flux et validation des mesures en présence de gradients thermiques extérieurs. *Agronomie* **1991**, *11*, 669-678.
4. Fuchs, S.; Leuschner, C.; Link, R.; Coners, H.; Schuldt, B. Calibration and comparison of thermal dissipation, heat ratio and heat field deformation sap flow probes for diffuse-porous trees. *Agr. Forest. Meteorol.* **2017**, *244*, 151-161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.04.003>
5. Fujime, N.; Kumagai, T.; Egusa, T.; Momiyama, H.; Uchiyama, Y. Importance of calibration in determining forest stand transpiration using the thermal dissipation method. *Agr. Forest. Meteorol.* **2021**, *301*, 108356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108356>
6. Granier, A. Une nouvelle méthode pour la mesure du flux de sève brute dans le tronc des arbres. *Annales des Sciences Forestières* **1985**, *42*, 193-200.
7. Gutiérrez, M. V.; Santiago, L. S. A comparison of sap flow measurements and potometry in two tropical lowland tree species with contrasting wood properties. *Revista de biología tropical* **2006**, *54*, 73-81.
8. Hadiwijaya, B.; Pepin, S.; Isabelle, P.-E.; Nadeau, D.F. The Dynamics of Transpiration to Evapotranspiration Ratio under Wet and Dry Canopy Conditions in a Humid Boreal Forest. *Forests* **2020**, *11*, 237. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f11020237>
9. Herbst, M.; Roberts, J. M.; Rosier, P. T. W.; Gowing, D. J.. Seasonal and interannual variability of canopy transpiration of a hedgerow in southern England. *Tree physi.* **2007**, *27*, 321-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/27.3.321>
10. Hu, M.; Ma, C.; Zhang, J.; Ma, Y.; Li, C.; Xiong, W. Calibration of Thermal Dissipation Probes for Xylem Sap Flow in the Wood of a Diffuse-Porous and a Conifer Species under Cyclic Heating. *Forests* **2022**, *13*, 1964. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13111964>
11. Hubbard, R. M.; Stape, J.; Ryan, M. G.; Almeida, A. C.; Rojas, J. Effects of irrigation on water use and water use efficiency in two fast growing *Eucalyptus* plantations. *Forest Ecol. Manag.* **2010**, *259*, 1714-1721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.10.028>
12. Hultine, K.R.; Nagler, P.L.; Morino, K.; Bus, S.E.; Burtch, K.G.; Dennison, P.E.; Glenn, E.P.; Ehleringer, J.R. Sap flux-scaled transpiration by tamarisk (*Tamarix spp.*) before, during and after episodic defoliation by the saltcedar leaf beetle (*Diorhabda carinulata*). *Agr. Forest. Meteorol.* **2010**, *150*, 1467-1475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.07.009>
13. Iida, S.; Takeuchi, S.; Shinozaki, K.; Araki, M. Calibration of sap flow techniques using the root-ball weighing method in Japanese cedar trees. *Trees* **2022**, *36*,

1747-1759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-022-02325-w>

14. Liu Y, Zhang H, Ma C, Liu, B.; Ding, C. Verification of sap flow characteristics and measurement errors of *Populus tomentosa* Carr. and *Salix babylonica* L. based on the liquid level equilibrium method. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2022**, 13, 946804. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.946804>
15. Lu P. Whole-plant water use of some tropical and subtropical tree crops and its application in irrigation management. *Acta Horticulturae* **2002**, 575, 781–789. <https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2002.575.92>
16. Ma, C.; Luo, Y.; Shao, M.; Sun, L.; Jia, X. Environmental controls on sap flow in black locust forest in Loess Plateau, China. *Sci. Rep-Uk.* **2017**, 7, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-13532-8>
17. Niu, F.; Röhl, A.; Hardanto, A.; Mejjide, A.; Köhler, M.; Hendrayanto.; Hölscher, D. Oil palm water use: calibration of a sap flux method and a field measurement scheme. *Tree Physiol.* **2015**, 35, 563-573. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpv013>
18. Ouyang, S.; Xiao, K.; Zhao, Z.; Xiang, W.; Xu, C.; Lei, P.; Deng, X.; Li, J. Stand Transpiration Estimates from Recalibrated Parameters for the Granier Equation in a Chinese Fir (*Cunninghamia lanceolata*) Plantation in Southern China. *Forests* **2018**, 9, 162. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f9040162>
19. Pasqualotto, G.; Carraro, V.; Menardi, R.; Anfodillo, T. Calibration of Granier-Type (TDP) Sap Flow Probes by a High Precision Electronic Potometer. *Sensors* **2019**, 19, 2419. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19102419>
20. Paudel, I.; Kanety, T.; Cohen, S. Inactive xylem can explain differences in calibration factors for thermal dissipation probe sap flow measurements. *Tree Physiol.* **2013**, 33, 986-1001. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpt070>
21. Peters, R.L.; Fonti, P.; Frank, D.; Poyatos, R.; Pappas, C.; Kahmen, A.; Carraro, V.; Prendin, A.L.; Schneider, L.; Baltzer, J.L.; et al. Quantification of uncertainties in conifer sap flow measured with the thermal dissipation method. *New Phytol.* **2018**, 219, 1283–1299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15241>
22. Renninger, H. J.; Phillips, N.; Salvucci, G. D. Wet-vs. dry-season transpiration in an Amazonian rain forest palm *Iriarte deltoidea*. *Biotropica* **2010**, 42, 470-478. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00612.x>
23. Rubilar, R. A.; Hubbard, R. M.; Yañez, M. A.; Medina, A. M.; Valenzuela, H. E. Quantifying differences in thermal dissipation probe calibrations for *Eucalyptus globulus* species and *E. nitens* × *globulus* hybrid. *Trees* **2017**, 31, 1263-1270.
24. Schmidt-Walter, P.; Richter, F.; Herbst, M.; Schuldt, B.; Lamersdorf, N. P. Transpiration and water use strategies of a young and a full-grown short rotation coppice differing in canopy cover and leaf area. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* **2014**, 195, 165-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2014.05.006>
25. Sérvulo, A. C. O.; Vellame, L. M.; Casaroli, D.; Júnior, J. A.; Souza, P. H. African Mahogany transpiration with Granier method and water table lysimeter. *Revista Brasileira de Engenharia Agrícola e Ambiental* **2017**, 21, 322-326. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-1929/agriambi.v21n5p322-326>
26. Shinohara, Y.; Iida, S.; Oda, T.; Katayama, A.; Tsuruta, K.; Sato, T.; Tanaka, N.; Su, M.-P.; Laplace, S.; Kijidani, Y.; et al. Are calibrations of sap flow measurements

based on thermal dissipation needed for each sample in Japanese cedar and cypress trees? *Trees* **2022**, *36*, 1219-1229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-022-02283-3>

27. Siddiq, Z.; Tomlinson, K.W.; Zhu, S.-D.; Cao, K.-F. Does fluctuation of meteorological conditions across years influence stand transpiration of *Tectona grandis* plantation?. *Ecohydrology* **2019**, *12*, e2116. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2116>
28. Song, L.; Zhu, J.; Zheng, X.; Wan, K.; Zhang, J.; Hao, G.; Wang, G.; Liu, J. Comparison of canopy transpiration between *Pinus sylvestris* var. *mongolica* and *Pinus tabuliformis* plantations in a semiarid sandy region of Northeast China. *Agr. Forest. Meteorol.* **2022**, *314*, 108784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108784>
29. Steppe, K.; De Pauw, D.J.; Doody, T.M.; Teskey, R.O. A comparison of sap flux density using thermal dissipation, heat pulse velocity and heat field deformation methods. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **2010**, *150*, 1046–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.04.004>
30. Sun, H.; Aubrey, D.P.; Teskey, R.O. A simple calibration improved the accuracy of the thermal dissipation technique for sap flow measurements in juvenile trees of six species. *Trees* **2012**, *26*, 631-640. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-011-0631-1>
31. Vellame, L. M.; Coelho Filho, M. A.; Paz, V. P. S. Transpiração em mangueira pelo método Granier. *Revista Brasileira de Engenharia Agrícola e Ambiental* **2009**, *13*, 516-523. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-43662009000500002>
32. Zeng, X.; Xu, X.; Zhong, F.; Xu, T.; Luo, W.; Yi, R.; Li, X. Use of gravimetric measurements to calibrate thermal dissipation probes with stem segments. *Hydrol. Process.* **2022**, *36*, e14478. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.14478>
33. Zhang, Z.; Zhou, J.; Zhao, P.; Zhao, X.; Zhu, L.; Ouyang, L.; Ni, G. Validation and in situ application of a modified thermal dissipation probe for evaluating standing water use of a clumped bamboo: *Bambusa chungii*. *Agr. Forest. Meteorol.* **2017**, *239*, 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.02.023>