Table S1. Nutrient concentrations in roots of 'Emerald' southern highbush blueberry grown with contrasting fertigation pH and substrate amendments for 77 days.

Treatment	Macronutrient concentrations (%)						Micronutrient concentration (ppm)				
	N	P	K	Ca	Mg	S	Fe	Mn	Zn	Cu	B
$CaCO_3$	1.77	0.21	0.63	0.31	0.24	0.26	283.21	208.75	272.25	29.55	10.20
Calexin	1.82	0.27	0.87	0.27	0.22	0.35	151.75	225.30	292.10	34.50	12.25
P value[z]	0.463	0.053	0.049	0.171	0.377	0.026	0.003	0.508	0.473	0.035	0.027
pH 6.5	1.63	0.24	0.81	0.32	0.23	0.31	253.00	219.10	206.75	27.45	11.10
pH 4.5	1.96	0.23	0.69	0.26	0.22	0.33	180.45	214.95	357.60	36.60	11.35
P value	< 0.001	0.748	0.297	0.045	0.436	0.751	0.088	0.868	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.781

[z] Means followed by the same letter were not significantly different according to Tukey LSD at $\alpha = 0.05$. The interaction of fertigation pH and substate amendment did not affect root nutrient concentrations ($P \geq 0.078$).

Table S2. Nutrient concentrations in leaves of 'Emerald' southern highbush blueberry grown with contrasting fertigation pH and substrate amendments for 77 days.

Amendment	Fertigation pH	Macronutrient concentrations (%)						Micronutrient concentration (ppm)				
		N	P	K	Ca	Mg	S	Fe	Cu	Mn	Zn	B
$CaCO_3$	6.5	1.88 c	0.13 c	0.65 b	0.46 c	0.18 c	0.22 c	55.80 b	3.30 b	145.70 c	32.60 b	67.60 b
	4.5	1.75 d	0.13 c	0.56 b	0.51 bc	0.19 bc	0.25 c	56.40 b	3.70 b	191.90 b	37.10 b	71.70 b
Calexin	6.5	2.00 b	0.15 b	0.92 a	0.53 b	0.20 b	0.46 b	56.70 b	3.40 b	213.80 b	36.60 b	99.40 a
	4.5	2.18 a	0.18 a	0.96 a	0.69 a	0.24 a	0.69 a	69.10 a	5.60 a	306.90 a	48.40 a	115.40 a
Effect[z]												
Amendment		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.080	0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
pH		0.427	0.008	0.517	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.097	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.106
Amendment x pH		< 0.001	0.013	0.075	0.011	0.044	0.009	0.044	0.003	0.073	0.045	0.332

[z] Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA. Means followed by the same letter were not significantly different according to Tukey LSD at $\alpha = 0.0$