# Supporting information 6

## S6 Table. Meta-analysis on distance to water (m). Number of selected and random trees is provided for each dataset with corresponding mean, standard deviation (SD), standardized mean difference (SMD) with 95 % CI, fixed weight (W), and random weight. Fixed effect and random effects SMD with 95 % CI, and prediction intervals are provided at the end of the table. All values are rounded upward to two decimal places.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Selected trees** | **Random trees** |  |   |  |  |
| **Study** | ***N*** | **Mean** | **SD** | ***N*** | **Mean** | **SD** | **SMD** | **95 % CI** | **W(fixed)** | **W(random)** |
| [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 105 | 1407 | 1332 | 119 | 1829 | 1385 | -0.30 | -0.57; -0.05 | 11.50 % | 6.00 % |
| [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 24 | 1205 | 926 | 23 | 1470 | 1352 | -0.20 | -0.80; 0.35 | 2.40 % | 3.80 % |
| [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 42 | 967 | 1056 | 104 | 1883 | 1428 | -0.70 | -1.05; -0.32 | 5.90 % | 5.30 % |
| [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 35 | 1582 | 1935 | 33 | 1551 | 1338 | 0.02 | -0.46; 0.49 | 3.50 % | 4.50 % |
| [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 22 | 1480 | 1599 | 26 | 1766 | 1127 | -0.20 | -0.78; 0.36 | 2.50 % | 3.90 % |
| [[2](#_ENREF_2)] | 25 | 627 | 469 | 314 | 580 | 400 | 0.11 | -0.29; 0.52 | 4.80 % | 5.00 % |
| [[3](#_ENREF_3)] | 40 | 779 | 799 | 40 | 1342 | 663 | -0.80 | -1.21; -0.30 | 3.90 % | 4.60 % |
| [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 8 | 197 | 476 | 157 | 256 | 365 | -0.20 | -0.87; 0.55 | 1.60 % | 3.10 % |
| [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 7 | 177 | 229 | 147 | 244 | 174 | -0.40 | -1.14; 0.38 | 1.40 % | 2.80 % |
| [[5](#_ENREF_5)] | 52 | 1032 | 413 | 61 | 770 | 500 | 0.56 | 0.19; 0.94 | 5.60 % | 5.20 % |
| [[6](#_ENREF_6)]  | 15 | 2283 | 871 | 52 | 1458 | 1262 | 0.69 | 0.10; 1.27 | 2.30 % | 3.70 % |
| [[6](#_ENREF_6)]  | 11 | 2283 | 746 | 52 | 1458 | 1262 | 0.68 | 0.02; 1.35 | 1.80 % | 3.30 % |
| [[7](#_ENREF_7)] | 57 | 127 | 100 | 31 | 121 | 89.1 | 0.06 | -0.38; 0.50 | 4.20 % | 4.80 % |
| [[8](#_ENREF_8)]  | 111 | 333 | 247 | 111 | 429 | 312 | -0.30 | -0.60; -0.07 | 11.40 % | 6.00 % |
| [[8](#_ENREF_8)]  | 57 | 164 | 139 | 57 | 192 | 146 | -0.20 | -0.57; 0.17 | 5.90 % | 5.30 % |
| [[9](#_ENREF_9)] | 33 | 923 | 925 | 66 | 1217 | 780 | -0.40 | -0.77; 0.07 | 4.50 % | 4.90 % |
| [[10](#_ENREF_10)] | 17 | 272 | 288 | 21 | 301 | 206 | -0.10 | -0.76; 0.52 | 2.00 % | 3.40 % |
| [[11](#_ENREF_11)] | 43 | 458 | 315 | 58 | 701 | 350 | -0.70 | -1.13; -0.31 | 4.80 % | 5.00 % |
| [[11](#_ENREF_11)] | 54 | 759 | 353 | 54 | 855 | 558 | -0.20 | -0.58; 0.17 | 5.60 % | 5.20 % |
| [[12](#_ENREF_12)] | 23 | 117 | 131 | 46 | 150 | 130 | -0.20 | -0.75; 0.26 | 3.20 % | 4.30 % |
| [[13](#_ENREF_13)] | 60 | 101 | 139 | 114 | 179 | 139 | -0.60 | -0.88; -0.24 | 7.90 % | 5.60 % |
| [[13](#_ENREF_13)] | 24 | 219 | 137 | 44 | 182 | 133 | 0.27 | -0.23; 0.77 | 3.20 % | 4.30 % |
| **Fixed effect** |  |  |  |  | **-0.20** | **-0.30; -0.12** | **100 %** | **-** |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  | **-0.20** | **-0.33; 0.00** | **-** | **100 %** |
| **Prediction range** |  |  |  |  | **-** | **-0.84; 0.52** |  |  |
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