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Google Earth Engine code used to retrieve and prepare NDVI and rainfall data for trend analysis:
iNDVI: https://code.earthengine.google.com/5ad235ae90ef916d7b2e0cdf446dc348
$i$ Rain: https://code.earthengine.google.com/42398cc10e53835e7a03b8364f82bea0


Figure 1. Yearly anomalies (in units of standard deviation) of a) iNDVI and b) iRain, averaged for the study area.


Figure 2. Map of Senegal showing locations of 24 sites with long-term in situ biomass data used to validate/support pixel-based trends.

Table 1. Summary of in situ data used to support pixel-based vegetation trend.

| Pixel trend inferred from RUE change | Site name | Number of years of available data | Woody leaf biomass trend ( $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ year $^{-1}$ ) | herbaceous biomass trend ( $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ year $^{-1}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RUE concept not applicable (2 sites) | C4L7 | 26 | NA | NA |
|  | C4L8 | 23 | NA | NA |
| no change (8 sites) | C23L2 | 21 | $(\checkmark) 24.93$ | $(\checkmark) 21.04$ |
|  | C2L2 | 27 | (X) 19.22* | $(\checkmark) 16.29$ |
|  | C2L3 | 25 | (X) 28.13* | $(\checkmark)$-2.39 |
|  | C2L4 | 25 | (X) $7.87^{*}$ | $(\checkmark)$-3.10 |
|  | C2L7 | 24 | $(\checkmark) 9.48$ | $(\checkmark)$-8.48 |
|  | C3L4 | 25 | (X) 47.49* | $(\checkmark) 7.54$ |
|  | C3L8 | 27 | (X) 96.57* | $(\checkmark)$-13.70 |
|  | C5L2 | 16 | (X) 84.53* | $(\checkmark)$-19.35 |
| herbaceous loss no woody change (1 site) | C3L7 | 17 | (X) 48.61* | (X) -30.11 |
| woody gain herbaceous loss (3 sites) | C3L5 | 30 | ( $\checkmark$ ) $50.32{ }^{*}$ | $(\checkmark)-15.85^{*}$ |
|  | C3L6 | 20 | $(\checkmark) 38.85 *$ | (X) -28.68 |
|  | C4L5 | 24 | $(\checkmark) 28.77^{*}$ | (X) 13.91 |
| woody gain no herbaceous change (10 sites) | C1L5 | 24 | (X) -. 90 | $(\checkmark) 17.93$ |
|  | C2L1 | 26 | ( $\checkmark$ ) $14.40{ }^{*}$ | $(\checkmark) 7.17$ |
|  | C2L5 | 26 | $(\checkmark) 28.78{ }^{*}$ | $(\checkmark)-14.55$ |
|  | C2L6 | 28 | $(\checkmark) 50.88 *$ | (X) -43.94* |
|  | C2L8 | 26 | $(\checkmark) 67.45^{*}$ | $(\checkmark)$-13.30 |
|  | C3L1 | 25 | (X) 7.74 | $(\checkmark) 1.60$ |
|  | C3L2 | 29 | (X) 14.82 | $(\checkmark) 12.62$ |
|  | C4L1 | 25 | (X) 14.98 | $(\checkmark) 7.06$ |
|  | C4L3 | 20 | $(\checkmark) 38.03^{*}$ | $(\checkmark)$-12.82 |
|  | C5L1 | 26 | $(\checkmark) 34.74 *$ | (X) $29.54 *$ |
|  |  |  | $\checkmark=50 \%$ | $\checkmark=77 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $X=50 \%$ | X $=23 \%$ |
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Figure 3. Comparison of mean in situ biomass trends ( $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ year $^{-1}$ ) across vegetation change categories inferred from RUE change analysis (See Figures 9 and S2 for categories). Error whiskers indicate a $95 \%$ confidence interval.


[^0]:    *significant trend ( p -value of slope of biomass vs time $<0.05$ ), RUE = rain use efficiency
    © $)=$ in situ data agrees with pixel trend
    X $=$ in situ data does not agree with pixel trend
    Agreement determined using sign, $+/-$, and statistical significance of trend at each site

