

(a)															
PFD		0 ppm			200 ppm			400 ppm			700 ppm				
70	94	0.102 ± 0.102	0.074 (0.00, 0.18)	h	no data			95	0.411 ± 0.241	0.38 (0.22, 0.60)	g	63	0.304 ± 0.172 0.29 (0.16, 0.42)	g	
60	68	0.696 ± 0.146	0.70 (0.62, 0.78)	f	76	0.610 ± 0.267	0.68 (0.41, 0.81)	f	78	0.880 ± 0.166	0.86 (0.76, 0.97)	de	76	0.930 ± 0.149 0.94 (0.86, 1.03)	d
50	77	0.773 ± 0.208	0.73 (0.61, 0.93)	ef	70	0.768 ± 0.192	0.77 (0.67, 0.89)	ef	78	0.968 ± 0.159	0.95 (0.85, 1.08)	d	81	0.941 ± 0.210 0.96 (0.81, 1.07)	d
40	64	0.956 ± 0.237	0.99 (0.76, 1.12)	cd	70	1.082 ± 0.145	1.06 (1.00, 1.18)	bc	74	1.275 ± 0.137	1.28 (1.18, 1.35)	a	72	1.158 ± 0.167 1.19 (1.10, 1.27)	b
N (≥ 4 samples × 15 cells) Mean ± SD Median (IQR) <i>post-hoc</i> DSCF (<i>p</i> < .01)															

(b)	PFD	CO ₂ ppm	(PFD vs CO ₂ ppm)
Spearman’s ρ	-0.7503**	0.2746**	(-0.0101)
** : <i>p</i> < .001 (N = 1136)			

Table 2.

Effects of the same CO₂ concentration treatment on the *f* index for Figure 9

(a) *f* values are given as Mean±SD and Median (range) with cell number (N). The Kruskal-Wallis test’s *p* < 0.001 (N > 4 samples × 15 cells, df = 14). Different alphabet letters indicate significant differences in *f* (*p* < 0.01, *post-hoc* DSCF pairwise comparisons).

(b) Spearman’s rank correlation ρ for *f* was evaluated for PFD and CO₂ concentration (*p* < 0.001. N = 1136), or between experimental conditions of PFD and CO₂ concentration (*p* = 0.73. N = 1136).