

Fig. 1. The count of signal (left) and red-listed signal species in production forests and WKHs in the Southern (Bergslagen) and Northern (Västerbotten) Sweden. The horizontal thick line gives the median value of richness, the lower and upper limit of box give $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ quartiles. Dots are outliers.


Fig 2. The volume and density of deadwood in production forests and WKHs in Southern (Bergslagen) and Northern (Västerbotten) Sweden. The horizontal thick line gives the median value of score, the lower and upper limit of box give $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ quartiles. Dots are outliers.


Fig. 3. The number of indicator species (left) and red-listed indicator species (right) found from each forest stand in Skogstyrelsen's invententories in relation to biodiversity assessment scores the forest stand obtained in the Skogsbiologerna's inventories.


Fig. 4. The number of signal species in each taxonomic group in forest stands in in relation to biodiversity assessment scores the forest stand obtained in the Skogsbiologerna's inventories.

Table 1. Pearson correlation coefficients between biodiversity assessment scores and occurrences of signal species or red-listed signal species in all stands, and separately for WKHs and production forests. Note that red-listed signal species are included in all signal species. Significant correlations with $\mathrm{r}>0.45$ are bolded.

| Indicator species group | All stands |  |  |  | WHKs | Production forests |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | r | p | r | p | r | p |
| All signal species | $\mathbf{0 . 7 4}$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 3}$ | $<0.001$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ |
| Macrofungi | $\mathbf{0 . 6 0}$ | $<0.001$ | 0.38 | 0.015 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
| Bryophytes | 0.34 | 0.009 | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.32 | 0.20 |
| Vascular plants | $\mathbf{0 . 4 5}$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | 0.38 | 0.016 | 0.26 | 0.31 |
| Lichens | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5}$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9}$ | $<0.001$ | 0.32 | 0.21 |
| All Redlisted Signal species | $\mathbf{0 . 6 1}$ | $<0.001$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 3}$ |
| RL Macrofungi | 0.39 | 0.020 | 0.21 | 0.26 | -0.22 | 0.78 |
| RL Bryophytes | -0.20 | 0.38 | -0.21 | 0.40 | - |  |
| RL Vascular plants | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| RL Lichens | $\mathbf{0 . 6 2}$ | $<0.001$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 2}$ |

Table 2. Pearson correlation coefficients between biodiversity assessment scores and structural variables. Significant $(\mathrm{p}<0.05)$ correlation coefficients $>0.45$ are bolded.

| Structural variables | $\mathbf{r}$ | p |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Deadwood volume | $\mathbf{0 . 5 6}$ | $<0.001$ |
| Deadwood density | $\mathbf{0 . 4 8}$ | $<0.001$ |
| Living spruces BA | 0.19 | 0.15 |
| Living pines BA | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 5}$ | $<0.001$ |
| Living birch BA | 0.10 | 0.46 |

Table 3. The Person correlation coefficients between occurrences of signal species and deadwood variables measured in the stands. Significant ( $p<0.05$ ) correlation coefficients $>0.45$ are bolded.

|  | Deadwood volume |  | Deadwood density |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All indicator species | r | p | r | p |
| Macrofungi | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ | $<0.001$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1}$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ |
| Bryophytes | $\mathbf{0 . 5 2}$ | $<0.001$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 2}$ | $<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ |
| Vascular plants | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7}$ | $<0.001$ | 0.34 | 0.006 |
| Lichens | 0.24 | 0.051 | 0.23 | 0.07 |

Table 4. The Pearson correlation coefficients between occurrences of indicator species and living tree variables measured in the stands. Statistically significant ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) correlations are bolded.

|  | BA living <br> spruce | BA <br> Living <br> Pine | BA Living <br> Birch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All indicator species | 0.08 | -0.38 | 0.24 |
| Macrofungi | 0.08 | -0.34 | 0.24 |
| Bryophytes | $\mathbf{0 . 3 7}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 3 0}$ | 0 |
| Vascular plants | $\mathbf{0 . 2 8}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 3 2}$ | 0.23 |
| Lichens | -0.12 | -0.24 | 0.19 |

Table 5. The results of the model selection of the generalized linear models explaining the variation in richness of signal species on inventoried production stands and WKHs. Model formulas and model selection based on AIC. The best model is bolded. Score=biodiversity assessment score.

|  | K | AICc | Delta_AICc | AICcWt | Cum.Wt | LL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Model 4 | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 3 . 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 1 8 . 5 5}$ |
| Model 3 | 4 | 445.26 | 1.69 | 0.29 | 0.97 | $\mathbf{- 2 1 8 . 2 4}$ |
| Model 2 | 3 | 449.86 | 6.29 | 0.03 | 1.00 | -221.70 |
| Model 1 | 2 | 453.62 | 10.05 | 0.00 | 1.00 | -224.69 |

Model 1: signal_sp rich ~ score
Model 2: signal_sp rich ~ score + DW_Vol_ha
Model 3: signal_sp rich ~ score + DW_Vol_ha + DW_Dens_ha
Model 4: signal_sp rich ~ score + DW_Dens_ha

