

S.1. Guiding questions for the semi-structured interviews

The section B of the semi-structured interviews is about local-urban people's perceptions regarding deforestation (i.e. presence/absence of deforestation, recent/outdated process -if deforestation occurred after or before 1990, respectively-, local/distant process -if deforestation in the study area occurred within or outside the province in which the interview takes place-, actors and drivers responsible for deforestation). The guiding questions for constructing this section's data were addressed:

- When and where did/does deforestation processes occur?
- How did deforestation happen?
- Who or who carried/carries it out?
- Why was it deforested?
- How much area was deforested?
- Do you perceive fencing of fields? Who do it? For what activity?
- In the cases that people perceived that deforestation occurred in the area only before the 1990s, they were inquired about the current main changes related to productive activities occurring in the area.

The section C of the semi-structured interviews is about the arguments in favor and opposing the different drivers of deforestation, regarding their impact on their well-being. The guiding questions for constructing this section's data were addressed:

- What do you think about the changes taking place in the area? Do they have positive or negative impacts on people's well-being? Would you prefer to develop this activity or another one?
- Do you perceive any economic, cultural, social, or educational impact because of these land-use changes? If yes, which are those impacts and from which activity come?
- Do you perceive any impact from land-use changes on your personal and family life? If yes, which are those impacts and from which activity come? How do you evaluate them?
- Do you perceive any impact from land-use changes broadly, it means in general on your town and neighborhood? If yes, which are those impacts and from which activity come? How do you evaluate them?
- Do you perceive any impact from land-use on other, more distant, regions? If yes, which are those impacts and from which activity come? How do you evaluate them?

S.2. Classification of localities into agricultural frontier stages during the period 2000-2013. The codes are linked to the map of the study area (figure 1 of the main document). The column AFS 00-13 indicates the class of agricultural-frontier stage during the period 2000-2013 (i.e. FN: new frontier; FAI: active-incipient frontier; FA: active frontier; and FM: mature frontier). Besides, for each locality, we show the number of interviews, the percentage of croplands, grazing, and forest area at the year 2000, and the percentage of converted-land area in a buffer of 50 km at the beginning of the study period (%CLA00), and during 2000-2013 (%CLA00-13). The Los Ralos locality was considered as a mature frontier though no data analysis was possible for the period 2000-2013. However, this locality was already a mature frontier during 1990-2000, a period when increased from 66.35% of converted land area (in 1990) to 72.97% (in 2000) (Sacchi and Gasparri 2015).

Locality	Code	AFS 00-13	Nº of interv.	crop%_00	graz%_00	fore%_00	%CLA00	%CLA00-13
El Sauzalito	ES	FN	0	0,39	1,89	91,91	2.28	4.31
Los Frentones	LF	FA	0	8,02	20,25	67,56	28.27	40.50
Miraflores	MF	FAI	15	4,22	6,14	84,52	10.35	10.25
N. Pompeya	NP	FN	18	0,28	1,52	93,17	1.79	4.10
P. del Infierno	PI	FA	10	10,05	22,75	64,06	32.80	38.11
Taco Pozo	TP	FAI	0	1,01	4,17	93,18	5.18	11.96
El Potrillo	EP	FAI	0	0,89	9,01	80,8	9.90	6.55
Est. Campo	EC	FAI	8	0,83	6,28	82,72	7.11	13.31
Ing. Juárez	IJ	FN	14	0,22	1,25	94,79	1.47	1.65
Laguna Yema	LY	FAI	11	0,39	3,16	88,6	3.56	10.07
Las Lomitas	LL	FAI	21	0,17	2,08	90,31	2.25	17.88
Po. del Tigre	PT	FAI	0	0,41	4,08	87,87	4.50	15.45
Cnel. J. Solá	JS	FN	12	0,66	0,85	85,43	1.51	2.79
El Galpón	EG	FAI	12	17,28	4,34	73,25	21.62	12.77
El Quebrachal	EQ	FA	20	13,39	10,49	70,76	23.88	27.76
J.V. González	JG	FA	17	22,54	9,62	63,09	32.16	27.84
Las Lajitas	LA	FA	30	32,3	11,88	52,62	44.18	32.84
La Unión	LU	FN	10	0,76	1,32	71,33	2.08	3.28
Rivadavia	RI	FN	0	0,54	1,43	80,19	1.97	4.19
Campo Gallo	CG	FAI	9	0,29	3,06	94,67	3.35	20.63
M. Quemado	MQ	FN	8	0,38	1,47	96,98	1.85	4.55
N. Esperanza	NE	FA	0	14,7	6,16	73,71	20.86	23.78
P. Guanacos	PG	FA	10	4,51	17,5	71,75	22.01	30.97
Sachayoj	SA	FA	5	8,27	28,42	58,71	36.69	50.51
El Chañar	CÑ	FM	9	51,81	10,4	33,89	62.21	14.35
G. Garmendia	GG	FM	7	34,22	10,13	50,97	44.35	24.67
Ranchillos	RA	FM	0	53,96	13,48	28,45	67.45	18.95
Va. Burruyacu	VB	FM	0	39,6	10,16	46,4	49.75	23.10
Los Ralos	LR	FM	8	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

S.3. Values of the C-coefficient between drivers of land-use changes and arguments perceived by local-urban people as positive or negative regarding their impact on their well-being. Values of the C-coefficient higher than 0.05 are indicated with *, while those values higher than 0.10 are indicated with **

Arguments/ Drivers		Global	Global	Forest	Real-Estate	Crop
		Agribusiness	Livestock	Exploitation	Transactions	Replacement
Positive	Social-cultural benefits	0,01	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,01
	Benefits (in a general way)	0,10**	0,04	0,00	0,02	0,04
	Incomes for the government	0,04	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01
	Rural employment	0,08*	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,03
	Direct-urban employment	0,07*	0,02	0,00	0,01	0,03
	Indirect-urban employment	0,07*	0,03	0,00	0,01	0,05*
Negative	High dependence on agriculture	0,05*	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,01
	Only temporal employment	0,04	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,10**
	Rural people's expulsion	0,08*	0,08*	0,01	0,17**	0,00
	Poor payment	0,03	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,03
	Big (social) gap	0,05*	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01
	No benefits (in a general way)	0,12**	0,07*	0,01	0,05*	0,06*
	No rural employment	0,20**	0,09*	0,01	0,06*	0,16**
	No direct -urban employment	0,17**	0,09*	0,01	0,06*	0,15**
	No indirect-urban employment	0,18**	0,08*	0,01	0,06*	0,15**
	Access restriction	0,04	0,05*	0,00	0,19**	0,00
	Sale of small fields	0,01	0,04	0,00	0,07*	0,01