## Supplement 2

Table S3: Firth's logistic regression, a penalized log-likelihood model, that tests for the effects of accessibility to crawling predators and tidal exposure on the quasi-completely separated blue mussel occurrence data of floating docks, rocky sites, and trees. Both predictor variables are significant to predict blue mussel occurrence ( $p$ values $<0.05$ ).

|  | Coefficient | Standard <br> error | Lower 95\% <br> $\mathbf{C l}$ | Upper 95\% <br> CI | $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{2}$ | $p$-value | Odds ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 4.04 | 1.43 | 2.08 | 8.89 | 35.15 | $<0.001$ | 57.00 |
| Tide | -2.48 | 1.47 | -7.35 | -0.35 | 5.65 | 0.017 | 0.084 |
| Accessibility | -4.19 | 0.54 | -5.33 | -3.20 | Inf | $<0.001$ | 0.015 |

Table S4: Logistic regression model with proportions that tests for differences in blue mussel mortality between the four cage categories. The model is corrected for overdispersion by using a quasibinomial link and a F test, and it shows that cage category is a significant predictor variable to predict blue mussel mortality within cages ( $p<0.05$ ). Tukey's pairwise comparison indicates between which cage categories blue mussel mortalities differ significantly from each other. "Small" stands for small-meshed cages, "Large" for large-meshed cages, and "DW" for dogwhelks.

|  | DF | Deviance <br> residuals | DF residuals | Dev | F | $\operatorname{Pr}(>F)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Null model |  |  | 35 | 396 |  |  |
| Model with cage <br> category as <br> predictor | 3 | 128 | 32 | 268 | 6.15 | 0.002 |
|  | Estimate | Standard error | z-value | Pr(>\|z|) |  |  |
| Small with DW - <br> Small without DW | -2.52 | 0.80 | -3.15 | $<0.01$ |  |  |
| Large without DW - <br> Small without DW | -2.48 | 0.81 | -3.04 | $<0.02$ |  |  |
| Large with DW - <br> Small without DW | -2.46 | 0.81 | -3.03 | $<0.02$ |  |  |
| Large without DW - <br> Small with DW | 0.05 | 0.54 | 0.10 | $>0.99$ |  |  |
| Large with DW - <br> Small with DW | 0.07 | 0.54 | 0.12 | $>0.99$ |  |  |
| Large with DW - <br> Large without DW | 0.01 | 0.56 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |

Table S5: Poisson regression for clustered data to test for the effect of cage category on the number of dogwhelks feeding or drilling. The random factor is individual cages, for each cage, data got collected 4-7 times. The null model includes this random factor as well but not cage category as predictor variable. The model comparison shows that cage category is a significant predictor variable ( $p<0.05$ ). Applying Tukey's pairwise comparison to the model with cage category as predictor variable shows between which cage categories the number of prey-handling dogwhelks differ significantly from each other. "Small" stands for small-meshed cages, "Large" for large-meshed cages, and "DW" for dogwhelks.

|  | npar | AIC | BIC | logLik | Deviance | $\chi^{2}$ | DF | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(>\chi^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Null model | 2 | 988 | 995 | -492 | 984 |  |  |  |
| Model with cage <br> category as predictor | 5 | 962 | 980 | -476 | 953 | 31.41 | 3 | $<0.001$ |
|  | Estimate | Standard error | z-value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|z\|)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Small with DW - <br> Small without DW | 2.84 | 0.51 | 5.56 | $<0.001$ |  |  |  |  |
| Large without DW - <br> Small without DW | 2.57 | 0.51 | 5.03 | $<0.001$ |  |  |  |  |
| Large with DW - <br> Small without DW | 2.55 | 0.51 | 5.01 | $<0.001$ |  |  |  |  |
| Large without DW - <br> Small with DW | -0.27 | 0.41 | -0.67 | $>0.90$ |  |  |  |  |
| Large with DW - <br> Small with DW | -0.29 | 0.41 | -0.70 | $>0.89$ |  |  |  |  |
| Large with DW - <br> Large without DW | -0.01 | 0.42 | -0.03 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |

Table S6: Polynomial regression model for Figure 6. The model shows that there is a significant positive correlation between the number of prey-handling dogwhelks and blue mussel mortality within the cages ( $p<0.05$ ).

|  | Estimate | Standard <br> error | t-value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|t\|)$ | Residual <br> standard <br> error | Multiple <br> $\boldsymbol{R}^{2}$ | Adjusted <br> $\boldsymbol{R}^{2}$ | F-statistic | $\boldsymbol{p}$-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 40.20 | 1.98 | 20.28 | $<0.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pol 1 | 181.09 | 11.89 | 15.23 | $<0.001$ | 11.89 on 33 <br> DF | 0.88 | 0.87 | 120.6 on 2 <br> and 33 DF | $<0.001$ |
| Pol 2 | -36.48 | 11.89 | -3.07 | 0.004 |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure S1: Number of prey-handling dogwhelks observed in each cage per visit for the four categories (A-D): small- and large-meshed cages, with or without 10 dogwhelks added per cage. Cages were visited 4-7 times, depending on weather conditions, during their 8 weeks in the field. Boxes indicate $25 \%, 50 \%$, and $75 \%$ quartiles. Whiskers end on the smallest value within 1.5 times the interquartile range below the 25th percentile and on the largest value within 1.5 times the interquartile range above the 75 th percentile. Outliers are $>1.5$ times the interquartile range beyond either end of the box and denoted by dots. Red horizontal lines indicate mean numbers of prey-handling dogwhelks within categories.

