Table S1. Summary of number, size ranges and references on relationships between carbon content (C, in μ g), prosome or total length (L, in μ m), volume (V, in μ L), ash-free dry weight (ADW in μ g) and dry weight (DW, in µg) for prey found in larval rainbow smelt gut contents.

Table S2. Results of permutational analyses of variance (PERMANOVA) performed on carbon weight data from visual analysis of larval gut contents and data from molecular *Eurytemora* spp. identification in larval gut contents via qPCR. PERMANOVA analyses were based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities (Bray & Curtis 1957) and were performed using 9999 permutations. The homogeneity of dispersion was verified prior to each PERMA-NOVA. For visual data, individual larvae were tested using the carbon weight (µgC) of each prey consumed divided by the standard length (mm) of the larva. Preliminary tests revealed no statistical influence of larval lineage in diet differences ($p > 0.05$), so this factor was removed from the analysis and two-way PERMANOVA were employed for diet composition comparison. For molecular data, diet composition in terms of the complex *E. affinis* NAC*/E. carolleeae* based on percentage of qPCR results per station was determined. Stations within salinity zones were considered as replicates.

Table S3. Diet composition expressed as percentage of prey-specific index of relative importance (%PSIRI) for the prey categories identified in rainbow smelt larval diet in each salinity zone sampled throughout summer 2021 in the MTZ of the St. Lawrence Estuary.

Table S3. *Continued.*

Figure S1. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) analysis plots of rainbow smelt diet in the four sampling periods separated by lineage (Atlantic or Acadian).

Figure S2. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) analysis plots of rainbow smelt diet and prey field composition across the salinity habitats of the MTZ (limnetic, oligohaline and mesohaline) for mid-June, late June, mid-July and early August.

Figure S3. Spatial-temporal comparisons of larval diet through salinity habitats and time, based on visual gut contents. Summary of pair-wise comparisons from the permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA). Spatial comparisons between salinity habitats in each survey (a) and temporal comparisons of each salinity habitat through the sampling period (b) are shown with significant interactions and p–values in bold. Prey with highest percent contribution to the dissimilarity (SIMPER) are shown for interactions with significant p-values.

Figure S4. Mean standard length (mm) of rainbow smelt larvae by salinity habitat in summer 2021. Boxplots show the median (horizontal line), interquartile range (IQR, box), and whiskers extending to 1.5 times the IQR. Outliers are indicated by small dots beyond the whiskers, while larger filled circles represent the mean values for each group.

REFERENCES

- Bottrell HH, Duncan A, Gliwicz ZM, Grygierek E, Herzig A, Hillbricht-Ilkowska A, Kurasawa H, Larsson P, Weglenska T (1976) Review of some problems in zooplankton production studies. Norw J Zool 24: 419–456
- Burkill PH, Kendall TF (1982) Production of the copepod *Eurytemora affinis* in the Bristol Channel. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 7: 21–31 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps007021
- Chigbu P, Sibley TH (1996) Biometrical relationships, energy content, and biochemical composition of *Neomysis mercedis* from Lake Washington. Hydrobiologia 337: 145– 150. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00028515
- Culver DA, Boucherle MM, Bean D, Fletcher JW (1985) Biomass of freshwater crustacean zooplankton from length-weight regressions. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 42: 1380–1390. https://doi.org/10.1139/f85-173
- Mauchline J (1998) The biology of Calanoid Copepods. In: John M, John HS B, Bruce D, Paul A T (eds) Advances in Marine Biology, Vol. 33. Academic Press, London, UK. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2881(08)X6020-1
- Mumm N (1991) On the summer distribution of mesozooplankton in the Nansen Basin, Arctic Ocean. Ber Polarforsch 92: 1–146
- Kiørboe T, Møhlenberg F, Riisgard HU (1985) In situ feeding rates of planktonic copepods: a comparison of four methods. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 88: 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/ 0022-0981(85)90202-3
- Legendre L, Michaud J (1998) Flux of biogenic carbon in oceans: size-dependent regulation by pelagic food webs. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 164: 1–11 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps 164001
- Omori M (1969) Weight and chemical composition of some important oceanic zooplankton in the North Pacific Ocean. Mar Biol 3: 4–10 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00355587
- Pöckl M (1992) Effects of temperature, age, and body size on moulting and growth in the freshwater amphipods *Gammarus fossarum* and *G. roeseli*. Freshw Biol 27(2): 211– 225. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1992.tb00534.x
- Rosen RA (1981) Length-dry weight relationships of some freshwater zooplankton. J Freshw Ecol 1(2): 225–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/02705060.1981.9664034
- Sirois P, Dodson JJ (2000a) Influence of turbidity, food density, and parasites on the ingestion and growth of larval rainbow smelt *Osmerus mordax* in an estuarine turbidity maximum. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 193: 167–179. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps193167
- Uye S-I (1982) Length-weight relationships of important zooplankton from the inland Sea of Japan. J Oceanogr Soc Jpn 38: 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02110286
- Wiebe PH (1988) Functional regression equations for zooplankton displacement volume, wet weight, fry weight, and carbon. A correction. Fish Bull 86: 833–835.
- Wilcox JR, Jeffries HP (1973) Growth of the sand shrimp, *Crangon septemspinosa*, in Rhode Island. Chesap Sci 14(3): 201. https://doi.org/10.2307/1350607