

## Food ration does not influence the effect of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on antipredator behaviour of a reef fish

Shannon J. McMahon\*, Jennifer M. Donelson, Philip L. Munday

\*Corresponding author: shannon.mcmahon@jcu.edu.au

*Marine Ecology Progress Series 586: 155–165 (2018)*

Table S1. AIC comparison tables “pre-stimulus feeding strikes” models. Display of four statistical models, one without random effects (GLS), three with the different possible combinations of random effects (LMEs).

Model	Model ID	df	AIC	BIC
GLS (no random effect)	1	20	6845.7	6923.9
LME (both random effects)	2	14	6837.8	6899.9
LME (Parent ID only)	3	13	6837.6	6893.3
LME (Tank ID only)	4	13	6840.8	6900.4

Table S2. AIC comparison tables “Feeding strike change” models. Display of four statistical models, one without random effects (GLS), three with the different possible combinations of random effects (LMEs).

Model	Model ID	df	AIC	BIC
GLS (no random effect)	1	20	-668.5	-570.2
LME (both random effects)	2	22	-675.7	-567.5
LME (Parent ID only)	3	21	-677.7	-574.5
LME (Tank ID only)	4	21	-668.2	-564.9

Table S3. Linear mixed effects model on pre-stimulus feeding rate of juvenile *A. percula*. Juveniles were reared in either high or low food treatment cross factored with control (489  $\mu$ atm) or elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (1022  $\mu$ atm). Juveniles were from parents exposed to either control (489  $\mu$ atm) or elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (1032  $\mu$ atm).

	Num. df	Den. df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	1	1001	3759.93	< <b>0.001</b>
Parent CO <sub>2</sub>	1	7	9.22	<b>0.019</b>
Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub>	1	1001	3.25	0.072
Food	1	1001	15.04	< <b>0.001</b>
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub>	1	1001	0.30	0.590
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Food	1	1001	2.42	0.120
Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Food	1	1001	2.97	0.081
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Food	1	1001	0.24	0.630

Table S4. Linear mixed effects model on feeding rate change of juvenile *A. percula*. Juveniles were reared in either high or low food treatment cross factored with control (489  $\mu\text{atm}$ ) or elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (1022  $\mu\text{atm}$ ). Juveniles were from parents exposed to either control (489  $\mu\text{atm}$ ) or elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (1032  $\mu\text{atm}$ ).

	Num. df	Den. df	<i>F</i>	p
Intercept	1	1001	537.22	< <b>0.001</b>
Parent CO <sub>2</sub>	1	7	1.38	0.279
Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub>	1	1001	2069.60	< <b>0.001</b>
Food	1	1001	6.66	<b>0.010</b>
Trial Cue	1	1001	1107.27	< <b>0.001</b>
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub>	1	1001	5.76	<b>0.017</b>
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Food	1	1001	0.34	0.558
Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Food	1	1001	2.93	0.087
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Trial Cue	1	1001	0.06	0.814
Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Trial Cue	1	1001	1049.62	< <b>0.001</b>
Food * Trial Cue	1	1001	2.04	0.154
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Food	1	1001	0.98	0.320
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Trial Cue	1	1001	0.01	0.950
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Food * Trial Cue	1	1001	0.45	0.502
Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Food * Trial Cue	1	1001	0.68	0.408
Parent CO <sub>2</sub> * Juvenile CO <sub>2</sub> * Food * Trial Cue	1	1001	0.63	0.427