The following supplement accompanies the article

Biotic resistance and facilitation of a non-indigenous mussel vary with environmental context

Ignacio Gestoso[1,*], Francisco Arenas[2], Celia Olabarria[1]

[1]Departamento de Ecoloxía y Bioloxía Animal, Universidade de Vigo, 36310 Vigo, Spain

[2]Laboratory of Coastal Biodiversity, CIIMAR, Centro Interdisciplinar de Investigação Marinha e Ambiental, Rua dos Bragas 289, 4050-123 Porto, Portugal

*Corresponding author: ignaciogestoso@uvigo.es

Marine Ecology Progress Series 506: 163–173

Supplement. Tables adding detailed information about the linear regressions used to calculate condition index of mussels (Tables S1) and about *a priori* contrasts used to analyse for density-dependent effects and the strength of intra- and inter-specific interactions (Tables S2 & S3)

Table S1. Linear regressions used to calculate condition index (CI) of the two mussel species at the start and the end of the pilot study and experiment, respectively. AP = antero-posterior length of mussels; DSW = dry shell weight and DTW = dry tissue weight

Phase	Mussel species	Time	Eq. (1)	R^2	p	Eq. (2)	R^2	p
Pilot	*Xenostrobus securis*	Start	DSW = 0.138 × AP – 2.857	0.90	**0.000**	DTW = 0.050 × DSW + 0.039	0.31	**0.030**
		End	DSW = 0.123 × AP – 2.528	0.83	**0.000**	DTW = 0.049 × DSW + 0.068	0.52	**0.000**
	Mytilus galloprovincialis	Start	DSW = 0.343 × AP – 10.898	0.94	**0.000**	DTW = 0.190 × DSW – 0.243	0.56	**0.000**
		End	DSW = 0.359 × AP – 11.836	0.82	**0.000**	DTW = 0.038 × DSW + 0.121	0.61	**0.000**
Experiment	*X. securis*	Start	DSW = 0.087 × AP – 1.383	0.83	**0.000**	DTW = 0.069 × DSW – 1.383	0.83	**0.000**
		End	DSW = 0.105 × AP – 2.072	0.83	**0.000**	DTW = 0.071 × DSW + 0.036	0.43	**0.000**
	M. galloprovincialis	Start	DSW = 0.107 × AP – 1.808	0.94	**0.000**	DTW = 0.116 × DSW – 0.015	0.86	**0.000**
		End	DSW = 0.186 × AP – 4.115	0.86	**0.000**	DTW = 0.065 × DSW + 0.013	0.59	**0.000**

Table S2. Test of hypotheses regarding the effects of Type of aggregation and Predation using linear *a priori* contrasts

Predation × Type of aggregation; LS Means (n = 12)

Predation	Type of aggregation	Contrast 1	Contrast 2	Survivorship (%)	
		XXX vs. XMM	X vs. XXX & XMM	Mean	SE
E	X	0	1.333	93.750	3.264
E	XXX	1	–0.666	79.167	11.024
E	XMM	–1	–0.666	85.417	5.723
O	X	0	1.333	39.063	10.964
O	XXX	1	–0.666	69.271	11.449
O	XMM	–1	–0.666	78.125	9.406

Contrast estimates (only significant results are shown: Contrast 2 – Open treatment)

Contrast 2	Estimate	SE	*t*	p
X < XXX & XMM	–46.181	14.050	–3.287	0.002

Table S3. Test of hypotheses regarding the effects of Type of aggregation and Site using linear *a priori* contrasts

Site × Type of aggregation; LS Means (n = 4)

Site	Type of aggregation	Contrast 1	Contrast 2	CI	
		MMM vs. MXX	M vs. MMM & MXX	Mean	SE
1	M	0	1	70.733	0.674
1	MMM	1	0	70.320	0.446
1	MXX	–1	–1	70.040	1.133
2	M	0	1	71.280	0.401
2	MMM	1	0	72.930	0.723
2	MXX	–1	–1	72.070	4.280
3	M	0	1	73.400	0.342
3	MMM	1	0	91.947	0.658
3	MXX	–1	–1	89.013	3.877

Contrast estimates (only significant results are shown: Contrast 2 – Site 3)

Contrast 2	Estimate	SE	*t*	p
M < MMM & MXX	–22.773	3.289	–6.923	0.000