

## Supporting Information

**Table S1:** Simper analysis results for the contribution of each size group to the differentiation of the pre-grazed communities.

Contrast between 0 – 40 ind L <sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed communities	
Size class (μm <sup>3</sup> )	%
big (1,000–10,000)	56.75
medium (100–1,000)	40.57
very big (>10,000)	1.69
small (10–100)	0.68
picoplankton (<10)	0.31
Contrast between 0 – 160 ind L <sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed communities	
Size class (μm <sup>3</sup> )	%
medium (100–1,000)	46
big (1,000–10,000)	32.76
picoplankton (<10)	13.73
very big (>10,000)	5.86
small (10–100)	1.65
Contrast between 40 – 160 ind L <sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed communities	
Size class (μm <sup>3</sup> )	%
big (1,000–10,000)	41.05
medium (100–1,000)	23.97
picoplankton (<10)	21.87
very big (>10,000)	11.11
small (10–100)	2

The size classes medium (100–1,000 μm<sup>3</sup>) and big (1,000–10,000 μm<sup>3</sup>) cells together contributed most to the differentiation of the pre-grazed communities (Table S1) (Simper Analysis; 0 ind L<sup>-1</sup> vs 40 ind L<sup>-1</sup> : 97.32%, 0 ind L<sup>-1</sup> vs 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup> : 76.76% and 40 ind L<sup>-1</sup> vs 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup> : 65.02%). In addition, the positive responses of picoplankton (<10 μm<sup>3</sup>) to pre-grazing also

contributed more than 10% to the differentiation of the 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed community from the others (Simpser Analysis; 0 ind L<sup>-1</sup> vs 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup>: 13.73% and 40 ind L<sup>-1</sup> vs 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup>: 21.87%). The change in very big cells (>10,000 µm<sup>3</sup>) contributed also more than 11.11% to the differentiation of the two pre-grazed communities (40 ind L<sup>-1</sup> vs 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup>) (Table S1).

**Table S2.** ANOVA results showing the short-term effects (days 13) of the factors pre-grazing, nutrient addition and the interaction between them on species growth rate. \*=p<0.05 45

Growth rate	Factor	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F
<i>Chaetoceros sp.</i>	pre-Grazing	2	0.43	0.22	4.2*
	Nutrients	1	0.87	0.87	16.7*
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.02	0.01	0.2
<i>Chaetoceros danicus</i>	pre-Grazing	2	0.19	0.10	3.9
	Nutrients	1	0.54	0.54	21.6*
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.18	0.09	3.6
<i>Pseudonitzschia sp.</i>	pre-Grazing	2	0.24	0.12	13.8*
	Nutrients	1	0.00	0.00	0.2
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.07	0.03	4*
<i>Guinardia delicatula</i>	pre-Grazing	1	0.26	0.26	3.8
	Nutrients	1	0.18	0.18	2.6
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	1	0.03	0.03	0.5
<i>Skeletonema marinoi</i>	pre-Grazing	2	0.82	0.41	8.8*
	Nutrients	1	0.60	0.60	12.9*
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	1.00	0.50	10.6*
<i>Thalassiosira sp.1</i>	pre-Grazing	1	0.07	0.07	0.3
	Nutrients	1	0.45	0.45	1.5
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	1	0.02	0.02	0.1
<i>Thalassiosira sp.2</i>	pre-Grazing	2	0.99	0.49	1.7
	Nutrients	1	0.21	0.21	0.7
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.49	0.25	0.8
<i>Dactyliosolen fragilissimus</i>	pre-Grazing	2	1.53	0.77	3.3
	Nutrients	1	0.34	0.34	1.4
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.39	0.19	0.8
<i>Teleaulax sp.</i>	pre-Grazing	2	0.17	0.09	0.4
	Nutrients	1	1.02	1.02	4.5

	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.25	0.12	0.6
<i>Atheya sp.</i>	pre-Grazing	2	1.52	0.76	18.6*
	Nutrients	1	0.70	0.70	17*
	pre-Grazing×Nutrients	2	0.15	0.08	1.9

Regarding the major species in these experimental communities, pre-grazing positively affected the growth rates of the species *Chaetoceros danicus*, *Skeletonema marinoi* (highest growth rate at 40 ind L<sup>-1</sup> -not present at 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed treatments) and *Atheya septentrionalis* (highest growth rate at 160 ind L<sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed treatments) (Figure S7, Table S2). The pre-grazing effect was in contrast negative for the growth rates of *Pseudonitzschia sp.* (highest growth rate at 0 ind L<sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed treatments). *Chaetoceros sp.* showed a different response to the treatments with the lowest growth rate observed at 40 ind L<sup>-1</sup> and highest growth rate at 0 ind L<sup>-1</sup> pre-grazed treatments (Figure S7, Table S2). Nutrients affected significantly both *Chaetoceros* species, *S. marinoi.*, and *A septentrionalis* while for *Pseudonitzschia sp.* and *S. marinoi* (Figure S7, Table S2) the combination of the factors was found significant. *Pseudonitzschia sp.* showed an additive negative effect from pre-grazing and nutrient addition while *S. marinoi* pre-grazing effect was positive for the nutrient enriched treatments (N) but negative for the nutrient control treatments (C) (Figure S7, Table S2).