

1 Supplemental Methods for Estimating Piecewise Functions

2 In order to test whether top predator (*TP*) biomass predicts herbivore (*HE*) biomass differently
3 over certain ranges of top predator biomass, I used non-linear least squares to estimate the cut
4 point and then used ordinary least squares to estimate a piecewise function. The model I
5 estimated using non-linear least squares was:

$$6 \quad HE = (a_1 + b_1 TP) * (TP < c) + (a_1 + b_1 TP + b_2 (TP - c)) * (TP \geq c)$$

7 where a_1 is the intercept, b_1 and b_2 are slopes, and c is the unknown cut point. The non-linear
8 least squares estimate of the cut point was 0.81 mT/ha (95% CI: 0.16, 1.44).

9
10 I then used the estimate for the cut point to generate a new variable, TP_c where $TP_c = TP - c$ if
11 $TP \geq c$ and $TP_c = 0$ if $TP < c$. This new variable allowed me to estimate the piece wise function:

$$12 \quad HE = a_2 + b_3 TP + b_4 TP_c$$

13 where a_2 is the intercept and b_3 and b_4 are slopes. The ordinary least squares estimate of the slope
14 for values of TP less than the cut point was 0.41 ($p < 0.01$) and for values of TP greater than or
15 equal to the cut point was -0.10 ($p = 0.63$).

16
17 I repeated these methods in order to test whether large-bodied fish biomass predicted small-
18 bodied fish biomass differently over certain ranges of large-bodied fish biomass. The non-linear
19 least squares estimate of the cut point was 2.04 mT/ha (95% CI: 1.16, 2.90). The ordinary least
20 squares estimate of the slope for values of large-bodied fish less than the cut point was 1.07
21 ($p < 0.001$) and for values of large-bodied fish greater than or equal to the cut point was -0.20
22 ($p = 0.61$).