Maximal feeding with active prey-switching: A kill-the-winner functional response and its effect on global diversity and biogeography

S. M. Vallina ^{a,b,*}, B. A. Ward ^{a,c}, S. Dutkiewicz ^a, M. J. Follows ^a

^aEarth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, MIT, Cambridge, USA ^bMarine Sciences Institute, ICM - CSIC, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain ^cCurrent address: CERES-ERTI, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France

Abstract

Predators' switching towards the most abundant prey is a mechanism that stabilizes population dynamics and helps overcome competitive exclusion of species in food webs. Current formulations of active prey-switching, however, display non-maximal feeding in which the predators' total ingestion decays exponentially with the number prey species (i.e. the diet breadth) even though the total prey biomass stays constant. We analyse three previously published multi-species functional responses which have either active switching or maximal feeding, but not both. We identify the cause of this apparent incompatibility and describe a kill-the-winner formulation that combines active switching with maximal feeding. Active switching is shown to be a community response in which some predators become preyselective and the formulations with maximal or non-maximal feeding are implicitly assuming different food web configurations. Global simulations using a marine ecosystem model with 64 phytoplankton species belonging to 4 major functional groups show that the species richness and biogeography of phytoplankton are very sensitive to the choice of the functional response for grazing. The phytoplankton biogeography reflects the balance between the competitive abilities for nutrient uptake and the degree of apparent competition which occurs indirectly between species that share a common predator species. The phytoplankton diversity significantly increases when active switching is combined with maximal feeding through predator-mediated coexistence.

Keywords: Zooplankton grazing, Foodweb stability, Ecosystem diversity, Ocean modelling

Article history: Received 1 June 2012 Received in revised form 8 Aug 2013 Accepted 9 Aug 2013 Available online 5 Sep 2013 Available printed 1 Jan 2014

1. Introduction

Active prey-switching is a predatory behaviour that has been documented in natural ecosystems (Murdoch, 1969, 1975; Hughes and Croy, 1993; Kiorboe et al., 1996; Gismervik and Andersen, 1997; Elliott, 2006; Kempf et al., 2008; Kiorboe, 2008; Kalinkat et al., 2011) and is known to stabilize ecosystem dynamics (Murdoch and Oaten, 1975; Haydon, 1994; Armstrong, 1999; Morozov, 2010). Active switching differs from passive switching in that the predators' switching is variable and based on relative prev density (i.e. frequency-dependent predation), rather than being fixed and based on constant prey preferences (see Gentleman et al. (2003) for a review). Thus, active switching represents a behavioural change of the predator (Gentleman et al., 2003), either in terms of feeding strategy (e.g. from passive suspension feeding to active ambush feeding) (Kiorboe et al., 1996; Gismervik and Andersen, 1997; Wirtz, 2012b) or learning how to increase the efficiency of capturing and handling certain prey types (Murdoch, 1973). Active switching makes the proportion of a given prey attacked to change from less than expected to more than expected as the relative abundance of that prey increases (Hassell, 2000).

From an ecosystem modelling perspective, active switching is

an interesting property because it allows for a greater degree of species co-existence in competitive food webs (Vallina and Le Quéré, 2011; Prowe et al., 2012a,b). Multi-species ecosystem models can overcome the competitive exclusion principle (Hardin, 1960; Hutchinson, 1961; Armstrong and McGehee, 1980) by including some form of active switching (Adjou et al., 2012). In a broad sense, selective predation can be argued to fit within the "killing the winner" theory, which is sometimes invoked to explain the high diversity we observe in microbial communities (Thingstad and Lignell, 1997; Thingstad, 2000). The basic idea is that the most abundant bacteria types will be killed preferentially by hostselective viral lysis. Therefore, the coexistence of competing bacterial species is ensured by the presence of viruses that kill-thewinner, whereas the differences in substrate affinity between the coexisting bacterial species determine viral abundance (Thingstad, 2000). Active switching follows conceptually the same principle but for predator-prey selectivity.

^{*}Corresponding author at: Marine Sciences Institute, ICM – CSIC, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain. Tel.: +34 932 309 607; fax: +34 932 309 555. E-mail address: vallina@icm.csic.es (S. M. Vallina)

However, current formulations of active prey-switching show anomalous dynamics, like *antagonistic* feeding and *sub-optimal* feeding in which predators are unable to maximize the ingestion of the total food available when it becomes divided among several prey (Tilman, 1982; Holt, 1983; Gentleman et al., 2003). In antagonistic feeding, if total food abundance is evenly distributed among many prey, it will give a smaller total ingestion than if the same total food is concentrated in one prey species (Tilman, 1982). In other words, for a given total food availability, the most even distribution of prey biomass will give the lowest total ingestion. Sub-optimal feeding occurs when an increase in the abundance of one prey can also result in a decrease of ingestion, despite that total food is actually increasing. Sub-optimal feeding is an extreme form of antagonistic feeding (Gentleman et al., 2003). When taken to the limit where each prey contributes to an infinitesimal fraction of the total prey abundance, these two modes of non-maximal feeding imply that the total ingestion by the predators will tend towards zero, even if the combined biomass of all their prey is high.

These formulation inconsistencies are conceptually problematic and have been used to warn against the use of active switching functional responses in ecosystem models (Gentleman et al., 2003). Here we argue that the problem does not lie with the use of active switching per-se but with the fact that current formulations are not completely satisfactory representations of switching behaviour (Holt, 1983; Mitra and Flynn, 2006; Anderson et al., 2010). Total ingestion should ideally depend on the total food amount and its quality but not necessarily on the biomass distribution of the prey. In such a functional response all the prey would be perfectly substitutable for equal fixed preferences (Tilman, 1982) and feeding will always be maximal. The original Holling Type II functional response is probably the best known example (Holling, 1959; Gentleman et al., 2003). However, it does not allow for active prey-switching and therefore the competitive exclusion among the prey is very difficult to prevent and the ecosystem stability is drastically reduced (Gismervik and Andersen, 1997). Ward et al. (2012) suggests an equation for the switching between herbivory and carnivory. We use a similar approach for the switching between individual prey.

The first objective of this work is to identify the origin of the observed incompatibility between active switching and maximal ingestion in current formulations of predation on multiple prey (Gentleman et al., 2003). We evaluate three classical formulations of predation: two that exhibit switching but non-maximal ingestion (one sub-optimal, one antagonistic); and one that exhibits maximal ingestion but no-switching. We also describe a kill-the-winner (KTW) functional response that combines active switching with maximal ingestion (see Appendix A). Maximal and non-maximal ingestion are shown to arise from the implicit assumptions of the food web configuration inherent to each functional response (see Appendix B).

The second objective of this work is to evaluate how grazing functional responses affect the simulated global distributions of marine phytoplankton diversity and biogeography. The choice of the grazing response has already been shown to drastically change the simulated distributions of phytoplankton biogeography (Anderson et al., 2010) and diversity (Prowe et al., 2012a). However, these results were obtained from comparing "passive-switching with maximal feeding" formulations (i.e. Real's) against "activeswitching with non-maximal feeding" formulations (i.e. Fasham's and Ryabchenko's). Following a similar approach here we also evaluate the effect of the new KTW formulation that combines active-switching with maximal feeding. Thus we implemented the four functional responses under study (i.e. Fasham, Ryabchenko, Real, KTW) in a global marine ecosystem model with 64 phytoplankton species belonging to 4 functional groups which are differentiated by their dependence of growth on external nutrients. We show that active switching is a mechanism that allows higher levels of species co-existence, specially when combined with strong topdown control (i.e. maximal feeding). We use the term "species" in a very broad and general sense, simply denoting variability of the phytoplankton traits for nutrient uptake. An alternative term could be phytoplankton ecotypes (Dutkiewicz et al., 2009).

2. Functional responses

(

The functional response describes how the ingestion rate of a predator changes with prey density. That is, it gives the function that relates the amount of prey ingested per predator and unit of time to the density of the prey in the environment (Murdoch, 1973). Although there are many functional responses described in the literature (Gentleman et al., 2003), the most common are the Holling Type I, II, III (Holling, 1959) and the Ivlev (Ivlev, 1961) functions for single prey type ingestion (see Figure 1). A predator can theoretically change mode between functional responses (Real, 1977, 1979; Wirtz, 2012a). This work will only focus on transitions between the Type II (hyperbolic) and Type III (sigmoidal) responses. The Type II response gives a decelerating ingestion rate with increasing prey density, and thus provides prey safety only at high abundances. This leads to a lower per capita risk of being eaten at high prey densities and to a higher per capita risk of being eaten at low prey densities, which tends to destabilize predatorprey interactions. The Type III response, on the other hand, also provides prey safety at low abundances, which tends to stabilize predator-prey interactions. Type III responses can be explained in terms of optimal foraging theory as a way to optimize the energy intake from feeding with respect to the energy cost of foraging (MacArthur and Pianka, 1966; Pahlow and Prowe, 2010).

Most multi-species functional responses for predation are simply variations of the original Holling Type II/III formulations for one prey (Holling, 1959) but extended to consider many prey (Murdoch, 1973), and can be found in the literature as several mathematically equivalent equations. The general expression common to all four functional responses in this study is:

$$G_{j} = g_{\max} Z \,\delta_{j} Q = V_{\max} \,\delta_{j} Q \qquad (1)$$

$$G = \sum G_j = V_{max} Q \sum \delta_j = V_{max} Q$$
 (2)



Fig. 1: Shape of the classical Holling Type (I, II, III) and Ivlev functional responses for ingestion [mmol $m^{-3} d^{-1}$] upon a single prey type [mmol m^{-3}] with a maximum grazing rate of 1.0 [mmol $m^{-3} d^{-1}$] and a half-saturation biomass of 33.33 [mmol m^{-3}].

where g_{max} [d⁻¹] is the maximum biomass-specific ingestion rate of a community of predator species Z [mmol m⁻³]; $V_{max} = g_{max}$ Z is the maximum ingestion rate [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹]; δ_j [n.d.] dictates switching towards prey p_j ; Q [n.d.] gives the predators' probability of feeding as a saturating function of the available (i.e. palatable) prey biomass; G_j [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹] is the ingestion rate upon prey p_j ; and G [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹] is the total ingestion rate from all prey. Both δ_j and Q are non-dimensional terms that vary between 0 and 1. The sum of their multiplication across all prey gives the total food limitation for the predator, which will also be between 0 and 1. The total ingestion rate will be controlled by Q (see equation 2) while the fraction of each prey in the diet will be determined by δ_i (see equation 1).

The differences between functional responses come from how they characterize the prey-switching δ_j and feeding-probability Q terms. When the relative frequency of prey eaten is their relative density in the environment, the switching is passive; otherwise the switching is active. When the total ingestion is a function of total food and independent of the prey biomass distribution, the feeding is maximal; otherwise the feeding is non-maximal. The term δ_j is only different for the one passive-switching functional response (Real's formulation), while the other three active prey-switching functional responses (Fasham, Ryabchenko, and KTW formulations) share the same δ_j but differ in their Q (see Tables 1 and 2).

2.1. Fasham's formulation

Based on the work by Hutson (1984), Fasham et al. (1990) suggested the following formulation to account for predators' switching towards the most abundant prey species. Note that here a predator means a *community* of predators belonging to a given species instead of a single individual organism:

$$G_{j} = V_{\max} \,\delta_{j} \,Q \tag{3}$$

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{F_{\phi}} \frac{F_{\phi}}{K + F_{\phi}}$$
(4)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{k_{sat} + \sum \phi_i p_i}$$
(5)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\rho_j p_j^2}{(k_{\text{sat}} \sum \rho_i p_i) + \sum \rho_i p_i^2}$$
(6)

where k_{sat} is the half-saturation constant for ingestion [mmol m⁻³]; ρ_j is the constant preference (i.e. not density dependent) for prey p_j [n.d.]; and ϕ_j is the variable preference (i.e. density dependent) for prey p_j [n.d.]. The parameter K is related to the half-saturation for ingestion k_{sat} and in Fasham's formulation is assumed to be constant (see Tables 1 and 2). The predators' active prey-switching is controlled by the variable parameter ϕ_j , which gives the relative abundance of each prey measured with respect to the total food available (see Table 2).

The *constant preference* (ρ_j) can reflect a given prey palatability, the matchup between attack-survival strategies, or be related to predator-prey size ratios. The *variable preference* (ϕ_j) is a way to characterize how predators may select preferentially the most abundant prey, reflecting an increase in efficiency at capturing or handling a given prey type as its biomass increases relative to the others. Switching can be interpreted as a way of reflecting a change in the activity or composition of a heterogeneous community of predators that is not explicitly resolved in the model (Fasham et al., 1990). That is, having one generalist predator with active prey-switching is implicitly accounting for having many specialist predators that attack their preferred prey when they become available (see section 4).

Table 1: Functional Responses. $k_{\rm sat}$ is the half-saturation constant for ingestion [mmol m⁻³]; $\rho_{\rm j}$ is the constant preference (i.e. not density dependent) [n.d.] for prey $p_{\rm j}$; and $\phi_{\rm j}$ is the variable preference (i.e. density dependent) [n.d.] for prey $p_{\rm j}$. Note that after substitution of the K parameter, the feeding probability Q for the Real and KTW formulations becomes identical, and that the only difference between Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations is their K parameter

		Real	Fasham	Ryabchenko	KTW
	$\delta_{ m j}$	$\frac{\rho_{\rm j} {\rm p}_{\rm j}}{{\rm F}_{\rho}}$	$\frac{\phi_{\rm j} {\rm p}_{\rm j}}{{\rm F}_{\phi}}$	$\frac{\phi_{\rm j} {\rm p}_{\rm j}}{{\rm F}_{\phi}}$	$\frac{\phi_{\rm j} {\rm p}_{\rm j}}{{\rm F}_{\phi}}$
•	Q	$\frac{\mathbf{F}_{\rho}^{\beta}}{\mathbf{K}^{\beta} + \mathbf{F}_{\rho}^{\beta}}$	$\frac{\mathbf{F}_{\phi}}{\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{F}_{\phi}}$	$\frac{\mathbf{F}_{\phi}}{\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{F}_{\phi}}$	$\frac{\mathbf{F}_{\phi}^{\beta}}{\mathbf{K}^{\beta} + \mathbf{F}_{\phi}^{\beta}}$
	Κ	$k_{\rm sat}$	$k_{\rm sat}$	$k_{\rm sat} \frac{k_{\rm sat}}{F_{\rho}}$	$k_{\rm sat} \frac{F_{\phi}}{F_{\rho}}$

Table 2: Functional Responses (cont.)

$F_{\phi} = \sum \phi_j p_j$	Total food using variable prey preference
$F_{\rho} = \sum \rho_j p_j$	Total food using constant prey preference
$\phi_{\rm j} = \frac{\rho_{\rm j} p_{\rm j}}{\sum \rho_{\rm j} p_{\rm j}}$	Variable prey preference parameter
$\rho_{\rm j} = [0-1]$	Constant prey preference parameter

2.2. Ryabchenko's formulation

This formulation has been derived independently by many authors (Ryabchenko et al., 1997; Gismervik and Andersen, 1997; Koen-Alonso, 2007; Smout et al., 2010) and is often referred to as basic multi-species Holling Type III functional response (Gentleman et al., 2003; Koen-Alonso, 2007; Prowe et al., 2012b):

$$G_{j} = V_{\max} \,\delta_{j} \,Q \tag{7}$$

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{F_{\phi}} \frac{F_{\phi}}{K + F_{\phi}}$$
(8)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{(k_{sat}^2 / \sum \rho_i p_i) + \sum \phi_i p_i}$$
(9)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\rho_j p_j^2}{k_{sat}^2 + \sum \rho_i p_i^2}$$
(10)

The only difference between the Ryabchenko and Fasham formulations is the parameter K of the Q term (see Table 1). In Ryabchenko's, K is made variable by scaling the half-saturation constant k_{sat} with the ratio between k_{sat} and the total prey abundance F_{ρ} (see Tables 1 and 2). In common with Fasham, a switching predator following Ryabchenko's formulation will concentrate its feeding on the relatively most abundant prey (Gismervik and Andersen, 1997).

2.3. Real's formulation

Derived from an analogy between feeding and enzyme reactions (Real, 1977, 1979), this formulation is equivalent to the general (Type II or III) Holling functional response. Extended to account for multiple prey, it takes the following form:

$$G_{j} = V_{\max} \,\delta_{j} \,Q \tag{11}$$

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\rho_j p_j}{F_{\rho}} \frac{F_{\rho}^{\rho}}{K^{\beta} + F_{\rho}^{\beta}}$$
(12)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\rho_j p_j}{F_{\rho}} \frac{F_{\rho}^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + F_{\rho}^{\beta}}$$
(13)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\rho_j p_j}{\sum \rho_i p_i} \frac{(\sum \rho_i p_i)^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + (\sum \rho_i p_i)^{\beta}}$$
(14)

The main differences with the two previous functional responses are that Real's formulation does not account for active preyswitching and that it always gives maximal feeding (e.g. see Michaelis-Menten of Class 1 multiple resource functional responses in Gentleman et al. (2003)). The power β or "Hill" coefficient (Mitra and Flynn, 2006) is a parameter that determines if the shape of feeding probability Q is Type II or Type III. For comparison with the previous Ryabchenko sigmoidal response, we have chosen $\beta = 2$. Therefore, we can also call this formulation a multi-species Holling Type III functional response for total food.

2.4. KTW formulation

Maximal feeding with active prey-switching can be achieved if we use a new scaling factor for the half-saturation constant k_{sat} in order to obtain a parameter K (see Table 2) that will make the feeding probability Q to be solely a function of the total food F_{ρ} and thus independent of the prey biomass distribution:

$$G_{j} = V_{\max} \,\delta_{j} \,Q \tag{15}$$

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{F_{\phi}} \frac{F_{\phi}^{\beta}}{K^{\beta} + F_{\phi}^{\beta}}$$
(16)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{F_{\phi}} \frac{F_{\rho}^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + F_{\rho}^{\beta}}$$
(17)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\phi_j p_j}{\sum \phi_i p_i} \frac{(\sum \rho_i p_i)^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + (\sum \rho_i p_i)^{\beta}}$$
(18)

$$= V_{\max} \frac{\rho_j p_j^2}{\sum \rho_i p_i^2} \frac{(\sum \rho_i p_i)^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + (\sum \rho_i p_i)^{\beta}}$$
(19)

The parameter K is now defined as k_{sat} times the ratio between the total prey abundance computed using the variable preference parameter F_{ϕ} and the total prey abundance computed using the constant preference parameter F_{ρ} (see Tables 1 and 2). The new scaling makes K to be dynamic and decrease when F_{ϕ} becomes smaller than F_{ρ} (e.g. when the food becomes evenly distributed among all prey) and simply reflects differential patterns in the attack rates upon each prey species (see Appendix A). Basically, this scaling removes the dependence of the feeding probability on F_{ϕ} , and thus its dependence on the particular distribution of food among the prey. Therefore, the feeding probability will only change as a function of total available food F_{ρ} and with a constant half-saturation for ingestion k_{sat} (see equation 17). The ecological assumption is that all prey are perfectly substitutable for equal fixed preferences (Tilman, 1982). Note that the KTW formulation combines the same δ_i as in the Fasham/Ryabchenko formulations with the same Q as in the Real formulation. As before, the power β will determine if the shape of Q is Type II or Type III for total food. In order to obtain the same feeding probability as Real's formulations we chose it to be β = 2. We give a formal derivation of the KTW formulation in Appendix A where we make an explicit link between active switching to fundamental properties like the attack rate upon different prey species.

3. Feeding mode: maximal and non-maximal

Figure 2 show ingestion upon each prey G_j as a function of the prey biomass p_j for an idealized ecosystem consisting of one predator species feeding upon two prey species with the four functional responses evaluated in this study. Figure 3 gives both the feeding probability Q and the total ingestion G from the two prey as a function of p_j . The total ingestion is $G = V_{max} Q$ and we assume $V_{max} = 1.0$ [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹] for simplicity. In common to all four functional responses, the total ingestion increases at low prey abundance and then starts to saturate at higher prey abundance (see Figure 3). Also, the feeding on a given prey (e.g. Prey 1) is relaxed as the biomass of the alternative prey (i.e. Prey 2) increases (Figure 2).

The first two functional responses (Fasham, Ryabchenko) account for active switching but while doing so they decrease the feeding probability as the total available food becomes evenly distributed among the prey (see Figures 3a and 3b), which leads to the nonmaximal feeding of these formulations (see Figure 4). This decrease in feeding probability does not occur for the other two functional responses (Real, KTW) for which the feeding is therefore always maximal (see Figures 3c and 3d and Figure 4). In both suboptimal (Fasham) and antagonistic (Ryabchenko) feeding, moving along an isocline of equal total food available (e.g. the dotted line connecting the points Prey 1 = Prey 2 = k_{sat} [mmol m⁻³] in Figure 3) gives different values of feeding probability. Furthermore, with sub-optimal feeding even an increase in the abundance of one prey, while keeping the abundance of the other prey constant (e.g. moving left-to-right along an horizontal line at any Prey 2 biomass), can sometimes lead to a decrease in the feeding probability despite the fact that the total food is actually increasing (see Figure 3a).

The third formulation (Real) does not consider active preyswitching. Thus, the feeding probability now depends on total food available but not on how biomass is distributed among the prey. This means that if the constant prey preferences ρ_j were all the same (e.g. say equal to 1.0), all prey would become perfectly substitutable from the point of view of the predator. In this situation the feeding is always maximal because the presence of other prey does not interfere antagonistically with the predators' feeding probability (see Figure 3c). Finally, the fourth formulation (i.e. KTW) behaves as a combination of the other three formulations: it accounts for active switching while giving maximal feeding (see Figure 3d). We will next give more details about the differences of each of these four functional responses and elaborate on the reasons behind their particular behaviour.

3.1. Fasham's formulation

In this formulation and in common to the other two functional responses with switching, the term δ_j is a non-linear function of the prey relative biomass and rapidly increases when the abundance of a given prey is high relative to the total food, which rapidly changes the relative fraction of alternative prey in the diet of the predator (see Figure 2a). Therefore, the predation pressure is disproportionately large on relatively more abundant prey and disproportionately small on relatively less abundant prey (Murdoch, 1969). That is because the non-linear (i.e. quadratic) increase of the switching term δ_j with prey p_j biomass happens faster than if it were simply a linear function of prey p_j biomass. This implies that relatively low abundant prey are granted implicitly a prey refuge through a relaxation of feeding at low relative prey densities (Vallina and Le Quéré, 2011; Prowe et al., 2012a). That is, when alter-



Fig. 2: Shape of the four functional responses (Fasham, Ryabchenko, Real, KTW) for the ingestion G_{p_1} [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹] upon Prey 1. Constant parameters: maximum grazing rate $V_{max} = 1.0$ [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹], half saturation for ingestion $k_{sat} = 33.33$ [mmol m⁻³], prey preferences $\rho_j = 1.0$ [n.d.]. The shaded areas depict the region where the functional response is sigmoidal (i.e. Type III). The non-shaded areas depict the region where the functional response is hyperbolic (i.e. Type III).



Fig. 3: Countour plots of the feeding probability Q [n.d.] and total ingestion $G = V_{max}$ Q [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹] from Prey 1 and Prey 2 for the four functional responses (Fasham, Ryabchenko, Real, KTW) as a function of prey abundance [mmol m⁻³]. The dotted line gives an isocline of equal total food available ($F_{\rho} = \sum \rho_j p_j = 33.33$ [mmol m⁻³]). Constant parameters: maximum grazing rate $V_{max} = 1.0$ [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹], half saturation for ingestion $k_{sat} = 33.33$ [mmol m⁻³], prey preferences $\rho_j = 1.0$ [n.d.]



Fig. 4: Feeding probability Q [n.d.] and total ingestion $G = V_{\rm max}$ Q [mmol m^{-3} d⁻¹] for a constant total food available of 100 [mmol m^{-3}] as a function of the number of equally abundant prey species (i.e. 100 / N) [mmol m^{-3}] in an idealized ecosystem composed of one predator species feeding upon N prey species with: maximal ingestion (Real and KTW formulations; black dotted line) and non-maximal ingestion (Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations; gray dotted line). Constant parameters: maximum grazing rate $V_{\rm max}$ = 1.0 [mmol m^{-3} d⁻¹], half saturation for ingestion $k_{\rm sat}$ = 100 [mmol m^{-3}], prey preferences $\rho_{\rm j}$ = 1.0 [n.d.]. (Note that Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations will give slightly different curves if $k_{\rm sat}$ \neq 100)

native prey are present the functional response becomes sigmoidal (see the shaded area in Figure 2a). Thus, the functional response on Prey 1 goes from being Type II when Prey 2 abundance is zero to being Type III when Prey 2 abundance is highest (see Figure 2a).

For a fixed amount of total food, the feeding probability Q decreases with the evenness of the prey biomass distribution (see Figure 3a). This happens because Q was calculated using F_{ϕ} as the measure of total food, which includes the variable preference ϕ_i (i.e. the relative abundance of each prey respect to total food; see Tables 1 and 2). The feeding probability can even decrease with total food for moderate increases of one prey biomass, leading to the sub-optimal feeding observed for this formulation (see Figure 3a). The main issue with using F_{ϕ} to calculate Q is that for mass conservative ecosystems having many co-existing species could imply that each of them represents just a small fraction of the total prey abundance. Thus, the parameter ϕ_j will become small because the fraction of each prey p_j abundance respect to a constant total prey abundance decreases with the number of prey. Smaller ϕ_i will make both F_{ϕ} and Q small as well. Taken to the limit where the relative fraction of each prey is infinitesimally small this will lead to the feeding probability tending to zero, regardless of total prey abundance (see the non-maximal feeding case in Figure 4).

3.2. Ryabchenko's formulation

One feature of Ryabchenko's formulation is that the shape of the functional response for predation upon any particular prey p_j is always sigmoidal, even if there is only one prey present (Gismervik and Andersen, 1997). Also, and in common to Fasham's formulation, as the biomass of alternative prey increases, the sigmoidal shape of the functional response for any given p_j becomes stronger (see the shaded area in Figures 2b). Secondly, the feeding probability Q shows lower dependence on prey abundance distribution than the Fasham formulation and always increases with total food (i.e. it does not cause sub-optimal feeding). Yet and in common with Fasham, the feeding probability Q leads to antagonistic feeding because it decreases with the evenness of the prey biomass distribution (see Figure 3b).

In Ryabchenko's formulation the feeding probability Q is also computed using F_{ϕ} (see Tables 1 and 2). However, the scaling of the half-saturation constant in the Ryabchenko formulation (i.e. k_{sat} is first squared and then scaled by the total prey abundance; see Table 1) eliminates the sub-optimal feeding of Fasham's formulation (see Figures 3a and 3b). Nevertheless, the feature of the feeding probability tending to zero as the relative fraction of biomass in each prey becomes infinitely small still persists in Ryabchenko's formulation (see the non-maximal feeding case in Figure 4). To avoid these conceptually problematic issues, the solution we suggest is to remove the variable preference ϕ_j from the calculation of the feeding probability Q and use ϕ_j only to compute the switching term δ_j (see section 3.4).

3.3. Real's formulation

This formulation does not include active switching. For moderate to high total prey abundance (i.e. values above k_{sat}) the predation on a given p_j will still decrease if the abundance of alternative prey increases but this only reflects that p_j becomes a smaller proportion of the total prey abundance in the environment. The term δ_j is now a linear function of the prey biomass and their constant prey preferences ρ_j . The switching is thus passive: for equal fixed preferences, the fraction of each prey in the diet will simply reflect their fraction in the environment.

Passive switching does not provide a refuge to relatively less abundant prey. In fact, the prey lose their refuge when the biomass of alternative prey increases: there is a transition from a Type III response to a Type II response (see the non-shaded area in Figure 2c). This differs from the behaviour of the Ryabchenko formulation, in which the predation upon each individual prey is always sigmoidal. Furthermore, it is exactly the opposite behaviour from the Fasham formulation, in which the transition went from Type II to Type III. With passive switching any increase in either prey will lead to higher predation on both species, especially at low total prey abundance (i.e. values below k_{sat} , before the term Q starts to saturate).

The best way to visualize this behaviour is by noting that the grazing refuge now applies to the *total* food, instead of to each individual prey. Starting at low total food abundance, as total food increases the refuge will slowly disappear for all prey, regardless of their relative abundances. Prey 1 loses its refuge when Prey 2 increases because Q increases faster than δ_1 decreases. However, the fact that Q is now computed using F_{ρ} , a measure of total food that does not include the variable preference ϕ_j (see Tables 1 and 2), has the advantage of leading to maximal feeding (see Figure 3c and Figure 4).

3.4. KTW formulation

This formulation uses the same active switching δ_j as the Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations, in combination with the maximal feeding probability Q of Real's. That is, the variable preference ϕ_j is now only used to compute the switching term but not to compute the feeding probability. The new scaling of the half-saturation constant (i.e. k_{sat} is multiplied by the ratio F_{ϕ}/F_{ρ}) makes the feeding probability to essentially depend on F_{ρ} (see Tables 1 and 2), which eliminates the non-maximal feeding observed for the Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations (see Figure 3). This results in a multi-species functional response that combines maximal feeding probability (before saturation) and relatively more abundant prey will contribute a larger fraction of the predators' diet than their fraction in the environment.



Fig. 5: Food web configurations that are implicit (left-side panels) to an explicit food web (right-side panel) composed of one predator species feeding on N identical prey species using functional responses with maximal feeding (upper panels; i.e. Real and KTW formulations) and non-maximal feeding (bottom panels; i.e. Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations). The dotted lines in the explicit food web reflect that the strength of predator-prey interactions decreases with the number of prey for the non-maximal feeding functional responses. See Appendix B.

Note that the only mathematical difference between the Real formulation and the KTW formulation is the use of quadratic prey abundances in the former to compute the switching term (see equations 14 and 19; see also kill-the-winner coefficient α in Appendix A). Since Real and KTW use the same feeding probability \overline{Q} , they both give maximal feeding (see Figures 3 and 4). However, adding active switching leads to important differences in behaviour between the two formulations. In particular, we note that now the functional response for each individual prey p_i is always Type III, with the sigmoidal shape becoming stronger as the biomass of alternative prey increases (see the shaded area in Figures 2d). The prey do not lose their refuge when the biomass of alternative prey increases, contrary to Real's formulation. This is similar to the Ryabchenko formulation but note that if we chose the power to be $\beta = 1$ (instead of $\beta = 2$), it will behave more like the Fasham formulation (transition from Type II to Type III).

4. Food web configuration: explicit and implicit

Figure 4 shows the feeding probability as a function of the number of equally abundant prey for maximal and non-maximal feeding formulations. Although the total food is constant, the ingestion decreases exponentially with the number of prey in the nonmaximal case (Fasham, Ryabchenko) while it is constant when the feeding is maximal (Real, KTW). The root cause of this behaviour is that maximal and non-maximal feeding formulations are implicitly assuming different food web configurations: switching is essentially a community response. Food web configuration (either explicit or implicit) has important consequences for the interaction strength between the whole predator and prey communities (see Appendix B) and for the community assembly process (Grover, 1994; Loreau, 2010).

Having one explicit predator species with active switching can be seen as a way of implicitly accounting for many predator species feeding preferentially upon different prey (Fasham et al., 1990). As some prey species become more relatively abundant, this will be followed by an increase in the proportion of their specific predators. Non-maximal feeding formulations with one explicit predator (see lower-right panel in Figure 5) are implicitly assuming a food web configuration of *pairwise* predator-prey interactions (i.e. oneto-one) in which a fraction of the community of predators feeds exclusively upon a single prey species (see lower-left panels in Figure 5). The fraction of the predator community that becomes fully specialized in a single prey species is given by the fraction of that prey in the environment. Maximal feeding formulations with one explicit predator (see upper-right panel in Figure 5) are implicitly assuming a food web configuration of *meshwise* predator-prey interactions (i.e. all-to-all) in which the whole community of predator can feed upon all prey species (see upper-left panels in Figure 5).

There is an inverse dependence of total ingestion with the number of prey (N) in the case of explicit pairwise predator-prey interactions that is absent in the case of meshwise predator-prey interactions (see the analytical derivation in the Appendix B). With fully specialized pairwise interactions adding more prey implies *splitting* the predators' biomass into attacking specific prey species, which decreases the strength of the non-linear interactions between the whole predator and prey communities. With meshwise interactions adding more prey does not affect the interaction strength between the whole predator and prey communities (see Appendix B). This therefore explains the non-maximal feeding observed for the Fasham's and Ryabchenko's formulations and the maximal feeding observed for Real's and KTW formulations. Both Fasham's and Ryabchenko's formulations are implicitly assuming a food web of pairwise interactions (following Type II and Type III responses, respectively), whereas for the Real and KTW formulations the total ingestion is independent of N because they are implicitly assuming a food web of meshwise interactions (see Appendix B).



Fig. 6: Phytoplankton biomass [mmolN m⁻³] by functional group (*Prochlorococcus, Synechococcus,* flagellates, diatoms): First column panels: Real formulation, Second column panels: Fasham formulation, Third column panels: Ryabchenko formulation, Fourth column panels: KTW formulation.

5. Global ocean simulations

We implemented the four functional responses described above in a global marine ecosystem model (Follows et al., 2007; Dutkiewicz et al., 2009) in order to evaluate the impact of different modes of predation (i.e. passive / active switching with maximal / non-maximal feeding) on marine phytoplankton diversity and biogeography (Barton et al., 2010; Prowe et al., 2012a). See Supp. Material (S1) for a detailed description of the model. We also performed a sensitivity analysis to the feeding pressure (i.e. low, medium, high) through varying the constant half-saturation constant for ingestion k_{sat} by \pm 50% respect to the control case. The results are the average of these 3 ensemble runs. The individual runs are given in the Supp. Material (S2).

5.1. Species traits

The model was initialized with 64 phytoplankton species belonging to four major phytoplankton functional groups and two sizeclasses: small phytoplankton (i.e. Prochlorococcus and Synechococcus) and large phytoplankton (i.e. flagellates and diatoms). The model also resolves two predator size classes that feed preferentially on small and large phytoplankton, respectively: a generic micro-zooplankton and a generic meso-zooplankton. For each phytoplankton group, we generated 16 species by allowing a $\pm 30\%$ variability of the two traits that characterize the groups' ability to take up nutrients: the maximum specific growth rate μ_{max} $[d^{-1}]$ and the half-saturation constant for nutrient uptake ks [mmol m⁻³]. Phytoplankton growth will only be limited by nutrients and light levels, without photo-inhibition or temperature dependence. Within each group, the most competitive species will be the one having the highest maximum specific growth rate with the lowest half-saturation constant, which leads to the highest uptake affinity (i.e. $\mu_{\rm max}$ / ks). Among groups, there is a trade-off between

growth rate and nutrient affinity, which provides each phytoplankton functional group a particular nutrient niche (Dutkiewicz et al., 2009).

The nutrient uptake affinities are related to the species' subsistence nutrient concentration or "R star", which is defined as $R^* = \frac{m_{phy}}{\mu_{max} - m_{phy}}$ ks. This concept was derived by Tilman (1977) and gives the equilibrium requirement of a shared common resource (e.g. phosphate) of a monoculture of each species with constant loss rates (Tilman, 1982). Note that in this restricted definition of R^\ast the mortality rate $m_{\rm phy}$ is assumed constant. However, including predators adds an extra mortality that varies with topdown pressure, causing m_{phy} (and thus R^*) to increase with the feeding rate. Species with lower maximum growth rate are more sensitive to changes in the mortality rate than species with higher growth rate: if m_{phy} and μ_{max} are of similar magnitude, the R^* will become very high. Therefore, the presence of shared predators adds the potential for apparent competition among the prey, which occurs indirectly between the species that share a common predator (Holt, 1977; Grover, 1994; Loreau, 2010)

5.2. Phytoplankton biogeography

The global simulations show that in a non-stationary environment the four phytoplankton groups are able to persist even without active switching (see Real maps in Figure 6) or even without any grazing at all (see Supp. Material S3). Since among groups there is a trade-off between growth rate and nutrient affinity that gives each phytoplankton group a particular nutrient niche (see Supp. Material S1); seasonality disturbances provide niches for both low-nutrient adapted groups (i.e. small phytoplankton) and highnutrient adapted groups (i.e. large phytoplankton) (Dutkiewicz et al., 2009). However, each group tends to occupy a well defined oceanic region, not being capable of co-existing with other groups



Fig. 7: Species richness by functional group (*Prochlorococcus, Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms): First column panels: Real formulation, Second column panels: Fasham formulation, Third column panels: Ryabchenko formulation, Fourth column panels: KTW formulation. Species richness is defined as the annual mean of monthly diversity. The monthly diversity is defined as the total number of species comprising greater than 1% of the total biomass at that location and month.

due to competitive exclusion. This is more easily noticeable in the individual simulations (see Supp. Material S2) than in the average of the ensemble that significantly blurs these features. Active switching (Fasham, Ryabchenko, KTW) allows for more spatial overlapping of phytoplankton groups; they co-exist over larger regions.

The biogeography of each group is very sensitive to the choice of the functional response. Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations give similar phytoplankton biogeography; Real's gives markedly different distributions; and KTW gives a biogeography that is intermediate. This is similar to the conclusions of an earlier study that tested four functional responses on phytoplankton group biogeography and also found large variations in the extent and magnitude of the simulated distributions of several phytoplankton groups with the grazing formulation (Anderson et al., 2010). With active switching (Fasham, Ryabchenko, KTW) the biogeography of the phytoplankton groups (Figure 6) matches their speciesrichness distribution (Figure 7): the highest diversity in each group is generally observed where it dominates. However, when using active switching with non-maximal feeding (i.e. Fasham and Ryabchenko) there is a probably unrealistic dominance of the small Prochlorococcus species over most of the ocean: they display almost global coverage and their biomass concentration is usually the highest of the four groups, even in the Southern Ocean (i.e. 40°S - 60°S) where larger diatoms are known to dominate the phytoplankton biomass (Boyd et al., 2000; Gall et al., 2001; Hoffmann et al., 2006; Hirata et al., 2011).

When using passive switching with maximal feeding (i.e. Real), the *Prochlorococcus* distribution appear more realistic since they are known to mostly dominate oligotrophic regions between 40° N and 40° S (Longhurst, 2006; Moore, 2010; Hirata et al., 2011).

However, at higher latitudes (e.g. Southern Ocean) the most dominant group should be the diatoms instead of the flagellates (Boyd et al., 2000; Gall et al., 2001; Marañon et al., 2001; Hoffmann et al., 2006; Hirata et al., 2011). The transition between biogeographic regions is also very sharp (see Supp. Material S2). When using active switching with maximal feeding (i.e. KTW) the phytoplankton functional group distributions are more balanced. Each group tends to dominate in some ocean areas with a smooth transition between biogeographic regions. The modelled analogs of *Prochlorococcus* dominate at low latitudes and diatoms dominate at high latitudes; *Synechococcus* analogs are more widely distributed than *Prochlorococcus*; and modelled flagellates are also more widely distributed than diatom analogs. Although diatoms show the highest local biomass, no functional group clearly dominates in terms of global abundance (see Figure 6).

The feeding probability of zooplankton (see Figure 8) has a very strong influence on total phytoplankton biomass (see Figure 9): the Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations lead to much higher biomass concentrations than the Real and KTW formulations (up to a factor of x3). The lower feeding probability of the non-maximal feeding formulations (i.e. Fasham and Ryabchenko) compared to the maximal feeding formulations (i.e. Real and KTW) means a weaker predator-prey interaction strength, which allows the total prey biomass to attain higher values.

5.3. Phytoplankton diversity

Regarding the global distribution of species richness obtained with the four functional responses, the two main features are: *i*) species co-existence within and among phytoplankton functional groups when using active switching (i.e. Fasham, Ryabchenko, KTW) and *ii*) dominance of one species per functional group and competitive



Fig. 8: Average feeding probability [n.d.] from the two generic zooplankton upon phytoplankton for the four functional responses: (a) Fasham formulation, (b) Ryabchenko formulation, (c) Real formulation, (d) KTW formulation.

exclusion of all the others within each group when using passive switching (i.e. Real) (see Figure 7). The highest level of diversity is obtained with the KTW formulation, both per functional group (see Figure 7) and total (see Figure 10). Species richness is defined here as the annual mean of monthly diversity, which is measured as the total number of species contributing greater than 1% of the total biomass at that location and month (Barton et al., 2010).

Without active switching (Real) we obtain the lowest level of maximum diversity: 4 species, one per functional group (Figure 10c); these are the best competitors of each group (see Supp. Material S1) and therefore they outcompete all other species of their group. With active switching plus maximum feeding (KTW) we obtain the highest level of maximum diversity: \approx 48 species on an annual average (Figure 10d); with active switching plus non-maximal feeding (Fasham and Ryabchenko) we obtain intermediate levels of diversity (Figures 10a and 10b). The Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations support lower diversity than the KTW formulation because their non-maximal feeding decreases the strength of the active switching stabilizing mechanism. Using Fasham's formulation Prowe et al. (2012a) showed that increasing the grazing pressure, increased phytoplankton diversity. We performed a sensitivity analysis of the feeding pressure that gives similar results (see Supp. Material S2). When the prey experience less predation pressure, they experience more competition for nutrients (Fuchs and Franks, 2010).

With active switching the lowest diversity is observed in nutrient poor regions like the subtropical gyres, and the highest diversity occurs at nutrient rich regions like the upwelling system off the coast of Peru (Figure 10). Slightly different patterns of diversity were reported by Barton et al. (2010) and Prowe et al. (2012a) but our results are not directly comparable to theirs. These studies included optimal niches of light and temperature that are absent in our simulations. Differences in light and temperature sensitivities affected the species fitness, leading to co-existence at low latitudes of phenotypes with similar subsistence resource concentrations but different light and temperature physiologies. That mechanism is ignored in our simulations for reasons of focus. Grazing induced mortality provides another avenue by which organisms may achieve similar fitness (i.e. \mathbb{R}^*).

Contrary to the results with active switching, increasing the grazing pressure with passive switching has been shown to decrease phytoplankton diversity (Prowe et al., 2012a) because non-selective grazing magnifies the competitive abilities for nutrient uptake of the different prey species which results in stronger competitive exclusion. This relates to the early findings of May (1974) with simple Lotka-Volterra models that an increase in inter-specific competition brings instability to the food web if the intra-specific competition remains constant. That is, when the sum of the inter-specific forces in the ecosystem is higher than the sum of its intra-specific forces, the system becomes unstable (e.g. species extinctions occur). Stronger predation with non-selective feeding falls within this scenario (Haydon, 1994). However, stronger predation with active switching increases intra-specific forces and thus it stabilizes the ecosystem through a negative (i.e. self-regulatory) feedback affecting each prey biomass (Haydon, 1994). That is why active switching combined with maximal feeding gives the higher level of diversity.



Fig. 9: Total phytoplankton biomass [mmolN m⁻³] for the four functional responses: (a) Fasham formulation, (b) Ryabchenko formulation, (c) Real formulation, (d) KTW formulation.

6. Discussion

Selective feeding is known to be an important component underpinning the assembly rules of predator-prey communities (Grover, 1994; Loreau, 2010) and the size-structure of marine communities (Armstrong, 1994; Poulin and Franks, 2010; Banas, 2011). Small phytoplankton types are good competitors for nutrients but are prevented from exhausting all available nutrients by selective top-down control (Ward et al., 2012). Grazing places a limit on the amount of phytoplankton biomass within each size-class, while the nutrient supply dictates the number of size classes and hence the total biomass in the system (Chisholm, 1992; Armstrong, 1994; Ward et al., 2012). This mechanism is based on the size-specificity of predator-prey interactions which makes the assumption that grazing interactions occur preferentially at a certain predator-prey size ratio. The success of one particular prey is held in check by the increased growth of the zooplankton that feed preferentially on that prey. Therefore, size-diversity increases with the amount of nutrients because the selective top-down control of smaller sizes allows larger size classes to invade and persist (Armstrong, 1994; Fuchs and Franks, 2010; Banas, 2011).

However, predator-prey linkages are not just given by body sizes but also by the consumers' feeding type (Wirtz, 2012b). There is a wide range of prey species at each predator size class (Hansen, 1994; Fuchs and Franks, 2010). Although our global scale simulations are based on just two broad size-classes of plankton (i.e. large and small), combining active switching with more highly resolved size-selective feeding will increase the species diversity within each prey size-class; size preferences alone cannot bring about within size-class diversity. Increasing the number of prey species in our study is thus analogous to increasing selective predator-prey interactions. That is why we find more prey diversity where they are more abundant (i.e. less limited by nutrients) in the global maps with active prey-switching (Fasham, Ryabchenko, KTW). More nutrients are able to sustain more species through selective feeding, which is implicit to active switching formulations (see Section 4). Selective feeding (explicit or implicit) leads to positive niche complementarity among the prey through differentiation of their predators (Loreau, 2010). Prey complementarity arises from avoidance of predator-mediated or "apparent" competition (Holt, 1977; Loreau, 2010).

Previous works have shown that there are large differences in the phytoplankton diversity (Prowe et al., 2012a) and biogeography (Anderson et al., 2010) between selective grazing (e.g. Fasham's and Ryabchenko's) versus non-selective grazing (i.e. Real's) formulations. However, there are also significant differences in the phytoplankton diversity and biogeography between the Fasham / Ryabchenko versus the KTW formulation. Although the three functional responses with active switching account for selective feeding, the fact that $\sum \phi_i p_i \leq \sum \rho_i p_i$ implies that with nonmaximal feeding probability the effective half-saturation for ingestion upon the whole prey community increases with the number of prey (Banas, 2011) (see Appendix B). That means that the ingestion rate of a given predator species decreases with the range of prey species available for consumption (Fuchs and Franks, 2010) which affects the degree of predator-mediated complementarity (Thébault and Loreau, 2003). Here we argue that the feeding probability should not necessarily change with the diet breadth.

Apparent competition occurs indirectly between prey that share a common predator species (Holt, 1977). This introduces a new element to the prey community assembly which now depends not



Fig. 10: Total species richness for the four functional responses: (a) Fasham formulation, (b) Ryabchenko formulation, (c) Real formulation, (d) KTW formulation. Species richness is defined as the annual mean of monthly diversity. The monthly diversity is defined as the total number of species comprising greater than 1% of the total biomass at that location and month.

only on the nutrient concentration but also on the predators' concentration (Grover, 1994; Loreau, 2010). Prochlorococcus tend to dominate in Fasham's and Ryabchenko's formulations because for weak apparent competition among prey they are intrinsically the best competitors (i.e. lowest R*). Complete suppression of grazing activity (i.e. zooplankton dying out of starvation) to evaluate the effect of removing apparent competition leads to similar phytoplankton biogeography, although now with only one species per phytoplankton group being able to survive due to the lack of active switching (see Supp. Material S3). However, strong apparent competition decreases the relative competitive ability of the species with slower maximum growth rate like Prochlorococ*cus*, which benefits the species with faster maximum growth rates like diatoms (see Supp. Material S2). The apparent competition of the Real and KTW formulations is stronger than in Fasham / Ryabchenko formulations due to the maximal feeding.

7. Limitations and generality

This work is essentially a theoretical exercise. No attempt has been made at this stage to formally validate the model simulations with global datasets of phytoplankton diversity and biogeography. The main goal of our analyses was to better understand the assumptions of switching functional responses with regard to the implicit food web configurations of predator-prey communities, and to explore the effect that the different functional responses for predation may have on modelled ecosystem dynamics. This work adds theoretical support to the early suggestion that active switching is a potentially powerful mechanism to sustain high levels of diversity (Oaten and Murdoch, 1975; Murdoch and Oaten, 1975). However, is active switching an important driver of diversity in natural ecosystems? More experimental and field work should be able to better answer this theoretical hypothesis. Although switching towards alternative prey has been documented to occur in the laboratory (Murdoch, 1969, 1975; Hughes and Croy, 1993; Gismervik and Andersen, 1997; Kiorboe et al., 1996; Elliott, 2006; Kiorboe, 2008; Kalinkat et al., 2011), conflicting results based on the analyses of even the same data sets have been also reported (e.g. (Rindorf et al., 2006; Kempf et al., 2008)). Thus, an unambiguous proof of its relevance in the field remains elusive (Hassell, 2000; Elliott, 2006).

Should we expect total ingestion always to be maximal? When the predators must trade off their own predation success against their own risk of predation, maximal feeding may not always be the emergent property (Mariani and Visser, 2010). Also, a decrease in the predation efficiency with the number of prey species could be an emergent property in some complex food webs if there is an increased difficulty for the predators to attack their prey due to an increase in habitat complexity with prey diversity, such as heterogeneities in prey distribution (i.e. patches) or prey-defense strategies (Abrams and Allison, 1982; Duffy et al., 2007). On the other hand, should we expect total ingestion to become infinitely small as prey diversity becomes large? Solutions with negligible total ingestion when prey diversity is high appear unphysical and enforcing a maximal feeding behaviour can alleviate this unrealistic response.

Active switching formulations are by design *phenomenological* models, which describe a phenomenon without explicit consideration of the lower-level processes that generate it (Loreau, 2010). Both the Hill coefficient β and the kill-the-winner coefficient α (see Appendix A) impose density-dependent predatory mortalities upon the prey without saying which mechanisms are causing it.

They are an abstraction for a wealth of factors that are neither well understood nor explicitly modeled. The focus is thus placed on the consequences that switching has on ecosystem dynamics, rather than on the causes that generate the switching itself. The main strength and the corresponding main weakness of phenomenological models is their simplicity: on the one hand they provide simple predictions and clear interpretations; on the other hand they do not provide a complete description of reality (Loreau, 2010). The lack of well-defined first-principle rules to model active switching from pure mechanistic grounds can lead to formulation inconsistencies (see Appendix C). Therefore active switching formulations should ideally move towards a more mechanistic approach. Also, it is worth noting that there is a clear mismatch between the scales at which the plankton communities interact and the scales at which global ocean models operate (Siegel, 1998).

8. Conclusions

Complex food web models need mechanisms to overcome the probably unrealistic but common outcome of one or few species outcompeting all others. The use of functional responses with active prey-switching can help alleviate competitive exclusion. However, active switching formulations in which the feeding is non-maximal (Fasham, Ryabchenko) have the problem that an increase in the number of modelled prey species implies a decrease of the average predator-prey interaction strength (Vallina and Le Quéré, 2011). If the strength of predator-prey interactions decreases, the total prey biomass will therefore increase. This mostly applies to closed (i.e. mass conservative) systems like the global ocean in which the total mass (biotic + abiotic) of essential elements is roughly constant at the seasonal scale and therefore more prey species means less biomass per prey, until reaching a point where they all become protected from predation in their own prey refuge and none can be eaten. With maximal feeding formulations (Real, KTW) the average of predator-prey interactions is unaffected by the number of prey species. However, the number of species decreases to very low levels in the absence of active switching due to strong competitive exclusion (Real). We derived a kill-the-winner functional response that combines active switching with maximal feeding (KTW). Global ocean simulations show that both active switching and maximal feeding are key elements to sustain higher levels of species diversity while providing realistic phytoplankton functional-group biogeography.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a Marie Curie Fellowship (IOF - FP7) to S.M.V. from the European Union (EU) and was performed within the MIT's Darwin Project. We would like to thank Prof. Kai W. Wirtz and three other anonymous reviewers for their thorough review of the manuscript. Our special thanks to Oliver Jahn for his assistance with the global ocean simulations.

References

- Abrams, P. A., Allison, T. D., 1982. Complexity, stability and functional response. The American Naturalist 119(2), 240--249.
- Adjou, M., Bendtsen, J., Richardson, K., 2012. Modeling the influence from transport, mixing and grazing on phytoplankton diversity. Ecological Modelling 225, 19--27.
- Anderson, T. R., Gentleman, W. C., Sinha, B., 2010. Influence of grazing formulations on the emergent properties of a complex ecosystem model in an ocean general circulation model. Progress in Oceanography 87(1-4), 201--213.
- Arditi, R., Michalski, J., 1995. Nonlinear food web models and their responses to increased basal productivity. In: Polis, G. A., Winemiller, K. O. (Eds.), Food Webs: Integration of Patterns and Dynamics. Chapman & Hall, London, England, pp. 122--133.
- Armstrong, R. A., 1994. Grazing limitation and nutrient limitation in marine ecosystems: steady-state solutions of an ecosystem model with multiple food chains. Limnology and Oceanography 39(3), 597--608.
- Armstrong, R. A., 1999. Stable model structures for representing biogeochemical diversity and size spectra in plankton communities. Journal of Plankton Re-

search 21(3), 445--464.

- Armstrong, R. A., McGehee, R., 1980. Competitive exclusion. The American Naturalist 115(2), 151--170.
- Banas, N. S., 2011. Adding complex trophic interactions to a size-spectral plankton model: Emergent diversity patterns and limits on predictability. Ecological Modelling 222, 2663--2675.
- Barton, A., Dutkiewicz, S., Flierl, G., Bragg, J. G., Follows, M. J., 2010. Patterns of diversity in marine phytoplankton. Science 327, 1509--1511.
- Berryman, A. A., Michalski, J., Gutierrez, A. P., Arditi, R., 1995. Logistic theory of food web dynamics. Ecology 76, 336--343.
- Boyd, P. W., Watson, A. J., Law, C. S., Abraham, E. R., Trull, T., Murdoch, R., Bakker, D. C. E., Bowie, A. R., Buesseler, K. O., Chang, H., Charette, M., Croot, P., Downing, K., Frew, R., Gall, M., Hadfield, M., Hall, J., Harvey, M., Jameson, G., LaRoche, J., Liddicoat, M., Ling, R., Maldonado, M. T., McKay, R. M., Nodder, S., Pickmere, S., Pridmore, R., Rintoul, S., Safi, K., Sutton, P., Strzepek, R., Tanneberger, K., Turner, S., Waite, A., Zeldis, J., 2000. A mesoscale phytoplankton bloom in the polar Southern Ocean stimulated by iron fertilization. Nature 407, 695--702.
- Chisholm, S. W., 1992. Phytoplankton size. In: Falkowski, P., Woodhead, A. D. (Eds.), Primary productivity and biogeochemical cycles in the sea (Environmental Science Research: Volume 43). Plenum Press, New York, pp. 213--237.
- de Baar, H. J. W., 1994. von liebig's law of the minimum and plankton ecology (1899-1991). Progress in Oceanography 33(4), 347--386.
- Duffy, J. E., Cardinale, B. J., France, K. E., McIntyre, P. B., Theabault, E., Loreau, M., 2007. The functional role of biodiversity in ecosystems: incorporating trophic complexity. Ecology Letters 10, 522--538.
- Dutkiewicz, S., Follows, M. J., Bragg, J. G., 2009. Modeling the coupling of ocean ecology and biogeochemistry. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 23, 1--15.
- Elliott, J. M., 2006. Prey switching in *Rhyacophila dorsalis* (Trichoptera) alters with larval instar. Freshwater Biology 51, 913--924.
- Fasham, M. J. R., Ducklow, H. W., McKelvie, D. S., 1990. A nitrogen-based model of plankton dynamics in the oceanic mixed layer. J. Mar. Res. 48, 591--639.
- Follows, M. J., Dutkiewicz, S., Grant, S., Chisholm, S. W., 2007. Emergent biogeography of microbial communities in a model ocean. Science 315, 1843--1846.
- Fuchs, H. L., Franks, P. J. S., 2010. Plankton community properties determined by nutrients and size-selective feeding. Marine Ecology Progress Series 413, 1--15.
- Gall, M. P., Boyd, P. W., Hall, J., Safi, K. A., Chang, H., 2001. Phytoplankton processes. Part 1: Community structure during the Southern Ocean iron release experiment (SOIREE). Deep-Sea Research II 48, 2551--2570.
- Gentleman, W., Leising, A., Frost, B., Strom, S., Murray, J., 2003. Functional responses for zooplankton feeding on multiple resources: a review of assumptions and biological dynamics. Deep-Sea Research II 50, 2847--2875.
- Gismervik, I., Andersen, T., 1997. Prey switching by *Acartia clausi*: experimental evidence and implications of intraguild predation assessed by a model. Marine Ecology Progress Series 157, 247--259.
- Grover, J. P., 1994. Assembly rules for communities of nutrient-limited plants and specialist herbivores. The American Naturalist 143(2), 258--282.
- Hansen, B. W., 1994. The size ratio between planktonic predators and their prey. Limnology and Oceanography 39(2), 395--403.
- Hardin, G., 1960. The competitive exclusion principle. Science 131, 1292--1297.
- Hassell, M. P., 2000. The spatial and temporal dynamics of host-parasitoid interactions. Oxford series in ecology and evolution. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Haydon, D., 1994. Pivotal assumptions determining the relationship between stability and complexity: An analytical synthesis of the stability-complexity debate. The American Naturalist 144(1).
- Hirata, T., Hardman-Mountford, N. J., Brewin, R. J. W., Aiken, J., Barlow, R., Suzuki, K., Isada, T., Howell, E., Hashioka, T., Noguchi-Aita, M., Yamanaka, Y., 2011. Synoptic relationships between surface chlorophyll-a and diagnostic pigments specific to phytoplankton functional types. Biogeosciences 8, 311-327.
- Hoffmann, L. J., Peeken, I., Lochte, K., Assmy, P., Veldhuis, M., 2006. Different reactions of Southern Ocean phytoplankton size classes to iron fertilization. Limnology and Oceanography 51(3), 1217--1229.
- Holling, C. S., 1959. The components of predation as revealed by a study of small mammal predation on the European pine sawfly. The Canadian Entomologist 91(5), 293--320.
- Holt, R. D., 1977. Predation, apparent competition, and the structure of prey communities. Theoretical Population Biology 12(2), 197--229.
- Holt, R. D., 1983. Optimal foraging and the form of the predator isocline. The American Naturalist 122(4), 521--541.
- Hughes, R. N., Croy, M. I., 1993. An experimental analysis of frequency-dependent predation (switching) in the 15-spined stickleback, *Spinachia spinachia*. Journal of Animal Ecology 62(2), 341--352.
- Hutchinson, G. E., 1961. The paradox of the plankton. The American Naturalist 95(882), 137--145.
- Hutson, V., 1984. Predator mediated coexistence with a switching predator. Mathematical Biosciences 68, 233--246.
- Ivlev, V. S., 1961. Experimental ecology of the feeding of fishes. Yale University Press, Yale.
- Kalinkat, G., Rall, B. C., Vucic-Pestic, O., Brose, U., 2011. The allometry of prey preferences. PLoS ONE 6(10), 1--11.

- Kempf, A., Floeter, J., Temming, A., 2008. Predator-prey overlap induced Holling type III functional response in the North Sea fish assemblage. Marine Ecology Progress Series 357, 295--308.
- Kiorboe, T., 2008. A mechanistic approach to plankton ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Kiorboe, T., Saiz, E., Viitasalo, M., 1996. Prey switching behaviour in the planktonic copepod Acartia tonsa. Marine Ecology Progress Series 143, 65--75.
- Koen-Alonso, M., 2007. A process-oriented approach to the multispecies functional response. In: N. Rooney, K.S. McCann, D. N. (Ed.), Energetics to Ecosystems: The Dynamics and Structure of Ecological Systems. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Ch. 1, p. 265.
- Longhurst, A. R., 2006. Ecological geography of the Sea. Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- Loreau, M., 2010. From Populations to Ecosystems: Theoretical Foundations for a New Ecological Synthesis. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- MacArthur, R. H., Pianka, E. R., 1966. On optimal use of a patchy environment. The American Naturalist 100(916), 603--609.
- Marañon, E., Holligan, P. M., Barciela, R., Gonzalez, N., Mauriño, B., Pazo, M. J., Varela, M., 2001. Patterns of phytoplankton size structure and productivity in contrasting open-ocean environments. Marine Ecology Progress Series 216, 43--56.
- Mariani, P., Visser, A. W., 2010. Optimization and emergence in marine ecosystem models. Progress in Oceanography 84, 89--92.
- May, R. M., 1974. Stability and complexity in model ecosystems. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Mitra, A., Flynn, K. J., 2006. Accounting for variation in prey selectivity by zooplankton. Ecological Modelling 199, 82--92.
- Moore, L. R., 2010. Prochlorococcus and other photosynthetic picoplankton. In: Encyclopedia of Life Sciences (ELS). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, United Kingdom, pp. 1--10.
- Morozov, A. Y., 2010. Emergence of Holling type III zooplankton functional response: Bringing together field evidence and mathematical modelling. Journal of Theoretical Biology 265, 45--54.
- Murdoch, W. W., 1969. Switching in general predators: experiments on predator specificity and stability of prey populations. Ecological Monographs 39(4), 335--354.
- Murdoch, W. W., 1973. The functional response of predators. Journal of Applied Ecology 14, 335--341.
- Murdoch, W. W., 1975. Switching in predatory fish. Ecology 56(5), 1094--1105.
- Murdoch, W. W., Oaten, A., 1975. Predation and population stability. Advances in Ecological Research 9, 1--131.
- Oaten, A., Murdoch, W. W., 1975. Switching, functional response, and stability in predator-prey systems. The American Naturalist 109(967), 299--318.
- Pahlow, M., Prowe, A. E. F., 2010. Model of optimal current feeding in zooplankton. Marine Ecology Progress Series 403, 129--144.
- Poulin, F. J., Franks, P. J. S., 2010. Size-structured planktonic ecosystems: constrains, controls and assembly instructions. Journal of plankton research 32(8), 1121--1130.
- Prowe, A. E. F., Pahlow, M., Dutkiewicz, S., Follows, M. J., Oschlies, A., 2012a. Top-down control of marine phytoplankton diversity in a global ecosystem model. Progress in Oceanography 101, 1--13.
- Prowe, A. E. F., Pahlow, M., Oschlies, A., 2012b. Controls on the diversityproductivity relationship in a marine ecosystem model. Ecological Modelling 225, 167--176.
- Real, L. A., 1977. The kinetics of functional response. The American Naturalist 111(978), 289--300.
- Real, L. A., 1979. Ecological determinants of functional response. Ecology 60(3), 481--485.
- Rindorf, A., Gislason, H., Lewy, P., 2006. Prey switching of cod and whiting in the North Sea. Marine Ecology Progress Series 325, 243--253.
- Ryabchenko, V. A., Fasham, M. J. R., Kagan, B. A., Popova, E. E., 1997. What causes short-term oscillations in ecosystem models of the ocean mixed layer? Journal of Marine Systems 13, 33--50.
- Siegel, D. A., 1998. Resource competition in a discrete environment: Why are plankton distributions paradoxical? Limnology and Oceanography 43(6), 1133--1146.
- Smout, S., Asseburg, C., Matthiopoulos, J., Fernandez, C., Redpath, S., Thirgood, S., Harwood, J., 2010. The functional response of a generalist predator. Public Library of Science - One 5(5), 1--7.
- Thébault, E., Loreau, M., 2003. Food-web constraints on biodiversity-ecosystem functioning relationships. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 100(25), 14949--14954.
- Thingstad, T. F., 2000. Elements of a theory for the mechanisms controlling abundance, diversity, and biogeochemical role of lytic bacterial viruses in aquatic systems. Limnology and Oceanography 45(6), 1320--1328.
- Thingstad, T. F., Lignell, R., 1997. Theoretical models for the control of bacterial growth rate, abundance, diversity and carbon demand. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 13, 19--27.
- Tilman, D., 1977. Resource competition between planktonic algae: an experimental and theoretical approach. Ecology 58, 338--348.
- Tilman, D., 1982. Resource competition and community structure. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Vallina, S. M., Le Quéré, C., 2008. Preferential uptake of ammonium over nitrate in marine ecosystem models: a simple and more consistent parameterization.

Ecological Modelling 218, 393--397.

- Vallina, S. M., Le Quéré, C., 2011. Stability of complex food webs: Resilience, resistance, and the average interaction strength. Journal of Theoretical Biology 272, 160--173.
- Visser, A. W., Fiksen, Ø., 2013. Optimal foraging in marine ecosystem models: selectivity, profitability and switching. Marine Ecology Progress Series 473, 91--101.
- Ward, B. A., Dutkiewicz, S., Jahn, O., Follows, M. J., 2012. A size-structured foodweb model for the global ocean. Limnology and Oceanography 57(6), 1877--1891.
- Wirtz, K. W., 2012a. Intermittency in processing explains the diversity and shape of functional grazing responses. Oecologia 169, 879--894.
- Wirtz, K. W., 2012b. Who is eating whom? morphology and feeding type determine the size relationship between planktonic predators and their ideal prey. Marine Ecology Progress Series 445, 1--12.
- Wunsch, C., Heimbach, P., 2007. Practical global ocean state estimation. Physica D - Nonlinear Phenomena 230, 197--208.

Appendix A: Kill-the-winner functional response

The generic functional response for feeding on multiple prey was mathematically derived by Murdoch (1973). The ingestion rate upon a single prey species j is characterized using the following expression:

$$G_{j} = \frac{a_{j} \rho_{j} P_{j} Z}{1 + \sum_{k} (a_{k}/h_{k}) \rho_{k} P_{k}}$$
(20)

where: Z is the concentration of predators [mmol m⁻³]; P_j is the concentration of prey species *j* [mmol m⁻³]; a_j is the predators' attack rate on prey species *j* [(m³ mmol⁻¹) d⁻¹]; h_j is the predators' handling rate of prey species *j* [d⁻¹]; and ρ_j is a constant prey preference [n.d.]. Assuming that the handling rates are constant and the same for all prey species (i.e. h_j = h) implies that any switching towards particular prey species will solely be given by differences in the attack rates:

$$a_{j} = a \frac{\delta_{j}}{\phi_{j}}$$
(21)

$$\phi_{j} = \frac{\rho_{j} P_{j}}{\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i}}$$
(22)

$$\delta_{j} = \frac{\rho_{j} P_{j}^{\alpha}}{\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i}^{\alpha}}$$
(23)

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}' \left(\sum_{\mathbf{i}} \rho_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)^{\beta - 1} \tag{24}$$

where: a is a density-dependent attack rate $[(m^3 \text{ mmol}^{-1}) \text{ d}^{-1}]$; a' is a density-independent (i.e. constant) attack rate $[(m^3 \text{ mmol}^{-1})^{\beta}$ $d^{-1}]$; ϕ_j is the relative abundance of prey species j [n.d.]; δ_j regulates the switching towards prey species j [n.d.]; β is the Hill coefficient that measures how the attack rate varies with total prey density [n.d.]; and α is the kill-the-winner coefficient that measures the potential for selective predation: when α is equal to 1.0 we have that $a_j = a$ and the switching is *passive* (i.e. no KTW predation); when α is bigger than 1.0 we have that $a_j \gtrless a$ and the switching is *active* (i.e. KTW predation). Note that $\sum a_j \rho_j P_j = a \sum \rho_j P_j$ which implies that total feeding is always maximal: if some species are being attacked faster then some others must be being attacked slower.

Substituting equations (21) and (22) into eq(20):

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{j}} \;=\; \frac{\mathrm{a}\,\delta_{\mathrm{j}}\left(\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}/\rho_{\mathrm{j}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)\rho_{\mathrm{j}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j}}\,\mathrm{Z}}{1+\left(\mathrm{a}/\mathrm{h}\right)\,\sum_{\mathrm{k}}\delta_{\mathrm{k}}\left(\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}/\rho_{\mathrm{k}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)\rho_{\mathrm{k}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}} \\ \;=\; \frac{\mathrm{a}\,\delta_{\mathrm{j}}\,\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\,\mathrm{Z}}{1+\left(\mathrm{a}/\mathrm{h}\right)\,\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\,\sum_{\mathrm{k}}\delta_{\mathrm{k}}}} \\ \;=\; \frac{\mathrm{a}\,\delta_{\mathrm{j}}\,\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\,\mathrm{Z}}{1+\left(\mathrm{a}/\mathrm{h}\right)\,\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\,\mathrm{Z}}} \\ \;=\; \frac{\mathrm{h}\,\delta_{\mathrm{j}}\,\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\,\mathrm{Z}}{\left(\mathrm{h}/\mathrm{a}\right)+\sum_{\mathrm{i}}\rho_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}\,\mathrm{Z}}} \end{split}$$

Substituting eq(24) into eq(25):

$$G_{j} = \frac{h \delta_{j} \sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i} Z}{(h/(a' (\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta-1})) + \sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i}}$$
$$= \frac{h \delta_{j} \sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i} (\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta-1} Z}{(h/a') + \sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i} (\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta-1}}$$
$$= \frac{h \delta_{j} (\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta} Z}{(h/a') + (\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta}}$$
(26)

We can now define:

$$V_{\rm max} = h Z \tag{27}$$

$$k_{sat}^{\beta} = h/a'$$
 (28)

where: V_{max} is the maximum ingestion rate [mmol m⁻³ d⁻¹] and k_{sat} is the half-saturation constant for ingestion [mmol m⁻³].

Substituting equations (27) and (28) into eq(26):

$$\begin{split} G_{j} &= V_{max} \frac{\rho_{j} P_{j}^{\alpha}}{\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i}^{\alpha}} \frac{(\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta} Z}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + (\sum_{i} \rho_{i} P_{i})^{\beta}} \\ &= V_{max} \, \delta_{j} \, \frac{F^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + F^{\beta}} \\ &= V_{max} \, \delta_{j} \, Q \end{split}$$
(29)

where: Q gives the overall feeding probability [n.d.]; δ_j dictates the switching towards prey species *j* [n.d.]; and $F = \sum_i \rho_i P_i$ is the total food available [mmol m⁻³].

Appendix B: Foodweb configuration and feeding mode

1 Explicit food webs

(25)

a) Pairwise interactions:

When a food web is composed by specialized predators that can only feed upon one single prey species (see lower-left panels in Figure 5), increasing the number of prey will decrease the total feeding of the predator community as a whole. Let's call N the number of prey and predators that are present in the food web. If the total biomass P of prey and the total biomass Z of predators is constant, we have that:

$$P = \sum_{j}^{N} P_{j}$$
(30)

$$Z = \sum_{j}^{N} Z_{j}$$
(31)

In the simplest scenario in which all the prey have equal biomass and all the predators have equal biomass, we have that:

$$P_{j} = P/N \tag{32}$$

$$Z_j = Z/N \tag{33}$$

The predators' total ingestion rate G will be given by:

$$G = \sum_{j}^{N} g_{\max} Z_{j} \frac{P_{j}^{\beta}}{K + P_{j}^{\beta}}$$
(34)

where the power β will regulate the functional response (Type II when $\beta = 1$ and Type III if $\beta = 2$) and K is a parameter related to the half-saturation constant for ingestion. Substituting equations (32) and (33) into eq(34) gives:

$$G = \sum_{i}^{N} g_{max} (Z/N) \frac{(P/N)^{\beta}}{K + (P/N)^{\beta}}$$
(35)

$$= g_{\max} Z \frac{(P/N)^{\beta}}{K + (P/N)^{\beta}}$$
(36)

$$= g_{\max} Z \frac{P^{\beta}}{N^{\beta} K + P^{\beta}}$$
(37)

If $\beta = 1$ and $K = k_{sat}$, we have the Type II case:

$$G = g_{max} Z \frac{P}{N k_{sat} + P}$$
(38)

If $\beta = 2$ and $K = k_{sat}^2/N$, we have the Type III case:

$$G = g_{max} Z \frac{P^2}{N k_{sat}^2 + P^2}$$
(39)

In either case, N is multiplying the half-saturation constant for ingestion k_{sat}. Thus, as we increase the number of prey with their own specific predator in the ecosystem, the total ingestion of the whole predator community will decrease exponentially. This simply reflects that increasing N implies splitting the predators' biomass into attacking specific prey. If we have a food web composed of only one prey and one predator (N = 1), all the predators' biomass is interacting with all the prey's biomass; whereas if we have a food web composed of two prey and two predators (N = 2), now half of all the predators' biomass is interacting with half of all the prey's biomass while the other half biomass are interacting independently. Therefore, the overall predator-prey interaction strength decreases with N. For example, if the total biomass of either predators and prey is 100 [mmolC m⁻³], and assuming for simplicity Lotka-Volterra interactions ($Z \cdot P$), we can see that 100 x 100 = 10,000 (one predator - one prey) is bigger than $(50 \times 50) +$ $(50 \times 50) = 5,000$ (two predators - two prey). Thus increasing N in the ecosystem will necessarily decrease the predators' total ingestion. This is analogous to the non-maximal feeding formulations (i.e. Fasham's and Ryabchenko's).

b) Meshwise interactions:

When a food web is composed by generalist predators that feed on all prey (see upper-left panels in Figure 5) and the total biomass of both prey and predators is constant, the feeding of the whole predator community will be independent of the number of prey and predators N in the system. The predators' total ingestion rate G will be given by:

$$G = \sum_{j}^{N} g_{\max} Z_{j} \frac{(\sum_{i}^{N} P_{i})^{\beta}}{K + (\sum_{i}^{N} P_{i})^{\beta}}$$
(40)

where the power β will regulate the functional response (Type II when $\beta = 1$ and Type III if $\beta = 2$) and K is a parameter related to the half-saturation constant for ingestion. Substituting equations (30) and (33) into eq(40) gives:

$$G = \sum_{i}^{N} g_{max} \left(Z/N \right) \frac{P^{\beta}}{K + P^{\beta}}$$
(41)

$$= g_{\max} Z \frac{P^{\beta}}{K + P^{\beta}}$$
(42)

If $\beta = 1$ and $K = k_{sat}$, we have the Type II case:

$$G = g_{max} Z \frac{P}{k_{sat} + P}$$
(43)

If $\beta = 2$ and $K = k_{sat}^2$, we have the Type III case:

$$G = g_{\max} Z \frac{P^2}{k_{sat}^2 + P^2}$$

$$(44)$$

In either case, the predators' total ingestion is independent of N. That means that changing the number of prey and predators in the ecosystem will have no effect on the predators' total ingestion as a whole. This reflects that all the predator biomass is always interacting with all the prey biomass, regardless of N. Thus, increasing N in the ecosystem will not affect the overall predator-prey interaction strength. This is analogous to the maximal feeding formulations (i.e. Reals's and KTW).

2 Implicit food webs

a) Non-maximal feeding:

For non-maximal feeding formulations, the total ingestion rate G is given by:

$$G = \sum_{j}^{N} g_{\max} Z \frac{P_{j}^{2}}{\chi + \sum_{i}^{N} P_{i}^{2}}$$
(45)

where N is the number of prey species (note that there is only one predator species) and χ is a parameter related to the half-saturation constant for ingestion. Substituting eq(32) into eq(45) gives:

$$G = \sum_{j}^{N} g_{max} Z \frac{(P/N)^{2}}{\chi + \sum_{i}^{N} (P/N)^{2}}$$

$$= \sum_{j}^{N} g_{max} Z \frac{P^{2}}{N^{2} \chi + N P^{2}}$$

$$= \sum_{j}^{N} g_{max} (Z/N) \frac{P^{2}}{N \chi + P^{2}}$$

$$= g_{max} Z \frac{P^{2}}{N \chi + P^{2}}$$
(46)

If $\chi = k_{sat}$ P, we have the solution for Fasham's formulation:

$$G = g_{max} Z \frac{P}{N k_{sat} + P}$$
(47)

If $\chi = k_{sat}^2$, we have the solution for Ryabchenko's formulation:

$$G = g_{max} Z \frac{P^2}{N k_{sat}^2 + P^2}$$
(48)

Note that equation (47) is equivalent to equation (38) and that equation (48) is equivalent to equation (39). This means that under the condition of constant total prey and predator biomass, and for the simplest scenario in which all prey have equal biomass, the Fasham and Ryabchenko formulations are implicitly resolving a community of specialist predators (not explicitly modelled) that form a food web of pairwise predator-prey interactions in which each predator feeds upon one single prey species (see lower panels in Figure 5).

b) Maximal feeding:

For maximal feeding formulations, the predators' total ingestion rate G is given by:

$$G = \sum_{j}^{N} g_{\max} Z \frac{P_{j}^{\alpha}}{\sum_{i}^{N} P_{i}^{\alpha}} \frac{P^{\beta}}{K + P^{\beta}}$$
(49)

where the power β will regulate the functional response for total food ingestion (Type II when $\beta = 1$ and Type III if $\beta = 2$), and the power α will regulate the prey switching (passive if $\alpha = 1$ and active if $\alpha = 2$; i.e. Real and KTW formulations, respectively). N is the number of prey species (note that there is only one predator species) and K is a parameter related to the half-saturation constant for ingestion (i.e. $K = k_{sat}^{\beta}$). Substituting eq(32) into eq(49) gives:

$$G = \sum_{i}^{N} g_{\max} Z \frac{(P/N)^{\alpha}}{\sum_{i}^{N} (P/N)^{\alpha}} \frac{P^{\beta}}{K + P^{\beta}}$$
(50)

$$=\sum_{i}^{N} g_{\max} Z \frac{(P/N)^{\alpha}}{N (P/N)^{\alpha}} \frac{P^{\beta}}{K+P^{\beta}}$$
(51)

$$=\sum_{i}^{N} g_{max} \left(Z/N \right) \frac{P^{\beta}}{K+P^{\beta}}$$
(52)

$$= g_{\max} Z \frac{P^{\beta}}{K + P^{\beta}}$$
(53)

Note that equation (53) is equivalent to equation (42). This means that under the condition of constant total prey and predator biomass, and for the simplest scenario in which all prey have equal biomass, the Real and KTW formulations are implicitly resolving a community of generalist predators (not explicitly modelled) that form a food web of meshwise predator-prey interactions in which all predators feed upon all prey (see upper panels in Figure 5).

Appendix C: The common-sense criterion

When a given species is divided into two (or more) identical species with a combined density equal to the density of the original species, this should not lead to a difference in the total amount of that species eaten (Arditi and Michalski, 1995; Berryman et al., 1995). Maximal feeding is a necessary, although not sufficient, condition for this common sense criterion to hold. Therefore both Fasham's and Ryabchenko's formulations violate this criterion under all conditions. On the other hand, while Real's formulation always fulfills the common sense criterion under any condition, the KTW formulation fulfills this criterion in the simplest case where one prey species is subdivided into two (or more) identical species. However, it can violate the criterion for more complicated cases where there are several different classes of prey (e.g. several food classes such as phytoplankton, bacteria, etc.) one of which is subdivided into two (or more) others that are identical. In that case the total ingestion from the food class being subdivided will decrease with the number of subdivisions (Visser and Fiksen, 2013).

This becomes clearer if we consider the case of an omnivorous predator that feeds on two different food classes, say phytoplankton and bacteria, with only one prey species per food class. If both food classes are present with the same relative abundance (i.e. 50% each), the predator will eat the same amount of phytoplankton and bacteria. If we now subdivide the phytoplankton food class into two identical prey species, each contributing 25% of the total food, while keeping bacteria as one prey species contributing 50% of the total food, the predator will now eat more bacteria than phytoplankton (66.66% vs. 33.33%) even though the combined amount of phytoplankton and bacteria has remain unchanged (50% - 50%). Yet, the predators' total feeding will be maximal and exactly the same for both scenarios; only the proportion of ingestion from each food class has changed.

Subdivision of the prey species present in one food class can thus alter the relative ingestion of the other food classes. This behaviour has no ecological basis and should be avoided or at least minimized. The cause is the way the prey-switching term δ_i is computed: the squared biomass of each prey species is compared to the sum of the squared biomass of *all* prey species, regardless of how closely related they might be. One sensible solution is to group biologically similar prey species into the same category or food class (e.g. primary producers, herbivores, carnivores, etc.), and then compute the prey-switching term for the prey within each food class independently. Switching among food classes can also be included (Ward et al., 2012). The generalized form of the KTW formulation that fulfills the common sense criterion for an indeterminate number of food classes *i* and prey species *j* per food class (under the condition that food classes themselves will not be further subdivided) is thus:

$$G_{p_{j}} = V_{max} \frac{\rho_{j} P_{j}^{\alpha}}{\sum \rho_{k} P_{k}^{\alpha}} \frac{F_{i}^{\gamma}}{\sum F_{k}^{\gamma}} \frac{F^{\beta}}{k_{sat}^{\beta} + F^{\beta}}$$
(54)

$$= V_{\max} \,\delta_{j} \,\delta_{i} \,Q \tag{55}$$

where $F = \sum F_k$ gives the total food available from all food classes; $F_i = \sum \rho_k p_k$ gives the food available from all prey within food class *i*; and the parameter ρ_j is a constant prey preference. The term δ_j dictates the switching towards prey *j* within food class *i*, and the term δ_i dictates the switching towards food class *i*. The power α will regulate the switching for prey species *j*: passive when $\alpha = 1$ and active if $\alpha = 2$. The power γ will regulate the switching for food class *i*. The power β will regulate the functional response for total food: Type II when $\beta = 1$ and Type III when $\beta = 2$. In all cases the total food ingestion will be maximal.

S1. Ecosystem model

The three dimensional (3D) global ocean model is based on a coarse resolution $(1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ} \text{ horizontally}, 24 \text{ levels vertically})$ of the MIT general circulation model (MITgcm) constrained to be consistent with large-scale hydrogeography and altimetry (Wunsch and Heimbach, 2007). The multi-species ecosystem model of two lower trophic levels (i.e. phytoplankton and zooplankton) is coupled to the 3D ocean physics such that organisms are passively transported by the fluid through advection and turbulent mixing (both vertical and horizontal). The coupled biophysical model was run for 8 years to reach (quasi) steady-state seasonal cycles.

The model assumes Monod kinetics for the uptake of nutrients and includes 64 phytoplankton species belonging to 4 phytoplankton functional groups: 16 analogs of *Prochlorococcus*, 16 *Synechococcus*, 16 flagellates, and 16 diatoms. The model also resolves two predator classes: a generic micro-zooplankton and a generic meso-zooplankton. *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus* analogs are defined in the model as small phytoplankton that are grazed preferentially by micro-zooplankton. Flagellates and diatoms are defined in the model as large phytoplankton that are grazed preferentially by meso-zooplankton (Table 3). Higher trophic levels are not explicitly modelled. Zooplankton losses due to consumption by higher predators is implicitly modelled using a squared background mortality (i.e. closure term).

The model includes four limiting nutrients in several forms of dissolved inorganic matter (DIM): phosphorous (P) as phosphate; nitrogen (N) as nitrate and ammonium; iron (Fe) as bioavailable soluble Fe²⁺; silicon (Si) as silicic acid. Phytoplankton nutrient limitation is computed with Liebig's law of the minimum (de Baar, 1994). Phosphate, ammonium and iron are used by all 4 functional groups. Diatoms are the only group requiring silica. The Prochlorococcus analogs are limited to ammonium as their sole source of nitrogen (Moore, 2010). The modelled analogs of Synechococcus, flagellates and diatoms are assumed to take up ammonium preferentially over nitrate (Vallina and Le Quéré, 2008). Background mortality and exudation losses are recycled to inorganic nutrients via constant rate degradation of several pools of organic matter: dissolved (DOM) and particulate (POM) for each nutrient element (with the exception of silica that does not have a particulate organic form).

In the model, the species' ability to take up nutrients is given by two parameters: the maximum specific growth rate $\mu_{\rm max}$ [d⁻¹] and the half-saturation constant for nutrient uptake ks [mmol m^{-3}] (see Figure 11a). These two parameters determine the shape of the nutrient uptake curves (see Figure 11b). We have assigned an average maximum specific growth rate for each functional group based on inherent physiological differences, and an average half-saturation constant based on mean cell size of each functional group (e.g. Ward et al. (2012)). Although only shown for nitrogen this applies equally to all nutrients because we assume constant Redfield ratios and no differential uptake rates for each nutrient among prey species. We discretized this two-dimensional (2D) species-traits space in 4 by 4 segments of -30% -10% +10% +30% change on each trait, with respect to its average value. This procedure gives a lattice with 4 x $\overline{4}$ = 16 combinations of μ_{max} and ks, which is a simple and more efficient way of sampling the 2D space of species traits than using random sampling.

Within each group, the most competitive species will be the one having the highest maximum specific growth rate with the lowest half-saturation constant, which leads to the highest uptake affinity (i.e. $\mu_{\rm max}$ / ks) (see Figure 11c). Among groups, there is a trade-off between growth rate and nutrient affinity which provides each phytoplankton group a particular nutrient niche (see Figure 11b). The nutrient uptake affinities are related to the species' subsistence nutrient concentration or "R star", which is defined as $R^* = \frac{m_{phy}}{\mu_{max} - m_{phy}}$ ks. Lower R^* means higher affinity for nutrients and thus higher fitness (see Figure 11d). Unlike earlier studies using the same model (Barton et al., 2010; Prowe et al., 2012a) and in order to reduce the niche dimensions of the ecosystem we consider neither light and temperature sensitivities for each species nor temperature dependence for phytoplankton and zooplankton. Phytoplankton growth will thus only be limited by nutrients (P,N,Fe,Si) and light levels, without photoinhibition. Background mortality, exudation, light harvesting, etc. are common to all phytoplankton species.

A list of the ecological model parameters is given in Table 3. We performed a small ensemble set of 3 simulations per functional response in order to assess the model sensitivity to changes in feeding pressure (see Supp. Material S2). By varing \pm 50% the constant half-saturation constant for ingestion k_{sat} respect to the control case given in Table 3 we obtain three scenarios: low feeding pressure (50% higher k_{sat}); medium feeding pressure (control case); and high feeding pressure (50% lower k_{sat}). The results are the average of these 3 ensemble runs. The individual runs are given in Supp. Material S2.



Fig. 11: Species characteristics by functional group (*Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms): a) Species maximum growth rate (μ_{max}) [d⁻¹] and half-saturation constant (ks) [mmolN m⁻³], b) Species growth rate [d⁻¹] as function of nutrient concentration [mmolN m⁻³], c) Species nutrient uptake affinity (μ_{max} / ks) [m³ mmol⁻¹ d⁻¹], d) Species nutrient requirement at equilibrium (R^{*} = $\frac{k_{s} \cdot m_{phy}}{\mu_{max} - m_{phy}}$) [mmolN m⁻³]. (Note that R^{*} was calculated for the shared common resource phosphate; for consistency with the rest of the results, the units are shown in nitrogen using a Redfield N:P ratio of 16:1)

S2. Sensitivity Analysis

We performed a sensitivity analysis to the feeding pressure through varying the constant half-saturation constant for ingestion $k_{\rm sat}$ by \pm 50% respect to the control case given in Table 3. Thus we performed a set of simulations with 3 levels of feeding pressure: low feeding pressure (i.e. high $k_{\rm sat}$); medium feeding pressure (i.e. control case); and high feeding pressure (i.e. low $k_{\rm sat}$).

The phytoplankton biomass of each functional group shows only moderate changes when going from low to high feeding pressure if the functional responses are non-maximal (Fasham, More significant changes can be seen if the Rvabchenko). functional responses are maximal (Real, Vallina). In either case, as the feeding pressure increases there is a shift in the biomass distribution from Prochlorococcus to diatoms. As we said in the main text, predators' top-down control adds an extra mortality that affects disproportionately the R* of the species with lower $\mu_{\rm max}$. That is, it decreases the relative competitive ability of the species with slower maximum growth rate (i.e. Prochlorococcus), which benefits the species with higher maximum growth rates (i.e. diatoms). This apparent competition among the phytoplankton functional groups is stronger in the high feeding pressure scenario and results in the competitive exclusion of Prochlorococcus over most of the global ocean. (see Figures 12, 14, 16).

On the other hand, the diversity in each functional group shows only moderate changes when going from low to high feeding pressure if the functional responses are passive-switching (Real); the maximum species richness per functional group is always 1 species and its distribution just changes with the biogeography of the biomass. More significant changes can be seen if the functional responses are active-switching (Fasham, Ryabchenko, Vallina). As the feeding pressure increases there is a general tendency towards higher diversity in each phytoplankton group. The only exception is *Prochlorococcus* with KTW formulation, which decreases in diversity for the high feeding pressure case. This is related to our previous previous point; apparent competition drives some species of *Prochlorococcus* to extinction because they have the lowest maximum growth rate μ_{max} (see Figures 13, 15, 17).

The total phytoplankton biomass decreases with the feeding pressure. However, the changes are more significant for the maximal feeding functional responses (Real, KTW), followed by the Ryabchenko formulation, and finally the Fasham formulation which shows very moderate changes in total biomass with the feeding pressure (see Figure 18; feeding pressure increases from top to down). The total diversity shows a clear increase with the feeding pressure for the functional responses with active-prey switching. The changes are stronger for the KTW formulation, followed by Ryabchenko's and finally Fasham's. The passive-switching formulation (Real) does not show any significant change with the feeding pressure since its maximum diversity is capped to 4 species (i.e. one per functional group) due to competitive exclusion (see Figure 19; feeding pressure increases from top to down).

We can conclude that the Fasham formulation is the least sensitive to \pm 50% changes in the constant half-saturation constant for ingestion $k_{\rm sat}$, either in terms of total phytoplankton biogeography or diversity; the Ryabchenko formulation shows a little higher sensitivity than Fasham's formulation, both in phytoplankton biogeography and diversity; the Real formulation only show significant changes on phytoplankton biogeography but

its diversity is too low to change; and the KTW formulation is the most sensitive. With KTW, as we increase the feeding pressure, the total biomass decreases and the total diversity increases. One clear feature is that the diversity builds up with feeding pressure mostly towards lower latitudes.

The mechanism by which stronger feeding pressure increases diversity in the active prey-switching functional responses lies with the self-regulatory forces in the ecosystem (i.e. the diagonal elements of the Jacobian of the system at equilibrium becoming more negative). That is, active prey-switching introduces a negative feedback in the ecosystem to each prey biomass. Thus, as we explain in the main text, higher predation with active prey-switching increases the strength of self-regulatory forces which help to stabilize the ecosystem, allowing for a higher predator-mediated co-existence of phytoplankton species and thus diversity.

	Parameter	Symbol	Value	Units
Phy Pro	max specific growth rate	$\mu_{ m max}^{ m pro}$	1.25 *	d^{-1}
Phy Syn	max specific growth rate	$\mu_{ m max}^{ m syn}$	1.75 *	d^{-1}
Phy Fla	max specific growth rate	$\mu_{ m max}^{ m fla}$	2.25 *	d^{-1}
Phy Dia	max specific growth rate	$\mu_{ m max}^{ m dia}$	2.75*	d^{-1}
Phy Pro	half-sat for DIM uptake	kspro	0.10 *	μM
Phy Syn	half-sat for DIM uptake	ks ^{syn}	0.30 *	μM
Phy Fla	half-sat for DIM uptake	ks ^{fla}	0.60*	μM
Phy Dia	half-sat for DIM uptake	$\mathrm{ks}^{\mathrm{dia}}$	1.20*	μM
Phy	assim efficiency	$eta_{ m phy}$	0.80	n.d.
Phy	mortality specific rate	m _{phy}	0.10	d^{-1}
Phy	mortality fraction to POM	$\omega_{ m phy}$	0.50	n.d.
Phy	non-assim fraction to POM	$\psi_{ m phy}$	0.50	n.d.
Zoo Mic	max specific ingestion rate	g_{\max}^{mic}	2.00	d^{-1}
Zoo Mes	max specific ingestion rate	$g_{\rm max}^{\rm mes}$	1.00	d^{-1}
Zoo Mic	half-sat for ingestion	kg ^{mic}	1.00	μM
Zoo Mes	half-sat for ingestion	kg ^{mes}	0.60	μM
Zoo Mic	preference for Phy Small	$ ho_{11}$	0.80	n.d.
Zoo Mes	preference for Phy Small	$ ho_{12}$	0.40	n.d.
Zoo Mic	preference for Phy Large	$ ho_{21}$	0.40	n.d.
Zoo Mes	preference for Phy Large	$ ho_{22}$	0.80	n.d.
Zoo	assim efficiency	$\beta_{ m zoo}$	0.50	n.d.
Zoo	mortality specific rate	m _{zoo}	0.05	d^{-1}
Zoo	mortality fraction to POM	$\omega_{ m zoo}$	0.50	n.d.
Zoo	non-assim fraction to POM	$\psi_{ m zoo}$	0.50	n.d.
POM	sinking rate	w̃	1.00	${\rm m}~{\rm d}^{-1}$
POM	degradation rate to DOM	m _{POM}	0.10	d^{-1}
DOM	degradation rate to DIM	m _{DOM}	0.10	d^{-1}

Table 3: List of ecological model parameters. The values are showed in units of nitrogen only. The corresponding values for phosphorous, iron and silica can be derived using a Redfield N:Si:P:Fe ratio of 16:16:1:0.001 [mol mol⁻¹]. (*) Mean value for each functional group



Fig. 12: Low feeding pressure scenario ($1.5 k_{sat}$) - Phytoplankton biomass [mmolN m⁻³] by functional group: *Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms (from top to down); and for the four functional responses: Real formulation, Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, KTW formulation (from left to right)

[Ryabchenko] [Real] [Fasham] [KTW] Pro. -30 -60 -90 Syn. -30 -60 -90 Fla. -30 -60 -90 Dia. -30 -60 -90

Fig. 13: Low feeding pressure scenario ($1.5 k_{sat}$) - Species richness by functional group: *Prochlorococcus, Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms (from top to down); and for the four functional responses: Real formulation, Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, KTW formulation (from left to right)



Fig. 14: Medium feeding pressure scenario (1.0 k_{sat}) - Phytoplankton biomass [mmolN m⁻³] by functional group: *Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms (from top to down); and for the four functional responses: Real formulation, Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, KTW formulation (from left to right)



Fig. 15: Medium feeding pressure scenario (1.0 k_{sat}) - Species richness by functional group: *Prochlorococcus, Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms (from top to down); and for the four functional responses: Real formulation, Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, KTW formulation (from left to right)



Fig. 16: High feeding pressure scenario (0.5 k_{sat}) - Phytoplankton biomass [mmolN m⁻³] by functional group: *Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms (from top to down); and for the four functional responses: Real formulation, Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, KTW formulation (from left to right)

[Ryabchenko] [Real] [Fasham] [KTW] Pro. -30 -60 -90 Syn. -30 -60 -90 Fla. -30 -60 -90 Dia. -30 -60 -90

Fig. 17: High feeding pressure scenario (0.5 k_{sat}) - Species richness by functional group: *Prochlorococcus, Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms (from top to down); and for the four functional responses: Real formulation, Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, KTW formulation (from left to right)



Fig. 18: Low to high feeding pressure scenarios (from top to bottom) - Total phytoplankton biomass $[mmolN m^{-3}]$ for the four functional responses (from left to right): Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, Real formulation, KTW formulation.

Diversity [KTW] Diversity [Real] Diversity [Fasham] Diversity [Ryabchenko] Lower -30 -60 -90 Control -30 -60 -90 Higher -30 -60 -90

Fig. 19: Low to high feeding pressure scenarios (from top to bottom) - Total species richness for the four functional responses (from left to right): Fasham formulation, Ryabchenko formulation, Real formulation, KTW formulation.

S3. Grazing-off simulation

We performed a simulation in which grazing was completely eliminated (i.e. zooplankton died out of starvation) to evaluate the effect of removing the potential for apparent competition among the prey. In this scenario the only loss to each phytoplankton species is the constant specific background mortality rate $[d^{-1}]$. The results are given in Figures 20 and 21. The phytoplankton biomass of each functional group shows that in the absence of apparent competition Prochlorococcus and Synechococcus display almost worlwide dominance because they are intrinsically better competitors (i.e. lower R*) than fagellates and diatoms which thus tend to be outcompeted over large regions of the ocean (see Figure 20). Only the non-stationary nature of ocean dynamics, which brings seasonal pulses of high nutrient supply specially at high latitudes, keeps these two lower competitors in the system and prevents their competitive exclusion. The trade-off between growth rate and nutrient affinity among phytoplankton functional groups provides each phytoplankton group with a unique nutrient niche (Dutkiewicz et al., 2009). Within, each functional group there is no trade-off between phytoplankton species and therefore only one species per group (i.e. the best competitor for nutrients) survives (see Figure 21).



Fig. 20: Phytoplankton biomass [mmolN m⁻³] by functional group (*Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms) for the scenario in which grazing has been totally removed in order to eliminate the apparent competition among prey.



Fig. 21: Species richness by functional group (*Prochlorococcus, Synechococcus*, flagellates, diatoms) for the scenario in which grazing has been totally removed in order to eliminate the apparent competition among prey.