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Text section S1. Derivation of equation 3

The ratio between the rates of increase of the population under contaminated conditions \( r(C) \) and reference conditions \( r(0) \) is calculated as:\(^1\):

\[
\frac{r(C)}{r(0)} = \frac{\ln\left[\left(1 + \left(\frac{C}{LC_{50}}\right)^\beta\right) / \ln\left(1 + \left(\frac{C}{EC_{50}}\right)^\beta\right)\right]}{\ln(R(0))} + 1
\]  \hspace{4cm} (Eq. S1)

with \( 1 + \left(\frac{C}{LC_{50}}\right)^\beta = \frac{1}{f_L} \) \hspace{4cm} (Eq. S2)

and \( 1 + \left(\frac{C}{EC_{50}}\right)^\beta = \frac{1}{f_E} \) \hspace{4cm} (Eq. S3)

where \( f_L \) and \( f_E \) represent the survival and reproduction under contaminated conditions, respectively, relative to the survival and reproduction rates in reference conditions.

Under the assumption that the effects of the various anthropogenic and natural stress factors included in this study are purely additive\(^2\), the ratio of increase rates of the population under multiple stress conditions \( r(S)/r(0) \) can be related to temperature \( T \), salinity \( S \), chlorophyll \( a \), and sediment concentrations of cadmium (Cd), copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn) according to

\[
\frac{r(S)}{r(0)} = \frac{-\ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{f_{L_i}}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_{E_i}}\right)\right) - \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{f_{L_i,S}}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_{E_i,S}}\right)\right) - \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{f_{L_i,Cd}}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_{E_i,Cd}}\right)\right) - \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{f_{L_i,Zn}}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{f_{E_i,Zn}}\right)\right)}{\ln(R(0))} + 1
\]  \hspace{4cm} (Eq. S4)
Table S1. Measured values for *Eurytemora affinis* abundance (ind·m$^{-3}$), temperature (°C), salinity (‰), chlorophyll $a$ (µg chl $a$·L$^{-1}$), metal concentrations (mg·kg$^{-1}$ dry weight) and total organic carbon (% TOC) in the SE and the DZE from 2003 through 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>DZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E. affinis</em> adults</td>
<td>996.5</td>
<td>20 – 5.3·10$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.7 – 25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.8 – 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophyll $a$</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.0 – 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9 – 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>46.5 – 214.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>399.8</td>
<td>310.0 – 598.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9 – 4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S1. The observed survival fractions by Devreker et al.\textsuperscript{3} and the interpolated survival fractions.
Figure S2. The ratio of increase rates of the population $r(S_i)/r(0)$ calculated for the Scheldt Estuary (SE) and the Darß-Zingst Estuary (DZE) as a function of (A) temperature, (B) salinity, (C) chlorophyll $a$, (D) cadmium, (E) copper, and (F) zinc.
Figure S3. Results of the sensitivity analysis with changes in (A) survival parameters (reproduction parameters unchanged) and (B) reproduction parameters (survival parameters unchanged). The value of the slope of the curve $a$ was changed by -15%, +15% and 0%, representing higher, lower and no change in tolerance to temperature, respectively. The optimal temperature $T_0$ was changed by -2°C, 2°C and 0°C.
**Figure S4.** The effect of a 0.5°C change in water temperature on the population density $N(t)$ in DZE.
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