

Table S1: GLM details and effects tests

Effects	NParm	DF	Response variables		
			Microcosm Biomass	Biofilm Strength	Biofilm Attachment
			P Value	P Value	P Value
<i>Biofilm type</i> (Viscous Mass & Wrinkly Spreader)	1	1	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
<i>DNA treatment</i> (Ctrl, LMW, HMW)	2	2	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
<i>DNA concentration</i> (0, 100, 300 & 600 µg/ml)	1	1	0.58	0.92	0.21
<i>Replicate</i> (1 - 8)	7	7	0.10	0.38	0.03*
<i>Biofilm type</i> x <i>DNA treatment</i> interaction	2	2	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01

Three separate GLM models were run with microcosm biomass (growth), biofilm strength and biofilm attachment as Response variables. *Biofilm type* (categorical variable), *DNA treatment* (categorical variable), *DNA concentration* (continuous variable) and *Replicate* (categorical variable) as effects, and *Biofilm type* x *DNA treatment* as an interaction (note that *Replicate* could not be modelled as a random effect because model residuals were not Normally distributed). Model summaries (all statistics rounded up to two decimal places): Microcosm biomass (OD_{600}), $r^2 = 0.77$; ANOVA, $F_{13,93} = 23.40$, $P < 0.01$; Biofilm strength (MDM, g), $r^2 = 0.86$; ANOVA, $F_{13,93} = 44.81$, $P < 0.01$; Biofilm attachment (A_{570}), $r^2 = 0.72$; ANOVA, $F_{13,93} = 17.98$, $P < 0.01$. NParm, Number of parameters; DF, Degrees of Freedom. * Effect further examined by LSMeans Differences Tukey HSD and no significant difference between means was found ($Q = 3.10$, $\alpha = 0.05$).