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## Supplementary Material

Tab. S1 - Summary table of herbaceous species presence/ abundance according to site and herbivory modality. Species with a cover of more than $2.5 \%$ in more than $5 \%$ of the subplots of at least one site. Mean abundance $\pm$ SE (frequency in \%), all years taken together. Results from an in situ experiment over an eight-year period at two different sites in a temperate hardwood forest in the North-East of France ("La petite Pierre"). We used paired control plot (unfenced area, free access to deer) and exclosure (fenced area, excluding deer) at both sites.

| Species | Plant function group | Site 1 |  | Site 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | control | exclosure | control | exclosure |
| Agrostis stolonifera | graminoids | $0.4 \pm 0.2$ (4.8) | $1.9 \pm 0.7$ (10.8) | $0 \pm 0$ (0.7) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) |
| Athyrium filix-femina | ferns | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $1 \pm 0.2$ (14.9) | $0.4 \pm 0.2$ (6.7) |
| Carex remota | graminoids | $1.6 \pm 0.5$ (15.2) | $4.5 \pm 0.7$ (40.5) | $3.7 \pm 0.6$ (32.4) | $5.3 \pm 0.9$ (34.7) |
| Carex sylvatica | graminoids | $0 \pm 0$ (3.8) | $4.6 \pm 0.9$ (37.8) | $0.4 \pm 0.1$ (13.5) | $0.6 \pm 0.2$ (8.7) |
| Digitalis purpurea | forbs | $0.7 \pm 0.3$ (7.6) | $2 \pm 0.5$ (16.2) | $0.1 \pm 0.1$ (1.1) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) |
| Dryopteris carthusiana | ferns | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $0 \pm 0$ (0.9) | $0.9 \pm 0.2(16.7)$ | $1.2 \pm 0.3$ (19.3) |
| Dryopteris dilatata | ferns | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $1 \pm 0.2$ (14.2) | $0.3 \pm 0.1$ (7.3) |
| Dryopteris filix-mas | ferns | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $2.2 \pm 0.5$ (20.4) | $2.4 \pm 0.5$ (27.3) |
| Epilobium angustifolium | forbs | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $1.7 \pm 0.7(16.2)$ | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) |
| Festuca altissima | graminoids | $0.8 \pm 0.3$ (12.4) | $1 \pm 0.3$ (12.6) | $0 \pm 0$ (1.5) | $0.3 \pm 0.2$ (4) |
| Festuca sylvatica | graminoids | $0.8 \pm 0.3$ (9.5) | $5.9 \pm 0.9$ (44.1) | $0 \pm 0$ (1.5) | $0 \pm 0$ (1.3) |
| Galeopsis tetrahit | forbs | $0.9 \pm 0.3$ (46.7) | $4.6 \pm 1.1$ (45) | $0.3 \pm 0$ (23.3) | $0.3 \pm 0.1$ (7.3) |
| Juncus effusus | graminoids | $0 \pm 0(0)$ | $0.3 \pm 0.2$ (4.5) | $2.1 \pm 0.4$ (22.5) | $5.5 \pm 1$ (33.3) |
| Lamiastrum galeobdolon | forbs | $0 \pm 0$ (2.9) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $1.3 \pm 0.3$ (8) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) |
| Luzula luzuloides | graminoids | $2.3 \pm 0.5$ (53.3) | $4 \pm 0.7$ (32.4) | $0.3 \pm 0.1$ (7.6) | $0 \pm 0$ (4) |
| Milium effusum | graminoids | $0.2 \pm 0.1$ (4.8) | $1.4 \pm 0.4(17.1)$ | $0.1 \pm 0.1$ (4.4) | $0.1 \pm 0.1$ (6) |
| Mycelis muralis | forbs | $0.1 \pm 0$ (5.7) | $1.8 \pm 0.4$ (37.8) | $0 \pm 0$ (0) | $0 \pm 0$ (0.7) |
| Oxalis acetosella | forbs | $0 \pm 0$ (1) | $0 \pm 0$ (0.9) | $0.7 \pm 0.2$ (9.8) | $0.6 \pm 0.2$ (8) |
| Poa nemoralis | graminoids | $0.6 \pm 0.3$ (9.5) | $0.8 \pm 0.3$ (9) | $0.3 \pm 0.1$ (3.3) | $0.1 \pm 0.1$ (2.7) |
| Rubus idaeus | rubus | $0.5 \pm 0.4$ (3.8) | $6.5 \pm 1.4(39.6)$ | $2.5 \pm 0.4(24)$ | $8.9 \pm 1.2(48)$ |
| Rubus sect. fruticosi | rubus | $0.2 \pm 0.1$ (6.7) | $6.7 \pm 1.4(46.8)$ | $16.3 \pm 1.6$ (51.6) | $60.5 \pm 2.5(98)$ |
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Fig.S1 - NMDS ordination of plant community cover recorded in the presence of deer (control plots - dotted line) and in the absence of deer (exclosures - solid line) for sites 1 and 2 from 2005 to 2014. a) Species centroid plots. b) Ellipse per year for Site/Fencing. A global solution was reached with two dimensions: 20 iterations achieved a minimum stress of 0.19 .
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Fig. S2 - Julve plant community light index for sites 1 and 2 from 2005 to 2014. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean. Wilcoxon tests were used to estimate differences between control and exclosure plots at each given year; the results of the tests are displayed at the top of each panel: ns $=$ non-significant; * $=\mathrm{p}$ value $<0.05 ; * *=\mathrm{p}$-value $<0.01 ; * * *=\mathrm{p}$-value $<0.001$. Letters next to points indicate differences between successive years at a $5 \%$ probability (Kruskal-Wallis): lower and upper case letters are for control and exclosure plots, respectively.


