Crop diversity enhances disease suppressive potential in soils

Ariane L. Peralta,[a,b]#* Yanmei Sun,[a]* and Jay T. Lennon[b]

Department of Biology, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA[a]; Department of

Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA[b]

Running Head: Crop diversity enhances disease suppression

#Address correspondence to Ariane L. Peralta, e-mail: peraltaa@ecu.edu

*A.L.P and Y.S. contributed equally to this work.

Keywords: crop diversity; disease suppression; microbial diversity; structure-function

relationships

ABSTRACT

Agricultural management can have lasting impacts on microbial community structure and function through changes in biotic (i.e., plant inputs) and abiotic (i.e., soil fertility) soil properties. Enhancing biodiversity is expected to increase ecosystem functions, and in an agricultural context, such functions include enhanced plant production and pest suppression. For example, disease suppressive soils are characterized by the biocontrol properties provided by resident soil microorganisms capable of producing antifungal or antibacterial compounds known to suppress the growth of soil-borne pathogens. In this study, we investigated the impact of long-term crop diversity on microbial communities and disease suppressive functional potential in soils. In 2012, we collected soil samples from the Biodiversity Gradient Experiment (established in 2000) at the Kellogg Biological Station Long-Term Ecological Research (KBS-LTER) site. We sampled 7 treatments along the crop diversity gradient (monoculture to 5 crop species) and a spring fallow treatment to examine the influence of crop diversity on total bacterial community composition (16S rRNA amplicon sequencing) and a subset of microorganisms capable of producing antifungal compounds (2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol: *phlD* gene fingerprint analysis; pyrrolnitrin: *prnD* gene quantitative PCR). Our study revealed that crop diversity significantly influenced bacterial community composition and abundance of disease suppressive functional groups. Variation in plant inputs to soil organic matter pools may be a possible mechanism driving shifts in microbial community patterns and disease suppressive functional potential.

INTRODUCTION

Intensive agricultural management leads to reduced biodiversity and declines in ecosystem functions (1). However, crop diversification within agricultural landscapes is known to restore ecosystem functions such as carbon sequestration, pest control, and nutrient cycling (2, 3). Restoring ecosystem functions remains challenging to achieve given the loss of complex biological, chemical, and physical functions that natural ecosystems provide and humans value (i.e., ecosystem services). Understanding the effect of crop diversity on microbial contributions to plant health can provide us with tools to enhance plant productivity beyond additions of chemical inputs (4-7). Enhancing aboveground biodiversity (i.e., incorporating cover crops, perennial crops) could enhance ecological functions in the context of agricultural production and environmental quality. By managing soils to support more complex soil food webs, ecosystem services such as nutrient cycling regulation and natural pest suppression can be restored (7-9).

Soil microorganisms influence plant growth and reproduction through solubilization of mineral nutrients in soil (10), N_2 fixation (11), plant growth promotion (12), and plant pathogen suppression (13-15). Plant-microbe interactions directly influence community composition above and belowground through plant-soil feedback mechanisms. The exchange of resources between plants and microorganisms can positively or negatively impact plant growth rates. The plant influences microbial community composition, and this change can affect plant growth rates (13, 16, 17). In addition, plants contribute root exudates with different qualities providing a variety of carbon substrates to soil microbes (18-21).

A subset of soil microorganisms is known to exhibit antimicrobial properties, which ultimately provide plants with protection from soil-borne plant pathogens. This disease suppressive capacity has been associated with the abundance of antagonistic bacteria and

associated reductions in fungal pathogens (14, 22). Bacterial production of secondary

metabolites 2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol (DAPG) and pyrrolnitrin (PRN) are two potent bacterial

toxins known to suppress fungal pathogens in agricultural soils (14, 23, 24). In a previous study,

increased plant diversity was associated with enhanced soil suppressiveness measured by

increased DAPG and PRN producers (25). In addition, streptomycetes are a well-known group of

microbes to have antibiotic inhibitory effects and contribute to disease suppression in agricultural

soils (15, 26). However, the diversity, composition, and disease suppressive activity among

streptomycetes communities was similar among high and low plant diversity treatments (27).

Thus, the relationship between biodiversity and disease suppression in agricultural soils remains

unclear. By focusing on disease suppressive capacity of soil, we can evaluate how agricultural

land-use strategies and subsequent changes in the soil environment and resident microbes impact

contemporary plant growth (27, 28).

Heavily managed agroecosystems are ideal locations to test the influence of crop

diversity effects on soil microorganisms. Specifically, long-term, replicated crop diversity trials

provide a unique opportunity to focus on plant effects on soil microbial communities. Our

research addresses the following questions: (1) What is the relationship between crop diversity

and soil microbial community composition and disease suppressive functional potential? and (2)

what is the relationship between changes in soil physicochemical properties and soil microbial

community composition and disease suppressive functional potential in response to a crop

diversity gradient? We tested the hypothesis that plant and microbial biodiversity provide disease

suppressive functions in soils. We predicted that soil microbes established under high crop

diversity (i.e., long crop rotations) have relatively higher soil suppressive capacity compared to

soil microbes developed under low crop diversity (i.e., short crop rotation).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental design

We collected at the Biodiversity Gradient Experiment plots at W.K. Kellogg Biological

Station Long-Term Ecological Research (KBS LTER) site in southwest, Michigan, USA. These

soils are Kalamazoo (fine-loamy) and Oshtemo (coarse-loamy) mixed, mesic, Typic Hapluadalfs

formed under glacial outwash (29). We sampled six diversity treatments including monoculture,

two-crop rotation, and three-crop rotation with two or three cover crops and a spring fallow

treatment (Table 1). Cover crops included in this experiment were red clover (*Trifolium pretense*

L.), crimson clover (*Trifolium incarnatum* L.) and cereal rye (*Secale cereal* L.). Plantings of

cover crop were dependent on the main crop in rotation (30). A complete set of biodiversity plots

is replicated four times. No additional fertilizer is applied to these plots.

Field sampling

We sampled 7 treatments (Table 1) all in the corn phase of the rotation along the biodiversity

gradient and a spring fallow treatment. At each of the four replicate 10 x 20 m plots, we

combined five soil cores (5 cm diameter) to a 10 cm depth. A subsample from each composite

sample was sieved through 4 mm in the field, flash frozen in the field in liquid nitrogen, and

stored at -80 °C prior to molecular-based microbial analyses. On a subsample of field-collected

soil, we analyzed inorganic nitrogen (N) (KCl extractable ammonium and nitrate) and

gravimetric soil moisture. The remaining soil was air-dried and ground for analysis of soil pH

and total C and N based on elemental combustion analysis.

Bacterial community sequencing

We extracted DNA using the MoBio PowerSoil® DNA Isolation Kit Soil (MO BIO

Laboratories, Inc., Carlsbad, CA). DNA concentration was adjusted to a standard concentration

of 20 ng μl^{-1} and used as template in PCR reactions. To characterize bacterial taxonomic

diversity, we used barcoded primers (515f/806r primer set) developed by the Earth Microbiome

Project to target the V4-V5 region of the bacterial 16S subunit of the ribosomal RNA gene

(rDNA) (31). For each sample, PCR product combined from three 50 μl reactions, concentration

quantified, and PCR product from each soil sample was combined in equimolar concentrations

for paired-end 250×250 sequencing using the Illumina MiSeq platform according to details in M.

Muscarella, et al. (32). Briefly, we assembled the paired-end 16S rRNA sequence reads using the

Needleman algorithm (33). All sequences were subjected to systematic checks to reduce

sequencing and PCR errors. High quality sequences (i.e., >200 bp in length, quality score of >25,

exact match to barcode and primer, and contained no ambiguous characters) were retained. In

addition, we identified and removed chimeric sequence using the UCHIME algorithm (34). We

aligned our sequence data set with the bacterial SILVA-based bacterial reference database (35).

During data analysis, operational taxonomic units (OTUs) were binned at 97% sequence identity

and phylogenetic classifications of bacterial sequences performed. Sequences were processed

using the software package *mothur* v.1.35.1 (36, 37).

Composition and abundance of disease suppression genes

We classify disease suppressive taxa as the subset of soil microorganisms possessing

genes that are required for the production of antifungal compounds 2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol

(DAPG) and pyrrolnitrin (PRN) (14, 24). We assessed the composition of disease suppressive

microorganisms by targeting the *phlD* gene using terminal restriction fragment length

polymorphism (T-RFLP) (38). For *phlD* gene amplification, the forward primer B2BF (5′-

ACCCACCGCAGCATCGTTTATGAGC-3′) and reverse primer FAM-BPR4 (5′-

CCGCCGGTATGGAAGATGAAAAAGTC-3′) to yield a 629 bp product. In each 25 μL PCR

reaction, we combined 5% dimethylsulfoxide, 0.8 mg ml^{-1} bovine serum albumin, 1×

GoTaq®Colorless Master Mix (Promega, Madison, WI), 0.2 μM of each primer and 5 μL of

template DNA. Reactions were cycled with initial denaturation at 94 °C for 2 min, followed by

35 cycles of 94 °C for 1 min, 60 °C for 1 min, and 72 °C for 2 min, with a final extension carried

out at 72 °C for 10 min (38). The amplified PCR products were purified with QIAquick PCR

purification kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). After purification, amplicons generated from each

sample were digested in multiple restriction enzymes overnight in 12 μL reaction mixtures

containing 4 μL of PCR product, 1× enzyme buffer (38). After digestion, the enzymes were

inactivated for 5 min at 80 °C, and the digested products were purified according to the

purification kit protocol (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). For T-RFLP analysis, we combined 1.5 μL of

the digested product with 9 μL of HiDi formamide (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) and

0.4 μL of internal size standard ABI GeneScan LIZ 600 (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA).

The samples were incubated for 3 min at 96 °C and then stored on ice prior to fragment analysis.

We determined the length and relative abundance of terminal restriction fragments (T-RFs) using

an ABI 3130×1 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). Electrophoresis

conditions were 60 °C and 15 kV with a run time of 41 min using POP-7 polymer. The resulting

data was analyzed using GeneMapper Software 4.0 (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). The

peak detection limit was set to 50 fluorescence intensity units.

We assessed the relative functional gene abundance of disease suppression by targeting

the *prnD* gene using quantitative PCR (qPCR) (24). The partial *prnD* gene abundance was

quantified using a SYBR green assay with primers prnD-F (5′-TGCACTTCGCGTTCGAGAC-

3′) and prnD-R (5′-GTTGCGCGTCGTAGAAGTTCT-3′) (24). The 25 μL PCR reaction

contained 1× GoTaq®Colorless Master Mix (Promega, Madison, WI), 0.4 μM of each primer,

and 5 μL of template DNA. Cycling conditions were the following: initial cycle 95 °C, 10 min,

and 30 cycles of 95 °C, 15 s and 60 °C, 1 min. For the qPCR standard curve, *prnD* gene was

amplified from soil genomic DNA. PCR fragments were cloned to pGEM®-T Easy Vector

System according to the manufacturer's manual (Promega, Madison, WI). Plasmids were

extracted using the QIAprep® Spin Miniprep kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), and cloned fragments

were verified by PCR and agarose gel electrophoresis. Dilutions of plasmid DNA containing

prnD gene were used to generate standard curves in quantities ranging from 5.0×10^2 to $5.0 \times$

10^7 copies. We quantified the *prnD* gene in 25 μL reaction volumes containing about 20 ng DNA

template, 1×TaqMan Environmental Master Mix 2.0 (Applied Biosystems, Valencia, CA), 1×

SYBR green I, and 0.4 μM of each primer. Fragments were amplified with an initial denaturation

step at 95 °C for 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of 95 °C for 15 s, 60 °C for 1 min. For each

sample, PCR reactions were run in triplicate. We obtained standard curves based on serial

dilutions of mixed PCR product amplified from soil samples. Reactions were analyzed on a BIO-

RAD CFX-96™ Real-Time System (Bio-Rad, Hercules, California, USA).

Statistical analyses

We used Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) to visualize microbial community

composition based on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity coefficient for each possible pair of samples

was used to visualize patterns of community composition using the R statistical package (R Core

Development Team 2015). To test for differences in bacterial communities among crop diversity

treatments, we used permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) using the

adonis function in the R Statistics Package R version 3.0.2 (R Development Core Team 2015).

PERMANOVA was also used to assess the contribution of soil factors to the variation in

bacterial community composition. The R^2 value reported refers to the treatment sums of squares

divided by the total sums of squares for each soil factor in the model. Because the *adonis*

function carries out sequential tests (similar to Type I sums of squares) (39), the effect of the last

soil factor or soil biological activity factor of the model was included in the final PERMANOVA

model summary (40). We also performed multiple linear regression (gene abundance ~ crop

number + total soil carbon + soil moisture + soil ammonium + soil nitrate) to test the influence

of soil factors and crop diversity number on abundance of disease suppression/biocontrol gene

prnD using the *lm* function in the R Statistics Package R version 3.0.2 (R Core Development

Team 2015).

RESULTS

Bacterial community composition along a crop diversity gradient

A total of 12,539,359 sequence reads were generated, and we analyzed 24,858 OTUs for

bacterial community patterns. A summary of soil attributes is presented in Table S1 and reported

in McDaniel et al. (2014) (41). The crop diversity treatment significantly influenced bacterial

community composition (PERMANOVA, crop rotation: $R^2 = 0.38$, *P* < 0.001; Table 2a, Fig. 1,

S1). Bacterial communities from the fallow plots and the longest crop rotations (CSW, CSW-

1cov, CSW-2cov) were more similar to each other than the lower crop diversity treatments (C-

1cov, CS) (Fig. 1). The monoculture corn (C) treatment was more distinct in bacterial

community composition than all other crop diversity treatments (Fig. 1). Bacterial diversity was

significantly higher under lower crop diversity and fallow treatments (Fig. 2). In addition,

percent sand, a soil texture factor, was the only soil property to significantly explain bacterial

community variation (PERMANOVA, Sand: $R^2 = 0.063$, $P = 0.044$, Table 3a). Potentially

mineralizable nitrogen, which represents the biologically available nitrogen pool, explained

variation in bacterial community composition (PERMANOVA, PMN: $R^2 = 0.085$, $P = 0.013$,

Table 3b).

Disease suppression functional potential in soils along a crop diversity

Crop diversity affected the composition of disease suppression soil microorganisms. We

observed a significant shift in disease suppression community composition (represented by *phlD*

gene T-RFLP) along the crop diversity gradient (PERMANOVA; crop rotation: $R^2 = 0.52$, $P =$

0.037; Fig. 3, Table 2b). The *phlD* community composition in the fallow treatment was different

from other cropping systems (Fig. 2). The relative abundance of dominant T-RF 280 bp fragment

group accounted for about 70% of the disease suppressive community under fallow conditions.

In addition, the disease suppressive functional group T-RF 582 bp was a dominant group,

representing about 31-97% relative abundance across all crop diversity treatments. In addition,

prnD gene abundances in cropping systems were higher than under fallow conditions (Fig. 3). In

cropping systems, the *prnD* gene in CSW-2cov treatment was the most abundant, and the gene

abundance was significantly higher than in CSW and fallow treatments (Fig. 3). The *prnD* gene

abundance results suggest CSW2cov>CSW1cov>CSW and C1cov>C, which indicated that the

treatments with cover crop tended to increase the *prnD* gene abundance (Fig. 3). When crop

input is removed, such as in the fallow treatment, *prnD* gene abundance was significantly

decreased (Fig. 4). Based on multiple linear regression analysis, plant and soil factors

significantly influenced *prnD* abundance (Adjusted R^2 = 0.398, F = 4.571, P = 0.005). Crop

species number (P = 0.003), soil carbon (P = 0.002), and soil moisture (P = 0.0005) significantly

influenced *prnD* gene abundance (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

Crop diversity and disease suppression function relationship

Crop rotation history impacts bacterial diversity and disease suppression potential in

soils. Our findings support the hypothesis that crop diversity influences bacterial community

composition and disease suppression potential in soils. Plants provide carbon to the soil

environment through root exudation of recently assimilated photosynthate, composed of soluble,

low molecular weight organic compounds (42). As a consequence, the increased C flow from

root exudates can stimulate soil microbial activity. Changes in plant inputs through variation in

root exudation are related to the crop species in the rotation. Changes in root exudates have been

observed to shift microbial community composition and stimulate a diverse microbial

community (18-21). Specifically, our results revealed that taxonomic diversity decreased while

functional diversity increased in response to increasing crop diversity. The addition of cover

crops in rotation increased disease suppressive potential. Crop diversity influenced the subset of

microbes associated with disease suppression of soil-borne pathogens. In previous studies,

interactions among the total microbial community and soil-borne pathogens in the plant

rhizosphere have influenced both plant growth and productivity (27, 43). Our results suggest that

plant diversity can enhance protection against soil-borne pathogens by fostering antagonistic soil

bacterial communities (25).

Crop rotation effects on DAPG and PRN producers

The gene abundance results suggest that incorporation of cover crop in rotations increases

prnD gene abundance. Specifically, cover crop species may have important effects on the *prnD*

gene abundance and disease suppressive functional potential in soils. The *prnD* gene abundance

in cropping systems is higher than in fallow treatment. In addition, there are no reports linking

the functional group T-RF 280 to a specific genotype of laboratory strains (38). In our study, this

bacterial group is capable of producing 2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol (DAPG) and affects DAPG

community composition (Fig. 3). The T-RF 582 bp was also reported to be a major 2,4-

diacetylphloroglucinol-producing functional *Pseudomonas kilonensis* in a previous study (38).

The abundance of DAPG and PRN producers increasing with plant diversity has been previously

observed (25). Compared to agricultural soils, the PRN producers were more frequently detected

in grassland or grassland-derived plots (23, 24). The PRN gene abundance increased in the

presence of grasses, but the legume species tended to decrease the DAPG and PRN producer

abundance (25). Together, our findings combined with previous studies suggest that the land-use

regime, plant diversity, and plant species are involved in structuring disease suppressive

microbial communities.

Testing the biodiversity-ecosystem function relationship

A framework to investigate biodiversity and ecosystem functioning includes four main

components: species composition, species abundance, functional traits possessed by each

species, and ecosystem function to measure in response to changes in biodiversity (44).

Microbial systems are ideal for addressing biodiversity and ecosystem functioning relationships

within this framework (45). In our study, higher crop diversity but lower soil bacterial diversity

supported disease suppression functional potential in soils. We posit that rotation has a filtering

effect on soil microbes, whereby crop diversity selects for antagonistic microbes with disease

suppressive potential. Our study further supports the hypothesis that plant diversity can support

biocontrol functional potential by enhancing antagonistic properties of resident soil microbes

against soil-borne pathogens. The soil microbial community composition may be more important

than soil microbial diversity to soil ecological function. Increasing evidence supports that crop

species and soil type have been shown to shape the soil microbial composition and function (2,

3); thus, land management can have a large effect on soil microbial processes and microbial

community composition (46-48).

Conclusion

Here, we demonstrate that crop diversity influenced bacterial community composition

and disease suppressive functional potential in soils. Higher disease suppressive potential is

supported when crop rotations are longer and more complex. Plants and microbes drive nutrient

cycling in this long-term cropping diversity since no other synthetic or organic amendments are

applied. In our study, once crop species were removed (fallow), disease suppressive potential

dramatically decreased. Managing for enhanced disease suppressive soils remains challenging to

implement given the complex plant-soil-microbial interactions occurring in agricultural soils.

However, the legacy effects associated with crop diversity have potential to be diluted by

changes in management when fields are not actively in agricultural production (e.g., fallow plots

no longer planted with crops).

FUNDING INFORMATION

USDA NIFA (#2012-67012-19845 to A.L.P.); NSF (#1442246 to J.T.L.)

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, preparation of the manuscript, or decision to submit the work for publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and Agriculture Postdoctoral Fellowship (2012-67012-19845 to A.L.P.) and the National Science Foundation (1442246 to J.T.L.). Support was also provided by the NSF Long-term Ecological Research Program (DEB 1027253) at the Kellogg Biological Station and by Michigan State University AgBioResearch. We would like to thank the Kellogg Biological Station LTER for logistical support and use of sampling sites. We also thank M. Muscarella, J. Ford, S. Krahnke, and M. Brewer for microbial analyses support and B. O'Neill, M. McDaniel, A.S. Grandy and T.M. Schmidt Labs for field and soil analyses support.

REFERENCES

1. **Tilman D, Cassman KG, Matson PA, Naylor R, Polasky S.** 2002. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. Nature **418:**671-677.

2. **McDaniel MD, Tiemann LK, Grandy AS.** 2013. Does agricultural crop diversity enhance soil microbial biomass and organic matter dynamics? A meta-analysis. Ecol Appl **24:**560-570.

3. **Tiemann LK, Grandy AS, Atkinson EE, Marin-Spiotta E, McDaniel MD.** 2015. Crop rotational diversity enhances belowground communities and functions in an agroecosystem. Ecol Lett **18:**761-771.

4.   **Postma J, Schilder MT, Bloem J, van Leeumen-Haagsma WK.** 2008. Soil

suppressiveness and functional diversity of the soilmicroflora in organic farming systems.

Soil Biol Biochem **40:**2394–2406.

5.   **Smukler SM, Sanchez-Moreno S, Fonte SJ, Ferris H, Klonsky K, O'Geen AT, Scow**

KM, Steenwerth KL, Jackson LE. 2010. Biodiversity and multiple ecosystem functions

in an organic farmscape. Agr Ecosyst Environ **139:**80-97.

6.   **Swift MJ, Izac AMN, van Noordwijk M.** 2004. Biodiversity and ecosystem services in

agricultural landscapes - are we asking the right questions? Agr Ecosyst Environ

104:113-134.

7.   **Young-Mathews A, Culman SW, Sánchez-Moreno S, O'Geen AT, Ferris H,**

Hollander AD, Jackson LE. 2010. Plant-soil biodiversity relationships and nutrient

retention in agricultural riparian zones of the Sacramento Valley, California. Agroforest

Syst **80:**41-60.

8.   **Letourneau DK, Bothwell SG.** 2008. Comparison of organic and conventional farms:

challenging ecologists to make biodiversity functional. Front Ecol Environ **6:**430-438.

9.   **Letourneau DK, van Bruggen A.** 2006. Crop protection in organic agriculture. *In*

Kirstiansen P, Taji A, Reganold J (ed), Organic Agriculture: A Gobal Perspective.

CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Australia.

10.   **Barness E, Chen Y, Hadar Y, Marschner H, Romheld V.** 1991. Siderophores of

Pseudomonas putida as an iron source for dicot and monocot plants. Plant Soil **130:**231-

241.

11.   **Reed SC, Townsend AR, Cleveland CC, Nemergut DR.** 2010. Microbial community

shifts influence patterns in tropical forest nitrogen fixation. Oecologia **164:**521-531.

12.   **Lugtenberg B, Kamilova F.** 2009. Plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria. Annu Rev

Microbiol **63:**541–545.

13.   **Bever JD, Westover KM, Antonovics J.** 1997. Incorporating the soil community into

plant population dynamics: the utility of the feedback approach. J Ecol **85:**561-573.

14.   **Haas D, Defago G.** 2005. Biological control of soil-borne pathogens by fluorescent

pseudomonads. Nature Rev Microbiol **3:**307-319.

15.   **Perez C, Dill-Macky R, Kinkel LL.** 2008. Management of soil microbial communities

to enhance populations of Fusarium graminearum-antagonists in soil. Plant Soil **302:**53-

69.

16.   **Kulmatiski A, Beard KH, Stevens JR, Cobbold SM.** 2008. Plant–soil feedbacks: a

meta-analytical review. Ecol Lett **11:**980–992.

17.   **Reynolds HL, Packer A, Bever JD, Clay K.** 2003. Grassroots ecology: Plant-microbe-

soil interactions as drivers of plant community structure and dynamics. Ecology **84:**2281-

2291.

18.   **Dijkstra FA, Morgan JA, Blumenthal D, Follett RF.** 2010. Water limitation and plant

inter-specific competition reduce rhizosphere-induced C decomposition and plant N

uptake. Soil Biol Biochem **42:**1073-1082.

19.   **Hooper DU, Bignell DE, Brown VK, Brussaard L, Dangerfield JM, Wall DH,**

Wardle DA, Coleman DC, Giller KE, Lavelle P, Van der Putten WH, De Ruiter PC,

Rusek J, Silver WL, Tiedje JM, Wolters V. 2000. Interactions between aboveground

and belowground biodiversity in terrestrial ecosystems: Patterns, mechanisms, and

feedbacks. Bioscience **50:**1049-1061.

20.   **Paterson E, Midwood AJ, Millard P.** 2009. Through the eye of the needle: a review of

isotope approaches to quantify microbial processes mediating soil carbon balance. New

Phytol **184:**19-33.

21.   **Stephan A, Meyer AH, Schmid B.** 2000. Plant diversity affects culturable soil bacteria

in experimental grassland communities. J Ecol **88:**988-998.

22.   **Weller DM, Raaijmakers JM, Gardener BBM, Thomashow LS.** 2002. Microbial

populations responsible for specific soil suppressiveness to plant pathogens. Annu Rev

Phytopathol **40:**309-+.

23.   **Garbeva P, van Veen JA, van Elsas JD.** 2004. Microbial diversity in soil: Selection of

microbial populations by plant and soil type and implications for disease suppressiveness.

Annu Rev Phytopathol **42:**243-270.

24.   **Garbeva P, Voesenek K, van Elsas JD.** 2004. Quantitative detection and diversity of

the pyrrolnitrin biosynthetic locus in soil under different treatments. Soil Biol Biochem

36:1453-1463.

25.   **Latz E, Eisenhauer N, Rall BC, Roscher C, Scheu S, Jousset A.** 2012. Plant diversity

improves protection against soil-borne pathogens by fostering antagonistic bacterial

communities. J Ecol **100:**597-604.

26.   **Wiggins E, Kinkel LL.** 2005. Green manures and crop sequences influence alfalfa root

rot and pathogen inhibitory activity among soil-borne streptomycetes. Plant Soil

268:271-283.

27.   **Bakker MG, Glover JD, Mai JG, Kinkel LL.** 2010. Plant community effects on the

diversity and pathogen suppressive activity of soil streptomycetes. Applied Soil Ecology

46:35-42.

28.   **Kulmatiski A, Beard KH.** 2011. Long-term plant growth legacies overwhelm short-term

393   plant growth effects on soil microbial community structure. Soil Biol Biochem **43:**823-

394   830.

395   29.   **Crum JR, Collins HP.** 1995. KBS Soils [Online].

396   http://www.lter.kbs.msu.edu/soil/characterization. Accessed

397   30.   **Smith RG, Gross KL.** 2006. Weed community and corn yield variability in diverse

398   management systems. Weed Sci **54:**106-113.

399   31.   **Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters WA, Berg-Lyons D, Huntley J, Fierer N, Owens**

400   **SM, Betley J, Fraser L, Bauer M, Gormley N, Gilbert JA, Smith G, Knight R.** 2012.

401   Ultra-high-throughput microbial community analysis on the Illumina HiSeq and MiSeq

402   platforms. ISME J **6:**1621-1624.

403   32.   **Muscarella M, Bird K, Larsen M, Placella S, Lennon J.** 2014. Phosphorus resource

404   heterogeneity in microbial food webs. Aquat Microb Ecol **73:**259-272.

405   33.   **Needleman SB, Wunsch CD.** 1970. A general method applicable to the search for

406   similarities in the amino acid sequence of two proteins. J Mol Biol **48:**443-453.

407   34.   **Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C, Knight R.** 2011. UCHIME improves

408   sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. Bioinformatics **27:**2194-2200.

409   35.   **Yilmaz P, Parfrey LW, Yarza P, Gerken J, Pruesse E, Quast C, Schweer T, Peplies**

410   **J, Ludwig W, Glöckner FO.** 2013. The SILVA and "All-species living tree project

411   (LTP)" taxonomic frameworks. Nucl Acids Res **42:**D643-D648.

412   36.   **Kozich JJ, Westcott SL, Baxter NT, Highlander SK, Schloss PD.** 2013. Development

413   of a dual-index sequencing strategy and curation pipeline for analyzing amplicon

sequence data on the MiSeq Illumina sequencing platform. Appl Environ Microbiol

79:5112-5120.

37.   **Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, Hollister EB,**

Lesniewski RA, Oakley BB, Parks DH, Robinson CJ, Sahl JW, Stres B, Thallinger

GG, Van Horn DJ, Weber CF. 2009. Introducing mothur: Open-Source, Platform-

Independent, Community-Supported Software for Describing and Comparing Microbial

Communities. Appl Environ Microbiol **75:**7537-7541.

38.   **von Felten A, Meyer JB, Defago G, Maurhofer M.** 2011. Novel T-RFLP method to

investigate six main groups of 2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol-producing pseudomonads in

environmental samples. J Microbiol Methods **84:**379-387.

39.   **Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos**

P, Stevens MHH, Wagner H. 2010. Community Ecology Package 'vegan'.

40.   **Peralta AL, Matthews JW, Flanagan DN, Kent AD.** 2012. Environmental Factors at

Dissimilar Spatial Scales Influence Plant and Microbial Communities in Restored

Wetlands. Wetlands **32:**1125-1134.

41.   **McDaniel MD, Grandy AS, Tiemann LK, Weintraub MN.** 2014. Crop rotation

complexity regulates the decomposition of high and low quality residues. Soil Biol

Biochem **78:**243-254.

42.   **Neumann G, Romheld V.** 2007. The Release of Root Exudates as Affects by the Plant

Physiological Status, p 23-72. *In* Pinton R, Varanini Z, Nannipieri P (ed), The

Rhizosphere: Biochemistry and Organic Substances at the Soil-plant Interface, 2nd ed.

CRC Press.

43.   **Penton CR, Gupta V, Tiedje JM, Neate SM, Ophel-Keller K, Gillings M, Harvey P,**

Pham A, Roget DK. 2014. Fungal community structure in disease suppressive soils

assessed by 28S LSU gene sequencing. PloS One **9:**e93893.

44.   **Naeem S, Wright JP.** 2003. Disentangling biodiversity effects on ecosystem

functioning: Deriving solutions to a seemingly insurmountable problem. Ecol Lett **6:**567-

579.

45.   **Jessup CM, Kassen R, Forde SE, Kerr B, Buckling A, Rainey PB, Bohannan BJM.**

2004. Big questions, small worlds: microbial model systems in ecology. Trends Ecol

Evol **19:**189-197.

46.   **Jangid K, Williams MA, Franzluebbers AJ, Sanderlin JS, Reeves JH, Jenkins MB,**

Endale DM, Coleman DC, Whitman WB. 2008. Relative impacts of land-use,

management intensity and fertilization upon soil microbial community structure in

agricultural systems. Soil Biol Biochem **40:**2843-2853.

47.   **Lauber CL, Strickland MS, Bradford MA, Fierer N.** 2008. The influence of soil

properties on the structure of bacterial and fungal communities across land-use types.

Soil Biol Biochem **40:**2407-2415.

48.   **Orr C, Stewart C, Leifert C, Cooper J, Cummings S.** 2015. Effect of crop

management and sample year on abundance of soil bacterial communities in organic and

conventional cropping systems. J Appl Microbiol.

TABLES

Table 1. Cropping diversity treatments at the Kellogg Biological Station Long-term Ecological

Research (KBS LTER) Biodiversity Gradient Experiment Plots. Plant treatments were

established in 2000. Treatments were composed of monoculture, two-crop rotation, three-crop

rotation +/- cover crops, and fallow plots (early successional) and soil collected during the corn

phase of the rotation. Treatment abbreviations are in parentheses.

Crop diversity treatment description	Number of crop species
(1) Continuous monoculture (C)	1
(2) Continuous monoculture, one cover crop (C-1cov)	2
(3) Two-crop rotation (CS)	2
(4) Three-crop rotation (CSW)	3
(5) Three-crop rotation, one cover crop (CSW-1cov)	4
(6) Three-crop rotation, two cover crops (CSW-2cov)	5
(7) Spring Fallow/early successional field (fallow)	10

Table 2. Effects of crop rotation on the composition of bacterial community composition and

disease suppressive community composition. Summary of the contribution of crop rotation (i.e.,

crop diversity) on (A) bacterial community variation based on 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing

or (b) disease suppressive community variation based on *phlD* gene T-RFLP at the KBS

Biodiversity Gradient Experimental Plots based on permutational MANOVA (PERMANOVA)

results. Rotation effect was considered to significantly contribute to community variation at $P <$

0.05.

(A) 16S rRNA

	df	SS	MS	F	R^2	P-value
Rotation	6	0.321	0.054	2.135	0.379	<0.001
Residuals	21	0.527	0.025	0.621		
Total	27	0.848	1.000			

(B) *phlD* gene

	df	SS	MS	F	R^2	P-value
Rotation	8	3.024	0.378	1.748	0.518	0.037
Residuals	13	2.811	0.216	0.482		
Total	21	5.835	1.000			

Table 3. Summary of the contribution of (A) soil factors and (B) soil biological activity on bacterial community variation at the KBS Biodiversity Gradient Experimental Plots based on permutational MANOVA (PERMANOVA). Soil factor effects were considered to significantly contribute to community variation at $P < 0.05$.

(A) Soil Factors

Effect	df	SS	MS	F	R^2	P-value
Sand	1	0.053	0.053	2.042	0.063	0.044
Silt	1	0.052	0.052	2.003	0.061	0.056
Clay	1	0.051	0.051	1.961	0.060	0.064
pH	1	0.024	0.024	0.915	0.028	0.513
Nitrate	1	0.010	0.010	0.385	0.012	0.982
Ammonium	1	0.009	0.009	0.345	0.011	0.981
Nitrogen	1	0.028	0.028	1.061	0.033	0.369
Carbon	1	0.013	0.013	0.501	0.015	0.902
Moisture	1	0.039	0.039	1.481	0.045	0.145
Residuals	18	0.469	0.026		0.553	
Total	27	0.848			1.000	

498   (B) Soil Biological Activity

Effect	df	SS	MS	F	R^2	P-value
PMN	1	0.072	0.072	2.485	0.085	0.013
PMC	1	0.038	0.038	1.314	0.045	0.211
POXC	1	0.050	0.050	1.715	0.059	0.104
Residuals	24	0.698	0.029		0.823	
Total	27	0.848			1.000	

514   Table 4. Summary of multiple linear regression to test the influence of disease suppressive

515   functional potential (*prnD* gene abundance) on soil factors and crop diversity.

Factor	Estimate	Std error	t-value	*p*-value
Intercept	7.444	0.420	17.728	< 0.001
Crop_number	-0.085	0.025	-3.355	0.003
Carbon	0.180	0.050	3.618	0.002
Moisture	-11.564	2.817	-4.105	< 0.001
Ammonium	-0.701	0.948	-0.739	0.468
Nitrate	0.093	0.136	0.684	0.501

FIGURES

Figure 1. Ordination from Principal Coordinates Analysis depicting soil bacterial communities

along a cropping diversity gradient. Symbols are colored according to cropping diversity

treatment (C=continuous corn; C-1cov=corn/1 cover crop; CS=corn/soy; CSW=corn/soy/wheat;

CSW-1cov=corn/soy/wheat/1 cover crop; CSW-2cov=corn/soy/wheat/2 cover crops;

fallow=spring fallow, tilled annually).

Figure 2. The bacterial diversity (mean ± SEM based on Shannon Diversity Index H') in

response to long-term crop diversity treatment. Different letters above points reflect significant

differences in gene abundance along crop diversity gradient at $P < 0.05$ (Tukey's HSD *post-hoc*

analysis).

Figure 3. Ordination from Principal Coordinates Analysis of disease suppressive community

based on T-RFLP of *phl*D gene (DAPG producers) T-RF relative abundance data obtained from

different cropping system treatments.

Figure 4. Abundance of *prn*D gene (PRN producers) in response to crop diversity treatment

analyzed using quantitative PCR and expressed as log copy number of *prn*D gene. Different

letters above points reflect significant differences in Different letters above boxplots considered

significantly different in gene abundance at $P < 0.05$ (Tukey's HSD *post-hoc* analysis).

Figure 1

Figure 1. Ordination from Principal Coordinates Analysis depicting soil bacterial communities

along a cropping diversity gradient. Symbols are colored according to cropping diversity

treatment (C=continuous corn; C-1cov=corn/1 cover crop; CS=corn/soy; CSW=corn/soy/wheat;

CSW-1cov=corn/soy/wheat/1   cover   crop;   CSW-2cov=corn/soy/wheat/2   cover   crops;

fallow=spring fallow, tilled annually).

565   Figure 2

567   Figure 2. The bacterial diversity (mean ± SEM based on Shannon Diversity Index H') in

568   response to long-term crop diversity treatment. Different letters above points reflect significant

569   differences in gene abundance along crop diversity gradient at $P < 0.05$ (Tukey's HSD *post-hoc*

570   analysis).

577   Figure 3

579   Figure 3. Ordination from Principal Coordinates Analysis of disease suppressive community

580   based on T-RFLP of *phl*D gene (DAPG producers) T-RF relative abundance data obtained from

581   different cropping system treatments.

589   Figure 4

592   Figure 4. Abundance of *prn*D gene (PRN producers) in response to crop diversity treatment

593   analyzed using quantitative PCR and expressed as log copy number of *prn*D gene. Different

594   letters above points reflect significant differences in Different letters above boxplots considered

595   significantly different in gene abundance at $P < 0.05$ (Tukey's HSD *post-hoc* analysis).

 SUPPLEMENTAL

603   Figure S1. Principal coordinates analysis plot of classified only 16S rRNA sequences based on

604   relative abundance of classified OTUs at the phylum, order, and genus levels.

SUPPLEMENTAL

605 Table S1. Soil properties measured along the KBS cropping diversity gradient averaged over four replicate blocks. Comparison of soil

606 properties and biological activity results are summarized in M.D. McDaniel et al. (2014) (41).

Treatment	Total C (g C kg^{-1} soil)	Total N (g N kg^{-1} soil)	NH$_4^+$ (mg N kg^{-1} soil)	NO$_3^-$ (mg N kg^{-1} soil)	pH	Clay (%)	Silt (%)	Sand (%)
Fallow	8.74 ± 2.41	0.77 ± 0.16	0.07 ± 0.04	1.50 ± 0.31	6.70 ± 0.28	25 ± 9	39 ± 19	36 ± 11
CSW-2cov	8.98 ± 1.81	0.91 ± 0.12	0.09 ± 0.04	1.24 ± 0.50	6.25 ± 0.11	21 ± 10	51 ± 22	29 ± 12
CSW-1cov	9.63 ± 1.29	0.91 ± 0.04	0.06 ± 0.02	1.09 ± 0.51	6.37 ± 0.25	24 ± 10	46 ± 17	31 ± 7
CSW	7.43 ± 1.58	0.70 ± 0.10	0.07 ± 0.03	1.26 ± 0.62	6.54 ± 0.21	21 ± 10	45 ± 21	34 ± 12
CS	7.70 ± 2.11	0.73 ± 0.26	0.10 ± 0.09	1.16 ± 0.74	6.66 ± 0.12	23 ± 11	41 ± 24	36 ± 14
C-1cov	9.09 ± 1.86	0.93 ± 0.16	0.06 ± 0.02	1.50 ± 0.65	6.46 ± 0.25	27 ± 8	36 ± 19	38 ± 12
C	8.09 ± 1.24	0.71 ± 0.15	0.16 ± 0.16	1.31 ± 0.36	6.58 ± 0.38	25 ± 9	36 ± 19	38 ± 11