Plant genetic effects on microbial hubs impact fitness across field trials

Benjamin Brachi[1, 2], Daniele Filiault[3*], Hannah Whitehurst[1*], Paul Darme[1], Pierre Le Gars[1],

Marine Le Mentec[1], Timothy C. Morton[1], Envel Kerdaffrec[3], Fernando Rabanal[3], Alison

Anastasio[1], Mathew S. Box[4], Susan Duncan[4], Feng Huang[1,5], Riley Leff[1], Polina Novikova[3],

Matthew Perisin[1], Takashi Tsuchimatsu[3], Roderick Woolley[1], Caroline Dean[4], Magnus

Nordborg[3], Svante Holm[6], Joy Bergelson[1]

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637

[2] Univ. Bordeaux, INRAE, BIOGECO, F-33610 Cestas, France

[3] Gregor Mendel Institute (GMI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna Biocenter (VBC),

Dr. Bohr-Gasse 3, 1030 Vienna, Austria

[4] John Innes Center, Norwich, UK

[5] South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guangzhou, China

[6] Mid-Sweden University, Sundsvall, Sweden

*contributed equally to the work

Abstract:

Although complex interactions between hosts and microbial associates are increasingly well documented, we still know little about how and why hosts shape microbial communities in nature. In addition, host genetic effects on microbial communities vary widely depending on the environment, obscuring conclusions about which microbes are impacted and which plant functions are important. We characterized the leaf microbiota of 200 *A. thaliana* genotypes in eight field experiments and detected consistent host effects on specific, broadly distributed microbial OTU's. Host genetics disproportionately influenced hubs within the microbial communities, with their impact then percolating through the community, as evidenced by a decline in the heritability of particular OTUs with their distance to the nearest hub. By simultaneously measuring host performance, we found that host genetics associated with microbial hubs explained over 10% of the variation in lifetime seed production among host genotypes across sites and years. We successfully cultured one of these microbial hubs and demonstrated its growth-promoting effects on plants grown in sterile conditions. Finally, genome-wide association mapping identified many putatively causal genes with small effects on the relative abundance of microbial hubs across sites and years, and these genes were enriched for those involved in the synthesis of specialized metabolites, auxins and the immune system. Using untargeted metabolomics, we corroborate the consistent association of variation in specialized metabolites and microbial hubs across field sites. Together, our results reveal that host natural variation impacts the microbial communities in consistent ways across environments and that these effects contribute to fitness variation among host genotypes.

Main

Hosts harbor complex microbial communities that are thought to impact health and development [1]. Human microbiota has been implicated in a variety of diseases, including obesity and cancer [2]. Efforts are thus underway to determine the host factors shaping these communities [3,4], and to use next-generation probiotics to inhibit colonization by pathogens [5]. Similarly, in agriculture, there is great hope of shaping the composition of the microbiota in order to mitigate disease and increase crop yield in a sustainable fashion. Indeed, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has made the use of biological control and growth-promoting microbial associations a clear priority for improving food production [6].

Plant-associated microbes can be beneficial in many ways, including improving access to nutrients, activating or priming the immune system, and competing with pathogens. For example, seeds inoculated with a combination of naturally occurring microbes were found to be protected from a sudden-wilt disease that emerged after continuous cropping [7]. Thus, it would be advantageous to breed crops that promote the growth of beneficial microbes under a variety of field conditions, a prospect that is made more likely by the demonstration of host genotypic effects on their microbiota [8–10]. However, microbial communities are complex entities that are influenced by the combined impact of host factors, environment and microbe-microbe interactions [11]. Indeed, several studies have found a strong influence of the environment on estimates of host genotype effects [8,12,13]. Although most, if not all, studies exploring the influence that host genotype exerts on microbial communities suggest that such plant control could be beneficial to plant performance, almost nothing is known about the relationship between host genotype effects on microbial communities and on plant performance or fitness. As a consequence, the extent to which host plants can control

microbial communities to their advantage, especially in a consistent manner across multiple

environments, remains unclear.

Here, we combine large-scale field experiments in natural environments, extensive

microbial community analysis, and genome-wide association mapping to: (i) determine how

host genotype affects different microbial community members, and thus shapes the overall

microbiome; (ii) estimate host genotype effects on microbial communities across eight

environments and investigate the contribution of those effects to the performance of plant

genotypes; and (iii) use genome-wide association mapping to identify key pathways that

shape the leaf microbial communities across multiple environmental conditions.

Snapshot of microbial community variation

We performed a set of field experiments that included natural inbred lines of *Arabidopsis*

thaliana (hereafter "accessions") originally collected throughout Sweden, mainly in two

climatically contrasted regions of the country (Supplementary Table 1); *A. thaliana* in the

north of Sweden experiences long, snowy winters, and as a consequence plants are typically

found on south-facing slopes of rocky cliffs. *Arabidopsis* populations in the south of Sweden,

on the other hand, tend to be associated with agricultural or disturbed fields that experience

highly variable snow cover over the winter months. We used replicate experiments in four

representative *Arabidopsis* sites, two each in the north (sites NM and NA) and south (sites SU

and SR) of Sweden. Experiments were repeated across two years, for a total of eight

experiments.

Each experiment was organized in a complete randomized block design including 24

replicates of 200 sequenced accessions [14], established as seedlings in a mixture of native

and potting soil and timed to coincide with local germination flushes in late summer.

Immediately upon snowmelt in early spring, we sampled and freeze-dried 5 to 6 whole

rosettes per accession. DNA was extracted from the freeze-dried rosettes and both the ITS1

portion of the Internal Transcribed Spacer (ITS) and the V5 to V7 regions of the 16S RNA

gene were sequenced to characterize the fungal and bacterial communities, respectively

[9,11,15]. The sequences obtained were clustered into Operational Taxonomic Units (OTUs)

using Swarm to generate community matrices [14] (see "Count table filtering" section in the

methods). The frequency distributions of OTUs were highly skewed, with the top ten most

common OTUs contributing on average 59% of the reads in each experiment (ranging from

45 to 78%). Taxonomic assignments indicate that the fungal communities were dominated

by Leotimycetes and Dothideomycetes while the bacterial communities included high

proportions of Alphaproteobacteria and Actinobacteria (Extended Data Fig. 1).

In a principal coordinate analysis, differences between northern and southern sites

explained 10 and 5% of the overall diversity in the fungal and bacterial communities,

respectively, while differences between the two consecutive years explained 5 and 3%. This

level of differentiation among experiments likely underestimates that present in the native

soil, as it has been shown that hosts filter the microbial community to reduce site-to-site

differences [17,18] (Fig. 1). In addition, there may have been a homogenizing effect of using

a combination of local and potting soil. Irrespective of how well our treatments mimicked

natural microbial communities, our analysis of eight common garden experiments permits

assessment of the consistency across time and space of plant genetic effects on their

associated microbial communities.

Fig. 1 | Plants grown in different environments have different microbial communities.
The plots represent the projection of each sample on the plane defined by the first two
constrained components of the fungal and bacterial communities, describing variation among
sites and years. The percentages in parentheses are the proportion of the total inertia (square
root of the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity) explained by each component. The colors of the points
indicate the site from which samples were collected. Experiments from the South are
represented in red (SU) and yellow (SR), and experiments from the North in light blue (NR)
and dark blue (NA). All points from 2012 and 2013 are encircled by a dark and lighter grey
line respectively.

Host effects on the microbiota

Our experiments provided a unique opportunity to investigate associations between

host genetic variation and their resident microbiomes, within the context of environmental

variation across time and space. We computed the proportion of variance explained by the

host genotype (hereafter heritability or H^2) based on simple unconstrained principal

coordinates (PCoA) within each experiment. Within each experiment, we found significant

heritability of components of the microbial communities (Extended Data Table 1), suggesting

that genetic variation in the host significantly impacts at least a fraction of the microbiota, in

line with results of previous studies [8–11,19,20].

Fig. 2 | The effect of host genetic variation on the microbial community targets relatively few OTUs and percolates through hubs. This figure corresponds to observations in the set of four experiments sampled in 2013, see Extended Data Figure 3 for experiments performed in 2012. **A-D:** Each frame presents the distribution of heritability estimates for individual OTUs in one site. In each frame, the inset graph is a box and whiskers plot contrasting the heritability (y-axis) of bacterial (B) and fungal (F) OTUs. **E-F:** The heritable hubs are represented by large dots, at a distance of 0 (hub). The other OTUs are represented by smaller dots and the x-axis represents their distance to the nearest heritable hub(s) within the sparse covariance networks. The number of heritable hubs detected in each experiment is indicated in the legend. The correlation coefficients presented are Kendall rank correlations calculated for OTUs with a distance to the heritable hub(s) above 0. NE stands for "no edge".

Significant heritability of principal components could arise from host genotypes

exerting weak control over a large number of community members, or by targeting a few

microbes that then influence the relative abundance of others through microbe-microbe

interactions. Random-effects linear modeling of log-transformed OTU counts revealed

significant genotypic effects (with the 95% confidence interval of heritability not overlapping

0) for between 10.52 and 22.65% of all OTUs, depending on the site and year (Fig. 2A-D and

Extended Data Fig. 2A-D). Thus, the influence of the host appears focused on relatively few

OTUs. We found no evidence that either fungal or bacterial communities are systematically

more impacted by host effects than the other (Fig. 2A-D and Extended Data Fig. 2A-D), nor

that mean relative abundance was strongly correlated with OTU heritability (Extended Data

Fig. 3).

Having found that host effects are concentrated on a small proportion of OTUs, we

investigated the possibility that these heritable OTUs trigger a broader community level

change in the microbiota. First, we computed networks of microbe co-occurrence for each

experiment. We explored the ecological importance of heritable OTUs by computing

networks of microbe co-occurrence for each experiment using the SPIEC-EASI pipeline [21].

Although our networks included both fungal and bacterial OTUs, most microbe-microbe

interactions occurred within each domain, with an average of only 8.71 [min=6.94,

max=10.38]% of edges connecting fungal and bacterial OTUs. We quantified the ecological

importance of OTUs using two common characteristics of nodes in a network ("Degree" and

"Between-ness centrality") [11], defining ecologically important "hubs" in each network as

OTUs in the 95% tail of both of these statistics (Extended data Fig. 4). We identified on

average 16.5 microbial hubs per experiment (ranging from 11 to 24), representing 77 unique

OTUs across all eight experiments. These hubs were connected to an average of 20.09

[min=14.50, max=25.23]% of the edges in the networks, indicating that they are likely

important in structuring the microbial community. In addition, hubs were involved in

proportionally more interactions between fungi and bacteria than the rest of the community

(Extended Data Table 3).

Next, we asked whether heritable OTUs are more likely to be ecological hubs,

because this could open the door to community-level impacts. Across all eight experiments,

we detected 23 OTUs that were both heritable and hubs at least once (Extended Data Table 2,

Supplementary Table 2). This represents a significant enrichment of hub OTUs amongst

heritable OTUs (Wilcoxon rank sum test: N=8, W=57, p-value= 0.00699), suggesting that

host effects on the microbiota preferentially influence the relative abundance of ecologically

important microbes. In fact, hub OTUs were often among the OTUs with the highest

heritability within each experiment.

Finally, we sought evidence of community level impacts of heritable hubs by

mapping heritability onto the ecological network. In six out of eight experiments, we

observed a significant negative relationship between heritability and the distance (number of

network edges) to the nearest heritable hub (combined p-value=$4.104e^{-15}$, using Fisher's

method for combining p-values)[22](Fig. 2E-H and Extended Data Fig. 2E-H). This suggests

that host genetic variation most strongly affects a few microbial hubs that then influence

other microbes, most likely through microbe-microbe interactions.

Not only do heritable hubs have an impact that appears to percolate through the

microbial community, they tend to be widely distributed among accessions, sites and years.

We were able to identify 278 fungal and bacterial OTUs that were found in at least 50% of

samples in all experiments. Interestingly, OTUs that were heritable hubs at least once were

over-represented in this core microbiota (χ^2=34.68, df=1, p-value=3.891e-9). This was not an

artifact of their being widespread; significant heritability estimates were detected across the

entire range of prevalence, with prevalence of an OTU explaining less than 1.4% of OTU

heritability across all experiments (F-statistic=29.48, df=4176, p-value=5.964e-08, Extended

Data Figure 5). Thus, ecologically important OTUs with greatest associations to host

genotypes were unusual in being widespread among plants in multiple experiments. Host

effects on the fungal OTU #8 (hereafter F8) are especially important; this OTU was heritable

in five out of the seven experiments in which it was a hub (Extended Data Table 2),

suggesting that natural variation in *A. thaliana* influences its microbiota with some

consistency across environments. The widespread prevalence of these heritable hubs suggests

that variation at particular host genes associate with particular hubs across time and space,

potentially providing a means to impact the microbiota in a robust fashion.

Variation in performance of host genotypes explained by their influence on microbial

hubs

The extent to which natural variation among host genotypes in their associated

microbes translates into fitness differences has yet to be determined. Our experiments

included additional replicates of all genotypes that were left to flower and mature in the field.

We harvested mature stems in early summer and used high-throughput image analysis to

estimate lifetime seed production (LSP) from mature stem size, using an independently

validated method (Extended Data Fig. 6) [23]. We observed that plant LSP estimates were

positively correlated across experiments (Extended Data Fig. 7), suggesting fitness variation

among accessions was relatively consistent across sites. We therefore asked whether host

effects on microbial hubs contributed to some genotypes producing more seeds across all

environments investigated. Specifically, we used random intercept models to estimate

genotype effects on both heritable microbial hubs and LSP in a series of analyses that jointly

considered all eight experiments and investigated the relationship between these two effects

(see methods "Heritable hubs and LSP across environments").

We found that the host genotype explained, on average, 6.88% (with a 95%

confidence interval [5.52, 8.34]) of our estimate of plant LSP. Host genotype effects (blups)

on the relative abundances of 19 of our 23 heritable microbial hubs were similarly modest,

explaining up to 4% of the variation (Fig. 3A, four heritable hubs were not detected in more

than 2 experiments and were removed for this analysis). In order to estimate genetic

correlations between host genotype effects on LSP and on microbial hubs, we performed a

multiple regression. After using model selection to identify significant relationships, we

detected positive correlations between accession effects on LSP and accession effects on

three heritable hubs, F8, B38 and B13, as well as a negative correlation between accession

effects on LSP and accession effects on F5 (Fig. 3B). The variation explained by host

genotype on the relative abundances of microbial hubs explained 12.4% of the host genotype

effects on LSP.

These results reveal that a sizable percentage of genetic variance in LSP is shared

with genetic variation associated with the relative abundance of a few broadly distributed

microbial hubs, consistent with a causal relationship between genotype and LSP mediated by

heritable microbial hubs. Of course, the proportion of shared genetic variation between LSP

and heritable microbial hubs is unlikely to be equally important across time and space. In

fact, in analyses performed on an experiment-by-experiment basis, we found that

relationships between host effects on hubs and LSP were stronger in southern Sweden, where

we detected significant relationships in both sites and both years (Extended data Table 4).

Overall, our results highlight the importance for plants to control their leaf microbial

community and suggest that breeding plants for their effects on specific members of

microbial communities has the potential to significantly increase plant productivity.

Fig. 3 | Relationship between host genotype seed production and influence on microbial hubs across sites and years. A. Proportion of heritable hub relative counts explained by host effects across all sites and years. **B**. Coefficients for the linear regression explaining lifetime see production variation among accession with accession effects on microbial hubs across experiments (after model selection).

Effect of hubs on growth in controlled condition

In an effort to verify the correlations between host performance and the relative abundance of

microbial hubs, we returned to the field to collect wild *A. thaliana* leaves [24], cultured

approximately 2400 microbial isolates from within these leaves, and sequenced both the 16S

RNA gene and gyrase-B. Among heritable hubs, only B38 was successfully cultured; this

isolate derived from Vårhallarna, in southern Sweden, and was identified by a 100% match in

16S sequencing (Extended data Table 5). We subsequently performed shotgun whole genome

sequencing of B38 which we identified as *Brevundimonas sp*. The assembled and annotated

genome did not identify putative pathogenic or virulence genetic factors present in the

genome.

To test the effects of B38 on host growth, we grew Arabidopsis plants of an accession

(#6136) from the South of Sweden chosen to have intermediate relative abundance of B38 in

the field. Plants were grown under sterile conditions in ½ MS media under long day

conditions in the growth chamber, with and without B38 inoculation. Approximately two

weeks after germination, over 600 plants were randomly selected for either drip inoculation

with the control or B38 inoculum, and measured for surface area growth over the following

two weeks. Accounting for variation in plant growth among trials and plates within trials, we

found that plants treated with B38 grew 5.375 (standard error=1.973) mm^2 larger than control

plants (F=7.3981, df=1, *p*-value=6.7e^{-3}) between day 7 and 14, corresponding to a 10.22%

growth increase.

The microbial hubs could in principle influence host fitness directly, for example by

contributing to growth, or indirectly through their influence on other beneficial members of

the microbial community [25]. Here we show that B38 directly improves host growth over

early life stages in isolation from the rest of the microbial community. This result is

consistent with our field observations, where we found a positive correlation between genetic

variation associated with B38 and with LSP, suggesting that in this instance the correlation is

causative. The possibility of additional indirect interactions in the field cannot, of course, be

excluded.

Mapping the genetic bases of consistent variation in the relative abundances of

microbial hubs across experiments

Our observation that host control of the relative abundances of four microbial hubs

explains ~12% of variation in LSP among Arabidopsis genotypes grown in 8 field trials

suggests the potential to reveal host genes that can enhance plant performance in the presence

of microbes, particularly across environments. Towards this end, we performed genome-wide

association mapping for host genotype effects on microbial hubs (N=19) and LSP across all

experiments. Despite significant differences among accessions, GWAs yielded few peaks

with *p*-values below accepted significance thresholds after correction for multiple testing.

Specifically, we found only two significant associations, both for microbial hub B41. The

first is located on chromosome 1 at position 29909876 in AT1G79510 annotated as a pseudo-

gene. The second is on chromosome 4 on positions 15704377, 15704472 and 15704478.

These consecutive SNPs are located between *YUC-1* (AT4G32540), involved in auxin

biosynthesis, and *LEUNIG* (AT4G32551), involved in the development of the leaf blade and

floral organs.

A potentially more powerful strategy to detect minor QTL involves computing local

association scores along the genome. The assumption underlying this method is that

neighboring markers in linkage disequilibrium with causal mutations will also carry

association signals; thus, aggregating *p*-values increases power [26]. This method identified

340 non-overlapping loci (hereafter QTLs), with sizes ranging from 93 to 150,926 bp

including a total of 25,529 SNPs. Out of the 340 QTLs, only 27 included SNPs associated

with multiple traits (Supplementary Table 3), suggesting a modest level of pleiotropy.

To investigate functions underlying these associations, we tested pathway and GO

term enrichment (Biological processes only)[27,28]. Using a combination of methods

accounting for multiple testing, overlapping gene lists, and the potential aggregation of

functions and associations along the genome [29–32], we identified 29 enriched GO terms

related to biological processes across 16 traits (Supplementary Table 4 and 5), including four

genes involved in the response to virus (GO:0009615) and nematodes (GO:0009624),

hypersensitive response (GO:0009626) and response to chitin (GO:0010200), all of which are

related to interactions with other organisms. Three enriched GO terms directly concern

auxins and their transport (GO:0009926, GO:0010540, GO:0009734); auxins have

previously been documented to contribute to shaping plant interactions with beneficial

bacteria [33,34]. Specialized metabolites also appear involved in shaping the relative

abundance of microbial hubs. Indeed hub B107 is associated with genes in the geranylgeranyl

diphosphate metabolism (GO:0033385), the universal precursor of monoterpenes, which are

volatile compounds with anti-microbial properties, [see 35 for a review] that potentially

shape within rosettes microbial communities. In addition, loci associated with B76 are

enriched in genes related to specialized metabolite biosynthesis (GO:0044550) and genes

involved in the synthesis of sinapoyl glucose and sinapoyl malate (PWY-3301), an

intermediate in the synthesis of phenylpropanoids. Genes involved in the synthesis of

glucosinolates from phenylalanine (#11 Bz [36] aka glucotropaeolin, PWY-2821) and

hexahomomethionine (specifically #69 mSOo [36] aka 8-(methylsulfinyl)octyl-glucosinolate

PWYQT-4475) are also enriched in loci associated with B5 and F71, respectively.

The functions highlighted by our analysis are in line with other studies suggesting the

involvement of specialized metabolites, auxins and the immune system in influencing the

leaf microbial communities [37,38]. Our analysis also highlights less obvious players, like

growth lipid metabolism and brassinosteroids (Supplementary Table 5). This is especially

true with regard to beneficial members of the community. For example, loci associated with

the relative abundance of the beneficial microbial hub B38 are enriched for transition metal

ion transport (GO:0000041), response to carbohydrates (GO:0009743), and fatty acid

biosynthesis (PWY-4381).

Plant specialized metabolites correlated with microbial hub abundance

Our biological processes and pathway enrichment analysis suggest that specialized

metabolites are involved in shaping microbial hubs. To support this result, we quantified 20

abundant compounds using untargeted metabolomics in a subset of the field samples in which

we characterized the rosette microbiome. We found that the relative abundance of 14 out of

19 hubs were significantly correlated with at least one of 11 specialized metabolites (after

correction for multiple testing), six of which displayed significant heritability in the field

across sites ranging from 1 to 38% (Extended Data Fig. 8A & B).

The molecule known as #69 mSOo (here 260_GSL_8MSO) displayed the strongest

relationship with multiple microbial hubs in the field (Extended Data Fig. 8A, Extended Data

Table 6), as well as significant heritability under field conditions (Extended Data Fig. 8B).

However, the variation among accessions of this abundant glucosinolate was less evident in

the greenhouse and in sterile conditions (Extended Data Fig. 8B), leaving open the possibility

that the correlation is induced by one or more of the microbial hubs. In contrast, other

molecules significantly related with the abundance of microbial hubs in the field across

experiments (354_C_Cy-GRGF_785 and 358_F_R-K-R_577, Extended Data Table 6) are

heritable in all conditions, and variation among accessions in the field is positively correlated

with the variation among accessions in the greenhouse. This suggests that these flavonoids

are constitutively and consistently produced by accessions and influence microbial hubs in a

manner that is robust to heterogeneity among field experiments.

Conclusion

In this study, we show that not only does host genetic variation influence the

microbiome, but it does so in consistent ways. Host genotype effects are centered on

16   16

ecologically important hub species, and percolate through the microbial community, most

likely as a result of microbe-microbe interactions. Our replicate field experiments were likely

instrumental in allowing us to reveal consistent host effects on the leaf microbiome via

common and widespread hub species.

Furthermore, we found that the influence of host genetics on a handful of prevalent

microbial hubs has a far-reaching impact on the community, associated with a substantial

fraction of the variation in our fitness estimates among accessions. Although these

relationships are correlational, we were able to culture one of the identified hubs and confirm

a direct positive effect on host fitness experimentally.

Understanding how host performance or fitness components are influenced by their

ability to shape microbial communities could provide a basis for breeding crops favoring

microbes that are beneficial both to growth and resistance to pathogens. We successfully

mapped variation in host microbe interactions using genome-wide association, and our results

suggest that natural and artificial selection can act on plant traits such as leaf specialized

metabolites, auxins and the immune system to improve plant performances through effects on

microbial communities [39,40]. In addition, we found that at least some plant metabolites are

expressed in a consistent manner that is robust to variation among our experiments and

correlates with the relative abundance of microbial hubs. Our results therefore suggest that

ongoing efforts to harness the microbiome for agricultural purposes can be successful and

highlight the value of explicitly considering abiotic variation in those efforts.

Methods:

Field experiments

This study uses a set of 200 diverse accessions (inbred lines, Supplementary Table 1) that were previously re-sequenced [14]. The seeds were produced simultaneously in the greenhouse of the University of Chicago under long day conditions, except for a 12-week vernalization period at 4°C, required to induce flowering. The seeds for the common garden experiments were cold stratified in water at 4°C for 3 days before being planted in trays of 66 open-bottom wells, each measuring 4 cm in diameter. The soil used was a 90:10 mix of standard greenhouse soil and soil from each of the four sites in which the experiments were installed:

- SU: Ullstorp (Agricultural field, lat: 56.067, long: 13.945)
- SR: Ratchkegården (Agricultural field, lat: 55.906, long: 14.260)
- NM: Ramsta (Agricultural field, lat: 62.85, long: 18.193)
- NA: Ådal (South facing slope, lat: 62.862, long 18.331)

Each experiment included 3 complete randomized blocks including 8 replicates per accession. Experiments were sown in pairs (2 in the North and 2 in the South) over 6 days, corresponding to the sowing of one block a day, alternating between the 2 experiments (between August 7th and 12th in the North, and between August 31st and September 5th in the South). The trays were placed in a common garden the morning after sowing under row tunnels to avoid disturbance by precipitation and to favor germination (on the campus of Mid Sweden University and Lund University, in the North and in the South, respectively). Trays were watered as needed and missing seedlings were transplanted between cells within blocks and then thinned to one per cell after 9 days. Seventeen days after sowing, trays were laid in the field in their final location over tilled soil. For each experiment, the blocks were laid

18 18

across the most obvious environmental gradient (exposition, shading, slope, soil humidity…).

The pierced bottom of the cells allowed the roots to grow through and reach the soil, as was

verified upon harvest. The same protocol was followed in 2011 and 2012.

Sample collection and processing

The rosettes used to characterize the microbial community were harvested in the

spring of 2012 and 2013 only a few days after the plants were exposed, following snow melt.

We harvested 2 randomly selected replicates per accession in each experimental block. Upon

harvest, the roots were removed and the rosettes were washed twice in successive baths of TE

and 70% ethanol to remove loosely attached microbes from the leaf surface. The rosettes

were then placed in sealed paper envelopes and placed on dry ice. The rosettes were kept at -

80°C until lyophilized. Freeze-dried rosettes were then transferred to 2 ml tubes along with 3

2mm silica beads. For 2 successive years, the tubes were randomized and separated in 34 and

46 sets of 96 tubes, respectively. Our randomization strategy maintained approximately the

same number of tubes from each of the 12 experimental units (3 blocks in 4 experiments) in

order to avoid confounding biologically meaningful effects. We powdered the samples using

a Geno/Grinder® (from Spex SamplePrep, USA, NJ) for 1min at 1750rpm, before

transferring 10 - 20 mg to 2ml 96-well plates, along with two zirconia/silica beads (diameter

= 2.3mm), for DNA extraction.

DNA extraction

DNA extraction started with 2 enzymatic digestions to maximize yield from Gram-

negative bacteria [41]. First, we added 250µl of TES with 50 units.µl^{-1} of Lysozyme (Ready-

Lys Lysozyme, Epicenter) to each well. The plates were then shaken using the Geno-Grinder

for 2 min at 1750 rpm, briefly spun and incubated 30 min at room temperature. Second, we

added 250µl of TES with 2% SDS and 1 mg.mL^{-1} of proteinase K. The plates were then

briefly vortexed and incubated at 55˚C for 4 hours. The protocol then followed [42], adapted

to the 96-well plate format and automated pipetting on a Tecan Freedom Evo Liquid Handler.

We added 500 µl of Chloroform:Isoamyl Alcohol (24:1), pipette mixed, and centrifuged the

plates at 6600 g for 15 min. We transferred 450 µl of the aqueous supernatant to a new plate

containing 500µl of 100% isopropanol. The plates were then sealed, inverted 50 times,

incubated at -20˚C for 1 hour, and centrifuged at 6600 g for 15 min. The Isopropanol was

then removed and the pellets were washed twice with 500 µl of 70% Ethanol, dried and re-

suspended in 100 µl of TE. After 5 min incubation on ice, the plates were centrifuged 12 min

at 6600 g and the supernatant was pipetted into a new plate.

PCR and Sequencing

To describe the microbial communities, we amplified and sequenced fragments of the

taxonomically informative genes *16S* and *ITS* for bacteria and fungi, respectively. For

bacteria we amplified the hypervariable regions V5, V6 and V7 of the *16S* gene using the

primers 799F (5'-AACMGGATTAGATACCCKG-3') and 1193R (5'-

ACGTCATCCCCACCTTCC-3') [9,43]. For fungi, we amplified the ITS-1 region using the

primers ITS1F (5'-CTTGGTCATTTAGAGGAAGTAA-3') [15] and ITS2 (5'-

GCTGCGTTCTTCATCGATGC-3') [44]. To the 5' end of these primers we added a 2bp

linker, a 10bp pad region, a 6bp barcode and the adapter to the Illumina flowcell, following

[45]. The appropriate linkers were chosen using the PrimerProspector program [46]. The PCR

reactions were realized in 25 µl including: 10 µl of Hot Start Master Mix 2.5x (5prime), 1µl

of a 1/10 dilution of the DNA template, 4µl of SBT-PAR buffer, and 5 µl of the forward and

reverse primers (1 µM). The SBT-PAR buffer is a modified version of the TBT-PAR PCR

buffer described in [47] with the trehalose replaced by sucrose (Sucrose, BSA, Tween20).

The PCR program consisted of an initial denaturing step at 94˚C for 2'30", followed by 35

cycles of a denaturing step (94˚C for 30"), an annealing step (54.3˚C for 40"), and an

extension step (68˚C for 40"). A final extension step at 68˚C was performed for 7' before

storing the samples at 4˚C. For each plate, the PCRs were performed in triplicates, pooled,

and purified using 90 µl of a magnetic bead solution prepared and used following [48]. The

purified PCR products were quantified with Picogreen following the manufacturer's

instruction [49] and pooled into an equimolar mix. Between 5 and 7 plates (480 to 672

samples) were pooled in each MiSeq run. If the bioanalyzer traces for pooled libraries

showed only one dominant peak, they were sequenced directly following the standard MiSeq

library preparation protocols for amplicons. In cases where the bioanalyzer trace presented

peaks for smaller fragments (remaining primers, primer dimers, small PCR products), the

libraries were first concentrated 20X on a speedvac (55˚C for 2 to 3 hours), purified with 0.9

volume of magnetic bead solution, and/or size selected using a Blue Pippin (range mode

between 300 and 800 bp).

The sequencing was performed using MiSeq 500 cycle V2 kits (251 cycles per read

and 6 cycles of index reads twice), using a loading concentration of 12.5pM for *ITS*

fragments and 8pM for *16S* fragments following the standard Illumina protocol. Sequencing

primers were designed and spiked in following [45]. The sequencing primer for the first read

of *16S* fragments was prolonged into the conserved beginning of the fragment amplified to

reach a sufficient melting temperature. This primer modification produced no change in the

Blast results of the primers against the GreenGene database. A total of 11 sequencing runs

were performed for each of the fungal and bacterial communities.

Sequence processing and clustering

The demultiplexed fastq files generated by MiSeq reporter for the first read of each

run were quality filtered and truncated to remove potential primer sequences and low quality

basecalls using the program cutadapt [50]. The reads were then further filtered and converted

to fasta files using the FASTX-Toolkit (-q 30 -p 90 -Q33). The fasta files for each run were

then de-replicated using AWK code provided in the swarm git repository

(https://github.com/torognes/swarm)[16]. The resulting de-replicated fasta files were filtered

for PCR chimeras using the vsearch uchime_denovo command

(https://github.com/torognes/vsearch). The de-replicated fasta files for each run were then

combined and further de-replicated at the study level. The fasta files were then used as input

for OTU clustering using swarm (-t 4 -c 20000). The clustering identified 150,412 and

251,065 OTUs for the fungal and bacterial communities, respectively. The output files were

combined into two separate community matrices using a custom python script (available at

https://bitbucket.org/bbrachi/microbiota.git). The taxonomy of each OTU was determined

using the quiime2 2019.1 v8 feature classifier trained on the UNITE V6 and SILVA 119

database for Bacteria and Fungi, respectively [51,52].

Count table filtering

The count tables obtained for both the bacterial and fungal communities were filtered in

successive steps by removing:

1) samples corresponding to empty wells and additional plant genotypes present in the

experiments sampled by mistake (leaving 7476 and 7240 samples for the fungal and

bacterial count tables, respectively).

2) samples with less than 1000 reads (leaving 6678 and 6819 samples for the fungal and

bacterial count tables, respectively)

3) OTUs represented by less than 10 read in 5 samples (leaving 1381 and 993 OTUs for

the fungal and bacterial count tables, respectively)

4) for the bacterial community, OTUs assigned to plant mitochondria (leaving 993 OTUs

in the bacterial count table, no OTUs assigned to plant mitochondria)

5) for a second time, samples with less than 1000 reads (leaving 6656 and 6783 samples

for the fungal and bacterial count tables, respectively).

The final count tables used in the study included 993 OTUs and 6783 samples for the

bacterial communities and 1381 OTUs and 6656 samples for the fungal community.

Differentiation of the microbial communities among sites and years

This analysis was performed for the fungal and bacterial communities independently,

including all samples and only OTUs with read counts above 0.01% of total read counts (after

the filtering described above) across sites and years. To investigate how the microbial

communities differed among sites and years, we performed a constrained ordination on log

transformed read counts using the capscale function in the R-package Vegan [53] and

following [54]. The log transformation offers the advantage of removing large differences in

scale among variables. The capscale function performs canonical analysis of principal

coordinates, an analysis similar to redundancy analysis (rda), but based on the decomposition

of a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix among samples (instead of euclidean distance in the

case of rda). This allows identification of the dimension that maximized the variance

explained by components, while discriminating groups of samples, here sites and years [54].

Core microbiota

In order to define a core microbiota, we counted, for each OTU, the number of

site/year combinations in which it was prevalent. We defined "prevalent" as being present in

at least 50% of the samples in a given site/year. We performed this analysis using count

tables for each experiment with the filtering described in the previous paragraph. Therefore,

for an OTU to be designated as a member of the core microbiota, it needed to have non-zero

counts in more than 50% of the samples within each site/year combinations and, due to

previously described filtering, needed to be represented by at least 10 reads in 5 of those

samples across all site/year combinations (see "Count table filtering").

Heritability of the microbiota

In this analysis, count tables were split per site and year before filtering for OTUs

represented by more than 0.01% of the reads (after the filtering described in the section

"Count table filtering") for each of the bacterial and fungal communities. The resulting 16

count tables were normalized to 1000 reads per sample and used to calculate 16 Bray-Curtis

pairwise dissimilarity matrices among samples. These matrices were then decomposed into

10 principal coordinates. For each component we estimated broad sense heritability (hereafter

H^2), *i.e.* the proportion of variance explained by a random intercept effect capturing the

identity of the accessions present in the experiment (plate effects had limited impact on H^2

estimates but were included in the models). Mixed models were fitted using the function lmer

in the lme4 R package [55]. We computed 95% confidence intervals using 1000 bootstraps,

and components were considered to have significant H^2 when their confidence

intervals did not overlap 0 (lower bound of the confidence interval $\geq$

0.01).

Heritability of individual OTUs

This analysis was also performed per site, year and community, as in the microbiota

H^2 estimation analysis. In this analysis, counts were transformed to centered log-ratios using

a dedicated function in the R package mixOmics [56,57]. H^2 estimates and confidence

intervals were computed for individual OTUs using the method described in the previous

paragraph (without the plate effect). H^2 estimates for our estimate of LSP (see below) were

estimated the same way using a box-cox transformation.

Microbe–microbe interaction networks

Microbe-microbe interaction networks were computed for the fungal and bacterial

communities together, using the count tables per site/ year and filtering OTUs represented by

less than 0.01% of the reads within each community. The count tables were then combined

into the same table and analyzed using the SPIEC-EASI (v1.1) pipeline [21]. This method

computes sparse microbial ecological networks in a fashion robust to compositional bias and

uses conditional independence to identify true ecological interactions, meaning that a

connection between 2 OTUs will be significant when one provides information about the

other, given the state of all other OTUs in the network. This means that covariance among

OTUs induced by micro-environmental and host genetic variation is controlled. SPIEC-EASI

was run using the neighborhood selection framework and model selection was regularized

with parameters set to a minimum lambda ratio of $1e^{-2}$ and a sequence of 50 lambda values

(see documentation for SPIEC-EASI and the huge R package, which provides regularization

functions)[58] .

Network statistics

The inferences of microbe-microbe ecological interactions inferred using SPIEC-

EASI were passed to the igraph package [59], which was used for enforcing simplicity of

graphs (no loops or duplicated edges), computing degree and betweenness centrality of

vertices, computing distances between vertices, and plotting. Within each of the 8 networks

thus computed, hubs were defined as OTUs with degree and betweenness centrality both in

the 5% tail of their respective distributions. We then checked the overlap between heritable

OTUs and hubs, and the over-representation of heritable OTUs among hubs was tested using

a simple χ^2 test across all site/year combinations. The relationship between distances to

heritable hubs (OTUs that are both hubs and have significant H^2) and heritability was

investigated using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. Distances were calculated as the

number of edges between OTUs and the closest heritable hub in the network. OTUs not

connected to heritable hubs were assigned a distance equal to one more than the maximum

distance observed for OTUs connected to heritable hubs.

Estimation of seed production

The experiments each included 8 replicates per block per accession (24 replicates per

experiment). While we harvested 2 replicates per block (6 replicates per experiment) for

microbiota analysis, the remaining plants were left to grow, flower and produce seeds in the

field. We harvested the mature stems of all remaining plants at the end of the spring, when all

plants had finished flowering and siliques were mature, and stored them flat in individual

paper envelopes. We estimated lifetime see production (LSP) by the size of the mature stems.

After removing remaining traces of roots and rosettes, each mature plant was photographed

on a black background, using a DSLR camera (Nikon 60D) mounted on a copy-stand and

equipped with a 60mm macro lens (Nikon 60mm). The photographs were segmented (using

custom scripts in R based on the EBimage package [60] to isolate plants from the image

background and estimate the total surface of the image they occupied.

We validated this method with mature plants harvested from a previous experiment

that was planted in NM in fall 2010, and that included the 200 accessions used in this study.

We counted siliques and estimated the average silique size for 1607 mature stems that were

also photographed. The total silique length produced per plant (number * average size) was

highly correlated with our size estimates based on image analysis (Spearman's rho=0.84) and

displayed a clear linear relationship.

Relationship between host effects on microbial hubs and fecundity

To investigate the relationship between host genotype effects on heritable hubs and

LSP in each experiment, we computed estimates of accession effects (Best unbiased linear

predictors or BLUPs) for both log-ratio transformed heritable hubs and box-cox transformed

LSP estimates. We then fitted multiple regressions for each site/year combination aiming to

explain LSP variation among accessions with their influence over microbial hubs and

following **eq. 1**.

$$f_i \sim \sum_{j=1}^{n} [(\beta_j.h_{ij}) + (\gamma_j.h_{ij}^2)] + \varepsilon_i$$

598   (**eq.1**)

where f_i is the LSP estimate of the ith accession (blup), h_{ij} is the effect of the ith accession on

the jth hub. β_j is the regression coefficient for the jth hub (h_j) and γ_j is the regression

coefficient for the jth hub squared. $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ captures residual variance per accession.

We then performed forward/backward model selection to obtain the final models presented in

(Extended Data Table 4).

Heritable hubs and LSP across environments

We next investigated host effects on heritable hubs and LSP across all 8 experiments.

Similarly to previous analyses, count tables were split per site and year before filtering for

OTUs represented by more than 0.01% of the reads (after the filtering described in the section

"Count table filtering") for each of the bacterial and fungal communities. The resulting 16

count tables were then combined into one before fitting a mixed-model following eq. 2:

$$Y_{ijk} \sim \beta.exp_j + a_k + \varepsilon_i$$ (**eq. 2**)

where Y_{ijk} are the transformed counts for a heritable hub measured the ith time in experiment

j (exp_j) (N=8, four sites and two years) and for accession k (N=200), β is the vector of fixed

experiment effects (N=8) and $a_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_a^2)$ is a random intercept estimated by restricted

maximum likelihood for each accession. $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_e^2)$ captures the residual variance.

Microbial hub heritability (H[2]) across experiments was estimated as the percentage of

variance explained by the random accession intercept:

$$H^2 = \frac{\sigma_a^2}{\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_e^2}.$$

620   LSP data was analyzed the same way, except we performed Box-Cox transformation

621   of the data. The lambda parameter for the Box-Cox transformation was estimated using the

622   same model, but without the random accession term.

623   For both heritable microbial hubs and LSP, we retrieved random intercept accession

624   effects (BLUPS) and fitted a multiple linear regression following:

$$F_i \sim \sum_{j=1}^{n} [(\beta_j . H_{ij}) + (\gamma_j . H_{ij}^2)] + \varepsilon_i$$

(eq. 3)

where F_i is the effect of the ith accession (N=200) on LSP (across all experiments) , H_{ij} is the

effect of accession i on hub j across all experiments, H_{ij}^2 is the squared effect of accession i

on hub j. β_j and γ_j are the corresponding regression coefficient for hub j and $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$

captures the residual variance per accession. The final model was obtained after

backward/forward model selection based on AIC.

Isolation, culture and identification of microbial hubs

Bacteria sampling from wild A. thaliana plants: We collected 2 leaves from 10

plants at 5 locations in Sweden (Extended data Table 5) . The leaves were first cleaned by

rinsing individually in ddH2O, and subsequently surface-sterilized by dipping 70% EtOH for

3-5 seconds. The leaves were ground in individual 1.5 mL tubes. The leaf material was stored

in 20% glycerol at -20ºC. Wild *A. thaliana* microbial isolates were collected using modified

methods that were previously described (Bai et al 2015). Briefly, the leaf and glycerol

mixture was plated on nine distinct media, including; R2A, Minimal media containing

Methanol, Tryptic Soy Agar, Tryptone Yeast extract Glucose Agar, Yeast Extract Manitol

Agar [24]; 0.1 Tryptic Soy Agar [61]; Potato Dextrose Agar, 0.2 Potato Dextrose Agar, and

Malt Extract Agar [62,63]. Colonies were picked over the next 14 days, restreaked, and

grown in liquid media in an orbital shaker for 1-4 days. A portion of the inoculum was saved

in 15-20% glycerol, and the rest of the liquid culture was pelleted by centrifugation and

decanted for DNA extraction. We performed a double enzymatic digest for all isolates, which

was performed using the Tecan: 30 minute incubation with 350 U Ready-Lyse Lysozyme and

245 U RNase A (QIAGEN, Germantown, MD) in 250ul TES (10 mM Tris-HCl pH ~8, 1 mM

EDTA, 100 mM NaCl), followed by the addition of 2 mg/mL Proteinase K in 250ul TES +

2% SDS and a 4-6 hour incubation at 55C. The SDS-protein complexes were precipitated

with .3 volume 5M NaCl and pelleted by a brief centrifugation. The clear supernatant was

pipetted into a clean plate, and a standard .5 volume SPRI bead DNA extraction was

performed with 2x 70% EtOH washes. Clean DNA was resuspended into MilliQ water. The

samples were then amplified for 16S sequencing using the same primers binding regions as

previously, 799F and 1193R, and sequenced by either Sanger or Illumina MiSeq (PE 300).

Illumina adapters were designed and generated as described by Illumina with internal

barcodes to increase sample count capacity per lane [64]. Isolate B38 was identified by 100%

match to the B38 representative sequence from the previous analysis.

B38 whole genome assembly

We used a low-input method for Illumina library prep [Baym]. Briefly, ~2 ng

extracted DNA was used in a reduced volume (5ul) tagmentation reaction with TDE1

(incubate 55C for 10 mins, room temperature for 5 mins). The tagmentation reaction was

added to a 15 ul PCR reaction, adding the Illumina adapters (Kapa HiFi Hotstart PCR kit

KK502, standard Illumina adapters and cycling). The library was cleaned with .8x volume

SPRI beads, quantified on the Bioanalyzer, and run on the MIseq2500 using paired end 300

chemistry. Reads were trimmed for adapters (BBDuk, ktrim=r k=23 mink=11 hdist=1 tbo)

and quality across a sliding window (k=4, trimq=20). Reads were assembled using SPAdes (-

isolate) and annotated with PROKKA. **Plant growths assays with B38**

Plant growth: *Arabidopsis thaliana* accession 6136 from Southern Sweden was used

in the growth assays. In our field experiments it displayed average relative counts for B38

(rank 102 of 199). The plant assay used slightly modified methods as previously described

[65]. The seeds were exposed to chlorine gas for sterilization: in a bell jar with dessicant, an

open 1.5 mL tube with seeds was placed next to a 50 mL beaker with 40 mL Chlorox bleach

and 1 mL hydrochloric acid, sealed with parafilm, and incubated for 4 hours. Sterilized seeds

were subsequently sown on 24-well tissue plates containing 1.5mL of ½ MS media

(Murashige & Skoog medium incl. Nitsch vitamins, bioWORLD, Dublin, Ohio) containing

500mg/L MES, pH 5.7 - 5.8. Plates were wrapped in parafilm, and vernalized in the dark at

$4^{\circ}C$ for 4 days. The plates were individually wrapped with micropore tape to prevent

environmental contamination and transferred to a growth chamber with 16 hours of light at

$16^{\circ}C$. The plants were treated with either B38 or control inoculum between days 13-15 post-

vernalization. The plates were returned to the chamber to grow for another 14 days.

B38 inoculation: The B38 isolate grew in R2A liquid media in an orbital shaker until

OD_{600}=0.2, approximately 3 days. To ensure no environmental contamination, a portion of the

inoculum was saved for DNA extraction and subsequent 16S Sanger sequencing verification.

The liquid cultures were pelleted by centrifuging 1800 RCF 18C for 7 minutes, decanted and

resuspended in 0.1 M $MgSO_4$. The plants in each 24-well plate were randomly selected to

receive the infection (B38 + 0.1 M $MgSO_4$) or control (0.1 M $MgSO_4$) treatment. Each plant

was drip inoculated using pipettes with 180ul of the selected treatment. The plates were re-

wrapped in micropore tape and returned to the growth chamber.

Measuring plant growth: We performed 3 trials of 11, 28, and 23 plates, totalling 62

24-well plates. Plants were not treated and removed from the experiment if they had less than

3 true leaves, cracked agar, or failed to germinate, resulting in a total of 1094 plants. The

plants were individually photographed immediately before inoculation, then again at 7 and 14

days post-inoculation. The images were processed using a custom script employing cv2 in

Python [66], which quantified plant surface area in each well by scaling based on the wells'

size, converting images into binary images, and measuring non-white pixels within each well

(i.e. plant surface area). The output images were manually inspected, and any images which

failed to be accurately processed were manually measured using the same pipeline described

above, but using Image J.

Due to the high humidity of the plates and the drip inoculation, 422 plants showed

signs of water log stress. Plants were scored for symptoms of stress induced by water logging

(blindly with regard to B38 inoculation) as categorized by translucent/white leaves or stunted

growth, and were removed from the experiment.

We used a linear mixed model (eq. 4) accounting for variation in plant growth among trials

and plates within trials to estimate the effect of B38 inoculation.

$G_{ij} \sim \beta.T_{ij} + p_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$ **(eq. 4)**

In equation 4, G_{ij} is the growth of ith plant in the jth plate/assay combination. β is the estimate

of the treatment effect compared to the controls (intercept) and T_{ij}, is the treatment

(inoculation with a B38 or control solution). $p_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_p^2)$ the random intercept effect

capturing variation among plates in assays (N=62 plates across three trials).

$\varepsilon_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_e^2)$ captures the residual variances.

Genome-wide association mapping

Single polymorphism calling and filtering

Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) used in this study were generated from the

sequences generated in the context of the 1001genome project [67] and published in

Long, Q. *et al.* [14]. As pipelines evolve, we re-ran SNP calling to ensure optimal quality.

For each sequenced individual, we performed 3' adapter removal (either TruSeq or

Nextera), quality trimming (quality 15 and 10 for 5' and 3'-ends, respectively) and N-end

trimming with cutadapt (v1.9) [50]. After processing, we only kept reads of approximately

half the length of the original read-length. We mapped all paired-end (PE) reads to the *A.*

thaliana TAIR10 reference genome with BWA-MEM (v0.7.8) [68,69]. We used Samtools

(v0.1.18) to convert file formats [70] and Sambamba (v0.6.3) to sort and index bam files [71].

We removed duplicated reads with Markduplicates from Picard (v1.101)

(http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/) and performed local realignment around indels with

GATK/RealignerTargetCreator and GATK/IndelRealigner functions from GATK (v3.5)

[72,73] by providing known indels from The 1001 Genomes Consortium (1001 Genomes

Consortium 2016). Similarly, we conducted base quality recalibration with the functions

GATK/BaseRecalibrator and GATK/PrintReads by providing known indels and SNPs from

The 1001 Genomes Consortium.

For variant calling, we employed GATK/HaplotypeCaller on each sample in 'GVCF

mode', followed by joint genotyping of a single cohort of 220 individuals with

GATK/GenotypeGVCFs. To filter SNP variants, we followed the protocol of variant quality

score recalibration (VQSR) from GATK. First, we created a set of 191,968 training variants

from the intersection between the 250k SNP array [74] used to genotype the RegMap panel

[75] and the SNPs from The 1001 Genomes Consortium. Second, this training set was further

filtered by the behavior in the population of several annotation profiles (DP < 10686,

InbreedingCoeff > -0.1, SOR < 2, FS < 10, MQ > 45, QD > 20) to leave 175,224 training

high-quality variants. Third, we executed GATK/VariantRecalibrator with the latter as the

training set, an *a priori* probability of 15, the maximum number of Gaussian distributions set

at 4, and annotations MQ, MQRankSum, ReadPosRankSum, FS, SOR, DP, QD and

InbreedingCoeff enabled. Finally, we applied a sensitivity threshold of 99.5 with

GATK/ApplyRecalibration and restricted our set to bi-allelic SNPs with

GATK/SelectVariants for a total of 2,303,415 SNPs in the population.

Preparation for use in genome-wide association analysis involved further filtering of

individuals and SNPs using Plink1.9 [76,77]. Individuals not included in this study were

removed and SNPs with over 5% missing data and with minor allele frequencies below 5% in

our collection of accessions were removed.

Phenotype preparation and association analysis

Association mapping analyses were performed for the 11 heritable microbial hubs for

which we estimated host genotype effects across experiment and accession LSP estimates.

Association analyses were performed using a classical one trait mixed model accounting for

genetic relatedness among accessions (kinship) [78].

In order to take advantage of linkage disequilibrium and gain power by grouping

association statistics in contiguous markers, we computed local association scores [26]. We

followed the instructions provided by the authors and defined the parameter X_i as the 0.999

quantile of the distribution of $-log(p-value)-1$ rounded to the closest integer for each

trait investigated (19 microbial hubs and LSP). The approach highlights regions, which we

call QTLs.

The null association model (without fixed SNP effect) from Gemma allows us to

estimate SNP-based heritability or pseudo-heritability [79], which is the proportion of

variance explained by the random accession effect, accounting for the genetic similarity

among accessions. To investigate if the regions highlighted by the local score approach

included true positives, we computed SNP based heritability for each trait, each time using

three sets of SNPs to compute the kinship matrix: 1) All the SNPs in the genome over 10%

frequency, 2) all the SNPs within QTLs identified by the local score approach, and 3) all

SNPs not included in the QTLs identified by the local score approach.

Pathway enrichment analysis

To investigate biological functions associated with LSP of accessions or their

influence over microbial hubs, we searched for enrichment in annotated pathways (BIOCYC)

and GO categories (Biological processes only) in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Gene-set enrichment

methods are designed for assays that directly assign *p*-values or effects to individual genes

(i.e. RNAseq experiments). Here, for each trait, each gene was attributed the largest absolute

SNP effect within a distance of 5kb on each side and followed the setRank procedure that

accounts for overlapping categories and multiple testing. We set the parameter "setPCutoff"

to 0.01 and the "fdrCutoff" to 0.05 [29]. To account for specificities of gene set enrichment in

the context of association mapping, we also tested the enrichment of the gene groups

identified by setRank using a weighted Kolmogorov-Smirnov score [30] and a permutation

scheme accounting for the non-independence of marker effects due to linkage disequilibrium

along the genome, as well as the potential clustering of genes with similar function [31,32].

Briefly, enrichment was calculated using a weighted Kolmogorov sum using gene effect rank

(and not a gene effect significance threshold)[30]. Enrichments were then tested against an

empirical distribution generated from 1e5 permutations. For each permutation, chromosomes

are randomly re-ordered and re-oriented and the whole genome is shifted (or "rotated") by a

random number, before re-assigning SNP effects to genes and calculating enrichment for the

groups of genes of interest. We considered only categories with an empirical *p*-values below

0.05.

Untargeted metabolomics

Plant material and sample preparation.

This analysis uses three sets of samples. The first are samples collected from the

experiments in Sweden and correspond to a subset of those used for the microbial

community. In particular we chose samples from the four experiments established in 2012

and focused on a subset of 50 accessions selected to span the genetic variation among hosts in

our mapping population. The second set of samples correspond to 6 replicates of the same 50

genotypes grown in the University of Chicago greenhouse during the summer 2014 under

long day conditions (16-hour light period), in standard culture soil. After 28 days, plants were

vernalized for three weeks at 4°C and leaf samples were collected after vernalization,

immediately flash frozen in liquid nitrogen, freeze-dried and stored at room temperature. The

third set corresponds to 3 replicates of the same 50 genotypes, grown on sterile agar medium

(Murashige and Skoog with Nitsch vitamins) in individual well plates in a growth chamber

with a 16-hour light period (long day condition). Seeds were sterilized by a 70% ethanol bath

for 10 minutes, and manipulated under a sterile hood. Samples were collected after 28 days of

growth, flash frozen, freeze-dried, and stored at room temperature.

Dried samples from the 3 sets were coarsely ground, and distributed in 18 96-well plates with

two ceramic grinding beads per well (10mg per well +/- 2mg). Samples were randomized

across all plates to limit confounding of biological effects. In addition, each plate included 16

random samples (1⁄6) from each experimental unit (greenhouse, sterile, and the 4 field

experiments).

Specialized metabolite extraction and LC-MS analysis

The extraction protocol was designed to extract polar compounds such as

glucosinolates and flavonoids. Samples in plates were ground using a Geno/Grinder (SPEX

SamplePrep 2010) at 1750 rpm for two minutes. The extraction buffer (70% methanol,

30% water, internal standard: quercetin, 0.0708 mM) was added using a Tecan pipetting

robot

(100 μl per milligram of dry material). Samples were shaken at room temperature for two

hours and filtered on 96-well filter plates (0.45μm) on a vacuum manifold. The flow-through

was collected in 96-well plates and stored at 4°C.

Samples were auto injected through a Zorbax SB-C18 2.1 × 150

mm, 3.5 μm column on an Agilent Q-TOF LC–MS with dual ESI (Agilent

6520) with the following parameters: 325 °C gas temperature, 6 L min−1

drying gas, 35 eV fixed collision energy, 35 psig nebulizer, 68 V skimmer

voltage, 750 V OCT 1 RF Vpp, 170 V fragmentor, and 3500 V capillary

voltage. Mass accuracy was within 2–5 ppm. Samples were eluted with

0.1% formic acid in water (A) and 100% acetonitrile (B) using the following

separation gradient: 95% A injection followed by a gradient to 90% A at 1

min, 45% A at 6 min, 100%B at 6.5 min with 4 min hold and 3 min

equilibration. An external standard (sinigrin, 1mM) was run 4 times before

each plate and one time every 20 samples to monitor and maintain run

quality. Compounds were characterized using retention times and fragmentation patterns of

chromatograms with automatic agile integration in Agilent Mass Hunter Software

(Qualitative Analysis B6 2012) and fragments were compared to online databases, massbank

(massbank.jp) and plantCyc (plantcyc.org). The XCMS package for peak detection in R

(cran.r-project.org) was used to align chromatograms, adjust retention times, and group the

peaks. For every molecule, a "barcode" peak was chosen to have a unique retention time and

mass to charge ratio (m/z) combination. The size of these peaks relative to the internal

standard, Quercetin, was used to quantify each molecule in every sample.

Statistical analysis.

The peaks intensities relative to the internal standard were used to capture molecule

concentration variation. Standardized intensities were square-root transformed before

analysis. Heritability of individual compounds in the three conditions were performed using

random intercept models identical to those used to estimate OTU heritability. A fixed "site"

effect was added for the field samples. In the greenhouse and sterile conditions, a simple

random accession term was used to quantify heritability and estimate accession effects

(blups). Those accession effects were used to estimate genetic correlation between

specialized metabolites field and greenhouse. We used Pearson's correlation coefficient and

corrected the corresponding p-values for false discovery rate (FDR, N=20).

For the field samples we modeled the relationships between the relative abundances

of 19 microbial hubs and the relative intensity of 20 compounds (Extended Data Table 6)

using a linear models following:

$$H_i \sim \beta 1_s . S_{si} + \beta 2 . M_i + \beta 3_s . S_{si} . M_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where H_i are the log-ratio transformed counts of one of the 19 microbial hubs used for

mapping, and $\beta 1_s$ are the four site effects, S_{si} is the design matrix assigning sample i to site

s, and $\beta 2$ is the effect of one of the 20 molecules identified in our untargeted screen, M_i is the

relative intensity of the molecules measured in sample i. $\beta 3_s$ are site specific regression

coefficients (interactions between the site and molecule effects). We fitted 380 models (19

hubs and 20 molecules) and used F-tests to estimate term significance. All *p*-values

corresponding to the molecule effect $\beta 2$ were corrected for False Discovery Rate (N=380).

857
858
859

860 **References:**
861

1.   Opstal EJ v., Bordenstein SR. Rethinking heritability of the microbiome.
Science. 2015;349: 1172–1173. doi:10.1126/science.aab3958
2.   Vétizou M, Pitt JM, Daillère R, Lepage P, Waldschmitt N, Flament C, et al.
Anticancer immunotherapy by CTLA-4 blockade relies on the gut microbiota. Science.
2015;350: 1079–84. doi:10.1126/science.aad1329
3.   Abdul-Aziz MA, Cooper A, Weyrich LS. Exploring relationships between host
genome and microbiome: New insights from genome-wide association studies. Front
Microbiol. 2016;7: 1–9. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01611
4.   Goodrich JK, Waters JL, Poole AC, Sutter JL, Koren O, Blekhman R, et al.
Human genetics shape the gut microbiome. Cell. 2014;159: 789–799.
doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.09.053
5.   Pamer EG. Resurrecting the intestinal microbiota to combat antibiotic-
resistant pathogens. Science. 2016;352: 535–538. doi:10.1126/science.aad9382
6.   FAO. Sustainable agriculture for biodiversity/biodiversity for sustainable
agriculture. 2016; 48. doi:FAO, 2016- I6602EN/1/12.16
7.   Santhanam R, Luu VT, Weinhold A, Goldberg J, Oh Y, Baldwin IT. Native
root-associated bacteria rescue a plant from a sudden-wilt disease that emerged during
continuous cropping. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112: E5013-20.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1505765112
8.   Wagner MR, Lundberg DS, Del Rio TG, Tringe SG, Dangl JL, Mitchell-Olds T.
Host genotype and age shape the leaf and root microbiomes of a wild perennial plant.
Nat Commun. 2016;7: 12151. doi:10.1038/ncomms12151
9.   Horton MW, Bodenhausen N, Beilsmith K, Meng D, Muegge BD,
Subramanian S, et al. Genome-wide association study of *Arabidopsis thaliana* leaf
microbial community. Nat Commun. 2014;5: 5320. doi:10.1038/ncomms6320
10.   Peiffer JA, Spor A, Koren O, Jin Z, Tringe SG, Dangl JL, et al. Diversity and
heritability of the maize rhizosphere microbiome under field conditions. Proc Natl Acad
Sci. 2013;110: 6548–6553. doi:10.1073/pnas.1302837110
11.   Agler MT, Ruhe J, Kroll S, Morhenn C, Kim S-T, Weigel D, et al. Microbial
hub taxa link host and abiotic factors to plant microbiome variation. Waldor MK, editor.
PLOS Biol. 2016;14: e1002352. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002352
12.   Rochefort A, Briand M, Marais C, Wagner M-H, Laperche A, Vallée P, et al.
Influence of environment and host plant genotype on the structure and diversity of the
Brassica napus seed microbiota. Phytobiomes J. 2019;3: 326–336.
doi:10.1094/PBIOMES-06-19-0031-R
13.   Veach AM, Morris R, Yip DZ, Yang ZK, Engle NL, Cregger MA, et al.
Rhizosphere microbiomes diverge among *Populus trichocarpa* plant-host genotypes
and chemotypes, but it depends on soil origin. Microbiome. 2019;7: 76.
doi:10.1186/s40168-019-0668-8
14.   Long Q, Rabanal FA, Meng D, Huber CD, Farlow A, Platzer A, et al. Massive
genomic variation and strong selection in *Arabidopsis thaliana* lines from Sweden. Nat
Genet. 2013;45: 884–890. doi:10.1038/ng.2678
15.   Gardes M, Bruns TD. *ITS* primers with enhanced specificity for
basidiomycetes–application to the identification of mycorrhizae and rusts. Mol Ecol.
1993;2: 113–118. doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.1993.tb00005.x
16.   Mahé F, Rognes T, Quince C, de Vargas C, Dunthorn M. Swarm: robust and
fast clustering method for amplicon-based studies. PeerJ. 2014;2: e593.
doi:10.7717/peerj.593
17.   Beilsmith K, Perisin M, Bergelson J. Natural bacterial assemblages in
Arabidopsis thaliana tissues become more distinguishable and diverse during host
development. Ecology; 2020 Mar. doi:10.1101/2020.03.04.958165
18.   Bulgarelli D, Rott M, Schlaeppi K, van Themaat E, Ahmadinejad N, Assenza
F, et al. Revealing structure and assembly cues for Arabidopsis root-inhabiting bacterial

microbiota. Nature. 2012;488: 91–95. doi:10.1038/nature11336

19.   Bergelson J, Mittelstrass J, Horton MW. Characterizing both bacteria and
fungi improves understanding of the Arabidopsis root microbiome. Sci Rep. 2019;9: 1–
11. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-37208-z

20.   Deng S, Caddell D, Yang J, Dahlen L, Washington L, Coleman-Derr D.
Genome wide association study reveals plant loci controlling heritability of the
rhizosphere microbiome. bioRxiv. 2020; 2020.02.21.960377.
doi:10.1101/2020.02.21.960377

21.   Kurtz ZD, Müller CL, Miraldi ER, Littman DR, Blaser MJ, Bonneau RA. Sparse
and compositionally robust inference of microbial ecological networks. von Mering C,
editor. PLOS Comput Biol. 2015;11: e1004226. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004226

22.   Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ. Biometry. The principles and practice of statistics in
biological research. 1969. doi:10.1126/science.167.3915.165

23.   Roux F, Gasquez J, Reboud X. The dominance of the herbicide resistance
cost in several *Arabidopsis thaliana* mutant lines. Genetics. 2004;166: 449–460.
doi:10.1534/genetics.166.1.449

24.   Bai Y, Müller DB, Srinivas G, Garrido-Oter R, Potthoff E, Rott M, et al.
Functional overlap of the Arabidopsis leaf and root microbiota. Nature. 2015;528: 364–
369. doi:10.1038/nature16192

25.   Farrar K, Bryant D, Cope-Selby N. Understanding and engineering beneficial
plant-microbe interactions: plant growth promotion in energy crops. Plant Biotechnol J.
2014;12: 1193–1206. doi:10.1111/pbi.12279

26.   Bonhomme M, Fariello MI, Navier H, Hajri A, Badis Y, Miteul H, et al. A local
score approach improves GWAS resolution and detects minor QTL: application to
Medicago truncatula quantitative disease resistance to multiple *Aphanomyces
euteiches* isolates. Heredity. 2019;123: 517–531. doi:10.1038/s41437-019-0235-x

27.   Mueller LA, Zhang P, Rhee SY. AraCyc: A Biochemical Pathway Database
for Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol. 2003;132: 453–460. doi:10.1104/pp.102.017236

28.   Schläpfer P, Zhang P, Wang C, Kim T, Banf M, Chae L, et al. Genome-Wide
Prediction of Metabolic Enzymes, Pathways, and Gene Clusters in Plants. Plant
Physiol. 2017;173: 2041–2059. doi:10.1104/pp.16.01942

29.   Simillion C, Liechti R, Lischer HEL, Ioannidis V, Bruggmann R. Avoiding the
pitfalls of gene set enrichment analysis with SetRank. BMC Bioinformatics. 2017;18:
151. doi:10.1186/s12859-017-1571-6

30.   Charmpi K, Ycart B. Weighted Kolmogorov Smirnov testing: an alternative for
Gene Set Enrichment Analysis. Stat Appl Genet Mol Biol. 2015;14: 279–293.
doi:10.1515/sagmb-2014-0077

31.   Brachi B, Faure N, Horton M, Flahauw E, Vazquez A, Nordborg M, et al.
Linkage and association mapping of *Arabidopsis thaliana* flowering time in nature.
PLoS Genet. 2010;6: e1000940. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000940

32.   Atwell S, Huang YS, Vilhjálmsson BJ, Willems G, Horton M, Li Y, et al.
Genome-wide association study of 107 phenotypes in *Arabidopsis thaliana* inbred lines.
Nature. 2010;465: 627–631. doi:10.1038/nature08800

33.   Donoso R, Leiva-Novoa P, Zúñiga A, Timmermann T, Recabarren-Gajardo G,
González B. Biochemical and Genetic Bases of Indole-3-Acetic Acid (Auxin
Phytohormone) Degradation by the Plant-Growth-Promoting Rhizobacterium
Paraburkholderia phytofirmans PsJN. Parales RE, editor. Appl Environ Microbiol.
2017;83: e01991-16, e01991-16. doi:10.1128/AEM.01991-16

34.   Ganin H, Kemper N, Meir S, Rogachev I, Ely S, Massalha H, et al. Indole
Derivatives Maintain the Status Quo Between Beneficial Biofilms and Their Plant Hosts.
Mol Plant-Microbe Interactions®. 2019;32: 1013–1025. doi:10.1094/MPMI-12-18-0327-
R

35.   Farré-Armengol G, Filella I, Llusia J, Peñuelas J. Bidirectional Interaction
between Phyllospheric Microbiotas and Plant Volatile Emissions. Trends Plant Sci.
2016;21: 854–860. doi:10.1016/j.tplants.2016.06.005

36.   Fahey JW, Zalcmann AT, Talalay P. The chemical diversity and distribution of
glucosinolates and isothiocyanates among plants. Phytochemistry. 2001;56: 5–51.
doi:10.1016/S0031-9422(00)00316-2

37.   Huang AC, Jiang T, Liu Y-X, Bai Y-C, Reed J, Qu B, et al. A specialized
metabolic network selectively modulates *Arabidopsis* root microbiota. Science.
2019;364: eaau6389. doi:10.1126/science.aau6389

38.   Castrillo G, Teixeira PJPL, Paredes SH, Law TF, Lorenzo L de, Feltcher ME,
et al. Root microbiota drive direct integration of phosphate stress and immunity. Nature.
2017;543: 513–518. doi:10.1038/nature21417

39.   Finkel OM, Castrillo G, Herrera Paredes S, Salas González I, Dangl JL.
Understanding and exploiting plant beneficial microbes. Curr Opin Plant Biol. 2017;38:
155–163. doi:10.1016/j.pbi.2017.04.018

40.   Foster KR, Schluter J, Coyte KZ, Rakoff-Nahoum S. The evolution of the host
microbiome as an ecosystem on a leash. Nature. 2017;548: 43–51.
doi:10.1038/nature23292

41.   Morgan JL, Darling AE, Eisen JA. Metagenomic sequencing of an in vitro-
simulated microbial community. PLoS ONE. 2010;5. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010209

42.   Amani J, Kazemi R, Abbasi AR, Salmanian AH. A simple and rapid leaf
genomic DNA extraction method for polymerase chain reaction analysis. Iran J
Biotechnol. 2011;9: 69–71.

43.   Chelius MK, Triplett EW. The diversity of archaea and bacteria in association
with the roots of *Zea mays L.* Microb Ecol. 2001;41: 252–263.
doi:10.1007/s002480000087

44.   White TJ, Bruns S, Lee S, Taylor J. Amplification and direct sequencing of
fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. 1990.

45.   Kozich JJ, Westcott SL, Baxter NT, Highlander SK, Schloss PD. Development
of a dual-index sequencing strategy and curation pipeline for analyzing amplicon
sequence data on the miseq Illumina sequencing platform. Appl Environ Microbiol.
2013;79: 5112–5120. doi:10.1128/AEM.01043-13

46.   Walters WA, Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Berg-Lyons D, Fierer N, Knight R.
PrimerProspector: De novo design and taxonomic analysis of barcoded polymerase
chain reaction primers. Bioinformatics. 2011;27: 1159–1161.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr087

47.   Samarakoon T, Wang SY, Alford MH. Enhancing PCR Amplification of DNA
from Recalcitrant Plant Specimens Using a Trehalose-Based Additive. Appl Plant Sci.
2013;1: 1200236. doi:10.3732/apps.1200236

48.   Rohland N, Reich D. Cost-effective, high-throughput DNA sequencing
libraries for multiplexed target capture. Genome Res. 2012;22: 939–946.
doi:10.1101/gr.128124.111

49.   Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters W a, Berg-Lyons D, Huntley J, Fierer N, et
al. Ultra-high-throughput microbial community analysis on the Illumina HiSeq and
MiSeq platforms. ISME J. 2012;6: 1621–1624. doi:10.1038/ismej.2012.8

50.   Martin M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput
sequencing reads. EMBnet.journal. 2011;17: 10. doi:10.14806/ej.17.1.200

51.   Kõljalg U, Nilsson RH, Abarenkov K, Tedersoo L, Taylor AFS, Bahram M, et
al. Towards a unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi. Mol Ecol.
2013;22: 5271–5277. doi:10.1111/mec.12481

52.   Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The
SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-
based tools. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41: D590–D596. doi:10.1093/nar/gks1219

53.   Dixon P. VEGAN, a package of R functions for community ecology. J Veg Sci.
2003;14: 927–930. doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2003.tb02228.x

54.   Anderson MJ, Willis TJ. Canonical analysis of principal coordinates : a useful
method of constrained ordination for ecology. Ecology. 2003;84: 511–525.
doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2003)084[0511:CAOPCA]2.0.CO;2

55.   Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models
using lme4. J Stat Softw. 2015. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01

56.   Aitchison J. The Statistical analysis of compositional data. J R Stat Soc Ser B.
1982;44: 365–374. doi:10.2307/2345821

57.   Lê Cao K-AK-A, González I, Déjean S, González I. Unravelling "omics" data
with the R package mixOmics. HAL. 2012.

58.   Zhao T, Liu H, Roeder K, Lafferty J, Wasserman L. The huge Package for
High-dimensional Undirected Graph Estimation in R. J Mach Learn Res JMLR.
2012;13: 1059–1062.

59.   Csárdi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network
research. InterJournal Complex Syst. 2006;1695: 1–9.

60.   Pau G, Fuchs F, Sklyar O, Boutros M, Huber W. EBImage–an R package for
image processing with applications to cellular phenotypes. Bioinformatics. 2010;26:
979–981. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq046

61.   McCaig AE, Grayston SJ, Prosser JI, Glover LA. Impact of cultivation on
characterisation of species composition of soil bacterial communities. FEMS Microbiol
Ecol. 2001;35: 37–48. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2001.tb00786.x

62.   Wang K, Sipilä TP, Overmyer K. The isolation and characterization of resident
yeasts from the phylloplane of Arabidopsis thaliana. Sci Rep. 2016;6: 39403.
doi:10.1038/srep39403

63.   Collado J, Platas G, Paulus B, Bills GF. High-throughput culturing of fungi
from plant litter by a dilution-to-extinction technique. FEMS Microbiol Ecol. 2007;60:
521–533. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2007.00294.x

64.   Bartoli C, Frachon L, Barret M, Rigal M, Huard-Chauveau C, Mayjonade B, et
al. In situ relationships between microbiota and potential pathobiota in *Arabidopsis*
thaliana. ISME J. 2018;12: 2024–2038. doi:10.1038/s41396-018-0152-7

65.   Karasov TL, Almario J, Friedemann C, Ding W, Giolai M, Heavens D, et al.
Arabidopsis thaliana and Pseudomonas pathogens exhibit stable associations over
evolutionary timescales. Cell Host Microbe. 2018;24: 168-179.e4.
doi:10.1016/J.CHOM.2018.06.011

66.   Bradski G. The OpenCV Library. Dr Dobbs J Softw Tools. 2000.

67.   Alonso-Blanco C, Andrade J, Becker C, Bemm F, Bergelson J, Borgwardt
KM, et al. 1,135 genomes reveal the global pattern of polymorphism in *Arabidopsis*
thaliana. Cell. 2016;166: 481–491. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.05.063

68.   Li H, Durbin R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler
transform. Bioinformatics. 2009;25: 1754–1760. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp324

69.   Li H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with
BWA-MEM. ArXiv Prepr ArXiv. 2013;00: 3. doi:arXiv:1303.3997 [q-bio.GN]

70.   Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The
Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009;25: 2078–2079.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352

71.   Tarasov A, Vilella AJ, Cuppen E, Nijman IJ, Prins P. Sambamba: Fast
processing of NGS alignment formats. Bioinformatics. 2015;31: 2032–2034.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btv098

72.   Van der Auwera GA, Carneiro MO, Hartl C, Poplin R, del Angel G, Levy-
Moonshine A, et al. From fastq data to high-confidence variant calls: the genome
analysis toolkit best practices pipeline. Curr Protoc Bioinforma. 2013.
doi:10.1002/0471250953.bi1110s43

73.   DePristo MA, Banks E, Poplin R, Garimella KV, Maguire JR, Hartl C, et al. A
framework for variation discovery and genotyping using next-generation DNA
sequencing data. Nat Genet. 2011;43: 491–498. doi:10.1038/ng.806

74.   Zhao K, Aranzana MJ, Kim S, Lister C, Shindo C, Tang C, et al. An
Arabidopsis example of association mapping in structured samples. PLoS Genet.
2007;3: e4. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.0030004

75.   Horton MW, Hancock AM, Huang YS, Toomajian C, Atwell S, Auton A, et al.

Genome-wide patterns of genetic variation in worldwide *Arabidopsis thaliana*
accessions from the RegMap panel. Nat Genet. 2012;44: 212–216.
doi:10.1038/ng.1042

76.   Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, a.R. Ferreira M, Bender D, et
al. PLINK: A tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage
analyses. Am J Hum Genet. 2007;81: 559–575. doi:10.1086/519795

77.   Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LCAM, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-
generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. GigaScience.
2015;4: 7. doi:10.1186/s13742-015-0047-8

78.   Zhou X, Stephens M. Genome-wide efficient mixed-model analysis for
association studies. Nat Genet. 2012;44: 821–4. doi:10.1038/ng.2310

79.   Yang J, Manolio TA, Pasquale LR, Boerwinkle E, Caporaso N, Cunningham
JM, et al. Genome partitioning of genetic variation for complex traits using common
SNPs. Nat Publ Group. 2011;43: 519–525. doi:10.1038/ng.823

1094
1095

Acknowledgements: Many thanks to Mia Holm for her hospitality and wonderful diners
after hard work in the field as well as help during harvesting; to Einar Holm for helping with
field work and taking photos of harvested plants; to Torbjörn Säll for assistance with
sampling and providing greenhouse space in Lund; and finally to the Kleen family, the
Öhman family, Nils Jönsson and the Rathckegården farm for allowing us to install our
experiments on their land. Thanks to Timothée Flutre and Talia Karasov for helpful
discussions on previous versions of the manuscript. Thanks to Man Yu from the Dean lab
who helped generate stem images used for seed production estimates and manual seed
production estimates. This work was funded by a grant from the National Health Institute
(R01 GM 083068) to JB, MN and CD, by a Dropkin Foundation Fellowship to BB and with
support from the University of Chicago to JB. BB has received the support of the EU in the
framework of the Marie-Curie FP7 COFUND People Programme, through the award of an
AgreenSkills/AgreenSkills+ fellowship (under grant agreement n° 267196). Computing
resources and storage were provided by: the Center for Research Informatics, funded by the
Biological Sciences Division at the University of Chicago with additional funding provided
by the Institute for Translational Medicine, CTSA grant number UL1 TR000430 from the
National Institutes of Health; the genotoul bioinformatics platform Toulouse Occitanie,
France (Bioinfo Genotoul, https://doi.org/10.15454/1.5572369328961167E12); and Bordeaux
Bioinformatics Center (CBiB) at the University of Bordeaux, France.

1115

Author Contributions: BB, DF, SH, JB, MN and CD designed the field trials. BB, DF and
SH coordinated fieldwork. BB, DF, EK, FR, AA, MB, SD, TCM, PN, TT, RW took part in
fieldwork. HW, with assistance from FH and RF isolated B38, produced the genome
sequence and assessed its growth promoting effect in controlled conditions. FR computed the
SNP data used for association analysis. BB, PD, MLM, RW produced the microbiota
sequence data. PLG, TCM and BB generated and analyzed the metabolomics data. BB and
JB conceived of analyses, and BB analyzed the data. BB and JB wrote the paper. MP helped
develop the methods for microbiota sequencing. DF, TCM, MP, CD, MN provided comments
on the manuscript.

1125

1126 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

1127

1128

Repeatability of analysis and data availability

All scripts used to performed the analyses presented in this paper, as well as non-essential but complementary figures, are available in the repository

https://forgemia.inra.fr/bbrachi/microbiota_paper.git

The ITS and 16S amplicons and B38 sequence data is available under bioproject

PRJNA707473

Supplementary Information is linked to the online version of the paper at www.nature.com/nature.

Materials & Correspondence

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints
The authors declare no competing financial interests.
Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to jbergels@uchicago.edu

 Figures:

 Fig. 1 | Plants grown in different environments have different microbial communities.
 The plots represent the projection of each sample on the plane defined by the first two
 constrained components of the fungal and bacterial communities, describing variation among
 sites and years. The percentages in parentheses are the proportion of the total inertia (square
 root of the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity) explained by each component. The colors of the points
 indicate the site from which samples were collected. Experiments from the South are
 represented in red (SU) and yellow (SR), and experiments from the North in blue (NR) and
 dark blue (NA). All points from 2012 and 2013 are encircled by a dark and lighter grey line
 respectively.

 Fig. 2 | The effect of host genetic variation on the microbial community targets
 relatively few OTUs and percolates through hubs. This figure corresponds to observations
 in the set of four experiments sampled in 2013, see Extended Data Figure 3 for experiments
 performed in 2012. **A-D:** Each frame presents the distribution of heritability estimates for
 individual OTUs in one site. In each frame, the inset graph is a box and whiskers plot
 contrasting the heritability (y-axis) of bacterial (B) and fungal (F) OTUs. **E-F**: The heritable
 hubs are represented by large dots, at a distance of 0 (hub). The other OTUs are represented
 by smaller dots and the x-axis represents their distance to the nearest heritable hub(s) within
 the sparse covariance networks. The number of heritable hubs detected in each experiment is
 indicated in the legend. The correlation coefficients presented are Kendall rank correlations
 calculated for OTUs with a distance to the heritable hub(s) above 0. NE stands for "no edge".

 Fig. 3 | Relationship between host genotype seed production and influence on microbial
 hubs across sites and years. A. Proportion of heritable hub relative counts explained by host
 effects across all sites and years. **B**. Coefficients for the linear regression explaining lifetime
 see production variation among accession with accession effects on microbial hubs across
 experiments (after model selection).

 Extended Data:

 Extended Data Fig. 1 | Relative frequency of the 10 most frequent OTUs. Each stacked
 bar (x-axis) corresponds to a site/year combination. The y-axis gives the proportion of the 10
 most frequent OTUs. The colors correspond to the taxonomic assignments of OTUs given in
 the legend (class / order / family).

 Extended Data Fig. 2 | The effect of host genetic variation on the microbial community
 targets relatively few OTUs and percolates through hubs. This figure corresponds to
 observations in the set of 4 experiments performed in 2012. The same figure is available for
 the 2013 experiments in Figure 1. **A-D:** Each frame presents the distribution of heritability
 estimates for individual OTUs in one site. In each frame, the inset graph is a box and
 whiskers plot contrasting the heritability (y-axis) of bacterial (B) and fungal (F) OTUs. **E-F:**
 The heritable hubs are represented by large dots, at a distance of 0 (hub). The other OTUs are
 represented by smaller dots and the x-axis represents their distance to the nearest heritable
 hub(s) within the sparse covariance networks. The number of heritable hubs detected in each

1190 experiment is indicated in the legend. The correlation coefficients presented are Kendall rank
1191 correlations calculated for OTUs with a distance to the heritable hub(s) above 0.
1192

Extended Data Fig. 3 | Relationship between the mean per site / year combination of the
normalized rank abundance of OTUs (x-axis, rank divided by the number of OTUs) in each
sample, and heritability (y-axis). Colored points are heritable OTUs and the color and shape
indicate the site and year, respectively. Normalized rank abundance of OTUs displays a
positive weak but significant relationship with heritability which has an adjusted r-squared of
0.04674 (Fstat=205.8, df=4176, p-value: < 2.2e-16).
1199

1200 **Extended Data Fig. 4 | Hubs in microbial networks.** Each frame presents the relationship
1201 between degree and betweenness centrality for vertices in the networks computed for each
1202 site (SU, SR, NM and NA) and year (2012, 2013). Each dot represents an OTU (fungal or
1203 bacterial). The larger and labeled dots correspond to OTUs that have values of betweenness
1204 centrality and degree in the 5% tail of both statistics.
1205

Extended data Fig. 5 | Relationship between prevalence, heritability (A) , betweenness
(B) and degree (C). We performed 8 independent experiments, over two years. For each
experiment, we defined prevalent OTUs as those detected in over 50% of the plants. In the
three panels, the x-axis represents the number of experiments (from 1 to 8) in which an OTU
was prevalent, with years distinguished by shape and sites distinguished by color. In A, the y-
axis indicates heritability of OTU relative abundance (i.e. variance explained by a random
accession effect) estimated within experiments. Colored points represent OTUs with
significant heritability. In B and C, the y-axis indicates betweenness and degree of OTU in
networks computed for each experiment and colors points are OTUs defined as hubs.
1215

1216 **Extended Data Fig. 6 | Correlation between lifetime seed production (LSP) estimates**
1217 **obtained by counting and measuring siliques (x-axis) versus automated LSP estimates**.
1218 A. Row data and Spearman rho rank correlation coefficient. B. Log transformed data and
1219 Pearson's correlation coefficient. In both panels, outliers are indicated in red.
1220

1221

1222 **Extended Data Fig. 7 | Positive correlations among genotype lifetime seed production**
1223 **(LSP) estimates in different experiments.** We measure LSP, a major component of fitness
1224 in this autogamous selfing species, in four sites over two years for 200 Swedish accessions.
1225 This figure shows the pairwise correlations between accession effects on this fitness
1226 component estimated in the eight experiments.
1227

Extended Data Fig. 8 | Abundant plant specialized metabolites contribute to shaping the
relative abundance of microbial hubs. A. Relationships between specialized metabolites
and microbial hubs across experiments. Each bar corresponds to an F-statistic for the
effects of the site (grey), the molecule (blue) and the interaction between the two (orange) in
a model following the formula HUB ~ Molecule + Site + Molecule *Site (in the form HUB ~
Molecule along the x-axis). The stars associated with each bar indicate the level of
significance of the Molecule effect (after FDR correction for 623 tests, only models with p-
value <0.01 for the molecule effects are shown). Site effects were large for all hubs but the
interactions between site and molecule were always small and generally not significant (33
significant in 623 tests without FDR correction; only one significant with FDR correction). **B.**
Heritability estimates of the molecules in the field (grey bars) and in the greenhouse (blue
bars), and in sterile conditions (orange bars) for each molecule. The vertical segments are

95% confidence intervals obtained with 500 bootstraps for heritability estimates. **C. Genetic correlations for specialized metabolites between accessions grown in the field and in the greenhouse.** Each bar represents a Pearson's correlation coefficient between field and greenhouse estimates of accession effects (blups) and significance is given by the stars (after FDR correction for 17 tests). Missing bars correspond to molecules with no heritability in the greenhouse and/or the field. B and C share the x-axis labels.

Extended Data Table 1 | Host variation has a subtle impact on overall community variation. The first 3 columns indicate the community, site and year for which the analyses were performed. Nh stands for the number of principal coordinate components with significant broad sense heritability estimates (95% confidence intervals not overlapping 0). A total of 10 components were computed for each community/site/year combination. "VE" indicates the total amount of microbial community variation captured by the first 10 components and "he" provides an estimated proportion of total variation explained by the identity of host accessions (over the i heritable components for each site/year combination). The overall host effects reported in the main text reflect the distribution of VE*he in this table.

Extended Data Table 2 | List of heritable hubs. Hub OTUs detected in each site and year. H2 is the point heritability estimate for each hub. The columns order, family and genus provide taxonomic assignments.

Extended Data Table 3 | Hubs are enriched for interkingdom connections (edges). For each site (first column) and year (second column), the table presents the results from a χ^2 testing for enrichment in interkingdom edges (third column) when considering all edges, or edges involving at least one hub. B_B, B_F, F_F give the number of edges between 2 bacterial OTUs, a bacterial and a fungal OTU, and 2 fungal OTUs, respectively. The following columns are chi-square values, p-values and FDR adjusted p-values for 8 tests.

Extended Data Table 4 | Relationships between host genotype lifetime seed production and influence over microbial hubs. For each experiment, we computed a multiple linear regression aimed at explaining variation in lifetime seed production among accessions as a function of variation in the effects of accessions on heritable microbial hubs (as well as their squared values indicated by "^{2}", for example F8 and F8^2) . The table summarizes the results for each site and year, giving the number of accessions used and the adjusted r^2 for each model after forward/backward model selection. The column "selected terms" indicate the microbial hubs included in the final model, the sign of the effect (-, +) with the significance in the last column (ns: p-value ≥ 0.1, . : $0.1 \geq p$-value > 0.05, *: $0.05 \geq p$-value > 0.01, **: $0.01 \geq p$-value > 0.001, *** : p-value ≤ 0.001).

Extended Data Table 5 | Geographical coordinates of Swedish collection sites for live microbial isolates.

Extended Data Table 6 | Secondary metabolites detected in this study. "ID" refers to the identifier assigned to each molecule. "Name" indicates the putative names for the molecules if identified. "Category" describes the type of metabolite: C stands for cyanidin, F stands for flavonoid; GSL stands for glucosinolate; O stands for other. "Base structure" describes the flavonol core of the flavonoids: C stands for Cyanidin, K for Kaempferol and Q for Quercetin. The next eight columns indicate the numbers of different saccharides or the

chemical groups that enter in the structure of molecules. "RT" stands for retention time (in second). "mass" indicates the molecular weight: "(obs)" stands for observed and "(exp)" for expected according to the formula.

Supplementary information:

Supplementary Table 1 | Natural accessions of *Arabidopsis thaliana* originating from Sweden and grown in 4 sites across Sweden.

Supplementary Table 2 | Bacterial and Fungal OTUs detected. The table provides, for the 581 Bacterial OTUs and 704 fungal OTUs, the taxonomic assignations. in addition column "heritable", "hubs", "heritable hub" indicate the number of experiment (0 to 8) in which OTUs were significantly influenced by host genotype, a hub in the community and both, respectively. Column "Nexp" indicates the number of experiments in which each OTU was prevalent. "Core microbiota" indicates if the OTU was part of the core microbiota defined in this study (1: yes, 0: no).

Supplementary Table 3 | QTLs associated with host effects on hubs and our fitness estimate across experiments. The columns "chromosome", "start", and "stop" indicate the genomic coordinates for each QTL. The columns "Nqtl" indicates the number of overlapping associated loci identified by the local score approach which were merged into the QTL. The column "repres" provides a representative SNP for each associated loci aforementioned. Representative SNPs are chosen to have the largest absolute effect on the phenotype for each associated loci. The following column describes which traits display associations with each QTL. For example on line 2, the QTL region overlaps with a loci associated with B41 (value =1) and is an exact match for the loci associated with B99 (value =2). The column "Ntraits" simply counts the number of traits with associations in a QTL region and the column "sizes" is simply the difference between "start" and "stop" and measures QTLs sizes in base pairs.

Supplementary Table 4 | Biological processes significantly enriched among genes overlapping with QTLs for microbial hub variation. "trait" simply indicates the trait for which we detected significant enrichment. The columns "name", "description" and "databases refer to GO terms identification. and "pathway" is the pathway description. "size" refers to the number of genes annotated with the corresponding terms, "setRank" is the setRank statistic characterizing the importance of a gene set, i.e. how much it overlaps with other gene sets, "pSetRank" expresses the probability of observing a gene set with the same setRank value in a random network with the same number of nodes and edges as the observed gene set network. "correctedPValue" is the enrichment *p*-value accounting for overlapping gene sets and "adjustedPValue" is the same probability but adjusted for multiple testing. "enr" and "pv" are the enrichment and associated *p*-value for the method accounting for linkage disequilibrium and non-random distribution of terms along the genome.

Supplementary Table 5 | Pathways significantly enriched among genes overlapping with QTLs for microbial hub variation. (See description Supplementary Table 4).