Integration of system phenotypes in microbiome networks to identify candidate synthetic communities: a study of the grafted tomato rhizobiome

Ravin Poudel[1234#], Ari Jumpponen[5], Megan M. Kennelly[4], Cary Rivard[6], Lorena Gomez-Montano[1234], and Karen A. Garrett[1234#].

[1]*Department of Plant Pathology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611*
[2]*Global Food Systems Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611*
[3]*Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611*
[4]*Department of Plant Pathology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506*
[5]*Division of Biology and Ecological Genomics Institute, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506*
[6]*Department of Horticulture and Natural Resources, Kansas State University, Olathe, KS 66061*

[#]*Correspondence: Ravin Poudel and Karen A. Garrett*
E-mail addresses: rp3448@ufl.edu and karengarrett@ufl.edu

Running title: Phenotype-based networks for microbial consortia design

ABSTRACT

Understanding factors influencing microbial interactions, and designing methods to identify key

taxa, are complex challenges for achieving microbiome-based agriculture. Here we study how

grafting and the choice of rootstock influence root-associated fungal communities in a grafted

tomato system. We studied three tomato rootstocks (BHN589, RST-04-106 and Maxifort) grafted to

a BHN589 scion and profiled the fungal communities in the endosphere and rhizosphere by

sequencing the Internal Transcribed Spacer (ITS2). The data provided evidence for a rootstock

effect (explaining ~2% of the total captured variation, $p < 0.01$) on the fungal community.

Moreover, the most productive rootstock, Maxifort, supported greater fungal species richness than

the other rootstocks or controls. We then constructed a phenotype-OTU network analysis

(PhONA) using an integrated machine learning and network analysis approach based on sequence-

based fungal Operational Taxonomic Units (OTUs) and associated tomato yield data. PhONA

provides a graphical framework to select a testable and manageable number of OTUs to support

microbiome-enhanced agriculture. We identified differentially abundant OTUs specific to each

rootstock in both endosphere and rhizosphere compartments. Subsequent analyses using PhONA

identified OTUs that were directly associated with tomato fruit yield, and others that were indirectly

linked to yield through their links to these OTUs. Fungal OTUs that are directly or indirectly linked

with tomato yield may represent candidates for synthetic communities to be explored in agricultural

systems.

IMPORTANCE

The realized benefits of microbiome analyses for plant health and disease management are often limited by the lack of methods to select manageable and testable synthetic microbiomes. We evaluated the composition and diversity of root-associated fungal communities from grafted tomatoes. We then constructed a phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) using these linear and network models. By incorporating yield data in the network, PhONA identified OTUs that were directly predictive of tomato yield, and others that were indirectly linked to yield through their links to these OTUs. Follow-up functional studies of taxa associated with effective rootstocks, identified using approaches like PhONA, could support the design of synthetic fungal communities for microbiome-based crop production and disease management. The PhONA framework is flexible for incorporation of other phenotypic data and the underlying models can readily be generalized to accommodate other microbiome or other 'omics data.

KEYWORDS

fungi, phenotypes, microbiome networks, model integration, grafting, tomato

Introduction

Interactions are key to defining system behaviors, structures, and outcomes. In microbial systems, interactions among organisms define their distribution, assemblies, and ecosystem functions. In addition to microbe-microbe interactions, microbes interact with their hosts, and are essential to host health and performance (1-8). In agriculture, plant–microbe interactions improve plant productivity by providing access to nutrients (9-11), reducing infection by plant pathogens (5, 12), triggering plant growth promoting factors (13, 14), and enhancing plant resistance (15, 16) and tolerance to abiotic stresses (17-19). Although the importance of microbes and host-microbe interactions to host health and ecological processes is well-known, interaction-based approaches to manage crop-production remain a scientific frontier. Past attempts to translate information about microbial interactions to design biocontrol agents or biofertilizers have often had limited efficacy and durability (20, 21). Most microbial inocula have been applied as single species, often selected based on pairwise relations of microbes with a pathogen or the host. Interactions among microbes as well as with the host are important, and the net outcome of these complex interactions defines host health and ecosystem functions(22). Thus, it is critical to understand the ecology of microbes selected for biological applications, and systems approaches centered on host-microbe interaction can help guide the selection of microbes for synthetic communities(23).

Among tools to better understand microbial interactions, network models of microbial communities, and studies of network structures and key groups, have proven popular for generating hypotheses about how to engineer microbial consortia. In such network models of microbiomes, a node represents an OTU, and a link exists between two OTUs if their sequence proportions are significantly associated across samples. When evaluated with other conventional measures of microbial community structures, such as diversity indices, network models can be used to identify hub taxa that may be key to maintaining microbial assemblages and diversity (24), or to evaluate changes in community complexity and interactions in response to experimental treatments (25). Microbiome networks are useful for describing general community structures and their key properties and are often the most practical option when additional information about species interactions is missing or the goal is to compare across studies with different types of data (26, 27). The utility of network analysis for identifying candidate assemblages for biocontrol can be enhanced by incorporating nodes that represent other additional types of features (28, 29). For instance, a novel association of host metadata with the microbiome was revealed in an integrated microbiome-metadata network (30), where a feature strongly associated with hub microbes can serve as a marker

to measure host performance. In agriculture, plant yield or other phenotypic traits can be integrated

in microbiome networks, with the potential to identify microbial consortia that are predictive of host

phenotypes. Because such models include host phenotypes, they facilitate finding candidate sets of

OTUs that may directly or indirectly affect host phenotypic traits. Visualization of networks is often

valuable for this purpose, but the real value of phenotype-based network models is their ability to

infer potential candidate taxa or consortia. The hypothesized beneficial sets of OTUs may represent

targets for pure culturing efforts or, if cultures exist, the sets can be further evaluated in laboratory

or field studies.

While phenotype-based network models have the potential to identify key taxa, application

of such models should be integrated with findings from other community analyses so that the

inference about key taxa is biologically and ecologically meaningful. For example, plant microbiome

studies indicate that a small but consistent proportion of variation in microbial communities is often

explained by the host genotype (31-37), indicating the potential for genotype-based modulation of

microbial communities in crop-production on a broader scale. These results support the idea of

host-specific microbial community selection (38). Many such microbes may be taxa that are

evolutionarily essential for the survival and function of plants (39, 40). In addition, the extent of host

genotype filtering of microbes differs across the rhizosphere, rhizoplane, and endosphere, and varies

from one host species to another (41-43). Results that indicate microbial filtering by different crop

hosts, plant compartments, geographic locations, and environmental factors (44, 45) are promising

for designing experiments to minimize the search space, or necessary sample numbers, to identify

candidate taxa for synthetic communities. For instance, factors that explain great variation in

microbial community composition, but that are outside the control of management, can be treated

as blocks in experimental designs, so that host- or compartment-specific effects on the microbial

community can be searched to identify the most desirable candidate taxa.

In our current study, building on previously described agricultural experiments in grafted

tomato systems (46, 47), we characterized the root-associated fungal (RAF) communities and

implemented an interaction-based approach to select potential candidate fungi that are predictive of

tomato yield and/or that are in significant association with other fungal taxa. The new phenotype-

OTU network analysis (PhONA) is a method for network-visualization and a framework to support

the selection of candidate taxa and to integrate system traits (such as host yield) in microbe-microbe

association networks. PhONA first identifies OTUs predictive of phenotype using lasso regression,

then uses the predicted OTUs from lasso regression to build a reduced GLM. PhONA then

combines the GLM results indicating positive or negative associations of the predicted OTUs with

the host phenotype as well as with other OTUs in a network model (Fig. 1). Due to the large

number of OTUs compared to the sample size, lasso regression was used because it is suited for

minimizing overfitting when applied with a relatively small sample size (48) and has been

implemented in microbiome studies (49, 50).

Phenotype-based selection of microbial consortia is promising as an effective approach to

select representative microbial taxa and could support the design of microbiome-based products.

Changes in abundance (51), successive selection over multiple generations (3), or analyses of binary

host-microbe relationships (52) are some of the recent phenotype-based applications to select

candidate taxa for biological applications. Despite the importance of biological test-based

approaches, difficulty in culturing all the microbes makes computational approaches instrumental to

define microbe-microbe and host-microbiome associations, and to identify the biological and

ecological key taxa. Tools to describe the community structures based on the co-occurrence matrix

or covariance structures (53, 54) are more common, whereas tools to integrate host phenotype or

environmental factors are at an earlier phase of development. Relatively small sample sizes

combined with large number of features may limit applications of the recent graph-based

approaches. Such methods allow measurement of direct associations via conditional dependence

structures and offer options to include environmental and phenotypic information in the model (55).

CoNet (56) and Flashweave (55) allow representation of the phenotype or an environmental variable

as an extra node or a column in the adjacency matrix, and the same statistical method can be applied

to define the associations among microbes and between microbes and phenotypes (taxa and

metadata). PhONA is generic as it allows the user to select data structure-specific models for

microbe-microbe and microbe-phenotype associations.

In the current case study, we used lasso regression to identify the subset of OTUs and then

fitted them using GLMs to predict OTU-phenotype associations, whereas the OTU-OTU

associations were defined using SparCC. Additionally, we contrasted the RAF community's diversity

and interactions among the rootstocks and the controls, for endosphere and rhizosphere

compartments. Based on our yield data, rootstock vigor, and previous studies of microbial

interactions (25), we expected a greater number of fungal OTUs and of microbial associations for

more productive rootstocks. Moreover, in our previous studies of bacterial communities in the

tomato rhizobiome, we observed compartment-specific (endosphere vs rhizosphere) effects of

grafting and rootstocks on bacterial community composition and diversity (47), and expected similar

effects on RAF diversity and composition. All the code and vignettes for PhONA are available at

https://ravinpoudel.github.io/PhONA/index.html and archived at zenodo (DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.6600986).

METHODS

Experimental Plots, Rootstocks, and Study Sites. We studied grafted tomato plants in

high tunnels in an experimental design similar to that described by Poudel et al. (47). Tomato plants

were grafted following a tube-grafting protocol described in Meyer et al. (46). Our study included

three rootstocks (BHN589; RST-04-106, and Maxifort) in four graft treatments: 1) nongrafted

BHN589 plants; 2) selfgrafted BHN589 plants (plants grafted to their own rootstock); 3) BHN589

grafted to RST-04-106; and 4) BHN589 grafted to Maxifort. We chose BHN589 as scion primarily

based on its popularity due to high yield and high-quality fruit with a long shelf life. For rootstocks,

we selected Maxifort because it is a productive and popular rootstock, and RST-04-106 as a new

rootstock variety based on tomato breeders' recommendations.

Our study included two sites: Olathe Horticulture Research and Extension Center (OHREC)

and Common Harvest Farm, a farm managed by a collaborating farmer. For more information

about the sites, see Table S1. At each study site, the four graft treatments were assigned to four plots

per block in a randomized complete block design. Each plot consisted of 5-8 plants, and one middle

plant per plot was sampled during the peak growth stage. There were six blocks at OHREC, and

four blocks at Common Harvest Farm, such that for each year, each graft treatment was replicated

10 times. The experiment was repeated for two years (2014 and 2015) with a similar design, with the

blocks and rootstocks randomly and independently assigned in each year.

Sample Preparation, DNA Extraction, and Amplicon Generation. To compare the

fungal communities, we selected a center plant from each plot and carefully dug the whole plant out

such that the majority of the roots remained intact. Endosphere and rhizosphere samples were

prepared as previously described (47) and the total genomic DNA was extracted using a DNA

extraction kit (MoBio UltraClean Soil DNA Isolation Kit; MoBio, Carlsbad, CA, USA) as per

manufacturer's protocol, with slight modification during the homogenization step (47). To recover

high genetic diversity, we opted for the two-step PCR approach. The primary PCR amplicons were

generated in 50 µL reactions under the following conditions: 1 µM forward and reverse primers, 10

ng template DNA, 200 µM of each dioxynucleotide, 1.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 10 µL 5x Phusion Green HF

buffer (Finnzymes, Vantaa, Finland), 24.5 µL molecular biology grade water, and 1-unit (0.5 µL)

Phusion Hot Start II DNA Polymerase (Finnzymes, Vantaa, Finland). PCR cycle parameters

consisted of a 98° C initial denaturing step for 30 seconds, followed by 30 cycles at 98° C for 10

seconds, 57° C annealing temperature for 30 seconds, and 72° C extension step for 30 seconds,

followed by a final extension step at 72° C for 10 minutes. All samples were PCR-amplified in

triplicate to minimize stochasticity, pooled, and cleaned using Diffinity RapidTip (Diffinity

Genomics, West Chester, PA, USA). In this PCR, we amplified the entire ITS region of fungal

rRNA genes using primers ITS1F-CTTGGTCATTTAGAGGAAGTAA and ITS4-

TCCTCCGCTTATTGATATGC (e.g. 57). The average amplicon length of the ITS region in fungi

is about 600 bp and could not reliably be fully covered with the Illumina MiSeq platform (v.3-

chemistry) in a single read. Thus, in the following nested PCR, only ITS2 of the ITS region was

amplified using fITS7-ITS4 primers (58) incorporating unique Molecular Identifier Tags (MIDs) at

the 5' end of the reverse primer (ITS4). For the nested PCR, we used similar reagents and PCR

conditions as in the primary PCR, with some modifications: the number of PCR cycles was reduced

to ten, total reaction volume was reduced to 25 ul, and 5 ul of cleaned PCR product from the first

PCR amplification was used as the DNA template. The nested PCR was also run in triplicate, pooled

by experimental unit, and cleaned with an Agencourt AmPure cleanup kit using a SPRIplate 96-ring

magnet (Beckman Coulter, Beverly, MA, USA) as per the manufacturer's protocol. Then, 200 ng of

cleaned, barcoded amplicons were combined per experimental unit, and the final pool was cleaned

again using an Agencourt AmPure cleanup kit as above. Illumina MiSeq adaptors were ligated to the

library and paired-end sequenced on a MiSeq Personal Sequencing System (Illumina, San Diego, CA,

USA) using MiSeq Reagent Kit V3 with 600 cycles. The endosphere and the rhizosphere amplicon

libraries were sequenced separately in two runs. Adaptor ligation and sequencing were performed at

the Integrated Genomics Facility at Kansas State University. All sequence data generated in this

study were deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive depository (BioProject:……).

207   **Bioinformatics and OTU Designation.** The sequence library of fastq files was curated

using the MOTHUR pipeline (Version 1.33.3; (59)) following steps modified from the MiSeq

Standard Operating Protocol (SOP; www.mothur.org/wiki/MiSeq_SOP). Briefly, the forward and

the reverse reads were assembled into contigs using the default alignment algorithm. Any sequences

shorter than 250 base pairs or containing an ambiguous base call or more than eight homopolymers

or missing MIDs were removed from the library. Barcoded sequences were assigned to experimental

units, and the data for endosphere and rhizosphere libraries were merged and processed together for

the remaining steps in the MOTHUR pipeline. The pairwise distance matrix based on the filtered

sequences was created and sequence data clustered into OTUs at 97% sequence similarity using the

nearest neighbor joining algorithm. The clustered OTUs were assigned to a putative taxonomic

identity using a Bayesian classifier (60) referencing the UNITE plus INSD non-redundant ITS

database (61). To minimize the bias resulting from unequal sequence counts per sample, samples

were rarified to the lowest sequence count among the samples (6,777). The final curated OTU

database included 1,084,281 total sequences representing 16,151 fungal OTUs, including singletons

(5,376).

Statistical analyses. We evaluated the network of associations among fungal OTUs with

network models to better understand the community composition and the interactions therein. The

observed OTU database was divided into eight subsets, each combination of the four rootstocks and

two compartments (endosphere and rhizosphere), such that we constructed eight networks in total.

In our network models, a node represents an OTU and a link exists between a pair of OTUs if there

is evidence ($p < 0.05$) that their frequencies are correlated (positively or negatively) across samples.

Reducing false associations due to compositional bias in network modeling of microbiome data is

important for clearer interpretation (62). Thus, we used a Sparse Correlations for Compositional

data (SparCC) method to evaluate the pairwise associations (62), designed to minimize the

compositional bias effect due to normalization. In our analyses, associations were defined in 20

iterations, and the significance of a pairwise association was determined from 100 bootstrapped

datasets. Once the matrix defining all the pairwise associations was derived, we selected only those

OTUs for which the absolute value of at least one association was greater than 0.5 (and $p < 0.05$) in

the network analyses for each of the rootstock genotypes.

To identify the OTUs associated with tomato yield in each rootstock, a regression-based

model was fitted to the observed data. Marketable tomato yield data reported by Meyer et al. (46)

was the response variable and fungal OTUs were potential predictors. We used the caret package

(63) to evaluate the lasso regression and selected OTUs using varImp functions. Lasso regression

used an L1 regularization approach to shrink the less important variables' coefficients to zero and to

reduce the number of variables in the model. In lasso regression, lambda determines the penalty of

regularization, and its value can range from zero to infinity; when it is zero, the results are similar to

the least square lines. A grid-based approach was used to tune the lambda parameter using repeated

(ITERS=500) 5-fold cross-validation and the value of lambda with lowest variance was selected.

Only the OTUs with non-zero coefficients were selected, based on the lasso-regression model, to

build the reduced GLM model, and the association type of each OTU with phenotype was
estimated. Given the small sample size, we did not evaluate the model performance by splitting the
data into training and test cases, although this would be a valuable step in future studies with larger
sample sizes. PhONA then integrates the results from the GLM model for yield with the OTU-
OTU association network. We plotted the resulting network using the igraph package (54) in R. To
evaluate the role of nodes in the network, we placed each node in one of four categories –
peripherals, module hubs, network hubs, and connectors – based on the within-module degree and
among-module connectivity (24, 55). Role analyses were only used the presence or absence of links
in the network and do not account for the link types (i.e. positive or negative associations).

To evaluate the effects of rootstocks on fungal diversity, Shannon entropy and species
richness were evaluated using the vegan package (64) wrapped by the phyloseq package (65) in R
(66). Differences in diversity across the rootstocks were compared using a mixed model ANOVA in
the lme4 package in R (67). Study site and sampling year were treated as random factors, blocked by
study sites, whereas the rootstock and compartments were treated as fixed factors. Changes in fungal
community composition across the samples were estimated based on a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity
distance matrix and visualized in non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plots. The
contribution of factors to the observed variation in fungal composition was estimated in a
permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA, using 1000 permutations) using the
adonis function in the vegan package (64). To identify OTUs that were sensitive to the rootstock
treatments, the observed frequency (proportion) of each OTU was evaluated by fitting a generalized
linear model (GLM) with negative binomial distribution, to identify depleted or enriched OTUs
(Differentially Abundant OTUs – DAOTUs). Likelihood ratio tests and contrast analyses (between
the hybrid rootstock and controls) were performed for the fitted GLM to identify the DAOTUs. We
used OTU frequencies from selfgrafts and nongrafts as controls, in comparisons with other
rootstocks, using contrasts. All tests were adjusted to control the false discovery rate (FDR, $p <$
0.01) using the Benjamini-Hochberg method (68). A differential abundance test was performed
within the controls (selfgraft vs. nongraft) to identify the OTUs responsive to the grafting
procedure, itself.

RESULTS

      RAF in the Grafted Tomato System. Once rare OTUs (<10 sequence counts, which accounted for more than 90% of the observed OTUs) were removed, the community consisted of 1586 OTUs and 1,063,017 sequences. Of these sequences, 4.8% remained unclassified at the phylum level (Fig. S1). The classified sequences represented Ascomycota (52.5%), Basidiomycota (25.6%), Zygomycota (11.5%), Chytridiomycota (3.6%), Glomeromycota (1.7%), and Rozellomycota (0.07%) (Fig. 1). At the class level, Pezizomycetes, Agaricomycetes, and Dothideomycetes were the most abundant across all the rootstocks. At the order level, the communities were dominated by Pezizales, Pleosporales, Cantharellales, Mortierellales, and Hypocreales. Analyses at the family level revealed that Pyronemataceae, Mortierellaceae, Ceratobasidiaceae, and Pleosporaceae were the most common taxa overall. At the genus level, *Mortierella*, *Thanatephorus*, and *Alternaria* were the most abundant genera.

      Effects of Grafting and Rootstock on α-Diversity. There was strong evidence for a rootstock effect on OTU richness ($F_{1,3}$ = 8.6, p < 0.001) and Shannon entropy ($F_{1,3}$ = 3.2, p = 0.02) for tomato RAF communities. Mean species richness was higher in both the endosphere (p = 0.01) and rhizosphere (p = 0.001) of one of the hybrid rootstocks, Maxifort, compared to the nongrafted control. Shannon entropy followed trends similar to richness with a higher estimate for Maxifort; however, there was only evidence for higher Shannon entropy in Maxifort for the rhizosphere (p = 0.004), but not for the endosphere (p = 0.6) (Fig. 2). Both species richness and Shannon entropy were higher (p < 0.001) in the rhizosphere than in the endosphere across all the rootstock genotypes (Fig. S2).

      Effects of Grafting and Rootstock on RAF Composition. Based on previous studies of the plant genotype effect on the rhizobiome ([47](#)), we expected a significant rootstock effect on community composition. Rootstock explained 2% of the variation in the RAF community composition (PERMANOVA; p<0.01), whereas compartment, study site, and year explained a greater proportion of the variation than rootstock (Fig. S3 and Table S2). Endosphere-rhizosphere compartments accounted for 8.92% of the variation. Study site and interannual variation explained 8.34% and 5.38% of the total variation, respectively (Table S2).

      Comparison of DAOTUs. The analysis of differential abundance found effects of rootstock genotype at the individual OTU level. While analyses of alpha diversity indicated higher diversity in the rhizosphere than in the endosphere, we observed the opposite in the analysis of DAOTUs, with nearly twice as many DAOTUs in the endosphere (n = 146 i.e. 9.2% of the total

OTUs) compared to the rhizosphere (n = 76 i.e. 4.8% of total OTUs) (Figs. 2 and S4). Comparison
across rootstocks indicated a greater number of DAOTUs in Maxifort (n = 80) than in RST-04-106
(n = 66) and the selfgraft control (n = 49). Compared to the hybrid rootstocks, the number of
depleted taxa was greater in the selfgraft control (n = 28). Among the enriched OTUs in Maxifort,
27 OTUs belonged to Basidiomycota, 20 to Ascomycota, and 11 to Glomeromycota, whereas four
basidiomycete, three ascomycete, and one zygomycete OTUs were depleted in Maxifort. In RST-04-
106, enriched taxa included 22 OTUs in Basidiomycota, 20 OTUs in Ascomycota and five OTUs in
Glomeromycota, whereas the depleted OTUs included six in Zygomycota. Comparing the self- and
nongraft controls, nine OTUs in Ascomycota, three OTUs in Basidiomycota, and four OTUs in
Zygomycota were enriched in the selfgraft treatment, whereas 12 OTUs in Basidiomycota, seven
OTUs in Ascomycota, four OTUs in Zygomycota, and three OTUs in Glomeromycota were
depleted in the selfgraft treatment.

Network Analysis/ General Network Structures. Fungal community complexity,
defined in terms of mean node degree and community structures/motifs, varied among the
rootstocks in both the endosphere and the rhizosphere, with a greater mean node degree in one of
the hybrid rootstocks, Maxifort, compared to both controls and RST-04-106 (Figs. 3, S5, S6, and
Table S3). Complexity was higher in the rhizosphere than in the endosphere compartment (Figs. 3,
S5, S6, and Table S3). In addition to the total number of links, the link type (either positive or
negative) differed among the rootstocks in both compartments (Table S3), with a higher ratio of
negative to positive links in Maxifort in both the endosphere and the rhizosphere compartments.
Rhizosphere fungal communities had a higher ratio of negative to positive links than those in the
endosphere, for all rootstocks. Although we observed rootstock-specific or compartment-specific
effects on the node degree and ratio of negative to positive links, the number of modules defined
using a simulated annealing (SA) algorithm were similar in both the endosphere and rhizosphere
compartments and across the rootstocks (Table S3). Our analyses of node types divided the
observed nodes in the association-network into four categories: peripherals, module hubs, network
hubs, and connectors. More taxa in the rhizosphere were identified as key nodes than in the
endosphere, and key nodes were more common in the hybrid rootstocks than in the non- and
selfgrafted controls (Figs. 4 and 5).

Lasso regression, GLM, and PhONA. Using lasso regression and GLM models, we
identified the OTUs predictive of tomato yield in each compartment in each rootstock. The number
of predictive OTUs identified by the varImp function was about the same across the rootstock

treatments in both the compartments. However, not all the predicted OTUs were associated with

other OTUs in the network models. The Maxifort rhizosphere had the highest number of OTUs

(10) associated with other OTUs in the network models. Only a subset of the entire microbiome was

predictive of the yield, among which only a few microbes were associated with other microbes in the

network models.

DISCUSSION

This study demonstrated the effect of rootstocks on RAF community composition and structure.

General diversity-based analyses indicated a rootstock effect. The most productive hybrid rootstock,

Maxifort, supported higher fungal richness and Shannon entropy, as well as a greater number of

DAOTUs than the controls, consistent with the expectation that higher diversity and a higher

number of responsive taxa (DAOTUs) would be associated with a more productive genotype. Also

consistent with our expectations, we observed higher microbial diversity and fewer responsive taxa

(DAOTUs) in the rhizosphere compared to the endosphere. The integrated host phenotype and

OTU network in the PhONA identified potential candidate taxa for each rootstock, and community

structures in the endosphere and rhizosphere compartments. The general network analysis found

more interactions and more complex network structures in fungal communities associated with

Maxifort, consistent with our expectation that a more productive rootstock would have greater

community complexity. Community complexity, when defined in terms of mean node degree,

differed between the root compartments: the endosphere community was less complex than the

rhizosphere community in all the rootstocks. Overall, our study i) showed that rootstocks and

grafting are significant drivers of RAF community composition, diversity and structure, and ii)

introduced and illustrated the use of PhONA as an analytical framework to select potential

candidates for microbiome-based agriculture. Potential candidates are those taxa that were directly

predictive of higher yield (taxa with direct positive links with the yield node in the network), taxa

that have positive associations with taxa positively associated with yield, and/or taxa that have

negative associations with taxa negatively associated with yield. There is the potential to consider

taxa multiple steps removed from the yield response, with the understanding that uncertainty about

the link to yield increases the more steps the taxon is from the yield node. From a practical

standpoint, our results indicate the potential for using plant genotypes and agricultural practices to

modulate plant-associated microbial communities, and the potential for the PhONA framework to

improve identification of candidate taxa to support microbiome-based crop production.

In contrast to network models that portray only microbe-microbe interactions, PhONA

integrates the results of GLM models of microbe association with phenotypic traits to support

inference about candidate taxa and predictive microbiome analyses. Thus, candidate taxa can be

selected not only because they have a direct association with the host response variable(s), but also

because they are indirectly associated with the host response variable through their associations with

community members that have direct associations with host traits. For instance, a node that has a

positive association with the system phenotype node (in our case, yield) might have negative or

positive associations with other OTUs. Such OTUs with indirect positive associations with the

desired phenotype might also be included in biofertilizer consortia. Using a PhONA, a rational

consortium can be selected based on the phenotype of interest. Applying PhONA for disease or

pathogen resistance phenotypes could be useful for designing rational biocontrol consortia. We also

observed some OTUs with direct negative associations with the yield node. Efforts to control

negatively associated taxa, as well as the taxa that have positive associations with these taxa, might

contribute to maximizing yield. Although we did not observe any disease symptoms in our

experiments, OTUs negatively associated with the yield node might represent a case of

asymptomatic negative microbial effects on yield. Efforts to explore negatively associated OTUs

might provide opportunities to minimize asymptomatic yield loss in crops.

The main goal of PhONA is to provide a systems framework to generate hypotheses about

the role of microbiome components in host function and performance, and to support the potential

for mechanistic/predictive models to better understand host-microbiome interactions. *In planta*

experiments with fungal cultures are essential to test the hypotheses generated by these models, to

help to differentiate between associations that are based on consistent biological interactions and not

simply based on shared (or opposing) environmental niche preferences. It is important to be

cautious in attributing biological interactions to the key structures in network attributes because the

links in the PhONA may or may not depict biological interactions. That is, many links may represent

only correlative relationships and not causal ones (28). For instance, the hub node in the network is

often regarded as a key node, but the high number of links with the hub node in the association

network could be due to shared niches, biological interactions, or a mixture thereof. If the

associations are mostly due to shared niches, removing such a hub node will have a more limited

effect, whereas removal of a hub node involved in many biological interactions could lead to

significant effects on the microbial community.

RAF community composition, diversity, and interactions differed between the endosphere

and rhizosphere compartments. Although the endosphere and the rhizosphere are physically

adjacent, they are distinct in community composition and diversity. Compartment specificity in

community composition and diversity has been reported for other plant species, in both natural and

agricultural settings (31, 69, 70). Usually, bulk soil is considered a source of microbial communities, a

subset of which is selected for in the rhizosphere (31, 71), mainly as a function of root exudates and

rhizodeposits (43, 72-75). Selection of the rhizosphere microbiome could be specific (*e.g.*,

antagonistic to plant pathogens) (76, 77) or more general with less influence of host genotype. In

comparison, the endosphere of host plants often supports lower microbial diversity compared to the

rhizosphere (70, 71). Host tissues and defense systems act as biotic filters (2). As a result, the

microbiome is more specialized in the endosphere than in the rhizosphere. RAF compartment

specificity may also be an important consideration for microbe-based disease management strategies

– especially for the management of pathogens or pests that are compartment specific, such as

endoparasites and ectoparasites.

RAF community composition and diversity also differed among the rootstock genotypes.

Plant genotypes can structure root-associated fungal communities (31, 70, 78). The commercial

rootstocks in our study have been bred to provide resistance against specific soilborne pathogens

and pests. Small host genotypic differences could alter the physiological and immunological

responses in the root systems, thereby selecting genotype-specific RAF communities (79). For

example, some root exudates and metabolites could be specific to a plant genotype (80-82) and

provide specific control of microbial communities (83-85). In some cases, the host genotype effect

can be directly attributed to root anatomy (77, 85, 86). Efficient root types and architectures are

desired agronomic traits to cope with biotic and abiotic stresses (87), and root systems vary among

and within plant species (86). Moreover, the effect of plant genotypes on microbial communities in

the root system may be linked to the flow of nutrients between the aboveground-scion and

belowground-rootstocks, where vigorous rootstock genotypes could drive greater resources to the

microbial communities by supporting larger scion biomass. In such a positive nutrient feedback

between the scion and rootstock, rootstock genotype appears to be a more critical driver than the

scion genotype (88). Rootstock genotypes supporting higher yield and biomass may support higher

microbial diversity by excreting a greater volume of photosynthates as root exudates and

metabolites. Although we did not evaluate root exudates, and used the same scion across the study,

our study is consistent with a role of higher yield and biomass (as for the Maxifort rootstock) being

associated with higher fungal diversity. Additionally, we observed an effect of rootstock on the RAF

community composition. Collectively, the results support our expectations of rootstock-specific

control of the RAF community.

Our definition of complexity is based on interactions in networks, using a definition similar

to that used in other microbiome network analyses (25, 34, 89). However, a greater number of

interactions and complex network structures/motifs would tend to be observed whenever more

nodes exist in these association networks, an inherent relationship not always considered in studies

of complexity in microbiomes. The higher number of OTUs associated with Maxifort would tend

to result in higher complexity compared to rootstocks with fewer OTUs. Another potential measure

of complexity is network density, the proportion of links observed in a network relative to the total

number of possible links. For all the rootstocks we studied, network density was similar (0.04) in

both compartments, indicating similar community complexity. Statistical methods comparable to

rarefaction, designed to equalize the number of nodes across networks or methods to balance OTU

richness for sampling efforts (90), will be a valuable future effort for understanding how network

complexity responds to treatments and for making comparisons across studies. In addition, methods

to optimize and automate the selection of association thresholds to define the pairwise relationships

in a microbiome network is a gap and opportunity for improving microbiome network analyses. For

graphics in the figures in this analysis, we selected a level of association such that an interpretable

number of OTUs were depicted for visual consideration. Studies directly applied to identify

potential microbial assemblages for agricultural applications could benefit from exploring results for

a range of thresholds.

Our study indicates the rootstock-genotype specific effect on RAF diversity, composition,

and interactions, and also demonstrates integration of system phenotypes such as plant yield in a

network-based model to support selection of candidate taxa for biological use. However, in

sequence-based studies such as ours, the biological and functional significance of the candidate

OTUs remains unknown. Follow-up experiments with fungal cultures will be necessary to determine

the biological roles of the candidate OTUs, and to differentiate causal associations from correlations

based on niche preference. Similarly, further development of PhONA to incorporate temporal

microbiome data and Bayesian learning and inference methodologies (91, 92) has the potential to

support causal inference, including understanding of directionality in microbiome networks.

PhONA utilizes a lasso regression and GLM to link OTUs with a system phenotype, although many

other models such as random forest and other machine learning approaches (93) could also be

employed. Given the nature of microbiome data, having a high number of features (p) and relatively
small number of samples (n), other models to address the n x p problem can improve PhONA
predictions. Rather than pure prediction, our methods aim to find the key predictors and use them
in the GLM model for evaluating associations with the yield response. PhONA focused on finding
the attributable predictors/OTUs that are key to biological interventions, which are missed in
approaches that are focused purely on prediction (94). Smaller sample size was a limitation in our
current study, reflecting the challenge of processing a large number of plant replicates, and we did
not validate the results from our model by splitting data into training and test sets. A rigorous model
validation step would improve the accuracy of PhONA. As lab-based technologies and
computational resources become less expensive, studies with large sample sizes are becoming more
practical and, when combined with an analytical framework like PhONA, microbial community
analyses can go beyond simple analyses of diversity to help make microbiome-based agriculture a
reality.

Acknowledgements
We appreciate support from the Ceres Trust, USDA NCR SARE Research and Education Grant
LNC13-355, Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research Grant
FF-NIA19-0000000050, the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station, the National Institute for
Mathematical and Biological Synthesis (NIMBioS), and the University of Florida. We thank
members of the Garrett lab for their comments on an early version of the manuscript. R.P., K.A.G.,
A.J., M.M.K., and C.L.R. designed the study. R.P. and L.G.M. collected and processed the samples.
R.P. analyzed and interpreted the data. R.P., K.A.G., and A.J. wrote the manuscript. R.P., K.A.G.,
A.J., M.M.K., C.L.R., and L.G.M. revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final
manuscript.

FIG 1 The Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) combines (A) an OTU-OTU association
network with (B) the nodes selected based on predictive model for their association with a host
phenotype variable such as yield, to create (C) a PhONA.
491
FIG 2 Enriched and depleted OTUs across tomato rootstock genotype combinations (nongraft
BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106 and
Maxifort)) evaluated for the rhizosphere (A) and the endosphere (B), using OTU counts from
selfgrafts and nongrafts as controls. All the tests were adjusted to control the false discovery rate
(FDR, $p < 0.01$) using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Each point represents an OTU labeled at
the genus level and colored based on phylum, and the position along the x-axis represents the
abundance fold-change contrast with controls (except for the selfgraft vs. nongraft comparison,
where the nongraft treatment was used as a control for the contrast).
500
FIG 3 Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) of endosphere fungal taxa for BHN589 grafted
on Maxifort. Node color indicates the phylum, except that the yellow-color node represents yield
associated with the rootstock. Nodes connected to the rootstock yield node with black links are taxa
that were predictive of rootstock yield, where dotted and solid lines indicate negative and positive
associations with the yield node, respectively. Red and blue links represent negative and positive
associations, respectively, between OTUs. Nodes are labeled with the finest-resolution taxonomic
categorization available.
508
FIG 4 Partitioning of endosphere fungal OTUs according to their network roles. Nodes were
divided into four categories based on within-module degree and among-module connectivity. The
blue dashed line represents a threshold value (0.62) for among-module connectivity, and the red
dashed line represents a threshold value (2.5) for within-module degree. Nodes were categorized as
peripherals, connectors, module hubs, and network hubs. Node color indicates rootstock treatment
(nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106
and Maxifort)).
516
FIG 5 Partitioning of rhizosphere fungal OTUs according to their network roles. Nodes were
divided into four categories based on within-module degree and among-module connectivity. The
blue dashed line represents a threshold value (0.62) for among-module connectivity, and the red
dashed line represents a threshold value (2.5) for within-module degree. Nodes were categorized as
peripherals, connectors, module hubs, and network hubs. Node color indicates rootstock treatment
(nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106
and Maxifort)).
524
525   **FIG S1** Relative abundance of endosphere and rhizosphere fungi at the phylum level recovered
526   from four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted
527   on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort). Each individual bar represents a rootstock
528   treatment, and the colored area within the bar represents the relative abundance of the
529   corresponding phylum.
530
FIG S2 Comparison of overall fungal diversity (A) and richness (B) associated with tomato
rootstock genotypes and controls, evaluated in the endosphere and rhizosphere. The plot is divided
by the four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589
grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort). Shannon entropy and species richness,
measures of community diversity, were both higher for Maxifort ($p < 0.005$) compared to the self-

graft and RST-04-106 in the rhizosphere, while there was not evidence for a difference in Shannon
entropy in the endosphere ($p = 0.634$). Treatment means were separated using the "difflsmeans"
function as specified in the lmerTest package in R. Tests for boxplots sharing a letter or letter case
type had $p > 0.05$.

FIG S3 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordination plot of samples labeled by tomato
rootstock (nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks
(RST-04-106 and Maxifort)), compartment (endosphere or rhizosphere), and study site, based on the
Bray-Curtis dissimilarity distance matrix of fungal OTUs. Color indicates rootstock treatment, shape
indicates study site, and size indicates compartment. Ellipses surrounding the samples indicate the
95% CI of the endosphere and rhizosphere sample centroids.

FIG S4 Number of DAOTUs in a contrast analysis, evaluated for the endosphere and rhizosphere
compartments for four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft and selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589
grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (Maxifort and RST-04-106). The green color in each bar represents
the number of enriched taxa, and the red color represents the number of depleted taxa. The number
of differentially changed taxa was greater for the endosphere than for the rhizosphere. Among the
contrast pairs, hybrid rootstocks had a greater number of enriched taxa compared to depleted taxa.
However, the number of depleted taxa was higher compared to enriched taxa in the controls.
Among the treatments, Maxifort had the highest number of DAOTUs in both compartments.

FIG S5 Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) of endosphere fungal taxa for tomato
rootstock treatments: (A) nongraft and (B) selfgraft BHN589, and (C) BHN589 grafted on RST-04-
106. Node color indicates the phylum, except that the yellow-color node represents yield associated
with the rootstock. Nodes connected to the rootstock yield node with black links are taxa that were
predictive of rootstock yield, where dotted and solid lines indicate negative and positive associations
with the yield node, respectively. Red and blue links represent negative and positive associations,
respectively, between OTUs. Nodes are labeled with the finest-resolution taxonomic categorization
available.

FIG S6 Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) of rhizosphere fungal taxa for tomato
rootstock treatments: (A) nongraft and (B) selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid
rootstocks ((C) RST-04-106 and (D) Maxifort). Node color indicates the phylum, except that the
tomato-color node represents yield associated with the rootstock. Nodes connected to the rootstock
yield node with black links are taxa that were predictive of rootstock yield, where dotted and solid
lines indicate negative and positive associations with the yield node, respectively. Red and blue links
represent negative and positive associations, respectively, between OTUs. Nodes are labeled with
the finest-resolution taxonomic categorization available.

TABLE S1 Sites included in the study, their soil type, and geographic coordinates.

TABLE S2 Results of the multivariate permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) for
fungal taxon abundance data. Permutation was based on the Bray-Curtis distance matrix generated
for root associated fungal communities at the OTU level from four tomato rootstock treatments:
nongraft and selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (Maxifort and RST-
04-106) (1000 permutations). P values < 0.05 are in bold.

TABLE S3 Network attributes and links observed in the fungal association networks for four
tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft and selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid
rootstocks (Maxifort and RST-04-106) in each of rhizosphere and endosphere compartments.
586
587   REFERENCES
588

1.   Berendsen RL, Pieterse CM, Bakker PA. 2012. The rhizosphere microbiome and plant
health. Trends Plant Sci 17:478-86.
2.   Lebeis SL, Paredes SH, Lundberg DS, Breakfield N, Gehring J, McDonald M, Malfatti S,
del Rio TG, Jones CD, Tringe SG, Dangl JL. 2015. Salicylic acid modulates colonization
of the root microbiome by specific bacterial taxa. Science 349:860-864.
3.   Panke-Buisse K, Poole AC, Goodrich JK, Ley RE, Kao-Kniffin J. 2015. Selection on soil
microbiomes reveals reproducible impacts on plant function. ISME J 9:980-9.
4.   Turnbaugh PJ, Hamady M, Yatsunenko T, Cantarel BL, Duncan A, Ley RE, Sogin ML,
Jones WJ, Roe BA, Affourtit JP, Egholm M, Henrissat B, Heath AC, Knight R, Gordon
JI. 2009. A core gut microbiome in obese and lean twins. Nature 457:480-4.
5.   Xue C, Penton CR, Shen Z, Zhang R, Huang Q, Li R, Ruan Y, Shen Q. 2015.
Manipulating the banana rhizosphere microbiome for biological control of Panama
disease. Sci Rep 5:11124.
6.   Gould AL, Zhang VV, Lamberti L, Jones EW, Obadia B, Korasidis N, Gavryushkin A,
Carlson JM, Beerenwinkel N, Ludington WB. 2018. Microbiome interactions shape host
fitness. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 115:E11951-E11960.
7.   Zhou X, Wang JT, Wang WH, Tsui CK, Cai L. 2020. Changes in bacterial and fungal
microbiomes associated with tomatoes of healthy and infected by *Fusarium oxysporum f.*
sp. lycopersici. Microb Ecol doi:10.1007/s00248-020-01535-4.
8.   Kaur S, Egidi E, Qiu Z, Macdonald CA, Verma JP, Trivedi P, Wang J, Liu H, Singh BK.
2022. Synthetic community improves crop performance and alters rhizosphere microbial
communities. J Sustain Agric 1:118-131.
9.   Jin CW, Ye YQ, Zheng SJ. 2014. An underground tale: Contribution of microbial activity
to plant iron acquisition via ecological processes. Ann Bot 113:7-18.
10.   Koide RT. 1991. Nutrient supply, nutrient demand and plant-response to mycorrhizal
infection. New Phytol 117:365-386.
11.   Mishra PK, Bisht SC, Mishra S, Selvakumar G, Bisht JK, Gupta HS. 2012. Coinoculation
of *rhizobium leguminosarum*-pr1 with a cold tolerant *pseudomonas* sp. Improves iron
acquisition, nutrient uptake and growth of field pea (*pisum sativum l.*). J Plant Nutr
35:243-256.
12.   Mendes R, Kruijt M, de Bruijn I, Dekkers E, van der Voort M, Schneider JHM, Piceno
YM, DeSantis TZ, Andersen GL, Bakker PAHM, Raaijmakers JM. 2011. Deciphering
the rhizosphere microbiome for disease-suppressive bacteria. Science 332:1097-1100.
13.   Gaiero JR, McCall CA, Thompson KA, Day NJ, Best AS, Dunfield KE. 2013. Inside the
root microbiome: Bacterial root endophytes and plant growth promotion. Am J Bot
100:1738-50.
14.   Glick BR. 1995. The enhancement of plant-growth by free-living bacteria. Can J
Microbiol 41:109-117.
15.   Conrath U. 2009. Priming of induced plant defense responses. Plant Innate Immunity
51:361-395.

16.   Pieterse CMJ, Zamioudis C, Berendsen RL, Weller DM, Van Wees SCM, Bakker
PAHM. 2014. Induced systemic resistance by beneficial microbes. Annu Rev
Phytopathol 52:347-375.
17.   Marasco R, Rolli E, Ettoumi B, Vigani G, Mapelli F, Borin S, Abou-Hadid AF, El-
Behairy UA, Sorlini C, Cherif A, Zocchi G, Daffonchio D. 2012. A drought resistance-
promoting microbiome is selected by root system under desert farming. PLoS One 7(10):
e48479.
18.   Yang J, Kloepper JW, Ryu CM. 2009. Rhizosphere bacteria help plants tolerate abiotic
stress. Trends Plant Sci 14:1-4.
19.   Yuan ZL, Druzhinina IS, Labbe J, Redman R, Qin Y, Rodriguez R, Zhang CL, Tuskan
GA, Lin FC. 2016. Specialized microbiome of a halophyte and its role in helping non-
host plants to withstand salinity. Sci Rep 6:32467.
20.   Mazzola M, Freilich S. 2017. Prospects for biological soilborne disease control:
Application of indigenous versus synthetic microbiomes. Phytopathology 107:256-263.
21.   Xu XM, Jeffries P, Pautasso M, Jeger MJ. 2011. Combined use of biocontrol agents to
manage plant diseases in theory and practice. Phytopathology 101:1024-1031.
22.   Shayanthan A, Ordoñez PAC, Oresnik IJ. 2022. The role of synthetic microbial
communities (syncom) in sustainable agriculture. Frontiers in Agronomy 4.
23.   de Souza RSC, Armanhi JSL, Arruda P. 2020. From microbiome to traits: Designing
synthetic microbial communities for improved crop resiliency. Front Plant Sci 11:1179.
24.   Agler MT, Ruhe J, Kroll S, Morhenn C, Kim ST, Weigel D, Kemen EM. 2016. Microbial
hub taxa link host and abiotic factors to plant microbiome variation. PLoS Biol 14(1):
e1002352.
25.   Shi S, Nuccio EE, Shi ZJ, He Z, Zhou J, Firestone MK. 2016. The interconnected
rhizosphere: High network complexity dominates rhizosphere assemblages. Ecol Lett
19:926-36.
26.   Ascunce MS, Shin K, Huguet-Tapia JC, Poudel R, Garrett KA, van Bruggen AHC, Goss
EM. 2018. Penicillin trunk injection affects bacterial community structure in citrus trees.
Microb Ecol 78:457–469.
27.   Garrett KA, Alcala-Briseno RI, Andersen KF, Buddenhagen CE, Choudhury RA, Fulton
JC, Hernandez Nopsa JF, Poudel R, Xing Y. 2018. Network analysis: A systems
framework to address grand challenges in plant pathology. Annu Rev Phytopathol
56:559-580.
28.   Poudel R, Jumpponen A, Schlatter DC, Paulitz TC, Gardener BBM, Kinkel LL, Garrett
KA. 2016. Microbiome networks: A systems framework for identifying candidate
microbial assemblages for disease management. Phytopathology 106:1083-1096.
29.   Rottjers L, Faust K. 2018. From hairballs to hypotheses-biological insights from
microbial networks. Fems Microbiology Reviews 42:761-780.
30.   Wang Z, Bafadhel M, Haldar K, Spivak A, Mayhew D, Miller BE, Tal-Singer R,
Johnston SL, Ramsheh MY, Barer MR, Brightling CE, Brown JR. 2016. Lung
microbiome dynamics in copd exacerbations. European Respiratory Journal 47:1082-
1092.
31.   Cregger MA, Veach AM, Yang ZK, Crouch MJ, Vilgalys R, Tuskan GA, Schadt CW.
2018. The *Populus* holobiont: Dissecting the effects of plant niches and genotype on the
microbiome. Microbiome 6:31.

32.   Edwards JA, Santos-Medellin CM, Liechty ZS, Nguyen B, Lurie E, Eason S, Phillips G,
675   Sundaresan V. 2018. Compositional shifts in root-associated bacterial and archaeal
676   microbiota track the plant life cycle in field-grown rice. PLoS Biol 16:e2003862.
677   33.   Fitzpatrick CR, Copeland J, Wang PW, Guttman DS, Kotanen PM, Johnson MTJ. 2018.
678   Assembly and ecological function of the root microbiome across angiosperm plant
679   species. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 115:E1157-E1165.
680   34.   Marasco R, Rolli E, Fusi M, Michoud G, Daffonchio D. 2018. Grapevine rootstocks
681   shape underground bacterial microbiome and networking but not potential functionality.
682   Microbiome 6:3.
683   35.   Wagner MR, Lundberg DS, del Rio TG, Tringe SG, Dangl JL, Mitchell-Olds T. 2016.
684   Host genotype and age shape the leaf and root microbiomes of a wild perennial plant. Nat
685   Commun 7:12151.
686   36.   Herrera J, Poudel R, Bokati D. 2013. Assessment of root-associated fungal communities
687   colonizing two species of tropical grasses reveals incongruence to fungal communities of
688   North American native grasses. Fungal Ecol 6:65-69.
689   37.   French E, Tran T, Iyer-Pascuzzi AS. 2020. Tomato genotype modulates selection and
690   responses to root microbiota. Phytobiomes Journal doi:10.1094/pbiomes-02-20-0020-r.
691   38.   Bulgarelli D, Schlaeppi K, Spaepen S, Ver Loren van Themaat E, Schulze-Lefert P.
692   2013. Structure and functions of the bacterial microbiota of plants. Annu Rev Plant Biol
693   64:807-38.
694   39.   Hol WHG, Bezemer TM, Biere A. 2013. Getting the ecology into interactions between
695   plants and the plant growth-promoting bacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. Front Plant
696   Sci 4:81.
697   40.   Ortiz-Castro R, Contreras-Cornejo HA, Macias-Rodriguez L, Lopez-Bucio J. 2009. The
698   role of microbial signals in plant growth and development. Plant Signal Behav 4:701-12.
699   41.   Edwards J, Johnson C, Santos-Medellín C, Lurie E, Podishetty NK, Bhatnagar S, Eisen
700   JA, Sundaresan V. 2015. Structure, variation, and assembly of the root-associated
701   microbiomes of rice. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 112:E911-E920.
702   42.   Lundberg DS, Lebeis SL, Paredes SH, Yourstone S, Gehring J, Malfatti S, Tremblay J,
703   Engelbrektson A, Kunin V, del Rio TG, Edgar RC, Eickhorst T, Ley RE, Hugenholtz P,
704   Tringe SG, Dangl JL. 2012. Defining the core *Arabidopsis thaliana* root microbiome.
705   Nature 488:86-90.
706   43.   Wang P, Marsh EL, Ainsworth EA, Leakey ADB, Sheflin AM, Schachtman DP. 2017.
707   Shifts in microbial communities in soil, rhizosphere and roots of two major crop systems
708   under elevated CO_2 and O_3. Sci Rep 7:15019.
709   44.   Herrera J, Poudel R, Nebel KA, Collins SL. 2011. Precipitation increases the abundance
710   of some groups of root-associated fungal endophytes in a semiarid grassland. Ecosphere
711   2(4):art50.
712   45.   Bokati D, Herrera J, Poudel R. 2016. Soil influences colonization of root-associated
713   fungal endophyte communities of maize, wheat, and their progenitors. J Mycol 2016:1-9.
714   46.   Meyer L. 2016. Grafting to increase high tunnel tomato productivity in the central united
715   states. Master Thesis. http://hdl.handle.net/2097/32736.
716   47.   Poudel R, Jumpponen A, Kennelly MM, Rivard CL, Gomez-Montano L, Garrett KA.
717   2019. Rootstocks shape the rhizobiome: Rhizosphere and endosphere bacterial
718   communities in the grafted tomato system. Appl Environ Microbiol 85:01765–01718.

48. Tibshirani R. 1996. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. Journal of the Royal
Statistical Society Series B (Methodological) 58:267-288.
49. Roguet A, Eren AM, Newton RJ, McLellan SL. 2018. Fecal source identification using
random forest. Microbiome 6:185.
50. Belk A, Xu ZZ, Carter DO, Lynne A, Bucheli S, Knight R, Metcalf JL. 2018.
Microbiome data accurately predicts the postmortem interval using random forest
regression models. Genes 9(2):104.
51. Niu B, Paulson JN, Zheng XQ, Kolter R. 2017. Simplified and representative bacterial
community of maize roots. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 114:E2450-E2459.
52. Paredes SH, Gao TX, Law TF, Finkel OM, Mucyn T, Teixeira PJPL, Gonzalez IS,
Feltcher ME, Powers MJ, Shank EA, Jones CD, Jojic V, Dangl JL, Castrillo G. 2018.
Design of synthetic bacterial communities for predictable plant phenotypes. Plos Biology
16.
53. Kurtz ZD, Muller CL, Miraldi ER, Littman DR, Blaser MJ, Bonneau RA. 2015. Sparse
and compositionally robust inference of microbial ecological networks. PLoS Comp Biol
11.
54. Friedman J, Alm EJ. 2012. Inferring correlation networks from genomic survey data.
PLoS Comput Biol 8:e1002687.
55. Tackmann J, Matias Rodrigues JF, von Mering C. 2019. Rapid inference of direct
interactions in large-scale ecological networks from heterogeneous microbial sequencing
data. Cell Syst 9:286-296 e8.
56. Faust K, Raes J. 2016. Conet app: Inference of biological association networks using
cytoscape. F1000Res 5:1519.
57. Gardes M, Bruns TD. 1993. Its primers with enhanced specificity for basidiomycetes--
application to the identification of mycorrhizae and rusts. Mol Ecol 2:113-8.
58. Ihrmark K, Bodeker ITM, Cruz-Martinez K, Friberg H, Kubartova A, Schenck J, Strid Y,
Stenlid J, Brandstrom-Durling M, Clemmensen KE, Lindahl BD. 2012. New primers to
amplify the fungal ITS2 region - evaluation by 454-sequencing of artificial and natural
communities. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 82:666-677.
59. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, Hollister EB, Lesniewski RA,
Oakley BB, Parks DH, Robinson CJ, Sahl JW, Stres B, Thallinger GG, Van Horn DJ,
Weber CF. 2009. Introducing mothur: Open-source, platform-independent, community-
supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities. Appl Environ
Microbiol 75:7537-41.
60. Wang Q, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM, Cole JR. 2007. Naive bayesian classifier for rapid
assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. Appl Environ Microbiol
73:5261-7.
61. Koljalg U, Nilsson RH, Abarenkov K, Tedersoo L, Taylor AFS, Bahram M, Bates ST,
Bruns TD, Bengtsson-Palme J, Callaghan TM, Douglas B, Drenkhan T, Eberhardt U,
Duenas M, Grebenc T, Griffith GW, Hartmann M, Kirk PM, Kohout P, Larsson E,
Lindahl BD, Luecking R, Martin MP, Matheny PB, Nguyen NH, Niskanen T, Oja J, Peay
KG, Peintner U, Peterson M, Poldmaa K, Saag L, Saar I, Schuessler A, Scott JA, Senes
C, Smith ME, Suija A, Taylor DL, Telleria MT, Weiss M, Larsson KH. 2013. Towards a
unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi. Mol Ecol 22:5271-5277.
62. Friedman J, Alm EJ. 2012. Inferring correlation networks from genomic survey data.
PLoS Comput Biol 8:e1002687.

63.   Kuhn M. 2008. Building predictive models in r using the caret package. Journal of
Statistical Software 28.
64.   Oksanen J, Blanchet F, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin P, O'Hara
R, Simpson G, Solymos P, Stevens M, Szoecs E, Wagner H. 2018. Vegan: Community
ecology package. R package version 2.4-6.:39pp.
65.   McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. 2013. Phyloseq: An r package for reproducible interactive
analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. PLoS One 8(4): e61217.
66.   R Core Team. 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
foundation for statistical computing, vienna, austria. Url https://www.R-project.Org.
67.   Bates D, Machler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models
using lme4. J Stat Softw 67:1-48.
68.   Ferreira JA. 2007. The benjamini-hochberg method in the case of discrete test statistics.
Int J Biostat 3:Article 11.
69.   Coleman-Derr D, Desgarennes D, Fonseca-Garcia C, Gross S, Clingenpeel S, Woyke T,
North G, Visel A, Partida-Martinez LP, Tringe SG. 2016. Plant compartment and
biogeography affect microbiome composition in cultivated and native Agave species.
New Phytol 209:798-811.
70.   Poli A, Lazzari A, Prigione V, Voyron S, Spadaro D, Varese GC. 2016. Influence of
plant genotype on the cultivable fungi associated to tomato rhizosphere and roots in
different soils. Fungal Biol 120:862-872.
71.   Gottel NR, Castro HF, Kerley M, Yang ZM, Pelletier DA, Podar M, Karpinets T,
Uberbacher E, Tuskan GA, Vilgalys R, Doktycz MJ, Schadt CW. 2011. Distinct
microbial communities within the endosphere and rhizosphere of *Populus deltoides* roots
across contrasting soil types. Appl Environ Microbiol 77:5934-5944.
72.   Badri DV, Vivanco JM. 2009. Regulation and function of root exudates. Plant Cell
Environ 32:666-681.
73.   Dennis PG, Miller AJ, Hirsch PR. 2010. Are root exudates more important than other
sources of rhizodeposits in structuring rhizosphere bacterial communities? FEMS
Microbiol Ecol 72:313-27.
74.   van der Heijden MG, Schlaeppi K. 2015. Root surface as a frontier for plant microbiome
research. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 112:2299-300.
75.   Seitz VA, McGivern BB, Daly RA, Chaparro JM, Borton MA, Sheflin AM, Kresovich S,
Shields L, Schipanski ME, Wrighton KC, Prenni JE. 2022. Variation in root exudate
composition influences soil microbiome membership and function. Appl Environ
Microbiol 88:e0022622.
76.   Berg G, Opelt K, Zachow C, Lottmann J, Gotz M, Costa R, Smalla K. 2006. The
rhizosphere effect on bacteria antagonistic towards the pathogenic fungus Verticillium
differs depending on plant species and site. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 56:250-261.
77.   Tian T, Reverdy A, She Q, Sun B, Chai Y. 2020. The role of rhizodeposits in shaping
rhizomicrobiome.
78.   Reazin C, Baird R, Clark S, Jumpponen A. 2019. Chestnuts bred for blight resistance
depart nursery with distinct fungal rhizobiomes. Mycorrhiza 29:313-324.
79.   Cardarelli M, Rouphael Y, Kyriacou MC, Colla G, Pane C. 2020. Augmenting the
sustainability of vegetable cropping systems by configuring rootstock-dependent
rhizomicrobiomes that support plant protection.

80.   Nasholm T, Huss-Danell K, Hogberg P. 2000. Uptake of organic nitrogen in the field by
811   four agriculturally important plant species. Ecology 81:1155-1161.
812   81.   Reeve JR, Smith JL, Carpenter-Boggs L, Reganold JP. 2008. Soil-based cycling and
813   differential uptake of amino acids by three species of strawberry (Fragaria spp.) plants.
814   Soil Biol Biochem 40:2547-2552.
815   82.   U'Ren N. 2007. Types, amounts, and possible functions of compounds released into the
816   rhizosphere by soil-grown plants, p 1-21, The rhizosphere
817   doi:10.1201/9781420005585.ch1. CRC Press.
818   83.   Beattie GA. 2018. Metabolic coupling on roots. Nat Microbiol 3:396-397.
819   84.   Zhalnina K, Louie KB, Hao Z, Mansoori N, da Rocha UN, Shi SJ, Cho HJ, Karaoz U,
820   Loque D, Bowen BP, Firestone MK, Northen TR, Brodie EL. 2018. Dynamic root
821   exudate chemistry and microbial substrate preferences drive patterns in rhizosphere
822   microbial community assembly. Nat Microbiol 3:470-480.
823   85.   Iannucci A, Canfora L, Nigro F, De Vita P, Beleggia R. 2021. Relationships between root
824   morphology, root exudate compounds and rhizosphere microbial community in durum
825   wheat. Applied Soil Ecology doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2020.103781.
826   86.   Warschefsky EJ, Klein LL, Frank MH, Chitwood DH, Londo JP, von Wettberg EJB,
827   Miller AJ. 2016. Rootstocks: Diversity, domestication, and impacts on shoot phenotypes.
828   Trends Plant Sci 21:418-437.
829   87.   Malamy JE. 2005. Intrinsic and environmental response pathways that regulate root
830   system architecture. Plant Cell Environ 28:67-77.
831   88.   Song F, Bai F, Wang J, Wu L, Jiang Y, Pan Z. 2020. Influence of citrus scion/rootstock
832   genotypes on arbuscular mycorrhizal community composition under controlled
833   environment condition. Plants 9:1-16.
834   89.   Cao X, Zhao D, Xu H, Huang R, Zeng J, Yu Z. 2018. Heterogeneity of interactions of
835   microbial communities in regions of taihu lake with different nutrient loadings: A
836   network analysis. Sci Rep 8:8890.
837   90.   Carlson CJ, Zipfel CM, Garnier R, Bansal S. 2019. Global estimates of mammalian viral
838   diversity accounting for host sharing. Nat Ecol Evol 3:1070-1075.
839   91.   McGeachie MJ, Sordillo JE, Gibson T, Weinstock GM, Liu YY, Gold DR, Weiss ST,
840   Litonjua A. 2016. Longitudinal prediction of the infant gut microbiome with dynamic
841   bayesian networks. Sci Rep 6:20359.
842   92.   Penalver Bernabe B, Cralle L, Gilbert JA. 2018. Systems biology of the human
843   microbiome. Curr Opin Biotechnol 51:146-153.
844   93.   Topcuoglu BD, Lesniak NA, Ruffin MTt, Wiens J, Schloss PD. 2020. A framework for
845   effective application of machine learning to microbiome-based classification problems.
846   mBio 11.
847   94.   Efron B. 2020. Prediction, estimation, and attribution. Journal of the American Statistical
848   Association 115:636-655.

(A) OTU-OTU association network based on SparCC

(B) OTUs predictive of host phenotype, based on predictive model

(C) PhONA predicting candidate taxa based on association network **(A)** and phenotype-predictive OTUs **(B)**

849
850 **FIG 1** The Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) combines (A) an OTU-OTU association

851 network with (B) the nodes selected based on predictive model for their association with a host

852 phenotype variable such as yield, to create (C) a PhONA.

853   (A)

854
855

(B)

FIG 2 Enriched and depleted OTUs across tomato rootstock genotype combinations (nongraft

BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106 and

Maxifort)) evaluated for the rhizosphere (A) and the endosphere (B), using OTU counts from

selfgrafts and nongrafts as controls. All the tests were adjusted to control the false discovery rate

(FDR, p < 0.01) using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Each point represents an OTU labeled at

the genus level and colored based on phylum, and the position along the x-axis represents the

abundance fold-change contrast with controls (except for the selfgraft vs. nongraft comparison,

where the nongraft treatment was used as a control for the contrast).

FIG 3 Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) of endosphere fungal taxa for BHN589

grafted on Maxifort. Node color indicates the phylum, except that the yellow-color node

represents yield associated with the rootstock. Nodes connected to the rootstock yield node with

black links are taxa that were predictive of rootstock yield, where dotted and solid lines indicate

negative and positive associations with the yield node, respectively. Red and blue links represent

negative and positive associations, respectively, between OTUs. Nodes are labeled with the

finest-resolution taxonomic categorization available.

877
878

FIG 4 Partitioning of endosphere fungal OTUs according to their network roles. Nodes were

divided into four categories based on within-module degree and among-module connectivity.

The blue dashed line represents a threshold value (0.62) for among-module connectivity, and the

red dashed line represents a threshold value (2.5) for within-module degree. Nodes were

categorized as peripherals, connectors, module hubs, and network hubs. Node color indicates

rootstock treatment (nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid

rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort)).

887
888
889

890
891
FIG 5 Partitioning of rhizosphere fungal OTUs according to their network roles. Nodes were

divided into four categories based on within-module degree and among-module connectivity.

The blue dashed line represents a threshold value (0.62) for among-module connectivity, and the

red dashed line represents a threshold value (2.5) for within-module degree. Nodes were

categorized as peripherals, connectors, module hubs, and network hubs. Node color indicates

rootstock treatment (nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid

rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort)).

FIG S1 Relative abundance of endosphere and rhizosphere fungi at the phylum level recovered

from four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589

grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort). Each individual bar represents a

rootstock treatment, and the colored area within the bar represents the relative abundance of the

corresponding phylum.

(A)

(B)

FIG S2 Comparison of overall fungal diversity (A) and richness (B) associated with tomato

rootstock genotypes and controls, evaluated in the endosphere and rhizosphere. The plot is

divided by the four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and

BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort). Shannon entropy and

species richness, measures of community diversity, were both higher for Maxifort ($p < 0.005$)

compared to the self-graft and RST-04-106 in the rhizosphere, while there was not evidence for a

difference in Shannon entropy in the endosphere ($p = 0.634$). Treatment means were separated

using the "difflsmeans" function as specified in the lmerTest package in R. Tests for boxplots

sharing a letter or letter case type had $p > 0.05$.

FIG S3 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordination plot of samples labeled by

tomato rootstock (nongraft BHN589, selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid

rootstocks (RST-04-106 and Maxifort)), compartment (endosphere or rhizosphere), and study

site, based on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity distance matrix of fungal OTUs. Color indicates

rootstock treatment, shape indicates study site, and size indicates compartment. Ellipses

surrounding the samples indicate the 95% CI of the endosphere and rhizosphere sample

centroids.

FIG S4 Number of DAOTUs in a contrast analysis, evaluated for the endosphere and

rhizosphere compartments for four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft and selfgraft BHN589,

and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (Maxifort and RST-04-106). The green color in

each bar represents the number of enriched taxa, and the red color represents the number of

depleted taxa. The number of differentially changed taxa was greater for the endosphere than for

the rhizosphere. Among the contrast pairs, hybrid rootstocks had a greater number of enriched

taxa compared to depleted taxa. However, the number of depleted taxa was higher compared to

enriched taxa in the controls. Among the treatments, Maxifort had the highest number of

DAOTUs in both compartments.

A)

946
947

948　**B)**

949
950

951   **C)**

952
FIG S5 Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) of **endosphere** fungal taxa for tomato

rootstock treatments: (A) nongraft and (B) selfgraft BHN589, and (C) BHN589 grafted on RST-

04-106. Node color indicates the phylum, except that the yellow-color node represents yield

associated with the rootstock. Nodes connected to the rootstock yield node with black links are

taxa that were predictive of rootstock yield, where dotted and solid lines indicate negative and

positive associations with the yield node, respectively. Red and blue links represent negative and

positive associations, respectively, between OTUs. Nodes are labeled with the finest-resolution

taxonomic categorization available.

A)

963
964

965 **B)**

966
967

968   **C)**

969
970

971   **D)**

972
FIG S6 Phenotype-OTU network analysis (PhONA) of **rhizosphere** fungal taxa for tomato

rootstock treatments: (A) nongraft and (B) selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two

hybrid rootstocks ((C) RST-04-106 and (D) Maxifort). Node color indicates the phylum, except

that the tomato-color node represents yield associated with the rootstock. Nodes connected to the

rootstock yield node with black links are taxa that were predictive of rootstock yield, where

dotted and solid lines indicate negative and positive associations with the yield node,

respectively. Red and blue links represent negative and positive associations, respectively,

between OTUs. Nodes are labeled with the finest-resolution taxonomic categorization available.

TABLE S1 Sites included in the study, their soil type, and geographic coordinates.

Study sites	Location	Latitude	Longitude	Soil type
Olathe Horticulture Research and Extension Center (OHREC)	Johnson County, KS	38.88N	94.99W	Chase silt loam
Common Harvest	Douglas County, KS	38.96N	95.20W	Eudora-Kimo complex

984 **TABLE S2** Results of the multivariate permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) for
985 fungal taxon abundance data. Permutation was based on the Bray-Curtis distance matrix
986 generated for root associated fungal communities at the OTU level from four tomato rootstock
987 treatments: nongraft and selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks
988 (Maxifort and RST-04-106) (1000 permutations). P values < 0.05 are in bold.

Factor	Sum of Squares	% Explained	P value
Rootstocks	1.24	2.07	**< 0.01**
Compartment	5.36	8.92	**< 0.001**
Study_Site	5.01	8.34	**< 0.001**
Year	3.23	5.38	**< 0.001**
Rootstocks:Compartment	0.58	0.97	0.972
Rootstocks:Study_Site	1.39	2.32	**< 0.01**
Compartment:Study_Site	1.59	2.65	**< 0.001**
Rootstocks:Year	1.00	1.66	0.111
Compartment:Year	1.00	1.66	**< 0.001**
Study_Site:Year	1.46	2.43	**< 0.001**
Rootstocks:Compartment:Study_Site	0.55	0.91	0.998
Rootstocks:Compartment:Year	0.49	0.82	1.000
Rootstocks:Study_Site:Year	1.22	2.03	**< 0.01**
Compartment:Study_Site:Year	0.60	1.00	**< 0.01**
Rootstocks:Compartment:Study_Site:Year	0.60	1.00	0.989
Residuals	34.75	57.86	
Total	60.07	100.01	

TABLE S3 Network attributes and links observed in the fungal association networks for four tomato rootstock treatments: nongraft and selfgraft BHN589, and BHN589 grafted on two hybrid rootstocks (Maxifort and RST-04-106) in each of rhizosphere and endosphere compartments.

Compartment	Rootstocks	N	Node	Edge	Node Degree	Density	Modules (SA)	Negative Edge	P⋯
Endosphere	Nongraft	20	78	112	1.6	0.04	10	5	
	Selfgraft	20	115	115	1.4	0.04	11	9	
	RST-04-106	20	71	110	1.5	0.04	11	9	
	Maxifort	20	92	182	2.0	0.04	10	32	
Rhizosphere	Nongraft	20	132	337	2.6	0.04	12	72	
	Selfgraft	20	113	272	2.4	0.04	9	63	
	RST-04-106	20	133	338	2.5	0.04	11	54	
	Maxifort	20	173	740	4.3	0.04	11	279	