1 **A subset of viruses thrives following microbial resuscitation during rewetting of a**

2 **seasonally dry California grassland soil**

4 Alexa M. Nicolas[1], Ella T. Sieradzki[2*], Jennifer Pett-Ridge[3, 4], Jillian F. Banfield[2,5,6], Michiko E.

5 Taga[1], Mary K. Firestone[2,6], Steven J. Blazewicz[3*]

6
[1]Plant & Microbial Biology Department, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

[2]Environmental Science, Policy & Management Department, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

[3]Physical and Life Sciences Directorate, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, USA

[4]University of California Merced, Life & Environmental Sciences Department, Merced, CA, USA

[5]Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

[6]Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California, CA, USA

[*]Corresponding author email: blazewicz1@llnl.gov or ella.shir@gmail.com

14
ABSTRACT

Viruses are abundant, ubiquitous members of soil communities that kill microbial cells, but how

they respond to perturbation of soil ecosystems is essentially unknown. Here, we investigated

lineage-specific virus-host dynamics in grassland soil following "wet-up", when resident

microbes are both resuscitated and lysed after a prolonged dry period. Quantitative isotope

tracing, time-resolved metagenomics and viromic analyses indicated that dry soil held a diverse

but low biomass reservoir of virions, of which only a subset thrived following wet-up. Viral

richness decreased by 50% within 24 h post wet-up, while viral biomass increased four-fold

within one week. Counter to recent hypotheses suggesting temperate viruses predominate in

soil, our evidence indicates that wet-up is dominated by viruses in lytic cycles. We estimate that

viruses drive a measurable and continuous rate of cell lysis, with up to 46% of microbial death

driven by viral lysis one week following wet-up. Thus, viruses contribute to turnover of soil

microbial biomass and the widely reported CO_2 efflux following wet-up of seasonally dry soils.

INTRODUCTION

Soil viruses are abundant and ubiquitous – a gram of soil can hold more than 10^9 viral-like particles (VLPs)[1,2] and recent studies illustrate their immense taxonomic diversity and potential functions[3,4]. While metagenomic studies hint at many possible functions for soil viruses[5–7], much remains unknown about their quantitative effect on soil microbiome turnover and ecology, especially in response to a perturbation. In marine systems, viruses are critically important to ecosystem biogeochemistry, killing upwards of ~40% of bacteria daily and redistributing up to 55% of bacterial carbon via the 'viral shunt'[8–10]. This vast impact largely occurs through targeted predation shaping microbial community composition and via expression of viral-encoded metabolisms[8,11–13]. However, in soils, viral-focused 'omic methods (viromics) represent recent developments[14,15] and viral contributions to soil organic matter turnover or microbial mortality have yet to be quantified[16].

Arid and semi-arid soils cover over 40% of the Earth's terrestrial surface and support more than one third of the world's population[17]. Many of these systems experience prolonged periods of water-deficit, after which, the first rainfall, 'wet-up', serves as a pivotal moment which resuscitates soil microbial activity and causes a rapid efflux of mineralized CO_2 (the "Birch Effect"[18]) that contributes disproportionately to annual carbon turnover[19,20]. This CO_2 pulse has been linked to the rapid growth and death of soil microorganisms[19,21,22], but the mechanisms driving these disturbance-induced successional patterns are unclear. Given observed differential mortality for microbial phyla after rewetting (e.g. Actinobacteria and Proteobacteria)[19,23] we hypothesized that soil viruses may be induced by rewetting and act both as a top-down control on microbial community assembly and a proximal driver behind the huge wet-up release of mineralized carbon.

The ecological triggers of lysogenic to lytic transitions is not well understood for temperate soil viruses[24,25], but may be stimulated by stress events or shifts in environmental conditions such as wet-up. Lysogenic viral populations can be maintained in soil bacterial genomes as prophages[24,26]. In culture, these prophages often encode an integrase gene that enables phage recombination into the host chromosome[27,28]; upon certain cues, they may excise from host chromosomes and enter a lytic cycle, ultimately lysing their host cell. Induction of prophages can occur due to population stochasticity, external stresses that cause DNA damage, or through quorum sensing pathways[29,30]. In certain marine systems, temperate phages dominate and lysogenic to lytic transitions have been linked to increased bacterial abundance[31], with more integrase-encoding phages found in locations with higher environmental stresses[32]. Given the unique attributes of the soil environment – extraordinary spatial heterogeneity, lack of mixing, microniches of low nutrient availability[33] – some hypothesize that lysogeny may be a predominant lifestyle of soil phages[2,6,26,30,34,35]. Previous studies have shown that soil moisture modulates soil viral counts, composition, and activity[36,37], and in arid and Mediterranean systems, soil microbes have substantially reduced activity and replication during the summer dry-down[19,21,38,39], possibly favoring lysogeny as a mechanism to persist. Thus, the burst of microbial growth that occurs after soil rewetting may suggest wet-up too serves as an environmental trigger of viruses that had persisted through the summer-dry down as prophages.

Here, we combined time-resolved viromics and quantitative stable isotope probing (qSIP)-informed metagenomics[40,41] to follow dynamics of free viruses, VLPs, and those actively infecting host cells, respectively. We used these data to understand lineage-specific viral-host temporal patterns following rewetting, and how viruses restructure the soil microbiome and contribute to cell death and carbon mineralization. In arid soils, abundant extracellular DNA and dormant cells can mask active microbial populations[42–44], since up to 75% of cells may be

inactive at any given time in soil[45]. However, qSIP allowed us to directly identify active microbes

by tracing a stable isotope (^{18}O via H$_2$^{18}O) into the DNA of microbes and viruses actively

replicating in response to rewetting[23,46,47]. Measuring the subsequent shift in DNA density[48]

allowed us to calculate the growth and mortality rates of host microbes, and quantify viral

contribution to microbial turnover. We also addressed the question of whether rewetting serves

as a major inducer of prophages. This work builds on our previous efforts to link taxon-specific

population dynamics with rainfall-induced carbon fluxes[21,23].

RESULTS

Viral Succession

We established the set of metagenome assembled genomes (MAGs) and viral operational

taxonomic units (vOTUs) to define the soil microbiome following wet-up from 234 metagenomes

over five timepoints and 18 viromes over six timepoints (each in triplicate) generated from

California grassland soil collected at the end of the dry season (see Methods and our paired

study[49]). We combined these newly resolved MAGs with MAGs from a previous study at our

field site which sampled soil during the previous winter[40]. In total, we resolved 542 dereplicated

MAGs: 503 from total soil metagenomes comprised of diverse soil bacteria and archaea; and 39

from small size-fraction metagenomes[50], i.e., viral-enriched metagenomes or viromes which

include genomes from ultrasmall cells such as those of candidate phyla radiation (CPR)

bacteria. This study detected 26,368 dereplicated vOTUs from viromes (26,139) and

metagenomes (229) (Figure 1). We consider vOTUs detected in viromes to be extracellularized

VLPs, which are distinct from vOTUs detected in metagenomes where analysis cannot

differentiate between intracellular and extracellular viral populations (Supplementary Table 1).

Prior to rewetting, our microbial community was dominated by Actinobacteria and

Proteobacteria[49]. Similar to previous work[20,23], Proteobacteria were highly active throughout wet-

up and responded early to rewetting and Actinobacteria were also a top-responding lineage to

wet-up, but showed less overall activity despite their higher abundance (see Sieradzki et al.,

2022[49] for more details on the microbial and functional response to rewetting).

To visualize the spatial and temporal succession of microbial and viral populations, we

calculated ordinations based on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity of relative abundance of MAGs

(Figure 2A left) and vOTUs (Figure 2A right). The first two principal components of MAG

abundances revealed that succession of potential hosts was most pronounced over time

(52.54% variance explained) with a minor spatial component and explained in total over 70% of

the variability. On the contrary, abundances of viruses had a significant spatial component. The

first two principal components of vOTUs represented a smaller variance compared to potential

hosts (35.6%). Overall, viruses showed more spatial heterogeneity than their hosts – most

viruses were only present in a single of three replicate microcosms whereas hosts (MAGs)

showed the reverse trend (Supplementary Figure 1A).

Following rewetting, we found that viral richness significantly decreases, while viral biomass

significantly increases. Early time points showed higher richness of vOTUs, but with lower

abundances per vOTU (Figure 2B, Supplementary Figure 1B). In contrast, later time points, in

particular 168 h, shifted to a less even viral community, with higher relative abundances of fewer

vOTUs. Average vOTU richness, as measured through the number of unique vOTUs per time

point, decreased significantly after 3 h (linear regression – *p value* = 0.02; R^2 = 0.28) (Figure

2B). While the number of vOTUs decreased by nearly 50% one-week post wetting, viral

biomass increased by at least four-fold (Figure 2C). We found viral biomass, as proxied by

measuring total extracted viral DNA through time, significantly increased after a week (linear

regression – *p value* = 2.1 x 10^{-3}; R^2 = 0.46).

To dissect temporal viral succession trends, we focused on the set of vOTUs that were present

in at least three time points within each replicate, i.e., "persistent vOTUs." In previous studies

we observed phylum-specific succession in response to wet-up[20,23,49]. We hypothesized that

persistent vOTUs would reflect host dynamics and show similar temporal response patterns. We

established groups of vOTUs that behaved similarly across wet-up by hierarchical clustering of

relative abundance (Supplementary Figure 2). This clustering demonstrated several broad

patterns of abundance dynamics consistent across replicates: 1) vOTUs present early in wet-up

(0 h, 3 h, 24 h) that then disappear or drastically decrease in abundance i.e. early vOTUs; 2)

vOTUs that appear for the first time at 48h, i.e. late responding vOTUs; 3) vOTUs that are

present across all time points throughout the wet-up, i.e. ubiquitous vOTUs; 4) vOTUs that are

present in dry soil (time 0) and at the end of the wet-up time course (168 h), but are not

detected in all time points in between, i.e. 0 h and 168 h vOTUs. vOTUs that did not fit into

these categories were included in the "other" category (Supplementary Figure 3A). Each of

these defined response categories represented up to 15% of the total virome reads. Overall, we

observed that viral successional patterns responding to wet-up followed field plot-specific trends

(Figure 2, Supplementary Figure 1-3).

We hypothesized that vOTUs would reflect their host responses to rewetting and target

Actinobacteria and *Proteobacteria* as growing bacteria are expected to be targeted by viruses

based on the "kill the winner" hypothesis[51]. While host phylum-level analyses of viruses do not

reflect known viral host ranges (which are thought to be often on a strain level)[1,52], wet-up shows

consistent phylum-level microbial responses and host analyses were limited to coarser

taxonomic predictions (see Discussion). We examined the vOTU putative host composition

within each response group (Supplementary Figure 3B) and found vOTUs infecting

Actinobacteria dominated the groups responding immediately and after 24 hours.

Alphaproteobacteria-infecting vOTUs were the second most numerous vOTUs across nearly all

response groups. Overall, we found that vOTUs of prevalent hosts in our system (*Actinobacteria*

and *Proteobacteria*) appeared as the most prevalent vOTUs in each response category, but we

did not observe viral signatures of host-specific successional dynamics previously detected of

bacteria following wet-up[20,23].

We were curious whether late vOTUs (first detected as VLPs at 48 hours) represented earlier

viral infections. We predicted that these late viruses could be found inside microbial cells or

integrated into host chromosomes and tested this by analyzing whether these vOTUs were

detected in the cellular fraction, i.e. in metagenomes, prior to 48 hours. However, metagenome

reads from time points 0 h and 24 h did not map to late vOTUs in a manner that aligned with this

hypothesis (Supplementary Figure 4).

Active virus-host dynamics illuminated with qSIP

To assess the ecological role of viruses during this highly dynamic moment in the soil

microbiome we focused on the active subset of viruses and their microbial hosts. We defined

activity as incorporating ^{18}O from the $H_2^{18}O$ wet-up (Figure 1) and applied qSIP formulas to

quantitate genome isotopic enrichment (atom percent excess, APE) of DNA[40,41]. We

hypothesized that relating viral and host activity following rewetting may reveal to what extent

soil viruses follow canonical Lotka-Volterra oscillations, i.e., host activity peaks and precedes

peak viral activity (Figure 3A).

Given the prevalence of MAGs and vOTUs with a taxonomy or host-level taxonomy assignment

of *Actinobacteria* and *Proteobacteria*, and the previous high degrees of mortality and growth

following wet-up calculated for these lineage[23], we highlighted analyses comparing vOTUs and

MAGs of these lineages. Specifically, within Proteobacteria we focused on Alpha- and Gamma-

proteobacteria as growth could not be detected for other classes within this phylum in our

experiment. Rather than reflecting Lotka-Volterra predator-prey type dynamics, we observed

distinct lineage-specific predatory-prey dynamics (Figure 3). Active vOTUs predicted to infect

Actinobacteria showed higher activity than their MAG hosts in the first 48 hours, then their

activity decreased while MAG activity increased. This appeared to display a reversed Lotka-

Volterra dynamic[53]. Meanwhile, the activity of vOTUs predicted to infect the *Proteobacteria*

lineages followed the same temporal trend as host activity did, conceptually shown in the

bottom panel of Figure 3A[54].

The number of detected active MAGs and vOTUs follow similar temporal trends for all three

lineages we focused on (Figure 3C). For both *Actinobacteria* and *Proteobacteria*, there were

higher counts of active vOTUs than their hosts at nearly all time points. At 24 hours, for

instance, there were more than twice as many vOTUs as MAGs for all lineages, and for

Actinobacteria in particular, over fifteen times as many vOTUs were detected as isotopically

enriched compared to MAGs. Overall, for both MAGs and vOTUs, we found the greatest

number of newly detected active genomes at 48h. We similarly analyzed other phyla using

these metrics of MAG APE, vOTU APE, number of enriched genomes through time and found

no discernable patterns. Of note, from the 177 total enriched vOTUs detected in metagenomes,

58 were found in VLP viromes, indicating that at least 33% of viruses replicating and

assimilating isotope within host cells were also detected as putative virions within the

experimental timeframe.

Viral lifestyle characterization

To discern the mechanism for how viruses may exist, persist, and control host populations

following wet-up we investigated the lysogenic potential of vOTUs. To test our hypothesis that

wet-up induces temperate viruses we searched for vOTU genomes found in both viromes and

metagenomes that contained bacterial flanking regions in metagenomes to discover and

quantify lysogeny in our system (see Methods). This strategy yielded just two candidates of

vOTUs found both as VLPs in the virome and as putative prophage in metagenome contigs and

only one of these candidates was successfully binned into a MAG, a *Gammaproteobacteria* of

the genus *Pantoea*. The unbinned sequence was predicted to be an *Alphaproteobacteria*,

Rhizobium leguminosarum. We did not further characterize this binned putative prophage – it

was only detected in one plot at two non-consecutive time points (0 and 24h).

Unsuccessful in finding vOTUs appearing as both integrated in MAGs or bacterial sequences

and as VLPs, we examined our system for temperate phage by analyzing the genomic capacity

of vOTUs to integrate, via an integrase gene, into a host chromosome (Figure 4). Of the total

vOTUs detected 17% (4,463) contained an integrase gene and were denoted as putative

prophages. Non-integrase encoding vOTUs represented the majority of total viromes and

appeared responsive to wet-up, whereas integrase-encoding vOTUs decreased in proportion

following wet-up. Further, non-integrase encoding vOTUs were more numerous at all time

points (Figure 4B).

Concerned that vOTU contigs may be partial viral genomes left fragmented during assembly,

we also split the results of integrase-encoding and -lacking viral genomes by vOTUs that

circularize, implying genomic completeness, and vOTUs that are linear, and thus may or may

not be complete. We found that the linear set of vOTUs followed similar trends to circularized

vOTUs, therefore our observed dynamics suggest biological trends rather than artifacts of

incomplete assembly (Supplementary Figure 5).

We hypothesized that if lysogeny was a predominant mechanism of viruses responding to wet-

up then vOTUs appearing after wet-up (0 h) would be enriched in integrase genes, as vOTUs

appearing for the first time following wet-up may be prophages excised from genomes.

However, post-wet-up detected vOTUs were not significantly enriched in integrase genes

compared to vOTUs in dry soil (Chi-square test – *statistic* = 1.6; *p value* = 0.2).

To further support the inference that wet-up does not induce temperate viruses in this system,

we took a MAG-centric approach, and predicted prophages in the context of bacterial genomes

to discern how many (counts), and how prevalent (abundant) prophages are in this system

(Supplementary Figure 6). We analyzed detected prophage per phylum using aggregated

relative abundance of MAGs per time point and the count of total MAGs containing prophages.

Most phyla contained a predicted prophage, but prophage-containing MAGs for each phylum

were fewer and less abundant than MAGs without prophages. We next identified just three

prophages that seemed to be actively replicating based on coverage differences between

prophage sequences and their flanking host genomic regions[55]. One of these prophages

appeared active at all time points in at least two out of the three replicates, and was integrated

into a MAG of *Alphaproteobacteria* genus *Microvirga*. The other two prophages were active only

in a single replicate and in either one or two time points, and were integrated into genomes of

Actinobacteria family *Gaiellaceae* and *Alphaproteobacteria* family *Xanthobacteraceae*,

respectively.

To further investigate viral lifestyle and assess whether VLPs correspond to lysis we looked for

evidence for *Inoviridae*, known to cause chronic infections that do not lyse the host. We

performed an HMM search using the pI-like ATPase protein family HMM, which is conserved in

filamentous inoviruses[56], and found no evidence of *Inoviridae* in our viromes or metagenomes.

Quantifying viral contribution to microbial mortality

We approximated the viral contribution to mortality following wet-up using VLP sequence data

from this work and bacterial mortality estimates from corresponding SIP-density fractionated

amplicon sequencing[49]. We modeled a range of viral burst sizes based on existing literature

from one virus released per cell lysed[2,57] to 200 viruses released per cell lysed[58]. Taken

cumulatively, at 168 hours viral contribution to microbial death ranged from 0.25% (burst size of

200) to 46.6% (burst size of 1) (Figure 5B). At 24 hours we observed the highest per day viral

contribution to microbial mortality 0.02% (burst size of 200) to 17.4% (burst size of 1).

DISCUSSION

Soil is a highly complex microbial habitat and home to tens of millions of microbial

populations[59,60], where biotic and abiotic factors shape microbial community structure[61–63].

Moments of acute pressure on a community, such as rapid environmental changes or fluxes in

resource availability, drive successional trajectories that result in altered community structures;

the first rainfall following the dry season, wet-up, is such a moment[19,23,38,64,65]. However, the

ecology, lifestyle, and impact of viruses in the soil microbiome during dynamic moments

remains unknown. To address this gap in knowledge, we applied viromics and SIP targeted

metagenomics to: 1) assess viral biomass and richness following rewetting and posited that dry

soil may serve as a seedbank of virions for the growing season; 2) analyze dynamics of active

viruses and found lineage-specific host trends where viruses may follow host populations or

control them; 3) investigate viral life cycle and observed minimal evidence for lysogeny

suggesting a lytic lifestyle is predominant following wet-up; 4) estimate viral contribution to

microbial mortality discovering viral contribution steadily increases following rewetting.

In response to rewetting, we observed a large decline in viral richness, and by extension

diversity, in the first 24 hours, which was inversely related to an increase in viral biomass

(Figure 5A). This pattern was consistent across all soil replicates making it detectable despite

the high degree of inter-sample heterogeneity (Figure 2A, Supplementary Figure 1). We

observed viral populations may degrade or thrive following rewetting, but after one week post

perturbation viral composition across plots did not become more similar. Rather, the virions

present at the end of the dry season determined the trajectory of the plot-specific viral

composition. At this timescale and sampling, wet-up is not a perturbation at which we observed

a convergence of viral populations across space despite relative host uniformity at the same

sampling (Figure 2). These results imply that dry soil may be a reservoir, or seedbank, of

diverse viruses, a subset of which becomes dynamic following rewetting (Figure 2,

Supplementary Figure 1B).

Intriguingly, analysis of the total viral pool responding to wet-up revealed patterns of succession,

but viral succession did not appear to be correspondent with known host responses previously

reported and observed in our corresponding study (Supplementary Figure 2-3)[20,23,49]. However,

focusing on the active subset of microbial and viral populations (Figure 3), we found taxon-

specific trends in viral-host dynamics wherein viruses may follow their microbial hosts or,

perhaps, control host populations. Studies from marine systems have shown that viruses may

follow their hosts' dynamics[54] and that high local diversity of viruses may be drawn from a

seedbank of nearby viruses[8]. As suggested in Chow et al.[54], our isotope targeted results

indicate that viruses putatively infecting *Alphaproteobacteria* follow their host dynamics, as

opposed to viruses directly controlling host activity or abundances. On the other hand,

Actinobacteria-infecting viruses appear to show a reversed Lotka-Volterra relationship which is

suggestive of coevolution driven dynamics[53]. Broadly, the total responding pool of putative

virions does not necessarily match the total microbial response to rewetting, therefore it is

important to focus on the active subset of vOTUs and MAGs to appreciate host-virus dynamics

in this soil system. Our study provides a first glimpse into fine spatiotemporal viral dynamics in

soil and enabled us to categorize distinct viral responses to rewetting.

Critical to understanding how viruses respond to wet-up and impact the soil microbiome is an

analysis of the mechanism of viral life and survival in soil. An emerging idea in soil viral ecology

suggests that lysogens, or temperate viruses, are prevalent in soil microbes, and further, that

lysogeny is a favorable lifestyle for viruses both to remain linked to a host and to weather

conditions difficult for growth, i.e., dry soil[1,2,5,6,29,35,60,66,67]. We tested this hypothesis looking

specifically at wet-up as an environmental perturbation that could induce prophage and found

no evidence to support this hypothesis.

Rather, our data suggests that vOTUs which cannot recombine into a host chromosome through

an integrase dominate this system. We found no clear evidence showing wet-up significantly

induces prophages. The viruses that do increase in abundance following the first 24 hours are

predominantly non-integrase encoding. We hypothesized that late-responding vOTUs may also

provide a window into viral life strategies (Supplementary Figure 3A) – that examining virome

late-responders in metagenomes would reveal these viruses were cell-associated prior to

appearance as VLPs. As late-responding viruses did not appear in metagenomes at earlier time

points at higher abundances than in later time points (Supplementary Figure 4); temperate

viruses did not predominate as responding viruses to wet-up; and prevalent MAGs did not

maintain detectable or active prophages (Supplementary Figure 6) we conclude that neither

lysogeny as a lifestyle nor temperate phages in general dominate during wet-up in this soil

system.

Whether all detected VLPs in our system originate from cell lysis events remains unclear. While

we did not find evidence of *Inoviridae* – viruses that can replicate and release virions without

lysing their hosts through a chronic infection[56], other non-lytic lifestyles may be possible.

Further, while neither the capacity to integrate into a host chromosome nor persistence as a

prophage is prevalent in our wet-up study, we were not able to rule out other mechanisms of

viral maintenance in a host cell when a virus is not lytically programmed, e.g.,

pseudolysogeny[68]. Perhaps evidencing the prevalence of pseudolysogeny or some other cell-

associated state of soil viruses, the majority (67%) of viral populations detected as active were

only found in metagenomes (direct DNA extraction from soil) rather than viromes. For a virus to

be detected as enriched it must be infecting host cells to replicate, thus assimilating the ^{18}O

isotope. Most of these active viruses may not be detected in the viromes (i.e., as putative

virions) because of their host-associated state. Importantly, the low fraction of persistent vOTUs

(Supplementary Figure 2-3) compared to total vOTUs suggests virome-detected viruses may

indeed derive from recent host infections.

Microbial death is critical to the flow of nutrients through biomes[60]. A significant feature of soil

wet-up is high rates of microbial mortality[19,21,23]. Our previous work demonstrated rapid bacterial

mortality following wet-up, with 25% of bacteria degrading in the first 3 hours and continued

mortality observed through 72 hours[21]. We hypothesized that the initial burst of mortality in the

first 3 hours was driven by osmotic lysis due to the rapid change in osmotic pressure, while

mortality after 3 hours was driven by viruses or other biological factors[19]. Others have also

speculated that viruses play a role in observed mortality following rewetting[69]. We found that

viruses play a minor role in mortality in the first 3 hours, when osmotic lysis is likely the

dominant mechanism of lysis, and the contribution to mortality by viruses increases through

time, more than doubling after the first 24 hours (Figure 5B). We estimate that viruses can drive

a sizeable portion of microbial mortality in soil – by 168 hours viral-mediated mortality may

contribute 0.23 % to 46.6 % of total microbial death dependent on burst size estimated. While

our evidence suggests viruses play an important role in microbial mortality following wet-up, we

infer that this influence is minimized as wet-up led to a rapid decline of viral particles in the first

24 hours (Figure 2B-C). If viral biomass continues to increase following 168 hours post wet-up,

we posit that the viral contribution to microbial mortality may be higher. Our estimate of viral

driven mortality in the soil microbiome aligns with estimates from marine systems ranging from

undetectable to majority of mortality is viral or the more commonly cited estimate via microscopy

of 20 - 40 % of bacteria daily lysed by viruses[10,70,71]. There may also be other circumstances in

the soil microbiome where viruses play a larger role in mediating microbial death, perhaps in the

rhizosphere, where turnover of cells is faster[72,73]. Further studies are required to improve our

calculations by constraining the average genome length of soil viruses, range of viral burst sizes

in soil, and how long VLPs persist in soil to understand whether virions represent recent

infections or whether these calculations require techniques that capture an active fraction of

viruses. Moreover, viral predation has impacts beyond contribution to mortality broadly. Even

low viral turnover rates of key lineages may profoundly impact strain selection and functional

potential of soil microbiomes.

Our data show spatial heterogeneity is an important feature in understanding the response of

viruses to rewetting. While a rapid decline in viral diversity, increase in viral biomass, and

successional patterns emerged as trends across the studied soil plots, the majority (59%) of

viruses appeared in fewer than three of our total 18 viromes and most do not appear in all

biological replicates (Supplementary Figure 1). The patchiness of viruses across plots precluded

tracking subsets of viruses through space and time to find statistically meaningful trends. The

heterogeneity of soil viruses suggests that infection may not be as uniform across space as

potential hosts are. Perhaps, this is the effect of rewetting: virions persisting in soil, may be

decoupled from their hosts, and the addition of water may exacerbate the hurdle of host-viral

physical interactions as previous research has predicted increased water potential is associated

with lower rates of direct cell-cell contact in soil[74]. On the other hand, wet-up may serve to

increase connectivity between soil microsites and relieve dispersal limitations of viruses,

promoting host encounters. As research has shown, water may constrain microbial or viral

dispersal[75,76]. Our observed increase of viral biomass following wet-up suggests water would

support physical interactions between viruses and their hosts.

The viral heterogeneity observed throughout our field site[77] also raises questions about our own

assumptions in the design of this experiment: that the field plot layout, informed by bacterial

biogeography would enable similar trends for viruses. Rather, our fine time-resolved study and

concurrent work studying heterogeneity on a field scale at longer time intervals[77] have

compelled us to question what scale of sampling for viruses represents biological replicates.

Our results suggest that future studies should consider the distinct scales of microbial and viral

populations in soil to have a holistic understanding of microbial communities[66].

Given the higher spatial homogeneity in microbial distribution and response to rewetting

compared to viral distribution (majority of MAGs appear in all samples, Supplementary Figure

1), it is tempting to hypothesize that this indicates microbes in soil are widely susceptible to

infection by many distinct viral populations. However, the lack of specific host-virus linkages in

our system prevented investigation of viral host breadth.

Linking individual viruses to their specific host genomes remains a challenge in ecovirology.

Using mixed methods and multiple databases we were able to determine at least a domain or

phylum-level taxonomy for 93% of vOTUs. We found few CRISPR spacer matches[78] and were

only able to directly link vOTUs to specific MAGs with high confidence in a few instances. Thus,

current limitations in informatics precluded us from directly implicating viruses as preying on

specific MAGs and track predator-prey dynamics on a strain level. Our phylum-level viral-host

predictions revealed that the most numerous and prevalent viruses in our system infected

Actinobacteria and *Proteobacteria*, which reflected the microbial community – the most common

viruses infected the most common hosts – implying that viruses may serve an important

regulatory role in soil microbial communities. Further, we were able to observe lineage-specific

viral-host dynamics on the phylum level which demonstrated that there is not a single mode of

viral impact on hosts. Instead, in a complex system, we found multiple models of virus-host

dynamics. Taken together, these observations suggest viruses exhibit lineage-specific impacts

on host populations and thus viruses serve an important role in structuring the soil microbiome.

In this work, we probed the wet-up of a seasonally dry soil to understand the role of viruses in

microbiome assembly. We found that dry soil is a low biomass yet highly rich seedbank of

unique virions, and that resuscitation of the microbiome yields a bloom in biomass of a subset of

viruses. Succession of the total pool of viruses is driven by spatial heterogeneity. We observed

that, on a phylum level, active viral populations show distinct models of impact on hosts.

Further, contrary to the emerging paradigm, our data show that lysogeny is not prevalent in our

system, underscoring that the reservoir of soil viruses may rely on other forms of host

interactions or on virions rather than as inserts in microbial genomes. Our combined use of

viromics, metagenomics, and isotope tracing facilitated estimation of the viral contribution to

microbial mortality following rewetting. While our conservative calculations indicate viruses may

not be the primary mechanism of observed mortality, viruses appear to play an important and

dynamic role in the microbial response following wet-up.

METHODS

Field sample collection

Topsoil samples (0-15 cm, roughly 0.5 m^3) from replicate field plots were collected from the

Hopland Research and Extension Center (HREC) in Northern California, which is unceded land

of the Shóqowa and Hopland People, on August 28th, 2018 after experiencing mean annual

precipitation during the rainy season, see our paired study Sieradzki et al. 2022[49] for full details.

During the growing season the same field plots were covered by mixed grassland flora with

Avena sp. (wild oat) as the most abundant plant. Soil was collected before the first rainfall event

of the season and average gravimetric soil moisture was 3%. The dry soil was transferred to

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) where it was homogenized and sieved (2mm)

to remove large rocks and roots.

Wet-up experiment

Stable isotope probing (SIP) is a method for tracking the incorporation of an isotope into the

DNA of replicating organisms via ultracentrifugation (Beckman-Coultier (Indianapolis, IN, USA)

VTi 65.2 rotor at 44,100 rpm for 109 h at 20ºC) of the DNA in a density gradient. DNA

equilibrates in the gradient according to its GC content and isotopic enrichment. The gradient is

then divided into density fractions each of which is analyzed for density (handheld AR200 digital

refractometer), amount of DNA (PicoGreen assay (Life Technologies)) and community

composition (in this case shotgun metagenomics). 5 g sieved soil from each of 3 field replicates

was weighed into separate 15 mL Nalgene flat bottom vials. Soil was wetted to 22% average

gravimetric soil moisture with either H$_2$^{18}O (98 atom% ^{18}O) or H$_2$^{16}O (natural abundance SIP)

controls) (Figure 1), after which the vials were sealed inside 500 mL mason jars and incubated

at room temperature in the dark. Three incubation treatments were established, each in

triplicate: 1) H$_2$^{16}O amended (used for DNA extraction, unfractionated DNA shotgun sequencing

and as a fractionated DNA control for qSIP); 2) watered with H$_2$^{18}O for DNA extraction, density

centrifugation, and shotgun sequencing (isotopically-labeled fractionated DNA for qSIP); 3)

watered with H$_2$^{16}O for viral-like particle (VLP) suspension, concentration, DNAse treatment

followed by DNA extraction and shotgun sequencing to generate viromes (unfractionated DNA

for viromics). Parallel jars were destructively harvested at 0, 3, 24, 48, 72, and 168 hours

following the water addition; at each harvest, soil vials were frozen in liquid nitrogen and then

stored at -80 °C.

Viral metagenomes ("viromes")

Soil viromes were generated as described in Nicolas et al. 2021[50] to assess viruses detected as

VLPs i.e. extracellularized. Briefly, two 5-gram soil microcosms from each of three field

replicates watered with $H_2^{16}O$ were combined for 10 g soil virome extractions. Soil was buffered

with a potassium citrate solution and the effluent was passed through a 0.2-µm filter,

concentrated, and treated with DNase to remove extracellular DNA. Prior to DNA extraction

using a phenol:chloroform strategy, we used an iron flocculation step to concentrate 0.2-µm

filtered and concentrated samples as described in Nicolas et al. 2021[50]. DNA was sequenced on

an Illumina Novaseq (2x150 cycles) (UC Davis). Sequencing was performed to attain an

average 40 Gb per sample. Illumina adapters and phiX were removed from resulting sequences

using BBTools (https://jgi.doe.gov/data-and-tools/bbtools/) and then quality trimmed using

Sickle[79]. Sequences were assembled with MEGAHIT version 1.2.9[80]; we co-assembled all

biological replicates per time point using default parameters. Open reading frames (ORF) were

predicted for each contig using Prodigal[81] and were annotated using sequence similarity

searches with USEARCH[82] to KEGG[83], uniref[84], and uniport[85].

Metagenome assembled genomes (MAGs) from viromes

To generate microbial bins from the size-fractionated metagenomes, i.e. viromes, we used

multiple binning methods. Contigs were binned using Maxbin[86], MetaBAT[87], Concoct[88], and

manually based on coverage, GC content, and taxonomy using in house tools on ggkbase

(https://ggkbase.berkeley.edu). DASTool[89] was used to predict best bins and bins were further

manually curated on ggKbase to remove highly divergent sequences based on coverage, GC,

and taxonomy. MAGs from viromes were clustered and dereplicated alongside MAGs from

metagenomes (discussed below) using dRep[90] requiring at least 75% completeness and no

more than 10% contamination, yielding 39 genomes from candidate phyla radiation bacteria and

archaea.

Viral prediction and generation of viral operational taxonomic unit (vOTU) set

To establish a set of viral genomes from our metagenomic efforts we used multiple methods of

prediction and dereplicated vOTUs across samples. Viruses were predicted from metagenome

and virome contigs. Viruses were predicted using: virsorter1[91] (all categories), virsorter2[92]

(dsDNA and ssDNA only), VIBRANT[93], deepvirfinder[94] (score ≥ 0.9; pvalue ≤ 0.05), and

seeker[95]. From the set of virome and metagenome contigs explored 3,979,792 were predicted

to be viral. Of these, 777,725 contigs were designated viral by more than one tool, and 32,660

of this subset were either circularized contigs by VRCA[96] (i.e. implied to be a complete

genome), or ≥ 10,000 base pairs long. This set of size-filtered, circularized, repeatedly predicted

viruses was dereplicated using mmseqs (95% ANI, 85% breadth required of sequences) to

26,368 viral operational taxonomic units (vOTUs). All vOTUs were annotated using DRAM-v[97],

and specifically searched for integrase genes.

DNA density fractionation

DNA was extracted from three biological replicates at each time point using a modified phenol-

chloroform protocol adapted from Barnard et al. (2015)[98] as described in[49]. For density gradient

SIP processing, 5 µg of DNA in 150 µL 1xTE was mixed with 1.00 mL gradient buffer, and 4.60

mL CsCl stock (1.885 g mL^{-1}) with a final average density of 1.730 g mL^{-1} as described in

Sieradzki et al (68).The fractions for each sample were binned into 5 groups based on density

(1.6400-1.7039 g/ml, 1.7040-1.7169 g/ml, 1.7170-1.7299 g/ml, 1.7300-1.7449 g/ml, 1.450-

1.7800 g/ml), and fractions within a binned group were combined and sequenced.

Unfractionated DNA (100 ng) from each soil sample was also saved for shotgun sequencing.

All sequencing was performed on an Illumina Novaseq 2x150 cycles. Pre-aliquoted

unfractionated DNA from each sample was sequenced to an average of 20 Gb per sample, and

DNA from each binned group of density fractions was sequenced to an average of 10 Gb per

binned group, yielding a total of 227 metagenomes. Illumina adapters and phiX were removed

using BBTools and reads were quality trimmed using Sickle using default parameters.

Metagenome assembly, annotation, and binning

To establish MAGs from metagenomes we approached assembly in two ways: 1) co-assembly

of unfractionated triplicates for each time point 2) co-assembly of the 5 density fractions from

each time point and each replicate. We used MEGAHIT version 1.2.9 for assemblies[80] with

preset large-meta and disconnect ratio 0.33[49]. Metawrap version 1.3.2[99] was used to map reads

from unfractionated metagenomes to contigs from each assembly, bin each assembly with

MetaBAT2[87] and Maxbin2[86] and refine bins. Genomic bins from all samples as well as bins from

soil metagenomes collected at the same site in the preceding winter[40] were then dereplicated at

95% average nucleotide identity (ANI) using dRep version 3.0.1[90] to create a final collection of

high quality 503 metagenome assembled genomes (MAGs) that were on average 87%

complete and 5% redundant. Taxonomy was assigned to bins using GTDB-tk version 1.5.1[100].

To calculate abundance measurements for MAGs, reads from unfractionated samples were

mapped back to the MAG collection using bbmap with minid=0.98 (https://jgi.doe.gov/data-and-

tools/bbtools/). Mapping statistics were then used to calculate coverage at reads per kilobase

million (RPKM), mapped read counts and breadth of coverage using CoverM

(https://github.com/wwood/CoverM), and were normalized to sequencing depth.

Calculating relative abundances of the vOTU collection

To quantify abundance of vOTUs in viromes and metagenomes and to assess activity via qSIP

we mapped reads from these sequencing efforts to our vOTUs. All reads from viromes,

metagenomes, and SIP-fractionated metagenomes were mapped to the set of vOTUs using

bbwrap.sh at 98% minimum identity. Samtools[101] sort and index functions were applied to

resulting bam files. We used CoverM to calculate breadth and read count per vOTU per sample.

Read counts were divided by total reads per sample to calculate relative abundance. For virome

relative abundance we considered vOTUs present in a sample if they had at least 80% breadth

covered (fraction of genome covered by reads). For use with the qSIP pipeline, we found that

few vOTUs had reads that mapped stringently (98% identity) and in all three replicates of

multiple density fractions in both ^{18}O and ^{16}O conditions and therefore chose a lower breadth

cutoff, 50%, for detection of vOTUs in SIP fractions (described below).

Ordination plots

To understand compositional differences through time responding to rewetting we constructed

ordination plots. For MAGs we constructed a matrix of metagenome relative abundance per

sample per genome. Similarly for vOTUs, we generated a matrix of relative abundance per

sample per genome, using vOTU relative abundance as calculated from our virome samples.

We used the python scikit package[102] to calculate Bray-Curtis dissimilarity and to perform

principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) to visualize the dissimilarity between samples.

Virus-host linkage and assigning viruses a host taxonomy

To link vOTUs to potential host microbial MAGs, we used multiple approaches, starting with

CRISPR spacer searches. We predicted CRISPR arrays using minced

(https://github.com/ctSkennerton/minced)[103] in the original set of MAGs (not dereplicated) from

this study, in MAGs from another qSIP study conducted in a soil from our field site[40], and in our

viromes. 84 MAGs and 32 vOTUs contained CRISPR arrays with at least 1 spacer. We aligned

the MAG spacers against the vOTUs using BLASTn[104], and vice versa, and screened for hits

with no more than one mismatch and no gaps between the full spacer and the vOTU. By these

criteria, only one vOTU spacer matched a MAG in our dataset. This vOTU appeared in two of

three plots and in two time points for each plot. In contrast, 25 MAG spacers from 6 MAGs

matched 19 vOTUs. From these linkages we assigned host taxonomies to vOTUs using the

associated MAGs GTDB taxonomy[100].

To assign host taxonomy to additional vOTUs we combined these CRISPR spacer searches in

MAGs, with a broader set of CRISPR spacer matches, and contig taxonomy predictions. In

addition to MAG and vOTU spacers, we also predicted spacers in unbinned metagenome

contigs using minced and established contig taxonomy for these unbinned contigs using

Kaiju[105]. We used the same BLAST parameters to match these unbinned CRISPR array

spacers to our dereplicated vOTU set. Next, we queried the comprehensive spacer database

generated in Shmakov et al. 2017[106] against our vOTU sequences using the same BLAST

parameters. Each spacer from this database[106] included an NCBI taxonomy that was assigned

to matching vOTU protospacers as the host taxonomy.

We also used vOTU sequences to inform host taxonomy. Previously, Al-Shayeb et al. 2020 and

others assigned host phyla to phages based on whether ORF annotations in phages were

predominantly of one phylum[107]. Here, we used Kaiju on vOTUs to assess taxonomy. Most

vOTUs were assigned to microbial taxonomies that presumably reflect shared host-virus

genome/gene content. We used this microbial taxonomic assignment to set a putative host. For

vOTUs predicted to have viral taxonomies we captured host lineages using the Virus-Host

Database[108].

Lastly, we created a database of all vOTUs, their host predictions, and the source of each host

prediction – CRISPR spacer-based taxonomy from GTDB for MAGs, unbinned spacers with

Kaiju taxonomic predictions, NCBI taxonomies from spacers matched from the spacer database

used, or Kaiju taxonomy predictions per vOTU. We used this database to determine the

consensus taxonomy between these sources closest to a species level by searching for the

greatest common denominator level of taxonomy. This allowed us to find putative hosts for

93.1% of total vOTUs at the domain level, and 92.8% at the phylum level. We also attempted

link specific MAGs and vOTUs using a network-based analysis modelling canonical predator-

prey dynamics, but were unsuccessful in ground truthing these linkages and thus did not include

these host matches.

Examination of evidence for viral induction

The following methods largely describe negative results, however we chose to disclose these

methods to provide information for method developments for the benefit of the scientific

community. To quantify viruses in our system that were present both as prophages in MAGs

and as VLPs in the virome we mapped virome reads to metagenomes and looked for alignment

between metagenome sequences and vOTUs. Specifically, we mapped all virome reads to

metagenome assembled sequences at 90% average nucleotide identity. We used coverM

(https://github.com/wwood/CoverM) to generate breadth and coverage calculations for mapped

reads and identify metagenome contigs that had virome reads mapping with at least 1000 bp

covered by reads, but not mapping with 100% breadth. We believed this implied that reads

mapped to a potential lysogenic viral genome embedded in the host genome. Using BLASTn

[104], we aligned the set of metagenome contigs that met these criteria against our vOTUs with a

minimum E-value of 10^{-100}. We subsetted the resulting matches to vOTUs that matched a

metagenome contig with greater than 90% nucleotide identity, aligned with a metagenome

sequence that had more than 10 Kbp of flanking region around the alignment, and an aligned

section of at least 10 Kbp. This resulted in 11 vOTUs representing candidate lysogenic viruses.

Using ggKbase (https://ggkbase.berkeley.edu/), we manually analyzed each of these vOTUs

and their corresponding metagenome contigs for aligned and unaligned regions consistent with

phage (enriched for hypothetical genes, viral structural genes, integrase genes). This resulted in

two sequences that appeared to be lysogenic: found both as vOTUs in viromes and in

metagenomes in the context of bacterial sequences.

Assessment of prophages in MAGs

Prophages were identified from our set of MAGs by virSorter version 1 categories 4 and 5[91], or

by VIBRANT[93]. Active prophages, i.e. prophages assessed as replicating more than their

flanking host genome, were identified by running PropagAtE[55] with metagenome read mapping

files to MAGs previously generated. PropagAtE relies on differential coverage between

prophage and flanking host regions.

Viral response categories

To establish viral response patterns through time, we constrained the set of vOTUs to 6,840

vOTUs present in a specific field plot for three or more time points; we refer to these as

"persistent vOTUs." We generated hierarchically clustered heatmaps (cluster maps) per field

plot in seaborn[109] using relative abundances per time point for each vOTU. With cluster map

observations and k-means clustering, we established 5 response categories based on vOTUs

presence or absence in given time points: 1) 'early vOTUs' present at 0 h, 3 h, and 24 h post

wet-up; 2) 'late responding vOTUs' present at 48 h, 72 h, and 168 h post wet-up; 3) 'ubiquitous

vOTUs' present in all time points; 4) 'vOTUs present at 0 h and 168 h' and one other time point;

5) 'other' vOTUs that did not fall into these categories. We summed vOTU relative abundances

across these categories for each time point per plot. We used the seaborn relplot function[109] to

visualize response categories through time per plot. To measure the host signal by response

category, we summed the unique vOTUs of a given bacterial putative host phylum or domain

per category. We visualized host abundances per response category by overlaying seaborn

swarmplots on boxplots where each point corresponds to a field plot.

Construction of integrase-containing vOTUs relative abundance and richness barplot

We used the seaborn relplot function[109] to construct graphs of vOTUs that did (4,463 unique

vOTUs) or did not contain integrase genes. We plotted the set of vOTUs split into these two

categories and by circular versus linear, by their aggregated relative abundance through time

and by vOTU richness per category through time.

Quantitative stable isotope probing

Atom percent excess (APE) isotopic enrichment values were calculated using quantitative

stable isotope probing (qSIP)[40,46,49] by normalizing MAG and vOTU relative abundance to the

quantity of DNA per density fraction[40]. Both bacterial and viral genomes were required to be

detected in all three replicates of each labeled ^{18}O treatment and in three replicates of unlabeled

(^{16}O) treatments for the bootstrapped median atom percent excess (APE) to be calculated per

genome. From the qSIP output we removed genomes with an APE median confidence interval

lower than 0 (i.e., not statistically significant). We plotted the average median APE MAG and

vOTU values through time for our most prevalent vOTU and host phyla – Actinobacteria,

Alphaproteobacteria, and Gammaproteobacteria – using seaborn line relplots. We enumerated

the number of detected enriched vOTU and MAG genomes and plotted these counts per

phylum through time.

Viral contribution to microbial mortality

We modeled the viral contribution to microbial mortality using a range of potential burst sizes

(virions per infected cell) to relate the number of approximated infectious viral particles through

time to observed microbial cell death counts. Counts of microbial cell mortality were derived

from our qSIP analysis of corresponding amplicon sequence data[49]. We used the median rate of

16S rRNA copies lost per gram soil per day and converted this rate to per gram soil by

multiplying by the number of days. To convert 16S rRNA copies to cells lost, we used a

conservative assumption of six rRNA copies per microbial cell[21,110]. The approximate loss of

microbial cells per gram of soil was used to represent the total observed microbial mortality. To

calculate the contribution of viruses to observed mortality, we estimated the number of total

virions per time point, using the mean aggregated relative abundance across plots (total reads

mapped to our vOTU dataset). We used the fraction of viral reads to estimate viral DNA of total

extracted DNA per time point per plot. With our estimate of viral DNA and a calculated mean

genome length in our vOTU dataset of 2.1254×10^4 bp, we used equation 1 (previously used to

estimate plasmid copy numbers from DNA) to calculate virions per time point:

689   (1)

690
$$\text{Virions} = \frac{X\,\text{ng} \times 6.0221 \times 10^{23}\,\frac{\text{molecules}}{\text{mole}}}{N \times 660\,\frac{\text{g}}{\text{mole}} \times 1 \times 10^9\,\frac{\text{ng}}{\text{g}}}$$

691                $X = Calculated\ viral\ DNA$

692                $N = Average\ calculated\ genome\ length\ (bp)$

As an average viral burst size in soils is unknown, we converted number of virions to cells lysed

by using a range of viral burst sizes from one virus released per cell[2,57] to 1000[58]. Virions scaled

to cells dead by the burst size range served as a numerator for viral contribution to microbial

mortality calculated with equation 2. We next captured cumulative viral contribution to microbial

mortality through time by taking the cumulative sum of all previous time points for each time

point.

701   (2)

$$Viral\ contribution\ to\ microbial\ mortality = \frac{Virions\ \times\ burst\ size}{\frac{degraded\ rRNA\ copies}{6}\ \times\ Days}$$

Our calculations made the following assumptions: 1) All virions detected lyse their host. 2)

Virions calculated for each time point represent new infections rather than virions persisting

through time i.e., virions were released from newly lysed cells. 3) Our VLP-virome extraction

protocol efficiently extracted 100% of soil viruses, i.e., viruses detected represent all possible

soil viruses. 4) The mean vOTU genome length represented an accurate approximation of soil

viral lengths irrespective of short read metagenomics and potential assembly fragmentation. Our

data supported the second assumption given that only a minority of vOTUs appeared in multiple

time points (Supplementary Figure 1). Further, we performed a sensitivity analysis of the impact

of genome length on our calculation and found a statistically significant relationship between

genome length and percent viral contribution to mortality (linear regression on log transformed

data, slope: -1.00, intercept: 7.80, r-value: -0.73, p-value: 6.63 x 10^{-07}) – changing viral genome

length by an order of magnitude led to an order of magnitude decrease in the percent

contribution to mortality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Biological and

Environmental Research (BER), Genomic Science Program Lawrence Livermore National

Laboratory (LLNL) 'Microbes Persist' Soil Microbiome Scientific Focus Area SCW1632, and a

subaward to UC Berkeley. Field plots and precipitation management were initially generated via

DOE BER awards DE-SC0020163 and DE-SC0016247 (to MKF) and awards SCW1589, and

SCW1421 (to JPR). Work at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory was conducted under the

auspices of the U.S. DOE under contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. We acknowledge funding

support to J.F.B. from the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub and the Innovative Genomics Institute at UC

Berkeley.

We would like to thank Rachel Hestrin and Alexander Jaffe for helpful conversations regarding

data analysis and visualization, and interpretations of isotopic data. We thank Katerina Estera-

Molina for her expertise and management of the Firestone Lab field work site at the Hopland

Research and Extension Center (HREC). Members of the Taga and Firestone labs provided

helpful commentary and criticisms of this work. In particular, Mengting Maggie Yuan engaged in

important conversations on statistical analyses. Rohan Sachdeva and Shufei Lei of the Banfield

lab equipped this project with the necessary computational power and data management via the

biotite server and ggKbase, respectively. Support staff at LLNL enabled the large-scale wet-up

microcosm experiment and sample extractions, particularly Xiao Bin Max Li and Marissa Lafler.

We acknowledge that HREC sits on traditional, unceded land of the Pomo Indians. Research

conducted at the University of California, Berkeley took place on the territory of xučyun

(Huichin), the ancestral and unceded land of the Chochenyo-speaking Ohlone people, the

successors of the sovereign Verona Band of Alameda County. This land was and continues to

be of great importance to the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe and other familial descendants of the

Verona Band.

J.F.B. is a founder of Metagenomi. The other authors declare no competing interests.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Raw data used in this publication is available on the NCBI short read archive under project submission number SUB11697222. Viral genome sequences i.e., vOTUs are available on ggkbase.berkeley.edu/project_groups/Hopland_4th_wedge. No custom tools were used to analyze the data.

REFERENCES

Williamson KE, Fuhrmann JJ, Wommack KE, Radosevich M. Viruses in Soil Ecosystems: An Unknown Quantity Within an Unexplored Territory. *Annual Review of Virology* 2017; 4: 201–219.

Kuzyakov Y, Mason-Jones K. Viruses in soil: Nano-scale undead drivers of microbial life, biogeochemical turnover and ecosystem functions. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 2018; 127: 305–317.

Emerson JB, Roux S, Brum JR, Bolduc B, Woodcroft BJ, Jang H Bin *et al.* Host-linked soil viral ecology along a permafrost thaw gradient. Nature Microbiology. 2018; 3: 870–880.

Paez-Espino D, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Pavlopoulos GA, Thomas AD, Huntemann M, Mikhailova N *et al.* Uncovering Earth's virome. *Nature* 2016. doi:10.1038/nature19094.

Pratama AA, van Elsas JD. The 'Neglected' Soil Virome – Potential Role and Impact. *Trends in Microbiology* 2018; 26: 649–662.

Emerson JB. Soil Viruses: A New Hope. *mSystems* 2019; 4: e00120-19.

Albright MBN, Gallegos-Graves LV, Feeser KL, Montoya K, Emerson JB, Shakya M *et al.* Experimental evidence for the impact of soil viruses on carbon cycling during surface plant litter decomposition. *ISME Communications* 2022; 2: 24.

Brum JR, Ignacio-Espinoza JC, Roux S, Doulcier G, Acinas SG, Alberti A *et al.* Patterns and ecological drivers of ocean viral communities. *Science* 2015; 348: 1261498.

777   9   Wilhelm SW, Suttle CA. Viruses and Nutrient Cycles in the Sea. *BioScience* 1999; 49:

778   781–788.

779   10   Suttle CA. Viruses in the sea. Nature. 2005; 437: 356–361.

780   11   Roux S, Brum JR, Dutilh BE, Sunagawa S, Duhaime MB, Loy A *et al.* Ecogenomics and

781   potential biogeochemical impacts of globally abundant ocean viruses. *Nature* 2016; 537:

782   689–693.

783   12   Weitz JS, Stock CA, Wilhelm SW, Bourouiba L, Coleman ML, Buchan A *et al.* A

784   multitrophic model to quantify the effects of marine viruses on microbial food webs and

785   ecosystem processes. *The ISME journal* 2015; 9: 1352–64.

786   13   Hurwitz BL, Hallam SJ, Sullivan MB. Metabolic reprogramming by viruses in the sunlit

787   and dark ocean. *Genome Biology* 2013; 14: R123.

788   14   Trubl G, Solonenko N, Chittick L, Solonenko SA, Rich VI, Sullivan MB. Optimization of

789   viral resuspension methods for carbon-rich soils along a permafrost thaw gradient. *PeerJ*

790   2016; 4: e1999.

791   15   Han L-L, Yu D-T, Zhang L-M, Shen J-P, He J-Z. Genetic and functional diversity of

792   ubiquitous DNA viruses in selected Chinese agricultural soils. *Scientific reports* 2017; 7:

793   45142.

794   16   Ackermann H-W. Sad State of Phage Electron Microscopy. Please Shoot the Messenger.

795   *Microorganisms* 2013; 2: 1–10.

796   17   Mortimore M. *Dryland Opportunities: A new paradigm for people, ecosystems and*

797   *development*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, IIED, London, UK and UNDP, New York, USA:

798   Nairobi, Kenya, 2009https://iied.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/migrate/G02572.pdf.

799   18   Birch HF. The effect of soil drying on humus decomposition and nitrogen availability.

800   *Plant and Soil* 1958; 10: 9–31.

801   19   Barnard RL, Blazewicz SJ, Firestone MK. Rewetting of soil: Revisiting the origin of soil

802   CO_2 emissions. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 2020; 147: 107819.

20 Placella SA, Brodie EL, Firestone MK. Rainfall-induced carbon dioxide pulses result from

sequential resuscitation of phylogenetically clustered microbial groups. *Proceedings of*

the National Academy of Sciences 2012; 109: 10931–10936.

21 Blazewicz SJ, Schwartz E, Firestone MK. Growth and death of bacteria and fungi

underlie rainfall-induced carbon dioxide pulses from seasonally dried soil. *Ecology* 2014;

95: 1162–1172.

22 Fraser FC, Corstanje R, Deeks LK, Harris JA, Pawlett M, Todman LC *et al.* On the origin

of carbon dioxide released from rewetted soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 2016; 101:

1–5.

23 Blazewicz SJ, Hungate BA, Koch BJ, Nuccio EE, Morrissey E, Brodie EL *et al.* Taxon-

specific microbial growth and mortality patterns reveal distinct temporal population

responses to rewetting in a California grassland soil. *ISME Journal* 2020; 14: 1520–1532.

24 Williamson KE, Radosevich M, Smith DW, Wommack KE. Incidence of lysogeny within

temperate and extreme soil environments. *Environmental Microbiology* 2007; 9: 2563–

2574.

25 Weitz JS, Beckett SJ, Brum JR, Cael BB, Dushoff J. Lysis, lysogeny and virus–microbe

ratios. *Nature* 2017; 549: E1–E3.

26 Ghosh D, Roy K, Williamson KE, White DC, Wommack KE, Sublette KL *et al.* Prevalence

of lysogeny among soil bacteria and presence of 16S rRNA and trzN genes in viral-

community DNA. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 2008; 74: 495–502.

27 Nafissi N, Slavcev R. Bacteriophage recombination systems and biotechnical

applications. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* 2014; 98: 2841–2851.

28 Correa AMS, Howard-Varona C, Coy SR, Buchan A, Sullivan MB, Weitz JS. Revisiting

the rules of life for viruses of microorganisms. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2021;

0123456789. doi:10.1038/s41579-021-00530-x.

29 Howard-Varona C, Hargreaves KR, Abedon ST, Sullivan MB. Lysogeny in nature:

mechanisms, impact and ecology of temperate phages. *The ISME Journal* 2017; 11:

1511–1520.

30 Ghosh D, Roy K, Williamson KE, Srinivasiah S, Wommack KE, Radosevich M. Acyl-

homoserine lactones can induce virus production in lysogenic bacteria: An alternative

paradigm for prophage induction. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2009; 75:

7142–7152.

31 Brum JR, Hurwitz BL, Schofield O, Ducklow HW, Sullivan MB. Seasonal time bombs:

dominant temperate viruses affect Southern Ocean microbial dynamics. *The ISME*

Journal 2016; 10: 437–449.

32 Jurgensen SK, Roux S, Schwenck SM, Stewart FJ, Sullivan MB, Brum JR. Viral

community analysis in a marine oxygen minimum zone indicates increased potential for

viral manipulation of microbial physiological state. *The ISME Journal* 2022; 16: 972–982.

33 Schimel JP. Life in dry soils: Effects of drought on soil microbial communities and

processes. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics. 2018; 49: 409–432.

34 Knowles B, Silveira CB, Bailey BA, Barott K, Cantu VA, Cobian-Guëmes AG *et al.* Lytic to

temperate switching of viral communities. *Nature* 2016; 531: 466–470.

35 Kimura M, Jia Z-J, Nakayama N, Asakawa S. Ecology of viruses in soils: Past, present

and future perspectives. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition* 2008; 54: 1–32.

36 Wu R, Davison MR, Gao Y, Nicora CD, Mcdermott JE, Burnum-Johnson KE *et al.*

Moisture modulates soil reservoirs of active DNA and RNA viruses. *Communications*

Biology 2021; 4: 1–11.

37 Williamson KE, Radosevich M, Wommack KE. Abundance and diversity of viruses in six

Delaware soils. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2005; 71: 3119–3125.

38 Placella SA, Firestone MK. Transcriptional response of nitrifying communities to wetting

of dry soil. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 2013; 79: 3294–302.

39 Barnard RL, Osborne CA, Firestone MK. Responses of soil bacterial and fungal

communities to extreme desiccation and rewetting. *The ISME Journal* 2013; 7: 2229–

2241.

40 Greenlon A, Sieradzki E, Zablocki O, Koch BJ, Foley MM, Kimbrel JA *et al.* Quantitative

Stable-Isotope Probing (qSIP) with Metagenomics Links Microbial Physiology and Activity

to Soil Moisture in Mediterranean-Climate Grassland Ecosystems. *mSystems* 2022; 7.

doi:10.1128/msystems.00417-22.

41 Nuccio EE, Blazewicz SJ, Lafler M, Campbell AN, Kakouridis A, Kimbrel JA *et al.* HT-SIP:

A semi-automated Stable Isotope Probing pipeline identifies interactions in the

hyphosphere of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *bioRxiv* 2022.

doi:10.1101/2022.07.01.498377.

42 Lennon JT, Jones SE. Microbial seed banks: The ecological and evolutionary implications

of dormancy. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2011; 9: 119–130.

43 Carini P, Marsden PJ, Leff JW, Morgan EE, Strickland MS, Fierer N. Relic DNA is

abundant in soil and obscures estimates of soil microbial diversity. *Nature Microbiology*

2016; 2: 16242.

44 Rousk J, Bååth E. Growth of saprotrophic fungi and bacteria in soil. *FEMS Microbiology*

Ecology 2011; 78: 17–30.

45 Couradeau E, Sasse J, Goudeau D, Nath N, Hazen TC, Bowen BP *et al.* Probing the

active fraction of soil microbiomes using BONCAT-FACS. *Nature Communications* 2019;

10: 2770.

46 Hungate BA, Mau RL, Schwartz E, Caporaso JG, Dijkstra P, van Gestel N *et al.*

Quantitative microbial ecology through stable isotope probing. *Applied and environmental*

microbiology 2015; 81: 7570–81.

47 Koch BJ, McHugh TA, Hayer M, Schwartz E, Blazewicz SJ, Dijkstra P *et al.* Estimating

taxon-specific population dynamics in diverse microbial communities. *Ecosphere* 2018; 9.

doi:10.1002/ecs2.2090.

48 Schwartz E. Characterization of growing microorganisms in soil by stable isotope probing

with H218O. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2007; 73: 2541–2546.

49 Sieradzki ET, Greenlon A, Nicolas AM, Firestone MK, Pett-Ridge J, Blazewicz SJ *et al.*

Functional succession of actively growing soil microorganisms during rewetting is shaped

by precipitation history. *bioRxiv* 2022; : 2022.06.28.498032.

50 Nicolas AM, Jaffe AL, Nuccio EE, Taga ME, Firestone MK, Banfield JF. Soil Candidate

Phyla Radiation Bacteria Encode Components of Aerobic Metabolism and Co-occur with

Nanoarchaea in the Rare Biosphere of Rhizosphere Grassland Communities. *mSystems*

2021; 6. doi:10.1128/msystems.01205-20.

51 Thingstad TF. Elements of a theory for the mechanisms controlling abundance, diversity,

and biogeochemical role of lytic bacterial viruses in aquatic systems. *Limnology and*

Oceanography 2000; 45: 1320–1328.

52 Ignacio-Espinoza JC, Ahlgren NA, Fuhrman JA. Long-term stability and Red Queen-like

strain dynamics in marine viruses. *Nature Microbiology* 2020; 5: 265–271.

53 Cortez MH, Weitz JS. Coevolution can reverse predator–prey cycles. *Proceedings of the*

National Academy of Sciences 2014; 111: 7486–7491.

54 Chow C-ET, Kim DY, Sachdeva R, Caron DA, Fuhrman JA. Top-down controls on

bacterial community structure: microbial network analysis of bacteria, T4-like viruses and

protists. *The ISME Journal* 2014; 8: 816–829.

55 Kieft K, Anantharaman K. Deciphering Active Prophages from Metagenomes. *mSystems*

2022. doi:10.1128/msystems.00084-22.

56 Roux S, Krupovic M, Daly RA, Borges AL, Nayfach S, Schulz F *et al.* Cryptic inoviruses

revealed as pervasive in bacteria and archaea across Earth's biomes. *Nature*

Microbiology 2019; 4: 1895–1906.

57 Williamson KE, Schnitker JB, Radosevich M, Smith DW, Wommack KE. Cultivation-

based assessment of lysogeny among soil bacteria. *Microbial ecology* 2008; 56: 437–47.

58   Sui B, Qi X, Wang X, Ren H, Liu W, Zhang C. Characterization of a Novel Bacteriophage

swi2 Harboring Two Lysins Can Naturally Lyse Escherichia coli. *Frontiers in Microbiology*

2021; 12: 1201.

59   Orgiazzi A, Bardgett RD, Barrios E, Behan-Pelletier V, Briones MJI, Chotte J-L *et al.*

(eds.). *Global Soil Biodiversity Atlas*. European Commission, 2016 doi:10.2788/2613.

60   Sokol NW, Slessarev E, Marschmann GL, Nicolas A, Blazewicz SJ, Brodie EL *et al.* Life

and death in the soil microbiome: how ecological processes influence biogeochemistry.

Nature Reviews Microbiology 2022; 0123456789. doi:10.1038/s41579-022-00695-z.

61   Yan Y, Klinkhamer PGL, van Veen JA, Kuramae EE. Environmental filtering: A case of

bacterial community assembly in soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 2019; 136: 107531.

62   Romdhane S, Spor A, Aubert J, Bru D, Breuil MC, Hallin S *et al.* Unraveling negative

biotic interactions determining soil microbial community assembly and functioning. *ISME*

Journal 2022; 16: 296–306.

63   Zegeye EK, Brislawn CJ, Farris Y, Fansler SJ, Hofmockel KS, Jansson JK *et al.*

Selection, Succession, and Stabilization of Soil Microbial Consortia. *mSystems* 2019; 4:

55–74.

64   Nemergut DR, Schmidt SK, Fukami T, O'Neill SP, Bilinski TM, Stanish LF *et al.* Patterns

and Processes of Microbial Community Assembly. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology*

Reviews 2013; 77: 342–356.

65   Wang C, Michalet R, Liu Z, Jiang X, Wang X, Zhang G *et al.* Disentangling Large- and

Small-Scale Abiotic and Biotic Factors Shaping Soil Microbial Communities in an Alpine

Cushion Plant System. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 2020; 11: 925.

66   Wilpiszeski RL, Aufrecht JA, Retterer ST, Sullivan MB, Graham DE, Pierce EM *et al.* Soil

Aggregate Microbial Communities: Towards Understanding Microbiome Interactions at

Biologically Relevant Scales. Applied and environmental microbiology. 2019; 85.

doi:10.1128/AEM.00324-19.

67   Jansson JK, Hofmockel KS. Soil microbiomes and climate change. Nature Reviews

Microbiology. 2020; 18: 35–46.

68   Miller R V., Day MJ. Contribution of lysogeny, pseudolysogeny, and starvation to phage

ecology. In: Abedon ST (ed). *Bacteriophage Ecology*. Cambridge University Press:

Cambridge, 2009, pp 114–144.

69   Naylor D, Sadler N, Bhattacharjee A, Graham EB, Anderton CR, McClure R *et al.* Soil

microbiomes under climate change and implications for carbon cycling. Annual Review of

Environment and Resources. 2020; 45: 29–59.

70   Jover LF, Effler TC, Buchan A, Wilhelm SW, Weitz JS. The elemental composition of

virus particles: Implications for marine biogeochemical cycles. *Nature Reviews*

Microbiology 2014; 12: 519–528.

71   Suttle CA. The significance of viruses to mortality in aquatic microbial communities.

Microbial Ecology 1994; 28: 237–243.

72   Starr EP, Shi S, Blazewicz SJ, Koch BJ, Probst AJ, Hungate BA *et al.* Stable-Isotope-

Informed, Genome-Resolved Metagenomics Uncovers Potential Cross-Kingdom

Interactions in Rhizosphere Soil. *mSphere* 2021; 6. doi:10.1128/mSphere.00085-21.

73   Pett-Ridge J, Firestone MK. Using stable isotopes to explore root-microbe-mineral

interactions in soil. *Rhizosphere* 2017. doi:10.1016/j.rhisph.2017.04.016.

74   Tecon R, Ebrahimi A, Kleyer H, Erev Levi S, Or D. Cell-to-cell bacterial interactions

promoted by drier conditions on soil surfaces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences of the United States of America 2018; 115: 9791–9796.

75   Jiao S, Yang Y, Xu Y, Zhang J, Lu Y. Balance between community assembly processes

mediates species coexistence in agricultural soil microbiomes across eastern China. *The*

ISME Journal 2020; 14: 202–216.

76   Durham DM, Sieradzki ET, ter Horst AM, Santos-Medellín C, Bess CWA, Geonczy SE *et*

al. Substantial differences in soil viral community composition within and among four

Northern California habitats. *ISME Communications* 2022; 2: 100.

77   Santos-Medellín C, Estera-Molina K, Yuan M, Pett-Ridge J, Firestone MK, Emerson JB.

Spatial turnover of soil viral populations and genotypes overlain by cohesive responses to

moisture in grasslands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2022; 119: 1–

11.

78   Burstein D, Sun CL, Brown CT, Sharon I, Anantharaman K, Probst AJ *et al.* Major

bacterial lineages are essentially devoid of CRISPR-Cas viral defence systems. *Nature*

Communications 2016; 7: 10613.

79   Joshi N, Fass J. Sickle: A sliding-window, adaptive, quality-based trimming tool for FastQ

files (Version 1.33). 2011.

80   Li D, Liu C-M, Luo R, Sadakane K, Lam T-W. MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node

solution for large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph.

Bioinformatics 2015; 31: 1674–1676.

81   Hyatt D, Chen G-L, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. Prodigal: prokaryotic

gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. *BMC bioinformatics* 2010; 11:

119.

82   Edgar RC. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST. *Bioinformatics*

2010; 26: 2460–2461.

83   Ogata H, Goto S, Sato K, Fujibuchi W, Bono H, Kanehisa M. KEGG: Kyoto encyclopedia

of genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Research. 1999; 27: 29–34.

84   Suzek BE, Huang H, McGarvey P, Mazumder R, Wu CH. UniRef: comprehensive and

non-redundant UniProt reference clusters. *Bioinformatics* 2007; 23: 1282–1288.

85   Magrane M, UniProt Consortium. UniProt Knowledgebase: A hub of integrated protein

data. *Database* 2011; 2011. doi:10.1093/database/bar009.

86   Wu Y-W, Tang Y-H, Tringe SG, Simmons BA, Singer SW. MaxBin: an automated binning

method to recover individual genomes from metagenomes using an expectation-

maximization algorithm. *Microbiome* 2014; 2: 26.

87   Kang DD, Froula J, Egan R, Wang Z. MetaBAT, an efficient tool for accurately

reconstructing single genomes from complex microbial communities. *PeerJ* 2015; 3:

e1165.

88   Alneberg J, Bjarnason BS, De Bruijn I, Schirmer M, Quick J, Ijaz UZ *et al.* Binning

metagenomic contigs by coverage and composition. *Nature Methods* 2014; 11: 1144–

1146.

89   Sieber CMK, Probst AJ, Sharrar A, Thomas BC, Hess M, Tringe SG *et al.* Recovery of

genomes from metagenomes via a dereplication, aggregation and scoring strategy.

Nature Microbiology 2018; 3: 836–843.

90   Olm MR, Brown CT, Brooks B, Banfield JF. dRep: a tool for fast and accurate genomic

comparisons that enables improved genome recovery from metagenomes through de-

replication. *The ISME Journal* 2017; 11: 2864–2868.

91   Roux S, Enault F, Hurwitz BL, Sullivan MB. VirSorter: mining viral signal from microbial

genomic data. *PeerJ* 2015; 3: e985.

92   Guo J, Bolduc B, Zayed AA, Varsani A, Dominguez-Huerta G, Delmont TO *et al.*

VirSorter2: a multi-classifier, expert-guided approach to detect diverse DNA and RNA

viruses. *Microbiome* 2021; 9: 37.

93   Kieft K, Zhou Z, Anantharaman K. VIBRANT: Automated recovery, annotation and

curation of microbial viruses, and evaluation of viral community function from genomic

sequences. *Microbiome* 2020; 8: 90.

94   Ren J, Song K, Deng C, Ahlgren NA, Fuhrman JA, Li Y *et al.* Identifying viruses from

metagenomic data using deep learning. *Quantitative Biology* 2020; 8: 64–77.

95   Auslander N, Gussow AB, Benler S, Wolf YI, Koonin E V. Seeker: Alignment-free

identification of bacteriophage genomes by deep learning. *Nucleic Acids Research* 2020;

48: E121.

96   Crits-Christoph A, Gelsinger DR, Ma B, Wierzchos J, Ravel J, Davila A *et al.* Functional

interactions of archaea, bacteria and viruses in a hypersaline endolithic community.

Environmental microbiology 2016; 18: 2064–2077.

97   Shaffer M, Borton MA, McGivern BB, Zayed AA, La Rosa SL 0003 3527 8101, Solden LM

et al. DRAM for distilling microbial metabolism to automate the curation of microbiome

function. *Nucleic Acids Research* 2020; 48: 8883–8900.

98   Barnard RL, Osborne CA, Firestone MK. Changing precipitation pattern alters soil

microbial community response to wet-up under a Mediterranean-type climate. *The ISME*

Journal 2015; 9: 946–957.

99   Uritskiy G V., Diruggiero J, Taylor J. MetaWRAP - A flexible pipeline for genome-resolved

metagenomic data analysis 08 Information and Computing Sciences 0803 Computer

Software 08 Information and Computing Sciences 0806 Information Systems. *Microbiome*

2018; 6. doi:10.1186/s40168-018-0541-1.

100 Chaumeil PA, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P, Parks DH. GTDB-Tk: A toolkit to classify

genomes with the genome taxonomy database. *Bioinformatics* 2020; 36: 1925–1927.

101 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.

102 Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, Haberland M, Reddy T, Cournapeau D *et al.* SciPy

1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nature Methods* 2020; 17:

261–272.

103 Bland C, Ramsey TL, Sabree F, Lowe M, Brown K, Kyrpides NC *et al.* CRISPR

Recognition Tool (CRT): A tool for automatic detection of clustered regularly interspaced

palindromic repeats. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2007; 8: 209.

104 Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. Basic local alignment search tool.

Journal of Molecular Biology 1990; 215: 403–410.

105 Menzel P, Ng KL, Krogh A. Fast and sensitive taxonomic classification for metagenomics

with Kaiju. *Nature Communications* 2016; 7. doi:10.1038/ncomms11257.

106   Shmakov SA, Sitnik V, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Severinov K V, Koonin E V. The CRISPR

Spacer Space Is Dominated by Sequences from Species-Specific Mobilomes. *mBio*

2017; 8: e01397-17.

107   Al-Shayeb B, Sachdeva R, Chen LX, Ward F, Munk P, Devoto A *et al.* Clades of huge

phages from across Earth's ecosystems. *Nature* 2020; 578: 425–431.

108   Mihara T, Nishimura Y, Shimizu Y, Nishiyama H, Yoshikawa G, Uehara H *et al.* Linking

Virus Genomes with Host Taxonomy. *Viruses* 2016; 8: 66.

109   Waskom M. seaborn: statistical data visualization. *Journal of Open Source Software*

2021; 6: 3021.

110   Klappenbach JA, Dunbar JM, Schmidt TM. rRNA operon copy number reflects ecological

strategies of bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2000; 66: 1328–1333.

1049

1050

Figure 1 | Experimental overview describing recovery of genomes from time-resolved cellular (metagenomes) and viral size-fraction metagenomes (viromes) following soil wet-up. Triplicate sampled soil microcosms were destructively harvested before (0 h) or following addition of natural abundance water ($H_2^{16}O$) (3 h, 24 h, 48 h, 72 and 168 h) for the generation of viromes and metagenomes or with $H_2^{18}O$, stable isotope-enriched water, for metagenomics with quantitative stable isotope probing (qSIP). Below the depiction of the microcosms is a cartoon of a microbial cell and its genome before (blue) and after (red) incorporation of ^{18}O-DNA. Microcosms fated for metagenomic sequencing did not include a 3h time point. Sample prep for viromes, metagenomes, and qSIP metagenomics prior to shotgun sequencing is shown on the right.

1051

Figure 2 | Temporal compositional changes in microbial and viral communities following soil wet-up. (A) PCoA plots of MAGs (left) and vOTUs (right) calculated based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarity colored by time with different marker shapes signifying distinct field plots (biological replicates). **(B)** Barplot of the mean total number of unique vOTUs per time point. Error bars (red) show standard error of mean across all three field plots. **(C)** Viral biomass approximated by total extracted viral DNA (ng) per gram of soil plotted through time. Each point represents a distinct microcosm. The shaded area around the line represents a 95% confidence interval.

1052

Figure 3 | Dynamics of isotope-enriched (growing) viruses and microbes through time following soil wet-up. Viruses or vOTUs are represented in all plots by dotted line, MAGs are depicted by solid line. Colors represent taxonomic groups (yellow are Actinobacteria, blue are Proteobacteria). **(A)** Hypothetical models of viral predation on microbes: Lotka-Volterra model, reversed Lotka-Volterra, and a model in which viruses track changes in host abundance. **(B)** Mean ^{18}O atom percent excess (APE) for MAGs and vOTUs through time post wet-up. Error bars represent standard error of genome APE means. **(C)** Number of unique MAGs and vOTUs per lineage detected as incorporating isotope at each time point post wet-up.

1053

Figure 4 | Relative abundance and richness of integrase-encoding vOTUs through time following soil wet-up. vOTUs were split by whether they encode an integrase gene (red) or not (blue). Cartoon above illustrates integrase-encoding vOTUs (red hexagon) have the capacity for their genomes to integrate into their host's chromosome or no integrase gene vOTUs (blue hexagon) may not be able to integrate their genome into a host's genome. **(A)** Relative abundance (percent of total sampled reads) of integrase-encoding or not integrase-encoding vOTUs. **(B)** Counts of integrase-containing and non-integrase containing vOTUs.

1054

Figure 5 | Viral response to wet-up and corresponding contribution to microbial mortality. (A) Conceptual model of changes in viral richness (gray-blue) and biomass (green) over time. **(B)** Modelled contribution of viruses to microbial mortality where each line graphed represents an estimated percent contribution for a different viral burst size shown in the legend ranging from 1 virion per lysed microbial cell to 1000 virions per lysed microbial cell.

1055