Viscosin synthesis influence *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 colonization and

microbial assembly at the wheat rhizoplane in response to plant genotype

Running title: Viscosin influence colonization and microbial assembly

Ying Guan[1], Frederik Bak[1,2], Rosanna Catherine Hennessy[1], Christine Lorenzen

Elberg[3], Dorte Bodin Dresbøll[1], Anne Winding[3], Rumakanta Sapkota[3], Mette Haubjerg

Nicolaisen[1, *]

[1] Department of Plant and Environmental Science, University of Copenhagen,

Thorvaldsensvej 40, 1871 Frederiksberg C, Denmark;

[2] Bioresources Unit, AIT Austrian Institute of Technology, Konrad-Lorenz-Straße 24,

3430, Tulln, Austria;

[3] Department of Environmental Science, Aarhus University, Frederiksborgvej 399, 4000

Roskilde, Denmark

* Corresponding author:

Mette Haubjerg Nicolaisen

Tel: (+45) 35 33 26 49

Email: meni@plen.ku.dk

University of Copenhagen

Thorvaldsensvej 40, DK-1871 Frederiksberg C, Denmark

Abstract

The importance of microbial functions for plant health and performance is unquestioned. Beneficial rhizosphere bacteria such as *Pseudomonas* spp. promote plant growth and protect against pathogens by producing a range of bioactive compounds, including cyclic lipopeptides (CLPs) known for their antimicrobial activities. However, the natural roles of CLPs during interactions between bacteria and plants remain underexplored especially in natural systems. Here, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 producing the CLP viscosin was used to unravel the impact of viscosin on bacterial colonization potential and microbiome assembly at the plant root. Two varieties of winter wheat were inoculated with SBW25 or its viscosin-deficient mutant. Viscosin was shown to improve colonization potential and have a significant effect on assembly of both bacterial and protist communities at the root-soil interphase. This effect was shown to be plant cultivar dependent and pinpoints the importance of microbe-microbe interactions in colonization of plant roots. This study provides new insights into the natural role of viscosin and specifically the importance of viscosin for the bacterial colonization of plant roots and in shaping the microbial communities associated with different wheat varieties.

Keywords: Cyclic lipopeptides, secondary metabolites, *Pseudomonas* sp., rhizoplane colonization, microbiome assembly, protists.

INTRODUCTION

Microorganisms associated with plant roots can influence plant health positively through multiple mechanisms e.g. nutrient acquisition, pathogen control and induction of plant defense responses [1]. While promising results on exploiting plant growth promoting bacteria to replace or reduce the use of fertilizers and pesticides in agriculture have been obtained [2, 3, 4], the translational power from laboratory studies to field performance is currently low [5]. One major obstacle is our inadequate understanding of the parameters governing bacterial colonization and microbial community assembly in natural systems. Plants and microbes have evolved in complex settings for millions of years giving rise to intimate interactions involving secondary metabolites used for both chemical combat as well as mediators in specific interactions [6, 7]. Obtaining fundamental knowledge on these microbe-microbe-plant interactions and the impact of the metabolic interplay on community assembly under natural soil conditions is hence essential for full exploitation of the plant growth promoting potential of bacteria in agricultural settings.

Cyclic lipopeptides (CLP) produced by *Pseudomonas* sp. are secondary metabolites reported to be involved in root colonization by influencing traits like motility and biofilm formation [8, 9]. Furthermore, the CLP viscosin has antimicrobial activity against protozoans and has been shown to protect *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 from protozoan predation by *Naegleria americana in vitro* as well as superior persistence in soil compared to viscosin-deficient mutants [10]. Moreover, viscosin has lytic activity against zoospores of the economically important plant pathogen *Phytophthora infestans* [11], and can protect germinating seedlings of sugar beet in *Phytium* infested soils [12].

Recently, viscosin-producing *Pseudomonas* strains were shown to be enriched in the

rhizoplane of winter wheat in a plant-cultivar dependent manner (Herms et al.,

unpublished). This suggests a role of viscosin in plant-bacterial interactions dependent

on plant genotype. Such plant-genotypic differences in the presence of viscosin-

producing pseudomonads, could have a direct effect on the microbial community

assembly on the roots, as well as an indirect effect through alternation of the protist

community. While bacterial and fungal community composition in the root-zone of diverse

crops has been extensively described at higher taxonomic levels by amplicon sequencing

[13, 14, 15], there is a lack of knowledge at the bacterial strain level. Such strain specific

knowledge is important due to high diversity of microbes even between strains of the

same species [16, 17]. Especially the impact and importance of specific bacterial

phenotypes e.g., production of secondary metabolites, on the overall assembly of the root

microbiome and plant performance makes these studies highly needed. In addition, root

colonization has primarily been explored in sterile root systems that lack indigenous soil

microorganisms [18, 19, 20]. This ignores the three-way interaction among the inoculant,

the root and the indigenous soil community, and competition for colonization space

operating under natural soil conditions [21, 22, 23]. Protist communities in the rhizosphere

are less well described, but studies have indicated major differences in the protist

community composition in different rhizosphere compartments [24]. Protists play an

important role in the rhizosphere because of their effect on nutrient availability in the soil

[25] and can impact the structure of the microbial communities [26]. However, knowledge

on specific predator-prey interactions and their effect on the microbial community

composition is scarce.

To unravel these intimate interactions at the root-soil interface and the importance of

secondary metabolites for early root colonization and microbiome assembly under

complex conditions, we used *P. fluorescens* SBW25 as a viscosin-producing model strain

in combination with two winter wheat cultivars, Sheriff and Heerup (Heerup naturally

enriching for viscosin producing pseudomonads compared to Sheriff; Herms et al,

unpublished). We inoculated wildtype *P. fluorescens* SBW25 (SBW25 WT), as well as its

corresponding mutant deficient in viscosin production (Δ*viscA*) on wheat seedlings and

evaluated their colonization potential and impact on bacterial and protist community

assembly in the rhizoplane. We propose two hypotheses: 1) the ability to produce viscosin

increases root colonization in a plant-genotype dependent manner and 2) the viscosin-

producing strain impacts the protist community by lowering the relative abundance of

potential plant pathogenic oomycetes because of the antiprotist properties of viscosin. In

addition, we ask the question whether the ability to produce viscosin has a plant-genotype

dependent impact on the microbial community assembly. Finally, we evaluated the plant

response to the microbial inoculation, as an important link of knowledge to an agricultural

setting.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strain construction and culture conditions

Bacterial strains and plasmids used in this study are listed in Table 1. *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 wild type (SBW25 WT) [27] and the viscosin-deficient mutant *P. fluorescens* SBW25 (Δ*viscA*) [11] was routinely grown in Luria Broth at 28□C, shaking at 180 rpm (1% tryptone, 0.5% yeast extract and 1% NaCl). When required, antibiotics were supplemented at final concentrations of 50 µg ml^{-1} kanamycin or 10 µg ml^{-1} gentamicin. Both strains were tagged with mCherry by introducing the mCherry delivery plasmid pME9407 and the helper plasmid pUX-BF13 by electroporation and selection by 10 µg ml^{-1} gentamicin as previously described [28].

Soil collection and properties

Soil was collected from the long-term nutrient depletion trial at the experimental farm of the University of Copenhagen in Taastrup, Denmark (55° 40′N, 12° 17′E) [29]. The soil is a sandy loam (164 g clay kg^{-1}, 173 g silt kg^{-1}, 333 g fine sand kg^{-1}, 312 g coarse sand kg^{-1}, and 17 g soil organic matter kg^{-1}) and is classified as a Luvisol. The chemical properties of the soil are shown in Table S1. Prior to experiments, the soil was air-dried and sieved through a 2 mm mesh.

Plant experiment setup

Two cultivars of winter wheat, Heerup and Sheriff (Sejet Plant Breeding, Horsens, Denmark), were grown in PVC pots (19 cm high and 3.5 cm in diameter). Soil was thoroughly mixed in the ratio 3:2 with 0.4 - 0.9 mm particle size sand (DANSAND,

Brædstrup, Denmark) in a plastic bag. The pots were sealed in the bottom with 50 µm

polyamide mesh (Sintab, Oxie, Sweden) before transferring the soil-sand mixture into the

pots.

Seeds were soaked in sterile Milli-Q water for 1 h and then transferred to Petri dishes with

2 layers of sterile filter paper, moistened with 5 ml of sterile Milli-Q water. Seeds were

kept in the dark at room temperature for 3 days for optimal germination. Overnight *P.*

fluorescens cultures were washed twice with sterile 0.9% NaCl, and OD_{600nm} was adjusted

to 1.0 (equivalent to approximately 5×10^8 CFU ml^{-1}) for seed coating. Germinating seeds

with primary roots of 3-4 cm in length were selected and soaked in a Petri dish with

bacterial or control solution for 1 hour and immediately transferred to the PVC pots, one

seed per pot. The germinated seeds of each wheat species were inoculated as follows:

(1) *P. fluorescens* SBW25 mCherry (SBW25 WT); (2) *P. fluorescens* SBW25 Δ*viscA*

mCherry (Δ*viscA*) and (3) control treatment with 0.9% NaCl. Eight replicates were set up

for each treatment: 5 for DNA extraction and 3 for CFU counting.

The water content of the soil-sand mixture was initially adjusted to 17% (w/w). Each pot

was supplemented with 0.83 ml of plant nutrient solution (Drivhusgødning, Park®,

Schmees, Twistringen, Germany) (NPK 3-1-4), containing 2.04% nitrate-nitrogen (N),

0.3% ammonium-N, 0.46% amide-N, 0.69% phosphorus (P), 4.38% potassium (K),

0.08% sulfur (S), 0.06% magnesium (Mg), 0.033% iron (Fe), 0.013% manganese (Mn),

0.002% copper (Cu), 0.002% zinc (Zn), 0.0006% molybdenum (Mo), and 0.004% boron

(B). The plants were grown in a growth chamber under the following conditions:

temperature 19/15°C (day/night), relative air humidity 60%/60% (day/night) and

photosynthetically active radiation 600/0 µmol $m^{-2} s^{-1}$ (day/night) with a photoperiod of

16h/8h. The pots were watered with deionized water every second day by weighing and

watering up to moisture content of 15% throughout the experimental period.

Sampling was performed after 14 days of growth. Root sample collection and

compartment processing were performed as described by Zervas et al. [30] to obtain

rhizosphere (soil adhering to the root; exclusively used for confirmation of proper

sampling of the compartments as tested by 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing (see below))

and rhizoplane (the root surface) associated microbes, respectively. Samples for DNA

extraction were immediately flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and kept on dry ice until storing

at -80°C. Samples were freeze-dried (CoolSafe 100-9 Pro freeze dryer, LaboGene,

Lynge, Denmark). All freeze-dried samples were stored at -20°C until DNA extraction.

Root and shoot length were recorded at sampling, and roots were scanned to determine

total root length and root diameter. Following sampling, roots and shoots were dried at

60□C for 3 days before determining the dry weight.

DNA extraction

166   Genomic DNA was extracted from 0.5 g sample using a FastPrep-24^{TM} 5G beadbeating

167   system (MP Biomedicals, Irvine, CA, USA) at 6.0 m/s for 40 s and the FastDNA^{TM} SPIN

168   Kit for soil (MP Biomedicals) following the manufacturer's instructions. The DNA extract

169   was stored at −20°C until further processing for qPCR analysis and rRNA gene amplicon

170   sequencing.

Quantitative PCR analysis of root colonization ability

Quantification of SBW25 WT and ΔviscA was performed by qPCR targeting the mCherry

gene using the AriaMx Real-Time PCR (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA).

The primers used are presented in Table 1. Twenty-microliter reactions were prepared

with 1 □ Brilliant III Ultra-Fast SYBR® Green Low ROX qPCR Master Mix (Agilent

Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA), 1 µg µl^{-1} bovine serum albumin (New England

Biolabs® Inc., Ipswich, MA, USA), 0.2 µM of each primer and 2 µl of template DNA.

Thermal cycling conditions were as follows: 95°C for 3 min, followed by 40 cycles of 95°C

for 20 s and 56°C for 30 s. A dissociation curve was generated at the end of the qPCR

program by including a cycle of 95°C for 1 min, 55°C for 30 s, and finally reaching 95°C

by increments of 0.5°C s^{-1}, each increment followed by a fluorescence acquisition step.

Absolute abundance was calculated based on a standard curve for the mCherry target

gene [31]. Standard curves used for quantification were based on a ten-fold serial dilution

of DNA from mCherry-tagged P. fluorescens SBW25. The standard curve was run with

three technical replicates per dilution, and had a dynamic range from 10^2 to 10^8 copies/µl.

The efficiency ranged from 99.0 to 99.6%, and R^2 values were > 0.99 for all standard

curves.

CFU analysis of root colonization ability

Colony forming units (CFUs) were determined for rhizoplane samples. Ten-fold dilutions

were inoculated on Gould's S1 [32] agar plates supplemented with 10 µg ml^{-1} gentamicin

to select for tagged SBW25 WT and ΔviscA cells. Plates were incubated at 28°C in the

dark for 48 h before recording CFUs.

Root imaging and analysis

Prior to root imaging, all roots were thoroughly rinsed to remove soil and sand particles, and stored in distilled water at 4°C. Upon imaging, roots were untangled and arranged in a shallow acrylic dish with distilled water and imaged using an Epson Perfection V700 Photo scanner (Epson, Suwa, Japan) in 8-bit greyscale mode with 400 dpi resolution, subsequently converted to 8-bit JPG for software compatibility. Root length in diameter size classes and average root diameter were determined using the skeletonization method in WinRhizo v. 2016a (Regent Instruments, Quebec, Canada). Roots were divided into 10 size classes between 0 mm diameter and 4.5 mm diameter in 0.5 mm increments and the total root length in each size class was calculated. Total root length, total root surface area, average root diameter and total root volume were also calculated. Size of class fractions were calculated by dividing the root length in a size class by the total root length for each sample pot. Fine roots were determined as those with diameter < 0.5 mm.

16S rRNA and 18S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing

The V5–V7 region of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene was amplified with primers 799F [33] and 1193R [34] (Table 1). This primer pair was found to amplify relatively low proportions of plant mitochondria and chloroplast DNA compared to bacterial DNA [35]. The purity and concentration of DNA were determined using a NanoDrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Carlsbad, CA, USA) and a Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The ZymoBIOMICS Microbial Community DNA Standard (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA, USA), pure culture SBW25 DNA, and two water

controls were included. A two-step dual indexing strategy for Illumina MiSeq (Illumina,

San Diego, CA, USA) sequencing was used. First, PCR amplicons were generated in a

25-µl setup using 0.8 U Platinum II Taq (Thermo Fisher Scientific), 1 □ Platinum II PCR

Buffer, 1 mM dNTP mix, 0.2 µM primer 799F, 0.2 µM primer 1193R, and 5 µl DNA

template. The PCR thermocycler program included an initial denaturation temperature of

95°C for 2 min, then 33 cycles of 95°C for 15 s, 55°C for 15 s, and 72°C for 15 s and a

final elongation step of 72°C for 5 min. The PCR amplification was confirmed by gel

electrophoresis on 1.5% agarose gels. PCR products were purified using AMPure XP

beads (Beckman Coulter Inc. Brea, CA, USA). The following library construction and

Illumina MiSeq sequencing (2 × 300 bp) were performed by Eurofins Genomics

(Ebersberg, Germany).

The 1380F and 1510R primer set (Table 1) [36] targeting the V9 region of the 18S rRNA

gene was used to evaluate the protist community composition. A two-step dual-indexing

strategy for Illumina NextSeq sequencing using a 2-step PCR was used. First, PCR

amplicons were generated in 25 µl-reactions with 1 □ PCRBIO Ultra Mix

(PCRBIOSYSTEMS), 0.2 µM of each primer, 0.4 µg µl^{-1} bovine serum albumin (New

England Biolabs® Inc., Ipswich, MA, USA) and 5 µl DNA template. The PCR thermocycler

program included an initial denaturation temperature of 95°C for 2 min, then 33 cycles of

95°C for 15s, 55°C for 15s, and 72°C for 40 s and finally a final elongation step of 72°C

for 4 min. Each reaction in the first PCR was done in duplicates, which were pooled, and

used for dual indexing in the second PCR. The second PCR was run with 5 µl of

amplicons produced in the first PCR, primers with Illumina adaptors and unique index

combinations (i7 and i5) using the reaction conditions described for the first PCR. The

second PCR was run using 98°C for 1 min, then 13 cycles of 98°C for 10 s, 55°C for 20

s and 72°C for 40 s and a final elongation of 72°C for 4 min. The PCR amplification was

confirmed using 1.5% agarose gels. Subsequently, the amplicon product was cleaned

using HighPrep™ magnetic beads (MagBio Genomics Inc. Gaithersburg, MD, USA),

according to the manufacturer's instructions. Finally, DNA concentrations were measured

using Qubit 4.0 fluorometer using the High-Sensitivity DNA assay (Thermo-Fischer

Scientific). Samples were then equimolarly pooled and sequenced on an Illumina Nextseq

sequencer.

Sequence processing

Raw amplicon reads were processed using the DADA2 pipeline v. 1.14.1 [37]. In brief,

reads were quality checked and primers were removed using trimLeft in the filterAndTrim

function. According to the sequence quality, the 16S rRNA gene reads were filtered using

default parameters except for trimRight and minLen (the reads were filtered by truncating

the last 20 bp of the forward reads and the last 128 bp of reverse reads using trimRight

and minLen = 150 to avoid poor quality and ambiguous sequences). Chimeras were

removed after merging denoised pair-end sequences. Each unique amplicon sequence

variant (ASV) was assigned to taxa according to SILVA database v. 138.1 [38] and PR^2

database v. 4.14.0 [39] for the 16S rRNA gene and the 18S rRNA gene, respectively. For

bacteria, non-bacterial ASVs including chloroplasts and mitochondrial reads were

removed. Similarly, for protist, we discarded plant (Streptophyta), animal (Metazoa), and

fungal reads to generate the retained and conservative protist ASV table. To reduce the

amount of spurious ASVs, ASVs with a relative abundance below 0.1% in each sample

were removed from the dataset [40].

Data analysis and statistics

Statistical analysis of the plant physiology experiments was performed using GraphPad

Prism v. 8.3.0. Differences between two groups were analyzed by unpaired *t*-test ($P <$

0.05). Multiple comparisons were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) via

Tukey's HSD test (*$P < 0.05$ and **$P < 0.01$).

The 16S rRNA and 18S rRNA datasets were analyzed in R version 4.1.3 [41]. For

microbiome diversity and composition analyses, we used the R packages phyloseq v.

1.38.0 [42], ampvis2 v. 2.7.17 [43] and microeco v. 0.11.0 [44]. The amp_rarecurve

function in the ampvis2 package was used to generate rarefaction curves (number of

reads vs number of observed ASVs) for each sample. For 16S rRNA, we excluded the

samples "YG6" (Sheriff), "YG34" (Heerup) and "YG51" (Heerup) from the analysis due to

their low read number. A sample overview is provided in Table S2. The alpha diversity

was estimated using Shannon diversity in Divnet v. 0.4.0 [45] with default parameters.

This method allows for cooccurrence of taxa in contrast to other methods, which estimate

the diversity based on multinomial models. Significance testing of the Shannon diversity

was done using beta function in breakaway v. 4.7.6 [46]. Samples were not rarefied prior

to downstream analyses to avoid discarding information [47].

Principal component analysis (PCA) based on Aitchison distance was performed using

the R function 'prcomp' and permutational multivariate analysis of variance

(PERMANOVA) was used to test the effect of the inoculant treatments, compartment and

plant genotype on the beta diversity of the microbial community in vegan v.2.6.2 [48].

Analysis of shared and unique ASVs between groups was done using the trans_venn

function in microeco package v. 0.11.0 [44].

The differential abundance of ASVs between inoculant treatments (SBW25 WT vs.

viscosin deficient mutant-treated, SBW25 WT-treated vs. control, and viscosin deficient

mutant-treated vs. control) were analyzed while controlling for the compartment of the two

wheat cultivars. The differential abundance was determined using beta-binomial

regression with the corncob package v. 0.2.0 [49]. Only ASVs that had an estimated

differential abundance of < -1 or >1, and P-values adjusted for multiple testing < 0.05

(FDR < 0.05) were considered significant.

Data availability

All raw sequencing data used in this study has been deposited in the NCBI Sequence

Read Archive (SRA) database under project accession numbers PRJNA928659 (16S

rRNA) and PRJNA931264 (18S rRNA).

RESULTS

Colonization ability of *P. fluorescens* SBW25 and its viscosin-deficient mutant

To elucidate the importance of viscosin production for the ability of *P. fluorescens* SWB25 to colonize wheat roots, we inoculated seedlings with mCherry-tagged *P. fluorescens* SBW25 wild type (SBW25 WT) or its viscosin-deficient mutant ($\Delta viscA$). Samples taken immediately after seedling inoculation showed similar colonization potential independent of the ability to produce viscosin, as measured by qPCR and CFU counts, respectively (Fig. 1). After two weeks of seedling growth, qPCR data showed higher abundance of SBW25 WT in the rhizoplane of both cultivars compared to $\Delta viscA$, although significant differences were observed only in the Sheriff cultivar. The CFU assay only detected SBW25 WT in the rhizoplane samples from Heerup and Sheriff, whereas no CFUs were observed for $\Delta viscA$ at the measured dilution, pointing to at least 10 times higher colonization by SBW25 WT compared to $\Delta viscA$ (Fig. 1).

Wheat genotype dependent effects of inoculation on plant growth

To evaluate the effect of SBW25 WT and $\Delta viscA$ on plant growth, we measured shoot length as well as shoot and root biomass and performed image analysis of the roots. In Sheriff, SBW25 WT and $\Delta viscA$ showed similar effects on seedlings, with significantly shorter shoot length ($P < 0.05$) and significantly higher root dry weight ($P < 0.01$) as compared to control treatment (Fig. 2). No effect on root length nor shoot dry weight was observed for any of the inoculations in Sheriff as compared to the control treatment (Fig. 2). In Heerup, the SBW25 WT and $\Delta viscA$ had contrasting effects on root dry weight, where $\Delta viscA$ induced a significantly higher root dry weight than both the SBW25 WT (P

< 0.05) and the control treatment ($P < 0.01$). In contrast, neither shoot length, root length

nor shoot dry weight were significantly impacted by inoculation with SBW25 WT or $\Delta viscA$

in Heerup, as compared to the control treatment.

The results of the root image analysis (Fig. S1A) showed only minor impact on plant

parameters by inoculation treatments. The only significant difference observed was a

significantly higher number of root tips in the Heerup cultivar ($P < 0.05$) when inoculated

with either SBW25 WT or $\Delta viscA$ as compared to the control (Fig. S1B, Table S3). Taken

together, the impact of the ability to produce viscosin on plant parameters were

dependent on the plant cultivar, as impacts on Sheriff were found to be independent,

whereas impacts on Heerup were dependent on the ability to produce viscosin.

Effects on bacterial community assembly

To investigate the effects of SBW25 WT and $\Delta viscA$ on the rhizoplane bacterial

microbiome assembly we used 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing. The sequencing

depths of all samples were sufficient since the number of ASVs was saturated for each

sample in the rarefaction curves (Fig. S2A). There were 57 samples with 3 263 907 reads

in the total dataset after filtering. The sample sizes ranged from 41 099 to 80 057 reads,

with a median of 56 564. The dataset consisted of 449 ASVs.

A clear separation of the bacterial communities in the rhizosphere samples from that in

the rhizoplane samples (PERMANOVA, $P < 0.001$) confirmed a successful separation of

the compartments during sampling (Fig. S3A, Table S4).

Inoculation with Δ*viscA* significantly increased the Shannon diversity (Breakaway, $P <$

0.001) in the rhizoplane of the Heerup cultivar as compared to the SBW25 WT and the

control treatments (Fig. S4A). In the rhizoplane of Sheriff, the Shannon diversity was

significantly higher upon inoculation with both the SBW25 WT and Δ*viscA* as compared

to the control treatment ($P < 0.001$). Hence, the influence on bacterial diversity reflects

the impact observed on the shoot length and root dry weight (Fig. 2A and 2E), with a

similar impact from the SBW25 WT and Δ*viscA* on the Sheriff cultivar, and a differential

impact of the two strains on the Heerup cultivar as compared to the control treatment.

In addition, inoculation had a significant effect on the bacterial community composition in

the rhizoplane (PERMANOVA, $R^2 = 0.12$, $P = 0.001$; Fig S5A, Table S5). Further, the

interaction between cultivar and inoculation treatment was also significant ($R^2 = 0.09$, P

< 0.05; Table S5), indicating a cultivar dependent impact of the inoculation treatments on

the community composition. This was confirmed by a significant but differential effect of

inoculation treatments on the rhizoplane bacterial community structure in Sheriff ($R^2 =$

0.20, $P = 0.003$) and Heerup ($R^2 = 0.25$, $P = 0.006$) cultivars, respectively (Fig. 3A and

3B).

Bacterial community composition response

The rhizoplane communities in both cultivars were dominated by Proteobacteria,

Actinobacteriota, and Firmicutes independent of treatment (Fig. S3C). Additionally,

Massilia, *Paenibacillus*, *Bacillus*, *Dyella*, and *Noviherbaspirillum* were the five most

abundant genera across all samples (Fig. S6A).

In the Sheriff rhizoplane, inoculation of SBW25 WT significantly (beta-binomial model, P

< 0.05) increased the relative abundance of 14 ASVs and decreased the relative

abundance of 11 ASVs compared to the control treatment (Fig. 4A). In contrast,

inoculation by $\Delta viscA$ significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected only seven ASVs, leading to

increased relative abundance of three ASVs, and decreased relative abundance of four

ASVs compared to the control treatment (Fig. 4B). Comparing the effects of $\Delta viscA$

inoculation with SBW25 WT inoculation, the relative abundance of five ASVs decreased,

whereas the relative abundance of only one ASV significantly increased ($P < 0.05$) (Fig.

4C). Taken together, this points to both a general impact of inoculation with *P.*

fluorescence SBW25, and a specific impact from the ability to produce viscosin in the

Sheriff rhizoplane.

In the rhizoplane of Heerup, no significant difference in ASV abundance was observed

between the SBW25 WT treatment and the control treatment. In contrast, inoculation with

$\Delta viscA$ significantly ($P < 0.05$) increased the relative abundance of 39 ASVs and

decreased the relative abundance of three ASVs when compared both to the SBW25 WT

and the control treatment (Fig. 5). An additional four ASVs significantly ($P < 0.05$)

increased and five ASVs decreased in relative abundance when seedlings were

inoculated with $\Delta viscA$ compared to inoculation with SBW25 WT (Fig. 5A).

For both culitvars, ASVs belonging to the genera *Bacillus* and *Massilia* were affected. In

the Sheriff rhizoplane, inoculations reduced the relative abundance of *Bacillus* and

increased the relative abundance of most *Massilia* compared to the control treatment,

however more pronounced for SBW25 WT (Fig. 4). In Heerup, $\Delta viscA$ increased the

relative abundance of *Bacillus* and decreased the relative abundance of *Massilia*

compared to the SBW25 WT and control treatment. (Fig. 5). Hence, visocosin seems to

have a generally negative effect on *Bacillus* ASVs, and a positive effect on the

colonization potential of *Massilia* ASVs.

Effects on protist community assembly

The protist communities were analyzed using 18S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing. The

sequencing depth of all samples was sufficient since the number of ASVs was saturated

for each sample in the rarefaction curves (Fig. S2B). There were 60 samples with 2 342

857 reads in the total dataset after filtering. The read sizes ranged from 19 495 to 70 412,

with a median of 37 461. The dataset consisted of 599 ASVs. Regarding the communities

of protists, the compartment was the most important factor for differences in community

composition (PERMANOVA, R^2 = 0.086, P = 0.001) (Fig. S3B, Table S4), again

supporting a reliable sampling strategy for obtaining specific compartment samples.

For the Sheriff rhizoplane community, the Shannon diversity was lower in SBW25 WT-

treated plants than $\Delta viscA$-treated plants and control plants (P < 0.001) (Fig. S4B). In

contrast, inoculation with SBW25 WT or $\Delta viscA$ had no effect on the Shannon diversity in

the rhizoplane communities of the Heerup cultivar.

Inoculation treatment had a significant effect on the protist community composition in the

rhizoplane (PERMANOVA, R^2 = 0.09, P = 0.007) (Fig. S5B; Table S5). When analyzed

separately, the inoculation treatments significantly impacted the rhizoplane protist

community in the Sheriff (R^2 = 0.18, P = 0.005) cultivar, whereas no significant effect (R^2 =

0.15, P = 0.292) was observed in the Heerup cultivar (Fig. 3C and 3D).

Protist community composition response

At the division level, the rhizoplane community in both cultivars were dominated by Oomycota (also referred to as Pseudofungi), Cercozoa, and Chlorophyta (Fig. S3D). At the genus level, the five most abundant genera across all samples were *Phytophthora* and four unclassified Oomycota (Fig. S6B). In the rhizoplane of Sheriff, the Cercozoa *Group-Te* was significantly ($P < 0.05$) reduced after inoculation with SBW25 WT compared to the other two treatments. In addition, inoculation of SBW25 WT significantly ($P < 0.05$) reduced the relative abundance of an unclassified Oomycota (Fig. S7) as compared to the control treatment. No significant difference in ASVs was found between treatment with the Δ*viscA* as compared to the control treatment.

In the rhizoplane of Heerup, only one ASV belonging to the Amoebozoa *Leptomyxidae* was significantly ($P < 0.05$) increased after inoculation with Δ*viscA* compared to the control treatment (Fig. S7). Furthermore, no ASVs were identified to exhibit significant differences in their abundance between the treatment by SBW25 WT and the control treatment, as well as between the treatment by SBW25 WT and the treatment by the Δ*viscA*.

Inoculation with SBW25 WT showed a trend of decreased relative abundance of *Pythium* as compared to Δ*viscA* and control treatments in the Sheriff rhizoplane (Fig. 6). For the Heerup rhizoplane, the trend was an increase in *Phytium* when inoculated with Δ*viscA* as compared to SBW25 and control treatments, with no difference between the SBW25 and control treatments.

DISCUSSION

Understanding drivers for microbial assembly at the root-soil interphase is fundamental for the ability to engineer a beneficial root microbiome for improved plant health and growth with a reduced environmental footprint – independent on whether the approach is based on microbial inoculants or plant breeding for below ground interactions. Further, high-resolution studies in natural soil with a high microbial complexity, are highly needed for in-depth analysis of the three-way interactions between plant, microorganisms and soil.

In the present study we addressed this challenge by growing wheat in natural soil with the viscosin producing *P. fluorescence* SBW25 WT or its viscosin-deficient mutant (Δ*viscA*), to study the effect of the ability to produce viscosin on colonization potential and microbial community assembly in two wheat cultivars, Heerup and Sheriff.

The ability to produce viscosin enhanced the colonization potential of SBW25 WT compared with Δ*viscA* in both cultivars. Viscosin has previously been shown to be involved in surface spreading on sterilized sugar beet roots in potting compost [12] and our results expand this finding by showing the importance of viscosin for wheat root colonization in a natural soil environment with competition from other microorganisms. Further, enhanced colonization by a CLP producing strain is in line with previous findings for massetolide A and amphisin producing strains [8, 9] pointing towards a general role of CLPs in root colonization. For viscosin, and CLPs in general, this associated colonization phenotype could be due to the amphiphilic properties of the compound, altering the surface charge of the bacteria or the root surface for an improved colonization [50]. In contrast to these findings, Yang et al. [51] did not find any impact on colonization

potential in wheat based on the ability to produce viscosin when comparing *P. fluorescens*

HC1-07 and its viscosin-deficient mutant. However, the *P. fluorescens* HC1-07 strain was

mutated in the *viscB* gene [51], whereas the impairment of viscosin production in *P.*

fluorescens SBW25 used in this study, was due to a mutation in the *viscA* gene [28].

Whether these contrasting results are mutant generation, soil condition, plant variety or

chemically determined is still to be elucidated.

The abundance of SBW25 and Δ*viscA* on plant roots decreased 100-fold over the

course of the experiment and they comprised less than 1% of the total community after

two weeks. This is in line with other work on wheat seed inoculation with growth-

promoting *Bacillus* strains in the field [52] and demonstrates that the assembly of the

rhizoplane community is highly deterministic leaving only a small part available for

exchange of bacteria. This might explain the often-low transitional power observed

when going from simple testing in greenhouse systems to field performance of bacterial

inoculants [5, 53].

Amplicon sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene showed a general colonization of the roots

by Proteobacteria, Actinobacteriota, and Firmicutes. This is in line with other studies of

the wheat microbiome under natural conditions [54, 55, 56], and supports that microbial

community assembly in our system mimics the assembly at natural soil conditions. Based

on culture-dependent work showing that viscosin producers were preferentially isolated

from Heerup over Sheriff (Herms et al., unpublished), we hypothesized that the ability to

produce viscosin would increase root colonization, but in a plant-genotype dependent

manner. However, no difference was observed between the two wheat cultivars in the

number of SBW25 colonizing the rhizoplane, and hence, only the first half of the

hypothesis was supported by our data. This may be explained by the inoculation strategy

applied in our experiment, where inoculants were added by root dipping, giving SBW25

a head-start for colonization compared to bacteria colonizing from the soil community.

Despite the similar colonization potential of the two wheat cultivars observed for SBW25

and Δ*viscA*, respectively, viscosin was found to impact plant root architecture parameters

dependent on plant genotype. It has previously been shown that inoculation of plants with

plant beneficial bacteria alters root colonization [57, 58, 59], but to our knowledge this is

the first time, that is has been shown to be cultivar-dependent. The observed differential

effect on plant root parameters could be the result of differential community assembly,

dependent both on plant genotype and/or the ability of the inoculant to produce viscosin.

This further supports the need for detailed studies on plant-microbe interactions for

optimized agricultural output, and the prospect of breeding for specific plant-microbe

interactions.

Despite the equal colonization potential, a pronounced difference in the microbial

community assembly, measured by ASVs significantly changing between treatments,

was observed between the two cultivars. The multitude of ASVs changing in relative

abundance, regardless of whether SBW25 WT or Δ*viscA* was introduced in the Sheriff

rhizoplane, hint to a general effect of *P. fluorescens* SBW25 independent of viscosin

production, on the Sheriff microbiome assembly. Additionally, a specific effect of

SBW25 WT was observed, with four ASVs from the genera *Paenibacillus,*

Rhodanobacter, Streptomyces and unclassified Rhodanobacteriaceae consistently

increasing in relative abundance after the addition of SBW25 WT in comparison to

inoculation with Δ*viscA*. These ASVs can be hypothesized to specifically respond to the

viscosin produced by SBW25 WT. However, to fully elucidate that, it is needed to show

that viscosin is being synthesized in the rhizoplane habitat, which currently is not

technically possible at relevant concentrations in soil systems.

In contrast to the *P. fluorescens* SBW25 and presumed viscosin effects on the bacterial

community assembly identified in the Sheriff cultivar, no ASVs changed significantly in

the Heerup rhizoplane as a response to SBW25 WT inoculation. However, inoculation

with the mutant revealed an almost identical impact on the microbial community as

compared to the control and the SBW25 WT. Interestingly, the majority of affected

ASVs increased in relative abundance, hinting to a competitive advantage of harboring

the viscosin gene. One explanation for the lack of impact seen for the SBW25 WT could

thus be that the Heerup rhizoplane is naturally colonized by viscosin-producing

pseudomonads, and that the presence of these strains are drivers for the overall

microbial assembly at the roots of this cultivar. Hence, it can be speculated that the

viscosin producers are first colonizers of the Heerup rhizoplane under natural

conditions, and independent on whether it is naturally soil-derived viscosin producers, or

artificially added viscosin producing inoculants, they play a defined role in the further

assembly of the Heerup rhizoplane microbiome. These observations call for further

research to evaluate the importance of this phenotype for microbiome assembly in

general in Heerup, and whether such an intimate interaction would be dependent on

root architecture, root exudate composition or root morphology [60].

Bacillus and *Massilia*, genera previously shown to be associated with the wheat

rhizosphere [61, 62], were observed to be specifically impacted by the inoculations in a

wheat cultivar and inoculation dependent manner, collectively accounting for 50% and

25% of the impacted ASVs in Sheriff and Heerup, respectively. *Bacillus* decreased

significantly as a response to *P. fluorescence* (both SBW25 WT and the viscosin-

deficient mutant) in the Sheriff rhizoplane, however with a more pronounced effect by

SBW25 WT. *Bacillus* was found to have a significantly higher relative abundance in the

rhizoplane of Heerup when Δ*viscA* was inoculated, as compared to both the control and

the SBW25 WT treatment. This suggests a direct impact of SBW25 WT on the *Bacillus*

community. *Bacillus* is well known for its plant-growth promoting abilities [63]. Further, it

is a preferred genus for microbial products for plant growth promotion, due to the ability

to produce spores, and hence specific knowledge on the colonization and microbial

assembly dynamics is key for product development and application range.

In contrast to *Bacillus*, *Massilia* increased in relative abundance by introduction of

SBW25 WT and to a lesser extent Δ*viscA*. Strains belonging to the genus *Massilia* are

known as copiotrophic root colonizers [62, 64, 65], and have been proposed as a hub

taxon in the wheat root microbiome [62]. Hence, our study provides basic knowledge on

how the abundance of hub taxons can be dependent on other community members,

and thereby might be prone for microbial engineering using inoculants. Furthermore,

Massilia species are known to colonize the endophytic compartment of wheat, and

hence may in several ways play an important role for early stage development and

microbial assembly [61].

These cultivar specific impacts illuminate the very distinct interactions present in the

rhizoplane of plants, and how impacts might be modulated by a single metabolite.

Moreover, it demonstrates the need for functional studies of microbes in natural

systems, as major impacts can be observed based on a single change in the ability to

produce a single specialized metabolite. It further emphasizes the need to understand

microbial interactions at the early stage of plant development, for predictive value in

microbiome assembly and plant impact throughout the plant growth cycle.

The resilience in the bacterial community of the Heerup rhizoplane was in agreement

with the phenotypic response of the plant. Hence, the root dry weight significantly

increased when the plant was challenged with the mutant, which also caused significant

changes in the microbiome, as compared to the SBW25 WT and water treatment. For

the Sheriff cultivar, both the SBW25 WT and Δ*viscA* caused a significant shift in the

microbiome coinciding with a significant increase in root dry weight for both treatments

compared to the control. Whether there is a direct link between viscosin production and

root dry weight is currently not known, as it could also be caused by secondary effects

from a changing microbiome.

The inoculation with *P. fluorescens* had only a minor effect on the protist communities,

with few ASVs being significantly affected. In the Sheriff cultivar, we observed a

decrease of the Cercozoa *Group-Te* in the SBW25 WT treated rhizoplane. *Group-Te* is

found in the rhizosphere of multiple crops and model plants, e.g. maize, Arabidopsis,

potato [66, 67], but the ecology of this organism is unknown. In contrast to the Sheriff

cultivar, SBW25 WT did not result in any changes of any protist ASVs in the rhizoplane

of the Heerup cultivar, in line with our results of the bacterial community.

This also agrees with observations on the bacterial community assembly, and further

supports the proposed explanation that the Heerup rhizoplane naturally recruits viscosin

producers to a specific carrying capacity, and hence the addition of SBW25 WT does

not have any significant impact. Together with the relatively low abundance of the

SBW25 WT, our results indicate that there is a high degree of predetermined factors

that regulate microbiome assembly in the wheat rhizoplane.

In the Sheriff rhizoplane SBW25 WT decreased the relative abundance of a single

oomycete ASV (ASV 25) in support of hypothesis two of viscosin producing bacteria

reducing abundance of oomycetes. While no single *Pythium* ASV changed significantly

between the treatments in Heerup, a trend of increased *Phytium* abundance when

plants were inoculated with Δ*viscA* as compared to SBW25 WT and the control

treatment was observed. This further supports hypothesis two. Oomycetes such as

Phytopthora and *Pythium* are abundant in the plant-soil habitat. While many species are

saprophytes, there are also several plant pathogenic species. Higher root dry mass is

Sheriff in the presence of SBW25 could be associated to a disease suppression ability,

however, viscosin production by microbial inhabitants of the rhizoplane might also be

important for decreasing abundance of this genus.

In conclusion, the ability to produce viscosin enhances root colonization and

significantly alters the relative abundance of several microbial community members with

limited effects on the protist communities. Surprisingly, and in contrast to our hypothesis

of cultivar-dependent root colonization, *P. fluorescens* SBW25 colonized both cultivars

to the same extent. This opens new questions on the importance of viscosin for root

colonization, and what governs the stability of the microbial assembly observed in the

Heerup rhizoplane.

This work shows how a specific secondary metabolite might impact the microbial

assembly in the rhizosphere, and further that such a response is plant cultivar

dependent. This knowledge is important for an improved understanding of microbial

ecology in the plant-soil interphase, and further provides valuable information for

developing microbial inoculants for plant growth promotion. The future bio-based society

might thus have to develop cultivar personalized inoculants for agriculture as a parallel

to the personalized medicine concept used in humans.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Dorette Müller-Stöver and Marie Louise Bornø for supplying experimental soils

and measurements of soil chemical characteristics. Thanks to Alex Gobbi for helping

prepare the bacterial sequencing library and Athanasis Zervas for helping with the

NextSeq. Thanks to our group members Courtney Horn Herms, Kitzia Yashvelt Molina

Zamudio, Jonathan Sølve, and Dorthe Thybo Ganzhorn for their support with the

sampling. This study was funded by the Novo Nordisk Foundation (Grant number:

NNF19SA0059360), and the Chinese Scholarship Council for a Ph.D. scholarship (CSC

Grant 201908510124).

Competing Interest Statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Harman G, Khadka R, Doni F, Uphoff N. Benefits to Plant Health and Productivity From Enhancing Plant Microbial Symbionts. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2021;11:610065.

2. Zandi P, Basu SK. Role of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) as BioFertilizers in Stabilizing Agricultural Ecosystems. Sustain Dev Biodiver. 2016;9:71-87.

3. Faltin F, Lottmann J, Grosch R, Berg G. Strategy to select and assess antagonistic bacteria for biological control of Rhizoctonia solani Kuhn. Can J Microbiol. 2004;50:811-820.

4. Elnahal ASM, El-Saadony MT, Saad AM, Desoky ESM, El-Tahan AM, Rady MM, et al. The use of microbial inoculants for biological control, plant growth promotion, and sustainable agriculture: A review. Eur J Plant Pathol. 2022;162:759-792.

5. Raymond NS, Gómez-Muñoz B, van der Bom FJT, Nybroe O, Jensen LS, Müller-Stöver DS, et al. Phosphate-solubilising microorganisms for improved crop productivity: a critical assessment. New Phytologist. 2021;229:1268-1277.

6. Berendsen RL, Pieterse CMJ, Bakker PAHM. The rhizosphere microbiome and plant health. Trends in Plant Science. 2012;17:478-486.

7. Venturi V, Keel C. Signaling in the Rhizosphere. Trends in Plant Science. 2016;21:187-198.

640 8. Tran H, Ficke A, Asiimwe T, Hofte M, Raaijmakers JM. Role of the cyclic

641   lipopeptide massetolide A in biological control of *Phytophthora infestans* and in

642   colonization of tomato plants by *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. New Phytol.

643   2007;175:731-742.

644 9. Nielsen TH, Nybroe O, Koch B, Hansen M, Sorensen J. Genes involved in cyclic

645   lipopeptide production are important for seed and straw colonization by

646   *Pseudomonas* sp strain DSS73. Appl Environ Microb. 2005;71:4112-4116.

647 10. Mazzola M, de Bruijn I, Cohen MF, Raaijmakers JM. Protozoan-induced

648   regulation of cyclic lipopeptide biosynthesis is an effective predation defense

649   mechanism for *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. Appl Environ Microbiol.

650   2009;75:6804-6811.

651 11. de Bruijn I, de Kock MJ, Yang M, de Waard P, van Beek TA, Raaijmakers JM.

652   Genome-based discovery, structure prediction and functional analysis of cyclic

653   lipopeptide antibiotics in *Pseudomonas* species. Mol Microbiol. 2007;63:417-428.

654 12. Alsohim AS, Taylor TB, Barrett GA, Gallie J, Zhang XX, Altamirano-Junqueira

655   AE, et al. The biosurfactant viscosin produced by *Pseudomonas fluorescens*

656   SBW25 aids spreading motility and plant growth promotion. Environmental

657   Microbiology. 2014;16:2267-2281.

658 13. Lundberg DS, Lebeis SL, Paredes SH, Yourstone S, Gehring J, Malfatti S, et al.

659   Defining the core *Arabidopsis thaliana* root microbiome. Nature. 2012;488:86-90.

14. Edwards J, Johnson C, Santos-Medellín C, Lurie E, Podishetty NK, Bhatnagar S,

et al. Structure, variation, and assembly of the root-associated microbiomes of

rice. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2015;112:E911-E920.

15. Peiffer JA, Spor A, Koren O, Jin Z, Tringe SG, Dangl JL, et al. Diversity and

heritability of the maize rhizosphere microbiome under field conditions.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2013;110:6548-6553.

16. Wang JN, Mei XL, Wei Z, Raza W, Shen QR. Effect of bacterial intra-species

community interactions on the production and activity of volatile organic

compounds. Soil Ecol Lett. 2021;3:32-41.

17. James GA, Beaudette L, Costerton JW. Interspecies Bacterial Interactions in

Biofilms. J Ind Microbiol. 1995;15:257-262.

18. Vesga P, Flury P, Vacheron J, Keel C, Croll D, Maurhofer M. Transcriptome

plasticity underlying plant root colonization and insect invasion by *Pseudomonas*

protegens. ISME J. 2020;14:2766-2782.

19. Rochat L, Pechy-Tarr M, Baehler E, Maurhofer M, Keel C. Combination of

Fluorescent Reporters for Simultaneous Monitoring of Root Colonization and

Antifungal Gene Expression by a Biocontrol Pseudomonad on Cereals with Flow

Cytometry. Mol Plant Microbe In. 2010;23:949-961.

20. Tovi N, Orevi T, Grinberg M, Kashtan N, Hadar Y, Minz D. Pairwise Interactions

of Three Related *Pseudomonas* Species in Plant Roots and Inert Surfaces. Front

Microbiol. 2021;12:666522.

21. Singh P, Singh RK, Zhou Y, Wang J, Jiang Y, Shen N, et al. Unlocking the

strength of plant growth promoting *Pseudomonas* in improving crop productivity

in normal and challenging environments: a review. Journal of Plant Interactions.

2022;17:220-238.

22. Lloyd DP, Allen RJ. Competition for space during bacterial colonization of a

surface. Journal of The Royal Society Interface. 2015;12:20150608.

23. Hawkes CV, DeAngelis KM, Firestone MK. CHAPTER 1 - Root Interactions with

Soil Microbial Communities and Processes. In: Cardon ZG, Whitbeck JL (eds).

The Rhizosphere. Academic Press, Burlington, 2007. pp 1-29.

24. Ceja-Navarro JA, Wang Y, Ning DL, Arellano A, Ramanculova L, Yuan MM, et al.

Protist diversity and community complexity in the rhizosphere of switchgrass are

dynamic as plants develop. Microbiome. 2021;9.

25. Clarholm M. Interactions of Bacteria, Protozoa and Plants Leading to

Mineralization of Soil-Nitrogen. Soil Biol Biochem. 1985;17:181-187.

26. Rosenberg K, Bertaux J, Krome K, Hartmann A, Scheu S, Bonkowski M. Soil

amoebae rapidly change bacterial community composition in the rhizosphere of

Arabidopsis thaliana. Isme J. 2009;3:675-684.

27. Rainey PB, Bailey MJ. Physical and genetic map of the *Pseudomonas*

fluorescens SBW25 chromosome. Molecular Microbiology. 1996;19:521-533.

28. Bonnichsen L, Bygvraa Svenningsen N, Rybtke M, de Bruijn I, Raaijmakers JM,

Tolker-Nielsen T, et al. Lipopeptide biosurfactant viscosin enhances dispersal of

Pseudomonas fluorescens SBW25 biofilms. Microbiology. 2015;161:2289-2297.

29. van der Bom F, Magid J, Jensen LS. Long-term P and K fertilisation strategies

and balances affect soil availability indices, crop yield depression risk and N use.

European Journal of Agronomy. 2017;86:12-23.

30. Zervas A, Ellegaard-Jensen L, Hennessy Rosanna C, Bak F, Guan Y, Horn

Herms C, et al. Diversity and Structure of Bacterial Communities in Different

Rhizocompartments (Rhizoplane, Rhizosphere, and Bulk) at Flag Leaf

Emergence in Four Winter Wheat Varieties. Microbiology Resource

Announcements. 2022;11:e00222-00222.

31. Shaner NC, Campbell RE, Steinbach PA, Giepmans BNG, Palmer AE, Tsien RY.

Improved monomeric red, orange and yellow fluorescent proteins derived from

Discosoma sp red fluorescent protein. Nat Biotechnol. 2004;22:1567-1572.

32. Gould WD, Hagedorn C, Bardinelli TR, Zablotowicz RM. New Selective Media for

Enumeration and Recovery of Fluorescent Pseudomonads from Various

Habitats. Appl Environ Microb. 1985;49:28-32.

33. Chelius MK, Triplett EW. The Diversity of Archaea and Bacteria in Association

with the Roots of Zea mays L. Microbial Ecology. 2001;41:252-263.

34. Bulgarelli D, Rott M, Schlaeppi K, Ver Loren van Themaat E, Ahmadinejad N,

Assenza F, et al. Revealing structure and assembly cues for *Arabidopsis* root-

inhabiting bacterial microbiota. Nature. 2012;488:91-95.

35. Anguita-Maeso M, Haro C, Navas-Cortés JA, Landa BB. Primer Choice and

Xylem-Microbiome-Extraction Method Are Important Determinants in Assessing

Xylem Bacterial Community in Olive Trees. Plants. 2022;11:1320.

36. Amaral-Zettler LA, McCliment EA, Ducklow HW, Huse SM. A Method for
Studying Protistan Diversity Using Massively Parallel Sequencing of V9
Hypervariable Regions of Small-Subunit Ribosomal RNA Genes. Plos One.
2009;4:e6372.

37. Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJ, Holmes SP.
DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat
Methods. 2016;13:581-583.

38. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA
ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-
based tools. Nucleic Acids Research. 2013;41:D590-D596.

39. Guillou L, Bachar D, Audic S, Bass D, Berney C, Bittner L, et al. The Protist
Ribosomal Reference database (PR2): a catalog of unicellular eukaryote Small
Sub-Unit rRNA sequences with curated taxonomy. Nucleic Acids Research.
2013;41:D597-D604.

40. Reitmeier S, Hitch TCA, Treichel N, Fikas N, Hausmann B, Ramer-Tait AE, et al.
Handling of spurious sequences affects the outcome of high-throughput 16S
rRNA gene amplicon profiling. ISME Communications. 2021;1:31.

41. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 2022.

42. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive
Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. Plos One. 2013;8:e61217.

43. Andersen KS, Kirkegaard RH, Karst SM, Albertsen M. ampvis2: an R package to
analyse and visualise 16S rRNA amplicon data. bioRxiv. 2018:299537.

44. Liu C, Cui Y, Li X, Yao M. microeco: an R package for data mining in microbial
community ecology. Fems Microbiol Ecol. 2021;97:fiaa255.

45. Willis AD, Martin BD. Estimating diversity in networked ecological communities.
Biostatistics. 2022;23:207-222.

46. Willis A, Martin BD, Trinh P, Teichman S, Clausen D, Barger K, et al. breakaway:
Species Richness Estimation and Modeling. 2021.

47. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. Waste Not, Want Not: Why Rarefying Microbiome Data
Is Inadmissible. PLOS Computational Biology. 2014;10:e1003531.

48. Oksanen J, Simpson GL, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, et al.
vegan: Community Ecology Package. 2022.

49. Martin BD, Witten D, Willis AD. corncob: Count Regression for Correlated
Observations with the Beta-Binomial. 2021.

50. Knights HE, Jorrin B, Haskett TL, Poole PS. Deciphering bacterial mechanisms
of root colonization. Env Microbiol Rep. 2021;13:428-444.

51. Yang MM, Wen SS, Mavrodi DV, Mavrodi OV, von Wettstein D, Thomashow LS,
et al. Biological control of wheat root diseases by the CLP-producing strain
Pseudomonas fluorescens HC1-07. Phytopathology. 2014;104:248-256.

52. Nunes I, Hansen V, Bak F, Bonnichsen L, Su J, Hao X, et al. Succession of the
wheat seed-associated microbiome as affected by soil fertility level and
introduction of *Penicillium* and *Bacillus* inoculants in the field. Fems Microbiol
Ecol. 2022;98:fiac028.

53. Nicolaisen MH, Cuong ND, Herschend J, Jensen B, Loan LC, Van Du P, et al.

Biological control of rice sheath blight using hyphae-associated bacteria:

development of an *in planta* screening assay to predict biological control agent

performance under field conditions. BioControl. 2018;63:843-853.

54. Usyskin-Tonne A, Hadar Y, Minz D. Spike Formation Is a Turning Point

Determining Wheat Root Microbiome Abundance, Structures and Functions. Int J

Mol Sci. 2021;22.

55. Rossmann M, Pérez-Jaramillo JE, Kavamura VN, Chiaramonte JB, Dumack K,

Fiore-Donno AM, et al. Multitrophic interactions in the rhizosphere microbiome of

wheat: from bacteria and fungi to protists. Fems Microbiol Ecol. 2020;96:fiaa032.

56. Chen X, Xu D, Zhang Y, Zhang L, Li F. Field level comparison of rhizosphere

microbiome characteristics between wheat cultivars Jimai22 and Xiaoyan22.

Agronomy Journal. 2023;n/a.

57. Ou K, He X, Cai K, Zhao W, Jiang X, Ai W, et al. Phosphate-Solubilizing

Pseudomonas sp. Strain WS32 Rhizosphere Colonization-Induced Expression

Changes in Wheat Roots. Front Microbiol. 2022;13:927889.

58. Liu X, Jiang X, He X, Zhao W, Cao Y, Guo T, et al. Phosphate-Solubilizing

Pseudomonas sp. Strain P34-L Promotes Wheat Growth by Colonizing the

Wheat Rhizosphere and Improving the Wheat Root System and Soil Phosphorus

Nutritional Status. Journal of Plant Growth Regulation. 2019;38:1314-1324.

59. Cao Y-y, Ni H-t, Li T, Lay K-d, Liu D-s, He X-y, et al. *Pseudomonas* sp. TK35-L

enhances tobacco root development and growth by inducing *HRGPnt3*

expression in plant lateral root formation. Journal of Integrative Agriculture.

2020;19:2549-2560.

60. Herms CH, Hennessy RC, Bak F, Dresbøll DB, Nicolaisen MH. Back to our roots:

exploring the role of root morphology as a mediator of beneficial plant–microbe

interactions. Environmental Microbiology. 2022;24:3264-3272.

61. Schlatter Daniel C, Yin C, Hulbert S, Paulitz Timothy C. Core Rhizosphere

Microbiomes of Dryland Wheat Are Influenced by Location and Land Use History.

Appl Environ Microb. 2020;86:e02135-02119.

62. Simonin M, Dasilva C, Terzi V, Ngonkeu ELM, Diouf D, Kane A, et al. Influence

of plant genotype and soil on the wheat rhizosphere microbiome: evidences for a

core microbiome across eight African and European soils. Fems Microbiol Ecol.

2020;96:fiaa067.

63. Blake C, Christensen MN, Kovács ÁT. Molecular Aspects of Plant Growth

Promotion and Protection by *Bacillus subtilis*. Mol Plant Microbe In. 2020;34:15-

25.

64. Ofek M, Hadar Y, Minz D. Ecology of Root Colonizing *Massilia*

(Oxalobacteraceae). Plos One. 2012;7:e40117.

65. Li X, Rui J, Mao Y, Yannarell A, Mackie R. Dynamics of the bacterial community

structure in the rhizosphere of a maize cultivar. Soil Biology and Biochemistry.

2014;68:392-401.

66. Taerum SJ, Micciulla J, Corso G, Steven B, Gage DJ, Triplett LR. 18S rRNA

gene amplicon sequencing combined with culture-based surveys of maize

rhizosphere protists reveal dominant, plant-enriched and culturable community

members. Env Microbiol Rep. 2022;14:110-118.

67. Sapp M, Ploch S, Fiore-Donno AM, Bonkowski M, Rose LE. Protists are an

integral part of the *Arabidopsis thaliana* microbiome. Environmental Microbiology.

2018;20:30-43.

68. Bao Y, Lies DP, Fu H, Roberts GP. An improved Tn7-based system for the

single-copy insertion of cloned genes into chromosomes of gram-negative

bacteria. Gene. 1991;109:167-168.

Tables

Table 1. Strains, plasmids and primers.

	Characteristics or sequence	**Reference**
Strains		
Pseudomonas fluorescens		
SBW25	WT, produces viscosin.	[27]
SBW25Δ*viscA*	Impaired in viscosin production: *viscA*::Tn*Mod* Km^r	[11]
Plasmids		
pME9407	Delivery plasmid for mini-Tn*7-mcherry*; pME3280a carrying *mcherry* placed under P$_{tac}$ control; Ap^r Gm^r	[19]
pUX-BF13	Helper plasmid encoding Tn7 transposition functions; R6K-replicon; Ap^r	[68]
Primers		
mCherry_Fw	5'-GCCCCGTAATGCAGAAGAAG-3'	This study
mCherry_Rv	5'-GTGTAGTCCTCGTTGTGGGA-3'	This study
799F	5'-AACMGGATTAGATACCCKG-3'	[33]
1193R	5'-ACGTCATCCCCACCTTCC-3'	[34]
1380F	5'-GCCTCCCTCGCGCCATCAG-3'	[36]
1510R	5'-GCCTTGCCAGCCCGCTCAG-3'	[36]

Figures

Fig.1 Colonization ability of *P. fluorescens* SBW25 WT and *P. fluorescens* SBW25 Δ*viscA*. (A) qPCR enumeration of inoculated bacteria immediately after inoculation. (B) qPCR enumeration of inoculated bacteria in the rhizoplane at two weeks after inoculation (n=5). (C) CFU enumeration of inoculated bacteria immediately after inoculation (n=4). (D) CFU enumeration of inoculated bacteria in the rhizoplane at two weeks after inoculation (n=3). Bars represent the mean + standard deviation, and each point represents a sample. Asterisks above histograms indicate whether two groups are significantly different (t-test, $p < 0.05$)

Fig.2 The effect of inoculation with *P. fluorescens* SBW25 WT or *P. fluorescens* SBW25 *ΔviscA* on plant growth (n = 8). Bars represent the mean + standard deviation, and each point represents a sample. Asterisks above histograms indicate whether two group are statistically significantly different as assessed by one-way ANOVA followed by a Tukey HSD test: *$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$.

Fig.3 Principal Component Analysis (PCA) based on Aitchison distances of bacterial and protist communities in each subset. The models were validated using an ANOVA-like permutation test (999 permutations) as indicated by the P-value. R^2 is expressed as the proportion of the mean sum of squares obtained from PERMANOVA. Each symbol represents individual sample points and samples are colored for inoculation treatment.

Fig.4 The bacterial ASVs/genera with significant differences in relative abundance between inoculation treatments in Sheriff. The differential abundance was determined using beta-binomial regression with the corncob. Only ASVs having an estimated differential abundance of < -1 or > 1 and P-values adjusted for multiple testing < 0.05 (FDR < 0.05) were considered significant. The red color indicates that inoculation with SBW25 WT showed a significant increase in ASVs compared to both control and mutant treatment.

Fig.5 The bacterial ASVs/genera with significant differences in relative abundance between inoculation treatments in Heerup. No significant difference in ASVs was found between SBW25 WT treatment and control treatment in Heerup rhizoplane. The differential abundance was determined using beta-binomial regression with the corncob. Only ASV that had an estimated differential abundance of < -1 or > 1 and P-values adjusted for multiple testing < 0.05 (FDR < 0.05) were considered significant.

Fig.6 The relative abundance of Pythium in the rhizoplane was analyzed in each group. The mean relative abundance of all Pythium in each treatment group (n=5). Sum represents the abundance of these four ASVs for each group. H: Heerup; S: Sheriff.