Interaction between climatic variation and pathogen diversity shape endemic disease dynamics in the agricultural settings

Rishi Bhandari*[1], Amanpreet Kaur*[1], Ivory Russell[1], Ogonnaya Michael Romanus[2], Destiny Brokaw[1], Anthony P Keinath[3], Zachary Snipes[4], Philip Rollins[4], Nettie Baugher[5], Inga Meadows[5], Ty Nicholas Torrance[6], Bhabesh Dutta[7], Edward Sikora[1], Roberto Molinari[2], Samuel Soubeyrand[8], Neha Potnis[1]

Affiliations

[1] Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA

[2] Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA

[3] Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, Clemson University, Charleston, SC 29414, USA

[4] Clemson Cooperative Extension Service, Clemson University, Charleston, SC, 29401, USA

[5] NC State Cooperative Extension, Mountain Research Station, North Carolina State University, Waynesville, NC 28786, USA

[6] UGA Cooperative Extension, Tift County Extension, University of Georgia, Tifton, GA, 31793, USA

[7] Department of Plant Pathology, University of Georgia, Tifton CAES Campus, Tifton, GA, 31793, USA

[8] INRAE, BioSP, 84914, Avignon, France

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Short title: Climate - Pathogen diversity interaction shape disease dynamics

Corresponding Author: Neha Potnis, nzp0024@auburn.edu

Abstract

Recurring outbreaks caused by endemic pathogens continue to pose problems in managing plant, wildlife, livestock and human health. Understanding how these outbreaks unfold and what drives the variability in disease epidemics across space and time is less understood, especially in the agricultural settings. In this study, we investigated the contribution of pathogen genetic diversity, climatic variation and their interaction towards disease dynamics, with an integrative approach grounded on multitype, high resolution sequencing data and analysis techniques. This investigation was carried out for bacterial spot disease epidemic by surveying tomato fields for bacterial pathogen (*Xanthomonas perforans*) across southeastern US over a span of three years. The strength of epidemic severity varied across space and time in the agricultural fields. Disease severity was positively associated with strain diversity, and was linked to environmental fluctuations, specifically, large variation and extreme changes in certain climatic factors. Strain-resolved metagenomics approach revealed that co-existence of multiple pathogen lineages was common in the individual fields, although accompanied by differential lineage dynamics. The co-occurring lineages displayed environmentally dependent fitness contributions. By tracing allelic frequencies in pathogen populations across temporal scales, we find evidence for asynchronous allele cycling across seasons, hinting at the presence of adaptive single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) being polymorphic in space in response to seasonality. Despite this pathogen heterogeneity, we identified positively selected loci under parallel evolution, which may explain the nature of selection pressures experienced by the pathogen. While single pathogen lineage is assumed to dominate the host in the agricultural settings, our findings challenge this notion by demonstrating genetic diversity in the pathogen population observed within a single field and linking it to the disease dynamics. Our results explain the role of pathogen genetic diversity, climate-dependent

compositional dynamics, and differential fitness contributions in dictating the variability of disease

epidemics in the agricultural settings. Such findings will be invaluable for building predictive

models in disease epidemiology. Our high-resolution combinatorial approach exploiting high-

resolution sequence data, metadata types and analysis tools, is general enough to finely investigate

disease epidemics at large scales in diverse case-studies concerning plant, animal and human

health.

Introduction

Predicting the disease epidemics in the face of climate change is a major challenge in

epidemiological studies of diseases impacting human, wildlife and plant health (1–4). Disease

epidemics result from complex host-pathogen-environment interactions where ecological and

evolutionary processes shape host and pathogen populations and environment can directly impact

pathogen fitness or indirectly impact host susceptibility (5–9). These complexities involving

interdependent interactions pose a challenge in dissecting the contribution of each component

towards variability in disease epidemics. In addition, while controlled experiments have provided

insights into specific environmental parameters in shaping disease outbreaks, we have little

experimental evidence on how frequent shifts in these climatic factors can impact disease

dynamics and whether climate change has already led to a surge of plant disease outbreaks over

the past century (10–15).

Among different factors contributing to variable incidences and trajectories of disease epidemics,

pathogen diversity plays a major role in this equation. While molecular markers and next-

generation sequencing approaches have accelerated characterization of pathogen diversity, the

diversity studies have been focused on informing pathogen population structure and evolution of

the pathogen (16–19). Integral role of population genetics into epidemiology and disease

management has been much appreciated with the rapid next-generation sequencing efforts (20,21).

Time-series isolate-genome sequencing has transformed our views on population genetics going

beyond conventional diagnostic tools informing races, pathotypes, or species (17), although

isolation-based approaches present a bias of choosing the most dominant pathogen genotype for

sequencing and thus, may suppose pathogen homogeneity in a diseased sample, leaving out the

details of low abundant pathogen variants that may be co-occurring. Such approaches may miss

the "true genetic diversity" existing within single field, or a single organ, or a single lesion. In case

of agricultural systems, majority of the focus has been on the dominant pathogen genotypes for

designing management strategies, specifically breeding efforts, and characterization of pathogen

spatial genetic structure studies at the micro-geographical scale are limited. Two recent studies

have indicated presence of polyclonal infections in a single disease lesion (22), and epidemics with

multiple co-existing pathogen genotypes (23) in a single field. These findings underscore the need

for characterizing spatio-temporal pathogen population structure and the strain dynamics at the

micro-geographical scale as disease epidemics unfold (24).

While much of the work in understanding the disease dynamics and pathogen diversity across

space and time has been conducted in the natural settings with wild plant pathogens (25,26), studies

linking pathogen diversity and dynamics to explaining disease epidemics in the agricultural

settings are limited (27–29). Many factors associated with modern agricultural practices such as

global trade, use of chemicals, or intensified monoculture system can predispose the system

susceptible to the disease epidemics. For example, in the case of seed-borne pathogens, the global

trade facilitating the continuous input of different pathogen genotypes on seeds or plant materials

circulated worldwide has been a driving force in the pathogen diversity observed under field

conditions (30). Thus, the initial strain composition of pathogen population entering the

agricultural fields can be variable, depending on the source of the inoculum on seeds, or

transplants, or surviving population from the previous epidemic season in the fields (31–33). Upon

establishment of these initial pathogen populations, variation in the pathogen dynamics across

different fields depends on many factors. These include differential fitness levels of pathogen

genotypes on the host considering both virulence and aggressiveness, interactions between

pathogen and host genotype (host specificity), strain competition, climate sensitivity of individual

pathogen genotypes, and other processes such as dispersal that may introduce new pathogen

genotypes on to the plant during the course of the season (34–39). In addition, local conditions

such as neighboring plants, may affect the strain assembly processes (40). Grower's practices such

as use of copper sprays, or other chemical pesticides can also impact strain composition,

facilitating dominance of chemically resistant population (41–43), while managing fitness trade-

offs with virulence. The field landscape can influence pathogen population structure (44). In

addition to the ecological dynamics, pathogen populations also undergo diversification through a

variety of genetic processes such as mutation or recombination, although studies characterizing

these genetic processes within a span of single or consecutive growing seasons are limited (39,45).

Higher genetic diversity in the pathogen population has been hypothesized to reflect higher

evolutionary potential (46), to facilitate genetic exchange (22) and was shown to contribute to

epidemic growth (24) and in some cases, higher genetic diversity was shown to affect transmission

dynamics (26).

The pathosystem of bacterial leaf spot (BLS) on tomatoes caused by *Xanthomonas perforans (Xp)* (also referred to as *Xanthomonas euvesicatoria pv. perforans*) is an example of an endemic disease where no known host resistance genes have been deployed in commercial tomato cultivars and disease epidemics continue to be observed across all the tomato producing regions (47). Genome sequencing of time-series collection of field isolates have informed that extensive shifts in the pathogen population, including species displacement and extensive diversification have been observed in the past decades (23,31,33,47–50). Tomato production system that introduces multiple pathogen genotypes into the fields via transplants has been shown to shape pathogen population structure in the field (31). In addition, inoculum from the previous growing season may also be additional source of introduction, depending on the cultural practices in the field. However, assuming variable probabilities of introductions of pathogen genotypes into the field, the following questions still remains unanswered: Does a single pathogen genotype dominate the agricultural fields as it is assumed for implementing management strategies? What factors explain variation in disease dynamics observed across the fields? How does pathogen respond to abrupt changes in the climatic patterns? We addressed these questions in the present study by specifically focusing on the contribution of climatic variation, pathogen diversity and strain dynamics in explaining different bacterial spot epidemic trajectories in the agricultural field outbreaks. Using strain-resolved metagenomics to characterize pathogen diversity within a single field (23), we surveyed tomato fields in the southeastern US over the course of growing season in three consecutive years and found that multiple (up to 5) pathogen genotypes co-exist and their abundance varies across the fields. While at least three different pathogen genotypes seemed to dominate the southeastern US, their differential abundance across fields and across seasons was explained by differential impact of abrupt climatic changes on the fitness of the three genotypes. The findings from this

work on strain dynamics and fitness will be useful in diversity-informed epidemiological

predictions, especially under changing climate.

Results

Varying levels of BLS disease severity exist within the Southeastern US

A total of 66 tomato phyllosphere samples were gathered over three years (2020-2022) from

Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina (Fig 1A; S1A Table). The sampling

method was determined based on the field size and the amount of disease present (Fig 1B).

Metagenomic DNA from the leaf samples was subjected to shotgun metagenomics to obtain a

high-resolution pathogen population structure in the southeastern US. Apart from five samples

showing no BLS symptoms, the sampled fields showed variable levels of disease severity (S1B

Table) across consistently sampled individual fields (S1 Fig), across the season and within and

across states (Figs 1C and S2A). We observed that average disease severity in samples from

Alabama was lower during mid-season compared to other states. But the average disease severity

during the end season was higher in Alabama compared to other states (Figs 1C and S2A).

However, disease severity was not consistently higher as the season progressed, as seen with

samples from Georgia and South Carolina (Figs 1C and S2A). We used the SNV profiling method,

strainEST, to detect pathogen lineages at finer resolution including those with low abundance

levels. For this, we screened metagenomic reads for the presence of BLS pathogenic species, *Xp*,

Xeu (Xanthmonas euvesicatoria pv. euvesicatoria), and *Xeu*-related pathovars (*Xeu* sister clades).

We observed the absence of *Xeu* in sampled tomato fields suggesting that *Xp* is the dominant

pathogen of BLS in tomatoes in the southeastern United States. Using correlation analysis as an

exploratory tool, we found that the absolute abundance of *Xp* (Figs 1D and S2B) positively

correlated with disease severity (mid-season: $R^2 = 0.381$, $p < 0.001$, end-season: $R^2 = 0.283$, $p <$

0.01). A similar observation was made with the relative abundance of *Xp* (S2C Fig) (mid-season:

$R^2 = 0.508$, $p < 0.001$, end-season: $R^2 = 0.378$, $p < 0.001$). The pathogen population was

significantly associated with disease severity during the early season compared to the late season

based on R^2 value. Although small-scale farms showed slightly higher disease severity, this

difference compared to commercial-scale farms was not statistically significant ($p = 0.45$, see S3A

Fig).

Fig 1. *Xanthomonas euvesicatoria* **pv.** *perforans* **(***Xp***) continues to be a significant pathogen in the tomato fields across** *the* **southeastern US, although with variable disease severity in the region. (A)** Map of the study area from Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia from Southeast United States. The dots in the figures represent the sampled farm, and the size of the dot represents the number of samples collected during the years 2020, 2021, and 2022. The samples were collected from two different growing seasons: summer (with mid and end-season sampling points) and fall season. **(B)** Sampling methods varied by field size. In small farms, stratified random sampling was used to collect representative leaflets (left). In large fields, samples were taken along an X (mid) or W (right) pattern. Split-violin plots showing **(C)** disease severity ratings for all collected samples estimated using the Horsfall-Barratt scale, which ranges from 1 to 12, with the scale of 1 being no disease and 12 being 100% defoliation (51) and **(D)** the absolute abundance of *Xp* collected from different states during 2020, 2021, and 2022. The absolute abundance for each sample was estimated by multiplying the amount of DNA per ng of the sample with relative abundance of *Xp* present in it.

Xanthomonas **abundance reveals a heterogeneous spatial distribution of pathogen lineages, and the increased pathogen diversity was associated with higher disease severity.**

Given our observation of varying levels of epidemics, we hypothesized that pathogen heterogeneity is responsible for varying disease dynamics. Thus, we assessed the heterogeneity in the pathogen population by studying the extent of diversity of *Xp* in individual fields. Our approach involved mapping the metagenome reads to the SNP matrices of known pathogen lineages or sequence clusters (SC) of *Xp* and calculating relative abundance for each SC. To understand the current global population structure of *Xp*, we leveraged the availability of extensive genome resources for *Xp* collected worldwide over the last three decades (473 genomes as of March 2023). Based on the phylogeny of these publicly available global *Xp* collections, determined by core genome single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), eight distinct lineages were identified within *Xp* strains referred to hereafter as sequence clusters (SC) or lineages (Fig 2A). This SNP-level resolution into different lineages was a baseline for our analysis to identify diversity and co-occurrence of pathogen lineages across field metagenomes. Surprisingly, we identified the presence of eight lineages in the field samples. Distantly related SC3 and 4 (SNP distance of 10,825 SNPs) co-existed in majority of the fields (Fig 2B). Three lineages, SC3, SC4, and SC6 were in higher abundance in these fields, although their abundance varied from field to field, and their

dynamics varied across neighboring fields (Figs 2C and S4). Notably, SC1, SC7, and SC8 were in

lower abundance, appearing in only eight samples (Figs 2C and S4). The co-occurrence of different

Xp lineages were observed in the samples, as noted in our previous limited metagenome survey

(23). Fields had a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5 lineages present at a given sampling time, and

this diversity of co-occurring lineages was different across different years, and samples from

neighboring states (Figs 2C and S4). Next, we investigated whether multiple co-occurring lineages

of *Xp* within individual fields influenced disease severity. Fields with more than two co-occurring

SCs displayed higher average nucleotide diversity, and showed significantly higher disease

severity compared to those with less than 2 SCs (S5 Fig). Correlation analysis between the

Shannon diversity index of the pathogen population and disease severity revealed a positive

association ($R^2 = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$) (S6 Fig). This suggests that *Xp* population diversity is positively

associated with disease severity. Changes in strain composition were not only evident across

different fields but also within individual fields throughout the growing season, spanning three

years. These dynamics in strain composition were marked by strain fluctuations, where the

abundance of lineages shifted from one season to the other, strain invasion where a new lineage

likely infected the plants during the growing season, and differential strain dynamics (Figs 2C and

S4). Overall, the diversity of *Xp* found globally is circulating in Southeastern US tomato fields,

and strain diversity and composition is significantly associated with disease severity.

Fig 2. Co-occurrence of multiple lineages of the BLS pathogen observed in the southeastern United States, which leads to increased BLS disease severity. (A) Midpoint-rooted maximum-likelihood phylogeny based on a concatenated alignment of core genome SNPs from 473 *Xp* strains. The tips are color-coded according to the lineages identified in the first level of the HierBAPS hierarchy. SC9 is a single-strain lineage exclusively found in Nigeria. **(B)** Dot plot shows the SNP differences across different SCs, where size and colour of each point refer to the number of SNPs differences present while comparing one SC (on x-axis) comparison to another SC (on y-axis). **(C)** Stacked bar plot depicting the co-occurrence of multiple *Xp* lineages, spatial and temporal variations, the introduction of new lineages, turnover, and dominance shifts in individual fields across various states during the mid and end of summer seasons and fall seasons for the years 2020, 2021, and 2022. Representative fields are shown in this figure. **S4 Fig** is showing data for all fields is included in the supplementary file.

Climatic shifts and extremes explain variation in BLS epidemics across the Southeastern United States

Given the findings of variable disease dynamics across neighboring states, we assessed the contribution of climatic factors and their spatial and temporal variations as drivers of disease epidemics. We used regression models to analyze how disease severity and pathogen abundance (response variables) are related to predictor variables such as climatic factors, sampling time, year, and farm scale (treating the latter three as categorical variables). While the data on disease severity, pathogen abundance, and pathogen diversity were collected for specific timepoints during the growing season, the datasets obtained from NASA-POWER for weather related variables (S2 Table) were at a much finer spatio-temporal resolution with daily record (0.5 x 0.625 latitude-longitude grid cell resolution). In addition to considering routine mean or median values of climatic variables for analyses, we also considered characteristics of climatic predictors using indexes that capture the spread (standard deviation), asymmetries, and tail-heaviness (skewness and kurtosis). This approach accounts for within-season climatic variations, considering interseasonal weather events, that may present highly conducive conditions for bacterial diseases. Considering the sample size, this approach, however, considerably increased the number of predictors so, to achieve reasonable statistical conclusions, for all regressions we ran a preliminary predictor-selection method (i.e. Lasso) and successively applied the appropriate regression on the selected

predictors for each response (see method section for Statistical analysis). Having selected the

relevant predictors for each response, we ran the logistic ordinal regression model to understand

drivers for disease severity which indicated that the Shannon diversity of various SCs of *Xp* present

in the field (t value = 4.15, *p* < 0.05) strongly influenced BLS disease severity as suggested in the

earlier result (S6A1 Fig). Among the climatic factors, the standard deviation of Wet Bulb

Temperature at 2 meters (t-value = 2.06, *p* < 0.05) and the standard deviation of the average of the

wind direction at 10 meters above the surface of the earth (t-value = 2.73, *p* < 0.05) significantly

increase BLS disease severity (Tables 1A and S3A), indicating that large variation in wet bulb

temperature (adiabetic saturation temperature) and wind direction values led to higher disease

severity. Next, a beta regression model predicting the drivers of *Xp* abundance identified one key

predictor: the standard deviation of wind direction at 10 meters above the earth's surface. This

variable has a positive association with the absolute (z-value = 2.08, *p* < 0.05)) (Tables 1B and

S3B) and relative (z-value = 2.69, *p* < 0.05) abundance of *Xp* (S3C Table). Additionally, kurtosis

and skewness of certain climatic parameters were observed as significant, suggesting extreme and

frequent shifts of climatic variables influence disease severity and pathogen abundance (S3 Table).

The complete analysis providing information about other significant climatic variables to explain

disease severity and pathogen abundance is available in the supplementary text (Supplementary

Text).

Finally, we used Dirichlet compositional regression to evaluate the influence of climatic factors in

explaining the differential dynamics of pathogen lineages or SCs across different fields. This type

of regression ensures that dependence between cluster abundance is accounted for (i.e. the

proportion of clusters must sum to one). We found that the variables that appeared to be significant

across pathogen lineages were the standard deviation of specific humidity at 2 meters and mid-

season (compared to end-season). In particular, these appeared to diminish abundance across all

clusters except for SC6 (S4 Table). These findings suggest that frequent shifts in the climatic

conditions can influence individual lineages and their abundance. Specific variables that impact

individual lineages are discussed in detail in the supplementary text (Supplementary Text).

Table 1. Various climatic factors influence disease dynamics and *Xp* abundance. (A) Significant
climatic variables from the ordinal regression model predict the degree of correlation between various
environmental factors and BLS disease severity. **(B)** Significant climatic variables from the beta
regression model, showing the degree of correlation between various environmental variables and the
absolute abundance of *Xp*. The Value represents the estimated increase in the log odds of the outcome for
a one-unit increase in the predictor variable. The Std. Error measures the precision of this estimate.
The t/z-value indicates that the effect of the predictor variable is statistically significant if the values
exceed 2 or fall below -2.

Table 1A			
Factors	**Value**	**Std. Error**	**t-value**
Shannon diversity	2.37409	0.57175	4.1523
Standard deviation of Wet Bulb Temperature at 2 Meters	0.96797	0.46843	2.0664
Standard deviation of Wind Direction at 10 Meters	0.09547	0.03492	2.7338
Skewness of Clear Sky Surface PAR Total	-0.94701	0.36778	-2.5749
Kurtosis of Temperature at 2 Meters Range (C)	-1.25559	0.59055	-2.1262

Table 1B				
Factors	**Estimate**	**Std. Error**	**z-value**	**Pr(>|z|)**
Standard deviation of Wind Direction at 10 Meters	0.03934	0.01885	2.087	0.0368
Skewness of Surface Pressure	-1.70069	0.52146	-3.261	0.0011
Kurtosis of Relative humidity at 2 Meters (%)	-0.66357	0.26293	-2.524	0.0116

Pathogen heterogeneity and variable fitness levels influence disease dynamics.

We observed differential strain dynamics with spatial and temporal variations in dominant lineages

(Fig 2C). The variation in strain dynamics can result from variability in fitness levels of different

pathogen lineages and/or variable effects of environment on host-pathogen genotype interactions.

This variation in fitness levels can stem from differential virulence and transmission capabilities

or direct or indirect (host-mediated) competition among co-occurring pathogen lineages. We asked

how pathogen heterogeneity and variable dynamics could contribute to the explanation of

fluctuating disease pressures during outbreaks. We used complementary data from the greenhouse

experiment and field data provided here to evaluate the hypothesis that different disease pressures

are caused by different fitness levels of co-existing pathogen lineages. The greenhouse experiment

involved infecting tomato plants with individual strains representative of different lineages or in

mixed infections. Overall, mixed infections led to higher disease severity than individual infections

and individual lineages differed in their disease severity levels (S7 Fig). For example, disease

severity level of mixed infection of SC3 and SC4 was significantly higher than that of individual

infections (S7B Fig).

Next, we used field metagenome data with the relative abundance of pathogen lineages and disease

severity data to assess pathogen fitness under the field condition. We used StrainRanking, a

regression-based method for ranking of pathogen strains with respect to their contribution to

epidemics. This allowed us to combine pathogen genetic data with epidemiological monitoring of

disease progression to investigate differences among pathogen lineages in their performance in the

field. The fitness of an SC is the contribution of SC to the variation in the observed disease severity

between the two sampling points, for example, mid and end season in this study, and is measured

by a parameter estimated with the StrainRanking approach. A positive value for this parameter

indicates that corresponding SC leads to an increase in the disease severity, and a negative value

corresponds to a decrease of the disease severity. Lineages SC4 and SC6 tend to have a higher

fitness than SC3 and other low frequency SCs with respect to their contribution to the field

epidemics, as indicated by their positive contribution towards disease severity from mid to end

season in the theoretical epidemic curves (Fig 3A). Equal weighted means of the genetic

frequencies observed during the mid- and end-seasons (p=0.5 for each) were taken into

consideration for this analysis. Even considering the weightage of genetic frequencies high (p=0.9)

at the mid-season (S8A Fig) or at the end of the season (p=0.10) (S9A Fig), SC6 and SC4

contributed significantly in terms of fitness towards the growth of disease severity. Because SC6

was not predominant lineage across our samples, so we did not consider SC6 for further analysis.

When strain interactions were evaluated for their fitness contributions, lineages SC4 (>20%

abundance) and SC3 (≤20% abundance) combination showed positive fitness, whereas interaction

corresponding to SC4 (≤20% abundance) whatever SC3 frequency led to negative fitness

contribution. When SC4 (>20% abundance) and SC3 (>20%) coexisted, we observed near zero

fitness contribution (Figs 3B, S8B and S9B). Next, we evaluated fitness levels of individual SCs

when strain-environment interactions were considered. It's interesting to note that we found that

various contextual factors significantly impacted SC4 fitness levels but less in SC3. When average

surface pressure and standard deviation of wind speed were less than mean values, but average

temperature and skewness of wet bulb temperature were more than mean values, SC4

demonstrated a larger positive fitness contribution (Fig 3C). We found that specific environmental

conditions that are observed in the middle or end of the season have different effects on the fitness

contributions of SC3 and SC4, particularly when taking into account genetic frequencies that are

reported at the end of the season (p=0.10) (S9C Fig). While lower values of the parameters promote

better fitness of SC3, higher values of the clear sky PAR standard deviation, kurtosis of surface

pressure, and standard deviation of temperature at 2 meters support higher fitness of SC4.

Conversely, lower levels of average clear sky PAR favor SC4 fitness (S9C Fig), whereas higher

values enhance SC3 fitness. However, when genetic frequencies which are reported in the mid of

the season were taken into account, SC4 was more fit in the across different environmental

parameters than SC3 (S8C Fig).

Fig 3. Different lineages have variable fitness levels and resilience towards different climatic factors and competition with co-occurring lineages. Using StrainRanking **(A)** Comparisons of different SCs with fitness estimates and their confidence intervals under main effects were made. These estimates focused on SC3, SC4, and SC6 (which were more abundant in samples), and a group of SCs (SC1, SC2, SC5, SC7, and SC8) that were categorized as low frequency (due to their lower relative abundance, as estimated in Fig. 2C). The bottom plot illustrates the growth curves of these SCs, estimating their contributions to the progression of disease severity from mid and end of the summer season. **(B)** Pathogen-pathogen interactions, specifically between the two dominant SCs (SC3 and SC4), were analyzed based on their combined frequencies being either below or above 20%. Fitness estimates with confidence intervals were

compared when the summed frequencies of SC3 and SC4 were taken into account. Different interaction scenarios were considered, such as SC3 > 20% & SC4 < 20%, SC4 > 20% & SC3 < 20%, and both SC3 & SC4 at equal frequencies, along with SC6 and the low-frequency SCs. The growth curves in the bottom plot highlight how these interactions contributed to the progression of disease during the season. **(C)** Pathogen-environment interactions were examined by applying the frequencies of SC3 or SC4 to different environmental variables, depending on whether each variable was above or below its mean at the sampling point. The analysis assumed an equal-weighted mean of genetic frequencies to calculate fitness levels: p x mid-frequency + (1 - p) x end-frequency, where (p = 0.5) in this figure. All the colour keys are specific in each section of the figure and a similar colour scheme is followed for their corresponding growth curve plots.

Tracing the allelic frequencies across seasons suggested presence of conditional SNPs that oscillate across temporal scales. While pathogen diversity analysis based on globally known pathogen lineages revealed strain dynamics driven by climatic factors and variable strain-fitness levels, we next investigated the extent of genetic polymorphism in the pathogen population (without having a bias of known pathogen lineages) by tracing allelic frequencies within and across the fields. For this analysis, a pangenome reference was constructed for *X. perforans* and allelic frequencies for different sites within the genome were obtained by mapping metagenomic reads to the pangenome. These allelic frequencies were monitored within and across seasons and fields to study the maintenance of genetic polymorphism and allele frequency dynamics. The influence of season and year on pathogen diversity led us to identify variants selected across pathogen populations over time and seasons. We looked for alleles whose frequencies changed within and across seasons and parallel across fields. For this analysis, we grouped all samples from each respective sampling time (i.e., summer or fall of a specific year) into a single metapopulation (Fig 4A). We then tracked the major and minor allele frequencies across three sampling points over three years. We observed a strong influence of seasonality on the allelic frequencies. Allelic frequencies at most sites differed across the mid/end of the summer and fall seasons. For example, several of the alleles (with f >=0.8) found in the middle or end of the summer growing season

showed a significant change in frequency (with $f <= 0.2$) during the fall seasons for both the years

of 2020 and 2022 (Fig 4B). Similarly, the alleles with their frequencies less than 0.8 during mid-

2020 remained in the population at intermediate frequencies during end seasons or mid-seasons in

the subsequent years but changed to either 1 or 0 during the fall seasons of the 2020 and 2022

(Figs 4C and S10). These polymorphisms that undergo dramatic rapid shifts in allelic frequency

and oscillate asynchronously between seasons repeatedly over subsequent years can be defined as

conditional or seasonal SNPs. These seasonal SNPs would most likely be adaptively responding

to selection pressures that vary across seasons.

Given the influence of seasonality on oscillating patterns of polymorphisms, we focused on

identifying alleles that were seen in parallel across at least 50% of farms with $f <= 0.2$ (called a

minor) during the first season and became $f >= 0.8$ (considered a major) in the following season

(Figs 4A and 4C). We found that 237 of the alleles that were minor/low-frequency alleles in mid-

2020 turned major (i.e., reached high frequency) during fall 2020, with 157 of those alleles

reappearing as major during fall 2022 but were not observed as high-frequency alleles in any other

season of the following years. Similarly, 1234 minor alleles that existed at the end of Summer

2020 reached high frequency (i.e., major alleles) in the fall of 2020. Of these, 138 alleles were

observed at high frequency in the subsequent fall season of 2022 (S11A Fig). Furthermore, we

observed 3598 allelic sites with allele frequency less than 0.2 during the fall of 2020 became major

during mid-season (summer) of the year 2021 and most of the sites (1025) appeared back as major

alleles in the mid-season of the year 2022 (S11B Fig).

Fig 4. Seasonal oscillations of allelic frequencies with the signature of parallel evolution. (A) A graphical representation of seasonal variation, where during mid-season (of summer), allele A was the major allele (allele frequency > 0.8) in the population. By the end of the season (of summer), the A was replaced with T, and allele A became minor in population. However, by the fall season, allele G became a major allele, and the rest were present in low abundance in the pathogen population. The line plot shows alleles with their average frequencies of **(B)** $f >= 0.8$ & **(C)** $f < 0.8$ in the pathogen population during mid-season (of summer) of year 2020. The allele frequencies were tracked for different sites of *Xp* during the following seasons over three years. **(D)** The Sankey plot presenting the counts of those alleles which were present in parallel across at least 50% of the farms sampled during the mid-season (of summer) of 2020 with frequency <= 0.2 (with read depth of at least 10) and became major allele ($f >= 0.8$) in the population in the next season and counted those same alleles which stayed as major allele during the next seasons of following years.

Despite variability in disease dynamics, signatures of selection and parallel evolution were

evident in the pathogen population.

Given the varying disease pressure observed across different farms, we sought to determine if

any genes in the pathogen genome were consistently under selection across these locations.

Using Metapop package, we estimated the pN/pS (non-synonymous to synonymous ratios) of

different genes of *Xp* and pooled out the genes with pN/pS > 1 values. We filtered out the genes

if they were present in at least 50 % of farms in a particular sampling point to provide evidence

for parallel evolution. We found eight genes under selection were parallel across farms (at least

50 % of farms of specific sampling time) and seasons. These genes comprised type VI secretion

system (T6SS) protein ImpG, ClpV1 family T6SS ATPase, S9 family peptidase,

aminotransferase, tonB-dependent receptors, S9 family proteins (S12 Fig and S5 Table).

However, none of these eight genes were clustered and are present at distinct locations based on

the reference genome of *Xp* LH3. Interestingly, two proteins associated with the T6SS were

under positive selection, suggesting the microbiome's potential role in selection pressure and

shaping the pathogen genome. We also identified a gene, class 1 fructose-bisphosphatase, under

positive selection only in the populations from both fall seasons of 2020 and 2022 (S5 Table).

Overall, these results suggest evidence of parallel evolution across farms and seasons in the *Xp*

pathogen population.

Fig 5. Integrated workflow to study pathogen outbreaks incorporating large scale field survey data, high-resolution metagenomics data and subsequent analyses to understand eco-evolutionary pathogen dynamics.

Discussion

The significance of strain diversity, strain fitness and compositional dynamics towards disease epidemics has been highlighted in wild plant pathogens but the importance of genetic polymorphism in explaining variability in disease outbreaks is less understood in the agricultural settings, partly due to an assumption of genetically monomorphic populations under monoculture system and the emphasis on the use of methods that lack resolution of pathogen population structure at microgeographic level. In this work, we developed an approach to study the extent of genetic polymorphism in the pathogen population within individual fields over the course of a growing season and over three years, linked the pathogen dynamics to climatic variables to explain variability of disease dynamics in the fields in neighboring states (Fig. 5). We found that as many as five pathogen lineages can co-exist within a single agricultural field. Prior studies have documented that under natural systems, no single lineage takes over and multiple lineages co-exist at low abundance but in contrast, single dominant lineage is assumed to dominate in the agricultural fields (25). We found that at least three distinct lineages dominate across different fields and at times, two distantly related lineages can co-exist within an individual field at high abundance throughout the growing season (Fig 2). The differential strain dynamics was observed across neighboring fields and was linked to differential climate sensitivity of the lineages and differential fitness contributions towards epidemics (Fig 3). When we conducted analysis of pathogen dynamics without having bias of known lineages, but by tracing the allelic variants over three years, the analysis revealed a considerable influence of seasonality on pathogen dynamics, with distinct seasonal alleles strongly favored throughout specific seasons in the consecutive years (Fig 4). This genetic heterogeneity with differential and environmentally dependent fitness contributions might be an adaptation strategy that enables pathogen to dynamically respond to

environmental fluctuations within seasonal timescales. These complex interdependent pathogen

genotype-genotype-environment interactions may complicate the selective pressures during a

host-pathogen arms race in case of endemic diseases in agricultural systems. Understanding the

roles of conditional seasonal alleles that we observed in this work and the role of loci under

selection in dictating the pathogen fitness represent an important avenue for future work.

Identifying the drivers of the disease dynamics and pathogen diversification will be critical in

reducing the frequency of pathogen outbreaks (Fig 5).

Regression models applied to link environmental data, disease outcomes and pathogen

diversity in this study revealed that extreme climatic events were significant drivers of disease

dynamics and pathogen diversity across different farms. More variations and extreme events such

as changes in wind direction, photosynthetically active radiation, temperature, humidity, and

surface pressure (Tables 1 and S3) can directly influence pathogen dispersal (52–54) and plant

host physiology (55–57), or indirectly alter host-pathogen, strain-strain, and pathogen-microbiome

interactions (39,58,59). While empirical evidence for how recent climatic shifts have contributed

to disease outbreaks is limited, studies on the impact of extreme weather events on the virulence

of fungal pathogens like *Hemileia vastatrix* (coffee rust), *Puccinia striiformis* (wheat stripe rust)*,*

and *Phytophthora cinnamomi* (Mediterranean oak decline) have highlighted the need for these

studies (60–62). Our approach of capturing the climatic extremes using measures such as standard

deviation, kurtosis, skewness of climatic variables observed for each farm across seasonal

timescales allowed us to assess the extent to which pathogen genetic divergence correlates with

climatic shifts. The findings from these models highlighted the importance of capturing these

climatic extremes in the epidemiological modeling, rather than average climatic variables. For

example, parameters that we identified as significant (negative impact on disease severity and

pathogen abundance) were more extreme values of temperature and humidity. Our observation of

more variation in wind direction being significantly associated with higher disease severity and

higher pathogen abundance align with previous observation of importance of dispersal in the

epidemic growth for bacterial spot disease. The aerosolization and long-distance dispersal of <=2m

was shown for this pathogen under humid transplant house conditions (63). Later a single effector,

XopJ2, was shown to provide increased fitness by increased dispersal in the field (64).

Our findings of co-existence also challenge the traditional view that a single lineage of an

abundant pathogen dominates the host population in agricultural systems. Two lineages, SC3 and

SC4 co-existed, both at large densities, but neither showed a strong dominance across different

fields in all three examined growing seasons (Figs 2C, S4). First, this observation is intriguing,

because it certainly challenges the competitive exclusion principle, which states that two species

occupying the same ecological niche cannot coexist indefinitely (65). Second, it reveals an

apparent paradox because, based on our analyses, SC4 seems to be fitter than SC3. SC6 also seems

to be as fit as SC4 but is present at a lower level with distribution limited to only certain fields in

Alabama than SC3 and SC4, thus, its contribution in the lineage dynamics could not be

systematically assessed. Here, we sought explanations for this apparently unexpected co-existence

of SC3 and SC4 and their ecological dynamics. Prior studies on *E. coli* have demonstrated the

prevalence and persistence of season-specific strains due to fluctuating temperatures throughout

the year (66–68). However, we have yet to observe any clear patterns of early or late-season

specialization of individual SCs, indicating that time partitioning is unlikely to explain their co-

existence. Since we did not sample outside the host, current data cannot explain whether these

lineages have high fitness outside the host or neighboring plant species (non-host). In addition,

lack of data on host genotypes or field landscapes do not allow to evaluate whether host

heterogeneity and landscape heterogeneity in the field supports their co-existence (44). Another

limitation of our approach which used pooled leaf samples representative of a field for

metagenome sequencing, was that we couldn't exclude spatial partitioning or microhabitat

difference (for example, leaves of different ages, or patchy distributions within individual fields)

that can support co-existence of two or more pathogen lineages. Resource specialization cannot be

ruled out either because the dominant lineages coexisting in the fields, SC3 and SC4, differ in type

III effector content and may differ in within-host multiplication rate and transmission rate, or they

may prefer different niches, such as leaf surface vs apoplast. Our finding that sudden seasonal

events or climatic fluctuations had a significant impact on defining individual lineages' fitness

contributions may potentially explain their coexistence. Two independent approaches assessing

compositional dynamics (S4 Table) and fitness dynamics highlighted the influence of

environmental parameters on individual lineages (Figs 3, S8 and S9), specifically SC3 and SC4,

specifically climatic fluctuations as indicated by skewness, kurtosis and standard deviation of

different parameters, being significant in dictating abundance of SC3 or SC4. We observed that

field-level fitness contribution by SC4 seemed to be impacted by other biotic (SC3) and abiotic

factors, whereas that by SC3 did not. The varying performance of SC4 depending on different

environmental conditions (from very fit to intermediately fit: fitness = 0) may contribute to the

similarity of its overall frequency with the SC3 frequency (more generalist with respect to the

values of tested factors and the presence of other SC). Thus, maintaining co-existence of lineages

that show overall environmental resilience as well as environmentally dependent fitness might be

a strategy that pathogen adopts to cope up with the sudden climatic shifts. All the arguments made

above that may contribute to explain the co-existence of SC3 and SC4 at relatively high and similar

levels, and the estimation of their relative fitness, can be summarized by making a parallel with

the effective reproduction number, Rt, classically considered in human and animal epidemiology.

Rt is the average number of new infections caused by a single infected individual at time t in the

partially susceptible population. Rt varies in time because of the variation of the number of

susceptible individuals but may also vary because of temporal heterogeneity in the eco-evo-

determinants of the transmission (e.g., because of lockdown measures during the covid-19

pandemic; (69)). Rt can obviously be considered at the lineage level. Broadly, the epidemic or the

lineage dynamics tends to keep going on if Rt $\geq$ 1. In terms of fitness, as estimated by the

StrainRanking analysis in this study, it is equivalent to a fitness value $\geq$ 0 (the fitness here is an

indicator that integrates diverse processes and variables and is therefore an aggregated

measurement of the capacity of the lineage to "multiply" in real conditions). Thus, SC4 with fitness

>0 and SC3 with fitness of around 0 indicate Rt $\geq$ 1, suggesting that both SC3 and SC4 are fit to

keep epidemic going or to expand. As Rt evolves in time, the fitness (viewed as an aggregated

measurement) may also evolve in time, and an interesting research area would be to finely

characterize the eventual variation in time of the SC's fitness, evaluation of lineage-specific genes

in contribution towards fitness, and to determine how the possible processes evoked above

contribute to this variation. This is because possibility of transitory state with co-existence as

opposed to equilibrium state cannot be ruled out, especially, given the limited geographical region

studied here (70) and that genetic divergence has been observed in this pathosystem (Potnis et al.

2021). Thus, continuing such high-resolution lineage fitness tracking across tomato producing

regions and disease outcomes will be important outputs to predict future outbreaks, and to design

disease management strategies that are tailored to concurrent pathogen population structure (i.e.

breeding for disease resistance and climate resilience).

Although seasonality was not evident at the individual lineage level, analyzing the data via

variant tracing indicated the presence of season-specific allelic pathogen variants (Fig 4),

particularly unique to the summer vs fall growing season over the three consecutive years of

sampling (Fig 5). These seasonal variants might be indicative of a trade-off between in-season

within-host multiplication, in-season transmission, and inter-season survival, where variants that

contribute as primary inoculum (the form under which pathogen survives host absence) in fall vs

summer might differ due to the variable inter-season survival periods experienced (71). One

approach to test this notion is to see if there is a trade-off between survival outside the host (with

varied overwintering durations) and infection efficiency (72). Periodic host absence has been

claimed to cause evolutionary divergence (also known as evolutionary branching), however,

contradictory evidence exists (73–75). The absence of year-round production in Alabama, South

Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia may drive evolutionary divergence. The seasonality could

also mean differing day lengths altering host physiological responses to the pathogen, thus

impacting the fitness contributions of different variants towards epidemics (76) or differing light

intensities impacting pathogen behavior and virulence, as seen with differing motilities and

differing epiphytic fitness in the case of *Pseudomonas syringae* strains (77). The findings of

seasonal oscillations of genome-wide allelic frequencies may suggest evidence of fluctuation

selection contributing towards the genetic variation observed in this population.

We also looked at signatures of parallel evolution by identifying loci under positive

selection across > 50% of the fields (S5 Table). Notably, we identified certain genes under positive

selection over three years, including the TonB-dependent receptor gene located adjacent to the

PepSy domain-containing protein. The widespread use of heavy fertilizers and pesticides in

agricultural systems (such as mancozeb applications to manage bacterial spot contain Mn and Zn)

may have been responsible for the selection of this TonB-dependent receptor likely involved in

heavy metal transport (78,79). Furthermore, multiple genes belonging to two separate Type VI

secretion system clusters were found to be under selection, suggesting that the microbiome may

play a significant role in driving the selection within the pathogen genome (80–82).

Consistent with the assumptions of seedborne diseases and their global spread (30,83–85)

in the agricultural fields, our survey indicated that almost all known *X. perforans* lineages

identified in the global population are circulating in the southeastern US fields. Although multiple

lineages co-existed in the individual fields, no such apparent link between genetic relatedness of

co-occurring lineages and disease severity was observed, as was previously shown to be important

through the mechanism of competition or increased virulence (86). This could be because co-

occurrence of SC3 and SC4 was predominant in majority of the cases, with other low frequency

lineages not particularly contributing towards fitness and we lacked consistent sampling of the

fields throughout the growing season. However, higher diversity (Shannon as well as average

nucleotide diversity) was correlated with higher disease severity (S6 Fig). Such observation could

be explained by ability of diverse strains to manipulate the host defenses in a variety of ways

(87,88), or through resource-mediated competition or through sharing of public goods, such as

quorum sensing signals (89). While our survey collected information on host cultivars, the lack of

information on host genetics or levels of tolerance/susceptibility did not allow evaluation of the

role of host genotypes in driving disease dynamics. However, age-related host resistance (90–92)

or the prevalence of other diseases later in the season might contribute towards seasonal disease

pressure and thus, seasonal dynamics that we observed. The regression analysis also included scale

of the farm as one of variables. While disease severity was not significantly different across small

vs commercial farms, more pathogen diversity was observed in the commercial farms compared

to small farms (S3 Fig). This intriguing observation brings about apparent contradiction, i.e. small-

scale farms often have transplants, seeds from a variety of sources, thus, possibility of introduction

of multiple pathogen genotypes. However, crop/genotype diversity in the small-scale farms with

intercropping may also lead to reduction in pathogen abundance and diversity (93). These

observations demand further investigation of whether such intercropping might be a resilient

strategy for disease control.

Taken together, we find that plant-pathogen interactions in agricultural environments are

much more complex than previously thought. Our study revealed that maintaining pathogen

heterogeneity and variable fitness with seasonal allele fluctuations in response to extreme weather

events are the strategies employed by the pathogen. This work also presents empirical evidence on

the influence of recent climatic changes on altering disease outcomes. We suggest that breeding

programs need to consider multiple pathogen lineages that show positive fitness contributions

based on large scale field surveys. Tracing these evolutionary changes can predict which lineages

will be a better fit in the long run, especially in the face of sudden climatic shifts, aiding in

developing more effective breeding strategies. Future work based on the results of this study

should focus on identifying the roles of specific fitness factors in pathogen biology, as this could

provide valuable insights into pathogen adaptation strategies and the selection pressures they face.

Finally, we present an integrated workflow utilizing metapangenomics to infer fine scale

microdiversity patterns in the pathogen population, coupled with epidemiological and statistical

modeling to link climatic variables to the eco-evolutionary processes impacting disease risk and

to study disease epidemics at large scales (Fig 5). This approach can allow disentangling targets

of long-term eco-evolutionary processes and for studying fundamental principles involved in

response of microbes in dynamically responding to environmental shifts. Such approach can be

applied to different case studies in plant, animal, and human health.

Materials and Methods

Reconstruction of the *X. perforans* core genome using publicly available *Xp* genomes from

NCBI

Sequencing reads for 467 *Xp* strains downloaded from NCBI (as of 08/15/2023) were used

to study the global diversity of *Xp* isolate genomes. To ensure high-quality and minimally biased

genomes, the genomes were de-replicated using dRep (v3.2.2) (94) using a 95% minimum genome

completeness and 5% maximum contamination. We manually discarded the genomes with more

than 400 contigs to ensure better alignment with the reference genome and avoid bias while

creating the SNV profile. Four hundred sixty-seven quality-controlled genomes collected from

tomato and pepper (with one eggplant isolate) around the globe were individually aligned against

the completed genome of *Xp* strain LH3. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) common to all

genomes were extracted to generate a concatenated set of high-quality core-genome SNPs using

Parsnp (95). The phylogenetic tree was visualized and annotated using iTol (v.6.7.5) (96)

Sample collection and disease severity estimation

To study the diversity of BLS *Xanthomonas* in the southeastern United States, we collected

66 leaf samples from 22 fields, designated as either commercial-scale or small-scale (Table S1).

These samples were collected from symptomatic and asymptomatic tomato plants grown in

Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina over 2020, 2021, and 2022 (Fig. 1A).

Samples were taken during mid-season, end-season of the summer growing season, and when

available, in the fall growing season (S1A Table) to capture the temporal dynamics of the pathogen

population. While sampling, two to three leaflets were randomly taken from individual plants in

the field using variable sampling methods based on the scale of the field (Fig. 2B). Multiple plants

were sampled across the field to obtain a representative 50-100 grams leaf tissue sample.

Assessments of the disease were made by estimating the percent of disease symptoms and

defoliation caused by bacterial spots (S1B Table) using the Horsfall-Barratt scale, which ranges

from 1 to 12, with scale of 1 being no disease and 12 being 100% defoliation (51).

DNA extraction and sequencing

Metagenomic DNA extraction, quantification, and sequencing of the samples were done

as described earlier (23). Approximately 40 grams of the leaf sample was taken in a Ziploc bag

(Ziploc®) with 50 ml 0.1% wash buffer (0.05M PBS, 8.5 g NaCl, and 0.2 ml tween 20 per liter of

water), sonicated for 20 minutes, followed by transfer of the buffer to a 50 ml falcon tube with the

help of a sterile plastic serological pipette. The tubes were centrifuged at 4000 rpm, 4°C for 20

minutes (Eppendorf® 5418 R) to collect all the cells. The cells were then washed twice with sterile

deionized water, and the metagenomic DNA extraction was done using Wizard® Genomic DNA

Purification Kit (Promega) as per the manufacturer's instructions with the addition of a phenol-

chloroform step to remove protein contamination. The extracted DNA was quantified using a

Qubit® fluorometer and dsDNA high-sensitivity assay kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA, USA)

and kept at -80^0C until further processing. Sequencing was performed on the Illumina HiSeq 4000

platform. The raw reads were processed and trimmed for the adapter using BBDuk (Bushnell,

2014). DynamicTrim command of SolexaQa was used to trim the reads based on quality values

with Qphred less than 20, followed by filtering the reads shorter than 50bp (97). Host reads were

separated and removed using tomato cv. Heinz 1706 as a reference (GCA_022405115.1) from the

metagenomic samples using KneadData tools (98) as a reference.

Taxonomic profiling and diversity estimation

The relative abundance of *Xanthomonas* sp. in quality-controlled and host-decontaminated

reads was performed using Kraken2 (v2.1.2) (99) against a standard Kraken2 standard database.

The database contained RefSeq libraries of archaeal, bacterial, human, and viral sequences as of

March 1, 2022 (100). The resulting Kraken2 report files were used as inputs for Bayesian re-

estimation of abundance using Kraken (Bracken) (v2.6.2) (101). We also calculated the absolute

abundance estimates for *Xp* by combining their relative abundance with the total DNA content in

each sample. Microbiota density, expressed as total DNA (ng) per mg of fresh sample, was

computed for each sample. This information was utilized to determine the absolute abundance of

Xp by multiplying the amount of DNA per mg of the sample with its relative abundance.

To explore the intraspecific diversity and dynamics of *Xp* in the metagenomic samples, we

employed the StrainEst pipeline (102). StrainEst is a reference-based method that utilizes single-

nucleotide variant (SNV) profiles from carefully selected reference genomes. This approach

enables us to estimate strains' presence and relative abundance within a given sample. Initially, we

conducted SNV profiling of representative strains from *Xp*, *Xeu*, and other closely related

pathovars belonging to *Xeu* species complex to determine their presence. A second round of

profiling was done to identify the diversity of *Xp* strains. A representative genome from each *Xp*

SC (Fig 2) was selected and aligned against the completed reference genome of *Xp* strain 91-118

using the MUMmer algorithm (103). This genome alignment was used to construct a SNV matrix,

where each row corresponded to a variable position in the reference genome, and columns

contained allelic variants present in the reference strains. This matrix was used as a reference in

modeling strain level abundance.

To assess the diversity of *Xp* SCs within the samples, we computed the Shannon diversity

index (Shannon-Wiener diversity index) using the "diversity()" function from the R package *vegan*

(v2.6-4) (104). The index considers the count of SCs present (richness) and their proportional

distribution (evenness). A higher index value indicates greater species diversity in the habitat.

When the Shannon diversity index of a sample is equal to 0, it implies that only a single SC is

detected in that sample.

Weather data

Daily climate data spanning three years for all 22 fields were compiled from the NASA

Power database using the nasapower (v4.0.12) package (105) in R. Data were collected during

mid-season, end-season of summer, and fall samples as per the sampling time in Table S1. The

gridded weather data used in this analysis are based on satellite observations and models and are

offered globally at a horizontal resolution of 0.5° X 0.625° latitude–longitude grid cell. Weather

variables, such as temperature, precipitation, solar radiation, relative humidity, wind, and others

(S2 Table), were consolidated over time and space. The intervening period between the planting

and sampling times was accounted for in the analysis for each weather parameter by calculating

averages. For instance, the mid-season average was determined by averaging daily weather data

from the planting date to the mid-season sampling time, which usually occurred 60 days after

transplanting. The end-season average was calculated from the planting date to the end-of-season

sampling time, typically 30 days after the mid-season sampling.   To account for interseason

climatic events, variability among the weather parameters was measured using descriptive

statistics (standard deviation, skewness, entropy, and kurtosis) for all the climatic variables to see

if the extreme weather events during the growing season impact disease severity, pathogen

diversity, and abundance. Standard deviation measures the deviation from the mean value. A

higher standard deviation indicates greater weather parameter variability, while a lower standard

deviation suggests a more consistent pattern. Skewness measures the degree and direction of

asymmetry. A positive skewness implies more extreme high weather parameters, while a negative

skewness suggests more extreme low, with zero suggesting a symmetric distribution. Kurtosis is

a measure of tail extremity reflecting the presence of outliers in a distribution (106). Higher

positive kurtosis implies extreme weather values or outliers, while negative kurtosis indicates a

flatter distribution with less extreme weather values. Similarly, entropy quantifies the level of

unpredictability in the weather values. The higher the entropy, the more unpredictability in the

weather fluctuations will be.

Statistical analysis via regression models

We quantified the relative abundance of various *Xp* lineages across the samples and analyzed their

distribution patterns in relation to different climatic factors. This analysis was designed to explain

three different types of responses based on climatic and other variables: (i) relative abundance, (ii)

absolute abundance, and (iii) disease severity. Before running these regressions, we chose to run a

predictor-selection procedure for each of these (given the high number of predictors we considered

for this work) by using Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (Lasso) regression, which

jointly aims at correctly predicting the response and selecting the most associated variables (107).

As no implemented or stable versions of the Lasso directly address the types of responses we have

considered in our work, we decided to use proxy responses to run the Lasso and then use the

selected variables from this step to run the specific regressions and inference described above.

More specifically, we use a logistic Lasso to select the variables for the (relative abundance) where

we classify low and high abundance based on the 50% threshold. In contrast, we use standard

Lasso regression on the severity scales (assuming they can be considered as continuous) and the

Shannon entropy (a continuous scale proxy for the distribution of abundance between clusters).

Predictor-selection was performed on the variables that still have non-zero coefficients after the

shrinkage process using the "cv.glmnet" function to prevent the overfitting of the model. This

study determined the tuning parameter for regularization using 10-fold cross-validation. The path

length (min_lambda/max-lambda) was chosen to be 0.001, and 100 default values along the

regularization path were tested to find the best lambda value. Once a selection was run for all

responses (proxies) of interest, we ran the appropriate regressions for each response. More

specifically, since disease severity is measured on a discrete ordered scale in the 0-12 range, we

used an ordinal logistic regression, which accounts for the order of severity and the discrete scale

of the response (108). On the other hand, as the abundance (both absolute and relative) of *Xp* is

measured on a 0-1 range, we employed a Beta regression (109) using the *betareg* package (110).

The beta regression model is employed for non-normally distributed data with a range between 0

and 1, addressing heteroskedasticity and asymmetry issues (109), and is specifically chosen here

due to the non-normal distribution of *Xp* relative abundance in the sample, which conforms to a

beta distribution. To analyze the distribution of abundance among different Xp lineages, we used

a compositional regression approach, which ensures that the regression model explains and

preserves the property that the total abundance among the clusters should sum to one (indeed, a

separate regression for each cluster would not consider the dependence between clusters). We used

the Dirichlet regression approach, using the *DirichletReg* package in R, to describe how the

distribution of various *Xp* lineages changes according to changes in these potential predictors

(111). As for the previous response variables, the use of the Lasso for this type of regression is

computationally unstable. Therefore, we chose to use the Shannon diversity of *Xp* as the response

when using the Lasso: this is a reasonable proxy since Shannon diversity is related to how the data

is distributed (in this case, across the lineages). Once this was obtained, 18 variables were selected

to run the Dirichlet regression.

Greenhouse Experiment

We evaluated the effects of different SCs of *Xp* on 4-5 week old tomato cultivar FL47 plants grown

under greenhouse conditions. Plants were dip-inoculated for approximately 30 seconds in bacterial

suspensions containing 10^6cfu/ml of representative strains from different SCs (SC3 (Xp2010), SC4

(AL57), SC5 (AL37), and SC6 (AL65)). These SCs were chosen based on their observed

abundance in samples from our previous study (23). Treatments included a control (0.01M

$MgSO_4$), individual inoculations with SC3, SC4, SC5, and SC6, as well as mixed co-infections of

SC4 + SC3, SC5 + SC6, SC3 + SC6, SC3 + SC5, and SC3 + SC5 + SC6. All treatments were

supplemented with 0.00025% Swilvet and replicated five times, with plants randomly arranged in

the greenhouse. Plants were watered daily, and disease severity was assessed on days 7 and 14,

with additional evaluations on days 9 and 12 for plants exhibiting delayed symptoms. Disease

severity was measured using the Horsfall-Barratt scale (51). To minimize bias, two observers

recorded the disease severity, and the average score was used. Raw disease severity indices were

then used to calculate the area under the disease progress curve (AUDPC), which correlates

multiple observations of disease progression into a single value (112). AUDPC values were plotted

for each treatment across seven experimental batches using the "dplyr" package in R Studio and

built linear and linear mixed-effects models using "lme4" and "lmerTest" (113,114). For individual

strains a generalized linear hypothesis test was used while for multiple comparisons Tukey's

method was used. Linear mixed effect models were used to assess the development of disease

severity slopes across treatments.

Strain Ranking

StrainRanking (115) was used to estimate and compare fitness differences between SCs (main

effects), between SCs considered alone or in association (pathogen-pathogen interaction), and

between SCs under specific environmental conditions (pathogen-environment interaction).

StrainRanking requires input data consisting of the frequencies of the SCs and the measurement

of disease growth or decline for each sampling location (i.e., fields), and estimates the fitness as

the relative contributions of SCs to the growth or the decline of disease severity between two

sampling times (i.e., Mid and End sampling times). SC frequencies were computed as a weighted

mean of Mid and End SC frequencies: $p \times$ Mid frequencies $+ (1 - p) \times$ End frequencies, where

p is equal to 0.1, 0.5 or 0.9 to consider different representativeness of Mid and End frequencies in

terms of disease dynamics between Mid and End sampling times of summer season. (Because of

low sample size, we did not include Fall season samples in this analysis.) Significance tests

performed in StrainRanking are based on randomization, which adequately accounts for the

relatively small sample sizes encountered when distributing data at the resolution of SCs or even

at a higher resolution (when one considers pathogen-pathogen or pathogen-environment

interactions). To account for the specificity of the severity measurement in the present study, which

is a mark ranging between 0 and 8, we added to the StrainRanking method a saturation level of the

growth and the decline at +8 and -8, respectively. In addition, we developed a function providing

confidence intervals for estimated fitness in addition to the pairwise comparison tests embedded

in the original StrainRanking R package.

For the study of main effects, StrainRanking was applied to SC3, SC4, SC6 and the group of SCs

with low frequencies (SC1, 2, 5, 7, and 8), say SCLowFreq.

For the study of pathogen-pathogen interaction, only the interaction between the two dominant

SCs was accounted for, namely SC3 and SC4. We consider SC3xSC4 interaction depending on

whether SC3 and SC4 are lower or larger than 20%. Thus, StrainRanking was applied to the

summed frequency freq(SC3)+freq(SC4) when freq(SC3)>20% and freq(SC4)>20%, and to the

frequencies of SC3 when freq(SC3)≤20% or freq(SC4)≤20%, SC4 when freq(SC4)≤20% or

freq(SC3)≤20%, SC6 and SCLowFreq. Not that the interaction has to be understood at the field

level here since we do not have information indicating whether or not SC3 and SC4 were collected

on the same plants.

For the study of pathogen-environment interaction, only the interaction with the two dominant SCs

was accounted for. This step incorporated only the significant environmental parameters identified

through statistical analyses using the regression model, along with their standard deviation,

skewness, entropy, and kurtosis. Hence, for each factor X (e.g., average temperature, kurtosis of

wind speed, etc.), StrainRanking was applied to the frequencies of SC3factor+, i.e. the frequency

of SC3 when $X > \bar{X}(SC3)$ (where $\bar{X}(SC3)$ is the mean of X at sampling points where SC3 is present,

i.e. freq(SC3)>0), SC3factor- (when $X \leq \bar{X}(SC3)$), SC4factor+ (when $X > \bar{X}(SC3)$), SC4factor-

(when $X \leq \bar{X}(SC4)$), SC6 and SCLowFreq. The value of X is the weighted mean of X observed at

Mid and End sampling times: $p \times [X \text{ at Mid point}] + (1 - p) \times [X \text{ at End point}]$, where p takes

the same value as for the weighted average of genetic frequencies.

Construction of *Xanthomonas* pan-genome

Initially, we downloaded 287 strains of *Xp (Xanthomonas euvesicatoria* pv. *perforans)* and *Xeu*

(Xanthomonas euvesicatoria pv. *euvesicatoria)* from the NCBI RefSeq database (as of February

16th, 2022). Using SuperPang (v0.9.4 beta1) (116), we constructed a non-redundant pangenome

as a reference for the subsequent analyses.

To avoid read stealing and donating of *Xanthomonas* with other microbiome species, we

implemented an additional filter to remove genes with more than 97% similarity in our

metagenomic reads. These genes were identified similarly to the method described by Kaur et al.,

2024. We used the "run_midas.py species" command to identify the predominant species in our

samples, utilizing the MIDAS (v1.3.2) default database as a reference, which consists of 31,007

bacterial reference genomes organized into 5,952 species groups (117). We then built a custom

database of non-redundant pangenomes (*Xp* and *Xeu*) using MIDAS and subjected it to BLAST

(blast+) with the concatenated gene sequences from species with a mean abundance > 0 from the

previous step. Genes with 97% similarity to those in the database were removed from all samples

using BBDuk (v37.36) (118). These reads were used for our subsequent analyses.

Genes under selection

We discarded the samples with zero *Xp* abundance in the following evolutionary analyses. To

calculate the genetic variation in our samples, we first mapped the samples to the non-redundant

pangenome using BWA-MEM (v0.7.12) (119). Next, we removed low-quality alignments and

duplicate reads using samtools (v1.11) (120) and picard (v1.79) (121), respectively. The resulting

bam files were then processed with MetaPop (v1.0) (122) to calculate the ratio of non-synonymous

to synonymous polymorphisms (pN/pS) for each gene. In order to find the genes under positive

selection, we chose the genes with pN/pS ratios >1 and present in at least 50% of the samples in a

particular season. Average nucleotide diversity values for each farm were also estimated using this

package.

Seasonal variants

To calculate the allele frequencies of SNV sites across the pangenome, we used the MIDAS

"midas.py snps" script (117). We treated all samples from different states in the southeastern USA

as a single population for each season. To increase the accuracy of results, we had additional filters

for removing SNV sites with a read depth of less than 10. For seasonal oscillations, we averaged

the allele frequencies of major alleles during the season. To identify parallel variants in the

population, we first extracted SNV sites where the frequency of minor alleles was less than 0.2

(considered minor alleles) and changed to greater than 0.8 (considered major alleles) in the

following season and remained major in subsequent seasons. For example, we identified sites with

minor alleles ($f <= 0.2$) during mid-season 2020 that became major alleles ($f >= 0.8$) by the end of

the 2020 season. We retained only those SNVs that exhibited this trend in at least 50% of the

samples in a given season.

Acknowledgments

The climatic data were obtained from the NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) POWER

Project funded through the NASA Earth Science/Applied Science Program. This work was made

possible in part by a grant of high-performance computing resources and technical support from

the Alabama Supercomputer Authority. We thank growers in the southeastern US for supporting

this project, allowing sampling their fields, providing metadata and communicating with us their

concerns in tomato production. This helped us better understand the nature of the outbreaks. We

thank the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, and Auburn University for providing

resources for conducting this work.

Data availability

Sequence data generated from this work have been deposited in the SRA (Sequencing Read

Achieve) database under the BioProject accessions number PRJNA1129844. All other data and

code used in this study are publicly and freely available through GitHub

(https://github.com/Potnislab/pathogendiversity).

Funding

This work was funded by the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research (FFAR) New

Innovator award to NP (NIA19 0050), USDA-NIFA hatch project funding to NP (7005375), and

BEYOND project (Grant ANR-20-PCPA-0002; French National Research Agency (ANR)) to SS.

Author contributions

NP conceptualized and designed the study. RB, AK, and IR processed the samples. RB, AK, and

IR conducted analyses; specifically, RB and IR conducted ecological dynamics analysis. RB and

IR, OR, and RM conducted statistical modeling analyses. AK worked on building pangenome and

removal of blacklisted genes and the evolutionary analyses. DB conducted the greenhouse

experiment. SS conducted analysis of pathogen fitness contributions towards epidemics using

StrainRanking. RB, AK, and NP worked on data interpretation. APK, ZS, PR, IM, TT, BD, and

ES helped collect samples and metadata from different tomato farms across four states. RB, AK,

and NP wrote the manuscript with contributions from all the authors.

References:

1.   King KC, Hall MD, Wolinska J. Infectious disease ecology and evolution in a changing world.
Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci. 2023 Feb 6;378(1873):20220002.

2.   Campbell AM, Hauton C, Baker-Austin C, van Aerle R, Martinez-Urtaza J. An integrated
eco-evolutionary framework to predict population-level responses of climate-sensitive
pathogens. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2023 Apr 1;80:102898.

3.   Singh BK, Delgado-Baquerizo M, Egidi E, Guirado E, Leach JE, Liu H, et al. Climate change
impacts on plant pathogens, food security and paths forward. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2023
Oct;21(10):640–56.

4.   Pfenning-Butterworth A, Buckley LB, Drake JM, Farner JE, Farrell MJ, Gehman ALM, et al.
Interconnecting global threats: climate change, biodiversity loss, and infectious diseases.
Lancet Planet Health. 2024 Apr 1;8(4):e270–83.

5.   Engering A, Hogerwerf L, Slingenbergh J. Pathogen–host–environment interplay and
disease emergence. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2013 Feb 6;2(2):e5.

6.   Burdon J, Thrall P, Ericson L. Genes, communities & invasive species: understanding the
ecological and evolutionary dynamics of host–pathogen interactions. Curr Opin Plant Biol.
2013 Aug 1;16(4):400–5.

7.   Parratt SR, Numminen E, Laine AL. Infectious Disease Dynamics in Heterogeneous
Landscapes. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2016 Nov 1;47(Volume 47, 2016):283–306.

8.   Höckerstedt L, Numminen E, Ashby B, Boots M, Norberg A, Laine AL. Spatially structured
eco-evolutionary dynamics in a host-pathogen interaction render isolated populations
vulnerable to disease. Nat Commun. 2022 Oct 13;13(1):6018.

9.   Barrat-Charlaix P, Neher RA. Eco-evolutionary dynamics of adapting pathogens and host
immunity. eLife [Internet]. 2024 Oct 18 [cited 2024 Oct 20];13. Available from:
https://elifesciences.org/reviewed-preprints/97350

10.   Koelle K, Pascual M, Yunus M. Pathogen adaptation to seasonal forcing and climate
change. Proc Biol Sci. 2005 May 7;272(1566):971–7.

11.   Garrett KA, Dendy SP, Frank EE, Rouse MN, Travers SE. Climate Change Effects on Plant
Disease: Genomes to Ecosystems. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2006 Sep 1;44(1):489–509.

12.   Lafferty KD. The ecology of climate change and infectious diseases. Ecology.
924   2009;90(4):888–900.

925   13.   Chakraborty S. Migrate or evolve: options for plant pathogens under climate change. Glob
926   Change Biol. 2013;19(7):1985–2000.

927   14.   Altizer S, Ostfeld RS, Johnson PTJ, Kutz S, Harvell CD. Climate change and infectious
928   diseases: from evidence to a predictive framework. Science. 2013 Aug 2;341(6145):514–9.

929   15.   Velásquez AC, Castroverde CDM, He SY. Plant-Pathogen Warfare under Changing Climate
930   Conditions. Curr Biol CB. 2018;28(10):R619–34.

931   16.   Sarkar SF, Guttman DS. Evolution of the core genome of Pseudomonas syringae, a highly
932   clonal, endemic plant pathogen. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2004 Apr;70(4):1999–2012.

933   17.   Vinatzer BA, Monteil CL, Clarke CR. Harnessing population genomics to understand how
934   bacterial pathogens emerge, adapt to crop hosts, and disseminate. Annu Rev Phytopathol.
935   2014 Aug 4;52(1):19–43.

936   18.   Holt KE, Wertheim H, Zadoks RN, Baker S, Whitehouse CA, Dance D, et al. Genomic
937   analysis of diversity, population structure, virulence, and antimicrobial resistance in
938   Klebsiella pneumoniae, an urgent threat to public health. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2015 Jul
939   7;112(27):E3574–81.

940   19.   Garfinkel AR, Coats KP, Sherry DL, Chastagner GA. Genetic analysis reveals unprecedented
941   diversity of a globally-important plant pathogenic genus. Sci Rep. 2019 Apr 30;9(1):6671.

942   20.   Milgroom MG. Population biology of plant pathogens : genetics, ecology, and evolution
943   [Internet]. APS Press,; 2015 [cited 2019 Oct 3]. 399 p. Available from:
944   http://www.sidalc.net/cgi-
945   bin/wxis.exe/?IsisScript=earth.xis&method=post&formato=2&cantidad=1&expresion=mfn
946   =040539

947   21.   Everhart S, Gambhir N, Stam R. Population Genomics of Filamentous Plant Pathogens—A
948   Brief Overview of Research Questions, Approaches, and Pitfalls. Phytopathology®. 2021
949   Jan;111(1):12–22.

950   22.   Pruvost O, Boyer K, Ravigné V, Richard D, Vernière C. Deciphering how plant pathogenic
951   bacteria disperse and meet: Molecular epidemiology of Xanthomonas citri pv. citri at
952   microgeographic scales in a tropical area of Asiatic citrus canker endemicity. Evol Appl.
953   2019;12(8):1523–38.

954   23.   Newberry E, Bhandari R, Kemble J, Sikora E, Potnis N. Genome-resolved metagenomics to
955   study co-occurrence patterns and intraspecific heterogeneity among plant pathogen
956   metapopulations. Environ Microbiol. 2020 Jul 2;22(7):2693–708.

957   24.   Eck JL, Barrès B, Soubeyrand S, Sirén J, Numminen E, Laine AL. Strain Diversity and Spatial
958   Distribution Are Linked to Epidemic Dynamics in Host Populations. Am Nat. 2022
959   Jan;199(1):59–74.

960   25.   Karasov TL, Almario J, Friedemann C, Ding W, Giolai M, Heavens D, et al. Arabidopsis
961   thaliana and Pseudomonas Pathogens Exhibit Stable Associations over Evolutionary
962   Timescales. Cell Host Microbe. 2018 Jul 11;24(1):168-179.e4.

963   26.   Susi H, Sallinen S, Laine AL. Coinfection with a virus constrains within-host infection load
964   but increases transmission potential of a highly virulent fungal plant pathogen. Ecol Evol.
965   2022;12(3):e8673.

966   27.   Gladieux P, Ravel S, Rieux A, Cros-Arteil S, Adreit H, Milazzo J, et al. Coexistence of
967   Multiple Endemic and Pandemic Lineages of the Rice Blast Pathogen. mBio. 2018 Apr
968   3;9(2):10.1128/mbio.01806-17.

969   28.   Roques L, Desbiez C, Berthier K, Soubeyrand S, Walker E, Klein EK, et al. Emerging strains
970   of watermelon mosaic virus in Southeastern France: model-based estimation of the dates
971   and places of introduction. Sci Rep. 2021 Mar 29;11(1):7058.

972   29.   Ali S, Gladieux P, Ravel S, Adreit H, Meusnier I, Milazzo J, et al. Evolution of the rice blast
973   pathogen on spatially structured rice landraces maintains multiple generalist fungal
974   lineages. Mol Ecol. 2023;32(10):2519–33.

975   30.   Elmer WH. Seeds as vehicles for pathogen importation. Biol Invasions. 2001;3:263–71.

976   31.   Klein-Gordon JM, Xing Y, Garrett KA, Abrahamian P, Paret ML, Minsavage GV, et al.
977   Assessing Changes and Associations in the Xanthomonas perforans Population Across
978   Florida Commercial Tomato Fields Via a Statewide Survey. Phytopathology. 2021
979   Jun;111(6):1029–41.

980   32.   Klein-Gordon JM, Timilsina S, Xing Y, Abrahamian P, Garrett KA, Jones JB, et al. Whole
981   genome sequences reveal the Xanthomonas perforans population is shaped by the tomato
982   production system. ISME J. 2022 Feb;16(2):591–601.

983   33.   Potnis N. Harnessing Eco-Evolutionary Dynamics of Xanthomonads on Tomato and Pepper
984   to Tackle New Problems of an Old Disease. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2021 Aug 25;59(Volume
985   59, 2021):289–310.

986   34.   Anderson AR, Moore LW. Host specificity in the genus Agrobacterium. Phytopathology.
987   1979;69(4):320–3.

988   35.   Mitchell SE, Rogers ES, Little TJ, Read AF. Host-Parasite and Genotype-by-Environment
989   Interactions: Temperature Modifies Potential for Selection by a Sterilizing Pathogen.
990   Evolution. 2005;59(1):70–80.

36. Laine A -L. Pathogen fitness components and genotypes differ in their sensitivity to nutrient and temperature variation in a wild plant–pathogen association. J Evol Biol. 2007 Nov 1;20(6):2371–8.

37. Barrett LG, Kniskern JM, Bodenhausen N, Zhang W, Bergelson J. Continua of specificity and virulence in plant host–pathogen interactions: causes and consequences. New Phytol. 2009;183(3):513–29.

38. Suffert F, Goyeau H, Sache I, Carpentier F, Gélisse S, Morais D, et al. Epidemiological trade-off between intra- and interannual scales in the evolution of aggressiveness in a local plant pathogen population. Evol Appl. 2018;11(5):768–80.

39. Kaur A, Russell I, Liu R, Holland A, Bhandari R, Potnis N. Within-host adaptation of a foliar pathogen, Xanthomonas, on pepper in presence of quantitative resistance and ozone stress [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2024 [cited 2024 Aug 14]. p. 2024.02.29.582737. Available from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.02.29.582737v1

40. Meyer KM, Porch R, Muscettola IE, Vasconcelos ALS, Sherman JK, Metcalf CJE, et al. Plant neighborhood shapes diversity and reduces interspecific variation of the phyllosphere microbiome. ISME J. 2022 May;16(5):1376–87.

41. Thompson JN, Burdon JJ. Gene-for-gene coevolution between plants and parasites. Nature. 1992 Nov;360(6400):121–5.

42. Fones HN, Bebber DP, Chaloner TM, Kay WT, Steinberg G, Gurr SJ. Threats to global food security from emerging fungal and oomycete crop pathogens. Nat Food. 2020 Jun;1(6):332–42.

43. Castledine M, Padfield D, Sierocinski P, Soria Pascual J, Hughes A, Mäkinen L, et al. Parallel evolution of Pseudomonas aeruginosa phage resistance and virulence loss in response to phage treatment in vivo and in vitro. eLife. 2022 Feb 21;11:e73679.

44. Papaix J, Carpentier F, Monod H, Lannou C. The role of spatial heterogeneity in shaping pathogen populations in agricultural landscapes. 2024 Jan 31 [cited 2024 Sep 25]; Available from: https://www.authorea.com/users/735225/articles/711720-the-role-of-spatial-heterogeneity-in-shaping-pathogen-populations-in-agricultural-landscapes

45. Sharma A, Timilsina S, Abrahamian P, Minsavage GV, Jones J, Vallad GE, et al. Bacterial mutation during seasonal epidemics. Mol Plant-Microbe Interactions® [Internet]. 2023 Dec 17 [cited 2024 Feb 11]; Available from: https://apsjournals.apsnet.org/doi/abs/10.1094/MPMI-10-23-0164-SC

46. McDonald BA, Linde C. Pathogen population genetics, evolutionary potential, and durable resistance. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2002 Sep 28;40(1):349–79.

47.   Jones JB, Lacy GH, Bouzar H, Stall RE, Schaad NW. Reclassification of the Xanthomonads
1026   Associated with Bacterial Spot Disease of Tomato and Pepper. Syst Appl Microbiol. 2004
1027   Dec 15;27(6):755–62.

1028   48.   Potnis N, Krasileva K, Chow V, Almeida NF, Patil PB, Ryan RP, et al. Comparative genomics
1029   reveals diversity among xanthomonads infecting tomato and pepper. BMC Genomics.
1030   2011 Dec 11;12(1):146.

1031   49.   Schwartz AR, Potnis N, Timilsina S, Wilson M, Patané J, Martins J, et al. Phylogenomics of
1032   Xanthomonas field strains infecting pepper and tomato reveals diversity in effector
1033   repertoires and identifies determinants of host specificity. Front Microbiol. 2015;6:535.

1034   50.   Newberry EA, Minsavage GV, Holland A, Jones JB, Potnis N. Genome-Wide Association to
1035   Study the Host-Specificity Determinants of Xanthomonas perforans. Phytopathology®.
1036   2023 Mar;113(3):400–12.

1037   51.   Horsfall JG, Barratt RW. An improved grading system for measuring plant diseases.
1038   Phytopathology. 1945;35:655.

1039   52.   El Jarroudi M, Karjoun H, Kouadio L, El Jarroudi M. Mathematical modelling of non-local
1040   spore dispersion of wind-borne pathogens causing fungal diseases. Appl Math Comput.
1041   2020 Jul 1;376:125107.

1042   53.   Myers TA, Scott RC, Zelinka MD, Klein SA, Norris JR, Caldwell PM. Observational
1043   constraints on low cloud feedback reduce uncertainty of climate sensitivity. Nat Clim
1044   Change. 2021 Jun;11(6):501–7.

1045   54.   Lahlali R, Taoussi M, Laasli SE, Gachara G, Ezzouggari R, Belabess Z, et al. Effects of climate
1046   change on plant pathogens and host-pathogen interactions. Crop Environ. 2024 Sep
1047   1;3(3):159–70.

1048   55.   Janda M, Lamparová L, Zubíková A, Burketová L, Martinec J, Krčková Z. Temporary heat
1049   stress suppresses PAMP-triggered immunity and resistance to bacteria in Arabidopsis
1050   thaliana. Mol Plant Pathol. 2019;20(7):1005–12.

1051   56.   Desaint H, Aoun N, Deslandes L, Vailleau F, Roux F, Berthomé R. Fight hard or die trying:
1052   when plants face pathogens under heat stress. New Phytol. 2021;229(2):712–34.

1053   57.   Chaloner TM, Gurr SJ, Bebber DP. Plant pathogen infection risk tracks global crop yields
1054   under climate change. Nat Clim Change. 2021 Aug;11(8):710–5.

1055   58.   Bilgin DD, Aldea M, O'Neill BF, Benitez M, Li M, Clough SJ, et al. Elevated Ozone Alters
1056   Soybean-Virus Interaction. Mol Plant-Microbe Interactions®. 2008 Oct;21(10):1297–308.

59.   Bhandari R, Sanz-Saez A, Leisner CP, Potnis N. Xanthomonas infection and ozone stress
distinctly influence the microbial community structure and interactions in the pepper
phyllosphere. ISME Commun. 2023 Mar 27;3(1):1–13.

60.   Scherm,H., Yang, X. B. Interannual variations in wheat rust development in China and the
United States in relation to the El Niño/Southern Oscillation. Phytopathol 970–976.
1995;(19951000069, English, Journal article).

61.   Brasier CM. Phytophthora cinnamomi and oak decline in southern Europe. Environmental
constraints including climate change. Ann Sci For. 1996;53(2–3):347–58.

62.   Corredor-Moreno P, Saunders DGO. Expecting the unexpected: factors influencing the
emergence of fungal and oomycete plant pathogens. New Phytol. 2020;225(1):118–25.

63.   Abrahamian P, Sharma A, Jones JB, Vallad GE. Dynamics and Spread of Bacterial Spot
Epidemics in Tomato Transplants Grown for Field Production. Plant Dis. 2021
Mar;105(3):566–75.

64.   Sharma A, Timilsina S, Abrahamian P, Minsavage GV, Colee J, Ojiambo PS, et al. Need for
speed: bacterial effector XopJ2 is associated with increased dispersal velocity of
Xanthomonas perforans. Environ Microbiol. 2021;23(10):5850–65.

65.   Gause GF. Experimental Analysis of Vito Volterra's Mathematical Theory of the Struggle
for Existence. Science. 1934 Jan 5;79(2036):16–7.

66.   Byappanahalli MN, Whitman RL, Shively DA, Sadowsky MJ, Ishii S. Population structure,
persistence, and seasonality of autochthonous Escherichia coli in temperate, coastal forest
soil from a Great Lakes watershed. Environ Microbiol. 2006;8(3):504–13.

67.   Jang J, Unno T, Lee SW, Cho KH, Sadowsky MJ, Ko G, et al. Prevalence of season-specific
Escherichia coli strains in the Yeongsan River Basin of South Korea. Environ Microbiol.
2011;13(12):3103–13.

68.   Jang J, Di DYW, Lee A, Unno T, Sadowsky MJ, Hur HG. Seasonal and Genotypic Changes in
Escherichia coli Phylogenetic Groups in the Yeongsan River Basin of South Korea. PLOS
ONE. 2014 Jul 7;9(7):e100585.

69.   Roques L, Klein EK, Papaïx J, Sar A, Soubeyrand S. Impact of Lockdown on the Epidemic
Dynamics of COVID-19 in France. Front Med [Internet]. 2020 Jun 5 [cited 2024 Sep 25];7.
Available from:
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/medicine/articles/10.3389/fmed.2020.00274/full

70.   Soubeyrand S, Garreta V, Monteil C, Suffert F, Goyeau H, Berder J, et al. Testing
Differences Between Pathogen Compositions with Small Samples and Sparse Data.
Phytopathology®. 2017 Oct;107(10):1199–208.

71. Van Den Berg F, Gilligan CA, Bailey DJ, Van Den Bosch F. Periodicity in Host Availability
Does Not Account for Evolutionary Branching as Observed in Many Plant Pathogens: An
Application to *Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici*. Phytopathology®. 2010
Nov;100(11):1169–75.

72. Penczykowski RM, Walker E, Soubeyrand S, Laine AL. Linking winter conditions to regional
disease dynamics in a wild plant–pathogen metapopulation. New Phytol [Internet]. 2015
[cited 2024 Aug 19];205(3):1142–52. Available from:
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13145

73. van den Berg F, Gilligan CA, Bailey DJ, van den Bosch F. Periodicity in host availability does
not account for evolutionary branching as observed in many plant pathogens: an
application to Gaeumannomyces graminis var. tritici. Phytopathology. 2010
Nov;100(11):1169–75.

74. van den Berg F, Bacaer N, Metz JAJ, Lannou C, van den Bosch F. Periodic host absence can
select for higher or lower parasite transmission rates. Evol Ecol [Internet]. 2011 Jan 1
[cited 2024 Aug 19];25(1):121–37. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-010-
9387-0

75. Hamelin FM, Castel M, Poggi S, Andrivon D, Mailleret L. Seasonality and the evolutionary
divergence of plant parasites. Ecology. 2011 Dec;92(12):2159–66.

76. Ballaré CL. Light regulation of plant defense. Annu Rev Plant Biol. 2014;65:335–63.

77. Beattie GA, Hatfield BM, Dong H, McGrane RS. Seeing the Light: The Roles of Red- and
Blue-Light Sensing in Plant Microbes. Annu Rev Phytopathol [Internet]. 2018 Aug 25 [cited
2024 Aug 19];56(Volume 56, 2018):41–66. Available from:
https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-phyto-080417-
045931

78. Yeats C, Rawlings ND, Bateman A. The PepSY domain: a regulator of peptidase activity in
the microbial environment? Trends Biochem Sci. 2004 Apr 1;29(4):169–72.

79. Gallois N, Alpha-Bazin B, Bremond N, Ortet P, Barakat M, Piette L, et al. Discovery and
characterization of UipA, a uranium- and iron-binding PepSY protein involved in uranium
tolerance by soil bacteria. ISME J. 2022 Mar;16(3):705–16.

80. Coyne MJ, Comstock LE. Type VI Secretion Systems and the Gut Microbiota. Microbiol
Spectr. 2019 Mar;7(2):10.1128/microbiolspec.psib-0009–2018.

81. Allsopp LP, Bernal P, Nolan LM, Filloux A. Causalities of war: The connection between type
VI secretion system and microbiota. Cell Microbiol. 2020 Mar;22(3):e13153.

82.   Serapio-Palacios A, Woodward SE, Vogt SL, Deng W, Creus-Cuadros A, Huus KE, et al. Type
1125   VI secretion systems of pathogenic and commensal bacteria mediate niche occupancy in
1126   the gut. Cell Rep. 2022 Apr 26;39(4):110731.

1127   83.   Thri Murty VS, Devadath S. Role of seed in survival and transmission of <i>Xanthomonas
1128   campestris *pv.* oryzae</i>. J Phytopathol. 1984 May 1;110(1):15–9.

1129   84.   Gitaitis R, Walcott R. The Epidemiology and Management of Seedborne Bacterial Diseases.
1130   Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2007 Sep 8;45(Volume 45, 2007):371–97.

1131   85.   Chalam VC, Deepika DD, Abhishek GJ, Maurya AK. Major Seed-Borne Diseases of
1132   Agricultural Crops: International Trade of Agricultural Products and Role of Quarantine. In:
1133   Kumar R, Gupta A, editors. Seed-Borne Diseases of Agricultural Crops: Detection, Diagnosis
1134   & Management [Internet]. Singapore: Springer; 2020 [cited 2024 Oct 28]. p. 25–61.
1135   Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9046-4_2

1136   86.   Koskella B, Giraud T, Hood ME. Pathogen relatedness affects the prevalence of within-host
1137   competition. Am Nat. 2006 Jul;168(1):121–6.

1138   87.   Thrall PH, Burdon JJ. Effect of resistance variation in a natural plant host–pathogen
1139   metapopulation on disease dynamics. Plant Pathol. 2000;49(6):767–73.

1140   88.   Susi H, Vale PF, Laine AL. Host Genotype and Coinfection Modify the Relationship of within
1141   and between Host Transmission. Am Nat. 2015 Aug;186(2):252–63.

1142   89.   Alizon S, de Roode JC, Michalakis Y. Multiple infections and the evolution of virulence. Ecol
1143   Lett. 2013 Apr;16(4):556–67.

1144   90.   Hu L, Yang L. Time to Fight: Molecular Mechanisms of Age-Related Resistance.
1145   Phytopathology®. 2019 Sep;109(9):1500–8.

1146   91.   Whalen MC. Host defence in a developmental context. Mol Plant Pathol. 2005 May
1147   1;6(3):347–60.

1148   92.   Sharabani G, Shtienberg D, Borenstein M, Shulhani R, Lofthouse M, Sofer M, et al. Effects
1149   of plant age on disease development and virulence of Clavibacter michiganensis subsp.
1150   michiganensis on tomato. Plant Pathol. 2013;62(5):1114–22.

1151   93.   Huss CP, Holmes KD, Blubaugh CK. Benefits and Risks of Intercropping for Crop Resilience
1152   and Pest Management. J Econ Entomol. 2022 Oct 1;115(5):1350–62.

1153   94.   Olm MR, Brown CT, Brooks B, Banfield JF. dRep: a tool for fast and accurate genomic
1154   comparisons that enables improved genome recovery from metagenomes through de-
1155   replication. ISME J [Internet]. 2017 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Nov 12];11(12):2864. Available from:
1156   /pmc/articles/PMC5702732/

95. Treangen TJ, Ondov BD, Koren S, Phillippy AM. The Harvest suite for rapid core-genome
alignment and visualization of thousands of intraspecific microbial genomes. Genome Biol.
2014 Nov 19;15(11):524.

96. Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL): an online tool for phylogenetic tree display
and annotation. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2007 Jan 1;23(1):127–8.

97. Cox MP, Peterson DA, Biggs PJ. SolexaQA: At-a-glance quality assessment of Illumina
second-generation sequencing data. BMC Bioinformatics. 2010 Sep 27;11(1):485.

98. The Huttenhower Lab. Kneaddata [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
https://github.com/biobakery/kneaddata

99. Wood DE, Lu J, Langmead B. Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken 2. Genome Biol.
2019 Nov 28;20(1):257.

100. O'Leary NA, Wright MW, Brister JR, Ciufo S, Haddad D, McVeigh R, et al. Reference
sequence (RefSeq) database at NCBI: current status, taxonomic expansion, and functional
annotation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016 Jan 4;44(D1):D733-745.

101. Lu J, Breitwieser FP, Thielen P, Salzberg SL. Bracken: estimating species abundance in
metagenomics data. PeerJ Comput Sci. 2017 Jan 2;3:e104.

102. Albanese D, Donati C. Strain profiling and epidemiology of bacterial species from
metagenomic sequencing. Nat Commun. 2017 Dec 22;8(1):2260.

103. Kurtz S, Phillippy A, Delcher AL, Smoot M, Shumway M, Antonescu C, et al. Versatile and
open software for comparing large genomes. Genome Biol. 2004;5(2):R12.

104. Dixon P. VEGAN, a package of R functions for community ecology. J Veg Sci [Internet].
2003 [cited 2022 Mar 21];14(6):927–30. Available from:
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2003.tb02228.x

105. Sparks AH. nasapower: a NASA POWER global meteorology, surface solar energy and
climatology data client for R [Journal of Open Source Software, vol. 3, no. 30, 1035
[Internet]. Baltimore, Maryland, United States: NumFOCUS; 2018 [cited 2023 Oct 18].
Available from: http://joss.theoj.org/papers/10.21105/joss.01035

106. Westfall PH. Kurtosis as Peakedness, 1905 - 2014. R.I.P. Am Stat. 2014;68(3):191–5.

107. Tibshirani R. Regression Shrinkage and Selection Via the Lasso. J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol
[Internet]. 1996 Jan 1 [cited 2023 Oct 22];58(1):267–88. Available from:
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1996.tb02080.x

108. McCullagh P. Regression Models for Ordinal Data. J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol [Internet].
1980 Jan 1 [cited 2024 Aug 20];42(2):109–27. Available from:
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1980.tb01109.x

109. Ferrari S, Cribari-Neto F. Beta Regression for Modelling Rates and Proportions. J Appl Stat
[Internet]. 2004 [cited 2023 Oct 26];31(7):799–815. Available from:
https://econpapers.repec.org/article/tafjapsta/v_3a31_3ay_3a2004_3ai_3a7_3ap_3a799-
815.htm

110. Cribari-Neto F, Zeileis A. Beta Regression in R. J Stat Softw [Internet]. 2010 Apr 5 [cited
2023 Oct 25];34:1–24. Available from: https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v034.i02

111. Hijazi RH, Jernigan RW. Modelling Compositional Data Using Dirichlet Regression Models.
Journal of Applied Probability & Statistics. 2009;4(1):77–91.

112. Simko I, Piepho HP. The area under the disease progress stairs: calculation, advantage, and
application. Phytopathology. 2012 Apr;102(4):381–9.

113. Bates, D, Sarkar, D, Bated, M. D., Matrix, L. The lme4 package. R package. 2007.

114. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed
Effects Models. J Stat Softw. 2017 Dec 6;82:1–26.

115. Soubeyrand S, Tollenaere C, Haon-Lasportes E, Laine AL. Regression-Based Ranking of
Pathogen Strains with Respect to Their Contribution to Natural Epidemics. PLOS ONE. 2014
Jan 31;9(1):e86591.

116. Puente-Sánchez F, Hoetzinger M, Buck M, Bertilsson S. Exploring intra-species diversity
through non-redundant pangenome assemblies [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2022 [cited 2023 Feb
26]. p. 2022.03.25.485477. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.03.25.485477v1

117. Nayfach S. Metagenomic Intra-Species Diversity Analysis System (MIDAS) [Internet]. 2022
[cited 2022 Nov 9]. Available from: https://github.com/snayfach/MIDAS

118. Bushnell B. BBDuk. Jt Genome Inst Available Online Httpsjgi Doe Govdata--Toolsbbtoolsbb-
Tools-Userguidebbduk-Guid 25 June 2020. 2020;

119. Li H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM
[Internet]. arXiv; 2013 [cited 2024 Aug 27]. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3997

120. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence
Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009 Aug 15;25(16):2078–9.

121. Broad Institute. Picard Toolkit [Internet]. 2019. Available from:
https://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/

122. Gregory AC, Gerhardt K, Zhong ZP, Bolduc B, Temperton B, Konstantinidis KT, et al.
MetaPop: a pipeline for macro- and microdiversity analyses and visualization of microbial
and viral metagenome-derived populations. Microbiome. 2022 Mar 15;10(1):49.

1224

1225

1226

Supporting Information:

1227

1228

1229   **Supplementary Text:**

1230   **S1 Appendix. Climatic shifts and extremes explain variation in BLS epidemics across the**
1231   **Southeastern United States**
1232
1233   **Supplementary Figures:**
1234
1235   **S1 Fig**. A total of 8 fields consistently sampled over all three years displayed variable disease
1236   pressures across three years. Disease severity score is based on percent leaf area affected and
1237   estimated using the Horsfall-Barratt scale, which ranges from 1 to 12, with scale of 1 being no
1238   disease and 12 being 100% defoliation (Horsfall and Barratt 1945).
1239
1240   **S2 Fig.** (**A**) Disease severity ratings for different sampling time points across different states of
1241   Southeastern US. (**B**) the absolute abundance and (**C**) Relative abundance of *Xp* collected from
1242   different states during 2020, 2021, and 2022.
1243
1244   **S3 Fig.** Plots are comparing the samples based on the farm size (commercial vs small scale
1245   farms) (**A**) disease severity ratings; (**B**) Shannon diversity & (**C**) Number of Sequence clusters
1246   (SCs) or pathogen lineages present in the samples. The pathogen diversity was significantly
1247   higher in commercial fields compared to small-scale farms, although disease severity values did
1248   not significantly vary.
1249
1250   **S4 Fig.** Stacked bar plot depicting the co-occurrence of multiple *Xp* lineages, spatial and
1251   temporal variations, the introduction of new lineages, turnover, and dominance shifts in
1252   individual fields across various states during the mid and end of the season for the years 2020,
1253   2021, and 2022
1254
1255   **S5 Fig.** Boxplots showing (**A**) disease severity ratings **& (B)** Average nucleotide diversity for
1256   farms having presence of less than and more than 2 Sequence clusters (pathogen lineages).
1257
S6 Fig. (**A**) Correlation plot showing the relationship between Shannon diversity of *Xp* lineages
and disease severity across all samples. The presence of more *Xp* lineages in the field correlates

with higher BLS disease severity; **(B)** Boxplot showing the Shannon diversity across the samples
with low and high disease severity conditions. High DS includes the samples with disease
severity scale ratings of more than and equal to 5, whereas low DS includes the farms with
disease severity scale ratings of less than 5.
1264
S7 Fig. Evaluating the fitness contributions of individual vs mixed infections by strains
belonging to different sequence clusters under greenhouse conditions. Plants were dip-inoculated
with ~1 X 10^6 of cell suspensions for each treatment. **(A)** Boxplot presenting the disease severity
ratings evaluated using Horsfall-Barratt scale at day 7 and 15 of post-inoculation. The mixed
infections showed higher disease severity compared to single infections**. (B)** pairwise-
comparisons of AUDPC values across different pairs of treatments. Differences in means of
disease development i.e. AUDPC for different treatment pairs are shown. Mean values of
disease development with a 95% confidence interval were contrasted between treatments.
Difference in means of disease development between treatments with an estimate 0 have no
difference in means of disease development among pair of strains. Negative and positive values
represent statistically significant treatments based on Tukey's HSD test.
1276
S8 Fig. Using StrainRanking, **(A)** Comparisons of different SCs with fitness estimates and their
confidence intervals under main effects were made. These estimates focused on SC3, SC4, and
SC6 (which were more abundant in samples), and a group of SCs (SC1, SC2, SC5, SC7, and SC8)
that were categorized as low-frequency (due to their lower abundance). The bottom plot illustrates
the growth curves of these SCs, estimating their contributions to the progression of disease severity
from mid and end of summer**. (B)** Pathogen-pathogen interactions, specifically between the two
dominant SCs (SC3 and SC4), were analyzed based on their combined frequencies being either
below or above 20%. Fitness estimates with confidence intervals were compared when the
summed frequencies of SC3 and SC4 were taken into account. Different interaction scenarios were
considered, such as SC3 > 20% & SC4 < 20%, SC4 > 20% & SC3 < 20%, and both SC3 & SC4
at equal frequencies, along with SC6 and the low-frequency SCs. The growth curves in the bottom
plot highlight how these interactions contributed to the progression of disease during the season.
(C) Pathogen-environment interactions were examined by applying the frequencies of SC3 or SC4
to different environmental variables, depending on whether each variable was above or below its
mean at the sampling point. The analysis assumed weighted mean of genetic frequencies to
calculate fitness levels as: p x mid-frequency + (1 - p) x end-frequency, where ($p = 0.90$).
1293
S9 Fig. Using StrainRanking: **(A)** Comparisons of different SCs with fitness estimates and their
confidence intervals under main effects were made. These estimates focused on SC3, SC4, and
SC6 (which were more abundant in samples), and a group of SCs (SC1, SC2, SC5, SC7, and SC8)
that were categorized as low-frequency (due to their lower abundance). The bottom plot illustrates
the growth curves of these SCs, estimating their contributions to the progression of disease severity
from mid and end of summer**. (B)** Pathogen-pathogen interactions, specifically between the two
dominant SCs (SC3 and SC4), were analyzed based on their combined frequencies being either
below or above 20%. Fitness estimates with confidence intervals were compared when the
summed frequencies of SC3 and SC4 were taken into account. Different interaction scenarios were
considered, such as SC3 > 20% & SC4 < 20%, SC4 > 20% & SC3 < 20%, and both SC3 & SC4
at equal frequencies, along with SC6 and the low-frequency SCs. The growth curves in the bottom
plot highlight how these interactions contributed to the progression of disease during the season.

(C) Pathogen-environment interactions were examined by applying the frequencies of SC3 or SC4 to different environmental variables, depending on whether each variable was above or below its mean at the sampling point. The analysis assumed weighted mean of genetic frequencies to calculate fitness levels as: p x mid-frequency + (1 - p) x end-frequency, where (p = 0.10).

S10 Fig. plot showing the average allele frequencies for those alleles having **(A)** *f >= 0.8* & **(B)** *f <0.8* during End-season 2020; **(C)** *f >= 0.8* & **(D)** *f <0.8* during Fall-season 2020 and traced for the frequency changes during the previous and following seasons of three years.

S11 Fig. Sankey plot shows counts of the alleles present in parallel across farms during **A)** End-Season 2020 & **B)** Fall-season of 2020 with frequency less than and equal to 0.2 and then counts for those alleles which stayed as major during the next seasons.

S12 Fig. In circos plot is presenting LH3 genome with all the colored bars indicating different genes in different scaffolds, where genes under positive selection are shown with the red colored asterisk sign in the grey colored ring and the red colored arrows are showing those genes which were present in parallel across farms and seasons.

Supplementary Tables:

S1A Table. Farm details and time of sampling during three sampling years

S1B Table. Details of farm and disease severity across season and sampling years used in the study

S2 Table. Climatic parameters used in the study and their meaning

S3A Table. Influence of various factors in BLS disease severity
S3B Table. Influence of various factors in absolute abundance of X. euvesicatoria pv. perforans
S3C Table. Influence of various factors in relative abundance of X. euvesicatoria pv. perforans

S4 Table. Coefficients Estimates and p-values for different Sequence Clusters

S5 Table. Gene under positive selection pressure (Annotations according LH3 Genome)