Ecological ubiquity and phylogeny drive nestedness in phages–bacteria networks and shape the bacterial defensome

Chloé Feltin [1]*, Sylvain Piry [1], Benoit Moury [1], Lola Chateau [1], Karine Berthier [1], Jonathan M. Jacobs [2,3], Jules Butchacas [2,3], Linda Fenske [4], Lillian Ebeling-Koning [2,3], Theo H. M. Smits [5], Cindy E. Morris [1], Clara Torres-Barceló [6]*

[1] Pathologie Végétale, INRAE, 84140 Montfavet, France

[2] Department of Plant Pathology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

[3] Infectious Disease Institute, The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

[4] Bioinformatics and Systems Biology, Justus-Liebig-Universitat Giessen, Giessen, Germany

[5] Environmental Genomics and Systems Biology Research Group, Institute of Natural Resource Sciences (IUNR), Zurich University of Applied Sciences: ZHAW Zurcher Hochschule fur Angewandte Wissenschaften, Wädenswil, Switzerland

[6] PHIM Plant Health Institute, INRAE, University of Montpellier, CIRAD, Institut Agro, IRD, Montpellier, France

* Corresponding authors

E-mails: clara.torresbarcelo@inrae.fr and chloe.feltin@inrae.fr

Abstract

Identifying the ecological and evolutionary factors that shape phage–bacterial interactions is key to understanding their dynamics in microbial communities. Yet, such interactions remain poorly characterised in plant agroecosystems. Here, we investigate the ecological determinants of the interaction between a highly diverse set of 23 phages isolated from diseased apricot trees and 44 bacterial strains from the *Pseudomonas syringae* species complex collected either from diseased apricot trees, healthy plants or non-agricultural environment. Based on their ecological origin, we expected phages to preferentially infect bacterial strains from the same ecological context, forming modular host-range patterns. Contrary to these expectations, we discovered a significantly nested structure, suggesting generalised infection dynamics rather than local adaptation, primarily driven by the broad ecological dynamics of this pathosystem. Analysis of the bacterial genomes showed that both the profiles of anti-phage defence systems and the distribution profiles of prophages are strongly shaped by bacterial phylogeny. Furthermore, while the number of defence systems showed limited correlation with the breadth of bacterial sensitivity to phages, prophage abundance exhibited a strong, non-linear link with phage virulence. Together, these findings provide an ecological and evolutionary perspective on phage–bacterium infection networks and new insights into a better understanding of the role of phages in agricultural ecosystems.

Author Summary

Viruses that infect bacteria, known as phages, are part of microbial communities and influence the abundance, diversity, and traits of their hosts. In an agriculture-related context, they are commonly considered as potential biocontrol agents, but studying the

bases of fundamental phage–bacterial interactions may help us better understand the plant

microbiome and its applications. Many factors influence these interactions, and identifying

which ones matter most remains a challenge. In our study, we investigated how phages from

diseased plants interact with bacteria collected from diseased and healthy plants, as well as

from surrounding environments. We expected phages to mainly infect bacteria from similar

environments, but instead observed that they often infected bacteria regardless of their

source. This suggests that phage activity in this system has few barriers, reflecting the wide

ecological distribution of their bacterial hosts. We further investigated how bacteria defend

against phages by identifying both defence systems and prophages within their genomes

and using this information to explore their contribution to bacterial resistance or sensitivity

to phages. Together, our findings offer new insights into how phage–bacterium relationships

evolve and function in plant ecosystems.

Introduction

Phages profoundly influence bacterial diversity and population dynamics (1). The impact of

phages on bacterial ecology and evolution has been extensively examined in ecosystems like

oceans and the human gut (2–7), research in agriculture (8). A deeper understanding of the

ecological roles, population dynamics, and interactions of phages with bacterial communities

in plant-associated systems, could provide fundamental insights to guide the development of

phage-based biocontrol strategies and the sustainable management of microbial

communities in agriculture.

Phage interactions with bacteria depend on a multitude of factors. The phage must

recognise and infect a host, integrate or replicate, while avoiding or blocking bacterial

defence systems (9,10). A range of approaches have been employed to unravel the

determinants of phage-bacterial interactions, including ecological and evolutionary analyses

of natural populations and experimental evolution (11,12). Mechanistic studies have

identified bacterial receptors (13,14), with more recent work focusing on defence systems

associated with susceptibility to phage (14–17). For example, *Vibrio lentus* strains with

identical phage receptors display varying levels of susceptibility depending on their phage

defence elements (18). However, research on prophages and defence systems in

phytopathogenic bacteria remains limited and have yet to connect these elements to host

range data (19–25).

The complexities of phage-bacterial interactions can be visualised as ecological networks,

which exhibit distinct structural patterns, commonly modularity or nestedness (26).

Nestedness, a structure in which phages exhibit a gradient of host range breadth and

bacteria varying levels of susceptibility, is commonly observed with limited genetic diversity

of phages or bacteria (26–28). In contrast, modularity, where phages and bacteria interact

within modules but rarely across them, tends to emerge at broader evolutionary or

ecological scales, such as when interactions involve hosts, or are examined over extended

time periods (11,29). Nonetheless, modules can also evolve rapidly and emerge within

species (*e.g.* (12)), although such events may be rare. A recent study introduced statistical

methods that incorporate quantitative host–parasite interaction data into ecological

networks (30). By considering interaction strength rather than simple infection presence or

absence, these approaches provide a more nuanced view of infection patterns, host

susceptibility, and phage infectivity, capturing dynamics overlooked by binary analyses.

The *Pseudomonas syringae* species complex is particularly interesting for studying phage-

bacterial interactions in agriculture, due to its high genetic diversity and broad ecological

distribution across cultivated plants, wild environments and aquatic habitats (31–33). *P.*

syringae strains responsible for bacterial canker of apricot trees (*Prunus armeniaca*) are

particularly diverse, spanning multiple phylogroups (PG01, PG02, PG03, PG07) (34). It is

hypothesized that the pathogenic success of these apricot strains may be driven primarily by

general ecological fitness rather than specific virulence factors. These lineages are not

apricot-specific but thrive across varied environments, raising questions about the ecological

contexts of their phage interactions, whether within the host or external reservoirs (34).

Exploring phage infectivity patterns on these strains can reveal how phylogenetic and

ecological diversity shapes phage-bacterium dynamics.

Historically, phage host range profiling was used to differentiate *P. syringae* strains (35–39).

More recent studies have emphasised the isolation and characterisation of novel *P. syringae*

phages and their potential as biocontrol agents (40,41). Most phage host range assays were

confined to the isolation host and the intended target, reflecting an applied focus. Others

included a broader set of strains, though typically limited to agricultural isolates. For

example, phages infecting *P. syringae* pv. *porri* exhibited strict specificity to this variant,

having been tested mainly against *porri* strains and a few non-*porri* isolates, and *P. syringae*

pv. *actinidiae* phages were largely pathovar-specific, with some extending activity to closely

related lineages (42).

We focused on the causal agents of bacterial canker of apricot trees to investigate the

structure and ecological drivers of phage–bacterium infection networks. We hypothesised

that phages would be locally adapted to their bacterial hosts, leading to a modular infection

network structure that could be explained by the presence of prophages and diverse

bacterial defence systems. To test this, we addressed the following questions: i) Are phages

isolated from diseased apricot trees specifically adapted to resident *P. syringae* compared to

closely-related strains from other environmental reservoirs? ii) Do closely-related bacteria

isolated from different environments differ in their adaptation to phages? iii) What bacterial

genomic traits underlie the observed infection network structure? We conducted an

integrative approach utilizing a quantitative host-range assay involving 23 genetically-diverse

P. syringae phages and 44 *P. syringae* strains. This was coupled with whole-genome

sequencing of all bacterial strains for detailed annotation of prophages and defence systems.

This comprehensive methodology provides mechanistic insights into how ecological origin

and bacterial genomic content shape phage–bacterial interactions.

Results

Host range characterization of a diverse panel of phages on P. syringae bacteria

We characterised the phage–bacterial infection network by testing 23 phages against 44

strains from the *P. syringae* species complex (hereafter referred to as *P. syringae* strains) in

liquid culture over 48 hours of bacterial growth monitoring. Unlike traditional plaque assays,

which primarily assess phage replication on solid media, this quantitative approach

measures the extent of bacterial growth suppression in liquid conditions, thereby capturing

a complementary aspect of phage–bacterium interactions (9,43). Each interaction was

quantified using two complementary metrics: 1/ a continuous variable, corresponding to the

percentage of bacterial growth inhibition by phages (0–100%) (S1A Table), and 2/ a binary

variable, indicating whether the inhibition was statistically significant (1) or not (0), based on

triplicate measurements (S1B Table). Because these values can be interpreted from either

the phage or bacterial perspective, we provide clear terminology to distinguish them. From

the bacterial perspective, these values represent susceptibility (percentage inhibition) and

sensitivity (binary significance of inhibition). Conversely, from the phage perspective, these

values reflect virulence (percentage inhibition) and infectivity (binary success of infection).

Overall, the tested bacterial strains showed continuous distributions of susceptibility and

sensitivity values, reflecting the diversity of interactions of the panel with phages. On

average, bacterial susceptibility to phages was moderate, with a 24% reduction in growth,

and strains were sensitive to 12.3 out of the 23 tested phages (53.5%) (S1A Fig), indicating a

broader sensitivity than suggested by inhibition levels alone. The most susceptible bacterial

strains were DG1a.7, GAW0089, and DG12.6 (all from PG02), with average inhibition levels

of 46%, 50%, and 42%, respectively (S1A Table). The most broadly sensitive strains, DG1a.7,

7C, and CCE0067 (all from PG02), were significantly inhibited by 20, 19, and 19 phages,

respectively (87%, 83%, and 83% of tested phages respectively) (S1B Table). In contrast,

bacterial strains CC1583, DG8.15, and DGA9CS5-8 (from PG10, PG07 and PG10 respectively)

showed the highest resistance, with average inhibition percentages of only 3%, 6%, and 6%,

respectively (S1A Table). DG8.15 (from PG07) resisted to 17 phages (74% of tested phages)

and seven other strains (19B, 41D, CST0086, DGA9CS5-15, FMU-107, and USA0088 from

PG01, PG02, PG02, PG10, PG07 and PG02) were resistant to 16 phages (70%) (S1B Table).

From the phage perspective, average bacterial growth inhibition across the strain panel was

23%, reflecting moderate virulence. However, each phage was able to infect an average of

22.4 out of 42 tested *P. syringae* strains (53.3%) (S1B Fig), indicating a relatively broad

infectivity despite moderate inhibition levels. The most virulent phages were Ghual01 (65%

inhibition), Arace01 (57%), and Draal03 (44%) (S1A Table). The most infecting phages were

Nican01, Arace01, and Ghual01 infecting 39 (93% of tested bacteria), 37 (88%), and 34 (81%)

strains, respectively (S1B Table). Moreover, Arace01 and Ghual01 were the only phages

capable of infecting strains from other species in the *Pseudomonas* genus. Arace01 infected

a *P. rhizosphaerae* strain at a low efficiency of plating (EOP) of 0.005, whereas Ghual01

infected a *P. graminis* strain at a moderate efficiency (EOP = 0.017). In contrast, Orimi01,

Cygsa01, and Pavpe01 displayed the lowest virulence, with an average bacterial growth

inhibition of 0%, 3%, and 4% respectively (S1A Table), while Orimi01, Cygsa01, and Touem01

had the lowest infectivity, infecting only 2 (5% of tested bacteria), 5 (12%), and 11 (26%)

strains, respectively (S1B Table).

The relationship between the breadth of infection and the strength of inhibition can reveals

underlying evolutionary dynamics, including trade-offs in both phages and bacteria (44,45).

When considering only significant inhibition interactions, we detected a positive correlation

between the phage virulence and the phage infectivity (Spearman rho = 0.56; p = 0.01; S9C

Fig), indicating that phages with broader host ranges tend to exhibit higher average

virulence not supporting the presence of a trade-off. However, this interpretation should be

viewed with caution, as some degree of metric dependency may persist. In contrast, no

correlation was observed between bacterial susceptibility and bacterial sensitivity

(Spearman rho = 0.24; p = 0.12; S9D Fig), reflecting greater variability among bacterial strains

in their response to phage infections and suggesting the potential for trade-offs in bacterial

defensive strategies.

These findings reveal substantial variability in phage virulence and infectivity, as well as

bacterial susceptibility and sensitivity, with over than half (53%) of combinations resulting in

significant growth inhibition. While some phages exhibit a broad host range, extending even

beyond *P. syringae*, others are highly specialised, only infecting a few strains, reflecting a

complex interplay between phage infectivity and bacterial resistance.

Nested structure of the phage-bacterial interaction network and association with

bacterial traits

The structure of the phage-bacterial infection network was analysed using multiple algorithms to assess its nestedness and modularity. Given the diversity of both phages and bacterial hosts, spanning 13 phage genera and four phylogroups of *P. syringae*, and the ecological origins of phages (diseased apricot trees) and bacteria (diseased apricot trees, healthy plants and other environmental reservoirs), we hypothesised a modular structure type. However, the network representing bacterial growth inhibition percentage by phages displayed a strong nested structure, as indicated by scores of 0.48 and 0.44, on a scale varying from 0 to 1, with the *WINE* and *wNODF* algorithms, respectively (Table 1). To determine the statistical significance of the nested pattern, the network was compared to null models, which are simulations differing in the constraints applied during randomization, ranging from unconstrained (S, N) to fully constrained (B). Nestedness was highly significant (p < 0.01) against nearly all null models, except null model B, which was shown to be excessively conservative (30).

Modularity analyses differed depending on the algorithm (Table 1). With the *spinglass* algorithm, selected for its good performance in terms of false positive rate (30), the modularity score was low (0.01, on a scale varying from -0.5 to 1) and was not significant, whatever the null model. The four alternative modularity algorithms produced slightly higher scores (0.09 < modularity < 0.25) and showed significant modularity (p < 0.01) with both null models C1 and R1. These four algorithms show lower performances than *spinglass* in terms of false positive rates, but combined with null models C1 and R1, they show generally acceptable performances in terms of false positive and false negative rates (30).

These results suggest globally a slight degree of modular organisation within the network.

The strong and significant nestedness and the weak modularity were further supported by

the analysis of the binary data representing the significance of bacterial growth inhibition (S2

Table).

Table 1. Analysis of nestedness and modularity of the bacterial growth inhibition network

combining 44 strains of the *P. syringae* species complex and 23 phages.

Analysis	Algorithm	Score (max. = 1.0)	Null model						
			B	N	C1	R1	S	C2	R2
Nestedness	wNODF	0.44	0.44	0	0	0	0	0	0
	WINE	0.48	1	0	0.01	0	0	0	0
Modularity	spinglass	0.01	1	1	1	1	0.07	0.29	0.18
	edge betweenness	0.09	0	0.02	0	0	1	1	1
	fast greedy	0.24	0	0	0	0	1	0.81	0.02
	leading eigenvector	0.14	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.94
	beckett	0.25	0	0	0	0	1	0.01	1

Null models are described in Moury *et al.* (30). For each null model and each algorithm, the

frequency of simulations, among 100, showing a strictly higher nestedness (or modularity)

score than that of the actual matrix is indicated. Significantly nested or modular networks (p

≤ 0.05) are indicated in red.

To assess whether the nested structure of phage–bacterial networks is shaped by bacterial

evolutionary history, we first tested for a phylogenetic signal in bacterial sensitivity summed

by bacteria (Fig 1). The analysis revealed a strong phylogenetic signal (λ = 1.0; LR (λ = 0) =

48.26; p < 0.01), indicating that closely-related bacterial strains tend to be infected by a

similar number of phages. To explore this pattern further, we evaluated the effect of

phylogroup identity using both a Generalised Linear Model (GLM) with the bacterial

sensitivity summed by bacteria (Fig 1C) and a PErmutational Multivariate ANalysis Of

VAriance (PERMANOVA) on bacterial susceptibility profiles (S2A Fig). Both analyses

confirmed a significant influence of phylogroup on bacterial susceptibility, explaining almost

10% of the variance (GLM: p < 0.01; PERMANOVA: R^2 = 0.09; p < 0.01). In contrast, ecological

origin had no significant effect in either test (GLM: p = 0.87; PERMANOVA: R^2 = 0.05; p =

0.29). Specifically, PG02 strains emerged as the most sensitive to phages, being infected on

average by 14.6 phages and showing the highest susceptibility, with 20.7% growth inhibition.

PG01 strains showed intermediate sensitivity being infected by 10.4 phages and an average

of 14.6% inhibition, followed closely by PG10 strains with 15.3% inhibition. In contrast, PG07

strains were the most resistant overall, infected on average by only 8.4 phages and

displaying the lowest susceptibility with 8.73% inhibition.

Fig 1. Networks of percentages of growth inhibition of 44 *P. syringae* species complex

strains (rows) by 23 phages (columns).

(A) Taxonomic organisation of the network presented on a maximum likelihood phylogenetic

tree based on bacterial core-genomes and phage genera. A node with a maximum likelihood

support value below 0.90 is marked with a red dot. (B) The same network after row and

column permutations showing its nested pattern, with phylogroups and ecological origins of

P. syringae strains displayed on the right side of panels A and B. (C) Bacterial sensitivity to

phages by bacterial phylogroup and ecological origins. Letters indicate Tukey post-hoc test

results from a generalised linear model (GLM) with a Poisson distribution; ns indicates non-

significant differences (p > 0.05). (D) Phylogenetic Host Range Index (PHRI) across phage

genera.

The broad taxonomic diversity of the phages studied here, covering 13 genera, includes both

specialists and generalists. To characterise phage host range, we calculated the Phylogenetic

Host Range Index (PHRI), which incorporates the number, the evenness, and the

phylogenetic diversity of host bacteria (46). The PHRI values ranged from 0 (Orimi01, a

specialist phage) to 0.38 (Arace01, a generalist phage), forming a gradient that reflects the

nested structure of the phage-bacteria interaction network (Fig 1D). Based on PHRI

classification, 9% of phages were categorised as specialists, 65% as generalists, and 26% as

having an intermediate host range (Fig 1D). At the genetic level, significant differences in

virulence were observed between phage genera (GLMM; p < 0.01). The generalist genus

Aravirus exhibited the highest virulence (52.8%), while the specialist genera *Cygnusvirus* and

Orionvirus displayed markedly lower virulence levels, averaging 1.1% and 4.2%, respectively

(S2B Fig). Additionally, phages with similar host infection profiles clustered by taxonomy,

with those sharing >70% nucleotide identity (same genus) explaining 63.5% of the variation

in virulence (PERMANOVA: R^2 = 0.64, p < 0.01), indicating genus-level host specificity (Fig

1A). For example, the two phages from the *Lyravirus sulafat* species and the *Uliginvirus*

genus exhibited highly similar infection host profiles.

These results demonstrate that the phage–bacterial interaction networks are predominantly

nested within the investigated panel of strains, with minimal modularity suggesting broad

host range overlap among phages rather than local adaptation based on ecological origin.

Bacterial susceptibility is phylogenetically constrained, with PG02 strains being highly

sensitive and PG07 strains resistant. Additionally, although more than half of the phages

were generalists, genus-level similarity drives host-range patterns.

Defence systems: profile and association with ecology and phylogeny

The 44 strains of *P. syringae* analysed in this study were examined for their accessory

genome content, with a particular focus on their repertoire of defence systems to

counteract mobile genetic elements such as phages. Across these strains, a total of 48

defence system types and 86 subtypes were identified (Fig 2A). The most abundant defence

subtypes included Septu (n = 81), type IV Restriction-Modification (RM) (n = 37), and Gabija

(n = 31) (Fig 2A). In contrast, 31 subtypes were sporadically detected across the bacterial

genomes, including rare defence systems such as three Abi subtypes (AbiH, AbiJ, and AbiO),

two Asv subtypes (AsvI and AsvII), and three DTR subtypes (DTR6, DTR8, and DTR3) (Fig 2A).

Defence systems are present at an average rate of 9.93 per strain, with two strains (AF0015

and P3.01.09C09, both from PG01) harbouring the highest number (15 systems), and four

strains (DG1A_7 from PG02, CSZ0293, SZ0119, and SZB0008 from PG10) the lowest number

(5 systems) (Fig 2A). Each defence system can be classified into different functional

categories to better characterise its role. Specifically, 38.4% of defence system subtypes are

associated with abortive infection, 24.4% with nucleic acid degradation, and 37.2% remain

unclassified (Fig 2A).

Fig 2. Defence system distribution in bacterial genomes and relationship with bacterial

sensitivity to phages.

(A) Matrix showing the number of defence systems present in the 44 *P. syringae* strains,

organised on a maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree based on their core-genomes. A node

with a maximum likelihood support value below 0.90 is marked with a red dot. The

phylogroup affiliation of each bacterial strain is indicated on the left using colours, and

defence systems are represented by subtypes with colours on the right indicating their

respective functional category. (B) Number of defence systems per bacterial strain according

to their phylogroups and ecological origins. ns: not significant (p > 0.05), according to post-

hoc Tukey tests from a Generalised Linear Model with a Poisson distribution. (C) Bacterial

sensitivity to phages as a function of the number of defence systems, with linear regressions

performed within each phylogroup.

To assess whether the distribution of defence systems across bacterial genomes was

influenced by phylogeny, we tested for a phylogenetic signal in the total number of encoded

systems per genome. A strong signal indicated that closely related strains tend to harbour

similar numbers of defence systems (λ = 1.0; LR test (λ = 0): 44.18; p < 0.01) (S3 Fig), as

described in a previous study (24). Phylogroup significantly explained variation in defence

system profiles (PERMANOVA, R^2 = 0.14, p < 0.01), with a weaker effect from ecological

origin (R^2 = 0.06, p < 0.01), while growth rate of the bacteria had no significant impact (R^2 =

0.02, p = 0.51) (Fig 2A). Post-hoc comparisons based on this analysis revealed that strains

from PG10 displayed significantly distinct defence system profiles compared to those from

PG02 and PG07, while strains isolated from healthy plants exhibited distinct defence system

profiles compared to other ecological origins. However, none of these factors significantly

affected the total number of defence systems, although the effect of phylogroup

approached significance (GLM: p = 0.06) (Fig 2B). This phylogroup trend is supported by a

larger dataset of 590 *P. syringae* genome assemblies, where PG01 strains encode the highest

number of defence systems, while PG07 and PG10 harbour some of the lowest counts (24).

While closely-related strains tend to possess similar numbers of defence systems, we further

investigated whether they also share the same subtypes of defence systems. To this end, we

calculated the percentage of shared defence system subtypes between each pair of bacterial

strains, where 100% indicates complete identity in the sets of subtypes. A weak but

significant positive correlation was observed between the percentage of shared defence

system subtypes and the genome-wide Average Nucleotide Identity (ANI) among bacterial

strains (GLMM; estimate = 0.015; p < 0.01) (S4 Fig). This relationship suggests that some

defence systems are partly inherited through vertical transmission, reflecting the influence

of phylogeny on their distribution. Furthermore, only 1.14% of the identified defence

systems were linked to prophages within bacterial genomes, indicating that the vast majority

are located outside prophage regions. This low prevalence indicates that while defence

systems may spread horizontally among bacterial populations, their dissemination is likely

mediated by mobile genetic elements other than prophages.

Defence systems may impose varying energetic costs on bacterial cells, potentially

influencing their allocation of resources (47,48). In strains of *P. syringae*, defence systems

related to nucleic acid degradation comprised, on average, 54% of the total defence

systems, while abortive infection systems, which are considered more metabolically costly

(49,50), constituted an average of 25% (S3 Fig). We then revealed that the proportion of

defence system categories were significantly shaped by phylogroup, explaining 16% of the

variance (PERMANOVA; R^2 = 0.16; p = 0.03), and growth rate (R^2 = 0.07; p = 0.04), but not

ecological origin (R^2 = 0.08; p = 0.11). Pairwise comparisons based on this analysis showed

that strains from PG07 had significantly different defence category profiles compared to

those from PG01 and PG02.

Our results revealed that the defence arsenal profiles in *P. syringae* are shaped by phylogeny

and slightly by ecological origin, consistent with partial vertical inheritance of defence

system profiles. Overall, these findings underscore the complexity of bacterial defence

strategies and indicate that multiple evolutionary and ecological factors influence phage

resistance.

Prophages: profile and association with ecology and phylogeny

We identified 88 prophages among the 44 genomes of *P. syringae*. On average, each strain

carried two prophages, with one strain (FMU-107) harbouring five prophages and 18 strains

(41%) containing a single cryptic prophage (Fig 3A). Among these prophages, 36% were

classified as high quality (complete or nearly complete according to CheckV software), 39%

as medium quality, and 25% as low quality. Prophage sizes ranged from 12.0 kb to 89.8 kb,

with an average size of 32.2 kb. The size distribution exhibited three peaks at approximately

18 kb, 44 kb, and 57 kb. To classify these prophages taxonomically, we used VIRIDIC, which

identified 65 novel phage species and 42 novel genera (S3 Table), while proteomic tree

analysis with Viptree revealed six distinct prophage clusters, corresponding approximately to

family-level taxonomic divisions (Fig 3A) (51). One of these, the CL4 family-like prophage,

was found in all 44 *P. syringae* strains, which span four distinct phylogroups (Fig 3A). CL4

family-like prophage is a tailocin, specifically an R-type syringacin, a bacteriocin derived from

a bacteriophage (52,53). These tailocins are widely distributed across the *P. syringae* species

complex and are thought to play a key role in inter-bacterial competition by enabling strains

to kill closely-related competitors (54,55). Moreover, we found that the taxonomy of the CL4

family-like prophage mirrors the phylogeny of their bacterial hosts across 68 strains from 10

phylogroups (including the 44 strains analysed in this study), with a significant

cophylogenetic congruence signal (Procrustes Approach to Cophylogeny (PACo): residual

sum of squares = 0.15; p < 0.01) (S5 Fig).

Fig 3. Diversity and distribution of prophages in bacterial genomes and relationship with

bacterial sensitivity to phages.

(A) Distribution of prophages in the genomes of the 44 *P. syringae* strains, categorised by

genus and family-like cluster (VipTree). Bacterial strains are organised based on a maximum

likelihood phylogenetic tree based on their core-genomes, with their phylogroups and

ecological origins indicated on the right. A node with a maximum likelihood support value

below 0.90 is marked with a red dot. (B) Abundance of prophages per bacterial strain

according to their phylogroups and ecological origins. ns: not significant (p > 0.05), according

to post-hoc Tukey tests from a Generalised Linear Model with a Poisson distribution. (C)

Bacterial sensitivity to phages as a function of the number of prophages, coloured by

phylogroups.

The abundance of prophages (*i.e.* the number of prophages per bacterial genome) and the

prophage distribution profiles in bacterial genomes are strongly shaped by phylogeny. A

significant phylogenetic signal was detected in prophage abundance (λ = 1.0; LR (λ = 0) =

46.48; p < 0.01), indicating that closely related strains tend to harbour similar numbers of

prophages (Fig 3B). Phylogroup significantly explained 16% of variation in prophage

distribution profiles (PERMANOVA, R^2 = 0.16; p < 0.01), with a weaker effect from ecological

origin (R^2 = 0.07; p < 0.01), while growth rate had no significant impact (R^2 = 0.03; p = 0.09)

(Fig 3A). All distinct phylogroups, as well as ecological origins, exhibited significantly different

prophage distribution profiles, supporting the idea that lineage and ecological context

influence the genomic landscape of prophages. However, none of these factors significantly

affected the abundance of prophages (GLM: phylogroup, p = 0.27; ecological origin, p = 0.92;

growth rate, p = 0.30), despite some observed variation. Indeed, PG07 strains showed the

highest prophage abundance, nearly double that of PG10 strains (Fig 3B). However, this

pattern contrasts with findings from broader dataset (590 *P. syringae* genome assemblies),

in which PG02 strains encoded among the highest numbers of prophages, PG07 among the

lowest, and PG01 and PG10 showed intermediate levels (24). In contrast, differences across

ecological origins were minimal (Fig 3B).

In conclusion, the comprehensive analysis of prophages within the *P. syringae* species

complex revealed a diverse array of complete and incomplete prophages integrated into the

genomes. The prophage distribution profiles are strongly explained by bacterial phylogeny

and ecological origins of the host strains.

Contribution of bacterial defence systems and prophages to bacterial sensitivity to

phages

Since bacterial defence systems target phages (50), a negative correlation is expected

between their number and bacterial sensitivity to phages. To test this, we examined the

correlation between bacterial sensitivity and the number of encoded defence systems, while

accounting for phylogenetic background. When considering all bacterial strains together, no

overall correlation was identified (p = 0.36) with a phylogroup effect (p < 0.01) and no effect

of ecological origins (p = 0.88). For both PG01 and PG02, no significant correlation was

detected (linear regression for PG01: adjusted R^2 = 0.12; p = 0.18; for PG02: adjusted R^2 = −

0.07; p = 0.94) (Fig 2C). In contrast, a negative correlation was detected in PG10, supporting

our expectation (linear regression for PG10: adjusted R^2 = 0.34; p = 0.05) (Fig 2C). In contrast,

PG07 exhibited an unexpected positive correlation, suggesting that strains with a higher

number of defence systems were more sensitive to phages (linear regression for PG07:

adjusted R^2 = 0.92; p < 0.01) (Fig 2C).

Although prophages can contribute to bacterial immunity against phage infection (56), we

found no significant association between prophage abundance and bacterial sensitivity to

phages (p = 0.82), and neither phylogroup (p = 0.31) nor ecological origin (p = 0.80) had a

detectable effect (Fig. 3C). Moreover, no correlation was observed between prophage

abundance and the number of defence systems encoded in bacterial genomes, suggesting

that these systems do not provide protection against prophage integration or maintenance

(linear regression; adjusted R^2 = −0.02; p = 0.64).

Influence of multiple bacterial and phage traits on bacterial growth inhibition

Having identified several bacterial and phage factors that individually influenced the

bacterial growth inhibition, we next sought to integrate these explanatory variables into a

unified framework to gain a more comprehensive understanding of phage−bacteria

interaction dynamics. The primary model included prophage abundance and the total

number of defence systems per strain as bacterial traits associated with phage resistance,

alongside phage- and bacterium-related traits examined in this study. We also tested an

alternative model incorporating PCA-derived variables related to bacterial defensome, but it

did not improve model performance (Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) = 16.70) compared

to the initial model (AIC = 16.69). Therefore, we retained the first model for its greater

interpretability.

Consistent with the above findings, bacterial phylogeny and phage taxonomy emerged as

the strongest explanatory variables for inhibition percentage, with an importance weight of

1.0 across the 256 models (Table 2). In addition, a variable indicating whether the phage had

been isolated using one of the tested bacterial strains was significantly associated with

inhibition level. Specifically, phages isolated from strains within the tested host range

exhibited a slightly lower inhibition capacity (mean = 15.1%) compared to those isolated

from external strains (mean = 17.7%).

Table 2. Relative importance of explanatory variables influencing bacterial growth

inhibition by phages.

Explanatory variable	Sum of AIC weights	N Models
Phage genera ⬚	**1.00**	54
Bacterial phylogroups	**1.00**	53
Number of prophages in bacterial genomes	**0.72**	29
Phages isolated with bacteria from the data set ⬚	**0.67**	31
Number of defence systems in bacterial genomes	0.38	26
Bacteria from the data set having isolated phages	0.37	24
Bacterial growth rate	0.29	23

Sum of AIC weights was computed from model averaging across the top-ranked models

whose cumulative weights reached ≥ 0.95, selected from a full set of 256 candidate models

generated by multi-model inference. The relative importance of each variable corresponds

to the sum of AIC weights across all retained models in which it appears. Bold values indicate

variables with high relative importance (sum of weights ≥ 0.60), selected as significant

predictors in the analysis. N Models: Number of retained models in which each variable

appears. Variables related to phages are marked with the symbol ▯; bacterial variables are

unmarked.

The model identified the total number of prophages in bacterial genomes as a significant

predictor of inhibition of bacterial growth (sum of weights = 0.72; Table 2). Inhibition levels

varied nonlinearly with prophage abundance: inhibition levels were 15.6%, 14.7%, 17.5%,

28.4%, and 10.9% for strains carrying 1 to 5 prophages, respectively. While prophage

abundance did not predict bacterial sensitivity, it appeared to influence bacterial

susceptibility, suggesting that prophage-rich bacteria may be more susceptible to highly-

effective phages. In contrast, the total number of defence systems did not significantly

explain bacterial growth inhibition (sum of weights = 0.38; Table 2), despite its correlation

with the bacterial sensitivity for some phylogroups.

Overall, these findings highlight that the primary determinants of the bacterial growth

inhibition by phage infection within the *P. syringae* species complex are bacterial phylogeny

and phage taxonomy rather than bacterial ecological origins. The integration of multiple

explanatory variables within a unified modelling framework further revealed that prophage

abundance, but not the total number of defence systems, significantly contributes to

variations in inhibition levels. This suggests that while prophages may not act as strict

barriers to infection, their presence can modulate the efficacy of phage infection. Together,

these results emphasize the complex and multifactorial nature of bacterial susceptibility to

phages, shaped by both evolutionary history and prophage-mediated genomic landscapes.

Discussion

Our study uncovered a strong nested structure in the phage–bacterial infection network

involving genetically-diverse *P. syringae* strains and phages. This discovery is in strong

contrast with the modular structure frequently reported (11,29). This pronounced

nestedness likely reflects the ubiquitous nature of the highly diverse *P. syringae* complex,

mirrored by a phage community ranging from specialists to generalists in host range. While

bacterial phylogeny had a marked influence on the nestedness of the infection network, we

found no evidence of local phages-bacteria co-adaptation. Defence systems and prophages

contributed to phage resistance, but their distribution was largely shaped by bacterial

phylogeny and ecological origin, rather than phage pressure alone. Together, these findings

highlight how evolutionary and ecological forces shape phage–bacterial infection networks

in natural environments.

Ecological origin and phylogenetic influences on bacterial sensitivity to phages

The observed nested infection network is unexpected when we consider the high genetic

diversity of the phages (13 genera, 17 species) and bacteria (4 phylogroups corresponding to

species levels and 7 clades), as well as the varied ecological origins of the bacterial strains

included in this study. Such a diversity of organisms could be expected to reveal local

adaptation, where phages perform better on sympatric than allopatric bacterial hosts, in line

with what has been demonstrated previously (57,11). However, our findings suggest that

phage–host interactions in this pathosystem transcend ecological boundaries. Phages

isolated from apricot tree soil infected bacterial strains from both diseased orchards and

aquatic environments with comparable efficiency, and bacterial origin did not broadly

influence bacterial sensitivity/susceptibility to phages. This absence of modularity, combined

with a lack of ecological signal in host range, points to broader ecological connectivity and

population flow within the *P. syringae* species complex. These results align with previous

work (58) showing that *P. syringae* population structures are shaped more by fluctuating

ecological dynamics than by geographic isolation, likely due to documented exchanges

between agricultural and aquatic environments (59). Overall, the nested structure observed

here implies that interaction dynamics in this system are maintained by widespread

generalism and ongoing ecological mixing, rather than niche-specific adaptation.

Bacterial phylogeny plays a central role in shaping both the composition of defence systems,

the distribution of prophages, and the sensitivity of *P. syringae* strains to phages. In our

study, PG02 strains, known for their ubiquitous presence across habitats and for containing

strains capable of infecting a broad range of plant species (60,33), were also the most

sensitive to phages, carried a moderate number of defence systems, and encoded one of the

highest prophage loads (24). In contrast, PG07 strains, which are predominantly associated

with diverse environmental reservoirs (60), were the most resistant to phages despite

encoding relatively few defence systems and prophages. PG01 strains, mainly isolated from

diseased plants (60), showed intermediate bacterial sensitivity to phages, possessed the

greatest number of defence systems, and encoded a moderate prophage load (24). Finally,

PG10 strains, exclusively environmental, showed moderate bacterial sensitivity to phages,

low numbers of defence systems, and a moderate prophage count (24). These findings

suggest a potential trade-off between ecological ubiquity and bacterial sensitivity to phages,

a hypothesis that requires direct experimental investigation. In a similar vein, a recent study

reported that effector gene counts in *P. syringae*, which are key to pathogenicity, positively

correlate with phage defences and show partial conservation within phylogroups (24).

Phylogroups show consistent patterns in defence system profiles, with closely-related strains

sharing portions of their defence arsenals, while ecological origins accounted for only minor

similarities. Strains within the same phylogroup also tend to retain consistent features in

their defensome, including the number and functional categories of defence systems.

Collectively, these findings suggest that each phylogroup may adopt a common anti-phage

strategy, implemented through distinct combinations of defence systems, mainly acquired

by horizontal gene transfers (50,61). For strains belonging to phylogroup PG10, we observed

a negative correlation between the number of defence systems and sensitivity to phages,

suggesting a protective effect from accumulating diverse systems in their genome (17).

Conversely, strains in PG07, although generally the most resistant to phages, showed a

positive correlation between bacterial sensitivity to phages and defence systems. This

counter-intuitive pattern could reflect historical predation by phages, where strains

subjected to intense phage attack would have accumulated defence systems (62).

Alternatively, the apparent lack of protection may arise because these systems target phages

or mobile genetic elements (MGEs) other than those tested here. However, it is important to

interpret these trends cautiously, as they are based on relatively small sample sizes (n=6 for

PG07; n=10 for PG10), and our understanding remains partial given the continual discovery

of novel defence systems (63). Although the sensitivity of specific phylogroups to phages

may be correlated to their defence systems, the overall contribution of these systems to

phage resistance in *P. syringae* strains appears limited and may depend on the activity of

particular defence mechanisms (64).

Limitations and alternative approaches for understanding phage-bacterium

interactions

Liquid culture assays offer the advantage of measuring a proxy for phage virulence by

continuously monitoring bacterial growth kinetics in a high-throughput format. This

automated approach enhances reproducibility, allows the simultaneous processing of a large

number of samples, and enables the use of diverse metrics to quantify phage-induced

inhibition of bacterial growth (65), including host-range, and potential indicators of bacterial

resistance to phages (9,43). In our dataset, certain phage–bacterium combinations exhibited

signs of evolutionary rescue (when a bacterial population initially suppressed by phages

recovers through the growth of resistant mutants) (66) (S11 Fig). Future studies could build

on these findings by examining their genetic co-evolution through temporal sampling and

genomic analyses. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that the phenomenon of lysis from

without (referring to bacterial lysis without phage replication, typically resulting from high

phage adsorption rates or abortive infections) cannot be entirely ruled out in our dataset

(67). Follow-up experiments measuring phage titres, bacterial population dynamics, or

adsorption efficiency would be valuable to confirm the underlying mechanisms of bacterial

suppression. Such analyses would also refine our understanding of the role of defence

systems during phage infection (14,17). In particular, quantifying phage adsorption rates

could help discriminate between pre- and post-adsorption resistance: successful adsorption

without subsequent lysis would suggest the involvement of intracellular defence

mechanisms, whereas failed adsorption would point to surface receptor incompatibility as

the main barrier to infection.

Analysis of bacterial membrane receptors recognised by phages is therefore essential in

interpreting host range patterns (68,12). Such factors have enabled accurate prediction of

phage-bacteria interactions at the strain level in *E. coli* (14). However, receptors for phages

infecting *P. syringae* remain poorly characterised compared to other bacterial models, with

only three distinct receptors identified in the *P. syringae* phage receptor database compared

to over 50 in *E. coli* (69). Increasing research on phage–phytopathogen interactions will help

to close this knowledge gap and improve our understanding of the molecular basis

underlying the observed interaction patterns.

A complementary strategy to uncover bacterial genetic determinants of sensitivity to phages

and resistance phenotypes involves genotype–phenotype association analyses, including

approaches based on gene presence–absence matrices, phylogenetic trait correlation

methods and genome-wide association studies (GWAS). This latter method has recently

been applied to 80 *P. aeruginosa* strains, identifying host genes that influence susceptibility

to two phages, particularly those related to flagella and LPS/O-antigens associated with

lipopolysaccharide biosynthesis (70). While our dataset of 44 *P. syringae* genomes may

provide a sufficient basis for GWAS, challenges remain. The high genomic diversity of the *P.*

syringae species complex and the large number of phages tested (n = 23), each potentially

interacting with different receptors or resistance pathways, add considerable complexity.

Future studies may address this by focusing on specific phage-host combinations or by

applying comparative genomics approaches that can help disentangle the genetic basis of

resistance across diverse strains.

Applied perspectives and future directions

From an applied perspective, we identified several generalist phages capable of infecting a

wide range of *P. syringae* species complex strains. Understanding the molecular basis of

their generalism could provide important phage evolutionary clues, *e.g.,* whether generalism

involves flexible receptor-binding proteins, the ability to evade diverse bacterial defence

systems, or other mechanisms. Many *P. syringae* strains are non-pathogenic members of the

plant microbiome, highlighting the need for targeted phage cocktails that selectively control

pathogenic strains while preserving beneficial microbes. Such specificity offers a more

sustainable and ecologically-balanced approach to biocontrol compared to using broad-

spectrum generalist phages (71). This exemplifies how fundamental ecological

understanding of phage–bacterium infection networks can directly inform and enhance the

development of effective biocontrol strategies.

To further test our hypothesis that ecological connectivity shapes the nested structure of

phage–*P. syringae* interactions, future studies should isolate phages from diverse non-

agricultural environmental, such as water and healthy plants to include cases of true

sympatry. These newly isolated phages should then be tested against the same bacterial

strains used in our study, or against new strains from corresponding habitats. If similar

nested network structures emerge, it would strengthen the idea that phage and *P. syringae*

populations continuously migrate between agricultural and non-agricultural environments,

forming an ecologically-connected meta-community. Moving forward, several key research

priorities should guide future investigations: verification of the role of specific defence

systems through genetic manipulation like gene deletion and heterologous expression;

systematic investigation of receptor usage by our studied phages to reveal molecular

determinants of host range; and strategic expansion of the bacterial strain collection to

improve phylogenetic and ecological coverage, with particular focus on understudied

phylogroups. These complementary approaches would collectively strengthen our

understanding of the molecular and ecological factors driving the phage-bacteria

interactions observed in this system. Extending such analyses to other ecologically and

phylogenetically-distinct plant-associated bacteria, such as *Xanthomonas*, *Ralstonia*, or

Agrobacterium, could reveal whether the patterns observed in *P. syringae*-phages infection

network are generalisable or reflect unique evolutionary dynamics of this highly diverse

species complex.

Materials and Methods

Phages panel

The 23 phages infecting strains of the *P. syringae* species complex used in this study were

isolated from soil samples collected in apricot orchards affected by bacterial canker and fully

described in a previous study (72). Briefly, this phage collection exhibits high genetic

diversity, encompassing 13 genera and 17 species, representing the three most common

morphological types (myovirus, podovirus, and siphovirus) and comprising 20 virulent and 3

temperate phages. The collection included two characterised DNA packaging mechanisms

(direct terminal repeat (DTR) and headful) alongside two newly identified but unverified

mechanisms, while the remaining packaging strategies remain unknown. The genomic GC

content of the phages ranged from 46% to 58%. All phage stocks were standardised to a

concentration of 10^7 PFU/mL and stored in SM buffer (100 mM NaCl, 8 mM MgSO$_4$·7H$_2$O, 50

mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4) at 4°C.

Bacterial strains panel

The 44 *P. syringae* species complex strains were obtained from the Plant Pathology Unit

collection at INRAE (Montfavet, France) and were not isolated as part of this project (S4

Table). The strains belonged to seven clades within four phylogroups (PG01, PG02, PG07,

PG10) corresponding to the species levels, according to Berge *et al.* (60). The strains were

sampled from three different environments: diseased apricot trees (exhibiting bacterial

canker symptoms) (34), healthy plant tissues, and non-agricultural environments (S4 Table).

Bacterial strains were revived from -80°C storage and cultured on King's B agar (73). Cultures

were maintained at 4°C for a maximum of one week.

Sequencing and analysis of whole genomes of bacterial strains

The bacterial cultures were grown on King's B (KB) agar medium for 48 hours at 25°C. A

bacterial suspension was then prepared to achieve an approximate concentration of 2×10^9

CFU in 4 mL of demineralised water. The suspension was subsequently centrifuged at 3,215

g for 10 minutes at 20°C to pellet the bacterial cells, after which the supernatant was

carefully discarded. Genomic DNA was extracted using the Qiagen Genomic-tips kit (Qiagen,

Valencia, CA, USA) following the manufacturer's protocol.

Of the 44 *P. syringae* strains, 39 were sequenced using 20 µL of genomic DNA, with

sequencing performed by Plasmidsaurus Inc (San Francisco, USA) using Oxford Nanopore

Technology (ONT) and a custom analysis and annotation pipeline

(https://plasmidsaurus.com/). The long-read sequencing library was prepared without

amplification using v14 library preparation chemistry, and sequencing was conducted with

R10.4.1 flow cells. The genomes of five additional strains were obtained from the RefSeq

library at NCBI: CC1559 (GCF_000452685.1), USA0007 (GCF_000452545.1), 41A

(GCF_000935775.1), MAFF302273[PT] (also known as JD08) (GCF_000145925.1), and CC1583

(GCF_000452665.1).

The core genome analysis was performed using a private database within the EDGAR 3.5

platform (74). The core genome was defined as the set of orthologous genes present in all

332 genomes of the *P. syringae* species complex, including the 44 strains analysed in this

study. A total of 1,346 core genes were identified per genome, corresponding to 446,872

aligned genes across all strains. Each set of orthologous genes was individually aligned at the

protein level using MUSCLE (74). The resulting alignment were then concatenated into a

single alignment, yielding approximatly 512,223 amino acid residues per genome and

170,058,036 in total across all genomes. Phylogenetic relationships were inferred using the

FastTree algorithm within EDGAR, which constructs maximum-likelihood phylogenetic trees

based on the core genome alignment (75). All phylogenetic trees of bacterial strains shown

in the figures were rooted at the midpoint of the longest path and the nodes with a

maximum likelihood support value below 0.90 were marked with red dots.

Identification of defence systems and prophages in bacterial genomes

The defence systems of the 44 *P. syringae* strains were identified using *DefenseFinder*

version 1.2.2 (76) based on assembled nucleotide sequences from the bacterial genomes.

Each defence system type was categorised into one of three functional groups: nucleic acid

degradation, abortive infection (Abi), or undetermined (ND).

The prophages within the 44 *P. syringae* strains were identified using *geNomad* version 1.5.0

(77) based on assembled nucleotide sequences of bacterial genomes. As prophage

prediction tools are still imperfect and may miss or misclassify certain elements, these

results should be interpreted with caution. Among the 97 identified prophage sequences,

only those classified as viral by *geNomad* and *CheckV* (78) were retained. Specifically,

sequences labelled as "No Terminal Repeats" in the topology column and those with a

"viral_genes" value of 0 were excluded. This filtering resulted in a final dataset of 88 verified

viral prophages, accounting for 91% of the total identified prophages across the 44 strains.

Additionally, a genetic analysis of the prophages was performed using *VIRIDIC* (79) to classify

them into genera and species (S3 Table). *VipTree* was used to generate prophage clusters

based on a proteomic tree analysis using distance-based methods (BIONJ from tBLASTx

scores) (80). *geNomad* and *VipTree* were then employed to identify prophages belonging to

the CL4 cluster and to construct a proteomic tree encompassing 68 CL4 prophages (24

reference strains + 44 analysed strains) (81).

To assess the congruence between the taxonomy of CL4 prophages and the phylogeny of

their bacterial hosts, we performed a PACo (Procrustes Approach to Cophylogeny) analysis.

Phylogenetic distance matrices were generated from the host and prophage trees using the

cophenetic function (82). These matrices were then centred and corrected for negative

eigenvalues using the "Cailliez" correction method. Congruence was tested using the *PACo*

function from the *paco* R package with 1,000 permutations to assess statistical significance.

The co-phylogeny visualisation was performed with *phytools* R package and *cophylo* function

(83).

Phage host range analysis

a. Experimental setup

To analyse the host range of phages infecting *P. syringae*, bacterial growth kinetics in the

presence of phages were measured using 96-well plates (65). This liquid culture approach

has been compared to other methods, including qPCR, spot assays, and plaque assays,

demonstrating its relevance for estimating phage host range across diverse bacterial–phage

combinations (65,84–86). Given the broad panel of phages and bacterial strains analysed, we

selected this method as it provides an optimal balance between throughput, reproducibility,

and comparability, while avoiding the more labour-intensive phage progeny quantification

assays.

The dataset comprised 44 bacterial strains tested in biological triplicate without phage as a

positive control, and the same 44 strains in biological triplicate exposed individually to each

of the 23 phages (S6 Fig). Each phage was tested against each biological triplicate of bacterial

strain, resulting in 3,036 growth kinetic measurements (23 phages × 44 bacterial strains × 3

replicates) (S6 Fig). Negative controls (culture medium) were used to check for

contamination, with plates containing more than two contaminated wells out of four

discarded (S6 Fig and S7A Fig). Two internal controls were included on each plate: the *P.*

syringae strain P1.01.01B03 (PG01a, isolated from apricot buds in France in 2014) and phage

Ghuch01, chosen because it completely inhibited the growth of strain P1.01.01B03 under

the experimental conditions used in this study (34,72) (S6 Fig and S7B-C Fig). A plate was

considered valid only when all three controls were visually confirmed: the internal bacterial

control exhibited visible turbidity, while both the internal phage control and the media

controls showed clear wells (S6 Fig).

Bacteria were incubated in 5 mL of liquid KB medium at 25°C and 200 rpm for 4 hours. Each

replicate was standardised to an OD_{600nm} = 0.01 (~10^7 CFU/mL) in phosphate buffer and

diluted in liquid KB medium to a final concentration of 10^5 CFU/mL. Each 96-well

spectrophotometric plate (NUNC, Thermo Scientific 267334) contained most phages

confronted with a single bacterial strain, with positive control wells containing 180 μL of

bacterial suspension and 20 μL of SM buffer. Experimental wells comprised 180 μL of

bacterial suspension and 20 μL of phage suspension at 10^7 PFU/mL, corresponding to a

multiplicity of infection (MOI) of 10, as determined from preliminary optimization tests.

Positive control measurements included between two and seven technical replicates per

biological replicate (except for bacterial strains 41A and 93D, which had only one technical

replicate per biological replicate). Measurements were taken using the SPECTROstar Omega

spectrophotometer (BMG Labtech, France) every 5 minutes for 48 hours at 25°C, with

intermittent orbital shaking at 200 rpm (200 seconds "ON" followed by 400 seconds "OFF").

To assess the host specificity of the 23 phages, their infectivity was tested on four

Pseudomonas spp. strains outside the *P. syringae* species complex using the double agar

layer method on solid medium. The selected strains were *P. aeruginosa* CFBP 2466, *P.*

fluorescens CFBP 2102, *P. graminis* 38B9, and *P. rhizosphaerae* 6B4. Strains were grown on

King's B (KB) agar for 48 h at 25°C (*P. fluorescens*, *P. graminis*) or 28°C (*P. aeruginosa*, *P.*

rhizosphaerae). Biological triplicates were inoculated into 5 mL of KB broth and incubated

overnight at 25°C with shaking at 200 rpm. Then, 500 μL of each culture was transferred to 5

mL fresh KB and incubated under the same conditions for 4 h. 300 μL of the culture in

exponential phase (OD between 0.2 and 0.8 at 600 nm) was mixed with 6 mL of 0.7% KB

semi-solid agar for the overlay. Each phage at an initial concentration of 10^7 PFU/mL was

serially diluted, and 10 μL of each dilution were spotted in duplicate onto the bacterial lawn.

Plates were allowed to dry and incubated overnight at 25°C before evaluation of plaque

lysis. The phage concentrations on the tested strains were divided by the concentration

obtained on their respective reference strains to calculate the efficiency of plating (EOP), a

standard metric.

b. Calculation of bacterial growth inhibition percentages and probability of

738   *significant inhibitory effects of phages on bacteria*

Bacterial growth curve data from each plate were analysed using R software (version 4.4.0)

with the *growthcurver* package (87). The area under the empirical growth curve (auc*e*) was

the primary parameter analysed. For each biological replicate of the bacterial control

condition (without phage), the mean and standard deviation of the auc*e* were calculated.

The percentage of bacterial growth inhibition caused by each phage was then determined

for each biological replicate using the following formula:

$$Bacterial\ growth\ inhibition(\%) = \frac{auce\ bacteria - auce\ phage}{auce\ bacteria} \times 100$$

where auc*e* bacteria represent the mean auc*e* of each bacterial control biological replicates,

and auc*e* phage corresponds to the auc*e* of the same bacterial strain when exposed to a

given phage. This normalisation accounts for potential differences in bacterial growth rates,

allowing for direct comparison of phage effects across bacterial strains (88). To evaluate

potential bias in this calculation, particularly when bacteria exhibit different maximal

densities (88), we assessed the coefficient of variation (CV) of the *k* parameter among

bacteria control condition. The CV was low (9.22%), supporting the validity of this approach

and indicating minimal bias associated with differences in growth maxima. Additionally, the

CV of the auc*e* values under bacteria control condition was moderate (11.34%), further

supporting the robustness of the percentage inhibition metric for cross-strain comparisons

while limiting potential biases (88).

Phage impact on bacterial growth was assessed using a probability value derived from a

normalised distribution, calibrated based on the mean (μ in the formula) and standard

deviation (σ in the formula) of the auce for each biological replicate of each bacterium

exposed to phages. The probability ranges from 0 to 1 and is calculated using:

$$auce\ phage \sim N(\mu(auce\ bacteria), \sigma(auce\ bacteria))$$

A probability value below 0.05 indicates a significant growth reduction in presence of phage,

while a value exceeding 0.95 indicates a significant growth stimulation of bacteria in

presence of phage. The distribution of inhibition percentages within the 0.05 to 0.95

probability range is approximately symmetric and unimodal (S8 Fig), resembling a Gaussian

distribution. However, the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated a significant deviation from strict

normality ($p < 0.01$), likely due to the large sample size. Despite this, the distribution shape

supports the use of this probability window to robustly summarise phage effects on bacterial

growth. Bacterial strains 41A and 93D had only one technical replicate per biological

replicate, precluding probability calculation.

A phage was considered capable of inhibiting a bacterial strain if at least one of the three

bacterial replicates showed a significant inhibition (probability < 0.05); in this case, the

phage—bacterium combination was assigned a value of 1, in order to capture the maximal

host range potential of each phage. If no replicates showed significant inhibition, the

combination was assigned a value of 0. This threshold was verified to yield consistent results

with a more stringent criterion (requiring at least two out of three replicates to be

significant), in order to confirm the robustness of our analysis.

The relationship between the breadth of infection and the strength of inhibition was first

examined using the full dataset. For the phage perspective, we plotted virulence (mean

percentage of inhibition per phage) against infectivity (the number of bacterial strains each

phage significantly infected) (S9A Fig). For the bacterial perspective, we plotted susceptibility

(mean percentage of inhibition per bacterial strain) against sensitivity (the number of phages

significantly infecting each strain) (S9B Fig). We then considered only combinations showing

significant inhibition, for both phages (S9C Fig) and bacteria (S9D Fig), in order to reduce the

dependency between variables. Spearman correlation tests were calculated exclusively on

this subset of significant interactions, as this approach removes part of the inherent

dependence generated by the shared underlying metric.

Generally, bacterial populations decreased in the presence of phages. In 17% of observed

phage-bacteria combinations, a "stimulatory" effect was identified, with inhibition values

reaching up to -40%. Given the lack of reproducibility of the stimulatory effect (S10 Fig), only

positive inhibition values were retained for all analyses.

Statistical analysis

a. Analysis of the structure of phage-bacteria interaction networks

The analysis of networks representing bacterial growth inhibition percentages of 44 bacterial

strains combined with 23 phages was computed using the mean of the three biological

replicates for each combination. The analyses were performed using the R software (version

4.4.0) with the *bipartite* (for nestedness and modularity analysis) and *igraph* (for modularity

analysis) packages, following Moury *et al.* (30) and Torres-Barceló *et al.* (46).

The nestedness of the inhibition percentage network was evaluated using two algorithms:

wNODF (a weighted nestedness metric based on overlap and decreasing fill) (89) and *WINE*

(weighted-interaction nestedness estimator) (90). Modularity was assessed using six

algorithms: *spinglass* (91–93), *edge betweenness* (91), *fast greedy* (94), *leading eigenvector*

(95), *Beckett* (96), and *louvain* (97).

Prior to nestedness and modularity analyses, the continuous inhibitory percentage data of

the matrix were transformed into discrete integer values spanning from 0 to 100.

In addition, we analysed a network of binary data (0 and 1 values) representing the

statistical significance of bacterial growth inhibition by phages. For this network, three

algorithms were used for nestedness: *WINE* as applied to quantitative data, *Binmatnest* (98),

and *NODF2* (89) and three algorithms were used for modularity (*spinglass, leading*

eigenvector, and *Beckett).*

For each algorithm and each network, the calculated nestedness and modularity scores were

compared with the scores obtained with seven (network of continuous inhibition data) or six

(network of binary inhibition significance data) different null models (i.e. simulated networks

for which no particular nestedness or modularity patterns are expected) in order to estimate

the statistical significance of nestedness and modularity of the actual networks (99,30,100).

Briefly, each null model differs by the constraints applied during randomization. The N

model preserves the total sum and number of zeros but not row or column totals. C1 and R1

apply the same principle column- or row-wise, respectively. The B model maintains both row

and column sums. The S model fully randomizes cell values, while C2 and R2 randomize

values within columns or rows, respectively. The PD (Probabilistic Degree) model takes the

original matrix and reshuffles positive infections while maintaining the same 'degree

distribution', on average, of both phages and hosts while reshuffling. Together, these models

span a gradient of constraint strength, from the least constrained (S, N) to the most

constrained (B).

b. Statistical analyses to explain bacterial sensitivity and susceptibility to phages

All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.4.2. The phylogenetic signal of the

number of phages infecting each bacterial strain was calculated using the *phylosig* function

from the *phytools* package, based on a phylogenetic tree reconstructed from bacterial core-

genome analysis (83).

The bacterial susceptibility profiles were tested with a PERmutational Multivariate ANalysis

Of VAriance (PERMANOVA), a non-parametric method that assesses the influence of

categorical variables on multivariate data by partitioning variation within a distance matrix.

Unlike traditional ANOVA, it makes no assumptions about data distribution and relies on

permutations to evaluate the statistical significance of group differences (101). Here, Bray–

Curtis dissimilarity was used to construct a distance matrix based on the mean percentage of

bacterial growth inhibition (from three replicates per combination). This matrix was then

analysed using the *adonis2* function from the *vegan* R package, with 9,999 permutations to

ensure robust p-value estimation (102). *"Phylogroup", "ecological origin",* and *"whether the*

strain was an isolation bacterial strain for the phages" were included as explanatory

variables. Multiple comparisons were conducted using the function *pairwise.adonis2* from

the *pairwiseAdonis* package (103), which is specifically adapted for PERMANOVA post-hoc

testing.

Additionally, the summed sensitivity, determined from the significant inhibition network

(see above), was used as a response variable in a Generalised Linear Model (GLM) with a

Poisson distribution with the function *glmmTMB* from the package *glmmTMB* (104). The

model included *"phylogroup"*, *"ecological origin"*, and their interaction as fixed effects. As no

significant interaction was detected, the simplified additive model (*phylogroup + ecological*

origin) was retained. No overdispersion was observed in the data (deviance/degrees of

freedom = 1.01). The effects of each explanatory variable were assessed using Type III

ANOVA with the *Anova* function from the *car* package. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons were

performed using Tukey's test implemented via the *multcomp* and *multcompView* packages,

with significance groups assigned accordingly.

c. Statistical analysis to explain infectivity and virulence of phages

The Phylogenetic Host Range Index (PHRI) (46), derived from the phylogenetic diversity

index *Hp* (105), was calculated using the *hilldiv* package . For this analysis, the bacterial

phylogenetic tree, constructed from core-genome analysis (see above), was transformed

into an ultrametric tree, and the PHRI index was determined using the matrix of percentage

inhibition.

The ranking of phage genera based on inhibition percentage (offset by +0.1 to avoid zeros)

was assessed using a GLMM with a Gamma distribution with a log-link, suitable for strictly

positive, continuous, and skewed data. The model included a random effect accounting for

the *"phage"* tested, the *"bacterial"* strain tested, and *"replicates"* nested within each

"phage:bacterium" combination. No overdispersion was detected (χ^2/ddl = 0.67). Post-hoc

pairwise comparisons between genera were performed using Tukey's test.

The phage-host infection profiles were tested with a PERMANOVA test based on the

distance matrix based on the mean percentage of bacterial growth inhibition compared with

"phage genus" and *"whether the phage had been isolated using one of the bacterial strains*

included in the experimental panel" explanatory variables (Bray-Curtis distance matrix; 9,999

permutations). Pairwise comparisons of phage infection patterns were performed using the

pairwise.adonis2 function (103).

d. Statistical analysis of defence systems and prophages

The phylogenetic signal of the total number of defence systems and the abundance of

prophages was calculated using the *phylosig* function from the *phytools* package, based on a

phylogenetic tree reconstructed from bacterial core-genome analysis (83).

The total number of bacterial defence systems per bacterial genome and the abundance of

prophages were tested against the explanatory variables *"phylogroup"*, *"ecological origin"*,

and *"growth rate"* in a GLM with a Poisson distribution with an additive model of the three

explanatory variables. No overdispersion was observed in the data (deviance/degrees of

freedom for defence systems = 0.61; for abundance of prophages = 0.47), and the effects of

each explanatory variable were assessed using Type III ANOVA. Finally, the post-hoc pairwise

comparisons were performed using Tukey's test and significance groups were assigned

accordingly.

The relationship between ANI of bacterial pairs and their percentage similarity in their

defence systems (offset by +0.1 to avoid zeros) was assessed using a GLMM with a Gamma

distribution and a log-link function. Random effects for each bacterium in the pair were

included to account for the non-independence of observations. No overdispersion was

detected (χ^2/ddl = 0.24).

The defence system profiles, the proportions of the defence system categories, and

prophages distribution profile across bacterial strains were analysed using a PERMANOVA

test based on a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix with 9,999 permutations. *"Phylogroup"*,

"ecological origin", and *"growth rate"* were included as explanatory variables. Pairwise

comparisons of the defence system and prophage composition between groups were

conducted using the *pairwise.adonis2* function (103).

Linear regressions were conducted to explain the number of phages infecting each bacterial

strain, using the *total number of defence system subtypes per bacterium*, the *phylogroups*,

and *ecological origins* as explanatory variables in a multiple linear regression model

(adjusted R^2 = 0.21; p = 0.02 for the overall model). The same analysis was applied using the

number of prophages per bacterium instead of defence systems, with *phylogroups* and

ecological origins as predictors (adjusted R^2 = -0.06; p = 0.81 for the overall model). Before

conducting these analyses, all assumptions of linear regression, including normality of

residuals and homoscedasticity, were verified.

e. Statistical analysis of host range data with multimodel analysis

To account for the widest range of explanatory variables influencing the percentage of

inhibition, we performed a multimodel analysis coupled with a generalised linear mixed

model (GLMM). To enhance model efficiency, the number of explanatory variables was

reduced through a multi-step process. Variables with more than 20% missing data were

excluded. To ensure independence among explanatory variables before multimodel analysis,

we assessed pairwise associations using Spearman's correlation for quantitative variables,

chi-squared tests for categorical variables, and Kruskal–Wallis tests for associations between

categorical and quantitative variables. Variables showing significant correlations (p < 0.05)

were considered dependent. In such cases, one of the correlated variables was retained,

while the others were excluded. To further refine the selection, Principal Component

Analyses (PCA) were conducted separately on the matrices representing the distributions of

defence systems and prophages across bacterial genomes. The most informative variables

contributing to the first principal components were retained for subsequent modelling.

The PCA on defence systems was performed without centring or scaling the data. Two

dimensions accounted for 32.5% of the variance and led to the selection of the variables

"Septu", *"Gabija"*, and *"RloC"*, which were among the most frequent defence systems in the

genomes. Similarly, the PCA on the distribution of prophage species in bacterial genomes,

also conducted without centring or scaling (already binary), captured 14% of the variance in

the first two dimensions and identified two perpendicular variable groups composed

respectively of prophage species *"17"*, *"54"*, *"26"*, and *"29"* on one side, and species *"7"*,

"47", *"57"*, *"22"*, and *"31"* on the other. One representative species from each group was

selected for the multimodel analysis (species *"17"* and *"22"*).

To identify factors explaining variations in bacterial growth inhibition percentage, we fitted a

GLMM. The response variable (offset by +0.1 to avoid zeros) was modelled using a Gamma

distribution with a log-link function. Random effects included *"phage"*, *"bacterium"*, and

their *"imbricated replicates"*.

To compare two approaches for modelling the effects of bacterial defence systems and

prophages on the percentage of inhibition, two separate GLMMs were constructed: one

using total counts of defence systems and prophages, and another incorporating PCA-

derived principal components of the distribution matrices (of prophages and defence

systems). No overdispersion was detected in either model (total counts: $\chi^2/df = 0.65$; PCA-

derived: $\chi^2/df = 0.66$), supporting the appropriateness of the Gamma distribution for

modelling the response variable.

To identify the most informative predictors explaining variation in phage replication

efficiency, we used a multimodel analysis. Model selection was performed using the *dredge*

function from the *MuMIn* package, ranking models based on corrected Akaike information

criterion (AIC). All possible sub-models were generated and evaluated. Models whose

cumulative AIC weights accounted for 95% of the total were retained for model averaging

using the *model.avg* function. The relative importance of each explanatory variable was then

estimated using the *sw* function, which computes the sum of the AIC weights across all

models in which the variable appears.

Acknowledgments

We thank Elisabeth Villard, Cécile Monteil, and Charlotte Chandeysson for their assistance

with experimental procedures. We are also grateful to Dominique Holtappels for valuable

discussions, and to Hannah Toth for her assistance in depositing bacterial genomes into

NCBI.

References

1.   Brown TL, Charity OJ, Adriaenssens EM. Ecological and functional roles of bacteriophages
in contrasting environments: marine, terrestrial and human gut. Curr Opin Microbiol.
2022 Dec 1;70:102229.

2.   Wilhelm SW, Suttle CA. Viruses and nutrient cycles in the sea: viruses play critical roles in
the structure and function of aquatic food webs. BioScience. 1999 Oct 1;49(10):781–8.

3.   Wommack KE, Colwell RR. Virioplankton: viruses in aquatic ecosystems. Microbiol Mol
Biol Rev. 2000 Mar;64(1):69–114.

4.   Suttle CA. Marine viruses — major players in the global ecosystem. Nat Rev Microbiol.
2007 Oct;5(10):801–12.

5.   Brussaard CPD, Wilhelm SW, Thingstad F, Weinbauer MG, Bratbak G, Heldal M, et al.
Global-scale processes with a nanoscale drive: the role of marine viruses. ISME J. 2008
June;2(6):575–8.

6.   Mirzaei MK, Maurice CF. Ménage à trois in the human gut: interactions between host,
bacteria and phages. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2017 July;15(7):397–408.

7.   De Sordi L, Lourenço M, Debarbieux L. The battle within: interactions of bacteriophages
and bacteria in the gastrointestinal tract. Cell Host Microbe. 2019 Feb;25(2):210–8.

8.   Svircev A, Roach D, Castle A. Framing the future with bacteriophages in agriculture.
Viruses. 2018 May;10(5):218.

9.   Hyman P, Abedon ST. Bacteriophage host range and bacterial resistance. In: Advances in
Applied Microbiology [Internet]. Elsevier; 2010 [cited 2024 Aug 12]. p. 217–48. Available
from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0065216410700071

10. Georjon H, Bernheim A. The highly diverse antiphage defence systems of bacteria. Nat
Rev Microbiol. 2023 Oct;21(10):686–700.

11. Piel D, Bruto M, Labreuche Y, Blanquart F, Goudenège D, Barcia-Cruz R, et al. Phage–host
coevolution in natural populations. Nat Microbiol. 2022 July;7(7):1075–86.

12. Borin JM, Lee JJ, Lucia-Sanz A, Gerbino KR, Weitz JS, Meyer JR. Rapid bacteria-phage
coevolution drives the emergence of multiscale networks. Science. 2023 Nov
10;382(6671):674–8.

13. Beamud B, García-González N, Gómez-Ortega M, González-Candelas F, Domingo-Calap P,
Sanjuan R. Genetic determinants of host tropism in *Klebsiella* phages. Cell Rep. 2023 Feb
6;42(2):112048.

14. Gaborieau B, Vaysset H, Tesson F, Charachon I, Dib N, Bernier J, et al. Prediction of strain
level phage–host interactions across the *Escherichia* genus using only genomic
information. Nat Microbiol. 2024 Nov;9(11):2847–61.

15. Johnson MC, Laderman E, Huiting E, Zhang C, Davidson A, Bondy-Denomy J. Core
defense hotspots within *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* are a consistent and rich source of
anti-phage defense systems. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023 June 9;51(10):4995–5005.

16. Burke KA, Urick CD, Mzhavia N, Nikolich MP, Filippov AA. Correlation of *Pseudomonas*
aeruginosa phage resistance with the numbers and types of antiphage systems. Int J Mol
Sci. 2024 Jan;25(3):1424.

17. Costa AR, van den Berg DF, Esser JQ, Muralidharan A, van den Bossche H, Bonilla BE, et
al. Accumulation of defense systems in phage-resistant strains of *Pseudomonas*
aeruginosa. Sci Adv. 2024 Feb 23;10(8):eadj0341.

18. Hussain FA, Dubert J, Elsherbini J, Murphy M, VanInsberghe D, Arevalo P, et al. Rapid
evolutionary turnover of mobile genetic elements drives bacterial resistance to phages.
Science. 2021 Oct 22;374(6566):488–92.

19. Czajkowski R. May the phage be with you? Prophage-like elements in the genomes of
soft rot Pectobacteriaceae: *Pectobacterium* spp. and *Dickeya* spp. Front Microbiol
[Internet]. 2019 Feb 14 [cited 2025 Apr 28];10. Available from:
https://www.frontiersin.orghttps://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/
10.3389/fmicb.2019.00138/full

20. Dominguez-Mirazo M, Jin R, Weitz JS. Functional and comparative genomic analysis of
integrated prophage-like sequences in "*Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus*". mSphere.
2019 Nov 13;4(6):10.1128/msphere.00409-19.

21. Castillo JA, Secaira-Morocho H, Maldonado S, Sarmiento KN. Diversity and evolutionary
dynamics of antiphage defense systems in *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex.
Front Microbiol [Internet]. 2020 May 20 [cited 2024 Sept 24];11. Available from:
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2020.00961/f
ull

22. Greenrod STE, Stoycheva M, Elphinstone J, Friman VP. Global diversity and distribution
of prophages are lineage-specific within the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex.
BMC Genomics. 2022 Oct 6;23(1):689.

23. Dougherty PE, Nielsen TK, Riber L, Lading HH, Forero-Junco LM, Kot W, et al. Widespread
and largely unknown prophage activity, diversity, and function in two genera of wheat
phyllosphere bacteria. ISME J. 2023 Dec;17(12):2415–25.

24. Holtappels D, Rickus GEJ, Morgan T, Rezende RR de, Koskella B, Alfenas-Zerbini P.
Evidence for the key roles of the *Pseudomonas syringae* mobilome in shaping biotic
interactions [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2024 [cited 2024 Aug 20]. p. 2024.03.19.585818.
Available from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.03.19.585818v2

25. Jimenez D, Beltran D, Castillo JA. Mobile genetic elements of *Xylella fastidiosa* and their
contribution to pathogenicity. Plant Pathol. 2024 Dec;73(9):2490–9.

26. Flores CO, Meyer JR, Valverde S, Farr L, Weitz JS. Statistical structure of host-phage
interactions. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2011 July 12;108(28):E288–97.

27. Gupta A, Peng S, Leung CY, Borin JM, Medina SJ, Weitz JS, et al. Leapfrog dynamics in
phage-bacteria coevolution revealed by joint analysis of cross-infection phenotypes and
whole genome sequencing. Ecol Lett. 2022;25(4):876–88.

28. Molina F, Menor-Flores M, Fernández L, Vega-Rodríguez MA, García P. Systematic
analysis of putative phage-phage interactions on minimum-sized phage cocktails. Sci
Rep. 2022 Feb 14;12(1):2458.

29. Kauffman KM, Chang WK, Brown JM, Hussain FA, Yang J, Polz MF, et al. Resolving the
structure of phage–bacteria interactions in the context of natural diversity. Nat
Commun. 2022 Jan 18;13(1):372.

30. Moury B, Audergon JM, Baudracco-Arnas S, Ben Krima S, Bertrand F, Boissot N, et al. The
quasi-universality of nestedness in the structure of quantitative plant-parasite
interactions. Peer Community J. 2021 Nov 30;1:e44.

31. Morris CE, Monteil CL, Berge O. The life history of *Pseudomonas syringae*: linking
agriculture to earth system processes. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2013;51:85–104.

32. Morris CE, Sands DC, Vinatzer BA, Glaux C, Guilbaud C, Buffière A, et al. The life history of
the plant pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* is linked to the water cycle. ISME J. 2008
Mar;2(3):321–34.

33. Morris CE, Lamichhane JR, Nikolić I, Stanković S, Moury B. The overlapping continuum of
host range among strains in the *Pseudomonas syringae* complex. Phytopathol Res. 2019
Jan 16;1(1):4.

34. Parisi L, Morgaint B, Blanco-Garcia J, Guilbaud C, Chandeysson C, Bourgeay JF, et al.
Bacteria from four phylogroups of the *Pseudomonas syringae* complex can cause
bacterial canker of apricot. Plant Pathol. 2019 Sept;68(7):1249–58.

35. Thomas MD, Leary JV. Bacteriophages from sewage specific for fluorescent phytogenic
Pseudomonads. Phytopathology. 1983 Sept;(73):403–6.

36. Cuppels DA. Isolation and characterization of phages useful for identifying *Pseudomonas*
syringae pv. tomato. Phytopathology. 1983 Apr;(73):1376–81.

37. Gross DC, Cody YS, Proebsting EL, Radamaker GK, Spotts RA. Ecotypes and pathogenicity
of ice-nucleation-active *Pseudomonas syringae* isolated from deciduous fruit tree
orchards. 1983 Sept;(74):241–8.

38. Cuppels DA. The use of pathovar-indicative bacteriophages for rapidly detecting
Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato in tomato leaf and fruit lesions. 1984 Feb;(74):891–4.

39. Taylor JD, Teverson DM, Allen DJ, Pastor-Corrales MA. Identification and origin of races
of *Pseudomonas syringae pv. phaseolicola* from Africa and other bean growing areas.
Plant Pathol. 1996;45(3):469–78.

40. Frampton RA, Taylor C, Holguín Moreno AV, Visnovsky SB, Petty NK, Pitman AR, et al.
Identification of bacteriophages for biocontrol of the kiwifruit canker phytopathogen
Pseudomonas syringae pv. actinidiae. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2014 Apr;80(7):2216–28.

41. James SL, Rabiey M, Neuman BW, Percival G, Jackson RW. Isolation, characterisation and
experimental evolution of phage that infect the horse chestnut tree pathogen,
Pseudomonas syringae pv. aesculi. Curr Microbiol. 2020 Aug 1;77(8):1438–47.

42. Rombouts S, Volckaert A, Venneman S, Declercq B, Vandenheuvel D, Allonsius CN, et al.
Characterization of novel bacteriophages for biocontrol of bacterial blight in leek caused
by *Pseudomonas syringae pv. porri*. Front Microbiol [Internet]. 2016 Mar 15 [cited 2024
Oct 8];7. Available from:
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00279/f
ull

43. Geng Y, Nguyen TVP, Homaee E, Golding I. Using bacterial population dynamics to count
phages and their lysogens. Nat Commun. 2024 Sept 6;15(1):7814.

44. Wright RCT, Friman VP, Smith MCM, Brockhurst MA. Cross-resistance is modular in
bacteria–phage interactions. PLOS Biol. 2018 Oct 3;16(10):e2006057.

45. Wright RCT, Friman VP, Smith MCM, Brockhurst MA. Resistance evolution against phage
combinations depends on the timing and order of exposure. mBio. 2019 Sept
24;10(5):10.1128/mbio.01652-19.

46. Torres-Barceló C, Boyer C, Garneau JR, Poussier S, Robène I, Moury B. A Phylogenetic
Host-Range Index reveals ecological constraints in phage specialisation and virulence.
Mol Ecol. 2025 July 28;n/a(n/a):e70052.

47. Seidel R, Bloom JGP, Dekker C, Szczelkun MD. Motor step size and ATP coupling
efficiency of the dsDNA translocase EcoR124I. EMBO J. 2008 May 7;27(9):1388–98.

48. Pleška M, Qian L, Okura R, Bergmiller T, Wakamoto Y, Kussell E, et al. Bacterial
autoimmunity due to a Restriction-Modification system. Curr Biol CB. 2016 Feb
8;26(3):404–9.

49. Berngruber TW, Lion S, Gandon S. Evolution of suicide as a defence strategy against
pathogens in a spatially structured environment. Ecol Lett. 2013 Apr;16(4):446–53.

50. van Houte S, Buckling A, Westra ER. Evolutionary ecology of prokaryotic immune
mechanisms. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2016 July 13;80(3):745–63.

51. Turner D, Kropinski AM, Adriaenssens EM. A roadmap for genome-based phage
taxonomy. Viruses. 2021 Mar;13(3):506.

52. Mavrodi DV, Loper JE, Paulsen IT, Thomashow LS. Mobile genetic elements in the
genome of the beneficial rhizobacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf-5. BMC Microbiol.
2009 Jan 13;9(1):8.

53. Hockett KL, Renner T, Baltrus DA. Independent co-option of a tailed bacteriophage into a
killing complex in *Pseudomonas*. mBio. 2015 Aug 11;6(4):10.1128/mbio.00452-15.

54. Backman T, Latorre SM, Symeonidi E, Muszyński A, Bleak E, Eads L, et al. A phage tail–like
bacteriocin suppresses competitors in metapopulations of pathogenic bacteria. Science.
2024 June 14;384(6701):eado0713.

55. Fautt C, Hockett K, Delattre S, Baltrus D, Couradeau E. Tailocin tail fiber diversity
correlates with rfbD variation in the *Pseudomonas syringae* species complex. ISME
Commun. 2025 Jan 1;5(1):ycaf099.

56. Hunter M, Fusco D. Superinfection exclusion: A viral strategy with short-term benefits
and long-term drawbacks. PLOS Comput Biol. 2022 May 10;18(5):e1010125.

57. Koskella B, Lin DM, Buckling A, Thompson JN. The costs of evolving resistance in
heterogeneous parasite environments. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 2011 Dec
14;279(1735):1896–903.

58. Morris CE, Sands DC, Vanneste JL, Montarry J, Oakley B, Guilbaud C, et al. Inferring the
evolutionary history of the plant pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* from its biogeography
in headwaters of rivers in North America, Europe, and New Zealand. mBio. 2010 June
29;1(3):e00107-10.

59. Monteil CL, Yahara K, Studholme DJ, Mageiros L, Méric G, Swingle B, et al. Population-
genomic insights into emergence, crop adaptation and dissemination of *Pseudomonas*
syringae pathogens. Microb Genomics [Internet]. 2016 Oct 1 [cited 2021 Sept 15];2(10).
Available   from:
https://www.microbiologyresearch.org/content/journal/mgen/10.1099/mgen.0.000089

60. Berge O, Monteil CL, Bartoli C, Chandeysson C, Guilbaud C, Sands DC, et al. A user's guide
to a data base of the diversity of *Pseudomonas syringae* and its application to classifying
strains in this phylogenetic complex. PLOS ONE. 2014 Sept 3;9(9):e105547.

61. Koonin EV, Makarova KS, Wolf YI. Evolutionary genomics of defense systems in archaea
and bacteria. Annu Rev Microbiol. 2017 Sept 8;71(Volume 71, 2017):233–61.

62. Bernheim A, Sorek R. The pan-immune system of bacteria: antiviral defence as a
community resource. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2020 Feb;18(2):113–9.

63. Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. Comparative genomics of defense systems in archaea
and bacteria. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013 Apr 1;41(8):4360–77.

64. Cooney-Nutley K, Chakravorty S, Nix I, Zeng Z, Greer SF, Rabiey M. Understanding
bacterial antiviral defence systems and phage receptors to better inform rational phage
cocktail design to treat bacterial canker. Microb Biotechnol. 2025 Sept 19;18(9):e70232.

65. Xie Y, Wahab L, Gill JJ. Development and validation of a microtiter plate-based assay for
determination of bacteriophage host range and virulence. Viruses. 2018 Apr;10(4):189.

66. Bell G. Evolutionary Rescue. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2017 Nov 2;48(Volume 48,
2017):605–27.

67. Abedon S. Lysis from without. Bacteriophage. 2011 Jan 1;1:46–9.

68. Nobrega FL, Vlot M, de Jonge PA, Dreesens LL, Beaumont HJE, Lavigne R, et al. Targeting
mechanisms of tailed bacteriophages. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2018 Dec;16(12):760–73.

69. Bertozzi Silva J, Storms Z, Sauvageau D. Host receptors for bacteriophage adsorption.
FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2016 Feb 1;363(4):fnw002.

70. Müller DM, Pourtois JD, Kim MK, Targ B, Burgener EB, Milla C, et al. Bacterial receptors
but not anti-phage defence mechanisms determine host range for a pair of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa lytic phages [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2024 [cited 2024 Sept 23]. p.
2024.04.30.591980.   Available   from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.04.30.591980v2

71. Kering KK, Kibii BJ, Wei H. Biocontrol of phytobacteria with bacteriophage cocktails. Pest
Manag Sci. 2019;75(7):1775–81.

72. Feltin C, Garneau JR, Morris CE, Bérard A, Torres-Barceló C. Novel phages of
Pseudomonas syringae unveil numerous potential auxiliary metabolic genes. J Gen Virol.
2024;105(6):001990.

73. King EO, Ward MK, Raney DE. Two simple media for the demonstration of pyocyanin and
fluorescin. J Lab Clin Med. 1954 Aug 1;44(2):301–7.

74. Dieckmann MA, Beyvers S, Nkouamedjo-Fankep RC, Hanel PHG, Jelonek L, Blom J, et al.
EDGAR3.0: comparative genomics and phylogenomics on a scalable infrastructure.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2021 July 2;49(W1):W185–92.

75. Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. FastTree 2 – approximately maximum-likelihood trees for
large alignments. PLOS ONE. 2010 Mar 10;5(3):e9490.

76. Tesson F, Hervé A, Mordret E, Touchon M, d'Humières C, Cury J, et al. Systematic and
quantitative view of the antiviral arsenal of prokaryotes. Nat Commun. 2022 May
10;13(1):2561.

77. Camargo AP, Roux S, Schulz F, Babinski M, Xu Y, Hu B, et al. Identification of mobile
genetic elements with geNomad. Nat Biotechnol. 2023 Sept 21;1–10.

78. Nayfach S, Camargo AP, Schulz F, Eloe-Fadrosh E, Roux S, Kyrpides NC. CheckV assesses
the quality and completeness of metagenome-assembled viral genomes. Nat Biotechnol.
2021 May;39(5):578–85.

79. Moraru C, Varsani A, Kropinski AM. VIRIDIC—a novel tool to calculate the intergenomic
similarities of prokaryote-infecting viruses. Viruses. 2020 Nov 6;12(11):1268.

80. Nishimura Y, Yoshida T, Kuronishi M, Uehara H, Ogata H, Goto S. ViPTree: the viral
proteomic tree server. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2017 Aug 1;33(15):2379–80.

81. Orfei B, Pothier JF, Fenske L, Blom J, Moretti C, Buonaurio R, et al. Race-specific
genotypes of *Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato* are defined by the presence of mobile
DNA elements within the genome. Front Plant Sci [Internet]. 2023 July 5 [cited 2025 June
7];14. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/plant-
science/articles/10.3389/fpls.2023.1197706/full

82. Balbuena JA, Míguez-Lozano R, Blasco-Costa I. PACo: A Novel Procrustes Application to
Cophylogenetic Analysis. PLOS ONE. 2013 Apr 8;8(4):e61048.

83. Revell LJ. phytools 2.0: an updated R ecosystem for phylogenetic comparative methods
(and other things). PeerJ. 2024 Jan 5;12:e16505.

84. Walsh SK, Imrie RM, Matuszewska M, Paterson GK, Weinert LA, Hadfield JD, et al. The
host phylogeny determines viral infectivity and replication across *Staphylococcus* host
species. PLOS Pathog. 2023 June 8;19(6):e1011433.

85. Holtappels D, Alfenas-Zerbini P, Koskella B. Drivers and consequences of bacteriophage
host range. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2023 July 1;47(4):fuad038.

86. Alseth EO, Roush C, Irby I, Kopylov M, Bobe D, Diggs MW, et al. Mystique, a broad host
range *Acinetobacter* phage, reveals the impact of culturing conditions on phage isolation
and infectivity. PLOS Pathog. 2025 Apr 10;21(4):e1012986.

87. Sprouffske K, Wagner A. Growthcurver: an R package for obtaining interpretable metrics
from microbial growth curves. BMC Bioinformatics. 2016 Apr 19;17:172.

88. Blazanin M, Vasen E, Vilaró Jolis C, An W, Turner PE. Quantifying phage infectivity from
characteristics of bacterial population dynamics. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2025 Sept
16;122(37):e2513377122.

89. Almeida-Neto M, Guimarães P, Guimarães Jr PR, Loyola RD, Ulrich W. A consistent metric
for nestedness analysis in ecological systems: reconciling concept and measurement.
Oikos. 2008;117(8):1227–39.

90. Galeano J, Pastor JM, Iriondo JM. Weighted-Interaction Nestedness Estimator (WINE): A
new estimator to calculate over frequency matrices. Environ Model Softw. 2009 Nov
1;24(11):1342–6.

91. Newman MEJ, Girvan M. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. Phys
Rev E. 2004 Feb 26;69(2):026113.

92. Reichardt J, Bornholdt S. Statistical mechanics of community detection. Phys Rev E. 2006
July 18;74(1):016110.

93. Traag VA, Bruggeman J. Community detection in networks with positive and negative
links. Phys Rev E. 2009 Sept 21;80(3):036115.

94. Clauset A, Newman MEJ, Moore C. Finding community structure in very large networks.
Phys Rev E. 2004 Dec 6;70(6):066111.

95. Newman MEJ. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. Phys Rev E. 2006 Sept 11;74(3):036104.

96. Beckett SJ. Improved community detection in weighted bipartite networks. R Soc Open Sci. 2016 Jan;3(1):140536.

97. Blondel VD, Guillaume JL, Lambiotte R, Lefebvre E. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. J Stat Mech Theory Exp. 2008 Oct;2008(10):P10008.

98. Rodríguez-Gironés MA, Santamaría L. A new algorithm to calculate the nestedness temperature of presence–absence matrices. J Biogeogr. 2006;33(5):924–35.

99. Moury B, Fabre F, Hébrard E, Froissart R. Determinants of host species range in plant viruses. J Gen Virol. 2017 Apr;98(4):862–73.

100. Weitz JS, Poisot T, Meyer JR, Flores CO, Valverde S, Sullivan MB, et al. Phage-bacteria infection networks. Trends Microbiol. 2013 Feb;21(2):82–91.

101. Anderson MJ. Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA). In: Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2017 [cited 2025 June 4]. p. 1–15. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118445112.stat07841

102. Dixon P. VEGAN, a package of R functions for community ecology. J Veg Sci. 2003;14(6):927–30.

103. Arbizu PM. pmartinezarbizu/pairwiseAdonis [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Apr 14]. Available from: https://github.com/pmartinezarbizu/pairwiseAdonis

104. Brooks M E, Kristensen K, Benthem K J ,van, Magnusson A, Berg C W, Nielsen A, et al. glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized linear mixed modeling. R J. 2017;9(2):378.

105. Allen B, Kon M, Bar-Yam Y. A new phylogenetic diversity measure generalizing the Shannon index and its application to phyllostomid bats. Am Nat. 2009 Aug;174(2):236–43.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Bacterial resistance to phages and host range breadth of the tested phages.

(A) Number of phages to which bacteria are sensitive or resistant, with the phylogeny of the

strains indicated at the bottom of the histogram. (B) Number of bacteria infected or not by

1234 the phages, with the taxonomy of the phages listed at the bottom of the histogram. Values

1235 are derived from the binary inhibition matrix.

1236

S2 Fig. Taxonomic and phylogenetic characteristics, and ecological origins of phages and

bacteria explaining host range.

(A) Bacterial percentage of inhibition by phages across bacterial phylogroups and ecological

origins. Significance letters indicate results from the PERMANOVA test and associated

pairwise comparisons. (B) Bacterial inhibition percentage of different phage genera.

Significance letters represent results from a GLMM with a Gamma regression distribution

and random effect (phage, bacteria, and the replicate imbricated in each of the phage-

bacteria interactions), and post hoc pairwise comparisons performed using Tukey's test.

1245

1246 **S3 Fig. Relative proportions of defence systems by functional category (%) and total**

1247 **number of defence systems across bacterial genomes.**

1248 On the left, a phylogenetic tree based on the core genomes of the bacterial strains is shown,

1249 with corresponding phylogroups indicated in the adjacent column.

1250

S4 Fig. Percentage of similarity of defence system subtypes among bacterial strains in

relation to their genome-wide average nucleotide identity (ANI).

Transparent grey dots represent individual observations (darker areas indicate overlap). The

overall trend is shown by the grey line, which represents the mean prediction from the

GLMM accounting for random effects associated with bacterial strains. The shaded ribbon

indicates the 95 % confidence interval of the model's marginal predictions.

1257

S5 Fig. Co-phylogeny of the CL4 prophage family-like (R-type syringacin).

Co-phylogenetic analysis between 68 strains of the *P. syringae* species complex (left),

represented by a maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree based on their core-genomes, and

their associated 68 CL4 family-like prophages (right), represented by a proteomic tree. The

44 bacterial strains included in this study are marked with dots at the tips of the bacterial

tree. Phylogroups and prophage-carrying strains are colour-coded accordingly. Two nodes

with a maximum likelihood support value below 0.90 are marked with red dots.

1265

S6 Fig. Experimental setup illustrating bacterial growth inhibition by phages.

Each biological replicate per bacterial strain is represented by a different colour, and each

row corresponds to the technical replicates within that biological replicate. For clarity, only 3

of the 23 tested phages are shown in this schematic, which does not depict the

randomisation of phages across plates. Three types of internal controls are included: positive

controls with bacteria only, negative controls with medium only, and internal reference

controls using the bacterial strain P1.01.01B03 (growth shown in S7B Fig) and the internal

phage Ghuch01, which consistently inhibits this strain (see S7C Fig). Icons were obtained

from open-source resources (microplate: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:96-

Well_plate.svg; phage: https://openclipart.org/detail/62785/virus; bacteria:

https://openclipart.org/detail/221334/lamarque-disease; bottle of media:

https://openclipart.org/detail/128449/reagent-bottle).

1278

1279 **S7 Fig. Analysis of the different controls used in the phage host range *in vitro* tests.**

1280 (A) Analysis of culture medium controls by plate (labelled by bacteria). (B) Area under the

1281 empirical curve (auc*e*) of the internal bacterial control, *P. syringae* strain P1.01.01B03. (C)

1282 Inhibition of the internal phage control Ghuch01 on the internal bacterial control (%).

1283

1284 **S8 Fig. Histogram showing the distribution of inhibition percentages within the 0.05 to**

1285 **0.95 probability range, displaying an approximately symmetric and unimodal shape.**

1286

S9 Fig. Relationship between infection breadth of infection and inhibition strength.

(A, C) Phage perspective: mean percentage of inhibition per phage (y-axis) is plotted against

the number of bacterial strains each phage significantly infected (x-axis). Colours indicate

phage genera. (B, D) Bacterial perspective: mean percentage of inhibition per bacterial strain

(y-axis) is plotted against the number of phages significantly infecting each strain (x-axis).

Colours represent bacterial phylogroups, and shapes indicate ecological niches. (A, B)

Analyses based on overall inhibition values. (C, D) Analyses restricted to significant phage–

bacterium interactions. Spearman's rho and associated p-values are reported for panels (C)

and (D). Icons were obtained from open-source resources (phage:

https://openclipart.org/detail/62785/virus; bacteria:

https://openclipart.org/detail/221334/lamarque-disease).

1298

S10 Fig. Results of additional experiments on five potentially stimulating phages and five potentially stimulated bacteria.

1299

1300

Generally, bacterial populations decreased in the presence of phages. In 17% of observed

phage-bacteria combinations, a "stimulatory" effect was identified, with inhibition values

reaching up to -40%. Five phages showing strong stimulatory effect and five bacteria

showing significant stimulation were chosen to test the reproducibility of the stimulation

effect in subsequent experiments. (A) Matrix of mean inhibition percentages for the five *P.*

syringae strains (rows) and five phages (columns), with their phylogenetic and taxonomic

affiliations indicated by colour. The number of stars indicates the number of replicates

showing a significantly inhibiting or stimulating percentage. Of ten initially identified

significant stimulating interactions (delimited by red lines), only three were confirmed in

subsequent experiments. (B) Size of the five bacterial populations in response to the phages.

Stars correspond to significant differences from the control (no phage) based on the results

of the GLM model, family = Gamma. Arrows indicate interactions with at least one of the

replicates showing a significant inhibition or stimulation percentage. Out of the three

significant interactions of stimulatory phenotype, only 2 phage-bacteria interactions resulted

in slightly higher bacterial densities in the presence of phages compared to phage-free

conditions, though this difference was not statistically significant. (C) Spearman correlation

between bacterial concentration and inhibition percentage, by bacterium and phage. No

correlation was significant and bacterial population size only poorly explains the inhibition

percentages.

1320

S11 Fig. Kinetics of bacterial growth inhibition across the full dataset.

Optical density (OD) is plotted over time (hours) for each phage–bacteria interaction, with

phages (n=23) in columns and bacterial strains (n=44) in rows. Grey curves represent the

average growth of bacteria alone for each phage–bacteria pair. Blue curves show individual

replicates for each interaction (n = 3), illustrating the variability in bacterial response to

phage infection.

1327

1328 **S1 Table. Phage–bacterium matrices showing (A) the percentage of bacterial growth**

1329 **inhibition and (B) the number of biological replicates (out of three) showing significant**

1330 **inhibition.**

1331 Rows correspond to bacterial strains, while columns represent phage clones, each annotated

1332 with their respective phylogroups and genera.

1333

S2 Table: Analysis of nestedness and modularity of the network of binary data

representing the significance or non-significance of bacterial growth inhibition by phages

(S1B Table).

Null models are described in Moury *et al.* (30) for B, N, C2, R2 and S, and in Moury *et al.* (99)

for PD. For each null model and each algorithm, the frequency of simulations, among 100,

showing a strictly higher nestedness (or modularity) score than that of the actual matrix is

indicated. Significantly nested or modular networks (p ≤ 0.05) are indicated in red.

1341

1342 **S3 Table. Genetic analysis of the 88 prophages identified in the 44 *P. syringae* strains using**

1343 **VIRIDIC.**

1344 The 27 reference phages are highlighted in yellow (25 from the collection described in Feltin

1345 *et al.* (72) and 3 from NCBI). Species and genus-level clusters of the prophages are indicated

1346 on the right in colour. High genetic similarities are highlighted in green.

1347

S4 Table. Phylogenetic characteristics, ecological origins, countries, and dates of sampling

of the 44 *P. syringae* strains used for the host range study.

The four *P. syringae* strains highlighted in bold are strains that were used to isolate some of

the phages tested in the host range assay. Four strains are in the CIRM-CFBP, the French

collection for plant-associated bacteria (https://cirm-cfbp.fr/ ; June 2025): USA0007(CFBP

8574), CC1559 (CFBP 8551), MAFF302273PT (CFBP 2339), and CC1583 (CFBP 8564).

1354

Data Availability Statement

The phage–bacterium infection network, based on average values, has been deposited in the

Viral Host Range Database hosted by Institut Pasteur

(https://viralhostrangedb.pasteur.cloud/data-source/287/). The raw optical density (OD)

kinetics data and the processed datasets used for analysis (e.g., AUC, inhibition values,

phage effect probability) have been deposited in Zenodo (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17735985).

The 39 bacterial genomes sequenced in this study have been deposited under the BioProject

accession number PRJNA1292126.

1363

Financial Disclosure Statement

The work described in our manuscript was founded by the Plant Health and Environment (SPE) Department of the French National Research Institute for Agriculture Food and the Environment (INRAE) (to C-TB) and Avignon University (AU) (to C-TB). CF received PhD funding from both the SPE Department of INRAE and AU. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.