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] INRAE, Pathologie Végétale, 84140 Montfavet, France

[2] Department of Plant Pathology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA

[3] Infectious Disease Institute, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA

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

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

[6] PHIM Plant Health Institute, University of Montpellier, INRAE, 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 have been extensively examined in ecosystems

like oceans and the human gut (2–7). However, in agriculture, research has predominantly

focused on the use of phages as biocontrol agents, while their ecological roles, population

dynamics, and interactions with bacterial communities in plant-associated ecosystems

remain largely underexplored (8). A deeper understanding of these ecological aspects could

provide fundamental insights to guide the development of phage-based biocontrol strategies

and sustainable management of plant-associated microbial communities in agricultural

systems.

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

recognise and infect a given bacterium, integrate into the host genome and/or replicate

while avoiding or blocking bacterial defence systems (9,10). A range of approaches have

been employed to unravel the determinants involved in phage-bacterial interactions,

including ecological and evolutionary analyses of natural populations, and experimental

evolution (11,12). Mechanistic studies have also investigated the bacterial receptors (13,14)

with more recent work focusing on defence systems associated with susceptibility to phage

(14–17). For example, a study showed that *Vibrio lentus* strains that share identical phage

receptors display varying levels of susceptibility depending on the phage defence elements

present in their genomes (18). As with other aspects of phage-bacterial interactions,

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 to

describe the underlying ecological and evolutionary drivers. These interaction networks are

rarely random and often exhibit distinct structural patterns, commonly modularity or

nestedness (26). Nestedness, a structure in which phages exhibit a gradient of host range

breadth and where bacteria display varying levels of susceptibility, is commonly observed

when studies involve 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 diverse bacterial hosts across species or genera, or when examined over extended

time periods (11,29). On a large scale, phage-bacterium interaction networks often exhibit

modular structures with nested substructures within each module, patterns that are mostly

observed across broad geographic regions (30), and/or in a host set comprising different

bacterial species (31). A recent study has introduced new statistical methods that

incorporate quantitative host–parasite interactions to analyse the structures of ecological

networks, providing deeper insights into the processes shaping phage–bacterial interactions

(32). Rather than relying solely on binary data (presence or absence of infection), these

approaches consider the strength of interactions, reflecting how effective each phage is at

infecting each host, and vice versa. This gradient-based perspective enables a more nuanced

understanding of infection patterns, host susceptibility, and phage infectivity, revealing

subtler ecological and evolutionary dynamics that would be overlooked by binary analyses

alone.

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

bacterial interactions in agricultural contexts due to its high genetic diversity and broad

ecological distribution (33). This phytopathogen colonises and causes disease across a wide

range of cultivated and wild plants and is also commonly found in water-related

environments such as snow, clouds, rain, rivers and epilithic biofilms (33–35). Several studies

highlight the dynamic exchanges occurring between agricultural and non-agricultural

ecosystems (33,35,36). A recent large-scale analysis of 590 *P. syringae* genomes revealed the

diversity and composition of its elaborate "defensome" integrated into the genome

(including prophages, and defence systems) (24). Yet, how this genomic arsenal translates

into phage resistance phenotypes remains unclear. Correlating phage–bacterial infection

network with defensome composition offers a valuable framework to infer potential links

between genetic defences and bacterial susceptibility to phages.

Historically, phage host range profiling was used to differentiate *P. syringae* strains (37–41).

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

phages and their potential as biocontrol agents (42,43). When reported, host-range assays

commonly aim to identify broad-host-range phages for practical applications (44). However,

ecological questions remain understudied, even though they offer valuable insights that

advance both fundamental and applied research. Investigating the roles of local adaptation,

host phylogeny and bacterial genomic defence arsenal (defensome) could help to clarify the

mechanisms shaping these networks, thereby guiding more effective biocontrol strategies.

In apricot trees (*Prunus armeniaca*), *P. syringae* strains from diverse phylogroups (PG) are

responsible for bacterial canker (45). The four main implicated phylogroups are: PG01, which

includes plant pathogens and environmental strains; PG02, the most ubiquitous phylogroup,

frequently isolated from diverse habitats (soil, water, plants, *ect*.); PG03, which comprises

numerous pathovars pathogenic to woody plants but is rarely found in the environment; and

PG07, which includes some pathogenic strains but is primarily associated with diverse

environmental reservoirs (45,46). The high genetic diversity of these strains suggests that

pathogenic success in apricot may be driven more by ecological fitness than by specific

virulence factors alone (47). This fitness includes the ability of strains to survive, compete,

and reproduce effectively within their environmental context, including interactions with the

host plant and other microbes, such as phages. Notably, *P. syringae* lineages found in apricot

trees are not host-specific but likely represent strains with general ecological fitness,

enabling them to succeed in various environmental conditions (45). This raises questions

about the ecological contexts in which these strains interact with phages, whether within

apricot tree hosts or in external reservoirs. Exploring the phage infectivity patterns on these

P. syringae strains can reveal how phylogenetic and ecological diversity shape phage-

bacterium dynamics.

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

structure and ecological drivers of phage–bacterium infection networks. Based on previous

studies, we hypothesised that phages would be locally adapted to their bacterial hosts,

leading to a modular infection network structure. We further proposed that this structure

could be explained by the presence of prophages and diverse bacterial defence systems

encoded in host genomes. To test these hypotheses, we addressed the following questions:

i) Are phages from diseased apricot trees specifically adapted to resident *P. syringae*

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

related bacteria from different environments differ in their adaptation to phage? iii) What

bacterial genomic traits underlie the observed infection network structure? We conducted a

quantitative host-range assay using 23 genetically-diverse *P. syringae* phages and 44 *P.*

syringae strains. Whole-genome sequencing of all bacterial strains enabled detailed

annotation of prophages and defence systems. This integrative approach provides

mechanistic insights into how ecological origin and bacterial genomic content shape phage–

bacterial interactions, contributing to our understanding of the roles that phages play in

agricultural ecosystems.

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. This allowed us to go beyond the information provided by traditional plaque

assays – that reveal phage replication – by providing data on bacterial growth. 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 4.5×10^4 PFU/mL, while Ghual01 infected a *P. graminis* strain at

1.7×10^5 PFU/mL. In contrast, Orimi01, Cygsa01, and Pavpe01 displayed the lowest

virulence, averaging 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).

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

bacterial susceptibility and sensitivity, with over one-third (39%) 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 several 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).

Nestedness was highly significant ($p < 0.01$) against nearly all null models, except null model

B, which was shown to be excessively conservative (32). Modularity analyses differed

depending on the algorithm (Table 1). With the *spinglass* algorithm, selected for its good

performance in terms of false positive rate (32), 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 (32). 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.* (32). 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 (48). 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, 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. However, no significant correlation was observed between the percentage of shared defence system subtypes and the genome-wide Average Nucleotide Identity (ANI) between strains (linear regression; adjusted R^2 = 0.03; $p < 0.01$) (S4 Fig). This suggests that, although phylogeny and

ecological origins influence the profile of defence systems, their inheritance does not follow

a strict vertical transmission. 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. 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), made up 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 ecological origin, but their specific composition is not strictly inherited, likely due to

horizontal transfer. 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) (50). 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 (51,52). 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 (53,54). 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 (49), 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. 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).

While prophages can contribute to bacterial immunity against phage infection (55), our

results revealed no significant correlation between prophage abundance and bacterial

sensitivity to phages. This suggests that the detected prophages do not play a defining role

in resistance, either overall (linear regression; adjusted R^2 = −0.02; p = 0.81) or within

individual phylogroups (PG01: adjusted R^2 = 0.01, p = 0.33; PG02: adjusted R^2 = −0.02, p =

0.43; PG07: adjusted R^2 = 0.01, p = 0.38; PG10: adjusted R^2 = −0.12, p = 0.94) (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
Bacterial ecological origins	0.12	21

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 local ecological adaptation. 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 and 7 clades,

corresponding to genus and species levels, respectively) used in this work as well as the

varied ecological origins of the bacterial strains. 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 (56,11).

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 (36) 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 (57). 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 (46,35), 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 (46), were the most resistant to phages despite

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

diseased plants (46), 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).

While phylogroups show consistent trends in defence system profiles, closely-related strains

often do not share identical defence systems, suggesting acquisition through horizontal gene

transfers (49,58). However, strains within the same phylogroup tend to retain consistent

features in their defensome, including the number and functional categories of defence

systems. This pattern suggests that each *P. syringae* phylogroup may follow a common anti-

phage strategy, while relying on distinct sets of defence systems to implement it. 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 (59). 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 (60).

Limitations and alternative approaches for understanding phage-bacterium

interactions

To comprehensively assess the impact of defence systems on phage infection, measuring

phage adsorption rates on bacteria would provide valuable insights (14,17). Successful

adsorption without subsequent lysis may indicate the action of post-adsorption defence

mechanisms, whereas failure of adsorption suggests that surface receptor compatibility,

rather than intracellular defences, governs the interaction.

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

interpreting host range patterns (61,12). 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* (62). 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 (63). 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 (64). 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. 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 (65). 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 and genus-like levels, respectively, according to Berge *et*

al. (46). The strains were sampled from three different environments: diseased apricot trees

(exhibiting bacterial canker symptoms) (45), healthy plant tissues, and non-agricultural

environments (S4 Table). Bacterial strains were revived from -80°C storage and cultured on

King's B agar (66). 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 (67). 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, resulting in a total of 446,872

aligned genes across 332 genomes. Each set of orthologous genes was aligned individually at

the protein level using MUSCLE (67). The resulting alignment were concatenated into a

single alignment, resulting in a total of 512,223 amino acid residues per genome and

170,058,036 residues 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 (68). 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 (69) 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

(70) based on assembled nucleotide sequences of bacterial genomes. Among the 97

identified prophage sequences, only those classified as viral by *geNomad* and *CheckV* (71)

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* (72) 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) (73). *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) (74).

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 (75). 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* package with 1,000 permutations to assess statistical significance.

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

(76).

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 (77). 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). The

combination of the two internal controls were added to 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 of this study (45,65) (S6 Fig). A plate was considered valid if the two

internal controls had all three replicates above the first quartile threshold of bacterial

growth and growth inhibition (S7B-C 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, establishing a

multiplicity of infection (MOI) of 10. 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,

Pseudomonas fluorescens CFBP 2102, *Pseudomonas graminis* 38B9, and *Pseudomonas*

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. The optical density was adjusted to 0.2 to 0.8 at 600 nm, and 300 µL of the adjusted

culture 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 onto the bacterial lawn. Plates were allowed to dry and incubated overnight at 25°C

before evaluation of plaque lysis.

b. Calculation of bacterial growth inhibition percentages and probability of

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 (78). 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 calculated for each

biological replicate of bacteria exposed to a given phage using the following formula:

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

Where auc*e* bacteria is the area under the curve of the empirical growth curve of each

bacterial replicate, and auc*e* phage is the area under the empirical growth curve of the

tested bacteria with each phage. This calculation standardises differences in bacterial growth

rates, allowing for a direct comparison of phage effects across different bacterial strains.

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

normalised distribution, calibrated based on the mean and standard deviation of the auc*e*

for each biological replicate of each bacterium exposed to phages. The probability ranges

from 0 to 1 and is calculated using:

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

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 biological replicate, precluding

probability calculation.

Generally, bacterial populations decreased in the presence of phages. In 7% 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 (S9 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.* (32) and Torres-Barceló *et al.* (48).

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

wNODF (a weighted nestedness metric based on overlap and decreasing fill) (79) and *WINE*

(weighted-interaction nestedness estimator) (80). Modularity was assessed using six

algorithms: *spinglass* (81–83), *edge betweenness* (81), *fast greedy* (84), *leading eigenvector*

(85), *Beckett* (86), and *louvain* (87).

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. A phage was considered

capable of inhibiting a bacterial strain if at least one of the three bacterial replicates was

significantly inhibited (probability < 0.05); in this case, the phage-bacterium combination was

assigned a value of 1. If no replicates showed significant inhibition, the combination was

assigned a value of 0. For this network, three algorithms were used for nestedness: *WINE* as

applied to quantitative data, *Binmatnest* (88), and *NODF2* (79) 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. Null models

are described in Moury *et al.* (89,32).

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 (76).

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 (90). 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 (91). *"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 (92), 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* (93). 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), derived from the phylogenetic diversity index *Hp*

(94), was calculated using the *hilldiv* package (48). 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 (92).

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 (76).

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 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 (92).

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

strain, using the total number of defence system subtypes and the number of prophages per

bacterium. Before conducting these analyses, all statistical test assumptions associated to

the linear regressions 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. Redundant variables were then removed based on their correlations, assessed

using Spearman's correlation for quantitative variables, chi-squared tests for categorical

variables, and Kruskal-Wallis tests for associations between categorical and quantitative

variables. 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, suitable for strictly positive, continuous, and skewed data.

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 principal

components PCA-derived 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. Flores CO, Valverde S, Weitz JS. Multi-scale structure and geographic drivers of cross-
infection within marine bacteria and phages. ISME J. 2013 Mar;7(3):520–32.

31. Cahier K, Piel D, Barcia-Cruz R, Goudenège D, Wegner KM, Monot M, et al.
Environmental *vibrio* phage-bacteria interaction networks reflect the genetic structure of
host populations. Environ Microbiol [Internet]. 2023 Mar 6 [cited 2023 Mar 9];n/a(n/a).
Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1462-2920.16366

32. 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.

33. 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.

34. 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.

35. 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.

36. 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.

37. Thomas MD, Leary JV. Bacteriophages from sewage specific for fluorescent phytogenic
Pseudomonads. Phytopathology. 1983 Sept;(73):403–6.

38. Cuppels DA. Isolation and characterization of phages useful for identifying *Pseudomonas*
syringae pv. tomato. Phytopathology. 1983 Apr;(73):1376–81.

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. 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.

42. 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.

43. 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.

44. 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

45. 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.

46. 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.

47. Omrani M, Roth M, Roch G, Blanc A, Morris CE, Audergon JM. Genome-wide association
multi-locus and multi-variate linear mixed models reveal two linked loci with major
effects on partial resistance of apricot to bacterial canker. BMC Plant Biol. 2019 Jan
21;19(1):31.

48. 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.

49. van Houte S, Buckling A, Westra ER. Evolutionary ecology of prokaryotic immune
mechanisms. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2016 July 13;80(3):745–63.

50. Turner D, Kropinski AM, Adriaenssens EM. A roadmap for genome-based phage
taxonomy. Viruses. 2021 Mar;13(3):506.

51. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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.

54. 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.

55. 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.

56. 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.

57. 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

58. 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.

59. 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.

60. 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.

61. 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.

62. Bertozzi Silva J, Storms Z, Sauvageau D. Host receptors for bacteriophage adsorption.
FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2016 Feb 1;363(4):fnw002.

63. 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

64. Kering KK, Kibii BJ, Wei H. Biocontrol of phytobacteria with bacteriophage cocktails. Pest
Manag Sci. 2019;75(7):1775–81.

65. 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.

66. 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.

67. 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.

68. Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. FastTree 2 – approximately maximum-likelihood trees for
large alignments. PLOS ONE. 2010 Mar 10;5(3):e9490.

69. 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.

70. 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.

71. 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.

72. 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.

73. 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.

74. 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

75. Balbuena JA, Míguez-Lozano R, Blasco-Costa I. PACo: A Novel Procrustes Application to
Cophylogenetic Analysis. PLOS ONE. 2013 Apr 8;8(4):e61048.

76. Revell LJ. phytools 2.0: an updated R ecosystem for phylogenetic comparative methods
(and other things). PeerJ. 2024 Jan 5;12:e16505.

77. 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.

78. Sprouffske K, Wagner A. Growthcurver: an R package for obtaining interpretable metrics
from microbial growth curves. BMC Bioinformatics. 2016 Apr 19;17:172.

79. 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.

80. 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.

81. Newman MEJ, Girvan M. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. Phys
Rev E. 2004 Feb 26;69(2):026113.

82. Reichardt J, Bornholdt S. Statistical mechanics of community detection. Phys Rev E. 2006
July 18;74(1):016110.

83. Traag VA, Bruggeman J. Community detection in networks with positive and negative
links. Phys Rev E. 2009 Sept 21;80(3):036115.

84. Clauset A, Newman MEJ, Moore C. Finding community structure in very large networks.
Phys Rev E. 2004 Dec 6;70(6):066111.

85. Newman MEJ. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of
matrices. Phys Rev E. 2006 Sept 11;74(3):036104.

86. Beckett SJ. Improved community detection in weighted bipartite networks. R Soc Open
Sci. 2016 Jan;3(1):140536.

87. 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.

88. Rodríguez-Gironés MA, Santamaría L. A new algorithm to calculate the nestedness
temperature of presence–absence matrices. J Biogeogr. 2006;33(5):924–35.

89. 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.

90. 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

91. Dixon P. VEGAN, a package of R functions for community ecology. J Veg Sci.
2003;14(6):927–30.

92. Arbizu PM. pmartinezarbizu/pairwiseAdonis [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Apr 14].
Available from: https://github.com/pmartinezarbizu/pairwiseAdonis

93. 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.

94. 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.

1149

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

the phages, with the taxonomy of the phages listed at the bottom of the histogram. Values

are derived from the binary inhibition matrix.

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.

S3 Fig. Relative proportions of defence systems by functional category (%) and total

number of defence systems across bacterial genomes.

On the left, a phylogenetic tree based on the core genomes of the bacterial strains is shown,

with corresponding phylogroups indicated in the adjacent column.

S4 Fig. Percentage of similarity of defence system subtypes among bacterial strains in

relation to their genome-wide average nucleotide identity (ANI).

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.

S6 Fig. Experimental setup illustrating bacterial growth inhibition by phages.

Each biological replicate per bacterial strain is represented by a different colour. For clarity,

only 3 of the 23 tested phages are shown. 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).

S7 Fig. Analysis of the different controls used in the phage host range *in vitro* tests.

(A) Analysis of culture medium controls by plate (labelled by bacteria). (B) The internal

bacterial control, *P. syringae* strain P1.01.01B03, with an area under the empirical curve

(AUC) threshold of 36 (first quartile), shows that for seven dates, all three replicates are

below this threshold (the dates are marked with a red dot). (C) The internal phage control,

Ghuch01, with an inhibition percentage threshold of 98% (first quartile), indicates that for

two dates, all three replicates are below this threshold (the dates are marked with a red

dot).

S8 Fig. Histogram showing the distribution of inhibition percentages within the 0.05 to

0.95 probability range, displaying an approximately symmetric and unimodal shape.

S9 Fig. Results of additional experiments on five potentially stimulating phages and five

potentially stimulated bacteria.

Generally, bacterial populations decreased in the presence of phages. In 7% 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.

1214

S1 Table. Phage-bacterium matrices representing the percentage of inhibition of bacterial

growth (A) and the statistical significance of inhibition (B).

Rows correspond to bacterial strains, while columns represent phage clones, each annotated

with their respective phylogroups and genera.

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.* (32) for B, N, C2, R2 and S, and in Moury *et al.* (89)

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.

S3 Table. Genetic analysis of the 88 prophages identified in the 44 *P. syringae* strains using

VIRIDIC.

The 27 reference phages are highlighted in yellow (25 from the collection described in Feltin

et al. (65) and 3 from NCBI). Species and genus-level clusters of the prophages are indicated

on the right in colour. High genetic similarities are highlighted in green.

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).

1237