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 ($\lambda = 1.0$; LR test ($\lambda = 0$): 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 ϕ	**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 φ	**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 φ; 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 $MgSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$, 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 (S6 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/) (S7 Table). 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: χ^2/df = 0.65; PCA-derived: χ^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

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.

1129

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.

1192

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 ($p \leq 0.05$) 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).

1214

Figure

Figure

Figure