Title: *Corylus avellana* disease management: using metagenomics to illuminate the rhizosphere

microbiome of hazelnut

Authors: John K. Robinson[1], John M. Steele[1], Thomas J. Molnar[2], Sharon Regan[1], George C.

diCenzo[1*]

Affiliations: [1] Department of Biology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

[2] Department of Plant Biology, Rutgers University, Newark, New Jersey, USA

* Corresponding author: George C. diCenzo, george.dicenzo@queensu.ca

Keywords: Hazelnut, Rhizosphere, Metagenomics, Microbiome, Plant-Microbe Interaction

ABSTRACT

The European hazelnut, *Corylus avellana*, is one of the most economically important tree nut crops

globally. The biotrophic ascomycete pathogen *Anisogramma anomala*, found naturally associated

with wild *C. americana*, continues to pose a significant threat to European hazelnut production

across North America. Here, metagenomics was used to examine the taxonomic and functional

features of the rhizosphere microbial communities of hazelnut trees differing in their levels of

resistance to *A. anomala*: highly tolerant *Corylus americana*, and resistant and susceptible *Corylus*

avellana. No statistically significant differences in microbial alpha diversity or beta diversity were

noted between the three rhizosphere groups. Compared to bulk soil, all three rhizosphere groups

were enriched for the fungal phylum Basidiomycota and bacterial phylum "*Candidatus*

Rokubacteriota". At the genus level, the bacterial genera *Actinospica*, *Occallatibacter*, and

"*Candidatus* Sulfotelmatobacter" were under-represented, while the genus *Rhizobacter* was over-

represented, in the resistant and susceptible *C. avellana* rhizosphere samples compared to the bulk

soil. A total of 45 dereplicated, high-quality metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) were

generated, corresponding to 41 bacteria and 4 archaea. Many of the MAGs carried multiple

biosynthetic gene clusters, including MAGs corresponding to the genera *Lysobacter* and

Actinospica. Overall, the low differentiation of the rhizosphere microbiomes suggest that

differences in *A. anomala* disease expression are likely not associated with differences in the

rhizosphere microbiome. Nevertheless, the results shed new light on the rhizosphere communities

of two species of hazelnut, and woody perennials more broadly, and identify potential avenues for

future research into the development of microbial inoculants for *Corylus* spp..

INTRODUCTION

Hazelnut cultivation has a rich history and is still of economic importance in contemporary

societies. The European hazelnut *Corylus avellana* has been cultivated since Roman times

(Boccacci and Botta 2009) and remains one of the world's principal tree nut crops (Helmstetter et

al. 2020). Approximately 70% percent of the world's hazelnuts are presently grown in Turkey

(Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations 2021), but the future of Turkey's

hazelnut industry remains uncertain. To stabilize existing hazelnut production and supply growing

global demand, the world's hazelnut orchards must expand across suitable growing regions.

Historically, commercial production of *C. avellana* in North America outside of the Pacific

Northwest was limited due to the devastating impact of the biotrophic ascomycete pathogen

Anisogramma anomala (Molnar 2011; Revord et al. 2020; Thompson et al. 1996). Unlike the

native but not-commercially amenable American hazelnut species, *Corylus americana*, that is

native to North America and resistant or highly tolerant of *A. anomala* infection, European

hazelnut is generally highly susceptible. In susceptible hosts, *A. anomala* infection results in the

formation of perennial cankers that girdle branches, culminating in tree death (Pinkerton 1995).

Current management practices are both costly and labour intensive relying on pruning and large

quantities of fungicides (Jeger et al. 2018). Further, it is documented that the *C. avellana* host

protection imparted through widely disseminated resistance (R) genes from *C. avellana* 'Gasaway'

in Oregon and other R genes mapped to the same linkage group, have been overcome in certain

regions (Jacobs et al. 2024a). Consequently, there is a pressing need to identify alternate strategies,

such as biocontrol, to reduce the impact of *A. anomala* on hazelnut cultivation.

A potential source of biocontrol agents is the native microbial community associated with

a plant species of interest. The plant microbiome is typically divided into three major regions: the

phyllosphere, representing the above-ground surface regions occupied by microbes; the

endosphere, representing the regions comprised of the plant's inner tissues; and the rhizosphere,

which refers to the thin layer of soil surrounding plant roots (Gupta et al. 2021; Santoyo 2022;

Zhang et al. 2021). The rhizosphere ecosystem is particularly complex (Jones and Hinsinger 2008)

laden with an exceptional diversity of life (Dlamini et al. 2022; Zhang et al. 2020). These plant

root-associated microbial communities have been referred to as the plant's second genome

(Berendsen et al. 2012), as they are capable of profoundly extending the plant's functional

potential (Bakker et al. 2013a). Notable examples of plant benefits conferred through these

associations include enhanced nutrient availability and improved tolerance to both biotic and

abiotic stress (Bakker et al. 2013b; Hakim et al. 2021; Pantigoso et al. 2022).

Importantly, rhizosphere microbial populations can be influenced by both the plant

genotype and its disease state (Liu et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2021; Liu et al. 2023a). Though conflicting

evidence has been reported (Fitzpatrick et al. 2018), increasing host plant phylogenetic distance

has been associated with less similar bacterial rhizosphere composition (Bouffaud et al. 2014; Lei

et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2023b), while two genotypes of the same plant species can possess similar

but distinguishable microbial populations (Peiffer et al. 2013). Likewise, domestication has been

found to influence microbiome assembly and metabolic functions (Yue et al. 2023).

At the same time, rhizosphere microbial communities may be modified based on plant root

secretions, with plants potentially recruiting and stimulating disease suppressive microbial taxa in

response to pathogens as a means of improving disease outcomes (Liu et al. 2023a). Rhizosphere

microbes may mitigate plant disease through antagonistic microbe-microbe interactions (Hassani

et al. 2018), priming of the plant immune system via induced systemic resistance (ISR) (Yu et al.

2022), and enhanced nutrient acquisition (Dordas 2008; Dotaniya and Meena 2015). Microbes that

exhibit these properties may therefore prove useful in disease management, through serving as

biopesticides, enhancing systemic plant disease tolerance through eliciting ISR, or by bolstering

overall plant vigour through facilitating nutrient acquisition. The rhizosphere microbiome is

therefore worth examining as a promising reservoir of disease attenuating agents, and

characterizing interactions between plant roots and their surrounding organisms has demonstrated

extensive promise for the improvement of economically valuable crops (Orozco-Mosqueda et al.

2022).

Unfortunately, the rhizosphere of woody perennial plants remains understudied relative to

annual crops. Despite the relative paucity of research in this area, the diverse utility of woody

perennial associated rhizosphere microbes has been validated by numerous studies. For example,

phosphate solubilizing microbes with plant growth promoting potential have been reported in the

peach rhizosphere (Li et al. 2025), highlighting the prospect of leveraging rhizosphere microbial

communities to enhance woody perennial vigour. In addition, the promise of certain walnut-

associated plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) for enhancing drought tolerance (Lotfi

et al. 2022) illustrates the abiotic stress ameliorating potential of microbes in the woody perennial

rhizosphere. Further, examples of the capacity of rhizosphere microbes to aid in combating biotic

stress have been reported for woody perennial crops including apple (Berdeni et al. 2018;

Derikvand et al. 2023), pear (Zhang et al. 2023), plum (Ali et al. 2018), and citrus (Ezrari et al.

2021). Collectively, these studies suggest woody perennial rhizosphere microbes may aid in

addressing several significant challenges facing woody perennial cultivation.

In the current study, shotgun metagenomics was used to investigate the rhizosphere

microbiome of North American grown hazelnut plants. To investigate the effect of genotype and

disease resistant phenotypes, samples were collected from an orchard infected with *A. anomala*

and were taken from the rhizospheres of native *C. americana* plants and *C. avellana* genotypes

that are resistant or susceptible to *A. anomala* infection. By gaining insight into the taxonomic and

functional features of hazelnut trees, this study broadens the scope of available genomic

information relevant to hazelnut improvement, including for disease management, and may help

guide future identification of biocontrol agents.

METHODS

Soil sample collection

Bulk soil and rhizosphere samples were collected from Hort Farm 3, 67 Ryders Lane, East

Brunswick, NJ 08816, between 1:00 PM and 4:00 PM on 19 October 2022. Soils were collected

using a small shovel that was sterilized with 70% ethanol before each sample collection, and

transferred to sterile 50 mL tubes. Soils from highly tolerant *C. americana* trees were collected

from row 1 of the farm. Soils from *C. avellana* trees collected from row 3 were divided into two

groups segregating for disease resistance, designated resistant and susceptible, based on the

presence or absence of pronounced *A. anomala* cankers. Five soil samples were collected for each

of the three hazelnut varieties; samples were collected at a depth of approximately 15 cm,

approximately 15 cm away from the trunk of the tree. In addition, five bulk soil samples were

collected at a depth of approximately 15 cm from five sites around the periphery of the hazelnut

orchard.

DNA isolation and sequencing

Approximately one hour after sample collection was complete, ~0.42 g subsamples of soil were

taken from each soil sample. DNA extraction was performed using a Qiagen DNeasy PowerSoil

Pro Kit, according to the manufacturer's instructions. One of the bulk soil samples was omitted

from downstream analysis due to failure of the DNA extraction. All other DNA samples were

subsequently refrigerated until they were shipped to Génome Québec (Montréal, Quebec, Canada)

for library preparation and Illumina sequencing. For samples B2, B3, B5, R1P5, R1P9, R1P14,

R3P3, R3P15, R3P20, R3P9-, R3P10-, R3P12- (**Table S1**), library preparation was performed

using the NxSeq® AmpFREE Low DNA Library Preparation Kit (Lucigen) using the Xp protocol,

as suggested by the manufacturer. These samples were sequenced using 150-bp paired-end

technology on an Illumina NovaSeq 6000 instrument. For samples B4, R1P1, R1P18, R3P5,

R3P11, R3P14-, R3P18- (**Table S1**), library preparation was performed using the Illumina® DNA

PCR-Free Prep, Tagmentation Kit following the manufacturer's recommendations. These samples

were likewise sequenced using 150-bp paired-end technology, but on an Illumina NovaSeq X Plus

instrument.

Taxonomic classification of the raw Illumina reads

Illumina reads were taxonomically classified using Kraken (v2.1.3) (Wood et al. 2019) using a

database consisting of the bacteria, archaea, fungi, and virus reference libraries, and post-processed

using Bracken (v2.7) (Lu et al. 2017). Alpha diversity and beta diversity measurements were

determined based on the species-level output of Bracken. Diversity measurements were

determined, analyzed, and visualized in R (v4.5.1) (R Core Team 2025) using the tidyverse

(v2.0.0) (Wickham et al. 2019), dplyr (v1.1.4) (Wickham et al. 2018) , phyloseq (v1.52.0)

(McMurdie and Holmes 2013), stats (v4.5.1) (R Core Team 2025), ggpubr (v0.6.1) (Kassambara

2025), vegan (v2.7.1) (Oksanen et al. 2024), pairwiseAdonis (v0.4.1) (Martinez Arbizu 2017),

ggplot2 (v4.0.0) (Wickham 2009), and patchwork (v1.3.2) (Pedersen 2019) packages.

KrakenTools (v1.2) (Lu et al. 2022) and KronaTools (v2.8) (Ondov et al. 2011) were used to

generate krona plots.

Metagenome assembly and binning

Illumina reads were filtered using BBduk (v39.06) (Bushnell 2014) and trimmed using

Trimmomatic (v0.39) (Bolger et al. 2014) with the parameters: LEADING:3 TRAILING:3

SLIDINGWINDOW:4:15 MINLEN:36. Following trimming, metagenomes were assembled

using MEGAHIT (v1.2.9) (Li et al. 2015) with the "presets" option set to "meta-large".

Metagenome assembly statistics were calculated using the stats.sh script of BBMap (v37.36)

(Bushnell 2014). In addition, to confirm that the alpha and beta diversity metrics were not

confounded by differences in sequencing depth, seqtk (v1.3) (https://github.com/lh3/seqtk) was

used to filter the trimmed reads to obtain a subset corresponding to 90% of the number of reads

from the sample with the fewest reads. These reduced read sets were then used for metagenome

assembly using MEGAHIT with the "presets" option set to "meta-large".

Assembly of metagenome-assembled genomes

Prior to binning, contigs less than 1500 bp were discarded using pullseq (v1.0.2)

(https://github.com/bcthomas/pullseq). Next, an all-against-all mapping of the Illumina reads

against each metagenome was performed using bowtie2 (v2.4.5) (Langmead and Salzberg 2012)

and sorted using samtools (v1.15.1) (Li et al. 2009). Binning was then performed independently

for each sample using MetaBAT2 (v2.14) (Kang et al. 2019), CONCOCT (v1.1.0) (Alneberg et

al. 2014), MaxBin2 (v2.2.7) (Wu et al. 2016), and SemiBin2 (v2.1.0) (Pan et al. 2023). From each

of the metagenomes, an optimized set of MAGs was produced using DAS_Tool (v1.1.4) (Sieber

et al. 2018) and the output of the four binning algorithms. In addition, bins were generated with

VAMB (v4.1.3) (Nissen et al. 2021, 20), using all metagenomes and with read mapping performed

using minimap2 (v2.24-r1122) (Li 2018). Finally, a non-redundant set of high-quality MAGs (>

70% completeness; < 10% contamination) was generated from all the produced MAGs using dRep

(v3.4.1) (Olm et al. 2017) and a secondary clustering threshold of 99%. The dependencies for dRep

included Mash (v2.3) (Ondov et al. 2016) MUMmer (v4.0.0rc1) (Kurtz et al. 2004), CheckM

(v1.2.2) (Parks et al. 2015), Prodigal (v2.6.3) (Hyatt et al. 2010), and pplacer (v1.1.alpha19)

(Matsen et al. 2010).

Taxonomic classification of the assembled metagenomes

Prior to taxonomic classification, contigs less than 500 bp were discarded using pullseq. Contigs

were taxonomically classified using MMSeqs2 (v0a6b8c) (Steinegger and Söding 2017) with the

UniRef90 database (downloaded 18 July 2024). Custom scripts were used to convert the MMSeqs2

output data into taxa abundance tables, with taxa abundances calculated as the sum of contig length

multiplied by contig sequencing depth for all contigs with a given taxonomic classification. Alpha

diversity and beta diversity metrics were determined, analyzed, and visualized in R using the

tidyverse, ggplot2, dplyr, phyloseq, stats, ggpubr, vegan, pairwiseAdonis, and patchwork

packages. The relative abundances of the taxa with an average relative abundance of at least 1.0%

were visualized as bubble plots and stacked bar plots with R's ggplot2, patchwork, and

randomcoloR (v1.1.0.1) (Ammar 2019) packages. Lastly, the R packages ANCOMBC2 (v2.10.1)

(Lin and Peddada 2024) and microbiome (v1.30.0) (Lahti and Shetty 2019) were used to identify

statistically significant differences in taxa abundances for taxa with an average relative abundance

of at least 0.1% across samples. Differentially abundant taxa were then visualized in R using the

pheatmap (v1.0.13) (Kolde 2025) package.

Taxonomic classification of metagenome-assembled genomes

MAGs were taxonomically classified using GTDB-Tk (v2.4.0) with the R220 database and the

classify_wf workflow (Chaumeil et al. 2020). To construct a phylogeny of the bacterial MAGs,

the identify function of GTDB-Tk was used to identify homologs of the bac120 gene set, following

which the align function of GTDB-Tk was used to align each marker set and then concatenate the

alignments. Lastly, the concatenated alignment was used to construct a maximum likelihood

phylogeny using IQ-TREE2 (v2.2.2.4) (Minh et al. 2020). First, ModelFinder (Kalyaanamoorthy

et al. 2017), was used to identify the best scoring model based on Bayesian information criterion

(BIC). Then, IQ-TREE2 was run using the best-scoring model (LG+F+R5) with branch support

assessed using the Shimodaira–Hasegawa-like approximate likelihood ratio test (SH-aLRT) and

ultrafast jackknife analysis with a subsampling proportion of 40%, with both metrics calculated

from 1,000 replicates. Phylogenies were visualized using iTOL (Letunic and Bork 2024).

Characterization of the metabolic potential of the metagenomes and MAGs

Prior to functional annotation, contigs less than 1000 bp were discarded from the metagenomes

using pullseq. Next, DRAM (v0.1.2) (Shaffer et al. 2020), as implemented on the KBase platform

(Arkin et al. 2018), was used to annotate all metagenomes and MAGs. For the metagenomes, the

KEGG annotations were extracted from the annotation file, and a Bray-Curtis distance matrix was

produced and visualized using a Principal Coordinate Analysis in R with the ggplot2, dplyr,

phyloseq, and patchwork packages. Statistical analyses were performed in R using the vegan and

pairwiseAdonis packages. Group specific functional differences were determined and visualized

using the dplyr, stats, dunn.test (v1.3.6) (Dinno 2024), and ggplot2 packages.

Prior to annotation of BGCs, contigs less than 500 bp were discarded from the

metagenomes using pullseq. BGCs were identified in the reduced metagenomes using antiSMASH

(v7.0) (Blin et al. 2023) with default parameters, after which BiG-SCAPE (v1.1.8) (Navarro-

Muñoz et al. 2020) was run with default parameters to examine BGC diversity across the

metagenomes. Likewise, BGCs were identified in the MAGs using antiSMASH and BiG-SCAPE.

The output files were processed and visualized as heatmaps in R using the dplyr, ggplot2 and

patchwork packages.

227   **RESULTS**

Hazelnut rhizosphere sampling

Rhizosphere samples were collected from 15 hazelnut trees situated at Rutgers University Hort

Farm 3, East Brunswick, New Jersey, USA, in October 2022. Five samples were collected from

each of the following tree types: native *C. americana* plants (henceforth referred to as "native"),

C. avellana resistant to *A. anomala* (henceforth referred to as "resistant), and susceptible *C.*

avellana (henceforth referred to as "susceptible"). The *C. americana* plants were derived from

open pollinated seeds obtained from wild plants in Dearborn, Michigan, whereas the *C. avellana*

plants were the product of a controlled cross of a H4AR21P05 (Jacobs et al. 2024b) female (open

pollinated seed from Warsaw, Poland) with a OSU 474.084 ('Lewis' x 'Tonda di Giffoni') x OSU

540.084 (a full sibling of 'Sacajawea') male pollen source, obtained from Shawn Mehlenbacher

of Oregon State University. These *C. avellana* plants were expected to segregate for a resistance

(R) gene originating from Poland (Capik et al., 2013). The two groups of *C. avellana* trees used

for this study, therefore, represent full siblings with the resistant group expressing no signs or

symptoms of disease and the susceptible expressing obvious signs of infection with pronounced

cankers and stem dieback predicated on segregation of the major R gene. At the time of collection,

the trees were ~6 years of age and have maintained consistent disease phenotypes for ~8 years as

of 2024. All rhizosphere samples were collected from soils adjacent to tree roots, at a depth of ~

15 cm and a radius of ~ 15 cm from the trunk of the tree. For comparison, five bulk soil samples

(not near tree roots) were also collected from a depth of ~ 15 cm around the orchard; however, the

DNA isolation from one bulk soil sample failed, leaving us with four bulk soil samples.

Metagenomic sequencing and assembly statistics

Illumina 150 bp paired-end sequencing was used to characterize the microbial community of each

of the soil samples, generating between ~ 35 million and ~118 million paired-end reads per sample

(**Table S1**), of which between ~ 31 million and ~ 113 million survived quality control (**Table S1**).

Metagenome assembly using MEGAHIT resulted in assemblies of 544 Mb to 4007 Mb in size,

with N50 values between 446 kb and 2260 kb (**Table S1**). When limiting the metagenomes to

contigs of at least 0.5 kb in size, the assemblies averaged 612 Mb and contained an average of

768,075 contigs (**Table S1**). Likewise, when limiting the metagenomes to contigs of at least 1 kb

in size, the assemblies averaged 187 Mb and contained an average of 115,156 contigs (**Table S1**).

Taxonomic characterization of the hazelnut rhizosphere

Initially, the community composition of each rhizosphere and bulk soil sample was evaluated

based on the raw Illumina reads using Kraken2 and Bracken, with a database consisting of the

bacteria, archaea, fungi, and virus reference libraries. However, the rate of classification by

Kraken2 was low, with just 0.80% to 1.77% of reads assigned a taxonomy (**Table S2**).

Consequently, we instead used MMSeqs2 with the UniRef90 database, to taxonomically classify

the assembled contigs (minimum contig size of 0.5 kb); using this approach, contigs encompassing

between 6% and 31% of reads were assigned a taxonomy (**Table S2**). Overall, the metagenomes

were dominated by bacteria, with 82% to 96% of reads mapping to the classified contigs

corresponding to bacteria, compared to 1.0% to 9.5% and 0.3% to 3.8% for archaea and

eukaryotes, respectively.

Alpha diversity (Shannon diversity index and Simpson diversity index [1-D]) was

calculated from the MMSeqs2 output (**Figures 1A, 1B**). No statistically significant differences

were observed between sample groups using either of the diversity measures. However, both

diversity metrics displayed a trend of the bulk soil samples having lower diversity than the

rhizosphere samples; indeed, statistically significant differences were detected for both diversity

metrics when comparing bulk soil versus all rhizosphere samples grouped as a single treatment

(Kruskal-Wallis p-value < 0.05 for both metrics). In addition, although not statistically significant,

there appeared to be greater between-replicate variance in the diversity metrics for the non-native

C. avellana compared to native *C. americana* samples, perhaps suggesting that the rhizosphere

microbial community of the non-native plants was less stably assembled than that of the native

plants.

Beta diversity was calculated at the species level using Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (**Figure

1C**). Statistically significant differences (PERMANOVA p-value < 0.001) in beta diversity were

observed between the control and each of the three rhizosphere sample groups, providing support

that the rhizosphere samples were correctly collected and were reflective of the rhizosphere

community. However, no significant differences were observed between the native, resistant, and

susceptible rhizosphere samples, suggesting that plant genotype or disease state had little to no

impact on the rhizosphere microbiome at a global level.

To ensure that the diversity metrics were not being skewed by differences in read depth,

the sequencing reads were subsampled to achieve equivalent read numbers (following QC), after

which metagenomes were reassembled and MMSeqs2 rerun. The alpha and beta diversity metrics

were then recalculated from these data. This process produced qualitatively similar results for the

alpha and beta diversity metrics (**Figure S1**), indicating that the observed diversity values were

not heavily skewed by differences in read counts between samples.

Differentially abundant taxa

The relative abundances of major taxa were investigated across samples at the phylum and genus

levels (**Figures 2 and 3**). Initial, qualitative examination of the data revealed that all samples were

dominated by the bacterial phyla *Actinomycetota*, *Pseudomonadota*, and *Acidobacteriota* (**Figure**

2A). At the genus level, the three most abundant taxa were the common soil bacteria

Bradyrhizobium, *Gaiella*, and *Nocardioides* (**Figure 3A**). Although the archaea represented only

a minority of the metagenomes, the archaeal component was dominated by the phylum

Thermoproteota (syn. *Nitrosophaerota*) (**Figure 2B**), driven by the abundance of the genera

Nitrososphaera and "*Candidatus* Nitrosocosmicus" (**Figure 3B**). Lastly, examination of the

eukaryotic taxa revealed the phylum Basidiomycota was substantially enriched in the rhizosphere

samples relative to the bulk soil control, while the phylum Ascomycota also appeared somewhat

enriched in many of the rhizosphere samples (**Figure 2C**). The differential abundance of the

phylum Basidiomycota was driven mostly by the genera *Hebeloma*, *Laccaria*, *Galerina*, and

Scleroderma, while the differential abundance of the phylum Ascomycota was driven mostly by

the genus *Morchella* and to a lesser extent the genus *Terfezia* (**Figure 3C**). It is important to note,

however, that some unexpected eukaryotic taxa were identified in relatively high abundance, such

as the shark genus *Chiloscyllium* (**Figure 3C**). This may be the result of poor taxonomic

classification of the eukaryotic contigs and/or the overall low abundance of eukaryotes in the data.

Regardless, it does suggest that caution should be taken in interpreting the abundance data for the

eukaryotic taxa.

Following qualitative assessment of the abundance data, ANCOMBC2 was used for

quantitative assessment of differential abundances of the taxa accounting for at least 0.1% of the

overall relative abundances of the communities. At the phylum level, the eukaryotic phylum

Basidiomycota and the bacterial phylum "*Candidatus* Rokuibacteriota" appeared enriched in all

three rhizosphere groups relative to the bulk soil controls with (log2[fold change] $\geq$ 3.9 and 2.3,

for Basidiomycota and "*Candidatus* Rokuibacteriota", respectively; **Figure 2A**). On the other

hand, the bacterial phylum *Verrucomicrobiota* appeared underrepresented specifically in the

rhizosphere communities of the "resistant" *C. avellana* plants relative to the bulk soil controls

(log2[fold change] of -1.2; **Figure 2A**). At the genus level, the three rhizosphere groups were

depleted in the bacterial genera *Trebonia* (log2[fold change] $\leq$ -2.6) and *Actinomadura* (log2[fold

change] $\leq$ -1.3) relative to the bulk soil (**Figure 3D**). Compared to the bulk soil controls, the

resistant and susceptible *C. avellana* samples (but not the *C. americana* samples) both had an

underrepresentation of the bacterial genera *Actinospica* (log2[fold change] $\leq$ -1.4), *Occallatibacter*

(log2[fold change] $\leq$ -2.8) and "*Candidatus* Sulfotelmatobacter" (log2[fold change] $\leq$ -2.9), while

the bacterial genus *Rhizobacter* appeared enriched (log2[fold change] $\geq$ 1.5) (**Figure 3D**). The

resistant *C. avellana* samples also appeared depleted in the bacterial genera *Amycolatopsis*

(log2[fold change] of -1.2), *Actinocrinis* (log2[fold change] of -1.4), and *Edaphobacter* (log2[fold

change] of -1.7) and enriched in *Phycicoccus* (log2[fold change] of 1.3), *Ilumatobacter* (log2[fold

change] of 1.9), and *Anatilimnocola* (log2[fold change] of 1.8) relative to the bulk soil (**Figure**

3D). Lastly, the bacterial genus *Microbacterium* was enriched in the resistant *C. avellana* samples

relative to the native variety (log2[fold change] of 2.0) (**Figure 3D**). *Microbacterium* also visually

appeared to be enriched in the susceptible *C. avellana* compared to the native variety although this

difference was not statistically significant.

Functional overview of the metagenomes

DRAM was used for functional annotation of all contigs of at least 1 kb in length, and the relative

abundance of genes assigned KEGG annotations were used to construct a PCoA plot using Bray-

Curtis dissimilarities as a general overview of the functional differentiation of each sample (**Figure**

4). Although global differences between samples were detected (PERMANOVA p-value of

0.031), no statistically significant differences were noted for any of the pairwise comparisons

between sample groups. However, although not statistically significant, there did appear to be a

slight trend towards the native *C. americana* and resistant *C. avellana* samples grouping together

and separating from the sensitive *C. avellana* and bulk soil. Likewise, no clear differences were

noted between sample types when comparing the presence of various functions and pathways

related to carbohydrate metabolism, methanogenesis and methanotrophy, nitrogen metabolism,

short-chain fatty acid and alcohol conversions, and sulfur metabolism (**Figure S2**). Overall, these

results indicate that there was little functional differentiation between the sample types at a global

level.

In addition, prokaryotic biosynthetic gene clusters (BGCs) were annotated in all

metagenome assemblies (limited to contigs of at least 0.5 kb) using the program antiSMASH. BiG-

SCAPE was then used to group the antiSMASH annotations based on the class and predicted

products of the BGCs (**Figure 5**). The distribution of BGCs across samples was largely similar,

regardless of the sample group, with BGCs associated with aryl polyenes, indoles, nonribosomal

peptides, phosphonates, ribosomally synthesized and post-translationally modified peptides,

polyketides, terpenes, and thioamitides detected across the majority of samples.

Reconstruction and characterization of metagenome-assembled genomes

Following dereplication using an average nucleotide identity (ANI) threshold of 99%, 45 high-

quality (completeness $\geq$ 70%, contamination $\leq$ 10%) metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs)

were constructed from the dataset and taxonomically categorized with GTDB-Tk, including 41

bacterial and 4 archaeal MAGs (**Figure 6, Table S3**). Interestingly, only one of the 45 MAGs

could be taxonomically classified at the species level when using the Genome Taxonomy Database

Toolkit (GTDB-Tk) with database R220, while an additional nine were classified to the genus

level. The four archaeal MAGs represent four distinct species from three genera within the family

Nitrososphaeraceae (phylum *Thermoproteota*). On the other hand, nine phyla are represented

amongst the 41 bacterial MAGs, with the majority of MAGs belonging to the phyla

Actinomycetota (21 MAGs), *Pseudomonadota* (9 MAGs), and *Acidobacteriota* (6 MAGs). MAGs

were functionally annotated with DRAM, and a summary of the results are provided as **Figure S3**.

In addition, antiSMASH and BiG-SCAPE were used to detect and summarize the abundance of

BGCs in the MAGs, and these results are summarized in **Figure S4**.

376   **DISCUSSION**

The hazelnut rhizosphere microbiome showed only minor differences compared to bulk soil

Previous studies examining bacterial community structure in the roots of woody plants (*Quercus*,

Populus, and *Pinus*) found that bacterial community structure was shaped more strongly by host

tree species than by soil origin (Bonito et al. 2014). We therefore expected to see differences

between the microbial community of the rhizosphere samples compared to the bulk soil samples.

As expected, the bulk soil samples were clearly delineated from the rhizosphere samples based on

the alpha and beta diversity measures. This differentiation appeared to be mainly driven by changes

in the frequencies of low abundance taxa as we observed few differences in the relative abundances

of the primary taxa (those with relative abundances $\geq 0.1\%$). However, the current study examined

only a single time point. Considering that another study observed that the prokaryotic component

of the maize rhizosphere only differed from bulk soil at specific stages of plant development

(Wattenburger et al. 2019), it may be that sampling at a different time of year, or sampling deeper

roots, would reveal more dramatic changes in the hazelnut rhizosphere microbial community

structure than observed here.

Few differences were observed between the microbial communities of the different

hazelnut genotypes, contrary to our expectation (Lopes et al. 2023). Likewise, we observed little

difference between *C. avellana* plants that were or were not infected with *A. anomala*, despite

previous studies observing that foliar pathogens can indirectly impact rhizosphere microbial

communities in ways that could potentially have positive impacts on plant disease tolerance

(Berendsen et al. 2018; Jiang et al. 2023; Luo et al., 2022; Yang et al. 2020). While these results

could suggest that hazelnut genotype and disease status have little impact on the rhizosphere

microbiome, it may also be that differences would be more pronounced at other times of the year,

or that deeper sequencing and/or taxonomic classification of a higher portion of the contigs would

reveal additional differences missed here.

Composition of the hazelnut microbial community

Composition of the hazelnut microbial community

We found that the fungal phylum Basidiomycota was enriched in all rhizosphere samples relative

to bulk soil. Likewise, the fungal phyla Ascomycota appeared slightly enriched in the rhizosphere

samples, although Ascomycota did not meet the 0.1% relative abundance threshold used to retain

abundant taxa from the results of ANCOMBC2. Interestingly, a separate study reported

Ascomycota, Basidiomycota, and Mortierellomycota as the dominant fungal phyla in the

rhizosphere of hazelnut varieties grown in Beijing, China (Ma et al. 2021). Similarly, the phyla

Basidiomycota and Ascomycota were the dominant fungal phyla in the rhizosphere of the

deciduous shrub *Paeonia ludlowii*, with Basidiomycota being the most dominant in the autumn

(Qiao et al. 2023). Overall, the consistency in these results provides support that our rhizosphere

samples accurately capture the hazelnut rhizosphere microbiome.

Although there is limited data on the effects of bacteria on hazelnut tree health and growth,

one study reported that inoculation of *C. avellana* seedlings with the bacteria *Pseudomonas putida*,

B. subtilis, and *Enterobacter cloacae* can improve growth (Rostamikia et al. 2017). Therefore, we

wished to use our metagenomics data to help identify microbes in the hazelnut rhizosphere

microbiome that could potentially be targets to develop into biocontrol agents to limit the impact

of *A. anomala* infection. To this end, we focused on the microbes that were either enriched or

depleted in the hazelnut microbiome. One taxon of particular interest based on the relative and

differential abundance data was the bacterial phylum "*Candidatus* Rokuibacteriota", which was

enriched in all three rhizosphere groups relative to bulk soil. "*Candidatus* Rokuibacteriota" have

large genomes with high GC content, with the capacity for multifaceted mixotrophic metabolism

(Becraft et al. 2017). Bacteria from this phylum have also been reported to encode numerous

biosynthetic loci in their genomes (Sharrar et al. 2020). Consequently, members of this phylum

exhibit characteristics of relevance for biocontrol applications, and we suggest that their utility

should be explored within this context.

On the other hand, the bacterial genera *Actinospica*, *Occallatibacter*, and "*Candidatus*

Sulfotelmatobacter" were depleted in the susceptible and tolerant varieties of *C. avellana* relative

to bulk soil, unlike the native *C. americana* variety. *Actinospica* may be of particular note for *A.*

anomala disease management, as there is an ongoing interest in the efficacy of acidophilic

actinomycetes as biocontrol agents against phytopathogenic fungi (Poomthongdee et al. 2015).

Supplementing the abundance of this genus in the *C. avellana* microbiome may therefore be a

strategy worth exploring for *A. anomala* disease management.

In terms of eukaryotic microbes, associations with mycorrhizal fungi have been shown to

enhance disease tolerance in woody perennials (Dong et al. 2021; Kebert et al. 2022), and a variety

of additional benefits have been described for mycorrhizal associated hazelnut trees. In *C.*

avellana, association with the ectomycorrhizal forming fungus *Tuber melanosporum* was reported

to regulate important plant defense genes, which may favourably impact the host plant's response

to stress (Sillo et al. 2022). Inoculation of hybrid hazel (*C. heterophylla* x *C. avellana*) seedlings

with the ectomycorrhizal fungus *Scleroderma bovista* was reported to promote growth, enhancing

photosynthetic efficiency and total plant weight (Cheng et al. 2024). In addition, inoculation with

the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus iranicum* var. *tenuihypharum* was found to increase the

number of female flowers and overall yield in the Tonda di Giffoni variety of *C. avellana* by 60%

and 38%, respectively, relative to the uninoculated control (Luciani et al. 2019). In our study, the

fungal genera *Hebeloma*, *Galerina*, *Laccaria*, *Morchella*, *Terfezia*, and *Scleroderma* appeared

enriched in the three groups of rhizosphere samples, relative to the control group; however, as the

overall relative abundance of fungi across samples was generally low, most of these taxa did not

meet the 0.1% relative abundance threshold required to be retained in the results from

ANCOMBC2. Isolates of species from these fungal taxa from the hazelnut rhizosphere may

therefore represent interesting candidates to explore for plant growth promotion and/or biocontrol

against *A. anomala* in North America.

Primary metabolism of the hazelnut rhizosphere microbiome

Rhizosphere microbes play important roles in nutrient cycling and availability (Thepbandit and

Athinuwat 2024) and consequently, they can impact plant nutrition and thus disease tolerance. For

example, nitrogen availability can impact both physical and biochemical defence mechanisms in

plants, yet the consequences of enhanced endogenous nitrogen can be difficult to anticipate, as

they may be favourable or detrimental to plant pathogen tolerance depending on context (Sun et

al. 2020). In our study, global differences in the KEGG metabolic annotations (PERMANOVA p-

value of 0.031) were observed between samples, however no pairwise differences were detected

between sample groups.

Pathways involved in nitrogen metabolism were well represented across most samples

including ammonia oxidation, conversion of nitrate to nitrite, nitrite to nitrate, nitrite to nitric

oxide, and nitric oxide to nitrous oxide. Though less common, some bulk soil and rhizosphere

samples possessed the capacity for nitrite reduction to ammonia. As nitrate serves as the major

source of nitrogen for most land plants in aerobic soils (Ho and Tsay 2010), the presence of

pathways involved in the production of nitrate across samples highlights the capacity of microbes

within these systems to facilitate the production of bioavailable nitrogen for hazelnut. Bioavailable

sulfur can also have drastic impacts on plant disease outcomes. For example, inorganic sulfate

salts can significantly enhance the resistance of plants to certain fungal pathogens, through a

process deemed sulfur-induced resistance (SIR) (Künstler et al. 2020). Here, pathways responsible

for the conversion of thiosulfate to sulfate were well represented across all samples besides one of

the Susceptible samples. As both bioavailable nitrogenous and sulfur-containing compounds have

been demonstrated to alter plant disease tolerance (Bloem et al. 2015; Mur et al. 2017) the

application of certain microbial communities that alter the abundance of bioavailable forms of

these compounds within the soil may be explored as an alternative means of broadly improving

plant health.

Many of the MAGs generated in this study, particularly those within the orders *Gaiellales*

and *Hyphomicrobiales* (syn. *Rhizobiales*), encoded pathways involved in the conversion of nitrite

to nitric oxide (NO). NO can be generated endogenously in plants and performs important

functions in various physiological responses and developmental stages (Hancock 2020; Sun et al.

2021), with roles in plant tolerance to abiotic and biotic stress (Fancy et al. 2017, 201; Mur et al.

2017). Exogenous application of NO, through the use of NO donors, has been shown to improve

plant disease tolerance in several instances (Nasir et al. 2020; Khan et al. 2021; Bakhoum et al.

2023). Furthermore, studies suggest that leveraging NO-producing organisms to enhance disease

tolerance in plants is a promising avenue to explore. For example, a study examining tomato

infected with *Ralstonia solanacearum* found that *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strains overproducing

NO displayed better biocontrol efficacy than those that do not overproduce NO (Wang et al. 2005).

Consequently, it would be interesting to isolate diverse strains from promising genera within the

Gaiellales and *Hyphomicrobiales* orders, which we found commonly encode the pathways for NO

production, and assess them for their impact on hazelnut disease tolerance. Of particularly interest

would be isolates that additionally have the potential to convert thiosulfate to sulfate.

Secondary metabolism of the hazelnut rhizosphere microbiome

Soil microbes represent a rich source of secondary metabolites (Sharrar et al. 2020) that perform diverse functions in ecological systems and can mediate symbioses between microbes and plants in certain contexts (Demain and Fang 2000) and ameliorate biotic stress in plants (Ruparelia et al. 2022). Analyzing the biosynthetic gene clusters (BGCs) involved in the production of secondary metabolites within the hazelnut rhizosphere, therefore, provides an opportunity to identify compounds and microbial taxa that can be screened as biological control agents in hazelnut.

In our study, no substantial differences in the distribution of BGC classes were evident between conditions, and all conditions had BGCs encoding the production of non-ribosomal peptides (NRPs), ribosomally synthesized and post-translationally modified peptides (RiPPs), and terpenes. The production of secondary metabolites of these classes has repeatedly been shown to contribute to the biocontrol potential of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPRs). For example, *Bacillus* species produce NRPs that can serve as biocontrol agents, such as iturin, surfactin, and fengycin (Ranjan et al. 2023). Likewise, species of the fungal genus *Trichoderma* have demonstrated potential as biocontrol agents (Sood et al. 2020), which could relate to the diversity of terpenoids and complex terpenes produced by these organisms (Bai et al. 2022; Lee et al. 2016).

Many of the MAGs assembled in this study have the genetic potential to produce diverse secondary metabolites. One such example is MAG-30, classified as belonging to the species "*Lysobacter yananisis*". Species of the genus *Lysobacter* have potential as biocontrol agents (Kilic-Ekici and Yuen 2003; Puopolo et al. 2014), and they produce a range of antibiotics active against numerous plant pathogens (Gómez Expósito et al. 2015; Hayward et al. 2010). Likewise, our *Lysobacter* MAG has the genetic potential to produce various secondary metabolites of

relevance for biocontrol, including NRPs, lantipeptides, polyketides, and RiPPs. Another MAG

with high biosynthetic potential is MAG-07, classified as belonging to the genus *Actinospica*.

Species of this genus have been isolated from diverse ecosystems including forest soils (Kusuma

et al. 2022; Cavaletti et al. 2006), and studies suggest that members of this genus have strong

biocontrol potential (Qi et al. 2019; Rodriguez-Mena et al. 2022). Indeed, members of the genus

Actinospica have high genetic potential to produce a wide array of secondary metabolites (Majer

et al. 2021). Likewise, our *Actinospica* MAG contains several genomic regions potentially

involved in the production of NRPs, lantipeptides, RIPPs, polyketides, and terpenes. Considering

these results, it would be interesting to isolate strains of the genera *Lysobacter* and *Actinospica*

from hazelnut rhizosphere soils and investigate their potential to serve as biocontrol strains and

reduce the susceptibility of hazelnut to *A. anomala* infection.

Conclusions

The co-evolution of plants and their resident microbial communities has resulted in a complex

dynamic where the microbial genetic complement can drastically impact important plant features.

Soil microbes participate in important biogeochemical cycles that impact plant nutrient

acquisition, while plant-associated microbes can also influence plant immunity. Here,

metagenomics was used to examine the microbial communities of three hazelnut rhizosphere

sample groups obtained from trees that displayed differing levels of resistance to the pathogen *A.*

anomala: *C. americana* (resistant), *C. avellana* (susceptible) and *C. avellana* (resistant). While the

rhizosphere samples were differentiated from the bulk soil samples, little taxonomic or functional

variation was seen between the different rhizosphere groups. A total of 45 dereplicated, high-

quality MAGs were generated, many of which carried multiple BGCs. This included two MAGs

representing organisms from the bacterial genera *Actinospica* and *Lysobacter* that have previously

been identified as potential biocontrol agents. This study serves to inform future efforts aimed at

leveraging hazelnut-associated microbes toward the improvement of diverse hazelnut features

including disease outcomes, identifying promising candidate taxa that could be isolated and

screened for their capacity to manage *A. anomala* infection. In addition, this study provides

insights into the taxonomic diversity and functional potential of the rhizosphere microbial

communities of hazelnut, expanding our understanding of the rhizosphere microbiome of woody

perennials.

Data availability

All raw Illumina sequencing data, metagenome assemblies, and MAGs are available from the

National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) under BioProject PRJNA1338491

Accessions for individual datasets are provided in **Table S3**. All code to repeat the analyses

described in this manuscript is available through GitHub (github.com/diCenzo-

Lab/016_2025_hazelnut_rhizosphere_metagenomics).

556   **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We thank Sharen Roland and other personnel at the Centre d'Expertise et de Services (CES) of

Génome Québec for the advice on sequencing strategies and for performing all the Illumina

sequencing reported in this study. We would also like to thank Rutgers University Department of

Plant Biology for providing access to their facilities for sample collection and preparation. This

work was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC)

through Discovery Grants to S.R. and G.C.D. and the NSERC Collaborative Research and

Training Experience Grant "Genome Editing for Food Security and Environmental Sustainability"

to S.R. This work was also supported by the USDA-NIFA Hatch project NJ12171 through the

New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station. This research was enabled, in part, through

computational resources provided by Compute Ontario (computeontario.ca) and the Digital

Research Alliance of Canada (alliancecan.ca).

REFERENCES

Ali, I., Sultan, T., Subhan, F., Haleem, K. S., Sultana, N., and Tauseef, I. 2018. PGPRs of plum

(*Prunus domestica*) rhizosphere enhance plant growth and antagonize fungal activity in

vitro. **Acta Agric. Scand. Sect. B — Soil Plant Sci.** 68:367–378.

https://doi.org/10.1080/09064710.2017.1410565.

Alneberg, J., Bjarnason, B. S., de Bruijn, I., Schirmer, M., Quick, J., Ijaz, U. Z., Lahti, L., Loman,

N. J., Andersson, A. F., and Quince, C. 2014. Binning metagenomic contigs by coverage and

composition. **Nat. Methods** 11:1144–1146. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3103.

Ammar, R. 2019. **randomcoloR: generate attractive random colors.** https://CRAN.R-

project.org/package=randomcoloR.

Arkin, A. P., Cottingham, R. W., Henry, C. S., Harris, N. L., Stevens, R. L., Maslov, S., Dehal, P.,

Ware, D., Perez, F., Canon, S., Sneddon, M. W., Henderson, M. L., Riehl, W. J., Murphy-

Olson, D., Chan, S. Y., Kamimura, R. T., Kumari, S., Drake, M. M., Brettin, T. S., Glass, E.

M., Chivian, D., Gunter, D., Weston, D. J., Allen, B. H., Baumohl, J., Best, A. A., Bowen,

B., Brenner, S. E., Bun, C. C., Chandonia, J.-M., Chia, J.-M., Colasanti, R., Conrad, N.,

Davis, J. J., Davison, B. H., DeJongh, M., Devoid, S., Dietrich, E., Dubchak, I., Edirisinghe,

J. N., Fang, G., Faria, J. P., Frybarger, P. M., Gerlach, W., Gerstein, M., Greiner, A.,

586   Gurtowski, J., Haun, H. L., He, F., Jain, R., Joachimiak, M. P., Keegan, K. P., Kondo, S.,

587   Kumar, V., Land, M. L., Meyer, F., Mills, M., Novichkov, P. S., Oh, T., Olsen, G. J., Olson,

588   R., Parrello, B., Pasternak, S., Pearson, E., Poon, S. S., Price, G. A., Ramakrishnan, S.,

589   Ranjan, P., Ronald, P. C., Schatz, M. C., Seaver, S. M. D., Shukla, M., Sutormin, R. A., Syed,

590   M. H., Thomason, J., Tintle, N. L., Wang, D., Xia, F., Yoo, H., Yoo, S., and Yu, D. 2018.

591   KBase: The United States Department of Energy Systems Biology Knowledgebase. **Nat.**

592   **Biotechnol.** 36:566–569. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4163.

593 Bai, B., Liu, C., Zhang, C., He, X., Wang, H., Peng, W., and Zheng, C. 2022. *Trichoderma* species

594   from plant and soil: an excellent resource for biosynthesis of terpenoids with versatile

595   bioactivities. **J. Adv. Res.** 49:81–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2022.09.010.

596 Bakhoum, G. Sh., Sadak, M. Sh., and Thabet, M. S. 2023. Induction of tolerance in groundnut

597   plants against drought stress and *Cercospora* leaf spot disease with exogenous application

598   of arginine and sodium nitroprusside under field conditions. **J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.**

599   23:6612–6631. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42729-023-01514-x.

600 Bakker, P. A. H. M., Berendsen, R. L., Doornbos, R. F., Wintermans, P. C. A., and Pieterse, C. M.

601   J. 2013a. The rhizosphere revisited: root microbiomics. **Front. Plant Sci.** 4.

602   https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2013.00165.

603 Bakker, P. A. H. M., Doornbos, R. F., Zamioudis, C., Berendsen, R. L., and Pieterse, C. M. J.

604   2013b. Induced systemic resistance and the rhizosphere microbiome. **Plant Pathol. J.**

605   29:136–143. https://doi.org/10.5423/PPJ.SI.07.2012.0111.

606 Becraft, E. D., Woyke, T., Jarett, J., Ivanova, N., Godoy-Vitorino, F., Poulton, N., Brown, J. M.,

607   Brown, J., Lau, M. C. Y., Onstott, T., Eisen, J. A., Moser, D., and Stepanauskas, R. 2017.

608   Rokubacteria: genomic giants among the uncultured bacterial phyla. **Front. Microbiol.** 8.

609 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.02264.

610 Berdeni, D., Cotton, T. E. A., Daniell, T. J., Bidartondo, M. I., Cameron, D. D., and Evans, K. L.

611  2018. The effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal colonization on nutrient status, growth,

612  productivity, and canker resistance of apple (*Malus pumila*). **Front. Microbiol.** 9:1461.

613  https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.01461.

614 Berendsen, R. L., Pieterse, C. M. J., and Bakker, P. A. H. M. 2012. The rhizosphere microbiome

615  and plant health. **Trends Plant Sci.** 17:478–486.

616  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2012.04.001.

617 Berendsen, R. L., Vismans, G., Yu, K., Song, Y., de Jonge, R., Burgman, W. P., Burmølle, M.,

618  Herschend, J., Bakker, P. A. H. M., and Pieterse, C. M. J. 2018. Disease-induced assemblage

619  of a plant-beneficial bacterial consortium. **ISME J.** 12:1496–1507.

620  https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-018-0093-1.

621 Blin, K., Shaw, S., Augustijn, H. E., Reitz, Z. L., Biermann, F., Alanjary, M., Fetter, A., Terlouw,

622  B. R., Metcalf, W. W., Helfrich, E. J. N., van Wezel, G. P., Medema, M. H., and Weber, T.

623  2023. antiSMASH 7.0: new and improved predictions for detection, regulation, chemical

624  structures and visualization. **Nucleic Acids Res.** 51:W46–W50.

625  https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad344.

626 Bloem, E., Haneklaus, S., and Schnug, E. 2015. Milestones in plant sulfur research on sulfur-

627  induced-resistance (SIR) in Europe. **Front. Plant Sci.** 5.

628  https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00779.

629 Boccacci, P., and Botta, R. 2009. Investigating the origin of hazelnut (*Corylus avellana* L.)

630  cultivars using chloroplast microsatellites. **Genet. Resour. Crop Evol.** 56:851–859.

631  https://doi.org/10.1007/s10722-009-9406-6.

Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., and Usadel, B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. **Bioinformatics** 30:2114–2120.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170.

Bonito, G., Reynolds, H., Robeson II, M. S., Nelson, J., Hodkinson, B. P., Tuskan, G., Schadt, C.

W., and Vilgalys, R. 2014. Plant host and soil origin influence fungal and bacterial

assemblages in the roots of woody plants. **Mol. Ecol.** 23:3356–3370.

https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12821.

Bouffaud, M., Poirier, M., Muller, D., and Moënne-Loccoz, Y. 2014. Root microbiome relates to

plant host evolution in maize and other Poaceae. **Environ. Microbiol.** 16:2804–2814.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.12442.

Bushnell, B. 2014. BBMap: a fast, accurate, splice-aware aligner.

https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1241166.

Capik, J. M., Muehlbauer, M., Novy, A., Honig, J. A., & Molnar, T. J. 2013. Eastern Filbert Blight-

resistant hazelnuts from Russia, Ukraine, and Poland. **HortScience** 48:466–

473. https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTSCI.48.4.466.

Cavaletti, L., Monciardini, P., Schumann, P., Rohde, M., Bamonte, R., Busti, E., Sosio, M., and

Donadio, S. 2006. *Actinospica robiniae* gen. nov., sp. nov. and *Actinospica acidiphila* sp.

nov.: proposal for *Actinospicaceae* fam. nov. and *Catenulisporinae* subord. nov. in the order

Actinomycetales. **Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.** 56:1747–1753.

https://doi.org/10.1099/ijs.0.63859-0.

Chaumeil, P.-A., Mussig, A. J., Hugenholtz, P., and Parks, D. H. 2020. GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to

classify genomes with the Genome Taxonomy Database. **Bioinformatics** 36:1925–1927.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz848.

Cheng, Y., Sun, S., Lou, H., Dong, Y., He, H., Mei, Q., and Liu, J. 2024. The ectomycorrhizal
fungus *Scleroderma bovista* improves growth of hazelnut seedlings and plays a role in auxin
signaling and transport. **Front. Microbiol**. 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2024.1431120.

Demain, A. L., and Fang, A. 2000. The natural functions of secondary metabolites. **Adv. Biochem.**
Eng. Biotechnol. 69:1–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44964-7_1.

Derikvand, F., Bazgir, E., El Jarroudi, M., Darvishnia, M., Mirzaei Najafgholi, H., Laasli, S.-E.,
and Lahlali, R. 2023. Unleashing the potential of bacterial isolates from apple tree
rhizosphere for biocontrol of *Monilinia laxa*: a promising approach for combatting brown
rot disease. **J. Fungi** 9:828. https://doi.org/10.3390/jof9080828.

Dinno, A. 2024. **dunn.test: dunn's test of multiple comparisons using rank sums**.
https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dunn.test.

Dlamini, S. P., Akanmu, A. O., and Babalola, O. O. 2022. Rhizospheric microorganisms: the
gateway to a sustainable plant health. **Front. Sustain. Food Syst.** 6:925802.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.925802.

Dong, F., Wang, Y., and Tang, M. 2021. Effects of *Laccaria bicolor* on gene expression of *Populus*
trichocarpa root under poplar canker stress**. J. Fungi** 7:1024.
https://doi.org/10.3390/jof7121024.

Dordas, C. 2008. Role of nutrients in controlling plant diseases in sustainable agriculture. A review.
Agron. Sustain. Dev. 28:33–46. https://doi.org/10.1051/agro:2007051.

Dotaniya, M. L., and Meena, V. D. 2015. Rhizosphere effect on nutrient availability in soil and its
uptake by plants: a review. **Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. India Sect. B Biol. Sci.** 85:1–12.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s40011-013-0297-0.

Ezrari, S., Mhidra, O., Radouane, N., Tahiri, A., Polizzi, G., Lazraq, A., and Lahlali, R. 2021.

Potential role of rhizobacteria isolated from citrus rhizosphere for biological control of citrus

dry root rot. **Plants Basel Switz.** 10:872. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants10050872.

Fancy, N. N., Bahlmann, A.-K., and Loake, G. J. 2017. Nitric oxide function in plant abiotic stress.

Plant Cell Environ. 40:462–472. https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12707.

Fitzpatrick, C. R., Copeland, J., Wang, P. W., Guttman, D. S., Kotanen, P. M., and Johnson, M. T.

J. 2018. Assembly and ecological function of the root microbiome across angiosperm plant

species.   **Proc.**   **Natl.**   **Acad.**   **Sci.**   115:E1157–E1165.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717617115.

Food   and   Agricultural   Organization   of   the   United   Nations.   2021.   **FAOSTAT**.

https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL [Accessed 15 Oct. 2024]

Gómez Expósito, R., Postma, J., Raaijmakers, J. M., and De Bruijn, I. 2015. Diversity and activity

of *Lysobacter* species from disease suppressive soils. **Front. Microbiol.** 6:1243.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01243.

Gupta, R., Anand, G., Gaur, R., and Yadav, D. 2021. Plant–microbiome interactions for sustainable

agriculture: a   review.   **Physiol.**   **Mol.**   **Biol.**   **Plants**   27:165–179.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s12298-021-00927-1.

Hakim, S., Naqqash, T., Nawaz, M. S., Laraib, I., Siddique, M. J., Zia, R., Mirza, M. S., and Imran,

A. 2021. Rhizosphere engineering with plant growth-promoting microorganisms for

agriculture and ecological sustainability. **Front. Sustain. Food Syst.** 5:617157.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.617157.

Hancock,   J.   T.   2020.   Nitric   oxide   signaling   in   plants.   **Plants**   9:1550.

https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9111550.

Hassani, M. A., Durán, P., and Hacquard, S. 2018. Microbial interactions within the plant

holobiont. **Microbiome** 6:58. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-018-0445-0.

Hayward, A. C., Fegan, N., Fegan, M., and Stirling, G. R. 2010. *Stenotrophomonas* and

Lysobacter: ubiquitous plant-associated gamma-proteobacteria of developing significance in

applied microbiology. **J. Appl. Microbiol.** 108:756–770. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-

2672.2009.04471.x.

Helmstetter, A. J., Oztolan-Erol, N., Lucas, S. J., and Buggs, R. J. A. 2020. Genetic diversity and

domestication of hazelnut (*Corylus avellana* L.) in Turkey. **Plants, People, Planet** 2:326–

339. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10078.

Ho, C. H., and Tsay, Y. F. 2010. Nitrate, ammonium, and potassium sensing and signaling. **Curr.**

Opin. Plant Biol. 13:604–610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2010.08.005.

Hyatt, D., Chen, G.-L., LoCascio, P. F., Land, M. L., Larimer, F. W., and Hauser, L. J. 2010.

Prodigal: prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. **BMC**

Bioinformatics 11:119. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-119.

Jacobs, D. C., Revord, R. S., Capik, J. M., Mehlenbacher, S. A., and Molnar, T. J. 2024a. Variable

response of eastern filbert blight resistance sources in New Jersey. **Front. Plant Sci.** 15.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.1419265.

Jacobs, D. C., Revord, R. S., Capik, J. M., and Molnar, T. J. 2024b. Eastern filbert blight

resistant *Corylus avellana* identified from 20 years of germplasm introduction and

evaluation at Rutgers University, New Jersey, USA. **Front. Plant Sci.** 15.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.1502392.

Jeger, M., Bragard, C., Caffier, D., Candresse, T., Chatzivassiliou, E., Dehnen-Schmutz, K.,

Gilioli, G., Grégoire, J., Jaques Miret, J. A., MacLeod, A., Navajas Navarro, M., Niere, B.,

Parnell, S., Potting, R., Rafoss, T., Rossi, V., Urek, G., Van Bruggen, A., Van der Werf, W.,

West, J., Winter, S., Boberg, J., Gonthier, P., and Pautasso, M. 2018. Pest categorization of

Anisogramma anomala. **EFSA J.** 16:e05184. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5184.

Jiang, H., Xu, X., Fang, Y., Ogunyemi, S. O., Ahmed, T., Li, X., Yang, Y., Yan, C., Chen, J., and

Li, B. 2023. Metabarcoding reveals response of rice rhizosphere bacterial community to rice

bacterial leaf blight. **Microbiol. Res.** 270:127344.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2023.127344.

Jones, D. L., and Hinsinger, P. 2008. The rhizosphere: complex by design. **Plant Soil** 312:1–6.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9774-2.

Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B. Q., Wong, T. K. F., von Haeseler, A., and Jermiin, L. S. 2017.

ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. **Nat. Methods**

14:587–589. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4285.

Kang, D. D., Li, F., Kirton, E., Thomas, A., Egan, R., An, H., and Wang, Z. 2019. MetaBAT 2: an

adaptive binning algorithm for robust and efficient genome reconstruction from metagenome

assemblies. **PeerJ.** 7:e7359. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.7359.

Kassambara, A. 2025. **ggpubr: 'ggplot2' based publication ready plots**. https://CRAN.R-

project.org/package=ggpubr.

Kebert, M., Kostić, S., Zlatković, M., Stojnic, S., Čapelja, E., Zorić, M., Kiprovski, B., Budakov,

D., and Orlović, S. 2022. Ectomycorrhizal fungi modulate biochemical response against

powdery mildew disease in *Quercus robur* L. **Forests** 13:1491.

https://doi.org/10.3390/f13091491.

Khan, M., Al Azawi, T. N. I., Pande, A., Mun, B.-G., Lee, D.-S., Hussain, A., Lee, B.-H., and Yun,

B.-W. 2021. The role of nitric oxide-induced ATILL6 in growth and disease resistance in

Arabidopsis thaliana. **Front. Plant Sci.** 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.685156.

Kilic-Ekici, O., and Yuen, G. Y. 2003. Induced resistance as a mechanism of biological control by

Lysobacter enzymogenes strain C3**. Phytopathology** 93:1103–1110.

https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2003.93.9.1103.

Kolde, R. 2025. **pheatmap: Pretty Heatmaps**.

https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.pheatmap.

Künstler, A., Gullner, G., Ádám, A. L., Kolozsváriné Nagy, J., and Király, L. 2020. The versatile

roles of sulfur-containing biomolecules in plant defense—a road to disease resistance. **Plants**

9:1705. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9121705.

Kurtz, S., Phillippy, A., Delcher, A. L., Smoot, M., Shumway, M., Antonescu, C., and Salzberg, S.

L. 2004. Versatile and open software for comparing large genomes. **Genome Biol.** 5:R12.

https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2004-5-2-r12.

Kusuma, A. B., Putra, K. E., Vanggy, L. R., Loh, J., Nouioui, I., and Goodfellow, M. 2022.

Actinospica acidithermotolerans sp. nov., a novel actinomycete isolated from sediment from

an Indonesian hot spring. **Arch. Microbiol.** 204:518. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00203-022-

03058-7.

Lahti, L., and Shetty, S. 2019. **microbiome R package**. http://microbiome.github.io

Langmead, B., and Salzberg, S. L. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. **Nat. Methods**

9:357–359. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1923.

Lee, S., Yap, M., Behringer, G., Hung, R., and Bennett, J. W. 2016. Volatile organic compounds

emitted by *Trichoderma* species mediate plant growth. **Fungal Biol. Biotechnol.** 3:7.

https://doi.org/10.1186/s40694-016-0025-7.

Lei, S., Xu, X., Cheng, Z., Xiong, J., Ma, R., Zhang, L., Yang, X., Zhu, Y., Zhang, B., and Tian, B.

2019. Analysis of the community composition and bacterial diversity of the rhizosphere

microbiome across different plant taxa. **MicrobiologyOpen** 8:e00762.

https://doi.org/10.1002/mbo3.762.

Letunic, I., and Bork, P. 2024. Interactive Tree of Life (iTOL) v6: recent updates to the

phylogenetic tree display and annotation tool. **Nucleic Acids Res.** 52:W78–W82.

https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkae268.

Li, D., Liu, C. M., Luo, R., Sadakane, K., and Lam, T.-W. 2015. MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-

node solution for large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph.

Bioinformatics 31:1674–1676. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv033.

Li, H. 2018. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. **Bioinformatics** 34:3094–

3100. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty191.

Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G.,

Durbin, R., and 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. 2009. The sequence

alignment/map format and SAMtools. **Bioinformatics** 25:2078–2079.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352.

Li, Z., Li, J., Liu, G., Li, Y., Wu, X., Liang, J., Wang, Z., Chen, Q., and Peng, F. 2025. Isolation,

characterization and growth-promoting properties of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria (PSBs)

derived from peach tree rhizosphere. **Microorganisms** 13:718.

https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms13040718.

Lin, H., and Peddada, S. D. 2024. Multigroup analysis of compositions of microbiomes with

covariate adjustments and repeated measures. **Nat. Methods** 21:83–91.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-023-02092-7.

Liu, F., Hewezi, T., Lebeis, S. L., Pantalone, V., Grewal, P. S., and Staton, M. E. 2019. Soil

indigenous microbiome and plant genotypes cooperatively modify soybean rhizosphere

microbiome assembly. **BMC Microbiol.** 19:201. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-019-1572-

x.

Liu, H., Li, J., Carvalhais, L. C., Percy, C. D., Prakash Verma, J., Schenk, P. M., and Singh, B. K.

2021. Evidence for the plant recruitment of beneficial microbes to suppress soil-borne

pathogens. **New Phytol.** 229:2873–2885. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17057.

Liu, L., Ma, L., Zhu, M., Liu, B., Liu, X., and Shi, Y. 2023b. Rhizosphere microbial community

assembly and association networks strongly differ based on vegetation type at a local

environment   scale.   **Front.   Microbiol.**   14:1129471.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1129471.

Liu, S., Tao, C., Zhang, L., Wang, Z., Xiong, W., Xiang, D., Sheng, O., Wang, J., Li, R., Shen, Z.,

Li, C., Shen, Q., and Kowalchuk, G. A. 2023a. Plant pathogen resistance is mediated by

recruitment   of   specific   rhizosphere   fungi.   **ISME   J.**   17:931–942.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-023-01406-z.

Lopes, A. C. de A., Mendes, L. W., Brito, K. A. da S. B., da Silva, J. L., Rocha, S. M. B., Antunes,

J. E. L., Oliveira, L. M. de S., Melo, V. M. M., Oliveira, F. A. S., Pereira, A. P. de A., Costa,

G. do N., da Silva, V. B., Gomes, R. L. F., de Alcantara Neto, F., and Araujo, A. S. F. 2023.

Rhizospheric microbial community in plant species from the *Phaseolus* genus. **Appl. Soil**

Ecol. 182:104731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2022.104731.

Lotfi, N., Soleimani, A., Çakmakçı, R., Vahdati, K., and Mohammadi, P. 2022. Characterization of

plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) in Persian walnut associated with drought

stress tolerance. **Sci. Rep.** 12:12725. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-16852-6.

Lu, J., Breitwieser, F., Thielen, P., and Salzberg, S. 2017. Bracken: estimating species abundance

in metagenomics data. **PeerJ Comput. Sci.** 3:e104. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.104.

Lu, J., Rincon, N., Wood, D. E., Breitwieser F. P., Pockrandt, C., Langmead, B., Salzberg S. L.,

Steinegger, M. 2022. Metagenome analysis using the Kraken software suite. **Nat**

Protoc. 17:2815–2839. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41596-022-00738-y.

Luciani, E., Palliotti, A., Tombesi, S., Gardi, T., Micheli, M., Berrios, J. G., Zadra, C., and Farinelli,

D. 2019. Mitigation of multiple summer stresses on hazelnut (*Corylus avellana* L.): effects

of the new arbuscular mycorrhiza *Glomus iranicum tenuihypharum* sp*. nova*. **Sci. Hortic.**

257:108659. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2019.108659.

Luo, L., Zhang, J., Ye, C., Li, S., Duan, S., Wang, Z., Huang, H., Liu, Y., Deng, W., Mei, X.,

He, X., Yang, M., Zhu, S. 2022. Foliar pathogen infection manipulates soil health through

root exudate-modified rhizosphere microbiome. **Microbiol Spectr** 10:e02418-22.

https://doi.org/10.1128/spectrum.02418-22

Ma, W., Yang, Z., Liang, L., Ma, Q., Wang, G., and Zhao, T. 2021. Characteristics of the fungal

communities and co-occurrence networks in hazelnut tree root endospheres and rhizosphere

soil. **Front. Plant Sci.** 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.749871.

Majer, H. M., Ehrlich, R. L., Ahmed, A., Earl, J. P., Ehrlich, G. D., and Beld, J. 2021. Whole

genome sequencing of *Streptomyces actuosus* ISP-5337, *Streptomyces sioyaensis* B-5408,

and *Actinospica acidiphila* B-2296 reveals secondary metabolomes with antibiotic potential.

Biotechnol. Rep. 29:e00596. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.btre.2021.e00596.

Martinez Arbizu, P. 2017. **pairwiseAdonis: pairwise multilevel comparison using adonis**.

https://github.com/pmartinezarbizu/pairwiseAdonis.

Matsen, F. A., Kodner, R. B., and Armbrust, E. V. 2010. pplacer: linear time maximum-likelihood

and Bayesian phylogenetic placement of sequences onto a fixed reference tree. **BMC**

Bioinformatics 11:538. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-538.

McMurdie, P. J., and Holmes, S. 2013. phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive

analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. **PLOS ONE** 8:e61217.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061217.

Minh, B. Q., Schmidt, H. A., Chernomor, O., Schrempf, D., Woodhams, M. D., von Haeseler, A.,

and Lanfear, R. 2020. IQ-TREE 2: new models and efficient methods for phylogenetic

inference in the genomic era. **Mol. Biol. Evol.** 37:1530–1534.

https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msaa015.

Molnar, T. J. 2011. Corylus. Pages 15–48 in: ***Wild Crop Relatives: Genomic and Breeding***

Resources: Forest Trees. C. Kole, ed. Springer, Heidelberg, Germany.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21250-5_2.

Mur, L. A. J., Simpson, C., Kumari, A., Gupta, A. K., and Gupta, K. J. 2017. Moving nitrogen to

the centre of plant defence against pathogens. **Ann. Bot.** 119:703–709.

https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcw179.

Nasir, N. N. M., Ho, C.-L., Lamasudin, D. U., and Saidi, N. B. 2020. Nitric oxide improves

tolerance to *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. cubense tropical race 4 in banana. **Physiol. Mol.**

Plant Pathol. 111:101503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmpp.2020.101503.

Navarro-Muñoz, J. C., Selem-Mojica, N., Mullowney, M. W., Kautsar, S. A., Tryon, J. H.,

Parkinson, E. I., De Los Santos, E. L. C., Yeong, M., Cruz-Morales, P., Abubucker, S.,

Roeters, A., Lokhorst, W., Fernandez-Guerra, A., Cappelini, L. T. D., Goering, A. W.,

Thomson, R. J., Metcalf, W. W., Kelleher, N. L., Barona-Gomez, F., and Medema, M. H.

2020. A computational framework to explore large-scale biosynthetic diversity. **Nat. Chem.**

Biol. 16:60–68. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41589-019-0400-9.

Nissen, J. N., Johansen, J., Allesøe, R. L., Sønderby, C. K., Armenteros, J. J. A., Grønbech, C. H.,

Jensen, L. J., Nielsen, H. B., Petersen, T. N., Winther, O., and Rasmussen, S. 2021. Improved

metagenome binning and assembly using deep variational autoencoders. **Nat. Biotechnol.**

39:555–560. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-00777-4.

Oksanen, J., Simpson, G. L., Blanchet, F. G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P. R., O'Hara, R.

B., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., Wagner, H., Barbour, M., Bedward, M.,

Bolker, B., Borcard, D., Carvalho, G., Chirico, M., De Caceres, M., Durand, S.,

Evangelista, H. B. A., FitzJohn, R., Friendly, M., Furneaux, B., Hannigan, G., Hill, M.

O., Lahti, L., McGlinn, D., Ouellette, M.-H., Ribeiro Cunha, E., Smith, T., Stier, A., Ter

Braak, C. J. F., and Weedon, J. 2024. **vegan: Community Ecology Package**.

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan

Olm, M. R., Brown, C. T., Brooks, B., and Banfield, J. F. 2017. dRep: a tool for fast and accurate

genomic comparisons that enables improved genome recovery from metagenomes through

de-replication. **ISME J.** 11:2864–2868. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2017.126.

Ondov, B. D., Bergman, N. H., and Phillippy, A. M. 2011. Interactive metagenomic visualization

in a web browser. **BMC Bioinformatics** 12:385. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-12-385.

Ondov, B. D., Treangen, T. J., Melsted, P., Mallonee, A. B., Bergman, N. H., Koren, S., and

Phillippy, A. M. 2016. Mash: fast genome and metagenome distance estimation using

MinHash. **Genome Biol.** 17:132. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-016-0997-x.

Orozco-Mosqueda, Ma. D. C., Fadiji, A. E., Babalola, O. O., Glick, B. R., and Santoyo, G. 2022.

Rhizobiome engineering: unveiling complex rhizosphere interactions to enhance plant

growth and health. **Microbiol. Res.** 263:127137.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2022.127137.

Pan, S., Zhao, X.-M., and Coelho, L. P. 2023. SemiBin2: self-supervised contrastive learning leads

to better MAGs for short- and long-read sequencing. **Bioinformatics** 39:i21–i29.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btad209.

Pantigoso, H. A., Newberger, D., and Vivanco, J. M. 2022. The rhizosphere microbiome: plant–

microbial interactions for resource acquisition. **J. Appl. Microbiol.** 133:2864–2876.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.15686.

Parks, D. H., Imelfort, M., Skennerton, C. T., Hugenholtz, P., and Tyson, G. W. 2015. CheckM:

assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and

metagenomes. **Genome Res.** 25:1043–1055. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.186072.114.

Pedersen, T. L. 2019. **patchwork: The Composer of Plots**. http://CRAN.R-

project.org/package=patchwork

Peiffer, J. A., Spor, A., Koren, O., Jin, Z., Tringe, S. G., Dangl, J. L., Buckler, E. S., and Ley, R. E.

2013. Diversity and heritability of the maize rhizosphere microbiome under field conditions.

Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 110:6548–6553. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1302837110.

Pinkerton, J. N. 1995. Infection of European hazelnut by *Anisogramma anomala*: ascospore

adhesion, mode of penetration of immature shoots, and host response. **Phytopathology**

85:1260. https://doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-85-1260.

Poomthongdee, N., Duangmal, K., and Pathom-aree, W. 2015. Acidophilic actinomycetes from

rhizosphere soil: diversity and properties beneficial to plants. **J. Antibiot.** 68:106–114.

https://doi.org/10.1038/ja.2014.117.

Puopolo, G., Giovannini, O., and Pertot, I. 2014. *Lysobacter capsici* AZ78 can be combined with

copper to effectively control *Plasmopara viticola* on grapevine. **Microbiol. Res.** 169:633–

642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.09.013.

Qi, G., Ma, G., Chen, S., Lin, C., and Zhao, X. 2019. Microbial network and soil properties are

changed in bacterial wilt-susceptible soil. **Appl. Environ. Microbiol.** 85:e00162-19.

https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00162-19.

Qiao, H., Gao, D., and Yuan, T. 2023. Differences in rhizosphere soil fungal communities of wild

and   cultivated   *Paeonia   ludlowii*   species.   **Front.   Plant   Sci.**   14.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2023.1194598.

Ranjan, A., Rajput, V. D., Prazdnova, E. V., Gurnani, M., Bhardwaj, P., Sharma, S., Sushkova, S.,

Mandzhieva, S. S., Minkina, T., Sudan, J., Zargar, S. M., Chauhan, A., and Jindal, T. 2023.

Nature's antimicrobial arsenal: non-ribosomal peptides from PGPB for plant pathogen

biocontrol. **Fermentation** 9:597. https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation9070597.

R Core Team. 2025. The R Project for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

Revord, R. S., Lovell, S. T., Capik, J. M., Mehlenbacher, S. A., and Molnar, T. J. 2020. Eastern

filbert blight resistance in American and interspecific hybrid hazelnuts. **J. Am. Soc. Hortic.**

Sci. 145:162–173. https://doi.org/10.21273/JASHS04732-19.

Rodriguez-Mena, S., Camacho, M., de los Santos, B., Miranda, L., and Camacho-Sanchez, M.

2022. Microbiota modulation in blueberry rhizosphere by biocontrol bacteria. **Microbiol.**

Res. 13:809–824. https://doi.org/10.3390/microbiolres13040057.

Rostamikia, Y., Tabari Kouchaksaraei, M., Asgharzadeh, A., and Rahmani, A. 2017. Effect of

growth promoting rhizobacteria on growth and nutrient elements of common hazelnut

(*Corylus avellana* L.) seedlings in Ardabil Fandoqlou nursery. **Iran. J. For. Poplar Res.**

25:126–116. https://doi.org/10.22092/ijfpr.2017.109781.

Ruparelia, J., Rabari, A., Mitra, D., Panneerselvam, P., Das-mohapatra, P. K., and Jha, C. K. 2022.

Efficient applications of bacterial secondary metabolites for management of biotic stress in

plants. **Plant Stress** 6:100125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stress.2022.100125.

Santoyo, G. 2022. How plants recruit their microbiome? New insights into beneficial interactions.

J. Adv. Res. 40:45–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2021.11.020.

Shaffer, M., Borton, M. A., McGivern, B. B., Zayed, A. A., La Rosa, S. L., Solden, L. M., Liu, P.,

Narrowe, A. B., Rodríguez-Ramos, J., Bolduc, B., Gazitúa, M. C., Daly, R. A., Smith, G. J.,

Vik, D. R., Pope, P. B., Sullivan, M. B., Roux, S., and Wrighton, K. C. 2020. DRAM for

distilling microbial metabolism to automate the curation of microbiome function. **Nucleic**

Acids Res. 48:8883–8900. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkaa621.

Sharrar, A. M., Crits-Christoph, A., Méheust, R., Diamond, S., Starr, E. P., and Banfield, J. F. 2020.

Bacterial secondary metabolite biosynthetic potential in soil varies with phylum, depth, and

vegetation type. **mBio** 11:e00416-20. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00416-20.

Sieber, C. M. K., Probst, A. J., Sharrar, A., Thomas, B. C., Hess, M., Tringe, S. G., and Banfield,

J. F. 2018. Recovery of genomes from metagenomes via a dereplication, aggregation and

scoring strategy. **Nat. Microbiol.** 3:836–843. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0171-1.

Sillo, F., Brunetti, C., Marroni, F., Vita, F., dos Santos Nascimento, L. B., Vizzini, A., Mello, A.,

and Balestrini, R. 2022. Systemic effects of *Tuber melanosporum* inoculation in two *Corylus*

avellana genotypes. **Tree Physiol.** 42:1463–1480. https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpac012.

Sood, M., Kapoor, D., Kumar, V., Sheteiwy, M. S., Ramakrishnan, M., Landi, M., Araniti, F., and

Sharma, A. 2020. Trichoderma: The "secrets" of a multitalented biocontrol agent. **Plants**

9:762. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9060762.

Steinegger, M., and Söding, J. 2017. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching for

the analysis of massive data sets. **Nat. Biotechnol.** 35:1026–1028.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3988.

Sun, C., Zhang, Y., Liu, L., Liu, X., Li, B., Jin, C., and Lin, X. 2021. Molecular functions of nitric

oxide and its potential applications in horticultural crops. **Hortic. Res.** 8:1–17.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41438-021-00500-7.

Sun, Y., Wang, M., Mur, L. A. J., Shen, Q., and Guo, S. 2020. Unravelling the roles of nitrogen

nutrition in plant disease defenses. **Int. J. Mol. Sci.** 21:572.

https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21020572.

Thepbandit, W., and Athinuwat, D. 2024. Rhizosphere microorganisms supply availability of soil

nutrients and induce plant defense. **Microorganisms** 12:558.

https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms12030558.

Thompson, M. M., Lagerstedt, H. B., and Mehlenbacher, S. A. 1996. Hazelnuts. Pages 125–184

in: **Fruit Breeding, vol. III Nuts.** J. Janick, and N. Moore, eds. John Wiley and Sons Inc,

New York, U.S.A.

Wang, Y., Yang, Q., Tosa, Y., Nakayashiki, H., and Mayama, S. 2005. Nitric oxide-overproducing

transformants of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* with enhanced biocontrol of tomato bacterial

wilt. J. **Gen. Plant Pathol.** 71:33–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10327-004-0157-0.

Wattenburger, C. J., Halverson, L. J., and Hofmockel, K. S. 2019. Agricultural management affects

root-associated microbiome recruitment over maize development. **Phytobiomes J.** 3:260–

272. https://doi.org/10.1094/PBIOMES-03-19-0016-R.

Wickham, H. 2009. **ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis**. Springer, New York, U.S.A.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-98141-3

Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., and Müller, K. 2018. **dplyr: A Grammar of Data**

Manipulation. https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=dplyr.

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan L. D., François, R., Grolemund, G.,

Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T. L., Miller, E., Bache S. M.,

Müller, K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D. P., Spinu, V., Takahashi, K., Vaughan, D.,

Wilke, C., Woo, K., Yutani, H. 2019. Welcome to the tidyverse. **Journal of Open Source**

Software 4:1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>

Wood, D. E., Lu, J., and Langmead, B. 2019. Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken

Genome Biol. 20:257. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-019-1891-0.

Wu, Y.-W., Simmons, B. A., and Singer, S. W. 2016. MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning algorithm

to recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets. **Bioinformatics** 32:605–607.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv638.

Yang, J., Wei, S., Su, D., Zhang, Z., Chen, S., Luo, Z., Shen, X., Lai, Y., Jamil, A., Tong, J., and

Cui, X. 2020. Comparison of the rhizosphere soil microbial community structure and

diversity between powdery mildew-infected and noninfected strawberry plants in a

greenhouse by high-throughput sequencing technology. **Curr. Microbiol.** 77:1724–1736.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00284-020-01948-x.

Yu, Y., Gui, Y., Li, Z., Jiang, C., Guo, J., and Niu, D. 2022. Induced systemic resistance for

improving plant immunity by beneficial microbes. **Plants** 11:386.

https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11030386.

Yue, H., Yue, W., Jiao, S., Kim, H., Lee, Y.-H., Wei, G., Song, W., and Shu, D. 2023. Plant

domestication shapes rhizosphere microbiome assembly and metabolic functions.

Microbiome 11:70. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-023-01513-1.

Zhang, F., Wen, S., Wang, B., Zhang, Z., Liu, F., Ye, T., Wang, K., Hu, H., Yang, X., and Fang, W.

2023. Biocontrol potential of *Streptomyces odonnellii* SZF-179 toward *Alternaria alternata*

to control pear black spot disease. **Int. J. Mol. Sci.** 24:17515.

https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms242417515.

Zhang, J., Cook, J., Nearing, J. T., Zhang, J., Raudonis, R., Glick, B. R., Langille, M. G. I., and

Cheng, Z. 2021. Harnessing the plant microbiome to promote the growth of agricultural

crops. **Microbiol. Res.** 245:126690. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2020.126690.

Zhang, M., Chai, L., Huang, M., Jia, W., Guo, J., and Huang, Y. 2020. Deciphering the archaeal

communities in tree rhizosphere of the Qinghai-Tibetan plateau. **BMC Microbiol.** 20:235.

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-020-01913-5.

1006

1007   **FIGURE LEGENDS**

Figure 1. Diversity metrics of the metagenomes. (A, **B**) Alpha diversity values calculated using

the (A) Shannon Diversity Index (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value = 0.16) or (B) Simpson

Diversity Index [1-D] (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value = 0.06) are shown. Alpha diversity

was calculated based on species level taxonomic classification of assembled contigs (minimum

length of 500 bp). (**C**) A Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plot based on Bray-Curtis

dissimilarity values is shown (PERMANOVA, p-value < 0.001), with pairwise adonis tests

indicating that the bulk soil was statistically different from the rhizospheres of the native

(p.adjusted = 0.048), susceptible (p.adjusted = 0.047), and resistant (p.adjusted = 0.047) varieties.

1016

Figure 2. Relative abundance of phyla across the metagenomes. The abundance of (**A**) bacterial

phyla, (**B**) archaeal phyla, and (**C**) eukaryotic phyla, displayed as a percentage of the total bacteria,

archaea, and eukaryotes, respectively. The rows represent each of the metagenomic samples,

colour coded by group, while the columns represent taxa with an average relative abundance of at

least 1% of the bacteria, archaea, or eukaryotes, respectively. The size of the dots corresponds is

proportional to the relative abundance of the taxon in a given sample, as indicated by the legend

to the right of the figure.

1024

Figure 3. Relative abundance of genera across the metagenomes. The abundance of (**A**)

bacterial genera, (**B**) archaeal genera, and (**C**) eukaryotic genera, displayed as a percentage of the

total bacteria, archaea, and eukaryotes, respectively. The rows represent each of the metagenomic

samples, colour coded by group, while the columns represent taxa with an average relative

abundance of at least 1% of the bacteria, archaea, or eukaryotes, respectively. The size of the dots

corresponds is proportional to the relative abundance of the taxon in a given sample, as indicated

by the legend to the right of the figure. (**D**) A heatmap showing the differential abundances of

bacterial genera identified as showing statistically significant differences in abundances across

treatments. Columns were scaled using pheatmap in R. Dark red indicates higher abundances while

dark blue indicates lower abundances.

1035

1036   **Figure 4. Global comparison of the metabolic potential of the metagenomes.** A Principal

1037   Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plot based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarity values calculated from the

1038   KEGG annotations produced for each metagenome using DRAM. While statistically significant

1039   global differences were observed (PERMANOVA, p-value = 0.031), no statistically significant

1040   differences between groups were detected using pairwise adonis tests.

1041

Figure 5. Putative biosynthetic gene clusters detected in the metagenomes. (**A**) A heatmap

showing distribution of predicted biosynthetic gene clusters summarized by biosynthetic gene

cluster classification. (**B**) A heatmap showing the distribution of predicted biosynthetic gene

clusters summarized by predicted product. (**A, B**) A coloured box indicates that a biosynthetic

gene cluster classification or predicted product was detected in a given metagenome, whereas a

white box indicates that the pathway was not detected.

1048

Figure 6. Unrooted phylogeny of the bacterial MAGs generated in this study. An unrooted,

maximum likelihood phylogeny of the 41 high-quality metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs)

generated in this study, prepared from a concatenated alignment of the bac120 gene set of the

Genome Taxonomy Database. Taxa names and branches are colour coded based on phylum. The

scale represents the mean number of nucleotide substitutions per site. The numbers on the nodes

indicate the SH-aLRT support values (top numbers) and the ultra-fast jackknife values using a

40% resampling rate (bottom numbers), both calculated from 1000 replicates; values are only

shown at nodes where at least one value is below 95.

1057

1058
1059
Figure 1. Diversity metrics of the metagenomes. (A, B) Alpha diversity values calculated using
the (A) Shannon Diversity Index (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value = 0.16) or (B) Simpson
Diversity Index [1-D] (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value = 0.06) are shown. Alpha diversity
was calculated based on species level taxonomic classification of assembled contigs (minimum
length of 500 bp). (**C**) A Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plot based on Bray-Curtis
dissimilarity values is shown (PERMANOVA, p-value < 0.001), with pairwise adonis tests
indicating that the bulk soil was statistically different from the rhizospheres of the native
(p.adjusted = 0.048), susceptible (p.adjusted = 0.047), and resistant (p.adjusted = 0.047) varieties.

1068
1069
Figure 2. Relative abundance of phyla across the metagenomes. The abundance of (**A**) bacterial
phyla, (**B**) archaeal phyla, and (**C**) eukaryotic phyla, displayed as a percentage of the total bacteria,
archaea, and eukaryotes, respectively. The rows represent each of the metagenomic samples,
colour coded by group, while the columns represent taxa with an average relative abundance of at
least 1% of the bacteria, archaea, or eukaryotes, respectively. The size of the dots corresponds is
proportional to the relative abundance of the taxon in a given sample, as indicated by the legend
to the right of the figure.

1077
1078
Figure 3. Relative abundance of genera across the metagenomes. The abundance of (**A**)
bacterial genera, (**B**) archaeal genera, and (**C**) eukaryotic genera, displayed as a percentage of the
total bacteria, archaea, and eukaryotes, respectively. The rows represent each of the metagenomic
samples, colour coded by group, while the columns represent taxa with an average relative
abundance of at least 1% of the bacteria, archaea, or eukaryotes, respectively. The size of the dots
corresponds is proportional to the relative abundance of the taxon in a given sample, as indicated
by the legend to the right of the figure. (**D**) A heatmap showing the differential abundances of
bacterial genera identified as showing statistically significant differences in abundances across
treatments. Columns were scaled using pheatmap in R. Dark red indicates higher abundances while
dark blue indicates lower abundances.

1089
1090
1091 **Figure 4. Global comparison of the metabolic potential of the metagenomes.** A Principal
1092 Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plot based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarity values calculated from the
1093 KEGG annotations produced for each metagenome using DRAM. While statistically significant
1094 global differences were observed (PERMANOVA, p-value = 0.031), no statistically significant
1095 differences between groups were detected using pairwise adonis tests.

1096
1097
Figure 5. Putative biosynthetic gene clusters detected in the metagenomes. (**A**) A heatmap showing distribution of predicted biosynthetic gene clusters summarized by biosynthetic gene cluster classification. (**B**) A heatmap showing the distribution of predicted biosynthetic gene clusters summarized by predicted product. (**A, B**) A coloured box indicates that a biosynthetic gene cluster classification or predicted product was detected in a given metagenome, whereas a white box indicates that the pathway was not detected.

1104
1105
Figure 6. Unrooted phylogeny of the bacterial MAGs generated in this study. An unrooted,
maximum likelihood phylogeny of the 41 high-quality metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs)
generated in this study, prepared from a concatenated alignment of the bac120 gene set of the
Genome Taxonomy Database. Taxa names and branches are colour coded based on phylum. The
scale represents the mean number of nucleotide substitutions per site. The numbers on the nodes
indicate the SH-aLRT support values (top numbers) and the ultra-fast jackknife values using a
40% resampling rate (bottom numbers), both calculated from 1000 replicates; values are only
shown at nodes where at least one value is below 95.