1 **Title**

2 Comparison of prokaryotic communities between the fields showing different

3 disinfestation effects by anaerobic soil disinfestation

4

5 **Authors**

6 Chol Gyu Lee[1,2], Toshiya Iida[1], Eriko Matsuda[3], Kayo Yoshida[3], Masato Kawabe[4],

7 Masayuki Maeda[5], Yasunori Muramoto[6], Hideki Watanabe[6], Yoko Otani[7], Kazhiro

8 Nakaho[8], Moriya Ohkuma[1]

9

10 **Affiliations**

11 [1]*Japan Collection of Microorganisms, RIKEN BioResource Center, Tsukuba, Ibaraki*

12 *305-0074, Japan.*

13 [2]*Graduate School of Bio-Applications and Systems Engineering, Tokyo University of*

14 *Agriculture and Technology, Koganei, Tokyo, 184-8588, Japan*

15 [3]*Ishikawa Agriculture and Forestry Research Center, Kanazawa, Ishikawa 920-3198,*

16 *Japan.*

17 *4Horticultural Research Institute, Toyama Prefectural Agricultural, Forestry and*

18 *Fisheries Research Center, Tonami, Toyama 939-1327, Japan.*

19 *5Niigata Agricultural Research Institute, Niigata, Nagaoka, Niigata 940-0826, Japan.*

20 *6Gifu Prefectural Agricultural Technology Center, Matamaru, Gifu 501-1152, Japan.*

21 *7Wakayama Agricultural Experiment Station, Kinokawa, Wakayama, 640-0423, Japan.*

22 *8Institute of Vegetable and Floriculture Science, National Agriculture and Food*

23 *Research Organization, Tsu, Mie 514-2392, Japan.*

24

25 **Abbreviations**

26 ASD: Anaerobic soil disinfestation, OTU: Operation taxonomic units, PCR: Polymerase

27 chain reaction,

28

29 **Keywords**

30   Bacterial wilt, Betaproteobacteria, Clostridia, Indicator species analysis, Multiple

31 fields

32

Abstract

34   Soil-borne pathogens are serious problems for crop production. Chemical-dependent

35   soil fumigation method has been an effective method for controlling soil-borne pathogens,

36   but it is escaped for food safety and environmental pollution. Anaerobic soil

37   disinfestation (ASD) is a chemical-independent fumigation method and can reduce

38   pathogens under 40 cm soil depth. However, their effect is not stable under the field

39   condition. Soil microbes have important roles for ASD. Microbial community reflects

40   the soil environment and some unique microbes are be detected under different

41   condition. If common microbes are shown in well-disinfested multiple fields, they will

42   be a good indicator for the success of ASD. For this purpose, we conducted the same

43   ASD treatment with 17 tomato greenhouses where tomato bacterial wilt occurred in the

44   geographically different areas. In this study, we compared soil prokaryotic communities

45   in the field which indicate different disinfestation effects after ASD treatment among

46   several fields using the next-generation sequencer. Weighted-UniFrac analysis showed

47   that prokaryotic communities in the fields showing different disinfestation effect were

48   not different and they were roughly separated to sampling fields. The relative abundance

49   of *Betaproteobacteria* and *Clostridia* were significantly increased in well- disinfested

50   fields. Indicator species analysis revealed that twenty-five operational taxonomic units

51   (OTUs) were specifically detected from various well-disinfested soil and 18 OTUs

52   belonged to phylogenetically diversified *Clostridia*. Other OTUs belonged to aerobic

53   bacteria and were not previously detected from ASD treated fields. Our results showed

54   that the prokaryotic communities were not largely differed by ASD efficiency but small

55   changing will be important for ASD.

1. Introduction

56

57   Soil-borne pathogens cause various plant diseases, including take-all and damping-off,

58   crown rots, and wilting. Bacterial wilt caused by *Ralstonia solanacearum* has a host

59   range exceeding 200 species and over 50 families (Kelman 1998). Disinfestation of this

60   pathogen is difficult because the pathogen is distributed evenly in a deep layer soil below

61   40 cm (Graham and Lloyd 1979). Several approaches have been attempted for bacterial

62   wilt control, including soil amendments, crop rotation, and field sanitation (Wang and

63   Lin 2005). Soil fumigation with chemical pesticides is an effective method for killing

64   the bacterial wilt pathogens but its efficacy tends to be unstable in deep soil and it is

65   escaped for food safety and environmental pollution.

66   Anaerobic soil disinfestation (ASD) is an effective method to reduce soil-borne

67   pathogens (Shinmura 2000). This method consists of incorporation of labile organic

68   matter in the soil, irrigation, and covering soil surface with polyethylene film. Organic

69   matter increases microbial respiration and irrigation purges soil air, polyethylene film

70   prevents an inflow of oxygen from the atmosphere, then reductive soil condition is

71   induced (Block et al. 2000; Momma et al. 2006). It is effective for the soil in the lower

5

72   layer under 40 cm, which uses water-soluble organic such as low concentration ethanol

73   or molasses as a carbon source (Momma et al. 2013). Therefore, ASD using

74   water-soluble carbon sources is useful for the disinfection of *R. solanacearum* in

75   deep-layer soils and is environmentally-friendly. However, the disinfestation effects by

76   ASD is unstable under field condition (Shrestha et al. 2016). Enough soil temperature,

77   incubation period, and amount of carbon amendments are needed to success of

78   disinfestation.

79   Soil microbes have important roles for ASD. Several microbes increase after the ASD

80   treatment and they may be involved in suppression of pathogens (Momma et al. 2007;

81   Mowlick et al. 2013, Huang et al. 2015, 2016; Strauss et al. 2017; Mazzola et al. 2018).

82   Soil microbes reflect soil environment and they are considered as one of the indicators

83   for soil healthiness (van Burggen and Semenov 2000; Mendes et al. 2011). Therefore,

84   different disinfestation efficiency fields can have the different soil microbial

85   communities. Recently, Mazzola et al. (2018) suggested that microbial community

86   changing by ASD is different among sampling fields. If the microbes which is increased

87   in well-disinfested soil are commonly detected among several fields, they will be a good

88   indicator for ASD treatment. For this purpose, we conducted the ASD treatment with

89   same substrate in 17 geographically different greenhouses and they showed different

90   disinfestation efficiency. We compared the prokaryotic communities among the fields

91   showing different disinfestation effect. This multi-fields study will show that 1)

92   microbial community may differ depending on disinfestation efficiency and 2) the

93   well-disinfested soil may have unique microbes compare with not-well-disinfested soil

94   among various fields.

95

96   **2. Materials and Methods**

97

98   **2.1. Sampling field and ASD treatment**

99   Field experiments were established in 17 greenhouses in 8 fields in Japan in which

100   occurrences of bacterial wilt were observed (Table 1). Sugar-containing diatoms,

101   defined as a sugar-rich byproduct, are a waste discharged from the food-processing

102   industry that 40 % sugar in weight. The sugar-containing diatoms were mixed into the

103   soil at a ratio of 15 t ha^{-1} with the rototiller in 30 cm soil layer. The field was covered by

7

104   polyethylene and flooded with water more about 150 L m^{-2}. Disinfestation was

105   conducted 21 days excepted for Ha field (17 days), because soil temperature in this field

106   were reached more than 35 °C during disinfestation period. ASD were treated in the

107   greenhouse (15 m × 6 m) and replicates were conducted among different greenhouses.

108   There were three replications in the Ha, Ni, Ts, and To fields, two replications in the Sa

109   field, and no replication in the IS, Gi, and Wa fields. The samples were collected from

110   each greenhouse before and after ASD treatment from two different depths (20-30 cm

111   and 40-50 cm) in each greenhouse using a Gauge Auger DIK-106B core sampler (Daiki

112   Rika Kogyo Co., LTD, Saitama, Japan) in Is, Ha, To, Gi, and Wa fields (9 greenhouse ×

113   4 soil samples, Totally 36 soil samples). In Ni, Ts and Sa field, only two soil samples

114   (before and after ASD treatment in the upper layer soil) were collected from each

115   greenhouse in these fields (8 greenhouse × 2 soil samples, Totally 16 soil samples). A

116   total of 52 soil samples were collected for analysis. Soil samples were collected from 5

117   randomly chosen points in each greenhouse and mixed well.

118

119   **2.2 Quantification of *R. solanacearum* in the field**

8

120   The most probable number (MPN)-PCR method, which is semi-quantitive *R*.

121   *solanacearum* counting method, was conducted as described by Inoue and Nakaho

122   (2014). Briefly, 10 g of soil was eluted in cultivation buffer and the soil extract was

123   diluted with buffer 10, 100, and 1000 times. Each aliquot was incubated at 35 °C for

124   approximately 24 h, and nested-PCR targeting *phcA* gene, which is a key gene for the

125   appearance of wilt disease, was conducted on the culture sample using the primer pairs

126   phcA2981f (5′-TGGATATCGGGCTGGCAA-3′) and phcA4741r

127   (5′-CGCTTTTGCGCAAAGGGA-3′) for the first step and phcA3538f

128   (5′-GTGCCACAGCATGTTCAGG-3′) and phcA4209r

129   (5′-CCTAAAGCGCTTGAGCTCG-3′) for the second step. The number of samples that

130   appeared in the PCR amplification around 700 bp length was collectively checked

131   against the MPN table. The detection limit of *R.solanacearum* by this method is 3 to

132   2400 colony forming units (cfu) g^{-1} dry soil and a detection indicates the risk of

133   outbreaking of bacterial wilt in the field.

134

135   **2.3 Tag-encoded amplicon sequencing targeted by 16S rRNA gene for prokaryotes**

9

136   DNA was extracted from 0.5 g soil with an ISOIL kit for bead beating (Nippongene,

137   Tokyo, Japan) following the manufacturer's instructions. DNA quantification and

138   integrity were measured using a Nanodrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific,

139   Waltham, MA, USA) and by gel visualization (0.8% agarose in TAE). PCR of each

140   sample was performed to amplify the V4 variable region of the 16S rRNA gene using

141   the bacterial and archaeal universal primers, 515F

142   (5'-GTGCCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA-3') and 806R

143   (5'-GGAC-TACVSGGGTATCTAA-3') (Camporaso et al. 2011). The library was

144   prepared by adaptor ligation and PCR primer pairs using the TruSeq Nano DNA Library

145   Prep Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). When two or more bands were detected by

146   1.5%-agarose gel electrophoresis, PCR products of approximately 300 bp in length were

147   excised from the gel and purified using a MonoFas DNA purification kit (GL Sciences,

148   Tokyo, Japan) for prokaryotes. One soil sample (the upper layer soil in To3 after ASD

149   treatment) was not amplified after PCR amplification and was excluded from the analyses.

150   Each PCR amplicon was cleaned twice using an Agencourt AMPure XP system

151   (Beckman Coulter, Inc, Palo Alto, CA, USA) to remove primers and short DNA

152   fragments, and was quantified using a Qubit Fluorometer (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA,

153   USA). After successful amplification, the PCR products were adjusted to equimolar

154   concentrations and subjected to unidirectional pyrosequencing at Bioengineering Lab.

155   Co., Ltd. (Kanagawa, Japan) on a MiSeq instrument (Illumina). A total of 3,114,333

156   sequences in the 51 samples were obtained after sequencing (Supplemental Table 1).

157   Sequencing data were deposited in the DNA Data Base of Japan (DDBJ) Sequence

158   Read Archive under accession number DRA006673.

159

160   **2.4 Data analyses**

161   The analysis of the sequencing data was conducted according to Lee et al. (2017). Raw

162   fasta files were pre-processed in the Quantitative Insights into Microbial Ecology

163   (QIIME) bioinformatic pipeline (Caporaso et al. 2010). Data from the read sequences,

164   quality, flows, and ancillary metadata were analyzed using the QIIME pipeline. Quality

165   filtering consisted of discarding reads < 200 bp or > 1000 bp in length, excluding

166   homopolymer runs of > 6 bp and continuous ambiguous bases of > 6, and accepting one

167   barcode correction and two primer mismatches. Moreover, a mean quality score < 25

11

168   was also removed. Finally, singleton operational taxonomic units (OTUs) and chimeric

169   sequences were removed for statistical analyses. Denoising was performed using the

170   built-in Denoiser algorithm, and chimera removal and OTU picking were accomplished

171   with USEARCH 61 considering a pairwise identity percentage of 0.97. Taxonomy

172   assignment was performed using the Ribosomal Database Project (RDP) naïve Bayesian

173   classifier with a minimum confidence of 0.8 against the Greengenes database, October

174   2012 release and Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST). OTU-based analysis

175   was performed on pyrotag-based datasets to calculate the richness and diversity using

176   the phyloseq R package, version 1.7.24 (McMurdie and Holmes 2013). The diversity

177   within each individual sample was estimated using the non-parametric Shannon

178   diversity index. The Chao1 estimator was calculated to estimate the richness of each

179   sample. Multivariate analysis of community structure and diversity was performed on

180   pyrotag-based datasets using a weighted Unifrac dissimilarity matrix calculated in

181   QIIME, jackknifing (1000 reiterations) read abundance data at the deepest level

182   possible (41,012 reads), and using unconstrained ordination by a Principal Coordinate

183   Analysis (PCoA) for prokaryotes in each soil layer. *K*-means clustering was used to

184 verify the effects of sampling fields and ASD treatment on prokaryotic community.

185 Finally, indicator value analysis was done using the indicspecies R package (De Cáceres

186 2009) with the aim of identifying OTUs associated with suppressive soil, rather than the

187 conducive soil or vice versa ($p < 0.05$). We created two patterns of soil groups. One

188 group was divided into samples from the soil before or after ASD treatment. The other

189 group was divided based on the efficiency of disinfestation. The datasets were merged

190 and the abundant OTUs that were associated with the pathogen non-detected soil after

191 ASD treatment were evaluated in each layer ($p < 0.001$). The number of random

192 permutation tests for the calculation of the indicator values was 999.

193

194 **2.5 Construction of phylogenetic tree**

195 The phylogenetic tree of clostridial members was constructed by a 1000-fold bootstrap

196 analysis using neighbor-joining methods with the Clustal W program (version 2.0

197 Developments) software (Larkin et al. 2007) and the NJ plot software (Perrière and

198 Gouy 1996). The phylogenetic tree contained 16S rRNA sequences of several clusters

199 of clostridial strains.

200

3. Results

202

3.1. Effectiveness of ASD treatment with sugar-containing diatoms

204   *R. solanacearum* in soil was not detected after treated ASD with sugar-contained

205   diatoms in 14 of the 17 greenhouses and 7 of the 9 greenhouses in the upper and lower

206   layers, respectively, (Table 2). Therefore, the ASD treatments were appropriate in each

207   fields. Some fields (in IS, Ha1, and Ha2 field) were not-well-disinfested by ASD. We

208   classified the soil samples from greenhouses into two groups based on the effect of

209   ASD: not-well-disinfested (disinfestation failure) soil as F-soil and well-disinfested

210   (disinfestation success) soil as S-soil.

211

3.2 Changes of prokaryotic communities after ASD treatment

213   The sequences were clustered into 74,539 OTUs at 97% similarity. Among S- and F-

214   soil, the DNA concentrations were significantly decreased in the upper layer of the

215   S-soil and the lower layer of the F-soil (Figure 1, Supplemental Table 2). Shannon

216   indices and Chao1 were decreased after ASD in the upper. OTU numbers were

217   significantly decreased in F-soil regardless of soil layers.

218   PCoAs based on weighted-UniFrac analysis showed that prokaryotic communities

219   were roughly classified by sampling fields (Figure 2). In the upper layer, Ha fields

220   contained one cluster regardless of ASD treatment and disinfestation efficiency (Figure

221   2A). IS, Wa and Ts fields were separated by before and after ASD treatment but not

222   affected by disinfestation efficiency. In the lower layer soil, IS, Ha, and Gi were also

223   different among sampling fields and ASD treatment, but not different by S- and F-soil

224   (Figure 2B). The microbes collected from same fields comprised same clusters before

225   and after ASD treatment in spite of ASD efficiency was different.

226   After ASD treatment, the relative abundance of *Firmicutes* was increased by more

227   than 2-times in 8 greenhouses (Supplemental Table 3). In the upper layer soil,

228   *Firmicutes* was significantly increased, while *Crenarchaeota* was decreased after ASD

229   treatement (Figure 3). *Acidobacteria* and *Verrcomicrobia* in the upper layer of the

230   S-soil, *Acidobacteria*, and *Crenarchaeota* in the lower layer of the F-soil were

231   significantly decreased. In the class level, *Clostridia* that belonged to the *Firmicutes*

15

232   phylum were increased more than 2-times after ASD in 15 of 16 and 8 of 9 greenhouses

233   in the upper and lower layers, respectively (Supplemental Table 4). Moreover,

234   *Betaproteobacteria* and *Clostridia* were significantly increased after ASD treatment in

235   the upper layer of the S-soil (Figure 4). In the S-soil, *Sphingobacteria* and *Cytophagia*

236   were significantly decreased in the upper layer, and *Thermoleophilia* and *Actinobacteria*

237   were decreased in the lower layer.

238

239   **3.4 Specifically increased OTUs in S-soil**

240   We successfully detected 25 OTUs specifically increased in the S-soil by ASD from

241   more than 8 of the 16 sites or 4 of the 6 sites from the upper and lower layers,

242   respectively (Table 3). They belonged to several classes, including *Clostridia*, *Bacillus*,

243   *Betaproteobacteria*, *Gammaproteobacteria*, and *Mollicutes*. Eighteen out of the 25

244   OTUs belonged to *Clostridia*. The phylogenetic trees consisting of OTUs related to

245   clostridial members showed that diversified *Clostridia* were specifically increased after

246   ASD treatment in the S-soil (Figure 5). Three OTUs belonged to the *Caloramator* group,

247   *Clostridium* cluster III and two OTUs belonged to the *Christensenella* group. OTU 50

16

248   (*Caloramator*) was commonly detected in 11 upper layer and five lower layer soil

249   samples. OTU311169 (*Bacillus*), OTU199301 and OTU624373 (*Christensenella*), OTU

250   112 (*Clostridium*), and OTU56 (*Rhodothermaceae*) were also increased in 10 of the 14

251   S-soils, while OTU934369 and OTU304 (*Caloramator*) and OTU212333

252   (*Symbiobacterium*) were commonly detected in more than five of the six fields of S-soil.

253   Prokaryotes decreased by ASD treatment common to the various fields in this criterion

254   were not detected (data not shown).

255

256   **4. Discussion**

257   In this study, we showed that microbial communities were not different even if the

258   fields indicated different disinfestation effect by ASD. Especially, in Ha field, we used

259   three contiguous greenhouses and they treated the same field managements for more

260   than 10 years. They showed a different disinfestation effect but were included in the

261   same cluster. Our previous study also showed that prokaryotic community structures

262   were affected more by indigenous communities than the disease suppression effect (Lee

263   et al. 2017). These results suggested that the difference of indigenous soil communities

17

264   are not affected to controlling of soil-borne pathogen. Runia et al. (2014) showed

265   Firmicutes are increased by ASD treatment among 5 soil types using the real-time PCR

266   method. We also showed that *Clostridia* belonged to Firmimutes have increased in

267   S-soil. *Clostridia*, are gram-positive anaerobic bacteria. During ASD, decreases in

268   oxygen availability along with increases in pH occur, which promotes the increased

269   prevalence of anaerobic microbes (Momma et al. 2006; Mowlick et al. 2013, 2014).

270   Several studies indicated that *Clostridia* increase in number and become dominant

271   bacteria following ASD treatment using plant material or low concentration ethanol as a

272   substrate (Huang et al. 2015, 2016; Mowlick et al. 2012; Strauss et al. 2017). The prior

273   and present results indicate that *Clostridia* increased after ASD treatment regardless of

274   soil types, field locations, and substrate types and they may be key microbes for

275   disinfestation by ASD. *Caloramator*-like OTUs were the most commonly found OTUs

276   in the upper and lower layers of various fields. They are rod-shaped, obligate anaerobic,

277   thermophilic endospore producers that can ferment several sugars and produce acetate,

278   isobutyrate, lactate, and other VFAs, while they do not degrade cellulose (Collins et al.

279   1994; Ogg and Patel 2011). Mowlick et al. (2012) reported that 63% of clostridial

280   clones that were increased after ASD treatment belonged to clostridium cluster I,

281   including the *Oxobacter* and *Caloramator* groups. *Symbiobacterium* is rod-shaped

282   thermophiles that are syntrophic with *Bacillus* spp., which possess a glucose

283   degradation pathway (Ohno et al. 2000). *Christensenella* is a non-spore forming, short,

284   straight rod with tapered ends; it can use various sugars and produce VFAs during

285   fermentation (Morotomi et al. 2012). *Christensenella* were detected in an anaerobic

286   cellulolytic microbial consortium from mangrove soil (Gao et al. 2014). These results

287   suggest that phylogenetically diverse clostridial members might be responsible for

288   suppression of pathogens through their production of VFAs during anaerobic

289   decomposition of sugar-containing diatoms.

290   Strauss et al. (2017) reported the increased of *Betaproteobacteria* by ASD treatment

291   with organic bran at soil depths of 15.2 cm and 45.7 cm. We showed

292   *Noviherbaspirillum*, belonged to *Betaproteobacteria*, which were specifically detected

293   from S-soil. They are gram-negative, aerobic, non-spore forming rods capable of

294   utilizing several carbohydrates as carbon sources (Lin et al. 2013). Moreover, several

295   *Bacillus* species have been described as biological control agents for bacterial wilt and

296   have been detected from soil after ASD treatment (Mowlick et al. 2012; Yamamoto et al.

297   2014; Yuliar et al. 2015). The family *Rhodothermaceae* of the class Cytophagia

298   comprises six genera; most are isolated from extreme environments, such as hypersaline

299   crystallized ponds in the Dead Sea and submarine hot spring (Xia et al. 2015). They

300   exhibit extreme thermophilic or halophilic growth characteristics. Mazzola et al (2018)

301   showed that these *Cytophagaceae* bacteria were significantly increased after ASD

302   treatment with rice bran. However, their role for disinfestation does not appear.

303   *Symbiobacterium*, *Christensenella*, *Noviherbaspirillum*, and *Rhodothermaceae* were not

304   previously detected from ASD treated soil. They might have important roles for

305   disinfestation of *R. solanacearum*. *Noviherbaspirillum*, *Bacillus*, and *Rhodothermaceae*

306   are aerobic bacteria that were also increased by ASD, as with anaerobic bacteria. In the

307   soil environment, some *Bacillus* might contribute to the rapid decrease of soil redox

308   potential at the initial stage of ASD treatment by consuming oxygen (Mowlick et al.

309   2012). Therefore, they might have important roles in maintaining anoxic soil conditions

310   during ASD treatment.

20

311   In conclusion, we revealed prokaryotic communities were not strongly affected by

312   disinfestation efficiency compare with sampling fields, but *Clostridia* and

313   *Betaproteobacteria* were significantly increased in well-disinfested soil. Twenty-five

314   OTUs were specifically detected in S-soil and most of them were affiliated to *Clostridia*,

315   which was well-known bacteria for ASD effect. However, some microbes were not

316   previously detected from ASD treated fields. These microbes will be a good indicator

317   for well-disinfested soil and future study will appear the role of these microbes for

318   disinfestation.

Acknowledgements

329

References

Blok, W.J., Lamers, J.G., Termorshuizen, A.J., Bollen, G.J., 2000. Control of soilborne

plant pathogens by incorporating fresh organic amendments followed by tarping.

Phytopathol. 90, 253-259.

Caporaso, J.G., J. Kuczynski, J. Stombaugh, *et al*. 2010. QIIME allows analysis of

high-throughput community sequencing data. Nature Methods. 7, 335–336.

Caporaso, J.G., C.L. Lauber, W.A., Walters, D., Berg-Lyons, C.A., Lozupone, P.J.,

Turnbaugh, N., Fierer and R. Knight. 2011. Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity

at a depth of millions of sequence per sample. Proc. of Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 108,

S4516–4522.

Collins, M.D., Lawson, P.A., Willems, A., Cordoba, J. J., Fernandez-Garayzabal, J.,

Garcia, P., Cai, J., Hippe, H., Farrow, J.A.E. 1994. The phylogeny of the genus

Clostridium: proposal of five new genera and eleven new species combinations. Int.

J. Syst. Bacteriol. 44, 812-826.

345   De Cáceres, M., Legendre. P., 2009. Associations between species and groups of sites:

346   indices and statistical inference. Ecology. 90, 3566–3574.

347   Gao, Z.M., Xu, X., Ruan, L.W., 2014. Enrichment and characterization of an anaerobic

348   cellulolytic microbial consortium SQD-1.1 from mangrove soil. Appl. Microbiol.

349   Biotechnol. 98, 465-474.

350   Graham, J. Lloyd, A.B., 1979. Survival of potato strain (race 3) of *Pseudomonas*

351   *solanacearum* in the deeper soil layers. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 30, 489–496.

352   Huang, X., Liu, L., Wen, T., Zhang, J., Wang, F., Cai, Z., 2016. Changes in the soil

353   microbial community after reductive soil disinfestation and cucumber seedling

354   cultivation. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 100, 5581-5593.

355   Huang, X., Liu, L., Wen, T., Zhu, R., Zhang, J., Cai, Z., 2015. Illumina Miseq

356   investigations on the changes of microbial community in the *Fusarium oxyporum*

357   f.sp. *cubense* infested soil during and after reductive soil disinfestation. Microbiol.

358   Res. 181, 33-42.

359   Inoue, Y., Nakaho, K., 2014. Sensitive quantitative detection of *Ralstonia*

360   *solanacearum* in soil by the most probable number-polymerase chain reaction

361   (MPN-PCR) method. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 98, 4169–4177.

362   Kelman, A., 1998. One hundred and one years of research on bacterial wilt, p. 1–5. *In*

363   P.H. Prior, C. Allen, J. Elphinstone (ed.), Bacterial Wilt Disease: Molecular and

364   Ecological Aspects, Springer, Heidelberg.

365   Lee, C.G., Iida, T., Uwagaki, Y., Otani, Y., Nakaho, K., Ohkuma, M., 2017.

366   Comparison of prokaryotic and eukaryotic communities in soil samples with and

367   without tomato bacterial wilt collected from different fields. Microb. Environ. 32,

368   376-385.

369   Lin, S.Y., Hameed, A., Arun, A.B., Liu, Y.C., Hsu, Y.H., Lai, W.A., Rekha, P.D.,

370   Young, C,C., 2013. Description of *Noviherbaspirillum malthae* gen. nov., sp. nov.,

371   isolated from an oil-contaminated soil, and proposal to reclassify *Herbaspirillum soli*,

372   *Herbaspirillum aurantiacum*, *Herbaspirillum canariense* and *Herbaspirillum*

373   *psychrotolerans* as *Noviherbaspirillum soli* comb. nov., *Noviherbaspirillum*

374   *aurantiacum* comb. nov., *Noviherbaspirillum canariense* comb. nov. and

375   *Noviherbaspirillum psychrotolerans* comb. nov. based on polyphasic analysis. Int. J.

376   Syst. Microbiol. 63, 4000-4007.

377   Liu, L., Kong., J., Cui, H., Zhang, J., Wang, F., Cai, Z., Huang, X., 2016. Relationships

378   of decomposability and C/N ratio in different types of organic matter with

379   suppression of *Fusarium oxysporum* and microbial communities during reductive

380   soil disinfestation. Biol. Control. 101, 103-113.

381   Mazzola, M., Hewacitharana, S.S., Strauss, S.L., Shennan, C., Muramoto, J., 2016.

382   Anaerobic soil disinfestation and *Brassica* seed meal amendment alter soil

383   microbiology and system resistance. Int. J. Fruit. Sci. 16, 47-58.

384   Mazzola, M., Muramoto, J., Shennan, C., 2018. Anaerobic disinfestation induced

385   changes to soil microbiome disease incidence and strawberry fruit yields in

386   California field trials. Appl. Soil. Ecol. 127, 74-86.

387   McMurdie, P.J., Holmes. S., 2013. phyloseq: An R package for reproducible interactive

388   analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. PLoS One. 8, e61217.

389   Mendes, R., Kruijt, M., de Bruijin I., et al. 2011. Deciphering the rhizosphere

390   microbiome for disease-suppressive bacteria. Science. 3321097-1100.

26

391   Momma, N., Momma, M., Kobara, Y., 2010. Biological soil disinfestation using

392   ethanol: effect on *Fusarium oxyporum* f. sp. <u>lycoperisici</u> and soil microorganisms. J.

393   Gen. Plant Pathol. 76, 336-344.

394   Momma, N., 2008. Biological soil disinfestation (BSD) of soilborne pathogens and its

395   possible mechanisms. Jpn. Agr. Res. Q. 7-12.

396   Momma, N., Kobara, Y., Uematsu, S., Kita, N., Shinmura, A., 2013. Development of

397   biological soil disinfestaion in Japan. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 97, 3801-3809.

398   Momma, N., Yamamoto, K., Shimandi, P., Shishido, M., 2006. Role of organic acids in

399   the mechanisms of biological soil disinfestation (BSD). J. Gen. Plant Pathol. 72,

400   247-252.

401   Momma, N., Usami, T., Shishido, M,. 2007. Detection of *Clostridium* sp. including

402   biological soil disinfestation (BSD) and suppression of pathogens causing Fusarium

403   wilt and bacterial wilt of tomato by gases evolved during BSD (in Japanese with

404   English summary). Soil Microorg. 61, 3-9.

405   Morotomi, M., Nagai, F., Watanabe, Y., 2012. Description of *Christensenella minuta*

406   gen. nov., sp. nov., isolated from human feces, which forms a distinct btranch in the

407   order *Clostridiales*, and proposal of *Christensenellaceae* fam. nov. Int. J. Syst.

408   Microbiol. 62, 144-149.

409   Mowlick, S., Yasukawa, H., Inoue, T., Takehara, T., Kaku, N., Ueki, K., Ueki, A., 2013.

410   Suppression of spinach wilt disease by biological soil disinfestation incorporated

411   with *Brassica juncea* plants in association with changes in soil bacterial

412   communities. Crop Prot. 54, 185-193.

413   Mowlick, S, Takehara, T., Kaku, N,, Ueki, K., Ueki, A., 2013. Proliferation of

414   diversified clostridial species during biological soil disinfestation incorporated with

415   plant biomass under various conditions. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 97,

416   8365-8379.

417   Mowlick, S, Hirota, K., Takehara, T., Kaku, N., Ueki, K., Ueki, A., 2012 Development

418   of anaerobic bacterial community consisted of diverse clostridial species during

419   biological soil disinfestation amended with plant biomass. Soil. Sci. Plant. Nutr. 58,

420   273-287.

421   Ogg, C.D., Patel, B.K.C., 2011. *Caloramator mitchellensis* sp. nov., a thermoanaerobe

422   isolated from the geothermal waters of the Great Artesian Basin of Australia, and

423   emended description of the genus *Caloramator*. Int. J. Syst. Microbiol. 61,

424   644-653.

425   Ohno, M., Shiratori, H., Park, M.J., Saitoh, Y., Kumon, Y., Yamahista, N., Hirata, A.,

426   Nishida, H., Ueda, K., Beppu, T., 2000. *Symbiobacterium thermophilum* gen. nov.,

427   sp. nov., a symbiotic thermophile that depends on co-culture with a *Bacillus* strain

428   for growth. Int. J. Syst. Microbiol. 50, 1829-1832.

429   Perrière, G., Gouy, M., 1996. WWW-Query: an online retrieval system for biological

430   sequence banks. Biochime. 78, 364-369.

431   Runia, W.T., Thoden, T.C., Molendijk, L.P.G., van den Berg, W., Termorshuizen, A.J.,

432   Streminska, M.A., van der Wurff, A.W.G., Feli, H., Meints, H., 2014. Unravelling

433   the mechanism of pathogen inactivation during anaerobic soil disinfestation. Acta.

434   Hortic. 1044, 177-193.

435   Shinmura, A., 2000 Causal agent and control of root rot of welsh onion. PSJ Soilborne

436   Disease Work Report. 20, 133-143.

437   Shrestha, U., Auge, R.M., Butler, D.M., 2016. A meta-analysis of the impact of

438   anaerobic soil disinfestation on pest suppression and yield of horticultural crops.

439   Front. Plant. Sci. 7, 1254.

440   Straus, S.L., Kluepfel, D.A., 2015. Anaerobic soil disinfestation: A

441   chemical-indipendent approach to pre-plant control of plant pathogens. J. Integr.

442   Agr. 14, 2309-2318.

443   Strauss, S.L., Greenhut, R.F., McClean, A.E., Kluepfel, D.A., 2017. Effect of anaerobic

444   soil disinfestation on the bacterial community and key soilborne phytopathogenic

445   agents under walnut tree-crop nursery conditions. Plant Soil. 415, 493-506.

446   van Agtmaal, M., van OS, G.J., Hol, W.H.G., Hundscheid, M.P.J., Runia, W.T.,

447   Hordijk, C.A., de Boer, W., 2015. Legacy effects of anaerobic soil disinfestation on

448   soil bacterial community composition and production of pathogen-suppression

449   volatiles. Front. Microbiol. 6, 701.

450   Van Bruggen, A.H.C., Semenov, A. M., 2000. In search of biological indicators for soil

451   health and disease suppression. Appl. Soil. Ecol. 15, 13-24.

452   Wang, J.F., Lin, C.H., 2005. Integrated management of tomato bacterial wilt.

453   AVRDC-The world vegetable center, Taiwan.

454   Xia, J., Zhou, Y.X., Zhao, L.H., Chen, G.J., Du, Z.J., *Longimonas halophile* gen. nov.,

455   isolated from marine solar saltern. Int. J. Syst. Microbiol. 65, 2272-2276.

456   Yamamoto, S., Shiraishi, S., Kawagoe, Y., Mochizuki, M., Suzuki, S., 2015. Impact of

457   *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* S13-3 on control of bacterial wilt and powdery mildew

458   in tomato. Pest Manag. Sci. 71, 722-727.

459   Yuliar, Nion, Y.A., Toyota, K., 2015. Recent trends in control methods for bacterial

460   wilt disease caused by *Ralstonia solanacearum*. Microb. Environ. 30, 1-11.

461

462   **Figure legend**

463

464   **Figure 1.** Comparison of DNA concentration, prokaryotic diversity and richness

465   between the F- and S-soil.

466   Asterisk represents a pair of means that show significant difference between the S- and

467   F- soil (t-test, $p < 0.05$).

468

31

469   **Figure 2.** A UniFrac-weighted principal component analysis of the soil prokaryotic

470   communities in the upper layer (A) and lower layer (B) of the field before and after

471   ASD treatment.

472   Closed circle: S-soil before ASD treatment, Open circle: S-soil after ASD treatment,

473   Closed triangle: F-soil before ASD treatment, Open triangle: F-soil after ASD

474   treatment.

475   The clustering was conducted by *k*-means analysis.

476

477   **Figure 3.** Comparison of the prokaryotic phyla which observed significant difference

478   between the S- and F-soil

479   Asterisk represents a pair of means that show a significant difference between the S-

480   and C- soil (Tukey's test, $p < 0.05$).

481

482   **Figure 4.** Comparison of the prokaryotic class that observed a significant difference

483   between the S- and F-soil

484   Asterisk represents a pair of means that show a significant difference between the S-

485   and C- soil (Tukey's test, $p < 0.05$).

486

487   **Figure 5.** Neighbor-joining tree showing the phylogenetic relationships of the

488   clostridial OTUs based on 16S rRNA gene sequencing (According to the clostridial

489   cluster analysis by Collins et al. 1994). The OTUs obtained from this study are shown

490   in gothic letters. *Bacillus subtilis* was used as the outgroup. Bold letters indicate OTUs

491   that specifically appeared in the S-soil.

Figure1

Fig. 1

Fig. 2A

Fig. 2B

Figure3
Click here to download high resolution image

Fig. 3

Figure4
Click here to download high resolution image

Fig. 4

Fig. 5

Table 1. Detailed information on the sampling fields

Field	Ishikawa	Hakusan	Niigata	Tsubame	Sanjo	Toyama	Gifu	Wakayama
Code	IS	Ha	Ni	Ts	Sa	To	Gi	Wa
latitude and longitude	36° 38′ N, 136° 42′ E	36° 29′ N, 136° 30′ E	37° 55′ N, 139° 9′ E	37° 38′ N, 138° 55′ E	37° 39′ N, 139° 57′ E	36° 61′ N, 136° 96′ E	35° 44′ N, 136° 70′ E	33° 27′ N, 135° 14′ E
Soil types	Gleysol	Gleysol	Fluvisol	Fluvisol	Fluvisol	Gleysol	Gleysol	Cambisols
Replication	1	3	3	3	2	3	1	1
pH	5.54	7.22	7.11	7.03	7.24	6.07	6.08	7.49
EC (mS cm-1)	0.03	0.31	0.32	0.24	0.20	0.29	0.12	0.88
ASD conducted schedule	7/27/2016 - 8/18/2016	7/11/2016 - 7/28/2016	8/18/2016 - 9/9/2016	7/31/2016 - 8/21/2016	9/1/2016 - 9/22/2016	8/2/2016 - 8/26/2016	8/11/2016 - 9/1/2016	7/29/2016 - 8/19/2016

Table 2. The number of *R.solanacearum* in each field before and after ASD treatment

	Soil layer	ASD treatment	IS	Ha1	Ha2	Ha3	Ni1	Ni2	Ni3	Ts1	Ts2	Ts3	San1	San2	To1	To2	To3	Gi	Wa
Number of *R.solanacearum* in soil (cfu soil^{-1})	Upper	Before	>2400	1100	46	23	95	210	460	95	75	120	160	43	64	43	23	>2400	>2400
		After	75	21	15	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
	Lower	Before	240	1100	39	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	53	12	1100	1100
		After	3	21	11	N.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.

The number of each fields indicate replication number
N.D.; *R. solanacearum* were not detected with this method.
-; No samples

Supplemental Table 1. Read numbers of the 16S rRNA gene in each soil sample

			Before	After
IS	IS	Upper	48,338	56,750
		Lower	51,336	66,408
	Ha-1	Upper	50,451	41,012
		Lower	54,223	65,242
	Ha-2	Upper	50,052	50,403
		Lower	54,362	65,817
	Ha-3	Upper	44,053	158,609
		Lower	50,653	56,204
To	1	Upper	49,838	52,458
		Lower	42,379	44,913
	2	Upper	120,447	106,275
		Lower	46,493	50,754
	3	Upper	-	55,666
		Lower	47,673	56,354
Ni	Shi1	Upper	70,925	58,473
	Shi2	Upper	65,166	65,462
	Shi3	Upper	63,392	63,830
	Tsu1	Upper	67,593	69,027
	Tsu2	Upper	60,868	58,135
	Tsu3	Upper	59,287	60,065
	San1	Upper	79,424	55,336
	San2	Upper	64,800	60,657
Gi		Upper	54,337	62,183
		Lower	58,254	47,825
Wa		Upper	57,969	61,009
		Lower	55,401	57,752

Supplemental Table 2. The change rate of the soil chemical properties or prokaryotic diversity, richness and DNA concentration before to after ASD treatment.

		IS				To						Ni					Gi	Wa
		IS	Ha-1	Ha-2	Ha-3	1	2	3	Shi1	Shi2	Shi3	Tsu1	Tsu2	Tsu3	San1	San2		
DNA concentration (μg g soil⁻¹)	Upper	0.20	0.26	0.49	0.31	0.32	0.32	0.30	0.50	0.59	0.58	0.35	0.64	0.23	1.35	1.66	0.27	0.45
	Lower	0.34	0.23	0.53	0.44	0.32	0.21	0.24	-	-	-	-	-	-			3.5	0.89
Shannon index	Upper	0.96	0.92	0.84	1.00	0.99	1.00	-	0.99	1.01	0.92	0.86	0.88	0.87	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.90
	Lower	0.79	0.90	0.83	0.95	0.99	0.98	0.98	-	-	-	-	-	-			0.80	0.87
Observed OTU	Upper	0.77	0.62	0.58	0.98	0.9	0.59	-	0.98	0.96	0.82	0.52	0.51	0.53	0.94	0.88	0.99	0.76
	Lower	0.65	0.78	0.65	0.80	0.91	1.03	0.77	-	-	-	-	-	-			0.32	0.66
Chao 1 estimator	Upper	0.08	0.62	0.64	0.98	0.88	0.84	-	0.96	0.99	0.82	0.55	0.54	0.58	0.99	0.89	1.01	0.72
	Lower	0.59	0.68	0.59	0.82	0.91	0.94	0.88	-	-	-	-	-	-			0.44	0.67

The red and blue cells indicate increasing or decreasing factors after ASD treatment compared with the before

treatment. The color intensities indicates the rate of each difference.

-; No samples

Supplemental Table 3. The change rate of the soil prokaryotic phylum before to after ASD treatment.

		IS				To			Ni								Gi	Wa
		IS	Ha-1	Ha-2	Ha-3	1	2	3	Shi1	Shi2	Shi3	Tsu1	Tsu2	Tsu3	San1	San2		
Proteobacteria	Upper	1.00	0.85	1.01	0.81	1.26	0.93	-	1.09	1.08	1.46	0.58	0.62	0.72	1.24	1.26	0.94	0.39
	Lower	1.79	1.07	1.52	1.07	1.28	1.30	1.18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.18	0.79
Firmicutes	Upper	1.54	1.84	0.82	2.39	2.11	1.42	-	1.09	0.80	1.34	2.64	2.83	2.95	0.98	0.71	1.43	3.85
	Lower	0.87	3.45	2.02	1.93	0.59	0.73	0.28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.54	0.12
Acidobacteria	Upper	0.66	1.06	1.66	0.64	0.68	1.03	-	0.65	0.71	0.35	0.59	0.65	0.70	0.53	0.49	1.17	1.22
	Lower	0.42	0.54	0.37	0.48	1.05	0.88	1.90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.17	0.34
Bacteroidetes	Upper	0.56	3.51	0.87	2.07	1.17	0.60	-	0.86	0.79	1.05	0.10	0.17	0.07	1.13	1.86	0.23	0.40
	Lower	0.46	4.15	5.94	2.04	1.42	1.39	0.55	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.30	0.47
Chloroflexi	Upper	1.39	0.94	1.03	0.78	0.70	1.77	-	1.35	1.44	0.79	2.53	2.03	2.68	1.30	1.36	0.92	0.72
	Lower	0.45	0.73	0.64	1.16	0.75	1.05	1.23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.90	0.52
Gemmatimonadetes	Upper	0.80	0.83	1.54	1.18	0.93	0.84	-	0.74	0.79	0.52	2.30	2.33	1.63	0.92	1.10	0.55	0.90
	Lower	0.45	0.44	0.33	0.62	1.07	0.89	1.02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.36	0.59
Actinobacteria	Upper	1.05	1.30	1.03	1.08	1.30	0.98	-	0.68	0.76	0.64	1.52	1.09	0.88	0.70	0.71	0.41	0.42
	Lower	0.75	0.87	0.78	0.68	1.02	0.52	0.62	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.67	0.20
Crenarchaeota	Upper	0.29	0.19	9.36	0.00	0.50	1.24	-	0.53	1.21	0.27	0.23	0.20	0.96	0.17	0.27	0.50	0.14
	Lower	0.12	0.19	0.04	0.59	1.02	1.02	0.55	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.17	5.82
Verrucomicrobia	Upper	0.47	0.89	0.64	1.35	0.53	0.78	-	0.79	1.01	0.60	0.27	0.40	0.16	0.49	0.38	0.20	0.26
	Lower	0.32	1.29	0.82	0.65	1.58	0.61	1.84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.36	0.85
Planctomycetes	Upper	0.81	0.59	1.10	0.78	0.44	1.15	-	0.78	0.79	0.59	0.58	0.49	0.98	0.66	0.83	0.74	0.31
	Lower	0.32	0.37	0.39	0.58	1.11	0.67	1.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.29	0.07

The red and blue cells indicate increasing or decreasing factors after ASD treatment compared with the before treatment. The color intensities indicates the rate of each difference.

-; No samples

Supplemental Table4
Click here to download high resolution image

Supplemental Table 4. The change rate of the soil prokaryotic class before to after ASD treatment.

Phylum	Class		IS	Ha-1	Ha-2	Ha-3	1	2	3	Shi1	Shi2	Shi3	Tsu1	Tsu2	Tsu3	San1	San2	Gi	Wa
			IS				To			Ni								Gi	Wa
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Upper	0.88	1.273	0.85	0.945	1.242	0.928	-	0.803	0.833	0.955	0.346	0.376	0.408	0.844	0.761	0.518	0.405
		Lower	0.52	1.435	1.452	0.563	0.997	0.754	0.678	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.129	0.324
	Betaproteobacteria	Upper	1.34	0.459	1.229	1.329	2.182	1.295	-	1.491	1.309	3.709	0.89	1.205	1.822	3.358	3.412	1.009	0.491
		Lower	3.16	1.026	0.695	1.957	2.069	1.463	1.36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.45	0.433
	Deltaproteobacteria	Upper	0.86	0.66	1.045	1.307	0.936	0.758	-	1.163	1.581	0.797	1.676	1.555	1.25	0.755	0.873	2.116	0.449
		Lower	1.02	0.953	1.036	2.279	1.335	0.924	1.117	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.383	0.329
	Gammaproteobacteria	Upper	1.00	0.772	0.596	0.375	0.755	0.78	-	1.242	1.067	1.071	0.245	0.393	0.345	0.808	1.172	0.56	0.205
		Lower	0.30	0.88	4.755	0.411	0.919	0.832	0.342	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.284	0.274
Firmicutes	Bacilli	Upper	0.96	1.798	1.865	1.934	1.048	1.077	-	0.718	0.663	0.646	1.826	1.981	2.518	0.821	0.458	1.096	1.773
		Lower	0.47	1.736	1.291	0.868	0.542	1.11	0.688	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	2.731
	Clostridia	Upper	5.79	2.375	6.151	5.619	11.921	4.588	-	2.266	1.354	3.242	7.663	7.569	5.503	2.804	3.574	3.132	21.45
		Lower	3.017	11.363	3.987	3.901	5.254	7.113	2.289	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.46	16.45
Acidobacteria	Acidobacteria-6	Upper	0.66	0.216	0.444	0.639	0.561	1.706	-	0.729	0.736	0.422	0.594	0.676	0.637	0.727	0.701	0.628	0.285
		Lower	0.251	0.246	0.257	0.589	0.531	0.515	0.818	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.382	0.216
	Acidobacteriia	Upper	0.466	1.995	0.637	0.826	0.834	0.612	-	0.726	0.798	0.373	0.299	0.494	0.877	5.479	3.111	1.75	0.293
		Lower	0.44	1.385	0.81	0.436	2.013	1.525	3.538	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.08	0.129
	Solibacteres	Upper	2.782	1.361	0.882	1.372	1.292	0.808	-	0.733	0.527	0.742	2.317	1.496	1.581	1.118	1.231	0.701	5.314
		Lower	1.068	0.841	0.778	0.587	0.974	1.05	1.949	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.895	3.996
	[Chloracidobacteria]	Upper	0.329	0.06	0.037	0.926	0.735	1.022	-	0.38	0.384	0.346	0.053	0.231	0.041	0.33	0.267	0.669	0.352
		Lower	0.204	0.259	0.401	0.74	0.868	0.349	0.366	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.069	0.185
Bacteroidetes	Sphingobacteria	Upper	0.698	4.267	3.244	1.958	0.613	0.57	-	0.991	0.606	0.282	0.183	0.324	0.063	0.298	0.364	0.521	0.82
		Lower	0.644	6.449	10.178	1.27	0.582	0.526	0.292	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.188	0.609
	Cytophagia	Upper	0.051	1.157	2.666	2.625	0.163	0.325	-	0.401	0.412	0.379	0.001	0.003	0.018	0.139	0.271	0.041	0.011
		Lower	0.139	1.044	2.852	0.691	0.287	0.212	0.212	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.05	0.012
Chloroflexi	Anaerolineae	Upper	2.26	0.072	0.064	1.752	0.476	2.129	-	1.884	1.859	0.919	0.851	1.12	3.981	1.56	2.082	1.365	0.302
		Lower	0.47	0.389	0.606	1.719	0.853	1.309	2.35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.293	0.149
Gemmatimonadetes	Gemmatimonadetes	Upper	0.94	1.829	0.782	1.442	1.018	0.824	-	0.647	0.744	0.559	4.01	4.075	2.878	0.654	0.654	0.387	0.874
		Lower	0.89	1.118	0.524	0.629	1.134	0.856	0.487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.075	0.627
	Gemm-1	Upper	0.596	0.198	0.051	0.424	0.728	0.761	-	0.83	0.683	0.427	1.102	0.96	0.754	1.325	1.807	0.654	0.791
		Lower	0.284	0.236	0.274	0.621	1.005	0.827	1.452	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.516	0.716
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Upper	0.88	1.057	0.921	0.742	1.4	0.922	-	0.699	0.738	0.56	1.913	1.395	0.858	0.753	0.706	0.306	0.312
		Lower	1.279	1.334	0.407	0.414	0.362	1.05	0.208	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.145	0.406
	Thermoleophilia	Upper	1.484	1.776	0.943	1.359	1.343	0.916	-	0.805	0.89	0.958	1.077	0.652	1.096	0.737	0.779	0.466	0.565
		Lower	0.397	0.728	0.902	0.462	0.707	0.537	0.613	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.559	0.632
Crenarchaeota	Thaumarchaeota	Upper	0.284	0.209	0.027	0.003	0.5	1.237	-	0.529	1.226	0.253	0.194	0.193	0.902	0.13	0.233	0.451	0.139
		Lower	0.093	0.239	0.034	0.581	0.527	0.616	0.281	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.326	0.112
Nitrospirae	Nitrospira	Upper	0.417	0.127	0.19	0.241	0.609	1.283	-	1.422	1.748	0.747	0.438	0.926	0.873	0.53	0.377	1.773	0.288
		Lower	0.413	0.184	0.317	0.695	0.98	0.813	1.872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.201	0.186