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Extended Data Fig. 1: Relative frequency of the first 10 most frequent OTUs. Each stacked bar ( x -axis) corresponds to a location/year combination. The y-axis gives the proportion of the 10 most frequent OTUs. The colors correspond to the taxonomical assignments of OTUs given in the legend (class / order / family).


Extended Data Fig. 2: Plants grown in different environments have different microbial communities. The plots represent the projection of each sample on the plane defined by the first two constrained components of the fungal (A and C) and bacterial (B and D) communities, describing variation among sites and year. The percentages in parentheses are the proportion of the total inertia (square root of the Bray-Curtis distance) explained by each component. In all plots each dot represents a sample. In A and B, colors indicate the site from which samples where collected. Experiments from the South are represented in red (S1) and yellow (S2), and experiments from the North in blue (N1) and dark blue (N2). In C and D, dark and lighter green identifies samples collected in 2012 and 2013, respectively. The barplots on the right represent the cumulative proportion of variance explained by the first 7 constrained components (CAP1 to 7) for the fungal and bacterial communities, respectively.


Extended Data Fig. 3: Distribution of heritability values estimated for individual OTUs. Each frame presents the distribution of heritability in one year/location combination, and the two smaller graphics within each frame represent the empirical cumulative frequency distribution of the heritability distribution and the boxplot contrasting bacterial (B) and fungal (F) OTUs.


Extended Data Fig. 4: Genome wide association results for $\mathbf{F 6 0}$ in $\mathbf{S 2}$ 2013. A. Genome-wide Manhattan plot. The $y$-axis represents the $-\log _{10}$ of the $p$-value. The x -axis is the position along the 5 chromosomes of $A$. thaliana, represented in different shades of blue. The points in yellow correspond to SNPs with $-\log$ (combined $p$-value) $\geq 8$ and the red vertical line indicates the center of the focal region for the following frames. B. Candidate genes in $\mathrm{a} \sim 40 \mathrm{~kb}$ focal region indicated by the red vertical line in A . The arrows indicate the $5^{\prime}-3$ ' orientation of genes (vertical position is random). C. Associations in the $\sim 20 \mathrm{kB}$ region around associated SNP. Axes are the same as in A. D. The $x$-axis is the same as in C. (coordinate in bp). The $y$-axis gives the minor allele frequency of all SNPs in the focal region. The segments in yellow correspond to the associated SNPs. E. Pattern of pairwise linkage disequilibrium in the focal region. The grey lines in the frame between D. and E. translate the coordinates from position in bp (in E. and above) to the SNP order.


Extended Data Fig. 5: Association peak 2, chromosome 2, between 12.99 and 13.01 Mbp. A. Genome-wide Manhattan plot. The y -axis represents the $-\log _{10}$ of the combined $p$-value for the 10 genetically correlated heritable hubs. The x -axis is the position along the 5 chromosomes of A. thaliana, represented in different shades of blue. The points in yellow correspond to SNPs with $\log$ (combined $p$-value) $\geq 8$ and the red vertical line indicates the center of the focal region for the following frames. B. Candidate genes in a $\sim 40 \mathrm{~kb}$ focal region indicated by the red vertical line in A. The arrows indicate the $5^{\prime}-3$ ' orientation of genes (vertical position is random). C. Associations in the $\sim 20 \mathrm{kB}$ region around associated SNP. Axes are the same as in A. D. The x-axis is the same as in C . (coordinate in bp ). The y -axis gives the minor allele frequency of all SNPs in the focal region. The segments in yellow correspond to the associated SNPs. E. Pattern of pairwise linkage disequilibrium in the focal region. The grey lines in the frame between D. and E. translate the coordinates from position in bp (in E. and above) to the SNP order.


Extended Data Fig. 6: Association peak 6, chromosome 4, between 8.53 and 8.65 Mbp. See Extended Data Fig. 5.


Extended Data Fig. 7: Heritable hubs contribute to fecundity variation. For each location/year, we fitted random forests regression models using breeding values per accession for fecundity as dependent variables. The explanatory variables were breeding values for heritable OTUs (including heritable hubs) and the first 3 components of the pairwise genetic distance (1-Kinship) matrix. In each frame, the $y$-axis gives the variable importance. Variables include heritable OTUs (blue), heritable hubs (yellow), and the genetic distance components (red).

Extended Data Table 1: Host variation has subtle impact on overall community variation. The first 3 columns indicate the community, location and year for which the analysis was performed. Nh stands for the number of principal coordinate components with significant broad sense heritability estimates ( $95 \%$ confidence intervals not overlapping 0 ). A total of 10 components were computed for each community/location/year combination. "VE" indicates the total amount of microbial community variation captured by the first 10 components and "he" provides an estimated proportion of total variation explained by the identity of host accessions. The overall host effects reported in the main text reflect the distribution of VE*he in this table. N samples and N OTUs indicate the number of samples and OTUs analyzed in each community/location/year combination.

| gene | location | year | Nh | VE | he | N samples | N OTUs |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 16S | ada | 2012 | 7 | 55.185 | 1.244 | 570 | 279 |
| 16S | ada | 2013 | 5 | 51.78 | 1.593 | 912 | 338 |
| 16S | ram | 2012 | 7 | 57.683 | 3.826 | 589 | 256 |
| 16S | ram | 2013 | 7 | 45.852 | 2.115 | 1021 | 375 |
| 16S | rat | 2012 | 4 | 57.188 | 1.204 | 695 | 250 |
| 16S | rat | 2013 | 8 | 45.904 | 1.958 | 973 | 295 |
| 16S | ull | 2012 | 7 | 49.242 | 2.529 | 1051 | 321 |
| 16S | ull | 2013 | 6 | 41.472 | 1.002 | 982 | 303 |
| Total number of bacterial OTU/location/year combinations | 2417 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITS | ada | 2012 | 6 | 61.578 | 1.656 | 530 | 210 |
| ITS | ada | 2013 | 5 | 54.646 | 0.607 | 889 | 320 |
| ITS | ram | 2012 | 9 | 60.073 | 2.743 | 578 | 163 |
| ITS | ram | 2013 | 7 | 42.543 | 1.379 | 996 | 425 |
| ITS | rat | 2012 | 4 | 47.986 | 1.990 | 696 | 163 |
| ITS | rat | 2013 | 9 | 49.498 | 2.650 | 981 | 233 |
| ITS | ull | 2012 | 9 | 58.717 | 5.248 | 996 | 156 |
| ITS | ull | 2013 | 3 | 56.253 | 0.724 | 990 | 244 |

Extended Data Table 2: Hubs are enriched for interkingdom connections (edges). For each site (first column) and year (second column), the table presents the results from a $\chi^{2}$ testing for enrichment in interkingdom edges when considering all edges, or edges involving at least one hub. B_B, B_F, F_F give the number of edges between 2 bacterial OTUs, a bacterial and a fungal OTU, and 2 fungal OTUs, respectively.

| site | year | edges | B_B | B_F | F_F | $\chi^{2}$ | $p$-value | FDR adj. $p$-value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S1 | 2012 | all | 1148 | 134 | 556 | 107.325 | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0002 |
|  |  | with hubs | 369 | 61 | 34 |  |  |  |
| S1 | 2013 | all | 976 | 140 | 844 | 26.922 | $4.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0003 |
|  |  | with hubs | 132 | 44 | 190 |  |  |  |
| S2 | 2012 | all | 981 | 137 | 484 | 41.968 | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0002 |
|  |  | with hubs | 277 | 41 | 50 |  |  |  |
| S2 | 2013 | all | 1039 | 157 | 873 | 25.536 | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0002 |
|  |  | with hubs | 132 | 49 | 162 |  |  |  |
| N1 | 2012 | all | 1212 | 157 | 637 | 71.122 | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0002 |
|  |  | with hubs | 240 | 29 | 23 |  |  |  |
| N1 | 2013 | all | 1427 | 288 | 1185 | 25.593 | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0002 |
|  |  | with hubs | 271 | 104 | 295 |  |  |  |
| N2 | 2012 | all | 951 | 71 | 430 | 15.604 | $6.20 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 0.0050 |
|  |  | with hubs | 183 | 16 | 42 |  |  |  |
| N2 | 2013 | all | 1720 | 229 | 1473 | 62.111 | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0002 |
|  |  | with hubs | 254 | 94 | 341 |  |  |  |

Extended Data Table 3: Breeding values of heritable hub F8 have a significant positive effects on breeding-values for fecundity in linear mixed model including a random term accounting for IBS kinship (K) among accessions. For each location and year, models were defined as follow $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}} \sim \mathrm{hh}_{1 \mathrm{i}}+\ldots+\mathrm{hh}_{\mathrm{ni}}+\mathrm{K}+$ error $_{i}$, where $Y_{i}$ is the fecundity breeding value for the $i^{\text {th }}$ accession, $\mathrm{hh}_{n i}$ are fixed effects for the breeding values for the $i^{\text {th }}$ accessions for the $\mathrm{n}^{\text {th }}$ heritable hub identified in the location/year combination, K is a random term capturing genome wide relatedness among accessions (kinship) and error $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{i}}$ captures residuals using a normal distribution.

|  |  | Fixed coefficients |  |  |  |  | Random effects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| experiment | sample size | coefficients | Value | Std Error | Z | $p$-value | Group | Std Dev | Variance |
| S1 2012 | 196 | Intercept F8 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00014 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 7 0 1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00049 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 5 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.29 \\ & 4.48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.70 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 7.60 \mathrm{E}-06 \end{aligned}$ | K <br> Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 8.61 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.006816532 \end{array}$ | $7.41 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| S1 2013 | 198 | Intercept B107 <br> B25 <br> F5 <br> F8 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00022 \\ -0.00476 \\ 0.00284 \\ -0.00499 \\ \mathbf{0 . 0 1 5 2 9} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.00052 \\ & 0.00596 \\ & 0.00744 \\ & 0.00705 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 4 2 8} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.42 \\ -0.80 \\ 0.38 \\ -0.71 \\ \mathbf{3 . 5 7} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.70 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 4.20 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 7.00 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 4.80 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & \mathbf{3 . 6 0 E}-04 \end{aligned}$ | K <br> Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 8.79 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.007283165 \end{array}$ | 7.73E-05 |
| S2 2012 | 177 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int } \\ & \text { B41 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.00064 \\ -0.00657 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00055 \\ & 0.00523 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.16 \\ -1.26 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.50 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 2.10 \mathrm{E}-01 \end{aligned}$ | K Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 9.22 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.006883981 \end{array}$ | $8.49 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| S2 2013 | 197 | Intercept <br> B26 <br> F5 <br> F60 <br> F8 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00007 \\ 0.00789 \\ -0.01309 \\ 0.01130 \\ \mathbf{0 . 0 0 8 8 3} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00032 \\ & 0.00387 \\ & 0.00351 \\ & 0.00369 \\ & \mathbf{0 . 0 0 3 9 4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.21 \\ 2.04 \\ -3.73 \\ 3.06 \\ \mathbf{2 . 2 4} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.40 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 4.10 \mathrm{E}-02 \\ & 1.90 \mathrm{E}-04 \\ & 2.20 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ & \mathbf{2 . 5 0 E}-\mathbf{0 2} \end{aligned}$ | K <br> Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 4.49 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.004501831 \\ 4.08 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.007389621 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.02 \mathrm{E}-05 \\ & 1.66 \mathrm{E}-05 \end{aligned}$ |
| N1 2012 | 160 | Intercept B28 <br> B38 F8 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.00080 \\ 0.00816 \\ -0.00707 \\ 0.00387 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.00060 \\ & 0.00692 \\ & 0.00585 \\ & 0.00289 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1.33 \\ 1.18 \\ -1.21 \\ 1.34 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1.80 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 2.40 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 2.30 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 1.80 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | K Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 4.08 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.007389621 \end{array}$ | $1.66 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| N1 2013 | 198 | Intercept <br> F19 <br> F60 <br> F8 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.00031 \\ 0.00590 \\ -0.02173 \\ 0.00276 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.00051 \\ & 0.00713 \\ & 0.00817 \\ & 0.00532 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.61 \\ 0.83 \\ -2.66 \\ 0.52 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5.40 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 4.10 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 7.80 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ & 6.00 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | K <br> Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 8.75 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.007104794 \end{array}$ | $7.65 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| N2 2012 | 179 | Intercept B26 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.00064 \\ & 0.00262 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.00056 \\ & 0.00457 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.15 \\ & 0.57 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.50 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 5.70 \mathrm{E}-01 \end{aligned}$ | K Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 1.49 \mathrm{E}-04 \\ 0.007457504 \end{array}$ | $2.22 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| N2 2013 | 197 | Intercept <br> B12 <br> B26 <br> B99 <br> F150 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.00005 \\ -0.00403 \\ 0.01793 \\ 0.00164 \\ -0.00073 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.00043 \\ & 0.00534 \\ & 0.00914 \\ & 0.00358 \\ & 0.00460 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.12 \\ -0.75 \\ 1.96 \\ 0.46 \\ -0.16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 9.10 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 4.50 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 5.00 \mathrm{E}-02 \\ & 6.50 \mathrm{E}-01 \\ & 8.70 \mathrm{E}-01 \end{aligned}$ | K Residual error | $\begin{array}{r} 6.44 \mathrm{E}-03 \\ 0.005948529 \end{array}$ | $4.15 \mathrm{E}-05$ |

