Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Current Opinion in Microbiology

Life in earth – the root microbiome to the rescue?

Tim H Mauchline[1] and Jacob G Malone[2,3]

Manipulation of the soil microbiome holds great promise for contributing to more environmentally benign agriculture, with soil microbes such as *Pseudomonas* promoting plant growth and effectively suppressing pathogenic microorganisms. Next-generation sequencing has enabled a new generation of research into soil microbiomes, presenting the opportunity to better understand and exploit these valuable resources. Soil bacterial communities are both highly complex and variable, and contain vast interspecies and intraspecies diversity, both of which respond to environmental variation. Therefore, we propose that a combination of whole microbiome analyses with in-depth examination of key microbial taxa will likely prove the most effective approach to understanding rhizosphere microbial interactions. This review highlights recent efforts in this direction, based around the important biocontrol bacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens*.

Addresses
[1] Department of AgroEcology, Rothamsted Research, Harpenden, UK
[2] Molecular Microbiology Department, John Innes Centre, Norwich, UK
[3] School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

Corresponding author: Malone, Jacob G (jacob.malone@jic.ac.uk)

Current Opinion in Microbiology 2017, **37**:23–28

This review comes from a themed issue on **Environmental microbiology**

Edited by **Marcio de Castro Silva Filho** and **Jorge Vivanco**

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2017.03.005

Introduction

The Green Revolution boosted global agricultural production in the 20th century through innovations centred on the development of high-yielding dwarf crop varieties that respond well to chemical fertilizers and other agrochemicals. It is estimated that this process saved between 18–27 million hectares of land from being converted to agriculture [1] and that the associated yield gains prevented over one billion people from starving. However, the continued heavy use of agrochemicals is costly, ecologically damaging, and unsustainable in the medium to long term. The use of precision agriculture, involving the better use of external inputs alongside genetically modified crops with more efficient nutrient-use characteristics is likely to be hugely important in achieving future productivity gains [2]. Additionally, the soil microbiome holds great promise for contributing to more environmentally benign agriculture. Naturally occurring soil-dwelling microbes influence plant health, resource-use efficiency and biocontrol [3,4]. However, their potential has been under-exploited to date. Recent advances in nucleic acid sequencing technologies have enabled a new generation of research into soil microbial communities, and offer the opportunity to better understand, and hence exploit, this resource.

Advances in soil microbiome analysis

Soil microbiomes are intricate, highly diverse ecosystems containing thousands of interacting microorganisms—a recent analysis of the microbiome of disease-suppressive soils identified over 33 000 bacterial and archaeal OTUs in the sugar beet rhizosphere [5•]. Recently, the ability to rapidly sequence and identify DNA extracted from soil samples has enabled the development of several powerful metagenomic analysis techniques [6]. For example, interrogation of the genetics of whole microbial communities allows us to probe the physiological characteristics and potential of plant-associated microorganisms [7,8]. Amplicon sequence analysis of marker genes, typically 16S rRNA in the case of bacteria, enable us to characterize the relative abundance of different species in phyllosphere and rhizosphere communities [9], while metatranscriptomic approaches may be used to examine the metabolic activities and regulatory mechanisms that function in different environments [10–12].

While much has been learned about the relative abundance of different microbial phyla and genera, and the functional and metabolic characteristics of the plant and soil-associated microbiome [13,14], it is also imperative to understand the metabolic, natural product and genomic diversity associated with individual species in the soil system to obtain a better understanding of microbial function [15•,16–18,19•]. For example, we now know that the metabolic behaviour of the nitrogen fixing species *Rhizobium* varies profoundly between the rhizospheres of different plant species [20]. Furthermore, environmental variation profoundly influences the relative abundance of individual genes in the population of a single species group [21•,22]. In the near future, newly developed methods for microbial isolation and culturing will markedly increase our capacity to understand both the overall microbiome, and the individual species within it [23•,24]. Total microbiome approaches by definition are more superficial in their analyses, while complete assignation of functional genes to particular microbial OTUs in the soil is challenging, although the

reconstruction of a draft genome from a novel soil methanogen indicates that this may become more commonplace in the future [25]. Nonetheless, in reality the reconstruction of discrete microbial genomes will always be problematic. Bacterial genomes are composed of multiple, often plastic genetic elements, leading to problems in assembling genome complements. This is especially the case in complex communities where species complexes are commonplace. Therefore, advances in sequence analysis will most likely give rise to the creation of 'species metagenomes'. The production of broader culturable metagenomes [26], coupled with an increased ability to sequence individual microbial isolates will be useful for verifying genome reconstruction from metagenomes, and also for use in manipulative experimentation. We propose that a combination of total community studies, with more in-depth analysis of key culturable microbial taxa will further our understanding of rhizosphere microbial interactions more effectively than either approach taken in isolation.

Biocontrol pseudomonads in the soil microbiome

As the harmful environmental impacts of chemical pesticides become more apparent, manipulation of the soil and plant-associated microbiota is gaining increasing recognition as a potential alternative treatment for a range of crop diseases and pests. This may occur on a whole-microbiome level, for example through the development of suppressive soils or the control of potato scab by irrigation, or alternatively through the stimulation/introduction of key biocontrol microorganisms, such as *Bacillus* or *Pseudomonas* spp. Many important fungal and bacterial diseases including fire blight (*Erwinia amylovora*, [27]), potato scab (*Streptomyces scabies*, [28]) and take-all (*Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici*, [29]) are effectively suppressed by members of the *Pseudomonas fluorescens* species group. These important, widespread soil-dwelling microbes have an established role in the development of take-all suppressive soils [29–33], where the fungal pathogen is maintained at a low level in the soil but is unable to cause disease. Take-all is a destructive fungal crop disease that causes substantial losses in cereal crops [34,35], and is therefore an attractive target for the development of *Pseudomonas* biocontrol agents. However, to date efforts in this direction have been plagued by inconsistency [36], in large part due to the huge complexity of the plant/pathogen/soil ecosystem.

Pseudomonas fluorescens

P. fluorescens are a diverse clade of Gram negative, γ-proteobacteria that non-specifically colonise a number of different plant species. They represent a major constituent of the rhizosphere microbiome, and exploit root exudates as source of nutrients and energy. *P. fluorescens* spp. are flexible, generalist bacteria that are able to colonise many different environmental niches and carbon sources. Their genomes are correspondingly complex, encoding around 6000 genes, and with a high degree of intraspecies diversity—the *Pseudomonas* core genome represents as little as 20% of an individual bacterial genome [19•], with much of the accessory genome given over to signal transduction, phenotypic output loci and secondary metabolism [15•,19•]. The high degree of genomic and metabolic plasticity among the soil pseudomonads allows both individual bacteria, and the microbial population as a whole, to effectively adapt to different plant–soil–microbiome environments.

Pseudomonas plant colonisation is a complex, tightly controlled process that begins with chemotaxis into the rhizosphere along a gradient of root exudates, followed by surface association and migration on the rhizoplane [37], and ultimately the formation of a bacterial biofilm [38•]. The early stages of colonisation are facilitated by flagella and type IV pili, and the production of biosurfactants, which together enable coordinated swarming motility [37,39]. The later stages are characterised by the formation of micro-colonies on the plant surface, then establishment of a mature biofilm. In addition to bacterial cells this protective matrix is composed of proteinaceous adhesins [40], lipopolysaccharide [41] and various exopolysaccharide molecules [38•,42]. To successfully colonise the plant rhizosphere, many *Pseudomonas* spp. produce enzymes that enable them to manipulate plants, encouraging growth and disrupting stress responses. For example, enzymes that synthesise and catabolise auxins [15•] and plant growth-promoting volatiles such as 2-3-butanediol and acetoin [43] have been identified in several *Pseudomonas* genomes [15•,19•]. In addition, many *Pseudomonas* spp. produce ACC deaminase, which protects plants from environmental stresses by short-circuiting ethylene production [44].

P. fluorescens in the rhizosphere is under continuous attack from other members of the soil microbiome. This takes the form of competition and antagonism from other microorganisms, as well as predation by nematodes and insects. To counter this second threat, and to prevent insect predation of their host plants, many *Pseudomonas* spp. produce insecticidal molecules such as the Mcf, IPD072Aa and Fit toxins [15•,45,46]. Meanwhile, to fight against hostile bacteria, oomycetes and fungi, soil *Pseudomonas* spp. secrete bacteriocins [47,48], alongside toxins and other natural products using specialised protein secretion pathways. Type III and Type VI complexes inject toxins and effector proteins into eukaryotic and bacterial cells, and contribute to various cytotoxicity and virulence-associated phenotypes [49]. Type II secretion systems are diverse protein exporters, and facilitate the secretion of bacteriocins, surface adhesins and extracellular enzymes [40]. *Pseudomonas* secrete a number of these exoenzymes including plant tissue-degrading lyases, proteinases and chitinases that contribute to

biocontrol by hydrolysing fungal cell walls [50,51]. As well as affecting plant behaviour, some *Pseudomonas* spp. also disrupt signal transduction by other rhizosphere microorganisms, for example by producing AHL lactonase to suppress quorum sensing [52].

Pseudomonas spp. also produce a diverse array of secreted natural products. These have varied functions, although many serve to kill or suppress plant predators and competing microorganisms [15•,53]. Even those molecules with a well-defined alternative function often function as antimicrobials. These include the metal ion-chelating siderophores, which also inhibit pathogenic fungi by inducing metal ion starvation in model rhizospheres [54]. Phenazines; flavin coenzyme analogues that function as electron shuttles in microoxic environments [55] also inhibit electron transport in plant pathogens [56,57], and are linked to ecological fitness in take-all infected wheat rhizospheres [58]. Likewise, viscosin and other cyclic lipopeptides act both as surfactants to enable swarming motility [37], and antibiotics that solubilise cell membranes [59]. Soil *Pseudomonas* spp. also produce a host of dedicated antimicrobials, such as the antifungal compounds pyoluteorin and pyrrolnitrin [60,61], phloroglucinols like 2-4-DAPG [62], and hydrogen cyanide [63]. A recently conducted metabolic profiling analysis based on soil isolates from Rothamsted Research (Harpenden, U.K.) demonstrated a remarkable level of natural product diversity within the rhizosphere *Pseudomonas* population, with isolates from a single wheat field producing a comparable natural product complement to an extensive library of global isolates from diverse environmental sources [64•].

Depending on the exact conditions in their environment, *P. fluorescens* populations select from the huge potential within the accessory genome to produce an optimal genetic and metabolic response. Clearly, if we can define the genetic loci and phenotypic characteristics that contribute to rhizosphere colonisation and biocontrol, and determine how these change with different plant/soil environments, we will be much better placed to exploit the soil *Pseudomonas* population to develop better crop management strategies and novel biocontrol agents.

Analyzing genomic diversity in plant associated *Pseudomonas* populations

A recent two-year experiment at Rothamsted [65] presented us with an opportunity to examine the relationship between the *Pseudomonas* genome and the environment, in the context of infection with take-all. This experiment compared high (Hereward) and low (Cadenza) take-all inoculum building (TAB) wheat varieties, and the impact on crop yield in the second wheat [65]. We isolated hundreds of *Pseudomonas* CFUs from the rhizospheres of second year wheat plants, and subjected them to extensive phenotypic, genotypic and genomic analysis, including whole genome sequencing of 19 isolates.

A phylogenetic tree of all *Pseudomonas* isolates based on ERIC PCR profiles and housekeeping gene sequences showed that the wheat variety grown in year one exerted considerable selective pressure on both the extent and nature of *Pseudomonas* genomic diversity. Hereward plots showed increased take-all build-up and *Pseudomonas* genomic richness, alongside yield losses of ~3 t/ha (Figure 1) [66•]. However, while distinct clusters of genotypes were observed when year one wheat variety was considered, no pattern was observed with cultivars from year two. These findings agree with a 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequence analysis of the rhizosphere soil in each plot, which showed that year one Hereward plots contained significantly larger *Pseudomonas* populations, alongside several different genera of saprophytes [21•].

We then took a statistical approach to combine our various datasets, conducting correlation coefficient analyses to identify the phenotypes and genes that were selected by different cultivar combinations over the course of the field trial. This analysis identified several interesting correlations between phenotypes, genotypes, and the wheat varieties from which strains were isolated [21•]. At least two distinct, mutually exclusive phenotypic/genotypic groups emerged from our analysis. The first of these showed increased levels of antimicrobial activity towards *Streptomyces* spp., and contained operons for cyclic-lipopeptide and LPS biosynthesis, type VI secretion and toxin production. The second group produced

Figure 1



Soil *Pseudomonas* genotypic richness is associated with more severe disease incidence in wheat roots.
Differences in *Pseudomonas fluorescens* genotypic richness and take-all disease incidence after year two, in response to cultivar planted in year one (figure adapted from Mehrabi *et al*. [66•]).

Figure 2



A model for year 1 wheat cultivar selection of soil *Pseudomonas* genotypes.
High take-all levels in the soil of first year Hereward plots lead to increased plant disease and root senescence. This in turn leads to increased populations of saprophytic microorganisms (green), and an associated shift in the *Pseudomonas* population towards a more aggressive, 'territorial' morphotype (blue). Conversely, where take all levels are low, the *Pseudomonas* population shifts towards phenotypes including metal ion scavenging and plant hormone production (red).

high levels of fluorescent siderophores, a phenotype that strongly correlated with acetoin catabolism loci [21•].

Excitingly, we also saw correlations between individual *Pseudomonas* genes and the wheat varieties grown in the first year. The operons associated with year one Hereward cultivation (high TAB) also positively correlated with *Streptomyces* suppression, while loci that positively correlated with year one Cadenza (low TAB) strongly associated with increased pyoverdin production [21•]. In addition, *Pseudomonas* isolates from this field experiment were used to construct synthetic community fungal antagonism assays [1]. Increased *Pseudomonas* spp. richness positively correlated with *in vitro* pathogen growth. This supported the field observation that first year Hereward plots, with a higher rhizosphere genotypic richness than first year Cadenza, developed more severe take-all disease, demonstrating a negative biodiversity effect (Figure 1). We propose that the increased levels of senescent root tissue and saprophytic microorganisms that accompany Hereward growth in year one may lead to an increased abundance of pseudomonads that are adapted to niche competition with other microbes, whereas the comparatively benign environment associated with Cadenza rhizospheres favours *Pseudomonas* genotypes that are better adapted to plant–host communication and increased production of metal scavenging siderophores (Figure 2).

Clearly, it remains to be established whether the model we propose for the interplay between wheat, take-all and *Pseudomonas* is correct, or whether there is a different reason for the population shifts we see. Nonetheless the impact of the first year wheat cultivar was still detectable two years after the beginning of the experiment, consistent with substantial selective pressure on the first-year rhizosphere population. A second long-term wheat experiment that will capture the full disease epidemic is underway, as are several laboratory experiments including root exudate metabolomic analysis, to strengthen and refine our initial conclusions. Our experiments indicate that first year wheat genotype affects both the overall *Pseudomonas* population, and also the distribution of individual genotypes in the second year rhizosphere [21•,65,66•]. In turn, these experiments support our contention that a better understanding of the soil microbiota, combined with smart manipulation of plant cropping systems may present a reliable future route to sustainable yield improvement and biocontrol.

Acknowledgements

Rothamsted Research receives strategic funding from BBSRC, and TM acknowledges support from the BBSRC ISPG; Optimisation of nutrients in soil–plant systems (BBS/E/C/00005196). JM was supported in this work by the University of East Anglia and the BBSRC ISPG; Biotic Interactions for Crop Productivity (BB/J004553/1), to the John Innes Centre.

References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- • of special interest

1. Stevenson JR, Villoria N, Byerlee D, Kelley T, Maredia M: **Green Revolution research saved an estimated 18 to 27 million hectares from being brought into agricultural production**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2013, **110**:8363-8368.

2. Garibaldi LA *et al.*: **Farming approaches for greater biodiversity, livelihoods, and food security**. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 2016, **32(1)**: 68-80.

3. Berendsen RL, Pieterse CM, Bakker PA: **The rhizosphere microbiome and plant health**. *Trends Plant Sci.* 2012, **17**: 478-486.

4. Mendes R, Garbeva P, Raaijmakers JM: **The rhizosphere microbiome: significance of plant beneficial, plant pathogenic, and human pathogenic microorganisms**. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 2013, **37**:634-663.

5. • Mendes R *et al.*: **Deciphering the rhizosphere microbiome for disease-suppressive bacteria**. *Science* 2011, **332**:1097-1100.
A metagenomic and functional analysis of the rhizosphere microbiome, focussing on taxa associated with fungal disease suppression. This paper describes and characterises the huge interspecies diversity in the rhizosphere soil, and shows how plants can exploit soil microbial consortia for protection against fungal infection.

6. Knief C: **Analysis of plant microbe interactions in the era of next generation sequencing technologies**. *Front. Plant Sci.* 2014, **5**.

7. Mendes LW, Kuramae EE, Navarrete AA, van Veen JA, Tsai SM: **Taxonomical and functional microbial community selection in soybean rhizosphere**. *ISME J.* 2014, **8**:1577-1587.

8. Sessitsch A *et al.*: **Functional characteristics of an endophyte community colonizing rice roots as revealed by metagenomic analysis**. *MPMI* 2012, **25**:28-36.

9. Lundberg DS *et al.*: **Defining the core *Arabidopsis thaliana* root microbiome**. *Nature* 2012, **488**:86-90.

10. Newman MM *et al.*: **Changes in rhizosphere bacterial gene expression following glyphosate treatment**. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2016, **553**:32-41.

11. Luo B, Gu W, Zhong J, Wang Y, Zhang G: **Revealing crosstalk of plant and fungi in the symbiotic roots of sewage-cleaning *Eichhornia crassipes* using direct *de novo* metatranscriptomic analysis**. *Sci. Rep.* 2015, **5**:15407.

12. Chaparro JM, Badri DV, Vivanco JM: **Rhizosphere microbiome assemblage is affected by plant development**. *ISME J.* 2014, **8**:790-803.

13. Bulgarelli D *et al.*: **Revealing structure and assembly cues for Arabidopsis root-inhabiting bacterial microbiota**. *Nature* 2012, **488**:91-95.

14. Tkacz A, Cheema J, Chandra G, Grant A, Poole PS: **Stability and succession of the rhizosphere microbiota depends upon plant type and soil composition**. *ISME J.* 2015, **9**:2349-2359.

15. • Loper JE *et al.*: **Comparative genomics of plant-associated *Pseudomonas* spp.: insights into diversity and inheritance of traits involved in multitrophic interactions**. *PLoS Genet.* 2012, **8**:e1002784.
This comprehensive bioinformatic study of annotated *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strains describes the vast genomic and phenotypic complexity of *P. fluorescens*, and represents an excellent introduction to the genetic structure and variability within this species group.

16. Silby MW *et al.*: **Genomic and genetic analyses of diversity and plant interactions of *Pseudomonas fluorescens***. *Genome Biol.* 2009, **10**:R51.

17. Redondo-Nieto M *et al.*: **Genome sequence of the biocontrol strain *Pseudomonas fluorescens* F113**. *J. Bacteriol.* 2012, **194**:1273-1274.

18. Seaton SC, Silby MW: **Genetics and functional genomics of the *Pseudomonas fluorescens* group**. *Genomics of Plant-Associated Bacteria, ed al. DCGe*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag; 2014, 99-125.

19. • Garrido-Sanz D *et al.*: **Genomic and genetic diversity within the *Pseudomonas fluorescens* complex**. *PLoS One* 2016, **11**: e0150183.
A bioinformatic analysis of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* genomic diversity. This study makes specific predictions about the size of the global *P. fluorescens* core and pan-genomes, and posits a series of phenotypically and genotypically distinct subspecies within the wider *P. fluorescens* species group.

20. Ramachandran VK, East AK, Karunakaran R, Downie A, Poole PS: **Adaptation of *Rhizobium leguminosarum* to pea, alfalfa and sugar beet rhizospheres investigated by comparative transcriptomics**. *Genome Biol.* 2011, **12**:R106.

21. • Mauchline TH *et al.*: **An analysis of Pseudomonas genomic diversity in take-all infected wheat fields reveals the lasting impact of wheat cultivars on the soil microbiota**. *Environ. Microbiol.* 2015, **17**:4764-4778.
In this manuscript, we outline a novel approach for the examination of microbial genomes in a complex environment, and use this to examine the relationship between crop variety, fungal load and Pseudomonas genetics in defined wheat fields.

22. Parejko JA, Mavrodi DV, Mavrodi OV, Weller DM, Thomashow LS: **Population structure and diversity of phenazine-1-carboxylic acid producing fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. from dryland cereal fields of central Washington State (USA)**. *Microb. Ecol.* 2012, **64**:226-241.

23. • Bai Y *et al.*: **Functional overlap of the Arabidopsis leaf and root microbiota**. *Nature* 2015, **528**:364-369.
A comprehensive examination of the leaf- and root-derived microbiota of Arabidopsis. This manuscript introduces several novel approaches to high throughput bacterial culturing and community analysis. This paper further demonstrates that there is a high degree of taxonomic overlap between the microbiota associated with leaves and root systems.

24. Ling LL *et al.*: **A new antibiotic kills pathogens without detectable resistance**. *Nature* 2015, **517**:455-459.

25. Mackelprang R *et al.*: **Metagenomic analysis of a permafrost microbial community reveals a rapid response to thaw**. *Nature* 2011, **480**:368-371.

26. Nichols D *et al.*: **Use of Ichip for high-throughput in situ cultivation of uncultivable microbial species**. *Appl. Environ. Microb.* 2010, **76**:2445-2450.

27. Stockwell VO, Johnson KB, Sugar D, Loper JE: **Control of fire blight by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* A506 and *Pantoea vagans* C9-1 applied as single strains and mixed inocula**. *Phytopathology* 2010, **100**:1330-1339.

28. Arseneault T, Goyer C, Filion M: **Phenazine production by *Pseudomonas* sp. LBUM223 contributes to the biological control of potato common scab**. *Phytopathology* 2013, **103**: 995-1000.

29. Yang MM *et al.*: **Biological control of take-all by fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. from Chinese wheat fields**. *Phytopathology* 2011, **101**:1481-1491.

30. Bergsma-Vlami M, Prins ME, Raaijmakers JM: **Influence of plant species on population dynamics, genotypic diversity and antibiotic production in the rhizosphere by indigenous *Pseudomonas* spp**. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 2005, **52**:59-69.

31. Cook RJ *et al.*: **Molecular mechanisms of defense by rhizobacteria against root disease**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 1995, **92**:4197-4201.

32. Mazzola M, Cook RJ: **Effects of fungal root pathogens on the population dynamics of biocontrol strains of fluorescent pseudomonads in the wheat rhizosphere**. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 1991, **57**:2171-2178.

33. Kwak YS, Weller DM: **Take-all of wheat and natural disease suppression: a review**. *Plant Pathol. J.* 2013, **29**:125-135.

34. Bateman GL, Gutteridge RJ, Jenkyn JF: **Take-all and grain yields in sequences of winter wheat crops testing fluquinconazole**

seed treatment applied in different combinations of years. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 2004, **145**:317-330.

35. Hornby D, Bateman GL: *Take-all Desease of Cereals: A Regional Perspective*. Wallingford: CAB International; 1998:. pp xxiii, 384 p., [388] p. of col. plates.

36. Weller DM: **Biological-control of soilborne plant-pathogens in the rhizosphere with bacteria**. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 1988, **26**:379-407.

37. Alsohim AS *et al.*: **The biosurfactant viscosin produced by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 aids spreading motility and plant growth promotion**. *Environ. Microbiol.* 2014, **16**:2267-2281.

38. • Chin-A-Woeng TFC, de Priester W, van der Bij AJ, Lugtenberg BJJ: **Description of the colonization of a gnotobiotic tomato rhizosphere by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* biocontrol strain WCS365, using scanning electron microscopy**. *Mol. Plant Microbe Interact.* 1997, **10**:79-86.
This manuscript presents an elegant and illuminating description of the different stages of rhizosphere colonisation and root biofilm formation by *Pseudomonas fluorescens*.

39. Lugtenberg BJ, Dekkers L, Bloemberg GV: **Molecular determinants of rhizosphere colonization by Pseudomonas**. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 2001, **39**:461-490.

40. Hinsa SM, Espinosa-Urgel M, Ramos JL, O'Toole GA: **Transition from reversible to irreversible attachment during biofilm formation by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* WCS365 requires an ABC transporter and a large secreted protein**. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2003, **49**:905-918.

41. de Weert S *et al.*: **The two-component colR/S system of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* WCS365 plays a role in rhizosphere competence through maintaining the structure and function of the outer membrane**. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 2006, **58**:205-213.

42. Gal M, Preston GM, Massey RC, Spiers AJ, Rainey PB: **Genes encoding a cellulosic polymer contribute toward the ecological success of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 on plant surfaces**. *Mol. Ecol.* 2003, **12**:3109-3121.

43. Ryu CM *et al.*: **Bacterial volatiles promote growth in Arabidopsis**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2003, **100**:4927-4932.

44. Klee HJ, Hayford MB, Kretzmer KA, Barry GF, Kishore GM: **Control of ethylene synthesis by expression of a bacterial enzyme in transgenic tomato plants**. *Plant Cell* 1991, **3**:1187-1193.

45. Pechy-Tarr M *et al.*: **Control and host-dependent activation of insect toxin expression in a root-associated biocontrol pseudomonad**. *Environ. Microbiol.* 2013, **15**:736-750.

46. Schellenberger U *et al.*: **A selective insecticidal protein from Pseudomonas for controlling corn rootworms**. *Science* 2016, **354**:634-637.

47. Parret AH, De Mot R: **Bacteria killing their own kind: novel bacteriocins of Pseudomonas and other gamma-proteobacteria**. *Trends Microbiol.* 2002, **10**:107-112.

48. Hert AP *et al.*: **Suppression of the bacterial spot pathogen *Xanthomonas euvesicatoria* on tomato leaves by an attenuated mutant of *Xanthomonas perforans***. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 2009, **75**:3323-3330.

49. Hayes CS, Aoki SK, Low DA: **Bacterial contact-dependent delivery systems**. *Annu. Rev. Genet.* 2010, **44**:71-90.

50. Liao CH, McCallus DE, Fett WF: **Molecular characterization of two gene loci required for production of the key pathogenicity factor pectate lyase in *Pseudomonas viridiflava***. *MPMI* 1994, **7**:391-400.

51. Ayyadurai N, Naik PR, Sakthivel N: **Functional characterization of antagonistic fluorescent pseudomonads associated with rhizospheric soil of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.)**. *J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 2007, **17**:919-927.

52. Jafra S *et al.*: **Detection and characterization of bacteria from the potato rhizosphere degrading *N*-acyl-homoserine lactone**. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 2006, **52**:1006-1015.

53. Haas D, Defago G: **Biological control of soil-borne pathogens by fluorescent pseudomonads**. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 2005, **3**:307-319.

54. Kloepper JW, Leong J, Teintze M, Schroth MN: **Enhanced plant-growth by siderophores produced by plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria**. *Nature* 1980, **286**:885-886.

55. Kempes CP, Okegbe C, Mears-Clarke Z, Follows MJ, Dietrich LE: **Morphological optimization for access to dual oxidants in biofilms**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2014, **111**:208-213.

56. Britigan BE *et al.*: **Interaction of the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* secretory products pyocyanin and pyochelin generates hydroxyl radical and causes synergistic damage to endothelial cells. Implications for Pseudomonas-associated tissue injury**. *J. Clin. Invest.* 1992, **90**:2187-2196.

57. Ran H, Hassett DJ, Lau GW: **Human targets of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* pyocyanin**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2003, **100**:14315-14320.

58. Mazzola M, Cook RJ, Thomashow LS, Weller DM, Pierson LS 3rd: **Contribution of phenazine antibiotic biosynthesis to the ecological competence of fluorescent pseudomonads in soil habitats**. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 1992, **58**:2616-2624.

59. de Bruijn I *et al.*: **Genome-based discovery, structure prediction and functional analysis of cyclic lipopeptide antibiotics in Pseudomonas species**. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2007, **63**:417-428.

60. Nowak-Thompson B, Chaney N, Wing JS, Gould SJ, Loper JE: **Characterization of the pyoluteorin biosynthetic gene cluster of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf-5**. *J. Bacteriol.* 1999, **181**:2166-2174.

61. Kirner S *et al.*: **Functions encoded by pyrrolnitrin biosynthetic genes from *Pseudomonas fluorescens***. *J. Bacteriol.* 1998, **180**:1939-1943.

62. Shanahan P, O'Sullivan DJ, Simpson P, Glennon JD, O'Gara F: **Isolation of 2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol from a fluorescent pseudomonad and investigation of physiological parameters influencing its production**. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 1992, **58**:353-358.

63. Blumer C, Haas D: **Mechanism, regulation, and ecological role of bacterial cyanide biosynthesis**. *Arch. Microbiol.* 2000, **173**:170-177.

64. • Nguyen DD *et al.*: **Indexing the Pseudomonas specialized metabolome enabled the discovery of poaeamide B and the bananamides**. *Nat. Microbiol.* 2016, **2**:16197.
In this paper, we discuss a metabolic profiling study of a global library of Pseudomonas isolates. The diversity of cyclic lipopeptides produced by Pseudomonas is examined, and compared between different environments. This study includes the Pseudomonas wheat isolate collection discussed in the Mauchline et al. manuscript [23•].

65. McMillan VE, Hammond-Kosack KE, Gutteridge RJ: **Evidence that wheat cultivars differ in their ability to build up inoculum of the take-all fungus, *Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici*, under a first wheat crop**. *Plant Pathol.* 2011, **60**:200-206.

66. • Mehrabi Z *et al.*: ***Pseudomonas* spp. diversity is negatively associated with suppression of the wheat take-all pathogen**. *Sci. Rep.* 2016, **6**:29905.
In this study, synthetic communities reveal that increased *Pseudomonas* spp. richness is positively correlated with in vitro growth of the take-all pathogen, demonstrating a negative biodiversity effect. This observation supported the analyses emerging from the corresponding field experiment [23•,66•].