Effects of Neonicotinoid Seed Treatments on Phyllosphere and Soil Bacterial Communities Over Time

Mona Parizadeh (✉ monaparizadeh@gmail.com)

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0567-7673>

Benjamin Mimee

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Steven W. Kembel

UQAM Département des sciences biologiques: Université du Québec à Montréal Département des Sciences Biologiques

Research

Keywords: bacterial community structure, bacterial diversity, bacterial succession, host-microbe interactions, neonicotinoid seed treatment, pesticide non-target effects, pesticide perturbation, phyllosphere, soil bacterial communities, temporal variation

Posted Date: September 17th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-76081/v1>

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

1 **Title page**

2 *Title*

3 **Effects of Neonicotinoid Seed Treatments on Phyllosphere and Soil Bacterial**
4 **Communities Over Time**

5 *Author information*

6 Mona Parizadeh: monaparizadeh@gmail.com

7 Benjamin Mimee: benjamin.mimee@canada.ca

8 Steven W. Kembel: kembel.steven_w@uqam.ca

9 *Author Affiliations*

10 Département des sciences biologiques, Université du Québec à Montréal, 141 Avenue du
11 Président-Kennedy, Montréal, Québec, H2X 1Y4, Canada

12 Mona Parizadeh & Steven W. Kembel

13 Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 430 Gouin Boulevard, Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Quebec, J3B
14 3E6, Canada

15 Mona Parizadeh & Benjamin Mimee

16 *Corresponding authors*

17 Correspondence to Benjamin Mimee or Steven W. Kembel.

18

19

20

Abstract

Background

The phyllosphere and soil are dynamic habitats for microbial communities. Non-pathogenic microbiota, including leaf and soil beneficial bacteria, plays a crucial role in plant growth and health, as well as in soil fertility and organic matter production. In sustainable agriculture, it is important to understand the composition of these bacterial communities, their changes in response to disturbances, and their resilience to agricultural practices. Widespread pesticide application may have had non-target impacts on these beneficial microorganisms. Neonicotinoids are a family of systemic insecticides being vastly used to control soil and foliar pests in recent decades. A few studies have demonstrated the long-term and non-target effects of neonicotinoids on agroecosystem microbiota, but the generality of these findings remains unclear. In this study, we used 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing to characterize the effects of neonicotinoid seed treatment on soil and phyllosphere bacterial community diversity, composition and temporal dynamics in a three-year soybean/corn rotation in Quebec, Canada.

Results

We found that habitat, host species and time are stronger drivers of variation in bacterial composition than neonicotinoid application. They respectively explained 37.3%, 3.2% and 2.9% of the community variation. However, neonicotinoids did have an impact on bacterial community structure, especially on the taxonomic composition of soil communities (2.6%) and over time (2.4%). They also caused a decrease in soil alpha diversity in the middle of the growing season. While the neonicotinoid treatment favored some bacterial genera known as neonicotinoid biodegraders, there was a decline in the relative abundance of some potentially beneficial soil bacteria, such as the plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria and the bacteria involved in the nitrogen

cycle, in response to the pesticide application.

Conclusions

Our results indicate that neonicotinoids have non-target effects on phyllosphere and soil bacterial communities in a soybean-corn agroecosystem, especially potentially beneficial bacteria that are vital for plant growth and improve soil fertility. Exploring the interactions among bacteria and other organisms, as well as the bacterial functional responses to the pesticide treatment, may enhance our understanding of these non-target effects and help us adapt agricultural practices to control these impacts.

Keywords: *bacterial community structure, bacterial diversity, bacterial succession, host-microbe interactions, neonicotinoid seed treatment, pesticide non-target effects, pesticide perturbation, phyllosphere, soil bacterial communities, temporal variation.*

Background

The phyllosphere (the aerial surfaces of plants including leaves) and soil are colonized by microbial communities (microbiota), which are of great importance in the regulation of host and ecosystem function. These microbial communities, including beneficial bacteria, play a crucial role in plant growth promotion, decomposition and health control [1], as well as in soil fertility, nitrogen fixation, and organic matter production [2, 3]. Previous studies have shown that the taxonomic composition of phyllosphere bacteria is associated with host plant species identity [4–6] and changes predictably during the growing season and as plant ages [7–9]. Host species were found to be a more important driver of variation in phyllosphere bacterial communities than time [10]. Other studies on the composition of soil bacteria have associated community variations with

host plant species and growth stage [11], site [12] and time [13, 14]. Host species were also shown to be a stronger driver of variation in soil bacterial communities than host plant growth stage and development time [11].

Bacterial succession refers to the bacterial community variation patterns over time and in response to environmental changes and disturbances [7]. Comparing temporal versus spatial variation in bacterial community structure, the effects of time (seasonal variability) on bacterial communities is often higher than habitat impacts [15]. Environmental disturbances and perturbations (such as cultivation methods, drought, climate change, and pesticide treatments) can also alter the bacterial community structure and composition [16, 17]. During the succession process, some bacterial communities may survive by modifying their habitat, increasing their abundance or becoming more resistant or resilient to disturbances [16, 18]. Hence, if a disturbance is persistent, it can cause long-term changes in bacterial community structure and affect bacterial succession [18]. During the last decades, the widespread application of chemical pesticides in agro-ecosystems has influenced many non-target species and their succession patterns [17, 19]. Pesticides can change the interaction between plants and some bacteria, such as nitrogen-fixing rhizobacteria, which may lead to the inhibition of nitrogen fixation [20, 21]. They can also affect soil fertility and quality by impacting soil bacterial diversity and function and altering their nitrification, denitrification and mineralization of organic matter [22]. In this study, to assess the effects of pesticides on the phyllosphere and soil bacterial community structure and intra- and inter-annual succession, we have focused on a class of the most widely used insecticide pesticides, neonicotinoids.

Neonicotinoids (also known as neonics) are a family of systemic and neuro-active insecticides, chemically similar to nicotine, that were introduced in the late 1980s [23, 24]. Like

90 nicotine, they interrupt neural transmission in the nervous system by binding to the nicotinic
91 acetylcholine receptors (nAChRs). Because of the fundamental distinctions between the nAChRs
92 of invertebrates and vertebrates, neonicotinoids are selectively more toxic to invertebrates, like
93 insects [25, 26]. In North America, neonicotinoids have mostly been used as seed treatments to
94 control a variety of foliar and soil early-season insect pests in corn, soybean, wheat and other
95 important crops [27–29]. These compounds are tiny molecules and are highly soluble in water
96 [30]. Given their systemic nature, plants take them up from the seed covering and translocate them
97 to different tissues and products, including nectar, guttation and pollen [31–33]. Neonicotinoids
98 may remain active from 20-30 days in soybean [34] and corn [35] to 200 days in winter wheat
99 [36]. Plants only absorb about 20% of the seed covering [31, 35]. The rest of the pesticide persists
100 in soil for up to three years, depending on its active ingredient and the soil properties (e.g. soil
101 type, organic matter content and pH) [30, 37]. During the last decades, many questions have been
102 raised about the potential impacts of the widespread and prophylactic [37, 38] use of
103 neonicotinoids on non-target organisms. Past studies have shown some negative effects of
104 neonicotinoids on agriculturally beneficial organisms, including beneficial soil invertebrates like
105 earthworms [39], and insect pollinators, particularly honeybees [28, 30, 40–42]. Although
106 neonicotinoids target organisms that possess a nervous system and the nAChRs, some studies have
107 reported that they have non-target impacts on the functions and structure of microbial
108 communities, such as fungal [43] and bacterial structure, abundance and community composition
109 in phyllosphere [43–45] and soil [46, 47]. Previous biochemical or culture-based microbiological
110 studies have also confirmed the effects of these insecticides on bacterial respiration, phosphatase
111 activity, and other enzyme activities, including ammonification, nitrification, and denitrification
112 [48–51].

Soybean and corn are two important agricultural crops and are among those that are typically treated by pesticides, including neonicotinoids. In this study, we aim to (1) characterize the drivers of variation in bacterial community structure of soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil and (2) identify the responses of bacterial community composition variation and diversity to neonicotinoid seed treatment in a three-year soybean/corn rotation. We hypothesized that (1) habitat, host species and time will all contribute to variation in bacterial community composition and diversity, and (2) neonicotinoid seed treatment will cause a shift in the bacterial community composition and a decrease in bacterial diversity of both phyllosphere and soil. We address these objectives and hypotheses by quantifying bacterial community structure using bacterial 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing in soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil samples collected over three years in Quebec, Canada.

Results

Effects of habitat, host species and time on the phyllosphere and soil bacterial communities

In this experiment, the habitat (phyllosphere versus soil) was the strongest driver of bacterial community variation. Habitat alone explained 37.3% of the community variation, while host plant species (soybean versus corn) explained only 3.2%, and their interaction 3.7% (PERMANOVA $P < 0.001$, Table 1). Community composition was significantly more homogenous among soil samples than phyllosphere samples (average distance to median 0.42 versus 0.50, ANOVA on multivariate homogeneity of groups dispersions $F = 24.13$, $P < 0.001$) and the phyllosphere communities exhibited less variation in corn than in soybean (average distance to median 0.38 versus 0.48, ANOVA on multivariate homogeneity of groups dispersions $F = 6.20$, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 1A). Bacterial alpha diversity was significantly higher in soil than in the

136 phyllosphere (Shannon index mean $\pm$ SE 7.0 ± 0.02 versus 4.2 ± 0.10 , Wilcoxon adjusted $P <$
137 0.0001). The relative abundance of several bacterial families was strongly associated with soil
138 (such as Gemmatimonadaceae and Solibacteraceae), soybean phyllosphere (such as
139 Beijerinckiaceae and Rhizobiaceae) or corn phyllosphere (such as Sphingomonadaceae and
140 Hymenobacteraceae) ($P < 0.001$, envfit analysis of correlation between PCoA axes and variables,
141 Fig. 1B; Supp. Tab. 1, Additional File).

142 Time was also a significant determinant of bacterial community variation, in particular in
143 the phyllosphere habitat. Month and year together explained 2.9% of the whole bacterial
144 community composition variation while the interactions between time, habitat and host species
145 explained 7.2% of the variation (PERMANOVA $P < 0.001$, Table 1). Time was a much greater
146 driver of community composition variation in the phyllosphere than in soil (15.7% versus 4.6%,
147 PERMANOVA $P < 0.001$, Table 1). Alpha diversity varied in time in the phyllosphere but not in
148 soil (Table 2). This effect in the phyllosphere was especially obvious between the first and the last
149 year of the rotation where diversity was highest in the last year (Shannon index mean $\pm$ SE
150 respectively, 4.0 ± 0.17 versus 4.8 ± 0.20 , Wilcoxon adjusted $P < 0.0001$, Table 2) but we also
151 observed intra-annual variation in diversity (Table 2).

152 ***Effects of neonicotinoid seed treatment on bacterial communities***

153 Neonicotinoid seed treatment showed complex effects on the composition of bacterial
154 communities. Neonicotinoid treatment alone explained a small but significant portion of the
155 variation in both the phyllosphere (1.3%) and soil (2.6%) (PERMANOVA $P < 0.01$, Table 3).
156 Since the bacterial composition varied greatly among host species and time (Table 3, Fig. 2), the
157 impacts of neonicotinoid seed treatment were partially masked by this variation. Effects of
158 neonicotinoid treatment were especially evident in soils in the middle of the growing season (Fig.
159 2C). To uncover neonicotinoid impacts, we analyzed each crop species separately, which revealed

a much stronger effect of the neonicotinoid seed treatment on the composition of the phyllosphere communities in corn (5.3%) than in soybean (1.6%) (PERMANOVA $P < 0.001$ and $P < 0.05$ respectively, Table 3, Fig. 3). There was no significant difference in phyllosphere alpha diversity between neonicotinoid treatments overall, but soil bacterial alpha diversity was significantly higher in control versus neonicotinoid-treated samples (Shannon index mean $\pm$ SE 7.2 ± 0.02 versus 7.0 ± 0.03 , Wilcoxon adjusted $P < 0.001$, Table 2).

The overall effect of neonicotinoid seed treatment on the temporal variation of bacterial community composition and alpha diversity was weak. In the phyllosphere, although there was a small significant effect of the interaction between neonicotinoid application and time (month and year) on variation in community composition (1.4%, PERMANOVA $P < 0.05$, Table 3), the impacts on inter-annual variation and specific interactions with individual host species were not significant. The interaction of neonicotinoid seed treatment and time was slightly stronger in soil, especially with month (2.4%, PERMANOVA $P < 0.01$, Table 3). Uncovering these effects by studying each crop separately revealed that this month-to-month temporal variation in bacterial community structure within a growing season was particularly important in corn (5.6%, PERMANOVA $P < 0.05$, Table 3). Similarly, while the interaction between neonicotinoid seed treatment with time had no significant effect on bacterial alpha diversity in the phyllosphere, soil alpha diversity was significantly reduced in the neonicotinoid-treated samples in July and August (interaction between neonicotinoid seed treatment and month: linear regression analysis of Shannon index, $F = 6.27$, ANOVA $P < 0.001$; significant interactions among months and treatment: Shannon index, Wilcoxon $P < 0.001$, Table 2).

Bacterial taxa impacted by neonicotinoid seed treatment

Neonicotinoid seed treatment led to changes in the relative abundance of some

phyllosphere and soil bacterial ASVs. Overall, we detected 34 bacterial ASVs in the phyllosphere and 294 in soil that were significantly differentially abundant between the control and neonicotinoid-treated samples. In the phyllosphere, 22 ASVs (mainly Bacteroidetes) were more abundant, and 12 (mainly Proteobacteria) were less abundant in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment (Table 4). The genera *Hymenobacter* (13 ASVs) and *Pseudomonas* (4 ASVs) were particularly favored by neonicotinoid treatment, while the genera *Arsenophonus* (4 ASVs) and *Skermanella* (3 ASVs) among others decreased in abundance in neonicotinoid-treated samples (DESeq2, Fig. 4A; Supp. Tab. 2, Additional File). In soil, 68 ASVs (mainly Actinobacteria and Chloroflexi) were more abundant in the neonicotinoid-treated samples, while 226 (mainly Proteobacteria) were less abundant (Table 4). More than 60 genera of soil bacteria were significantly impacted by neonicotinoid treatment (Fig. 4B; Supp. Tab. 3, Additional File). Genera negatively affected by neonicotinoid treatment included some of the beneficial soil bacteria (e.g. *Ammoniphilus*, *Bacillus*, *Bosea*, *Bradyrhizobium*, *Hyphomicrobium*, *Mesorhizobium*, *Microvirga*, *Nitrospira*, *Nitrosospira*, *Rhizobacter* and *Rhodanobacter*) while the genera favored by the neonicotinoid treatment were dominated by Actinobacteria, including genera potentially involved in neonicotinoid degradation (e.g. *Mycobacterium* [52] and *Streptomyces* [53]) or other pesticides degradation (e.g. *Arthrobacter* [54]).

Discussion

Our findings indicate that habitat (soil versus phyllosphere), host species (soy versus corn), time, and their interactions are all strong drivers of bacterial composition variation in a soybean and corn agroecosystem. While this result is perhaps not surprising given that previous studies have identified these factors as important drivers of phyllosphere [5, 6, 55] and soil bacterial communities [11, 13, 14], our results suggest that complex interactions among these factors drive

overall community composition and diversity. In particular, we have shown a role for temporal variation, alone and in interaction with habitat and host species, as an important driver of bacterial community composition variation, especially in the phyllosphere. While succession of microbial communities in the phyllosphere has been documented previously [7, 9, 56], here we have shown that even in a rotation of annual crops, the patterns of bacterial succession within and among years are an important driver of community structure.

We have shown that neonicotinoid seed treatments have a non-target impact on bacterial community structure and diversity in a soybean/corn agroecosystem, in particular on the taxonomic composition of soil bacterial communities over the growing season. Phyllosphere and soil bacteria exhibit different patterns of community composition, alpha diversity and temporal variation throughout the growing season and in response to neonicotinoid application. In the phyllosphere, host plant species and time are stronger drivers of bacterial community variation than neonicotinoid seed treatment; however, neonicotinoids interact with these parameters to influence the phyllosphere bacterial community composition. Overall, soil bacteria exhibited stronger changes in community composition and a significant decline in bacterial alpha diversity in response to neonicotinoid treatment, while phyllosphere bacteria responses to neonicotinoids were weaker. Our results complement previous lab-based studies of neonicotinoid effects on bacterial communities [47, 57, 58], providing some of the first field-based evidence that neonicotinoids impact bacterial diversity in agroecosystems.

Overall, soil bacterial communities were more affected by neonicotinoid pesticide treatment than phyllosphere bacterial communities. Neonicotinoid effects on soil bacterial community composition and diversity varied greatly in time, with the impacts of neonicotinoid application on the soil bacterial community composition and alpha diversity most pronounced in

the middle of the growing season. We suggest that this could be explained by the fact that neonicotinoids' active period is much shorter in plants [34, 35] than in soils, where they potentially persist for months or years [30, 37]. Despite the reported accumulation potential of neonicotinoids in soils over time [59], we did not observe any significant inter-annual difference in bacterial diversity among years in interaction with the pesticide treatment, perhaps due to degradation or leaching of the neonicotinoids [60, 61].

We also observed that the more homogenous the bacterial community composition is, the more it is altered by the neonicotinoid application (soil more than phyllosphere and corn phyllosphere more than soybean phyllosphere). We need further studies to determine if the homogeneity of the bacterial communities resulted in less resilience in response to perturbations or if less variability within groups allowed us to notice more changes in the communities.

In addition to community-wide responses of bacteria to the neonicotinoid treatment, numerous bacterial taxa increased or decreased in relative abundance in response to neonicotinoids. Bacterial taxa that were favored by the pesticide treatment include several genera that are known to be potentially involved in neonicotinoid degradation (e.g. *Hymenobacter* [62], *Mycobacterium* [52], *Pseudomonas* [63], and *Streptomyces* [53]). In soils, there was a decline in the relative abundance of several ASVs from Proteobacteria and Gemmatimonadetes phyla and an increase in some ASVs from Chloroflexi and Actinobacteria, a result partially in accordance with a previous study that reported a decrease in the relative abundance of Gemmatimonadetes and OD1 phyla and an increase in the relative abundance of the Chloroflexi and Nitrospirae phyla in response to the neonicotinoid treatments [47].

Neonicotinoid seed treatment led to decreases in the relative abundance of several potentially beneficial soil bacteria, including the plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR)

that are capable of developing a symbiotic association with host plants (e.g. *Bacillus*, *Bosea*, *Mesorhizobium* and *Rhizobacter* [64]), nitrogen-fixing bacteria (e.g. *Bradyrhizobium* and *Microvirga* [65]), and other bacteria involved in the nitrogen cycle (e.g. *Ammoniphilus*, *Hyphomicrobium*, *Nitrospira*, *Nitrosospora* and *Rhodanobacter* [66]). While we did not measure the effects of neonicotinoid treatments on ecosystem processes such as nitrification, our results suggest a potential mechanism for the negative effects of neonicotinoids on nitrification that have been observed in previous studies [50, 58].

Conclusion

To date, there have been few studies that have evaluated the impacts of neonicotinoid seed treatment on phyllosphere and soil bacterial communities. To our knowledge, this study is the first with an experimental design that represents real farming conditions in a crop rotation. Despite the fact that neonicotinoids target invertebrates, we observed non-target impacts of neonicotinoids on bacterial communities of the phyllosphere and soil, especially the beneficial bacteria that are crucial for plant growth and health and soil fertility and quality. Future studies to identify the genomic and physiological features associated with tolerance of neonicotinoids will be required to understand the mechanistic reasons for these associations. Investigating the biological interactions among bacteria and other micro- and macro-organisms that are affected by pesticides will help us to better understand the non-target effects of pesticides on microbial diversity and how to control them with better agricultural practices.

Methods

Study Site

We cultivated a three-year rotation of soybean (2016 and 2018) and corn (2017) on the Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada experimental farm in L'Acadie (ACA) (45°17'38.0"N; 73°20'58.0"W), Quebec, Canada. L'Acadie is located in Canadian hardiness zone 5a. The region is characterized by having a clay loam soil type and a temperate climate. In mid-May of each year, we sowed soybean or corn on a 100 x 30 m field, previously a meadow, that had not received neonicotinoid application during the three years preceding the experiment. Four replicates of each non-neonicotinoid (control) and neonicotinoid-treated plots (100 x 3 m) were established alternately and consisted of four rows each. Two extra neonicotinoid-treated plots surrounded the experimental field. Soybean and corn seeds were coated with three fungicides (difenoconazole, metalaxyl-M and sedaxane) in both control and treated plots. The neonicotinoid-treated seeds were also covered by thiamethoxam at 0.25 mg/seed. The fields were under no-till farming, and glyphosate was applied twice during each growing season (before seeding and one month after it) to control weeds. The corn field was also fertilized with 400 kg/ha NPK (15-15-15) before seeding and 222 kg/ha N (27.5%) one month after seeding. Soil physicochemical properties (e.g. pH, etc.) were constant across the experimental field and did not differ between the growing seasons.

Sample Collection

To study the phyllosphere bacteria (the bacteria collected from the leaf surface in our case), each year we collected 48 samples (two samples per plot at three sampling times during the growing seasons), for a total of 144 samples. The three annual sampling occasions happened in July, August and September. We sampled 50-100 g of healthy mature middle leaves of 6-10 close plants from the two middle rows of each plot. We then stored each sample in a sterile plastic bag

and transferred it to the laboratory in a cooler, surrounded by ice packs. We immediately collected the bacterial cells from the leaves by washing them in a 0.85% saline solution and agitating the solution using a stomacher at 250 rpm for 30 sec. We then transferred the solutions to 50-ml tubes, centrifuged them at 4,000 g for 20 minutes and discarded the supernatants. We kept the remaining pellets at -80 °C until use.

To study the soil bacteria, we sampled bulk soil (soil that does not adhere to plant roots) from the upper 12-15 cm layer of soil with a corer (2 cm in diameter) from the soil around the same plants that we sampled for the phyllosphere. For each soil sample, we collected soil from six different spots, in a zigzag pattern and at 10 cm from the plants, and then mixed and pooled them into one 400-500 g sample [8, 67]. We transferred samples to the laboratory in a cooler and stored at -80 °C until use. Each year, we collected 48 soil samples (two samples per plot at the same three sampling times as phyllosphere), for a total of 144 samples.

DNA extraction

We extracted DNA from the samples of phyllosphere (pellets containing bacterial cells) and soil (directly) using MoBio PowerSoil DNA isolation kit (QIAGEN). Considering the high amount of material to be extracted from each soil sample, we extracted DNA twice, each time from 0.5 g of the same sample, and pooled the extractions together in order to better capture soil bacterial community variation. The rest of the extraction was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. Then, we measured the concentration and quality of the extracted DNA using Qubit (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and Nanodrop (Thermo Fisher Scientific) prior to storing them at -80 °C.

Bacterial DNA amplification

Following previously described protocols [6, 10, 68], we amplified the V5-V6 hypervariable regions of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene, using chloroplast-excluding primers (16S

primers 799F- 1115R [69, 70]). We added variable length barcodes and Illumina adaptor sequence to the 5' end of the primers. Each PCR reaction (25 μ L) contained 1 μ L of genomic DNA (1:10 dilution for soil samples), 5 μ L 5xHF buffer (Thermo Scientific), 0.5 μ L dNTPs (10 mM each), 0.75 μ L DMSO, 0.25 μ L Phusion Hot Start II polymerase (Thermo Scientific), 1.0 μ L of each primer (5 μ M), and 15.50 μ L double-distilled water. We amplified the bacterial DNA in an Agilent SureCycler 8800 using the following conditions: 98 $^{\circ}$ C for 30 sec, 35 cycles of 98 $^{\circ}$ C, 15-sec denaturation; 64 $^{\circ}$ C, 30-sec annealing, and 72 $^{\circ}$ C, 30-sec elongation; followed by a final elongation at 72 $^{\circ}$ C, 10 min. All samples were distributed randomly into several 96-well PCR plates for DNA amplification. Each PCR plate contained one positive and one negative control. Each positive control included *Clavibacter michiganensis*, *Pectobacterium* sp., *E. coli* DHS alpha, *Pantoea stewartii* and *Xanthomonas* sp., while the negative controls were nuclease-free, DEPC-treated and autoclaved water. We also had negative controls of the sampling plastic bags, tubes and the extraction kit. All PCR products were electrophoresed on a 2% agarose gel in 1X TAE buffer, stained with AMRESCO's EZ-Vision dye as loading buffer (VWR Life Science), and visualized by G:BOX gel doc (Syngene).

Normalization, library preparation and sequencing

All PCR products were normalized using SequalPrep PCR Normalization kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific). One library per PCR plate was prepared by pooling all the amplified and normalized DNA. The concentration of each library was determined using Qubit. For each sequencing run, an equimolar concentration of each library was pooled and purified using Ampure XP (Beckman Coulter by Thermo Fisher Scientific), according to the manufacturer's protocol. We used Qubit and Bioanalyzer DNA analysis kit (Agilent) to verify the final concentration and quality of the purified DNA. According to MiSeq Illumina guidance, the 4 nM DNA was denatured using NaOH 0.2 N and then diluted to a 14 pM library. Then, it was PE (paired-end) sequenced on

Illumina MiSeq (2 x 300bp), using a 600-cycle MiSeq reagent kit v3, at Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Bioinformatic analyses

We used BBDuk (<http://jgi.doe.gov/data-and-tools/bb-tools/>) to remove Illumina adapters. We also removed barcodes and primers and then demultiplexed the Illumina reads. Afterwards, we applied DADA2 v1.12.1 [71] to remove low-quality sequences, correct the Illumina-sequencing amplicon errors, merge paired-end sequences, eliminate chimeric sequences, and identify amplicon sequence variants (ASVs). We used default parameter settings for all functions except for the following functions: i) in filterAndTrim function, we removed all the sequences with fewer than 50 nucleotides (minLen = 50, instead of 20), ii) in dada function, we set the algorithm to perform pseudo-pooling between samples, and iii) in mergePairs, we set a minimum overlap length of 10 (minOverlap = 10, instead of 12) in order to merge the forward and reverse reads. We finally used the RDP naive Bayesian classifier method implemented in DADA2 with the SILVA 132 rRNA database [72, 73] to annotate the taxonomic identity of ASVs.

Sample quality control, decontamination and rarefaction

After verifying the presence and composition of the mock communities in the positive controls, we removed them from the dataset. To minimize sequence artifacts caused by PCR and sequencing errors [74], which may result in spurious ASVs, we performed the following steps of quality filtering and decontamination: (1) removing ASVs that were not taxonomically annotated as belonging to a bacterial phylum (0.78% of all sequences); (2) eliminating the outlier samples (including two of the negative control samples) that had a very different composition from the other samples based on the non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities [75]; (3) filtering all the samples with less than 1,000 sequences (39 samples,

including all the other negative controls, except for the phyllosphere and soil sampling bag controls); (4) removing the contaminating DNA from the bacterial communities using the prevalence method (probability threshold = 0.5) of the decontam package v1.1.2 [76] in R v4.0.0 [77], which identified 50 ASVs as contaminants based on the most prevalent ASVs in the negative controls; (5) eliminating all the ASVs recognized as chloroplasts or mitochondria (0.15%); (6) excluding the samples with low alpha diversity (Shannon richness < 2, including the soil sampling bag control and one phyllosphere sample); (7) removing the rare ASVs with less than 10 reads (37% of ASVs); and (8) eliminating again the outlier samples detected in the denoised dataset (five samples, including the last remaining negative control, one phyllosphere and four soil samples), which had a highly different composition (based on NMDS on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities) or species richness (based on Shannon diversity) from the other samples of the same habitat. Finally, we selected cutoffs to rarefy samples based on inspection of rarefaction curves for phyllosphere and soil samples, choosing rarefaction cutoffs that approached saturation in the ASV rarefaction curve while keeping as many samples as possible. We first rarefied the soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil samples to 5,000 reads per sample, which excluded 12 samples that contained insufficient numbers of sequences and 699 ASVs. We then made a subset of non-treated (control) samples (119 samples and 13,042 ASVs) to study the soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil bacterial community diversity and composition. We also made a subset of phyllosphere samples (110 samples and 6,695 ASVs) to study the variations in the phyllosphere bacterial community diversity and composition in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment. Since soil samples had more sequences per sample than phyllosphere samples, we rarefied the dataset again, this time to 10,000 reads per sample, which excluded 22 samples that contained insufficient numbers of sequences and 195 ASVs. Therefore, we subset soil samples to study the effects of

neonicotinoid seed treatment on their bacterial diversity and composition (132 samples and 13,137 ASVs). Overall, quality control and filtering, decontamination, and rarefaction procedures at 5,000 and 10,000 cutoffs (Fig. 5) respectively eliminated 41% and 39% of the low-quality ASVs and 20% and 23% of the samples (including all the 15 negative controls). We then analyzed these datasets using different R packages.

Statistical analyses

Characterization of phyllosphere and soil bacterial composition and diversity

To identify the bacterial composition and diversity of the soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil, we analyzed the non-neonicotinoid treated (control) samples that were rarefied to 5,000 reads per sample. This dataset contained 119 samples (including 30 soybean and 21 corn phyllosphere samples, as well as 45 soybean and 23 corn soil samples) with an average of $1,174 \pm 65.0$ ASVs (mean $\pm$ SE) per sample. We conducted permutational multivariate analyses of variance (PERMANOVA) [78] using the `adonis2` function of the `vegan` package in R with 999 permutations first on the whole community dissimilarity matrix to test for the effects of habitats (phyllosphere and soil), host species (soybean and corn), time (month and year), and their interactions on the bacterial composition variation (model: $. \sim \text{habitat} * \text{host species} * \text{month/year}$), and then on each habitat individually to test for the effects of host species, time and their interactions on the bacterial community composition (model: $. \sim \text{host species} * \text{month/year}$).

To assess the bacterial community homogeneity of each habitat and also each host species individually in phyllosphere and soil, we used a multivariate homogeneity test of groups dispersions using the `betadisper` function of the `vegan` package in R and then performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA)-like permutation test with 999 permutations to evaluate the significance of the results.

Furthermore, we used the Shannon index to estimate the soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil bacterial alpha diversity. We conducted the non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test [79] to compare the Shannon diversity for the following groups: between phyllosphere versus soil samples, and individually in each habitat between soybean versus corn samples, among years, and among months. This test was applied to determine the statistically significant differences of the bacterial ASVs richness among the mentioned groups. We adjusted the p-values using Holm's method [80].

To understand which families drove the variation in bacterial composition across habitats and hosts, we studied the correlations among all the bacterial families of soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil, which had an average relative abundance of more than 0.01, with their habitats and hosts. To achieve this, we used the envfit function of the vegan package in R, which computes the goodness of fit values (R^2) and their significance (with 999 permutations) of the vectors of bacterial families relative abundance onto the principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) ordination (based on Bray-Curtis distances).

Effects of neonicotinoid seed treatment on bacterial community composition, diversity and temporal variation

To study the bacterial community variations in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment, we separately analyzed the rarefied phyllosphere (5,000 reads per sample) and soil (10,000 reads per sample) samples. The phyllosphere dataset contained 110 samples (including 67 soybean and 43 corn samples) with an average of 391.1 ± 20.3 ASVs (mean $\pm$ SE) per sample, and the soil dataset contained 132 samples (including 85 soybean and 47 corn samples) with an average of $2,257 \pm 30.0$ ASVs (mean $\pm$ SE) per sample. We evaluated the relationships between bacterial communities and their host species, time (year and month) and neonicotinoid seed treatment, using

a PERMANOVA with 999 permutations on the community matrix (model: . ~ host species * year * month * neonicotinoid seed treatment) for each habitat individually. We also performed a PCoA (on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities) per habitat to illustrate the composition variation in the bacterial communities. Given the strong effects of host plants on the phyllosphere [5, 6, 10] and soil [11] bacterial community structure and according to our preliminary results, we also studied the soybean and corn samples individually to understand whether the impacts of neonicotinoid seed treatment on the patterns of bacterial community variation were masked by host species. Thereafter for each crop, we performed a PCoA (based on Bray-Curtis distances) and a PERMANOVA test (model: . ~ year * month * neonicotinoid seed treatment) to explore the phyllosphere and soil bacterial community composition and the drivers of its variation.

We used the Shannon index to determine the phyllosphere and soil bacterial alpha diversity. Then, we conducted the non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test to compare the Shannon diversity between the control versus neonicotinoid-treated samples in each habitat, as well as in soybean and corn separately for each habitat (model: Shannon ~ neonicotinoid seed treatment). For each habitat individually, we used a linear model to evaluate the effects of neonicotinoid application on the bacterial alpha diversity across time (phyllosphere model: Shannon ~ neonicotinoid seed treatment * month; soil model: Shannon ~ neonicotinoid seed treatment * month * year), followed by an ANOVA test to determine the significant interactions. We then used the Wilcoxon rank-sum test, in which we grouped the samples by month (phyllosphere and soil models: Shannon ~ neonicotinoid seed treatment, group by = month) and by year (soil model: Shannon ~ neonicotinoid seed treatment, group by = year) to identify the significance of the interactions suggested by our model. We adjusted the p-values using Holm's method.

Effects of neonicotinoid seed treatment on bacterial taxonomic composition

To determine the differentially abundant ASVs and taxa between control and neonicotinoid-treated samples in each habitat, we performed a differential expression analysis of sequence data (DESeq2 [81]) using the Wald significance test with a local fit type and compared the results by estimating the log₂ fold changes. We analyzed the non-rarefied and non-normalized quality filtered and decontaminated bacterial phyllosphere (118 samples, including 58 control and 60 neonicotinoid-treated samples) and soil samples (137 samples, including 69 control and 68 neonicotinoid-treated samples) separately to identify the differentially abundant ASVs and taxa using the DESeq2 test. We then adjusted the p-values (significance cutoff of 0.05) using the Benjamini-Hochberg false-discovery rate (FDR) method [82] to identify the significantly differentially abundant ASVs and taxa between the control and neonicotinoid-treated samples during three years of rotation individually for each habitat.

List of abbreviations

ANOVA Analysis of variance
ASV Amplicon sequence variant
DESeq2 Differential expression analysis of sequence data
FDR False-discovery rate
NMDS Non-metric multidimensional scaling
NST Neonicotinoid seed treatment
PCoA Principal coordinate analysis
PERMANOVA Permutational analysis of variance

481 SE Standard error

482

483 **Declarations**

484 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

485 Not applicable

486 *Consent for publication*

487 Not applicable

488 *Availability of data and materials*

489 We have deposited the raw sequences at the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (SRA): PRJNA662376.

490 Our scripts to perform the analyses of the current study are available in the following GitHub

491 repository: https://github.com/memoll/acadie_16s.

492 *Competing interests*

493 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

494 **Acknowledgements**

495 We are grateful to Michel Fortin, Éléonore Tremblay, Pierre-Yves Véronneau, Katherine Bisaillon

496 and other colleagues in AAFC for assistance in crop cultivation and sample collection, processing

497 and sequencing. We also thank Gaston Mercier (AAFC) for performing soil physicochemical

498 analysis. Finally, we thank Étienne Lord (AAFC) for his help in data processing, and Geneviève

499 Labrie (CRAM) and Annie-Ève Gagnon (AAFC) for their valuable scientific advice and

500 suggestions.

501 **Funding**

502 This research was funded by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (BM), the Natural Sciences and

503 Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery Grants program (SK) and the Canada

504 Research Chair (SK). It was also enabled in part by support provided by Compute Canada and

Calcul Quebec.

Author contributions

MP, BM and SK conceived and designed the study; BM and SK obtained the funding; MP collected and analyzed data and wrote the manuscript; All authors critically reviewed and edited the manuscript.

References

1. Vorholt JA. Microbial life in the phyllosphere. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2012;10:828–40.
2. Doran JW, Zeiss MR. Soil health and sustainability: managing the biotic component of soil quality. *Appl Soil Ecol*. 2000;15:3–11.
3. Garbeva P, van Veen JA, van Elsas JD. Microbial diversity in soil: selection of microbial populations by plant and soil type and implications for disease suppressiveness. *Annu Rev Phytopathol*. 2004;42:243–70.
4. Whipps JM, Hand P, Pink D, Bending GD. Phyllosphere microbiology with special reference to diversity and plant genotype. *J Appl Microbiol*. 2008;105:1744–55.
5. Knief C, Ramette A, Frances L, Alonso-Blanco C, Vorholt JA. Site and plant species are important determinants of the Methylobacterium community composition in the plant phyllosphere. *ISME J*. 2010;4:719–28.
6. Kembel SW, O'Connor TK, Arnold HK, Hubbell SP, Wright SJ, Green JL. Relationships between phyllosphere bacterial communities and plant functional traits in a neotropical forest. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2014;111:13715–20.
7. Redford AJ, Fierer N. Bacterial succession on the leaf surface: a novel system for studying successional dynamics. *Microb Ecol*. 2009;58:189–98.
8. Sugiyama A, Ueda Y, Zushi T, Takase H, Yazaki K. Changes in the Bacterial Community of Soybean Rhizospheres during Growth in the Field. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9:e100709.
9. Wagner MR, Lundberg DS, Del Rio TG, Tringe SG, Dangl JL, Mitchell-Olds T. Host genotype and age shape the leaf and root microbiomes of a wild perennial plant. *Nat Commun*. 2016;7:12151.
10. Laforest-Lapointe I, Messier C, Kembel SW. Tree phyllosphere bacterial communities: exploring the magnitude of intra- and inter-individual variation among host species. *PeerJ*. 2016;4:e2367.
11. Wieland G, Neumann R, Backhaus H. Variation of microbial communities in soil, rhizosphere, and rhizoplane in response to crop species, soil type, and crop development. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2001;67:5849–54.
12. Clairmont LK, Stevens KJ, Slawson RM. Site-specific differences in microbial community structure and function within the rhizosphere and rhizoplane of wetland plants is plant species dependent.

539 Rhizosphere. 2019;9:56–68.

540 13. Tarlera S, Jangid K, Ivester AH, Whitman WB, Williams MA. Microbial community succession and
541 bacterial diversity in soils during 77,000 years of ecosystem development. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol*.
542 2008;64:129–40.

543 14. Hannula SE, Kielak AM, Steinauer K, Huberty M, Jongen R, De Long JR, et al. Time after Time:
544 Temporal Variation in the Effects of Grass and Forb Species on Soil Bacterial and Fungal Communities.
545 *MBio*. 2019;10. doi:10.1128/mBio.02635-19.

546 15. Samaritani E, Mitchell EAD, Rich J, Shrestha J, Fournier B, Frey B. Soil bacterial communities and
547 ecosystem functioning change more strongly with season than habitat in a restored floodplain. *Appl Soil*
548 *Ecol*. 2017;112:71–8.

549 16. Schimel J, Balser TC, Wallenstein M. Microbial stress-response physiology and its implications for
550 ecosystem function. *Ecology*. 2007;88:1386–94.

551 17. Itoh H, Navarro R, Takeshita K, Tago K, Hayatsu M, Hori T, et al. Bacterial population succession
552 and adaptation affected by insecticide application and soil spraying history. *Front Microbiol*. 2014;5:457.

553 18. Fierer N, Nemergut D, Knight R, Craine JM. Changes through time: integrating microorganisms into
554 the study of succession. *Res Microbiol*. 2010;161:635–42.

555 19. Rodríguez-Valdecantos G, Manzano M, Sánchez R, Urbina F, Hengst MB, Lardies MA, et al. Early
556 successional patterns of bacterial communities in soil microcosms reveal changes in bacterial community
557 composition and network architecture, depending on the successional condition. *Applied Soil Ecology*.
558 2017;120:44–54.

559 20. Fox JE, Gullledge J, Engelhaupt E, Burow ME, McLachlan JA. Pesticides reduce symbiotic efficiency
560 of nitrogen-fixing rhizobia and host plants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2007;104:10282–7.

561 21. Lo CC. Effect of pesticides on soil microbial community. *J Environ Sci Health B*. 2010;45:348–59.

562 22. Hussain S, Siddique T, Saleem M, Arshad M, Khalid A. Impact of Pesticides on Soil Microbial
563 Diversity, Enzymes, and Biochemical Reactions - Chapter 5. In: *Advances in Agronomy*. Academic
564 Press; 2009. p. 159–200.

565 23. Kagabu S. Studies on the Synthesis and Insecticidal Activity of Neonicotinoid Compounds. *J Pestic*
566 *Sci*. 1996;21:231–9.

567 24. Tomizawa M, Casida JE. Neonicotinoid insecticide toxicology: mechanisms of selective action. *Annu*
568 *Rev Pharmacol Toxicol*. 2005;45:247–68.

569 25. Tomizawa M, Latli B, Casida JE. Structure and Function of Insect Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors
570 Studied with Nicotinoid Insecticide Affinity Probes. In: Yamamoto I, Casida JE, editors. *Nicotinoid*
571 *Insecticides and the Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptor*. Tokyo: Springer Japan; 1999. p. 271–92.

572 26. Tomizawa M, Casida JE. Selective toxicity of neonicotinoids attributable to specificity of insect and
573 mammalian nicotinic receptors. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 2003;48:339–64.

574 27. Elbert A, Haas M, Springer B, Thielert W, Nauen R. Applied aspects of neonicotinoid uses in crop
575 protection. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2008;64:1099–105.

576 28. Samson-Robert O, Labrie G, Chagnon M, Fournier V. Neonicotinoid-contaminated puddles of water
577 represent a risk of intoxication for honey bees. *PLoS One*. 2014;9:e108443.

578 29. Douglas MR, Tooker JF. Large-scale deployment of seed treatments has driven rapid increase in use
579 of neonicotinoid insecticides and preemptive pest management in US field crops. *Environ Sci Technol*.
580 2015;49:5088–97.

581 30. Bonmatin J-M, Giorio C, Girolami V, Goulson D, Kreutzweiser DP, Krupke C, et al. Environmental
582 fate and exposure; neonicotinoids and fipronil. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*. 2015;22:35–67.

583 31. Sur R, Stork A. Uptake, translocation and metabolism of imidacloprid in plants. *Bull Insectology*.
584 2003;56:35–40.

585 32. Bonmatin JM, Marchand PA, Charvet R, Moineau I, Bengsch ER, Colin ME. Quantification of
586 Imidacloprid Uptake in Maize Crops. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*. 2005;53:5336–41.

587 33. Girolami V, Mazzon L, Squartini A, Mori N, Marzaro M, Di Bernardo A, et al. Translocation of
588 neonicotinoid insecticides from coated seeds to seedling guttation drops: a novel way of intoxication for
589 bees. *J Econ Entomol*. 2009;102:1808–15.

590 34. Myers C, Hill E. Benefits of neonicotinoid seed treatments to soybean production. *Epa J*. 2014.

591 35. Alford A, Krupke CH. Correction: Translocation of the neonicotinoid seed treatment clothianidin in
592 maize. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0186527.

593 36. Zhang P, Zhang X, Zhao Y, Wei Y, Mu W, Liu F. Effects of imidacloprid and clothianidin seed
594 treatments on wheat aphids and their natural enemies on winter wheat. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2016;72:1141–9.

595 37. Goulson D. REVIEW: An overview of the environmental risks posed by neonicotinoid insecticides.
596 *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 2013;50:977–87.

597 38. Labrie G, Gagnon A-È, Vanasse A, Latraverse A, Tremblay G. Impacts of neonicotinoid seed
598 treatments on soil-dwelling pest populations and agronomic parameters in corn and soybean in Quebec
599 (Canada). *PLoS One*. 2020;15:e0229136.

600 39. Pisa LW, Amaral-Rogers V, Belzunces LP, Bonmatin JM, Downs CA, Goulson D, et al. Effects of
601 neonicotinoids and fipronil on non-target invertebrates. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*. 2015;22:68–102.

602 40. Iwasa T, Motoyama N, Ambrose JT, Roe RM. Mechanism for the differential toxicity of
603 neonicotinoid insecticides in the honey bee, *Apis mellifera*. *Crop Prot*. 2004;23:371–8.

604 41. Sanchez-Bayo F, Goka K. Pesticide residues and bees--a risk assessment. *PLoS One*. 2014;9:e94482.

605 42. Samson-Robert O, Labrie G, Chagnon M, Fournier V. Planting of neonicotinoid-coated corn raises
606 honey bee mortality and sets back colony development. *PeerJ*. 2017;5:e3670.

607 43. Moulas C, Petsoulas C, Rousidou K, Perruchon C, Karas P, Karpouzas DG. Effects of systemic
608 pesticides imidacloprid and metalaxyl on the phyllosphere of pepper plants. *Biomed Res Int*.
609 2013;2013:969750.

610 44. Zhang B, Zhang H, Jin B, Tang L, Yang J, Li B, et al. Effect of cypermethrin insecticide on the
611 microbial community in cucumber phyllosphere. *J Environ Sci*. 2008;20:1356–62.

- 612 45. Zhang B, Bai Z, Hoefel D, Tang L, Wang X, Li B, et al. The impacts of cypermethrin pesticide
613 application on the non-target microbial community of the pepper plant phyllosphere. *Sci Total Environ.*
614 2009;407:1915–22.
- 615 46. Cycoń M, Markowicz A, Borymski S, Wójcik M, Piotrowska-Seget Z. Imidacloprid induces changes
616 in the structure, genetic diversity and catabolic activity of soil microbial communities. *J Environ Manage.*
617 2013;131:55–65.
- 618 47. Yu B, Chen Z, Lu X, Huang Y, Zhou Y, Zhang Q, et al. Effects on soil microbial community after
619 exposure to neonicotinoid insecticides thiamethoxam and dinotefuran. *Sci Total Environ.*
620 2020;725:138328.
- 621 48. Singh J, Singh DK. Ammonium, Nitrate and Nitrite Nitrogen and Nitrate Reductase Enzyme Activity
622 in Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) Fields After Diazinon, Imidacloprid and Lindane Treatments.
623 *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part B.* 2006;41:1305–18.
- 624 49. Ahemad M, Khan MS. Ecological Assessment of Biototoxicity of Pesticides towards Plant Growth
625 Promoting Activities of Pea (*Pisum sativum*)-Specific *Rhizobium* sp. Strain MRP1. *Journal of the Science*
626 *of Food and Agriculture.* 2012;24:334–43.
- 627 50. Filimon MN, Voia SO, Popescu R, Dumitrescu G, Ciochina LP, Mituletu M, et al. The effect of some
628 insecticides on soil microorganisms based on enzymatic and bacteriological analyses. *Rom Biotechnol*
629 *Lett.* 2015;20:10439–47.
- 630 51. Cycoń M, Piotrowska-Seget Z. Biochemical and microbial soil functioning after application of the
631 insecticide imidacloprid. *J Environ Sci .* 2015;27:147–58.
- 632 52. Kandil MM, Trigo C, Koskinen WC, Sadowsky MJ. Isolation and Characterization of a Novel
633 Imidacloprid-Degrading *Mycobacterium* sp. Strain MK6 from an Egyptian Soil. *J Agric Food Chem.*
634 2015;63:4721–7.
- 635 53. Guo L, Fang W-W, Guo L-L, Yao C-F, Zhao Y-X, Ge F, et al. Biodegradation of the neonicotinoid
636 insecticide acetamiprid by Actinomycetes *Streptomyces canus* CGMCC 13662 and characterization of the
637 novel nitrile hydratase involved. *J Agric Food Chem.* 2019;67:5922–31.
- 638 54. Tam AC, Behki RM, Khan SU. Isolation and characterization of an s-ethyl-N, N-
639 dipropylthiocarbamate-degrading *Arthrobacter* strain and evidence for plasmid-associated s-ethyl-N, N-
640 dipropylthiocarbamate degradation. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 1987;53:1088–93.
- 641 55. Laforest-Lapointe I, Messier C, Kembel SW. Host species identity, site and time drive temperate tree
642 phyllosphere bacterial community structure. *Microbiome.* 2016;4:27.
- 643 56. Manching HC, Carlson K, Kosowsky S, Smitherman CT, Stapleton AE. Maize Phyllosphere
644 Microbial Community Niche Development Across Stages of Host Leaf Growth. *F1000Res.* 2017;6:1698.
- 645 57. Cai Z, Ma J, Wang J, Cai J, Yang G, Zhao X. Impact of the novel neonicotinoid insecticide
646 Paichongding on bacterial communities in yellow loam and Huangshi soils. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int.*
647 2016;23:5134–42.
- 648 58. Zhang P, Ren C, Sun H, Min L. Sorption, desorption and degradation of neonicotinoids in four
649 agricultural soils and their effects on soil microorganisms. *Sci Total Environ.* 2018;615:59–69.
- 650 59. Wood TJ, Goulson D. The environmental risks of neonicotinoid pesticides: a review of the evidence

651 post 2013. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2017;24:17285–325.

652 60. Banerjee K, Patil SH, Dasgupta S, Oulkar DP, Adsule PG. Sorption of thiamethoxam in three Indian
653 soils. J Environ Sci Health B. 2008;43:151–6.

654 61. Kurwadkar ST, Dewinne D, Wheat R, McGahan DG, Mitchell FL. Time dependent sorption behavior
655 of dinotefuran, imidacloprid and thiamethoxam. J Environ Sci Health B. 2013;48:237–42.

656 62. Guo L, Dai Z, Guo J, Yang W, Ge F, Dai Y. Oligotrophic bacterium *Hymenobacter latericoloratus*
657 CGMCC 16346 degrades the neonicotinoid imidacloprid in surface water. AMB Express. 2020;10:7.

658 63. Pandey G, Dorrian SJ, Russell RJ, Oakeshott JG. Biotransformation of the neonicotinoid insecticides
659 imidacloprid and thiamethoxam by *Pseudomonas* sp. 1G. Biochem Biophys Res Commun.
660 2009;380:710–4.

661 64. Podile AR, Krishna Kishore G. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria. Plant-Associated Bacteria
662 Springer, Netherlands. 2006;:195–230.

663 65. Kumar A, Bahadur I, Maurya BR, Raghuwanshi R, Meena VS, Singh DK, et al. Does a plant growth-
664 promoting rhizobacteria enhance agricultural sustainability. J Pure Appl Microbiol. 2015;9:715–24.

665 66. Pitombo LM, do Carmo JB, de Hollander M, Rossetto R, López MV, Cantarella H, et al. Exploring
666 soil microbial 16S rRNA sequence data to increase carbon yield and nitrogen efficiency of a bioenergy
667 crop. GCB Bioenergy. 2016;8:867–79.

668 67. Gagic V, Kleijn D, Báldi A, Boros G, Jørgensen HB, Elek Z, et al. Combined effects of agrochemicals
669 and ecosystem services on crop yield across Europe. Ecol Lett. 2017;20:1427–36.

670 68. Kim M-S, Bae J-W, Park E-J. Geographic and Host-Associated Variations in Bacterial Communities
671 on the Floret Surfaces of Field-Grown Broccoli. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2018;84.
672 doi:10.1128/AEM.02837-17.

673 69. Chelius MK, Triplett EW. The Diversity of Archaea and Bacteria in Association with the Roots of
674 *Zea mays* L. Microb Ecol. 2001;41.

675 70. Redford AJ, Bowers RM, Knight R, Linhart Y, Fierer N. The ecology of the phyllosphere: geographic
676 and phylogenetic variability in the distribution of bacteria on tree leaves. Environmental Microbiology.
677 2010;12:2885–93.

678 71. Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJA, Holmes SP. DADA2: High-resolution
679 sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat Methods. 2016;13:581–3.

680 72. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene
681 database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41 Database
682 issue:D590–6.

683 73. Yilmaz P, Parfrey LW, Yarza P, Gerken J, Pruesse E, Quast C, et al. The SILVA and “All-species
684 Living Tree Project (LTP)” taxonomic frameworks. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42:D643–8.

685 74. Acinas SG, Sarma-Rupavtarm R, Klepac-Ceraj V, Polz MF. PCR-induced sequence artifacts and bias:
686 insights from comparison of two 16S rRNA clone libraries constructed from the same sample. Appl
687 Environ Microbiol. 2005;71:8966–9.

75. Bray JR, Curtis JT. An Ordination of the Upland Forest Communities of Southern Wisconsin. *Ecol Monogr.* 1957;27:325–49.
76. Davis NM, Proctor DM, Holmes SP, Relman DA, Callahan BJ. Simple statistical identification and removal of contaminant sequences in marker-gene and metagenomics data. *Microbiome.* 2018;6. doi:10.1186/s40168-018-0605-2.
77. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2019.
78. Anderson MJ. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral Ecol.* 2001;26:32–46.
79. Wilcoxon F. Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods. *Biometrics Bulletin.* 1945;1:80.
80. Holm S. A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. *Scand Stat Theory Appl.* 1979;6:65–70.
81. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* 2014;15:550.
82. Hochberg Y, Benjamini Y. More powerful procedures for multiple significance testing. *Stat Med.* 1990;9:811–8.

Figures

Fig. 1 Soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil bacterial community diversity and the families who are driving this diversity pattern. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities (A) of the bacterial community composition and the correlations between bacterial family abundances and different axes of the PCoA ordination (B) in the phyllosphere and soil bacterial communities in a three-year soybean/corn rotation in L’Acadie, Quebec, Canada. Ordinations show that habitat (red points: soil, green points: phyllosphere) and host species (circle points: corn, triangle points: soybean) explain the bacterial community composition variations. The axes of the ordinations explain 46.6% of the variation in the bacterial community composition. Ellipses (A) are shaded based on host species (yellow for corn and green for soybean samples) and represent a 99% confidence level. Grey arrows (B) indicate the significant correlations ($P = 0.001$, except for the Pseudomonadaceae family) among the bacterial families that had an average relative abundance of more than 0.01 and their habitat and host species. Arrows directions show the correlations among habitats and host species and arrow length indicates the strength of these correlations.

Fig. 2 Phyllosphere and soil bacterial community composition variations in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities demonstrates the composition of phyllosphere (A and B) and soil (C) bacterial community in a three-year soybean (2016: circles and 2018: cubes) and corn (2017: triangles) rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada. The phyllosphere bacterial community variation among control (blue points) and neonicotinoid-treated (pink points) samples is masked by the effects of host species (A) and time (B). While in soil (C), the bacterial communities vary among control (green points) and neonicotinoid-treated (red points) samples. Ellipses are shaded based on treatment (blue for control and yellow for neonicotinoid-treated samples) and represent a 95% confidence level.

Fig. 3 Soybean and corn phyllosphere bacterial community composition variations in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment and year. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities illustrates the phyllosphere bacterial variation individually for each host species and year of rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada: A) soybean (left: year 2016; right: year 2018) and B) corn (year 2017). The shapes of the points represent the month and the colors show the treatment. Ellipses are shaded based on treatment (blue for control and pink for neonicotinoid-treated samples) and represent a 95% confidence level.

Fig. 4 Phyllosphere and soil bacterial taxa (phyla and genera) associated with control and neonicotinoid seed treatment. Differential expression analysis of sequence data (DESeq2) illustrates the bacterial ASVs that are significantly differentially abundant (adjusted $P < 0.05$) between control and neonicotinoid-treated samples of soybean and corn phyllosphere (A) and soil (B) in a three-year rotation in L'Acadie. Each point represents one ASV related to a genus on the x-axis, and its color shows the phylum it belongs to. The ASVs on the top of each graph ($\log_2\text{FoldChange} > 0$) are associated with the neonicotinoid-treated samples, while the others ($\log_2\text{FoldChange} < 0$) are related to the controls.

Fig. 5 Rarefaction curves of the phyllosphere and soil bacterial ASVs. Rarefaction curves are shown for all the phyllosphere and soil samples according to the observed ASVs richness. Each line and color represent one sample. The sequencing coverage (x-axis: number of sequences) is

20,000 reads with cutoffs at 1,000, 2,000, 5,000 and 10,000 reads.

Tables

Table 1. Main drivers of the phyllosphere and soil bacterial community composition variation in a three-year soybean/corn rotation. PERMANOVA (Bray-Curtis dissimilarities) determines the contributions of habitat and host plant species and their interactions in the soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil bacterial composition variation in a three-year soybean/corn rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada. (:) represents the interaction between variables. Significance levels for each variable are given by: *** $P < 0.001$; ** $P < 0.01$; * $P < 0.05$; NS, $P \geq 0.05$.

Variables	Phyllosphere & Soil			Phyllosphere			Soil		
	R2 (%)	F	Pr(>F)	R2 (%)	F	Pr(>F)	R2 (%)	F	Pr(>F)
Habitat	37.3	100.98	0.001***	-	-	-	-	-	-
Host species	3.2	8.69	0.001***	18.6	19.62	0.001***	2.5	1.83	0.007**
Month/Year	2.9	3.93	0.001***	15.7	8.28	0.001***	4.6	1.66	0.002**
Habitat: Host species	3.7	10.07	0.001***	-	-	-	-	-	-
Habitat: Month/Year	3.6	4.9	0.001***	-	-	-	-	-	-
Host species: Month/Year	2.1	2.89	0.005**	11.4	6.02	0.001***	NS	NS	NS
Host species: Month: Year	2.5	2.97	0.005**	14.6	5.14	0.001***	8	1.94	0.001***
Habitat: Host species: Month	2.5	3.35	0.003**	-	-	-	-	-	-
Habitat: Host species: Month: Year	7.2	3.26	0.001***	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 2 Bacterial alpha diversity explained by time (year and month) and neonicotinoid seed treatment. Variance in the bacterial alpha diversity (Shannon index) explained by year, month, neonicotinoid seed treatment (NST) in soybean and corn together and individually, interactions between NST and month, and interactions between NST and year. Means and standard errors (SE) of each group are calculated and compared. The significance of their differences is determined using a non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test, and the p-values are adjusted using Holm's method. Significance levels for each variable are given by: **** $P < 0.0001$; *** $P < 0.001$; ** $P < 0.01$; * $P < 0.05$; NS: $P \geq 0.05$.

Variables		Phyllosphere		Soil		
		Mean ± SE	Adjusted P-value	Mean ± SE	Adjusted P-value	
Host Species	Soybean	4.4 ± 0.15	NS	7.0 ± 0.03	NS	
	Corn	4.0 ± 0.12		7.0 ± 0.04		
Year	2016	4.0 ± 0.17	NS	7.0 ± 0.05	NS	
	2017	4.0 ± 0.12		7.0 ± 0.04		
	2017	4.0 ± 0.12	< 0.01**	7.0 ± 0.04	NS	
	2018	4.8 ± 0.20		7.1 ± 0.02		
	2016	4.0 ± 0.17	< 0.0001****	7.0 ± 0.05	NS	
	2018	4.8 ± 0.20		7.1 ± 0.02		
Month	July	4.6 ± 0.30	< 0.05*	7.0 ± 0.03	NS	
	August	3.8 ± 0.11		7.0 ± 0.04		
	August	3.8 ± 0.11	< 0.001***	7.0 ± 0.04	NS	
	September	4.4 ± 0.86		6.9 ± 0.04		
	July	4.6 ± 0.30	NS	7.0 ± 0.03	< 0.05*	
	September	4.4 ± 0.86		6.9 ± 0.04		
Treatment & Host Species	Control	4.2 ± 0.10	NS	7.2 ± 0.02	< 0.001***	Soybean & Corn
	NST	4.1 ± 0.08		7.0 ± 0.03		
	Control	4.4 ± 0.15	NS	7.2 ± 0.03	< 0.01**	Soybean
	NST	4.2 ± 0.10		7.1 ± 0.03		
	Control	4.0 ± 0.12	NS	7.1 ± 0.05	< 0.01**	Corn
	NST	3.9 ± 0.10		7.0 ± 0.05		
Treatment & Month	Control	4.6 ± 0.30	NS	7.2 ± 0.03	< 0.001***	July
	NST	4.4 ± 0.20		7.0 ± 0.04		
	Control	3.8 ± 0.11	NS	7.2 ± 0.04	< 0.001***	August
	NST	3.8 ± 0.11		7.0 ± 0.05		
	Control	4.4 ± 0.09	NS	7.1 ± 0.05	NS	September
	NST	4.2 ± 0.08		7.1 ± 0.05		
Treatment & Year	Control	-	-	7.1 ± 0.05	NS	2016
	NST	-	-	7.0 ± 0.05		
	Control	-	-	7.1± 0.05	< 0.01**	2017
	NST	-	-	6.9 ± 0.05		
	Control	-	-	7.2 ± 0.03	NS	2018
	NST	-	-	7.2 ± 0.03		

774

775

Table 3 Drivers of the phyllosphere and soil bacterial community composition variation in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment in a three-year soybean/corn rotation.

PERMANOVA (Bray-Curtis dissimilarities) identifies the proportion of bacterial community composition variation explained by host plant species, time (year and month), neonicotinoid seed treatment (NST) and their interactions in the soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment in a three-year soybean/corn rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada. (:) represents the interaction between variables. Significance levels for each variable are given by: *** $P < 0.001$; ** $P < 0.01$; * $P < 0.05$; NS, $P \geq 0.05$.

Variables	Bray-Curtis Dissimilarities	Phyllosphere						Soil					
		Soybean & Corn		Soybean		Corn		Soybean & Corn		Soybean		Corn	
Host species	R2 (%)	14.7		-		-		2.4		-		-	
	F Pr(>F)	32.9	0.001** *	-	-	-	-	3.61	0.001** *	-	-	-	-
Year	R2 (%)	7.4		13.1		-		5.7		9.2		-	
	F Pr(>F)	16.6	0.001** *	16.8	0.001** *	-	-	8.42	0.001** *	8.92	0.001** *	-	-
Month	R2 (%)	15.2		28.3		30		2.6		3.2		5.8	
	F Pr(>F)	16.9 6	0.001** *	18.2 7	0.001** *	9.25	0.001** *	1.89	0.001** *	1.55	0.012*	1.39	0.036*
NST	R2 (%)	1.3		1.6		5.3		2.6		3.4		3.7	
	F Pr(>F)	2.81	0.002**	2.12	0.021*	3.3	0.001** *	3.82	0.001** *	3.33	0.001** *	1.78	0.017*
NST: Host species	R2 (%)	1.2		-		-		NS		-		-	
	F Pr(>F)	2.56	0.002**	-	-	-	-	NS	NS	-	-	-	-
NST: Year	R2 (%)	0.8		NS		-		1.1		1.8		-	
	F Pr(>F)	1.73	0.043*	NS	NS	-	-	1.63	0.030*	1.73	0.014*	-	-
NST: Month	R2 (%)	NS		NS		NS		2.4		NS		5.6	
	F Pr(>F)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	1.8	0.002**	NS	NS	1.34	0.048*
NST: Month: Host species	R2 (%)	1.4		-		-		NS		-		-	
	F Pr(>F)	1.55	0.028*	-	-	-	-	NS	NS	-	-	-	-
NST: Year: Month	R2 (%)	1.4		NS		-		NS		NS		-	
	F Pr(>F)	1.57	0.026*	NS	NS	-	-	NS	NS	NS	NS	-	-

Table 4 Phyllosphere and soil bacterial phyla associated with control and neonicotinoid seed treatment. Differential expression analysis of sequence data (DESeq2) identified the bacterial phyla of the ASVs that are significantly differentially abundant (adjusted $P < 0.05$) between control and neonicotinoid-treated samples of soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil in a three-year rotation in L'Acadie.

Habitat	Phylum	Number of ASVs associated with treatment	
		Control	Neonicotinoid-treated
Phyllosphere	Actinobacteria	1	3
	Bacteroidetes	0	14
	Deinococcus-Thermus	1	0
	Proteobacteria	10	5
Soil	Acidobacteria	11	0
	Actinobacteria	27	31
	Bacteroidetes	11	1
	Chloroflexi	3	33
	Firmicutes	2	0
	Gemmatimonadetes	27	2
	Nitrospirae	2	0
	Patescibacteria	0	1
	Proteobacteria	139	0
	Spirochaetes	1	0
	Verrucomicrobia	3	0

Supplementary information

Additional file

Supplementary Tables. This additional file contains 3 supplementary tables, referred to in the main text.

Figures

Figure 1

Soybean and corn phyllosphere and soil bacterial community diversity and the families who are driving this diversity pattern. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities (A) of the bacterial community composition and the correlations between bacterial family abundances and

different axes of the PCoA ordination (B) in the phyllosphere and soil bacterial communities in a three-year soybean/corn rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada. Ordinations show that habitat (red points: soil, green points: phyllosphere) and host species (circle points: corn, triangle points: soybean) explain the bacterial community composition variations. The axes of the ordinations explain 46.6% of the variation in the bacterial community composition. Ellipses (A) are shaded based on host species (yellow for corn and green for soybean samples) and represent a 99% confidence level. Grey arrows (B) indicate the significant correlations ($P = 0.001$, except for the Pseudomonadaceae family) among the bacterial families that had an average relative abundance of more than 0.01 and their habitat and host species. Arrows directions show the correlations among habitats and host species and arrow length indicates the strength of these correlations.

Figure 2

Phyllosphere and soil bacterial community composition variations in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities demonstrates the composition of phyllosphere (A and B) and soil (C) bacterial community in a three-year soybean (2016: circles and 2018: cubes) and corn (2017: triangles) rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada. The phyllosphere bacterial community variation among control (blue points) and neonicotinoid-treated (pink

points) samples is masked by the effects of host species (A) and time (B). While in soil (C), the bacterial communities vary among control (green points) and neonicotinoid-treated (red points) samples. Ellipses are shaded based on treatment (blue for control and yellow for neonicotinoid-treated samples) and represent a 95% confidence level.

Figure 3

Soybean and corn phyllosphere bacterial community composition variations in response to neonicotinoid seed treatment and year. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities illustrates the phyllosphere bacterial variation individually for each host species and year of rotation in L'Acadie, Quebec, Canada: A) soybean (left: year 2016; right: year 2018) and B) corn (year 2017). The shapes of the points represent the month and the colors show the treatment. Ellipses are shaded based on treatment (blue for control and pink for neonicotinoid-treated samples) and represent a 95% confidence level.

Figure 4

Phyllosphere and soil bacterial taxa (phyla and genera) associated with control and neonicotinoid seed treatment. Differential expression analysis of sequence data (DESeq2) illustrates the bacterial ASVs that

are significantly differentially abundant (adjusted $P < 0.05$) between control and neonicotinoid-treated samples of soybean and corn phyllosphere (A) and soil (B) in a three-year rotation in L'Acadie. Each point represents one ASV related to a genus on the x-axis, and its color shows the phylum it belongs to. The ASVs on the top of each graph ($\log_2\text{FoldChange} > 0$) are associated with the neonicotinoid-treated samples, while the others ($\log_2\text{FoldChange} < 0$) are related to the controls.

Figure 5

Rarefaction curves of the phyllosphere and soil bacterial ASVs. Rarefaction curves are shown for all the phyllosphere and soil samples according to the observed ASVs richness. Each line and color represent one sample. The sequencing coverage (x-axis: number of sequences) is 20,000 reads with cutoffs at 1,000, 2,000, 5,000 and 10,000 reads.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [ParizadehMsep2020AddFileSuppTab3.xlsx](#)
- [ParizadehMsep2020AddFileSuppTab2.xlsx](#)
- [ParizadehMsep2020AddFileSuppTab1.xlsx](#)
- [ParizadehMsep2020AdditionalFile.pdf](#)