

## Structural responses of non-targeted bacterial and hppd communities to the herbicide tembotrione in soil

Hugo Terol, Clémence Thiour-Mauprivez, Marion Devers, Fabrice Martin-Laurent, Marcelino Suzuki, Christophe Calvayrac, Lise Barthelmebs

#### ► To cite this version:

Hugo Terol, Clémence Thiour-Mauprivez, Marion Devers, Fabrice Martin-Laurent, Marcelino Suzuki, et al.. Structural responses of non-targeted bacterial and hppd communities to the herbicide tembotrione in soil. Science of the Total Environment, 2024, 908, pp.168198. 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.168198 . hal-04342889

### HAL Id: hal-04342889 https://hal.science/hal-04342889

Submitted on 18 Dec 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Structural responses of non-targeted bacterial and hppd communities to the
2	herbicide tembotrione in soil.
3	
4	Hugo Terol <sup>1,2</sup> , Clémence Thiour-Mauprivez <sup>3</sup> , Marion Devers <sup>3</sup> , Fabrice Martin-Laurent <sup>3</sup> ,
5	Marcelino Suzuki <sup>2</sup> , Christophe Calvayrac <sup>1,2</sup> , Lise Barthelmebs <sup>1,2*</sup>
6	
7	<sup>1</sup> Université de Perpignan Via Domitia, Biocapteurs-Analyse-Environnement, 66860,
8	Perpignan, France
9	<sup>2</sup> Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Laboratoire de Biodiversité et Biotechnologies Microbiennes,
10	LBBM, F-66650, Banyuls-sur-Mer, France
11	<sup>3</sup> Agroécologie, INRAE, Institut Agro, Univ. Bourgogne, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté,
12	F-21000 Dijon, France
13	
14	*Corresponding author: barthelm@univ-perp.fr
15	
16	Abstract:
17	
18	Tembotrione (TBT) is a $\beta$ -triketone herbicide targeting the 4-Hydroxyphenylpyruvate
19	dioxygenase enzyme (4-HPPD) of weeds. This molecule can also affect soil microorganisms,
20	either through both direct and indirect toxic effects for microorganisms expressing 4-HPPD, or
21	by promoting tolerant and/or degrading microbial populations. Our study aimed to characterize
22	the impacts of TBT on the diversity of total- and hppd (coding for 4-HPPD) -soil bacterial
23	communities. Soil microcosms were treated with the active ingredient TBT at the
24	recommended field dose (100g a.i/ha; D1) or the tenfold dose (D10). Soil samples were
25	collected from 0 to 55 days post-treatment to study: (i) total- and hppd-bacterial diversities
26	using 16SrRNA and <i>hppd</i> amplicons sequencing, respectively; (ii) TBT dissipation in soil. Both 1

27 total- and hppd-bacterial community composition was not affected by TBT treatments (D1 and D10). However, D10 treatment slightly increased richness and phylogenetic diversity of the 28 29 total bacterial community while decreasing hppd richness. Overall, the highest dose of TBT 30 seemed to promote TBT-tolerant or TBT-degrading bacterial populations and to deplete TBT-31 sensitive ones. These effects were transient as TBT was rapidly dissipated with a DT<sub>50</sub> of 7 days and 15 days for D1 and D10, respectively. Differential abundance analysis with a 32 33 Generalized Linear Model allowed the identification of Sphingomonas, Steroidobacter and 34 Lysobacter as genus that were influenced by TBT, and which could be used as a new class 35 of exposure biomarkers.

36

37 Keywords: β-triketone, Microbial ecotoxicology, biomarker, HPPD function

38

# 1. Introduction

Soil is one of the world's greatest reservoir of microbial diversity and contains the most diverse 39 and abundant groups of organisms on earth (Hicks et al., 2022). Those soil microorganisms 40 41 are known to live in hot spots, in close contact with all the organic matter naturally present in, 42 or added to the soil, such as plant protection products (PPPs) which are applied in conventional agriculture to increase crop yields and feed an ever-growing population. The Yin 43 44 and Yang concept has been proposed in the literature to illustrate the potential effects of PPPs 45 exposure on microbial communities (Karpouzas et al., 2016). On the Yang side of the 46 interaction, PPPs could be used as an energy source by a part of the soil microbial community. 47 Whereas on the Yin side, PPPs could exert toxicity on soil microorganisms. Since the effects 48 of PPPs on microbial communities are also highly dependent on both the physicochemical 49 properties of soils and the active ingredient, as these parameters influence PPPs fate and 50 bioavailability (Griffiths & Philippot, 2013), it seems important to consider the ecosystem where 51 microorganism and PPP interactions take place, as proposed by the microbial ecotoxicology 52 approach (Cébron et al., 2022). Among the studies assessing PPPs effects in microbial 53 communities, approximately 30% and 25% of those published from 2000 to today deal with 54 the glyphosate or atrazine respectively (Pubmed research with the following guery: (microbial 55 community) AND (herbicide effects)). Moreover, a meta-analysis carried out at three French ministries' request (Ecological Transition, Agriculture, and Research) and led by INRAE and 56 IFREMER between 2020 and 2022, summarized the knowledge on PPPs impacts on 57 biodiversity and ecosystems (Mamy et al., 2022). The authors highlighted the fact that the 58 59 main herbicide active ingredients applied in agrosystems were poorly studied, except for 60 glyphosate, considered in more than 100 out of the 579 publications studied in the meta-61 analysis. This statement was particularly true in the case of recently authorized molecules and 62 was the motivation to the current study.

63 Tembotrione (TBT) is a synthetic organic molecule available as a PPP since 2007 and 64 belonging to the  $\beta$ -triketone herbicide family (Group 27 HRAC classification, 2022). This family 65 also includes sulcotrione and mesotrione, released on the market in 1993 and 2001, 66 respectively. In 2020, 970 tons of  $\beta$ -triketone herbicides were sold in the European Union, 67 representing 0.8 % of the total herbicide sales in this region (ec.europa.eu/eurostat). However, 68 despite this low volume and because of their low recommended field dose of application (RfD) (*i.e.*, 100-200 g a.i. / ha), the area of land on which  $\beta$ -triketones are applied is important, 69 70 representing 4.85 – 9,7 million of ha cropped with corn (ACTA- Les Instituts Techniques 71 Agricoles, France, 2023).

72

The toxicity of  $\beta$ -triketones, including TBT, has been evaluated on different isolated model microorganisms by measuring toxicity endpoints (EC<sub>50</sub> or MIC), with toxicity values ranging from 10 to 100 mg/L (Dumas et al., 2017; Tawk et al., 2015). As for ecotoxicological effects in soil environment, little or no effects have been observed for sulcotrione or mesotrione applied at the RfD on the abundance, the diversity or the enzymatic activity of soil microbial
communities (bacteria, fungi, archaea and photoautotrophs) while applications beyond 5 times
the RfD did have impacts, ranging from stimulation of heterotrophic activities to a decrease of
cyanobacterial diversity and abundance (Borowik et al., 2017; Crouzet et al., 2010, 2013,
2016; Du et al., 2018; Joly et al., 2012, 2013, 2014; Kaczynski et al., 2016; Pose-Juan et al.,
2015; Thiour Mauprivez et al., 2021). Nonetheless, to our knowledge, ecotoxicological effects
of TBT on soil microbial communities has not been studied yet.

84

85 Recently, new approaches have been proposed to better characterize the effects of pollutants 86 on microbial communities, focusing on the functions they support. Interestingly, in the case of 87  $\beta$ -triketones, soil bacteria are known to harbor the *hppd* gene, which encodes for 4-88 Hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase (HPPD, EC 1.11.13.27) an enzyme targeted by  $\beta$ -89 triketones (Thiour-Mauprivez et al., 2022). In plants, the HPPD enzyme is involved in 90 plastoquinone and  $\alpha$ -tocopherol biosynthesis, two essential photosynthesis cofactors (Moran, 91 2005). In bacteria, HPPD allows the production of homogentisate from tyrosine, latter 92 transformed in acetoacetate and fumarate in the associated metabolic pathway. Homogentisate could also lead to the production of a brown pigment called pyomelanin 93 94 through polymerization and oxidation (Pavan et al., 2020). Noteworthy, little is known about the role of HPPD in soil bacteria. Recently, HPPD activity of three environmental bacterial 95 96 strains have been evaluated with agronomic doses of  $\beta$ -triketone herbicides (including TBT), 97 establishing the existence of sensitive or tolerant populations to the tested molecules (Singh 98 et al., 2018; Thiour-Mauprivez et al., 2022). These interesting results support the suggestions 99 made by some authors to look for tolerant and/or sensitive populations of "non-target 100 microorganisms" that nonetheless carry the enzyme specifically targeted by PPP active 101 ingredient in the frame of environmental risk assessment (ERA); (Petric et al., 2016; Thiour-102 Mauprivez et al., 2019).

103 In the current study we evaluated the ecotoxicological impacts of TBT - the most recently 104 authorized β-triketone - on soil bacterial communities. We set up an experimental design 105 where soil microcosms were treated with TBT either at RfD or at 10 times that dose. Treatment 106 with RfD was chosen to assess the impact of TBT on soil microbial communities in a realistic 107 exposure scenario, close to what would happen in treated fields. A tenfold RfD was chosen to 108 assess this impact in a worst-case exposure scenario and to observe effects which couldn't 109 be significant enough at RfD, as it is a common design applied in many ecotoxicological 110 studies of PPPs (Puglisi, 2017). A molecular approach and a high throughput DNA sequencing 111 allowed us to study the structure and the diversity of both the total- and the hppd-bacterial 112 community in TBT-treated and control soil microcosms. In addition, to reach European Food 113 Safety Authority (EFSA) goals, willing to integrate new microbial tools for the a priori and a 114 posteriori ERA, our objective was also to identify microbial groups and bacterial HPPD-115 containing organisms significantly impacted by TBT applications, which could be used as new 116 biomarkers sensitive to TBT. The exposure scenario was also evaluated by following the 117 dissipation of the active ingredient in soil microcosms over time.

# 118 **2. Materials and Methods**

#### 119 **2.1. Chemicals**

TBT ( $\geq$  98 % purity, PESTANAL®, weak acid, pKa = 3.2 and MW = 440.8 g/mol) was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, France. Dichloromethane (DCM), methanol (MeOH), acetonitrile (ACN), and water for pesticide analyses were pesticide analysis grade and purchased from VWR (France). Acetic acid (glacial, HPLC quality) was purchased from Carlo Erba. For all the other analyses, distilled water was used.

#### 125 2.2. Soil microcosms and experimental design

#### 126 **2.2.1. Soil sampling**

127 Soil samples were collected from the surface layer (0-20 cm) of an experimental arable field 128 with no previous herbicide treatment, located at the University of Perpignan Via Domitia, 129 France (coordinates: 42°40'55.2"N, 2°53'49.2"E). Soil was sieved to 2 mm, remaining vegetal 130 matter was discarded and soil moisture was measured by weighting soil samples before and 131 after drying at 100°C (6.5 % of dry weight, % dw). Soil samples were stored for one week at 132 4°C in the dark, prior to use. Thiour-Mauprivez and collaborators used soil from the same field 133 in a previous study and characterized soil composition. It is composed of 16.2% clay, 29.1% 134 silt, and 54.7% sand (sandy loam soil). It contains 27.5 g/kg of organic matter, 15.99 g/kg of 135 organic carbon and 1.25 g/kg nitrogen. Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC) is of 99 meg/kg, 136  $Ca^{2+}/CEC$  of 260.3% and pH of 8.04 (Thiour-Mauprivez et al., 2021).

#### 137 **2.2.2. Microcosm set up**

138 Soil microcosms were made of 20 g of the sampled soil with relative humidity maintained at 139 20 % (% dw) in rectangular, lidded, plastic boxes. The soil underwent a 1-week period of pre-140 incubation at 21 ± 2 °C in the dark before the microcosm setup. Subsets of 2 g of soil were 141 placed in 50 mL conical polypropylene tubes and were treated with 300 µL of concentrated 142 TBT solubilized in MeOH or with 300 µL of MeOH only for controls (D0, control). The concentration of TBT solutions was chosen to treat soil at one time the RfD (D1, 0.3  $\mu q/q$ ). 143 144 and ten times the RfD (D10,  $3 \mu q/q$ ) (RfD = 100 g a.i. /ha, (ACTA- Les Instituts Techniques 145 Agricoles, France, 2023)). Tubes were left open for 2 hours under a fume hood to evaporate 146 the MeOH. Then, soil level was completed to reach the appropriate dry soil mass and tubes 147 were shaken by inversion during 5 min to ensure a complete mixture of TBT in soil. Mixed and 148 contaminated soils were then transferred into the microcosm boxes and sterile distilled water was added on the top to reach 20 g of soil at 20% relative humidity (% dw) per microcosm. Microcosms were then lidded and incubated in the dark at 21  $\pm$  2 °C. Sampling by sacrifice was done on the microcosms at 0 (+ 10 min after setup); 3; 7; 14; 25; 40 and 55 days after treatment. Every 2 days, microcosms were ventilated, and the soil moisture was adjusted if needed by addition of distilled water under sterile conditions. Soil microcosms were prepared in triplicates for each treatment and time points (n = 63).

#### 155 **2.3. Microbial community structure**

#### 156 **2.3.1. DNA extraction, purification, and quantification**

Soil microbial DNA extraction was performed on 0.250 g of soil immediately after sampling, using the ZymoBIOMICS<sup>TM</sup> DNA Miniprep Kit (Zymo Research, USA). DNA extracts were stored at -20°C until use. DNA quality was checked by migration of PCR products (amplification of the 16S rRNA gene) on agarose gel electrophoresis. DNA was quantified using the Quant-iT<sup>TM</sup> PicoGreen® dsDNA Assay Kit P7589 (Invitrogen<sup>TM</sup>, France). A mean of 14.5 ± 1.7 µg/g of soil was obtained.

#### 163 2.3.2. Amplicon sequencing

164 The diversity of total and *hppd*-containing bacterial communities was monitored by sequencing 165 (Illumina MiSeq paired end sequencing, 2 x 300pb) 16S rRNA and hppd amplicons, 166 respectively. *hppd* amplicon libraries were prepared from DNA extracts using a two-step PCR protocol described previously (Thiour-Mauprivez et al., 2020, 2021), with a PCR#1 volume of 167 3 µL instead of 1 µL used as template in PCR#2. 16S rRNA amplicons libraries were prepared 168 from DNA extracts also with a two-step PCR protocol targeting the hypervariable V3-V4 region 169 170 using the 341F (5-CCTACGGGNGGCWGCAG-3) and 805R (5-171 GACTACHVGGGTATCTAATCC- 3) primer pair (Klindworth et al., 2013). Preparation,

verification, and normalization of these libraries was performed by the Bio-Environment platform (University of Perpignan Via Domitia, France). Primer pairs contained, appended to 5' end, adaptor sequences followed by 2 or 3 random N bases used as spacers to add diversity in the Illumina flow cell cluster detection. 16S rRNA libraries and *hppd* libraries were pooled with proportion of 2/3 and 1/3 respectively and sequenced in only one Illumina flow cell by the Bio-Environment platform (University of Perpignan Via Domitia, France). All sequences were submitted to NCBI under the BioProject accession number PRJNA1011008.

#### 179 **2.3.3. Bioinformatic analysis of amplicon sequences**

180 Analysis of hppd amplicon sequencing data was performed as described previously (Thiour-181 Mauprivez et al., 2021), with the difference that hppd amplicon sequences were clustered at 182 85% amino-acid sequence identity threshold after conversion of DNA sequences into protein 183 sequences (HPPD clusters). Multiple sequence alignment of HPPD sequences identified by 184 differential abundance analysis (see 3.3) and phylogenetic reconstructions were performed 185 using the function "build" of ETE3 3.1.2 (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2016), as implemented on 186 GenomeNet (https://www.genome.jp/tools/ete/). Phylogenetic tree of the aligned 187 sequences was constructed using FastTree v2.1.8 default parameters (Price et al., 2010). 188 Taxonomic affiliations of HPPD clusters were retrieved using NCBI's blastp against the nr 189 database.

190 16S rRNA sequence data were analyzed using QIIME 2<sup>™</sup> (Quantitative Insight into Microbial 191 Ecology) version 2022.8.3 (Bolyen et al., 2019). Primers and heterogeneity spacers were 192 removed from the reads with CUTADAPT (Martin, 2011). Reads were filtered, denoised, 193 assembled and chimeras removed using the DADA2 plugin (Callahan et al., 2016) with default 194 settings and trimmed at the 3' end of reads based on sequence quality scores (trimming at 195 280 bp for forward reads, 250 bp for reverse reads). Representative sequences for each 196 Amplicon Sequence Variant (ASV) were aligned using MAFFT (Katoh & Standley, 2013) and

a 16S phylogenetic tree was constructed using FastTree (Price et al., 2010). Taxonomy was
assigned to ASVs using the FEATURE CLASSIFIER plugin with a classifier previously trained
on the 16S rRNA V3-V4 region (Bokulich et al., 2018). The SILVA 138 SSURef NR99
reference database pre-formatted with RESCRIPt was used to train the classifier (Quast et
al., 2013; Robeson et al., 2021).

Alpha diversity indexes were calculated for HPPD clusters or ASV rarefied tables (subsampling by minimum depth). Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plots were generated (in QIIME for *hppd* and QIIME 2<sup>™</sup> for 16S rRNA) based on weighted and unweighted UniFrac, Bray Curtis or Jaccard distance matrices to detect variations in the composition of communities and coordinates were used to create 3D figures using the EMPEROR plugin of QIIME 2<sup>™</sup> (Vázquez-Baeza et al., 2013).

#### 208 **2.4. Tembotrione fate in soil microcosms**

At each time point of the experiment, 10 g of soil were collected from microcosms and stored
at -20°C for further TBT quantification as described below.

#### 211 **2.4.1. Herbicide extraction & chromatographic analysis**

212 A modified QuEChERS (for Quick, Easy, Cheap, Efficient, Rugged and Safe) method from 213 Rani and co-authors (Rani et al., 2020) was adapted to extract TBT from our soil samples. 214 Briefly, 15 mL of DCM was added to the 10 g of soil in 50 mL conical polypropylene tubes. 215 After 5 min of vortexing at maximum power followed by 5 min of ultrasonication at 37 kHz at 216 room temperature and 20 min of mixing by inversion, samples were centrifuged at 4750xG for 217 10 min. Supernatants were carefully collected and a second extraction was done as previously 218 described above. The two supernatants were combined, and DCM was evaporated to dryness 219 at 30°C using a rotary evaporator. Dry extracts were resuspended in 2 mL of MeOH and stored at -20°C prior to analysis. Extracts were analyzed by a High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) VWR Hitachi LaChrom apparatus consisting in an auto-sampler L-2200, HTA L-2130 pump modules equipped with a Discovery® C18 column (5µm, 150 mm × 4.6 mm) and a DAD L-2450 UV/Vis detector set at  $\lambda$ =285 nm. For TBT detection, the mobile phase consisted in a mixture of water (AW) and acetonitrile (ACN) acidified with 0.1 % acetic acid, delivered at a flow rate of 1 mL/min under an isocratic mode 40/60 (AW/ACN) for 8 min.

#### 226 2.4.2. Analytical performances

227 A calibration curve was obtained using blank soil sample replicates (n= 3) prepared according 228 to the procedure mentioned above. Soil samples were spiked with a concentration range of 229 TBT from 0.015 µg/g to 6 µg/g. Soil samples spiked only with MeOH were used to estimate 230 matrix interferences. The mean recovery rate was estimated at 71 ± 5 % for TBT and the limit of quantification (LOQ) of the method was estimated at 0.1 µg/g, with a limit of detection (LOD) 231 232 corresponding to  $\frac{1}{2}$  x LOQ = 0.05  $\mu$ g/g. The obtained calibration curve (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.99) was used 233 to estimate the concentration of TBT in microcosm soil extracts. Extraction and quantification 234 steps were also performed for blank and MeOH control.

#### 235 **2.4.3.** Fitting of dissipation models

Dissipation kinetics of TBT and endpoints were assessed following the recommendations of the FOCUS (Forum for the Co-ordination of pesticide fate models and their Use) Degradation Kinetics Workgroup (Boesten et al., 2006). Data points below the LOQ were removed and average values were used for each time point. A Fitting of the Single First Order (SFO) kinetic model was performed using the ModelMaker4 software. Dissipation Time 50 % (DT50) and error percentage of  $\chi^2$  test were calculated using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the FOCUS group (<u>https://esdac.jrc.ec.europa.eu/projects/degradation-kinetics-software</u>).

#### 243 **2.5. Statistical analysis**

Differences in alpha diversity were analyzed with the R package v4.2.1 (R core team, 2022) using RStudio (2022.07.2). Homogeneity of variance (Levene's test) was checked prior to analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) tests. A significance threshold was set at a *p*-value of 0.05. Data were transformed and data points were removed when needed based on ANOVA results. Beta diversity distance matrices were subjected to a PERMANOVA analysis and pairwise tests.

250 A Generalized Linear Mixed effect Model (GLMM) analysis was performed to select 251 discriminant HPPD clusters / ASVs between experimental treatments (Huet et al., 2023), using 252 the function "glmer" from R package Ime4 (Bates et al., 2015) with a prior filtering of the HPPD 253 clusters/ASVs based on their prevalence, relative abundance and headcount. Indeed, they 254 were selected based on their presence in each triplicate (with relative abundance  $\geq 0.0005$ ) 255 and with an average count  $\geq$  20 between triplicates within each treatment. A homemade script 256 was used to identify the discriminant HPPD clusters/ASVs by performing an ANOVA on each 257 of these HPPD clusters/ASVs.

# **3. Results**

#### **3.1. Effects of tembotrione on soil total bacterial**

#### 260 **community**

The V3-V4 region of 16S rRNA genes was amplified from the soil DNA and sequenced to study the overall soil bacterial community structure and diversity. A range of 7713 to 36249 sequences per sample (mean = 22749 sequences) was obtained after a DADA2 analysis
producing a feature table with 17324 ASVs. ASV table was rarefied at 7700 sequences.

Soil bacterial Beta diversity analysis (Figure 1) showed that the soil bacterial community composition was strongly affected by incubation time, as samples were visibly grouped according to time points on PCoA of weighted Unifrac distances, with significant differences (Pairwise PERMANOVA, p = 0.001). Beta diversity was not affected by any of the treatments applied to soil (Fig. 1).

Dominant phyla in the studied soil were *Actinobacteriota*, *Proteobacteria*, *Chloroflexi*, *Planctomycetota* and *Acidobacteria*, representing, when added together, approximately 80% in relative abundance, across all conditions (Figure S1). Even if variations occurred for less dominant phyla along the time course of the experiment (*i.e.*, increasing proportion of both *Verrucomicrobiota* and *Patescibacteria* from day 25 to 55), there were no visible changes in the taxonomic composition between treatments.

276 Richness, Faith's phylogenetic diversity (PD index), and evenness (Dominance) of 16S rRNA 277 sequences were compared between treatments at each sampling time point (Table S1). 278 Bacterial richness in soil, as measured by the Chao1 index, was influenced by sampling time and by TBT treatments too. Indeed, in control and D1 microcosms, level of richness dropped 279 280 after day 3 before increasing above its initial level after day 14. In contrast, D10 microcosms 281 stayed at their initial richness level from day 3 to day 14, before increasing at day 25 (Table 282 S1). As a result, the mean richness was significantly higher in D10 microcosms than both 283 control and D1 (Table 1). The evolution of the PD index among time and treatments showed 284 a similar trend with average values significantly higher in D10 than in D1 and control 285 microcosms (Table 1). The dominance index, estimating bacterial species evenness, showed 286 important variations throughout the experiment span. Values were significantly lower in D10,

indicating a higher species evenness, compared to D1 and control (Table 1), this differencebeing most significant at day 3 (Table S1).

Overall, one can conclude that TBT applied at D1 had no significant effect on the diversity of the soil bacterial community. However, when applied at D10, TBT slightly increased richness and phylogenetic diversity in soils, even after 55 days post-treatment. At day 3, D10 TBT seems to limit the drop of specific evenness observed in control and D1 treatments.

#### **3.2. Effect of tembotrione on soil** *hppd***-containing**

#### 294 bacterial community

295 *hppd*-amplicons were sequenced to assess the effect of TBT on *hppd*-soil bacterial 296 community. A range of 6437 to 61138 sequences per sample (mean = 29162 sequences) 297 remained after filtering and correction. The remaining sequences were grouped into 4667 298 clusters at 85% amino-acid sequence identity threshold. For further analysis, the obtained 299 OTU table was rarefied at 6400 sequences.

Soil HPPD Beta diversity was investigated (Fig. 2). As previously, samples were grouped according to time points, independently of their treatment. Significant differences between time points were observed (Pairwise PEMANANOVA, p = 0.001), suggesting a strong effect of time on *hppd* bacterial community composition. However, community composition of soil HPPDs was not affected by TBT treatment.

Several alpha-diversity indexes were calculated to compare richness (observed clusters), PD index and evenness (Simpson's reciprocal) of HPPD clusters between treatments at each time point (Table S2). The average of the richness index showed that observed HPPD clusters were significantly lower in soil treated with the highest dose of TBT (Table 2). Compared to the control, a decrease ranging from 2.1 % to 7.3 % was observed between day 0 and day 40 (Table S2). A similar pattern was observed with the PD index of HPPD clusters which was significantly lower in D10 than in the control (Table 2) with a decrease of 0.8 to 5.5% from day 0 to day 40 (Table S2). Regarding Simpson's reciprocal index, no significant variation was observed between treatments (Table 2) although a trend was visible from day 3 to day 40 where values were lower in treated soils compared to control ones, but this was not statistically significant (Table S2).

Altogether, TBT applied at D1 does not impact neither the structure nor the composition of the *hppd*-containing bacterial community in soil microcosms. At the highest dose (D10), TBT slightly reduced richness and phylogenetic diversity of *hppd*-containing bacterial community in soil. These changes were nonetheless transient and did not persist until the end of the experiment.

#### 321 3.3. Differential abundance analysis and identification

#### 322 of tembotrione-specific discriminating bacterial and

#### 323 hppd-containig taxa

324 To further investigate the impact of TBT treatment on ASVs and HPPD clusters in soils, a 325 Generalized Linear Mixed effect Model (GLMM, glmer function, R package Ime4) was 326 performed on the most abundant and representative ASVs and HPPD clusters. Among the 327 963 ASVs analyzed and the 575 HPPD clusters, 26 ASVs from 16S rRNA data and 27 HPPD 328 clusters were selected and identified as discriminant between different TBT treatments and/or 329 within each time point (p.adj. < 0.05). They are listed in tables S3 and S4 with their 330 corresponding taxonomic affiliations. The ASVs and HPPD clusters with the most relevant and 331 significant variations in relative abundance were chosen for further analysis.

332 The mean fold change in relative abundance compared to controls, expressed in percentage, 333 are shown for D1 and D10 at each day, for the selected and discriminating ASVs and HPPD 334 clusters (Figures 3 and 4, respectively). Results showed that relative abundances were either 335 enriched or reduced by TBT. Interestingly, there were discriminant bacterial ASVs and HPPD 336 clusters sharing similar taxonomic affiliations and similar variations in relative abundance, 337 such as the two Gammaproteobacteria Steroidobacter (ASV-60 and cluster-1573) and 338 Lysobacter (ASV-425 and cluster-1463) and Alphaproteobacteria in the Sphingomonadaceae 339 (ASV-365 and clusters-0 and cluster-1479).

Relative abundance of *Steroidobacter* (ASV-60, Fig. 3) and HPPD cluster affiliated to *Steroidobacter gossypii* (cluster-1573, Fig. 4) increased significantly at D10 (from 50% at day 342 3 to 70 % at day 7) compared to control. In both cases, after 7 days, control and treated soils 343 showed similar relative abundances of these ASV/cluster. HPPD cluster-1553, also related to 344 *S. gossypii*, showed similar results (data not shown).

Sequences affiliated to the *Lysobacter* genus were significantly reduced in treated soils during the experiment. This reduction was significant for ASV-425 at day 14 with a mean reduction of 30% to 40% (Fig. 3). This trend was clear for the HPPD cluster (*L. tabacisoli* cluster-1463) with significant reduction from day 7 to day 55 in both D1 and D10 and a greater effect for D10 with up to 50% reduction in relative abundance at day 7 (Fig. 4).

As for *Sphingomonadaceae*, two identified discriminant HPPD clusters associated with *Sphingomonas* sp. G124 (cluster-1479 and cluster-0) were enriched following TBT treatment in terms of relative abundance (Fig. 4). For cluster-1479 and cluster-0, significant increases (up to 60% and 20% compared to the control, respectively) occurred at day 3, 14, 25 (and day 40 for cluster-0) for D1 and D10. At day 55, the relative abundance of cluster-0 was significantly reduced in treated soils. Noteworthy, cluster-0 was the most abundant HPPD cluster found among all the *hppd* amplicon sequencing data, representing almost 10% of all the HPPD clusters (data not shown). Other HPPD clusters affiliated to *Sphingomonas* showed a similar but less clear trend (cluster-1564, cluster-1464, cluster-1470, data not shown). ASV-365 (*Sphingomonadaceae*, genus *Sphingoaurantiacus*) shared similar variations with the HPPD cluster-0 at the end of the experiment, with a significant decrease of its relative abundance at day 40 and 55 in treated soils, but not as important as the one for the HPPD clusters described above (Fig. 3).

363 Regarding Betaproteobacteria, three ASVs exhibited a significant decrease in relative 364 abundance in microcosms treated with TBT. ASV-21, assigned to the genus Methylotenera, 365 showed a relative abundance approximately 30% to 50% lower in D10 than in the control at day 3, 7 and 14 (Fig. 3). ASV-568 and ASV-3, affiliated to the Methylophilaceae family (which 366 367 include the Methylotenera genus), exhibited similar variations (data not shown), unlike the relative abundance of HPPD cluster 877 (Massilia spp.) which was significantly higher in 368 369 treated microcosms at day 3, 40 and 55 (Fig.4). Other HPPD clusters, associated with the 370 genus Massilia, also showed similar trends (cluster-728, 834, 123, 669, 1310 and 1304, data 371 not shown). Finally, the relative abundance of an HPPD sequence assigned to Ramlibacter 372 sp. WS9 (cluster-4101) exhibited a significant decrease at day 3 and 7 and an increase from 373 day 14 to 40 in the treated soils compared to the control ones (Fig. 4). A similar increase was 374 observed in another HPPD cluster also associated to Ramlibacter genus (cluster-4124) in D1 375 and D10 treatments at day 40 and 55 (data not shown).

Another interesting ASV, assigned to *Nitrospira* (*Nitrospirota;* ASV-29) decreased over time with a significant drop in D10 microcosms at day 7 and 55 (approximately 40 % less abundant than in the control, Fig. 3). ASV-193 (*Rhizobiaceae*, Alphaproteobacteria) was significantly enriched in treated soils at day 3, with an increase of its relative abundance up to two-fold compared to the control (Fig. 3).

Using the full HPPD sequences from the BLASTP best hit of each discriminant HPPD cluster
 (see accession numbers on Table S4), a multiple sequence alignment allowed us to construct
 16

a phylogenetic tree. Sequences from the clusters cited above but not shown in the figures
were also included. Interestingly, the HPPD sequence from *Lysobacter tabacisoli* seems
isolated and separated on a single branch of the tree, compared to other discriminant HPPD
sequences (Fig. S2). Cluster-1463, which is affiliated to *Lysobacter tabacisoli*, is the only
HPPD cluster negatively impacted by TBT treatment in soil, suggesting that the HPPD from
this taxon might be sensitive to TBT, likely due to a specificity in its protein sequence.

To sum up, the results presented above indicate that, on the one hand, the proportions of *Steroidobacter, Sphingomonas, Massilia* and a taxon from the *Rhizobiaceae* family were enriched in TBT treated soils. *Lysobacter, Nitrospira* and *Methylotenera*, on the other hand, decreased in their relative abundance in the treated soils. These effects were identified through 16S rRNA or the *hppd* functional-gene marker, or both, for some taxa. Considering the D10 treatment, these effects seemed to be more significant, with some exceptions.

#### **395 3.4. Tembotrione dissipation in soil microcosms**

396 Aiming to assess the chemical behavior of the active ingredient during the exposure scenario 397 of soil bacterial communities in microcosms and to better understand the effects observed on 398 community composition, TBT concentration in soil microcosms was estimated at each time 399 point, for both D1 and D10 TBT treatments. Expected concentrations of TBT were measured 400 at the beginning of the experiment (day 0). A rapid dissipation of TBT was observed at D1 with 401 concentration values reaching the LOD after 14 days (Figure 5B). At D10, TBT concentrations 402 also decreased through time, reaching the RfD after 40 days. In this condition, TBT was still 403 quantifiable at the end of the experiment (55 days) with an estimated concentration just above 404 the LOD. Dissipation curves could reasonably fit a Single First Order (SFO) kinetic model 405 (C =  $C_{0.}e^{-kt}$ ), as estimated by error levels of chi2-tests, where values obtained were below 406 15% for the two doses applied (2.6% and 8.4% for D1 and D10, respectively ; fig. 5A). The 407 half-life of TBT in soil microcosms was thus, estimated at 7 days for D1 and 15 days for D10. 17

To conclude, TBT was rapidly dissipated with an exponential decay in soil microcosms and TBT concentration was below the LOD after 14 days for D1 and just above the LOD after 55 days of incubation for D10.

# 411 **4. Discussion**

# 4.1. Effect of RfD of tembotrione on the structure of total and *hppd*-containing bacterial communities

414 Amplicon Illumina sequencing was used to determine the effect of TBT RfD on the diversity of the total- and on the hppd-containing bacterial communities. Our results suggest that, under 415 416 our experimental conditions, TBT had no or a very little effect on the structure and the diversity 417 of both the total- and the *hppd*-containing communities when applied at RfD (D1). This conclusion is consistent with what has already been observed, using a similar approach as 418 419 ours, for other synthetic β-triketones herbicides applied at RfD in soil. Indeed, RfD of 420 sulcotrione (active ingredient or formulated product) did not change soil bacterial and hppdbacterial community composition and diversity (Romdhane et al., 2016; Thiour-Mauprivez et 421 al., 2021), nor did RfD of mesotrione alone or formulated on the composition and diversity of 422 423 total bacterial and nitrogen cycling bacterial communities in soil (Crouzet et al., 2010, 2016; 424 Joly et al., 2012). These results could be explained by the low persistence of  $\beta$ -triketone 425 herbicides in soil when applied at the RfD (*i.e.*, 100 g/ha for TBT).

The studied soil has already been used in previous studies for  $DT_{50}$  determination of other βtriketones herbicides (*i.e.*, synthetic ones: sulcotrione, mesotrione or natural one: leptospermone,) with values ranging from 4 to 8 days when applied at RfD (Calvayrac et al., 2012; Chaabane et al., 2008; Romdhane, et al., 2016, 2019; Thiour-Mauprivez et al., 2021). 430 In some of these studies, high dissipation times were observed in abiotic controls, suggesting 431 that herbicide degradation was mainly due to biological activity. From these living soils, several 432 triketone-degrading bacterial strains were isolated (Batisson et al., 2009; Calvayrac et al., 433 2012; Chaabane et al., 2008; Romdhane, et al., 2016). The TBT dissipation kinetics observed in our experiments are in accordance with those found by Rani and co-authors (Rani et al., 434 435 2020), showing that dissipation of TBT applied at 0.12  $\mu$ g/g in a sandy loam soil and a clayev loam soil followed first order kinetics with DT<sub>50</sub> of 9.3 days and 8.1 days respectively. Also, 436 other DT<sub>50</sub> were estimated between 4 and 72 days (depending on soils physico-chemical 437 438 characteristics) in soils maintained under aerobic conditions (EFSA, 2013; Tarara et al., 2009; 439 US EPA, 2007). Thus, we can assume that, in soil microcosms treated with D1, TBT is rapidly 440 dissipated, mostly due to its rapid biodegradation and, therefore, exposition of soil 441 microorganisms to TBT is only occurring over a short period of time.

Romdhane et al. (Romdhane et al., 2016, 2019) showed that leptospermone, a triketone from natural origin, applied at the RfD had significant effects on the composition of soil bacterial communities. However, the authors highlighted the higher (~ 10-fold) application rate of leptospermone compared to synthetic β-triketones (i.e., 1500 g a.i. /ha for RfD).

# 446 4.2. Changes in bacterial and *hppd*-contaning 447 communities to tembotrione exposition considering a 448 higher exposure scenario

At the highest dose (D10), TBT had some ecotoxicological effects towards total- and *hppd*bacterial communities. While overall community composition was not significantly affected, small but significant variations occurred in alpha-diversity measurements, driven by taxa with lower relative abundance. This is consistent with the exposure scenario, as the measured DT<sub>50</sub> 453 was two times higher for D10 than that for D1. One could observe that, in D10 microcosms,
454 TBT concentration was still three times the RfD 25 days after its application.

455 Total bacterial richness and phylogenetic diversity fluctuated over time but overall, and even 456 when effect of sampling time was considered, they showed higher levels in D10 treated soils 457 than in the control ones. This might be the result of the expansion of TBT-resistant bacterial 458 populations and/or the growth of saprophytic bacterial species feeding on dead TBT-sensitive 459 organisms, as previously suggested by Dumas and coworkers to explain the stimulation of 460 heterotrophic communities in soil by high doses of pure or formulated mesotrione (Dumas et 461 al., 2017). TBT-tolerant populations, rare or in low numbers before TBT application, are no longer in competition for resources with TBT-sensitives microorganisms and can colonize their 462 463 niche. Moreover, TBT application might have favored the emergence of degrading-bacterial 464 populations able to use TBT as an energy source. Indeed, several triketones degrading 465 bacterial strains have been isolated from soils and the degradation pathway were identified 466 for mesotrione and sulcotrione (Batisson et al., 2009; Calvayrac et al., 2012). Even if no TBT 467 degrading soil strain has been isolated yet, we could hypothesize that they are present in our 468 soil. Nguyen and co-authors (Nguyen et al., 2016), suggested, in a meta-analysis, that 469 glyphosate at high doses of application could stimulate microbial growth, acting as a carbon, 470 nitrogen, or phosphorus source. While the degrading community being promoted, one is then 471 unable to detect the possible toxic effects on the sensitive community.

472 Meanwhile, D10 treatment decreased richness and phylogenetic diversity of HPPD clusters 473 indicating a possible direct toxic effect on sensitive *hppd*-containing populations through a 474 disruption of the tyrosine catabolic pathway *via* HPPD inhibition. This effect appeared to be 475 transient and dependent on TBT presence in soil, as this effect was clearly visible until day 40 476 but not anymore at the end of the experiment, when TBT reached the LOD level.

477 These discrepancies between hppd and 16S rRNA gene amplicon analysis could likely be 478 explained by the fact that the *hppd*-containing bacteria constitute a sub-pool of the total 479 bacterial community containing the TBT targeted enzyme. Analysis of the total bacterial 480 community mostly highlighted positive effects (Yang effect, cf. Karpouzaz et al., 2016) 481 discussed above, thus hiding effects (Yin effects) seen on sensitive bacterial HPPD. This 482 underlines the importance of looking at specific bacterial functional groups, in addition to 483 taxonomic diversity, as conclusions on the effect of a pollutant on bacterial populations can be 484 different, as our results show.

Finally, as our results showed that effect of TBT could occur in a worst-case scenario of exposure in controlled conditions, it would have been interesting to also test TBT effects in field experiments with more realistic exposure scenarios, but experimental conditions become difficult to control (Thiour-Mauprivez et al., 2021).

#### 489 **4.3. Taxa responding to TBT in soils: towards a new**

#### 490 class of exposure biomarkers?

Since the relative abundance of some specific 16S rRNA ASVs and HPPD clusters was significantly influenced by TBT in the tested soil and that these ASVs and clusters shared the same or close taxonomic affiliations associated with the same responses, they could potentially represent HPPD+ bacterial taxa indicator of TBT or other  $\beta$ -triketones exposure in soil.

This was the case for *Sphingomonas* and *Steroidobacter*, whose relative abundances were increased by TBT. These taxa could use TBT as a carbon or energy source and/or could exhibit degradation capabilities. These taxa were also enriched in soils after leptospermone exposition (Romdhane et al., 2016; 2019) and the degradation of other herbicides in soil such as isoproturon, 2,4-D or fomesafen by *Sphingomonas* has already been shown (Hu et al., 501 2019; Sørensen et al., 2001; Vanitha et al., 2023). The genus Steroidobacter is known to be 502 associated with the rhizosphere of diverse plants and has a range of organic compound-503 degrading capabilities (Gong et al., 2016; Ikenaga et al., 2021). Moreover, taxa from the same 504 genera could have benefited from resources left by sensitive populations in the community and might be tolerant to TBT or even harbor resistant HPPDs, as it was the case for a 505 506 Sphingobium strain, a Sphingomonadales genus phylogenetically close to Sphingomonas 507 species, that possesses an HPPD resistant to mesotrione and TBT to a lesser extent (Liu et 508 al., 2020).

509

510 Other 16S rRNA ASVs and HPPD clusters enriched in TBT treated soils are associated to 511 species that are known to (i) degrade herbicides or other organic compounds: linuron and 512 polycyclic aromatic carbons for *Ramlibacter* (Lerner et al., 2020; Su et al., 2022), 513 chloroacetamide and atrazine in soil for *Massilia* (Lee et al., 2017; Luo et al., 2021) ; (ii) be 514 involved in plant-bacteria symbiosis and are able to degrade complex organic molecules for 515 members of the *Rhizobiaceae* family (Carrareto Alves et al., 2014).

516

517 Conversely, 16S rRNA ASV and HPPD cluster associated to Lysobacter were negatively 518 affected by TBT, indicating a potential sensitivity of their HPPD. To our knowledge, no previous 519 study has investigated HPPD sensitivity to  $\beta$ -triketones in *Lysobacter*. Interestingly, the 520 alignment and phylogenetic analysis of HPPD sequences showed that Lysobacter HPPD has 521 an amino acid sequence distinct from the other taxa. In addition, as far as we know, no 522 previous study reported negative effects of PPP on this taxon in soil. However, it has already 523 been observed that members of this genus have degrading abilities and are promoted by the 524 use of acetochlor S, an herbicide, in soil (Han et al., 2021). Nonetheless, negative effects of TBT on Lysobacter could be of ecological importance as this genus is recognized as a 525 526 beneficial organism in the rhizosphere and acts as a protective agent against some plant 527 pathogens (Brescia et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2022).

529 Similarly, the relative abundance of *Nitrospira* was significantly reduced by TBT, similarly to 530 previous observations after exposition to the herbicide linuron in soil (Medo et al., 2021). 531 Nitrospira is found in rhizospheric habitats and is involved in the nitrogen cycle (Daims & 532 Wagner, 2018) so, a potential toxicity of herbicides on this strain could then be of ecological 533 importance. It should be noticed that this genus is known to possess an HPPD but, it was 534 absent from our hppd sequencing dataset. It was also the case for Methylotenera ASVs, which 535 were decreased in TBT-treated soil and which might play a role in the nitrogen cycle too (Yi et 536 al. 2022). This taxon is not known to possess the *hppd* gene so its TBT-sensitivity could not 537 be explained by a toxic action of TBT on its HPPD.

538 We hence suggest a use of the TBT-sensitive taxa identified in our study, notably those 539 carrying an HPPD and negatively affected, or their respective *hppd* genes, as potential 540 biomarkers of exposure to triketones in soils.

541

# 5. Conclusion

542 To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the fate and ecotoxicological impacts of TBT 543 herbicide on soil microbial communities. Our results showed that the active ingredient applied 544 in microcosms according to field recommendations did not have a significant impact, neither 545 on the structure of soil microbial community, nor on the structure of non-targeted bacterial 546 hppd community. However, TBT applied at tenfold the RfD might negatively affect some 547 sensitive populations, even though these effects were light and could have been hidden by 548 the emergence and selection of tolerant and/or degrading populations within the soil bacterial 549 community. This was supported by an easy and rapid dissipation of the active ingredient in 550 soil. Thus, both enhanced bacterial taxa with putative TBT-degrading abilities and/or TBT-551 tolerance and diminished taxa with potential sensitive HPPD, identified by our differential abundance analysis, could be proposed in ERA as relevant biomarkers of TBT-contaminatedagricultural soils.

# **6.** Acknowledgments

555

The authors thank the Région Occitanie, and Perpignan University Via Domitia for their
financial support, and Laetitia Fournier for her technical help.

558

**7. Funding** 

560 This work was supported by the Région Occitanie and Université de Perpignan Via Domitia

# 561 **8. References**

- 562 ACTA- Les Instituts Techniques Agricoles. (2023). Index acta phytosanitaire 2021, 59<sup>ème</sup>
- 563 édition (Acta éditions, Vol. 59).
- 564 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. M., & Walker, S. C. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects
- 565 Models Using Ime4. Journal of Statistical Software, 67(1), 1–48.
- 566 https://doi.org/10.18637/JSS.V067.I01
- 567 Batisson, I., Crouzet, O., Besse-Hoggan, P., Sancelme, M., Mangot, J. F., Mallet, C., &
- 568 Bohatier, J. (2009). Isolation and characterization of mesotrione-degrading Bacillus sp. from
- soil. Environmental Pollution, 157(4), 1195–1201.
- 570 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2008.12.009

- Boesten, J. J. T. I., Aden, K., Beigel, C., Beulke, S., Dust, M., Dyson, J. S., Fomsgaard, S.,
  Jones, R. L., Karlsson, S., Van Der Linden, A. M. A., Richter, O., Magrans, J. O., & Soulas,
  G. (2006). Guidance Document on Estimating Persistence and Degradation Kinetics from
  Environmental Fate Studies on Pesticides in EU Registration The Final Report of the Work
  Group on Degradation Kinetics of FOCUS (FOrum for the Co-ordination of pesticide fate
  models and their USe).
- 577 Bokulich, N. A., Kaehler, B. D., Rideout, J. R., Dillon, M., Bolyen, E., Knight, R., Huttley, G.
- 578 A., & Gregory Caporaso, J. (2018). Optimizing taxonomic classification of marker-gene

amplicon sequences with QIIME 2's q2-feature-classifier plugin. Microbiome, 6(1), 1–17.

- 580 https://doi.org/10.1186/S40168-018-0470-Z/TABLES/3
- 581 Bolyen, E., Rideout, J. R., Dillon, M. R., Bokulich, N. A., Abnet, C. C., Al-Ghalith, G. A.,
- 582 Alexander, H., Alm, E. J., Arumugam, M., Asnicar, F., Bai, Y., Bisanz, J. E., Bittinger, K.,
- 583 Brejnrod, A., Brislawn, C. J., Brown, C. T., Callahan, B. J., Caraballo-Rodríguez, A. M.,
- 584 Chase, J., ... Caporaso, J. G. (2019). Reproducible, interactive, scalable and extensible
- 585 microbiome data science using QIIME 2. Nature Biotechnology, 37(8), 852–857.
- 586 https://doi.org/10.1038/S41587-019-0209-9
- 587 Borowik, A., Wyszkowska, J., Kucharski, J., Baćmaga, M., & Tomkiel, M. (2017). Response
- 588 of microorganisms and enzymes to soil contamination with a mixture of terbuthylazine,
- 589 mesotrione, and S-metolachlor. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 24(2),
- 590 1910–1925. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-7919-z
- 591 Brescia, F., Pertot, I., & Puopolo, G. (2020). Lysobacter. In Beneficial Microbes in Agro-
- 592 Ecology: Bacteria and Fungi (pp. 313–338). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-
- 593 823414-3.00016-2

- Callahan, B. J., McMurdie, P. J., Rosen, M. J., Han, A. W., Johnson, A. J. A., & Holmes, S.
- 595 P. (2016). DADA2: High resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nature
- 596 Methods, 13(7), 581. https://doi.org/10.1038/NMETH.3869
- 597 Calvayrac, C., Martin-Laurent, F., Faveaux, A., Picault, N., Panaud, O., Coste, C. M.,
- 598 Chaabane, H., & Cooper, J. F. (2012). Isolation and characterisation of a bacterial strain
- 599 degrading the herbicide sulcotrione from an agricultural soil. Pest Management Science,
- 600 68(3), 340–347. https://doi.org/10.1002/PS.2263
- 601 Carrareto Alves, L. M., De Souza, J. A. M., Varani, A. D. M., & Lemos, E. G. D. M. (2014).
- 602 The family Rhizobiaceae. The Prokaryotes: Alphaproteobacteria and Betaproteobacteria,
- 603 9783642301971, 419–437. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30197-1\_297/COVER
- 604 Cébron, A., Karpouzas, D. G., Martin-Laurent, F., Morin, S., Palacios, C., & Schmitt-Jansen,
- 605 M. (2022). Editorial: Microbial Ecotoxicology Advances to Improve Environmental and
- Human Health Under Global Change. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *13*, 870404.
- 607 https://doi.org/10.3389/FMICB.2022.870404/BIBTEX
- 608 Chaabane, H., Vulliet, E., Calvayrac, C., Coste, C. M., & Cooper, J. F. (2008). Behaviour of
- sulcotrione and mesotrione in two soils. Pest Management Science, 64(1), 86–93.
- 610 https://doi.org/10.1002/PS.1456
- 611 Crouzet, O., Batisson, I., Besse-Hoggan, P., Bonnemoy, F., Bardot, C., Poly, F., Bohatier, J.,
- 612 & Mallet, C. (2010). Response of soil microbial communities to the herbicide mesotrione: A
- 613 dose-effect microcosm approach. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 42(2), 193–202.
- 614 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.10.016
- 615 Crouzet, O., Wiszniowski, J., Donnadieu, F., Bonnemoy, F., Bohatier, J., & Mallet, C. (2013).
- 616 Dose-dependent effects of the herbicide mesotrione on soil cyanobacterial communities.

- 617 Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 64(1), 23–31.
- 618 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-012-9809-9
- 619 Crouzet, O., Poly, F., Bonnemoy, F., Bru, D., Batisson, I., Bohatier, J., Philippot, L., & Mallet,
- 620 C. (2016). Functional and structural responses of soil N-cycling microbial communities to the
- 621 herbicide mesotrione: a dose-effect microcosm approach. Environmental Science and
- 622 Pollution Research, 23(5), 4207–4217. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11356-015-4797-
- 623 8/METRICS
- Daims, H., & Wagner, M. (2018). Nitrospira. Trends in Microbiology, 26(5), 462–463.
- 625 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TIM.2018.02.001
- 626 Du, Z., Zhu, Y., Zhu, L., Zhang, J., Li, B., Wang, J., Wang, J., Zhang, C., & Cheng, C.
- 627 (2018). Effects of the herbicide mesotrione on soil enzyme activity and microbial
- 628 communities. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 164(April), 571–578.
- 629 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2018.08.075
- 630 Dumas, E., Giraudo, M., Goujon, E., Halma, M., Knhili, E., Stauffert, M., Batisson, I., Besse-
- Hoggan, P., Bohatier, J., Bouchard, P., Celle-Jeanton, H., Costa Gomes, M., Delbac, F.,
- 632 Forano, C., Goupil, P., Guix, N., Husson, P., Ledoigt, G., Mallet, C., ... Sarraute, S. (2017).
- 633 Fate and ecotoxicological impact of new generation herbicides from the triketone family: An
- overview to assess the environmental risks. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 325, 136–156.
- 635 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.11.059
- 636 EFSA (2013). Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active
- 637 substance tembotrione. EFSA Journal, 11(3), 1–81. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3131
- Gong, Z. L., Zhang, C. F., Jin, R., & Zhang, Y. Q. (2016). Steroidobacter flavus sp. nov., a
- 639 microcystin-degrading Gammaproteobacterium isolated from soil. Antonie van
- 640 Leeuwenhoek, 109(8), 1073–1079. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10482-016-0706-5

- 641 Griffiths, B. S., & Philippot, L. (2013). Insights into the resistance and resilience of the soil
- 642 microbial community. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*, 37(2), 112–129.
- 643 https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1574-6976.2012.00343.X
- Han, L., Fang, K., Liu, Y., Fang, J., Wang, F., & Wang, X. (2021). Earthworms accelerated
- 645 the degradation of the highly toxic acetochlor S-enantiomer by stimulating soil microbiota in
- repeatedly treated soils. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 420, 126669.
- 647 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.126669
- Huerta-Cepas, J., Serra, F., & Bork, P. (2016). ETE 3: Reconstruction, Analysis, and
- 649 Visualization of Phylogenomic Data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 33(6), 1635–1638.
- 650 https://doi.org/10.1093/MOLBEV/MSW046
- Hicks, L. C., Frey, B., Kjøller, R., Lukac, M., Moora, M., Weedon, J. T., & Rousk, J. (2022).
- Toward a function-first framework to make soil microbial ecology predictive. *Ecology*, *103*(2),
  e03594. https://doi.org/10.1002/ECY.3594
- 654 Hu, H., Zhou, H., Zhou, S., Li, Z., Wei, C., Yu, Y., & Hay, A. G. (2019). Fomesafen impacts
- 655 bacterial communities and enzyme activities in the rhizosphere. Environmental Pollution,
- 656 253, 302–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVPOL.2019.07.018
- Huet, S., Romdhane, S., Breuil, M.-C., Bru, D., Mounier, A., Spor, A., & Philippot, L. (2023).
- 658 Experimental community coalescence sheds light on microbial interactions in soil and
- restores impaired functions. *Microbiome*, *11*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-023-
- 660 01480-7
- 661 Huang, X., Yang, X., Lin, J., Franks, A. E., Cheng, J., Zhu, Y., Shi, J., Xu, J., Yuan, M., Fu,
- K., & He, Y. (2022). Biochar alleviated the toxicity of atrazine to soybeans, as revealed by
- soil microbial community and the assembly process. Science of The Total Environment, 834,
- 664 155261. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2022.155261

- 665 Ikenaga, M., Kataoka, M., Yin, X., Murouchi, A., & Sakai, M. (2021). Characterization and
- 666 Distribution of Agar-degrading Steroidobacter agaridevorans sp. nov., Isolated from
- 667 Rhizosphere Soils. Microbes and Environments, 36(1).
- 668 https://doi.org/10.1264/JSME2.ME20136
- Joly, P., Besse-Hoggan, P., Bonnemoy, F., Batisson, I., Bohatier, J., & Mallet, C. (2012).
- 670 Impact of Maize Formulated Herbicides Mesotrione and S-Metolachlor, Applied Alone and in
- 671 Mixture, on Soil Microbial Communities. ISRN Ecology, 2012, 1–9.
- 672 https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/329898
- Joly, P., Bonnemoy, F., Charvy, J. C., Bohatier, J., & Mallet, C. (2013). Toxicity assessment
- 674 of the maize herbicides S-metolachlor, benoxacor, mesotrione and nicosulfuron, and their
- 675 corresponding commercial formulations, alone and in mixtures, using the Microtox® test.
- 676 Chemosphere, 93(10), 2444–2450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.08.074
- Joly, P., Misson, B., Perrière, F., Bonnemoy, F., Joly, M., Donnadieu-Bernard, F., Aguer, J.
- P., Bohatier, J., & Mallet, C. (2014). Soil surface colonization by phototrophic indigenous
- organisms, in two contrasted soils treated by formulated maize herbicide mixtures.
- 680 *Ecotoxicology*, 23(9), 1648–1658. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-014-1304-9
- Kaczynski, P., Lozowicka, B., Hrynko, I., & Wolejko, E. (2016). Behaviour of mesotrione in
  maize and soil system and its influence on soil dehydrogenase activity. Science of the Total
- 683 Environment, 571, 1079–1088. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.100
- 684 Karpouzas, D. G., Tsiamis, G., Trevisan, M., Ferrari, F., Malandain, C., Sibourg, O., &
- 685 Martin-Laurent, F. (2016). "LOVE TO HATE" pesticides: felicity or curse for the soil microbial
- 686 community? An FP7 IAPP Marie Curie project aiming to establish tools for the assessment
- of the mechanisms controlling the interactions of pesticides with soil microorganisms.

- 688 Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(18), 18947–18951.
- 689 https://doi.org/10.1007/S11356-016-7319-4/METRICS
- 690 Katoh, K., & Standley, D. M. (2013). MAFFT Multiple Sequence Alignment Software Version
- 691 7: Improvements in Performance and Usability. Molecular Biology and Evolution, 30(4), 772–
- 692 780. https://doi.org/10.1093/MOLBEV/MST010
- 693 Klindworth, A., Pruesse, E., Schweer, T., Peplies, J., Quast, C., Horn, M., & Glöckner, F. O.
- 694 (2013). Evaluation of general 16S ribosomal RNA gene PCR primers for classical and next-
- 695 generation sequencing-based diversity studies. Nucleic Acids Research, 41(1).
- 696 https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/GKS808
- Lee, H., Kim, D. U., Park, S., Yoon, J. H., & Ka, J. O. (2017). Massilia chloroacetimidivorans
- sp. nov., a chloroacetamide herbicide-degrading bacterium isolated from soil. Antonie van
- 699 Leeuwenhoek, 110(6), 751–758. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10482-017-0845-3
- Lerner, H., Öztürk, B., Dohrmann, A. B., Thomas, J., Marchal, K., De Mot, R., Dehaen, W.,
- Tebbe, C. C., & Springael, D. (2020). Culture-Independent Analysis of Linuron-Mineralizing
- 702 Microbiota and Functions in on-Farm Biopurification Systems via DNA-Stable Isotope
- 703 Probing: Comparison with Enrichment Culture. Environmental Science and Technology,
- 704 54(15), 9387–9397.
- 705 https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.EST.0C02124/SUPPL\_FILE/ES0C02124\_SI\_002.XLSX
- 706 Liu, B., Peng, Q., Sheng, M., Ni, H., Xiao, X., Tao, Q., He, Q., & He, J. (2020). Isolation and
- 707 Characterization of a Topramezone-Resistant 4-Hydroxyphenylpyruvate Dioxygenase from
- 708 Sphingobium sp. TPM-19. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 68(4), 1022–1029.
- 709 https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.JAFC.9B06871/SUPPL\_FILE/JF9B06871\_SI\_001.PDF
- 710 Luo, S., Zhen, Z., Zhu, X., Ren, L., Wu, W., Zhang, W., Chen, Y., Zhang, D., Song, Z., Lin,
- 711 Z., & Liang, Y. Q. (2021). Accelerated atrazine degradation and altered metabolic pathways

- in goat manure assisted soil bioremediation. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 221.
- 713 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOENV.2021.112432
- Mamy, L. (ed.), Pesce, S. (ed.), Sanchez, W. (ed.), Leenhardt, S. (ed.), Amichot, M.,
- 715 Artigas, J., Aviron, S., Barthélémy, C., Beaudouin, R., Bedos, C., Berard, A., Berny, P.,
- 716 Bertrand, C., Bertrand, C., Betoulle, S., Bureau-Point, E., Charles, S., Chaumot, A., Chauvel,
- 717 B., ... Tournebize, J. (2022). Impacts des produits phytopharmaceutiques sur la biodiversité
- 718 et les services écosystémiques. Rapport d'ESCo. https://doi.org/10.17180/0GP2-CD65
- 719 Martin, M. (2011). Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing
- 720 reads. EMBnet.Journal, 17(1), 10–12. https://doi.org/10.14806/EJ.17.1.200
- 721 Medo, J., Maková, J., Medová, J., Lipková, N., Cinkocki, R., Omelka, R., & Javoreková, S.
- 722 (2021). Changes in soil microbial community and activity caused by application of
- dimethachlor and linuron. Scientific Reports, 11(1), 12786. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41598021-91755-6
- 725 Moran, G. R. (2005). 4-Hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase. Archives of Biochemistry and
- 726 *Biophysics*, 433(1), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ABB.2004.08.015
- 727 Nguyen, D. B., Rose, M. T., Rose, T. J., Morris, S. G., & van Zwieten, L. (2016). Impact of
- 728 glyphosate on soil microbial biomass and respiration: A meta-analysis. Soil Biology and
- 729 Biochemistry, 92, 50–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOILBIO.2015.09.014
- 730 Pavan, M. E., López, N. I., & Pettinari, M. J. (2020). Melanin biosynthesis in bacteria,
- regulation and production perspectives. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology, 104(4),
- 732 1357–1370. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-019-10245-y
- 733 Petric, I., Karpouzas, D. G., Bru, D., Udikovic-Kolic, N., Kandeler, E., Djuric, S., & Martin-
- Laurent, F. (2016). Nicosulfuron application in agricultural soils drives the selection towards
- 735 NS-tolerant microorganisms harboring various levels of sensitivity to nicosulfuron.

- 736 Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(5), 4320–4333.
- 737 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5645-6
- 738 Pose-Juan, E., Sánchez-Martín, M. J., Herrero-Hernández, E., & Rodríguez-Cruz, M. S.
- 739 (2015). Application of mesotrione at different doses in an amended soil: Dissipation and
- r40 effect on the soil microbial biomass and activity. Science of the Total Environment, 536, 31–
- 741 38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.07.039
- 742 Price, M. N., Dehal, P. S., & Arkin, A. P. (2010). FastTree 2 Approximately Maximum-
- Likelihood Trees for Large Alignments. PLOS ONE, 5(3), e9490.
- 744 https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0009490
- 745 Puglisi, E. (2017). Response of microbial organisms (aquatic and terrestrial) to pesticides.
- 746 EFSA Supporting Publications, 9(11). https://doi.org/10.2903/sp.efsa.2012.en-359
- 747 Quast, C., Pruesse, E., Yilmaz, P., Gerken, J., Schweer, T., Yarza, P., Peplies, J., &
- 748 Glöckner, F. O. (2013). The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data
- 749 processing and web-based tools. Nucleic Acids Research, 41(Database issue).
- 750 https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/GKS1219
- Rani, N., Duhan, A., & Tomar, D. (2020). Ultimate fate of herbicide tembotrione and its
- metabolite TCMBA in soil. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 203(July), 111023.
- 753 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111023
- 754 Robeson, M. S., O'Rourke, D. R., Kaehler, B. D., Ziemski, M., Dillon, M. R., Foster, J. T., &
- 755 Bokulich, N. A. (2021). RESCRIPt: Reproducible sequence taxonomy reference database
- management. PLOS Computational Biology, 17(11), e1009581.
- 757 https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PCBI.1009581
- Romdhane, S., Devers-Lamrani, M., Barthelmebs, L., Calvayrac, C., Bertrand, C., Cooper, J.
- F., Dayan, F. E., & Martin-Laurent, F. (2016). Ecotoxicological impact of the bioherbicide

- 760 leptospermone on the microbial community of two arable soils. Frontiers in Microbiology,
- 761 7(MAY), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00775
- Romdhane, S., Devers-Lamrani, M., Beguet, J., Bertrand, C., Calvayrac, C., Salvia, M. V.,
- Jrad, A. Ben, Dayan, F. E., Spor, A., Barthelmebs, L., & Martin-Laurent, F. (2019).
- 764 Assessment of the ecotoxicological impact of natural and synthetic β-triketone herbicides on
- the diversity and activity of the soil bacterial community using omic approaches. Science of
- 766 the Total Environment, 651, 241–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.09.159
- 767 Singh, D., Kumar, J., & Kumar, A. (2018). Isolation of pyomelanin from bacteria and
- role evidences showing its synthesis by 4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase enzyme encoded
- by hppD gene. International Journal of Biological Macromolecules, 119, 864–873.
- 770 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJBIOMAC.2018.08.003
- 771 Sørensen, S. R., Ronen, Z., & Aamand, J. (2001). Isolation from Agricultural Soil and
- 772 Characterization of a Sphingomonas sp. Able To Mineralize the Phenylurea Herbicide
- Isoproturon. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 67(12), 5403.
- 774 https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.67.12.5403-5409.2001
- Su, A., Xu, Y., Xu, M., Ding, S., Li, M., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Resilience of the wheat root-
- associated microbiome to the disturbance of phenanthrene. The Science of the Total
- 777 Environment, 838(Pt 3). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2022.156487
- Vanitha, T. K., Suresh, G., Mohan Bhandi, M., Krishna Reddy Mudiam, M., & Mohan, S. V.
- (2023). Microbial Degradation of Organochlorine Pesticide: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid
- by Axenic and Mixed Consortium. Bioresource Technology, 129031.
- 781 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2023.129031</u>
- Tarara, G., Fliege, R., Desmarteau, D., Kley, C., & Peters, B. (2009). Environmental fate of
- tembotrione. *Bayer CropScience Journal*, 62, 63-78.

- Tawk, A., Deborde, M., Labanowski, J., & Gallard, H. (2015). Chlorination of the β-triketone
- herbicides tembotrione and sulcotrione: Kinetic and mechanistic study, transformation
- 786 products identification and toxicity. *Water Research*, 76, 132–142.
- 787 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.02.060
- 788 Thiour-Mauprivez, C., Martin-Laurent, F., Calvayrac, C., & Barthelmebs, L. (2019). Effects of
- herbicide on non-target microorganisms: Towards a new class of biomarkers? Science of the
- 790 Total Environment, 684, 314–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.05.230
- 791 Thiour-Mauprivez, C., Devers-Lamrani, M., Mounier, A., Beguet, J., Spor, A., Calvayrac, C.,
- 792 Barthelmebs, L., & Martin-Laurent, F. (2020). Design of a degenerate primer pair to target a
- 503 bacterial functional community: The hppd bacterial gene coding for the enzyme targeted by
- herbicides, a study case. Journal of Microbiological Methods, 170(January), 105839.
- 795 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2020.105839</u>
- Thiour-Mauprivez, C., Devers-Lamrani, M., Bru, D., Béguet, J., Spor, A., Mounier, A., Alletto,
- 797 L., Calvayrac, C., Barthelmebs, L., & Martin-Laurent, F. (2021). Assessing the Effects of β-
- 798 Triketone Herbicides on the Soil Bacterial and hppd Communities: A Lab-to-Field
- Experiment. Frontiers in Microbiology, 11, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.610298
- 800 Thiour-Mauprivez, C., Dayan, F. E., Terol, H., Devers, M., Calvayrac, C., Martin-Laurent, F.,
- 801 & Barthelmebs, L. (2022). Assessing the effects of  $\beta$ -triketone herbicides on HPPD from
- 802 environmental bacteria using a combination of in silico and microbiological approaches.
- 803 Environmental Science and Pollution Research. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-22801-7
- Vázquez-Baeza, Y., Pirrung, M., Gonzalez, A., & Knight, R. (2013). EMPeror: a tool for
- visualizing high-throughput microbial community data. GigaScience, 2(1).
- 806 https://doi.org/10.1186/2047-217X-2-16

- Yi, M., Zhang, L., Qin, C., Lu, P., Bai, H., Han, X., & Yuan, S. (2022). Temporal changes of
- 808 microbial community structure and nitrogen cycling processes during the aerobic
- degradation of phenanthrene. Chemosphere, 286, 131709.
- 810 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2021.131709
- 811 **9. Figures**



813

Figure 1: Principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) of the weighted Unifrac distance matrix of 16S
rRNA *v3-v4 region* amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) showing the evolution of the bacterial
community composition in control (D0) and tembotrione-treated soil microcosms (D1 and D10)
after 0; 7; 14; 25; 40; and 55 days of incubation. The percentage of variance explained by
each axis is given.



819 <u>Figure 2:</u> Principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) of the weighted Unifrac distance matrix of
820 HPPD sequences showing the evolution of the *hppd* community composition in control (D0)
821 and tembotrione-treated soil microcosms (D1 and D10) after 0; 7; 14; 25; 40 and 55 days of
822 incubation. The percentage of variance explained by each axis is given.



<u>Figure 3:</u> Mean fold changes in relative abundance for 16S rRNA ASVs identified by a GLMM analysis and discriminant between treatments (control: D0, tembotrione: D1 or D10) and sampling time (T0; T3; T7; T14; T25; T40; and T55). Taxonomic affiliations and ASV number in the dataset are indicated at the top of each plot. Fold changes are expressed as % relative abundance of control for each sampling time. Error bars are standard errors of mean values (n=3) and are shown also for controls with mean = 0%. Significant differences between



treatments and controls are indicated by the (†) symbol. Significant differences between treatments are indicated by the (•) symbol (pairwise test,  $p \le 0.05$ )

832

Figure 4: Mean fold changes in relative abundance for HPPD cluster sequences identified by a GLMM analysis and discriminant between treatments (control: D0, tembotrione: D1 or D10) and sampling time (T0; T3; T7; T14; T25; T40; and T55). BLASTP results of amino-acid sequences for each HPPD cluster and its number in the dataset are indicated at the top of each plot. Fold changes are expressed as % relative abundance of control for each sampling time. Error bars are standard errors of mean values (n=3) and are shown also for controls with 839 mean = 0%. Significant differences between treatments and controls are indicated by the (†) 840 symbol. Significant differences between treatments are indicated by the (•) symbol (pairwise 841 test,  $p \le 0.05$ )



Figure 5: Dissipation curves of tembotrione in soil microcosms treated with: D1 (A) and D10 (B). Mean concentrations ( $\mu$ g/g soil) of tembotrione are given for each day. Errors bars are the standard errors (n=3). The limit of detection (L.O.D.) is indicated by a dotted line. Single First Order (SFO) kinetics of tembotrione dissipation in soil microcosms (a: C<sub>0</sub> = initial concentration; b : k = kinetic rate constant ; c : DT = Dissipation Time for 50% or 90% dissipation) (C).



849 <u>Figure S1:</u> Relative abundance of microbial phyla (expressed as % of the total frequency of
850 16S rRNA ASVs) in soil microcosms for each sampling time (T0; T3; T7; T14; T25; T40 and

T55) and treatments (control: D0, tembotrione: D1, D10).

863 <u>Table S1:</u> Alpha-diversity indices of soil bacterial community calculated for each sampling date 864 (0; 3; 7; 14; 40; and 55 days) after treatment (control: D0, tembotrione: D1 or D10). Mean 865 values  $\pm$  standard error are shown. Different letters indicate significant differences between 866 treatment at each time point (post-hoc Tukey's test,  $p \le 0.05$ ).

Time (days)	Treatment	Chao1	Phylogenetic diversity	Dominance (*10 <sup>-4</sup> )
0	D0	954 ± 116	74 ± 2	32 ± 3.7
	D1	961 ± 81	72 ± 6	30 ± 1.5
	D10	1127 ± 43	73 ± 2	28 ± 1.5
3	D0	960 ± 61	73 ± 1	148 ± 14.2 <b>a</b>
	D1	1029 ± 116	78 ± 6	132 ± 22.1 <b>a</b>
	D10	1094 ± 86	75 ± 1	40 ± 15 <b>b</b>
7	D0	825 ± 109	78 ± 10	74 ± 8
	D1	923 ± 26	76 ± 1	78 ± 2.5
	D10	1126 ± 24	85 ± 7	72 ± 5.1
14	D0	773 ± 82	71 ± 4	53 ± 0.7
	D1	904 ± 55	75 ± 6	55 ± 2.5
	D10	1092 ± 86	82 ± 5	53 ± 3.5
25	D0	1090 ± 14 <b>a</b>	79 ± 3	28 ± 0.4
	D1	1067 ± 157 <b>a</b>	77 ± 6	33 ± 3.9
	D10	1555 ± 81 <b>b</b>	106 ± 2	23 ± 0.6
40	D0	1348 ± 115	114 ± 7	22 ± 1.3
	D1	1311 ± 90	92 ± 6	23 ± 1.3
	D10	1423 ± 32	106 ± 7	21 ± 1
55	D0	1051 ± 71	82 ± 8 <b>a</b>	27 ± 0.7
	D1	1219 ± 31	106 ± 8 <b>ab</b>	25 ± 0.5
	D10	1430 ± 129	125 ± 10 <b>b</b>	21 ± 1.4

873 Table S2: Alpha-diversity indices of soil HPPDs calculated for each sampling date (0; 3; 7; 14; 874 40; and 55 days) after treatment (control: D0, tembotrione: D1 or D10). Mean values ± 875 standard error are shown. Different letters indicate significant differences between treatment 876 at each time point (post-hoc Tukey's test,  $p \le 0.05$ ).

Time (days)	Treatment	Observed HPPD	Phylogenetic Diversity	Simpson reciprocal
0	D0	532 ± 6 <b>ab</b>	133 ± 1 <b>ab</b>	48.7 ± 0.3 <b>ab</b>
	D1	559 ± 2 a	139 ± 1 <b>a</b>	56.4 ± 1.1 <b>a</b>
	D10	521 ± 2 <b>b</b>	131 ± 1 <b>b</b>	54.4 ± 1.2 <b>b</b>
3	D0	501 ± 5	124 ± 1	35.7 ± 1.6
	D1	491 ± 5	124 ± 1	35.9 ± 0.7
	D10	490 ± 8	123 ± 1	33.2 ± 1
7	D0	501 ± 8	125 ± 2	35.4 ± 1.6
	D1	486 ± 2	122 ± 1	35 ± 1.1
	D10	476 ± 7	118 ± 2	33.1 ± 3.2
14	D0	521 ± 3	131 ± 1 <b>a</b>	42.3 ± 1.4
	D1	506 ± 7	125 ± 1 <b>ab</b>	37.5 ± 2.3
	D10	498 ± 1	124 ± 1 <b>b</b>	38 ± 0.4
25	D0	535 ± 5	133 ± 2	52.2 ± 0.6 <b>a</b>
	D1	531 ± 5	133 ± 1	43 ± 1.9 <b>b</b>
	D10	520 ± 9	131 ± 2	49.4 ± 2.3 <b>ab</b>
40	D0	552 ± 7	138 ± 1	49.5 ± 1.1
	D1	528 ± 4	133 ± 1	45.6 ± 1.5
	D10	512 ± 1	131 ± 1	45 ± 0.9
55	D0	538 ± 9 <b>a</b>	139 ± 2	50.1 ± 0.1
	D1	540 ± 5 <b>ab</b>	139 ± 0.5	54.4 ± 1.1
	D10	556 ± 11 <b>b</b>	140 ± 1	54.4 ± 0.5

878

879 Table S3 (next page): List and taxonomic affiliations of 16S rRNA ASVs identified by the 880 GLMM model with differential abundance analysis. Taxonomic affiliations of 16S rRNA ASVs 881 were done using the SILVA 138 database and « feature classifier » tool of QIIME2. Confidence 882 of identification is shown (max = 1).

883

Discriminant 155 RNA ASVs         Taxonomic identification, bard on SILVA 138 database for 165 rRNA         Confidence of (domain, priVinc, dass, order), family, genus, species)         Confidence of           ASV-3         Bacteria: Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Bucholderailes; Nethylophilacae; Skermanella         0.999           ASV-5         Bacteria: Proteobacteria; Rubrobacteria; Shingomonadaes; Shingomonadaes; Shingomonadaes; Rubrobacteria; Rubr			
Identified by GLMM analysis         (domain:, phythym; Class;, operation, species)         (dentification           ASV-3         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Asospirilates, Nachylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Santhomadeae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae;	Discriminant 16S rRNA ASVs	Taxonomic identification, baed on SILVA 138 database for 16S rRNA	Confidence of
ASV-3         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Autholderiales; Acospirillaeae; Methylophilacaee; Methylophilac	identified by GLMM analysis	(domain; phylum; dass; order; family; genus; species)	dentification
ASV-5         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Acospirilaes; Acospirilaes; Netrospirilaes; Rubrobacteria         0.999           ASV-15         Bacteria; Actinobacteria; S. Nubrobacteria; Burkholderales; Methylophilaese; Rubrobacteria         0.999           ASV-15         Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderales; Methylophilaese; Rubrobacteria         0.999           ASV-21         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136         0.991           ASV-38         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136         0.994           ASV-39         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136         0.994           ASV-31         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136         0.994           ASV-32         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136         0.994           ASV-31         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gltt-GS-136; Gltt-GS-136         0.994           ASV-138         Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Internomicroblaes; Ja30-KF-CM45; JG30-KF-CM45; Juncultured bacterium         0.998           ASV-215         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Shingomonadaes; Shingomonadaese; Uvobacteri         0.999           ASV-250         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Nucroichiaes; Microichiaes; Microichiaes; Microichiaes; Microichiaes; Microichiae	ASV-3	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; Methylotenera	0.9991
ASV-15         Bacteria, Actinobacteria; Rubrobacteria; Rubrobacteriaes; Rubrobacteriaese; Rubrobacter; uncultured bacterium         0.702           ASV-21         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Butkholderiales; Methylothaceae, Methylotenera         0.994           ASV-23         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Althrospirae; Nitrospirae: Nit	ASV-5	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Azospirillales; Azospirillaceae; Skermanella	0.9999
ASV-21         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; Methylophilaceae; Nethylophilaceae; Nocadioides; Saponyces; Agromyces; Agromyces; Nethylophilaceae;	ASV-15	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Rubrobacteria; Rubrobacterales; Rubrobacteriaceae; Rubrobacter; uncultured bacterium	0.7002
ASV-29       Bacteria; Nitrospirales; Nitrospirales; Nitrospiraceae; Nitrospira, uncultured soil       0.877-         ASV-33       Bacteria; Chiorofiexi; Gitt-GS-136; Gitt-GS-136; Gitt-GS-136       1.000         ASV-38       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaese       1.000         ASV-38       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaese, uncultured       0.998         ASV-104       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acdimicrobia; Microtrichales; Ilumatobacteraceae; uncultured bacterium       0.998         ASV-218       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Actrobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingononadaese; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.998         ASV-220       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Acetobacterales; Acetobacteraceae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium       0.713         ASV-250       Bacteria; Bacterioida; Catonygoteobacteria; Suntomonadales; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.713         ASV-568       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Proteobacteria; Catonobacteria; Proteobacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteriota; Catonbacteria; Proteobacteria; Prot	ASV-21	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; Methylotenera	0.9948
ASV-33       Bacteria; Chloroftexi; Gitt-G5-136; Gitt-G5-136; Gitt-G5-136; Gitt-G5-136       1.000         ASV-33       Bacteria; Chloroftexi; Acidimicrobia; Microtrichales; Jahingomonadaes; Sphingomonadaes;       1.000         ASV-32       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Acidimicrobia; Microtrichales; Jamatobacteraceae; Junultured       1.000         ASV-104       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobia; Microtrichales; Jamatobacteraceae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium       0.991         ASV-138       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sohingomonadaes; Sphingomonadaese; Sphi	ASV-29	Bacteria; Nitrospirota; Nitrospiria; Nitrospirales; Nitrospiraceae; Nitrospira; uncultured soil	0.8774
ASV-38       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaceae       1.000         ASV-52       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobia; Microtrichales; Ilumatobacteraceae; uncultured bacterium       0.9716         ASV-104       Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Thermomicrobiales; JG30-KF-CM45; UroCM5/LG30-KF-CM45; uncultured bacterium       0.9716         ASV-128       Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Thermomicrobiales; JG30-KF-CM45; UroCM5/LG30-KF-CM45; uncultured bacterium       0.9716         ASV-221       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Iamiaeceae; Iamia       0.9929         ASV-234       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Mc1011 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.722         ASV-235       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Mc1011 soil group; wD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.722         ASV-236       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Mc1011 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.722         ASV-258       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Shroobacteria; Shroobacteri	ASV-33	Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Gitt-GS-136; Gitt-GS-136; Gitt-GS-136; Gitt-GS-136	1.0000
ASV-52       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; Microtrichales; Ilumatobacteraceae; uncultured       0.968         ASV-104       Bacteria; Chioroflexi; Chioroflexia; Thermomicrobilae; J.G30-KF-CM45; J.G30-KF-CM45; uncultured bacterium       0.991         ASV-138       Bacteria; Chioroflexi; Chioroflexia; Thermoleophila; Microtrichales; Jamiaceae; Jamiaceae	ASV-38	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaceae	1.0000
ASV-104         Bacteria; Chloroflexia; Thermomicrobiales; JG30-KF-CM45; JG30-KF-CM45; uncultured bacterium         0.9714           ASV-138         Bacteria; Actinobacterica; Alphaproteobacteria; Aetobacteraceae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium         0.3929           ASV-222         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Aetobacteraeae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium         0.724           ASV-224         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Aetobacteraee; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium         0.713           ASV-250         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaceae; Lysobacter         0.714           ASV-500         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Nanthomonadales; Nanthomonadaceae; Usobacter         0.774           ASV-50         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Nucroscillaceae; uncultured         bacteria           ASV-50         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Actinobacteria; Nucrooccales; Microscillaceae; Nocardioidaceae; Usobacter         0.774           ASV-50         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Actinobacteria; Nucrooccales; Microbacteriales; Necrdiobacteriaes; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus         0.800           ASV-50         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Nucrooccales; Nucrodobacteraceae; Spronyces; Agromyces ramosus         0.998           ASV-50         Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Nucrooccales; Nucrodobacteraceae; Seroidobacter         0.911 <td>ASV-52</td> <td>Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; Microtrichales; Ilumatobacteraceae; uncultured</td> <td>0.9684</td>	ASV-52	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; Microtrichales; Ilumatobacteraceae; uncultured	0.9684
ASV-138       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; Microtrichales; Iamiaceae; Iamia       0.9999         ASV-222       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Acetobacterales; Acetobacteraceae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium       0.722         ASV-234       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Acetobacterales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7123         ASV-234       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Xanthomonadales; Sohingomonadaceae; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.7133         ASV-235       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Xanthomonadales; Noticomonadaceae; Lysobacter       0.7142         ASV-200       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteria; Surkholderiales; Necradioidaceae; Nocardioides       1.0000         ASV-20       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Microoccales; Microbacteriaes; Nicrobacteriaes; Agromyces; Agromyces; Ramosus       0.714         ASV-54       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacteriaes; Agromyces; Agromyce; Adviceae; Actinobacteria; Alphapoteobacteria; Micro26255; MiC	ASV-104	Bacteria; Chloroflexi; Chloroflexia; Thermomicrobiales; JG30-KF-CM45; JG30-KF-CM45; uncultured bacterium	0.9716
ASV-222       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Acetobacteraceae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium       0.722         ASV-234       Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7132         ASV-234       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadaceae; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.7132         ASV-455       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Cammaproteobacteria; Shingomonadaceae; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.9998         ASV-568       Bacteria; Bacteroidota; Bacteroida; Cytophagales; Microscillaceae; uncultured       bacterium       0.998         ASV-584       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Nethylophilaceae; NM2; uncultured bacterium       0.998         ASV-500       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides       0.998         ASV-504       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Propionibacteriae; Nocardioidaceae; Nacordioides       0.998         ASV-505       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Nicroscillaceae; Nacordioidaceae; Nacordioides       0.714         ASV-505       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Nicroscillaceae; Nacordiobacteraceae; Nacordioides       0.714         ASV-505       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacteriae; Steroidobacter       0.711         ASV-506       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroid	ASV-138	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; Microtrichales; Iamiaceae; Iamia	0.9996
ASV-234       Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phydisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7130         ASV-365       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaceae; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.9999         ASV-350       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Xanthomonadales; Xanthomonadaceae; Lysobacter       0.9999         ASV-500       Bacteria; Bacteroidota; Bacteroidia; Cytophagales; Microscillaceae; uncultured       1.0000         ASV-588       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Nethylophilaceae; NM2; uncultured bacterium       0.9989         ASV-540       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Attinobacteria; Nicrooscillaceae; Nocardioidaseae; NM2; uncultured bacterium       0.9989         ASV-540       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Attinobacteria; Nicrooccales; Microbacteriae; Agromyces; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus       0.000         ASV-519       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Nicrooccales; Nicrobacteriae; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter       0.714         ASV-194       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Acdinnicrobiale; Nicrobacteria; Rhizobialeceae       0.714         ASV-270       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Acidimicrobiale; NicC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured bacterium       0.7511         ASV-219       Bacteria; Bacteria; Gammatimonadates; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas       0.7512         ASV-270       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Act	ASV-222	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Acetobacterales; Acetobacteraceae; Craurococcus-Caldovatus; uncultured bacterium	0.7224
ASV-365       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaceae; Sphingoaurantiacus       0.9995         ASV-425       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Xanthomonadales; Xanthomonadaceae; Lysobacter       1.000         ASV-500       Bacteria; Bacteroidia; Cytophagales; Microscillaceae; uncultured       0.774         ASV-568       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides       0.998         ASV-784       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Nicroscillaceae; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides       0.998         ASV-50       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Nicrobacteriaes; Nicrobacteriaes; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides       0.998         ASV-54       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Nicrococcales; Microbacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap25       0.951         ASV-59       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Khizobiaceae; Steroidobacter       0.991         ASV-194       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Phydisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7968         ASV-219       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured Acidimicrobiia       0.7960         ASV-226       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Oenmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas       0.701         ASV-219       Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Oenmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadalees; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatim	ASV-234	Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium	0.7130
ASV-425Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Xanthomonadales; Xanthomonadaceae; Lysobacter1.000ASV-500Bacteria; Bacteroidota; Bacteroidia; Cytophagales; Microscillaceae; uncultured0.774ASV-500Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; MM2; uncultured bacterium0.774ASV-58Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; NM2; uncultured bacterium0.998ASV-784Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Burkholderiales; Nocardioidaceae; NM2; uncultured bacterium0.998ASV-20Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides0.8600ASV-54Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Micrococcales; Microbacteriaceae; Agromyces; Agromyces; ramosus0.7118ASV-60Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap250.7118ASV-193Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacteraee; Steroidobacter0.991ASV-219Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium0.751ASV-226Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas0.714ASV-316Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium0.990ASV-316Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium0.8596	ASV-365	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Sphingomonadales; Sphingomonadaceae; Sphingoaurantiacus	0.9999
ASV-500Bacteria; Bacteroidota; Bacteroidia; Cytophagales; Microscillaceae; uncultured0.774ASV-508Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; MM2; uncultured bacterium0.9988ASV-784Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides0.704ASV-700Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Microoccales; Microbacteriaceae; Agromyces; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus0.8600ASV-54Bacteria; Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Microoccales; Nicrobacteriap25; bacteriap250.714ASV-60Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacterales; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter0.9514ASV-193Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Shizobiales; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae0.7511ASV-219Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; Uncultured bacterium0.7511ASV-226Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas0.7512ASV-210Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium0.7962ASV-210Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium0.9902ASV-316Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiellales; Gaiella, uncultured bacterium0.8596	ASV-425	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Xanthomonadales; Xanthomonadaceae; Lysobacter	1.0000
ASV-568Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; MM2; uncultured bacterium0.9986ASV-784Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides1.0000ASV-784Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides0.9986ASV-784Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nicrobacteriaceae; Nocardioides0.000ASV-70Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Micrococcales; Microbacteriaceae; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus0.8600ASV-54Bacteria; Proteobacteria; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap250.8100ASV-193Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacterales; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter0.951/1ASV-219Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; MD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium0.7968ASV-226Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; O319-7L14; Uncultured Acidimicrobiia0.7910ASV-236Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium0.9900ASV-316Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium0.8590	ASV-500	Bacteria; Bacteroidota; Bacteroidia; Cytophagales; Microscillaceae; uncultured	0.7744
ASV-784Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides1.000ASV-20Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Micrococcales; Microbacteriaceae; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus0.860ASV-54Bacteria; Myxococcota; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap250.7118ASV-60Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacterales; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter0.951/ASV-193Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae0.7968ASV-194Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium0.7968ASV-226Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimona0.9902ASV-316Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium0.8596	ASV-568	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Burkholderiales; Methylophilaceae; MM2; uncultured bacterium	0.9986
<ul> <li>ASV-20 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Micrococcales; Microbacteriaceae; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus</li> <li>ASV-54 Bacteria; Myxococcota; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap25</li> <li>ASV-54 Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacteriap25</li> <li>ASV-193 Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae</li> <li>ASV-194 Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; Uncultured bacterium</li> <li>ASV-206 Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonadacterium</li> <li>ASV-206 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium</li> <li>ASV-207 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium</li> <li>ASV-316 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium</li> <li>0.8596</li> </ul>	ASV-784	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Propionibacteriales; Nocardioidaceae; Nocardioides	1.0000
ASV-54       Bacteria; Myxococcota; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap25       0.7118         ASV-60       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacterales; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter       0.9514         ASV-193       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae       1.000         ASV-194       Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7512         ASV-219       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured Acidimicrobiia       0.7512         ASV-226       Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas       1.0000         ASV-270       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaes; Gaiella; uncultured actinobacterium       0.9903         ASV-316       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaeeae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium       0.8596	ASV-20	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; Micrococcales; Microbacteriaceae; Agromyces; Agromyces ramosus	0.8600
ASV-60       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacterales; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter       0.951/         ASV-193       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae       1.000         ASV-193       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae       1.000         ASV-194       Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7968         ASV-219       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured Acidimicrobiia       0.7513         ASV-226       Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas       1.0000         ASV-270       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium       0.9902         ASV-316       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium       0.8596	ASV-54	Bacteria; Myxococcota; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap25; bacteriap25	0.7118
ASV-193       Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae       1.0000         ASV-194       Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7968         ASV-219       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured Acidimicrobiia       0.7517         ASV-226       Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas       1.0000         ASV-270       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium       0.9903         ASV-316       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium       0.8596	ASV-60	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Gammaproteobacteria; Steroidobacterales; Steroidobacteraceae; Steroidobacter	0.9514
ASV-194       Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium       0.7968         ASV-219       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured Acidimicrobiia       0.7512         ASV-226       Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas       1.0000         ASV-270       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium       0.9902         ASV-316       Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium       0.8596	ASV-193	Bacteria; Proteobacteria; Alphaproteobacteria; Rhizobiales; Rhizobiaceae	1.0000
ASV-219 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured Acidimicrobiia ASV-226 Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas ASV-270 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium ASV-316 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium 0.8596	ASV-194	Bacteria; Planctomycetota; Phycisphaerae; Tepidisphaerales; WD2101 soil group; WD2101 soil group; uncultured bacterium	0.7968
ASV-226 Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas 1.0000 ASV-270 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium ASV-316 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium 0.8596	ASV-219	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Acidimicrobiia; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; IMCC26256; uncultured Acidimicrobiia	0.7517
ASV-270 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium 0.9902 ASV-316 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium 0.859	ASV-226	Bacteria; Gemmatimonadota; Gemmatimonadetes; Gemmatimonadales; Gemmatimonadaceae; Gemmatimonas	1.0000
ASV-316 Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium 0.8596	ASV-270	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Actinobacteria; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; 0319-7L14; uncultured actinobacterium	0.9901
	ASV-316	Bacteria; Actinobacteriota; Thermoleophilia; Gaiellales; Gaiellaceae; Gaiella; uncultured bacterium	0.8596

Discriminant HPPD clusters identified by GLMM analysis (n°	BLASTP best hit	BLASTP score	BLASTP expect value	Accession number of best hit HPPD sequence
158	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Microvirga sp. KLBC 81]	151 bits(382)	3.00E-42	WP 116528755.1
834	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Massilia sp. PAMC28688]	161 bits(408)	3.00E-46	WP 219883008.1
877	MULTISPECIES: 4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [unclassified Massilia]	156 bits(394)	4.00E-44	WP 182988546.1
1304	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Massilia sp. Root351]	167 bits(423)	2.00E-48	WP_057158391.1
1351	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Vitiosangium sp. GDMCC 1.1324]	140 bits(353)	3.00E-38	WP 108066616.1
1399	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Pseudoduganella rivuli]	128 bits(321)	2.00E-33	WP_154380629.1
1463	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Lysobacter tabacisoli]	162 bits(409)	2.00E-46	WP_196778621.1
1479	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Sphingomonas sp. G124]	149 bits(375)	2.00E-41	WP_235067680.2
1568	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Proteobacteria bacterium]	145 bits(367)	2.00E-40	MBS0379841.1
1646	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Steroidobacteraceae bacterium]	134 bits(338)	6.00E-36	MBC8027036.1
0	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Sphingomonas sp. G124]	162 bits(410)	1.00E-46	WP_235067680.1
123	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Massilia sp. TS11]	142 bits(359)	7.00E-39	WP 237807894.2
211	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Methylobacterium indicum]	124 bits(311)	8.00E-32	WP_058617985.1
669	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Massilia sp. 9I]	161 bits(407)	4.00E-46	WP 201303265.1
728	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Massilia sp. LPB0304]	155 bits(393)	5.00E-44	WP_193685763.2
1310	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Massilia sp. PAMC28688]	162 bits(409)	3.00E-46	WP_219883008.1
1464	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Sphingomonas segetis]	154 bits(390)	1.00E-43	WP_155263959.1
1470	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Sphingomonas sp.]	156 bits(395)	2.00E-44	MBA2466995.1
1553	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Steroidobacter gossypii]	149 bits(376)	1.00E-41	WP_203165151.1
1564	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Sphingomonas sp. G124]	156 bits(394)	3.00E-44	WP_235067680.1
1573	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Steroidobacter gossypii]	144 bits(364)	8.00E-40	WP_203165151.1
2819	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Actinomycetia bacterium]	134 bits(338)	5.00E-36	MBV9254971.1
2821	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Streptomyces sporangiiformans]	164 bits(414)	4.00E-47	WP_119102138.1
4101	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Ramlibacter sp. WS9]	154 bits(389)	2.00E-43	WP_141512490.1
4124	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Ramlibacter lithotrophicus]	138 bits(348)	3.00E-37	WP_168109283.1
4134	4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase [Variovorax sp. SG517]	140 bits(354)	3.00E-38	WP_176668964.1
4121	4-hvdroxvnhenvlnvruvate dioxvgenase [Vogesella orvzae]	116 hite/2011	5 UUE-20	110 1 JA0 JE0 10 1

886 <u>Table S4:</u> List and taxonomic affiliations of discriminant HPPD clusters identified by GLMM

of HPPD clusters, and the hits with best score are shown.

model with differential abundance analysis. *Blastp* was performed on amino acid sequences



893

Figure S2: Phylogenetic tree of discriminant 4-HPPD sequences between tembotrione treatments in soil, identified by differential abundance analysis and a GLM Model. HPPD clusters from sequencing data and full protein sequences from the *Blastp* best hits were used for multiple sequence alignment and construction of the tree. Phylogenetic tree of the aligned sequences was constructed using FastTree v2.1.8 with default parameters.