

Figure S1: Wood sampling from the inner trunk at two different positions (Trunk head and Trunk center)



Figure S2: A longitudinal trunk section showing an example of the measured wood necrosis



Figure S3: Boxplot illustrating the differences in alpha diversity measures (Observed index) of the fungal (A) and bacterial (B) communities between vineyards

Table S1: Pairwise PERMANOVAs of beta	diversity indexes	between	vineyards	for fungal
and bacterial communities.				

	Fungi	Bacteria
	p-value	p-value
Vineyard_1 vs Vineyard_2	0.001	0.07
Vineyard_1 vs Vineyard_3	0.001	0.001
Vineyard_1 vs Vineyard_4	0.001	0.001
Vineyard_2 vs Vineyard_3	0.001	0.001
Vineyard_2 vs Vineyard_4	0.001	0.001
Vineyard_3 vs Vineyard_4	0.001	0.001

Table S2: Alpha richness and diversity indexes for fungal (A) and bacterial communities (B) of treatment effect. T1 and T2 correspond to sampling time points, 2- and 10-months after Esquive[®] WP treatment, respectively. Significant *p* values are shown in bold.

	Bacteria								
(A)		Observed				Shannon			
	T1		T2		T1		T2		
	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk head	
Vineyard_1	0.82	0.96	0.46	0.2	0.7	0.36	0.72	0.26	
Vineyard_2	0.32	0.81	0.67	0.6	0.3	0.04	0.84	0.45	
Vineyard_3	0.63	0.7	0.97	0.12	0.58	0.42	0.27	0.11	
Vineyard_4	0.97	0.35	0.36	0.23	0.001	0.64	0.52	0.83	
(D)	Fungi								
(D)		Obse	erved			Shan	nnon		
	T1		Τ2		T1		T2		
	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk head	
Vineyard_1	0.9	0.34	0.79	0.55	0.61	0.6	0.2	0.2	
Vineyard_2	0.99	0.77	0.6	0.67	0.49	0.71	0.95	0.72	
								0.72	
Vineyard_3	0.85	0.39	0.59	0.7	0.01	0.54	0.83	0.72	

Table S3: PERMANOVAs of beta diversity indexes for fungal and bacterial communities. T1 and T2 correspond to sampling time points, 2- and 10-months after Esquive[®] WP treatment, respectively. Showed values correspond to *p values*.

		Bacteria				Fun	ıgi		
	,	T1		T2		T1		T2	
	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk center	Trunk head	Trunk head	
Vineyard_1	0.42	0.65	0.79	0.45	0.5	0.39	0.68	0.81	
Vineyard_2	0.132	0.125	0.878	0.41	0.11	0.4	0.28	0.35	
Vineyard_3	0.26	0.07	0.06	0.57	0.6	0.39	0.8	0.71	
Vineyard 4	0.06	0.76	0.73	0.46	0.833	0.82	0.8	0.35	



Figure S4: Heat tree of factor Treatment. Heat Trees report the effect of treatment on hierarchical structure of taxonomic fungal classifications in Esquive[®] WP treated and control plants, 10 months post-inoculation. Each cladogram shows pairwise comparisons between treatments (Esquive[®] WP vs control), in the different vineyards, at two different tissues (trunk head and trunk center). The indicated taxa with red nodes were significantly abundant in the



Esquive[®] WP -treated plants, while green nodes significantly more abundant in fungal communities of control plants.

Figure S5: Heat tree of factor Treatment. Heat Trees report the effect of treatment on hierarchical structure of taxonomic bacterial classifications in Esquive[®] WP treated and control plants, 10 months post-inoculation. Each cladogram shows pairwise comparisons between treatments (Esquive[®] WP vs control), in the different vineyards, at two different tissues (trunk head and trunk center). The indicated taxa with red nodes were significantly abundant in the

Esquive[®] WP -treated plants, while green nodes significantly more abundant in bacterial communities of control plants.