

# Analyses of 37 composts revealed microbial taxa associated with disease suppressiveness

Anja Logo,<sup>1,2,3</sup> Benedikt Boppré,<sup>2</sup> Jacques Fuchs,<sup>2</sup> Monika Maurhofer,<sup>3</sup> Thomas Oberhänsli,<sup>2</sup> Barbara Thürig,<sup>2</sup> Franco Widmer,<sup>1</sup> Johanna Mayerhofer,<sup>1</sup> Pascale Flury<sup>4</sup>

**AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS** See affiliation list on p. 21.

**ABSTRACT** Compost is a valuable amendment for soil and potting substrate when it comes to suppressing soilborne pathogens. However, the effectiveness of different composts varies and cannot yet be predicted. Microbial communities in compost play a key role in disease suppression, and therefore their composition or specific taxa may serve as indicators of suppressive composts. In this study, we investigated 37 composts from 7 commercial compost producers to analyze the association of their bacterial and fungal communities with suppressive activity in three plant-pathogen systems: cress-*Globisporangium ultimum*, cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and cucumber-*Rhizoctonia solani*. Our results underscore that compost suppressiveness is primarily pathogen-specific and, to a lesser extent, host-plant-specific. Suppressiveness was not correlated with physico-chemical properties, microbial activity, or the alpha- and beta-diversity of composts' bacterial and fungal communities. Instead, microbial composition was largely shaped by producer-specific composting conditions and maturation processes, which were not necessarily linked to suppressive activity. A more nuanced comparison between the most and least suppressive composts revealed bacterial and a few fungal taxa as potential indicators of suppressiveness for each plant-pathogen system. Notably, for *G. ultimum*-suppression, bacteria from the genera *Luteimonas*, *Sphingopyxis*, and *Algoriphagus*, and for *R. solani*, bacteria belonging to the phylum *Actinomycetota* emerged as promising candidates.

**IMPORTANCE** Soilborne diseases are a major yield-limiting factor in agricultural crop production worldwide, particularly in seedling cultivation. Their control remains a significant challenge and still largely relies on chemical fumigation of soils and steam sterilization of potting substrates. While chemical fumigants are increasingly criticized for their negative environmental impact, sterilization practices, in general, disrupt beneficial microbial communities, making substrates more susceptible to pathogen (re)-infestation. Amending soil or potting substrate with disease-suppressive compost offers a promising alternative. However, the targeted use of compost for plant protection is hindered by variable effectiveness and the lack of reliable tools to identify effective composts. This study provides a comprehensive abiotic and biotic characterization of compost, enabling a detailed analysis of the properties associated with suppressiveness. The identification of bacterial and fungal taxa indicative of disease-suppressive composts lays the groundwork for targeted isolation of microorganisms and functional studies, with the ultimate aim of predicting and optimizing compost-mediated disease suppression.

**KEYWORDS** soilborne diseases, biocontrol, *Rhizoctonia solani*, *Pythium ultimum*, *Globisporangium ultimum*, soil amendments

Soilborne diseases are a persistent challenge in agricultural crop production. Particularly, damping-off of seedlings, caused by fungi and fungus-like organisms

**Editor** Irina S. Druzhinina, Royal Botanic Gardens, Surrey, United Kingdom

Address correspondence to Johanna Mayerhofer, johanna.mayerhofer@agroscope.admin.ch, or Pascale Flury, pascale.flury@unibas.ch.

Johanna Mayerhofer and Pascale Flury contributed equally to this article.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

See the funding table on p. 22.

**Received** 28 May 2025

**Accepted** 29 August 2025

**Published** 8 October 2025

Copyright © 2025 Logo et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

such as *Rhizoctonia* spp. and *Globisporangium* spp. (syn. *Pythium* spp.), is a major yield constraint in both nurseries and fields (1). Current disease management strategies, especially in organic agriculture, are limited and rely primarily on soil or substrate disinfestation to eradicate pathogens (2). However, these practices can negatively impact (soil) microbial communities (3). With growing recognition of the essential role of beneficial microorganisms in agroecosystems (4), there is an urgent need to develop more sustainable disease management approaches. One such strategy is the promotion of disease-suppressive conditions—environments where pathogens either fail to establish or persist, or are present but cause little to no damage to the host plant (5). The use of compost in soils or soilless substrates (e.g., peat) can promote disease suppressiveness and enhance overall plant health, offering a promising and environmentally sustainable strategy for managing soilborne diseases (6–10).

Suppressive activity of composts has been reported against a broad range of plant pathogens, including fungi, oomycetes, bacteria, nematodes, and viruses (11, 12). However, efficacy varies from compost to compost and is often specific to plant-pathogen interactions (8, 13, 14). Feedstock composition and compost maturity and stability, as well as the composting process, have been shown to influence the development of disease-suppressive composts (8, 15, 16). However, despite decades of compost research, the key factors driving disease-suppressive activity remain poorly understood (17, 18). Moreover, we still lack reliable indicators to predict the suppressive potential of a given compost (11, 13). To enable the more effective and targeted use of compost in crop protection, it is essential to deepen our understanding of the mechanisms behind disease suppression and to develop reliable diagnostic tools.

It is widely acknowledged that microorganisms play a crucial role in disease suppression by composts (6, 9, 13, 19). This is supported by studies showing that most composts lose their suppressiveness when sterilized by heat treatment or gamma irradiation (7, 20), and that suppressiveness can be restored by reintroducing compost-associated microorganisms (21, 22). Moreover, microbial recolonization during the cooling phase of the composting process is essential for the development of suppressive activity (15). Compost microorganisms can suppress soilborne pathogens directly via predation, parasitism, antibiosis, or competition and indirectly via the plant through inducing resistance and improving plant nutrition (19). However, mechanisms of action have only been studied for a few genera of compost microorganisms (12), while for the majority of the diverse bacteria and fungi present in composts, the effects on plant pathogens and crop health, as well as their mechanisms of action, remain unknown.

Although not yet fully understood, the central role of compost microorganisms in disease suppression suggests that they could serve as indicators for identifying disease-suppressive composts. Thus, we proposed an integrated approach to identify beneficial microorganisms and key microbial consortia in disease-suppressive composts (12). This approach combines standardized bioassays to assess suppressive activity with metagenomics to characterize the microbial communities of composts. In a later step, promising microorganisms are isolated and their role in disease suppression is investigated. Studies following a similar approach, though based on small compost sets ( $n < 10$ ), have identified various bacterial and fungal groups associated with disease-suppressive composts (20, 23–25). However, particularly bacterial compost communities show high taxonomic variability across compost (26) and thus, large compost sets are needed to identify robust patterns.

In a previous study (27), we applied the integrated approach to 17 composts targeting the pathogen *Globisporangium ultimum* (syn. *Pythium ultimum*), a globally distributed soilborne pathogen with a wide host range (1). The composts were tested in a peat-based substrate, which is generally considered conducive to pathogen development, making it a suitable baseline for assessing the suppressive potential of compost amendments (28). Moreover, peat remains widely used in seedling production despite environmental concerns over carbon emissions from peat extraction and its near non-renewable nature (29). We assessed compost's suppressive activity using cress as a

model plant and characterized the composts' bacterial communities through amplicon sequencing of the 16S rRNA (V3–V4) gene region (27). This revealed a significant association between the bacterial community structure and suppressive activity and identified 75 bacterial amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) as indicative of the most suppressive composts.

Building on this foundation, we aimed to validate the robustness of these bacterial indicators and expand upon the scope of previous work by identifying fungal indicators, utilizing an unprecedented data set of 37 new compost samples. To consider possible plant-pathogen specificity of compost's suppressive activity, we extended the analysis beyond the *G. ultimum* model system to include two additional plant-pathogen systems. To compare *G. ultimum*-suppression between host plants, we also tested suppression in cucumber, an important horticultural crop. To allow comparison between pathogens, we tested suppressiveness in cucumber also against the fungal pathogen *Rhizoctonia solani*, which likely shows a different response to compost application than *G. ultimum* (8). Finally, we constructed an extensive data set by integrating bacterial and fungal community profiling with assessments of 14 compost properties. This integration enabled us to comprehensively explore the relationships between compost properties, microbial communities, and disease-suppressive activity across multiple plant-pathogen systems, ultimately identifying indicators of disease-suppressive composts.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Selection and collection of composts

Recognizing that composts derived from different feedstocks harbor distinct microbial communities, this study focused on composts primarily made from green waste (27, 30, 31). Samples were collected from seven large-scale composting sites (A–G) in Switzerland at four collection time points (I–IV) in May, June, and September 2022, and April 2023. At each time point, two composts of differing maturation stages were collected from sites A–E, when possible; additional samples were sourced from sites F and G as needed. Sites A, B, and F compost in tabular windrows (up to 3.5 m high), while sites C, D, E, and G used triangular windrows (up to 2 m high, 3–4 m wide). Composting was done on paved ground, except for site E, where composting took place along agricultural fields directly on soil. Details about the composting process of each composting site can be found in Table S1. Three composts (Ex1–Ex3) were excluded from the data set due to their negative effect on cress shoot growth in the absence of pathogen application (Fig. S1), resulting in a final data set of 37 composts. The composting site, method, compost age, and feedstock composition are listed for all composts in Table 1.

Three to five subsamples of each compost pile were pooled and sieved through a 10 mm mesh for bioassays and physicochemical analyses. For assessing maximum water holding capacity (WHC), microbial activity, and microbial communities, composts were further sieved through a 2 mm mesh. Most analyses were initiated within 1 week of collection. Microbial activity analysis and *R. solani* bioassays were started 2 weeks later, during which samples were stored at 5°C.

### Physicochemical properties and microbial activity of composts

Dry substance (DS) was determined by quantifying water loss after heating 200 g of compost at 105°C for 24 h. To measure total nitrogen ( $N_{\text{tot}}$ ) and total organic carbon ( $C_{\text{org}}$ ), dried compost samples were milled with an impact rotor mill (Retsch, Germany) and sieved through a 1 mm mesh. Then, 500 mg each was analyzed using an elemental analyzer (Vario Max Cube, Elementar, Langenselbold, Germany) as described by Krause et al. (32). The maximum WHC was assessed via capillary binding capacity using the reference method of Agroscope (33). Nitrite ( $\text{NO}_2^-$ ), nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ), ammonium ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ), phosphate ( $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$ ), and pH were measured in a calcium chloride ( $\text{CaCl}_2$ ) extract, while salinity and the content of  $\text{OD}_{550}$  were measured in a water extract of the compost.

**TABLE 1** Composition, composting site, and compost age of all 37 composts<sup>a</sup>

ID	Set	Site	Method	Start date	Age (days)	Feedstock composition
1	I	A	Tabular	18.11.21	179	40% LV, 25% GR, 15% DG, 10% GW, 10% DSR
2	I	B	Tabular	16.11.21	181	70% DSR, 10% GW, 10% LV, 10% other
3	I	B	Tabular	15.10.21	213	60% DSR, 20% DG, 15% GW, 5% LV
4	I	C	Triangle	21.12.21	146	75% GW, 20% MC, 5% SL
5	I	D	Triangle	28.03.22	49	65% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 5% VW
6	I	D	Triangle	01.09.21	257	55% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 10% MC, 5% VW
7	I	E	Field	21.12.21	146	100% GW
8	I	E	Field	09.08.21	280	100% GW
9	II	A	Tabular	26.01.22	173	30% GW, 30% LV, 30% GR, 5% MC, 5% DG
10	II	B	Tabular	01.04.22	108	70% DSR, 20% GW, 10% other
11	II	C	Triangle	14.06.22	34	75% GW, 20% MC, 5% SL
12	II	C	Triangle	28.04.22	81	75% GW, 20% MC, 5% SL
13	II	C	Triangle	07.03.22	133	75% GW, 20% MC, 5% SL
14	II	D	Triangle	31.05.22	48	55% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 10% MC, 5% VW
15	II	D	Triangle	18.05.22	61	55% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 10% MC, 5% VW
16	II	E	Field	19.04.22	90	100% GW
17	II	E	Field	01.02.22	167	100% GW
18	III	A	Tabular	26.04.22	153	40% GR, 30% LV, 25% GW, 5% DSR
19	III	A	Tabular	15.03.22	195	35% GW, 30% LV, 25% GR, 5% SL, 5% MC
20	III	B	Tabular	01.06.22	117	80% DSR, 15% GW, 5% other
21	III	C	Triangle	05.08.22	52	75% GW, 20% MC, 5% SL
22	III	C	Triangle	14.06.22	104	75% GW, 20% MC, 5% SL
23	III	D	Triangle	01.09.22	25	55% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 10% MC, 5% VW
24	III	D	Triangle	08.08.22	49	55% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 10% MC, 5% VW
25	III	E	Field	26.07.22	62	100% GW
26	III	E	Field	01.02.22	237	100% GW
27	IV	A	Tabular	08.12.22	141	40% LV, 35% GW, 25% GR
28	IV	A	Tabular	09.11.22	170	40% GR, 35% LV, 20% GW, 5% DSR
29	IV	B	Tabular	03.11.22	176	60% DSR, 15% MA, 15% other
30	IV	B	Tabular	01.09.22	239	70% DSR, 20% GW, 10% other
31	IV	C	Triangle	NA	NA	NA
32	IV	C	Triangle	NA	NA	NA
33	IV	D	Triangle	24.09.22	216	55% GW, 20% MA, 10% SL, 10% MC, 5% VW
34	IV	E	Field	15.11.22	164	100% GW
35	IV	E	Field	27.09.22	213	100% GW
36	IV	G	Tabular	20.12.22	129	50% GW, 40% GR, 10% CE
37	IV	F	Triangle	18.10.22	196	100% GW

<sup>a</sup>Pick up set I–IV (16 May, 18 July, and 26 September 2022 and 28 April 2023). All information was obtained from the composting protocols provided by the compost producers. For compost 31–IV and 32–IV, the protocol was missing (labeled with NA). CE, cellulose; DG, digestate; DSR, digestate sieve residue; GR, grass; GW, green waste; LV, leaves; MA, manure; MC, mature compost; SL, soil; VW, vegetable waste.

Microbial activity was assessed using fluorescein diacetate (FDA) hydrolysis and basal respiration, each measured in three technical replicates (34, 35). Details on the methods are provided in the Supplementary Methods A and B. The total mineral nitrogen ( $N_{\min}$ ) was calculated as the sum of  $\text{NO}_2^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ; the nitrification index ( $\text{NO}_3^- - \text{N}/N_{\min}$ ) as  $\text{NO}_3^-$  divided by  $N_{\min}$ ; and the carbon-nitrogen ratio ( $C_{\text{org}}/N_{\text{tot}}$ ) as  $C_{\text{org}}$  divided by  $N_{\text{tot}}$ . The measured values for the physicochemical properties and the mean for the microbial activities are listed in Table S2.

### Pot assays to assess disease suppression

A total of 37 composts were tested for their disease-suppressive activity in peat across three plant-pathogen systems: cress-*G. ultimum*, cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and cucumber-*R.*

*solani*. The peat-compost mixtures are hereafter referred to as compost-substrates (1–37). Unamended peat served as the control in all experiments and is hereafter referred to as the no-compost control. All substrates were tested at low and high pathogen concentrations to account for variation in pathogen virulence, as well as without pathogen. With six replicate pots per treatment for cress and eight for cucumber, the total number of pots was 738 and 984, respectively.

More precisely, composts were mixed at a 1:4 ratio (vol/vol) with a peat-substrate (Einheitserde Typ 0, Einheitserdewerke Werkverband e.V., Sinntal-Altengronau, Germany) and fertilized with horn meal (2.30 g L<sup>-1</sup> substrate, Biorga Hornmehl, Hauert, Grossaffoltern, Switzerland). The no-compost controls received also horn meal and were additionally supplemented with 1.94 g L<sup>-1</sup> Granuphos (Landor, Muttentz, Switzerland) and 1.33 g L<sup>-1</sup> Biorganic Kali-Magnesia (Hauert, Grossaffoltern, Switzerland) to compensate for the nutrients input from composts. All substrates were moistened with tap water (20%, vol/vol) and incubated at room temperature for 1 week prior to inoculation with the pathogen.

Pathogens were cultured on potato dextrose agar (PDA; Carl Roth, Karlsruhe, Germany) at 20°C for *G. ultimum* (strain D265 provided by ETH Zurich) and at 24°C for *R. solani* (strain MIAE01733 provided by INRAE; anastomosis group 4). For each experiment, pathogens were freshly cultured from long-term stocks. Long-term stocks consisted of mycelium-agar plugs in autoclaved ultra-pure water (ELGA LabWater, Celle, Germany) stored at 20°C for *G. ultimum* and in 10% glycerin + 5% trehalose at -80°C for *R. solani*.

For inoculation with *G. ultimum*, three 5-mm-diameter agar plugs from a 7-day-old culture on PDA were transferred to a Petri dish containing 20 g sterilized organic millet seeds soaked in 10 mL autoclaved water. The cultures were incubated in the dark at 20°C for 7 days. The colonized millet was then chopped, mixed with sand, and gently homogenized with a mortar. Immediately afterward, 20 g of the millet-sand-pathogen mix, containing either 0.45 g or 1.35 g of inoculum (representing low and high pathogen concentration, respectively) or no pathogen, was added per L of compost-substrate or no-compost control. Control pots without a pathogen received sand without inoculum. Substrates with and without pathogen were filled into pots with 6 cm (cress) or 9 cm diameter (cucumber). For the *R. solani* bioassays, the pathogen was cultured on PDA for 3 days. Three agar plugs (diameters: 0.8 or 1.4 cm for sets I–III; 0.6 or 0.8 cm for compost set VI) were placed into pots pre-filled to one-third with substrate, which was then topped up to the brim.

For the cress bioassay, each pot was sown with 0.6 g organic cress seeds (approximately 260 seeds, *Lepidium sativum*, Bigler Samen AG, Steffisburg, Switzerland) and moistened with a hand sprayer. For the cucumber bioassays, seeds (*Cucumis sativus*, cultivar “Chinese snake,” Bigler Samen AG, Steffisburg, Switzerland) were surface-sterilized in 0.1% (vol/vol) potassium hydrochloride solution for 10 min, rinsed six times with sterile water, placed on 1.5% water agar, and incubated at 24°C in the dark for 46–52 hours. Each pot received five pre-germinated seeds, planted at a depth of 2 cm. All pots of a treatment were placed on plastic trays (cress: Licefa, Germany; cucumber: Anzuchtsbox M, Romberg, Germany) and covered for 3 days to maintain high humidity (cress trays: plastic bags; cucumber trays: transparent lids). After this period, cress pots were watered daily, while cucumber pots were watered every 2–4 days. Shoot biomass was harvested after 6, 11, and 13 days for the cress-*G. ultimum*, cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and cucumber-*R. solani* system, respectively. All bioassays were performed in climate chambers (GroBanks, CLF Plant Climatics, Wertingen, Germany) at a day/night regime of 16 h/8 h and a light intensity of 130  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ . The air humidity was maintained at 70%, and the temperatures were set to 20°C day/18°C night for *G. ultimum* and 23°C day/21°C night for *R. solani*.

Disease suppression for each substrate was calculated as relative biomass by dividing the shoot weight of plants grown with pathogen application by the mean shoot weight of plants grown without. Additionally, disease symptoms were visually assessed for each cress pot and cucumber plant using a disease scoring. For all three plant-pathogen



systems, the disease scoring correlated with relative shoot biomass (Fig. S2). To compare disease suppression across test sets, one pathogen level was selected based on the relative biomass observed in the no-compost control (Fig. S3). We aimed for at least a 50% reduction in plant biomass due to pathogen inoculation in the no-compost control, and no significant difference among the four sets. This was accomplished by applying 0.45 g *G. ultimum*-millet mix L<sup>-1</sup> substrate for cress-*G. ultimum*; for cucumber-*G. ultimum*, 0.45 g L<sup>-1</sup> was used in sets I and II, and 1.35 g L<sup>-1</sup> in sets III and IV. For cucumber-*R. solani*, a plug size of 1.4 cm was used in set I, and 0.8 cm in sets II–IV.

### Bacterial and fungal amplicon sequencing

For DNA extraction, 200 mg of 2-mm-sieved compost or peat samples were combined with 1 mL of NucleoMag lysis buffer and 1.5 g of beads (SiLibeads Type ZY S 0.4–0.6 mm, Sigmund Lindner, Germany) in 2 mL screw-cap tubes. The samples were prepared in four technical replicates and stored at –20°C until use. DNA was extracted using the NucleoMag DNA Microbiome for DNA purification from soil, stool, and biofilm DNA extraction kit (Macherey Nagel, Düren, Germany), following the manufacturer's instructions with the following adaptations. All samples were homogenized using a TissueLyser (Qiagen, Netherlands) at 30 Hz for 4 min. To remove leftover ethanol, the magnetic beads were dried at 70°C for 30 min prior to elution of the DNA in 0.1× TE buffer (1 mM Tris, 0.1 mM Na<sub>2</sub>EDTA, pH 8.0). DNA was quantified using Quant-iT PicoGreen dsDNA Assay kit (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA, USA) with a Cary Eclipse fluorescence spectrophotometer (Varian, Palo Alto, CA, USA). For PCR amplification, DNA extracts were diluted to 5 ng μL<sup>-1</sup> using deionized and autoclaved H<sub>2</sub>O. Between steps, DNA extracts were stored at –20°C.

For the bacteria, the variable regions 3 and 4 of the 16S rRNA gene marker were amplified using the primer pair 341F (5'-CCTAYGGGDBGCWSCAG-3') and 806R (5'-GGAC-TACNVGGGTHCTAAT-3'). For the fungi, the internal transcribed spacer region 2 (ITS2) was amplified using the primer pair ITS3 (5'-CANCATGAAGAACGYRG-3') and ITS4 (5'-CCTSCSCTTANTDATATGC-3') modified by Tedersoo et al. (36). PCRs were performed as described in Mayerhofer et al. (27), with the following modifications: 1 μM of each primer was used, the PCR included 30 and 33 cycles for the 16S and ITS2 primer pair, respectively, and the annealing temperature was set to 56°C. A no-template control was included for each 96-well plate. PCRs were run in quadruplets and pooled, following quality control on an Agarose gel. DNA concentration of PCR products was quantified as described for genomic DNA and diluted to 20 ng mL<sup>-1</sup>. Library preparation included tagging with TruSeq indices, normalizing read counts from an Illumina MiniSeq run, and sequencing on the Illumina NextSeq2000 platform. Paired-end sequencing was performed with 300 bp long reads (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA, USA) at the Functional Genomics Center Zurich, University of Zurich/ETH Zurich (Switzerland).

### Bioinformatics and quality control

Quality control, ASV inference, and taxonomic classification of sequences were performed using a pipeline adapted from Frey et al. (37) and Mayerhofer et al. (38). Briefly, raw sequences were trimmed by removing primer sequences using cutadapt (v.3.5 [39], one mismatch allowed). Implemented in vsearch (v.2.27.0 [40]), sequences were merged, quality filtered, and dereplicated. To obtain ASV, sequences were de-noised with the UNOISE algorithm (41). Chimera removal was done with UCHIME (42). Checking for the presence of ribosomal signatures was performed using Metaxa2 (v.2.2.3 [43]) for the bacteria and ITSx (v.1.1.3 [44]) for the fungi. All sequences without a ribosomal signature were discarded. Finally, reads were mapped against the final set of identified ASVs using the algorithm "usearch\_global". Taxonomic classification of ASVs was performed with the command "classify\_seqs" in MOTHUR (v.1.47 [45]). Bacterial sequences were classified using the Genome Taxonomy Database (release SSU 214 [46]), trimmed to the 16S gene as described by Mayerhofer et al. (47). Fungal sequences were classified using the UNITE database (version 9.0; Abarenkov et al. [48]).

Non-bacterial sequences (e.g., archaea, chloroplasts, and mitochondria) and non-fungal sequences (e.g., protists and plants) were removed. For the fungi, three samples were excluded as outliers since they had less than 10,000 fungal sequences. To standardize read counts, all samples were rarefied to the lowest counts (35,928 bacterial; 10,211 fungal sequences) with 100 iterations using “*rrarefy*” from the *vegan* package. Analyses were performed on the 100 times sub-sampled ASV tables or their median counts. The number of sequences and ASVs for the different filtering steps is indicated in Table S3.

## Statistical analyses

All analyses and visualizations were performed in R (v.4.3.1 [49]) using RStudio (v.2023.06) and the *tidyverse* packages (50). Statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$ , with Benjamini–Hochberg correction applied for multiple testing when appropriate (51). Differences in suppressive activity among substrates were analyzed per compost set using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey’s honestly significant difference (Tukey HSD) post hoc test (52) or Kruskal-Wallis and pairwise Wilcoxon tests when normality (assessed via residual plots) was violated. The same approach was used to compare alpha diversity and other compost properties across substrates, composting sites, and sets. Pearson or Spearman correlation was used depending on Shapiro-Wilk normality tests; only correlations with  $|\text{coefficient}| > 0.4$  were considered significant. Principal component analysis (PCA) of compost properties was based on Euclidean distance. Strongly co-correlated compost properties ( $|\rho| > 0.8$ , Fig. S7) and those with missing data (basal respiration, compost age) were excluded. Microbial community analyses were performed using the *vegan* package (53). Alpha diversity measures of microbial communities were calculated using the “*specnumber*” and “*diversity*” functions on 100 times sub-sampled ASV tables and then averaged. Bray-Curtis dissimilarities were computed using “*vegdist*” on the same sub-sampled data. Compositional differences in physicochemical properties and microbial communities were tested with multivariate permutation analysis of variance (PERMANOVA [54]) using “*adonis2*,” and visualized using nonmetric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) using the “*metaMDS*” function.


Four statistical approaches were used to identify ASV associated with the nine most suppressive composts for each plant-pathogen system: Point Biserial Correlation and Indicator Species Analysis (55), MaAsLin2 (56), and ALDEx2 (57). The settings for each approach are provided in Supplementary Methods C. A consensus approach as suggested by Nearing et al. (58) was applied, considering ASVs as “indicative” if they were significantly associated in at least three approaches. ChatGPT version 4o was used for code debugging.

## RESULTS

### The disease-suppressive activity of composts was plant pathogen specific

To investigate the factors associated with disease suppression by composts, we evaluated 37 composts across three plant-pathogen systems: cress-*G. ultimum*, cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and cucumber-*R. solani*. Of these, 33 composts were significantly disease suppressive compared to the no-compost control in at least one system (Fig. 1A through C). Three composts (24-III, 34-IV, and 35-IV) were effective in all three systems, while four (9-II, 10-II, 11-II, and 12-II) showed no suppressive effect in any. The highest number of suppressive composts was found in the cress-*G. ultimum* system (Fig. 1D). Fewer composts were effective in the cucumber-*G. ultimum* system, with 14 overlapping between the two *G. ultimum* systems. Suppression of *G. ultimum* in cress and cucumber was significantly correlated ( $r = 0.63$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Fig. S4). In the cucumber-*R. solani* system, the least composts were suppressive, and suppression was not correlated with *G. ultimum*-suppression (cress:  $r = -0.07$ ,  $P = 0.662$ ; cucumber:  $r = 0.03$ ,  $P = 0.543$ ).

The composts originated from seven composting sites (A–G, Table 1), with at least one compost from each site showing suppressive activity in one or more plant-pathogen systems. Suppression did not significantly differ between sites, with two exceptions:



**FIG 1** Disease suppression of composts differed between plant-pathogen systems. Thirty-seven composts were tested in three plant-pathogen systems: (A) cress-*G. ultimum*, (B) cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and (C) cucumber-*R. solani*. Disease suppression is expressed as relative biomass, which is calculated by dividing the shoot biomass with pathogen application by the average shoot biomass without pathogen application for each substrate. The relative biomass of each (Continued on next page)



Fig 1 (Continued)

replicate pot ( $n = 6$  for cress and  $n = 8$  for cucumber) is shown as a gray point; boxes represent the interquartile range, and dashes denote the median. Composts are identified by numbers followed by Roman numerals, which represent their respective compost set (I–IV; I = May 2022, II = July 22, III = September 22, IV = May 2023). No-compost controls are labeled with “NC.” Substrate treatments are ordered by increasing means. Red asterisks indicate compost substrates with significantly higher relative biomass compared to the no-compost control in the respective set (statistical test results in Table S4). The shape of the symbol following the substrate name highlights the nine most (circle) and least (square) suppressive composts in each system, used for associating single ASVs with the most suppressive composts. (D) The Venn diagram depicts the number of suppressive composts shared across plant-pathogen systems.

composts from site D showed higher suppression in the cucumber-*G. ultimum* system compared to site C, and those from site E were more effective in the cucumber-*R. solani* system than those from site B (Fig. S5). These results indicate that disease suppression cannot be consistently attributed to the composting site.

The 37 composts were collected and tested in four sets of 8–10 composts at different time points. Each set included both suppressive and non-suppressive composts. While the mean suppressive activity of sets I, III, and IV was similar, set II showed significantly reduced suppression in both *G. ultimum* systems (Fig. S5).

### Physicochemical properties and microbial activities of composts were primarily associated with the composting site and compost maturation

Mean disease suppression of the 37 composts in the three plant-pathogen systems showed no correlation with any of the 14 physicochemical compost properties, basal respiration, FDA hydrolysis, or compost age (Spearman's Rank sum test,  $|\rho| > 0.4$ ,  $P\text{-adj} < 0.05$ , Table 2, scatter plots Fig. S8 to S10). We hypothesized that a combination of properties, rather than individual ones, might be associated with disease suppression. However, a PCA based on nine compost properties did not confirm this (Table 2; Fig. S6). Although not linked to disease suppression, the PCA showed that composts cluster by composting site along the first principal component (PC1; PERMANOVA,  $R^2 = 42.4\%$ , Pseudo- $F = 3.68$ ,  $P = 0.001$ , Fig. 2A), and to a lesser extent by compost age along PC2 ( $R^2 = 8.3\%$ , Pseudo- $F = 2.99$ ,  $P = 0.014$ , Fig. 2B). PC1 was mainly driven by  $C_{org}$ , FDA,  $PO_4^{3-}$ , and salinity, while PC2 reflected variation in pH,  $NH_4^+$ , and  $NO_3^-$ —the latter typically associated with compost maturation. These patterns suggest that the compost properties reflect composting site and maturation stage rather than disease-suppressive activity.

### Bacterial and fungal communities were linked with compost properties but not with disease-suppressive activity

We characterized the bacterial and fungal communities of the 37 composts and four no-compost controls using 16S (V3–V4) and ITS2 amplicon sequencing, identifying 19,129 bacterial and 2,309 fungal ASVs. NMDS ordination revealed tight clustering of technical replicates (Fig. S11) and PERMANOVA confirmed strong differences among composts in both bacterial ( $R^2 = 96.1\%$ , Pseudo- $F = 76.01$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ) and fungal community structure ( $R^2 = 96.2\%$ , Pseudo- $F = 76.14$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ). Only 0.8% of bacterial and 0.3% of fungal ASVs were shared across all composts, further emphasizing community distinctness across composts. Despite low ASV overlap, abundant taxa at the phylum, family, and genus levels were common across composts (Fig. S12, S13 and Table S5). Bacterial communities were taxonomically diverse, while fungal communities were often dominated by a few genera. Bacterial and fungal community structures were significantly correlated (Mantel test, Pearson's  $r = 0.62$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ).

All assessed alpha diversity measures (ASV richness, Shannon evenness, and Shannon diversity) differed significantly across composts for both bacteria and fungi (Fig. 3; Fig. S14, ANOVA results in Table S6). Bacterial richness ranged from 955 to 5,021 ASVs (mean: 2,691, SD: 936), and fungal richness from 35 to 401 ASVs (mean: 177.5, SD: 96.9). Bacterial and fungal alpha diversity measures were significantly correlated ( $\rho = 0.66\text{--}0.74$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

**TABLE 2** Correlation analyses of disease-suppressive activity of composts with physicochemical properties, microbial activities, and alpha- and beta-diversity measures<sup>a,b</sup>

		<i>Cress-G. ultimum</i>			<i>Cucumber-G. ultimum</i>			<i>Cucumber-R. solani</i>		
		$\rho$	<i>P</i>	<i>P</i> -adj	$\rho$	<i>P</i>	<i>P</i> -adj	$\rho$	<i>P</i>	<i>P</i> -adj
Compost properties	Compost age [days]	0.21	ns	ns	0.37	*	ns	0.18	ns	ns
	Dry substance (DS)* [%]	−0.08	ns	ns	0.04	ns	ns	0.32	.	ns
	Max. WHC <sup>c</sup>	0.01	ns	ns	−0.18	ns	ns	−0.27	.	ns
	pH <sup>g</sup>	−0.03	ns	ns	−0.20	ns	ns	−0.17	ns	ns
	Salinity <sup>g,d</sup>	0.11	ns	ns	0.14	ns	ns	0.11	ns	ns
	OD <sub>550</sub> <sup>g</sup>	0.12	ns	ns	0.05	ns	ns	−0.19	ns	ns
	NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>−</sup> -N <sup>e</sup>	−0.28	.	ns	−0.24	ns	ns	0.14	ns	ns
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>−</sup> -N <sup>g,e</sup>	0.10	ns	ns	0.12	ns	ns	0.30	.	ns
	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N <sup>g,e</sup>	−0.22	ns	ns	−0.30	.	ns	−0.10	ns	ns
	N <sub>min</sub> <sup>e</sup>	0.06	ns	ns	0.06	ns	ns	0.23	ns	ns
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>−</sup> -N/N <sub>min</sub>	0.20	ns	ns	0.37	*	ns	0.27	ns	ns
	PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3−</sup> -P <sup>g,e</sup>	0.09	ns	ns	0.06	ns	ns	0.05	ns	ns
	N <sub>tot</sub> [%]	0.11	ns	ns	0.06	ns	ns	0.06	ns	ns
	C <sub>org</sub> <sup>g</sup> [%]	−0.03	ns	ns	−0.07	ns	ns	−0.10	ns	ns
Microbial activity	C <sub>org</sub> /N <sub>tot</sub>	−0.27	ns	ns	−0.26	ns	ns	−0.38	*	ns
	Basal respiration <sup>f</sup>	0.05	ns	ns	0.04	ns	ns	−0.30	.	ns
Alpha diversity	FDA hydrolysis <sup>g</sup>	−0.16	ns	ns	−0.45	**	ns	−0.01	ns	ns
	Bacterial richness	0.49	**	**	0.31	.	ns	0.29	.	ns
	Bacterial Shannon evenness	0.45	**	**	0.16	ns	ns	0.04	ns	ns
	Bacterial Shannon diversity	0.55	***	**	0.24	ns	ns	0.18	ns	ns
	Fungal richness	0.25	ns	ns	0.13	ns	ns	0.14	ns	ns
	Fungal Shannon evenness	0.35	*	.	0.18	ns	ns	0.14	ns	ns
	Fungal Shannon diversity	0.36	*	.	0.16	ns	ns	0.16	ns	ns
Multivariate analysis	PCA compost properties	0.82 (2.3%)	ns	— <sup>h</sup>	1.01 (2.8%)	ns	—	1.54 (4.0%)	ns	—
	Bacterial community structure	1.48 (4.0%)	ns	—	0.92 (2.6%)	ns	—	1.38 (3.8%)	ns	—
	Fungal community structure	1.36 (3.9%)	ns	—	1.10 (3.1%)	ns	—	1.16 (3.2%)	ns	—

<sup>a</sup>For univariate analysis, Spearman's rank sum correlation was used. For multivariate analysis, PERMANOVA was calculated based on Euclidean distance of compost properties and the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity of bacterial and fungal ASV abundances. Compost properties included in the PCA in Fig. 2 are marked with an asterisk. *P*-values for Spearman's correlation were adjusted for multiple testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for compost properties and microbial activities (*n* = 17) and alpha diversity measures (*n* = 3).

<sup>b</sup>ns, not significant; ., *P* < 0.1; \*, *P* < 0.05; \*\*, *P* < 0.01; \*\*\*, *P* < 0.001.

<sup>c</sup>WHC, waterholding capacity [g H<sub>2</sub>O (g DS)<sup>−1</sup>].

<sup>d</sup>[g Potassium chloride-equivalent (kg DS)<sup>−1</sup>].

<sup>e</sup>[mg (kg DS)<sup>−1</sup>].

<sup>f</sup>[mg CO<sub>2</sub>-C h<sup>−1</sup>].


<sup>g</sup>[μg FDA (min g DS)<sup>−1</sup>].

<sup>h</sup>—, no correction for multiple testing.

All bacterial alpha diversity measures were positively correlated with *G. ultimum* suppression in cress (Fig. 3C), while fungal evenness and diversity showed a non-significant positive trend (Table 2). No such relationships were found for the cucumber systems. The correlation in cress was driven by composts from set II, which had low diversity and low suppressive activity. In contrast, set III showed high suppression despite low diversity (Fig. 3D and E). Removing set II from the analysis eliminated the observed correlations (*P* > 0.05).

To explore potential drivers of alpha diversity, we assessed correlations with compost properties (Table S7). Bacterial richness increased with compost age and the NO<sub>3</sub><sup>−</sup>-N/N<sub>min</sub>—both associated with compost maturation—while fungal richness showed similar, albeit not significant, trends.

Bacterial and fungal community structure, based on the mean ASV abundance of technical replicates, was not significantly associated with disease-suppressive activity in any of the three plant-pathogen systems (PERMANOVA, Table 2; Fig. S15). However, both bacterial and fungal communities were significantly associated with the composting site (Fig. 4A and B; Table S8), the compost age (Fig. 4C and D), and with most compost




**FIG 2** Compost properties were associated with the composting site and compost age. The Euclidean distance between composts was calculated based on nine selected compost properties (indicated with an asterisk in Table 2). The plots display the first and second principal components. Each compost is represented by a dot colored according to either its (A) composting site or (B) compost age. Two composts (31-IV, 32-IV) with unknown compost age are displayed in white. In A, the compost IDs (1–37) are indicated, and in B, the loading vectors of the PCA for all nine compost properties are shown in dark red.

properties (Table S7). Bacterial community structures of the composts were most strongly associated with OD<sub>550</sub>, PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup>, and FDA hydrolysis, while fungal community structure with N<sub>tot</sub>, salinity, and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>. In summary, the composting site and compost properties explained the fungal and bacterial community structure, but this was not linked to disease suppression.

### Potential indicator taxa for disease-suppressive composts were mostly bacteria and specific to the plant-pathogen systems


Bacterial and fungal community structures did not explain differences in disease suppression. However, specific taxa may still be associated with suppressive composts. To investigate this, we compared the abundance of individual bacterial and fungal ASVs between the nine most and nine least suppressive composts for each plant-pathogen system (selected composts labeled in Fig. 1A through C). ASVs were included in the association analysis if their mean abundance was at least one read in six or more of the 18 selected composts. This was the case for 70, 85, and 88 fungal and 1,738, 1,827, and 1,664 bacterial ASVs, for the cress-*G. ultimum*, cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and cucumber-*R. solani* system, respectively. ASVs were considered indicative if they were statistically significant in at least three of the four methods (Point Biserial Correlation, Indicator Species Analysis, MaAsLin2, ALDEx2). In total, 317 bacterial and 9 fungal ASVs were identified as indicative of the most suppressive composts in at least one system (number of ASVs for each method and overlaps shown in Fig. S16).

All indicative fungal ASVs were specific to individual plant-pathogen systems (Fig. 5A). Those associated with *G. ultimum*-suppression in cress and *R. solani*-suppression in cucumber belonged to the phylum *Ascomycota* but could not be classified at the genus level (Table S14). In the cucumber-*G. ultimum* system, three ASVs were identified as *Ascomycota*, including one as *Kernia* sp. and one as *Scenedosporium* sp. Additionally, one ASV was classified to the phylum *Basidiomycota* (genus *Coperinellus*), and one to the



**FIG 3** Bacterial and fungal diversity differed among composts and sets but did not explain differences in disease suppression. Boxplots display (A) bacterial and (B) fungal richness for the 37 composts (1–37) and the no-compost control (NC) of the four compost sets (I–IV) ordered by their means ( $n = 4$ ). (C) The scatter plot shows the relationship between bacterial richness and disease suppression in the *cress-G. ultimum* system. The linear trend line is depicted in dark red. Boxplots show differences among compost sets for (D) bacterial richness and (E) disease suppression in the *cress-G. ultimum* system. For all boxplots, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR, 25th–75th percentile), the horizontal line within the box indicates the median, the whiskers extend to  $1.5 \times$  IQR, and outliers ( $>1.5 \times$  IQR) are shown as points.

phylum *Mortierellomycota* (genus *Mortierella*). Compared to bacteria, fewer fungal ASVs were identified, and their association with disease suppression was weaker, as indicated by lower effect sizes in statistical tests (Table S14). Consequently, bacterial taxa appear more relevant for indicating disease suppression by composts, and further analyses focused on them.



**FIG 4** Bacterial and fungal community structures were linked to composting site, compost age, and compost properties. Bray-Curtis dissimilarities were calculated based on the mean ASV abundance of the four replicates. A NMDS plot is shown for (A and C) bacterial community structure and (B and D) fungal community structure, colored by the (A and B) composting site and (C and D) compost age. The dark red arrows indicate compost properties significantly associated with community structure along the first two NMDS axes (PERMANOVA results are provided in Tables S7 and S8). Compost 20-III, which exhibited a distinct community structure, was considered an outlier and excluded from the fungal ordination (Fig. S11).

Most bacterial ASVs were system specific, with more ASVs associated with *G. ultimum*-suppression in cress and cucumber than *R. solani*-suppression in cucumber (Fig. 5B, all indicative ASVs shown in Tables S15 to S17). One bacterial ASV (ASV2887, order Longimicrobiales) was indicative across all three systems. Indicative bacterial ASVs were taxonomically diverse, spanning 18 phyla. In all three systems, the most common phylum was *Pseudomonadota* (Table S9), which was also the most abundant phylum overall (Table S5). While over two-thirds of the indicative ASVs were assigned to family level, genus level assignments were less frequent—23%, 37%, and 35% in the cress-*G. ultimum* system, cucumber-*G. ultimum* system, and cucumber-*R. solani* system, respectively. Taxonomic overlap at the genus level was low, with few ASVs sharing the same classification (Table S9).

To identify the strongest bacterial indicators, ASVs were ranked by effect size across all statistical methods, and rank sums were used to identify the top 20 per system (Table 3). While most indicators were system-specific, 40 ASVs were shared between the two *G. ultimum* systems (Fig. 5B). These shared ASVs may serve as general indicators of *G. ultimum*-suppression and are shown in Fig. 5C.

We conducted a literature search for all 62 bacterial and 4 fungal genera assigned to indicative ASVs. Forty-four bacterial and all fungal genera have previously been reported

**TABLE 3** Bacterial ASVs most strongly associated with suppressive composts and their correlation with disease suppression across all 37 composts for each plant-pathogen system<sup>a</sup>


System	ASV	n	$\rho$	P	Phylum	Family	Genus/species
cress- <i>G. ultimum</i>	618	32	0.48	**	Planctomycetota	Lalipirellulaceae	NA
	594	29	0.45	**	Planctomycetota	Tepidisphaeraceae	NA
	135	30	0.47	**	Acidobacteriota	Pyrinomonadaceae	OLB17
	922	23	0.42	**	Pseudomonadota	Sphingobacteriaceae	Sphingomicrobium
	94	33	0.47	**	Chloroflexota	Phototrophicaceae	NA
	1,927	28	0.50	**	Pseudomonadota	Caulobacteraceae	Brevundimonas basaltis
	87	36	0.38	*	Pseudomonadota	Steroidobacteraceae	NA
	824	31	0.53	**	Pseudomonadota	Rhizobiaceae	NA
	702	32	0.37	*	Bacteroidota	Cyclobacteriaceae	NA
	1,379	31	0.43	**	Pseudomonadota	Beijerinckiaceae	Microvirga
cucumber- <i>G. ultimum</i>	689	30	0.44	**	Chloroflexota	Caldilineaceae	NA
	124	34	0.43	**	Bacteroidota	Cyclobacteriaceae	UBA2336
	424	32	0.55	***	Pseudomonadota	Sphingomonadaceae	NA
	661	30	0.62	***	Pseudomonadota	Burkholderiaceae C	NA
	1,339	21	0.61	***	Bacteroidota	Sphingobacteriaceae	Parapedobacter
	146	35	0.50	**	Pseudomonadota	Sphingomonadaceae	Sphingopyxis
	308	33	0.55	***	Pseudomonadota	Xanthomonadaceae	NA
	1,513	26	0.65	***	Pseudomonadota	Rhizobiaceae	Sinorhizobium fredii
	840	29	0.54	**	Pseudomonadota	Erythrobacteraceae	Croceibacterium
	184	32	0.47	**	Bacteroidota	Flavobacteriaceae	NA
cucumber- <i>R. solani</i>	1,432	17	0.50	**	Planctomycetota	Planctomycetaceae	NA
	500	34	0.47	**	Pseudomonadota	Nitrosomonadaceae	Nitrosomonas nitrosa
	58	37	0.45	**	Pseudomonadota	Xanthomonadaceae	Luteimonas D
	567	32	0.48	**	Bacteroidota	Chitinophagaceae	Flavipsychrobacter
	124	34	0.39	*	Bacteroidota	Cyclobacteriaceae	UBA2336
	252	28	0.31	.	Bacteroidota	Chitinophagaceae	Edaphocola
	2,767	22	0.49	**	Pseudomonadota	Xanthomonadaceae	Luteimonas D colneyensis
	243	37	0.56	***	Actinomycetota	Mycobacteriaceae	Mycobacterium hassiacum
	434	33	0.34	*	Pseudomonadota	Rhodomicriobiaceae	Rhodomicrobium
	423	36	0.40	*	Planctomycetota	Tepidisphaeraceae	UBA2421
cucumber- <i>R. solani</i>	144	35	0.24	.	Pseudomonadota	Steroidobacteraceae	NA
	178	34	0.51	**	Actinomycetota	Streptosporangiaceae	Nonomuraea
	1,101	35	0.33	*	Pseudomonadota	Steroidobacteraceae	NA
	483	35	0.50	**	Actinomycetota	Ilumatobacteraceae	NA
	595	26	0.37	*	Actinomycetota	Micromonosporaceae	NA
	609	32	0.35	*	Actinomycetota	Streptosporangiaceae	Actinocorallia
	642	33	0.42	**	Pseudomonadota	Rariloculaceae	ZC4RG20
	10	37	0.52	**	Chloroflexota	Thermomicrobiaceae	Sphaerobacter thermophilus

<sup>a</sup>Strength of association with the nine most suppressive composts was determined based on the summed rank of the effect size of all four statistical methods (Point Biserial correlation, Indicator Species Analysis, MaAsLin2, ALDEx2; rank sum shown in Tables S15, S16, and S17). Only ASVs that were among the top 20 and classified at least to the family level are shown. NA indicates unclassified. Column "n" indicates the number of composts in which the ASV was found. Significance levels for Spearman's Rank Sum test: ns, not significant; .,  $P < 0.1$ ; \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

to occur in composts (Table S12). For 28 bacterial and one fungal genus, prior evidence supported their involvement in disease suppression (Table S13).

To assess consistency with previous work, we compared the 317 ASVs from this study with 75 indicative ASVs from Mayerhofer et al. (27) with a BLAST search. Twelve matched at > 99% identity to an ASV from the previous study: six were specific to cress-*G. ultimum*, four to cucumber-*G. ultimum*, one shared between *G. ultimum* systems, and one from the cucumber-*R. solani* system (Table S10). Notable matches included ASV467 (*Algoriphagus*, 99.8% identity) and ASV146 (*Sphingopyxis*, 100%), both among the top 20 indicators for *G. ultimum* suppression (Table 3).





**FIG 5** ASVs indicative of the most suppressive composts were predominantly bacteria and specific to a plant-pathogen system. Number of indicative ASVs in the three plant-pathogen systems, cress-*G. ultimum*, cucumber-*G. ultimum*, and cucumber-*R. solani*, and the numbers shared among the systems are shown for (A) fungi and (B) bacteria. (C) Depicts the 40 indicative bacterial ASVs shared between the two *G. ultimum* systems. For all ASVs, the lowest taxonomic classification based on the Genome Taxonomy Database is indicated (s = species, g = genus, f = family, o = order, c = class). (D) A heat map shows the correlation between ASV abundance and the disease-suppressive activity against *G. ultimum* in cress and cucumber across all 37 composts. Spearman rank sum correlation was used, and *P*-values were adjusted for multiple testing (Benjamini & Hochberg). Non-significant correlations (*P*-adj < 0.05) are indicated as gray boxes. cr-Gu: cress-*G. ultimum*, cuc-Gu: cucumber-*G. ultimum*.

### The abundance of indicative bacterial ASVs reflects the suppression patterns across all 37 composts

The indicative bacterial ASVs were identified by comparing the nine most and nine least suppressive composts for each plant-pathogen system. To evaluate their relevance across all composts, we assessed their presence and abundance. Most of the 317 ASVs were detected in more than two-thirds of the 37 composts and had higher median relative abundance in significantly suppressive than in non-suppressive composts (0.016% vs. 0.004%) (Fig. S17). Generally, they showed intermediate abundance (0.01%–0.1%) in suppressive composts and low abundance (<0.01%) in non-suppressive ones. A

substantial proportion of the indicative ASVs correlated significantly and positively with suppression in their respective system: 80 in cress-*G. ultimum* (60.6%), 76 in cucumber-*G. ultimum* system (52.1%), and 45 in cucumber-*R. solani* system (56.3%) ( $|\rho| > 0.4$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ; Tables S15 to S17).

To evaluate whether the indicative ASVs reflect the suppressive activity of individual composts, we summed their scaled abundances per compost for each plant-pathogen system. As expected, summed ASV abundances were lowest in the least suppressive composts and highest in the most suppressive ones (“flop v. top” categories; Fig. 6). Notably, composts with intermediate suppression levels, which were not included in the initial association analysis, showed increasing summed ASV abundance with increasing suppression. Across all 37 composts, summed ASV abundance was significantly correlated with disease suppression in each system (cress-*G. ultimum*:  $\rho = 0.61$ ; cucumber-*G. ultimum*:  $\rho = 0.62$ ; cucumber-*R. solani*:  $\rho = 0.71$ ; all  $P < 0.001$ ).

Summed ASV abundance best represented suppression in the cucumber-*R. solani* system (Fig. 6C). In the cress-*G. ultimum* system, several significantly suppressive composts—most not among the top nine—showed similarly low summed ASV abundance as non-suppressive composts (Fig. 6A). Conversely, some non-suppressive composts in the cucumber-*G. ultimum* system (composts 15-II, 25-III, 29-IV, and 32-IV) exhibited high summed abundance of indicative ASVs (Fig. 6B). These observations indicate that although the summed abundance of indicative ASV does not allow reliable prediction of the suppressive effect of all composts, the overall trends are well represented, even for composts not included in the association analysis.


## DISCUSSION

### Suppressive activity of compost was plant-pathogen-specific and not linked to compost properties or microbial communities

In this study, most of the 37 composts suppressed disease in at least one plant-pathogen system (Fig. 1). Composts with no suppressive activity were rare, as were those with broad-spectrum efficacy. Suppression of *G. ultimum* was more frequent than that of *R. solani*, which is consistent with previous studies (8, 15, 20, 59). However, suppression efficacy against *G. ultimum* also varied between the two host plants, cress and cucumber. These differences might be explained by plant-specific recruitment of beneficial microorganisms. Root exudates are known to shape rhizosphere microbiota (60) and vary across plant species (61). Plant-induced assembly of compost-associated microorganisms has been proposed as a mechanism underlying disease suppression (9) and has been experimentally demonstrated in compost-mediated suppression of vascular wilt in tomato (62, 63). Together, these findings highlight that indicators for suppressive composts need to be defined specifically for different plant-pathogen systems.

The two pathogens, *G. ultimum* and *R. solani*, prefer different environmental conditions and are primarily controlled by different mechanisms (1). *G. ultimum* is often reported to be suppressed by general microbial activity or diversity, as it competes poorly with saprophytic microorganisms in nutrient-rich environments (15). *R. solani* is suggested to be controlled by specific biocontrol organisms (28). However, in this study, neither microbial activity nor diversity could explain suppression of *G. ultimum*. Although disease suppression in the *G. ultimum*-cress system was positively correlated with bacterial diversity, further analysis revealed that this correlation was driven by composts from set two, which showed both low suppressive activity and low bacterial diversity. In contrast, composts from set III exhibited low bacterial diversity yet were among the most suppressive. This suggests that high bacterial diversity (relative to typical compost diversity levels) is not a prerequisite for effective *G. ultimum* suppression. This observation aligns with our previous findings in cress, as well as with studies on *G. ultimum* in cucumber and *Phytophthora nicotianae* in pepper, which reported similar conclusions (23, 27, 64).

The low suppressiveness of composts from set II was likely linked to the spring drought in 2022, during which they were composted (65). We suspect that this



**FIG 6** Summed abundance of indicative ASVs was correlated with disease suppression across all 37 composts for (A) the cress-*G. ultimum* system (137 ASVs), (B) the cucumber-*G. ultimum* system (147 ASVs), and (C) the cucumber-*R. solani* system (80 ASVs). To ensure equal weighting of each ASV, its abundance was scaled to a range of 0–1 prior to summation. The shape of the points represents the suppression category, with “top” and “flop” used to identify indicative ASVs during the association analysis. Shading indicates whether a compost was significantly suppressive compared to the no-compost control (Fig. 1). The linear trend lines are shown in dark red.

environmental stress may have interfered with the development of disease-suppressive activity against *G. ultimum*, which cannot only be explained by low microbial diversity, but is probably due to the lack of specific beneficial microorganisms. Interestingly, suppressiveness against *R. solani* appeared unaffected by the dry conditions, with composts 14-II and 17-II being among the most effective against this pathogen.

Our analysis showed that, across all three plant-pathogen systems, compost-mediated disease suppression was not linked to the physicochemical properties of the compost, which is consistent with the conclusions of a large meta-analysis on indicators of disease-suppressive amendments (13). This finding extended to fungal and

bacterial community structures and alpha diversity, none of which were associated with suppression either. However, physicochemical properties and bacterial and fungal community structure were strongly associated with the composting site and were interrelated (Fig. 2 and 4). As composting sites differ in many respects, for example, in terms of feedstock composition, composting method, local microbiota, and environmental conditions, we could not determine the main factors influencing community structures. Some studies suggest that feedstock composition strongly influences physicochemical properties (reviewed by Kong et al. (66) and microbial community development, particularly during compost maturation (67, 31). In contrast, a study on 116 composts found that pH, moisture content, and total nitrogen—rather than feedstock—best explained variation in bacterial communities (26). Thus, it remains unclear whether compost properties or composting site-specific factors primarily shape the microbial communities in composts.


Bacterial and fungal diversity tended to increase as the compost matured, a trend that has already been reported for bacteria (30, 31). The compost maturation stage has been linked to suppressive activity against *G. ultimum* in earlier studies (11, 15). Also, in our previous work, we found that younger composts were more effective at suppressing *G. ultimum* than older, more mature ones (27). However, in the larger compost set analyzed here, both young, microbial-active composts (e.g., composts 5-I and 25-III) and older, less active ones (e.g., composts 6-I and 8-I) were able to strongly suppress *G. ultimum* in cress. Further analysis of the 17 composts from our earlier study (27) showed that when disease suppression and compost age were tested together, only compost age had a significant association with bacterial community structure (Table S11). This suggests that the previously observed link between community structure and disease suppression is probably indirectly due to compost age.

In summary, our findings show that disease suppression by composts is not explained by physicochemical properties, overall microbial diversity, or microbial community structure, although it is likely influenced by both abiotic and biotic factors (17). This emphasizes the need for more targeted analyses, particularly of specific microbial taxa, which will be discussed in the following section. Figure 7 summarizes our findings and outlines the complex relationship between disease-suppressive activity and compost characteristics.

### Bacterial ASVs comprised promising indicators for disease-suppressive composts

By comparing the nine most and least suppressive composts, we identified bacterial and a few fungal ASVs indicative of disease suppression for each plant-pathogen system. Most bacterial and all fungal ASVs were plant-pathogen specific, with the greatest overlap observed between the two *G. ultimum* systems (Fig. 5). We focused on the bacterial indicators and demonstrated that the indicative bacteria were phylogenetically diverse and generally prevalent in composts. For each plant-pathogen system, their summed abundance was correlated with disease suppression across all 37 composts, making them promising candidates to serve as indicators for disease-suppressive composts.

Although fungi have been widely reported in compost-mediated disease suppression, for example, *Trichoderma* spp. against *R. solani* (28, 69), only a few fungal indicators were identified in this study. Several factors may explain this. First, fungal communities in composts were generally less diverse (20, 30, 70) and dominated by a few abundant taxa, with limited overlap of rare taxa across samples. Second, greater variability among sequencing replicates suggests a more heterogeneous fungal distribution. Third, sieving composts for DNA extraction excluded larger, less-degraded wood particles. These particles may harbor fungi, such as cellulolytic species, which are often associated with less-humidified organic matter (71) and are abundant in composts (72). Thus, refining sampling and DNA extraction methods could improve fungal coverage and increase the



### Compost-mediated disease suppression is...

- ... pathogen-(host plant)-specific. Broad-spectrum efficacy is rare.
- ... NOT indicated by physicochemical properties, microbial activity, diversity and community structure.
- ... best indicated by specific and phylogenetically diverse bacterial indicators.



**FIG 7** The complex relationship between disease-suppressive activity and compost characteristics. (1) Composting site-specific factors (particularly feedstock) are known to influence compost maturation and physicochemical properties (31, 68). (2) Composting site, physicochemical compost properties, and maturation processes influence the microbial compost properties. (3) Bacterial and fungal richness increase with compost maturation. (4) The physicochemical properties, microbial activity, and alpha and beta diversity may influence the disease-suppressive activity but were not indicative of suppression in our study. (5) Association analyses between the most and least suppressive composts for each plant-pathogen system revealed indicative taxa for disease suppression. Created in BioRender Basel, P. (2025).

number of indicative fungi. Nonetheless, our results suggest that bacteria are more promising indicators of disease-suppressive composts than fungi.

To enable comparison with existing literature, we focused on indicative ASVs classified to at least the genus level. However, the relevance of ASVs classified only at higher taxonomic resolution should not be overlooked. These may be identified in the future as novel taxa are described. Additionally, these indicative ASVs hold promise for meta-analyses and may serve as genetic markers for diagnosing disease-suppressive composts (73).

For the fungi, only one indicative ASV was assigned to a genus previously linked to disease suppression: an ASV associated with *G. ultimum* suppression in cucumber, classified as *Mortierella*. This genus was recently identified as a key indicator of soil suppressiveness against *G. ultimum* (74). For the bacteria, ASVs indicative of *R. solani*-suppression in cucumber were assigned to the genera *Streptomyces* and *Mycobacterium*, for which both suppressive activities have previously been reported (75, 76). Both genera belong to the phylum Actinomycetota, to which a quarter of all ASVs indicative of *R. solani*-suppression were assigned to, and which is known for harboring many disease-suppressive strains, particularly also associated with compost and soil suppressiveness against *R. solani* (77–79).



Among the bacterial ASVs indicative of *G. ultimum*-suppression, we identified 26 genera with promising links to the literature regarding disease suppression (Table S13). Many of them were reported enriched in soils suppressive to *Fusarium* or bacterial wilt, with some genera specifically linked to compost-mediated effects, that is, the genera *Agrobacterium*, *Glutamicibacter*, *Streptomyces*, and *Luteimonas* (75, 80, 81). Particularly, the genus *Luteimonas* has been reported as an indicator of composts suppressive of *Globisporangium irregulare* in lettuce (30) and *Rhizoctonia solani* and *Sclerotinia minor* in cress (25). Indicative ASVs assigned to this genus were not only found among the top 20 for suppression of *G. ultimum* in cucumber, but also among the ASVs indicative of *G. ultimum* independently of the host plant. Moreover, among the indicated ASVs from our previous study (27) that could be validated in this study, we found ASVs classified to the genera *Algoriphagus*, *Devosia*, *Poalibacter*, and *Sphingopyxis*, all of which were previously reported in the context of disease suppression (82–85).

Many of the genera associated with ASVs indicative of *G. ultimum* suppression were also previously found to be enriched together in the rhizosphere of tomato plants grown in *Fusarium*-suppressive soils (86). These include *Brevundimonas*, *Devosia*, *Cellvibrio*, *Chthoniobacter*, *Flavobacterium*, *Microvirga*, *Novosphingobium*, *Shinella*, *Sphingobium*, and *Sphingopyxis*. This observation is particularly noteworthy given the growing body of evidence suggesting that disease suppression is conferred by complex microbial networks, rather than by individual strains (87). Thus, it is plausible that the identified bacteria contribute to *G. ultimum* suppression collectively, functioning as part of a microbial consortium.

### Toward general indicators for disease-suppressive composts and the use of compost microorganisms for crop protection

The identified bacteria (and a few fungi) indicative of suppressive composts represent a promising starting point for predicting disease suppression by composts. However, their presence or relative abundance in composts is not sufficient to robustly model disease suppression. Composts provide a complex growing environment for microorganisms, and it is well described that the activity, particularly of microorganisms with biocontrol activity, depends on the properties of the substrate they are applied with (and applied to) (59). Thus, we should aim for predictive models that integrate microbiome data with compost properties. We attempted such modeling, but it was hindered by two main limitations: strong composting site effects and too few observations compared to the number of potential predictors. Although, to our knowledge, this is the largest data set of composts tested for disease suppression and profiled for bacterial and fungal communities to date.

To overcome these limitations, we propose narrowing down the scope in future studies, for instance, by focusing on compost at similar maturation stages, produced from similar feedstock, or tracking composts over time. Moreover, meta-studies, as successfully applied to suppressive soils (88–90), could help identify general predictors. Additionally, the observation that composts with large differences in abiotic and biotic properties can show suppressive activity suggests that suppression results from several mechanisms (17). Disentangling these mechanisms *in situ* and directly comparing composts with similar functional profiles would be crucial but remains experimentally challenging. Furthermore, a better understanding of disease suppression mechanisms may allow us to explain differences in disease suppression across plant-pathogen systems. Since crops are often simultaneously attacked by multiple pathogens in the field, the plant-pathogen specificity of compost suppressiveness and associated indicators poses a challenge for the development of practical diagnostic tools.

However, even with extensive data sets, the high taxonomic variability among composts likely limits the discovery of universal microbial indicators. Similar challenges have been reported in identifying taxonomic indicators of compost maturation (31). We suggest that despite the high taxonomic diversity, functional redundancy exists among compost microorganisms, as has been reported for soil microbiota (91). Metagenomic



approaches, such as shotgun sequencing, will help identify functional genes associated with disease suppression, as shown in studies on suppressive soils (92, 93). However, these sequencing technologies are still costly and the analysis and interpretation of complex communities—such as those found in compost—challenging (94). In parallel, we need studies that expand our knowledge of compost microbiota potentially involved in disease suppression, for which the current study sets an important foundation.

Our study identified promising bacterial and a few fungal indicators that will support the development of diagnostic tools and guide the targeted isolation of key microorganisms in future studies. Testing these microorganisms for disease-suppressive activity, individually and in consortia, combined with genomic and metabolic profiling, could reveal genes and functions involved in suppression (12). This would deepen our understanding of the mechanisms driving disease suppression and support the development of reliable predictors and potentially microbial inoculants to enhance compost suppressiveness. Together, these strategies could advance the use of compost as a sustainable solution for promoting plant health.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank all the people who supported us in the lab, in particular Malgorzata Glowala (former intern at FiBL), Tabea Koch (Agroscope), Nadine Peter (FiBL), and Sonja Reinhard (FiBL), as well as Eva Burgunder and Mónica Camareno Rodriguez (both University of Basel), Miro Zehnder, Martina Fischbach, Alicia Nussbaumer, Verena Huber, Dominik Moser, and Nicolas Enggist (former interns or civil servants at FiBL). We also thank Jan Wächli (University of Basel) for the support with the statistics and the Analytic team at FiBL, in particular Anton Kuhn and Adolphe Munyangabe, for their support for physico-chemical and microbial compost characterization. We are grateful to the composting facilities in northwestern Switzerland that provided us with the tested composts. We gratefully acknowledge the Functional Genomics Center Zurich (FGCZ) of the University of Zurich and ETH Zurich, and in particular Maria Domenica Moccia, for the support in amplicon sequencing.

This work was supported by the Swiss Federal Office for Agriculture (FOAG) as part of the project entitled 'Optimierung des Kompostmikrobioms gegen bodenbürtige Krankheiten mittels Diagnostik und Antagonisten' (project number FOAG21.19, grant number 627001953). The work was further co-funded by the Swiss centre of excellence for agricultural research (Agroscope, Switzerland) and the Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL, Switzerland) and supported with material, facilities and knowhow by the University of Basel and ETH Zurich.

## AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

<sup>1</sup>Molecular Ecology, Agroscope, Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Department of Crop Sciences, Plant Protection: Phytopathology and Entomology, Research Institute of Organic Agriculture FiBL, Frick, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Plant Pathology, Institute of Integrative Biology, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>4</sup>Plant Microbe Interactions, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

## PRESENT ADDRESS

Benedikt Boppré, Ecology and Biodiversity, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

## AUTHOR ORCIDs

Anja Logo  <http://orcid.org/0009-0005-0595-0958>

Benedikt Boppré  <http://orcid.org/0009-0007-0964-3546>

Jacques Fuchs  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7441-3559>

Monika Maurhofer  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5408-6290>

Thomas Oberhänsli  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9404-5271>

Barbara Thürig  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0662-5234>

Franco Widmer  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1735-8397>

Johanna Mayerhofer  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1833-2276>

Pascale Flury  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9581-1716>

## FUNDING

Funder	Grant(s)	Author(s)
Swiss Federal Office for Agriculture	627001953	Anja Logo Benedikt Boppré Jacques Fuchs Thomas Oberhänsli Barbara Thürig Johanna Mayerhofer Pascale Flury

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Anja Logo, Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing | Benedikt Boppré, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review and editing | Jacques Fuchs, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Resources | Monika Maurhofer, Supervision, Writing – review and editing | Thomas Oberhänsli, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – review and editing | Barbara Thürig, Methodology, Writing – review and editing, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition | Franco Widmer, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration | Johanna Mayerhofer, Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing | Pascale Flury, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing

## DATA AVAILABILITY

All raw sequences have been deposited at the NCBI Sequence Read Archive under the BioProject accession numbers [PRJNA1200637](#) (bacteria) and [PRJNA1201072](#) (fungi). R code and session info are available on [GitHub](#).

## ADDITIONAL FILES

The following material is available [online](#).

### Supplemental Material

**Supplemental material (AEM01100-25-s0001.pdf).** Supplemental methods, Fig. S1 to S17, and Tables S1 to S17.

## REFERENCES

- Lamichhane JR, Dürr C, Schwanck AA, Robin M-H, Sarthou J-P, Cellier V, Messéan A, Aubertot J-N. 2017. Integrated management of damping-off diseases. a review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 37:1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-017-0417-y>
- Gullino ML, Garibaldi A, Gamliel A, Katan J. 2022. Soil disinfestation: from soil treatment to soil and plant health. *Plant Dis* 106:1541–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-21-2023-FE>
- Castellano-Hinojosa A, Boyd NS, Strauss SL. 2022. Impact of fumigants on non-target soil microorganisms: a review. *J Hazard Mater* 427:128149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.128149>
- Hartmann M, Six J. 2023. Soil structure and microbiome functions in agroecosystems. *Nat Rev Earth Environ* 4:4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00366-w>
- Baker KF, Cook RJ. 1974. *Biological control of plant pathogens*. Vol. 11. W.H. Freeman & Co.
- Hoitink H, Kuter G. 1986. Effects of composts in growth media on soilborne pathogens, p 289–306. In *The role of organic matter in modern agriculture*. Vol. 13. Springer.
- Noble R, Coventry E. 2005. Suppression of soil-borne plant diseases with composts: a review. *Biocontrol Sci Technol* 15:3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sae.2.70041>

8. Termorshuizen AJ, van Rijn E, van der Gaag DJ, Alabouvette C, Chen Y, Lagerlöf J, Malandrakis AA, Paplomatas EJ, Rämert B, Ryckeboer J, Steinberg C, Zmora-Nahum S. 2006. Suppressiveness of 18 composts against 7 pathosystems: variability in pathogen response. *Soil Biol Biochem* 38:2461–2477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2006.03.002>
9. De Corato U. 2020. Disease-suppressive compost enhances natural soil suppressiveness against soil-borne plant pathogens: a critical review. *Rhizosphere* 13:100192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rhisph.2020.100192>
10. Edlinger A, Herzog C, Garland G, Walder F, Banerjee S, Keel SG, Mayer J, Philippot L, Romdhane S, Schiedung M, Schmidt MWI, Seitz B, Wüst -Galley C, van der Heijden MGA. 2025. Compost application enhances soil health and maintains crop yield: insights from 56 farmer-managed arable fields. *J Sustain Agric Environ* 4:e70041–2477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sae.2.70041>
11. Neher DA, Hoitink HA, Biala J, Rynk R, Black G. 2020. Compost use for plant disease suppression, p 847–878. In *The composting handbook*. Elsevier.
12. Lutz S, Thuerig B, Oberhaensli T, Mayerhofer J, Fuchs JG, Widmer F, Freimoser FM, Ahrens CH. 2020. Harnessing the microbiomes of suppressive composts for plant protection: from metagenomes to beneficial microorganisms and reliable diagnostics. *Front Microbiol* 11:1810. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.01810>
13. Bonanomi G, Antignani V, Capodilupo M, Scala F. 2010. Identifying the characteristics of organic soil amendments that suppress soilborne plant diseases. *Soil Biol Biochem* 42:136–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.10.012>
14. Pane C, Spaccini R, Piccolo A, Scala F, Bonanomi G. 2011. Compost amendments enhance peat suppressiveness to *Pythium ultimum*, *Rhizoctonia solani* and *Sclerotinia minor*. *Biol Control* 56:115–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2010.10.002>
15. Scheuerell SJ, Mahaffee WF. 2005. Microbial recolonization of compost after peak heating needed for the rapid development of damping-off suppression. *Compost Sci Util* 13:65–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10656565.2005.10702219>
16. Zmora-Nahum S, Danon M, Hadar Y, Chen Y. 2008. Compost curing reduces suppression of plant diseases. *Compost Sci Util* 16:250–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1065657X.2008.10702386>
17. Hadar Y, Papadopolou KK. 2012. Suppressive composts: microbial ecology links between abiotic environments and healthy plants. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 50:133–153. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-08.12.11-172914>
18. Bouchtaoui EM, Haouas A, Dababat AA, Lahlali R, Benali A, Fahr M, Smouni A, Azim K, Liu Z, Li J, Mokri F. 2024. Exploring mechanisms of compost-mediated suppression of plant pathogens: a critical review. *Agric, Ecosyst Environ, Appl Soil Ecol* 203:105644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2024.105644>
19. Mehta CM, Palni U, Franke-Whittle IH, Sharma AK. 2014. Compost: its role, mechanism and impact on reducing soil-borne plant diseases. *Waste Manag* 34:607–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2013.11.012>
20. De Corato U, Patruno L, Avella N, Lacolla G, Cucci G. 2019. Composts from green sources show an increased suppressiveness to soilborne plant pathogenic fungi: relationships between physicochemical properties, disease suppression, and the microbiome. *Crop Prot* 124:104870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.104870>
21. Nelson EB, Kuter G, Hoitink H. 1983. Effects of fungal antagonists and compost age on suppression of *Rhizoctonia damping-off* in container media amended with composted hardwood bark. *Phytopathology* 73:1457. <https://doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-73-1457>
22. Cao Y, Tian Y, Gao Y, Li J. 2018. Microbial diversity in compost is critical in suppressing plant fungal pathogen survival and enhancing cucumber seedling growth. *Compost Sci Util* 26:189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1065657X.2018.1438933>
23. Yu D, Sinkkonen A, Hui N, Kurola JM, Kukkonen S, Parikka P, Vestberg M, Romantschuk M. 2015. Molecular profile of microbiota of Finnish commercial compost suppressive against *Pythium* disease on cucumber plants. *Agric, Ecosyst Environ, Appl Soil Ecol* 92:47–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.03.005>
24. De Corato U, Salimbeni R, De Pretis A, Patruno L, Avella N, Lacolla G, Cucci G. 2018. Microbiota from “next-generation green compost” improves suppressiveness of composted Municipal-Solid-Waste to soil-borne plant pathogens. *Biol Control* 124:1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2018.05.020>
25. Scotti R, Mitchell AL, Pane C, Finn RD, Zaccardelli M. 2020. Microbiota characterization of agricultural green waste-based suppressive composts using omics and classic approaches. *Agriculture* 10:61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture10030061>
26. Wang Y, Gong J, Li J, Xin Y, Hao Z, Chen C, Li H, Wang B, Ding M, Li W, Zhang Z, Xu P, Xu T, Ding G-C, Li J. 2020. Insights into bacterial diversity in compost: core microbiome and prevalence of potential pathogenic bacteria. *Sci Total Environ* 718:137304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137304>
27. Mayerhofer J, Thuerig B, Oberhaensli T, Enderle E, Lutz S, Ahrens CH, Fuchs JG, Widmer F. 2021. Indicative bacterial communities and taxa of disease-suppressing and growth-promoting composts and their associations to the rhizosphere. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 97:fiab134. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiab134>
28. Hoitink H, Boehm M. 1999. Biocontrol within the context of soil microbial communities: a substrate-dependent phenomenon. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 37:427–446. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.phyto.37.1.427>
29. Kitiir N, Yildirim E, Şahin Ü, Turan M, Ekinçi M, Ors S, Kul R, Ünlü H. 2018. Peat use in horticulture. IntechOpen London, UK.
30. Hernández-Lara A, Ros M, Cuartero J, Bustamante MÁ, Moral R, Andreu-Rodríguez FJ, Fernández JA, Egea-Gilabert C, Pascual JA. 2022. Bacterial and fungal community dynamics during different stages of agro-industrial waste composting and its relationship with compost suppressiveness. *Sci Total Environ* 805:150330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150330>
31. Estrella-González MJ, Suárez-Estrella F, Jurado MM, López MJ, López-González JA, Siles-Castellano AB, Muñoz-Mérida A, Moreno J. 2020. Uncovering new indicators to predict stability, maturity and biodiversity of compost on an industrial scale. *Bioresour Technol* 313:123557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2020.123557>
32. Krause H-M, Stehle B, Mayer J, Mayer M, Steffens M, Mäder P, Fließbach A. 2022. Biological soil quality and soil organic carbon change in biodynamic, organic, and conventional farming systems after 42 years. *Agron Sustain Dev* 42:117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-022-00843-y>
33. Agroscope. 2020. Schweizerische Referenzmethoden der Forschungsanstalten Agroscope: Bestimmung der maximalen Wasserhaltekapazität. Agroscope, Zürich, Switzerland. Available from: <https://ira.agroscope.ch/de-CH/Page/Einzelpublikation/Download?einzelpublikationId=48969>
34. Ntougias S, Ehalotis C, Papadopolou KK, Zervakis G. 2006. Application of respiration and FDA hydrolysis measurements for estimating microbial activity during composting processes. *Biol Fertil Soils* 42:330–337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-005-0031-z>
35. Alef K, Nannipieri P. 1995. Estimation of microbial activities, p 193–270. In *Methods in Applied Soil Microbiology and Biochemistry*. Academic Press, London.
36. Tederloo L, Anslan S, Bahram M, Pölme S, Riit T, Liiv I, Kõljalg U, Kisand V, Nilsson H, Hildebrand F, Bork P, Abarenkov K. 2015. Shotgun metagenomes and multiple primer pair barcode combinations of amplicons reveal biases in metabarcoding analyses of fungi. *Mycoskeys* 10:1–43. <https://doi.org/10.3897/mycokeys.10.4852>
37. Frey B, Rime T, Phillips M, Stierli B, Hajdas I, Widmer F, Hartmann M. 2016. Microbial diversity in European alpine permafrost and active layers. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 92:fiw018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiw018>
38. Mayerhofer J, Wächter D, Calanca P, Kohli L, Roth T, Meuli RG, Widmer F. 2021. Environmental and anthropogenic factors shape major bacterial community types across the complex mountain landscape of Switzerland. *Front Microbiol* 12:581430. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.581430>
39. Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. *EMBnet J* 17:10. <https://doi.org/10.14806/ej.17.1.200>
40. Rognes T, Flouri T, Nichols B, Quince C, Mahé F. 2016. VSEARCH: a versatile open source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ* 4:e2584. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2584>
41. Edgar RC, Flyvbjerg H. 2015. Error filtering, pair assembly and error correction for next-generation sequencing reads. *Bioinformatics* 31:3476–3482. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv401>
42. Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C, Knight R. 2011. UCHIME improves sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. *Bioinformatics* 27:2194–2200. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr381>
43. Bengtsson-Palme J, Hartmann M, Eriksson KM, Pal C, Thorell K, Larsson DGJ, Nilsson RH. 2015. METAXA2: improved identification and taxonomic

- classification of small and large subunit rRNA in metagenomic data. *Mol Ecol Resour* 15:1403–1414. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12399>
44. Bengtsson - Palme J, Ryberg M, Hartmann M, Branco S, Wang Z, Godhe A, De Wit P, Sánchez - García M, Ebersberger I, de Sousa F, Amend A, Jumpponen A, Unterseher M, Kristiansson E, Abarenkov K, Bertrand YJK, Sanli K, Eriksson KM, Vik U, Veldre V, Nilsson RH. 2013. Improved software detection and extraction of ITS1 and ITS2 from ribosomal ITS sequences of fungi and other eukaryotes for analysis of environmental sequencing data. *Methods Ecol Evol* 4:914–919. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12073>
  45. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, Hollister EB, Lesniewski RA, Oakley BB, Parks DH, Robinson CJ, Sahl JW, Stres B, Thallinger GG, Van Horn DJ, Weber CF. 2009. Introducing mothur: open-source, platform-independent, community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 75:7537–7541. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01541-09>
  46. Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Chaumeil P, Hugenholtz P. 2021. GTDB: an ongoing census of bacterial and archaeal diversity through a phylogenetically consistent, rank normalized and complete genome-based taxonomy. *Nucleic Acids Res* 50:D785–D794. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkab776>
  47. Mayerhofer J, Richter F, Fox A, Widmer F, Lüscher A, Klaus V, Hartmann M. 2025. Impact of grassland management intensity on associations between bacterial, fungal and plant communities. *Eur J Soil Biol* 126:103754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsobi.2025.103754>
  48. Abarenkov K, Nilsson RH, Larsson K-H, Taylor AFS, May TW, Frøslev TG, Pawlowska J, Lindahl B, Pöldmaa K, Truong C, et al. 2024. The UNITE database for molecular identification and taxonomic communication of fungi and other eukaryotes: sequences, taxa and classifications reconsidered. *Nucleic Acids Res* 52:D791–D797. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad1039>
  49. R Core Team. 2023. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
  50. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan LD, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen TL, Miller E, Bache SM, Müller K, Ooms J, Robinson D, Seidel DP, Spinu V, Takahashi K, Vaughan D, Wilke C, Woo K, Yutani H. 2019. Welcome to the tidyverse. *J Open Source Softw* 4:1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
  51. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc Series B* 57:289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>
  52. Lenth RV. 2024. Emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package version 1.10.0.
  53. Oksanen J, Simpson GL, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, et al. 2022. *vegan*: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.6-4. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>
  54. Anderson MJ, Ellingsen KE, McArdle BH. 2006. Multivariate dispersion as a measure of beta diversity. *Ecol Lett* 9:683–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00926.x>
  55. Cáceres MD, Legendre P. 2009. Associations between species and groups of sites: indices and statistical inference. *Ecology* 90:3566–3574. <https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1823.1>
  56. Mallick H, Rahnavard A, McIver LJ, Ma S, Zhang Y, Nguyen LH, Tickle TL, Weingart G, Ren B, Schwager EH, Chatterjee S, Thompson KN, Wilkinson JE, Subramanian A, Lu Y, Waldron L, Paulson JN, Franzosa EA, Bravo HC, Huttenhower C. 2021. Multivariable association discovery in population-scale meta-omics studies. *PLoS Comput Biol* 17:e1009442. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009442>
  57. Fernandes AD, Reid JN, Macklaim JM, McMurrough TA, Edgell DR, Gloor GB. 2014. Unifying the analysis of high-throughput sequencing datasets: characterizing RNA-seq, 16S rRNA gene sequencing and selective growth experiments by compositional data analysis. *Microbiome* 2:15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-2618-2-15>
  58. Nearing JT, Douglas GM, Hayes MG, MacDonald J, Desai DK, Allward N, Jones CMA, Wright RJ, Dhanani AS, Comeau AM, Langille MGI. 2022. Microbiome differential abundance methods produce different results across 38 datasets. *Nat Commun* 13:342. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28034-z>
  59. Bonanomi G, Lorito M, Vinale F, Woo SL. 2018. Organic amendments, beneficial microbes, and soil microbiota: toward a unified framework for disease suppression. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 56:1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-080615-100046>
  60. Sasse J, Martinoia E, Norrhen T. 2018. Feed your friends: do plant exudates shape the root microbiome? *Trends Plant Sci* 23:25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2017.09.003>
  61. Matthews A, Pierce S, Hipperson H, Raymond B. 2019. Rhizobacterial community assembly patterns vary between crop species. *Front Microbiol* 10:581. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.00581>
  62. Antoniou A, Tsolakidou M-D, Stringlis IA, Pantelides IS. 2017. Rhizosphere microbiome recruited from a suppressive compost improves plant fitness and increases protection against vascular wilt pathogens of tomato. *Front Plant Sci* 8:2022. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.02022>
  63. Ding J, Wang N, Liu P, Liu B, Zhu Y, Mao J, Wang Y, Ding X, Yang H, Wei Y, Li J, Ding G-C. 2023. Bacterial wilt suppressive composts: significance of rhizosphere microbiome. *Waste Manag* 169:179–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2023.07.011>
  64. Blaya J, Marhuenda FC, Pascual JA, Ros M. 2016. Microbiota characterization of compost using omics approaches opens new perspectives for *Phytophthora* root rot control. *PLoS One* 11:e0158048. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158048>
  65. MeteoSchweiz. 2022. Klimabulletin Fruehling 2022. MeteoSchweiz, Zürich, Schweiz.
  66. Kong Y, Zhang J, Zhang X, Gao X, Yin J, Wang G, Li J, Li G, Cui Z, Yuan J. 2024. Applicability and limitation of compost maturity evaluation indicators: a review. *Chem Eng J* 489:151386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2024.151386>
  67. Villar I, Alves D, Garrido J, Mato S. 2016. Evolution of microbial dynamics during the maturation phase of the composting of different types of waste. *Waste Manag* 54:83–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.05.011>
  68. Bai Y, Wu D, Dolfing J, Zhang L, Xie B. 2024. Dynamics and functions of biomarker taxa determine substrate-specific organic waste composting. *Bioresour Technol* 393:130118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2023.130118>
  69. Kwok OCH. 1987. Interactions Between Bacteria and *Trichoderma hamatum* in Suppression of Rhizoctonia Damping-off in Bark Compost Media. *Phytopathology* 77:1206. <https://doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-77-1206>
  70. Galitskaya P, Biktasheva L, Saveliev A, Grigoryeva T, Boulygina E, Selivanovskaya S. 2017. Fungal and bacterial successions in the process of co-composting of organic wastes as revealed by 454 pyrosequencing. *PLoS One* 12:e0186051. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186051>
  71. Zhang Q, Liang G, Guo T, He P, Wang X, Zhou W. 2017. Evident variations of fungal and actinobacterial cellulolytic communities associated with different humified particle-size fractions in a long-term fertilizer experiment. *Soil Biol Biochem* 113:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2017.05.022>
  72. Langarica-Fuentes A, Zafar U, Heyworth A, Brown T, Fox G, Robson GD. 2014. Fungal succession in an in-vessel composting system characterized using 454 pyrosequencing. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 88:296–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6941.12293>
  73. Freeland JR. 2017. The importance of molecular markers and primer design when characterizing biodiversity from environmental DNA. *Genome* 60:358–374. <https://doi.org/10.1139/gen-2016-0100>
  74. Kurm V, Visser J, Schilder M, Nijhuis E, Postma J, Korthals G. 2023. Soil suppressiveness against *Pythium ultimum* and *Rhizoctonia solani* in two land management systems and eleven soil health treatments. *Microb Ecol* 86:1709–1724. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-023-02215-9>
  75. Wang H, Han L, Feng J, Zhang X. 2015. Evaluation of two *Streptomyces* spp. and compost for growth promotion and biocontrol potential against *Rhizoctonia solani* on pepper. *Biocontrol Sci Technol* 25:852–857. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09583157.2015.1015485>
  76. Postma J, Geraats BPJ, Pastoor R, van Elsas JD. 2005. Characterization of the microbial community involved in the suppression of *Pythium aphanidermatum* in cucumber grown on rockwool. *Phytopathology* 95:808–818. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-95-0808>
  77. Diaz-Diaz M, Bernal-Cabrera A, Trapero A, Medina-Marrero R, Sifontes-Rodríguez S, Cupull-Santana RD, García-Bernal M, Agustí-Brisach C. 2022. Characterization of actinobacterial strains as potential biocontrol agents against *Macrophomina phaseolina* and *Rhizoctonia solani*, the main soil-borne pathogens of *Phaseolus vulgaris* in Cuba. *Plants* 11:645. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11050645>
  78. Cordovez V, Carrion VJ, Etalo DW, Mumm R, Zhu H, van Wezel GP, Raaijmakers JM. 2015. Diversity and functions of volatile organic compounds produced by *Streptomyces* from a disease-suppressive soil. *Front Microbiol* 6:1081. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01081>



79. Mendes R, Kruijt M, de Bruijn I, Dekkers E, van der Voort M, Schneider JHM, Piceno YM, DeSantis TZ, Andersen GL, Bakker P, Raaijmakers JM. 2011. Deciphering the rhizosphere microbiome for disease-suppressive bacteria. *Science* 332:1097–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1203980>
80. Charest M-H, Beauchamp CJ, Antoun H. 2005. Effects of the humic substances of de-inking paper sludge on the antagonism between two compost bacteria and *Pythium ultimum*. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 52:219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsec.2004.11.017>
81. Borker SS, Thakur A, Kumar S, Kumari S, Kumar R, Kumar S. 2021. Comparative genomics and physiological investigation supported safety, cold adaptation, efficient hydrolytic and plant growth-promoting potential of psychrotrophic *Glutamicibacter arilaitensis* LJH19, isolated from night-soil compost. *BMC Genomics* 22:307. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-021-07632-z>
82. Zheng X, Wang J, Chen M, Chen Y, Chen Z, Wang M, Liu B. 2024. Testing a biocontrol agent consortium for suppression of tomato bacterial wilt through rhizosphere microecological regulation. *Agric, Ecosyst Environ, Appl Soil Ecol* 193:105155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2023.105155>
83. Liu Y, Zhang H, Wang J, Gao W, Sun X, Xiong Q, Shu X, Miao Y, Shen Q, Xun W, Zhang R. 2024. Nonpathogenic *Pseudomonas syringae* derivatives and its metabolites trigger the plant “cry for help” response to assemble disease suppressing and growth promoting rhizomicrobiome. *Nat Commun* 15:1907. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-46254-3>
84. Ou Y, Penton CR, Geisen S, Shen Z, Sun Y, Lv N, Wang B, Ruan Y, Xiong W, Li R, Shen Q. 2019. Deciphering underlying drivers of disease suppressiveness against pathogenic *Fusarium oxysporum*. *Front Microbiol* 10:2535. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.02535>
85. Snelders NC, Rovenich H, Petti GC, Rocafort M, van den Berg GCM, Vorholt JA, Mesters JR, Seidl MF, Nijland R, Thomma BPHJ. 2020. Microbiome manipulation by a soil-borne fungal plant pathogen using effector proteins. *Nat Plants* 6:1365–1374. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-020-00799-5>
86. Jaiswal AK, Elad Y, Paudel I, Graber ER, Cytryn E, Frenkel O. 2017. Linking the belowground microbial composition, diversity and activity to soil-borne disease suppression and growth promotion of tomato amended with biochar. *Sci Rep* 7:44382. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep44382>
87. Liu X, Mei S, Salles JF. 2023. Inoculated microbial consortia perform better than single strains in living soil: a meta-analysis. *Agric, Ecosyst Environ, Appl Soil Ecol* 190:105011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2023.105011>
88. Zhang Z, Zhang Q, Cui H, Li Y, Xu N, Lu T, Chen J, Penuelas J, Hu B, Qian H. 2022. Composition identification and functional verification of bacterial community in disease-suppressive soils by machine learning. *Environ Microbiol* 24:3405–3419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.15902>
89. Sagova-Mareckova M, Omelka M, Kopecky J. 2023. The golden goal of soil management: disease-suppressive soils. *Phytopathology* 113:741–752. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-09-22-0324-KD>
90. Wang Y, Zou Q. 2024. Deep learning meta-analysis for predicting plant soil-borne fungal disease occurrence from soil microbiome data. *Agric, Ecosyst Environ, Appl Soil Ecol* 202:105532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2024.105532>
91. Chen H, Ma K, Lu C, Fu Q, Qiu Y, Zhao J, Huang Y, Yang Y, Schadt CW, Chen H. 2022. Functional redundancy in soil microbial community based on metagenomics across the globe. *Front Microbiol* 13:878978. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2022.878978>
92. Carrión VJ, Perez-Jaramillo J, Cordovez V, Tracanna V, de Hollander M, Ruiz-Buck D, Mendes LW, van Ijcken WFJ, Gomez-Exposito R, Elsayed SS, Mohanraju P, Arifah A, van der Oost J, Paulson JN, Mendes R, van Wezel GP, Medema MH, Raaijmakers JM. 2019. Pathogen-induced activation of disease-suppressive functions in the endophytic root microbiome. *Science* 366:606–612. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaw9285>
93. Tracanna V, Ossowicki A, Petrus MLC, Overduin S, Terlouw BR, Lund G, Robinson SL, Warris S, Schijlen EGWM, van Wezel GP, Raaijmakers JM, Garbeva P, Medema MH. 2021. Dissecting disease-suppressive rhizosphere microbiomes by functional amplicon sequencing and 10x metagenomics. *mSystems* 6:e0111620. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.01116-20>
94. Anthony WE, Allison SD, Broderick CM, Chavez Rodriguez L, Clum A, Cross H, Eloé-Fadros E, Evans S, Fairbanks D, Gallery R, Gontijo JB, Jones J, McDermott J, Pett-Ridge J, Record S, Rodrigues JLM, Rodriguez-Reillo W, Shek KL, Takacs-Vesbach T, Blanchard JL. 2024. From soil to sequence: filling the critical gap in genome-resolved metagenomics is essential to the future of soil microbial ecology. *Environ Microbiome* 19:56. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40793-024-00599-w>