



HAL
open science

Letter to the Editor: The *Ralstonia* research community rejects the proposal to classify phylotype I *Ralstonia* into the new species *Ralstonia nicotianae*

Tiffany Lowe-Power, Parul Sharma, Poliane Alfenas-Zerbini, Belén Álvarez, Mohammad Arif, Caroline Baroukh, Elena Biosca, Ana Maria Bocsanczy, Jose Castillo, Gilles Cellier, et al.

► To cite this version:

Tiffany Lowe-Power, Parul Sharma, Poliane Alfenas-Zerbini, Belén Álvarez, Mohammad Arif, et al.. Letter to the Editor: The *Ralstonia* research community rejects the proposal to classify phylotype I *Ralstonia* into the new species *Ralstonia nicotianae*. *PhytoFrontiers*, 2023, 10.1094/PHYTOFR-06-23-0071-LE . hal-04188467

HAL Id: hal-04188467

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04188467>

Submitted on 25 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



Online Proofing System Instructions

The Online Proofing System allows proof reviewers to review PDF proofs, mark corrections, respond to queries, upload replacement figures, and submit these changes directly from the locally saved PDF proof.

1. For the best experience reviewing your proof in the Online Proofing System ensure you are connected to the internet. This will allow the PDF proof to connect to the central Online Proofing System server. If you are connected to the Online Proofing System server you should see a green check mark icon above in the yellow banner.



Connected




Disconnected

2. Please review the article proof on the following pages and mark any corrections, changes, and query responses using the annotation tools outlined on the next 2 pages.



3. Save your proof corrections by clicking the “Publish Comments” button in the yellow banner above. Corrections don’t have to be marked in one sitting. You can publish comments and log back in at a later time to add and publish more comments before you click the “Complete Proof Review” button below. Please compile the changes from all authors before clicking “Complete Proof Review.”



4. If you need to supply additional or replacement files bigger than 5 Megabytes (MB) do not attach them directly to the PDF Proof, please click the “Upload Files” button to upload files.

Upload files

[Click Here](#)

5. When your proof review is complete and all corrections have been published to the server by clicking the “Publish Comments” button, please click the “Complete Proof Review” button below:

IMPORTANT: Did you reply to all queries listed on the Author Query Form appearing before your proof?

IMPORTANT: Did you click the “Publish Comments” button to save all your corrections? Any unpublished comments will be lost.

IMPORTANT: Once you click “Complete Proof Review” you will not be able to add or publish additional corrections.

Complete Proof Review

[Click Here](#)

For technical questions about reviewing your proof contact Aptara_ops_support@aptaracorp.com
For all other questions, please feel free to contact PhytoFrontiers™ at: phytofrontiers@scisoc.org


USING e-ANNOTATION TOOLS FOR ELECTRONIC PROOF CORRECTION

Required software to e-Annotate PDFs: **Adobe Acrobat Professional** or **Adobe Reader (version 11 or above)**. (Note that this document uses screenshots from **Adobe Reader DC**.)

The latest version of Acrobat Reader can be downloaded for free at: <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>

Once you have Acrobat Reader open on your computer, click on the **Comment** tab (right-hand panel or under the Tools menu).

This will open up a ribbon panel at the top of the document. Using a tool will place a comment in the right-hand panel. The tools you will use for annotating your proof are shown below:




1. Replace (Ins) Tool – for replacing text.

 Strikes a line through text and opens up a text box where replacement text can be entered.

How to use it:

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on .
- Type the replacement text into the blue box that appears.



2. Strikethrough (Del) Tool – for deleting text.

 Strikes a red line through text that is to be deleted.

How to use it:

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on .
- The text will be struck out in red.

experimental data if available. For ORFs to be had to meet all of the following criteria:

1. Small size (35-250 amino acids).
2. Absence of similarity to known proteins.
3. Absence of functional data which could not be the real overlapping gene.
4. Greater than 25% overlap at the N-terminus with another coding feature; or both ends; or ORF containing a tRNA.

3. Commenting Tool – for highlighting a section to be changed to bold or italic or for general comments.

  Use these 2 tools to highlight the text where a comment is then made.

How to use it:

- Click on .
- Click and drag over the text you need to highlight for the comment you will add.
- Click on .
- Click close to the text you just highlighted.
- Type any instructions regarding the text to be altered into the box that appears.




4. Insert Tool – for Inserting missing text at specific points in the text.

 Marks an insertion point in the text and opens up a text box where comments can be entered.

How to use it:

- Click on .
- Click at the point in the proof where the comment should be inserted.
- Type the comment into the box that appears.




AUTHOR QUERIES

PLEASE RESOLVE ALL QUERIES

Thank you for publishing with *PhytoFrontiers*TM. Please feel free to contact project manager Melissa Evans (Melissa.Evans@aptaracorp.com) and APS technical editor Ted Salk (tsalk@scisoc.org) with questions and feedback. Please take the time to review the article carefully, including checking author names and affiliations. This is your last opportunity to make corrections.

- Q1:** AU: Note that any changes you made at First Look might not appear in the edited article because it was automatically exported for production quickly after acceptance. Please check if you made any changes and mark them clearly if this document does not already reflect them.
- Q2:** AU: Is there any funding source that you need to acknowledge? If so, please indicate it on the galley proof.
- Q3:** AU: Please provide the city for every affiliation where it is missing.
- Q4:** AU: Revision to affiliation 10 correct?
- Q5:** AU: Please provide keywords.
- Q6:** AU: ICSP was not used elsewhere, so I removed it.
- Q7:** AU: Lowe-Power et al. 2020 is not included in literature cited. Please either correct the citation or add the source to the list.
- Q8:** AU: Lowe-Power et al. 2020 is not included in literature cited. Please either correct the citation or add the source to the list.
- Q9:** AU: Lowe-Power et al. 2020 is not included in literature cited. Please either correct the citation or add the source to the list.
- Q10:** AU: Please check that the APHIS url is correct. It did not resolve when checked during copyediting.
- Q11:** AU: Fegan and Prior 2005 – please provide the name(s) of the editor(s).



Q1 Letter To The Editor

Q2 The *Ralstonia* Research Community Rejects the Proposal to Classify Q3 Phylotype I *Ralstonia* into the New Species *Ralstonia nicotianae*

Tiffany Lowe-Power^{1,†} | Parul Sharma² | Poliane Alfenas-Zerbini³ | Belén Álvarez⁴ | Mohammad Arif⁵ | Caroline Baroukh⁶ | Ana Maria Bocsanczy⁷ | Elena G. Biosca⁸ | José A. Castillo⁹ | Gilles Cellier¹⁰ | Teresa Coutinho¹¹ | André Drenth¹² | Ville-Petri Friman¹³ | Stephane Genin⁶ | Alice Guidot⁶ | Yasufumi Hikichi¹⁴ | Qi Huang¹⁵ | Anjali Iyer-Pascuzzi¹⁶ | Kenji Kai¹⁷ | Yann Pecrix¹⁸ | Stephane Poussier¹⁹ | Jane Ray²⁰ | Maurício Rossato²¹ | Rebecca Schomer²² | Maria Inés Siri²³ | Boris Vinatzer^{2,†} | Caitilyn Allen^{24,†}

¹ University of California, Davis, U.S.A.

² Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, U.S.A.

³ Department of Microbiology, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, MG, Brazil

⁴ Plant Protection Laboratory, IMIDRA, Community of Madrid, Spain

⁵ Department of Plant and Environmental Protection Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, U.S.A.

⁶ LIPME, Université de Toulouse, INRAE, CNRS, Castanet-Tolosan, France

⁷ University of Florida, U.S.A.

⁸ Universitat de València, Spain

⁹ Yachay Tech University, Ecuador

¹⁰ Anses Laboratoire de la sante des vegetaux, Saint-Pierre, Reunion Island, France

¹¹ Department of Biochemistry, Genetics and Microbiology, Centre for Microbial Ecology and Genomics/Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa

¹² University of Queensland, Australia

¹³ Department of Microbiology, University of Helsinki, Finland

¹⁴ Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Kochi University, Japan

¹⁵ Floral and Nursery Plants Research Unit, US National Arboretum, USDA/ARS, Beltsville, MD, U.S.A.

¹⁶ Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Purdue University, U.S.A.

¹⁷ Osaka Metropolitan University, Japan

¹⁸ CIRAD, UMR PVBMT, F-97410 Saint-Pierre, Réunion Island, France

¹⁹ Université de la Réunion, France

²⁰ Northern Territory Government, Australia

²¹ Universidade de Brasília, Brazil

²² School of Plant Sciences, University of Arizona, U.S.A.

²³ Molecular Microbiology Laboratory, Biosciences Department, School of Chemistry, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay

²⁴ Department of Plant Pathology, University of Wisconsin-Madison USA

† Corresponding authors: T. Lowe-Power; Tlowepower@ucdavis.edu, B. Vinatzer; vinatzer@vt.edu, and C. Allen; caitilyn.allen@wisc.edu

Accepted for publication 13 June 2023.

T. Lowe-Power and P. Sharma are co-first authors.

The author(s) declare no conflict of interest.

Abstract

The *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex is a group of globally important plant pathogens. Bacteria in this very large and genetically diverse group all colonize the xylem elements of angiosperm plants and cause high-impact wilting diseases of many crops. Because they threaten economic and food security, several *R. solanacearum* species complex subgroups are strictly regulated as quarantine pests. Biologically meaningful and consistent nomenclature is essential for organisms that have major economic and regulatory importance, such as plant-pathogenic *Ralstonia*. There are currently three species of *Ralstonia* wilt pathogens: *R. pseudosolanacearum* (corresponding to two phylogenetic groups that are described in the literature as phylotypes I and III), *R. solanacearum* (phylotypes IIA, IIB, and IIC), and *R. syzygii* (phylotype IV, containing three subspecies: subsp. *syzygii*, subsp. *celebensis*, and subsp. *indonesiensis*). A recent paper proposed reclassifying phylotype I as a new species named “*Ralstonia nicotianae*.” The purpose of this commentary is to register our objection to the taxon “*Ralstonia nicotianae*.”

Keywords:

The *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex (RSSC) is a group of globally important plant pathogens. Bacteria in this very large and genetically diverse group all colonize the xylem elements of angiosperm plants and cause high-impact wilting diseases of many crops. Because they threaten economic and food security, several RSSC subgroups are strictly regulated as quarantine pests (see “Regulation” section before the references). Biologically meaningful and consistent nomenclature is essential for organisms that have major economic and regulatory importance, such as plant-pathogenic *Ralstonia*. There are currently three species of *Ralstonia* wilt pathogens: *R. pseudosolanacearum* (corresponding to two phylogenetic groups that are described in the literature as phylotypes I and III), *R. solanacearum* (phylotypes IIA, IIB, and IIC), and *R. syzygii* (phylotype IV, containing three subspecies: subsp. *syzygii*, subsp. *celebensis*, and subsp. *indonesiensis*). A recent paper proposed reclassifying phylotype I as a new species named “*Ralstonia nicotianae*” (Liu et al. 2023). The purpose of this commentary is to register our objection to the taxon “*Ralstonia nicotianae*.”

ALTHOUGH CHANGING BACTERIAL TAXONOMY IS SOMETIMES NECESSARY, THE RALSTONIA NICOTIANAE PROPOSAL IS NOT JUSTIFIED

Changing the taxonomy of any group of organisms can be disruptive to both scientists and regulators, so it should not be proposed for trivial reasons, as explained in the



code of the International Committee on Systematics of Prokaryotes (Oren et al. 2023). There are two main reasons to propose new bacterial species. First, the isolation and discovery of novel bacteria that do not belong to any named species justifies the naming of a new species. Second, better data from technological and analytical advances can change our understanding of the diversity and evolution of bacterial lineages. With sufficient evidence, these advances can justify taxonomic revisions so that the newly named species better reflect evolutionary relationships. However, the *R. nicotianae* proposal is not based on discovery of a new lineage, nor does it reflect novel insight into the evolutionary relationships within the RSSC. As demonstrated below, the *R. nicotianae* proposal ignores natural phylogenetic gaps among the existing three species. Moreover, it is based on inappropriately selective use of molecular analyses.

During their decades-long careers, Drs. Philippe Prior and Mark Fegan collected and studied the diversity of RSSC plant pathogens from around the world. Both research group leaders concurred that the RSSC is properly divided into three species (Fegan and Prior 2005; Prior et al. 2016; Remenant et al. 2010, 2011; Safni et al. 2014). Specifically, extensive genomic and biological analyses of phylotype I and III strains led these and other experts to conclude that phylotype I and III should not be divided into distinct species (Prior et al. 2016; Sharma et al. 2022; Truchon et al. 2023). As a result, three RSSC species were validly published in 2014 as *R. solanacearum*, *R. pseudosolanacearum*, and *R. syzygii* (Safni et al. 2014). These names were subsequently validated by the list editors of the *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* (IJSEM). Figure 1 shows the overall relationships among subgroups of the RSSC in a phylogenetic tree constructed using the core genome of the species complex. *R. pseudosolanacearum* is composed of two major subgroups (phylotype I and III). *R. solanacearum* is composed of three major subgroups (phylotype IIA, IIB, and IIC).

NATURAL GAPS IN GENETIC DIVERSITY SEPARATE THE THREE RSSC SPECIES

Average nucleotide identity (ANI) is now an accepted way to use whole-genome sequences to measure relationships between strains and propose species delineations (Oren et al. 2023). The ANI between any pair of genomes can be calculated based on different algorithms, such as BLAST comparisons (“ANIb”) or the MUMMER index (“ANIm”). We used pyani (Pritchard et al. 2016), a Python-based ANIb software, to calculate pairwise ANIb values for 300 RSSC genomes, including genomes of 11 phylotype III strains and 148 phylotype I strains. When the resulting 90,000 ANIb values are hierarchically clustered and visualized as a heatmap, three obvious clusters correspond to the three accepted RSSC species (Fig. 2A).

AN ANI THRESHOLD OF 96% IS NOT THE APPROPRIATE CUTOFF FOR DELINEATING SPECIES IN THE RSSC

Depending on the taxon, bacterial species borders can be drawn using ANI threshold values of 95 to 96% (Chun et al. 2018; Oren et al. 2023). However, an ANI <95% is the most widely used cutoff for dividing species. This threshold has been applied across the bacterial domain in the Genome Taxonomy Database (Parks et al. 2020). We investigated the distributions of 90,000 ANIb comparisons among 300 RSSC genomes to determine if there is a biologically relevant cutoff that separates RSSC species.

The *R. nicotianae* proposal applied an 96% ANI species threshold value. However, our analysis of 300 RSSC genomes suggests that 95% is the appropriate threshold for delineating species

within the RSSC (Fig. 2). Visualizing the distribution of ANI values reveals an obvious natural gap in ANIb values: No pairwise comparison yields an ANI value between 92.57 and 95.06% (Fig. 2B). Applying an ANI cutoff of 96% (indicated by the red lines in Fig. 2 graphs) would interrupt a continuous distribution of genetic distances within the RSSC as a whole (Fig. 2B), within *R. solanacearum* (Fig. 2C), and within *R. pseudosolanacearum* (Fig. 2D). In contrast, a 95% ANI cutoff (indicated by the blue lines) separates the RSSC into three species with clear gaps that suggest that these groups have distinct evolutionary histories (Fig. 2E), and the existing three-species nomenclature may thus represent their natural phylogenetic order.

THE DATA PRESENTED IN THE *R. NICOTIANAE* PROPOSAL DO NOT SUPPORT A DIVISION OF PHYLTYPE I INTO A NEW SPECIES

This section provides a detailed dissection of ANI data to highlight the methodological problems in the *R. nicotianae* proposal.

The *R. nicotianae* proposal was based on limited analyses that compared genomes of a single phylotype I and a single phylotype III genome against other *R. pseudosolanacearum* genomes. This approach significantly biased the statistics and phylogenetic analyses, as it does not reflect the diversity of a representative population of isolates. The focal strains were the established type strain of *R. pseudosolanacearum* (phylotype III strain LMG9673^T) and a phylotype I strain (RS) that was proposed as a type strain for the novel species. Hereafter, we refer to this strain as RS^{proposed_T}.

The *R. nicotianae* proposal calculated ANI with three methods: FastANI using the Genome Taxonomy Database website interface, ANIb using the JSpeciesWS website interface, and MUMMER-based ANI (ANIm) using the JSpeciesWS website interface. The authors then carried out 434 FastANI comparisons (LMG9673^T and RS^{proposed_T} vs. 204 phylotype I and 11 phylotype III strains), 24 ANIb comparisons (LMG9673^T and RS^{proposed_T} vs. 1 phylotype I and 11 phylotype III strains), and 24 ANIm comparisons (LMG9673^T and RS^{proposed_T} vs. 1 phylotype I and 11 phylotype III strains).

Comparing RS^{proposed_T} to the 11 phylotype III genomes yielded FastANI values from 95.85 to 96.06%, ANIm values from 96.12 to 96.26%, and ANIb values from 94.95 to 95.33% as described in the *R. nicotianae* proposal. We also computed ANIb values, but we used the Python-based pyani tool over a larger sample size of phylotype I and III genomes (Fig. 2). In the subset of comparisons that overlap between our analysis and that of the *R. nicotianae* proposal, pyani yielded ANIb values from 95.77 to 96.02%. An overview of these data is presented in Figure 3A, which compares the ANI values obtained for each of the comparisons and methods.

For taxonomic classification, the most important ANI comparisons are between type strains. In the *R. nicotianae* proposal, comparisons between RS^{proposed_T} and the *R. pseudosolanacearum* type strain LMG9673^T yielded values of 95.97 to 96.02% (FastANI), 96.14 to 96.15% (ANIm), and 95.23 to 95.30% (ANIb). Our pyani calculation of ANIb yielded a narrow range of values from 95.81 to 95.82%.

Before genome sequences were readily available, the gold standard for classifying bacterial strains into species was a wet-lab technique called DNA-DNA hybridization (DDH). A 70% DDH threshold was used to delineate bacterial species. The *R. nicotianae* proposal used three digital DDH calculations (dDDH) to estimate DDH between RS^{proposed_T} and LMG9673^T. Two dDDH calculations yielded values above the standard 70% threshold (74.9 and 75.8%), and a third dDDH calculation yielded a value of 66.2%. If averaged, the three calculations yield 72.3%,




FIGURE 1 Core genome phylogenetic tree demarcating the three *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex species and their major subdivisions: *R. pseudosolanacearum* (phylotype I and III subdivisions), *R. solanacearum* (phylotype IIA, IIB, and IIC subdivisions (Sharma et al. 2022), and *R. syzygii*. The tree was built using IQtree (Minh et al. 2020) using the core-genome alignments obtained with PIRATE (Bayliss et al. 2019) as input.




FIGURE 2

The biologically relevant average nucleotide identity (ANI) threshold for delineating *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex (RSCC) species is 95%. **A**, Robust ANI analysis of 300 RSCC genomes reveals three species clusters corresponding to *R. pseudosolanacearum*, *R. solanacearum*, and *R. syzygii*. Pairwise comparisons are shown in an ANI heatmap calculated with the BLAST-based ANIb method using pyani (Pritchard et al. 2016). **B**, The distribution of pairwise ANIb values between 300 RSCC strains reveals a natural gap between pairs sharing 92.57 and 95.06% ANIb. ANIb was calculated with pyani (Pritchard et al. 2016). **C**, Comparison of ANI values within the *R. pseudosolanacearum* species and its two major subdivisions. **D**, Comparison of ANI values within the *R. solanacearum* species and its three major subdivisions. **E**, Comparison of ANI values between the three validated RSCC species. Blue lines show the biologically relevant ANI threshold of 95%, and red lines show the biologically inappropriate threshold of 96%.

above the 70% species cutoff. Figure 3B shows the full distribution of dDDH scores from the *R. nicotianae* proposal. However, the text of the *R. nicotianae* proposal emphasized only the lowest of these three DDH values.

The careful assessment above reveals that the conclusions in the *R. nicotianae* proposal were based on the sole DDH analysis and the sole ANI analysis where comparisons of type strains yielded a value less than the 70% DDH threshold and an ANI value in the gray zone of 95 to 96% ANI. This ignored the molecular phylogenomic analysis results that suggested that phylotype I should remain within the *R. pseudosolanacearum* species. Selecting among obtained results to present only the subset of results that support a preferred narrative is not consistent with good scientific practice (Casadevall and Fang 2016).

EVEN IF THERE WAS GENOMIC AND BIOLOGICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SEPARATION OF PHYLOTYPIC I INTO A NOVEL SPECIES, *NICOTIANAE* WOULD BE A MISLEADING SPECIES EPITHET FOR PHYLOTYPIC I

The epithet *nicotianae* was suggested because pathogenic bacteria are sometimes named for their host of isolation, usually the primary host, and the proposed Type strain RS^{proposed_T} was isolated from an experimental tobacco plot. However, this name would be misleading because infecting tobacco is not a distinguishing trait of phylotype I. RSSC strains from each of the four phylotypes have been isolated from tobacco (Lowe-Power et al. 2020). Furthermore, phylotype I strains have the broadest host range within the RSSC; Phylotype I strains have been isolated from 95 plant species in 79 genera in 46 families (Lowe-Power et al. 2020). In comparison, the other three phylotypes combined have been isolated from only 69 plant species in 40 genera in 28 families (Lowe-Power et al. 2020).

Proposing new names without careful consideration can create confusion in the research community and potentially in the

published literature. For example, the widely used NCBI genome database transiently adopted the *R. nicotianae* proposal. Within two weeks of the publishing of the *R. nicotianae* proposal in *Frontiers in Microbiology*, we noticed that NCBI had renamed the genome of the much studied model *R. pseudosolanacearum* strain GMI1000 as “*Ralstonia nicotianae*.” This occurred before the IJSEM list editors had the opportunity to consider this proposal and issue a decision about publishing the new name. Although GMI1000 is a phylotype I *R. pseudosolanacearum* strain, the GMI1000 genome was still labeled in NCBI as “*Ralstonia solanacearum*” for historical reasons: The genome was sequenced and deposited 14 years before the RSSC was formally divided into three species (Salanoubat et al. 2002). Importantly, this error was promptly corrected when it was brought to the attention of NCBI.

SUMMARY

Adopting “*R. nicotianae*” as a newly named species corresponding to phylotype I and reducing the validly published species *R. pseudosolanacearum* to include only phylotype III is not justified based on either genomic similarity or evolutionary relationships. On the contrary, the comparative genomics analyses presented in the *R. nicotianae* proposal are consistent with the conclusion that phylotype I and phylotype III are two subgroups of the same species, *R. pseudosolanacearum*. Furthermore, accepting a division of phylotype I and III into separate species would complicate and disrupt scientific and regulatory communication about strains and genomes of plant-pathogenic *Ralstonia*. Changing the name of a taxon that has been established and validated through multiple rigorous studies would create unnecessary confusion. This proposal violates three of the four essential elements of Principle 1 of the International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes, which states that nomenclature should “1) Aim at stability of names; 2) Avoid or reject names that create er-




FIGURE 3 The *R. nicotianae* proposal focused on outlier average nucleotide identity (ANI) and digital DNA-DNA hybridization (dDDH) calculations that supported a new species. **A**, Comparison of ANI values from the 12 pairs of genomes that were shared between the *R. nicotianae* proposal and our larger-scale analysis (Figs. 1 and 2). The *R. nicotianae* proposal analyzed ANI between six phylotype III genomes to two strains: the *R. pseudosolanacearum* type strain (LMG9673^T) and the phylotype I strain proposed as a new type strain (RS^{proposed_T}). **B**, Comparison of dDDH calculations from the *R. nicotianae* proposal. Lines connect the same strain pairings that were analyzed using three different dDDH tools. ANI and DDH comparisons of *R. pseudosolanacearum* type strain LMG9673^T and RS^{proposed_T} are shown in red. Arrows indicate the outlier results favored in the *R. nicotianae* proposal.

ror or confusions; and 3) Avoid the useless creation of names” (Oren et al. 2023). Finally, the chosen species name would be misleading regarding the host range of the strains that belong to it and to the related strains in other species within the RSSC and is thus in conflict with International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes Recommendation 12(c) 2: “Avoid [epithets] that express a character common to all, or nearly all, the species of a genus” (Oren et al. 2023). These reasons, together with the analyses presented in this letter, establish that “*Ralstonia nicotianae*” Liu et al. 2023 is at most a junior heterotypic synonym of *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* Safni et al. 2014.

Therefore, we strongly encourage our fellow scientists in the RSSC community not to adopt *R. nicotianae* in publications and scientific communication in general. We further respectfully request that the IJSEM list editors review the evidence presented here when considering whether *R. nicotianae* should be validly published.

Regulation

European Union: Regulation (EU) 2016/2031 of the European Parliament of the Council of 26 October 2016 on protective measures against pests of plants, amending Regulations (EU) No 228/2013, (EU) No 652/2014 and (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directives 69/464/EEC, 74/647/EEC, 93/85/EEC, 98/57/EC, 2000/29/EC, 2006/91/EC and 2007/33/EC <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/2031/oj>

United Kingdom: <https://planthealthportal.defra.gov.uk/pests-and-diseases/pest-and-disease-factsheets/notifiable-diseases/>

Canada: <https://inspection.canada.ca/plant-health/invasive-species/regulated-pests/eng/1363317115207/1363317187811>

United States: <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/import-information/rppl/rppl-table>

LITERATURE CITED

Bayliss, S. C., Thorpe, H. A., Coyle, N. M., Sheppard, S. K., and Feil, E. J. 2019. PIRATE: A fast and scalable pangenomics toolbox for clustering diverged orthologues in bacteria. *Gigascience* 8:giz119.

Casadevall, A., and Fang, F. C. 2016. Rigorous science: A how-to guide. *mBio* 7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01902-16>

Chun, J., Oren, A., Ventosa, A., Christensen, H., Arahall, D. R., da Costa, M. S., Rooney, A. P., Yi, H., Xu, X.-W., De Meyer, S., and Trujillo, M. E. 2018. Proposed minimal standards for the use of genome data for the taxonomy of prokaryotes. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 68:461-466.

Fegan, M., and Prior, P. 2005. How complex is the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex? Pages 449-461 in: *Bacterial Wilt Disease and the Ralstonia solanacearum Species Complex*. American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN.

Liu, J.-Y., Zhang, J.-F., Wu, H.-L., Chen, Z., Li, S.-Y., Li, H.-M., Zhang, C.-P., Zhou, Y.-Q., and Lu, C.-H. 2023. Proposal to classify *Ralstonia*

solanacearum phylotype I strains as *Ralstonia nicotianae* sp. nov., and a genomic comparison between members of the genus *Ralstonia*. *Front. Microbiol.* 14:1135872.

Lowe-Power, T., Avalos, J., Bai, Y., Charco Munoz, M., Chipman, K., Tom, C., and Williams, D. 2022. A meta-analysis of the known global distribution and host range of the *Ralstonia* species complex. *bioRxiv* <https://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.13.189936>

Minh, B. Q., Schmidt, H. A., Chernomor, O., Schrempf, D., Woodhams, M. D., von Haeseler, A., and Lanfear, R. 2020. IQ-TREE 2: New models and efficient methods for phylogenetic inference in the genomic era. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 37:1530-1534.

Oren, A., Arahall, D. A., Göker, M., Moore, E. R. B., Rossello-Mora, R., and Sutcliffe, I. C. (eds). 2023. International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes. Prokaryotic Code (2022 Revision). *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 73:005585.

Parks, D. H., Chuvochina, M., Chaumeil, P.-A., Rinke, C., Mussig, A. J., and Hugenholz, P. 2020. A complete domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 38:1079-1086.

Prior, P., Ailloud, F., Dalsing, B. L., Remenant, B., Sanchez, B., and Allen, C. 2016. Genomic and proteomic evidence supporting the division of the plant pathogen *Ralstonia solanacearum* into three species. *BMC Genomics* 17:90.

Pritchard, L., Glover, R. H., Humphris, S., Elphinstone, J. G., and Toth, I. K. 2016. Genomics and taxonomy in diagnostics for food security: Soft-rotting enterobacterial plant pathogens. *Anal. Methods* 8:12-24.

Remenant, B., Coupat-Goutaland, B., Guidot, A., Cellier, G., Wicker, E., Allen, C., Fegan, M., Pruvost, O., Elbaz, M., Calteau, A., Salvignol, G., Mornico, D., Mangenot, S., Barbe, V., Médigue, C., and Prior, P. 2010. Genomes of three tomato pathogens within the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex reveal significant evolutionary divergence. *BMC Genomics* 11:379.

Remenant, B., de Cambiaire, J.-C., Cellier, G., Jacobs, J. M., Mangenot, S., Barbe, V., Lajus, A., Vallenet, D., Médigue, C., Fegan, M., Allen, C., and Prior, P. 2011. *Ralstonia syzygii*, the blood disease bacterium and some Asian *R. solanacearum* strains form a single genomic species despite divergent lifestyles. *PLoS One* 6:e24356.

Safni, I., Cleenwerck, I., De Vos, P., Fegan, M., Sly, L., and Kappler, U. 2014. Polyphasic taxonomic revision of the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex: Proposal to emend the descriptions of *Ralstonia solanacearum* and *Ralstonia syzygii* and reclassify current *R. syzygii* strains as *Ralstonia syzygii* subsp. *syzygii* subsp. nov., *R. solanacearum* phylotype IV strains as *Ralstonia syzygii* subsp. *indonesiensis* subsp. nov., banana blood disease bacterium strains as *Ralstonia syzygii* subsp. *celebesensis* subsp. nov. and *R. solanacearum* phylotype I and III strains as *Ralstonia pseudosolanacearum* sp. nov. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 64:3087-3103.

Salanoubat, M., Genin, S., Artiguenave, F., Gouzy, J., Mangenot, S., Arlat, M., Billault, A., Brottier, P., Camus, J. C., Cattolico, L., Chandler, M., Choisine, N., Claudel-Renard, C., Cunnac, S., Demange, N., Gaspin, C., Lavie, M., Moisan, A., Robert, C., Saurin, W., Schiex, T., Siguier, P., Thébault, P., Whalen, M., Wincker, P., Levy, M., Weissenbach, J., and Boucher, C. A. 2002. Genome sequence of the plant pathogen *Ralstonia solanacearum*. *Nature* 415:497-502.

Sharma, P., Johnson, M. A., Mazloom, R., Allen, C., Heath, L. S., Lowe-Power, T. M., and Vinatzer, B. A. 2022. Meta-analysis of the *Ralstonia solanacearum* species complex (RSSC) based on comparative evolutionary genomics and reverse ecology. *Microb. Genom.* 8:00079.

Truchon, A. N., Dalsing, B. L., Khokhani, D., MacIntyre, A., McDonald, B. R., Ailloud, F., Klassen, J., Gonzalez-Orta, E. T., Currie, C., Prior, P., Lowe-Power, T. M., and Allen, C. 2023. Plant-pathogenic *Ralstonia* phylotypes evolved divergent respiratory strategies and behaviors to thrive in xylem. *MBio* 14:e0318822.

Q10

Q11