

1

2 **Phage-host interactions as a driver of population dynamics during wine**  
3 **fermentation: betting on underdogs**

4

5 **Amel Chaïb, Cécile Philippe, Féty Jaomanjaka, Yasma Barchi, Florencia Oviedo-**  
6 **Hernandez, Olivier Claisse and Claire Le Marrec\***

7

8 UMR 1366 OENOLOGIE, Univ. Bordeaux, INRAE, Bordeaux INP, Bordeaux Sciences Agro,  
9 Institut des Sciences de la Vigne et du Vin, Villenave d'Ornon, France.

10

11 \* Correspondence: clehenaff@enscbp.fr (CLM)

12

13 **Abstract**

14 Winemaking is a complex process in which numerous microorganisms, mainly yeasts and  
15 lactic acid bacteria (LAB), play important roles. After alcoholic fermentation (AF), most  
16 wines undergo malolactic fermentation (MLF) to improve their organoleptic properties and  
17 microbiological stability. *Oenococcus oeni* is mainly responsible for this crucial process where  
18 L-malic acid (MA) in wine converts to softer L-lactic acid. The bacterium is better adapted to  
19 the limiting conditions imposed by the wine matrix and performs MLF under regular  
20 winemaking conditions, especially in wines with a pH below 3.5. Traditionally, this process  
21 has been conducted by the natural microbiota present within the winery. However, the start,  
22 duration and qualitative impact of spontaneous MLF are unpredictable, which prompts  
23 winemakers to use pure starter cultures of selected bacteria to promote a more reliable,  
24 simple, fast and efficient fermentation. Yet, their use does not always ensure a problem-free  
25 fermentation. Spontaneous initiation of the process may prove very difficult or does not

26 occur at all. Such difficulties arise from a combination of factors found in some wines upon  
27 the completion of AF (high ethanol concentration, low temperature and pH, low nutrient  
28 concentrations, presence of free and bound SO<sub>2</sub>). Alongside these well documented facts,  
29 research has also provided evidence that negative interactions between *O. oeni* and other  
30 biological entities such as yeasts may also impact MLF. Another insufficiently described, but  
31 highly significant factor inhibiting bacterial growth is connected to the presence of  
32 bacteriophages of *O. oeni* which are frequently associated to musts and wines. The purpose  
33 of this review is to summarize the current knowledge about the phage life cycles and  
34 possible impacts on the trajectory of the microbiota during winemaking.

35

## 36 **Highlights**

37 ► Up to date inventory of lytic and temperate oenophages infecting *O. oeni* ► Interactions  
38 between MLF bacteria and phages over fermentation and impact on wine quality ►  
39 Lysogeny and selection of commercial starters ► Future prospects

40

## 41 **Keywords**

42 Malolactic Fermentation, Phage diversity, Lysogeny, Predation, Evolution, Starter selection

43

44

## 45 1. Introduction

46 Musts and wines are harsh environments sheltering a diverse microbial population  
47 inherited from grape berries, which undergo a succession of microbial community shifts  
48 during the winemaking process. The alcoholic fermentation (AF) is first driven by yeasts and  
49 is usually followed by the malolactic fermentation (MLF). The lactic acid bacterium (LAB)  
50 *Oenococcus oeni* is mostly involved in this transformation, which consists in the  
51 decarboxylation of L-malic acid (MA) into L-lactic acid and CO<sub>2</sub>. De-acidification will  
52 increase microbial stability through the utilization of remaining substrates and/or the  
53 production of antimicrobial components. MLF will also influence sensory properties and the  
54 wine color profile (Lorentzen and Lucas, 2019; Viridis et al., 2021).

55 Traditionally, MLF has been conducted by the natural microbiota present within the  
56 winery, and starts when the LAB population reaches 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL (Bartowsky, 2005;  
57 Lorentzen and Lucas, 2019). The MLF step is indeed a capricious step and slow or stuck MLF  
58 are frequent. Such issues can increase the risk of spoilage by other microorganisms and then  
59 decline the quality of wines. To better control MLF, commercial starters have been  
60 progressively selected. Despite great progress in the selection of robust strains, their  
61 stabilization through freeze-drying and acclimatization before inoculation, and finally use of  
62 different inoculation strategies (sequential versus co-inoculation), some wine types are still  
63 difficult to ferment. In the same time, natural solutions are searched for and should include  
64 environmentally friendly tools to improve the sustainability aspects of winemaking all along  
65 the production chain (Nardi, 2020).

66 The most frequently studied causes of problematic MLF have been identified and are well  
67 documented (Malherbe et al., 2007). They arise from a combination of factors found in some  
68 wines upon the completion of AF (high ethanol concentration, low temperature and pH, low

69 nutrient concentrations, presence of SO<sub>2</sub>). Aside from these physicochemical factors, little is  
70 known about the involvement of microbiological interactions. Antagonistic interactions  
71 between wine yeasts and LAB have been reported (Balmaseda et al., 2018; Viridis et al., 2021)  
72 showing that inhibitory metabolites produced by yeasts may also have an important role in  
73 the correct development of MLF. As natural predators of bacteria, bacteriophages may also  
74 impact the population of *O. oeni* over winemaking. High viral lysis pressure on the host may  
75 exert a major impact on bacterial diversity and the community structure (Braga et al., 2020).  
76 More importantly, for most phages infecting *O. oeni* (also named oenophages), lysis is not the  
77 only possible infection outcome. Most *O. oeni* strains are known to bear one or more  
78 prophages, which are released in wine upon their spontaneous induction from lysogens  
79 (Claisse et al., 2021).

80 Evidences about the crucial role of phages on ecosystem functions start to accumulate  
81 from other environments such as oceans, animal gut, or fermented foods (Braga et al., 2020;  
82 Paillet and Dugat-Bony, 2021). This may be time to look back on the knowledge gleaned on  
83 phage-host interactions in wine over the last 40 years. The objective of this review is to  
84 provide an update on the current knowledge and research on phage-host interactions in the  
85 wine LAB *O. oeni* and outline significant questions for future research. An analysis of the  
86 main structural and genomic characteristics of oenophages characterized during past  
87 decades will be given. Next the phage life cycles will be outlined, with a focus on the lytic-  
88 lysogeny decisions and co-evolution between the host and its phages. Finally, a perspective  
89 on the impact of lysogeny in the area of starter selection is discussed.

90

## 91 **2. Isolation and life cycles of oenophages**

### 92 *2.1. The isolation of oenophages from the enological environment*

93 Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) provided the earliest evidence of viral  
94 abundance in diverse red and white grape varieties in Switzerland (Cazelle and Gnaegi,  
95 1982; Gnaegi, 1983; Gnaegi et al., 1984; Sozzi et al., 1976, 1982), Australia (Henick-Kling et al.,  
96 1986a) and Germany (Arendt and Hammes, 1992). Although most wines under study had  
97 been inoculated by *O. oeni* specific strains, additional LAB were also part of the indigenous  
98 microbiota, such as pediococci, which are considered undesirable bacteria because of flavor  
99 depreciation and ropiness. An essential step was therefore to establish that the observed viral  
100 particles corresponded indeed to oenophages. To this aim, researchers exploited their own  
101 strain collections and wines in order to find the key sensitive strains of *O. oeni* that would  
102 serve as a host indicator to propagate the phages (Henick-Kling et al., 1986a). Most teams  
103 successfully isolated oenophages from wines by plating filtered samples directly with a  
104 sensitive host and looking for spot clearing or plaque formation using the double-agar plate  
105 (DAP) assay (Gratia, 1936). Philippe et al. (2017) later published an alternative enrichment  
106 culture method that might be useful when phage concentrations in samples are very low.  
107 Unfiltered samples were diluted into MRS broth containing pimarinic acid, an antimycotic  
108 compound killing yeasts, molds and other fungi and incubated during 5 days prior to  
109 plating. Phage lytic growth during this initial step was expected to be enhanced, while  
110 natural lysogens were also likely to release prophages.

111 Since the 80's, the DAP technique has been the gold standard method to detect  
112 oenophages over winemaking, in crushed fruits, musts, as well as over AF and MLF. A list of  
113 major phage biodiversity surveys in enological environment is given in **Table S1**. Trials to  
114 isolate oenophages from grape berries and vine leaves have been so far unsuccessful  
115 (Jaomanjaka et al., 2013; Nel et al., 1987), possibly due to low concentrations of metabolically  
116 active bacteria at these steps of the winemaking process. Of note, oenophages have been

117 isolated from materials such as second hand barrels (Berthelot, 2000). This may guide future  
118 surveillance in this neglected reservoir where *O. oeni* forms biofilms which confer specific  
119 technological properties to wine associated with the chemical transfers occurring at the  
120 wood/wine interface (Coelho et al., 2019). More importantly the DAP method also gave first  
121 insights into the viral community of wines. Plaques with distinct sizes, aspects and turbidity  
122 morphotypes could be repeatedly observed, reflecting phage diversity in wine samples  
123 (Philippe et al., 2017; Sozzi et al., 1976, 1982). Upon excision, several rounds of purification  
124 using the streak plating purification method were necessary to obtain a pure lysate for each  
125 individual phage, before subsequent characterization.

126

## 127 2.2. Strains as a reservoir for oenophages.

128 Most references related to the isolation of oenophages constantly reported the observation  
129 of turbid plaques on bacterial host lawns, and turbid plaques are the typical plaque  
130 morphology of temperate phages. It was therefore logical to screen bacterial isolates for  
131 lysogeny. Accordingly, cultivation-based assessment of lysogeny in the *O. oeni* species  
132 mobilized the community of microbiologists from all wine producing countries. The first  
133 demonstration of lysogeny amongst MLF bacteria was provided by Lee (1978) using  
134 mitomycin C (MC) as the inducing agent. This alkylating agent forms adducts with DNA  
135 and triggers prophage induction through bacterial DNA damage SOS response. Induction  
136 was carried out on early exponential cultures grown in MRS broth (OD 0.3-0.5) (**Table 1**).  
137 The test was considered as positive when lysis in MC-treated cultures was higher than in the  
138 control without MC. Chemical treatments of lysogenic strains with 0.5 to 1 µg/mL were the  
139 most effective at inducing phage production in *O. oeni* (Arendt et al., 1990, 1991; Cavin et al.,  
140 1991; Doria et al., 2013; Huang et al., 1996; Jaomanjaka et al., 2013; Poblet-Icart et al., 1998;

141 Tenreiro et al., 1993). Additional experimental verifications consisted in checking that the  
142 MC-treated culture supernatants formed lysis plaques on a sensitive strain, and not on the  
143 original lysogenic strain due to immunity to superinfection (Arendt and Hammes, 1992;  
144 Boizet et al., 1992; Huang et al., 1996; Tenreiro et al., 1993). A better efficacy of prophage  
145 release during UV treatment was reported by Doria et al. (2013) (**Table 1**).

146 Overall, there was a good correlation between lysis under the inducing agent and plaque  
147 forming capacity on a sensitive bacterial lawn. A few exceptions were observed including  
148 data by Tenreiro et al. (1993), who observed no MC-induced lysis for some strains, even  
149 though the supernatants produced lysis plaques on a host. In contrast, other authors  
150 observed lysis in MC-treated cultures without the concomitant detection of phages,  
151 suggesting the presence of defective phages and/or the lack of indicator strains in the panel  
152 used (Arendt et al., 1991). Finding a host to propagate a given induced phage is not as easy,  
153 and an alternative was proposed by Cavin et al. (1991) who successfully tested a MC-based  
154 curing treatment to isolate sensitive strains of *O. oeni*.

155 Convincing arguments for a high incidence of lysogeny in the species were provided by  
156 independant research groups, with frequencies ranging from 45% (Huang et al., 1996; Poblet-  
157 Icart et al., 1998) to 66% (Tenreiro et al., 1993) in different sets of strains. Molecular biological  
158 tools such as genetic mapping of strains (Zé-Zé et al., 2008), genomic subtractive  
159 hybridization (Bon et al., 2009) and finally high throughput genome comparisons (Borneman  
160 et al., 2010; Claisse et al., 2021) later confirmed that bacterial genomes are replete with  
161 prophages. Fast-sequencing throughput methods have increased the number of completely  
162 and publically available sequenced bacterial genomes to about 247 by february 2022, with the  
163 number increasing rapidly. Sequence-based explorations reported rates of 64%, 78% and 58%  
164 using sets of 14 (Borneman et al., 2010, 2012), 28 (Jaomanjaka et al., 2013) and 231 strains

165 (Claisse et al., 2021), respectively. In the later study, lysogens mostly harbored a single  
166 prophage (64.2%). Yet, a total of 48 poly-lysogens were identified and contained two (n=43)  
167 or three distinct prophages (n=5). Last, a bacteriophage sequence was shown to be tandemly  
168 duplicated at the integration site (Borneman et al., 2012).

169

### 170 2.3. Other phage life cycles

171 The existence of virulent oenophages was first suggested by Arendt et al. (1990) during  
172 the preparation of starter cultures. Strain 58N exhibited an unusual lysis and either  
173 spontaneous and MC-inductions of the culture resulted in the isolation of two nearly  
174 identical phages, namely P58I and P58II. No homology was observed between both phage  
175 DNAs and the chromosomal DNA. In addition, phage-free cultures of strain 58N could be  
176 isolated upon successive single-colony isolations. Both observations suggested unstable  
177 lysogeny in the cultures. Of note, *O. oeni* 58N strain was not immune any more to phage  
178 P58I. Its virulent behavior was proposed to result from a mutational event occurring into the  
179 prophage and leading to a poor repressor/operator affinity. Santos et al. (1996) and  
180 Jaomanjaka et al. (2016) made similar observations, and OE33PA was the first ex-temperate  
181 oenophages (phages which lost their ability to initiate and/or maintain lysogeny) to be  
182 characterized (Jaomanjaka et al., 2016).

183 These data also raised a number of questions regarding whether oenophages can establish  
184 a relationship with their hosts where bacteria and phages remain associated in equilibrium.  
185 Such persistent forms of infection have been described in virulent phages, and include the  
186 carrier state life cycle, which is also often observed during nutrient-limited conditions. Under  
187 these circumstances, phages can remain associated with a compatible host and continue to  
188 produce free virions to prospect for new hosts. The possible implications of this specific



189 phage-host interaction, both with respect to phage evolution and phage adaptation to new  
190 hosts have been recently discussed in the dairy LAB *Lc. lactis* (Marcelli et al., 2020) and  
191 deserve more work in *O. oeni*.

192 While microbial communities seemed to be shaped through ecological interactions  
193 between *O. oeni*, temperate and ex-temperate phages, the lack of strictly lytic oenophages  
194 was intriguing, and could be interpreted as an indication of an insufficiently sampled  
195 environment. In 2013, the whole oenological reservoir was explored for this specific phage  
196 hunt (Philippe et al., 2017). The strategy was to sample all wine-types and essential steps of  
197 the winemaking process (crushed grapes before fermentation, also named must; AF; MLF  
198 and aging wine in bottle) and to achieve a faster processing of the 166 samples as possible. A  
199 set of 30 phages producing clear plaques were isolated from the early steps of winemaking,  
200 including the representative strictly lytic Vinitor 162 phage (Philippe et al., 2021).

201

### 202 **3. Main characteristics of oenophages**

203

#### 204 *3.1. Oenophages electron microscopy and protein profiles*

205 Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) was used to observe more than 45 oenophages  
206 isolated from the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. They all possess icosahedral heads  
207 and long non-contractile tails (**Fig. 1; Table S2**) and are morphologically very similar to other  
208 characterized LAB phages, bearing in mind that most are of dairy origin (White et al., 2022).  
209 Phages able to infect other wine-associated LAB species such as *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum*,  
210 as well as *Leuconostoc* and *Weisella* species associated to various vegetable fermentations are  
211 more diverse and include tailless particles as well as phages with contractile tails (Kot et al.,  
212 2014; Kyrkou et al., 2019, 2020).

213 Head and tail structures vary in size among oenophages. Up to a twofold difference in  
214 phage-particle size was observed in lysates. LTH33P (head  $75 \pm 5$  nm and tail  $303 \pm 20$  nm)  
215 isolated in Germany (Schwarzriesling) is the larger oenophage observed so far (Arendt and  
216 Hammes, 1992). Santos et al. (1996) observed the smaller phage fogPSU-1 (head 34-43 nm  
217 and tail 228-243 nm) upon the MC treatment of a commercial starter (Tenreiro et al., 1993)  
218 (**Table S2**). The dimensions of the recently characterized strictly lytic phage Vinator 162  
219 (head  $55 \pm 3$  nm and tail  $205 \pm 8$  nm) fell in this range. Of note, Vinator 162 differed from  
220 other oenophages by presence of an extended unique thin tail fiber at the extremity of its tail  
221 (Philippe et al., 2021). The authors suggested that the tail extension harbors the receptor  
222 binding modules (carbohydrate binding modules) and constitutes therefore the *bona fide*  
223 receptor binding protein of the phage.

224 Consistent with the results generated using TEM, oenophages could also be  
225 distinguished based on the number and sizes of major structural proteins. Using one-  
226 dimensional SDS gels, particles were shown to contain 1 to 5 major proteins, in the molecular  
227 weight range of 14 to 46.5 kDa (**Table 2**). Phages were divided into 3 (Arendt and Hammes,  
228 1992; Arendt et al., 1991) or 4 groups (Santos et al., 1996).

229

### 230 3.2. Host ranges and burst sizes

231 The host range of a bacteriophage is defined by what bacterial genera, species and strains  
232 it can infect. As seen in **Table 2**, the host ranges of oenophages encompassed just certain  
233 strains of *O. oeni*. Phages 84,  $\Phi$ 1002, fog30, OE33PA and Vinator162 could not infect any  
234 strains of the related *O. kitaharae* species, nor bacteria from different LAB genera such as  
235 Pediococci, Lactiplantibacilli, Lactococci and *Leuconostoc* (**Table 3**).

236 The quantitative study of the life cycle of oenophages was characterized by one-step  
237 growth experiments. Data were obtained for 6 oenophages, namely P58I, P58II,  $\Phi$ 1002,  
238 LcO23, S1.1S and OE33PA. The most rapid phage growth in MRS broth was observed with  
239  $\Phi$ 1002 which had a relatively short latent period (60 min), followed by a rise period of 100  
240 min. The burst sizes all 6 tested oenophages were calculated to be approximately 16-20 to 55  
241 phage particles per infected bacterial cell (**Table 3**).

242

### 243 3.3. Oenophages and their genomes

244 As from 2005, NGS technologies combined with sophisticated bioinformatics changed the  
245 field of phage studies in *O. oeni* (Mills et al., 2005). Such innovations enabled a drastic  
246 increase in available sequence data (prophages and virulent phages) and paved the way to  
247 comparative genomic analyses. When processing these data, we and others could measure  
248 the importance and accuracy of the work carried out over previous decades using more time-  
249 consuming and technically-demanding strategies.

250 During the pre-genomic era, restriction enzymes proved to be useful for the physical  
251 dissection of the double-stranded DNA genomes of around fifteen oenophages. Restriction  
252 patterns of the genomes with various endonucleases (*Bam*HI, *Blg*I, *Eco*RI, *Eco*RV, *Hind*III,  
253 *Hinf*I, *Nde*I, *Stu*I) showed unambiguous differences between the temperate phages infecting  
254 *O. oeni*, which distributed into 3 to 6 groups (**Table 2**). The sizes of the phage genomes could  
255 also be deduced from the sum of the restriction fragments and ranged from 25.3 kb (phage  
256 P58I) to 40 kb (phage fog30) (Arendt et al., 1990; Santos et al., 1998). In 2021, the full genomes  
257 of 189 temperate and lytic oenophages, of various geographical origins and types of beverage  
258 (red, dry and sweet white wines, sparkling wines, cider and kombucha tea) have become  
259 available (Claisse et al., 2021; Jaomanjaka et al., 2018; Philippe et al., 2021). Their comparison

260 confirmed the limited variation in genome size (ranging from 35 to 46.2 kb) amongst  
261 oenophages and their uniform distribution across this interval. Of note, no phage holding a  
262 genome of about 25 kb resembling those earlier observed by Arendt et al. (1990) was  
263 identified. As the set of genomes analyzed contained most exclusively temperate phages, it is  
264 therefore likely that efforts are still needed to expand the repertoire of lytic phages infecting  
265 *O. oeni*.

266 All sequenced oenophages (lytic, temperate and ex-temperate) share the same synteny in  
267 terms of genome organization, with the replication module followed by modules for DNA  
268 packaging, morphogenesis, and lysis (Borneman et al., 2012; Chaïb et al., 2019; Jaomanjaka et  
269 al., 2016; Philippe et al., 2021) (**Fig. 2**). Host lysis relies on the viral endolysin and holin  
270 activities (Nascimento et al., 2008; São-José et al., 2000). Of note, the Lys44 lysin encoded by  
271 phage fOg44 has brought to light a new mechanism for endolysin targeting the  
272 peptidoglycan since it contains a peptide signal which allows its secretion to the periplasm.  
273 The peptide was later shown to be exported by the Sec machinery from the moment of its  
274 synthesis, and kept in an inactive state in the murein layer. Local conditions may inhibit the  
275 catalytic site of the enzyme, until the proper moment for lysis occurs (São-José et al., 2000).  
276 Oenophage gene sequences specifying endolysins are polymorphic (Borneman et al., 2012;  
277 Doria et al., 2013). The substrate recognition and optimum activity of such enzymes are not  
278 known.

279 Most temperate phages harbor two additional modules (**Fig. 2**). First prophages harbor  
280 unique complements of morons (“more DNA”) organized in a specific region downstream of  
281 the lysis module. Accretion of such elements is suggested to increase host fitness by  
282 encoding novel genes that make the bacteria more competitive in an old niche or allow them  
283 to exploit a new niche (Cumby et al., 2012).

284 A module at the left end of the genome is dedicated to lysogeny establishment and  
285 maintenance of temperate phages (**Fig. 2**). To carry out the site- specific recombination (SSR),  
286 such phages utilize an integrase of the tyrosine integrase family, of which *Escherichia coli*  
287 phage  $\lambda$  is the prototypical example. The two major constituents of the SSR unit,  
288 corresponding to the phage integrases and attachment sites (*attB*), have been studied in  
289 detail and this resulted in the clustering of prophages into six major groups (Int<sub>A</sub> to Int<sub>F</sub>),  
290 which are related to the integration site in the host chromosome (Claisse et al., 2021;  
291 Gindreau et al., 1997; Jaomanjaka et al., 2013; Parreira et al., 1999). All known members of a  
292 group included: 1) high identity of the integrase sequences (> 98% at the amino acid level)  
293 and 2) tropism for a specific bacterial attachment site corresponding to the 3' end of a tRNA  
294 gene. All identified integrases were observed to preferentially drive prophage integration  
295 into their expected cognate site, except some Int<sub>B</sub> prophages (22%) which become integrated  
296 at a secondary *att* site (Claisse et al., 2021; São-José et al., 2004).

297 Prophage genomes in wine strains belong to four groups (Int<sub>A</sub> to Int<sub>D</sub>) while Int<sub>E</sub> and Int<sub>F</sub>  
298 phages are likely to be associated with cider and kombucha strains, respectively. All  
299 prophage genomes are architecturally mosaics. In particular, temperate phages of the Int<sub>A</sub>,  
300 Int<sub>B</sub> and Int<sub>C</sub> groups are uniquely interconnected from an evolutionary perspective and  
301 undergo multiple events of genetic exchange, possibly in response to the selective pressure  
302 of their hosts, which drives their diversity (**Fig. 3**). Such homologies had been earlier  
303 observed during hybridization experiments between labeled phage DNA and the restriction  
304 fragments obtained from other phage genomes (Arendt and Hammes, 1992; Boizet et al.,  
305 1992; Nel, et al., 1987; Santos et al., 1996; Tenreiro et al., 1993).

306 The dominance of Int<sub>A</sub> prophages has been reported in wine-related strains (Chaïb et al.,  
307 2022; Claisse et al., 2021). They also represent most of the free-replicating phages isolated

308 from the oenological environment (Philippe et al., 2017). The intra-group relatedness reveals  
309 a continuum of genetic diversity which is shown in **Fig. 4 A**.

310 The reconstructed phylogeny of temperate oenophages showed that the sequences of Int<sub>D</sub>  
311 phages segregated into a distinct and well-supported cluster (**Fig. 3**). This particular cluster  
312 is homogeneous, and its members show few variable loci on their genomes. They have been  
313 recently assigned to the new genus Sozzivirus (Walker et al., 2021). A third cluster is  
314 represented by the lytic Vinitor phages (**Fig. 4 B**), a possible hybrid group, such as recently  
315 observed amongst dairy phages (see for review Romero et al., 2020). The phylogenetic trees  
316 constructed using their whole nucleic acid sequences as well as the MCP and TerL proteins  
317 indicated that Vinitor phages and a prophage in *C. intestini* (a gut-associated LAB from the  
318 bumble bee) are more closely related to each other than to any other sequenced LAB phages  
319 (Philippe et al., 2020).

320 Such clustering of oenophages was also later supported by the analyses of the  
321 mechanisms of encapsidation. Indeed, NGS data contain all the information necessary to  
322 deduce the genome end types and locations by using programs such as Phage Term  
323 (Garneau et al., 2017). A joint branching of the *cos*-containing oenophages of the Int<sub>A</sub>-Int<sub>B</sub>-Int<sub>C</sub>  
324 group was observed while Int<sub>D</sub> as well as Vinitor clusters harbor terminally redundant and  
325 circularly permuted phages due to headful packaging (*pac*-phages) (Claisse et al., 2021;  
326 Jaomanjaka et al., 2013).

327

#### 328 **4. Presence of oenophages during winemaking and impact on MLF**

329 During the 80's, a body of information from industrial dairy fermentations suggested that  
330 presence of phages resulted in reduced factory productivity and product quality worldwide.  
331 These elements highly challenged the development of dairy starter cultures (Romero et al.,

2020). Accordingly, first studies on oenophages also questioned the relationships between phage abundance and MLF defects in wines (Henick-Kling et al., 1986b; Gnaegi and Sozzi, 1983). The first reported oenophages were indeed successfully isolated from wines with sluggish or delayed MLF at the Swiss Federal Research Institute Changins. Cazelles and Gnaegi (1982) monitored 30 wines in swiss cellars which all exhibited a delay in their spontaneous MLF and phages were detected in 16 tanks. Sozzi et al. (1982) inoculated 4 wines with a single strain of *O. oeni*. All assays showed irregular or stuck MLF and phages were also readily observed. The same trend was later observed by Arendt and Hammes (1992), and oenophages were detected in 11 of 34 wines with problematic MLF. Lastly Davies et al. (1985) observed loss of viability of *O. oeni* in a Cabernet-Sauvignon wine and a concomitant interruption of MA degradation. This was not seen with Shiraz wines. Interestingly, the cellars which suffered viral attacks did not have any difficulties during the next vintage (Gnaegi, 1983).

These experimental data provided evidence that physicochemical parameters over winemaking (such as low pH and SO<sub>2</sub>) were impacting MLF. For the first time, they also suggested that phages could be responsible for irregular MLF and/or failure of starter activity upon inoculation. Hence, the observations made in cellars provided a major input into the possible impact of phage-host dynamics on the kinetics and efficiency of MA degradation in wines. Presence of phages was proposed to delay MLF (thereby increasing the time of storage) and produce wines with loss of freshness and residual MA content, allowing other undesirable LAB to develop, even in bottled wine (Davies et al., 1985; Gnaegi et al., 1984).

At this point, the observations from the cellars also left researchers with many unanswered questions. As an example, most studies included a qualitative assessment of the

356 presence of phage over MLF, and no continuous monitoring of the phage population was  
357 carried out over the whole process. Additional avenues for further research focused on (i) the  
358 nature of the mechanisms producing phages *in vino* (phage predation of sensitive cells *versus*  
359 prophage induction and lysis of lysogens), (ii) the possible permissiveness of some wine  
360 compositions towards phage growth and (iii) the ability of the ecosystem to readily evolve  
361 resistance to phage attack. Lastly, some technical challenges could also be pointed out in  
362 relation with the sampling design and striking limitations of the DAP method, due to  
363 possible adverse effects of the food matrix on phage particles. All these points are discussed  
364 below.

365

#### 366 *4.1. Limitations of the DAP method and wine factors determining phage activity and stability*

367 The DAP method requires a permissive strain to detect/enumerate oenophages and there  
368 is little chance that all phages present in a given wine will infect that specific strain. To date,  
369 few highly sensitive strains have been identified. As an example, Poblet-Icart et al. (1998)  
370 identified an isolate that proved to be sensitive to 75% of the strains of the FOEB collection  
371 (Faculty of Oenologie, Bordeaux, France). With this caveat, there is evidence that phage  
372 numbers in wines are likely to be underestimated when using the DAP method.

373 Plaque assay is restricted to the viruses that induce cell lysis or death and is therefore  
374 used to count infectious particles. Yet, phage infectivity may be lost upon prolonged  
375 incubation in wine and/or during storage of the collected samples prior to their processing in  
376 the laboratory. Phage lysates in MRS broth are stable during several months at 4°C  
377 (Jaomanjaka et al., 2013). In contrast, irreversible inactivation of particles was observed when  
378 the pH of the lysate was lowered from 4.8 to 3.5, resulting in a drastic decrease in titer of 1.6



379 and 4 log<sub>10</sub> after 22 h and 45 h of incubation, respectively. Oenophages lose their ability to  
380 form plaques in low pH wines below 3.5 (Davies et al., 1985; Henick-Kling et al., 1986a).

381 Ethanol is another compound that may alter phage infectivity. Its concentration in wines  
382 is most often ranging from 12.5% to 14.5% (vol/vol). Scarcely any reduction of the OE33PA  
383 phage titer was observed after 72 h of storage in the presence of 15% ethanol, and similar  
384 trends have been observed with most LAB phages (Jaomanjaka et al., 2013). Robustness of  
385 particles to alcohol is supported in the data by Liu et al. (2015) who successfully used phages  
386 to control production losses due to spoiling *Lb. plantarum* strains in the ethanol fermentation  
387 industry.

388 Different treatments such as the addition of sulfites (SO<sub>2</sub> >50 mg/mL) and bentonite also  
389 inactivate phage particles during the storage of red and white wines (Davies et al., 1985;  
390 Henick-Kling et al., 1986a). Bentonite is used for fining, clarification, settling and stabilization  
391 of white or rosé wines.

392 As a conclusion, there's a complexity of wine styles and chemical compositions  
393 worldwide. Phage inactivation can be due to a number of factors of which some are arguably  
394 little understood, and yet unspecified ones. Taking this into account, the design of surveys  
395 using the DAP method should encourage the frequent collect of samples in cellars and their  
396 rapid processing back to the laboratory. Future developments based on qPCR, digital PCR or  
397 new imaging strategies are also needed to help in circumventing the current issues during  
398 phage studies on wine (Jaomanjaka et al., 2013; Perlemoine et al., 2021; Philippe, 2017).

399

#### 400 4.3. Phage populations in wine reflect the spontaneous induction from lysogens during MLF

401 Presence of prophages has been progressively shown to be prevalent amongst commercial  
402 strains (Borneman et al., 2010; Jaomanjaka et al., 2013; Onetto et al., 2021; Patel, 1989) as well

403 as in the dominating indigenous population isolated from red wines upon completion of  
404 MLF (Chaïb et al., 2022). During the successful spontaneous MLF of red wines, prophages  
405 were shown to be excised from the chromosome, replicated, packaged, and then released  
406 from the cells in substantial amounts. Parallel growth curves of bacteria and phages were  
407 observed and the bacteria to phage ratio, as assessed by the DAP method, kept constant  
408 (about  $10^3$ - $10^4$ ) (Gindreau, 1998). Later Jaomanjaka et al. (2013) compared the spontaneous  
409 phage induction (SPI) of strains harboring Int<sub>A</sub>, Int<sub>B</sub> or Int<sub>D</sub> type prophages. Strains were  
410 inoculated in a filtered wine at the initial concentration of  $5 \times 10^7$  CFU/mL. Lower phage  
411 concentrations were measured for strains carrying an Int<sub>D</sub> prophage compared to others,  
412 suggesting a higher stability of the Int<sub>D</sub> prophage or a higher sensitivity of Int<sub>D</sub> particles to  
413 wine (Jaomanjaka, 2014). Such differences ~~in the lysis lysogeny decision amongst different~~  
414 ~~types of prophages~~ were also observed in MRS and Red Grape Juice (RGJ) broths (Chaïb et  
415 al., 2019; Jaomanjaka et al., 2013). Intriguingly, the induced release of prophages did not  
416 seem to result in massive cell lysis under laboratory conditions. It has been long thought that  
417 when ratios of phage to bacteria are high, phages would enter a lysogenic life cycle to ensure  
418 persistence in the community. However, Knowles et al. (2016) proposed an opposing view  
419 point. With increased bacterial abundances, phages would make a transition from lysis to  
420 lysogeny allowing them to take advantage of the success of their host in “Piggy-Back-The-  
421 Winner” dynamics.

422

#### 423 *4.4. Does phage predation occur during winemaking ?*

424 Another important question to better understand phage-host dynamics “in the wild” has  
425 been to assess whether oenophages could prey on bacteria under regular wine conditions  
426 during MLF. Phage infection requires actively metabolic bacterial cells. Also as a first step in

427 the process, the recognition and binding of the phage to its bacterial host requires the  
428 presence of functional and accessible receptors and anti-receptors on the host and the phage,  
429 respectively. It was therefore anticipated that growth in wine could not only determine  
430 phage infectivity and stability but also impact the bacterial partner in this interaction. To  
431 study phage predation under wine conditions, the indigenous microbiota was removed by  
432 filtration offering simpler wine models in which bacteria and phages were added.

433 A first trial by Davies et al. (1985) reported on the inoculation of a filter-sterilized Shiraz  
434 wine (pH 3.5; no SO<sub>2</sub>) with two *O. oeni* sensitive strains, in conjunction with 10<sup>3</sup> PFU of  
435 phage. Infection did not modify the trajectory of the culture and MLF was completed. In  
436 another study, filtered red and white wines were inoculated with a single phage and its  
437 respective host for propagation, and a phage-free culture served as a control (Henick-Kling  
438 et al., 1986b). Two phages were tested: Lco23 from a Chasselas white wine from Switzerland  
439 and S1.1s from an Australian red wine. In red wine, phage S1.1s inhibited MLF at pH 3.25; 3.5  
440 and 4. The onset and completion of MLF were delayed by 8 and 2 days in the infected assays  
441 at pH 3.25. In contrast, phage Lco23 did not modify the trajectory of the culture in the same  
442 wines. It was further shown in laboratory media that S1.1s and Lco23 were the most active at  
443 low (3.5) and high pH (5.5), respectively.

444 More importantly, this elegant study also showed that MLF in the white wine tested was  
445 not inhibited by either phage. This pointed to the possible distinct level of permissiveness of  
446 wines to phage infection and attention was drawn to their phenolic compounds. Monomeric  
447 phenolic compounds such as caffeic acid, present at high concentration in white wines, were  
448 shown to protect *Lacticaseibacillus casei* strain from the attack by phage PL-1 (Lee et al., 1985).  
449 Supporting data were later obtained by Philippe et al. (2017). Quercetin, myricetin and *p*-  
450 coumaric acid, significantly reduced the phage predation of *O. oeni* by phage OE33PA when

451 provided as individual pure molecules, as also did other structurally related compounds  
452 such as cinnamic acid. Their presence was correlated with a reduced adsorption rate of the  
453 phage on its host. Strikingly, none of the identified compounds affected the killing activity of  
454 the distantly related lytic phage Vinitor162. OE33PA and Vinitor162 were recently shown to  
455 exhibit different entry mechanisms to penetrate into bacterial cells (Goulet and Cambillau,  
456 2021; Philippe et al., 2021). The authors proposed that ligand-receptor interactions that  
457 mediate phage adsorption to the cell surface are diverse in *O. oeni* and are subject to  
458 differential interference by phenolic compounds. Their presence did not induce any  
459 modifications in the cell surface as visualized by TEM. In contrast, docking analyses suggest  
460 that quercetin and cinnamic acid may interact with the tail of OE33PA and compete with  
461 host recognition.

462

#### 463 4.5. Resilience of the ecosystem to phage pressure

464 Some of the different studies described above highlighted the possible resilience of the  
465 wine ecosystem upon phage attack during MLF. In phage-containing wines, a succession of  
466 decrease and regrowth of the bacterial population (although at a slower rate than initially)  
467 was observed (Davis et al., 1985; Henick-Kling et al., 1986a). It was early proposed that wines  
468 contain a population of distinct *O. oeni* strains which perform MLF, and this has been  
469 recently confirmed through progress in genotyping (Chaïb et al., 2022; El Khoury et al.,  
470 2017). A diversity of the indigenous microflora regarding to phage sensitivity (~~was expected~~  
471 ~~to lead to the rapid emergence of resistant clones which would then outgrow the other~~  
472 ~~strains (Davis et al., 1985; Henick-Kling et al., 1986a). Thus, initial bacterial diversity post AF~~  
473 ~~in wines)~~ would ensure the production of a sufficient biomass to degrade MA in the presence  
474 of phages. ~~The hypothesis that phage selection can maintain steady state bacterial~~

475 ~~community composition via classic predator-prey dynamics was confirmed by)~~ Recent *in*  
476 *silico* analyses of bacterial genomes ~~which~~ highlighted the presence of phage resistant  
477 determinants such as Sie (superexclusion), Abi (abortive infection) and RM (restriction-  
478 modification) which may serve to limit phage host range in *O. oeni* (Claisse et al., 2021;  
479 Jaomanjaka et al., 2013). Other types of innate immunity mechanisms in bacteria have been  
480 recently reviewed and may be present and prove to be functional in the *O. oeni* species (see  
481 for review Isaev et al., 2021). The possible contribution of mobile genetic elements to  
482 extensive horizontal gene transfer of such defense systems and their turnover in bacterial  
483 populations also deserve further work in *O. oeni* (Claisse et al., 2021; Hussain et al., 2021).

484 Recent advances now suggest to integrate ecological interactions into a co-evolutionary  
485 framework. The Red Queen hypothesis, also termed the evolutionary arms-race hypothesis,  
486 posits that competitive environmental interactions, such as those displayed by hosts and  
487 parasites, will lead to continuous variation and selection towards adaptation of the host, and  
488 counter-adaptations on the side of the parasite (Stern and Sorek, 2011; Van Valen, 1973).  
489 Bacterium-phage coevolution produces consecutive rounds of mutations whereby bacteria  
490 evolve resistance to initial adsorption or infection, followed by phage host range mutations  
491 to overcome resistance. In agreement with the hypermutator status of the species (Marcobal  
492 et al., 2008), Bacterial Insensitive Mutants (BIMs) have been readily produced with different  
493 two oenophages (Vinitor162 and OE33PA) under laboratory conditions (Philippe et al., 2020).  
494 Sequencing of BIMs derivatives should bring important information on the bacterial genes  
495 that are necessary for these phages to complete their lytic cycle in *O. oeni*. In contrast to the  
496 dairy LAB *Streptococcus thermophilus*, the emergence of BIMs will not be dependent on  
497 CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats)-Cas system, as the

498 later system is absent in the *O. oeni* species (Borneman et al., 2010; Marcobal et al., 2008; Mills  
499 et al., 2005).

500

## 501 **5. Lysogeny during winemaking: part of the problem or the solution ?**

### 502 *5 .1. Lysogens are detected upon completion of MLF in wines*

503 A simple and effective tool to provide genetic, ecological, and functional insights into  
504 lysogeny in the *O. oeni* species was proposed by Chaïb et al. (2019). Lysogens were observed  
505 to undergo white-red morphotypic switching when grown on agar media containing red  
506 grape juice, providing a simple and inexpensive method to distinguish between lysogenic  
507 and non lysogenic derivatives. The method was further used to assess the incidence of  
508 lysogeny during winemaking in 3 wineries (Chaïb et al., 2022). The dominant LAB  
509 population present in eleven red wines was collected at the end of the MLF step and  
510 enumerated on RGJ agar. Using VNTR and prophage typing analyses, the authors showed  
511 the prevalence of lysogeny in the *O. oeni* population driving the spontaneous MLF in red  
512 wines (58.5%, n= 94 strains). The rate of lysogeny was not homogeneous across wineries  
513 (24%, 65% and 86%). Yet, a few prophage-types belonging to the Int<sub>A</sub> and Int<sub>B</sub> groups  
514 dominated amongst the mono- and double-lysogens isolated, as well as amongst the free  
515 replicating particles found in the tested wines. Interestingly, some bacterial genetic  
516 backgrounds were particularly prone to lysogenization. This would suggest that lysogens  
517 may release prophages which may infect and convert other sensitive strains to lysogeny  
518 (Chaïb et al., 2022).

519

### 520 *5 .2. Lysogeny amongst MLF starters*

521 Today, more than 50 different strains are commercialized and the market is highly  
522 competitive. Cultures were first available in liquid forms, and direct inoculation of freeze-  
523 dried cultures have been progressively developed. They contain a minimum of  $10^{11}$  CFU/g  
524 and are inoculated to ensure an initial population of  $10^6$  CFU/mL, which is required to start  
525 MLF. Winemakers have the possibility to inoculate wine LAB into the grape must together  
526 with the yeast or sequentially at the end or post AF.

527 The early studies on oenophages questioned the need to take proactive strategies to phage  
528 management in the enological sector, especially during the development of MLF cultures. In  
529 particular, the question was raised as to select several strains with different sensitivity to  
530 phages and use them to design mixed and possibly rotational mixtures (Sozzi et al., 1982).  
531 Yet, the majority of the selected wine LAB starter cultures are currently the pure single strain  
532 cultures. An exception is the use of a mixed culture consisting of one selected  
533 *Lactobacillus plantarum* and one selected *O. oeni* strain (Krieger-Weber et al., 2020).  
534 Multi-strain starters are not currently favored because no scientific data proved any synergy  
535 between strains, resulting in a higher performance compared to pure strains.

536 Guidelines for selecting MLF starters were proposed by Torriani et al. (2011) and included  
537 the absence of prophages in selected strains. From the perspective of a supplier of  
538 commercial MLF starter cultures, the instability of prophages was expected to impose a huge  
539 metabolic burden on the cells by phage particle production. Alternately, prophages may also  
540 recombine with other lysogenic or lytic phages in wines, resulting in the release of new  
541 phages with modified host range and virulence. Yet, recent surveys of prophages among *O.*  
542 *oeni* commercial strains highlighted a contrasted situation with prophage-free strains, as well  
543 as lysogens harboring one or two prophages (Jaomanjaka et al., 2013; Onetto et al., 2021).  
544 This might suggest that lysogeny is not detrimental during the production and

545 implementation of these strains in wines. Most commercial starters have been isolated from  
546 wines that exhibited rapid and efficient MLF. The question is then to know whether the  
547 selection of lysogens is a pure coincidence reflecting the high prevalence of lysogeny during  
548 spontaneous MLF, or whether true benefits can be due to prophages at some stages.

549 First insights were provided by Chaïb et al. (2019) who observed that temperate  
550 oenophages do not impose a cost to cellular growth in RGJ broth and may even favor  
551 growth. The authors used a sensitive strain that was lysogenized by distinct phages  
552 ( $\Phi$ CiNe<sub>IntA</sub>,  $\Phi$ 10MC<sub>IntB</sub> or  $\Phi$ OE33SAG<sub>IntD</sub>). The growth profiles and quantification of phage  
553 particle release of the original strain and its three derivatives were monitored  
554 simultaneously. Strains had similar growth patterns in RGJ broth but the lag time duration  
555 was significantly lower for the derivative harboring  $\Phi$ 10MC<sub>IntB</sub>. In another study, lysogens  
556 isolated from wines were observed to be the most phage-resistant strains (Costantini et al.,  
557 2017) suggesting that prophages may therefore provide protection to the bacterial host  
558 against other phages.

559 Ongoing research and analysis will shed more light on the interactions between starters  
560 and the indigenous flora, which may change over winemaking, in relation with population  
561 levels and composition of the medium. Prophage may supply beneficial functions contained  
562 in morons and/or control expression of essential bacterial genes under stressful conditions.  
563 Alternately, prophages may also constitute weapons in bacterial competition (Alexeeva et al.,  
564 2018). The release of active phage particles by SPI in this context may therefore facilitate  
565 starter implantation (Harrison and Brockhurst, 2017).

566

## 567 **6. Future prospects and conclusive remarks**



568 Investigations in the last four decades show that *O. oeni* co-exists with a diversity of  
569 temperate as well as strictly lytic phages. However, the infection strategies are more intricate  
570 than previously postulated. It is likely that bacteriophage predation regulates microbial  
571 abundance and diversity and more efforts are needed to expand the repertoire of lytic  
572 oenophages. Yet, the impact and ecology of temperate oenophages have been  
573 underestimated and they may be “double-edged swords” in bacterial warfare (Gama et al.,  
574 2013).

575 These complex interactions probably reflect the oenological parameters of the wines and  
576 the overall fluctuating resources resulting from competition with other microorganisms.  
577 Data found in the literature point to the importance of a broader understanding of the  
578 spatiotemporal dynamics of oenophages and their hosts. Future work is needed to better  
579 understand how evolved and intrinsic bacterial phage resistance drives antagonistic  
580 coevolution that can shape phage and bacterial host genomes.

581 Phage-host interactions offer a comprehensive way of viewing the biology of *O. oeni*.  
582 They may provide insights into cell wall dynamics, mobile elements with regard to phage  
583 defense systems and their horizontal transfer through transduction, architecture of the  
584 genomes, and domestication to specific niches. Research advances may also give interesting  
585 clues as to the selection of MLF starters and fitness trade-offs resulting from bacteriophage  
586 resistance, and open the way for novel biocontrol strategies in the sector.

587

## 588 **Acknowledgements**

589 Special thanks should be given to our colleagues from the Phages.fr network for  
590 stimulating discussions, encouragement and useful critiques of the research work performed

591 in our laboratory on phage-host interactions in wine. Advice and financial support by the  
592 Nouvelle-Aquitaine Region, the Lallemand company (Magali Bou-Deleris and Sibylle  
593 Krieger) and the french ANR agency (grant ANR-20-CE20-0008-01) have been a great help in  
594 our work.

595

## 596 **References**

597 Alexeeva et al., 2018 S. Alexeeva, J.A.G. Martínez, M. Spus, E.J. Smid

598 **Spontaneously induced prophages are abundant in a naturally evolved bacterial starter**  
599 **culture and deliver competitive advantage to the host**

600 BMC Microbiol., 18 (2018), pp. 1–16

601 Arendt et al., 1990 E.K. Arendt, H. Neve, W.P. Hammes

602 **Characterization of phage isolates from a phage-carrying culture of *Leuconostoc oenos***  
603 **58N.**

604 Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 34 (1990), pp. 220–224

605 Arendt et al., 1991 E.K. Arendt, A. Lonvaud, W.P. Hammes

606 **Lysogeny in *Leuconostoc oenos***

607 Microbiology, 137 (1991), pp. 2135–2139

608 Arendt and Hammes, 1992 E.K. Arendt, W.P. Hammes

609 **Isolation and characterization of *Leuconostoc oenos* phages from German wines**

610 Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 37 (1992), pp. 643–646

611 Balmaseda et al., 2018 A. Balmaseda, C. Bordons, C. Reguant, J. Bautista-Gallego

612 **Non-Saccharomyces in wine: effect upon *Oenococcus oeni* and malolactic fermentation**

613 Front. Microbiol., 9 (2018), Article 534

614 Bartowsky, E.J., 2005 E.J. Bartowsky

615 ***Oenococcus oeni* and malolactic fermentation – moving into the molecular arena**  
616 FEMS Microbiol. Rev., 41 (2017), pp.84-94  
617 Berthelot, 2000 S. Berthelot

618 **Utilisation and maintenance of second hand barrels: risks and opportunities**  
619 2<sup>nd</sup> International Viticulture and Enology Congress, Cape Town, South Africa  
620 Boizet et al., 1992 B. Boizet, M. Mata, O. Mignot, P. Ritzenthaler, T. Sozzi

621 **Taxonomic characterization of *Leuconostoc mesenteroides* and *Leuconostoc oenos***  
622 **bacteriophage**  
623 FEMS Microbiol. Lett., 90 (1992), pp. 211–215

624 Bon et al., 2009 E. Bon, A. Delaherche, E. Bihère, A. de Daruvar, A. Lonvaud-Funel, C. Le  
625 Marrec

626 ***Oenococcus oeni* genome plasticity is associated with fitness.**  
627 Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 75 (2009), pp 2079–2090

628 Borneman et al., 2010 A.R. Borneman, E.J. Bartowsky, J. McCarthy, P.J. Chambers

629 **Genotypic diversity in *Oenococcus oeni* by high-density microarray comparative**  
630 **genome hybridization and whole genome sequencing**  
631 Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 86 (2010), pp.681–691

632 Borneman et al., 2012 A.R. Borneman, J.M. McCarthy, P.J. Chambers, E.J. Bartowsky

633 **Comparative analysis of the *Oenococcus oeni* pan genome reveals genetic diversity in**  
634 **industrially-relevant pathways**  
635 BMC Genomics, 13 (2012), Article 373

636 Cavin et al., 1991 J.F. Cavin, F.Z. Drici, H. Prevost, C. Divies

637 **Prophage curing in *Leuconostoc oenos* by mitomycin C induction**  
638 Am. J. Enol. Vitic., 42 (1991), pp. 163–166

639 Cazelles and Gnaegi, 1982 O. Cazelles, F. Gnaegi  
640 **Enquête sur l'importance pratique du problème des bactériophages dans le vin**  
641 Rev. Suisse Vitic. Arboric Hortic., 14 (1982), pp. 267–270

642 Chaïb et al., 2019 A. Chaïb, C. Philippe, F. Jaomanjaka, O. Claisse, M. Jourdes, P. Lucas, S.  
643 Cluzet, C. Le Marrec  
644 **Lysogeny in the lactic acid bacterium *Oenococcus oeni* is responsible for modified**  
645 **colony morphology on red grape juice agar**  
646 Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 85 (2019), Article 00997-19

647 Chaïb et al., 2022 A. Chaïb, O. Claisse, E. Delbarre, J. Bosviel, C. Le Marrec  
648 **Assessment of the lysogenic status in the lactic acid bacterium *O. oeni* during the**  
649 **spontaneous malolactic fermentation of red wines**  
650 Food Microbiol., 103 (2022), Article 103947

651 Claisse et al., 2021 O. Claisse, A. Chaïb, F. Jaomanjaka, C. Philippe, Y. Barchi, P.M. Lucas, C.  
652 Le Marrec  
653 **Distribution of prophages in the *Oenococcus oeni* species**  
654 Microorganisms, 9 (2021), Article 856

655 Coelho et al., 2019 C. Coelho, R.D. Gougeon, L. Perepelkine, H. Alexandre, J. Guzzo, S.  
656 Weidman  
657 **Chemical transfers occurring through *Oenococcus oeni* biofilm in different enological**  
658 **conditions**  
659 Front. Nutr., 6 (2019), Article 95

660 Costantini et al., 2017 A. Costantini, F. Doria, J.C. Saiz, E. Garcia-Moruno  
661 **Phage-host interactions analysis of newly characterized *Oenococcus oeni***  
662 **bacteriophages: Implications for malolactic fermentation in wine**

663 Int. J. Food Microbiol., 246 (2017), pp.12–19

664 Cumby et al., 2012 N. Cumby, A.R. Davidson, K.L. Maxwell

665 **The moron comes of age**

666 Bacteriophage, 2 (2012), pp.225-228

667 Davis et al., 1985 C. Davis, N.F. Silveira, G.H. Fleet

668 **Occurrence and properties of bacteriophages of *Leuconostoc oenos* in Australian wines**

669 Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 50 (1985), pp.872–876

670 Doria et al. 2013 F. Doria, C. Napoli, A. Costantini, G. Berta, J.C. Saiz, E. Garcia-Moruno

671 **Development of a new method for detection and identification of *Oenococcus oeni***

672 **bacteriophages based on endolysin gene sequence and randomly amplified**

673 **polymorphic DNA**

674 Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 79 (2013), pp.4799–4805

675 El Khoury et al., 2017 M.E. Khoury, H. Campbell-Sills, F. Salin, E. Guichoux, O. Claisse, P.M.

676 Lucas

677 **Biogeography of *Oenococcus oeni* reveals distinctive but nonspecific populations in**

678 **wine-producing regions**

679 Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 83 (2017), Article e02322-16

680 Gama et al., 2013 J.A. Gama, A.M. Reis, I. Domingues, H. Mendes-Soares, A.M. Matos, F.

681 Dionisio

682 **Temperate bacterial viruses as double-edged swords in bacterial warfare**

683 PLOS ONE, 8 (2013), Article e59043

684 Garneau et al., 2017 J.R. Garneau, F. Depardieu, L.C. Fortier, D. Bikard, M. Monot

685 **PhageTerm: a tool for fast and accurate determination of phage termini and packaging**

686 **mechanism using next-generation sequencing data**

687 Sci. Rep. 7 (2017), Article 8292

688 Gindreau, 1998 E. Gindreau

689 **Etudes sur les bactériophages de *O. oeni***

690 PhD University Bordeaux, France

691 Gindreau et al., 1997 E. Gindreau, S. Torlois, A. Lonvaud-Funel

692 **Identification and sequence analysis of the region encoding the site-specific integration**

693 **system from *Leuconostoc oenos* (*OEnococcus oeni*) temperate bacteriophage phi 10MC**

694 FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 147 (1997), pp. 279–285

695 Goulet and Cambillau, 2021 A. Goulet, C. Cambillau

696 **Structure and topology prediction of phage adhesion devices using AlphaFold2: the**

697 **case of two *Oenococcus oeni* phages**

698 Microorganisms, 9 (2021), Article 2151

699 Gnaegi, 1983 F. Gnaegi

700 **Les bactériophages de *Leuconostoc oenos* et leur importance œnologique**

701 Bull. O.I.V., 354 (1983), pp.352-357

702 Gnaegi et al., 1984 F. Gnaegi, O. Cazelles, T. Sozzi, N. D'Amico

703 **Connaissance sur les bactériophages de *Leuconostoc oenos* et progrès dans la maîtrise**

704 **de la fermentation malolactique des vins**

705 Rev. Suisse Vitic. Arboric. Hortic., 16 (1984), pp.59–65.

706 Gnaegi and Sozzi, 1983 F. Gnaegi, T. Sozzi

707 **Les bactériophages de *Leuconostoc oenos* et leur importance œnologique**

708 Rev. Suisse Vitic. Arboric. Hortic., 627 (1983), pp.352–357.

709 Gratia, 1936 A. Gratia.

710 **Des relations numériques entre bactéries lysogènes et particules de bactériophage**

711 Ann. Inst. Pasteur, 57 (1936), pp.652–676.

712 Harrison and Brockhurst, 2017 E. Harrison, M.A. Brockhurst

713 **Ecological and evolutionary ebnefits of temperate phage: what does or doesn't kill you**

714 **makes you stronger**

715 BioEssays, 39 (2017), Article 1700112

716 Henick-Kling et al.,1986a T. Henick-Kling, T.H. Lee, D.D. Nicholas

717 **Characterization of the lytic activity of bacteriophages of *Leuconostoc oenos* isolated**

718 **from wine**

719 J. Appl. Bacteriol., 61 (1986), pp.525–534.

720 Henick-Kling et al.,1986b T. Henick-Kling, T.H. Lee, D.D. Nicholas

721 **Inhibition of bacterial growth and malolactic fermentation in wine by bacteriophage**

722 J. Appl. Bacteriol., 61 (1986), pp.287–293.

723 Huang et al., 1996 C.M. Huang, R.V. Asmundson, W.J. Kelly

724 **Characterization of a temperate phage isolated from *Leuconostoc oenos* strain 1002**

725 **Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 45 (1996), pp. 472–476**

726 Hussain et al., 2021 F.A. Hussain, J. Dubert, J. Elsherbini, M. Murphy, D. VanInsberghe , P.

727 Arevalo, K. Kauffman, B.K. Rodino-Janeiro, H. Gavin, A. Gomez, A. Lopatina, F. Le Roux,

728 M.F. Polz

729 **Rapid evolutionary turnover of mobile genetic elements drives bacterial resistance to**

730 **phages**

731 Science, 374 (2021), Article 6566, pp. 488-492

732 Isaev et al., 2021 A.B. Isaev, O.S. Musharova, K.V. Severinov

733 **Microbial Arsenal of Antiviral Defenses – Part I**

734 Biochem. Moscow, 86 (2021), pp. 319–337

735 Jaomanjaka et al., 2013 F. Jaomanjaka, P. Ballestra, M. Dols-lafargue, C. Le Marrec  
736 **Expanding the diversity of oenococcal bacteriophages: Insights into a novel group**  
737 **based on the integrase sequence**  
738 Int. J. Food Microbiol., 166 (2013), pp.331–340  
739 Jaomanjaka, 2014 F. Jaomanjaka  
740 **Diversité des bactériophages infectant la bactérie lactique *Oenococcus oeni*,**  
741 **responsable de la fermentation malolactique des vins**  
742 These de doctorat, (2014). University Bordeaux  
743 Jaomanjaka et al., 2016 F. Jaomanjaka, O. Claisse, M. Blanche-Barbat, M. Petrel, P. Ballestra,  
744 C. Le Marrec  
745 **Characterization of a new virulent phage infecting the lactic acid bacterium *Oenococcus***  
746 ***oeni***  
747 Food Microbiol., 54 (2016), pp. 167–177  
748 Jaomanjaka et al., 2018 F. Jaomanjaka, C. Philippe, O. Claisse, C. Le Marrec C  
749 **Complete genome sequence of lytic *Oenococcus oeni* bacteriophage OE33PA**  
750 Microbiol. Resour. Announc., (2018), Article7:e00818-18  
751 Kot et al., 2014 W. Kot, H. Neve, K.J. Heller, F.K. Vogensen  
752 **Bacteriophages of *Leuconostoc*, *Oenococcus*, and *Weissella***  
753 Front. Microbiol., 5 (2014), Article 186  
754 Kyrkou et al., 2019 I. Kyrkou, C. Byth, A. Ellegaard-Jensen, W. Kot, A. Zervas, A.M.  
755 Djurhuus, H. Neve, M. Hansen, L. Hestbjerg Hansen  
756 **Expanding the diversity of *Myoviridae* phages infecting *Lactobacillus plantarum*-a**  
757 **novel lineage of *Lactobacillus* phages comprising five new members**  
758 Viruses, 11 (2019), Article 611



759 Kyrkou et al., 2020 I. Kyrkou, A.B. Carstens, L. Ellegaard-Jensen, W. Kot, A. Zervas, A.M.  
760 Djurhuus, H. Neve, C.M.A.P. Franz, M. Hansen, L.H. Hansen  
761 **Isolation and characterisation of novel phages infecting *Lactobacillus plantarum* and**  
762 **proposal of a new genus, “*Silenusvirus*”**  
763 Sci. Rep., 10 (2020), Article 8763.

764 Krieger-Weber et al., 2020 S. Krieger-Weber, J.M. Heras, C. Suarez  
765 *Lactobacillus plantarum*, a new biological tool to control malolactic fermentation: a review  
766 and an outlook. Beverages, 6 (2020), Article 23.

767 Lee, 1978 A. Lee  
768 **Bacteriophages associated with Lactobacilli isolated from wine**  
769 In: E. Lemperle, J. Frank (Eds.): Proceeding of the 5th International Oenological  
770 symposium, 13-15 February 1978. International Association of Modern Winery  
771 Technology and Management, Breisach, pp. 287–295.

772 Lee et al., 1985 A. Lee, R. Eschenbruch, J. Waller  
773 **Effect of phenolic compounds, ethyl alcohol, and sodium metabisulphite on the lytic**  
774 **activity of phage PL-1 on a *Lactobacillus casei* S strain**  
775 Can. J. Microbiol., 31 (1985), pp. 873–875

776 Liu et al., 2015 M. Liu, K.M. Bischoff, J.J. Gill, M.D. Mire-Criscione, J.D. Berry, R. Young, E.J.  
777 Summer  
778 **Bacteriophage application restores ethanol fermentation characteristics disrupted by**  
779 ***Lactobacillus fermentum***  
780 Biotechnol. Biofuels 8, 132

781 Lorentzen and Lucas, 2019 M.P.G. Lorentzen, P.M. Lucas  
782 **Distribution of *Oenococcus oeni* populations in natural habitats**

783 Appl. Microbiol Biotechnol., 103 (2019), pp. 2937-2945

784 Malherbe et al., 2007 S. Malherbe, F. Bauer, M. Du Toit

785 **Understanding problem fermentations – a review**

786 South Afr. J. of Enol.Vitic., 28 (2007), pp. 169-186.

787 **Marcobal et al., 2008** A.M. Marcobal, D.A. Sela, Y.I. Wolf, K.S. Makarova, D.A. Mills

788 **Role of hypermutability in the evolution of the genus Oenococcus**

789 J. Bacteriol., 190 (2008), pp. 564-570

790 Marcelli et al., 2020 B. Marcelli, A. de Jong, T. Janzen, J. Kok, O.P. Kuipers

791 **Alternative phage-host interaction in *Lactococcus lactis*: the carrier state drives rapid**

792 **evolution of phages**

793 bioRxiv, Article 04.27.063958

794 Mills et al. 2005 D.A. Mills, H. Rawsthorne, C. Parker, D. Tamir, K. Makarova

795 **Genomic analysis of *Oenococcus oeni* PSU-1 and its relevance to winemaking**

796 FEMS Microbiol. Rev., 29 (2005), pp.465–475

797 Nascimento et al., 2008 J.C. Nascimento, M.C. Guerreiro-Pereira, S.F. Costa, C. São-José, M.A.

798 Santos, 2008

799 **Nisin-triggered activity of Lys44, the secreted endolysin from *Oenococcus oeni* phage**

800 **fOg44**

801 J. Bacteriol., 190 (2008), pp. 457–461

802 Nardi, 2020 T. Nardi

803 **Microbial resources as a tool for enhancing sustainability in winemaking**

804 Microorganisms, 8 (2020), Article 507

805 Nel et al., 1987 L. Nel, B.D. Wingfield, L.J. Van der Meer, H.J.J. Van Vuuren

806 **Isolation and characterization of *Leuconostoc oenos* bacteriophages from wine and**  
807 **sugarcane**  
808 FEMS Microbiol. Lett., 44 (1987), pp. 63–67.

809 Onetto et al., 2021 C.A. Onetto, P.J. Costello, R. Kolouchova, C. Jordans, J. McCarthy, S.A.  
810 Schmidt.

811 **Analysis of transcriptomic response to SO<sub>2</sub> by *Oenococcus oeni* growing in continuous**  
812 **culture**  
813 Microbiol Spectr., 9 (2021), Article e0115421

814 Paillet and Dugat-Bony, 2021 T. Paillet, E. Dugat-Bony

815 **Bacteriophage ecology of fermented foods: anything new under the sun?**  
816 Cur. Op. Food Sc., 40 (2021), pp. 102-111,

817 Parreira et al., 1999 R. Parreira, C. São-José, A. Isidro, S. Domingues, G. Vieira, M.A. Santos

818 **Gene organization in a central DNA fragment of *Oenococcus oeni* bacteriophage fOg44**  
819 **encoding lytic, integrative and non-essential functions**  
820 Gene, 226 (1999), pp.83–93.

821 Patel (1989) J. Patel

822 **Lysogenic *Leuconostoc oenos* strain L181, and implications of lysogenic strains in MLF**  
823 In: Williams, P.J., Davidson, D.M., Lee, T.H. (Eds.), Proceedings of the seventh Australian  
824 Wine Industry Technical Conference, Adelaide, South Australia, pp. 258

825 Perlemoine et al., 2021 P.R. Marcoux, E. Picard, E. Hadji, M. Zelsmann, G. Mugnier, A.  
826 Marchet, G. Resch, L. O’Connell, E. Lacot.

827 **Phage susceptibility testing and infectious titer determination through wide-field**  
828 **lensless monitoring of phage plaque growth**  
829 PLOS One, 16(2021), Article e0248917

830 Philippe et al., 2017 C., Philippe, F. Jaomanjaka, O. Claisse, R. Laforgue, J. Maupeu, M. Petrel,  
831 C. Le Marrec  
832 **A survey of oenophages during wine making reveals a novel group with unusual**  
833 **genomic characteristics**  
834 Int. J. Food Microbiol., 257 (2017), pp.138–147  
835 Philippe et al., 2020 C. Philippe, A. Chaïb, F. Jaomanjaka, S. Cluzet, A. Lagarde, P. Ballestra,  
836 A. Decendit, M. Petrel, O. Claisse, A. Goulet, C. Cambillau, C. Le Marrec  
837 **Wine phenolic compounds differently affect the host-killing activity of two lytic**  
838 **bacteriophages infecting the lactic acid bacterium *Oenococcus oeni***  
839 Viruses, 12 (2020), Article 1316  
840 Philippe et al., 2021 C. Philippe, A. Chaïb, F. Jaomanjaka, O. Claisse, P.M. Lucas, J. Samot, C.  
841 Cambillau, C. Le Marrec  
842 **Characterization of the first virulent phage infecting *Oenococcus oeni*, the queen of the**  
843 **cellars**  
844 Front. Microbiol., 11 (2021), Article 103389  
845 Poblet-Icart et al., 1998 M. Poblet-Icart, A. Bordons, A. Lonvaud-Funel  
846 **Lysogeny of *Oenococcus oeni* (syn. *Leuconostoc oenos*) and study of their induced**  
847 **bacteriophages**  
848 Curr. Microbiol., 36 (1998), pp. 365–369  
849 Santos et al., 1996 R. Santos, G. Vieira, M.A. Santos, H. Paveia  
850 **Characterization of temperate bacteriophages of *Leuconostoc oenos* and evidence for**  
851 **two prophage attachment sites in the genome of starter strain PSU-1**  
852 J. Appl. Bacteriol., 81 (1996), pp. 383–392  
853 Santos et al., 1998 R. Santos, C. São-José, G. Vieira, H. Paveia, M.A. Santos

854 **Genome diversity in temperate bacteriophages of *Oenococcus oeni***  
855 Arch Virol., 143(1998), pp.523-536  
856 São-José et al., 2000 C. São-José, R. Parreira, G. Vieira, M.A. Santos  
857 **The N-terminal region of the *Oenococcus oeni* bacteriophage fOg44 lysin behaves as a**  
858 **bona fide signal peptide in *Escherichia coli* and as a cis-inhibitory element, preventing**  
859 **lytic activity on oenococcal cells**  
860 J. Bacteriol., 182 (2000), pp. 5823–5831  
861 São-José et al., 2004 C. São-José, S. Santos, J. Nascimento, A.G. Brito-Madurro, R. Parreira,  
862 M.A. Santos  
863 **Diversity in the lysis-integration region of oenophage genomes and evidence for**  
864 **multiple tRNA loci, as targets for prophage integration in *Oenococcus oeni***  
865 Virology, 325 (2004), pp.82–95  
866 Sozzi et al. 1976 T. Sozzi, R. Maret, J.M. Poulin  
867 **Mise en évidence de bactériophages dans le vin**  
868 Separatum Exp., 32 (1976), pp. 568–569  
869 Sozzi et al. 1982 T. Sozzi, F. Gnaegi, N. D’Amico, H. Hose  
870 **Difficultés de fermentation malolactique du vin dues à des bactériophages de**  
871 ***Leuconostoc oenos***  
872 Rev Suisse Vitic. Arboric. Hortic., 14 (1982), pp. 17–23  
873 Stern and Sorek, 2011 A. Stern, R. Sorek  
874 **The phage-host arms race: shaping the evolution of microbes**  
875 Bioessays, 33 (2011), pp. 43–51  
876 Tenreiro et al., 1993 R. Tenreiro, R. Santos, L. Brito, H. Paveia, G. Vieira, M.A. Santos

877 **Bacteriophages induced by mitomycin C treatment of *Leuconostoc oenos* strains from**  
878 **Portuguese wines**  
879 Lett. Appl. Microbiol., 16 (1993), pp. 207–209  
880 Torriani et al., 2011 S. Torriani, G.E. Felis, F. Fracchetti  
881 **Selection criteria and tools for malolactic starters development: an update**  
882 Ann. Microbiol., 61 (2011), pp. 33–39  
883 Van Valen, 1973 L. Van Valen  
884 **A new evolutionary law**  
885 Evol. Theor., 1 (1973)1973, pp. 1–30  
886 Viridis et al., 2021 C. Viridis, K. Sumbly E. Bartowsky, V. Jiranek  
887 **Lactic acid bacteria in wine: technological advances and evaluation of their functional**  
888 **role**  
889 Front Microbiol., 11 (2021), Article 612118  
890 Walker et al., 2021 P.J. Walker, S.G. Siddell, E.J. Lefkowitz et al.  
891 **Changes to virus taxonomy and to the International Code of Virus Classification and**  
892 **Nomenclature ratified by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses**  
893 Arch. Virol., 166 (2021), pp 2633–2648.  
894 White et al., 2022 K. White, J.H. Yu, G. Eraclio , F. Dal Bello, A. Nauta, J. Mahony, D. van  
895 Sinderen  
896 **Bacteriophage-host interactions as a platform to establish the role of phages in**  
897 **modulating the microbial composition of fermented foods**  
898 Microbiome Res. Rep., 1 (2022), Article 3.  
899 Zé-Zé et al., 2008 L. Zé-Zé, I.M. Chero, R. Tenreiro

900      **Evolution of genome organization in *Oenococcus oeni* revealed by physical and genetic**  
901      **map comparison**  
902      Int. Microbiol., 4 (2008), pp. 237–244