

**Preferred title:** Using fish models for assessing the role of sociality on the microbiome: the next step for translational microbiome research?

**Alternative title:** Using fish models to research the links between microbiome and social behaviour: the next step for translational microbiome research?

**Running title:** Links between microbiomes and sociality in fish

**Marta Candeias Soares<sup>1</sup>, Jo Cable<sup>2</sup>, Monica Gomes Lima-Maximino<sup>3</sup>, Caio Maximino<sup>4</sup>, Raquel Xavier<sup>1\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> CIBIO/InBIO, Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos da Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal

<sup>2</sup> School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF10 3AX, U.K.

<sup>3</sup> DMCF, Departamento de Morfologia e Ciências Fisiológicas, Universidade do Estado do Pará, Marabá, Brazil

<sup>4</sup> IESB, Instituto de Estudos em Saúde e Biológicas, Universidade Federal do Sul e Sudeste do Pará, Unidade III, Marabá, Brazil

## Abstract

Recent research has revealed surprisingly important connections between animals' microbiome and social behaviour. Social interactions can affect the composition and function of the microbiome; conversely, the microbiome affects social communication by influencing the hosts' central nervous system and peripheral chemical communication. These discoveries set the stage for novel research venues focusing on the evolution and physiology of animal social behaviour in relation to microbial transmission strategies. Here, we discuss the emerging roles of teleost fish model candidates and their key potential for advancing research fields linked to sociality and microbial regulation. We argue that fish models, such as the zebrafish, sticklebacks, guppies and cleaner-client dyads, will provide valuable insights into the roles of microbiome in shaping social behaviour and vice versa, while also being of direct relevance to the food and ornamental fish trades.

Keywords: behaviour/sociality; cleaner fish; gut-brain axis; poeciliids; sticklebacks; zebrafish

## Table of contents:

1. The gut-brain axis and its importance for health, stress physiology and behaviour
2. From human to fish: widening microbiome-based behavioural neuroscience
  - 2.1. Fish microbiome: what we know
  - 2.2. A fishy absence: the gut-brain axis in fish
3. The usefulness of fish models to study microbiome-behaviour interactions
  - 3.1. Zebrafish

- 3.2. Poeciliids
- 3.3. Sticklebacks
- 3.4. Cleaner fish
- 4. Concluding remarks

# **1. The gut-brain axis and its importance for health, stress physiology and behaviour**

The microbiota-gut-brain axis (MGB axis) has a pivotal role in health, stress physiology and behaviour (Foster, Rinaman, & Cryan, 2017). The interaction between the gut microbiome and the brain is now well established, at least in mammals, and involves multiple pathways, including immune signaling or neurotransmission through bacteria-derived metabolites (such as serotonin, histamine and catecholamine regulators; Sandhu et al., 2017). Host genetics, but also the external environment, are key determinants of microbiome composition from birth (e.g. Yang et al., 2016; Gilbert, 2014; Bonder et al., 2016; Cong et al., 2016). In humans, this includes neonatal hospital conditions, antibiotic use, birth delivery mode, breastfeeding vs bottle feeding, and early life stress (e.g. see Yang et al., 2016). This intimacy between the microbiome and its host has given rise to the concept of the ‘holobiont’, and to the theory that microbial colonization of the foetus and newborn follows co-evolutionary patterns (Gilbert, 2014). After three years of age, the microbial composition in healthy individuals should be relatively stable (but see Desbonnet, Clarke, Shahanan, Dinan, & Cryan, 2014), with the gut harbouring a diverse community, dominated by benign bacteria (Guarner & Malagelada, 2003; Walker, 2013). Concomitantly with early establishment of the gut microbiome are key neurodevelopmental landmarks critical for establishing normal motor,

cognitive and emotional function (Cong et al., 2016; Borre et al., 2014). Synaptogenesis, which onsets post-birth, is one of these crucial steps in early neurodevelopment (reviewed by Borre et al., 2014). The interaction between the microbiome, neurodevelopment and the central nervous system, the gut-brain axis is beginning to be understood, and is based on the observation that stress can increase intestinal permeability, allowing bacteria to translocate through the intestinal mucosa to access immune cells and neurons in the enteric nervous system (Gareau, Silva & Perdue, 2008; Teitelbaum, Gareau, Jury, Yang & Perdue, 2008; Tognini, 2017). The appearance of depressive episodes, related to dysregulations of the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis (Barden, 2004), appear to have a close relationship with gut microbiome colonization. For instance, germ-free (GF) rats, that lack commensal gut bacteria – and, consequently, have a poorly developed immune system – are more reactive to stress when subject-ed to restraint or to novel environments (Sudo et al., 2004; Clarke et al., 2013). Indeed, neonatal stress leads to long-term changes in the diversity and composition of the gut microbiome (García-Ródenas et al., 2006; O'Mahony et al., 2009), which could contribute to long-term changes in stress reactivity and in the stress-related behaviour observed in these rats. Treatment with probiotics (mainly *Lactobacillus* spp.) through the initial stress stage normalizes basal corticosterone levels, which are elevated after maternal separation (Gareau et al., 2008). Likewise, pre-treatment of rats with *Lactobacillus farciminis* reduces the intestinal permeability that results from restraint stress, as well as the associated hyperactivity of the HPA axis (AitBelgnaoui et al., 2012) and potential stimulation of the MGB axis. In addition to these findings relating microbiome and HPA axis function, there is direct evidence that the microbiome can influence central nervous system activity through the activation of stress-related neurons; for example, orally administered bacteria induce c-Fos

expression in afferent vagal neurons (Lyte, Li, Opitz, Gaykema, & Goehler, 2006) and in paraventricular hypothalamic neurons in GF rats (Sudo et al., 2004) in the absence of systemic immune responses, suggesting that commensal and pathogenic bacteria in the gastrointestinal tract release signals to the central stress circuits. Moreover, electrophysiological experiments demonstrated that vagal nerve endings in the gut are less excitable in GF rodents (McVey Neufeld, Mao, Bienenstock, Foster, & Kunze, 2013), or more excitable after probiotic administration (Kunze et al., 2009), suggesting changes in enteric neuronal responses due to variations in commensal microbiome.

The reciprocal relationship between the microbiome and social life of hosts arose as a surprising topic, emphasizing the impact of microbial communities on animal social communication and signaling. Microbial transfer between socially interacting partners is common and was recently reviewed by Archie and Tung (2015) and Vuong et al. (2017). The general consensus is that commensal bacteria can affect social behaviour, potentially to maximize their transmission and colonization of new hosts (e.g. Archie & Tung, 2015), akin to host manipulation by macroparasites (e.g. Poulin, 2013). It is undisputable that bacteria can manipulate behaviour through the production of metabolites, which mediate chemical communication between interacting host partners (e.g. Ezenwa & Williams, 2014). Commensal bacteria are responsible for the production of odours that allow sexual and reproductive state recognition (Theis et al., 2013) and can be determinants in mate choice (Sharon et al., 2010). Additionally, commensal bacteria may be key drivers in the cost-benefit calculus of group network interactions (e.g. Archie & Tung, 2015; Tung et al., 2015) and while in some cases social microbe transmission can benefit the host by promoting disease resistance (Endt et al., 2010; Stecher et al., 2010; Koch & Schmid-Hempel, 2011), in others bacterial transfer might facilitate pathogen transmission (Garrett, Gordon, & Glimcher, 2010;

Elinav, Strowig, Henao-Mejia, & Flavell, 2011). Although research on microbial influence on animal social behaviour is vibrant and emergent, with much being discovered every year, most mechanistic pathways (neurophysiological for example) are unclear or unknown (see Vuong, Yano, Fung, & Hsiao, 2017). Furthermore, the focus of such studies has been mammalian models (reviewed by Pascoe, Hauffe, Marchesi, & Per-kins, 2017). Here, we discuss the emerging roles of fish model candidates and their potential for advancing research fields linked to microbial regulation.

## **2. From human to fish: widening microbiome-based behavioural neuroscience**

### ***2.1. Fish microbiome: what we know***

The most comprehensive review of teleost microbiome research collated 46 studies spanning 2006 to early 2014 that focused on the microbiomes of different mucosa in fish (see Table 1 of Llewellyn, Boutin, Hoseinifar, & Derome, 2014). These studies were mostly culture and/or 16S Sanger sequencing-based, focusing on hosts with high fishery, aquaculture or ornamental value. Most were purely descriptive or assessed the effects of diet (e.g. food substitution or supplements with prebiotics or probiotics) or host factors (ontogenetic, genetic or species-specific) on gut microbiota. Since 2014 the number of fish microbiome studies has more than doubled (see for example Tarnecki et al. (2017) for a review on fish gut microbiome studies). The focus of these new studies continues to address the effects of diet supplements on gut microbiota (e.g. Ray et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2016), but increased effort has been placed in determining which ecological factors are determinants of microbiome composition. For example, the effects of abiotic factors (e.g. salinity [e.g. Schmidt, Gomez-Chiarri, Roy, Smith & Amaral-Zettler, 2015], pH [e.g. Sylvain et al., 2016], season [e.g. Zarkasi et al., 2015]

and geography [e.g. Wilkins, Rogivue, Schutz, Fumagalli, & Wedekind, 2015]) on fish microbiome composition are starting to be unraveled, including those driven by pollutants and habitat degradation (e.g. Narro et al., 2015). Disentangling the links between microbiome and fish health is a hot topic, particularly given the growth of aquaculture industry. In this respect, the impact of pathogens, antibiotics and probiotics on microbiome composition has been subject of several studies (e.g. Llewellyn et al., 2017; Reid et al., 2017; Li et al., 2016; Hennersdorf et al., 2016; Carlson, Leonard, Hyde, Petrosino, & Primm, 2017; Gonçalves & Gallardo-Escarate, 2017).

## ***2.2. A fishy absence: the gut-brain axis in fish***

As our understanding of fish host-microbiota interactions increases, so it becomes obvious that more research is necessary, particularly on the interdependence between the microbiota and fish behavioural responses. This contrasts with the rise in popularity of fish behavioural neuroscience, where several fish species are widely used as models to study social cognition and behaviour (Oliveira, 2013; Soares, Cardoso, Carvalho, & Maximino, 2018). While there is no doubt a significant bias towards using birds and mammals to study animal social behaviour and cognition, fish possess much more than just a predictable mixture of unlearned predispositions (Brown, 2015). Fish display sophisticated behaviours and complex social networks, such as Machiavellian strategies of deception and reconciliation (Bshary, Wickler, & Fricke, 2002), the ability to monitor the behaviour of others and their own reputation, to cooperate and to adjust their investment levels in accordance to context and even to use social tools to achieve direct goals (Brown & Laland, 2003; Soares, 2017; Soares et al., 2018). This complexity mirrors some homologous components of fish' neural representations with that of higher vertebrates (Oliveira, 2013). However, much remains to be discovered

about the similarities and dissimilarities of behaviour and brain processes between fish and mammals.

### **3. The usefulness of fish models to study microbiome-behaviour interactions**

Given that fish display a complex array of social behaviours, from lone individuals to complex group behaviour based on reciprocity, we should expect a variety of effects on (and of) the microbiome. Nonetheless, an important gap in the literature is the virtual absence of gut-brain axis studies on fish species. We argue that fish models, such as the zebrafish, sticklebacks, guppies, cleaner-client dyads among others (Box 1), can help provide valuable insights into the roles of microbiome in shaping social behaviour and vice versa.

#### **3.1 Zebrafish**

The zebrafish is a key model organism in developmental biology and genetics and is increasingly used in behavioural neuroscience (Norton & Bally-Cuif, 2010; Kalueff, Stewart, & Gerlai, 2014; Stewart, Braubach, Spitsbergen, Gerlai & Kalueff, 2014). A wide array of tools, from behavioural assays to neurogenetic and neurogenomic tools (Rinkwitz, Mourrain, & Becker, 2011; Gerlai, 2014) have been developed for zebrafish, including specific assays for anxiety- and fear-like behaviour, as well as for stress responses (Jesuthasan & Mathuru, 2008; Maximino et al., 2010; Clark, Boczek, & Ekker, 2011; Stewart et al., 2014). There is mounting evidence for a species-specific “core” gut microbiota in zebrafish, as animals reared for generations in the laboratory show similar components in relation to animals captured in the wild (Roeslers et al., 2011).

The core microbiome of the zebrafish gut is known from many experimental studies. As described for other vertebrates, zebrafish exhibit ontogenetic shifts in mi-



crobiome composition (Falcinelli et al., 2015; Roeselers et al., 2011; Hall, Tolonen, & Xavier, 2017; Shin, Whon, & Bae, 2015). Recently, the effects of probiotics on zebrafish, namely on their behaviour, have been assessed. Adult zebrafish treated with the probiotic *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* IMC 501 for 28 days showed increases in the abundance of taxa belonging to Phylum Firmicutes in the gut (Borrelli et al., 2016). Treatment of zebrafish larvae with *L. rhamnosus* IMC 501 from 0 to 8 days post-fertilization decreased the relative abundance of Proteobacteria and increased Firmicutes. Borrelli et al. (2016) found similar increases in Firmicutes after 28 days of treatment in adult animals. Importantly, adult zebrafish treated with *L. rhamnosus* IMC 501 displayed less shoaling and increased bdnf mRNA in the brain, with upregulation of genes involved in the serotonergic system in the brain (tph1a, tph1b, tph2, htr1aa, slc6a4a, and mao) and gut (tph1a) (Borrelli et al., 2016). The reductions in shoaling could represent an anxiolytic-like effect; however, Schneider et al. (2016) did not find alterations in anxiety-like behaviour after 15 days of treatment with *L. rhamnosus* GG – although this probiotic prevented the anxiolytic-like effect of chronic ethanol treatment. These discrepancies could also be due to differences in treatment duration (28 vs. 15 days). Consistent with this hypothesis, Davis et al. (2016) found that treatment with *Lactobacillus plantarum* for 30 days decreased anxiety-like behaviour in the novel tank test, an effect that was accompanied by increased slc6a4a (serotonin transporter) expression in the brain (but no alterations in the GABAergic, neuropeptide Y, or oxytocin-like pathways). *L. plantarum* did not alter gut microbiota diversity, but Mycoplasmataceae, Stenotrophomonas, Catenibacterium, unclassified Lactobacillaceae, and Achromobacter were enriched in *Lactobacillus*-treated animals. Interestingly, when *L. plantarum*-treated animals were exposed to a chronic unpredictable stress paradigm, serum cortisol and leukogram alterations were not altered, but the probiotic protected

against the gut dysbiosis induced by stress. Interpreting these findings is hard, as the authors did not report any behavioural alterations in stressed animals. For now results based on probiotic treatment should be treated with caution, but suggest that, at least in zebrafish, the microbiome is associated with defensive (anxiety-like) behaviour, and therefore could indirectly mediate sociality by altering the anti-predatory component of social behaviour or by decreasing the neophobia associated with social novelty.

### 3.2. *Poeciliids*

The guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*) and indeed a range of other poeciliid fish are widely studied tropical fish species (Evans, Pilastro, & Schlupp, 2011), renowned models of ecology and evolution. The Trinidadian guppy system in particular has been used to study the complex role of gene flow on adaptation and fitness in a natural setting. Naturally isolated populations provide natural (replicated) study systems that have been used intensively to assess the impact of different environmental factors, and predation and parasitism pressure on host morphology, genotype and behaviour (e.g. Endler, 1995; Magurran, 2005; Reznick, Shaw, Rodd, & Shaw, 1977; Reznick & Ricklefs, 2009). While these wild guppies have been used to study micro-evolutionary speciation in both field and laboratory studies, the ease with which they can be maintained and bred in captivity has meant they are also one of the most common fish in the world-wide ornamental trade. Their popularity relates to the availability of many different domestic colour and ornament varieties and hybrids (locally known as rainbowfish or millionsfish to reflect their colour and abundance). As the trade continues to expand, new strains are being selectively bred as these small viviparous fish have a fast generation time and are relatively tolerant of poor water quality. This has provided the basis for numerous studies on the genetics, immunology, particularly the MHC-genes (e.g.

Phillips et al., 2018) as well as the ecology and behaviour (Croft et al., 2011) of this model species.

Using the ‘natural Trinidad laboratory’ of replicated distinct up- and downstream populations across four rivers, Sullam et al. (2015) were the first to assess the guppy microbiome, and they did so in relation to host adaptation. They found clear microbiome differences in the guts of wild-caught and laboratory bred fish, and from field specimens revealed that gut microbiome communities varied temporally, across streams and between ecotypes in a stream-specific manner. But this study also highlighted the myriad of other biotic and abiotic factors that could be driving microbiome divergence (Sullam et al., 2015).

Although still largely unexplored, there is some parallel between the response of poeciliid and mammal microbiome to antibiotic use. In mammals, antibiotics can disrupt microbiome communities resulting in decreased microbiome-mediated disease resistance (otherwise known as ‘colonisation resistance’) so although there may be a short-term gain from treatment in the long-term health, and even survival, can be compromised (Adleberth, Cerquetti, Poilane, Wold, & Collignon, 2000; Fons, Gomez, & Karjalainen, 2000). Likewise, in poeciliids (e.g. mosquitofish, Carlson, Hyde, Petrosino, Manage, & Primm, 2015) antibiotics can disrupt the host microbiome and impact health. ‘Probiotic rescue’ is being tested as a solution to this problem. Schmidt et al. (2017) found that probiotics (*Phaeobacter inhibens* S4Sm and *Bacillus pumilus* RI06-95Sm) can reduce antibiotic-associated mortality in *Poecilia sphenops*.

Studies assessing the social behaviour of guppies revealed how different life-history trajectories shape sociality (e.g., Dugatkin, 1988; Farr, 1975) and the importance of cooperation in the establishment of these social groups (Dugatkin & Alfieri, 1991). If the gut microbiome does influence its host behaviour and if there is a probability of

transmission between conspecifics, we should then expect, similar to what was found for zebrafish, social interactions and prosocial behaviour to be associated with microbiome composition.

### 3.3 *Sticklebacks*

The three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) is the temperate equivalent of the guppy, being a small freshwater fish that is robust and easy to maintain and breed in large numbers in both the laboratory and field. But this fish is not just a leading model in ecology and evolutionary research; following publication of its genome (Jones et al., 2012) it arguably has reached supermodel status. Following glacial retreat in the northern hemisphere 12,000 years ago, repeated evolution from ancestral oceanic to derived freshwater forms resulted in many beneficial genetic variants surviving in thousands of distinct natural populations (Bell & Foster, 1994). Unlike laboratory genetic screening, which identifies mutants causing abnormal development, physiology or behaviour, these natural variants highlight biological innovations. Consequently, a large community of researchers utilises stickleback variants to understand adaptive speciation, behaviour, development, immunology (e.g. Cresko, McGuigan, Phillips, & Postlethwait, 2007; Huntingford, Ostlund-Nilsson, & Mayer, 2006; Scharsack, Kalbe, Harrod, & Rauch, 2007), and a range of projects are in progress assessing the microbiome of sticklebacks across a range of different environments. To date, such research has been largely confined to correlative approaches: QTL mapping, divergence mapping, and association studies.

Stickleback microbiome research has only just got off the starting block, but we already know that diet has a sex-specific effect on the gut microbiota (Bolnick et al.,

2014b), and perhaps surprisingly individuals with more generalised diets have less diverse microbiota than dietary specialists (Bolnick et al., 2014c). Of key importance is host genotype compared to transient environmental factors (Smith, Snowberg, Caporaso, Knight, & Bolnick, 2015), but systems-based approaches in the future are likely to reveal the true complexity of these interactions. Oceanic (ancestral) sticklebacks mount a strong immune response to residential microbiota compared to freshwater variants as revealed by the use of the stickleback as a newly developed gnotobiotic vertebrate model (Milligan-Myhre et al., 2016). Alongside zebrafish, sticklebacks could provide a powerful tool for mapping the natural genetic basis of the variation in immune response to microbes (Small, Milligan-Myhre, Bassham, Guillemin, & Cresko, 2017), and thus provide important clues regarding the role of intrinsic factors in micro-biome composition. In the next few years, improved genome annotation will facilitate identification of candidate genes and experimental gene manipulation will provide the tools to validate suspected candidate genes. Importantly, recent research has already shown that specific Major Histocompatibility Complex alleles and diversity are related to the composition and diversity of gut bacteria in sticklebacks (Bolnick et al., 2014a), as has previously been discerned for macroparasites (Matthews, Harmon, M'Gonigle, Marchinko, & Schaschl, 2010; Eizaguirre, Lenz, Kalbe, & Milinski, 2012).

### ***3.4. Cleaner fish***

Cleaning mutualisms are interspecific associations where cleaners remove ectoparasites and infected tissue from the body surface, mouth and gill chambers of their client fish (Côte, 2000). These interactions have been extensively studied, particularly in tropical regions, where obligate cleaner fish (cleaners that depend exclusively on client-gleaned

material throughout their life cycle) occupy territories (known as cleaning stations) that are visited by fish species (often referred to as clients). Cleaner-client fish dyads are perfect candidate models to study the role of microbiome in mutualistic behaviour and physiology as both partners come in close physical contact during interactions, allowing direct microbe transmission (skin-to-skin) while potentially also modulating the gut microbiome of cleaners, which feed actively of clients' mucus, parasites and hyperparasites.

In recent years, a priority has been identification of neurohormonal candidates that may modulate behavioural changes in marine cleaning mutualisms, allowing us to relate social cognition to the underlying mechanistic and neural mechanisms (Soares, 2017). These studies have highlighted the importance of neuromodulators such as nonapeptide arginine-vasotocin (AVT), which has substantial motivational and learning effects on cleaners (Soares, Bshary, Mendonça, Grutter, & Oliveira, 2012a; Cardoso et al., 2015a, Cardoso, Paitio, Oliveira, Bshary, & Soares, 2012b). Monoamines such as serotonin and dopamine (DA) also have a crucial impact, with serotonin increases being responsible for changes in motivation to engage mutualistically (Paula, Messias, Grutter, Bshary, & Soares, 2015), while disruption in dopamine transmission leads the cleaner to anticipate a lower probability of feeding or, alternatively, a higher likelihood of being punished by being chased or the client leaving (Messias, Paula, Grutter, Bshary, & Soares, 2016a). The effects of pharmacological stimulation of the DAergic system were most evident during the learning process, in which individual learning abilities of cleaners were tested in laboratory conditions (Messias, Santos, Pinto, & Soares, 2016b). The involvement of the dopaminergic system on cleaners' decision-making changed depending on context and the predictive condition of reward (for instance when time delays occur, Soares, Cardoso, Malato, & Messias, 2017a), or with

familiarity/novelty (Soares, Santos, & Messias, 2017b). Moreover, the role of social stress on cleaning performance has been studied. Indeed, one of the most notable behaviours by these animals is the cleaning and entering of predators' mouths, a behaviour that has been interpreted as altruistic on behalf of the clients that may simply eat the cleaner (Trivers, 1971). This seemingly fearless behaviour became a paradoxical feature of cleaners' proactivity and 'gutsy' cooperative behaviour, but also of putative anxiety and stress control, particularly when cleaners were found to show a preference for predatory over herbivorous clients, despite no obvious increase in ectoparasitic crustaceans in these hosts (Soares, Cardoso, & Côté, 2007). The main hypothesis raised to explain this behaviour is that cleaners need to be more proactive and spend more time inspecting predators (therefore glean more parasites and other material), in response to an increase in cortisol levels of energetic expenditure and putative decrease of immune reactivity (Soares, Bshary, Cardoso, Côté, Oliveira, 2012b). The role of stress mechanisms mediating the cleaners' cooperative levels were further tested, as these mechanisms were discovered to be involved in cleaners' decisions, as the exogenous effects of cortisol rises were found to propitiate cleaners' behavioural switch from cooperation to cheating (e.g. more stress led to more cheating; Soares, Cardoso, Grutter, Oliveira, & Bshary, 2014).

Our current understanding of cleaner fishes' social behaviour and proximate mechanisms prompts us to hypothesise that the cleaners and clients' microbial composition may have a direct role in determining the costs and benefits of these complex behavioural trade-offs. But at this point it is impossible to know which behaviours are influenced by cleaners' microbiota, especially given the diversity of social challenges cleaner must face.

#### **4. Concluding remarks**

The use of fish in microbiome-related research is expanding (Llewellyn et al., 2014), although currently the research is mostly ecological or diet focused on farmed or commercially valuable fish species (Box 2). The advantages of fish use in basic and applied neurobehavioural research include: rapid generation time and fertility (typically external fertilization), small size, genetic diversity, amenability to genetic manipulation, and finally intermediate physiological and behavioural complexity in relation to other model organisms (Friedrich, Genoud, Wanner, Ahrens, & Hughes 2013; Friedrich, Jacobson, & Zhu, 2010, Kalueff et al., 2012, 2014; Maximino et al., 2015; Norton & Bally-Cuif, 2010; Rinkwitz et al., 2011; Stewart et al., 2015; Soares et al., 2018). Moreover, complex neuroscientific tools and sophisticated behavioural paradigms have been developed for the zebrafish model. On the other hand, fish use in behavioural studies covers a multitude of species. A combination of the laboratory tools available for zebrafish and the ecological and ethological perspectives gleaned from other fish species is ideal (Hall, Serrano, Rodd, & Tropepe, 2014).

A key difference between fish and other terrestrial models for microbiome studies is the fact that living in aquatic conditions may increase the level of microbiota contamination from surrounding water. However, many studies have compared the surrounding water microbiome with that of the fish, and while for larvae colonization from water microbiota seems to occur, for adult fish the observed differences are enough to discard this hypothesis. At this point, the major drawback of our suggested systems is an overall lack of core information. So far microbiome research in fish disregards behavioural and physiological responses. Nevertheless, the potential of using fish models is endless considering their diversity, and the fact we may build from extensive knowledge regarding behavioural ecology (guppies, sticklebacks), physiology and genetics (cleaners and zebrafish) and animal production of certain key species. This



opens the door for a wealth of research: for example, do most fish species share common behavioural and physiological end-points arising from modulation by microbiota?

The multidimensionality of fish diverse behavioural systems sets the stage for future interdisciplinary research that should start with a strong ecological (field-derived) approach, being followed by lab-based cognitive and pharmacological experimentation. The implications of such integrated approaches may be of translational relevance to human behavioural deficits and psychiatric disorders, especially regarding the influence of social conditions to microbiome functionality (see Box 2).

## **Box list**

### **Box 1. A move to therapy? The use of model fish species to unravel the effects of microbiome into human social behavioural disorders**

Animal-focused research is pivotal to the advancement of scientific knowledge, but fish use in translational medical research has mostly focused on zebrafish. In neurosciences and behaviour, both larval and adult zebrafish have contributed to our understanding of the genetic control of brain processes, and the effects of pharmacological manipulations. In fact, the similarities between mammalian and zebrafish paradigms are a clear demonstration of the evolutionarily conserved nature of behaviour and physiological modulation across species (Kalueff et al., 2014). We expect fish to share an increasing role when it comes to microbiome-based research and, most specially, in contributing

empirically to the influence of skin and gut microbiome on the onset and development of several human behavioural disorders.

The study of the microbiome of model fish organisms could generate interest-ing insights into conserved and derived features of host-microbiome interactions and their impact on behaviour. Importantly, while the study of fish models is likely to be useful in the study of the evolutionary biology of host-microbiome interactions, the availability of behavioural assays for anxiety in both adult and larval zebrafish offers potential biomedical applications. The development of models for stress-induced dysbiosis, novel developments regarding the zebrafish inflammasome (Angosto & Mulero, 2014), and the interactions between these mechanisms pave the way for innovative models for psychiatric disorders. In addition, fish are emerging models of social behaviour and associated pathological alterations. Sociality is a fundamental dimension of human interactions and altered social behaviour is a symptom of many psychiatric disorders. In fish, due to the widespread influence of ecological and ecophysiological research, the focus has been largely aggressive behaviour – a symptom of acute psychotic states, drug abuse and mood disorders. A recent review highlighted that the broader array of social behaviour and cognition – from social motivation, social anxiety and social avoidance through social cognition, reproductive behaviour, and altruism and cooperation – represent important endpoints which could be used as models of specific disordered domains of psychiatric conditions related to mood disorders and social anxiety (Soares et al., 2018). Understanding how the microbiome interacts with these factors could open avenues for investigation on probiotics and other live biotherapeutics on psychiatric disorders (Marchesi et al., 2015; O'Toole, Marchesi, & Hill, 2017).

## **Box 2. The social life of farmed fish: the search for new boundaries of social learning and stress response**

Fish farming is crucial for maintaining global protein sources for rising human consumption and for providing animals that can restock exploited or/and degraded habitats or for create new fishing areas (Fernö, Huse, Jakobsen, & Kristiansen, 2006). When these hatchery-reared fish, however, are released into the wild they tend to have low survival partially due to behavioural deficits, although other causes (and consequences) are still under debate (Young, 2013; NASCO, 2017). Overall, available information indicates that this is a product of rearing environment, which limits fish exposure to natural stimuli and has profound consequences in fish learning and decision-making skills. In summarizing the differences (and implications) between natural and farmed fish, we identify the following:

1. Behavioural shifts. i) Foraging: fish reared in restricted conditions are less able to adjust to novel situations, which may occur when reared fish are released into the wild, needing to identify and catch live prey; ii) Aggression and reproduction: implications of rapid growth and high density.

1. Spatial dynamics. Farmed fish live in high density groups, but because these constantly changing, the establishment of clear individual and collective behaviour may thus be limited. While exposure to a greater number of conspecifics could be a source of extra information and learning, in practice the ability to recognize and associate with conspecifics may also decrease with group size for some species (Griffiths & Magurran, 1997; Ward, Holbrook, Krause, & Hart, 2005). Additionally, artificial grouping of similar sized animals may also modulate behaviour.

1. Coping and anti-predator responses. The monocultural and relatively sterile conditions of aquaculture tend to produce fish unable to appropriately cope with novel and complex (natural) environments. The lack of previous exposure to predators, limits individual recognition which may become fatal (Brown & Warburton, 1999).
2. Parasite resistance. Stressful conditions can lead to immunocompromised fish that are more prone to infection and directly transmitted pathogens can spread rapidly amongst high density hosts.
3. Poorer development and physiological state (ontogeny), due to differences in nutrition, exercise and putative chronic stress levels of tank reared fish. Indeed, a combination of factors during the development of these fish, such as high levels of stress exposure and absence of appropriate socio-environmental stimulation may lead to limited neural and sensory development (Fernö et al., 2006).

In addition, many farmed fish are genetically selected which is likely to change their physical characteristics, usually targeting rapid growth but this may also change key behavioural traits. The implications of fish domestication in terms of behavioural and physiological variation urgently warrants further research.

### **Acknowledgements**

MCS and RX are currently supported by FCT under the Programa Operacional Potencial Humano – Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional funds from the European Social Fund and Portuguese Ministério da Educação e Ciência (MCS: SFRH/BPD/109433/2015; RX: IF/00359/2015). Research on cooperative fish was mostly supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology-FCT (grant PTDC/MAR/105276/2008) and by the European Regional Development Fund

(ERDF) through COMPETE program and by National Funds through FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology (project PTDC/MAR-BIO/0902/2014- POCI-01-0145-FEDER-016550; and project POCI-01-0145-FEDER-027995). JC and RX were partially funded by the Welsh Government and Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) AquaWales Project through the Sêr Cymru National Research Network for Low Carbon Energy and Environment (NRN-LCEE). CM and MGLM are currently supported by CNPq/Brazil under Edital Universal 2016 (CM: 400726/2016-5; MGLM: 423735/2016-0). The authors have no conflicting interests.

## References

- Adeleberth, I., Cerquetti, M., Poilane, I., Wold, A., & Collignon, A. (2000). Mechanisms of colonisation and colonisation resistance of the digestive tract part 1: Bacteria/host interactions. *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease*, 12, 223-239. doi: 10.1080/089106000750060486.
- Ait-Belgnaoui, A., Durand, H., Cartier, C., Chaumaz, G., Eutamene, H., Ferrier, L., Houdeau, E., Fioramonti, J., Bueno, L., & Theodorou, V. (2012). Prevention of gut leakiness by a probiotic treatment leads to attenuated HPA response to an acute psychological stress in rats. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 37, 1885-1895. doi: 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2012.03.024.
- Angosto, D., & Mulero, V. (2014). The zebrafish as a model to study the inflammasome. *Inflammasome*, 1, 27-29. doi:10.2478/infl-2014-0002.

Archie, E. A., & Tung, J. (2015). Social behavior and the microbiome. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 28-34. doi: 10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.07.008.

Barden, N. (2004). Implication of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis in the physiopathology of depression. *Journal of Psychiatry and Neurosciences*, 29, 185-193.

Bell, M. A., & Foster, S. A. (1994). *The Evolutionary Biology of the Threespine Stickleback*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Binning, S. A., Rey, O., Wismer, S., Triki, Z., Glauser, G., Soares, M. C., & Bshary, R., (2017). Reputation management promotes strategic adjustment of service quality in cleaner wrasse. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 8425. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-07128-5.

Bolnick, D. I., Snowberg, L. K., Caporaso, J. G., Lauber, C., Knight, R., & Stutz, W. E. (2014a) Major Histocompatibility Complex class IIb polymorphism influences gut microbiota composition and diversity. *Molecular Ecology*, 23: 4831-4845. doi: 10.1111/mec.12846

Bolnick, D. I., Snowberg, L. K., Hirsch, P. E., Lauber, C. L., Org, E., Parks, B., Lusi, A. J., Knight, R., Caporaso, J. G., & Svanbäck, R. (2014b). Individual diet has sex-dependent effects on vertebrate gut microbiota. *Nature Communications*, 5, 4500. doi: 10.1038/ncomms5500.

Bolnick, D. I., Snowberg, L. K., Hirsch, P. E., Lauber, C. L., Knight, R., Caporaso, J. G., & Svanbäck, R. (2014c) Individuals' diet diversity influences gut microbial diversity in two freshwater fish (threespine stickleback and Eurasian perch). *Ecology Letters*, 17, 979-987. doi: 10.1111/ele.12301.

Bonder, M. J., Kurilshikov, A., Tigchelaar, E. F., Mujagic, Z., Imhann, F., Vila, A. V., Deelen, P., Vatanen, T., Schirmer, M., Smekens, S. P., Zhernakova, D. V., Jankiper-

- sadsing, S. A., Jaeger, M., Oosting, M., Cenit, M. C., Masclee, A. A. M., Swertz, M. A., Li, Y., Kumar, V., Joosten, L. Harmsen, H., Weersma, R. K., Franke, L. Hofker, M. H., Xavier, R. J., Jonkers, D., Netea, M. G., Wijmenga, C., Fu, J., & Zhernakova, A. (2016). The effect of host genetics on the gut microbiome. *Nature Genetics*, 48, 1407-1412. doi: 10.1038/ng.3663.
- Borre, Y. E., O'Keeffe, G. W., Clarke, G., Stanton, C., Dinan, T. G., Cryan, J. F. (2014). Microbiota and neurodevelopmental windows: Implications for brain disorders. *Trends in Molecular Medicine*, 20, 509-518. doi: 10.1016/j.molmed.2014.05.002.
- Borrelli, L., Aceto, S., Agnisola, C., De Paolo, S., Dipineto, L., Stilling, R. M., Dinan, T. G., Cryan, J. F., Menna, L. F., & Fioretti, A. (2016). Probiotic modulation of the microbiota-gut-brain axis and behaviour in zebrafish. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 30046. doi:10.1038/srep30046.
- Brown, C. (2015). Fish intelligence, sentience and ethics. *Animal Cognition*, 18: 1-17. doi: 10.1007/s10071-014-0761-0.
- Brown, C., & Laland, K. (2001). Social learning and life skills training for hatchery reared fish. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 59: 471–493. doi:10.1006/jfbi.2001.1689.
- Brown, C., & Warburton, K. (1999). Differences in timidity and escape responses between predator-naïve and predator-sympatric rainbowfish populations. *Ethology*, 105, 491-502. doi: 10.1046/j.1439-0310.1999.00442.x.
- Brown, C., Laland, K., & Krause, J. (eds) (2006) *Fish Cognition and Behavior*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK. doi: 10.1002/9780470996058.fmatter.
- Bshary, R., Wickler, & W. Fricke, H. (2002) Fish cognition: A primate's eye view. *Animal Cognition*, 5, 1-13. doi:10.1007/s10071-001-0116-5.

- Bshary, R., & Côté, I.M., 2008. New perspectives on marine cleaning mutualism. In Magnhagen, C., Braithwaite, V.A., Forsgren, E., Kapoor, B.G. (Eds.), *Fish Behaviour* (pp. 563–592). Science Publishers, New Hampshire.
- Burns, J. G., & Rodd, F. H. (2008). Hastiness, brain size and predation regime affect the performance of wild guppies in a spatial memory task. *Animal Behaviour*, 76, 911-922. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.02.017.
- Cardoso, S.C., Bshary, R., Mazzei, R., Paitio, J.R., Oliveira, R.F., & Soares, M.C., 2015a. Arginine vasotocin modulates associative learning in a mutualistic cleaner fish. *Behavior Ecology and Sociobiology*, 69, 1173-1181. doi:10.1007/s00265-015-1931-z.
- Cardoso, S.C., Paitio, J.R., Oliveira, R.F., Bshary, R., Soares, M.C., 2015b. Arginine vasotocin reduces levels of cooperative behaviour in a cleaner fish. *Physiol. Behav.* 139: 314-320. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.11.052.
- Carlson, J.M., Hyde, E.R, Petrosino, J. F., Manage, A.B., & Primm, T.P. (2015). The host effects of *Gambusia affinis* with an antibiotic-disrupted microbiome. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part C: Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 178, 163-168. doi:10.1016/j.cbpc.2015.10.004.
- Carlson, J. M., Leonard, A. B., Hyde, E. R., Petrosino, J. F., & Primm, T. P. (2017). Microbiome disruption and recovery in the fish *Gambusia affinis* following exposure to broad-spectrum antibiotic. *Infection and Drug Resistance*, 10, 143-154. doi:10.2147/IDR.S129055.
- Clark, K. J., Boczek, N. J., & Ekker, S. C. (2011). Stressing zebrafish for behavioral genetics. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 22: 49-62. doi: 10.1515/rns.2011.007.



Clarke, G., Grenham, S., Scully, P., Fitzgerald, P., Moloney, R. D., Shanahan, F., Dinan, T. G., & Cryan, J. F. (2013). The microbiome-gut-brain axis during early life regulates the hippocampal serotonergic system in a sex-dependent manner. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 18, 666-673. doi: 10.1038/mp.2012.77.

Cong, X., Xu, W., Janton, S., Henderson, W. A., Matson, A., McGrath, J. M., Maas, K., & Graf, J. (2016). Gut microbiome developmental patterns in early life of preterm infants: Impacts of feeding and gender. *PLoS ONE*, 11:e0152751. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0152751.

Côté, I. M. (2000). Evolution and ecology of cleaning symbioses in the sea. *Oceanography and Marine Biology*, 38, 311–355.

Côté, I. M., & Soares, M. C. (2011). Gobies as cleaners. In R. A. Patzner, J. L. Van Tassel, M. Kovačic & B. G. Kapoor (Eds) *The Biology of Gobies* (pp. 563-592). Enfield, NH: Science Publishers Inc.

Cresko, W. A., McGuigan, K. L., Phillips, P. C. & Postlethwait, J. H. (2007). Studies of threespine stickleback developmental evolution: progress and promise. *Genetica*, 129: 105-126. doi:10.1007/s10709-006-0036-z.

Croft, D. P., Edenbrow, M., Darden, S.K., Ramnarine, I. W., van Oosterhout, C., & Cable, J. (2011). Effect of gyrodactylid ectoparasites on host behaviour and social network structure in guppies *Poecilia reticulata*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65, 2219-2227. doi: 10.1007/s00265-011-1230-2.

Davis, D. J., Doerr, H. M., Grzelak, A. K., Busi, S. B., Jasarevic, E., Ericsson, A. C., & Bryda, E. C. (2016). *Lactobacillus plantarum* attenuates anxiety-related behavior and protects against stress-induced dysbiosis in adult zebrafish. *Scientific Reports*, 6,33726 doi: 10.1038/srep33726.

Desbonnet, L., Clarke, G., Shahanan, F., Dinan, T. G., & Cryan, J. F. (2014). Microbiota is essential for social development in the mouse. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 19, 146-148. doi: 10.1038/mp.2013.65.

Dugatkin, L. A. (1988). Do guppies play TIT FOR TAT during predator inspection visits? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 23, 395. doi: 10.1007/BF00303714.

Dugatkin, L. A., & Alfieri, M. (1991). Guppies and the TIT FOR TAT strategy: preference based on past interaction. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 28, 243. doi:10.1007/BF00175096

Eizaguirre, C., Lenz, T. L., Kalbe, M., & Milinski, M. (2012). Rapid and adaptive evolution of MHC genes under parasite selection in experimental vertebrate populations. *Nature Communications*, 3, 621. 10.1038/ncomms1632.

Elinav, E., Strowig, T., Henao-Mejia, J., & Flavell, R. A. (2011). Regulation of the antimicrobial response by NLR proteins. *Immunity*, 34, 665-679. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2011.05.007

Endler, J.A. (1995). Multiple-trait coevolution and environmental gradients in guppies. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 22-29.

Endt, K., Stecher, B., Chaffron, S., Slack, E., Tchitchek, N., Benecke, A., Van Maele, L., Sirard, J.-C., Mueller, A. J., Heikenwalder, M., Macpherson, A. J., Strugnell, R., von Mering, C., & Hardt, W.-D. (2010). The microbiota mediates pathogen clearance from the gut lumen after non-typhoidal *Salmonella* diarrhea. *PLoS Pathogens*, 6, e1001097. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1001097.

Evans JP, Pilastro P, & Schlupp I. (2011). *Ecology and Evolution of Poeciliid Fishes*. The University of Chicago Press.

Ezenwa, V. O., & Williams, A. E. (2014). Microbes and animal olfactory communication: Where do we go from here? *BioEssays*, 36, 847-854. doi: 10.1002/bies.201400016.

Falcinelli, S., Picchietti, S., Rodiles, A., Cossignani, L., Merrifield, D. L., Taddei, A. R., Maradonna, F., Olivotto, I., Gioacchini, G., & Carnevali, O. (2015). *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* lowers zebrafish lipid content by changing gut microbiota and host transcription of genes involved in lipid metabolism. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 9336. doi: 10.1038/srep09336.

Fernö, A., Huse, G., Jakobsen, P. J. & Kristiansen, T. S. (2006). The role of fish learning skills in fisheries and aquaculture. In C. Brown, K. Laland & J. Krause (Eds) *Fish Cognition and Behavior*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK. doi: 10.1002/9780470996058.ch14

Farr, J. A. (1975). The role of predation in the evolution of social behaviour of natural populations of the guppy, *Poecilia reticulata* (Pisces: Poeciliidae). *Evolution*, 29, 151-158. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.1975.tb00822.x.

Fons, M., Gomez, A., & Karjalainen T. (2000). Mechanisms of colonisation and colonisation resistance of the digestive tract part 2: Bacteria/bacteria interactions. *Microbial ecology in Health and Disease*, 12, 240-246. doi: 10.1080/089106000750060495.

Foster, J. A., Rinaman, L., & Cryan, J. F. (2017). Stress & the gut-brain axis: Regulation by the microbiome. *Neurobiology of Stress*, 7, 124-136. doi: 10.1016/j.ynstr.2017.03.001.

Friedrich, R.W., Genoud, C., Wanner, A.A., Ahrens, M.B., & Hughes, H. (2013). Analyzing the structure and function of neuronal circuits in zebrafish. *Front. Neural Circuits*, 7:71. doi:10.3389/fncir.2013.00071.

Friedrich, R. W., Jacobson, G. A., & Zhu, P. (2010). Circuit neuroscience in zebrafish. *Current Biology*, 20, R371–R381. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.02.039.

García-Ródenas, C. L., Bergonzelli, G. E., Nutton, S., Schumann, A., Cherbut, C., Turini, M., Ornstein, K., Rochat, F., & Corthésy-Theulaz, I. (2006). Nutritional approach to restore impaired intestinal barrier function and growth after neonatal stress in rats. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition*, 43, 16-24. doi: 10.1097/01.mpg.0000226376.95623.9f.

Gareau, M. G., Silva, M. A., & Perdue, M. H. (2008). Pathophysiological mechanisms of stress-induced intestinal damage. *Current Molecular Medicine*, 8: 274-281.

Garrett, W. S., Gordon, J. I., & Glimcher, L. H. (2010). Homeostasis and inflammation in the intestine. *Cell*, 140, 859-870. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2010.01.023.

Gerlai, R. (2014). Fish in behavior research: Unique tools with a great promise! *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 234, 54-58. doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2014.04.015.

Gilbert, S. F. (2014). A holobiont birth narrative: the epigenetic transmission of the human microbiome. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 5, 282. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2014.00282.

Gonçalves, A. T., & Gallardo-Escarate, C. (2017). Microbiome dynamic modulation through functional diets based on pre- and probiotics (mannan-oligosaccharides and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) in juvenile rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 122: 1333–1347. doi: 10.1111/jam.13437.

Griffiths, S. W., & Magurran, A. E. (1997). Schooling preferences for familiar fish vary with group size in a wild guppy population. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 264, 547-551. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1997.0078.

- Grutter, A. S., Murphy, J. M., & Choat, H. (2003). Cleaner fish drives local fish diversity on coral reefs. *Current Biology*, 13, 64-67. doi: 10.1016/S0960-9822(02)01393-3.
- Guarner, F. G., & Malagelada, J.-R. (2003). Gut flora in health and disease. *Lancet*, 361, 512-519. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(03)12489-0
- Hall, Z. J., De Serrano, A. R., Rodd, F. H., & Tropepe, V. (2014). Casting a wider fish net on animal models in neuropsychiatric research. *Progress in Neuropsychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, 55, 7-15. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2014.04.003.
- Hall, A. B., Tolonen, A. C., & Xavier, R. J. (2017). Human genetic variation and the gut microbiome in disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 18, 690-699. doi: 10.1038/nrg.2017.63.
- Hennersdorf, P., Kleinertz, S., Theisen, S., Abdul-Aziz, M. A., Mrotzek, G., Palm, H. W., & Saluz, H. P. (2016). Microbial diversity and parasitic load in tropical fish of different environmental conditions. *PLoS ONE*, 11, e0151594. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0151594.
- Huntingford, F. A., Ostlund-Nilsson, S., & Mayer, I. (2006) *Biology of the Three Spined Stickleback*. Taylor & Francis Group, CRC Press.
- Jesuthasan, S. J., & Mathuru, A. S. (2008). The alarm response in zebrafish: Innate fear in a vertebrate genetic model. *Journal of Neurogenetics*, 22, 221-228. doi:10.1080/01677060802298475
- Jones, F. C., M. G. Grabherr, Y. F. Chan, P. Russell, E. Mauceli, J. Johnson, R. Swofford, M. Pirun, M. C. Zody, S. White, E. Birney, S. Searle, J. Schmutz, J.

Grimwood, M. C. Dickson, R. M. Myers, C. T. Miller, B. R. Summers, A. K. Knecht, S. D. Brady, H. Zhang, A. A. Pollen, T. Howes, C. Amemiya, B. I. G. S. P. a. W. G. A. Team, E. S. Lander, F. Di Palma, K. Lindblad-Toh, & Kingsley, D. M. (2012). The genomic basis of adaptive evolution in threespine sticklebacks. *Nature*, 484, 55-61. doi: 10.1038/nature10944.

Kalueff, A. V, Stewart, A.M., & Gerlai, R., (2014). Zebrafish as an emerging model for studying complex brain disorders. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 35, 63-75. doi: 10.1016/j.tips.2013.12.002.

Kalueff, A. V, Stewart, A. M., Kyzar, E. J., Cachat, J., Gebhardt, M., Landsman, S., Robinson, K., Maximino, C., Herculano, A. M., Jesuthasan, S., Wisenden, B., Bally-Cuif, L., Lange, M., Vernier, P., Norton, W., Tierney, K., Tropepe, V., Neuhauss, S. C. F., & Zebrafish Neuroscience Research Consortium (2012). Time to recognize zebrafish “affective” behavior. *Behaviour*, 149, 1019-1036. doi:10.1163/1568539X-00003030.

Koch, H, & Schmid-Hempel, P. (2011). Socially transmitted gut microbiota protect bumble bees against an intestinal parasite. *Proceeding of Natural Academy of Sciences USA*, 108, 19288-19292. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1110474108.

Kunze, W. A., Mao, Y. K., Wang, B., Huizinga, J. D., Ma, X., Forsythe, P., & Bienenstock, J. (2009). *Lactobacillus reuteri* enhances excitability of colonic AH neurons by inhibiting calcium-dependent potassium channel opening. *Journal of Cellular and Molecular Medicine*, 13, 2261-2270. doi: 10.1111/j.1582-4934.2009.00686.x

Li, T., Long, M., Ji, C., Shen, Z., Gatesoupe, F. -J., Zhang, X., Zhang, Q., Zhang, L., Zhao, Y., Liu, X., & Li, A. (2016). Alterations of the gut microbiome of largemouth bronze gudgeon (*Coreius guichenoti*) suffering from furunculosis. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 30606. doi: 10.1038/srep30606.

Llewellyn, M. S., Boutin, S., Hoseinifar, S. H., & Derome, N. (2014). Teleost microbiomes: The state of the art in their characterization, manipulation and importance in aquaculture and fisheries. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 5, 207. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2014.00207.

Llewellyn, M.S., Leadbeater, S., Garcia, C., Sylvain, F.E., Custodio, M., Ang, K.P., Powell, F., Carvalho, G.R., Creer, S., Elliot, J., & Derome, N. (2017). Parasitism perturbs the mucosal microbiome of Atlantic Salmon. *Scientific Reports*, 7: 43465. doi: 10.1038/srep43465.

Lyte, M., Li, W., Opitz, N., Gaykema, R. P., Goehler, L. E. (2006). Induction of anxiety-like behavior in mice during the initial stages of infection with the agent of murine colonic hyperplasia *Citrobacter rodentium*. *Physiology and Behavior*, 89, 350-357. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2006.06.019.

Magurran AE. (2005). *Evolutionary Ecology: The Trinidadian Guppy*. Oxford University Press: New York.

Marchesi, J. R., Adams, D. H., Fava, F., Hermes, G. D. A., Hirschfield, G. M., Hold, G., Quraishi, M. N., Kinross, J., Smidt, H., Tuohy, K. M., Thomas, L. V., Zoetendal, E. G., & Hart, A. (2015). The gut microbiota and host health: a new clinical frontier. *Gut*, 65, 330-339. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2015-309990.

Matthews B, Harmon LJ, M'Gonigle L, Marchinko KB, & Schaschl H (2010) Sympatric and allopatric divergence of MHC genes in threespine stickleback. *PLoS One*, 5, e10948. Doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010948.

Maximino, C., de Brito, T. M., Batista, A. W. S., Herculano, A. M., Morato, S., & Gouveia Jr., A. (2010). Measuring anxiety in zebrafish: A critical review. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 214, 151-171. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2010.05.031.

Maximino, C., Silva, R.X. do C., da Silva, S. de N.S., Rodrigues, L. do S.D.S., Barbosa, H., de Carvalho, T.S., Leão, L.K.D.R., Lima, M.G., Oliveira, K.R.M., & Herculano, A.M. (2015). Non-mammalian models in behavioral neuroscience: Consequences for biological psychiatry. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neurosciences*, 9, 233.  
doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00233

Mayer I, Meager J, Skjæraasen JE, Rodewald P, Sverdrup G, & Fernö A. (2010). Domestication causes rapid changes in heart and brain morphology in Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 92, 181-186. doi: 10.1007/s10641-011-9831-1.

McVey Neufeld, K. A., Mao, Y. K., Bienenstock, J., Foster, J. A., & Kunze, & W. A. (2013). The microbiome is essential for normal gut intrinsic primary afferent neuron excitability in the mouse. *Neurogastroenterology and Motility*, 25, 183-188. doi: 10.1111/nmo.12049.

Messias, J.P.M., Paula, J.R., Grutter, A.S., Bshary, R., & Soares, M.C. (2016a). Dopamine disruption increases negotiation for cooperative interactions in a fish. *Scientific Reports*, 6: 20817. doi:10.1038/srep20817.

Messias, J. P. M., Santos, T. P., Pinto, M., S& oares, M. C., 2016b. Stimulation of dopamine D1 receptor improves learning capacity in cooperating cleaner fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283, 20152272.  
doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2272.

Milligan-Myhre, K., Small, C. M., Mittge, E. K., Agarwal, M., Currey, M., Cresko, W. A., & Guillemin, K. (2016). Innate immune responses to gut microbiota differ between oceanic and freshwater threespine stickleback populations. *Disease Models and Mechanisms*, 9, 187-198. doi: 10.1242/dmm.021881.



Narrowe, A. B., Albuthi-Lantz, M., Smith, E. P., Bower, K. J., Roane, T. M., Vajda, A. M., & Miller, C. S. (2015). Perturbation and restoration of the fathead minnow gut microbiome after low-level triclosan exposure. *Microbiome*, 3, 6. doi: 10.1186/s40168-015-0069-6.

NASCO (2017). Understanding the risks and benefits of hatchery and stocking activities to wild Atlantic salmon populations. (2017). Report of a Theme-based Special Session of the Council of NASCO. Chaput, G., Knight, P., Russell, I., Sivertsen, A., Hutchinson, P. & Forero Segovia, S. L. (Eds) NASCO Council document CNL(17) (61-116pp)

Norton, W., & Bally-Cuif, L. (2010). Adult zebrafish as a model organism for behavioural genetics. *BMC Neurosciences*, 11, 90. doi:10.1186/1471-2202-11-90.

Oliveira, R.F., 2013. Mind the fish: Zebrafish as a model in cognitive social neuroscience. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits*, 7, 131. doi:10.3389/fncir.2013.00131

O'Mahony, S. M., Marchesi, J. R., Scully, P., Codling, C., Ceolho, A. M., Quigley, E. M., Cryan, J. F., & Dinan, T. G. (2009). Early life stress alters behavior, immunity, and microbiota in rats: Implications for irritable bowel syndrome and psychiatric illnesses. *Biological Psychiatry*, 65, 263-267. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2008.06.026.

O'Toole, P. W., Marchesi, J., & Hill, C. (2017). Next-generation probiotics: The spectrum from probiotics to live biotherapeutics. *Nature Microbiology*, 2, 17057. doi: 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2017.57.

Pascoe, E. L., Hauffe, H. C., Marchesi, J. R., & Perkins, S. E. (2017). Network analysis of gut microbiota literature: An overview of the research landscape in non-human animal studies. *ISME Journal*, 11, 2644-2651. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2017.133.

- Paula, J. R., Messias, J. P., Grutter, A. S., Bshary, R., Soares, M. C. (2015). The role of serotonin in the modulation of cooperative behavior. *Behavioral Ecology*, 26, 1005-1012. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arv039
- Phillips KP, Cable, J., Mohammed, R. S., Herdegen-Radwan, M., Raubic, J., Przesmycka, K. J., van Oosterhout, C., & Radwan, J. (2018) Immunogenetic novelty confers a selective advantage in host–pathogen coevolution. *Proceedings of the Natural Academy of Science U.S.A*, 115, 1552-1557. doi:10.1073/pnas.1708597115.
- Poulin, R. (2013). Parasite manipulation of host personality and behavioural syndromes. *Journal of Experimental Biological*, 216, 18-26. doi: 10.1242/jeb.073353.
- Ray, C., Bujan, N., Tarnecki, A., Davis D. A., Browdy, C., & Arias, C. R. (2017). Analysis of the gut microbiome of Nile tilapia *Oreochromis niloticus* L. fed diets supplemented with Previda® and saponin. *Journal of Fisheries sciences.com*, 11, 36.
- Reid, K.M., Patel, S., Robinson, A.J., Bu, L., Jarungsriapisit, J., Moore, L.J., & Salinas, I. (2017). Salmonid alphavirus infection causes skin dysbiosis in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) post-smolts. *PloS ONE*, 12, e0172856. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172856.
- Reznick, D. N., Shaw, F. H., Rodd, F. H., & Shaw, R. G. (1997). Evaluation of the rate of evolution in natural populations of guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Science*, 275, 1934-1937.
- Reznick, D. N., & Ricklefs, R. E. (2009). Darwin's bridge between microevolution and macroevolution. *Nature*, 457, 837-842. doi: 10.1038/nature07894.

Rinkwitz, S., Mourrain, P., & Becker, T.S. (2011). Zebrafish: An integrative system for neurogenomics and neurosciences. *Progress in Neurobiology*, 93, 231–243. doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2010.11.003.

Roeslers, G., Mittge, E. K., Stephens, W. Z., Parichy, D. M., Cavanaugh, C. M., Guillemin, K., & Rawls, J. F. (2011). Evidence for a core gut microbiota in the zebrafish. *ISME Journal*, 5, 1595-1608. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2011.38.

Sampson, T. R., & Mazmanian, S. K. (2015). Control of brain development, function, and behavior by the microbiome. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 21, 786-796. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2015.04.011.

Sandhu, K. V., Sherwin, E., Schellekens, H., Stanton, C., Dinan, T. G., & Cryan, J. F. (2017). Feeding the microbiota-gut-brain axis: Diet, microbiome, and neuropsychiatry. *Translational Research*, 179, 223-244. doi: 10.1016/j.trsl.2016.10.002.

Scharsack, J. P., Kalbe, M., Harrod, C., & Rauch, G. (2007). Habitat-specific adaptation of immune responses of stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) lake and river eco-types. *Proceeding of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, 274, 1523-1532. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2007.0210

Schmidt, V. T., Smith, K. F., Melvin, D. W., Amaral-Zettler, L. A. (2015). Community assembly of a euryhaline fish microbiome during salinity acclimation. *Mol. Ecol.* 24: 2537-2550. doi: 10.1111/mec.13177.

Schmidt, V., Gomez-Chiarri, M., Roy, C., Smith, K., & Amaral-Zettler, L. (2017). Subtle microbiome manipulation using probiotics reduces antibiotic-associated mortality in fish. *Msystems*, 2, e00133-17. doi: 10.1128/mSystems.00133-17.

Schneider, A. C. R., Rico, E. P., de Oliveira, D. L., Rosemberg, D. B., Guizzo, R., Meurer, F., & da Silveira, T. R. (2016). *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG effect on behavior of zebrafish during chronic ethanol exposure. *BioResearch Open Access*, 5, 1-5. doi:10.1089/biores.2015.0026.

Sharon, G., Segal, D., Ringo, J. M., Hefetz, A., Ziber-Rosenberg I., & Rosenberg, E. (2010). Commensal bacteria play a role in mating preference of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the Natural Academy of Sciences USA*, 107, 20051-20056. doi:10.1073/pnas.1009906107.

Shin, N.-R., Whon, T. W., & Bae, J. -W. (2015). Proteobacteria: Microbial signature of dysbiosis in gut microbiota. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 33, 496-503. doi: 10.1016/j.tibtech.2015.06.011.

Sikkel, P. C., Cheney, K. L., & Côté, I. M. (2004). In situ evidence for ectoparasites as a proximate cause of cleaning interactions in marine reef fish. *Animal Behavior*, 68, 241-247.

Small, C. M., Milligan-Myhre, K., Bassham, S., Guillemin, K., & Cresko, W. A. (2017). Host genotype and microbiota contribute asymmetrically to transcriptional variation in the threespine stickleback gut. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 9, 504-520. doi: 10.1093/gbe/evx014.

Smith, C. C., Snowberg, L. K., Gregory Caporaso, J., Knight, R., & Bolnick, D. I. (2015) Dietary input of microbes and host genetic variation shape among-population differences in stickleback gut microbiota. *ISME Journal*, 9, 2515-2526. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2015.64.

Soares, M. C., Cardoso, S. C., Carvalho, T. S., & Maximino, C. (2018). The use of model fish as tools for research the biological mechanisms of cooperative behaviour: a

future for translational research concerning social anxiety disorders? *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, 82, 205-215. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2017.11.014.

Soares, M. C. (2017). The neurobiology of cooperation: The cleanerfish swims into the spotlight. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neurosciences*, 11, 191. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2017.00191.

Soares, M.C., Bshary, R., Mendonça, R., Grutter, A.S., & Oliveira, R.F. (2012a). Arginine vasotocin regulation of interspecific cooperative behaviour in a cleaner fish. *PLoS One*, 7, e39583. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039583.

Soares, M.C., Bshary, R., Cardoso, S.C., Côté, I.M., Oliveira, R.F. (2012b). Face your fears: Cleaning gobies inspect predators despite being stressed by them. *PLoS One*, 7, e39781. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039781.

Soares, M.C., Cardoso, S.C., & Côté, I.M. (2007). Client preferences by caribbean cleaning gobies: Food, safety or something else? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 61, 1015-1022. doi: 10.1007/s00265-006-0334-6.

Soares, M.C., Cardoso, S.C., Grutter, A.S., Oliveira, R.F., & Bshary, R. (2014). Cortisol mediates cleaner wrasse switch from cooperation to cheating and tactical deception. *Hormones and Behavior*, 66, 346-350. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2014.06.010.

Soares, M.C., Cardoso, S.C., Malato, J.T., & Messias, J.P.M. (2017a). Can cleanerfish overcome temptation? A selective role for dopamine influence on cooperative-based decision making. *Physiology and Behavior*, 169, 124-129. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2016.11.028.

- Soares, M. C., Santos, T. P., & Messias, J. P. M. (2017b). Dopamine disruption increases cleanerfish cooperative investment in novel client partners. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4, 160609. doi:10.1098/rsos.160609.
- Stecher, B., Chaffron, S., Käppeli, R., Hapfelmeier, S., Friedrich, S., Weber, T. C., Kirundi, J., Suar, M., McCoy, K. D., von Mering, C., Macpherson, A. J., & Hardt, W.-D. (2010). Like will to like: Abundances of closely related species can predict susceptibility to intestinal colonization by pathogenic and commensal bacteria. *PLoS Pathogens*, 6, e1000711. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1000711.
- Stewart, A. M., Braubach, O., Spitsbergen, J., Gerlai, R., & Kalueff, A. V. (2014). Zebrafish models for translational neuroscience research: from tank to bedside. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 37, 264-278. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2014.02.011>
- Stewart, A. M., Ullmann, J. F. P., Norton, W. H. J., Parker, M. O., Brennan, C. H., Gerlai, R., & Kalueff, A. V. (2015). Molecular psychiatry of zebrafish. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 20, 2-17. doi:10.1038/mp.2014.128
- Sudo, N., Chida, Y., Aiba, Y., Sonoda, J., Oyama, N., Yu, X.-N., Kubo, C., & Koga, Y. (2004). Postnatal microbial colonization programs the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal system for stress response in mice. *Journal of Physiology*, 558, 263-275. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2004.063388.
- Sullam, K. E., Rubin, B. E., Dalton, C. M., Kilham, S. S., Flecker, A. S., & Russell, J. A. (2015). Divergence across diet, time and populations rules out parallel evolution in the gut microbiomes of Trinidadian guppies. *ISME Journal*, 9, 1-15. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2014.231.
- Sylvain, F.-E., Cheaib, B., Llewellyn, M., Gabriel Correia, T., Barros Fagundes, D., Luis Val, A., & Derome, N. (2016). pH drop impacts differentially skin and gut micro-

biota of the Amazonian fish tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*), *Scientific Reports*, 6, 32032. doi:10.1038/srep32032.

Tarnecki, A. M., Burgos, F. A., Ray, C. L. & Arias, C. R. (2017). Fish intestinal microbiome: Diversity and symbiosis unravelled by metagenomics. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 123, 2-17. doi: 10.1111/jam.13415.

Teitelbaum, A. A., Gareau, M. G., Jury, J., Yang, P. C., & Perdue, M. H. (2008). Chronic peripheral administration of corticotropin-releasing factor causes colonic barrier dysfunction similar to psychological stress. *American Journal of Physiology*, 295, G452-G459. doi: 10.1152/ajpgi.90210.2008.

Theis, K. R., Venkataraman, A., Dycus, J. A., Koonter, K. D., Schmitt-Matzen, E. N., Wagner, A. P., Holekamp, K. E., Schmidt, T. M. (2013). Symbiotic bacteria appear to mediate hyena social odors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 110: 19832-19837. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1306477110.

Tognini, P. (2017). Gut microbiota: A potential regulator of neurodevelopment. *Frontiers in Cellular Neurosciences*, 11, 25. doi:10.3389/fncel.2017.00025.

Trivers, R. L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *The Quarterly Review in Biology*, 46, 35-57.

Tung, J., Barreiro, L. B., Burns, M. B., Grenier, J-C., Lynch, J., Grieneisen, L. E., Altmann, J., Alberts, S. C., Blekhman, R., & Archie, E. A. (2015). Social networks predict gut microbiome composition in wild baboons. *Elife.*, 4, e05224. doi:10.7554/eLife.05224.

- Vuong, H. E., Yano, J. M., Fung, T. C., & Hsiao, E. Y. (2017). The microbiome and host behavior. *Annual Review in Neurosciences*, 40, 21-49. doi: 10.1146/annurev-neuro-072116-031347.
- Walker, W. A. (2013). Initial intestinal colonization in the human infant and immune homeostasis. *Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism*, 63, 8-15. doi: 10.1159/000354907.
- Wang, J., Tao, Q., Wang, Z., Mai, K., Xu, W., Zhang, Y., & Ai, Q. (2017). Effects of fish meal replacement by soybean meal with supplementation of functional compound additives on intestinal morphology and microbiome of Japanese seabass (*Lateolabrax japonicus*). *Aquaculture Research*, 48, 2186-2197. doi:10.1111/are.13055.
- Ward, A. J. W., Holbrook, R. I., Krause, J., & Hart, P. J. B. (2005). Social recognition in sticklebacks: the role of direct experience and habitat cues. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 57, 575. doi: 10.1007/s00265-004-0901-7.
- Wilkins, L. G. E., Rogivue, A., Schütz, F., Fumagalli, L., & Wedekind, C. (2015). Increased diversity of egg-associated bacteria on brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) at elevated temperatures. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 17084. doi: 10.1038/srep17084.
- Wismer, S., Pinto, A. I., Vail, A. L., Grutter, A. S., & Bshary, R. (2014). Variation in cleaner wrasse cooperation and cognition: potentially caused by developmental environment? *Ethology*, 120, 519–531. doi: 10.1111/eth.12223
- Yang, I., Corwin, E. J., Brennan, P. A., Jordan, S., Murphy, J. R., & Dunlop, A. (2016). The infant microbiome: Implications for infant health and neurocognitive development. *Nursing Research*, 65, 76-88. doi: 10.1097/NNR.0000000000000133.



Young, K.A. (2013) The balancing act of captive breeding programmes: Salmon stocking and angler catch statistics. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 20, 434-444. doi: 10.1111/fme.12032

Zarkazi, K., Abell, G. C., Taylor, R. S., Neuman, C., Hatje, E., Tamplin, M. L., Katouli, M., Bowman. (2014). Pyrosequencing-based characterization of gastrointestinal bacteria of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) within a commercial mariculture system. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 117: 18-27. doi: 10.1111/jam.12514.

Zheng, P., Zeng, B., Zhou, C., Liu, M., Fang, Z., Xu, X., Zeng, L., Chen, J., Fan, S., Du, X., Zhang, X., Yang, D., Yang, Y., Meng, H., Li, W., Melgiri, N. D., Licionio, J., Wei, H., & Xie, P. (2016). Gut microbiome remodeling induces depressive-like behaviors through a pathway mediated by the host's metabolism. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 21, 786-796. doi: 10.1038/mp.2016.44.