

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Next-generation sequencing characterization of the gut bacterial community of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*, L.) fed low fishmeal based diets with increasing soybean meal levels

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Next-generation sequencing characterization of the gut bacterial community of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*, L.) fed low fishmeal based diets with increasing soybean meal levels / Luca Parma; Candela Marco; Soverini Matteo; Turrone Silvia; Consolandi Clarissa; Brigidi Patrizia; Mandrioli Luciana; Sirri Rubina; Fontanillas Ramon; Gatta Pier Paolo; Bonaldo Alessio. - In: ANIMAL FEED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. - ISSN 0377-8401. - STAMPA. - 222:(2016), pp. 204-216.
[10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2016.10.022]

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/571891> since: 2020-02-28

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2016.10.022>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Luca Parma, Marco Candela, Matteo Soverini, Silvia Turrone, Clarissa Consolandi, Patrizia Brigidi, Luciana Mandrioli, Rubina Sirri, Ramon Fontanillas, Pier Paolo Gatta, Alessio Bonaldo, *Next-generation sequencing characterization of the gut bacterial community of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*, L.) fed low fishmeal based diets with increasing soybean meal levels*, Animal Feed Science and Technology, Volume 222, 2016, Pages 204-216,

The final published version is available online at:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2016.10.022>

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

1 **Next-generation sequencing characterization of the gut**
2 **bacterial community of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*,**
3 **L.) fed low fishmeal based diets with increasing soybean**
4 **meal levels**

5

6 Luca Parma^{a*}, Marco Candela^b, Matteo Soverini^b, Silvia
7 Turroni^b, Clarissa Consolandi^c, Patrizia Brigidi^b, Luciana
8 Mandrioli^a, Rubina Sirri^a, Ramon Fontanillas^d, Pier Paolo
9 Gatta^a, Alessio Bonaldo^a

10

11 ^aDepartment of Veterinary Medical Sciences, University of
12 Bologna, Via Tolara di Sopra 50, 40064 Ozzano Emilia,
13 Bologna, Italy.

14 ^bDepartment of Pharmacy and Biotechnology, University of
15 Bologna, Via Belmeloro 6, 40126 Bologna, Italy.

16 ^cInstitute of Biomedical Technologies, National Research
17 Council, Via Fratelli Cervi 93, 20090 Segrate, Milano, Italy.

18 ^dSkretting Aquaculture Research Centre, Box 48, 4001
19 Stavanger, Norway.

20 *Corresponding author: Luca Parma, Department of
21 Veterinary Medical Sciences, University of Bologna, Viale
22 Vespucci 2, 47042 Cesenatico, FC, Italy.

23 E-mail address: luca.parma@unibo.it.

24 Keywords: *Sparus aurata*, Soybean meal, Gut bacterial
25 community, Next-generation sequencing, Growth, Gut

26 histology.

27

28 **Abstract**

29 The present study was carried out to evaluate growth, gut
30 histology and gut bacterial community of gilthead sea bream
31 (*Sparus aurata*) fed with increasing dietary soybean meal
32 (SBM) levels in a low fishmeal (FM) based diet, in comparison
33 with a control diet. Five isoproteic and isolipidic experimental
34 diets were formulated to contain increasing levels of SBM (0,
35 100, 200, and 300 g kg⁻¹ named S0, S10, S20 and S30,
36 respectively) with 150 g kg⁻¹ of FM, and one control diet (C)
37 without SBM and containing 350 g kg⁻¹ of FM. Sixty sea bream
38 (initial body weight 75.9 ± 1.9 g, n = 900) per tank were reared
39 in a recirculation system at 23.0 ± 1.0 °C and fed to satiation.
40 The trial was run in triplicate and lasted 100 days. At the end of
41 the trial fish fed the S30 diet showed a higher ($P \leq 0.05$)
42 specific growth rate (SGR) compared to S0 (SGR, 1.17 ± 0.03,
43 1.20 ± 0.01, 1.22 ± 0.01, 1.25 ± 0.01 and 1.21 ± 0.04 for S0,
44 S10, S20, S30 and C, respectively), and a higher feed intake
45 (FI) compared to S0, S10 and S20. Sea bream fed the C diet
46 had a higher ($P \leq 0.05$) FI compared to S0 (FI, 1.40 ± 0.01,
47 1.45 ± 0.01, 1.44 ± 0.03, 1.51 ± 0.03 and 1.46 ± 0.02 for S0,
48 S10, S20, S30 and C, respectively). No significant differences
49 in feed conversion rate, protein efficiency ratio, gross protein
50 efficiency and gross lipid efficiency among the treatments were
51 detected. No specific histopathological changes indicative of
52 soy-induced enteritis were observed in the intestine of any fish

53 examined. Gut bacterial community of the distal intestine
54 content was analyzed by Next-Generation Sequencing. At the
55 phylum level, the gut bacterial community was dominated by
56 *Firmicutes* (relative abundance 71%), while the most
57 represented family was *Lactobacillaceae* (26%). Even if no
58 significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$) in the gut bacterial
59 community α and β -diversity according to the different diets
60 were detected, *Cyanobacteria* and *Lactobacillaceae*
61 progressively increased from diet C to diet S30. In conclusion
62 results of growth, nutrient utilization, gut histology and gut
63 bacterial community indicate that SBM can be successfully
64 incorporated up to a level of 300 g kg⁻¹ with the inclusion of
65 150 g kg⁻¹ of FM, without any deleterious effects on growth,
66 protein utilization and gut health during the on-growing of sea
67 bream.

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77 **1. Introduction**

78

79 Gilthead sea bream is one of the most important species for
80 European aquaculture, representing around 51% of the total
81 finfish marine production in the Mediterranean area (FAO,
82 2010). Due to the current economic downturn and the
83 fluctuation of the gilthead sea bream market, a reduction in
84 feed costs while ensuring optimal growth and fish health is
85 essential to maintain the profitability of its farming (Martinez-
86 Llorens et al., 2009; Mongile et al., 2014). In this context, the
87 importance of vegetable protein is well recognized by feed
88 industry operators due to the growing pressure for alternative
89 fishmeal (FM) substitutes in fish diets. Among the different
90 ingredients, soybean meal (SBM) is one of the most interesting
91 alternative FM because of the advantages of supply, price, and
92 protein and amino acid composition (Bonaldo et al., 2008).
93 However this ingredient may induce a variety of histological
94 and functional changes in the gastrointestinal tracts of fish,
95 especially in salmonids, including morphological alterations
96 and inflammation (Krogdahl et al., 2003, 2010). These changes
97 may be due to direct effects of anti-nutritional factors in plant
98 ingredients and/or the indirect result of diet-induced changes in
99 the structure and function of the intestinal bacterial community
100 (Olsen et al., 2001; Ringø et al., 2006).

101 Previous studies on gilthead sea bream have shown that the
102 optimum dietary SBM levels, using a dietary FM content
103 higher than 200 g kg⁻¹, were 205 g kg⁻¹ for maximum growth
104 (Martinez-Llorens et al., 2009). Further increasing the level of
105 SBM up to 300 g kg⁻¹ of the diet had no significant effects on
106 the specific growth rate (SGR), feed intake (FI) and feed
107 conversion rate (FCR) in juvenile specimens of the same
108 species, although high SBM level led to some changes in the
109 distal intestine, with the presence of cellular infiltration of the
110 submucosa and lamina propria (Bonaldo et al., 2008).

111 In this context the exploration of fish gut bacterial
112 community can represent an emerging tool to evaluate the
113 application of vegetal ingredients in fish feed formulations.
114 Increased knowledge of the human gut microbiota is driving
115 research into development, immunity, disease, lifestyle and
116 nutrition (Furusawa et al., 2013). Similarly, the knowledge and
117 manipulation of the gut microbiome in teleosts, especially in
118 aquaculture, could be potentially addressed through nutrient
119 digestion, synthesis, absorption, pathogen resistance, growth,
120 sexual maturation, morphogenesis and survivorship (Llewellyn
121 et al., 2014). To date, our understanding of the teleost gut
122 bacterial community and of its functional significance has
123 lagged well behind that of humans and other terrestrial
124 vertebrates (Ray et al., 2012). Most understanding of the
125 intestinal microbiota of fish is largely derived from culture-

126 based approaches and 16S rRNA gene fingerprinting methods
127 such as denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (DGGE).
128 However, these methods usually reveal only a limited range of
129 microbial diversity (Desai et al., 2012; Carda-Diéguez et al.,
130 2014). Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) has been used in
131 recent years to examine the gut microbiome of humans,
132 terrestrial and marine vertebrate including some fish species as
133 recently reviewed by Ghanbari et al. (2015). However, only for
134 a few species such as rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss*,
135 Siberian sturgeon *Acipenser baerii* and zebrafish *Danio rerio*,
136 was this technique applied to explore the impact of diet on the
137 gut bacterial community (Desai et al., 2012; Semova et al.,
138 2012; Geraylou et al., 2013). In sea bream, *Sparus aurata*, data
139 on gut bacterial community using NGS have been recently
140 published regarding fish fed exclusively fishmeal or vegetable
141 protein based diets (Estruch et al., 2015), while no data are
142 available for this species fed increasing SBM levels in practical
143 diet formulations.

144 Furthermore few studies have explored in this species the
145 effects of increasing levels of SBM on performance using low
146 FM based diets as the only animal protein source and most of
147 the data on literature were restricted to replace FM with SBM.
148 At this regards, we evaluated the effects of SBM by replacing a
149 mixture of vegetal ingredients, wheat meal (WM), wheat gluten
150 (WG), corn gluten (CG) and sunflower meal (SM) which are

151 currently used in practical formulation at industrial level to
152 determine the optimal inclusion rate in practical low fish meal
153 diet.

154 The aims of this study were: 1) to evaluate the effects of
155 dietary inclusion of SBM and a low FM content in practical
156 diet formulations on growth, nutrient utilization and gut
157 histology of gilthead sea bream; 2) to evaluate changes in the
158 gut bacterial community of gilthead sea bream fed practical
159 diets with increasing levels of SBM and a low FM content, in
160 comparison to a control diet.

161

162 **2. Materials and methods**

163

164 *2.1. Diets*

165

166 Ingredients and proximate composition of the experimental
167 diets are presented in Table 1. Four isoproteic and isolipidic
168 diets were formulated with practical ingredients to contain
169 increasing levels of SBM (0, 100, 200, and 300 g kg⁻¹, named
170 S0, S10, S20, and S30, respectively) with a low FM content
171 (150 g kg⁻¹), while a control diet (C) was formulated to contain
172 0 g kg⁻¹ SBM and 350 g kg⁻¹ FM content. SBM was replaced
173 by adding WM, WG, CG and SM. The diets were
174 manufactured by Skretting Aquaculture Research Centre
175 (Stavanger, Norway) using extrusion technology. According to

176 the feed manufacturer, the protein and lipid levels were within
177 the range of the commercial diets for sea bream as well as the
178 FM level in the C group which was chosen as optimal standard
179 level for commercial diet of this species. All feeds were
180 produced as extruded sinking pellets (specific gravity 1.15)
181 with a diameter of 4 mm.

182

183 *2.2. Fish, experimental set-up and sampling*

184

185 The experiment was carried out at the Laboratory of
186 Aquaculture, Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences of the
187 University of Bologna, Cesenatico, Italy. Sea bream with an
188 initial average weight of 75.9 ± 1.9 g were obtained from the
189 hatchery Panittica Italia, Fasano, Italy. Before the experiment,
190 fish were acclimated for 2 weeks to the experimental tanks and
191 fed a mix of the experimental diets. At the beginning of the
192 trial, 60 fish per tank were randomly distributed into 15, 1000 L
193 square conical bottom tanks to obtain five triplicate fish groups,
194 each per dietary treatment. Tanks were provided with natural
195 seawater and connected to a closed recirculation system
196 consisting of a mechanical sand filter (Astralpool, Spain), an
197 ultraviolet light (Philips, the Netherlands) and a biofilter
198 (Astralpool, Spain). The water exchange rate within each tank
199 was 100% every hour. The water renewal of the total system
200 was 5 % daily. Mean water temperature was maintained at 23.0

201 ± 1.0 °C throughout the experiment; photoperiod was held
202 constant at a 12 h day length through artificial light (300 lux at
203 the water surface — Delta Ohm luxmeter HD-9221; Delta-
204 Ohm, Padua, Italy). The oxygen level was kept constant ($8.0 \pm$
205 1.0 mg L⁻¹) by a liquid oxygen system connected to a software
206 controller (B&G Sinergia snc, Chioggia, Italy). Ammonia (total
207 ammonia nitrogen, TAN ≤ 0.1 mg L⁻¹), nitrite (NO₂ ≤ 0.2 mg
208 L⁻¹) and nitrate (NO₃ ≤ 50 mg L⁻¹) were determined
209 spectrophotometrically once a day (Spectroquant Nova 60,
210 Merk, Lab business) at 12.00 p.m. At the same time, pH (7.8–
211 8.2) and salinity (28–33 g L⁻¹) were determined. The feeding
212 trial lasted a total of 100 days. Fish were overfed by automatic
213 feeders twice a day with a 5–10 % overfeeding ration for six
214 days a week, while one meal was supplied on Sundays. Each
215 meal lasted 1 hour and after that the uneaten feed was trapped
216 by a feed collector at the water output of tanks, dried overnight
217 at 105°C and the weight deducted from the feed intake for
218 overall calculations.

219 At the beginning and at the end of the experiment, all the
220 fish of each tank were individually weighed. At the end of the
221 trial digesta samples from 3 fish per tank were collected
222 individually. The gastrointestinal tract was dissected under
223 sterile conditions and the distal gut content was squeezed out
224 into an Eppendorf tube (one per fish) and placed at –80 °C until
225 DNA extraction (Desai et al., 2012).

226 Carcass proximate composition was determined on a pooled
227 sample of ten fish collected at the beginning of the trial and on
228 pooled samples of five fish per tank collected at the end of the
229 trial. Furthermore, at the end of the trial, wet weight of viscera
230 and liver was individually recorded from five fish per tank to
231 determine visceral (VSI) and hepatosomatic (HSI) indices.

232 All experimental procedures were evaluated and approved
233 by the Ethical-scientific Committee for Animal
234 Experimentation of the University of Bologna, in accordance
235 with the European directive 2010/63/UE on the protection of
236 animals used for scientific purposes.

237

238 2.3. *Gut histology*

239

240 At the end of the trial 15 animals per treatment were
241 randomly sampled. After euthanasia with a lethal dose of 2-
242 phenoxyethanol, the gut was removed and the intestine was
243 divided into two segments, proximal and distal; from each
244 segment a 5 mm-long piece was sectioned and fixed in 10%
245 buffered formalin. Samples were then processed for routine
246 histology to obtain 3 µm thick transverse sections, which were
247 stained with haematoxylin-eosin (H&E). Sections were
248 evaluated under a light microscope (Nikon Eclipse 80i).

249

250 2.4. *Gut bacterial community 16S sequencing*

251
252 Total bacterial DNA was extracted from a pool of distal
253 intestine content obtained from 3 fish per tank (100 mg of distal
254 intestine content per fish) as reported by Schnorr et al. (2014).
255 PCR amplifications of the V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene
256 were carried out in 25 µl volumes with 25 ng of microbial
257 DNA, 2x KAPA HiFi HotStart ReadyMix (KAPA Biosystems),
258 and 200 nM of the primers S-D-Bact-0341-b-S-17/S-D-Bact-
259 0785-a-A-21 (Klindworth et al., 2013) including Illumina
260 overhang adapters. Reaction conditions were as follows: initial
261 denaturation at 98°C for 3 min, followed by 30 cycles of
262 denaturation at 95°C for 30 sec, annealing at 55°C for 30 sec,
263 and extension at 72°C for 30 sec, with a final extension step at
264 72°C for 5 min. Amplicons were purified using Agencourt
265 AMPure XP magnetic beads. This magnetic bead-based system
266 is recommended in the Illumina protocol “16S Metagenomic
267 Sequencing Library Preparation” for the MiSeq system, and has
268 been used in several other publications (Soverini et al., 2016).
269 According to the Illumina protocol, 20% PhiX control was
270 used. Indexed libraries were prepared by using Nextera
271 technology and cleaned up with Agencourt® magnetic beads.
272 The final libraries were pooled at equimolar concentrations,
273 denatured and diluted to 6 pM before loading onto the MiSeq
274 flow cell. Sequencing was performed on Illumina MiSeq
275 platform using a 2 × 300 bp paired end protocol, according to

276 the manufacturer's instructions (Illumina, San Diego, CA).
277 Raw sequences were processed using the QIIME pipeline
278 (Caporaso et al., 2010). After length (minimum/maximum =
279 300/600 bp) and quality filtering with default parameters, reads
280 were binned into OTUs at a 0.97 similarity threshold using
281 UCLUST (Edgar, 2010). Assignment was carried out by using
282 the RDP classifier against Greengenes database (May 2013
283 version). Alpha-diversity rarefaction curves were performed
284 using the Faith's phylogenetic diversity, Chao1, observed
285 species, and Shannon index metrics. Beta-diversity was
286 estimated by weighted and unweighted UniFrac distances,
287 which were used as input for principal coordinates analysis
288 (PCoA).

289

290 2.5. Analytical methods

291

292 Diets and whole body samples were analyzed for proximate
293 composition. Moisture content was obtained by weight loss
294 after drying samples in a stove at 105 °C until a constant
295 weight was achieved. Crude protein was determined as total
296 nitrogen (N) by using the Kjeldahl method and multiplying N
297 by 6.25. Total lipids were determined according to Bligh and
298 Dyer's (1959) extraction method. Ash content was estimated by
299 incineration to a constant weight in a muffle oven at 450 °C.

300

301 *2.6. Calculations*

302

303 The formulae employed were as follows:

304 Specific growth rate (SGR) (day^{-1}) = $100 * (\ln \text{FBW} - \ln$
305 IBW)/days (where FBW and IBW represent the final and the
306 initial body weights).

307 Feed intake (FI) ($\% \text{ day}^{-1}$) = $100 * (\text{crude feed intake}/$
308 ABW/day) (where ABW (g) = average body weight = (FBW +
309 IBW)/2).

310 Feed conversion ratio (FCR) = feed intake/weight gain.

311 Visceral somatic index (VSI) (%) = $100 * (\text{viscera}$
312 weight/body weight).

313 Hepatosomatic index (HSI) (%) = $100 * (\text{liver weight/body}$
314 weight).

315 Protein efficiency ratio (PER) = $(\text{FBW} - \text{IBW})/\text{protein}$
316 intake.

317 Gross protein efficiency (GPE) (%) = $100 * [(\% \text{ final body}$
318 protein * FBW) - (% initial body protein * IBW)]/total protein
319 intake fish^{-1} .

320 Gross lipid efficiency (GLE) (%) = $100 * [(\% \text{ final body}$
321 lipid * FBW) - (% initial body lipid * IBW)]/total lipid intake
322 fish^{-1} .

323

324 *2.7. Statistics*

325

326 Data of growth performance, VSI, HSI, and nutritional
327 indices are presented as mean \pm standard deviation (SD) of
328 three replicate groups and were analyzed by a one-way
329 ANOVA followed by a Tukey's multiple comparison test.
330 Statistical analysis of gut bacterial community was carried out
331 by using R packages Stats and Vegan. Significant differences in
332 the relative abundance of gut bacterial community components
333 were obtained by Kruskal-wallis test. Data separation in the
334 PCoA was tested using a permutation test with pseudo F-ratios
335 (function Adonis in the Vegan package).

336

337 **3. Results**

338

339 *3.1. Growth and histology*

340

341 Growth performance is summarized in Table 2. At the end
342 of the trial fish fed the S30 diet showed a higher ($P \leq 0.05$)
343 SGR compared to S0 and a higher FI compared to S0, S10 and
344 S20. Sea bream fed the C diet had a higher ($P \leq 0.05$) FI
345 compared to S0, while no significant differences in FCR among
346 the treatments were detected (Table 2). No significant
347 differences in VSI, HSI, whole body composition and the
348 nutritional indices PER, GPE, GLE, were observed among the
349 treatments (Table 3). No specific histopathological changes

indicative of soy-induced enteritis were observed in the intestine of any fish examined (Fig. 1).

3.2. Gut bacterial community characterization

Fifteen pools of distal intestine content were analyzed by NGS of the V3 and V4 regions of the 16S rDNA gene. A total of 5,584,914 high quality reads were obtained from the starting 15,956,896 reads obtained, ranging from a minimum of 93,673 to a maximum of 687,596 reads per sample, with an average of 372,327 reads per sample. Further information about the number of reads for each sample and the coverage are reported in Supplementary Table 1. The number of reads across samples was normalized basing on the sample with the lowest number of reads and singletons were omitted from the analysis. Reads were clustered into 13,099 operational taxonomic units (OTUs) at 97% of identity, of which a total of 5,525 diet-specific OTUs were found (1,082 for diet S30; 1,016 for diet S20; 1,038 for diet S10; 833 for diet S0; 1,556 for control diet). Different metrics have been utilized to calculate α -diversity, including phylogenetic diversity, OTU species count, Chao 1 index for microbial richness and Shannon index for biodiversity (Fig. 2a). Rarefaction curves of the phylogenetic diversity approximated saturation, indicating a good coverage of the gut bacterial community. No differences in the gut bacterial

community α -diversity according to the different diets were detected (Fig. 2b).

At the phylum level, the average sea bream gut bacterial community is dominated by *Firmicutes* (relative abundance (rel. ab.) 71%), *Actinobacteria* (rel. ab. 9%), *Bacteroidetes* (rel. ab. 7%) and *Proteobacteria* (rel. ab. 6%), while *Cyanobacteria* (rel. ab. 3%) and *Verrucomicrobia* (rel. ab. 3%) were subdominant (Fig. 3a). The most represented families are: *Lactobacillaceae* (rel. ab. 26%), *Ruminococcaceae* (rel. ab. 12%), *Lachnospiraceae* (rel. ab. 10%) and *Clostridiales* families (rel. ab. 7%) (Fig. 3b). Among the subdominant families the most represented were, *Streptococcaceae* (rel. ab. 3%), *Cyanobacteria* (rel. ab. 3%), *Staphylococcaceae* (rel. ab. 3%), *Verrucomicrobia* (rel. ab. 3%) and *Enterobacteriaceae* (rel. ab. 2 %).

In order to highlight the impact of the different diets (S0, S10, S20, S30 and C) on the gut bacterial ecology of sea bream, we performed the PCoA analysis of the UniFrac distances among the gut bacterial community profiles (Fig. 4). Even though no significant differences among dietary groups were detected, both weighted and unweighted PCoA showed a tendency toward a samples separation according to the different diets. Fig. 5 shows the relative abundance of bacteria composition per sample at phylum (a) and family (b) levels, while in Fig. 6 we report the gut bacterial community components which showed

a different abundance in the different dietary groups. In particular, the abundance of *Cyanobacteria* progressively increased from diet C to diet S30 (Fig. 6a), while *Synergistetes* tend to show an opposite trend (Fig. 6b). Differently, *Actinobacteria* showed a higher abundance in diets S0 and S30 (Fig. 6c). Although there were no statistically significant effects, the *Lactobacillaceae* family was highly represented in fish fed S30 (Rel. ab. 43.3%) compared to those fed C diet (Rel. ab. 11.2%) (Fig. 6d).

4. Discussion

The inclusion of SBM at 100, 200 and 300 g kg⁻¹ (S10-S30) of the diet with a low FM content (150 g kg⁻¹) led to equal growth and protein utilization in comparison to a control diet without SBM and having 350 g kg⁻¹ of FM. The present results are in agreement with previous studies which have demonstrated the feasibility of including up to 300, 390 and 395 g kg⁻¹ SBM in diets for on-growing sea bream without negative effects on growth and nutritive efficiency (Bonaldo et al., 2008; Martinez-Llorens et al., 2009; Kokou et al., 2012), although FM levels in these studies were higher than in the present trial or amino acid supplements were used. In the present study the lack of differences in the SGR, FCR, PER and GPE between S10, S20, S30, the C diet suggests that the

425 inclusion of 150 g kg⁻¹ of FM in combination with SBM, WG
426 and CG will supply sufficient protein quality for this species.
427 Similarly, Dias. et al. (2009), showed that the growth
428 performance of sea bream towards the end of the grow-out
429 phase can be sustained by a practical dietary formulation
430 containing plant protein-derived and as little as 13% of marine-
431 derived proteins. However, in that study AA supplementation
432 and haemoglobin powder were also incorporated in the feed
433 while in the present study FM was the only animal protein
434 source. Focusing on the diets at low FM level (S0, S10, S20,
435 S30), fish fed S30 showed a higher SGR compared to those fed
436 S0. This seems mainly due to an increment of FI with
437 increasing dietary content of SBM. The reduced FI commonly
438 observed in fish given feeds containing plant protein may be
439 related to a reduced feed palatability and, in this regard, the use
440 of several mixtures of plant protein should reduce the potential
441 inhibition of feed consumption due to the specific effect of a
442 single ingredient (Fournier et al., 2004). Other studies reported
443 an increased feed consumption with increasing dietary levels of
444 SBM assuming that fish to meet their energy needs would have
445 increased the FI for a reduced available energy content as SBM
446 inclusion increased (Venou et al., 2006; Kokou et al., 2012).
447 SBM contains about 20% of non-starch polysaccharides (NSP)
448 and 10% oligosaccharides (Snyder and Kwon, 1987; Bach
449 Knudsen, 1997), which are considered indigestible by fish

450 compared to wheat and glutsens. Therefore, despite the
451 isoenergetic content of the diets, a reduction of available energy
452 content would be expected at higher SBM inclusion level
453 (Kokou et al., 2012). However, possible action of the gut
454 bacterial community could allow part of SBM energy
455 originating from NSP to be available to the fish in the form of
456 low molecular weight fatty acids (Kihara and Sakata, 2002;
457 Mountfort et al., 2002; Refstie et al., 2005; Kokou et al., 2012).

458 Gut histology revealed no specific histopathological changes
459 indicative of soy-induced enteritis in the intestines of any fish
460 examined. In a previous study on sea bream the inclusion of
461 30% SBM seemed to cause moderate and diffused expansion of
462 lamina propria in the distal intestine due to an increase of
463 mononuclear cell infiltration when compared to other
464 treatments with 18 and 0% of SBM (Bonaldo et al., 2008). A
465 dilatation of the submucosa by eosinophilic cells infiltration
466 was also found in the distal intestine of sea bream fed diet
467 containing bioprocessed SBM at the 40 and 60% levels (Kokou
468 et al., 2012). However both studies were conducted at juveniles
469 stage (weight range, 17.4 - 96.0 g and 15.7 - 48.9 g,
470 respectively) compared to the on-growing stage of the present
471 study (weight range 75.1 - 259.5 g). The inclusion levels of
472 SBM seem to be better tolerated by fish at on-growing phase as
473 supported by Martinez-Llorens et al. (2007) which concluded
474 that dietary SBM might be included in the diets up to 30% in

475 juveniles and up to 50% in grow-out fish without affecting
476 animal performance. In addition sea bream in grow-out phase
477 showed high tolerance for soy saponins while in juvenile sea
478 bream fed diets containing phytosterols and soy saponins some
479 disturbances of the intestinal mucosa were observed (Couto et
480 al., 2014 a, b); however, the histomorphological changes
481 observed were very mild and, although statistically significant,
482 the differences were judged to be minor and to represent
483 normal adaptation to changes in diet composition (Couto et al.,
484 2014a).

485 In the present study the gut bacterial community was
486 characterized. According to our findings, the gut bacterial
487 community is widely dominated by *Firmicutes* (rel. ab. 71%),
488 showing *Actinobacteria* as the second dominant phyla (rel. ab.
489 9%). *Bacteroidetes*, *Proteobacteria* and *Cyanobacteria* were
490 subdominant components with a relative abundance ranging
491 from 3 to 7 % of the bacterial community. Our data are in
492 general agreement with the previous Next Generation
493 Sequencing-based survey of the gut bacterial community in sea
494 bream (Estruch et al., 2015). Further, by mean of
495 pyrosequencing of the V1-V3 region of the 16S rDNA, the
496 Authors showed a co-dominance of *Actinobacteria* (rel. ab.
497 35%), *Proteobacteria* (rel. ab. 32%) and *Firmicutes* (rel. ab.
498 24%) in the hindgut bacterial community. The dominance of
499 *Firmicutes* we observed in the sea bream analyzed in the

500 present study may be imputed to their specific dietary regimen
501 and rearing conditions, which represent environmental
502 variables known to mold the compositional structure of the gut
503 bacterial community. According to our findings, the gut
504 bacterial community of sea bream was enriched in several
505 fibrolytic *Firmicutes*, such as *Ruminococcaceae*,
506 *Lachnospiraceae* and *Clostridiales*. By producing butyrate
507 from indigestible complex polysaccharides, these
508 microorganisms may provide important beneficial functions for
509 the host (Nicholson et al., 2012). Indeed, butyrate plays
510 multiple roles in host physiology, being strategic for the
511 amelioration of energy extraction from diet, for the
512 reinforcement of the gut epithelium barrier as well as for
513 modulation of the host immune function (Petersson et al., 2011;
514 Arpaia et al., 2013; Russell et al., 2013). In addition, our
515 finding of *Cyanobacteria* in the sea bream gut bacterial
516 community is of particular interest in the context of the recent
517 findings by Di Rienzi et al. (2013). The Authors performed the
518 first whole genome reconstruction of *Cyanobacteria* detected in
519 the gut and proposed their specific designation as a new
520 candidate sibling phylum named *Melainabacteria*. Differently
521 from environmental *Cyanobacteria*, gut *Melainabacteria* are
522 non-photosynthetic and non-respiratory, while, according to the
523 authors, these microorganisms are obligate anaerobic
524 fermenters capable to relay on the different carbon sources

525 present in the gut. Analogous to certain *Firmicutes*,
526 *Melainabacteria* can ferment plant polysaccharides in the gut,
527 and being able to provide the host with B and K vitamins, these
528 microorganisms have been included among the mutualistic
529 components of the gut bacterial community (Di Rienzi et al.,
530 2013).

531 Our finding showed only a subtle impact for the different
532 diets on the overall gut bacterial composition of sea bream, as
533 shown by PCoA analysis. However, evidence suggesting the
534 impact of different levels of SBM on specific components of
535 the gut bacterial community was obtained. At phylum level,
536 increasing SBM dietary levels seem to favor the increase of
537 *Cyanobacteria* and a correspondent decrease in *Synergistetes*.
538 While the first is considered as a mutualistic gut bacterial
539 community component able to provide the host with essential
540 vitamins, *Synergistetes* act as opportunistic pathogens in the gut
541 (Marchandin et al., 2010). Moreover, within the phylum of
542 *Firmicutes* the fish fed a high level of SBM (S30) were
543 enriched with the family of *Lactobacillaceae*, compared to
544 those fed the control diet. The functional impact of lactic acid
545 bacteria on fish intestine is still unclear, but potentially they
546 may have beneficial effects on the immune system, could
547 protect the fish against pathogenic invasion through the
548 intestinal surface, are probiotic candidates and are generally
549 considered as organisms associated with a healthy intestinal

550 epithelium (Cai et al., 1998; Nayak, 2010; Salinas et al., 2008;
551 Dimitroglou et al., 2009; Ingerslev et al., 2014). Interestingly,
552 in rainbow trout, Wong et al. (2013) described a trend of taxa
553 within the phylum *Firmicutes* that were significantly
554 discriminatory for diet type in which the relative abundance of
555 *Lactobacillaceae* was enriched in fish fed a grain-based diet.
556 Also the cichlid, *Astatotilapia burtoni*, which mostly feeds on
557 plants and algae, exhibited most of the gut microbial
558 biodiversity seen in cichlids with several nearly exclusive
559 bacterial taxa such as *Lactobacillales* and gut *Melainabacteria*
560 (Baldo et al., 2015).

561 What favors the presence of *Lactobacillaceae* in fish fed a plant
562 diet is not well known, but some studies have shown that
563 polyunsaturated fatty acids depress the intestinal lactobacilli
564 population in fish (Ringø, 1993) in accordance with the more
565 recent finding of Ingerslev et al. (2014), where a significantly
566 lower amount of lactic acid bacteria was found in rainbow trout
567 fed a marine-based diet compared to the fish fed a plant-based
568 diet containing rape seed oil and pea meal. In contrast, in sea
569 bream total fishmeal replacement with plant protein had a
570 negative effect on the relative abundance of *Firmicutes*
571 throughout the gut, particularly on the lactic acid bacteria
572 *Lactobacillus* and *Streptococcus* (Estruch et al., 2015).
573 *Lactobacillus* species are well equipped to metabolize
574 oligosaccharides that occur in their habitats, such as sucrose,

575 stachyose and raffinose which are contained in soybeans at
576 approximately 10 % (Espinosa-Martosy and Rupérez, 2006;
577 NRC, 2011; Gänzle and Follador, 2012). Moreover,
578 *Lactobacillus* can benefit from simple sugars derived from
579 primary degraders in the gut, establishing syntrophic networks.
580 Thus, in the context of our research, it is reasonable to
581 hypothesize that the *Lactobacillaceae* growth could be
582 supported by these oligosaccharides.

583

584 **5. Conclusion**

585

586 In conclusion results of growth, nutrient utilization and gut
587 histology indicate that SBM can be successfully incorporated
588 up to a level of 300 g kg⁻¹ with the inclusion of 150 g kg⁻¹ of
589 FM as the only animal protein source, without any deleterious
590 effects on growth, protein utilization and gut health during the
591 on-growing phase.

592 A deep sequencing of the gut bacterial community of sea
593 bream during the on-growing phase was successfully obtained.
594 For the first time in this species, the gut bacterial community
595 was analyzed by NGS in fish fed increasing SBM levels using
596 practical current formulations. The overall gut bacterial
597 community was largely dominated by *Firmicutes*, including
598 several fibrolytic bacteria, supporting the hypothesis that this
599 species could be predisposed to digest plant-based ingredients.

600 A minimal impact of increasing dietary SBM levels on the
601 overall gut bacterial community was observed. However SBM
602 seems to favor positively specific components of the gut
603 bacterial community such as *Cyanobacteria* and
604 *Lactobacillaceae* which may provide important beneficial
605 functions for the host and be associated with a healthy intestinal
606 epithelium.

607

608 **Conflicts of interest**

609

610 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

611

612 **Acknowledgments**

613

614 The author would like to thank Gillian Forlivesi Heywood
615 for English language editing.

616

617 **References**

618

619 Arpaia, N., Campbell, C., Fan, X., Dikiy, S., van der Veeken,
620 J., deRoos, P., Liu, H., Cross, J.R., Pfeffer, K., Coffier,
621 P.J., Rudensky, A.Y., 2013. Metabolites produced by
622 commensal bacteria promote peripheral regulatory T-
623 cell generation. *Nature* 504 (7480), 451–455.

624 Bach Knudsen, K.E., 1997. Carbohydrate and lignin contents of
 625 plant materials used in animal feeding. *Anim. Feed Sci.*
 626 *Technol.* 67, 319–338.

627 Baldo, L., Riera, J.L., Tooming-Klunderud, A., Albà, M.M.,
 628 Salzburger, W., 2015. Gut microbiota dynamics during
 629 dietary shift in eastern African cichlid fishes. *PLoS*
 630 *ONE* 10 (5), e0127462.

631 Bligh, E.G., Dyer, W.J., 1959. A rapid method of total lipid
 632 extraction and purification. *Can. J. Biochem. Physiol.*
 633 37 (8), 911–917.

634 Bonaldo, A., Roem, A.J., Fagioli, P., Pecchini, A., Cipollini, I.,
 635 Gatta, P.P., 2008. Influence of dietary levels of soybean
 636 meal on the performance and gut histology of gilthead
 637 sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L.) and European sea bass
 638 (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.). *Aquac. Res.* 39, 970–978.

639 Cai, Y., Benno, Y., Nakase, T., Oh, T.K., 1998. Specific
 640 probiotic characterization of *Weissella hellenica* DS-12
 641 isolated from flounder intestine. *J. Gen. Appl.*
 642 *Microbiol.* 44, 311–316.

643 Caporaso, J.G., Kuczynski, J., Stombaugh, J., Bittinger, K.,
 644 Bushman, F.D., Costello, E.K., Fierer, N., Peña, A.G.,
 645 Goodrich, J.K., Gordon, J.I., Huttley, G.A., Kelley,
 646 S.T., Knights, D., Koenig, J.E., Ley, R.E., Lozupone,
 647 C.A., McDonald, D., Muegge, B.D., Pirrung, M.,
 648 Reeder, J., Sevinsky, J.R., Turnbaugh, P.J., Walters,

649 W.A., Widmann, J., Yatsunenko, T., Zaneveld, J.,
 650 Knight, R., 2010. QIIME allows analysis of high-
 651 throughput community sequencing data. *Nat. Methods* 7
 652 (5), 335-336.

653 Carda-Diéguez, M., Mira, A., Fouz, B., 2014. Pyrosequencing
 654 survey of intestinal microbiota diversity in cultured sea
 655 bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) fed functional diets. *Fems*
 656 *Microbiol. Ecol.* 87, 451-459.

657 Couto, A., Kortner, T.M., Penn, M., Bakke, A.M., Krogh, A.,
 658 Oliva-Teles, A., 2014a. Effects of dietary
 659 phytosterols and soy saponins on growth, feed
 660 utilization efficiency and intestinal integrity of gilthead
 661 sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) juveniles. *Aquaculture* 432,
 662 295–303.

663 Couto, A., Kortner, T.M., Penn, M., Bakke, A.M., Krogh, A.,
 664 Oliva-Teles, A., 2014b. Effects of dietary soy
 665 saponins and phytosterols on gilthead sea bream
 666 (*Sparus aurata*) during the on-growing period. *Anim.*
 667 *Feed Sci. Tech.* 98, 203-214.

668 Desai, A. R., Links, M. G., Collins, S. A., Mansfield, G. S.,
 669 Drew, M. D., Van Kessel, A. G., Hill, G. E., 2012.
 670 Effects of plant-based diets on the distal gut
 671 microbiome of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).
 672 *Aquaculture* 350–353, 134–142.

673 Dias, J., Conceicao, L.E.C., Ribeiro, A.R., Borges, P., Valente,
674 L.M.P., Dinis, M.T., 2009. Practical diet with low fish-
675 derived protein is able to sustain growth performance in
676 gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*) during the grow-out
677 phase. *Aquaculture*, 293, 255-262.

678 Dimitroglou, A., Merrifield, D.L., Moate, R., Davies, S.J.,
679 Spring, P., Sweetman, J., Bradley, G., 2009. Dietary
680 mannan oligosaccharide supplementation modulates
681 intestinal microbial ecology and improves gut
682 morphology of rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*
683 (Walbaum). *J. Anim. Sci.* 87, 3226–3234.

684 Di Rienzi, S.C., Sharon, I., Wrighton, K.C., Koren, O., Hug,
685 L.A., Thomas, B.C., Goodrich, J.K., Bell, J.T., Spector,
686 T.D., Banfield, J.F., Ley, R.E., 2013. The human gut
687 and groundwater harbor non-photosynthetic bacteria
688 belonging to a new candidate phylum sibling to
689 Cyanobacteria. *ELife* (2), e01102, doi:
690 10.7554/eLife.01102.001.

691 Edgar, R.C., 2010. Search and clustering orders of magnitude
692 faster than BLAST, *Bioinformatics* 26 (19), 2460-2461.

693 Espinosa-Martosy, I., Rupérez, P., 2006. Soybean
694 oligosaccharides. Potential as new ingredients in
695 functional food. *Nutr Hosp* 21, 92–96.

696 Estruch, G., Collado, M.C., Peñaranda, D.S., Tomás Vidal, A.,
697 Jover Cerdá, M., Pérez Martínez, G., Martinez-Llorens,

698 S., 2015. Impact of fishmeal replacement in diets for
 699 gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) on the
 700 gastrointestinal microbiota determined by
 701 pyrosequencing the 16S rRNA gene. PLoS ONE 10 (8),
 702 e0136389, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136389.

703 FAO, 2010. FishStatJ manual: software for fishery statistics
 704 analysis. Version 2.0.0. FAO, Roma, Italy.

705 Fournier, V., Huelvan, C., Desbruyeres, E., 2004. Incorporation
 706 of a mixture of plant feedstuffs as substitute for fish
 707 meal in diets of juvenile turbot (*Psetta maxima*).
 708 Aquaculture 236, 451–465.

709 Furusawa, Y., Obata, Y., Fukuda, S., Endo, T.A., Nakato, G.,
 710 Takahashi, D., Nakanishi, Y., Uetake, C., Kato, K.,
 711 Kato, T., Takahashi, M., Fukuda, N.N., Murakami, S.,
 712 Miyauchi, E., Hino, S., Atarashi, K., Onawa, S.,
 713 Fujimura, Y., Lockett, T., Clarke, J.M., Topping, D.L.,
 714 Tomita, M., Hori, S., Ohara, O., Morita, T., Koseki, H.,
 715 Kikuchi, J., Honda, K., Hase, K., Ohno, H., 2013.
 716 Commensal microbe-derived butyrate induces the
 717 differentiation of colonic regulatory T cells. Nature 504,
 718 446–450.

719 Gänzle, M.G., Follador, R., 2012. Metabolism of
 720 oligosaccharides and starch in lactobacilli: a review.
 721 Front. Microbiol. 3, 340.

722 Geraylou, Z., Souffreau, C., Rurangwa, E., Maes, G.E.,
 723 Spanier, K.I., Courtin, C.M., 2013. Prebiotic effects of
 724 arabinoxylan oligosaccharides on juvenile Siberian
 725 sturgeon (*Acipenser baerii*) with emphasis on the
 726 modulation of the gut microbiota using 454
 727 pyrosequencing. FEMS Microbiol. Ecol. 86, 357–371.
 728 Ghanbari, M., Kneifel, W., Domig, K.J., 2015. A new view of
 729 the fish gut microbiome: Advances from next-
 730 generation sequencing. Aquaculture 448, 464–475.
 731 Ingerslev, H.C., von Gersdorff Jørgensen, L., Lenz Strube, M.,
 732 Larsen, N., Dalsgaard, I., Boye, M., Madsen, L., 2014.
 733 The development of the gut microbiota in rainbow trout
 734 (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) is affected by first feeding and
 735 diet type. Aquaculture 424–425, 24–34.
 736 Kihara, M., Sakata, T., 2002. Production of short-chain fatty
 737 acids and gas from various oligosaccharides by gut
 738 microbes of carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.) in micro-scale
 739 batch culture. Comp. Biochem. Phys. A 132, 333–340.
 740 Klindworth, A., Pruesse, E., Schweer, T., Peplies, J., Quast, C.,
 741 Horn, M., Glöckner, F.O., 2013. Evaluation of general
 742 16S ribosomal RNA gene PCR primers for classical and
 743 next-generation sequencing-based diversity studies.
 744 Nucleic Acids Res. 41(1), e1, doi: 10.1093/nar/gks808.
 745 Kokou, F., Rigos, G., Henry, M., Kentouri, M., Alexis, M.,
 746 2012. Growth performance, feed utilization and non-

747 specific immune response of gilthead sea bream *Sparus*
 748 *aurata* L. fed graded levels of a bioprocessed soybean
 749 meal. Aquaculture 364–365, 74–81.

750 Krogdahl, Å., Bakke-McKellep, A.M., Baeverfjord, G., 2003.
 751 Effects of graded levels of standard soybean meal on
 752 intestinal structure, mucosal enzyme activities, and
 753 pancreatic response in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.).
 754 Aquacult. Nutr. 9, 361–371.

755 Krogdahl, Å., Penn, M., Thorsen, J., Refstie, S., Bakke, A.M.,
 756 2010. Important antinutrients in plant feedstuffs for
 757 aquaculture: an update on recent findings regarding
 758 responses in salmonids. Aquac. Res. 41, 333–344.

759 Llewellyn, M.S., Boutin, S., Hoseinifar, S.H., Derome, N.,
 760 2014. Teleost microbiomes: the state of the art in their
 761 characterization, manipulation and importance in
 762 aquaculture and fisheries. Front. Microbiol. 5, 207.

763 Marchandin, H., Damay, A., Roudiere, L., Teyssier, C.,
 764 Zorogniotti, I., Dechaud, H., Jean-Pierre, H., Jumas-
 765 Bilak, E., 2010. Phylogeny, diversity and host
 766 specialization in the phylum Synergistetes with
 767 emphasis on strains and clones of human origin. Res.
 768 Microbiol. 161, 91–100.

769 Martínez-Llorens, S., Moñino, A.V., Tomás Vidal, A.,
 770 Salvador, V.J.M., Pla Torres, M., Jover Cerdá, M.,
 771 2007. Soybean meal as a protein source in gilthead sea

772 bream (*Sparus aurata* L.) diets: effects on growth and
773 nutrient utilization. *Aquac. Res.* 38, 82-90.

774 Martínez-Llorens, S., Tomas-Vidal, A., Jauralde, I., Pla Torres,
775 M., Jover, Cerdá, M., 2009. Optimum dietary soybean
776 meal level for maximizing growth and nutrient
777 utilization of on-growing gilthead sea bream (*Sparus*
778 *aurata*). *Aquacult. Nutr.* 15, 320–328.

779 Mongile, F., Bonaldo, A., Fontanillas, R., Mariani, L., Badiani,
780 A., Bonvini, E., Parma, L., 2014. Effects of dietary lipid
781 level on growth and feed utilization of gilthead
782 seabream (*Sparus aurata* L.) reared at Mediterranean
783 summer temperature. *Ital. J. Anim. Sci.* 13, 30-35.

784 Mountfort, D.O., Campbell, J., Clements, K.D., 2002. Hindgut
785 fermentation in three species of marine herbivorous
786 fish. *Appl. Environ. Microb.* 68, 1374–1380.

787 Nayak, S.K., 2010. Probiotics and immunity: a fish perspective.
788 *Fish Shellfish Immunol.* 29, 2–14.

789 Nicholson, J.K., Holmes, E., Kinross, J., Burcelin, R., Gibson,
790 G., Jia, W., Pettersson, S., 2012. Host-gut microbiota
791 metabolic interactions. *Science* 336 (6086), 1262–1267.

792 NRC (National Research Council), 2011. Nutrient requirements
793 of fish and shrimp. The National Academies Press,
794 Washington, DC.

795 Olsen, R.E., Myklebust, R., Kryvi, H., Mayhew, T.M., Ringo,
796 E., 2001. Damaging effect of dietary inulin on intestinal

797 enterocytes in Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus* L.).
 798 Aquac. Res. 32, 931–934.
 799 Petersson, J., Schreiber, O., Hansson, G.C., Gendler, S.J.,
 800 Velich, A., Lundberg, J.O., Roos, S., Holm, L.,
 801 Phillipson, M., 2011. Importance and regulation of the
 802 colonic mucus barrier in a mouse model of colitis. Am.
 803 J. Physiol.- Gastr. L. 300, G327–333.
 804 Ray, A.K., Ghosh, K., Ringø, E., 2012. Enzyme-producing
 805 bacteria isolated from fish gut: a review. Aquacult.
 806 Nutr., 18, 465–492.
 807 Refstie, S., Sahlström, S., Bråthen, E., Baeverfjord, G.,
 808 Krogedal, P., 2005. Lactic acid fermentation eliminates
 809 indigestible carbohydrates and antinutritional factors in
 810 soybean meal for Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*).
 811 Aquaculture 246, 331–345.
 812 Ringø, E., 1993. Does dietary linoleic acid affect intestinal
 813 microflora in Arctic charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (L.)?
 814 Aquacult. Fish. Manag. 24, 133–135.
 815 Ringø, E., Sperstad, S., Myklebust, R., Refstie, S., Krogdahl,
 816 Å., 2006. Characterisation of the microbiota associated
 817 with intestine of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua* L.). The
 818 effect of fish meal, standard soybean meal and a
 819 bioprocessed soybean meal. Aquaculture 261, 829–841.
 820 Russell, W.R., Hoyles, L., Flint, H.J., Dumas, M.E., 2013.
 821 Colonic Bacterial Metabolites and Human Health. Curr.

822 Opin. Microbiol 16 (3), 246–254.
 823 doi:10.1016/j.mib.2013.07.002.

824 Salinas, I., Myklebust, R., Esteban, M.A., Olsen, R.E.,
 825 Meseguer, J., Ringo, E., 2008. In vitro studies of
 826 *Lactobacillus delbrueckii* subsp. *lactis* in Atlantic
 827 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) foregut: tissue responses and
 828 evidence of protection against *Aeromonas salmonicida*
 829 subsp. *salmonicida* epithelial damage. Vet. Microbiol.
 830 128, 167–177.

831 Schnorr, S.L., Candela, M., Rampelli, S., Centanni, M.,
 832 Consolandi, C., Basaglia, G., Turrioni, S., Biagi, E.,
 833 Peano, C., Severgnini, M., Fiori, J., Gotti, R., De Bellis,
 834 G., Luiselli, D., Brigidi, P., Mabulla, A., Marlowe, F.,
 835 Henry, A.G., Crittenden, A.N., 2014. Gut microbiome
 836 of the Hadza hunter-gatherers. Nat. Commun. 5, 3654,
 837 doi: 10.1038/ncomms4654.

838 Semova, I., Carten, J.D., Stombaugh, J., Mackey, L.C., Knight,
 839 R., Farber, S.A., Rawls, J.F., 2012. Microbiota regulate
 840 intestinal absorption and metabolism of fatty acids in
 841 the zebrafish. Cell Host Microbe 12, 277–288.

842 Snyder, H.E., Kwon, T.W., 1987. Soybean Utilization. Van
 843 Nostrand Reinhold, New York, NY, USA. 346 pp.

844 Soverini, M., Rampelli, S., Turrioni, S., Schnorr, S.L., Quercia,
 845 S., Castagnetti, A., Biagi, E., Brigidi, P., Candela, M.,
 846 2016. Variations in the Post-weaning Human Gut

847 Metagenome Profile As Result of *Bifidobacterium*
848 Acquisition in the Western Microbiome. Front.
849 Microbiol. 7:1058. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01058.

850 Venou, B., Alexis, M.N., Fountoulaki, E., Haralabous, J., 2006.
851 Effects of extrusion and inclusion level of soybean meal
852 on diet digestibility, performance and nutrient
853 utilization of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*).
854 Aquaculture 261, 343–356.

855 Wong, S., Waldrop, T., Summerfelt, S., Davidson, J., Barrows,
856 F., Kenney, P.B., Welch, T., Wiens, G.D., Snekvik, K.,
857 Rawls, J.F., Good, C., 2013. Aquacultured rainbow
858 trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) possess a large core
859 intestinal microbiota that is resistant to variation in diet
860 and rearing density. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 79,
861 4974–4984.

862

863 **Figure captions**

864 Figure 1: histology of sea bream foregut (a,c,e,g,i) and hindgut
865 (b,d,f,h,l). Control diet, C (a,b); 0 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet, S0 (c,d);
866 100 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet, S10 (e,f); 200 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet, S20 (g,h)
867 and 300 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet, S30 (I,l). Intestine does not show any
868 differences in terms of inflammatory or degenerative changes
869 among diets (H&E, 20x objective).

870 Figure 2 a, b: OTUs rarefaction curves carried out with
871 different α -diversity metrics (Faith's phylogenetic diversity
872 (PD whole tree), observed OTUs, the Chao1 measure of
873 microbial richness, and the Shannon index of biodiversity).

874 Figure 3: sea bream gut bacterial community composition at
875 phylum (a) and family levels (b).

876 Figure 4: weighted and unweighted UniFrac distance PCoA of
877 the gut bacterial community of sea bream treated with different
878 diets, color code: S30 diet red, S20 diet green, S10 diet yellow,
879 S0 diet blue, C diet purple. MDS1 and MDS1 represent the
880 15.4 and 2.6 % of the total variability, respectively.
881 Permutation test with pseudo F-ratios: $P = 0.107$ and $P = 0.091$
882 for weighted and unweighted UniFrac, respectively.

883 Figure 5: relative abundance of bacteria composition per
884 sample at phylum (a) and family levels (b).

885 Figure 6: box plot showing the relative abundance of (a)
886 *Cyanobacteria*, (b) *Synergistetes*, (c) *Actinobacteria* and (d)

887 *Lactobacillaceae* in different diets. Significance of the
888 differences was obtained by Kruskal-Wallis test.

889

890

Table 1. Formulation and proximate composition of the experimental diets

<i>Ingredients (g kg⁻¹)</i>	S0	S10	S20	S30	C
FM North Atlantic	150	150	150	150	350
Hi Pro SBM	0	100	200	300	0
Wheat meal	206.4	165.6	125.8	84.0	229.3
Wheat gluten	226	199.1	175.9	150	127.7
Corn gluten	200	185	165	150	130
Sunflower meal	80	60	40	20	40
Fish oil North Atlantic	132.5	135.3	138.3	141	118
Vit/Min premix*	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Proximate composition (g kg⁻¹)</i>					
Moisture	77	76	78	80	60
Crude protein	466	466	479	478	460
Crude fat	194	192	199	209	197
Ash	45	47	48	57	69

FM, fishmeal; SBM, soybean meal; S0, 0 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S10, 100 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S20, 200 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S30, 300 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; C, control diet.

*Vitamin and mineral premix; Skretting, Stavanger, Norway (fulfilling recommendations for marine fish species given by NRC, 2011).

891
892
893
894
895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

Table 2. Growth performance of sea bream fed the experimental diets

	Experimental diet				
	S0	S10	S20	S30	C
<i>Growth</i>					
IBW (g)	76.0 ± 1.6	75.1 ± 0.6	77.1 ± 3.1	76.7 ± 1.9	74.4 ± 0.9
FBW (g)	249.1 ± 6.1	249.2 ± 3.9	257.6 ± 6.2	259.5 ± 5.9	256.2 ± 5.8
SGR (day ⁻¹)	1.17 ± 0.03 ^a	1.20 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	1.22 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	1.25 ± 0.01 ^b	1.21 ± 0.04 ^{ab}
FI (% day ⁻¹)	1.40 ± 0.01 ^a	1.45 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	1.44 ± 0.03 ^{ab}	1.51 ± 0.03 ^c	1.46 ± 0.02 ^{bc}
FCR	1.33 ± 0.03	1.35 ± 0.01	1.33 ± 0.01	1.36 ± 0.04	1.36 ± 0.05

S0, 0 g kg⁻¹ soybean meal SBM diet; S10, 100 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S20, 200 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S30, 300 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; C, control diet. IBW, initial body weight; FBW, final body weight; SGR, specific growth rate, 100 * (ln FBW - ln IBW) / days; FI, feed intake, 100 * (crude feed intake / ((FBW + IBW) / 2) / days; FCR, feed conversion rate, (feed intake / weight gain).

Data are given as the mean (n=3; n=60 for IBW and FBW) ± SD. In each line, different superscript letters indicate significant differences among treatments ($P \leq 0.05$).

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

Table 3. Viscerosomatic index, hepatosomatic index, body composition and nutritional indices of sea bream fed the experimental diets.

<i>Experimental diet</i>					
	S0	S10	S20	S30	C
VSI	5.62 ± 0.83	5.98 ± 0.95	5.99 ± 0.93	5.72 ± 0.70	5.78 ± 1.03
HSI	1.70 ± 0.34	1.60 ± 0.31	1.64 ± 0.33	1.59 ± 0.32	1.59 ± 0.35
<i>Whole body composition (g kg⁻¹)</i>					
Moisture	619 ± 4.7	626 ± 6.2	628 ± 4.6	632 ± 1.3	615 ± 5.1
Crude protein	174 ± 2.4	174 ± 2.6	175 ± 2.6	179 ± 0.9	173 ± 0.7
Total lipids	173 ± 9.3	175 ± 7.1	175 ± 9.2	180 ± 5.6	174 ± 6.0
Ash	33 ± 2.1	33 ± 1.3	32 ± 2.5	30 ± 0.7	33 ± 2.0
<i>Nutritional indices</i>					
PER	1.62 ± 0.04	1.59 ± 0.01	1.58 ± 0.03	1.54 ± 0.04	1.60 ± 0.06
GPE	28.8 ± 0.92	28.2 ± 0.50	28.4 ± 1.07	28.3 ± 0.86	28.2 ± 1.21
GLE	69.6 ± 4.14	70.1 ± 3.98	69.8 ± 5.26	67.2 ± 4.10	70.3 ± 4.92

S0, 0 g kg⁻¹ soybean meal SBM diet; S10, 100 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S20, 200 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; S30, 300 g kg⁻¹ SBM diet; C, control diet. VSI, viscerosomatic index; HSI, hepatosomatic index; PER, protein efficiency ratio; GPE, gross protein efficiency; GLE, gross lipid efficiency.

Data are given as the mean (n=3; n=15 for VSI and HSI) ± SD. In each line, different superscript letters indicate significant differences among treatments ($P \leq 0.05$). PER, ((final body weight – initial body weight) / protein intake); GPE, (100*[(% final body protein * final body weight) – (% initial body protein * initial body weight)] / total protein intake fish⁻¹); GLE, (100*[(% final body lipid * final body weight) – (% initial body lipid * initial body weight)] / total lipid intake fish⁻¹).

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935


936

937


938

939

940



943 Figure 2a




944

945

946

947 Figure 2b




948

949

950


951 Figure 3



952

953


954 Figure 4



955

956

957 Figure 5



958

959

