# Mining zebrafish microbiota reveals key community-level resistance against fish pathogen infection

Franziska A. STRESSMANN[1,2†], Joaquin BERNAL-BAYARD[1,3†], David PEREZ-PASCUAL[1], Bianca AUDRAIN[1], Olaya RENDUELES[1,4], Valérie BRIOLAT[5], Sebastian BRUCHMANN[6,7], Stevenn VOLANT[8], Amine GHOZLANE[8], Susanne HAUSSLER[6,9], Eric DUCHAUD[10] Jean-Pierre LEVRAUD[5] and Jean-Marc GHIGO[1]*

[1] *Genetics of Biofilms Laboratory, Institut Pasteur*, UMR CNRS2001, *Paris 75015, France*

[2] *current address: Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries, Department of Chemical Analytics and Biogeochemistry, Müggelseedamm 310, 12587, Berlin, Germany*

[3] *Departamento de Genética, Facultad de Biología, Universidad de Sevilla, Apartado 1095, 41080 Sevilla, Spain*

[4] *current address: Microbial Evolutionary Genomics Laboratory, Institut Pasteur, UMR3525, Paris 75015, France*

[5] *Macrophages and Development of Immunity Laboratory, Institut Pasteur, UMR3738 CNRS, Paris 75015, France*

[6] *Department of Molecular Bacteriology, Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research, Braunschweig, Germany.*

[7] *current address: University of Cambridge, Department of Veterinary Medicine, Madingley Road Cambridge CB3 0ES, UK*

[8] *Hub de Bioinformatique et Biostatistique – Département Biologie Computationnelle, Institut Pasteur, USR 3756 CNRS, Paris, France*

[9] *current address:Department of Clinical Microbiology, Rigshospitalet; Copenhagen, 2100, Denmark*

[10] *Unité VIM, INRAE, Université Paris-Saclay, 78350 Jouy-en-Josas, France.*

† FS and JBB equally contributed to this work.

**\* Corresponding author:** Jean-Marc Ghigo (jmghigo@pasteur.fr).

**Running title:** Microbiota-based colonization resistance in zebrafish

**Keywords:** Zebrafish; germ-free; probiotic; microbiota; colonization resistance, infection, *Flavobacterium columnare*.

**ABSTRACT**

The identification of commensal bacteria conferring resistance against pathogens is often

hindered by the complexity of host microbial communities. We used germ-free,

conventional and re-conventionalized zebrafish as a model to study the determinant of

microbiota-associated colonization resistance against the fish pathogen *Flavobacterium*

*columnare*. We showed that a consortium of 10 culturable endogenous bacterial species

protects zebrafish from lethal intestinal damages caused by *F. columnare* infection using

two different scenarios that do not rely on host innate immunity. Alteration of microbiota

composition upon antibiotic dysbiosis first identified *Chryseobacterium massilliae* as a

key bacterium protecting both larvae and adult zebrafish. We also showed that an

assembly of 9 species that do not otherwise protect individually confer a community-level

resistance to infection. Our study reveals the ecological strategies at play in microbiota-

based protection against pathogens in a low-complexity *in vivo* model, opening

perspectives for the rational engineering of resilient microbial communities.

## INTRODUCTION

Animal resident microbial consortia form complex and long-term associations with important community-level functions essential for host development and physiology (Rolig et al. 2015, McFall-Ngai 2002). Microbial ecosystems also provide protection against exogenous pathogens by inhibition of pathogen settlement and growth and/or stimulation of the host immune system (van der Waaij, Berghuis-de Vries, and Lekkerkerk-van der Wees 1972, Cani and Delzenne 2009, Stecher and Hardt 2008, 2011, Falcinelli et al. 2016, Olsan et al. 2017). From the perspective of microbial community composition, a shift or reduction in resident microbial diversity, a phenomenon generally referred to as dysbiosis, is often associated with increased susceptibility to infection due to the loss or change in abundance of key microbial community members (Littman and Pamer 2011, van der Waaij, Berghuis-de Vries, and Lekkerkerk-van der Wees 1972). These observations early supported the notion that addition or promotion of individually or communally protective bacteria (such as probiotics) could minimize microbiota dysbiosis or directly prevent infection to restore host health (Heselmans et al. 2005, Boirivant and Strober 2007, Robinson, Bohannan, and Young 2010).

Although the efficacy of probiotics has been shown in animal and humans, their mechanisms of action are poorly understood and low throughput experimental models often offer limited information on the individual contribution of probiotic species to community functions (Vollaard and Clasener 1994, Gill 2003, Stecher and Hardt 2011, Rolig et al. 2015, Falcinelli et al. 2016). Moreover, characterization of bacterial strains improving colonization resistance is still hindered by the complexity of host-commensal ecosystems. Zebrafish have recently emerged as a powerful tool to study microbe-microbe and host-microbe interactions (Rawls, Samuel, and Gordon 2004, Milligan-Myhre et al. 2011, Burns and Guillemin 2017, Douglas 2019, Flores et al. 2020). Zebrafish can be easily reared germ-free or gnotobiotically in association with specific bacterial species (Rawls, Samuel, and Gordon 2004, Melancon et al. 2017). Moreover, zebrafish bacterial communities are increasingly well characterized and a number of phylogenetically distinct zebrafish gut bacteria can be cultured, making this model system directly amenable to microbiota manipulation and assessment of probiotic effect on host infection resistance (Cantas et al. 2012, Rendueles et al. 2012, Caruffo et al. 2016, Perez-

Ramos et al. 2018). Several studies have used zebrafish to evaluate the effect of
exogenous addition of potential probiotics on host resistance to infection by various
pathogens (Rendueles et al. 2012, Chu et al. 2014, Caruffo et al. 2016, Wang et al. 2016,
Qin et al. 2017, Perez-Ramos et al. 2018, Girija et al. 2018, Lin et al. 2019). However,
the role of the endogenous microbial community in protecting against invasive pathogen
was rarely assessed and the reported protections were often partial, illustrating the
difficulty in identifying fully protective exogenous probiotics.

Here we used germ-free and conventional zebrafish larvae to mine the indigenous
commensal microbiota for bacterial species protecting against *Flavobacterium*
*columnare*, a bacterial pathogen affecting wild and cultured fish species. We identified
two distinct infection resistance strategies preventing mortality caused by *F. columnare*,
mediated either by an individual member of the microbiota, the *Bacteroidetes*
*Chryseobacterium massiliae* or by an assembly of 9 individually non-protecting bacterial
species that formed a protective community. Our results demonstrated that mining host
microbiota constitutes a powerful approach to identify key mediators of intrinsic
colonization resistance, providing insight into how to engineer ecologically resilient and
protective microbial communities.

**RESULTS**

***Flavobacterium columnare* kills germ-free but not conventional zebrafish**

To investigate microbiota-based resistance to infection in zebrafish, we compared the sensitivity of germ-free (GF) and conventional (Conv) zebrafish larvae to *F. columnare*, an important fish pathogen affecting carp, channel catfish, goldfish, eel, salmonids and tilapia and previously shown to infect and kill adult zebrafish (Soto et al. 2008, Olivares-Fuster et al. 2011, Declercq et al. 2013, Li et al. 2017, Robinson, Bohannan, and Young 2010). We used bath immersion to expose GF and Conv zebrafish larvae at 6 days post fertilization (dpf), to a collection of 28 *F. columnare* strains, belonging to four different genomovars for 3h at $5.10^5$ colony forming units (cfu)/mL. Daily monitoring showed that 16 out of 28 *F. columnare* strains killed GF larvae in less than 48h (Supplementary Fig. S1A), whereas Conv larvae survived exposure to all tested virulent *F. columnare* strains (Supplementary Fig. S1B). Exposure to the highly virulent strain ALG-00-530 (hereafter *F. columnare*[ALG]) also showed that GF mortality was fast (1 day) and dose-dependent and that Conv zebrafish survived all but the highest dose ($10^7$ cfu/mL) (Fig. 1). Similar survival of infected Conv larvae was obtained with zebrafish AB strain eggs obtained from 4 different zebrafish facilities (Supplementary Fig. S2), suggesting that conventional zebrafish microbiota could provide protection against *F. columnare* infection.

**A community of 10 culturable bacterial strains protect against *F. columnare* infection**

In our rearing conditions, the conventional larval microbiota is acquired after hatching from microorganisms present on the egg chorion and in fish facility water. To test the hypothesis that microorganisms associated with conventional eggs provided protection against *F. columnare*[ALG], we exposed sterilized eggs to either fish facility tank water or to non-sterilized conventional eggs at 0 or 4 dpf (before or after hatching, respectively). In both cases, these re-conventionalized (re-Conv) zebrafish survived *F. columnare*[ALG] infection as well as Conv zebrafish (Supplementary Fig. S3). To determine the composition of conventional zebrafish microbiota, we generated 16S rRNA gene clone libraries from homogenate pools of Conv larvae aged 6 and 11 dpf exposed or not to *F.*

*columnare*[ALG], sampled over 3 months from 3 different batches of larvae (n=10). A total

of 857 clones were generated for all samples. We identified 15 operational taxonomical

units (OTUs), 10 of which were identified in all experiments (Table 1, Suppl. Table S1).

Two OTUs (belonging to an *Ensifer* sp. and a *Hydrogenophaga* sp.) were only detected

once, and a *Delftia* sp., a *Limnobacter* sp. and a *Novosphingobium* sp. were detected more

than once (2, 3 and 2 times, respectively), but not consistently in all batches of fish (Table

1, Suppl. Table S1). Moreover, deep-sequencing of the 16S rRNA V3-V4 region of

gDNA retrieved from larvae originating from the other four zebrafish facilities described

above, revealed that OTUs for all of these 10 strains were also detected in Conv larvae,

with the exception of *A. veronii* strain 2 that was not detected in all samples (Suppl. Table

S2).

To isolate culturable zebrafish microbiota bacteria, we plated dilutions of homogenized

6 dpf and 11 dpf larvae pools on various growth media and we identified 10 different

bacterial morphotypes. 16S-based analysis followed by full genome sequencing

identified 10 bacteria corresponding to 10 strains of 9 different species that were also

consistently detected by culture-free approaches (Table 1). To assess the potential

protective role of these 10 strains, we re-conventionalized GF zebrafish at 4 dpf with a

mix of all 10 identified culturable bacterial species (hereafter called Mix10), each at a

concentration of $5.10^5$ cfu/mL and we monitored zebrafish survival after exposure to *F.*

*columnare*[ALG] at 6 dpf. We showed that zebrafish re-conventionalized with the Mix10

(Re-Conv[Mix10]) displayed a strong level of protection against all identified highly virulent

*F. columnare* strains (Supplementary Fig. S4). These results demonstrated that the Mix10

constitutes a core protective bacterial community providing full protection of zebrafish

larvae against *F. columnare* infection.

**Community dynamics under antibiotic-induced dysbiosis reveal a key contributor**

**to resistance to *F. columnare* infection**

To further analyze the determinants of Mix10 protection against *F. columnare*[ALG]

infection, we inoculated 4 dpf larvae with an equal-ratio mix of the 10 bacteria (at $5.10^5$

cfu/mL each) and monitored their establishment over 8 hours. We first verified that whole

larvae bacterial content (OTU abundance) was not significantly different from content of

dissected intestinal tubes (p=0.99, two-tailed t-test) (Supplementary Fig. S5) and

proceeded to use entire larvae to monitor bacterial establishment and recovery in the rest

of the study. We then collected pools of 10 larvae immediately after re-

conventionalization ($t_0$), and then at 20 min, 2 hours, 4 hours and 8 hours in three

independent experiments. Illumina sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene was used to follow

bacterial relative abundance. At $t_0$, all species were present at > 4% in the zebrafish, apart

from *A. veronii* strains 1 (0.2%) and 2 (not detected) (Supplementary Fig. S6). *Aeromonas*

*caviae* was detected as the most abundant species (33%), followed by *Stenotrophomonas*

*maltophilia* (23%) and *Chryseobacterium massiliae* (12%), altogether composing 68% of

the community (Supplementary Fig. S6). The relative species abundance, possibly

reflecting initial colonization ability, was relatively stable for most species during

community establishment, with similar species evenness at $t_0$ (E = 0.84) and $t_{8h}$ (E = 0.85).

Whereas both Conv and Re-Conv$^{Mix10}$ larvae were protected against *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$

infection, the global structure of the reconstituted Mix10 population was different from

the conventional one at 4 dpf (Supplementary Fig. S6).

To test the sensitivity to disturbance and the resilience of the protection provided by

Mix10 bacterial community, we subjected Re-Conv$^{Mix10}$ zebrafish to non-toxic antibiotic

treatment at 4dpf using either 250 µg/mL penicillin/streptomycin combination (all

members of the Mix10 bacteria are sensitive to penicillin/streptomycin) or 50 µg/mL

kanamycin (affecting all members of the Mix10 bacteria except *C. massiliae*, *P.*

*myrsinacearum* and *S. maltophilia*) (Suppl. Fig. S7). At 5 dpf, after 16 hours of exposure,

antibiotics were washed off and zebrafish were immediately exposed to *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$.

Both antibiotic treatments resulted in complete loss of the protection against *F.*

*columnare*$^{ALG}$ infection observed in Re-Conv$^{Mix10}$ (Fig. 2A). We then used the same

antibiotic treatments but followed by a 24h recovery period after washing off the

antibiotics at 5 dpf, therefore only performing the infection at 6 dpf (Fig. 2B). Whilst Re-

Conv$^{Mix10}$ larvae treated with penicillin/streptomycin showed similar survival to infected

GF larvae, kanamycin-treated Re-Conv$^{Mix10}$ zebrafish displayed restored protection after

24h recovery and survived similarly to untreated conventionalized fish (Fig. 2B).

Sampling and 16S gene analysis during recovery experiments at different time points

showed that bacterial community evenness decreased after antibiotic administration for

both treatments (E = 0.85 for 4 dpf control, E = 0.72 for $t_0$ kanamycin and E = 0.7 for $t_0$

penicillin/streptomycin), and continued to decrease during recovery (E = 0.6 and 0.64 for

kanamycin and penicillin/streptomycin treatment after 24h recovery, respectively).

Although *C. massiliae* remained detectable immediately after both antibiotic treatments,

penicillin/streptomycin treatment led a significant reduction in its relative abundance

(0.21%) (Fig. 2C). By contrast, *C. massiliae* relative abundance rebounded 6h after

cessation of kanamycin treatment and was the dominant member (52%) of the

reconstituted microbiota after 24h recovery period (Fig. 2D), suggesting that the

protective effect observed in the kanamycin-treated larvae might be due to the recovery

of *C. massiliae*.

**219    Resistance to *F. columnare* infection is provided by both individual and**

**220    community-level protection**

To test the potential key role played by *C. massiliae* in protection against *F. columnare*[ALG]

infection, we exposed 4 dpf GF zebrafish to *C. massiliae* only and showed that it

conferred individual protection at doses as low as $5.10^2$ cfu/mL (Fig. 3). Whereas none

of the 9 other species composing the Mix10 were protective individually (Fig. 3A), their

equiratio combination (designated as Mix9) conferred protection to zebrafish, although

not at doses lower than $5.10^4$ cfu/mL and not as reproducibly as with *C. massiliae* (Fig.

3B). To identify which association of species protected Re-Conv[Mix9] zebrafish against *F.*

*columnare*[ALG] infection, we tested all 9 combinations of 8 species (Mix8), as well as

several combinations of 7, 6, 4 or 3 species and showed no protection (Suppl. Fig. S8A

and Suppl. Table S4). We then tested whether lack of protection of Mix8 compared to

Mix9 could rely on a density effect by doubling the concentration of any of the species

within the non-protective Mix8a (Suppl. Fig. S8B) and showed no protection. These

results therefore indicated that microbiota-based protection against *F. columnare*[ALG]

infection relied on either *C. massiliae*-dependent membership effect or on a community-

dependent effect mediated by the Mix9 consortium.

**237    Pro- and anti- inflammatory cytokine production does not contribute to microbiota-**

**238    mediated protection against *F. columnare*[ALG] infection.**

To test the contribution of the immune response of zebrafish larvae to resistance to *F.*

*columnare* infection, we used qRT-PCR to measure cytokine mRNA expression in GF

and Conv zebrafish exposed or not to *F. columnare*[ALG]. We also tested the impact of re-

conventionalization with *C. massiliae* (re-Conv$^{Cm}$), Mix10 (re-Conv$^{Mix10}$) or with Mix4

(*A. caviae*, both *A. veronii* spp., *P. mossellii*) as a non-protective control (Suppl. Table

S4). We tested genes encoding IL1β (pro-inflammatory), IL22 (promoting gut repair),

and IL10 (anti-inflammatory) cytokines. While we observed some variation in *il10*

expression among non-infected re-conventionalized larvae, this did not correlate with

protection. Furthermore, *il10* expression was not modulated by infection in any of the

tested conditions (Fig. 4A). By contrast, we observed a strong induction of *il1b* and *il22*

in GF zebrafish exposed to *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$ (Fig. 4BC). However, although this

induction was reduced in protected Conv, Re-Conv$^{Cm}$ and Re-Conv$^{Mix10}$, it was also

observed in non-protective Re-Conv$^{Mix4}$ larvae, indicating that down-modulation of the

inflammatory response induced by *F. columnare* does not correlate with resistance to

infection. Consistently, the use of a *myd88* mutant, a key adaptor of IL-1 and toll-like

receptor signalling deficient in innate immunity(Cheesman et al. 2011, van der Vaart et

al. 2013), showed that Conv or Re-Conv$^{Mix10}$, but not GF *myd88* mutants survived *F.*

*columnare* as well as wild-type zebrafish (Figure 4D). Moreover, *il1b* induction by *F.*

*columnare* infection was observed only in GF larvae and was *myd88*-independent (Suppl.

Figure S9). These results therefore indicated that the tested cytokine responses do not

play a significant role in the microbiota-mediated protection against *F. columnare*

infection.

***C. massiliae* and Mix9 protect zebrafish from intestinal damages upon *F.***

***columnare*$^{ALG}$ infection**

Histological analysis of GF larvae fixed 24h after exposure to *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$ revealed

extensive intestinal damage (Fig. 5A) prior to noticeable signs in other potential target

organs such as gills or skin. To test the requirement for gut access in *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$

infection process, we modified our standard rearing protocol of GF fish, which involves

feeding with live germ-free *T. thermophila*. We found that, if left unfed, GF zebrafish did

not die after *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$ exposure, while feeding with either *T. thermophila* or

another food source such as sterile fish food powder, restored sensitivity to *F.*

*columnare*$^{ALG}$ infection (Suppl. Fig S10), suggesting that successful infection requires

feeding and ingestion.

Histological sections consistently showed severe disorganization of the intestine with
blebbing in the microvilli and vacuole formation in *F. columnare*[ALG]-infected GF larvae
(Fig. 5). In contrast, zebrafish pre-incubated with either *C. massiliae* or Mix9 consortium
at 4 dpf, and then exposed to *F. columnare*[ALG] at 6 dpf showed no difference compared
to non-infected larvae or conventional infected larvae (Fig. 5), confirming full protection
against *F. columnare*[ALG] at the intestinal level.

***C. massiliae* protects larvae and adult zebrafish against *F. columnare***
The clear protection provided by *C. massiliae* against *F. columnare*[ALG] infection
prompted us to test whether exogenous addition of this bacterium could improve
microbiota-based protection towards this widespread fish pathogen. We first showed that
zebrafish larvae colonized with *C. massiliae* were fully protected against all virulent *F.*
*columnare* strains identified in this study (Fig. 6A). To test whether *C. massiliae* could
also protect adult zebrafish from *F. columnare* infection, we pre-treated conventional 3-
4-month-old Conv adult zebrafish with *C. massiliae* for 48h before challenging them with
a high dose ($5.10^6$ cfu/mL) *F. columnare*[ALG]. Monitoring of mortality rate showed that
pre-treatment with *C. massiliae* significantly increased the survival rate of adult zebrafish
upon *F. columnare*[ALG] infection compared to non-treated conventional fish (p=0.0084
Mann-Whitney test, Figure 6B). Taken together, these results show that *C. massiliae* is a
putative broad-spectrum probiotic protecting zebrafish against columnaris disease caused
by *F. columnare*.

**DISCUSSION**

In this study, we used re-conventionalization of otherwise germ-free zebrafish larvae to show that conventional-level protection against infection by a broad range of highly virulent *F. columnare* strains is provided by a set of 10 culturable bacterial strains, belonging to 9 different species, isolated from the indigenous standard laboratory zebrafish microbiota. With the exception of the Bacteroidetes *C. massiliae*, this protective consortium was dominated by Proteobacteria such as *Pseudomonas* and *Aeromonas* spp., bacteria commonly found in aquatic environments (Mena and Gerba 2009, Goncalves Pessoa et al. 2019). Despite the relative permissiveness of zebrafish larvae microbiota to environmental variations and inherent variability between samples (Stephens et al. 2016), we showed that these ten bacteria were consistently identified in four different zebrafish facilities, suggesting the existence of a core microbiota with important colonization resistance functionality. Use of controlled combinations of these 10 bacterial species enabled us to show a very robust species-specific protection effect in larvae mono-associated with *C. massiliae*. We also identified a community-level protection provided by the combination of the 9 other species that were otherwise unable to protect against *F. columnare* when provided individually. This protection was however less reproducible and required a minimum inoculum of $5.10^4$ cfu/mL, compared to $5.10^2$ cfu/mL with *C. massiliae*. These results therefore suggest the existence of two distinct microbiota-based protection scenarios: one based on a membership effect provided by *C. massiliae*, and the other mediated by the higher-order activity of the Mix9 bacterial community.

Although protection against *F. columnare* infection does not seem to rely on microbiota-based immuno-modulation, we cannot exclude that, individually, some members of the studied core zebrafish microbiota could induce pro- or anti-inflammatory responses masked in presence of the full Mix10 consortium (Rolig et al. 2015).Further studies will be required to characterize the different mechanisms of the two identified colonization resistance scenarios, which could include nutrient depletion, adhesion inhibition, direct contact-growth inhibition or release of inhibitory molecules leading to niche exclusion (Vollaard and Clasener 1994, Stecher and Hardt 2011). In the case of the protection provided by *C. massilliae* against *F. columnare,* these two phylogenetically close bacteria could compete for similar resources and directly antagonize each other, as

shown to occur between *Bacteroidetes* species (Chatzidaki-Livanis, Coyne, and

Comstock 2014, Russell et al. 2014, Roelofs et al. 2016, Jacobson et al. 2018).

Interestingly, infected larvae re-conventionalized with either C. *massiliae* or Mix9

showed no signs of the intestinal damage displayed by germ-free larvae, suggesting that

both *C. massiliae* and Mix9 provide similar intestinal resistance to *F. columnare*

infection. Whereas microbial colonization contributes to gut maturation and stimulates

the production of epithelial passive defences such as mucus (Kamada et al. 2013, Ganz,

Melancon, and Eisen 2016), lack of intestinal maturation is unlikely to be contributing to

*F. columnare*-induced mortality, as mono-colonized larvae or larvae re-conventionalized

with non-protective mixes died as rapidly as germ-free larvae.

Several studies have monitored the long-term assembly and development of the

zebrafish microbiota from larvae to sexually mature adults, however little is known about

the initial colonization establishment of the larvae after hatching (Bates et al. 2006, Yan,

van der Gast, and Yu 2012). Neutral (stochastic) and deterministic (host niche-based)

processes (Costello et al. 2012, Rogers et al. 2013, Burns et al. 2016) lead to microbial

communities that are mostly represented by a limited number of highly abundant species

with highly diverse low-abundant populations. In our experiments, the Mix10 species

inoculum corresponded to an equiratio bacterial mix, thus starting from an engineered

and assumed total evenness (E = 1) (Hibbing et al. 2010, Shafquat et al. 2014). Evenness

was still relatively high (0.84) and remained similar up until 8h in our study, indicating

that most of the ten species were able to colonize the larvae. From the perspective of

community composition, a loss of diversity is often associated with decreased

colonization resistance, but it remains unclear whether this increased susceptibility is due

to the loss of certain key member species of the microbial community and/or a change in

their prevalence (van der Waaij, Berghuis-de Vries, and Lekkerkerk-van der Wees 1972,

Littman and Pamer 2011).

We further investigated resistance to infection by exposing established bacterial

communities to different antibiotic perturbations, followed by direct challenge with *F.*

*columnare* (to study core microbiota sensitivity to disturbance) or after recovery (to study

its resilience) (Robinson, Bohannan, and Young 2010, Shade et al. 2012). Antibiotics are

known to shift the composition and relative abundances of the microbiota according to

their spectrum (Vollaard and Clasener 1994, Willing, Russell, and Finlay 2011). We

observed that penicillin/streptomycin treatment that would affect most of the core species,
reduced the abundance of all but two species (*A. veronii* 1 and *P. myrsinacearum)* that
became relatively dominant during recovery, but failed to provide protection against *F.*
*columnare*. With the kanamycin treatment, colonization resistance was fully restored at
the end of the 24h recovery period, indicative of a resilience that could result from species
recovering quickly to their pre-perturbation levels due to fast growth rates, physiological
flexibility or mutations (Brugman et al. 2009). Interestingly, even taking into account
potential biases associated with the use of the 16S rRNA as a proxy index to determine
relative abundance (Salonen et al. 2010, Kunin et al. 2010), evenness was similarly
reduced during recovery for both treatments, but abundance at phylum level changed to
48% for Proteobacteria, and 52% for Bacteroidetes compared to the >98% of
Proteobacteria with the penicillin/streptomycin treatment. Furthermore, *C. massiliae* was
detected as rare (<1%) in conventional larvae, suggesting that it could have a
disproportionate effect on the community or that community-level protection provided
by the nine other bacteria was also responsible for the protection of conventional larvae
to *F. columnare* infection.

Our study showed that germ-free zebrafish larvae are highly susceptible to a
variety of different *F. columnare* genomovars isolated from different hosts,
demonstrating that they are a robust animal model for the study of its pathogenicity.
Recently, *F. columnare* mutants in Type 9 secretion system (T9SS) were shown to be
avirulent in adult zebrafish, suggesting that proteins secreted by the T9SS are likely to be
key, but still largely unidentified, *F. columnare* virulence determinants (Li et al. 2017).
Body skin, gills, fins and tail are also frequently damaged in salmonid fish, whereas
severe infection cases are associated with septicemia (Bernardet and Bowman 2006). We
could not identify such clear *F. columnare* infection sites in zebrafish larvae, perhaps due
to the very low dose of infection used, with less than 100 cfu recovered from infected
moribund larvae. However, several lines of evidence suggest that the gut is the main target
of *F. columnare* infection in our model: (i) unfed germ-free larvae survived exposure, (ii)
histology analysis showing severe disruption of the intestinal region just hours after
infection in germ-free larvae, and (iii) induction of *il22* in germ-free larvae exposed to *F.*
*columnare*, since a major function of IL-22 is to promote gut repair (Shabgah et al. 2017).
This induction appears to be a consequence of the pathogen-mediated damage, as there

393 was no observed induction in conventional or re-conventionalized larvae. The very rapid

394 death of larvae likely caused by this severe intestinal damage may explain why other

395 common target organs of columnaris disease showed little damage.

397   In this study, we showed that *C. massiliae* is a promising probiotic candidate that

398 could contribute to reduce the use of antibiotic to prevent columnaris diseases in research

399 and aquaculture settings. Whereas *C. massiliae* provided full and robust protection

400 against all tested virulent *F. columnare* genomovars and significantly increased survival

401 of exposed adult conventional zebrafish, further studies are needed to elucidate *C.*

402 *massiliae* protection potential in other teleost fish. However, the endogenous nature of *C.*

403 *massiliae* suggests that it could establish itself as a long-term resident of the zebrafish

404 larval and adult microbiota, an advantageous trait when seeking a stable modulation of

405 the bacterial community over long periods (Lemon et al. 2012).

407 In conclusion, the use of a simple and tractable zebrafish larval model to mine indigenous

408 host microbial communities allowed us to identify two independent protection pathways

409 against the same pathogen. Whereas further study will determine how these pathways

410 may contribute to protection against a wider range of pathogens, this work also provides

411 insights into how to the engineering of stable protective microbial communities with

412 controlled colonization resistance functions.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Bacterial strains and growth conditions.** Bacterial strains isolated from zebrafish

microbiota are listed in Table 1. *F. columnare* strains (Suppl. Table S3) were grown at

28°C in tryptone yeast extract salts (TYES) broth [0.4 % (w/v) tryptone, 0.04 % yeast

extract, 0.05 % (w/v) MgSO$_4$ 7H$_2$O, 0.02 % (w/v) CaCl$_2$ 2H$_2$O, 0.05 % (w/v) D-glucose,

pH 7.2]. *F. columnare* strains were assigned into four genomovar groups using 16S rRNA

restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis, including genomovar I, I/II, II, and

III (Garcia et al. 2018). All 10 strains of the core zebrafish microbiota species were grown

in TYES or LB at 28°C.

**Ethics statement**

All animal experiments described in the present study were conducted at the Institut

Pasteur (larvae) or at INRA Jouy-en-Josas (adults) according to European Union

guidelines        for        handling        of        laboratory        animals

(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/lab_animals/home_en.htm)        and        were

approved by the relevant institutional Animal Health and Care Committees.

**General handling of zebrafish**. Wild-type AB fish, originally purchased from the

Zebrafish International Resource Center (Eugene, OR, USA), or *myd88*-null mutants

(*myd88$^{hu3568/hu3568}$*) (van der Vaart et al. 2013), kindly provided by A.H Meijer, (Leiden

University, the Netherlands), were raised in our facility. A few hours after spawning, eggs

were collected, rinsed, and sorted under a dissecting scope to remove faeces and

unfertilized eggs. All following procedures were performed in a laminar microbiological

cabinet with single-use disposable plasticware. Fish were kept in sterile 25 cm$^3$ vented

cap culture flasks containing 20 mL of water (0-6 dpf- 15 fish per flasks) or 24-well

microtiter plates (6-15 dpf-1 fish per 2 mL well) in autoclaved mineral water (Volvic) at

28°C. Fish were fed 3 times a week from 4 dpf with germ-free *Tetrahymena thermophila*

protozoans (Rendueles et al. 2012). Germ-free zebrafish were produced after sterilizing

the egg chorion protecting the otherwise sterile egg, with antibiotic and chemical

treatments (see below), whereas conventional larvae (with facility-innate microbiota)

were directly reared from non-sterilized eggs and then handled exactly as the germ-free

larvae.

**Sterilization of zebrafish eggs.** Egg sterilization was performed as previously described

with some modifications (Rendueles et al. 2012). Freshly fertilized zebrafish eggs were

first bleached (0.003%) for 5 min, washed 3 times in sterile water under gentle agitation

and maintained overnight in groups of 100 eggs per 75 cm$^3$ culture flasks with vented

caps containing 100 mL of autoclaved Volvic mineral water supplemented with

methylene blue solution (0.3 µg/mL). Afterwards, eggs were transferred into 50 mL

Falcon tubes (100 eggs per tube) and treated with a mixture of antibiotics (500 µL of

penicillin G: streptomycin, 10,000 U/ml: 10 mg/mL GIBCO #P4333), 200 µL of filtered

kanamycin sulfate (100 mg/mL, SERVA Electrophoresis #26899) and antifungal drug

(50 µL of amphotericin B solution Sigma-Aldrich (250 µg/mL) #A2942) for 2 h under

agitation at 28°C. Eggs were then washed 3 times in sterile water under gentle agitation

and bleached (0.003%) for 15 min, resuspending the eggs every 3 min by inversion. Eggs

were washed again 3 times in water and incubated 10 min with 0.01% Romeiod (COFA,

Coopérative Française de l'Aquaculture). Finally, eggs were washed 3 times in water and

transferred into 25 cm$^3$ culture flasks with vented caps containing 20 mL of water. After

sterilization, eggs were transferred with approximately 30 to 35 eggs / flasks and were

transferred into new flasks at 4 dpf before re-conventionalization with 10 to 15 fish /

flask. We monitored sterility at several points during the experiment by spotting 50 µL of

water from each flask on LB, TYES and on YPD agar plates, all incubated at 28°C under

aerobic conditions. Plates were left for at least 3 days to allow slow-growing organisms

to multiply. Spot checks for bacterial contamination were also carried out by PCR

amplification of water samples with the 16S rRNA gene primers and procedure detailed

further below. If a particular flask was contaminated, those fish were removed from the

experiment.

**Procedure for raising germ-free zebrafish.** After hatching, fish were fed with germ-

free *T. thermophila* 3 times per week from 4 dpf onwards. *(i) T. thermophila stock.* A

germ-free line of *T. thermophila* was maintained at 28°C in 20 mL of PPYE (0.25%

proteose peptone BD Bacto #211684, 0.25% yeast extract BD Bacto #212750)

supplemented with penicillin G (10 unit/mL) and streptomycin (10µg/mL). Medium was

inoculated with 100 µL of the preceding *T. thermophila* stock. After one week of growth,

samples were taken, tested for sterility on LB, TYES and YPD plates and restocked again.

*(ii) Growth. T. thermophila* were incubated at 28°C in MYE broth (1% milk powder, 1% yeast extract) inoculated from stock suspension at a 1:50 ratio. After 24 h of growth, *T. thermophila* were transferred to Falcon tubes and washed (4400 rpm, 3 min at 25°C) 3 times in 50 mL of autoclaved Volvic water. Finally, *T. thermophila* were resuspended in sterile water and added to culture flasks (500 µL in 20 mL) or 24-well plates (50 µL / well). Sterility of *T. thermophila* was tested by plating and 16S rRNA PCR as described in the section above. (iii) *Fine-powder feeding*. When indicated, fish were fed with previously γ-ray-sterilized fine-powdered food suitable for an early first feeding gape size (ZM-000 fish feed, ZM Ltd) every 48 hours (Pham et al. 2008).

**Re-conventionalization of germ-free zebrafish**. At 4 dpf, just after hatching, zebrafish larvae were re-conventionalized with a single bacterial population or a mix of several. The 10 bacterial strains constituting the core protective microbiota were grown for 24h in suitable media (TYES or LB) at 28°C. Bacteria were then pelleted and washed twice in sterile water, and all adjusted to the same cell density ($OD_{600}$ = 1 or $5.10^7$ cfu/mL) (i) *Re-conventionalization with individual species.* Bacteria were resuspended and transferred to culture flasks containing germ-free fish at a final concentration of $5.10^5$ cfu/mL. (ii) *Re-conventionalization with bacterial mixtures*. For the preparation of Mix10, Mix9, Mix8 and all other mixes used, equimolar mixtures were prepared by adding each bacterial species at initial concentration to $5.10^7$ cfu/mL. Each bacterial mixture suspension was added to culture flasks containing germ-free fish at a final concentration of $5.10^5$ cfu/mL.

**Infection challenges.** *F. columnare* strains (Suppl. Table S3) were grown overnight in TYES broth at 28°C. Then, 2 mL of culture were pelleted (10,000 rpm for 5 min) and washed once in sterile water. GF zebrafish were brought in contact with the tested pathogens at 6 dpf for 3h by immersion in culture flasks with bacterial doses ranging from $5.10^2$ to $5.10^7$ cfu/mL. Fish were then transferred to individual wells of 24-well plates, containing 2 mL of water and 50 µL of freshly prepared GF *T. thermophila* per well. Mortality was monitored daily as described in (Rendueles et al. 2012) and as few as 54±9 cfu/larva of *F. columnare* were recovered from infected larvae. All zebrafish experiments were stopped at day 9 post-infection and zebrafish were euthanized with tricaine (MS-222) (Sigma-Aldrich #E10521). Each experiment was repeated at least 3 times and

between 10 and 15 larvae were used per condition and per experiment.

**Collection of eggs from other zebrafish facilities.** Conventional zebrafish eggs were

collected in 50 mL Falcon tubes from the following facilities: Facility 1 - zebrafish facility

in Hospital Robert Debré, Paris; Facility 2 - Jussieu zebrafish facility A2, University Paris

6; Facility 3 - Jussieu – zebrafish facility C8 (UMR7622), University Paris 6; Facility 4:

AMAGEN commercial facility, Gif sur Yvette; Larvae were treated with the same rearing

conditions, sterilization and infection procedures used in the Institut Pasteur facility.

**Determination of fish bacterial load using cfu count.** Zebrafish were euthanized with

tricaine (MS-222) (Sigma-Aldrich #E10521) at 0.3 mg/mL for 10 minutes. Then they

were washed in 3 different baths of sterile PBS-0.1% Tween to remove bacteria loosely

attached to the skin. Finally, they were transferred to tubes containing calibrated glass

beads (acid-washed, 425 μm to 600 μm, SIGMA-ALDRICH #G8772) and 500 μL of

autoclaved PBS. They were homogenized using FastPrep Cell Disrupter (BIO101/FP120

QBioGene) for 45 s at maximum speed (6.5 m/s). Finally**,** serial dilutions of recovered

suspension were spotted on TYES agar and cfu were counted after 48h of incubation at

28°C.

**Characterization of zebrafish microbial content**. Over 3 months, the experiment was

run independently 3 times and 3 different batches of eggs were collected from different

fish couples in different tanks. Larvae were reared as described above. GF and Conv

larvae were collected at 6 dpf and 11 dpf for each batch. Infected Conv larvae were

exposed to *F. columnare*[ALG] for 3h by immersion as described above. For each

experimental group, triplicate pools of 10 larvae (one in each experimental batch) were

euthanized, washed and lysed as above. Lysates were split into 3 aliquots, one for culture

followed by 16S rRNA gene sequencing (A), one for 16S rRNA gene clone library

generation and Sanger sequencing (B), and one for Illumina metabarcoding-based

sequencing (C).

*A) Bacterial culture followed by 16S rRNA gene-based identification*

Lysates were serially diluted and immediately plated on R2A, TYES, LB, MacConkey,

BHI, BCYE, TCBS and TSB agars and incubated at 28ºC for 24-72h. For each agar,

colony morphotypes were documented, and colonies were picked and re-streaked on the

same agar in duplicate. In order to identify the individual morphotypes, individual

colonies were picked for each identified morphotype from each agar, vortexed in 200 μL

DNA-free water and boiled for 20 min at 90ºC. Five μL of this bacterial suspension were

used as template for colony PCR to amplify the 16S rRNA gene with the universal primer

pair for the Domain bacteria 8f (5'-AGA GTT TGA TCC TGG CTC AG-3') and 1492r

(5'-GGT TAC CTT GTT ACG ACT T-3'). Each primer was used at a final concentration

of 0.2 μM in 50 μL reactions. PCR cycling conditions were - initial denaturation at 94°C

for 2 min, followed by 32 cycles of denaturation at 94 °C for 1 min, annealing at 56°C for

1 min, and extension at 72°C for 2 min, with a final extension step at 72°C for 10 min.

16S rRNA gene PCR products were verified on 1% agarose gels, purified with the

QIAquick® PCR purification kit and two PCR products for each morphotype were sent

for sequencing (Eurofins, Ebersberg, Germany). 16S rRNA sequences were manually

proofread, and sequences of low quality were removed from the analysis. Primer

sequences were trimmed, and sequences were compared to GenBank (NCBI) with

BLAST, and to the Ribosomal Database Project with SeqMatch. For genus determination

a 95% similarity cut-off was used, for Operational Taxonomic Unit determination, a 98%

cut-off was used.

*B) 16S rRNA gene clone library generation*

Total DNA was extracted from the lysates with the Mobio PowerLyzer® Ultraclean® kit

according to manufacturer's instructions. Germ-free larvae and DNA-free water were

also extracted as control samples. Extracted genomic DNA was verified by Tris-acetate-

EDTA-agarose gel electrophoresis (1%) stained with GelRed and quantified by applying

2.5 μL directly to a NanoDrop® ND-1000 Spectrophotometer. The 16S rRNA gene was

amplified by PCR with the primers 8f and 1492r, and products checked and purified as

described in section A. Here, we added 25-50 ng of DNA as template to 50 μL reactions.

Clone libraries were generated with the pGEM®-T Easy Vector system (Promega)

according to manufacturer's instructions. Presence of the cloned insert was confirmed by

colony PCR with vector primers gemsp6 (5'-GCT GCG ACT TCA CTA GTG AT-3')

and gemt7 (5'-GTG GCA GCG GGA ATT CGA T-3'). Clones with an insert of the

correct size were purified as above and sent for sequencing (Eurofins, Ebersberg,

Germany). Blanks using DNA-free water as template were run for all procedures as

controls. For the three independent runs of the experiment, 10 Conv fish per condition (6

and 11 dpf, exposed or not to *F. columnare*) and per repeat were pooled. Each pool of 10

fish was sequenced separately, generating 3 replicates for each condition (n=12), resulting

in a total of 857 clones. Clone library coverage was calculated with the following formula

$[1-(n_1/N_2)] \times 100$, where $n_1$ is the number of singletons detected in the clone library, and

$N_2$ is the total number of clones generated for this sample. Clone libraries were generated

to a minimum coverage of 95%. Sequence analysis and identification was carried out as

in section A.

*C) by 16S rRNA V3V4 Amplicon Illumina sequencing*

To identify the 16S rRNA gene diversity in our facility and fish collected from 4 other

zebrafish facilities, fish were reared as described above. GF fish were sterilised as above,

and uninfected germ-free and conventional fish were collected at 6 dpf and 11 dpf.

Infection was carried out as above with *F. columnare*[ALG] for 3h by bath immersion,

followed by transfer to clean water. Infected conventional fish were collected at 6 dpf 6h

after infection with *F. columnare* and at 11 dpf, the same as uninfected fish. GF infected

larvae were only collected at 6 dpf 6h post infection, as at 11 dpf all larvae had succumbed

to infection. Triplicate pools of 10 larvae were euthanized, washed and lysed as above.

Total DNA was extracted with the Mobio PowerLyzer® Ultraclean® kit as described

above and quantified with a NanoDrop® ND-1000 Spectrophotometer and sent to IMGM

Laboratories GmbH (Germany) for Illumina sequencing. Primers Bakt_341F (5'-

CCTACGGGNGGCWGCAG-3')            and            Bakt_805R            (5'-

GACTACHVGGGTATCTAATCC-3'), amplifying variable regions 3 and 4 of the 16S

gene were used for amplification (Lemon et al. 2012).

Each amplicon was purified with solid phase reversible immobilization (SPRI)

paramagnetic bead-based technology (AMPure XP beads, Beckman Coulter) with a

Bead:DNA ratio of 0.7:1 (v/v) following manufacturer´s instructions. Amplicons were

normalized with the Sequal-Prep Kit (Life Technologies), so each sample contained

approximately 1 ng/µl DNA. Samples, positive and negative controls were generated in

one library. The High Sensitivity DNA LabChip Kit (was used on the 2100 Bioanalyzer

system (both Agilent Technologies) to check the quality of the purified amplicon library.

For cluster generation and sequencing, MiSeq® reagents kit 500 cycles Nano v2

(Illumina Inc.) was used. Before sequencing, cluster generation by two-dimensional

bridge amplification was performed, followed by bidirectional sequencing, producing 2

x 250 bp paired-end (PE) reads.

MiSeq® Reporter 2.5.1.3 software was used for primary data analysis (signal processing,

de-multiplexing, trimming of adapter sequences). CLC Genomics Workbench 8.5.1

(Qiagen) was used for read-merging, quality trimming and QC reports and OTU

definition were carried out in the CLC plugin Microbial Genomics module.

**Comparison of whole larvae vs intestinal bacterial content.** Larvae re-

conventionalized with Mix10 and infected with *F. columnare*[ALG] at 6 dpf for 3h were

euthanized and washed. DNA was extracted from pools of 10 whole larvae or of pools of

10 intestinal tubes dissected with sterile surgical tweezer and subjected to Illumina 16S

rRNA gene sequencing. GF larvae and dissected GF intestines were sampled as controls.

As dissection of the larval guts involved high animal loss and was a potential important

contamination source, we proceeded with using entire larvae for the rest of the study.

**Whole genome sequencing**. Chromosomal DNA of the ten species composing the core

of zebrafish larvae microbiota was extracted using the DNeasy Blood & Tissue kit

(QIAGEN) including RNase treatment. DNA quality and quantity were assessed on a

NanoDrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific).

DNA sequencing libraries were made using the Nextera DNA Library Preparation Kit

(Illumina Inc.) and library quality was checked using the High Sensitivity DNA LabChip

Kit on the Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies). Sequencing clusters were generated

using the MiSeq reagents kit v2 500 cycles (Illumina Inc.) according to manufacturer's

instructions. DNA was sequenced at the Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research by

bidirectional sequencing, producing 2 x 250 bp paired-end (PE) reads. Between 1,108,578

and 2,914,480 reads per sample were retrieved with a median of 1,528,402. Reads were

quality filtered, trimmed and adapters removed with trimmomatic 0.39 (Bolger, Lohse,

and Usadel 2014) and genomes assembled using SPAdes 3.14 (Bankevich et al. 2012).

**Bacterial species identification**. Whole genome-based bacterial species identification

was performed by the TrueBac ID system (v1.92, DB:20190603)

[https://www.truebacid.com/; (Ha et al. 2019). Species-level identification was

performed based on the algorithmic cut-off set at 95% ANI when possible or when the

16S rRNA gene sequence similarity was >99 %.

**Monitoring of bacterial dynamics**. Three independent experiments were run over 6

weeks with eggs collected from different fish couples from different tanks to monitor

establishment and recovery. Larvae were reared, sterilized and infected as above with the

only difference that 75 cm$^3$ culture flasks with vented caps (filled with 50 mL of sterile

Volvic) were used to accommodate the larger number of larvae required, as in each

experiment. Larvae for time course Illumina sequencing were removed sequentially from

the experiment that monitored the survival of the larvae. Animals were pooled (10 larvae

for each time point/condition), euthanized, washed and lysed as described above and

stored at -20ºC until the end of the survival monitoring, and until all triplicates had been

collected.

*A) Community establishment*

In order to follow the establishment of the 10 core strains in the larvae, GF larvae were

re-conventionalized with an equiratio Mix10 as above. Re-con$^{Mix10}$ larvae were sampled

at 4 dpf immediately after addition of the 10 core species and then 20 min, 2h, 4h and 8h

after. Germ-free, conventional larvae and the inoculum were also sampled as controls.

*B) Induction of dysbiosis*

Different doses of kanamycin (dose 1= 200 µg/mL; dose 2= 50 µg/mL; dose 3= 25

µg/mL) and a penicillin/streptomycin antibiotic mix (dose 1= 250 µg/mL; dose 2= 15.6

µg/mL were tested on re-con$^{Mix10}$ 4 dpf zebrafish larvae by adding them to the flask water

to identify antibiotic treatments that were non-toxic to larvae but that caused dysbiosis.

After 16 hours of treatment, antibiotics were extensively washed off with sterile water

and larvae were challenged with *F. columnare*$^{ALG}$, leading to the death of all larvae – e.g.

successful abolition of colonization resistance with best results in all repeats with 250

µg/mL penicillin/streptomycin and 50 µg/mL kanamycin as antibiotic treatment.

*C) Community recovery*

As in B) after 8h of incubation, 4 dpf recon$^{Mix10}$ larvae were treated with 250 µg/mL

penicillin/streptomycin and 50 µg/mL kanamycin for 16h. Antibiotics were extensively

washed off and larvae were now left to recover in sterile water for 24h to assess resilience

of the bacterial community. Samples (pools of 10 larvae) were taken at 3h, 6h, 12h, 18h

and 24h during recovery and sent for 16S rRNA Illumina sequencing. Larvae were then

challenged at 6 dpf with *F. columnare*[ALG] for 3h and survival was monitored daily for 9

days post-infection. All time course samples were sequenced by IMGM Laboratories

GmbH, as described above.

**Statistical analysis of metataxonomic data**. 16S RNA analysis was performed with

SHAMAN (Volant et al. 2019)]. Library adapters, primer sequences, and base pairs

occurring at 5' and 3'ends with a Phred quality score <20 were trimmed off by using

Alientrimmer (v0.4.0). Reads with a positive match against zebrafish genome (mm10)

were removed. Filtered high-quality reads were merged into amplicons with Flash

(v1.2.11). Resulting amplicons were clustered into operational taxonomic units (OTU)

with VSEARCH (v2.3.4) (Rognes et al. 2016). The process includes several steps for de-

replication, singletons removal, and chimera detection. The clustering was performed at

97% sequence identity threshold, producing 459 OTUs. The OTU taxonomic annotation

was performed against the SILVA SSU (v132) database (Quast et al. 2012) completed

with 16S sequence of 10 bacterial communities using VSEARCH and filtered according

to their identity with the reference (Yarza et al. 2014). Annotations were kept when the

identity between the OTU sequence and reference sequence is $\geq 78.5\%$ for taxonomic

Classes, $\geq 82\%$ for Orders, $\geq 86.5\%$ for Families, $\geq 94.5\%$ for Genera and $\geq 98\%$ for

species. Here, 73.2% of the OTUs set was annotated and 91.69 % of them were annotated

at genus level.

The input amplicons were then aligned against the OTU set to get an OTU contingency

table containing the number of amplicon associated with each OTU using VSEARCH

global alignment. The matrix of OTU count data was normalized for library size at the

OTU level using a weighted non-null count normalization. Normalized counts were then

summed within genera. The generalized linear model (GLM) implemented in the DESeq2

R package (Love, Huber, and Anders 2014) was then applied to detect differences in

abundance of genera between each group. We defined a GLM that included the treatment

(condition) and the time (variable) as main effects and an interaction between the

treatment and the time. Resulting P values were adjusted according to the Benjamini and

Hochberg procedure.

The statistical analysis can be reproduced on shaman by loading the count table, the

taxonomic results with the target and contrast files that are available on figshare

https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.11417082.v2.

**Determination of cytokine levels**. Total RNAs from individual zebrafish larvae were

extracted using RNeasy kit (Qiagen), 18h post pathogen exposure (12h post-wash).

Oligo(dT17)-primed reverse transcriptions were carried out using M-MLV H- reverse-

transcriptase (Promega). Quantitative PCRs were performed using Takyon SYBR Green

PCR Mastermix (Eurogentec) on a StepOne thermocycler (Applied Biosystems). Primers

for *ef1a* (housekeeping gene, used for cDNA amount normalization), *il1b*, *il10* and *il22*

are described in (Rendueles et al. 2012). Data were analysed using the $\Delta\Delta Ct$ method. Four

larvae were analysed per condition. Zebrafish genes and proteins mentioned in the text:

*ef1a* NM_131263*; il1b* BC098597*; il22* NM_001020792*; il10* NM_001020785*; myd88*

NM_212814.

**Histological comparisons of GF, Conv and Re-Conv fish GF infected or not with *F.***

***columnare***

Fish were collected 24h after infection (7 dpf) and were fixed for 24h at 4°C in Trump

fixative (4% methanol-free formaldehyde, 1% glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M PBS, pH 7.2) and

sent to the PIBiSA Microscopy facility services (https://microscopies.med.univ-tours.fr/ )

in the Faculté de Médecine de Tours (France), where whole fixed animals were processed,

embedded in Epon. Semi-thin sections (1µm) and cut using a X ultra-microtome and then

either dyed with toluidine blue for observation by light microscopy and imaging or

processed for Transmission electron microscopy.

**Adult zebrafish pre-treatment with *C. massiliae***

The zebrafish line AB was used. Fish were reared at 28°C in dechlorinated recirculated

water, then transferred into continuous flow aquaria when aging 3-4 months for infection

experiments. *C. massiliae* was grown in TYES broth at 150 rpm and 28°C until stationary

phase. This bacterial culture was washed twice in sterile water and adjusted to $OD_{600nm} =$

1. Adult fish re-conventionalization was performed by adding *C. massiliae* bacterial

suspension directly into the fish water (1L) at a final concentration of $2.10^6$ cfu/mL.

Bacteria were maintained in contact with fish for 24 h by stopping the water flow then

subsequently removed by restoring the water flow. *C. massiliae* administration was
performed twice after water renewal. In the control group, the same volume of sterile
water was added.
750
**Adult zebrafish infection challenge**
*F. columnare* infection was performed just after fish re-conventionalization with *C.*
*massiliae*. The infection was performed as previously described by Li and co-workers
with few modifications [Li et al., 2017]. Briefly, *F. columnare* strain ALG-0530 was
grown in TYES broth at 150 rpm and 28 °C until late-exponential phase. Then, bacterial
cultures were diluted directly into the water of aquaria (200 mL) at a final concentration
of $5.10^6$ cfu/mL. Bacteria were maintained in contact with fish for 1 h by stopping the
water flow then subsequently removed by restoring the water flow. Sterile TYES broth
was used for the control group. Bacterial counts were determined at the beginning of the
immersion challenge by plating serial dilutions of water samples on TYES agar. Water
was maintained at 28°C and under continuous oxygenation for the duration of the
immersion. Groups were composed of 10 fish. Virulence was evaluated according to fish
mortality 10 days post-infection.
764
**Statistical methods.** Statistical analyses were performed using unpaired, non-parametric
Mann-Whitney test or unpaired t-tests. Analyses were performed using Prism v8.2
(GraphPad Software).
Evenness: The Shannon diversity index was calculated with the formula ($H_S$ = -
$\Sigma[P(\ln(P)])$) where P is the relative species abundance. Total evenness was calculated for
the Shannon index as $E = H_S/H_{max}$. The less evenness in communities between the species
(and the presence of a dominant species), the lower this index is.
772

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Mark McBride, Pierre Boudinot and Rebecca Stevick for critical reading of the manuscript. We are grateful to the late and regretted Covadonga Arias for the gift of *F. columnare* ALG 00-530, to Mark McBride for *F. columnare* C#2 strain and to Jean-François Bernardet for all other *F. columnare* strains. Prof. Annemarie Meijer (Leiden University) kindly provided the *myd88* mutant zebrafish line. We thank Julien Burlaud-Gaillard and Rustem Uzkebov the IBiSA Microscopy facility, Tours University, France for their reactivity and the following zebrafish facility teams for providing eggs: José Perez and  Yohann Rolin(Institut Pasteur), Nadia Soussi-Yanicostas (INSERM Robert Debré), Sylvie Schneider-Manoury and Isabelle Anselme (UMR7622, University Paris 6) and Frédéric Sohm (AMAGEN Gif-sur-Yvette). This work was supported by the Institut Pasteur*,* the French Government's *Investissement d'Avenir* program: *Laboratoire d'Excellence* 'Integrative Biology of Emerging Infectious Diseases' (grant no. ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID to J.M.G.), the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale (grant no. DEQ20180339185 to J.M.G.). F.S. was the recipient of a post-doctoral Marie Curie fellowship from the EU-FP7 programme, J.B.B. was the recipient of a long-term post-doctoral fellowship from the Federation of European Biochemical Societies(FEBS) and by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 842629 D.P-P was supported by an Institut Carnot MS Postdoctoral fellowship.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

F. A. S., J. B. B., D.P.-P., J.-P. L. and J.-M.G. designed the experiments. O.R. contributed to the initial experiments. V.B. and J.-P. L. provided zebrafish material and advice. F. A. S, J. B. B., D.P.-P., B.A., V.B. and J.-P. L. performed the experiments. S.B., S.H. performed bacterial genome sequencing and analysis, A.G., S.V., F. A. S and D.P.-P. performed the bioinformatic and sequence analyses. F. A. S, J. B. B., D.P.-P., J.-P. L. and J.-M.G. analysed the data and wrote the paper with significant contribution from O.R. and E.D..

**COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS**

The authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: a provisional patent application has been filed: "*bacterial strains for use as probiotics, compositions thereof, deposited strains and method to identify probiotic bacterial strains*" by J.-M.G, F. A. S., D.P.-P. and J. B. B. The other authors declare no conflict of interest in relation to the submitted work.

**DATA AVAILABILITY**

Bacterial genome sequences obtained in the present study are available at the European Nucleotide Archive with the project number PRJEB36872, under accession numbers numbers ERS4385993 (*Aeromonas veronii 1*); ERS4386000 (*Aeromonas veronii 2*); ERS4385996 (*Aeromonas caviae*); ERS4385998 (*Chryseobacterium massiliae*); ERS4385999 (*Phyllobacterium myrsinacearum*); ERS4406247 (*Pseudomonas sediminis*); ERS4385994 (*Pseudomonas mossellii*) ERS4386001 (*Pseudomonas nitroreducens*); ERS4385997 (*Pseudomonas peli*); ERS4385995 (*Stenotrophomas maltophilia*);

824 **REFERENCES**
825

Bankevich, A., S. Nurk, D. Antipov, A. A. Gurevich, M. Dvorkin, A. S. Kulikov, V. M.
Lesin, S. I. Nikolenko, S. Pham, A. D. Prjibelski, A. V. Pyshkin, A. V. Sirotkin, N.
Vyahhi, G. Tesler, M. A. Alekseyev, and P. A. Pevzner. 2012. "SPAdes: a new
genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing." *J Comput*
*Biol* 19 (5):455-77. doi: 10.1089/cmb.2012.0021.
Bates, J. M., E. Mittge, J. Kuhlman, K. N. Baden, S. E. Cheesman, and K. Guillemin.
2006. "Distinct signals from the microbiota promote different aspects of zebrafish gut
differentiation." *Dev Biol* 297 (2):374-86. doi: 10.1016/j.ydbio.2006.05.006.
Bernardet, J.-F., and J. P. Bowman. 2006. "The Genus Flavobacterium." *Prokaryotes*
7:481-531.
Boirivant, M., and W. Strober. 2007. "The mechanism of action of probiotics." *Curr*
*Opin Gastroenterol* 23 (6):679-92. doi: 10.1097/MOG.0b013e3282f0cffc.
Bolger, A. M., M. Lohse, and B. Usadel. 2014. "Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for
Illumina sequence data." *Bioinformatics* 30 (15):2114-20. doi:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170.
Brugman, S., K. Y. Liu, D. Lindenbergh-Kortleve, J. N. Samsom, G. T. Furuta, S. A.
Renshaw, R. Willemsen, and E. E. Nieuwenhuis. 2009. "Oxazolone-induced
enterocolitis in zebrafish depends on the composition of the intestinal microbiota."
*Gastroenterology* 137 (5):1757-67 e1. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2009.07.069.
Burns, A. R., and K. Guillemin. 2017. "The scales of the zebrafish: host-microbiota
interactions from proteins to populations." *Curr Opin Microbiol* 38:137-141. doi:
10.1016/j.mib.2017.05.011.
Burns, A. R., W. Z. Stephens, K. Stagaman, S. Wong, J. F. Rawls, K. Guillemin, and B.
J. Bohannan. 2016. "Contribution of neutral processes to the assembly of gut microbial
communities in the zebrafish over host development." *ISME J* 10 (3):655-64. doi:
10.1038/ismej.2015.142.
Cani, P. D., and N. M. Delzenne. 2009. "The role of the gut microbiota in energy
metabolism and metabolic disease." *Curr Pharm Des* 15 (13):1546-58.
Cantas, L., J. R. Sorby, P. Alestrom, and H. Sorum. 2012. "Culturable gut microbiota
diversity in zebrafish." *Zebrafish* 9 (1):26-37. doi: 10.1089/zeb.2011.0712.
Caruffo, M., N. C. Navarrete, O. A. Salgado, N. B. Faundez, M. C. Gajardo, C. G.
Feijoo, A. Reyes-Jara, K. Garcia, and P. Navarrete. 2016. "Protective Yeasts Control
V. anguillarum Pathogenicity and Modulate the Innate Immune Response of
Challenged Zebrafish (Danio rerio) Larvae." *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 6:127. doi:
10.3389/fcimb.2016.00127.
Chatzidaki-Livanis, M., M. J. Coyne, and L. E. Comstock. 2014. "An antimicrobial
protein of the gut symbiont Bacteroides fragilis with a MACPF domain of host
immune proteins." *Mol Microbiol* 94 (6):1361-74. doi: 10.1111/mmi.12839.
Cheesman, S. E., J. T. Neal, E. Mittge, B. M. Seredick, and K. Guillemin. 2011.
"Epithelial cell proliferation in the developing zebrafish intestine is regulated by the
Wnt pathway and microbial signaling via Myd88." *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108
Suppl 1:4570-7. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1000072107.
Chu, W., S. Zhou, W. Zhu, and X. Zhuang. 2014. "Quorum quenching bacteria Bacillus
sp. QSI-1 protect zebrafish (Danio rerio) from Aeromonas hydrophila infection." *Sci*
*Rep* 4:5446. doi: 10.1038/srep05446.

Costello, E. K., K. Stagaman, L. Dethlefsen, B. J. Bohannan, and D. A. Relman. 2012. "The application of ecological theory toward an understanding of the human microbiome." *Science* 336 (6086):1255-62. doi: 10.1126/science.1224203.

Declercq, A. M., F. Haesebrouck, W. Van den Broeck, P. Bossier, and A. Decostere. 2013. "Columnaris disease in fish: a review with emphasis on bacterium-host interactions." *Vet Res* 44:27. doi: 10.1186/1297-9716-44-27.

Douglas, A. E. 2019. "Simple animal models for microbiome research." *Nat Rev Microbiol* 17 (12):764-775. doi: 10.1038/s41579-019-0242-1.

Falcinelli, S., A. Rodiles, S. Unniappan, S. Picchietti, G. Gioacchini, D. L. Merrifield, and O. Carnevali. 2016. "Probiotic treatment reduces appetite and glucose level in the zebrafish model." *Sci Rep* 6:18061. doi: 10.1038/srep18061.

Flores, E. M., A. T. Nguyen, M. A. Odem, G. T. Eisenhoffer, and A. M. Krachler. 2020. "The zebrafish as a model for gastrointestinal tract-microbe interactions." *Cell Microbiol* 22 (3):e13152. doi: 10.1111/cmi.13152.

Ganz, J., E. Melancon, and J. S. Eisen. 2016. "Zebrafish as a model for understanding enteric nervous system interactions in the developing intestinal tract." *Methods Cell Biol* 134:139-64. doi: 10.1016/bs.mcb.2016.02.003.

Garcia, J. C., B. R. LaFrentz, G. C. Waldbieser, F. S. Wong, and S. F. Chang. 2018. "Characterization of atypical Flavobacterium columnare and identification of a new genomovar." *J Fish Dis* 41 (7):1159-1164. doi: 10.1111/jfd.12778.

Gill, H. S. 2003. "Probiotics to enhance anti-infective defences in the gastrointestinal tract." *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol* 17 (5):755-73.

Girija, V., B. Malaikozhundan, B. Vaseeharan, S. Vijayakumar, N. Gobi, M. Del Valle Herrera, J. C. Chen, and P. Santhanam. 2018. "In vitro antagonistic activity and the protective effect of probiotic Bacillus licheniformis Dahb1 in zebrafish challenged with GFP tagged Vibrio parahaemolyticus Dahv2." *Microb Pathog* 114:274-280. doi: 10.1016/j.micpath.2017.11.058.

Goncalves Pessoa, R. B., W. F. de Oliveira, D. S. C. Marques, M. T. Dos Santos Correia, Evmm de Carvalho, and Lcbb Coelho. 2019. "The genus Aeromonas: A general approach." *Microb Pathog* 130:81-94. doi: 10.1016/j.micpath.2019.02.036.

Ha, S. M., C. K. Kim, J. Roh, J. H. Byun, S. J. Yang, S. B. Choi, J. Chun, and D. Yong. 2019. "Application of the Whole Genome-Based Bacterial Identification System, TrueBac ID, Using Clinical Isolates That Were Not Identified With Three Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionization Time-of-Flight Mass Spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) Systems." *Ann Lab Med* 39 (6):530-536. doi: 10.3343/alm.2019.39.6.530.

Heselmans, M., G. Reid, L. M. Akkermans, H. Savelkoul, H. Timmerman, and F. M. Rombouts. 2005. "Gut flora in health and disease: potential role of probiotics." *Curr Issues Intest Microbiol* 6 (1):1-7.

Hibbing, M. E., C. Fuqua, M. R. Parsek, and S. B. Peterson. 2010. "Bacterial competition: surviving and thriving in the microbial jungle." *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8 (1):15-25. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2259.

Jacobson, A., L. Lam, M. Rajendram, F. Tamburini, J. Honeycutt, T. Pham, W. Van Treuren, K. Pruss, S. R. Stabler, K. Lugo, D. M. Bouley, J. G. Vilches-Moure, M. Smith, J. L. Sonnenburg, A. S. Bhatt, K. C. Huang, and D. Monack. 2018. "A Gut Commensal-Produced Metabolite Mediates Colonization Resistance to Salmonella Infection." *Cell Host Microbe* 24 (2):296-307.e7. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2018.07.002.

Kamada, N., S. U. Seo, G. Y. Chen, and G. Nunez. 2013. "Role of the gut microbiota in
immunity and inflammatory disease." *Nat Rev Immunol* 13 (5):321-35. doi:
10.1038/nri3430.
Kunin, V., A. Engelbrektson, H. Ochman, and P. Hugenholtz. 2010. "Wrinkles in the
rare biosphere: pyrosequencing errors can lead to artificial inflation of diversity
estimates." *Environ Microbiol* 12 (1):118-23. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-
2920.2009.02051.x.
Lemon, K. P., G. C. Armitage, D. A. Relman, and M. A. Fischbach. 2012. "Microbiota-
targeted therapies: an ecological perspective." *Sci Transl Med* 4 (137):137rv5. doi:
10.1126/scitranslmed.3004183.
Li, N., Y. Zhu, B. R. LaFrentz, J. P. Evenhuis, D. W. Hunnicutt, R. A. Conrad, P.
Barbier, C. W. Gullstrand, J. E. Roets, J. L. Powers, S. S. Kulkarni, D. H. Erbes, J. C.
Garcia, P. Nie, and M. J. McBride. 2017. "The Type IX Secretion System Is Required
for Virulence of the Fish Pathogen Flavobacterium columnare." *Appl Environ*
*Microbiol* 83 (23). doi: 10.1128/AEM.01769-17.
Lin, Y. S., F. Saputra, Y. C. Chen, and S. Y. Hu. 2019. "Dietary administration of
Bacillus amyloliquefaciens R8 reduces hepatic oxidative stress and enhances nutrient
metabolism and immunity against Aeromonas hydrophila and Streptococcus
agalactiae in zebrafish (Danio rerio)." *Fish Shellfish Immunol* 86:410-419. doi:
10.1016/j.fsi.2018.11.047.
Littman, D. R., and E. G. Pamer. 2011. "Role of the commensal microbiota in normal
and pathogenic host immune responses." *Cell Host Microbe* 10 (4):311-23. doi:
10.1016/j.chom.2011.10.004.
Love, Michael I., Wolfgang Huber, and Simon Anders. 2014. "Moderated estimation of
fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2." *Genome Biology* 15
(12):550. doi: 10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8.
McFall-Ngai, M. J. 2002. "Unseen forces: the influence of bacteria on animal
development." *Dev Biol* 242 (1):1-14. doi: 10.1006/dbio.2001.0522.
Melancon, E., S. Gomez De La Torre Canny, S. Sichel, M. Kelly, T. J. Wiles, J. F.
Rawls, J. S. Eisen, and K. Guillemin. 2017. "Best practices for germ-free derivation
and gnotobiotic zebrafish husbandry." *Methods Cell Biol* 138:61-100. doi:
10.1016/bs.mcb.2016.11.005.
Mena, K. D., and C. P. Gerba. 2009. "Risk assessment of Pseudomonas aeruginosa in
water." *Rev Environ Contam Toxicol* 201:71-115. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0032-6_3.
Milligan-Myhre, K., J. R. Charette, R. T. Phennicie, W. Z. Stephens, J. F. Rawls, K.
Guillemin, and C. H. Kim. 2011. "Study of host-microbe interactions in zebrafish."
*Methods Cell Biol* 105:87-116. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-381320-6.00004-7.
Olivares-Fuster, O., S. A. Bullard, A. McElwain, M. J. Llosa, and C. R. Arias. 2011.
"Adhesion dynamics of Flavobacterium columnare to channel catfish Ictalurus
punctatus and zebrafish Danio rerio after immersion challenge." *Dis Aquat Organ* 96
(3):221-7. doi: 10.3354/dao02371.
Olsan, E. E., M. X. Byndloss, F. Faber, F. Rivera-Chavez, R. M. Tsolis, and A. J.
Baumler. 2017. "Colonization resistance: The deconvolution of a complex trait." *J*
*Biol Chem* 292 (21):8577-8581. doi: 10.1074/jbc.R116.752295.
Perez-Ramos, A., M. L. Mohedano, M. A. Pardo, and P. Lopez. 2018. "beta-Glucan-
Producing Pediococcus parvulus 2.6: Test of Probiotic and Immunomodulatory
Properties in Zebrafish Models." *Front Microbiol* 9:1684. doi:
10.3389/fmicb.2018.01684.

Pham, L. N., M. Kanther, I. Semova, and J. F. Rawls. 2008. "Methods for generating and colonizing gnotobiotic zebrafish." *Nat Protoc* 3 (12):1862-75. doi: 10.1038/nprot.2008.186.

Qin, C., Z. Zhang, Y. Wang, S. Li, C. Ran, J. Hu, Y. Xie, W. Li, and Z. Zhou. 2017. "EPSP of L. casei BL23 Protected against the Infection Caused by Aeromonas veronii via Enhancement of Immune Response in Zebrafish." *Front Microbiol* 8:2406. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2017.02406.

Quast, Christian, Elmar Pruesse, Pelin Yilmaz, Jan Gerken, Timmy Schweer, Pablo Yarza, Jörg Peplies, and Frank Oliver Glöckner. 2012. "The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools." *Nucleic Acids Research* 41 (D1):D590-D596. doi: 10.1093/nar/gks1219.

Rawls, J. F., B. S. Samuel, and J. I. Gordon. 2004. "Gnotobiotic zebrafish reveal evolutionarily conserved responses to the gut microbiota." *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 101 (13):4596-601. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0400706101.

Rendueles, O., L. Ferrieres, M. Fretaud, E. Begaud, P. Herbomel, J. P. Levraud, and J. M. Ghigo. 2012. "A new zebrafish model of oro-intestinal pathogen colonization reveals a key role for adhesion in protection by probiotic bacteria." *PLoS Pathog* 8 (7):e1002815. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1002815.

Robinson, C. J., B. J. Bohannan, and V. B. Young. 2010. "From structure to function: the ecology of host-associated microbial communities." *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 74 (3):453-76. doi: 10.1128/MMBR.00014-10.

Roelofs, K. G., M. J. Coyne, R. R. Gentyala, M. Chatzidaki-Livanis, and L. E. Comstock. 2016. "Bacteroidales Secreted Antimicrobial Proteins Target Surface Molecules Necessary for Gut Colonization and Mediate Competition In Vivo." *MBio* 7 (4). doi: 10.1128/mBio.01055-16.

Rogers, G. B., L. R. Hoffman, M. P. Carroll, and K. D. Bruce. 2013. "Interpreting infective microbiota: the importance of an ecological perspective." *Trends Microbiol* 21 (6):271-6. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2013.03.004.

Rognes, T., T. Flouri, B. Nichols, C. Quince, and F. Mahe. 2016. "VSEARCH: a versatile open source tool for metagenomics." *PeerJ* 4:e2584. doi: 10.7717/peerj.2584.

Rolig, A. S., R. Parthasarathy, A. R. Burns, B. J. Bohannan, and K. Guillemin. 2015. "Individual Members of the Microbiota Disproportionately Modulate Host Innate Immune Responses." *Cell Host Microbe* 18 (5):613-20. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2015.10.009.

Russell, A. B., A. G. Wexler, B. N. Harding, J. C. Whitney, A. J. Bohn, Y. A. Goo, B. Q. Tran, N. A. Barry, H. Zheng, S. B. Peterson, S. Chou, T. Gonen, D. R. Goodlett, A. L. Goodman, and J. D. Mougous. 2014. "A type VI secretion-related pathway in Bacteroidetes mediates interbacterial antagonism." *Cell Host Microbe* 16 (2):227-236. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2014.07.007.

Salonen, A., J. Nikkila, J. Jalanka-Tuovinen, O. Immonen, M. Rajilic-Stojanovic, R. A. Kekkonen, A. Palva, and W. M. de Vos. 2010. "Comparative analysis of fecal DNA extraction methods with phylogenetic microarray: effective recovery of bacterial and archaeal DNA using mechanical cell lysis." *J Microbiol Methods* 81 (2):127-34. doi: 10.1016/j.mimet.2010.02.007.

Shabgah, A. G., J. G. Navashenaq, O. G. Shabgah, H. Mohammadi, and A. Sahebkar. 2017. "Interleukin-22 in human inflammatory diseases and viral infections." *Autoimmun Rev* 16 (12):1209-1218. doi: 10.1016/j.autrev.2017.10.004.

Shade, A., H. Peter, S. D. Allison, D. L. Baho, M. Berga, H. Burgmann, D. H. Huber, S.
Langenheder, J. T. Lennon, J. B. Martiny, K. L. Matulich, T. M. Schmidt, and J.
Handelsman. 2012. "Fundamentals of microbial community resistance and resilience."
*Front Microbiol* 3:417. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2012.00417.
Shafquat, A., R. Joice, S. L. Simmons, and C. Huttenhower. 2014. "Functional and
phylogenetic assembly of microbial communities in the human microbiome." *Trends*
*Microbiol* 22 (5):261-6. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2014.01.011.
Soto, E., M. J. Mauel, A. Karsi, and M. L. Lawrence. 2008. "Genetic and virulence
characterization of Flavobacterium columnare from channel catfish (Ictalurus
punctatus)." *J Appl Microbiol* 104 (5):1302-10. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
2672.2007.03632.x.
Stecher, B., and W. D. Hardt. 2008. "The role of microbiota in infectious disease."
*Trends Microbiol* 16 (3):107-14. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2007.12.008.
Stecher, B., and W. D. Hardt. 2011. "Mechanisms controlling pathogen colonization of
the gut." *Curr Opin Microbiol* 14 (1):82-91. doi: 10.1016/j.mib.2010.10.003.
Stephens, W. Z., A. R. Burns, K. Stagaman, S. Wong, J. F. Rawls, K. Guillemin, and B.
J. Bohannan. 2016. "The composition of the zebrafish intestinal microbial community
varies across development." *ISME J* 10 (3):644-54. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2015.140.
van der Vaart, M., J. J. van Soest, H. P. Spaink, and A. H. Meijer. 2013. "Functional
analysis of a zebrafish myd88 mutant identifies key transcriptional components of the
innate immune system." *Dis Model Mech* 6 (3):841-54. doi: 10.1242/dmm.010843.
van der Waaij, D., J.M. Berghuis-de Vries, and J.E.C. Lekkerkerk-van der Wees. 1972.
"Colonization resistance of the digestive tract and the spread of bacteria to the
lymphatic organs in mice." *The Journal of Hygiene* 70:335-342.
Volant, Stevenn, Pierre Lechat, Perrine Woringer, Laurence Motreff, Christophe
Malabat, Sean Kennedy, and Amine Ghozlane. 2019. "SHAMAN: a user-friendly
website for metataxonomic analysis from raw reads to statistical analysis."
*bioRxiv*:2019.12.18.880773. doi: 10.1101/2019.12.18.880773.
Vollaard, E. J., and H. A. Clasener. 1994. "Colonization resistance." *Antimicrob Agents*
*Chemother* 38 (3):409-14.
Wang, Y., Z. Ren, L. Fu, and X. Su. 2016. "Two highly adhesive lactic acid bacteria
strains are protective in zebrafish infected with Aeromonas hydrophila by evocation of
gut mucosal immunity." *J Appl Microbiol* 120 (2):441-51. doi: 10.1111/jam.13002.
Willing, B. P., S. L. Russell, and B. B. Finlay. 2011. "Shifting the balance: antibiotic
effects on host-microbiota mutualism." *Nat Rev Microbiol* 9 (4):233-43. doi:
10.1038/nrmicro2536.
Yan, Q., C. J. van der Gast, and Y. Yu. 2012. "Bacterial community assembly and
turnover within the intestines of developing zebrafish." *PLoS One* 7 (1):e30603. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0030603.
Yarza, P., P. Yilmaz, E. Pruesse, F. O. Glockner, W. Ludwig, K. H. Schleifer, W. B.
Whitman, J. Euzeby, R. Amann, and R. Rossello-Mora. 2014. "Uniting the
classification of cultured and uncultured bacteria and archaea using 16S rRNA gene
sequences." *Nat Rev Microbiol* 12 (9):635-45. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3330.
1056
1057

1058

1059 **FIGURES**

1060

1061

**Figure 1.** *Flavobacterium columnare* **kills germ-free but not conventional zebrafish.**

6 dpf (corresponding to 0 dpi) GF or Conv zebrafish larvae were exposed to different

doses of *F. columnare*[ALG] by bath immersion and transferred after 3h into sterile water.

Mean survival is represented by a thick horizontal bar with standard deviation. For each

condition, n = 12 zebrafish larvae. Larvae mortality rate was monitored daily and

surviving fish were euthanized at day 9 post infection. Statistics correspond to unpaired,

non-parametric Mann-Whitney test comparing all conditions to non-infected GF (left) or

Conv (right). ****: $p < 0.0001$; ***: $p < 0.001$; *: $p < 0.05$, absence of *: non-significant.

Blue mean bars correspond to non-exposed larvae and red mean bars correspond to larvae

exposed to *F. columnare*.

1072

1073

1074

1075

**Figure 2 Analysis of protection against *F. columnare* infection after antibiotic dysbiosis. A:** Response of zebrafish larvae to exposure to *F. columnare*[ALG] after antibiotic-induced dysbiosis with a diagram showing timing and treatments of the experiment. **B:** A 24h period after antibiotic treatment allows the recovery of protection in kanamycin-treated zebrafish larvae with a diagram showing timing and treatments. Mean survival is represented by a thick horizontal bar with standard deviation. For each condition, n = 12 zebrafish larvae. Blue mean bars correspond to larvae not exposed to the pathogen and red mean bars correspond to exposed larvae. Larvae mortality rate was monitored daily and surviving fish were euthanized at day 9 post exposition to the pathogen. Indicated statistics correspond to unpaired, non-parametric Mann-Whitney test. ****: p<0.0001; absence of *: non-significant. **C:** Community recovery profile with streptomycin/penicillin treatment. **D:** Community recovery profile with kanamycin treatment. Pools of 10 larvae were collected for 16S rRNA sequencing.

Figure 3. Protection against *F. columnare* in zebrafish re-conventionalized with individual or mixed bacterial strains isolated from zebrafish. **A**: Determination of the level of protection provided by each of the 10 bacterial strains composing the core protective zebrafish microbiota. Bacteria were added individually to the water on hatching day (dose $5.10^5$ cfu/mL). **B**: Level of protection provided by different amount of *C. massiliae* and Mix9. Mix9 only protected at the highest inoculum doses. Mean survival is represented by a thick horizontal bar with standard deviation. For each condition, n = 12 zebrafish larvae. Blue mean bars correspond to larvae not exposed to the pathogen and red mean bars correspond to exposed larvae. Larvae mortality rate was monitored daily and surviving fish were euthanized at day 9 post exposition to the pathogen. Indicated statistics correspond to unpaired, non-parametric Mann-Whitney test. ****: p<0.0001; absence of *: non-significant.

Figure 4. Zebrafish immune response to *F.columnare* infection. A-C: qRT-PCR analysis of host gene expression, 18 hours after exposure to *F. columnare,* in larvae re-conventionalized with indicated bacteria or bacterial mixes; each point corresponds to an individual larva. Expression of *il10* (A), *il1b* (B), and *il22* (C), by wild-type AB zebrafish; D: Comparison of the survival of *myd88-/-* and background-matched *myd88+/+* zebrafish after re-conventionalization and exposure to *F. columnare*[ALG]. Mean survival is represented by a thick horizontal bar with standard deviation. For each condition, n = 12 zebrafish larvae. Larvae mortality rate was monitored daily and surviving fish were euthanized at day 9 post exposition to the pathogen. A-D: Blue bars correspond to larvae not exposed to the pathogen and red mean bars correspond to exposed larvae. Indicated statistics correspond to unpaired, non-parametric Mann-Whitney test. ****: p<0.0001; **: p<0.005*: p<0.05, absence of *: non-significant.

**Figure 5. Intestine of infected germ-free zebrafish displays severe disorganization.**
Germ-free, conventional and re-conventionalized zebrafish larvae. Re-conventionalized
zebrafish were inoculated at 4 dpf with Mix9 or *C. massiliae.* **A**: Representative picture
of intestines of non-infected larvae. Fish were fixed for histology analysis or electron
microscopy at 7 dpf. **B**: Representative picture of intestines of infected larvae exposed
at 7 dpf to *F.columnare*[ALG]. In **A** and **B**: *Left column:* Toluidine blue staining of Epon-
embedded zebrafish larvae for Light microscopy. *Right column*: Transmission electron
microscopy. at 7 dpf (*right*). L= intestinal lumen.

**Figure 6. Pre-exposure to *C. massiliae* protects larval and adult zebrafish against *F. columnare* infection**

**A:** Zebrafish larvae were inoculated at 4 dpf with $5.10^5$ cfu/mL of *C. massiliae* for 48h before infection at 6 dpf with virulent *F. columnare* strains. **B:** Survival of adult zebrafish with or without pre-exposure to *C. massiliae* ($2.10^6$ cfu/mL for 48h) followed by exposure to *F. columnare*ALG ($5.10^6$ cfu/mL for 1h) Mean survival is represented by a thick horizontal bar with standard deviation. For each condition, n = 12 zebrafish larvae or 10 adult. Zebrafish mortality rate was monitored daily and surviving fish were euthanized at day 9 post exposition to the pathogens. Blue bars correspond to larvae not exposed to the pathogen and red mean bars correspond to exposed larvae. Indicated statistics correspond to unpaired, non-parametric Mann-Whitney test. ****: $p<0.0001$; **: $p<0.005$; absence of *: non-significant.

1147 **TABLES**

1148

1149 **Table 1. The 10 strains composing the core of zebrafish larvae microbiota**

1150 Bacterial strains consistently detected at all time points (6 and 11 dpf) in all experiment

1151 runs and constituting the core of conventional zebrafish larval microbiota and their

1152 taxonomic affiliation.

1153

| Bacterial species of the core zebrafish microbiota | ANI %[a] | 16S rRNA (%)[b] | recA (%)[c] | rplC (%)[d] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Aeromonas veronii 1* | *96.52* | *98.27* | *97.00* | *99.84* |
| *Aeromonas veronii 2* | *96.58* | *99.53* | *98.31* | *99.68* |
| *Aeromonas caviae* | *97.97* | *99.94* | *98.78* | *99.84* |
| *Chryseobacterium massiliae* | *95.85* | *99.86* | *96.61* | *99.84* |
| *Phyllobacterium myrsinacearum* | *98.58* | *99.86* | *99.72* | *100* |
| *Pseudomonas sediminis* | *96.12* | *99.73* | *97.70* | *99.84* |
| *Pseudomonas mossellii* | *99.39* | *98.27* | *100* | *99.84* |
| *Pseudomonas nitroreducens** | *92.14* | *99.80* | *94.95* | *99.06* |
| *Pseudomonas peli** | *88.84* | *99.20* | *91.51* | *95.44* |
| *Stenotrophomas maltophilia** | *90.94* | *97.85* | *95.38* | *99.08* |

1154

1155 [a] Average Nucleotide Identity value

1156 [b] 16S rRNA gene sequence similarity

1157 [c] *recA* gene sequence similarity

1158 [d] *rplC* gene sequence similarity

1159 *Species ambiguously identified

1160