Genome scale epigenomic analysis of response to acute stress in the

European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*, L.)

Krick M.V.[1], Desmarais E.[1], Samaras A.[2], Gueret E.[1,3,4], Dimitroglou A.[5], Pavlidis M.[2],

Tsigenopoulos C.S.[6], Guinand B.[1]*

Affiliations :

1 –   UMR CNRS UM IRD EPHE ISEM- Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution de Montpellier,

Montpellier, France

2 –   University of Crete, Department of Biology, 70013 Heraklion, Greece

3 –   Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, INSERM, Montpellier, France

4 –   Montpellier GenomiX, France Génomique, Montpellier, France

5 –   Nireus Aquaculture S.A. Purgoulaki Kastella, 344 00 Evvoia, Greece

6 –   Institute of Marine Biology, Biotechnology and Aquaculture (IMBBC), Hellenic Centre for

Marine Research (HCMR), 715 00, Heraklion, Greece

* : corresponding author: bruno.guinand@umontpellier.fr

ORCID: A. Samaras: 0000-0003-3616-7032
18   M. Pavlidis: 0000-0003-1937-5032
19   C.S. Tsigenopoulos: 0000-0003-0615-7941
20   B. Guinand: 0000-0002-6934-1677
21
22

23 Running title: Epigenomics of stress in sea bass

24 Keywords: cytosine methylation, epiGBS, red blood cells, challenge test, coping styles,

25 aquaculture

Abstract

Understanding the molecular basis of stress is of long standing interest in biology and fish science. We tackled this question by modifying the epiGBS (epiGenotyping By sequencing) technique to screen for cytosine methylation and explore the genome-wide epigenomic response to a repeated acute stress challenge in the European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*). Following a minimally invasive sampling using nucleated red blood cells (RBCs), our modified epiGBS protocol retrieved 501,108,033 sequencing reads after trimming, with a mean mapping efficiency of 73.0% (unique best hits). Sequencing reads mapped across all linkage groups (LGs). A total of 47,983 CpG coordinates with a minimum 30X read depth was retained for differential methylation analysis between pre- and post-stress fish. A family effect was demonstrated, and 57 distinct differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs) distributed on 17 of 24 LGs were found between RBCs of pre- and post-stress individuals and located close to 51 distinct stress-related genes. Thirty-eight of these genes were previously reported as differentially expressed in the brain of zebrafish, most of them involved in stress coping differences. Some DMC-related genes appear as good candidates to study the stress response, especially a set of them associated to the Brain Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF), a protein that favors stress adaptation and fear memory. Limits to our study and future directions are presented, including the use of RBCs as a surrogate to other target tissues, to provide with classical physiological measurements a more complete picture of the stress response in fish.

1 - Introduction

The study of stress is of large interest in biological sciences. Stress affects cells as well as ecosystems and influences processes that span from seconds to evolutionary time scales (Balasch and Tort 2019; Petitjean et al. 2019). Reaching a common definition is quite complex (Levine 1985; Schreck and Tort 2016; Del Giudice et al. 2018; Balasch and Tort 2019), but stress often refers to the non-specific, total response of one organism to answer to internal and/or external stimuli acting as stressors. Accordingly, the stress response represents the repertoire of physiological, metabolic and behavioural changes developed during and observed after a threat to counteract the effect of stressors and recover or approach the homeostatic equilibrium. In teleost fish – the largest group of vertebrates - an integrative understanding of the stress response is still expected (Balasch and Tort 2019; Petitjean et al. 2019). This concerns natural populations that develop(ed) plastic and adaptive response to stressors (Schulte 2014; Petitjean et al. 2019), but also cultured species in order to increase fish health and welfare in stressful farming environments (Ashley 2007; Ellis et al. 2012; Sneddon et al. 2016).

The study of stress is complex as it may differ in nature, intensity and/or duration, plus number of stressors. This poses many challenges that remain to be overcome (Romero et al. 2015) and stress studies have to integrate physiological, immunological, neurobiological and behavioural components that altogether shape the stress response in fish (Pottinger 2008; Ellis et al. 2012; Nardocci et al. 2014; Castanheira et al. 2017). The stress response implies, among others, a primary neuroendocrine and a secondary immune response, with interacting roles of neuropeptides and cytokines in each respective system (Wendelaar-Bonga 1997; Yada and Nakanishi 2002; Geven and Klaren 2017). The Hypothalamus-Pituitary-Interrenal (HPI) axis plays

a crucial role in the manifestation and regulation of the stress response through the release of

neuropeptides, catecholamines and glucocorticoids. In teleosts, cortisol is the primary

circulating glucocorticoid and species-specific differences in the timing, magnitude and peak

duration of post-stress plasma cortisol concentrations have been reported (Fanouraki et al.

2011). Glucose - another classical biomarker of stress - is also under control of hypothalamus,

and its blood level depends on glycogen metabolism as well as gluconeogenesis, themselves

triggered by interrenal glands and catecholamines (Gamperl et al. 1994; Mommsen et al. 1999).

Beyond the classical HPI axis, several mediators of allostasis, organs and systems (e.g. serotonin

and the serotonergic system; osteocalcin and the parasympathetic nervous system) are involved

in stress and anxiety (Backström and Winberg 2017; Foster et al. 2017; Berger et al. 2019). A

proper regulation of the stress response requires the consideration of a complex regulatory

network of non-linear actions to integrate the whole organism response to stressors (McEwen

2008; Gray et al. 2017).

In the past few years, the stress response largely inspired genome-wide epigenetic

studies in model organisms (Dirven et al. 2017; Burns et al. 2018; Floriou-Servou et al. 2018;

Denzel et al. 2019; Perrone and Martinelli 2020). For animal models, it was established that

stress can especially reshape the stress axis/network through epigenetic modification of genes

in the hippocampus, hypothalamus and other stress-responsive brain regions (Reul et al. 2015;

Gray et al. 2017; Zhou and Fang 2018). In human stress studies, it has been shown that blood

cells responded to DNA methylation in the brain (Auta et al. 2013; Blaze et al. 2018; Vinkers et

al. 2019), and more generally that blood is useful whenever target tissues cannot be easily

sampled or biopsied, or because blood collections are available for large-scale screening of

methylation profiles (Houseman et al. 2015). As blood cells are also mobilized as part of the

stress response in fish (Tort 2011; Burgos-Aceves et al. 2019), it might be appealing to

investigate if an epigenomic signature of stress is present in their nucleated red blood cells

(RBCs). Indeed, the use of RBCs in fish transcriptomics or proteomics has received attention

over the last decade (Morera et al. 2011; Puente-Marin et al. 2018). However, fish epigenetics

has not embarked on this path yet and genome-wide epigenetic studies using RBCs are quite

rare in fish (Gavery et al 2018). This contrasts with the over-increasing interest to investigate

epigenomic variation in teleosts (e.g. zebrafish: Chatterjee et al. 2016; Olsvik et al. 2019;

medaka: Wang and Bhandari 2019; tongue sole: Shao et al. 2014; killifish: Berbel-Filho et al.

2020; salmonids: Le Luyer et al. 2017; Boltana et al. 2018; Gavery et al. 2018, 2019; stickleback:

Metzger and Schulte 2017, 2018; Heckwolf et al. 2020; tilapias: Wan et al. 2016; Hilliard et al.

2019; carp: Zhang et al. 2019; guppy: Hu et al. 2018; striped bass: Woods et al. 2018; wrasse:

Todd et al. 2019; goby: Sommerville et al. 2019). Furthermore, documenting more directly the

epigenomics of the stress axis/network also remains scarce (Uren-Webster et al. 2018), while Li

and Leatherland (2013) or Faught et al. (2016) asked for greater attention on this topic. Only few

epigenomic studies dealt explicitly with a specific component of the stress response (e.g.

immune function: Hu et al. 2018, Uren-Webster et al. 2018), while others are more elusive (e.g.

'early-life stress': Moghadam et al. 2017).

After salmonids, the European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) is certainly the most

investigated marine fish species in Europe using molecular tools. It has been extensively studied

over the last three decades (reviewed in Vandeputte et al. 2019). This includes the sequencing

of its genome (Tine et al. 2014) and an increasing number of epigenetic studies (e.g. Navarro-

Martín et al. 2011; Anastasiadi et al. 2018; Anastasiadi and Piferrer 2019). The stress response of

European sea bass remains evaluated using blood parameters that have been shown to reflect

multiple components of its stress response (Vazzana et al. 2002; Fanouraki et al. 2011), despite

authors have proposed alternatives (e.g. Tognoli et al. 2010; Cœurdacier et al. 2011). How the

European sea bass methylome may capture such components is actually missing.

In this study, we adapted the epiGenotyping By sequencing (epiGBS) protocol originally

proposed by Van Gurp et al. (2016) to assess the genome-wide epigenomic variation in the RBCs

of *D. labrax* submitted to periods of acute stress. EpiGBS targets variation in cytosine

methylation – the covalent addition of a methyl group to cytosine nucleotides – that has long

been accepted as an important epigenetic modification in many organisms (Schübeler 2015;

Allis and Jenuwein 2016). Our aims were to explore the epigenomic landscape of the stress

response in the European sea bass using this protocol, and to investigate if nucleated RBCs from

minimally invasive blood samples could provide relevant information on this issue.

2 - Materials and Methods

2 - 1 : Rearing, stress challenge, and blood sampling

Four hundred European sea bass were initially used in this study. They resulted of a single

crossing experiment (12 dams, 20 sires) that took place in January 2018. During the larval

phase, 20 different families labelled from A to T were raised. Each family was reared separately

in open circulation tanks at Nireus S.A. research facilities (Greece). To avoid environmental

effects, fish were tagged at ~280 days post-hatch (July 10-13th 2018) and distributed in 20 tanks;

each tank receiving 1 fish from each family (i.e., 20 fish per tank). Fish were fed twice a day, for

6 days a week, using a commercial diet (Blue Line 45:20 3.5 mm, Feedus S.A., Greece).

Throughout the experimental period, the photoperiod was set at 12L:12D, the water

temperature and the salinity held constant (18.1 ± 0.2°C and 28 ppt, respectively). Fish weights

(mean $\pm$ SD) were 48.1 ± 12.8g and 86.2 ± 24.1g in pre- and post-stress individuals,

respectively.

Fish were submitted to one acute challenge test per month for three consecutive

months, from July to October 2018. During this challenge, fish were exposed to high density

stress by lowering water levels in the tank to 1⁄3 of the original volume, followed by chasing of

the fish with a net for five minutes and a 30 min waiting period before sampling. These stressors

are classical in sea bass studies regarding response to acute stress (e.g. Fanouraki et al. 2011;

Samaras et al. 2016). This protocol took place in each tank then for each fish individual entering

the experiment. It was repeated for 3 consecutive times at 20-21 day intervals (period long

enough for fish to recover).

An initial blood sampling occurred two weeks prior to the implementation of the stress

challenge (hereafter T0, July 19th, 2018, pre-stress/control group) then at the end of the

challenge test (hereafter T4, October 5th, 2018). Blood from the caudal vessel was collected.

Plasma and RBCs were separated by centrifugation at 2,000g for 10 min. Careful separation of

the plasma and RBCs was performed using 200 µl pipettes. RBC extracts were heparinized

(heparin sodium; Sigma-Aldrich), transferred in microtubes and conserved at -20°C in 1 ml of

RNA later. DNA was extracted using the Macherey Nagel Nucleo Spin Tissue DNA kit and

quantified using a Qubit fluorometer (Qubit dsDNA BR Assay Kit, Q32853, Invitrogen). Thirty-

seven blood samples at T0 (pre-stress) and thirty-seven additional samples at T4 (post-stress)

have been randomly selected for the downstream epigenomic analysis.

2 - 2 : Library preparation and sequencing

We followed the epiGBS protocol published by van Gurp et al (2016). As the method was

developed for plants (with methylation occurring in CpG, CHH, and CHG context; H being any

nucleotide but a cytosine) and used a single digestion approach, the protocol was modified to

make it more suitable and straightforward for our vertebrate system. Particularly, a double

digest instead of the single digest approach was implemented. We chose the restriction enzyme

MspI, a standard choice in reduced representation bisulfite sequencing-like (RRBS) studies, as its

recognition site targets CpG rich regions (Gu et al. 2011). A second enzyme (*SfbI*) with a

recognition site length of 8 bp was used to reduce fragment numbers, and thus to increase read

depth per fragment. The choice of this enzyme was guided by *in silico* digestion of the European

sea bass genome (Tine et al. 2014) using *simRAD* (Lepais and Weir 2014). This genome is

available at: https://www.ensembl.org/Dicentrarchus_labrax/Info/Index.

One single library was prepared for a set of 74 samples. For this library, 200 ng of DNA of

each sample were digested in a 40 µl reaction, using 0.25 µl *MspI* (NEB, 20,000 U/ml R0106S),

0.25 µl S*bfI*-HiFi (NEB 20,000 U/ml R3642L) and 4 µl of 10X cutsmart buffer. The reaction was

run overnight at 37°C. Unique forward and reverse adapter combinations allow multiplexing

samples in the library. We added forward and reverse adapters in unique combinations (1 µl of

adapter, 2.5 µM), 0.5 µl T4 Ligase (NEB, 400,000 U/ml m0202L), 6 µl of 10X T4 ligase buffer and

11.5µl water were added directly to the digested DNA. Sequences of adapters are provided as

Suppl. Mat. Table S1. Adapters were ligated for 3 h at 23°C followed by 10 min of enzyme

inactivation at 65°C. After ligation, all samples were pooled and one third of the total volume

was used in the following step. The mixture volume was reduced using a Qiaquick PCR

purification kit (28104 Qiagen). The resulting product was cleaned a second time to ensure the

removal of small fragments and adapter remnants using CleanPCR paramagnetic beads

(Proteigene, CPCR-0050) with a ratio of 0.8X [sample : beads].

Since oligonucleotides were not phosphorylated (see Suppl. Mat. Table S1), a nick

translation was performed to repair the nick of the DNA at the restriction site and to fully

methylate the hemi-methylated adapters. To do so, 19.25 µl of the concentrated and purified

ligation pool were used in a 25 µl reaction, including 0.75 µl DNA Polymerase I (*E. coli*, 10,000

U/ml M0209S), 2.5 µl of 10 mM 5-Methylcytosine dNTP mix (Zymo Research, D1030), and

incubated at 15 °C for one hour. The library was then treated with sodium bisulfite using the EZ

DNA Methylation Gold Kit (D5005, Zymo Research) following manufacturer instructions to

convert unmethylated cytosines to uracil, paying attention to the optimal DNA amount per

reaction. After bisulfite conversion, 14 cycles of PCR (95°C for 1 min, 91°C for 10s, 65°C for 15s,

72°C for 10s and a final elongation step at 72°C for 5 min) were performed, followed by a

paramagnetic bead clean up with a 0.8X ratio. The library quality (fragment size distribution, no

adapters left, no primers left; fragment size range from 300 to 800 bp, Suppl. Mat. Fig. S1) was

verified on an Agilent 5300 Fragment Analyzer (Santa Clara, USA). It was sequenced (paired-end,

150 bp) on one lane of a SP flow cell on an ILLUMINA™ NovaSeq 6000 at the MGX sequencing

facility in Montpellier, France.

2 - 3 : Bioinformatics analysis

Raw sequencing data were trimmed of low quality reads and adapter residues using *Trim*

Galore! (v.0.6.4; available at

https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/trim_galore/). The trimmed reads were

then demultiplexed using the `process_radtags` command of Stacks (Catchen et al 2013).

The option `disable_rad_check` was applied to avoid reads with bisulfite-modified

restriction sites to be discarded. The demultiplexed reads were trimmed a second time on both

5' and 3' ends with the options `--clip_R1 --clip_R2` and `--three_prime_clip_R1`

`--three_prime_clip_R2` to remove introduced methylated cytosines during adapter

ligation. Using the `bismark_genome_preparation` function of the program *bismark*

(Krueger & Andrews 2011), a bisulfite converted version of the European sea bass genome was

prepared against which the demultiplexed and trimmed reads were mapped.

2 - 4 : Methylation analysis

The R package MethylKit (Akalin et al 2012) was used to determine differential methylation

between pre- and post-stress fish. CpGs with less than 30 read depth and with coverage >99.9%

of the distribution of read counts were filtered out to account for PCR bias. Coverage was

normalized across samples, and only CpGs present in at least 20 out of 37 samples per group

(56%) were kept for further analysis. Differentially methylated CpG sites were determined

between pre- and post-stress individuals using logistic regression (`calculateDiffMeth`

function). Pre-stress individuals were considered as the baseline. Cytosines were considered as

differentially methylated when presenting at least 15% methylation difference (as in Anastasiadi

and Piferrer 2019 for epigenomic variation in *D. labrax*), and a nominal *q*-value < 0.001 between

pre- and post-stress fish. Reads presenting differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs) were

extracted using GENEIOUS (v.11.0; available at https://www.geneious.com/) and mapped along

LGs of the European sea bass reference genome (Tine et al. 2014;

http://seabass.mpipz.mpg.de/) to produce a primary annotation of potential candidate genes.

As the annotation of the European sea bass and the sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) reference

genomes have been recently released on ENSEMBL (http://www.ensembl.org/index.html), gene

names and models have been controlled, eventually including a TBLASTN search in case of

discrepancy.

2 - 5 : Literature surveys and protein-protein association

A first literature survey was performed in order to decipher if genes found associated to

European sea bass DMCs were candidates related to stress in vertebrates. We searched PUBMED

(https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) for studies in which they could have been mentioned as

responding to stress. This approach was preferred to, e.g. GO-terms or enrichment analyses that

are useful summaries of functional knowledge, but less suitable when searching how one or a

specific set of genes might be involved more precisely in the stress response, if they are known

to be associated to each other and/or how they were found related to stress (e.g. in which

organism, context, study, organ or tissues). As relatively few DMCs were detected (see Results),

this detailed approach was amenable.

The data mining considered a DMC relevant to the stress response when associated to a

gene related to a stress phenotype (typically issued from genome-wide association studies,

knock-out experiments or empirical evidence of impairment and dysfunction when facing

stressors). Eight stress response themes were identified and used to structure the mining:

'*blood*' (including issues on red blood cells, blood homeostasis, blood volume, hemato- and

erythropoiesis, platelets, hypo- and hypertension, angiogenesis), '*stress*' (including stress-

related genes, physiological disorders, HPI/HPA axis, adrenals, head kidney, stress

resistance/response), '*immunity*' (including issues on all types of leukocytes and immune

response, cytokines, cytotoxicity and response to pathogens), '*hormones*' (including issues

related to catecholamines, corticosteroids, glucocorticoids, neuro- and peptide transmitters,

other hormones related to the HPI axis in fish), '*brain*' (including issues on hypothalamus and

pituitary themselves, forebrain, limbic brain, neuronal development and plasticity, signaling

pathways in the brain, serotonergic/dopaminergic activities), '*glucose*' (including issues on

glucose metabolism [systemic and brain], lactate, glycolysis, gluconeogenesis, [pro]insulin,

diverse receptors, pancreatic β-cells), and '*behaviour*' as stress-induced behavioural changes

and not only physiological changes. Diverse health disorders related to stress often well-studied

in mammalian models were screened, as well as some genetic disorders that affect behaviour.

This may include changes in mood, emotional and affective states (e.g. fear, anxiety), cognitive

traits (e.g. memory, learning abilities), or psychiatric disorders and neurodegenerative diseases

(e.g. bipolar disorders, autism, schizophrenia). One additional category ('*others*') was included

to report significant items known to be important for, e.g., epigenetic regulation that could not

be directly addressed with previous themes. Cellular issues of stress such like, e.g., oxidative,

chromatin or endoplasmic reticulum stress where not covered.

A second literature survey focused on the literature dealing with stress, stress response

and high-throughput transcriptomics or epigenomics in fish. We searched PUBMED for relevant

articles over the period 2010-2020 (June) and, when available, their associated supplementary

materials, and searching for difference in gene expression or methylation. Our goal was to

evaluate if DMC-related genes detected here in RBCs are relevant to brain and/or processes

specific to brain or if they are commonly detected whatever the target tissues and the nature of

stressors. For this survey, we first mined gene expression studies that used blood within fish

species in order to verify whether sea bass DMC-related genes were not commonly

overexpressed in this tissue. In a second time, we focused on zebrafish for which functional

annotation is well established. We searched for transcriptomics (RNA sequencing) studies

dealing with stress in various tissues (liver, kidney, gill, brain, gonad, muscle, eye and skin). The

following search string was used: '*zebrafish*' AND '*RNA seq**' AND '*stress*' AND ['*tissue name*'].

As mRNA studies often consider several tissues, results were manually curated. Studies whose

title referred to single gene families (e.g. heat shock proteins) or microRNAs were discarded.

Finally, fish epigenomic studies were also analyzed. About this issue, we first analyzed gene

transcripts and differentially methylated genes in the single genome-wide epigenomic study

performed so far in sea bass (Anastasiadi and Piferrer 2019). As genome-wide methylation

studies remain relatively few in fish, this was extended to other species in a second time.

Transcriptomics and methylation data sets that did not provide for gene names and/or gene

symbols were discarded. Reported gene names and symbols were considered to be exact.

Finally, in order to complete these manually curated surveys, we used STRING

(https://string-db.org/) to investigate if DMC-related genes encoded for proteins are known to

interact together. We used our gene list as input and the zebrafish genome as a reference for

annotation. This search was done without reference to the thematic stress categories

mentioned above, and when one interaction was provided we specifically explored the

literature for confirmation and relevant experimental evidence.

2 – 6 : Data analysis

A principal component analysis (PCA) on the methylation profiles of individual samples at DMCs

was performed to analyse the potential grouping structures within our data set. Differences in

the distribution of mean individual loading scores for pre- and post-stress fish were tested along

each principal components axis using a Student t-test. Additionally, a hierarchical clustering was

performed using Ward's linkage method on Euclidean distances in order to explore whether sea

bass families structure the data set.

3 - Results

Nineteen out of 20 families were represented by at least one individual among the 74 samples

analyzed in this study. Fish number per family ranged from one (families A, D, N) to nine (family

R) individuals. Except for the families with a single representative and family M with post-stress

fish only (four), both pre-stress and post-stress individuals were present in the 15 remaining

families. Four individuals from four distinct families were retained twice by chance, and were

thus analyzed for both pre- and post-challenge stress conditions. A total of 70 distinct fish has

been analyzed in this study.

3 - 1 : epiGBS library construction and sequencing

We obtained 504,271,331 total sequencing reads of which 99.4% (501,108,033) were retrieved

after trimming. After demultiplexing, read numbers per sample ranged from 2,284,915 to

16,314,759, with an average of 5,212,596 reads per sample (see Suppl. Mat. Table S2).

Demultiplexed samples were mapped against the *D. labrax* reference genome with a mean

mapping efficiency of 74.5% (73.0% for unique best hits; Suppl. Mat. Table S2). Sequencing

reads mapped across all linkage groups (Fig. 1). The mean per base pair read depth was 250X.

3 - 2 : Methylation analysis

Out of the 10,368,945 CG dinucleotides (0.46% of the whole) present in the *MspI-SbfI* reduced-

representation of *D. labrax* genome we obtained, 47,983 CpG coordinates were extracted with a

minimum of 30X read depth and presence in at least 20 individuals. They were filtered out using

a 15% methylation difference threshold and a nominal cut-off value of $q < 0.001$. With these

parameters, only a total of 57 cytosines in CpG context were defined as DMCs between pre- and

post-stress sea bass (Table 1). Methylation differences ranged from -27.5% to -15.0% for

hypomethylated cytosines, and 15.0% to 46.4% for hypermethylated cytosines. Hyper-

methylation was more frequently detected than hypomethylation (11 [19.30%] hypo- *vs* 46

[80.70%] hypermethylated DMCs) in post-stress sea bass. DMCs were distributed on 17 out of

24 LG groups and in or close to 51 distinct genes. Further information is provided in Suppl. Mat.

Table S3 (e.g. gene annotations, CpG context).

Most identified DMCs were found located within identified gene bodies (44 out of 57,

77.19%), one in the 3'UTR regions of the Solute Carrier family 22 Member 2 (*SLC22A2*) gene on

LG17, and one in a repeated region (a non LTR Retrotransposon Element on LG20). In the

remaining cases (*n* = 11), DMCs are intergenic and located in a window ranging from 0.9kb to

51kb to the closest gene (respectively: *SASH1A* on LG12 and *TRMT11* on LG16; Table 1). Two

pairs of overlapping, but inversely oriented genes share on their sense vs. antisense strand an

identical DMC: *PLG* and *SLC22A2* on LG17, and *SART3* and *FICD* on LG20 (Table 1)

When located on the same LG, DMCs were usually distant by at least 30kb from each

other. In only four instances, DMCs occurred as differentially methylated regions (DMRs) that

grouped 2-3 DMCs separated by only few hundreds of base pairs (Table 1). This includes three

hypo-methylated cytosines grouped in a DMR located ~1500 bp downstream of the predicted

Kelch Repeat and BDB domain 13 (*KBTBD13*) gene with at most 88 bp between the cytosines.

Another DMR includes three hypomethylated cytosines (>20%) on LG1A in the second intron of

the forkhead box J3 (*FOXJ3*) gene. Two other groups of two cytosines were found either in the

same exon (distant by 3 bp) of the *BTR30* gene or in two different introns (distant by 3.8Kb) of a

predicted CREB regulated transcription coactivator 2 (*CRTC2* or *TORC2*: Transducer Of Regulated

cAMP Response Element-Binding Protein [CREB] 2) (Table 1). In these two latter cases, one

cytosine was found hypomethylated while the other is hypermethylated. A single DMC was

associated to a repeat region and two DMCs were found to refer to the same gene (homologous

to the *Gasterosteus aculeatus* paralogue of *COL4A5*, a collagen gene of type IV mostly

implicated in the protein network of the basement membrane) (Table 1). For this gene, one

DMC is located in the first intron while the second is 16.5kb upstream of the start codon. They

were not considered as a DMR.

3 - 3 : Clustering

Hierarchical clustering showed a strong family effect in methylation patterns (i.e. individuals

within family clustered together; Fig. 3). It is interesting to note that the four individuals that

were caught twice displayed after-stress methylation pattern very similar to their before-stress

pattern, and clustered together by pairs in all four cases. These individuals have the lowest

levels of dissimilarity in hierarchical clustering, suggesting very few differences in their

methylation profiles in pre- *vs* post-stress condition.

Despite this strong family effect and clues of low impact of the stress on methylation,

pre- (T0) and post-stress (T4) groups can be distinguished based on their DMC profile in PCA.

Mean loading scores of individuals were found significant among T0 and T4 for PC1 that

explained 7.2% of total variance (Student *t*-test; $p < 0.005$, Fig. 4). No significant difference was

found for loading scores along PC2 (3.0% of total variation; $P= 0.404$).

3 - 4 : Literature surveys

Thematic survey - Our first literature survey showed that DMC-related genes detected in this

study were found involved in one of the eight themes we retained to describe the stress

response in fish (Fig. 2 and Suppl. Mat. Table S4 for a more extensive description of gene

involvement in the stress response, including references). Most of them were previously

analysed or detected in human or mice stress studies, in few cases in other model organisms

(e.g. *Drosophila*) (Suppl. Mat. Table S4). Additionally, the *GLI2* gene encoding for a zinc-finger

protein and the *BTR30* (bloodthirsty-related gene family member 30, also known as E3

ubiquitin-protein ligase *TRIM39*-like) gene (Table 1) were found differentially regulated in sea

bass cultured-cells submitted to viral infection and involved in the immune response (Chaves-

Pozo et al. 2019) (Fig. 2).

Transcriptomics survey in zebrafish - In a second time, we searched for differential expression of

sea bass DMC-related genes in studies using high-throughput transcriptomics in fish blood. Only

four studies were retained (Morera et al. 2011; Dahle et al. 2015; Martos-Sitcha et al. 2017;

Puente-Marin et al. 2018), and none of our DMC-related genes was found to be differentially

expressed in these studies.

After curation of PubMed lists and addition of few undetected studies, we surveyed 22

zebrafish studies analyzing the transcriptomics of the stress response in six tissues: brain (n =

10), liver (n = 7), muscle (n = 2), gonads (n = 1), intestine (n = 1), skin (n = 1) (no high-throughput

transcriptomics study in gill, kidney, one in muscles of eye that was accounted for 'muscle'; see

Suppl. Mat. Text S1). The main outcome of this survey was to document 38 out of 51 RBC's

DMC-related genes (74.51%) in stress-related studies. Strikingly, these 38 DMCs were reported

mainly from few neurotranscriptomics zebrafish studies that dealt either with reactive-proactive

behavioural response to stress (Rey et al. 2013; Wong et al. 2015) or with changes in social

regulation that may promote stressful behaviour among congeners (Greenwood and Peichel

2015; Oliveira et al. 2016) (Fig. 2 and Suppl. Mat. Table S4). Some genes are shared among these

studies. A recent studies recorded five of them as also differentially expressed in Siamese

fighting fish (*Betta splendens*) brain during male contests (Vu et al. 2020) (Suppl. Mat. Table S4),

FBOX33 was not formerly reported in zebrafish, suggesting that 39 DMCs found in sea bass RBCs

could be associated to stress.

Only four of these DMC-related genes were reported in the former RNA sequencing

study of Anastasiadi and Piferrer (2019) in sea bass. This included *CILP1* and *PTGFRN* in muscle,

PRKCQ in testis, and *RRM2* in liver (blood and brain not investigated) (Fig.2). In comparison, the

twelve other zebrafish studies investigating other organs than brain retrieved only 15 of the sea

bass DMC-related genes found in RBCs (details in Suppl. Mat. Text S1).

Epigenomic survey - We finally looked at former studies dealing with epigenomics in fish. The

studies retained (*n* = 31) are presented in Suppl. Mat. Table S5. Twenty studies reported

differential methylation at genes also found differentially methylated in sea bass RBCs (Suppl.

mat. Table S5). Data sets were highly heterogeneous for different reasons (e.g. experimental set-

ups, nature of stressors if any, thresholds considered to define a DMC/DMR). However, main

observations might be summarized as follows: all articles considering brain tissue and with all

gene annotations made available (*n* = 6) reported at least one match with DMC-related genes

found in the present study, and more specifically data of the former sea bass epigenomic study

by Anastasiadi and Piferrer (2019) reported five genes of the present study as differentially

methylated in the brain (*GLG1a, GFRA2, CELF2, PRKCQ, ROBO3*), three in muscle (*CILP1, FURIN,*

KBTBD13), one in testis (*GLG1a*), and any in liver (total: eight distinct genes). This indicated

slightly more matches with brain. However, the single previous study analyzing RBC methylome

in fish so far (Gavery et al. 2018) shared no DMC-related gene with the present study. Finally,

the study that reported the largest number of genes found as DMC-related genes was Gavery et

al. (2019) (n = 15) in the liver of hatchery *vs* wild rainbow trout during a so-called 'temporal

analysis' (Suppl. Mat. Table S5). Another study by Olvsik et al. (2019) on zebrafish reported 11

genes in common with the present study, but was not organ specific (Suppl. Mat. Table S5).

3 - 5 : Protein-protein interactions

Further database mining screening for specific protein interactions on the STRING server revealed

few other possible pairs of associations (n = 8): *ROBO3-CHN1*, *ROBO3-PRKCQ*, *ROBO3-LRRC3*,

DLG1-NCBP2, *FURIN-PLG*, *PLG-MMRN2α*, *CELF-RRM2*, and *CRTC2-DENND4B* (Suppl. Mat. Fig.

S2). The *FURIN-PLG* and *DLG1-NCBP2* associations were also detected in our literature survey.

The first one will be presented in the 'Discussion' (see Suppl. Mat. Table S4 for the second one).

However, most of these associations retrieved only poor information relative to the stress

response. *ROBO3* and *CHN1* have been shown to interact in the brain with poorly-understood

implications of *CHN1* in neurological disorders (Walsh and Engle 2010; *CHN1* may have other

stress-related functions, see Suppl. Mat. Table S4). *CELF2* (CUGBP Elav-like family member 2)

and *RRM2* (Ribonucleotide reductase M2 polypeptide) are both known to participate to

messenger RMA (mRNA) metabolism (Vlasova-StLouis et al. 2013). *CELF2* acts to post-

transcriptionally stabilize mRNAs by relocating them to stress granules in the cytosol. *CELF2*

interferes with *RRM2* that modulates its splicing activity. As post-transcriptional activities are at

the core of methylation studies, the detection of this association is relevant to our study. To

illustrate some limits of these associations: *CRTC2* and *DENN4B* were detected apparently

because they are located close to the sex determining region of *Onchorhyncus mykiss* (Phillips et

al. 2013). No relationship with stress is suspected. The relationship between multimerin

(*MMRN2*) and plasminogen (*PLG*) via its co-activator remains poorly investigated and supported

(Øynebråten et al. 2005). This automatic search using STRING did not really enrich our findings.

4 - Discussion

In this study, we showed that a modified epiGBS protocol originally proposed by Van Gurp et al.

(2016) was applicable to further analyze patterns of cytosine methylation at a genome-wide

scale in *D. labrax*. This is the first use of epiGBS in fish and the second in an animal species

(Canadian lynx; Meröndun et al. 2019). The addition of a second restriction enzyme illustrates

the flexibility of the epiGBS and more generally RRBS protocols to improve data acquisition and

impact (Paun et al. 2019). This is however not the first RRBS protocol dedicated to the addition

of a second restriction enzyme (Wang et al. 2013), but this is hereby proposed in a context of

improved multiplexing of samples and increased sequencing capacities, thus offering more

opportunities to explore important biological processes at a genome-wide scale, such as the

stress response. Data allowed us to explore how RBC's DNA methylation may respond to

stressors in the European sea bass and - albeit some limitations that will be discussed below -

was shown to complement both the traditional evaluation of the stress response based on

analyses of blood serum samples (e.g. Vezzana et al. 2002; Seponka et al. 2016) or on gene

expression variation, often using invasive brain samples (e.g. Aluru and Vijayan 2009; Rey et al.

2013; Martos-Sitcha et al. 2014; Ghalambor et al. 2015. Wong et al. 2015; Metzger and Schulte

2016; Gerlai et al. 2017; Nyman et al. 2020).

4 - 1 : Mining the epigenome…

The information provided in this study is based on the analysis of 47,983 distinct methylated

sites distributed over all sea bass LGs. The mapping efficiency was high (74.5%) when compared

to early values retrieved in human (~65%; Krueger and Andrews 2011), or in some recent fish

studies implementing genome-wide methylation studies (e.g. 55-60% in Wan et al. 2016; 40% in

Gavery et al. 2018). Other studies reported similar mapping efficiencies, but reported

percentages of mapping for unique best hits that were generally lower. For example, in

Kryptolebias marmoratus, Berbel-Filho et al. (2020) reported a mean mapping efficiency of

74.2% but 61.1% unique best hits while, in this study, this latter percentage reached 73.0%. This

reflects a more robust mapping of the DMCs we detected and significantly enlarge the breadth

of the sites that can confidently exploit to retrieve functional information. Taking advantage of

the epiGBS protocol that allow to process more samples (Van Gurp et al. 2016), the number of

individuals considered in this study is rather high (n = 70 distinct individuals), when most

epigenomic studies in fish dealt with less than 30 individuals (range: n = 3 in Wang et al. 2019; n

= 106 in Heckwolf et al. 2020 for a population study). In sea bass, Anastasiadi and Piferrer (2019)

previously reported a study that used 27 samples and as many libraries to be sequenced while

our data were obtained from a unique library preparation. Our modified epiGBS protocol

provides a considerable amount of information, certainly at a reasonable cost, to decipher

methylation landscapes of sea bass or other species.

The operational and statistical thresholds used in the successive steps of this study are

large, resulting in the discovery of a rather low total number of methylated sites. For example a

threshold of 30X and nominal cut-off value of 0.001 are quite conservative, when some studies

might consider a threshold of 5X or 10X for a CpG to be analysed and associated cut-off values

of 0.05 or 0.01 (e.g. Wan et al. 2016; Hu et al. 2018; Anastasiadi and Piferrer 2019). Relaxing

thresholds would enable to retrieve more DMCs, but elevated thresholds should normally

ensure that relevant information is retrieved. Thus, only 57 DMCs have been found in RBCs of

pre- and post-stress European sea bass, and only few were grouped as DMRs. Considering DMRs

rather than DMCs is common in genome-wide methylation studies, including sea bass

(Anastasiadi and Piferrer 2019). Methylation changes grouped in clusters (i.e. DMRs) are more

likely to influence transcriptional activity at nearby loci than single cytosines (e.g. Richards et al.

2017). However, other experimental issues associated to the flexibility of RRBS protocols (e.g.

single- *vs* paired-end sequencing, likelihood of annotation, selection and size of fragments) can

made the advantages of considering DMRs over DMCs perhaps more disputable (Paun et al.

2019). In this study, DMCs were found mostly hypermethylated in post-stress individuals

compared to the pre-stress individuals, and mostly located in gene bodies of fifty-one different

genes (44 out of 57; 77.2%). It has been shown that such location of differential methylation

may regulate splicing and/or act as alternative promoters to reshape gene expression

(Maunakea et al. 2010; Ehrlich and Lacey 2013; Lev Maor et al. 2015). Thus, despite a low

number of DMRs in this study, a large fraction of DMCs points to the transcriptionally active

portion of the genome and to important stress-related genes (see below).

In addition to DMCs located in gene bodies, a dozen of DMCs were found in intergenic

regions (21.0%). Intergenic cytosine methylation has been frequently described, including in

stress studies (Hing et al. 2018), but its role remains poorly understood (Suzuki et al. 2011;

Rajarajan et al. 2016). While numbers of genic *vs* intergenic DMCs may greatly vary, a ratio of

~80% of DMCs located in gene bodies and ~20% located in other genomic regions has been

reported in other fish studies (e.g. Hu et al. 2018). Sometimes proportions are approximately

reversed (~80% intergenic *vs* ~20% in gene bodies; e.g. Metzger and Schulte 2017). While

under-represented in our data, the role for differentially methylated transposable elements is

also poorly understood (Lerat et al. 2019; Jönnson et al. 2020), while certainly crucial in the

stress response (Hunter 2020).

4 - 2 : … but mining the unknown

Studies looking at the epigenomic landscape of RBCs in fish are scarce. Gavery et al. (2018)

reported 85 DMRs between hatchery and wild fish in *O. mykiss*. This study suggested that blood

DNA methylation patterns are indicative of the stressors experimented in the environment, but

we are still currently mining the unknown to gain supporting information.

We nevertheless demonstrate that fish RBCs are relevant candidates to investigate the

stress response at the epigenomic level in the European sea bass. Numerous DMC-related genes

reported here have been previously shown to respond to stress or implicated in variation of the

stress response in animal models. Overall, our comparative surveys showed that the DMC-

related genes we detected in sea bass using RBCs have more connections with results found in

the brain than in other tissues. Five DMC-related genes were previously found differentially

methylated in sea bass brain by Anastasiadi and Piferrer (2019) and reports from other studies

suggest that RBC methylome might integrate epigenetic components of the stress response

observed in the brain. This relationship is however weak at the epigenomic level and about one

third of our DMC-related genes have also been detected in liver of trout (Gavery et al. 2019).

Liver is classically used in transcriptomic and epigenomic studies, may certainly integrate

information because of its pivotal role in metabolism, but generally necessitates sacrificing fish.

Nevertheless, the relationship is far more pronounced when genome-wide gene expression

difference is considered. Indeed, genome-wide neurotranscriptomics studies dealing with

personality and stress coping styles (Rey et al. 2013; Wong et al. 2015), or social regulation

(Greenwood and Peichel 2015) collectively reported thirty-eight of our 51 DMC-related genes as

expressed and potentially associated to the stress response in zebrafish. As differential

methylation is classically interpreted as leading to differential gene expression (but see, e.g.,

Jones 2012; Lea et al. 2018 for a more nuanced consideration), this observation is one

interesting signal indicating that RBCs might monitor events occurring in the brain. However, it

remains unclear why most of them are related to coping and personality, and to studies where

fish were under stress for few minutes (Rey et al. 2013; Wong et al. 2015), hours or days

(Greenwood and Peichel 2015). How distinct stress contexts and challenges may apparently rely

on similar stress circuitry has to be investigated further.

4 - 3 : A Brain-derived neutrophic factor (BDNF) network

The roles of the DMC-related genes have to be exposed more extensively to illustrate their

possible involvement in the stress response of sea bass. This is not place to fully expand on all

DMC-related genes (see Suppl. Mat. Table S4 for details), but one single selected example can

be developed. The best representative is a set of DMC-related genes from the BDNF network

whose role in the stress response is commonly reported. BDNF is a protein synthesized in the

brain that offers resistance to neurodegenerative diseases and favors stress adaptation and

resilience (Taliaz et al. 2011; Notaras and van den Buuse 2020), but also energy homeostasis

(Marosi and Mattson 2013). BDNF has emerged as one of the most important molecule in

memory (Beckinschtein et al. 2014; Gonzalez et al. 2019). It consolidates both the within- and

between-generation fear memory owing to epigenetic regulation (Lubin et al. 2008; Coley et al.

2019). Its activity is strongly linked to glucocorticoid stress to imprint neurogenesis (Numakawa

et al. 2017) and it acts as both a regulator and a target of stress hormone signaling (Notaras and

van den Buuse 2020). In fish, cortisol binds the glucocorticoid receptor (*gr*) and controls BDNF

expression in the brain. With *gr* and relatively few other genes, BDNF has thus emerged as one

of the target genes of interest in stress studies, as shown for zebrafish (e.g. Pavlidis et al. 2015),

sea bream (Vindas et al. 2018) and sea bass (Tognoli et al. 2010; Sadoul et al. 2018; Samaras et

al. 2018; Alfonso et al. 2019). BDNF is also involved in other aspects of the stress response in

fish (e.g. regulation of the microbiota-gut-brain axis; Borrelli et al. 2016). Variation in BDNF

methylation status could not be investigated in this study as no *SbfI* restriction site is present

within or close to this gene. Nevertheless, a methylation signature of stress associated to BDNF

is likely present in our data and illustrates how blood methylation may provide a snapshot of

events studied in the brain.

Indeed, several DMC-related gees are involved in the maturation of proBDNF to mature

BDNF or the regulation of its activities (*ABLIM2, ADCY1b, CRTC2, FURIN, NPAS3, PLG,* and

possibly *SLC22A2*). Most of these DMC-related genes were already found differentially

expressed in the zebrafish brain (Rey et al. 2013; Greenwood and Peichel 2015; Wong et al.

2015), but an outline of their interaction was not presented. The adenyl(ate) cyclase (AC,

ADCY1b gene) is a brain-specific signaling enzyme that synthesizes the cyclic AMP (Sassone Corsi

2012). In the brain, AC is activated by PACAP (Protein Adenylate Cyclase Activating Protein) and

stimulates memory and long term potentiation (Wang H. et al. 2004). This inducible signaling

pathway participates to the synthesis of the active form of BDNF (proBDNF to mature BDNF; Lee

and Seo 2014). ProBDNF is processed by furin and the plasminogen system (Marosi and Mattson

2013), including processing steps that necessitate actions of actin-binding LIM kinases (ABLIM;

Bennett and Lagopoulos 2014). Furin - encoded by *FURIN* - is a subtilisin-like protein

proconvertase ubiquitously expressed in fish (Murata and Kinoshita 2015) that presents an

intracellular cleaving activity of numerous biologically relevant molecules in the trans-Golgi

network. This includes BDNF in the brain, notably in pre-synaptic axons. In mice, furin has been

shown to participate to dendrite morphogenesis and modulate learning abilities and memory

(Zhu et al. 2018). Stress imprinting at *FURIN* is likely since it has recently been shown that

transgenerational epigenetic effects of furin activity were active in brain of mice (Buck et al.

2019). ProBDNF cleavage by furin depends on brain AC and CREB (cAMP Response Element-

binding protein) signaling (Marcinkiewicz et al. 1996; Chen et al. 2015) and plasminogen (*PLG*;

Yeh et al. 2015). This activity itself is modulated by stress hormones (corticosteroids) and is

essential to brain hippocampal plasticity in mammals (Pang et al. 2004; McEwen 2008). One

interesting supplementary observation is that CREB signaling necessary to furin is associated to

CRTC2 - a CREB co-activator – found as one of the four DMRs reported in this study. In mice,

CRTC2 is known to act as a switch for BDNF and glucocorticoids to direct the expression of

corticotropin-releasing hormone (CRH) in the hypothalamus (Jeanneteau et al. 2012).

In the brain, plasminogen encoded by *PLG* is converted to plasmin that cleaves BDNF in

the extracellular synaptic domain (Gray and Ellis 2008; Marosi and Mattson 2013). *PLG* has also

been shown to regulate pro-opiomelanocortin (POMC) in the hypothalamic-pituitary axis, then

the production of peptides hormones such as the adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH; Wang N.

et al. 2004).

In relation to BDNF, two other DMC-related genes should be mentioned: *NPAS3*

(neuronal PAS domain containing protein 3) and *SLC22A2*. *SLC22A2* - also known as *OCT2*

(organic cation transporter 2) – associated to the unique 3'UTR DMC found in this study is

implied in numerous transmembrane transports (Liu 2019), including at the blood-brain barrier

(Strazielle and Ghersi-Egea 2015). It was found involved in memory in mice (Couroussé and

Gautron 2015; Couroussé et al. 2015) or *Drosophila* (Gai et al. 2016), and associated itself to

neurodegenerative diseases (Jedlitschky et al. 2014). Substrates of *SLC22A2* include

neurotransmitters such as norepinephrine, but also dopamine, serotonin and a wide-variety of

internal or exogenous compounds (Bacq et al. 2012; Volk 2014). Functional links of *SLC22A2*

with BDNF remain however poorly documented (Kendall et al. 1995), while they have been

found co-expressed and co-regulated in the brain during drug administration experiments (e.g.

methamphetamine, mimicking the action of catecholamines; Thomas et al. 2004). In this study,

PLG and *SLC22A2* are associated to the same DMC; the functional significance of this situation

should be investigated further. Finally, *NPAS3* has a well-established action in memory (e.g.

Erbel-Sieler et al. 2004; Luoma et al. 2018). It participates to neurogenesis in the hippocampus

within a network that also includes BDNF (Yang et al. 2016), but is also known associated to the

glial cell line-derived neurotrophic factor (GDNF) receptor-alpha2 gene (*GFRA2*) detected in this

study and related to stress and anxiety (Lavedan et al. 2009). The *DLG1* (Disk-large homolog 1)

gene could be also associated to BDNF, but this will be not develop further (Suppl. Mat. Table

S4).

Results suggest that even in absence of BDNF sequencing reads, some DMCs/DMRs with

a potential impact in fear memory and anxiety response as expected in fish after an acute stress

challenge certainly did not occur only by chance in this study. They have also a role in processes

that regulate the HPI axis and hormones. The measurement of methylation difference now used

to monitor the BDNF activity and its relationship to stress (Uwaya et al. 2016; Coley et al. 2019)

could thus potentially depend on the methylation status observed at or close to *ADCY1b,*

ABLIM2, FURIN, CRTC2, *PLG* and other genes such as *SLC22A2* and *NPAS3*. This should be

investigated further to improve our understanding of changes in the directionality of multigenic

epigenetic modifications and inter-individual variation in stress coping. Candidate genes coming

from other fish studies with role in memory consolidation could be added (see, e.g. Nyman et

al. 2020; Yang et al. 2020 for proposals).

As at least *ADCY1b, FURIN, CRTC2, PLG* and *SLC22A2* have other well-recognized

relationships with stress and the stress response (especially the glucose metabolism and the

immune function; see Suppl. Mat. Table S4), this example illustrates the complex non-linear

network modulating the stress response in fish with a pivotal role in the brain associated to

BDNF and secondary additional outcomes in other tissues and organs.

4 - 4 : Family effect, development and few individuals

While the PCA showed that pre- and post-stress individuals have in average distinct methylation

profiles that may represent stress imprinting during the challenge test, a strong family effect

was also detected. Family effects were already reported in fish (e.g. Metzger and Schulte 2018;

Xiu et al. 2019; Sagonas et al. 2020), and sea bass families certainly do not have the same

sensitivity to stress. This may suggest that (*i*) their genomic backgrounds alter how family will

develop an epigenetic stress response over the period covered by the challenge test, (*ii*) that the

developmental period during which families were distributed over different tanks was a "critical

time window" (e.g. Safi-Stibler and Gabory 2020) sufficient to imprint individuals and lead them

to develop a familial response to stress during the challenge, or that (*iii*) some degree of

transgenerational inheritance in methylation profiles is present. These are not mutually

exclusive. Transgenerational inheritance has gained interest over the last years (e.g. Perez and

Lehner 2019), notably in marine species (e.g. Beemelmanns and Roth 2017; Metzger and

Schulte 2017; Fallet et al. 2020), also including sea bass (Anastasiadi and Piferrer 2019). Parents

and/or the germline were unfortunately not sampled in this study for further analysis. As

Gavery et al. (2018) reported that *BTR30*, *DLG1*, *MMRN2*, and *NOL4B* - also found in this study -

were differentially methylated in the sperm of *O. mykiss*, these differentially methylated genes

could be interesting candidates for transgenerational inheritance study of the stress response.

Other candidates are possible. For example, Ghalambor et al. (2015) reported rapid evolution in

brain gene expression of the Trinidadian guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*) for the *TNKS* and *NCBP2*

genes, found as DMC-related genes in this study. It would thus be interesting to investigate how

gene expression and cytosine methylation at these genes may co-vary within and between

species over generations.

Anastasiadi and Piferrer (2019) showed that the domestication process in *D. labrax*

resulted notably in genome-wide methylation differences for genes involved in the nervous

system and neural crest cell differentiation. In our study, *GLI2* (e.g. Cerrizuala et al. 2018), *PBX1*

(Welsh et al. 2018), *DLG1* (Mostowska et al. 2018) and *FOXJ3* (Landgren and Carson 2004) are

DMC-related genes involved in neural crest cell proliferation and differentiation. *ROBO3* is

involved in the immune response, but also implied in early neurogenesis (Friocourt and

Chédotal 2017), as well as *NPAS3* (Kamm et al. 2013). With *BMP3* (Nie 2005), *FURIN* (Walker et

al. 2006); *NOL4B* (Kumari et al. 2018), and *Myf5* (Gustaffson et al. 2002; Lin et al. 2013), most of

these genes are engaged in the development of the anterior region and/or the craniofacial

skeleton which is modified during sea bass farming (Anastasiadi and Piferrer 2019). This

suggests that methylation patterns observed in sea bass could also potentially rely on the

ontogenetic regulation of a particular phenotype between pre- and post-stress fish, rather than

being directly related to the stress challenge. Variation in gene expression or methylation

accompanying ontogeny are reported in fish (Baumgart et al. 2014; Gavery et al. 2019) and, as

for other organisms, cytosine methylation is known to vary with age in sea bass (Anastasiadi and

Piferrer 2020). Collateral effects of stress – a process sometimes coined as 'epigenetic drift'

(Vaiserman 2018) - might thus be present in our data as suggested by the fact that fifteen genes

we found differentially methylated in RBCs were reported as also differentially methylated in

the liver of the rainbow trout by Gavery et al. (2019).

On another hand, the epigenetic profiles of four individuals were analyzed in the pre-

and post-stress situations and clustered very closely from each other in each case. While based

on few observations, this suggests that neither the stress challenge itself, nor development have

a strong impact on the cytosine methylation landscape in sea bass. How a transgenerational and

within-generation stress-imprinting events influenced by ontogeny may interact to shape both

the plastic and the heritable component of the stress response in relation to environmental

stimuli require in depth evaluation (Burggren 2015; Trollope et al. 2017). Nature and strength of

family-based epigenomic variation are of considerable importance for selection breeding

improvements in a cultured fish like sea bass (Houston et al. 2020), including also issues about

health and welfare (Triantaphyllopoulos et al. 2016).

4 - 5 : Blood and RBCs : extending the perspective

As fish engaged in aquaculture programs as sea bass are costly and based on breeders that

cannot be easily sacrificed, epiGBS using blood samples may offer a genome-wide assessment of

stress-induced epigenetic marks over a significant number of individuals and at reasonable cost.

Blood is widely used in human epigenomics (e.g. Houseman et al. 2015), but not in fish despite

the presence of nucleated cells and minimally invasive sampling that allows for multiple

measurements. Using RNA-sequencing, Morera et al. (2011) or Dahle et al. (2015) already

suggested that fish erythrocytes would be useful to provide insights on the innate immunity or

response to pathogens. Our study suggests that blood could effectively offer an in depth insight

for the evaluation of the stress response from a novel perspective, accompanied by classical

physiological measurements (e.g. cortisol, glucose, lactate) and may provide a more complete

picture of the stress response in fish than currently performed.

The link between brain and blood epigenomics remains however to be explored more

deeply in fish and requires careful evaluation and validation to correct for tissue specificity, as

requested in human (Lauschke et al. 2017). Our attempts to survey fish studies undoubtedly

showed that considerably more knowledge has to be accumulated in fish epigenomics before to

reach this issue. In human, the lack of access to brain tissues have been shown to impede some

epigenomic studies and naturally raised ethical issues certainly also valid for fish (Barr and

Misener 2016; Bunnik et al. 2020). *In situ* hybridization techniques in brain have been shown to

be especially important to link neurobiological activities and stress coping in fish (Vindas et al.

2017, 2018). Their use and thus sacrifice of individuals cannot be ruled out. Actually,

methylation differences among full brain or brain areas have been rarely studied in fish, mostly

in zebrafish (e.g. Zhang et al. 2016), but recently in a tilapia (Hilliard et al. 2019), a goby

(Sommerville et al. 2019), and a killifish (Berbel-Filho et al. 2020).

5 - Conclusion and future directions

With the works of Anastasiadi and co-workers (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020) and others (Navarro-

Martín et al. 2011; Geay et al. 2012; Terova et al. 2016), the European sea bass has become one

of the most studied species in fish epigenetics. Because of the availability of its genome and the

development of selection programs, efforts should be dedicated to further explore its

epigenomic landscape regarding the stress response, especially in an aquaculture context. This

should be done over a multigenerational scale to identify pathways structuring the stress

response at key life stages, on different tissues to better delineate stress-responsive cellular

networks, and investigating the effects of the nature, the duration, and the number of stressors.

Studies in epigenomics including phenotypic information (e.g. Birney et al. 2016; Lin et al. 2016)

could increase the panel of diagnostic tools for breeding selection in aquaculture if blood could

be – at least partly - substituted to brain or other tissues when studying the stress response.

Screening for genome-wide epigenomic variation in natural populations as already done for

genomic variation (Duranton et al. 2018) is now also conceivable in this species. Our modified

version of the original epiGBS protocol seems to be a powerful and affordable method to screen

a significant number of individuals with sufficient depth and coverage to reach meaningful

conclusions. While it should be compared to others (e.g. Wang et al. 2013; Suzuki et al. 2018),

our protocol is close to the double digestion restriction site DNA sequencing protocol used in

genomics. Their parallel use certainly deserves attention to design more integrated epigenomic-

genomic studies (e.g. Prudencio et al. 2018; Crotti et al. 2020), and more generally multi-omics

investigations of stress, health and welfare (Suravajhala et al. 2016; Schwartz 2020).

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the EU ERA-NET FP7 programme for the Cooperation in Fisheries,

Aquaculture and Seafood Processing (COFASP) and the Agence Nationale pour la Recherche

(ANR-16-0001-COFA). Data used in this work were partly produced through the GenSeq

technical facilities at ISEM and benefited from the Montpellier Bioinformatics Biodiversity

(MBB) platform supported by the LabEx CeMEB, both supported by ANR "Investissements

d'Avenir" program (ANR-10-LABX-04-01). MGX acknowledges financial support from the France

Génomique National infrastructure, also funded as part of "Investissement d'Avenir" program

managed by ANR (ANR-10-INBS-09). We thank N. Wagemaker at the Radboud University

(Nijmegen, The Netherlands) for his support when implementing and developing the lab work,

and Prof. C. Grunau at the University of Perpignan Via Domitia (France) for hosting M.V.K at

various steps of this work. S. Ben Chehida greatly helped during the last stages of manuscript

preparation.

Conflicts of interest

None declared

Ethics statements

All experiments were performed in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. Nireus

S.A. research facilities are certified and have obtained the codes for the rearing and use of fish

for scientific purposes (EL04-BIOexp-01). All procedures on fish used in this study were

approved by the Departmental Animal Care Committee following the Three Rs principle, in

accordance with Greek (PD 56/2013) and EU (Directive 63/2010) legislation on the care and use

of experimental animals. All sample procedures were performed by FELASA certified researchers

(http://www.felasa.eu/).

References

Akalin A., Kormaksson M., Li S., Garrett-Bakelman F.E. et al. 2012. MethylKit: a comprehensive R package for the
analysis of genome-wide DNA methylation profiles. *Genome Biol*. **13:** R87. doi: 10.1186/gb-2012-13-10-R87

Alfonso S., Sadoul B., Gesto M. et al. 2019. Coping styles in European sea bass: the link between boldness, stress
response and neurogenesis. *Physiol. Behav*. **207:** 67-85. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2019.04.020

Allis C.D., Jenuwein T. 2016. The molecular hallmarks of epigenetic control. *Nat. Rev. Genet*. **17(8):** 487-500. doi:
10.1038/nrg.2016.59

Aluru N., Vijayan M.M. 2009. Stress transcriptomics in fish: a role for genomic cortisol signaling. *Gen. Comp. Endo-*
crinol. **164(2-3):** 142-150. doi: 10.1016/j.ygcen.2009.03.020

Anastasiadi D., Díaz N., Piferrer F. 2017. Small ocean temperature increases elicit stage-dependent changes in DNA
methylation and gene expression in a fish, the European sea bass. *Sci. Rep*. **7(1):** 12401. doi:
10.1038/s41598-017-10861-6

Anastasiadi D., Vandeputte M., Sánchez-Baizán N. et al. 2018. Dynamic epimarks in sex-related genes predict gon-
ad phenotype in the European sea bass, a fish with mixed genetic and environmental sex determination. *Ep-*
igenetics **13(9):** 988–1011. doi: 10.1080/15592294.2018.1529504

Anastasiadi D., Piferrer F. 2019. Epimutations in developmental genes underlie the onset of domestication in
farmed European sea bass. *Mol. Biol. Evol*. **36(10):** 2252-2264. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msz153

Anastasiadi D., Piferrer F. 2020. A clockwork fish: Age prediction using DNA methylation-based biomarkers in the
European seabass. *Mol. Ecol. Resour*. **20(2):** 387-397. doi: 10.1111/1755-0998.13111

Ashley P.J. 2007. Fish welfare: Current issues in aquaculture. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci*. **104(3):** 199-235. doi:
10.1016/j.applanim.2006.09.001

Auta J., Smith R.C., Dong E. et al. 2013. DNA-methylation gene network dysregulation in peripheral blood lympho-
cytes of schizophrenia patients. *Schizophr Res*. 150(1): 312-318. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2013.07.030

Backström T, Winberg S. 2017. Serotonin coordinates responses to social stress - what we can learn from fish.
Front. Neurosci. **11:** 595. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2017.00595

Bacq A., Balasse L., Biala G. et al. 2012. Organic cation transporter 2 controls brain norepinephrine and serotonin
clearance and antidepressant response. *Mol. Psychiatry* **17(9):** 926-939. doi: 10.1038/mp.2011.87

Balasch J.C., Tort L. 2019. Netting the stress responses in fish. *Front. Endocrinol*. **10:** 62. doi:
10.3389/fendo.2019.00062;

Barr C.L., Misener V.L. 2016. Decoding the non-coding genome: elucidating genetic risk outside the coding ge-
nome. *Genes Brain Behav*. **15(1):** 187-204. doi: 10.1111/gbb.12269

Baumgart M., Groth M., Priebe S. et al. 2014. RNA-seq of the aging brain in the short-lived fish *N. furzeri* - con-
served pathways and novel genes associated with neurogenesis. *Aging Cell* **13(6):** 965-974.
doi:10.1111/acel.12257

Beemelmanns A., Roth O. 2017. Grandparental immune priming in the pipefish *Syngnathus typhle*. *BMC Evol. Biol*.
17(1): 44. doi: 10.1186/s12862-017-0885-3

Bekinschtein P., Cammarota M., Medina J.H. 2014. BDNF and memory processing. *Neuropharmacology* **76 Pt C**:
677-683. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2013.04.024

Bennett M.R., Lagopoulos J. 2014. Stress and trauma: BDNF control of dendritic-spine formation and regression.
Prog. Neurobiol. **112:** 80-99. doi: 10.1016/j.pneurobio.2013.10.005

Berbel-Filho W.M., Berry N., Rodríguez-Barreto D. et al. 2020. Environmental enrichment induces intergenerational
behavioural and epigenetic effects on fish. *Mol Ecol*. doi:10.1111/mec.15481

Berger J.M., Singh P., Khrimian L. et al. 2019. Mediation of the acute stress response by the skeleton. *Cell Metab.*
30(5): 890-902.e8. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2019.08.012

Blaze J., Wang J., Ho L. et al. 2018. Polyphenolic compounds alter stress-induced patterns of global DNA methyla-
tion in brain and blood. *Mol. Nutr. Food Res***. 62(8):** e1700722. doi:10.1002/mnfr.201700722

Birney E., Smith G.D., Greally J.M. 2016. Epigenome-wide association studies and the interpretation of disease -
omics. *PLoS Genet*. **12(6):** e1006105. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1006105

Boltana S., Aguilar A., Sanhueza N. et al. 2018. Behavioral fever drives epigenetic modulation of the immune re-
sponse in fish. *Front. Immunol*. **9:** 1241. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2018.01241

Borrelli L., Aceto S., Agnisola C. et al. 2016. Probiotic modulation of the microbiota-gut-brain axis and behaviour in
zebrafish. *Sci. Rep.* **6:** 30046. doi: 10.1038/srep30046

Buck J.M., O'Neill H.C., Stitzel J.A. 2019. Developmental nicotine exposure elicits multigenerational disequilibria in
proBDNF proteolysis and glucocorticoid signaling in the frontal cortices, striata, and hippocampi of adoles-
cent mice. *Biochem. Pharmacol*. **168:** 438-451. doi: 10.1016/j.bcp.2019.08.003

Bunnik E.M., Timmers M., Bolt I.L. 2020. Ethical Issues in research and development of epigenome-wide technolo-
gies. *Epigenet. Insights* 13: 2516865720913253. doi: 10.1177/2516865720913253

Burggren W.W. 2015. Dynamics of epigenetic phenomena: intergenerational and intragenerational phenotype
'washout'. *J. Exp. Biol.* **218:** 80-87. doi: 10.1242/jeb.107318

Burgos-Aceves M.A., Lionetti L., Faggio C. 2019. Multidisciplinary haematology as prognostic device in environmen-
tal and xenobiotic stress-induced response in fish. *Sci. Tot. Environm*. **670:** 1170-1183. doi:
10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.275

Burns S.B., Szyszkowicz J.K., Luheshi G.N. et al. 2018. Plasticity of the epigenome during early-life stress. *Semin. Cell*
Dev. Biol. **77:** 115-132. doi: 10.1016/j.semcdb.2017.09.033

Castanheira M.F., Conceição L.E.C., Millot S. et al. 2017. Coping styles in farmed fish: consequences for aquacul-
ture. *Rev. Aquaculture* **9:** 23–41. doi: 10.1111/raq.12100

Catchen J., Hohenlohe P., Bassham S. et al. 2013. Stacks: an analysis tool set for population genomics. *Mol. Ecol*.
22(11): 3124-3140. doi: 10.1111/mec.12354

Cerrizuela S., Vega-López G.A., Palacio M.B. et al. 2018. *Gli2* is required for the induction and migration of *Xenopus*
laevis neural crest. *Mech. Dev*. **154:** 219-239. doi: 10.1016/j.mod.2018.07.010

Chatterjee A., Lagisz M., Rodger E.J. et al. 2016. Sex differences in DNA methylation and expression in zebrafish
brain: a test of an extended 'male sex drive' hypothesis. *Gene* **590(2):** 307-316.
doi:10.1016/j.gene.2016.05.042

Chaves-Pozo E., Bandín I., Olveira J.G. et al. 2019. European sea bass brain DLB-1 cell line is susceptible to noda-
virus: A transcriptomic study. *Fish Shellfish Immunol*. **86:** 14-24. doi: 10.1016/j.fsi.2018.11.024

Chen Y., Zhang J., Deng M. 2015. Furin mediates brain-derived neurotrophic factor upregulation in cultured rat
astrocytes exposed to oxygen-glucose deprivation. *J. Neurosci. Res*. **93(1):** 189-194. doi: 10.1002/jnr.23455

Cœurdacier J.-L., Dutto G., Gasset E. et al. 2011. Is total serum protein a good indicator for welfare in reared sea
bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*)? *Aquat. Living Resourc*. **24:** 124-127. doi: 10.1051/alr/2011130

Coley E.J.L., Demaestri C., Ganguly P. et al. 2019. Cross-generational transmission of early life stress effects on HPA
regulators and Bdnf are mediated by sex, lineage, and upbringing. *Front. Behav. Neurosci*. **13:** 101. doi:
10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00101

Couroussé T., Bacq A., Belzung C. et al. 2015. Brain organic cation transporter 2 controls response and vulnerability
to stress and *GSK3β* signaling. *Mol. Psychiatry* **20(7):** 889-900. doi: 10.1038/mp.2014.86

Couroussé T., Gautron S. 2015. Role of organic cation transporters (OCTs) in the brain. *Pharmacol. Ther*. **146:**
94-103. doi: 10.1016/j.pharmthera.2014.09.008

Crotti M., Adams C.E., Elmer K.R. 2020. Population genomic SNPs from epigenetic RADs: gaining genetic and epige-
netic data from a single established next-generation sequencing approach. *Methods Ecol. Evol*. doi:
10.1111/2041-210X.13395

Dahle M.K., Wessel Ø., Timmerhaus G. et al. 2015. Transcriptome analyses of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.)
erythrocytes infected with piscine orthoreovirus (PRV). *Fish Shellfish Immunol*. **45(2):** 780-790. doi:
10.1016/j.fsi.2015.05.049

Del Giudice M., Buck C.L., Chaby L.E. et al. 2018. What is stress? A systems perspective. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **58(6):**
1019-1032. doi: 10.1093/icb/icy114

Denzel M.S., Lapierre L.R., Mack H.I.D. 2019. Emerging topics in *C. elegans* aging research: Transcriptional regula-
tion, stress response and epigenetics. *Mech. Ageing Dev*. **177:** 4-21. doi:10.1016/j.mad.2018.08.001

de Wit J, Ghosh A. 2014. Control of neural circuit formation by leucine-rich repeat proteins. *Trends Neurosci.*
37(10): 539-550. doi: 10.1016/j.tins.2014.07.004

Dirven B.C.J., Homberg J.R., Kozicz T. et al. 2017. Epigenetic programming of the neuroendocrine stress response
by adult life stress. *J. Mol. Endocrinol*. **59(1):** R11-R31. doi: 10.1530/JME-17-0019

Duranton M., Allal F., Fraïsse C. et al. 2018. The origin and remolding of genomic islands of differentiation in the
European sea bass. *Nat. Commun.* **9:** 2518. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-04963-6

Ehrlich M., Lacey M. 2013. DNA methylation and differentiation: silencing, upregulation and modulation of gene
expression. *Epigenomics* **5(5):** 553-568. doi: 10.2217/epi.13.43

Ellis T., Yildiz H.Y., López-Olmeda J. et al. 2012. Cortisol and finfish welfare. *Fish Physiol. Biochem*. **38:** 163–188. doi:
10.1007/s10695-011-9568-y

Erbel-Sieler C., Dudley C., Zhou Y. et al. 2004. Behavioral and regulatory abnormalities in mice deficient in the
NPAS1 and *NPAS3* transcription factors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101(37):** 13648-53. doi:
10.1073/pnas.0405310101

Fallet M., Luquet E., David P. et al. 2020. Epigenetic inheritance and intergenerational effects in mollusks. *Gene*
729: 144166. doi: 10.1016/j.gene.2019.144166

Fanouraki E., Mylonas C.C., Papandroulakis N. et al. 2011. Species specificity in the magnitude and duration of the
acute stress response in Mediterranean marine fish in culture. *Gen. Comp. Endocrinol*. **173:** 313–322. doi:
10.1016/j.ygcen.2011.06.004

Faught E., Aluru N., Vijayan M.M. 2016. The molecular stress response. Pp. 113-166. In: "*Biology of Stress in Fish*".
Fish Physiology, Vol. 35". C.B. Schreck, L. Tort, A.P. Farrell, C.J. Brauner Eds. Academic Press, Cambridge
(MA). doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-802728-8.00004-7

Floriou-Servou A., von Ziegler L., Stalder L. et al. 2018. Distinct proteomic, transcriptomic, and epigenetic stress
responses in dorsal and ventral hippocampus. *Biol. Psychiatry* **84(7):** 531-541. doi:
10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.02.003

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

Friocourt F., Chédotal A. 2017. The *Robo3* receptor, a key player in the development, evolution, and function of
commissural systems. *Dev. Neurobiol*. **77(7):** 876-890. doi: 10.1002/dneu.22478.

Gai Y., Liu Z., Cervantes-Sandoval I. et al. 2016. Drosophila *SLC22A* transporter is a memory suppressor gene that
influences cholinergic neurotransmission to the mushroom bodies. *Neuron* **90(3):** 581-595.
doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2016.03.017

Gamperl A.K., Vijayan N.M., Boutilier R.G.. 1994. Experimental control of stress hormone levels in fishes: tech-
niques and applications. *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish*. **4:** 215-255. doi: 10.1007/BF00044129

Gavery M.R., Nichols K.M., Goetz G.G. et al. 2018. Characterization of genetic and epigenetic variation in sperm
and red blood cells from adult hatchery and natural-origin steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss. G3: Genes, Ge-*
nomes., Genetics **8(11):** 3723-3736. doi: 10.1534/g3.118.200458

Gavery M.R., Nichols K.M., Berejikian B.A. et al. 2019. Temporal dynamics of DNA methylation patterns in response
to rearing juvenile steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in a hatchery versus simulated stream environment.
Genes **10:** 356. doi: 10.3390/genes10050356

Geay F., Zambonino-Infante J., Reinhardt R. et al. 2012. Characteristics of *fads2* gene expression and putative
promoter in European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*): comparison with salmonid species and analysis of
CpG methylation. *Mar. Genomics* **5:** 7-13. doi: 10.1016/j.margen.2011.08.003

Gerlai R., Poshusta T.L., Rampersad M. et al. 2017. Forward genetic screening using behavioral tests in zebrafish: a
proof of concept analysis of mutants. *Behav Genet*. **47(1):** 125-139. doi: 10.1007/s10519-016-9818-y

Geven E.J.W., Klaren P.H.M. 2017. The teleost head kidney: integrating thyroid and immune signaling. *Dev. Comp.*
Immunol. **66:** 73-83. doi: 10.1016/j.dci.2016.06.025

Ghalambor C.K., Hoke K.L., Ruell E.W. et al. 2015. Non-adaptive plasticity potentiates rapid adaptive evolution of
gene expression in nature. *Nature* **525(7569):** 372-375. doi: 10.1038/nature15256

Gonzalez M.C., Radiske A., Cammarota M. 2019. On the involvement of BDNF signaling in memory reconsolidation.
Front. Cell. Neurosci. **13:** 383. doi: 10.3389/fncel.2019.00383

Gray J.D., Kogan J.F., Marrocco J. et al. 2017. Genomic and epigenomic mechanisms of glucocorticoids in the brain.
Nat. Rev. Endocrinol. **13(11):** 661-673. doi: 10.1038/nrendo.2017.97

Gray K, Ellis V. 2008. Activation of pro-BDNF by the pericellular serine protease plasmin. *FEBS Lett*. 582(6): 907-910.
doi: 10.1016/j.febslet.2008.02.026

Greenwood A.K., Peichel C.L. 2015. Social regulation of gene expression in threespine sticklebacks. *PLoS One* **10(9):**
e0137726. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0137726

Gu H., Smith Z.D., Bock C. et al. 2011. Preparation of reduced representation bisulfite sequencing libraries for ge-
nome-scale DNA methylation profiling. *Nat. Protocols* **6:** 468-481. doi: 10.1038/nprot.2010.190

Gustafsson M.K., Pan H., Pinney D.F. et al. 2002. *Myf5* is a direct target of long-range *Shh* signaling and *Gli* regula-
tion for muscle specification. *Genes Dev.* **16(1):** 114-126. doi: 10.1101/gad.940702

Heckwolf M.J., Meyer B.S., Häsler R. et al. 2020. Two different epigenetic information channels in wild three-spined
sticklebacks are involved in salinity adaptation. *Sci. Adv*. **6(12):** eaaz1138. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz1138

Hilliard A.T., Xie D., Ma Z. et al. 2019. Genome-wide effects of social status on DNA methylation in the brain of a
cichlid fish, *Astatotilapia burtoni*. *BMC Genomics* **20(1):** 699. doi: 10.1186/s12864-019-6047-9

Hing B., Braun P., Cordner Z.A. et al. 2018. Chronic social stress induces DNA methylation changes at an evolution-
ary   conserved   intergenic   region   in   chromosome   X.   *Epigenetics*   **13(6):**   627–641.   doi:
10.1080/15592294.2018.1486654

Houseman E.A., Kim S., Kelsey K.T. et al. 2015. DNA Methylation in whole blood: uses and challenges. *Curr. Environ.*
Health Rep. **2(2):** 145-154. doi: 10.1007/s40572-015-0050-3

Houston R.D., Bean T.P., Macqueen D.J. et al. 2020. Harnessing genomics to fast-track genetic improvement in
aquaculture. *Nat. Rev. Genet*. **21:** 389-409. doi: 10.1038/s41576-020-0227-y

Hu J., Pérez-Jvostov F., Blondel L. et al. 2018. Genome-wide DNA methylation signatures of infection status in Trin-
idadian guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Mol. Ecol*. **27(15):** 3087–3102. doi: 10.1111/mec.14771

Hunter R.G. 2020. Stress, adaptation and the deep genome: why transposons matter. *Integr. Comp. Biol*.
doi:10.1093/icb/icaa050

Jeanneteau F.D, Lambert W.M., Ismaili N. et al. 2012. BDNF and glucocorticoids regulate corticotrophin-releasing
hormone (CRH) homeostasis in the hypothalamus. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109(4):** 1305-1310. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1114122109

Jedlitschky G., Grube M., Mosyagin I. et al. 2014. Targeting CNS transporters for treatment of neurodegenerative
diseases. *Curr. Pharm. Des*. **20(10):** 1523-1533. doi: 10.2174/13816128113199990460

Jones P.A. 2012. Functions of DNA methylation: islands, start sites, gene bodies and beyond. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*
13(7): 484-492. doi: 10.1038/nrg3230

Jönsson M.E., Garza R., Johansson P.A., Jakobsson J. 2020. Transposable elements: a common feature of neurode-
velopmental and neurodegenerative disorders. *Trends Genet*. S0168-9525(20)30102-5. doi:
10.1016/j.tig.2020.05.004

Kamm G.B., Pisciottano F., Kliger R. et al. 2013. The developmental brain gene *NPAS3* contains the largest number
of accelerated regulatory sequences in the human genome. *Mol. Biol. Evol*. **30(5):** 1088-1102. doi:
10.1093/molbev/mst023.

Kendall G., Brar-Rai A., Ensor E. et al. 1995. Nerve growth factor induces the Oct-2 transcription factor in sensory
neurons with the kinetics of an immediate-early gene. *J. Neurosci. Res*. **40(2):** 169-176. doi:
10.1002/jnr.490400205

Krueger F., Andrews S.R. 2011. Bismark: A flexible aligner and methylation caller for bisulfite-Seq applications.
Bioinformatics **11:** 1571-1572. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btr167

Kumari P.K., Ali A., Singh S.K. et al. 2018. Genetic heterogeneity in Van der Woude syndrome: identification of
NOL4 and *IRF6* haplotype from the noncoding region as candidates in two families. *J. Genet.* **97(1):** 275-285.
PMID: 29666346

Landgren H., Carson P. 2004. *FoxJ3*, a novel mammalian Forkhead gene expressed in neuroectoderm, neural crest,
and myotome. *Dev. Dyn*. **231:** 1396-1401. doi: 10.1002/dvdy.20131

Lauschke V.M., Ivanov M., Ingelman-Sundberg M. 2017. Pitfalls and opportunities for epigenomic analyses focused
on disease diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci*. **38(9):** 765-770. doi:
10.1016/j.tips.2017.05.007

Lavedan C., Licamele L., Volpi S. et al. 2009. Association of the *NPAS3* gene and five other loci with response to the
antipsychotic iloperidone identified in a whole genome association study. *Mol. Psychiatry* **14(8):** 804-819.
doi: 10.1038/mp.2008.56.

Lea A.J., Vockley C.M., Johnston R.A. et al. 2018. Genome-wide quantification of the effects of DNA methylation on
human gene regulation. *Elife* **7:** e37513. doi: 10.7554/eLife.37513

Lee E.H., Seo S.R. 2014. Neuroprotective roles of pituitary adenylate cyclase-activating polypeptide in neurodegen-
erative diseases. *BMB Rep*. **47(7):** 369-375. doi: 10.5483/bmbrep.2014.47.7.086

Le Luyer J., Laporte M., Beacham T.D. et al. 2017. Hatchery-induced epigenetic modification in salmon. *Proc. Natl.*
Acad. Sci. USA **114(49):** 12964-12969. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1711229114

Lepais O., Weir J.T. 2014. SimRAD: an R package for simulation-based prediction of the number of loci expected in
RADseq and similar genotyping by sequencing approaches. *Mol. Ecol. Resour*. **14:** 1314-1321. doi:
10.1111/1755-0998.12273

Lerat E., Casacuberta J., Chaparro C. et al. 2019. On the importance to acknowledge transposable eements in
epigenomic analyses. *Genes* **10(4):** 258. doi:10.3390/genes10040258

Levine S. 1985. A definition of stress? Pp. 51-69. In: *Animal Stress*. Moberg GP, editor. New York (NY). Springer.

Lev Maor G., Yearim A., Ast G. 2015. The alternative role of DNA methylation in splicing regulation. *Trends Genet*.
31(5): 274–280. doi: 10.1016/j.tig.2015.03.002

Li M., Leatherland J.F. 2013. The implications for aquaculture practice of epigenomic programming of components
of the endocrine system of teleostean embryos: lessons learned from mammalian studies. *Fish Fish*. **14:** 528-
553. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-2979.2012.00486.x

Lin C.Y., Lee H.C., Chen H.C. et al. 2013. Normal function of *Myf5* during gastrulation is required for pharyngeal
arch cartilage development in zebrafish embryos. *Zebrafish* **10(4):** 486-499. doi: 10.1089/zeb.2013.0903

Lin X., Barton S., Holbrook J.D. 2016. How to make DNA methylation wide studies more powerful. *Epigenomics*
8(8): 1117-1129. doi: 10.2217/epi-2016-0017

Liu X. 2019. SLC Family Transporters. *Adv. Exp. Med. Biol*. **1141:** 101-202. doi:10.1007/978-981-13-7647-4_3

Lubin F.D., Roth T.L., Sweatt J.D. 2008. Epigenetic regulation of BDNF gene transcription in the consolidation of fear
memory. *J. Neurosci*. **28(42):** 10576-10586. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1786-08.2008

Luoma L.M., Macintyre G., Tibbo P.G. et al. 2018. *NPAS3* exonic SNP genotype is linked to working memory per-
formance in healthy young adults. *Psychiatry Res*. **265:** 263-264. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2018.04.063.

Marcinkiewicz M., Seidah N.G., Chrétien M. 1996. Implications of the subtilisin/kexin-like precursor convertases in
the development and function of nervous tissues. *Acta Neurobiol. Exp*. **56(1):** 287-298. PMID: 8787188

Martos-Sitcha J.A., Bermejo-Nogales A., Calduch-Giner J.A. et al. 2017. Gene expression profiling of whole blood
cells supports a more efficient mitochondrial respiration in hypoxia-challenged gilthead sea bream (*Sparus*
aurata). *Front. Zool*. **14:** 34. doi: 10.1186/s12983-017-0220-2

Martos-Sitcha J.A., Wunderink Y.S., Straatjes J. et al. 2014. Different stressors induce differential responses of the
CRH-stress system in the gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*). *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A Mol. Integr. Physiol*.
177: 49-61. doi: 10.1016/j.cbpa.2014.07.021

Maunakea A.K., Nagarajan R.P., Bilenky M. et al. 2010. Conserved role of intragenic DNA methylation in regulating
alternative promoters. *Nature* **466(7303):** 253–257. doi: 10.1038/nature09165

McEwen B.S. 2008. Central effects of stress hormones in health and disease: understanding the protective and
damaging effects of stress and stress mediators. *Eur. J. Pharmacol*. **583(2-3):** 174-185. doi:
10.1016/j.ejphar.2007.11.071

Meröndun J., Murray D.L., Shafer A.B.A. 2019. Genome-scale sampling suggests cryptic epigenetic structuring and
insular divergence in Canada lynx. *Mol. Ecol*. **28(13):** 3186-3196. doi: 10.1111/mec.15131

Metzger D.C., Schulte P.M. 2016. Maternal stress has divergent effects on gene expression patterns in the brains of
male and female threespine stickleback. *Proc. Biol. Sci*. **283(1839):** 20161734. doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.1734

Metzger D.C.H., Schulte P.M. 2017. Persistent and plastic effects of temperature on DNA methylation across the
genome of threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *Proc. Biol. Sci*. **284(1864):** 20171667.
doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.1667

Metzger D.C.H., Schulte P.M. 2018. The DNA methylation landscape of stickleback reveals patterns of sex chromo-
some evolution and effects of environmental salinity. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **10(3):** 775-785.
doi:10.1093/gbe/evy034

Moghadam H.K., Johnsen H., Robinson N. et al. 2017. Impacts of early life stress on the methylome and transcrip-
tome of Atlantic salmon. *Sci. Rep*. **7:** 5023 doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-05222-2

Mommsen T.P., Vijayan M.M., Moon T.W. 1999. Cortisol in teleosts: dynamics, mechanisms of action, and meta-
bolic regulation. *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish*. **9:** 211 - 268. doi: 10.1023/A:1008924418720

Morera D.; Roher N.; Ribas L. et al. 2011. RNA-Seq reveals an integrated immune response in nucleated erythro-
cytes. *PLoS ONE* **6:** e26998. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0026998

Mostowska A., Gaczkowska A., Żukowski K. et al. 2018. Common variants in *DLG1* locus are associated with non-
syndromic cleft lip with or without cleft palate. *Clin. Genet*. **93(4):**784-793. doi: 10.1111/cge.13141.

Murata K., Kinoshita M. 2015. Establishment of proprotein convertase, furinA knocked-out lines in medaka, *Oryzias*
latipes, and unique form of medaka furin-like prorprotein convertase (mflPC). *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. C*
*Toxicol. Pharmaco*l. **178:** 169-180. doi:10.1016/j.cbpc.2015.10.005

Nardocci G., Navarro C., Cortés P.P. et al. 2014. Neuroendocrine mechanisms for immune system regulation during
stress in fish. *Fish Shellfish Immunol*. **40(2):** 531-538. doi:10.1016/j.fsi.2014.08.001

Navarro-Martín L., Viñas J., Ribas L. et al. 2011. DNA methylation of the gonadal aromatase (*cyp19a*) promoter is
involved in temperature-dependent sex ratio shifts in the European sea bass. *PLoS Genet.* **7:** e1002447. doi:
10.1371/journal.pgen.1002447

Nie X.G. 2005. Differential expression of *Bmp2, Bmp4* and *Bmp3* in embryonic development of mouse anterior and
posterior palate. *Chin. Med. J. (Engl).* **118(20):** 1710-1716. PMID: 16313756

Notaras M., van den Buuse M. 2020. Neurobiology of BDNF in fear memory, sensitivity to stress, and stress-related
disorders. *Mol. Psychiatry* doi: 10.1038/s41380-019-0639-2

Numakawa T., Odaka H., Adachi N. 2017. Actions of brain-derived neurotrophic factor and glucocorticoid stress in
neurogenesis. *Int. J. Mol. Sci*. **18(11):** 2312. doi: 10.3390/ijms18112312

Nyman C., Hebert F.O., Bessert-Nettelbeck M et al. 2020. Transcriptomic signatures of social experience during
early development in a highly social cichlid fish. *Mol. Ecol*. **29(3):** 610-623. doi: 10.1111/mec.15335

Oliveira R.F., Simões J.M., Teles M.C. et al. 2016. Assessment of fight outcome is needed to activate socially driven
transcriptional changes in the zebrafish brain. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113(5):** E654-E661.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1514292113

Olsvik P.A., Whatmore P., Penglase S.J. et al. 2019. Associations between behavioral effects of bisphenol A and
DNA methylation in zebrafish embryos. *Front. Genet*. **10:** 184. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2019.00184

Øynebråten I., Barois N., Hagelsteen K. et al. 2005. Characterization of a novel chemokine-containing storage gran-
ule in endothelial cells: evidence for preferential exocytosis mediated by protein kinase A and diacylglycerol.
J. Immunol. **175(8):** 5358-5369. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.175.8.5358

Pang P.T., Teng H.K., Zaitsev E. et al. 2004. Cleavage of proBDNF by tPA/plasmin is essential for long-term hippo-
campal plasticity. *Science* **306:** 487-491. doi: 10.1126/science.1100135

Paun O., Verhoeven K.J.F., Richards C.L. 2019. Opportunities and limitations of reduced representation bisulfite
sequencing in plant ecological epigenomics. *New Phytol*. **221(2):** 738-742. doi:10.1111/nph.15388

Pavlidis M., Theodoridi A., Tsalafouta A. 2015. Neuroendocrine regulation of the stress response in adult zebrafish,
Danio rerio. *Prog. Neuropsychopharmacol*. *Biol. Psychiatry* **60:** 121-131. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2015.02.014

Perez M.F., Lehner B. 2019. Intergenerational and transgenerational epigenetic inheritance in animals. *Nat. Cell.*
Biol. **21(2):**143-151. doi: 10.1038/s41556-018-0242-9

Perrone A, Martinelli F. 2020. Plant stress biology in epigenomic era. *Plant Sci.* **294:** 110376. doi:
10.1016/j.plantsci.2019.110376

Petitjean Q., Jean S., Gandar A. et al. 2019. Stress responses in fish: from molecular to evolutionary processes. *Sci.*
Tot. Environm. **684:** 371-380. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.05.357

Phillips R.B., De Koning J.J., Brunelli J.P. et al. 2013. Characterization of the *OmyY1* region on the rainbow trout Y
chromosome. *Int. J. Genomics* **2013:** 261730. doi: 10.1155/2013/261730

Pottinger T.G. 2008. The stress response in fish - mechanisms, effects and measurement. Pp. 32-48. In: *Fish Wel-*
fare (E.J. Branson Ed.). Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford.

Prudencio Á.S., Werner O., Martínez-García P.J. et al. 2018. DNA methylation analysis of dormancy release in al-
mond (*Prunus dulcis*) flower buds using epi-genotyping by sequencing. *Int. J. Mol. Sci*. **19(11):** 3542. doi:
10.3390/ijms19113542

Puente-Marin S., Nombela I., Ciordia S. et al. 2018. In silico functional networks Identified in fish nucleated red
blood cells by means of transcriptomic and proteomic profiling. *Genes* **9(4):** 202. doi:
10.3390/genes9040202

Rajarajan P., Gil S.E., Brennand K.J., Akbarian S. 2016. Spatial genome organization and cognition. *Nat. Rev. Neu-*
rosci. **17(11):** 681-691. doi: 10.1038/nrn.2016.124

Reul J.M.H.M., Collins A., Saliba R.S. et al. 2015. Glucocorticoids, epigenetic control and stress resilience. *Neurobiol.*
Stress **1:** 44–59. doi: 10.1016/j.ynstr.2014.10.001

Rey S., Boltana S., Vargas R. et al. 2013. Combining animal personalities with transcriptomics resolves individual
variation within a wild-type zebrafish population and identifies underpinning molecular differences in brain
function. *Mol. Ecol*. **22:** 6100–6115. doi: 10.1111/mec.12556

Richards C.L., Alonso C., Becker C. et al. 2017. Ecological plant epigenetics: Evidence from model and non-model
species, and the way forward. *Ecol. Lett*. **20(12):** 1576-1590. doi:10.1111/ele.12858

Robledo D., Hamilton A., Gutiérrez A.P. et al. 2020. Characterising the mechanisms underlying genetic resistance to
amoebic gill disease in Atlantic salmon using RNA sequencing. *BMC Genomics* **21(1):** 271. doi:
10.1186/s12864-020-6694-x.

Romero L.M., Platts S.H., Schoech S.J. et al. 2015. Understanding stress in the healthy animal—potential paths for
progress. *Stress* **18:** 491–497. doi: 10.3109/10253890.2015.1073255

Sadoul B., Alfonso S., Bessa E. et al. 2018. Enhanced brain expression of genes related to cell proliferation and
neural differentiation is associated with cortisol receptor expression in fishes. *Gen. Comp. Endocrinol*. **267:**
76–81. doi: 10.1016/j.ygcen.2018.06.001

Safi-Stibler S., Gabory A. 2020. Epigenetics and the developmental origins of health and disease: parental environ-
ment signalling to the epigenome, critical time windows and sculpting the adult phenotype. *Semin. Cell Dev.*
Biol. **97:** 172-180. doi:10.1016/j.semcdb.2019.09.008

Sagonas K., Meyer B.S., Kaufmann J. et al. 2020. Experimental parasite infection causes genome-wide changes in
DNA methylation. *Mol. Biol. Evol*. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msaa084

Samaras A., Dimitroglou A., Sarropoulou E. et al. 2016. Repeatability of cortisol stress response in the European sea
bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) and transcription differences between individuals with divergent responses. *Sci.*
Rep. **6:** 34858. doi: 10.1038/srep34858

Samaras A., Espirito Santo C., Papandroulakis N. et al. 2018. Allostatic load and stress physiology in European sea-
bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.) and gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata* L.). *Front. Endocrinol*. **9:** 451. doi:
10.3389/fendo.2018.00451.

Sassone-Corsi P. 2012. The cyclic AMP pathway. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol*. **4(12):** a011148. doi:
10.1101/cshperspect.a011148

Schreck C.B., Tort L. 2016. The concept of stress in fish. Pp. 1-34. In: "*Biology of Stress in Fish*". Fish Physiology, Vol.
35. C.B. Schreck, L. Tort, A.P. Farrell, C.J. Brauner Eds. Academic Press, Cambridge (MA). doi: 10.1016/B978-
0-12-802728-8.00001-1

Schübeler D. 2015. Function and information content of DNA methylation. *Nature* **517(7534):** 321-326. doi:
10.1038/nature14192

Schulte P.M. 2014. What is environmental stress? Insights from fish living in a variable environment. *J. Exp. Biol*.
217(Pt 1): 23-34. doi: 10.1242/jeb.089722

Schwartz T.S. 2020. The promises and the challenges of integrating multi-omics and systems biology in compara-
tive stress biology. *Integr. Comp. Biol*. doi:10.1093/icb/icaa026

Shao C., Li Q., Chen S. et al. 2014. Epigenetic modification and inheritance in sexual reversal of fish. *Genome Res*.
24(4): 604-615. doi: 10.1101/gr.162172.113

Sneddon L.U., Wolfenden D.C.C., Thomson J.S. 2016. Stress management and welfare. Pp. 463-539. In: "*Biology of*
Stress in Fish". Fish Physiology, Vol. 35". C.B. Schreck, L. Tort, A.P. Farrell, C.J. Brauner Eds. Academic Press,
Cambridge (MA). doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-802728-8.00012-6

Söllner C., Wright G.J. 2009. A cell surface interaction network of neural leucine-rich repeat receptors. *Genome*
Biol. **10:** R99. doi: 10.1186/gb-2009-10-9-r99

Somerville V., Schwaiger M., Hirsch P.E. et al. 2019. DNA methylation patterns in the round goby hypothalamus
support an on-the-spot decision scenario for territorial behavior. *Genes* **10(3):** 219. doi:
10.3390/genes10030219

Sopinka N.M., Donaldson M.R., O'Connor C.M. et al. 2016. Stress indicators in fish. Pp. 405-462. In: "*Biology of*
Stress in Fish". Fish Physiology, Vol. 35. C.B. Schreck, L. Tort, A.P. Farrell, C.J. Brauner Eds. Academic Press,
Cambridge (MA). doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-802728-8.00011-4

Strazielle N., Ghersi-Egea J.-F. 2015. Efflux transporters in blood-brain interfaces of the developing brain. *Front.*
Neurosci. **9:** 21. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2015.00021

Suravajhala P, Kogelman LJ, Kadarmideen HN. 2016. Multi-omic data integration and analysis using systems ge-
nomics approaches: methods and applications in animal production, health and welfare. *Genet. Sel. Evol.*
48(1): 38. doi: 10.1186/s12711-016-0217-x

Suzuki M., Liao W., Wos F. et al. 2018. Whole-genome bisulfite sequencing with improved accuracy and cost. *Ge-*
nome Res. **28(9):** 1364-1371. doi: 10.1101/gr.232587.117

Suzuki M., Oda M., Ramos M.P. et al. 2011. Late-replicating heterochromatin is characterized by decreased cyto-
sine methylation in the human genome. *Genome Res*. **21(11):** 1833–1840. doi: 10.1101/gr.116509.110

Taliaz D., Loya A., Gersner R. et al. 2011. Resilience to chronic stress is mediated by hippocampal brain-derived
neurotrophic factor. *J. Neurosci*. **31(12):** 4475-4483. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5725-10.2011

Terova G., Díaz N., Rimoldi S. et al. 2016. Effects of sodium butyrate treatment on histone modifications and the
expression of genes related to epigenetic regulatory mechanisms and immune response in European sea
bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) fed a plant-based diet. *PLoS One* **11(7):** e0160332. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0160332

Thomas D.M., Francescutti-Verbeem D.M., Liu X; et al. 2004. Identification of differentially regulated transcripts in
mouse striatum following methamphetamine treatment - an oligonucleotide microarray approach. *J. Neuro-*
chem. **88(2):** 380-393. doi: 10.1046/j.1471-4159.2003.02182.x

Tine M., Kuhl H., Gagnaire P.-A. et al. 2014. European sea bass genome and its variation provide insights into adap-
tation to euryhalinity and speciation. *Nat. Commun*. **5:** 5770. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6770.

Todd E.V., Ortega-Recalde O., Liu H. et al. 2019. Stress, novel sex genes, and epigenetic reprogramming orchestrate
socially controlled sex change. *Sci. Adv.* **5(7):** eaaw7006. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aaw7006

Tognoli C., Rossi F., Di Cola F. et al. 2010. Acute stress alters transcript expression pattern and reduces processing
of proBDNF to mature BDNF in *Dicentrarchus labrax*. *BMC Neurosci.* **11:** 4. doi: 10.1186/1471-2202-11-4

Tort L. 2011. Stress and immune modulation in fish. *Dev. Comp. Immunol*. **35:** 1366-1375. doi:
10.1016/j.dci.2011.07.002

Triantaphyllopoulos K.A., Ikonomopoulos I., Bannister A.J. 2016. Epigenetics and inheritance of phenotype varia-
tion in livestock. *Epigenetics Chromatin*. **9:** 31. doi: 10.1186/s13072-016-0081-5

Trollope A.F., Mifsud K.R., Saunderson E.A. et al. 2017. Molecular and epigenetic mechanisms underlying cognitive
and adaptive responses to stress. *Epigenomes* **1(3):** 17. doi:10.3390/epigenomes1030017

Tsalafouta A., Papandroulakis N., Gorissen M. et al. 2014. Ontogenesis of the HPI axis and molecular regulation of
the cortisol stress response during early development in *Dicentrarchus labrax*. *Sci. Rep*. **4:** 5525. doi:
10.1038/srep05525

Uren Webster T.M., Rodriguez-Barreto D., Martin S.A.M. et al. 2018. Contrasting effects of acute and chronic stress
on the transcriptome, epigenome, and immune response of Atlantic salmon. *Epigenetics* **13(12):** 1191-1207.
doi: 10.1080/15592294.2018.1554520

Uwaya A., Lee H., Park J. et al. 2016. Acute immobilization stress following contextual fear conditioning reduces
fear memory: timing is essential. *Behav. Brain Funct*. **12(1):** 8. doi: 10.1186/s12993-016-0092-1

Vaiserman A. 2018. Developmental tuning of epigenetic clock. *Front Genet*. **9:** 584. doi:10.3389/fgene.2018.00584

Vandeputte M., Gagnaire P.-A., Allal F. 2019. The European sea bass: a key marine fish model in the wild and in
aquaculture. *Anim. Genet*. **50(3):** 195-206. doi: 10.1111/age.12779

van Gurp T.P., Wagemaker N.C.A.M., Wouters B. et al. 2016. epiGBS: reference-free reduced representation bisul-
fite sequencing. *Nat. Meth*. **13:** 322-324. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.3763

Vazzana M., Cammarata M., Cooper E.L. et al. 2002. Confinement stress in sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) de-
presses peritoneal leukocyte cytotoxicity. *Aquaculture* **210:** 231-243. doi: 10.1016/S0044-8486(01)00818-3

Vindas M..A, Fokos S., Pavlidis M. et al. 2018. Early life stress induces long-term changes in limbic areas of a teleost
fish: the role of catecholamine systems in stress coping. *Sci. Rep*. **8(1):** 5638. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-
23950-x

Vindas M.A., Gorissen M., Hoglund E. et al. 2017. How do individuals cope with stress? Behavioural, physiological
and neuronal differences between proactive and reactive coping styles in fish. *J. Exp. Biol*. **220:** 1524–1532.
doi: 10.1242/jeb.153213

Vinkers C.H., Geuze E., van Rooij S.J.H. et al. 2019. Successful treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder reverses
DNA methylation marks. *Mol. Psychiatry* 10.1038/s41380-019-0549-3. doi: 10.1038/s41380-019-0549-3

Vlasova-St Louis I., Dickson A.M., Bohjanen P.R. et al. 2013. CELFish ways to modulate mRNA decay. *Biochim*
.Biophys. Acta **1829(6-7):** 695-707. doi: 10.1016/j.bbagrm.2013.01.001

Volk C. 2014. OCTs, OATs, and OCTNs: structure and function of the polyspecific organic ion transporters of the
SLC22 family. *WIREs Membr. Transp. Signal* **3:** 1–13. doi: 10.1002/wmts.100

Vu T.D., Iwasaki Y., Shigenobu S. et al. 2020. Behavioral and brain- transcriptomic synchronization between the two
opponents of a fighting pair of the fish *Betta splendens*. *PLoS Genet*. **16(6):** e1008831.
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1008831

Walker M.B., Miller C.T., Coffin Talbot J. et al. 2006. Zebrafish furin mutants reveal intricacies in regulating Endo-
thelin1 signaling in craniofacial patterning. *Dev. Biol*. **295(1):** 194-205. doi:1 0.1016/j.ydbio.2006.03.028

Walsh C.A., Engle E.C. 2010. Allelic diversity in human developmental neurogenetics: insights into biology and dis-
ease. *Neuron* **68(2):** 245-253. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2010.09.042

Wan Z.Y., Xia J.H., Lin G. et al. 2016. Genome-wide methylation analysis identified sexually dimorphic methylated
regions in hybrid tilapia. *Sci. Rep.* **6:** 35903. doi: 10.1038/srep35903

Wang H., Ferguson G.D., Pineda V.V. et al. 2004. Overexpression of type-1 adenylyl cyclase in mouse forebrain
enhances recognition memory and LTP. *Nat. Neurosci*. **7(6):** 635–642. doi:10.1038/nn1248.

Wang J., Liu Y., Jiang S. et al. 2019. Transcriptomic and epigenomic alterations of Nile tilapia gonads sexually re-
versed by high temperature. *Aquaculture* **508:** 167-177. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.04.073

Wang J., Xia Y., Li L. et al. 2013. Double restriction-enzyme digestion improves the coverage and accuracy of
genome-wide CpG methylation profiling by reduced representation bisulfite sequencing. *BMC Genomics* **14:**
11. doi: 10.1186/1471-2164-14-11

Wang N., Zhang L., Miles L. et al. 2004. Plasminogen regulates pro-opiomelanocortin processing. *J. Thromb. Hae-*
most. **2(5):** 785-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1538-7836.2004.00694.x

Wang X., Bhandari R.K. 2019. DNA methylation dynamics during epigenetic reprogramming of medaka embryo.
Epigenetics **14(6):** 611-622. doi: 10.1080/15592294.2019.1605816

Welsh I.C., Hart J., Brown J.M. et al. 2018. *Pbx* loss in cranial neural crest, unlike in epithelium, results in cleft pal-
ate only and a broader midface. *J. Anat*. **233(2):** 222-242. doi: 10.1111/joa.12821

Wendelaar Bonga S.E. 1997. The stress response in fish. *Physiol. Rev*. **177(3):** 591-625. doi:
10.1152/physrev.1997.77.3.591

Wong R.Y., Lamm M.S., Godwin J. 2015. Characterizing the neurotranscriptomic states in alternative stress coping
styles. *BMC Genomics* **16(1):** 425. doi: 10.1186/s12864-015-1626-x

Woods III, L.C., Li Y., Ding Y. et al. 2018. DNA methylation profiles correlated to striped bass sperm fertility. *BMC*
Genomics **19:** 244. doi: 10.1186/s12864-018-4548-6

Xiu Y., Shao C., Zhu Y. et al. 2019. Differences in DNA methylation between disease-resistant and disease-
susceptible Chinese tongue sole (*Cynoglossus semilaevis*) families. *Front. Genet*. **10:** 847. doi:
10.3389/fgene.2019.00847

Yada T., Nakanishi T. 2002. Interaction between endocrine and immune systems in fish. *Internat. Rev. Cytol*. **220:**
35-92. doi: 10.1016/s0074-7696(02)20003-0

Yang D., Zhang W., Padhiar A. et al. 2016. *NPAS3* regulates transcription and expression of VGF: Implications for
neurogenesis and psychiatric disorders. *Front. Mol. Neurosci*. **9:** 109. doi: 10.3389/fnmol.2016.00109.

Yang L., Wang J., Wang D. et al. 2020. Delayed behavioral and genomic responses to acute combined stress in
zebrafish, potentially relevant to PTSD and other stress-related disorders: Focus on neuroglia, neuroinflam-
mation, apoptosis and epigenetic modulation. *Behav. Brain Res*. **389:** 112644. doi:
10.1016/j.bbr.2020.112644

Yeh F.-C., Kao C.-F., Kuo P.-H. 2015. Explore the features of brain-derived neurotrophic factor in mood disorders.
PLoS One **10(6):** e0128605. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128605

Zanin-Zhorov A., Kumari S., Hippen K.L. et al. 2017. Human in vitro-induced regulatory T cells display *Dlgh1* de-
pendent and *PKC-ϑ* restrained suppressive activity. *Sci Rep*. **7(1):** 4258. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-04053-5

Zhang C., Hoshida Y., Sadler K.C. 2016. Comparative epigenomic profiling of the DNA methylome in mouse and
zebrafish uncovers high interspecies divergence. *Front. Genet*. **7:** 110. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2016.00110

Zhang H., Xu P., Jiang Y. et al. 2019. Genomic, transcriptomic, and epigenomic features differentiate genes that are
relevant for muscular polyunsaturated fatty acids in the common carp. *Front. Genet*. **10:** 217. doi:
10.3389/fgene.2019.00217

Zhou J.N., Fang H. 2018. Transcriptional regulation of corticotropin-releasing hormone gene in stress response.
IBRO Rep. **5:** 137-146. doi: 10.1016/j.ibror.2018.08.003

Zhu B., Zhao L., Luo D. et al. 2018. Furin promotes dendritic morphogenesis and learning and memory in transgenic
mice. *Cell Mol. Life Sci*. **75(13):** 2473-2488. doi: 10.1007/s00018-017-2742-3

1228

Data accessibility

1230 Individual Illumina raw reads (one round of trimming) and processed files are currently under

1231 submission to NCBI as a GEO project submission and a sequence read archive (SRA). Deposits

1232 will be completed during the submission to the journal.

1233

Author contributions

MVK, ED, BG developed the protocol, MVK and ED conducted the lab work, EG ensured tech-

nical assistance and supervised sequencing. AS, AD, MP and CST established the study design of

the challenge test. Experiments with live fish were conducted by AD, AS, MP, with contribution

of MVK. MVK performed data analyses under supervision of ED and BG. MVK, ED, BG drafted

the manuscript; others authors reviewed drafts. CST and BG coordinated this study.

Caption of the Table

1241

Table 1: Location on the European sea bass linkage groups (LGs) of the 57 differentially

methylated cytosines (DMCs) found in this study between pre- and post-stress individuals. The

four differentially methylated regions (DMRs) are highlighted in grey. For each DMC, the false-

discovery rate adjusted q-values at the nominal q = 0.001 cut-off threshold are reported,

together with their methylation difference. Gene names and gene symbols (IDs) of DMC-related

genes (n = 51) are reported. The location of each DMC is given (*gb*: gene body, *int.*: intergenic,

3'UTR or *rr*: repeat region). We did not arbitrarily defined promoter regions in this study. An

extended version of this table reporting annotations and further useful information are offered

in Suppl. Mat. Table S3.

1251

Caption of the Table

Table 1: Location on the European sea bass linkage groups (LGs) of the 57 differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs) found in this study between pre- and post-stress individuals. The four differentially methylated regions (DMRs) are highlighted in grey. For each DMC, the false-discovery rate adjusted q-values at the nominal $q = 0.001$ cut-off threshold are reported, together with their methylation difference. Gene names and gene symbols (IDs) of DMC-related genes ($n = 51$) are reported. The location of each DMC is given (*gb*: gene body, *int.*: intergenic, 3'UTR or *rr*: repeat region). We did not arbitrarily defined promoter regions in this study. An extended version of this table reporting annotations and further useful information are offered in Suppl. Mat. Table S3.

Captions of the Figures

Figure 1: Coverage of the 24 linkage groups (LGs) of the sea bass genome by sequencing epiGBS reads. Ordinates represent the mean number of sequencing reads. LG numbers are those used by Tine et al. (2014). Complex IDs resulting from the merging of previously defined LGs during final assembly (e.g. LG22-25 resulted in the fusion of previous LG22 and LG25). SB-UN (sea bass – unknown; hereby SB) indicates a composite LG made from originally unassembled scaffolds (Tine et al. 2014).

Figure 2: Diagrammatic representation of the involvement of the 51 DMC-related genes found in this study and issues regarding the stress response (see main text for detailsOne additional issue was added for few genes that are involved in the regulation, the control and the dynamics of epigenetic process (*NCBP2, GTPF*), and acid-base homeostasis in kidney without formal proof of actual relation with a stress issue (*CLDN4*). DMCs located within gene bodies are indicated in black, in brown for intergenic regions including promoters. The hatched symbols refer to genes also reported in high-throughput transcriptomic studies in zebrafish (main text and Suppl. Mat. Table S4). This does not mean that our literature survey at DMC-related genes was supported only by these studies, but it illustrates their importance over results. Stars with full line indicate genes detected as differentially expressed (*BTR30, GLI2*) in one immunity-related transcriptomic study in sea bass (Chavez-Pozo et al. 2019), while stars with broken lines indicate genes with methylation differences (*PTPRB, SASH1A*) (stickleback: Sagonas *et al.* 2020; rainbow trout: Uren-Webster et al. 2018; respectively). Reports outside of the above-mentioned studies are

indicated by filled symbols. On the right are indicated genes found differentially expressed (RNA)

or differentially methylated (CpG) in the genome-wide study by Anastasiadi and Piferrer (2019)

(*A&P 2019*) on European sea bass. Tissues in which genes were found differentially

expressed/methylated are indicated (brain not investigated in transcriptomics). Association with

the *LRRC3* gene is reported in grey as leucine-rich repeat (LRR) gene family is classically involved

in neuroimmunity. Variations in transcription or methylation have been shown to impact

behaviours after stress events within this family (see e.g. *LRRTM4L2* in this study). However,

LRRC3 is amongst the most poorly known gene within this family (Söllner and Wright 2009), and

this remains presumptive. Additional support including references for these DMC-related genes

is given in Supplementary Materials Table S4, as well as comparisons with other epigenomic

studies.

1297

1298   **Figure 3:** Hierarchical clustering based on of the 57 differentially methylated cytosines (15%

1299   threshold) of the randomly caught 74 pre- and post-stress sea bass samples considered during

1300   this study. Nineteen out the twenty families (A to T) used in this study are present in this graph

1301   and each family is associated to one single colour. Capital letters refer to the family, while T0

1302   and T4 are for pre- and post-stress individuals, respectively.

1303

1304   **Figure 4:** PCA based on the methylation profiles of the 57 differentially methylated cytosines

1305   (15% threshold) reported in this study (Table 1). Pre- and post-stress individual sea bass (in red

1306   and blue, respectively) differ significantly along PC1 ($p < 0.001$), but not PC2. The insert illustrate

1307   the distribution of individual scores along PC1. Ellipses represent the 95% confidence limits over

1308   PC1 and PC2.

1309

1310

1311 **Table 1**

D. labrax LG	Ensembl LG	q-value	methylation difference (%)	D. labrax Name	Gene ID	Gene Name	Location
LG1A	HG916837.1	0	-21,40	DLAgn_00094580	FOXJ3	forkhead box protein J3	gb
LG1A	HG916837.1	0	-21,67				gb
LG1A	HG916837.1	0	-15,51				gb
LG3	HG916843.1	1,54E-95	18,14	DLAgn_00141440	ABLIM2	actin binding LIM protein family -- member 2	gb
LG4	HG916844.1	1,08E-84	16,41	DLAgn_00145290	CELA3b	proproteinase E-like (elastase 2)	
LG4	HG916844.1	0	21,38	DLAgn_00146200	NCBP2	nuclear cap-binding protein subunit 2	int.
LG5	HG916845.1	3,67E-265	21,91	DLAgn_00159160	CILP1	cartilage intermediate layer protein 1	gb
LG5	HG916845.1	8,93E-89	16,64	DLAgn_00159900	GRPT1a	growth hormone regulated TBC protein 1	ge
LG6	HG916846.1	6,44E-245	20,44	DLAgn_00164450	GLG1	golgi glycoprotein 1	gb
LG6	HG916846.1	0	-21,01	DLAgn_00166360	GDPGP1	gdp-d-glucose phosphorylase 1	exon
LG6	HG916846.1	0	-18,98	DLAgn_00172370	KBTBD13	kelch repeat and btb domain-containing protein 13-like	int.
LG6	HG916846.1	0	-18,18				int.
LG6	HG916846.1	0	-16,12				int.
LG8	HG916848.1	2,77E-247	22,52	DLAgn_00186250	BTPF	nucleosome-remodeling factor subunit bptf	gb
LG10	HG916827.1	2,44E-79	15,44	DLAgn_00005890	PBX1a	pre-B-cell leukemia homeobox 1	gb
LG10	HG916827.1	6,98E-125	21,55	DLAgn_00006210	ADCY1b	adenylate cyclase 1 (brain)	gb
LG11	HG916828.1	0	27,70	DLAgn_00016970	MMNR2a	multimerin 2a Precursor Elastin Microfibril Interface Located Elastin Microfibril Interfacer	gb
LG12	HG916829.1	0	22,32	DLAgn_00019700	FBXO33	F-box protein 33	int.
LG12	HG916829.1	1,23E-128	20,01	DLAgn_00025280	SASH1A	sam and sh3 domain-containing protein 1-like	int.
LG14	HG916831.1	1,48E-53	15,74	DLAgn_00037440	COL4A5	collagen type IV alpha 5 chain	int.
LG14	HG916831.1	0	42,05	DLAgn_00037440	COL4A5	collagen type IV alpha 5 chain	gb
LG14	HG916831.1	0	22,46	DLAgn_00038760	ROBO3	roundabout homolog 2-like	int.
LG14	HG916831.1	5,22E-212	17,93	DLAgn_00044110	CLDN4	claudin 4	gb
LG14	HG916831.1	1,25E-155	27,48	DLAgn_00046110	TMEM132E	transmembrane protein 132e	gb
LG16	HG916833.1	2,78E-168	26,24	DLAgn_00063590	CSMD3a	CUB and Sushi multiple domains 3a	gb
LG16	HG916833.1	9,78E-92	17,12	DLAgn_00063770	TRMT11	tRNA methyltransferase 11 homolog	int.
LG16	HG916833.1	8,81E-215	17,80	DLAgn_00064610	FURIN	furin-like protease kpc-1	gb
LG16	HG916833.1	0	17,76	DLAgn_00064820	SPIRE1b	protein spire homolog 1-like	gb
LG17	HG916834.1	1,91E-82	18,84	DLAgn_00073160 ; DLAgn_00073170	PLG (sense); SLC22A2 (antisense)	Plasminogen (sense) / Solute carrier family 22 member 2-like (antisense)	gb / 3'UTR
LG17	HG916834.1	1,28E-231	19,86	DLAgn_00073770	RRM2	ribonucleotide reductase regulatory subunit M2	gb
LG20	HG916840.1	2,76E-207	15,01	DLAgn_00114460	TNKSb	tankyrase, TRF1-interacting ankyrin-related ADP-ribose polymerase b	gb
LG20	HG916840.1	1,34E-115	15,35	DLAgn_00114810	LRRTM4L2	leucine-rich repeat transmembrane neuronal protein 4-like	gb
LG20	HG916840.1	3,78E-68	15,32	DLAgn_00116160 ; DLAgn_00116150	FICD (sense) ; SART3 (antisense)	Adenosine monophosphate-protein transferase ficd-like (sense) / Spliceosome associated factor 3, U4/U6 recycling protein (antisense)	gb
LG20	HG916840.1	1,02E-88	18,04	DLAgn_00121270		Coding region of a truncated Non LTR Retrotransposable Element (RTE) RET-1_AFC	rr
LG20	HG916840.1	0	35,61	DLAgn_00122640	BMP3	Bone morphogenetic protein 3	gb
LG20	HG916840.1	0	15,40	DLAgn_00124110	ZMAT4b	zinc finger matrin-type 4b	gb
LG22-25	HG916841.1	7,62E-96	16,89	DLAgn_00125750	NOL4Lb	nucleolar protein 4-like b	gb
LG22-25	HG916841.1	3,26E-99	15,05	DLAgn_00132500	CCDC30	coiled-coil domain containing protein 30 like	gb
LG24	HG916842.1	2,81E-43	-15,63	DLAgn_00136190	GLI2b	zinc finger protein gli2-like	gb
LG24	HG916842.1	2,87E-112	16,47	DLAgn_00136980	LRRC3	leucine rich repeat containing 3	int.
LG24	HG916842.1	0	30,68	DLAgn_00137190	UNC80	Protein unc-80 homolog isoform 2	gb
LG24	HG916842.1	0	15,42	DLAgn_00137560	CHN1	N-chimerin	gb
LG24	HG916842.1	9,47E-204	17,08	DLAgn_00139980	PTGFRN	prostaglandin f2 receptor negative regulator	gb
LGx	HG916850.1	4,18E-251	19,94	DLAgn_00209310	MYF5	myogenic factor 5	gb
LGx	HG916850.1	4,52E-204	23,46	DLAgn_00209760	CELF2	cugbp elav-like family member 2	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	1,61E-152	16,29	DLAgn_00218300	PRKCQ	protein kinase c theta type	int.
SB-UN	HG916851.1	1,09E-120	16,34	DLAgn_00220000	PTPRB	protein tyrosine phosphatase receptor type B	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	6,07E-154	18,95	DLAgn_00222790	NPAS3	neuronal PAS domain-containing protein 3-like	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	0	-21,55	DLAgn_00227120	CRTC2	CREB regulated transcription coactivator 2	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	6,11E-56	15,79				gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	4,15E-61	17,53	DLAgn_00227130	DENND4B	Denn domain-containing protein 4b	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	1,51E-46	15,84	DLAgn_00236500	GFRA2	GDNF family receptor alpha-2	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	0	46,39	DLAgn_00238280	DLG1	disks large homolog 1-like	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	9,43E-157	26,15	DLAgn_00242570	BTR30	E3 ubiquitin-protein ligase TRIM39-like (bloodthirsty-related gene family, member 30)	gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	6,99E-209	-17,71				gb
SB-UN	HG916851.1	2,11E-216	-27,49	DLAgn_00244380	GMPPB	GDP-mannose pyrophosphorylase B	exon
SB-UN	HG916851.1	5,09E-256	20,97	DLAgn_00245980	MATR3	matrin-3	exon

1312

1313 **Figure 1**

1314

1315

1316

1317 **Figure 2**

1318

1319   **Figure 3**

1320

1321   **Figure 4**

1322

1323

1324

59