Genome-wide epigenomic stress response 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 ID's: A. SAMARAS: 0000-0003-3616-7032
M. PAVLIDIS: 0000-0003-1937-5032
C.S. TSIGENOPOULOS: 0000-0003-0615-7941
B. GUINAND: 0000-0002-6934-1677
22

Abstract

Background: While the stress response inspired genome-wide epigenetic studies in vertebrate

models, it remains mostly ignored in fish. We modified the epiGBS (epiGenotyping By

sequencing) technique to explore changes in genome-wide cytosine methylation to a repeated

acute stress challenge in the nucleated red blood cells (RBCs) of the European sea bass

(*Dicentrarchus labrax*). This species is widely studied in both the natural and farmed

environments, including issues regarding health and welfare.

Results: We retrieved 501,108,033 sequencing reads after trimming, with a mean mapping

efficiency of 73.0% (unique best hits). Fifty-seven differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs)

close to 51 distinct stress-related genes distributed on 17 of 24 linkage groups (LGs) were

detected between RBCs of pre- and post-stress individuals. Literature surveys indicated that

thirty-eight of these genes were previously reported as differentially expressed in the brain of

zebrafish, most of them involved in stress coping differences. DMC-related genes associated to

the Brain Derived Neurotrophic Factor, a protein that favors stress adaptation and fear memory,

are especially relevant.

Conclusion: We provide an improved epiGBS protocol with increased multiplexing and

sequencing capacities that offer new opportunities to improve data acquisition and to

investigate important biological processes at a genome-wide level, such as the stress response.

Minimally invasive RBCs deserve more attention to investigate the epigenetic response to stress

without sacrificing fish.

Background

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 [1,2]. Reaching a common definition is quite complex [2-5], 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 [1,2]. This concerns natural populations that may develop plastic and adaptive response to stressors [1,6], but also cultured species in order to increase fish health and welfare in stressful farming environments [7-9].

Classically, stress studies have to integrate physiological, immunological, neurobiological and behavioural components that altogether shape the stress response in fish [8, 10-12]. 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 [13-15]. 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 [16]. 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 [17, 18].

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 [19-21]. 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 [22, 23].

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

studies in model organisms [24-28]. 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 [23,29,30]. Human stress

studies have shown that blood cells responded to DNA methylation in the brain [31-33, but see

34], and more generally that blood is useful whenever target tissues cannot be easily sampled

or biopsied [35]. Because blood cells are mobilized as part of the stress response in fish [36, 37],

it is appealing to investigate if an epigenomic signature of stress is present in their nucleated

red blood cells (RBCs). The use of RBCs in fish transcriptomics or proteomics has received

attention over the last decade [38-40]. However, fish epigenetics has not embarked on this path

yet and genome-wide epigenetic studies using RBCs are quite rare in fish [41]. This contrasts

with the over-increasing interest to investigate epigenomic variation in teleosts [41–72]

Nevertheless, documenting the epigenomics of the stress axis/network also remains scarce [58],

while authors asked for greater attention on this topic [73,74].

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, for both natural and farmed populations (reviewed in [75]). This

includes the sequencing of its genome [76] and an increasing number of epigenetic studies [77-

84]. The stress response of European sea bass remains evaluated using blood parameters that

have been shown to reflect multiple components of its stress response [16,85], despite authors

have proposed alternatives [86,87]. How the European sea bass methylome may capture such

components is actually missing.

We adapted the epiGenotyping By sequencing (epiGBS) protocol originally proposed by

Van Gurp et al. [88] 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 [89,90]. This modification integrates a

second restriction enzyme and further multiplexing of individuals, saving costs. 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 in an economically important fish like sea bass.

Results

Nineteen out of 20 sea bass 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.

EpiGBS library construction and sequencing

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

after trimming of our single library. 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 Additional File 1).

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

mapping efficiency of 74.5% (73.0% for unique best hits; Additional File 1). Sequencing reads

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

125   ---------------- Table 1 here ----------------

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 up to 46.4% for hypermethylated

cytosines, and down to -27.5% for hypomethylated 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 Additional File 2 (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.

Clustering

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

within family clustered together; Fig. 3). The four individuals that were caught twice 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; $P = 0.404$).

Literature surveys

Several literature surveys (see the Methods section for details) were performed to better

understand if DMC-related genes detected in sea bass RBCs could effectively *(i)* represent real

candidates to investigate the stress response if fish, and *(ii)* be indicative of processes occurring

in the brain.

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 Additional File 3). Most of them were previously analysed or

detected in human or mice stress studies, in few cases in other model organisms (see Additional

File 3). 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 thus involved in the immune response [91].

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 [38-40,92], 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';

Additional File 4). 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 [93, 94] or with changes in social regulation that may promote

stressful behaviour among congeners [95, 96] (Fig. 2 and Additional File 3). 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 [97] (see

Additional File 3), *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 [83] 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 detected in RBCs (see Additional File 4).

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

studies retained (*n* = 31) are presented in Additional File 5. Twenty studies reported differential

methylation at genes also found differentially methylated in sea bass RBCs (see Additional File

5). 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). Main observations might be

summarized as follows: all studies considering brain tissue for which gene annotations were

made available (*n* = 6) reported at least one match with DMC-related genes found in the present

study. More specifically, data of the single former sea bass epigenetic study performed at a

genome-wide level [83] 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 the brain than with other organs investigated so far. However, the single previous

study analyzing RBC methylome in fish so far [41] shared no DMC-related gene with the present

study. Finally, the study that reported the largest number of genes also found as DMC-related

genes in sea bass (*n* =15) was by Gavery et al. [45]; These authors were interested in the liver of

hatchery *vs* wild rainbow trout during a so-called 'temporal analysis' (see Additional File 5).

Another study on zebrafish reported 11 genes in common with the present study, but was not

organ specific (see Additional File 5) [53].

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-MMRN2a, CELF-RRM2, and *CRTC2-DENND4B* (see Additional File

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

The first one will be presented in the 'Discussion' (see Additional File 3 for the second

association). 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 [98] (*CHN1* may have other stress-

related functions, see Additional File 3). *CELF2* (CUGBP Elav-like family member 2) and *RRM2*

(Ribonucleotide reductase M2 polypeptide) are both known to participate to messenger RMA

(mRNA) metabolism [99]. *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* [100]. No relationship with stress is suspected. The relationship

between multimerin (*MMRN2*) and plasminogen (*PLG*) via its co-activator remains poorly

investigated and supported [101]. This automatic search using STRING did not really enrich our

findings.

Discussion

We showed that a modified epiGBS protocol originally proposed by Van Gurp et al. [88] 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

[102]). The addition of a second restriction enzyme illustrates the flexibility of the epiGBS and

more generally of reduced-representation bisulfite sequencing (RRBS) protocols to improve data

acquisition and impact [103]. This is however not the first RRBS protocol dedicated to the

addition of a second restriction enzyme [104], 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, 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 discussed below - was shown to complement both the

traditional evaluation of the stress response based on analyses of blood serum samples

[85,105], or on gene expression variation, often using invasive brain samples [93,94,106-111].

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%) [112], or in some recent fish studies screening for

genome-wide methylation (e.g. 55-60% in [59]; 40% in [41]). 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. [43] 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 [88],

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 [60]; n

= 106 in [47] for a population study). In sea bass, Anastasiadi and Piferrer [83] 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. [46,59,83]). Relaxing thresholds would enable to retrieve more DMCs, but

elevated thresholds should normally ensure that access to relevant information is reached.

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 [83]. Methylation changes grouped in clusters (i.e.

DMRs) are more likely to influence transcriptional activity at nearby loci than single cytosines

[113]. 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 [103] and

DMRs are not always accessible [114]. 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 [115-117]. 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.

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 [118], but its role remains poorly understood [119,120]. 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. [46]). Sometimes

proportions are approximately reversed (~80% intergenic *vs* ~20% in gene bodies; e.g. [50]).

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

elements is also poorly understood [121, 122], while crucial in the stress response [123].

… but mining the unknown

Studies looking at the epigenomic landscape of RBCs in fish are scarce. Gavery et al. [41]

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. 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 [45]. This

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 [93,94], or social regulation [95] collectively reported thirty-eight of our 51

DMC-related genes as expressed and potentially associated to the stress response in zebrafish

(one added when including a study on *B. splendens* [96]). As differential methylation is

classically interpreted as leading to differential gene expression (but see, e.g., [124, 125] 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

[93,94], hours or days [95]. How distinct stress contexts and challenges may apparently rely on

similar stress circuitry has to be investigated further.

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 Additional File 3 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 [126,127], but also energy homeostasis [128]. BDNF has emerged as one of the most

important molecule in memory [129, 130]. It consolidates both the within- and between-

generation fear memory owing to epigenetic regulation [131,132]. Its activity is strongly linked

to glucocorticoid stress to imprint neurogenesis [133] and it acts as both a regulator and a target

of stress hormone signaling [127]. 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 [134],

sea bream [135] and sea bass [86,136-138]. BDNF is also involved in other aspects of the stress

response in fish (e.g. regulation of the microbiota-gut-brain axis [139]). 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 [93-95], 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 [140]. In the brain, AC is activated by PACAP (Protein Adenylate Cyclase

Activating Protein) and stimulates memory and long term potentiation [141]. This inducible

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

BDNF) [142]. ProBDNF is processed by furin and the plasminogen system [128], including

processing steps that necessitate actions of actin-binding LIM kinases (ABLIM) [143]. Furin -

encoded by *FURIN* - is a subtilisin-like protein proconvertase ubiquitously expressed in fish

[144]. It 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 [145]. Stress imprinting at *FURIN* is likely and it has recently been shown that

transgenerational epigenetic effects of furin activity were active in brain of mice [146]. ProBDNF

cleavage by furin depends on brain AC and CREB (cAMP response element-binding protein)

signaling [147,148] and plasminogen (*PLG*) [149]. This activity is modulated by stress hormones

(corticosteroids) and is essential to brain hippocampal plasticity in mammals [22,150]. 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 [151].

Addiitonally, in the brain, plasminogen encoded by *PLG* is converted to plasmin that

cleaves BDNF in the extracellular synaptic domain [128,152]. *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) [153].

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 [154], including at the blood-brain barrier

[155]. It was found involved in memory in mice [156,157] or *Drosophila* [158], and associated

itself to neurodegenerative diseases [159]. Substrates of *SLC22A2* include neurotransmitters

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

exogenous compounds [160,161]. Functional links of *SLC22A2* with BDNF remain however

poorly documented [162], 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) [163]. 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 [164,165]. It participates to neurogenesis in the hippocampus

within a network that also includes BDNF [166]. *NPAS3* is also associated to the glial cell line-

derived neurotrophic factor (GDNF) receptor-alpha2 gene (*GFRA2*) detected in this study and

related to stress and anxiety [167]. The *DLG1* (Disk-large homolog 1) gene could be also

associated to BDNF, but this will be not develop further (see Additional File 3).

Overall, 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 are also

related to 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 [132,168] 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 or more generally vertebrate studies with role in memory consolidation could be added

(e.g. [112,169] 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 Additional File 3), this also 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.

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 epigenetic studies [51,54,63],

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" [170] 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 proposals are not mutually exclusive. Transgenerational inheritance has gained interest

over the last years [171], notably in marine species [50,172,173], and including sea bass [83].

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

As Gavery et al. [41] 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. [108] 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 [83] 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* [174], *PBX1* [175], *DLG1* [176] and *FOXJ3* [177]

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 [178], as well as *NPAS3*

[179]. With *BMP3* [180], *FURIN* [181]; *NOL4B* [182], and *Myf5* [183,184], 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 [83]. 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 [45,

185] and, as for other organisms, cytosine methylation is known to vary with age in sea bass

[84]. Collateral effects of stress 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 [45] (see Additional File 5).

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 [186,187]. Nature and strength of family-based epigenomic

variation are of considerable importance for selection breeding improvements in a cultured fish

like sea bass [188], including also issues about health and welfare [189].

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, but not in fish despite the presence of nucleated

cells and minimally invasive sampling that allows for multiple measurements. Using RNA-

sequencing, authors [38,39] 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 [190]. Our attempts to survey fish studies undoubtedly showed that

considerably more knowledge has to be accumulated 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 [191,192]. *In situ* hybridization

techniques in brain have been shown to be especially important to link neurobiological activities

and stress coping in fish [134,193]. 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 [194], but recently in a tilapia [48], a goby [56], and a killifish [43].

Conclusion

The European sea bass has become one of the most studied species in fish epigenetics [77-84].

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

[195,196] 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 [197] 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. [104,198,199]), 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

[200,201], and, more generally, multi-omics investigations of stress, health and welfare

[202,203].

Methods

Rearing, stress challenge, and blood sampling

Four hundred European sea bass were initially used in this study. Fish were produced in the hatchery facility of Nireus S.A. from breeders maintained in this company for scientific purposes. 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 $\pm$ 0.2°C and 28 ppt, respectively). Fish weights (mean $\pm$ SD) were 48.1 $\pm$ 12.8g and 86.2 $\pm$ 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 [16]. 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 samplings were performed in

anesthetized fish. Specifically, fish were anesthetized in 2-phenoxyethanol (300 ppm; Merck;

807291; USA). Recovery was performed in a separate tank with provision of air before fish

returned to their holding tank. 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.

Library preparation and sequencing

We followed the epiGBS protocol published by van Gurp et al [88]. 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 [204]. 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 [76] using *simRAD* [205]. 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

Additional File 1. 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 Additional File 7), 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; see Additional File 8) 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.

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 [206]. 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* [112], a

bisulfite converted version of the European sea bass genome was prepared against which the

demultiplexed and trimmed reads were mapped.

Methylation analysis

The R package MethylKit [207] 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 [83] 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 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.

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. gene ontology 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 [83]. 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.

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.

683 Abbreviations

ABLIM: actin-binding LIM kinase; AC: adenyl(-ate) cyclase; ACTH: adrenocorticotropic hormone;

BDNF: Brain Derived Neurotrophic Factor; cAMP: cyclic adenosine monophosphate; CpG:

cytosine-phosphate-guanine; CREB: cAMP response element-binding; CRH: corticotropin-

releasing hormone; DMC: differentially methylated cytosine; DMR: differentially methylated

region; epiGBS: epiGenotyping By sequencing, GDNF: glial cell line-derived neurotrophic factor;

HPA: Hypothalamus-Pituitary-Adrenal; HPI: Hypothalamus-Pituitary-Interrenal; LG: linkage

group; mRNA: messenger RNA; NCBI: National Center for Biotechnology Information; PACAP:

Protein Adenylate Cyclase Activating Protein; POMC: pro-opiomelanocortin; RBC: red blood cell;

RRBS: reduced representation bisulfite sequencing, UTR: untranslated region.

696 DECLARATIONS

698 Ethics approvals and consent to participate

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/).

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

Individual Illumina raw reads (one round of trimming) and processed files have been deposited

in NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus [208] and are accessible through GEO Series accession

number GSE153838 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE153838).

Competing interests

None declared

Funding

This research 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

(grant number: ANR-16-0001-COFA). These funding sources had no role in the design of the

study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Author contributions

MVK, ED, BG developed the protocol, MVK and ED conducted the lab work, EG ensured techni-

cal assistance and supervised sequencing. AS, AD, MP and CST established the study design

used during the challenge test. Experiments with live fish were conducted by AD, AS, MP, with

technical 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. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

Author details

See first page

Acknowledgements

Data used in this work were partly produced through the GenSeq technical facilities at ISEM and

benefited from the Montpellier Bioinformatics Biodiversity (MBB) facility, both supported by the

LabEx CeMEB, and 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,

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 helped during the last stages of manuscript

preparation.

References

1. Petitjean Q, Jean S, Gandar A, Côte J, Laffaille P, Jacquin L. Stress responses in fish: from molecular to evolutionary processes.
Sci Tot Environm 2019; 684: 371-380. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.05.357

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

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

4. Schreck CB, Tort L. 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). 2016. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-802728-8.00001-1

5. Del Giudice M, Buck CL, Chaby LE, Gormally BM, Taff CC, Thawley CJ et al. What is stress? A systems perspective. Integr.
Comp. Biol. 2018; 58(6): 1019-1032. doi: 10.1093/icb/icy114

6. Schulte PM. What is environmental stress? Insights from fish living in a variable environment. 2014; J Exp Biol 217: 23-34. doi:
10.1242/jeb.089722

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

8. Ellis T, Yildiz HY, López-Olmeda J, Spedicato MT, Tort L, Overli O et al. 2012. Cortisol and finfish welfare. Fish Physiol Biochem
2012;38: 163–188. doi: 10.1007/s10695-011-9568-y

9. Sneddon LU, Wolfenden DCC, Thomson JS. Stress management and welfare. Pp. 463-539. In: Biology of Stress in Fish". Fish
Physiology, Vol. 35. CB Schreck, L Tort, AP Farrell, CJ Brauner Eds. Academic Press, Cambridge (MA). 2016. doi:
10.1016/B978-0-12-802728-8.00012-6

10. Pottinger TG. The stress response in fish - mechanisms, effects and measurement. Pp. 32-48. In: Fish Welfare (E.J. Branson
Ed.). Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford. 2008.

11. Nardocci G., Navarro C, Cortés PP, Imarai M, Montoya M, Valenzuela B et al. Neuroendocrine mechanisms for immune
system regulation during stress in fish. Fish Shellfish Immunol 2014; 40(2): 531-538. doi:10.1016/j.fsi.2014.08.001

12. Castanheira MF, Conceição LEC, Millot S, Rey S, Bégout ML, Damsgard B et al. 2017. Coping styles in farmed fish: conse-
quences for aquaculture. Rev Aquaculture 2017; 9: 23–41. doi: 10.1111/raq.12100

13. Yada T, Nakanishi T. Interaction between endocrine and immune systems in fish. Internat Rev Cytol 2002; 220: 35-92. doi:
10.1016/s0074-7696(02)20003-0

14. Wendelaar Bonga SE. The stress response in fish. Physiol Rev 1997; 177(3): 591-625. doi: 10.1152/physrev.1997.77.3.591

15. Geven EJW, Klaren PHM. 2017. The teleost head kidney: integrating thyroid and immune signaling. Dev Comp Immunol
2017 ;66: 73-83. doi: 10.1016/j.dci.2016.06.025

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

1.] Gamperl AK, Vijayan NM, Boutilier RG. Experimental control of stress hormone levels in fishes: techniques and applications.
Rev Fish Biol Fish 1994;4: 215-255. doi: 10.1007/BF00044129

18. Mommsen TP, Vijayan MM, Moon TW. Cortisol in teleosts: dynamics, mechanisms of action, and metabolic regulation. Rev
Fish Biol Fish 1999;9: 211 - 268. doi: 10.1023/A:1008924418720

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

20. Berger JM, Singh P, Khrimian L, Morgan DA, Chowdhury S, Arteaga-Solis E et al. Mediation of the acute stress response by
the skeleton. Cell Metab 2019; 30(5): 890-902.e8. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2019.08.012

21. Foster JA, Rinaman L, Cryan JF. Stress and the gut-brain axis: Regulation by the microbiome. Neurobiol Stress 2017;7:
124-136. doi: 10.1016/j.ynstr.2017.03.001

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

23. Gray JD, Kogan JF, Marrocco J, McEwen BS. Genomic and epigenomic mechanisms of glucocorticoids in the brain. Nat Rev
Endocrinol 2017; 13(11): 661-673. doi: 10.1038/nrendo.2017.97

24. Burns SB, Szyszkowicz JK, Luheshi GN, Lutz PE, Turecki G. Plasticity of the epigenome during early-life stress. Semin Cell Dev.
Biol 2018; 77: 115-132. doi: 10.1016/j.semcdb.2017.09.033

25. Dirven BCJ, Homberg JR, Kozicz T, Henckens MJAG. Epigenetic programming of the neuroendocrine stress response by adult
life stress. J Mol Endocrinol 2017 ;59(1): R11-R31. doi: 10.1530/JME-17-0019

26. Floriou-Servou A, von Ziegler L, Stalder L, Sturman O, Privitera M, Rassi A et al. Distinct proteomic, transcriptomic, and epi-
genetic stress responses in dorsal and ventral hippocampus. Biol Psychiatry 2018; 84(7): 531-541. doi:
10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.02.003

27. Denzel MS, Lapierre LR, Mack HID. Emerging topics in C. elegans aging research: Transcriptional regulation, stress response
and epigenetics. Mech Ageing Dev 2019;177: 4-21. doi:10.1016/j.mad.2018.08.001

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

29. Reul JMHM., Collins A, Saliba RS, Mifsud KR, Carter SD, Gutierrez-Mecinas M et al. Glucocorticoids, epigenetic control and
stress resilience. Neurobiol Stress *2015*;1: 44–59. doi: 10.1016/j.ynstr.2014.10.001

30. Zhou JN, Fang H. Transcriptional regulation of corticotropin-releasing hormone gene in stress response. IBRO Rep 2018;5:
137-146. doi: 10.1016/j.ibror.2018.08.003

31. Auta J, Smith RC, Dong E, Tueting P, Sershen H, Boules S et al. DNA-methylation gene network dysregulation in peripheral
blood lymphocytes of schizophrenia patients. Schizophr Res 2013;150(1): 312-318. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2013.07.030

32. Blaze J, Wang J, Ho L, Mendelev N, Haghighi F, Pasinetti GM. Polyphenolic compounds alter stress-induced patterns of
global DNA methylation in brain and blood. Mol Nutr Food Res 2018;62(8): e1700722. doi:10.1002/mnfr.20170072

33. Vinkers CH, Geuze E, van Rooij SJH, Kennis M, Schür RR, Nispeling DM et al. Successful treatment of post-traumatic stress
disorder reverses DNA methylation marks. Mol Psychiatry 2019; 10.1038/s41380-019-0549-3. doi: 10.1038/s41380-019-
0549-3

34 Arockiaraj AI, Liu D, Shaffer JR, Koleck TA, Crago EA, Weeks DE, Conley YP. Methylation data processing protocol and com-
parison of blood and cerebral spinal fluid following aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Front Genet 2020;11: 671.
doi: 10.3389/fgene.2020.00671

35. Houseman EA, Kim S, Kelsey KT, Wiencke JK. 2015. DNA Methylation in whole blood: uses and challenges. Curr Environ
Health Rep 2015; 2(2): 145-154. doi: 10.1007/s40572-015-0050-3

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

37. Burgos-Aceves MA, Lionetti L, Faggio C. Multidisciplinary haematology as prognostic device in environmental and xenobiotic
stress-induced response in fish. Sci Tot Environm 2019; 670: 1170-1183. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.275

38. Morera D; Roher N; Ribas L, Balasch JC, Donate C, Callol A et al. RNA-Seq reveals an integrated immune response in nucle-
ated erythrocytes. PLoS ONE 2011; 6: e26998. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0026998

39. Dahle MK, Wessel Ø, Timmerhaus G, Nyman IB, Jorgensen SM, Rimstad E et al. Transcriptome analyses of Atlantic salmon
(Salmo salar L.) erythrocytes infected with piscine orthoreovirus (PRV). Fish Shellfish Immunol 2015;45(2): 780-790. doi:
10.1016/j.fsi.2015.05.049

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

41. Gavery MR, Nichols KM, Goetz G, Middleton MA, Swanson P. Characterization of genetic and epigenetic variation in sperm
and red blood cells from adult hatchery and natural-origin steelhead, Oncorhynchus mykiss. G3: Genes, Genomes, Ge-
netics 2018; 8(11): 3723-3736. doi: 10.1534/g3.118.200458

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

43. Berbel-Filho WM, Berry N, Rodríguez-Barreto D, texeira SR, de Leaniz CG, Consuegra S. Environmental enrichment induces
intergenerational behavioural and epigenetic effects on fish. Mol Ecol 2020; 29(12): 2888-2299.   doi:
10.1111/mec.15481

44. Boltana S, Aguilar A, Sanhueza N, Donoso A, Mercado L, Imarai M et al. Behavioral fever drives epigenetic modulation of the
immune response in fish. Front. Immunol 2018;9: 1241. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2018.01241

45. Gavery MR, Nichols KM, Berejikian BA, Tatara CP, Goetz GW, Dickey JT et al. Temporal dynamics of DNA methylation pat-
terns in response to rearing juvenile steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in a hatchery versus simulated stream environ-
ment. *Genes* 2019;*10:* 356. doi: 10.3390/genes10050356

46. Hu J, Pérez-Jvostov F, Blondel L, Barrett RDH. Genome-wide DNA methylation signatures of infection status in Trinidadian
guppies (Poecilia reticulata). Mol Ecol 2018;27(15): 3087–3102. doi: 10.1111/mec.14771

47. Heckwolf MJ, Meyer BS, Häsler R, Hoppner MP, Eizaguirre MC, Reusch TBH. Two different epigenetic information channels
in wild three-spined sticklebacks are involved in salinity adaptation. Sci Adv 2020 ;6(12): eaaz1138.
doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz1138

48. Hilliard AT, Xie D, Ma Z, Snyder MP, Fernald RD. Genome-wide effects of social status on DNA methylation in the brain of a
cichlid fish, Astatotilapia burtoni. BMC Genomics 2019; 20(1): 699. doi: 10.1186/s12864-019-6047-9

49. Le Luyer J, Laporte M, Beacham TD, Kaukinen KH, Whitler RE, Leong JS et al. 2017. Hatchery-induced epigenetic modifica-
tion in salmon. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2017;114(49): 12964-12969. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1711229114

50. Metzger DCH, Schulte PM. Persistent and plastic effects of temperature on DNA methylation across the genome of
threespine stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus). Proc Biol Sci 2017;284(1864): 20171667. doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.1667

51. Metzger DCH, Schulte PM. The DNA methylation landscape of stickleback reveals patterns of sex chromosome evolution
and effects of environmental salinity. Genome Biol Evol 2018;10(3): 775-785. doi:10.1093/gbe/evy034

52. Moghadam HK, Johnsen H, Robinson N, Andersen O, Jorgensen EH, Johnsen HK et al. Impacts of early life stress on the
methylome and transcriptome of Atlantic salmon. Sci Rep 2017;7: 5023 doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-05222-2

53. Olsvik PA, Whatmore P, Penglase SJ, Skjaerven KH, d'Auriac MA, Ellinsen S. Associations between behavioral effects of
bisphenol A and DNA methylation in zebrafish embryos. Front Genet 2019 ;10: 184. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2019.00184

54. Sagonas K, Meyer BS, Kaufmann J, Lenz TL, Häsler R, Eizaguirre C. Experimental parasite infection causes genome-wide
changes in DNA methylation. Mol Biol Evol 2020; doi: 10.1093/molbev/msaa084

55. Shao C, Li Q, Chen S, Zhang P, Lian JM, Hu QM et al. Epigenetic modification and inheritance in sexual reversal of fish. Ge-
nome Res 2014; 24(4): 604-615. doi: 10.1101/gr.162172.113

56. Somerville V, Schwaiger M, Hirsch PE, Walser JC, Bussmann K, Weyrich A et al. DNA methylation patterns in the round goby
hypothalamus support an on-the-spot decision scenario for territorial behavior. Genes 2019;10(3): 219. doi:
10.3390/genes10030219

57. Todd EV, Ortega-Recalde O, Liu H, Lamm MS, Rutherford KM, Cross H et al. Stress, novel sex genes, and epigenetic repro-
gramming orchestrate socially controlled sex change. Sci Adv 2019;5(7): eaaw7006. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aaw7006

58. Uren Webster TM, Rodriguez-Barreto D, Martin SAM, Van Oosterhout C, Orozco-terWengel P, Cable J et al. Contrasting
effects of acute and chronic stress on the transcriptome, epigenome, and immune response of Atlantic salmon. Epige-
netics 2018;13(12): 1191-1207. doi: 10.1080/15592294.2018.1554520

59. Wan ZY, Xia JH, Lin G, Wang L, Lin VCL, Yue GH. Genome-wide methylation analysis identified sexually dimorphic methylated
regions in hybrid tilapia. Sci Rep 2016;6: 35903. doi: 10.1038/srep35903

60. Wang J, Liu Y, Jiang S, Li WH, Gui L, Zhou T et al. Transcriptomic and epigenomic alterations of Nile tilapia gonads sexually
reversed by high temperature. Aquaculture 2019; 508: 167-177. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.04.073

61. Wang X, Bhandari RK. DNA methylation dynamics during epigenetic reprogramming of medaka embryo. Epigenetics
2019;14(6): 611-622. doi: 10.1080/15592294.2019.1605816

62. Woods III LC, Li Y, Ding Y, liu JN, Reading BJ, Fuller SA et al. DNA methylation profiles correlated to striped bass sperm fertili-
ty. BMC Genomics 2018;19: 244. doi: 10.1186/s12864-018-4548-6

63. Xiu Y, Shao C, Zhu Y, Li YZ, Gan T, Xu WT et al. Differences in DNA methylation between disease-resistant and disease-
susceptible Chinese tongue sole (Cynoglossus semilaevis) families. Front Genet 2019 ;10: 847. doi:
10.3389/fgene.2019.00847

64. Zhang H, Xu P, Jiang Y, Zhao ZX, Feng JX, Tai RY et al. Genomic, transcriptomic, and epigenomic features differentiate genes
that are relevant for muscular polyunsaturated fatty acids in the common carp. Front Genet 2019; 10: 217. doi:
10.3389/fgene.2019.00217

65. Robinson NA, Johnsen H, Moghadam H, Andersen Ø, Tveiten H. Early developmental stress affects subsequent gene expres-
sion response to an acute stress in Atlantic salmon: an approach for creating robust fish for aquaculture? G3: Genes,
Genomes, Genetics 2019;9(5): 1597-1611. doi: 10.1534/g3.119.400152

66. Rodriguez Barreto D, Garcia de Leaniz C, Verspoor E, Sobolewska H, Coulson M, Consuegra S. DNA methylation changes in
the sperm of captive-reared fish: A route to epigenetic introgression in wild populations. Mol Biol Evol 2019;36(10):
2205-2211. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msz135

67. Smith G, Smith C, Kenny JG, Chaudhuri RR, Ritchie MG. Genomewide DNA methylation patterns in wild samples of two
morphotypes of threespine stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus). Mol Biol Evol 2015;32(4): 888–895. doi:
10.1093/molbev/msu344

68. Zhang C, Hoshida Y, Sadler KC. Comparative epigenomic profiling of the DNA methylome in mouse and zebrafish uncovers
high interspecies divergence. Front Genet 2016 ;7: 110. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2016.00110

69. Laporte M, Le Luyer J, Rougeux C, Dion-Côté AM, Krick M, Bernatchez L. DNA methylation reprogramming, TE derepression,
and postzygotic isolation of nascent animal species. Sci Adv 2019;5(10): eaaw1644. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aaw1644

70. Gao D, Wang C, Xi Z, Zhou Y, Wang Y, Zuo Z. Early-life benzo[a]pyrene exposure causes neurodegenerative syndromes in
adult zebrafish (Danio rerio) and the mechanism involved. Toxicol Sci 2017;157(1): 74-84. doi: 10.1093/toxsci/kfx028

71 Baerwald MR, Meek MH, Stephens MR, Nagarajan RP, Goodbla AM, Tomalty KMH et al. Migration-related phenotypic diver-
gence is associated with epigenetic modifications in rainbow trout. Mol Ecol 2016;25(8): 1785-1800. doi:
10.1111/mec.13231

72. Artemov AV, Mugue NS, Rastorguev SM, Zhenilo S, Mazur AM, Tsygankova SV et al. Genome-wide DNA methylation profil-
ing reveals epigenetic adaptation of stickleback to marine and freshwater conditions. Mol Biol Evol 2017;34(9): 2203–
2213. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msx156

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

74. Faught E, Aluru N, Vijayan MM. The molecular stress response. Pp. 113-166. In: Biology of Stress in Fish. Fish Physiology,
Vol. 35. CB Schreck, L Tort, AP Farrell, CJ Brauner Eds. Academic Press, Cambridge (MA). 2016. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-
802728-8.00004-7

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

76. Tine M, Kuhl H, Gagnaire PA, Louro B, Desmarais E, martins RST et al. European sea bass genome and its variation provide
insights into adaptation to euryhalinity and speciation. Nat Commun 2014;5: 5770. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6770

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

78. Geay F, Zambonino-Infante J, Reinhardt R, Kuhl H, Santigosa E, Cahu C et al. 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 2012;5: 7-13. doi: 10.1016/j.margen.2011.08.003

79. Terova G, Díaz N, Rimoldi S, Ceccotti C, Gliozheni E, Piferrer F. Effects of sodium butyrate treatment on histone modifica-
tions 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 2016;11(7): e0160332. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0160332

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

81. Anastasiadi D, Vandeputte M, Sánchez-Baizán N, Allal F, Piferrer F. Dynamic epimarks in sex-related genes predict gonad
phenotype in the European sea bass, a fish with mixed genetic and environmental sex determination. Epigenetics
2018;13(9): 988–1011. doi: 10.1080/15592294.2018.1529504

82. Barrachina F, Anastasiadi D, Jodar M, Castillo J, Estanyol JM, Piferrer F et al. Identification of a complex population of chro-
matin-associated proteins in the European sea bass (Dicentrarchus labrax) sperm. Syst Biol Reprod Med 2018;64(6):
502-517. doi: 10.1080/19396368.2018.1482383

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

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

85. Vazzana M, Cammarata M, Cooper EL, Parrinello N. Confinement stress in sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) depresses
peritoneal leukocyte cytotoxicity. Aquaculture 2002;210: 231-243. doi: 10.1016/S0044-8486(01)00818-3

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

87. Cœurdacier JL, Dutto G, Gasset E, Blancheton JP. 2011. Is total serum protein a good indicator for welfare in reared sea bass
(Dicentrarchus labrax)? Aquat Living Resour 2011;24: 124-127. doi: 10.1051/alr/2011130

88. van Gurp TP, Wagemaker NCAM., Wouters B, Vergeer P, Ouborg JNJ, verhoeven KJS. epiGBS: reference-free reduced repre-
sentation bisulfite sequencing. Nat Meth 2016;13: 322-324. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.3763

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

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

91. Chaves-Pozo E, Bandín I, Olveira JG, Esteve-Codina A, Gomez-Garrido J, Dabad M et al. 2019. European sea bass brain DLB-1
cell line is susceptible to nodavirus: A transcriptomic study. Fish Shellfish Immunol 2019;86: 14-24. doi:
10.1016/j.fsi.2018.11.024

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

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

94. Wong RY, Lamm MS, Godwin J. Characterizing the neurotranscriptomic states in alternative stress coping styles. BMC Ge-
nomics 2015;16(1): 425. doi: 10.1186/s12864-015-1626-x

95. Greenwood AK, Peichel CL Social regulation of gene expression in threespine sticklebacks. PLoS One 2015;10(9): e0137726.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0137726

96. Oliveira RF, Simões JM, Teles MC, Oliveira CR, Becker JD, Lopez JS. Assessment of fight outcome is needed to activate social-
ly driven transcriptional changes in the zebrafish brain. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2016;113(5): E654-E661.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1514292113

97. Vu TD, Iwasaki Y, Shigenobu S, Marubo A, Oshima K, Lioka E et al. 2020. Behavioral and brain-transcriptomic synchronization
between the two opponents of a fighting pair of the fish Betta splendens. PLoS Genet 2020; 16(6): e1008831.
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1008831

98. Walsh CA, Engle EC. Allelic diversity in human developmental neurogenetics: insights into biology and disease. Neuron
2010;68(2): 245-253. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2010.09.042

99. Vlasova-St Louis I, Dickson AM, Bohjanen PR, Wilusz CJ. 2013. CELFish ways to modulate mRNA decay. Biochim Biophys Acta
2013;1829(6-7): 695-707. doi: 10.1016/j.bbagrm.2013.01.001

100. Phillips RB, De Koning JJ, Brunelli JP, Faber-Hammond JJ, Hansen JD, Christensen KA et al. Characterization of the OmyY1
region on the rainbow trout Y chromosome. Int J Genomics 2013;2013: 261730. doi: 10.1155/2013/261730

101. Øynebråten I, Barois N, Hagelsteen K, Johansen FE, Bakke O, Haraldsen G. Characterization of a novel chemokine-
containing storage granule in endothelial cells: evidence for preferential exocytosis mediated by protein kinase A and
diacylglycerol. J Immunol 2005;175(8): 5358-5369. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.175.8.5358

102. Meröndun J, Murray DL, Shafer ABA. Genome-scale sampling suggests cryptic epigenetic structuring and insular diver-
gence in Canada lynx. Mol Ecol 2019;28(13): 3186-3196. doi: 10.1111/mec.15131

103. Paun O, Verhoeven KJF, Richards CL. Opportunities and limitations of reduced representation bisulfite sequencing in plant
ecological epigenomics. New Phytol 2019;221(2): 738-742. doi: 10.1111/nph.15388

104. Wang J, Xia Y, Li L, Gong DS, Yao Y, Luo HJ et al. Double restriction-enzyme digestion improves the coverage and accuracy
of genome-wide CpG methylation profiling by reduced representation bisulfite sequencing. BMC Genomics 2013;14: 11.
doi: 10.1186/1471-2164-14-11

105. Sopinka NM, Donaldson MR, O'Connor CM, Suski CD, Cooke SJ. Stress indicators in fish. Pp. 405-462. In: Biology of Stress in
Fish. Fish Physiology, Vol. 35. CB Schreck, L Tort, AP Farrell, CJ Brauner Eds. Academic Press, Cambridge (MA). 2016. doi:
10.1016/B978-0-12-802728-8.00011-4

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

107. Gerlai R, Poshusta TL, Rampersad M, Fernandez Y, Greenwood TM, Cousin E et al. Forward genetic screening using behav-
ioral tests in zebrafish: a proof of concept analysis of mutants. Behav Genet 2017;47(1): 125-139. doi: 10.1007/s10519-
016-9818-y

108. Ghalambor CK, Hoke KL, Ruell EW, Fisher EK, Reznick DN, Hughes KA. Non-adaptive plasticity potentiates rapid adaptive
evolution of gene expression in nature. Nature 2015;525(7569): 372-375. doi: 10.1038/nature15256

109. Martos-Sitcha JA, Wunderink YS, Straatjes J, Skrzynska AK, Mancera JM, Martinez-Rodriguez G. Different stressors induce
differential responses of the CRH-stress system in the gilthead sea bream (Sparus aurata). Comp Biochem Physiol A Mol
Integr Physiol 2014;177: 49-61. doi: 10.1016/j.cbpa.2014.07.021

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

111. Nyman C, Hebert FO, Bessert-Nettelbeck M, Aubin-Horth N, Taborsky B. Transcriptomic signatures of social experience
during early development in a highly social cichlid fish. Mol Ecol 2020;29(3): 610-623. doi: 10.1111/mec.15335

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

113. Richards CL, Alonso C, Becker C, Bossdorf O, Bucher E, Colome-Tatche M et al. Ecological plant epigenetics: Evidence from
model and non-model species, and the way forward. Ecol Lett 2017; 20(12): 1576-1590. doi:10.1111/ele.12858

114. Trucchi E, Mazzarella AB, Gilfillan GB, Lorenzo MT, Schönswetter P, Paun O. BsRADseq: screening DNA methylation in
natural populations of non-model species. Molecular Ecology 2016;25(8): 1697-1713. doi: 10.1111/mec.13550

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

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

117. Maunakea AK, Nagarajan RP, Bilenky M, Ballinger TJ, D'Souza C, Fouse SD et al. Conserved role of intragenic DNA methyla-
tion in regulating alternative promoters. Nature 2010 ;466(7303): 253–257. doi: 10.1038/nature09165

118. Hing B, Braun P, Cordner ZA, Ewald ER, Moody L, McKane M et al. 2018. Chronic social stress induces DNA methylation
changes at an evolutionary conserved intergenic region in chromosome X. Epigenetics 2018;13(6): 627–641. doi:
10.1080/15592294.2018.1486654

119. Suzuki M, Oda M, Ramos MP, Pascual M, Lau K, Stasiek E et al. Late-replicating heterochromatin is characterized by de-
creased cytosine methylation in the human genome. Genome Res 2011;21(11): 1833–1840. doi: 10.1101/gr.116509.110

120. Rajarajan P, Gil SE, Brennand KJ, Akbarian S. Spatial genome organization and cognition. Nat Rev Neurosci 2016 ;17(11):
681-691. doi: 10.1038/nrn.2016.124

121. Lerat E, Casacuberta J, Chaparro , Vieira C. 2019. On the importance to acknowledge transposable elements in epigenomic
analyses. Genes 2019;10(4): 258. doi:10.3390/genes10040258

122. Jönsson ME, Garza R, Johansson PA, Jakobsson J. Transposable elements: a common feature of neurodevelopmental and
neurodegenerative disorders. Trends Genet 2020 S0168-9525(20)30102-5. doi: 10.1016/j.tig.2020.05.004

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

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

125. Lea AJ, Vockley CM, Johnston RA, Del Carpio CA, Barreiro LB, Reddy TE et al. Genome-wide quantification of the effects of
DNA methylation on human gene regulation. Elife 2018;7: e37513. doi: 10.7554/eLife.37513

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

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

128. Marosi K, Mattson MP. BDNF mediates adaptive brain and body responses to energetic challenges. *Trends Endocrinol*
Metab 2014; 25(2): 89-98. doi: 10.1016/j.tem.2013.10.006

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

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

131. Lubin FD, Roth TL, Sweatt JD. Epigenetic regulation of BDNF gene transcription in the consolidation of fear memory. J
Neurosci 2008 ;28(42): 10576-10586. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1786-08.2008

132. Coley EJL, Demaestri C, Ganguly P, Honeycutt JA, Peterzell S, Rose N 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
2019;13: 101. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00101

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

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

135. Vindas MA, Fokos S, Pavlidis M, Hoglund E, Dyonisopoulou S, Ebbesson LOE et al. Early life stress induces long-term
changes in limbic areas of a teleost fish: the role of catecholamine systems in stress coping. Sci Rep 2018;8(1): 5638. doi:
10.1038/s41598-018-23950-x

136. Sadoul B, Alfonso S, Bessa E, Bouchareb A, Blondeau-Bidet E, Clair P et al. Enhanced brain expression of genes related to
1055   cell proliferation and neural differentiation is associated with cortisol receptor expression in fishes. Gen Comp
1056   Endocrinol 2018 ;267: 76–81. doi: 10.1016/j.ygcen.2018.06.001

1057   137. Samaras A, Espirito Santo C, Papandroulakis N, Mitrizakis N, Pavlidis M, Hoglund E et al. Allostatic load and stress physiol-
1058   ogy in European seabass (Dicentrarchus labrax L.) and gilthead seabream (Sparus aurata L.). Front Endocrinol 2018;9:
1059   451. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2018.00451.

1060   138. Alfonso S, Sadoul B, Gesto M, Joassard L, Chatain B, Bégout ML. Coping styles in European sea bass: the link between bold-
1061   ness, stress response and neurogenesis. Physiol Behav 2019;207: 67-85. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2019.04.020

1062   139. Borrelli L, Aceto S, Agnisola C, De Paolo S, Dipineto L, Stilling RM et al. Probiotic modulation of the microbiota-gut-brain
1063   axis and behaviour in zebrafish. Sci Rep 2016;6: 30046. doi: 10.1038/srep30046

1064   140. Sassone-Corsi P. The cyclic AMP pathway. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol 2012, 4(12): a011148. doi:
1065   10.1101/cshperspect.a011148

1066   141. Wang H, Ferguson GD, Pineda VV, Cundiff PE, Storm DR. Overexpression of type-1 adenylyl cyclase in mouse forebrain
1067   enhances recognition memory and LTP. Nat Neurosci 2004;7(6): 635–642. doi:10.1038/nn1248.

1068   142. Lee EH, Seo SR. Neuroprotective roles of pituitary adenylate cyclase-activating polypeptide in neurodegenerative diseases.
1069   BMB Rep 2014;47(7): 369-375. doi: 10.5483/bmbrep.2014.47.7.086

1070   143. Bennett MR, Lagopoulos J. Stress and trauma: BDNF control of dendritic-spine formation and regression. Prog Neurobiol
1071   2014;112: 80-99. doi: 10.1016/j.pneurobio.2013.10.005

1072   144. Murata K, Kinoshita M. Establishment of proprotein convertase, furinA knocked-out lines in medaka, Oryzias latipes, and
1073   unique form of medaka furin-like prorprotein convertase (mflPC). Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol Pharmacol 2015;178:
1074   169-180. doi:10.1016/j.cbpc.2015.10.005

1075   145. Zhu B, Zhao L, Luo D, Xue DM, Tan T, Dong ZF et al. Furin promotes dendritic morphogenesis and learning and memory in
1076   transgenic mice. Cell Mol Life Sci 2018;75(13): 2473-2488. doi: 10.1007/s00018-017-2742-3

1077   146. Buck JM, O'Neill HC, Stitzel J.A. Developmental nicotine exposure elicits multigenerational disequilibria in proBDNF prote-
1078   olysis and glucocorticoid signaling in the frontal cortices, striata, and hippocampi of adolescent mice. Biochem
1079   Pharmacol 2019 ;168: 438-451. doi: 10.1016/j.bcp.2019.08.003

1080   147. Marcinkiewicz M, Seidah NG, Chrétien M. Implications of the subtilisin/kexin-like precursor convertases in the develop-
1081   ment and function of nervous tissues. Acta Neurobiol Exp 1996;56(1): 287-298. PMID: 8787188

1082   148. Chen Y, Zhang J, Deng M. Furin mediates brain-derived neurotrophic factor upregulation in cultured rat astrocytes exposed
1083   to oxygen-glucose deprivation. J Neurosci Res 2015 ;93(1): 189-194. doi: 10.1002/jnr.23455

1084   149. Yeh FC, Kao CF, Kuo PH. Explore the features of brain-derived neurotrophic factor in mood disorders. PLoS One 2015;10(6):
1085   e0128605. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128605

1086   150. Pang PT, Teng HK, Zaitsev E, Woo NT, Sakata K, Zhen SH et al. Cleavage of proBDNF by tPA/plasmin is essential for long-
1087   term hippocampal plasticity. Science 2004;306: 487-491. doi: 10.1126/science.1100135

1088   151. Jeanneteau FD, Lambert WM, Ismaili N, Bath KG, Lee FS, Garabedian MJ et al. BDNF and glucocorticoids regulate cortico-
1089   trophin-releasing hormone (CRH) homeostasis in the hypothalamus. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2012;109(4): 1305-1310.
1090   doi: 10.1073/pnas.1114122109

1091   152. Gray K, Ellis V. Activation of pro-BDNF by the pericellular serine protease plasmin. FEBS Lett 2008;582(6): 907-910. doi:
1092   10.1016/j.febslet.2008.02.026

153. Wang N, Zhang L, Miles L, Hoover-Plow J. Plasminogen regulates pro-opiomelanocortin processing. J Thromb Haemost
2004;2(5): 785-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1538-7836.2004.00694.x

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

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

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

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

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

159. Jedlitschky G, Grube M, Mosyagin I, Kroemer HK, Vogelgesang S. Targeting CNS transporters for treatment of neurodegen-
erative diseases. Curr Pharm Des 2014;20(10): 1523-1533. doi: 10.2174/13816128113199990460

160. Bacq A, Balasse L, Biala G, Guiard B, gardier AM, Schinkel A et al. Organic cation transporter 2 controls brain norepineph-
rine and serotonin clearance and antidepressant response. Mol Psychiatry 2012;17(9): 926-939. doi:
10.1038/mp.2011.87

161. Volk C. OCTs, OATs, and OCTNs: structure and function of the polyspecific organic ion transporters of the SLC22 family.
WIREs Membr Transp Signal 2014; 3: 1–13. doi: 10.1002/wmts.100

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

163. Thomas DM, Francescutti-Verbeem DM, Liu XM, Kuhn DM. Identification of differentially regulated transcripts in mouse
striatum following methamphetamine treatment - an oligonucleotide microarray approach. J Neurochem 2004 ;88(2):
380-393. doi: 10.1046/j.1471-4159.2003.02182.x

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

165. Luoma LM, Macintyre G, Tibbo PG, Wild TC, Colman I, Purdon SE. NPAS3 exonic SNP genotype is linked to working memory
performance in healthy young adults. Psychiatry Res 2018 ;265: 263-264. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2018.04.063.

166. Yang D, Zhang W, Padhiar A, Yue Y, Shi YH, Zheng TZ et al. NPAS3 regulates transcription and expression of VGF: Implica-
tions for neurogenesis and psychiatric disorders. Front Mol Neurosci 2016 ;9: 109. doi: 10.3389/fnmol.2016.00109.

167. Lavedan C, Licamele L, Volpi S, Hamilton J, Heaton C, Mack K 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
2009;14(8): 804-819. doi: 10.1038/mp.2008.56

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

169. Yang L, Wang J, Wang D, HU GJ, Liu ZY, Yan DN et al. Delayed behavioral and genomic responses to acute combined stress
in zebrafish, potentially relevant to PTSD and other stress-related disorders: Focus on neuroglia, neuroinflammation,
apoptosis and epigenetic modulation. Behav Brain Res 2020;389: 112644. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2020.112644

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

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

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

173. Fallet M, Luquet E, David P, Cosseau C. Epigenetic inheritance and intergenerational effects in mollusks. Gene 2020;729:
144166. doi: 10.1016/j.gene.2019.144166

174. Cerrizuela S, Vega-López GA, Palacio MB, Tribulo C, Aybar MJ. Gli2 is required for the induction and migration of Xenopus
laevis neural crest. Mech Dev 2018;154: 219-239. doi: 10.1016/j.mod.2018.07.010

175. Welsh IC, Hart J, Brown JM, Hansen K, marques MR, Aho RJ et al. Pbx loss in cranial neural crest, unlike in epithelium,
results in cleft palate only and a broader midface. J Anat 2018;233(2): 222-242. doi: 10.1111/joa.12821

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

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

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

179. Kamm GB, Pisciottano F, Kliger R, Franchini LF. The developmental brain gene NPAS3 contains the largest number of accel-
erated regulatory sequences in the human genome. Mol Biol Evol 2013;30(5): 1088-1102. doi: 10.1093/molbev/mst023

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

181. Walker MB, Miller CT, Coffin Talbot J, Stock DW, Kimmel CB. Zebrafish furin mutants reveal intricacies in regulating Endo-
thelin1 signaling in craniofacial patterning. Dev Biol 2006;295(1): 194-205. doi:1 0.1016/j.ydbio.2006.03.028

182. Kumari PK, Ali A, Singh SK, Chaurasia A, Raman R. Genetic heterogeneity in Van der Woude syndrome: identification of
NOL4 and IRF6 haplotype from the noncoding region as candidates in two families. J Genet 2018;97(1): 275-285. PMID:
2966634

183. Gustafsson MK, Pan H, Pinney DF, Liu YL, Lewandowski A, Epstein DJ et al. 2002. Myf5 is a direct target of long-range Shh
signaling and Gli regulation for muscle specification. Genes Dev 2002;16(1): 114-126. doi: 10.1101/gad.940702

184. Lin CY, Lee HC, Chen HC, Hsieh CC, Tsai HJ. Normal function of Myf5 during gastrulation is required for pharyngeal arch
cartilage development in zebrafish embryos. Zebrafish 2013;10(4): 486-499. doi: 10.1089/zeb.2013.09

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

186. Burggren WW. Dynamics of epigenetic phenomena: intergenerational and intragenerational phenotype 'washout'. J Exp
1170     Biol 2015;218: 80-87. doi: 10.1242/jeb.107318

1171 187. Trollope AF, Mifsud KR, Saunderson EA, Reul JMHM. Molecular and epigenetic mechanisms underlying cognitive and adap-
1172     tive responses to stress. Epigenomes 2017; 1(3): 17. doi:10.3390/epigenomes1030017

1173 188. Houston RD, Bean TP, Macqueen DJ, Gundappa MK, Jin YH, Jenkins TL et al. 2020. Harnessing genomics to fast-track genet-
1174     ic improvement in aquaculture. Nat Rev Genet 2020;21: 389-409. doi: 10.1038/s41576-020-0227-y

1175 189. Triantaphyllopoulos KA, Ikonomopoulos I, Bannister AJ. Epigenetics and inheritance of phenotype variation in livestock.
1176     Epigenetics Chromatin 2016;9: 31. doi: 10.1186/s13072-016-0081-5

1177 190. Lauschke VM, Ivanov M, Ingelman-Sundberg M. Pitfalls and opportunities for epigenomic analyses focused on disease
1178     diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy. Trends Pharmacol Sci 2017;38(9): 765-770. doi: 10.1016/j.tips.2017.05.007

1179 191. Barr CL, Misener VL. Decoding the non-coding genome: elucidating genetic risk outside the coding genome. Genes Brain
1180     Behav 2016;15(1): 187-204. doi: 10.1111/gbb.12269

1181 192. Bunnik EM, Timmers M, Bolt IL. Ethical issues in research and development of epigenome-wide technologies. Epigenet.
1182     Insights 2020; 13: 2516865720913253. doi: 10.1177/2516865720913253

1183 193. Vindas MA, Gorissen M, Hoglund E, Flik G, Tronci V, Damsgard B et al. How do individuals cope with stress? Behavioural,
1184     physiological and neuronal differences between proactive and reactive coping styles in fish. J Exp Biol 2017;220: 1524–
1185     1532. doi: 10.1242/jeb.153213

1186 194. Zhang C, Hoshida Y, Sadler KC. Comparative epigenomic profiling of the DNA methylome in mouse and zebrafish uncovers
1187     high interspecies divergence. Front Genet 2016;7: 110. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2016.00110

1188 195. Birney E, Smith GD, Greally JM 2016. Epigenome-wide association studies and the interpretation of disease -omics. PLoS
1189     Genet 2016;12(6): e1006105. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1006105

1190 196. Lin X, Barton S, Holbrook JD. How to make DNA methylation wide studies more powerful. Epigenomics 2016;8(8): 1117-
1191     1129. doi: 10.2217/epi-2016-0017

1192 197. Duranton M, Allal F, Fraïsse C, Bierne N, Bonhomme F; Gagnaire PA. 2018. The origin and remolding of genomic islands of
1193     differentiation in the European sea bass. Nat Commun 2018;9: 2518. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-04963-6

1194 198. Suzuki M, Liao W, Wos F, Johnston AD, DeGrazia J, Ishii J et al. Whole-genome bisulfite sequencing with improved accuracy
1195     and cost. Genome Res 2018; 28(9): 1364-1371. doi: 10.1101/gr.232587.117

1196 199. Werner O, Prudencio ÁS, de la Cruz-Martinez E, Nieto-Lugilde M, Martinez-Gomez P, Ros RM. A cost-reduced variant of
1197     epi-genotyping by sequencing for studying DNA methylation in non-model organisms. Front Plant Sci 2020; 11: 694; doi:
1198     10.3389/fpls.2020.00694

1199 200. Prudencio ÁS, Werner O, Martínez-García PJ, Dicenta F, Ros RM, Martinez-Gomez P. DNA methylation analysis of dor-
1200     mancy release in almond (Prunus dulcis) flower buds using epi-genotyping by sequencing. Int J Mol Sci 2018; 19(11):
1201     3542. doi: 10.3390/ijms19113542

1202 201. Crotti M, Adams CE, Elmer KR. Population genomic SNPs from epigenetic RADs: gaining genetic and epigenetic data from a
1203     single established next-generation sequencing approach. Methods Ecol Evol 2020; 11: 839-849.doi: 10.1111/2041-
1204     210X.13395

1205 202. Suravajhala P, Kogelman LJ, Kadarmideen HN. Multi-omic data integration and analysis using systems genomics ap-
1206     proaches: methods and applications in animal production, health and welfare. Genet Sel Evol 2016;48(1): 38. doi:
1207     10.1186/s12711-016-0217-x

203. Schwartz TS. 2020. The promises and the challenges of integrating multi-omics and systems biology in comparative stress
biology. Integr Comp Biol doi:10.1093/icb/icaa026
204. Gu H, Smith ZD, Bock C, Boyle P, Gnirke A, Meissner A. Preparation of reduced representation bisulfite sequencing libraries
for genome-scale DNA methylation profiling. Nat Protocols 2011; 6: 468-481. doi: 10.1038/nprot.2010.190
205. Lepais O, Weir JT. 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 2014;14: 1314-1321. doi: 10.1111/1755-0998.12273
206. Catchen J, Hohenlohe P. Bassham S, Amoros A, Cresko WA. Stacks: an analysis tool set for population genomics. Mol Ecol.
2013; 22(11): 3124-3140. doi: 10.1111/mec.12354
207. Akalin A, Kormaksson M, Li S, Garrett-Bakelman FE, Figueroa ME, Melnick A et al. MethylKit: a comprehensive R package
for the analysis of genome-wide DNA methylation profiles. Genome Biol. 2012;13: R87. doi: 10.1186/gb-2012-13-10-R87
208. Edgar R, Domarachev M, Lash AE. Gene expression Omnibus: NCBI gene expression and hybridization array data reposi-
tory. Nucleic Acids Res. 2002;30(1): 207-201.

1220
1221
1222

Figure Legends

1224

1225 **Figure 1:** Coverage of the 24 linkage groups (LGs) of the sea bass genome by sequencing epiGBS

1226 reads. Ordinates represent the mean number of sequencing reads. LG numbers are those used

1227 in [76]. Complex IDs resulting from the merging of previously defined LGs during final assembly

1228 (e.g. LG22-25 resulted in the fusion of previous LG22 and LG25). SB-UN (sea bass – unknown;

1229 hereby SB) indicates a composite LG made from originally unassembled scaffolds [76].

1230

Figure 2: Diagrammatic representation of the involvement of the 51 DMC-related genes found

in this study and issues regarding the stress response. One 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 [93-96] (main text and Additional File 3).

This does not mean that our literature survey 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

[91], while stars with broken lines indicate genes with methylation differences (*PTPRB, SASH1A*)

(stickleback: [54]; rainbow trout: [58]; 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 (*A&P 2019*) on European sea bass [83]. 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), but this relationship remains presumptive for *LRRC3*. Additional support including

references for these DMC-related genes is reported in Additional File 3, as well as comparisons

with other epigenomic studies.

1253

Figure 3: Hierarchical clustering based on of the 57 differentially methylated cytosines (15%

threshold) of the randomly caught 74 pre- and post-stress sea bass samples considered during

this study. Nineteen out the twenty families (A to T) used in this study are present in this graph

and each family is associated to one single colour. Capital letters refer to the family, while T0

and T4 are for pre- and post-stress individuals, respectively.

Figure 4: PCA based on the methylation profiles of the 57 differentially methylated cytosines

(15% threshold) reported in this study (Table 1). Pre- and post-stress individual sea bass (in red

and blue, respectively) differ significantly along PC1 ($p < 0.001$), but not PC2. The insert illustrate

the distribution of individual scores along PC1. Ellipses represent the 95% confidence limits over

PC1 and PC2.

1264

Table 1: Differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs) found in this study between pre- and post-stress sea bass

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	GRPT1	growth hormone regulated TBC protein 1	gb
LG6	HG916846.1	6,44E-245	20,44	DLAgn_00164450	GLG1a	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	PBX1	pre-B-cell leukemia homeobox 1	gb
LG10	HG916827.1	6,98E-125	21,55	DLAgn_00006210	ADCY1	adenylate cyclase 1 (brain)	gb
LG11	HG916828.1	0	27,70	DLAgn_00016970	MMNR2	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	ZMAT4	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	GLI2	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

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 in bold. 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 Additional File 2.

1266   **Figure 1:**

1267

1268

1269

Figure 2

1272   **Figure 3**

1273

1274 **Figure 4:**

1275

1276

55