

# Influence of the microbiota-gut-brain axis on behavior and welfare in farm animals: A review

Narjis Kraimi, Marian Dawkins, Sabine G. Gebhardt-Henrich, Philippe Velge, Ivan Rychlik, Jiri Volf, Pauline Creach, Adrian Smith, Frances Colles, Christine Leterrier

# ▶ To cite this version:

Narjis Kraimi, Marian Dawkins, Sabine G. Gebhardt-Henrich, Philippe Velge, Ivan Rychlik, et al.. Influence of the microbiota-gut-brain axis on behavior and welfare in farm animals: A review. Physiology & behavior, 2019, 210, 12 p. 10.1016/j.physbeh.2019.112658. hal-02627992

# HAL Id: hal-02627992 https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02627992

Submitted on 20 Dec 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1	Influence of the microbiota-gut-brain axis
2	on behavior and welfare in farm animals: A review
3	
4 5	<u>Authors:</u> Narjis Kraimi <sup>1*</sup> , Marian Dawkins <sup>2</sup> , Sabine G. Gebhardt-Henrich <sup>3</sup> , Philippe Velge <sup>4</sup> , Ivan Rychlik <sup>5</sup> , Jiří Volf <sup>5</sup> , Pauline Creach <sup>6</sup> , Adrian Smith <sup>2</sup> , Frances Colles <sup>2</sup> , Christine Leterrier <sup>1</sup>
6	
7 8	(1) INRA, CNRS, IFCE, Université de Tours, UMR 85, Centre Val de Loire, 37380 Nouzilly, France
9 10	(2) University of Oxford, Department of Zoology, OX1 3PS Oxford, Great Britain
11 12	(3) University of Bern, Center for Proper Housing: Poultry and Rabbits, CH-3052 Zollikofen, Switzerland
13	(4) ISP, INRA, Université de Tours, UMR 1282, Centre Val de Loire, 37380 Nouzilly, France
14	(5) Veterinary Research Institute, Brno 62100, Czech Republic
15	(6) ITAVI, 41 rue Beaucemaine, 22440 Ploufragan, France
16	
17	* Corresponding author: Christine.Leterrier@inra.fr
18	
19	
20	Abstract
21	There is increasing evidence of a pivotal role of the gut microbiota (GUT-M) in key physiological
22	functions in vertebrates. Many studies discuss functional implications of the GUT-M not only on
23	immunity, growth, metabolism, but also on brain development and behavior. However, while the
24	influence of the microbiota-gut-brain axis (MGBA) on behavior is documented in rodents and
25	humans, data on farm animals are scarce. This review will first report the well-known influence of the
26	MGBA on behavior in rodent and human and then describe its influence on emotion, memory, social
27	and feeding behaviors in farm animals. This corpus of experiments suggests that a better
28	understanding of the effects of the MGBA on behavior could have large implications in various fields
29	of animal production. Specifically, animal welfare and health could be improved by selection,

30 nutrition and management processes that take into account the role of the GUT-M in behavior.

31

32 Key words: Microbiota, microbiota-gut-brain axis, behavior, welfare, emotion, livestock

33

### 34 Table of contents

- 35 Introduction
- 36 I The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and
- 37 human models
- 38 1- Effects on anxiety-like behavior and stress responses
- 39 2- Effects on memory
- 40 3- Effects on social behavior
- 41 4- Effects on feeding behavior
- 42 II- The gut microbiota of farm animals
- 43 1- Investigation of the GUT-M in farm animals
- 44 2- Variations in the GUT-M linked to the host
- 45 3- Variations of the GUT-M linked to the environment
- 46 III- Effect of the microbiota-gut-brain axis on behavior in farm animals
- 47 1- Effects on emotional reactivity and anxiety-like behavior
- 48 2- Effects on memory
- 49 3- Effects on social behavior
- 50 4- Effects on feeding behavior
- 51 IV- Prospective of the microbiota-gut-brain axis concept in the welfare of farm animals
- 52 1- Selecting the host GUT-M
- 53 2- Improving behavior *via* nutrition and the GUT-M
- 54 3- Improving management practices through the GUT-M

- 55 4- Needs for improved tools to use the MGBA
- 56 Conclusion

57

### 58 Introduction

59

60 The gut microbiota (GUT-M) has received increased interest for several years because it is involved in many functions in humans and animals. The GUT-M is composed of bacteria, archaea, viruses and 61 62 eukaryotes (including protozoa and fungi). The GUT-M has been demonstrated to influence immune 63 function for years and to have wide impacts on health. Moreover, impairments of gut health can lead 64 to many intestinal diseases and to dysbiosis, an unbalance in GUT-M, which facilitates many 65 pathological states involving infections with pathogens or metabolic disorders [1-4]. The GUT-M has 66 also a pivotal role in many extra-intestinal tissues and in various developmental processes and 67 metabolism in host organs such as the liver, adipose tissue, bone, etc [5]. The brain is also a major 68 target of the GUT-M because the microbiota produces metabolites and neurochemicals. At the same 69 time, neurotransmitters like epinephrine and norepinephrine from the host influence the growth and 70 virulence of bacteria [6]. The relationship between the GUT-M and the brain, so called microbiota-71 gut-brain axis (MGBA) includes influences upon brain development, neural processes (such as 72 myelination or neurogenesis), pain processes, the hypothalamo-pituitary axis (HPA) and behavior [7]. 73 The MGBA is also called microbiome-gut-brain axis by some authors, since the microbiome consists 74 of not only the microbiota, but also microbiota genomes and products [8]. Although some methods 75 used to investigate the MGBA have been recently criticized [9], there are more and more studies 76 describing the influence of the GUT-M on the central nervous system (CNS) and the mechanisms 77 involved in this interaction. The influence of the GUT-M on behavior is increasingly reported in 78 rodents using germ-free animals (living in the absence of detectable living microorganisms) or in 79 rodents and humans following the use of special diets affecting GUT-M composition, or microbiota 80 transfer [10-16] using antibiotics or probiotics (live strains of strictly selected microorganisms which, 81 when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host (see [17] for 82 definitions). These studies demonstrate that there is increasing evidence that changes in the GUT-M

83	affect physiological and behavioral processes that are directly relevant to welfare such as stress,
84	anxiety, changes in social behavior and memory. Whilst demonstrations of the influence of the GUT-
85	M on behavior in farm animals remain scarce, manipulation of the microbiota in farm animals by
86	supplying probiotics is common to improve production. Therefore, a critical examination of the
87	influence of the GUT-M on behavior would be especially interesting from an animal welfare
88	perspective.
89	This review aims at summarizing the influence of the MGBA on behavior in rodents and humans and
90	to point out what has been observed in farm animals. Moreover, because the GUT-M varies
91	according to host genetics and many external factors (Figure 1), we suggest that the GUT-M could be
92	used to improve behavior and welfare on the farm.
93	
94	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and
94 95	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models
94 95 96	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models
94 95 96	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models
94 95 96 97	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the
94 95 96 97 98	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of
94 95 96 97 98 99	<ul> <li>I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models</li> <li>There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of interaction between the GUT-M and the brain have been identified, including the immune and the</li> </ul>
94 95 96 97 98 99 100	<ul> <li>I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models</li> <li>There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of interaction between the GUT-M and the brain have been identified, including the immune and the enteroendocrine pathways, the enteric nervous system and the vagus nerve (Figure 2). Products of</li> </ul>
94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of interaction between the GUT-M and the brain have been identified, including the immune and the enteroendocrine pathways, the enteric nervous system and the vagus nerve (Figure 2). Products of bacterial metabolism and structural components of bacterial cell walls influence a wide range of
94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of interaction between the GUT-M and the brain have been identified, including the immune and the enteroendocrine pathways, the enteric nervous system and the vagus nerve (Figure 2). Products of bacterial metabolism and structural components of bacterial cell walls influence a wide range of processes including host immune responses (e.g. cytokines) and activation of enteroendocrine cells
94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of interaction between the GUT-M and the brain have been identified, including the immune and the enteroendocrine pathways, the enteric nervous system and the vagus nerve (Figure 2). Products of bacterial metabolism and structural components of bacterial cell walls influence a wide range of processes including host immune responses (e.g. cytokines) and activation of enteroendocrine cells which can affect the nervous system locally and systemically. The enteric nervous system is a major
94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104	I – The gut microbiota and its impact on brain development and behavior in rodent and human models There is increasing evidence that the microbiota can influence host behavior. Most of the investigations on behavior have focused on the GUT-M in vertebrates where various routes of interaction between the GUT-M and the brain have been identified, including the immune and the enteroendocrine pathways, the enteric nervous system and the vagus nerve (Figure 2). Products of bacterial metabolism and structural components of bacterial cell walls influence a wide range of processes including host immune responses (e.g. cytokines) and activation of enteroendocrine cells which can affect the nervous system locally and systemically. The enteric nervous system is a major interface between the GUT-M and the host and it forms the most complex of intrinsic nerve circuits

106 many aspects of the CNS and intimately interfaces with it *via* the autonomic nervous system.

107 Although seldom recognized, the number of neurons in the enteric nervous system is comparable to

108 the number of neurons in the spinal cord, leading some authorities to refer to the enteric nervous 109 system as the "second brain" or the "little brain" [18]. Moreover, research has demonstrated that 80 110 percent of the vagus nerve fibres carry information from the gut to the brain, rather than the other 111 way round [19]. Thus, the vagus nerve is a major pathway of the MGBA as demonstrated by surgical 112 sections that abolish the effect of the GUT-M on the brain and on behavior in mice [20-23]. 113 Conversely, the brain modulates the physiology of the gut, the enteric immune system and the 114 composition of the GUT-M. This influence can impair gut activity especially during host stress [24-26]. 115 The GUT-M can additionally influence the behavior of host's conspecifics through sensory cues even 116 if they are not considered usually as constitutive of the MGBA [27]. These cues are mainly olfactory 117 [28] but the GUT-M could even be related with visual cues in some cases: in pigeons for example [29], GUT-M composition is related to feather microbiota composition and the bacterial load on the 118 119 plumage has been shown to influence the iridescent color of the feathers which is a fitness cue for 120 the congeners.

121

122

### 1- Effects on anxiety-like behavior and stress responses

123 The question of the role of the GUT-M in anxiety-like behavior was raised following the pioneering 124 study of Sudo et al. [30] which showed hyperactivity of the HPA axis under stress conditions in germ-125 free mice (without any microbiota) compared to specific pathogen-free mice. Other teams have 126 subsequently confirmed the influence of the GUT-M on the development and regulation of the stress 127 response system [13,14,16,31]. In addition, patients with gastro intestinal disorders such as irritable 128 bowel syndrome (IBS) also have a deregulation of HPA axis activity [32,33]. Consequently, a link 129 between the MGBA and anxiety-like behavior is not surprising and a significant modification of 130 anxiety-like behavior has been observed in germ-free rodents compared with specific pathogen-free 131 rodents in various tests [34-39]. These studies reveal the importance of the genetic background in 132 the influence of the GUT-M on behavior. Indeed, the absence of GUT-M leads to increased anxiety133 like behavior in rodent strains genetically prone to exacerbate emotionality (F344 rats and BALB/c 134 mice) [11,12] and provoked a reduction of anxiety-like behavior in moderately emotive strains (NMRI 135 and Swiss mice) [37,38]. The germ-free rodent studies represent a large part of the literature on the 136 MGBA concept. Nevertheless, the germ-free animal presents several important physiological 137 alterations compared to a colonized one such as a reduction of the growth, alterations of the 138 digestive functions or immune system impairments ([40] for review), thus it is not easy to 139 demonstrate that the behavioral modifications observed in these animals are a direct consequence 140 of the absence of GUT-M rather than of physiological changes. However, some authors have tried to 141 reinforce the role of the presence of GUT-M in their studies by re-introducing standard microbiota 142 into these germ-free animals and have observed a reversal of behavioral responses following 143 bacterial colonization [37,39]. When it is not completely abolished, the GUT-M can be modified by 144 the use of antibiotics. BALB/c mice treated with a mixture of nonabsorbable antimicrobials 145 (bacitracin, neomycin and pimaricin) for seven days showed reduced anxiety-like behavior compared 146 to controls in a light-dark box test [20]. Similarly, the low doses of penicillin in late pregnancy and 147 early postnatal life induced long-term changes of microbiota composition and behavior. The 148 antibiotic-treated mice exhibited impaired anxiety-like and social behaviors, and displayed a 149 higher level of aggression in several tests, while concurrent Lactobacillus rhamnosus JB-1 probiotic 150 supplementation prevented some of those alterations [41]. However, these results must be 151 interpreted cautiously because antibiotic treatments are known to have neuroactive and neurotoxic 152 potential. Regardless or in addition to their microbicidal effects, the antibiotics themselves may also 153 influence enteric, peripheral and central nervous system functions [10]. 154 Probiotics are live naturally occurring microorganisms which can improve health directly or indirectly 155 by inhibiting growth and attachment of pathogens and favor the development of the intestinal 156 epithelium and the immune responses. A probiotic can be used alone or in combination with other

- 157 probiotics, a cocktail of microorganisms that may have different or common properties [42]. The
- 158 exact mechanisms through which probiotics provide benefits are being studied and may differ

159 depending on the specific formulation. These mechanisms include modifications of the pH of the 160 gastrointestinal tract, the provision of nutrients to the host, the production of antimicrobial or 161 signaling molecules, competition with pathogens for ecological niches and available nutrients, 162 promotion of the intestinal cell differentiation and turnover, increased mucus production and 163 maturation of the immune system. Many studies in the literature suggest an anxiolytic effect of some 164 probiotics. Mice treated with the probiotic Lactobacillus rhamnosus expressed reduced anxiety 165 compared to control mice during the elevated plus maze [33] and a chronic administration of 166 Lactobacillus plantarum leads to lower anxiety-like behavior in the open-field and elevated plus maze 167 tests [43]. More demonstrative yet, Bercik et al. [44] showed that a daily gavage with the probiotic 168 Bifidobacterium longum can normalize anxiety-like behavior in mice with infectious colitis in the step-169 down test and a supplementation with the probiotic Lactobacillus helveticus has led to a reduction 170 of chronic stress-induced anxiety and depression in rats [45]. Messaoudi et al. [46] investigated the 171 effect of a mixture of two probiotics (Lactobacillus helveticus and Bifidobacterium longum) on 172 rodents and human volunteers. In both cases, a decrease in anxiety was revealed. Infection with 173 pathogenic bacteria is another way to modify the composition of the GUT-M, which often leads to 174 increased anxiety-like behavior in rodents. An infection of mice with Campylobacter jejuni or 175 Citrobacter rodentium exacerbated anxiety-like behavior compared to control mice in different 176 situations such as the elevated plus maze or the hole-board open field test [19,47,48]. Furthermore, 177 the anxiogenic effects of these infections were not the result of an immunological response but 178 appeared to be a direct action of bacteria on neural activation pathways [19,47]. However, one of 179 the most striking experiment on the influence of the GUT-M on anxiety-like behavior is the study of 180 Bercik et al. [20] who carried out a GUT-M transfer between a low (NIH Swiss) and a high (BALB/C) 181 anxiety-like mouse strains presenting different microbial profiles based on denaturing gradient gel 182 electrophoresis (DGGE). The germ-free BALB/c mice that received the GUT-M from the opposite 183 mouse strain were less anxious than the controls BALB/c mice during the step-down test. In contrast, 184 germ-free NIH Swiss mice responded more anxiously than controls during the same test. Therefore,

this experiment suggests that the GUT-M would be involved in the anxiety-like phenotype of these
mice. Taken together, these findings suggest a significant influence of the MGBA on anxiety-like
behavior.

188

189 2- Effects on memory

190 It is now increasingly recognized that the GUT-M communicates with the brain and acts on several 191 brain structures such as the amygdala, the cortex and the hippocampus that all have a key role in 192 memory processes [12,37,40]. Moreover, the relationship between anxiety and memory and learning 193 has been widely demonstrated, suggesting an effect of the GUT-M on cognitive abilities [30,49,50]. 194 This idea is supported by results obtained when comparing germ-free mice and specific pathogen-195 free mice in the novel object test and the T-maze test [15]. In both tests, the germ-free mice 196 displayed memory deficits. Consistent with these findings, treatment with an antibiotic formulation 197 resulted in a cecal composition shift with reduction of Firmicutes and Bacteroidetes and increase of 198 Proteobacteria and Cyanobacteria and a decrease in memory capacities in mice subjected to novel 199 object recognition test and social transmission of food preference test [51]. The influence of an 200 antibiotic treatment on memory may nevertheless depend on the number of antibiotic products 201 used and the sensitivity of the bacteria to this antibiotic. For example, in the Morris water maze the 202 vancomycin antibiotic had no significant effect on murine memory despite a significant alteration of 203 fecal microbiota [2]. The gut microbiota may also have different effects depending on the type of 204 memory assessed. In a recent study, a treatment with an antibiotic mixture strongly disrupted 205 microbial composition of mice and impaired novel object recognition but not spatial memory in the 206 Barnes maze test [52]. Studies on probiotics supplementation agree that there are beneficial effects 207 on memory performance in rodents [33,45,53-55]. Works conducted on pathogenic infections (with 208 E. coli or C. rodentium) reported deleterious effects on memory in the mouse [15,56] and, in both 209 cases, a treatment with probiotics attenuated these memory impairments. However, it is important

to emphasize that only the study of Smith et al. [54] performed a GUT-M composition analysis
following probiotic administration and reported significant changes in the fecal microbiota of the
mice. In humans also, improvement of emotional memory after probiotic administration has been
associated with changes in GUT-M community composition [57].

214 An alternative strategy for modifying the microbiota is to use dietary prebiotics. Prebiotics are 215 fermentable oligosaccharides or polysaccharides that induce the growth of some gut bacteria that 216 increase gut health. Unabsorbed or undigested carbohydrates are fermented by the gut microbiota 217 in the large bowel, producing different end products like short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) and lactic 218 acid, which may have multiple effects. For example, it has been described that oral administration of 219 fructo-oligosaccharides (FOS) and galacto-oligosaccharides (GOS) affects behavior and specifically 220 anxiety, depression-like behavior, cognition, and social behavior. These modifications are related to 221 specific gene expression in the hippocampus and hypothalamus, gut microbiota composition, several 222 SCFAs produced, and elevations in corticosterone and pro-inflammatory cytokine levels [6]. 223 Modifications of the GUT-M through changes in raw materials of the diet appear also to influence 224 cognitive abilities. An enrichment of beef in the diet of mice increases the microbial diversity in the 225 colon and their memory scores in the hole-board apparatus [58]. A diet characterized by a high-fat

226 composition also leads to differences in GUT-M composition and to memory impairments in the227 mouse and the rat [29,59,60].

However, studies are still needed to strengthen a causal relationship between GUT-M changes and
 memory abilities in these nutrition experiments.

230

### 231 3- Effects on social behavior

The MGBA seems to be also involved in other highly emotional behaviors such as social behavior.
This behavior is impaired in germ-free rats in a test which consists of measuring behavior during an
encounter with an unknown partner [36]. During the 2 minutes of the test, compared to specific

235 pathogen-free rats, the germ-free rats spend less time sniffing an unknown. These results are 236 consistent with what Desbonnet et al. [24] found in a mouse model tested in the 3-chambered 237 sociability test. The germ-free mice displayed social preference deficits by spending less time 238 exploring a chamber containing a mouse than an empty chamber. In addition, when the germ-free 239 mice are post-weaning colonized, their behavioral responses are reversed in the same test. However, 240 this result could not be replicated in a subsequent study using the same mouse strain and the same 241 3-chambered test in which the authors observed opposite results [35]. Indeed, germ-free mice 242 expressed greater social preference than specific pathogen-free mice. The authors assumed that the 243 difference in the age of the germ-free mice between the two studies could be the explanation for the 244 contradictory findings. They also mentioned the hyperactive behavioral responses of the mice in the 245 Arentsen et al. work [35] and the differences in living conditions of the specific pathogen-free mice 246 (isolators rearing in a study and not in the other). More recently, social behavior impairments and 247 dysbiosis in the gut have also been reported in mouse offspring from mothers fed with a high-fat diet 248 [61]. Interestingly, a probiotic (Lactobacillus reuteri) supplementation in the drinking water during 4 249 weeks led to the normalization of social behavior and this reversal of the social deficits involved the 250 vagal pathway. In conclusion, all these data indicate that the GUT-M is required for a normal 251 expression of social behavior in rodents. Moreover, differences of GUT-M composition have been 252 revealed between autistic and control patients in an expanding volume of studies [42,62-64]. 253 Similarly, altered GUT-M composition and social deficits have also been noted in a murine model of 254 ASD [65,66]. These mice are characterized by disturbed anxiety-like and stereotyped behavior similar 255 to those observed with germ-free mice [38]. An administration of probiotic Bacteroides fragilis has 256 improved many of these behaviors including anxiety-like behavior (open-field exploration), 257 communication deficits (ultrasonic vocalizations) and stereotyped behavior [65]. More interestingly, 258 Sandler et al. [67] tested the effect of an antibiotic on 11 children with regressive-onset autism. Significant behavioral improvements were noticed during the treatment period and the behavioral 259 260 improvements disappeared after the treatment. It has also been recently demonstrated that

261 *Lactobacillus reuteri* rescues social deficits in various mouse models for ASD based on genetic,
262 environmental and idiopathic alterations [68].

263

264 *4-* Influence on feeding behavior

Fetissov [69] suggested that the bacteria-host communication influences the appetite-satiety balance in humans and rodents. First, bacterial components and metabolites have been shown to stimulate satiety pathways in the host in the short term through the stimulation of endocrine cells involved and the production of peptides related to feed intake [70,71]. Secondly, bacterial peptides use systemic routes and might act directly in the hypothalamus and so play a role in the long-term regulation of appetite. Moreover, the GUT-M appears to be involved in the expression of taste receptors in rodents [72,73].

It is now recognized that the MGBA is involved in many behavioral responses in humans and rodents and interventions with probiotics reinforce the theory of the influence of the GUT-M on behavior and the cognitive abilities. However, it is also important to note that the causal mechanisms by which the GUT-M and the brain communicate are not well described or understood and further investigations are needed to shed light on this microbiota-gut-brain axis communication.

277

### 278 II- The gut microbiota of farm animals

279

There is an increasing knowledge about the composition of GUT-M of farm animals (ruminants, horse, pig, rabbit, chicken, turkey, *etc*). Indeed, it is very important to characterize the GUT-M in farm animals so that it is possible to detect normal and abnormal changes. This knowledge should help to define and identify dysbiosis and to restore a healthy GUT-M. It should also help to predict susceptibility to infection and prevent welfare and health problems since GUT-M composition is involved in the control of pathogen colonization [74,75]. However, understanding GUT-M

286 composition is a complex issue since it varies along the digestive tract and there are also differences

287 between lumen and mucosa, and even between the tip of the villi and the crypt. Moreover, GUT-M

variations are induced by many factors related to the host and to the host environment.

289

290

### 1- Investigation of the GUT-M in farm animals

291 While the GUT-M is composed of bacteria, but also viruses, archea and eukaryotes and while 292 bacteriophages have been shown to have an important role in bacteria composition, most studies 293 only take into account the bacterial composition of the GUT-M. This is in line with methods available 294 to measure this composition since there are more libraries of bacteria available for 16S rRNA gene 295 sequencing than for viruses, archea and eukaryotes. Several methods are used to characterize the 296 the GUT-M. The 16S rRNA gene sequencing directed by PCR, is commonly used to quantify GUT-M 297 diversity and is effective in demonstrating the major phyla, families or genuses, but sometimes gives 298 limited resolution. The table provides the characteristics of GUT-M bacteria in the main farm species 299 (cow, sheep, horse, pig, rabbit, chicken, quail, duck) established by 16S rRNA gene sequencing. This 300 table gives the composition at phylum level and sheds light on the large variation found within host 301 species. Though not the main focus of this review, it is clear that accurate descriptions of the 302 composition (at the genus or the species level) of the bacteria in different parts of the digestive tract 303 greatly help us to understand the effects of host and external factors of modulation on the GUT-M 304 ([71] in cow for example). Quantitative metagenomic shotgun sequencing also aims at investigating 305 diversity directly from samples but can be technically challenging and is less frequently used. Other 306 approaches look for GUT-M functionality by metatranscriptomics (RNA sequencing), metaproteomics 307 (Mass spectrometry) or metabolomics (High resolution spectroscopy).

308 Each gut compartment hosts a microbiota with a particular composition and many studies

investigated GUT-M composition along the digestive tract ([76] in pigs; [77] in horses; [78] in quail).

310 In horses for example, the composition of the GUT-M collected in the lumen is very different in 311 caecum and colon compared to the upper compartments (stomach, jejunum and ileum) and is 312 different from the GUT-M from mucosa [77]. In this example, data suggest that analysis from feces 313 would be related to colonic segments only, but would not be related to upper compartments. 314 Numerous studies use fecal samples to avoid animal sacrifice, which could be misleading. 315 Gut microbiota of the small intestine, caecum and colon in healthy adults is dominated by bacterial 316 species belonging to two main phyla, Gram positive Firmicutes and Gram negative Bacteroidetes 317 (Table). The small intestine is usually dominated by Firmicutes with major families including 318 Lactobacillaceae, Peptostreptococcaceae or Enterococcaceae. Microbial complexity considerably 319 increases in distal parts of intestinal tract, i.e. in the caecum and colon. It is important to remember, 320 however, that the descriptions of the gut microbiota leave out many important factors such as host 321 genetics, age or feed regime (see below) that may give rise to much greater variation. These factors 322 may affect microbiota development and composition in the youngest animals and the differential 323 development in early days of life.

324

### 325 2- Variations in the GUT-M linked to the host

326 The host genetics affects the GUT-M in numerous ways and this impact is related to inter and intra 327 species differences in the GUT-M [79]. Domestication has also induced changes in GUT-M 328 composition. For example, a metagenomic approach followed by a quantitative PCR showed that the 329 GUT-M in wild Suidae (wild boars and Red river hogs) was characterized by a high abundance in 330 Bifidobacterium which was not the case in domesticated Suidae characterized by abundance in 331 Lactobacillus and Enterobacteriaceae as the major family [80]. It is important to note that diet was 332 not controlled and thus confounded with genetics in this study. However, it has been demonstrated 333 in domesticated pigs from the Pietrain strain that pig genome influences the GUT-M in the mid-colon 334 and that the heritability of the load of some bacteria can even reach high values such as 0.32 to 0.57

335 [81]. Differences in the GUT-M related to host genetics have also been established between lines of 336 the same species. With chicken lines selected on body weight, Zhao et al. [82] demonstrated that the 337 host genotype and gender affected 68 out of 190 GUT-M species and that among them 15 belonged 338 to Lactobacillus. Genetic selection on Salmonella carriage in chickens enabled the detection of 339 Quantitative Trait Locis (QTLs) for both resistance to carrier state and resistance to Salmonella 340 colonization [83,84]. Some bacterial families can be affected particularly by host genotype: in Pekin 341 and Muscovy ducks for example, genotype affects Lachnospiracecae, Bacteroidaceae and 342 Desulfovibrionaceae in the cecum, while overfeeding affects other families such as Clostridiaceae, 343 Lactobacillaceae, Streptococcaceae and Enterococcaceae [85]. A divergent genetic selection on 344 increased digestive efficiency in chickens was linked to changes in the GUT-M and has enabled the 345 detection of QTLs related to the presence of some GUT-M bacteria [86]. In chickens, QTL for the 346 presence of bacteria such as Lactobacillus and L. crispatus co-localize with QTLs for feeding behavior 347 [87]. Host genetics would then influence both the behavioral phenotype and GUT-M composition. It 348 is highly probable that behavior and the GUT-M influence each other as it has been demonstrated in 349 stress processes where the brain influences gut peristaltis and GUT-M composition while the GUT-M 350 interacts with CNS and the HPA axis [13].

The age of the host is also a major factor and the ontogeny of the GUT-M has been studied in many farm animals. The changes during early life have been described in several farm animals (chick: [88]; calf: [89,90]; piglet: [91]; foal: [92]). Microbial colonization is a complex process influenced by the host and many external factors, including maternal microbiota, birth process, early diet, perinatal stress and antibiotics use.

356

357

358 3- Variations of the GUT-M linked to the environment

359 The environment dramatically influences the newborn's GUT-M. In mammals, the contact of the 360 newborn animal with its mother is physiologically indispensable and during parturition, the offspring 361 is naturally inoculated with microbiota from the mother. However, in case of avian farm species, the 362 young birds are industrially hatched, which means that eggs are disinfected and chicks reared 363 without any contact with their mother or any older conspecific and the source of microbiota is thus 364 limited to the environment. This way of husbandry is in sharp conflict with the natural conditions, 365 where the mother bird represents the principal source of the GUT-M. Experimentally, young chicks 366 reared in a sanitized environment with no contact with older conspecifics had profoundly different 367 microbiota compared with chicks which were kept for 24 hours with the adult hen [93]. 368 Other external factors such as infections can give rise to unbalance in the GUT-M. For example, early 369 exposure to pathogenic bacteria can shape the overall microbiota composition in chicks infected with 370 Salmonella Enteritidis inducing an expansion in the Enterobacteriacecae [94] and exposures to 371 *Campylobacter jejuni* revealed that the shift of the GUT-M varies upon the age at which the chickens 372 become colonized by this bacteria [95]. Parasitism can also influence GUT-M composition and the 373 interplay between helminths and the bacterial populations is being elucidated. The various ways 374 both populations influence each other are complex [96] and suggest that a better knowledge of the 375 gut microbiota of nematodes themselves could lead to a better prevention of parasitic diseases [97]. 376 Throughout life, housing conditions influence cecal microbiota in rabbits [98] and pigs [99] showing 377 that environmental bacterial load influence the GUT-M. Breeding in different rearing systems can 378 also influence GUT-M composition at the phylum level. For example, Bacteroidetes and 379 Proteobacteria were more prevalent in chickens reared under free-range conditions than in cages, 380 but this difference was manifested only in one of both lines [100]. Stocking density can influence crop and cecal microbiota composition in chickens [101]. Rearing conditions inducing stress can also 381 382 influence the GUT-M. In horses for example, weaning and transport are stressful events and both can 383 affect the GUT-M composition [102,103]. In Mach's experiment, foals' microbiota was modified 384 during the first week after weaning until a relatively stable gut community was established at day 7

385 post-weaning. This modification can be partly explained by the nutritional change, however GUT-M 386 composition after weaning was slightly modulated by the weaning method suggesting that the stress 387 induced by the abrupt method has impacted the microbiota modification. An experiment in pigs has 388 shown that even mild handling stressor such as single daily weighing is able to alter the GUT-M [104]. 389 Another very important external modulation of the GUT-M is given by the feed which may drastically 390 influence GUT-M composition and activity. Such influences are being increasingly studied since diets, 391 or the water bacterial load, may induce unbalance in the GUT-M and lead to pathological states. Such 392 unbalance can lead to dysbiosis and then enteritis, or to other diseases targeting some other organs 393 such as lungs, since unbalance gives rise to inflammation of the gut wall and facilitate bacteria 394 leakage across the epithelial wall. This modulation by the diet has mainly been investigated in farm 395 animals and reviewed in many animal species [105] for review in horses; [106] in chicken; [107] in 396 piglets, [85,108] in ducks, etc). Most of these studies compare diets based on high fiber with diets 397 containing raw materials providing high energy levels. Other nutritional means used to modify the 398 GUT-M are the provision of prebiotics or probiotics. Prebiotics are fermentable oligosaccharides or 399 polysaccharides that induce the growth of some gut bacteria that increase gut health while, as 400 previously mentioned, probiotics are microorganisms which improve animal health directly or 401 indirectly by producing substrates that stimulate growth of commensals, inhibit growth of 402 pathogens, favor the development of the intestinal epithelium and the immune responses. Probiotics 403 are largely used in animal nutrition to improve gut health, increase feed efficiency and milk quality 404 [42,109] and it has been demonstrated in piglets that they can influence serotonin and dopamine 405 concentrations in the hypothalamus [110]. They are also use to prevent the effects of stressful events 406 such as transportation in horses for example [111] but this improvement is not always related to a 407 change in the GUT-M as mentioned by a meta-analysis carried out in calves [109]. Lactic acid bacteria 408 are commonly used as probiotics, and their impact on gut health, immunity and the prevention of 409 the establishment of pathogenic bacteria has been increasingly studied.

410	Farm animal GUT-M can thus vary with a wide range of factors each of which have many different
411	consequences but the results on behavior are weakly documented and rarely taken into account.
412	Furthermore, only few studies have used GUT-M manipulations to disentangle effects of nutritional
413	or environmental factors and GUT-M effects.

414

### 415 III- Effect of the microbiota-gut-brain axis on behavior in farm animals

416

417 There is emerging evidence that the GUT-M is able to influence behavior in farm animals as has been 418 shown in rodents and humans. Colonization of farm animals with a pathogen was known to induce 419 sickness behavior for a long time, but recent studies demonstrate that the influence of the MGBA is 420 not limited to the area of disease and can also occur in healthy animals. Studies based on germ-free 421 animals, provisions of probiotics or prebiotics, diet modifications, demonstrated that changes in the 422 GUT-M are related with changes in many behavioral patterns. Because of the size of farm animals, 423 this influence of the MGBA has been established mainly with studies using probiotics while very few 424 studies on germ-free animals are available since these animals must be kept in isolators.

425

426

### 1- Effects on emotional reactivity and anxiety-like behavior

A recent experiment with germ-free birds demonstrated that the absence of GUT-M reduces emotional reactivity in Japanese quail in fear and social perturbation situations without major influence on growth [112]. The authors used germ-free quail chicks that were kept germ-free or inoculated with a dilution of GUT-M from adults of the same line. Quail chicks were reared and tested in isolators in order to avoid contamination. Germ-free quails spent less time in tonic immobility, were less reactive during the social separation test and were less neophobic in a novel object test than inoculated quail chicks. The use of a GUT-M transfer has also demonstrated the 434 influence of microbiota on emotional reactivity in this species [113]. The authors used genetic lines of 435 quails that have been selected for either a high fearfulness (E+) or a low fearfulness (E-). Germ-free 436 quail chicks from the E+ line were inoculated with feces from either a E+ quail or from a E- quail and 437 were reared in different isolators. Quails that received feces from the E- line expressed a lower 438 emotional reactivity during the second week of age than the quails colonized by feces from the E+ 439 line. This result was reversed two weeks later. These behavioral differences can be related to GUT-M 440 differences and modifications over time and they could be the consequence of the resilience of the 441 GUT-M to recover its equilibrium present in the E+ host, which is in part driven by the host genotype. 442 Abdel-Azeem et al. [114] showed that the administration of the probiotic Bacillus amyloliquefaciens 443 helped to reduce distress calls in turkeys and the supplementation of the diet with a probiotic (Pediococcus acidilactici) reduced emotional reactivity in quails [115]. 444 445 In horses, the relationship between the GUT-M and behavior has been suggested by correlations 446 obtained in fistulated horses submitted to behavioral tests before and after a nutritional change 447 [116]. The modification of the diet from a fibrous diet with 100% hay to a diet with increased energy 448 (57% hay and 43% barley) induced significant increases of colonic total anaerobic bacteria, lactate-449 utilizing bacteria and amylolytic bacteria concentrations. After this transition, the horses were 450 submitted to a sociability test where behavior was analyzed when an unfamiliar horse was 451 introduced into the adjacent stall and to a neophobia test assessed from the reaction to the presence 452 of a novel object placed near a feeder in a test arena. The time spent in vigilance during the 453 sociability test tended to positively correlate with cecal and colonic amylolytic bacteria 454 concentrations while the time spent in vigilance during novel object test was correlated with caecal 455 lactate-utilizing and colonic amylolytic bacteria concentrations.

456

457 *2- Effects on memory* 

458 As in rodents, probiotics have been shown to enhance memory in quail: supplemented birds made 459 fewer errors in a test where they had to remember the cup they had previously visited among eight 460 rewarded cups [115]. In Yucatan pigs, differences in the maternal diet during gestation and lactation have been used to modify microbiota activity in the sows and their offspring [117]. Sows were either 461 462 fed a standard diet or a Western diet enriched in energy, sugar and fat. SCFAs used to measure 463 microbiota activity were decreased in sows fed the Western diet and in their piglets. Piglets from 464 sows fed the Western diet, i.e with reduced GUT-M activity, had higher working memory in a hole 465 board test where they had to learn where were the bowls that contained chocolate-coated peanuts 466 among unrewarded bowls.

467

### 468 *3- Effects on social behavior*

469 Using probiotics, it has been shown that spores of Bacillus amyloquefaciens decrease aggression in 470 turkeys [114]. However, the most promising information was obtained for feather pecking behavior 471 in hens. Gentle feather pecking is considered as a normal social exploratory behavior and consists in 472 a soft pecking while severe feather pecking is an intense pecking and pulling out feathers which can 473 induce pain in the victim. This injurious behavior considered as an abnormal behavior have been recently supposed to be associated with the MGBA. Indeed, it has been shown that divergently 474 475 selected lines of hens for severe feather pecking also differ in hens' GUT-M [118] and in immunity 476 [119]. Nevertheless, it is still not possible to decide conclusively whether differences in feather 477 pecking induced difference in the GUT-M or whether differences in the GUT-M induced difference in 478 behavior via the MGBA [120]. The latter explanation agrees with data about GUT-M metabolites such 479 as total SCFAs and biogenic amines since both were also different between these lines [121] and 480 SCFAs have been shown to be involved in the MGBA and influence social behavior. Differences in the 481 gene expression of two genes (ABCB1 and TNSF15) involved in inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) are 482 also been reported between birds expressing feather pecking or not [122]. Moreover, the serotonin whose synthesis depends on various bacterial families in the GUT-M [49,50,123,124] is also involved in feather pecking behavior in hens [120]. Ingestion of feathers could lead to an increase of gut wall stimulation and therefore an impaired serotonin signalling [125]. These data would then be in agreement with an influence of GUT-M activity on the development of feather pecking through the MGBA. Brunberg et al. [125] proposed to investigate if the differences in GUT-M composition are already present in the young chick before the development of feather pecking behavior in order to characterize the main direction of the microbiota-gut-brain interactions in this model.

490

### 491 4- Effects on feeding behavior

492 Gut pathogens may induce illnesses states that are commonly accompanied by reduction in feed 493 intake but some other influences of the GUT-M on feeding behavior can be found in farm animals. 494 In turkeys, spores of Bacillus amyloquefaciens have been shown to increase feeding frequency and 495 duration [114]. The genetic lines of chickens divergently selected on feed efficiency we previously 496 mentioned differ in feeding behavior and a QTL for feeding behavior co-localizes with QTLs for some 497 bacteria from the GUT-M [87]. This co-localization suggests an influence of these bacteria on eating 498 behavior but this influence still need to be strengthened by experiments using GUT-M manipulation. 499 Changes in feeding behavior induced by the MGBA are suspected in ruminants when they are 500 affected by acidosis which occurs with high-energy low-fiber diets. Eating behavior can be modified 501 with rumen liquor transplantation when cows are affected by acidosis [126] and even if pain 502 alleviation or inflammation reduction can also explain the effect on eating behavior, this veterinary 503 practice suggests that rumen microbiota influences appetite in such pathological state. In cows 504 affected by subacute acidosis, ruminal GUT-M is modified [127] and feeding behavior is affected with 505 a reduced feed intake and a reduced duration of rumination. Saccharomyces cerevisiae, a probiotic 506 commonly used in ruminants, has a protective effect on physiological changes induced by acidosis 507 such as reduction of the ruminal pH, changes in volatile fatty acids [42,128] and it has been shown to

508 induce also behavioral changes such as reduction of the minimum interval between meals and

tendency for longer time spent ruminating [129].

This limited information about the influence of the MGBA on behavior in farm animals suggests that it can have large influences that have not been properly appreciated. These influences of the GUT-M on behavior can be added to its influence on health *via* its role in the immune response and tends to put the GUT-M as a pivotal actor for welfare state achievement [130].

514

515 IV- Prospective of the microbiota-gut-brain axis concept in the welfare of farm animals

516

517 The concept of the MGBA leads us to reconsider many factors that can influence behavior and health 518 in farm animals. The influence of the MGBA will have to be taken into account in future and that 519 may drastically change genetic selection, infection detection, nutrition and management processes. 520 Furthermore, the improvement of gastrointestinal functionality is of the utmost importance because 521 it positively influences health and welfare of animals, but also performance by preventing loss in feed 522 efficiency and the use of antibiotics.

523

### 524 1 Selecting the host GUT-M

Even if a recent article demonstrated that the human GUT-M is shaped more by environmental factors than by human genome [131], we should not underestimate the influence of the host genetics on the colonization of the gut by the microbiota. Several studies have demonstrated that the host genome influences the composition of the GUT-M. For example, a study from twins has identified many microbial taxa whose abundances were influenced by host genetics [132] and associations between host single nucleotide polymorphisms and bacterial taxa have been described [133]. The host gut is able to select the microbiota it encounters and only part of the bacteria present 532 in the gut are able to develop in it. This explains why different genetic lines reared in similar 533 conditions and fed the same diets have different GUT-M compositions. Selection for different genotypes could then lead to differences in GUT-M and consequently in behavior, immunity and feed 534 535 efficiency [134]. As previously mentioned, selection for increased feed efficiency has led to 536 differences in GUT-M in chickens and several QTLs are related to these differences in GUT-M 537 composition and co-localize with loci involved in feeding behavior [87]. Moreover, these lines 538 divergently selected for feed efficiency also differ in emotional reactivity. It appears then that these 539 differences in behavior may have been driven by the effect of selection on the host genes involved in 540 behavior, but also on the genes involved in GUT-M carriage.

A better understanding of the relationship between the host genome, the GUT-M and deleterious behaviors would be of great interest for animal welfare. A comprehensive link between the GUT-M and feather pecking could lead to alternative strategies for selection against this damaging behavior. As previously indicated, many rearing situations can induce stress and are related with changes in the GUT-M. It appears then that when stressful situations cannot be avoided, selection for resilient GUT-M would help reducing anxiety-like and depressive-like behaviors.

547

### 548

### 2 Improving behavior via nutrition and the GUT-M

The MGBA concept should have large consequences in livestock nutrition. Diet composition (use of 549 550 prebiotics or probiotics or raw materials) is already carefully checked to favor a good GUT-M and gut 551 health. However, it appears with the MGBA that diet composition will also have to be designed for desired behaviors or to ensure a "good" neurobiological development when more data are available. 552 553 Supplementation with pre- or probiotics would be useful before or during stressful events such as 554 manipulation or transport, to avoid the activation of the HPA axis and anxiety-like behaviors. The 555 provision of various amino acids modifies GUT-M composition but the consequences on behavior are 556 poorly documented. In chickens, provision of tryptophan has been shown to modify the GUT-M [135] 557 and to reduce serum corticosterone, serotonin and heat shock protein 70. These results can be 558 related with other studies demonstrating that tryptophan metabolism into serotonin is involved in 559 feather pecking behavior [136] and that its supplementation can reduce gentle feather pecking 560 behavior in this species [137]. Moreover, a better understanding of the roles of GUT-M in feeding 561 behavior, especially in modulation of appetite and satiety, could have large consequences on animal 562 nutrition. Animal nutrition is presently based on our knowledge of needs and the ability of various 563 diets to fulfil these needs but if it is considered that the GUT-M also modulates appetite and satiety 564 as shown in rodents and humans, this could have large consequences on feed preferences and intake 565 if it is established in farm animal. In future, nutritional rules for farm animals could be improved by 566 increased knowledge about the way bacterial growth modulates the digestive cues related to satiety 567 and taste, and about peptides produced by bacteria that could be involved in the hypothalamic 568 regulation of appetite. A better understanding of appetite regulation would help managing feed 569 intake, feed frustration and anorexia related to disease states.

570 From a practical point of view, provision of pre- or probiotics in addition to the diet is the easiest way 571 to influence the GUT-M via nutrition. Prebiotics and probiotics can have complementary effects, 572 however there are expensive contrary to the modifications of the feed composition. For poultry, 573 probiotics could be fed at the hatchery in order to improve gut colonization. In ovo injection of 574 prebiotics or a combination of pre-and probiotic at the 12<sup>th</sup> day of the embryonic development has 575 been shown to influence host transcription and appears to stimulate the proliferation of the 576 embryonic GUT-M [138,139]. We need more studies to quantify the long-term effect on health and 577 behavior of such provision of pre- or probiotics at the hatchery. An exciting new perspective on GUT-578 M - host symbiosis comes from the finding that pioneer colonizers, the first bacteria to reach the 579 neonatal gut, will impact the future health since they can directly influence the development of the 580 intestine and the nutrient matrix it provides for sequential implantation of future microorganisms 581 [140].

In mammals, the GUT-M can even be orientated before birth since the maternal diet can influence GUT-M composition in the offspring. As previously mentioned in rodents [141], the maternal diet can influence GUT-M activity in the offspring and this modulation can influence social behavior. In piglets, GUT-M activity (measured by quantitative analysis of SCFAs) is reduced and responses to reward are modified when sows are fed with a high-sugar and fat diet during pregnancy [117]. Such demonstrations suggest that nutrition of breeders may be able to modulate behavior in the offspring and that this has to be investigated in farm animals.

589

## 590

### 0 3- Improving management practices through the GUT-M

591 Many husbandry situations can give rise to stress states during animal rearing and this state may 592 modify GUT-M composition which can reinforce the negative effects of stress. Based on these 593 interactions described among the MGBA, it appears that protecting a balanced GUT-M would help in 594 the management of stress [13,142] and this would help preventing infection [24]. We saw that most 595 of studies focusing on behavior used probiotics that were able to decrease stress cues [114,115] and 596 to modify behavior and prevent various diseases such as acidosis in ruminants [128,143]. Nutritional 597 transition focusing specific GUT-M changes could also help reducing stress since we saw in horses 598 that these GUT-M changes due to increased diet energy are related to behavioral stress response 599 related to particular bacteria [116].

A better knowledge about the MGBA of the farm animal would also help to detect silent infections and then modify the management of many diseases. Changes in behavior are commonly used to detect illness. Inflammatory states are commonly associated with changes in a reduction of comfort and feeding behavior and in motivation for social interactions. However, some pathogens do not induce illness cues at animal level and this asymptomatic carrier state prevents the detection of such infections. The existence of the MGBA suggests that changes in behavior could happen, even if the host does not express classical sickness behavior commonly associated with disease. This would explain why the presence of Campylobacter, a bacterium that is involved in a foodborne toxiinfection in human, can be detected by automated behavioral analysis of poultry flocks [144] while
no clinical cue can be detected in chickens carrying this bacterium. Another example is given with
chickens that have been infected by *Salmonella* Enteritidis and that are also considered as
asymptomatic carriers. While no clinical cue can be detected in each infected chick, changes in
behavior occur during the weeks and sometimes the days following infection: reduction in feeding
[145], in inter-individual distances and in running bouts [146].

614

615

### 5 4- Needs for improved tools to use the MGBA

616 This enhanced understanding requires improved methods. The use of germ-free animals (mainly rodents but also chicks) has been critical to our understanding of how the GUT-M can influence 617 618 health, disease, and behavior especially when coupled with mono-association (inoculation with a 619 single bacterial strain), defined microbiota, or humanized microbiota strategies. To circumvent some 620 of the physiological disadvantages of germ-free and mono-associated mice (poor barrier effect, 621 maturation of immune response and intestine development) while still maintaining a controlled 622 microbiota, mice reconstituted with defined microbiota were established. Schaedler initiated these 623 studies by defining key cultivable bacteria, which were experimentally inoculated to germ-free mice 624 in various "cocktails" of aerobes and anaerobes [147,148]. The cocktail was refined and standardized 625 resulting in "altered Schaedler's flora" (ASF) that is now most commonly used in gnotobiotic research 626 and companies [149]. The ASF community offers significant advantages to study homeostatic as well 627 as disease-related interactions by taking advantage of a well-defined, limited community of 628 microorganisms. Now, it would be interesting to develop such cocktails of bacteria for each farm 629 animal species to go further in the MGBA studies.

Additionally, moving forward, we face a number of challenges in each animal model. For example,
the vast majority of intestinal microorganisms remain uncultivable. Can novel culture methods or

creative strategies to eliminate selectively targeted agents be developed? How to include other GUTM members like viruses, protozoa and fungi in the MGBA analyzes? How do we avoid microbiota drift
to optimize reproducibility among studies? Can microbiota be banked adequately for future studies?
Facing these issues is a great challenge to improve our knowledge about the MGBA in farm animals.

636

### 637 Conclusion

638

639 Thanks to the many ways of manipulating the GUT-M (germ-free, antibiotics, probiotics, diet, 640 microbiota transfer), it is increasingly recognized that the microorganisms colonizing the host's 641 digestive tract can directly or indirectly act on the nervous system and influence host behavior. The 642 majority of studies on the subject have used rodent or human models and it seems that the GUT-M 643 can influence emotional behavior, memory capacities, social and feeding behavior also in poultry, 644 pig, horse and ruminants. However, germ-free animals reared and kept in isolators are poor models 645 for farm animals and it will be a big step to apply results to the farm environment. Many studies are 646 correlational and the presence of specific microorganisms is not controlled experimentally while 647 investigations with microbiota reconstitutions that reverse behavioral changes and investigate 648 mechanisms are still lacking. Many methodological issues have to be faced to get a better knowledge 649 about the variations of the GUT-M, the role it can play in the MGBA of the farm animal and how it 650 could help reducing certain deleterious behaviors and increasing behavioral adaptation via genetic 651 selection, nutrition, stress management and detection of silent infections. In summary, it is 652 necessary to take this MGBA concept into account in an applied interest to farming conditions since 653 it can have large consequences in animal welfare.

654

655 Acknowledgement

- This work has been supported by EraNet ANIHWA, H2020 cofound EJP OneHealth-MoMIR-PPC and
- 657 PHASE department from INRA. IR and PV have been partially supported by project
- 658 CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16\_025/0007404 from the Czech Ministry of Education.
- 659
- 660

### 661 Table and figure captions

- Table: Taxonomic profiles of major gut bacterial communities at the phylum level in farm animals
- using 16 rRNA gene pyrosequencing (Percentage of sequences assigned), based on [89], [150], [77],
- 664 [151], [98], [95], [78], [85].
- 665 Figure 1: Gut microbiota as a key actor for animal welfare
- 666 Figure 2: Influence of the microbiota-gut-brain axis on behavior

### 667 References

- 668 [1] J. C. Alverdy, J. N. Luo, The Influence of Host Stress on the Mechanism of Infection: Lost
  669 Microbiomes, Emergent Pathobiomes, and the Role of Interkingdom Signaling, Front.
  670 Microbiol. 8 (2017), doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00322.
- S. M. O'Mahony, V. D. Felice, K. Nally, H. M. Savignac, M. J. Claesson, P. Scully, J. Woznicki, N.
  P. Hyland, F. Shanahan, E. M. Quigley, J. R. Marchesi, P. W. O'Toole, T. G. Dinan, J. F. Cryan,
  Disturbance of the gut microbiota in early-life selectively affects vusceral pain in adulthood
  without impacting cognitive or anxiety-related behaviors in male rats, NeuroSci. 277 (2014)
  885-901, doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2014.07.054.
- T. R. Sampson, J. W. Debelius, T. Thron, S. Janssen, G. G. Shastri, Z. E. Ilhan, C. Challis, C. E.
  Schretter, S. Rocha, V. Gradinaru, M.-F. Chesselet, A. Keshavarzian, K. M. Shannon, R.
  Krajmalnik-Brown, P. Wittung-Stafshede, R. Knight, S. K. Mazmanian, Gut Microbiota
  Regulate Motor Deficits and Neuroinflammation in a Model of Parkinson's Disease, Cell 167
  (2016) 1469-1480, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.11.018.
- [4] B. L. Williams, M. Hornig, T. Buie, M. L. Bauman, M. C. Paik, I. Wick, A. Bennett, O. Jabado, D.
  [52] L. Hirschberg, W. I. Lipkin, Impaired Carbohydrate Digestion and Transport and Mucosal
  [63] Dysbiosis in the Intestines of Children with Autism and Gastrointestinal Disturbances, PLoS
  [684 One 6 (2011), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0024585.
- F. Sommer, F. Backhed, The gut microbiota masters of host development and physiology,
  Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 11 (2013) 227-238, doi:10.1038/nrmicro2974.
- 687 [6] A. Burokas, S. Arboleya, R. D. Moloney, V. L. Peterson, K. Murphy, G. Clarke, C. Stanton, T. G.
  688 Dinan, J. F. Cryan, Targeting the Microbiota-Gut-Brain Axis: Prebiotics Have Anxiolytic and
  689 Antidepressant-like Effects and Reverse the Impact of Chronic Stress in Mice, Biol. Psychiatry
  690 82 (2017) 472-487, doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.12.031.

691 [7] J. Bienenstock, W. Kunze, P. Forsythe, Microbiota and the gut-brain axis, Nut. Rev. 73 (2015) 692 28-31, doi:10.1093/nutrit/nuv019. M. J. Tetel, G. J. de Vries, R. C. Melcangi, G. Panzica, S. M. O'Mahony, Steroids, stress and the 693 [8] 694 gut microbiome-brain axis, J. Neuroendocrinol. 30 (2018), doi:10.1111/jne.12548. [9] 695 K. B. Hooks, J. P. Konsman, M. A. O'Malley, Microbiota-gut-brain research: a critical analysis, 696 The Behavioral and brain sciences (2018) 1-40, doi:10.1017/s0140525x18002133. 697 [10] K. Champagne-Jorgensen, W. A. Kunze, P. Forsythe, J. Bienenstock, K.-A. M. Neufeld, 698 Antibiotics and the nervous system: More than just the microbes?, Brain Behavior and 699 Immunity 77 (2019) 7-15, doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2018.12.014. 700 [11] S. M. Collins, M. Surette, P. Bercik, The interplay between the intestinal microbiota and the 701 brain, Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 10 (2012) 735-742, doi:10.1038/nrmicro2876. 702 [12] J. F. Cryan, T. G. Dinan, Mind-altering microorganisms: the impact of the gut microbiota on 703 brain and behaviour, Nat. Rev. Neurosci. 13 (2012) 701-712, doi:10.1038/nrn3346. 704 [13] T. G. Dinan, J. F. Cryan, Regulation of the stress response by the gut microbiota: Implications 705 for psychoneuroendocrinology, Psychoneuroendocrinol. 37 (2012) 1369-1378, 706 doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2012.03.007. 707 [14] J. A. Foster, K.-A. M. Neufeld, Gut-brain: how the microbiome influences anxiety and 708 depression, Trends Neurosci. 36 (2013) 305-312, doi:10.1016/j.tins.2013.01.005. 709 [15] M. G. Gareau, E. Wine, D. M. Rodrigues, J. H. Cho, M. T. Whary, D. J. Philpott, G. MacQueen, 710 P. M. Sherman, Bacterial infection causes stress-induced memory dysfunction in mice, Gut 60 711 (2011) 307-317, doi:10.1136/gut.2009.202515. 712 [16] T. R. Sampson, S. K. Mazmanian, Control of Brain Development, Function, and Behavior by 713 the Microbiome, Cell Host & Microbe 17 (2015) 565-576, doi:10.1016/j.chom.2015.04.011. 714 [17] P. Markowiak, K. Slizewska, The role of probiotics, prebiotics and synbiotics in animal 715 nutrition, Gut Pathogens 10 (2018), doi:10.1186/s13099-018-0250-0. 716 [18] M. D. Gershon, The enteric nervous system: A second brain, Hospital Pract. 34 (1999) 31-52, 717 doi:10.3810/hp.1999.07.153. M. Lyte, J. J. Varcoe, M. T. Bailey, Anxiogenic effect of subclinical bacterial infection in mice in 718 [19] 719 the absence of overt immune activation, Physiology & Behavior 65 (1998) 63-68, 720 doi:10.1016/s0031-9384(98)00145-0. 721 [20] P. Bercik, E. Denou, J. Collins, W. Jackson, J. Lu, J. Jury, Y. Deng, P. Blennerhassett, J. Macri, K. 722 D. McCoy, E. F. Verdu, S. M. Collins, The Intestinal Microbiota Affect Central Levels of Brain-723 Derived Neurotropic Factor and Behavior in Mice, Gastroenterol. 141 (2011) 599-U701, 724 doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2011.04.052. 725 [21] J. A. Bravo, P. Forsythe, M. V. Chew, E. Escaravage, H. M. Savignac, T. G. Dinan, J. 726 Bienenstock, J. F. Cryan, Ingestion of Lactobacillus strain regulates emotional behavior and 727 central GABA receptor expression in a mouse via the vagus nerve, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S. 728 A. 108 (2011) 16050-16055, doi:10.1073/pnas.1102999108. 729 [22] P. Forsythe, J. Bienenstock, W. A. Kunze, Vagal Pathways for Microbiome-Brain-Gut Axis 730 Communication. in Microbial Endocrinology: The Microbiota-Gut-Brain Axis in Health and 731 Disease Vol. 817 Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology (eds M. Lyte & J. F. Cryan) 732 115-133 (2014) doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-0897-4\_5. 733 [23] P. Bercik, A. J. Park, D. Sinclair, A. Khoshdel, J. Lu, X. Huang, Y. Deng, P. A. Blennerhassett, M. 734 Fahnestock, D. Moine, B. Berger, J. D. Huizinga, W. Kunze, P. G. McLean, G. E. Bergonzelli, S. 735 M. Collins, E. F. Verdu, The anxiolytic effect of Bifidobacterium longum NCC3001 involves 736 vagal pathways for gut-brain communication, Neurogastroenterol. Motility 23 (2011) 1132-737 E1544, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2982.2011.01796.x. 738 [24] L. Desbonnet, G. Clarke, F. Shanahan, T. G. Dinan, J. F. Cryan, Microbiota is essential for social 739 development in the mouse, Molecular Psychiatry 19 (2014) 146-148, 740 doi:10.1038/mp.2013.65.

741	[25]	A. Bharwani, M. F. Mian, J. A. Foster, M. G. Surette, J. Bienenstock, P. Forsythe, Structural &
742		functional consequences of chronic psychosocial stress on the microbiome & host,
743		Psychoneuroendocrinol. 63 (2016) 217-227, doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2015.10.001.
744	[26]	P. P. E. Freestone, S. M. Sandrini, R. D. Haigh, M. Lyte, Microbial endocrinology: how stress
745		influences susceptibility to infection, Trends Microbiol. 16 (2008) 55-64,
746		doi:10.1016/j.tim.2007.11.005.
747	[27]	J. Bienenstock, W. A. Kunze, P. Forsythe, Disruptive physiology: olfaction and the
748		microbiome-gut-brain axis, Biological Reviews 93 (2018) 390-403, doi:10.1111/brv.12348.
749	[28]	O. Maraci, K. Engel, B. A. Caspers, Olfactory Communication via Microbiota: What Is Known
750		in Birds?, Genes 9 (2018), doi:10.3390/genes9080387.
751	[29]	B. P. Jorgensen, J. T. Hansen, L. Krych, C. Larsen, A. B. Klein, D. S. Nielsen, K. Josefsen, A. K.
752		Hansen, D. B. Sorensen, A Possible Link between Food and Mood: Dietary Impact on Gut
753		Microbiota and Behavior in BALB/c Mice, PLoS One 9 (2014),
754		doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103398.
755	[30]	N. Sudo, Y. Chida, Y. Aiba, J. Sonoda, N. Oyama, X. N. Yu, C. Kubo, Y. Koga, Postnatal microbial
756		colonization programs the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal system for stress response in
757		mice, J. Physiol. London 558 (2004) 263-275, doi:10.1113/jphysiol.2004.063388.
758	[31]	S. H. Rhee, C. Pothoulakis, E. A. Mayer, Principles and clinical implications of the brain-gut-
759		enteric microbiota axis, Nature Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 6 (2009) 306-314,
760		doi:10.1038/nrgastro.2009.35.
761	[32]	I. B. Jeffery, P. W. O'Toole, L. Ohman, M. J. Claesson, J. Deane, E. M. M. Quigley, M. Simren,
762		An irritable bowel syndrome subtype defined by species-specific alterations in faecal
763		microbiota, Gut 61 (2012) 997-1006, doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2011-301501.
764	[33]	P. J. Kennedy, J. F. Cryan, T. G. Dinan, G. Clarke, Irritable bowel syndrome: A microbiome-gut-
765		brain axis disorder?, World J. Gastroenterol. 20 (2014) 14105-14125,
766		doi:10.3748/wjg.v20.i39.14105.
767	[34]	L. Zeng, B. Zeng, H. Wang, B. Li, R. Huo, P. Zheng, X. Zhang, X. Du, M. Liu, Z. Fang, X. Xu, C.
768		Zhou, J. Chen, W. Li, J. Guo, H. Wei, P. Xie, Microbiota Modulates Behavior and Protein
769		Kinase C mediated cAMP response element-binding protein Signaling, Sci. Reports 6 (2016),
770		doi:10.1038/srep29998.
771	[35]	T. Arentsen, H. Raith, Y. Qian, H. Forssberg, R. Diaz Heijtz, Host microbiota modulates
772		development of social preference in mice, Microbial Ecol. Health and Disease 26 (2015)
773		29719-29719, doi:10.3402/mehd.v26.29719.
774	[36]	M. Crumeyrolle-Arias, M. Jaglin, A. Bruneau, S. Vancassel, A. Cardona, V. Dauge, L. Naudon, S.
775		Rabot, Absence of the gut microbiota enhances anxiety-like behavior and neuroendocrine
776		response to acute stress in rats, Psychoneuroendocrinol. 42 (2014) 207-217,
777		doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2014.01.014.
778	[37]	R. D. Heijtz, S. Wang, F. Anuar, Y. Qian, B. Bjorkholm, A. Samuelsson, M. L. Hibberd, H.
779		Forssberg, S. Pettersson, Normal gut microbiota modulates brain development and behavior,
780		Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S. A. 108 (2011) 3047-3052, doi:10.1073/pnas.1010529108.
781	[38]	K. M. Neufeld, N. Kang, J. Bienenstock, J. A. Foster, Reduced anxiety-like behavior and central
782		neurochemical change in germ-free mice, Neurogastroenterol. Motility 23 (2011),
783		doi:10.1111/j.1365-2982.2010.01620.x.
784	[39]	R. Nishino, K. Mikami, H. Takahashi, S. Tomonaga, M. Furuse, T. Hiramoto, Y. Aiba, Y. Koga, N.
785		Sudo, Commensal microbiota modulate murine behaviors in a strictly contamination-free
786		environment confirmed by culture-based methods, Neurogastroenterol. Motility 25 (2013),
787		doi:10.1111/nmo.12110.
788	[40]	P. Luczynski, KA. M. Neufeld, C. S. Oriach, G. Clarke, T. G. Dinan, J. F. Cryan, Growing up in a
789		Bubble: Using Germ-Free Animals to Assess the Influence of the Gut Microbiota on Brain and
790		Behavior, International J. Neuropsychopharmacol. 19 (2016), doi:10.1093/ijnp/pyw020.
791	[41]	S. Leclercq, F. M. Mian, A. M. Stanisz, L. B. Bindels, E. Cambier, H. Ben-Amram, O. Koren, P.
792		Forsythe, J. Bienenstock, Low-dose penicillin in early life induces long-term changes in

793 murine gut microbiota, brain cytokines and behavior, Nature Comm. 8 (2017), 794 doi:10.1038/ncomms15062. 795 [42] M. De Angelis, M. Piccolo, L. Vannini, S. Siragusa, A. De Giacomo, D. I. Serrazzanetti, F. 796 Cristofori, M. E. Guerzoni, M. Gobbetti, R. Francavilla, Fecal Microbiota and Metabolome of 797 Children with Autism and Pervasive Developmental Disorder Not Otherwise Specified, PLoS 798 One 8 (2013), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076993. 799 [43] A. I. Herrero, C. Sandi, C. Venero, Individual differences in anxiety trait are related to spatial 800 learning abilities and hippocampal expression of mineralocorticoid receptors, Neurobiol. 801 Learn. Mem. 86 (2006) 150-159, doi:10.1016/j.nlm.2006.02.001. 802 [44] P. Bercik, A. J. Park, D. Sinclair, A. Khoshdel, J. Lu, X. Huang, Y. Deng, P. A. Blennerhassett, M. 803 Fahnestock, D. Moine, B. Berger, J. D. Huizinga, W. Kunze, P. G. Mclean, G. E. Bergonzelli, S. 804 M. Collins, E. F. Verdu, The anxiolytic effect of Bifidobacterium longum NCC3001 involves 805 vagal pathways for gut-brain communication, Neurogastroenterology and Motility 23 (2011) 806 1132-1139, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2982.2011.01796.x. 807 [45] S. Liang, T. Wang, X. Hu, J. Luo, W. Li, X. Wu, Y. Duan, F. Jin, Administration of Lactobacillus 808 Helveticus NS8 improves behavioral, cognitive and biochemical aberrations caused by 809 chronic restraint stress, NeuroSci. 310 (2015) 561-577, 810 doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.09.033. 811 [46] M. Messaoudi, R. Lalonde, N. Violle, H. Javelot, D. Desor, A. Nejdi, J.-F. Bisson, C. Rougeot, M. Pichelin, M. Cazaubiel, J.-M. Cazaubiel, Assessment of psychotropic-like properties of a 812 813 probiotic formulation (Lactobacillus helveticus R0052 and Bifidobacterium longum R0175) in rats and human subjects, Brit. J. Nut. 105 (2011) 755-764, doi:10.1017/s0007114510004319. 814 815 [47] M. Lyte, W. Li, N. Opitz, R. P. A. Gaykema, L. E. Goehler, Induction of anxiety-like behavior in 816 mice during the initial stages of infection with the agent of murine colonic hyperplasia 817 Citrobacter rodentium, Physiology & Behavior 89 (2006) 350-357, 818 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2006.06.019. 819 [48] L. E. Goehler, S. M. Park, N. Opitz, M. Lyte, R. P. A. Gaykema, Campylobacter jejuni infection 820 increases anxiety-like behavior in the holeboard: Possible anatomical substrates for 821 viscerosensory modulation of exploratory behavior, Brain Behavior and Immunity 22 (2008) 822 354-366, doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2007.08.009. 823 [49] W. R. Wikoff, A. T. Anfora, J. Liu, P. G. Schultz, S. A. Lesley, E. C. Peters, G. Siuzdak, 824 Metabolomics analysis reveals large effects of gut microflora on mammalian blood 825 metabolites, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S. A. 106 (2009) 3698-3703, 826 doi:10.1073/pnas.0812874106. 827 [50] H. Wang, Y. H. Kwon, V. Dewan, F. Vahedi, S. Syed, M. E. Fontes, A. A. Ashkar, M. G. Surette, 828 W. I. Khan, TLR2 Plays a Pivotal Role in Mediating Mucosal Serotonin Production in the Gut, J. 829 Immunol. 202 (2019) 3041-3052, doi:10.4049/jimmunol.1801034. 830 [51] L. Desbonnet, G. Clarke, A. Traplin, O. O'Sullivan, F. Crispie, R. D. Moloney, P. D. Cotter, T. G. 831 Dinan, J. F. Cryan, Gut microbiota depletion from early adolescence in mice: Implications for 832 brain and behaviour, Brain Behavior and Immunity 48 (2015) 165-173, 833 doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2015.04.004. 834 [52] E. E. Froehlich, A. Farzi, R. Mayerhofer, F. Reichmann, A. Jacan, B. Wagner, E. Zinser, N. 835 Bordag, C. Magnes, E. Froehlich, K. Kashofer, G. Gorkiewicz, P. Holzer, Cognitive impairment 836 by antibiotic-induced gut dysbiosis: Analysis of gut microbiota-brain communication, Brain 837 Behavior and Immunity 56 (2016) 140-155, doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2016.02.020. 838 [53] H. M. Savignac, M. Tramullas, B. Kiely, T. G. Dinan, J. F. Cryan, Bifidobacteria modulate 839 cognitive processes in an anxious mouse strain, Behav. Brain Res. 287 (2015) 59-72, 840 doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2015.02.044. 841 C. J. Smith, J. R. Emge, K. Berzins, L. Lung, R. Khamishon, P. Shah, D. M. Rodrigues, A. J. Sousa, [54] 842 C. Reardon, P. M. Sherman, K. E. Barrett, M. G. Gareau, Probiotics normalize the gut-brain-843 microbiota axis in immunodeficient mice, American J. Physiol.: Gastrointestinal and Liver 844 Physiol. 307 (2014) G793-G802, doi:10.1152/ajpgi.00238.2014.

- 845 [55] S. Davari, S. A. Talaei, H. Alaei, M. Salami, Probiotics treatment improves diabetes-induced
  846 impairement of synaptic activity and cognitive function: behavioral and electrophysiological
  847 proffs for microbiome-gut brain axis, NeuroSci. 240 (2013) 287-296,
  848 doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2013.02.055.
- S. E. Jang, S. M. Lim, J. J. Jeong, H. M. Jang, H. J. Lee, M. J. Han, D. H. Kim, Gastrointestinal
  inflammation by gut microbiota disturbance induces memory impairment in mice, Mucosal
  Immunol. 11 (2018) 369-379, doi:10.1038/mi.2017.49.
- Bagga, J. L. Reichert, K. Koschutnig, C. S. Aigner, P. Holzer, K. Koskinen, C. Moissl-Eichinger,
  V. Schoepf, Probiotics drive gut microbiome triggering emotional brain signatures, Gut
  Microbes 9 (2018) 486-496, doi:10.1080/19490976.2018.1460015.
- 855 [58] W. Li, S. E. Dowd, B. Scurlock, V. Acosta-Martinez, M. Lyte, Memory and learning behavior in
  856 mice is temporally associated with diet-induced alterations in gut bacteria, Physiology &
  857 Behavior 96 (2009) 557-567, doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2008.12.004.
- A. J. Bruce-Keller, J. M. Salbaum, M. Luo, E. Blanchard, C. M. Taylor, D. A. Welsh, H.-R.
  Berthoud, Obese-type Gut Microbiota Induce Neurobehavioral Changes in the Absence of
  Obesity, Biol. Psychiatry 77 (2015) 607-615, doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.07.012.
- [60] T. Chunchai, W. Thunapong, S. Yasom, K. Wanchai, S. Eaimworawuthikul, G. Metzler, A.
  [60] T. Chunchai, W. Thunapong, S. Yasom, K. Wanchai, S. Eaimworawuthikul, G. Metzler, A.
  [60] Lungkaphin, A. Pongchaidecha, S. Sirilun, C. Chaiyasut, W. Pratchayasakul, P. Thiennimitr, N.
  [63] Chattipakorn, S. C. Chattipakorn, Decreased microglial activation through gut-brain axis by
  [64] prebiotics, probiotics, or synbiotics effectively restored cognitive function in obese-insulin
  [65] resistant rats, J. Neuroinflammation 15 (2018), doi:10.1186/s12974-018-1055-2.
- 866 [61] S. A. Buffington, G. V. Di Prisco, T. A. Auchtung, N. J. Ajami, J. F. Petrosino, M. Costa-Mattioli,
  867 Microbial Reconstitution Reverses Maternal Diet-Induced Social and Synaptic Deficits in
  868 Offspring, Cell 165 (2016) 1762-1775, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.06.001.
- S. M. Finegold, D. Molitoris, Y. L. Song, C. X. Liu, M. L. Vaisanen, E. Bolte, M. McTeague, R.
  Sandler, H. Wexler, E. M. Marlowe, M. D. Collins, P. A. Lawson, P. Summanen, M. Baysallar, T.
  J. Tomzynski, E. Read, E. Johnson, R. Rolfe, P. Nasir, H. Shah, D. A. Haake, P. Manning, A. Kaul,
  Gastrointestinal microflora studies in late-onset autism. in *Clinical Infectious Diseases* Vol. 35
  S6-S16 (2002) doi:10.1086/341914.
- [63] S. M. Finegold, S. E. Dowd, V. Gontcharova, C. Liu, K. E. Henley, R. D. Wolcott, E. Youn, P. H.
  Summanen, D. Granpeesheh, D. Dixon, M. Liu, D. R. Molitoris, J. A. Green, III, Pyrosequencing
  study of fecal microflora of autistic and control children, Anaerobe 16 (2010) 444-453,
  doi:10.1016/j.anaerobe.2010.06.008.
- [64] D.-W. Kang, J. G. Park, Z. E. Ilhan, G. Wallstrom, J. LaBaer, J. B. Adams, R. Krajmalnik-Brown,
   Reduced Incidence of Prevotella and Other Fermenters in Intestinal Microflora of Autistic
   Children, PLoS One 8 (2013), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0068322.
- [65] E. Y. Hsiao, S. W. McBride, S. Hsien, G. Sharon, E. R. Hyde, T. McCue, J. A. Codelli, J. Chow, S.
  882 E. Reisman, J. F. Petrosino, P. H. Patterson, S. K. Mazmanian, Microbiota Modulate Behavioral and Physiological Abnormalities Associated with Neurodevelopmental Disorders, Cell 155
  884 (2013) 1451-1463, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.11.024.
- [66] C. G. M. de Theije, H. Wopereis, M. Ramadan, T. van Eijndthoven, J. Lambert, J. Knol, J.
  Garssen, A. D. Kraneveld, R. Oozeer, Altered gut microbiota and activity in a murine model of
  autism spectrum disorders, Brain Behavior and Immunity 37 (2014) 197-206,
  doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2013.12.005.
- R. H. Sandler, S. M. Finegold, E. R. Bolte, C. P. Buchanan, A. P. Maxwell, M. L. Vaisanen, M. N.
  Nelson, H. M. Wexler, Short-term benefit from oral vancomycin treatment of regressiveonset autism, J. Child Neurol. 15 (2000) 429-435, doi:10.1177/088307380001500701.
- M. Sgritta, S. W. Dooling, S. A. Buffington, E. N. Momin, M. B. Francis, R. A. Britton, M. CostaMattiolit, Mechanisms Underlying Microbial-Mediated Changes in Social Behavior in Mouse
  Models of Autism Spectrum Disorder, Neuron 101 (2019) 246-259,
  doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2018.11.018.

896 [69] S. O. Fetissov, Role of the gut microbiota in host appetite control: bacterial growth to animal 897 feeding behaviour, Nat. Rev. Endocrinol. 13 (2017) 11-25, doi:10.1038/nrendo.2016.150. 898 [70] P. D. Cani, C. Knauf, How gut microbes talk to organs: The role of endocrine and nervous 899 routes, Mol. Metabolism 5 (2016) 743-752, doi:10.1016/j.molmet.2016.05.011. 900 [71] S. Mao, M. Zhang, J. Liu, W. Zhu, Characterising the bacterial microbiota across the 901 gastrointestinal tracts of dairy cattle: membership and potential function, Sci. Reports 5 902 (2015), doi:10.1038/srep16116. 903 [72] F. A. Duca, T. D. Swartz, Y. Sakar, M. Covasa, Increased Oral Detection, but Decreased 904 Intestinal Signaling for Fats in Mice Lacking Gut Microbiota, PLoS One 7 (2012), 905 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039748. 906 [73] T. D. Swartz, F. A. Duca, T. de Wouters, Y. Sakar, M. Covasa, Up-regulation of intestinal type 1 907 taste receptor 3 and sodium glucose luminal transporter-1 expression and increased sucrose 908 intake in mice lacking gut microbiota, Brit. J. Nut. 107 (2012) 621-630, 909 doi:10.1017/s0007114511003412. 910 [74] W. A. Awad, C. Hess, M. Hess, Re-thinking the chicken-Campylobacter jejuni interaction: a review, Avian Pathol. 47 (2018) 352-363, doi:10.1080/03079457.2018.1475724. 911 912 Z. F. Han, T. Willer, L. Li, C. Pielsticker, I. Rychlik, P. Velge, B. Kaspers, S. Rautenschlein, [75] Influence of the Gut Microbiota Composition on Campylobacter jejuni Colonization in 913 914 Chickens, Infection Immunity 85 (2017), doi:10.1128/iai.00380-17. 915 [76] D. Crespo-Piazuelo, J. Estelle, M. Revilla, L. Criado-Mesas, Y. Ramayo-Caldas, C. Ovilo, A. I. 916 Fernandez, M. Ballester, J. M. Folch, Characterization of bacterial microbiota compositions 917 along the intestinal tract in pigs and their interactions and functions, Sci. Reports 8 (2018), 918 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-30932-6. 919 [77] A. C. Ericsson, P. J. Johnson, M. A. Lopes, S. C. Perry, H. R. Lanter, A Microbiological Map of 920 the Healthy Equine Gastrointestinal Tract, PLoS One 11 (2016), 921 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166523. 922 [78] N. Wilkinson, R. J. Hughes, W. J. Aspden, J. Chapman, R. J. Moore, D. Stanley, The 923 gastrointestinal tract microbiota of the Japanese quail, Coturnix japonica, App. Microbiol. 924 Biotechnol. 100 (2016) 4201-4209, doi:10.1007/s00253-015-7280-z. 925 [79] A. Kurilshikov, C. Wijmenga, J. Y. Fu, A. Zhernakova, Host Genetics and Gut Microbiome: 926 Challenges and Perspectives, Trends Immunol. 38 (2017) 633-647, 927 doi:10.1016/j.it.2017.06.003. K. Ushida, S. Tsuchida, Y. Ogura, A. Toyoda, F. Maruyama, Domestication and cereal feeding [80] 928 929 developed domestic pig-type intestinal microbiota in animals of suidae, Anim. Sci. J. 87 930 (2016) 835-841, doi:10.1111/asj.12492. 931 [81] A. Camarinha-Silva, M. Maushammer, R. Wellmann, M. Vital, S. Preuss, J. Bennewitz, Host 932 Genome Influence on Gut Microbial Composition and Microbial Prediction of Complex Traits 933 in Pigs, Genetics 206 (2017) 1637-1644, doi:10.1534/genetics.117.200782. 934 [82] L. L. Zhao, G. Wang, P. Siegel, C. He, H. Z. Wang, W. J. Zhao, Z. X. Zhai, F. W. Tian, J. X. Zhao, 935 H. Zhang, Z. K. Sun, W. Chen, Y. Zhang, H. Meng, Quantitative Genetic Background of the 936 Host Influences Gut Microbiomes in Chickens, Sci. Reports 3 (2013), doi:10.1038/srep01163. 937 [83] F. Calenge, P. Kaiser, A. Vignal, C. Beaumont, Genetic control of resistance to salmonellosis 938 and to Salmonella carrier-state in fowl: a review, Gen. Select. Evol. 42 (2010), 939 doi:10.1186/1297-9686-42-11. 940 [84] T. S. Tran, C. Beaumont, N. Salmon, M. Fife, P. Kaiser, E. Le Bihan-Duval, A. Vignal, P. Velge, F. 941 Calenge, A maximum likelihood QTL analysis reveals common genome regions controlling 942 resistance to Salmonella colonization and carrier-state, Bmc Genomics 13 (2012), 943 doi:10.1186/1471-2164-13-198. 944 F. Vasai, K. B. Ricaud, M. D. Bernadet, L. Cauquil, O. Bouchez, S. Combes, S. Davail, [85] 945 Overfeeding and genetics affect the composition of intestinal microbiota in Anas 946 platyrhynchos (Pekin) and Cairina moschata (Muscovy) ducks, Fems Microbiol. Ecol. 87 947 (2014) 204-216, doi:10.1111/1574-6941.12217.

- 948 [86] S. Mignon-Grasteau, A. Narcy, N. Rideau, C. Chantry-Darmon, M. Y. Boscher, N. Sellier, M.
  949 Chabault, B. Konsak-Ilievski, E. Le Bihan-Duval, I. Gabriel, Impact of Selection for Digestive
  950 Efficiency on Microbiota Composition in the Chicken, PLoS One 10 (2015),
  951 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0135488.
- S. Mignon-Grasteau, C. Chantry-Darmon, M. Y. Boscher, N. Sellier, E. Le Bihan-Duval, A.
  Bertin, Genetic Determinism of Fearfulness, General Activity and Feeding Behavior in
  Chickens and Its Relationship with Digestive Efficiency, Behav. Genet. 47 (2017) 114-124,
  doi:10.1007/s10519-016-9807-1.
- 956 [88] P. Videnska, K. Sedlar, M. Lukac, M. Faldynova, L. Gerzova, D. Cejkova, F. Sisak, I. Rychlik,
  957 Succession and Replacement of Bacterial Populations in the Caecum of Egg Laying Hens over
  958 Their Whole Life, PLoS One 9 (2014), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0115142.
- 959[89]E. Jami, A. Israel, A. Kotser, I. Mizrahi, Exploring the bovine rumen bacterial community from960birth to adulthood, Isme J. 7 (2013) 1069-1079, doi:10.1038/ismej.2013.2.
- 961 [90] S. J. Meale, F. Chaucheyras-Durand, H. Berends, L. L. Guan, M. A. Steele, From pre- to
  962 postweaning: Transformation of the young calf's gastrointestinal tract, J. Dairy Sci. 100 (2017)
  963 5984-5995, doi:10.3168/jds.2016-12474.
- 964 [91] R. Gresse, F. Chaucheyras-Durand, M. A. Fleury, T. Van de Wiele, E. Forano, S. Blanquet-Diot,
  965 Gut Microbiota Dysbiosis in Postweaning Piglets: Understanding the Keys to Health, Trends
  966 Microbiol. 25 (2017) 851-873, doi:10.1016/j.tim.2017.05.004.
- 967 [92]M. C. Costa, H. R. Stampfli, E. Allen-Vercoe, J. S. Weese, Development of the faecal968microbiota in foals, Equine Vet. J. 48 (2016) 681-688, doi:10.1111/evj.12532.
- 969 [93] T. Kubasova, M. Kollarcikova, M. Crhanova, D. Karasova, D. Cejkova, A. Sebkova, J.
  970 Matiasovicova, M. Faldynova, A. Pokorna, A. Cizek, I. Rychlik, Contact with adult hen affects
  971 development of caecal microbiota in newly hatched chicks, PLoS One 14 (2019),
  972 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0212446.
- 873 [94] K. Mon, P. Saelao, M. Halstead, G. Chanthavixay, H. Chang, L. Garas, E. Maga, H. Zhou,
  874 Salmonella enterica Serovars Enteritidis infection alters the indigenous microbiota diversity
  975 in young layer chicks, Front. Vet. Sci. 3 (2016) 55-72, doi:doi:10.3389/fvets.2015.00061.
- 976 [95] P. L. Connerton, P. J. Richards, G. M. Lafontaine, P. M. O'Kane, N. Ghaffar, N. J. Cummings, D.
  977 L. Smith, N. M. Fish, I. F. Connerton, The effect of the timing of exposure to Campylobacter
  978 jejuni on the gut microbiome and inflammatory responses of broiler chickens, Microbiome 6
  979 (2018), doi:10.1186/s40168-018-0477-5.
- 980 [96] M. M. Zaiss, N. L. Harris, Interactions between the intestinal microbiome and helminth 981 parasites, Parasite Immunol. 38 (2016) 5-11, doi:10.1111/pim.12274.
- 982 [97] G. Hogan, S. Walker, F. Turnbull, T. Curiao, A. A. Morrison, Y. Flores, L. Andrews, M. J.
  983 Claesson, M. Tangney, D. J. Bartley, Microbiome analysis as a platform R&D tool for parasitic
  984 nematode disease management, Isme J. (2019), doi:10.1038/s41396-019-0462-4.
- 985 [98] S. Combes, K. Massip, O. Martin, H. Furbeyre, L. Cauquil, G. Pascal, O. Bouchez, N. Le Floc'h,
  986 O. Zemb, I. P. Oswald, T. Gidenne, Impact of feed restriction and housing hygiene conditions
  987 on specific and inflammatory immune response, the cecal bacterial community and the
  988 survival of young rabbits, Animal 11 (2017) 854-863, doi:10.1017/s1751731116002007.
- 989 [99] N. Le Floc'h, C. Knudsen, T. Gidenne, L. Montagne, E. Merlot, O. Zemb, Impact of feed
   990 restriction on health, digestion and faecal microbiota of growing pigs housed in good or poor
   991 hygiene conditions, Animal 8 (2014) 1632-1642, doi:10.1017/s1751731114001608.
- 992 [100] J. Sun, Y. Wang, N. Li, H. Zhong, H. Xu, Q. Zhu, Y. Liu, Comparative Analysis of the Gut
  993 Microbial Composition and Meat Flavor of Two Chicken Breeds in Different Rearing Patterns,
  994 Biomed. Res. Int. (2018), doi:10.1155/2018/4343196.
- 995 [101] S. Guardia, B. Konsak, S. Combes, F. Levenez, L. Cauquil, J. F. Guillot, C. Moreau-Vauzelle, M.
  996 Lessire, H. Juin, I. Gabriel, Effects of stocking density on the growth performance and
  997 digestive microbiota of broiler chickens, Poult. Sci. 90 (2011) 1878-1889,
  998 doi:10.3382/ps.2010-01311.

- 999 [102] N. Mach, A. Foury, S. Kittelmann, F. Reigner, M. Moroldo, M. Ballester, D. Esquerre, J. Riviere,
  1000 G. Salle, P. Gerard, M. P. Moisan, L. Lansade, The Effects of Weaning Methods on Gut
  1001 Microbiota Composition and Horse Physiology, Front. Physiol. 8 (2017),
  1002 doi:10.3389/fphys.2017.00535.
- 1003 [103] E. Perry, T.-W. L. Cross, J. M. Francis, H. D. Holscher, S. D. Clark, K. S. Swanson, Effect of Road
  1004 Transport on the Equine Cecal Microbiota, J. Equine Vet. Sci. 68 (2018) 12-20,
  1005 doi:10.1016/j.jevs.2018.04.004.
- 1006 [104] S. E. Dowd, T. R. Callaway, J. Morrow-Tesch, Handling may cause increased shedding of
   1007 Escherichia coli and total coliforms in pigs, Foodborne Pathogens Disease 4 (2007) 99-102,
   1008 doi:10.1089/fpd.2006.53.
- 1009[105]V. Julliand, P. Grimm, The impact of diet on the hindgut microbiome, J. Equine Vet. Sci. 521010(2017) 23-28, doi:10.1016/j.jevs.2017.03.002.
- 1011 [106] Y. Shang, S. Kumar, B. Oakley, W. K. Kim, Chicken Gut Microbiota: Importance and Detection
   1012 Technology, Front. Vet. Sci. 5 (2018) 254-254, doi:10.3389/fvets.2018.00254.
- 1013 [107] M. K. Saraf, B. D. Piccolo, A. K. Bowlin, K. E. Mercer, T. LeRoith, S. V. Chintapalli, K. Shankar, T.
  1014 M. Badger, L. Yeruva, Formula diet driven microbiota shifts tryptophan metabolism from
  1015 serotonin to tryptamine in neonatal porcine colon, Microbiome 5 (2017),
  1016 doi:10.1186/s40168-017-0297-z.
- 1017 [108] F. Vasai, K. B. Ricaud, L. Cauquil, P. Daniel, C. Peillod, K. Gontier, A. Tizaoui, O. Bouchez, S.
  1018 Combes, S. Davail, Lactobacillus sakei modulates mule duck microbiota in ileum and ceca
  1019 during overfeeding, Poult. Sci. 93 (2014) 916-925, doi:10.3382/ps.2013-03497.
- [109] M. L. Signorini, L. P. Soto, M. V. Zbrun, G. J. Sequeira, M. R. Rosmini, L. S. Frizzo, Impact of probiotic administration on the health and fecal microbiota of young calves: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of lactic acid bacteria, Res. Vet. Sci. 93 (2012) 250-258, doi:10.1016/j.rvsc.2011.05.001.
- Interpretation
   Interpretating in the interpretation
   Interpretation
- [111] C. Faubladier, F. Chaucheyras-Durand, L. da Veiga, V. Julliand, Effect of transportation on
   fecal bacterial communities and fermentative activities in horses: Impact of Saccharomyces
   cerevisiae CNCM I-1077 supplementation, J. Anim. Sci. 91 (2013) 1736-1744,
   doi:10.2527/jas.2012-5720.
- 1032 [112] N. Kraimi, L. Calandreau, M. Biesse, S. Rabot, E. Guitton, P. Velge, C. Leterrier, Absence of Gut
   1033 Microbiota Reduces Emotional Reactivity in Japanese Quails (Coturnix japonica), Front.
   1034 Physiol. 9 (2018), doi:10.3389/fphys.2018.00603.
- 1035 [113] N. Kraimi, L. Calandreau, O. Zemb, K. Germain, C. Dupont, P. Velge, E. Guitton, S. Lavillatte, C.
   1036 Parias, C. Leterrier, Effects of a gut microbiota transfer on emotional reactivity in Japanese
   1037 quails (Coturnix japonica), J. Exp. Biol. (2019), doi:10.1242/jeb.202879.
- 1038[114]N. Abdel-Azeem, Do probiotics affect behavior of turkey poults?, J. Vet. Med. Anim. Health 51039(2013) 144-148, doi:10.5897/JVMAH2012.0196.
- 1040 [115] S. Parois, L. Calandreau, N. Kraimi, I. Gabriel, C. Leterrier, The influence of a probiotic
  1041 supplementation on memory in quail suggests a role of gut microbiota on cognitive abilities
  1042 in birds, Behav. Brain Res. 331 (2017) 47-53, doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2017.05.022.
- 1043 [116] A. Destrez, P. Grimm, F. Cezilly, V. Julliand, Changes of the hindgut microbiota due to high1044 starch diet can be associated with behavioral stress response in horses, Physiology &
  1045 Behavior 149 (2015) 159-164, doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.05.039.
- 1046 [117] D. Val-Laillet, M. Besson, S. Guerin, N. Coquery, G. Randuineau, A. Kanzari, H. Quesnel, N.
  1047 Bonhomme, J. E. Bolhuis, B. Kemp, S. Blat, I. Le Huerou-Luron, C. Clouard, A maternal
  1048 Western diet during gestation and lactation modifies offspring's microbiota activity, blood
  1049 lipid levels, cognitive responses, and hippocampal neurogenesis in Yucatan pigs, Faseb J. 31
  1050 (2017) 2037-2049, doi:10.1096/fj.201601015R.

- 1051 [118] P. Birkl, A. Bharwani, J. B. Kjaer, W. Kunze, P. McBride, P. Forsythe, A. Harlander-Matauschek,
  1052 Differences in cecal microbiome of selected high and low feather-pecking laying hens, Poult.
  1053 Sci. 97 (2018) 3009-3014, doi:10.3382/ps/pey167.
- 1054 [119] J. A. J. van der Eijk, T. B. Rodenburg, A. Lammers, Divergent selection on feather pecking
  affects coping style and microbiota composition. in *ISAE Conference 2017, Hoogeloon (NL)*.
  (eds L. Webb & L. Stadig)6 (2017).
- 1057 [120] E. N. de Haas, J. A. J. van der Eijk, Where in the serotonergic system does it go wrong?
  1058 Unravelling the route by which the serotonergic system affects feather pecking in chickens,
  1059 Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. (2018), doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.07.007.
- 1060 [121] B. Meyer, J. Zentek, A. Harlander-Matauschek, Differences in intestinal microbial metabolites
  1061 in laying hens with high and low levels of repetitive feather-pecking behavior, Physiology &
  1062 Behavior 110 (2013) 96-101, doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2012.12.017.
- 1063 [122] E. Brunberg, P. Jensen, A. Isaksson, L. Keeling, Feather pecking behavior in laying hens:
  1064 Hypothalamic gene expression in birds performing and receiving pecks, Poult. Sci. 90 (2011)
  1065 1145-1152, doi:10.3382/ps.2010-00961.
- 1066 [123] M. Lyte, Probiotics function mechanistically as delivery vehicles for neuroactive compounds:
   1067 Microbial endocrinology in the design and use of probiotics, Bioessays 33 (2011) 574-581,
   1068 doi:10.1002/bies.201100024.
- 1069 [124] M. Singhal, B. A. Turturice, C. R. Manzella, R. Ranjan, A. A. Metwally, J. Theorell, Y. Huang, W.
  1070 A. Alrefai, P. K. Dudeja, P. W. Finn, D. L. Perkins, R. K. Gill, Serotonin Transporter Deficiency is
  1071 Associated with Dysbiosis and Changes in Metabolic Function of the Mouse Intestinal
  1072 Microbiome, Sci. Reports 9 (2019), doi:10.1038/s41598-019-38489-8.
- 1073 [125] E. I. Brunberg, T. B. Rodenburg, L. Rydhmer, J. B. Kjaer, P. Jensen, L. J. Keeling, Omnivores
  1074 Going Astray: A Review and New Synthesis of Abnormal Behavior in Pigs and Laying Hens,
  1075 Front. Vet. Sci. 3 (2016), doi:10.3389/fvets.2016.00057.
- 1076 [126] R. G. Thomson, Rumenitis in cattle, Can. Vet. J. 8 (1967) 189-192. Medline: 17421876
- 1077 [127] R. Nagata, Y. H. Kim, A. Ohkubo, S. Kushibiki, T. Ichijo, S. Sato, Effects of repeated subacute
   ruminal acidosis challenges on the adaptation of the rumen bacterial community in Holstein
   bulls, J. Dairy Sci. 101 (2018) 4424-4436, doi:10.3168/jds.2017-13859.
- 1080 [128] M. Desnoyers, S. Giger-Reverdin, D. Sauvant, G. Bertin, C. Duvaux-Ponter, The influence of
  acidosis and live yeast (Saccharomyces cerevisiae) supplementation on time-budget and
  1082 feeding behaviour of dairy goats receiving two diets of differing concentrate proportion, App.
  1083 Anim. Behav. Sci. 121 (2009) 108-119, doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2009.09.001.
- 1084[129]T. J. DeVries, E. Chevaux, Modification of the feeding behavior of dairy cows through live1085yeast supplementation, J. Dairy Sci. 97 (2014) 6499-6510, doi:10.3168/jds.2014-8226.
- 1086 [130] Z. Han, T. Willer, L. Li, C. Pielsticker, I. Rychlik, P. Velge, B. Kaspers, S. Rautenschlein, Influence
  1087 of the Gut Microbiota Composition on Campylobacter jejuni Colonization in Chickens,
  1088 Infection Immunity 85 (2017), doi:10.1128/iai.00380-17.
- [131] D. Rothschild, O. Weissbrod, E. Barkan, A. Kurilshikov, T. Korem, D. Zeevi, P. I. Costea, A.
  Godneva, I. N. Kalka, N. Bar, S. Shilo, D. Lador, A. V. Vila, N. Zmora, M. Pevsner-Fischer, D.
  Israeli, N. Kosower, G. Malka, B. C. Wolf, T. Avnit-Sagi, M. Lotan-Pompan, A. Weinberger, Z.
  Halpern, S. Carmi, J. Y. Fu, C. Wijmenga, A. Zhernakova, E. Elinav, E. Segal, Environment
  dominates over host genetics in shaping human gut microbiota, Nature 555 (2018) 210-215,
  doi:10.1038/nature25973.
- 1095 [132] J. K. Goodrich, J. L. Waters, A. C. Poole, J. L. Sutter, O. Koren, R. Blekhman, M. Beaumont, W.
  1096 Van Treuren, R. Knight, J. T. Bell, T. D. Spector, A. G. Clark, R. E. Ley, Human Genetics Shape
  1097 the Gut Microbiome, Cell 159 (2014) 789-799, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.09.053.
- 1098 [133] M. J. Bonder, A. Kurilshikov, E. F. Tigchelaar, Z. Mujagic, F. Imhann, A. V. Vila, P. Deelen, T.
  1099 Vatanen, M. Schirmer, S. P. Smeekens, D. V. Zhernakova, S. A. Jankipersadsing, M. Jaeger, M.
  1100 Oosting, M. C. Cenit, A. A. M. Masclee, M. A. Swertz, Y. Li, V. Kumar, L. Joosten, H. Harmsen,
  1101 R. K. Weersma, L. Franke, M. H. Hofker, R. J. Xavier, D. Jonkers, M. G. Netea, C. Wijmenga, J.

1102 Fu, A. Zhernakova, The effect of host genetics on the gut microbiome, Nature Genet. 48 1103 (2016) 1407-1412, doi:10.1038/ng.3663. J. Ji, C. L. Luo, X. Zou, X. H. Lv, Y. B. Xu, D. M. Shu, H. Qu, Association of host genetics with 1104 [134] 1105 intestinal microbial relevant to body weight in a chicken F2 resource population, Poult. Sci. 1106 (2019), doi:10.3382/ps/pez199. 1107 A. U. Bello, Z. Idrus, G. Y. Meng, E. J. Narayan, A. S. Farjam, Dose-response relationship of [135] 1108 tryptophan with large neutral amino acids, and its impact on physiological responses in the 1109 chick model, General Comp. Endocrinol. 260 (2018) 146-150, 1110 doi:10.1016/j.ygcen.2018.01.012. [136] P. Birkl, L. Franke, T. B. Rodenburg, E. Ellen, A. Harlander-Matauschek, A role for plasma 1111 1112 aromatic amino acids in injurious pecking behavior in laying hens, Physiology & Behavior 175 1113 (2017) 88-96, doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.03.041. 1114 [137] Y. M. van Hierden, J. M. Koolhaas, S. M. Korte, Chronic increase of dietary L-tryptophan decreases gentle feather pecking behaviour, App. Anim. Behav. Sci. 89 (2004) 71-84, 1115 1116 doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2004.05.004. A. Slawinska, A. Plowiec, M. Siwek, M. Jaroszewski, M. Bednarczyk, Long-Term 1117 [138] 1118 Transcriptomic Effects of Prebiotics and Synbiotics Delivered In Ovo in Broiler Chickens, PLoS 1119 One 11 (2016), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0168899. L. A. Rubio, Possibilities of early life programming in broiler chickens via intestinal microbiota 1120 [139] modulation, Poult. Sci. 98 (2019) 695-706, doi:10.3382/ps/pey416. 1121 1122 [140] J. Xu, M. K. Bjursell, J. Himrod, S. Deng, L. K. Carmichael, H. C. Chiang, L. V. Hooper, J. I. 1123 Gordon, A genomic view of the human-Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron symbiosis, Science 299 1124 (2003) 2074-2076, doi:10.1126/science.1080029. 1125 [141] G. Sharon, T. R. Sampson, D. H. Geschwind, S. K. Mazmanian, The Central Nervous System 1126 and the Gut Microbiome, Cell 167 (2016) 915-932, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.10.027. 1127 [142] D. N. Villageliu, M. Lyte, Microbial endocrinology: Why the intersection of microbiology and 1128 neurobiology matters to poultry health, Poult. Sci. 96 (2017) 2501-2508, 1129 doi:10.3382/ps/pex148. 1130 [143] F. Chaucheyras-Durand, A. Ameilbonne, A. Bichat, P. Mosoni, F. Ossa, E. Forano, Live yeasts 1131 enhance fibre degradation in the cow rumen through an increase in plant substrate 1132 colonization by fibrolytic bacteria and fungi, J. App. Microbiol. 120 (2016) 560-570, 1133 doi:10.1111/jam.13005. F. M. Colles, R. J. Cain, T. Nickson, A. L. Smith, S. J. Roberts, M. C. J. Maiden, D. Lunn, M. S. 1134 [144] 1135 Dawkins, Monitoring chicken flock behaviour provides early warning of infection by human 1136 pathogen Campylobacter, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 283 (2016), 1137 doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2323. 1138 [145] M. J. Toscano, L. Sait, F. Jorgensen, C. J. Nicol, C. Powers, A. L. Smith, M. Bailey, T. J. 1139 Humphrey, Sub-clinical infection with Salmonella in chickens differentially affects behaviour 1140 and welfare in three inbred strains, Brit. Poult. Sci. 51 (2010) 703-713, 1141 doi:10.1080/00071668.2010.528748. 1142 [146] N. Kraimi, L. Calandreau, S. Rabot, E. Guitton, P. Velge, O. Zemb, M. Biesse, C. Leterrier, From 1143 genotype to phenotype: influence of gut microbiota in Japanese quails. in European 1144 Conference in Behavioural Biology 2018, Liverpool (UK). 37. R. W. Schaedler, R. Dubos, R. Costello, Development of bacterial flora in gastrointestinal tract 1145 [147] 1146 of mice, J. Experimental Medicine 122 (1965) 59-66, doi:10.1084/jem.122.1.59. 1147 [148] R. W. Schaedler, R. Dubos, R. Costello, Association of germfree mice with bacteria isolated 1148 from normal mice, J. Experimental Medicine 122 (1965) 77-83, doi:10.1084/jem.122.1.77. 1149 [149] R. P. Orcutt, F. J. Gianni, R. J. Judge. Development of an altered Schaedler flora for NCI 1150 gnotobiotic rodents. Vol. 17 (1987). 1151 [150] L. Mi, B. Yang, X. L. Hu, Y. Luo, J. X. Liu, Z. T. Yu, J. K. Wang, Comparative Analysis of the 1152 Microbiota Between Sheep Rumen and Rabbit Cecum Provides New Insight Into Their 1153 Differential Methane Production, Front. Microbiol. 9 (2018), doi:10.3389/fmicb.2018.00575.

- 1154 [151] B. D. Piccolo, K. E. Mercer, S. Bhattacharyya, A. K. Bowlin, M. K. Saraf, L. Pack, S. V.
- 1155Chintapalli, K. Shankar, S. H. Adams, T. M. Badger, L. Yeruva, Early Postnatal Diets Affect the1156Bioregional Small Intestine Microbiome and Ileal Metabolome in Neonatal Pigs, J. Nut. 147
- 1157 (2017) 1499-1509, doi:10.3945/jn.117.252767.

1158

1159



Figure 1: Gut microbiota as a key actor for animal welfare





Influence on the gut:

Influence on the brain:

Brain development Myelination Neurogenesis HPA axis

Gut physiology and motility Microbiota composition



# Figure 2: Influence of the MGBA on behavior.

Different strategies can be used to modify the gut microbiota composition (indicated at the bottom of the figure: germ-free animals, antibiotic, probiotic, pathogen infection, microbiota transfer, dietary modification). The gut microbiota composed of viruses, archaea and bacteria can act directly or indirectly on the brain via cell structural components (lipo-polysaccharides = LPS) or with the release of microbial metabolites (short-chain fatty acids = SCFAs, neurotransmitters, catecholamines, indole ...), that can be absorbed by the intestinal epithelium, then released into the bloodstream and cross the bloodbrain barrier; use the immune pathway and the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines by immune cells (IC); stimulate the enteric nervous system (ENS) and its sensory neurons or induce the secretion of neuropeptides by entero-endocrine cells (EEC). All these molecules can reach the brain via the blood circulation or the activation of vagal afferent fibers. In addition to the effects on brain development, myelination, neurogenesis or HPA axis activity, the consequences of the MGBA have been investigated on the anxiety-like behavior in human, rodent, turkey, quail and horse; on memory capacities in human, rodent, quail and pig; on social behavior in human, rodent, chicken, turkey and quail; on feeding behavior in rodent, goat, cow, chicken and turkey. The bi-directional communication of this MGBA also involve effects of the nervous system on gut microbiota motility, physiology and composition.

Host	Gut segmen	t Phylum					
		References	Firmicutes	Bacteroidetes	Actinobacteria	Proteobacteria	Verrucomicrobia
Cow	Rumen	[89]	25-58%	38-75%	<1%	0-5%	-
Sheep	Rumen	[150]	49%	47%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Horse	Cecum	[77]	30-50%	30-50%	-	5%	<7%
Pig	Hindgut	[151]	35-95%	<2%	<1%	3-40%	-
Rabbit	Cecum	[98]	83%	6%	<1%	<1%	-
Chicken	Cecum	[95]	85%	-	6%	6%	-
Quail	Cecum	[78]	56-70%	25-35%	-	-	-
Duck	Cecum	[85]	34%	57%	-	7%	-

Table: Taxonomic profiles of major gut bacterial communities at the phylum level in farm animalsusing 16 rRNA gene pyrosequencing (Percentage of sequences assigned)