

1 **Running title:** *Bacillus* probiotics in aquaculture

2
3 **Genus *Bacillus*, promising probiotics in aquaculture: Aquatic animal**
4 **origin, bioactive components, bioremediation in fish and shellfish**

5
6 Mehdi Soltani ^{1,2*}, Koushik Ghosh³, Seyed Hosseinifar⁴, Vikash Kumar^{5,6}, Alan Lymbery²,
7 Suvra Roy^{5,6}, Einar Ringø⁷

8 **1** Department of Aquatic Animal Health, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of
9 Tehran, PO Box 14155-6453, Tehran, Iran.

10 **2** Freshwater Fish Group and Fish Health Unit, Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch
11 University, 90 South Street, Murdoch, WA 6150, Australia.

12 **3** Aquaculture Laboratory, Department of Zoology, The University of Burdwan, Burdwan,
13 West Bengal, India

14 **5** Aquaculture & Artemia Reference Center, Department of Animal Production, Faculty of
15 Bioscience Engineering, Ghent University, 9000 Gent, Belgium

16 **6** ICAR-Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute (ICAR-CIFRI), Barrackpore, 700120,
17 India.

18 **4** Department of Fisheries, Gorgan University of Agricultural Sciences and Natural
19 Resources, Gorgan, Iran

20 **7** Norwegian College of Fishery Science, Faculty of Bioscience, Fisheries and Economics,
21 UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway.

22 ***Correspondence**

23 Department of Aquatic Animal Health, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tehran,
24 PO Box 14155-6453, Tehran, Iran. msoltani@ut.ac.ir

25 **Present address:** Freshwater Fish Group and Fish Health Unit, Veterinary and Life Sciences,
26 Murdoch University, 90 South Street, Murdoch, WA 6150, Australia. [mehdi.soltani@](mailto:mehdi.soltani@murdoch.edu.au)
27 murdoch.edu.au

28

29 Abstract

30 *Bacillus* are Gram-positive spore-forming bacteria that are resistant to aggressive physical and
31 chemical conditions with various species exhibiting unusual physiological features enabling them
32 to survive in various environmental conditions including fresh waters, marine sediments, desert
33 sands, hot springs, Arctic soils and the gastrointestinal (GI) tract of finfish and shellfish. They
34 are able to rapidly replicate, tolerate a multitude of environmental conditions giving a wide
35 range of beneficial effects in aquaculture sector. Application of *Bacillus* as probiotics in feed
36 or as bioremediation in the aquaculture rearing water is one of the pleasant issues in a
37 sustainable aquaculture sector. *Bacillus* bacteria can play a desirable role in removal of waste
38 products from aquaculture environments, maintaining optimum water quality and reducing
39 stress conditions, that can lead to an optimum immuno-physiological balance, better growth and
40 survival in the target aquatic animal. The available data show that application of probiotic
41 *Bacillus* can directly or indirectly enhance the growth and immune status of aquatic organisms.
42 Probiotic *Bacillus* species can also assist in maintaining a higher density of beneficial bacteria
43 and a lower load of pathogenic agents in the aquaculture ponds. However, effects of a particular
44 *Bacillus* species or strain on different finfish/shellfish species, age, growth condition, water
45 quality and diet types can identify the conditions in which the probiotics could work well. This
46 review addressed the presence of *Bacillus* in the GI tract of finfish and shellfish, their ability
47 to produce enzymes and antibacterial compounds, pathogenic bacilli and their efficacy and
48 potency as probiotics in aquaculture.

49 **Key words:** *Bacillus*, bioremediation, growth, immunity, probiotic

50 1. Introduction

51 In the 1870s, [Cohn \(1876\)](#), [Koch \(1876\)](#) and [Tyndall \(1877\)](#) independently discovered that
52 certain species of bacteria spend at least part of their lives as dormant cellular structures, known
53 as endospores. These bacteria were later classified as *Bacillus* and are now classified in phylum
54 Firmicutes, class Bacilli, and order Bacillales. They are Gram-positive, endospore-forming, aerobic or
55 facultative anaerobic, characterized by their rod-shaped morphology (between 2.5-10 μm), and
56 are catalase positive. Genus *Bacillus* comprises of approximately 200 bacterial species and are

57 almost ubiquitous in nature; in soil, in compost (*Bacillus composti* and *Bacillus thermophilus*;
58 Yang *et al.* 2013), in extreme environments such as high pH (*Bacillus firmus* OF4; Sturr *et al.*
59 1994), high temperature (*Bacillus thermophilus*; Yang *et al.* 2013), high salt (*Bacillus*
60 *halodurans*; Annamalai *et al.* 2013), aquatic environment (Motta *et al.* 2004; Ichimatsu *et al.*
61 2000) as well as in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract of aquatic animals (Ray *et al.* 2012). They
62 exhibit quite diverse physiological properties such as the ability to produce cellulase, phytase,
63 tannase, chitinase, xylanase, protease and lipase (Ray *et al.* 2012, Ghosh *et al.* 2018) as well as
64 degradation of palm (*Elaeis guineensis*) biodiesel (Lutz *et al.* 2006). Another favourable trait
65 of *Bacillus* is; they produce antimicrobial substances such as peptide and lipopeptide antibiotics
66 and bacteriocins (Stein 2005; Abriouel *et al.* 2011). The sporulation capacity and the production
67 of antimicrobial substances and enzymes confer the capacity of genus *Bacillus* to colonise
68 different habitats and to contribute to nutrition of the host. Moreover, adding selected strains of
69 *Bacillus* as probiotics to control *Vibrio* species in penaeid aquaculture ponds (Moriarty, 1998)
70 and as dietary probiotics (Hong *et al.* 2005) are widely used.

71 Optimal GI functionality is essential for sustainable animal production, and effective
72 functionality of the GI tract and its gut microbiota play an important role in host health (e.g.
73 Clemente *et al.* 2012; Xiong *et al.* 2017; Ringø *et al.* 2018), and several complex mechanisms
74 are involved. The microbial community of fish gut are influenced by the anatomy; with or
75 without stomach, with pyloric caeca (up to 1000) or without, and short and long intestine
76 (relative intestinal length). In the absence of intestinal microbiota, normal immune development
77 and function are impaired, protection against infections, gut health as well as contributors to
78 nutrition (e.g. Rawls *et al.* 2004, 2006; Gómez & Balcázar 2008; Ray *et al.* 2012; Wang *et al.*,
79 2018; Li *et al.* 2018a). Therefore it is crucial to increase our knowledge on beneficial gut
80 bacteria, in the context of improved growth performance and health.

81 As alteration of the GI tract microbiota (dysbiosis) may enhance the risk for allergies and other
82 conditions (Mazmanian *et al.* 2008; Sokol *et al.* 2008), it is of importance to investigate the
83 intestinal microbiota of endothermic animals as well as aquatic organisms. The presence of
84 beneficial bacteria such as genus *Bacillus* in the GI tract of aquatic organisms merits
85 investigations, as autochthonous bacteria, adherent to mucosa, rapidly colonise the digestive
86 tract at early developmental larval stages (Ringø *et al.* 1996; Hansen & Olafsen 1999; Vadstein
87 *et al.* 2018).

88 During the last 20 years, numerous studies have been published on *Bacillus* in the intestine of
89 finfish and shellfish, their potential as probiotics, pathogenicity and their effect on the immune
90 system (e.g. Abriouel *et al.* 2011; Cha *et al.* 2013; Kim *et al.* 2014; Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016;
91 Wu *et al.*, 2016; Sreenivasulu *et al.*, 2016; Dash *et al.*, 2018; Bachruddin *et al.* 2018).
92 Therefore, the current review aimed to present an overview of published data on *Bacillus* in the
93 GI tract of finfish and shellfish, antagonistic ability, health benefits as probiotics, pathogenicity
94 and their effect on immunostimulation.

95 2. *Bacillus* in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract of finfish and shellfish

96 Optimal GI functionality is of importance for sustainable animal production, and three
97 components namely diet, mucosa and commensal microbiota are essential for gut health.
98 Evaluation of the gut microbiota of finfish dates back to late 1920`s and early 1930`s (Reed &
99 Spence 1929; Gibbons 1933) and since then numerous studies have been published. The GI tract
100 microbiota in fish is divided into; the GI lumen microbiota (the allochthonous), and those that
101 adhere to the mucosal surface (the autochthonous microbiota), however, several factors can
102 modulate the gut microbiota (Ringø *et al.* 2016). The intestinal microbiota contributes to several
103 essential factors such as pathogen displacement, nutrient- and receptor competition, production
104 of antimicrobial factors, structural factors (induction of IgA, tightening of tight junction and
105 immune system development) and several metabolic functions. Of the commensal gut
106 microbiota of aquatic animals, phylum Firmicutes which include genus *Bacillus* is essential,
107 and the contribution of Sugita and colleagues (Japanese scientists) and Indian scientists (Ghosh
108 and colleagues, and Ray and colleagues) can not be underestimated.

109 Since the first studies were published on salmonids by Trust & Sparrow (1974) and Trust (1975),
110 numerous investigations on the isolations of *Bacillus* in the GI tract of finfish and shellfish
111 have been carried out. In several *Bacillus* studies showed in Table 1 have, characterized
112 autochthonous (adherent) *Bacillus* isolated from the GI tract, and this is of importance as they
113 may contribute to nutrition, inhibit pathogen adherence and colonization, may affect the
114 immune system and may have potential as probiotics. In Table 1, features of isolated bacilli
115 are indicated, however, in numerous studies, the intestinal microbiota were only described, and
116 this is indicated by no information available.

117 2.1. *Bacillus* in finfish

118 In numerous studies, counts of presumptive *Bacillus* has been revealed, but without going into
119 further identification (Table 1). These studies are not discussed in the present review, even
120 though they investigate dietary effects (e.g. de Paula Silva *et al.* 2011; Green *et al.* 2013; Barreto-
121 Curriel *et al.* 2018; Nymann *et al.* 2017), effects of antibiotic supplementation (Austin & Al-
122 Zahrani 1988; Sugita *et al.* 1988a; 1989), production of enzymes (e.g. Sugita *et al.* 1997; Bairagi
123 *et al.* 2002; Ray *et al.* 2010; Askarian *et al.* 2012), putative probionts (e.g. Geraylou *et al.* 2014;
124 Nandi *et al.* 2017), effect of prebiotics (Ringø *et al.* 2006), antimicrobial potential (Sugita *et al.*
125 1989, 1998), seasonal variations (Hovda *et al.* 2012), effect of stress (Olsen *et al.* 2008) and wild
126 vs. farmed fish (Strøm & Olafsen 1990; Ramirez & Romero 2017). Readers with special interest
127 in these studies and other studies only identified *Bacillus* without going into detailed
128 identification are recommended to have a closer look at the original papers. In the following,
129 bacteria identified as *Bacillus aerius*, *Bacillus aerophilus*, *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens*, *Bacillus*
130 *altitudinis*, *Bacillus aryabhattai*, *Bacillus atrophaeus*, *Bacillus cereus*, *Bacillus circulans*,
131 *Bacillus clausii*, *Bacillus coagulans*, *Bacillus flexus*, *Bacillus licheniformis*, *Bacillus*
132 *megaterium*, *Bacillus methylotrophicus*, *Bacillus pumilus*, *Bacillus sonorensis*, *Bacillus*
133 *subtilis*, *Bacillus tequilensis*, *Bacillus thermoamylovorans*, *Bacillus thuringiensis*, *Bacillus*
134 *stratosphericus* and *Solibacillus silvestris* isolated from the finfish GI tract are discussed.

135 ***B. aerius***. To our knowledge, only one study has isolated this bacterium from the GI tract of
136 finfish. Dutta *et al.* (2015) reported autochthonous *B. aerius* in the distal intestine (DI) catla
137 (*Catla catla*) in a study where probiotic characterization of exoenzyme-producing bacteria were
138 investigated.

139 ***B. aerophilus***. In a study evaluating the autochthonous microbiota of Indian major carp
140 (*Cirrhinus mrigala*) by cultivation, Mukherjee *et al.* (2016) reported *B. aerophilus*, a bacterium
141 with probiotic potential based on good growth in intestinal mucus, resistant to diluted bile juice
142 (2–20%), safe for the target fish, and production of bacteriocin.

143 ***B. amyloliquefaciens***. This bacterium has been isolated in eight finfish studies of eight fish
144 species, and culture-based methods were used in seven of them (Table 1). The features of most
145 strains were; probiotic potential, enzyme-production and antagonism, and bacteriocin
146 production. More recently this bacillar species has been isolated from the intestines of flounder
147 (Chen *et al.* 2016a), southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) (Chen *et al.*, 2016b), rohu

148 (*Labeo rohita*) (Mukherjee *et al.*, 2017) and Inidan major carp (Kavitha *et al.* (2018) using
149 bculture-based methods, and these studies revealed promising features.

150 ***Bacillus altitudinis*, *Bacillus aryabhatai* and *Bacillus atrophaeus*.** These bacteria, all
151 autochthonous, have been detected by cultivation in the DI of mrigal (Banerjee *et al.* 2016),
152 proximal intestine (PI) of walking catfish (*Clarias batrachus*) (Dey *et al.* 2016) and stinging
153 catfish (*Heteropneustes fossilis*) (Khan & Ghosh 2012). The major feature of these bacilli were
154 they produce enzymes, and one species, *B. altitudinis*, revealed antibacterial potential.

155 ***B. cereus*.** This bacterium capable by proudcing amylase, cellulase and protease has been
156 isolated from the PI and DI of mrigal by Ray *et al.* (2010). In a study evaluated the microbial
157 diversity in the gut of wild and farmed olive flounder (*Paralichthys olivaceus*), Kim & Kim
158 (2013) revealed culturable autochthonous *B. cereus* in the DI of wild fish. When investigating
159 the bacterial community in DI of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) by cultivation, Askarian *et al.*
160 (2012) revealed that *B. cereus* was a part of the bacterial community. In a study using culture-
161 based method by Kavitha *et al.* (2018), *B. cereus* was recovered from intestine of Indian major
162 carp.

163 ***B. circulans*.** Four studies using cultivation have revealed *B. circulans* in the GI tract of rainbow
164 trout fed different antibiotics (Austin & Al-Zahrani 1988), and studies evaluating the the
165 intestinal microbiota of rohu (Ghosh *et al.* 2002), common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) (Ray *et al.*
166 2007) and Mossambicus tilapia (Saha *et al.* 2006) (Table 1). In the studies with rohu, common
167 carp and tilapia, the strains revealed enzyme-producing activities.

168 ***Bacillus clausii*.** Ma *et al.* (2010) recovered this *Bacillus* species from the gut of orange spotted
169 grouper (*Epinephelus coioides*) demonstrated a remarkable tolerance to mimic GI environment
170 and antagonistic activities to some potential pathogenic bacteria.

171 ***B. coagulans*.** Ray *et al.* (2010) isolated amylase, cellulase and protease-producing
172 autochthonous bacteria in the PI and DI of three species of Indian major carps, catla, mrigal and
173 rohu, by cultivation and one of the strains from PI of catla showed high similarity to *B.*
174 *coagulans*.

175 ***B. flexus***. To our knowledge, only two studies have revealed this bacterial species in the GI
176 tract of mrigal (Banerjee *et al.* 2015b) and walking catfish (*Clarias batrachus*) (Dey *et al.*
177 2016). In the study of mrigal, optimization of strain CMF2 was investigated by various
178 fermentation parameters, pH, incubation temperature, incubation time, carbon sources,
179 colloidal chitin etc. to insure optimal chitinase production. In contrast to this study, Dey *et al.*
180 (2016) investigated the extracellular activities, amylase, protease, cellulase and lipase of several
181 autochthonous strains isolated from PI and DI, and revealed that strain FG43 showed high
182 similarity to *B. flexus*.

183 ***B. licheniformis***. *B. licheniformis* has been isolated from several species of cold water and
184 warm water finfish species with various degree of pathogen inhibition and enzyme production
185 (Table 1). Ghosh *et al.* (2010) and Mondal *et al.* (2010) isolated this bacilli species from the PI
186 of rohu and bata (*Labeo bata*) by cultured-based methods. In an investigation by Askarian *et al.*
187 (2012), *B. licheniformis* was identified in PI and DI of Atlantic salmon by culture method, but
188 the strain did not display promising exo-enzyme activities or *in vitro* growth inhibition towards
189 the four pathogens tested. Later, Banerjee *et al.* (2013) revealed that *B. licheniformis* was a
190 member of the autochthonous enzyme-producing bacteria isolated from PI and DI of two
191 species of Indian air-breathing fish, murrel (*Channa punctatus*) and stinging catfish using
192 conventional culture technique. (Kim & Kim (2013) displayed culturable autochthonous exo-
193 enzyme-producing *B. licheniformis* in the DI of farmed olive flounder. Later on, a strain of *B.*
194 *licheniformis* was isolated from the mid-intestine (MI) of long whiskers catfish (*Mystus gulio*)
195 by Das *et al.* (2014), and displayed exo-enzyme activities. Three studies, isolated *B.*
196 *licheniformis* from the gut of mrigal (Mukherjee *et al.*, 2016), rohu intestine (Mukherjee *et al.*,
197 2017) and PI of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) (Ghosh *et al.*, 2017) and revealed pathogen
198 inhibition- and potential probiotic characteristics.

199 ***B. megaterium***. To our knowledge, several studies have reported *B. megaterium* with some
200 enzyme producing and antagonistic features in the intestine of fishfish. However, Austin & Al-
201 Zahrani (1988) in rainbow trout, Green *et al.* (2013) in Atlantic salmon and Kim & Kim (2013)
202 in the DI of wild olive flounder reported no major features as the authors only focused on gut
203 microbiota evaluations. In contrast to Saha *et al.* (2006) and (Banerjee *et al.* (2016) who
204 displayed exo-enzymes producing and exo-producing, and antagonistic *B. megaterium* in the
205 intestines of Mossambicus tilapia and PI of grass carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idellus*).

206 ***B. methylotrophicus***. In a study by [Kim & Kim \(2013\)](#), the authors revealed that *B.*
207 *methylotrophicus* was a part of microbial diversity in the DI of wild and farmed olive flounder.
208 *B. methylotrophicus* was also isolated from the EI of channel catfish ([Ran et al. \(2012\)](#)) and from
209 PI of Indian major carp (*Catla catla*) ([Mukherjee & Ghosh \(2016\)](#)). Recently, this bacilli was
210 isolated as a part of autochthonous gut microbiota of rohu intestine with a various antagonistic
211 effect towards pathogenic *Aeromonas* spp. More recently, [Mukherjee et al. \(2017\)](#) and
212 [Ramirez-Torrez et al. \(2018\)](#) isolated *B. methylotrophicus* with potential probiotic features from
213 the PI of rohu and EI content of rainbow trout, respectively.

214 ***B. nealsonii***. To our knowledge, only one study has revealed *B. nealsonii* in the intestine of
215 finfish, rainbow trout, in a study investigated commonly used antibiotics against non-
216 pathogenic and important fish pathogens ([Yilmaz et al. 2018](#)).

217 ***B. pumilus***. The first study, showing *B. pumilus* in the intestine of fish, rohu, was carried out
218 by [Ghosh et al. \(2002\)](#). The isolate produced extracellular protease, amylase and cellulase, and
219 the authors suggested that the bacterial strain might play an important role in rohu fingerlings
220 nutrition. [Ma et al. \(2010\)](#) recovered *B. pumilus* from the gut of orange spotted grouper. An
221 allochthonous *B. pumilus* with potential as probiotic was isolated from the EI of channel catfish
222 by [Ran et al. \(2012\)](#). The autochthonous gut microbiota of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) was
223 studied by [Al-Hisnawi et al. \(2015\)](#) and *B. pumilus* was displayed a member of the identified
224 bacterial community isolated from the fish distal intestine (DI) based on cultivation. In addition,
225 this bacilli species, autochthonous, with a chitinase-producing character was recovered from the
226 DI of silver carp (*Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*) by [Banerjee et al. \(2015b\)](#). In their review
227 devoted to modulation of gut microbiota by dietary manipulations, [Ringø et al. \(2016\)](#) revealed
228 autochthonous *B. pumilus* in the (DI) of rainbow trout (*Onchorhynchus mykiss*) fed linseed oil.
229 However, the bacterium was not detected in the DI of fish fed sunflower-, rapeseed- or marine
230 oil. Strains of enzyme-producing *B. pumilus* showing an antagonist characteristic were isolated
231 from the PI mrigal and rohu ([Banerjee et al. 2016](#)). Recently, [Ramirez-Torrez et al. \(2018\)](#)
232 successfully recovered this bacilli species from the EI rainbow trout with a good adhesion
233 feature.

234 ***B. sonorensis***. Strains of autochthonous enzyme-producing *B. sonorensis* with antagonistic
235 feature were recovered from the DI of mrigal by [Dutta & Ghosh \(2015\)](#), and based on their

236 results, the author suggested that *in vivo* studies merits investigations to clarify their effect on
237 growth performance and health.

238 ***B. subtilis***. This species has been revealed in the GI tract of several finfish studies (Table 1).
239 [Askarian et al. \(2012\)](#) reported it as autochthonous in PI and DI of Atlantic salmon, and similar
240 findings were later reported by [Green et al. \(2013\)](#). [He et al. \(2013\)](#) investigated the microbial
241 communities in the intestinal content of black carp (*Mylopharyngodon piceus*), gibel carp
242 (*Carassius gibelio*) and bluntnose black bream (*Megalobrama amblycephala*) and revealed *B.*
243 *subtilis*. A *B. subtilis* strain with a remarkable antimicrobial activity against *Edwardsiella*.
244 *ictaluri* was isolated from the catfish intestine ([Ran et al. 2012](#)). [Banerjee et al. \(2013\)](#)
245 recovered *B. subtilis* from the PI and DI of Indian air-breathing fish, murrel (*Channa*
246 *punctatus*) and stinging catfish using base-culture method. Furthermore, based on culture
247 methods this species has been recovered from DI-content cyprinid species ([Li et al., 2015](#)), the
248 intestines of southern flounder ([Chen et al., 2016a, 2016b](#)), PI and DI of Nile tilapia ([Talukdar](#)
249 [et al., 2016](#)) and Inidan major carp ([Kavitha et al. \(2018\)](#)). When discussing the presence of *B.*
250 *subtilis* it worth to mention isolation of autochthonous *B. subtilis* subsp. *subtilis* from MI of
251 mrigal ([Das & Ghosh 2013](#)) revealing high phytase activity, which later was used in a solif-
252 state fermentation study ([Das & Ghosh 2015](#)). A potential probiotic *B. subtilis* subsp. *spizizenii*,
253 autochthonous, was isolated from DI Indian major carp ([Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016](#)), and the
254 authors suggested the bacterium to be a bio-control agent, but *in vivo* studies merits
255 investigations.

256 ***B. tequilensis***. This species is seldomly isolated from finfish, as only one recent study has
257 revealed its presence in the PI of silver carp ([Banerje et al. 2016](#)). The isolate, HMF6X, revealed
258 high cellulase and xylanase activities vs. the other isolates isolated from the fish species. In
259 addition, strain HMF6X revealed antagonistic activity towards *Aeromonas salmonicida*.

260 ***B. thermoamylovorans***. To our knowledge, *B. thermoamylovorans* has only been detected in
261 one finfish study, by [Nyman et al. \(2017\)](#) investigating the bacterial community in the intestinal
262 content of Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*). However, no further evaluation of the extracellular
263 enzymes-production and the probiotic potential was carried out; topics that merits further
264 investigations.

265 ***B. thuringiensis***. In a study evaluating the culturable autochthonous gut bacteria in Atlantic
266 salmon fed diets with or without chitin, [Askarian et al. \(2012\)](#) revealed that *B. thuringiensis*
267 isolated from DI produced enzymes and inhibited *in vitro* growth of four fish pathogens tested.
268 Later, [Yilmaz et al. \(2018\)](#) displayed *B. thuringiensis* in the intestine of rainbow trout.

269 ***B. stratosphericus***. Two cultured based studies, revealed cellulase activity by a strain isolated
270 from mid intestine (MI) of Piau-com-pinta (*Leporinus friderici*) ([Peixoto et al. 2010](#)). Later
271 [Mukherjee et al. \(2016\)](#) demonstrated the probiotic potential of an autochthonous bacteria
272 isolated from PI of Indian major carp.

273 ***S. silvestris***. The first study isolating *Bacillus silvestris* was carried out by [Rheims et al. \(1999\)](#)
274 isolating the bacterium from forest soil. In 2009, [Krishnamurthi and co-authors](#) re-classified the
275 bacterium to *S. silvestris*. To our knowledge, only one study has revealed *S. silvestris* in the GI
276 tract of fish; Indian major carp ([Mukherjee et al. 2016](#)).

277 **2.2. *Bacillus* in shellfish**

278 The GI tract of shellfish consist of three main segments; foregut (stomach), and mid- and
279 hindgut. During the last 20 years, several studies have been published on the gut microbiota of
280 shellfish (e.g. [Daniels et al. 2010](#); [Zhu et al. 2016](#); [Li et al. 2018b](#); [Mongkol et al. 2018](#)).
281 However, less information is available on *Bacillus* in shellfish intestine (Table 2), compared to
282 that reported for fish fish. In shellfish studies, *B. cereus* isolated to tiger shrimp (*Penaeus*
283 *monodon*) revealed growth and immune enhancer features ([Chandran et al. 2014](#)), while one
284 study by [Vargas-Albores et al. \(2017\)](#) evaluating the gut microbiota of Pacific white shrimp
285 (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) by culture-independent method revealed *B. cereus*, *B. thuringiensis*
286 and *Bacillus weihenstephanensis* ([Vargas-Albores et al. 2017](#)).

287 **Table 1 here**

288 **4. Products by *Bacillus*: exo-enzymes**

289 Genus *Bacillus* is ubiquitous in the environment and, is one of the most commonly used
290 probiotics in aquaculture ([Hong et al. 2005](#); [Zokaeifar et al. 2012b](#); [Zokaeifar et al. 2014](#)).
291 *Bacillus* spp. are heterogenous, both phenotypically and genotypically ([Slepecky & Hemphill](#)

292 2006). In consequence, they exhibit quite diverse physiological properties, e.g., the ability to
293 degrade different substrates derived from plant or animal sources that include cellulose, starch,
294 proteins, hydrocarbons (Lutz *et al.* 2006), and diverse anti-nutritional factors (Ghosh *et al.*
295 2018). Furthermore, some *Bacillus* species are heterotrophic nitrifiers, denitrifiers, nitrogen-
296 fixers, iron precipitators, selenium oxidizers, oxidizers and reducers of manganese, facultative
297 chemolithotrophs, acidophiles, alkalophiles, psychrophiles, thermophiles and others (Priest
298 1993; Slepecky & Hemphill 2006; Abriouel *et al.* 2011).

299 Being metabolically active, genus *Bacillus* produce a wide arsenal of useful enzymes and
300 numerous antimicrobial compounds that may include antibacterial, antiviral or antifungal
301 activity (Prieto *et al.* 2012). The probiotic attributes of the bacilli often lie with their metabolites
302 that encompass an extensive range of substances with diverse biological functions. Generally,
303 *Bacillus* spp. is well known as major producers of proteinaceous substances (Zokaeifer *et al.*
304 2012a), which includes both enzymes and bacteriocins or bacteriocin like inhibitory substances
305 (BLIS). This section provides an overview on the exo-enzymes and bacteriocins produced by
306 bacilli and their beneficial attributes, with notes on present status of knowledge and prospects
307 in aquaculture. Although enzyme-producing ability of bacilli from diverse sources has been
308 widely known, this section focus on the autochthonous enzyme-producing bacilli recorded from
309 fish gut. Autochthonous gut-adherent bacteria seemed to be ideal for aquaculture application,
310 since microorganisms from the fish source might ensure their colonization and enzyme
311 supplementation within the intestine, and otherwise, would likely to eliminate the risk of
312 harmful effects by the microorganisms or their metabolites (Ghosh *et al.* 2018).

313 4.1. Gut associated bacilli and their exo-enzymes

314 Unlike the ruminants and higher vertebrates, probable contribution of the endosymbionts in the
315 nutritional physiology of fish has been recognized of late (Ray *et al.* 2012). Apart from the
316 endogenous digestive enzymes, exogenous enzymes produced and supplemented by the
317 autochthonous microbiota could be considered as one of the important secondary factors that
318 affects nutrition and feed utilization in fish. In fact, a wide range of enzymes, viz.,
319 carbohydrases, phosphatases, esterases, lipases and peptidases produced by gut bacteria might
320 contribute to the digestive processes in fish (Ghosh *et al.* 2018). Extensive studies on Indian
321 major carps (e.g., Ray *et al.* 2012; Mandal & Ghosh 2013; Das & Ghosh 2014; Dutta *et al.*
322 2015; Dutta and Ghosh, 2015; Banerjee *et al.* 2016; Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016; Mukherjee *et*

323 *al.* 2016; Mukherjee *et al.* 2017) and other teleosts (e.g., Cahil 1990; Ringø *et al.* 1995, 2010,
324 2016; Llewellyn *et al.* 2014; Al-Hisnawi *et al.* 2014; Hosseinifar *et al.* 2016; Ringø & Song
325 2016) have indicated the presence of autochthonous gut-associated microorganisms in fish and
326 their beneficial attributes in nutrition. The enzymes of nutritional importance produced by the
327 gut bacteria may be categorized into (1) digestive enzymes, e.g., protease, amylase, lipase etc.,
328 and (2) degradation enzymes, e.g., non-starch polysaccharide (NSP) - degrading enzymes,
329 phytase, tannase and chitinase. The review of Ray *et al.* (2012) illustrated contribution of the
330 diverse exo-enzyme producing gut bacteria in the nutrition and well being of the host fish,
331 where gut-associated bacilli were recognized as one of the major groups of bacteria within fish
332 gut. Later, ability of the fish gut-microbiota in enzymatic degradation of plant-derived anti-
333 nutritional factors was displayed by Ghosh *et al.* (2018), in which numerous strains of *Bacillus*
334 were promising. Therefore, the following sub-section will present an extract and update of the
335 research endeavours depicting the occurrence and importance of exo-enzyme producing gut
336 associated bacilli in fish (Table 2).

337 4.2. Exo-enzyme producing bacilli: digestive enzymes

338 Endogenous digestive enzymes in fish hydrolyze organic macromolecules (mainly,
339 carbohydrate, protein and lipid) into simpler compounds. In addition, as established for higher
340 vertebrates, supplementation of digestive enzymes (viz., amylase, protease, lipase) from
341 microbial source could be of importance to improve nutrient utilization in fish. Although
342 preliminary studies on microbial amylase activity within fish gut noticed the presence of
343 bacterial amylase, characterization and identification of the specific amylase-producing strains
344 were mostly not carried out (Lesel *et al.* 1986; Das & Tripathi 1991; Bairagi *et al.* 2002). On
345 the other hand, microorganisms with efficient proteolytic activity are widespread in nature
346 because of their rapid growth and *Bacillus* spp. by far the most common among them (Ray *et*
347 *al.* 2012). To the authors' knowledge, occurrence of proteolytic and amylolytic bacilli (*B.*
348 *circulans*, *B. cereus* and *B. pumilus*) was first reported in the gut of an Indian major carp (IMC),
349 rohu by Ghosh *et al.* (2002) and correlated it with the feeding habit. However, they didnt
350 quantify enzyme activities. Later, Esakkiraj *et al.* (2009) documented extracellular protease
351 production by *B. cereus* isolated from the gut of flathead grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) and
352 indicated that bacterial protease was efficient in utilizing different preparations of tuna-
353 processing wastes, e.g., raw fish meat, defatted fish meat and alkali or acid hydrolysate as

354 nitrogen sources. Mondal *et al.* (2010) detected both protease- and amylase-producing ability
355 of *B. licheniformis* and *B. subtilis* in the gut of bata. Similarly, Ray *et al.* (2010) isolated various
356 strains of bacilli in the gut of three Indian major carps, viz. catla (*B. coagulans*, *B. cereus*);
357 mrigal (*Bacillus* sp., *B. cereus*) and rohu (*Bacillus* sp.), and protein or starch hydrolyzing
358 abilities were demonstrated. Subsequently, presence of amylase- and protease-producing bacilli
359 (*B. thuringiensis*, *B. cereus*, *B. subtilis*, *Bacillus* sp.) in the gut of a marine teleost (Atlantic
360 salmon) were recorded by Askarian *et al.* (2012). Later, *Brevibacillus parabrevis* and *B.*
361 *licheniformis* isolated from two brackish water fish species, crescent perch (*Terapon jarbua*)
362 and long whiskers catfish (*Mystus gulio*), respectively, were noticed with considerable amylase
363 and protease activities *in vitro* (Das *et al.* 2014). Since then, diverse *Bacillus* spp. capable of
364 producing amylolytic and proteolytic enzymes were documented from several fish species that
365 included IMCs (Dutta & Ghosh 2015; Dutta *et al.* 2015; Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016; Mukherjee
366 *et al.* 2016; Mukherjee *et al.* 2017); climbing perch (*Anabas testudineus*) (Banerjee *et al.*
367 2015a); walking catfish (*Clarias batrachus*) (Banerjee *et al.* 2015a; Dey *et al.* 2016) grass carp
368 and rohu (Guo *et al.* 2016; Banerjee *et al.* 2017), striped dwarf catfish (*Mystus vittatus*) (Nandi
369 *et al.* 2017a) and Indian major carp (Kavitha *et al.*, 2018), a brief description of which are
370 presented in Table 2.

371 Gut bacteria might induce lipolysis either by enzymatic breakdown of triglyceride through
372 direct bacterial action, or by altering pancreatic lipase activity with bacterial proteases (Ringø
373 *et al.* 1995). Although reports on specific lipase-producing bacilli from fish gut were scarce,
374 some of the studies describing amylase, protease or cellulase-producing bacilli within fish gut
375 also addressed lipolytic activity, if any. Thus, lipase-producing bacilli were detected in the guts
376 of IMCs (Dutta & Ghosh 2015; Dutta *et al.* 2015; Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016; Mukherjee *et al.*
377 2016, Mukherjee *et al.* 2017); Atlantic salmon (Askarian *et al.* 2012); brackish water fishes, *T.*
378 *jarbua* and *M. gulio* (Das *et al.* 2014) catfishes (Dey *et al.* 2016; Nandi *et al.* 2017a) and Nile
379 tilapia (Ghosh *et al.* 2017).

380 4.3. Exo-enzyme producing bacilli: degradation enzymes

381 Cellulose and hemicelluloses (e.g., xylans) are the major NSPs in plant feedstuffs commonly
382 encountered by the fish under culture condition, either through natural food (algae,
383 phytoplankton, detritus, aquatic macrophytes) or formulated diets as there is a thrust to replace
384 animal sources in fish feed with plant ingredients (rice bran, wheat husks, different oil cakes).

385 The principal endogenous polysaccharide digesting enzymes in fish specifically hydrolyze the
386 α -glycosidic linkages of starch and yield glucose. However, cellulose remains mostly indigestible
387 in monogastric animals due to the presence of β -(1 \rightarrow 4) glycosidic linkages and lack of the
388 endogenous cellulase. Likewise, β -glucanases and β -xylanases capable of digesting other NSPs
389 are also either rare or not present in fish (Kuźmina 1996). Symbiotic gut microorganisms are
390 likely to be involved in the fermentative degradation of cellulosic material for the host fish
391 (Clements 1997). Thus, among the degradation enzymes, emphasis has been given on the ability
392 of the gut-microbiota to produce cellulase as the major NSP-degrading enzyme (for review, see
393 Ray *et al.* 2012). Although presence of microbial cellulase within the fish gut was first indicated
394 in the common carp (Shcherbina & Kazlauskienė 1971), involvement of gut-associated bacilli
395 in cellulase production was detected much later (Ghosh *et al.* 2002). Protease- and amylase-
396 producing bacilli (*B. circulans*, *B. cereus* and *B. pumilus*) isolated from rohu were also efficient
397 in producing cellulase, although none of the enzymes-producing ability was quantified (Ghosh
398 *et al.* 2002). Importantly, presence of diverse exo-enzyme producing bacilli was correlated it
399 with the omnivorous feeding aptitude of the concerned carp species. Afterwards, a large number
400 of cellulose-degrading bacilli have been recorded in the guts of grass carp and tilapia (Saha *et*
401 *al.* 2006); rohu, catla and mrigal (Ray *et al.* 2010); bata (Mondal *et al.* 2010); pacu (*Piaractus*
402 *esoptamicus*) and piaucom–piñata (*Leporinus friderici*) (Peixoto *et al.* 2011); walking catfish
403 (Dey *et al.* 2016) and striped dwarf catfish (Nandi *et al.* 2017a). While considering *in vitro*
404 cellulase-producing ability of the gut bacilli, Ray *et al.* (2007) noticed that cellulase production
405 by *B. subtilis* CY5 and *B. circulans* TP3, isolated from the gut of common carp and
406 Mozambique tilapia, *Oreochromis mossambicus*, respectively was enhanced under optimized
407 condition through solid-state fermentation (SSF). Further, Peixoto *et al.* (2011) noticed
408 cellulolytic potential of *B. subtilis* P6 and *Bacillus velesensis* P11, and pH 7.0-9.0 was recorded
409 for the maximum residual cellulase activity. These observations were instrumental in view of
410 future utilization of the cellulolytic bacilli in bio-processing of plant feedstuffs *in vitro*.

411 On the contrary, reports on xylanase-producing gut microorganisms in fish are meager (German
412 & Bittong 2009; Banerjee & Ghosh 2014; Banerjee *et al.* 2016). Banerjee *et al.* (2016) carried
413 out screening of cellulose and xylan degrading autochthonous gut bacteria from six freshwater
414 carps. In their study, the strains *Bacillus pumilus* LRF1X, *B. pumilus* CMF1C, *B. tequilensis*
415 HMF6X, *B. megaterium* CtIF1C and *B. altitudinis* CMH8X revealed both xylan- and cellulose-
416 degrading ability. Following which, degradation of cellulose and xylan under SSF by *B.*

417 *pumilus* and *B. tequilensis* isolated from the proximal intestines of rohu and silver carp,
418 respectively, has also been documented (Banerjee & Ghosh 2016). Furthermore, cellulase and
419 xylanase-producing ability of autochthonous bacilli isolated from the gut of rohu, catla and
420 mrigal have been reported (Dutta *et al.* 2015; Dutta & Ghosh 2015; Mukherjee *et al.* 2016;
421 Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016; Mukherjee *et al.* 2017), which are summarized in Table 2.

422 Phytase is another important degradation enzyme, supplementation of which might improve the
423 availability of phosphorus and other minerals bound to phytic acid by hydrolysis of the phytate
424 compounds (Oatway *et al.* 2001). Protein rich oil cakes used in aquafeed formulation are the
425 major source of phytate compounds. Only a few reports have considered exogenous phytase
426 activity represented by gut bacteria in fish. The first study, indicating phytase-producing bacilli
427 within fish gut was accomplished by Roy *et al.* (2009), who depicted two phytase-producing
428 strains of *B. licheniformis* from rohu. Afterward, Askarian *et al.* (2012) demonstrated phytase
429 activity by autochthonous *B. subtilis*, *B. thuringiensis*, *B. cereus* and *Bacillus* sp. isolated from
430 the gut of Atlantic salmon fed with or without chitin supplemented diet, although phytase-
431 producing ability was not quantified. In a comprehensive investigation of phytase-producing
432 bacteria in freshwater teleosts, Khan & Ghosh (2012) documented *B. subtilis* LB1.4 and *B.*
433 *atrophaeus* GC1.2 isolated from the digestive tracts of a minor carp, bata and Indian river shad,
434 *Gudusia chapra*, respectively as efficient phytase-producing strains. Further, phytase-
435 producing capacity of *B. subtilis* was evaluated *in vitro* in a later study under SSF and phytate-
436 degrading ability of the strain was established (Khan & Ghosh 2012). In addition, phytase-
437 producing ability of autochthonous exo-enzyme producing bacilli isolated from the IMCs have
438 been reported in subsequent studies (Dutta *et al.* 2015; Dutta & Ghosh, 2015; Mukherjee *et al.*
439 2016; Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016; Mukherjee *et al.* 2017).

440 Tannins are widespread in nature and are considered as the most common among the plant-
441 derived anti-nutritional factors. Tannin-degrading ability of *Bacillus* and some other genera
442 have been recorded by Deschamps *et al.* (1980). Presence of tannase-producing microbiota has
443 been detected in the digestive tract of ruminants feeding on tannin rich forage (Goel *et al.* 2005).
444 However, information on tannase-producing bacteria from fish gut is scanty as studies carried
445 out on this topic are inadequate. To the authors' knowledge, only one study illustrated tannase-
446 producing bacilli in fish gut, where *B. subtilis* KP765736 and *Brevibacillus agri* KP765734
447 isolated from Nile tilapia represented tannase activity (Talukdar *et al.* 2016). The authors

448 hypothesized that the tannase-producing bacteria established a symbiotic relation with the host
449 fish and adapted to the neutral or alkaline pH of the fish gut (Talukdar *et al.* 2016).

450 Chitin is considered as the second most abundant biomass in the world after cellulose that forms
451 a major constituent in many fish food organisms, viz., protozoans, coelenterates, crustaceans,
452 molluscs, fungi and green algae (Ray *et al.* 2012). Although the first report of bacterial chitin
453 destruction involved *Bacillus chitinovor* isolated from an aquatic source (Benecke 1905),
454 chitinolytic bacilli from fish gut was documented much later. Askarian *et al.* (2012) recorded
455 chitinase-producing ability of bacilli in the digestive tract of Atlantic salmon fed with (*B.*
456 *subtilis*) or without (*B. thuringiensis*, *B. cereus* and *Bacillus* sp.) chitin supplemented diets.
457 Further, Banerjee *et al.* (2015b) detected potent chitinolytic activity of *B. pumilus* KF454036
458 and *B. flexus* KF454035 isolated from the digestive tracts of silver carp, and mrigal, respectively
459 and opined that there is possibility of using chitinolytic bacilli from fish gut for chitinase
460 production or as probiotics to improve feed efficiency in fish.

461 4.4. Application of gut associated bacilli in feed-biotechnology

462 Apart from the use of bacilli as probiotic feed supplements, the recent review of Ghosh *et al.*
463 (2018) proposed to utilize the exo-enzyme producing microorganisms judiciously for bio-
464 processing of the plant feedstuffs through SSF. Exo-enzyme producing bacilli isolated from
465 fish gut have been shown to reduce the contents of anti-nutritional factors, viz., fibre, tannin,
466 phytic acid and trypsin inhibitor in the plant ingredients through SSF (Bairagi *et al.* 2004;
467 Ramachandran *et al.* 2005; Ramachandran & Ray 2007; Khan & Ghosh 2013). Apart from
468 elimination of the anti-nutritional factors, increase in nutrient level through microbial synthesis
469 of essential bio-molecules (viz., amino acids, fatty acids and vitamins) is expected during the
470 bio-processing through SSF (Banerjee & Ghosh 2016). Thus, SSF has been suggested to
471 improve digestibility of feedstuffs by augmenting bioavailability of nutrients, reducing
472 antinutrients and synthesizing bio-molecules (Ghosh *et al.*, 2018). However, in view of
473 application of the SSF-processed substrate as fish feed ingredient, microbial symbionts
474 originally isolated from fish gut are preferred in this process so as to avoid likely inclusion of
475 harmful metabolites in the fermentation-product (Khan & Ghosh 2013).

476 Bacterial cellulase supplementation in the formulated diet (as probiotics) or processing of plant
477 feedstuffs with cellulase-producing bacilli have been used in a number of instances (Bairagi *et*
478 *al.* 2002; Ghosh *et al.* 2004). Ramachandran & Ray (2007) conducted fermentation of black
479 gram seed meal with a *Bacillus* sp. that was effective in reducing crude fibre, tannin and phytic

480 acid. Further, in an attempt to use phytase-producing bacilli in processing of plant ingredient,
481 *B. licheniformis* LF1 and *B. licheniformis* LH1 isolated from rohu were used for fermentation
482 of sesame oilseed meal (Roy *et al.* 2014). Diets incorporated with fermented oilseed meal
483 significantly ($P < 0.05$) improved the apparent digestibility of macro-molecules (protein, lipid)
484 and minerals (phosphorus, calcium, copper, iron and manganese). Another study reporting
485 processing of sesame oil cake by the phytase-producing fish gut bacterium, *B. subtilis* subsp.
486 *subtilis* through SSF resulted in significant ($P < 0.05$) reduction of the anti-nutrients (e.g. phytic
487 acid, tannins, trypsin inhibitor and crude fibre), while levels of free amino acids, fatty acids and
488 different minerals were noticed to be enhanced (Das & Ghosh 2015). Subsequently,
489 fermentation (SSF) of linseed oil-cake with *B. pumilus* LRF1X and *B. tequilensis* HMF6X
490 revealed minor enhancement in the contents of macro-molecules, total free amino acids and
491 fatty acids as compared to the raw substrate (Banerjee & Ghosh 2016). In addition, anti-
492 nutrients (cellulose, hemicelluloses, crude fibre, tannins, phytic acid and trypsin inhibitor) were
493 significantly ($P < 0.05$) reduced and more interestingly, amino acid composition indicated
494 significant ($P < 0.05$) boost in the levels of numerous amino acids (arginine, cystine, histidine,
495 isoleucine, methionine, phenylalanine, threonine, tryptophan and valine) in the fermented oil-
496 cake, although, lysine and leucine contents were decreased (Banerjee & Ghosh 2016).
497 Therefore, it seems that fermentation by autochthonous exo-enzyme producing bacilli could be
498 effective in improving the feed value of the plant feedstuffs, which would have a great
499 contribution in aquafeed-technology in the upcoming era.

500 **5. Bacteriocins produced by *Bacillus* and their antibacterial activity**

501 The antimicrobial compounds produced by bacteria are usually divided into two major groups;
502 (1) non-ribosomal secondary metabolites, such as peptide or lipopeptide antibiotics and (2)
503 ribosomally synthesized proteins/peptides, such as bacteriocins (Abriouel *et al.* 2011; Lee &
504 Kim, 2011). Bacteriocins are ribosomally synthesized antimicrobial peptides produced by
505 bacteria that often present bactericidal effects against other closely related species (Cotter *et al.*
506 2005). Bacteriocins are the most abundant and diverse of the bacterially produced
507 antimicrobials (Riley, 2009). These heterogeneous substances portray variable biochemical
508 properties, inhibitory spectra, molecular weights and mechanisms of action (OSullivan *et al.*
509 2002). Antibiotics have been used in the fish health manager's for the treatment of bacterial
510 diseases in fish since years. However, massive use of broad spectrum antibiotics and
511 antimicrobial drugs increases the selective pressure by developing emergence of bacterial

512 resistance (Verschuere *et al.* 2000). The development of antibiotic resistance among the
513 microorganisms associated with fish diseases has become a global concern during the past years
514 (Kolndadacha *et al.* 2011). Thus, much interest has been paid on the search for novel
515 antibacterial compounds, preferably proteins with prophylactic and/or curative potential, for
516 which the pathogens may not develop resistance (Patil *et al.* 2001). In this regard, bacteriocins
517 from natural sources have been suggested to be an alternative to control the bacterial diseases
518 in aquaculture (Kim *et al.* 2014; Sahoo *et al.* 2016).

519 Bacteriocins produced by lactic acid bacteria (LAB) are the most widely studied (Nes *et al.*
520 2007; Ringø *et al.* 2018), while, the *Bacillus* spp. have been less studied in this respect (Abriouel
521 *et al.* 2011). The genus *Bacillus* includes an assortment of industrially important species and
522 has a history of safe use in both food and industry (Paik *et al.* 1997). Moreover, investigations
523 of the antimicrobial potential of genus *Bacillus* is of interest to investigate, as bacilli produce
524 several bacteriocins or bacteriocin-like inhibitory substances (BLIS) representing different
525 chemical structures (Von Döhren, 1995; Abriouel *et al.* 2011). The production of bacteriocins
526 or BLIS has been described for some *Bacillus* species including *B. thuringiensis* (Paik *et al.*
527 1997), *B. subtilis* (Zheng *et al.* 1999), *B. cereus* (Bizani & Brandelli 2002) and *B.*
528 *amyloliquefaciens* (An *et al.* 2015). Like the LAB, the genus *Bacillus* also includes
529 representatives that are generally recognized as safe (GRAS), such as *B. subtilis* and *B.*
530 *licheniformis* (Smitha & Bhat 2013), and hence can be used in the aquaculture as probiotics for
531 prevention of some bacterial diseases such motile *Aeromonas* septicemia and vibriosis. *Bacillus*
532 bacteriocins are increasingly becoming imperative owing to their broader spectra of inhibition
533 that may include some Gram-negative bacteria and Gram-positive species belonging to genera
534 of *Aeromonas*, *Edwardsiella*, *Streptococcus*, *Pseudomonas* and *Vibrio* (Dutta & Ghosh 2015;
535 Chen *et al.* 2016b; Chen *et al.* 2016b; Sumathi *et al.* 2017)

536 The gut microbiota in some finfish species such as Indian carp has been reported to be fairly
537 dominated by the genus *Bacillus* (Class I of the phylum Firmicutes i.e. the bacilli), that has
538 become evident through both culture dependent and culture in-dependent methods (Ringø *et al.*
539 2006; Ghosh *et al.* 2010; Ray *et al.* 2010; Sarkar & Ghosh 2014; Li *et al.* 2015; Das & Ghosh
540 2015; Mukherjee *et al.* 2016; Yilmaz *et al.* 2018). Further, fish gut associated bacilli are known
541 to play an important role for prevention of infections in aquaculture by production of
542 antibacterial substances (e.g. Dimitroglou *et al.* 2011; Mukherjee *et al.* 2017; Nandi *et al.* 2017a;

543 [Nandi et al. 2017b](#); [Ghosh et al. 2017](#)). Although several studies on bacteriocins from *Bacillus*
544 have exhibited their important aspects of food safety ([Gautam & Sharma 2009](#); [Abriouel et al.](#)
545 [2011](#); [Nath et al. 2015](#)), very few have addressed the potential application of these antimicrobial
546 substances to be used against bacterial diseases in aquaculture ([Ran et al. 2012](#); [Kim et al. 2014](#);
547 [Luo et al. 2014](#); [Guo et al. 2016](#); [Mukherjee et al. 2017](#)). Moreover, studies on fish gut
548 associated bacilli with regard to likely bacteriocinogenic potential have been rarely addressed
549 ([Sirtori et al. 2006](#); [Giri et al. 2011](#)). Therefore, it needs extensive study for screening and
550 characterization of the bacteriocinogenic bacilli from the fish gut and their antibacterial
551 compounds to obtain more scientific understanding and knowledge to prevent diseases in
552 aquaculture. This section will present an overview of the diverse classes of bacteriocins
553 produced by bacilli, and an update on the efficacy of fish gut associated *Bacillus* spp. against
554 fish pathogens, and their prospective future applications.

555 **5.1. Classes of bacteriocins produced by *Bacillus***

556 Genus *Bacillus* are known to produce a wide variety of
557 antimicrobial substances that include peptide or lipopeptide antibiotics, bacteriocins and
558 bacteriocin-like inhibitors ([Stein 2005](#), [Sumi et al. 2015](#)). Antimicrobial peptides produced by
559 bacteria through ribosomal synthesis are generally referred to as bacteriocins, which are a
560 heterologous group of proteinaceous antimicrobial substances and known to produce by
561 bacteria from every major group ([Riley & Wertz 2002a,b](#)). Many other antimicrobial substances
562 that are not well characterized or the peptide nature of the compound has not been confirmed
563 and they are referred to as bacteriocin-like inhibitory substances (BLIS) ([Abriouel et al. 2011](#)).
564 The *Bacillus* group of bacteria often produce lipopeptide antibiotics by non-ribosomal synthesis
565 (e.g. iturins). This section will present an overview on the classification of bacteriocins or BLIS
566 produced by the bacilli excluding the non-ribosomally synthesized peptides.

567 To date, most of the classification efforts are made with the bacteriocins from LAB. The
568 classification scheme of LAB bacteriocins was primarily developed by [Klaenhammer \(1993\)](#),
569 who grouped bacteriocins into four distinct classes with sub-classes: Class I or lantibiotics
570 (post-translationally modified, thermostable peptides, containing lanthionine or derivatives, <5
571 kDa); Class II (unmodified small heat-stable peptides, <10 kDa); Class III (unmodified large
572 heat-labile peptides, >30 kDa) and Class IV (large complex proteins, containing carbohydrates
573 or lipid moieties). This grouping has formed the basis of all subsequent classification schemes

574 for bacteriocins produced by the Gram-positive bacteria. Readers with special interest are
575 referred to the reviews of Mokoena (2017) and Ringø *et al.* (2018) where updated classification
576 schemes of bacteriocins produced by the LAB have been presented. Genus *Bacillus* may be
577 considered as the second most important group for the production of bacteriocins and BLIS
578 after the LAB. It was evident that the bacteriocins produced by *Bacillus* spp. display broad
579 range of molecular mass; e.g. the smallest bacteriocin-like compound (800 Da) is produced by
580 *B. licheniformis* (Teixeira *et al.* 2009), whereas *B. thuringiensis* produced the largest
581 bacteriocin (950 kDa) such as thuricin (Cherif *et al.* 2001). Many *Bacillus* bacteriocins belong
582 to the lantibiotics, post-translationally modified peptides commonly dispersed among different
583 bacterial groups. Lantibiotics are the best-described antimicrobial peptides with regard to
584 biosynthesis mechanisms, genetic determinants and peptide structure. Members of the genus
585 *Bacillus* also produce many other unmodified bacteriocins within Class II of LAB bacteriocins
586 (Klaenhammer 1993; Drider *et al.* 2006; Nes *et al.* 2007), which includes the pediocin-like
587 bacteriocins (Class IIa) and the two-peptide bacteriocins (Class IIb), while others show
588 completely novel peptide sequences (Abriouel *et al.* 2011). Some of the well described
589 bacteriocins produced by *Bacillus* spp. are, subtilin by *B. subtilis* (Banerjee & Hansen 1988),
590 cerein by *B. cereus* (Oscariz *et al.* 1999), bacillocin 490 by *B. licheniformis* (Martirani *et al.*
591 2002), haloduracin by *B. halodurans* (Lawton *et al.* 2007), thuricin by *B. thuringiensis* (Gray
592 *et al.* 2006), subtilosin by *B. amyloliquifaciens* (Sutyak *et al.* 2008), and megacin by *B.*
593 *megaterium* (Kiss *et al.*, 2008), and they are mostly active against Gram-positive organisms
594 such as *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Gardnerella vaginalis*, *Streptococcus agalactiae*,
595 *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Leuconostoc mesenteroides*. In view of the increasing number of
596 bacteriocins described within different bacterial groups such as lactic acid bacteria, it is very
597 difficult to ascertain a combined classification scheme of bacteriocins (Nes *et al.* 2007).
598 Therefore, the *Bacillus* bacteriocin classification system may be adopted independently even
599 though some compounds produced by both *Bacillus* and LAB have very similar characteristics.
600 Consequently, a simple classification scheme for the bacteriocins / BLIS produced by the
601 *Bacillus* spp. was proposed by Abriouel *et al.* (2011) that holds three classes of bacteriocins
602 (Table 3): Class I (antimicrobial peptides that undergo post-translational modifications); Class
603 II (small nonmodified and linear peptides, heat and pH stable, 0.77–10 kDa) and Class III (large
604 proteins with phospholipase activity, >30 kDa).

605

5.2. Pathogen inhibition by bacilli and their bacteriocinogenic activity

Bacterial antagonism is a regular incident in nature that might play a vital role in maintaining the balance between potentially beneficial and pathogenic microorganisms associated with fish (Balcázar *et al.* 2006; Pandiyan *et al.* 2013). Growth inhibition of pathogenic bacteria by the beneficial bacteria could be due to the individual or combined production of antibacterial metabolites (e.g., bacteriocins, siderophores, lysozymes, proteases), competition for essential nutrients, alteration of pH by organic acid production and competitive exclusion (Verschuere *et al.* 2000; De Vrese & Schrezenmeir 2008; Laloo *et al.* 2010; Mukherjee & Ghosh 2016). Among these, antimicrobial peptides or bacteriocins have received major attention as an alternative bio-control agent limiting colonization of pathogenic bacteria in GI fish (Ghanbari *et al.* 2013). Consequently, *Bacillus* spp. isolated from different environments presented a huge variety of species producing bacteriocins or BLIS, which displayed antimicrobial activity against other bacteria including fish pathogens (Abriouel *et al.* 2011; Sahoo *et al.* 2016). In general, the majority of aquatic origin bacteriocins with antagonistic activities against bacterial pathogens have been reported from the marine fish with a lesser extent from freshwater fish species (Sahoo *et al.* 2016). Moreover, bacteriocinogenic bacilli directly recovered from fish and/or characterizations of the bacteriocins are sparse (Sirtori 2006; Bhaskar *et al.* 2007; An *et al.* 2015). Compare to allochthonous microbiota, the use of autochthonous microbiota and their metabolites might be preferred to induce disease resistance e.g. inhibiting the pathogens and avoid their likely harmful effects on the host fish and the normal microbiota (Ringø *et al.* 2018). Numerous studies have revealed that genus *Bacillus* is a part of the autochthonous bacterial community in fish (Ray *et al.* 2012; Ghosh *et al.* 2018). In some aquaculture species such as Indian carp, the justification of using bacilli or bacteriocinogenic bacilli of autochthonous nature might be associated with the bacterial strains, target pathogens and the hosts, all essentially share the same ecological niche (Mukherjee *et al.* 2016; 2017). In view of application of bacteriocinogenic bacilli, research endeavours towards disease resistance or pathogen inhibition in aquaculture may be grouped into three categories: (1) bacteriocin production has not been confirmed, but assumed to be the reason behind pathogen inhibition, (2) proteinaceous nature of the BLIS has been confirmed with partial characterization, and (3) specific bacteriocins produced by bacilli has been characterized and identified. The most reports are associated with the first two categories. In contrast, studies on bacteriocinogenic bacilli

637 from aquatic sources and identification of bacteriocins produced by aquatic
638 animals/environments are scarce (Table 4).

639 During the last two decades, information on antagonism by fish gut associated bacilli against
640 diverse pathogenic bacteria has become available, and this section presents an overview on the
641 pathogen inhibitory bacilli isolated from different fish species (Table 5). Antimicrobial
642 substances produced by bacilli isolated from GI tracts of Japanese coastal fish (Sugita *et al.*
643 1998) and an Indian major carp (IMC), rohu (Giri *et al.* 2011) have been reported. Antibacterial
644 compound produced by *B. licheniformis* P40 isolated from an Amazon basin fish *Leporinus* sp.
645 was bactericidal and bacteriolytic to *Listeria monocytogenes* (Cladera-Olivera *et al.* 2004). In
646 addition, *B. subtilis* SG4 (Ghosh *et al.* 2007), *B. aerius* CCH1A and *B. sonorensis* CCH1Ph
647 (Dutta *et al.* 2015) isolated from mrigal, *C. mrigala*; *B. methylotrophicus* isolated from channel
648 catfish, *Ictalurus punctatus* (Ran *et al.* 2012) and catla, *Catla catla*, (Mukherjee & Ghosh
649 2016); and *B. cereus* and *B. circulans* obtained from the GI tract of some other fish species
650 (Laloo *et al.* 2010; Geraylou *et al.* 2014) were established as antagonistic against different
651 strains of *Aeromonas hydrophila* pathogenic to fish. Strains of *B. methylotrophicus* isolated
652 from soil or channel catfish intestine inhibited fish pathogens causing enteric septicaemia (*E.*
653 *ictaluri*) and motile aeromonad septicaemia (*A. hydrophila*) (Ran *et al.* 2012). Another strain,
654 *B. subtilis* BHI344, isolated from the GI tract of channel catfish was shown to depressed growth
655 of pathogenic *A. hydrophila*, *A. sobria*, and *A. caviae*, *in vitro* (Luo *et al.* 2014); while strain
656 *B. sonorensis* CM2H3L isolated from the gut of mrigal inhibited *in vitro* growth of *A.*
657 *salmonicida* (Dutta & Ghosh 2015). Mukherjee *et al.* (2016) revealed that *B. stratosphericus*
658 KM277362, *B. aerophilus* KM277363, *B. licheniformis* KM277364 and *S. silvestris*
659 KM277365 isolated from the GI tract of mrigal inhibited *in vitro* growth of *A. hydrophila*, *A.*
660 *salmonicida*, *P. fluorescens* and *P. putida*. Inhibition of pathogenic aeromonads was also
661 revealed by *B. methylotrophicus* (NR116240), *B. amyloliquefaciens* (NR117946) and *B.*
662 *licheniformis* (NR118996) isolated from rohu (Mukherjee *et al.* 2017). However,
663 characterization and identification of the antibacterial compounds produced by these gut
664 bacteria was not evaluated in the above mentioned studies, and inhibition was assumed to be
665 due to bacteriocins or BLIS. Some of these observations made an attempt for partial purification
666 and characterization of the inhibitory substances, and the proteinaceous nature of the BLIS were
667 confirmed (Giri *et al.* 2011; Mukherjee *et al.* 2017). Among three bacilli species; *B. subtilis*, *B.*
668 *cereus* and *B. amyloliquefaciens* recovered from the gut of IMC, only *B. amyloliquefaciens*

669 demonstrated antagonistic activity against three fish pathogens *A.*
670 *hydrophila*, *Acinetobacter* sp. and *Acinetobacter tandoii* (Kavitha *et al.*, 2018). *B. subtilis*
671 (ATCC 6633) inhibited *in vitro* growth of *A. hydrophila* and *P. fluorescens* (Aly *et al.* 2008),
672 while *B. subtilis* strains isolated from grass carp intestine exhibited inhibitory activities against
673 fish pathogenic bacteria, including *A. hydrophila*, *A. punctata*, *E. ictaluri*, *A. punctata f.*
674 *intestinali*, *Vibrio fluvialis*, and *Str. agalactiae*, but the inhibitory effect varied with highest
675 effect against *A. hydrophila* and *A. punctata* (Guo *et al.*, 2016). In a study by Banerjee *et al.*
676 (2017), *B. subtilis* LR1 isolated from the GI tract of rohu exhibited a bacteriocin (~50 kDa)
677 with inhibitory activity against four fish pathogens; *B. mycoides*, *A. salmonicida*, *P. fluorescens*
678 and *A. hydrophila*. *B. subtilis* and *B. amyloliquefaciens* recovered from GI tract of marine fish
679 (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) and cultured pond of sea cucumber exhibited antagonistic activity
680 against *V. anguillarum*, *V. harveyi*, *V. vulnificus*, *Streptococcus* sp. and *Staphylococcus aureus*
681 (Chen *et al.*, 2016a). Among the eight *Bacillus* strains isolated from the intestine of the fish
682 species; *Scophthalmus maximus*, *Paralichthys olivaceus*, *Epinephelus coioides* and
683 *Clupanodon punctatus*, revealed *B. amyloliquefaciens* M001 more antagonistic activity against
684 multiple aquatic bacterial pathogens including *V. anguillarum*, *V. campbellii*, *V. vulnificus*, *V.*
685 *parahamolyticus*, *Streptococcus* sp. and *Edwardsiella tarda* (Chen *et al.* 2016b). It is worth to
686 mention that very few of the well-characterized bacteriocins produced by fish gut associated
687 *Bacillus* spp., e.g., *Bacillus* sp. P45 isolated from *Piaractus mesopotamicus*, Amazon basin
688 fish (Sirtori *et al.*, 2006) and *B. amyloliquefaciens* isolated from the marine fish *Epinephelus*
689 *areolatus* (An *et al.*, 2015) have been investigated. However, it has become evident that several
690 reports suggested that fish gut associated bacilli displayed inhibitory activity against the major
691 fish pathogens, which could be due to bacteriocins. However, purification and characterization
692 of the specific bio-active compounds and mechanism behind the pathogen inhibition are still
693 less understood in most of the cases.

694 The use of purified bacteriocins in aquaculture is a controversial issue, as the main concern
695 would be application of these compounds to the farmed fish that are aquatic (Rather *et al.*,
696 2017). Instead, application of the bacteriocinogenic strains as probiotics have been suggested
697 (Gatesoupe 2008; Karthikeyan & Santhosh, 2009; Issazadeh *et al.* 2012). In reality, this could
698 be a more rational and economically feasible approach than application of purified bacteriocins
699 considering the fact that the ability of the bacteriocinogenic bacilli to sporulate would enable
700 them to establish within the Gi tract of the hosts and in the aquatic environments (Rather *et al.*

701 2017). Another benefit by using live *Bacillus spp.* is that they are not generally involved in the
702 processes of horizontal gene transfer with Gram-negative bacteria (e.g. *Vibrio* and *Aeromonas*
703 spp.), and thus are unlikely to acquire genes of antibiotic resistance or virulence from these
704 species (Moriarty, 1999). The production of antimicrobial substances and sporulation capacity
705 confer *Bacillus* strains with a double advantage in terms of their survival in different habitats.
706 Furthermore, the proteinaceous nature of the bacteriocins or BLIS implies putative degradation
707 of the anti-microbial substance within the GI tract of fish, suggesting their use as prophylactic
708 or therapeutic feed supplements (Ringø *et al.* 2018). However, subsequent studies on
709 purification, characterization and identification of the bacteriocins from bacilli are necessary to
710 realize effectiveness of the vast array of compounds produced by diverse species and also to
711 develop a sustainable strategy to explore the potential bacteriocinogenic bacilli for disease
712 resistance and pathogen prevention in aquaculture.

713 **Tables 2 to 5 here**

714 **6. *Bacillus* as bioremediation of water quality**

715 The aquatic ecosystems including aquaculture sector is the first ecosystem that greatly affected
716 by different sources of pollutions, and bioremediation by probiotic bacteria is a process in which
717 beneficial bacteria are used to clean up contaminated water and soil. Generally a successful
718 bioremediation of rearing water by probiotics can occur via several ways including (i)
719 optimizing nitrification rates to maintain a low ammonia concentration, (ii) optimizing
720 denitrification rates to remove the excess nitrogen from the ponds as nitrogen gas, (iii)
721 maximizing sulphide oxidation to decrease the accumulated hydrogen sulphide, (iv)
722 maximizing carbon mineralization to carbon dioxide to minimize the sludge accumulation, (v)
723 maximizing primary pond productivity to enhance the production of the growing target aquatic
724 animal as well as the secondary crops and (vi) maintaining a diverse and stable pond community
725 to avoid from the dominance of the undesirable species in the ponds. Probiotics like *Bacillus*
726 can modulate the microbial communities in water and sediment leading to a reduction and/or
727 elimination of some pathogenic agents as well as improving the growth and survival of the
728 target animal. However, the efficacy of probiotics is associated with a good understanding the
729 nature of bacterial competition between species or strains.

730 Among probiotics bacteria, are *Bacillus* sp. especially associated with improved water quality.
731 The rationale is that Gram-positive bacteria are efficient in converting organic matter into CO₂
732 compared to Gram-negative bacteria (Kumar *et al.*, 2016). The buildup of dissolved and
733 particulate organic matter is very common phenomenon observed during shrimp production
734 cycles, however high levels of Gram-positive bacteria (e.g., probiotic *Bacillus*) can be used to
735 minimize the levels of organic carbon in the system. Bacterial species belongs to the *Bacillus*
736 genera are also known to be a potential bio-remediators for organic wastes (Thomas & Ward,
737 1992). These probiotic bacteria regulate the population of beneficial microbiota in aquatic
738 environment and control the pathogenic microorganism and subsequently enhances the
739 decomposition of undesirable organic substances in the water and sediments (Chávez-Crooker
740 & Obreque-Contreras, 2010).

741 When certain *Bacillus* strains are added to the water in a sufficient density, they may cause a
742 significant impact, by competing with the bacterial microbiota naturally exist for the available
743 organic matter e.g. uneaten feed and aquatic animal feces. Such biologically interaction activity
744 is a reflecting of not only the strain capacity for the enzyme production, but also some
745 environmental conditions such as water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, organic and
746 inorganic substances. For instance, Yu *et al.* (2012) demonstrated that among nine strains of
747 ammonia nitrogen degradation bacteria of wastewater origin, *B. amyloliquefaciens* revealed
748 highest degrading activity than the other strains at 35°C, pH 7.0 and rotation 200 r/min
749 (aeration). At high temperature (>35°C) and pH (>7) was degradation activity gradually
750 reduced. In an early study, Focht & Verstraete (1977) suggested that temperature is critical by
751 influencing growth, absorption and utilization of substances via changing the enzyme
752 activities. In addition, environmental alkaline/acidic condition influence the degradation of
753 ammonia nitrogen by some *Bacillus* bacteria. The degradation rate also declined with an
754 increase in carbon source (glucose) level, probably due to glucose overloaded that inhibited
755 the degrading level of ammonia nitrogen, indicating that ammonia nitrogen consumed in
756 medium is utilized to proliferate the new bacterial cells. Further, the optimal shaking speed (as
757 source of oxygen) to reach a maximum ammonia nitrogen degradation was obtained at 200
758 r/min and decreased gradually thereafter indicating that some *Bacillus* species can perform a
759 better activity for removal of ammonia from the water column under aeration condition than
760 anaerobic one.

761 Studies demonstrated the efficacy of some commercial and indigenous *Bacillus* as probiotics
762 and suggested that bacilli improved the water quality parameters in cultured ponds or
763 recirculation systems. Members with this trait, including *B. subtilis*, *B. licheniformis*, *B. cereus*,
764 *B. coagulans* are suggested as suitable for bioremediation of organic detritus (Divya *et al.*,
765 2015), although they do not seem to be present in sufficient population level in the water
766 column or sediment. *B. subtilis* and *B. licheniformis* are two suitable candidates for
767 bioremediation of aquaculture rearing water (Singh, 2002), and some details of efficacy of
768 *Bacillus* probiotics in aquaculture rearing water is presented in Table 6.

769 **6.1. *Bacillus* probiotic efficacy on rearing water of fish**

770 Chen & Chen (2001) revealed that a combination application of *B. subtilis* and *B. megaterium*
771 (supplemented twice a week) into rearing recirculating-water systems of red-parrot fish (male
772 midas cichlid *Cichlasoma citrinellum* × female redhead cichlid (*C. synspilum*) not only
773 significantly maintained total ammonia nitrogen (TAN), chemical oxygen demands (COD) and
774 water transparency values to the lower levels than the control, but also reduced the high
775 mortality of fish reared at high-density cultured environment. The low values of TAN and
776 COD and the higher water transparency in the water by *Bacillus*-treatment could be attributed
777 to the presence of *Bacillus* spp. that were counted as the dominant bacterial species in the water
778 of the treated group. In a study by Laloo *et al.* (2007), a combined supplementation of *B.*
779 *subtilis*, *B. mycoides* and *B. licheniformis* originally recovered from mud sediment and
780 common carp intestinal tract at 7-day intervals was able to significantly reduce ammonia,
781 nitrite, nitrate and phosphate ions in the rearing water of common carp held in recirculation
782 tanks at 20°C. *B. subtilis* secretes two enzymes of nitrate and nitrite reductases that under
783 nitrogen limitation condition, they reduce nitrate to ammonia (via nitrite), as *B. subtilis* is able
784 to use nitrate or nitrite as sole source of nitrogen and also as the electron acceptors for anaerobic
785 respiration (Laloo *et al.*, 2007). Heterotrophic nitrification by *Bacillus* has also been reported
786 by Mevel & Prieur (2000). Such biological functions by *B. subtilis* and *B. cereus* grown under
787 aerobic, facultative aerobic and anaerobic conditions make them able to change nitrogen
788 metabolism that facilitate both nitrification and denitrification processes. Naderi-Samani *et al.*
789 (2016) demonstrated that inclusion of *Bacillus* sp. in the rearing tank water of common carp
790 significantly decreased TAN compared to control, but nitrate increased. When a combination
791 of *B. pumilus* and *Lb. delbrueckii* probiotics applied to the rearing water of common carp in a

792 biofloc culture system with molasses as carbon source, no change was displayed in
793 temperature, pH and dissolved oxygen compared vs. the control, whereas a sudden decline in
794 TAN was observed in the water of the probiotic treated groups after the 7th week and onwards
795 following 20% water exchange (Dash *et al.*, 2018). In addition, an increase in total suspended
796 solids (TSS) and total dissolved solid (TDS), and a fluctuation in nitrate level was observed.
797 Use of *B. pumilus* as a known nitrogen removal bacterium along with periphytic algae available
798 in such biofloc system could efficiently reduce total ammonia and nitrite in an aquaculture
799 system as demonstrated by Banerjee *et al.* (2010) who used *B. pumilus* in rearing water of *P.*
800 *monodon*. Furthermore, no significant change was seen in pH, salinity, dissolved oxygen and
801 temperature values. In a previous study, Ghosh *et al.* (2008) evaluated the supplementation
802 effect of an indigenous isolate of *B. subtilis* strain recovered from the intestine of mrigal into
803 the rearing water of four ornamental fish species; *Poecilia reticulata*, *P. sphenops*, *Xiphophorus*
804 *helleri* and *X. maculatus* at four different concentrations every 15 days interval significantly
805 reduced the levels of dissolved organic matter, TAN as well as total counts of coliforms and
806 motile *Aeromonas* compared to control ones suggesting a well inhibitory activity by *B. subtilis*
807 towards some Gram-negative bacteria. More recently, Zhang *et al.* (2013) demonstrated that
808 supplementation of a indigenous *B. subtilis* strain isolated from grass carp to a fish pond for
809 7 days significantly reduced ammonia, nitrite and total nitrogen levels in water over an extended
810 period compared with the control group, but nitrate did not show significant difference. Also,
811 the microbial diversity increased in the probiotic treated groups, and could be due to secretion
812 of some antimicrobial substances such as coagulin, amicoumacin and subtilisin by *B. subtilis*,
813 findings that Cutting (2011) suggested to suppress the growth of competing microbes and
814 enteric pathogens. The interesting finding that the probiotic treated group was dominated by
815 *Proteobacteria*, *Bacteroidetes* and *Actinobacteria* may be interest as *Proteobacteria*, has
816 previously been shown to play a role in nitrogen removal (Labbe' *et al.* 2007; Shapleigh, 2011).
817 Prophylactic efficacy of *B. subtilis* in rearing water of *Tilapia nilotica* previously infected with
818 *Flavobacterium columnare* improved some water quality parameters (TAN, dissolved oxygen
819 and pH) and survival of fish (Mohamed *et al.*, 2011) suggesting the production of an
820 antagonistic capacity by *B. subtilis* to columnaris disease. Despite an adequate data reported on
821 the positive effects of bacilli probiotics as bioremediation of water quality of aquaculture
822 species, scarce data are available on their negative effects as water quality bioremediators.
823 Gupta *et al* (2016) reported that an eight-week application of *Paenibacillus polymyxa* (10^3 - 10^5

824 cfu/ml) as probiotic in common carp rearing water demonstrated no significant effect on some
825 water quality parameters including pH, total ammonia, nitrite and dissolved oxygen.

826 **6.2. *Bacillus* probiotic efficacy in rearing water of shrimp**

827 [Dalmin et al \(2001\)](#) in a study demonstrated that application of an indigenous *Bacillus* spp in
828 rearing water of *P. monodon* culture was able to maintain the optimum transparency and low
829 organic carbon of the pond waters combined with a decrease in *Vibrio* count in the water
830 column. [Matias et al \(2002\)](#) compared the efficacy of two commercial probiotic products on
831 the water quality parameters of commercial *P. monodon* grow-out ponds, and relatively a lower
832 concentration in TAN, nitrate, COD and biological oxygen demand was seen in the early culture
833 phase in ponds treated with mixture of *Bacillus* sp and *Saccharomyces* sp than treated ponds with
834 mixture of *Bacillus* sp., *Nitrosomonas* sp. and *Nitrobacter* sp. Additionally, no significant
835 change was recorded in values of salinity, ammonia, hydrogen sulphide, while dissolved
836 oxygen and transparency values were slightly increased, while pH value was almost constant.
837 Use of commercial probiotics (a mixture of *Bacillus* sp., *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*,
838 *Nitrosomonas* sp. and *Nitrobacter* sp in the rearing water of *L. vannamei* ponds improved
839 density of beneficial bacteria, dissolved oxygen and water transparency, but reduced
840 concentrations of total inorganic nitrogen, phosphate and COD ([Wang et al., 2005](#)). Also, no
841 significant variation was seen in pH value of probiotic treated group, while pH level in control
842 one was significantly increased after a remarkable decrease during first 40 days of the trail. The
843 average counts of *Bacillus* sp., ammonifying bacteria, and protein mineralizing bacteria were
844 also significantly higher in probiotic treated ponds compared to control ones. Further,
845 application of the probiotics significantly improved dissolved oxygen, while COD was
846 decreased. A higher counts of protein mineralizing bacteria and ammonifying bacteria in the
847 probiotic treated ponds indicating an efficient mineralization and relation with a decrease in
848 values of COD, dissolved inorganic nitrogen and phosphorus. Also, a more stable in pH value
849 (7.8-8.6) was seen in the water of probiotic treated ponds than control ones (7.23-9.26). Such a
850 lower fluctuation in the pH might be due to a lower source of carbon dioxide and total alkalinity
851 in the water column providing a better environmental condition for the shrimp growth.
852 Additionally, higher values of dissolved oxygen and transparency in water column of probiotic
853 treated ponds could be due to a higher density of phytoplankton in the treated ponds as was
854 confirmed by the workers. A reduction in COD was also seen by [Porubcan \(1991\)](#) who used a

855 *Bacillus* sp. probiotic into pond aerators of shrimp with an increase in final production. Use of
856 a mixture of some species of commercial *Bacillus* strains including *B. subtilis* and *B.*
857 *licheniformis* (Sanolife MIC) in hatcheries of *P. monodon* and *L. vannamei* were able to
858 improve the water quality and reduced the density of *Vibrio* bacteria in water column (Decamp
859 *et al.*, 2008). However, the exact water quality parameters were not described in their works. In
860 a study by Rahiman *et al* (2010) a lower value in ammonia, nitrite and pH was seen in the
861 *Bacillus* sp treated water of *M. rosenbergii* culture during 60 days cultivation period, while no
862 change was observed in dissolved oxygen value compared to control groups. *In vitro*
863 bioremediation assessment of three indigenous *Bacillus* species; *B. pumilus*, *B. licheniformis*
864 and *B. subtilis* isolated from marine water and soil sample showed that these bacilli bacteria
865 were able to reduce TAN with an optimum growth occurred at occurred at 30 °C, pH 7.5, and
866 1.5% NaCl (Devaraja *et al.*, 2013). Also, under *in vivo* condition, *B. pumilus* reduced TAN
867 concentration in the rearing water of *P. monodon*. de Paiva Maia *et al.* (2013) appraised the
868 efficacy of commercial *Bacillus* probiotics on the bacterial population and phytoplankton
869 concentration in intensive *L. vannamei* culture with recirculation system. The results indicated
870 that probiotics bacteria improve total heterotrophic bacteria count in the sediment and caused
871 marked change in the percentage value of Pyrrophyta concentration, environmental quality of
872 water and sediment in ponds with recirculation system. The change in heterophilic bacteria was
873 probably due to addition of molasses as a source of carbohydrate that is important for the
874 survival and growth of heterogenic bacteria in water column. It is also worth to say that under
875 such a closed recirculation system; an aeration is important to provide sufficient dissolved
876 oxygen in the production system to prevent the limitation of the *Bacillus* probiotic efficiency.
877 Application of an indigenous probiotic *B. subtilis* once a week started 2 days after rearing
878 beginning on the water quality and bacterial community of *L. vannamei* culture enhanced the
879 water quality values by a decreasing in pH, nitrite, water transparency and soluble reactive
880 phosphorus and an increasing in COD and *Chlorophyl* a density (Wu *et al.*, 2016). The probiotic
881 also affected the bacterial community of culturing water at different culture stages with a more
882 impact was seen on the early and middle phases of shrimp culture than in the late phase,
883 probably due attribution of a better initial colonization and multiplication of probiotic by
884 peptone addition in the water column, similar to Lara-Anguiano *et al.* (2013) who demonstrated
885 that use of molasses as a fertilizer increased *Bacillus* spp. density in water column. However,
886 probiotic could not directly maintain this effect in the late culture stage probably because of a

887 high organic load in the water and an increasing of indigenous microorganism observed at this
888 stage. It seems application of encapsulated probiotics in water column prefers the beneficial
889 bacteria in shrimp and culture water and enhanced water quality for the levels of pH, ammonia
890 and nitrite of culture water. This was supported by [Nimrat et al. \(2012\)](#) who revealed lower
891 level in pH, ammonia and nitrite in the treated shrimp compared to the controls, when two
892 mixtures of *Bacillus* species (first mixture-*B. thuringiensis*, *B. megaterium*, *B. polymyxa*, *B.*
893 *licheniformis*, *B. subtilis* and second mixture-*B. subtilis*, *B. polymyxa*, *B. megaterium*, *B.*
894 *circulans*, *B. pumilus*) in the form of microencapsulated probiotic using *Artemia* in the rearing
895 water of *L. vannamei* were used. Also, higher densities of total heterotrophic bacteria and
896 *Bacillus* count were obtained in shrimp and water of the treated groups than in controls.
897 [Zokaeifar et al. \(2014\)](#) reported that application of *Bacillus* mixture in culture water of *L.*
898 *vannamei* resulted in significant improvement in water quality parameters, i.e., reduction in
899 ammonia, nitrite and nitrate ions and confers beneficial effect on growth performance, digestive
900 enzyme activity, immune response and disease resistance against *V. harveyi*. Furthermore,
901 assessment of some water quality parameters including salinity, carbonates, bicarbonates, total
902 alkalinity, Mg hardness, Ca hardness, total hardness, ammonia and pH in rearing water of *L.*
903 *vannamei* treated with *B. pumilus* resulted in a slight increase in pH, total alkalinity and
904 hardness, but with a fluctuation in other parameters ([Sreenivasulu et al., 2016](#)).

905 In a consequence, biological methods to treat water in aquaculture systems is regarded as the
906 most promising treatment technology and is being widely used to minimize toxic nitrogenous
907 compounds in aquaculture systems, and application of some bacteria such as *Bacillus* have been
908 recognized as beneficial in converting hazardous organic wastes into environmentally safe
909 compounds via ammonification and nitrification processes ([Roa et al. 1997](#); [Mevel & Prieur,](#)
910 [2000](#)). Improving of the rearing water quality parameters by *Bacillus* probiotics will enhance
911 the health status of aquatic animals via providing an optimum environmental condition that can
912 result in an approach in an optimum physiological condition as well. Also, *Bacillus* probiotics
913 suppress the density of potential pathogenic microorganisms via bacterial competition causing
914 a reduction stress culture condition and improving the animal immune-physiological balance.
915 Under such optimum animal physiological and environmental conditions, the cultured animal
916 can reflect a better growth performance and survival. However, it is worth to say that *Bacillus*
917 species are not a highly ammonia cleaner, and no single *Bacillus* strain been so far reported to
918 remove above 90% of ammonia ([Meng et al. 2009](#); [Xie et al. 2013](#)). Thus, to simultaneously

919 remove the ammonia and nitrite from aquaculture rearing waters, a combination of a high
 920 cleaner ammonia bacteria plus a *Bacillus* species as nitrifying probiotic could be recommended
 921 as bioremediation purposes in the rearing water of cultured aquatic animals as [Jawahar](#)
 922 [Abraham et al. \(2004\)](#) showed that a mixture of *Nitrosomonas* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. was the most
 923 efficient in removing 96% TAN in microcosm experiments. Although, most of researchers who
 924 used bacilli probiotics as a supplementary diet did not measure the water quality parameters,
 925 it seems oral application may improve the water quality conditions as a 21-day use of *B.*
 926 *licheniformis* and *B. flexus* in diet of *L. vannamei* illustrated a significant reduction in total
 927 ammonia nitrogen and chemical oxygen demand of the shrimp rearing water ([Cai et al., 2019](#)).

928 **Table 6 here**

929 **7. *Bacillus* as probiotics**

930 **7.1. *Bacillus* as probiotics in fish**

931 Over the past decade there were increasing attempts to evaluate different types of bacteria
 932 as probiotic in aquaculture (e.g. [Ringø et al., 2018](#); [Hoseinifar et al., 2018](#)). Among
 933 promising bacterial strains, *Bacillus* sp. showed beneficial effects on growth performance
 934 and disease resistance of different fish species ([Dawood et al., 2017](#); [Fečkaninová et al.,](#)
 935 [2017](#); [Dawood & Koshio, 2016](#); [Li et al., 2018](#); [Hoseinifar et al., 2016](#)). Regarding the
 936 studies on *Bacillus* sp. it seems that the main focus was on *B. subtilis* ([Zhang et al., 2014](#)).
 937 The present section summarized and discuss the effects of different species of *Bacillus* on
 938 growth performance, immune parameters and resistance against diseases.

939 **7.1.1. *Bacillus* probiotics as growth promoter**

941 It is now well accepted that the costs of diet composes a large portion of farmers costs; reported
 942 to be around 50-60% ([Amiri et al., 2017](#)). Therefore, several researchers are working on
 943 different approaches to decrease the costs, especially by using different types of growth
 944 promoters ([Ng & Koh, 2016](#); [Hoseinifar et al., 2017b](#)). Growth promotion by dietary
 945 administration of probiotics has been reported in different fish species ([Hai, 2015](#)), and the
 946 mode of actions proposed for growth enhancement is producing exogenous enzymes by
 947 probiotics as well as improving the intestinal physiology ([Hoseinifar et al., 2017a](#)). Regarding
 948 different *Bacillus* species there were contradictory reports ([Table 7](#)). Even, in case of identical

949 probiotic and fish species, different authors reported different results. This can be attributed to
950 difference in intestinal microbiota, life stages and culture condition of target aquatic organisms.
951 To the best of our knowledge, the first study using *B. subtilis* as fish growth promoters was
952 done by [Kumar et al. \(2006\)](#), by feeding rohu different levels ($0.5, 1.0$ and 1.5×10^7 CFU g⁻¹)
953 of *B. subtilis* for 15 days and observed significant increase in weight gain. Later, [Bagheri et al.](#)
954 (2008) supplemented rainbow trout fry diet with varying levels ($4.8 \times 10^8, 1.2 \times 10^9, 2.01 \times 10^9,$
955 $3.8 \times 10^9, 6.1 \times 10^9$ CFU g⁻¹) of commercial *B. subtilis*. After a short administration duration
956 period (13 days), probiotic fed fish showed noticeable increase in weight gain, specific growth
957 rate (SGR) and feed conversion ratio (FCR). The best growth promotion was obtained when
958 fish fed with 3.8×10^9 CFU g⁻¹ probiotic. Moreover, in a 28-days feeding trial, [Liu et al. \(2012\)](#)
959 investigated the effects of oral administration of *B. subtilis* E20 ($10^4, 10^6$ and 10^8 CFU g⁻¹) on
960 growth performance parameters of orange-spotted grouper, and revealed that dietary probiotic
961 significantly increased feeding efficiency and weight gain. The authors suggested that this
962 improvement can be attributed to provision of nutrient and exogenous enzymes e.g. protease
963 and lipase by *B. subtilis*. It has been reported that *Bacillus* sp. can supply essential nutrients,
964 such as amino acid, and vitamins K and B₁₂ for host organism which can have beneficial effects
965 on growth performance ([Sun et al., 2012](#); [Liu et al., 2012](#)). [Wu et al. \(2012\)](#) used another strain
966 (*B. subtilis* Ch9) in grass carp diet. Fish were fed with different levels ($1.0 \times 10^9, 3.0 \times 10^9$ and
967 5.0×10^9 CFU kg⁻¹) of probiotic for 56 days, and at the end of feeding trial, probiotic fed fish
968 had significantly higher weight gain, SGR and FCR. The best results achieved when fish fed
969 with 3.0×10^9 CFU kg⁻¹ of *B. subtilis*. Besides, the authors noticed significant increase of
970 digestive enzymes activity and improved intestinal morphology in probiotic fed fish. Similarly,
971 dietary administration of *B. Subtilis* (1×10^{10} CFU g⁻¹) significantly increased final weight, FCR
972 and protein efficiency ratio of olive flounder compared to those fish fed basal diet ([Cha et al.,](#)
973 [2013](#)). Furthermore, supplementation of Nile tilapia diet with 5×10^6 CFU g⁻¹ level of *B. subtilis*

974 significantly improved growth performance parameters (Telli *et al.*, 2014). The survival rate and
975 weight gain of Nile tilapia (65.5 g) were significantly increased when fish were fed with *B.*
976 *subtilis* at 1×10^7 /g for two months (Aly *et al.* 2008). Recently, Liu *et al.*, (2017) revealed in
977 a 8-week experiment that dietary administration of *B. subtilis* HAINUP40 (10^8 cfu/g⁻¹)
978 effectively enhances growth performance, intestinal probiotic recovery, digestive enzyme
979 activities in Nile tilapia (95 ± 8 g). Dietary administration of *B. subtilis* ($0.42 - 1.35 \times 10^7$ cfu
980 g⁻¹) in juvenile large yellow croaker (*Larimichthys crocea*) (7.82 g) in floating sea cages for 10
981 weeks provided a better growth performance at the higher dosage of probiotic than lower
982 dosage, suggesting a significant effect by probiotic dosage optimization (Ai *et al.*, 2011) as
983 similar results were revealed when Nile tilapia was orally fed high dosage of *B.*
984 *amyloliquefaciens* for two months (Reda *et al.*, 2015). Reda *et al.* (2015) revealed that high
985 dosage of the bacilli resulted in an increase of intestinal villi heights, higher numbers of goblet
986 cells and intraepithelial lymphocytes in fish intestine vs. control and/or low supplemented
987 levels. Further, higher levels of protein and lipid contents were measured in fish carcass fed
988 higher level of the bacilli. However, Gobi *et al.* (2016) in a study with catfish (*Pangasius*
989 *hypophthalmus*) revealed that application of *B. licheniformis* Dahb1 (10^5 cfu mL⁻¹) was more
990 effective on growth than higher dosage indicating of host and probiotic specific species.
991 Further, juvenile Asian sea bass (*Lates calcalifier*) fed diets supplemented with different dosages
992 of the combination of *B. licheniformis* and *B. subtilis* showed significantly a better growth at
993 1×10^6 CFU g⁻¹ than higher or lower levels of the probiotics after being fed for 2 months (Adorian
994 *et al.*, 2018). Also, a better performance in terms of body composition, total protein and digestive
995 enzymes (protease, lipase, and amylase) were seen in this dosage than others suggesting the
996 dosage optimization could play a significant role on the fish growth status.

997

998 In addition to *B. subtilis*, some attempts have been also carried out to demonstrate the possible
999 effects of other *Bacillus* species as probiotic on the growth of fish. [Bandyopadhyay and](#)
1000 [Mohapatra \(2009\)](#) studied the effects of *B. circulans* PB7 isolated from the intestine of *Catla*
1001 *catla* as feed additive in *C. catla* fingerlings diet. Fish were fed on various levels of probiotic
1002 including 2×10^4 , 2×10^5 , 2×10^6 CFU 100 g^{-1} for 60 days. At the end of feeding trial, the authors
1003 observed positive effects on growth performance parameters. The best results were obtained
1004 when fish were fed on 2×10^5 CFU g^{-1} . Also, in a 30 days study, [Sun et al. \(2010\)](#) administered
1005 a single dose of two species of Bacilli in orange spotted grouper diet. The authors supplied
1006 probiotic strain from the gut of orange spotted grouper. However, unlike previous studies with
1007 Bacilli probiotics, these probiotics were unable to affect growth performance parameters.
1008 Similarly, the effects of *B. amyloliquifaciens* was evaluated in in a 90-days feeding trial with
1009 Nile tilapia ([Silva et al., 2015](#)). Fish were fed 1×10^6 CFU g^{-1} , 5×10^6 CFU g^{-1} , and 1×10^7 CFU
1010 g^{-1} levels of probiotic. The result revealed that this probiotic had no significant effect on Nile
1011 tilapia. A six-week dietary administration of *B. amyloliquifaciens* in turbot demonstrated a
1012 marginal enhancement in the fish growth performance, but digestive enzyme activities i.e.
1013 protease, amylase in hepatopancreas, protease activity in intestine and lipase activity in stomach
1014 of treated fish significantly showed an increase compared to the control fish ([Chen et al. 2016b](#)).
1015 When silver carp larvae were fed with *B. latrospores* and *B. licheniformis* via rotifers
1016 (*Brachionus plicatilis*) as live probiotic vehicle, a better growth performance was seen in treated
1017 fish than control one ([Sahandi et al., 2012](#)). However, the water quality including water
1018 temperature used is not stated. A 62-day oral application of *B. velezensis* previously isolated
1019 from rearing water of salmon improved the growth and antioxidant capability of juvenile
1020 Atlantic salmon reared in a recirculating aquaculture ([Wang et al., 2019](#)). They reported that a
1021 combined administration of *B. velezensis* and *R. mucilaginosus* demonstrated a better effect on
1022 growth performance, feed utilization, immune response, and antioxidant capability and
1023 mortality, suggesting a more beneficial effect of multi-species probiotic than single one. Such
1024 beneficial effect was also found by [Giri et al., 2014](#)) when *B. subtilis* in combination with *P.*
1025 *aeruginosa* + *L. plantarum* were orally used in *Labeo rohita* with a better result in improvement
1026 of weight gain, SGR and FCR than fish received *B. subtilis* alone. However, in a study by [Doan](#)
1027 [et al. \(2018\)](#) no significant difference was seen on the growth of tilapia fed either *B. velezensis*
1028 in single form or in a combination with *L. plantarum* for 30 days.

1029 Beside the oral administration of *Bacillus*, a few studies attempted to assess the effect of bath
1030 application of *Bacillus* on fish growth. For instance, in a study with Nile tilapia, [Zhou et al.](#)
1031 [\(2010\)](#) used *B. coagulans* as water probiotic. The culture water was treated with a single dose
1032 (10^7 CFU ml⁻¹) of probiont for 40 days, the authors stated that fish in probiotic treated group
1033 had significantly higher final weight and SGR compared to the control one. Also, 56-days
1034 application of *B. subtilis* (10^7 CFU ml⁻¹ with 2 days interval) as water additive caused a
1035 remarkable increase in final weight and specific growth weight in the probiotic treated fish
1036 [\(Zhou et al., 2010\)](#). However, the mode of action of water probiotic on fish growth performance
1037 warranted further research works.

1038 **7.1.2. *Bacillus* probiotics as enhancer of immune status and disease resistance**

1039 Among different probiotic strains, there are some reports on beneficial effects of *Bacillus* sp. on
1040 the immune functions of fish. The first study on using of *B. subtilis* as immunostimulant was
1041 performed by [\(Newaj-Fyzul et al., 2007\)](#). The authors isolated *B. subtilis* AB1 from the
1042 digestive tract of rainbow trout and supplemented rainbow trout diet with a single dose (10^7 g
1043 kg⁻¹) for 14 days. Interestingly, probiotic fed fish showed significant increase of immune
1044 parameters including respiratory burst, serum and gut lysozyme, peroxidase, phagocytic killing,
1045 total and a1-antiprotease activities. Furthermore, probiotic fed fish demonstrated higher
1046 resistance against *Aeromonas* sp. Also, [Liu et al. \(2012\)](#) studied protective effects of *B. subtilis*
1047 E20 isolated from fermented boiled soybeans, and revealed a significant increase in some
1048 immune parameters including lysozyme, phagocytosis, respiratory burst and complement
1049 activities. When treated fish were challenged with *Streptococcus* sp an increase resistance was
1050 seen indicating a positive correlation between immune responses and survival. Also, the most
1051 beneficial effects was noticed in fish fed with higher levels of the probiotic. Similarly, dietary
1052 *B. subtilis* protected olive flounder against *Streptococcus iniae* [\(Cha et al., 2013\)](#). This was
1053 attributed to positive effects of *B. subtilis* on immune system, as the authors observed
1054 significantly higher responses of respiratory burst, lysozyme, superoxide dismutase and
1055 myeloperoxidase activities in probiotic fed fish. In two separate studies with Nile tilapia, [Zhou](#)
1056 [et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Telli et al. \(2014\)](#) studied possible effects of *B. subtilis* on some immune
1057 parameters. However, the studies were different both in terms of administration dose (10^7 CFU
1058 ml⁻¹ or 5×10^6 CFU g⁻¹) and route (oral or bath). Interestingly, both studies showed that this
1059 probiont significantly increased the fish immune responses including lysozyme, phagocytosis,

1060 catalase and myeloperoxidase activities. Nile tilapia fed *B. subtilis* demonstrated an
1061 enhancement in some immune parameters including nitroblue tetrazolium assay, neutrophil
1062 adherence and lysozyme activity compared with the untreated control group (Aly et al. 2008).
1063 When yellow croaker was fed with *B. subtilis*, a significant enhancement was seen in fish
1064 immune responses and survival after challenging with *V. harveyi*. It was interesting that the
1065 addition of fructooligosaccharide as a feed source of probiotic in fish diet did not significantly
1066 affect immune responses, disease resistance and growth performance of treated fish (Ai et al.,
1067 2011). *B. subtilis* LR1 isolated from the intestine of rohu could effectively reduce bacterial
1068 pathogenicity in Indian major carp (Banerjee et al., 2017). In a study by Liu et al. (2017) oral
1069 use of *B. subtilis* HAINUP40 enhanced some immune responses and disease resistance of Nile
1070 tilapia challenged with *Str. agalactiae* (Table 7).

1071 Apart from *B. subtilis*, the immune responses of fish treated with other bacilli have been also
1072 demonstrated by some researchers. Sun et al. (2010) fed orange spotted grouper with previously
1073 isolated *B. clausii* and *B. pumilus* from this fish gut at a single dose (10^8 CFU g⁻¹) for 60 days.
1074 The results revealed that both *Bacillus* bacteria were able to significantly increase phagocytosis,
1075 and complement C3, but no significant effect on lysozyme and superoxide dismutase activities.
1076 Such results suggest a beneficial effect of endogenous *Bacilli* on fish immune responses.
1077 However, more details works are requested to judge such results. For example, a correlation
1078 of efficacy of the probiotic on immune status with the survival of target animal after being
1079 challenged with a virulent pathogen is essential to approve the efficacy of the probiotic. The
1080 immunomodulatory and disease controlling effects of *B. amyloliquefaciens* have been studied
1081 in two separate studies on *C. catla* (Das et al., 2013) and Nile tilapia (Selim & Reda, 2015). In
1082 both trials the probiotics increased immune parameters including serum and mucus lysozyme,
1083 serum and mucus myeloperoxidase, respiratory burst, nitric oxide, serum bactericidal activity
1084 and some immune genes expression. Interestingly, *B. amyloliquefaciens* increased mucosal
1085 immunity of catla as well as resistance against *E. tarda* (Das et al., 2013). Further, the possible
1086 effects of two *Bacillus* species (*B. coagulans* MTCC 9872, and *B. licheniformis* MTCC 6824)

1087 on non-specific immunity of common carp and fish protection against *A. hydrophila* infection
1088 was evaluated by Gupta *et al.* (2014). After 80-days application of a single dose (10^9 CFU g⁻¹),
1089 both probiotics significantly increased lysozyme, myeloperoxidase and respiratory burst
1090 activities. This increase in immune parameters also resulted in noticeably protection against *A.*
1091 *hydrophila*. A 14-days oral application of *B. amyloliquefaciens* G1 (3×10^7 and 3×10^9 cfu/g feed) in
1092 eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) resulted in cumulative mortalities of 69.24% and 30.76% lower than in the high
1093 and low probiotic-cell-density groups, respectively compared to control groups, when fish were
1094 challenged with *A. hydrophila* at 1×10^9 cfu/cells (Lu *et al.*, 2011). Use of *B. amyloliquefaciens* in diet
1095 of tilapia increased the erythrocyte and leukocyte counts, hemoglobin content and hematocrit, but higher
1096 level of bacilli provided a better effect on serum total protein and globulin levels (Reda *et al.*, 2015).
1097 When turbot was orally subjected to *B. amyloliquefaciens*, significantly a higher activity of sera
1098 superoxide dismutase and total protein content as well as a higher relative per cent of survival (62.7%)
1099 were obtained after challenging fish with *V. anguillarum* (Chen *et al.*, 2016b). Again, oral administration
1100 of trout with 1:1 mixture of *B. subtilis* and *B. licheniformis* spores (BioPlus2B) could improve the
1101 survival and immune responses (antibody titer, lymphocyte and total protein) of fish against *Yersinia*
1102 *ruckeri* challenge (Raida *et al.*, 2003), suggesting that *Bacillus* and *Yersinia* may share antigens with
1103 some similarity to expand certain B- or T-lymphocyte clones induced by the *Bacillus* that could confer
1104 some protection against yersiniosis. Asian sea bass fed combined bacilli probiotics (*B.*
1105 *licheniformis* and *B. subtilis*) demonstrated an enhancement in immunocompetent cell
1106 populations (leukocytes) (Adorian *et al.*, 2018).

1107 Use of a lower dosage (10^5 cfu/ml) of *B. licheniformis* provided a better efficacy on catfish
1108 immune parameters and antioxidant than higher dosage (10^7 cfu/ml) (Table 7) (Gobi *et al.*,
1109 2016). Again, a better protective effect was seen when fish were challenged with *V.*
1110 *parahaemolyticus*. Such a promising result via bath administration of bacilli raised various
1111 issues including effectiveness of different administration methods, dosage of bacilli and
1112 duration of its application as well as the species of target fish. Innate immunological variables

1113 including lysozyme activity, respiratory burst assay, myeloperoxidase content, catalase and
1114 superoxidase dismutase activities were improved when common carp were treated by *P.*
1115 *polymyxa* as water additive probiotic for 8 weeks at 29.5°C (Table 7) (Gupta *et al.*, 2016). Such
1116 enhancement in immune variables was confirmed by an increase resistance in the treated fish
1117 challenged with *A. hydrophia*. Atlantic salmon fed either with single *B. velezensis* or in
1118 combination with *R. mucilaginoso* demonstrated an enhancement in immune responses (Table
1119 7) and disease resistance after fish being challenged with *A. salmonicida* (Wang *et al.*, 2018).
1120 Further, application of *B. velezensis* either in a single form or in combination with *L. plantarum*
1121 significantly enhanced various innate immune responses and resistance against *S. agalactiae*
1122 infection in Nile tilapia compared to control fish (Doan *et al.*, 2018). Giri *et al.* (2014) revealed
1123 that application of *B. subtilis* as single probiotic or in combination with *P. aeruginosa* + *L.*
1124 *plantarum* enhanced some immune responses and diseases resistance against *A. hydrophial* in
1125 of rohu compared to control one.

1126 Recently, the specific strains probiotics in specific host has been an attractive subject for the
1127 researchers, but minimum data is available related to aquaculture species. In a study by
1128 Galagarza *et al.* (2018) some strains of *B. subtilis* stimulated immune responses both locally
1129 and systemically in tilapia. More recently, it has been shown that *Bacillus* spores can be used
1130 as a perfect oral vaccine delivery system for their forceful specialty, gene operability, safety
1131 and adjuvant property. Jiang *et al.* (2019) demonstrated that higher survival and specific Ig M
1132 and IgZ as well as an up-regulation of some immune-related genes in grass carp orally
1133 vaccinated with recombinant *B. subtilis* spores carrying grass carp reovirus VP4 protein after
1134 the immunized fish being challenged with the virus.

1135 **Table 7 here**

1136 7.2. *Bacillus* as probiotics in shellfish culture

1137 Among the several probiotic candidates in shrimp aquaculture, *Bacillus* has brought
1138 encouraging results (Zokaeifar *et al.*, 2012b). *Bacillus* have been used to improve the growth
1139 performance, enhance immune response and disease management (e.g. Shen *et al.*, 2010;
1140 Keysami *et al.*, 2012). In addition, it is also well documented that *Bacillus* species are able to
1141 secrete a wide range of extracellular substances and antimicrobial peptides, which improves the
1142 water quality, feed digestion and absorption, boost shrimp health and immunity, promotes
1143 growth and reproduction and survival against pathogenic microorganism (Zokaeifar *et al.*,

1144 2012b; NavinChandran *et al.*, 2014; Chai *et al.*, 2016; Laranja *et al.*, 2017). Detail of effects of
1145 *Bacillus* as probiotics on growth performance, immune responses and disease resistances in
1146 shrimp culture are presented in Table 8.

1147 7.2.1. *Bacillus* probiotics as growth promoter

1148 In shrimp aquaculture, manipulation of microbiota using probiotics have been reported as a
1149 worthy practice to control or inhibits the pathogenic bacteria, improves digestive enzyme
1150 activity and growth performance and enhance immune response of host against pathogenic
1151 infection or physical stress (Balcázar *et al.*, 2006; Pérez *et al.*, 2010). One of the expected
1152 advantage of *Bacillus* as probiotics is a direct growth-promoting effect by induction of digestive
1153 enzymes, including protease and amylase, which consequently stimulates the natural digestive
1154 enzyme activity of the host (Liu *et al.*, 2009; Wang, 2007). In shrimps, it has been reported that
1155 *Bacillus* sp. have contributes to host nutrition, especially by supplying fatty acids and vitamins
1156 and improves growth and survival in *P. monodon* postlarvae without water exchange (Devaraja
1157 *et al.*, 2013; NavinChandran *et al.*, 2014; Kumar *et al.*, 2016). Zokaeifar *et al.* (2012b, 2014)
1158 demonstrated that *Bacillus* probiotic enhances the digestive enzyme activity, growth
1159 performance in shrimps. The results further revealed that adminsitartion of *B. subtilis* to *L.*
1160 *vannamei* increased the activity of protease and amylase digestive enzyme and subsequently
1161 improves the growth of shrimp juveniles i.e., final weight and weight gain(Zokaeifar *et al.*,
1162 2012b; Zokaeifar *et al.*, 2014). Nimrat *et al.* (2012) and Sadat Hoseini Madani *et al.* (2018)
1163 assessed the effect of commercial *Bacillus* probiotics application in growth performance,
1164 bacterial number, feed efficiency, body composition during rearing of *L. vannamei*. The study
1165 pointed out that *L. vannamei* with *Bacillus* probiotics added to their experimental tanks had
1166 significantly higher effect on their length gain %, weight gain %, average daily gain, SGR %
1167 and FCR than with the control. The probiotic bacteria also improves feed utilization of *L.*
1168 *vannamei* postlarvae. Bachruddin *et al.* (2018) reported that probiotics treatment which includes
1169 *Bacillus* into the culture water white shrimp, *L. vannamei* significantly improves weight gain,
1170 total length, FCR of shrimp species. Kongnum & Hongpattarakere (2012) and Chai *et al.* (2016)
1171 investigated the effects of *Bacillus* probiotic bacteria isolated from intestine of a healthy, wild
1172 shrimps on the growth rate in *L. vannamei*. The results of these studies show that *Bacillus*
1173 probiotics reduced shrimp culture risks becuase of stressful conditons or facotors and improved
1174 the growth performance, i.e., total weight, relative growth rate %, FCR, digestion and nutrient

1175 absorption of shrimp. In a study by [Olmos et al. \(2011\)](#) best growth performance in term of
1176 weight gain and food-conversion ratio was observed in juvenile *L. vannamei* orally fed with *B.*
1177 *subtilis* compare to both control and the fish fed with *B. megaterium* suggesting probiotic
1178 species selection is an important factor. Dietary application of *B. licheniformis* either LS-1 or
1179 *B. flexus* LD-1, or in a combined form demonstrated an enhancement in the weight gain and
1180 SGR of *L. vannamei* and improve water quality suggesting of dual beneficial effects of *Bacillus*,
1181 both to the host and to the rearing water ([Cai et al., 2019](#)).

1182 Apart from beneficial role of probiotics bacteria in shrimp growth, there are also few reports
1183 which suggests that application of poly- β -hydroxybutyrate (PHB), a bacterial storage
1184 compound deposited intracellularly in amorphous state in inclusion in the cytoplasm
1185 accumulated as a cellular energy and carbon reserve by large variety of bacterial species, have
1186 been reported as a biocontrol agent for crustacean culture and **found** promising to control
1187 vibriosis ([Jiang et al., 2008](#); [Rebah et al., 2009](#); [Borah et al., 2002](#); [Defoirdt et al., 2007](#); [Wang](#)
1188 [et al., 2012](#); [Sui et al., 2012](#)). *Bacillus* are commonly found in the intestine of shrimp species
1189 like *B. megaterium* and *B. pasteurii* have been shown to accumulate PHB in the range 11 % up
1190 to as high as 79 % on cell dry weight under optimized conditions ([Singh et al., 2009](#); [Kaynar](#)
1191 [& Beyatli, 2009](#)). [Laranja et al. \(2014\)](#) assessed the curative action of PHB accumulating
1192 *Bacillus* species on growth and abiotic stress. The study revealed that PHB accumulating
1193 *Bacillus* bacteria isolated from Philippine shrimp culture ponds, improves the growth
1194 performance, i.e., average body weight, average body length *P. monodon* postlarvae and
1195 ammonia stress ([Laranja et al., 2014](#)).

1196 **7.2.2. *Bacillus* probiotics as an enhancer of immune status and disease resistance**

1197 Products which can enhance host immunity and disease resistance of shrimps have probiotics
1198 gathered much interest during the last decade ([Tseng et al., 2009](#); [Kumar et al., 2016](#)). Among
1199 probiotic bacteria, *Bacillus* species have been demonstrated as harmless bacteria that promotes
1200 the health of the host animal by stimulating the innate immune response and improve resistance
1201 towards pathogenic microbial infection ([Rengpipat et al., 2000](#); [Sánchez-Ortiz et al., 2016](#);
1202 [Laranja et al., 2017](#)).

1203 Earlier studies with *Bacillus* suggested that the probiotic bacteria were able to enhance provide
1204 resistance of shrimp species (e.g. *P. monodon*) when challenged with *Vibrio harveyi* ([Rengpipat](#)

1205 *et al.*, 1998a; Rengpipat *et al.*, 1998b). However, the mode of action was only understood after
1206 few authors started describing the underlying mechanism including immune response, whether
1207 invertebrates including shrimps are able to mount an immune response with some of the
1208 attributes of the vertebrate's immune system. Rengpipat *et al.* (2000) observed that *Bacillus*
1209 probiotics (e.g. *Bacillus* S11) stimulates the immune response by activating phenoloxidase,
1210 phagocytosis and antimicrobial activity in hemolymph of *P. monodon* and improves survival
1211 and disease resistance against *V. harveyi* (Rengpipat *et al.*, 2000). It has been also shown that
1212 feeding *Bacillus* probiotics can increase the survival of shrimp species against bacterial and
1213 viral pathogens through immune modification, e.g. *B. subtilis* E20, isolated from fermented
1214 soyabean have been reported to increase resistance to white shrimp (*L. vannamei*) against *V.*
1215 *alginolyticus* through increase in phenoloxidase, and phagocytic activity, whereas, feeding
1216 *Bacillus* OJ, to white leg shrimp enhance the immune response (phenoloxidase, phagocytosis,
1217 etc.) and provide protection against white spot syndrome virus (WSSV) (Tseng *et al.*, 2009; Li
1218 *et al.*, 2009). Feeding of *L. vannamei* with *Bacillus* probiotics as a supplemented diet decreased
1219 the total viable counts of bacteria and the *Vibrio* count in the shrimp intestine (Li *et al.* 2009).
1220 Bath administration of *B. fusiformis* (10^5 cfu mL⁻¹) added either as daily or as interval day
1221 increased survival in both treatments in the larvi-culture system of *L. vannamei* (Guo *et al.*,
1222 2009).
1223 *B. cereus* enhanced various immunological variables including phenoloxidase, lysozyme,
1224 respiratory burst, bactericidal activity in *P. monodon* (Chandran *et al.*, 2014). Such
1225 enhancement of immune status was confirmed by higher a survival seen in the treated shrimp
1226 after being challenged with *V. harveyi*.

1227 Moreover, *B. subtilis* E20, isolated from natto (fermented soyabean human health food), has
1228 also been reported to improve some immune responses variables such as lysozyme and
1229 prophenoloxidase I and II, survival and stress tolerance including water temperature, salinity
1230 and nitrite-N in white shrimp (Liu *et al.*, 2010).

1231 A higher survival level together with a better stress tolerance to ammonia oxygen deficiency was
1232 seen in *L. vannamei* orally fed with *B. subtilis* than control group (Olmos *et al.* 2011) that could be
1233 due to ammonia conversion-transformation by the *B. subtilis* probiotic, less content-production of
1234 ammonia by the functional feed and ammonia less oxygen consumption by the functional feed
1235 which can result in extensive physiological and biochemical functions.

1236 [Dong et al. \(2014\)](#) evaluated the role of *Bacillus* as protective agent and immunomodulator in
1237 *Marsupenaeus japonicus* juveniles against temperature stress. The study revealed that *Bacillus*
1238 improved growth, minimize damage caused by free radicals generated from insufficient oxygen
1239 metabolism due to high temperature and to enhance immune response in *M. japonicus* during
1240 the high temperature farming period. In another study, administration of *Bacillus* (e.g., *Bacillus*
1241 *subtilis*, *B. licheniformis*) in *L. vannamei* culture water, have been shown to enhance immune
1242 response, i.e., prophenoloxidase (ProPO), peroxinectin (PE), lipopolysaccharide and β -1,3-
1243 glucan binding protein (LGBP), lysozyme and serine protein ([Zokaeifar et al., 2012b](#); [Zokaeifar](#)
1244 [et al., 2014](#); [Sadat Hoseini Madani et al., 2018](#)). Moreover, the probiotic bacteria also enhances
1245 disease resistance in white shrimp juveniles against pathogenic *V. harveyi* ([Zokaeifar et al.,](#)
1246 [2012b](#); [Zokaeifar et al., 2014](#))

1247 Alternatively, some studies revealed that *Bacillus* probiotics bacteria, isolated from same
1248 environmental condition or system where they will be applied, can boost the cellular and
1249 humoral component of innate immunity in shrimp species. *B. cereus* enhanced various
1250 immunological variables including phenoloxidase, lysozyme, respiratory burst, bactericidal
1251 activity in *P. monodon* ([Chandran et al., 2014](#)). Such enhancement of immune status was
1252 confirmed by higher a survival seen in the treated shrimp after being challenged with *V. harveyi*.
1253 ([Chandran et al., 2014](#)). Later in 2016, [Chai et al](#) shows that *Bacillus* probiotic PC465 strain,
1254 isolated from gut of *Fenneropenaeus chinensis*, enhances immunity including ProPO,
1255 peroxinectin, penaeidin, thioredoxin, lectins, haemocyanin and crustin and provide protection
1256 against white spot syndrome virus infection in *L. vannamei* ([Chai et al., 2016](#)). Another
1257 interesting observation was noted by some authors that *Bacillus* species (like *B. thuringiensis*)
1258 have shown to carry poly-beta-hydroxybutyrate (PHB), a well-known bacterial storage
1259 compound and a polymer of the short chain fatty acids β -hydroxybutyrate, that exert its
1260 beneficial effect by stimulating both the specific and non-specific immune mechanism in
1261 aquatic animals ([Suguna et al., 2014](#); [Defoirdt et al., 2007](#)). Further, few authors have
1262 highlighted the beneficial role of PHB-accumulating *Bacillus* on immunity and survival of
1263 shrimp species against pathogenic microorganism ([Laranja et al., 2014](#)). [Laranja et al. \(2017\)](#)
1264 reported that *Bacillus* strain with PHB can able to stimulates innate immune response in *P.*
1265 *monodon* postlarvae. The results explained that, *P. monodon* postlarvae fed with PHB containing
1266 *Bacillus* sp. JL47 enriched *Artemia* larvae, increase the relative expression of innate immune
1267 genes, i.e., ProPO, transglutaminase (Tgase) and heat shock protein 70 (Hsp70) after *V.*

1268 *campbellii* challenge. More recently, innate immune enzyme activities, digestive enzyme
 1269 activities, stress tolerance and disease resistance to *V. harveyi* have been reported in *L.*
 1270 *vannamei* after shrimp being fed *B. licheniformis* and *B. flexus* either in single or in a combined
 1271 form for 21 days at 28°C (Cai *et al.*, 2019).

1272
 1273

Table 8 here

1274 **8. Pathogenic *Bacillus***

1275 Few reports describing pathogenesis of *Bacillus* affecting fish and shellfish. Furthermore, no
 1276 report has been published on the experimental pathogenicity of these *Bacillus* spore formers in
 1277 aquatic animals so far. Goodwin *et al.* (1994) reported *B. mycoides* as the causative agent of a
 1278 superficial epizootic disease in commercial channel catfish in Alabama, USA. The affected fish
 1279 had pale areas or ulcers on the dorsal area and focal necrosis of epaxial muscle with chains of
 1280 Gram-positive bacilli identified as *B. mycoides*. When healthy catfish were subjected to the
 1281 isolated bacterium either intramuscularly or subcutaneously at 1.6×10^4 cfu/fish, development
 1282 of lesions resembled those in natural epizootic were seen. A possible explanation for the
 1283 congestion and lack of bleeding seen in the affected fish could be due to toxin products by these
 1284 bacilli bacteria e.g. *B. cereus* that are able to cause a disseminated intravascular coagulation.

1285 Wang *et al* (2000) reported a new bacterial white spot syndrome caused by *B. subtilis* in
 1286 cultured tiger shrimp in Malaysian shrimp farming. The affected shrimp showed white spots
 1287 similar to symptoms caused by white spot viral disease (WSVD), but the affected shrimp were
 1288 active and grew normally with no significant morbidity and mortality. The appeared white spots
 1289 were lichen-like with the puncture centers unlike the melanized dots in the white spots caused
 1290 by WSVD. Microscopy evaluations revealed degeneration and discoloration of the cuticle of
 1291 the epicuticle and underlying cuticular layers were detected. It was suggested that such disease
 1292 may be associated with the regular use of *B. subtilis* probiotic in shrimp ponds. *B. subtilis* can
 1293 excrete enzymes of protease, amylase, glucanase and lipase (Shady, 1997) suggesting that the
 1294 bacterium ability to lyse the shrimp cuticle composition i.e. chitin, calcium carbonate and lipid
 1295 (Branson, 1993).

1296 In an experimental study by Sineva *et al.* (2009) expression of *B. cereus* hemolysin II in *B.*
 1297 *subtilis* rendered the bacterium being pathogenic for the crustacean *Daphnia magna* when was
 1298 challenged with the expressed *B. subtilis* at 0^4 - 10^6 cfu L⁻¹ at water temperature $20 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$. The

1299 lethal concentrations 50% (LC₅₀) on the fifth day of the experiment for the expressed *B. subtilis*
1300 and *B. cereus* were 5.4×10^5 and 4.5×10^5 cfu mL⁻¹, respectively.

1301 More recently, a new bacterial white patch disease caused by *B. cereus* has been reported from
1302 different *L. vannamei* aquaculture farms industry in India in 2015 (Velmurugan *et al.*, 2015).
1303 The disease caused a continuous morbidity and mortality, and the affected shrimps showed
1304 white opaque patches in the carapace, necrosis, whitish blue coloration, loss of appetite and
1305 pale white muscles. A mortality up to 70% was observed within 3-5 days at the acute stage of
1306 the disease outbreak. The isolated *B. cereus* strains represented high virulence factors including
1307 hemolytic and lipase activities, and mortality up 100% occurred in *L. vannamei* and *Artemia*
1308 *franciscana* after challenging them with the bacterium intraperitoneally at 10⁶ cfu/shrimp or via
1309 bath at 10⁸ cfu/ml in both shrimp and *Artemia* at unknown water temperature. *B. cereus* is
1310 capable of proliferating in a wide range of environments including soils, clays, sediment, dust,
1311 mineral water, processed foods, and is able to secrete protease, amylase, glucanase and lipase
1312 (Hendriksen *et al.*, 2006), thus it may be able to invade the suppressed aquatic animals under
1313 an adverse environmental condition in which is suitable for expressing of the virulence genes
1314 of the bacterium (Andreeva *et al.*, 2007).

1315 9. Safety of *Bacillus*

1316 The possible use of *Bacillus* as probiotics in aquatic animal feed or supplementation to the
1317 rearing water entering the human food chain should be considered as an important public health
1318 issue. However, there is no data available related to the risk of human food contamination with
1319 *Bacillus* used in aquatic animals. Transfer of an antibiotic resistance via the presence of
1320 transmissible antibiotic resistance genes in some probiotic bacteria is one of the critical risk
1321 issues. Also, infections from the probiotics and existing of enterotoxins and emetic toxins in
1322 probiotic bacteria is another important risk requires serious attention in aquaculture industry.
1323 However, Almost all published data relating to *Bacillus* probiotics in aquaculture are
1324 associated with their efficacy rather than the safety. It is also worth to say that safety evaluation
1325 and data on a specific *Bacillus* strain probiotic must not be considered common to similar
1326 probiotic strain because the safety and risk assessment of each probiotic should be concerned
1327 based on a case-by-case basis. The severity of a negative effect by a particular probiotic is
1328 associated with the level of susceptibility of immune-physiological conditions of the target

1329 aquatic animal e.g. early hatched fish larvae. Therefore, it is possible that a *Bacillus* probiotic
1330 strain is considered as a safe under particular conditions but it is unsafe in other conditions.
1331 Like antibiotics, it is feasible to say that there is no specific probiotic to be regarded as 100%
1332 safe. Also, the existence of unwanted/contaminated bacteria or their toxic substances in the
1333 form of a probiotic can be also considered as another important safety and quality issue.
1334 Sometimes such contaminants may be a more significant issue than the specific quality of the
1335 probiotics. At the present time probiotics such as *Bacillus* species used in aquatic animal feed
1336 or in their water cultures are generally considered as safe. However, some of the bacterial
1337 probiotic species potentiate some risks of transmission of antibiotic resistance to some
1338 pathogenic bacteria or production of some their enterotoxins (Anadón *et al.*, 2006).

1339 **9.1. Risks related to the use of *Bacillus* as probiotics**

1340 Despite, *Bacillus* used as probiotics in water or as feed supplement to aquatic animals are
1341 relatively safe, it is worth to say that protection of human, animals and the environment from
1342 the potentially unsafe probiotic bacteria is an essential issue. Generally, the risks associated
1343 with the use of *Bacillus* as probiotics in aquaculture sector can be summarized as suggested by
1344 Marteau (2001), FAO/WHO (2002), Doron & Snyderman (2015); (a) transfer of antibiotic
1345 resistance from the probiotics to other pathogenic bacteria, (b) GI or systemic infection of the
1346 target animal fed with the probiotic, (c) GI or systemic infection of the consumers of the animal
1347 products produced by animals fed with the probiotics, (d) GI or systemic infection of the
1348 handlers of animal or aquatic animal feed, (e) release of infectious bacteria or their toxic
1349 substances to the environment from the animal production system, (f) sensitization of the
1350 external tissues such as skin, eye and mucus membrane in the handlers of the probiotics, (g)
1351 toxic effects in the host due to the production of toxins by the bacteria contaminated in the
1352 probiotics and (h) hypersensitivity of the immune system reactions in susceptible hosts.

1353 **9.2. Risk assessment**

1354 Assessment of *Bacillus* probiotics in aquatic animal diets or in their rearing water against the
1355 potential risks is a significant issue The *Bacillus* used as probiotics need to be recognized to
1356 strain level with any infection in humans and aquatic animals. Also, such probiotic must not
1357 carrier the transferable antibiotic resistance genes. *Bacillus* able to produce toxins or cause
1358 hypersensitivity reactions in the target host are not suitable for probiotics. Since 2007 the
1359 European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has been using a concept [Qualified Presumption of

1360 Safety, QPS), European approach for the assessment of the safety of probiotics] as a generic
1361 risk assessment tool to assess the safety of a microorganism such as *Bacillus* (EFSA, 2007).
1362 *Bacillus* as spore-forming bacteria are becoming popular as the promising probiotics for use in
1363 aquatic animal feed or in their rearing water because of their tolerance to fluctuations in the
1364 water temperatures that make them easier to handle during manufacture, storage and
1365 transportation of feed. A number of 13 *Bacillus* species including *B. subtilis*, *B.*
1366 *amyloliquefaciens*, *B. licheniformis*, *B. coagulans* and *B. megaterium* have been recognized by
1367 EFSA (2013) to be used as probiotics for animal feed including fish and shellfish. The safety
1368 of these *Bacillus* species was detected based on the absence of enterotoxins and emetic toxins.
1369 However, it is important to note that some *Bacillus* bacteria such as *B. anthracis*, *B. cereus*, *B.*
1370 *thuringiensis* are serious pathogens in humans and animals (e.g. Damgaard *et al.*, 1997;
1371 Hernandez *et al.*, 1998; Little & Ivins, 1999; Kotiranta *et al.*, 2000.; Raymond *et al.*, 2010).
1372 Despite a good information available about the pathogenesis of *B. anthracis* and *B. cereus*, no
1373 evidence of pathogenic effects for other endospore-forming bacteria is available. The emetic
1374 toxin (cereulide), enterotoxins haemolysin, non-haemolytic enterotoxin and cytotoxin products
1375 by *B. cereus* are well known toxins that can affect humans (e.g. Granum & Lund, 1997; Schoeni
1376 & Lee Wong, 2005). In a study by From *et al.* (2005) from 333 strains of different *Bacillus*
1377 species, eight strains of *B. subtilis*, *B. mojavensis*, *B. pumilus* and *B. fusiformis* were able to
1378 produce emetic toxins and cytotoxins. Also, some disorders such as cattle mastitis (Parkinson
1379 *et al.*, 1999) and cattle abortion (Agerholm *et al.*, 1997) have been reported by *B. cereus* and *B.*
1380 *licheniformis*, but no data available regarding aquatic animals. There are also some antibiotic
1381 resistance reports in *Bacillus subtilis* showing this bacterium carriers conjugative transposons
1382 e.g. Tn5397, which is able to transfer resistance to tetracycline encoded by the tet(M) gene
1383 (Mullany *et al.*, 1990; Roberts *et al.*, 1999) and tet(L) gene (Phelan *et al.*, 2011) as well as
1384 macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B resistance determinants on the plasmid (Monod *et al.*,
1385 1986).

1386 10. Conclusions

1387 Several reports exist in finfish and shellfish regarding the presence of *Bacillus* in the GI tract.
1388 However, when investigating *Bacillus* in the GI tract, one major concern popped up; several
1389 studies have focus to characterize the GI lumen communities (the allochthonous microbiota)
1390 and the gut microbiota from faecal samples, while fewer studies have focus on bacteria that
1391 adhere to the mucosal surface (the autochthonous microbiota) which may be important in

1392 specialized physiological functions. We therefore recommend in future studies, more focus on
1393 the autochthonous gut microbiota.

1394 Most previous studies evaluating *Bacillus* in the GI tract of finfish and shellfish were based on
1395 culture-based approaches, but this approach may be question. Although there is a discussion
1396 among scientists about the value and need of using culture-based techniques vs. culture-
1397 independent approaches, it is apparent that viable cells are valuable to culture collections, in
1398 vaccine production, as well as their use in probiotics and synbiotic studies. During the last
1399 decades, the denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (DGGE) method has been commonly used,
1400 but the method only detect 1-2% of the microbial diversity. Therefore, we recommend; next-
1401 generation sequencing when evaluating the gut microbiome, including the presence of *Bacillus*
1402 species in the GI tract of finfish and shellfish species.

1403 Use of *Bacillus* bacteria as probiotics in feed or as biodegrading bacteria in the ponds rearing
1404 water and soil is now a sustainable motion to reduce the environmental impact induced by
1405 aquaculture industry. There are at least ten species of *Bacillus* used as the main components of
1406 commercial probiotic (bioremediation) products for improvement of water quality of aquatic
1407 animals. Bioremediation by some *Bacillus* strains in finfish and shellfish pond waters have
1408 revealed not only an increase in the bioremediation efficacy, but also improved survival of the
1409 cultured animals. These probiotic *Bacillus* species are a well tool by maintaining a higher
1410 density of beneficial bacteria and a lower load of pathogenic agent in the ponds. As probiotics,
1411 *Bacillus* play a significant role in maintaining optimum water quality parameters particularly
1412 toxic gases including ammonia, nitrite, nitrate, hydrogen sulphide and carbon dioxide
1413 throughout the growing period with a significant reduction of stress level. Elimination of
1414 stressors, thus lead to an optimum immuno-physiological balance in the target animal with a
1415 better growth performance and survival rate as the final consequence of the aquaculture activity.
1416 Therefore, the application of *Bacillus* as probiotics in aquaculture is growing rapidly,
1417 particularly in the regions where intensive aquaculture systems have been developed. *Bacillus*
1418 probiotics as components of biocontrol products either in feed or in water column and sediment
1419 are often used as a mixture of different species to provide a range of beneficial effects on
1420 aquaculture systems. *Bacillus* as the ubiquitous bacteria in sediments are also naturally ingested
1421 by aquatic animals. Also, study about the effects of a particular *Bacillus* species or strains on
1422 different fish and shellfish species, age, growth condition, water quality condition and diet types

1423 can identify the condition in which the probiotics could work well. *Bacillus* spp. are not
 1424 generally involved in horizontal gene transfer processes with Gram-negative bacteria e.g.
 1425 *Vibrio* and *Aeromonas*. Thus, obtaining antibiotic resistance genes from these *Bacillus*
 1426 probiotics is doubtful. *Bacillus* probiotics are able to rapidly replicate, tolerate a multitude of
 1427 environmental conditions giving a wide range of beneficial effects in aquaculture sector. Also,
 1428 the sporulation process by *Bacillus* probiotics enables them for the simple process and
 1429 formulation as well shelf-stable probiotic spore products. However, some *Bacillus* species used
 1430 as probiotics e.g. *B. subtilis* produce cytotoxic and emetic toxins. Therefore, detailed safety
 1431 studies are recommended for these bacterial strains before to be used as the safe probiotics.

1432 **Acknowledgements**

1433 This research work was supported by University of Tehran and University of Morduch and
 1434 their supports is fully acknowledged.

1435

1436 **References**

- 1437 Adorian TJ, Jamali H, Ghafari Farsani H, Darvishi P, Hasanpour S, Bagheri T, Roozbehfar R
 1438 (2018) Effects of probiotic bacteria *Bacillus* on growth performance, digestive enzyme activity,
 1439 and hematological parameters of Asian sea bass, *Lates calcarifer* (Bloch). *Probiotics and*
 1440 *Antimicrobial Proteins*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12602-018-9393-z>
 1441
- 1442 Abriouel H, Farzan CMAP, Omar NB, Galvez A (2011) Diversity and applications of *Bacillus*
 1443 bacteriocins. *FEMS Microbiol Reviews* **35**: 201–232.
- 1444 Agerholm J, Willadsen C, Nielsen TK, Giese SB, Holm E, Jensen L, Agger J (1997) Diagnostic
 1445 studies of abortion in Danish dairy herds. *Journal of Veterinary Medicine*, **44**: 551–558.
 1446
- 1447 Ai Q, Xu H, Mai K, Xu W, Wang J, Zhang W (2011) Effects of dietary supplementation of
 1448 *Bacillus subtilis* and fructooligosaccharide on growth performance, survival, non-specific
 1449 immune response and disease resistance of juvenile large yellow croaker, *Larimichthys crocea*.
 1450 *Aquaculture* **317**: 155-161.
- 1451 Al-Hisnawi A, Ringø E, Davies SJ, Wainnes P, Bradley G, Merrifield DL (2015) First report on
 1452 the autochthonous gut microbiota of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*). *Aquaculture Research* **46**:
 1453 2962-2971.
- 1454 Al-Harbi AH, Uddin MN (2005) Microbiological quality changes in the intestine of hybrid
 1455 tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* x *Oreochromis aureus*) in fresh and frozen storage condition.
 1456 *Letters in Applied Microbiology* **40**: 486-490.
- 1457 Aly SM, Ahmed YSG, Ghareeb AAA, Mohamed MF (2008) Studies on *Bacillus*
 1458 *subtilis* and *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, as potential probiotics, on the immune response and

- 1459 resistance of *Tilapia nilotica* (*Oreochromis niloticus*) to challenge infections. *Fish and Shellfish*
 1460 **25**:128-136, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2008.03.013>
- 1461 Amiri O, Kolangi Miandare H, Hoseinifar SH, Shabani A, Safari R (2017) Skin mucus protein
 1462 profile, immune parameters, immune related genes expression and growth performance
 1463 of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) fed white bottom mushroom (*Agaricus*
 1464 *bisporus*) powder. *International Journal of Medicinal Mushrooms* **20**:337-347.
- 1465 An J, Zhu W, Ying L, Zhang X, Sun L, Hong P, et al. (2015) Purification and characterization
 1466 of a novel bacteriocin CAMT2 produced by *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* isolated from
 1467 marine fish *Epinephelus areolatus*. *Food Control* **51**: 278–282.
- 1468 Anadón A, Martínez-Larrañaga MR & Martínez MA (2006) Probiotics for animal nutrition in
 1469 the European Union. Regulation and safety assessment. *Regulatory Toxicology and*
 1470 *Pharmacology*, **45**(1): 91–95.
- 1471 Andreeva, ZI, Nesterenko, VF, Fomkina, MG, Ternovsky, VI, Suzina, NE, Bakulina, AY,
 1472 Solonin AS & Sineva EV (2007) The properties of *Bacillus cereus* hemolysin II pores depend
 1473 on environmental conditions. *Biochemistry and Biophysics Acta* **1768**: 253–263.
- 1474 Annamalai N, Rajeswari MV, Elayaraja S, Balasubramanian T (2013) Thermostable,
 1475 haloalkaline cellulase from *Bacillus halodurans* CAS 1 by conversion of lignocellulosic
 1476 wastes. *Carbohydrate Polymers* **94**: 409-415.
- 1477 Askarian F, Zhou Z, Olsen RE, Sperstad S, Ringø E (2012) Culturable autochthonous gut bacteria in
 1478 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) fed diets with or without chitin. Characterization by 16S rRNA
 1479 gene sequencing, ability to produce enzymes and *in vitro* growth inhibition of for fish pathogens.
 1480 *Aquaculture* **326-329**: 1-8.
- 1481 Austin B & Al-Zahrani AMJ (1988) The effect of antimicrobial compounds on the gastrointestinal
 1482 microflora of rainbow trout, *Salmo gairdneri* Richardson. *Fish Biology*,
 1483 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.1988.tb05444.x>
- 1484 Bachruddin M, Sholichah M, Istiqomah S, Supriyanto A (2018) Effect of probiotic culture
 1485 water on growth, mortality, and feed conversion ratio of Vaname shrimp (*Litopenaeus*
 1486 *vannamei* Boone). 7th ASEAN-FEN Int. *Fish. Symposium IFS 2017* 137.
 1487 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/137/1/012036>
- 1488 Bagheri T, Hedayati SA, Yavari V, Alizade M, Farzanfar A (2008) Growth, survival and gut
 1489 microbial load of rainbow trout (*Onchorhynchus mykiss*) fry given diet supplemented
 1490 with probiotic during the two months of first feeding. *Turkish Journal of Fisheries and*
 1491 *Aquatic Sciences*, **8**, 43-48.
- 1492 Bairagi A, Sarkar Ghosh K, Sen SK, Ray AK (2002) Duck weed (*Lemna polyrhiza*) leaf meal
 1493 as a source of feedstuff in formulated diets for rohu (*Labeo rohita* Ham.) fingerlings after
 1494 fermentation with a fish intestinal bacterium. *Bioresource Technology* **85**: 17–24.
- 1495 Bairagi A, Sarkar Ghosh K, Sen SK, Ray AK (2004) Evaluation of nutritive value of
 1496 *Leucaena leucocephala* leaf meal inoculated with fish intestinal bacteria *Bacillus*
 1497 *subtilis* and *Bacillus circulans* in formulated diets for rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton)
 1498 fingerlings. *Aquaculture Research* **35**: 436–446.
- 1499 Balcazar JL, de Blas I, Ruiz-Zaruela I, Cunningham D, Vendrell D, Muzquiz JL (2006) The
 1500 role of probiotics in aquaculture. *Veterinary Microbiology* **114**: 173–186.

- 1501 Bandyopadhyay P, Mohapatra PKD (2009) Effect of a probiotic bacterium *Bacillus circulans*
 1502 PB7 in the formulated diets: on growth, nutritional quality and immunity of *Catla*
 1503 *catla* (Ham.). *Fish physiology and biochemistry*, **35**, 467-478.
- 1504 Banerjee S, Hansen JN (1988) Structure and expression of a gene encoding the precursor of
 1505 subtilin, a small protein antibiotic. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry* **263**: 9508–9514.
- 1506 Banerjee S, Ghosh K (2014) Enumeration of gut associated extracellular enzyme-producing
 1507 yeasts in some freshwater fishes. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* **30**: 986–993.
- 1508 Banerjee S, Ghosh K (2016) Bio-processing of linseed oil-cake through solid state fermentation
 1509 by non-starch polysaccharide degrading fish gut bacteria. *Fermentation Technology* **5**: 1–
 1510 10.
- 1511 Bairagi A, Sarkar Ghosh K, Sen SK, Ray AK (2002) Duck weed (*Lemna polyrhiza*) leaf meal
 1512 as a source of feedstuff in formulated diets for rohu (*Labeo rohita* Ham.) fingerlings after
 1513 fermentation with a fish intestinal bacterium. *Bioresource Technology* **85**: 17–24.
- 1514 Banerjee S, Khatoon H, Shariff M, Yusoff FM (2010) Enhancement of *Penaeus monodon*
 1515 shrimp post-larvae growth and survival without water exchange using marine *Bacillus pumilus*
 1516 and periphytic microalgae. *Fisheries Science*, **76**(3): 481-487.
- 1517 Banerjee G, Ray AK, Askarian F, Ringø E (2013) Characterisation and identification of enzyme-
 1518 producing autochthonous bacteria from the digestive tract of two Indian air-breathing fish.
 1519 *Beneficial Microbes* **4**: 277-284.
- 1520 Banerjee G, Dan SK, Nandi A, Ghosh P, Ray AK (2015a) Autochthonous gut bacteria in two
 1521 Indian air-breathing fish, climbing perch (*Anabas testudineus*) and walking catfish (*Clarias*
 1522 *batrachus*): Mode of association, identification and enzyme producing ability. *Polish*
 1523 *Journal of Microbiology* **64**(4): 361–368.
- 1524 Banerjee S, Mukherjee A, Dutta D, Ghosh K (2015b) Evaluation of chitinolytic gut microbiota
 1525 in some carps and optimization of culture conditions for chitinase production by the selected
 1526 bacteria. *Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences* **5**:12–19.
- 1527 Banerjee S, Mukherjee A, Dutta D, Ghosh K (2016) Non-starch polysaccharide degrading gut
 1528 bacteria in Indian major carps and exotic carps. *Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences* **9**(1):
 1529 69 – 78.
- 1530 Banerjee G, Nandi A, Ray AK (2017) Assessment of hemolytic activity, enzyme production
 1531 and bacteriocin characterization of *Bacillus subtilis* LR1 isolated from the gastrointestinal tract
 1532 of fish. *Archives of Microbiology* **199**: 115–124.
- 1533 Barreto-Curiel F, Ramirez-Puebla ST, Ringø E, Escobar-Zepeda A, Godoy-Lozano EE,
 1534 Vazquez-Duhalt R *et al.* (2018) Effects of extruded aquafeed on growth performance and
 1535 gut microbiome of juvenile *Totoaba macdonaldi*. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*
 1536 [Epub ahead of print], doi: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2018.09.002.
- 1537 Bhaskar N, Sudeepa ES, Rashmi HN, Tamil-Selvi A (2007) Partial purification and
 1538 characterization of protease of *Bacillus proteolyticus* CFR3001 isolated from fish
 1539 processing waste and its antibacterial activities. *Bioresource Technology* **98**: 2758–2564.
- 1540 Bindiya ES, Tina KJ, Raghul SS, Bhat SG (2015) Characterization of deep sea fish gut bacteria
 1541 with antagonistic potential, from *Centroscyllium fabricii* (deep sea shark). *Probiotics and*
 1542 *Antimicrobial Proteins* **7**: 157-163.

- 1543 Bizani D, Brandelli A (2002) Characterization of a bacteriocin produced by a newly isolated
1544 *Bacillus* sp. strain 8A. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **93**: 512–519.
- 1545 Borah B, Thakur PS, Nigam JN (2002) The influence of nutritional and environmental
1546 conditions on the accumulation of poly- β -hydroxybutyrate in *Bacillus mycoides* RLJ B-
1547 017. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **92**: 776–783.
- 1548 Branson E (1993) Basic anatomy and physiology. In: Brown L (ed) Aquaculture for
1549 veterinarians, fish husbandry and medicine. *Pergamon Press*, Oxford, p 1-30.
1550
- 1551 Cahil MM (1990) Bacterial flora of fishes: A review. *Microbial Ecology* **19**: 21–41.
- 1552 Cai Y, Yuan W, Wang S, Guo W, Li A, Wu Y, et al. (2019) *In vitro* screening of putative
1553 probiotics and their dual beneficial effects: to white shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) postlarvae
1554 and to the rearing water. *Aquaculture*, doi:10.1016/j.aquaculture.2018.08.024
- 1555 Castro C, Couto A, Diógenes AF, Corraze G, Panserat S, Serra CR *et al.* (2018) Vegetable oil
1556 and carbohydrate-rich diets marginally affected intestine histology, digestive enzymes
1557 activities, and gut microbiota of gilthead sea bream juveniles. *Fish Physiology and*
1558 *Biochemistry* 10.1007/s10695-018-0559-9
- 1559 Cha J-H, Rahimnejad S, Yang S-Y, Kim K-W, Lee K-J (2013) Evaluations of *Bacillus* spp. as
1560 dietary additives on growth performance, innate immunity and disease resistance of
1561 olive flounder (*Paralichthys olivaceus*) against *Streptococcus iniae* and as water
1562 additives. *Aquaculture*, **402**, 50-57.
- 1563 Chai PC, Song XL, Chen GF, Xu H, Huang J (2016) Dietary supplementation of probiotic
1564 *Bacillus* PC465 isolated from the gut of *Fenneropenaeus chinensis* improves the health
1565 status and resistance of *Litopenaeus vannamei* against white spot syndrome virus. *Fish*
1566 *and Shellfish Immunology* **54**: 602–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2016.05.011>
- 1567 Chandran MN, Iyapparaj P, Moovendhan Ramasubburayan R, Prakash S, Immanuel G, *et al.*
1568 (2014) Influence of probiotic bacterium *Bacillus cereus* isolated from the gut of wild
1569 shrimp *Penaeus monodon* in turn as a potent growth promoter and immune enhancer in *P.*
1570 *monodon*. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology* **36**: 38-45.
- 1571 Chen CC and Chen SN (2001) Water quality management with *Bacillus* spp. in the high
1572 density culture of red-parrot fish (*Cichlasoma citrinellum* \times *C. synspilum*). *North American*
1573 *Journal of Aquaculture* **63(1)**: 66-73. [https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8454\(2001\)063](https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8454(2001)063)
- 1574 Chen Y, Li J, Xiao P, Zhu W, Mo ZL (2016a) The ability of marine *Bacillus* spp. isolated from
1575 fish gastrointestinal tract and culture pond sediment to inhibit growth of aquatic pathogenic
1576 bacteria. *Iranian Journal of Fisheries Sciences* **15**: 701–714.
- 1577 Chen Y, Li J, Xiao P, Li GY, Yue S, Huang J, et al (2016b) Isolation and characterization of
1578 *Bacillus* spp. M001 for potential application in turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus* L) against *Vibrio*
1579 *anguillarum*. *Aquaculture Nutrition* **22**: 374–381.
- 1580 Cherif A, Ouzari H, Daffonchio D, Cherif H, Ben Slama K, Hassen A, Jaoua S, Boudabous A
1581 (2001) Thuricin 7: a novel bacteriocin produced by *Bacillus thuringiensis* BMG1.7, a new
1582 strain isolated from soil. *Letters in Applied Microbiology* **32**: 243–247.
- 1583 Chopra L, Singh G, Choudhary V, Sahoo DK (2014) Sonorensin: An antimicrobial peptide,
1584 belonging to the heterocycloanthracin subfamily of bacteriocins, from a new marine isolate,
1585 *Bacillus sonorensis* MT93. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **80**: 2981–2990.

- 1586 Cladera-Olivera F, Caron GR, Brandelli A (2004) Bacteriocin-like substance production by
1587 *Bacillus licheniformis* strain P40. *Letters in Applied Microbiology* **38**: 251–256.
- 1588 Clements KD (1997) Fermentation and gastrointestinal microorganisms in fishes. In:
1589 *Gastrointestinal Microbiology Vol I. Gastrointestinal Ecosystems and Fermentations*
1590 (Mackie, R.I. & White, B.A. eds), pp. 156-198. Chapman & Hall, New York.
- 1591 Clemente JC, Ursell LK, Parfrey LW, Knight R (2012) The impact of the gut microbiota on
1592 human health: an integrative view. *Journal of Cell* **148**: 1258-1270.
- 1593 Cohn F (1876) Untersuchungen über Bakterien. IV. Beiträge zur Biologie der Bacillen.
1594 *Beiträge zur Biologie der Pflanzen* **2**: 249–276.
1595
- 1596 Cotter PD, Hill C, Ross RP (2005) Bacteriocins: developing innate immunity for food. *Nature*
1597 *Reviews Microbiology* **3**: 777–788.
- 1598 Cutting SM (2011) Bacillus probiotics. *Food Microbiol* 28:214–220 Dalmin G, Kathiresan K,
1599 Purushothaman A (2001) Effect of probiotics on bacterial population and health status of
1600 shrimp in culture pond ecosystem. *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology* **39**: 939–942.
- 1601 Damgaard PH, Granum PE, Bresciani J, Torregrossa MV, Eilenberg J & Valentino L (1997)
1602 Characterization of *Bacillus thuringiensis* isolated from infections in burn wounds. *FEMS*
1603 *Immunological Medical Microbiology* **18(1)**: 47–53.
- 1604 Daniels CL, Merrifield DL, Boothroyd DP, Davies SJ, Factor JP, Arnold KE (2010) Effect of
1605 dietary *Bacillus* spp. and mannan oligosaccharides (MOS) on European lobster (*Homarus*
1606 *gammarus* L.) larvae growth performance, gut morphology and gut microbiota.
1607 *Aquaculture* **304**: 49-57.
- 1608 Das KM, Tripathi SD (1991) Studies on the digestive enzymes of grass carp,
1609 *Ctenopharyngodon idella* (Val.). *Aquaculture* **92**: 21-32.
- 1610 Das P, Ghosh K (2014) The presence of phytase in yeasts isolated from the gastrointestinal tract
1611 of four major carps [*Labeo rohita* (Hamilton, 1822), *Catla catla* (Hamilton, 1822),
1612 *Cirrhinus mrigala* (Hamilton, 1822), *Hypophthalmichthys molitrix* (Valenciennes, 1844)],
1613 climbing perch [*Anabas testudineus* (Bloch, 1792)] and Mozambique tilapia [*Oreochromis*
1614 *mossambicus* (Linnaeus, 1758)]. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* **30**: 403–407.
- 1615 Das P, Ghosh K (2013) Evaluation of phytase-producing ability by a fish gut bacterium,
1616 *Bacillus subtilis* subsp. *subtilis*. *Journal of Biological Sciences* **13**: 691-700.
- 1617 Das P, Ghosh K (2015) Improvement of nutritive value of sesame oil cake in formulated diets
1618 for rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton) after bio-processing through solid state fermentation by
1619 a phytase-producing fish gut bacterium. *International Journal of Aquatic Biology* **3**: 89–
1620 101.
- 1621 Das P, Mandal S, Khan A, Manna SK, Ghosh K (2014) Distribution of extracellular enzyme-
1622 producing bacteria in the digestive tracts of 4 brackish water fish species. *Turkish Journal*
1623 *of Zoology* **38**: 79–88.
- 1624 Das A, Nakhro K, Chowdhury S, Kamilya D (2013) Effects of potential probiotic *Bacillus*
1625 *amyloliquifaciens* FPTB16 on systemic and cutaneous mucosal immune responses and
1626 disease resistance of catla (*Catla catla*). *Fish & shellfish immunology*, **35**, 1547-1553.
- 1627 Dash P, Tandel RS, Bhat RAH, Mallik S, Singh AK, Sarma D (2018) The addition of probiotic
1628 bacteria to microbial floc: Water quality, growth, non-specific immune response and disease

- 1629 resistance of *Cyprinus carpio* in mid-Himalayan altitude. DOI:
1630 doi:10.1016/j.aquaculture.2018.06.056
- 1631 Dawood MAO, Koshio S (2016) Recent advances in the role of probiotics and prebiotics in
1632 carp aquaculture: A review. *Aquaculture*, **454**, 243-251.
- 1633 Dawood MAO, Koshio S, Esteban MÁ (2017) Beneficial roles of feed additives as
1634 immunostimulants in aquaculture: a review. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, n/a-n/a.
- 1635 Decamp O, Moriarty DJW & Lavens P (2008) Probiotics for shrimp larviculture: review of
1636 field data from Asia and Latin America. *Aquaculture Research* **39**: 334-338.
1637 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2109.2007.01664.x
- 1638 Defoirdt T, Boon N, Sorgeloos P, Verstraete W, Bossier P (2007) Alternatives to antibiotics to
1639 control bacterial infections: luminescent vibriosis in aquaculture as an example. *Trends in*
1640 *Biotechnology* **25**: 472–479.
- 1641 Del`Duca A, Cesar DE, Abreu PC (2015) Bacterial community of pond`s water, sediment and
1642 in the guts of tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) juveniles characterized by fluorescent in situ
1643 hybridization technique. *Aquaculture Research* **46**: 707-715.
- 1644 De Paula Silva FC, Nicoli JR, Zambonino-Infante JL, Kaushik S, Gatesoupe F-J (2011).
1645 Influence of the diet on the microbial diversity of faecal and gastrointestinal contents of
1646 gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) and intestinal contents in goldfish (*Carassius auratus*).
1647 *FEMS Microbiology and Ecology* **78**: 285-296.
- 1648 De Vrese D, Schrezenmeir M (2008) A comprehensive review that critically evaluates modes
1649 of actions and medicinal applications of prebiotics and synbiotics. *Advances in Biochemical*
1650 *Engineering / Biotechnology* **111**: 1–66.
- 1651 Dey A, Ghosh K, Hazra N (2016) Evaluation of extracellular enzyme-producing autochthonous
1652 gut bacteria in walking catfish, *Clarias batrachus* (L.). *Journal of Fisheries* **4**: 345–352.
- 1653 Devaraja T, Banerjee S, Yusoff F, Shariff M, Khatoon H (2013) A holistic approach for
1654 selection of *Bacillus* spp. as a bioremediator for shrimp postlarvae culture. *Turkish Journal*
1655 *of Biology*. **37**:92–100. <https://doi.org/10.3906/biy-1203-19>
- 1656 Dimitroglou A, Merrifield DL, Carnevali O, Picchiatti S, Avella M, Daniels C, et al. (2011)
1657 Microbial manipulations to improve fish health and production-A Mediterranean
1658 perspective. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **30**: 1–16.
- 1659 Divya M, Aanand S, Srinivasan A and Ahilan B (2015) Bioremediation – An eco-friendly tool
1660 for effluent treatment: A Review. *International Journal of Applied Research* **1(12)**: 530-537.
- 1661 Doan HV, Hoseinifar SH, Khanongnuch C., Kanpiengjai A, Unban K, Kim VV, et al (2018)
1662 Host-associated probiotics boosted mucosal and serum immunity, disease resistance and growth
1663 performance of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). *Aquaculture* **491**: 94–100.
- 1664 Dong HB, Su YG, Mao Y, You XX, Ding SX, Wang J (2014) Dietary supplementation with
1665 *Bacillus* can improve the growth and survival of the kuruma shrimp *Marsupenaeus japonicus*
1666 in high-temperature environments. *Aquac. Int.* **22**, 607–617, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-013-9688-8)
1667 [013-9688-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-013-9688-8)
- 1668 Doron S & Snyderman DR (2015) Risk and Safety of Probiotics. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, **60**
1669 (suppl. 2): S129–S134.
- 1670 Drider D, Fimland G, Hechard Y, McMullen LM, Prevost H (2006) The continuing story of
1671 class IIa bacteriocins. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* **70**: 564-582.

- 1672 Dubois J-YF, Kouwen TRHM, Schurich AKC, Reis CR, Ensing HT, Trip EN *et al.* (2009)
 1673 Immunity to the bacteriocin sub lancin 168 is determined by the SunI (YolF) protein of
 1674 *Bacillus subtilis*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* **53**(2): 651–661.
- 1675 Dutta D, Banerjee S, Mukherjee A, Ghosh K (2015) Selection and probiotic characterization of
 1676 exoenzyme-producing bacteria isolated from the gut of *Catla catla* (Actinopterygii:
 1677 Cypriniformes: Cyprinidae). *Acta Ichthyologica et Piscatoria* **45**: 373–384.
- 1678 Dutta D, Ghosh K (2015) Screening of extracellular enzyme-producing and pathogen inhibitory
 1679 gut bacteria as putative probiotics in mrigal, *Cirrhinus mrigala* (Hamilton, 1822).
 1680 *International Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Studies* **2**: 310–318.
- 1681 EFSA [European Food Safety Authority] (2007) Opinion of the Scientific Committee on a
 1682 request from EFSA on the introduction of a Qualified Presumption of Safety (QPS) approach
 1683 for assessment of selected micro-organisms referred to EFSA. *The EFSA Journal*, **587**: 1–16.
 1684 EFSA (2013) Scientific opinion on the maintenance of the list of QPS biological agents
 1685 intentionally added to food and feed (2013 update). safety, QPS, bacteria, yeast, fungi, virus.
 1686 First published in the EFSA Journal: 14 November 2013, Last Updated: 12 September
 1687 2017. DOI:10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3449
- 1688 Elsabagh M, Mohamed R, Moustafa EM, Hamza A, Farrag F, Decamp O *et al.* (2018) Assessing
 1689 the impact of *Bacillus* strains mixture probiotic on water quality, growth performance, blood
 1690 profile and intestinal morphology of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*. *Aquaculture Nutrition*.
 1691 <https://doi.org/10.1111/anu.12797>.
 1692
- 1693 Esakkiraj P, Immanuel G, Sowmya SM, Iyapparaj P, Palavesam A (2009) Evaluation of
 1694 protease-producing ability of fish gut isolate *Bacillus cereus* for aqua feed. *Food and*
 1695 *Bioprocess Technology* **2**: 383–390.
- 1696 FAO/WHO (2002) Guidelines for the evaluation of probiotics in food. [http://www.fda.gov/](http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/95s0316/95s-0316-rpt0282-tab-03-ref-19-joint-faowho-vol219.pdf)
 1697 [ohrms/dockets/dockets/95s0316/95s-0316-rpt0282-tab-03-ref-19-joint-faowho-vol219.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/95s0316/95s-0316-rpt0282-tab-03-ref-19-joint-faowho-vol219.pdf).
 1698 Fečkaninová A, Koščová J, Mudroňová D, Popelka P, Toropilová J (2017) The use of
 1699 probiotic bacteria against *Aeromonas* infections in salmonid aquaculture. *Aquaculture*,
 1700 **469**, 1-8.
- 1701 From C, Pukall R, Schumann P, Hormazábal V, Granum PE (2005) Toxin-producing ability
 1702 among *Bacillus* spp. outside the *Bacillus cereus* group. *Applied and Environmental*
 1703 *Microbiology*, **71**(3): 1178–1183.
- 1704 Focht DD, Verstraete W (1977) Biochemical ecology of nitrification and dinitrification.
 1705 *Advances in Microbial Ecology*, **1**; 135-214.
- 1706 Foster ASJ (1999) The role of peptidoglycan structure and structural dynamics during
 1707 endospore dormancy and germination. *Anton Van Leeuw*, **75**:299-307.
- 1708 Galagarza OA, Smith SA, Drahos DJ, Robert JD, Williams C, Kuhn DD (2018) Modulation of
 1709 innate immunity in Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) by dietary supplementation of *Bacillus*
 1710 *subtilis* endospores. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology* **83**: 171-179.
- 1711 Gao S, Pan L, Huang F, Song M, Tian C, Zhang M (2019) Metagenomic insights into the
 1712 structure and function of intestinal microbiota of the farmed Pacific white shrimp
 1713 (*Litopenaeus vannamei*). *Aquaculture* **499**: 109-118.

- 1714 Gatesoupe FJ (2008) Updating the importance of lactic acid bacteria in fish farming: Natural
 1715 occurrence and probiotic treatments. *Journal of Molecular*
 1716 *Microbiology and Biotechnology* **14**: 107–114.
- 1717 Gatesoupe F-J, Huelvan C, Le Bayon N, Le Delliou H, Madec L, Mouchel O, *et al.* (2016) The
 1718 highly variable microbiota associated to intestinal mucosa correlates with growth and
 1719 hypoxia resistance of sea bass, *Dicentrarchus labrax*, submitted to different nutritional
 1720 histories. *BMC Microbiology* **16**: 266.
- 1721 Gautam N, Sharma N (2009) Bacteriocin: Safest approach to preserve food products *Indian*
 1722 *Journal of Microbiology* **49**(3):204-11, DOI: 10.1007/s12088-009-0048-3
- 1723
- 1724 Geraylou Z, Vanhove MPM, Souffreau C, Rurangwa E, Buyse J, Ollevier F (2014) *In vitro*
 1725 selection and characterization of putative probiotics isolated from the gut of *Acipenser*
 1726 *baerii* (Brandt, 1869). *Aquaculture Research* **45**: 341-352.
- 1727 German DP, Bittong RA (2009) Digestive enzyme activities and gastrointestinal fermentation
 1728 in wood-eating catfishes. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B, Biochemical, Systemic,*
 1729 *and Environmental Physiology* **179**: 1025–1042.
- 1730 Ghanbari M, Jami M, Kneifel W, Domig KJ (2013) Antimicrobial activity and partial
 1731 characterization of bacteriocins produced by lactobacilli isolated from sturgeon fish. *Food*
 1732 *Control* **32**: 379–385.
- 1733 Ghosh Sh, Sinha A, Sahu Ch (2008) Bioaugmentation in the growth and water quality of live
 1734 bearing ornamental fishes. *Aquaculture International* **16**: 393–403. DOI 10.1007/s10499-007-
 1735 9152-8.
- 1736 Ghosh S, Sinha A, Sahu C (2007) Isolation of putative probionts from the intestines of Indian
 1737 major carps. *Israeli Journal of Aquaculture- Bamidgah* **59**: 127–132.
- 1738 Ghosh K, Ray AK, Ringø E (2018) Applications of plant ingredients for tropical and sub-
 1739 tropical finfish: possibilities and challenges. *Reviews in Aquaculture* [Epub ahead of print],
 1740 doi: 10.1111/raq.12258.
- 1741 Ghosh K, Banerjee S, Moon UM, Khan HA, Dutta D (2017) Evaluation of gut associated
 1742 extracellular enzyme-producing and pathogen inhibitory microbial community as potential
 1743 probiotics in Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*. *International Journal of Aquaculture* **7**:
 1744 143-158.
- 1745 Ghosh K, Roy M, Kar N, Ringø E (2010) Gastrointestinal bacteria in rohu, *Labeo rohita*
 1746 (Actinopterygii: Cypriniformes: Cyprinidae): Scanning electron microscopy and
 1747 bacteriological study. *Acta Ichthyologica et Piscatoria* **40**: 129–135.
- 1748 Ghosh K, Sen SK, Ray AK (2002) Characterization of bacilli isolated from gut of rohu, *Labeo*
 1749 *rohita*, fingerlings and its significance in digestion. *Journal of Applied Aquaculture* **12**: 33–
 1750 42.
- 1751 Ghosh K, Sen SK, Ray AK (2004) Growth and survival of rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton, 1822)
 1752 spawn fed diets fermented with intestinal bacterium, *Bacillus circulans*. *Acta Ichthyologica*
 1753 *Et Piscatoria* **34** (2): 155–165
- 1754 Gibbons NE (1933) The slime and intestinal flora of some marine fishes. *Contribution of*
 1755 *Canadian Biology and Fisheries* **8**: 275-290. CHECK
- 1756 Giri SS, Sukumaran V, Sen SS, Vinumonia J, Nazeema-Banu B, Jena PK (2011) Antagonistic
 1757 activity of cellular components of potential probiotic bacteria, isolated from the gut of

- 1758 *Labeo rohita*, against *Aeromonas hydrophila*. *Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins* **3**:
1759 214–222.
- 1760 Giri SS, Sukumaran V, Sen SS, Jena PK (2014) Effects of dietary supplementation of potential
1761 probiotic *Bacillus subtilis* VSG1 singularly or in combination with *Lactobacillus*
1762 *plantarum* VSG3 or/and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* VSG2 on the growth, immunity and disease
1763 resistance of *Labeo rohita*. *Aquaculture Nutrition*, **20**:163-171,
- 1764
- 1765 Gobi N, Malaikozhundan B, Sekar V, Shanthi S, Vaseeharan B, Jayakumar R, Nazar AK (2016)
1766 GFP tagged
1767 *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* Dahv2 infection and the protective effects of probiotic *Bacillus*
1768 *licheniformis* Dahb1 on the growth, immune and antioxidant responses in *Pangasius*
1769 *hypophthalmus*. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **52**: 230–238.
- 1770 Goel G, Puniya AK, Singh K (2005) Interaction of gut microflora with tannins in feeds.
1771 *Naturwissenschaften* **92**: 497–503.
- 1772 Gómez GD, Balcázar JL (2008) A review on the interactions between gut microbiota and
1773 innate immunity of fish. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol.* **52**(2):145-54.
- 1774 Goncalves AT, Gallardo-Escárate C (2017) Microbiome dynamic modulation through
1775 functional diets based on pre- and probiotics (mannan-oligosaccharides and
1776 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) in juvenile rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Journal of*
1777 *Applied Microbiology* **122**: 1333-1347.
- 1778 Goodwin AE, Spencer RoyJ Jr, Grizzle JM, Goldsby MTJ (1994) *Bacillus mycoides*: a bacterial
1779 pathogen of channel catfish. *Diseases of aquatic Organisms* **18**: 173-179.
- 1780
- 1781 Granum PE, Lund T (1997) *Bacillus cereus* and its food poisoning toxins. *FEMS Microbiology*
1782 *Letters*, **157**(2): 223–228.
- 1783 Gray EJ, Di Falco M, Souleimanov A, Smith DL (2006) Proteomic analysis of the bacteriocin
1784 thuricin 17 produced by *Bacillus thuringiensis* NEB17. *FEMS Microbiol Letters* **255**: 27–
1785 32.
- 1786 Green TJ, Smullen R, Barnes AC (2013) Dietary soybean protein concentrate-induced intestinal
1787 disorder in marine farmed Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* is associated with alterations in
1788 gut microbiota. *Veterinary Microbiology* **166**: 286-292.
- 1789 Guo JJ, Liu KF, Cheng SH, Chang CI, Lay JJ, et al. (2009) Selection of probiotic bacteria for
1790 use in shrimp larviculture. *Aquaculture Research* **40**: 609-618.
- 1791 Guo X, Chen D-D, Peng K-S, Cui Z-W, Zhang X-J, Li S, Zhang Y-A (2016) Identification and
1792 characterization of *Bacillus subtilis* from grass carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idellus*) for use as
1793 probiotic additives in aquatic feed. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology*, **52**: 74–84, doi: 10.1016/
1794 j.fsi.2016.03.017.
- 1795 Gupta A, Gupta P, Dhawan A (2014) Dietary supplementation of probiotics affects growth,
1796 immune response and disease resistance of *Cyprinus carpio* fry. *Fish & Shellfish*
1797 *Immunology*, **41**, 113-119.
- 1798 Gupta A, Gupta P, Dhawan A (2016) *Paenibacillus polymyxa* as a water additive improved
1799 immune response of *Cyprinus carpio* and disease resistance against *Aeromonas hydrophila*.
1800 *Aquaculture Reports* **4**: 86–92.

- 1801 Hai NV (2015) Research findings from the use of probiotics in tilapia aquaculture: A review.
1802 *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, **45**, 592-597.
- 1803 Hansen GH, Olafsen JA (1999) Bacterial interactions in early life stages of marine cold-water
1804 fish. *Microbial Ecology* **38**: 1-26.
- 1805 He S, Wu Z, Liu Y, Wu N, Tao Y, Xu L *et al.* (2013) Effects of dietary 60g kg⁻¹ dried distiller`s
1806 grains in least-cost practical diets on production and gut allochthonous bacterial
1807 composition of cage-cultured fish: comparison among fish species with different natural
1808 food habits. *Aquaculture Nutrition* **19**: 765-772.
- 1809 Hendriksen, NB, Hansen, BM, Johansen, JE (2006) Occurrence and pathogenic potential of
1810 *Bacillus cereus* group bacteria in a sandy loam. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* **89**: 239–249.
- 1811 Hernandez E, Ramisse F, Ducoureau JP, Cruel T, Cavallo JD (1998) *Bacillus thuringiensis*
1812 subsp. *konkukian* (serotype H34) superinfection: case report and experimental evidence of
1813 pathogenicity in immunosuppressed mice. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, **36(7)**: 2138–
1814 2139.
- 1815 Hindu SV, Chandrasekaran N, Mukherjee A, Thomas J (2018) Effect of dietary
1816 supplementation of novel probiotic bacteria *Bacillus vireti* 01 on antioxidant defence
1817 system of freshwater prawn challenge with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Probiotics &*
1818 *Antimicrobial Proteins* **10**, 356-366.
- 1819 Hong HA, Duc LH, Cutting SM (2005) The use of bacterial spore formers as probiotics. *FEMS*
1820 *Microbiology Reviews* **29**: 813-835.
- 1821 Hong HA, Duc le H, Cutting SM (2005) The use of bacterial spore formers as probiotics. *FEMS*
1822 *Microbiology Reviews* **29**: 813–835.
- 1823 Hoseinifar SH, Ringø E, Shenavar Masouleh A, Esteban MÁ (2016) Probiotic, prebiotic and
1824 synbiotic supplements in sturgeon aquaculture: a review. *Reviews in Aquaculture* **8**: 89–
1825 102.
- 1826 Hoseinifar SH, Dadar M, Ringø E (2017a) Modulation of nutrient digestibility and digestive
1827 enzyme activities in aquatic animals: the functional feed additives scenario.
1828 *Aquaculture research*, **48**, 3987-4000.
- 1829 Hoseinifar SH, Sun Y-Z, Caipang CM (2017b) Short chain fatty acids as feed supplements for
1830 sustainable aquaculture: an updated view. *Aquaculture Research*, **48**, 1380–1391.
- 1831 Hoseinifar SH, Sun Y, Wang A, Zhou Z (2018) Probiotics as means of diseases control in
1832 aquaculture, A Review of current knowledge and future perspectives. *Frontiers in*
1833 *Microbiology*, **9**, 2429.
- 1834 Hovda BF, Lundestad BT, Fontanillas R, Rosnes JT (2007) Molecular characterisation of the
1835 intestinal microbiota of farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *Aquaculture* **272**: 581-
1836 588.
- 1837 Hovda BF, Fontanillas R, McGurk C, Obach A, Rosnes JT (2012) Seasonal variations in the
1838 intestinal microbiota of farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *Aquaculture Research*
1839 **43**: 154-159.
- 1840 Ichimatsu T, Mizuki E, Nishimura K, Akao T, Saitoh H, Higuchi K *et al.* (2000) Occurrence of
1841 *Bacillus thuringiensis* in fresh water of Japan. *Current Microbiology* **40**: 217-220.
- 1842 Issazadeh K, reza majid-Khoshkhol Pahlaviani M, Massiha A (2012) Isolation of *Lactobacillus*
1843 species from sediments of Caspian Sea for bacteriocin production. In: *2nd*
1844 *International Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Technology IPCBEE* **34**: 79-84.
1845 IACSIT Press, Singapore.

- 1846 Izvekova GI, Izvekov EI, Plotnikov AO (2007) Symbiotic microflora in fishes of different
1847 ecological groups. *Biology Bulletin* **34**: 610-618.
- 1848 Jasmin MY, Wagaman H, Yin TA, Ina-Salwany MY, Daud HM, Karim M (2016) Screening
1849 and evaluation of local bacteria isolated from shellfish as potential probiotics against
1850 pathogenic Vibrios. *Journal of Environmental Biology* **37**: 801-809.
- 1851 Jawahar Abraham T, Sasmal D, Ghosh S (2004) Development and efficacy of bioremediations
1852 for ammonia removal in shrimp aquaculture. Int: *Proceedings of the National Seminar on New
1853 Frontiers in Marine Bioscience Research*, Allied, India, pp 69-75.
- 1854 Jiang Y, Song X, Gong L, Li P, Dai C, Shao W (2008) High poly- β -hydroxybutyrate production
1855 by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* A2a5 from inexpensive substrates. *Enzyme and Microbial
1856 Technology* **42**: 167-172.
- 1857 Jiang H, Bian Q, Zeng W, Ren P, Sun, Lin Z, et al (2019) Oral delivery of *Bacillus subtilis*
1858 spores expressing grass carp reovirus VP4 protein produces protection against grass carp
1859 reovirus infection. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **84**: 768-780.
- 1860 Jung-Schroers V, Adamek M, Jung A, Harris S, Doza O-S, Baumer A *et al.* (2016) Feeding of
1861 β -1,3/1,6-glucan increases the diversity of the intestinal microflora of carp (*Cyprinus
1862 carpio*). *Aquaculture Nutrition* **22**: 1026-1039.
- 1863 Kavitha M, Raja M, Perumal P (2018) Evaluation of probiotic potential of *Bacillus* spp.
1864 isolated from the digestive tract of freshwater fish *Labeo calbasu* (Hamilton, 1822).
1865 *Aquaculture Reports* **11**: 59-69.
- 1866 Kaynar P, Beyatli Y (2009) Determination of poly- β -hydroxybutyrate production by *Bacillus*
1867 spp. isolated from the intestines of various fishes. *Fishery Sciences* **75**: 439-443.
- 1868 Karthikeyan V, Santhosh SW (2009) Study of bacteriocin as a food preservative and the *L.*
1869 *acidophilus* strain as probiotic. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition* **8**: 335-340.
- 1870 Keysami MA, Mohammadpour M, Saad CR (2012) Probiotic activity of *Bacillus subtilis* in
1871 juvenile freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (de Man) at different methods of
1872 administration to the feed. *Aquatic International* **20**: 499-511.
1873 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-011-9481-5>
- 1874 Khan A, Ghosh K (2012) Characterization and identification of gut-associated phytase-
1875 producing bacteria in some freshwater fish cultured in ponds. *Acta Ichthyologica et
1876 Piscatoria* **42**: 37-45.
- 1877 Khan A, Ghosh K (2013) Evaluation of phytase production by fish gut bacterium, *Bacillus*
1878 *subtilis* for processing of *Ipomea aquatica* leaves as probable aquafeed ingredient. *Journal
1879 of Aquatic Food Product Technology* **22**: 508-519.
- 1880 Kim D-H, Kim D-y (2013) Microbial diversity in the intestine of olive flounder (*Paralichthys
1881 olivaceus*). *Aquaculture* **414-415**: 103-108.
- 1882 Kim D-H, Brunt J, Austin B (2007) Microbial diversity of intestinal contents and mucus in
1883 rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **102**: 1654-1664.
- 1884 Kim YK, Park IS, Kim DJ, Nam BH, Kim DG, Jee YJ, *et al.* (2014) Identification and
1885 characterization of a bacteriocin produced by an isolated *Bacillus* sp. SW1-1 that exhibits

- 1886 antibacterial activity against fish pathogens. *Journal of the Korean Society for Applied*
1887 *Biological Chemistry* **57**: 605–612.
- 1888 Kiss A, Balikó G, Csorba A, Chuluunbaatar T, Medzihradzsky KF, Alföldi L (2008) Cloning
1889 and characterization of the DNA γ region responsible for megacin A-216 production in
1890 *Bacillus megaterium* 216. *Journal of Bacteriology* **190**: 6448–6457.
- 1891 Klaenhammer TR (1993) Genetics of bacteriocins produced by lactic acid bacteria. *FEMS*
1892 *Microbiology Letters* **12**: 224–227.
- 1893 Koch R (1876) Untersuchungen über Bakterien. V. Die Aetiologie der Milzbrand Krankheit,
1894 begründet auf Entwicklungs geschichte des *Bacillus anthracis*. *Beiträge zur Biologie der*
1895 *Pflanzen* **2**: 277–308.
- 1896 Kolndadacha OD, Adikwu IA, Okaeme AN, Atiribom RY, Mohammed A, Musa YM (2011)
1897 The role of probiotics in aquaculture in Nigeria – a review. *Continental Journal of Fisheries*
1898 *Aquatic Science* **5**: 8–15.
- 1899 Kongnum K, Hongpattarakere T (2012) Effect of *Lactobacillus plantarum* isolated from
1900 digestive tract of wild shrimp on growth and survival of white shrimp (*Litopenaeus*
1901 *vannamei*) challenged with *Vibrio harveyi*. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **32**: 170–177.
- 1902 Kotiranta A, Lounatmaa K & Haapasalo M (2000) Epidemiology and pathogenesis of *Bacillus*
1903 *cereus* infections. *Microbial Infection* **2(2)**: 189–198.
- 1904 Krishnamurthi S, Chakrabarti T, Stackebrandt E (2009) Re-examination of the taxonomic
1905 position of *Bacillus silvestris* Rheims et al. 1999 and proposal to transfer it to *Solibacillus*
1906 gen. nov. as *Solibacillus silvestris* comb. Nov. *International Journal of Systematic and*
1907 *Evolutionary Microbiology* **59**: 1054–1058.
- 1908 Kumar R, Mukherjee SC, Prasad KP, Pal AK (2006) Evaluation of *Bacillus subtilis* as a
1909 probiotic to Indian major carp *Labeo rohita* (Ham.). *Aquaculture Research*, **37**, 1215-
1910 1221.
- 1911 Kumar V, Bossier P (2018) Importance of plant-derived compounds and/or natural products in
1912 aquaculture. *Aquafeed* **10**, 28–31.
- 1913 Kumar V, Roy S, Meena DK, Sarkar UK (2016) Application of probiotics in shrimp
1914 aquaculture: Importance, mechanisms of action, and methods of administration. *Reviews*
1915 *in Fishery Science and Aquaculture* **24**: 342–368.
- 1916 Kumar P, Jain KK, Sardar P (2018) Effects of dietary synbiotic on innate immunity, antioxidant
1917 activity and disease resistance of *Cirrhinus mrigala* juveniles. *Fish and Shellfish*
1918 *Immunology* **80**, 124-132.
- 1919 Kuźmina VV (1996) Influence of age on digestive enzyme activity in some freshwater teleost.
1920 *Aquaculture* **148**: 25–37.
- 1921 Labbe´ N, Laurin V, Juteau P, Parent S, Villemur R (2007) Microbiological community
1922 structure of the biofilm of a methanol-fed, marine denitrification system, and identification of
1923 the methanol-utilizing microorganisms. *Microbial Ecology* **53**:621–630.
- 1924 Lara-Anguiano GF, Esparza-Leal HM, Sainz-Hernandez JC, Ponce-Palafox JT, Valenzuela-
1925 Quinonez W, Apun-Molina JP, Klanian MG (2013) Effects of inorganic and organic
1926 fertilization on physicochemical parameters, bacterial concentrations, and shrimp growth
1927 in *Litopenaeus vannamei* cultures with zero water exchange. *Journal of The World*
1928 *Aquaculture Society* **44 (4)**: 499-510.

- 1929 Lalloo R, Ramchuran S, Ramduth D, Gørgens J, Gardiner N (2007) Isolation and selection of
1930 *Bacillus* spp. as potential biological agents for enhancement of water quality in culture of
1931 ornamental fish. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **103**(5):1471–1479
- 1932 Lalloo R, Moonsamy G, Ramchuran S, Gørgens J, Gardiner N (2010) Competitive exclusion
1933 as a mode of action of a novel *Bacillus cereus* aquaculture biological agent. *Letters in*
1934 *Applied Microbiology* **50**: 563–570.
- 1935 Laranja JLQ, Ludevese-Pascual GL, Amar EC, Sorgeloos P, Bossier P, De Schryver P (2014)
1936 Poly- β -hydroxybutyrate (PHB) accumulating *Bacillus* spp. improve the survival, growth
1937 and robustness of *Penaeus monodon* (Fabricius, 1798) postlarvae. *Veterinary*
1938 *Microbiology* **173**: 310–317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2014.08.011>
- 1939 Laranja JLQ, Amar EC, Ludevese-Pascual GL, Niu Y, Geaga MJ, De Schryver P, Bossier P,
1940 (2017) A probiotic *Bacillus* strain containing amorphous poly-beta-hydroxybutyrate
1941 (PHB) stimulates the innate immune response of *Penaeus monodon* postlarvae. *Fish and*
1942 *Shellfish Immunology* **68**: 202–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2017.07.023>
- 1943 Lawton EM, Cotter PD, Hill C, Ross RP (2007) Identification of a novel two-peptide lantibiotic,
1944 haloduracin, produced by the alkaliphile *Bacillus halodurans* C-125. *FEMS Microbiology*
1945 *Letters* **267**: 64-71.
- 1946 Le Marrec C, Hyronimus B, Bressollier P, Verneuil B, Urdaci MC (2000) Biochemical and
1947 genetic characterization of coagulins, a new antilisterial bacteriocin in the pediocin family
1948 of bacteriocins, produced by *Bacillus coagulans* I4. *Applied and Environmental*
1949 *Microbiology* **66**: 5213–5220.
- 1950 Lee H, Kim HY (2011) Lantibiotics, class I bacteriocins from the genus *Bacillus*. *Journal of*
1951 *Microbiology and Biotechnology* **21**: 229–235.
- 1952 Lesel R, Fromageot C, Lesel M (1986) Cellulase digestibility in grass carp, *Ctenopharyngodon*
1953 *idella* and in gold fish, *Carassius auratus*. *Aquaculture* **54**: 11–17.
- 1954 Li J, Tan B, Mai K (2009) Dietary probiotic *Bacillus* OJ and isomaltooligosaccharides
1955 influence the intestine microbial populations, immune responses and resistance to white
1956 spot syndrome virus in shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*). *Aquaculture* **291**: 35–40.
1957 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2009.03.005>
- 1958 Li T, Long M, Gatesoupe FJ, Zhang Q, Li A, Gong X (2015) Comparative analysis of the
1959 intestinal bacterial communities in different species of carp by pyrosequencing. *Microbial*
1960 *Ecology* **69**: 25–36.
- 1961 Li Z, Xu L, Liu W, Liu Y, Ringø E, Du Z, Zhou Z (2015) Protein replacement in practical diets
1962 altered gut allochthonous bacteria of cultured cyprinid species with different food habits.
1963 *Aquaculture International* **23**: 913-928.
- 1964 Li X, Ringø E, Hoseinifar SH, Lauzon H, Birkbeck H, Yang D (2018a) Adherence and
1965 colonisation of microorganisms in the fish gastrointestinal tract. *Reviews in Aquaculture*.
- 1966 Li E, Xu C, Wang X, Wang S, Zhao Q, Zhang M *et al.* (2018b) Gut microbiota and its
1967 modulation for healthy farming of Pacific white shrimp *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Reviews in*
1968 *Fisheries Science & Aquaculture* **26**: 381-399.
- 1969 Liu C-H, Chiu C-H, Wang S-W, Cheng W (2012) Dietary administration of the probiotic,
1970 *Bacillus subtilis* E20, enhances the growth, innate immune responses, and disease

- 1971 resistance of the grouper, *Epinephelus coioides*. *Fish & shellfish immunology*, **33**,
1972 699-706.
- 1973 Liu CH, Chiu CS, Ho PL, Wang SW (2009) Improvement in the growth performance of white
1974 shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*, by a protease-producing probiotic, *Bacillus subtilis* E20,
1975 from natto. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **107**: 1031–1041.
1976 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2009.04284.x>
- 1977 Liu KF, Chiu CH, Shiu YL, Cheng W, Liu CH (2010) Effects of the probiotic, *Bacillus subtilis*
1978 E20, on the survival, development, stress tolerance, and immune status of white shrimp,
1979 *Litopenaeus vannamei* larvae. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **28**: 837–844.
- 1980 Liu H, Wang S, Cai Y, Guo X, Cao Z, Zhang Y, et al. (2017) Dietary administration of *Bacillus*
1981 *subtilis* enhances growth, digestive enzyme activities, innate immune responses and disease
1982 resistance of tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **60**:326-33.
- 1983 Liu J, Pang J-j, Tu Z-c, Wang H, Sha X-m, Shao Y-h *et al.* (2018) The accumulation,
1984 histopathology, and intestinal microorganisms effect of waterborne cadmium on *Carassius*
1985 *auratus gibelio*. *Fish Physiology and Biochemistry* 10.1007/s10695-018-0557-2
- 1986 Llewellyn MS, Boutin S, Hoseinifar SH, Derome N (2014) Teleost microbiomes: the state of
1987 the art in their characterization, manipulation and importance in aquaculture and fisheries.
1988 *Frontiers in Microbiology* **5**: 1–17.
- 1989 Lu L, Cao H, He S, Wei R, Diong M (2011) *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* G1: a potential
1990 antagonistic bacterium against eel-pathogenic *Aeromonas hydrophila*. *Evidence-Based*
1991 *Complementary and Alternative Medicine* <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/824104>.
- 1992 Luo Z, Bai XH, Chen CF (2014) Integrated application of two different screening strategies to
1993 select potential probiotics from the gut of channel catfish *Ictalurus punctatus*. *Fisheries*
1994 *Science* **80**: 1269–1275.
- 1995 Lutz G, Chavarria M, Arias ML, Mata-Segreda JF (2006) Microbial degradation of palm (*Elaeis*
1996 *guineensis*) biodiesel. *Revista Biologia Tropical* **54**: 59-63.
- 1997 Ma RL, Yang HL, Sun YZ, Ye JD, Zhang CX, Lin WY (2010) Biological characteristics of
1998 two *Bacillus* strains isolated from the gut of grouper *Epinephelus coioides*. *Fisheries*
1999 *Science* **29**: 505-509.
- 2000 Marteau P (2001) Safety aspects of probiotic products. *Scandinavian Journal of Nutrition*. **45**:
2001 22–24.
- 2002 Mandal S, Ghosh K (2013a) Isolation of tannase-producing microbiota from the gastrointestinal
2003 tracts of some freshwater fish. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* **29**: 145–153.
- 2004 Martirani L, Varcamonti M, Naclerio G, De Felice M (2002) Purification and partial
2005 characterization of bacillocin 490, a novel bacteriocin produced by a thermophilic strain of
2006 *Bacillus licheniformis*. *Microbial Cell Factories* **1**: 1–5.
- 2007 Mazmanian SK, Round JL, Kasper DL (2008) A microbial symbiosis factor prevents intestinal
2008 inflammatory disease. *Nature* **453**: 620-625.
- 2009 Meng R, He LS, Xi BD, Hu X, Li YY (2009) Experimental study on purifying aquaculture
2010 wastewater between *Bacillus* and nitrifying bacteria. *Environmental Science and*
2011 *Technology* **32(11)**:28–31.
- 2012 Mente E, Nikouli E, Antonopoulou E, Martin SAM, Kormas KA (2018) Core versus diet-
2013 associated and postprandial bacterial communities of the rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus*
2014 *mykiss*) midgut and faeces. *Biology Open* **7**: bio034397.

- 2015 Mevel G, Prieur D (2000) Heterotrophic nitrification by a thermophilic *Bacillus* species as
2016 influenced by different culture conditions. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* **46**: 465-473.
- 2017 Miao S, Zhao C, Zhu J, Hu J, Dong X, Sun L (2018) Dietary soybean meal affects intestinal
2018 homoeostasis by altering the microbiota, morphology and inflammatory cytokine gene
2019 expression in northern snakehead. *Scientific Reports* **8**: 113.
- 2020 Mohamed MH, Ahmed Refat NAG (2011) Pathological Evaluation of Probiotic, *Bacillus*
2021 *Subtilis*, against *Flavobacterium columnare* in *Tilapia Nilotica (Oreochromis Niloticus)*
2022 Fish in Sharkia Governorate, Egypt. *Journal of American Science* **7(2)**:
2023 <http://www.americanscience.org> <http://www.americanscience.org> 244
- 2024 Mokoena MP (2017) Lactic acid bacteria and their bacteriocins: Classification, biosynthesis
2025 and applications against uropathogens: A mini-review. *Molecules* **22**: 1255.
- 2026 Mondal S, Roy T, Ray AK (2010) Characterization and identification of enzyme-producing
2027 bacteria isolated from the digestive tract of bata, *Labeo bata*. *Journal of the World*
2028 *Aquaculture Society* **41**: 369-376.
- 2029 Mongkol P, Bunphimpapha P, Rungrassamee W, Arayamethakorn S, Klinbunga S, Menasveta
2030 P *et al.* (2018) bacterial community composition and distribution in different segments of
2031 the gastrointestinal tract of wild-caught adult *Penaeus monodon*. *Aquaculture Research* **49**:
2032 378-392.
- 2033 Monod M, DeNoya C, Dubnau D (1986) Sequence and properties of pIM13, a macrolide-
2034 lincosamide-streptogramin B resistance plasmid from *Bacillus subtilis*. *Journal of Bacte-*
2035 *riology* **167(1)**: 138-147.
- 2036 Moriarty DJW (1998) Control of luminous *Vibrio* species in penaeid aquaculture ponds.
2037 *Aquaculture* **164**: 351-358.
- 2038 Moriarty DJW (1999) Disease control in shrimp aquaculture with probiotic bacteria. In:
2039 *Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Microbial Ecology* (ed. Bell CR,
2040 Brylinsky M, Johnson-Green P) pp. 237-244. Halifax, NS, Canada: *Atlantic Canada*
2041 *Society for Microbial Ecology*.
- 2042 Motta AS, Cladera-Olivera F, Brandelli A (2004) Screening for antimicrobial activity among
2043 bacteria isolated from the Amazon basin. *Brazilian Journal of Microbiology* **35**: 307-310.
- 2044 Mukherjee A, Ghosh K (2016) Antagonism against fish pathogens by cellular components and
2045 verification of probiotic properties in autochthonous bacteria isolated from the gut of an
2046 Indian major carp, *Catla catla* (Hamilton). *Aquaculture Research* **47**: 2243-2255.
- 2047 Mukherjee A, Dutta D, Banerjee S, Ringø E, Breines EM, Hareide E, *et al.* (2016) Potential
2048 probiotics from Indian major carp, *Cirrhinus mrigala*. Characterization, pathogen
2049 inhibitory activity, partial characterization of bacteriocin and production of exoenzymes.
2050 *Research in Veterinary Science* **108**: 76-84.
- 2051 Mukherjee A, Dutta D, Banerjee S, Ringø E, Breines EM, Hareide E, *et al.* (2017) Culturable
2052 autochthonous gut bacteria in rohu, *Labeo rohita*. *In vitro* growth inhibition against
2053 pathogenic *Aeromonas* spp., stability in gut, bio-safety and identification by 16S rRNA gene
2054 sequencing. *Symbiosis* **73**: 165-177.
- 2055 Mullany P, Wilks M, Lamb I, Clayton C, Wren B, Tabaqchali S (1990) Genetic analysis of a
2056 tetracycline resistance element from *Clostridium difficile* and its conjugal transfer to and
2057 from *Bacillus subtilis*. *Journal of General Microbiology*, **136(7)**: 1343-1349.

- 2058 Naderi Samani M, Jafaryan H, Gholipour H, Harsij M, Farhangi M (2016) Effect of different
 2059 concentration of profitable *Bacillus* on bioremediation of common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*)
 2060 pond discharge. *Iranian Journal of Aquatic Animal Health* **2(2)**: 44-54.
- 2061 Nandi A, Dan SK, Banerjee G, Ghosh P, Ghosh K, Ringø E, Ray AK (2017a) Probiotic potential
 2062 of autochthonous bacteria isolated from the gastrointestinal tract of four freshwater teleost.
 2063 *Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins* **9**: 12-21.
- 2064 Nandi A, Banerjee G, Dan SK, Ghosh P, Ghosh K, Ray AK (2017b) Screening of
 2065 autochthonous intestinal microbiota as candidate probiotics isolated from four freshwater
 2066 teleosts. *Current Science* **113**: 767-773.
- 2067 Nath S, Chowdhury S, Dora KC (2015) Application of *Bacillus* sp. as a biopreservative for
 2068 food preservation. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications* **5(4)**, (Part
 2069 -2): 85-95.
- 2070
- 2071 Nedoluha PC, Westhoff D (1995) Microbial analysis of striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) grown
 2072 in flow-through tanks. *Journal of Food Protection* **58**: 1363-1368.
- 2073 Nedoluha PC, Westhoff D (1997) Microbial analysis of striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) grown
 2074 in a recirculation system. *Journal of Food Protection* **60**: 948-953.
- 2075
- 2076 Nes IF, Yoon S-S, Diep, DB (2007) Ribosomally synthesized antimicrobial peptides
 2077 (bacteriocins) in lactic acid bacteria: a review. *Food Science and Biotechnology* **16**: 675–
 2078 690.
- 2079 Newaj-Fyzul A, Adesiyun AA, Mutani A, Ramsubhag A, Brunt J, Austin B (2007) *Bacillus*
 2080 *subtilis* AB1 controls *Aeromonas* infection in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*,
 2081 Walbaum). *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, **103**, 1699-1706.
- 2082 Ng W-K, Koh C-B (2016) The utilization and mode of action of organic acids in the feeds of
 2083 cultured aquatic animals. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 10.1111/raq.12141.
- 2084 Nimrat S, Suksawat S, Boonthai T, Vuthiphandchai V (2012) Potential *Bacillus* probiotics
 2085 enhance bacterial numbers, water quality and growth during early development of white
 2086 shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*). *Veterinary Microbiology* **159**: 443–450.
- 2087 Nyman A, Huyben D, Lundh T, Dicksved J (2017) Effects of microbe- and mussel-based diets
 2088 on the gut microbiota in Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*). *Aquaculture Reports* **5**: 34-40.
- 2089 Oatway L, Vasanthan T, Helm JH (2001) Phytic acid. *Food Reviews International* **17**: 419–
 2090 431.
- 2091 Olmos J, Ochoa L, Paniagua-Michel J, Contreras R (2011) Functional feed assessment on
 2092 *Litopenaeus vannamei* using 100% fish meal replacement by soybean meal, high levels of
 2093 complex carbohydrates and *Bacillus* probiotic strains. *Marine Drugs* **9**: 1119-1132.
- 2094 Olsen RE, Sundell K, Ringø E, Myklebust R, Hemre G-I, Hansen T, Karlsten Ø (2008) The
 2095 acute stress response in fed and food deprived Atlantic cod, *Gadus morhua* L. *Aquaculture*
 2096 **280**: 232-241.

- 2097 Oscariz JC, Pisabarro AG (2000) Characterization and mechanism of action of cerein 7, a
2098 bacteriocin produced by *Bacillus cereus* Bc7. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **89**: 1–10.
- 2099 Oscariz JC, Lasa I, Pisabarro AG (1999) Detection and characterization of cerein 7, a new
2100 bacteriocin produced by *Bacillus cereus* with a broad spectrum of activity. *FEMS*
2101 *Microbiol Letters* **178**: 337–341.
- 2102 OSullivan L, Ross RP, Hill C (2002) Potential of bacteriocin producing lactic acid bacteria for
2103 improvements in food safety and quality. *Biochimie* **84**: 593–604.
- 2104 Paik HD, Bae SS, Pan JG (1997) Identification and partial characterization of tochicin, a
2105 bacteriocin produced by *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *tochigiensis*. *Journal of Industrial*
2106 *Microbiology and Biotechnology* **19**: 294–298.
- 2107 Pandiyan P, Balaraman D, Thirunavukkarasu R, George EGT, Subaramaniyan K, Manikkam
2108 S, et al. (2013). Probiotics in aquaculture. *Drug Invention Today* **5**: 55–59
- 2109 Parkinson TJ, Merrall M, Fenwick SG (1999) A case of bovine mastitis caused by *Bacillus*
2110 *ceres*. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal* **47(4)**: 151–152.
- 2111 Parisot J, Carey S, Breukink E, Chan WC, Narbad A, Bonev B
2112 (2008) Molecular mechanism of target recognition by subtilin, a Class I lanthionine
2113 antibiotic. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* **52**: 612–618.
- 2114 Patil R, Jeyasekaran G, Shanmugam SA, Shakila JR (2001) Control of bacterial pathogens,
2115 associated with fish diseases, by antagonistic marine actinomycetes isolated from marine
2116 sediments. *Indian Journal of Marine Science* **30**: 264–267.
- 2117 Peixoto SB, Cladera-Olivera F, Daroit DJ, Brandelli A (2011) Cellulase-producing *Bacillus*
2118 strains isolated from the intestine of Amazon basin fish. *Aquaculture Research* **42**: 887–
2119 891.
- 2120 Pérez T, Balcázar JL, Ruiz-Zarzuola I, Halaihel N, Vendrell D, De Blas I et al. (2010) Host-
2121 microbiota interactions within the fish intestinal ecosystem. *Mucosal Immunology* **3**: 355–
2122 360.
- 2123 Pflug J, Smith GM, Christensen R (1981) Effect of soybean casein digest agar lot on number
2124 of *Bacillus stearothermophilus* spores recovered. *Applied Environmental Microbiology*
2125 **42**:226-230.
- 2126 Phelan RW, Clarke C, Morrissey JP, Dobson AD, O’Gara F & Barbosa TM (2011) Tetracycline
2127 resistance-encoding plasmid from *Bacillus* sp. strain# 24, isolated from the marine sponge
2128 *Haliclona simulans*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **77(1)**: 327–329.
- 2129 Porubcan RS (1991) Reduction in chemical oxygen demand and improvement in *Panaeus*
2130 *monodon* yield in ponds inoculated with aerobic *Bacillus* bacteria. Program and Abstracts
2131 of the 22nd Annual Conference and Exposition, 16-20 June 1991, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
2132 *World Aquaculture Society*.
- 2133 Pradeep B, Pandey PK, Ayyapan S (2003) Effects of probiotics and antibiotics on water quality
2134 and bacterial flora. *Journal of Inland Fishery Society India* **35(2)**:68-72.
- 2135 Prieto ML, O’Sullivan L, Tan SP, McLoughlin P, Hughes H, O’Connor PM et al. (2012)
2136 Assessment of the bacteriocinogenic potential of marine bacteria reveals lichenicidin
2137 production by seaweed derived *Bacillus* spp. *Marine Drugs* **10**: 2280–2299.
- 2138 Rahiman KMM, Jesmi Y, Thomas AP & Hatha AAM (2010) Probiotic effect of *Bacillus* NL110
2139 and *Vibrio* NE17 on the survival, growth performance and immune response of

- 2140 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (de Man). *Aquaculture Research* 41: 120-134
2141 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2109.2009.02473.x
- 2142 Raida MK, Larsen JL, Nielsen ME, Buchmann K (2003) Enhanced resistance of rainbow trout,
2143 *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (Walbaum), against *Yersinia ruckeri* challenge following oral
2144 administration of *Bacillus subtilis* and *B. licheniformis* (BioPlus2B). *Journal of Fish*
2145 *Diseases* 26 (8): 495–498.
- 2146 Rajesh D, Karthikeyan S, Jayaraman G (2012) Isolation and partial characterization of a new
2147 bacteriocin from *Bacillus pumilus* DR2 isolated from seawater. *CIBTech Journal*
2148 *of Microbiology* 1: 33–41.
- 2149 Ramachandran S, Ray AK (2007) Nutritional evaluation of fermented black gram seed meal
2150 for rohu *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton) fingerlings. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* 23: 74–79.
- 2151 Ramachandran S, Bairagi A, Ray AK (2005) Improvement of nutritive value of grass pea
2152 (*Lathyrus sativus*) seed meal in the formulated diets for rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.)
2153 fingerlings after fermentation with a fish gut bacterium. *Bioresource Technology* 96: 1465–
2154 1472.
- 2155 Ramirez C, Romero J (2017) Fine flounder (*Paralichthys adspersus*) microbiome showed
2156 important differences between wild and reared specimens. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 8:
2157 271.
- 2158 Ramirez-Torrez JA, Monroy-Dosta MC, Hernández-Hernández LH, Castro-Mejia, Bustos-
2159 Martinez JA, Hamdan-Partida A (2018) Presumptive probiotic isolated from *Oncorhynchus*
2160 *mykiss* (Walbaum, 1792), cultivated in Mexico. *International Journal of Aquatic Sciences*
2161 9: 3–12.
- 2162 Ran C, Carrias A, Williams MA, Capps N, Dan BCT, et al. (2012) Identification of *Bacillus*
2163 strains for biological control of catfish pathogens. *PLoS ONE* 7: e45793.
2164 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0045793
- 2165 Rasheeda MK, Rangamaran VR, Srinivasan S, Ramaiah SK, Gunasekaran R, Jaypal S *et al.*
2166 (2017) Comparative profiling of microbial community of three economically important
2167 fishes reared in sea cages under tropical offshore environment. *Marine Genomics* 34: 57-
2168 65.
- 2169 Rather IA, Galope R, Bajpai VK, Lim J, Paek WK, Park Y (2017) Diversity of marine bacteria
2170 and their bacteriocins: Applications in aquaculture, *Reviews in Fisheries Science &*
2171 *Aquaculture* 25(4): 257-269.
- 2172 Rawls JF, Samuel BS, Gordon JI (2004) Gnotobiotic zebrafish reveal evolutionarily conserved
2173 responses to the gut microbiota. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
2174 *United States of America* 101: 4596–4601.
- 2175 Rawls JF, Mahowald MA, Ley RE, Gordon JI (2006) Reciprocal gut microbiota transplants
2176 from zebrafish and mice to germ-free recipients reveal host habitat selection. *Cell* 127: 423–
2177 433.
- 2178 Ray AK, Bairagi A, Sarkar Ghosh K, Sen SK (2007) Optimization of fermentation conditions
2179 for cellulase production by *Bacillus subtilis* CY5 and *Bacillus circulans* TP3 isolated from
2180 fish gut. *Acta Ichthyologica et Piscatoria* 37: 47–53.

- 2181 Ray AK, Roy T, Mondal S, Ringø E (2010) Identification of gut-associated amylase, cellulase
2182 and protease-producing bacteria in three species of Indian major carps. *Aquaculture*
2183 *Research* **41**: 1462-1469.
- 2184 Ray AK, Ghosh K, Ringø E (2012) Enzyme-producing bacteria isolated from fish gut: a review.
2185 *Aquaculture Nutrition* **18**: 465-492.
- 2186 Raymond B, Johnston PR, Nielsen-LeRoux C, Lereclus D, Crickmore N (2010) *Bacillus*
2187 *thuringiensis*: an impotent pathogen? *Trends in Microbiology*, 18(5): 189–194.
- 2188 Rebah FB, Prévost D, Tyagi RD, Belbahri L (2009) Poly- β -hydroxybutyrate production by fast-
2189 growing rhizobia cultivated in sludge and in industrial wastewater. *Applied Biochemistry*
2190 *and Biotechnology* **158**: 155–163.
- 2191 Reda RM, Selim KM (2015) Evaluation of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* on the growth
2192 performance, intestinal morphology, hematology and body composition of Nile tilapia,
2193 *Oreochromis niloticus*. *Aquaculture International* **23**: 203-217.
- 2194 Reed GB & Spence CM (1929) The intestinal and slime flora of the haddock: a preliminary
2195 report. *Contribution of Canadian Biology and Fisheries* **4**: 257-264.
- 2196 Rengpipat S, Phianphak W, Piyatiratitivorakul S, Menasveta P (1998a) Effects of a probiotic
2197 bacterium on black tiger shrimp *Penaeus monodon* survival and growth. *Aquaculture* **167**:
2198 301–313. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486\(98\)00305-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(98)00305-6)
- 2199 Rengpipat S, Rukpratanporn S, Piyatiratitivorakul S, Menasaveta P (2000) Immunity
2200 enhancement in black tiger shrimp (*Penaeus monodon*) by a probiont bacterium (*Bacillus*
2201 S11). *Aquaculture* **191**: 271–288.
- 2202 Rengpipat S, Rukpratanporn S, Piyatiratitivorakul S and Menasveta P (1998b) Probiotics in
2203 Aquaculture : A case study of probiotics for larvae of the black tiger shrimp (*Penaeus*
2204 *monodon*). In: Flegel TW(ed) Advances in shrimp biotechnology, *National Center for*
2205 *Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology*, Bangkok, pp. 177-181.
- 2206 Rheims H, Fruhling A, Schumann P, Rohde M, Stackebrandt E (1999) *Bacillus silvestris* sp.
2207 nov., a new member of the genus *Bacillus* that contains lysine in its cell wall. *International*
2208 *Journal of Systematic Bacteriology* **49**: 795–802.
- 2209 Ricaud K, Rey M, Plagnes-Juan E, Larroquet L, Even M, Quillet E *et al.* (2018) Composition
2210 of intestinal microbiota in two lines of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) divergently
2211 selected for muscle fat content. *The Open Microbiology Journal* **12**: 308-320.
- 2212 Riley MA, Wertz JE (2002a) Bacteriocin diversity: ecological and evolutionary perspectives.
2213 *Biochimie* **84**: 357–364.
- 2214 Riley MA, Wertz JE (2002b) Bacteriocins: evolution, ecology, and application. *Annual Review*
2215 *of Microbiology* **56**: 117–137.
- 2216 Riley M (2009) Bacteriocins, Biology, Ecology, and Evolution. In: *Encyclopedia of*
2217 *Microbiology*, Schaechter M, Ed. 3rd ed. pp. 32–44. *Academic Press*: Oxford, UK.
- 2218 Ringø E, Song, SK (2016) Application of dietary supplements (synbiotics and probiotics in
2219 combination with plant products and β -glucans) in aquaculture. *Aquaculture Nutrition* **22**:
2220 4–24.
- 2221 Ringø E, Strøm E, Tabachek JA (1995) Intestinal microflora of salmonids: a review.
2222 *Aquaculture Research* **26**: 773–789.

- 2223 Ringø E, Sperstad S, Myklebust R, Mayhew TM, Olsen RE (2006) The effect of dietary inulin
2224 on aerobic bacteria associated with hindgut of Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus* L.).
2225 *Aquaculture Research* **37**: 891-897.
- 2226 Ringø E, Hoseinifar SH, Ghosh K, Doan HV, Beck BR, Song SK (2018) Lactic acid bacteria
2227 in finfish-An update. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **9**: 1818
- 2228 Ringø E, Zhou Z, Vecino JLG, Wadsworth S, Romero J, Krogdahl A *et al.* (2016) Effect of
2229 dietary components on the gut microbiota of aquatic animals. A never-ending story?
2230 *Aquaculture Nutrition* **22**: 219–282.
- 2231 Ringø E, Olsen RE, Gifstad TØ, Dalmo RA, Amlund H, Hemre GI, Bakke AM (2010)
2232 Prebiotics in aquaculture: a review. *Aquaculture Nutrition* **16**: 117–136.
- 2233 Ringø E, Birkbeck TH, Munro PD, Vadstein O, Hjelmeland K (1996) The effect of early
2234 exposure to *Vibrio pelagius* on the aerobic bacterial flora of turbot, *Scophthalmus maximus*
2235 (L.) larvae. *Journal of Applied Bacteriology* **81**: 207-211.
- 2236 Ringø E, Zhou Z, He S, Olsen RE (2014) Effect of stress on intestinal microbiota of Arctic
2237 charr, Atlantic salmon, rainbow trout and Atlantic cod: A review. *African Journal of*
2238 *Microbiology Research* **8**: 609-618.
- 2239 Roa PS, Sudha PM, Sreekanta S, Sasi N (1997) Bioaugmentation in aquaculture systems. Fish
2240 Health Section News Letter, *Asian Fisheries Society*, pp 3-7.
- 2241 Roberts AP, Pratten J, Wilson M & Mullany P (1999) Transfer of a conjugative transposon,
2242 Tn5397 in a model oral biofilm. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, **177(1)**: 63–66.
- 2243 Roy T, Banerjee G, Dan SK, Ghosh P, Ray AK (2014) Improvement of nutritive value of
2244 sesame oilseed meal in formulated diets for rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton), fingerlings after
2245 fermentation with two phytase-producing bacterial strains isolated from fish gut.
2246 *Aquaculture International* **22**: 633–652.
- 2247 Roy T, Mondal S, Ray AK (2009) Phytase-producing bacteria in the digestive tracts of some
2248 freshwater fish. *Aquaculture Research* **40**: 344–353.
- 2249 Sadat Hoseini Madani N, Adorian TJ, Ghafari Farsani H, Hoseinifar SH (2018) The effects of
2250 dietary probiotic bacilli (*Bacillus subtilis* and *Bacillus licheniformis*) on growth
2251 performance, feed efficiency, body composition and immune parameters of whiteleg
2252 shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) postlarvae. *Aquaculture Research* **49**: 1926–1933.
2253 <https://doi.org/10.1111/are.13648>
- 2254 Saha S, Roy RN, Sen SK, Ray AK (2006) Characterization of cellulase-producing bacteria from
2255 the digestive tract of tilapia, *Oreochromis mossambica* (Peters) and grass carp,
2256 *Ctenopharyngodon idella* (Valenciennes). *Aquaculture Research* **37**: 380–388.
- 2257 Sahandi J, Jafaryan H, Roozbehfar R, Dehestani M (2012) The use of two enrichment forms
2258 (*Brachionus plicatilis* enrichment and rearing water enrichment) with probiotic bacilli
2259 spore on growth and survival of Silver carp (*Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*). *Iranian*
2260 *Journal of Veterinary Research* **13(4)**:289-295
- 2261 Sahoo TK, Jena PK, Patel AK, Seshadri S (2016) Bacteriocins and their applications for the
2262 treatment of bacterial diseases in aquaculture: a review. *Aquaculture Research* **47**: 1013–
2263 1027.

- 2264 Sánchez-Ortiz AC, Angulo C, Luna-González A, Álvarez-Ruiz P, Mazón-Suástegui JM,
2265 Campa-Córdova ÁI (2016) Effect of mixed-*Bacillus* spp isolated from pustulose ark
2266 *Anadara tuberculosa* on growth, survival, viral prevalence and immune-related gene
2267 expression in shrimp *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Fish Shellfish Immunology* **59**: 95–102.
- 2268 Sanchez LM, Wong WR, Riener RM, Schulze CJ, Linington RG (2012) Examining the fish
2269 microbiome: vertebrate-derived bacteria and an environmental niche for the discovery of
2270 unique marine natural products. *PLoS ONE* **7**: e35398.
- 2271 Schoeni JL & Lee Wong AC (2005) *Bacillus cereus* food poisoning and its toxins. *Journal of*
2272 *Food Protection* **68**(3): 636–648.
- 2273 Sella SRBR, Vandenberghe LPS, Soccol CR (2014) Life cycle and spore resistance of spore-
2274 forming *Bacillus atrophaeus*. *Microbiological Research* **169**: 931-939, DOI:
2275 <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.micres.2014.05.001>
2276
- 2277 Selim KM, Reda RM (2015) Improvement of immunity and disease resistance in the Nile
2278 tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*, by dietary supplementation with *Bacillus*
2279 *amyloliquefaciens*. *Fish & shellfish immunology*, **44**, 496-503.
- 2280 Shapleigh JP (2011) Oxygen control of nitrogen oxide respiration, focusing on a-proteobacteria.
2281 *Biochemical Society Transactions* **39**:179–183
- 2282 Shcherbina MA, Kazlauskienė OP (1971) The reaction of the medium and the rate of absorption
2283 of nutrients in the intestine of carp. *Journal of Ichthyology* **11**: 81–85.
- 2284 Shen W-Y, Fu L-L, Li W-F, Zhu Y-R (2010) Effect of dietary supplementation with *Bacillus*
2285 *subtilis* on the growth, performance, immune response and antioxidant activities of the
2286 shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*). *Aquaculture Research* **41**: 1691–1698.
2287 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2109.2010.02554.x>
- 2288 Singh BJS (2002) Bioremediation in prawn grow out systems. Technical paper-22, Central
2289 Marine Fisheries Research Institute.
- 2290 Silva TFA, Petrillo TR, Yunis-Aguinaga J, Marcusso PF, da Silva Claudiano G, de Moraes
2291 FR, de Moraes JRE (2015) Effects of the probiotic *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* on
2292 growth performance, hematology and intestinal morphometry in cage-reared Nile
2293 tilapia. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Research*, **43**, 963-971.
- 2294 Singh M, Patel SK, Kalia VC (2009) *Bacillus subtilis* as potential producer for
2295 polyhydroxyalkanoates. *Microbial Cell Factories*. **8**: 38. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-8-38)
2296 [2859-8-38](https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-8-38)
- 2297 Sineva EV, Andreeva-Kovalevskaya Z.I, Shadrin AM, Gerasimov YL, Ternovsky VI,
2298 Teplova VV et al. (2009) Expression of *Bacillus cereus* hemolysin II in *Bacillus subtilis* renders
2299 the bacteria pathogenic for the crustacean *Daphnia magna*. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*,
2300 **299**(1): 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.2009.01742.x>
- 2301 Sirtori LR, Cladera-Olivera F, Lorenzini DM, Tsai SM, Brandelli A (2006) Purification and
2302 partial characterization of an antimicrobial peptide produced by *Bacillus* sp. strain P45, a
2303 bacterium from the Amazon basin fish *Piaractus mesopotamicus*. *Journal of General and*
2304 *Applied Microbiology* **52**: 357–363.
- 2305 Smitha S, Bhat SG (2013) Thermostable bacteriocin BL8 from *Bacillus licheniformis* isolated
2306 from marine sediment. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **114**: 688–694.

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

- 2307 Sokol H, Pigneur B, Watterlot L, Lakhdari O, Bermúdez-Humarán LG, Gratadoux JJ *et al.*
 2308 (2008) *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* is an anti-inflammatory commensal bacterium
 2309 identified by gut microbiota analysis of Crohn disease patients. *PNAS* **105**: 16731-16736.
- 2310 Sreenivasulu P, Suman Joshi DSD, Narendra K, Venkata Rao G, Krishna Satya A (2016)
 2311 *Bacillus pumilus* as a potential probiotic for shrimp culture. *International Journal of*
 2312 *Fisheries and Aquatic Studies* **4(1)**: 107-110
- 2313 Stein T (2005) *Bacillus subtilis* antibiotics: structures, syntheses and specific functions.
 2314 *Molecular Microbiology* **56**: 845-857.
- 2315 Stewart KAV, Setlow P (2013) Numbers of individual nutrient germinant receptors and other
 2316 germination proteins in spores of *Bacillus subtilis*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, **195(7)**:1484-
 2317 1491.
- 2318 Strøm E, Olafsen JA (1990) The indigenous microflora of wild-captured juvenile cod in net-
 2319 pen rearing. In: *Microbiology of Poecilotherms* (Lesel R, ed.), pp. 181-184.
- 2320 Sturr MG, Guffanti AA, Krulwich TA (1994) Growth and bioenergetics of alkaliphilic *Bacillus*
 2321 *firmus* OF4 in continuous culture at high pH. *Journal of Bacteriology* **176**: 3111-3116.
- 2322 Sugita H, Kawasaki J, Deguchi Y (1997) Production of amylase by the intestinal microflora in
 2323 cultured freshwater fish. *Letters in Applied Microbiology* **824**: 105-108.
- 2324 Sugita H, Hirose Y, Matsuo N, Deguchi Y (1998) Production of antibacterial substances by
 2325 *Bacillus* sp. strain NM 12, an intestinal bacterium of Japanese coastal fish. *Aquaculture* **165**:
 2326 269-280.
- 2327 Sugita H, Fukumoto M, Koyama H, Deguchi Y (1985) The intestinal microflora of carp
 2328 *Cyprinus carpio*, grass carp *Ctenopharyngodon idella*, and tilapia *Sarotherodon niloticus*.
 2329 *Bulletin of the Japanese Society of Scientific Fisheries* **51**: 1325-1329.
- 2330 Sugita H, Tsunohara M, Fukumoto M, Deguchi Y (1987) Comparison of microflora between
 2331 intestinal contents and fecal pellets of freshwater fishes. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi* **53**: 287-
 2332 290.
- 2333 Sugita H, Fukumoto M, Koyama H, Deguchi Y (1988a) Changes in the faecal microflora of
 2334 goldfish *Carassius auratus* with the oral administration of oxytetracycline. *Nippon Suisan*
 2335 *Gakkaishi* **54**: 2181-2187.
- 2336 Sugita H, Tsunohara T, Ohkoshi T, Deguchi Y (1988b) The establishment of an intestinal
 2337 microflora in developing goldfish (*Carassius auratus*) of culture ponds. *Microbial Ecology*
 2338 **15**: 333-344.
- 2339 Sugita H, Miyajima C, Kobiki Y, Deguchi Y (1990) The daily fluctuation and inter-individual
 2340 variation of the faecal flora of carp, *Cyprinus carpio* L. *Journal of Fish Biology* **36**: 103-
 2341 105.
- 2342 Sugita H, Miyajima C, Iwata J-C, Arai S, Kubo T, Igarashi S *et al.* (1988c) Intestinal microflora
 2343 of Japanese coastal fishes. *Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi* **54**: 875-882.
- 2344 Sugita H, Miyajima C, Fukumoto M, Koyama H, Deguchi Y (1989) Effect of oxolinic acid on
 2345 faecal microflora of goldfish (*Carassius auratus*). *Aquaculture* **80**: 163-174.
- 2346 Suguna P, Binuramesh C, Abirami P, Saranya V, Poornima K, Rajeswari V, Shenbagarathai R

- 2347 (2014) Immunostimulation by poly- β hydroxybutyrate-hydroxyvalerate (PHB-HV) from
 2348 *Bacillus thuringiensis* in *Oreochromis mossambicus*. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **36**:
 2349 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2013.10.012>
- 2350 Sui L, Cai J, Sun H, Wille M, Bossier P (2012) Effect of poly- β -hydroxybutyrate on Chinese
 2351 mitten crab, *Eriocheir sinensis*, larvae challenged with pathogenic *Vibrio anguillarum*.
 2352 *Journal of Fish Disease* **35**, 359–364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2761.2012.01351.x>
- 2353 Sumathi C, Nandhini A, Padmanaban J (2017) Antagonistic activity of probiotic *Bacillus*
 2354 *megaterium* against *Streptococcus mutans*. *International Journal of Pharmacological and*
 2355 *Biological Sciences* **8**: 270–274.
- 2356 Sumi CD, Yang BW, Yeo IC, Hahm YT (2015) Antimicrobial peptides of the genus *Bacillus*:
 2357 a new era for antibiotics. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology*, **61**(2):93-103. doi:10.1139/cjm-
 2358 2014-0613.
- 2359
- 2360 Sun Y-Z, Yang H-L, Ma R-L, Lin W-Y (2010) Probiotic applications of two dominant gut
 2361 *Bacillus* strains with antagonistic activity improved the growth performance and
 2362 immune responses of grouper *Epinephelus coioides*. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, **29**,
 2363 803-809.
- 2364 Sun Y, Wen Z, Li X, Meng N, Mi R, Li Y, Li S (2012) Dietary supplement of
 2365 fructooligosaccharides and *Bacillus subtilis* enhances the growth rate and disease
 2366 resistance of the sea cucumber *Apostichopus japonicus* (Selenka). *Aquaculture*
 2367 *Research*, **43**, 1328-1334.
- 2368 Sutyak KE, Wirawan RE, Aroucheva AA, Chikindas ML (2008) Isolation of the *Bacillus*
 2369 *subtilis* antimicrobial peptide subtilisin from the dairy product-derived *Bacillus*
 2370 *amyloliquefaciens*. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **104**: 1067–1074.
- 2371 Talukdar S, Ringø E, Ghosh K (2016) Extracellular tannase-producing bacteria detected in the
 2372 digestive tracts of seven freshwater fishes. *Acta Ichthyologica et Piscatoria* **46**: 201-210.
- 2373 Teixeira ML, Cladera OF, dos Santos J, Brandelli A (2009) Purification and characterization of
 2374 a peptide from *Bacillus licheniformis* showing dual antimicrobial and emulsifying activities.
 2375 *Food Research International* **42**: 63–68.
- 2376 Telli GS, Ranzani-Paiva MJT, de Carla Dias D, Sussel FR, Ishikawa CM, Tachibana L (2014)
 2377 Dietary administration of *Bacillus subtilis* on hematology and non-specific immunity
 2378 of Nile tilapia *Oreochromis niloticus* raised at different stocking densities. *Fish &*
 2379 *shellfish immunology*, **39**, 305-311.
- 2380 Trust TJ (1975) facultative anaerobic bacteria in the digestive tract of chum salmon
 2381 (*Oncorhynchus keta*) maintained in fresh water under defined culture conditions. *Applied*
 2382 *Microbiology* **29**: 663-668.
- 2383 Trust TJ, Sparrow RAH (1974) The bacterial flora in the alimentary tract of freshwater
 2384 salmonid fishes. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* **20**: 1219-1128.
- 2385 Trust TJ, Bull LM, Currie BR, Buckley JT (1979) Obligate anaerobic bacteria in the
 2386 gastrointestinal microflora of the grass carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idella*), goldfish
 2387 (*Carassius auratus*), and rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). *Journal of the Fisheries*
 2388 *Research Board of Canada* **36**: 1174-1179.

- 2389 Tseng DY, Ho PL, Huang SY, Cheng SC, Shiu YL, Chiu CS, Liu CH (2009) Enhancement of
 2390 immunity and disease resistance in the white shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*, by the
 2391 probiotic, *Bacillus subtilis* E20. *Fish Shellfish Immunology* **26**: 339–344.
 2392 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2008.12.003>
- 2393 Tyndall J (1877) Further researches on the department and vital persistence of putrefactive and
 2394 infective organisms from a physical point of view. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
 2395 *Society of London* **167**: 149–206.
- 2396 Tzeng T-D, Pao Y-Y, Chen P-C, Weng FC-H, Jean WD, Wang D (2015) Effects of host
 2397 phylogeny and habitats on gut microbiomes of oriental river prawn (*Macrobrachium*
 2398 *nipponense*). *PLOS One* **10**: e0132860.
- 2399 Vadstein O, Attramadal KJK, Bakke I, Forberg T, Olsen Y, Verdegem M, *et al.* (2018)
 2400 Managing the microbial community of marine fish larvae: A holistic perspective for
 2401 larviculture. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **9**: 1820.
- 2402 Vargas-Albores F, Porchas-Cornejo MA, Martinez-Porshas M, Villalpando E, Gollas-Galván
 2403 T, Martinez-Córdova LR (2017) bacterial biota of shrimp intestine is significantly modified
 2404 by the use of a probiotic mixture: a high throughput sequencing approach. *Helgoland*
 2405 *Marine Research* **71**: 5.
- 2406 Velmurugan S, Palanikumar P, Velayuthani P, Donio MBS, Michael Babu M, Lelin C, *et al.*
 2407 (2015) Bacterial white patch disease caused by *Bacillus cereus*, a new emerging disease in
 2408 semi-intensive culture of *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Aquaculture* **444**: 49–54.
- 2409 Verschuere L, Rombaut G, Sorgeloos P, Verstraete W (2000) Probiotic bacteria as biological
 2410 control agents in aquaculture. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* **64**: 655–671.
- 2411 Von Döhren H (1995) Peptides: In: *Genetics and Biochemistry of antibiotic production* (Ed.
 2412 Vining LC, Stuttard C). pp.129-171. Newton MA. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- 2413 Wang YB (2007) Effect of probiotics on growth performance and digestive enzyme activity of
 2414 the shrimp *Penaeus vannamei*. *Aquaculture* **269**: 259–264.
- 2415 Wang AR, Ran C., Ringo, E, Zhou ZG (2018) Progress in fish gastrointestinal microbiota
 2416 research. *Reviews in Aquaculture* **10**: 626-640.
- 2417 Wang YG, Lee KL, Najiah M, Shariff M, Hassan MD (2000) A new bacterial white spot
 2418 syndrome (BWSS) in cultured tiger shrimp *Penaeus monodon* and its comparison with
 2419 white spot syndrome (WSS) caused by virus. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* **41**: 9-18.
- 2420 Wang B, Sharma-Shivappa RR, Olson JW, Khan SA (2012) Upstream process optimization of
 2421 polyhydroxybutyrate (PHB) by *Alcaligenes latus* using two-stage batch and fed-batch
 2422 fermentation strategies. *Bioprocess and Biosystems Engineering*, **35**: 1591–1602.
- 2423 Wang C, Liu Y, Sun G, Li X, Liu Z (2019) Growth, immune response, antioxidant capability,
 2424 and disease resistance of juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) fed *Bacillus velezensis*
 2425 V4 and *Rhodotorula mucilaginosa* compound. *Aquaculture*, **500**: 65-74.
- 2426 Wong S, Waldrop T, Summerfelt S, Davidson J, Barrows F, Kenney B *et al.* (2013)
 2427 Aquacultured rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) possess a large core intestinal
 2428 microbiota that is resistant to variation in diet and rearing density. *Applied and*
 2429 *Environmental Microbiology* **79**: 4974-4984.

- 2430 Wu Z, Feng X, Xie L, Peng X, Yuan J, Chen X (2012) Effect of probiotic *Bacillus subtilis*
 2431 Ch9 for grass carp, *Ctenopharyngodon idella* (Valenciennes, 1844), on growth
 2432 performance, digestive enzyme activities and intestinal microflora. *Journal of Applied*
 2433 *Ichthyology*, **28**, 721-727.
- 2434 Wu DX, Zhao SM, Peng N, Xu C P, Wang J & Liang YX (2016) Effects of a probiotic (*Bacillus*
 2435 *subtilis* FY99-01) on the bacterial community structure and composition of shrimp
 2436 (*Litopenaeus vannamei*, Boone) culture water assessed by denaturing gradient gel
 2437 electrophoresis and high-throughput sequencing. *Aquaculture Research* **47**: 857–869
 2438 doi:10.1111/are.12545
- 2439 Xie F, Zhu T, Zhang F, Zhou Z, Zhao Y and Li Z (2013) Using *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* for
 2440 remediation of aquaculture water. *Springer Plus* **2**:119.
 2441 <http://www.springerplus.com/content/2/1/119>.
- 2442 Xiong J, Zhu J, Dai W, Dong C, Qiu Q Li C (2017) Integrating gut microbiota immunity and
 2443 disease-discriminatory taxa to diagnose the initiation and severity of shrimp disease.
 2444 *Environmental Microbiology* **19**: 1490-1501.
- 2445 Yang G, Chen M, Yu Z, Lu Q, Zhou S (2013) *Bacillus composti* sp. nov. and *Bacillus*
 2446 *thermophilus* sp. nov, two thermophilic Fe (III)-reducing bacteria isolated from compost.
 2447 *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **63**: 3030-3036.
- 2448 Yang H-T, Zou S-S, Zhai L-J, Wang Y, Zhang F-M, An L-G *et al.* (2017) Pathogen invasion
 2449 changes the intestinal microbiota composition and induces innate immune responses in the
 2450 zebrafish intestine. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology* **71**: 35-42.
- 2451 Yang P, Hu H, Liu Y, Li Y, Ai Q, Xu W *et al.* (2018) Dietary stachyose altered the intestinal
 2452 microbiota profile and improved intestinal barrier function of juvenile turbot,
 2453 *Scophthalmus maximus*. *Aquaculture* **486**: 98-106.
- 2454 Yilmaz S, Sova M, Ergün S (2018) Antimicrobial activity of trans-cinnamic acid and commonly
 2455 used antibiotics against important fish pathogens and nonpathogenic isolates. *Journal of*
 2456 *Applied Microbiology* doi: 10.1111/jam.14097.
- 2457 Yu, Cai-Hong, Yawang Tao Guo, Wan-Xin Shen, Ming- Xin Gu (2012) Isolation and
 2458 identification of ammonia nitrogen degradation strains from industrial waste water. *Journal*
 2459 *of Scientific Research* **4**:790-793.
- 2460 Zhang Q, Yu H, Tong T, Tong W, Dong L, Xu M, Wang Z (2014) Dietary supplementation
 2461 of *Bacillus subtilis* and fructooligosaccharide enhance the growth, non-specific
 2462 immunity of juvenile ovate pompano, *Trachinotus ovatus* and its disease resistance
 2463 against *Vibrio vulnificus*. *Fish & shellfish immunology*, **38**, 7-14.
- 2464 Zhang X, Fu L, Deng B, Liang Q, Zheng J, Sun J, Zhu H, Peng L, Wang Y, Wenyong S, Li W
 2465 (2013) *Bacillus subtilis* SC02 supplementation causes alterations of the microbial diversity
 2466 in grass carp water. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* **29**:1645–1653. DOI
 2467 10.1007/s11274-013-1327-z
- 2468 Zheng G, Yan LZ, Vederas JC, Zuber P (1999) Genes of the sboalb locus of *Bacillus subtilis*
 2469 are required for production of the antilisterial bacteriocin subtilisin. *Journal of*
 2470 *Bacteriology* **181**: 7346–7355.
- 2471 Zhou X, Tian Z, Wang Y, Li W (2010) Effect of treatment with probiotics as water additives
 2472 on tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) growth performance and immune response. *Fish*
 2473 *physiology and biochemistry*, **36**, 501-509.

Field Code Changed

- 2474 Zhou Z, Karlsen Ø, He S, Olsen RE, Yao B, Ringø E (2013) The effect of dietary chitin on the
2475 autochthonous gut microbiota of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua* L.). *Aquaculture Research*
2476 **44**: 1889-1900.
- 2477 Zhu J, Dai W, Qiu Q, Dong C, Zhang J, Xiong J (2016) Contrasting ecological processes and
2478 functional compositions between intestinal bacterial community in healthy and diseased
2479 shrimp. *Microbial Ecology* **72**: 975-985.
- 2480 Zokaeifar H, Balcázar JL, Kamarudin MS, Sijam K, Arshad A, Saad CR (2012a) Selection and
2481 identification of non-pathogenic bacteria isolated from fermented pickles with antagonistic
2482 properties against two shrimp pathogens. *Journal of Antibiotics* **65**: 289-294.
- 2483 Zokaeifar H, Balcázar JL, Saad CR, Kamarudin MS, Sijam K, Arshad A, Nejat N (2012b)
2484 Effects of *Bacillus subtilis* on the growth performance, digestive enzymes, immune gene
2485 expression and disease resistance of white shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Fish and*
2486 *Shellfish Immunology* **33**: 683-689.
- 2487 Zokaeifar H, Babaei N, Saad CR, Kamarudin MS, Sijam K, Balcazar JL (2014) Administration
2488 of *Bacillus subtilis* strains in the rearing water enhances the water quality, growth
2489 performance, immune response, and resistance against *Vibrio harveyi* infection in juvenile
2490 white shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology* **36**: 68-74.
- 2491