Habitat and Client Diversity Influence the Skin Microbiome of the Caribbean Cleaner Goby *Elacatinus Evelynae*

Ana Pereira (✉ anantunespereira@gmail.com)

CIBIO: Universidade do Porto Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5328-1668>

Marta C. Soares

University of Porto

Teresa Santos

University of Porto

Ana Poças

University of Porto

Marcos Pérez-Losada

University of Porto

Amy Apprill

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole

Paul C. Sikkell

Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences

Raquel Xavier

University of Porto

Research Article

Keywords: Skin microbiota, microbial diversity, cleanerfish, *Elacatinus evelynae*, coral reefs

Posted Date: August 27th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-828485/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Fish associated microorganisms are known to be affected by the environment and other external factors, such as microbial transfer between interacting partners. One of the most iconic mutualistic interactions on coral reefs are the cleaning interactions between cleanerfishes and their clients, during which direct physical contact occurs. Here, we characterized the skin bacteria of the Caribbean cleaner sharknose goby, *Elacatinus evelynae*, in four coral reefs of the US Virgin Islands using sequencing of the V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene. We specifically tested the relationship between gobies' level of interaction with clients and skin microbiota diversity and composition. Our results showed differences in microbial alpha- and beta-diversity in the skin of gobies from different reef habitats and high inter-individual variation in microbiota diversity and structure. Overall, the results showed that fish-to-fish direct contact and specifically, access to a diverse clientele, influences the bacterial diversity and structure of cleaner gobies' skin. Because of their frequent contact with clients, and therefore, high potential for microbial exchange, cleanerfish may serve as models in future studies aiming to understand the role of social microbial transfer in reef fish communities.

Introduction

Coral reefs are highly complex marine ecosystems that have been the focus of numerous studies examining the drivers of biodiversity and community dynamics [1]. As in other ecosystems, coral reef microorganisms are emerging as key members to maintaining reef health and resilience in the face of large-scale degradation due to climate change, human impacts and emerging diseases of corals (reviewed by [2]). This has resulted in increased efforts to characterize diseases of reef microbial communities, and to identify which organisms influence resilience and recovery (e.g. [3]). Recent studies have shown the importance of interactions between the coral microbiome and the larger reef community (e.g. between reef-building coral and benthic algae, [4]). However, relatively few studies have examined the microbiome associated with the most mobile members of the reef community, such as fishes (e.g. [5, 6]).

Fish microbial communities are known to be affected by multiple biotic and abiotic variables. There is evidence that fish-associated bacteria are organ-specific, species-specific and individual specific, thus comprising highly diverse communities [7–9]. While host factors seem to be the major drivers of fish gut bacterial diversity [10, 11], the physicochemical properties of the water exert a considerable effect on the diversity of fish skin-associated microbes (e.g. temperature and salinity, [12]). Despite the impact of the surrounding environment, the contribution of the water microbiota to the fish skin microbiota composition seems negligible, with fish mucosae being a highly selective environment (e.g. [13]). However, other external factors, such as direct transfer of microorganisms between fishes, might also play a major and still unexplored role [14–16]. Microbial transfer between interacting partners has been shown to be common in nature, shaping microbial consortia in humans and other animal groups (reviewed in [17, 18]), including fish [14]. Although social microbial transmission could ultimately increase microbiome complexity, which may reduce the abundance of opportunistic and/or pathogenic taxa, as seen in bees

[19] or chimpanzees [18], social interactions may also facilitate pathogen transmission and consequently increase levels of infection and disease (reviewed by [20]).

One of the most iconic mutualistic interactions on coral reefs is the relationship between cleanerfishes and clients. Cleaners attract individuals from multiple species (clients) to their “cleaning stations”, which are usually fixed territories where they inspect the body of multiple client fishes per day to remove parasites, dead tissue and mucus [21]. Although many small fish species clean opportunistically, members of two genera are obligate or “dedicated” cleaners [22]. These include the cleaner wrasses (*Labroides* spp.) in the Indo-Pacific and the cleaner gobies (*Elacatinus* spp.) in the Caribbean region. Cleaner gobies of the genus *Elacatinus* reside on benthic substrate, moving only to make contact with client fishes [21, 23], which travel and interrupt other activities to visit cleaner gobies [24, 25]. Visits to cleaner goby stations can be influenced by multiple factors including location relative to territorial client fish [24–26], local fish abundance [27], structural complexity [28], and parasite activity and abundance [26, 29]. Consequently, the abundance and diversity of client fishes can vary widely among cleaning stations. Because of their frequent contact with heterospecifics, and therefore, high potential for microbial exchange, cleanerfish may serve as a useful animal model system to understand the role of social microbial transfer in ecological communities [16]. Indeed, a recent study comparing “cleaner” vs “non-cleaner” ecotypes of *E. prochilos* from Barbados found that bacterial diversity was significantly increased in “cleaner” ecotypes [15].

Here, we characterized the skin bacteria of the most ubiquitous Caribbean cleaner goby species, the sharknose goby *Elacatinus evelynae*, in several reefs within the US Virgin Islands, using 16S rRNA gene (V4 hypervariable region) amplicon sequencing. We specifically studied the relationship between gobies’ level of interaction with clients, and skin microbiota diversity and composition. We expected to find a relationship between microbial diversity and client diversity and geographical differences in the skin microbiota among reefs due to putative socio-environmental differences.

Methods

Study species, sites, and behavioral observations

This study was conducted in the United States Virgin Islands in July 2017. All behavioral observations were performed at four sampling localities: two sites on the Island of St. Thomas: Brewers Bay (18.339998, -64.977417; n = 7 cleaner gobies) and Hull Bay (18.369340, -64.952925; n = 13), and two on the island of St. John: one along the west rim of Greater Lameshur Bay at West Lameshur (18.317928, -64.723946; n = 12) and another along the east rim at Donkey Bight (18.314054, -64.720945; n = 12) (Fig. 1). Donkey Bight is dominated by a mix of rocky reef, live and dead coral, sand, and seagrass, while West Lameshur is highly degraded with almost no live coral, and it is located near a mangrove swamp [30].

We focused on the sharknose goby *Elacatinus evelynae*, which are small fish (1.2–3.5 cm total length) with a prominent lateral blue and yellow stripe running from the snout to the base of the tail. This species is common across the study reef sites, inhabiting the surface of living coral, usually *Siderastrea* spp., *Orbicella* spp., *Montastrea* spp., *Diploria* spp., and *Pseudodiploria* spp. [23]. Cleaning stations were identified, and a subset was randomly selected for this study. Observations of cleaning interactions were made by two snorkelers positioned as far from the station as possible while still being able to see cleaning interactions (at least 2 m). Individual gobies were observed for 30 min at each location three times a day (at dawn, midday and dusk, totaling 1h30min for each cleaner) encompassing the hours during which *E. evelynae* are more active [25]. Observations were registered after a 2–5 min delay to allow the fish to become accustomed to the presence of the observer. During each observation period, the number of clients visiting each cleaning station, number of clients inspected, number of client genera visiting, number of client genera inspected, and average inspection time were recorded.

Following the final observation, cleaner gobies were captured using individual hand nets. Nets were submerged in a 30% bleach solution and rinsed with fresh water prior to each use. Upon capture, both sides of each fish were swabbed with tubed sterile cotton swabs (MedicalWire), which were stored at -80°C until DNA extraction.

Laboratory procedures

Total DNA was extracted using the PowerSoil extraction kit and following manufacturer's protocol. Extracted DNA was shipped in dry ice to the Centre for Microbial Systems at the University of Michigan Medical School (USA) where the V4 hypervariable region of the 16S rRNA gene (~ 250 bp) was amplified for each sample and controls (i.e. extraction and PCR blanks) with the primers 515F/806R [31] and sequenced using a dual indexing sequencing strategy [32]. Libraries were pooled and sequenced in a single Illumina MiSeq sequencing run.

Data analysis

Raw FASTQ files were analyzed using the DADA2 pipeline [33] for merging paired end reads, filtering and sequencing error correction using the following parameters: trimLeft = 20, truncLen = c(220, 200), maxN = 0, maxEE = c(2,2), truncQ = 2. Singletons were discarded and reads were collapsed into amplicon sequence variants (ASVs). Taxonomy was determined against the SILVA reference database (release 132) [34]. ASVs present in PCR and extraction blanks, that remained unclassified or were classified as Mitochondria (identified as Family) and Chloroplast (identified as Class) were removed from the dataset. Archaea were also excluded since the primers used are known to discriminate against this group in the marine environment [35]. An ASV frequency table was constructed with the R package *phyloseq* [36] and read normalized counts were obtained via the negative binomial distribution implemented in DESeq2 [37]. Raw sequence reads were deposited into NCBI's Short Read Archive under accession PRJNA756005.

Alpha-diversity (intra-sample) was estimated using Shannon, Fisher and Faith's Phylogenetic Diversity (PD) indices using the R package *phyloseq* [36]. Alpha-diversity differences among localities were tested using Generalized Linear Models (GLMs) and post-hoc comparisons were evaluated with Tukey's HSD

test. To test the effect of each cleaning behavior on microbial alpha-diversity, Linear Mixed Models (LME) were performed using the number of clients visiting each cleaning station, number of clients inspected, number of client genera visiting, number of client genera inspected and average inspection time for each model as fixed factors (predictors). Locality was included as a random factor and models were built using the R package *lmer*. The significance of GLM and LME models was estimated using ANOVA of type III with Satterthwaite approximation for degrees of freedom. Beta-diversity (inter-samples) was estimated using phylogenetic informed weighted and unweighted Unifrac [38] and Bray Curtis (BC) indices. Dissimilarity in microbial structure among reef locations was visualized using principal coordinates analysis (PCoA). The homogeneity of beta diversity dispersion among localities was also assessed by first calculating the average distance to the sample group centroid using the *betadisper* function of the *vegan* R package [39] and then compared using a permutation test. Tukey's HSD test was used for post-hoc comparisons. Differences in microbial structure among reefs were then tested with a PERMANOVA with the strata option for locality and 9999 permutations, as implemented in the *adonis* function of the *vegan* package. Post-hoc comparisons were performed using a pairwise PERMANOVA with the Bonferroni p-value correction for multiple testing. Additionally, the differences in the abundances of phyla or genera represented by $\geq 3\%$ on average of all sequences were also assessed among reef locations and cleaning activity using the same GLM and LME structure described above. A Venn diagram was used to depict the number of ASVs shared among reef locations.

A dissimilarity matrix with the client genera inspected by each goby was constructed and differences among localities were also tested with a PERMANOVA using the BC index. To test the correlation between cleaning activity and the microbial community of each locality, Mantel statistical correlations based on Spearman's rank were performed between the number of clients visiting the cleaning station, number of clients inspected, number of client genera visiting and inspected and the beta-diversity distance matrices using the *vegan* R package. For all tests, differences were considered significant when $P < 0.05$.

Results

Client composition and cleaning activity

A total of 44 fish species belonging to 29 genera and 14 families visited the observed cleaning stations (Supplementary Table S1). The striped parrotfish (*Scarus iseri*) was the most common client fish in Brewers Bay (22% of the total visits in that reef), the yellow goatfish (*Mulloidichthys martinicus*) in Hull Bay (33%), the ocean surgeonfish (*Acanthurus bahianus*) in Donkey Bight (20%) and the longfin damselfish (*Stegastes diencaeus*) in West Lameshur (19%) (Supplementary Table S1). Client fish genera composition was significantly different among reefs (PERMANOVA, $F = 2.11$, $p = 0.001$), and the pairwise differences were significant between Donkey Bight and West Lameshur (both located in St John) ($F = 3.72$, $p = 0.03$) and also between West Lameshur and Hull Bay ($F = 2.78$, $p = 0.03$). Cleaner gobies from Donkey Bight and West Lameshur inspected the highest number of client genera (Mean (M) = 4.9, Standard Deviation (SD) = 2.4 and M = 4.8, SD = 2.2 respectively; M = 4.0, SD = 0.8 in Brewers Bay and M =

2.6, SD = 1.6 in Hull Bay). Moreover, dawn was the observation period with the highest cleaning activity (see Supplementary Table S2).

The skin microbiome of the cleaner goby *Elacatinus evelynae*

Bacteria-associated 16S rRNA amplicons present in the skin of 44 *E. evelynae* cleaner gobies from four reefs in the US Virgin Islands (Brewers Bay, Hull Bay, Donkey Bight and West Lameshur) were sequenced, generating 1,245,579 raw reads, 1,099,501 filtered sequences and 1,222 ASVs. From those, 223 ASVs were present in Brewers Bay, 586 ASVs in Donkey Bight, 341 ASVs in West Lameshur, and 457 ASVs in Hull Bay (Fig. 2). The most abundant bacterial phyla ($\geq 3\%$) across all samples were Proteobacteria (58%), Bacteroidota (16%), Firmicutes (7%), Actinobacteriota (4%) and Cyanobacteria (4%). *Pseudomonas* was the most abundant genus in Brewers Bay (17.7%), *Ekhidna* in Hull Bay (14.8%), and *Psychrobacter* in Donkey Bight and West Lameshur (15.7% and 15.5% respectively). The most abundant genera ($\geq 3\%$) found for each locality are detailed in Table 1. Differences in phyla abundance among localities were not found ($p > 0.05$), while significant differences were found for the genera *Alcanivorax*, *Cloacibacterium*, *Halomonas*, *Pseudomonas* and an unclassified genus from Pseudomonadaceae family ($p < 0.04$) (Supplementary Table S3).

Table 1

Percentage of the most abundant bacterial taxa collapsed by phyla and genera for each reef location.
Values in bold represent an abundance $\geq 3\%$.

% of sequences				
Bacterial taxa	Brewers Bay	Hull Bay	Donkey Bight	West Lameshur
Phyla	2.2	6.7	4.3	3.7
<i>Actinobacteriota</i>				
<i>Bacteroidota</i>	22.0	14.9	6.3	21.8
<i>Bdellovibrionota</i>	10.4	0.1	0.2	0.8
<i>Cyanobacteria</i>	6.8	3.4	3.1	5.1
<i>Firmicutes</i>	3.9	8.2	5.2	9.5
<i>Planctomycetota</i>	3.0	0.1	0.4	0.02
<i>Proteobacteria</i>	48.4	63.4	67.8	48.8
Genera				
<i>Acinetobacter</i>	1.0	1.8	3.1	4.0
<i>Alcanivorax</i>	0.0	0.0	4.8	2.2
<i>Cloacibacterium</i>	3.9	0.2	6.4	0.8
<i>Ekhidna</i>	12.7	14.8	1.9	0.4
<i>Endozoicomonas</i>	0.0	0.1	0.8	5.8
<i>Enterovibrio</i>	0.0	6.3	0.2	3.0
<i>Halomonas</i>	0.0	0.1	9.6	5.5
<i>Marinobacter</i>	0.1	0.0	2.6	1.1
<i>Mycoplasma</i>	1.7	4.8	0.1	0.0
NS5 marine group (Flavobacteriaceae)	0.1	1.9	0.2	2.9
OM27 (Bdellovibrionaceae)	10.3	0.6	0.0	0.1
<i>Pseudomonas</i>	17.7	10.3	1.9	8.9
<i>Psychrobacter</i>	9.1	3.7	15.7	15.5
<i>Stenotrophomonas</i>	4.3	2.6	0.6	0.8
<i>Synechococcus</i>	4.2	2.8	0.7	2.5

	% of sequences			
Unclassified Neisseriaceae	0.0	5.2	0.1	0.0
Unclassified Pseudomonadaceae	0.0	0.0	6.3	3.3
Unclassified Rhodobacteraceae	2.7	0.5	0.5	0.1

Although a total of 43 ASVs were common among reefs (Fig. 2), no single ASV was present in all sampled fish. Nevertheless, two ASVs identified as *Rubrobacter* sp. and *Cloacibacterium* sp. were found in all samples from Donkey Bight (n = 12), therefore constituting the core microbiota in that locality.

Variation of the skin microbiome of cleaner gobies with cleaning activity

Alpha diversity of the bacterial communities associated with the cleaner goby skin was positively (i.e., increasingly) correlated to the number of clients and client genera visiting the cleaning station and inspected for all reefs except for West Lameshur, which showed an inverted pattern, i.e., higher number and diversity of clients corresponded to lower values of alpha diversity (Fig. 3). However, none of the trends were statistically significant ($p > 0.24$, Supplementary Table S3). Moreover, average inspection time did not correlate with alpha-diversity ($p > 0.15$, Supplementary Table S3).

Beta diversity was not explained by the cleaning activity variables (i.e., the number of clients visiting the cleaning station, number of clients inspected, average inspection time, number of client genera visiting and inspected) with all beta diversity indices ($p > 0.08$, Supplementary Table S3). However, there was a significant positive correlation between cleaner gobies' microbial beta-diversity using the Unweighted Unifrac distance and the number of client genera inspected in Brewers Bay and Hull Bay (Mantel test, $p < 0.02$, Supplementary Table S4). In Donkey Bight, there was also a positive correlation between goby microbial beta-diversity using the BC index and number of client genera visiting and inspected (Mantel test, $p < 0.003$, Supplementary Table S4) and the same correlation was found in West Lameshur with the Weighted Unifrac distance (Mantel test, $p < 0.02$, Supplementary Table S4).

Diversity of the skin microbiome of cleaner gobies across reef locations

Skin bacterial alpha-diversity was significantly different among reef localities ($p < 0.02$, Supplementary Table S3), with pairwise comparisons showing that cleaner gobies from Donkey Bight harbored significantly higher alpha diversity compared to those from the other localities ($p < 0.04$; Fig. 4). No differences were observed in the alpha diversities of individuals from the remaining locations.

Bacterial community structure (beta-diversity) was significantly different amongst reef localities with all beta diversity indices ($p < 0.003$), with significant pairwise differences between Donkey Bight and each of the other reef sites ($p < 0.02$; Fig. 5a,b,c and Supplementary Table S5). Beta dispersion was also significantly different among locations considering the Bray Curtis ($F = 5.94$, $p = 0.002$; Fig. 5d) and

weighted Unifrac ($F = 6.97$, $p = 0.001$; Fig. 5e) indices. Pairwise comparisons of beta dispersion for the Bray Curtis index showed differences between Donkey Bight and West Lameshur, as well as between Donkey Bight and Hull Bay (TukeyHSD, $p < 0.003$; Fig. 5d). For the weighted Unifrac distance, differences were found between Donkey Bight and all remaining localities (Tukey HSD, $p < 0.03$; Fig. 5e).

Discussion

Cleaning stations have been shown to attract a wide diversity of fish species and thus, enhance local reef fish biodiversity and abundance (e.g. [40]). Because of the direct physical contact between cleaners and clients, there is the potential for cleaning stations to act as hubs for microbial exchange between fish. In this study, we used a 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing approach to test whether clientele diversity was associated with differences in the skin microbiome of the cleaner goby *E. evelynae* in the US Virgin Islands. Our results showed differences in alpha- and beta-diversity amongst gobies from different sampled reefs with few shared ASVs among them and high inter-individual variation in microbiota diversity and structure. Overall, the results showed increasing bacterial alpha diversity with the number of clients and client genera inspected (except in West Lameshur), as well as a positive correlation between beta-diversity and clientele diversity.

Goby cleaning activity impacts skin microbial diversity

Access by gobies to different reef fish species might be shaped by the level of reef degradation and therefore influence cleaning interactions and consequently, goby microbiome. Our results showed a positive correlation between goby skin bacterial beta-diversity and the diversity of clientele inspected (i.e., number of client genera) in all sampled reefs. Moreover, differences in clientele diversity visiting cleaning stations were also observed in our study. For example, although diversity of client species was high at West Lameshur, the most common clients were *Stegastes* damselfish, which are territorial fish only visiting cleaning stations within their territories [24], but usually less parasitized [29]. The territorial behavior of these fish can also influence which other potential client species gain access to cleaning stations. By contrast, the remaining sites showed higher visitation rates of larger fish species, such as striped parrotfish (*Scarus iseri*) in Brewers Bay, yellow goatfish (*Mulloidichthys martinicus*) in Hull Bay and ocean surgeonfish (*Acanthurus bahianus*) in Donkey Bight, all of which are “preferred” clients, likely due to larger body size and thus higher parasite burden [23, 41]. Larger clients, therefore, engage in longer cleaning interactions [41], which could increase bacterial transfer. However, in our study only client diversity was positively correlated with bacterial structure in the skin of cleaner gobies, indicating a stronger effect of client diversity compared to duration of inspection.

Recent studies have shown microbial changes between fish participants of symbiotic relationships. For example, microbial composition of clownfish mucus changes with contact with its anemone host [42]. Similarly, a “cleaner” ecotype of the Barbadian broadstripe cleaner goby *Elacatinus prochilos* harbored higher skin microbiota diversity than “non-cleaner” ecotypes [15]. Microbial interhost dispersal in zebrafish has also shown to influence diversity and composition of microbial communities affecting host

immune system [14]. However, the mechanisms involved in those changes are not well understood. Despite the high diversity of clients visiting cleaning stations in West Lameshur, not only did cleaners from that location have similar bacterial alpha-diversity levels to the ones from Brewers Bay and Hull Bay, but they also showed a contrasting relation between microbial diversity and cleaning activity when compared to the gobies in the other reefs. A possible explanation for the differences found in West Lameshur might be related to the greater habitat degradation at this sampling locality [30], which could have altered local reef community dynamics. Although reef animal communities harbor some of the most diverse microbial communities of the marine environment [42], it is estimated that the changes in host communities in a given location may impact microbial diversity in the entire reef [43]. Cleaner gobies inspect multiple client fish per day and engage in direct fish-to-fish contact [21, 44]. Although this creates the opportunity for exchange of microbes, given the interspecific nature of the interactions, actual exchange and persistence of microbes cannot be assumed. Our data, while correlative, supports this hypothesis (i.e., microbial exchange increases with cleaning activity). The alternative explanation, that cleaners with more diverse microbiota attract a more diverse array of clients, seems less likely but cannot be ruled out without experimental manipulation.

Cleanerfish have been shown to remove significant numbers of ectoparasites from hosts [45], which could otherwise compromise client welfare by causing skin damage, feeding on blood, and acting as vectors for diseases (reviewed by [46]). Nonetheless, the gain of a seemingly easy meal for cleaners (client-gleaned ectoparasites and mucous) may come with a price: while obviously predatory clients may eat the cleaners [23], less obvious is the fact that clients may also be vectors of parasites, bacterial contamination, and consequently disease to cleaners [47]. Although frequent contact with other reef fish seems to potentiate chances of increased microbial diversity and diversity in cleaners, which may protect against infections [48], further experiments on cleaner fish microbial exchange should be performed to understand the potential risks of cleaning activity and their impacts on reef communities.

Goby skin microbiota varies across reef locations

Spatial differences in skin microbiota have been reported for vertebrates, such as bats [49], amphibians [50], and marine species [51, 52], including reef fishes [5, 6]. Although our main goal was to examine the relationship between client diversity and microbial diversity, we also observed differences in goby skin microbial composition among reef sites. Interestingly, those differences include contrasting results from fish captured from different reef habitats within less than 500 m of each other. Even though they are located within the same bay, Donkey Bight and West Lameshur differ in coral cover [30]. Additionally, a mangrove swamp empties out near West Lameshur site, and therefore water quality parameters and reef communities are likely to vary among our sites [53], leading to differences in fish microbial consortia. In fact, several studies have shown that fish skin microbiota respond to changes in the physicochemical composition of the water [11, 13].

Despite host taxonomy being considered one of the main factors influencing fish microbiome [5], a high skin microbial variability among individuals was found alongside the absence of a core microbiome in the study area for *E. evelynae*. Indeed, only a small proportion of bacterial taxa (3.5%) was common to all

localities (Fig. 2), suggesting that local environmental differences might have a significant impact on the structure of goby skin bacteria. Other studies examining microbial composition of marine species between different localities found a core microbiome even between distant locations (e.g., whale blow between Pacific and Atlantic humpback whales, [54]). The present data shows that cleaner gobies share a considerably low proportion of bacteria even in a small geographic context, suggesting a substantial effect of environment, which may also be responsible for differences in clientele diversity and abundance at each sampled site.

Conclusions

This study suggests that fish-to-fish direct contact and specifically, access to a diverse clientele, influences the bacterial diversity and structure of cleaner gobies' skin. However, our study did not control for environmental factors and therefore, the extent to which microbial diversity of cleaner gobies can be influenced by the surrounding environment and social behavior needs to be further explored in controlled experimental conditions. Nonetheless, this study sets the stage for future research using cleaner gobies as models to understand microbial dynamics in coral reefs. Besides the cleaner gobies studied herein, the microbiome of other obligate cleaners such as wrasses in Indo-Pacific reefs and the less studied but highly diverse group of cleaner shrimps [22], may also be influenced by cleaning behavior, and specifically by client diversity. Given current concerns over reef degradation worldwide and the importance of microbial commensals towards reef resilience, holistic studies examining microbial transfer to and from cleanerfish and other reef fish and the potential cascading effects deriving from such interactions are warranted. Additionally, microbial communities residing in areas surrounding cleaning stations, where fish largely congregate, should also be investigated due to their potential effects to the entire reef holobiont.

Declarations

Funding

Funding was provided by the National Science Foundation awards OCE-2023420 to PCS and OCE-2022955 to AA, and by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through the COMPETE program and by National Funds through Foundation for Science and Technology (project PTDC/BIA-MIC/27995/2017 POCI-01-0145- FEDER-027995) to RX. RX was also supported by Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) under the Programa Operacional Potencial Humano-Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional funds from the European Social Fund and Portuguese Ministério da Educação e Ciência (IF/00359/2015, and 2020.00854.CEECIND). Field data were collected with support from NSF OCE-1536794 to PCS.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Availability of data and material

Raw sequence reads are available in NCBI's Short Read Archive under accession PRJNA756005.

Code availability

Not applicable.

Ethics approval

Fish were collected under permit number DFW18072U from the US Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife and permit number VIIS-2018-SCI-0008 for sites within the Virgin Islands National Park, and under IACUC ethics protocol number 778227-1, PC Sikkel, PI.

Consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Acknowledgements: We thank the Center for Marine and Environmental Studies (CMES) and the Virgin Islands Environmental Resource Station (VIERS) of the University of the Virgin Islands for logistical support. Thanks also to Matthew Nicholson, Gina Hendrick, and Andres Pagan for assisting with field logistics. This work is contribution number 238 from the University of the Virgin Islands Center for Marine and Environmental Studies.

References

1. Langmead O, Sheppard C (2004) Coral reef community dynamics and disturbance: a simulation model. *Ecological Modelling* 175: 271-290. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2003.10.019
2. Vanwonderghem I, Webster NS (2020) Coral Reef Microorganisms in a Changing Climate. *iScience* 23: 100972. doi: 10.1016/j.isci.2020.100972
3. Apprill A, Hugueny K, Mincer T (2013) Major similarities in the bacterial communities associated with lesioned and healthy *Fungiidae* corals. *Environ Microbiol* 15: 2063-2072. doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.12107
4. Barott KL, Rodriguez-Mueller B, Youle M, Marhaver KL, Vermeij MJ, Smith JE, Rohwer FL (2012) Microbial to reef scale interactions between the reef-building coral *Montastraea annularis* and benthic algae. *Proc Biol Sci* 279: 1655-1664. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2011.2155
5. Chiarello M, Auguet JC, Bettarel Y, Bouvier C, Claverie T, Graham NAJ, Rieuvilleneuve F, Sucre E, Bouvier T, Villeger S (2018) Skin microbiome of coral reef fish is highly variable and driven by host phylogeny and diet. *Microbiome* 6: 147. doi: 10.1186/s40168-018-0530-4

6. Xavier R, Pereira A, Pagan A, Hendrick GC, Nicholson MD, Rosado D, Soares MC, Pérez-Losada M, Sikkell PC (2020) The effects of environment and ontogeny on the skin microbiome of two *Stegastes damselfishes* (Pomacentridae) from the eastern Caribbean Sea. *Marine Biology* 167. doi: 10.1007/s00227-020-03717-7
7. Larsen A, Tao Z, Bullard SA, Arias CR (2013) Diversity of the skin microbiota of fishes: evidence for host species specificity. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 85: 483-494. doi: 10.1111/1574-6941.12136
8. Chiarello M, Villegier S, Bouvier C, Auguet JC, Bouvier T (2017) Captive bottlenose dolphins and killer whales harbor a species-specific skin microbiota that varies among individuals. *Sci Rep* 7: 15269. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-15220-z
9. Chiarello M, Villegier S, Bouvier C, Bettarel Y, Bouvier T (2015) High diversity of skin-associated bacterial communities of marine fishes is promoted by their high variability among body parts, individuals and species. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 91. doi: 10.1093/femsec/fiv061
10. Huang Q, Sham RC, Deng Y, Mao Y, Wang C, Zhang T, Leung KMY (2020) Diversity of gut microbiomes in marine fishes is shaped by host-related factors. *Mol Ecol* 29: 5019-5034. doi: 10.1111/mec.15699
11. Sylvain FE, Holland A, Bouslama S, Audet-Gilbert E, Lavoie C, Val AL, Derome N (2020) Fish Skin and Gut Microbiomes Show Contrasting Signatures of Host Species and Habitat. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 86. doi: 10.1128/AEM.00789-20
12. Krotman Y, Yergaliyev TM, Alexander Shani R, Avrahami Y, Szitenberg A (2020) Dissecting the factors shaping fish skin microbiomes in a heterogeneous inland water system. *Microbiome* 8: 9. doi: 10.1186/s40168-020-0784-5
13. Rosado D, Perez-Losada M, Pereira A, Severino R, Xavier R (2021) Effects of aging on the skin and gill microbiota of farmed seabass and seabream. *Anim Microbiome* 3: 10. doi: 10.1186/s42523-020-00072-2
14. Burns AR, Miller E, Agarwal M, Rolig AS, Milligan-Myhre K, Seredick S, Guillemin K, Bohannon BJM (2017) Interhost dispersal alters microbiome assembly and can overwhelm host innate immunity in an experimental zebrafish model. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 114: 11181-11186. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1702511114
15. Xavier R, Mazzei R, Perez-Losada M, Rosado D, Santos JL, Verissimo A, Soares MC (2019) A Risky Business? Habitat and Social Behavior Impact Skin and Gut Microbiomes in Caribbean Cleaning Gobies. *Front Microbiol* 10: 716. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2019.00716
16. Soares MC, Cable J, Lima-Maximino MG, Maximino C, Xavier R (2019) Using fish models to investigate the links between microbiome and social behaviour: The next step for translational microbiome research? *Fish and Fisheries*. doi: 10.1111/faf.12366
17. Archie EA, Tung J (2015) Social behavior and the microbiome. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 6: 28-34. doi: 10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.07.008
18. Moeller AH, Foerster S, Wilson ML, Pusey AE, Hahn BH, Ochman H (2016) Social behavior shapes the chimpanzee pan-microbiome. *Sci Adv* 2: e1500997. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.1500997

19. Koch H, Schmid-Hempel P (2011) Socially transmitted gut microbiota protect bumble bees against an intestinal parasite. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108: 19288-19292. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1110474108
20. Schmid-Hempel P (2017) Parasites and Their Social Hosts. *Trends Parasitol* 33: 453-462. doi: 10.1016/j.pt.2017.01.003
21. Côté IM, Soares MC (2011) Gobies as cleaners. *The Biology of Gobies*. Science Publishers, St. Helier, pp. 525
22. Vaughan DB, Grutter AS, Costello MJ, Hutson KS (2017) Cleaner fishes and shrimp diversity and a re-evaluation of cleaning symbioses. *Fish and Fisheries* 18: 698-716. doi: 10.1111/faf.12198
23. Soares MC, Cardoso SC, Côté IM (2007) Client preferences by Caribbean cleaning gobies: food, safety or something else? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 61: 1015-1022. doi: 10.1007/s00265-006-0334-6
24. Cheney KL, Côté IM (2001) Are Caribbean cleaning symbioses mutualistic? Costs and benefits of visiting cleaning stations to longfin damselfish. *Animal Behaviour* 62: 927-933. doi: 10.1006/anbe.2001.1832
25. Sikkell PC, Herzlieb SE, Kramer DL (2005) Compensatory cleaner-seeking behavior following spawning in female yellowtail damselfish. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 296: 1-11. doi: 10.3354/meps296001
26. Sikkell PC, Fuller CA, Hunte W (2000) Habitat/sex differences in time at cleaning stations and ectoparasite loads in a Caribbean reef fish. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 193: 191-199. doi: 10.3354/meps193191
27. Arnal C, Côté IM, Sasal P, Morand S (2000) Cleaner-client interactions on a Caribbean reef: influence of correlates of parasitism. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 47: 353-358. doi: 10.1007/s002650050676
28. Whittey KE, Dunkley K, Young GC, Cable J, Perkins SE (2021) Microhabitats of sharknose goby (*Elacatinus evelynae*) cleaning stations and their links with cleaning behaviour. *Coral Reefs*. doi: 10.1007/s00338-021-02105-x
29. Cheney KL, Côté IM (2005) Mutualism or parasitism? The variable outcome of cleaning symbioses. *Biol Lett* 1: 162-165. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2004.0288
30. Artim JM, Nicholson MD, Hendrick GC, Brandt M, Smith TB, Sikkell PC (2020) Abundance of a cryptic generalist parasite reflects degradation of an ecosystem. *Ecosphere* 11: e03268. doi: 10.1002/ecs2.3268
31. Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters WA, Berg-Lyons D, Huntley J, Fierer N, Owens SM, Betley J, Fraser L, Bauer M, Gormley N, Gilbert JA, Smith G, Knight R (2012) Ultra-high-throughput microbial community analysis on the Illumina HiSeq and MiSeq platforms. *ISME J* 6: 1621-1624. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2012.8
32. Kozich JJ, Westcott SL, Baxter NT, Highlander SK, Schloss PD (2013) Development of a dual-index sequencing strategy and curation pipeline for analyzing amplicon sequence data on the MiSeq Illumina sequencing platform. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 79: 5112-5120. doi: 10.1128/AEM.01043-13

33. Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJ, Holmes SP (2016) DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nat Methods* 13: 581-583. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.3869
34. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, Peplies J, Glockner FO (2013) The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Res* 41: D590-596. doi: 10.1093/nar/gks1219
35. Parada AE, Needham DM, Fuhrman JA (2016) Every base matters: assessing small subunit rRNA primers for marine microbiomes with mock communities, time series and global field samples. *Environ Microbiol* 18: 1403-1414. doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.13023
36. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S (2013) phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. *PLoS One* 8: e61217. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0061217
37. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S (2014) Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* 15: 550. doi: 10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8
38. Lozupone C, Lladser ME, Knights D, Stombaugh J, Knight R (2011) UniFrac: an effective distance metric for microbial community comparison. *ISME J* 5: 169-172. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2010.133
39. Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, Wagner H (2020) vegan: Community Ecology Package.
40. Grutter AS, Bshary R (2003) Cleaner wrasse prefer client mucus: support for partner control mechanisms in cleaning interactions. *Proc Biol Sci* 270 Suppl 2: S242-244. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2003.0077
41. Dunkley K, Ellison AR, Mohammed RS, van Oosterhout C, Whittey KE, Perkins SE, Cable J (2019) Long-term cleaning patterns of the sharknose goby (*Elacatinus evelynae*). *Coral Reefs* 38: 321-330. doi: 10.1007/s00338-019-01778-9
42. Pratte ZA, Patin NV, McWhirt ME, Caughman AM, Parris DJ, Stewart FJ (2018) Association with a sea anemone alters the skin microbiome of clownfish. *Coral Reefs* 37: 1119-1125. doi: 10.1007/s00338-018-01750-z
43. Chiarello M, Auguet JC, Graham NAJ, Claverie T, Sucre E, Bouvier C, Rieuvilleneuve F, Restrepo-Ortiz CX, Bettarel Y, Villegier S, Bouvier T (2020) Exceptional but vulnerable microbial diversity in coral reef animal surface microbiomes. *Proc Biol Sci* 287: 20200642. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2020.0642
44. Quimbayo JP, Zapata FA (2018) Cleaning interactions by gobies on a tropical eastern Pacific coral reef. *J Fish Biol* 92: 1110-1125. doi: 10.1111/jfb.13573
45. Grutter AS (1996) Parasite removal rates by the cleaner wrasse *Labroides dimidiatus*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 130: 61-70. doi: 10.3354/meps130061
46. Sikkell PC, Welicky RL (2019) The Ecological Significance of Parasitic Crustaceans. *Parasitic Crustacea*, pp. 421-477
47. Narvaez P, Vaughan DB, Grutter AS, Hutson KS (2021) New perspectives on the role of cleaning symbiosis in the possible transmission of fish diseases. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 31: 233-251. doi: 10.1007/s11160-021-09642-2

48. Esteban MÁ (2012) An Overview of the Immunological Defenses in Fish Skin. *ISRN Immunology* 2012: 1-29. doi: 10.5402/2012/853470
49. Avena CV, Parfrey LW, Leff JW, Archer HM, Frick WF, Langwig KE, Kilpatrick AM, Powers KE, Foster JT, McKenzie VJ (2016) Deconstructing the Bat Skin Microbiome: Influences of the Host and the Environment. *Front Microbiol* 7: 1753. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01753
50. Ellison S, Rovito S, Parra-Olea G, Vasquez-Almazan C, Flechas SV, Bi K, Vredenburg VT (2019) The Influence of Habitat and Phylogeny on the Skin Microbiome of Amphibians in Guatemala and Mexico. *Microb Ecol* 78: 257-267. doi: 10.1007/s00248-018-1288-8
51. Apprill A, Robbins J, Eren AM, Pack AA, Reveillaud J, Mattila D, Moore M, Niemeyer M, Moore KM, Mincer TJ (2014) Humpback whale populations share a core skin bacterial community: towards a health index for marine mammals? *PLoS One* 9: e90785. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0090785
52. Chiarello M, Paz-Vinas I, Veyssiere C, Santoul F, Loot G, Ferriol J, Bouletreau S (2019) Environmental conditions and neutral processes shape the skin microbiome of European catfish (*Silurus glanis*) populations of Southwestern France. *Environ Microbiol Rep* 11: 605-614. doi: 10.1111/1758-2229.12774
53. Becker CC, Weber L, Suca JJ, Llopiz JK, Mooney TA, Apprill A (2020) Microbial and nutrient dynamics in mangrove, reef, and seagrass waters over tidal and diurnal time scales. *Aquatic Microbial Ecology* 85: 101-119. doi: 10.3354/ame01944
54. Apprill A, Miller CA, Moore MJ, Durban JW, Fearnbach H, Barrett-Lennard LG (2017) Extensive Core Microbiome in Drone-Captured Whale Blow Supports a Framework for Health Monitoring. *mSystems* 2. doi: 10.1128/mSystems.00119-17

Figures

Figure 1

Sampling sites located in the US Virgin Islands. Map created on ArcGIS software by Esri

Figure 2

Venn diagram with the number of shared and unique ASVs amongst localities

Figure 3

Boxplots of the alpha-diversity measures for each locality with Tukey's HSD significance for pairwise differences. * indicates significant differences

Figure 4

Linear regression plots depicting alpha diversity measures versus each of the observed cleaning variables

Figure 5

a), b), c) PCoA plots with beta-diversity distances grouped by locality with 95% confidence interval ellipse, d), e), f) beta dispersion represented by distance to centroid for each beta diversity measure

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Supplementaryinformation.docx](#)