

**Replacement of marine fish oil with *de novo* omega-3 oils from transgenic *Camelina sativa* in feeds for gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L.)**

Betancor, M.B.<sup>1\*</sup>, Sprague, M.<sup>1</sup>, Montero, D.<sup>2</sup>, Usher, S.<sup>3</sup>, Sayanova, O.<sup>3</sup>, Campbell, P.J.<sup>4</sup>, Napier, J.A.<sup>3</sup>, Caballero, M.J.<sup>2</sup>, Izquierdo, M.<sup>2</sup>, Tocher, D.R.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Aquaculture, School of Natural Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>Grupo de Investigación en Acuicultura (GIA), Instituto Universitario Ecoaqua, Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Ctra. Taliarte s/n, 35214 Telde, Las Palmas, Canary Islands, Spain

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biological Chemistry and Crop Protection, Rothamsted Research, Harpenden AL5 2JQ, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>Biomar Ltd., North Shore Road, Grangemouth FK3 8UL, United Kingdom

\* Corresponding author;

Dr. Mónica B. Betancor, Tel: +44-1786-467993, [m.b.betancor@stir.ac.uk](mailto:m.b.betancor@stir.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** Sea bream, genetically modified, Camelina, sustainable feeds

## Abstract

Omega-3 (n-3) long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids (LC-PUFA) are essential components of the diet of all vertebrates and. The major dietary source of n-3 LC-PUFA for humans has been fish and seafood but, paradoxically, farmed fish are also reliant on marine fisheries for fish meal and fish oil (FO), traditionally major ingredients of aquafeeds. Currently, the only sustainable alternatives to FO are vegetable oils, which are rich in C<sub>18</sub> PUFA, but devoid of the eicosapentaenoic (EPA) and docosahexaenoic acids (DHA) abundant in FO. Two new n-3 LC-PUFA sources obtained from genetically modified (GM) *Camelina sativa* containing either EPA alone (ECO) or EPA and DHA (DCO) were compared to FO and wild-type camelina oil (WCO) in juvenile sea bream. Neither ECO nor DCO had any detrimental effects on fish performance, although final weight of ECO-fed fish (117 g) was slightly lower than that of FO- and DCO-fed fish (130 and 127 g, respectively). Inclusion of the GM-derived oils enhanced the n-3 LC-PUFA content in fish tissues compared to WCO, although limited biosynthesis was observed indicating accumulation of dietary fatty acids. The expression of genes involved in several lipid metabolic processes, as well as fish health and immune response, in both liver and anterior intestine were altered in fish fed the GM-derived oils. This showed a similar pattern to that observed in WCO-fed fish reflecting the hybrid fatty acid profile of the new oils. Overall the data indicated that the GM-derived oils could be suitable alternatives to dietary FO in sea bream.

44    **Abbreviations**

45	ADC: Apparent digestibility coefficient
46	ARA: Arachidonic acid
47	BACTIN: $\beta$ actin
48	CASP: Caspase
49	CPT: Carnitine palmitoyltransferase 1
50	CYTB: Cytochrome b
51	DCO: EPA+DHA Camelina oil
52	DHA: Docosahexaenoic acid
53	DPA: Docosapentaenoic acid
54	ECO: EPA-Camelina oil
55	ELF1 $\alpha$ : elongation factor 1 $\alpha$
56	ELOVL: Fatty acid elongase
57	EPA: Eicosapentaenoic acid
58	FABP2: Fatty acid binding protein 2
59	FADS2: Fatty acyl desaturase 2
60	FAME: Fatty acid methyl esters
61	FCR: Feed conversion ratio
62	FM: Fish meal
63	FO: Fish oil
64	GC: Gas-liquid chromatography
65	GM: Genetically modified
66	HL: Hepatic lipase
67	HSI: Hepatosomatic index
68	IL: Interleukin
69	K: Condition factor
70	LC-PUFA: Long chain polyunsaturated fatty acid
71	LPCAT: Lysophosphatidylcholine acyltransferase
72	LPL: Lipoprotein lipase
73	LTB <sub>4</sub> : Leukotriene B <sub>4</sub>

74 MUFA: Monounsaturated fatty acid  
75 n-3: Omega 3  
76 n-6: Omega 6  
77 n.d.: Not determined  
78 NMDS: Non-metric multidimensional scaling plot  
79 NPTII: Kanamycin resistance gene  
80 NTC: Non-template control  
81 PCA: Principal component analysis  
82 PCNA: Proliferating cell nuclear antigen  
83 PGE2: Prostaglandin E<sub>2</sub>  
84 PPAR: Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor  $\alpha$   
85 PUFA: Polyunsaturated fatty acid  
86 SAFA: Saturated fatty acid  
87 SGR: Specific growth rate  
88 SREBP: Sterol regulatory element binding protein 1  
89 TAG: Triacylglycerol  
90 VLC-FA: Very long chain fatty acids  
91 VO: Vegetable oil  
92 VSI: Viscerosomatic index  
93 WCO: Wild-type Camelina oil  
94  
95

## Introduction

Fish is considered as the main source of the beneficial omega-3 (n-3) long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids (LC-PUFA) eicosapentaenoic and docosahexaenoic acids, EPA (20:5n-3) and DHA (22:6n-3), respectively. These LC-PUFA play important roles in neural development, immune and inflammatory responses as well as having beneficial effects in certain pathologies such as those affecting the cardiovascular and neurological systems or some types of cancers [1-5]. According to estimations of the International Society for the Study of Fatty acids and Lipids (ISSFAL), a daily intake of 500 mg of EPA and DHA is recommended for optimum cardiovascular health [6]. In a world where the global population is expected to grow to reach 9.6 billion people by 2050 [7], more than 1.7 million metric tonnes of EPA + DHA would be necessary to cover annual human requirements. This quantity is not met by the actual total global supply of n-3 LC-PUFA and thus there is a large gap between supply and demand [8-9].

Farmed fish and seafood accounted for 44.1 percent of total production (including for non-food uses) from capture fisheries and aquaculture in 2014, up from 42.1 percent in 2012 and 31.1 percent in 2004 [7]. Although fish farming contributes to the global n-3 LC-PUFA production in order to meet human dietary requirements, the marine ingredients, fish meal and oil (FM and FO, respectively) are still, almost exclusively, the only raw materials in aquafeeds that, in turn, can supply n-3 LC-PUFA to farmed fish. The use of high levels of FM and FO to maintain n-3 LC-PUFA levels in farmed fish is not a sustainable practice as they are finite (on an annual basis) and limited resources [9]. Sustainable alternatives to FO used at present are vegetable oils (VO), which are rich in C<sub>18</sub> but lack n-3 LC-PUFA, which in turn reduces the proportions of EPA and DHA in farmed fish, and does not significantly increase global production of n-3 LC-PUFA [9]. Obtaining alternative sources of n-3 LC-PUFA from other marine organisms such as microalgae or zooplankton (krill or copepods) poses significant technological and economic challenges and there are no currently feasible alternatives for mass supply [9]. Therefore, it is clear that completely new, *de novo* sources of EPA and DHA are required. In this respect, metabolic engineering of oilseed crops such as *Camelina sativa* or false flaxseed provides a currently viable option to deliver n-3 LC-PUFA in the place of fish oil [10-12]. By the insertion of cassettes containing five or seven fatty acyl desaturase and elongase genes from several algae species, genetically modified (GM) *Camelina* is capable of producing EPA or both EPA and DHA in their seeds [10]. Recent studies have successfully demonstrated the feasibility of using both the high-EPA and

EPA+DHA oils as substitutes for FO in feeds for post-smolt Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) without compromising fish growth or health [13-15].

Total replacement of FO in salmonids has been shown to be feasible without compromising fish performance, although a reduction in tissue n-3 LC-PUFA was observed due to reduced dietary intake and limited biosynthesis [16-18]. In contrast, total substitution of FO by VO in gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) feeds significantly reduced fish performance [19] and greatly altered fatty acid profile of bream tissues [20] given their incomplete LC-PUFA biosynthesis pathway [21-22]. In this context, the aim of the present study was to evaluate the new GM Camelina-derived oils that contain features of both marine fish (n-3 LC-PUFA) and terrestrial plant (high levels of C<sub>18</sub> fatty acids) oils as substitutes for FO in feeds for a marine teleost species that have a very limited LC-PUFA biosynthesis capacity from C<sub>18</sub> PUFA [22]. The specific objectives were to evaluate the efficacy of the high-EPA and EPA+DHA oils as replacements for dietary FO in feeds for gilthead sea bream juveniles in terms of growth, feed efficiency, health and welfare, and nutritional quality of the fish focussing particularly on tissue levels of EPA and DHA. Additionally, assessment of the expression of genes of lipid metabolism as well as molecular markers of health and immune function was also performed.

## **Materials and methods**

### *Diets and feeding trial*

Four isonitrogenous and isoenergetic diets were formulated to contain 50 g/kg crude protein and 11 g/kg crude lipid, and manufactured at BioMar Tech-Centre (Brande, Denmark). The four feeds were produced by vacuum coating identical dry basal extruded pellets with either fish oil (FO), wild-type Camelina oil (WCO), EPA-Camelina oil (ECO) or EPA+DHA-Camelina oil (DCO) and were named according to the oils used (Table 1). ECO and DCO oils were produced as previously described [10, 13, 15]. In line with commercial practice, non-defatted fishmeal was employed as the major protein source to ensure EFA requirements were met [23], and yttrium oxide was added (0.5 g/kg) as an inert marker for calculation of lipid and fatty acid digestibility.

A total of 420 juvenile gilthead sea bream with an average body weight of  $55.5 \pm 0.4$  g (mean  $\pm$  S.D.) were distributed into 12 seawater tanks (35 per tank) and fed one of the four experimental feeds in triplicate for 11 weeks. The experimental system comprised 500 L

tanks supplied by flow-through seawater (9 L/min) at ambient temperature that averaged  $20.3 \pm 0.6$  °C. Experimental feeds were delivered until apparent satiation by hand-feeding three times a day with uneaten feed collected 30 min later in order to determine accurate feed efficiency. Collected feed was placed in an oven (110 °C) until constant weight was achieved in order to calculate feed intake based on initial moisture content. All procedures were conducted in accordance with the regulations set forward by the Spanish RD 53/2013 (BOE 8th February 2013) and the Directive 2010/63/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010 on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes. The experiment was subjected to ethical review by the Animal Welfare and Bioethical Committee at the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Ref 007/202 CEBA ULPGC).

#### *Sample collection and digestibility*

After 11 weeks of feeding, fish were not fed for 48 h prior to being sampled. All fish were anaesthetised with clove oil and weighed and lengthed. Ten fish for biometric measurements (hepato-somatic and viscero-somatic indices) and tissue analyses were killed by overdose with clove oil. Samples of anterior intestine, liver, gills, flesh and brain from 3 fish per tank were immediately frozen and stored at  $-70$  °C prior to total lipid extraction and fatty acid analyses. Further samples of liver and anterior intestine were collected from six fish per treatment (two per tank) and stabilised in RNeasy<sup>®</sup> (Sigma, Poole, UK) prior to RNA extraction. All remaining fish were fed for a further week prior to faeces being collected according to the method described by [24]. Briefly, fish were killed by overdose with clove oil 7 h after being fed and faecal samples collected after dissecting the rectum of the fish. Faecal samples were pooled by tank and stored  $-20$ °C prior to lipid and fatty acid analysis. The apparent digestibility coefficient (ADC) of lipid and selected fatty acids was calculated as:  $100 - [100 \times (Y_2O_3 \text{ concentration in feed} / Y_2O_3 \text{ concentration in faeces}) \times (\text{lipid or fatty acid concentration in faeces} / \text{lipid or fatty acid concentration in feed})]$ . The concentration of individual fatty acids in diets and faeces were calculated based on the relative proportion of each fatty acid compared with a known amount of the internal standard (17:0) added and the total lipid content determined in the samples. Yttrium was estimated after acid digestion of the samples via Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (Thermo Scientific, XSeries2 ICP-MS, USA) using argon and hydrogen as carrier gas.

#### *Proximate composition*

Diets and whole fish were ground before determination of proximate composition according to standard procedures [25]. Fish were pooled per tank ( $n = 3$ ) and freeze-dried until further analysis whereas three technical replicates of feeds (single batch production) were analysed. Moisture contents were obtained after drying in an oven at 110 °C for 24 h and ash content determined after incineration at 600°C for 16 h. Crude protein was measured by determining nitrogen content ( $N \times 6.25$ ) using automated Kjeldahl analysis (Tecator Kjeltex Auto 1030 analyser, Foss, Warrington, UK) and crude lipid content determined gravimetrically after Soxhlet lipid extraction (Tecator Soxtec system 2050 Auto Extraction apparatus).

#### *Faeces and tissue lipid content and fatty acid composition.*

Samples of faeces, muscle (flesh), liver, gills, anterior intestine and brain from three fish per tank were prepared as pooled homogenates ( $n = 3$  per treatment) and total lipid extracted by homogenising in chloroform/methanol (2:1, v/v) using an Ultra-Turrax tissue disrupter (Fisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK), with content determined gravimetrically [26]. Fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) were prepared from total lipid by acid-catalysed transesterification at 50 °C for 16 h [27], and FAME extracted and purified as described previously [28]. FAME were separated and quantified by gas-liquid chromatography using a Fisons GC-8160 (Thermo Scientific, Milan, Italy) equipped with a 30 m  $\times$  0.32 mm i.d.  $\times$  0.25  $\mu$ m ZB-wax column (Phenomenex, Cheshire, UK), on-column injector and a flame ionisation detector. Data were collected and processed using Chromcard for Windows (version 2.01; Thermoquest Italia S.p.A., Milan, Italy). Individual FAME were identified by comparison to known standards and published data [28] and results expressed as mole percentage.

#### *Histological analysis*

Samples of liver and intestine from 2 fish per tank ( $n = 6$  per treatment) were fixed in 4 % buffered formalin dehydrated through graded alcohol, then xylene, and finally embedded in paraffin wax. The paraffin blocks were sectioned at 3  $\mu$ m and stained with haematoxylin and eosin [29] before blind examination under a light microscope. Stained sections of liver were assessed for cytoplasmic lipid vacuolization and peripancreatic fat infiltration using a four graded examination scheme: 0, not observed; 1, few; 2, medium; 3, severe. Posterior intestine sections were examined for integrity of the intestinal mucosa and the presence of any inflammatory response.



## RNA extraction.

Liver and anterior intestine from six individual fish per dietary treatment were homogenised in 1 ml of TriReagent® (Sigma-Aldrich, Dorset, UK) RNA extraction buffer using a bead tissue disruptor (Bio Spec, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, USA). Total RNA was isolated following the manufacturer's instructions and quantity and quality determined by spectrophotometry using a Nanodrop ND-1000 (Labtech Int., East Sussex, UK) and electrophoresis using 250 ng of total RNA in a 1 % agarose gel. cDNA was synthesised using 2 µg of total RNA and random primers in 20 µl reactions and the High capacity reverse transcription kit without RNase inhibitor according to the manufacturer's protocol (Applied Biosystems, Warrington, UK). The resulting cDNA was diluted 20-fold with milliQ water. Expression of genes of interest was determined by quantitative PCR (qPCR) from fish fed all diets (Table 2). Results were normalised using reference genes, *elongation factor 1α (elf1α)* and beta-actin (*bactin*), as their expression did not vary among treatments. The efficiency of the primers for each gene was previously evaluated by serial dilutions to ensure that it was close to 100 %. qPCR was performed using a Biometra TOptical Thermocycler (Analytik Jena, Goettingen, Germany) in 96-well plates in duplicate 20 µl reaction volumes containing 10 µl of Luminaris Color HiGreen qPCR Master Mix (Thermo Scientific, Hemel Hempstead, UK), 1 µl of the primer corresponding to the analysed gene (10 pmol), 3 µl of molecular biology grade water and 5 µl of cDNA, with the exception of the reference genes, which were determined using 2 µl of cDNA. In addition amplifications were carried out with a systematic negative control (NTC-non template control) containing no cDNA. Standard amplification parameters contained a UDG pre-treatment at 50 °C for 2 min, an initial denaturation step at 95 °C for 10 min, followed by 35 cycles: 15 s at 95 °C, 30 s at 60 °C and 30 s at 72 °C.

## Tracking of the *nptII* gene in gilthead sea bream liver, intestine and muscle

Genomic DNA was extracted from fish flesh, pyloric caeca and liver using REALPURE extraction kit (Valencia, Spain) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, tissue samples were incubated in 300µl of lysis solution overnight at 55 °C with 3 µl of Proteinase K. Following the incubation, samples were cooled down and RNase treatment performed (37 °C for 60 min). After protein precipitation, DNA was precipitated by adding 600 µl of isopropanol and hydrated with 5mM Tris. Total DNA was quantified by spectrophotometry and quality determined by electrophoresis as described above. Two primers pairs targeting an endogenous sea bream gene (cytochrome b; *cytb*) and a transgene marker for ECO – plants

(Kanamycin resistance gene, *nptII*) were used (Table 2). Fifty ng of extracted DNA was used in PCR amplifications that were performed in a final volume of 10 µl, containing 5 µl of MyTaq™ HS Mix (Bioline, London, UK). Each set of PCR included a positive control (DNA from genetically modified-Camelina) and a non-template control (NTC).

### *Statistical analysis*

All data are means  $\pm$  S.E. (n = 3) unless otherwise specified. Percentage data were subjected to arcsin square-root transformation prior to statistical analyses. Data were tested for normality and homogeneity of variances with Levene's test prior to one-way analysis of variance followed by a Tukey-Kramer HSD multiple comparisons of means. A non-metric multidimensional scaling plot (NMDS) was performed in order to separate the fatty acid profile of the five evaluated tissues. Stress values <0.05 indicated an excellent representation of the clusters and <0.1 and <0.2 indicated good and potentially useful plots respectively. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (IBM SPSS Statistics 19; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA), excepting the NMDS analysis (PAST) [30].

## **Results**

### *Fish performance*

Sea bream fed all the experimental diets more than doubled in weight after 11 weeks feeding, and no mortalities were recorded (Table 3). Fish fed ECO displayed the lowest final weight and total length among the dietary treatments, although not different to fish fed WCO, with highest growth achieved in fish fed the FO and DCO feeds (Table 3). Final weights reflected feed intake, which was highest in fish fed FO and DCO, lowest in fish fed ECO and intermediate in fish fed WCO. There were no significant differences in weight gain or specific growth rate (SGR) other than it being slightly lower in fish fed ECO compared to fish fed FO (Table 3). There were no differences in the hepatosomatic or viscerosomatic index (HSI and VSI, respectively), although values tended to be lowest in fish fed DCO and ECO (p = 0.576 and 0.869 respectively). No differences were observed in other fish performance parameters including feed conversion ratio (FCR) or k condition factor (Table 3).

### *Lipid and fatty acid digestibility*

The apparent digestibility coefficients (ADC) were calculated for lipids and fatty acids using yttrium oxide as an inert marker. There were no significant differences in crude lipid ADC among the dietary treatments (Table 4). Fig. 1 represents the analysed fatty acid composition of feeds and faeces in order to compare which fatty acid groups were preferentially digested and absorbed (i.e. those found in lower amounts in faeces). There was a trend for higher proportions of saturated fatty acids (SAFA) in faeces relative to the feeds, with the ADC for SAFA varying between around 81 and 87 %, generally slightly lower than the ADCs for the other fatty acids (Table 4). In contrast, proportions of PUFA in the faeces were generally lower compared to proportions in feeds with ADCs ranging from 93 to almost 97 %, whereas proportions of monounsaturated fatty acid (MUFA) were similar in diet and faeces with ADC ranging from around 83 to 92 % (Fig. 1). Some variations were found between feeds, with ADC of SAFA being highest in fish fed FO and lowest in fish fed ECO, with ADC of MUFA being higher in fish fed ECO and DCO compared to fish fed FO (Table 4). Similarly, ADC of 18:2n-6 and n-6 PUFA were higher in fish fed DCO compared to fish fed FO. Digestibility was highest with n-3 PUFA generally although ADC for EPA was lowest in WCO, although not different to that of ECO. Regarding DHA, FO and DCO showed the highest ADC, being over 96 % (Table 4).

#### *Whole fish composition*

No differences were found in any of the analysed components among fish fed the four dietary treatments (Table 3). However, there were trends for higher lipid content in fish fed the vegetable-based feeds ( $p = 0.186$ ), and increased protein in fish fed the ECO and DCO feeds containing oil from transgenic *Camelina* ( $p = 0.202$ ).

#### *Tissue lipid content*

The lipid content of flesh (muscle) varied between around 3 and 4.5 % but diet had no significant effect (Table 5). In contrast, the lipid content of liver was higher in fish fed WCO than in fish fed FO with fish fed the oils derived from transgenic *Camelina* showing intermediate values (Table 6). Diet had no significant effect on the lipid content of other tissues including gill (Table 6), anterior intestine and brain (Table 7).

#### *Tissue fatty acid compositions*

*Muscle (flesh).* No differences were observed in the proportions of total n-3 PUFA in muscle ( $p = 0.508$ ), although clear differences were found in individual fatty acids (Table 5). The

mole percentages of EPA were highest in fish fed FO and ECO, lowest in fish fed WCO and intermediate in fish fed DCO. Proportions of DHA were similar in fish fed FO and DCO and higher than in fish fed WCO, with fish fed ECO showing intermediate values. Fish fed the FO and ECO diets displayed similar proportions of n-3 docosapentaenoic acid (DPA, 22:5n-3) in flesh, which were significantly higher than those found in fish fed WCO or DCO. The totals of EPA+DHA and EPA+DPA+DHA in fish fed all feeds varied in the rank order FO > ECO > DCO > WCO. The proportions of 18:2n-6 and total n-6 PUFA were higher in flesh of sea bream fed all the diets containing VOs (WCO, ECO and DCO) compared to fish fed FO (Table 5). No differences were observed in total SAFA and total MUFA were higher in fish fed FO and WCO compared to fish fed the oils from transgenic *Camelina*.

*Liver.* The fatty acid profile of liver was similar to that of muscle and mainly reflected dietary compositions. No differences were found in total n-3 PUFA among the four dietary treatments as low levels of n-3 LC-PUFA were associated with high levels of short chain precursors (Table 6). The percentages of EPA were similar and highest in fish fed FO and ECO, lowest in fish fed WCO and intermediate in fish fed DCO. Proportions of DHA were similar in fish fed FO and DCO and higher than in fish fed WCO, with fish fed ECO showing intermediate values. Again, the totals of EPA+DHA and EPA+DPA+DHA in fish fed all feeds were in the rank order FO > ECO > DCO > WCO. Proportions of total n-6 PUFA were higher in liver of fish-fed ECO and DCO reflecting the higher dietary n-6 contents, particularly 18:2n-6 and arachidonic acid (ARA, 20:4n-6).

*Gills.* In general terms, gill fatty acid compositions mirrored dietary input, although some small differences were found (Table 6). Proportions of EPA varied in the rank order FO = ECO > DCO > WCO, DHA in the rank order FO > DCO > ECO = WCO, and EPA+DHA and EPA+DPA+DHA in the rank order FO > ECO > DCO > WCO. 18:2n-6 was higher in gills of fish fed the VO diets compared to fish fed FO while ARA varied in the rank order ECO > DCO = FO > WCO (Table 6).

*Anterior intestine.* Proportions of EPA, DHA and total EPA+DPA+DHA varied in anterior intestine with essentially the same pattern as described for gills (Table 7). However, total n-6 PUFA contents were higher in anterior intestine than in the other tissues analysed, particularly in fish fed the diets containing oil from transgenic *Camelina* due to higher levels of 18:2n-6 and ARA.

*Brain.* The fatty acid composition of brain was least influenced by diet, with fewer individual fatty acids showing significant differences and the magnitude of differences being lower (Table 7). Specifically and importantly, DHA, EPA+DHA, EPA+DPA+DHA and EPA/DHA ratio did not vary between fish fed the different diets, and neither did 18:2n-6 or the totals of n-3 PUFA, PUFA, SAFA and MUFA.

The non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plot clearly showed that tissue fatty acid compositions were affected by the dietary input rather than by tissue type with the exception of brain, which clustered in a different group (Fig. 2, Stress 0.07). This was confirmed by the global R value and low p obtained ( $R = 0.481$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) when comparing the feeds. Pair-wise R indicated that the segregation was strongest between fish fed FO and WCO ( $R = 0.711$ ;  $p = 0.005$ ), whereas the weakest separation was observed between fish fed the ECO and DCO diets ( $R = 0.233$ ;  $p = 0.030$ ). The tissue fatty acid profiles of fish fed the two transgenic-derived oils did not show high separation with WCO ( $R = 0.431$  and  $0.404$ , and  $p = 0.003$  and  $0.004$  for ECO and DCO, respectively). Tissue-wise, a weak segregation was observed (global  $R = 0.261$ ;  $p = 0.008$ ), although brain displayed a strong separation from other tissues (i.e.  $R = 1$  for muscle and  $0.958$  for gill).

#### *Tissue histology*

Fish fed the FO diet showed regular hepatocyte morphology with large centrally located nuclei with few cytoplasmic vacuoles that did not alter hepatocyte shape or size (Table 8). Fish fed wild-type Camelina oil (WCO) displayed a higher degree of vacuolisation, although no structural changes, such as inflammation, necrosis or perivascular cuffing were observed. Fish fed the feeds containing the GM-derived oils showed intermediate levels of vacuolisation, with no differences between FO and DCO-fed fish or between WCO and ECO-fed fish (Table 8). No significant differences were observed in the infiltration of peripancreatic fat although fish fed FO showed the lowest scores and DCO-fed fish the highest ( $p = 0.293$ ; Table 8). With intestinal tissue, good integrity of the absorptive membrane was observed in the sections from fish fed all the dietary treatments. However, cellular infiltration, mainly represented by acidophilic granulocytes and some lymphocytes was observed, mainly in fish fed ECO (data not shown). Most of the acidophilic granulocytes were located in the lamina propria although a few could be found in submucosa and were present both in mid and hindgut.

#### *Liver and anterior intestine gene expression*

*LC-PUFA biosynthetic genes.* In liver, higher expression of fatty acyl desaturase 2 (*fads2*) was observed in fish fed all three diets containing VO (WCO, ECO and DCO), with expression significantly greater in liver of WCO-fed fish compared to FO-fed fish (Fig. 3A). Similarly higher expression in liver of fish fed all VOs was observed in fatty acid elongase 4 (*elovl4*), significantly so in fish fed both GM-derived oils compared to fish fed FO (Fig. 3A). There was also a non-significant trend for increased expression of fatty acid elongase 5 (*elovl5*) in fish fed VO diets compared to fish fed FO (Fig. 3A). In contrast, anterior intestine showed different nutritional regulation of these genes. Firstly, only *elovl4* expression showed a similar pattern of expression to that observed in liver with higher expression, albeit not significant, in fish fed the VOs compared to fish fed FO (Fig. 3B). Secondly, fold changes (FC) were less with the highest being 1.7 FC for *elovl4* for ECO-fed fish (Fig. 3B) compared to 4.6 FC in liver for this gene in fish fed ECO (Fig.3A). Only *fads2* showed significant regulation by dietary oil source, being down-regulated in intestine in VO-fed fish compared to fish fed FO, and a similar, non significant, trend was found in *elovl5* in intestine (Fig. 3B).

*Lipid metabolism genes.* As above, the nutritional regulation of this group of genes was more marked in liver (Fig. 4A) than in anterior intestine (Fig. 4B). Lysophosphatidylcholine acyltransferase (*lpcat*) was up-regulated in VO-fed fish in both tissues, although the highest expression was found in liver of ECO-fed fish, whereas fish fed WCO showed the highest significant FC in intestine. Fatty acid binding protein 2 (*fabp2*) gene expression was also regulated in liver, with highest expression in fish fed ECO, whereas no dietary regulation of this gene was observed in anterior intestine. Both lipoprotein lipase (*lpl*) and hepatic lipase (*hl*) genes showed the same pattern in liver, with highest levels of expression in fish fed both diets with GM-derived oils, with WCO showing intermediate levels between those of ECO/DCO and fish fed FO (Fig. 4A). In contrast, no regulation was observed in the anterior intestine for *lpl*, although its expression showed a downward trend in VO-fed fish, and *hl* could not be detected in intestinal tissue (Fig. 4B).

*Fatty acid catabolism genes.* Gene expression of two isoforms of carnitine palmitoyltransferase 1, *cpt1a* and *cpt1b*, were evaluated in liver and anterior intestine of sea bream (Fig. 5). In general terms, expression of both *cpt1* in liver was higher in fish fed the VOs compared to fish fed FO. However, WCO-fed fish showed intermediate values of *cpt1a* expression, lower FC than fish fed ECO, but in the same range as DCO-fed fish (Fig. 5A). Fish fed all three VO diets showed similar and higher levels of expression of *cpt1b* in liver than fish fed FO. No

significant differences in expression of either *cpt1a* or *cpt1b* were observed in anterior intestine of sea bream fed the dietary treatments (Fig. 5B).

*Nuclear receptors.* Liver expression of the three evaluated nuclear receptors was generally higher in fish fed all of the VO diets compared to fish fed FO, although differences were not significant for peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor  $\alpha$  (*ppara*) (Fig. 6A). Expression in liver of *pparg* was highest in ECO- and DCO-fed fish with WCO-fed fish showing intermediate values, whereas fish fed all the VO diets showed higher expression of sterol regulatory element binding protein 1 (*srebp1*) (Fig. 6A). Although there were no significant differences in the expression of these genes among the dietary treatments in anterior intestine, a consistent pattern of lower expression in fish fed the VO diets was observed for all three nuclear receptors (Fig. 6B).

*Fish health and immune system genes.* Again the three evaluated genes all showed higher expression in liver of fish fed the VO diets compared to fish fed FO (Fig. 7A). In the case of caspase 3 (*casp3*), ECO-fed fish showed the highest expression levels, although no differences were found with WCO and DCO-fed fish which also showed similar levels of expression to FO-fed fish (Fig. 7A). No statistical differences were observed for proliferating cell nuclear antigen (*pcna*) expression in liver, although DCO, and particularly ECO-fed fish, tended to have higher levels of expression. DCO-fed fish showed a clear up-regulation in hepatic interleukin 8 (*il8*) expression, with WCO and ECO-fed fish displaying intermediate levels (Fig. 7A). In contrast, although *il8* was also differentially regulated by dietary oil source in intestine, the pattern was opposite to that observed in liver, with VO-fed fish showing lower expression compared to FO-fed fish (Fig. 7B).

*Transgenes.* All analysed sea bream tissues (muscle, liver and anterior intestine) tested negative for the presence of the Camelina T-DNA gene construct as monitored by the use of npt-II primers (data not shown).

## Discussion

The replacement of FO in aquafeeds depends on finding alternative, sustainable sources of EPA and DHA, with this currently being one of the main issues in aquaculture nutrition, particularly in marine species that have limited ability for endogenous synthesis of LC-PUFA. Previous trials completely replacing FO by VO in feeds for gilthead sea bream resulted in reduced growth probably related to a reduced intake of essential LC-PUFA, which

are not found in VO [31-33]. In the present study we evaluated the complete substitution of FO by two different oils obtained from GM-oilseed crops rich in either EPA (ECO) or containing both EPA and DHA (DCO) in feeds for sea bream juveniles. Both oils proved to be effective substitutes of FO, displaying growth rates that were similar to those achieved by fish fed FO (in the case of DCO) or WCO (for ECO). Similarly, recent studies employing both oil iterations as substitutes for FO in Atlantic salmon feeds showed that fish fed these oils were as successful as those fed FO [13, 15]. The lack of effect on growth in WCO-fed fish in the present trial is explained by the inclusion of relatively high levels of FM which ensured that n-3 LC-PUFA requirements were fully satisfied (1.9 % n-3 LC-PUFA in WCO-feed), estimated to be 0.9 % of dry feed [34].

It was surprising that the ECO-fed fish showed slightly reduced performance, albeit no different to WCO-fed fish, given that n-3 LC-PUFA requirements, including DHA, were satisfied. One reason for this could be related to the balance between the different dietary LC-PUFA including the dietary EPA/DHA ratio, which differed among the feeds. An EPA/DHA ratio of 2:1 was reported to be optimal for sea bream juveniles [35] and in the present trial ECO feed presented a ratio of approximately 3:1, perhaps suggesting an imbalance in these essential fatty acids. However, in previous trials in Atlantic salmon, where the EPA/DHA ratio was even higher (around 9:1), given the higher oil inclusion and lower FM level, no adverse effect was observed on growth [13]. However, it should be noted that the optimal dietary EPA/DHA ratio is likely to be species-specific. Another fatty acid that differed between ECO and the other feeds was ARA, with the ECO diet having more than double the ARA content of the FO diet. Increased dietary ARA levels have been associated with enhanced stress resistance, survival and improved growth in sea bream juveniles and larvae [36-40] as occurs in other marine warm water species such as European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) [41]. However, ARA produces pro-inflammatory effects due to production of prostaglandin E<sub>2</sub> (PGE<sub>2</sub>), leukotriene B<sub>4</sub> (LTB<sub>4</sub>) and lipoxins [42], and so diets rich in n-6 PUFA, primarily ARA, could lead to overproduction of PGE<sub>2</sub> although that can, in turn, have an immunosuppressant effect [43]. Although no major or obvious alteration in fish health was shown by the histology and qPCR results in the present study, increased ARA levels or even imbalanced proportions of n-3 and n-6 PUFA may partly explain the slightly lower growth of ECO-fed sea bream. On the other hand, the ratios of ARA, EPA and DHA to each other are also known to be of importance for marine finfish nutrition. For instance, a diet with high EPA and low ARA (9:1) significantly reduced performance of Atlantic salmon



when compared to fish fed a more balanced ratio of EPA and ARA (1.5:1) [44], similar to what was observed in the present trial. Additionally, multiple regression analysis demonstrated meaningful relationships between ARA and DHA in California yellowtail (*Seriola dorsalis*) with ARA and DHA contributing positively to weight gain whereas EPA contributed negatively [45]. Thus, the lower growth observed in ECO-fed sea bream could be due to imbalanced proportions between these three essential LC-PUFA.

Despite the slightly reduced performance of ECO-fed fish compared to FO and DCO-fed fish, no marked differences were observed in lipid or individual fatty acid digestibility, which is consistent with previous studies in salmon using the same oil [14]. However, ECO-fed fish consumed less feed (g/tank) than fish fed FO or WCO diets, which may suggest a palatability issue with this oil. However, it must be noted that both oils were extracted using the same process and stabilized using the same concentration of antioxidant (ethoxyquin). In addition, exactly the same batch of ECO was used in the earlier trial in salmon where no differences in performance were observed between treatments [13]. Moreover, the sea bream feeds were formulated with higher FM levels than the earlier salmon feeds, which would in turn be expected to increase palatability. Thus, it appears that the slightly reduced performance of ECO-fed fish is more likely to be related to a species-specific sensitivity to high dietary ARA/n-6 levels that affected feed intake rather than a problem with palatability.

Complete substitution of dietary FO by VO is also associated with increased deposition of C<sub>18</sub> fatty acids and reduced proportions of LC-PUFA in fish tissues. The two-GM derived oils investigated in the present trial can be considered as “hybrid” oils given that they contain features of both vegetable and marine oils, and the tissue fatty acid profiles reflected this characteristic. Thus, in general terms tissues of ECO and DCO fed fish had higher proportions of n-3 LC-PUFA than fish fed WCO, which in the case of flesh enhanced the nutritional value of the product. Some limited biosynthetic activity was observed particularly in fish fed ECO with high EPA (and ARA), where higher levels of DPA (22:5n-3) and 22:4n-6 were observed in liver, muscle and gills compared to fish fed either WCO or DCO. This likely reflected the higher hepatic expression of *elovl4*, an enzyme that participates in the elongation of ARA and EPA to 22:4n-6 and 22:5n-3, respectively [46], observed in ECO and DCO-fed fish. However, the increased expression of *fads2* was not statistically significant in ECO fed fish, which showed intermediate values between FO and WCO-fed fish. However, increased expression of *fads2* has been reported previously in sea bream fed VO compared to fish fed FO [21-22]. The involvement of *elovl4* in only later stages of the biosynthetic

pathway (predominantly elongation of C<sub>22</sub>), particularly the synthesis of very long chain fatty acids (VLC-FA), explains why sea bream tissue fatty acid compositions largely reflected dietary fatty acid compositions. This was clear in the PCA (NMDS Plot) analysis where all tissues, except brain, grouped according to the feeds, with ECO and DCO clustering in the same group. This indicated that the fatty acid composition of brain was more conserved and less affected by diet than the other tissues, consistent with other studies in the same species [20] and other teleost species [47-48].

Inclusion of high levels of VO and reduction of FO in feeds has been associated with increased tissue lipid deposition in several fish species [13-14, 33, 49-51]. In the present study increased lipid deposition was observed only in liver, being highest in WCO-fed fish with ECO and DCO-fed fish showing intermediate values, with liver histology following the same trend. Similar results were found in Atlantic salmon fed high ECO, reflecting the hybrid nature of the GM-derived oil [13-14]. The mechanism for increased lipid deposition in fish fed VOs is not clear although high n-3 LC-PUFA levels found in FO can suppress triacylglycerol (TAG) accumulation in mammalian pre-adipocytes [52] and lipid accumulation in Atlantic salmon adipocytes [53]. Another explanation for the enhanced lipid deposition could be the high levels of both C<sub>18</sub> fatty acids, 18:2n-6 and 18:3n-3, together with the limited LC-PUFA biosynthetic capacity of this species [22]. In the present study we evaluated the expression of genes involved in lipid and energy metabolism, as well as transcription factors such as SREBP1, which plays a key role in lipid metabolism participating in fatty acid metabolism and *de novo* lipogenesis [54]. Up-regulation in *srebp1* expression in liver was observed in fish fed the three VOs in agreement with studies carried out in *elov15<sup>-/-</sup>* mice that indicated low levels of EPA and DHA lead to activation of this transcription factor [55]. Similar results have been obtained in other fish species when fed low levels of n-3 LC-PUFA or VO [50, 56-58]. Up-regulation of *srebp1* in VO-fed fish could lead to the regulation of *srebp1* target genes such as *fads2*, *hl*, *lpl*, *cpt1a* and *cpt1b*. Hydrolysis of TAG in lipoproteins is mediated by *lpl*, and *hl* converts intermediate density lipoprotein to low density lipoprotein, mediating uptake of fatty acids by tissues. Thus, enhanced expression of these two lipase genes would enhance lipid deposition in liver in agreement with a previous study in turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*) fed soybean oil [50]. On the other hand, *cpt1a*, a gene involved in fatty acid oxidation was up-regulated in fish fed the GM-derived oils and, although it is a *srebp1* target gene, down-regulation of this gene was expected [50]. However, in comparison to the clear effects on liver *cpt* expression in the

present study, published data show only marginal effects of replacing FO by VO on  $\beta$ -oxidation [59-60]. In addition, there are other nutrients that can affect the regulation of these genes such as carbohydrate that can affect lipid metabolism, enhancing the expression of *srebp1* and *cpt1a* and *cpt1b* in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) when fed VO [18].

Two other transcription factors, *ppara* and *pparg*, that regulate lipid metabolism and energy homeostasis [61] were evaluated in the present trial, but no regulation of *ppara* was noted in either liver or anterior intestine. PPAR $\alpha$  activation by n-3 LC-PUFA may induce the expression of lipolytic genes, such as *cpt*, enhancing fatty acid oxidation [62]. However, in the present study and others, no regulation of *ppara* expression has been observed in fish fed more sustainable diets based on VO [50, 63-65]. In contrast, feeding VO, particularly the GM-derived oils, increased *pparg* expression. PPAR $\gamma$  activation in mice is known to increase glycolysis, fat storage, fatty acid desaturation and elongation [66]. Thus, up-regulation of *pparg* may be a compensatory mechanism to attenuate the increased lipid deposition found in fish fed high levels of VO, although it did not have a direct effect on lipolytic genes. Consistent with this, *pparg* expression was up-regulated in mice fed the high-EPA oil (ECO) compared to mice fed a FO-based diet [67].

Acyltransferases such as LPCAT play a major role in phospholipid remodelling as they alter the fatty acid composition of phospholipids at the sn-2 position [68]. The expression of this gene tended to increase in VO-fed fish compared to FO-fed fish in both liver and intestine. This could be reflected in enhanced conversion of lysophosphatidylcholine to phosphatidylcholine in VO-fed fish. Although there is only limited information regarding the regulation of this gene in teleosts, n-3 PUFA have been found to regulate *lpcat1* in larvae of Senegalese sole (*Solea senegalensis*), where gene expression was up-regulated in larvae fed diets containing linseed oil compared to other sources of VO, although no differences were observed with fish fed FO [69]. It is difficult to make comparisons with this study, as fast growing larvae have a high requirement for dietary phospholipids [70] but it is clear that nutritional regulation by n-3 PUFA or LC-PUFA occurs regardless of the life stage. In fact, *lpcat1* regulation has also been found in sea bream [71] and sea bass [72] subjected to fasting, although the direction of regulation varied among species. Also *fabp2*, a gene related to fatty acid transport and uptake, was regulated in liver, being clearly up-regulated in fish fed ECO. Similarly, Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) fed plant meal diets showed a trend towards up-regulation of *fabp2* compared to fish fed fishmeal, in this case associated with lower fat

digestibility of the plant-based feeds [73]. Although we cannot fully explain this result at present, we suggest that the up-regulation may be associated with the lower growth of these fish, which in turn could elicit compensatory mechanisms such as fatty acid mobilization.

Some genes were analysed in order to evaluate the immune system and fish health in response to dietary oils. Caspases are central regulators of apoptosis, while PCNA is a marker of cell proliferation, also expressed in non-dividing cells undergoing DNA synthesis and repair [74]. In previous studies, expression of caspases was affected by replacement of dietary FO by VO in fish [63-64, 75]. Apoptosis is particularly important in tissues with high cell turnover rate such as liver [76] but, in addition, their expression can be altered by factors such as pathological or toxic conditions [77]. Certain VO have been found to enhance oxidative stress and cellular damage [78], and DHA can suppress caspase 3 activation and cell death in neurons [79], which suggests FO diets could have a cellular protective effect in fish. In contrast, the lack of nutritional regulation in anterior intestine was consistent with the results observed in sea bass fed diets containing soybean oil [80]. Expression of PCNA was not altered when fish were fed the VO-feeds consistent with a previous study in Atlantic salmon [75]. Interleukin 8, a cytokine that serves as a chemical messenger in innate and adaptive immune systems, showed differential regulation in liver and intestine of fish fed VO, probably related to the specific functions of each tissue and their response to nutritional challenge. In this respect, fish gut epithelium acts and reacts as the first line of protection against potentially harmful substances in the diet, with VO causing changes in fish that could favour intestinal dysfunction, including alterations in the gut associated immune system [81]. Thus, down-regulation of *il8* in intestine of VO-fed fish confirmed the importance of dietary fatty acid profile on the immune system of marine fish in agreement with previous studies [80, 82]. In contrast, liver of DCO-fed fish showed higher expression of *il8*, albeit not different to expression in liver of bream fed the other VO diets, which may indicate that the VO fatty acid profile may enhance *il8* activity in this tissue.

In summary, both genetically engineered Camelina oils (EPA only or EPA + DHA) were shown to be viable sources of n-3 LC-PUFA and potential candidates to replace FO in feeds for sea bream, with the growth of fish fed DCO similar to that of fish fed FO. Both oils improved the nutritional quality of the fish fillet, enhancing the n-3 LC-PUFA levels compared to the fish fed the regular (wild-type) VO. Limited LC-PUFA biosynthesis was observed, specifically in liver of fish fed ECO, reflected in higher levels of n-3 DPA, consistent with increased expression of *elovl4* elongase. In general, gene expression reflected

the “hybrid” fatty acid composition of the GM-derived oils, eliciting responses that were between the levels of expression in FO and WCO-fed fish, although often more similar to WCO. This may suggest the importance of not only EPA and DHA, but also C<sub>18</sub> PUFA levels in marine fish lipid metabolism. Based on histology and gene expression, no adverse effects on fish health were observed and thus the cause for the slight reduction in feed intake and consequent fish growth observed in fish fed ECO was not clear but may be related to dietary ARA levels and/or LC-PUFA ratios. Longer term trials with fish up to market size are required to further validate the feasibility of oils from transgenic oilseed crops in marine fish aquaculture.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors are grateful to R. Cruz, D. Domínguez and N. Oubramy for their excellent technical assistance in fish rearing and fish sampling. MBB and this project were partly funded by a UK Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) Industrial Partnership Award (/BB/J001252/1). The trial was performed thanks to an Aquaexcel transnational action (0119//08/12/28) and trip costs were funded thanks to a Santander Staff Mobility Fund both awarded to MBB.

### **Conflict of interest**

None of the authors has any conflicts of interest to declare.

### **References**

1. Gil A, Serra-Majem L, Calder PC, Uauy R (2012) Systematic reviews of the role of omega-3 fatty acids in the prevention and treatment of disease. *Br J Nutr* 107: S1-S2.
2. Campoy C, Escolano-Margarit V, Anjos T, Szajewska H, Uauy R (2012) Omega 3 fatty acids on child growth, visual acuity and neurodevelopment. *Br J Nutr* 107: S85-S106.
3. Delgado-Lista J, Perez-Martinez P, Lopez-Miranda J, Perez-Jimenez F (2012) Long chain omega-3 fatty acids and cardiovascular disease: a systematic review. *Br J Nutr* 107: S201-S213.
4. Miles EA, Calder PC (2012) Influence of marine n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids on immune function and a systematic review of their effects on clinical outcomes in rheumatoid arthritis. *Br J Nutr* 107: S171-S184.
5. Laviano A, Rianda S, Molino A, Rossi Fanelli F (2013) Omega-3 fatty acids in cancer. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metabolic Care* 16: 156-161.

- 635 6. International Society for the Study of Fatty Acids and Lipids (ISSFAL). Report of the sub-  
636 committee on: Recommendations for intake of polyunsaturated fatty acids in healthy  
637 adults. (ISSFAL, Brighton, 2004).
- 638 7. FAO (2016) State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2016. Food and Agriculture  
639 Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- 640 8. Naylor RL, Hardy RW, Bureau DP, Chiu A, Elliott M, Farrell AP, Forster I, Gatlin DM,  
641 Goldburg RJ, Hua K, Nichols PD (2009) Feeding aquaculture in an era of finite resources.  
642 Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 106: 15103–15110.
- 643 9. Tocher DR (2015) Omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids and aquaculture in  
644 perspective. Aquaculture 449: 94-107.
- 645 10. Ruiz-Lopez N, Haslam RP, Napier JA, Sayanova O (2014) Successful high-level  
646 accumulation of fish oil omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in a transgenic  
647 oilseed crop. Plant J 77: 198-208.
- 648 11. Haslam RP, Usher S, Sayanova O, Napier JA, Betancor MB, Tocher DR (2015) The  
649 supply of fish oil to aquaculture: a role for transgenic oilseed crops? World Agriculture 5:  
650 15-23.
- 651 12. Usher S, Haslam RP, Ruiz-Lopez N, Sayanova O, Napier JA (2015) Field trial evaluation  
652 of the accumulation of omega-3 long chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in transgenic  
653 *Camelina sativa*: Making fish oil substitutes in plants. Metabolic Engineering  
654 Communications 2: 93-98.
- 655 13. Betancor MB, Sprague M, Usher S, Sayanova O, Campbell PJ, Napier JA, Tocher DR  
656 (2015) A nutritionally-enhanced oil from transgenic *Camelina sativa* effectively replaced  
657 marine fish oil as a source of eicosapentaenoic acid for farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo*  
658 *salar*). Sci Rep 5: 8104 (DOI: 10.1038/srep08104).
- 659 14. Betancor MB, Sprague M, Sayanova O, Usher S, Campbell PJ, Napier JA, Tocher DR  
660 (2015) Evaluation of a high-EPA oil from transgenic *Camelina sativa* in feeds for Atlantic  
661 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.): Effects on tissue fatty acid composition, histology and gene  
662 expression. Aquaculture 444: 1-12.
- 663 15. Betancor MB, Sprague M, Sayanova O, Usher S, Metochis C, Campbell PJ, Napier JA;  
664 Tocher DR (2016) Nutritional evaluation of an EPA-DHA oil from transgenic *Camelina*  
665 *sativa* in feeds for post-smolt Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). PLoS ONE, in press (doi:  
666 10.1371/journal.pone.0159934).
- 667 16. Bell JG, McEvoy J, Tocher DR, McGhee F, Campbell PJ, Sargent JR (2001)  
668 Replacement of fish oil with rapeseed oil in diets of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) affects  
669 tissue lipid compositions and hepatocyte fatty acid metabolism. J Nutr 131: 1535-1543.
- 670 17. Caballero MJ, Obach A, Rosenlund G, Montero D, Gisvold M, Izquierdo MS (2002)  
671 Impact of different dietary lipid sources on growth, lipid digestibility, tissue fatty acid

- composition and histology of rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. Aquaculture 214: 253-271
18. Kamalam BS, Médale F, Larroquet L, Corraze G, Panserat S (2013) Metabolism and fatty acid profile in fat and lean rainbow trout lines fed with vegetable oil: Effect of carbohydrates. PLoS ONE 8, e76570.
  19. Menoyo D, Izquierdo MS, Robaina L, Ginés R, Lopez-Bote CJ, Bautista JM (2004) Adaptation of lipid metabolism, tissue composition and flesh quality in gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) to the replacement of dietary fish oil by linseed and soyabean oils. Br J Nutr 92: 41-52.
  20. Benedito-Palos L, Navarro JC, Kaushik S, Pérez-Sánchez J (2010) Tissue-specific robustness of fatty acid signatures in cultured sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) fed practical diets with a combined high replacement of fish meal and fish oil. J Anim Sci 88: 1759-1770.
  21. Mourente G, Tocher DR (1993) Incorporation and metabolism of <sup>14</sup>C-labelled polyunsaturated fatty acids in juvenile gilthead sea bream *Sparus aurata* L. in vivo. Fish Physiol Biochem 10: 443-453.
  22. Izquierdo MS, Juárez-Carrillo E, Oliva V, Hernández-Cruz CM, Afonso JM (2008) Regulation of growth, fatty acid composition and delta 6 desaturase expression by dietary lipids in gilthead seabream larvae (*Sparus aurata*). Fish Physiol Biochem 34: 117-127.
  23. National Research Council (NRC). *Nutrient Requirements of Fish and Shrimp*. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC (2011).
  24. Fernández F, Miquel AG, Cumplido LR, Guinea J, Ros E (1996) Comparisons of faecal collection methods for digestibility determinations in gilthead sea bream. J Fish Biol 49: 735-738.
  25. Folch J, Lees N, Sloane-Stanley GH (1957) A simple method for the isolation and purification of total lipids from animal tissues. J Biol Chem 226: 497-509.
  26. AOAC (2000) Official Methods of Analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, DC.
  27. Christie WW (2003) Lipid Analysis, third ed. Oily Press, Bridgwater.
  28. Tocher DR, Harvie DG (1988) Fatty acid compositions of the major phosphoglycerides from fish neural tissues; (n-3) and (n-6) polyunsaturated fatty acids in rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) and cod (*Gadus morhua*) brains and retinas. Fish Physiol Biochem 5: 229-239.
  29. Martoja R, Martoja-Pearson M (1970) Técnicas de Histología Animal. Toray-Masson S.A., Barcelona.

- 706 30. Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD (2001) PAST: Paleontological statistics software  
707 package for education and data analysis. *Paleontol Electron* 4: 9.
- 708 31. Benedito-Palos L, Navarro JC, Sitjà-Bobadilla A, Bell JG, Kaushik S, Pérez-Sánchez J  
709 (2008) High levels of vegetable oils in plant protein-rich diets fed to gilthead sea bream  
710 (*Sparus aurata* L.): growth performance, muscle fatty acid profiles and histological  
711 alterations of target tissues. *Br J Nutr* 100: 992-1003.
- 712 32. Montero D, Grasso V, Izquierdo MS, Ganga R, Real F, Tort L, Caballero MJ, Acosta F  
713 (2008) Total substitution of fish oil by vegetable oils in gilthead sea bream (*Sparus*  
714 *aurata*) diets: Effects of Mx expression and some immune parameters. *Fish and Shellfish*  
715 *Immunol* 24: 147-155.
- 716 33. Fountoulaki E, Vasilaki A, Hurtado R, Grigorakis K, Karacostas I, Nengas I, Rigos G,  
717 Kotzamanis Y, Venou B, Alexis MN (2009) Fish oil substitution by vegetable oils in  
718 commercial diets for gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L.); effects on growth  
719 performance, flesh quality and fillet fatty acid profile: Recovery of fatty acid profiles by a  
720 fish oil finishing diet under fluctuating water temperatures. *Aquaculture* 289: 317-326.
- 721 34. Kalegeropoulos N, Alexis MN, Henderson RJ (1992) Effects of dietary soybean and cod-  
722 liver oil levels on growth and body composition of gilthead bream (*Sparus aurata*).  
723 *Aquaculture* 104, 293-308.
- 724 35. Ibeas C, Cejas JR, Fores R, Badía P, Gómez T, Lorenzo-Hernández A (1997) Influence of  
725 eicosapentaenoic to docosahexaenoic acid ratio (EPA/DHA) of dietary lipids on growth  
726 and fatty acid composition of gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*) juveniles. *Aquaculture*  
727 150: 91-102.
- 728 36. Bessonart M, Izquierdo MS, Salhi M, Hernández-Cruz CM, González MM, Fernández-  
729 Palacios H (1999) Effect of dietary arachidonic acid levels on growth and survival of  
730 gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L.) larvae. *Aquaculture* 179: 265-275.
- 731 37. Koven W, Barr Y, Lutzky S, Ben-Atia I, Weiss R, Harel M, Behrens P, Tandler A (2001)  
732 The effect of dietary arachidonic acid (20:4n-6) on growth, survival and resistance to  
733 handling stress in gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*) larvae. *Aquaculture* 193: 107-122.
- 734 38. Koven W, van Anholt R, Lutzky S, Ben Atia I, Nixon O, Ron B, Tandler A (2003) The  
735 effect of dietary arachidonic acid on growth, survival, and cortisol levels in different-age  
736 gilthead seabream larvae (*Sparus aurata*) exposed to handling or daily salinity change.  
737 *Aquaculture* 228: 307-320.
- 738 39. Van Anholt RD, Spanings FAT, Koven WM, Nixon O, Wemdelaar Bonga SE (2004)  
739 Arachidonic acid reduces the stress response of gilthead seabream *Sparus aurata* L. *J Exp*  
740 *Biol* 207: 3419-3430.
- 741 40. Atalah E, Hernández-Cruz CM, Benítez-Santana T, Ganga R, Roo J, Izquierdo MS  
742 (2011) Importance of the relative levels of dietary arachidonic acid and eicosapentaenoic



743 acid for culture performance of gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*). Aquacult Res 42:  
744 1279-1288.

745 41. Montero D, Terova G, Rimoldi S, Betancor MB, Atalah E, Torrecillas S, Caballero MJ,  
746 Zamorano MJ, Izquierdo, MS (2015a) Modulation of the expression of components of the  
747 stress response by dietary arachidonic acid in European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*)  
748 larvae. Lipids 50: 1029-1041.

749 42. Lall SP (2000) Nutrition and health of fish. In: Cruz-Suárez LE, Ricque-Marie D, Tapia-  
750 Salazar M, Olvera-Novoa MA, Civera-Cerecedo R (Eds). Avances en Nutrición Acuícola  
751 V. Memorias del V Simposium Internacional de Nutrición Acuícola, pp. 19-22. Mérida,  
752 Yucatán, Mexico.

753 43. Bell JG, Ashton I, Secombes CJ, Weitzel BR, Dick JR, Sargent JR (1996) Dietary lipid  
754 affects phospholipid fatty acid compositions, eicosanoid production and immune function  
755 in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Prostag Leukot Essent Fatty Acids 54: 173-182.

756 44. Norambuena F, Rombenso A, Turchini GM (2016) Towards the optimization of Atlantic  
757 salmon reared at different water temperatures via the manipulation of dietary ARA/EPA  
758 ratio. Aquaculture 450: 48-57.

759 45. Rombenso AN, Trushenki JT, Jirsa D, Drawbridge M (2016) Docosahexaenoic acid  
760 (DHA) and arachidonic acid (ARA) are essential to meet LC-PUFA requirements of  
761 juvenile California Yellowtail (*Seriola dorsalis*). Aquaculture 463: 123-134.

762 46. Monroig Ó, Webb K, Ibarra-Castro L, Holt J, Tocher DR (2011) Biosynthesis of long-  
763 chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in marine fish: Characterization of an Elovl4-like  
764 elongase from cobia *Rachycentrum canadum* and activation of the pathway during early  
765 life stages. Aquaculture 312: 145-153.

766 47. Betancor MB, Howarth FJE, Glencross BD, Tocher DR (2014) Influence of dietary  
767 docosahexaenoic acid in combination with other long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids on  
768 expression of biosynthesis genes and phospholipid fatty acid compositions in tissues of  
769 post-smolt Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Comp Biochem Physiol 172-173B: 74-89.

770 48. Geay F, Wenon D, Mellery J, Tinti E, Mandiki SNM, Tocher DR, Debier C, Larondelle  
771 Y, Kestemont P (2015) Dietary linseed oil reduces growth while differentially impacting  
772 LC-PUFA synthesis and accretion into tissues in Eurasian perch (*Perca fluviatilis*). Lipids  
773 50: 1219-1232.

774 49. Benítez-Dorta V, Caballero MJ, Izquierdo MS, Manchado M, Infante C, Zamorano MJ,  
775 Montero D. (2013). Total substitution of fish oil by vegetable oils in Senegalese sole  
776 (*Solea senegalensis*) diets: effects on fish performance, biochemical composition and  
777 expression of some glucocorticoid receptor related genes. Fish Physiology Biochem 39:  
778 335-349

779 50. Peng M, Xu W, Mai K, Zhou H, Zhang Y, Liufu Z, Zhang K, Ai A (2014) Growth  
780 performance, lipid deposition and hepatic lipid metabolism related gene expression in  
781 juvenile turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus* L.) fed diets with various fish oil substitution levels  
782 by soybean oil. *Aquaculture* 433: 442-449.

783 51. Ballester-Lozano GF, Benedito-Palos L, Estensoro I, Sitjà-Bobadilla A, Kaushik S,  
784 Pérez-Sánchez J (2015) Comprehensive biometric, biochemical and histopathological  
785 assessment of nutrient deficiencies in gilthead sea bream fed semi-purified diets. *Br J Nutr*  
786 114: 713-726.

787 52. Kim, H. K., Della-Fera, M., Lin, J., Baile, C.A. (2006) Docosahexaenoic acid inhibits  
788 adipocyte differentiation and induces apoptosis in 3T3-L1 preadipocytes. *J Nutr* 136:  
789 2965-2969.

790 53. Todorčević M, Vegusdal A, Gjølén T, Sundvold H, Torstensen BE, Kjær MA, Ruyter B  
791 (2008) Changes in fatty acids metabolism during differentiation of Atlantic salmon  
792 preadipocytes; effects of n-3 and n-9 fatty acids. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1781: 326-335.

793 54. Horton JD, Goldstein JL, Brown MS (2003) SREBPs: activators of the complete program  
794 of cholesterol and fatty acid synthesis in the liver. *J Clin Invest* 109: 1125-1131.

795 55. Moon YA, Hammer RE, Horton JD (2009) Deletion of ELOVL5 leads to fatty liver  
796 through activation of SREBP-1c in mice. *J Lipid Res* 50: 412-423.

797 56. Geay F, Ferrarresso S, Zambonino-Infante JL, Bargellioni L, Quentel C, Vandeputte M,  
798 Kaushik S, Cahu CL, Mazurais D (2011) Effects of the total replacement of fish-based diet  
799 with plant-based diet on the hepatic transcriptome of two European sea bass  
800 (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) half-sibfamilies showing different growth rates with the plant-  
801 based diet. *BMC Genomics* 12: 522.

802 57. Morais S, Pratoomyot J, Taggart JB, Bron JE, Guy DR, Bell JG, Tocher DR (2011)  
803 Genotype-specific responses in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) subject to dietary fish oil  
804 replacement by vegetable oil: a liver transcriptomic analysis. *BMC Genomics* 12: 255.

805 58. Limtipsuntorn U, Haga Y, Kondo H, Hirono I, Satoh S (2014) Microarray analysis of  
806 hepatic gene expression in juvenile japanese flounder *Paralichthys olivaceus* fed diets  
807 supplemented with fish or vegetable oils. *Mar Biotechnol* 16: 88-102.

808 59. Stubhaug I, Lie Ø, Torstensen BE (2006)  $\beta$ -oxidation capacity in liver increases during  
809 parr-smolt transformation of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) fed vegetable and fish oil. *J*  
810 *Fish Biol* 69: 504-517.

811 60. Stubhaug I, Lie Ø, Torstensen BE (2007) Fatty acid productive value and  $\beta$ -oxidation  
812 capacity in Atlantic salmon tissues (*Salmo salar* L.) fed on different lipid sources along  
813 the whole growth period. *Aquacult Nutr* 13: 145-155.

- 814 61. Evans R, Barish GD, Wang YX (2004) PPARs and the complex journey to obesity. Nat  
815 Med 20: 355-361.
- 816 62. Poudyal H, Panchal SK, Diwan V, Brown L (2011) Omega-3 fatty acids and metabolic  
817 syndrome: effects and emerging mechanisms of action. Prog Lipid Res 50: 371-387.
- 818 63. Morais S, Silva T, Cordeiro T, Rodrigues P, Guy DR, Bron JE, Taggart JB, Bell JG,  
819 Tocher DR (2012a) Effects of genotype and dietary fish oil replacement with vegetable oil  
820 on the intestinal transcriptome and proteome of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). BMC  
821 Genomics 13: 448.
- 822 64. Morais S, Edvardsen RB, Tocher DR, Bell JG (2012b) Transcriptomic analyses of  
823 intestinal gene expression of juvenile Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) fed diets with  
824 Camelina oil as replacement for fish oil. Comp Biochem Physiol 161B: 283-293.
- 825 65. Li Y, Zhao Y, Zhang Y, Liang X, Zhang Y, Gao J (2015) Growth performance, fatty acid  
826 composition, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors gene expressions, and  
827 antioxidant abilities of blunt snout bream, *Megalobrama amblycephala*, fingerlings fed  
828 different dietary oil sources. J World Aquac Soc 46: 395-408.
- 829 66. Roberts LD, Murray AJ, Menassa D, Ashmore T, Nicholls AW, Griffin JL (2011) The  
830 contrasting roles of PPAR $\delta$  and PPAR $\gamma$  in regulating the metabolic switch between  
831 oxidation and storage of fats in white adipose tissue. Genome Biol 12: R75.
- 832 67. Tejera N, Vauzour D, Betancor MB, Sayanova O, Usher S, Cochard M, Rigby N, Ruiz-  
833 Lopez N, Menoyo D, Tocher DR, Napier JA, Miniñane AM (2016) A transgenic *Camelina*  
834 *sativa* seed oil replaces fish oil as a dietary source of eicosapentaenoic acid in mice. J Nutr  
835 146: 227-235.
- 836 68. Lands WE (1958) Metabolism of glycerolipids; a comparison of lecithin and triglyceride  
837 synthesis. J Biol Chem 231: 883-888.
- 838 69. Bonacic K, Campoverde C, Sastre M, Hachero-Cruzado I, Ponce M, Manchado M,  
839 Estevez A, Gisbert E, Morais S (2016) Mechanisms of lipid metabolism and transport  
840 underlying superior performance of Senegalese sole (*Solea senegalensis*, Kaup 1858)  
841 larvae fed diets containing n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids. Aquaculture 450: 383-396.
- 842 70. Tocher DR, Bendiksen EA, Campbell PJ, Bell JG (2008) The role of phospholipids in  
843 nutrition and metabolism of teleost fish. Aquaculture 280: 21-34.
- 844 71. Benedito-Palos L, Caldach-Giner JA, Ballester-Lozano GF, Pérez-Sánchez J (2013)  
845 Effect of ration size on fillet fatty acid compositions, phospholipid allostasis and mRNA  
846 expression patterns of lipid regulatory genes in gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*). Br J  
847 Nutr 109: 1175-1187.
- 848 72. Rimoldi S, Benedito-Palos L, Terova G, Pérez-Sánchez J (2015) Wide-targeted gene  
849 expression infers tissue-specific molecular signatures of lipid metabolism in fed and fasted  
850 fish. Rev Fish Biol Fisheries 26: 93-108.

73. Lilleeng E, Frøystad MK, Vekterud K, Valen EC, Krogdahl Å (2007) Comparison of intestinal gene expression in Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) fed standard fish meal or soybean meal by means of suppression subtractive hybridization and real-time PCR. *Aquaculture* 267: 269-283.
74. Williams K, Schwartz A, Corey S, Orandle M, Kennedy W, Thompson B, Alvarez X, Brown C, Gartner S, Lackner A (2002) Proliferating cellular nuclear antigen expression as a marker of perivascular macrophages in simian immunodeficiency virus encephalitis. *Am J Pathol* 161: 575-585.
75. Olsvik PA, Torstensen BE, Nermtssen MHG (2007) Effects of complete replacement of fish oil with plant oil on gastrointestinal cell death, proliferation and transcription of eight genes' encoding proteins responding to cellular stress in Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* L. *J Fish Biol* 71: 550-568.
76. Lajtha A, Latzkovits L, Toth J (1976) Comparison of turnover rates of proteins of the brain, liver and kidney in mouse in vivo following long term labelling. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 425: 511-520.
77. Sweet LI, Passino-Reader DR, Meier PG, Omann GM (1999) Xenobiotic-induced apoptosis: significance and potential application as a general biomarker of response. *Biomarkers* 4: 237-253.
78. Kadir NHA, David R, Rossiter JT, Gooderham NJ (2015) The selective cytotoxicity of the alkenyl glucosinolate hydrolysis products and their presence in *Brassica* vegetables. *Toxicology* 334: 59-71.
79. Akbar M, Calderon F, Wen Z, Kim HY (2005) Docosahexaenoic acid: a positive modulator of Akt signalling in neuronal survival. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 102: 10858-10863.
80. Torrecillas S, montero D, Caballero MJ, Pittman KA, Custódio M, Campo A, Sweetman J, Izquierdo M (2015) Dietary mannan oligosaccharides: counteracting the side effects of soybean meal oil inclusion in European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) gut health and skin mucosa mucus production? *Frontiers in Immunology* 6: 397.
81. Montero D, Izquierdo MS (2010) Welfare and health of fish fed vegetable oils as alternative lipid sources to fish oil. In: Turchini G, Ng W, Tocher D, editors. In: Fish oil replacement and alternative lipid sources in aquaculture feeds. Cambridge: CRC Press, pp 439-485.
82. Montero D, Benitez-Dorta V, Caballero MJ, Ponce M, Torrecillas S, Izquierdo M, Zamorano MJ, Manchado M (2015b) Dietary vegetable oils: Effects on the expression of immune-related genes in Senegalese sole (*Solea senegalensis*) intestine. *Fish and Shellfish Immunol* 44: 100-108.



## Figure legends

**Figure 1.** Fatty acid compositions (mole %) of the four experimental feeds and faeces showing preferential order of absorption with differing degree of unsaturation of dietary fatty acids.

**Figure 2.** Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plot based on logarithmically transformed fatty acid composition of liver, muscle, gill, anterior intestine and brain from gilthead sea bream fed the four dietary treatments for 11 weeks.

**Figure 3.** Expression, measured by qPCR of LC-PUFA biosynthesis pathway genes in sea bream liver (A) and anterior intestine (B) after eleven weeks of feeding. Different superscript letters denote differences in gene expression among the treatments according to one-way ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ). Results are normalized expression ratios (average  $\pm$  SEM;  $n = 6$ ) of the expression of these genes in fish fed the different diets in relation to fish fed FO feed. Diets contain either fish oil (FO), wild-type Camelina oil (WCO), high-EPA Camelina oil (ECO) or EPA+DHA Camelina oil (DCO). *fads2*, delta-6-fatty acyl desaturase; *elovl4*, fatty acid elongase 4; *elovl5*, fatty acyl elongase 5.

**Figure 4.** Expression, measured by qPCR of lipid metabolism genes in sea bream liver (A) and anterior intestine (B) after eleven weeks of feeding. Different superscript letters denote differences in gene expression among the treatments according to one-way ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ). Results are normalized expression ratios (average  $\pm$  SEM;  $n = 6$ ) of the expression of these genes in fish fed the different diets in relation to fish fed FO feed. Diets contain either fish oil (FO), wild-type Camelina oil (WCO), high-EPA Camelina oil (ECO) or EPA+DHA Camelina oil (DCO). *lpcat1*, lysophosphatidylcholine acyltransferase 1; *fabp2*, fatty acid binding protein 2; *hl*, hepatic lipase; *lpl*, lipoprotein lipase.

**Figure 5.** Expression, measured by qPCR of energy metabolism genes in sea bream liver (A) and anterior intestine (B) after eleven weeks of feeding. Different superscript letters denote differences in gene expression among the treatments according to one-way ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ). Results are normalized expression ratios (average  $\pm$  SEM;  $n = 6$ ) of the expression of these genes in fish fed the different diets in relation to fish fed FO feed. Diets contain either fish oil (FO), wild-type Camelina oil (WCO), high-EPA Camelina oil (ECO) or EPA+DHA Camelina oil (DCO). *cpt1a*, carnitine palmitoyltransferase, isoform 1a; *cpt1b*, carnitine palmitoyltransferase, isoform 1b.

**Figure 6.** Expression, measured by qPCR of transcription factor genes in sea bream liver (A) and anterior intestine (B) after eleven weeks of feeding. Different superscript letters denote differences in gene expression among the treatments according to one-way ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ). Results are normalized expression ratios (average  $\pm$  SEM;  $n = 6$ ) of the expression of these genes in fish fed the different diets in relation to fish fed FO feed. Diets contain either fish oil (FO), wild-type Camelina oil (WCO), high-EPA Camelina oil (ECO) or EPA+DHA Camelina oil (DCO). *ppara*, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor alpha; *pparg*, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma; *srebp1*, sterol regulatory element-binding protein 1.

**Figure 7.** Expression, measured by qPCR of fish health and immune system genes in sea bream liver (A) and anterior intestine (B) after eleven weeks of feeding. Different superscript letters denote differences in gene expression among the treatments according to one-way ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ). Results are normalized expression ratios (average  $\pm$  SEM;  $n = 6$ ) of the expression of these genes in fish fed the different diets in relation to fish fed FO feed. Diets contain either fish oil (FO), wild-type Camelina oil (WCO), high-EPA Camelina oil (ECO) or EPA+DHA Camelina oil (DCO). *cas3*, caspase 3; *pcna*, proliferating cell nuclear antigen; *il8*, interleukin 8.

**Table 1.** Formulations, proximate and fatty acid compositions (% of fatty acids) of the experimental feeds

	FO	WCO	ECO	DCO
<i>Feed ingredients (%)</i>				
Fish meal, NA LT 70	24.43	24.43	24.43	24.43
Fish meal, SA 68 Superprime	24.43	24.43	24.43	24.43
Soy protein concentrate (60%)	9.79	9.79	9.79	9.79
Maize gluten	14.66	14.66	14.66	14.66
Wheat	14.66	14.66	14.66	14.66
Fish oil <sup>1</sup>	11.53	-	-	-
Wild-type Camelina oil <sup>1</sup>	-	11.53	-	-
EPA-Camelina oil <sup>1</sup>	-	-	11.53	-
EPA+DHA-Camelina oil <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	11.53
Vitamins/Minerals	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45
Yttrium oxide	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
<i>Analysed composition</i>				
Dry matter (%)	93.78	93.57	94.05	93.94
Crude protein (%)	50.00	50.72	50.23	50.53
Crude lipid (%)	18.47	18.27	17.90	17.93
Ash	8.37	8.33	8.45	8.15
<i>Fatty acid composition (mole %)</i>				
<b>Σ saturated<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>32.60</b>	<b>15.89</b>	<b>18.84</b>	<b>19.71</b>
<b>Σ monounsaturated<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>27.55</b>	<b>31.93</b>	<b>21.25</b>	<b>22.23</b>
18:2n-6	5.61	18.25	21.90	19.72
20:2n-6	0.15	1.31	1.46	0.78
20:3n-6	0.13	n.d.	1.17	0.82
20:4n-6	1.09	0.22	2.44	1.53
22:4n-6	0.07	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
<b>Σ n-6 PUFA<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>7.56</b>	<b>19.85</b>	<b>28.16</b>	<b>26.56</b>
18:3n-3	1.03	23.78	8.68	10.96
20:3n-3	0.06	0.89	0.80	0.52
20:4n-3	0.55	0.14	2.15	1.66
20:5n-3	13.15	2.31	13.53	6.24
22:5n-3	1.39	0.25	0.78	1.21
22:6n-3	9.67	3.91	4.20	6.88
<b>Σ n-3 PUFA</b>	<b>27.86</b>	<b>31.84</b>	<b>31.25</b>	<b>30.99</b>
<b>Σ PUFA<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>39.85</b>	<b>52.18</b>	<b>59.91</b>	<b>58.06</b>
<b>Total n-3 LC-PUFA</b>	<b>24.75</b>	<b>6.61</b>	<b>20.66</b>	<b>15.99</b>

<sup>1</sup>Fatty acid compositions of the oils were provided previously [13,15].

<sup>2</sup>Includes 15:0, 22:0 and 24:0; <sup>3</sup>Includes 16:1n-9, 20:1n-11, 20:1n-7, 22:1n-9 and 24:1n-9; <sup>4</sup>Includes 22:4n-6 and 22:5n-6; <sup>5</sup>Includes C16 PUFA. DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic Camelina; ECO, feed containing high-EPA oil from transgenic Camelina; FO, fish oil feed; LC- PUFA, long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids (sum of 20:4n-3, 20:5n-3 22:5n-3 and 22:6n-3). n.d., not detected; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.



970 **Table 2.** Details of primer used for qPCR or PCR analysis

Aim	Transcript	Primer sequence (5'→3')	Amplicon (bp)	Ta	Accession no
qPCR	<i>fads2</i>	F: GCAGGCGGAGAGCGACGGTCTGTTCC	72	60 °C	AY055749
		R: AGCAGGATGTGACCCAGGTGGAGGCAGAAG			
	<i>elovl4</i>	F: CGGTGGCAATCATCTTCC	79	60 °C	JX975701
		R: TCAACTGGCTGTCTGTGT			
	<i>elovl5</i>	F: CCTCCTGGTGTCTACAAT	112	60 °C	AY660879
		R: GTGAGTGTCTTGGCAGTA			
	<i>lpcat1</i>	F: CGTGATAGCCTTATCTGTCGTATGC	90	60 °C	JQ390612
		R: CCGTCTCTCTGCTCTCA			
	<i>fabp2</i>	F: CGAGCACATTCCGCACCAAAG	93	60 °C	AM957164
		R: CCCACGCACCCGAGACTTC			
	<i>hl</i>	F: TTGTAGAAGGTGAGGAAAACCTG	131	60 °C	EU254479
		R: GCTCTCCATCAGACCATCC			
	<i>lpl</i>	F: CGTTGCCAAGTTTGTGACCTG	192	60 °C	AY495672
		R: AGGGTGTTCTGGTTGTCTGC			
	<i>cpt1a</i>	F: GTGCCTTCGTTTCGTTCCATGATC	82	60 °C	JQ308822
		R: TGATGCTTATCTGCTGCCTGTTTG			
	<i>cpt1b</i>	F: CCACCAGCCAGACTCCACAG	78	60 °C	DQ866821
		R: CACCACCAGCACCCACATATTTAG			
	<i>srebp1</i>	F: AGGGCTGACCACAACGTCTCCTCTCC	77	60 °C	JQ277709
		R: GCTGTACGTGGGATGTGATGGTTTGGG			
	<i>ppara</i>	F: TCTCTTCAGCCACCATCCC	116	60 °C	AY590299
		R: ATCCCAGCGTGTCGTCTCC			
	<i>pparg</i>	F: CGCCGTGGACCTGTCAGAGC	103	60 °C	AY590304
		R: GGAATGGATGGAGGAGGAGGAGATGG			
	<i>casp3</i>	F: CCAGTCAGTCGAGCAGATGA	113	60 °C	EU722334
		R: GAACACACCCTCGTCTCCAT			
	<i>pcna</i>	F: GATGTGGAGCAGCTGGGTAT	205	60 °C	FG263675
		R: TGTCTACGTTGCTGGTCTGG			
	<i>il8</i>	F: CAGCAGAGTCTTCATCGTCACTATTG	66	60 °C	JX976619
		R: AGGCTCGCTTCACTGATGG			
	<i>actb</i>	F: TCCTGCGGAATCCATGAGA	50	60 °C	X89920
		R: GACGTGCGCACTTCATGATGCT			
	<i>ef1a</i>	F: ACGTGTCCGTCAAGGAAATC	109	60 °C	AF184170
		R: GGGTGGTTTCAGGATGATGAC			
PCR	<i>nptII</i>	F: CTCACCTTGCTCCTGCCGAGA	215	60 °C	KJ081792.1
		R: CGCCTTGAGCCTGGCGAACAG			
	<i>cytb</i>	F: CCGCTTCTTTGCCTTCCATT	219	57 °C	NC_024236.1
		R: AGATTAGGGGCGAATAGGGC			

971 *fads2*, fatty acid desaturase 2; *elovl4*, fatty acid elongase 4; *elovl5*, fatty acid elongase 5; *lpcat1*,  
972 lysophosphatidylcholine acyltransferase 1; *fabp2*, fatty acid binding protein 2; *hl*, hepatic lipase; *lpl*,  
973 lipoprotein lipase; *cpt1a*, carnitine palmitoyltransferase 1A, liver isoform; *cpt1b*, Carnitine  
974 palmitoyltransferase 1b, muscle isoform; *srebp1*; sterol regulatory element binding protein 1; *ppara*,  
975 peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor  $\alpha$ ; *pparg*, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor  $\gamma$ ;  
976 *casp3*, caspase 3; *pcna*, proliferating cell nuclear antigen; *il8*, interleukin 8; *actb*,  $\beta$ -actin; *ef1a*,  
977 elongation factor 1; *nptII*, neomycin phosphotransferase II; *cytb*, cytochrome b

978

979 **Table 3.** Growth performance, survival, feed utilization and basic and whole body proximate  
980 composition (% dry weight) of gilthead sea bream after 11 weeks of feeding the experimental  
981 diets

982

	FO			WCO			ECO			DCO		
Initial weight (g)	55.4	±	6.5	55.8	±	6.5	55.0	±	7.2	56.0	±	6.1
Final weight (g)	129.9	±	10.8 <sup>a</sup>	123.2	±	15.5 <sup>ab</sup>	117.3	±	13.6 <sup>b</sup>	126.9	±	20.0 <sup>a</sup>
Final length (cm)	18.3	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	18.0	±	0.7 <sup>ab</sup>	17.8	±	0.6 <sup>b</sup>	18.3	±	0.9 <sup>a</sup>
Weight gain (g)	74.5	±	2.3	73.5	±	9.7	62.2	±	2.6	71.1	±	4.1
HSI	1.4	±	0.3	1.6	±	0.3	1.4	±	0.2	1.5	±	0.2
VSI	8.0	±	1.4	8.0	±	1.0	7.8	±	0.5	7.9	±	1.0
FI (g/tank)	3482.1	±	215.5 <sup>a</sup>	3108.1	±	88.9 <sup>ab</sup>	2898.1	±	130.3 <sup>b</sup>	3465.9	±	127.9 <sup>a</sup>
FCR	1.3	±	0.1	1.2	±	0.2	1.3	±	0.1	1.4	±	0.1
SGR	1.0	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.0	±	0.2 <sup>ab</sup>	0.9	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	1.0	±	0.2 <sup>ab</sup>
k	1.2	±	0.1	1.1	±	0.2	1.1	±	0.1	1.1	±	0.2
<i>Whole body composition (% dry wt.)</i>												
Crude protein	47.5	±	0.7	48.0	±	1.7	49.6	±	1.3	49.3	±	0.5
Crude lipid	35.7	±	2.0	38.4	±	1.6	38.5	±	1.2	37.3	±	0.3
Ash	9.8	±	0.9	9.8	±	0.6	9.8	±	0.5	9.9	±	0.2

983  
984 Data are means ± SD (n = 3). DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic  
985 Camelina; ECO, feed containing high-EPA oil from transgenic Camelina; FI, feed intake;  
986 FO, fish oil feed; HSI, hepatosomatic index; k, condition factor. SGR, specific growth rate;  
987 VSI, viscerosomatic index; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.

988

989

**Table 4.** Apparent digestibility coefficient (ADC) of lipid and fatty acids in gilthead sea bream fed the four experimental diets differing in oil source

	FO		WCO		ECO		DCO		
Lipid ADC	83.8	± 4.1	81.2	± 6.3	80.5	± 8.0	85.8	± 5.2	
14:0	88.8	± 3.4	80.2	± 10.3	84.0	± 8.5	87.1	± 6.1	
15:0	99.0	± 0.2	97.7	± 0.9	97.5	± 1.1	98.2	± 0.6	
16:0	83.3	± 4.0	78.5	± 8.0	78.5	± 8.8	83.4	± 5.1	
18:0	78.9	± 3.9	75.8	± 5.7	77.3	± 0.2	78.5	± 4.9	
<b>Total saturated<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>87.4</b>	<b>± 1.3<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>86.5</b>	<b>± 1.4<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>± 0.4<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>± 0.5<sup>b</sup></b>	
16:1n-7	89.4	± 4.8	83.3	± 5.0	90.2	± 0.2	90.8	± 1.4	
18:1n-9	81.8	± 8.3	82.9	± 9.1	86.9	± 8.1	84.7	± 8.6	
18:1n-7	86.2	± 5.8	84.7	± 6.7	86.2	± 7.4	88.9	± 6.1	
20:1n-9	89.6	± 4.0	89.8	± 3.9	88.6	± 6.3	92.7	± 3.1	
20:1n-7	87.4	± 3.7	86.2	± 4.6	89.0	± 1.4	89.5	± 3.4	
22:1n-11	93.2	± 1.6 <sup>a</sup>	87.2	± 4.5 <sup>b</sup>	88.8	± 1.5 <sup>ab</sup>	92.3	± 0.1 <sup>b</sup>	
22:1n-9	78.3	± 7.9	83.1	± 5.0	84.0	± 2.7	84.7	± 4.8	
<b>Total monoenes<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>83.4</b>	<b>± 1.2<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>87.9</b>	<b>± 3.5<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>± 0.5<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>91.9</b>	<b>± 1.0<sup>a</sup></b>	
18:2n-6	90.6	± 2.9 <sup>b</sup>	92.6	± 2.3 <sup>ab</sup>	95.0	± 0.1 <sup>ab</sup>	95.8	± 0.6	
20:2n-6	88.8	± 3.1	89.5	± 4.3	93.2	± 0.7	92.6	± 1.4	
20:4n-6	97.4	± 0.1	92.9	± 1.2	96.1	± 2.3	95.6	± 1.5	
<b>Total n-6 PUFA<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>± 2.3<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>± 0.7<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>95.1</b>	<b>± 0.1<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>96.1</b>	<b>± 0.5<sup>a</sup></b>	
18:3n-3	92.7	± 2.0 <sup>b</sup>	95.0	± 1.8 <sup>ab</sup>	96.4	± 0.3 <sup>a</sup>	97.1	± 0.4 <sup>a</sup>	
18:4n-3	97.6	± 0.4 <sup>a</sup>	92.9	± 2.0 <sup>b</sup>	97.5	± 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	98.1	± 0.3 <sup>a</sup>	
20:3n-3	96.0	± 4.0	90.8	± 3.5	94.4	± 0.1	95.4	± 0.5	
20:4n-3	95.2	± 1.1 <sup>a</sup>	82.2	± 5.1 <sup>b</sup>	97.1	± 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	96.9	± 1.3	
20:5n-3	98.2	± 0.3 <sup>a</sup>	95.5	± 0.9 <sup>b</sup>	97.3	± 0.0 <sup>ab</sup>	98.0	± 1.7	
22:5n-3	93.4	± 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	80.4	± 2.2 <sup>b</sup>	87.8	± 4.1 <sup>ab</sup>	92.2	± 1.8	
22:6n-3	96.8	± 1.2 <sup>a</sup>	93.6	± 1.2 <sup>b</sup>	93.6	± 1.8 <sup>b</sup>	96.6	± 1.9	
<b>Total n-3 PUFA</b>	<b>97.4</b>	<b>± 0.4<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>± 1.9<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>± 0.3<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>97.1</b>	<b>± 1.3<sup>ab</sup></b>	
<b>Total PUFA<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>± 0.7<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>93.0</b>	<b>± 2.3<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>95.9</b>	<b>± 0.2<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>96.7</b>	<b>± 0.4<sup>a</sup></b>	

Data expressed as means ± SD (n = 3). Different superscript letters within a row denote significant differences among diets. Statistical differences were determined by one-way ANOVA with Tukey's comparison test (p < 0.05). <sup>1</sup>Includes 22:0 and 24:0; <sup>2</sup>Includes 16:1n-9 and 24:1n-9; <sup>3</sup>Includes 22:4n-6 and 22:5n-6; <sup>4</sup>Includes C<sub>16</sub> PUFA. DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic Camelina; ECO, feed containing oil from transgenic Camelina; FO, fish oil feed; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.

**Table 5.** Total lipid content (percentage of wet weight) and total lipid fatty acid composition (mole percentage) of muscle (flesh) of sea bream after feeding the experimental diets for 11 weeks.

	FO			WCO			ECO			DCO		
Lipid content (%)	4.5	±	0.6	3.6	±	0.6	2.9	±	0.6	3.5	±	0.5
<u>Fatty acid composition</u>												
14:0	4.6	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	3.0	±	1.3 <sup>ab</sup>	2.4	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	2.2	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
16:0	19.6	±	0.3	17.4	±	2.5	16.5	±	0.2	16.6	±	0.3
18:0	4.3	±	0.2 <sup>ab</sup>	4.1	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	4.6	±	0.2 <sup>ab</sup>	4.8	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>
20:0	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.4	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.7	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.6	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Total saturated<sup>1</sup></b>	29.3	±	0.3	25.2	±	3.9	24.7	±	0.3	24.7	±	0.4
16:1n-7	6.8	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	4.4	±	2.1 <sup>ab</sup>	3.3	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>	3.2	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>
18:1n-9	19.9	±	0.6 <sup>a</sup>	20.2	±	0.7 <sup>a</sup>	17.1	±	0.8 <sup>b</sup>	17.7	±	0.4 <sup>b</sup>
18:1n-7	3.4	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	2.5	±	0.7 <sup>ab</sup>	2.5	±	0.0 <sup>ab</sup>	2.4	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
20:1n-11	0.3	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>
20:1n-9	1.4	±	0.0	4.2	±	2.4	3.2	±	0.1	3.4	±	0.1
20:1n-7	0.2	±	0.0	0.2	±	0.0	0.3	±	0.0	0.2	±	0.0
22:1n-11	1.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	1.0	±	0.3 <sup>ab</sup>	0.9	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.9	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>
22:1n-9	0.4	±	0.0	1.0	±	0.5	0.7	±	0.0	0.7	±	0.0
<b>Total monounsaturated<sup>2</sup></b>	34.9	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	35.0	±	1.1 <sup>a</sup>	29.2	±	1.1 <sup>b</sup>	30.0	±	0.7 <sup>b</sup>
18:2n-6	6.6	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	11.1	±	4.1 <sup>a</sup>	14.6	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	13.6	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>
18:3n-6	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.6	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	1.8	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>
20:2n-6	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.8	±	0.1 <sup>ab</sup>	1.0	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.6	±	0.0 <sup>ab</sup>
20:3n-6	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.3	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.9	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.0	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>
20:4n-6	0.9	±	0.0 <sup>bc</sup>	0.6	±	0.3 <sup>c</sup>	1.7	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	1.3	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
22:4n-6	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>bc</sup>	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total n-6 PUFA<sup>3</sup></b>	8.5	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	13.2	±	4.3 <sup>ab</sup>	19.2	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	18.7	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>
18:3n-3	1.2	±	0.0 <sup>d</sup>	12.1	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	4.6	±	0.2 <sup>c</sup>	5.8	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
18:4n-3	1.1	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.6	±	0.0 <sup>d</sup>	0.7	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	1.7	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>
20:3n-3	0.1	±	0.0	0.6	±	0.5	0.5	±	0.0	0.4	±	0.0
20:4n-3	0.7	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.6	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	1.4	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	1.5	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>
20:5n-3	8.0	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	4.5	±	3.1 <sup>c</sup>	7.8	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>	5.7	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
22:5n-3	2.9	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.3	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	2.9	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	2.2	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
22:6n-3	10.8	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	7.4	±	0.9 <sup>c</sup>	8.3	±	0.9 <sup>bc</sup>	9.7	±	0.6 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Total n-3 PUFA</b>	25.2	±	0.3	25.6	±	1.4	26.3	±	1.2	26.1	±	0.5
<b>Total PUFA<sup>4</sup></b>	35.8	±	0.6 <sup>c</sup>	39.8	±	4.1 <sup>bc</sup>	46.1	±	1.3 <sup>a</sup>	45.3	±	0.5 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>EPA+DHA</b>	18.8	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	12.0	±	3.2 <sup>b</sup>	16.1	±	1.2 <sup>ab</sup>	14.4	±	0.5 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>EPA/DHA</b>	0.7	±	0.0	0.6	±	0.4	0.9	±	0.1	0.5	±	0.0
<b>EPA+DPA+DHA</b>	21.7	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	13.3	±	3.3 <sup>b</sup>	19.0	±	1.3 <sup>a</sup>	16.6	±	0.6 <sup>ab</sup>

Data are expressed as means ± SD (n=3).<sup>1</sup>Includes 15:0, 22:0 and 24:0.<sup>2</sup>Includes 16:1n-9 and 24:1n-9.<sup>3</sup>Includes 22:5n-6; <sup>4</sup>Includes C<sub>16</sub> PUFA; DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic Camelina; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid (22:6n-3); DPA, docosapentaenoic acid (22:5n-3); ECO, feed containing high-EPA oil from transgenic Camelina; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid (20:5n-3); FO, fish oil feed; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.

**Table 6.** Total lipid content (percentage of wet weight) and fatty acid compositions (mole percentage) of total lipid of liver and gills of sea bream

	FO			WCO			ECO			DCO		
<i>Liver</i>												
Lipid content	7.6	±	1.6 <sup>b</sup>	10.4	±	1.6 <sup>a</sup>	8.8	±	0.1 <sup>ab</sup>	8.6	±	0.6 <sup>ab</sup>
<u>Fatty acid composition</u>												
16:0	20.8	±	0.4 <sup>a</sup>	18.1	±	1.3 <sup>b</sup>	16.7	±	0.9 <sup>b</sup>	18.1	±	1.3 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total saturated<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>31.7</b>	±	<b>0.7<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>26.5</b>	±	<b>1.8<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>25.9</b>	±	<b>1.5<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>27.7</b>	±	<b>1.8<sup>b</sup></b>
18:1n-9	21.2	±	1.0 <sup>ab</sup>	23.6	±	1.8 <sup>a</sup>	17.9	±	1.4 <sup>b</sup>	18.6	±	1.8 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total monounsaturated<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>35.1</b>	±	<b>1.7<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>37.3</b>	±	<b>2.4<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>29.2</b>	±	<b>1.9<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>30.2</b>	±	<b>2.4<sup>b</sup></b>
18:2n-6	4.6	±	0.7 <sup>c</sup>	10.9	±	0.7 <sup>b</sup>	13.6	±	0.6 <sup>a</sup>	12.0	±	0.7 <sup>ab</sup>
20:4n-6	1.3	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.6	±	0.2 <sup>c</sup>	2.2	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>	1.7	±	0.2 <sup>ab</sup>
22:4n-6	0.1	±	0.1 <sup>bc</sup>	0.0	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Total n-6 PUFA<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>7.0</b>	±	<b>0.6<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>13.8</b>	±	<b>0.9<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>19.4</b>	±	<b>1.1<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>17.9</b>	±	<b>0.9<sup>a</sup></b>
18:3n-3	0.8	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	9.8	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	4.2	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	5.2	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>
20:5n-3	7.4	±	0.4 <sup>a</sup>	2.1	±	0.6 <sup>c</sup>	6.9	±	0.7 <sup>a</sup>	3.9	±	0.6 <sup>b</sup>
22:5n-3	2.9	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.9	±	0.2 <sup>c</sup>	3.2	±	0.4 <sup>a</sup>	1.9	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>
22:6n-3	11.8	±	1.4 <sup>a</sup>	6.5	±	1.7 <sup>b</sup>	7.9	±	0.7 <sup>b</sup>	9.2	±	1.7 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Total n-3 PUFA</b>	<b>24.7</b>	±	<b>1.7</b>	<b>22.2</b>	±	<b>3.3</b>	<b>25.1</b>	±	<b>2.4</b>	<b>23.9</b>	±	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Total PUFA<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>33.2</b>	±	<b>1.6<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>36.2</b>	±	<b>4.2<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>44.9</b>	±	<b>3.4<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>42.2</b>	±	<b>4.2<sup>ab</sup></b>
<b>EPA+DHA</b>	<b>19.1</b>	±	<b>1.8<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>8.6</b>	±	<b>2.3<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>14.7</b>	±	<b>1.4<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>13.2</b>	±	<b>2.3<sup>bc</sup></b>
<b>EPA/DHA</b>	<b>0.6</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.3</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>0.9</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.4</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>c</sup></b>
<b>EPA+DPA+DHA</b>	<b>22.1</b>	±	<b>1.9<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>9.5</b>	±	<b>2.5<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>17.9</b>	±	<b>1.8<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>15.1</b>	±	<b>2.5<sup>b</sup></b>
<i>Gills</i>												
Lipid content	10.5	±	1.5	9.9	±	1.7	12.1	±	1.0	11.7	±	1.5
<u>Fatty acid composition</u>												
16:0	19.0	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	15.6	±	0.6 <sup>b</sup>	15.6	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>	15.8	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total saturated<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>28.3</b>	±	<b>0.2<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>22.6</b>	±	<b>0.7<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>23.3</b>	±	<b>0.6<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>23.4</b>	±	<b>0.5<sup>b</sup></b>
18:1n-9	20.4	±	0.3 <sup>ab</sup>	21.8	±	0.9 <sup>a</sup>	18.7	±	0.7 <sup>b</sup>	19.7	±	0.6 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total monounsaturated<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>36.0</b>	±	<b>0.2<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>37.1</b>	±	<b>1.1<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>31.9</b>	±	<b>0.9<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>32.9</b>	±	<b>0.8<sup>b</sup></b>
18:2n-6	7.2	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	13.4	±	0.4 <sup>b</sup>	15.1	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	13.8	±	0.4 <sup>b</sup>
20:4n-6	0.9	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.4	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	1.5	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.1	±	0.0 <sup>ab</sup>
22:4n-6	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.0	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total n-6 PUFA<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>9.2</b>	±	<b>0.2<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>15.4</b>	±	<b>0.5<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>19.4</b>	±	<b>0.4<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>18.4</b>	±	<b>0.6<sup>a</sup></b>
18:3n-3	1.3	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	11.0	±	0.6 <sup>a</sup>	4.6	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	5.6	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>
20:5n-3	7.5	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	2.8	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	7.0	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>	4.5	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
22:5n-3	2.8	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.3	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	2.7	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	2.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>
22:6n-3	10.6	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	6.9	±	0.5 <sup>c</sup>	7.4	±	0.2 <sup>c</sup>	8.8	±	0.3 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total n-3 PUFA</b>	<b>24.4</b>	±	<b>0.3</b>	<b>24.2</b>	±	<b>1.2</b>	<b>24.7</b>	±	<b>1.1</b>	<b>24.7</b>	±	<b>0.2</b>
<b>Total PUFA<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>35.6</b>	±	<b>0.2<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>40.3</b>	±	<b>1.7<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>44.8</b>	±	<b>1.4<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>43.7</b>	±	<b>0.8<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>EPA+DHA</b>	<b>18.0</b>	±	<b>0.2<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>9.7</b>	±	<b>0.6<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>14.5</b>	±	<b>0.4<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>13.3</b>	±	<b>0.3<sup>c</sup></b>
<b>EPA/DHA</b>	<b>0.7</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.4</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>0.9</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.5</b>	±	<b>0.0<sup>c</sup></b>
<b>EPA+DPA+DHA</b>	<b>20.8</b>	±	<b>0.2<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>11.0</b>	±	<b>0.6<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>17.2</b>	±	<b>0.6<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>15.5</b>	±	<b>0.3<sup>c</sup></b>

Data are expressed as means ± SD (n=3).<sup>1</sup>Includes 15:0, 22:0 and 24:0.<sup>2</sup>Includes 16:1n-9 and 24:1n-9.<sup>3</sup>Includes 22:5n-6; <sup>4</sup>Includes C<sub>16</sub> PUFA; DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic Camelina; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid (22:6n-3); DPA, docosapentaenoic acid (22:5n-3); ECO, feed containing high-EPA oil from transgenic Camelina; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid (20:5n-3); FO, fish oil feed; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.

**Table 7.** Total lipid content (percentage of wet weight) and fatty acid compositions (mole percentage) of total lipid of anterior intestine and brain of sea bream

	FO			WCO			ECO			DCO		
<i>Anterior intestine</i>												
Lipid content	6.9	±	1.8	5.0	±	1.4	4.5	±	1.0	5.0	±	0.2
<u>Fatty acid composition</u>												
16:0	19.7	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	13.4	±	0.8 <sup>b</sup>	14.6	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>	15.0	±	0.8 <sup>b</sup>
Total saturated <sup>1</sup>	33.1	±	1.3 <sup>a</sup>	22.1	±	1.9 <sup>c</sup>	25.3	±	0.2 <sup>bc</sup>	27.1	±	1.5 <sup>b</sup>
18:1n-9	15.3	±	1.5 <sup>ab</sup>	17.8	±	1.3 <sup>a</sup>	14.5	±	0.5 <sup>ab</sup>	8.3	±	7.0 <sup>b</sup>
Total monounsaturated <sup>2</sup>	30.6	±	2.5 <sup>a</sup>	32.9	±	1.7 <sup>a</sup>	26.7	±	0.6 <sup>b</sup>	31.7	±	3.8 <sup>ab</sup>
18:2n-6	5.7	±	0.8 <sup>b</sup>	15.4	±	0.6 <sup>a</sup>	16.2	±	0.7 <sup>a</sup>	16.6	±	2.1 <sup>a</sup>
20:2n-6	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	1.3	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.2	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.8	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
20:3n-6	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	1.0	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	1.3	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>
20:4n-6	1.7	±	0.4 <sup>b</sup>	0.8	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>	3.0	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	2.9	±	0.7 <sup>a</sup>
22:4n-6	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.0	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.3	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Total n-6 PUFA <sup>3</sup>	8.4	±	0.4 <sup>c</sup>	18.0	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>	22.3	±	1.0 <sup>a</sup>	24.0	±	2.3 <sup>a</sup>
18:3n-3	0.9	±	0.2 <sup>c</sup>	13.9	±	1.7 <sup>a</sup>	5.1	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>	6.9	±	1.3 <sup>b</sup>
20:5n-3	8.1	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	2.6	±	0.3 <sup>d</sup>	7.0	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>	4.2	±	0.2 <sup>c</sup>
22:5n-3	2.3	±	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	1.0	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>	2.6	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>	1.7	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
22:6n-3	12.4	±	2.3 <sup>a</sup>	7.4	±	1.5 <sup>b</sup>	7.8	±	0.4 <sup>b</sup>	10.8	±	1.3 <sup>ab</sup>
Total n-3 PUFA	25.7	±	2.1	26.6	±	0.1	25.1	±	0.5	26.8	±	0.9
Total PUFA <sup>4</sup>	36.3	±	1.6 <sup>c</sup>	45.0	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>	47.9	±	0.4 <sup>ab</sup>	51.2	±	3.1 <sup>a</sup>
EPA+DHA	20.6	±	2.6 <sup>a</sup>	9.9	±	1.8 <sup>c</sup>	14.9	±	0.6 <sup>b</sup>	15.0	±	1.1 <sup>b</sup>
EPA/DHA	0.7	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.4	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.9	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.4	±	0.1 <sup>c</sup>
EPA+DPA+DHA	22.9	±	2.5 <sup>a</sup>	10.9	±	1.8 <sup>c</sup>	17.5	±	0.9 <sup>b</sup>	16.8	±	1.0 <sup>b</sup>
<i>Brain</i>												
Lipid content	9.6	±	0.2	9.6	±	0.7	8.9	±	1.0	8.1	±	0.2
<u>Fatty acid composition</u>												
16:0	19.1	±	0.6	19.3	±	0.1	18.9	±	0.8	18.6	±	1.3
Total saturated <sup>1</sup>	34.3	±	0.9	34.3	±	0.3	34.4	±	0.4	33.9	±	1.0
18:1n-9	21.4	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	21.3	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	20.4	±	0.6 <sup>ab</sup>	20.2	±	0.5 <sup>b</sup>
Total monounsaturated <sup>2</sup>	34.4	±	1.1	33.8	±	0.6	32.7	±	1.4	32.6	±	0.7
18:2n-6	2.0	±	0.8	2.8	±	0.5	3.1	±	0.6	3.5	±	0.6
20:2n-6	0.1	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
20:3n-6	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>d</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.3	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.4	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
20:4n-6	1.7	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	1.5	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	2.0	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	2.0	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>
22:4n-6	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>ab</sup>	0.1	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.2	±	0.0 <sup>ab</sup>
Total n-6 PUFA <sup>3</sup>	4.1	±	0.8 <sup>b</sup>	4.8	±	0.5 <sup>ab</sup>	5.9	±	0.7 <sup>a</sup>	6.5	±	0.7 <sup>a</sup>
18:3n-3	0.4	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	1.7	±	0.5 <sup>a</sup>	0.9	±	0.3 <sup>ab</sup>	1.3	±	0.3 <sup>ab</sup>
20:5n-3	4.6	±	0.3 <sup>a</sup>	3.6	±	0.2 <sup>b</sup>	4.3	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	3.7	±	0.1 <sup>b</sup>
22:5n-3	1.6	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.2	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	1.5	±	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.3	±	0.0 <sup>b</sup>
22:6n-3	20.0	±	0.9	20.0	±	0.5	19.8	±	0.7	20.1	±	0.8
Total n-3 PUFA	27.0	±	0.5	27.0	±	0.5	27.0	±	1.0	27.0	±	0.3
Total PUFA <sup>4</sup>	31.3	±	0.9	31.9	±	0.8	32.9	±	1.6	33.5	±	0.6
EPA+DHA	24.6	±	0.7	23.7	±	0.8	24.0	±	0.8	23.8	±	0.7
EPA/DHA	0.2	±	0.0	0.2	±	0.0	0.2	±	0.0	0.2	±	0.0
EPA+DPA+DHA	26.2	±	0.6	24.9	±	0.8	25.6	±	0.7	25.1	±	0.6

Data are expressed as means ± SD (n=3).<sup>1</sup>Includes 15:0, 22:0 and 24:0.<sup>2</sup>Includes 16:1n-9 and 24:1n-9.<sup>3</sup>Includes 22:5n-6; <sup>4</sup>Includes C<sub>16</sub> PUFA; DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic Camelina; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid (22:6n-3); DPA, docosapentaenoic acid (22:5n-3); ECO, feed containing high-EPA oil from transgenic Camelina; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid (20:5n-3); FO, fish oil feed; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.

**Table 8.** Mean scores for the lipid vacuolisation and peripancreatic fat infiltration in liver of gilthead sea bream fed the experimental diets for 11 weeks

	FO	WCO	ECO	DCO
Cytoplasmic lipid vacuolisation	$0.3 \pm 0.3^c$	$2.3 \pm 0.7^a$	$1.4 \pm 0.7^{ab}$	$0.8 \pm 0.4^{bc}$
Peripancreatic fat	$0.5 \pm 0.4$	$1.0 \pm 0.5$	$1.0 \pm 1.2$	$1.4 \pm 0.7$

Data are expressed as means  $\pm$  SD (n = 6). Scoring was on a scale from 0 to 3 as described in detail in the Methods section with 0 = not observed, 1 = few, 2 = medium, and 3 = severe. DCO, feed containing EPA+DHA oil from transgenic Camelina; ECO, feed containing high-EPA oil from transgenic Camelina; FO, fish oil feed; WCO, wild-type Camelina oil feed.




Figure 1



□ Liver   Δ Intestine   ▽ Muscle   ○ Head kidney   ◇ Gills   ◻ Brain  
 ■ FO   □ WCO   ■ ECO   ■ DCO




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5

1092