A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 14 March 2019.

Hieke AC, Hubert SM, Athrey G. 2019. Circadian disruption and divergent microbiota acquisition under extended photoperiod regimens in chicken. PeerJ 7:e6592 https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.6592

Circadian disruption and divergent microbiota acquisition under extended photoperiod regimens in chicken

Anne-Sophie Charlotte Hieke [1], **Shawna Marie Hubert** [1], **Giridhar Athrey** Corresp. [1, 2]

[1] Poultry Science, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, United States of America

[2] Faculty of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

Corresponding Author: Giridhar Athrey
Email address: giri.athrey@tamu.edu

The gut microbiota is crucial for metabolic homeostasis, immunity, growth and overall health, and it recognized that early-life microbiota acquisition is a pivotal event for later life health. Recent studies show that gut microbiota diversity and functional activity are synchronized with the host circadian rhythms in healthy individuals, and circadian disruption elicits dysbiosis in mammalian models. However, no studies have determined the associations between circadian disruption in early life, microbiota colonization, and the consequences for microbiota structure in birds.

Chickens, as a major source of protein around the world, are one of the most important agricultural species, and their gut and metabolic health are significant concerns. The poultry industry routinely employs extended photoperiods (>18 hours' light) as a management tool, and their impacts on the chicken circadian, its role in gut microbiota acquisition in early life, and consequences for later life microbiota structure remain unknown. In this study, the objectives were to a) characterize chicken circadian activity under two different light regimes (12/12 hours' Light/Dark and 23/1 hours Light/Dark), b) characterize gut microbiota acquisition and composition in the first four weeks of life, c) determine if gut microbiota oscillate in synchrony with the host circadian, and d) to determine if fecal microbiota is representative of cecal microbiota. Expression of clock genes (*clock*, *bmal1*, and *per2*) were assayed, and fecal and cecal microbiota was characterized using 16s rRNA amplicon analyses from birds raised under two photoperiod treatments.

Chickens raised under 12/12 LD photoperiods exhibited rhythmic clock gene activity, which was absent in birds raised under the extended (23/1 LD) photoperiod. This study is also the first to report differential microbiota acquisition under different photoperiod regimes. Gut microbiota members showed a similar oscillating pattern as the host, but this association was not as strong as found in mammals. Finally, the fecal microbiota was found to be not representative of cecal microbiota membership and structure. This is one of the first studies to demonstrate the use of photoperiods to modulate microbiota acquisition, and show its potential utility as a tool to promote the colonization of beneficial microorganisms.

Circadian disruption and divergent microbiota acquisition under extended photoperiod regimens in chicken

Authors

Anne-Sophie Charlotte Hieke[1], Shawna Marie Hubert[1], Giridhar N. Athrey[1,2]

Affiliations

[1]Poultry Science Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, U.S.A

[2]Faculty of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, U.S.A

Corresponding Author

Giridhar Athrey

giri.athrey@tamu.edu

PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27120v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 16 Aug 2018, publ: 16 Aug 2018

Abstract

The gut microbiota is crucial for metabolic homeostasis, immunity, growth and overall health, and it recognized that early-life microbiota acquisition is a pivotal event for later life health. Recent studies show that gut microbiota diversity and functional activity are synchronized with the host circadian rhythms in healthy individuals, and circadian disruption elicits dysbiosis in mammalian models. However, no studies have determined the associations between circadian disruption in early life, microbiota colonization, and the consequences for microbiota structure in birds.

Chickens, as a major source of protein around the world, are one of the most important agricultural species, and their gut and metabolic health are significant concerns. The poultry industry routinely employs extended photoperiods (>18 hours' light) as a management tool, and their impacts on the chicken circadian, its role in gut microbiota acquisition in early life, and consequences for later life microbiota structure remain unknown. In this study, the objectives were to a) characterize chicken circadian activity under two different light regimes (12/12 hours' Light/Dark and 23/1 hours Light/Dark), b) characterize gut microbiota acquisition and composition in the first four weeks of life, c) determine if gut microbiota oscillate in synchrony with the host circadian, and d) to determine if fecal microbiota is representative of cecal microbiota. Expression of clock genes (*clock*, *bmal1*, and *per2*) were assayed, and fecal and cecal microbiota was characterized using 16s rRNA amplicon analyses from birds raised under two photoperiod treatments.

Chickens raised under 12/12 LD photoperiods exhibited rhythmic clock gene activity, which was absent in birds raised under the extended (23/1 LD) photoperiod. This study is also the first to report differential microbiota acquisition under different photoperiod regimes. Gut

47 microbiota members showed a similar oscillating pattern as the host, but this association was not
48 as strong as found in mammals. Finally, the fecal microbiota was found to be not representative
49 of cecal microbiota membership and structure. This is one of the first studies to demonstrate the
50 use of photoperiods to modulate microbiota acquisition, and show its potential utility as a tool to
51 promote the colonization of beneficial microorganisms.

52

53 Keywords: Microbiota acquisition, circadian disruption, photoperiods, poultry, gut health, Cecal
54 microbiota, fecal microbiota

Introduction

Photoperiods and photo-intensity have played important roles in the success of domestic chickens as a globally important food source. Poultry products constitute a significant and growing proportion of global consumption (Henchion et al. 2014). Lighting has been one of the ubiquitious tools used to manage performance and welfare in broiler and layer production (Ernst et al. 1987; Morris 1967). The use of photoperiods to stimulate egg-laying is one of the most important transformations in the commercial poultry industry, and in addition to modulating reproductive behavior (Sharp et al. 1984), lighting has been of interest in reducing cannibalism, optimizing feed intake and activity levels in modern poultry environments (Ernst et al. 1987; Morris 1967). Blokhuis (1983) suggested that benefits of sleep in poultry are comparable to those in mammals, and several works have reported on the role of lighting for welfare (Kristensen 2008; Manser 1996; Martrenchar 1999) and production (Lewis & Morris 1999) in poultry. Whether photoperiods play the same role in modulating poultry health and homeostasis, as they do in mammals, remains unclear.

One of the key biological systems directly influenced by photoperiods is the circadian system, with a well-documented role in influencing health. For instance, circadian disruption is associated with a variety of metabolic, and immune disorders in mammals (Archer et al. 2014; Buxton et al. 2012; Fonken et al. 2010). In modern poultry rearing environments, extended photoperiods - ranging from 14 to 23 hours of light - are routinely used as a management practice (Olanrewaju et al. 2006). The impact of extended photoperiods has been addressed in poultry previously, but the existing literature has focused on balancing welfare and performance (Deep et al. 2012; Schwean-Lardner et al. 2012). As recent interest in the role of circadian disruption in human health has increased, we have learned about the multiple functional processes regulated by the circadian system. These studies point to the critical role that circadian function plays in metabolic, immune, and musculoskeletal health, with a high relevance for livestock species (Aoyama & Shibata 2017; Di Cara & King-Jones 2016; Ohta et al. 2006; Shimizu et al. 2016; Stothard et al. 2017). However, we do not know how extended photoperiods influence the circadian system and clock-controlled processes, such as gut microbiota acquisition, metabolic, and gut health in poultry. A better characterization of these interactions is necessary, as we attempt to make progress towards safe, secure and sustainable food for the future.

The circadian clock system is the central regulatory system that controls almost all aspects of an organism's behavior, physiology, and molecular function (Cassone 2015; Dawson et al. 2001). The circadian is an evolutionarily conserved, hierarchically organized system with a master clock and peripheral clocks (Bell-Pedersen et al. 2005). In birds, the master circadian clock is a tripartite system of pacemakers, including the pineal gland, the retinae, and the suprachiasmatic nucleus (SCN), which responds to environmental cycles and photoperiods (Cassone 2014; Cassone & Westneat 2012). Peripheral clocks are found in almost all cells in the body and are synchronized with the master clock, ensuring specific day-night molecular processes that anticipate environmental and behavioral changes (Albrecht 2012). At the molecular level, rhythmic expression of genes is controlled by a feedback loop that includes the positive elements (*clock* and *bmal1*), and the negative elements (*Period 2, Period 3, Cryptochrome 1 and Cryptochrome 2*) (Cassone 2014). It has been shown in songbirds and galliformes (including chicken) that the rhythmic production of the pineal hormone melatonin

entrains circadian rhythms. In mammals, the diurnal oscillations of circadian clock genes (*bmal1*, *clock*, *per2* etc.) and of clock-controlled genes (CCG) are an important indicator of health and homeostasis (Mukherji et al. 2013; Thaiss et al. 2014), whereas a disruption of normal circadian rhythms is associated with metabolic, and gut microbiota dysfunction (Miyazaki et al. 2011; Shimizu et al. 2016). In birds, photoperiods directly or indirectly entrain circadian rhythms, with each of the three components (SCN, retinae, pineal) interacting to maintain master and peripheral clock rhythms (Cassone 2014). As light can be perceived by both the pineal and retinal components of the avian clock, changes in light duration can render the avian circadian arrhythmic (Cassone et al. 2008).

Evidence from avian studies on photoperiods and lighting intensity has demonstrated negative consequences for welfare traits (Barbur et al. 2002; Prescott et al. 2003), as well as for eye development and function (Barbur et al. 2002; Kristensen 2008; Lauber et al. 1961; Nickla & Totonelly 2016). These studies indicate a mechanistic basis for circadian disruption under extended photoperiods. Although the organization of the circadian system in birds is slightly different, and more complex, compared to mammals (Bell-Pedersen et al. 2005; Cassone 2014), the functioning and downstream regulation at the molecular level are expected to be broadly similar to mammals (Bell-Pedersen et al. 2005). The expression of clock genes (*clock*, *bmal1* and *bmal2*) in the pineal gland of the chicken has been demonstrated previously (Kommedal et al. 2013; Nickla & Totonelly 2016; Okano et al. 2001), and while clock gene expression has been shown in peripheral tissues (Chong et al. 2003), the synchrony of peripheral rhythms with the master clock has not been characterized. In poultry species clock gene expression (*bmal1*, *per3*) in the pineal gland (Turkowska et al. 2014), and melatonin production (Kommedal et al. 2013) do not display under continuous dark or light conditions.

One common feature of most commercial production systems is the lighting regimens that newly hatched chicks are reared under. Both broiler and layer chicks are started at 20-23 hours of continuous light during the first few weeks of their life. While broilers are maintained at extended photoperiods for the entirety of their life (6-7 weeks), layer chicks follow a varying photoperiod regimen until sexual maturity. In both cases, chicks experience 20+ hours of continuous lighting for the first few weeks of life. This early-life period also overlaps with a crucial window for the acquisition of the gut microbiota, which in turn is linked with later life metabolic and immune homeostasis. It is being increasingly recognized that early life microbiota acquisition determines the later life microbiota structure and diversity.

In most vertebrates studied to date, including chicken, commensal microorganisms colonize the gastrointestinal tract (Pritchard 1972; Salanitro et al. 1974; Waite & Taylor 2014), and the membership of these communities have broad similarities across vertebrate species. In chicken, and birds in general, the crop, and the ceca are considered the most interesting foci in terms of their significance for host physiology or performance. Early studies such as Apajalahti et al (2004) showed that the chicken gastrointestinal tract is colonized rapidly in the first days of life. In terms of diversity and complexity, and the immune maturation it elicits, it has been shown that acquisition of new taxa continued up to and beyond day 19 (Crhanova et al. 2011). This data supports the view that the early life microbiota acquisition is crucial for the establishment of a stable microbiota in later life (Stanley et al. 2013). The diversity of microbiota, acquired early in life, has been shown to be critical for the regulation of immune and

metabolic health in vertebrates (Cox et al. 2014; Lee et al. 2013; Moloney et al. 2014; Subramanian et al. 2015; Thaiss et al. 2014) and also in chicken (Crhanova et al. 2011; Kogut 2013; Stanley et al. 2014). A resilient, healthy microbiota is crucial for health, whereas a dysbiotic microbiota may cause disease (Sommer et al. 2017).

Recent work has revealed the association of microbiota in homeostasis; in animals with a functional circadian, gut microbiota show rhythmic oscillations in synchrony with the host circadian clock (Thaiss et al. 2014). Since then, other studies have also reported on the circadian regulation of gut microbiota (Liang et al. 2015; Rosselot et al. 2016). However, no studies to date have characterized this relationship in birds. In domestic chicken, these associations take on special significance; the extended photoperiods used in poultry production systems likely disrupt normal circadian rhythms, and influence the normal acquisition of microbiota, and establishment of stable communities. Additionally, as the poultry industry transitions to antibiotic free production, there is an urgent need to identify economical solutions for promoting gut health. If gut microbiota structure and membership can be influenced by photoperiods in early life, this approach can become a potentially valuable, and economical approach to manage gut and metabolic health in poultry.

In this study, we investigated the relationship between extended photoperiods, host circadian oscillations and the gut microbiota acquisition under two photoperiod regimens. Additionally, this study also tracked the early life microbiota (cecal and fecal) in the first three weeks of life to determine if and when cecal microbiota communities diverge under different photoperiods. Finally, we compared fecal and cecal microbiota in the first three weeks (period of circadian entrainment, and microbiota establishment) to answer whether fecal microbiota are representative of early life cecal microbiota.

Materials and Methods

Animal Ethics Statement

All animal work was conducted in accordance with national and international guidelines for animal welfare. The animal trials were approved and monitored by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of Texas A&M University (Assurance Number 2016-0064).

Animals and Experimental Design

All birds used in the study were female Hy-Line Brown Layers (*Gallus gallus domesticus*). Eighty hatch day chicks were obtained from a local hatchery and transported to the Texas A&M Poultry Research and Education Center in College Station, Texas. Forty chicks were randomly assigned to one of two treatments, and then moved into one of two identical environmental chambers with independent lighting controls. Within each chamber, 20 chicks were placed into one of two brooder cages. Each environmental chamber was set to one of the photoperiod treatments - normal photoperiod (NP) of 12 h of light and 12 h of darkness (12/12 LD), with lights-on at 06:00 h, and extended photoperiod (EP) treatment of 23 h L and 1 h D (23/1 LD), with lights-off from 05:00-06:00 h. Following the convention from circadian studies, Zeitgeber Time 0 (ZT0) was defined as the time of lights-on (0600 hours). A total of 40 birds were raised under each photoperiod. Except for the photoperiod treatment, the experimental birds experienced identical conditions, and had *ad libitum* access to feed and water. Temperature

controlled experimental rooms were maintained at 32 ± 2°C for the first week and then decreased by ca. 2-3°C per week down to 23°C, following the producer's manual.

Sample Collection

For birds raised under each photoperiod, we monitored early life cecal and fecal microbiota for the first 19 days of life (entrainment period), followed by two days of circadian sampling (19-21 days old). To monitor the cecal microbiome during the entrainment period (Day 1-18), chicken were sacrificed every other day at ZT1 (12:00 h) starting on Day 4 (n=1 individual/treatment/day) and the cecal content was collected and stored as described below. In addition, two fecal samples were collected every day (Day 1-20) from both groups at ZT1. To ensure collection of fecal samples deposited close to ZT1, fecal trays were lined with clean lab bench paper, which was replaced after every sampling event, and only fresh fecal samples were collected. Fecal samples were transported to the laboratory on ice and stored at -80°C until further processing.

At the end of the entrainment period (19 days), two birds were randomly selected and euthanized at every 6 hour intervals to characterize circadian oscillations. Individual birds were euthanized by exposure to 5 minutes of CO_2 followed by cervical dislocation. Two birds from each photoperiod treatment were sampled this way every 6 h (2 individuals/treatment/time point) over a 48 h period, starting at ZT0. For collections in the dark period (NP), birds were taken in the dark using only an infrared lamp to avoid light exposure, and placed in a dark container which was used as the euthanasia chamber. Tissue samples (brain, ceca, cecal content) were collected within 30 minutes of euthanasia and immediately placed into RNALater (1:5 ratio). Both ceca were removed and the bottom tips were separated. Cecal content from each cecum was then gently squeezed into a sterile collection tube to obtain enough cecal content for downstream analyses. As birds from both treatments had to be sampled at exactly the same times, four personnel simultaneously performed identical steps from euthanasia to tissue collection, within 30 min post-mortem. Following the dissections, tissue samples were stored at 4°C for at least 24 h to ensure complete penetration of RNALater. Following the removal of RNALater, the samples were stored at -80°C. A total of 18 individual samples were collected (9 time points x 2 birds per time point) for each photoperiod treatment. These 18 samples per photoperiod treatment were used for microbiota community analyses.

DNA/RNA isolation and gene expression analyses

Brain and ceca tissue samples were homogenized in Trizol reagent (Invitrogen) using a hand-held Tissuemiser (Fisher Scientific) and total RNA was extracted according to the manufacturer's instructions. Tissue samples were collected for expression analysis from 2 individuals at each of 9 time points over a 48-hour period (6-hour intervals), for each photoperiod treatment. One hundred nanograms of total RNA were used to generate cDNA using the SuperScript VILO MasterMix RT-PCR kit (Invitrogen). RealTime PCR was performed using gene-specific primers (Integrated DNA Technologies) and PowerUp SYBR Green Master Mix (Applied Biosystems) on a 7900HT Fast Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems). PCR conditions were 50°C for 2 min, 95°C for 2 min, followed by 40 cycles of 95°C for 15 s and 57°C for 1 min.

Microbiota Analysis

DNA from cecal content and fecal samples was extracted using the MoBio PowerFecal kit according to the manufacturer's instructions. 20 ng of purified DNA were used for PCR amplification of bacterial 16S rRNA gene sequences, using Q5® High-Fidelity DNA polymerase (NEBNext® High-Fidelity 2X PCR Master Mix, New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA). We used a 15-cycle PCR to first amplify the 16s sequence (in triplicate) followed by 7-cycle PCR to add the Illumina barcodes. The V4 primer pair was specifically chosen to avoid amplification of eukaryotic 18S rRNA gene sequences (Hyb515F_rRNA: 5'-TCGTCGGCAGCGTCAGATGTGTATAAGAGACAGGTGYCAGCMGCCGCGGTA -3' , Hyb806R_rRNA: 3'-TAATCTWTGGGVHCATCAGGGACAGAGAATATGTGTAGAGGCTCGGGTGCTCTG-5') (Wang & Qian 2009). Barcoded amplicons were cleaned up using Ampure beads (Beckman Coulter, Indianapolis, USA). Library preparation and sequencing was performed in at the Genome Sequencing and Analysis Facility (GSAF, University of Texas, Austin, TX). Amplicons were sequenced in 2x250 bp paired-end mode on an Illumina MiSeq platform (Illumina, San Diego, CA). Reads were processed using the Mothur software, version 1.38, (Schloss 2009). Briefly, paired-end reads were joined using the make.contigs command. Sequences of incorrect length and with ambiguous base calls were removed using the screen.seqs command. The remaining sequences were aligned against the SILVA database (release 123) (Quast et al. 2013) using the NAST algorithm (DeSantis et al. 2006) and screened for homopolymers greater than eight bases. Chimeras were removed with UCHIME (Edgar et al. 2011) and sequences were classified against the SILVA taxonomy (Yilmaz et al. 2014) using the Bayesian classifier (Wang et al. 2007). Sequences that classified to Eukaryota, Archaea, chloroplast, mitochondria, or unknown were removed from the data set. Sequences were clustered into operational taxonomic units (OTUs) of 97% sequence similarity using the average neighbor algorithm (default). Rarefaction curves for the observed number of OTUs were generated in Mothur using 1,000 randomizations. Weighted and Unweighted Unifrac analyses were also performed using the Mothur software. α diversity and the impact of other variables (photoperiod, sample type and age) on community differences was analyzed and compared using the Phyloseq (version 1.14.0) (McMurdie & Holmes 2013) and vegan (version 2.4-2) (Oksanen et al. 2017) packages in the R software environment (R et al. 2012). Principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) and non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plots were created in R. Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) with linear model fitting (Anderson 2001; McArdle & Anderson 2001) using the "Adonis" function in the vegan package was performed to test how well the groupings, based on the metadata factors, accounted for the variation between the samples. Statistical tests of α and β diversity (PERMANOVA, metastats, LEfSe) between the two photoperiods were based on 18 replicates per treatment. All other statistical tests were performed in R.

Analysis of circadian oscillations

Gene expression values and microbial abundance data were both analyzed for rhythmic oscillations using the JTK_cycle test (Hughes et al. 2010). JTK_Cycle is a program that performs the Jonckheere-Terpstra-Kendall nonparametric test for detecting patterns and ordering across independent groups. In this context, the program tests for rhythmic changes in the length of circadian period (the amount of time between a recurring event), and the phase (the time of peak activity). The implementation of Kendalls' Tau is known to reduce the impact of outliers, and

hence provides a more robust detection of periods and phases. Furthermore, this program has been shown to be less prone to false positives compared to other commonly used tests for circadian rhythms (Hughes et al. 2010). For the analysis of rhythmic oscillations and their amplitudes we used a window of 24-36 hours for the detection of circadian periodicity and phase. Bonferroni-adjusted *P*-values < 0.05 were considered significant. The dataset for circadian analysis (both gene expression and microbiota) was comprised of 18 samples for each photoperiod (9 time points x two birds per time point).

Results

Absence of circadian rhythms under extended photoperiods

Circadian oscillations, and their corresponding period and phase, were analyzed using the gene expression data for three clock genes (*clock, bmal1, per2*) from the time-series experiment. JTK_Cycle analyses showed that all three assayed genes oscillated with significant 24-hour rhythms in the brains of chicks entrained to the normal photoperiod (12/12 hours Light/Dark), whereas such rhythms were absent in the brains of the chicks entrained to the extended photoperiod (23/1 hours Light/Dark) (Figure 1). *Clock* and *bmal1* gene expression peaked towards the beginning of the scotophase, and was at its lowest expression towards the start of the photophase. *Per2* mRNA levels peaked at the end of the scotophase, and were lowest towards the end of the photophase. In contrast, gene expression levels in chick brains exposed to the extended photoperiod did not show distinct oscillation patterns. *Clock* and *per2* mRNA levels did not oscillate at all and *bmal1* mRNA levels were lowest during the 1-hour scotophase. These results show that chicken raised under a NP treatment have a functioning circadian rhythm, whereas chicken raised under EP treatment do not have a discernible circadian rhythm.

Clock gene (*clock, bmal1, per2*) expression levels in the ceca followed the same pattern as the brain, but with a slight delay in phase (Figure 1). These results indicate that the peripheral clock in the ceca is synchronized with the central clock and also oscillates in a 24-hour rhythm under the 12/12LD photoperiod even under *ad libitum* feeding conditions, but not in the extended photoperiod treatment.

Different photoperiods promote differential microbiota membership and structure

Amplicon sequencing resulted in 495,572 sequences, of which 442, 177 sequences were retained after quality filtering (wrong length and ambiguous base calls). Sequence counts per sample averaged 13,614-paired reads. Following the analysis of microbiota using the Mothur pipeline, a total of 843 operational taxonomic units (OTUs) were observed in the entire data set. The 843 OTUs were classified into 19 phyla, 89 families, and 118 genera. Among these, 595 OTUs were classified into 14 phyla, 58 families, and 94 genera in the NP treatment. In the extended photoperiod (EP) treatment, we observed 646 OTUs that were classified into 18 phyla, 75 families, and 100 genera. However, as singletons and low abundance OTUs can inflate measures of diversity, and bias community analysis (Kunin et al. 2010; Schloss et al. 2011; Zhan et al. 2014) singletons and low abundance OTUs were filtered out. The total dataset was filtered at two thresholds recommended in the Phyloseq manual – namely 10^{-5} (0.01%) and a more stringent, 10^{-3} (1%) threshold, based on the mean abundance across samples. We considered these filtered data thresholds to be more biologically relevant, especially from the point of detecting taxa that oscillate rhythmically across time points. For taxa occurring at very low

abundance, it may be difficult to distinguish presence-absence resulting from low biological occurrence, versus an oscillating pattern generated due to circadian rhythmicity in microbial abundance. Our inferences and discussion are based on the 0.01% threshold, but we report 1% threshold data for comparison.

Above the 0.01% threshold, 382 OTUs (45% of the original 843 OTUs) were retained that were classified into 10 phyla, 36 families, and 69 genera. At this abundance threshold, 14 and 11 OTUs were found exclusively in the NP and EP treatments respectively. A list of these OTUs can be found in the supplementary data (Supplemental Table 1). At the 1% threshold, a total of 190 OTUs (23% of the original 843 OTUs) were retained that were classified into 7 phyla, 20 families, and 43 genera. For the NP treatment, the dominant phylum was *Firmicutes* (94.2%), followed by *Tenericutes* (1.3%), *Actinobacteria* (0.65%), and *Proteobacteria* (0.14%). For the extended photoperiod, the dominant phylum was also *Firmicutes* (90.89%), followed by *Bacteroidetes* (2.92%), *Tenericutes* (1.19%), *Actinobacteria* (0.63%), and *Proteobacteria* (0.15%). At the genus level (>1%), the normal photoperiod was dominated by *Faecalibacterium* (24.5%), followed by *Lachnoclostridium* (8.9%), *Ruminococcaceae*_UCG-014 (7.1%), *Anaerotruncus* (4.1%), and *Lactobacillus* (3.7%). The EP treatment was also dominated by *Faecalibacterium* (31.3%), followed by *Ruminococcaceae*_UCG-014 (8.1%), *Lachnoclostridium* (7.8%), *Anaerotruncus* (4.0%), and *Alistipes* (2.9%). Stacked bar plots depicting all the classified genera above 1% relative abundance for both the NP and EP treatments are shown in Figure 2. Considering only the OTUs with a relative abundance above 1% across all the samples, the two photoperiods shared 129 OTUs (80.1%) and 18 (11.2%) and 14 (8.7%) OTUs were unique to the normal and extended photoperiods respectively. A list of unique OTUs for each photoperiod is presented in Table 1.

Next, the OTU tables were used to estimate α and β diversity. All statistical analyses were performed using 18 replicates available for each photoperiod treatment taken during the circadian sampling (day 19-21). The PCoA plot showed that the two communities do not cluster completely independently of each other, and show some overlap (Figure 3), which is not entirely unexpected given the same tissue, age, and diet of the subjects. However, α diversity estimates using Mann-Whitney U-tests were significantly higher (Z-Score=-1.91, P=0.02) for the NP group across different estimators (Chao, Simpson, Inverse Simpson), showing that NP photoperiods supported a higher overall microbial diversity (Figure 4).

To compare the microbial community between treatments (β diversity), we used a permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA), parsimony (clustering within tree), as well as Weighted and Unweighted Unifrac analyses. The PERMANOVA analysis on the Bray-Curtis distances revealed that the cecal gut microbiota communities were significantly different for the two photoperiods (P=0.002). Similarly, β diversity between the NP and EP groups were found to be significantly different using the parsimony (P=0.034), unweighted UniFrac (P<0.001), as well as weighted UniFrac (P<0.001) approaches. The weighted and unweighted UniFrac analyses both show that membership and structure of the microbiota communities were different between the photoperiod treatments.

To investigate the directionality and extent of differences in microbiota between the two photoperiod treatments, differentially abundant taxa was investigated using the program Metastats, and the non-parametric Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) tool LEfSe. The latter

approach is used to detect biomarkers that differ between two or more phenotypes in a metagenomic context. The non-parametric approaches are considered more robust to violations of normality that is typical in smaller datasets. Metastats analysis showed that 62 taxa (16% of total) occurred at significantly different abundance (P<0.05) between the two light treatments. The LEfSe analysis showed that 33 total taxa were differentially enriched between the two treatments, of which 26 were enriched in NP and 7 were enriched in EP treatments respectively. The top enriched taxa by effect size (LDA score) were *Rikenellaceae* (*Alistipes*) in EP, and *Lachnospiraceae* in NP (Figure 5).

Rapid cecal microbiota divergence under different photoperiods

To understand how long after hatch and entrainment under different photoperiods the cecal microbiota communities diverge, median α diversity indices over the first three weeks were compared (Figure 2). This analysis utilized cecal samples collected every second day during the entrainment period (first 20 days), and divided them by week since hatch (weeks 1, 2, 3). Within each photoperiod treatment, the α diversity indices showed a linear increasing pattern, but there was weak correlation between the two populations (R^2=0.58, P=0.10). Overall, the EP group had lower median α diversity values compared to the NP treatment, but these differences were not statistically significant for the whole group. The non-parametric test Mann-Whitney U test, showed that α diversity values were statistically different in the second week (Z-score=-2.28, P=0.013), and in the third week (Z-score=-1.69, P=0.045). Median α diversity for the first week was compared using Chi-square goodness-of-fit test (due to lower replication), and was also significantly different (χ^2=52.61, df=1, P<0.001). Comparisons of β diversity using AMOVA and PERMANOVA were not significant, owing to the small sample sizes. However, Metastats analysis showed an increasing number of differentially abundant taxa with every passing week. There were five (1.3% of total), eighteen (4.7 of total), and twenty-three (6% of total) taxa found at significantly different abundances in Week 1, Week 2, and Week 3 respectively, between the two photoperiod treatments. In summary, microbiota structure appears to differentiate starting within the first few days of life under different photoperiods.

Cecal microbiota oscillations show concordance with host circadian rhythms

Abundance data for 382 OTUs were analyzed for circadian oscillations using JTK_cycle. For the NP treatment, five OTUs oscillated with a significant 24-hour rhythm, whereas one OTU oscillated with a 36-hour rhythm (P_{adj}<0.05) (Table 2). Except for the taxon oscillating on a 36-hour period, all other oscillating OTU's had a low phase shift (0-12 hour), indicating that abundance of these taxa follows the host rhythms closely. On the other hand, six OTUs were found to oscillate rhythmically in the EP treatment. Three of these were on 24-hour rhythm, whereas three were in a 36-hour rhythm (P_{adj}<0.05) (Table 3). However, all the oscillating OTUs in the EP treatment showed prolonged phase-shifts, ranging from 15-33 hours.

Overall, the results showed that a small fraction of the total cecal microbiota oscillate with a significant rhythm in either photoperiod treatment, and fewer still oscillated with a 24-hour rhythm. When taxa with significant 24-hour rhythms were found, they were almost exclusively in the normal photoperiod treatment. The absence of 24 hour rhythms and protracted phase shifts observed in the extended photoperiods correspond with the host circadian gene expression, which showed a complete lack of 24-hour rhythms.

Fecal microbiota is not reflective of cecal microbiota

The large majority of OTUs found in the cecal and fecal samples belonged to the phylum *Firmicutes*, followed by *Bacteroidetes* (data not shown). These two phyla are commonly found in the cecal chicken microbiome (Oakley et al. 2014b). However, at the family level, there were distinct differences between cecal and fecal samples. The cecal samples (Day 4-20) were mainly composed of *Ruminococcaceae* (ca. 50-75%), followed by *Lachnospiraceae* (ca. 20-40%). On the other hand, the fecal samples (Day 16-20) were largely composed of *Lactobacillaceae* (ca. 10-75%), followed by *Ruminococcaceae* (ca. 50%)*, Clostridiaceae_1* (ca. 25-60%) and *Lachnospiraceae* (ca. 5-20%). The cecal samples from the entrainment period (days 4-18) group closely with the cecal samples, and show a temporal movement as chicks get older.

A Principal of Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) shows a clustering of the three different sample types (Figure 6), with overlap between the cecal flora as noted previously. The fecal microbiota is furthest removed from the two cecal populations, whereas the two cecal populations (CC = Day 19-20, EC = Day 4-18) start out further apart and converge with the passage of time (and chick age). The PERMANOVA results indicate that these three populations do not have the same centroid and are significantly different from each other ($P = 0.001$, 999 permutations). Weighted and unweighted UniFrac analyses also showed these communities to be significantly different ($P<0.001$).

Discussion

Expression of clock genes in the brain and ceca for the two photoperiods

Circadian gene expression oscillation patterns found in this study were in line with what has been previously reported about photoperiods and rhythmic oscillations in various vertebrates including chicken. Particularly, these results agree with Abraham (Abraham et al. 2003) and Turkowska (2014), both of which studied circadian gene expression in the brain of sparrows and chickens, respectively. This study confirms that chicks entrained to the normal photoperiod (12/12LD) have a functioning circadian rhythm in both the brain and the ceca, whereas chicks entrained to the extended photoperiod (23/1LD) do not show a functioning circadian rhythm in the brain or the ceca. In essence, the chicks entrained to the extended photoperiod could be said to be in a constant state of jetlag.

Different photoperiods promote different microbiota membership and structure

Various analysis of β diversity showed that the cecal microbiota differed significantly between the two photoperiods. Examining the unique genera more closely revealed that the chicks entrained to normal photoperiod possess genera that are typically associated with healthy guts, whereas the chicks entrained to the extended photoperiod possess genera that are typically found in diseased guts. The most abundant genus for both photoperiods was the *Faecalibacterium*, which belongs to the class *Clostridia* and the phylum *Firmicutes* and is considered a common gut microbe in chickens (Oakley et al. 2014a).

While the microbial communities acquired under the two photoperiods were found to be different according to the diversity metrices, the presence and enrichment of specific taxa under each treatment is perhaps more biologically relevant and interesting. Analysis of differential enrichment showed a lopsided distribution of enriched taxa between the two treatments. The

genus *Alistipes*, which was only found in the extended photoperiod and belongs to the family *Rikenellaceae*, thrives on high-fat diets and grows especially well in the gut of people suffering from obesity (Clarke et al. 2013). Furthermore, it has been found in higher numbers in patients suffering from Irritable Bowel Syndrome (Saulnier et al. 2011) and children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (De Angelis et al. 2013). Two other enriched taxa (out of seven enriched in EP) were *Ruminiclostridium* and *Blautia.* The enrichment of *Blautia* spp (Family Lachnospiraceae) has been reported in patients with primary sclerosing choalangitis (PSC) (Torres et al. 2016), a chronic liver disease with links to inflammatory bowel disease. *Ruminiclostridium* (Family: Ruminococcaceae) has been found to be important in the metabolism of lignocellulosic biomass (Sheng et al. 2016), which is a component of plant-based protein and energy sources (corn, soy). The enrichment of this taxon suggests a functional shift to optimize energy utilization from plant-based feed.

On the other hand, taxa enriched in the NP treatments were also suggestive of differential emphasis on biological function of the taxa and associations to metabolic health. The family *Christensenellaceae*, which was found at a higher abundance in the GI tract of chicks entrained to NP, has been associated with a reduction in body weight and adiposity in mice. It has been found in higher numbers in the gut microbiome of people with a lower body mass index and has been shown to have a strong protective effect against visceral fat (Goodrich et al. 2014). *Eubacterium hallii*, a common gut microbe with an important role in maintaining intestinal metabolic balance, was also found at a higher abundance in the gut microbiome of birds entrained to the normal photoperiod compared to the extended photoperiod. This gut microbe is able to utilize glucose and the fermentation intermediates acetate and lactate. Lactate accumulation has been associated with malabsorption and intestinal diseases (Engels et al. 2016). Finally, three *Lactobacillus* members were found to be enriched in the NP treatment (LEfSe analysis). *Lactobacillus* spp are a well-studied group with various known benefits for metabolic and gut health, from antimicrobial activity (Schillinger & Lucke 1989; Silva et al. 1987), to their probiotic activity (Marco et al. 2017; Patten & Laws 2015). While the mechanisms for selective colonization of specific, beneficial microbes need to be further investigated and understood, our results provide a framework for relating normal circadian activity in early life to gut health.

The results show that cecal microbiota acquisition starts diverging (based on α diversity) as early as the first week in birds raised under different photoperiods. As these differences are observed when the only variable was photoperiod suggests that rhythmic physiological processes (as inferred from clock gene expression) may directly influence the colonization efficiency of different microorganisms. A secondary possibility is that the extended photoperiods affect feeding behaviors and patterns, which are also likely to directly influence the acquisition and colonization process. This study did not measure feed intake specifically, and resolving that association was beyond the scope of this study. Specifically, as poultry rearing systems all utilize *ad libitum* feeding, our intention was to assess only the effect of photoperiods on circadian. However, we did observe that birds in 12/12 LD did not entirely stop feeding during dark hours, and also that birds in 23/1 LD did not constantly feed during all hours. We also found that the final weights of birds raised in either photoperiod were not significantly different, which shows that the differences observed in microbiota composition was not due to differences in feeding behaviors. Overall, the differences observed in microbiota communities, and the clear observation of early and rapid differentiation of microbiota communities within the first week of

life emphasize the potential utility of using photoperiods to modulate gut microbiota structure and function.

Cecal microbiota oscillations

Cecal gut microbiota in the normal photoperiod oscillate in a 24-hour rhythm in synchrony with their host. On the other hand, cecal gut microbiota in the extended photoperiod do not oscillate in a 24-hour rhythm and are not in synchrony with their host. In addition, they exhibit greater phase shifts, further indicating the absence of rhythmic oscillations. While mammalian studies (Thaiss et al. 2014) have shown strong signals of gut microbiota oscillations in synchrony with the host circadian clock, this study did not show a comparable fraction of oscillating microbiota. Mouse studies have showed that these oscillations represent both compositional and functional differences of the microbiota (eg. Wu *et al*, 2018), and the same processes are likely in chicken. While some authors have used tools such as PICRUSt (Phylogenetic Investigation of Communities by Reconstruction), those inferences expected to improve with the quality of underlying microbial function database. At the moment, such databases are best representative of human and human-model organisms, and may not be accurate for chicken gut microbiota studies. Another option to infer the function of oscillating microbial taxa would be utilizing microbial transcriptome or metabolome data (eg. Thaiss et al 2014, 2016). We did not generate microbial transcriptome data in the current study, but the results from this study emphasize the validity and need for generating additional functional data in chicken models. While oscillations within treatments were observed, there was a general correspondence between host rhythms and microbiota oscillations. A relatively small number of OTUs, representing limited cumulative abundance, were found to be oscillating. One potential explanation for this pattern is that the birds used in our study were placed on *ad libitum* feed, whereas mammalian studies typically use time-restricted feeding. It has been shown that gut microbiota oscillations are responsive to the host circadian, as well as feeding times (Adamovich et al. 2014; Asher & Sassone-Corsi 2015; Hatori et al. 2012).

One of the potential caveats in this study is the lower replication of microbiota sampling, in comparison to mice studies which have previously reported on these phenomena. For example, Thaiss et al (2016; 2014) used 5-10 replicates per time point, compared to two replicates in this study. However, one major difference between mice and chicken studies is the suitability of fecal samples for gut microbiota studies. While the applicability of mouse data for human health has been discussed (Nguyen et al. 2015), mouse fecal pellets are an accepted and reliable source of information about gut microbiota. However, chicken fecal samples are not a reliable indicator of gastrointestinal tract microbial communities as reported previously (Stanley et al. 2015) and confirmed in this study. Taken together with the suitability of fecal samples, and the smaller space requirements, longitudinal and temporal studies with higher replication is less challenging in mouse models compared to chicken models. While our study provides initial evidence of the association between host microbiota and gut microbiota oscillations in chicken, further confirmation of mechanisms and functional outcomes will require additional data. Future studies would benefit from use of novel, non-invasive approaches to assay gut microbiota in chicken and other avian models.

Cecal versus fecal microbiota communities

This study showed that fecal and cecal microbiota communities are significantly different. Furthermore, it also found that these differences do not follow any discernible pattern during the acquisition period (first three weeks) or later. While overlap in the cecal and fecal communities was observed, and they are in broad agreement with the findings of Stanley et al (2015), and Oakley & Kogut (2016), this data shows that fecal samples are not a reliable indicator of divergence in gut microbiota colonization, membership, or structure. As the present study focused on the first four weeks, it is not clear how the findings apply to later life microbiota. Additional studies are required to investigate these patterns extending up to and beyond sexual maturity.

Conclusions

Here, we present the first report on avian circadian and related gut microbiota oscillations, comparing the consequences of normal versus extended photoperiod exposure. This study is also the first to describe differential microbiota acquisition under different photoperiod regimens in birds, or in any vertebrates to our knowledge. This study provides evidence for a framework linking photoperiod-driven circadian rhythms in early life to benefits for gut health. While this study provides the first evidence of these associations in early life, additional investigation of similar and variable photoperiod regimens and their influence on microbiota are required. Additionally, in-depth understanding of the mechanisms of selective microbiota colonization under photoperiods, their functional importance, and the later life benefits for the host is required to make this knowledge applicable for animal and human health. Finally, this study points to potential applications for the modulation of colonization by beneficial microbiota in livestock species, especially in the context of raising antibiotic free animals.

Acknowledgements

We thank Hoa Nguyen-Phuc, Ralf Singh-Bischofberger, and Rohit Rohra for assistance with experimental sampling. We also thank the Texas A&M University Poultry Research Center for logistical help in the performance of this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author contributions:

GA conceived and designed experiment, and assisted in performance of experiments. AH assisted in design of experiment, and performed experiments, sample collection, and processing. SP assisted with sample collection and processing, and with manuscript preparation. GA and AH worked together on data analysis, interpretation and preparation of manuscript**.**

References

Abraham U, Albrecht U, and Brandstatter R. 2003. Hypothalamic circadian organization in birds. II. Clock gene expression. *Chronobiology International* 20:657-+. 10.1081/Cbi-120022414

Adamovich Y, Rousso-Noori L, Zwighaft Z, Neufeld-Cohen A, Golik M, Kraut-Cohen J, Wang M, Han XL, and Asher G. 2014. Circadian Clocks and Feeding Time Regulate the Oscillations and Levels of Hepatic Triglycerides. *Cell Metabolism* 19:319-330. 10.1016/j.cmet.2013.12.016

Albrecht U. 2012. Timing to perfection: the biology of central and peripheral circadian clocks. *Neuron* 74:246-260. 10.1016/j.neuron.2012.04.006

Anderson MJ. 2001. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral Ecology* 26:32-46. DOI 10.1111/j.1442-9993.2001.01070.pp.x

Aoyama S, and Shibata S. 2017. The Role of Circadian Rhythms in Muscular and Osseous Physiology and Their Regulation by Nutrition and Exercise. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 11. ARTN 63
10.3389/fnins.2017.00063

Apajalahti J, Kettunen A, and Graham H. 2004. Characteristics of the gastrointestinal microbial communities, with special reference to the chicken. *Worlds Poultry Science Journal* 60:223-232. 10.1079/Wps200415

Archer SN, Laing EE, Moller-Levet CS, van der Veen DR, Bucca G, Lazar AS, Santhi N, Slak A, Kabiljo R, von Schantz M, Smith CP, and Dijk DJ. 2014. Mistimed sleep disrupts circadian regulation of the human transcriptome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 111:E682-691. 10.1073/pnas.1316335111

Asher G, and Sassone-Corsi P. 2015. Time for food: the intimate interplay between nutrition, metabolism, and the circadian clock. *Cell* 161:84-92. 10.1016/j.cell.2015.03.015

Barbur JL, Prescott NB, Douglas RH, Jarvis JR, and Wathes CM. 2002. A comparative study of stimulus-specific pupil responses in the domestic fowl (Gallus gallus domesticus) and the human. *Vision Research* 42:249-255. Pii S0042-6989(01)00279-6
Doi 10.1016/S0042-6989(01)00279-6

Bell-Pedersen D, Cassone VM, Earnest DJ, Golden SS, Hardin PE, Thomas TL, and Zoran MJ. 2005. Circadian rhythms from multiple oscillators: Lessons from diverse organisms. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 6:544-556. 10.1038/nrg1633

Blokhuis HJ. 1983. The Relevance of Sleep in Poultry. *Worlds Poultry Science Journal* 39:33-37. Doi 10.1079/Wps19830003

Buxton OM, Cain SW, O'Connor SP, Porter JH, Duffy JF, Wang W, Czeisler CA, and Shea SA. 2012. Adverse metabolic consequences in humans of prolonged sleep restriction combined with circadian disruption. *Sci Transl Med* 4:129ra143. 10.1126/scitranslmed.3003200

Cassone VM. 2014. Avian circadian organization: a chorus of clocks. *Front Neuroendocrinol* 35:76-88. 10.1016/j.yfrne.2013.10.002

Cassone VM. 2015. Avian Circadian Organization. In: Aguilar-Roblero R, Diaz-Munoz M, and Fanjul-Moles ML, eds. *Mechanisms of Circadian Systems in Animals and Their Clinical Relevance*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 69-96.

Cassone VM, Bartell PA, Earnest BJ, and Kumar V. 2008. Duration of melatonin regulates seasonal changes in song control nuclei of the house sparrow, Passer domesticus: independence from gonads and circadian entrainment. *J Biol Rhythms* 23:49-58. 10.1177/0748730407311110

Cassone VM, and Westneat DF. 2012. The bird of time: cognition and the avian biological clock. *Front Mol Neurosci* 5:32. 10.3389/fnmol.2012.00032

649 Chong NW, Chaurasia SS, Haque R, Klein DC, and Iuvone PM. 2003. Temporal-spatial
650 characterization of chicken clock genes: circadian expression in retina, pineal gland, and
651 peripheral tissues. *Journal of Neurochemistry* 85:851-860. 10.1046/j.1471-
652 4159.2003.01723.x
653 Clarke SF, Murphy EF, O'Sullivan O, Ross RP, O'Toole PW, Shanahan F, and Cotter PD. 2013.
654 Targeting the microbiota to address diet-induced obesity: a time dependent challenge.
655 *PLoS One* 8:e65790. 10.1371/journal.pone.0065790
656 Cox LM, Yamanishi S, Sohn J, Alekseyenko AV, Leung JM, Cho I, Kim SG, Li H, Gao Z,
657 Mahana D, Zarate Rodriguez JG, Rogers AB, Robine N, Loke P, and Blaser MJ. 2014.
658 Altering the intestinal microbiota during a critical developmental window has lasting
659 metabolic consequences. *Cell* 158:705-721. 10.1016/j.cell.2014.05.052
660 Crhanova M, Hradecka H, Faldynova M, Matulova M, Havlickova H, Sisak F, and Rychlik I.
661 2011. Immune response of chicken gut to natural colonization by gut microflora and to
662 Salmonella enterica serovar enteritidis infection. *Infect Immun* 79:2755-2763.
663 10.1128/IAI.01375-10
664 Dawson A, King VM, Bentley GE, and Ball GF. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in
665 birds. *Journal of Biological Rhythms* 16:365-380. Doi 10.1177/074873001129002079
666 De Angelis M, Piccolo M, Vannini L, Siragusa S, De Giacomo A, Serrazzanetti DI, Cristofori F,
667 Guerzoni ME, Gobbetti M, and Francavilla R. 2013. Fecal microbiota and metabolome of
668 children with autism and pervasive developmental disorder not otherwise specified. *PLoS*
669 *One* 8:e76993. 10.1371/journal.pone.0076993
670 Deep A, Schwean-Lardner K, Crowe TG, Fancher BI, and Classen HL. 2012. Effect of light
671 intensity on broiler behaviour and diurnal rhythms. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*
672 136:50-56. 10.1016/j.applanim.2011.11.002
673 DeSantis TZ, Jr., Hugenholtz P, Keller K, Brodie EL, Larsen N, Piceno YM, Phan R, and
674 Andersen GL. 2006. NAST: a multiple sequence alignment server for comparative
675 analysis of 16S rRNA genes. *Nucleic Acids Res* 34:W394-399. 10.1093/nar/gkl244
676 Di Cara F, and King-Jones K. 2016. The Circadian Clock Is a Key Driver of Steroid Hormone
677 Production in Drosophila. *Curr Biol* 26:2469-2477. 10.1016/j.cub.2016.07.004
678 Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C, and Knight R. 2011. UCHIME improves sensitivity
679 and speed of chimera detection. *Bioinformatics* 27:2194-2200.
680 10.1093/bioinformatics/btr381
681 Engels C, Ruscheweyh HJ, Beerenwinkel N, Lacroix C, and Schwab C. 2016. The Common Gut
682 Microbe Eubacterium hallii also Contributes to Intestinal Propionate Formation. *Front*
683 *Microbiol* 7:713. 10.3389/fmicb.2016.00713
684 Ernst RA, Millam JR, and Mather FB. 1987. Review of Life-History Lighting Programs for
685 Commercial Laying Fowls. *Worlds Poultry Science Journal* 43:45-55. Doi
686 10.1079/Wps19870005
687 Fonken LK, Workman JL, Walton JC, Weil ZM, Morris JS, Haim A, and Nelson RJ. 2010. Light
688 at night increases body mass by shifting the time of food intake. *Proceedings of the*
689 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 107:18664-18669.
690 10.1073/pnas.1008734107
691 Goodrich JK, Waters JL, Poole AC, Sutter JL, Koren O, Blekhman R, Beaumont M, Van
692 Treuren W, Knight R, Bell JT, Spector TD, Clark AG, and Ley RE. 2014. Human
693 genetics shape the gut microbiome. *Cell* 159:789-799. 10.1016/j.cell.2014.09.053

694 Hatori M, Vollmers C, Zarrinpar A, DiTacchio L, Bushong EA, Gill S, Leblanc M, Chaix A,
695 Joens M, Fitzpatrick JA, Ellisman MH, and Panda S. 2012. Time-restricted feeding
696 without reducing caloric intake prevents metabolic diseases in mice fed a high-fat diet.
697 *Cell Metab* 15:848-860. 10.1016/j.cmet.2012.04.019
698 Henchion M, McCarthy M, Resconi VC, and Troy D. 2014. Meat consumption: trends and
699 quality matters. *Meat Sci* 98:561-568. 10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.06.007
700 Hughes ME, Hogenesch JB, and Kornacker K. 2010. JTK_CYCLE: An Efficient Nonparametric
701 Algorithm for Detecting Rhythmic Components in Genome-Scale Data Sets. *Journal of*
702 *Biological Rhythms* 25:372-380. 10.1177/0748730410379711
703 Kogut MH. 2013. The gut microbiota and host innate immunity: Regulators of host metabolism
704 and metabolic diseases in poultry? *Journal of Applied Poultry Research* 22:637-646.
705 10.3382/japr.2013-00741
706 Kommedal S, Csernus V, and Nagy AD. 2013. The embryonic pineal gland of the chicken as a
707 model for experimental jet lag. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 188:226-231.
708 10.1016/j.ygcen.2013.04.006
709 Kristensen H. 2008. The effects of light intensity, gradual changes between light and dark and
710 definition of darkness for the behaviour and welfare of broiler chickens, laying hens,
711 pullets and turkeys. A Review for the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety.
712 Kunin V, Engelbrektson A, Ochman H, and Hugenholtz P. 2010. Wrinkles in the rare biosphere:
713 pyrosequencing errors can lead to artificial inflation of diversity estimates. *Environ*
714 *Microbiol* 12:118-123. 10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.02051.x
715 Lauber JK, Shutze JV, and Mcginnis J. 1961. Effects of Exposure to Continuous Light on Eye of
716 Growing Chick. *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine*
717 106:871-&.
718 Lee SM, Donaldson GP, Mikulski Z, Boyajian S, Ley K, and Mazmanian SK. 2013. Bacterial
719 colonization factors control specificity and stability of the gut microbiota. *Nature*
720 501:426-429. 10.1038/nature12447
721 Lewis PD, and Morris TR. 1999. Light intensity and performance of domestic pullets. *Worlds*
722 *Poultry Science Journal* 55:241-250. Doi 10.1079/Wps19990018
723 Liang X, Bushman FD, and FitzGerald GA. 2015. Rhythmicity of the intestinal microbiota is
724 regulated by gender and the host circadian clock. *Proceedings of the National Academy*
725 *of Sciences of the United States of America* 112:10479-10484. 10.1073/pnas.1501305112
726 Manser CE. 1996. Effects of Lighting on the Welfare of Domestic Poultry: A Review. *Animal*
727 *Welfare* 5:341-360.
728 Marco ML, Heeney D, Binda S, Cifelli CJ, Cotter PD, Foligne B, Ganzle M, Kort R, Pasin G,
729 Pihlanto A, Smid EJ, and Hutkins R. 2017. Health benefits of fermented foods:
730 microbiota and beyond. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* 44:94-102. 10.1016/j.copbio.2016.11.010
731 Martrenchar A. 1999. Animal welfare and intensive production of turkey broilers. *Worlds*
732 *Poultry Science Journal* 55:143-152. Doi 10.1079/Wps19990010
733 McArdle BH, and Anderson MJ. 2001. Fitting multivariate models to community data: A
734 comment on distance-based redundancy analysis. *Ecology* 82:290-297. Doi
735 10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082[0290:Fmmtcd]2.0.Co;2
736 McMurdie PJ, and Holmes S. 2013. phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive
737 Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. *Plos One* 8. ARTN e61217
738 10.1371/journal.pone.0061217

739 Miyazaki M, Schroder E, Edelmann SE, Hughes ME, Kornacker K, Balke CW, and Esser KA.
740 2011. Age-associated disruption of molecular clock expression in skeletal muscle of the
741 spontaneously hypertensive rat. *PLoS One* 6:e27168. 10.1371/journal.pone.0027168
742 Moloney RD, Desbonnet L, Clarke G, Dinan TG, and Cryan JF. 2014. The microbiome: stress,
743 health and disease. *Mammalian Genome* 25:49-74. 10.1007/s00335-013-9488-5
744 Morris TR. 1967. The effect of light intensity on growing and laying pullets. *Worlds Poult Sci J*
745 23:246-252.
746 Mukherji A, Kobiita A, Ye T, and Chambon P. 2013. Homeostasis in intestinal epithelium is
747 orchestrated by the circadian clock and microbiota cues transduced by TLRs. *Cell*
748 153:812-827. 10.1016/j.cell.2013.04.020
749 Nguyen TLA, Vieira-Silva S, Liston A, and Raes J. 2015. How informative is the mouse for
750 human gut microbiota research? *Disease Models & Mechanisms* 8:1-16. doi:
751 10.1242/dmm.017400
752 Nickla DL, and Totonelly K. 2016. Brief light exposure at night disrupts the circadian rhythms in
753 eye growth and choroidal thickness in chicks. *Experimental Eye Research* 146:189-195.
754 10.1016/j.exer.2016.03.003
755 Oakley BB, and Kogut MH. 2016. Spatial and Temporal Changes in the Broiler Chicken Cecal
756 and Fecal Microbiomes and Correlations of Bacterial Taxa with Cytokine Gene
757 Expression. *Fronteris in Veterinary Science* 3:12.
758 https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2016.00011
759 Oakley BB, Lillehoj HS, Kogut MH, Kim WK, Maurer JJ, Pedroso A, Lee MD, Collett SR,
760 Johnson TJ, and Cox NA. 2014a. The chicken gastrointestinal microbiome. *FEMS*
761 *Microbiol Lett* 360:100-112. 10.1111/1574-6968.12608
762 Oakley BB, Lillehoj HS, Kogut MH, Kim WK, Maurer JJ, Pedroso A, Lee MD, Collett SR,
763 Johnson TJ, and Cox NA. 2014b. The chicken gastrointestinal microbiome. *Fems*
764 *Microbiology Letters* 360:100-112. 10.1111/1574-6968.12608
765 Ohta H, Mitchell AC, and McMahon DG. 2006. Constant light disrupts the developing mouse
766 biological clock. *Pediatr Res* 60:304-308. 10.1203/01.pdr.0000233114.18403.66
767 Okano T, Yamamoto K, Okano K, Hirota T, Kasahara T, Sasaki M, Takanaka Y, and Fukada Y.
768 2001. Chicken pineal clock genes: implication of BMAL2 as a bidirectional regulator in
769 circadian clock oscillation. *Genes to Cells* 6:825-836. DOI 10.1046/j.1365-
770 2443.2001.00462.x
771 Oksanen JF, Blanchet G, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin PR, O'Hara
772 RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, and Wagner H. 2017. Vegan:
773 Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.4-2.
774 Olanrewaju HA, Thaxton JP, Dozier III WA, Purswell J, Roush WB, and Branton SL. 2006. A
775 Review of Lighting Programs for Broiler Production. *International Journal of Poultry*
776 *Science* 5:301-308.
777 Patten DA, and Laws AP. 2015. Lactobacillus-produced exopolysaccharides and their potential
778 health benefits: a review. *Benef Microbes* 6:457-471. 10.3920/BM2014.0117
779 Prescott NB, Wathes CM, and Jarvis JR. 2003. Light, vision and the welfare of poultry. *Animal*
780 *Welfare* 12:269-288.
781 Pritchard PJ. 1972. Digestion of Sugars in Crop. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology*
782 43:195-+. Doi 10.1016/0300-9629(72)90482-3

783 Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, Peplies J, and Glockner FO. 2013.
784 The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-
785 based tools. *Nucleic Acids Res* 41:D590-596. 10.1093/nar/gks1219
786 R, Core, and Team. 2012. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,
787 Austria.
788 Rosselot AE, Hong CI, and Moore SR. 2016. Rhythm and bugs: circadian clocks, gut microbiota,
789 and enteric infections. *Current Opinion in Gastroenterology* 32:7-11.
790 10.1097/Mog.0000000000000227
791 Salanitro JP, Fairchilds IG, and Zgornicki YD. 1974. Isolation, Culture Characteristics, and
792 Identification of Anaerobic Bacteria from Chicken Cecum. *Applied Microbiology* 27:678-
793 687.
794 Saulnier DM, Riehle K, Mistretta TA, Diaz MA, Mandal D, Raza S, Weidler EM, Qin X, Coarfa
795 C, Milosavljevic A, Petrosino JF, Highlander S, Gibbs R, Lynch SV, Shulman RJ, and
796 Versalovic J. 2011. Gastrointestinal microbiome signatures of pediatric patients with
797 irritable bowel syndrome. *Gastroenterology* 141:1782-1791.
798 10.1053/j.gastro.2011.06.072
799 Schillinger U, and Lucke FK. 1989. Antibacterial activity of Lactobacillus sake isolated from
800 meat. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 55:1901-1906.
801 Schloss PD. 2009. A high-throughput DNA sequence aligner for microbial ecology studies.
802 *PLoS One* 4:e8230. 10.1371/journal.pone.0008230
803 Schloss PD, Gevers D, and Westcott SL. 2011. Reducing the effects of PCR amplification and
804 sequencing artifacts on 16S rRNA-based studies. *PLoS One* 6:e27310.
805 10.1371/journal.pone.0027310
806 Schwean-Lardner K, Fancher BI, and Classen HL. 2012. Impact of daylength on behavioural
807 output in commercial broilers. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 137:43-52.
808 10.1016/j.applanim.2012.01.015
809 Sharp BL, Quicke FC, and Jansen EJ. 1984. Aspects of the Behavior of 5 Anopheline Species in
810 the Endemic Malaria Area of Natal. *Journal of the Entomological Society of Southern*
811 *Africa* 47:251-258.
812 Sheng T, Zhao L, Gao LF, Liu WZ, Cui MH, Guo ZC, Ma XD, Ho SH, and Wang AJ. 2016.
813 Lignocellulosic saccharification by a newly isolated bacterium, Ruminiclostridium
814 thermocellum M3 and cellular cellulase activities for high ratio of glucose to cellobiose.
815 *Biotechnol Biofuels* 9:172. 10.1186/s13068-016-0585-z
816 Shimizu I, Yoshida Y, and Minamino T. 2016. A role for circadian clock in metabolic disease.
817 *Hypertens Res* 39:483-491. 10.1038/hr.2016.12
818 Silva M, Jacobus NV, Deneke C, and Gorbach SL. 1987. Antimicrobial substance from a human
819 Lactobacillus strain. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 31:1231-1233.
820 Sommer F, Anderson JM, Bharti R, Raes J, and Rosenstiel P. 2017. The resilience of the
821 intestinal microbiota influences health and disease. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 15:630-638.
822 10.1038/nrmicro.2017.58
823 Stanley D, Geier MS, Chen H, Hughes RJ, and Moore RJ. 2015. Comparison of fecal and cecal
824 microbiotas reveals qualitative similarities but quantitative differences. *Bmc*
825 *Microbiology* 15. ARTN 51
826 10.1186/s12866-015-0388-6

827 Stanley D, Geier MS, Hughes RJ, Denman SE, and Moore RJ. 2013. Highly variable microbiota
828 development in the chicken gastrointestinal tract. *PLoS One* 8:e84290.
829 10.1371/journal.pone.0084290
830 Stanley D, Hughes RJ, and Moore RJ. 2014. Microbiota of the chicken gastrointestinal tract:
831 influence on health, productivity and disease. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*
832 98:4301-4310. 10.1007/s00253-014-5646-2
833 Stothard ER, McHill AW, Depner CM, Birks BR, Moehlman TM, Ritchie HK, Guzzetti JR,
834 Chinoy ED, LeBourgeois MK, Axelsson J, and Wright KP. 2017. Circadian Entrainment
835 to the Natural Light-Dark Cycle across Seasons and the Weekend. *Current Biology*
836 27:508-513. 10.1016/j.cub.2016.12.041
837 Subramanian S, Blanton LV, Frese SA, Charbonneau M, Mills DA, and Gordon JI. 2015.
838 Cultivating healthy growth and nutrition through the gut microbiota. *Cell* 161:36-48.
839 10.1016/j.cell.2015.03.013
840 Thaiss CA, Levy M, Korem T, Dohnalová L, Shapiro H, Jaitin DA, David E, Winter DR, Gury-
841 BenAri M, Tatirovsky E, Tuganbaev T, Federici S, Zmora N, Zeevi D, Dori-Bachash M,
842 Pevsner-Fischer M, Kartvelishvily E, Brandis A, Harmelin A, Shibolet O, Halpern Z,
843 Honda K, Amit I, Segal E, and Elinav E. 2016. Microbiota Diurnal Rhythmicity
844 Programs Host Transcriptome Oscillations. *Cell* 167:1495-1510.e1412.
845 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.11.003
846 Thaiss CA, Zeevi D, Levy M, Zilberman-Schapira G, Suez J, Tengeler AC, Abramson L, Katz
847 MN, Korem T, Zmora N, Kuperman Y, Biton I, Gilad S, Harmelin A, Shapiro H, Halpern
848 Z, Segal E, and Elinav E. 2014. Transkingdom control of microbiota diurnal oscillations
849 promotes metabolic homeostasis. *Cell* 159:514-529. 10.1016/j.cell.2014.09.048
850 Torres J, Bao X, Goel A, Colombel JF, Pekow J, Jabri B, Williams KM, Castillo A, Odin JA,
851 Meckel K, Fasihuddin F, Peter I, Itzkowitz S, and Hu J. 2016. The features of mucosa-
852 associated microbiota in primary sclerosing cholangitis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 43:790-
853 801. 10.1111/apt.13552
854 Turkowska E, Majewski PM, Rai S, and Skwarlo-Sonta K. 2014. Pineal oscillator functioning in
855 the chicken - Effect of photoperiod and melatonin. *Chronobiology International* 31:134-
856 143. 10.3109/07420528.2013.832279
857 Waite DW, and Taylor MW. 2014. Characterizing the avian gut microbiota: membership, driving
858 influences, and potential function. *Front Microbiol* 5:223. 10.3389/fmicb.2014.00223
859 Wang Q, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM, and Cole JR. 2007. Naive Bayesian classifier for rapid
860 assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Appl Environ Microbiol*
861 73:5261-5267. 10.1128/AEM.00062-07
862 Wang Y, and Qian PY. 2009. Conservative fragments in bacterial 16S rRNA genes and primer
863 design for 16S ribosomal DNA amplicons in metagenomic studies. *PLoS One* 4:e7401.
864 10.1371/journal.pone.0007401
865 Wu G, Tang W, He Y, Hu J, Gong S, He Z, Wei G, Lv L, Jiang Y, Zhou H, and Chen P. 2018.
866 Light exposure influences the diurnal oscillation of gut microbiota in mice. *Biochemical*
867 *and Biophysical Research Communications*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2018.04.095
868 Yilmaz P, Parfrey LW, Yarza P, Gerken J, Pruesse E, Quast C, Schweer T, Peplies J, Ludwig W,
869 and Glockner FO. 2014. The SILVA and "All-species Living Tree Project (LTP)"
870 taxonomic frameworks. *Nucleic Acids Res* 42:D643-648. 10.1093/nar/gkt1209

871 Zhan A, Xiong W, He S, and Macisaac HJ. 2014. Influence of artifact removal on rare species
872 recovery in natural complex communities using high-throughput sequencing. *PLoS One*
873 9:e96928. 10.1371/journal.pone.0096928
874

875

876

877

878 **Figure Legends**

879 Figure 1. Expression of clock genes (*per2, bmal1*, and *clock*) in the chicks entrained to either
880 normal (12L:12D) (yellow) or extended photoperiods (23L:1D) (blue), measured with qPCR.
881 The shaded areas represent the hours of darkness. Top panel shows expression and oscillation
882 patterns in brain tissue, whereas bottom panel shows expression oscillation in cecal tissue.

883

884 Figure 2. Relative abundance (> 1%) at the taxonomic genus level depicting the diversity of
885 cecal microbial communities in HyLine Brown layer chicks entrained to the normal photoperiod
886 (top) and the extended photoperiod (bottom). Samples were taken at 6 hour intervals over a 48-
887 hour period from Day 19-21.

888

889 Figure 3. Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plot of cecal microbial communities entrained
890 under normal photoperiods (NP) and extended photoperiods (EP). Solid shaded ellipses around
891 colored points show the 90% Euclidean distance from the center, whereas dashed lines show the
892 95% normal distribution span.

893

894 Figure 4. Alpha diversity measures for the two different photoperiods, normal (NP) (12L:12D)
895 and extended (EP) (23L:1D). Top panel shows boxplots of α diversity during the entrainment
896 period (first three weeks), divided by each week. The bottom panel shows boxplots of α diversity
897 estimates from samples taken during the circadian experiment.

898

899 Figure 5: A plot of the results from Linear Discriminant Analysis Effect Size to determine
900 differential enrichment of taxa between photoperiod treatments. Of thirty three differentially
901 enriched taxa between treatments, 26 were enriched above an LDA score of 2 the normal
902 photoperiod treatment, whereas the rest were enriched in the extended photoperiod treatment.
903
904 Figure 6. Principal Coordinate Analysis plot of cecal and fecal bacterial communities in HyLine
905 Brown layer chicks. CC = cecal samples Day 19-20, EC = cecal samples Day 4-18, FE = fecal
906 samples Day 16-20.

907

Figure 1(on next page)

Plots of gene expression in the brain, and cecal tissue of birds raised under different photoperiods.

Expression of clock genes (*per2, bmal1*, and *clock*) in the chicks entrained to either normal (12L:12D) (yellow) or extended photoperiods (23L:1D) (blue), measured with qPCR. The shaded areas represent the hours of darkness. Top panel shows expression and oscillation patterns in brain tissue, whereas bottom panel shows expression oscillation in cecal tissue.

PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27120v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 16 Aug 2018, publ: 16 Aug 2018



PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27120v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 16 Aug 2018, publ: 16 Aug 2018

Figure 2(on next page)

Column plots of microbiota structure over a 48-hour sampling period.

Relative abundance (> 1%) at the taxonomic genus level depicting the diversity of cecal microbial communities in HyLine Brown layer chicks entrained to the normal photoperiod (top) and the extended photoperiod (bottom). Samples were taken at 6 hour intervals over a 48-hour period from Day 19-21.





PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27120v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 16 Aug 2018, publ: 16 Aug 2018

Figure 3(on next page)

Ordination plots showing clustering of microbiota from different photoperiod treatments

Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) plot of cecal microbial communities entrained under normal photoperiods (NP) and extended photoperiods (EP). Solid shaded ellipses around colored points show the 90% Euclidean distance from the center, whereas dashed lines show the 95% normal distribution span.



Figure 4(on next page)

Alpha diversity estimates during the acquisition period (3 weeks) and during the circadian experiment.

Alpha diversity measures for the two different photoperiods, normal (NP) (12L:12D) and extended (EP) (23L:1D). Top panel (4A) shows boxplots of α diversity during the entrainment period (first three weeks), divided by each week. The bottom panel (4B) shows boxplots of α diversity estimates from samples taken during the circadian experiment.





Figure 5(on next page)

Results of linear discriminant analyses identifying differentially enriched taxa between photoperiod treatments.

A plot of the results from Linear Discriminant Analysis Effect Size to determine differential enrichment of taxa between photoperiod treatments. Of thirty three differentially enriched taxa between treatments, 26 were enriched above an LDA score of 2 the normal photoperiod treatment, whereas the rest were enriched in the extended photoperiod treatment.



PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27120v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 16 Aug 2018, publ: 16 Aug 2018

Figure 6(on next page)

Ordination plot showing clustering of cecal and fecal microbiota profiles from birds raised under different photoperiods

Principal Coordinate Analysis plot of cecal and fecal bacterial communities in HyLine Brown layer chicks. CC = cecal samples Day 19-20, EC = cecal samples Day 4-18, FE = fecal samples Day 16-20.



Table 1(on next page)

Taxa that were oscillating with a rhythm in birds raised under 23/1 LD treatment

Oscillating cecal microbiota members in the extended photoperiod (23L:1D) treatment.

PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27120v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 16 Aug 2018, publ: 16 Aug 2018

Table 1. List of unique OTUs (>1% relative abundance) for the normal and extended photoperiods.

Taxa that were found uniquely in the normal photoperiod treatment				
Phylum	**Class**	**Order**	**Family**	**Genus**
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	Faecalibacterium
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	Tyzzerella
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Peptostreptococcaceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	Lachnoclostridium
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	Ruminococcaceae_UCG-014
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	Lachnospiraceae_NC2004_group
Firmicutes	Erysipelotrichia	Erysipelotrichales	Erysipelotrichaceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	Ruminococcaceae_UCG-010
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Christensenellaceae	Christensenellaceae_R-7_group
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Christensenellaceae	Christensenellaceae_R-7_group
Taxa that were found uniquely in the extended photoperiod treatment				
Phylum	**Class**	**Order**	**Family**	**Genus**
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Clostridiaceae_1	Candidatus_Arthromitus
Bacteroidetes	Bacteroidia	Bacteroidales	Rikenellaceae	Alistipes
Bacteria _unclassified	Bacteria _unclassified	Bacteria _unclassified	Bacteria_unclassified	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Clostridiales_vadinBB60_group	NA

Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Clostridiales_unclassified	NA
Tenericutes	Mollicutes	Mollicutes_RF9	Mollicutes_RF9 _unclassified	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	Ruminiclostridium_5
Tenericutes	Mollicutes	Mollicutes_RF9	Mollicutes_RF9 _unclassified	NA
Tenericutes	Mollicutes	Mollicutes_RF9	Mollicutes_RF9 _unclassified	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Bacteria _unclassified	Bacteria _unclassified	Bacteria _unclassified	Bacteria_unclassified	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	Ruminiclostridium_9
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	NA
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Ruminococcaceae	Anaerotruncus

3

4

Table 2(on next page)

Taxa that showed rhythmic oscillations in birds raised in 12/12 LD treatment

Oscillating cecal microbiota members in the normal photoperiod (12L:12D) treatment.

1 Table 2. Oscillating cecal microbiota members in the normal photoperiod (12L:12D) treatment.

Taxa	Adjusted p-value	Period	Phase Shift	Amplitude
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Defluviitaleaceae, Defluviitaleaceae_UCG-011	0.0005	24	0	0.0005
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Oscillibacter	0.0142	36	33	0.0016
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Ruminococcaceae_UCG-014	0.0196	24	12	0.0007
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Ruminococcaceae_UCG-014	0.0312	24	0	0.0001
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Lachnospiraceae, NA	0.0358	24	3	0.0021
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Anaerotruncus	0.0417	24	0	0.0001

2

3

Table 3(on next page)

Taxa that were found either in the normal or the extended photoperiod treatments only

List of unique taxa (>1% relative abundance) for the normal and extended photoperiods.

Table 3. Oscillating cecal microbiota members in the extended photoperiod (23L:1D) treatment.

Taxa	Adjusted p-value	Period	Phase Shift	Amplitude
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Christensenellaceae, Christensenellaceae_R-7_group	0.0043	24	21	0.0006
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Lachnospiraceae, NA	0.0073	24	15	0.0007
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Ruminococcaceae_UCG-004	0.0142	36	21	0.0005
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Lachnospiraceae, NA	0.0266	36	33	0.0023
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Ruminococcus_1	0.0417	36	24	0.0024
Firmicutes, Clostridia, Clostridiales, Ruminococcaceae, Ruminiclostridium_5	0.0417	24	21	0.0005