

Learned Social Preference in Zebrafish

Raymond E. Engeszer,^{1,*} Michael J. Ryan,¹
and David M. Parichy^{1,2}

¹Section of Integrative Biology
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

²Section of Molecular, Cell and
Developmental Biology
Institute for Cellular and Molecular Biology
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Summary

How social aggregations arise and persist is central to our understanding of evolution, behavior, and psychology [1–3]. When social groups arise within a species, evolutionary divergence and speciation can result [4, 5]. To understand this diversifying role of social behavior, we must examine the internal and external influences that lead to nonrandom assortment of phenotypes [6]. Many fishes form aggregations called shoals that reduce predation risk while enhancing foraging and reproductive success [7–9]. Thus, shoaling is adaptive, and signals that maintain shoals are likely to evolve under selection. Given the diversity of pigment patterns among *Danio* fishes [10–13], visual signals might be especially important in mediating social behaviors in this group. Our understanding of pigment pattern development in the zebrafish *D. rerio* [14, 15] allows integrative analyses of how molecular variation leads to morphological variation among individuals and how morphological variation influences social interactions. Here, we use the zebrafish pigment mutant *nacre/mitfa* [16] to test roles for genetic and environmental determinants in the development of shoaling preference. We demonstrate that individuals discriminate between shoals having different pigment pattern phenotypes and that early experience determines shoaling preference. These results suggest a role for social learning in pigment pattern diversification in danios.

Results and Discussion

A diversity of communication systems mediate social behavior, and though the functional aspects of these systems have been well studied (reviewed in [17]), little is known of their underlying genetic and molecular mechanisms. The zebrafish system affords us both an organism that engages in a variety of social interactions and a set of developmental and molecular tools particularly well suited to examining the proximate mechanisms responsible for these interactions. For example, a diverse array of adult pigment patterns is exhibited by different *Danio* species, and species with dramatically

different pigment patterns cooccur in natural populations [18, 19; California Academy of Sciences Ichthyology Collection catalog numbers CAS134662 and CAS140204]. The pigment patterns of fishes are associated with a variety of behavioral interactions, including shoaling, predation avoidance, species recognition, and mate choice, and such patterns have had important roles in adaptive radiations and speciation [20–24]. In *D. rerio*, numerous single-locus mutants affecting the pigment pattern have been isolated, and several of the corresponding genes now have been identified at the molecular level [16, 25–28]. Such mutants provide an opportunity to dissect the ecological and behavioral significance of pigment patterns at a level not previously achieved. Here, we used a pigment pattern mutant that differs dramatically from wild-type to determine if *D. rerio* exhibits variation in their shoaling preference, if that preference is mediated through visual signals, and what roles internal and external factors play in the acquisition of such a preference.

As a first step in dissecting the behavioral roles of the zebrafish pigment pattern, we compared the shoaling preferences of wild-type fish and *nacre*^{w2} mutants (Figure 1). *nacre* mutants completely lack melanophore stripes owing to a recessive point mutation in *mitfa*, which encodes a basic helix-loop-helix transcription factor that normally acts autonomously to the neural crest-melanophore lineage to specify melanophore fate [16, 29]. We generated families segregating the *nacre* phenotype by backcrossing *nacre* heterozygotes (maintained in the wild-type strain AB^{WT} background) to *nacre* homozygotes. Offspring from these crosses were phenotypically either wild-type (*nacre/+*) or *nacre* mutant (*nacre/nacre*). This design randomizes across effects of other loci that are not linked to the *nacre* mutation.

We sorted subject fish prior to hatching into three treatments: controls (reared with three siblings of the same phenotype), isolates (reared alone), and cross-rears (reared with three siblings of the alternate phenotype). Fish were maintained in these conditions throughout the experiment. When fish developed adult pigment patterns, we tested shoaling preferences by placing individual subject fish ($n = 219$) in a test tank containing separate wild-type and *nacre* stimulus shoals (Figure 2). Prospective shoaling partners were derived from excess siblings of both phenotypes that had been pooled at the outset of the experiment. Each stimulus shoal contained two males and two females that were size matched to the subject. A double pane of ultraviolet-transparent Plexiglas separated each stimulus compartment from the central compartment. The resultant air space blocked any potential chemical or auditory cues. Any variation in preference exhibited by the subject fish would therefore reflect variation in visual signals alone. After allowing fish to acclimate, we recorded the time subjects spent swimming near each shoal during each of two 5 min intervals (methodological details in the Supplemental Data).

We asked first whether zebrafish exhibit a native pref-

*Correspondence: rayeng@mail.utexas.edu



Figure 1. Zebrafish Adult Pigment Pattern
(A) Phenotypically wild-type, heterozygous *nacre* and (B) homozygous *nacre*.

erence for the pigment pattern phenotype of prospective shoaling partners. Our results show that control subject fish exhibited a strong, positive, assortative preference for their own phenotype: wild-type preferred wild-type and *nacre* preferred *nacre* (Figures 3A and 3B). Thus, zebrafish are able to distinguish between alternative pigment pattern phenotypes visually, and there is a strong preference to shoal with individuals of like phenotype. This result suggested either an effect of early environment or a major effect of *nacre* or another closely linked locus on the preference exhibited by subject fish.

We then asked whether the shoaling preference of zebrafish is innate and independent of early environment by rearing subject fish in isolation. Unlike controls, isolates did not show a preference for either phenotype. Wild-type isolates spent 259 ± 84 s (mean \pm SD) in association with wild-type shoals and 220 ± 80 s in association with *nacre* shoals ($n = 40$, $t_{39} = 1.83$, $p = 0.08$, paired two-tailed t test). *nacre* isolates spent 243 ± 82 s in association with wild-type shoals and 233 ± 70 s in association with *nacre* shoals ($n = 37$, $t_{36} = 0.53$, $p = 0.6$, paired two-tailed t test). This result suggests that early experience is critical in the development of shoaling preference.

To further elucidate the role of early experience in the acquisition of social preference, we examined fish crossreared with the alternative phenotype: we raised wild-type subjects with *nacre* mutant siblings, and *nacre* mutant subjects with wild-type siblings. Figures 3C and




Figure 2. Test Tank




Figure 3. Early Environment Determines Zebrafish Shoaling Preference

(A) Wild-type fish raised with wild-type siblings spent more time in association with wild-type stimulus shoals as compared to *nacre* stimulus shoals ($n = 38$, $t_{37} = 3.04$, $p = 0.004$, two-tailed paired t test).

(B) *nacre* fish raised with *nacre* siblings spent more time in association with *nacre* stimulus shoals as compared to wild-type stimulus shoals ($n = 38$, $t_{37} = 3.41$, $p = 0.002$, two-tailed paired t test).

(C) Wild-type fish raised with *nacre* siblings spent more time with *nacre* stimulus shoals ($n = 35$, $t_{34} = 3.03$, $p = 0.008$, two-tailed paired t test).

(D) *nacre* fish raised with wild-type siblings spent more time with wild-type stimulus shoals ($n = 33$, $t_{32} = 2.19$, $p = 0.036$, two-tailed paired t test). Shown are means \pm 95% confidence intervals.

3D show that crossrearing reverses preferences. Cross-reared wild-type subjects exhibited a strong preference for *nacre* mutants, whereas crossreared *nacre* subjects exhibited a strong preference for wild-type. These analyses suggested that rearing treatment, rather than genotype, was the principal determinant of shoaling preference. This role for environment in the acquisition of shoaling preference was further confirmed by factorial analysis of variance: comparisons of time spent with like phenotype revealed significant effects of rearing treatment (control versus cross-reared, $F_{1,138} = 29.43$, $p < 0.0001$), but not genotype ($F_{1,138}$, $p = 0.7$), or genotype by treatment interaction ($F_{1,138} = 0.04$, $p = 0.8$; comparing arcsine transformed proportions of time spent with like phenotype over time spent in association with both phenotypes). These results are concordant with an interspecific analysis in which wild-type zebrafish spent less time with other wild-type zebrafish after crossrearing with pearl danios, *D. albolineatus*, though preferences for zebrafish versus *D. albolineatus* were not examined [30]. Our experiments demonstrate that early environment plays a key role in the acquisition of intraspecific shoaling preference in zebrafish.

These shoaling preferences were not due to mate preferences. Our stimulus shoals included both male

and female fish to simulate naturally occurring mixed sex shoals. Thus, the preference of subjects to associate with one shoal over the other might indicate a mate preference. For example, a female subject might prefer a male in one shoal over the males in the other shoal and therefore spend more time with the shoal containing the preferred male. We therefore repeated these tests by comparing the responses of wild-type females (raised with other wild-type siblings) presented with all-female *nacre* and all-female wild-type shoals, to our wild-type controls (Figure 3A). The response of females to all-female shoals was indistinguishable from that of our wild-type controls to mixed-sex shoals. Wild-type females spent 311 ± 124 s in association with all-female wild-type shoals and 189 ± 98 s with all-female *nacre* shoals ($n = 33$, $t_{32} = 3.23$, $p < 0.005$, paired two-tailed t test). Times spent with wild-type shoals did not differ significantly between all-female and mixed-sex stimulus shoals ($n = 33$, $t_{32} = 0.23$, $p = 0.8$, two-tailed t test; comparing arcsine transformed proportions of time spent with wild-type over time spent in association with both phenotypes). Thus, individual behaviors in these assays principally reflect social preference rather than mate preference.

Our results demonstrate that zebrafish exhibit preferences for prospective shoaling partners, that such preferences are mediated by visual signals, and that preferences for specific phenotypes are acquired during development. This is the first time that social preferences and the effect of early environment on social preferences have been shown in a developmental model system. Our knowledge of the genetic and developmental mechanisms underlying the visual signal (i.e., the pigment pattern) offers the opportunity to further dissect how early experience interacts with the development of visual and nervous systems to shape these critical social behaviors in zebrafish and other species. Indeed, the availability of pigment pattern mutants obviates classical methods for altering fish pigment patterns such as freeze branding, dye injection, and video playback. While commonly used, these manipulations are likely to have unpredictable consequences for both the pigment phenotype (given the tetrachromatic nature of zebrafish vision [31]) and the behavioral phenotype (given the small size and fragility of these fish). The results of this study thus set the stage for a complete description of multidimensional preference space [32] and identification of the salient visual elements for shoaling (R.E.E., M.J.R., and D.M.P., unpublished data) by using the stunning variety of pigment patterns provided by zebrafish mutants and double mutants that are one and two mutational steps away from the wild-type pigment pattern [11].

We propose that social preferences of individuals in natural populations also are determined by early experience, as it is highly unlikely that the ability to learn preferences arose de novo in our wild-type AB^{UT} laboratory strain. Learned preferences, therefore, could have substantial evolutionary and behavioral consequences in nature. Zebrafish populations in the wild harbor major-effect mutations including adult pigment pattern variants ([33], and D.M.P., unpublished data). Furthermore, laboratory-derived pigment pattern mutants often re-

semble the naturally occurring phenotypes of other species [12]. The results of this study demonstrate that pigment patterns serve as visual signals, and early experience with this signal variation determines future social consorts. Thus, a single mutation causes dramatic changes in both the signal and receiver, and thereby constrains the social milieu of an individual to certain genotypes and phenotypes. Since mating is more likely to take place with others in the same social unit, shoaling preferences can promote assortative mating. Thus, even in the absence of specific mate preferences for pigment pattern, shoaling preferences could contribute to genetic divergence. Our analyses of shoaling preference therefore provide a model for how variation at the molecular level can potentially impact population level dynamics and speciation.

Supplemental Data

Supplemental Data including Experimental Procedures and exclusion of a UV effect on preference are available at <http://www.current-biology.com/cgi/content/full/14/10/881/DC1/>.

Acknowledgments

Supported by the National Institutes of Health (R01 GM62182, D.M.P.) and a National Science Foundation predoctoral fellowship (R.E.E.). Thanks to P. Hurd, I. Schlupp, J. Wallingford, and two anonymous reviewers for comments on the manuscript; M. Kierstead and K. Musser for assistance with data collection; and C. Lee for assisting with fish maintenance.

Received: February 10, 2004

Revised: March 18, 2004

Accepted: March 18, 2004

Published: May 25, 2004

References

1. Darwin, C. (1882). *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, Second Edition (London: John Murray).
2. Wilson, E.O. (1971). *The Insect Societies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
3. Schneirla, T.C. (1965). Aspects of stimulation and organization in approach/withdrawal processes underlying vertebrate behavioral development. In *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, D.S. Lehrman, R. Hinde, and E. Shaw, eds. (New York: Academic Press), pp. 1–71.
4. Bolnick, D.I., Svanback, R., Fordyce, J.A., Yang, L.H., Davis, J.M., Hulsey, C.D., and Forister, M.L. (2003). The ecology of individuals: incidence and implications of individual specialization. *Am. Nat.* **161**, 1–28.
5. Hochberg, M.E., Sinervo, B., and Brown, S.P. (2003). Socially mediated speciation. *Evolution Int. J. Org. Evolution* **57**, 154–158.
6. Autumn, K., Ryan, M.J., and Wake, D.B. (2002). Integrating historical and mechanistic biology enhances the study of adaptation. *Q. Rev. Biol.* **77**, 383–408.
7. Krause, J., Butlin, R.K., Peuhkuri, N., and Pritchard, L. (2000). The social organization of fish shoals: a test of the predictive power of laboratory experiments for the field. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **75**, 477–501.
8. Magurran, A.E. (1994). The adaptive significance of schooling as an anti-predator defense in fish. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* **30**, 225–232.
9. Lachlan, R.F., Crooks, L., and Laland, K.N. (1998). Who follows whom? Shoaling preferences and social learning of foraging information in guppies. *Anim. Behav.* **56**, 181–190.
10. Kullander, F. F. (2001). *Phylogeny and Species Diversity of the South and Southeast Asian Cyprinid Genus Danio Hamilton (Teleostei, Cyprinidae)*. (Stockholm: Stockholm University).

11. Parichy, D.M. (2003). Pigment patterns: fish in stripes and spots. *Curr. Biol.* *13*, R947–R950.
12. Parichy, D.M., and Johnson, S.L. (2001). Zebrafish hybrids suggest genetic mechanisms for pigment pattern diversification in *Danio*. *Dev. Genes Evol.* *211*, 319–328.
13. McClure, M. (1999). Development and evolution of melanophore patterns in fishes of the genus *Danio* (Teleostei: Cyprinidae). *J. Morphol.* *241*, 83–105.
14. Quigley, I.K., and Parichy, D.M. (2002). Pigment pattern formation in zebrafish: a model for developmental genetics and the evolution of form. *Microsc. Res. Tech.* *58*, 442–455.
15. Rawls, J.F., Mellgren, E.M., and Johnson, S.L. (2001). How the zebrafish gets its stripes. *Dev. Biol.* *240*, 301–314.
16. Lister, J.A., Robertson, C.P., Lepage, T., Johnson, S.L., and Raible, D.W. (1999). *nacre* encodes a zebrafish microphthalmia-related protein that regulates neural-crest-derived pigment cell fate. *Development* *126*, 3757–3767.
17. Krause, J., and Ruxton, G. (2002). *Living in Groups*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
18. Talwar, P.K., and Jhingran, A.G. (1991). *Inland Fishes of India and Adjacent Countries* (New Delhi, India: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.).
19. Monkolprasit, S., Sontirat, S., Vimolohakarn, S., and Songsirikul, T. (1997). Checklist of Fishes in Thailand. (Bangkok, Thailand: Office of Environmental Policy and Planning).
20. Allender, C.J., Seehausen, O., Knight, M.E., Turner, G.F., and Maclean, N. (2003). Divergent selection during speciation of Lake Malawi cichlid fishes inferred from parallel radiations in nuptial coloration. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *100*, 14074–14079.
21. Couldridge, V.C.K., and Alexander, G.J. (2002). Color patterns and species recognition in four closely related species of Lake Malawi cichlid. *Behav. Ecol.* *13*, 59–64.
22. Santos, J.C., Coloma, L.A., and Cannatella, D.C. (2003). Multiple, recurring origins of aposematism and diet specialization in poison frogs. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *100*, 12792–12797.
23. Houde, A.E. (1997). *Sex, Color, and Mate Choice in Guppies*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
24. Endler, J.A. (1983). Natural and sexual selection on color patterns in Poeciliid fishes. *Env. Biol. Fishes* *9*, 173–190.
25. Kawakami, K., Amsterdam, A., Shimoda, N., Becker, T., Mugg, J., Shima, A., and Hopkins, N. (2000). Proviral insertions in the zebrafish *hagoromo* gene, encoding an F-box/WD40-repeat protein, cause stripe pattern anomalies. *Curr. Biol.* *10*, 463–466.
26. Parichy, D.M., Ransom, D.G., Paw, B., Zon, L.I., and Johnson, S.L. (2000). An orthologue of the *kit*-related gene *fms* is required for development of neural crest-derived xanthophores and a subpopulation of adult melanocytes in the zebrafish, *Danio rerio*. *Development* *127*, 3031–3044.
27. Parichy, D.M., Mellgren, E.M., Rawls, J.F., Lopes, S.S., Kelsh, R.N., and Johnson, S.L. (2000). Mutational analysis of endothelin receptor b1 (*rose*) during neural crest and pigment pattern development in the zebrafish *Danio rerio*. *Dev. Biol.* *227*, 294–306.
28. Parichy, D.M., Rawls, J.F., Pratt, S.J., Whitfield, T.T., and Johnson, S.L. (1999). Zebrafish *sparse* corresponds to an orthologue of *c-kit* and is required for the morphogenesis of a subpopulation of melanocytes, but is not essential for hematopoiesis or primordial germ cell development. *Development* *126*, 3425–3436.
29. Goding, C.R. (2000). *Mitf* from neural crest to melanoma: signal transduction and transcription in the melanocyte lineage. *Genes Dev.* *14*, 1712–1728.
30. McCann, L.I., and Carlson, C.C. (1982). Effect of cross-rearing on species identification in zebra fish and pearl danios. *Dev. Psychobiol.* *15*, 71–74.
31. Robinson, J., Schmitt, E.A., Harosi, F.I., Reece, R.J., and Dowling, J.E. (1993). Zebrafish ultraviolet visual pigment: absorption spectrum, sequence, and localization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *90*, 6009–6012.
32. Ryan, M.J., and Rand, A.S. (2003). Sexual selection in female perceptual space: how female túngara frogs perceive and respond to complex population variation in acoustic mating signals. *Evolution Int. J. Org. Evolution* *57*, 2608–2618.
33. McCune, A.R., Fuller, R.C., Aquilina, A.A., Dawley, R.M., Fadool, J.M., Houle, D., Travis, J., and Kondrashov, A.S. (2002). A low genomic number of recessive lethals in natural populations of bluefin killifish and zebrafish. *Science* *296*, 2398–2401.