

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE NUTRITIONAL MANAGEMENT OF FOOD
HYPERSENSITIVITY IN DOGS AND CATS:
AN ASSESSMENT OF A PROTEIN HYDROLYSATE**

by

NICHOLAS J. CAVE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF VETERINARY SCIENCE

AT

MASSEY UNIVERSITY

2001

The Nutritional Management of Food Hypersensitivity of Dogs and Cats: An Assessment of a Protein Hydrolysate

ABSTRACT

Adverse reactions to food are exceedingly common reasons for the presentation of cats and dogs to veterinarians. Of those cases, a relatively small number involve a truly immune-mediated reaction to the food substance. However, differentiating those that are from the more common food intolerances is usually difficult and often impossible. In addition, certain individuals with a true food hypersensitivity are difficult to manage with conventional diets. The identification and availability of nutritionally complete commercially prepared diets with a protein component that is truly novel to the patient under investigation is often the stumbling block to successful diagnosis and management of food hypersensitivity. The recent development of protein hydrolysate based pet foods for dogs and cats provides an exciting tool for more reliable diagnosis and management of food hypersensitivity in those species. Chapter 1 of this thesis describes the immunological and pathophysiological basis of food hypersensitivity and presents some of the key areas of recent research that have led to a deeper, if still incomplete understanding of the aetiological mechanisms responsible. The development and maintenance of oral tolerance is discussed including the key roles that the resident antigen presenting cells in the mucosa play. From that description follows a presentation of some of the current hypotheses regarding mechanisms by which oral tolerance is lost or not established. These include the action of mucosal adjuvants, parasitism, IgA deficiency and alterations in mucosal permeability. Building on this discussion is an examination of the methods currently available to veterinarians for the diagnosis of food hypersensitivity, their clinical usefulness and limitations.

The importance of obtaining a complete and accurate dietary history is emphasized. The difficulties in doing so and the consequences of not doing so are discussed. As stated, the recent development of diets in which the protein content has been hydrolysed provides a new tool for the veterinarian. Some of the practical aspects behind producing hydrolysate diets are presented and the theoretical basis, especially the importance of the molecular weight of remaining polypeptide fragments, is emphasized. Finally recommendations as to their use and the role that they may play in the future are discussed.

Chapter 2 describes the initial assessment of 2 candidate hydrolysates, one made from fish and the other from chicken proteins. The method used for this initial experiment was high-performance size-exclusion liquid chromatography. The investigation revealed the chicken hydrolysate to have the more favourable molecular weight profile of the two. The finding that 92.9% of the hydrolysate was of a molecular weight less than 5kDa is supportive of its potential value in a hypoallergenic diet. The molecular weight profile was then compared with a selection of those published in the human medical literature. Cow's milk hydrolysates have been widely available and used for the past 2-3 decades. The chicken hydrolysate appeared to compare very favourably to a number of extensively hydrolysed human infant formulae that have been demonstrated experimentally and clinically to be truly hypoallergenic. Despite the extensive use of molecular weight profiles to compare hydrolysates, they remain unreliable as predictors of allergenicity.

Chapter 3 describes the experimental evaluation of the *antigenicity* of the chicken hydrolysate. Following successful immunization of dogs to the intact parent protein, an IgG inhibition ELISA was developed using sera from the immunized dogs. It was demonstrated that the hydrolysate retained some ability to bind IgG but that at equal

levels of antibody binding, the concentration of the hydrolysate solution required was 66 times greater than that of the intact parent protein. It is likely that this represents a clinically highly significant reduction in antigenicity.

Of the limitations of the inhibition ELISA study, perhaps the greatest from the perspective of hydrolysate diet analysis is its inability to differentiate the molecular weight of the IgG-binding fragments. This is important since if they are less than 6-10kDa, they are unlikely to participate in IgE-mediated allergic reactions. Chapter 4 describes the experiment chosen to determine the size of the remaining IgG-binding fragments, namely Western blotting. It was established that the major antigenic fraction remaining in the parent protein following SDS-PAGE separation was a c.69kDa protein consistent with chicken serum albumin. It was demonstrated by both the Western blotting and the HP-SEC that this antigen was absent from the hydrolysate. The actual size of the few remaining binding fragments in the hydrolysate was not, however, clearly elucidated.

It was concluded that the chicken hydrolysate assessed during this thesis is a promising candidate for inclusion as the peptide component of a diet for the diagnosis and management of food hypersensitivity in dogs and cats. In addition, the diet has theoretical promise for the prevention of food hypersensitivity during periods of mucosal inflammation such as idiopathic inflammatory bowel disease and acute gastroenteritis. Ultimately, clinical trials are required to conclusively demonstrate the value of the hydrolysate in the diagnosis and management of these disorders.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Hill's Pet Nutrition Inc. for their generous support of this project, for the supply of the two hydrolysates and intact proteins and for their patience in awaiting its completion. I would also like to acknowledge and thank the Dairy Research Institute of New Zealand and in particular Anne Singh for her expertise in producing the molecular weight profiles. I am deeply appreciative of the willingness of Dr Jane Oliaro and Dr Sandy McLachlan to undertake one of Hercules' labours in helping me to avoid the ignominy of repeating some of the disturbing mistakes during the learning of the Western blotting techniques. I am likewise indebted to Jim Learmonth for ignoring the demands of his own responsibilities in teaching me the intricacies of ELISA techniques.

To my friends and colleagues Todd Halsey, Frazer Allan and Dr Richard Squires I would like to extend my warmest thanks for their continual encouragement, interest and friendship.

To my supervisor Professor Grant Guilford I offer my sincere thanks for his careful combination of encouragement, judicious criticism and whip cracking; but most of all for his unending ability to install enthusiasm and positivity to those around him, repeatedly producing bright phoenixes from the most fearful infernos.

Finally, no acknowledgement would be complete without expressing the deepest gratitude to my dearest wife Kay and our wonderful daughter Jessica. Whilst I have tested your understanding and at times exceeded your patience, you never forgot to remind me that your love is enduring. So then is mine for you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
Chapter 1. _____	
Food Hypersensitivity in Dogs and Cats: A Literature Review	1
1.1 Background and Definitions	2
1.2 Significance	3
1.2.1 Prevalance	3
1.2.2 Owner/General Public Perceptions	5
1.3 Gastrointestinal Immunity	6
1.3.1 Scope of Antigenic Challenge	6
1.3.2 Anatomical and Functional Organisation	9
1.3.3 Antigen Presentation	23
1.3.4 Lymphocyte Recirculation	29
1.3.5 Oral Tolerance	30
1.4 General Mechanisms for Loss of Tolerance	41
1.5 Pathophysiology of Food Hypersensitivity	53
1.6 Clinical Signs	62
1.6.1 Cutaneous Signs	62
1.6.2 Gastrointestinal Signs	64
1.6.3 Other Clinical Signs	67
1.7 Food Allergens	70
1.7.1 Definition	70
1.7.2 Biochemistry	70
1.7.3 Foods	72
1.8 Diagnosis	73
1.8.1 History	74
1.8.2 Physical Examination	75
1.8.3 Elimination Diets / Novel Proteins	76
1.8.4 Hydrolysates	80
1.8.5 Food Challenge Trials	81
1.8.6 Other Tests for Food Hypersensitivity	83
1.9 Management of Food Hypersensitivity	91
1.9.1 Avoidance	91
1.9.2 Sacrificial Proteins	92
1.9.3 Pharmacological Therapy	94
1.9.4 Hyposensitization	96
1.9.5 Probiotics	97
1.10 Protein Hydrolysates	98
1.10.1 Heat Treatment	98
1.10.2 pH Treatment	100

1.10.3 Hydrolysis	100
1.10.4 Ultra-filtration	102
1.10.5 Problems with Hydrolysates	103
1.10.6 Nutritional Evaluation	104
1.10.7 Immunological Evaluation	106
1.10.8 Clinical Evidence of Efficacy	108
1.10.9 Toleragenic Peptides	109
1.11 Indications for the Use of Hydrolysates	111
1.12 Conclusion	112
References	115

Chapter 2. _____

Molecular Weight Profiles of Two Hydrolysates	130
Introduction	131
Objectives	134
Materials and Methods	135
Results	140
Discussion	144
Summary and Conclusion	146
References	147

Chapter 3. _____

<i>In Vitro</i> Assessment of Antigenicity of a Protein Hydrolysate	148
Introduction	149
Objective	150
Materials and Methods	150
Results	153
Discussion	169
References	176

Chapter 4. _____

An Attempt to Identify and Describe the Antigenic Fragments in a Chicken Protein Hydrolysate	177
Introduction	178
Phase 1. Objectives	180
Materials and Methods	180
Results	186
Discussion	189
Phase 2. Objectives	190
Materials and Methods	190
Results	193
Discussion	195
Conclusions	200
References	201

Chapter 5.	
Summary and Conclusions	203
Future Directions	205

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1.1	Recorded Prevalence of Food Hypersensitivity in Dogs and Cats.	4
1.2	Subsets of IEL in Mice Defined on the Basis of CD8 and TCR expression.	18
1.3	Actions of Mast Cells in Allergic Disease.	22
1.4	Prevalence of Cutaneous Signs in Dogs and Cats with Food Hypersensitivity.	63
1.5	Prevalence of Individual Food Allergens Amongst 194 Individual Canine and Feline Hypersensitivites.	73
1.6	General Guidelines to Consider when Evaluating Potential Food Hypersensitivity.	75
1.7	Food Grade Protein Hydrolytic Enzymes.	102
1.8	Disadvantages of Protein Hydrolysates.	105
1.9	Indications for the Use of Hydrolysate Diets.	112
2.1	Molecular Weight Standards for HPSEC Column Calibration.	136
2.2	Molecular Weight Standards Running Times TSKSW XL Column.	137
2.3	Molecular Weight Standards Running Times TSK G2000 SW Column.	138
2.4	Molecular Weight Distribution of Two Candidate Hydrolysates (TSKSW XL column).	143
2.5	Molecular Weight Distribution of Chicken Hydrolysate (TSK SW column).	143
2.6	Molecular Weight Distribution of 2 Hydrolysates and 8 Hypoallergenic Infant Formulae.	144
3.1	Corrected Absorbance Values for Serum/Antigen Optimization (Read @ 450nm) BSA Block Nunc® Plate.	154
3.2	Corrected Absorbance Values for Serum/Antigen Optimization (Read @ 450nm) HAS Block Nunc® Plate.	156
3.3	Absorbance Values (@450nm) for Nunc Maxisorb® Plate.	157
3.4	Absorbance Values (@450nm) for Nunc Polysorb® Plate.	157
3.5	Corrected Absorbance Values for Serum/Antigen Optimization (Read @ 450nm) HAS Block Nunc Maxisorb® Plate.	160
3.6	Corrected Absorbance and Control Values for Sequential Titres. (Read @ 450nm) HSA Block Nunc Maxisorb® Plate.	162
3.7	Corrected Absorbance and Control Values for Inhibition Optimization (Read @ 450nm) HSA Block Nunc Maxisorb® Plate.	164
3.8	Corrected Absorbance and Control Values for Inhibition ELISA (Read @ 450nm) HSA Block Nunc Maxisorb® Plate. 1:80 solid phase dilution , serum Dilution 1:80.	166
3.9	Percentage Inhibition of Antibody Binding at Inhibitor Concentration of 1g/l.	169

3.10	ELISA Inhibition Results Using Several Commercial Hypoallergenic Hydrolysate Formulae and Pooled Serum from 215 Milk Allergic Patients.	172
3.11	ELISA Inhibition Results Using Several Commercial Hypoallergenic Hydrolysate Formulae and Pooled Serum from Two Rabbits Sensitized to the ABBOS Peptide. ABBOS** used as solid phase and formulae used as inhibitors.	173
3.12	ELISA Inhibition Results with Alfar® ^a Hydrolysate, using sera from 5 milk allergic patients.	173
3.13	Mean RAST Inhibition Results for Several Commercial Hypoallergenic Hydrolysate Formulae Using Serum from 10 Milk Allergic Patients.	174
4.1	Molecular Weight Standards.	182
4.2	Bio-Rad Kaleidoscope Pre-stained Standards.	191

LIST OF FIGURES

Number		Page
2.1	Plot of molecular weight against retention time for molecular weight standards using a TSKSW XL gel filtration column.	137
2.2	Plot of molecular weight against retention time for molecular weight standards using a TSK SW gel filtration column.	139
2.3	Chromatographic separation of peptides in a chicken hydrolysate.	141
2.4	Chromatographic separation of peptides in a fish hydrolysate.	142
2.5	Chromatographic separation of peptides in a chicken hydrolysate.	143
3.1	Graph of Absorbance vs Antigen Dilution for Serum / Antigen Optimization. Nunc Plate, BSA Block.	154
3.2	Graph of Absorbance vs Antigen Dilution for Serum / Antigen Optimization. Nunc Plate, HSA Block.	156
3.3	Graph of Absorbance vs Serum Dilution for Serum / Antigen Optimization. Nunc Maxisorb® Plate, HSA Block.	158
3.4	Graph of Absorbance vs Serum Dilution for Serum / Antigen Optimization. Nunc Polysorb® Plate, HSA Block.	159
3.5	Graph of Absorbance vs Antigen Dilution for Serum / Antigen Optimization. Nunc Maxisorb® Plate, HSA Block.	161
3.6	Graph of Absorbance @450nm versus Time following Sensitisation to Chicken Protein. HSA Block Nunc Maxisorb® Plate. 1:80 solid phase dilution.	163
3.7	Graph of Absorbance versus Serum Dilutions for Optimization of Inhibition ELISA Nunc Maxisorb® Plate, HSA Block, Whole Chicken Protein Inhibitor 1:80 solid phase dilution.	165
3.8	Inhibition of Canine IgG Binding to Intact Chicken Protein by a Chicken Hydrolysate, Intact Chicken Protein and HSA (Nunc Maxisorb® Plate, HSA Block, Whole Chicken Protein Inhibitor.)	167
3.9	Inhibition of Canine IgG Binding to Intact Chicken Protein by a Chicken Hydrolysate, Intact Chicken Protein and HSA (Nunc Maxisorb® Plate, HSA Block, Whole Chicken Protein Inhibitor, 1:80 solid phase dilution.)	168
4.1	SDS-PAGE of intact chicken protein with 5µg, 50µg or 75µg protein loaded per well. Gel stained with Coomassie blue.	187
4.2	SDS-PAGE of intact chicken protein and chicken hydrolysate.	188
4.3	Canine IgG binding to intact chicken protein and chicken hydrolysate isolated on SDS-PAGE immunoblot.	194
4.4	Graph to show Migration of Molecular Weight Standards and Plot of a Major Antigen in Intact Chicken Protein.	195