

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.

ANALYSIS OF THE POTENTIAL FOR
RUBUS FRUIT ELLAGITANNINS TO
INDUCE ANTI-INFLAMMATORY
EFFECTS IN *IN VITRO* MODELS

A dissertation presented in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

MPhil in Nutritional Sciences

at Massey University, Manawatū

Alana Jocelyn Srubar-Vernon

March 31st 2014

Abstract

Nutrigenomics is the study of interactions between human diets and the genome with the aim of discerning how food components influence gene and protein expression in individuals. Previous studies have established the potential for ellagitannins (ETs) isolated from various fruits, to induce anti-inflammatory responses that may be beneficial to those afflicted with Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD).

The hypothesis of this thesis is that *Rubus* fruit extracts, rich in ETs, induce an anti-inflammatory effect in mammalian cells involved in inflammatory processes.

Methods were developed to extract, purify, and quantify the phytochemical composition of three selected *Rubus* fruit cultivars (HB19, Wakefield and ZZ).

Extracts (EX: phenolic extract, ETx: ET-enriched extract) were initially assessed using a secondary cell line: RAW 264.7 macrophages. Cell viability using the MTT assay, found no cytotoxic effect at polyphenolic concentrations up to 100 µg/mL. The Griess assay measured levels of nitric oxide (NO) production and found a decrease at 50 µg/mL of polyphenolic exposure for most extracts except ZZ EX. Cytokine assessment showed that the extract, Wakefield ETx, lowered production of Interleukin 6 (IL6) by macrophages. All extracts increased production of Tumour Necrosis Factor alpha (TNFα) by macrophages.

Colonic intestinal epithelial cells (colonic IEC) and bone marrow derived macrophages (BMDM), were isolated from control C57Bl/6J mice and Interleukin 10 gene-deficient mice (*Il10*^{-/-}). Viability results suggested that the polyphenolic concentration of 50 µg/mL, was the highest tolerated concentration for NO and cytokine assays. NO production was decreased for BMDM (*Il10*^{-/-}) with extracts Wakefield EX and ZZ EX, and for BMDM (C57) with most extracts except HB19 EX. IL6 production by colonic IEC (*Il10*^{-/-}) was decreased for all extracts. The cytokine profile for BMDM (*Il10*^{-/-}) mice showed a decrease in IL12 and IL6 production, and no change in TNFα production in response to co-incubation with all extracts.

There are indications from research done in this thesis that the *Rubus* fruit extracts from “ZZ” and “Wakefield” cultivars reduce inflammatory immune responses or potentially having the ability to act on different pathways or induce a wound healing response.

Acknowledgements

First I would like to thank my husband, Martin. Without his support this research would have never been undertaken. I love you so much! I would also like to thank my parents for their continued support throughout this thesis and previous theses.

To all my supervisors, Nicole Roy, Janine Cooney, Jeffrey Greenwood, William Laing and Paul Moughan, I sincerely thank you for your time, knowledge, advice, and teaching. I have learnt so much during the past 2 years from advanced phytochemistry to cell culturing to animal studies. It has been a privilege to work with you all and learn from you.

Nutrigenomics New Zealand has been exceedingly helpful by funding my scholarship (through The New Zealand Institute for Plant & Food Research Limited) and helping to set up this collaboration with Plant & Food, AgResearch, and Massey University. To Plant & Food Research (Ruakura and Auckland), and AgResearch (Palmerston North), thanks for finding room for me and letting me use the facilities during my studies.

I will be forever grateful to Wendy Smith for taking the time to help me with my phytochemistry work and hosting me when I returned to Ruakura. I would also like to thank Dwayne Jensen and Tania Trower for their effort in quantifying my samples. Thanks to Leslie Larsen for synthesising additional metabolites for me to test, and to Jo Stephens for supplying the cultivars used in my research. Thanks to Mark Wohlers for his help with doing all the statistical assessment.

All the PhD students at AgResearch, Palmerston North site, you guys were awesome. Thanks for accepting me during my stints of research there. In particular, Nadja Berger with advice and animal maintenance, so I could see Martin every so often. Sebastian Riedle, you were an amazing support. Your constant help with primary cell culturing can never fully be repaid.

Leigh Ryan, you are amazing. Thank you so much for helping with my animal work, with “Skinny Jim” in particular, and all the effort and early mornings for my tissue collections. Thanks to Kelly Armstrong, Wayne Young and Mark McCann for all your advice, help, and teaching during my times in Palmerston North. Thanks Di Brewster for sharing an office in Auckland with me for a while, and also teaching me about Proteomics. Thanks to Anna, Brent and David Moore for hosting me during the cold long nights in Palmerston North. You kept my spirits up and toes toasty.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Table of Figures and Tables.....	viii
Abbreviations Used.....	viii
Chapter 1: Literature Review	13
1.1 Preface	13
1.2 Nutrigenomics in Applied Research	14
1.3 Inflammatory Bowel Disease	16
1.3.1 Characteristics and Pathology.....	17
1.3.2 Genetic Component	18
1.3.3 Microbial Involvement.....	21
1.3.4 Environmental Influences	22
1.3.4.1 Nutrigenomic Assessment of Environmental Influences.....	22
1.4 Plant Polyphenols.....	24
1.4.1 Ellagitannins (ETs)	24
1.4.2 <i>In Vivo</i> Metabolism of Ellagitannins (ETs) and Ellagic Acid (EA)	26
1.4.3 Ellagitannins (ETs) and Ellagic Acid (EA):.....	28
Potential for Amelioration of IBD	28
1.4.4 <i>Rubus</i> fruits of New Zealand and their Polyphenols.....	29
1.5 Outline of the thesis.....	32
Chapter 2: Chemical Preparation and Analysis of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts.....	34
2.1 Introduction	34
2.1.1 Polyphenolic Composition of <i>Rubus</i> Fruits	34
2.1.2 Variation in Ellagitannins (ETs) in <i>Rubus</i> Fruits.....	35
2.1.3 Aims	36

2.2 Methods.....	37
2.2.1 <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Cultivar Preparation.....	37
2.2.2 Ellagitannin (ET) Extraction Method Optimisation	37
2.2.2.1 Sample Preparation	38
2.2.2.2 Solvent Extraction Efficiency.....	38
2.2.2.3 Ellagitannin (ET) Purification Method Optimisation	39
2.2.3 Preparation of Extracts from Selected <i>Rubus</i> Cultivars	39
2.2.3.1 Preparation of Phenolic Extracts.....	40
2.2.3.2 Preparation of Ellagitannin (ET) -enriched Extracts.....	41
2.2.4 HPLC and LCMS Compositional Analysis of Extracts	41
2.2.4.1 Ellagitannins (ETs)	42
2.2.4.2 Anthocyanins	43
2.2.5 Determination of Extract Stability	43
2.2.5.1 Stability of Test Extract at Different pH Conditions.....	44
2.2.5.2 Stability of Extracts in Cell Culture Medium	44
2.2.6 Statistical Analysis.....	44
2.3 Results.....	45
2.3.1 Extraction Method Optimisation	45
2.3.1.1 Characterisation of the Major Ellagitannins in <i>Rubus</i> Fruit	45
2.3.1.2 Solvent Extraction Efficiency.....	47
2.3.1.3 Ellagitannin (ET) Purification Method Optimisation	48
2.3.2 Preparation of Extracts from Selected <i>Rubus</i> Cultivars	49
2.3.3 Determination of Extract Stability	52
2.4 Discussion and Conclusions	54
2.4.1 Extraction Method Optimisation	54
2.4.2 pH Stability of Phenolic Compounds.....	55
Chapter 3: <i>Rubus</i> fruit extracts and their effects on RAW 264.7 cells.....	57
3.1 Introduction	57

3.1.1 Macrophages	58
3.1.1.1 Secondary Murine RAW 264.7 Macrophages	58
3.1.1.2 Inflammatory Markers	59
3.1.3 Aims	61
3.2 Methods.....	62
3.2.1 Cell Culture Materials	62
3.2.2 Cell Counting.....	62
3.2.3 Culture of Macrophage-Like RAW 264.7 Cell Line	63
3.2.4 <i>In Vitro</i> Assays.....	64
3.2.4.1 <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extract Solution for Cell Culture Testing.....	64
3.2.5 Cytotoxicity of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts for RAW 264.7 Macrophages.....	64
3.2.6 Cell Activation with LPS.....	66
3.2.7 Measuring Nitric Oxide (NO) Production	66
3.2.7.1 Measuring Interference by Anthocyanins.....	67
3.2.8 Measuring Cytokine Production for RAW 264.7 Macrophages	68
3.2.9 Statistical Analysis.....	69
3.3 Results.....	70
3.3.1 Cytotoxicity of Cultivar Extracts on RAW264.7 Cells	70
3.3.2 Nitric Oxide Production (NO) by RAW 264.7 Cells	72
3.3.2.1 Optimisation of LPS Stimulation	72
3.3.2.2 Effect of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts on Nitric Oxide (NO) Production.....	73
3.3.3 Effect of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts on Cytokine Production	74
3.4 Discussion and Conclusions	76
3.4.1 Cytotoxicity	76
3.4.2 Nitrite.....	77
3.4.3 Cytokines.....	77
Chapter 4: Effects of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts on Murine Isolated Primary Cell Cultures of Bone Marrow Derived Macrophages and Colon Cells	80

4.1 Introduction	80
4.1.2 Aims	81
4.2 Methods.....	82
4.2.1 Materials	82
4.2.2 Preliminary Study.....	82
4.2.2.1 Bone Marrow Derived Macrophages Isolation.....	84
4.2.2.2 Intestinal Epithelial Cells Isolation	85
4.2.2.3 Cytotoxicity Assay of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts	87
4.2.2.4 Nitric Oxide Assay	88
4.2.2.5 Cytokine Assay	88
4.2.3 Chemical Interference by Extracts and Optimisation of LPS-Stimulation for Bone Marrow Derived Macrophages.....	89
4.2.4 Main Study.....	90
4.2.4.1 Intestinal Bacteria Inoculation.....	91
4.2.4.2 Bone Marrow Derived Macrophages Isolation.....	92
4.2.4.3 Colon Cells Isolation.....	92
4.2.4.4 Cytotoxicity of <i>Rubus</i> Fruit Extracts	93
4.2.4.5 Measuring Nitric Oxide Production in Bone Marrow Derived Macrophages.....	94
4.2.4.6 Measuring Cytokine Production in Bone Marrow Derived Macrophages.....	94
4.2.4.7 Measuring Cytokine Production from Colon Cells.....	95
4.2.5 Statistical Analysis.....	96
4.3 Results.....	96
4.3.1 Preliminary Study.....	96
4.3.1.1 Cytotoxicity	96
4.3.1.2 Nitric Oxide Production.....	99
4.3.1.3 Cytokine Production.....	100
4.3.2 Chemical Interference by Extracts.....	102
4.3.3 LPS Stimulation of BMDM.....	104

4.3.4 Main Study	104
4.3.4.1 Animal Performance	105
4.3.4.2 Cytotoxicity Assay	107
4.3.4.3 Nitrite Production	117
4.3.4.4 Cytokine Production.....	120
4.4 Discussion.....	130
4.4.1 Preliminary Study	130
4.4.2 Main Study	131
4.4.1 Conclusion.....	133
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion	135
5.1 Summary and Discussion of Experimental Work.....	135
5.2 Limitations of the Methods.....	139
5.3 Future Experimental Work.....	141
5.4 Conclusions	142
References:	143
Appendix	154
A.1 Additional Media Preparations.....	154
A.2 Additional Mouse Methods	157
A.3 Urolithins	158
A.3.1 Urolithin Synthesis.....	158
A.3.2 RAW 264.7 macrophages	158
A.3.3 Mouse Study.....	160
A.3.3.1 Cytotoxicity	160
A.3.3.2 Griess Assay	165
A.3.3.3 Cytokine Assays	167
A.4 Declaration confirming content of digital version of thesis	175

Table of Figures and Tables

Figure 1: Demonstration of the complex interactions in the development of IBD	16
Figure 2: Anatomic distribution of CD and UC in GIT	17
Figure 3: IBD susceptibility loci.....	19
Figure 4: A model for IBD pathways based on genome-wide association studies.....	20
Figure 5: The chemical structure of the two main ETs found in red raspberry and Boysenberries.	25
Figure 6: The proposed metabolism of EA (from ET origin: punicalagin) to Uro's by microbial action.	27
Figure 7: EA bacterial metabolites.	28
Figure 8: The two main Rubus fruit grown in New Zealand Boysenberries (right) and red raspberries....	30
Figure 9: Schematic demonstrating the work flow used to prepare extracts for in vitro study from three Rubus cultivars.	40
Figure 10: Representative Boysenberry phenolic HPLC UV profile	45
Figure 11: LCMS confirmation of ET identity.....	46
Figure 12: Effect of extraction solvent on yield of SH6 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$) from the representative Fruzio sample...	47
Figure 13: Effect of time on yield of SH6 from Fruzio extract.....	48
Figure 14: Percentage polyphenolic composition for Rubus cultivar extracts.....	49
Figure 15: Polyphenolic profiles of the cultivar extracts prepared in this study.....	51
Figure 16: pH sensitivity of Fruzio extract analysed by HPLC	52
Figure 17: Stability of SH6 in cell culture media for all cultivar extracts over time	53
Figure 18: Schematic diagram demonstrating the Griess reaction.. ..	60
Figure 19: Layout of custom designed Multiplex ELISArray for RAW 264.7 macrophages.	68
Figure 20: MTT cytotoxicity results for RAW 264.7 macrophages co-incubated with Rubus fruit extract	71
Figure 21: Optimisation of LPS concentration for stimulating NO response in RAW 264.7 macrophages	72
Figure 22: Effect of Rubus fruit extracts on nitrite concentration, as an indicator of NO production, by LPS stimulated RAW 264.7 macrophages.	74
Figure 23: Cytokine production in LPS-stimulated RAW264.7 macrophages as a result of co-incubation with Rubus extracts.	75
Figure 24: Schematic summary showing experimentation for preliminary study.	83
Figure 25: Summary schematic for main study focusing on BMDM and colon cells.	91
Figure 26: Relative viability of Rubus fruit extract-treated small intestinal IEC compared with control IEC	97
Figure 27: Relative viability of Rubus fruit extract-treated colonic IEC compared with control IEC.....	98
Figure 28: Relative viability of Rubus fruit extract-treated BMDM compared with control BMDM	99
Figure 29: The effect of 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ Rubus fruit extracts, after 19 h co-incubation, on the production of IL6 by colonic IEC isolated from group 2 mice.....	101

Figure 30: The effect of 50 µg/mL Rubus fruit extracts on the production of IL6, IL10 and TNFα by BMDM isolated from group 2 mice	102
Figure 31: Effects of Rubus fruit extracts and medium on absorbance for the A: WST-1 and B: MTT assay methods.	103
Figure 32: Optimisation of LPS concentration for stimulating NO response in BMDM cells.	104
Figure 33: Individual mouse body weights throughout the study	105
Figure 34: Average weight of $Il10^{-/-}$ and C57 mice in group 1 and group 2 throughout the study.....	106
Figure 35: Relative viability of extract-treated colonic IEC compared with control IEC.	109
Figure 36: Relative viability of extract-treated colonic IEC compared with control IEC	110
Figure 37: Relative viability of extract-treated colonic IEC compared with control IEC.	111
Figure 38: Relative viability of extract-treated colonic IEC compared with control IEC	112
Figure 39: Relative viability of extract-treated BMDM compared with control BMDM.....	113
Figure 40: Relative viability of extract-treated BMDM compared with control BMDM.....	114
Figure 41: Relative viability of extract-treated BMDM compared with control BMDM.....	115
Figure 42: Relative viability of extract-treated BMDM compared with control BMDM	116
Figure 43: Effect of Rubus fruit extracts on NO production by LPS-stimulated BMDM relative to control BMDM, from group 1 mice.....	118
Figure 44: Effect of Rubus fruit extracts on NO production by LPS-stimulated BMDM relative to control BMDM, from group 2 mice.....	119
Figure 45: IL6 production for colonic IEC isolated from group 1 $Il10^{-/-}$ and C57 mice.....	121
Figure 46: IL6 production for colonic IEC isolated from group 2 $Il10^{-/-}$ and C57 mice.....	122
Figure 47: Relative production of IL6 by colonic IEC in comparison to control IEC.....	123
Figure 48: Relative production of IL6 by colonic IEC in comparison to control IEC.	124
Figure 49: Effect of co-incubation with Rubus extracts on cytokine production relative to the control BMDM for LPS-stimulated BMDM from group 1 C57 mice.	126
Figure 50: Effect of co-incubation with Rubus extracts on cytokine production relative to the control BMDM for LPS-stimulated BMDM from group 2 C57 mice	127
Figure 51: Effect of co-incubation with Rubus extracts on cytokine production relative to the control BMDM for LPS-stimulated BMDM from group 1 $Il10^{-/-}$ mice.	128
Figure 52: Effect of co-incubation with Rubus extracts on cytokine production relative to the control BMDM for LPS-stimulated BMDM from group 2 $Il10^{-/-}$ mice.	129
Figure 53: RAW 264.7 macrophages were co-incubated with the 10 µM Uro A and B with 0.05% DMSO, and LPS-stimulation (0.05 µg/mL).....	159
Figure 54: Relative viability results for colonic IEC co-incubated with Uro A and Uro B, from group 1 C57 and $Il10^{-/-}$ mice, relative to DMSO control.....	161
Figure 55: Relative viability results for colonic IEC co-incubated with Uro A and Uro B, for group 2 C57 and $Il10^{-/-}$ mice, relative to DMSO control.....	162

<i>Figure 56: Relative viability results for BMDM co-incubated with Uro A and Uro B, for group 1 C57 and Il10^{-/-} mice, relative to DMSO control.</i>	<i>163</i>
<i>Figure 57: Relative viability results for BMDM co-incubated with Uro A and Uro B, for group 2 C57 and Il10^{-/-} mice, relative to DMSO control.</i>	<i>164</i>
<i>Figure 58: Relative production of NO by BMDM isolated from group 1 C57 and Il10^{-/-} mice, relative to DMSO control. A: C57 and B: Il10^{-/-}.</i>	<i>166</i>
<i>Figure 59: Relative production of NO produced by BMDM isolated from group 2 Il10^{-/-} mice, relative to DMSO control.</i>	<i>167</i>
<i>Figure 60: Production of IL6 from group 1 colonic IECs isolated from A: Il10^{-/-} and B: C57 mice.</i>	<i>169</i>
<i>Figure 61: IL6 production from group 2 colonic IEC isolated from A: Il10^{-/-} and B: C57 mice.</i>	<i>170</i>
<i>Figure 62: BMDM isolated from group 1 C57 mice, cytokine production relative to the DMSO control.</i>	<i>171</i>
<i>Figure 63: Group 2 results for C57 BMDM cytokine production relative to control.</i>	<i>172</i>
<i>Figure 64: Cytokine production relative to control for BMDM isolated from group 1 Il10^{-/-} mice.</i>	<i>173</i>
<i>Figure 65: Cytokine production relative to control for BMDM isolated from group 2 Il10^{-/-} mice.</i>	<i>174</i>
<i>Table 1: Comparison between different extraction methods for Rubus fruits and the effect on total polyphenolic content recorded.</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Table 2: Polyphenolic composition of extracts prepared in this study.</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Table 3: Summary flow chart describing experimental procedures for isolating IEC.</i>	<i>86</i>
<i>Table 4: Layout of custom designed Multiplex ELISArray for cytokine analysis of supernatants collected from C57 or Il10^{-/-} mice.</i>	<i>95</i>
<i>Table 5: Summary of effect of Rubus fruit extracts on cell viability at polyphenolic concentration 50 µg/mL.</i>	<i>108</i>

Abbreviations Used

Abbreviation	Full meaning
BMDM	Bone marrow derived macrophages
C57	C57Bl/6J mice
CA	Cellulose acetate
CD	Crohn's Disease
CFU	Colony forming units
CIF	Conventional intestinal flora
COX2	Cyclooxygenase-2
Complete BRPMI	Complete Bone Marrow RPMI-1640
Complete IRPMI	Complete IEC RPMI-1640
DM	Dry matter
Complete DMEM	Liquid high-glucose Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DSS	Dextran sodium sulfate
DTT	Dithiothreitol
DTT HBSS	HBSS 1% Pen/Strep with 15 mM DTT
EA	Ellagic acid
EGF	Epidermal growth factor
ES	<i>Enterococcus</i> suspension
ET	Ellagitannin
ETx	<i>Rubus</i> fruit ellagitannin enriched extract
EX	<i>Rubus</i> fruit phenolic
FBS	Foetal bovine serum
FW	Fresh weight
GHS	General Health Score
GIT	Gastrointestinal tract
GWAS	Genome-wide association studies
HBSS	Hanks' Balanced Salt Solution
HETx	HB19 ellagitannin extract
HEX	HB19 phenolic extract
HHDP	Hexahydroxydiphenoyl
HPLC	High-performance liquid chromatography
IBD	Inflammatory Bowel Disease
IEC	Intestinal epithelial cells
IFN γ	Interferon γ
IL	Interleukin cytokine (family group name)
<i>Il10</i> ^{-/-}	IL10 gene-deficient mice
Lam C	Lambertianin C
LCMS	Liquid chromatograph-mass spectrometry
LPS	Lipopolysaccharide
MAPK	Mitogen-activated protein kinases
M-CSF	Macrophage colony stimulating factor
MTT	MTT assay
NED	Naphthylenediamine dihydrochloride
NF- $\kappa\beta$	Nuclear factor- $\kappa\beta$
NO	Nitric Oxide
NOD2	Nucleotide oligomerisation domain 2

PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PE	Pomegranate extract
Pen/Strep	Penicillin and Streptomycin
Plant & Food Research	The New Zealand Institute for Plant & Food Research Limited
RPMI	Liquid Roswell Park Memorial Institute medium
RT	Room temperature
SH6	Sanguin-H6
SNP	Single nucleotide polymorphisms
T _h 1	T helper 1
TLR	Toll-like receptor
TNF α	Tumour Necrosis Factor alpha
UC	Ulcerative Colitis
Uro	Urolithin
WETx	Wakefield ellagitannin extract
WEX	Wakefield phenolic extract
WST-1	WST-1 assay
ZETx	ZZ ellagitannin extract
ZEX	ZZ phenolic extract