

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.

**A comparative study of two *Lactobacillus fermentum* strains  
that show opposing effects on intestinal barrier integrity**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for  
the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

Massey University

Manawatu, New Zealand

**Ranjita Sengupta**

2014



## ***ABSTRACT***

The *Lactobacillus* species can exert health promoting effects in the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) of humans through several mechanisms, which include pathogen inhibition, maintenance of microbial balance, immunomodulation and enhancement of the GIT barrier function. However, different strains of lactobacilli can evoke different responses in the host and not all strains of the same species can be considered health promoting. Two strains identified as *Lactobacillus fermentum*, namely AGR1485 and AGR1487, isolated from human oral cavities, exhibit opposing effects on intestinal barrier integrity. Studies have shown that AGR1485 maintains trans-epithelial electric resistance (TEER), a measure of GIT barrier integrity, across Caco-2 cell monolayers, while AGR1487 decreases TEER by 12 hours.

This work aimed to test the hypotheses that the varying effects shown by these two *L. fermentum* strains are related to phenotypic differences between the two strains and are mediated by the interaction of secreted and/or cell-associated bacterial components with the GIT epithelial layer. Differences in metabolic events that occur during the various phases of growth in bacteria can impact not only cellular structure and secreted molecules, but may also affect their interactions with the intestinal epithelial cells. TEER assays were conducted to investigate if variation in bacterial secreted molecules and cell wall components associated with various phases of microbial growth can affect Caco-2 cell TEER. The effect on Caco-2 cell TEER caused by both strains was independent of bacterial growth phase. To test the hypothesis that it is the bacterial structural and/or secreted components that influence

Caco-2 cell TEER, assays were conducted with live versus UV-killed bacteria on Caco-2 cells. Results showed that for both strains of *L. fermentum*, dead bacteria have similar effects on Caco-2 cell TEER as live bacteria, implying that direct bacterial contact with Caco-2 cells is necessary for the effects. Analogous to TEER assays, live AGR1487 increased mannitol permeability while UV-killed AGR1487 did not, implying that AGR1487 uses both cell surface structures and/or metabolites through distinct mechanisms to modulate host barrier properties. Subsequent experiments conducted using secreted metabolites from bacteria, Caco-2 cells and bacteria-Caco-2 cell interactions indicated that they have no effect on Caco-2 cell TEER, strengthening the assumption that bacterial cell surface-associated components are involved in mediating these effects.

The bacterial cells were subjected to ultrasonication followed by ultracentrifugation to isolate the bacterial cell wall extract. TEER assays conducted with the cell wall extracts from both strains resulted in decreasing Caco-2 cell TEER, although at high concentrations, further strengthening the role of bacterial cell surface components in influencing barrier integrity of the Caco-2 cells. To narrow down proteinaceous components of the cell wall extracts from both the strains that influence Caco-2 cell TEER, they were fractionated through size exclusion chromatography and the effects of these cell wall fractions on Caco-2 cell TEER were studied. One fraction of AGR1487 CW appeared to decrease Caco-2 cell TEER, although at a high concentration. However, the results could not be repeated when the same fraction was applied at concentrations that the proteins comprising this fraction would be found in

live AGR1487. Even the high concentration tested previously did not decrease Caco-2 cell TEER and the discrepancy in results remains unexplained.

The results reported in this dissertation have added to the knowledge that the two strains of *L. fermentum* AGR1485 and AGR1487 show differences in their genome size and in their phenotypic characteristics. In addition, these bacteria utilise both cell surface and/or secreted metabolites through multiple mechanisms to modulate host response. In the future, identification of specific bacterial effector molecules that influence host response will be a major step towards understanding strain-specific characteristics shown by *Lactobacilli*.

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***

I sincerely thank AgResearch and the Riddet Institute, a Centre of Research Excellence, for funding this research and my PhD fellowship and Massey University for honouring me with the Massey Doctoral Scholarship. It is with immense gratitude that I acknowledge and sincerely thank AgResearch for this project and allowing me the opportunity to work in the excellent research facilities and work environment that AgResearch provides. I want to specially thank the Riddet Institute for allowing me the opportunity to enter a PhD programme and to fulfil a personal dream.

I thank Professor Paul Moughan, whom I will always consider my mentor and cannot thank enough for having faith in me. I thank Professor Warren McNabb for his support and guidance, making me see the silver lining and providing every opportunity so I would not give up. My heartfelt gratitude to Dr Nicole Roy for her incredible compassion, her efficiency and patience and most of all, her always being available to listen and help. My sincerest gratitude to Dr Eric Altermann, whose vast knowledge has been a constant source of awe and inspiration to me and whose guidance helped me realise my own strengths and weaknesses. I wish to thank Dr Rachel Anderson, who guided me with her knowledge, helped me stay focussed and provided the most valuable support any student needs and that is encouragement. Thanks to all my excellent supervisors, for their valuable time, effort, kindness and faith in guiding me all the way through my PhD journey.

I wish to thank to Dr Bill Kelly for his valuable guidance and patience in teaching me laboratory techniques for conducting pulsed-field gel electrophoresis that

were new to me. I thank Dr Dongwen Luo, Dr Siva Ganesh and Dr John Koolaard for their invaluable help with the statistical analysis of my data. I wish to thank Dr Linley Scholfield for her excellent guidance, time and patience in teaching me all that she could about HPLC. I am extremely grateful to Kelly Armstrong for her excellent technical support and to both Kelly and Dr Mark McCann for their valuable advice in regards to tissue culture. Mannitol assays and TEER assays conducted with bacterial fractions reported in chapter 4 were done with Kelly Armstrong's expert technical assistance and I could not have completed those assays while writing this thesis without her help. I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to Bruce Sinclair for his expert advice and suggestions all through my PhD. Special thanks to Denise Martin for her support, advice and always being available for any help needed.

I am and will always be grateful to my friends and colleagues in the student room, who made this journey not only a learning experience but an adventure and a fun experience as well. Special thanks to Francisco, Dulantha, Sam and Quentin for providing me with invaluable help with my work and writing of my thesis and thanks to Nadja, Alicia, Milica, Carol, Haike, Filomena, Sonal, Tom, Sandeep and Eva for being such great office mates and always being there to help. The international environment that my fellow students provided is a memory I will treasure for life and each of them have helped me learn not just science, but so much more. I will cherish every moment I have spent with my colleagues and fellow students here at AgResearch.

I wish to thank my family for letting me embark on a really difficult journey and seeing me complete it with patience, love and a lot of sacrifices on their part. I wish to



thank Dr Abhimanyu Sarkar, for being a pillar of strength and always being there for me, I would not be here if it was not for him. My heart-felt gratitude to Dr. Abhik Ghosh for with his generosity and kindness of heart, providing my children and myself with fun escapades from reality during our toughest times. I wish to thank my parents and my sisters in India for making me realise the importance of being independent. My children, Avroneel Ghosh and Aishani Sarkar, no words can express what I feel for them. Their love and understanding, their patience and encouragement, have been the beacon that I have always needed. I dedicate this thesis to my children, Avroneel and Aishani, I did this for you. Last but the most important, I wish to thank The Almighty, for giving me the strength, courage and perseverance to complete this journey.

# ***TABLE OF CONTENTS***

ABSTRACT .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xv
LIST OF TABLES .....	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xviii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. CHAPTER 1: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
1.1 THE HUMAN GASTROINTESTINAL BARRIER.....	4
1.1.1. THE INTESTINAL MICROBIOTA AND HOST-MICROBE INTERACTIONS .....	9
1.2 LACTOBACILLI .....	13
1.2.1 CELL SURFACE STRUCTURES OF LACTOBACILLI.....	15
1.2.1.1. Peptidoglycan .....	17
1.2.1.2. Teichoic acids .....	18
1.2.1.3. Cell wall polysaccharides .....	19
1.2.1.4. Pili and flagella.....	20

1.2.1.5. Cell surface proteins .....	21
1.2.1.5.1. Covalently anchored proteins .....	23
1.2.1.5.2. Non-covalently anchored proteins.....	24
1.2.1.5.3. S-layer proteins.....	24
1.2.1.5.4. Proteins displaying cell wall binding domains.....	25
1.2.2 CELL SURFACE ADAPTATIONS OF LACTOBACILLI IN RESPONSE TO HOST ENVIRONMENT.....	26
1.2.2.1. Acid and bile stress.....	27
1.2.2.2. Oxidative and osmotic stress .....	28
1.2.2.3. Starvation stress.....	30
1.2.3 LACTOBACILLI-HOST INTERACTIONS INVOLVING BACTERIAL CELL SURFACE AND SECRETED FACTORS .....	32
1.2.3.1. Adherence factors of lactobacilli.....	35
1.2.3.1.1. Mucus binding proteins .....	35
1.2.3.1.2. Sortase-dependent proteins.....	37
1.2.3.1.3. S-layer proteins.....	38
1.2.3.1.4. Proteins mediating adhesion to extracellular matrix .....	39
1.2.3.1.5. Non-protein adhesins.....	40
1.2.3.1.6. Cytoplasmic and cell surface associated proteins as adhesins	41
1.2.3.2. Preservation of epithelial barrier function.....	42
1.2.3.3. Immunomodulation through interaction with host cell types.....	46

1.3	STRAIN SPECIFICITY AND CELL SURFACE FACTORS .....	49
1.4	IN VITRO MODELS OF THE INTESTINAL EPITHELIAL BARRIER .....	50
1.4.1	In vitro epithelial cell model systems .....	51
1.4.2	Caco-2 monolayers as in vitro epithelial cell model system.....	51
1.4.3	Cell and culture related factors influencing Caco-2 cell monolayers .....	52
1.4.4	In vitro model system to study microbe-host interactions.....	53
1.4.5	Trans-epithelial electrical resistance assay .....	54
1.4.6	Paracellular permeability of Caco-2 using mannitol assay.....	55
1.5	CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES .....	56
1.6	AIM, HYPOTHESIS, APPROACH AND OUTLINE OF DISSERTATION.....	57
2.	CHAPTER 2: GENOME SIZE AND PHENOTYPIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO LACTOBACILLUS FERMENTUM STRAINS.....	61
2.1	INTRODUCTION .....	62
2.2	AIM AND HYPOTHESIS .....	63
2.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	64
2.3.1	Bacterial strains.....	64
2.3.1.1.	Preparation of bacterial stocks and culture medium.....	64
2.3.2	Gram staining.....	65
2.3.3	Cell culture for transepithelial electrical resistance assay .....	66

2.3.3.1	Tight junction integrity.....	67
2.3.4	16S rRNA sequencing .....	69
2.3.4.1	Genomic DNA Isolation.....	69
2.3.4.2	Polymerase chain reaction.....	70
2.3.4.3	DNA sequencing and identification of strains.....	71
2.3.5	Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis .....	73
2.3.6	Sugar utilisation .....	74
2.3.7	Bile and acid tolerance.....	75
2.3.7.1	Agar spot test.....	76
2.4	RESULTS.....	77
2.4.1	Gram staining.....	77
2.4.2	Effect of the two strains on transepithelial electrical resistance.....	79
2.4.3	Identification of bacterial strains .....	79
2.4.4	Strain differentiation using pulsed field gel electrophoresis .....	81
2.4.5	Sugar utilisation by the two strains.....	81
2.4.6	Ability of the two strains to tolerate gastrointestinal conditions .....	85
2.5	DISCUSSION.....	87
3.	CHAPTER 3: EFFECTS OF LACTOBACILLUS FERMENTUM CELL VIABILITY, GROWTH PHASE AND SECRETED COMPOUNDS ON INTESTINAL BARRIER EPITHELIUM. ....	93

3.1. INTRODUCTION .....	94
3.2. AIM AND HYPOTHESIS .....	97
3.3. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	97
3.3.1 Cell culture for the intestinal barrier assays.....	97
3.3.2 Bacterial strains.....	98
3.3.3 Bacterial growth curve.....	98
3.3.4 Bacterial growth phase for transepithelial electrical resistance assays.....	99
3.3.5 Preparation of UV-killed bacteria.....	100
3.3.5.1 Method development for UV inactivation of bacteria.....	100
3.3.5.1.1 UV inactivation of bacteria on agar plates .....	100
3.3.5.1.2 UV inactivation of bacteria in M199.....	101
3.3.5.2 Determining the effect of UV-killed versus live bacteria on transepithelial electrical resistance.....	102
3.3.5.3 Determining the effect of UV-killed bacteria on paracellular permeability (3H -mannitol assay).....	103
3.3.6 Preparation of supernatants containing metabolites produced by bacterial- Caco-2 cell interactions .....	106
3.4. RESULTS.....	110
3.4.1 Bacterial growth phases based on growth curves .....	110
3.4.2 Effect of bacterial growth phase on transepithelial electrical resistance .....	112

3.4.3 Effect of UV on bacterial growth on agar plates .....	112
3.4.4 Effect of UV on bacterial growth in M199.....	114
3.4.5 Effect of UV-killed bacteria on transepithelial electrical resistance .....	114
3.4.6 Effect of UV-killed bacteria on paracellular permeability .....	118
3.4.7 Effect of metabolites produced by bacterial-Caco-2 interactions on transepithelial electrical resistance.....	120
3.5. DISCUSSION.....	120
 4. CHAPTER 4: FRACTIONATION OF CRUDE BACTERIAL CELL WALL FROM AGR1485 AND AGR1487 TO DETERMINE EFFECTS OF FRACTIONS ON THE INTESTINAL BARRIER INTEGRITY.....	 127
4.1. INTRODUCTION .....	128
4.2. AIM AND HYPOTHESIS .....	130
4.3. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	131
4.3.1. Bacterial strains.....	131
4.3.2. Preparation of bacterial whole cell lysate and separation of crude cell wall from cell lysate supernatant.....	131
4.3.2.1. Bacterial cell wall preparation using guanidine hydrochloride ....	132
4.3.2.2. Bacterial cell wall preparation using sonication and ultracentrifugation.....	133
4.3.2.3. SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis .....	135

4.3.2.4. Protein concentration determination of crude bacterial cell wall and cell lysate supernatant .....	135
4.3.3. Fractionation of the crude bacterial cell wall.....	136
4.3.3.1. Size-exclusion high performance liquid chromatography.....	136
4.3.3.2. Protein concentration determination of bacterial cell wall fractions.. .....	138
4.3.4. Transepithelial electrical resistance assay with crude bacterial cell wall and cell lysate supernatant .....	139
4.3.5. Transepithelial electrical resistance assay with bacterial cell wall fractions..	140
4.3.6. Transepithelial electrical resistance assay with different concentrations of AGR1487 cell wall fraction 4 .....	141
4.3.7. Statistical analysis.....	141
4.4. RESULTS.....	142
4.5. DISCUSSION.....	158
5 CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND GENERAL DISCUSSION .....	163
5.1 BACKGROUND .....	164
5.2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	165
5.3 GENERAL DISCUSSION .....	168
5.3.1 Advancement of knowledge .....	168
5.3.2 Lactobacilli cell surface components affecting host-microbe interactions.....	170



5.3.3 Lactobacilli secreted molecules affecting host-microbe interactions .....	171
5.3.4 The AGR1487 cell wall .....	172
5.3.5 Strengths/limitations of methodologies used .....	175
5.3.6 Next steps and suggested improvements in methodologies.....	177
5.4 CONCLUSIONS .....	183
APPENDIX.....	185
REFERENCES.....	200

## ***LIST OF FIGURES***

Figure 1.1 Components of the human intestinal barrier.....	5
Figure 1.2 Cell envelope of lactobacilli.....	16
Figure 1.3 The different types of cell surface proteins found in Gram positive bacteria.....	22
Figure 1.4 MAMP-PRR recognition and signalling in epithelial cells.....	47
Figure 1.5 Structure of dissertation: Outline of thesis and research chapters.....	60
Figure 2.1 Gram stain of (A) AGR1485 and (B) AGR1487.....	78
Figure 2.2 Change in trans-epithelial electrical resistance across Caco-2 monolayers over time.....	80
Figure 2.3 Pulsed field gel electrophoresis of genomic DNA from AGR1485 and AGR1487.....	82
Figure 2.4 Growth of AGR1485 and AGR1487 in the presence of bile.....	86
Figure 2.5 Agar spot test of (A) AGR1485 and (B) AGR1487.....	88
Figure 3.1 Flow diagram showing the treatments applied to the lactobacilli strains AGR1485 and AGR1487.....	108
Figure 3.2 Growth curves for AGR1485 (A) and AGR1487 (B) and log phase of growth for AGR1485 (C) and AGR1487 (D).....	111

Figure 3.3 Effect of bacterial growth phase on trans-epithelial electrical resistance over time. ....	113
Figure 3.4 Effect of live versus UV-killed bacteria (AGR1485 and AGR1487) on Caco-2 cell monolayers over time. ....	117
Figure 3.5 Effect of bacteria (live and UV-killed) on permeability of Caco-2 cell monolayers. ....	119
Figure 3.6 Effect of metabolites on trans-epithelial electrical resistance across Caco-2 cell monolayers. ....	121
Figure 4.1 SDS-PAGE of bacterial cell wall and cell lysate supernatant preparations of AGR1487 and AGR1485. ....	143
Figure 4.2 Effect of bacterial cell wall and cell lysate supernatant of (A) AGR1485 and (B) AGR1487 on Caco-2 monolayers over time. ....	146
Figure 4.3 Chromatogram and standard curve of the standard proteins. ....	148
Figure 4.4 Chromatogram of the cell wall sample of AGR1485. ....	149
Figure 4.5 Chromatogram of the cell wall sample of AGR1487. ....	150
Figure 4.6 Effect of bacterial cell wall fractions of AGR1485 and AGR1487 on transepithelial electrical resistance. ....	154
Figure 4.7 Effect of AGR1487 cell wall fraction 4 applied at different concentrations on transepithelial electrical resistance. ....	157

## ***LIST OF TABLES***

Table 1.1 Lactobacilli cell surface factors implicated in microbe-host interactions.	33
Table 2.1 Oligonucleotide sequences used for 16S rRNA sequence analysis. ....	72
Table 2.2 Comparison of sugar source utilisation between the two strains, AGR1485 and AGR1487, based on API50CH fermentation patterns. ....	83
Table 3.1 Bacterial viability after UV exposure on agar plates for varying periods of time.....	115
Table 3.2 Bacterial viability after UV exposure in M199 for varying periods of time.....	116
Table 4.1 Protein concentrations of fractions. ....	152

## ***LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS***

ANOVA	Analysis of variance
ATCC	American Type Culture Collection
BHI	Brain-heart infusion
BLASTN	NCBI nucleotide Basic Local Alignment Search
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
cDNA	Complementary DNA
CFU	Colony-forming units
CM	Cell membrane
CnBP	Collagen binding protein
CLR	C-type lectin receptor
CPS	Capsular polysaccharides
CW	Cell wall
DC	Dendritic cells
DC-SIGN	Dendritic cell-specific intercellular adhesion molecule-grabbing non-integrin

ddNTPs	Dideoxynucleotides
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTP	Deoxyribonucleotide
EDTA	Ethylenediamine tetra-acetic acid
EF-Tu	Elongation factor Tu
EHEC	Enterohemorrhagic <i>Escherichia coli</i>
EIEC	Enteroinvasive <i>Escherichia coli</i>
EPEC	Enteropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i>
EPS	Exopolysaccharides
ERK	Extracellular signal regulated kinases
Fbp	Fibronectin binding protein
FBS	Foetal bovine serum
GAPDH	Glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase
G+C	Guanine plus cytosine
GlcNAc	N-acetyl-glucosamine

GIT	Gastrointestinal tract
H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Hydrogen peroxide
IBD	Inflammatory bowel disease
IEC	Intestinal epithelial cells
IFN	Interferon
IKK	IκB kinase
IL	Interleukin
IRAK	IL-1-receptor-associated kinase
IRF	IFN-regulatory factor
IκB	Inhibitor of NF-κB
KEGG	Kyoto Encyclopaedia of Genes and Genomes
LAB	Lactic acid bacteria
LACOG	<i>Lactobacillales</i> -specific clusters of orthologous genes
LTA	Lipoteichoic acids
LPS	Lipopolysaccharides
LSD	Least significant difference

M199	Medium 199
MAMPs	Microbe-associated molecular patterns
MAPK	Mitogen activated protein kinases
MBF	Mucus binding factor
MDCK	Madin Darby canine kidney
MLCK	Myosin light chain kinase
mRNA	Messenger RNA
MRS	Man, Rogosa and Sharpe
Msa	Mannose-specific adhesin
Mub	Mucus binding protein
MurNAc	$\beta$ -1-4linked N-acetyl-muramic acid
MyD88	Myeloid differentiation primary response gene
NADH	Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide
NCBI	National Center for Biotechnology Information
NEAA	Non-essential amino acids
NF- $\kappa$ B	Nuclear factor kappa B



NLR	NOD-like receptor
NOD	Nucleotide-binding and oligomerisation-domain
OD	Optical density
O <sub>2</sub>	Superoxide anion radicals
·OH	Hydroxyl radicals
PAMPs	Pathogen-associated molecular patterns
PC	Polycarbonate (Transwell® cell culture inserts)
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PG	Peptidoglycan
PKC	Protein kinase C
PLA2	Group IIA phospholipase A2
PRRs	Pathogen recognition receptors
PFGE	Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis
REML	Restricted maximum likelihood
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
RNase	Ribonuclease A

ROS	Reactive oxygen species
rRNA	Ribosomal RNA
SDS	Sodium dodecyl sulphate
SDP	Sortase-dependent proteins
SEM	Standard error of the mean
Slp	S-layer proteins
SN	Supernatant
SOD	Superoxide dismutase
SrtA	Sortase enzyme
TA	Teichoic acids
TDCA	Taurodeoxycholic acid
TEER	Transepithelial electrical resistance
TGF	Transforming growth factor
TJ	Tight junction
TLR	Toll-like receptor
TNF	Tumour necrosis factor

UV	Ultraviolet
WPS	Wall polysaccharides
WTA	Wall teichoic acids
ZO	Zonula occludens