



"Isolation and Characterization of Some Potential Probiotic Candidates for the Control of *Clostridium difficile* Infection"

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master degree

In Pharmaceutical Sciences
(Microbiology and Immunology)

By

May Mohamed Awad Bahr

Bachelor of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University, 2010

2017



"Isolation and Characterization of Some Potential Probiotic Candidates for the Control of *Clostridium difficile* Infection"

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master degree

In Pharmaceutical Sciences
(Microbiology and Immunology)

By

May Mohamed Awad Bahr

Bachelor of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University, 2010

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Walid Faisal Ahmed Elkhatib, PhD

Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy,
Ain Shams University.

Prof. Dr. Khaled Mohamed Anwar Aboshanab, PhD

Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy,
Ain Shams University.

Prof. Dr. Nahla Mokhtar Hassanein Mansour, PhD

Professor of Molecular Microbiology, Department of Natural and Microbial
Products, Pharmaceutical Industries Division,
National Research Centre.

2017

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First, and foremost my thanks must go to "**Allah**" for granting me the power to accomplish this work.

Special words of thanks and deep everlasting gratitude are directed to **Dr. Walid Faisal Ahmed Elkhatab**, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University, for planning the work, scientific supervision, valuable discussions and constructive criticism throughout this study. He saved no effort to supply me with the required facilities to achieve this work. He also spared me a lot of his valuable time in revising this thesis.

I am also indebted to **Dr. Khaled Mohamed Anwar Aboshanab**, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University, for his continuous support and motivation. I would like to express my deepest and most sincere gratitude for his immense patience and encouragement throughout my studies, valuable discussion, brilliant comments, precious advices and constant effort on revision of the thesis.

I would like to express my deep gratitude and sincere appreciation to **Dr. Nahla Mokhtar Mansour**, Professor of Molecular Microbiology, Department of Natural and Microbial Products, Pharmaceutical Industries Division, National Research Centre, for suggesting this research point as well as for her continuous guidance and supervision throughout the whole work. The thesis would not have been possible without her consistent support. I shall always be deeply indebted for her encouragement, guidance and support from the initial to the final level. Moreover this research was totally funded and supported by the **National Research Centre**, Egypt.

My deepest everlasting thanks and appreciation are for my beloved **parents** who have never failed to give me moral support and encouragement throughout my life. I would like to thank with all my heart all my **colleagues** and I offer my regards and blessing to all of those who supported me in any respect during the completion of this thesis.

May Bahr

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	I
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	III
LIST OF FIGURES.....	V
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
ABSTRACT.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
1. Probiotics.....	4
2. Antagonistic mechanisms of probiotics.....	8
3. Gut microbiota.....	11
4. <i>C. difficile</i> pathogen.....	13
MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	24
MATERIALS.....	24
1. Microorganisms.....	24
2. Kits.....	25
3. Chemicals.....	26
4. Instruments and other materials.....	27
5. Buffers and Solutions	28
6. Media and media ingredients.....	28
7. Primers.....	31
METHODS.....	32
8. Isolation of bacterial isolates from fecal samples.....	32
9. Screening of bacterial isolates for <i>C. difficile</i> inhibition.....	32
10. Auto- and Co-aggregation assay of the selected isolates.....	33
11. Co-culturing of the selected isolates with <i>C. difficile</i>	33
12. Phenotypic characterization of the selected isolates.....	34
13. Molecular identification of the selected isolates.....	35
14. Probiotic features of the selected strains.....	36
15. Safety profile of the selected strains.....	38
16. Antimicrobial activity assay of the selected strains.....	39
17. <i>In vivo</i> evaluation of the selected strains.....	40
RESULTS.....	44
1. Isolation of bacterial isolates from fecal samples.....	44
2. Screening of bacterial isolates for <i>C. difficile</i> inhibition.....	44

3. Auto- and Co-aggregation assay of the selected isolates.....	46
4. Co-culturing of the selected isolates with <i>C. difficile</i>	48
5. Phenotypic characterization of the selected isolates.....	49
6. Molecular identification of the selected isolates.....	50
7. Probiotic features of the selected strains.....	52
8. Safety profile of the selected strains.....	55
9. Antimicrobial activity assay of the selected strains.....	58
10. In <i>vivo</i> evaluation of the selected strains.....	58
DISCUSSION.....	64
SUMMARY.....	73
REFERENCES.....	75
الملخص العربي	

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAD	Antibiotic associated diarrhea
<i>A. fecalis</i>	<i>Alcaligenes fecalis</i>
API	Analytical profile index
ATCC	American Type Culture Collection
<i>B. bifidum</i>	<i>Bifidobacterium bifidum</i>
BHI	Brain Heart Infusion
BLAST	Basic Local Alignment Search Tool
BP	Base Pair
<i>B. subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>
Caco-2	Colon adenocarcinoma cells
CDAD	<i>Clostridium difficile</i> associated diarrhea
CDI	<i>Clostridium difficile</i> infection
<i>C. difficile</i>	<i>Clostridium difficile</i>
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CLSI	Clinical and laboratory standards institute
Co.	Company
DMSO	Di methyl sulfoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
<i>E. coli</i>	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
EDTA	Ethylene diamine tetra acetic acid
<i>E. faecium</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>
<i>E. fecalis</i>	<i>Enterococcus fecalis</i>
ELISA	Enzyme linked imuunosorbent assay
FAO	Food and agriculture organization
FBS	Fetal bovine serum
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FMT	Fecal microbiota transplant
GIT	Gastro intestinal track
GRAS	Generally recognized as safe
h	hours
IC 50	Inhibitory concentration 50
Ig	Immunoglobulin
IL	Interleukin
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>
<i>L. acidophilus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i>

<i>L. delbrueckii</i>	<i>Lactobacillus delbrueckii</i>
<i>L. rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus</i>
LAB	Lactic acid bacteria
LB	Lurai Bertani
<i>M. luteus</i>	<i>Micrococcus luteus</i>
MRS	Man Rogosa Sharpe
MTT	3-[4, 5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl]-2, 5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide
NCBI	National Center for Biotechnology Information
NRRL	The Northern Regional Research Laboratory
OD	Optical Density
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
q PCR	Quantitative polymerase chain reaction
QPS	Qualified presumption of safety
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
RPMI	Roswell Park memorial Institute Medium
rRNA	Ribosomal ribonucleic acid
<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
SCFA	Short chain fatty acid
SD	Standard deviation
sIg	Secretory immunoglobulin
<i>S. thermophiles</i>	<i>Streptococcus thermophiles</i>
TAE	Tris acetic ethylene diamine tetra acetic acid
TLRs	Toll like receptors
TNF	Tumor necrosing factor
U.K	United Kingdom
U.S.A	United states of America
WHO	World Health Organization

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Antagonistic mechanisms of probiotic bacteria against pathogens.....	9
Figure 2: CDI pathogenesis.....	15
Figure 3: Proposed mechanism of microbiota on pathogen resistance during CDI.....	16
Figure 4: Inhibition percentage of the cell free supernatant of fecal isolates against <i>C. difficile</i> in broth assay.....	45
Figure 5: Inhibition percentage of the cell free supernatant neutralized and non-neutralized of the selected isolates against <i>C. difficile</i> in broth assay.....	46
Figure 6: Auto-aggregation percentage of the selected isolates.....	47
Figure 7: Microscopic examination of auto-aggregation ability of the selected isolates..	47
Figure 8: PCR amplification of 16S rRNA genes from the selected isolates.....	51
Figure 9: A neighbor joining phylogenetic tree between the 16S rRNA sequence derived from the selected isolates and from other strains.....	52
Figure 10: Comparative evaluation of cytotoxicity of the bacterial metabolites of the selected strains on Caco-2 cells using MTT assay.....	57
Figure 11: Evaluation of IC50 of the bacterial metabolites of the selected strains on Caco-2 cells using MTT assay.....	57
Figure 12: Representative intestinal histology pictures about protection effects of the selected strains from <i>C. difficile</i> infection in tested mice group compared to control mice group.....	61
Figure 13: Representative liver histology pictures about protection effects of the selected strains from <i>C. difficile</i> infection in tested mice group compared to control mice group.....	61

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Examples of commercial probiotic products in the market.....	5
Table 2: Health benefits of probiotics which confirmed in human trials.....	8
Table 3: Different indicator strains and their sources for antibacterial studies.....	25
Table 4: The different chemicals used in the present study.....	26
Table 5: The ready made media used in the present study.....	28
Table 6: Universal primers used for molecular identification of the selected isolates.....	31
Table 7: Primers used for detection of toxin A and toxin B genes of <i>C. difficile</i>	31
Table 8: Primers used for detection of enterococcal virulence genes.....	31
Table 9: Co-aggregation ability of the selected isolates after cultivation with <i>C. difficile</i> in broth using live and inactivated cell suspension	48
Table 10: Bacterial count (CFU/ml) of the co-culture and control samples.....	48
Table 11: Relative abundance of the toxin A and toxin B genes within the DNA extracted from co-culture of mixed selected isolates and <i>C. difficile</i>	49
Table 12: Probiotic properties of the selected strains – Survival at acidic medium.....	53
Table 13: Probiotic properties of the selected strains – Survival at bile salts.....	54
Table 14: Probiotic properties of the selected strains –Survival at pancreatic enzyme.....	54
Table 15: Antibiotic susceptibility test of the selected strains according to CLSI guidelines.	55
Table 16: PCR screening for tested genes of the selected strains.....	56
Table 17: Antimicrobial activity of the selected strains against Gram positive and Gram negative indicator pathogenic strains.....	58
Table 18: Bacterial count (CFU/ml) of the mice fecal samples from each group	59
Table 19: Relative abundance of the toxin A and toxin B genes within the DNA extracted from the fecal samples	62
Table 20: Different immunoglobulin concentrations within mice serum in tested groups compared to control group	63

ABSTRACT

This study is aimed at the isolation, identification, and characterization of potential probiotic strains capable of inhibiting *C. difficile* infection *in vitro* and *in vivo*.

Twenty isolates were isolated from breast fed infant fecal samples and screened against *C. difficile* using their cell-free supernatant. Only three isolates showed maximum inhibition from 56.05% to 60.60% thus they were characterized for probiotic properties and safety. The results revealed their tolerance to the GIT conditions and safety profile. They were identified by sequencing 16S rRNA as *E. faecalis* NM815, *E. faecalis* NM915 and *E. faecium* NM1015. Their sequences were submitted to GenBank as KU365166, KU365167 and KU365168 respectively.

For *in vivo* evaluation, a viable mixture of the three strains (10^9 CFU/ml) was administrated to group of mice (treated group) in daily dose for 14 days, then followed by a challenge with viable *C. difficile* (10^5 CFU/ml) in daily dose for 7 days, then a second administration of a viable mixture of the three strains was done daily for 10 days. For control two mice groups were used; control group which was administrated PBS only, untreated group which received PBS instead of the probiotic mixture before and after the challenge with *C. difficile*. The results obtained from histological analysis in addition to assessment of the toxin A and toxin B gene copies within the mice fecal samples from each group, confirmed the effectiveness of the three potential probiotic strains which expressed as inhibition of *C. difficile*, reduction in the toxin A and toxin B gene copies and maintenance of the structural integrity of the examined intestinal and liver cells compared to the untreated groups.

INTRODUCTION

Probiotics are defined as ‘live micro-organisms, which when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host (FAO/WHO, 2001). Various bacterial species have been identified as probiotics according to their beneficial effects and contributions, including the most familiar two genera *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* in addition to some species of *Enterococcus* and yeast especially *Saccharomyces boulardii*. The research on this field had a clear conclusion confirmed that the health benefits conferred by any probiotic bacterium are strain specific and cannot be global to other strains from the same species. The individual strains possess different specific abilities and characteristics thus make the differentiation and specificity for each strain. For example, *L. rhamnosus* GG is a specific bacterial strain which demonstrates a probiotic effect in the prevention of AAD (McFarland, 2006), other strain of *L. rhamnosus* species may not have this effect, and likewise other species in the genus of *Lactobacillus* may not act as probiotics. This is because individual strains exhibit different specific characteristics (Jacobsen, *et al.*, 1999).

C. difficile infection (CDI) is considered a dominant health problem in hospitals causing an acquired diarrhea in adults (Bauer, *et al.*, 2009). The consequence of CDI varies from mild diarrhea to fulminant colitis, toxic mega colon and death. *C. difficile* showed colonization in low percentage in healthy adults up to 5% (Parkes, *et al.* 2009; Hautmann, *et al.* 2011; Hell, *et al.* 2012; Moudgal and Sobel, 2012), while in patients at hospital, the colonization reached high percentage up to 39% (Hickson, 2011; McFarland, 2011). It is recognized as the major antibiotic associated infection which causes morbidity and increases health care overheads. Antibiotics cause disorder of the original gut microbiota and generate other conditions within the intestine that stimulates circumstances for *C. difficile* from spore germination, vegetative growth and toxin production, causing epithelial damage and colitis. Several studies and scientific reports demonstrated the possible ability of indigenous microbiota to inhibit growth and persistence of *C. difficile*. Although the specific mechanisms

of these processes are not known, they are likely to interfere with key aspects of the pathogen's physiology, including spore germination and competitive growth. Increasing our understanding of how the intestinal microbiota manages *C. difficile* could lead to better means of controlling this important nosocomial pathogen.

Aim of this study includes isolation and characterization of potential probiotic strains that able to adhere to the intestinal mucosa and control *C. difficile* pathogenesis. This is a principle of using probiotics for therapeutic and prophylactic manipulation of the intestinal pathogens such as *C. difficile*.

Aim of the work:

Protocol of the present study includes the following:

1. Isolation of Gram positive isolates from infants' fecal samples.
2. In *vitro* evaluation of probiotic isolates against *C. difficile* pathogen.
3. Characterization of the probiotic properties of the promising probiotic isolates.
4. Molecular identification of the promising probiotic isolates.
5. Evaluation of the safety of the selected probiotic isolates.
6. In *vivo* evaluation of the promising probiotic isolates.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Probiotics

1.1. Definition

The term "Probiotic" is elaborated from Greek language which means "for life" and it is opposite to antibiotic "for death". Probiotics are defined as the live micro-organisms that when administrated exert a health benefit on the human body (FAO / WHO, 2001); in addition there are certain principles for probiotics which showed to be accomplished.

1.2. History

The discovery of beneficial microbes or probiotics refers to the olden days in 1907, when the Russian Nobel laureate Elie Metchnikoff mentioned his idea that ingestion of certain beneficial microbes could benefit human health and he endorsed the longevity of Bulgarian peasants to their yogurt drinking. Then Metchnikoff established a theory that aging is begun by toxic bacteria in the gut and that lactic acid resulted from yogurt bacteria possibly would prolong life. He supported the potential life lengthening properties of lactic acid bacteria in particular *L. delbrueckii subsp. Bulgaricus* (Podolsky, 2012; Mackowiak, 2013). Metchnikoff explained that aging process could be due to putrefaction in the large intestine and he suggested restoring this problem by replacing the proteolytic micro-organisms in the colon with saccharolytic strains that produced lactic acid (Hamilton-Miller, 2008). In this way, the gut environment becomes more favorable to the growth of beneficial micro-organisms and less favorable to harmful micro-organisms.

1.3. Probiotic Species

The common bacterial genera that are known as probiotics are Lactic Acid Bacteria and bifidobacteria. LAB group are generally recognized as safe (GRAS) status and approved by the qualified presumption of safety (QPS) for food production and human consumption (Leuschner, *et al.*, 2010). Furthermore they have a long history in

manufacturing food and dairy products. LAB members are classified as probiotics among species of *Lactobacillus*, *Enterococcus* and *Streptococcus*. In addition to these common genera, there are other genus members which are proved as probiotic such as: strains belonging to *Propionibacterium*, *Bacillus* and *Escherichia coli*. Examples of commercial probiotic products in the market are listed in Table (1).

Table (1): Examples of commercial probiotic products in the market

Probiotic product	Manufacturer	Strains
1. Accuflora	Northwest Natural Products	<i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>L. rhamnosus</i> , <i>B. bifidum</i> , <i>L. salivarius</i> , <i>S. thermophiles</i>
2. Acidophilus Complex	Puritan's Pride	<i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>B. bifidum</i>
3. Acidophilus XTRA	Sundown Naturals	<i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>B. lactis</i> , <i>L. bulgaricus</i> , <i>S. thermophiles</i>
4. ACTIFlora	Kendy	<i>L. bulgaricus</i> , <i>L. acididophilus</i> , <i>B. ssp</i> , <i>S. thermophiles</i>
5. Active Balance High Potency Probiotic	Active Balance	<i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>B. bifidum</i>
6. Adult Probiotic	CVS Pharmacy	<i>B. breve</i> , <i>B. longum</i> , <i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>L. casei</i> , <i>L. rhamnosus</i> , <i>L. plantarum</i> , <i>L. lactis</i> , <i>S. thermophiles</i>
7. Advanced Acidophilus Plus	Solgar	<i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>B. lactis</i>

1.3.1. *Enterococcus* genus

The genus *Enterococcus* consists of non-spore forming, Gram positive cocci bacteria which are common commensal inhabitants of the gut microbiota in human and animal, in addition to their impact in the food and cheese industries, such as black pickled olives (Franz, *et al.*, 1996) and specific type of cheeses (Coppola, *et al.*, 1990; Litopoulou-

Tzanetaki and Tzanetakis, 1992; Olasupo, *et al.*, 1994; Giraffa, *et al.*, 1995). They are also known for production of a wide group of bacteriocins (enterocins), a family of ribosomally synthesized antimicrobial peptides and proteins with potential antibacterial activity against food borne pathogenic bacteria so they became attractive compounds in the food and dairy industries. They are widely used as supplementary starter cultures for the bio-preservation of vegetables and cheeses (Nunez, *et al.*, 1997; Sarantinopoulos, *et al.*, 2002; Moreno, *et al.*, 2003).

Enterococci are proved as probiotics (Holzapfel, *et al.*, 1998) such as, the *E. faecium* SF 68 which has been investigated and established for the cure of antibiotic associated diarrhea (Marteau, *et al.*, 2001) and modifies the immune responses (Sun, *et al.*, 2010; Bybee, *et al.*, 2011). In addition, *E. faecium* MMRA recognized as enterocin producer with a strong activity against the pathogenic *Listeria* (Rehaiem, *et al.*, 2010). Actually, there are some strains presently in usage as therapeutic treatments such as: 1- Cylactins (Hoffmann-La Roche, Basel, Switzerland) for antibiotic associated diarrhea, 2- Fargo 688s (Quest International, Naarden, The Netherlands) to alleviate the symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome, 3- Ecoflor (Walthers Health Care, Den Haag, The Netherlands) for diarrhea, 4- Symbioflor 1 (Symbio Pharm, Herborn, Germany) for bronchitis (Moreno, *et al.*, 2006).

1.3.1.1. Safety of *Enterococcus* members

Even though *Enterococcus* species are members in LAB and included in dairy and food fermentation, in addition to arise of many strains as probiotics, many researches have observed that some *Enterococcus* could contain virulence genes (Weckx, *et al.*, 2010; Leisner, *et al.*, 2012). In fact, such species do not own strong virulence factors or toxins, but they may have some structural and metabolic traits in addition to multiple antibiotic resistances, which could be considered as virulence factors from the view of some researchers (Cebrián, *et al.*, 2012). The existence of one or more virulence determinants does not certainly sort a strain pathogenic (Frans, *et al.*, 2011).

Enterococci are well known for their capability to exchange genetic information by conjugation (Clewell, 1990), and this exchange is recognized to occur in the gastrointestinal tract (Huycke, *et al.*, 1992). Transmissible plasmids carrying antibiotic resistance, virulence factors such as hemolysin - cytolysin production and the capacity for