

Comparison of immune cells of colostrum from gilts and sows

<u>Gabrielly E. Bombassaro¹</u>, Franciana A. V. Bellaver¹, Francisco N. Fonseca², Shaiana Maciag³, Danielle Gava², Leticia S. Lopes², Ana P. Bastos²

¹Instituto Federal Catarinense – Campus Concórdia, Concórdia, SC; ²Embrapa Suínos e Aves, Concórdia, SC ³Universidade Estadual do Centro-Oeste do Paraná- campus CEDETEG, Guarapuava-PR, Brazil. E-mail:gabibombassaro@gmail.com

Introduction

The early and sufficient intake of good quality colostrum is essential for piglet's health and growth. After farrowing, the newborn piglet goes from a sterile intrauterine environment to an antigen-rich external environment, which requires an adequate immune response to survive (1,2). In swine, maternal immunity is transferred to offspring only after birth via colostrum ingestion. In addition, porcine mammary secretions contain leukocytes, which are absorbed by the neonate and produce a measurable immune activity and numerous soluble factors with antimicrobial and/or immunomodulating activity (2). This study aimed to compare the immune cells presented in colostrum from gilts and sows.

Materials and Methods

Eighty dams (40 gilts and 40 sows) had the farrow induced by an analog of prostaglandin F2a (Alfabédyl®) on day 113 of gestation and colostrum was manually collected after the birth of the first piglet. Teats were scrubbed with alcohol and iodine and gloves were worn to minimize contamination. Colostrum was diluted in PBS containing 5% fetal calf serum, centrifuged and the fat upper layer was discarded. The cells' viability was evaluated by the trypan blue exclusion test. For flow cytometry, colostrum samples were incubated with the following antibodies: isotypes controls; mouse anti-pig CD3, CD4, CD8, granulocytes, macrophages, CD27, CD45RA, CD79a, CD5, CD14, CD16, IgM, CD45RA/B220, and CD335. Flow cytometry was performed with Accuri® flow cytometer (Becton Dickinson) and 50.000 events were analyzed. The data were pre analyzed by the K-S test. The transversal analyses were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test, with the Student-Newman-Keuls posttest.

View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

The dams' colostrum was composed of 30% of lymphocytes, 40% of macrophages, and neutrophils are the predominant granulocyte in mammary secretions (Table 1). It was observed a numerically but not a statistically significant increase in granulocyte, NK cells (CD3⁻CD8^{low}CD335⁺) and B-lymphocytes subsets in sows compared with gilts. Sows showed CD4⁺ T cell subsets and monocyte/macrophage (macrophages CD14 CD16) significantly higher than gilts (p \leq 0.05). The phenotypic classification of CD4[†] T cell subsets that increased are naive $CD4^{+}$ T cells

CD4⁺CD27⁺CD45RA⁺, central memory CD4⁺T cells as CD4⁺CD27⁺CD45RA⁻, effector memory CD4⁺T cells as CD4⁺CD27⁻CD45RA⁻, and central memory CD8⁺T cells as CD8⁺CD27⁺CD45RA.

Table 1. Comparison of immune cells of colostrum from gilts and sows.

Immune Cells	Gilts	Sows
Granulocytes ⁺	7.062±1.589	11.06±2.408
Macrophages ⁺	40.74±1.050	40.51±2.180
CD79A ⁺	16.47±3.064	13.83±2,216
IGM ⁺ CD45R/B220 ⁺	18.93±1.085 1.856±0.547	25.63±4.022 2.846±0.470
CD5 ⁺	32.36±1.820	32.53±1.884
CD3 ⁺ CD4 ⁺	9.354±2.277	11.81±2.117
CD4 ⁺ CD27 ⁺ CD45RA ⁻	8.380±1.215 ^a	18.31±3.110
CD4 ⁺ CD27 ⁺ CD4RA ⁺	2.955±0.761 ^a	6.258±1.274
CD4'CD27-CD45RA-	21.53±2.360	29.16±3.331
CD3 ⁺ CD8 ⁺	7.205±1.536	7.880±1.266
CD8 ⁺ CD27 ⁺ CD45RA ⁻ CD8 ⁺ CD27 ⁺ CD45RA ⁺	10.09±1.706 ^a 3.848±1.077	18.33±2.348 7.426±2.050
CD3-CD8lowCD335+	13.20±1.098	16.31±1.735
Macrophages ⁺ CD16 ⁺ Macrophages ⁺ CD14 ⁺ CD16 ⁺	27.60±1.286 10.88±1.695 ^a	25.90±1.945 16.76±1.888
^a Superscripts indicate differences within main e	•	significant

Conclusions and Discussion

gilts and sows' colostrum.

Dams' colostrum contains lymphocytes (T and B cells), phagocytes (neutrophils and macrophages), and enithelial cells. The estimated number and types of lely between dams and are affected by party of out. This study provides new data about population of cells existing in porcine colostrum, mainly regarding to subsets of T-lymphocytes and the difference about these subsets in

References

- 1. Bandrick M C et al. 2014. Developmental and Comparative Immunology 43:114-120.
- 2. Devillers N et al. 2011. Animal 5:1605-12.