

2006

## Studies on the impact of probiotic bacteria on enteric microbial diversity and immune response

Xi-Yang Wu  
*University of Wollongong*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

### University of Wollongong

#### Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

### Recommended Citation

Wu, Xi-Yang, Studies on the impact of probiotic bacteria on enteric microbial diversity and immune response, PhD thesis, School of Biological Sciences, University of Wollongong, 2006.  
<http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/596>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: [research-pubs@uow.edu.au](mailto:research-pubs@uow.edu.au)

## **NOTE**

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

## **UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG**

### **COPYRIGHT WARNING**

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**STUDIES ON THE IMPACT OF PROBIOTIC  
BACTERIA ON ENTERIC MICROBIAL  
DIVERSITY AND IMMUNE RESPONSE**

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements  
for the award of the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy in Biological Sciences**

**from**

**UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG**

**by**

**Xi-Yang Wu  
(Master of Science)**

**School of Biological Sciences  
University of Wollongong  
Australia**

**2006**

# Abstract

The mechanism of action of probiotics is based on competitive exclusion and immune modulation. However, the literature is scant on supporting data because of the failure to adopt a systems approach to probiotic functionality. This has been partially addressed in this thesis by taking into consideration the tripartite interaction between bacteria and bacteria in the enteric community; between bacteria and the host animal and finally, between the host immune response (innate or acquired) on the plethora of microbes that inhabit the gastrointestinal tract.

A trial involving newly inducted cattle in a feedlot, formed the basis of initial attempts to assess the benefits of a commercial probiotic formulation – Protexin on intestinal health by enumeration of a select subset of cultivable bacteria species and by assessment of immune modulation. The results failed to demonstrate a significant change in the population dynamics of cultured faecal microbes but did show that Protexin stimulated immune responsiveness in T cells. Carcass analysis demonstrated a significant reduction in marbling or intramuscular fat deposition.

In the course of examining the faecal microflora from feedlot cattle, the presence of high levels of *Bacillus* spores suggested that one possible reason for the lack of a growth benefit may be attributed to a high endogenous level of bacilli. Since there were no reliable methodologies for identifying *Bacillus* species, an alternative procedure was developed involving amplified ribosomal DNA restriction analysis (ARDRA). With this protocol, we were able to show that cattle faeces contained large numbers of *Bacillus* spores representing different mesophilic species, where *B. subtilis*, *B. licheniformis* and *B. clausii* dominated.

The presence of a stable population of coliforms in cattle faeces that was not altered by probiotic feeding highlighted the importance of developing better techniques to characterise diversity in *E. coli*, a potential food-borne pathogen of economic significance to the cattle industry. The use of virulence genes to genotype coliforms provided a method for differentiating between pathogenic, clinical and commensal

isolates of *E. coli*. Altogether, a combination of uni- and multiplex PCR assays was developed to screen for 50 virulence genes (VGs) from 8 pathotypes of *E. coli*. There was a significant association between phylogroupings and VG ownership. This result showed clearly that the lack of or possession of VGs in member isolates of each phylogenetic group can be used to assess diversity and potential pathogenesis of *E. coli*.

To understand better the importance of pathogenic enteric coliforms, an alternative animal model involving pigs with post-weaning diarrhoea was used to investigate the relationship between pathogenicity and commensalism by VG profiling. Porcine enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC) were found to carry VGs identified in *E. coli* that cause extraintestinal infection. Furthermore, by using the appropriate methods of statistical analysis, VG profiling had the capacity to predict the pathogenic and commensal status of individual clones. By developing the capacity to rapidly characterise and genotype virulence and commensalism in *E. coli*, it is now feasible to examine how probiotic feeding can modulate the population dynamics of different community members in pigs with enteric disease, as well as changes in the coliform populations.

Finally, another arm of the tripartite interaction involving bacteria and host interaction was modelled *in vitro* by examining the primary signalling events between bacteria and intestinal epithelial cells. These investigations focused on the judicious selection of T84 as the reporter intestinal epithelial cell line because of low level expression of inflammatory transcripts from 6 other epithelial cell lines. Using a panel of coliforms genotyped for virulence or lack of virulence, the signalling events that followed on from the primary interaction between bacterium and cell, showed there was a lack of correlation between VGs and gene activation. Nonetheless, all the coliform strains tested varied in their capacity to signal transduce T84, confirming that this differential bioactivity can be exploited in the ranking of candidate probiotic strains. The differential responses seen with different *E. coli* strains and the lower and more consistent activation patterns recorded by LABs for both cytokine and chemokine gene activation, demonstrate that a semi-quantitative ranking of microbial bioactivity can be obtained. Such an approach if adopted in conjunction with an even wider panel of genes in a standardised *in vitro* environment can provide invaluable information on the selection of appropriate strains to be further tested *in vivo*.

# Certification

I, Xi-Yang Wu, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the School of Biological Sciences, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualification at any other academic institution

**Xi-Yang Wu**

**Signature:** .....

**Date:** .....

# Acknowledgements

---

I would like to deeply thank my supervisor, A/Prof. James Chin at Elizabeth Macarthur Agricultural Institute, NSW Department of Primary Industry, for his outstanding knowledge, encouragement, guidance and constructive advice throughout this study.

I am very grateful to Prof. Mark Walker, School of Biological Science, University of Wollongong, for his supervision and attention which have contributed to the success of this study.

I express my great gratitude to Chris Lawlor and Kevin Healey, International Animal Health, Pty. Ltd., for their invaluable advice and long-term support.

I acknowledge Dr. Barbara Vanselow and CRC Beef Quality for the sustainment during my work.

Especially thankful to Dr. Darren Trott, Dr. Michael Hornitzky and Dr. Steve Djordjevic for their scientific guidance.

I offer my warmest thanks to Toni Chapman, Bernadette Turner, Jannine Petterson, Sameer Dixit and all the members at the 'JC's Group' for the friendship and assistance.

Very special thanks to my parents and my wife, Xiaoyin Wang, for your endless love, much needed understanding and unconditional support ever since then.

Last, but not least my lovely daughter Bethany, for all the happiness in the world.

# List of Publications

---

This thesis is based on the following articles

**Xi-Yang Wu**, Mark J Walker, Michael Hornitzky and James Chin (2006): Identification of *Bacillus* species from environmental sources using amplified ribosomal DNA restriction analysis (ARDRA). *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 64: 107-119

**Xi-Yang Wu**, James Chin, Aida Ghalayini and Michael Hornitzky (2005): Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis typing and oxytetracycline sensitivity of *Paenibacillus larvae* subsp. *larvae* isolates of Australian origin and those recovered from honey imported from Argentina. *Journal of Apiculture Research* 44(2): 87-92

**Xi-Yang Wu**, Mark Walker, Barbara Vanselow, Ri-Liang Chao and James Chin (2006): Characterization of mesophilic bacilli in faeces of feedlot cattle. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* (Published article online: 15-Aug-2006)

Toni Chapman, **Xi-Yang Wu**, Idris Barchia, Karl Bettelheim, Steven Driesen, Darren Trott, Mark Wilson and James J-C Chin (2006): A comparison of virulence gene profile between *E. coli* strains isolated from healthy and diarrheic swines. *Applied & Environmental Microbiology* 72(7):4782-95

Do T, Stephens C, Townsend K, **Wu X-Y**, Chapman T, Chin J, McCormick B, Bara M and Trott DT (2005): Rapid identification of virulence genes in enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* isolates associated with diarrhoea in Queensland piggeries. *Australian Veterinary Journal* 83: 25-31

S. M. Dixit, D. M. Gordon, **X-Y. Wu**, T. Chapman, K. Kailasapathy and J. J.-C. Chin (2004): Diversity analysis of commensal porcine *Escherichia coli* - associations between genotypes and habitat in the porcine gastrointestinal tract. *Microbiology* 150: 1735-1740



**X-Y. Wu**, T. Chapman, D. Gordon, D.N. Thuy, S. Driesen, M. Walker and J. Chin (2003): Molecular virulence gene typing of clinical *E. coli* isolates from pigs with postweaning diarrhoea. In: Paterson, J.E. (ed). "Manipulating pig production IX", pp59. Proceedings of the ninth biennial conference of the Australasian pig science association (Inc.)

**X-Y. Wu**, T. Chapman, M-K, Tan, D. Trott, M. Walker and J. Chin (2003): Comparison of pig enterotoxigenic *E. coli* isolates by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE). In: Paterson, J.E. (ed). "Manipulating pig production IX", pp68. Proceedings of the ninth biennial conference of the Australasian pig science association (Inc.)

T. Chapman, **X-Y. Wu**, D. Broek, D. Jordan, M. Wilson and J. Chin (2003): Haemolytic bacterial population analysis in rectal swabs from healthy and scouring neonates. In: Paterson, J.E. (ed). "Manipulating pig production IX", pp35. Proceedings of the ninth biennial conference of the Australasian pig science association (Inc.)

T. Chapman, **X-Y. Wu**, R. Smith, D. Broek, D. Jordan, M. Wilson and J. Chin (2003): Population analysis of haemolytic bacteria in rectal swabs from healthy and scouring weaners. In: Paterson, J.E. (ed). "Manipulating pig production IX", pp29. Proceedings of the ninth biennial conference of the Australasian pig science association (Inc.)

**X-Y. Wu**, T. Chapman, D. Trott, D.N. Thuy, S. Driesen, M. Walker and J. Chin (2006): Virulence gene profiling of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* isolates associated with post-weaning diarrhoea in pigs. Applied & Environmental Microbiology (In press)

**X-Y. Wu**, T. Chapman, D. Gordon, K. Bettelheim, M. Walker and J. Chin (2006): Validation of *Escherichia coli* phylogenetic assignments based on virulence gene ownership (submitted to Microbiology)

James Chin, Toni Chapman and **Xi-Yang Wu** (2006): A re-appraisal of early signalling events and gene activation in a human intestinal epithelial cell line *in vitro* by probiotic and enteric pathogenic bacteria species (Manuscript)

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Frontispiece</b>	
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Certification</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Publications</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>xiv</b>
<b>List of Figures</b> .....	<b>xvi</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>xix</b>
<b>Chapter 1 – Literature Review</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 What are probiotics?</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1.1 Definition of probiotics.....	<b>2</b>
1.1.2 Use of probiotics as alternatives to growth promotants for intensive animal industries .....	<b>2</b>
1.1.3 Selection criteria for a probiotic strain.....	<b>6</b>
1.1.4 Safety assessment of probiotics - the accurate identification of probiotic strains.....	<b>8</b>
1.1.5 <i>Bacillus</i> probiotic strains.....	<b>11</b>
1.1.6 <i>Escherichia coli</i> ( <i>E. coli</i> ) probiotic strains.....	<b>14</b>
1.1.7 Mechanisms of probiotic action/efficacy.....	<b>17</b>
1.1.7.1 Adhesion and competitive exclusion.....	<b>17</b>
1.1.7.2 Immunomodulation.....	<b>19</b>

<b>1.2 Intestinal microbial diversity</b> .....	<b>19</b>
1.2.1 Intestinal microbial ecosystem.....	<b>19</b>
1.2.2 Traditional approaches for the analysis microbial diversity.....	<b>22</b>
1.2.3 Molecular techniques used to investigate gut microflora diversity.....	<b>23</b>
<b>1.3 Virulence genes versus adaptive genes – the difference</b>	
<b>between commensals and pathogens</b> .....	<b>27</b>
1.3.1 Definition of virulence genes and adaptive genes.....	<b>27</b>
1.3.2 Possession of virulence genes in <i>E. coli</i> .....	<b>30</b>
1.3.3 <i>E. coli</i> phylogeny and diversity.....	<b>33</b>
1.3.4 Detection of virulence genes.....	<b>35</b>
<b>1.4 Host-bacteria interactions</b> .....	<b>36</b>
1.4.1 The structure of the gut epithelium.....	<b>36</b>
1.4.2 The role of enterocytes in intestinal barrier integrity.....	<b>38</b>
1.4.3 Inflammatory response in the gut.....	<b>40</b>
1.4.4 Immunomodulative function of probiotics.....	<b>42</b>
<b>1.5 Thesis objectives</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>Chapter 2 – Materials and Methods</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>2.1 List of ATCC and commercially sourced bacteria strains</b> ....	<b>47</b>
<b>2.2 Bacterial culture media</b> .....	<b>48</b>
2.2.1 Non-selective bacterial culture media.....	<b>48</b>
2.2.2 Selective culture media (SCM).....	<b>49</b>
<b>2.3 Cell culture media</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>2.4 Bacterial growth and storage</b> .....	<b>50</b>
2.4.1 Recovery of bacteria from environmental samples.....	<b>50</b>
2.4.2 Freezedown storage.....	<b>50</b>
2.4.3 Microbead storage.....	<b>51</b>
<b>2.5 Bacterial counting</b> .....	<b>51</b>

<b>2.6 Cell culture and storage</b> .....	<b>51</b>
2.6.1 Revival and growth of cell Lines from frozen storage.....	<b>51</b>
2.6.2 Maintenance and subculture of cells.....	<b>52</b>
2.6.3 Preparation of frozen stocks.....	<b>52</b>
<b>2.7 DNA and RNA extractions</b> .....	<b>53</b>
2.7.1 Bacterial genomic DNA extraction.....	<b>53</b>
2.7.2 RNA extraction.....	<b>54</b>
<b>2.8 PCR and gel electrophoresis</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<b>2.9 DNA cloning and sequencing</b> .....	<b>55</b>
2.9.1 Competent cell preparation.....	<b>55</b>
2.9.2 Ligation and transformation.....	<b>55</b>
2.9.3 Plasmid DNA extraction and sequencing.....	<b>56</b>
<b>2.10 Statistic analysis</b> .....	<b>56</b>

### **Chapter 3 – Field Assessment of the Function of a Panel of**

<b>Probiotic Strains in Feedlot Cattle</b> .....	<b>57</b>
<b>3.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>58</b>
<b>3.2 Materials and methods</b> .....	<b>59</b>
3.2.1 Description of the experimental substance .....	<b>59</b>
3.2.2 Trial farm and animals .....	<b>60</b>
3.2.3 Experimental design.....	<b>61</b>
3.2.4 Feeding regime.....	<b>61</b>
3.2.5 Faecal flora determination.....	<b>62</b>
3.2.6 Assessment of immune responses.....	<b>63</b>
3.2.7 Statistical analysis.....	<b>63</b>
<b>3.3 Results</b> .....	<b>64</b>
3.3.1 Faecal bacterial enumeration using culture media.....	<b>64</b>
3.3.2 Immune response.....	<b>65</b>

3.3.3 Animal growth performance.....	65
<b>3.4 Discussion.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Chapter 4 – Bacillus as Candidate Probiotics – Molecular</b>	
<b>Characterisation.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>4.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>4.2 Materials and methods.....</b>	<b>78</b>
4.2.1 Reference strains and culture conditions .....	78
4.2.2 Morphological and biochemical identification of <i>Bacillus</i> strains.....	78
4.2.3 DNA isolation.....	78
4.2.4 Primer design and PCR amplification.....	79
4.2.5 ARDRA analysis of PCR amplicons.....	83
4.2.6 <i>Bacillus</i> spore isolation from environmental sources.....	83
4.2.7 Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) for <i>Bacillus</i> isolates.....	84
4.2.8 DNA sequence analysis.....	84
<b>4.3 Results.....</b>	<b>84</b>
4.3.1 Selection and validation of a <i>Bacillus</i> specific forward and reverse primer set.....	84
4.3.2 Genus-specific amplification of reference <i>Bacillus</i> strains.....	87
4.3.3 Speciation of reference <i>Bacillus</i> strains by ARDRA.....	87
4.3.4 Validation of ARDRA by speciation of probiotic strains from commercial sources.....	90
4.3.5 Identification of test <i>Bacillus</i> isolates from environmental sources.....	90
4.3.6 Determination of the intraspecies clonal variation of <i>B. licheniformis</i> by PFGE.....	93
<b>4.4 Discussion.....</b>	<b>95</b>

<b>Chapter 5 – Validation of <i>Escherichia coli</i> Phylogenetic</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Assignments Based on Virulence Gene Ownership</b> .....	
<b>5.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>103</b>
<b>5.2 Materials and methods</b> .....	<b>105</b>
5.2.1 Bacterial strains and clinical characteristics.....	<b>105</b>
5.2.2 Serotyping.....	<b>105</b>
5.2.3 Phylogenetic grouping.....	<b>105</b>
5.2.4 Virulence genotypes.....	<b>108</b>
5.2.5 Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) for coliforms.....	<b>111</b>
5.2.6 Biometric analysis.....	<b>111</b>
<b>5.3 Results</b> .....	<b>112</b>
5.3.1 Validation of primer set for virulence gene detection.....	<b>112</b>
5.3.2 Phylogenetic status of <i>E. coli</i> isolates.....	<b>112</b>
5.3.3 Presence of virulence genes.....	<b>114</b>
5.3.4 Prevalence of significant virulence genes in isolates belonging to different phylogroups.....	<b>115</b>
5.3.5 Phylogenetic distribution of virulence genes.....	<b>116</b>
5.3.6 Principal coordinate (PCO) analysis.....	<b>116</b>
5.3.7 Phylogenetic grouping based on PFGE DNA fingerprinting.....	<b>117</b>
<b>5.4 Discussion</b> .....	<b>122</b>
<b>Chapter 6 – Comparative Analysis of Virulence Genes, Genetic</b>	
<b>Diversity and Phylogeny Between Commensal and</b>	
<b>Enterotoxigenic <i>E. coli</i> from Weaned Pigs</b> .....	<b>128</b>
<b>6.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>129</b>
<b>6.2 Materials and methods</b> .....	<b>131</b>
6.2.1 <i>E. coli</i> strains used in this study.....	<b>131</b>
6.2.2 Serotyping porcine <i>E. coli</i> isolates.....	<b>131</b>

6.2.3 Detection of virulence genes and rapid phylogenetic analysis by PCR.....	131
6.2.4 Statistic analysis.....	132
<b>6.3 Results</b> .....	<b>133</b>
6.3.1 Prevalence of virulence genes in porcine <i>E. coli</i> PWD and commensal isolates.....	133
6.3.2 Phylogenetic group analysis of porcine <i>E. coli</i> PWD and commensal isolates.....	134
6.3.3 Clustering analysis of porcine <i>E. coli</i> based on virulence gene attributes.....	135
6.3.4 PFGE analysis of PWD isolates.....	135
6.3.5 Analysis of porcine commensal isolates by PFGE and serotyping.....	136
<b>6.4 Discussion</b> .....	<b>139</b>

<b>Chapter 7 – A Re-appraisal of Early Signalling Events and Gene Activation in a Human Intestinal Epithelial Cell Line <i>in Vitro</i> by Probiotic and Enteric Pathogenic Bacteria</b> .....	<b>146</b>
<b>7.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>147</b>
<b>7.2 Materials and Methods</b> .....	<b>148</b>
7.2.1 Growth of human cell lines .....	148
7.2.2 Preparation of bacteria .....	151
7.2.3 Bacteria-cell interaction.....	151
7.2.4 Detection of gene activation by semi-quantitative reverse transcriptase-PCR (RT-PCR).....	152
7.2.4.1 cDNA synthesis.....	152
7.2.4.2 PCR with gene-specific primers.....	152
7.2.5 Detection of NF-κB activation by electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA).....	154

7.2.5.1 DNA probe labelling.....	154
7.2.5.2 Nuclear protein extraction.....	154
7.2.5.3 Assay of NF- $\kappa$ B activation.....	154
<b>7.3 Results</b> .....	<b>155</b>
7.3.1 Selection and validation of probiotic and pathogenic Gram-negative coliforms .....	155
7.3.2 Basal levels of gene activation in 7 different cell lines .....	157
7.3.3 Activation of NF- $\kappa$ B.....	158
7.3.4 Activation of multi-functional genes by Gram-negative coliforms.....	158
7.3.5 Activation of multi-function genes by a panel of LABs.....	159
<b>7.4 Discussion</b> .....	<b>163</b>
<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>167</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>173</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>217</b>



# List of Tables

---

Table 1.1	Infection potential of probiotic microorganisms.....	9
Table 1.2	Microbes used for probiotics.....	11
Table 1.3	Selective media used for the culture of different strains.....	23
Table 1.4	Comparison of some molecular techniques which have been frequently used for the study of the intestinal microflora.....	28
Table 1.5	Review of the major pathotypes of pathogenic <i>E. coli</i>	31
Table 1.6	Review the ability of some probiotic bacteria to modulate immune responses <i>in vitro</i> .....	43
Table 2.1	Reference strains used in this study.....	47
Table 3.1	Microbial composition of Protexin.....	60
Table 3.2	Faecal flora determination using bacterial culture medium....	63
Table 4.1	List of bacterial strains used as a source of genomic DNA for the validation of primer pairs K-B1/F and K-B1/R1.....	80
Table 4.2A	List of <i>Bacillus</i> taxa providing 16S rDNA gene sequences from GenBank for the design of primers.....	81
Table 4.2B	List of non- <i>Bacillus</i> genera providing 16S rDNA gene sequences from GenBank for the design of primers.....	82
Table 4.3	Speciation of <i>Bacillus</i> isolates in cattle faeces and feedlot feed.....	93
Table 5.1	List of bacterial strains used in the analysis.....	107
Table 5.2	Virulence genes included in the uni/multiplex combinatorial PCR assays.....	109

<b>Table 5.3</b>	<b>Ranking the relative importance of the virulence genes (top 21 out of 50) based on the deviance value contributed to by phylogroup differences.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Table 6.1</b>	<b>Additional virulence genes tested in this study.....</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Table 6.2</b>	<b>The prevalence of VGs detected in porcine PWD and commensal isolates.....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>Table 7.1</b>	<b>List of human cell lines used in this study.....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Table 7.2</b>	<b>Culture conditions for growing human cell lines.....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Table 7.3</b>	<b>Bacteria strains used in this study.....</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Table 7.4</b>	<b>Oligonucleotide primers and PCR product size.....</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>Table 7.5</b>	<b>Characteristics (serotype, pathotype and phylogroup) of coliforms.....</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>Table 7.6</b>	<b>Baseline level of gene transcripts in different cell lines determined by RT-PCR.....</b>	<b>157</b>

# List of Figures

---

Figure 1.1	Anatomical regions of the human gastrointestinal tract.....	20
Figure 1.2	Sequence structure of bacterial 16S ribosomal RNA gene.....	24
Figure 1.3	Various culture-independent molecular approaches to analyse the human intestinal microbial community.....	26
Figure 3.1	Counts of total aerobic bacteria on blood agar (A), lactic acid bacteria on MRS agar (B), coliform bacteria on MAC agar (C), streptococci and enterococci bacteria on KEA agar (D), and enterococci bacteria on CATC agar (E), recovered from cattle faeces during the Protexin DFM trial ( $\log_{10}$ CFU $g^{-1}$ ).....	66
Figure 3.2	Effects of ovalbumin (OVA) vaccination on the serum IgG response of cattle against OVA.....	67
Figure 3.3	Assessment of cellular immunity of Protexin feeding by PHA activation.....	67
Figure 3.4	Average daily feed intake (ADFI) for 10 cattle fed rations containing Protexin versus 10 cattle fed a control diet.....	68
Figure 3.5	Average daily weight gain (ADWG) for 10 cattle fed rations containing Protexin versus 10 cattle fed a control diet.....	68
Figure 3.6	Meat quality of animals was investigated by measuring the P8, 12/13 <sup>th</sup> rib and EMA values using ultrasound scanning.....	69
Figure 3.7	Percentage of intramuscular fat at three sites – IMF 1, 2 and 3.	69
Figure 4.1A	Alignment of primer K-B1/F with homologous target sequences of 16S rDNA ( <i>E. coli</i> numbering scheme - 255 and 273) from <i>Bacillus</i> , <i>Paenibacillus</i> , <i>Brevibacillus</i> and other genera, obtained from GenBank.....	86
Figure 4.1B	Alignment of primer K-B1/R1 with homologous target sequences of 16S rDNA ( <i>E. coli</i> numbering scheme - nucleotides 1350 and 1368) from <i>Bacillus</i> , <i>Paenibacillus</i> , <i>Brevibacillus</i> and other genera.....	86

Figure 4.2A	<i>AluI</i> restriction profiles of amplified regions of the 16S rRNA genes of <i>Bacillus</i> reference strains.....	88
Figure 4.2B	<i>TaqI</i> restriction profiles of <i>Bacillus</i> reference strains.....	88
Figure 4.2C	Theoretical prediction of ARDRA profiles generated with restriction enzymes <i>AluI</i> (a) and <i>TaqI</i> (b) based on published 16S rDNA sequences from GenBank.....	89
Figure 4.3	ARDRA analysis of 17 commercial probiotics strains corresponding to <i>AluI</i> digestion.....	92
Figure 4.4	Counts of aerobic spores on TSA media recovered from cattle faeces during feedlotting ( $\log_{10}$ CFU g <sup>-1</sup> ).....	92
Figure 4.5A	Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) with <i>ApaI</i> showing the intraspecies clonal variation of 12 cattle isolates in <i>B. licheniformis</i> species.....	94
Figure 4.5B	Dendrogram clustering showing similarity among 12 cattle <i>B. licheniformis</i> isolates based on their PFGE profiles described in 4.5A.....	94
Figure 5.1	Agarose gel electrophoresis of uni/multiplex combinatorial PCR amplified <i>E. coli</i> virulence genes.....	113
Figure 5.2	Clustering of 42 <i>E. coli</i> isolates based on their virulence gene profiles and phylogenetic groups.....	118
Figure 5.3	PCO analysis with 37 VGs (included 3 Clermont genes).....	119
Figure 5.4	PCO analysis with 34 VGs (excluded 3 Clermont genes).....	120
Figure 5.5	Clustering of 42 <i>E. coli</i> isolates based on their PFGE profiles with <i>XbaI</i> digestion.....	121
Figure 5.6	Venn diagram describing the virulence gene distribution in EXPEC, IPEC and commensal isolates.....	123
Figure 6.1	Clustering analysis of the genetic variation between PWD and commensal porcine <i>E. coli</i> isolates based on the virulence gene attributes.....	137

<b>Figure 6.2</b>	<b>Clustering analysis of porcine PWD isolates from different geographic origin (NSW, Qld and Vietnam) based on PFGE patterns obtained by digestion of bacterial genomic DNA with <i>NotI</i>.....</b>	<b>138</b>
<b>Figure 7.1</b>	<b>Representative EMSA demonstrating NF-<math>\kappa</math>B activation in bacterially stimulated T84 cells.....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Figure 7.2</b>	<b>Gene activation in T84 cells incubated with 7 different <i>E. coli</i> strain.....</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>Figure 7.3</b>	<b>Gene activation in T84 cells incubated with 4 different LAB strain.....</b>	<b>162</b>

# Abbreviations

---

ARDRA	Amplified ribosomal DNA restriction analysis
bp	Basepair(s)
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
cDNA	Complementary DNA
CE	Competitive exclusion
CFU	Colony forming units
Da	Dalton(s)
DFM	Direct-fed microbial
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTP	Deoxyribonucleic triphosphate
DTT	Dithiothreitol, threo-1,4-Dimercapto-2,3-butandiol
EaggEC	Enteroaggregative <i>E. coli</i>
EDTA	Ethylendiamin-N,N,N',N'-tetra acid
EHEC	Enterohemorrhagic <i>E. coli</i>
EIEC	Enteroinvasive <i>E. coli</i>
EMSA	Electrophoretic mobility shift assay
EPEC	Enteropathogenic <i>E. coli</i>
ETEC	Enterotoxigenic <i>E. coli</i>
ExPEC	Extraintestinal pathogenic <i>E. coli</i>
FCS	Fetal calf serum
GIT	Gastrointestinal tract
h	Hour
IEC	Intestinal epithelial cell
IL	Interleukin
IPEC	Intestinal pathogenic <i>E. coli</i>
kb	Kilobasepair(s)
LAB	Lactic acid bacteria
M	Molar
Mb	Megabase

min	Minutes
MLEE	Multilocus enzyme electrophoresis
MOI	Multiplicity of infection
MQ-H <sub>2</sub> O	Milli-Q filtered deionised water
mRNA	Messenger RNA
NMEC	Neonatal Meningitis <i>E. coli</i>
O.D.	Optic density
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PFGE	Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis
PWD	Post-weaning diarrhoea
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
RNase	Ribonuclease
rpm	Revolution per minute
RT	Room temperature
RT-PCR	Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction
sec	Second(s)
TBE	Tris-borate-EDTA
TE	Tris-EDTA
TEMED	N,N,N',N'-tetramethylethylenediamin
µg	Microgram
UPEC	Urinary pathogenic <i>E. coli</i>
V	Voltages
v/v	Volume for volume
VG	Virulence gene
Vol	Volume