



Title

**The *Eimeria*-host cell interaction in broiler
chickens**

Manouchehr Khazandi

Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M, Oromieh, Iran)

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**DISCIPLINE OF AGRICULTURE AND ANIMAL SCIENCE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE
ROSEWORTHY CAMPUS
ROSEWORTHY, SA 5371
AUSTRALIA
DECEMBER 2006**

Dedication

To, Ali, my dear son

My kind son, my best friend who always gives me strength and force to tolerate everything....

I am so sorry; I may fulfill your wish for going back to your country, Iran, where you told me many people like you and you want to live there. I will never forget that you told me; “Dad please finish your study and backing to Iran”. I tried, but failed to grant your wish,

It is not your fault but mine. I know a day will come when you can make the decision for yourself and you can choose your country for the rest of your life.

I shall never forget you and the way that you put your arm around my neck.

I do not know if there will come a day when we can meet each other or not, but Ali, you know that I love you forever. Wherever I will not forget you until my heart stops beating.

Your father

Table of contents

Table of contents	I
List of figures	IX
List of figures	IX
List of plates	X
List of plates	X
Summary	XI
Declaration	XIII
Acknowledgments	XIV
Abbreviations used in thesis	XV
CHAPTER 1: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Life cycle of <i>Eimeria</i>	6
1.3 <i>Eimeria</i> pathogenicity and damage	7
1.4 Immunity against coccidiosis	9
1.5 Control of coccidiosis.....	9
1.5.1 Prophylactic control.....	9
1.5.2 Vaccination.....	10
1.5.2.1 Attenuated vaccines.....	11
1.5.2.2 Non-attenuated vaccines.....	11
1.5.3 Problems of coccidiosis control.....	12
1.6 Intestinal barrier.....	14
1.7 The invasion process of <i>Eimeria</i>	16
1.7.1 <i>Eimeria</i> sporozoite motility	16
1.7.2 The role of carbohydrates in <i>Eimeria</i> attachment	17
1.7.3 The role of <i>Eimeria</i> micronemes in invasion	18
1.8 Site specificity of <i>Eimeria in vivo</i>	19

1.8.1 Host cell receptor	20
CHAPTER 2: GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	22
2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 Biological materials	23
2.2.1 Hatching and killing chickens	23
2.2.2 Collection of tissues.....	23
2.2.3 Preparation of frozen segments	23
2.3 Histology	24
2.3.1 Fixation	24
2.3.2 Preparation of samples for paraffin imbedding	24
2.3.3 Frozen sectioning.....	24
2.3.4 Deparaffination of sections.....	25
2.3.5 Staining methods	25
2.3.5.1 Hematoxylin and eosin staining	25
2.3.5.2 Periodic-acid-Schiff staining	25
2.3.5.3 Periodic-acid-Schiff and aniline blue-orange G staining.....	26
2.4 Eimeria oocysts.....	26
2.4.1 Purification of oocysts	26
2.4.2 Counting oocysts	27
2.4.3 Determination of sporulated oocysts	27
2.4.4 Preparation of sporocysts.....	27
2.4.5 Preparation of sporozoites	27
2.4.5.1 Extraction of sporozoites	27
2.4.5.2 Purification of sporozoites.....	27
2.4.5.2.1 DE-52 cellulose	28
2.4.5.2.2 Preparation of DE-52 and nylon wool column.....	28
2.4.5.3 Identification of the sporozoite viability	28
2.4.5.4 Staining <i>Eimeria</i> sporozoites.....	29
CHAPTER 3: DEVELOPMENT OF METHODS FOR PREPARING PARASITES	31
3 INTRODUCTION.....	32
3.1 Determination of viable sporulated oocysts	32
3.1.1 Introduction	32
3.1.2 Method.....	33
3.1.2.1 Staining oocysts to assess viability.....	33
3.1.2.2 Determination of <i>Eimeria</i> oocyst viability	33
3.1.3 Results	33
3.1.4 Discussion.....	35

3.2 Preparation of <i>Eimeria</i> sporocysts	35
3.2.1 Introduction	35
3.2.2 Methods	35
3.2.2.1 Purification of oocysts	35
3.2.2.2 Preparation of sporocysts by sonication	36
3.2.2.3 Preparation of sporocysts using glass beads with three breakage methods.....	36
3.2.2.4 Statistical analysis.....	36
3.2.3 Results	36
3.2.3.1 Sonication method	36
3.2.3.2 Breaking oocysts using a vortex shaker	37
3.2.3.3 Breaking oocysts using a wrist shaker.....	37
3.2.3.4 Breaking oocysts using a micro-tube shaker	37
3.2.4 Discussion.....	38
3.3 The viability of <i>Eimeria</i> sporocysts	39
3.3.1 Introduction	39
3.3.2 Materials and Methods	39
3.3.2.1 Preparation <i>Eimeria</i> sporocysts	39
3.3.2.2 Identification of viability	39
3.3.2.3 Statistical analysis.....	39
3.3.3 Results	40
3.3.4 Discussion.....	41
3.4 Extraction of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites	41
3.4.1 Introduction	41
3.4.2.1 Preparation of sporocysts.....	41
3.4.2.2 The incubation buffers.....	41
3.4.2.3 The extraction of <i>Eimeria</i> sporozoites.....	41
3.4.2.4 Statistical analysis.....	42
3.4.3 Results	42
3.4.4 Discussion.....	43
3.4.5 Conclusion.....	44
3.5 Extraction of <i>Eimeria acervulina</i> sporozoites.....	44
3.5.1 Introduction	44
3.5.2 Method.....	44
3.5.3 Result.....	45
3.5.4 Discussion.....	45
3.5.5 Conclusion.....	45
CHAPTER 4: INTERACTION BETWEEN <i>EIMERIA TENELLA</i> SPOROZOITES AND CAECAL ENTEROCYTES	46
4 INTRODUCTION.....	47

4.1 Determination of intestinal tissue viability in organ culture	47
4.1.1 Introduction	47
4.1.2 Materials and methods.....	48
4.1.2.1 Selecting animals	48
4.1.2.2 Tissue segments.....	48
4.1.2.3 Incubation of caecal tissue.....	48
4.1.2.4 Evaluation of epithelial cell viability.....	48
4.1.2.4.1 Basic assessment of histology	49
4.1.2.4.2 Propidium iodide-hematoxylin method	50
4.1.2.5 Statistical analysis.....	51
4.1.3 Results	51
4.1.4 Discussion.....	53
4.1.5 Conclusion	54
4.2 Investigating <i>Eimeria</i>-enterocyte interactions using caecal tissue in organ culture.....	54
4.2.1 Introduction	54
4.2.2 Materials and methods.....	55
4.2.2.1 Selecting animals	55
4.2.2.2 Estimation of enterocyte numbers	55
4.2.2.3 Estimation of sporozoite numbers	55
4.2.2.4 Preparation of sporozoites	55
4.2.2.5 Binding assay.....	56
4.2.2.6 Histology	56
4.2.2.7 Staining of sections.....	56
4.2.2.8 Number of attached sporozoites	56
4.2.3 Results	56
4.2.4 Discussion.....	57
4.2.5 Conclusion	58
4.3 <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoite interaction with, and entry into, isolated enterocytes	58
4.3.1 Introduction	58
4.3.2 Materials and methods.....	59
4.3.2.1 Selecting animals	59
4.3.2.2 Isolation of enterocytes.....	59
4.3.2.3 Identification of enterocyte viability	59
4.3.2.4 Preparation of sporozoites	60
4.3.2.5 Staining of sporozoites	60
4.3.2.6 Binding assay.....	60
4.3.2.7 Quantification of invasion	60
4.3.3 Results	60
4.3.4 Discussion.....	61
4.3.5 Conclusion	62
4.4 Impact cell isolation methodology in the interaction between sporozoites and enterocytes	63

4.4.1	Introduction	63
4.4.2	Materials and methods.....	63
4.4.2.1	Selecting animals.....	63
4.4.2.2	Preparing and staining of sporozoites.....	63
4.4.2.3	Isolation of enterocytes.....	64
4.4.2.4	Use of kidney cells	64
4.4.2.5	The viability of cells.....	65
4.4.2.6	Binding assay.....	65
4.4.2.7	Quantification of binding and invasion	65
4.4.3	Results	66
4.4.3.1	Cell viability	66
4.4.3.2	Binding of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites to cells.....	66
4.4.4	Discussion.....	67
4.4.4	Conclusion.....	68
4.5	<i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoite interaction with, and entry into, frozen sections.....	68
4.5.1	Introduction	68
4.5.2	Materials and methods.....	69
4.5.2.1	Selecting animals.....	69
4.5.2.2	Preparation and staining of sporozoites.....	69
4.5.2.3	Frozen segments	70
4.5.2.4	Frozen sectioning.....	70
4.5.2.5	Preparation of chamber.....	70
4.5.2.6	Binding assays	70
4.5.2.7	Quantification of sporozoite binding.....	70
4.5.2.8	Statistical analysis.....	71
4.5.3	Results	71
4.5.4	Discussion.....	73
4.5.5	Conclusion.....	74
CHAPTER 5: FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ATTACHMENT OF <i>EIMERIA TENELLA</i>		
TO SPECIFIC SITES OF THE INTESTINE		75
5	INTRODUCTION.....	76
Experiment 5.1 Attachment of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites to their preferred and non-		
preferred sites of infection		77
5.1.1	Introduction	77
5.1.2	Materials and methods.....	78
5.1.2.1	Selecting animals.....	78
5.1.2.2	Preparing and staining of sporozoites.....	78
5.1.2.3	Frozen sections	78
5.1.2.4	Binding assays	78
5.1.2.5	Quantification of binding.....	79
5.1.2.6	Statistical analysis.....	79

5.1.3 Result.....	79
5.1.4 Discussion.....	80
5.1.5 Conclusion.....	82
Experiment 5.2 Role of D-galactose and mucus in the <i>Eimeria</i>-enterocyte interaction.....	82
5.2.1 Introduction.....	82
5.2.2 Materials and methods.....	83
5.2.2.1 Selecting animals.....	83
5.2.2.2 Frozen segments and sectioning.....	83
5.2.2.3 Preparing and staining of sporozoites.....	83
5.2.2.4 Preparation of intestinal mucus.....	84
5.2.2.5 Binding assays.....	84
5.2.2.6 Quantification of <i>Eimeria</i> binding.....	84
5.2.2.7 Statistical analysis.....	85
5.2.3 Results.....	85
5.2.3.1 The effect of D-galactose on sporozoite attachment.....	85
5.2.3.2 The effect of mucus on sporozoite attachment.....	85
5.2.4 Discussion.....	86
5.2.5 Conclusion.....	87
CHAPTER 6: SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION OF <i>EIMERIA</i> SPOROZOITES IN SAMPLES BY PCR.....	88
6.1 Introduction.....	89
6.2 Materials and methods.....	91
6.2.1 Selecting animals.....	91
6.2.2 Preparation of sporozoites.....	91
6.2.3 Binding sporozoites to intestinal mucus.....	92
6.2.4 DNA extraction.....	92
6.2.5 DNA concentration and quality.....	93
6.2.6 Oligonucleotides.....	93
6.2.7 Optimisation of PCR conditions.....	93
6.2.8 Electrophoresis and staining of PCR reactions.....	94
6.3 Results.....	94
6.3.1 Optimising of PCR conditions.....	94
6.3.2 Sensitivity of PCR for purified <i>Eimeria</i> DNA.....	96
6.3.3 Identification of <i>Eimeria</i> species from infected tissue DNA.....	96
6.3.4 Identification of <i>Eimeria</i> sporozoites in mucus.....	97
6.4 Discussion.....	99

CHAPTER 7: GENERAL DISCUSSION	101
7.1 Characteristics of <i>Eimeria</i> sporozoites and host cells in the attachment process	102
7.2 The role of receptors in site specificity	103
7.3 The role of intestinal mucus in the attachment.....	105
7.4 The effect of cell type in the attachment.....	106
7.5 Determination of oocyst viability	107
7.6 Identification of <i>Eimeria</i> in samples.....	109
7.7 Improvement of sporozoite extraction.....	110
7.8 Problems of <i>Eimeria acervulina</i> in binding assays.....	110
7.9 Direction of future studies	111
CHAPTER 8: REFERENCES	112

List of Tables

Table 1.1 The mode of action of anticoccidial drug in chickens.....	10
Table 1.2 Attenuated and non-attenuated vaccines for broiler chickens exposed to <i>Eimeria</i> species	12
Table 1.3 The site specificity of species of <i>Eimeria</i> in chickens and turkey hosts	19
Table 4.1 Morphological scoring of caecal tissue in organ culture system.....	50
Table 6.1 Oligonucleotide sequences of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> , <i>E. acervulina</i> and chicken growth factor primers.	93
Table 6.2 Determination of optimal PCR conditions for <i>Eimeria tenella</i> , <i>E. acervulina</i> and chicken growth factor gene primers.	95
Table 6.3 Identification of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> and <i>E. acervulina</i> in purified oocysts, tissue and mucus by PCR.....	97

List of figures

Figure 1.1 The life cycle of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> , including, the asexual, sexual and sporogony steps...	7
Figure 1.2 Specific sites of binding and damage in the gastrointestinal tract of chickens when challenged with the seven species of <i>Eimeria</i>	8
Figure 1.3 Structural components of the intestinal barrier	15
Figure 3.1 The mean percentage of released sporocysts and intact oocysts with different procedures.....	38
Figure 3.2 The mean percentage of the viability of <i>Eimeria</i> sporocysts stored with and without PBS buffer at 4°C and frozen in liquid nitrogen by the PI method.	40
Figure 3.3 The mean number of extracted <i>E. tenella</i> sporozoites after incubation in HBSS, PBS and PBS with MgCl ₂	43
Figure 4.1 The viability of caecal tissue in the organ culture system using a propidium iodide-hematoxylin and histology method at different times at 41°C.	53
Figure 4.2 The viability of isolated cells after 10 minutes and 24 hours by trypan blue exclusion.	66
Figure 4.3 The dose dependence of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites attaching to each mm length of epithelium of frozen caecal sections.....	72
Figure 5.1 The mean number of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites attached to duodenal and caecal enterocytes per mm length of epithelial cells in frozen sections.	80
Figure 5.2 The mean number of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoite attached per mm length of enterocytes in caecal sections after treatment with 0.7% D-galactose, 1 mg CM, 5 mg CM, 1 mg DM, 5 mg DM, and in control group..	85
Figure 6.1 Specificity of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> and <i>E. acervulina</i> primers with <i>E. tenella</i> and <i>E. acervulina</i> DNA.....	96
Figure 6.2 Detection of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> in purified oocysts, duodenal and caecum mucus and chicken caecum.....	98
Figure 6.3 Detection of <i>Eimeria acervulina</i> in purified oocysts, duodenal and caecal mucus and chicken duodenum.....	98

List of plates

Plate 2.1 <i>Eimeria</i> sporozoites extracted from sporocysts and staining with PKH-67 fluorescent dye	30
Plate 3.1 Detection of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> oocyst viability using the propidium iodide method.....	34
Plate 3.2 The assessment of <i>Eimeria</i> sporocysts viability by the propidium iodide method	40
Plate 4.1 The viability of caecal tissue maintained in organ culture systems at 41°C from 0 to 120 minutes as assessed by the propidium iodide-hematoxylin method.....	52
Plate 4.2 The observed interaction of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites with differing preparations of isolated caecal enterocytes viewed with fluorescent microscopy.....	61
Plate 4.3 The attachment of <i>Eimeria tenella</i> sporozoites to caecal epithelium in frozen section	72

Summary

Coccidiosis is an enteric infection of chickens caused by protozoan parasites of the genus *Eimeria*. Coccidiosis is a worldwide disease with an economic impact on broiler chicken production. An outbreak of disease can reduce weight gain and feed digestion in the entire flock, reducing the production of processed meat for market. The major characteristics of *Eimeria* species are the invasion of specific sites in the intestine of chickens and specificity of the immune response.

To date, prophylaxis and vaccination are used to control coccidiosis. However, the continuous use of chemotherapeutics has led to increased drug resistance by *Eimeria*. In the case of vaccination, immunity against *Eimeria* is species-specific, hence, there is a need to vaccinate chickens against all species of *Eimeria* for complete protection. The *Eimeria*-host cell interaction is the first stage in the reproductive cycle in chickens that produces the damage in the chicken intestine. A more complete understanding of the environmental factors within the intestinal tract that influence this interaction will be useful to control the disease. The lack of a suitable method to study the interaction between *Eimeria* and host cells derived from different areas of intestine has hampered our understanding of the disease. The cell type of interest for this study was the chicken enterocyte. A layer of mucus is secreted by goblet cells in the intestinal epithelial to protect the enterocytes. *Eimeria* sporozoites have to cross the mucus layer in order to invade the epithelial cells. It is reasonable to assume that this mucus may have some involvement in *Eimeria*-enterocyte attachment. The objectives of this study were to investigate the roles of the enterocyte and intestinal mucus in the attachment process and the subsequent penetration of host cells by *Eimeria* sporozoites.

Newly hatched, and 3-week-old chickens, were killed and intestinal segments were collected for developing an *in vitro* method *ex vivo* (organ culture system, isolated enterocytes and a frozen section method) to study the *Eimeria* interaction with intestinal epithelial cells. *Eimeria* sporozoites were extracted from oocysts and then labelled with a fluorescent dye (PKH-67). The frozen section model was found to be superior to the use of isolated enterocytes and organ culture systems, and was used for subsequent experiments in this project. This method was used to

investigate the *Eimeria*-enterocyte attachment at preferred and non-preferred sites on the surface of enterocyte membranes. Indeed, the use of this method demonstrated that D-galactose on the surface of sporozoites had an important role in the attachment of *E. tenella* sporozoites to caecal enterocytes, with caecal and duodenal mucus both functioning as a physical barrier to *E. tenella*. In addition, two other major developments resulted from this project, these being; the development of a PCR protocol that can specifically identify different *Eimeria* species in a mixed sample containing at least 0.05 ng/ μ l of *Eimeria* DNA and a propidium iodide method that is a suitable indicator tool to assess the viability of oocysts and sporocysts. Finally, the inclusion of MgCl₂ in the extraction buffer increases the hatchability of sporozoites from sporocysts.

In conclusion, this study led to development of a frozen section method which can be used *ex vivo* to investigate further the role of mucus from vaccinated and non-vaccinated chickens, diets with different compositions, anticoccidial drugs, and the identification of the specific receptors in different areas of the chicken intestine. Finally, the propidium iodide method in combination with the PCR protocols can be used as a quality assurance tool in the production of *Eimeria* vaccines.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to God for his guidance and sustenance.

My gratitude also goes to the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology of The Islamic Republic of IRAN for providing the scholarship that enabled my study at The University of Adelaide.

I am thankful to my Panel of Supervisors, Drs. David Tivey, Bob Hughes and Cindy Bottema, who patiently monitored my journey in a new research area, and to Margaret Cargill for her cooperation on my Panel.

Eimeria Pty Ltd kindly provided *Eimeria* oocysts and, from the company, Dr. Grant Richards helpfully cooperated in my project.

Dr. Graham Webb is particularly thanked for his help and encouragement on many occasions, and for reading and correcting my English and to some extent, my science.

I am grateful for the technical assistance and advice of Dr. Madan Naik. Thanks also to Sally Elieff, Dr. Chris Smyl and Natasha Penno.

I am grateful to my family: your hopes and prayers kept me going; and finally, the journey has come to an end.

Abbreviations used in thesis

µg	Microgram
µl	Microlitre
µm	Micrometer
°C	Degrees centigrade
<i>C.</i>	<i>Cryptosporidium</i>
cells/ml	Cells per millilitre
cm	Centimetre
cm ²	Square Centimetre
DE-52	Dimethylaminoethyl cellulose
D-gal	D-galactose
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTP	2'-deoxynucleoside 5'-triphosphate
<i>E.</i>	<i>Eimeria</i>
<i>E.a</i>	<i>Eimeria acervulina</i>
<i>E.t</i>	<i>Eimeria tenella</i>
FBS	fetal bovine serum
g	Gram
g/L	Gram per litre
HBSS	Hanks' Balanced Salt solution
IU	International unit
IU/ml	International units per milliliter
MAbs	Monoclonal antibodies
MDBK	Madin Darby Bovine Kidney
MEM	Minimum Essential Medium Eagle
mg/ml	Milligram per millilitre
ml	Millilitre

mM	Millimole
mm	Millimetre
NBF	Neutral buffered formalin
ng	Nanogram
nm	Nanometre
OD	Optical density
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
pM	Picomole
PI	Propidium iodide
RAPD	Random amplified polymorphic DNA
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
rpm	Revolutions-per-minute
SD	Standard deviation
SCAR	Sequence-characterized amplified regions
TAE	Tris acetate-EDTA
Taq	Thermostable DNA polymerase
Tris	Tris[hydroxymethyl]aminomethane
x 40	A magnification of x 40
xg	Times gravity
UV	Ultraviolet
v/v	Volume by volume
W/v	Weight by volume