

**An *in vivo* model to study mucin-bacterial interactions during
early post-hatch development of broiler chickens**

Rebecca Edith Anne Forder BSc. (Hons)

13th of September, 2007

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the award of PhD in the Discipline of
Agricultural and Animal Science, School of Agriculture, Food and Wine at the University
of Adelaide, South Australia

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	VIII	
DECLARATION	XI	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	XII	
ABBREVIATIONS	XVI	
PUBLICATIONS	XVIII	
PUBLISHED CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS	XVIII	
CHAPTER 1	LITERATURE REVIEW	1
1.1.	Introduction	2
1.2.	Goblet cells	3
1.3.	The mucus layer	5
<i>1.3.1.</i>	<i>Mucin structure</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>1.3.2.</i>	<i>Biosynthesis and packaging</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>1.3.3.</i>	<i>Granule discharge and intracellular transport pathways</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>1.3.4.</i>	<i>Region specificity of mucin</i>	<i>14</i>
1.4.	Development – changes in mucin composition with age	16
1.5.	Germ-free versus conventionally raised animals	18
1.6.	Bacterial adhesion	20

1.7.	Microbial modulation of mucus production	23
1.7.1.	<i>Indirect response through host-derived factors</i>	25
1.7.2.	<i>Microbial modulation of glycosylation</i>	26
1.7.3.	<i>Microbial mucolysis</i>	27
1.8.	Conclusion	28
CHAPTER 2	ANIMAL TRIALS.....	30
	A SMALL-SCALE, LOW-COST ISOLATION SYSTEM FOR THE INCUBATION AND REARING OF LOW BACTERIAL LOAD CHICKS AS A MODEL TO STUDY MICROBIAL-INTESTINAL INTERACTIONS	30
2.1.	Introduction	31
2.2.	Materials and methods.....	32
2.2.1.	<i>Isolator construction.....</i>	32
2.2.2.	<i>Testing for leaks.....</i>	35
2.2.3.	<i>Sterilisation of isolators</i>	35
2.2.4.	<i>Isolator type B: incubation and hatching.....</i>	36
2.2.5.	<i>Isolator type A: brooding</i>	36
2.2.6.	<i>Sterilisation of feed and drinking water</i>	37
2.2.7.	<i>Procedure for low bacterial load chicks</i>	37
2.2.8.	<i>Cultures</i>	39
2.2.9.	<i>Animal welfare.....</i>	40
2.2.10.	<i>Statistical analysis</i>	40
2.3.	Results.....	41
2.3.1.	<i>Hatchability</i>	41

2.3.2.	<i>Microbial analysis</i>	41
2.3.2.1.	Trial 1	41
2.3.2.2.	Trial 2	42
2.3.3.	<i>Body weights</i>	45
2.4.	Discussion	46
CHAPTER 3	HISTOLOGICAL STUDY	49
BACTERIAL MODULATION OF SMALL INTESTINAL GOBLET CELLS AND MUCIN COMPOSITION DURING EARLY POST-HATCH DEVELOPMENT OF POULTRY		49
3.1.	Introduction	50
3.2.	Materials and methods	53
3.2.1.	<i>Intestinal sample collection</i>	53
3.2.2.	<i>Neutral and acidic mucin staining</i>	53
3.2.3.	<i>Morphometry</i>	54
3.2.4.	<i>Statistical analysis</i>	54
3.3.	Results	56
3.3.1.	<i>Cell numbers</i>	56
3.3.2.	<i>Goblet cell area</i>	60
3.3.3.	<i>Villus breadth</i>	61
3.3.4.	<i>Villus length</i>	63
3.3.5.	<i>Villus area</i>	63
3.3.6.	<i>Crypt depth</i>	63
3.4.	Discussion	66

CHAPTER 4 MASS SPECTROSCOPY ANALYSIS..... 71

EFFECTS OF BACTERIAL EXPOSURE TO MUCIN OLIGOSACCHARIDE

STRUCTURE DURING POST-HATCH DEVELOPMENT 71

4.1. Introduction 72

4.2. Materials and methods..... 74

4.2.1. *Intestinal sample collection* 74

4.2.2. *Purification of intestinal mucin samples* 74

4.2.3. *Determination of purity* 75

4.2.4. *Alkali/borohydride treatment of mucin glycoproteins*..... 75

4.2.5. *Analysis of oligosaccharide fractions* 76

4.2.5.1. *Mass spectrometry: time-of-flight (TOF)*..... 76

4.2.5.2. *Tandem mass spectrometry (MS/MS)* 77

4.3. Results..... 78

4.3.1. *SDS-PAGE*..... 78

4.3.2. *Fraction assays*..... 78

4.3.3. *Oligosaccharide weights* 80

4.3.4. *Mass spectrometry: time-of-flight (TOF)* 80

4.3.5. *Tandem MS/MS*..... 80

4.4. Discussion 84

CHAPTER 5 BACTERIAL BINDING ASSAYS..... 88

BACTERIAL ADHESION TO ILEAL TISSUE AND MUCIN SAMPLES OF

CONVENTIONALLY REARED AND LOW BACTERIAL LOAD CHICKS..... 88

5.1.	Introduction	89
5.2.	Materials and methods.....	91
5.2.1.	<i>Bacteria</i>	<i>91</i>
5.2.2.	<i>Preparation of fluorescein isothiocyanate-conjugated bacteria.....</i>	<i>91</i>
5.2.3.	<i>Intestinal samples</i>	<i>92</i>
5.2.4.	<i>Bacterial adhesion.....</i>	<i>92</i>
5.2.4.1.	<i>Microscopy</i>	<i>93</i>
5.2.5.	<i>Preparation of E. coli for mucin binding assays.....</i>	<i>93</i>
5.2.6.	<i>Binding to ileal mucin.....</i>	<i>94</i>
5.2.6.1.	<i>Microscopy</i>	<i>94</i>
5.2.7.	<i>Statistical analysis</i>	<i>94</i>
5.3.	Results.....	95
5.3.1.	<i>E. coli binding to ileal sections</i>	<i>95</i>
5.3.2.	<i>L. salivarius binding to ileal sections.....</i>	<i>99</i>
5.3.3.	<i>E. coli binding to ileal mucin.....</i>	<i>101</i>
5.3.4.	<i>Correlations with goblet cell mucin composition.....</i>	<i>102</i>
5.4.	Discussion	103
CHAPTER 6	GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	107
APPENDICES.....		116
APPENDIX 1: CONSTRUCTION OF ISOLATORS.....		117
APPENDIX 2: STAINING PROTOCOLS FOR GOBLET CELL MUCIN GLYCOPROTEIN.....		126

APPENDIX 3: PURIFICATION OF MUCIN GLYCOPROTEIN FROM GASTROINTESTINAL MUCUS	131
APPENDIX 4: SOLUTIONS FOR BACTERIAL BINDING ASSAYS	143
REFERENCES.....	147

Abstract

Mucins, synthesised and secreted by goblet cells, possess potential binding sites for both commensal and pathogenic organisms, and may perform a defensive role during establishment of the intestinal barrier in newly hatched chickens. Increasing interest has been directed toward bacterial interactions within the mucus layer, and the mechanisms by which bacterial colonisation can influence mucus composition during early development. This is important, firstly, as a means to understand initiation of infection and secondly, to optimise the gut microflora for enhanced animal production. Currently, information on mucosal-bacterial interactions in poultry is limited. In order to observe the effects of bacterial exposure on intestinal goblet cell mucin production during early development, differences in the small intestine of conventionally-raised (CV) and low bacterial load (LBL) broiler chicks were examined during the first 7 days post-hatch.

The initial aim of the study was to construct a small-scale, economical isolator system to hatch and raise chicks in a bacterial-free environment as a means to observe bacterial interactions with the intestinal mucosa in chickens exposed to normal environmental conditions. The design and construction of flexible plastic isolators for incubation and brooding are described, along with methodologies for preparation of eggs for entry into the isolators, incubation and hatching. Two trials were conducted, the first in August 2005 and the second in March 2006. It was found that the isolator system was successful in producing low bacterial load chicks for comparative studies with conventionally raised chicks, without compromising body weight.

A histological study was then conducted whereby ileal and jejunal goblet cells were stained with either periodic acid-Schiff or high iron diamine/alcian blue pH 2.5 to

discriminate between neutral, sulphated and sialyated acidic mucins. Total goblet cell numbers and goblet cell and villous/crypt morphology were also examined. Bacterial colonisation of CV animals induced an increase in sialic acid moieties in both ileal and jejunal goblet cell such that initiation of these changes occurred at day 3-4 post-hatch. Differences in intestinal morphology were also consistent with other germ-free animal studies.

In order to further understand the extent to which bacteria affected mucin composition, purified, isolated oligosaccharide fractions from ileal mucin at d 4 and 7 post-hatch were collected and analysed using mass spectrometry techniques to determine any structural differences in chain length or chain number between LBL and CV animals. No differences in chain length or number were observed between CV and LBL animals at either d 4 or 7 post-hatch with both groups equally displaying chain lengths of both low and high molecular weights.

Although structural differences in mucin oligosaccharides were not observed between LBL and CV animals, bacterial binding assays utilising whole ileal sections were employed to determine whether or not the differences in mucin composition between LBL and CV animals during early development may have deterred or enhanced binding of certain bacterial species. *Escherichia coli* and *Lactobacillus salivarius* were selected for the experiment. Binding of *L. salivarius* to ileal sections was very low whereas *E. coli* binding was greater, and more pronounced in LBL animals, especially at d 7 post-hatch. No statistically significant differences were observed in binding of *E. coli* to purified ileal mucin from LBL and CV animals at either d 4 or d 7 post-hatch. Correlations between *E. coli* and *L. salivarius* adherence to ileal tissue and mucin samples, and goblet cell parameters, were not statistically significant when fitted as co-variates. It was concluded

that the changes in mucin composition played a minor role in bacterial adhesion of *L. salivarius* and this *E. coli* serotype.

In summary, this thesis explores the physiological changes in goblet cell mucin production in response to bacterial exposure post-hatch. The thesis outlines the complexity of mucosal-bacterial interactions which would benefit from the employment of specialised techniques such as nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy and microarray technologies to examine a greater range of mucin structures and gene expression. This thesis provides support for future investigations into the influence of intestinal microflora on mucosal and mucin dynamics of poultry and the potential development of prebiotics for use in animal production.

Declaration

This thesis contains no material that 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 being made available in the University of Adelaide Library.

Date

Rebecca Forder

Acknowledgements

First of all, my PhD could not have occurred without the funding and support of the Australian Poultry CRC. Thankyou for giving me this opportunity, the experience I have gained during my candidature has been invaluable.

I would like to express my most sincere graitude to my supervisors. To Dr David Tivey, thank you for teaching me how to work independently, your knowledge created an excellent platform for me to go about expanding my ideas without restriction. To Dr Bob Hughes, thank you for all your help with my trials and preparation of my thesis, your ideas and enthusiasm were greatly appreciated. To Assoc/Prof Gordon Howarth, thank you for all your time and effort during the final year of my PhD, you have provided me with many opportunities that I would never have taken if it was not for your eagerness and persistence. Although I was sometimes hesitant, your reassurance was always good motivation.

Thanks to everyone who helped set up the chicken isolators, they were the bain of my existence for a good couple of years! I might have gone insane if it wasn't for the help of Dr Gordon Firth, the engineer behind the isolators, Professor Steven Walkden-Brown, for letting me buy them at a reasonable price, and Mr Norman Bee, Property Services and Stephen Clarke for their handy man 'savvy', I learnt a lot!

Thank you to Sally Elieff and Natasha Penno for their vast technical knowledge of all things laboratory. If you need an insignificant object that has not been used for a good 10 years, they know how to find it, fix it and use it to the best of its abilities.

To Dr Greg Natrass, for giving up his time to teach me the ways of SDS-PAGE –thank you master.

To Derek Schultz and Evelyn Daniels, thank you for all your help with the chicken side of business. Having a very limited knowledge of poultry in the beginning, I am grateful for all your expertise and patience when teaching me the ins and outs of broiler chickens-literally!

To Dr Mark Geier, thanks for all your help with statistical analysis, the loaning of Futurama DVDs and the brewing of Earl Grey tea! A big thank you to Kathy Haskard, from *Biometrics SA*, Adelaide, South Australia, for conducting the multivariate statistical analysis.

I would like to thank *Gribbles Veterinary Laboratory*, in particular Daniella Signoriello, for conducting all microbial analysis. I would also like to thank Dr Valeria Torok and Ms Teresa Mammone from SARDI Plant Research Centre, for all their assistance with growing and suppling bacterial cultures and their helpful ideas and advice throughout my PhD.

A huge thank you goes to Dr Jorge Ruiz and all the staff from *HiChick Breeding Company*, Bethel SA for generously providing the broiler eggs and giving me advice on incubation and hatching.

For assistance and use of facilities concerning mucin purification and gel filtration chromatography, I would like to thank Dr. Magali Faure from the Nestlé Research Center, France; Steve Van Sluter, from the Australian Wine Research Institute, Waite Campus, and Sharon Byers from the Women's and Children's Hospital, Adelaide

To Professor Dennis Taylor, Dr Thomas Avery from the Discipline of Wine and Horticulture and Mr Phil Clements from the Discipline of Chemistry, thank you so much for giving up your time to help me with the oligosaccharide analysis, both in running all the samples and in interpreting what it all meant. I am extremely grateful.

To my cousin Skye, thank you for all your help through out my PhD. I know most of the work I got you to do was mind numbing, but you always managed to keep a smile on your face. I am sure it was out of love, or bribery with “Crunchies”, either way, thanks heaps!

To my amazing work colleagues, who I now consider friends, thank you so much for your help throughout my animals trials and for maintaining my sanity both at work and outside of work (agh, the drunken fuzzy memories). Special mention to Anna Toland, Nicole Heberle, Serina Digby, Kylie Chenoweth, Alex Stewart, Sarah Weaver and Fiona Johnson.

To my office buddy Hayley, thanks for being on this journey with me. The powers that be never quite warn you how crazy this whole PhD thing can get. How we survived the whole process I will never know, but I do know without you, I probably would not have made it this far. Thank you for all of your support and friendship; you will never know how much I have valued it (love ewe).

To my “boys”, the greatest friends a gal could ever ask for. Julian, Monkey (Craig), Clinton and Matty, I know venting my PhD frustrations was at times highly fanatical and confusing, the fact that you took the time to listen and nodded like you understood meant so much. Thanks for the good times!

Lastly, to *all* my family, there is no way to express how much I am grateful for all your support, patience, generosity and love. It has been an incredibly emotional three and half years, sometimes happy, sometimes not. I could not have got through it all without you behind me. Mum, Dad and Jess – I love you.

Abbreviations

°C	-	Degrees Celsius
AB	-	Alcian blue
ANOVA	-	Analysis of variance
BSA	-	Bovine serum albumin
CV	-	Conventionally reared
d	-	Day
DMSO	-	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DTT	-	Dithiotreitol
FITC	-	Fluorescein isothiocyanate
GF	-	Germ free
h	-	Hours
HCl	-	Hydrochloric acid
HID	-	High iron diamine
kDa	-	Kilodaltons
LBL	-	Low bacterial load
LPS	-	Lipopolysaccharide
min	-	Minutes
mL	-	Millilitres
MS	-	Mass spectrometry
MUC	-	Mucin core peptide gene
NFW	-	Nuclease free water
NMR	-	Nuclear magnetic resonance
OCT	-	Optimal cutting temperature
PAS	-	Periodic acid-schiff

PBS	-	Phosphate-buffered saline
PC2	-	Physical containment level 2
PLB	-	Protein loading buffer
PVC	-	Polyvinyl chloride
SDS-PAGE	-	Sodium dodecyl sulphate polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
SHQ	-	Super high quality
SPF	-	Specific pathogen free
TGS	-	Tris-glycine-saline
TRITC	-	Tetramethylrhodamine B-isothiocyanate
WGA	-	Wheat germ agglutinin

Publications

Forder, R.E.A., Firth, G., Howarth, G.S., Tivey D.T. and Hughes, R.J. (2007) A small-scale, low-cost isolation system for the incubation and rearing of low bacterial load chicks as a model to study microbial-intestinal interactions. *Laboratory Animals*. In press

Forder, R.E.A., Howarth, G.S., Tivey D.T. and Hughes, R.J. (2007) Bacterial modulation of small intestinal goblet cells and mucin composition during early post-hatch development of poultry. *Poultry Science*. In Press

Published Conference Proceedings

Forder, R. E. A., Tivey, D. R. and Hughes R. J. (2005) Intestinal goblet cells and mucus production in the chicken. *Proceedings of the Australian Poultry Science Symposium*, Vol 17, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, pp 284-285.

Australian Gastroenterology Week (AGW), October 2006, Adelaide, SA

Forder, R. E. A., Tivey, D. R. and Hughes R. J. (2006) Changes in ileal mucin production through interactions with intestinal microflora during early post-hatch development of poultry. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, Vol 21, Supp. 4, A265.

Digestive Diseases Week, May 2007, Washington D.C., USA

Forder, R. E. A., Howarth, G. S., Tivey, D. R. and Hughes, R. J. (2007) Changes in ileal mucin production through interactions with intestinal microflora during early post-hatch

development of poultry. Proceeding of the American Gastroenterological Association,
Washington D.C. *Gastroenterology* 132(4): Supp 2: A551.

This thesis is dedicated to Dan Thompson, an amazing man who touched the hearts of so many. I will miss you.

1979-2007