



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**STUDIES ON THE MECHANISMS AND UTILIZATION
OF PROBIOTICS (DIRECT-FED MICROBIALS) IN
BROILERS**

JIN LIZHI

FPV 1996 1

**STUDIES ON THE MECHANISMS AND UTILIZATION OF PROBIOTICS
(DIRECT-FED MICROBIALS) IN BROILERS**

By

JIN LIZHI

Dissertation Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty
of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia

May 1996



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation and sincere gratitude to the chairman of the supervisory committee, Professor Dato' Dr. Syed Jalaludin, Vice Chancellor, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, for his invaluable guidance and advice throughout the course of this study and in the preparation of this thesis. I am also indebted to all the other three supervisory committee members, Professor Dr. Ho Yin Wan, Department of Biology, for her support, encouragement and invaluable guidance; Associate Professor Dr. Norhani Abdullah, Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, for her guidance; and Dr. Manaf Ali, Department of Biotechnology, for his advice on animal cell culture and for allowing me to use the Animal Cell Culture Laboratory.

Special appreciation goes to Dr. Kudo, Japanese Agricultural Research Institute, for his advice on the isolation and identification of bacteria and the financial support provided at the beginning of my study.

I am indebted to all the staff of the Rumen Microbiology Laboratory, Animal Cell Culture Laboratory, Mycology Laboratory, Animal Nutrition Laboratory, Scanning Electron Microscope Unit, and Chicken Farm of Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, for their technical assistance and co-operation in carrying out this study.



I also wish to thank Dr. M. Mortar, Veterinary Research Ipoh, and Dr. G. Joseph, Veterinary Microbiology Laboratory, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, for generosity in providing me strains of *E. coli* and salmonella.

The statistical advice and assistance of Dr. Mohd. Rizwan Abd. Halim, Department of Agronomy and Horticulture, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, have been invaluable and are gratefully acknowledged.

I would like to thank Universiti Pertanian Malaysia and the Malaysian government for the scholarship which enables me to pursue my Ph.D. degree.

Finally, I wish to record my sincere gratitude to many of my friends in Malaysia, especially Khairul Kamar, Michael Wong, Hanita, Kasmah, Sieo Chin Chin, Kalai, Wan, Jivan and Siva, and many others who have helped me and made my stay in Malaysia a pleasant and memorable one.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xv
ABSTRACT.....	xvii
ABSTRAK.....	xxi
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
Poultry Industry.....	4
Problems on the Use of Antibiotics in Animal Production.....	5
The Microflora in Digestive Tract of Chicken.....	7
Development of Microflora in Chicken Intestine.....	7
Effects of Diet on Intestinal Microflora of Chicken.....	11
<i>Lactobacillus</i> spp. in Chicken Intestine.....	13
Definition of Probiotic (Direct-fed Microbial).....	15
The Effects of Probiotic (Direct-fed Microbial) on the Performance of Broiler Chicken.....	16
Modes of Action of Probiotic (Direct-fed Microbial).....	19
Maintaining Beneficial Microflora in Alimentary Tract	19
Alteration of Bacterial Metabolism	26
Other Effects of Probiotic.....	28



III	INTESTINAL MICROFLORA OF CHICKEN.....	30
	Materials and Methods.....	31
	Animals and Diet.....	31
	Fecal Extract Preparation.....	31
	Rumen Fluid Preparation.....	31
	Anaerobic Culture Technique.....	33
	Preparation of Media.....	33
	Enumeration of Intestinal Bacteria.....	35
	Preparation of Intestinal Samples.....	35
	Identification of Intestinal Bacterial Strains.....	36
	Analyses of Fermentation Products.....	36
	Isolation and Identification of <i>Lactobacillus</i> from the Intestine.....	37
	Preparation of Intestinal Section for Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM).....	38
	Statistics.....	39
	Results.....	39
	Comparison of Media and Incubation Period for Intestinal Bacteria.....	39
	Bacterial Population in the Duodenum, Jeju-ileum and Cecum.....	40
	Isolation and Identification of Intestinal Bacterial Strains.....	45
	Distribution of Bacteria in the Intestinal tract.....	49
	Isolation and Identification of Intestinal <i>Lactobacillus</i>	51
	Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) of the Intestinal Epithelia.....	51
	Discussion.....	60
IV	ACID AND BILE TOLERANCES OF <i>LACTOBACILLUS</i> ISOLATES AND THEIR ADHESION TO CHICKEN INTESTINAL CELLS IN VITRO AND IN VIVO.....	63
	Materials and Methods.....	65
	Adhesion In Vitro.....	65
	Adhesion In Vivo.....	69
	Acid Tolerance Test.....	69



	Bile Tolerance Test	70
	Statistics	71
	Results	71
	Adhesion of <i>Lactobacillus</i> In Vitro	71
	Adhesion of <i>Lactobacillus</i> In Vivo	76
	Bile Tolerance	80
	Acid Tolerance	80
	Discussion	89
V	COMPETITIVE EXCLUSION AND ANTAGONISTIC ACTION AGAINST SALMONELLA BY ADHERENT <i>LACTOBACILLUS</i> ISOLATES	94
	Materials and Methods	96
	<i>Lactobacillus</i> Culture	96
	Study on Antagonism	96
	In Vitro Competitive Exclusion Study	100
	In Vivo Competitive Exclusion Study	103
	Statistics	106
	Results	107
	Antagonistic Action of <i>Lactobacillus</i> isolates	107
	Inhibitory Substances	111
	In Vitro Competitive Exclusion of Salmonella	111
	In Vivo Competitive Exclusion Study	116
	Discussion	124
VI	COMPETITIVE EXCLUSION AND ANTAGONISTIC ACTION AGAINST <i>ESCHERICHIA COLI</i> BY ADHERENT <i>LACTOBACILLUS</i> ISOLATES	131
	Materials and Methods	132
	<i>Lactobacillus</i> Culture	132
	<i>E. coli</i> Cultures	132
	Study on Antagonism	133



	In Vitro Competitive Exclusion Study.....	134
	In Vivo Competitive Exclusion Study.....	134
	Statistics.....	136
	Results.....	136
	Antagonistic Action of <i>Lactobacillus</i>	136
	In Vitro Competitive Exclusion.....	142
	In Vivo Competitive Exclusion.....	145
	Discussion.....	150
VII	EFFECTS OF ADHERENT <i>LACTOBACILLUS</i> CULTURES AND COMMERCIAL BACTERIAL CULTURES ON THE DIGESTIVE ENZYMES AND BACTERIAL ENZYMES OF BROILERS.....	155
	Materials and Methods.....	157
	Chicken Used.....	157
	Experimental Design.....	157
	Bacterial Cultures Used.....	159
	Sampling Procedure.....	160
	Preparation of Extra- and Intra-cellular Digestive Enzyme Assay for <i>Lactobacillus</i> ...	161
	Amylase (α -1,4 glucan 4-glucanohydrolase, EC 3.2.1.1.) Assay.....	162
	Lipase (LPS, Triacylglycerol lipase, EC 3.1.1.3.) Assay.....	163
	Protease Assay.....	164
	β -Glucosidase (EC 3.2.1.21).....	165
	β -Glucuronidase (GRS, EC 3.2.2.31).....	166
	Protein Determination.....	167
	Statistics.....	167
	Results.....	167
	Digestive Enzymes Produced by the <i>Lactobacillus</i> Isolates.....	167
	Effects of <i>Lactobacillus</i> and <i>B. subtilis</i> on Intestinal Digestive Enzymes of Broilers.....	169
	Duodenal Digestive Enzymes.....	177
	β -Glucosidase.....	178
	β -Glucuronidase.....	183

	Discussion	188
VIII	INFLUENCE OF ADHERENT <i>LACTOBACILLUS</i> AND COMMERCIAL LACTOBACILLI AND <i>BACILLUS</i> <i>SUBTILIS</i> ON THE PERFORMANCE OF BROILERS	195
	Materials and Methods	196
	Experiment I	197
	Experiment II	200
	Statistics	201
	Results	202
	Experiment I	202
	Experiment II	213
	Discussion	223
X	GENERAL DISCUSSION	229
XI	CONCLUSION	241
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	245
	APPENDIX	266
	BIOGRAPHICAL VITA	271
	PUBLICATIONS FROM THIS THESIS	272

LIST OF TABLES

Table		page
1	Composition of basal diet and calculated nutrient analysis.....	32
2	Composition of media (per liter).....	34
3	Comparison of M98-5, FM98-5 and MOD-SD roll tube media on colony counts in duodenum and incubation time.....	41
4	Comparison of M98-5, FM98-5 and MOD-SD roll tube media on colony counts in jeju-ileum and incubation time.....	42
5	Comparison of M98-5, FM98-5 and MOD-SD roll tube media on colony counts in cecum and incubation time.....	43
6	Percentage recovery of anaerobes from cecal samples in three different media.....	44
7	Bacterial populations in intestinal tracts of chicken.....	44
8	Presumptive identification features of bacteria isolated from the duodenum and jeju-ileum of chicken.....	46
9	Presumptive identification features of bacteria isolated from the cecum of chicken.....	48
10	Distribution of intestinal bacteria in chicken.....	50
11	Catalase reaction, growth and carbohydrate fermentation of <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp.....	52
12	Distribution of <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp. in the chicken intestine.....	54
13	Adhesive ability of <i>Lactobacillus</i> isolates to the ileal epithelial cells isolated from chicken.....	72
14	Adherence capacity of intestinal <i>Lactobacillus</i> isolates to ileal epithelial cells of chickens.....	74
15	Effects of incubation temperature, pH of buffer and incubation time on the attachment of <i>L. acidophilus</i> I 26 to the ileum epithelial cells of chicken.....	77



Table		page
16	Comparison of bile tolerance of strains of <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp isolated from the intestine of broilers	82
17	Survival of <i>L. acidophilus</i> I26 and <i>L. fermentum</i> I25 at various pH, as determined by counts of viable bacteria	83
18	Survival of ileal <i>Lactobacillus</i> at various pH, as determined by counts of viable bacteria	84
19	Survival of cecal <i>Lactobacillus</i> at various pH, as determined by counts of viable bacteria	85
20	Sources and characteristics of <i>Salmonella</i> spp used in the experiment	97
21	Antagonism of intestinal <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp against salmonella of chicken	108
22	The ability of <i>Salmonella</i> to coaggregate with adherent strains of <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp isolated from chicken	112
23	Effect of <i>L. acidophilus</i> I 26 and <i>L. fermentum</i> I 25 on the attachment of [¹⁴ C] <i>Salmonella</i> spp to ileal epithelial cells under the conditions of exclusion, competition and displacement	115
24	Screening for bacteria in the in vivo study	117
25	Effect of treatment with <i>L. acidophilus</i> or a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the number of <i>S. pullorum</i> in the duodenal, ileal and cecal contents of broiler chicks	118
26	Effect of <i>L. acidophilus</i> and a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> on the percentage of chicks with <i>S. typhimurium</i> in the intestinal tract	120
27	Population of lactobacilli in the intestine of broilers treated or untreated with <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures	122
28	Total aerobic and anaerobic bacteria and pH values in the intestine of broilers treated and untreated with <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures 10 days after being challenged with salmonella	123

Table		page
29	Sources and characteristics of <i>E. coli</i> used in the experiment.....	133
30	Antagonism of intestinal <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp. against <i>E. coli</i> of chicken.....	138
31	Coaggregation between <i>E. coli</i> and adherent strains of <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp. isolated from chicken.....	143
32	The effects of <i>L. acidophilus</i> I 26 and <i>L. fermentum</i> I 25 on the attachment of [¹⁴ C] <i>E. coli</i> to ileal epithelial cells under the conditions of exclusion, competition and displacement.....	144
33	Enumeration of <i>E. coli</i> in the duodenum, ileum and cecum of chicks treated with or without <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures.....	147
34	Enumeration of lactobacilli in the duodenum, ileum and cecum of broilers treated with or without <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures.....	148
35	Basal diet composition and calculated nutrient analysis in first experiment.....	158
36	Reagents for determination of lipase.....	163
37	Reagents for determination of protease.....	164
38	Reagents for determination of β-glucosidase.....	165
39	Reagents for determination of β-glucuronidase.....	166
40	Extra- or intra- cellular amylase, protease and lipase of the <i>Lactobacillus</i> isolated from chicken intestine.....	168
41	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the amylolytic activity in the small intestine of chicken.....	170
42	Effect of commercial lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on the amylase activity in the intestine of chicken.....	171
43	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the proteolytic activity in the small intestine of chicken.....	173



Table		page
44	Effect of commercial lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on the proteolytic activity in the small intestine of chicken	174
45	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the lipolytic activity in the small intestine of chicken	175
46	Effect of commercial lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on the lipolytic activity in the small intestine of chicken	176
47	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the duodenal amylase, protease and lipase activity 40 days after feeding	177
48	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on fecal β -glucosidase activity of chicken	179
49	Effect of lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on fecal β -glucosidase activity of chicken	180
50	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on intestinal β -glucosidase activity of chicken	181
51	Effect of lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on intestinal β -glucosidase activity of chicken	182
52	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on fecal β -glucuronidase activity of chicken	184
53	Effect of lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on fecal β -glucuronidase activity of chicken	185
54	Effect of adherent <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on intestinal β -glucuronidase activity of chicken	186
55	Effect of lactobacilli and <i>B. subtilis</i> cultures on intestinal β -glucuronidase activity of chicken	187
56	The temperature and relative humidity during the experimental period in experiment I	202
57	Effect of feeds incorporated with <i>L. acidophilus</i> or a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> on body weight gain, feed efficiency and mortality of broilers in experiment I	204

Table	page
58	Effects of <i>L. acidophilus</i> or a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the cecal VFA and pH of broilers in experiment I..... 205
59	Effects of <i>L. acidophilus</i> or a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the ileal VFA and pH of broilers in experiment I..... 206
60	Effects of <i>L. acidophilus</i> or a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures on the cecal and ileal non-VFA of broilers in experiment I.. 207
61	Percentage of the weight of organs from broilers fed diets with or without <i>L. acidophilus</i> or a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures at 42 days after feeding in experiment I..... 208
62	Populations of ileal and cecal lactobacilli in broilers fed with or without <i>L. acidophilus</i> and a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures in experiment I..... 210
63	Populations of ileal and cecal coliforms in broilers fed with or without <i>L. acidophilus</i> and a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> cultures in experiment I..... 211
64	Populations of total aerobes, total anaerobes, <i>Bifidobacteria</i> and streptococci in the ileum and cecum of broilers fed diets with or without <i>L. acidophilus</i> and a mixture of <i>Lactobacillus</i> at 40 days after feeding..... 212
65	Temperature and relative humidity during the experimental period in experiment II..... 213
66	Bacterial population in basal feed and drinking water used in the experiment II..... 214
67	Effect of feeds incorporated with <i>B. subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures on body weight gain, feed efficiency and mortality of broilers in experiment II..... 215
68	Liver (as percent of body weight) of broilers fed diets with or without <i>B. subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures at 0 to 28 days after feeding in experiment II..... 216



Table	page	
69	Bursa (as a percent of body weight) of broilers fed diets with or without <i>B subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures in experiment II	217
70	Spleen (as a percent of body weight) of broilers fed diets with or without <i>B subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures in experiment II	218
71	Populations of intestinal lactobacilli of broilers fed diets with or without <i>B subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures at 0 to 28 days after feeding in experiment II	220
72	Populations of intestinal coliform of broilers fed diets with or without <i>B subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures in experiment II	221
73	Populations of facultative anaerobic bacteria in the duodenum, jejunum and cecum of broilers fed diets with or without <i>B subtilis</i> and lactobacilli cultures in experiment II	222
74	Dilution blank solution (per liter)	266
75	Composition of peptone yeast extract-glucose (PYG) medium (per liter)	267
76	Composition of mineral solution S2 for M98-5 medium (per liter)	268
77	Composition of mineral I and II for MOD-SD medium (per liter)	269
78	Composition of vitamin and VFA for MOD-SD medium (per liter)	270



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Scanning electron micrograph of the duodenal epithelial surface of a 21-day-old chicken showing a dividing bacterium which resembles <i>Lactobacillus</i>	55
2	Scanning electron micrograph of the jeju-ileal epithelial surface of a 21-day-old chicken showing thick rod-shaped bacteria, singly or in chains	56
3	Scanning electron micrograph of the cecal epithelial surface of a 21-day-old chicken showing dense population of bacteria comprising mixed rods, cocci and spirillum covering the epithelial surface	57
4	Scanning electron micrograph of the cecal epithelial surface of a 21-day-old chicken showing rods, cocci and spirillum on epithelial surface with pores	58
5	Scanning electron micrograph of the cecal epithelial surface of a 21-day-old chicken showing that bacteria inside the cecal epithelial pore opening	59
6	Scanning electron micrograph of isolated ileal epithelial cells of chicken fasted for 24 h	66
7	Scanning electron micrograph of an ileal epithelial cell (C) with attached <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> I26 (L)	75
8	Scanning electron micrograph of an ileal section from a chicken inoculated with <i>L acidophilus</i> I 26 showing lactobacilli attached on the epithelial surface	78
9	Scanning electron micrograph of an cecal section from a chicken inoculated with <i>L acidophilus</i> I 26 showing lactobacilli attached on the epithelial surface	79
10	Growth of <i>L acidophilus</i> I 26 and <i>L fermentum</i> I 25 in MRS broth with and without 0.3% chicken bile	86

Figure		Page
11	Growth of <i>Lactobacillus</i> isolated from ileum in MRS broth with and without 0.3% chicken bile.....	87
12	Growth of <i>Lactobacillus</i> isolates from cecum in MRS broth with and without 0.3% chicken bile.....	88
13	Antagonistic activity of <i>L. fermentum</i> C16 and <i>L. brevis</i> C17 towards salmonellae using the spot test method.....	109
14	Antagonistic activity of <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp. towards salmonella using the spot test method.....	110
15	Inhibition of salmonella by the <i>Lactobacillus</i> culture supernatants in agar well diffusion assays.....	113
16	Scanning electron micrograph of the intestinal surface of chickens (two days after challenge with <i>S. pullorum</i>) showing attached <i>S. pullorum</i>	121
17	Antagonistic activity of <i>L. fermentum</i> C16 and <i>L. brevis</i> C17 towards <i>E. coli</i> using the spot test method.....	139
18	Antagonistic activity of <i>Lactobacillus</i> towards <i>E. coli</i> using the spot tests method.....	140
19	Inhibition of <i>E. coli</i> by the <i>Lactobacillus</i> culture supernatants using agar well diffusion assay.....	141
20	Scanning electron micrograph of the intestinal surface of chicks two days after challenge with <i>E. coli</i> O1:K2 showing attached <i>E. coli</i>	149

Abstract of the dissertation submitted to the Senate of Universiti Pertanian Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

STUDIES ON THE MECHANISMS AND UTILIZATION OF PROBIOTICS
(DIRECT-FED MICROBIALS) IN BROILERS

By

JIN LIZHI

May 1996

Chairman: Prof. Dato' Dr. SYED JALALUDIN SYED SALIM

Faculty : Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science

A series of experiments were conducted to isolate and characterize suitable intestinal microbes as direct-fed microbials and to investigate their effects on broiler and the mechanisms associated with their utilization.

The major types of bacteria found in the duodenum and jeju-ileum of chicken were *Lactobacillus*, *Streptococcus* and *E. coli*. In the cecum, ten groups of bacteria, namely, *Streptococcus*, *Staphylococcus*, *Lactobacillus*, *E. coli*, anaerobic coccus, *Eubacterium*, *Propionibacterium*, *Clostridium*, *Fusobacterium* and *Bacteroides* were isolated and identified. The main *Lactobacillus* species in chicken intestine were *L. acidophilus*, *L. fermentum* and *L. brevis*

In vitro adhesion study demonstrated that 12 out of the 46 intestinal *Lactobacillus* isolates showed moderate to good ability to adhere to the ileal epithelial



cell of chicken. Temperature (between 4°C and 42°C) did not have an effect on the attachment of the *Lactobacillus* isolates to the ileal epithelial cell. Incubation (contact) time of 30 min was found to be insufficient for the attachment of bacterial to the ileal epithelial cell, but contact time extended beyond 1 h did not improve the ability of the bacteria to adhere to the ileal epithelial cell. The pH values of suspending buffer for the *Lactobacillus* strains, ranging from 4 to 7, did not have any significant effect on the attachment of the bacteria to the ileal epithelial cell, but pH 8 reduced significantly ($P < 0.05$) the attachment of bacteria. The growth of the 12 adherent *Lactobacillus* isolates was inhibited only slightly by the inclusion of 0.3% chicken bile in the culture medium, and they all showed a tolerance (in varying degrees) to low pH values (1.0 or 2.0).

Antagonistic study indicated that all the 12 adherent *Lactobacillus* isolates were able to inhibit the growth of the five strains of salmonella, viz., *S. enteritidis* 935/79, *S. pullorum*, *S. typhimurium*, *S. blockley* and *S. enteritidis* 94/448, and the three strains of *E. coli* (i.e. *E. coli* O1:K1, O2:K1 and O78:K80) in varying degrees in vitro. Inhibition of the pathogenic bacteria was probably due to the production of organic acids by the *Lactobacillus* isolates. In vitro study on competitive exclusion toward pathogenic bacteria showed that *L. acidophilus* I 26 significantly reduced ($P < 0.05$) the attachment of *S. pullorum* to ileal epithelial cell in the tests for exclusion and competition but not in the displacement tests. *L. fermentum* I 25 was found to have some ability to reduce the attachment of *S. typhimurium* to ileal epithelial cell

under the conditions of exclusion ($P < 0.08$), competition ($P < 0.09$), but not displacement. However, both *L. acidophilus* I26 and *L. fermentum* I 25 were unable to reduce the adherence of *S. enteritidis* and three strains of *E. coli* to ileal epithelial cell under the conditions of exclusion, competition and displacement. In the in vivo experiment, treatment of chicks with *L. acidophilus* I 26 reduced the number of *S. pullorum* in the ileum and cecum 5 days after challenge with salmonella, and in the cecum 10 days after challenge. Treatment of chicks with a mixture of 12 adherent *Lactobacillus* isolates reduced significantly the mean number of *S. pullorum* in their duodenum, ileum and cecum 5 days after being challenged by salmonella, and in their cecum 10 days after challenge. Treatment with *L. acidophilus* I 26 did not reduce significantly the population of *E. coli* in the duodenum, ileum and cecum 5 days or 10 days after being challenged with *E. coli* O2:K1. On the other hand, there was a significant reduction in the number of *E. coli* in the duodenum, ileum and cecum of chicks treated with a mixture of *Lactobacillus* 5 days and 10 days after challenge.

All the 12 adherent *Lactobacillus* isolates were found to secrete amylase, protease and lipase, either extracellularly or intracellularly, or both extracellularly and intracellularly. Amylase activity in the lower part of small intestine increased when the adherent *Lactobacillus* cultures were fed to the broilers but there was no effect on the activity when commercial lactobacilli were fed. In general, lipolytic and proteolytic activities in the lower small intestine were not affected by feeding either adherent *Lactobacillus* or commercial lactobacilli and *B. subtilis* to the broilers. Duodenal

amylolytic, lipolytic and proteolytic activities were also not affected by the supplementation of either adherent or commercial *Lactobacillus* cultures. The bacterial enzyme, β -glucuronidase, in the small intestine and feces was reduced when *L. acidophilus* was fed to the chickens. The enzyme activity was also significantly lower in the intestine of birds fed a diet with a mixture of *Lactobacillus*. Fecal β -glucosidase activity was lower ($P < 0.05$) in birds fed diets with adherent *Lactobacillus* cultures, but the intestinal enzyme levels were not affected. There was no effect on either intestinal or fecal β -glucuronidase and β -glucosidase activities in chicks fed diets with commercial lactobacilli or *B. subtilis* cultures.

The results of feeding trials showed that chicks fed either a single strain of *L. acidophilus* or a mixture of *Lactobacillus* cultures had significantly more body weight gain and better feed conversion rate than control chicks 6 weeks after feeding. The birds fed diets with commercial lactobacilli or *B. subtilis* for 4 weeks also grew faster than the control, but the incorporation of lactobacilli in the drinking water did not affect the growth of the chicks. Supplementing *L. acidophilus* or a mixture of *Lactobacillus* cultures to the diets of chicks did not affect the weights of liver, spleen, bursa, gizzard, duodenum, jejunum and total small intestine 42 days after feeding. The weights of the liver, spleen and bursa were also not affected by the incorporation of commercial lactobacilli or *B. subtilis* to the diets.

Abstrak disertasi yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Pertanian Malaysia bagi memenuhi syarat untuk mendapatkan ijazah Doktor Falsafah

KAJIAN MENGENAI MEKANISME BERKAITAN DENGAN PENGGUNAAN
PROBIOTIK (MIKROB MAKANAN) DALAM AYAM DAGING

Oleh

JIN LIZHI

Mei 1996

Pengerusi : Prof. Dato' Dr. SYED JALALUDIN SYED SALIM

Fakulti : Kedokteran Veterinar dan Sains Peternakan

Satu siri eksperimen telah dilakukan untuk mengasing dan mencirikan mikrob usus yang sesuai untuk digunakan sebagai mikrob makanan dan menyelidik kesan mereka terhadap ayam daging serta mekanisme berkaitan dengan penggunaannya.

Jenis bakteria utama dalam duodenum dan jeju-ileum ayam ialah *Lactobacillus*, *Streptococcus* dan *Escherichia*. Dalam sekum, sepuluh kumpulan bakteria iaitu, *Streptococcus*, *Staphylococcus*, *Lactobacillus*, *E. coli*, kokus anaerobik, *Eubacterium*, *Propionibacterium*, *Clostridium*, *Fusobacterium* dan *Bacteriodes* telah diasing dan dikenalpasti. Spesies utama *Lactobacillus* dalam usus ayam ialah *L. acidophilus*, *L. fermentum* dan *L. brevis*.

Kajian penglekatan *in vitro* menunjukkan 12 dari 46 isolat *Lactobacillus* dari usus melekat dengan baik ke sel ileal epitelia ayam. Suhu (antara 4°C dan 42°C)

tidak menjejaskan penglekatan isolat *Lactobacillus* ke sel ileal epitelia. Masa pengeraman (sentuhan) selama 30 min didapati tidak cukup untuk penglekatan bakteria ke sel ileal epitelia, tetapi masa melebihi 1 j tidak meningkatkan keupayaan bakteria melekat pada sel ileal epitelia. Nilai pH pemampam untuk strain *Lactobacillus* dalam jarak 4 ke 7, tidak memberi kesan bererti terhadap penglekatan bakteria ke sel ileal epitelia, tetapi pH 8 merendahkan secara bererti ($P < 0.05$) penglekatan bakteria. Pertumbuhan 12 isolat *Lactobacillus* melekat direncat sedikit oleh 0.3% hempedu ayam dalam media kultur dan kesemua menunjukkan ketahanan terhadap nilai pH yang rendah (1.0 ke 3.0).

Kajian antagonistik menunjukkan kesemua 12 isolat *Lactobacillus* melekat boleh merencat pertumbuhan lima strain Salmonella iaitu *S. enteritidis* 935/79, *S. pullorum*, *S. typhimurium*, *S. blockley* dan *S. enteritidis* 94/448 dan ketiga strain *E. coli* iaitu *E. coli* (O1:K1, O2:K1 dan O78:K80) dengan tahap yang berbeza *in vitro*. Perencatan bakteria patogenik mungkin kerana penghasilan asid organik oleh isolat *Lactobacillus*. Kajian *in vitro* mengenai penyingkiran persaingan terhadap bakteria patogenik menunjukkan yang *L. acidophilus* I 26 secara bererti ($P < 0.05$) menurunkan pengelekatan *S. pullorum* ke sel ileal epitelia dalam ujian penyingkiran dan persaingan tetapi tidak dalam ujian penggantian. *L. fermentum* I 25 dilihat mempunyai keupayaan menurunkan penglekatan *S. typhimurium* ke sel ileal epitelia di dalam keadaan penyingkiran ($P < 0.08$), persaingan ($P < 0.09$), tetapi tidak untuk penggantian. Walau bagaimanapun, kedua *L. acidophilus* I 26 dan *L. fermentum* I 25 tidak

berupaya untuk menurunkan penglekatan *S. enteritidis* dan ketiga strain *E. coli* ke sel ileal epitelia di dalam keadaan penyingkiran, persaingan dan penggantian. Dalam kajian *in vivo*, rawatan anak ayam dengan *L. acidophilus* I 26 menurunkan jumlah *S. pullorum* dalam ileum dan sekum selepas lima hari dicabar dengan salmonela dan dalam sekum selepas 10 hari dicabar. Anak ayam yang dirawat dengan campuran 12 isolat *Lactobacillus* melekat menunjukkan penurunan secara bererti min jumlah *S. pullorum* dalam duodenum, ileum dan sekumnya selepas lima hari dicabar dengan salmonela, dan dalam sekum selepas 10 hari dicabar. Rawatan dengan *L. acidophilus* I 26 tidak menurunkan populasi *E. coli* dalam duodenum, ileum dan sekum 5 atau 10 hari selepas dicabar dengan *E. coli* O2:K1. Sebaliknya, terdapat penurunan yang bererti ($P < 0.05$) dalam jumlah *E. coli* dalam duodenum, ileum dan sekum anak ayam yang dirawat dengan campuran *Lactobacillus* selepas 5 dan 10 hari dicabar.

Kesemua 12 isolat *Lactobacillus* melekat didapati merembeskan amilase, protease dan lipase samada secara ekstrasel atau intrasel atau kedua-duanya. Aktiviti amilase dalam bahagian bawah usus kecil meningkat bila kultur *Lactobacillus* melekat dimakan oleh ayam daging, tetapi kesan ini tidak dilihat bila laktobasili komersial digunakan. Secara am, aktiviti lipolitik dan proteolitik di bahagian bawah usus kecil tidak terjejas oleh *Lactobacillus* melekat atau laktobasili komersial dan *B. subtilis* bila dimakan oleh ayam daging. Aktiviti amilolitik, lipolitik dan proteolitik tidak juga terjejas oleh penambahan kultur *Lactobacillus* melekat atau komersial. Aktiviti enzim β -glukoronidase bakteria, dalam usus kecil dan tahi dikurangkan bila

L. acidophilus dimakan oleh ayam. Aktiviti enzim juga rendah secara bererti ($P < 0.05$) dalam usus ayam yang diberi diet mengandungi campuran *Lactobacillus*. Aktiviti β -glukosidase tahi lebih rendah ($P < 0.05$) dalam ayam yang diberi kultur *Lactobacillus* melekat, tetapi tahap enzim usus tidak terjejas. Tiada kesan terhadap aktiviti β -glukoronidase dan β -glukosidase usus atau tahi dalam anak ayam yang diberi diet mengandungi laktobasili komersial atau kultur *B. subtilis*.

Hasil kajian pemberian makanan menunjukkan anak ayam bila diberi makan satu strain *L. acidophilus* atau satu campuran kultur *Lactobacillus* mempunyai peningkatan berat badan yang lebih dan kadar penukaran makanan yang lebih baik bila dibandingkan dengan anak ayam kawalan selepas 6 minggu percubaan. Ayam yang diberi makan laktobasili komersial atau *B. subtilis* selama 4 minggu juga membesar lebih cepat dari ayam kawalan, tetapi pencampuran laktobasili dalam air minuman tidak mempengaruhi pembesaran anak ayam. Penambahan *L. acidophilus* atau satu campuran kultur *Lactobacillus* ke diet anak ayam tidak mempengaruhi berat hati, limpa, bursa, tembolok, duodenum, jejunum dan keseluruhan usus kecil 42 hari selepas pemberian makanan. Berat hati, limpa dan bursa juga tidak dipengaruhi oleh campuran laktobasili komersial atau *B. subtilis* ke dalam diet.