

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

USE OF CRYOPROTECTANTS IN ENHANCING VIABILITY OF PROBIOTIC LACTOBACILLUS STRAINS DURING FREEZE-DRYING AND STORAGE

ANAHITA KHORAMNIA

FBSB 2007 17



USE OF CRYOPROTECTANTS IN ENHANCING VIABILITY OF PROBIOTIC LACTOBACILLUS STRAINS DURING FREEZE-DRYING AND STORAGE

By

ANAHITA KHORAMNIA



Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

October 2007

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

USE OF CRYOPROTECTANTS IN ENHANCING VIABILITY OF PROBIOTIC LACTOBACILLUS STRAINS DURING FREEZE-DRYING AND STORAGE

By

ANAHITA KHORAMNIA

October 2007



Chair: Professor Norhani Abdullah, PhD

Faculty: Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences

In recent years, probiotics have been considered to be used as feed supplements to improve the health and growth performance of poultry in place of antibiotic growth promoters. This is due to concerns that the rampant use of antibiotic growth promoters in livestock, particularly poultry, may produce adverse effects on humans, such as the development of antibiotic resistant bacteria and production of antibiotic residues in animal products. Unlike probiotics for humans, which are usually kept refrigerated, probiotics for poultry are normally kept in the farm at room temperature, and this may reduce the viability of the micro-organisms used in the probiotics Cryoprotectants incorporated during freeze drying of the probiotic could during storage. enhance the shelf-life of the probiotic micro-organisms. Thus, in this investigation, the main objective was to determine the best combination of cryoprotectants to enhance the viability of Lactobacillus brevis I25 and L. reuteri C10 during freeze-drying by using the response surface methodology (RSM). A five-level, three-variable central composite rotatable design (CCRD) was used to evaluate the interactive effects of skim milk, sucrose and lactose as cryoprotectants, on the viability of L. brevis I25 and L. reuteri C10 during freeze drying. The inputs, log cfu/ml, were derived experimentally and tested by RSM. The models were found to describe adequately the experimental range studied. The optimum combination of cryoprotectants derived via RSM analysis were: 8% skim milk, 22% sucrose, 0.5% lactose for L. brevis I25 and 19.5% skim milk, 1% sucrose, 9% lactose for L. reuteri C10. The actual experimental results on the viability of L. brevis I25 and L. reuteri C10 after freeze-drying were 8.88 and 8.83 log cfu/ml, respectively, under optimum formulation. These values were highly comparable to the predicted values by



RSM method of SAS/STAT which were 8.82 log cfu/ml for L. brevis I25 and 8.89 log cfu/ml for L. reuteri C10. The log cfu/ml values for controls (freeze-dried without cryoprotectants) were 7.65 and 7.2 for L. brevis I25 and L. reuteri C10, respectively. During the six month storage study at 4°C and 30°C, the optimum cryoprotectant combination for L. brevis I25 had a very high survival rate at 4°C but not at 30°C. On the other hand, the survival rate of the best combination for L. reuteri C10 was very high at both temperatures during storage. There was 0% residual viability for control culture after 16 weeks of storage for L. brevis I25 at 4°C and after 4 weeks at 30°C. For L. reuteri C10 after 12 and 8 weeks no bacterial growth were detected at 4°C and 30°C, respectively. The organic acids and amylase activity of bacterial cultures were also analysed during storage. The results showed that during storage at 4°C, the acetic acid concentration decreased from 144 mM to 100.25 mM for L. brevis I25 and from 153 mM to 115.6 mM for L. reuteri C10. In the case of lactic acid, the concentration decreased from 294 mM to 215 mM for L. brevis I25 and 205 mM to 124 mM for L. reuteri C10. The concentration of succinic acid also decreased from 2.9 mM to 1.2 mM for L. brevis I25 and from 17 mM to 9.4 mM for L. reuteri C10. There was also a reduction in amylase activity from 0.2 U to 0.11 U for L. brevis I25 and from 0.34 U to 0.18 U for L. reuteri C10. Acid production and amylase activity patterns for both Lactobacillus strains correspond to the survival rate of the bacteria during storage at 30°C.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

GUNA 'CRYOPROTECTANT' DALAM MENINGKATKAN KEMADDIRAN STRAIN PROBIOTIK *LACTOBACILLUS* SEMASA KENING BELUN DAN PENYIMPANAN .

Oleh

ANAHITA KHORAMNIA



Oktober 2007

Pengerusi: Profesor Norhani Abdullah, PhD

Fakulti: Bioteknologi dan Sains Biomolekul

Kebelakangan ini, probiotik telah diberi pertimbangan sebagai makanan tambahan bagi meningkatkan kesihatan dan prestasi pertumbahan ternakan ayam sebagai gantian kepada antibiotik promoter pertumbuhan. Ini adalah disebabkan oleh penggunaan antibiotik promoter pertumbuhan yang berlebihan dalam penternakan, terutamanya bagi ternakan ayam akan mengakibatkan kesan kepada manusia seperti perkembangan bakteria rintang antibiotik dan juga kehadiran residu antibiotik dalam produk haiwan. Tidak seperti probiotik untuk manusia yang biasanya disimpan sejuk, probiotik ternakan ayam biasanya disimpan di dalam ladang ternakan di dalam suhu bilik dan keadaan ini akan mengurangkan bilangan mikroorganisma hidup yang digunakan di dalam probiotik semasa penyimpanan. Penggunaan 'cryoprotectant' semasa proses kering beku dalam probiotik dapat meningkatkan jangka hayat mikroorganisma probiotik. Oleh yang demikian, objektif utama dalam kajian ini adalah untuk mengenalpasti kombinasi 'cryoprotectant' terbaik bagi meningkatkan bilangan Lactobacillus brevis I25 dan L. reuteri C10 semasa proses kering beku dengan menggunakan kaedah 'Response Surface Methodology' (RSM). ' Satu kaedah lima peringkat dengan tiga pengubahsuai 'CCRD' telah digunakan untuk menilai kesan interaktif antara susu skim, sukrosa dan laktosa sebagai 'cryoprotectant, ke atas bilangan L. brevis I25 dan L. reuteri C10 semasa proses kering beku. Input dan log cfu/ml telah diperolehi secara eksperimen dan dianalisa menggunakan RSM. Model-model yang diperolehi dapat menghuraikan julat eksperimen yang dikaji dengan baik. Keadaan optima yang diperolehi menerusi analisis RSM adalah seperti berikut: 8% susu skim, 22% sukrosa, dan 0.5% laktosa



bagi L. brevis 125 dan 19.5% susu skim, 1% sukrosa, dan 9% laktosa bagi L. reuteri C10. Keputusan eksperiment sebenar bilangan L. brevis 125 dan L. reuteri C10 selepas kering beku adalah 8.88 dan 8.86 log cfu/ml di dalam keadaan optima. Nilai-nilai ini adalah sebanding dengan nilai ramalan yang diperolehi menerusi kaedah RSM bagi SAS/STAT iaitu 8.82 dan 8.89 log cfu/ml. Nilai log cfu/ml untuk kawalan ialah 7.65 untuk L. brevis I25 dan 7.20 untuk L. reuteri C10. Bagi kajian mengenai kesan penyimpiren keatas kemandiran bakteria pada 4°C 30°C selama enam bulan, didapati kombinasi 'cryoprotectant' bagi L. brevis I25 dan memberi nilai peratus kemandiran yang lebih tinggi pada suhu 4°C, berbanding dengan suhu 30°C. Manakala untuk L. reuteri C10, kadar kemandiran adalah sangat baik untuk kedua suhu penyimpanan. Peratus residual bagi kultur kawalan adalah 0% selepas 16 minggu bagi L. brevis I25 pada suhu 4°C dan 4 minggu pada suhu 30°C. Bagi L. reuteri C10 kawalan, tiada pertumbuhan bakteria dikesan selepas 12 dan 8 minggu pada suhu 4 dan 30°C, masing-masing. Asid organik dan aktiviti amylase kultur bakteria juga dikaji semasa storan. Hasil kajian menunjukkan pada suhu 4°C, kepekatan asid asetik menurun daripada 144 mM kepada 100.25 mM bagi L. brevis I25 dan 205 mM kepada 124 mM bagi L. reuteri C10. Asid suksinik juga menurun daripada 2.9 mM kepada 1.2 mM bagi L. brevis I25 dan daripada 17 mM kepada 9.4 mM bagi L. reuteri C10. Aktiviti amilase juga menurun daripada 0.2 U kepada 0.11 U bagi L. brevis I25 dan 0.34 U kepada 0.18 U bagi L. reuteri C10. Corak penghasilan asid and aktiviti enzim amilase untuk kedua spesies Lactobacillus menyamai kadar kemandiran bakteria semasa storan pada suhu 30°C.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In The Name of God, The Most Merciful and Most Beneficent

All praises do to God, Lord of the universe. Only by His grace and mercy this thesis can be completed.



The completion of this thesis would have been impossible if not for the assistance and direct involvement of so many kindhearted individuals. Thus, I am very much indebted to my previous mentors and I have no way of repaying such a dept except to express my sincerest gratitude.

First and foremost, I am very grateful to my supervisor Professor Dr. Norhani Abdullah, for her strong support, guidance, and patience. I am also grateful to Professor Dr. Ho Yin Wan for the very enriching and thought provoking discussion and lectures which helped to shape the thesis. She was always there to provide everything I needed in the laboratory. I am also grateful to Dr. Sieo Chin Chin and Dr. Kalavathy Ramasamy in their capacity as members of the Supervisory Committee. I am also indebted to the staff of the Institute of Bioscience, University Putra Malaysia, Mr. Kairul, Mr. Saparin and Madam Haw for their help and cooperation. Special thanks are also extended to Dr. Liew Siew Ling who helped me in every way possible.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, my brother Amir and my sister, Arezoo for their prayers, continuous moral support and unending encouragement. Last but not least, I wish especially to acknowledge my beloved husband, Afshin Ebrahimpour for his love, support, patience and understanding for every situation I am in.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 23th October 2007 to conduct the final examination of Anahita Khoramnia on her Master of Science thesis entitled "Use of cryoprotectants in enhancing viability of probiotic *Lactobacillus* strains during freeze-drying and storage" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the degree of Master of Science. Members of the Examination Committee were as follows:

Mohd Puad Abdullah, PhD

Lecturer Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)



Rosfarizan Mohamad, PhD

Lecturer Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Shuhaimi Mustafa, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Rosli MD Illias, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Chemical Engineering and Natural Resources Engineering Universiti Technology Malaysia (External Examiner)

HASANAH MOHD. GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 3 January 2008

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Norhani Abdullah, PhD

Professor Faculty of Biotechnology and Bimolecular Sciences Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Ho Yin Wan, PhD Professor Institute of Bioscience



Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

Sieo Chin Chin, PhD

Lecturer Faculty of Biotechnology and Bimolecular Sciences Universiti Putra Malaysia (Mmember)

Kalavathi Ramasamy, PhD Lecturer

Faculty of Pharmacy Universiti Technology Mara (Member)

AINI IDERIS, PhD

Professor and Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 22 January 2008

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.



ANAHITA KHORAMNIA

Date: 4 March 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|------------------|-------|
| ABSTRACT | ii |
| ABSTRAK | V |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | viii |
| APPROVAL | Х |
| DECLARATION | xii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xvi |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xviii |

CHAPTER



| 1 | INTR | ODUC | TION | | | | | | 1 | |
|---------|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 2 | LITEI | RATUR | REVIEW | | | | | | 4 | |
| | 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 2.8 | What A History Probio Lactob Lactob Mecha Down | 2.8.1.2 | of Prob sing of F f Cells Foam F Spray I | Probioti Formati Drying | ion | | | 4 5 7 8 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 | |
| | | 2 | 2.8.1.3 2.8.1.4 .8.2 Cryopn 2.8.1 2.8.1 | Freeze- cotective 2.1 | -Drying (a) (b) (c) e Addit Mecha | g The Pr Freezi Freeze ives (Cl anisms o charides | inciple ng Con -Dryin PA) of Cryo | g Draw Backs protective Action | 14 g | 15 17 19 20 22 22 |
| 22 | | | | | <i></i> | (a) | Sucro | se | | |
| | | 2.8.3 | 2.8.2.3 Optimization 2.8.3.1 2.8.3.2 | Comple | Respo | | s ed Milk face Me | ethodology (RSN | 26 | 23 25 26 |
| | 28 | | | | | | (a) | Preliminary Stu | ıdy | |
| Finding | 5 | 29 | | | The B | est-Fitte | (b) ed Mod | Experimental el | Design | and |
| 22 | | | | (c) | Deterr | ninatior (d) | - | timal Operating Conditions cation of the Pred | | |
| 33 | | | | | Optim | um Poi | nt | | | |
| 3 | MATH | E RIALS 3.1 | S AND METH Microorganisr | | | | | | 34 | 34 |
| | 3.2 | Buffer | Preparation | | | | | | 34 | |



| | 3.3 | Inocu | lum Preparation | 34 | |
|---|--------------|--------|--|-----|----------|
| | 3.4 | Prepa | ration Suspending Medium of Cryoprotectants | 35 | |
| | 3.5 | Exper | imental Design and Statistical Analysis | 37 | |
| | | 3.6 | Verification of Estimated Data | | 39 |
| | | 3.7 | Sample Preparation for Freeze-Drying | | 40 |
| | | 3.8 | Viable Cell Count | | 40 |
| | | 3.9 | Storage Study | | 41 |
| | | 3.10 | Determination of Amylase | | 42 |
| | | 3.11 | Determination of Fermentation End Products | | 43 |
| 4 | RESU | TITS | | 45 | |
| - | KL 50 | 4.1 | Response Surface Methodology | 73 | 45 |
| | 4.2 | | evis I25 Response Surface Methodology | 45 | ч. |
| | 7.2 | L. Dre | 4.2.1 Study on the Effects of the First Range of | ч.) | 45 |
| | | | Concentration on <i>L. Brevis</i> I25 Viability | | ч. |
| | | | 4.2.2 Model Adequacy Evaluation of <i>L. Brevis</i> I25 | | 48 |
| | | | with the First Range of Factors Level | | -0 |
| | | | 4.2.3 Evaluation of the Model Visualization | | 50 |
| | | | | | 53 |
| | | | | | 55 55 |
| | | | 4.2.5 Evaluation of the Model with the Second Range of Factors Level | | 55 |
| | | | 4.2.6 Evaluation of the Model Visualization | | 59 |
| | | 12 | | | |
| | | 4.3 | Developing a Regression Model for Finding a Best-Fitted | | 61 |
| | | | l for L. Brevis 125 | | |
| | | 4.4 | Finding the Optimum Point of the Factors for <i>L. Brevis</i> I25 | | 66 |
| | | 4.5 | Three-Dimensional Response Surface Plots | | 66 70 |
| | | 4.6 | Definition of Range of Factors Level for <i>L. Reuteri</i> C10 | | 70 70 |
| | | | 4.6.1 Determination of Cell Viability Based on CCRD | | 70 |
| | | | Conditions for <i>L. Reuteri</i> C10 | | 70 |
| | | | 4.6.2 Evaluation of the Model Adequacy for <i>L. Reuteri</i> C10 |) | 72 |
| | | | First Ranges | | |
| | | | 4.6.3 Evaluation of the Model Visualization | | 75 |
| | | 4.7 | Developing a Regression Model for <i>L. Reuteri</i> C10 | | 77 |
| | | 4.8 | Finding the Optimum Point of the Factors for <i>L. Reuteri</i> C10 | | 80 |
| | | 4.9 | Three-Dimensional Response Surface Plots | | 82 |
| | | 4.10 | Verification of the Optimum Points | | 86 |
| | | 4.11 | Storage Study | | 87 |
| | | 4.12 | Acid Production | | 92 |
| | | | 4.12.1 Acetic Acid | | 92 |
| | | | 4.12.2 Lactic Acid | | 93 |
| | | | 4.12.3 Succinic Acid | | 95 |
| | | 4.13 | Amylase Activity of Cultures During Storage | | 98 |
| 5 | DISC | USSIO | Ν | 100 | |
| | | 5.1 | L. Reuteri and L. Brevis | | 100 |
| | | 5.2 | Bacterial Preservation | | 101 |



| | | 5.2.1 Cryo | protectants | 102 | |
|---|-----|-------------|--|-----|-----|
| | | 5.2.2 Freez | ze-Drying of Bacterial Culture | 104 | |
| | | 5.3 Op | timization of Lactobacillus Preservation Using RSM | | 106 |
| | | 5.4 Sto | rage Study | | 110 |
| | | 5.5 Fer | mentation Activity of Bacterial Culture | | 114 |
| | 5.6 | Amylase A | Activity | 116 | |
| 6 | CON | CLUSION A | AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR | 118 | |
| | REF | ERENCES | | 120 | |
| | APP | ENDICES | | 130 | |
| | BIO | DATA OF S' | FUDENT | 133 | |



LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

| 1. | Bacterial growth inhibitory products produced by probiotic bacteria and mechanisms of inhibition on target organisms | 9 |
|----|--|----|
| 2. | Treatment combinations based on central composite design (CCRD) | 36 |
| 3. | Independent variables and levels used for central composite rotatable design (CCRD) | 38 |
| 4. | L. brevis I25 first range combinations and responses according to the CCRD | 47 |
| 5. | Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Response Surface Quadratic Model of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 1st ranges | 49 |
| 6. | L. brevis I25 (first range) second order model coefficient of estimates | 50 |
| 7. | The top 10 solutions released from the software analysis 53 | |
| 8. | Second experimental range and levels of the three independent variables used in RSM in terms of actual and coded factors | 54 |
| 9. | L. brevis I25 2 nd range combinations and responses according to the CCRD | 56 |
| 10 | . Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Response Surface Quadratic Model of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 2 nd range of concentration | 57 |
| 11 | . Coefficient of estimates for response surface quadratic model of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 2 nd ranges | 58 |
| 12 | Analysis of variance (ANOVA) in the regression model selected through variable selection | 62 |
| 13 | . Coefficient estimates in the regression model selected through variable selection | 63 |



| 14. The actual and predicted values of the L. brevis I25 viability | 65 |
|---|----|
| 15. L. reuteri C10 first range combinations and responses according to the CCRD | 71 |
| 16. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Response Surface Quadratic Model of <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 1 st ranges | 73 |
| 17. Coefficient of estimates for Response Surface Quadratic Model of L. reuteri C10 1st ranges | 74 |
| 18. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for evaluation of the second-order model for <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 | 78 |
| 19. Coefficient estimates in the second-order model for L. reuteri C10 | 79 |
| 20. The actual and predicted values of the L. reuteri C10 viability | 81 |
| 21. Optimum conditions predicted by the model and corresponded experimental values (cfu/ml) | 87 |
| 22. Survival rate of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 and <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 at different storage periods | 91 |
| 23. Amounts of different acids before storage and after 6 months storage | 97 |



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

Page

| 1. | The procedure of freeze-drying | 16 |
|-----|---|----|
| 2. | Different kinds of contour plots | 31 |
| 3. | Three-dimensional plot including a peak | 32 |
| 4. | The model diagnostic for L. brevis I25 (first range) | 51 |
| 5. | Three-dimensional plot of the model graph for L. brevis I25 (first range) | 52 |
| 6. | Contour plot of the model graph for L. brevis I25 (first range) | 52 |
| 7. | Diagnostic graph for <i>L. brevis</i> I25 2 nd range of concentrations | 59 |
| 8. | Three-dimensional plot of the model graph for <i>L. brevis</i> I25 2 nd ranges | 60 |
| 9. | Contour plot of the model graph for <i>L. brevis</i> 2 nd ranges | 61 |
| 10. | Response surface for the effects of skim milk and sucrose on the viability | 68 |



| of L. brevis I25 at the coded level of -1.67 of lactose | |
|--|----|
| 11. Response surface for the effects of skim milk and sucrose on the viability of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 at +0.86 coded level of lactose | 68 |
| 12. Response surface for the effects of skim milk and lactose on the viability of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 at 1.18 coded level of sucrose | 69 |
| 13. Response surface for the effects of sucrose and lactose on the viability of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 at 0.872 coded level of skim milk | 70 |
| 14. Diagnostic evaluations for L. reuteri C10 model | 75 |
| 15. Three-dimensional response surface model graph for L. reuteri C10 | 76 |
| 16. Contour plot surface model graph for L. reuteri C10 | 76 |
| 17. Response surface plot for the effects of skim milk and lactose on the viability of <i>L. reuteri</i> at -1.65 coded level of sucrose | 83 |
| 18. Response surface plot for the effects of skim milk and lactose on the viability of <i>L. reuteri</i> at 0.38 coded level of sucrose | 84 |
| 19. Response surface plot for the effects of sucrose and lactose on the viability of <i>L. reuteri</i> at 1.6 coded level of skim milk | 85 |
| 20. Response surface plot for the effects of sucrose and skim milk on the viability of <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 at - 0.79 coded level of lactose | 85 |
| 21. Viability of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 stored at different periods at 4°C | 88 |
| 22. Viability of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 stored at different periods at 30°C | 88 |
| 23. Viability of <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 stored at different periods at 4°C | 90 |
| 24. Viability of <i>Lreuteri</i> C10 stored at different periods at 30°C | 90 |
| 25. Acetic acid concentrations of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 cultures at different storage periods at 4 and 30°C | 93 |
| 26. Acetic acid concentrations of <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 cultures during storage at 4 and 30°C | 94 |
| 27. Lactic acid concentrations of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 cultures at different storage periods at 4 and 30°C | 94 |
| 28. Lactic acid concentrations of L. reuteri C10 cultures at different storage | 95 |



periods at 4 and 30°C

| 29. Succinic acid concentrations of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 cultures at different storage periods at 4 and 30°C | 96 |
|---|-----|
| 30. Succinic acid concentrations of <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 cultures at different storage periods at 4 and 30°C | 97 |
| 31. Amylase activity of <i>L. brevis</i> I25 cultures at different storage periods at 4 and 30°C | 98 |
| 32. Amylase activity of <i>L. reuteri</i> C10 cultures at different storage periods at 4 and 30°C | 99 |
| 33. Generation of a Central Composite Rotatable Design | 107 |
| 34. Major metabolic pathways leading to the formation of succinic acid and byproducts | 116 |



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past 50 years, antibiotics have been used in poultry production at therapeutic levels to treat bacterial infections as well as at sub-therapeutic levels to promote growth. Many of the antibiotics used as growth promoters in the poultry industry are also used in human medicine. Shortly after the initiation of widespread use of antibiotics in the livestock industry, particularly the poultry industry, the practice was placed under increased scrutiny because of concern over the development of bacterial resistance to the usual microbiocidal effects of the antibiotics. Since then, the indiscriminate use of antibiotics in poultry production has become a cause for concern (Edens, 2003).

The growing concern on the development of antibiotic resistant bacteria that are potentially lethal when transmitted to humans has led to considerable interest to find other means of promoting growth in poultry without the use of antibiotic. An understanding of the importance of the intestinal microflora in the maintenance of health and the prevention of disease in poultry has led to the suggestion that probiotics could be used as an alternative to antibiotic growth promoters. Currently, the poultry industry is under pressure to seek new approaches to meet the demand of the public for safe and healthy food. Public concerns on animal production and food safety will drive decision-making processes in the future. The European Union (EU) has officially banned the usage of all antibiotics for the sole purpose of growth promotion in poultry and



livestock. With the ultimate end of antibiotic growth promoter usage in the EU and restricted antibiotic usage in other poultry producing centers in the world, the future for application of probiotics appears to increase (Edens, 2003).

Lactic acid bacteria (LAB) are widely used as probiotics in human and animal nutrition, because of a supposed beneficial influence on the intestinal microflora. The viability and stability of LAB probiotics are critical factors to be considered for industrial producers.

Drying methods are the most common techniques used for preservation of LAB (Carvalho *et al.*, 2003). Preservation of large quantities of bacteria by freeze-drying is an alternative method to drying or freezing. Freeze-drying is the preferred method for culture collections world wide (Morgan *et al.*, 2006). Freeze-dried powders are the most stable state for biological organisms and are also easier to handle (Cornad *et al.*, 2002). However, this technique exposes the bacterial cells to additional stressful processing steps (Saarella *et al.*, 2005; Schoug, 2006) and loss in viability of the cells occurs during freeze-drying. To prevent these adverse effects, protective substances called cryoprotectants are commonly added to samples before freezing or freeze-drying (Leslie *et al.*, 1995). Skim milk, sucrose and lactose have been commonly used as cryoprotectants (Hubalek, 2003). Optimization of individual cryoprotectants or a combination of them during freeze-drying is essential for enhancing the survival of LAB during freeze-drying and subsequent storage and ensuring cost-effective production.

In the classical approach for optimization, there is a parameter change while keeping the others constant. A large number of experiments are required in this method and it is



time-consuming, not cost-effective and not very accurate. In order to overcome these problems, optimization studies have been performed using Response Surface Methodology (RSM). It is the most popular optimization method used in recent years. It is an effective statistical technique for developing, improving and optimizing of microbial processes (Bas and Boyaci, 2007a).

The present study was undertaken to optimize a combination of cryoprotectants to enhance the viability of *Lactobacillus brevis* I25 and *L. reuteri* C10 during freeze-drying using RSM, and to assess their survival rate, enzyme activity and acid production during storage. The importance of each cryoprotectant and its level were obtained from previous reports (Hubalek, 2003; Vasiljevic and Jelen, 2003; Palmfeldt *et al.*, 2005).

The specific objectives of this study were:

- (i) To find the best combination of cryoprotectants for preservation of the *Lactobacillus* strains using RSM;
- (ii) To validate the optimum combination of cryoprotecants on the viability of bacteria based on the parameters determined by RSM;
- (iii) To study the effects of the best combination of cryoprotectants obtained from RSM (from ii) on the viability of the *Lactobacillus* strains during storage of up to six months at 4°C and 30°C;
- (iv) To study the effect of storage on the enzyme activity and acid production of the *Lactobacillus* strains.

