



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**OPTIMIZATION OF FERMENTATION AND FREEZE-DRYING
PROCESSES TO ENHANCE THE PRODUCTIVITY AND STABILITY OF
A PROBIOTIC, *LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS* I 24**

LIM CHIN MING

IB 2006 10



**OPTIMIZATION OF FERMENTATION AND FREEZE-DRYING
PROCESSES TO ENHANCE THE PRODUCTIVITY AND STABILITY OF A
PROBIOTIC, *LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS* I 24**

By

LIM CHIN MING

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

November 2006



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

OPTIMIZATION OF FERMENTATION AND FREEZE-DRYING PROCESSES TO ENHANCE THE PRODUCTIVITY AND STABILITY OF A PROBIOTIC, *LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS* I 24

By

LIM CHIN MING

November 2006

Chairman: Professor Arbakariya Ariff, PhD

Institute: Bioscience

Production of *Lactobacillus salivarius* I 24, a probiotic strain for chicken; was studied in batch and fed-batch fermentations using shake flasks and a 2-L stirred tank fermenter. In addition, preservation of *L. salivarius* I 24 using freeze-drying technique was also carried out. From a preliminary study, glucose and yeast extract were found to be the best carbon and nitrogen sources, respectively. Response surface method (RSM) was then used to optimize the culture medium for the growth of *L. salivarius* I 24. The factors investigated were yeast extract, glucose and initial culture pH. A polynomial regression model with cubic and quartic terms was used for the analysis of the experimental data. Estimated optimal conditions of the factors for the growth of *L. salivarius* I 24 were: 3.32% (w/v) of glucose, 4.31% (w/v) of yeast extract and an initial pH of 6.10.



Further improvement of cell production was made by using an optimization approach in the process condition. Aeration, pH, mixing and inoculum size were investigated. Cell production and viability were greatly influenced by the culture pH compared to other parameters. The optimum culture conditions for the cultivation of *L. salivarius* I 24 in the 2-L stirred tank fermenter were as follows: impeller tip speed, 0.42 m/s; pH, 6.10, and inoculum size of 10% (v/v) in facultative condition. Under these conditions, the final cell viability was 14.1×10^9 cfu/mL; viable cell yield was 4.37×10^{11} cfu/g_{Glucose} and productivity was 17.59×10^8 cfu/mL.h.

A model employing the logistic and Leudeking-Piret equation for mixed-growth associated product formation was found to be sufficient to describe growth of *L. salivarius* I 24 and lactic acid production. The general kinetic parameters were calculated from the analysis of a large number of experimental data from batch fermentations. The calculate value of μ_{max} was 0.69 h^{-1} . Fed-batch cultivation was used in an attempt to further improve biomass production of *L. salivarius* I 24 by enhancing carbon flux to cell built up and reduce the flux to lactic acid production. Stepwise fed-batch cultivation (SFBC) gave better result than constant fed-batch cultivation (CFBC) when operated at a μ of 0.3 h^{-1} , which gave 528% improvement in viable cell counts when compared to CFBC. Results obtained form SFBC at a μ of 0.3 h^{-1} indicated that this cultivation mode might be a good alternative for *L. salivarius* I 24 production as higher cell concentration and lower lactic acid production could be achieved compared to batch cultivation.

Prior to the freeze-drying process, addition of protective agents could effectively improve the viability of the freeze-dried *L. salivarius* I 24 cultures. Among the protective agents investigated, 9.85% (w/v) of skim milk and 10.65% (w/v) of sucrose demonstrated the best survival rate of *L. salivarius* I 24. Better survival of *L. salivarius* I 24 during freeze-drying was also observed when the pH and temperature were controlled during cultivation, and when the cultures were frozen at -80°C for 5 h before the freeze-drying process. Under these conditions, the highest survival rate, which was 65.2%, was achieved, and the viable counts of *L. salivarius* I 24 remained almost stable after 6 months of storage at -30°C .



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**PENGOPTIMUMAN DALAM PROSES FERMENTASI DAN
PENGERINGAN SEJUK-BEKU DEMI MEMPERTINGKATKAN
PRODUKTIVITI SERTA KESTABILAN SATU PROBIOTIK,
LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS I 24**

Oleh

LIM CHIN MING

November 2006

Pengerusi: Profesor Arbakariya Ariff, PhD

Institut: Biosains

Penghasilan *Lactobacillus salivarius* I 24, satu probiotik untuk industri penternakan ayam telah dikaji secara fermentasi sesekelompok dan fermentasi suapan sesekelompok dengan penggunaan kelalang kon dan fermenter berpengaduk 2 L. Tambahan pula, pengawetan *L. salivarius* I 24 dengan cara pengeringan sejuk-beku juga dijalankan. Glukosa dan ekstrak yis merupakan unsur karbon dan nitrogen yang terbaik dalam kajian awal. Kaedah Respons Permukaan (KRP) telah digunakan untuk megoptimumkan medium kultur bagi pertumbuhan *L. salivarius* I 24. Faktor media yang dikaji ialah kepekatan glukosa, ekstrak yis dan pH permulaan media kultur. Model regresi polinomial dengan sebutan kubik dan kuartik digunakan untuk analisis data eksperimen. Keadaan optimum factor-faktor berkenaan bagi

pertumbuhan *L. salivarius* I 24 adalah seperti berikut: 3.32% (w/v) bagi glukosa, 4.31% (w/v) bagi ekstrak yis dan pH permulaan adalah 6.10.

Penghasilan sel seterusnya dipertingkatkan dengan menggunakan pendekatan pengoptimuman proses. Keadaan pengudaraan, pH, pengadukan dan saiz inokulum merupakan parameter fermentasi yang dikaji. pH memberi pengaruh yang lebih kuat ke atas penghasilan sel berbanding dengan parameter yang lain. Keadaan optimum factor-faktor berkenaan bagi penghasilan *L. salivarius* I 24 dalam fermenter berpengaduk 2 L adalah seperti berikut: pengadukan, 0.42 m/s; pH, 6.10 and saiz inokulum, 10 % (v/v) dalam keadaan fakultatif. Di bawah keadaan tersebut, bilangan sel yang terhasil adalah 14.1×10^9 cfu/mL; penghasilan sel hidup adalah 4.37×10^{11} cfu/g_{Glucose} dan produktiviti adalah 17.59×10^8 cfu/mL.h.

Satu model yang berdasarkan persamaan-persamaan logistik dan Leudeking-Piret bagi penghasilan produk secara proses bercampur (pertumbuhan berkait dan pertumbuhan tidak berkait) telah dikemukakan untuk menerangkan pertumbuhan *L. salivarius* I 24 dan penghasilan asid laktik. Unsur-unsur kinetic yang biasa telah ditentu selepas menganalisis sejumlah besar data eksperimen dari fermentasi sesekelompok. Nilai μ_{max} yang dikirakan adalah 0.69 h^{-1} . Fermentasi suapan sesekelompok digunakan untuk meningkatkan lagi penghasilan sel *L. salivarius* I 24 dengan merangasangkan aliran karbon ke arah pembinaan sel. Di sebaliknya, mengurangkan aliran ini dalam penghasilan asid laktik. Fermentasi suapan sesekelompok secara peringkat (FSSP) menunjukkan keputusan yang lebih baik berbanding dengan fermentasi suapan sesekelompok secara konstan (FSSK) bila μ

ditetapkan pada 0.3 h^{-1} , peningkatan sebanyak 528 % bagi bilangan sel hidup. Keputusan yang diperolehi dari FSSP mencadangkan ia merupakan satu pilihan baik bagi penghasilan *L. salivarius* I 24 jika μ ditetapkan pada 0.3 h^{-1} kerana bukan sahaja bilangan sel yang lebih tinggi tetapi kepekatan asid laktik yang lebih rendah boleh diperolehi jika berbanding dengan fermentasi sesekelompok.

Sebelum menuju ke proses pengeringan sejuk beku, penambahan agen perlindungan ke atas sel didapati boleh meningkatkan keupayaan hidup *L. salivarius* I 24 yang telah dikering sejuk-bekukan. 9.85 % (w/v) susu skim dan 10.65 % (w/v) sukrosa memamerkan kadar hidupan yang paling tinggi di kalangan agen perlindungan yang dikaji. Bila pH dan suhu dikawal semasa penghasilan serta sejuk-beku pada -80°C selama 5 jam sebelum proses pengeringan sejuk-beku juga menunjukkan peningkatan dari segi kestabilan sel. Dalam keadaan sedemikian, kadar kehidupan yang tertinggi telah dicapai iaitu sebanyak 65.2 %. Sementara, bilangan sel hidup *L. salivarius* I 24 berada dalam keadaan yang agak stabil selepas penyimpanan pada suhu -30°C selama 6 bulan.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I wish to express my utmost thanks and deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Arbakariya Ariff for his supervision, guidance and invaluable advices throughout this study. I would also like to express my appreciation, from the bottom of my heart, to Professor Dr. Ho Yin Wan for her invaluable guidance, never ending patient and kind assistance. Thanks also extended to Associate Professor Dr. Raha Abdul Rahim for her guidance during this study.

I wish to express my thanks to all the staffs and students at Fermentation Technology Unit, Institute of Bioscience, Universiti Putra Malaysia, especially Dr. Hii Siew Ling, during the period of this study.

Last but not least, I wish to dedicate my gratefulness to my beloved husband, son and family for their support and encouragement throughout the project to the completion of this project and thesis.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 17th November 2006 to conduct the final examination of Lim Chin Ming on her Doctor of Philosophy thesis entitled "Optimization of Fermentation and Freeze-drying Processes to Enhance The Productivity and Stability of A Probiotic, *Lactobacillus salivarius* I 24" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Suraini Abdul Aziz, PhD

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

Foo Hooi Ling, PhD

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

Norhaini Abdullah, PhD

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

Mohammad Roji Sarmidi, PhD

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

HASANAH MOHD. GHAZALI, PhD

Professor/Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:



This thesis 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 are as follows:

Arbakariya Ariff, PhD

Professor

Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences

Universiti Putra Malaysia

(Chairman)

Ho Yin Wan, PhD

Professor

Institute of Bioscience

Universiti Putra Malaysia

(Member)

Raha Abdul Rahim, PhD

Associate Professor

Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences

Universiti Putra Malaysia

(Member)

AINI IDERIS, PhD

Professor/Dean

School of Graduate Studies

Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 8 MARCH 2007



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.

LIM CHIN MING

Date: 10 JANUARY 2007



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
APPROVAL	ix
DECLARATION	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvii
LIST OF FIGURES	xxi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Application of Antibiotics in Poultry Industry	7
2.2 Probiotics	8
2.2.1 Definition	8
2.2.2 Possible Mechanisms for Probiotics' Beneficial Effects	9
2.2.3 Currently Available Probiotic Products	11
2.3 Lactic Acid Bacteria	13
2.3.1 The Genus <i>Lactobacillus</i>	17
2.3.2 <i>Lactobacillus salivarius</i>	18
2.4 Selection Criteria for Probiotic	18
2.5 Production of Probiotic Bacteria	22
2.5.1 Optimization of Growth Medium	23
2.5.2 Optimization of Culture Conditions	25
2.5.3 Fermentation Techniques	27
2.6 Preservation Techniques	31
2.6.1 Microencapsulation	32
2.6.2 Spray-Drying	37
2.6.3 Freeze-Drying	40
2.7 Concluding Remarks	48



3	GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS	51
3.1	Microorganisms	51
3.2	Inoculum Preparation and Medium Composition	52
3.3	Plan of Experimental Work	52
3.4	Description of The Fermenter	56
3.5	Analytical Procedures	59
3.5.1	Viable Cell Counts	59
3.5.2	Cell Growth by Optical Density Measurement	59
3.5.3	Measurement of Dry Cell Weight	60
3.5.4	Determination of Organic Acid	60
3.5.5	Determination of Sugars	61
3.5.6	Broth Viscosity Determination	61
4	FORMULATION OF GROWTH MEDIUM FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE CULTIVATION OF <i>LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS</i> I 24	63
4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Materials and Methods	65
4.2.1	Preparation of Inoculum	65
4.2.2	Medium Composition	65
4.2.3	Analytical Procedures	67
4.2.4	Statistical Analysis	67
4.3	Results and Discussion	67
4.3.1	Effects of Individual Nitrogen Sources on Growth	67
4.3.2	Effects of Mixed Nitrogen Sources on Growth	70
4.3.3	Effects of Carbon Sources on Growth	77
4.4	Conclusion	81
5	FORMULATION AND OPTIMIZATION OF GROWTH MEDIUM FOR <i>LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS</i> I24 CULTIVATION USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHOD (RSM)	83
5.1	Introduction	83
5.2	Materials and Methods	85
5.2.1	Microorganism	85
5.2.2	Medium Composition	85
5.2.3	Experiments Using RSM	86
5.2.4	Analytical Techniques	86
5.2.5	Experimental Design	87
5.2.6	Statistical Analysis	88
5.3	Results and Discussion	89
5.3.1	Development of A Regression Model	89
5.3.2	Determining the Optimum Point of The Factors	92



5.3.3	Assessment of Factor Effects with The Partial-effects Plot	94
5.3.4	Plotting Three Dimensional Response Surface Plots	96
5.3.5	Validation of The Optimum Points of The Factors	99
5.4	Conclusion	101
6	EFFECTS OF FERMENTATION CONDITIONS ON GROWTH OF <i>LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS</i> I 24 IN 2-L STIRRED-TANK FERMENTER	102
6.1	Introduction	102
6.2	Materials and Methods	104
6.2.1	Inoculum Preparation	104
6.2.2	Fermenter and Medium Composition	104
6.2.3	Fermentation Conditions	104
6.2.4	Analytical Procedures	106
6.2.5	Estimation of Mixing Time in The Fermenter	106
6.2.6	Statistical Analysis	108
6.3	Results and Discussion	109
6.3.1	Effect of pH Control Strategy	109
6.3.2	Effect of Aeration on Cultivation Performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	112
6.3.3	Effect of Mixing on Cultivation Performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	116
6.3.4	Effect of Inoculum Size on Cultivation Performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	121
6.5	Conclusions	124
7	KINETICS AND MODELLING OF BATCH CULTIVATION OF <i>LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS</i> I 24	125
7.1	Introduction	125
7.2	Materials and Methods	126
7.2.1	Culture Medium and Conditions	126
7.2.2	Analytical Methods	127
7.2.3	Model Development	127
7.2.4	Mathematical Method	139
7.3	Results and Discussion	139
7.3.1	Estimation of Growth Phases in Batch Cultures Based on A Multiple Model	139
7.3.2	Testing of Growth Models: Monod vs. Logistic Equations	141
7.3.3	Testing of Proposed Models	143
7.4	Conclusions	147



8	FED-BATCH CULTIVATION OF <i>LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS</i> I 24	149
8.1	Introduction	149
8.2	Materials and Methods	152
8.2.1	Theory of Fed-Batch Fermentation	152
8.2.2	Medium Composition for Constant Fed-Batch Cultures (CFBC)	156
8.2.3	Medium Composition for Stepwise Fed-batch Cultures (SFBC)	158
8.2.4	Analytical Techniques	158
8.2.5	Statistical Analysis	159
8.3	Results and Discussion	160
8.3.1	Influence of Feedrate on CFBC of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	160
8.3.2	Effect of Substrate Concentration in The Feed on CFBC of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	167
8.3.3	Efficiency in Controlling Specific Growth Rate (μ) of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 by SFBC	169
8.3.4	Effect of μ_{set} of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 by SFBC on Cell Production and Other Kinetic Parameters	170
8.3.5	Comparison Between Fed-batch and Batch Fermentation on Cell Production	178
8.4	Conclusion	180
9	THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT PROTECTIVE AGENTS ON SURVIVAL OF <i>LACTOBACILLUS SALIVARIUS</i> I24 SUBJECTED TO FREEZE-DRYING FOR PRODUCTION OF LIVE CELL IN POWDERIZED FORM	181
9.1	Introduction	181
9.2	Materials and Methods	183
9.2.1	Protective Agents	183
9.2.2	Preparation of Samples	185
9.2.3	Recovery and Storage Study	187
9.2.4	Analytical Methods	187
9.3	Results and Discussion	188
9.3.1	Effects of Protective Agents	188
9.3.2	Formulation and Optimization of Protective Agent for <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 Using RSM	190
9.3.3	Influence of Freezing Conditions on Viability of Freeze-dried <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 Cultures	195
9.3.4	Influence of Growth Conditions Subjected to Freeze-drying	199



9.3.5	Survival Rates of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 During Six Months Storage at Different Temperatures	201
9.3.6	Comparison Between Individual Protective Agents and A Mixture of Protective Agents	206
9.4	Conclusions	208
10	GENERAL DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER WORK	210
	REFERENCES	222
	APPENDICES	250
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	254
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	255



LISTS OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Possible mechanisms of probiotics	10
2.2	Probiotic effects for farm animals (Fuller, 1999)	11
2.3	Examples of commercial probiotics	12
2.4	Desirable criteria from three categories for an effective probiotic strain	19
2.5	Examples of medium formulation for lactobacilli fermentation	24
2.6	Examples of optimized culture conditions for cultivation of Lactic acid bacteria	26
2.7	Examples of lactobacilli fermentation cultivation modes	30
2.8	Microencapsulation of lactic acid bacteria by the extrusion and emulsion techniques	35
2.9	Examples of spray-dried commercial probiotics	38
2.10	Examples of freeze-dried commercial probiotics	41
2.11	Examples of some protective agents used in the freeze-drying process of live microbial cells	45
4.1	Basal medium used for biomass production of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	66
4.2	Composition of the basal medium reported by Champ <i>et al.</i> (1983)	66
4.3	Effects of individual nitrogen sources on growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	69
4.4	Effects of two combined nitrogen sources with total nitrogen concentrations of 20 g/L and 10 g/L on the growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	71
4.5	Effects of three combined nitrogen sources with total nitrogen concentration of 10 g/L, 20 g/L and 30 g/L on the growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	73



4.6	Effects of different carbon sources on <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 growth	78
5.1	Actual factor level corresponding to coded factor levels	86
5.2	Treatment combinations and responses	88
5.3	Analysis of variance for evaluation of the second-order model ^a	89
5.4	Analysis of variance in the regression model selected through variable selection ^a	91
5.5	Coefficient estimates in the regression model selected through variable selection	92
5.6	Compositions of three media for the growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	100
6.1	Effect of culture pH on growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 during batch fermentation in 2-L stirred-tank fermenter	111
6.2	Effects of different cultivation conditions (facultative and anaerobic) on growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 during batch fermentation in stirred-tank fermenter	114
6.3	Effects of agitation on the cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	118
6.4	Effects of inoculum sizes on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	122
7.1	Comparison of experimental and calculated data using linear regression	144
7.2	The kinetic parameter values of growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 in batch cultivation	146
7.3	The range of values of α (growth associated constant) and β (non-growth associated constant) for lactic acid bacteria by different researchers	147
8.1	Feeding rates used for constant fed-batch cultivation (CFBC) of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	157
8.2	Composition of media used for constant fed-batch cultivation (CFBC) of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	157
8.3	Values of parameters used to design fed-batch cultures of <i>L.</i>	158



	<i>salivarius</i> I 24	
8.4	Effect of feeding rate using FM A on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 in CFBC	160
8.5	Effects of feeding rates using FM B on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 in CFBC	161
8.6	Comparison of the cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 in CFBC at 0.1 L/h using different substrate concentrations	168
8.7	Comparison of the predetermined and actual μ values of SFBC of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	170
8.8	Effect of μ_{set} on <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 fermentation	174
8.9	Comparison of batch, CFBC and SFBC for biomass and lactic acid production by <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	179
9.1	Actual factor levels corresponding to coded factor levels for 4 variables	184
9.2	Actual factor levels corresponding to coded factor levels for 3 variables	184
9.3	Actual factor levels corresponding to coded factor levels for 2 variables	184
9.4	Summary of condition of freezing prior to 24-h freeze-drying process	186
9.5	Various growth conditions employed during cultivation of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24	186
9.6	Effects of various protective agents on the survival rates of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 after the freeze-drying process	189
9.7	Analysis of variance for evaluation of the second-order model ^a	191
9.8	Eigenvectors analysis for 4 variables tested	191
9.9	Analysis of variance for evaluation of the second-order model ^a	192
9.10	Analysis of variance in the regression model selected through variable selection ^a	193
9.11	Analysis of variance for evaluation of the second-order model ^a	194

9.12	Analysis of variance in the regression model selected through variable selection ^a	195
9.13	Survival rate (%) of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 after freeze-drying under different freezing conditions	196
9.14	The effects of growth conditions on the survival rates (%) of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 after freeze-drying	200
9.15	Effects of protective agents on the viabilities of freeze-dried <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 cultures immediately after freeze-drying (0 month) and during subsequent storage of 6 months at different storage temperatures	203
10.1	Estimation values of 10,000-L production by batch and fed-batch cultivations	216

LISTS OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Generalized scheme for the fermentation of glucose in lactic acid bacteria (Axelsson, 1993).	15
2.2	Technological factors influencing the functionality of probiotics (Mattila-Sandholm <i>et al.</i> , 2002).	21
2.3	Rationale for the research and development for production of probiotics.	22
2.4	Flow diagram of microencapsulation of bacteria by the extrusion and emulsion techniques.	34
2.5	Schematic diagram of a spray dryer.	37
2.6	The flow chart of a general freeze-drying process of live microbial cells.	41
2.7	Typical lyophilisation cakes. (A) uniform distribution of constituents; (B) non-uniform distribution of constituents in the cake with a crust or glaze on the upper surface; (C) a cake with poor self-supporting structural properties; (D) a cake showing signs of collapse; (E) disappearing cake, i.e., dissolution of the cake by excess water; (F) puffing resulting from incomplete freezing of the matrix before evacuation of the dryer; and (G) example of meltback.	44
3.1	Flow diagram of the experimental work.	51
3.2	A photograph of 2-L stirred-tank fermenter used in this study	53
3.3	Schematic diagram, dimension and operating variables of the 2-L stirred tank fermenter used in this study.	54
4.1	Effects of using different combinations of nitrogen sources with 10 g/L of YE concentration on cell yield based on viable cell count, (■) and yield based on dry cell weight, (□).	71
4.2	The profiles of viable cell counts during the cultivation of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 using different carbon sources. Symbols represent glucose (■); fructose (◆); sucrose (●); maltose (Δ); lactose (□).	72
4.3	The profiles of residual carbon sources concentrations during	75

cultivation of *L. salivarius* I 24 using different carbon sources. Symbols represent glucose (□); fructose (◆); sucrose (●); maltose (Δ); lactose (■).

5.1	Grid of points for X ₂ and X ₃	88
5.2	Partial-effects plot of (◆) glucose, (■) yeast extract and (▲) pH.	90
5.3	Response surface for the effects of glucose and yeast extract on the growth of <i>L salivarius</i> I 24 at pH = 6.10.	92
5.4	Response surface for the effects of yeast extract and pH on the growth of <i>L salivarius</i> I 24 at glucose = 3.324%.	92
5.5	Response surface for the effects of glucose and pH on the growth of <i>L salivarius</i> I 24 at yeast extract = 4.31%.	93
5.6	Growth curves of <i>L salivarius</i> I 24 in MRS broth (▲), optimum-point (■) and center point (●) media as obtained from the validation experiment.	95
6.1	Effects of pH on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24. (■, □) residual glucose, (●, ○) log cfu/mL, (▲, Δ) lactic acid. Closed symbols denote pH control at 6.10 and open symbols denote no pH control. For data points without error bars, the errors are smaller than the size of the symbols. Error bars indicate the mean ± standard deviation of three experiments.	106
6.2	Effects of aeration modes on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24. (■, □) residual glucose, (●, ○) log cfu/mL, (▲, Δ) lactic acid. Closed symbols denote facultative condition and open symbols denote anaerobic condition. For data points without error bars, the errors are smaller than the size of the symbols. Error bars indicate the mean ± standard deviation of three experiments.	108
6.3	Effects of impeller tip speeds on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24. (◆, ◇) 0.14 m/s, (●, ○) 0.42 m/s, (▲, Δ) 0.75 m/s and (■, □) 0.97 m/s. (A) viable cell count and glucose consumption, (B) dry cell weight and lactic acid production. Opened symbols denote glucose concentration in (A) and lactic acid concentration in (B). Closed symbols denote viable cell count in (A) and dry cell weight in (B). For data points without error bars, the errors were smaller than the size of the symbols. Error bars indicate the mean ± standard deviation of	114

	three experiments.	
6.4	Effects of inoculum sizes on cultivation performance of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24. (◆, ◇) 2.5%, (●, ○) 5%, (▲, △) 7.5% and (■, □) 10%. (A) dry cell weight and glucose consumption, (B) viable cell count and lactic acid production. Opened symbols denote glucose concentration in (A) and lactic acid concentration in (B). Closed symbols denote viable cell count in (A) and dry cell weight in (B). For data points without error bars, the errors were smaller than the size of the symbols. Error bars indicate the mean ± standard deviation of three experiments.	117
7.1	Dynamic of a microbial culture	128
7.2	Growth of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 in optimized medium. Validity domains of three models. Observed biomass (◆), fitted biomass (—). (A) Model 1, (B) Model 2 and (C) Model 3.	134
7.4	Typical profile of specific growth rate (μ) of <i>L. salivarius</i> I 24 in batch culture.	136
7.5	Comparison of calculated and experimental data for batch fermentation. (□) cell concentration, (o) glucose consumption and (△) lactic acid production; solid lines represent data calculated.	138
8.1	The time course of CFBC at 0.05 L/h using (a) FM A and (b) FM B. Symbols represent: (◇) DCW, (□) cfu/mL, (o) lactic acid and (△) glucose.	156
8.2	The time course of CFBC at 0.033 L/h using (a) FM A and (b) FM B. Symbols represent: (◇) DCW, (□) cfu/mL, (o) lactic acid and (△) glucose.	158
8.3	The time course of CFBC at 0.1 L/h using (a) FM A and (b) FM B. Symbols represent: (◇) DCW, (□) cfu/mL, (o) lactic acid and (△) glucose.	160
8.4	The time course of SFBC at different μ_{set} of (A) 0.1 h ⁻¹ , (B) 0.2 h ⁻¹ . Symbols represent: (□) DCW, (△) cfu/mL, (◇) lactic acid and (o) glucose. The vertical dotted lines indicate the initiation of the fed-batch phase.	165
8.5	The time course of SFBC at different μ_{set} of (A) 0.3 h ⁻¹ , (B) 0.4 h ⁻¹ . Symbols represent: (□) DCW, (△) cfu/mL, (◇) lactic acid	166

- and (o) glucose. The vertical dotted lines indicate the initiation of the fed-batch phase.
- 8.6 Time courses of biomass production in SFBC operated at different μ_{set} . (\blacklozenge \lozenge) 0.1 h^{-1} , (\blacktriangle \triangle) 0.2 h^{-1} , (\bullet o) 0.3 h^{-1} and (\blacksquare \square) 0.4 h^{-1} . Closed and open symbols denote total biomass [VX (g and cfu)]. Error bars indicate the mean \pm standards deviation of three experiments. 167
- 8.7 Profile of specific glucose consumption rates in SFBC operated at different μ_{set} . (\lozenge) 0.1 h^{-1} , (\triangle) 0.2 h^{-1} , (\circ) 0.3 h^{-1} and (\square) 0.4 h^{-1} . The vertical dotted line indicates the initiation of the fed-batch phase. Error bars indicate the mean \pm standards deviation of three experiments. 170
- 8.8 Profile of specific lactic acid production rates in SFBC operated at different μ_{set} . (\lozenge) 0.1 h^{-1} , (\triangle) 0.2 h^{-1} , (\circ) 0.3 h^{-1} and (\square) 0.4 h^{-1} . The vertical dotted line indicates the initiation of the fed-batch phase. Error bars indicate the mean \pm standards deviation of three experiments. 171
- 9.1 Survival rates of *L. salivarius* I 24 during one months of storage period at 30°C with different protective agents: (\square) MSA, (\square) MSB and (\square) MSG at various growth condition: A, B and C. 199
- 9.2 The survival rates of freeze-dried *L. salivarius* I 24 cultures with different protective agents. SM (Skim milk), Suc (Sucrose), Gly (Glycerol), Ca (Ca^{2+}), MSA (9.85 % (w/v) skim milk + 10.65 % (w/v) sucrose), MSB (17.80 % (w/v) skim milk + 5.5 % (w/v) sucrose) and MSG (16.55 % (w/v) skim milk + 9.01 % (w/v) sucrose + 3.34 % (v/v) glycerol). 201
- 10.1 Examples of flow process and unit operation involved in large-scale production of live cells of *L. salivarius* I 24 using up to 10,000-L stirred-tank fermenter (Batch mode). 207
- 10.2 Examples of flow process and unit operation involved in large-scale production of live cells of *L. salivarius* I 24 using up to 10,000-L stirred-tank fermenter (Fed-batch mode). 209

