

**The effect of yeast cell wall preparations
on salmonella colonisation,
gastrointestinal health and performance
of broiler chickens**

by

Mieke Brümmer

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree M.Sc. (Agric) in the
Faculty of the Natural & Agricultural Science
University of Pretoria
January 2007**

I, Mieke Brümmer, declare that this dissertation for the degree M.Sc. (Agric) at the University of Pretoria has not been submitted by me for a degree at any other university.

Acknowledgements:

Appreciation is extended to the following persons for their contributions to this study:

- Dr Christine Jansen van Rensburg, my promoter, for countless hours of dedication
- Dr Colm Moran for his inspirational guidance as my supervisor at Alltech
- Alltech: Dr T. Pearse Lyons, Mrs Deirdre Lyons, Dr Karl Dawson and Dr Ronan Power for making the internship available and allowing me to conduct the research at the Alltech North American Biosciences Center, Kentucky, USA
- The Alltech laboratory technicians, especially Ursula Thielen, for their assistance and help in the completion of this research

A special thank you to Vaughn, Pablo, my parents and Wichard for all the moral support and understanding

Table of contents

Abstract	i
Frequently used abbreviations	iii
List of Tables	iv
List of Figures	vii

Chapter 1: Literature review – The application of mannan oligosaccharides in animal health and nutrition

1.1) Introduction.....	1
1.2) What are mannan oligosaccharides?.....	2
1.3) How does mannan oligosaccharides function?.....	2
1.4) The use of MOS as a replacement for antibiotics.....	6
1.5) The effect of MOS on chickens.....	9
1.6) The effect of MOS on other animal species.....	15
1.7) Conclusion.....	21
1.8) Motivation for conducting this study.....	22

Chapter 2: The effect of feeding Bio-Mos, mannose or a soluble mannan preparation on the colonization of *Salmonella* Typhimurium in broiler chickens

2.1) Materials and methods.....	25
2.1.1) Chickens.....	25
2.1.2) Standard inoculums.....	25
2.1.3) Bacteria.....	25
2.1.4) Experimental design.....	26
2.1.5) Husbandry.....	27
2.1.6) Sampling and sample analysis.....	27
2.1.7) Procedures for autoclaved shavings.....	29

2.1.8) Procedures for autoclaved feed.....	29
2.1.9) Procedures for fresh caecal culture preparation.....	29
2.1.10) Treatments used in the different trials.....	29
2.1.11) Data analysis.....	31
2.2) Results.....	32
2.2.1) Trial 1; 05-006.....	32
2.2.2) Trial 2; 05-013.....	34
2.2.3) Trial 3; 05-019.....	36
2.2.4) Trial 4; 05-025.....	37
2.2.5) Trial 5; 05-031.....	39
2.2.6) Trial 6; 05-033.....	41
2.2.7) Trial 7; 05-044.....	43
2.2.8) Trial 8; 05-048.....	45
2.3) Discussion.....	49
2.4) Conclusion.....	53

Chapter 3: The effect of Bio-Mos, with or without the addition of a soluble mannan preparation, on the performance and gastrointestinal health of broiler chickens

3.1) Materials and methods.....	54
3.1.1.) General experimental procedures.....	54
3.1.1.1) Experimental design	54
3.1.1.2) Chickens	54
3.1.1.3) Husbandry	55
3.1.1.4) Treatments	55
3.1.1.5) Sampling and sample analysis.....	55
3.1.1.6) Response variables.....	56
3.1.1.7) Data analysis.....	58

3.1.2) Histology.....	59
3.1.2.1) Processing of fresh tissue samples.....	59
3.1.2.2) Alcian-Blue/ Periodic Acid Schiff's staining technique.....	59
3.2) Results.....	62
3.2.1) Feed conversion ratios.....	62
3.2.2) Histology.....	64
3.2.2.1) Villus height, villus width, crypt depth and muscle thickness.....	64
3.2.2.2) Goblet cell measurements.....	65
3.2.3) VFA analysis.....	66
3.2.4) VRBA Plates.....	68
3.3) Discussion.....	70
3.4) Conclusion.....	74
Chapter 4: Conclusion.....	75
Chapter 5: References.....	76
Appendix: a) Preparation of Microbial media.....	88
b) Preparation of staining media.....	90

Abstract

The main aim of the studies was to evaluate the modes of actions of Bio-Mos and the effect that it has on intestinal health as well as performance in broiler chickens. For the purpose of this study there were 2 main objectives. The first was to determine the effect of Bio-Mos as well as soluble mannan on salmonella colonization and to do this it was necessary to develop an *in vivo* pathogen challenge model, specifically designed for salmonella, using the chicken as animal model. The aim with this salmonella assay was to design a model that could accurately determine the efficacy of different components of the yeast cell wall at reducing or eliminating salmonella colonisation in chickens. The second objective was to evaluate the effect of Bio-Mos with or without the addition of a soluble mannan, fed at different inclusion levels, on chicken health. Specific parameters measured included feed conversion ratios (FCR), volatile fatty acid (VFA) analysis, antibiotic resistance amongst coliform populations, immunoglobulin quantification and gut morphology. Gut morphology measurements included villi height and width, crypt depth, muscularis thickness, goblet cell size and goblet cell density.

The salmonella assay trial was not able to yield positive results for either the cell wall preparations or the positive control, indicating that there are some external factors that have to be addressed before this assay can be used to draw any accurate conclusions from. The second section of this study did show FCR differences between some of the treatments, but did not show numerically large differences for VFA production or antibiotic resistance, however the histological evaluation did yield interesting results. Measurements based on the villi height and width, crypt depth and muscularis thickness showed no significant differences between treatments but there was a treatment effect on the goblet cells. The goblet cells of chickens receiving cell wall preparations were statistically significantly larger and present at a higher density than those of the control treatment birds.

In an attempt to develop the salmonella assay several aspects of the existing assay model were altered or eliminated. It is possible that the assay can work with some more

adjustments, but due to time constrictions it was not possible to further explore alternative approaches. Little research has been done on the effect of nutrition on the goblet cells in chicken intestines. The results noted in this report warrant a more in-depth investigation into the exact modes of action resulting in the differences in goblet cells observed. The use of cell wall preparations on a commercial level holds many advantages, as cell wall preparations appear to affect animal health in a positive way.

Frequently used abbreviations

MOS: Mannan oligosaccharide

MRF: Mannan rich fraction

H & E stain: Hematoxylin and Eosin stain

AB/PAS: Alcian Blue and Periodic Acid Schiff's stain

FCR: Feed conversion ratio

VFA: Volatile fatty acid

CFU: Colony forming unit

CE: Competitive exclusion

FCC: Fresh caecal culture

List of tables

Table 2.1. Raw material composition of the basal starter diet.....	26
Table 2.2. Raw material composition of the mannose basal diet balanced for the mannose treatment group.....	27
Table 2.3. Specific alterations made to the standard method between different trials.....	29
Table 2.4. The different treatments applied for the various trials.....	30
Table 2.2.1. Log ₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents ¹ and number of birds infected per pen (n=10) comparing mannose against methyl manno-pyranoside in their efficacy at reducing salmonella colonisation in the caeca.....	32
Table 2.2.2. Log ₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents ¹ and number of birds infected with <i>Salmonella typhimurium</i> per pen (n=10) with mannose as positive control and Bio-Mos as third treatment.....	34
Table 2.2.3. Log ₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents ¹ and number of birds infected with <i>Salmonella typhimurium</i> per pen (n=10) for broilers receiving diets containing no additive, mannose or Bio-Mos.....	35
Table 2.2.4. Log ₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents ¹ and number of birds infected with <i>Salmonella typhimurium</i> per pen (n=10), with mannose as positive control treatment, a negative control with no additive, and Bio-Mos as the third treatment.....	37

Table 2.2.5. Log₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents¹ and number of birds infected with *Salmonella typhimurium* per pen (n=10) indicating the efficacy of mannose as positive control and a soluble mannan (mannan rich fraction /MRF) in the reduction of salmonella colonisation in chicken caeca..... **38**

Table 2.2.6. Log₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents¹ and number of birds infected with *Salmonella typhimurium* per pen (n=10) with a negative control with no additives, mannose as positive control and a soluble mannan (mannan rich fraction /MRF)...**40**

Table 2.2.7. Log₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents¹ and number of birds infected with *Salmonella typhimurium* per pen (n=10) testing the efficacy of Bio-Mos against salmonella colonisation in the caeca, with a negative control treatment with no additives, mannose as positive control and Bio-Mos..... **41**

Table 2.2.8. Log₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents¹ and number of birds infected with *Salmonella typhimurium* per pen (n=10). A negative control with no additives, a positive control as mannose and Bio-Mos were used as the treatments..... **43**

Table 2.2.10. Summary of the Bio-Mos and MRF trials presented as log₁₀ CFU/g wet caecal contents and the colonisation percentages for the specific treatments in brackets..... **46**

Table 3.1. Raw material composition of the basal starter diet..... **54**

Table 3.2.1. Feed conversion ratio values obtained by the broilers for the respective treatments, as well as the statistical analysis results..... **61**

Table 3.2.2.1. Summary of villi measurements (µm), including villi height (VH), villi width (VW), crypt depth (CD), muscularis thickness (MT) and villi height to crypt depth ratio (VH: CD)..... **62**

Table 3.2.2.2. Measurements representing goblet cell (GC) size (μm^2) as well as goblet cell (GC) density (number goblet cells per $100\mu\text{m}^2$)..... **64**

Table 3.2.3.1. VFA (mM) results measured from the caeca contents of birds for each of the treatments..... **64**

Table 3.2.4.1. Antibiotic resistance measured as the number of *coliform* colonies that grow on a Violet Red Bile Agar (VRBA) plate and the number of colonies that survives when transferred to a tetracycline containing VRBA plate (30 mg/kg)..... **67**

List of Figures

- Figure 2.2.1.** Colonisation percentages¹ comparing the efficacy of mannose against that of methyl manno-pyranoside to determine which can be used as positive control..... 33
- Figure 3.2.2.** Colonisation percentages¹ comparing Bio-Mos against the positive control, mannose..... 34
- Figure 2.2.3.** Colonisation percentages¹ comparing the percentage of birds colonized by Salmonella typhimurium for the Bio-Mos treatment group against that of the mannose treatment and control group..... 36
- Figure 2.2.4.** Colonisation percentages¹ showing the similar salmonella colonisation observed in the for each of the 3 treatment groups.....37
- Figure 2.2.5.** Illustration of the colonisation percentages¹ showing the soluble mannan product, MRF, as a more efficient product than the positive control..... 39
- Figure 2.2.6.** Colonisation percentages¹ indicating the difference between the colonisation percentages for mannose vs. MRF..... 40
- Figure 2.2.7.** Colonisation percentages¹ indicating no differences between the various treatments..... 42
- Figure 2.2.8.** Colonisation percentages¹ for mannose vs Bio-Mos indicating the ability of mannose to reduce colonisation..... 44
- Figure 2.2.9.** Mannose vs. Bio-Mos trials¹ comparing the variation in colonisation percentage as changes were applied to the standard protocol..... 45

Figure 3.2.1. Effect of dietary inclusion of Bio-Mos and mannan rich fraction, alone or in combination, on the FCR¹ of broilers at 14 days of age..... **60**

Figure 3.2.2.1. Pictures taken at 400 X magnifications illustrating the differences observed between treatments for both goblet cell size and density..... **63**

Figure 3.2.3.1. Effect of dietary inclusion of Bio-Mos and mannan rich fraction, alone or in combination, on volatile fatty acids composition in the caeca contents of broilers..... **65**

Figure 3.2.4.1. Antibiotic resistant populations as measured across treatments in comparison to total amount of coliforms present..... **66**