



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Journal of Immunological Methods

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/jim](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jim)

1 Research paper

Q1 2 Antigen administration by continuous feeding enhances oral  
3 tolerance and leads to long-lasting effects

Q2 4 Rafael Pires Oliveira, Andrezza Fernanda Santiago, Sabine Madsen Ficker,  
5 Ana Cristina Gomes-Santos, Ana Maria Caetano Faria \*

6 Departamento de Bioquímica e Imunologia, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

## 9 A R T I C L E I N F O

## 10 Article history:

11 Received 23 December 2014  
12 Received in revised form 14 February 2015  
13 Accepted 15 February 2015  
14 Available online xxxx

## 26 Keywords:

27 Oral tolerance  
28 Feeding protocols  
29 Continuous feeding  
30 Gavage  
31 Gut mucosa

## A B S T R A C T

The ability to avoid inflammatory responses to dietary components and microbiota antigens in the gut mucosa is achieved by a mechanism termed oral tolerance. This phenomenon is crucial to maintain the physiological immune activity in the gut and to prevent inflammatory disorders such as food allergy and inflammatory bowel diseases. Moreover, orally administered antigens induce regulatory cells that control systemic inflammatory responses as well. Given its specific, systemic and long-lasting effects, oral tolerance represents a promising approach for immunotherapies that aim to modulate inflammatory and autoimmune diseases. However, there are different protocols of feeding for induction of oral tolerance, and they have an impact in tolerance efficiency and length. Herein, we present and discuss different experimental feeding protocols and how they influence the outcome of oral administration of antigens.

© 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V. 25

## 32 1. Introduction

33 The intestine is the largest surface area of the human body  
Q3 34 (Mestecky et al., 2005); it also bears an abundant lymphoid  
35 tissue that is continuously contacting a plethora of environ-  
36 mental stimuli such as dietary and microbiota antigens  
37 (Veldhoen and Brucklacher-Waldert, 2012; Randall and  
38 Mebius, 2014). The default outcome from this daily stimulation  
39 is the maintenance of physiological non-inflammatory state of  
40 homeostasis. The mechanisms involved in such state are also  
41 able to generate specific tolerance to ingested antigens, a  
42 phenomenon named oral tolerance. Although originated in  
43 the gastrointestinal tract, oral tolerance has systemic effects  
44 inhibiting the production of specific serum antibodies, cell  
45 proliferation and cytokine production in other tissues (Faria  
46 and Weiner, 2005).

Since the pioneer studies reporting that eating a certain 47  
protein inhibits immune responses to the same antigen after 48  
immunization (Richman et al., 1978), a great advance in the 49  
understanding of oral tolerance has been achieved. Several 50  
mechanisms have been shown to be involved in the phenom- 51  
enon depending on a unique set of mucosal organized 52  
structures and lymphoid compartments cooperating to gener- 53  
ate tolerogenic responses. Special features of gut macrophages 54  
and dendritic cells are essential to collect and present gut- 55  
derived antigens in a non-immunogenic fashion (Mazzini et al., 56  
2014). The production of anti-inflammatory cytokines such as 57  
IL-10 and TGF-beta and the induction of CD4<sup>+</sup> regulatory T cells 58  
expressing the transcription factor Foxp3 are also critical for 59  
oral tolerance induction (Mucida et al., 2005). 60

Despite being a promising approach for immunoregulatory 61  
interventions and having successfully prevented a number of 62  
inflammatory and autoimmune diseases in animal models, oral 63  
tolerance has not been effectively translated to a clinical setting 64  
yet (Weiner et al., 2011). 65

Therefore, is imperative to consider the full requirements 66  
for boosting the tolerogenic mechanisms induced by mucosal 67  
antigen exposure and improve protocols and regimens for oral 68

\* Corresponding author at: Departamento de Bioquímica e Imunologia, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Av. Antonio Carlos 6627, 31270-901, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil. Tel./fax: +55 31 34092640.

E-mail address: [afaria@icb.ufmg.br](mailto:afaria@icb.ufmg.br) (A.M.C. Faria).

69 tolerance induction and maintenance. A number of studies  
 70 have shown that the frequency as well as form of the antigen  
 71 administration by the oral route is a critical factor for oral  
 72 tolerance induction. Experiments in mice, rats and guinea pigs  
 73 (Heppell and Kilshaw, 1982; Saklayen et al., 1984; Peng et al.,  
 74 1989) showed that multiple feeding by gavage were more  
 75 effective than a single feeding of antigen to induce oral  
 76 tolerance to inflammatory immune responses and autoim-  
 77 mune disease models (Higgins and Weiner, 1988; Thompson  
 78 and Staines, 1990; Melamed et al., 1996). Our group and others  
 79 have also demonstrated that continuous feeding of the antigen  
 80 is more efficient than single or multiple feedings by gavage in  
 81 inducing suppression of inflammatory disease models (Faria  
 82 et al., 1998; Russo et al., 1998; Marth et al., 2000). Continuous  
 83 feeding correlates with enhanced production of TGF- $\beta$  and  
 84 IL-10 (Marth et al., 2000; Faria et al., 2003). These studies have  
 85 presented convincing data on the suppressive effects of single,  
 86 multiple and continuous regimens of antigen feeding. Howev-  
 87 er, there is no systematic study available comparing side by side  
 88 the two most used regimens of feeding, gavage (intra-gastric  
 89 administration of antigen) and continuous feeding (antigen  
 90 administration in the drinking water), in inducing durable oral  
 91 tolerance under distinct immunological settings and in differ-  
 92 ent mouse strains. Herein, we present and discuss our results  
 93 regarding such comparative study. We also present methodo-  
 94 logical details on the two protocols of feeding that are relevant  
 95 for their effects.

## 96 2. Materials and methods

### 97 2.1. Animals

98 Eight- to twelve-week-old male or female BALB/c, C57BL/6  
 99 and B6D2F1 mice were supplied by the Animal Facility of  
 100 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). All animal  
 101 procedures were approved by the local Ethical Committee for  
 102 Animal Experimentation (CETEA-UFMG). Mice were kept in  
 103 the conventional experimental animal facility of Laboratório de  
 104 Imunobiologia, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade  
 105 Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil. Experimental  
 106 groups contained 4–16 mice.

### 107 2.2. Oral tolerance induction

108 The antigen used was ovalbumin (OVA, grade III, Sigma, St.  
 109 Louis, MO). Single and multiple feedings were performed by  
 110 daily intra-gastric administration (gavage) of 20 mg OVA in  
 111 0.2 ml saline using a round-tip 18-gauge stainless animal feeding  
 112 needle (Thomas Scientific, Swedesboro, NJ). Continuous feeding  
 113 refers to the administration of the antigen (at a concentration of  
 114 4 mg/ml) in the drinking water for 24 h. Control groups received  
 115 either gavages of saline or bottles containing water.

### 116 2.3. Antigen and immunizations

117 Seven days after oral treatment mice were injected intra-  
 118 peritoneally (i.p.) with 10  $\mu$ g OVA plus 3 mg of Al(OH)<sub>3</sub> as  
 119 adjuvant in 0.2 ml of saline. A booster with 10  $\mu$ g Ova in saline  
 120 was given i.p. 14 days later and 7 days thereafter, mice were

121 ble under anaesthesia from the axillary plexus and serum was  
 122 collected for antibody assays. For delayed-type hypersensitivity  
 123 (DTH) assay, mice received 100  $\mu$ g OVA emulsified in complete  
 124 Freund's adjuvant (CFA) containing 50  $\mu$ g *Mycobacterium*  
 125 *tuberculosis* H37 RA (DIFCO, Detroit, MI) subcutaneously (s.c.)  
 126 in the base of the tail 7 days after oral treatment. Mice were  
 127 challenged with 30  $\mu$ l 1% thermally aggregated OVA (600  $\mu$ g  
 128 OVA/mouse after 2 min treatment at 100 °C) in the right  
 129 footpad 14 days later. Animals were injected with 30  $\mu$ l saline  
 130 in left footpad for control purposes. Increase in footpad  
 131 thickness was measured 24 h later using a caliper.

### 2.4. Antibody assays 132

#### 2.4.1. Anti-OVA total Ig and Anti-OVA IgG1 133

134 Anti-OVA antibody titers were determined by enzyme  
 135 linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). Briefly, 96-well plates  
 136 (Nunc, Roskild, Denmark) were coated overnight with 20  $\mu$ g/ml  
 137 OVA solution in sodium carbonate buffer, pH 9.6, at 4 °C. Plates  
 138 were washed with PBS containing 0.05% Tween 20 and blocked  
 139 for 1 h at room temperature (RT) with PBS containing 0.25%  
 140 casein. Plates were incubated for 1 h at 37 °C with eight  
 141 dilutions of mouse serum samples starting at 1/100 in PBS-  
 142 casein. They were washed and incubated with either  
 143 horseradish-peroxidase (HRP)-labeled goat anti-mouse IgG1  
 144 or HRP-labeled goat anti-mouse Ig (Southern Biotechnology,  
 145 Birmingham, AL) for 1 h at 37 °C. Plates were washed, and  
 146 incubated in the dark with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the presence of  
 147 orthophenylenediamine (OPD, Sigma) in sodium citrate buffer;  
 148 pH 5.0 for 20 min. Reaction was stopped with 20  $\mu$ l of 2N  
 149 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. Optical density was measured using an automatic  
 150 ELISA reader at 492 nm. Results were calculated by running  
 151 sum of ODs of serum dilutions between 1:100 and 1:12,800  
 152 of individual mice. This method represents more precisely  
 153 antibody titers as previously described by our group (Carvalho  
 154 et al., 1994; Verdolin et al., 2001). Alternatively, the anti-Ova  
 155 IgG1 concentration was obtained by interpolating a standard  
 156 curve obtained by different concentrations of a mouse mono-  
 157 clonal anti-Ova IgG1 antibody (monoclonal OVA-14, Sigma).

#### 2.4.2. Anti-OVA IgE 158

159 Anti-OVA antibody titers were determined by a modified  
 160 enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) based on the  
 161 method previously described by Facincone et al. (1997). Briefly,  
 162 96-well plates (Nunc, Roskild, Denmark) were coated over-  
 163 night with rat anti-mouse IgE-UNLB (Southern Biotechnology,  
 164 Birmingham, AL) in sodium carbonate buffer solution, pH 9.6,  
 165 at 4 °C. Plates were washed with PBS containing 0.05%  
 166 Tween 20 and blocked for 1 h at room temperature with PBS  
 167 containing 0.25% casein. Plates were incubated for 1 h at room  
 168 temperature with undiluted mouse serum samples, further  
 169 washed and incubated with a PBS solution containing 20  $\mu$ g/ml  
 170 biotinylated ovalbumin and 0.25% casein for 1 h at room  
 171 temperature. Plates were washed and incubated with  
 172 streptavidin-HRP (Southern Biotechnology, Birmingham, AL)  
 173 solution at room temperature for 1 h. Then plates were washed  
 174 and incubated in the dark with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the presence of  
 175 orthophenylenediamine (OPD, Sigma) in sodium citrate buffer,  
 176 pH 5.0, for 20 min. Reaction was stopped with 20  $\mu$ l of 2N

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8417463>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8417463>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)