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Abstract

In present study, enzyme-resistant dextrin, prepared by heating of potato starch in the presence of hydrochloric (0.1% db) and tartaric (40% db) acid at 130°C for 2 h (TA-dextrin), was tested as the source of carbon for probiotic lactobacilli and bifidobacteria cultured with intestinal bacteria isolated from faeces of three healthy 70-year old volunteers. The dynamics of growth of bacterial monocultures in broth containing tartaric acid (TA)-modified dextrin was estimated. It was also investigated whether lactobacilli and bifidobacteria cultured with intestinal bacteria in the presence of resistant dextrin would be able to dominate the intestinal isolates. Prebiotic fermentation of resistant dextrin was analyzed using prebiotic index (PI). Fermentation products were determined by HPLC. It was shown that all of the tested bacteria were able to grow and utilize TA-modified dextrin as a source of carbon, albeit to varying degrees. In co-cultures of intestinal and probiotic bacteria, the environment was found to be dominated by the probiotic strains of Bifidobacterium and Lactobacillus, which is a beneficial effect.
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Introduction

Nowadays, one’s lifestyle is indicative of one’s future health. Many factors determine the risk of disease, or conversely, the possibility of remaining healthy. Physical activity and an appropriate diet are examples of daily routines that may influence one’s health. A lack of physical activity, particularly if associated with overconsumption, increases the risk of development of nutrition-related chronic diseases, such as obesity, hypertension, cardiovascular diseases, osteoporosis, type II diabetes, and several types of cancer. Over the last decade, dramatic changes have taken place in the perception and understanding of the importance of the daily diet. Foods are no longer judged in terms of taste and immediate nutritional needs, but also in terms of their ability to improve the health and well-being of the consumers. The role of diet in human health has led to the recent development of the so-called functional food concept. A functional food is a dietary ingredient that has cellular or physiological effects above its normal nutritional value. It can also contain prebiotics [1].

“A prebiotic is a non-digestible food ingredient that beneficially affects the host by selectively stimulating the growth and/or activity of one or a limited number of bacteria in the colon, and thus improves host health” [2]. The definition updated by Gibson specifies that a prebiotic is “a selectively fermented ingredient that allows specific changes, both in the composition and/or activity in the gastrointestinal microflora that confers benefits upon host well-being and health” [3]. The current definition of prebiotics was suggested during the ISAPP experts’ meeting in 2008, according to which “a dietary prebiotic is a selectively fermented ingredient that results in specific changes in the composition and/or activity of the gastrointestinal microbiota, thus conferring benefit(s) upon host health” [4]. For a substance to qualify as a prebiotic, it must meet certain criteria: it must be chemically characterized, exhibit health benefits that are measurable and outweigh any adverse effects, and appropriately modulate the composition or activity of the microbiota in the target host [5].

Some carbohydrates, such as fructo oligosaccharides (FOS) [6,7], inulin [8]; Van Loo, [9], transgalacto-oligosaccharides (TOS) [10,11] and lactulose [12,13] are well-accepted prebiotics, while isomaltooligosaccharides (IMO) [14] and xylooligosaccharides [15] are candidate prebiotics. The fermentation of some oligosaccharides is not as selective as that of FOS, so their prebiotic status remains in doubt. Promising sources of prebiotics are starch products, especially resistant starch (RS) [16-18], and products of partial degradation of starch, that is, dextrins [19,20].

The objective of this study was to determine whether dextrin obtained as a result of heating starch with tartaric acid (patent claim no. 392894) is a substance with prebiotic properties [7]. Thus, it was examined whether the dextrin would be utilized as a source of carbon by probiotic and intestinal bacteria. It was also investigated whether probiotic lactobacilli and bifidobacteria cultured with intestinal bacteria in the presence of resistant dextrin would be able to dominate the intestinal isolates. In the study, the prebiotic index (PI) and the fermentation products of resistant dextrin were determined.

Materials and Methods

Materials

Potato starch and tartaric acid (≥99.5%) were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich Corp. (Poznan, Poland). Hydrochloric acid and ethanol (96%) were procured from POCH (Gliwice, Poland). Lactobacillus, Starch on Growth and Metabolism of Intestinal Bacteria.
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Bifidobacterium, Clostridium, Fusobacterium, Escherichia coli and Enterococcus bacteria strains were isolated from feces of three healthy 70-year old men volunteers. The 24-h cultures were frozen at -20°C: (a) Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium in MRS broth with 20% glycerol, (b) Fusobacterium, and Clostridium in VL broth, and (c) Escherichia, Enterococcus in a nutrient bouillon with 20% glycerol. Prior to experiments bacteria were activated by twofold inoculation (3%) in: (a) liquid MRS broth (Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium), (b) liquid VL broth (Fusobacterium, Clostridium), and (c) nutrient broth (Escherichia, Enterococcus).

Preparation of dextrin

Enzyme-resistant tartaric acid-modified dextrin (TA–dextrin) was prepared following the method of Jochym et al. [21]. Thus potato starch was sprayed with hydrochloric acid solution (0.5% w/w) to obtain a final HCI concentration of 0.1% on a dry starch basis (db). The tartaric acid solution (20% w/w) was then added to obtain a final organic acid concentration of 40% dsb. Thoroughly mixed sample was dried at 110°C to obtain final moisture content below 5%. Dried sample (10 g) was placed in an anti-pressure bottle (SIMAX), capped and heated at 130°C for 2 h in an ELF 11/6 EUROTERM CARBOLITE oven (Hope, England). Product was cooled in a desiccator and milled into powder with a particle size of <1 mm. Dextrin was then washed with 80% EtOH to remove excess of tartaric acid, and low molecular weight material formed during dextrinization, dried overnight at 50°C, and then at 110°C for 1 h, and finally milled in a cyclone lab sample mill (UDY Corp., Fort Collins, CO, USA) fitted with a 0.50 mm screen.

The dynamics of growth of mixtures of bacteria

The intestinal bacteria Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium, Escherichia coli, Enterococcus, Clostridium, and Fusobacterium were co-cultured in the presence of resistant dextrin to determine whether the beneficial bacteria Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium can dominate their environment in the presence of a mixture of isolated intestinal bacteria. Inoculants of bacterial monocultures were prepared in such a way that after 24 h of growth the number of particular bacteria ranged from 3.50×10^9 to 4.50×10^10 CFU/mL, corresponding to the number of these bacteria in the terminal section of the ileum [22]. The monocultures of bacteria isolated from three 70-year-old persons were incubated in liquid MRS (Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium), in liquid VL medium (Clostridium and Fusobacterium) and in liquid broth (Escherichia coli and Enterococcus). All monocultures were incubated in sterile 15 mL test tubes (Marfouir) – Lactobacillus, Escherichia coli, Enterococcus under aerobic conditions and Bifidobacterium, Fusobacterium and Clostridium under anaerobic conditions. After incubation, the cultures were centrifuged in a MPW-350R centrifuge (Med. Instruments, Poland) at 9.000 rpm for 10 min at 22°C, the supernatant was decanted and the biomass was transferred to 100 mL of medium of Wynne et al. [23] with the addition of resistant dextrin (TA-dextrin). The cultures were incubated for 168 h under anaerobic conditions (in similar conditions as in the intestine). Following dilution in physiological salt, the cultures were plated (Koch’s plate method) in duplicate immediately after inoculation (0 h) and after 24, 48, 72 and 168 h on selective media: Lactobacillus on Rogosa agar, Bifidobacterium on RCA agar with the addition of the antibiotic diacloxacinil, Escherichia coli on ENDO agar, Enterococcus on bile-esculin agar, Clostridium on DRCM agar and Fusobacterium on Schaedler agar with an antibiotic. The plates were incubated for 48 h at 37°C, Lactobacillus, Escherichia coli, and Enterococcus under aerobic conditions and Bifidobacterium, Fusobacterium and Clostridium under anaerobic conditions in a Concept 400 anaerobic chamber (Ruskinn Biotrace, USA). The control trial was determined by the trial without the addition of the source carbon.

Determination of prebiotic index (PI)

Prebiotic fermentation of resistant dextrins were analyzed using quantitative equation (prebiotic index – PI). The PI equation is based on the changes in key bacterial groups during fermentation. The bacterial groups incorporated into this PI equation were bifidobacteria, lactobacilli, clostridia and Fusobacterium. The equation assumes that an increase in the populations of bifidobacteria and/or lactobacilli is a positive effect while an increase in Fusobacterium and clostridia are negative [8].

The PI equation is described below:

\[ PI = \frac{Bif}{Total} - \frac{Fus}{Total} + \frac{Lac}{Total} - \frac{Clos}{Total} \]

where PI is prebiotic index; Bif, bifidobacterial numbers at sample time/numbers at inoculation; Fus, Fusobacterium numbers at sample time/numbers at inoculation; Lac, lactobacilli numbers at sample time/numbers at inoculation; Clos, clostridia numbers at sample time/numbers at inoculation; Total, total bacteria numbers at sample time/numbers at inoculation.

pH changes

Changes in pH were monitored with an Elmetron CP-401 pH-meter (Elmetron, Zabrze, Poland).

Determination of fermentation products by High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)

Organic acids, aldehydes and ethanol concentrations were determined by HPLC in supernatant liquid. The chromatographic analysis was performed by Finnigan Surveyor HPLC system (Thermo Scientific, Riviera Beach FL, USA) with refractive index (RI Plus) and photodiode (PDA Plus) detectors. The column used was an Aminex HPX 87H, 300 × 7.8 mm (HPLC Organic Acid Analysis Column, Bio-Rad, Hercules CA, USA). The mobile phase was 0.005 M H₂SO₄. The separation was carried out by isocratic elution with a flow rate of 0.6 ml/min, and the column temperature was maintained at a constant 60°C.

Quantification of fermentation products was carried out using the external standard method. Lactic acid, formic acid, acetic acid, propionic acid, butyric acid, succinic acid, ethanol, and acetaldehyde of known retention times were used as external standards. For each standard, solutions were prepared, filtered through 0.22 µm syringe filters (Millipore, Belford, USA), and injected into the HPLC system to provide standard curves (concentration versus peak area), and for calculating the quantities of organic acids, aldehydes and ethanol. Linear regression curves based on peak areas were calculated for the individual standards covering a broad range of concentrations (Table 1).

Results and Discussion

It seems likely that prebiotic activity will be exhibited by dextrin obtained by simultaneous thermolysis and chemical modification of potato starch in the presence of a volatile inorganic acid (hydrochloric acid) as a catalyst of the dextrinization process and an excess amount of an organic acid (tartaric acid) as a modifying factor (patent claim no. 392894 “Preparation with prebiotic qualities”). In previous research, Kapusniak et al. [24] analyzed this dextrin in terms of the solubility and pH of its 1% aqueous solution, the content of reducing sugars,
The content of the resistant fraction was above 68% [27]. Kapusniak et al. [27] showed that the actual content of insoluble dietary fiber and the high molecular weight fractions in dextrin modified with tartaric acid, determined by means of AOAC enzymatic-spectrophotometric method, amounted to 44.5%. However, the results obtained by the pancretin-gravimetric method, determined by means of AOAC 2001.03 method (50%) [27,24]. The observed differences among the various methods in terms of the measured content of the resistant fraction in dextrin modified with tartaric acid was caused by the fact that, according to the latest reports, enzymatic-gravimetric methods (including AOAC 2001.03) using thermostable α-amylase can determine only part of resistant starch type 4 [29]. And based on enzymatic tests, it can be argued that dextrin obtained using an excessive amount of tartaric acid may be classified as resistant starch type 4.

In the present study, enzyme-resistant dextrin, prepared by heating of potato starch in the presence of hydrochloric (0.1% dsb) and tartaric (40% dsb) acid at 130°C for 2 h (TA-dextrin), was tested as the source of carbon for probiotic lactobacilli and bifidobacteria cultured with the intestinal bacteria isolated from the feces of three healthy 70-year-old volunteers.

In media where TA-dextrin was the source of carbon, all Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium strains reached the stationary phase at 24 h of incubation. The number of bacteria of the genus Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium in the stationary phase was similar and amounted to: 8.70 log cfu/mL and 8.41 cfu/mL, respectively. At 168 h of culture in a medium with dextrin modified with tartaric acid, the number of lactobacilli and bifidobacteria remained high and ranged from 7.75 to 7.91 log cfu/mL, which shows their substantial viability (Figure 1).

The control strains were cultured in media with glucose. At 24 h of incubation, in cultures with glucose the number of lactobacilli and bifidobacteria amounted to from 9.35 to 8.83 log cfu/mL. The bacteria entered the stationary phase, similarly as in media containing dextrin.
after 24 h of incubation. However, the stationary phase lasted much shorter than in media containing dextrin. At 168 h of culture, the number of viable Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium cells cultured with glucose was much lower than that of cells cultured with resistant dextrin, and amounted to from 5.56 to 6.70 log cfu/mL (Figure 1).

In the medium containing dextrin, the acidifying activity of bifidobacteria was higher than that of lactobacilli. After incubation, a test of culture pH revealed that Bifidobacterium had the highest acidifying activity (pH 4.9), while Lactobacillus – the lowest (pH 5.6). In the control medium containing glucose, the pH of Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium cultures decreased much more than that in the medium containing dextrin; at 168 h the pH was 3.50 (Figure 1).

In media containing TA-dextrin, the other bacteria isolated from human feces were able to grow and utilize TA-dextrin as a source of carbon, albeit to varying degrees. The highest growth was recorded for Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium. Bifidobacterium strains were also characterized by the highest acidifying activity (lowering pH to 4.9), which remains consistent with the results reported by other authors [15,30,31]. The weakest growth was observed for Clostridium and E. coli. It was found that the stationary phase for Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium strains was much longer than for other intestinal bacteria. After prolonging culture time to 72-168 h, which corresponds to retarded or pathological passage of digesta through the large intestine, the viability of intestinal bacteria in a medium with resistant dextrin was found to be lower by 1-1.5 log cycles than that of Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium. The

---

Figure 2: The growth curves (--) and changes in pH (–) for Fusobacterium, Clostridium, Enterococcus and Escherichia coli bacteria grown in the medium containing TA–dextrin (■) or glucose (control) (●). Results show means and standard deviations of n=3 replicates.
number of Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium, and other bacteria isolated from fecal samples grown in media containing 1% glucose was lower by 1-2.5 log cycles than that of corresponding bacteria grown in a medium containing dextrin. This may have been caused by the lower pH values of the controls, under which the culture environment became unfavorable to preserving high viability by the studied bacteria. This may have also been caused by the protective effects of dextrin on the bacteria.

It was shown that the PI values in media with TA-dextrin were positive; furthermore, the prebiotic index increased with the time of culture (from 0.24 at 24 h of incubation to 0.31 at 168 h), which proves that beneficial bacteria (Bifidobacterium and Lactobacillus) can dominate their environment in the presence of a mixture of intestinal bacteria cultured with the addition of resistant dextrin.

The calculated PI values for TA-dextrin were higher than those reported by Olano-Martin et al. [32] or by Kordyl [33] inulin and oligosaccharides under the same incubation conditions (anaerobiosis; pH 6.8; incubation temperature of 37°C), which shows that TA-dextrin may act as a prebiotic substance.

The HPLC results indicate that the main metabolite produced by Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium was lactic acid (Table 2). Depending on the bacterial strain, its concentration after 24 h of incubation ranged from 90.5 mg/100 mL for Bifidobacterium to 112.7 mg/100 mL for Lactobacillus.

Another fermentation product was acetic acid (1.5 mg/100 mL for Lactobacillus and 18.2 mg/100 mL for Bifidobacterium), propionic acid (4.5-4.6 mg/100 mL for Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium), and butyric acid (20.0 mg/100 mL for Lactobacillus and 11.5 mg/100 mL for Bifidobacterium). Bifidobacteria generated up to 50 mg/100 mL of formic acid. Furthermore, Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium strains fermenting TA-dextrin produced acetaldehyde (0.3 to 2.2 mg/100 mL) and ethanol (0.1-0.2 mg/100 mL).

It was found that the main metabolite produced during the fermentation of TA-dextrin by Fusobacterium was propionic acid, with a concentration reaching 390 mg/100 mL. Fusobacterium also produced lactic acid (53.5 mg/100 mL), succinic acid (28.1 mg/100 mL), acetic acid (14.0 mg/100 mL), and small amounts of acetaldehyde (5.1 mg/100 mL) (Table 1).

The fermentation of TA-dextrin by Enterococcus led mostly to lactic and formic acids. The concentration of those acids, determined also with a concentration reaching 390 mg/100 mL.

According to the results, the major products of the fermentation of TA-dextrin by Clostridium were butyric, acetic and lactic acids. The concentration of these acids was 80.5, 71.5, and 55.2 mg/100 mL, respectively. The concentration of other metabolites, namely succinic acid and acetaldehyde, was considerably lower. Moreover, traces of ethanol were also present (Table 1).

The HPLC results showed that E. coli also metabolized TA-dextrin, producing a considerable amount of lactic and formic acids, at concentrations reaching 85 mg/100 mL. The concentration of another fermentation product, acetic acid, was 19.5 mg/100 mL. Succinic acid and acetaldehyde were produced at a similar level (5.5-6.0 mg/100 mL). E. coli produced traces of ethanol as well (Table 2).

Conclusions

The experiments showed that dextrin obtained as a result of heating potato starch in the presence of hydrochloric acid (0.1% of starch dry mass) and tartaric acid (40% of starch dry mass) at 130°C for 2 h may have prebiotic properties. The presented results are promising, but, according to the recommendations of FAO experts concerning the applications of prebiotics, it is still necessary to continue with in vivo experiments, which are now being conducted.
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Table 2: Concentration (mg/100 ml) of fermentation products after 24-h incubation of bacteria isolated from gastrointestinal tract of man in the broth containing TA–dextrin as the only one source of carbon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fermentation products</th>
<th>Lactobacillus</th>
<th>Bifidobacterium</th>
<th>Escherichia coli</th>
<th>Enterococcus</th>
<th>Clostridium</th>
<th>Fusobacterium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lactic acid</td>
<td>112.7 ± 0.81</td>
<td>109.5 ± 0.42</td>
<td>85.0 ± 1.00</td>
<td>90.2 ± 1.50</td>
<td>55.2 ± 0.90</td>
<td>53.5 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetic acid</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.15</td>
<td>18.2 ± 0.50</td>
<td>19.5 ± 0.15</td>
<td>6.5 ± 0.30</td>
<td>71.5 ± 0.05</td>
<td>14.0 ± 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formic acid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49.2 ± 0.25</td>
<td>84.5 ± 0.26</td>
<td>60.0 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propionic acid</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.01</td>
<td>4.6 ± 0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>390.0 ± 1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butyric acid</td>
<td>20.0 ± 0.12</td>
<td>11.5 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80.5 ± 0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succinic acid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0 ± 1.00</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.10</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.11</td>
<td>28.1 ± 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaldehyde</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.15</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.01</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.02</td>
<td>5.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>0.20 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: Standard Deviation; n=3 replicates.


