Bioactive properties of blueberry extracts obtained by different drying techniques against Helicobacter pylori





Jose Manuel Silvan^{1*}, Anna Michalska-Ciechanowska², Marisol Villalva¹, Jessica Brzezowska², Soledad Díaz¹, Adolfo J. Martinez-Rodriguez¹

¹ Microbiology and Biocatalysis group (MICROBIO), Department of Biotechnology and Food Microbiology, Institute of Food Science Research (CIAL, CSIC-UAM), Calle Nicolás Cabrera 9, Campus de Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain

² Department of Fruit, Vegetable and Plant Nutraceutical Technology, Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Science, Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, Chełmonskiego 37, 51-630 Wrocław, Poland

E-mail: jm.silvan@csic.es





INTRODUCTION

Helicobacter pylori (H. pylori) is one of the most successful and prevalent human pathogens that infect more than 50% of the world's population [1]. Chronic inflammation of the gastric mucosa is one of the main consequences of this infection and is associated with the risk of gastric cancer [2]. Blueberries are rich in different bioactive compounds with antibacterial and anti-inflammatory properties [3] that could contribute to reduce the problems associated with H. pylori infection. However, these properties may vary depending on the blueberry variety. Furthermore, the industrial processing of blueberry extracts involves

the use of a number of technical procedures that could affect these bioactive properties [4]. For this reason, the main objective of the present work was to

evaluate the antibacterial and anti-inflammatory properties of three blueberry extracts from different varieties and obtained by different drying methods against H. pylori.



Bacterial strain, growth media and culture conditions

- ✓ Strain: Helicobacter pylori Hp59 from MICROBIO group's bacterial collection and isolated from gastric biopsy.
- \checkmark Selective growth media: Brucella Broth supplemented with 10% horse serum (BBH) and Mueller-Hinton agar supplemented with 5% sheep blood (MHB).



RESULTS

> Antibacterial activity

Table 1. Antibacterial activity of blueberry extracts (2 mg/mL) on the viable counts of H. pylori Hp59 after 24 hours of treatment. Results are expressed as CFU/mL (mean ± standard deviation) (n=4).

	Blueberry extracts		
Cultivars	Bluejay	Berkley	Bluecrop
FD	1.50 ± 0.58×10 ^{2 *a} A	4.00 ± 0.50×10 ^{2 *a} B	<1.00×10 ² *a _A
VD50	<1.00×10 ² *a _A	<1.00×10 ² *a _A	<1.00×10 ² *a _A
VD70	2.25 ± 1.06×10 ^{2 *a} A	<1.00×10 ² *a _A	<1.00×10 ² *a _A
VD90	2.13 ± 1.25×10 ^{2 *a} _A	<1.00×10 ² *a _A	<1.00×10 ² *a _A
SD	<1.00×10 ² *a _A	3.75 ± 0.35×10 ^{2 *a} _B	<1.00×10 ² *a _A

^a Different superscript letters denote statistical difference within a row (p<0.05 ANOVA Tukey test). ^{A,B} Different subscript letters denote statistical difference within a column (p<0.05 ANOVA Tukey test). * An asterisk denotes statistical difference in comparison with the control growth (p<0.05 ANOVA Tukey test). Control growth = $1.42 \pm 0.67 \times 10^8$ CFU/mL. Growth detection limit = 1.00×10^2 CFU/mL (Bactericidal effect)

Growth conditions: strains reactivation into MHB and incubation for 72h at 37°C, in microaerophilic atmosphere in VAIN workstation (85% N_2 , 10% CO₂, 5% O₂).



.

VAIN workstation

Antibacterial activity

✓ Procedure:

- Bacterial culture mixture:

1 mL of extracts (2 mg/mL) disolved in BBH (or only BBH for control growth) 4 mL BB supplemented with 10% horse serum 100 µL bacterial inoculum (~1x10⁸ CFU/mL)



- Incubation for 24h at 37°C, 150 rpm, in microaerophilic atmosphere (VAIN)

- Serial decimal dilutions of bacterial cultures were plated onto fresh MHB agar
- Incubation microaerobically for 72h at 37°C in microaerophilic atmosphere (VAIN)
- Antibacterial activity determination by CFU counting

Anti-inflammatory activity on infected-gastric AGS cells

Sandwich-ELISA (450 nm) Pre-treatment AGS cells with blueberry extracts (2 mg/mL) for 2h Cellular H. pylori Hp59 В Infection with H. pylori for 24h supernatants recovery 72h at 37°C С VAIN AGS cells (Non-infected control) H. pylori D IL-8 cytokine 24h at 37°C, inoculum quantification 5% CO (~1x10⁸CFU/mL)

Anti-inflammatory activity



	Blueberry extracts		
Cultivars	Bluejay	Berkley	Bluecrop
FD	78.2 ± 1.2 *a _A	82.9 ± 3.4 *a _A	81.5 ± 4.0 *a _B
VD50	76.8 ± 1.0 *a _A	84.1 ± 2.2*ab _A	88.9 ± 2.6 * ^b _B
VD70	74.5 ± 0.7 *ab _A	80.4 ± 4.3 * ^b _A	67.3 ± 5.0 *a _A
VD90	72.9 ± 2.1*a _A	77.8 ± 4.3 *a _A	69.2 ± 0.7 *a _A
SD	78.1 ± 4.8 *a _A	83.0 ± 1.9 *ab _A	85.3 ± 0.2 * ^b _B

 $^{\alpha,b}$ Different superscript letters denote statistical difference within a column (p<0.05 ANOVA Tukey test). ^{A,B} Different subscript letters denote statistical difference within a row (p<0.05 ANOVA Tukey test). * Asterisk denotes statistical difference in comparison with the control growth (untreated AGS cells) (p<0.05 ANOVA Tukey test).



Human gastric AGS cells

CONCLUSIONS

- All blueberry extracts showed significant antibacterial activity against H. pylori Hp59 and some of these extracts showed bactericidal effect.
- The rest of blueberry extracts without bactericidal effect were able to reduce H. pylori Hp59 growth by more than 5 log CFU/mL.
- Bluecrop extracts showed the most effective antibacterial activity, because all extracts obtained by the different drying methods resulted bactericidal.
- Vacuum drying (VD) at 50°C were the most effective drying method since the extracts of the three varieties obtained by this method were bactericidal.
- Regarding anti-inflammatory activity, all blueberry extracts reduced IL-8 production in H. pylori-infected AGS cells.
- Bluecrop extracts obtained by the VD at 70°C and 90°C showed the most active anti-inflammatory effect reducing IL-8 production by 32% and 30%, respectively.
- These results suggest that the selection of the blueberry variety and drying method can be an effective tools for modulating the antibacterial and anti-inflammatory properties of blueberry extracts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: This work was founded through Project HELIFOOD (AGL2017-89566-R) from MCIN/AEI/FEDER.

REFERENCES: [1] Kusters et al. (2006). Clin. Microbiol. Rev., 19, 449-490. [2] White et al. (2015). J. Inflamm. Res., 8, 137-147. [3] Tobar-Bolaños et al. (2021). J. Food Sci., 86, 5062–5077. [4] Michalska et al. (2015). Int. J. Mol. Sci., 16, 18642-18663.

The 3rd International Electronic Conference on Foods: Food, Microbiome, and Health

