# **Resistance mechanisms adopted by a bacteriophage insensitive** *Salmonella* **Typhimurium**

- 
- 5 Changbao Wang<sup>a, b</sup>, Yunbin Lvy<sup>a</sup>, Fuxing Lin<sup>a</sup>, Ian F. Connerton<sup>c</sup>, Zhaoxin Lu<sup>a\*</sup>,
- 6 Shoubiao Zhou<sup>b</sup>, Hua Hang<sup>b</sup>
- 
- 8<sup>a</sup> College of Food Science and Technology, Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing
- 210095, PR China
- 10<sup>b</sup> College of Environmental Science and Engineering, Anhui Normal University,
- Wuhu 241002, PR China
- 12 <sup>c</sup> Division of Food Sciences, School of Biosciences, Sutton Bonington Campus,
- University of Nottingham, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE12 5RD, United
- Kingdom
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 21 \* Corresponding author.
- E-mail address: fmb@njau.edu.cn (Zhaoxin Lu)

### **ABSTRACT**

 Bacteriophages have key roles in regulating bacterial populations in most habitats. A *Salmonella* Typhimurium mutant (N18) with impaired sensitivity to phage fmb-p1 was examined to establish the adsorption efficiency of fmb-p1 to N18 was reduced to 6%, compared to more than 97% for wild type *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115. Reduced adsorption was accompanied by a reduction of 90% in the LPS content compared to wild type. Electron microscopy showed phage scattered around N18 with minimal engagement, while the phage were efficiently adsorbed to the wild type with tails oriented towards the bacterial surface. Evidence suggests fmb-p1 can inefficiently infect N18 but this does not give rise to an increase of phage titer. RT- qPCR data show that several *Salmonella* genes involved in lipopolysaccharide synthesis and five virulence related genes were down-regulated upon exposure of N18 to phage fmb-p1. In contrast, phage resistance related genes such as the SOS response, restriction-modification (RM), and the CRISPR/Cas1 cluster were up-regulated in N18. These data suggest that although inefficient adsorption and entry is the primary mechanism of resistance, transcriptional responses to phage exposure indicate alternative resistance mechanisms against phage infection are also brought to bear, including digestion of phage nucleic acids and activation of the SOS. These findings may help develop strategies for biocontrol of *Salmonella* where multi-resistant bacteria are encountered or emerge in applications for food production, bioremediation or wastewater treatment.

 **Key word:** bacteriophage; *Salmonella*; lipopolysaccharide; O-antigen; gene expression; virulence

### **1. Introduction**

 *Salmonella* is one of the most important pathogens that frequently causes serious foodborne disease worldwide (CDC, 2017; EFSA, ECDC, 2017; Song et al., 2018). Globally, *S.* Typhimurium frequently isolated non-typhoid *Salmonella* serovar found in eggs and poultry meats (Li et al., 2017; Panzenhagen, et al., 2016), pigs and pork (Boyen et al., 2008), and human infection (Boxstael et al., 2012). Decades of the overuse of antimicrobial agents in food animal production is regarded as one of the underlying reasons for the emergence of antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella*  (Hvistendahl, 2012). Multidrug resistance and cross resistance phenotypes are often observed in *Salmonella* isolated from food products (Cai et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2017). These resistant types can be transmitted to humans through foods of animal origin, which pose a serious threat to public health.

 As natural predators of bacteria, bacteriophage (phage) are viruses that specifically kill target bacterial strains, and generally do not attack non-target bacterial species. It is estimated that phages are at least tenfold more abundant than their bacterial hosts (Casjens, 2008). Increasing antibiotic-resistance worldwide (Li et al., 2013; Newell et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2016) has led to a re-evaluation of phage to control these bacteria in food, medical and environmental applications (Endersen et al., 2013; Akhtar et al., 2014; Mostafa et al., 2016). The global incidence of *Salmonella* has provoked a number of studies using phage infecting members of the genus, such as *Salmonella* phage P22 (*Podoviridae*) and *Salmonella* phage Felix-O1 (*Myoviridae*) (LeLièvre et al., 2018; Yeh et al., 2017). Phages with activity against *Salmonella* present in many foods have been reported. These include dairy products  (Virginie et al., 2019), pork (Hooton et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2017a), chicken meat (Duc et al., 2018), duck meat (Wang et al., 2017b), liquid eggs, drinks, milk (Zinno et al., 2014), hot dogs, cooked and sliced turkey breast, mixed seafood, chocolate milk, and egg yolk (Guenther et al., 2012). To date, more than 100 *Salmonella* phage genomes have been completely sequenced (NCBI Database, 2018).

 The interaction between phage and bacteria is understood for relatively few phages but an exemplar *Salmonella* phage P22 (Baxa et al., 1996; Steinbacher et al., 1997; Casjens and Thuman-Commike, 2011). The phage infection process begins with the specific adsorption of the phage to a receptor on the host surface. The repetitive O-antigen structure in *Salmonella* lipopolysaccharide (LPS) was found to be the receptor of phage P22 (Baxa et al., 1996). Phage P22 binds to the receptor via six homotrimeric tailspikes, which possess endoglycosidase activity, hydrolyzing the O- antigen polysaccharide, before binding a secondary cell receptor. Thereafter, the phage injects its genome into the target cell to direct host cell resources to complete the life cycle of the phage, culminating in host cell lysis and the emergence of new virions.

 However, host bacteria develop antiphage strategies to prevent cell lysis, for example *Salmonella* modify the structure of LPS to block the adsorption of phage P22 (Steinbacher et al., 1997). Bacterial strains can contain multiple antiphage barriers, which are of concern for phage therapy applications. Phage resistance mechanisms in bacteria have been reported at various stages in the phage life cycle, including the prevention of phage adsorption, the prevention of phage DNA entry, targeted cleavage of phage nucleic acids, abortive infection systems and prophage mediated mechanisms that prevent super-infection (Labrie et al., 2010; Davis and Waldor, 2002). However, the impact of multiple mechanisms in the same bacterial cell has

 rarely been assessed to date. Furthermore, the mechanism of interaction between a *Siphoviridae* phage and *Salmonella* host are not well documented.

 This study aimed to provide insights into the mechanisms of phage resistance that occur in *Salmonella* Typhimurium when phage and *Salmonella* coexist. The expression of LPS biosynthetic genes, recognized virulence genes of *S.* Typhimurium in a phage-insensitive mutant have been determined in this work. The molecular mechanisms and strategies of how *S.* Typhimurium becomes resistant to phage are analyzed and discussed.

# **2. Material and methods**

# **2.1. Phage, bacterial strains and culture**

 Phage fmb-p1 morphologically resembles the *Siphoviridae* exhibiting a virulent life cycle (no evidence of lysogeny) that was isolated from sewage in 2014. The genome of fmb-p1 is composed of a 43,327-bp double-stranded DNA molecule with 60 open reading frames. Phage fmb-p1 lyses seven serovars of *Salmonella* (*S.*  Typhimurium, *S*. Enteritidi*s*, *S*. Anatum, *S.* Miami, *S.* Agona, *S.* Saintpaul and *S.* 115 Paratyphi-C), and remains stable over a range of temperatures (40-75 °C), pH (4-10) and NaCl solutions (1-11%). The latent period of fmb-p1 was approximately 20 min, 117 and the burst size was  $77 \pm 4$  PFU/cell (Wang et al., 2017b). Phage fmb-p1 was stored in SM buffer (10 mM NaCl, 10 mM MgSO4, 50 mM Tris•HCl, pH 7.5) at -20℃ prior to experiment.

 *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 (wild type) and *S.* Typhimurium N18 (mutant) were used in this study. *S.* Typhimurium N18 was isolated after infection of a *S*. 122 Typhimurium culture CMCC50115 ( $10^9$  CFU/mL) in LB with phage ( $10^2$  PFU/mL), after 7 days at 25 °C. Ten single colonies were recovered from an aliquot of the

124 culture spread on LB agar at 37  $\degree$ C for 24h. After purification of the presumptive resistant strains on LB agar, the stability of the phage resistance phenotype was verified by five consecutive sub-cultures in the presence of fmb-p1.

#### **2.2 Characterization of** *S.* **Typhimurium N18**

 A fresh working culture of N18 was prepared by inoculating the stock into 50 mL 129 LB and incubated at 37 °C for 12 h with constant, gentle shaking (180 r/min) to obtain 130 cell concentrations of  $\sim 10^9$  CFU/mL. The culture was used to inaculate LB and *Salmonella* Chromogenic Medium plates and incubated at 37 °C for 24h. The characteristics of N18 were tested using a *Salmonella* dehydration biochemical identification kit according to the manufacturer's specifications (Luqiao, Beijing). The phage sensitivity of N18 was tested by the spot test method as described by Wang et al. (2017a). The genomic DNA (gDNA) of N18 was extracted and purified using a bacterial gDNA extraction kit (Shenggong, Shanghai, China). The concentration of gDNA was measured using a Nano Drop 2000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). DNA samples were stored at −20 °C for PCR. The gDNA of N18 was tested using a specific primer pair for *S.* Typhimurium gene STM4494 and a specific primer pair for phage fmb-p1gene P28 (Table 1). The PCR amplification mixtures contained 12.5 μL 2×Taq Master Mix (Vazyme Biotech, Nanjing, China), 142 1 $\mu$ L of each primer (10 mmol/L, 1  $\mu$ L gDNA (50 ng/ $\mu$ L)) and sterile distilled water up to 25 μL. A reaction mixture with sterile distilled water instead of template DNA was used as a negative control, the gDNA of CMCC50115 and phage fmb-p1 were used as positive controls. The PCR cycling program consisted of an initial 146 denaturation at 94 °C for 5 min, followed by 30 amplification cycles (94 °C for 30 s, 147 55 °C for 30 s, and 72 °C for 45 s), and a final extension step at 72 °C for 10 min. The

 PCR products were separated on 1% agarose gel electrophoresis and visualized using a UV transilluminator. All the experiments were performed in triplicate.

#### **2.3. Determination of phage adsorption**

 Phage adsorption was determined according to the method of Kropinski (2009) with minor modifications. Briefly, a mid-log phase bacterial culture was infected with a phage suspension to achieve a multiplicity of infection (MOI) of 0.01. The mixture was allowed to adsorb for 15 min at room temperature before centrifugation at 10,000  $\times$ g for 2 min. The supernatant was used for the determination of the unabsorbed phage titer using the agar overlay method (Hungaro et al., 2013). The phage adsorption efficiency was calculated as following:

 phage adsorption efficiency = (total phage titer- unadsorbed phage titer)/total phage titer×100%

### **2.4 Determination of phage adsorption using transmission electron microscopy**

 Bacterial cultures (CMCC50115 or N18) wwere prepared by inoculating the stock into 50 mL LB and incubated at 37 °C for 12 h with constant, gentle shaking (180 r/min) to obtain cell concentrations of  $\sim 10^9$  CFU/mL. The culture was diluted to  $10^7$  CFU/mL with SM buffer in a 1.5 mL tube, then a 100μL dilution solution and 100μL 165 phage stock ( $10^{10}$  PFU/mL) were mixed together in a new tube and kept static for 10 min at room temperature. Negative staining method was used to image phage adsorption structures (Kropinski, 2009). Phage/host morphologies were examined using a H-7650 electron microscope (Hitachi, Japan) operated at 80 kV.

# **2.5. Extraction, purification and determination of LPS**

 *Salmonella* without phage were inoculated into 100 mL LB and incubated at 171 37 °C for 12 h with 180 r/min to obtain  $\sim 10^9$  CFU/mL prior to experiment. The 172 culture was centrifuged with Eppendorf centrifuge at 8,000 g at 4  $\degree$ C for 10min. The 173 pellet was washed twice with normal saline, washed once with  $ddH<sub>2</sub>O$ , and finally re suspended in 10ml ddH2O. The cell suspension was sonicated using a Scientz-ⅡD Ultrasonic unit (Ningboxinzhi, China) for 1h until the solution clarified. The treated 176 solution was added as the bulk volume with 90% phenol, churned at 68  $\degree$ C for 30 min, 177 put on ice overnight and then centrifuged with 5,000 g at 4  $\degree$ C for 20 min. The 178 supernatant was collected, and the phenol saturated with  $ddH<sub>2</sub>O$  before centrifuging again. The aqueous supernatants were collected and dialyzed with flow water for 24 h, 180 and then dialyzed with ddH<sub>2</sub>O for 72 h (until no purple emerged using a FeCl<sub>3</sub> test).The solution was concentrated to a quarter of the original volume in a fume hood. The concentrate contained the crude LPS extract.

 DNase and RNase were added into the LPS crude extract to final concentrations 184 of 100 μg/mL, respectively. The suspension was then incubated at 37  $\degree$ C for 4 h. After this, proteinase K was added into the suspension to final concentrations of 100 μg/mL, and then incubated at 37°C for 3 h. The suspension was then heated at 100°C for 10 minutes, centrifuged at 5,000 g for 30 min after cooling to room temperature. The supernatant was added to two-fold volume of acetone and kept overnight. The solution was centrifuged with 10,000 g for 10 min, and the precipitate dried in a fume hood. The dried precipitate represents purified LPS.

191 The purified LPS was dissolved in ddH<sub>2</sub>O for further detection. The concentration of LPS solution was determined using phenol-sulfuric acid method (Gabriela et al., 2003) with slight modifications as indicated below. The LPS solution (1.0 mL) and 194 the phenol solution (0.5 mL) were added to screw cap tubes ( $13\times150$  mm), which were capped and vortex-stirred. Then 3.0 mL of concentrated sulfuric acid was added slowly down the side of the tube. The tubes were then closed, vortex-stirred for 5 s and incubated at 100°C for 20 min, and then cooled to room temperature with flow  water, before reading the absorbance at 490 nm using distilled water as blank in a UV-2600 UV/Visible spectrophotometer (Shimadzu, Japan).

### **2.6 LPS as a decoy for phage adsorption**

 The extract solutions of *Salmonella* LPS were diluted to the same concentration (400 μg/mL) with sterile distilled water prior to the experiment. An 203 overnight *Salmonella* culture of 100  $\mu$ L (10<sup>5</sup> CFU/mL) was added into 6 sterilized tubes with cap (20 mL). Then, either 100μL or 400μL of LPS solution from either wild type (50115LPS) or mutant (N18LPS) were added to the first four of the tubes. Fresh LB medium was added to each of the six tubes to a total volume of 9.9 mL. 207 Finally, 100 μL of phage  $(10^{11} PFU/mL)$  was added into 5 of the above tubes, and 100μL of SM buffer was added to the last tube as a negative control. All tubes were shaken and gently mixed and incubated at room temperature for 15 minutes. The *Salmonella* count of each test tube was determined after incubation at 37 ℃ for 4 h. All experiments were performed in triplicate.

# **2.7. Gene expression analysis**

 To detect the gene expression of *Salmonella* exposed to phage, total RNA was extracted immediately after phage addition, after 10 min and 24h of incubation. 215 Salmonella infection was initiated by adding 100  $\mu$ L of phage (10<sup>7</sup> PFU/mL) and 100 216 μL of overnight cultures of *Salmonella* N18 and CMCC50115 (10<sup>9</sup>CFU/mL) to 100 217 mL of LB broth at 37 °C. All extractions were performed in triplicate.

 Total RNA was isolated from *Salmonella* cells using a Bacterial RNA Kit (Omega Bio-tek, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions, and then each RNA sample was treated with recombinant DNase I (Takara, Japan). The DNase-treated RNA was reverse-transcribed using the First strand cDNA synthesis kit (Vazyme, 222 China), according to manufacturer's specifications (5 min at 25 °C, 15 min at 50 °C, 5 223 min at  $85 \degree C$ ). The concentrations of cDNA were determined using a Nano Drop 2000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). The cDNA samples were then 225 divided into small volumes and stored at -20 °C until use.

 Real-time PCR assays were prepared as follows (20 μL final volume per sample): 10 μL of SYBR® Green Master Mix (High ROX Premixed, Vazyme), 0.4 μL of each 228 primer (10 mM, Table1), 2  $\mu$ L of cDNA template (100 ng/ $\mu$ L), and 7.2  $\mu$ L of RNase- free water. A thermocycler (ABI StepOnePlus™ system) was programmed as follows: 230 initial denaturation at 95 °C for 5 min, followed by 40 cycles of 10 s at 95 °C, 30 s at 231 60  $\degree$ C, with a single fluorescence measurement; a final melting curve program of 15 s 232 at 95 °C and 1 min at 60 °C, followed by 15 s at 95 °C. A cDNA template-free negative control was included in each run to confirm that there was no background contamination, and a housekeeping gene for 16S rRNA was used as an endogenous control since it is constitutively expressed under a wide range of conditions. The mean values of curve thresholds (Ct) were considered to calculate the relative expression of 237 target genes by the comparative method using the  $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$  equation (Livak & Schmittgen, 2001). PCR efficiency was determined and melting curve analysis was performed to ensure that a single gene product was amplified for each target gene prior to experiment.

# **2.8. Statistical analysis**

 Statistical significances were determined by analysis of variance (ANOVA) in SAS, and Duncan's new-multiple range test of SPSS 13.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, 244 USA). The level of statistical significance was  $p < 0.05$ .

**3. Results**

# **3.1 Characterization of** *S***. Typhimurium N18**

 *S*. Typhimurium N18 was isolated and purified post-infection of *S*. Typhimurium CMCC50115 with phage fmb-p1. Plaque assays indicated strain N18 could not be lysed by phage fmb-p1 (see Fig. 1B compared to wild type 1A). Fig. 1D shows the N18 mutant produces an atypical colony morphology with irregular borders on LB solid medium compared to the regular round colonies of wild type *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 (Fig. 1C). However, N18 retains the diagnostic purple color on *Salmonella* Chromogenic Medium plate as *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 (Figs. 1E, 1F) and the same biochemical profile as the wild type. Genomic DNA of N18 could be PCR amplified with specific primers designed on the *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 strain but did not produce amplicons with fmb-p1 phage specific primers (Fig. 1G). These results suggest that N18 is a phage insensitive non-lysogenic derivative of *S*. Typhimurium CMCC50115.

# **3.2 Differences in phage adsorption between N18 and CMCC50115**

 Transmission electron microscopy showed that phages gathered in an orderly fashion upon encountering *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 cells with phage tails observed near the host cell (Fig. 2A, 2C). However, there were only a few non- adherent phage particles scattered around N18 cells, and even fewer adsorbed with tails orientated towards the N18 cell (Figs. 2B, 2D). These images suggest that the primary interaction of phage fmb-p1 with N18 has been compromised. The phage adsorption rate to *S.* Typhimurium N18 was reduced in comparison to *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115, with only 6% of the applied titer adsorbed by N18 as against 97% for CMCC50115 (Fig. 2E). Phage replication was not evident after 24h incubation with N18, while the phage titer of wild type *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 271 increased by 4 log<sub>10</sub> PFU/mL (Fig. 2F). As shown in Table 2, the LPS content of N18  was determined as only 10% of that for *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115, which may account for the lack of adsorption.

 Fig. 3 shows the ability of LPS to act as decoy for phage fmb-p1 binding to *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 to reduce phage infection the degree of the fall in the viable count. In the absence of LPS the viable count of *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 277 falls from  $log_{10} 5.3$  CFU/ml to undetectable levels post exposure to  $10^{10}$  PFU fmb-p1. LPS extracted from wild type *S.* Typhimurium acts an effective decoy reducing the 279 loss in viable count to 0.9 or 0.3  $log_{10}$  CFU/mL from cultures containing respectively low (100 μL) or high (400 μL) concentrations of 50115LPS. The N18 LPS extract 281 was not as effective with reductions of 2.1 or 1.5 log<sub>10</sub> CFU/mL in the *Salmonella* 282 count containing respectively either low (100  $\mu$ L) or high (400  $\mu$ L) concentrations of N18LPS.

# **3.3 Effect of phage on** *Salmonella* **LPS synthesis gene expression**

 The biosynthetic pathway and export mechanisms of LPS are common to most Gram-negative bacteria (Wang & Quinn, 2010). The expression of the majority of LPS-related synthesis genes in the absence of phage was not significantly different between the wild type strain and phage-insensitive isolate N18 in LB broth. However, there were four key exceptions to this: *lpxA, rfaL, pagP* and *wzzB* that show reduced expression in N18 (Fig. 4). Fig 5A shows 13 LPS synthesis genes of *S.* Typhimurium 291 N18 were significantly down-regulated  $(p \le 0.01)$  upon exposure to phage with most 292 showing down-regulation greater than  $3 \log_2 6$  fold, compared to the control. Genes *lpxA*, *lpxB*, *pagP*, and *msbA* have key functions in lipid A biosynthesis. These four 294 genes of N18 were down-regulated  $(3.9-, 3.7-, 3.4-, \text{ and } 3.8- \log_2 \text{ fold}, \text{ respectively})$ , suggesting that the lipid A biosynthesis was reduced in phage-exposed *Salmonella*. Genes *rfaG*, *rfaI*, *rfaJ*, *rfaK*, and *rfaL* play an important role in core oligosaccharide

 biosynthesis. These five genes of N18 strain were also down-regulated by phage (3.7-, 298 3.6-, 3.8-, 3.5-, and 3.7-  $log_2$  fold, respectively), indicating that the core oligosaccharides biosynthesis was similarly affected. Genes *rfbA*, *kdtA*, *wzzB*, *lpdT* are the major genes responsible for O-antigen biosynthesis. These four genes of N18 strain were down-regulated by phage (3.8-, 3.8-, 3.6-, and 3.4- log<sup>2</sup> fold, respectively), indicating that the O-antigens biosynthesis were modified in *Salmonella*. These results were consistent with the reduction of LPS content observed for N18 (Table 2). However, seven genes of *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 were down-regulated by phage fmb-p1 exposure. Under these circumstances (10 minutes post-infection at MOI=1) *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 is phage infected with demonstrable transcription of the representative phage genes *p1, p11* and *p28*. In contrast, phage gene transcription in the phage insensitive mutant N18 at 10 minutes was undetectable but was evident by 24 h; accordingly, the differences recorded for *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 were significantly less than that determined for N18.

### **3.4 Effect of phage on the expression of** *Salmonella* **virulence genes**

 The virulence of *Salmonella* is of general concern as it represents a serious threat to the health of domestic animals and humans worldwide. In the present study, expression of five host virulence genes (*invA, sseL, mgtC, sopB* and *spvC*) was tested during phage infection. Fig. 5B shows the expression of five virulence genes to be significantly down-regulated by phage in *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 and N18.

# **3.5 Effect of phage on gene expression of phage resistance in** *Salmonella*

 Phage infection up-regulated gene expression of *lexA, recA,* and *CRISPR/cas1* in *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 by 1.5, 1.3 and 2.9-log<sub>2</sub> fold, respectively (Fig 6A). These changes were greater than the corresponding values observed for the phage 321 treatment of N18 (0.9, 0.7, and 1.4-log<sub>2</sub> fold,).

 As shown in Fig. 6B, genes *hsdR, hsdM* and *hsdS* comprising the type I RM 323 system were up-regulated by phage in strain N18 (1.7, 1.1, and 1.4-log<sub>2</sub> fold, respectively). In contrast, *hsdM* was up-regulated by phage in *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115, and *hsdS* was slightly down-regulated after phage infection. Two genes 326 representing the type III RM system were significantly up-regulated ( $p < 0.05$ ) by phage in both *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 and N18 (Fig. 6C).

### **4. Discussion**

 Recently, there has been renewed interest in phage-bacteria interactions because phages have the potential to treat multi-drug resistant bacteria in in medicine and agriculture. However, there are still obstacles to phage application, notably phage resistance. Phage resistance mechanisms include the inhibition of phage attachment to cell surface receptors, cleavage of the invading phage genome, replication interference exerted by bacterial CRISPR–Cas systems and even the inductive abortion of phage infection (Labrie et al., 2010; Samson et al., 2013).

 The *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115 derivative N18 was largely but not completely insensitive to infection by bacteriophage fmb-p1. Phage gene transcription was detected in N18 was detected 24 h post treatment albeit at low levels. Low-level transcription may have arisen as a consequence of mutant instability permitting phage access to a subpopulation of bacteria, or that a genetic subpopulation of phage can achieve entry and initiate transcription or simply that sufficient phage host interactions can give rise to infection by stochastic process. These interactions do not give rise to an increase in phage titer either because the replication does not complete or that the subpopulations supporting phage infection are insufficient to increase phage titer against phage loss due to inactivation.

 The first barrier to phage replication in N18 is poor adsorption. Transmission electron microscopy confirmed that adsorption of fmb-p1 to the surface of N18 bacteria is disordered compared to the regular engagement observed for the wild type strain. LPS is a significant structure in this process as demonstrated by the concentration dependent decoy effect of LPS extracts to reduce phage infection of sensitive *S.* Typhimurium CMCC50115. *S.* Typhimurium N18 yielded only 10% of the extractable LPS of wild type. *S.* Typhimurium cells may decrease the density of LPS or alter the structure of the receptor critical for phage adsorption. This mechanism could be conducive for the survival of bacteria along with phage present in the same habitat. LPS extracts of wild type *S.* Typhimurium and phage- insensitive mutant can interfere with the infection and lysis of *Salmonella* by phage. The LPS of N18 is not as effective as wild type LPS in preventing phage adsorption but is still capable of interfering with phage adsorption and lysis suggesting the essential structures for LPS phage interaction are present but are limited due low overall LPS content and low specificity in the phage-insensitive *Salmonella*. We also observed down-regulation of the LPS synthesis genes upon exposure to phage. These data imply a host adaptive response to phage infection that was most notable in the phage insensitive *S.* Typhimurium, likely because the host was not wholly committed to phage transcription and the shifts in host metabolism that support replication. These data do not rule out external sensor signaling as a result of phage host surface interactions or early diffusible lysis products.

 Bacteria have evolved a range of barriers to prevent phage adsorption, such as the blocking of phage receptors, the production of extracellular matrix and the production of competitive inhibitors. For example, *Escherichia coli* phage T5, produces a lipoprotein (Llp) that blocks its own receptor, ferrichrome-iron receptor (FhuA)  (Pedruzzi et al., 1998). Phage ФV10 possesses an O-acetyltransferase that modifies the O157 antigen of *E. coli* O157:H7 to block adsorption of ΦV10 and phages with similar specificities (Perry et al., 2009). *Salmonella* phage P22, which recognizes the O antigen, has also evolved to specifically recognize polysaccharides such as O antigens (Steinbacher et al., 1997). The antimicrobial molecule microcin J25 uses FhuA as a receptor and can outcompete phage T5 for binding to FhuA (Destoumieux- Garzón et al., 2005). The changes we observed in LPS of *Salmonella* CMCC50115 upon phage infection show broad similarity to mechanisms adopted to evade phage infection.

 High concentrations of LPS can induce fever, increase heart rate, and lead to septic shock and death following organ failure (Wang & Quinn, 2010). The content of LPS in N18 was much lower than that of the wild type *S.* Typhimurium strain. The selection of phage insensitive types with reduced LPS content could also reduce the risk associated with endotoxicity of *Salmonella*, and given that LPS is a common feature of many Gram-negative bacteria this may be true of other phage therapy targets (Tran & Whitfield, 2009). Attenuated virulence has been observed for phage resistant *Salmonella* that lack the O-polysaccharide chain from LPS (Santander and Robeson, 2007). However, this is in contrast to reports of temperate phage that can add to the pathogenicity or virulence of their hosts, such as *Vibrio cholera* phage CTXɸ and *E*. coli phages STX (Waldor & Mekalanos, 1996; O'Brien et al., 1984).

 The virulence *Salmonella* requires the expression of *Salmonella* pathogenicity islands (SPIs), 16 variants of which are currently described (Sterzenbach et al., 2013). Some of these SPIs are conserved throughout the genus, and others serovar specific (Hensel, 2004). The *invA* gene is essential for *Salmonella* to enter cultured epithelial cells and belongs to SPI-1 (Galán et al., 1992), whereas *sseL* encodes a *Salmonella*   deubiquitinase required for macrophage killing and virulence which belongs to SPI-2 (Rytkönen et al., 2007). SPI-1 and SPI-2 encode effectors of the type III secretion systems (T3SS) that confer the major virulence traits of *Samonella* enterica (*S*. enterica), such as invasion, intracellular survival and proliferation, and enteropathogenesis (Burkinshaw & Strynadka, 2014). The *mgtC* gene encodes a 402 virulence factor of *Salmonella* in response to low  $Mg^{2+}$  and pH levels and belongs to SPI-3. *Salmonella* require *mgtC* to adapt to the nutritional limitations of the intraphagosomal habitat, and down regulation would adversely affect phagosomal survival (Retamal et al., 2009). Gene *sopB* encodes proteins to hydrolyze inositol phosphatase and belongs to SPI-5 (Norris et al., 1998). Down-regulation of *sopB*  could reduce the action of inositol phosphatase involved in triggering fluid secretion and diarrhoeal symptoms. Gene *spvC* is present on the virulence plasmid of *Salmonella* and is a T3SS effector, and which is closely related to bacterial adhesion, colonization and serum resistance factors (Mazurkiewicz et al., 2008). Down- regulation of *spvC* would reduce the capacity of *Salmonella* to cause disease. A phage resistant *Salmonella* strain called Salp572φ1R lacks the O-polysaccharide from LPS, and expression of several genes related to virulence was under-expressed. Moreover, Salp572φ1R was avirulent in mice. These examples suggest that modifications in LPS can produce phage resistance and impair virulence (Capparelli et al., 2010). In this study, five virulent genes were shown to be down-regulated by phage in *S.* Typhimurium N18.

 When the first defensive line is broken, bacteria maintain an arsenal of defense mechanisms against the phage. Gene *lexA* encodes protein binding to its specific recognition motif in the promoter region of SOS genes. Gene *recA* encodes RecA protein that promotes the autocatalytic cleavage of LexA repressor (Little, 1991). The  relative gene expression level of *recA* has clearly increased in both *Salmonella* strains by phage. The SOS genes of *Salmonella* were induced by gene *recA* encoding products. This mechanism enables cell survival in the presence of extensive DNA damage. Gene *CRISPR/Cas1* encodes CRISPR/Cas system-associated protein Cas1, 426 which targets invasive nucleic acid in the host cell for degradation (Touchon & Rocha, 2012). The increase of gene expression level of *CRISPR/Cas1* indicated that *Salmonella* cell increased its capacity to degrade of exogenous nucleic acids during phage infection. The type I restriction-modification (RM) systems consisting of the gene products *hsdR*, *hsdM* and *hsdS* cleaves nonmethylated DNA randomly at a remote site from the recognition sequence determined by the specificity subunit. This could enable the bacterium to distinguish between its own (methylated) DNA and incoming non-methylated DNA (Murray, 2000). The type III RM systems, consisting of the gene products Res and Mod, hemimethylate the DNA and cleave DNA at specific sites (Rao et al., 2014). Higher gene expression of type I RM and type III RM systems in phage treated strains could be part of a stress response or a general adaptation to phage interaction.

# **5. Conclusion**

 While bacterial strains often contain multiple antiphage barriers, the conjunction of these mechanisms in a single host have rarely been assessed. This study has shown that several phage resistance mechanisms of *S*. Typhimurium can function together in a single strain, including the prevention of phage adsorption, the prevention phage DNA entry, awakening of the SOS system, and the targeting of phage nucleic acids. Furthermore, this study found that virulent phage could decrease the content of LPS and the potential toxicity of *Salmonella*. These findings will assist in the development  of phage biocontrol strategies for *Salmonella* when responses to multi-resistant bacteria are required.

#### **Acknowledgements**

 This work was financially supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 31571887), and Anhui Provincial Natural Science Foundation (1808085MC73), and the Natural Science Foundation of Anhui Higher Education Institutions (KJ2018A0314), and the Doctor's Research Foundation of Anhui Normal University (2018XJJ53) and Jiangsu Collaborative Innovation Center of Meat Production and Processing, Quality, and Safety Control.

#### **References**

Akhtar M, Viazis S, Diez-Gonzalez F. (2014). Isolation, identification and characterization of lytic,

 wide host range bacteriophages from waste effluents against *Salmonella enterica, serovars*. Food Control, 38(1), 67–74.

Baxa U, Steinbacher S, Miller S, Weintraub A, Huber R, Seckler R. (1996). Interactions of phage

 P22 tails with their cellular receptor, *Salmonella* O-antigen polysaccharide. Biophysical Journal, 71(4), 2040-2048.

Boxstael SV, Dierick K, Huffel XV, Uyttendaele M, Berkvens D, Herman L, et al. (2012).

- Comparison of antimicrobial resistance patterns and phage types of *Salmonella*  Typhimurium isolated from pigs, pork and humans in Belgium between 2001 and 2006. Food Research International, 45(2), 913-918.
- Boyen, F., Haesebrouck, F., Maes, D., Van, I. F., Ducatelle, R., & Pasmans, F. (2008). Non-
- typhoidal *Salmonella* infections in pigs: a closer look at epidemiology, pathogenesis and
- control. Veterinary Microbiology, 130(1–2), 1-19.

Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Molecular Cell Research, 1843(8), 1649-1663.

 Cai, Y., Tao, J., Jiao, Y., Fei, X., Zhou, L., & Wang, Y., et al. (2016). Phenotypic characteristics and genotypic correlation between *Salmonella* isolates from a slaughterhouse and retail

markets in Yangzhou, China. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 222, 56-64.

 Casjens S R. (2008). Diversity among the tailed-bacteriophages that infect the Enterobacteriaceae. Research in Microbiology, 159(5), 340-348.

- Casjens, SR, Thuman-Commike, PA. (2011). Evolution of mosaically related tailed bacteriophage genomes seen through the lens of phage P22 virion assembly. Virology, 411(2), 393-415.
- Capparelli R., Nocerino N., Iannaccone M., Ercolini D., Parlato M., Chiara M., et al. (2010).
- Bacteriophage therapy of *Salmonella* enterica: a fresh appraisal of bacteriophage therapy. Journal of Infectious Diseases, 201, 52–61.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2017). *Salmonella* and food. https://www.cdc.gov/salmonella/braenderup-08-14/signs-symptoms.html (Accessed 5 July 2017).
- Davis B M, Waldor M K. (2002). Mobile genetic elements and bacterial pathogenesis. In Mobile DNA II (Eds), ASM Press, pp 1040–1059.
- Destoumieux-Garzón D, Duquesne S, Peduzzi J, Goulard C, Desmadril M, Letellier L, et al.
- (2005). The iron-siderophore transporter FhuA is the receptor for the antimicrobial peptide microcin J25: role of the microcin Val11-Pro16 beta-hairpin region in the recognition mechanism. Biochemical Journal, 389(3), 869-876.
- Duc, H. M. , Son, H. M. , Honjoh, K. , & Miyamoto, T. (2018). Isolation and application of bacteriophages to reduce *Salmonella* contamination in raw chicken meat. LWT, 91, 353– 360.
- EFSA, ECDC. ( 2017). The European Union summary report on trends and sources of zoonoses, zoonotic agents and food‐borne outbreaks in 2016. EFSA Journal, 15, 1-288.
- Ellen T. Arena, Sigrid D. Auweter, L. Caetano M. Antunes, A. Wayne Vogl, Jun Han, & Julian A.
- Guttman, et al. (2011). The deubiquitinase activity of the *Salmonella* pathogenicity island 2
- effector, ssel, prevents accumulation of cellular lipid droplets. Infection and immunity, 79(11), 4392-4400.
- Endersen L, Coffey A, Neve H, Mcauliffe O, Ross RP, O'Mahony JM. (2013). Isolation and characterisation of six novel mycobacteriophages and investigation of their antimicrobial potential in milk. International Dairy Journal, 28(1), 8-14.
- Gabriela C, Norma S, Bessio MI, Fernando F, Hugo M. (2003). Quantitative determination of pneumococcal capsular polysaccharide serotype 14 using a modification of phenol-sulfuric acid method. Journal of microbiological methods, 52(1), 69-73.
- Galán J E, Ginocchio C, Costeas P. (1992). Molecular and functional characterization of the *Salmonella* invasion gene *invA*: homology of InvA to members of a new protein family.
- Journal of Bacteriology, 174(13), 4338-4349.
- Guenther S, Herzig O, Fieseler L, Klumpp J, Loessner MJ. (2012). Biocontrol of *Salmonella*
- Typhimurium in RTE foods with the virulent bacteriophage FO1-E2. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 154(1-2), 66-72.
- Hensel M. (2004). Evolution of pathogenicity islands of *Salmonella enterica*. International Journal
- of Medical Microbiology, 294(2-3), 95-102.
- Hooton SP, Atterbury RJ, Connerton IF. (2011). Application of a bacteriophage cocktail to reduce
- *Salmonella Typhimurium* U288 contamination on pig skin. International Journal of Food Microbiology 151, 157-163.
- Hungaro HM, Mendonça RCS, Gouvêa DM, Vanetti MCD, Pinto CLDO. (2013). Use of
- bacteriophages to reduce *Salmonella*, in chicken skin in comparison with chemical agents. Food Research International, 52(1), 75-81.
- Hvistendahl, M. (2012). China takes aim at rampant antibiotic resistance. Science, 336, 795.
- Kropinski AM. ( 2009). In Bacteriophages: methods and protocols, vol 1. Editors: Clokie MRJ and Kropinski AM. Humana Press.
- Labrie S J, Samson J E, Moineau S. (2010). Bacteriophage resistance mechanisms. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 8(5), 317-327.
- LeLièvre V, Besnard A, Schlusselhuber M, Desmasures N, & Dalmasso M. (2018). Phages for biocontrol in foods: What opportunities for *Salmonella* sp. control along the dairy food chain?. Food microbiology. Volume 78, 89-98.
- Li K, Ye S, AlaliWQ, Wang Y, Wang X, & Xia X.et al (2017). Antimicrobial susceptibility, virulence gene and pulsed-field gel electrophoresis profiles of *Salmonella* enterica serovar Typhimurium recovered from retail raw chickens, China. Food Control, 72, 36-42.

- Li R, Lai J, Wang Y, Liu S, Li Y, Liu Ket al. (2013). Prevalence and characterization of *Salmonella* species isolated from pigs, ducks and chickens in Sichuan Province, China. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 163, 14-18.
- Little JW. (1991). Mechanism of specific LexA cleavage: autodigestion and the role of RecA coprotease. Biochimie, 73(4), 411-422.
- Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. (2001). Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. Methods, 25(4), 402-408.
- Mazurkiewicz P., Thomas J., Thompson J. A., Liu M., Arbibe L., Sansonetti P. & Holden D. W.

 (2008). SpvC is a *Salmonella* effector with phosphothreonine lyase activity on host mitogen 544 • activated protein kinases. Molecular microbiology, 67(6), 1371-1383.

- Mostafa M M, Nassef M, Badr A. (2016). Computational determination of the effects of virulent *Escherichia* coli and *Salmonella* bacteriophages on human gut. Computer Methods & Programs in Biomedicine, 135, 27-35.
- Murray NE. (2000). Type Ⅰ restriction systems: sophisticated molecular machines, (a legacy of bertani and weigle). Microbiology & Molecular Biology Reviews, 64(2), 412-434.

National Center for Biotechnology Information Database (NCBI).

- [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome?term=salmonella+phage&cmd=DetailsSearch.](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome?term=salmonella+phage&cmd=DetailsSearch)
- 2017/6/22.
- Newell DG, Koopmans M, Verhoef L, Duizer E, Aidara-Kane A, Sprong H, et al. (2010). Food-
- borne diseases-the challenges of 20 years ago still persist while new ones continue to emerge. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 139:S3-S15.

 Norris FA, Wilson MP, Wallis TS, Galyov EE, Majerus PW. (1998). SopB, a protein required for virulence of *Salmonella* dublin, is an inositol phosphate phosphatase. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 95(24), 14057-14059.

- O'Brien AD, Newland JW, Miller SF, Holmes RK, Smith HW, Formal SB. (1984). Shiga-like toxin-converting phages from *Escherichia coli* strains that cause hemorrhagic colitis or infantile diarrhea. Science, 226(4675), 694-696.
- O'Flynn G, Coffey A, Fitzgerald G, Ross RP. (2007) *Salmonella enterica* phage-resistant mutant
- colonies display an unusual phenotype in the presence of phage Felix 01. Letters in Applied Microbiology 5:581-585
- Oliveira A, Sillankorva S, Quinta R, Henriques A, Sereno R, Azeredo J. (2009). Isolation and characterization of bacteriophages for avian pathogenic *E. coli*, strains. Journal of Applied Microbiology, 106(6), 1919-1927.
- Panzenhagen, PHN, Aguiar WS, Frasão B DS, Pereira V LDA, Abreu DL DC, & Rodrigues D. P, et al. (2016). Prevalence and fluoroquinolones resistance of *Campylobacter*, and *Salmonella*, isolates from poultry carcasses in rio de janeiro, brazil. Food Control, 61, 243- 247.
- Pedruzzi I, Rosenbusch J P, Locher K P. (1998). Inactivation in vitro of the *Escherichia coli*, outer membrane protein FhuA by a phage T5-encoded lipoprotein. FEMS Microbiology Letters, 168(1), 119-125.
- Perry L L, Sanmiguel P, Minocha U, Terekhov AI, Shroyer ML, Farris LA, et al. (2009). Sequence analysis of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 bacteriophage ΦV10 and identification of a phage-encoded immunity protein that modifies the O157 antigen. FEMS Microbiology Letters, 292(2), 182-186.
- Rao D N, Dryden D T, Bheemanaik S. (2014). Type III restriction-modification enzymes: a historical perspective. Nucleic Acids Research, 42(1), 45-55.
- Retamal P., Castillo-Ruiz M. & Mora G. C. (2009). Characterization of MgtC, a virulence factor
- of *Salmonella* enterica Serovar Typhi. PLoS One, 4(5), e5551.

- Rytkönen A., Poh, J., Garmendia J., Boyle C., Thompson A., Liu M. & Holden D. W. (2007). SseL, a *Salmonella* deubiquitinase required for macrophage killing and virulence.
- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104(9), 3502-3507.
- Samson J. E., Magadán A. H., Sabri M. & Moineau S. (2013). Revenge of the phages: defeating bacterial defences. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 11(10), 675-687.
- Santander J. & Robeson J. (2007). Phage-resistance of *Salmonella* enterica serovar Enteritidis and pathogenesis in Caenorhabditis elegans is mediated by the lipopolysaccharide. Electronic Journal of Biotechnology, 10, 627–632.
- Song, Q., Xu, Z., Hong, G., & Zhang, D. (2018). Overview of the development of quinolone
- resistance in *Salmonella* species in China, 2005–2016. Infection & Drug Resistance, 11, 267-274.
- Steinbacher S, Miller S, Baxa U, Weintraub A, Seckler R. (1997). Interaction of *Salmonella* phage
- P22 with its O-antigen receptor studied by X-ray crystallography. Biological Chemistry, 378(3-4), 337-343.
- Sterzenbach T, Crawford RW, Winter SE, Ba¨umler AJ. (2013). *Salmonella* virulence mechanisms and their genetic basis. In: Barrow, P.A., Methner, U. (Eds.), *Salmonella* in Domestic Animals. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK.
- Thompson JA. (2008). SpvC is a *Salmonella* effector with phosphothreonine lyase activity on host
- mitogen-activated protein kinases. Molecular Microbiology, 67(6), 1371-1383
- Touchon M, Rocha EP. (2012). The small, slow and specialized CRISPR and anti-CRISPR of *Escherichia* and *Salmonell*a. Plos One, 5(6), 11126-11140.
- Tran AX, Whitfield C. (2009). Lipopolysaccharides (Endotoxins). Encyclopedia of Microbiology, 71(1), 513-528.
- Virginie LeLièvre, Alexandra Besnard, Margot Schlusselhuber, Nathalie Desmasures, Marion Dalmasso. (2019). Phages for biocontrol in foods: What opportunities for Salmonella sp.
- control along the dairy food chain? Food Microbiology, 78, 89-98.
- Waldor MK, Mekalanos JJ. (1996). Lysogenic Conversion by a *Filamentous* Phage Encoding Cholera Toxin. Science, 272(5270), 1910.
- Wang C, Yang J, Zhu X, Lu Y, Xue Y, Lu Z. (2017a). Effects of *Salmonella*, bacteriophage, nisin
- and potassium sorbate and their combination on safety and shelf life of fresh chilled pork. Food Control, 73, 869-877.
- Wang C, Chen Q, Zhang C, Yang J, Lu Z, Lu F, Bie X. (2017b). Characterization of a wide host
- spectrum virulent *Salmonella* bacteriophage fmb-p1 and its application on duck meat. Virus Research , 236, 14–23.
- Wang X, Quinn PJ. (2010). Lipopolysaccharide: Biosynthetic pathway and structure modification. Progress in Lipid Research, 49(2), 97-107.
- Yang X, Huang J, Wu Q, Zhang J, Liu S, Guo W. (2016). Prevalence, antimicrobial resistance and genetic diversity of *Salmonella*, isolated from retail ready-to-eat foods in China. Food Control, 60, 50-56.
- Yeh Y, Purushothaman P, Gupta N, Ragnone M, Verma SC, & De Mello AS. (2017).
- Bacteriophage application on red meats and poultry: Effects on *Salmonella* population in final ground products. Meat science, 127, 30-34.
- Zhai LG. (2015). Molecular rapid detection method research of *Salmonella* and pathogenic 626 serotypes in food. Nanjing: Nanjing Agricultural University.
- Zheng J, Tian F, Cui S, Song J, Zhao S, Brown EW., et al. (2011). Differential gene expression by
- RamA in ciprofloxacin-resistant *Salmonella Typhimurium*. PLOS One, 7, 22161-22169.
- Zhu Y, Lai H, Zou L, Yin S, Wang C, & Han X. et al.(2017). Antimicrobial resistance and
- resistance genes in *Salmonella* strains isolated from broiler chickens along the slaughtering process in China. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 259, 43-51.
- Zinno P, Devirgiliis C, Ercolini D, Ongeng D, Mauriello G. (2014). Bacteriophage P22 to
- challenge *Salmonella* in foods. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 191C(1), 69-74.
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 



# 647 **Table 1 The primers of PCR assay in this study**







658

656

659

660

661



 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$