

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications in Food Science and
Technology

Food Science and Technology Department

July 2007

Functional analysis of the fructooligosaccharide utilization operon in *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195

Yong Jun Goh

North Carolina University, Raleigh, NC

Jong-Hwa Lee

School of Bioresource Sciences, Andong National University, Andong, South Korea

Robert W. Hutkins

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, rhutkins1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/foodsciefacpub>



Part of the [Food Science Commons](#)

Goh, Yong Jun; Lee, Jong-Hwa; and Hutkins, Robert W., "Functional analysis of the fructooligosaccharide utilization operon in *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195" (2007). *Faculty Publications in Food Science and Technology*. 18.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/foodsciefacpub/18>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Food Science and Technology Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications in Food Science and Technology by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Functional analysis of the fructooligosaccharide utilization operon
in *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195

Yong Jun Goh¹, Jong-Hwa Lee² and Robert W. Hutkins*

University of Nebraska

Department of Food Science and Technology

Lincoln, NE 68583-0919

¹Current address: North Carolina State University, Department of Food Science,
Raleigh, NC 27695-7624

²Current address: School of Bioresource Sciences, Andong National University, Andong,
South Korea

*Corresponding author. Mailing address: University of Nebraska, Department of Food
Science and Technology, 338 FIC, Lincoln, NE 68583-0919. Phone: 402-472-2820. Fax:
402-472-1693. E-mail: rhutkins1@unl.edu

ABSTRACT

1
2 The *fosABCDXE* operon encodes components of a putative fructose/mannose
3 phosphoenolpyruvate-dependent phosphotransferase system (PTS) and a β -
4 fructosidase precursor (FosE) that are involved in the fructooligosaccharide (FOS)
5 utilization pathway of *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195. The presence of an N-terminal
6 signal peptide sequence and a LPQAG cell wall anchor motif at the C-terminal region of
7 the deduced FosE precursor amino acid sequence predicted that the enzyme is cell
8 wall-associated, indicating that FOS may be hydrolyzed extracellularly. In this study,
9 cell fractionation experiments demonstrated that the FOS hydrolysis activity was
10 contained exclusively in the cell wall extract of *L. paracasei* previously grown on FOS.
11 In contrast, no measurable FOS hydrolysis activity was detected in the cell wall extract
12 from the isogenic *fosE* mutant. Induction of β -fructosidase activity was observed when
13 cells were grown on FOS, inulin, sucrose, or fructose, but not glucose. A diauxic growth
14 pattern was observed when cells were grown on FOS in the presence of limiting
15 glucose (0.1%). Analysis of the culture supernatant revealed that glucose was
16 consumed first, followed by the longer chain FOS species. Transcription analysis
17 further showed that the *fos* operon was expressed only after glucose was depleted in
18 the medium. Expression of *fosE* in a non-FOS-fermenting strain, *Lactobacillus*
19 *rhamnosus* GG, enabled the recombinant strain to metabolize FOS, inulin, sucrose, and
20 levan.

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The consumption of fermented food products or dietary supplements containing probiotic species of *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacteria* has been suggested to promote gastrointestinal (GI) health in humans and other animals by increasing the population of these microorganisms in the GI tract (10, 40). However, the beneficial effects of these bacteria may be transient due to colonization resistance by the commensal microbiota, which restricts the ability of probiotic bacteria to become well established in the intestinal environment (3, 15). An approach to overcome this limitation is to include prebiotics in the host diet. Prebiotics are specific nondigestible dietary sugars that are selectively metabolized by certain probiotic bacteria and that enhance their survival and colonization in the GI tract (12). Such an approach would also enrich the population of indigenous bifidobacteria and lactobacilli, allowing them to occupy a more dominant position in the gut ecosystem.

Fructooligosaccharides (FOS) are among the prebiotic substances that have been shown to selectively stimulate the growth and activity of certain strains of *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* (4, 11, 13, 16, 47). Two types of FOS, that differ based on their methods of preparation, are commercially available and are widely used in food. One type, referred to as the GF_n-type of FOS, is enzymatically produced from sucrose, and consists of a glucose monomer (G) linked α -1,2 to two or more β -2,1-linked fructose units (F), forming a mixture of GF₂, GF₃, and GF₄ (16, 17). The other type of commercial FOS is produced by partial enzymatic hydrolysis of the fructan polymer, inulin. The resulting product consist of a mixture of linear fructose oligomers, in the FF_n form, also linked β -2,1, and having a degree of polymerization varying from 2

1 to 10. Due to the presence of a terminal glucose on the inulin molecule, the latter
2 products also contain oligosaccharide species in the GF_n form (6).

3 Despite considerable commercial and research interests on the beneficial effects
4 of FOS, the molecular basis for FOS metabolism by probiotic bacteria and specific
5 members of the intestinal microflora has only recently been examined. It now appears,
6 however, that utilization of FOS occurs via one of two metabolic routes. Either the
7 substrate is transported intact and is hydrolyzed in the cytoplasm, or it is hydrolyzed by
8 extracellular enzymes, followed by subsequent accumulation of the hydrolysis products.
9 In *Lactobacillus acidophilus* NCFM, for example, the FOS metabolic pathway is
10 encoded by a multiple sugar metabolism (*msm*) operon that resembles the *msm* operon
11 of *Streptococcus mutans* and the raffinose (*raf*) operon of *Streptococcus pneumoniae*
12 (1). The *msm* operon encodes an ATP-dependent binding cassette (ABC)-type
13 transport system and a cytoplasmic β -fructosidase that mediate FOS uptake and
14 intracellular hydrolysis. Expression of the operon was inducible by sucrose and FOS,
15 but not glucose or fructose. Similarly, cytoplasmic β -fructofuranosidases from
16 *Bifidobacterium adolescentis*, *B. infantis*, and *B. lactis* have also been reported to
17 hydrolyze FOS (9, 19, 20, 34-36, 46). Although FOS transport in bifidobacteria has not
18 been reported, the presence of at least seven gene loci encoding oligosaccharide
19 transport and metabolism in the genome sequence of *B. longum* (44) suggests that
20 uptake of FOS may also be mediated by specific oligosaccharide transporters. In
21 contrast, extracellular enzymes that hydrolyze FOS have also been reported for non-
22 intestinal bacteria, including a fructan β -fructosidase from *Lactobacillus pentosus*, and

1 levanbiohydrolases from *Streptomyces exfoliatus* and *Microbacterium laevaniformans*
2 (39, 41, 45).

3 Recently, microarray expression analyses of *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195 grown
4 on FOS led to the identification of a putative *fos* operon that plays a major role in the
5 FOS utilization pathway (14). The *fosABCDXE* operon encodes a putative
6 fructose/mannose PTS (FosABCDX) and a β -fructosidase precursor (FosE) that has
7 high sequence identity with the putative levanase (*lev*) operons of *Lactobacillus casei*
8 strains ATCC 334 and BL23. Inactivation of the *fosE* gene led to the inability of the
9 mutant strain to grow on FOS and other β -fructose-linked sugars. The deduced amino
10 acid sequence of FosE contains an N-terminal signal peptide sequence and a LPQAG
11 cell wall anchor motif at the C-terminal region, suggesting that FOS may be hydrolyzed
12 extracellularly by FosE, with the subsequent uptake of the hydrolysis products mediated
13 by the FosABCDX PTS. Microarray analyses also indicated that expression of the
14 FOS-induced genes was subject to catabolite regulation by glucose (14). Hence, the
15 objectives of this study were to establish the location of the FOS hydrolysis activity in *L.*
16 *paracasei* 1195 and to examine the effect of glucose on FOS utilization by *L. paracasei*.
17 Additionally, we established the functional role of the *fos* operon by expressing the *fosE*
18 gene in *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG, a widely used probiotic strain that has a limited
19 ability to metabolize FOS (21) and other β -fructose-linked carbohydrates.

20

21

MATERIALS AND METHODS

22 **Bacterial strains and growth conditions.** Strains and plasmids used in this study are

23 listed in Table 1. Parental strains of *L. paracasei* 1195 and *L. rhamnosus* GG were

1 routinely grown in MRS broth (Difco, Inc., Ann Arbor, MI) at 37°C in ambient
2 atmosphere under static condition, and recombinant strains were grown in MRS
3 medium containing 5 µg/ml of erythromycin (Erm). For growth and enzyme experiments,
4 cells were grown in modified MRS (mMRS) basal medium (14), supplemented with
5 filter-sterilized solutions of FOS of the GFn (GTC Nutrition, Westminster, CO) or the FFn
6 type (Orafti North America, Malvern, PA), glucose (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO),
7 fructose (Sigma), or sucrose (Sigma), at the indicated concentrations. Inulin- or levan-
8 containing mMRS was prepared by addition of inulin (Sigma) or levan (Sigma) into
9 mMRS prior to heat sterilization of the culture medium. For diauxie experiments, *L.*
10 *paracasei* 1195 were grown in semi-defined medium (SDM) (23) containing (per liter):
11 10 g Bacto casitone (Difco), 5 g yeast nitrogen base (Difco), 1 g polysorbate 80 (Fisher
12 Chemicals, Fairlawn, NJ), 2 g ammonium citrate (Sigma), 5 g sodium acetate (Sigma),
13 0.1 g magnesium sulfate (Sigma), 0.05 g manganese sulfate (Sigma), 2 g dipotassium
14 phosphate (MCB Manufacturing Chemists, Norwood, OH), and supplemented with 0.1%
15 (wt/vol) glucose, 0.35% (wt/vol) FOS (GFn form), or 0.1% glucose plus 0.35% FOS.
16 *Escherichia coli* DH5α, used as host for routine cloning procedures, was grown in Luria-
17 Bertani (LB) medium or Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) medium at 37°C with aeration at 200
18 rpm. When necessary, Erm was added at final concentrations of 250 µg/ml and 450
19 µg/ml for BHI and LB media, respectively.

20 **DNA isolation and manipulations.** Isolation of genomic DNA from *L. rhamnosus* GG
21 was performed as previously described for *L. paracasei* (14). Plasmid DNA from *E. coli*
22 was isolated using Zippy Plasmid Miniprep I Kit (Zymo Research Corp., Orange, CA)
23 according to the manufacturer's recommendations. Restriction enzymes (New England

1 Biolabs Inc., Ipswich, MA, and Takara Mirus Bio Inc., Madison, WI) were used as
2 recommended by manufacturers. DNA ligation was performed using Fast-Link DNA
3 Ligation Kit (Epicentre Biotechnologies, Madison WI) according to supplied instructions.
4 PCR amplicons were generated using Easy-A High Fidelity PCR cloning enzyme or
5 PfuTurbo DNA polymerase (Stratagene Corp., La Jolla, CA) in an Amplifon II
6 Thermolyne thermocycler (Barnstead/Thermolyne Corp., Dubuque, IA). Primers were
7 synthesized by Sigma-Genosys (The Woodlands, TX). The PCR products were
8 electrophoresed in 0.8% agarose gel, and DNA fragments were purified using
9 Zymoclean Gel DNA Recovery Kit (Zymo Research) prior to downstream applications.
10 DNA sequencing was performed by the Genome Core Research Facility (University of
11 Nebraska, Lincoln, NE).

12 For electroporation, *E. coli* cells were prepared according to protocols of the Wolf
13 Laboratory (<http://www.research.umbc.edu/%7Ejwolf/m7.htm>). Electroporation was
14 performed in pre-chilled 0.2-cm electroporation cuvettes (Boca Scientific Inc., Boca
15 Raton, FL) using a Gene Pulser electroporation system (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.,
16 Hercules, CA) set at 12.5 kV cm⁻¹, 200 Ω, and 25 μF. Electrotransformation of *L.*
17 *rhamnosus* GG were performed as previously described (14). Briefly, stationary-phase
18 cells were used to inoculate 100 ml of MRS broth (2% inoculum) and grown for 3 hrs
19 (optical density at 625 nm ~ 0.1 to 0.2). Then, freshly prepared filter-sterilized penicillin
20 G solution was added to a final concentration of 10 μg/ml, and the culture was grown for
21 additional 1.5 to 2.0 hrs. Cells were harvested at 5,500 x g for 15 min at 4°C, washed
22 with 10 ml and 50 ml of ice-cold filter-sterilized 1X PEB buffer (per liter: 272 mM sucrose,
23 1 mM MgCl₂, 7mM potassium phosphate [KPO₄], pH 7.4) sequentially, followed by a

1 third wash with 10 ml of ice-cold 10% (vol/vol) glycerol, and finally resuspended in 1 ml
2 of 10% glycerol. For electroporation, ~ 0.1 µg of DNA was added to 50 µl of the cells,
3 and the mixture was transferred into a pre-chilled 0.2-cm electroporation cuvette, and
4 incubated on ice for 2 min. Cells were electroporated at 12.5 kV cm⁻¹, 400 Ω, and 25 µF
5 and placed on ice immediately. Transformed cells were supplemented with 950 µl of
6 MRS broth and recovered for 3 to 4 hrs at 37°C. Cells were then plated onto MRS agar
7 containing 2.5 to 5.0 µg/ml of Erm and incubated at 37°C for 48 to 72 hrs under ambient
8 atmospheric condition.

9 **Purification of *L. paracasei* total RNA.** Total RNA was isolated as previously
10 described (14) using TRI Reagent (Molecular Research Center, Inc., Cincinnati, OH).
11 The RNA samples were subsequently treated with DNase I using Turbo DNAfree kit
12 (Ambion Inc., Austin, TX). The quality and integrity of RNA samples were assessed
13 spectrophotometrically (A_{260}/A_{280} 1.6 to 1.9) and gel electrophoresis, as described
14 previously (14).

15 **FOS hydrolysis assay.** *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195 and the BHe mutant strain were
16 grown in mMRS broth containing 1% FOS (GFn form), and harvested by centrifugation
17 at 3,000 x g for 15 min at room temperature when the OD_{625 nm} reached 0.60 and 0.35,
18 respectively. Culture supernatants were filter-sterilized through 0.45 µm filters and
19 concentrated to 1/20 of the initial volume using Amicon Ultra-4 centrifugal filter units
20 (30,000 MWCO; Millipore Corp., Bedford, MA). Cell pellets were washed twice in 0.1 M
21 potassium phosphate buffer (pH 6.6) and resuspended in 1 ml of the same buffer. The
22 cell suspension was transferred into 1.5 ml conical tubes (BioSpec Products, Inc.,
23 Bartlesville, OK) containing 400 mg of 0.1 mm diameter glass beads (BioSpec

1 Products), and cells were disrupted by homogenization using a Mini-Beadbeater
2 (BioSpec Products) at 4,200 rpm for 6 cycles of 1 min, with 1 min on ice between each
3 interval. Cell lysates were transferred into fresh tubes, and the fraction containing cell
4 wall fragments was separated from the cytoplasmic extract by centrifugation at $13,800 \times$
5 g for 10 min at room temperature. This cell wall fraction was resuspended in 1 ml of
6 phosphate buffer, whereas the cytoplasmic extract was concentrated to 1/5 of initial
7 volume using Amicon Ultra-4, as described above.

8 For induction experiments, *L. paracasei* 1195 was sub-cultured twice in mMRS
9 containing 1% FOS (separately, in both GFn and FFn types), sucrose, inulin, fructose,
10 glucose, or 0.5% levan. The cultures were subsequently used to inoculate (2%
11 inoculum) 30 ml of mMRS containing the respective sugars at the same concentrations.
12 When the $OD_{625 \text{ nm}}$ reached 0.6 to 0.7, the cells were collected by centrifugation at
13 $3,000 \times g$ for 20 min at 4°C . Cell fractionation was performed as described above.

14 For all β -fructosidase assays, 10 μl of the concentrated culture supernatant, cell wall
15 fraction, or cytoplasmic extract was added to 190 μl of 1% (wt/vol) FOS (GFn or FFn
16 type), sucrose, or inulin solution. Reaction mixtures were incubated at 37°C for 3 hrs
17 and inactivated by boiling for 2 min, and activities were reported as the amount of
18 fructose released per minute per mg of protein. Fructose concentrations were
19 determined by using a Fructose Assay Kit (Sigma), according to the manufacturer's
20 instructions or by HPLC using an Aminex HPX-42C column (Bio-Rad Laboratories) and
21 a RI 410 reflective index detector. The internal and external temperatures of the column
22 were maintained at 40°C and 85°C , respectively, with a column heater. Water was
23 used as mobile phase with a flow rate of 0.6 ml/min. Protein concentrations were

1 determined by the Bradford Reagent (Sigma), based on the manufacturer's
2 specifications. All experiments were done in duplicate.

3 **Lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) assay.** Samples of cell-free culture supernatant, cell
4 wall extract and cytoplasmic extract were assayed for LDH activity as previously
5 described (18). Briefly, the reaction mixtures contained 1 ml of 0.1 M triethanolamine-
6 hydrochloride (pH 7.5), 80 μ l of 0.1 M sodium pyruvate, 40 μ l of 30 mM fructose-1,6-
7 diphosphate, 40 μ l of freshly prepared 4 mM NADH, and 40 μ l of each cell fraction or
8 the culture supernatant. The decrease in absorbance at 340 nm was recorded over 6
9 minutes and used to calculate LDH activity.

10 **Catabolite repression studies.** Overnight cultures of *L. paracasei*, grown in SDM
11 containing 1% FOS (GF_n), were used to inoculate 1.2 liter of SDM containing 0.1%
12 glucose, 0.35% FOS (GF_n), or 0.1% glucose plus 0.35% FOS (GF_n). Cultures were
13 incubated at 37°C in ambient atmosphere under static condition. At various times, the
14 cell densities were recorded, and portions of cultures grown were centrifuged and cell
15 supernatants saved for analysis. In addition, cells grown on SDM-0.1% glucose +
16 0.35% FOS were centrifuged at 3,000 \times g for 10 min at room temperature for isolation of
17 total RNA. To prepare RNA samples for gel electrophoresis on formaldehyde gel, 30 μ g
18 of each sample in 10 μ l was mixed with 2.5 μ l of 10X MOPS (0.2 M MOPS, 80 mM
19 sodium acetate, 10 mM EDTA; pH 7.0), 3 μ l of formaldehyde solution (Fisher [37%
20 vol/vol]), 12.5 μ l of formamide, and 1 μ l of 1 mg/ml ethidium bromide. The mixtures
21 were incubated at 65°C for 10 min, chilled on ice for 2 to 3 min, followed by
22 electrophoresis on a formaldehyde gel (1% agarose, 0.66 M formaldehyde, 1X MOPS).

1 The RNA was subsequently transferred onto Zeta-Probe blotting membrane (Bio-Rad
2 Laboratories) using standard procedures (42). The membrane was then soaked in 2X
3 SSC (1X SSC is 0.15 M NaCl plus 0.015 M sodium citrate) for 5 min, and RNA was
4 subsequently immobilized on the wet membrane by UV-crosslinking twice at 120,000
5 μ Joules in a Stratalinker Crosslinker (Stratagene). The internal region of *fosE* gene
6 (981 bp) used for synthesis of hybridization probe was amplified from *L. paracasei* 1195
7 genomic DNA using *fosE*-for1 and *fosE*-rev1 primers (Table 1) in a 50 μ l reaction
8 containing 1 μ l of 10 mM dNTP mix, 0.5 μ g of genomic DNA, 2.5 U of Taq DNA
9 polymerase, and 25 pmol of each primer in 1X Taq DNA polymerase buffer (Stratagene).
10 PCR amplification was carried out in the following condition: 1 cycle at 95°C for 3 min,
11 30 cycles of 30 sec at 95°C, 30 sec at 55°C, 1 min at 72°C, and a final cycle at 72°C for
12 10 min. Synthesis of DIG-labeled *fosE* probe with the *fosE* PCR product, hybridization,
13 and detection of hybridized signals were performed using the DIG High Prime DNA
14 Labeling and Detection Starter Kit II (Roche Diagnostics Corp., Indianapolis, IN) as
15 described by manufacturer. Hybridization signals were exposed onto X-Omat Blue XB-
16 1 imaging films (Gold Biotechnology, Inc., St. Louis, MO) in multiple exposure times (2
17 to 8 min) to obtain optimum signal strength.

18 **Sugar analyses.** Glucose concentration in culture supernatants was measured using a
19 YSI 2700 SELECT Biochemistry Analyzer (YSI Incorp., Yellow Springs, OH) equipped
20 with glucose membranes (YSI 2365). To determine the concentration of each FOS
21 fraction in the culture supernatants, the samples along with FOS standards (0.05%,
22 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.4%) were spotted onto 20 x 20 cm thin layer chromatography (TLC)
23 silica gel plates (Whatman Ltd., Kent, UK). The plates were developed twice in acetic

1 acid-chloroform-water (7:5:1) solvent. Spots were visualized by spraying plates with
2 ethanolic 50% sulfuric acid, and heated at 115 °C for 5 min. The TLC plates were
3 subsequently scanned on a Epson Perfection 1660 Photo scanner (Epson America, Inc.,
4 Long Beach, CA), and density of spots on the scanned image was analyzed using the
5 Scion Image for Windows software
6 (http://www.scioncorp.com/frames/fr_download_now.htm).

7 **Expression of the *L. paracasei* β -fructosidase gene in *L. rhamnosus* GG.** To
8 introduce the *fosE* gene into *L. rhamnosus* GG, a fragment containing the *fosE* gene
9 with its native ribosomal binding sequence (RBS) and a promoter sequence isolated
10 from *L. rhamnosus* GG, P-GL1 (33), were sequentially cloned into the pTRKH2 shuttle
11 vector (38). Briefly, the 4,131-bp *fosE* gene was PCR-amplified from the genomic DNA
12 of *L. paracasei* 1195 using *fosE*-for2 and *fosE*-rev2 primers (Table 1). The *fosE*
13 amplicon was digested with *Xho*I and *Pst*I, ligated into pTRKH2 with compatible ends,
14 and transformed into *E. coli* DH5 α . The recombinant plasmid, designated as pRH5,
15 was verified by restriction digest and sequencing. Next, the P-GL1 promoter and the
16 RBS for the *fosE* gene were cloned upstream of the *fosE* gene in the pRH5 plasmid.
17 The P-GL1 promoter region was PCR-amplified from *L. rhamnosus* GG genomic DNA
18 using PGL1-for and PGL1-rev primers (Table 1), with the *fosE* RBS incorporated into
19 the latter primer. The 103-bp PCR amplicon was restricted with *EcoRV* and *Xho*I, and
20 ligated into similarly digested pRH5. The ligation products were purified using DNA
21 Clean & Concentrator-5 kit (Zymo Research) and transformed into *E. coli* DH5 α .
22 Ligation of the PGL-1 promoter and the *fosE* RBS upstream of *fosE* gene in the
23 recombinant plasmid, designated as pYG582, was confirmed by DNA sequencing. The

1 recombinant plasmid pYG582 was subsequently electroporated into *L. rhamnosus* GG,
2 and transformants were recovered on MRS plates containing 2 to 5 µg/ml of Erm after
3 incubation at 37°C in ambient atmosphere for 48 to 72 hrs. The *L. rhamnosus* GG
4 transformants harboring pYG582 were streaked on mMRS-1% FOS agar containing 5
5 µg/ml Erm and 100 mg/L bromocresol purple to determine their ability to ferment FOS.
6 One recombinant isolate that formed a yellow zone as a result of acid production from
7 fermentation of FOS was selected and designated as *L. rhamnosus* GGE582. The
8 presence of pYG582 in the GGE582 strain was verified by direct cell PCR method
9 essentially as described previously (5). For phenotypic analysis, strains of GG and
10 GGE582 were grown in mMRS and mMRS containing 5 µg/ml of Erm, respectively, and
11 supplemented with 1% of glucose, fructose, sucrose, FOS (both types), inulin, or 0.5%
12 levan.

14 RESULTS

15 **Location of β-fructosidase activities in *L. paracasei* 1195.** To identify the location of
16 the β-fructosidase activity in *L. paracasei* 1195, cells grown in mMRS broth containing
17 1% FOS (GFn type) were harvested, and three fractions, representing the concentrated
18 culture supernatant, crude cell wall extract, and cytoplasmic extract, were prepared as
19 described above. The same fractions were also obtained from the mutant strain, BHe.
20 Using FOS (GFn type) as the substrate, the β-fructosidase activity of the wild type strain
21 was detected almost exclusively in the cell wall extract (Table 2). In contrast, FOS
22 hydrolysis activity in the culture supernatant or the cytoplasmic extracts was negligible,
23 relative to that in the cell wall extract. No FOS hydrolysis activity was detected in the

1 BHe strain. To confirm that the cell fractionation procedure had adequately separated
2 the different fractions, all cell fractions and supernatants were assayed for LDH, a
3 cytoplasmic marker enzyme. As expected, LDH activity was detected only in the
4 cytoplasmic extract (data not shown).

5 **Induction of β -fructosidase activity during growth on various sugars.** The
6 influence of various carbohydrate growth substrates on the induction of β -fructosidases
7 and their substrate specificities was examined (Fig. 1). Regardless of the carbohydrate
8 source in the media, β -fructosidase activities were only present in the cell wall extracts.
9 Cells grown on inulin resulted in the highest enzyme activities, followed by cells grown
10 in both types of FOS. The two FOS products (GFn and FFn) and inulin also served as
11 the preferred substrates. In contrast, sucrose- and fructose-grown cells had the lowest
12 activities, and only when FOS was the substrate. Sucrose was the least preferred
13 substrate, even for sucrose-grown cells. No β -fructosidase activity was detected from
14 the cell wall extract of glucose-grown cells, indicating that the enzyme was either not
15 induced or repressed in the presence of glucose. Analysis of the FOS (GFn) hydrolysis
16 products by HPLC showed that fructose and sucrose were the major products from FOS
17 hydrolysis. Inulin hydrolysis generated primarily fructose with no oligomeric
18 intermediate released. These observations suggested that the β -fructosidases
19 hydrolyzed the substrates in an exo-type fashion.

20 **Catabolite repression of FOS utilization by glucose.** Previous microarray
21 expression analyses suggested that the expression of FOS-induced genes in *L.*
22 *paracasei* 1195 was subject to catabolite repression by glucose (14). To further assess
23 the effect of glucose on FOS utilization, growth of cells in SDM containing both glucose

1 and FOS (0.1% and 0.35%, respectively) was compared to cells grown in SDM
2 supplemented with either 0.1% glucose or 0.35% FOS. A typical diauxic growth pattern
3 was observed during growth on glucose plus FOS (Fig. 2). The diauxic lag was likely
4 caused by the depletion of glucose, since cessation of growth was also observed at a
5 similar time and cell density for cells grown separately on the same amount of glucose.
6 After the diauxic lag phase, cells resumed growth and entered a second growth phase
7 using FOS as the carbon source, with the culture ultimately reaching approximately
8 similar cell density that was achieved for cells grown on 0.35% FOS alone (i.e., about
9 1.5). Sugar analyses of the culture supernatants revealed that FOS was utilized only
10 after glucose was consumed, confirming that glucose was metabolized preferentially
11 (Fig. 3A). When cells entered the second growth phase, GF₄ and GF₃ were rapidly
12 hydrolyzed, resulting in a transient increase in the GF₂ concentration. Subsequently,
13 the GF₂ concentration gradually decreased to an undetectable level, with a
14 simultaneous increase in the concentrations of glucose and sucrose (data not shown)
15 from the hydrolysis of GF₂.

16 To examine the kinetics of transcription of the *fos* operon during the diauxic shift,
17 northern blot analysis, using a *fosE* probe, was performed on RNA samples obtained
18 from cells grown on 0.1% glucose plus 0.35% FOS. As expected, no hybridization
19 signal for the *fos* genes was detected during the first growth phase when glucose was
20 utilized as the preferred carbon source (Fig. 3B and 3C). Shortly after the onset of the
21 diauxic lag phase, the signal intensity associated with *fosE* gradually increased, with
22 maximum transcript levels observed during the period when GF₄ and GF₃ were actively
23 hydrolyzed (Fig. 3A). This was followed by a dramatic reduction in the *fosABCDXE*

1 mRNA level as the GF₄ and GF₃ were depleted, along with a slight increase in the
2 glucose concentration. A second induction of the *fos* mRNA transcript was then
3 observed (Fig. 3C, lane 14), coinciding with a decrease in the GF₂ concentration.
4 During the next few hours, the signal intensity of the *fos* operon decreased to an
5 undetectable level (Fig. 3C, lanes 15 to 17). This time frame is associated with the
6 depletion of GF₂ and an increase in glucose and sucrose levels in the culture
7 supernatant.

8 **Expression of the *fosE* gene in *L. rhamnosus* GG.** In a previous study it was
9 reported that *L. rhamnosus* GG, a widely used probiotic strain, was unable to utilize
10 FOS as an energy source (21). However, this strain is able to ferment fructose,
11 indicating the presence of at least one fructose transport system. Thus, only the *fosE*
12 gene from the *fos* operon was introduced into the GG strain. To construct a
13 recombinant GG strain capable of metabolizing FOS, the *fosE* gene, along with its RBS,
14 and the P-GL1 promoter sequence from *L. rhamnosus* GG (33) were cloned into the
15 pTRKH2 shuttle vector (see Materials and Methods). The resulting construct, pYG582,
16 was transformed into the GG strain. Unlike the parent strain, the recombinant GGE582
17 strain harboring the pYG582 was able to utilize FOS for growth (Fig. 4). In addition, the
18 GGE582 strain gained the ability to grow in mMRS medium containing sucrose, inulin,
19 and levan. None of these sugars supported the growth of the parent strain.

20

21

DISCUSSION

22

23

Recent microarray transcriptome analyses of *L. paracasei* revealed the presence
of an FOS metabolic pathway, encoded by the *fosABCDXE* operon, that was comprised

1 of a putative cell wall-associated β -fructosidase and a fructose/mannose PTS (14).
2 Expression of the *fos* genes was induced by FOS and repressed in the presence of
3 glucose. Previous studies of FOS metabolism in *L. paracasei* 1195, however, had
4 suggested that FOS uptake and hydrolysis were mediated by an ABC transport system
5 and a cytoplasmic β -fructofuranosidase, respectively (22). The cytoplasmic location of
6 the FOS hydrolyzing enzyme, was based, in part, on the absence of activity in the
7 supernatant, and also on the presence of activity associated with the crude cytoplasmic
8 fraction. In this report, the intracellular as well as the cell wall fractions were both
9 examined, and β -fructosidase assays showed that the FOS hydrolysis activity was
10 present primarily in the cell wall extract. This fraction had very high activity and had not
11 previously been assayed for β -fructosidase activity. No cytoplasmic-specific LDH
12 activity was detected in the culture supernatant or in the cell wall fraction. These results
13 indicate that cell lysis was minimal when the cultures were harvested prior to cell
14 fractionation and also that the location of the β -fructosidase activity was distinct from the
15 LDH activity. These data provide evidence that FosE is a cell wall-associated β -
16 fructosidase, that, like other enzymes possessing LPXTG anchor motifs, faces the
17 extracellular side of the cell wall and therefore, catalyzes FOS hydrolysis extracellularly
18 (2, 25). The anchoring of the FosE to the cell wall is likely mediated by the action of a
19 sortase that cleaves between the alanyl and glycyl residues of the LPQAG motif, and
20 subsequently catalyzes the formation of amide-linkage of the alanyl residue to the
21 peptide crossbridge in the peptidoglycan layer (37). The resulting 1,303-amino acid
22 residue of the mature anchored β -fructosidase thus has an estimated molecular weight
23 of 139 kDa.

1 The essential role of FosE in the FOS utilization pathway was demonstrated
2 previously, when it was reported that insertional inactivation of *fosE* gene severely
3 impaired the ability of the *L. paracasei* BHe mutant to grow on FOS (14). In the present
4 study, no β -fructosidase activity was detected from the cell wall extract of the BHe
5 mutant. In addition, the mutation prevented the utilization of FOS (FFn type), inulin,
6 levan, and sucrose as sole carbon source, indicating that the *fos* operon is essential for
7 metabolism of not only FOS and but also other fructose-containing carbohydrates.

8 Expression of the β -fructosidase was induced during growth on FOS, inulin, and
9 to a lesser extent, sucrose and fructose, but not on glucose. Similarly, the preferred
10 substrates were FOS of the FFn and GFn form, followed by inulin, with minor activity
11 towards sucrose. These results indicate that this enzyme may have preference for
12 oligosaccharides having β -2,1-linkages. The FFn form of FOS is composed of ca. 75%
13 of fructose oligomers with a degree of polymerization of 2 to 10 and which do not
14 contain a terminal glucose molecule. Thus, most of the FOS chains have more fructosyl
15 units per oligomer as substrates for successive exo-hydrolysis by β -fructosidase
16 compared to the GFn form of FOS. The low activity against the α -1,2 glucose-fructose
17 bond in GFn, as indicated by the near absence of free glucose in reaction mixtures,
18 would also explain why sucrose was not hydrolyzed. Furthermore, the lower activities
19 observed for inulin also indicate a preference for intermediate short chain length
20 oligosaccharides. The exo-hydrolysis activity of the β -fructosidase is supported by the
21 observation that hydrolysis of the GF₄ and GF₃ fractions in FOS occurred first,
22 producing GF₂, sucrose, and fructose. The latter two then accumulated gradually as the
23 concentration of GF₂ decreased. Finally, that no growth was observed on raffinose, a

1 trisaccharide composed of galactose, glucose, and fructose, implies that raffinose is not
2 a substrate for the β -fructosidase (data not shown).

3 The diauxic growth pattern exhibited by *L. paracasei* 1195 grown on FOS in the
4 presence of limiting glucose demonstrated that FOS utilization is subject to catabolite
5 repression by glucose. This observation was consistent with the results from
6 transcriptome experiments showing that glucose repressed the transcription of FOS-
7 induced genes (14). During growth on limiting glucose plus FOS, glucose was
8 consumed first, although the cells had been sub-cultured in medium containing FOS.
9 After the diauxic lag period, FOS was utilized in the order of GF₄, GF₃, and GF₂,
10 presumably due to the substrate preferences of FosE. Interestingly, Northern
11 hybridization analysis revealed that the expression of the *fos* genes was not constant
12 during the post-diauxic secondary growth phase. Rather, repression of the *fos* operon
13 also occurred during the second growth phase. While a small amount of glucose was
14 generated from the hydrolysis of FOS, which may have contributed to the decreased
15 transcript level of the *fos* mRNA, it also appears that the repression effect was not
16 sufficient to cause a second diauxic lag.

17 Although the molecular basis of regulation of the *fos* operon expression was not
18 examined in detail during the present study, given the similarity in operon structure, the
19 transcription of *fos* in *L. paracasei* 1195 is likely controlled by similar regulatory
20 mechanisms as described for the *lev* operons in *L. casei* BL23 and *Bacillus subtilis* (27-
21 32). However, unlike the *lev* operon of *B. subtilis*, transcriptional activation of the *lev*-
22 PTS in *L. casei* BL23 and the *fos* operon by LevR and FosR, respectively, are
23 independent of a σ^{54} -like sigma factor, since no -12, -24 promoter sequence

1 (CTGGCACN₅TTGCA) was found in regions preceding both the BL23 *lev* operon and
2 the *fos* operon (7, 8, 32). In BL23, the activity of LevR is regulated by dual PTS-
3 catalyzed phosphorylation at conserved histidine residues in the EIIA and PRD2
4 domains by P~His-HPr and P~His-EIIB^{Lev}, respectively (32). In the presence of
5 substrate for Lev-PTS, P~His-EIIB^{Lev} preferably donates its phosphoryl group to the
6 transported sugar, leading to dephosphorylation of LevR at His-776 by P~His-EIIB^{Lev}
7 and LevR activation, and thereby induction of the *lev*-PTS. On the other hand, when
8 metabolically preferred PTS sugars are present, such as glucose, the phosphoryl group
9 of P~His-HPr is used for sugar phosphorylation. Poor phosphorylation at His-488 by
10 P~His-HPr renders LevR less active and down regulates expression of *lev*-PTS.
11 Therefore, the *lev* operon is subject to carbon catabolite repression (CCR) by P~His-
12 HPr dephosphorylation via LevR. The presence of a putative *cre* sequence overlapping
13 the transcriptional start site of the *lev* operon of BL23 (32) and the *fos* operon indicated
14 that the expression of both operons are also controlled by CCR via binding of catabolite
15 control protein CcpA to the *cre* site (14, 32). In *B. subtilis*, accumulation of glycolytic
16 intermediates, such as fructose-1,6-bisphosphate (FBP) from uptake of rapidly
17 metabolizable sugars was proposed to stimulate the phosphorylation of HPr by HPr
18 kinase (HprK) at Ser-46 (29). P~Ser-HPr acts as a co-repressor by interacting with
19 CcpA, enabling CcpA to bind to *cre* and prevents transcription of the *lev* operon.

20 Although certain strains of *Lactobacillus* are widely used as probiotics due to
21 their various desirable traits (24), their ability to utilize prebiotic oligosaccharides, such
22 as FOS, may be limited (21). We have shown that the introduction of the *fosE* gene into
23 the non-FOS-fermenting *L. rhamnosus* GG not only conferred on the recombinant

1 GGE582 strain the ability to utilize both forms of FOS efficiently, but also other
2 prebiotics such as inulin and levan. Although β -fructosidase activity was not measured
3 in the FOS-fermenting transformant, this strain appeared to grow on these fructans as
4 well as on glucose and fructose. This demonstrates the feasibility of developing novel
5 probiotic strains having enhanced metabolic functionality.

6 In contrast to our findings that *L. paracasei* 1195 could grow on both forms of
7 FOS, Saulnier et al. (43) recently reported that *L. plantarum* WCF1 was unable to grow
8 on the FF_n form. Although *L. plantarum* WCF1 also possesses a putative β -
9 fructofuranosidase, this enzyme is apparently intracellular and is part of a sucrose
10 transport and metabolic system. The authors suggest that the small GF_n
11 oligosaccharides are transported via this sucrose system in *L. plantarum* WCF1. This
12 strain also had preference for GF₂ and GF₃, with relatively little consumption of GF₄.
13 Although *L. paracasei* 1195 was originally reported to have a similar substrate
14 preference (21), the current data indicates that all of the FOS fractions, including GF₄
15 were metabolized by this strain.

16 Another related strain, *Lactobacillus paracasei* subsp. *paracasei* 8700:2 was also
17 reported to use short and long chain fractions of FF_n FOS, simultaneously, although
18 when grown on inulin and FOS, the FF_n chains were preferred (26). Fructose, as well
19 as sucrose and various FF_n and GF_n oligosaccharides, were also formed during growth
20 on FOS and inulin, indicating that an enzyme capable of extracellular hydrolysis is
21 present in this organism.

22 Overall, results from this study and previous mutational analysis of the *fosE* gene
23 (14) have provided evidence that the *fos* operon encodes key components for the

1 utilization of FOS and other structurally similar carbohydrates by *L. paracasei* 1195.
2 While the cell wall-anchored FosE of the *fos* system may provide versatility in the
3 utilization of larger prebiotic substrates without dependence on dedicated transporters
4 for uptake of the substrates, it may also promote cross-feeding by providing access of
5 the hydrolysis products to other intestinal microorganisms that do not possess a FOS
6 metabolic pathway. In addition, the results show that glucose, generated from
7 hydrolysis of FOS or other glucose-containing polysaccharides, may catabolite repress,
8 at least transiently, FOS metabolism in the GI environment. Collectively, these results
9 emphasize that understanding the mechanisms and regulation of prebiotic sugar
10 utilization by probiotic bacteria and targeted commensals is necessary for rational
11 selection and development of effective probiotics and prebiotics.

12 13 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

14 This study was supported, in part, by a grant from Dairy Management Inc.

15 We thank T. Klaenhammer for providing pTRKH2, ConAgra Foods for providing
16 *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG, and GTC Nutrition and Orafiti Group for their generous
17 donation of commercial prebiotics. We also thank Andy Benson for helpful discussions.

18 19 **REFERENCES**

- 20 1. **Barrangou, R., E. Altermann, R. Hutkins, R. Cano, and T. R. Klaenhammer.** 2003.
21 Functional and comparative genome analyses of an operon involved in
22 fructooligosaccharide utilization by *Lactobacillus acidophilus*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.
23 A. **100**:8957-8962.

- 1 2. **Boekhorst, J., M. W. H. J. de Been, M. Kleerebezem, and R. J. Siezen.** 2005.
2 Genome-wide detection and analysis of cell wall-bound proteins with LPxTG-like sorting
3 motifs. *J. Bacteriol.* **187**:4928-4934.
- 4 3. **Bouhnik, Y., P. Pochart, P. Marteau, G. Arlet, I. Goderel, and J. C. Rambaud.** 1992.
5 Fecal recovery in humans of viable *Bifidobacterium* sp. ingested in fermented milk.
6 *Gastroenterology* **102**:875-878.
- 7 4. **Buddington, R. K., C. H. Williams, S. C. Chen, and S. A. Witherly.** 1996. Dietary
8 supplement of neosugar alters the fecal flora and decreases activities of some reductive
9 enzymes in human subjects. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **63**:709-716.
- 10 5. **Christensen, J. E., and J. L. Steele.** 2003. Impaired growth rates in milk of
11 *Lactobacillus helveticus* peptidase mutants can be overcome by use of amino acid
12 supplements. *J. Bacteriol.* **185**:3297-3306.
- 13 6. **Crittenden, R. G.** 1999. Prebiotics, p. 141-156. *In* G. W. Tannock (ed.), *Probiotics: a*
14 *critical review.* Horizon Scientific Press, Wymondham, United Kingdom.
- 15 7. **Debarbouille, M., I. Martin-Verstraete, A. Klier, and G. Rapoport.** 1991. The
16 transcriptional regulator LevR of *Bacillus subtilis* has domains homologous to both σ^{54} -
17 and phosphotransferase system-dependent regulators. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
18 **88**:2212-2216.
- 19 8. **Debarbouille, M., I. Martin-Verstraete, F. Kunst, and G. Rapoport.** 1991. The *Bacillus*
20 *subtilis sigL* gene encodes an equivalent of σ^{54} from Gram-negative bacteria. *Proc. Natl.*
21 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **88**:9092-9096.
- 22 9. **Ehrmann, M. A., M. Korakli, and R. F. Vogel.** 2003. Identification of the gene for β -
23 fructofuranosidase of *Bifidobacterium lactis* DSM10140^T and characterization of the
24 enzyme expressed in *Escherichia coli*. *Curr. Microbiol.* **46**:391-397.

- 1 10. **Fuller, R., and G. R. Gibson.** 1997. Modification of the intestinal microflora using
2 probiotics and prebiotics. *Scand. J. Gastroenterol.* **32**:28-31.
- 3 11. **Gibson, G. R., E. R. Beatty, X. Wang, and J. H. Cummings.** 1995. Selective
4 stimulation of bifidobacteria in the human colon by oligofructose and inulin.
5 *Gastroenterology* **108**:975-982.
- 6 12. **Gibson, G. R., and M. B. Roberfroid.** 1995. Dietary modulation of the human colonic
7 microbiota: introducing the concept of prebiotics. *J. Nutr.* **125**:1401-1412.
- 8 13. **Gibson, G. R., and X. Wang.** 1994. Enrichment of bifidobacteria from human gut
9 contents by oligofructose using continuous culture. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **118**:121-127.
- 10 14. **Goh, Y. J., C. Zhang, A. K. Benson, V. Schlegel, J.-H. Lee, and R. W. Hutkins.** 2006.
11 Identification of a putative operon involved in fructooligosaccharide utilization by
12 *Lactobacillus paracasei*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **72**:7518-7530.
- 13 15. **Goldin, B. R., S. L. Gorbach, M. Saxelin, S. Barakat, L. Gualtiere, and S. Salminen.**
14 1992. Survival of *Lactobacillus* species (strain GG) in human gastrointestinal tract. *Dig.*
15 *Dis. Sci.* **37**:121-128.
- 16 16. **Hidaka, H., T. Eida, T. Takizawa, T. Tokunaga, and Y. Tashiro.** 1986. Effects of
17 fructooligosaccharides on intestinal flora and human health. *Bifidobacteria Microflora*
18 **5**:37-50.
- 19 17. **Hidaka, H., M. Mirayama, and N. Sumi.** 1988. A fructooligosaccharide-producing
20 enzyme from *Aspergillus niger* ATCC 20611. *Agric. Biol. Chem.* **52**:1181-1187.
- 21 18. **Hillier, A. J., and G. R. Jago.** 1982. L-lactate dehydrogenase, FDP-activated, from
22 *Streptococcus cremoris*. *Methods Enzymol.* **89**:362-367.
- 23 19. **Imamura, L., K. Hisamitsu, and K. Kobashi.** 1994. Purification and characterization of
24 β -fructofuranosidase from *Bifidobacterium infantis*. *Biol. Pharm. Bull.* **17**:596-602.

- 1 20. **Janer, C., L. M. Rohr, C. Pelaez, M. Laloi, V. Cleusix, T. Requena, and L. Meile.** 2004.
2 Hydrolysis of oligofructose by the recombinant β -fructofuranosidase from
3 *Bifidobacterium lactis*. Syst. Appl. Microbiol. **27**:279-285.
- 4 21. **Kaplan, H., and R. W. Hutkins.** 2000. Fermentation of fructooligosaccharides by lactic
5 acid bacteria and bifidobacteria. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **66**:2682-2684.
- 6 22. **Kaplan, H., and R. W. Hutkins.** 2003. Metabolism of fructooligosaccharides by
7 *Lactobacillus paracasei* 1195. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **69**:2217-2222.
- 8 23. **Kimmel, S. A., and R. F. Roberts.** 1998. Development of a growth medium suitable for
9 exopolysaccharide production by *Lactobacillus delbrueckii* spp. *bulgaricus* RR. Int. J.
10 Food Microbiol. **40**:87-92.
- 11 24. **Kullen, M. J., and T. R. Klaenhammer.** 1999. Genetic modification of lactobacilli and
12 bifidobacteria, p. 65-83. In G. W. Tannock (ed.), Probiotics: a critical review. Horizon
13 Scientific Press, Wymondham, United Kingdom.
- 14 25. **Leenhouts, K., G. Buist, and J. Kok.** 1999. Anchoring of proteins to lactic acid bacteria.
15 Antonie van Leeuwenhoek **76**:367-376.
- 16 26. **Makras, L., G. Van Acker, and L. De Vuyst.** 2005. *Lactobacillus paracasei* subsp.
17 *paracasei* 8700:2 degrades inulin-type fructans exhibiting different degrees of
18 polymerization. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **71**:6531-6537.
- 19 27. **Martin-Verstraete, I., V. Charrier, J. Stulke, A. Galinier, B. Erni, G. Rapoport, and J.**
20 **Deutscher.** 1998. Antagonistic effects of dual PTS-catalysed phosphorylation on the
21 *Bacillus subtilis* transcriptional activator LevR. Mol. Microbiol. **28**:293-303.
- 22 28. **Martin-Verstraete, I., M. Debarbouille, A. Klier, and G. Rapoport.** 1990. Levanase
23 operon of *Bacillus subtilis* includes a fructose-specific phosphotransferase system
24 regulating the expression of the operon. J. Mol. Biol. **214**:657-671.

- 1 29. **Martin-Verstraete, I., J. Deutscher, and A. Galinier.** 1999. Phosphorylation of HPr and
2 Crh by HprK, early steps in the catabolite repression signaling pathway for the *Bacillus*
3 *subtilis* levanase operon. J. Bacteriol. **181**:2966-2969.
- 4 30. **Martin-Verstraete, I., J. Stulke, A. Klier, and G. Rapoport.** 1995. Two different
5 mechanisms mediate catabolite repression of the *Bacillus subtilis* levanase operon. J.
6 Bacteriol. **177**:6919-6927.
- 7 31. **Martin, I., M. Debarbouille, A. Klier, and G. Rapoport.** 1989. Induction and metabolite
8 regulation of levanase synthesis in *Bacillus subtilis*. J. Bacteriol. **171**:1885-1892.
- 9 32. **Maze, A., G. Boel, S. Poncet, I. Mijakovic, Y. Le Breton, A. Benachour, V. Monedero,**
10 **J. Deutscher, and A. Hartke.** 2004. The *Lactobacillus casei ptsH147T* mutation causes
11 overexpression of a LevR-regulated but RpoN-independent operon encoding a mannose
12 class phosphotransferase system. J. Bacteriol. **186**:4543-4555.
- 13 33. **McCracken, A., M. S. Turner, P. Giffard, L. M. Hafner, and P. Timms.** 2000. Analysis
14 of promoter sequences from *Lactobacillus* and *Lactococcus* and their activity in several
15 *Lactobacillus* species. Arch. Microbiol. **173**:383-389.
- 16 34. **Muramatsu, K., S. Onodera, M. Kikuchi, and N. Shiomi.** 1992. The production of β -
17 fructofuranosidase from *Bifidobacterium* spp. Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem. **56**:1451-1454.
- 18 35. **Muramatsu, K., S. Onodera, M. Kikuchi, and N. Shiomi.** 1993. Purification and some
19 properties of β -fructofuranosidase from *Bifidobacterium adolescentis* G1. Biosci.
20 Biotechnol. Biochem. **57**:1681-1685.
- 21 36. **Muramatsu, K., S. Onodera, M. Kikuchi, and N. Shiomi.** 1994. Substrate specificity
22 and subsite affinities of β -fructofuranosidase from *Bifidobacterium adolescentis* G1.
23 Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem. **58**:1642-1645.

- 1 37. **Navarre, W. W., and O. Schneewind.** 1994. Proteolytic cleavage and cell wall
2 anchoring at the LPXTG motif of surface proteins in Gram-positive bacteria. *Mol.*
3 *Microbiol.* **14**:115-121.
- 4 38. **O'Sullivan, D. J., and T. R. Klaenhammer.** 1993. High- and low-copy-number
5 *Lactococcus* shuttle cloning vectors with features for clone screening. *Gene* **137**:227-
6 231.
- 7 39. **Paludan-Muller, C., L. Gram, and F. P. Rattray.** 2002. Purification and characterisation
8 of an extracellular fructan β -fructosidase from a *Lactobacillus pentosus* strain isolated
9 from fermented fish. *System. Appl. Microbiol.* **25**:13-20.
- 10 40. **Rolfe, R. D.** 2000. The role of probiotic cultures in the control of gastrointestinal health. *J.*
11 *Nutr.* **130**:396S-402S.
- 12 41. **Saito, K., K. Kondo, I. Kojima, A. Yokota, and F. Tomita.** 2000. Purification and
13 characterization of 2,6- β -D-fructan 6-levanbiohydrolase from *Streptomyces exfoliatus*
14 F3-2. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **66**:252-256.
- 15 42. **Sambrook, J., E. F. Fritsch, and T. Maniatis.** 1989. *Molecular cloning: a laboratory*
16 *manual*, 2nd ed. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y.
- 17 43. **Saulnier, D. M. A., D. Molenaar, W. M. de Vos, G. R. Gibson, and S. Kolida.** 2007.
18 Identification of prebiotic fructooligosaccharide metabolism in *Lactobacillus plantarum*
19 WCFS1 through microarrays. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **73**:1753-1765.
- 20 44. **Schell, M. A., M. Karmirantzou, B. Snel, D. Vilanova, B. Berger, G. Pessi, M.-C.**
21 **Zwahlen, F. Desiere, P. Bork, M. Delley, R. D. Pridmore, and F. Arigoni.** 2002. The
22 genome sequence of *Bifidobacterium longum* reflects its adaptation to the human
23 gastrointestinal tract. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **99**:14422-14427.
- 24 45. **Song, E.-K., H. Kim, H.-K. Sung, and J. Cha.** 2002. Cloning and characterization of a
25 levanbiohydrolase from *Microbacterium laevaniformans* ATCC 15953. *Gene* **291**:45-55.

- 1 46. **Warchol, M., S. Perrin, J.-P. Grill, and F. Schneider.** 2002. Characterization of a
2 purified β -fructosidase from *Bifidobacterium infantis* ATCC 15697. Lett. Appl. Microbiol.
3 **35:462-467.**
- 4 47. **Williams, C. H., S. A. Witherly, and R. K. Buddington.** 1994. Influence of dietary
5 Neosugar on selected bacterial groups of the human faecal microbiota. Microb. Ecol.
6 Health Dis. **7:91-97.**

FIGURE LEGENDS

14 Figure 1. Induction and substrate specificities of β -fructosidases in cell wall extracts of
15 *L. paracasei* 1195.

17 Figure 2. Growth of *L. paracasei* 1195 in SDM supplemented with 0.1% glucose (\square),
18 0.35% FOS (Δ), or 0.1% glucose plus 0.35% FOS (\bullet).

19
20 Figure 3. Sugar utilization and *fos* operon expression during diauxic growth of *L.*
21 *paracasei* 1195. Cells were grown in SDM (A) containing 0.1% glucose plus 0.35%
22 FOS. Cell densities (\bullet) and the concentrations of glucose (o), GF₄ (Δ), GF₃ (X), and
23 GF₂ (\square) present in the culture supernatant were determined. In a parallel experiment,

1 cells were grown in the same medium (B), and Northern analysis of the *fosABCDE*
2 mRNA transcript levels (C), relative to the cell density (●) and glucose concentration (○)
3 in the culture supernatant were determined. Numbers labeled on the growth curves
4 correspond to the lane numbers on the Northern blot indicating the time points at which
5 cells were collected.

6
7 Figure 4. Growth of *L. rhamnosus* GG wild type (A) and GGE582 recombinant strain (B)
8 in mMRS only (no CHO), or mMRS supplemented with 1% sugars or 0.5% levan, with 5
9 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ of Erm added into each growth medium for GGE582 strain. All cultures were
10 inoculated to an initial $\text{OD}_{625\text{nm}}$ of ~ 0.02 to 0.05 and grown at 37°C in ambient
11 atmosphere under static conditions of growth.

TABLE 1. Bacterial strains, plasmids, and primers used in this study

	Genotype or characteristics	Source or reference
Strains		
<i>L. paracasei</i> 1195	Parent strain, FOS-fermenter	UNL collection ^a
BHe	1195 isogenic strain with <i>fosE</i> gene disrupted by insertion inactivation	14
<i>L. rhamnosus</i> GG GGE582	Parent strain, non-FOS-fermenter GG harboring pYG582	ConAgra ^b This study
<i>E. coli</i> DH5 α	F ⁻ ϕ 80d <i>lacZ</i> Δ M15 Δ (<i>lacZYA-argF</i>)U169 <i>deoR endA1 recA1 hsdR17</i> (r _K ⁻ m _K ⁺) <i>phoA supE44 λ thi-1 gyrA96 relA1</i>	Gibco-BRL ^c
Plasmids		
pTRKH2	High copy number shuttle cloning vector, P15A <i>ori</i> , pAM β 1 <i>ori</i> , Erm ^r , <i>lacZ'</i>	38
pRH5	pTRKH2 with <i>fosE</i> gene cloned into <i>XhoI/PstI</i> sites	This study
pYG582	pRH5 with P-GL1 promoter and <i>fosE</i> RBS cloned upstream of <i>fosE</i>	This study
Primers		
	Sequence (5' to 3') ^d	This study
fosE-for1	TGGCTTAGGAAAAGACGCCA	
fosE-rev1	TGATCATCAGATACTCGCAA	
fosE-for2	CGGACCTCGAGTTGGAAATGGATGAAAAGAAAC	
fosE-rev2	ATTATCTGCAGTTAGACTCGCTTCACCCGCCTC	
PGL1-for	ATCAATGATATCACGGTTTTAAAATGAGCGTTG	
PGL1-rev	GCTACCTCGAGT catcctcc AACTTATTATGTTAATAA	

^aUniversity of Nebraska Department of Food Science and Technology Culture Collection, Lincoln, NE.

^bConAgra Foods Inc., Omaha, NE.

^cGibco-BRL, Rockville, MD.

^drestriction enzyme sites, underlined; ribosomal binding site, lower case in bold.

TABLE 2. FOS hydrolysis activities from culture supernatants and cell extracts of *L. paracasei* 1195 wild type and BHe mutant strain previously grown on mMRS containing 1% FOS.

	Fructose released (nmoles/min/mg protein)
<i>L. paracasei</i> 1195	
culture supernatant	4
cell wall extract	3,400
cytoplasmic extract	13
<i>L. paracasei</i> BHe	
culture supernatant	0.2
cell wall extract	nd ^a
cytoplasmic extract	nd

^a nd , none detected

Figure 1. Goh et al.




Figure 2. Goh et al.




Figure 3. Goh et al.




Figure 4. Goh et al.

