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Einar Ringsø
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The Norwegian School of Veterinary Science
Stakkevollveien 23 b, N-9292 Tromsø, Norway

ABSTRACT

The skin, lateral line, gills and gastrointestinal tract or a combination of these organs are suggested to be infection routes in fish. This presentation will present some information on pathogenesis, protection against bacterial adhesion, autochthonous microbiota in the gastrointestinal tract and prebiotics. This information is important when discussing the use of probiotics in aquaculture.

Intensive fish production has increased the risk of infectious diseases and there is a growing need to find alternatives to antibiotic treatment for disease control as indiscriminate use of antibiotics in many parts of the aquaculture industry has led to the development of antibiotic resistance in bacteria. Today, a range of microorganisms have been suggested as or evaluated as fish probiotics. These include lactic acid bacteria, Bacillus species, Pseudomonas species, Vibrio species and other Gram-negatives. However, research in probiotics for aquaculture is at an early stage and much work is still needed.

Another aspect on fish health is the use of prebiotics to increase the population level of already beneficial bacteria colonizing the gastrointestinal tract and the effect of diet in disease resistance.

INTRODUCTION

Before presenting the hard facts on probiotics in aquaculture a short background about pathogenesis, protection against bacterial adhesion and the autochthonous microbiota in the gastrointestinal tract is first provided here. This background information is important when discussing the use of probiotics in aquaculture. Pathogenic microorganisms have evolved mechanisms to target skin, gills or gastrointestinal tract as a points of entry, and today it is generally accepted that the three major routes of infection in fish are through: (a) skin (Kawai et al., 1981; Muroga and de la Cruz, 1987; Kanno et al., 1990; Magarinos et al., 1995; Svendsen and Bøgvald, 1997; Spanggard et al., 2001); (b) gills (Hjeltnes et al., 1987; Baudin Laurencin and Germon, 1987; Svendsen et al., 1999); and (c) gastrointestinal tract (Sakai, 1979; Rose et al., 1989; Chair et al., 1994; Olsson, 1995; Grisez et al., 1996; Olsson et al., 1996; Romalde et al., 1996; Jöborn et al., 1997; Robertson et al., 2000; Lødemel et al., 2001).
Pathogenicity can be divided into four different phases (Birkbeck and Ringø, 2002): (1) the initial phase where the pathogen enters the host’s environment, including the gastrointestinal tract; (2) the exponential phase where the pathogen adheres to and colonizes mucosal surfaces, replicates to sufficient numbers and translocate into host enterocytes; (3) the stationary phase where the pathogen replicates within the host and circumvents the host defence system. In this phase the host is moribund and this can quickly be followed by (4) the death phase.

In aquatic ecosystems, the intimate relationships between microorganisms and other biota and the constant flow of water through the gastrointestinal tract of fish and invertebrates will also affect their indigenous microbiota. Against this background, we may assume that the natural microbiota on eggs, larvae, fry, juveniles and adult fish may help to protect against colonization by a harmful microbiota. Another aspect seen from a microbial point of view is the fact that the microbiota of intensive rearing systems differs dramatically from that in the sea, and it is influenced by many factors such as: rearing techniques, nutrient, disinfection techniques and the use of antibiotics.

In order to adhere successfully, colonize and produce disease the pathogen must overcome the host defence system. It is well known that stress from environmental factors, such as oxygen tension, water temperature and water salinity, are important in increasing the susceptibility of fish to microbial pathogens. The water milieu can also facilitate transmission of these pathogens.

The pathogenesis of Vibrio infections in mammals is primarily a gut infection, and it is therefore logical to ask whether the same is true in fish. Fish pathogenic bacteria, such as Vibrio salmonicida and V. anguillarum, have been shown in vivo to adhere to the intestinal epithelium of fish larvae and to promote severe destruction of microvilli (Olafsen and Hansen, unpublished results, cited in Knudsen et al., 1999). Severe damage with loss of cellular integrity was also noted in midgut of spotted wolffish (Anarhichas minor Olafsen) fry infected by V. anguillarum (Ringø, Mikkelsen and Myklebust, unpublished data, cited in Ringø et al., 2002a) (Fig. 1), compared to normal enterocytes (Fig. 2) (Olsen, Myklebust and Ringø, unpublished data). Scanning electron microscopy investigations of human intestinal mucosa infected with enteropathogenic Escherichia coli (EPEC), showed that EPEC adhere intimately in microcolonies and cause gross alterations at the apical surface of infected enterocytes (Knutton et al., 1987; Knutton, 1995).

Figure 1. Spotted wolffish (Anarhichas minor Olafsen) fry infected by Vibrio anguillarum. Notice the severe cellular damage. (after Ringø, Mikkelsen and Myklebust, unpublished data)
The susceptibility of early life stages of turbot and Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippocampus* L.) to *Aeromonas salmonicida* ssp. *salmonicida* was studied in challenge experiments (Bergh *et al.*, 1997). Larvae of both species experienced high mortality during the yolk sac stage, and the authors suggested that this was as a result of the challenge test. However, the bacterium could not be recovered from the larvae by culture, but the pathogen was shown to be present in the intestinal lumen of some turbot larvae examined using immunohistochemical techniques (Fig. 3). Based on this result, the authors (Bergh *et al.*, 1997) proposed that *A. salmonicida* ssp. *salmonicida* may persist in the larvae.
Endocytosis of bacteria by enterocytes has been observed in the hindgut of several fish species (Ringø et al., 2002a). In their study on turbot (Scophthalmus maximus L.) larvae, Grisez et al. (1996) reported free *V. anguillarum* from an endosome in the lamina propria by immunohistochemical staining (Fig. 4).

**Figure 4.** *Vibrio anguillarum* infection in turbot (Scophthalmus maximus L.) after oral challenge. *Vibrio anguillarum* attached to the microvilli (brush border) of the intestinal epithelium. (after Grisez et al., 1996)

Readers with special interest in pathogenesis and the gastrointestinal tract of growing fish are referred to the review of Birkbeck and Ringø (2002).

**PROTECTION AGAINST BACTERIAL ADHESION MUCUS**

The internal surface of the host is the first defence barrier to infection. Intestinal mucins secreted by specialized epithelial goblet cells located in the intestinal enterocytes form a viscous, hydrated blanket on the surface of the intestinal mucosa that protects the delicate columnar epithelium. This is thought to be a vital component of the intestinal mucosal barrier in prevention of colonization by pathogens in both fish and endothermic animals (Florey, 1962; Forstner, 1978; Westerdahl et al., 1991; Maxson et al., 1994; Mims et al., 1995; Henderson et al., 1999). Gastrointestinal mucus is thought to have three major functions: (1) protection of the underlying mucosa from chemical and physical damage; (2) lubrication of the mucosal surface; and (3) to provide a barrier against enteroadherence of pathogenic organisms to the underlying mucosal epithelium.

It is well known that intestinal mucus is composed almost entirely of water (90-95%) and the electrolyte composition is similar to plasma, accounting for about 1% of the mucus weight. The remaining 4-10% is composed of high-molecular-weight glycoproteins (mucins), consisting of a protein core with numerous carbohydrate (fucose and galactose) sidechains. Hydrolysis of intestinal mucus material of rainbow trout liberated increased amounts of N-acetylgalactosamine and N-acetylglucosamine (O'Toole et al., 1999), indicated that these carbohydrates may be present as mucin-bound moieties in fish intestinal mucus as the case for mucus from other animal species (Roussel et al., 1988). The majority of intestinal mucus-associated lipids in rainbow trout partitioned to the organic phase during extraction with chloroform/methanol and was found to contain...
saturated and unsaturated free fatty acids, phospholipids, bile acid, cholesterol, and monoglycerides and diglycerides (O’Toole et al., 1999).

Olsson et al. (1992) put forward the hypothesis that the gastrointestinal tract is a site of colonization of *V. anguillarum* as the pathogen could utilize diluted turbot intestinal mucus as sole nutrient source. In a later study, Garcia et al. (1997) concluded that Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) intestinal mucus is an excellent growth medium of *V. anguillarum*. This result is an important aspect of the pathogenesis of this pathogen.

The mucous blanket is constantly renewed by the secretion of high molecular weight glycoproteins from individual goblet cells throughout the epithelium. Goblet cells differentiate in the lower portion of the crypts of both small and large intestine and gradually migrate onto the villi or mucosal surface.

In an early study on histopathology changes caused by *V. anguillarum*, Ransom et al. (1984) found large amounts of goblet (mucus producing) cells in the anterior part of gastrointestinal tract of infected chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta* Walbaum). The first reaction of Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus* L.), a salmonid fish, infected by pathogenic bacteria (*A. salmonicida* ssp. *salmonicida*) the causative agent of furunculosis is to peel off the infected mucus by increased goblet (mucus producing) cell production compared to uninfected fish (Lødemel et al., 2001) (Fig. 5). A similar reaction to that found in infected Arctic charr, is also observed in rabbit and rats infected by pathogenic bacteria (Mantle et al., 1989, 1991; Enss et al., 1966), and this reaction may be considered a normal host response to particular intestinal infections (Mims et al., 1995).

![Figure 5.](http://repository.seafdec.org.ph) Light microscopic view of villi in the midgut from Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus* L.) fed soybean oil prior to challenge and post challenge with the fish pathogen *Aeromonas salmonicida* ssp. *salmonicida*. Note the substantially more conspicuous goblet (mucus producing) cells (arrows) along the villi of infected fish. (after Lødemel et al., 2001)

Furthermore, the peel off of mucus might lead to loss of the autochthonous (indigenous) microbiota closely associated with the intestinal epithelium forming one of the first defence to limit colonization of pathogenic bacteria.
AUTOCHTHONOUS MICROBIOTA

Savage (1983) defined bacteria isolated from the digestive tract as either autochthonous (indigenous) or allochthonous (transient). Recently, Ringø and Birkbeck (1999) presented a list of criteria (found in healthy animals, colonize early stages and persist throughout life, found in both free-living and hatchery-cultured fish, grow anaerobically, and found associated with epithelial mucosal in the digestive tract) for testing autochthony of bacteria from the gastrointestinal tract of fish. To define the presence of autochthonous microbiota in fish, electron microscope investigations are a useful tool (Ringø et al. 2002a). One might put forward the hypothesis that autochthonous microbiota associated closely with the intestinal epithelium form a barrier serving as the first defence to limit direct attachment or interaction of pathogenic bacteria to the mucosa as reported for endothermic animals (van der Waaij et al., 1972; Forstner, 1978; Slomiany et al., 1994; Henderson et al., 1996). A remarkable feature of the indigenous intestinal microbiota of fish is that situations like stress, antibiotic administration, and even small dietary changes, affect the microbial community of the digestive tract. The stability of the intestinal flora is an extremely important factor in the natural resistance of fish to infections produced by bacterial pathogens in the digestive tract. Interest in the phenomenon of resistance provided by flora components against colonization by pathogens has existed for many years in the endothermic literature (for review see Hentges, 1983; Hentges, 1992; Tancrède, 1992; Salminen et al., 1996). A fundamental question when discussing translocation from the gastrointestinal tract in fish is if the autochthonous microbiota has a protective role against pathogenic bacteria by producing antibacterial substances. Information about the existence of antibacterial substances produced by bacteria isolated from the digestive tract of fish has been demonstrated in several comprehensive reviews (Ringø and Gatesoupe, 1998; Gatesoupe, 1999; Hansen and Olafsen, 1999; Ringø and Birkbeck, 1999; Gomez-Gill et al., 2000; Gram and Ringø, 2002; Ringø et al., 2002b). However, it is not yet known to what extent the natural microbiota of fish may be protective towards pathogen colonization. This is an important subject to clarify as the aquaculture industry is plagued by many disease problems, and an important goal for the microbiologist should therefore be to increase colonization of the gut by bacteria with an antibacterial potential against fish pathogens.

PROBIOTICS

The use of food containing live microorganisms with beneficial properties has been known for centuries. O'Sullivan et al. (1992) refer to Plino who advocated the use of fermented milk products in the treatment of various gastrointestinal infections as early as 76 BC. In modern time the term “probiotic” was first used in 1954 by Vergin, but since then, many different variations of the definition have been proposed (Table 1).

Antibiotic treatment to prevent infection is not recommended because of selection for strains resistant to chemotherapy but also because of concern about environmental risk and that resistant strains in the environment may transfer R plasmid to human intestinal microbiota. Nevertheless, its use is still a practical measure even methods do not prevent pathogenic proliferation in the system. Furthermore, the use of antibiotics may dramatically change the intestinal microflora of the fish and, thus impair its first-line defences (Austin and Al-Zahrani, 1988; Strøm and Ringø, 1993). An alternative method to antibiotic treatment would be the use of
Table 1. Definitions of probiotics by various authors (after Gram and Ringsø, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>microbial compounds which promotes body functions and beneficial microorganisms</td>
<td>Vergin, 1954</td>
<td>products - not live culture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microbially produced “factors” which promote growth of other organisms</td>
<td>Lilly and Stillwell, 1965</td>
<td>growth promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal feed supplements - organisms and substances that have a beneficial effect on the host animal by contributing to its intestinal microbial balance</td>
<td>Parker, 1974</td>
<td>only feed what is “microbial balance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live microbial feed supplements which beneficially affect the host animal by improving its intestinal microbial balance</td>
<td>Fuller, 1989</td>
<td>only feed what is “microbial balance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a microbial dietary adjuvant that beneficially affects the host physiology by modulating mucosal and systemic immunity, as well as improving nutritional and microbial balance in the intestinal tract</td>
<td>Naidu et al., 1999</td>
<td>only feed what is “microbial balance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live microorganisms supplemented in food or feed which give beneficial effects on the intestinal microbial balance</td>
<td>Gildberg et al., 1997</td>
<td>only feed what is “microbial balance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a live microbial supplement which beneficially affects the host animal by improving its microbial balance is based on elimination of harmful microflora from the animal’s digestive tract</td>
<td>Gram et al., 1999</td>
<td>what is “microbial balance” elimination? only dietary tract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mono- or mixed cultures of live microorganisms which when applied to animal or man, beneficially affect the host by improving the properties of the indigenous microflora</td>
<td>Bogut et al., 1998</td>
<td>what are “properties of indigenous microflora”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viable microorganisms (bacteria or yeasts) that exhibit a beneficial effect on the health of the host when they are ingested</td>
<td>Havenaar et al., 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficial bacteria which may override pathogens by producing inhibitory substances, or by preventing pathogenic colonization of the host</td>
<td>Conway, 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficial bacteria that displace pathogens by competitive processes or by release of growth inhibitors</td>
<td>Holzapfel et al., 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live intestinal bacteria that are added to promote the viability of the host, but the term is also proper for bacteria able to regulate colonization of the outer surfaces</td>
<td>Salminen et al., 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live microbial adjunct which has a beneficial effect on the host by modifying the host-associated or ambient microbial community, by ensuring improved use of the feed or enhancing its nutritional value, by enhancing the host response towards disease, or by improving the quality of its ambient environment</td>
<td>Riquelme et al., 2000</td>
<td>what is “override”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral probiotics are living microorganisms, which upon ingestion in certain numbers, exert health benefits beyond inherent basic nutrition</td>
<td>Moriarty, 1997</td>
<td>how is “colonization” regulated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live microbial cultures added to feed or environment (water) to increase viability (survival) of the host</td>
<td>Skjermo and Vadstein, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verschuere et al., 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guarner and Schaafsma, 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gram and Ringsø, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
probiotics, or beneficial bacteria, which override pathogens by producing inhibitory substances, or by preventing pathogenic colonization in the host.

Table 2 shows the effect of addition of probiotic microorganisms (*Vibrio pelagius, V. mediterranei* Q40, *Aeromonas media, Pseudomonas* ssp. *Vibrio* ssp. and *Thalassobacter utilis*) on fish and crustacean larval survival.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presumed probiont</th>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Host organisms</th>
<th>Effect on survival</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Vibrio pelagius</em></td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>Turbot larvae</td>
<td>Increase accumulated survival from 6-9% on day 12 and from day 0-3% on 16 after hatching</td>
<td>Ringø and Vadstein, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vibrio mediterranei</em> Q40</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>Turbot larvae</td>
<td>Increase accumulated survival (5 days post hatching) in 5 separate experiments (e.g. 14 to 55% in trial 75 to 81% in trial 4)</td>
<td>Huys <em>et al.</em>, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aeromonas media</em></td>
<td><em>Vibrio tubiashii</em></td>
<td>Oyster larvae</td>
<td>Increase survival after 6 days from 4-100%</td>
<td>Gibson <em>et al.</em>, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas</em> and unknown strain</td>
<td><em>Vibrio anguillarum</em> like</td>
<td>Scallop larvae</td>
<td>Increase survival from 5-60% after 14 days</td>
<td>Riquelme <em>et al.</em>, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas</em> and <em>Vibrio</em></td>
<td>field trial? not known</td>
<td>Scallop larvae</td>
<td>Same survival after 48 hours as antibiotic treated tanks</td>
<td>Riquelme <em>et al.</em>, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thalassobacter utilis</em></td>
<td>field trial not known <em>(Vibrio spp.)</em></td>
<td>Crab larvae</td>
<td>Increase survival from 16 to 26%</td>
<td>Nogami and Maeda, 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gatesoupe (1997) tested in his study a siderophore-producing *Vibrio* as probiotic by feeding infected turbot larvae with rotifers enriched by the *Vibrio*. He reported improved larval survival 48 hours after infection. However, 10 days post-infection, no difference was seen in survival. In contrast to these results, Ringø and Vadstein (1998) reported that addition of *V. pelagius*, originally isolated from turbot larvae, to early developing turbot larvae had no short term effect, but caused a slight increase in survival after 12-16 days compared to larvae exposed to *Aeromonas caviae*. In an earlier study, Ringø *et al.* (1996) suggested by using an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay that *V. pelagius* seems to colonize the larval gut when the bacteria was added to the tank water at the day of hatching but it was, however, not shown whether the
bacterium could persist in the gut if the larvae were removed from the V. pelagius-containing tank water.

In a recent study, Huys et al. (2001) searched for beneficial bacterial strains for turbot larviculture and reported increased survival of larvae by addition of a V. mediterranei Q40 originally isolated from sea bream larvae and an unknown organism isolated from turbot larvae at a concentration of $10^5$ bacteria per ml water.

Some information is available on bacterial probiotics in culturing of Pacific oyster (Crassostrea gigas Thunberg) larvae. Gibson et al. (1998) used an Aeromonas media-like strain, originally isolated from Koi carp (Cyprinus carpio) from the Hawkesbury River (Gibson, pers. com., 2001 to Lone Gram, Danish Institute for Fisheries Research, Denmark), by adding the probiont to waters of oyster larvae which had been challenged with the pathogen V. tubiashii. The challenge test caused an increase in numbers of the pathogen and a complete kill of the oyster population within five days, but by adding the Aeromonas media strain together with the pathogen, reduced numbers of V. tubiashii and resulted in complete survival of the population. These results are in accordance with earlier results demonstrating that additions of both algae (McCausland et al., 1999) and bacteria (strain CA2) (Douillet and Langdon, 1994) improved growth of the Pacific oyster larvae.

Riquelme et al. (1997) investigated 506 bacterial isolates, obtained from laboratory and hatchery sources for their potential probiotic effect in Chilean scallop (Argopecten purpuratus Lamarck 1819) larval culture. Initially, both a Pseudomonas isolate showing in vitro activity against a larval pathogen a V. anguillarum-related strain and an unidentified isolate with no in vitro inhibitory activity were found to improve survival from 5% in the non-probiotic treated to 60% in the probiotic treated over a 14 day period. Screening the 506 bacterial strains, the authors found that only 11 isolates were able to inhibit growth of a V. anguillarum related bacterium associated with mortality of scallop larvae. However, several strains showing in vitro activity increased mortality of scallop larvae. Thus, this study clearly demonstrates the importance of in vivo testing, as strains with in vitro effect may be dangerous to the animals, and strains with no in vitro effect may have probiotic effects in vivo.

Recently, Riquelme et al. (2001) reported that growth and survival in field trials with Chilean scallop larvae treated with pathogen-antagonizing bacteria (Vibrio sp. C33 and Pseudomonas sp. 11) at $10^3$ colony forming units per ml (CFU/ml) were the same as when the larvae were treated with antibiotics. The antagonizing bacteria were added to the water at the initiation of the experiment and again after 48 hours. Controls with no treatment were not included as the commercial producer experienced rapid mortality when no treatment was used. In an earlier investigation, Riquelme et al. (2000) studied the uptake of pathogen-inhibiting bacterial cultures in Chilean scallop larvae, and found that an Arthrobacter was ingested in significant numbers. This can be a way of continuously adding the probiotic culture to the scallop larvae. The Arthrobacter strain was not tested in in vivo infection trials.

In two studies, Nogami and Maeda (1992) and Nogami et al. (1997) added $10^5$-$10^6$ CFU/ml of bacterial culture isolated from shrimp pond to seawater used for crab (Portunus trituberculatus) culture. The strain was a Gram-negative, non-fermentative, motile rod identified as Thalassobacter utilis (Maeda and Liao, 1992; Nogami et al., 1997). The culture, which was added once every
seven days, was selected based on its ability to improve survival in in vivo infection trials. The organism also inhibited growth of V. anguillarum, in vitro. By adding the culture, a decline in concentration of Vibrio spp. in the seawater occurred and crab survival was significantly improved. It should be emphasized that the addition of five other microbial cultures (e.g. a Bacillus subtilis) accelerated mortality of the larvae (Nogami and Maeda, 1992).

Prevention of bacterial disease in growing fish is somewhat easier than in larvae, fry and juveniles. However, vaccination of fish smaller than 35 g (Intervet International, The Netherlands; Aqua Health Ltd, Canada) is not recommended, making the smaller stages of fish still susceptible to infection. For a range of bacterial pathogen-host combinations, good vaccines have been developed, and their optimization and use will be facilitated as further understanding of the pathogen virulence factors and of the host immune system emerges. The studies described in Table 3 should be regarded as trials of the probiotic concept rather than as suggestions for actual use of probiotics. Both the bacteriophage, Tetraselmis, Gram-positive bacteria (bacilli and carnobacteria, a lactic acid bacteria) and Gram-negative bacteria such as Vibrio and Pseudomonas have been evaluated as potential probionts and the experiments cover both additions to the rearing water or incorporation in the feed (Table 3).

The pathogens which are most frequently used include; Pseudomonas plecoglossicida, anguillarum, V. ordalli, Yersinia ruckeri, and A. salmonicida. In most of the cited studies in Table 3 increased survival of the host organisms were observed.

Readers who want more information about probiotics in aquaculture are referred to the reviews of Gatesoupe (1999), Gomez-Gil et al. (2000), Verschuere et al. (2000) and Gram and Ringø (2002).

LACTIC ACID BACTERIA (LAB)

It is suggested that lactic acid bacteria (LAB) along with other bacteria that belong to the autochthonous (indigenous) microbiota of aquatic animals might be an important part of the defence mechanism against colonization of fish pathogens in the gastro-intestinal tract. In addition to the antagonistic microorganisms colonizing the mucus surface in the natural microbial defence mechanisms, it has been shown that the surface mucus also plays a role in the prevention of colonization by parasites, bacteria and fungi.

Effects of LAB administration on intestinal microbiota

It is well known that LAB under normal circumstances are not numerically dominant in the digestive tract of fish (Ringø and Gatesoupe, 1998). In order to increase the proportion of LAB, some investigations have attempted to increase their population level by dietary factors such as: (1) chromic oxide (Ringø, 1993); (2) different oils (Ringø et al., 1998; Ringø et al., 2002b); (3) high and low dietary lipids (Ringø and Olsen, 1999); and (4) inulin (Ringø, Myklebust and Olsen, unpublished results). Another important criterion for the use of LAB in commercial aquaculture, is the colonization potential of LAB in the fish gut, as Vibrionaceae may also persist...
**Table 3.** Effect of addition of probiotic microorganisms on fish survival. (after Gram and Ringø, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presumed probiont</th>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Host organisms</th>
<th>Effect on survival</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bacteriophage¹</td>
<td><em>Pseudomonas plecoglossicida</em></td>
<td>ayu</td>
<td>increase survival from 35-75%</td>
<td>Park <em>et al.</em>, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tetraselmis suecica</em></td>
<td>Several Gram-negatives</td>
<td>salmon</td>
<td>increase survival from 0-15% to 20-100%</td>
<td>Austin <em>et al.</em>, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacillus spp., <em>Carnobacterium</em> sp.</td>
<td>field trial not known</td>
<td>channel catfish</td>
<td>increase survival from 56-80%</td>
<td>Queiroz and Boyd, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vibrio anguillarum</em></td>
<td>salmon</td>
<td>no effect on survival</td>
<td>Robertson <em>et al.</em>, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vibrio ordalii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase survival from 23-74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Yersinia ruckeri</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase survival from 42-71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aeromonas salmonicida</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase survival from 0-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aeromonas salmonicida</em></td>
<td>trout</td>
<td>increase survival from 32-74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vibrio alginolyticus</em></td>
<td><em>Aeromonas salmonicida</em></td>
<td>salmon</td>
<td>increase survival from 0-82%</td>
<td>Austin <em>et al.</em>, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vibrio anguillarum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase survival from 10-26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vibrio ordalii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase survival from 0-26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Yersinia ruckeri</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>no effect on survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas fluorescens</em></td>
<td><em>Aeromonas salmonicida</em></td>
<td>salmon</td>
<td>increase healthy fish from 25-70 to 90-100%</td>
<td>Smith and Davey, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas fluorescens</em></td>
<td><em>Vibrio anguillarum</em></td>
<td>trout</td>
<td>increase survival from 50-70%</td>
<td>Gram <em>et al.</em>, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas</em> spp.</td>
<td><em>Vibrio anguillarum</em></td>
<td>trout</td>
<td>increase survival (some strains)</td>
<td>Spanggaard <em>et al.</em>, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas fluorescens</em></td>
<td><em>Aeromonas salmonicida</em></td>
<td>salmon</td>
<td>no effect (some strains)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ It is debatable whether or not a bacteriophage qualifies as a probiont “a live microbial...” due to the inert nature of viruses
for days or weeks in fish (Austin et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1995; Ringø and Vadstein, 1998). Some recent studies have demonstrated that carnobacteria strains are able to survive for several days in the intestine of larval and juvenile fish (Strøm and Ringø, 1993; Jøborn et al., 1997; Gildberg and Mikkelsen, 1998; Ringø, 1999). Three of these studies (Jøborn et al., 1997; Gildberg and Mikkelsen, 1998; Ringø, 1999) have suggested that there is apparently no host specificity with regard to colonization of the fish gut with carnobacteria, contrary to endothermic animals where adhesion of LAB appears to be complicated by host specificity (Lin and Savage, 1984; Fuller, 1986, 1989; Conway, 1989). However, the colonization site in the fish gut is also an important criterion. In a recent study, Gildberg and Mikkelsen (1998) administered two *Carnobacterium divergens* strains originally isolated from the intestine of mature Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua* L.) and Atlantic salmon, to Atlantic cod juveniles via the food. When the Atlantic cod isolate was used, the authors only detected *C. divergens* in pyloric caeca, while the concentration of the bacteria was approximately ten fold higher in the pyloric caeca than in the intestine when the salmon isolate was used.

Transient bacteria may also be efficient if the cells are introduced at high dose. Moreover, as LAB may exert antibacterial effects against undesirable microbes, some investigators have attempted to increase the proportion of LAB associated with the fish digestive tract. In a study with four days old Atlantic cod larvae, Strøm and Ringø (1993) used an antagonistic LAB strain which, when added to the rearing water, favourably influenced the intestinal microbiota of the larvae by increasing the proportion of LAB from approximately 5% up to 70% and by a subsequent decrease in the proportion of the bacteria genera *Pseudomonas*, *Cytophaga/Flexibacter* and *Aeromonas* (Table 4). These results indicate that the LAB are able to colonize and may comprise a major part of the autochthonous microbiota in the gut of the larvae. A similar increase in intestinal LAB was also found in Atlantic cod fry fed a diet containing *C. divergens* (Gildberg et al., 1997) (Table 4). In a study with Atlantic salmon fry, Gildberg et al. (1995) demonstrated that administration of LAB reported as *Lb. plantarum*, but later reclassified as *C. divergens* (Ringø et al., 2001a) increased the proportion of adherent LAB to intestinal wall from nil to 100% (Table 4).

Recently, Byun et al. (1997) evaluated the effect of LAB (*Lactobacillus* sp. DS-12) administration via the feed on the intestinal microbiota of flounder (*Paralichthys olivaceus*) after one month of feeding (Table 4). *Lactobacillus* sp. DS-12 was not detected in the intestine of the control group, but $10^7$/g LAB were found in the GIT when the fish were fed a LAB supplemented feed.

In a recent study, Bogut et al. (2000) evaluated the effect of *Enterococcus faecium* on the intestinal microbiota of Sheat fish (*Silurus glanis*). In this study, the fish were exposed to *E. faecium* by including the bacteria in the diet. After approximately two months of feeding, some interesting differences in the intestinal microbiota were observed between the two rearing groups. *Enterococcus faecium*-administration decreased the population level of *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli* and other bacteria of the family Enterobacteriaceae, and resulted in complete elimination of *Clostridium* spp. (Table 4).

Only one investigation has evaluated the influence of a commercial LAB preparation on the allochthonous intestinal microbiota. Supplementation of one gram of *E. faecium* M74 per 100 kg feed influenced the intestinal microbiota of 0+ Israeli carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) to some extent (Bogut et al., 1998). While *E. coli* disappeared from the intestinal microbiota of the fish after 14
Table 4. Effect of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) administration on intestinal microbiota. (after Ringø et al., 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fish species</th>
<th>LAB used</th>
<th>Bacterial genera isolated and proportion of microflora population</th>
<th>after administration</th>
<th>after challenge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic cod - larvae</td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em></td>
<td><em>Pseudomonas</em> 42.5; <em>Cytophaga/Flexibacter</em> 42.5 <em>Aeromonas</em> 10; <em>C. divergens</em> 5</td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em> 70; <em>Pseudomonas</em> 20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*Strøm and Ringø, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic cod - fry</td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em></td>
<td>No information was given</td>
<td>No information was given</td>
<td><em>C. divergens 75</em></td>
<td><em>Gilberg et al., 1997</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic salmon-fry</td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em></td>
<td><em>Pseudomonas</em>, <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> Gram positive cocci</td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em> 100</td>
<td><em>A. salmonicida 90</em></td>
<td><em>Gildberg et al., 1995</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbot - larvae</td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em></td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em> n.d. <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 4.3 (5/5); *G(+) 4.6 (5/5) Yeast 4.6 (5/5); *Hemolytic bacteria 5.8 (2/5) *Mucoid colony form 4.8 (1/5); *Aerobes 8.5 (5/5) <em>Anaerobes 7.6 (5/5)</em></td>
<td><em>C. divergens</em> (8x10³) <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 4.8 (5/5); *G(+) 4.3 (5/5) Yeast 4.3 (1/5); *Hemolytic bacteria 5.1 (1/5)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td><em>Ringsø, 1999</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flounder¹</td>
<td><em>Lactobacillus</em> sp. DS-12</td>
<td><em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 4.3 (5/5); *G(+) 4.6 (5/5) Yeast 4.6 (5/5); *Hemolytic bacteria 5.8 (2/5) *Mucoid colony form 4.8 (1/5); *Aerobes 8.5 (5/5) <em>Anaerobes 7.6 (5/5)</em></td>
<td><em>Lactobacillus</em> sp. DS-12 7.0 (3/5) <em>Clostridium</em> 4.3 (1/5); *Yeast 4.3 (1/5); *Hemolytic bacteria 5.1 (1/5)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td><em>Byun et al., 1997</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap²</td>
<td><em>Ent. faecium</em></td>
<td><em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 6.2; <em>E. coli</em> 4.2</td>
<td><em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 6.2; <em>E. coli</em> n.d.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td><em>Bogut et al., 1998</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheat fish³</td>
<td><em>Ent. faecium</em></td>
<td><em>Escherichia coli</em> 3.1; <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 3.0 <em>Staph. aureus</em> 4.7 <em>Bacillus</em> 6.0; <em>Clostridium</em> 2.1</td>
<td><em>Escherichia coli</em> 1.1; <em>Enterobacteriaceae</em> 1.9 <em>Staph. aureus</em> 1.4 <em>Bacillus</em> 5.6; <em>Clostridium</em> n.d</td>
<td>*</td>
<td><em>Bogut et al., 2000</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Data are presented as log 10 and frequency are shown in parentheses; ¹ - Data are presented as log 10 after 58 days of feeding; ² - Data are presented as log 10 after 4 weeks of feeding; ³ - Data are presented as log 10 after 58 days of feeding; n.d - not detected; ⁴ - challenge test not done
days and onwards by feeding the probiotic preparation (Table 4), the population level of Enterobacteriaceae, *E. faecalis*, *S. aureus*, *Bacillus* spp. and *Clostridium* spp. were not reduced as a result of including *E. faecium* into the diet (Bogut et al., 1998). The authors suggested a high adhesive ability in the epithelium of carp digestive tract for *E. faecium*. However, as they isolated the allochthonous (transient) intestinal microbiota, convincing experimental evidence was not provided.

When dealing with the potential of probiotics (for example LAB) in aquaculture the fundamental question arises whether it is possible to colonize and maintain the probiotic bacteria within the digestive tract. This is particularly important when long-term exposure may be required for the probiotic effect. In this respect, electron microscope investigations are a useful tool (Ringø et al., 2001b, 2002a).

During the last decade some reports have been published on the nutritional contribution of LAB to the production rate of rotifer *Brachionus plicatilis* (Gatesoupe, 1990; Gatesoupe, 1991), while the control of the microbiota of rotifer cultures has received less attention.

Challenges in vivo

The major factors involved in the biocontrol of bacterial pathogens in the gastrointestinal tract are primarily those regulating the composition, functions and interactions of indigenous microbial populations with the animal tissues. This concept is supported by repeated observations that strains of transient enteropathogens can colonize intestinal habitats of endothermic animals. The fact that fish contain intestinal microbiota with antagonistic effects against fish pathogens has prompted investigators to conduct challenge experiments with LAB during the last decade (Gatesoupe, 1994; Gildberg et al., 1995, 1997; Gildberg and Mikkelsen, 1998; Harzevili et al., 1998). However, in these studies some conflicting results on the mortality were reported when the control group was compared with probiotic treatment (Table 5).

Gatesoupe (1994) suggested that in vivo experiments with turbot larvae using rotifers grown on LAB strains (resembling those of *Lactobacillus plantarum* or *Carnobacterium* sp.) improved the disease resistance in challenge tests with pathogenic *Vibrio* (*V. splendidus* strain VS 11). However, the results reported in this study were registered after 48 and 72 hours, beyond which the mortality pattern was not discussed. In three papers, Gildberg and Mikkelsen (1998) and Gildberg et al. (1995; 1997) have used two LAB strains originally isolated from Atlantic salmon and Atlantic cod by Strøm (1988). These two isolates were recently identified by 16S rDNA and AFLP™ fingerprinting as *C. divergens* (Ringø et al., 2001a). In challenge trials with cohabitants with *A. salmonicida*, Gildberg et al. (1995) in contrast to the expectations, registered highest mortality of Atlantic salmon fry with fish given the diet containing *C. divergens*, originally isolated from Atlantic salmon intestine. In their study with Atlantic cod fry, Gildberg and Mikkelsen (1998) observed the same cumulative mortality independent whether the *C. divergens* isolates supplemented to the commercial feed were originally isolated from the digestive tract of Atlantic cod or Atlantic salmon, when the fish were bath exposed to *V. anguillarum*. On the other hand, an improved disease resistance of Atlantic cod fry was observed by supplementing a commercially dry feed with a strain of *C. divergens* originally isolated from the cod (Gildberg et al., 1997). The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAB isolate used</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Way of administration</th>
<th>Effect in challenge test</th>
<th>Suggested mode of action</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Carnobacterium spp.**
  a                      | Turbot - larvae     | *V. splendidus*| Enrichment of rotifers | +                        | Antagonism and/or improved nutritional value of the rotifers   | Gatesoupe, 1994                |
| **C. divergens**
  b                      | Atlantic salmon - fry | *A. salmonicida* | Addition to the diet   | -                        |                                                                  | Gildberg et al., 1995          |
| **C. divergens**
  c                      | Atlantic cod - juveniles | *V. anguillarum* | Addition to the diet   | +                        | Not specified                                                   | Gildberg et al., 1997          |
| **C. divergens**
  b                      | Atlantic cod - fry | *V. anguillarum* | Addition to the diet   | +e                       | Antagonism                                                      | Gildberg and Mikkelsen, 1998   |
| **C. divergens**
  c                      | Atlantic cod - fry | *V. anguillarum* | Addition to the diet   | -                        |                                                                  | Gildberg and Mikkelsen, 1998   |
| **Lb. rhamnosus**
  d                      | Rainbow trout       | *A. salmonicida* | Addition to the diet   | +                        |                                                                  | Nikoskelainen et al., 2001     |

+ improved disease resistance; - no significant effect

* - isolated from rotifer; b - isolated from intestine of Atlantic salmon (Strøm, 1988); c - isolated from intestine of Atlantic cod (Strøm, 1988); d - a probiotic for human use

e - Twelve days after infection significant reduced cumulative mortality was recorded in fish given feed supplemented with *C. divergens* isolated from Atlantic salmon, but no effect was detected four weeks after infection.
explanation for these conflicting results has not been elucidated. Gildberg and Mikkelsen (1998) put forward a hypothesis that bacteriocin production can be inducible and may not occur if the bacteria are not frequently challenged with inhibitors as previously demonstrated by Schrøder et al. (1980). Furthermore, a recent study by Nikoskelainen et al. (2001) used the human probiotic *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* in a challenge test with *A. salmonicida* with promising results (Table 5). These results should stimulate fish microbiologist to use human probiotic LAB in future studies.

If the intestine is involved in infection as suggested by several authors, the fundamental question arises whether there are differences between the posterior part of the intestine and the hindgut region of the intestine? It is well established that the intestine in an immature or inflammatory state has an enhanced capacity to absorb intact macromolecules (for review see Olsen and Ringø, 1997). Furthermore, some studies report endocytosis of bacteria by enterocytes in the epithelial border of hindgut of herring (*Clupea harengus*) larvae (Hansen et al., 1992; Hansen and Olafsen, 1999), herring and Atlantic cod larvae (Olafsen and Hansen, 1992) and 36 days old juvenile turbot (Grisez et al., 1996). It is generally accepted that mature and non-inflammatory intestines of adult salmonids are not permeable to microparticulates in contrast to the mammalian gastrointestinal tract where M-cells are active in phagocytosis. However, a recent study demonstrated endocytosis of bacteria by enterocytes in the epithelial border of hindgut of adult salmonid fish (Fig. 6a), as well as in the posterior part of the intestine (pyloric caeca) (Fig. 6b) (Ringø et al., 2002b). These results are in accordance with observations made by Vigneulle and Laurencin (1991) and Tamura et al. (1993) who measured phagocytosis of fixed *V. anguillarum* in the posterior intestine of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*), turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*) and eel (*Anguilla anguilla*).

![Endocytosis of bacteria demonstrated in the hindgut region (a) and pyloric caeca (b) of Arctic char (*Salvelinus alpinus* L.). (after Ringø et al., 2002b)](image-url)
The observations of Vigneulle and Laurencin (1991), Tamura et al. (1993) and Ringø et al. (2001b, 2002a, 2002b) indicate that the intestine is involved in bacterial translocation. Yet no clear evidence is available on possible differences between different parts of the intestine with regard to bacterial infection.

It is well known that rotifers are often suspected of being a vector for bacterial infections to the predating organisms (Perez-Benavente and Gatesoupe, 1988; Tanasomwang and Muroga, 1988; Nicolas et al., 1989). It is therefore surprising that studies dealing with the proliferation of larval pathogens in rotifer cultures are so scarce (Gatesoupe, 1991; Hazevili et al., 1998). Gatesoupe (1991) reported that the proliferation of *A. salmonicida* that accidentally appeared in the experimental rotifer culture was inhibited by treatment with *Lb. plantarum*. Hazevili et al. (1998) reported that administration of the probiotic strain *Lac. lactis* AR21 under sub-optimal feeding regime, counteracted the growth inhibition of the rotifers due to *V. anguillarum*.

Readers with special interest in lactic acid bacteria in fish are referred to the comprehensive reviews of Ringsø and Gatesoupe (1998) and Ringsø et al., 2002c.

**PREBIOTICS**

Specific bacterial pathogens can be an important cause of mortality as intensive husbandry practices often result in breakdown of natural barriers between the host and pathogens. Nowadays, the prevention and control of these diseases has concentrated on good husbandry practices and the use of vaccines and antibiotics. However, treatment by feeding antibiotics may cause the development of resistant bacteria through plasmids or bacteriophages (Towner, 1995). Therefore, there is an increased interest within the aquaculture industry in the control or elimination of antimicrobial use. Alternative methods need to be developed to maintain a healthy microbial environment. Two such methods that are gaining acceptance within the industry are the use of probiotic bacteria or prebiotics to control potential pathogens.

During the last decade, several reviews have dealt with the potential of probiotics in aquaculture (Ringsø and Gatesoupe, 1998; Gatesoupe, 1999; Hansen and Olafsen, 1999; Ringsø and Birkbeck, 1999; Gomez-Gill et al., 2000; Verschuere et al., 2000; Gram and Ringsø, 2002; Ringø et al., 2002c). It is therefore a pertinent question whether it is possible to colonize and maintain probiotic bacteria within the digestive tract. This is particularly important when long-term exposure is required for the probiotic effect. However, to date, there is no real evidence demonstrating the preventive effect of probiotics against colonization and adherence of fish pathogenic bacteria in aquaculture. The reason for this may be that the probiotics used are unable to colonize the mucus layer of the digestive tract or external surfaces. Examination of adhesion has become a standard procedure for selecting new probiotic strains for human application (Salminen et al., 1996), but it is less common in aquaculture.

The addition of high doses of probiotic strains (for example, lactic acid bacteria) to established microbial communities of fish provoked a temporary change in the composition of the intestinal microbial community. However, within a few days after administration had stopped, the added strains showed a sharp decrease and were lost from the gastrointestinal tract (Jöborn et al.,
Another way to colonize and increase the population level of beneficial bacteria with antagonistic ability is the use of prebiotics. The modern concept of prebiotics implies the use of selective agents to favour growth of the protective indigenous gut microbiota. Dietary fiber is a prebiotic that belongs to the broad category of carbohydrates. Burkitt et al. (1972) defined dietary fiber as “the sum of polysaccharides and lignin which are not digested by the endogenous secretions of the human gastrointestinal tract.” They can be classified into soluble (e.g., inulin and oligofructose), insoluble (e.g., cellulose) or mixed (e.g., bran). It is well known from endothermic investigations that dietary fibers are fermented by the anaerobic intestinal microbiota, primarily those colonizing the large intestine (Roberfroid, 1993; Gibson et al., 1995; Roberfroid, 1995; Gibson, 1998; Rumessen and Gudmand-Høyer, 1998), leading to the production of lactic acid, short chain fatty acids (SCFA-acetate, propionate, and butyrate) and gases (H₂, CO₂ and CH₄) (Roberfroid, 1993) that are utilized by the host (Schneeman, 1999).

Inulin, is a polydisperse carbohydrate consisting mainly of β (2→1) fructosyl-fructose links, generally referred to as fructan and is found in various edible fruits and vegetables such as wheat, onions, leeks, garlic, asparagus, artichokes and bananas (Roberfroid, 1993; Van Loo et al., 1995). Although inulin is not a natural fiber in fish diet, the prebiotic potential of inulin and other dietary fibers may also have interesting applications in aquaculture. Some information is available about fermentation of inulin by fish gut microbiota, notably, Carnobacterium piscicola (Ringø et al., 1998), C. mobile (Ringø and Olsen, 1999), and Carnobacterium spp. (Ringø and Olsen, 1999; Ringø et al., 2001a). It is also known that dietary inulin resulted in damage to intestinal enterocytes of the salmonid fish Arctic charr (Fig. 7) (Olsen et al., 2001) compared to normal enterocytes (Fig. 8), and that dietary inulin alters the adherent gut microbiota of Arctic charr (Ringø, unpublished results). However, the effect of dietary inulin on fish welfare is not yet known.

Figure 7. The epithelium in the hindgut of Arctic charr (Salvelinus alpinus L.) fed dietary inulin. The cells are highly vacuolated and many of the vacuoles have lamellar content (small arrows) which may be inulin. The apical surface of these cells shows sign of damage including loss of membrane and microvilli (large arrows). (after Olsen et al., 2001)
Figure 8. Epithelial cells in the hindgut of Arctic charr (Salvelinus alpinus L.) fed control diet (dietary dextrin). The columnar cells typically show numerous vacuoles varying in size and electron density (arrows). Cytoplasm, microvilli and intracellular organelles appear normal. In the upper middle part of the field, an effete enterocyting is probably being shed as part of normal epithelial turnover. (after Olsen et al., 2001)
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