

1 A bacteriophage cocktail significantly reduces *Listeria* 2 *monocytogenes* without deleterious impact on the 3 commensal gut microbiota under simulated gastro-intestinal 4 conditions

5 Rasmus Riemer Jakobsen^{1,#}, Jimmy T. Trinh², Louise Bomholtz¹, Signe Kristine Brok-Lauridsen¹
6 ,Alexander Sulakvelidze², and Dennis Sandris Nielsen¹

7 1. Section of Microbiology and Fermentation, Dept. of Food Science, Faculty of Science,
8 University of Copenhagen, Denmark

9 2. Intralytix, Inc., 8681 Robert Fulton Drive, Columbia, MD 21046, USA

10 # Corresponding author. E-mail: rasmus@food.ku.dk, phone: +45 50541606, Address:
11 Rolighedsvej 26, 1958 Frederiksberg C, Copenhagen, Denmark.

12 Running Title: Phages selectively kill *Listeria* in a human gut model

13 Abstract

14 In this study, we examined the effect of a bacteriophage cocktail (tentatively designated FOP, for
15 Foodborne Outbreak Pill) on the levels of *Listeria monocytogenes* in simulated small intestine, large
16 intestine, and Caco-2 model systems. We found that FOP survival during simulated passage of the
17 upper gastrointestinal was dependent on stomach pH, and that FOP robustly inhibited *L.*
18 *monocytogenes* levels with effectiveness comparable to antibiotic treatment (ampicillin) under
19 simulated ileum and colon conditions. FOP did not inhibit the commensal bacteria, whereas ampicillin
20 treatment led to dysbiosis-like conditions. FOP was also more effective than antibiotic in protecting

Caco-2 cells from adhesion and invasion by *L. monocytogenes*, while not triggering an inflammatory response. Our data suggest that FOP may provide a robust protection against *L. monocytogenes* should the bacterium enter the human gastrointestinal tract (e.g., by consumption of contaminated food), without deleterious impact on the commensal bacteria.

Introduction

Antibiotics have been our main tool for the control of bacterial disease since their discovery in the late 1920s. However, their widespread use (and sometimes overuse) has also led to some major unintended consequences, such as increasing prevalence of resistant bacteria (1). In addition to the development of resistance, antibiotic treatment can heavily disrupt the ecology of the human microbiome by collateral damage to the commensal and symbiotic (2). The resulting dysbiosis might in turn increase the risk for developing diseases like obesity, asthma and inflammatory bowel disease (3–5). Consequently, there is an increasing interest in treatments that selectively target pathogenic bacteria, without disturbing the commensal gut microbiota of the gastrointestinal (GI) tract. Phage therapy is one such treatment option being explored, which involves the use of lytic bacteriophages to selectively kill disease-causing bacteria without impacting non-targeted benign bacteria that maybe beneficial for health (6, 7).

Bacteriophages (or “phages” for short) are viruses that attack bacteria in a host-specific manner, acting as self-replicating antimicrobials. Lytic phages replicate through the lytic cycle, where the phage infects the bacterial cell, uses the bacterial replication and translation machinery to replicate, and then lyses the cell to release new phage particles. Phages have the distinct advantage that they are (i) host specific, often only targeting specific strains within a specific species or (more seldom) within a limited number of related species and (ii) unable to infect and replicate in eukaryotic cells. These factors make phage therapy a promising means of targeted bacterial eradication within a microbial population without collateral damage to commensal bacteria (6). Furthermore, the

mechanisms by which antibiotics and phages kill bacteria are fundamentally different, meaning potential bacterial resistances arise differently (8). Consequently, phages can kill bacteria that available antibiotics cannot, and the emergence of resistance to either would likely be mutually exclusive, allowing for the opportunity of phage-antibiotic complementary treatments (9). Phages may also be utilized for biocontrol applications, e.g., where phages are added to food products to reduce contamination with foodborne bacteria and consequent risk of foodborne diseases.

Listeria monocytogenes is a facultative gram-positive bacterium responsible for many cases of food-borne illness, manifesting as gastroenteritis, meningitis, encephalitis, mother-to-fetus infections, and septicemia. Although the annual number of *L. monocytogenes* infections globally is moderate, with 2,502 confirmed cases in the EU in 2017 (10) and an estimated 23,150 global cases in 2010, the mortality rate of infected individuals is considerable at 20-30% (11). The diverse clinical manifestations of *L. monocytogenes* are a result of its ability to enter both macrophages and other cell types, where it can survive and multiply (12). Crossing the epithelial barrier by adhering to and invading intestinal epithelial cells, gaining access to internal organs is the first step towards systemic infection of the host. In severe cases, the pathogen can also cross the blood-brain barrier to infect brain and meninges or cross the placental barrier to infect the fetus.

Preventive or therapeutic use of lytic phages is potentially an attractive approach for enhancing natural gut defenses against pathogenic bacteria such as *L. monocytogenes*, and/or as a complement to the current standard of care for various bacterial infections, including antibiotic treatment (13). For optimal efficacy, orally administered phages must first pass through several harsh environments during GI passage, including low pH in the stomach and pancreatic enzymes and bile salt in the small intestine. All these factors may reduce phage stability, destroying them or rendering them less active. Despite the long history of using phages therapeutically (14), the pharmacokinetics of orally administered phage preparations is still not well understood, and there is striking paucity of data on

the impact GI passage on the phage viability and their ability to lyse their targeted bacteria in the GI tract after such passage.

The goals of this study were to test (i) survivability of phages under conditions mimicking those found in the stomach, (ii) potential of using the FOP bacteriophage cocktail to selectively target *L. monocytogenes* in the gut, using simulated human GI conditions (small and large intestines), and (iii) the ability of the same phage cocktail to protect Caco-2 cells from adhesion and invasion by *L. monocytogenes*.

Materials and methods

Bacteriophage cocktail

The FOP bacteriophage cocktail was created by Intralytix Inc. by combining, in approximately equal concentrations, three FDA-cleared commercial phage preparations currently marketed in the United States for food safety applications: ListShield™ (six phages active against *Listeria monocytogenes*), EcoShield PX™ (three phages active against Shiga toxin producing *E. coli* (STEC)), and SalmoFresh™ (six phages active against *Salmonella enterica*). Therefore, the FOP cocktail contains 15 unique lytic phages which together target *L. monocytogenes*, *Salmonella* spp., and STEC, including O157:H7 strains (**Table S1**). The FOP cocktail in liquid form is a clear to slightly milky in colour aqueous solution (pH 6.5-7.5) that was stored refrigerated (2-8°C) in the dark until use. For the stock FOP solution used in the experiments, the number of viable bacteriophages against *L. monocytogenes* was determined to be 10.83 PFU/ml by plaque assay (15) using *L. monocytogenes* strain LM114 on Luria-Bertani (LB)+ (10 g tryptone/L, 5 g yeast extract/L, 10 g NaCl/L, 0.02 M MgCl₂, 0.001 M CaCl₂, pH = 7.0) 1.5% agar.

Bacterial strains

The *L. monocytogenes* strains, LM114 (serotype 4b) and LM396 (serotype 1/2a), were isolated from food processing plants, and provided by Intralytix. These strains were confirmed to be susceptible to the FOP cocktail via plaque assay (15). Both *L. monocytogenes* strains were propagated in LB broth (10 g tryptone, 5 g yeast extract, 10 g NaCl/L pH = 7.0) at 37°C with shaking (90 rpm). Quantification of all strains was performed via determination of colony forming units on LB agar.

Consortium of small intestinal bacteria

To simulate a normal, healthy, small intestine microbiome, a consortium of 7 bacterial species were selected to represent a healthy ileal microbiota(16, 17) (**Table 1**). All bacteria were acquired from the German Collection of Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (DSMZ) and prepared and enumerated as described previously(18). 1 ml of consortium containing 10^8 CFU ml⁻¹ small intestinal bacteria was added to each TSI reactor.

Table 1. Small intestinal consortium bacterial strains, source, culturing time, and culture media.

Species	Strain source	Origin	Culture time [h]	Culture media
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	DSM 1058	Human origin	24	GAM
<i>Streptococcus salivarius</i>	DSM 20560	Blood	6	GAM
<i>Streptococcus luteinensis</i>	DSM 15350	Human origin	24	GAM
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	DSM 20478	Human faeces	24	GAM
<i>Bacteroides fragilis</i>	DSM 2151	Appendix abscess	24	GAM
<i>Veillonella parvula</i>	DSM 2008	Human intestine	48	GAM
<i>Flavonifractor plautii</i>	DSM 6740	Human faeces	48	GAM

GAM = Gifu Anaerobic Medium. Modified from Cieplak et al. 2018 (18).

104 Small intestinal model system

105 Small intestine in vitro simulation


106 To simulate passage of phages through the human stomach and small intestine, we used a recently
 107 developed dynamic *in vitro* model (TSI) (18), using fed state parameters (1h stomach passage, pH 4,
 108 bile salts = 10 mM, pancreatic juice = 100 U/ml) (18). For preliminary studies of phage viability
 109 during stomach passage, fed state parameters (30 minutes stomach passage at pH 2, bile salts = 4mM,
 110 pancreatic juice = 40 U/ml) were tested for comparison. The TSI model consists of five reactors with
 111 working volumes of 12 ml, each simulating the small intestine of one individual. pH and temperature
 112 were maintained at physiologically relevant levels, while simulated intestinal media, food, bile salts
 113 and digestive enzymes levels were established and maintained to simulate passage through stomach,
 114 duodenum, jejunum and ileum as previously described (18).

115 Bacteriophage impact on *L. monocytogenes* during stomach and small intestine passage

116 At the onset of simulated passage of the upper gastrointestinal tract, TSI reactors were inoculated
 117 with 0.5 ml of the FOP bacteriophage cocktail (10.81 log PFU/ml resulting in 10.03 log PFU/ml in
 118 the reactor) or ampicillin (500 mg/l in final solution), using saline solution (0.5 ml, 0.9% NaCl) as a
 119 control (**Figure 1A**). Before the ileal step 1 ml of *L. monocytogenes* strain LM396 suspension (7 log
 120 CFU/ml and 1ml of small intestinal consortium, was added into each reactor. Samples were taken
 121 from each reactor at the beginning and end of the ileum step and bacterial enumeration was performed
 122 by plate count on Palcam selective agar (19). The simulated small intestinal microbiota was
 123 enumerated using four different culturing media: Palcam Listeria Selective Agar (Palcam selective
 124 agar with Palcam selective supplement, Sigma-Aldrich) for enumeration of *L. monocytogenes*, Violet
 125 Red Bile Agar (VRB, Sigma Aldrich) for enumeration of *E. coli*, M17 Agar (M17, Oxoid) for
 126 enumeration of *Streptococcus* sp., MacConkey Agar (MCC, Sigma-Aldrich) for enumeration of *E.*
 127 *faecalis*, and Gifu Anaerobic Agar (GAM, NISSUI) where all species from the small intestinal

consortium can be cultivated. Experiments were conducted for each preparation in triplicate.

A - Gastric and small intestinal passage



B - Colon passage




Figure 1. Flowchart of the (A) gastric and small intestine (TSI) and (B) colon (CoMiniGut) simulations showing *L. monocytogenes* (blue) and phage cocktail (grey) additions (upwards arrows) and sampling (downwards arrows) time points.

Preliminary experiments to test the persistence of the phage cocktail during gastric and small intestinal transit, and its efficacy under simulated intestinal conditions, were performed using only *L. monocytogenes* and phage cocktail, without adding the small intestinal bacterial consortium. 0.5 ml FOP was added at the beginning of the stomach stage, and samples were taken at the beginning of the jejunum, beginning of ileum, and at the end of the ileum stage (Figure 1A). Samples were diluted in SM buffer, refrigerated and the PFU was determined on the same day.

139 Colon model system

140 Large intestine model system

141 To simulate colonic passage we used the CoMiniGut *in vitro* colon model (20). The CoMiniGut
142 consists of five anaerobic reactors with working volume of 5 ml each. Reactors were filled with basal
143 colon medium mixed with faecal inoculum from an anonymous adult donor (Ethical Committee (E)
144 for the Capital Region of Denmark no. H-20028549) prepared as described (20) previously, and
145 parameters like pH and temperature were monitored and maintained at physiologically relevant levels
146 during simulations. In order to mimic the passage through the colon, pH was continuously controlled
147 and gradually elevated from pH 5.7 to 6.9 over a 24 h period (20). Before the start of the experiment,
148 the pH was adjusted to be 5.7 and anaerobic conditions were confirmed.

149 Impact of the FOP bacteriophage preparation on *L. monocytogenes* and colon microbiome

150 At the start of the experiments, combinations of 0.2 ml of the FOP phage cocktail (10^{10} pFU/ml in
151 the reactors), 10^8 CFU/ml *L. monocytogenes* strain LM 396, 0.5 ug/ml ampicillin or 0.9% saline
152 controls were added and the colon simulation was run as previously described (20). Samples were
153 taken at 3, 6 and 24h (**Figure 1B**). The number of viable *L. monocytogenes* cells was determined by
154 plate count on PALCAM *Listeria* selective agar. To assess the impact of treatments on overall
155 microbial composition samples, total bacterial DNA was extracted and subjected to 16S rRNA gene
156 amplicon sequencing as described below.

157 Sequencing of bacterial community

158 Library Preparation and Sequencing

159 The bacterial community composition was determined by Illumina NextSeq-based high-throughput
160 sequencing (HTS) of the 16S rRNA gene V3-region, according to Krych et al. (21). Briefly, the
161 amplified fragments with adapters and tags were purified and normalized using custom made beads,
162 pooled, and subjected to 150 bp pair-ended Illumina NextSeq (V3 region 16S rRNA) sequencing.

163 The raw dataset containing pair-end reads with corresponding quality scores were merged and
164 trimmed with usearch (22), using the following settings: -fastq_minovlen 100, -fastq_maxee 2.0, -
165 fastq_truncal 4, and -fastq_minlen of 130 bp. De-replicating, purging from chimeric reads, and
166 constructing de-novo zero-radius Operational Taxonomic Units (zOTU) were conducted using the
167 UNOISE pipeline (23) and taxonomically assigned with syntax (24) coupled to the EZtaxon (25) 16S
168 rRNA gene reference database. Sequences are available at the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA)
169 with accession number PRJEB42055, <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena/browser/view/PRJEB42055>.

170 Bioinformatic Analysis

171 Initially the dataset was purged for zOTU's, which were detected in less than 5% of the samples, but
172 the resulting dataset still maintained 98 % of the total reads. Cumulative sum scaling (CSS) (26) was
173 applied for the analysis of beta-diversity to counteract that a few zOTU's represented a majority of
174 count values, since CSS have been benchmarked with a high accuracy for the applied metrics (27).
175 CSS normalisation was performed using the R software using the metagenomeSeq package (28).
176 Alpha-diversity analysis was based on raw read counts, rarified to a median depth of 44574. R version
177 4.01 (29) was used for subsequent analysis and presentation of data. The data and code used is
178 uploaded as supplementary data. The main packages used were phyloseq (30), vegan (31), ggpubr
179 (32) and ggplot2 (33). Beta-diversity was represented by Bray Curtis dissimilarity.

180 Caco-2 intestinal epithelial model

181 Caco-2 cell culturing

182 The human colon adenocarcinoma cell line Caco-2 (ATTC HTB-37, LGC standards, Middlesex, UK)
183 at passage 53 was grown in Dulbecco's Modified Eagles Medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10%
184 (v/v) heat inactivated foetal bovine serum (FBS; Lonza, Basel, Switzerland), 1× Non Essential Amino
185 Acids (NEAA), and 0.1 mg/mL gentamicin. Media was changed 3 times weekly. All solutions were

obtained from Invitrogen, Gibco (Naerum, Denmark). The cells were cultured at 37 °C in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO₂.

Adhesion and invasion assay

Approximately 10⁵ Caco-2 cells were seeded in a 24-well microtiter plate in wells coated with 0.1% gelatin and grown for 14 days in DMEM supplemented with 20% HI-FBS, 10 mM HEPES, and an antibiotic-antimycotic solution (Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific) at 37°C in a humidified atmosphere maintained at 5% CO₂. The medium was changed every 2-3 days. *L. monocytogenes* strain LM 396 was resuspended at 10⁸ CFU/mL in a solution comprising 80% DMEM with 10 mM HEPES and 10% FBS with appropriate amounts of the phage cocktail to achieve a MOI of 10, 100, or 1,000. After 30 min of pre-incubation, the *L. monocytogenes*-phage mixture was added to wells containing the Caco-2 cells and incubated for 1 h. The medium was then removed and saved for plate counting and cytokine measurements. The Caco-2 cells were washed with Dulbecco's PBS (DPBS; Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO). Cells were then either lysed or incubated using DMEM with 10 mM HEPES containing 50 µg/mL gentamicin for 1.5 h. Cells treated with gentamicin were then washed with DPBS and lysed. For selected dilutions of the lysed cells that did not receive gentamicin, the lysed cells that received the antibiotic, or the medium removed prior to the first wash step (for the wells used for both the adhesion and invasion assay and the invasion assay), 100 µl was spread on LB agar plates and incubated at 37°C. After 48 h, the number of *L. monocytogenes* colonies was determined. Each trial was performed in triplicate.

Trans-epithelial resistance (TER) assay

The protective effect of FOP on the epithelial barrier exposed to *L. monocytogenes* was evaluated by measurement of TER using the Millicell Electrical Resistance System (Millipore, Bedford, MA) as previously described (34). To obtain polarized monolayers, Caco-2 cells were seeded onto Transwell filter inserts (0.4 µm pore size, 12 mm inside diameter, polycarbonate; Corning Incorporated,

210 Corning, NY) at a concentration of 2×10^5 cells/ml and cultivated for 14 days, with media change
 211 every 2 days. At 90-95% confluence, cells were moved into a cellZcope 2 next generation impedance-
 212 based cell monitoring unit. Treatments were performed after 2-3 days, once TER reached >1800
 213 Ohm/cm². Overnight cultures of bacteria were suspended in cell growth medium without antibiotics.
 214 A *L. monocytogenes* LM396 suspension in DMEM was added to the apical compartment at
 215 10^6 CFU/ml and incubated in a Forma Series 2 Water-Jacketed CO₂ Incubator (Thermo Fischer,
 216 Waltham, MA) at 37 °C in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO₂. TER was measured before the
 217 addition of the bacteria (time zero) and then at 30 min time intervals and expressed as the ratio of
 218 TER at time t in relation to the initial value (at time zero) for each series. The net value of the TER
 219 was corrected for background resistance by subtracting the contribution of cell free filter and the
 220 medium (150 Ω). The TER of monolayers without added bacteria represented the control for each
 221 experiment. Experiments were performed with triplicate determinations.

222 Statistics


223 R version 4.01 (29) was used for statistics and presentation of data (the data and code used is uploaded
 224 as supplementary material) using the vegan (31), ggpubr (32) and ggplot2 (33) packages. Analysis of
 225 variance (ANOVA) and (permutational ANOVA) permanova was used to evaluate group
 226 comparisons using Tukey's range test and the Bonferroni-Holm method respectively for multiple
 227 testing correction. Significance was determined at $P < 0.05$ level.

228 Results

229 The FOP bacteriophage cocktail selectively reduces *Listeria monocytogenes* in a small intestine *in* 230 *vitro* model

231 The TSI (The Smallest Intestine) model was used to investigate the ability of the bacteriophage
 232 cocktail to endure digestive tract conditions and reduce *L. monocytogenes* levels in the ileum. The
 233 FOP phage cocktail was added before stomach passage, and *L. monocytogenes* was added at the

234 beginning of the Ileum phase of the simulated small intestinal passage (**Figure 2A**). The
 235 bacteriophage cocktail caused a significant 1.5 log reduction in *L. monocytogenes* levels ($q = 0.01$)
 236 after two hours of ileal passage, while other representative ileal bacteria were not significantly
 237 affected (**Figure 2B**). Ampicillin treatment showed a similar 1.5 log reduction of *L. monocytogenes*
 238 ($q = 0.01$), but in contrast to the phage treatment, representative ileal bacteria also showed a 1.5 log
 239 fold reduction on average (**Figure 2B**). The small intestinal simulation was run using “fed” small
 240 intestine conditions (i.e., added food components, stomach pH 4, bile salts = 4mM; pancreatic juice
 241 = 40 U/ml), as stomach pH values of below 3.5 resulted in total phage deactivation (Figure S1). These
 242 “fed state” conditions use adjusted gastric pH values and bile salt concentrations to mimic GI
 243 conditions after a meal (18).



244

245 **Figure 2.** Impact of the FOP bacteriophage cocktail on *L. monocytogenes* in the ileum under
246 simulated small intestinal conditions. A) Overview of experimental setup and sampling. B) Impact of
247 the FOP and ampicillin treatment on *L. monocytogenes* and 7 representative bacterial species (Table
248 1) (6). The simulated small intestinal microbiota was enumerated using four different culturing media:
249 Palcam *Listeria* Selective Agar (Palcam) for enumeration of *L. monocytogenes*, Violet Red Bile Agar
250 (VRB) for enumeration of *E. coli*, M17 Agar (M17) for enumeration of *Streptococcus* sp.,
251 MacConkey Agar (MCC) for enumeration of *E. faecalis*, and Gifu Anaerobic Agar (GAM) where all
252 species from the small intestinal consortium can be cultivated. All experiments were performed in
253 triplicate. Significance calculated using one-way ANOVA using Tukey's range test using non-treated
254 samples with *L. monocytogenes* added as controls. * $q < 0.05$.

The bacteriophage cocktail significantly reduces *L. monocytogenes* in a colon model while preserving bacterial community structure

To test the effect of the FOP phage cocktail on *L. monocytogenes* and the overall bacterial community in the colon, we used the CoMiniGut colon *in vitro* model. Phage cocktail, ampicillin or saline control was added at the start of the experiment, and the model was run for 24 hours to simulate colon passage. Samples treated with the bacteriophage cocktail had a 3-log reduction ($p < 0.01$) in *L. monocytogenes* CFU at 3 hours, and a drastic 5-log reduction ($p < 0.01$) after 24 hours of simulated colon passage (**Figure 3**). Ampicillin treatment resulted in a similar 2-log reduction of *L. monocytogenes* at 3 hours ($p < 0.01$), with a final 5-log reduction ($p < 0.01$) at 24 hours, compared to saline treated control samples.





Figure 3: Impact of the FOP bacteriophage cocktail and ampicillin treatment on *L. monocytogenes* in the CoMiniGut *in vitro* colon model. Bacteria and treatments were added to the CoMiniGut reactors followed by sampling at 3, 6 and 24 hours. Experiments were performed in triplicate, and *L. monocytogenes* was enumerated by plate count on Palcam *Listeria* Selective agar. Significance calculated using one-way ANOVA using Tukey's range test, using samples with *L. monocytogenes* added without treatment as control values. * $q < 0.05$, ** $q < 0.01$, *** $q < 0.001$.

To determine the overall impact of the phage cocktail on the colon bacterial community structure, 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing was performed. While there were shifts in bacterial community

274 composition over time, *L. monocytogenes* was able to persist at relative abundance of approximately
 275 25% throughout the 24 hours of simulated colon passage in non-treated (control) samples (**Figure**
 276 **4A, B**). The measured decrease in the relative abundance *L. monocytogenes* showed a similar trend
 277 to plate count results, with a decrease to 5% relative abundance at 6 hours and below detection limit
 278 (0.1%) at 24 hours (**Fig 4A, B**). No significant effects of treatments were seen on alpha diversity, but
 279 overall, 24-hour samples showed a decrease in alpha diversity (**Fig S2**). Noteworthy, at 24 hours the
 280 bacterial communities treated with the phage cocktail had community structure close to that of the
 281 untreated control (**Figure 4C**), while those treated with ampicillin markedly differed from on-treated
 282 controls ($p = 0.002$) (**Figure 4D**). Addition of *L. monocytogenes* had no significant effect on the
 283 overall bacterial community composition in non- treated samples at 24 hours ($p = 0.24$).



284

285 **Figure 4:** Impact of the FOP bacteriophage cocktail and ampicillin on the bacterial community in the
 286 CoMiniGut *in vitro* colon model, determined by 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing. Bacteria and
 287 treatments were added to the CoMiniGut reactors followed by sampling at 3, 6 and 24 hours. A)
 288 Relative abundance of bacterial genera ordered by average abundance. Legend colour order
 289 corresponds to chart order. B) Relative abundance of *L. monocytogenes* by treatment over 24 hours.
 290 C and D) PCoA plot of Bray-curtis dissimilarity metrics after 24h *in vitro* simulated colon passage

with FOP or ampicillin treatment. Experiments were performed in triplicate and significance calculated using one-way ANOVA using Tukey's range test.

The FOP bacteriophage cocktail significantly reduces *L. monocytogenes* adhesion and invasion of Caco-2 cells

To examine if the FOP phage preparation may have protective effects in the intestine, we used Caco-2 epithelial cell line-based adhesion and invasion assays. Phage cocktail, ampicillin or PBS control was added to DMEM media containing *L. monocytogenes* and pre-incubated for 30 minutes, added to confluent Caco-2 cell monolayers and incubated for one hour. The bacteriophage cocktail resulted in a 5-log reduction ($q < 0.0001$) in both adhesion and invasion of *L. monocytogenes*, while ampicillin treatment only resulted in a 1-log reduction ($q < 0.001$) in adhesion and invasion (**Figure 5 A, B**). The reduction was highly dosage dependant with phage treatment at MOI 10 resulting in 1-log reduction ($p > 0.0001$), while MOI 100 strongly reduced both adhesion and invasion ($p > 0.0001$), and MOI 1000 prevented both adhesion and invasion ($p > 0.0001$) (**Figure 5 C, D**).




Figure 5: Impact of the FOP bacteriophage cocktail and ampicillin treatment on adhesion and invasion on a Caco-2 cell monolayer. Phage cocktail, ampicillin, or PBS control was added to a *L. monocytogenes* suspension in DMEM and pre-incubated for 30 minutes. The pre-incubated mixtures were added to wells and incubated for one hour. A) Adhesion and invasion CFU counts after 1 hour treatment with phage cocktail (MOI 100), ampicillin (500mg/L) or *L. monocytogenes* alone. B) Percentage adhesion and invasion after 1-hour treatment with phage cocktail (MOI 100), ampicillin (500mg/L) or *L. monocytogenes* alone. C) Adhesion and invasion CFU counts after 1 hour treatment with phage cocktail by MOI. D) Percentage adhesion and invasion CFU counts after 1-hour treatment with phage cocktail by MOI. Experiments were performed in triplicate, and *L. monocytogenes* was enumerated by plate count on Palcam *Listeria* Selective agar. Significance calculated using one-way ANOVA using Tukey's range test, using samples with *L. monocytogenes* added without treatment as control values. * $q < 0.05$ – significant, ** $q < 0.01$, *** $q < 0.001$.

Cytokine production and trans-epithelial resistance in Caco-2 cells.

To further assess the protective effect of the phage cocktail on the intestinal epithelium, we measured the cytokine response of Caco-2 cells after one hour of incubation with *L. monocytogenes* with or without 30 minutes of pre-incubation with the phage cocktail. However, we did not measure any cytokine response of neither IFN- γ , IL-1 β , IL-6 nor TNF- α in regardless of treatment, with a detection limit of < 0.22 pg/ml (data not shown). Samples treated with the phage cocktail alone also had no detected effect on cytokine levels.

To measure the ability of the FOP phage cocktail in preserving epithelial integrity, we used a Caco-2 Transwell model to measure the effect on trans-epithelial resistance (TER) after exposure to *L. monocytogenes* with or without pre-incubation with the phage cocktail. Initial experiments showed that *L. monocytogenes* treatment led to a rapid drop in TER after 3 hours, but phage pre-treatment delayed this drop in a dosage dependent manner (**Figure S4A**). However, inspection of the wells after

the experiment revealed an equally dosage dependent drop in pH. After the addition of HEPES buffer to stabilize pH, the drop in TER was delayed until after 24 hours (**Figure S4B**). pH measurements revealed that pH had decreased again at this time. We therefore concluded that *L. monocytogenes* was able to disrupt the integrity of the Caco-2 monolayer only by lowering the pH of media, and not through direct interaction with the cells. FOP appeared to have some dosage effect on preserving epithelial integrity, which was likely due to bacteriophages reducing the levels of and/or slowing the growth of the bacteria, delaying the lowering of pH.

Discussion

In the present study we demonstrate that the FOP bacteriophage cocktail was able to survive gastric passage (under “fed” conditions) and selectively and significantly reduce *L. monocytogenes* in both the ileum and colon during *in vitro* simulated gastrointestinal tract passage. The bacteriophage treatment resulted in a significant reduction (up to 5 logs, $p < 0.01$) of *L. monocytogenes* levels in both the ileum and colon model systems. Similar reductions were achieved by ampicillin treatment. However, the FOP phage cocktail specifically reduced only *L. monocytogenes* levels and had no impact on the commensal bacterial communities, whereas ampicillin indiscriminately affected both *L. monocytogenes* and the commensal bacterial communities.

In the TSI small intestinal *in vitro* model, treatment with the FOP cocktail led to a significant 1.5 log reduction in the *L. monocytogenes* levels during the relatively short 2-hour ileum transit time. In both the ileum and colon systems, the FOP cocktail only reduced *L. monocytogenes*, without an impact on any of the other commensal bacteria included in our system. In contrast, ampicillin treatment led to a significant killing-off of commensal small intestinal bacteria, in addition to a reduction of *L. monocytogenes*. In the CoMiniGut *in vitro* colon model, *L. monocytogenes* CFU counts were significantly reduced by 3 logs after 3 hours, and by 5 logs after 24 hours following bacteriophage

352 treatment. Treatment by FOP did not alter the composition of the existing microbiome, demonstrating
 353 that FOP retains *L. monocytogenes*-specific bactericidal activity within the complex colonic bacterial
 354 community (in addition to *L. monocytogenes*, FOP also targets *Salmonella* spp. and STEC, but
 355 representatives of those pathogens were not included in our *in vitro* system). In the untreated samples,
 356 both CFU/ml and relative abundance of *L. monocytogenes* remained relatively stable over the 24-
 357 hour period. This is in contrast to other studies which have shown that *L. monocytogenes* is able to
 358 disrupt the composition of existing microbiota and infect robustly (35), and that certain probiotic
 359 intestinal species can inhibit the ability of *L. monocytogenes* to invade and grow (36). It is possible
 360 that we did not observe significant interaction between *L. monocytogenes* and colon bacteria because
 361 of the diluted conditions of the TSI and CoMiniGut models relative to the human GI tract.

362 Determination of the adhesion and invasion properties of *L. monocytogenes* to a Caco-2 epithelial
 363 cell monolayer showed that pre-treating *L. monocytogenes* with the FOP had a strong protective
 364 effect. This suggests that a sufficient intestinal bacteriophage concentration could prevent *L.*
 365 *monocytogenes* from invading the epithelial barrier. In support of this, a study using a mouse model
 366 with oral gavage with ListShield™ bacteriophage cocktail (the *L. monocytogenes*-targeting
 367 component of FOP) was able to reduce the concentration of *L. monocytogenes* in the GI tract, as well
 368 as its translocation to the spleen and liver (37). While high dosage / multiplicity of infection (MOI)
 369 appear to be vital for successful bacteriophage treatment (38), production of appropriately high titer
 370 preparations is feasible (39)(38).

371 We did not observe any significant effect of *L. monocytogenes* or the phage cocktail on neither trans-
 372 epithelial resistance (TER), nor cytokine production in the Caco-2 epithelial cell model. Previous
 373 studies have reported that *L. monocytogenes* strains producing listeriolysin O elicited a persistent IL-
 374 6 response (40). We do not know whether the LM396 strain we used during our studies produces
 375 listeriolysin O and/or its expression levels; thus, it is possible that the observed discrepancy between

our study and the previous report (40) on the impact of *L. monocytogenes* on IL-6 production is due to LM396 not producing listeriolysin O or producing it in lower levels compared to the strains used in that previous study. With regards to the FOP phage preparation, our results support the idea that the phage cocktail itself does not provoke inflammatory response from the epithelial cells, as demonstrated by not eliciting IFN- γ , IL-1 β , IL-6 nor TNF- α production in the Caco-2 cells.

Phage treatment is most commonly delivered orally, although many other modes of delivery such as auricular, intravesical, intrapulmonary, rectal, topical, and intravenous have also been used (41). We here show that the component of the bacteriophage cocktail targeting *L. monocytogenes* was able to survive gastric conditions, but only when stomach pH was 4 or above. The acidity of the human stomach is highly variable over time and between individuals, but stomach pH values of 4-5 are representative of conditions after meal ingestion (42). These results agree with the general observation that phage protein structures are acid labile (43, 44). Our data showed that the bacteriophages contained in FOP could survive “fed state” gastric conditions which simulate stomach and small intestinal conditions after a meal. However, phage titers declined more rapidly in the “unfed” gut conditions, suggesting that phage efficacy may be significantly reduced by more acidic stomach conditions. Furthermore, it is possible that some of the GI conditions not examined in our model systems such as intestinal peristalsis, complex microbiota, various diets, etc. may further reduce phage viability – and thus efficacy - *in vivo*. One approach commonly used during therapeutic phage applications in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe (and during some animal studies) was to administer oral phage preparations together or shortly after administering sodium bicarbonate to reduce stomach acidity. Alternatively, there is currently a wide range of encapsulation methods available that could be used to formulate lytic phage preparations in “enteric” gel caps or tablets, to ensure phage survival through the stomach and their release in the intestine (45).

In summary, our data demonstrate that the FOP bacteriophage cocktail is able to (i) endure gastric passage under “fed” conditions, and (ii) significantly reduce *L. monocytogenes* in a highly selective manner under *in vitro* human gastric conditions while having no detectable deleterious effect on the commensal gut microbiota. Furthermore, the data suggest that the phage cocktail has a strong protective effect on adhesion and invasion by *L. monocytogenes* through a Caco-2 monolayer. These results are in agreement with previous reports that FOP can provide robust protection against pathogenic bacteria both *in vivo* (46) and *in vitro* (47), while avoiding detrimental effects on the existing microbiota. Taken together, our data provide further support to the idea that lytic phages may provide some important health benefits, e.g., when consumed as dietary supplements, by enhancing natural defenses of the GI tract against specific foodborne bacterial pathogens. For example, phages with strong lytic potency against *L. monocytogenes* included in the FOP preparation may help increase gut resilience against *L. monocytogenes* by specifically killing these bacteria (and preventing their attachment and invasion into epithelial cells) if they are introduced into the gut via consumption of contaminated food. Such nutraceutical products (FOP or similar) may be taken routinely as a regular gut enhancing supplements, or during outbreaks of foodborne diseases or food recalls caused by bacterial pathogens targeted by the lytic phages in those supplements and may help reduce the risk of foodborne illness caused by major foodborne bacterial pathogens.

Acknowledgements

AS holds an equity stake in Intralytix, Inc. JTT is an employee at Intralytix Inc. Funding for the study was provided by Intralytix, Inc. The phage preparations contained in the FOP are the subject of several issued and pending patent applications.

Literature Cited:

1. Aminov RI. 2010. A brief history of the antibiotic era: Lessons learned and challenges for the

future. *Front Microbiol* 1.

2. Sprenger M, Fukuda K. 2016. New mechanisms, new worries. *Science* (80-). American Association for the Advancement of Science.

3. Yatsunenko T, Rey FE, Manary MJ, Trehan I, Dominguez-Bello MG, Contreras M, Magris M, Hidalgo G, Baldassano RN, Anokhin AP, Heath AC, Warner B, Reeder J, Kuczynski J, Caporaso JG, Lozupone CA, Lauber C, Clemente JC, Knights D, Knight R, Gordon JI. 2012. Human gut microbiome viewed across age and geography. *Nature* 486:222.

4. Ferrer M, Méndez-García C, Rojo D, Barbas C, Moya A. 2017. Antibiotic use and microbiome function. *Biochem Pharmacol*. Elsevier Inc.

5. Francino MP. 2016. Antibiotics and the human gut microbiome: Dysbioses and accumulation of resistances. *Front Microbiol*. Frontiers Media S.A.

6. Cieplak T, Soffer N, Sulakvelidze A, Nielsen DS. 2018. A bacteriophage cocktail targeting *Escherichia coli* reduces *E. coli* in simulated gut conditions, while preserving a non-targeted representative commensal normal microbiota. *Gut Microbes* 9:391–399.

7. Duan Y, Llorente C, Lang S, Brandl K, Chu H, Jiang L, White RC, Clarke TH, Nguyen K, Torralba M, Shao Y, Liu J, Hernandez-Morales A, Lessor L, Rahman IR, Miyamoto Y, Ly M, Gao B, Sun W, Kiesel R, Hutmacher F, Lee S, Ventura-Cots M, Bosques-Padilla F, Verna EC, Abalde JG, Brown RS, Vargas V, Altamirano J, Caballería J, Shawcross DL, Ho SB, Louvet A, Lucey MR, Mathurin P, Garcia-Tsao G, Bataller R, Tu XM, Eckmann L, van der Donk WA, Young R, Lawley TD, Stärkel P, Pride D, Fouts DE, Schnabl B. 2019. Bacteriophage targeting of gut bacterium attenuates alcoholic liver disease. *Nature* 575:505–511.

8. Domingo-Calap P, Delgado-Martínez J. 2018. Bacteriophages: Protagonists of a post-antibiotic era. *Antibiotics* 7:1–16.

- 446 9. Segall AM, Roach DR, Strathdee SA. 2019. Stronger together? Perspectives on phage-
447 antibiotic synergy in clinical applications of phage therapy. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 51:46–50.
- 448 10. ECDC, Stockholm. 2020. Listeriosis, Annual Epidemiological report for 2017. *Surveill Rep*
449 6.
- 450 11. de Noordhout CM, Devleeschauwer B, Angulo FJ, Verbeke G, Haagsma J, Kirk M,
451 Havelaar A, Speybroeck N. 2014. The global burden of listeriosis: A systematic review and
452 meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 14:1073–1082.
- 453 12. Rácz P, Tenner K, Mérö E. 1972. Experimental Listeria enteritis. I. An electron microscopic
454 study of the epithelial phase in experimental listeria infection. *Lab Invest* 26:694–700.
- 455 13. Hernandez-Milian A, Payeras-Cifre A. 2014. What is new in Listeriosis? *Biomed Res Int*
456 2014.
- 457 14. Kortright KE, Chan BK, Koff JL, Turner PE. 2019. Phage Therapy: A Renewed Approach to
458 Combat Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria. *Cell Host Microbe*. Cell Press.
- 459 15. Dulbecco R, Vogt M. 1953. Some problems of animal virology as studied by the plaque
460 technique. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* 18:273–279.
- 461 16. Dlugosz A, Winckler B, Lundin E, Zakikhany K, Sandström G, Ye W, Engstrand L,
462 Lindberg G. 2015. No difference in small bowel microbiota between patients with irritable
463 bowel syndrome and healthy controls. *Sci Rep* 5:8508.
- 464 17. Chung CS, Chang PF, Liao CH, Lee TH, Chen Y, Lee YC, Wu MS, Wang HP, Ni YH. 2016.
465 Differences of microbiota in small bowel and faeces between irritable bowel syndrome
466 patients and healthy subjects. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 51:410–419.
- 467 18. Cieplak T, Wiese M, Nielsen S, Van de Wiele T, van den Berg F, Nielsen DS. 2018. The
468 Smallest Intestine (TSI)-a low volume in vitro model of the small intestine with increased
469 throughput. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 365.

- 470 19. Netten P van, Gaal B van, Mossel DAA. 1991. Selection, differentiation and counting of
471 haemolytic *Listeria* spp. on PALCAM medium. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 12:20–22.
- 472 20. Wiese M, Khakimov B, Nielsen S, Sørensen H, van den Berg F, Nielsen DS. 2018.
473 CoMiniGut—a small volume in vitro colon model for the screening of gut microbial
474 fermentation processes. *PeerJ* 6:e4268.
- 475 21. Krych Ł, Kot W, Bendtsen KMB, Hansen AK, Vogensen FK, Nielsen DS. 2018. Have you
476 tried spermine? A rapid and cost-effective method to eliminate dextran sodium sulfate
477 inhibition of PCR and RT-PCR. *J Microbiol Methods* 144:1–7.
- 478 22. Edgar RC. 2010. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST.
479 *Bioinformatics* 26:2460–2461.
- 480 23. Edgar RC. 2016. UNOISE2: improved error-correction for Illumina 16S and ITS amplicon
481 sequencing. *bioRxiv* 081257.
- 482 24. Edgar R. 2016. SINTAX: a simple non-Bayesian taxonomy classifier for 16S and ITS
483 sequences. *bioRxiv* 074161.
- 484 25. Kim OS, Cho YJ, Lee K, Yoon SH, Kim M, Na H, Park SC, Jeon YS, Lee JH, Yi H, Won S,
485 Chun J. 2012. Introducing EzTaxon-e: A prokaryotic 16s rRNA gene sequence database with
486 phylotypes that represent uncultured species. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 62:716–721.
- 487 26. Paulson JN, Stine OC, Bravo HC, Pop M. 2013. Differential abundance analysis for
488 microbial marker-gene surveys. *Nat Methods* 10:1200–1202.
- 489 27. Weiss S, Xu ZZ, Peddada S, Amir A, Bittinger K, Gonzalez A, Lozupone C, Zaneveld JR,
490 Vázquez-Baeza Y, Birmingham A, Hyde ER, Knight R. 2017. Normalization and microbial
491 differential abundance strategies depend upon data characteristics. *Microbiome* 5:27.
- 492 28. Paulson J. 2014. metagenomeSeq: Statistical analysis for sparse high-throughput sequencing.
493 *BioconductorJp* 1–20.

- 494 29. Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Title. 4.0.1. R Foundation for
495 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 496 30. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. 2013. Phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive
497 Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. PLoS One 8:e61217.
- 498 31. Dixon P. 2003. VEGAN, a package of R functions for community ecology. J Veg Sci.
499 Opulus Press AB.
- 500 32. Kassambara A. “ggplot2” Based Publication Ready Plots [R package ggpubr version 0.4.0].
- 501 33. Wickham H. 2011. ggplot2. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Stat 3:180–185.
- 502 34. Klingberg TD, Pedersen MH, Cencic A, Budde BB. 2005. Application of measurements of
503 transepithelial electrical resistance of intestinal epithelial cell monolayers to evaluate
504 probiotic activity. Appl Environ Microbiol 71:7528–7530.
- 505 35. Quereda JJ, Dussurget O, Nahori MA, Ghazlane A, Volant S, Dillies MA, Regnault B,
506 Kennedy S, Mondot S, Villoing B, Cossart P, Pizarro-Cerda J. 2016. Bacteriocin from
507 epidemic *Listeria* strains alters the host intestinal microbiota to favor infection. Proc Natl
508 Acad Sci U S A 113:5706–5711.
- 509 36. Becattini S, Pamer EG. 2018. Multifaceted defense against *Listeria monocytogenes* in the
510 gastro-intestinal lumen. Pathogens. MDPI AG.
- 511 37. Mai V, Ukhanova M, Visone L, Abuladze T, Sulakvelidze A. 2010. Bacteriophage
512 administration reduces the concentration of *Listeria monocytogenes* in the gastrointestinal
513 tract and its translocation to spleen and liver in experimentally infected mice. Int J Microbiol
514 2010.
- 515 38. Rasmussen TS, Koefoed AK, Jakobsen RR, Deng L, Castro-Mejía JL, Brunse A, Neve H,
516 Vogensen FK, Nielsen DS. 2020. Bacteriophage-mediated manipulation of the gut
517 microbiome - promises and presents limitations. FEMS Microbiol Rev 1–15.

- 518 39. García R, Latz S, Romero J, Higuera G, García K, Bastías R. 2019. Bacteriophage
519 production models: An overview. *Front Microbiol.* Frontiers Media S.A.
- 520 40. Tsuchiya K, Kawamura I, Takahashi A, Nomura T, Kohda C, Mitsuyama M. 2005.
521 Listeriolysin O-induced membrane permeation mediates persistent interleukin-6 production
522 in Caco-2 cells during *Listeria monocytogenes* infection in vitro. *Infect Immun* 73:3869–
523 3877.
- 524 41. Kutter E, Sulakvelidze A. 2004. Bacteriophage therapy in humans *Bacteriophages: Biology*
525 *and Applications.* CRC Press.
- 526 42. Fallingborg J, Christensen LA, Ingeman-Nielsen M, Jacobsen BA, Abildgaard K, Rasmussen
527 HH, Rasmussen SN. 1990. Measurement of gastrointestinal pH and regional transit times in
528 normal children. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 11:211–214.
- 529 43. Watanabe R, Matsumoto T, Sano G, Ishii Y, Tateda K, Sumiyama Y, Uchiyama J, Sakurai S,
530 Matsuzaki S, Imai S, Yamaguchi K. 2007. Efficacy of bacteriophage therapy against gut-
531 derived sepsis caused by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in mice. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*
532 51:446–452.
- 533 44. Ly-Chatain MH. 2014. The factors affecting effectiveness of treatment in phages therapy.
534 *Front Microbiol.* Frontiers Media SA.
- 535 45. Malik DJ, Sokolov IJ, Vinner GK, Mancuso F, Cinquerrui S, Vladislavljevic GT, Clokie
536 MRJ, Garton NJ, Stapley AGF, Kirpichnikova A. 2017. Formulation, stabilisation and
537 encapsulation of bacteriophage for phage therapy. *Adv Colloid Interface Sci.* Elsevier B.V.
- 538 46. Dissanayake U, Ukhanova M, Moye ZD, Sulakvelidze A, Mai V. 2019. Bacteriophages
539 Reduce Pathogenic *Escherichia coli* Counts in Mice Without Distorting Gut Microbiota.
540 *Front Microbiol* 10:1–13.
- 541 47. Moye ZD, Woolston J, Abbeele P Van den, Duysburgh C, Verstrepén L, Marzorati M,

542 Sulakvelidze A. 2019. A Bacteriophage Cocktail Eliminates Salmonella Typhimurium from
 543 the Human Colonic Microbiome while Preserving Cytokine Signaling and Preventing
 544 Attachment to and Invasion of Human Cells by Salmonella In Vitro. J Food Prot 82:1336–
 545 1349.
 546