microbial biotechnology

Open Access

Coverage of diarrhoea-associated *Escherichia coli* isolates from different origins with two types of phage cocktails

Gilles Bourdin,¹ Armando Navarro,² Shafiqul A. Sarker,³ Anne-C. Pittet,¹ Firdausi Qadri,³ Shamima Sultana,³ Alejandro Cravioto,^{2,3} Kaisar A. Talukder,³ Gloria Reuteler¹ and Harald Brüssow^{1*}

¹Nutrition and Health Department, Nestlé Research Center, Lausanne, Switzerland

²Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico, Mexico

³International Center for Diarrheal Disease Research, Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Summary

Eighty-nine T4-like phages from our phage collection were tested against four collections of childhood diarrhoea-associated Escherichia coli isolates representing different geographical origins (Mexico versus Bangladesh), serotypes (69 O, 27 H serotypes), pathotypes (ETEC, EPEC, EIEC, EAEC, VTEC, Shigella), epidemiological settings (community and hospitalized diarrhoea) and years of isolation. With a cocktail consisting of 3 to 14 T4-like phages, we achieved 54% to 69% coverage against predominantly EPEC isolates from Mexico, 30% to 53% against mostly ETEC isolates from a prospective survey in Bangladesh. 24% to 61% against a mixture of pathotypes isolated from hospitalized children in Bangladesh, and 60% coverage against Shigella isolates. In comparison a commercial Russian phage cocktail containing a complex mixture of many different genera of coliphages showed 19%, 33%, 50% and 90% coverage, respectively, against the four

Received 31 October, 2013; revised 18 December, 2013; accepted 18 December, 2013. *For correspondence. E-mail harald.bruessow@ rdls.nestle.com; Tel. (+0041) 21 785 8676; Fax (+0041) 21 785 8544. *Microbial Biotechnology* (2014) **7**(2), 165–176 doi:10.1111/1751-7915.12113

Funding Information Laboratory work in Mexico was performed at Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and supported by grants from PAPIIT/DGAPA N218311 project, UNAM. The research activity at icddr,b was funded by Nestle Research Centre, Lausanne, Switzerland (icddr,b GR 651/6 (R-1). icddr,b acknowledges with gratitude the commitment of Nestlé Research Centre, Lausanne, Switzerland to its research efforts.

above-mentioned collections. Few O serotypespecific phages and no broad-host range phages were detected in our T4-like phage collection. Interference phenomena between the phage isolates were observed when constituting larger phage cocktails. Since the coverage of a given T4-like phage cocktail differed with geographical area and epidemiological setting, a phage composition adapted to a local situation is needed for phage therapy approaches against *E. coli* pathogens.

Introduction

The antibiotic crisis has rekindled the interest in phage therapy approaches that were developed in Eastern Europe (Brüssow, 2012). Phage therapy has theoretical advantages over antibiotic therapy. Phage is a selfamplifiable antibacterial agent that increases in titer only when it meets in vivo its target (Payne et al., 2000). Phage is guickly eliminated from the body in the absence of the pathogen as shown in pioneer work in mice (Merril et al., 1996) and later in humans (Bruttin and Brüssow, 2005). In addition, phages are mostly species-specific bacterial viruses. Exceptions are phages infecting Listeria innocua and Listeria monocytogenes or Salmonella and Escherichia coli (Santos et al., 2010). Consequently, and in notable contrast to antibiotics, no collateral damage on the commensal microbiota is to be expected. However, the full scale of ecological relationships between coexisting bacterial species in a given microbial community is quite complex and is not fully described or understood yet. Data from human healthy subjects do not suggest phageinduced gut microbiota changes induced by oral phage (Sarker et al., 2012; McCallin et al., 2013). The specificity of phages has also a downside: many phages are not only species-specific, but are also strain-specific. This property becomes a coverage problem when phage therapy targets a disease caused by a complex pathogen like diarrhoea-associated E. coli, which is represented pathotypes and bv many different serotypes (Chibani-Chennoufi et al., 2004a,b). The constitution of complex phage cocktails then becomes also a commercial problem of producing a standardized preparation. For some bacterial pathogens, broad host-range phages have

© 2014 The Authors. *Microbial Biotechnology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd and Society for Applied Microbiology. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

been described (Salmonella: Santos et al., 2010; Staphylococcus aureus: Kelly et al., 2011). However, no such broad host-range phages have so far been isolated for E. coli. Recent data suggest that coliphage phi92, isolated from an encapsulated K1 E. coli strain and belonging to the novel genus of rv5-like phages, might have a broad host range (Schwarzer et al., 2012) like the multivalent Salmonella phage PVP-SE1 infecting both Salmonella and E. coli (Santos et al., 2010). These phages have not vet been tested against large collections of pathogenic E. coli strains. Phage therapy against E. coli must therefore rely on phage cocktails. The structure of host-phage interaction matrices has recently become an active research area (Flores et al., 2011; Weitz et al., 2013). Different types of interaction were identified: specialist phages that may infect a unique host leading to a nearly diagonal matrix when columns indicate phage and rows host isolates; phage-host interactions that may describe block-like matrices, which exhibit high degrees of modularity: generalist phages and phage-host interaction that are random.

For regulatory reasons, we worked with a cocktail containing only a single phage genus, reasoning that it might be easier to demonstrate safety for a single phage group than for a cocktail containing numerous different phage genera. We settled for the T4-like genus of Myoviridae (Bruttin and Brüssow, 2005; Sarker et al., 2012) because professional virulent phages that destroy the host genome during the infection process are considered by many researchers as best candidates for phage therapy (Brüssow, 2012). Early on, it was reported that T4-like phages recognize lipopolysaccharides (LPS) in the outer membrane of E. coli (O antigens) as primary phage receptors (Tamaki et al., 1971). However, LPS synthesizing genes represent a hotspot of genetic diversity in E. coli (Heinrichs et al., 1998). In fact, the specificity of LPS became the basis for the definition of more than 150 different O serotypes, although not all O serotypes are encountered in pathogenic E. coli (Robins-Browne, 1987). If LPS is the receptor for T4-like phages on E. coli, one would predict problems for achieving high coverage of a phage cocktail against diarrhoea-associated E. coli. Other researchers identified the outer membrane protein OmpC as receptor (Hashemolhosseini et al., 1994; Yu et al., 2000) for T4 phages. Since this gene is well conserved across different genera of Enterobacteriaceae when using the E. coli K-12 gene in BLAST searches, multivalent T4-like phages should be expected. In the present report, we explored the coverage of phage cocktails composed of T4-like phages against E. coli isolates from different epidemiological settings compared with a commercial Russian phage cocktail containing many different genera of coliphages (McCallin et al., 2013). We conclude that pathogen coverage is dependent on the epidemiological context requiring flexible and locally adapted phage cocktails.

Materials and methods

Phages

Our T4-like phage collection was described in Sarker and colleagues (2012), and the commercial Russian ColiProteus phage cocktail from Microgen (product number 460502100204; batch numbers 16/ 0905/09. 06 and 3/0307/03. 09) was described in McCallin and colleagues (2013). ColiProteus contains phages directed against *Proteus* and *E. coli*. Sextaphage was another commercial phage cocktail from Microgen (product number 4602784002612 batch numbers 531/ 0211 /III 13 and 196–17 /1205/I 08). Sextaphage (also called Pyobacteriophage Polyvalent by Microgen) contains phages directed against six pathogens: *Staphylococcus aureus, Streptococcus pyogenes, Proteus mirabilis* and *Proteus vulgaris, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Klebsiella pneumoniae*, and *E. coli*.

Phage propagation and lysis tests

The test phages were propagated on the E. coli strain K-12 derivative K803, which lacks prophage lambda, obtained from E. Kutter, Evergreen College, Olympia, Wa, USA. Luria-Bertani (LB) broth was inoculated with 1% of an overnight bacterial culture and incubated at 37°C for 2 h to reach 1×10^8 cfu/ml. Phage lysate was added to the culture to get 1 to 5×10^8 pfu/ml and the infected culture was incubated at 37°C for 3 to 5 further hours with agitation (100 r.p.m.). After removal of bacterial cells and cellular debris by centrifugation for 15 min at 14 000 \times g and passing the lysate through a 0.22 μ m Millipore filter, the phage titers in the lysates were determined by the plaque assay as described previously (Bruttin and Brüssow, 2005). In small experimental series 100 μ l of an appropriate phage dilution and 100 μ l of an exponentially growing test pathogenic E. coli culture to achieve an moi of 3 were incubated at 37°C in 10 ml tubes containing LB broth, and the OD development was read at different time points against the uninfected test cell as control. For larger experimental series (100 phage isolates against about 100 E. coli isolates at three moi in duplicates resulting in 60 000 tests) we used the microtiter lysis test; 96-well plates with 10 µl of centrifugation-cleared and sterile-filtered (0.22 um pore size) phage lysate and 180 µl of fresh LB broth were inoculated with 20 µl of the test E. coli target strains to obtain an moi of 0.1, 0.01 and 0.001 respectively. The plate was incubated at 37°C for 4 h under agitation (200 r.p.m.). Every hour the OD₅₉₅ was meas-

167 G. Bourdin et al.

ured in a Dynex reader (MRX model, Magellan Biosciences, Chantilly, VA). The *E. coli* strain without phage and non-inoculated LB medium were used as positive and negative controls respectively.

E. coli strains from Mexico

Several hundred E. coli test strains were collected between 1985 and 2003 from children who experienced an episode of diarrhoea in two regions of Mexico (Mexico City and the State of Morelos). Eighty-nine strains representing the diversity of O and H serotypes encountered were selected for phage susceptibility testing. The E. coli strains isolated from children in the State of Morelos belonged to a field study reported previously (Cravioto et al., 1990). In short, the isolates were characterized as E. coli strains by the Vitek automated bacterial identification system from BioMérieux. The strains were then serotyped by agglutination assays (Ørskov and Ørskov, 1984) using 96-well microtitre plates and rabbit serum (SERUNAM) obtained against 187 somatic antigens and 53 flagellar antigens for E. coli, as well as against 45 somatic antigens for Shigella species. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays were used to determine the presence of virulence genes with primers specified in Supplementary Table 1. The presence of the following genes was investigated: for enteropathogenic E. coli (EPEC), intimin gene (eae) (Karch et al., 1993) and bundle forming pilus (bfp) gene (Gunzburg et al., 1995); for enterotoxigenic E. coli (ETEC), heat-labile enterotoxin LTh (Schultsz et al., 1994), heat-stable enterotoxins STh and STp genes (Schultsz et al., 1994); and for enterohemorrhagic E. coli (EHEC), the Shiga-like toxin Stx genes (Pollard et al., 1990). The bacterial strains were stored at -20°C on 'Protect Bacterial Preservers' beads (Technical Service Consultants, Lancashire, UK).

E. coli strains from Bangladesh

A prospective community-based study was conducted in an urban slum in Mirpur, Dhaka, Bangladesh, from April 2002 to October 2004. Pregnant mothers were screened and 300 newborn children were followed prospectively for diarrhoeal diseases (Qadri *et al.*, 2007). *E. coli* colonies were isolated as described previously (Albert *et al.*, 1995; Qadri *et al.*, 2000). In case of diarrhoea, six lactose-fermenting *E. coli* colonies from MacConkey agar were inoculated on GM1-coated microtiter plates containing LB broth for 18 h. The supernatant was tested for ST using an inhibition ELISA procedure (Svennerholm *et al.*, 1986) and for LT by using an anti-LT monoclonal antibody (Svennerholm and Wiklund, 1983). ETEC strains were cultured on CF antigen agar (McConnell *et al.*, 1989) and tested for the expression of CFA/I, CS1 to CS8, CS12, CS14, CS17, CS19, and CS21 by monoclonal antibody-based dot blot assay (Qadri *et al.*, 2000).

Results

E. coli pathogens from a community survey of childhood diarrhoea in Mexico

Since LPS, the chemical determinant of the somatic O antigen, was identified as receptor for T4-like phages on E. coli cells by some authors (Tamaki et al., 1971; Thomassen et al., 2003), we first tested our T4-like phage collection against a collection of O serotype-defined, diarrhoea-associated E. coli strains. E. coli strains were isolated from children with diarrhoea living in two regions of Mexico (Cravioto et al., 1990). From this collection, we chose 89 E. coli strains for screening against our T4-like phage collection (Table 1). The test E. coli strains represented 69 different O serotypes. Six O serotypes were associated with two or three different H serotypes. Overall, 26 different H serotypes were observed, several H serotypes were associated with up to 4 O serotypes (the strains were selected for maximal serotype diversity). Fifty isolates showed the EPEC-specific *eae1* gene. Only three of them also showed the *bfp* gene characterizing them as classical EPEC strains, making the majority of the Mexican isolates atypical EPEC. Fourteen isolates showed enterotoxin genes - the most prevalent combination were strains with STh+LTh genes (n = 7). Only few strains showed STp+LTh gene combination (n = 2), only LTh (n=2), only STp (n=2) and STp+STh+LTh genes (n = 1). Compared to the 50 EPEC isolates, only 14 isolates were thus diagnosed as ETEC strains. Shiga-like toxin was found in a single isolate.

Coverage of the Mexican E. coli pathogens with coliphages

The susceptibility of the individual 89 *E. coli* strains for the 98 T4-like phages from our collection (Sarker *et al.*, 2012) was tested in a lysis test at three different multiplicities of infection (moi = 0.1, 0.01, 0.001). The lytic effect of the phage was rated according to the observed lysis: grades 1, 2 and 3 lysis represented growth inhibition only at the highest moi, at two and all three moi levels, respectively (Fig. 1). Most T4-like phages had only a narrow host range on the 89 serotyped test strains, but no clear correlation with O serotypes was seen (data not shown). A few phage isolates lysed many *E. coli* strains independent of the O serotype (Supplementary Table 2). The T4-like phage with the broadest host range showed lytic activity on 44 bacterial strains (49% of the total). When combining three T4-like phages with the broadest individual host

Table 1. Host-range determination of different T4-like coliphage cocktails and a commercial Russian phage cocktail on a collection of *E. coli* strains isolated from children with diarrhoea in Mexico.

OitHAS oad1 1 1 2 1 C2:H4 eee1 3 1 1 1 1 C2:H4 eee1 3 3 2 3 1 2 C3:H16 STh, LTN 3 3 2 3 1 1 OS:H17 STN, LTN 3 3 1 1 1 OS:H17 STN, LTN 3 3 1 1 1 OS:H17 STN, LTN 3 1	O:H type	VF	N 1-p	N 3-p	N 6-p	N 9-p	Micro	N 10-p
OthHs 	O1:H45	eae1				2		
O2:144earl332311O5:H11D/p332312O6:H-D/p33122O6:H-D/p3112O6:H-D/p31121O6:H-D/p3311O6:H-D/p3311O6:H-D/p3311O7:H-Bear2331O7:H-Bear23311O7:H-Bear11111O7:H-Bear11111O7:H-Bear11111O7:H-Bear111122O7:H-Bear1112211O7:H-Bear1112211O7:H-Bear1112211O7:H-Bear11112211O7:H-13331112111211111111111111111111111111111 </td <td>O1:H45</td> <td>eae1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>1</td>	O1:H45	eae1	1	1	1	3		1
Odd/Hife ever/ I 1 05H11 bbp 3 3 1 2 2 05H16 STh, LTh 3 1 2 2 05H19 STh, LTh 3 1 2 2 05H20 STh, LTh 3 1 2 3 3 05H147 STh, LTh 3 2 1 1 1 05H21 eaer 2 3 3 1 1 011147 eaer 2 3 3 1 1 011147 n1 3 1 2 1 3 3 1 011147 n1 3 1 2 1 3 3 1 1 011147 eaer 1 1 3 3 1 1 011147 eaer 1 3 3 3 1 1 022113 eaer 3	O2:H4	eae1	3					
DS:H11 bhp 3 3 2 3 1 2 OB:H+ BTh, ITh 3 1 2 3 1 1 OB:H+ BTh, ITh 3 1 2 3 1 1 OB:H-1 STh, ITh 3 1 2 3 1 1 OB:H-1 STh, ITh 3 1 2 3 3 1 1 OB:H-17 met 2 3 3 1 2 3 1 1 O111H-7 met 2 1 3 3 3 1 1 O111H-7 met 2 1 3 3 3 1 1 O111H-7 met 2 1 3 3 3 1 1 O11H-7 met 1 1 1 3 3 1 1 O11H-7 eet 1 3 3 <td>O4:H16</td> <td>eae1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	O4:H16	eae1				1	1	
Ock-He Sh, LTh 3 1 2 2 Ock-He 00-0 2 3 1 1 Ock-He STh, LTh 3 1 1 Ock-He STh, LTh 3 1 1 Ock-He STh, LTh 3 3 1 1 Ock-He STh, LTh 3 3 1 1 Oth-He aear 2 3 3 1 Oth-He aear 1 2 1 1 Oth-He aear 1 1 2 1 Oth-He aear 1 1 2 1 Oth-He aear 1 1 3 1 Oth-He aear 1 1 3 1 Oth-He aear 1 1 3 3 1 Oth-He aear 1 1 3 3 1 1 Oth-He	O5:H11	bfp	3	3	2	3	1	2
Och++ ead / 2 3 3 1 1 Och+4 STh, LTh 3 -	O6:H16	STh, LTh	3	3	1	2		2
Obi+H STh, LTh 3 OBi+H1 nt 2 3 3 Olish-1 2 3 3 1 Olish-2 3 3 1 1 Olish-4 acal 2 3 3 1 Olish-1 acal 1 2 1 1 Olish-1 acal 1 2 3 1 1 Olish-1 acal 1 1 1 2 1 1 Olish-1 acal 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 2 1 3 1	O6:H-	eae1		2	3	3	1	1
OB:H- STh, LTh 3 OB:H21 nt 1 OB:H25 nt 1 OI1:H- eaa1 2 3 OI1:H- eaa1 2 3 OI1:H- nt 3 1 2 OI1:H- nt 3 1 2 1 OI1:H- nt 3 1 2 1 1 OI1:H- nt 3 1 2 1 1 OIS:H3 ear1 2 1 3 1 2 OIS:H4 ear1 3 1 1 3 1 C2:H1 nt 3 2 3 3 1 C2:H1 nt 3 3 3 3 1 C2:H1 eaa1 3 3 3 3 3 1 C2:H1 eaa1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	O8:H9	STh, LTh	3					
Odd:H11 nt 2 011:H27 ete1 2 3 3 011:H ete1 2 3 3 011:H nt 3 1 2 2 011:H nt 3 1 2 1 1 011:H nt 3 1 2 1 1 011:H nt 3 1 2 1 1 011:H nt 2 1 3 3 1 01:H nt 2 1 3 3 1 1 01:H ete1 1 1 1 3 1 2 01:H ete1 3 1 1 3 3 1 2 02:H ete1 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 02:H ete1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	08:H-	STh, LTh	3					
Ody-122 nt 1 011:H-7 eee1 2 3 3 011:H-1 eae1 2 3 3 011:H-1 nt 3 1 2 1 011:H-1 nt 3 1 2 1 1 011:H-7 nt 3 1 2 1 1 1 011:H-7 nt 3 1 2 1 3 1 1 01:H-7 etae1 3 1 2 3 3 1 1 01:H-7 etae1 3 1 1 3 1 2 01:He7 etae1 3 2 3 3 1 2 01:He7 etae1 3 2 3 3 1 2 02:H11 etae1 3 3 3 3 1 1 02:H11 etae1 3 3 3 <	O8:H11	nt	2					
O1112// ead1 2 3 3 O113+- nt 3 1 2 2 O113+- nt 3 1 2 1 1 O113+- nt 3 1 2 1 1 O113+0 nt 3 3 3 1 1 O113+10 nt 2 1 3 3 1 1 O15416 ead1 1 3 3 3 1 2 O15416 nad1 1 3 3 3 1 2 O186C+1 ead1 3 1 1 3 3 1 2 O22H1 ead1 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 2 1 0 <td>O9:H25</td> <td>nt</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	O9:H25	nt	1					
Offith- debt 2 3 3 Offith nt 3 1 2 1 1 Offith nt 3 1 2 1 1 Offith eef - - 3 3 1 Offith nt 3 1 2 3 3 1 Offith nt 3 1 2 3 3 1 Offith aeaf 1 1 1 2 3 1 Offith eaef 1 3 3 1 2 3 1 O22H1 nt 3 3 3 3 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 0 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td>011:H2/</td> <td>eae1</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td>	011:H2/	eae1		2	3	3		
Diff.** nt 3 1 2 2 1 1 Off-hild nt 3 3 3 1 1 Off-hild nt 3 1 1 1 1 1 Off-hild nt 2 1 3 3 1 1 Off-hild nt 2 1 3 3 1 1 2 Off-hild eaef 1 1 1 3 1 2 Off-hild eaef 1 3 3 3 1 2 Off-hild nt 3 2 3 3 3 1 O22H11 eaef 3 3 3 3 3 1 O26H1 eaef 3 3 3 3 3 3 O26H2 eaef 2 3 3 3 3 3 O26H2 eaef 2	011:H-	eael	0	2	3	3		
Dilnin In 3 2 1 1 Off-H10 nt 3 1 2 3 1 Off-H18 eaef 1 3 1 2 3 1 Off-H2 eaef 1 1 1 2 3 1 Off-H2 eaef 1 1 1 2 3 1 Off-H2 eaef 3 1 1 3 1 O22H1 aeef 1 3 3 3 1 O22H1 aeef 3 3 3 3 3 1 O22H1 aeef 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O25H4 naeef 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 O28H9 aaef 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O38H9 aaef 1 1		nt	3	I	2	2		1
Diff.nit0 nt 3 3 1 D15H18 naar 1 3 3 1 D15H1 nt 2 1 3 3 1 D15H7 aaar 1 1 2 3 1 D16H7 aaar 1 1 1 2 3 1 D16H7 aaar 3 1 1 3 1 2 D18acH- aaar 1 3 3 3 1 2 D22H1 nt 1 3 3 3 3 1 D22H1 eeef 3 3 3 3 3 1 D2EH4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 D2EH4 eeef 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 D2BH12 eeef 2 3 3 3 3		nt	3		2			1
Olshin mean 1 3 1 2 3 3 1 015H32 nt 3 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 015H32 nt 1 1 1 1 2 3 1 016kH7 eae1 3 1 1 3 1 2 018kH3 eae1 3 2 3 3 1 1 022H1 nt 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 025H4 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 025H4 eae1 3		nii 0201	3		3	3		I
Oldsing m 2 1 3 1 2 3 1 016HP eaef 1 1 1 3 1 016HP eaef 3 1 1 3 1 016HP eaef 3 1 1 3 1 020H13 eaef 3 2 3 3 1 022H1 nt 3 3 3 3 1 025H4 eaef 3 3 3 3 3 1 025H1 eaef 3 1 2 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 025H6 nt 1 1 2 1 3	015.010	eae i nt	2	1	3	3		1
OTE+TO east I	015:H32	nt	2	1	2	3		
OTBACH- O22H13 east 3 1 1 3 1 022H13 east 3 2 3 3 1 022H13 022H14 1 3	016·H?	eae1	0	1	1	1		2
O20-1113 each 0 1 <th< td=""><td>018ac:H-</td><td>eae1</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>·</td><td>3</td><td>1</td></th<>	018ac:H-	eae1	3	1	1	·	3	1
023:H1 nt 1 3 1 3 1 023:H15 eae1 3 2 3 3 3 2 025:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 025:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 025:H4 nt 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 025:H4 nt 1 3	O20:H13	eae1	0	·	1	1	0	•
025:H15 eaef 3 2 3 3 025:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 1 025:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 1 026:H1 eaef 3 3 3 2 1 026:H8 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 027:H20 STp 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 028:H9 eaef 3 1 1 1 5 3 <	O22:H1	nt			1	3		1
O25:H- eae1 1 3 3 3 O25:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 1 O25:H4 nt 1 1 1 1 1 O26:H1 eae1 3 1 2 1 1 O27:H2O STp 1 3 3 3 3 3 O28:H4 eae1 3 1 2 1 </td <td>O23:H15</td> <td>eae1</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td>	O23:H15	eae1	3	2	3	3		
Q25:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 Q26:H3 nt 1 3 3 3 2 1 Q26:H4 nt 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 Q28ac bfp 3 1 1 1 2 3 <td>O25:H-</td> <td>eae1</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td>	O25:H-	eae1		1	3	3		
O26.H11 eacl 3 3 2 1 O26.H8 nt 1 1 1 1 O27.H20 STp 1 3 3 3 3 3 O28.H21 eacl 3 1 2 1 1 1 O28.H21 eacl 3 3 3 3 3 3 O39.H12 eacl 3 3 3 3 3 3 O45.H- eacl 2 3 3 2 1 1 O45.H30 nt 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 O45.H40 eacl 3 3 3 3 1 1 1 O75.H5 eacl 1 1 3 3 3 2 0 O86.H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 2 0 O86.H18 eac	O25:H4	nt	3	3	3	3	3	1
C2E1H8 nt 1 3 3 3 3 C2TH20 bfp 3 1 2 1 2 C2Bac bfp 3 1 2 1 2 C2BH21 eae1 3 1 1 1 2 3 C38:H9 eae1 2 3 3 2 1 C38:H9 eae1 2 3 3 2 1 C45:H- eae1 1 1 1 1 1 1 C45:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 C63:H- eae1,bfp 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 C76:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 C86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 2 2 C90:H26 STh, LTh 1 1 <t< td=""><td>O26:H11</td><td>eae1</td><td></td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td></td><td>1</td></t<>	O26:H11	eae1		3	3	2		1
027.H20 STp 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 028ac bfp 3 1 2 1 7 028.H21 eae1 3 1 1 7 7 038.H19 eae1 2 3 3 3 2 1 038.H12 eae1 2 3 3 2 1 7 045.H4 eae1 3 1 1 1 1 7 7 045.H6 eae1 3 3 3 3 1 1 1 055.H6 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 078.H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 078.H10 STp, LTh, eae1 1 3 3 3 3 2 2 086.H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 0101.H2 STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 <td>O26:H8</td> <td>nt</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	O26:H8	nt			1			
O28ac bfp 3 1 2 1 029:H21 eae1 3 1 1 1 O29:H21 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 039:H12 eae1 2 3 3 2 1 045:H- eae1 3 3 2 1 045:H- eae1 3 3 2 1 045:H- eae1 3 3 3 1 1 053:H6 eae1 3 3 3 3 1 1 053:H6 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 075:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 075:H6 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 2 06:H18 eae1 1 0 0 2 0 0 2 0 0	O27:H20	STp	1	3	3	3		3
O29:H21 eae1 3 1 1 O38:H9 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 O38:H12 eae1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 O45:H- eae1 2 3 3 2 1 O45:H6 eae1 3 3 3 2 1 O55:H6 eae1 1 1 1 1 1 1 O53:H- eae1,bfp 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O80:H26 STp, LTh, 6ae1 1 3 3 3 3 3 2 O84:H2 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 2	O28ac	bfp	3	1	2	1		
O38:H9 eae1 3	O29:H21	eae1	3	1	1			
O39:H12 eae1 2 3 3 2 1 O45:H- eae1 3 1 1 1 1 1 O55:H6 eae1 3 3 3 3 1 1 O55:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 O78:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 O78:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O84:H7 eae1 1 <td>O38:H9</td> <td>eae1</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>3</td>	O38:H9	eae1	3	3	3	3		3
O48:H- eae1 2 3 3 2 1 O48:H30 nt 1 1 1 1 1 O55:H6 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 O63:H- eae1,b/p 1 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 O76:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 O78:H5 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 O78:H6 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O80:H26 STp, LTh,eae1 1 0 2 0 3 3 3 2 O86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 O100:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 1 1 O103:H4 eae1 2 3 3 3	O39:H12	eae1			2	1		
O48:H30 nt 1 1 1 1 O55:H6 eae1,bfp 1 3 3 3 1 1 O55:H6 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 O78:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 O78:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 O80:H26 STp, LTh,eae1 1 - </td <td>O45:H-</td> <td>eae1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>1</td>	O45:H-	eae1	2	3	3	2		1
O55:H6 eae1 3 063:H- eae1,bfp 1 3 3 1 1 075:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 1 1 078:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 078:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 078:H2 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 080:H26 STp, LTh, eae1 1 0	O48:H30	nt		1	1	1		
O63:H- eael, bip 1 3 3 3 3 O75:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 O75:H5 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 1 1 O80:H26 STp, LTh, eae1 1<	O55:H6	eae1	3					
07/5:H5 eae1 1 1 3 3 1 1 078:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 1 1 078:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 1 1 078:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 080:H26 STp, LTh, eae1 1	O63:H-	eae1,bfp	1	3	3	3		
078:H10 SIh, Lin 3 3 3 3 3 078:H10 STh, LTh 3 3 3 3 1 080:H26 STp, LTh, eae1 1	075:H5	eae1	1	1	3	3	1	1
O78:III0 S1I, LIII 3 3 3 3 1 080:H26 STp, LTh,eae1 1	078:H10	SIN, LIN	3	3	3	3		4
Cool.n26 Sip. Lin.ede'r 1 082:H8 eae1 1 084:H? eae1 3 3 3 3 2 086:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 086:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 086:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 2 088:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 2 010:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 010:H43 eae1 1 2 3 2 0103:H- STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 0104:H- eae1 2 2 3 3 2 0103:H- STh, LTh 1 2 2 3 3 1 0105ab:H5 bfp 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0111:he:H- eae1 2 3 3 3 3 3 0113:H21		SIN, LIN STR ITh cool	4	3	3	3		I
Odd: H0 eae1 1 O85:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 O86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 O100:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 2 3 2 2 O103:H- STh, LTh 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>STP, LITI, eae I</td><td>I</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>		STP, LITI, eae I	I					
OBS:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 O86:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 O88:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 3 2 O100:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 2 3 2 2 O103:H3 eae1 1 2 3 3 2 2 O104:H- eae1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O105ab:H5 bfp 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O112a:H9 eae1 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O113:H2 LTh 1 1 3	084·H2	eae1	1					
Observed Bodd	085:H10	eae1	3	3	3	3	3	2
086:H18 eae1 3 3 3 3 2 088:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 2 0100:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 0101:H- eae1 1 2 3 2 0103:H43 eae1 1 2 3 2 0103:H- STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 0104:H- eae1 3 3 2 3 2 0105ab:H5 bfp 3 <	O86:H18	eae1	3	3	3	3	3	2
O88:H10 eae1 3 3 3 3 2 O100:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 O101:H- eae1 1 2 3 2 O103:H43 eae1 1 2 3 2 O103:H- STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 O103:H- STh, LTh 1 2 3 2 2 O103:H- STh, LTh 1	O86:H18	eae1	-	-	-	-	-	_
0100:H25 STh, LTh 1 1 1 0101:H- eae1 1 2 3 2 0103:H43 eae1 1 2 3 2 0103:H- STh, LTh 1 1 1 0104:H- eae1 3 3 2 1 0104:H- eae1 2 2 3 3 1 0105ab:H5 bfp 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 0110:H16 eae1 2 2 3 3 3 1 3 3 3 3 1 3	O88:H10	eae1		3	3	3		2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	O100:H25	STh, LTh						
0103:H43 eae1 1 2 3 2 0103:H- STh, LTh 1 1 1 1 0104:H- eae1 3 3 2 1 0105ab:H5 bfp 3 3 3 3 3 0110:H16 eae1 2 2 3 3 3 0111ab:H- eae1 2 3 3 3 3 0112ac:H9 eae1 1 1 1 3 3 3 3 0113:H21 LTh 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0113:H- bfp 1 1 3 3 3 3 3 0113:H- bfp 3	O101:H-	eae1					1	1
O103:H- STh, LTh 1 1 O104:H- eae1 3 3 2 O105ab:H5 bfp 3 3 3 O1105ab:H5 bfp 2 2 3 3 O1105ab:H6 eae1 2 2 3 3 O1105ab:H6 eae1 2 3 3 3 O111ab:H- eae1 2 3 3 3 O112ac:H9 eae1 1 7 7 7 O113:H- bfp 1 1 7 7 O113:H- bfp 3 3 3 3 O113:H- eae1, bfp 3 3 3 3 O114:H49 nt 1 3 3 3 O117:H27 SLT 1 1 2 2 2 1 O118:H- bfp 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O119:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	O103:H43	eae1		1	2	3		2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	O103:H-	STh, LTh	1					1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	O104:H-	eae1		3	3	2		
0110:H16 eae1 2 2 3 3 0111ab:H- eae1 2 3 3 3 0112ac:H9 eae1 1 1 1 3 3 3 0113:H21 LTh 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0113:H21 LTh 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0113:H- bfp 1 1 3 3 3 3 3 0113:H- eae1, bfp 3	O105ab:H5	bfp		3	3	3		
O111ab:H- eae1 2 3 3 O112ac:H9 eae1 1 1 O113:H21 LTh 3 3 3 3 O113:H21 LTh 3 3 3 3 O113:H- bfp 1 1 1 3 3 O113:H- eae1, bfp 3 3 1 3 3 3 O113:H- eae1, bfp 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O114:H49 nt 1 1 2 2 2 1 O117:H27 SLT 1 1 2 2 2 1 O118:H- bfp 3 1 1 1 1 1 O119:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O120:H27 eae1 1 2 1 1 1 1	O110:H16	eae1		2	2	3		3
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	O111ab:H-	eae1		2	3	3		
O113:H21 LTh 3 3 3 3 3 O113:H- bfp 1 1 1 1 1 O113:H- eae1, bfp 3 3 3 3 3 O113:H- eae1, bfp 3 1 3 3 3 O114:H49 nt 1 3 3 3 3 O114:H49 nt 1 1 2 2 2 1 O117:H27 SLT 1 1 2 2 2 1 O118:H- bfp 3 1 1 1 1 1 O119:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 O120:H27 eae1 1 2 1 1 1 1 O121:H19 eae1 1 2 1 1 1 1	O112ac:H9	eae1		_	1	_		-
OTI3:H- Dtp 1 O113:H- eae1, bfp 3 O114:H49 nt 1 3 3 O117:H27 SLT 1 1 2 2 1 O118:H- bfp 3 1 1 1 1 O119:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 O120:H27 eae1 1 2 1	0113:H21	LIN		3	3	3		3
O 11 3: H- eae1, btp 3 O 114: H49 nt 1 3 3 3 O 114: H49 nt 1 2 2 2 1 O 117: H27 SLT 1 1 2 2 2 1 O 118: H- bfp 3 1 1 1 1 O 119: H4 nt 3 3 3 3 O 120: H27 eae1 1 2 1	U113:H-	otp	6		1			
O 114:rH49 nt I 3 3 3 O 117:H27 SLT 1 1 2 2 2 1 O 118:H- bfp 3 1 1 1 1 O 119:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 O 120:H27 eae1 1 2 1	0113:H-	eae1, bip	3		0	0		0
OTTV.TEZ SET I I Z Z Z Z I O118:H- bfp 3 1 1 1 O119:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 O120:H27 eae1 1 2 1 O121:H19 eae1 1 2 1	0114:049		4	1	3	3	0	3
Officitie Dip S I I Of10:H4 nt 3 3 3 3 O120:H27 eae1 1 2 1 0121:H19 eae1		JLI bfn	1 0	I	2	∠ ۱	∠ ۱	I
O120:H27 eae1 1 2 1 O121:H19 eae1 1 2 1	O110.H-	orp nt	3	3	3	1 3	I	3
O121:H19 eae1	O120.H27	eae1		1	2	1		5
	O121:H19	eae1			-			

Table 1. cont.

O:H type	VF	N 1-p	N 3-p	N 6-p	N 9-p	Micro	N 10-p
O125ab:H33	eae1						
O125ab:H18	nt			1	3	3	2
O125ac:H-	nt			1			
O126:H21	nt		2	2	1		
O127:H11	eae1	3	3	3	3	2	1
O128:H27	eae1		3	3	3		3
O132:H8	bfp	1	3	3	3		2
O135:H?	bfp						3
O141:H32	eae1			1	1		1
O141:H26	nt	3	1	2	2		
O142:H?	eae1						
O145:H45	eae1						
O146:H8	eae1		2	3	3		3
O147:H32	nt	3	3	3	3		3
O148:H28	STp. STh. LTh	3	3	3	3	1	3
O149:H-	eae1			3	2		
O153:H12	eae1					1	
O158:H9	eae1			2	1	1	
O159:H25	STp.LTh	2	3	3	3		
O163:H19	eae1	1		3	3		
O165:H18	eae1	1	3	3	3		3
O166:H5	eae1. bfp	3				1	
O167:H5	LTh	3					
O169:H-	STp	3					2

Notes: All isolates were *E. coli* strains identified by the Vitek automated bacterial Identification system (BioMerieux) O:H: The O and H serotypes were identified by reference sera VF (virulence factors): The presence of the following virulence genes from diarrhoea-associated bacteria were assessed by PCR: enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC) were diagnosed by the presence of the heat-labile enterotoxin LTh (encoded by the *eltA/B* genes) or heat-stable enterotoxins STh (encoded *estA* gene) or STp (encoded by the *st1* gene); enteropathogenic E. coli (EPEC) were diagnosed by the presence of the intimin (encoded by the *eae* 1 gene) and the bundle forming pilus (*bfp*) gene; the strains were also tested for the presence of the gene encoding the Shiga-like toxin (SLT); nt: not tested N1-p to N10-p: The indicated *E. coli* strains were tested for lysis graded by 1, 2 and 3 (according to the OD decrease observed at different moi, see Fig. 1) by the following phage cocktails: N1-phage (NPC1001), N3-phage (NPC1001, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1007, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1003, NPC 1008, NPC 1007, NPC 1009, NPC 1004, NPC 1003, NPC 1000, NPC 1001, NPC 1007, NPC 1008, NPC 1004, NPC 1003, NPC 1004, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1007, NPC 1008, NPC 1009) (for the phage cocktail (NPC 1001, NPC 1001, NPC 1002, NPC 1003, NPC 1004, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1007, NPC 1008, NPC 1009) (for the phage cocktail (NPC 1001, NPC 1001, NPC 1002, NPC 1003, NPC 1004, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1007, NPC 1008, NPC 1009) (for the phage cocktail (NPC 1001, NPC 1001, NPC 1002, NPC 1003, NPC 1004, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1007, NPC 1008, NPC 1009) (for the phage cocktail (NPC 1001, NPC 1001, NPC 1002, NPC 1003, NPC 1004, NPC 1005, NPC 1006, NPC 1007, NPC 1008, NPC 1009) (for the phage cocks see Sarker *et al.*, 2012) and the commercial Microgen ColiProteus phage cocktail Micro (containing an unknown number of phage isolates representing according to metagenomic analysis at least ten different phage genera, representing all three major families of tailed pha

ranges, an arithmetical coverage of 87% should have been achieved. However, the physical combination of these three T4-like phages only resulted in the lysis of 54% of the *E. coli* strains suggesting interference between the phages (Table 1). When six T4-like phages were combined into a cocktail, we could increase the coverage to 69%. Further increasing the number to nine phages did not result in enlarged coverage (Table 1). A commercial Russian phage cocktail (Coli-Proteus phage cocktail from Microgen) only lysed 17 of the 89 test bacteria (19% coverage) (Table 1).

Coverage of E. coli pathogens from a community diarrhoea survey in Bangladesh

The commercial Russian phage cocktail was presumably selected for good coverage on *E. coli* strains from Russia. Its low coverage on the Mexican *E. coli* pathogens raises the question whether phage cocktails display geographical specificities. We do not know the selection process of phages for the Microgen cocktail, but at the Eliava Institute in Tbilisi/Georgia where Soviet phage

therapy took its origin, new phages against E. coli pathotypes not covered by the previous stock are in regular intervals added to the cocktail (Chanishvili, 2012). To test the hypothesis of geographical diversity, we studied the coverage of the above-mentioned phage cocktails against 40 E. coli isolates from a community survey of childhood diarrhoea in Bangladesh (Qadri et al., 2007). In contrast to the Mexican collection, only 5 isolates represented EPEC strains while 35 strains were ETEC strains with different combinations of ST and LT enterotoxins and colonization factors as assessed by ELISA and monoclonal antibody-based dot blot assays, respectively (Table 2). Our nine-phage cocktail lysed only 30% of the pathogenic *E. coli* strains from Bangladesh compared with its 69% coverage on the Mexican strains. We then increased the number of constituting T4-like phages to 14 in the cocktail, based on the lytic properties of individual phage strains from our cocktail against ETEC strains from Bangladesh. We achieved 53% coverage, while the Microgen phage cocktail showed 33% coverage on this strain collection from Bangladesh compared with 19% coverage it had achieved on the Mexican



Fig. 1. OD development in microtiter wells inoculated with a given pathogenic *E. coli* strain and given a T4-like phage added at three different multiplicities of infection (moi: 0.001, 0.01 and 0.1) in comparison with an uninoculated well (Ctrl–) and uninfected control culture (Ctrl+). A. The phage got a lysis score of three because it lyses at all three moi.

B. The phage got a lysis score of two because it lyses only at the two higher moi.

C. The phage got a lysis score of one because it lyses only at the highest moi.

D. It showed a bacterium-phage pair where no lysis was observed at any of the three moi.

collection. For a subset of the *E. coli* strains, the phage susceptibility of the strain was confirmed by the plaque assay (Table 2).

Coverage of E. coli pathogens from diarrhoea patients hospitalized in Bangladesh

The distinct coverage observed with the same phage cocktail on different sets of E. coli pathogens could reflect the difference in location (Mexico versus Bangladesh) or pathotype (EPEC versus ETEC). To separate both effects, we tested the cocktails against different pathotypes of E. coli obtained from the same geographical region. From the Enteric Microbiology and Immunology Units of the International Center for Diarrheal Disease Research in Dhaka/Bangladesh (icddr,b) we obtained E. coli isolates that represented all major pathotypes, namely 15 EPEC, 15 ETEC, 10 enteroaggregative (EAEC), 3 enteroinvasive (EIEC), and 3 Verotoxin-producing (VTEC) E. coli strains, all isolated from diarrhoea patients hospitalized in 2008 at icddr,b. Our T4-like phage cocktail consisting of nine phages lysed 24% of these E. coli strains while the Microgen phage cocktail showed 50% coverage (Table 3). Two different batches of Microgen ColiProteus phage cocktails showed a nearly identical lysis pattern on these strains (data not shown) while two different batches from Microgen 'Sextaphage' cocktail showed an overlapping, but distinct lysis pattern with an overall lower coverage of 35% (Table 3). Since we were not satisfied with the 24% coverage by our nine-phage cocktail, we modified its composition to obtain a broader coverage. Modification was done on the basis of lytic host range determined for each individual phage strain against the *E. coli* pathogens isolated in 2008 from patients at icddr,b. A new cocktail consisting of 10 T4-like phages led to an increased coverage of 50% on these hospital-derived *E. coli* pathogens. With the 14-phage T4 cocktail, 61% coverage was achieved (Table 3).

Notably, the 10-phage cocktail lysed only 46% of the Mexican strains, less than the 68% lysed by the 9-phage cocktail (Table 1). Changing the phage composition of a cocktail in order to achieve a higher coverage in one geographical region might thus result in lesser coverage in another region. *E. coli* pathogen coverage by a phage cocktail is thus strongly context-dependent, suggesting that phages for therapy should be tested, if not isolated, using the most prevalent pathogenic strains in a given geographical area.

In 2011, we requested again random ETEC and EPEC isolates from children hospitalized with diarrhoea at icddr,b to explore temporal variation of pathogen coverage by given phage cocktails. The 10-phage T4 cocktail showed 29% coverage in the tube lysis test. The T4-like phage cocktail showed phage plaque counts in excess

 Table 2. Lysis of pathogenic *E. coli* strains isolated from children who

 experienced a bout of diarrhoea in the community, which did not lead

 to hospitalization (prospective study from Dhaka/Bangladesh).

No	Toxins	CF	O type	N 9-p	N 14-p	Microgen
1 2 3	LT+ST+ LT+ST+ LT+ST+	CS2+CS3 CS1+CS3,CS21 CS2+CS3	O6 O6 O6	L L	L L L	
4 5 6	LT+ST+ LT+ST+ LT+ST+	CS5+CS6 CS1+CS3,CS21 CS14	O6	L	L	
7 8 9	LT+ LT+ST+ ST+	CS17 CS2+CS3 CFA/I	O6 O126		L	L .
10 11 12	ST+ ST+ IT+ST+	CS5+CS6 CFA/I CS4+CS6	O115 O126 O25		L	L
13 14 15 16	LT+ ST+ ST+ LT+ST+	CS7 CS14 CFA/I,CS21 CS45+CS6	0114	L L L	L L	L L L
17 18 19 20 21	LT+ LT+ST+ LT+ST+ LT+ST+ LT+ST+	CS7 CS5+CS6 CFA/I, CS21 CS1+CS3,CS21 CS2+CS3	06 06		L L L	L
22 23 24 25	LT+ST+ LT+ST+ ST+ LT+	NEG NEG NEG		Ē	L	
26 27 28	ST+ LT+ ST+	NEG NEG NEG		L	L	L
29 30 31	LT+ST+ LT+ ST+	NEG NEG CFA/I	O126	Ŀ	L L	L
32 33 34	LT+ST+ ST+	CS1+CS3,CS21 CS6			L	
35 36 37	LT+ EPEC EPEC	NEG		L	L	L
38 39 40	EPEC EPEC EPEC				L L	L L

Note: Of the 40 pathogenic *E. coli* isolates, 35 were identified as ETEC strains by the presence of the heat-stabile (ST) or heat-labile (LT) enterotoxin. The strains were further characterized by the presence of colonization factor (CF) antigens and by O serotype. Five strains were EPEC isolates. The lysis (L) as observed in the 10 ml test tube lysis assay on the indicated host strain is indicated for a 9-phage (Table 1) and 14-phage T4-like phage cocktail (NPC 1000, NPC 1001, NPC 1002, NPC 1003, NPC 1004, NPC 1005, NPC 1009, NPC 1032, NPC 1040, NPC 1041, NPC 1042, NPC 1043, NPC 1044, NPC 2017) and for the commercial Microgen phage cocktail. Underlined values from the 9-phage cocktail were confirmed by plaque assay. NEG, negative for tested CF.

of 10⁴ pfu/ml in all cases where lysis was observed (Table 4). The Microgen Coliproteus phage cocktail lysed only 6% of these test strains, but formed plaques on half of them, but plaque counts were low when the cells were not lysed. Apparently, plaque counts higher than 2×10^3 pfu/ml are needed to cause lysis of the cells (Table 4). Lysis was occasionally observed when no plaques were seen in the plaque assay. Whether this

represents 'lysis from without' by phage tail-associated lytic enzymes from phages that cannot complete an infection cycle or 'abortive infection' is not clear, but according to the low moi which we used and a theoretical paper (Abedon, 2011), the second diagnosis is more appropriate. Independent of this question of clear terminology,

Table 3. Lysis of *E. coli* strains representing different pathotypes isolated in 2008 from patients hospitalized with diarrhoea at icddr,b hospital in Dhaka, Bangladesh with the indicated phage cocktails.

No	Pathotype	AGE	N 9-p	N 10-p	N 14-p	Micro	Sexta
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	EAggEC EAggEC EAggEC EAggEC EAggEC EAggEC EAggEC	P P P P P	L	L L L			L L L
9 10 11 12 13	EAggEC EAggEC EAggEC EIEC EIEC EIEC EIEC	Р Р Р	L L L	L L L L			L L L
14 15 16 17	EPEC EPEC EPEC			L	L		
18 19 20	EPEC EPEC EPEC	P P	L	L L	L L	L	L
21 22 23	EPEC EPEC EPEC	P P P	L	L	L	L	1
25 26 27	EPEC EPEC EPEC	Р		L	L L	L	L
28 29 30 31	EPEC VTEC VTEC VTEC	P	L L L	L L L	L L L	L L L	L L L
32 33 34 35	ETEC O114 ETEC O167 ETEC O6 ETEC O25	P P P P	_	Ĺ	L L	L	L
36 37 38	ETEC O25 ETEC O78 ETEC O115	P P P		L L	L L	L	L
39 40 41 42	ETEC 0114 ETEC 0115 ETEC 025 ETEC 0115	Р Р Р				L L	L
43 44 45	ETEC O6 ETEC O167	P P P	L	L	L		
45 46	ETEC 0114 ETEC 08	Р Р		L	L	L	

Notes: Pathotypes: Enteroaggregative *E. coli* (EAggEC), Enteroinvasive *E. coli* (EIEC), Enteropathogenic *E. coli* (EPEC), Verotoxin producing *E. coli* (VTEC), Enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC) – the latter were serotyped for O antigen. Age: P indicates pediatric patient. Phage cocktails: N9-p cocktail consisting of 9 T4-like phages, N10-p cocktail consisting of 10 T4-like phages (for composition see Table 1); N14-p cocktail consisting of 14 T4-like phages (for composition see Table 2), Micro: ColiProteus phage cocktail; Sexta: Sextaphage cocktail from Microgen. L: lysis in 10 ml test tube assay.

Table 4. Phage susceptibility of ETEC and EPEC strains isolated from pediatric diarrhoea patients hospitalized in 2011 at icddr,b, Dhaka, Bangladesh as assessed by tube lysis and plaque assay.

No	Pathotype	N10-p	N10-p	Micro	Micro
1 2 3	ETEC ETEC EPEC	lysis	pfu/ml < 10 < 10 < 10	lysis lysis	pfu/ml < 10 < 10 4 × 10 ⁵
4 5 6 7	ETEC ETEC EPEC ETEC		< 10 < 10 < 10 < 10		< 10 < 10 < 10 < 10
8 9 10	EPEC EPEC ETEC	lysis lysis	< 10 1 × 10 ⁵ 1 × 10 ⁵	(lysis)	20 200 50
11 12 13 14	EPEC ETEC ETEC ETEC	lysis	< 10 < 10 5 × 10 ⁴ < 10		2000 < 10 10 < 10
15 16 17	ETEC EPEC ETEC	lysis lysis	1 × 10 ⁵ < 10 1 × 10 ⁵		10 300 2000

bacterial cells do not experience the same environment when they are grown in solid medium as compared to liquid that leads to a distinct expression of some surface proteins which may affect the infection process.

Since *Shigella* is taxonomically not even a subspecies of *E. coli*, we extended the testing to *Shigella* isolates from 10 different pediatric patients. The isolates represented two different *Shigella* 'species'; one was represented with four different serotypes. All strains showed the *ipaH* virulence genes, while none contained the Shiga toxin gene. The Microgen ColiProteus phage cocktail formed plaques on 9 *Shigella* isolates while 10 T4-like phage cocktail showed lysis and plaques on 6 *Shigella* isolates (Table 5).

Discussion

T4-like phages from our collection were with few exceptions all isolated on a non-pathogenic laboratory E. coli strain, more specifically K803, a derivative of the K-12 strain lacking the lambda prophage (Chibani-Chennoufi et al., 2004b). This restriction could be a significant selection bias which might explain the relatively poor coverage observed in the current study. One might object that phages should be isolated using prevalent pathogenic E. coli as indicator strains even if this renders the whole experimental work more difficult to handle (need of a safety laboratory, need of many propagating strains). If these phages are subsequently propagated on a nonpathogenic laboratory strain for commercial purposes, then their ability to lyse the most prevalent pathogenic strains should be confirmed. In fact, in the initial phase of our work, we isolated phages from stool samples of diarrhoea patients using in parallel an enteropathogenic

E. coli strain, which was commonly isolated from childhood diarrhoea cases, and the laboratory K803 E. coli strain (Chibani-Chennoufi et al., 2004b). We obtained less phage isolates on the pathogenic strain than on the laboratory E. coli strain. Furthermore, the phage isolates made on the pathogenic E. coli strain were Siphoviridae with 50 kb genomes showing the morphology of Jerseyand beta-4 like phages and a narrower lytic pattern on O-serotyped pathogenic E. coli strains than phage isolates from the laboratory K803 strain, which yielded Myoviridae with a 170 kb genome, the morphology of T4-like phages and a broader host range on O-serotyped pathogenic E. coli strains (Chibani-Chennoufi et al., 2004b). We also obtained rather narrow host-range phage isolates when using a few other pathogenic E. coli as indicator strains (unpublished observations).

It is not unusual to select and propagate phages for phage therapy purpose against pathogenic bacteria on a nonpathogenic host strain. For example, a multivalent *Salmonella* phage was selected and amplified on a nonpathogenic *E. coli* strain. After serial passage on the two alternative hosts, the researchers observed a smaller burst size and longer rise period for the phage propagated on the heterologous *E. coli* host than on the homologous *Salmonella* host, but the lower cost of producing a safer phage product justified in their opinion these growth disadvantages. Notably, no difference in host range was observed between the phage propagated on the pathogenic *Salmonella* or non-pathogenic *E. coli* host (Santos *et al.*, 2010).

Propagation on a laboratory strain avoids biosafety production conditions and the risk of transfer of bacterial or prophage-encoded toxins (Canchaya *et al.*, 2003) from the pathogenic host into the phage preparation. The fact that K-12 displays only a truncated LPS molecule with a shortened O side chain (Qimron *et al.*, 2006) might not only have changed biological phenotypes like pathogenicity for infection models in worms (Browning *et al.*, 2013). Use of K-12 might have selected against phages recognizing the O side chain-specific sugar residues as recep-

 Table 5. Lysis of Shigella strains from patients at icddr,b, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Species	Virulence gene	Serotype	N10-p	Microgen
Shigella flexneri	ipaH	1b	< 10	1 × 10 ⁴
S. flexneri	ipaH	2a	< 10	1×10^4
S. flexneri	ipaH	3a	< 10	2×10^4
S. flexneri	ipaH	6	< 10	< 10
S. flexneri	ipaH	6	1×10^3	2×10^{5}
Shigella sonnei	ipaH		1×10^{8}	$3 imes 10^6$
S. sonnei	ipaH		9×10^7	2×10^{6}
S. sonnei	ipaH		5×10^7	$5 imes 10^4$
S. sonnei	ipaH		1×10^{5}	1×10^{5}
S. sonnei	ipaH		$9 imes10^7$	$3 imes 10^{6}$

173 G. Bourdin et al.

tor potentially explaining why the phages selected on the laboratory E. coli strain showed a broader host range on O-serotyped pathogenic *E. coli* than the phages selected on a pathogenic E. coli strain displaying a complete O side chain. While the majority of our phage isolates still showed a rather narrow infection range on our pathogenic E. coli strain collection, only few of them were actually O serotype-specific. We do not know what receptor structures our phages recognized. Some researchers had demonstrated that the conserved inner parts of the LPS molecule can serve as receptors for T4 and T7 (Tamaki et al., 1971; Qimron et al., 2006), potentially explaining the infection of many different O serotypes with a single phage. Recognition of alternative T4 phage receptors like the membrane protein OmpC proposed by other researchers (Hashemolhosseini et al., 1994; Yu et al., 2000) is not very likely for the isolated phages since one would expect a much broader cross-reactivity on O-serotypes E. coli pathogens than was actually observed.

One might also object that determining the host range of the isolated phages on E. coli growing in LB broth as done for enterobacteria propagation in the laboratory has nothing in common with the conditions encountered in vivo. For example, in our experiments, the infected E. coli cells were shaken to assure oxygen access while the lower parts of the gut display anaerobic conditions. To address this problem, we tested whether the investigated T4-like phages could infect E. coli under anaerobic in vitro growth conditions. This was the case: our T4-like phages yielded in vitro similar titers under aerobic and anaerobic growth (Weiss et al., 2009). Of course, there are many other conditions that differentiate in vitro from in vivo growth (Brüssow, 2013). For example, in their natural environment bacteria grow mostly in biofilms while broth culture represents growth in suspension. Indeed, T4 phage showed lytic infections on biofilms (Doolittle et al., 1995), but nutrient limitation in biofilms delayed the lysis process (Doolittle et al., 1996). One might therefore wonder whether in vitro conditions better adapted to in vivo growth conditions would not be preferable to standard broth culture. Since the in vivo growth conditions of E. coli are still poorly characterized, it is unfortunately not yet clear what in vitro conditions best mimic the in vivo condition.

It is widely believed that phage therapy approaches need phage cocktails (Brüssow, 2012). If resistance development is an issue during phage therapy (Cairns *et al.*, 2009), it is less likely to develop against a phage cocktail than against a single phage. However, combining phages into a cocktail can create interference problems making the actual lytic capacity of a phage cocktail less than the sum of its parts. This phenomenon was here observed with cocktails of T4-like phages. Mechanistically, superinfection of E. coli cells with two T4-like phages causes lysis inhibition (Abedon, 1992) preventing an OD decrease, which was the read-out of our test. We tried different combinations of individual T4-like phages hoping to identify specific phage strain combinations displaying antagonistic behavior in order to eliminate them from the cocktail. However, no such specific interference problems between individual phage strains were spotted, suggesting merely random effects when increasing the overall number of T4-like phages in a cocktail. Retrospectively. one might also ask whether limiting the phage cocktail to a single phage genus like T4-like phages for safety reasons was a good strategy. Safety trials showed no difference when using a T4-like phage cocktail (Sarker et al., 2012) or the Russian phage cocktail containing in addition to T4and T7-like phages a dozen further phage genera (McCallin et al., 2013). As the in vivo phage growth conditions in the human gut are still largely undefined, working with a complex phage cocktail as done by the Eastern European phage tradition might represent a hedge betting strategy for diversifying risk. However, when considering only the coverage of the target pathogen with in vitro lysis tests, no clear superiority of the Microgen phage cocktails over the T4-like phage cocktail was observed.

If we accept the hypothesis that in vitro lysis is a necessary, although not sufficient condition for in vivo lysis, coverage is critical for efficient phage therapy. To illustrate it numerically: with 50% coverage, two E. coli patients need to be treated to expect an effect in one of them. If only one out of two to three hospitalized pediatric diarrhoea patients suffers from an E. coli diarrhoea as is the case in Bangladesh (Albert et al., 1999), four to six patients need to be treated for one to profit from phage treatment. This calculation neglects the possibility that many patients are infected with similar strains which is actually the case during a given epidemic (Qadri et al., 2005), while this might not be the same strains between epidemics (Chowdhury et al., 2011). This consideration put aside, relatively large numbers of children with diarrhoea need to be enrolled into a controlled clinical trial to observe a treatment effect raising even an ethical conundrum using a therapeutical preparation which only cures a limited proportion of the patients. This problem could be solved when targeting Shigella infections. Dysentery symptoms are so characteristic that it can be easily diagnosed clinically and its coverage by phage was much higher than for *E. coli* diarrhoea. The combination of both factors makes it likely that at least every second dysentery patient could profit from phage therapy. In line with other reports (Chang and Kim, 2011), Shigella was lysed by coliphages, but this should not be surprising since Shigella qualifies not even as a subspecies of E. coli (Sims and Kim, 2011). In support to this conclusion identifying Shigella infections as a suitable target for phage therapy,

the only clinical trial published by Soviet phage therapy researcher reported successful prevention of *Shigella* dysentery (Sulakvelidze *et al.*, 2001). Diarrhoeaassociated *E. coli* pathogens in contrast are a difficult target for phage therapy since the pathogen coverage by phages varies with geographical region, epidemiological setting and time as demonstrated in the present study. It is not clear whether our observations can be generalized. Due to frequent inundation by flood water, Bangladesh displays an exceptionally high dynamic of diarrhoea pathogens (Harris *et al.*, 2008) making it not a typical, but a worst-case scenario.

Evolutionary biologists have asked whether in vitro phage-host systems are adequate models for the in situ situation in the real ecological niche (Forde et al., 2008). For clinical efficacy, phages must display the appropriate in vivo stability to survive the gastro-intestinal passage, a good in situ bioavailability at their site of action and a good replication potential on E. coli demonstrating different physiological states in different gut segments. None of these phenotypes can be easily tested in vitro. Some pathogenic E. coli strains multiply in the small intestine (e.g. EPEC), others replicate in the large intestine (e.g. EHEC, Shigella). Data on intestinal phage-host interaction in laboratory mice were equivocal. In our laboratory, a T4-like phage was less efficient than a T7-like phage in replicating on slowly growing commensal E. coli in the gut (Weiss et al., 2009). In another laboratory, a T4-like phage was a better replicator than a T7-like phage on a pathogenic E. coli strain asymptomatically colonizing the gut of mice (Maura et al., 2012a,b). In both models, oral T7-like phages replicated to high titers in the gut without, however, having a sustained effect on the fecal E. coli titer (Weiss et al., 2009; Maura et al., 2012a). When investigating phage-host interaction in different segments of the gut, marked differences were observed (Weiss et al., 2009; Maura et al., 2012b). Our understanding of coliphage E. coli interaction in the gut, their natural ecological niche, is apparently so limited (Brüssow, 2013) that testing a phage cocktail for in vitro coverage can only be seen as a step towards a successful phage therapy approach. In the absence of an E. coli diarrhoea model in small laboratory animals, we study currently the faecal excretion pattern in children hospitalized with E. coli diarrhoea who were treated with two different phage cocktails to get data on the in vivo replication of oral phage cocktails.

Acknowledgements

We thank our NRC colleagues Enea Rezzonico and Olga Sakwinska in Switzerland for critical reading of the manuscript, Delia Licona, Gabriel Pérez and Luis Antonio León for technical support in the Mexico laboratory by performing *E. coli* serotyping, Azmira Begum, Senior Health assistant for the collection of stool samples and strains from the Bangladesh laboratory and sending it to NRC.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

References

- Abedon, S.T. (1992) Lysis of lysis-inhibited bacteriophage T4-infected cells. *J Bacteriol* **174:** 8073–8080.
- Abedon, S.T. (2011) Lysis from without. *Bacteriophage* 1: 46–49.
- Albert, M.J., Faruque, S.M., Faruque, A.S.G., Neogi, P.K.B., Ansaruzzaman, M., Bhuiyan, N.A., *et al.* (1995) Controlled study of *Escherichia coli* diarrheal infections in Bangladeshi children. *J Clin Microbiol* **33**: 973–977.
- Albert, M.J., Faruque, A.S., Faruque, S.M., Sack, R.B., and Mahalanabis, D. (1999) Case-control study of enteropathogens associated with childhood diarrhea in Dhaka, Bangladesh. J Clin Microbiol 37: 3458–3464.
- Browning, D.F., Wells, T.J., França, F.L., Morris, F.C., Sevastsyanovich, Y.R., Bryant, J.A., *et al.* (2013) Laboratory adapted *Escherichia coli* K-12 becomes a pathogen of *Caenorhabditis elegans* upon restoration of O antigen biosynthesis. *Mol Microbiol* 87: 939–950.
- Bruttin, A., and Brüssow, H. (2005) Human volunteers receiving *Escherichia coli* phage T4 orally: a safety test of phage therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **49:** 2874– 2878.
- Brüssow, H. (2012) What is needed for phage therapy to become a reality in Western medicine? *Virology* **434:** 138–142.
- Brüssow, H. (2013) Bacteriophage-host interaction: from splendid isolation into a messy reality. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 16: 500–506.
- Cairns, B.J., Timms, A.R., Jansen, V.A., Connerton, I.F., and Payne, R.J. (2009) Quantitative models of in vitro bacteriophage-host dynamics and their application to phage therapy. *PLoS Pathog* **5**: e1000253.
- Canchaya, C., Proux, C., Fournous, G., Bruttin, A., and Brüssow, H. (2003) Prophage genomics. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 67: 238–276.
- Chang, H.W., and Kim, K.H. (2011) Comparative genomic analysis of bacteriophage EP23 infecting *Shigella sonnei* and *Escherichia coli. J Microbiol* **49**: 927–934.
- Chanishvili, N. (2012) Phage therapy-history from Twort and d'Herelle through Soviet experience to current approaches. *Adv Virus Res* **83:** 3–40.
- Chibani-Chennoufi, S., Sidoti, J., Bruttin, A., Kutter, E., Sarker, S., and Brüssow, H. (2004a) In vitro and in vivo bacteriolytic activities of *Escherichia coli* phages: implications for phage therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **48**: 2558–2569.
- Chibani-Chennoufi, S., Sidoti, J., Bruttin, A., Dillmann, M.L., Kutter, E., Qadri, F., *et al.* (2004b) Isolation of *Escherichia coli* bacteriophages from the stool of pediatric diarrhea patients in Bangladesh. *J Bacteriol* **186**: 8287– 8294.

175 G. Bourdin et al.

- Chowdhury, F., Rahman, M.A., Begum, Y.A., Khan, A.I., Faruque, A.S., Saha, N.C., *et al.* (2011) Impact of rapid urbanization on the rates of infection by *Vibrio cholerae* O1 and enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **5**: e999.
- Cravioto, A., Reyes, R., Trujillo, F., Uribe, F., Navarro, A., De la Roca, J., *et al.* (1990) Risk of diarrhea during the first year of life associated with initial and subsequent colonization by specific enteropathogens. *Am J Epidemiol* **131**: 886–904.
- Doolittle, M.M., Cooney, J.J., and Caldwell, D.E. (1995) Lytic infection of *Escherichia coli* biofilms by bacteriophage T4. *Can J Microbiol* **41:** 12–18.
- Doolittle, M.M., Cooney, J.J., and Caldwell, D.E. (1996) Tracing the interaction of bacteriophage with bacterial biofilms using fluorescent and chromogenic probes. *J Ind Microbiol* **16**: 331–341.
- Flores, C.O., Meyer, J.R., Valverde, S., Farr, L., and Weitz, J.S. (2011) Statistical structure of host-phage interactions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**: E288–E297.
- Forde, S.E., Beardmore, R.E., Gudelj, I., Arkin, S.S., Thompson, J.N., and Hurst, L.D. (2008) Understanding the limits to generalizability of experimental evolutionary models. *Nature* **455**: 220–223.
- Gunzburg, S.T., Tornieporth, N.G., and Riley, L.W. (1995) Identification of enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli* by PCRbased detection of the bundle-forming pilus gene. *J Clin Microbiol* **33**: 1375.
- Harris, A.M., Chowdhury, F., Begum, Y.A., Khan, A.I., Faruque, A.S., Svennerholm, A.M., *et al.* (2008) Shifting prevalence of major diarrheal pathogens in patients seeking hospital care during floods in 1998, 2004, and 2007 in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **79:** 708–714.
- Hashemolhosseini, S., Montag, D., Krämer, L., and Henning, U. (1994) Determinants of receptor specificity of coliphages of the T4 family. A chaperone alters the host range. *J Mol Biol* **241**: 524–533.
- Heinrichs, D.E., Yethon, J.A., and Whitfield, C. (1998) Molecular basis for structural diversity in the core regions of the lipopolysaccharides of *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enterica*. *Mol Microbiol* **30**: 221–232.
- Karch, H., Böhm, H., Schmidt, H., Gunzer, F., Aleksic, S., and Heesemann, J. (1993) Clonal structure and pathogenicity of Shiga-like toxin-producing, sorbitol-fermenting *Escherichia coli* O157:H. J Clin Microbiol **31**: 1200–1205.
- Kelly, D., McAuliffe, O., Ross, R.P., O'Mahony, J., and Coffey, A. (2011) Development of a broad-host-range phage cocktail for biocontrol. *Bioeng Bugs* 2: 31–37.
- McCallin, S.E., Sarker, S.A., Barretto, C., Sultana, S., Berger, B., Huq, S., *et al.* (2013) Safety analysis of a Russian phage cocktail: from metagenomic analysis to oral application in healthy human subjects. *Virology* **443**: 187–196.
- McConnell, M.M., Chart, H., Field, H., Hibberd, M., and Rowe, B. (1989) Characterization of a putative colonization factor (PCFO166) of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* of serogroup O166. *J Gen Microbiol* **135**: 1135–1144.
- Maura, D., Morello, E., du Merle, L., Bomme, P., Le Bouguénec, C., and Debarbieux, L. (2012a) Intestinal colonization by enteroaggregative *Escherichia coli* supports long-term bacteriophage replication in mice. *Environ Microbiol* **14:** 1844–1854.

- Maura, D., Galtier, M., Le Bouguénec, C., and Debarbieux, L. (2012b) Virulent bacteriophages can target O104:H4 enteroaggregative *Escherichia coli* in the mouse intestine. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **56:** 6235–6242.
- Merril, C.R., Biswas, B., Carlton, R., Jensen, N.C., Creed, G.J., Zullo, S., and Adhya, S. (1996) Long-circulating bacteriophage as antibacterial agents. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S* A 93: 3188–3192.
- Ørskov, F., and Ørskov, I. (1984) Serotyping of *Escherichia coli. Meth Microbiol* **14:** 43–112.
- Payne, R.J., Phil, D., and Jansen, V.A. (2000) Phage therapy: the peculiar kinetics of self-replicating pharmaceuticals. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **68:** 225–230.
- Pollard, D.R., Johnson, W.M., Lior, H., Tyler, S.D., and Rozee, K.R. (1990) Rapid and specific detection of verotoxin genes in *Escherichia coli* by the polymerase chain reaction. *J Clin Microbiol* **28**: 540–545.
- Qadri, F., Das, S.K., Faruque, A.S.G., Fuchs, G.J., Albert, M.J., Sack, R.B., and Svennerholm, A.-M. (2000) Prevalence of toxin types and colonization factors in enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* isolated during a 2-year period from diarrheal patients in Bangladesh. *J Clin Microbiol* **38**: 27–31.
- Qadri, F., Khan, A.I., Faruque, A.S., Begum, Y.A., Chowdhury, F., Nair, G.B., *et al.* (2005) Enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* and *Vibrio cholerae* diarrhea, Bangladesh, 2004. *Emerg Infect Dis* **11**: 1104–1107.
- Qadri, F., Saha, A., Ahmed, T., Al Tarique, A., Begum, Y.A., and Svennerholm, A.M. (2007) Disease burden due to enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* in the first 2 years of life in an urban community in Bangladesh. *Infect Immun* **75**: 3961–3968.
- Qimron, U., Marintcheva, B., Tabor, S., and Richardson, C.C. (2006) Genomewide screens for *Escherichia coli* genes affecting growth of T7 bacteriophage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **103**: 19039–19044.
- Robins-Browne, R.M. (1987) Traditional enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli* of infantile diarrhea. *Rev Infect Dis* **9**: 28–53.
- Santos, S.B., Fernandes, E., Carvalho, C.M., Sillankorva, S., Krylov, V.N., Pleteneva, E.A., *et al.* (2010) Selection and characterization of a multivalent Salmonella phage and its production in a nonpathogenic *Escherichia coli* strain. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **76**: 7338–7342.
- Sarker, S.A., McCallin, S., Barretto, C., Berger, B., Pittet, A.C., Sultana, S., *et al.* (2012) Oral T4-like phage cocktail application to healthy adult volunteers from Bangladesh. *Virology* **434**: 222–232.
- Schultsz, C., Pool, G.J., van Ketel, R., de Wever, B., Speelman, P., and Dankert, J. (1994) Detection of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* in stool samples by using nonradioactively labeled oligonucleotide DNA probes and PCR. *J Clin Microbiol* **32**: 2393–2397.
- Schwarzer, D., Buettner, F.F., Browning, C., Nazarov, S., Rabsch, W., Bethe, A., *et al.* (2012) A multivalent adsorption apparatus explains the broad host range of phage phi92: a comprehensive genomic and structural analysis. *J Virol* 86: 10384–10398.
- Sims, G.E., and Kim, S.H. (2011) Whole-genome phylogeny of *Escherichia coli/Shigella* group by feature frequency profiles (FFPs). *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**: 8329–8334.
- © 2014 The Authors. *Microbial Biotechnology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd and Society for Applied Microbiology, *Microbial Biotechnology*, 7, 165–176

- Sulakvelidze, A., Alavidze, Z., and Morris, J.G., Jr (2001) Bacteriophage therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **45**: 649–659.
- Svennerholm, A.-M., and Wiklund, G. (1983) Rapid GM1enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay with visual reading for identification of *Escherichia coli* heat-labile enterotoxin. *J Clin Microbiol* **17:** 596–600.
- Svennerholm, A.M., Wikström, M., Lindblad, M., and Holmgren, J. (1986) Monoclonal antibodies against *Escherichia coli* heat-stable toxin (STa) and their use in a diagnostic ST ganglioside GM1-enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. *J Clin Microbiol* **24**: 585–590.
- Tamaki, S., Sato, T., and Matsuhashi, M. (1971) Role of lipopolysaccharides in antibiotic resistance and bacteriophage adsorption of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J Bacteriol* **105**: 968–975.
- Thomassen, E., Gielen, G., Schütz, M., Schoehn, G., Abrahams, J.P., Miller, S., and van Raaij, M.J. (2003) The

structure of the receptor-binding domain of the bacteriophage T4 short tail fibre reveals a knitted trimeric metalbinding fold. *J Mol Biol* **331:** 361–373.

- Weiss, M., Denou, E., Bruttin, A., Serra-Moreno, R., Dillmann, M.L., and Brüssow, H. (2009) In vivo replication of T4 and T7 bacteriophages in germ-free mice colonized with *Escherichia coli. Virology* **393**: 16–23.
- Weitz, J.S., Poisot, T., Meyer, J.R., Flores, C.O., Valverde, S., Sullivan, M.B., and Hochberg, M.E. (2013) Phage-bacteria infection networks. *Trends Microbiol* **21**: 82–91.
- Yu, S.L., Ko, K.L., Chen, C.S., Chang, Y.C., and Syu, W.J. (2000) Characterization of the distal tail fiber locus and determination of the receptor for phage AR1, which specifically infects *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. *J Bacteriol* 182: 5962–5968.