

# **REVIEW ARTICLE**

# Beneficial effects of probiotics in upper respiratory tract infections and their mechanical actions to antagonize pathogens

M. Popova<sup>1</sup>, P. Molimard<sup>2</sup>, S. Courau<sup>2</sup>, J. Crociani<sup>3</sup>, C. Dufour<sup>3</sup>, F. Le Vacon<sup>1</sup> and T. Carton<sup>1</sup>

1 Biofortis, Saint Herblain, France

2 Merck Médication Familiale, Dijon Cedex, France

3 Silliker, Cergy-Pontoise, France

#### Keywords

competition, mechanical actions, otitis, probiotics, upper respiratory tract infections.

#### Correspondence

Thomas Carton, Biofortis, 3, route de la Chatterie, 44800 Saint Herblain, France. E-mail: thomas.carton@mxns.com

2012/0804: received 2 May 2012, revised 22 June 2012 and accepted 5 July 2012

doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2012.05394.x

#### Summary

Probiotics are live micro-organisms with beneficial effects on human health, which have the ability to counteract infections at different locations of the body. Clinical trials have shown that probiotics can be used as preventive and therapeutic agents in upper respiratory tract infections (URTIs) and otitis. Their mechanical properties allow them to aggregate and to compete with pathogens for nutrients, space and attachment to host cells. Consequently, they can directly antagonize pathogens and thus exert beneficial effects without directly affecting the metabolism of the host. An overview of the probiotics with such traits, tested up to date in clinical trials for the prevention or treatment of URTIs and otitis, is presented in this review. Their mechanical properties in the respiratory tract as well as at other locations are also cited. Species with interesting in vitro properties towards pharyngeal cells or against common respiratory pathogens have also been included. The potential safety risks of the cited species are then discussed. This review could be of help in the screening of probiotic strains with specific mechanical properties susceptible to have positive effects in clinical trials against URTIs.

#### Introduction

When they were discovered in the middle of the twentieth century, antibiotics offered the promise of efficient and cheap treatment of bacterial infections and even the possibility to eliminate infectious diseases. Pathogens have, however, found a way to survive by developing resistance to a range of antibiotics. This not only makes treatment of disease more difficult but also presents a serious threat to immunodeprived populations. As alternative antimicrobial approaches are being developed, probiotics have gained special interest in the last years.

According to the latest definition by the World Health Organization, probiotics are live micro-organisms that when administered in adequate amounts confer a health benefit to the host (FAO/WHO 2001). Probiotic treatment aims to direct the composition of the microbiota from potentially harming to a microbiota that would be beneficial to the host. Probiotics can be used as means of prevention by reducing the risk for overgrowth of potential pathogenic bacteria, thus suppressing colonization by the latter (Ouwehand et al. 2002). They also aim to restore lost bacteria or metabolic activities in colonized organs or to stimulate the immune response (Kalliomaki and Isolauri 2003). Probiotics have been shown to be beneficial at different sites of the human body - oral cavity, respiratory tract, gastrointestinal tract and urogenital tract. They have well established positive effects in the treatment of diarrhoea, including antibiotic associated and traveller's diarrhoea, vaginitis and functional gastrointestinal disorders [for review see (Allen et al. 2010; MacPhee et al. 2010; Girardin and Seidman 2011)]. Nowadays, various probiotic strains are commercialized with the aim to prevent or to treat these types of diseases. Human clinical trials and animal studies have shown that probiotics could have broader applications and they

could also be used to prevent, to treat or to relieve symptoms in cases of caries, periodontitis, allergies, atopic disease, respiratory infections, otitis, inflammatory bowel disease, Crohn's disease, colorectal cancer, acute gastroenteritis, lactose intolerance and cystitis [for review see (Stamatova and Meurman 2009b; Stamatova *et al.* 2009a; Ozdemir 2010; Gupta 2011; Meijer and Dieleman 2011; Yu 2011)].

In vitro and animal studies have allowed to elucidate some of the properties and modes of action of these beneficial micro-organisms. Their action can be directed at the host, the pathogen or both. Probiotics may modulate the host's innate or acquired immune response by products like metabolites, cell wall components and DNA, or they may increase intestinal mucin production (Mack et al. 1999). They may produce substances that inhibit pathogens - low-molecular-weight substances, low- and high-molecular-weight bacteriocins, antibiotics and microcins (Oelschlaeger 2010). These beneficial bacteria can also exert direct, mechanical effects on pathogens. These mechanical properties allow them to antagonize and to compete with them without affecting the metabolism neither of the host, nor of the pathogen. Competition involves adhesion, binding sites, nutrients and space (Lepargneur and Rousseau 2002).

The ability to adhere to the surface of epithelial cells or mucus enables probiotics to form a protective layer, thus blocking contact between pathogens and host cells. Adhesion ability also allows probiotics to compete with pathogenic bacteria for binding sites (Lepargneur and Rousseau 2002). If they bind to the same receptor and the affinity of the probiotic is higher, it has the ability to displace the pathogen. Furthermore, adherent probiotics occlude the access of recently arrived pathogens to the epithelium and thus exert competitive exclusion (O'Toole and Cooney 2008). Size can also be an important factor. Large-sized probiotic bacteria could exert better competitive exclusion of pathogens than small-sized ones by masking specific receptor sites for pathogenic micro-organisms on the cell surface by steric hindrance (Merk et al. 2005). Competition for nutrients results from the depletion by probiotics of nutrients from the environment that would otherwise be available for the pathogens. Additionally, they may bind and render unavailable to pathogens limited substances, such as iron (Oelschlaeger 2010). Probiotics and pathogens also compete for space that is essential for the multiplication of all micro-organisms (Alvarez-Olmos and Oberhelman 2001).

Another desirable mechanical property for probiotics is their capacity to aggregate among themselves (autoaggregation), with other probiotics or with pathogens (co-aggregation). Through auto-aggregating or co-aggregating with other probiotics, an adequate mass is achieved which is necessary for these micro-organisms to manifest their beneficial effects (Collado *et al.* 2007). Aggregation also enables the formation of a barrier that protects the host's epithelium from colonization by pathogens. Moreover, the ability to co-aggregate with a pathogen allows the probiotics to entrap it (Boris *et al.* 1998; Re *et al.* 2000).

All properties and modes of action are probably involved in the global beneficial effect exerted by probiotics. The properties and modes of action differ among probiotics and are strain specific. Moreover, the mechanical properties are also location specific. Thus, a single probiotic cannot be a remedy for all diseases (Oelschlaeger 2010). This underlines the importance of choosing the appropriate strain for a given condition.

Upper respiratory tract infections (URTIs) represent the most common acute illness in the patient outsetting, and they account for 9% of all consultations in general practice (Bourke 2007). URTIs include rhinitis, rhinosinusitis, rhinopharyngitis, also called the common cold, pharyngitis, epiglottitis and laryngitis. We have also included otitis in this review. Even though otitis does not affect the respiratory tract, infections of the upper respiratory tract can extend to the ears through the Eustachian tubes. URTIs can have viral or bacterial origin. The most common viruses causing URTIs are rhinoviruses, coronaviruses, parainfluenza and influenza viruses. Among the bacteria causing URTIs, the most frequent pathogens are group A streptococci, Mycoplasma pneumoniae, Chlamidia pneumoniae, Corynebacterium diphteriae, Staphylococcus aureus and Streptococcus pneumoniae (Bourke 2007). In the case of pharyngitis, the origin of the infection is viral in 15-40% of cases in children and 30-60% of cases in adults. Bacterial origin accounts for 38-40% of cases in children and 5-10% of cases in adults (Pichichero 2007). URTIs of bacterial origin are commonly treated by antibiotics. As mentioned earlier, however, antibiotherapy presents drawbacks, especially the occurrence of resistant bacteria. An alternative method for the treatment of URTIs could be the use of probiotics.

The aim of this review is to present the probiotic species that have been tested up to date in clinical trials for the prevention or treatment of URTIs and otitis (Table 1). All of them were bacteria, and no yeast species were found. We have mainly focused on the species with mechanical properties, but probiotics with both mechanical properties and immune stimulatory effects were also included. Trials conducted on subjects under heavy physical training, as well as trials employing synbiotics, were excluded. *In vitro* and animal studies have explained some of the mechanical properties and modes of action of the tested probiotics. Table 2 summarizes the mechanical properties of these probiotics in the upper respiratory tract, as well as at other sites of the body. This

| Probiotic  | Strain             | Population                  | Effect of treatment  | Reference                       |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Lactobacillus rhamnosus  | GG                 | Healthy children            | Reduction of RTI (otitis media, sinusitis,<br>bronchitis and pneumonia) and antibiotic<br>treatment                                | Hatakka <i>et al.</i><br>(2001) |
| Lact. rhamnosus  | GG                 | Healthy children            | Reduction of the risk of RTI<br>Reduction of the number of days with<br>respiratory symptoms                                       | Hojsak <i>et al.</i><br>(2010)  |
| Lact. rhamnosus  | GG                 | Otitis-prone children       | No decrease in the occurrence or recurrence of   | Hatakka <i>et al.</i>           |
| Bifidobacterium breve  | 99                 | ,                           | acute otitis media   | (2007)                          |
| Propionibacterium  | JS                 |                             | Tendency to decrease recurrent RTI   |                                 |
| freudenreichii   |                    |                             | No decrease in the nasopharyngeal carriage of  |                                 |
| subsp. shermanii   |                    |                             | S. pneumoniae. H. influenzae   |                                 |
|  |                    |                             | Increased prevalence of <i>M. catarrhalis</i>  |                                 |
| Lact. rhamnosus  | GG                 | Healthy adults              | Reduction of the nasal colonization with   | Gluck and                       |
| Streptococcus<br>thermophilus                                    |                    |                             | pathogens ( <i>Staphylococcus aureus and</i><br>S. pneumoniae)   | Gebbers<br>(2003)               |
| Lact. acidophilus  | 145                |                             |  |                                 |
| <i>Bifidobacterium sp.</i><br>(Actifit plus, Emmi<br>Schweiz AG) | B420               |                             |  |                                 |
| Lact. rhamnosus  | GG                 | Healthy infants             | Reduction of the incidence of recurrent RTI  | Rautava <i>et al.</i>           |
| Bif. animalis subsp. lactis                                      | Bb-12              |                             | Reduction of the risk of acute otitis media<br>Reduction of the need for antibiotic treatment                                      | (2009)                          |
| Bif. animalis subsp. lactis                                      | Bb-12              | Healthy new-born<br>infants | Decrease in respiratory infections<br>No significant difference in otitis media<br>No significant difference in use of antibiotics | Taipale <i>et al.</i><br>(2011) |
| Bif. animalis subsp. lactis                                      | Bb-12              | Healthy children            | Significant difference in respiratory illness  | Weizman <i>et al.</i><br>(2005) |
| Lact. acidophilus  | NCFM               | Healthy children            | Reduction of fever, rhinorrhoea, cough   | Leyer et al.                    |
| Bif. animalis subsp. lactis                                      | Bi-07              |                             | incidence  | (2009)                          |
|  |                    |                             | Reduction of antibiotic prescription   |                                 |
| Lact. delbrueckii  | OLL1073R-1         | Healthy adults and          | Decreased risk of catching the common cold or  | Makino et al.                   |
| subsp. bulgaricus  |                    | elderly                     | influenza virus  | (2010)                          |
| Strep. thermophilus  | OLS3059            | ,                           |  |                                 |
| Lact. paracasei  | DN-114001          | Healthy free-living         | Reduction of duration of URTIs, specifically   | Guillemard                      |
| subsp. <i>paracasei</i>  |                    | elderly                     | rhinopharyngitis   | et al. (2010)                   |
| Strep. thermophilus  |                    | ,                           |  |                                 |
| Lact. delbrueckii  |                    |                             |  |                                 |
| subsp. bulgaricus  |                    |                             |  |                                 |
| (Actimel)  |                    |                             |  |                                 |
| Lact. paracasei  | DN-114001          | Healthy children            | Decrease in incidence of URTIs   | Merenstein                      |
| subsp. <i>paracasei</i>  |                    | 5                           |  | <i>et al.</i> (2010)            |
| Strep. thermophilus  |                    |                             |  |                                 |
| Lact. delbrueckii<br>subsp. bulgaricus                           |                    |                             |  |                                 |
| (Actimel)  |                    |                             |  |                                 |
| Lact. plantarum  | HEAL 9 (DSM 15312) | Healthy adults              | Reduction of incidence and duration of   | Berggren <i>et al.</i>          |
| Lact. paracasei  | 8700:2 (DSM 13434) |                             | common cold episodes<br>Reduction of severity of symptoms  | (2011)                          |
| Lact. gasseri  | PA 16/8            | Healthy adults              | Reduction in the duration of common cold   | Vrese <i>et al.</i>             |
| Bif. longum  | SP 07/3            |                             | episodes   | (2005)                          |
| <i>Bif. bifidum</i> (Tribion harmonis)                           | MF 20/5            |                             | Reduction in the severity of symptoms  |                                 |

Table 1 Effect of probiotics used in clinical trials for the prevention or treatment of upper respiratory tract infections (URTIs) and otitis

(Continued)

| Probiotic           | Strain   | Population                               | Effect of treatment  | Reference                         |
|---------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Corynebacterium     | Co304 Isolated from nasal<br>mucus of a healthy<br>volunteer | Healthy adults                           | Prevents and eliminates colonization of the nasal cavity by <i>Staph. aureus</i> | Uehara <i>et al.</i><br>(2000)    |
| Strep. sanguinis    | 89a, NCIMB 40104   | Children with fluid in<br>the middle ear | Complete or almost complete resorption of<br>middle ear fluid                    | Skovbjerg <i>et al.</i><br>(2009) |
| Strep. sanguinis    |  | Pharyngotonsillitis-                     | Decrease in the recurrence of streptococcal                                      | Roos et al.                       |
| Strep. mitis (Bacto | normal,  | prone patients                           | tonsillitis  | (1993a)                           |
| Essum AB, Swee      | len)   |  |  |                                   |
| Strep. sanguinis    |  | Tonsillitis-prone                        | Decrease in the recurrence of tonsillitis  | Roos et al.                       |
| Strep. mitis        |  | patients                                 |  | (1993b)                           |
| Strep. sanguinis    |  | Pharyngotonsillitis-                     | Decrease in the recurrence of tonsillitis  | Roos et al.                       |
| Strep. mitis        |  | prone patients                           |  | (1996)                            |
| Strep. mitis        |  | Patients with acute                      | Decrease in the recurrence rate of group A                                       | Falck <i>et al.</i>               |
| Strep. sanguinis    |  | pharyngotonsillitis                      | streptococci   | (1999)                            |
| Strep. sanguinis    | Isolated from the  | Otitis media-prone                       | Decrease in the recurrence of otitis media                                       | Roos et al.                       |
| Strep. mitis        | opening of the   | children                                 |  | (2001)                            |
| Strep. oralis       | Eustachian tubes o<br>healthy children                       | f  |  |                                   |
| Strep. sanguinis    | Isolated from the  | Otitis media-prone                       | No significant effect  | Tano et al.                       |
| Strep. mitis        | nasopharynges of   | children                                 |  | (2002)                            |
| Strep. oralis       | healthy children   |  |  |                                   |

review may be of help in the identification of novel strains among the cited species as a new way of management of infectious disease.

# Probiotics with Effects in Upper Respiratory Tract Infections

We have identified 21 clinical trials addressing the effect of probiotics in URTIs and otitis. Four trials have shown no significant difference in the outcome measures between the probiotic and placebo groups (Tano *et al.* 2002; Weizman *et al.* 2005; Hatakka *et al.* 2007; Taipale *et al.* 2011). Moreover, the clinical trial conducted by Hatakka and colleagues showed an increase in the prevalence of *Moraxella catarrhalis* in the probiotic group. All the other trials reported a beneficial effect of the probiotic and improvement in specific sickness-related outcome measures.

A variety of probiotic strains have been used in these clinical trials. We have chosen to include three probiotic species (*Lactobacillus casei*, *Lact. helveticus* and *Lactococcus lactis*) to this review, which have not been tested in clinical trials for their effect on URTIs. However, *in vitro* studies have shown that they possess mechanical properties that allow them to antagonize respiratory tract pathogens. They could thus be potential probiotic candidates for future clinical studies.

#### Lactobacillus rhamnosus

The most commonly used strain of Lact. rhamnosus in URTI trials is GG. Alone or in association with Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis Bb-12, this probiotic reduced the incidence of respiratory infections and acute otitis media in children, as well as the use of antibiotics (Hatakka et al. 2001; Rautava et al. 2009). The combination of these two probiotics may reduce the colonization by respiratory pathogens through local inhibition, as well as through immunomodulation throughout the common mucosa-associated immune system (Rautava et al. 2009). Hojsak and colleagues demonstrated not only a reduced risk of URTIs upon consumption of Lact. rhamnosus GG, but also a reduction in the total number of days with respiratory symptoms (Hojsak et al. 2010). In combination with Strep. thermophilus, Lact. acidophilus 145 and Bifidobacterium sp B420, Lact. rhamnosus GG was shown to reduce the nasal colonization with pathogens such as Staph. aureus and Strep. pneumoniae in adults. An immunostimulatory mechanism may be involved (Gluck and Gebbers 2003).

In another clinical trial, however, strain GG in association with *Bif. breve* 99 and *Propionibacterium freudenreichii* subsp. *shermanii* JS did not show beneficial effects. No decrease in the occurrence or recurrence of acute otitis media or in the nasopharyngeal carriage of Table 2 Mechanical effects of probiotics used in clinical trials for the prevention or treatment of upper respiratory tract infections and otitis. Most of these properties have been demonstrated *in vitro* 

| Probiotic                | Mechanical properties              | Site of action                               | Reference   |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Lactobacillus rhamnosus  | Auto-aggregation                   | /  | Pascual et al. (2008)   |
|                          | Co-aggregation                     | resp., oral cav., intest.,<br>urog., intest. | Collado et al. (2007), Pascual et al. (2008), Twetman<br>et al. (2009)  |
|                          | Adherence                          | resp., oral cav., intest., urog.             | Tuomola and Salminen (1998), He <i>et al.</i> (2001),<br>Haukioja <i>et al.</i> (2006), Morelli <i>et al.</i> (2006),<br>Pascual <i>et al.</i> (2008), Stamatova <i>et al.</i> (2009a),<br>Gualielmetti <i>et al.</i> (2010b) |
|                          | Competitive exclusion              | vag.   | Reid <i>et al.</i> (1987), Roos <i>et al.</i> (2001), Sookkhee <i>et al.</i> (2001), (2001), Gudielmetti <i>et al.</i> (2010a)  |
|                          | Competition by steric              | intest.                                      | Lee and Puong (2002)  |
|                          | Competition for binding sites      | vag., intest.                                | Princivalli <i>et al.</i> (2009)  |
|                          | Competition for adhesion           | intest.                                      | Forestier <i>et al.</i> (2001), Gopal <i>et al.</i> (2001),<br>Coudeyras <i>et al.</i> (2008)   |
| Lact. acidofilus         | Auto-aggregation                   | /  | Boris et al. (1998)   |
|                          | Co-aggregation                     | oral cav vag                                 | Boris et al. (1998) Twetman et al. (2009)   |
|                          | Adherence                          | intest., vag.                                | Chauviere <i>et al.</i> (1992), Coconnier <i>et al.</i> (1992),<br>Bernet <i>et al.</i> (1994), Tuomola and Salminen<br>(1998), Gopal <i>et al.</i> (2001), Zarate and Nader-<br>Macias (2006)                                |
|                          | Competitive exclusion              | vag.   | Zarate and Nader-Macias (2006)  |
|                          | Competition by steric<br>hindrance | vag.   | Reid <i>et al.</i> (1987)   |
|                          | Competition for binding<br>sites   | vag.   | Boris <i>et al.</i> (1998)  |
| Bifidobacterium animalis | Auto-aggregation                   | /  | Gopal <i>et al.</i> (2001)  |
| subsp. <i>lactis</i>     | Co-aggregation                     | intest.                                      | Collado et al. (2007)   |
|                          | Adherence                          | intest.                                      | Gopal <i>et al.</i> (2001)  |
|                          | Competitive exclusion              | intest.                                      | Candela <i>et al.</i> (2008)  |
| Lact. delbrueckii subsp. | Auto-aggregation                   | /  | Aslim <i>et al.</i> (2007)  |
| bulgaricus               | Co-aggregation                     | intest.                                      | Aslim <i>et al.</i> (2007)  |
|                          | Adherence                          | oral cav., intest.                           | Greene and Klaenhammer (1994),<br>Stamatova <i>et al.</i> (2009a)   |
|                          | Competition for adhesion           | intest.                                      | Banerjee <i>et al.</i> (2009)   |
| Bif. longum              | Auto-aggregation                   | /  | Vlkova <i>et al.</i> (2008)   |
|                          | Co-aggregation                     | /  | Vlkova <i>et al.</i> (2008)   |
|                          | Adherence                          | intest.                                      | Re et al. (2000), Candela et al. (2008)   |
|                          | Competitive exclusion              | intest.                                      | Candela et al. (2008)   |
| Lact. plantarum          | Auto-aggregation                   | /  | Vizoso Pinto <i>et al.</i> (2007)   |
|                          | Co-aggregation                     | oral cav., intest.                           | Vizoso Pinto <i>et al.</i> (2007),<br>Twetman <i>et al.</i> (2009)  |
|                          | Adherence                          | intest.                                      | Klarin et al. (2005), Vizoso<br>Pinto et al. (2007), Ramiah et al. (2008)   |
|                          | Competitive exclusion              | intest.                                      | Candela <i>et al.</i> (2008)  |
|                          | Competition for adhesion           | intest.                                      | Ramiah <i>et al.</i> (2008)   |
| Streptococcus salivarius | Adherence                          | resp.  | Guglielmetti <i>et al.</i> (2010a), Taverniti <i>et al.</i><br>(2012)   |
|                          | Competitive exclusion              | resp.  | Guglielmetti <i>et al.</i> (2010a)  |
| Corynebacterium Co304    | Aggregation                        | /  | Uehara <i>et al.</i> (2000)   |
|                          | Competition for adhesion           | nasal cav.                                   | Uehara <i>et al.</i> (2000)   |
|                          | Abiotic action                     | nasal cav.                                   | Uehara <i>et al.</i> (2000)   |

(Continued)

| Probiotic           | Mechanical properties              | Site of action       | Reference   |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| Lact. paracasei     | Co-aggregation                     | oral cav.            | Twetman <i>et al.</i> (2009)                                      |
|                     | Adherence                          | intest., vag.        | Zarate and Nader-Macias (2006), Jankowska <i>et al.</i><br>(2008) |
|                     | Competition for adhesion           | intest.              | Jankowska <i>et al.</i> (2008)                                    |
|                     | Competitive exclusion              | vag.                 | Zarate and Nader-Macias (2006)                                    |
| Lact. casei         | Adherence                          | oral cav., intest.   | Tuomola and Salminen (1998)                                       |
|                     | Competitive by steric<br>hindrance | resp., intest.       | Lee and Puong (2002)  |
| Lact. helveticus    | Adherence                          | upper resp.          | Guglielmetti <i>et al.</i> (2010b)                                |
|                     | Competition for adhesion           | upper resp.          | Guglielmetti et al. (2010b)                                       |
|                     | Competitive exclusion              | upper resp.          | Guglielmetti et al. (2010b)                                       |
| Strep. thermophilus | Adherence                          | intest.              | Perea Velez et al. (2007), Khalil (2009)                          |
| Lactococcus lactis  | Adherence                          | upper resp., intest. | Kimoto <i>et al.</i> (1999), Guglielmetti <i>et al.</i> (2010b)   |
| Strep. sanguinis    | Adherence                          | oral cav.            | Okahashi <i>et al.</i> (2010, 2011)                               |
| Strep. mitis        | Adherence                          | oral cav.            | Hoogmoed <i>et al.</i> (2008)                                     |

#### Table 2 (Continued)

resp., respiratory tract; oral cav., oral cavity; intest., intestinal tract; urog., urogenital tract; nasal cav., nasal cavity.

*Strep. pneumoniae* and *Haemophilus influenzae* was observed in the probiotic group. Moreover, the presence of *Mor. catarrhalis* was increased (Hatakka *et al.* 2007).

The mechanical properties of *Lact. rhamnosus* are among the most extensively studied among probiotics. Different strains of this probiotic have mechanical effects on respiratory tract, intestinal, urogenital and oral cavity pathogens. *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* strains show the following mechanical properties: auto-aggregation, co-aggregation, adherence, competitive exclusion, competition by steric hindrance, competition for adhesion and competition for binding sites.

*In vitro, Lact. rhamnosus* GG has a good binding capacity to human pharyngeal cells (Guglielmetti *et al.* 2010b). It antagonizes respiratory tract pathogens such as *Strep. pyogenes* (Guglielmetti *et al.* 2010b). *In vitro* studies have shown that strain GG has no antimicrobial activity against group A streptococci. Its antagonistic activity may be exerted by inhibiting cell invasion by pathogens, probably by competition for Fn binding sites – a fibronectin required for efficient entry into epithelial cells (Princivalli *et al.* 2009). Strains L17 and N8, isolated from the oral cavities of healthy Thai volunteers, antagonize *Staph. aureus* (Sookkhee *et al.* 2001).

Lactobacillus rhamnosus LB21 has the capacity to co-aggregate with cariogenic pathogens (*Strep. mutans* and *Strep. sobrinus*) (Twetman *et al.* 2009). Strain GG co-aggregates with intestinal pathogens (*Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enterica*) (Collado *et al.* 2007) and interferes with their adhesion through steric hindrance (Lee and Puong 2002). This strain adheres to buccal epithelial cells and to saliva-coated surfaces (Haukioja *et al.* 2006; Stamatova *et al.* 2009a), to human epithelial intestinal cells (Tuomola and Salminen 1998), to the colon (Morelli *et al.* 2006) and to intestinal mucus (He *et al.* 2001). Strains DR20 and Lcr35 also adhere to human intestinal epithelial cells, and they compete with intestinal pathogens for adherence to these cells (Forestier *et al.* 2001; Gopal *et al.* 2001). Another strain that adheres to human epithelial intestinal cells is LC-705 (Tuomola and Salminen 1998). Strain Lcr35 competes with vaginal pathogens for adhesion to cervical and vaginal cells (Coudeyras *et al.* 2008). *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* L60 adheres to vaginal epithelial cells and co-aggregates with vaginal pathogens (*E. coli, Gardnerella vaginalis* and *Candida albicans*) (Pascual *et al.* 2008). Strain GR-1 adheres to squamous uroepithelial cells and competes with uropathogens by competitive exclusion (Reid *et al.* 1987; Reid 2001).

# Lactobacillus acidophilus

A clinical trial involving *Lact. acidophilus* NCFM alone or in combination with *Bif. animalis* subsp. *lactis* Bi-07 shows that this probiotic reduces influenza-like symptoms (fever, rhinorrhoea, cough incidence and duration of antibiotic prescription). No explanation was given by the authors to explain this effect (Leyer *et al.* 2009). Strain 145 of *Lact. acidophilus* along with *Lact. rhamnosus* GG, *Strep. thermophilus* and *Bifidobacterium* sp B420 reduced the nasal colonization with pathogens such as *Staph. aureus* and *Strep. pneumoniae* in adults possibly by an immunostimulatory mechanism (Gluck and Gebbers 2003).

Lactobacillus acidophilus strains possess numerous mechanical properties, one of which is auto-aggregation (Boris *et al.* 1998). Strain CCUG 5917 can co-aggregate with cariogenic bacteria (*Strep. mutans* and

Strep. sobrinus) (Twetman et al. 2009). Strains isolated from a healthy woman's vagina can co-aggregate with vaginal pathogens (E. coli, G. vaginalis and C. albicans) and compete with them for binding to glycogen receptors of the vaginal cells (Boris et al. 1998). Lactobacillus acidophilus CRL 1259 adheres to vaginal epithelial cells and competitively excludes Staph. aureus (Zarate and Nader-Macias 2006). Strains LB, BG2FO4, LA-1, HNO17, LC1 and NCFM/N2 show adherence to human epithelial intestinal cells in culture (Chauviere et al. 1992; Coconnier et al. 1992; Bernet et al. 1994; Tuomola and Salminen 1998; Gopal et al. 2001). Strains BG2FO4, LA-1 and HNO17 also adhere to intestinal mucus (Chauviere et al. 1992; Bernet et al. 1994; Gopal et al. 2001). Strain LB inhibits the adhesion of diarrhoeagenic enterotoxic E. coli to the brush border of intestinal cells (Coconnier et al. 1993) and competes with this pathogen by steric hindrance for attachment to enterocytic pathogen receptors (Reid et al. 1987). Strain HN017 inhibits colonization of the intestinal monolayer by E. coli (Gopal et al. 2001). Lactobacillus acidophilus strain UO 001 inhibits the growth of certain enteropathogens (Salmonella, Listeria and Campylobacter) (Fernandez et al. 2003).

#### Streptococcus salivarius

*Streptococcus salivarius* BLIS K12 Throat Guard is a probiotic product described as a natural remedy for the common cold and flu. *Streptococcus salivarius* K12 reduces halitosis (Burton *et al.* 2006; Masdea *et al.* in press) and is commercialized as a probiotic against oral malodour.

Strain K12 has the capacity to adhere to human epithelial pharyngeal cells *in vitro*. It antagonizes *Strep. pyogenes* through exclusion and competition (Guglielmetti *et al.* 2010a). This strain also inhibits the growth of *C. albicans in vitro* and protects mice from oral cadidosis (Ishijima *et al.* 2012). *In vitro*, alone or in combination with *Lact. helveticus* MIMLh5, strain ST3 adheres to pharyngeal epithelial cells, antagonizes *Strep. pyogenes* and modulates host innate immunity by inducing potentially protective effects (Taverniti *et al.* 2012). Strain NCC1561 modulates the growth of oral bacteria *in vitro* (Comelli *et al.* 2002).

#### Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis

*Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* Bb-12 alone or in combination with *Lact. rhamnosus* GG reduced respiratory infections (Rautava *et al.* 2009; Taipale *et al.* 2011). In the trial conducted by Rautava and collaborators, the association of the two probiotics also reduced the risk of early acute otitis media, as well as the use of antibiotics.

This effect may have been mediated via both reduction of colonization by pathogens by local inhibition and immunomodulation throughout the common mucosa-associated immune system (Rautava et al. 2009). However, Taipale and co-authors reported no difference in the incidence of otitis media or in the use of antibiotics (Taipale et al. 2011). A significant difference in the rate and duration of respiratory illnesses between the probiotic and the placebo group upon administration of Bif. animalis subsp. lactis Bb-12 was also absent in the trial conducted by Weizman and colleagues (Weizman et al. 2005). Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis Bi-07 was administered alone or in combination with Lact. acidophilus NCFM in another clinical trial. This resulted in the reduction of influenza-like symptoms and the duration of antibiotic use (Leyer et al. 2009).

*Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* has the ability to auto-aggregate. Strain DR10 adheres to the brush border of intestinal epithelial cells and to intestinal mucus (Gopal *et al.* 2001). *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* Bb-12 co-aggregates with *E. coli* and *Salm. enterica* (Collado *et al.* 2007), and strain Bar30 exerts competitive exclusion against these intestinal pathogens (Candela *et al.* 2008).

# Lactobacillus delbrueckii subsp. bulgaricus

A clinical trial involving *Lact. delbrueckii* subsp. *bulgaricus* OLL1073R-1 in association with *Strep. salivarius* subsp. *thermophilus* OLS3059 showed a reduced risk of catching the common cold when probiotics were ingested. Subsequent *in vitro* studies showed that this probiotic has immunostimulatory effects (Makino *et al.* 2010).

In vitro, Lact. delbrueckii subsp. bulgaricus strains B3 and G12 have the capacity to auto-aggregate and to co-aggregate with *E. coli* (Aslim *et al.* 2007). A number of strains of the laboratory collection of LB Lactis, Bulgaria, adhere to saliva-coated surfaces (Stamatova *et al.* 2009a). Strain 1489 can bind to intestinal epithelial cells (Greene and Klaenhammer 1994) and strain B-30892 inhibits the cytotoxic effects and adhesion of pathogenic *Clostridium difficile* to these cells (Banerjee *et al.* 2009).

# Lactobacillus paracasei

Lactobacillus paracasei 8700:2, in association with Lact. plantarum HEAL 9, lowered the incidence of common cold episodes and reduced the severity of pharyngeal symptoms. No explanation was given by the authors for this effect (Berggren *et al.* 2011). Lactobacillus casei DN-114001, named Lact. paracasei subsp. paracasei according to the current nomenclature, is contained in Actimel in association with Strep. thermophilus and Lact. delbrueckii subsp. bulgaricus. The consumption of this commercially available fermented probiotic dairy drink reduced the duration of URTIs, specifically rhinopharyngitis (Guillemard *et al.* 2010; Merenstein *et al.* 2010). Even though no explanation of this effect was given by the authors, Guillemard and colleagues did not observe modulation of immune parameters (natural killer cell activity, cytokine secretion) (Guillemard *et al.* 2010).

Lactobacillus paracasei F19 co-aggregates with cariogenic bacteria (*Strep. mutans* and *Strep. sobrinus*) (Twetman *et al.* 2009). Strains D6, D14 and N14, isolated from the oral cavities of healthy volunteers, possess high capacity to antagonize important oral pathogens, including *Staph. aureus* (Sookkhee *et al.* 2001). Strain IBB2588 adheres to human epithelial intestinal cells and competes for adhesion with *Salm. enterica in vitro* (Jankowska *et al.* 2008). Strain CRL 1289 adheres to vaginal epithelial cells *in vitro* and exerts competitive exclusion against *Staph. aureus* (Zarate and Nader-Macias 2006).

# Lactobacillus plantarum

A clinical trial conducted with *Lact. plantarum* HEAL 9 in association with *Lact. paracasei* 8700:2 showed a reduced incidence and duration of common cold episodes and a reduction in the severity of pharyngeal symptoms. No explanation for this effect was given by the authors (Berggren *et al.* 2011).

Lactobacillus plantarum 299v co-aggregates with cariogenic bacteria (*Strep. mutans* and *Strep. sobrinus*) (Twetman *et al.* 2009). Strain 299v also adheres *in vitro* to mucosal colonic cells and to the rectal mucosa of patients (Klarin *et al.* 2005). Strain BFE 1685 has the capacity to auto-aggregate, to adhere to human epithelial intestinal cells and to co-aggregate with intestinal pathogens (Vizoso Pinto *et al.* 2007). Lactobacillus plantarum Bar10 exerts competitive exclusion and displacement of *Salm. typhimurium* and *E. coli* (Candela *et al.* 2008). Strain 423 adheres to human epithelial intestinal cells and competes for adhesion with *Clostridium sporogenes* and *Enterococcus faecalis* (Ramiah *et al.* 2008).

#### Streptococcus thermophilus

In association with *Lact. delbrueckii* subsp. *bulgaricus* OLL1073R-1, *Strep. thermophilus* OLS3059 reduced the risk of catching the common cold in healthy adults and elderly. Subsequent *in vitro* studies showed that this probiotic has immunostimulatory effects (Makino *et al.* 2010). *Streptococcus thermophilus* in combination with *Lact. rhamnosus* GG, *Lact. acidophilus* 145 and *Bifidobacterim* sp B420 reduced the nasal colonization with pathogenic bacteria. An immunostimulatory effect is suspected for this action (Gluck and Gebbers 2003).

*Streptococcus thermophilus* CHCC 3534 adheres relatively well to intestinal epithelial cells (Perea Velez *et al.* 2007) and to intestinal mucus (Khalil 2009).

#### Bifidobacterium longum

*Bifidobacterium longum* SP 07/3, in combination with *Lact. gasseri* PA 16/8 and *Bif. bifidum* MF 20/5, reduced the duration of common cold episodes and the severity of symptoms in a clinical trial. This may be due to immune stimulatory effects (Vrese *et al.* 2006).

Bifidobacterium longum I10 possesses the capacity to auto-aggregate and to co-aggregate with Clostridia in vitro (Vlkova et al. 2008). Strain Bar33 adheres to the brush border of intestinal cells and to intestinal mucus and exerts competitive exclusion against *E. coli* and Salmonella (Candela et al. 2008). Strains isolated from gastric juice adhered to intestinal epithelial cells (Re et al. 2000).

# Bifidobacterium bifidum

*Bifidobacterium bifidum* MF 20/5, in association with *Lact. gasseri* PA 16/8 and *B. longum* SP 07/3, reduced the duration of episodes of common cold and reduced the severity of symptoms by an immunostimulatory effect (Vrese *et al.* 2006). *Bifidobacterium bifidum* I4 has the capacity to auto-aggregate as well as to co-aggregate with *Clostridia in vitro* (Vlkova *et al.* 2008).

# Corynebacterium Co304

A study on volunteers followed by *in vitro* analysis shows that *Coryne*. Co304, isolated from the nares of a healthy volunteer, prevented and eliminated colonization of the nasal cavity by pathogens such as *Staph. aureus* using a non-bacteriocin-like mechanism. This strain possesses aggregation capacity and possibly competes with *Staph. aureus* for an attachment molecule (Uehara *et al.* 2000).

# Streptococcus sanguinis

Streptococcus sanguinis has been tested in seven clinical trials. In one clinical trial with strain 89a, NCIMB 40104, a complete or almost complete resorption of middle ear fluid was observed in children with secretory otitis media. The authors suggested that stimulation of antibacterial immune effector mechanisms, rather than bacterial interference, might be responsible for the observed clinical effect (Skovbjerg *et al.* 2009). In association with *Strep. mitis, Strep. sanguinis* decreased the recurrence rate of group A streptococci in patients with acute streptococcal pharyngotonsillitis (Falck *et al.* 1999). This combination of probiotics also decreased the recurrence of tonsillitis in patients suffering from recurrent acute streptococcal tonsillitis or pharyngotonsillitis (Roos *et al.* 1993a,b, 1996). A combination of *Strep. sanguinis*, *Strep. mitis* and *Strep. oralis* strains isolated from the opening of the Eustachian tubes of healthy children decreased the recurrence of otitis media (Roos *et al.* 2001). In another clinical trial, the same combination of probiotic species, isolated from the nasopharynges of healthy children, had no beneficial effect (Tano *et al.* 2002).

In vitro, Strep. sanguinis strains isolated from the opening of the Eustachian tubes of healthy children have the capacity to antagonize pathogens including Strep. pneumoniae, H. influenza, Mor. catarrhalis and Strep. pyogenes (Roos et al. 2001). Strain SK36 binds to human oral epithelial cells and to saliva (Okahashi et al. 2010, 2011). Strain KTH-4 inhibits Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans, an oral bacterium found in infections of the oral cavity, mainly periodontitis (Sliepen et al. 2009).

#### Streptococcus mitis

The effect of Strep. mitis on URTIs has been tested in six clinical trials. A combination of Strep. mitis, Strept. oralis and Strept. sanguinis strains, isolated from the nasopharynges of healthy children, were used by Tano and colleagues. This clinical trial did not show significant outcomes (Tano et al. 2002). On the contrary, upon administration of Strep. mitis, Strep. oralis and Strep. sanguinis strains isolated from the opening of the Eustachian tubes of healthy children, Roos and colleagues observed a decrease in the recurrence rate of group A streptococci in children suffering from recurrent otitis media (Roos et al. 2001). Four clinical trials were conducted with a combination of Strep. mitis and Strep. sanguinis strains. A decrease in the recurrence of tonsillitis was observed in patients with acute recurrent tonsillitis or pharyngotonsillitis (Roos et al. 1993a,b, 1996), as well as a decrease in the recurrence rate of group A streptococci (Falck et al. 1999). In vitro, strain BMS reduces the adhesion of and inhibits Prevotella gingivalis (Hoogmoed et al. 2008).

#### Streptococcus oralis

The effect of *Strep. oralis* has been studied in two clinical trials both employing a combination of *Strep. oralis*, *Strep. sanguinis* and *Strep. mitis*. One of the clinical trials had a positive outcome, and a significant decrease in the recurrence rate of group A streptococci was observed in the treated group. This trial used strains isolated from the opening of the Eustachian tubes of healthy children (Roos *et al.* 2001). The second clinical trial employed

strains isolated from the nasopharynges of healthy children and showed no positive outcomes (Tano *et al.* 2002).

In vitro, Strep. oralis strains Parker and Booth, isolated from the nasopharynges of patients undergoing adenoidectomy for either hypertrophy or recurrent otitis media, have been analysed. These strains have the capacity to antagonize and inhibit the growth of pathogens in the nasopharynx including *Strep. pneumoniae*, *H. influenza*, *Mor. catarrhalis* and *Strep. pyogenes* (Bernstein *et al.* 2006).

#### Lactobacillus casei

Lactobacillus casei has not been tested in a clinical trial for its effect against URTIs. In vitro, Lact. casei Shirota exhibits a high binding capacity to saliva-coated surfaces and survives in saliva (Haukioja *et al.* 2006). This strain also possesses an antagonist activity against *Strep. pyogenes* by exclusion (Guglielmetti *et al.* 2010b).

Lactobacillus casei Fyos adheres to human intestinal epithelial cells (Tuomola and Salminen 1998) and strain Shirota competes with intestinal pathogens (*E. coli, Salm. enterica*) probably by steric hindrance (Lee and Puong 2002).

#### Lactobacillus helveticus

*Lactobacillus helveticus* MIMLh5 adheres to human pharyngeal cells *in vitro*. It antagonizes *Strep. pyogenes* through exclusion and competition for adhesion sites on cells (Guglielmetti *et al.* 2010b). This probiotic has not been used in clinical trials against URTIs.

#### Lactococcus lactis

*Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *cremoris* Viili possesses a high binding capacity to human pharyngeal cells and antagonizes *Strep. pyogenes* (Guglielmetti *et al.* 2010b).

Strain NIAI527 adheres to colonic cells and to human intestinal mucus (Kimoto *et al.* 1999). A strain not specified by the authors reduced the adhesion and viability of *Staph. aureus* (Vesterlund *et al.* 2006). Clinical trials have not been conducted with this probiotic up to date.

# Discussion

In a time when the drawbacks and the risks of unjustified antibiotic treatment have been understood, patients and doctors may be turning to probiotics as a safer means for prevention and treatment of disease. Here, we have presented the probiotics that have been employed in clinical trials aiming to prevent or treat URTIs and otitis. Many of these bacteria have not only mechanical but also immune stimulatory effects. The discussion of their immune properties is a vast topic and was not the subject of the present review. In the following sections, only the mechanical properties of probiotics are discussed.

Most of the probiotics reported in this review are lactic acid bacteria and belong to the *Lact.*, *Lactococcus* and *Bifidobacterium* families, but there are also several *Strep.* species.

A very important aspect that should be considered before developing a probiotic product is safety. A large number of lactic acid bacteria are considered as safe. They have been approved by EFSA for their introduction into the food chain and have been granted a positive QPS status. 'Qualified Presumption of Safety' is a safety assessment system based on four parameters: establishing the identity, body of knowledge, possible pathogenicity and end use of the micro-organism. Organisms that are granted a QPS status do not raise safety concerns and can be used as probiotic substances without further safety assessment other than satisfying any qualifications specified. The lack of a positive QPS status does not imply that a micro-organism is hazardous; however, it must undergo full safety assessment (EFSA 2007). A microorganism might not be approved by EFSA but may have gained a GRAS (Generally Recognized as Safe) status by the FDA in the USA. This is the case for Strep. salivarius. It has also been approved as a food ingredient in both Australia and New Zealand. Its safety has recently been assessed in a clinical trial which shows that the intake of this bacterium is well tolerated by humans (Burton et al. 2011).

Most of the species effective against URTIs have been granted a positive QPS status. In very rare cases and in the presence of predisposing factors such as underlying disease, immunocompromised status or early age, some of the presented species have been associated with infection (EFSA 2007). It is important to underline that these cases are extremely rare and are not related to the consumption of probiotics. As an example, Strep. mitis, Strep. oralis and Strep. sanguinis have been responsible for rare cases of infectious endocarditis (Miyata et al. 2007; Nyawo et al. 2007; Renton et al. 2009). Lactococcus lactis can also very rarely cause severe infections, such as infectious endocarditis (Halldorsdottir et al. 2002). This commonly consumed bacterium is a dairy starter and its consumption in large quantities in cheese and fermented milks is generally safe. It has, however, been denied a QPS status by EFSA.

The large majority of the here-cited clinical trials conducted against URTIs and otitis show positive outcomes. Among the 21 clinical trials presented in this review, 17 had a positive outcome and only four showed no beneficial effect of the use of probiotics. Moreover, six clinical trials have been conducted with *Strep. mitis*, *Strep. oralis* and *Strep. sanguinis*. They have all shown positive outcomes without any clinical complications.

In the search of a probiotic strain for a given condition, the aim of the probiotic preparation should be clearly defined. Prevention of infection or its treatment may necessitate different mechanical properties. In the case of prevention, probiotics should establish a microbiota capable to inhibit and/or block colonization by pathogens. In the case of treatment, however, probiotics will need to confront an already established population of pathogens. In both cases, aggregation and adherence are required properties for the probiotic. In the absence of pathogens, the probiotic would adhere to the host cells and protect them by blocking the access of pathogens. When a pathogen arrives, they could trap it by co-aggregating with it and thus eliminate it. It is possible that probiotics do not confer complete protection against infection. However, they could help fight pathogens and thus reduce the duration and the severity of symptoms. In an already infected organism, a desirable ability for a probiotic is to exert competitive exclusion. A higher affinity for binding sites would allow them to exclude attached pathogens that could subsequently be eliminated through co-aggregation. On the other hand, strong adherence to host cells would allow the probiotic to occupy any free space on the epithelial surface. Thus, they could slow down the multiplication of the pathogens by competing with them for space and nutrients. In the case of URTIs, most clinical trials are destined to prevent disease in the healthy population or to prevent recurrence in disease-prone patients.

# Conclusion

This review aimed to underline the importance of the mechanical properties of probiotics in their action against pathogens with a special interest on the probiotics that have shown to be effective in the prevention of URTIs and otitis. The properties of a probiotic being strain specific, what we know up to date is only a small part of the potential offered by these 'friendly bacteria'. This review might help the choice of probiotic species for the development of novel probiotic applications. Of the 16 here-cited species, almost half are lactic bacteria belonging to the Lact. genus (Lact. rhamnosus, Lact. acidophilus, Lact. delbrueckii, Lact. paracasei, Lact. plantarum, Lact. casei and Lact. helveticus) and the Bifidobacterium genus (Bif. animalis, B. longum and B. bifidum). Some species, as Lact. rhamnosus and Lact. acidophilus, have been extensively studied compared to others that have been tested in few clinical trials. These extensively studied species have well-documented mechanical properties and seem to offer a bigger chance of success in the search of new strains. The mechanical properties of the less studied probiotics are less well known, but their potential should not be underestimated. Finally, it could also be interesting to investigate the less frequently used in URTI studies *Streptococcus* genus (*Strep. salivarius*, *Strep. mitis*, *Strep. oralis* and *Strep. sanguinis*).

# References

- Allen, S.J., Martinez, E.G., Gregorio, G.V. and Dans, L.F. (2010) Probiotics for treating acute infectious diarrhoea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 11, CD003048.
- Alvarez-Olmos, M.I. and Oberhelman, R.A. (2001) Probiotic agents and infectious diseases: a modern perspective on a traditional therapy. *Clin Infect Dis* **32**, 1567–1576.
- Aslim, B., Onal, D. and Beyatli, Y. (2007) Factors influencing autoaggregation and aggregation of *Lactobacillus delbrueckii* subsp. bulgaricus isolated from handmade yogurt. J Food Prot 70, 223–227.
- Banerjee, P., Merkel, G.J. and Bhunia, A.K. (2009) Lactobacillus delbrueckii ssp. bulgaricus B-30892 can inhibit cytotoxic effects and adhesion of pathogenic Clostridium difficile to Caco-2 cells. Gut Pathog 1, 8.
- Berggren, A., Lazou Ahren, I., Larsson, N. and Onning, G. (2011) Randomised, double-blind and placebo-controlled study using new probiotic lactobacilli for strengthening the body immune defence against viral infections. *Eur J Nutr* **50**, 203–210.
- Bernet, M.F., Brassart, D., Neeser, J.R. and Servin, A.L. (1994) Lactobacillus acidophilus LA 1 binds to cultured human intestinal cell lines and inhibits cell attachment and cell invasion by enterovirulent bacteria. Gut 35, 483–489.
- Bernstein, J.M., Haase, E., Scannapieco, F., Dryja, D., Wolf, J., Briles, D., King, J. and Wilding, G.E. (2006) Bacterial interference of penicillin-sensitive and -resistant *Streptococcus pneumoniae* by *Streptococcus oralis* in an adenoid organ culture: implications for the treatment of recurrent upper respiratory tract infections in children and adults. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol* 115, 350–356.
- Boris, S., Suarez, J.E., Vazquez, F. and Barbes, C. (1998) Adherence of human vaginal lactobacilli to vaginal epithelial cells and interaction with uropathogens. *Infect Immun* 66, 1985–1989.
- Bourke, S.J. (2007) *Lecture Notes: Respiratory Medicine*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Burton, J.P., Wescombe, P.A., Moore, C.J., Chilcott, C.N. and Tagg, J.R. (2006) Safety assessment of the oral cavity probiotic *Streptococcus salivarius* K12. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 72, 3050–3053.
- Burton, J.P., Cowley, S., Simon, R.R., McKinney, J., Wescombe, P.A. and Tagg, J.R. (2011) Evaluation of

safety and human tolerance of the oral probiotic *Streptococcus salivarius* K12: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. *Food Chem Toxicol* **49**, 2356–2364.

- Candela, M., Perna, F., Carnevali, P., Vitali, B., Ciati, R., Gionchetti, P., Rizzello, F., Campieri, M. *et al.* (2008) Interaction of probiotic *Lactobacillus* and Bifidobacterium strains with human intestinal epithelial cells: adhesion properties, competition against enteropathogens and modulation of IL-8 production. *Int J Food Microbiol* **125**, 286–292.
- Chauviere, G., Coconnier, M.H., Kerneis, S., Fourniat, J. and Servin, A.L. (1992) Adhesion of human *Lactobacillus* acidophilus strain LB to human enterocyte-like Caco-2 cells. J Gen Microbiol 138 (Pt 8), 1689–1696.
- Coconnier, M.H., Klaenhammer, T.R., Kerneis, S., Bernet, M. F. and Servin, A.L. (1992) Protein-mediated adhesion of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* BG2FO4 on human enterocyte and mucus-secreting cell lines in culture. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 58, 2034–2039.
- Coconnier, M.H., Bernet, M.F., Chauviere, G. and Servin, A.L. (1993) Adhering heat-killed human *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, strain LB, inhibits the process of pathogenicity of diarrhoeagenic bacteria in cultured human intestinal cells. J Diarrhoeal Dis Res 11, 235–242.
- Collado, M.C., Meriluoto, J. and Salminen, S. (2007) Measurement of aggregation properties between probiotics and pathogens: in vitro evaluation of different methods. *J Microbiol Methods* **71**, 71–74.
- Comelli, E.M., Guggenheim, B., Stingele, F. and Neeser, J.R. (2002) Selection of dairy bacterial strains as probiotics for oral health. *Eur J Oral Sci* **110**, 218–224.
- Coudeyras, S., Jugie, G., Vermerie, M. and Forestier, C. (2008) Adhesion of human probiotic *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* to cervical and vaginal cells and interaction with vaginosisassociated pathogens. *Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol* 2008, 549640.
- EFSA (2007) Opinion of the Scientific Committee on a request from EFSA on the introduction of a Qualified Presumption of Safety (QPS) approach for assessment of selected microorganisms referred to EFSA. *The EFSA J* 587, 1–16.
- Falck, G., Grahn-Hakansson, E., Holm, S.E., Roos, K. and Lagergren, L. (1999) Tolerance and efficacy of interfering alpha-streptococci in recurrence of streptococcal pharyngotonsillitis: a placebo-controlled study. *Acta Otolaryngol* 119, 944–948.
- FAO/WHO (2001) Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Evaluation of Health and Nutritional Properties of Probiotics in Food Including Powder Milk with Live Lactic Acid Bacteria. Cordoba: FAO/WHO.
- Fernandez, M.F., Boris, S. and Barbes, C. (2003) Probiotic properties of human lactobacilli strains to be used in the gastrointestinal tract. J Appl Microbiol 94, 449–455.

- Forestier, C., De Champs, C., Vatoux, C. and Joly, B. (2001) Probiotic activities of *Lactobacillus casei* rhamnosus: in vitro adherence to intestinal cells and antimicrobial properties. *Res Microbiol* 152, 167–173.
- Girardin, M. and Seidman, E.G. (2011) Indications for the use of probiotics in gastrointestinal diseases. *Dig Dis* **29**, 574–587.
- Gluck, U. and Gebbers, J.O. (2003) Ingested probiotics reduce nasal colonization with pathogenic bacteria (*Staphylococcus aureus*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, and beta-hemolytic streptococci). Am J Clin Nutr 77, 517–520.
- Gopal, P.K., Prasad, J., Smart, J. and Gill, H.S. (2001) In vitro adherence properties of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* DR20 and Bifidobacterium lactis DR10 strains and their antagonistic activity against an enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli*. Int J Food Microbiol **67**, 207–216.
- Greene, J.D. and Klaenhammer, T.R. (1994) Factors involved in adherence of lactobacilli to human Caco-2 cells. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **60**, 4487–4494.
- Guglielmetti, S., Taverniti, V., Minuzzo, M., Arioli, S., Stuknyte, M., Karp, M. and Mora, D. (2010a) Oral bacteria as potential probiotics for the pharyngeal mucosa. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 76, 3948–3958.
- Guglielmetti, S., Taverniti, V., Minuzzo, M., Arioli, S., Zanoni, I., Stuknyte, M., Granucci, F., Karp, M. *et al.* (2010b) A dairy bacterium displays in vitro probiotic properties for the pharyngeal mucosa by antagonizing group A streptococci and modulating the immune response. *Infect Immun* 78, 4734–4743.
- Guillemard, E., Tondu, F., Lacoin, F. and Schrezenmeir, J. (2010) Consumption of a fermented dairy product containing the probiotic *Lactobacillus casei* DN-114001 reduces the duration of respiratory infections in the elderly in a randomised controlled trial. *Br J Nutr* **103**, 58–68.
- Gupta, G. (2011) Probiotics and periodontal health. *J Med Life* **4**, 387–394.
- Halldorsdottir, H.D., Haraldsdottir, V., Bodvarsson, A., Thorgeirsson, G. and Kristjansson, M. (2002) Endocarditis caused by *Lactococcus cremoris*. Scand J Infect Dis 34, 205–206.
- Hatakka, K., Savilahti, E., Ponka, A., Meurman, J.H., Poussa, T., Nase, L., Saxelin, M. and Korpela, R. (2001) Effect of long term consumption of probiotic milk on infections in children attending day care centres: double blind, randomised trial. *BMJ* **322**, 1327.
- Hatakka, K., Blomgren, K., Pohjavuori, S., Kaijalainen, T., Poussa, T., Leinonen, M., Korpela, R. and Pitkaranta, A. (2007) Treatment of acute otitis media with probiotics in otitis-prone children-a double-blind, placebo-controlled randomised study. *Clin Nutr* 26, 314–321.
- Haukioja, A., Yli-Knuuttila, H., Loimaranta, V., Kari, K., Ouwehand, A.C., Meurman, J.H. and Tenovuo, J. (2006) Oral adhesion and survival of probiotic and other lactobacilli and bifidobacteria in vitro. *Oral Microbiol Immunol* 21, 326–332.

- He, F., Ouwehand, A.C., Isolauri, E., Hosoda, M., Benno, Y. and Salminen, S. (2001) Differences in composition and mucosal adhesion of bifidobacteria isolated from healthy adults and healthy seniors. *Curr Microbiol* 43, 351–354.
- Hojsak, I., Snovak, N., Abdovic, S., Szajewska, H., Misak, Z. and Kolacek, S. (2010) Lactobacillus GG in the prevention of gastrointestinal and respiratory tract infections in children who attend day care centers: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Clin Nutr* 29, 312–316.
- Van Hoogmoed, C.G., Geertsema-Doornbusch, G.I., Teughels, W., Quirynen, M., Busscher, H.J. and Van der Mei, H.C. (2008) Reduction of periodontal pathogens adhesion by antagonistic strains. *Oral Microbiol Immunol* 23, 43–48.
- Ishijima, S.A., Hayama, K., Burton, J.P., Reid, G., Okada, M., Matsushita, Y. and Abe, S. (2012) Effect of *Streptococcus* salivarius K12 on the in vitro growth of *Candida albicans* and its protective effect in an oral candidiasis model. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 78, 2190–2199.
- Jankowska, A., Laubitz, D., Antushevich, H., Zabielski, R. and Grzesiuk, E. (2008) Competition of *Lactobacillus paracasei* with *Salmonella enterica* for adhesion to Caco-2 cells. *J Biomed Biotechnol* **2008**, 357964.
- Kalliomaki, M. and Isolauri, E. (2003) Role of intestinal flora in the development of allergy. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol* 3, 15–20.
- Khalil, R. (2009) Evidence for probiotic potential of a capsular-producing *Streptococcus thermophilus* CHCC 3534 strain. *Pol J Microbiol* 58, 49–55.
- Kimoto, H., Kurisaki, J., Tsuji, N.M., Ohmomo, S. and Okamoto, T. (1999) Lactococci as probiotic strains: adhesion to human enterocyte-like Caco-2 cells and tolerance to low pH and bile. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 29, 313–316.
- Klarin, B., Johansson, M.L., Molin, G., Larsson, A. and Jeppsson, B. (2005) Adhesion of the probiotic bacterium *Lactobacillus plantarum* 299v onto the gut mucosa in critically ill patients: a randomised open trial. *Crit Care* 9, R285–R293.
- Lee, Y.K. and Puong, K.Y. (2002) Competition for adhesion between probiotics and human gastrointestinal pathogens in the presence of carbohydrate. *Br J Nutr* 88(Suppl 1), S101–S108.
- Lepargneur, J.P. and Rousseau, V. (2002) Protective role of the Doderlein flora. J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris) 31, 485–494.
- Leyer, G.J., Li, S., Mubasher, M.E., Reifer, C. and Ouwehand, A.C. (2009) Probiotic effects on cold and influenza-like symptom incidence and duration in children. *Pediatrics* 124, e172–e179.
- Mack, D.R., Michail, S., Wei, S., McDougall, L. and Hollingsworth, M.A. (1999) Probiotics inhibit enteropathogenic *E. coli* adherence in vitro by inducing intestinal mucin gene expression. *Am J Physiol* 276, G941–G950.

MacPhee, R.A., Hummelen, R., Bisanz, J.E., Miller, W.L. and Reid, G. (2010) Probiotic strategies for the treatment and prevention of bacterial vaginosis. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 11, 2985–2995.

Makino, S., Ikegami, S., Kume, A., Horiuchi, H., Sasaki, H. and Orii, N. (2010) Reducing the risk of infection in the elderly by dietary intake of yoghurt fermented with *Lactobacillus delbrueckii* ssp. bulgaricus OLL1073R-1. Br J Nutr 104, 998–1006.

Masdea, L., Kulik, E.M., Hauser-Gerspach, I., Ramseier, A.M., Filippi, A. and Waltimo, T. (in press) Antimicrobial activity of *Streptococcus salivarius* K12 on bacteria involved in oral malodour. *Arch Oral Biol* doi: 10.1016/j. archoralbio.2012.02.011.

Meijer, B.J. and Dieleman, L.A. (2011) Probiotics in the treatment of human inflammatory bowel diseases: update 2011. J Clin Gastroenterol 45(Suppl), \$139–\$144.

Merenstein, D., Murphy, M., Fokar, A., Hernandez, R.K., Park, H., Nsouli, H., Sanders, M.E., Davis, B.A. *et al.* (2010)
Use of a fermented dairy probiotic drink containing *Lactobacillus casei* (DN-114 001) to decrease the rate of illness in kids: the DRINK study. A patient-oriented, double-blind, cluster-randomized, placebo-controlled, clinical trial. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 64, 669–677.

Merk, K., Borelli, C. and Korting, H.C. (2005) Lactobacilli – bacteria-host interactions with special regard to the urogenital tract. *Int J Med Microbiol* **295**, 9– 18.

Miyata, E., Satoh, S., Inokuchi, K., Aso, A., Kimura, Y., Yokoyama, S., Mori, E., Nakamura, T. *et al.* (2007) Three fatal cases of rapidly progressive infective endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus aureus*: one case with huge vegetation. *Circ J* 71, 1488–1491.

Morelli, L., Garbagna, N., Rizzello, F., Zonenschain, D. and Grossi, E. (2006) In vivo association to human colon of *Lactobacillus paracasei* B21060: map from biopsies. *Dig Liver Dis* 38, 894–898.

Nyawo, B., Shoaib, R.F., Evemy, K. and Clark, S.C. (2007) Infective endocarditis during pregnancy: case report. *Heart* Surg Forum 10, E480–E481.

Oelschlaeger, T.A. (2010) Mechanisms of probiotic actions – a review. *Int J Med Microbiol* **300**, 57–62.

Okahashi, N., Nakata, M., Sakurai, A., Terao, Y., Hoshino, T., Yamaguchi, M., Isoda, R., Sumitomo, T. *et al.* (2010) Pili of oral *Streptococcus sanguinis* bind to fibronectin and contribute to cell adhesion. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 391, 1192–1196.

Okahashi, N., Nakata, M., Terao, Y., Isoda, R., Sakurai, A., Sumitomo, T., Yamaguchi, M., Kimura, R.K. *et al.* (2011) Pili of oral *Streptococcus sanguinis* bind to salivary amylase and promote the biofilm formation. *Microb Pathog* **50**, 148–154.

O'Toole, P.W. and Cooney, J.C. (2008) Probiotic bacteria influence the composition and function of the intestinal microbiota. *Interdiscip Perspect Infect Dis* **2008**, 175285. Ouwehand, A.C., Salminen, S. and Isolauri, E. (2002) Probiotics: an overview of beneficial effects. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* 82, 279–289.

Ozdemir, O. (2010) Any benefits of probiotics in allergic disorders? *Allergy Asthma Proc* **31**, 103–111.

Pascual, L.M., Daniele, M.B., Ruiz, F., Giordano, W., Pajaro, C. and Barberis, L. (2008) *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* L60, a potential probiotic isolated from the human vagina. *J Gen Appl Microbiol* 54, 141–148.

Perea Velez, M., Hermans, K., Verhoeven, T.L., Lebeer, S.E., Vanderleyden, J. and De Keersmaecker, S.C. (2007)
Identification and characterization of starter lactic acid bacteria and probiotics from Columbian dairy products. *J Appl Microbiol* 103, 666–674.

Pichichero, M. (2007) *Clinical Management of Streptococcal Pharyngitis.* West Islip, NY: Professional Communications, Inc.

Princivalli, M.S., Paoletti, C., Magi, G., Palmieri, C., Ferrante, L. and Facinelli, B. (2009) *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG inhibits invasion of cultured human respiratory cells by prtF1-positive macrolide-resistant group A streptococci. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 48, 368–372.

Ramiah, K., van Reenen, C.A. and Dicks, L.M. (2008) Surface-bound proteins of *Lactobacillus plantarum* 423 that contribute to adhesion of Caco-2 cells and their role in competitive exclusion and displacement of *Clostridium sporogenes* and *Enterococcus faecalis. Res Microbiol* 159, 470–475.

Rautava, S., Salminen, S. and Isolauri, E. (2009) Specific probiotics in reducing the risk of acute infections in infancy–a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Br J Nutr 101, 1722–1726.

Del Re, B., Sgorbati, B., Miglioli, M. and Palenzona, D. (2000) Adhesion, autoaggregation and hydrophobicity of 13 strains of Bifidobacterium longum. *Lett Appl Microbiol* **31**, 438–442.

Reid, G. (2001) Probiotic agents to protect the urogenital tract against infection. *Am J Clin Nutr* **73**, 437S–443S.

Reid, G., Cook, R.L. and Bruce, A.W. (1987) Examination of strains of lactobacilli for properties that may influence bacterial interference in the urinary tract. *J Urol* 138, 330–335.

Renton, B.J., Clague, J.E. and Cooke, R.P. (2009) Streptococcus oralis endocarditis presenting as infective discitis in an edentulous patient. Int J Cardiol 137, e13–e14.

Roos, K., Grahn, E., Holm, S.E., Johansson, H. and Lind, L. (1993a) Interfering alpha-streptococci as a protection against recurrent streptococcal tonsillitis in children. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 25, 141–148.

Roos, K., Holm, S.E., Grahn, E. and Lind, L. (1993b) Alphastreptococci as supplementary treatment of recurrent streptococcal tonsillitis: a randomized placebo-controlled study. *Scand J Infect Dis* 25, 31–35.

Roos, K., Holm, S.E., Grahn-Hakansson, E. and Lagergren, L. (1996) Recolonization with selected alpha-streptococci for

prophylaxis of recurrent streptococcal pharyngotonsillitis– a randomized placebo-controlled multicentre study. *Scand J Infect Dis* **28**, 459–462.

Roos, K., Hakansson, E.G. and Holm, S. (2001) Effect of recolonisation with "interfering" alpha streptococci on recurrences of acute and secretory otitis media in children: randomised placebo controlled trial. *BMJ* 322, 210–212.

Skovbjerg, S., Roos, K., Holm, S.E., Grahn Hakansson, E., Nowrouzian, F., Ivarsson, M., Adlerberth, I. and Wold, A.
E. (2009) Spray bacteriotherapy decreases middle ear fluid in children with secretory otitis media. *Arch Dis Child* 94, 92–98.

Sliepen, I., Van Essche, M., Loozen, G., Van Eldere, J., Quirynen, M. and Teughels, W. (2009) Interference with Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans: colonization of epithelial cells under hydrodynamic conditions. Oral Microbiol Immunol 24, 390–395.

Sookkhee, S., Chulasiri, M. and Prachyabrued, W. (2001) Lactic acid bacteria from healthy oral cavity of Thai volunteers: inhibition of oral pathogens. *J Appl Microbiol* **90**, 172–179.

Stamatova, I. and Meurman, J.H. (2009b) Probiotics: health benefits in the mouth. *Am J Dent* **22**, 329–338.

Stamatova, I., Kari, K., Vladimirov, S. and Meurman, J.H. (2009a) In vitro evaluation of yoghurt starter lactobacilli and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG adhesion to saliva-coated surfaces. Oral Microbiol Immunol 24, 218–223.

Taipale, T., Pienihakkinen, K., Isolauri, E., Larsen, C., Brockmann, E., Alanen, P., Jokela, J. and Soderling, E. (2011) *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. lactis BB-12 in reducing the risk of infections in infancy. *Br J Nutr* 105, 409–416.

Tano, K., Grahn Hakansson, E., Holm, S.E. and Hellstrom, S. (2002) A nasal spray with alpha-haemolytic streptococci as long term prophylaxis against recurrent otitis media. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 62, 17–23.

Taverniti, V., Minuzzo, M., Arioli, S., Junttila, I., Hamalainen, S., Turpeinen, H., Mora, D., Karp, M. *et al.* (2012) In vitro functional and immunomodulatory properties of the *Lactobacillus helveticus* MIMLh5-*Streptococcus salivarius* ST3 association that are relevant to the development of a pharyngeal probiotic product. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **78**, 4209–4216. Tuomola, E.M. and Salminen, S.J. (1998) Adhesion of some probiotic and dairy Lactobacillus strains to Caco-2 cell cultures. *Int J Food Microbiol* **41**, 45–51.

Twetman, L., Larsen, U., Fiehn, N.E., Stecksen-Blicks, C. and Twetman, S. (2009) Coaggregation between probiotic bacteria and caries-associated strains: an in vitro study. *Acta Odontol Scand* 67, 1–5.

Uehara, Y., Nakama, H., Agematsu, K., Uchida, M., Kawakami, Y., Abdul Fattah, A.S. and Maruchi, N. (2000) Bacterial interference among nasal inhabitants: eradication of *Staphylococcus aureus* from nasal cavities by artificial implantation of *Corynebacterium* sp. *J Hosp Infect* 44, 127–133.

Vesterlund, S., Karp, M., Salminen, S. and Ouwehand, A.C. (2006) *Staphylococcus aureus* adheres to human intestinal mucus but can be displaced by certain lactic acid bacteria. *Microbiology* **152**, 1819–1826.

Vizoso Pinto, M.G., Schuster, T., Briviba, K., Watzl, B., Holzapfel, W.H. and Franz, C.M. (2007) Adhesive and chemokine stimulatory properties of potentially probiotic Lactobacillus strains. *J Food Prot* **70**, 125–134.

Vlkova, E., Rada, V., Smehilova, M. and Killer, J. (2008) Autoaggregation and co-aggregation ability in bifidobacteria and clostridia. *Folia Microbiol (Praha)* 53, 263–269.

de Vrese, M., Winkler, P., Rautenberg, P., Harder, T., Noah, C., Laue, C., Ott, S., Hampe, J. *et al.* (2005) Effect of *Lactobacillus gasseri* PA 16/8, Bifidobacterium longum SP 07/ 3, B. bifidum MF 20/5 on common cold episodes: a double blind, randomized, controlled trial. *Clin Nutr* 24, 481–491.

de Vrese, M., Winkler, P., Rautenberg, P., Harder, T., Noah, C., Laue, C., Ott, S., Hampe, J. *et al.* (2006) Probiotic bacteria reduced duration and severity but not the incidence of common cold episodes in a double blind, randomized, controlled trial. *Vaccine* 24, 6670–6674.

Weizman, Z., Asli, G. and Alsheikh, A. (2005) Effect of a probiotic infant formula on infections in child care centers: comparison of two probiotic agents. *Pediatrics* 115, 5–9.

Yu, H. (2011) Bacteria-mediated disease therapy. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 92, 1107–1113.

Zarate, G. and Nader-Macias, M.E. (2006) Influence of probiotic vaginal lactobacilli on in vitro adhesion of urogenital pathogens to vaginal epithelial cells. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 43 174–180.