

13 *ABSTRACT*

14 Yeast cell wall products (YCWs) are used worldwide as alternatives to antibiotics growth promoters 15 for health and performances improvement in livestock. The success of yeast and YCWs as feed 16 additives in farm animals' nutrition relies on their capacity to bind enteropathogenic bacteria**,** and 17 on their immunomodulatory activity. *In vivo* studies report their anti-infectious activity on Gram-18 positive pathogens like clostridia. However, the *in vitro* antimicrobial activity of YCWs seems to be 19 limited to some Gram-negative enteropathogens, and literature lacks*in vitro* evidences for 20 antimicrobial effect of YCWs against *Clostridium perfringens*. This study aims to measure the 21 antimicrobial activity of YCWs on *C. perfringens*. Five different YCWs were assayed for their 22 capacity to inhibit the growth of *C. perfringens*, by analysing the growth kinetics of the pathogen. 23 All YCWs inhibited the growth of the pathogen, by reducing the growth rate and the maximum 24 growth value and extending the lag phase duration. The effect on the growth parameters was 25 product- and dosage-dependent. The most effective YCW (namely YCW2), at the minimum 26 effective concentration of 1.25mg/mL, increased the lag phase duration by 3.6h, reduced the 27 maximum growth rate by more than 50%, and reduced the final cell count by 10^2 CFU/mL in 24h, 28 with respect to the control. YCWs did not show a strain-dependent impact on *C. perfringens* growth 29 when tested on different strains of the bacterium.

30 **Keywords**: yeast cell wall; antimicrobial; *Clostridium perfringens*; growth kinetics; feed;

31 foodborne pathogens; food safety.

32 *INTRODUCTION*

33 *Clostridium perfringens* is a Gram-positive spore-forming obligate anaerobic bacillus widely 34 distributed throughout the environment, and it is found in foods, sewage, soil, faeces, and 35 gastrointestinal tract of healthy persons and animals (McClane, 2013). In poultry, *C. perfringens* is 36 found in the intestinal content of healthy bird (Shimizu *et al*., 2002), in meat, on eggshells, paper 37 pads and chicken dander in the hatchery (Craven *et al*., 2001). *C. perfringens* is one of the most 38 important causes of foodborne disease in humans, and it is also commonly involved in several 39 human and animal diseases, including gas gangrene, enterotoxaemia, food poisoning and necrotic 40 enteritis (Collins *et al*., 1989; EU. 2003).

41 After EU ban in 2006 on the use of antibiotic drugs as growth promoters (AGPs) and for

42 prophylactic purposes, antimicrobial additives are increasingly used in farm animals nutrition as

43 substitutes of AGPs, and some natural substances are being used or researched for their

44 antimicrobial effect, like prebiotics (inulin, fructo-oligosaccharides, mannan-oligosaccharides),

45 probiotics (yeasts, lactic acid bacteria) and anti-infectious substances (Jouany*et al*., 2007;

46 Murugesan *et al*., 2015; Ravindran, 2013; Strickling*et al*., 2000; Zanini*et al*., 2015).

47 Yeast cell wall products (YCWs), derived from brewery or bakery yeast, are used worldwide as an 48 alternative to AGPs concerning the promotion of health and performance in livestock (Fowler *et al*., 49 2015; Ghosh *et al*., 2012). The success of YCWs as growth promoters is based on their capacity to 50 bind enteropathogenic bacteria (Ganner*et al*., 2013), and on their immunomodulatory activity 51 (Kogan and Kocher, 2007). YCWs are suggested as anti-adhesive agents and are thus proposed to 52 prevent attachment of pathogenic bacteria to the intestinal epithelium of the host, by interfering on 53 the adhesion of bacterial fimbriae or afimbrial adhesins with surface lectins of the intestinal cells of 54 the host, hence preventing the colonization of the intestinal mucosa by the pathogenic bacteria 55 (Songer*et al*., 1996). Using the *in vitro* agglutination method and microscopy, different authors

56 showed that mannan-oligosaccharides in YCW bind *E. coli, Salmonella,* and *Vibrio cholerae*

57 (Eshdat*et al*., 1978; Mirelman*et al*., 1980; Oyofo*et al*., 1989; Spring *et al*., 2000; Trevisi*et al*., 58 2012). A quantitative *in vitro* microplate assay was developed by Ganner*et al*. (Ganner*et al*., 2010; 59 Ganner*et al*., 2013) and is based on the measurement of the optical density as growth indicator of 60 adhering bacteria. The authors demonstrated that a purified YCW can differentially bind Gram-61 negative pathogens, such as some *E. coli* strains and *Salmonella* spp., but it did not bind Gram-62 positive bacteria of the genera lactobacilli and bifidobacteria, as well as *C. perfringens*. On the 63 whole, all these *in vitro* results confirm the efficacy of YCWs as antimicrobial, thus reducing the 64 amount of the pathogens that can adhere on the intestinal wall (Trevisi*et al*., 2012; Ganner*et al*., 65 2010; Pérez-Sotelo *et al*., 2005), and reveal that they may exert a selective effect against some 66 bacteria while having no adverse effect on beneficial and commensal bacterial population. Recent *in* 67 *vivo* reports highlighted the beneficial effects of yeast products in maintaining animal performances 68 and health while minimizing mortality and morbidity when there is a *C. perfringens* challenge in an 69 antibiotic-free production situation (Fowler *et al*., 2015; Hashim*et al*., 2018; M'Sadeq*et al*., 2015; 70 Thanissery*et al*., 2010; Van Immerseel*et al*., 2004).

71 YCWs composition is very variable, depending on the species and strain they are originated, so it is 72 not possible to make general considerations on their effect, but it is necessary to test *in vitro* their 73 efficacy as antimicrobials against pathogenic bacteria (Ganner*et al*., 2013; Trevisi*et al*., 2012). So 74 far, yeasts and derivatives are under-represented in the literature as anti-*C. perfringens* agents and 75 more research is needed to confirm their effectiveness as antimicrobials versus strict anaerobic 76 pathogens(Santovito*et al*., 2018). This study aims to evaluate the *in vitro* efficacy of selected yeast 77 cell walls in inhibiting the growth of *C. perfringens* and paves the way to understand the 78 mechanism underlying the antimicrobial activity of YCWs towards the pathogen.

79

80 *MATERIALS AND METHODS*

81 **Yeast cell wall products**

82 YCWs were provided by Phileo/Lesaffre International. Four out of five products contained cell wall

- 83 fractions derived from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (YCW1-4), while one was a mannoproteins
- 84 concentrate (MAN). The supplier declared that products were obtained using different production
- 85 methods. YCWs were analysed for microbial contamination by aerobes and anaerobes, according to

86 ISO methods (ISO7937. 2004; ISO4832. 2006; ISO4833-1. 2013).

87 **Bacterial strains and culture conditions**

88 *Clostridium perfringens* type C strains and isolates are listed in Table 1. All strains were grown at

89 37°C under anaerobic conditions in thioglycollate broth (TG, Biolife, Italy) in an 815PGB series

90 La Petite glove box (PlasLabs Inch), supplied with anaerobic 10% CO2/10%Hydrogen/Nitrogen gas

91 mixture. In the TG broth we did not observe precipitation of YCWs and YCW:bacteria complexes.

92 Therefore,we used TG broth since it ensuredoptimal spatial interaction between cells and

93 antimicrobial compounds.

94 The inoculum density was standardized by photometric measurement at 600 nm wavelength using

95 anUltrospec 3100 Pro Spectrophotometer (Amersham, UK). The enumeration of *C. perfringens* was

96 performed by serial 10-fold dilutions in physiological saline and pour-plating on

97 TryptoseSulfiteCycloserine (TSC) agar (Biolife, Italy) according to ISO methods (ISO7937. 2004).

98 Strains were maintained in TG broth supplied with 20% glycerol and stored at −80 °C. Each strain

99 was analysed individually in all the experiments.

100 **Kinetic growth assays**

101 The experiment was designed to assess the inhibitory effect of YCWs on the growth kinetics of *C.*

- 102 *perfringens* ATCC 13124^T. Fowler *et al.* (2015) found that the optimal dose of YCW products
- 103 tested in their study was approximately 0.25-0.30 mg/mL. In order to verify if the same YCWs
- 104 concentration can have an antimicrobial effect *in* vitro, test tubes containing 10 mL of sterile TG
- 105 broth were supplemented with 0 to 10mg/mL of each YCWs. Three independent replicates were

106 prepared per each YCWs dosage and sampling time. Sampling times were 0, 6.5, 7.5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 20, and 24h. A mid-exponential phase culture of *C. perfringens* ATCC 13124^T at OD_{600nm}= 0.61 \pm 108 0.14 was used for the inoculum, and duly diluted to have a final concentration of ca. 10^4 CFU/mL 109 per each test tube. Blanks were prepared for each YCW dosage by adding sterile broth in place of 110 the cell culture. Growth controls were prepared by inoculating the test strain in the absence of 111 YCWs.

112 Samples were incubated in anaerobic conditions at 37 ± 1 °C up to 24 hours. At each time point, 113 tubes were vortexed for 10 seconds and growth was monitored by measuring the absorbance at 600 114 nm. The net absorbance readings of each inoculated sample were obtained by subtracting the 115 absorbance of the blank controls at each YCWs dosage from the absorbance of the respective test 116 samples. At each time point, the corresponding Log[CFU/mL] count was measured by plate 117 counting on TSC agar. The experiments were performed three times on three different days (n=9). 118 The antimicrobial effect of YCWs was further proven on other strains (Table 1), by measuring the 119 CFU/mL reduction after 24 h. The results were expressed as the logarithm of the CFU count 120 reduction per mg of YCW.

121 **Data calculation and curve fitting**

122 The OD600nm values and the Log[CFU/mL] were plotted versus time (h). The Log[CFU/mL] data

123 were analysed by non-linear regression analysis using the Baranyi and Roberts model (Baranyi and

- 124 Roberts, 1994). The maximum specific growth rate *μmax*(i.e. the specific growth rate at the
- 125 exponential phase, h⁻¹), the maximum cell number y_{max} (Log[CFU/mL]), and the duration of the lag
- 126 phase *λ* (h) were calculated using the Excel® macro DMFit, version 3.5
- 127 (www.ifr.ac.uk/safety/DMfit) (Baranyi and Roberts, Institute of Food Research, Norwich).

128 **Inhibition rate**

129 The inhibition rate (IR) (Li *et al*., 2016) was calculated using the following equation:

130 IR = $(\mu_0 - \mu_C)/\mu_0 = 1 - \mu_C/\mu_0$

131 Where μ c is the specific growth rate at the concentration C of an YCW, and μ_0 is that of the control

- 132 in the absence of YCWs. IR₅₀ is the concentration of YCW that causes 50% inhibition (i.e., IR =
- 133 0.5), and was derived from the inhibitory curves of IR as a function of YCW concentrations.

134 **Lag time extension**

- 135 To determine the effect of YCWs on the lag phase duration, we used a parameter termed "lag time
- 136 extension" (LE) that is defined as follows (Li *et al*., 2016):

137 $LE = \lambda_c - \lambda_0$

- 138 Where λ_c is the duration of the lag phase λ (h) of a microorganism at the concentration C (obtained
- 139 by DMFit analysis) of an YCW, and *λ*0 is that of a control without the YCWs. In the scenario where

140 bacterial growth is completely inhibited, λ is regarded as infinite.

141 **Growth reduction**

- 142 The parameter *y*R was used to estimate the reduction in the *ymax* as a function of YCW
- 143 concentration. The *y*R parameter was calculated as follows:
- 144 $yR = 1 (y_C y_i)/(y_0 y_i)$

145 Where y_c is the y_{max} obtained in 24h incubation, y_i is the concentration of the initial inoculum and y_0

- 146 is that of a control without the YCW. *y*R50 is the concentration of YCW that causes 50% reduction
- 147 (i.e., *y*R = 0.5) and was derived from the curves of *y*R as a function of YCW concentrations.

148 **Statistical analysis**

- 149 The growth parameters were analysed with All Pairwise Multiple Comparison Procedures (Tukey
- 150 post hoc test), with a 0.05 significance level. Growth parameters were correlated to YCWs
- 151 concentration using the Pearson correlation test at p < 0.05, and the SigmaPlot 12 software (Systat
- 152 Software, San Jose, CA).

154 *RESULTS*

155 The chemical composition of YCWs as reported by the supplier is given in Table 2. YCWs did not 156 differ substantially in chemical composition. The total viable aerobe count was negligible, being 157 less than 3 CFU per mg of product (Table 2). Neither anaerobic bacteria nor *C. perfringens* isolates 158 were found using the protocol indicated in ISO7973:2004. Blank controls that contained YCWs in 159 TG broth did not show any growth in 24 h of incubation at 37°C in anaerobiosis. Therefore, it can 160 be stated that endogenous microbial contamination did not interfere with the growth of the tested 161 strains.

162 TG broth prevented the precipitation of bacterial cells and YCWs, in the overall incubation period

163 of 24 h at 37°C. The TG broth was therefore selected as optimal medium, since it ensured a fast

164 growth of *C. perfringens* and maintained cells and YCWs suspended, thus facilitating their

165 interaction during the experiment.

166 On the assumption that a linear trend exists in the exponential growth phase (Hall *et al*., 2014), the 167 absorbance values of the *C. perfringens* broth cultures (determined in the absence of YCWs, and in 168 the exponential phase) were correlated to the respective CFU counts obtained by plate counting. A 169 linear relationship was found between these values ($R^2 > 0.99$), and an optical density of 1.0 ± 0.05 170 corresponded to $9.30 \pm 0.21 \times 10^7$ CFU/mL. Growth curves obtained by plotting the growth data as 171 OD600nm and as Log[CFU/mL] count are shown in Figure 1. All Log[CFU/mL] data well fitted to 172 the model of Baranyi and Roberts, with R^2 values > 0.97 .

173 Examining the growth dynamics of *C. perfringens* over time, product- and concentration-dependent 174 effects became evident. Even though all YCWs affected the growth of *C. perfringens*, the typical 175 sigmoid curve shape was maintained. The curve fitting by the Baranyi and Roberts model allowed 176 the calculation of the growth parameters *ymax*, *λ*, and *µmax*. The analysis of *C. perfringens* growth 177 kinetics in the presence of different YCWs showed that growth parameters were significantly 178 affected ($p < 0.05$) by the products.

198 YCW4 (Figure 2A-iv); and 0.8 – 4.4 h for MAN (Figure 2A-v). No correlation was found between

199 LE and YCWs dosage ($p > 0.05$), except for MAN. A positive Pearson correlation coefficient ($p <$

- 200 $\,$ 0.001) and a linear relationship (linear regression with R² = 0.962) was found between LE and
- 201 MAN concentration. To rank the YCWs we determined the minimum YCW concentration that
- 202 gives at least 3 h increase in *λ* when compared to the control. These concentration values were
- 203 0.625 mg/mL for YCW1, YCW2, YCW3, and YCW4 (with LE values of 3.72 ± 0.21 h, 3.76 ± 0.64

204 h, 3.35 ± 0.15 h, and 3.12 ± 0.04 h respectively); and 5 mg/mL for MAN (LE = 3.17 \pm 0.13 h). The 205 LE/C value were calculated by dividing the LE values by the relevant YCW concentration. The 206 parameter LE/C represents the delay in the lag phase that each product can induce per mg, 207 expressed in h×mL/mg. These values were 5.95 ± 0.33 , 6.02 ± 1.03 , 5.36 ± 0.24 , 4.99 ± 0.07 and 208 0.63 \pm 0.03 h×mL/mg for YCW1, YCW2, YCW3, YCW4, and MAN, respectively. The most 209 efficient products in extending the lag phase duration were YCW1 and YCW2, followed by YCW3, 210 YCW4, with MAN resulting as the less effective.

211 As shown in Figure 2B, all YCWs affected the *ymax*, in a dose-dependent manner. A significant

212 negative correlation between y_{max} and YCWs dosage was found ($R²$) 0.936, p < 0.05). Increasing

213 dosages of YCW2 and MAN induced exponential decay of *ymax*values (Figure 2B). The curve

214 obtained for YCW2 was sharper at the lowest dosages, proving the high efficacy of this product in

215 inhibiting the growth of *C. perfringens*. Negative linear regression coefficients $(R^2 > 0.936)$ were

216 determined for YCW1, YCW3 and YCW4.

217 For the selection of the most efficient YCW in reducing *ymax*, we considered as effective the

218 minimum YCW concentration reducing the *ymax* value by 50% in 24 h. As shown in Figure 3B, the

219 *y*R50 values were 4.38, 2.35, 5.42, 4.55, and 7.81 mg/mL for YCW1, YCW2, YCW3, YCW4, and

220 MAN respectively. Table 3 summarizes the results obtained by the analysis of the growth kinetic 221 parameters.

222 Table 4 shows the values obtained for *μmax*, *λ*, and *ymax* from growth curve fitting to the Baranyi and 223 Roberts model, with the correlation between each value and the YCW dosage obtained by Pearson's 224 correlation test and one-way ANOVA.

225 To confirm the YCWs inhibitory activity on *C. perfringens*, all products were tested towards four

226 isolates with different origin, at the dosage determined as above. As shown in Figure 4, YCW2

227 confirmed its high efficacy in inhibiting the growth of *C. perfringens*. One mg of this product

- 228 reduced by *ca*. 2 Logs the final CFU count for Ad 1600, CP 56 and Ad 211b. The effect of YCW1
- 229 on bacterial growth was lower, being 1 Log CFU/mL count reduction per 1 mg/mL of product. The
- 230 YCW4, YCW3, and MAN were found as the less effective. Interestingly, YCWs did not show a
- 231 strain-dependent impact on growth inhibition.
- 232
- 233

234 *DISCUSSION*

235 The success of YCWs as AGPs is due to the ability of their significant components - e.g., mannan-236 oligosaccharides and β-glucans - to prevent colonization by bacterial pathogens in the intestinal 237 tract. YCWs have been proven to reduce the viability of specific bacterial pathogens and to increase 238 the number of beneficial bacteria, with the consequent improvement of animal's performance and 239 immunity (Kogan *et al*., 2007; Morales-Lopez and Brufan, 2013; Reisinger *et al*., 2012). The 240 heterogeneous nature and diversity of YCWs makes it difficult to define *in vitro* assays that can be 241 used to study the activity of these natural antimicrobial candidates. As a consequence, the central 242 point to elucidate the efficacy and the mode of action of YCWs in preventing gut infections is the 243 availability of accurate *in vitro* methods for studying the antimicrobial efficacy of YCWs on *C.* 244 *perfringens*. The currently available test used for *in vitro* screening of YCWs is based on 245 sedimentation and agglutination of the bacteria: yeast complexes, and by light and electron 246 microscopy to visualize the binding of the bacteria (including *C. perfringens*) to YCWs (Ganan *et* 247 *al*., 2012; Pérez-Sotelo *et al*., 2005; Posadas *et al*., 2017). Although providing the visualization of 248 the interaction between YCWs and bacterial cells, this method did not allow the quantification of 249 the extent of the inhibitory effect on the growth of target pathogens. In addition, the agar well/disc 250 diffusion assays cannot be used with this kind of products, given the complex, tri-dimensional 251 interaction of YCWs with the target bacteria in liquid medium.

252 Using the *in vitro* approach herein proposed, we studied the antimicrobial effect of YCWs on *C.* 253 *perfringens* by analysing the effect of YCWs on the growth dynamics of the pathogen. The present 254 study provides evidence on the inhibitory effect exerted by YCWs on *C. perfringens*, by direct 255 counting of the residual Log[CFU/mL], and proposes a method that can be used to measure the 256 direct effect of YCWs on the viability of the bacterium, granting the optimal growth conditions for 257 the pathogen. In this study we demonstrated that the OD_{600nm} was directly correlated to the

258 Log[CFU/mL] count and that OD_{600nm} reduction in TG broth can be taken as an indicator for 259 interaction and thus for antimicrobial effectiveness.

260 All YCWs assayed herein inhibited the growth of the pathogen by reducing the growth rate and the 261 maximum growth value, and by extending the duration of the lag phase. The effect of YCWs on 262 growth parameters was product- and dosage-dependent. LE was not affected by YCW 263 concentration, unlike MAN. This may be due to the lower mannoproteins content in YCW1-4 than 264 in MAN (mannoproteins concentrate), although no evidences of the direct implication of 265 mannoproteins on the LE were found. YCWs did not show a strain-dependent impact on 266 *C.perfringens* growth. One product out of five YCWs, namely YCW2, was selected as the most 267 promising candidate for *C. perfringens* growth inhibition. Results on the effect of YCWs 268 composition on the antimicrobial activity are not significant in this study, therefore further analysis 269 are needed to identify components mainly contribute to the antimicrobial activity of YCWs. 270 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first *in vitro* study on the effect of YCWs on the growth 271 kinetics of *C. perfringens*. Previous studies *in vivo* by Fowler *et al.* (2015) reported that the 272 optimum dose for some YCWs was approximately 0.25-0.30 mg/mL, when these products were 273 supplemented in starter broilers under an immune stress and *C. perfringens* challenge*.* Although the 274 scenario is different, since *in vitro* studies do not reflect the conditions *in vivo*, it can be stated that 275 the method proposed in this study can be useful to select the YCWs candidates to be used for *in* 276 *vivo* studies. 277 Further studies are needed to elucidate the mechanisms underlying the growth inhibition effect

278 exerted by YCWs on *C. perfringens* as well as on other anaerobic pathogens, which require specific 279 set up of the growing conditions.

280 **Acknowledgments**

- 281 The authors thank Prof. Filip Van Immerseel (U-Ghent, Belgium) and ADRIA Développement
- 282 (Quimper, France) for providing the strains used in this study.

283 *References*

286 Collins JE, Bergeland ME, Bouley D, Ducommun AL, Francis DH, Yeske P. Diarrhea 287 Associated with *Clostridium perfringens* Type A Enterotoxin in Neonatal Pigs. J Vet Diagn Invest 288 1989; 1:351-353.

289 Craven S, Stern N, Bailey J, Cox N. Incidence of *Clostridium perfringens* in broiler

290 chickens and their environment during production and processing. Avian Dis 2001; 887-896.

291 Eshdat Y, Ofek I, Yashouv-Gan Y, Sharon N, Mirelman D. Isolation of a mannose-specific

292 lectin from *Escherichia coli* and its role in the adherence of the bacteria to epithelial cells.

293 BiochemBiophys Res Commun 1978; 85:1551-1559.

294 EU. 2003. Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 295 22 September 2003 on additives for use in animal nutrition. Official Journal of the European Union.

296 Fowler J, Kakani R, Haq A, Byrd J, Bailey C. Growth promoting effects of prebiotic yeast 297 cell wall products in starter broilers under an immune stress and *Clostridium perfringens* challenge.

298 J ApplPoult Res 2015; 24:66-72.

299 Ganan M, Carrascosa AV, de Pascual-Teresa S, Martinez-Rodriguez AJ. Effect of 300 mannoproteins on the growth, gastrointestinal viability, and adherence to caco-2 cells of lactic acid 301 bacteria. J Food Sci 2012; 77:M176-M180.

302 Ganner A, Stoiber C, Uhlik JT, Dohnal I, Schatzmayr G. Quantitative evaluation of *E. coli* 303 F4 and *Salmonella typhimurium* binding capacity of yeast derivatives. AMB Express 2013; 3:62-62.

- 326 Jouany J-P, Morgavi D. Use of 'natural'products as alternatives to antibiotic feed additives 327 in ruminant production Animal 2007; 1.10: 1443-1466.
- 328 Kogan G, Kocher A. Role of yeast cell wall polysaccharides in pig nutrition and health 329 protection. Livest Sci 2007; 109:161-165.
- 330 Li B, Qiu Y, Shi H, Yin H. The importance of lag time extension in determining bacterial 331 resistance to antibiotics. Analyst 2016; 141:3059-3067.
- 332 McClane B, Robertson S, Li J. *Clostridium perfringens*, 4th ed., Washington, DC: ASM 333 Press, 2013.
- 334 Mirelman D, Altmann G, Eshdat Y. Screening of bacterial isolates for mannose-specific 335 lectin activity by agglutination of yeasts. J ClinMicrobiol 1980; 11:328-331.
- 336 Morales-Lopez R, Brufau J. Immune-modulatory effects of dietary *Saccharomyces* 337 *cerevisiae* cell wall in broiler chickens inoculated with *Escherichia coli* lipopolysaccharide effects 338 of different yeast cell wall supplements added to maize- or wheat-based diets for broiler chickens 339 supplementation of direct-fed microbials as an alternative to antibiotic on growth performance, 340 immune response, cecal microbial population, and ileal morphology of broiler chickens. Br Poult 341 Sci 2013; 54:5.
- 342 M'Sadeq SA, Wu S-B, Choct M, Forder R, Swick RA. Use of yeast cell wall extract as a 343 tool to reduce the impact of necrotic enteritis in broilers. Poult Sci 2015; 94:898-905.
- 344 Murugesan GR, Syed B, Haldar S, Pender C. Phytogenic feed additives as an alternative to 345 antibiotic growth promoters in broiler chickens. Front Vet Sci 2015; Aug 3;2-21.
- 346 Oyofo B, Droleskey R, Norman J, Mollenhauer H, Ziprin R, Corrier D, DeLoach J.
- 347 Inhibition by mannose of *in vitro* colonization of chicken small intestine by *Salmonella*
- 348 *typhimurium*. Poult Sci 2015; 68:1351-1356.

349 Pérez-Sotelo L, Talavera-Rojas M, Monroy-Salazar H, Lagunas-Bernabé S, Cuarón-

350 Ibargüengoytia J, Jimenez R, Vázquez-Chagoyán J. *In vitro* evaluation of the binding capacity of 351 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Sc47 to adhere to the wall of *Salmonella* spp. Rev LatinoamMicrobiol 352 2005; 47:5.

353 Posadas GA, Broadway PR, Thornton JA, Carroll JA, Lawrence A, Corley JR, Thompson 354 A, Donaldson JR. Yeast pro-and paraprobiotics have the capability to bind pathogenic bacteria 355 associated with animal disease. TranslAnim Sci 2017; 1:60-68.

356 Ravindran V. Feed enzymes: The science, practice, and metabolic realities. J ApplPoult Res 357 2013; 22:628-636.

358 Reisinger N, Ganner A, Masching S, Schatzmayr G, Applegate TJ. Efficacy of a yeast 359 derivative on broiler performance, intestinal morphology and blood profile. Livest Sci 2012; 360 143:195-200.

361 Santovito E, Greco D, Logrieco AF, Avantaggiato G. Eubiotics for food security at farm 362 level: yeast cell wall products and their antimicrobial potential against pathogenic bacteria.

363 Foodborne Pathog Dis 2018; 15(9):531-537.

364 Shimizu T, Ohtani K, Hirakawa H, Ohshima K, Yamashita A, Shiba T, Ogasawara N,

365 Hattori M, Kuhara S, Hayashi H. Complete genome sequence of *Clostridium perfringens*, an

366 anaerobic flesh-eater. PNAS 2002; 99:996-1001.

367 Songer JG. Clostridial enteric diseases of domestic animals. ClinMicrobiol Rev 1996; 9:216.

368 Spring P, Wenk C, Dawson KA, Newman KE.The effects of dietary mannaoligosaccharides

369 on cecal parameters and the concentrations of enteric bacteria in the ceca of *Salmonella*-challenged

370 broiler chicks. Poult Sci 2000; 72:6.

374 Thanissery R, McReynolds JL, Conner DE, Macklin KS, Curtis PA, Fasina YO. Evaluation 375 of the efficacy of yeast extract in reducing intestinal *Clostridium perfringens* levels in broiler 376 chickens. Poult Sci2010;89:2380-2388.

377 Trevisi P, Priori D, Gandolfi G, Colombo M, Coloretti F, Goossens T, Bosi P. *In vitro* test 378 on the ability of a yeast cell wall based product to inhibit the *Escherichia coli* F4ac adhesion on the 379 brush border of porcine intestinal villi. J Anim Sci 2012;90:2.

380 Immerseel FV, Buck JD, Pasmans F, Huyghebaert G, Haesebrouck F, Ducatelle R.

381 *Clostridium perfringens* in poultry: an emerging threat for animal and public health. Avian Pathol 382 2004;Dec 1;33(6):537-49.

383 Zanini S, Dolores R, Pina-Pérez M, Sanz M, Martinez A. Use of Antimicrobials from Plants 384 in Feed as a Control Measure for Pathogenic Microorganisms. J MicrobBiochemTechnol 385 2015;7:248-252.

386

388 *Figure legends*

389 **Figure 1. Growth curves of** *C. perfringens* **in the presence of different concentrations of each** 390 **YCW.**

391 Growth data are reported as OD600nm and Log[CFU/mL] and as a function of time (h) in the presence

392 and in the absence of YCW1-4 and MAN. Values are mean \pm standard deviation (n = 9).

393 **Figure 2. Growth rate (** μ **), lag phase (** λ **), and** y_{max} **variation.**

394 The values obtained by the analysis of the growth rate (μ) , lag phase (λ) , and y_{max} variation are

395 reported as a function of YCWs concentration. Experimental points are mean \pm standard deviation (n

 $396 = 9$. A (i)-(v) are results obtained with different concentrations of YCW1-4 and MAN. B represent

397 *ymax* variation in the presence of different concentrations of YCW1-4 and MAN.

398 **Figure 3. Inhibition rate (IR) and reduction of** *y***max (***y***R) variation.**

399 The values obtained by the analysis of (A) the inhibition rate (IR) and (B) the reduction of $y_{\text{max}}(yR)$

400 are reported as a function of YCWs concentration. The grey line represents the ordinate value of the

401 constant IR=0.5 (A) and $yR=0.5$ (B) for the calculation of IR₅₀ and yR_{50} values respectively. Data

402 points are mean \pm standard deviation in three independent experiments (n = 9).

403

404 **Figure 4. Growth reduction of different** *C. perfringens* **strains induced by YCWs.**

405 Data represent the final cell density measured after 24 h of incubation by plate counting. The final 406 CFU/mL count was referred to the control and expressed as (Log) CFU count reduction per mg of 407 each YCW. The effect of YCWs on the growth of *C. perfringens* strains is represented as mean of 408 three replicates in three independent experiments. Error bars are standard deviations among 409 replicates.

413 Figure 1

416 Figure 2

419 Figure 3

422 Figure 4