

## Table of Figures

<b>Chapter 1</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>Fig. 1.1</b>	Global sugar consumption (Lustig et al., 2012)	2
<b>Fig. 1.2</b>	Trends in per capita consumption of white sugar and Gur-Khandsari in India	3
<b>Fig. 1.3</b>	Glucose and fructose are dietary sugars (Lyssiotis et al., 2013)	4
<b>Fig. 1.4</b>	Hepatic metabolism of glucose and fructose (Tappy et al., 2010)	5
<b>Fig. 1.5</b>	Mechanism of fructose induced dyslipidemia (Tappy et al., 2010)	7
<b>Fig. 1.6</b>	Mechanisms for fructose-induced de novo lipogenesis: fructose acutely and chronically increases intrahepatic de novo lipogenesis (Tappy et al., 2010)	8
<b>Fig. 1.7</b>	Effect of genetic sensitivity, sugar and insufficient antioxidants on hypertension (Vasdev et al., 1996)	11
<b>Fig. 1.8</b>	Activation of signaling cascade in response to AGEs in smooth muscle (Anderson et al., 1999)	12
<b>Fig. 1.9</b>	Two Hit Theory (Lim et al., 2010)	14
<b>Fig. 1.10</b>	Link between obesity and fructose exposure during critical development period (Goran et al., 2013)	17
<b>Fig. 1.11</b>	Overall sucrose effect on appetite signals	20
<b>Fig. 1.12</b>	Overall metabolic effect of hyperglycemic diet (Devaraj et al., 2013)	21
<b>Fig. 1.13</b>	Diversity and distribution of microflora throughout GI tract (Sekirov et al., 2010)	24
<b>Fig. 1.14</b>	Interaction between diet and gut microbiota affect host metabolism (Kovatcheva-Datchary et al., 2013)	48
<b>Fig. 1.15</b>	Source of ROS and antioxidant defences (Finkel et al., 2000)	51
<b>Fig. 1.16</b>	Major signalling pathway of ROS (Finkel et al., 2000)	52
<b>Fig. 1.17</b>	Enzymatic and non-enzymatic antioxidants (Carocho et al., 2013)	55
<b>Fig. 1.18</b>	Schematic model for suppression of fat deposition	65

	accumulation via GPR43 (Kimura et al., 2013)	
<b>Chapter 2</b>		67
<b>Fig. 2.1</b>	Schematic representation of the work plan of the experiment.	71
<b>Fig. 2.2</b>	Confirmation and functionality of <i>pqq</i> gene cluster	77
<b>Fig. 2.3</b>	Blood antioxidant status. (A) LPO; (B) CAT; (C) SOD and (D) G6PDH. Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM (n=6 each group). *P $\leq$ 0.05, **P $\leq$ 0.01 and ** P $\leq$ 0.001	80
<b>Fig. 2.4</b>	Effect of probiotic on length of colon (A and B) and lipid peroxidation (Liver (C) and Colon (D)) in different groups treated with DMH after 10 weeks. Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM (n=4 each group).a*P $\leq$ 0.01 and a** P $\leq$ 0.001 compared with DMH group. b* P $\leq$ 0.01, b**P $\leq$ 0.001 compared with 16:: <i>vgb-gfp</i> ( <i>pqq</i> ) group in (A) and (B). (C) and (D) values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM (n=6 each group). *P $\leq$ 0.01 and ** P $\leq$ 0.001 compared with DMH group.	81
<b>Fig. 2.5</b>	Histology of colonic tissue in different groups. (A) Control (B) DMH (C) CFR 16 (D) CFR 16:: <i>vgb-gfp</i> (E) Orally fed PQQ (F) Vitamin C (G) CFR16:: <i>vgb-gfp</i> vector (H) CFR16:: <i>vgb-gfp</i> ( <i>pqq</i> )	83
<b>Fig. 2.6</b>	Brain neurotransmitter status. (A) Serotonin; (B) Epinephrine; (C) Nor-epinephrine and (D) Dopamine. Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM (n=6 each group). *P $\leq$ 0.05, **P $\leq$ 0.01 and ** P $\leq$ 0.001.	86
<b>Chapter 3</b>		92
<b>Fig. 3.1</b>	Genomic integration of <i>gfp</i> and <i>vgb</i> in EcN	100
<b>Fig. 3.2</b>	Growth curve of EcN W/T and EcN:: <i>vgb-gfp</i> alone and in co-inoculation	101
<b>Fig. 3.3</b>	Colonization of EcN ( <i>gfp</i> ) and EcN:: <i>vgb-gfp</i> in rat intestine	102
<b>Fig. 3.4</b>	Functionality of <i>pqq</i> gene cluster in Tris buffered media and PQQ quantification	102
<b>Fig. 3.5</b>	Effect of EcN on serum lipid profile: Values are expressed as	109

	Mean $\pm$ SEM (n= 6 each group). (A) Triglyceride; (B) Cholesterol; (C) HDL. **P $\leq$ 0.01 and ***P $\leq$ 0.001.	
<b>Fig. 3.6</b>	Effect of Ec16 on serum lipid profile: Values are expressed as Mean $\pm$ SEM (n= 6 each group). (A) Triglyceride; (B) Cholesterol; (C) HDL. **P $\leq$ 0.01 and ***P $\leq$ 0.001.	109
<b>Fig. 3.7</b>	Oil red O staining of liver tissue. Black arrows indicate the accumulation of lipid droplets in Hepatocytes of fructose fed rat (Fructose control). Images were taken by LEICA DME microscope at 100 X magnification (A) Control, (B) Fructose control and (C) EcN-4.	110
<b>Fig. 3.8</b>	Effect of EcN on blood and liver antioxidant status: Values are expressed as Mean $\pm$ SEM (n= 6 each group). (1A) Blood LPO; (1B) Blood CAT; (1C) Blood SOD; (1D) Blood GSH; (2A) Liver LPO; (2B) Liver CAT; (2C) Liver SOD and (2D) Liver GSH. *P $\leq$ 0.05, *P $\leq$ 0.01 and **P $\leq$ 0.001.	111
<b>Fig. 3.9</b>	Effect of Ec16 on blood and liver antioxidant status: Values are expressed as Mean $\pm$ SEM (n= 6 each group). (1A) Blood LPO; (1B) Blood CAT; (1C) Blood SOD; (1D) Blood GSH; (2A) Liver LPO; (2B) Liver CAT; (2C) Liver SOD and (2D) Liver GSH. *P $\leq$ 0.05, *P $\leq$ 0.01 and **P $\leq$ 0.001.	112
<b>Fig. 3.10</b>	mRNA expression levels of (A) Fatty acid synthase and Acyl Coenzyme A oxidase in hepatic tissue. Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM (n=6 each group). ***P $\leq$ 0.001 **P $\leq$ 0.01 and *P $\leq$ 0.01.	113
<b>Fig. 3.11</b>	Proposed mechanism of EcN-4 on fructose induced metabolic effects	116
<b>Fig. 3.12</b>	Proposed mechanism of EcN-4 in neutralizing ROS generated by dietary fructose consumption	117
<b>Chapter 4</b>		118
<b>Fig. 4.1</b>	Work plan for the plasmid based long term animal experimentation.	122
<b>Fig. 4.2</b>	Work plan to test EcN genomic integrants on sucrose induced rat models.	124

<b>Fig. 4.3</b>	Strategy used for construction of recombinant plasmid pMALp2Δ <i>lacIq-inuJ-pqq</i> .	125
<b>Fig. 4.4</b>	Authentication of recombinant plasmids containing <i>ppq</i> gene cluster in T-vector and <i>inuJ</i> in pMALP2Δ <i>lacIq</i> vector.	126
<b>Fig. 4.5</b>	Restriction digestion of pMaL-P2 Δ <i>lacIq pqq-inuJ</i> with <i>XbaI</i> .	126
<b>Fig. 4.6</b>	Functional characterization of EcN:: <i>vgb-gfp (pqq)</i> and EcN:: <i>vgb-gfp (pqq-inuJ)</i> on Tris buffered minimal medium and sucrose containing minimal M9 medium.	127
<b>Fig. 4.7</b>	Effect of genetically engineered probiotic <i>E. coli</i> Nissle 1917 on (A) Body weight gain (gm) (B) Food intake gm/day (C) Fasting Glucose levels (mg/dl) and (D) serum insulin (μg/L) of sucrose fed rats. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001.	128
<b>Fig. 4.8</b>	Effect of genetically engineered probiotic <i>E. coli</i> Nissle 1917 on serum lipid profile of rats. (A) Triglyceride (B) Cholesterol and (C) HDL. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01 and ***P ≤ 0.001. Values are expressed as mg/dl.	129
<b>Fig. 4.9</b>	Effect of genetically engineered probiotic <i>E. coli</i> Nissle 1917 on Blood (A) Catalase (CAT) activity (B) Superoxide Dismutase (SOD) activity, (C) RBC Lipid peroxidation (LPO) and GSH levels. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=5 each group). *P ≤ 0.05, **P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001.	131
<b>Fig. 4.10</b>	Effect of genetically engineered probiotic <i>E. coli</i> Nissle 1917 on liver (A) Lipid peroxidation (LPO) (B) Superoxide Dismutase (SOD) (C) Catalase (CAT) and (D) GSH levels. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05, **P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001.	132
<b>Fig. 4.11</b>	Effect of genetically modified <i>E. coli</i> Nissle 1917 on liver (A) Fatty acid synthase, (B) Acyl CoA oxidase, (C), PGC1-α relative mRNA expression and relative mitochondria to nucleus DNA ratio. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=5 each group). *P ≤ 0.05 and** P ≤ 0.01 compared with control	133

	group.	
<b>Fig. 4.12</b>	Gradient PCR of <i>pqq-inuJ</i> amplicon from <i>pMALp2ΔlacIq-inuJ-pqq</i> recombinant plasmid.	134
<b>Fig. 4.13</b>	Strategy used for sub-cloning of <i>pqq-inuJ</i> amplicon in pGRG36 <i>vgb-gfp</i> recombinant plasmid.	135
<b>Fig. 4.14</b>	Confirmation of recombinant pGRG36 <i>vgb-gfp-pqq-inuJ</i> by gene specific PCR.	135
<b>Fig. 4.15</b>	Restriction digestion of pGRG36 <i>vgb-gfp-pqq-inuJ</i>	136
<b>Fig. 4.16</b>	Functionality of modified EcN harboring <i>pqq</i> and <i>pqq-inuJ</i> on Tris buffered and minimal M9 media containing sucrose as carbon source, respectively.	136
<b>Fig. 4.17</b>	Body weight profile of different groups over the period of the experiment.	137
<b>Fig. 4.18</b>	(A) Fasting blood glucose and serum insulin levels. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05 and*** P ≤ 0.001 compared with control group.	138
<b>Fig. 4.19</b>	Serum lipid profile: (A) Triglyceride, (B) Cholesterol and (C) HDL Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P* ≤ 0.05, *P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001	139
<b>Fig. 4.20</b>	Blood antioxidant status: (A) LPO, (B) Catalase and (C) SOD. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001.	140
<b>Fig. 4.21</b>	Liver antioxidant status: (A) LPO, (B) Catalase and (C) SOD. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.01, **P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001.	141
<b>Fig. 4.22</b>	(A) Blood and (B) liver GSH levels. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (N=6 each group). * P ≤ 0.05 and ***P≤ 0.01.	141
<b>Fig. 4.23</b>	Colonic SCFAs. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=5-6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05 and** P ≤ 0.01.	142
<b>Fig. 4.24</b>	Fecal gluconic acid Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). **P ≤ 0.01.	143
<b>Fig. 4.25</b>	Fecal PQQ quantification Values are expressed as mean ±	143

	SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05 and** P ≤ 0.01.	
<b>Fig. 4.26</b>	Proposed mechanism of EcN producing PQQ and InuJ	146
<b>Fig. 4.27</b>	Proposed mechanism of EcN producing PQQ and InuJ	147