Table of Tables

Chapter 1		
Table 1.1	Drugs previously used as therapeutic for obesity (Rodgers et al., 2012). DA: Dopamine; NA: Noradrenaline; 5-HT: 5-hydroxytryptamine	22
Table 1.2	Proposed health benefit of probiotics	27
Table 1.3	Commercially available probiotic in market	30
Table 1.4	Probiotic effect, mechanisms and fitness factors of EcN (Schultz et al., 2011)	32
Table 1.5	List of natural probiotics used for management of obesity	40
Table 1.6	List of natural and recombinant probiotic strains used in infection, allergy and inflammation model	47
Table 1.7	EcN in treatment of IBD (Malchow et al., 1997; Kruis et al., 1997; Rembacken et al., 1996; Kruis et al., 2004; Henker et al., 2008)	49
Table 1.8	Different prebiotics (Macfarlane et al., 2006).	62
Chapter 2		67
Table 2.1	Bacterial strains and plasmid	72
Table 2.2	Fecal PQQ concentration of all rat groups at the end of the experiment	78
Table 2.3	Serum SGOT and SGPT levels. Values are expressed as Mean ± SEM (n=6). ***P≤ 0.001, ** P≤ 0.01 in comparison to control rat group. ## P≤ 0.01 in comparison to Vitamin C group.	79
Table 2.4	Effect of orally fed PQQ, different constructs of *E. coli* CFR 16 probiotics and Vitamin-C on SOD (Superoxide dismutase), CAT (Catalase) and GPx (Glutathione peroxidase) activity in control and experimental rats. Values are expressed as Mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). a $P \leq 0.05$, a* $P \leq 0.001$ compared with DMH group. b $P \leq 0.05$, b* $P \leq 0.001$ compared with 16:: *vgb-gfp (pqq)* group.	84
Chapter 3		92

Table 3.1	Bacterial strains and plasmids	106
Table 3.2	Effect of modified EcN and Ec16 on body weight gain, food intake, fasting glucose, serum insulin and serum uric levels of rats. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n = 6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01 and *** P ≤ 0.001 compared with control group. # # P ≤ 0.01 compared with fructose control group.	107
Table 3.3	PQQ concentration in liver tissue and fecal sample of rats fed with modified strains of EcN and Ec16 at the end of experiment: Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n = 6 each group). ** P ≤ 0.01 and ***P ≤ 0.001 compared with control.	108
Table 3.4	Hepatic lipid profile. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n = 6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01 and ***P ≤ 0.001 compared with control. ##P≤ 0.01 compared with fructose control. Hepatic values are expressed as mg/g Tissue.	108
Table 3.5	Colonic short chain fatty acid (SCFA). Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n = 6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05 and** P ≤ 0.01 compared with control group. # P ≤ 0.05 and ##P ≤ 0.001 compared with Fructose control group. Concentration (µMoles/g Fecal matter)	113
Chapter 4		118
Table 4.1	Plasmid constructs and strains	123
Table 4.2	Effect of genetically engineered probiotic *E. coli* Nissle 1917 on liver lipid profile of rats. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). ** P ≤ 0.01 compared with control. ##P ≤ 0.01 compared with Sucrose control. Values are expressed as mg/g Tissue.	130
Table 4.3	Effect of genetically modified probiotic *E. coli* Nissle 1917 on Colonic SCFA. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). *P ≤ 0.05 and** P ≤ 0.01 compared with control group. Concentration (µMoles/ gm Fecal matter).	133
Table 4.4	Liver lipid profile of rats. Values are expressed as mean ± SEM (n=6 each group). * P ≤ 0.05, ** P ≤ 0.01 compared with	139

	control. #P ≤ 0.05, ##P ≤ 0.01 compared with Sucrose control. Values are expressed as mg/g Tissue.	