

Immunological effect of propolis in *E. coli* infected rats

Ayman S. Farid, Khaled M. M. Farrah, and Ghada A. Mousa

Clinical Pathology Department, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Benha University

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to elucidate the immunostimulant effects of propolis in experimentally induced microbial infection in rats via evaluating leukocytes count and cytokines (TNF α , interleukin (IL)-1 β and IL-4), immunoglobulins (IgG and IgM), and leukocyte phagocytic activity. One hundred male Wister rats aging about 5 weeks and weighing about 170-200 gm. rats were divided into five groups as follows: Group 1: control group: consists of 20 male rats served as a control received sterile saline injection. Group 2: propolis: consists of 20 male rats and were given 300 mg/kg body weight propolis extract orally once daily for 16 days. Group 3: E. coli (Infected): consists of 20 male rats, which were injected intra-peritoneal with E. coli. Group 4: Propolis + E. coli-infected: consists of 20 male rats, which were given propolis extract orally for 2 weeks then injected intra-peritoneal with E. coli. Group 5: E. coli + propolis: consists of 20 male rats, which were injected intra-peritoneal with E. coli then given propolis for 16 days. Leukogram showed that E. Coli-Infected group had significant leukocytosis and granulocytosis after 2, 4, 8 and 16 days' post-infection when compared with control, while, there was a significant lymphocytosis after 4 days' postinfection. Propolis + E. coil group showed significant decrease in leukocytes and granulocytes when compared with E. *coli* infected group. *E. coli* group showed significant increases in TNF- α and IL-1 β , significant decrease in IL-4 after 2 and 16 days when compared with control. On the other hand, Propolis + E. coli group induced significant decreases in TNF- α and IL-1 β when compared with *E. coli* infected group, While *E. coli* + propolis group induced significant decreases in TNF- α after and IL-1 β after 16 days. E. Coli-Infected group showed significant decrease in IgM when compared with control. While, Propolis + E. coli group was found to induce significant increase in IgM when compared with E. coli infected group. Phagocytic % and phagocytic index showed significant decrease in phagocytic % and phagocytic index in E. coli group. On the other hand, Propolis + E. coli and E. coli + propolis groups showed a significant increase in phagocytic % and phagocytic index when compared to E. coli infected group. Therefore, it is concluded that propolis had significant immunostimulant effect in rats infected with E. coli.

Keywords: E. Coli, propolis, TNF-α, IL-1β, Phagocytic %

(http://www.bvmj.bu.edu.eg)

(BVMJ-32(2):111-118,2017)

1. INTRODUCTION

Propolis is a resinous hive product collected by honey bees from various plant sources; it is a popular folk medicine possessing a broad spectrum of biological activities (Banskota et al., 2001). The use of propolis goes back to ancient times at least to 300 BC, and it has been used as a medicine in local and popular medicine in many parts of the world, both internally and externally (Ghisalberg, 1979). Propolis has attracted researchers' interest in the last decades because of several biological and pharmacological properties such as immunomodulatory, antitumor, antimicrobial, anti-inflammatory and antioxidant (Bankova et al., 2000). Immunity is the ability of the host system to recognise different arrays of foreign substances (antigens) in the body and react

against them. The response of a host to any particular pathogen may involve a complex set of responses; the humoral and/or cellular arms of the specific (adaptive) immune response and the nonspecific (innate) responses (Janeway et al., 2005). Macrophages are important in the regulation of immune responses. They are often referred to as scavengers or antigen-presenting cells (APC) because they pick up and ingest foreign materials and present these antigens to other cells of the immune system such as T cells and B cells (Janeway et al., 2001). On the other hand, after ingestion of the antigens macrophages can destroy themselves through the action of enzymes such as toxic peroxidases present in their cytoplasm, they are known to digest more than 100 bacterial cells before they die (Ryan and

Ray., 2004). Endotoxin or lipopolysaccharides (LPSs) produced by Gram-negative bacteria stimulates monocytes and macrophages to release various cytokines including tumor necrosis factor-a (TNF-a) which contributes to organ dysfunction in sepsis (Nathan et al., 1980). Escherchia coli is the most common Gram negative bacterium to cause septicemia (Tunkel and Scheid., 1993). It is probably the best-known bacterial species and one of most frequently isolated organisms from clinical specimens (Mark et al., 2001). It is one of main species of bacteria that normal inhabitants lower intestines of worm blooded animals including birds and mammals (Rosario et al., 2004). LPS is an integral component of the outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria and plays a major role in the pathogenesis of septic shock (Morikawa et al., 1996).

Therefore, this study was undertaken to elucidate the immunostimulant effects of propolis in experimentally induced microbial infection in rats via evaluating leukocytes count and cytokines (TNF α , interleukin (IL)-1 β and IL-4), immunoglobulins (IgG and IgM), and leukocyte phagocytic activity.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Animals:

One hundred male Wister rats aging about 5 weeks and weighing about 170-200 gm were obtained from the Animal House, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Benha University, Egypt. All animals were caged and maintained on a standard diet with free access to tape water and were acclimatized for 1 week before starting the experiments.

2.2. Escherichia coli:

Strain of *E. coli* used in this experiment was kindly obtained as a gift from the Department of Bacteriology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Benha University, Egypt. The culture was suspended in nutrient broth at a concentration of 1 X 10^9 CFU/ml and administrated intraperitoneal at a single dose of 1 ml/Kg body weight following the method of Hegazy et al., (2010).

2.3. Propolis:

Propolis was obtained from the Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Egypt. Propolis was given as an aqueous extract. propolis samples were mixed with distilled water, heated gently and filtered through Whatman No.1 filter paper. Propolis was freshly prepared and administered to animal by oral gavage (*El-Khayat et al., 2009*). The obtained extract was administered orally at adose of 300 mg/kg b.w (*Basnet et al., 1996a*).

2.4. Chemicals and Reagents:

Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid, CLINDIAG Diluent, CLINDIAG Detergent, CLINDIAG Hemolysin (Belgium).

2.5. Experimental design:

In this study, rats were divided into five groups as follows: Group 1: control group: consists of 20 male rats served as a control received sterile saline injection (1 ml/Kg) by IP route. Group 2: propolis: consists of 20 male rats and were given 300 mg/kg body weight propolis extract orally once daily for 16 days. C. Group 3: E. coli (Infected): consists of 20 male rats, which were injected intra-peritoneal with E. coli 1 ml of 1 x10⁹CFU/m1 single dose. D. Group 4: Propolis + E. coli-infected: consists of 20 male rats, which were given 300 mg/kg body weight propolis extract orally for 2 weeks then injected intra-peritoneal with E. coli of 1 x10⁹CFU/m1 single dose then given propolis 300 mg/kg body weight orally for 16 days. Group 5: E. coli + propolis: consists of 20 male rats, which were injected intra-peritoneal with E. coli of 1 x10⁹CFU/m1 then given propolis 300 mg/kg body weight orally for 16 days.

2.6. Blood Samples:

Blood samples were collected by the retroorbital bleeding method from 5 rats from each group at 2, 4, 8, and 16 days of E. coli injection and blood samples were divided into 2 parts, first part (0.5-1 ml) collected on dipotassium salt of EDTAtubes for complete blood count and second part (3 ml) collected on plain tubes for serum separation. Blood count was evaluated by using automatic cell counter (H.A.-Vet Clindiag, Belgium).

2.7. Measurement of Immunological parameters:

TNF- α (according to Beyaert and Fiers, (1998), IL-1 β (ELISA kit obtained from RayBiotech Inc.), IL-4 (biosource Inc. according to Prokopchuk (2005)), Rat IgG and IgM (my Biosource .com), and phagocytic activity and phagocytic index (according to goddeeris et al. (1986) were measured.

2.8. Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the statistical software package for social science (SPSS) for Windows (Version 16.0; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL). The significance of differences between the experimental groups was evaluated by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). If one-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference, then differences between individual groups were estimated using Duncan as a post hoc. Results are expressed as the mean \pm standard error of mean. A *P*-value of less than 0.05 was considered significant (Kinnear and Gray 2006).

3. RESULTS:

Leukogram showed that *E*. Coli-Infected group had significant leukocytosis and granulocytosis after 2, 4, 8 and 16 days' postinfection when compared with control, While, there was a significant lymphocytosis after 4 days' post-infection. Propolis + *E. coil* group showed significant decrease in leukocytes after (4, 8 and 16 days) and granulocytes after 2, 4, 8 and 16 days post-infection when compared with *E. coli* infected group. *E. coli* group showed significant increases in TNF- α and IL-1 β , significant decrease in IL-4 after 2 and 16 days when compared with control. On the other hand, Propolis + E. coli group induced significant decreases in TNF- α and IL-1 β after 2 and 16 days when compared with E. coli infected group, While E. coli + propolis group induced significant decreases in TNF- α after 2 and 16 days but IL-1ß after 16 days. Regarding to antibodies, E. Coli-Infected group showed significant decrease in IgM after 2 and 16 days' post-infection when compared with control. While, Propolis + E. coli group was found to induce significant increase in IgM after 16 days' post-infection when compared with E. coli infected group. Phagocytic % and phagocytic showed significant decrease in index phagocytic % and phagocytic index in E. coli group, E. coli infection cause impairment of polymorphonuclear leukocytes (PMNLs) function, decreased phagocytic activity.

On the other hand, Propolis + E. coli and E. coli + propolis groups showed a significant increase in phagocytic % and phagocytic index when compared to E. coli infected group.

Groups	WBC,	Granulocytes	Lymphocyte (x $10^3/\mu 1$) Monocyte
	$(x10^{3}/\mu 1)$	$(x10^{3}/\mu 1)$	$(x10^{3}/_{1}11)$
Control D2	$11.73\pm0.38^{\text{d}}$	$5.32{\pm}0.45^{c}$	$6.08\pm 0.18^a \qquad \qquad 0.32\pm 0.01^b$
Propolis D2	$12.55\pm0.37^{\text{cd}}$	$5.2\pm0.41^{\text{c}}$	$6.86 \pm 0.10^{a} \qquad \qquad 0.49 \pm 0.01^{a}$
E. coli-Infected D2	$16.05\pm0.91^{\text{a}}$	$9.41\pm0.61^{\text{a}}$	$6.50\pm 0.35^a \qquad \qquad 0.14\pm 0.01^c$
Propolis + E. coli D2	$13.79\pm0.85^{\text{abc}}$	$7.6\pm0.43^{\text{b}}$	5.98 ± 0.43^{a} 0.22 ± 0.02^{a}
E. coli + Propolis D2	15.44 ± 0.28^{ab}	$8.82\pm0.13^{\text{ab}}$	$6.38 \pm 0.32^{a} \qquad \qquad 0.23 \pm 0.01^{c}$
Control D4	$12\pm0.34^{\text{c}}$	$5.49 \pm 0.26^{\text{d}}$	$6.16 \pm 0.20^{b} \qquad \qquad 0.35 \pm 0.05^{a}$
Propolis D4	$12.57\pm0.40^{\circ}$	$5.22\pm0.23^{\text{d}}$	6.92 ± 0.24^{a} 0.43 ± 0.02^{a}
E. coli-Infected D4	$16.49{\pm}~0.28^{\text{a}}$	$9.84\pm0.28^{\text{a}}$	$6.51 \pm 0.30^{ab} \qquad \qquad 0.14 \pm 0.02^{c}$
Propolis + E. coli D4	$14.53\pm0.25^{\text{b}}$	$7.96\pm0.25^{\rm c}$	$6.30\pm 0.21^{ab} \qquad \qquad 0.27\pm 0.01^{b}$
E. coli + Propolis D4	$15.69\pm0.19^{\text{a}}$	$8.94\pm0.22^{\text{b}}$	$6.54 \pm 0.14^{ab} \qquad \qquad 0.21 \pm 0.02^{b}$

Table (1): Leukogram after 2 and 4 days after intra-peritoneal injection of *E. coli* ($lx \ 10^9$ CFU/ml) and/or treatment with propolis (300 mg/kg body weight)

Results are expressed as mean \pm S.E.M. Different superscripts (a, b, c, d) at the same check point in the same column indicate significant differences at (P < 0.05)

Groups	WBC, (x10 ³ /µ1)	Granulocytes $(x10^3/\mu 1)$	Lymphocyte (xl 0 ³ 4d)	Monocyte $(x \ 10^3/0)$
Control D8	$11.68\pm0.28^{\text{c}}$	$5.37\pm.25^{d}$	$6.08\pm0.18^{\text{a}}$	$0.23\pm0.02^{\text{b}}$
Propolis D8	$12.14\pm0.37^{\text{c}}$	$4.86\pm.14^{d}$	$6.96\pm0.40^{\rm a}$	$0.32\pm0.01^{\text{a}}$
E. coli-Infected D8	$17.37\pm0.35^{\text{a}}$	$10.58\pm.36^{\text{a}}$	$6.63\pm0.40^{\rm a}$	$0.16\pm0.01^{\rm c}$
Propolis + E. coli 08	15.02 ± 0.37^{b}	$8.25\pm.19^{\rm c}$	$6.55\pm0.22^{\text{a}}$	$0.23\pm0.01^{\text{b}}$
E. coli + Propolis D8	$15.92\pm0.50^{\rm b}$	$9.10\pm.20^{b}$	$6.63\pm0.32^{\rm a}$	$0.19\pm0.01^{\text{c}}$
Control D16	11 ± 0.62^{ab}	$5\pm0.49^{\rm c}$	$5.73\pm0.22^{\rm a}$	$0.28{\pm}~0.08^{\text{b}}$
Propolis D16	$13.09\pm0.60^{\prime}$	$4.90\pm0.13^{\circ}$	$7.75\pm0.66^{\rm a}$	$0.43\pm0.02^{\rm a}$
E. coli-Infected D16	$15.09\pm0.96^{\rm a}$	$7.14\pm0.34^{\rm a}$	$7.75\pm0.69^{\rm a}$	$0.21\pm0.02^{\text{b}}$
Propolis + E. coli D1	6 12.37 \pm 0.29 ^b	5.97 ± 0.23^{6}	$6.17\pm0.14^{\rm a}$	$0.23\pm0.03^{\text{b}}$
E. coli + Propolis D1	613.24 ± 1.16^{ab}	$5.95\pm0.17^{\rm b}$	$7.06 \pm 1.13^{\text{a}}$	$0.23\pm0.04^{\rm b}$

Table (2): Leukogram after 8 and 16 days after intra-peritoneal injection of *E. coli* ($1x10^9$ CFU/ml) and/or treatment with propolis (300 mg/kg body weight)

Results are expressed as mean \pm S.E.M. Different superscripts (a, b, c, d) at the same check point in the same column indicate significant differences at (P < 0.05)

Table	(3):	TNF- α .	IL-16.	IL-4.	IøG	and	ΙσΜ	after	2 and	16	days	of i	ntra-ne	eritoneal	injection	of E.	coli
$(1x10^{\circ})$	CFU	I/m1) an	d/or trea	atment	with	prop	olis	(300 1	ng/kg l	oody	y weig	ght):				01 21	0011

Groups	TNF-α	IL-1β	IL-4	IgG	IgM
Groups	(pg/ml)	(pg/ml)	(pg/ml)	(Mg/m1)	(ng/ml)
control D2	$25 \pm 2.97^{\circ}$	$^{\circ}$ 278.92 ± 28.35°	46.18 ± 3.43^{ab}	$7.78\pm1.31^{\mathrm{a}}$	$b 11.69 + 1.82^{a}$
propolis D2	$19.68\pm2.35^{\text{c}}$	$245.32\pm42.09^{\circ}$	$53.47\pm5.58^{\rm a}$	11.42 ± 1.63	$a^{a}13.21 \pm 2.38^{a}$
E. coli-Infected D2	67.75 ± 3.91^{a}	$689.98 \pm 84.61^{\rm a}$	$25.34\pm4.4^{\text{c}}$	$3.75\pm0.42^{\text{b}}$	$5.4\pm1.31^{\text{b}}$
Propolis + E. coli D2	32.41 ± 3.94^{bc}	$470.99\pm43.61^{\text{b}}$	$34.95\pm3.17b^{\text{c}}$	$6.79 \pm 1.42^{\text{b}}$	10.15 ± 1.4^{ab}
E. coli + propolis D2	41.37 ± 6.47^{b}	552.37 ± 25.36^{ab}	$33.03\pm4.64^{\text{bc}}$	$5.97 \pm 1.29^{\text{b}}$	7.77 ± 1.71^{ab}
control D16	27.34 ± 4.21^{bc}	$302.55 \pm 46.59^{\circ}$	50.13 ± 6.9^{ab}	$8.62\pm1.42^{\mathrm{a}}$	^b 11.5 ± 1.21^{ab}
propolis D16	$20.33\pm2.82^{\text{c}}$	$267.07 \pm 41.97^{\rm c}$	$59.19\pm5.29^{\rm a}$	11.49 ± 2.22	2^{a} 14.68 ± 1.52 ^a
E. coli-Infected D16	$53.19\pm4.64^{\rm a}$	1246.21 ± 126.25	^a $26.14 \pm 3.4^{\circ}$	$4.66\pm0.94^{\text{b}}$	$5.56 \pm 1.10^{\rm c}$
Propolis + E. coli D16	30.56 ± 2.83^{bc}	$482.88\pm46.66^{\text{bc}}$	$37.94 \pm 4.1^{\text{bc}}$	$7.36 \pm 1.66^{\rm a}$	$^{b}10.75 \pm 1.19^{ab}$
E. coli + propolis D16	$36.78\pm3.18^{\text{b}}$	$605.91 \pm 118.03^{\text{b}}$	37.64 ± 4.72^{bc}	$6.35\pm1.34^{\mathrm{a}}$	^b 8.5 ± 1.35^{bc}

Groups	Phagocytic %	Phagocytic Index
Control	$69.25\pm1.25^{\text{b}}$	$6.15\pm0.13^{\rm b}$
Propolis E. coli-Infected	$\begin{array}{c} 79.5 \pm 0.65^{a} \\ 54 \pm 0.91^{d} \end{array}$	8.48 ± 0.06^{a} 3.1 ± 0.11^{e}
Propolis + E. coli	$66.75\pm1.25^{\text{b}}$	$5.58\pm0.14^{\rm c}$
E. coli + Propolis	$61.75\pm0.85^{\rm c}$	$4.9\pm0.07^{\text{d}}$

Table (4): Phagocytic % and phagocytic index 16 days after intra-peritoneal injection of *E. coli* $(1x10^9 CFU/m1)$ and/or treatment with propolis (300 mg/kg body weight)

Results are expressed as mean \pm S.E.M. Different superscripts (a, b, c, d) at the same check point in the same column indicate significant differences at (P < 0.05)

4. DISCUSSION

Propolis is an aresinous material collected by bees from bud and exudates of the plants, which is transformed in the presence of bee enzymes (*Burdock*, 1998). Flavonoids, aromatic acids, caffeic acid, terpenes and phenolic constituents appear to be the principal components responsible for the biological and pharmacological activities of propolis (*Bankova et al.*, 2000; Orsolic et al., 2004).

Concerning to leukogram, E. Coli-Infected group showed significant leukocytosis and granulocytosis after 2, 4, 8 and 16 days' postinfection when compared with control, While, there was a significant lymphocytosis after 4 days' post-infection. Our results agree with Shin et al., (1998) who found that Shiga toxin of E. coli caused marked increase (seven fold) of granulocytes in the peripheral blood. Tanaka et al., (2006) demonstrated that I/P injection of *E. coli* lipopolysaccharide (LPS) inflammatory response. stimulate The response in turn caused release of chemical mediators such as macrophage colony stimulating factor which in turn activates various cell systems as macrophage and neutrophils.

Propolis + *E. coil* group showed significant decrease in leukocytes after (4, 8 and 16 days) and granulocytes after 2, 4, 8 and 16 days' post-infection when compared with *E. coli* infected group. While *E. coli* + propolis group showed significant decrease in leukocytes after 16 days and significant decrease in granulocytes after 4, 8 and 16 days' post-infection when compared with *E. coli* infected group. These results agreed with *Machado et al.*, (2012) who demonstrated local and systemic anti-inflammatory action resulting from an immunomodulatory action of propolis. These effects may be due to synergic

and/or additive effect(s) of various propolis compounds there by decreasing the inflammation observed. The extracts are also capable of modulating the production of proinflammatory and anti-inflammatory cytokines preventing amplification of the inflammatory process.

Regarding to cytokines, E. coli group showed significant increases in TNF-α and IL-1β, significant decrease in IL-4 after 2 and 16 days when compared with control. On the other hand, Propolis + E. coli group induced significant decreases in TNF- α and IL-1 β after 2 and 16 days when compared with E. coli infected group, While E. coli + propolis group induced significant decreases in TNF- α after 2 and 16 days but IL-1ß after 16 day These results agree partially with Korish and Arafa., (2011) who found marked increase in the proinflammatory cytokines TNF- α and IL-1 β levels and non-significant decrease in IL-4 in animals with lipopolysaccharide endotoxemia reveals picture of systemic inflammatory reaction, On the other hand, propolis treatment with E. coli infection was found to cause significant decrease in TNF- α and IL-1 β . This may be attribute to the ability of propolis to decrease the infiltration of the liver cells by the inflammatory (neutrophil and monocytes) cells which is suggested to strengthen the defense mechanisms against reactive oxygen species into the liver cells and attenuate the excessive inflammatory injury induced by TNF-α and IL- 1β as demonstrated by decreased plasma levels of these cytokines in the treated groups (Yildiz et al., 2009). Propolis treatment with E. coli infection was found to be associated with a significant increase in IL-4 levels in the treated group. This may be explained by the potential anti-inflammatory effect of propolis which decreases the release of the inflammatory

cytokines from the inflammatory cells and at the same time it stimulates anti-inflammatory cytokines synthesis like IL-4 (*Doughty et al.*, 2002).

Regarding to antibodies, E. Coli-Infected group showed significant decrease in IgM after 2 and 16 days' post-infection when compared with control. While, Propolis + E. coli group was found to induce significant increase in IgM after 16 days' post-infection when compared with E. coli infected group. Our results agree with Giurgea et al., (1983) who found that rats fed with a standard propolis extract together with E. coli antigen, showed an increase in the formation of antibodies compared with rats did not receive propolis. Propolis activates the immune system, increasing macrophage activity (Dimov et al., 1991) and increasing interleukin-2, and interleukin-4 levels (Orsolic and Basic., 2003; Park et aL, 2004). These cytokines stimulate B lymphocytes and then they are changed to plasma cells, which would be able to produce immunoglobulins (Diker., 1998).

Concerning to phagocytic % and phagocytic index, our data showed significant decrease in phagocytic % and phagocytic index in E. coli group, E. coli infection cause impairment of polymorphonuclear leukocytes (PMNLs) function, decreased phagocytic activity and ineffective opsonization (Hegazy et al., 2010). These results agree with Abd El-Tawab et al., (2015) who found significant decrease in phagocytosis and this may be due to exhaustion of immune system by E. coli infection. On the other hand, Propolis + E. coli and E. coli + propolis groups showed a significant increase in phagocytic % and phagocytic index when compared to E. coli infected group. These results agree with Gao et al., (2014) who found that administration of Brazilian green propolis could promote peritoneal phagocytosis and increased phagocytic index in comparison to the control group. A study conducted by Fischer et al., showed that the polyphenol (2010)compounds extracted from Brazilian green propolis could promote specific antibody secretion in mice. Artepillin-C a lowmolecular-weight phenolic compound was effective in T helper cells expansion and activation, as well as macrophage activation as demonstrated previously by Cheung et al., (2011) and Kimoto et al., (1998). Therefore, we consider a possibility that artepillin-C may be one of the most important ingredients in green propolis activating macrophage in

phagocytosis.

5. REFERENCES

- Abd El-Tawab, A.A., El-komy, A, A., Khalid, I. El-Ekhnawy, and Asmaa, T. Talaie., (2015): Effect of fosfomycin on *E. coli* 078 isolated from broiler chickens in-vitro and in vivo. Benha Veterinary Medical Journal, VOL. 28, NO. 1:294-300.
- Bankova.V, R. Christov, A. Kujumgiev, M. C. Marcucci, and S. Popov., (1995): "Chemical composition and antibacterial activity of Brazilian propolis," *Zeitschrift fur Naturforschung. Section C*, vol. 50, no. 3-4, pp. 167-172.
- Bankova, V. S., S. L. Castro., and M. C. Marcucci., (2000): Propolis: Recent advances in chemistry and plant origin. Apidologie (Celle) 31:3-15.
- Banskota, A. H., Y. Tezuka, I. K., Adnyana, K. Midorikawa, K. Matsushige, D. Message, A. A. Huertas., and S. Kadota., (2000): Cytotoxic, hepatoprotective and free radical scavenging effects of propolis from Brazil, Peru, the Netherlands and China. J. Ethnopharmacol. 72:239-246.
- Basnet, P., Matsushiga, K., Kadota, S., and Namba, T., (1996): Potent antihepatotoxic activity of dicaffeoyl quinic acids from propolis. Biological and Pharmacological Bulletin; 19(4): 655-657.
- Beyaert, R. and Fiers, W., (1998): Tumor Necrosis Factor and lymphotoxin. In cytokines, A. R. M. S. a. R. Thorpe, eds. Academic Press, San Diego, p. 335-360.
- Burdock, G. A., (1998): Review of the biological properties and toxicity ofbee propolis (propolis). Food and Chemical Toxicology 36, 347-363.
- Cheung, K.W., Sze, D.M., Chan, W.K., Deng, R.X., Tu, W., Chan; G.C., (2011): Brazilian green propolis and its constituent, artepillin C inhibits allogeneic activated human CD4 T cells expansion and activation. J Ethnopharmacol; 138: 463-471.
- Diker, S. K., (1998): Immunoloji. 1st ed. Medisan Yayinevi, Ankara, Turkey.
- Dimov. V, Neychev, H., Slavcheva, E., Shirova, L., Vuleva, V., Manolova, N., Gegova, G., (1988): Effect of "TR fraction" on experimental infection with Kl 2^{nd} pneumonia. In: Abstracts of Symposium on Current Problems in Testing and Evaluation of Experimental Effects and Clinical of

Immunomodulators. CSFR, Kosico, 6-7.

- Doughty, L., Clark, R.S., Kaplan, S.S., Sasser, H., Carcillo, J., (2002): sFas and sFas ligand and pediatric sepsis-induced multiple organfailure syndrome. Pediatr Res; 52(6):922-7.
- E1-khayat, Z., Ezzat, A. R., Arbid, M. S., Rasheed, WI., Elias, T. R., (2009): Potential effects of bee honey and propolis against the toxicity of ochratoxin A in rats. Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences; 2(4): 1-8.
- Fischer, G., Paulino, N., Marcucci, M.C., et al., (2010): Green propolis phenolic compound as vaccine adjuvants, improving humoral and cellular responses in mice inoculated with inactivated vaccines. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz; 105: 908-913.
- Gao. Weina, Jianquan Wu, Jingyu Wei, Lingling Pu, Changjiang Guo⁻, Jijun Yang, Ming Yang and Haiji Luo., (2014): Brazilian green propolis improves immune function in aged mice, J. Clin. Biochem.Nutr, vol. 55.no. 1, 7-10. doi: 10.3164/j cbn.13 70.
- Ghisalberg, E.L., (1979): Propolis: a review. Bee World 60, 59-84.
- Giurgea, R., Popescu, H., Polrencu, C., (1983): Effect of standardized propolis extract (S.P.E) on immune reactions. Clujul Medical, 56(1): 73-76.
- Goddeeris, B. M., Baldwin C. L., Ole- Moi Yoi, 0., and Morrison, W. I., (1986): Improved methods for purification and depletion of monocytes from bovine peripheral blood mononuclear cells: Functional evaluation of monocytes in response to lectins. J. Immunol Method, 89: 165-170.
- Hegazy, A. M., Abd-El samie, L.K., and El-Sayed, E.M., (2010): The immunosuppressive effect of *E. coli* in chickens vaccinated with infectious bronchitis (IB) or Infectious Bursal disease (IBD) vaccines. Journal of American Science, 6(9): 762-767.
- Janeway, C.A., Travers, P., Walport, M., Shlomchik, M.J., (2005): Immunobiology. (6th ed.). Garland Science, pp 7310-4.
- Janeway, C.A., Travers, P., Walport, M., and Shlomchik, M.J., (2001): Immunobiology. (5th ed.). New York and London: Garland Science, pp
- Kimoto, T. Arai., S, Kohguchi, M., et al., (1998): Apoptosis and suppression of tumor growth by artepillin C extracted from Brazilian propolis. Cancer Detect Prey; 22: 506-515.
- Kinnear, P., and Gray, C., (2006). SPSS 12 made simple. Psychology press.

- Korish, A. A., and Arafa, Maha. M., (2011): Propolis derivatives inhibit the systemic inflammatory response and protect hepatic and neuronal cells inacute septic shock. *Braz J Infect Dis 2011; 15(4):332-338.*
- Machado, J.L., Anne, K. Martins. Assuncao., Mayara, Cristina. Pinto da Aramys, Silva dos Reis., Graciomar, Conceicao.Costa., Diego de Sousa, Arruda., Bruno, Alves.Rocha., Mirela, Mara de Oliveira. Lima Leite Vaz., Antonio, Marcus de Andrade. Paes., Rosane, Nassar.Meireles Guerra., Andresa, Aparecida. Berretta., and Flavia, Raquel. Fernandes do Nascimento., (2012): Brazilian Green Propolis:Anti-Inflammatory Property bv an Immunomodulatory Activity, Hindawi Corporation, Evidence-Based Publishing Complementary and Alternative Medicine, Volume 2012, Article ID 157652, 10 pages, doi:10.1155/2012/157652.
- Mark, D., C.Annette., and B. Jean., (2001): "Estimated Annual Costs Due to Selected Food-Borne Pathogens," Data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Food Related Illness and Death in the United States Economic Research Service, US Department of Agriculture.
- Morikawa, A., Sugiyama, T. Kato., Y. Koide., N. Jiang., G.Z, Takahashi., K. Tamada Y., Yokochi, T., (1996): Apoptotic cell death in the response of D-galactosamine sensitized mice to lipopolysaccharide as an experimental endotoxic shock model. Infect Immun; 64:737-8.
- Nathan, C.F., Murray, H.W., and Cohn, Z.A., (1980): The macrophage as an effector cell. N. Engl. J. Med. 303: 622-626
- Orsolic, N., A. H. Knezevic., L. Sver., S. Terzic., and I. Basic., (2004): Immunomodulatory and antimetastatic action of propolis and related polyphenolic compounds. J. Ethnopharmacol. 94:307-315.
- Orsolic, N., and I. Basic., (2003): Immunomodulation by water-soluble derivative of propolis: A factor of antitumor reactivity. J. Ethnopharmacol. 84:265-273.
- Park, J.H., Lee, J.K., Kim, H.S., Chung, S.T., Eom, J.H., Kim, K.A., Chung, S.J., Paik, S.Y., Oh, H.Y., (2004): Immunomodulatory effect of caffeic acid phenethyl ester in BALB/c mice. International Immunopharmacology 4,429-436.
- Prokopchuk, O., Liu, Y., Henne-Bruns, D., Kornmann, M., (2005): Interleukin-4 enhances proliferation of human pancreatic cancer cells: evidence for autocrine and

paracrine actions. Br J Cancer; 92(5):921-8.

- Rosario, C.C., A. C. Lopaz., I. G. Tellez., O. A. Navarro., R. C. Anderson., and C.C. Eslava., (2004): "Serotyping and Virulence Genes Detection in *Escherichia coli* Isolated from Fertile and Infertile Eggs, Dead-in-Shell Embryos, and Chickens with Yolk Sac Infection," *Avian Diseases*, Vol. 48, No., pp. 791-802.
- Ryan, K.J., and Ray, C.G., (2004): Sherris Medical Microbiology (4th ed). McGraw Hill Inc.New York, p 8529 - 9.
- Shin. K, K. Yamauchi, S. Teraguchi, H. Hayasawa, M. Tomita, Y. Otsuka and S. Yamazaki, (1998): "Antibacterial Acti- vity of Bovine Lactoferrin and Its Peptides against Enterohaemorrhagic Escherichia coli 0157:H7," Letters in Applied Microbiology,

Vol. 26, pp. 407-411.

- Tanaka, H., N, Tanaba., M. Shoji., T. Katono., S. Sato., M. Motohashi., and M. Maeno., (2006): "Nicotine and Lipopolysaccharide Stimulate the Formation of Osteoclast-Like Cells by Increasing Macrophage Colony-Stimulating Factor and Prostaglandin E2 Production by Osteoblasts," *Life Sciences*, Vol. 78, No. 15, pp. 1733 -1740.
- Tunkel, A.R., and W.M. Scheld., (1993): Pathogenesis and pathophysiology of bacterial meningitis. Clin.Microbiol.Rev. 6:118-136.
- Yildiz Y, Serter M, Ek RO et al., (2009): Protective effects of caffeic acid phenethyl ester on intestinal ischemia-reperfusion injury. Dig Dis Sci; 54(4):738-44.