MOLECULAR DETECTION OF ENTAMOEBA GINGIVALIS USING POLYMERASE CHAIN REACTION
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ABSTRACT

Background and objective: Periodontitis is still until now not understood, it's being recorded as public health problems. This disease is caused by bacteria and parasite. Two parasites found in mouth Trichomonas tenax and Entamoeba gingivalis. Entamoeba gingivalis; opportunistic parasite finding in mouth, has only trophozoite form. This parasite possibly has a connection with Periodontitis. The objective of the study: compares between multi – methods for E. gingivalis detection, including microscopic examination, culturing the parasite in a modifying Trypaticase-Yeast Extract-Serum-Gastric Mucin-9 (TYSGM-9) medium and molecular detection of Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR).

Methods: 100 Cotton swab samples from patients with Periodontitis were collected using three or two sterile cotton swabs for everyone. The 50 samples were diagnosed by microscopic examination and 50 samples culturing on modifying TYSGM-9 media and then using PCR to insure found Entamoeba gingivalis grew on media and The 50 samples were diagnosed by PCR using specific primers of the SSU rDNA gene (Small Subunit of the ribosomal DNA gene). The No. of sample under testing 100 or 150.

Result: About 18 (36%) samples positive by microscope, and 20 (40%) samples positive by culture. Whereas the result of PCR positive for these 20samples of culture. So the PCR technique is the best method to detect E. gingivalis and modify TYSGM-9 media is perfect to grow this parasite. You mean all patients under study infections by parasite but no bacteria?

Conclusions: The modifying TYSGM-9 medium and molecular detection by PCR using specific primers of the SSU rDNA gene are the best methods for E. gingivalis detection as ceasing to periodontal diseases and distinguished from other pathogens.
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INTRODUCTION

Periodontitis has multiple clinical types. It was distributed widely among people (Burt 2005); Causes by bacteria and parasite such as Entamoeba gingivalis and Trichomonas tenax (Robert, et al., 2011). Entamoeba gingivalis is a parasitic protozoa of the oral cavity, it has trophozoite only, which not create cyst (Gros 1849). This parasite is one of Entamoeba kind, which have a small nucleus and multiple vacuoles (Okada, et al., 2002). Periodontitis is most popular diseases all over the world. Inflammation of gum is characterized by pain, bone loss and bleeding of gum. In some cases, erosion of gum causes loss of tooth. So these signs are important for diagnosis of this disease-ase, so patient feel discomfort (Steele, et al., 2004). Habits of patients are related to frequent infection. For that we can detect E. gingivalis by using genetic methods (Kikuta, et al., 1996). Some studies helped to make sure the pre-sence of that parasite in periodntal pockets via molecular methods (Bonner, et al., 2014). The objective of the study compares between multi – methods for E. gingivalis detection, including microscopic examination, culturing the parasite in a modifying TYSGM-9 medium and molecular detection by Polymerase Chine Reaction (PCR).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection: The samples (100) were taken from patients with Periodontitis using two or three sterile cotton swabs for everyone. The 50 swabs used to detect E. gingivalis using microscope, whereas, the other swabs (50) have been cultured on modifying TYSGM-9 media.

Microscopic examination: The 50 swabs were tested under microscopic directly using wet mount swabs with normal saline (Jabuk, et al., 2015).

Culture: The 50 samples were culturing on modifying medium Trypaticase-Yeast Extract-Serum-Gastric Mucin-9 (TYSGM-9) (this media prepare from: Casein digest peptone 2.0gm, Sodium chlo-ride 7.5 gm, Potassium phosphate dibasic 2.8 gm, Yeast extract (BBL) 1.0 gm, Potassium phosphate monobasic 0.4 gm and distilled water 970 ml) for the parasite growing, which incubated at 37°C for 48-72 hours (Hussien 2017). After that the culture was examined with microscope to insure the prese-nce of E. gingivalis and then accomplished by molecular technique using PCR.

DNA extraction: The DNA of the parasite was extracted using Stool or Tool DNA isolation-mini kit (Favroprep) according to the manual guide instructions. The DNA extracts were examined by agarose gel electrophoresis. DNA quantity and quality were determined using an ultraviolet-visi-ble
Spectrophotometer-NanoDrop instrument (OP-TIZ-EN POP - Korea). The concentration of DNA was measured at 260 nm, which ranged 50-100 ng/ml and the DNA purity ranged between 1.7 and 2.0. The DNA extracts were stored at -20°C until PCR accomplished.

**PCR amplification and electrophoresis:** For *E. gingivalis* detection, the target DNA regions of the SSU rDNA gene were amplified using specific primers were mentioned in Table 1. The reaction mixtures were prepared using a PCR Master Mix (Promega GoTaq® Green Master Mix -USA) according to kit instructions. Each PCR reaction was carried out in a final volume of 20 μl under the conditions were displayed in Table 2. The reaction mixture composed of The using 12.5 μl of master mix from (promega company) and 5 μl mastermix from bionner company(making sure), 2μl of DNA sample (40ng), 1.5μl of each forward and reverse primer and 10μl free-nuclease distilled water. We used a TRIO Thermal Cycler (Biometa-Germany) for gDNA amplification. PCR products and 100bp DNA molecular ladder (Promega) were migrated and visualized in 1% (w/v) agarose gel electrophoresis in 1X of TAE buffer (Tris Acetate- Ethylene-diamine-tetraacetic acid) buffer composed of 0.040 mol Tris-acetate and 0.001 mol EDTA were dissolved in 1 l deionized distilled water and the pH value was adjusted to 8.0±0.2. Gels were stained with ethidium bromide solution (5 μg/ml) using horizontal electrophoresis (Cleaver Scientific, UK) and Gel Documentation System (UVsolo touch, Biometra-Germany).

### Table 1: Primers used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Primer sequence</th>
<th>Tm</th>
<th>Fragment size (bp)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSU rDNA</td>
<td>F: 5′-AGGAATGAACCGAACGTACA-3′ 56.4</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: 5′-CCATTTCCTTCTTCTATTGTTTCAC-3′ 60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: PCR protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermocycle</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>Cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial denaturation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denaturation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annealing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final extension</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Statistical analysis:** Data were analyzed using SPSS version 22 software Fisher’s exact and T-Test with a significant P<0.05.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Out of 50 samples tested by microscope, 18 samples were positive for *E. gingivalis*. Whereas, only 20/50 samples contained the parasite and had ability to grow in the modifying culture media (Fig.1). Out of 50 samples only 20 samples gave positive detection by PCR using specific primer of SSU rDNA gene (Small Subunit of the ribosomal DNA gene) as shown in figure (2); And the same samples gave the parasite cultures (20/20) which appeared positive molecular detection of *E. gingivalis* by PCR. These results indicate that the modifying TYSGM-9 medium and PCR detection were more specific for Detection of *E. gingivalis* than microscopic examination. In the other hand, the results of the parasites detected by microscopy primarily may be belong to the species *E. gingivalis* but not absolutely and that the presence of the parasite is correlated with periodontitis.

**Fig. 1:** Comparison between diagnostic methods of Entamoeba gingivalis.

The methods, including the direct examination by the light microscope, culturing in modifying TYS-GM-9 medium and PCR technique using specific primers of the SSU rDNA gene for *E. gingivalis* detection.
E. gingivalis found in oral cavity lives in gum, on the surface of the tooth and gingival pockets. The first way to diagnose this parasite using wet mount sample and tested by microscope (Jabuk et al., 2015). The other way by culturing the parasite using different media, including modifying (MSF) culture, Wantland's egg medium, and (TTY-SB) to grow E. gingivalis. The comparison among them, the researchers found that these media were not suitable for culture or detection the parasite under different conditions (Gannon and Linke 1989). While, the other study used a modify Trypticase-Yeast Extract-Serum-Gastric Mucin to grow this parasite and showed it is a suitable medium for E. gingivalis growing (Hussien 2017). In recent study used modify (TYSGM-9) to grow parasite within 24h, and reach high growing at 72h. without using any solution for parasites growth. There are numerous genetic studies for Entamoeba genus, particularly to identify virulence factors of the pathogenic organism Entamoeba histolytica. In some studies, new amoebae similar to E. histolytica, recognized in samples from animals, and the molecular identification created the phylogenetic trees of the Entamoeba genus depending on their small subunit ribosomal DNA sequence (Stensvold et al., 2011). Amoebae have the ability to colonize the human host are extensively within the genus, depending on the sequence of this gene; They reflected their differences in the nucleus number of their cyst form. The mouth-colonizing E. gingivalis has no identified cyst form, in spite of its vicinity to species producing mono- or tetra-nucleated cysts, depending on their small subunit ribosomal DNA (SSU rDNA) sequences (Bonner, et al., 2014). Recently, the researchers have been using PCR technique to detect E. gingivalis depending on genetic material (Bonner, Amard et al. 2014). That's useful to ensure it’s the same parasite.

CONCLUSION

The modifying medium Trypticase-Yeast Extract-Serum-Gastric Mucin-9 (TYSGM-9) and molecular detection by PCR using specific primers of the SSU rDNA gene are the best methods for E. gingivalis detection as ceasing to periodontal diseases and distinguished from other pathogens.
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