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Figure 4.6 Binding of serum antibodies from fish immunised with r22C03 produced distinctly different profiles against the recombinant protein and the whole Neoparamoeba perurans antigens. (A) Anti-r22C03 antibodies in pooled serum of fish immunised 8, 10 and 12 weeks prior with r22C03 (n=4-5), reacted to a band of approximately 17 kDa (lanes 2, 3, and 4), but not pooled serum of fish before immunisation (lane 1, n=5). (B) In contrast, binding of serum antibodies of fish immunised with r22C03 8, 10 and 12 weeks prior to sampling (n=4-5), produced a smear across a broad molecular range against amoebae antigens.
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Figure 5.1 Antibody levels (units) in serum, mucus, gill and skin explant of Atlantic salmon against the recombinant protein r22C03, before challenge with *Neoparamoeba perurans*. Fish in groups RP and mRP had been immunised with r22C03 at week 0 and given a booster at week 5. Tables show statistical differences between the vaccinated groups (RP and mRP) and their respective controls for each time point. Groups are identified as: Initial (*), RP (●); ADJ (■), BF (▲), mRP (○), mADJ (□) and mBF (∆). Symbols represent values for individual fish, bars represent averages for each group. n=4 for each treatment at each time point. *= P between 0.05 and 0.01, **= P<0.01 by a one-way ANOVA.

Figure 5.2 Antibody levels (units) in serum, mucus, gill and skin explant of Atlantic salmon against the recombinant protein r22C03, after the second challenge with *Neoparamoeba perurans*. Fish in groups RP and mRP had been immunised with r22C03 29 weeks prior and given a booster at 24 weeks earlier than sampling. Different letters represent statistical differences between the vaccinated groups (RP and mRP) and with their respective controls by a one-way ANOVA. Symbols represent values for individual fish; bars represent averages for each group.

Figure 5.3 Percent survival for Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) vaccinated with r22C03 after infection with *Neoparamoeba perurans*, in challenged tanks (A) or in a non-infection control tank (B). Fish in groups RP and mRP had been immunised with r22C03 21 weeks prior and given a booster at 16 weeks before the challenge.

Figure 5.4 Percentage of affected filaments (A), average size of AGD lesions in affected filaments (B) and correlation between these two variables (C) in gills of surviving Atlantic salmon from different vaccination treatments and controls, 58
d after the second infection with *N. perurans*. Symbols represent values for individual fish; bars represent averages for each group.

Figure 6.1 Protein extractions from Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) gill mucus resolved by Bis-Tris 4-12% NuPAGE® Novex® Mini gel and silver stained. Each lane contains a similar amount of protein yield (~6 µg per lane), after dialysis and lyophilisation. Lane 1 MWM, lanes 2-6: gill mucus samples from AGD-naïve fish, lanes 7-10: gill mucus from AGD-affected fish. Stars (★) indicate bands that were excised and subjected to in-gel digestion for identification by nanoLC-MS/MS.

Figure 6.2 Principal component analysis of the full set of proteins identified at a high confidence level (≥2 peptides) in the biological replicates (n=5) of gill (A) and skin (B) mucus of Atlantic salmon. The blue dots denote the AGD naïve fish and the red dots represent AGD-affected fish.

Supplementary Figure 6.3 Ingenuity pathway of three proteins networks identified during the experiment in gill mucus of Atlantic salmon affected by AGD, one in main image and two in the inset (one in grey, one in purple). Each gene involved in the pathway is denoted by their ENTREZ gene symbol or in some cases full gene name. The proteins indicated in coloured circles showed statistically significant (*P*<0.05) differential expression by beta-binomial distribution analysis in R (red denotes over expressed, while green denotes under expressed). Figures in white indicate other proteins involved in the pathway. Solid arrows indicate direct protein interactions and dashed arrows indicate indirect protein interactions. Pathway analysis was done based on the mammalian orthologues of the proteins identified.

Supplementary Figure 6.4 Two ingenuity pathways of proteins identified during the experiment in skin mucus of Atlantic salmon affected by AGD. Each gene involved in the pathway is denoted by their ENTREZ gene symbol or in some cases full gene name. The proteins indicated in coloured circles showed statistically significant (*P*<0.05) differential expression by beta-binomial distribution analysis in R (red denotes over expressed, while green denotes under expressed). Figures in white indicate other proteins involved in the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-D</td>
<td>two dimensional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>amoebic gill disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>analysis of variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>antibody secreting cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>bicinchoninic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>basic local alignment search tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bp</td>
<td>base pair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>bovine serum albumin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.w.</td>
<td>body weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>cytotoxic T lymphocyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>degrees of freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>deoxyribonucleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNP</td>
<td>dinitrophenol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>Freund’s complete adjuvant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIA</td>
<td>Freund’s incomplete adjuvant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITC</td>
<td>fluorescein isothiocyanate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>gauge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>horseradish peroxidase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSWB</td>
<td>high salt wash buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>immunocytochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgG</td>
<td>immunoglobulin G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgM</td>
<td>immunoglobulin M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgT</td>
<td>immunoglobulin T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.p.</td>
<td>intraperitoneal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kDa</td>
<td>kilodalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLH</td>
<td>keyhole limpet haemocyanin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>litre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-15</td>
<td>L-15 Medium (Leibovitz) for cell culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Luria Bertani media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC MS/MS</td>
<td>liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSWB</td>
<td>low salt wash buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>mol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mAb</td>
<td>monoclonal antibody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBP</td>
<td>mannose-binding protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg</td>
<td>milligram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHC</td>
<td>Major histocompatibility complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mL</td>
<td>millilitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>millimetre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mM</td>
<td>micromole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mRNA</td>
<td>messenger ribonucleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>number of samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nm</td>
<td>nanometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPS</td>
<td>nucleic acid preservation solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBI</td>
<td>National Centre for Biotechnology Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMCRS</td>
<td>National Centre for Marine Conservation and Resource Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>optical density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>World Organization for Animal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.a.</td>
<td>peranal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMP</td>
<td>pathogen associated molecular pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>phosphate-buffered saline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>polymerase chain reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRR</td>
<td>pattern recognition receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSN</td>
<td>penicillin – streptomycin – neomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDF</td>
<td>polyvinylidene difluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS-PAGE</td>
<td>sodium dodecyl sulphate - polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>standard error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>recombinant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA</td>
<td>ribonucleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rpm</td>
<td>revolutions per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>room temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>tris-buffered saline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLR</td>
<td>Toll-like receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMB</td>
<td>3,3′,5,5′-tetramethyl benzidine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Volts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>western blot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μm</td>
<td>micrometre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μL</td>
<td>microlitre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amoebic gill disease (AGD) is the main disease affecting the Tasmanian salmonid industry and the condition has also been described in other major salmon and trout producing countries. AGD is caused by *Neoparamoeba perurans*, and outbreaks of the disease appear during the marine grow-out phase, in particular when water temperature rises. Some characterisation of the host immune response against the parasite has been achieved through gene expression studies and through others investigations which focused on antibody responses against *N. perurans*, particularly IgM. A variety of treatments have been tested, but currently the only treatment option widely used in Tasmania is freshwater bathing, which represent a high economic burden for the industry. Therefore, the development of a vaccine remains a high priority for salmon producers and different types of vaccines have been previously tested against AGD without success.

In order to develop a potentially successful vaccine strategy, a better understanding of the antibody immune response associated with the disease is necessary. To address this general objective, the followings aims were studied in this thesis:

- Investigate the mucosal and systemic immune response of Atlantic salmon against *N. perurans*, the causative agent of AGD.
- Investigate mucosal and systemic anti-*N. perurans* antibody responses to a recombinant putative attachment protein of the amoeba, first identified by the generation of a cDNA library from the parasite.
- Investigate vaccine formulations for AGD, using the recombinant protein described above.
- Investigate other mucosal components potentially involved in the host response against *N. perurans*.

This thesis presents the results obtained from several different experiments aimed at addressing the above stated aims. Firstly, an experiment where the immune responses of Atlantic salmon were assessed at transcription and antibody production levels, after repeated infections with *N. perurans*. Secondly, an experiment where immune responses were assessed after a single infection and fish were fed commercially
developed diets containing immunostimulants. We showed that antibody levels do not always correlate with mRNA transcription levels identified in AGD gill lesions, which is possibly explained by weak correlations existing between protein and mRNA abundances in cells and tissues. Additionally, we demonstrated that the use of immunostimulants containing diets did not affect the levels of serum or skin mucus IgM and were unable to induce IgM and IgT transcription at the site of AGD infection.

Following from this experiment; the systemic and mucosal immune responses of Atlantic salmon were studied using two protein-hapten antigens. This study aimed at evaluating the best delivery method of antigens to be used in the testing of a vaccine candidate in subsequent experiments. The results showed that i.p. injection of immunogens emulsified in FCA was the best delivery method for inducing systemic and mucosal antibody responses.

We described the production of a recombinant protein named r22C03, identified as a mannose-binding protein-like (MBP-like) similar to attachment factors of other amoebae, and a putative attachment factor of N. perurans. This protein was capable of inducing systemic and mucosal antibody responses against the amoebae and both systemic and mucosal antibodies produced were able to bind the surface of formalin-fixed N. perurans. The recombinant protein was then tested as a vaccine candidate against AGD, following the rationale that by using functional antibodies present in mucosal surfaces, the putative attachment factor of N. perurans might be blocked and the severity of AGD could potentially be reduced. Fish were immunised with r22C03 using two different vaccination strategies and then challenged with the parasite. A strong antibody response against the recombinant protein was observed in serum and mucosal surfaces of vaccinated salmon, but no differences in survival curves or size of lesion in the gills were observed. However, a concurrent infection with Yersinia ruckeri was present during the experiment, and even though the simultaneous presentation of both pathogens could represent a situation more closely related to infection patterns observed on commercial farms, survival results obtained after the parasite challenge had to be examined with caution in the context of vaccine efficacy against N. perurans.
Executive Summary

Following from the unsuccessful challenge, nanoLC-MS/MS and proteomics analyses were used on skin and gill mucus of AGD-affected fish, as a tool to identify the changes in the proteome of mucus after repeated infection with amoebae. Proteins that have been previously related to gene expression in AGD-affected gills as well as proteins that have not been previously described in AGD-affected fish were identified and it was proposed that future research should focus on better understanding the role these components play in the response against infection with *N. perurans*.

This thesis provided further understanding into the mucosal responses to AGD. However, the role mucosal antibodies play in responses against AGD cannot be completely comprehended until the study of IgT responses in AGD-affected fish can be completed, as it has been hampered by the lack of available reagents. Finally, adjuvants that have been designed specifically to elicit mucosal responses need to be fully tested in AGD vaccine formulations.