# Pathophysiology of staphylococcal bone and joint infections

### Pr Frédéric LAURENT

Department of Bacteriology – North Hospital, Hospices Civils de Lyon French National Reference Centre for Staphylococci International Centre for Infectiology Research - INSERM U1111 Institut des Sciences Pharmaceutiques et Biologiques de Lyon



Lyon, France

















Physiological context

Healthy bone







# Bone and joint infections

# Definitions

- Osteomyelitis
- Spondylodiscitis (vertebra)
- Septic arthritis



- Acute or chronic: delay of 1 month (arbitrary!)
  - Implant-associated or not prothesis or osteosynthesis



# Bone and joint infections

### Hematogeneous

during bacteriemia



Risk on prosthesis:< 1%

Except for *S. aureus* : 30-40%

Acute

### **Direct Inoculation**

joint puncture/infiltration open surgery or arthroscopy

## Contiguous



Prosthetic-joint infection Coagulase-negative; staphylococci; Staph aureus; polymicrobial Streptococcus spp; gram-negative aerobic bacilli Skull osteomyelitis P. acnes; Coagulase-negative staphylococci

> Shoulder prosthesis joint infection P. acnes; Coagulase-negative staphylococci

> > Vertebral osteomyelitis Stoph oureus; gram-negative aerobic bacilli; Streptococcus spp; Mycobacterium tuberculosis Brucella C. burnetii

> > > **Osteomyelitis** Staph aureus; Streptococcus spp. Kingella kingae

Post-traumatic infection Staph aureus; polymicrobial gram-negative aerobic bacilli; anaerobes

Septic arthritis

Streptococcus spp;

Veisseria gonorrhoeae.

Staph aureus:

E. coli;

Diabetic foot infection Staph aureus; Streptococcus spp; Enterococcus spp; coagulase-negative staphylococci; gram-negative aerobic bacilli; anaerobes

# Acute BJIs

#### Osteomyelitis in childhood Hematogenous

Septic arthritis Hematogenous Post-operative Contigous

Spondylodiscitis Hematogenous

Spinal implant infection Hematogenous Post-operative

Joint prosthesis or osteosynthesis infection Hematogenous Post-operative Contigous Acute post-operative hip prosthesis infection

Tumefaction Collection Inflammation

Discharge

Fight quickly and adequately for prosthesis salvage Prosthetic-joint infection Coagulase-negative; staphylococci; Staph aureus; polymicrobial Streptococcus spp; gram-negative aerobic bacilli

Septic arthritis

Streptococcus spp;

Post-traumatic infection

Staph aureus;

polymicrobial

gram-negative

aerobic bacilli:

anaerobes

Neisseria gonorrhoeae

Staph aureus:

E. coli;

Skull osteomyelitis

P. acnes; Coagulase-negative staphylococci

Shoulder prosthesis joint infection P. acnes; Coagulase-negative staphylococci

> Vertebral osteomyelitis Stoph aureus; gram-negative aerobic bacilli; Streptococcus spp; Mycobacterium tuberculosis Brucella C. burnetii

> > **Osteomyelitis** Staph aureus; Streptococcus spp.

Diabetic foot infection Staph aureus; Streptococcus spp; Enterococcus spp; coagulase-negative staphylococci; gram-negative aerobic bacilli; anaerobes

# **Chronic BJI**

Osteomyelitis in childhood relapsing in adulthood Hematogenous

Spinal implant infection Post-operative

Post-trauma infections Post-operative Contigous

Prosthesis joint or osteosynthesis infection Hematogenous Post-operative

Skull bone flap Post-operative

Diabetic foot Contigous Prosthetic-joint infection

Coagulase-negative; staphylococci; Staph aureus; polymicrobial Streptococcus spp; gram-negative aerobic bacilli Skull osteomyelitis P. acnes; Coagulase-negative staphylococci

> Shoulder prosthesis joint infection P. acnes; Coagulase-negative staphylococci

> > Vertebral osteomyelitis Stoph oureus; gram-negative aerobic bacilli; Streptococcus spp; Mycobacterium tuberculosis

# **Chronic BJI**

Osteomyelitis in childhood relapsing in adulthood Hematogenous

Spinal implant infection Spinal implant infection Spinal implant infection



Small colony variants

Staph aure Streptococ E. coli; Neisseria g

Septic arth

Post-trau infection Staph aure polymicro gram-neg aerobic ba anaerobe



staphylococci; gram-negative aerobic bacilli; anaerobes

Diabetic foot Contigous

# Pathophysiopathology of BJI

*S. aureus* = 40% to 70% of BJI

**Classical acute virulence** 

+ Recurrence et chronicity ++

### Biofilm



### Internalization



Small Colony Variant (SCV)



# Pathophysiopathology of BJI

*S. aureus* = 40% to 70% of BJI

**Classical acute virulence** 

+ Recurrence et chronicity ++

### Biofilm



### Internalization



Small Colony Variant (SCV)



# Biofilm

## Biofilm on prothesis (true life !)



# Biofilm







# Biofilm



### Each bacteria is in a different microenvironment

### Do l'adhárance au hiofilm



Polymer surface: hydrophobicity, AtlE, Aae and teichoic acids

Host matrix proteins: SdrF, SdrG, SdrH, Ebp, AtlE and Aae

PNAG, teichoic acids, Bap and Aap

PSMs? Proteases?

#### Bactéries IOA = +/- biofilm / intracellulaire









#### 2 h

Fixation des S. aureus sur des irrégularités à la surface du matériel

#### 4 h

Début de fabrication du "slime "

#### 8 h

recouverte par une couche épaisse de "slime"

#### 24 h

La surface du matériel est Des bactéries émergent du biofilm, libres et prêtes à se fixer ailleurs





#### + free DNA + human/bacterial proteins + polysaccharides = GLUE

Otto, M. Nat Rev Microbiol, 2009.



### Planctonic bacteria

. Elimination by the mechanisms of natural defense : antibodies, phagocytes

. Susceptibility to antibiotics

× Antibiotics

Anticorps



Oplanctonic bacteria

JW Costerton (1999) Science, 284:1318-1322



Bacteria and bifiofilm= adhesion on biotic or abiotic surfaces then adhesion bacteria/bacteria

- . Resistance to antibodies
- . Resistance to phagocytes
- . Resistance to most of teh antibiotics



Anticorps



Oplanctonic bacteria



bacteria in biofilm



phagocytes attracted by bacterial biofilm
 unefficient phagocytosis

 but local release of lysosomial enzymes
 from phagocytes unable to destroy
 biofilm matrix

× Antibiotics

Anticorps



Oplanctonic bacteria



bacteria in biofilm

JW Costerton (1999) Science, 284:1318-1322



. local release of lysosomial enzymes from phagocytes unable to destroy biofilm matrix

Tissue damages around prosthesis = loosening of prothesis

. Swarming of bacteria from biofilm

× Antibiotics

Anticorps



Oplanctonic bacteria

lacksquare

bacteria in biofilm

JW Costerton (1999) Science, 284:1318-1322

In BHI+ 1% glucose after 48H



Clinical MSSA isolatescollected in patient suffering from BJI

### In BHI+ 1% glucose after 48H



In human sera after 48H/D30



![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

### In BHI after 48H

In human sera + 1% Glusoce after D2/D10/D15/D20/D25/D30

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

### In BHI after 48H

In human sera + 1% Glusoce after D2/D10/D15/D20/D25/D30

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

### In BHI after 48H

In human sera + 1% Glusoce after D2/D10/D15/D20/D25/D30

![](_page_30_Figure_3.jpeg)

### In BHI after 48H

In human sera + 1% Glusoce after D30

![](_page_31_Figure_3.jpeg)

t

Relevance of data ? in vivo predictive value of data? Standardisation needed ? But which conditions ?

# Pathophysiopathology of BJI

*S. aureus* = 40% to 70% of BJI

**Classical acute virulence** 

+ Recurrence et chronicity ++

### Biofilm

![](_page_32_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Internalization

![](_page_32_Picture_7.jpeg)

Small Colony Variant (SCV)

![](_page_32_Picture_9.jpeg)

## Osteoblast invasion by S. aureus

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

Electronic microscopy Hoffmann *et al.*, Eur J Cell Biol 2011 Invasion of host cells is thought to result in a **bacterial sanctuary** 

Inserm

UNIVERSITE DE LYON

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Unresolved** questions

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Loss of homeostasy due to

Loss of osteoblast function (destruction, reduction of mineralisation) ? and/or gain of osteoclast function (increase resorption) ?

### **Consequences of intracellular interaction**

S. aureus / osteoblasts ? S. aureus / osteoclasts ?
# Intracellular *S. aureus* and osteoblasts

#### Invade to escape or invade to kill ?







## Intracellular *S. aureus* and osteoblasts Model CA-MRSA / HA-MRSA PVL, alpha-toxine and PSMs

### Intracellular S. aureus and osteoclasts

Invasion of precursors Impact on osteoclastogenesis Impact on bone resorption

#### Background

## MRSA as study model of BJIs : two clinical patterns

#### HA-MRSA

- Post-surgical infections
- Periprosthetic infections
- Indolent / relapsing / chronic infections

**CA-MRSA** Panton-Valentine leukocidin (PVL)+

- Acute osteomyelitis (children++)
- Rapid progression with sepsis
- Major inflammation, bone destruction, involvement of surrounding soft tissue

Underlying mechanisms ? Genotypic differences ? ↓ Optimization of therapeutic strategies

#### Objectives

## **Working hypothesis**

- Interactions of CA- and HA-MRSA with osteoblasts might differ
  - CA-MRSA => host cell damage
  - HA-MRSA => intracellular survival

## **Objectives**

 Compare CA- and HA-MRSA virulence phenotypes in an ex vivo model of osteoblast intracellular infection

- Main readouts:
  - Host cell damage
  - Viable intracellular bacterial load

#### Osteoblast model



#### Materials

#### **Bacterial strains**

- 7 lineages, 5 strains in each lineage
  - CA-MRSA, n=15 / HA-MRSA, n=20

	Genotype	Origin	HA/CA	Seq. type	agr	SCC <i>mec</i> type
CONTROL	8325-4	-	-	8	1	- (MSSA)
	ST80	France	CA	80	3	IV
CA-MRSA	ST30	Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Samoa, Singapour	CA	30	3	IV
HA-MRSA	USA300	US	CA	8	1	IV
	EMRSA-2	France	НА	8	1	IV
	ST228	Switzerland	HA	228	2	I
	ST239	Poland, Greece, Bulgaria	НА	239	1	III
	EMRSA-15	UK, Germany, Austria	НА	22	1	IV

Cytotoxicity of CA- and HA-MRSA after 24h



Damage to infected cells: CA-MRSA >> HA-MRSA

Rasigade et al. PLoS One 2013



Intracellular persistence of CA- and HA-MRSA after 24h



Intracellular persistence: HA-MRSA >> CA-MRSA



#### **Kinetics experiments**



Bone cells bear ≈ 1 CA-MRSA / cell vs ≈ 5 HA-MRSA / cell Differences increase over time

Osteoblast mortality percentage (same experiments)



≈ 1 intracellular CA-MRSA / cell → 50% host cell mortality after 24h

 $\approx$  5 intracellular HA-MRSA / cell  $\rightarrow$  20% host cell mortality after 24h

## Conclusions

#### CA-MRSA are **less efficient at invading osteoblasts and surviving** inside them than are HA-MRSA

But ...

## CA-MRSA cause much stronger damage to infected osteoblasts than HA-MRSA



#### Intracellular S. aureus and osteoblasts

Model CA-MRSA / HA-MRSA

PVL, alpha-toxine and PSMs

## Intracellular S. aureus and osteoclasts

Invasion of precursors Impact on osteoclastogenesis Impact on bone resorption

#### Objectives

## Part II.

Role of CA-MRSA virulence determinants in osteoblast damages observed after invasion

Major virulence determinants of CA-MRSA = toxins

We know that

- Panton-Valentine leukocidin (PVL) = present +++
- Alpha-toxin (HLA) = overexpression
- Phenol-soluble modulins (PSMs) = overexpression



Panton-Valentine leukocidin and alpha-toxin (loss-of-function approach)

>deletion of *pvl* or *hla* genes in lineages USA300, ST80 and ST30 had no impact on cytotoxicity



#### **PSM expression associated with death of invaded osteoblasts**



- Alpha-type PSMs in strain USA300 SF8300 are involved in cytotoxicity
- Level of expression of PSM (qRT-PCR) correlated to cytotoxic damages

#### Phenol soluble modulins

#### PSMare expressed after entrance in cells A expression

- PSM expressed 1h post invasion
- No or low expression by extracellular *S. aureus* extracellulaires



#### **PSM = first intracellular toxins of** *S. aureus*

Surewaard et al. PLoS Pathogens 2012

#### **BJI due to CA-MRSA**

#### Pathophysiological model



#### PVL : *in vivo* mechanism



C5aR dependant: no expression of C5a on osteoblasts ???

#### Rabbit Model of Staphylococcus aureus pneumonia



#### Diep et al., Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010.

#### **BJI due to CA-MRSA**

#### **Pathophysiological model**



#### Osteoblast invasion by S. aureus





Electronic microscopy Hoffmann *et al.*, Eur J Cell Biol 2011 Invasion of host cells is thought to result in a **bacterial sanctuary** 

Inserm

UNIVERSITE DE LYON

#### Osteoblast model



#### Osteoblast invasion by S. non-aureus



#### Osteoblast invasion by S. non-aureus



## S. aureus invasion and osteoclasts

#### **Direct and indirect impacts on bone resorption**





## Aim :

- To study the direct impact of *S. aureus* on osteoclasts :
  - Phenotypic aspect (osteoclastogenesis)
  - Functional aspect (bone resorption)

#### Strategy of study

#### To test the S. aureus impact on different phase of osteoclastic differentiation



Tartrate-resistant acid Phosphatase

#### Material and methods



Osteoclastogenesis ?

## Evaluation of bone resorption on bone matrix





#### Impact of live S. aureus infection on osteoclastogenesis



 Supernatent = boost resorption by mature uninfected OC

#### Interaction Ostéoclastes – S. aureus



#### Material and methods



Osteoclastogenesis ?

## Evaluation of bone resorption on bone matrix

## Infection of mature osteoclasts



#### Interaction osteoclasts – S. aureus



#### Interaction Osteoclasts – S. aureus

#### unfected mature osteoclast - Control

#### S. aureus-infected osteoclast





Intracellular S. aureus increases the capacity of resorption of mature osteoclasts

#### Interaction osteoclasts – S. aureus


#### Interaction osteoclasts – S. aureus



infectés

#### Direct impact of recombinant toxins on osteoclasts



#### Cytotoxic effect of staphylococcal toxins



Toxines (ng/mL)

3 replicates in 3 different donors

#### Direct impact of recombinant toxins on osteoclasts



#### Direct impact of recombinant toxins on osteoclasts



#### Impact of recombinant toxins on osteoclasts



→ TSST-1 increase the capacity of resorption of mature osteoclasts

#### From acute BJI to chonic BJI

Bettina Loeffler showed us in vitro data and data from animal about SCV

To date, **no study** comparing isolates recovered from **the same patient** at time of acute BJI and at time of chronicization have been performed

### Aim of the study

To date, **no study** comparing isolates recovered from **the same patient** at time of acute BJI and at time of chronicization have been performed

To determine if bacterial mechanisms involved in persisting BJIs are present at acute infection or are the consequence of *in vivo* adaptation.

#### S.aureus strains

**3 couples** of MSSA strains isolated from patients suffering from recurrent or persisting prosthetic joint infection (PJI) at *initial diagnosis* of PJI and at the *time of relapse*.

#### Clinical data

Patient no	Sexe, age (year)	Site of infection	Duration of symptoms (days)	Surgical treatment	Duration of antibiotherapy (days)	Time to failure or relapse (days)
1	H,26	Tibia osteosynthesis material	12	Material Removed	82	82
2	H,80	Total knee arthroplasty	3	Irrigation and debridment	191	201
3	F,82	Total hip arthroplasty	3	Irrigation and debridment	98	134

#### S.aureus strains

**3 couples** of MSSA strains isolated from patients suffering from recurrent or persisting prosthetic joint infection (PJI) at *initial diagnosis* of PJI and at the *time of relapse*.

Clinical data						
Sexe, age Patient no (year) Site of infection		Duration of symptoms (days)	Surgical Duration of treatment antibiotherapy (da		Time to failure or relapse (days)	
1	H,26	Tibia osteosynthesis material	12	Material Removed	82	82
2	H,80	Total knee arthroplasty	3	Irrigation and debridment	191	201
3	3 F,82 Total hip arthroplasty		3	Irrigation and debridment	98	134

Same antibiotic susceptibility profile

#### S.aureus strains

**3 couples** of MSSA strains isolated from patients suffering from recurrent or persisting prosthetic joint infection (PJI) at *initial diagnosis* of PJI and at the *time of relapse*.

#### **Clinical data** Duration of Time to failure Surgical **Duration of** Sexe, age Patient no Site of infection symptoms (days) or relapse antibiotherapy (days) (year) treatment (days) Material Tibia osteosynthesis H,26 1 12 82 82 material Removed Total knee Irrigation and 2 H,80 3 191 201 arthroplasty debridment Irrigation and 3 F,82 Total hip arthroplasty 3 98 134 debridment

#### Same antibiotic susceptibility profile

#### Material and methods



Biofilm ringtest<sup>®</sup> method: Evaluation of early biofilm formation



All patients





First strain

.....

8 15 20

---- T+

- T-

Recurrent strain





All patients



#### Same capacity of formation of precoce biofilm

2 experiments in duplicate





Persisting strains form more mature biofilm than initial ones.

#### Materials et methods



#### in vitro infection model

#### **Cell culture**





MC-3T3

Human primary osteoblasts isolated from non-infected patients and sampled during routine hip surgery

#### In vitro: infection model of osteoblasts



### Adhesion to osteoblasts



Adhesion to osteoblasts, mean (%) +/- SD

	Initial strain	Recurrent strain	р
MC3T3 cells	100 +/- 19	115 +/- 45	0.126
Primary cells	100 +/- 40	78 +/- 25	0.569

3 experiments in duplicate. Statistical analysis: Mann- Whitney test (\*) confirmed by multivariate analysis controling with patients (Ŧ)

### Adhesion to osteoblasts



# Same capacity of adhesion to osteoblasts for initial and recurrent strains

3 experiments in duplicate. Statistical analysis: Mann- Whitney test (\*) confirmed by multivariate analysis controling with patients (Ŧ)

### Capacity of internalization in osteoblasts



Internalisation in	osteoblasts, mean	(%) +/- SD
--------------------	-------------------	------------

	Initial strain	Recurrent strain	р
MC3T3 cells	100 +/- 12	117 +/- 64	0.525
Primary cells	100 +/- 15	118 +/- 75	0.4

Statistical analysis: Mann- Whitney test

### Capacity of internalization in osteoblasts



Same capacity of internalization in osteoblasts for initial and recurrent strains

#### Persistence in primary osteoblasts



3 experiments in duplicate.

Bacterial persistence in primary osteoblasts, mean (%) +/- SD

	Initial strain	Recurrent strain	р
24h pi	100 +/- 17	125 +/- 80	0.007
48h pi	100 +/- 32	322 +/- 320	0.014

Statistical analysis: Mann- Whitney test (\*) confirmed by multivariate analysis controling with patients (Ŧ)

#### Persistence in primary osteoblasts



Recurrent strains have a higher capacity of persistence in primary osteoblasts than initial strains at 24h and 48h

### Cytotoxicity: primary human osteoblasts



#### Cytotoxicity of MC3T3 cells (ΔLDH), mean (%) +/- SD

	Initial strain	Recurrent strain	р
24h pi	1.89 +/- 3.78	- 0.17 +/- 2.35	0.133
48h pi	8 +/- 4.02	3.17 +/- 3.47	0.018

3 experiments in duplicate.

Statistical analysis: Mann- Whitney test (\*) confirmed by multivariate analysis controling with patients (Ŧ)

### Cytotoxicity: primary human osteoblasts

![](_page_98_Figure_1.jpeg)

Recurrent strains are less cytotoxic than initial strains in primary osteoblasts

#### Immune response

Quantification of cytokines concentrations in cell culture supernatant of human primary supernatant 48h post infection d'infection

![](_page_99_Figure_2.jpeg)

Osteoblasts infected by recurrent isolates secrete less inflammatory cytokines that those infected by initial ones

#### To sum up data from in vitro infection model

![](_page_100_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Materials et methods

![](_page_101_Figure_1.jpeg)

in vitro infection model

#### In vivo: intra-peritoneal infection model

![](_page_102_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### In vivo: intra-peritoneal infection model

![](_page_103_Figure_1.jpeg)

Recurrent isolates **persist longer in peritoneal cavity** than initial ones -> less recognized by immune cells (because less virulent)

Test de Mann- Whitney

#### In vivo: lung infection model

![](_page_104_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### *In vivo*: lung infection model

![](_page_105_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### *In vivo*: lung infection model

![](_page_106_Figure_1.jpeg)

Lower mortality observed with recurrent isolates

#### Genomic data

Patient	Isolate	Chromosome size (bp)	Plasmid size (bp)	% GC content chromosom e	% GC content plasmid	Overall alignment rate (initial genome covered by recurrent isolate reads)	Total nb of SNPs (recurrent vs initial)	Nb of SNPS in coding regions
1	initial	2726238	20632	32,89	28,38	28,38 98.88	5	0
	recurrent	2726193	20633	32,89	28,38			
2	initial	2749852	17307	32,82	28,38	99,07	5	0
	recurrent	2749888	17307	32,82	28,38			
3	initial	2679642	20720	32,86	28,37	99,14	4	3
	recurrent	2678500	no <u>plasmid</u>	32,86	-			

No genetic convergenceentr when comapring SNP in the three pairs No gene with specific function involved

![](_page_107_Picture_3.jpeg)

If it is not DNA ..... Could it be RNA ? RNAseq underway ... If its not RNA ... Could it be epigenetic modification ? ...
# Modèles in vivo

### Séquençage des génomes complet

Patient	Isolate	Chromosome size (bp)	Plasmid size (bp)	% GC content chromosom e	% GC content plasmid	Overall alignment rate (initial genome covered by recurrent isolate reads)	Total nb of SNPs (recurrent vs initial)	Nb of SNPS in coding regions
1	initial	2726238	20632	32,89	28,38	98.88	5	0
	recurrent	2726193	20633	32,89	28,38			
2	initial	2749852	17307	32,82	28,38	<del>9</del> 9,07	5	0
	recurrent	2749888	17307	32,82	28,38			
3	initial	2679642	20720	32,86	28,37	<del>9</del> 9,14	4	3
	recurrent	2678500	no <u>plasmid</u>	32,86	-			

Pas de convergence génétique entre les trois couples Pas de gènes de fonction connue

Si ce n'est pas l'ADN... c'est l'ARN ??? Technique RNAseq en cours

It is crucial to explore BJI ...

it is and it will be a hot topic of interest in the future



It is crucial to explore BJI ... it is and it will be a hot topic of interest in the future



It is crucial to explore BJI ... it is and it will be a hot topic of interest in the future



2016



It is crucial to explore BJI ... it is and it will be a hot topic of interest in the future



2016







Centre International

de Recherche en Infectiologie



ج



**Jason TASSE Céline DUPIEUX** Jean-Philippe RASIGADE **Yousef MAALI** Sacha FLAMMIER Virginie TAFANI William MOUTON **Régis VILLET** Yann DUMONT







Científíca

**Guilherme Loss** 



Laboratório Ana Tereza Vasconcelos Nacional de

...



F

Pr. Francois VANDENESCH Pr. Jérome ETIENNE Pr. Gérard LINA Dr. Anne TRISTAN Dr. Michèle BES Dr. Olivier DAUWALDER Dr. Oana DUMITRESCU Dr. Hélène MEUGNIER **Yvonne BENITO** Cédric BADIOU

Christine COURTIER Christine GARDON Caroline BOUVEYRON **Roxane SCHNEL** 

**Anne-Marie FREYDIERE** Michèle de MONTCLOS **Ghislaine DESCOURS Anne-Gaelle RANC** 

Dr.Sylvestre TIGAUD Dr. Chantal ROURE Dr. Hélène SALORD toutes les techniciennes du Nord !!!



#### Sophie ASSANT-TROUILLET



**Pr. Tristan FERRY** 



Pr Sébastien LUSTIG



**Dr. Florent VALOUR** 

**Patricia SIMOES** 

# Part I : Impact of *S. aureus* on osteoclastic precursors



# Osteoblast invasion by S. aureus





Electronic microscopy Hoffmann *et al.*, Eur J Cell Biol 2011 Invasion of host cells is thought to result in a **bacterial sanctuary** 

Inserm

UNIVERSITE DE LYON

#### mpact of five *S. dureus* miection on

## osteoclastogenesis

# Impact of live *S. aureus*, infection on osteoclastogenesis



# Effect of particulate, membranes, secretome ?

→ Heat-killed Staphylococci → Latex bead 2 and 0,75µm (size of *Staphylococci*)



No effect of particulate Low effect of killed bacteria / bacterial membranes Major effect of secretome

# Characterization **of** mononuclear TRAP negative cells induced after *S. aureus* internalization

CD11b

Macrophagic differentiation

With J. Marvel and P. Parroche

Characterization of mononuclear TRAP negative cells induced after *S. aureus* internalization

Cytokine/chemokine profile





Pro-inflammatory chemokine release

## Impact of pro-inflammatory cytokines on osteoclastogenesis

Uninfected OC precursors + culture supernatant from infected OC



Composition

of culture medium

Infected OC precursors boost osteoclastogenesis

# Conclusion part I

- Intracellular staphylococci inhibits osteoclastogenesis independently of the presence of FnBP
- No effect of particulates but specific effect of intracellular staphylococci
- Infected osteoclastic precursors differentiate in macrophages secreting proinflammatory factors such as MCP-1 (pro-osteoclastogenic properties)





# Part II : Impact of *S. aureus* on mature osteoclasts



### Internalization and S. aureus intracellular persistance









Hours post infection

### Impact of S. aureus on cellular spreading and osteoclasts fusion



72h post infection, increase of size and fusion of osteoclasts

### Impact on S. aureus bone resorption

Method : bone matrix + OC for 24h , then microscopic imaging

Control



S. aureus infection enhances bone resorption of mature osteoclasts



 Staphylococcal impact on mature osteoclasts is independent of the presence of FnBP

 Intracellular staphylococci modify cellular spreading and fusion and induce enhancement of bone resorption capacity







Take home message

# Direct and indirect effects of *S. aureus* invasion of bone cells on bone homeostasy

- Invasion of osteoblasts (CA-MRSA)
  - PSM (-> autophagy ->) mort cellulaire
  - perte de fonction



- Invasion of osteoclastic precursors
  - Hijacking to macrophagic differentiation -> cytokines -> enhacement of osteoclastogenesis
- Invasion mature osteoclast
  - Increase of bone resorption

All effects are in favour of bone looseming

#### THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION

#### **STAPHYLOCOCCAL** PATHOGENESIS **INSERM U1111**

#### **STAPHYLOCOCCUS REFERENCE CENTER** MICROBIOLOGY LAB LYON UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL



# **CLINICAL** LYON UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL



#### Frédéric LAURENT

**Chantal ROURE-SOBAS Hélène SALORD** Jean-Philippe RASIGADE Sophie TROUILLET-ASSANT Patricia MARTINS-SIMOES **Céline DUPIEUX Michèle BES Florent VALOUR** 

### François VANDENESCH Jerome ETIENNE Gérard LINA

Annie MARTRA

**Martine ROUGIER** 

**Christine COURTIER** 

**Christine GARDON** 

Sophie JARRAUD

Anne TRISTAN

Team Inserm U1111 :

- Dr Tristan FERRY(Associate Professor, Infectious Disease)
- Dr Sébastien LUSTIG (Associate Professor, Orthopedic surgery)
- Jean-Philippe RASIGADE PhD
- Sophie TROUILLET-ASSANT PhD
- Patricia MARTINS-SIMOES Ingeneer
- Céline DUPIEUX PhD
- Florent VALOUR PhD
- Jason TASSE PhD
- Sacha FLAMMIER Master
- Lucie LELIEVRE Master

<u>finovi</u>

Team IGFL

- Pr Pierre Jurdic
- Marlène Gallet
- Pauline Nauroy
- Margot Grignard
- Chantal Domenge, Irma Machuca Gayet, Dan Georgess

# Is there a correlation between cytotoxicity and intracellular survival ?



Cytotoxicity and intracellular survival were **not independently associated** in multivariate analysis controlling for the CA- or HA-MRSA status

# **Quantification escape / autophagy en MET**

- Gentamicin protection assay
- Cells harvested 6h post-infection and processed for TEM
- TEM-based scoring of bacteria based on surrounding membranes:

NO MEMBRANE Free in cytoplasm

SINGLE MEMBRANE Enclosed in phagosome DOUBLE MEMBRANE Enclosed in autophagosome







# Phagosomal escape and autophagy induction



46.5% of infected cells contained at least 1 wild type *S.aureus*-containing autophagosome

 $psm\alpha$  deletion: 2.27-fold reduction (p < 0.001)

# PSMs induce/hijack autophagy

Fisher's chact test, chact binormal 5570013, 2 macp. Enp.



# Part II

Impact of staphylococcal regulators on the cytotoxic phenotype of CA-MRSA


#### Results

## Role of major regulatory systems ?

#### Materials

- isogenic bacteria deleted for agr or sarA or saeRS

- mesure of cytotocity after osteoblast invasion

#### Conclusion

 Functional agrA and sarA regulators are required for cytotoxicity in strain SF8300

No impact of saeRS deletion

Profiles of regulation in CA-MRSA :

- . *agr* : upregulates **PSMs**, alpha-toxin and PVL
- . sarA: upregulates PSMs and alpha-toxin
- . *sae*RS: upregulates alpha-toxin, **not PSMs**

=> regulatory requirements of cytotoxicity seem consistent with a predominant role of PSMs



UNIVERSITE DE LYO

### Objectives

# Part III.

Role of CA-MRSA virulence determinants in osteoblast damage

Major virulence determinants of CA-MRSA:

- Panton-Valentine leukocidin (PVL): recruits and kills neutrophils
- Alpha-toxin (HLA) overexpression: haemolysis
- **Phenol-soluble modulins** (PSMs) overexpression: recruit and kill neutrophils BUT controversial

Profiles of regulation in CA-MRSA :

- . *agr* : upregulates **PSMs**, alpha-toxin and PVL
- . sarA: upregulates PSMs and alpha-toxin
- . saeRS: upregulates alpha-toxin, not PSMs

⇒regulatory requirements of cytotoxicity seem consistent with a predominant role of PSMs