## Shiga Toxin-Associated Hemolytic Uremic Syndrome: Effect of Sodium Butyrate on Sensitivity of Human Umbilical Vein Endothelial Cells to Shiga Toxin

CHANDRA B. LOUISE,<sup>1</sup> SUSAN A. KAYE,<sup>1</sup> BETH BOYD,<sup>2</sup> CLIFFORD A. LINGWOOD,<sup>2</sup> AND TOM G. OBRIG<sup>1\*</sup>

*Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, New York 14642,*<sup>1</sup> *and Department of Microbiology, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario M5G 1X8, Canada*<sup>2</sup>

Received 13 January 1995/Returned for modification 23 February 1995/Accepted 4 April 1995

*Escherichia coli* **O157:H7-related vascular damage such as hemolytic uremic syndrome is believed to require the Shiga-like toxins. This study demonstrated that sodium butyrate sensitized human umbilical vein endothelial cells to Shiga toxin and increased the expression of Shiga toxin receptor, globotriaosylceramide (Gb3), on human umbilical vein endothelial cells.**

Shiga toxin-producing *Shigella dysenteriae* 1 and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 are associated with the development of hemorrhagic colitis and hemolytic uremic syndrome (5, 7, 8). Intoxication of cells by Shiga toxin involves binding of the toxin to a cell surface receptor followed by internalization and transport to the trans-Golgi network (for a review, see reference 17). Retrograde transport of toxin from the Golgi to the endoplasmic reticulum may also be required for the action of Shiga toxin toward cells (23, 25). Shiga toxin acts on eukaryotic ribosomes to inhibit protein synthesis (17). The protein synthesis-inhibitory action of Shiga toxin is believed to be responsible for its cytotoxicity toward a number of different cell types.

All Shiga toxin-sensitive cells express the receptor for Shiga toxin, globotriaosylceramide (Gb<sub>3</sub>) (10, 12, 32). Some Shiga toxin-insensitive cells do not express  $Gb_3$ , whereas other insensitive cell types do (9, 23–25). In both cases, the cells are sensitized to Shiga toxin by incubation with sodium butyrate (9, 23–25). Butyrate is a naturally occurring compound in the colon and in the peripheral circulation (1, 4) and may play an important role in sensitizing cells to Shiga toxin during the pathogenesis of Shiga toxin-related diseases. Under normal conditions, the concentration of butyrate in the colon is in the millimolar range, whereas in the systemic circulation it is present in micromolar amounts (4). The concentration of butyrate in the circulation of patients with hemorrhagic colitis and/or hemolytic uremic syndrome is not known but may be elevated because of the disruption of the colonic epithelium and endothelium during the course of infection with *E. coli* O157 or *S. dysenteriae* 1.

Vascular endothelial cells are the putative target of Shiga toxin during the pathogenesis of hemorrhagic colitis and hemolytic uremic syndrome (5, 11, 20–22). For this reason, the ability of sodium butyrate to sensitize human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVEC) to Shiga toxin was examined. Further, the results were compared with those obtained with tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF), which is known to sensitize HUVEC to Shiga toxin (14, 18, 28, 30, 31). Additionally, since TNF induces expression of the Shiga toxin receptor  $Gb_3$  (18,

31), activation of the transcription factor NF-kB (15), and expression of the procoagulant molecule tissue factor (16) in HUVEC, the ability of butyrate to induce these activities in HUVEC was examined.

HUVEC were obtained, passaged, and plated as described previously (14). Cells were treated with sodium butyrate (Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo.), TNF (yeast recombinant; Boehringer-Mannheim, Indianapolis, Ind.), and/or Shiga toxin (gift of J. E. Brown), as described in each figure legend. The number of viable cells was determined as the uptake of the dye neutral red, as reported previously (14). For binding studies, Shiga-like toxin 1 (SLT-1; purified as described in reference 6) was radiolabeled with Iodobeads (Pierce, Rockford, Ill.) for 5 min at 25°C to a specific activity of 293,000 cpm/pmol. SLT-1 was used in place of Shiga toxin because of its ease of availability; it differs from Shiga toxin by only a single amino acid in a nonbinding region of the protein (17, 26). HUVEC were incubated with 5 nM  $\left[1^{125}I\right]SLT-1$  for 5 h at 4°C. This incubation period was sufficient to achieve binding equilibrium (unpublished data). Cells were then rinsed twice and were solubilized in  $0.5$  N NaOH for 30 min at  $37^{\circ}$ C. Counts per minute (cpm) of the solubilized cell solution were determined in a gamma counter. Nonspecific binding was determined as the amount of [<sup>125</sup>I]SLT-1 bound in the presence of 200 nM unlabeled SLT-1, a concentration of unlabeled toxin which has previously been shown to compete effectively with  $[^{125}I] SLT-1$  for binding to HUVEC (13). This value was subtracted from the total binding to obtain the specific binding values reported in Fig. 2.

The  $Gb<sub>3</sub>$  contents of untreated and butyrate-treated HUVEC were determined by high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) of whole-cell extracts as described previously (18). Tissue factor activity was determined by cleavage of the chromogenic substrate S2222 (KABI Pharmacia, Franklin, Ohio) in the presence of coagulation factors VII, IX, X, and II (proplex T; Baxter Healthcare, Glendale, Calif.) as described previously  $(27)$ . NF- $\kappa$ B-binding activity was determined by electrophoretic mobility shift assays with HUVEC nuclear extracts prepared by the method of Marui et al. (15). The protein concentration of these extracts was determined by the Bio-Rad protein assay kit with bovine serum albumin as the standard, such that  $3 \mu$ g of protein was added to each binding reaction. Binding-reaction mixtures (20  $\mu$ l) consisted of 10 mM Tris-Cl (pH 7.5), 60 mM NaCl, 1 mM dithiothreitol, 1 mM EDTA,

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Mailing address: Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, 601 Elmwood Ave., Rochester, NY 14642. Phone: (716) 275-6634. Fax: (716) 473-9573.



FIG. 1. Butyrate increases HUVEC sensitivity to Shiga toxin. HUVEC were plated into 96-well plates at a density of 12,000 cells per well and allowed to attach overnight. Medium was removed, and cells were treated with medium alone, medium plus the indicated concentrations of butyrate, or medium plus 200 U of TNF per ml. Following a 24-h incubation at 37°C, medium was changed and cells were treated for an additional 24 h at 37°C with the same experimental agents as described above. The cells were then treated with 1 nM Shiga toxin for  $24$  h at  $37^{\circ}$ C. Cell viability was determined by the neutral red assay. Open bars, treatment with Shiga toxin only (no butyrate or TNF pretreatment); hatched bars, pretreatment with butyrate or TNF only (no subsequent Shiga toxin treatment); cross-hatched bars, pretreatment with butyrate or TNF followed by treatment with Shiga toxin. Control untreated cells represent 100% viability.

10% glycerol, 1  $\mu$ g of poly(dI-dC), 1  $\mu$ l (approximately 100,000 cpm) of double-stranded  $32P$ -labeled oligonucleotide containing the NF-kB site from the murine immunoglobulin kappa enhancer (5'-AGCTTAGAGGGGACTTTCCGAGAGGA-3', labeled with 25  $\mu$ Ci of  $\left[\alpha^{-3/2}P\right]$ dATP and the Klenow fragment of  $E$ . *coli* DNA polymerase I), and  $3 \mu$ g of nuclear extract. Binding-reaction mixtures were incubated at room temperature for 25 min. The reaction mixtures were then loaded onto 4% polyacrylamide gels and were electrophoresed for 1.5 h at 32 mA, as specified for the high-ionic-strength conditions described by Ausubel et al. (2). The gels were dried and autoradiographed for 18 h.

Error bars in each figure represent the mean and standard deviation of triplicate samples. Each figure is representative of several experiments.

Treatment of HUVEC with sodium butyrate sensitized the HUVEC to the cytotoxic action of Shiga toxin (Fig. 1). This sensitization was dependent on the dose of butyrate (Fig. 1) and was greater after 48 h than after shorter incubation times (unpublished observations). The 48 h required for induction of HUVEC sensitivity to Shiga toxin was similar to that described by Sandvig et al. for A431 cells and may reflect a requirement for de novo gene transcription and/or protein synthesis (25).

To determine whether the greater sensitivity of butyratetreated HUVEC was due to a larger number of Shiga toxin receptors on the HUVEC cell surface, the ability of butyrate to increase the binding of  $[^{125}I] SLT-1$  to  $HUVEC$  was examined. Treatment of HUVEC with 5 mM butyrate caused a sixfold increase in the amount of  $[^{125}I] SLT-1$  bound to HUVEC (Fig. 2). Lower concentrations of butyrate induced [<sup>125</sup>I]SLT-1 binding to a lesser extent (Fig. 2). The same concentrations of butyrate which induced  $[^{125}I] SLT-1$  binding to HUVEC also increased the  $Gb_3$  content of HUVEC (Fig.  $3$ ). These effects of butyrate on  $Gb_3$  expression occurred despite no apparent change in cellular glucosylceramide content or in cell size (un-



FIG. 2. Butyrate increases [<sup>125</sup>I]SLT-1 binding to HUVEC. HUVEC were plated into 96-well plates at a density of 12,000 cells per well. After overnight attachment, medium was changed and cells were treated with control medium (A), 1 mM butyrate (B), 2 mM butyrate (C), 5 mM butyrate (D), or 200 U of TNF per ml  $(E)$  for 24 h at 37°C. Medium was replaced with fresh medium containing the substances listed above, and the cells were incubated for an additional 24 h at 37°C. Medium was removed, cold ( $4^{\circ}$ C) medium was added to the wells, and the cells were incubated for 0.5 h at  $4^{\circ}$ C. SLT-1 was then added to the wells (final incubation volume,  $30 \mu l$ ), and the amount of binding was determined as described in the text. Results are expressed as specific binding per 12,000 cells.

published observations). These results suggest that the sensitization of HUVEC to Shiga toxin by butyrate may be due to an increased number of Shiga toxin receptors on HUVEC.

Since these effects of butyrate qualitatively resembled those of the cytokine TNF on HUVEC (13, 14, 18, 28, 30, 31), the actions of TNF were directly compared with those of butyrate toward HUVEC. Taking into account the inhibitory effect of butyrate alone on HUVEC cell number, TNF (200 U/ml) and butyrate (5 mM) sensitized HUVEC to Shiga toxin to approximately the same degree (Fig. 1). That is, pretreatment of HUVEC with 5 mM butyrate followed by treatment with 1 nM Shiga toxin reduced the number of viable cells to 18% of that in untreated controls. Pretreatment of HUVEC with 200 U of TNF per ml followed by treatment with 1 nM Shiga toxin reduced the HUVEC cell number to 45% of that in untreated controls. The difference between butyrate- and TNF-treated



FIG. 3. Butyrate increases the  $Gb_3$  content of HUVEC. HUVEC were grown to confluency in T-75 flasks. The medium was then changed, and the cells were either not treated (A) or treated with 1.2 mM (B), 2.5 mM (C), or 5 mM (D) butyrate for 24 h at  $37^{\circ}$ C. The medium was changed again, and the cells were treated with the same concentrations of butyrate for an additional 24 h at  $37^{\circ}$ C. The cells were then removed from the flasks, and the  $Gb<sub>3</sub>$  content of the cell pellets was assayed.



FIG. 4. Butyrate does not induce tissue factor expression in HUVEC. HU-VEC were plated into 96-well plates at a density of 12,000 cells per well. Following overnight attachment, medium was removed and cells were treated either with 5 mM butyrate (open circles) or with 200 U of TNF per ml (solid circles) at 378C for the times indicated in the figure. Medium was removed, and the cells were rinsed twice. S2222 and proplex  $\overline{T}$  (final concentrations of 250 µg/ml and 0.5 factor VII U/ml, respectively) were then added to the cells, which were incubated for 2 h at 37°C. Then optical density units were determined at a wavelength of 405 nm.

HUVEC was likely to be due to the effect of butyrate itself on HUVEC cell number. That is, treatment of HUVEC with 5 mM butyrate, in the absence of subsequent Shiga toxin treatment, resulted in 74% viable cells compared with untreated controls (Fig. 1). In contrast, 200 U of TNF per ml did not affect HUVEC cell number in the absence of subsequent treatment with Shiga toxin (105% viable cells). Since butyrate is known to inhibit the proliferation of HUVEC in culture (29), the smaller number of butyrate-treated HUVEC than of TNFtreated HUVEC upon subsequent treatment with Shiga toxin reflected this effect of butyrate itself on HUVEC cell number rather than a greater relative ability of butyrate to sensitize HUVEC to Shiga toxin.

Despite the approximately equal ability of butyrate and TNF to sensitize HUVEC to Shiga toxin at the dosages used, butyrate caused a much larger increase in [<sup>125</sup>I]SLT-1 binding to HUVEC than did TNF (Fig. 2). This result suggests that butyrate may induce a subclass of SLT-1-binding sites which are not functional receptors for Shiga toxin in HUVEC. Treatment of HUVEC with butyrate resulted in the appearance of a second peak in the elution profile of  $Gb<sub>3</sub>$  by  $\hat{H}PLC$  (unpublished observations). This result suggests that the fatty acid composition of  $Gb_3$  may in fact differ in butyrate-treated and untreated HUVEC. Since the lipid moiety of  $Gb<sub>3</sub>$  profoundly affects its ability to serve as a functional receptor for Shiga toxin  $(3, 10, 12, 19)$ , any change in the type $(s)$  of  $Gb<sub>3</sub>$  could be an important factor in the sensitivity of cells to Shiga toxin. Butyrate is known to change the fatty acid composition of  $Gb<sub>3</sub>$ expressed in A431 cells (25). The implications of these observations in HUVEC and A431 cells remain to be determined.

Nevertheless, our binding studies suggest a distinct difference between the actions of butyrate and TNF toward HU-VEC. This applies to other HUVEC parameters as well. For instance, treatment of HUVEC with TNF results in the transient expression of a procoagulant molecule, tissue factor, on the endothelial cell surface (Fig. 4) (16). In contrast, butyrate did not induce tissue factor expression in HUVEC at any time point examined (Fig. 4). Further, butyrate differed from TNF in that butyrate did not induce transcription factor NF-kB binding activity in nuclear extracts of HUVEC, whereas TNF



FIG. 5. Butyrate does not induce NF-kB binding activity in HUVEC nuclear extracts. HUVEC were split into T-75 flasks and grown to confluence. The medium was changed, and HUVEC were stimulated with no agent (lane 1), with 200 U of TNF per ml (lane 2), or with 5 mM sodium butyrate (lane 3). Following a 1-h incubation at  $37^{\circ}$ C, cells were removed from the flasks and nuclear extracts were prepared; the binding activity of these extracts to an oligonucleotide containing the NF-kB site of the murine immunoglobulin kappa enhancer was determined by electrophoretic mobility shift assay. Arrow, specific NF-kB-binding activity which was inhibited by a 100-fold excess of unlabeled oligonucleotide; NS, nonspecific binding of extract which was not inhibited by a 100-fold excess of unlabeled oligonucleotide; FR, free (unbound) oligonucleotide.

did (Fig. 5). Thus, while some of the actions of butyrate toward HUVEC are similar to those of TNF (Fig. 1), some of the mechanisms by which butyrate acts on HUVEC almost certainly differ from those used by TNF. We do not yet know whether the activation of NF- $\kappa$ B is necessary for the sensitization of HUVEC to Shiga toxin by TNF. Nevertheless, these data suggest that the action of butyrate toward HUVEC does not require NF-kB.

Butyrate may influence intracellular trafficking in HUVEC, as well as increasing Shiga toxin binding to the cell surface. That is, the cytotoxic action of Shiga toxin requires transport of the toxin to the Golgi apparatus and possibly to the endoplasmic reticulum as well (23–25). These processes are stimulated by butyrate in A431 cells (23–25). However, it is also possible that toxin transport is not affected by butyrate in HUVEC, since there are several distinct differences in the regulation of Shiga toxin sensitivity in A431 cells and HUVEC. For instance, elevation of cyclic AMP (cAMP) levels in A431 cells, either with cholera toxin or with 8-bromo-cAMP, sensitized A431 cells to Shiga toxin (25). In contrast, treatment of HUVEC for 24 h with the cAMP-elevating agents forskolin (1 to 100  $\mu$ M), dibutyryl cAMP (1 to 10  $\mu$ M), or 3-isobutyl-1-methylxanthine (100 to 3,000  $\mu$ M) failed to sensitize HUVEC to Shiga toxin (unpublished data). Thus, cAMP does not appear to play a role in the regulation of HUVEC sensitivity to Shiga toxin, although we did not confirm that the addition of these agents elevated intracellular cAMP levels in the HUVEC used for those experiments. Nevertheless, the action of TNF also differed in A431 cells and HUVEC, since TNF sensitized HUVEC but not A431 cells to Shiga toxin (Fig. 1) (14, 25). These results indicate that the factors which govern the sensitivity of different cells to Shiga toxin, as well as their responses to different pharmacologic agents, may depend on the cell type being examined.

An understanding of the effects of butyrate on different cell types may lead to a greater understanding of Shiga toxin binding, internalization, intracellular transport, and activation in eukaryotic cells. These studies may also lead to a greater appreciation of the mechanisms which determine the sensitivity or resistance of different cell types to Shiga toxin. The ability of Shiga toxin to damage different cells is likely to influence the severity of Shiga toxin-related disease. Thus, a more comprehensive knowledge of the differences between Shiga toxinsensitive and insensitive cells will be important to our understanding of the vascular and nonvascular complications of Shiga toxin-associated infections.

This work was supported by PHS award AI24431 (to T.G.O.) and Medical Research Council Program grant 11123 (to C.A.L.). Support for C.B.L. was provided by PHS predoctoral training grant 5T32AI 07062.

We thank J. Cerilli for his help in obtaining HUVEC. We also thank J. E. Brown for providing purified Shiga toxin.

## **REFERENCES**

- 1. **Abdinejad, A., A. M. Fisher, and S. Kumar.** 1981. Production and utilization of butyryl-coA by fatty acid synthetase from mammalian tissues. Arch. Biochem. Biophys. **208:**135–145.
- 2. **Ausubel, F. M., R. Brent, R. E. Kingston, D. D. Moore, J. G. Seidman, J. A. Smith, and K. Struhl.** 1988. Mobility shift DNA-binding assay using gel electrophoresis, p. 12.2.1–12.2.10. *In* Current Protocols in Molecular Biol-ogy, vol. 2. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- 3. **Boyd, B., G. Magnusson, Z. Zhiuyan, and C. A. Lingwood.** 1994. Lipid modulation of glycolipid receptor function. Availability of Gal  $(\alpha1-4)$  Gal disaccharide for verotoxin binding in natural and synthetic glycolipids. Eur. J. Biochem. **223:**873–878.
- 4. **Cummings, T. H., E. W. Pomare, W. J. Branch, C. P. E. Naylor, and G. T. MacFarlane.** 1987. Short chain fatty acids in human large intestine, portal, hepatic, and venous blood. Gut **28:**1221–1227.
- 5. **Fontaine, A., J. Arondel, and P. Sansonetti.** 1988. Role of Shiga toxin in the pathogenesis of bacillary dysentery, studied by using a Tox<sup>-</sup> mutant of *Shigella dysenteriae* 1. Infect. Immun. **56:**3099–3109.
- 6. **Head, S. C., M. A. Karmali, and C. A. Lingwood.** 1991. Preparation of VT1 and VT2 hybrid toxins from their purified dissociated subunits. Evidence for B subunit modulation of A subunit function. J. Biol. Chem. **266:**3617–3621.
- 7. **Karmali, M. A., M. Petric, C. Lim, P. Fleming, C. Arbus, and H. Lior.** 1985. The association between idiopathic hemolytic uremic syndrome and infection by verotoxin-producing *Escherichia coli*. J. Infect. Dis. **151:**775–782.
- 8. **Karmali, M. A., M. Petric, B. Steele, and C. Lim.** 1983. Sporadic cases of haemolytic-uraemic syndrome associated with faecal cytotoxin and cytotoxin-producing *Escherichia coli* in stools. Lancet **i:**619–620.
- 9. **Keusch, G. T., M. Jacewicz, D. Acheson, M. Mobassaleh, R. Moore, and A. Donohue-Rolfe.** 1993. Effect of butyrate on receptor expression and sensitivity to Shiga-like toxin-1 in intestinal and renal epithelial cell lines, p. 151–157. *In* Abstracts of the 29th Joint Conference on Cholera and Related Diseases, 1993.
- 10. **Kiarash, A., B. Boyd, and C. A. Lingwood.** 1994. Glycosphingolipid receptor function is modified by fatty acid content. J. Biol. Chem. **269:**11138–11146.
- 11. **Koster, F., V. Boonpucknavig, S. Sujaho, R. Gilman, and M. Rahaman.** 1984. Renal histopathology in the hemolytic-uremic syndrome following shigellosis. Clin. Nephrol. **21:**126–133.
- 12. **Lingwood, C. A.** 1993. Verotoxins and their glycolipid receptors. Adv. Lipid Res. **25:**189–211.
- 13. **Louise, C. B., T. P. Moran, C. A. Lingwood, P. J. Del Vecchio, D. J. Culp, and**

**T. G. Obrig.** Binding of  $\lceil 125 \rceil$ Shiga-like toxin-1 to human endothelial cells: implications for the pathogenesis of Shiga toxin-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. Endothelium, in press.

- 14. **Louise, C. B., and T. G. Obrig.** 1991. Shiga toxin-associated hemolytic uremic syndrome: combined cytotoxic effects of Shiga toxin, interleukin-1 $\beta$ , and tumor necrosis factor alpha on human vascular endothelial cells in vitro. Infect. Immun. **59:**4173–4179.
- 15. **Marui, N., M. K. Offermann, R. Swerlick, C. Kunsch, C. A. Rosen, M. Ahmad, R. W. Alexander, and R. M. Medford.** 1993. Vascular cell adhesion molecule-1 (VCAM-1) gene transcription and expression are regulated through an antioxidant-sensitive mechanism in human vascular endothelial cells. J. Clin. Invest. **92:**1866–1874.
- 16. **Nawroth, P. P., and D. M. Stern.** 1986. Modulation of endothelial cell hemostatic properties by tumor necrosis factor. J. Exp. Med. **163:**740–745.
- 17. **O'Brien, A. D., V. L. Tesh, A. Donohue-Rolfe, M. P. Jackson, S. Olsnes, K. Sandvig, A. A. Lindberg, and G. T. Keusch.** 1992. Shiga toxin: biochemistry, genetics, mode of action, and role in pathogenesis. Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol. **180:**65–94.
- 18. **Obrig, T. G., C. B. Louise, C. A. Lingwood, B. Boyd, L. Barley-Maloney, and T. O. Daniel.** 1993. Endothelial heterogeneity in Shiga toxin receptors and responses. J. Biol. Chem. **268:**15484–15488.
- 19. **Pellizzari, A., H. Pang, and C. A. Lingwood.** 1992. Binding of verocytotoxin 1 to its receptor is influenced by differences in receptor fatty acid content. Biochemistry **31:**1363–1370.
- 20. **Raghupathy, P., A. Date, J. C. M. Shastry, A. Sudarsanam, and M. Jadhav.** 1978. Hemolytic uremic syndrome complicating shigella dysentery in South Indian children. Br. Med. J. **1:**1518–1521.
- 21. **Richardson, S. E., M. A. Karmali, L. E. Becker, and C. R. Smith.** 1988. The histopathology of the hemolytic uremic syndrome associated with verocytotoxin-producing *E. coli*. Hum. Pathol. **19:**1102–1108.
- 22. **Richardson, S. E., T. A. Rotman, V. Jay, C. R. Smith, L. E. Becker, M. Petric, N. F. Olivieri, and M. A. Karmali.** 1992. Experimental verocytotoxemia in rabbits. Infect. Immun. **60:**4154–4167.
- 23. **Sandvig, K., O. Garred, K. Prydz, J. V. Kozlov, S. H. Hansen, and B. van Deurs.** 1992. Retrograde transport of endocytosed shiga toxin to the endoplasmic reticulum. Nature (London) **358:**510–512.
- 24. **Sandvig, K., K. Prydz, M. Ryd, and B. van Deurs.** 1991. Endocytosis and intracellular transport of the glycolipid-binding ligand Shiga toxin in polarized MDCK cells. J. Cell Biol. **113:**553–562.
- 25. **Sandvig, K., M. Ryd, O. Garred, E. Schweda, P. K. Holm, and B. van Deurs.** 1994. Retrograde transport from the Golgi complex to the ER of both Shiga toxin and the nontoxic Shiga B-fragment is regulated by butyric acid and cAMP. J. Cell Biol. **126:**53–64.
- 26. **Strockbine, N. A., M. P. Jackson, L. M. Sung, R. K. Holmes, and A. D. O'Brien.** 1988. Cloning and sequencing of the genes for Shiga toxin from *Shigella dysenteriae* type 1. J. Bacteriol. **170:**1116–1122.
- 27. **Surprenant, Y. M., and S. H. Zuckerman.** 1989. A novel microtiter plate assay for the quantitation of procoagulant activity on adherent monocytes, macrophage, and endothelial cells. Thromb. Res. **53:**339–346.
- 28. **Tesh, V. L., J. E. Samuel, L. P. Perera, J. B. Sharefkin, and A. D. O'Brien.** 1991. Evaluation of the role of Shiga and Shiga-like toxins in mediating direct damage to human vascular endothelial cells. J. Infect. Dis. **164:**344–352.
- 29. **Tse, C. S., and D. M. Williams.** 1992. Inhibition of human endothelial cell proliferation *in vitro* in response to n-butyrate and propionate. J. Periodontal Res. **27:**506–510.
- 30. **van de Kar, N. C. A. J., T. Kooistra, M. Vermeer, W. Lesslauer, L. A. H. Monnens, and V. W. M. van Hinsbergh.** 1995. Tumor necrosis factor a induces endothelial galactosyl transferase activity and verocytotoxin receptors. Role of specific tumor necrosis factor receptors and protein kinase C. Blood **85:**734–743.
- 31. **van de Kar, N. C. A. J., L. A. H. Monnens, M. A. Karmali, and V. W. M. van Hinsbergh.** 1992. Tumor necrosis factor and interleukin-1 induce expression of the verocytotoxin receptor globotriaosylceramide on human endothelial cells: implications for the pathogenesis of the hemolytic uremic syndrome. Blood **80:**2755–2764.
- 32. **Waddell, T., A. Cohen, and C. A. Lingwood.** 1990. Induction of verotoxin sensitivity in receptor-deficient cell lines using the receptor glycolipid globotriaosylceramide. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **87:**7898–7901.