Editorial Manager(tm) for European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious
Diseases
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: EJCMI-D-10-00204R1

Title: Comparative antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm versus planktonic forms of *Salmonella* spp. isolated from children with gastroenteritis.

Article Type: Article

Keywords: Antimicrobial resistance; biofilms; planktonic bacteria; *Salmonella enterica*; gastroenteritis.

Corresponding Author: Prof. Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Athens - Medical School

First Author: Konstantina Papavasileiou, MD

Order of Authors: Konstantina Papavasileiou, MD; Eleni Papavasileiou, PhD; Angelina Tseleni-Kotsovili, PhD; Sotiris Bersimis, PhD; Chryssoula Nicolaou, PhD; Anastassios Ioannidis, PhD; Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou, PhD

Abstract: Purpose. In the present study 194 *S. enterica* strains, isolated from infected children, belonging to various serotypes were investigated for their ability to form biofilms and the biofilm forms of the isolated strains were compared to their corresponding planktonic forms with respect to the antimicrobial susceptibility.

Methods. For the biofilm forming strains the Minimal Inhibitory Concentration for Bacterial Regrowth from the Biofilm (MICBR) of nine clinically applicable antimicrobial agents, was determined, and the results were compared to the respective MIC values of the planktonic forms.

Results. A hundred and nine *S. enterica* strains out of 194 (56%) belonging to 13 serotypes were biofilm forming. The biofilm forms showed increased antimicrobial resistance versus the planktonic bacteria. The highest resistance rates of the biofilm bacteria were observed with respect to gentamicin (89.9%) and ampicillin (84.4%) and the lowest rates with respect to ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin (2.8% for both).

Conclusions. A remarkable shift of the MICBR50 and MICBR90 toward resistance was observed in the biofilm forms as compared to the respective planktonic forms. Further studies are required to elucidate the biofilm antimicrobial resistance mechanisms of the bacterial biofilms and their contribution to the therapeutic failure in infections with in vitro susceptible bacteria.

Response to Reviewers: Dear Mr. Alex van Belkum,

we have taken into consideration all the reviewer's comments and we have revised the manuscript accordingly. There is one exception with respect to the introduction comments g. and h. where we rewrote the text, but not in the proposed way because this would alter the essence. We have also corrected the references.

with best regards,

Prof. Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou

1 Concise Article

2

3 **Comparative antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm versus planktonic forms of**

4 ***Salmonella enterica* strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis.**

5

6 Konstantina Papavasileiou¹, Eleni Papavasileiou¹, Angelina Tseleni-Kotsovili², Sotiris

7 Bersimis³, Chrysoula Nicolaou⁴, Anastassios Ioannidis⁵, Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou ⁴.

8

9 1 Department of Clinical Microbiology, Penteli Children's Hospital, Athens, Greece.

10 2 Department of Microbiology, University of Athens, Medical School.

11 3 Department of Statistics and Insurance Science, University of Piraeus, Greece

12 4 Laboratory of Biopathology and Clinical Microbiology, Aeginition Hospital,

13 Medical School, University of Athens.

14 5 Department of Nursing, Faculty of Human Movement and Quality of Life Sciences,

15 University of Peloponnese, Greece

16

17 Corresponding author:

18 Prof. Dr. Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou

19 Athens Medical School – Aeginition Hospital

20 Department of Biopathology and Clinical Microbiology

21 Vass. Sophias av. 72-74, 115 28 Athens – Greece

22 Tel.: 0030 – 2107289192

23 Fax : 0030 – 2106004608

24 e-mail : chatlouk@hotmail.com, and schatzi@med.uoa.gr

25

26

27

28

29

30

Abstract

32

Purpose. In the present study 194 *S. enterica* strains, isolated from infected children, belonging to various serotypes were investigated for their ability to form biofilms and the biofilm forms of the isolated strains were compared to their corresponding planktonic forms with respect to the antimicrobial susceptibility.

Methods. For the biofilm forming strains the Minimal Inhibitory Concentration for Bacterial Regrowth from the Biofilm (MICBR) of nine clinically applicable antimicrobial agents, was determined, and the results were compared to the respective MIC values of the planktonic forms.

Results. A hundred and nine *S. enterica* strains out of 194 (56%) belonging to 13 serotypes were biofilm forming. The biofilm forms showed increased antimicrobial resistance versus the planktonic bacteria. The highest resistance rates of the biofilm bacteria were observed with respect to gentamicin (89.9%) and ampicillin (84.4%) and the lowest rates with respect to ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin (2.8% for both).

Conclusions. A remarkable shift of the MICBR₅₀ and MICBR₉₀ toward resistance was observed in the biofilm forms as compared to the respective planktonic forms. The development of new consensus methods for the determination of the antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm forms seems to be a major research challenge. Further studies are required in order to elucidate the biofilm antimicrobial resistance mechanisms of the bacterial biofilms and their contribution to the therapeutic failure in infections with in vitro susceptible bacteria.

53

Key words: Antimicrobial resistance; biofilms; planktonic bacteria; *Salmonella enterica*; gastroenteritis.

56

57

Introduction

59

Microbial biofilms are a major concern in human and veterinary medicine. They consist of growing microorganisms intimately associated with each other, producing an extracellular polymeric substance (ESP) consisting of carbohydrate (exopolysaccharide) adhering to synthetic or biological surfaces [1-4]. The encased sessile microorganisms bear quite distinct properties from those growing independently or as planktonic populations in liquid media. One of the most important properties of the biofilm associated bacteria in clinical medicine is the markedly enhanced resistance to antimicrobial agents, through protection by the ESP, leading to multidrug resistance and therapeutic failure.

Although the mechanisms are poorly understood, there is evidence that the biofilm associated resistance should be related to modified nutrient environments, leading to suppression of growth rate within the biofilm, interaction between exopolymer matrices and the antimicrobial, as well as the development of biofilm / attachment specific phenotypes [5-8].

In comparative antimicrobial susceptibility studies, many common gram-negative and gram-positive bacterial pathogens produce biofilms showing significantly higher antimicrobial resistance rates than their planktonic state. Most of these studies have largely focused on *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Staphylococcus epidermidis* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* [9].

Little is known about the response to antimicrobials of the biofilm forms of the *Salmonella enterica* serotypes, which are worldwide the most common cause of acute, self – limited gastroenteritis, usually not requiring treatment [10,11]. However, the majority of *Salmonella enterica* strains are able to form biofilms and to synthesize cell surface components, that help them survive in hostile or suboptimal environments [12], and express resistance to multiple antimicrobials. This ability contributes to their persistence in the host after the acute phase of infection (carrier state), the dissemination of the organism over a long period of time in the environment and its transmission to new individuals [13]. Regarding these properties *Salmonella enterica* could serve as a very good model for the study of the comparative response to antimicrobials between the planktonic and their respective biofilm forms.

The present study aimed to detect the production of biofilms by clinical strains of *S. enterica* serotypes isolated from children with gastroenteritis and to compare the antimicrobial susceptibility of planktonic versus biofilm forming bacteria.

90

91 **Patients and Methods**

92

93 During a three year period (2006-2008) 194 *S. enterica* strains were collected from children
94 with gastroenteritis, either hospitalized or attended at the outpatient clinic. The age of the
95 children balanced from 1-14 years. The isolation and serological identification of *S. enterica*.
96 was performed by conventional methods.

97 Biofilm formation was detected by the use of silicone disks (Folio C6 0,25 mm,
98 NOVATECH; new biotechnology for life ZI ATHELIA III-VOIE ANTIOPE 13705 LA CIOTAT
99 CEDEX-FRANCE) modified as described previously [14]. The silicone disks were cut in
100 similar size (4-5 mm) and weight (25-30 mg) through an in-house invented spacer
101 construction and were placed into tubes, weighed at a scale and left overnight under UV
102 irradiation for sterilization. Tubes containing 2,5 ml trypticase soya broth (TSB) were
103 inoculated with *Salmonella* strains and incubated for 72 hours at 30° C. The content was then
104 poured off and the tubes were washed 3 times with distilled water and air dried in a laminar
105 flow for 24 hours. The tubes containing the silicone disks with the attached bacteria were
106 weighed once more and the difference in weight showed the presence of biofilms.

107 Antimicrobial susceptibility of the planktonic bacterial forms was performed by means of
108 determination of the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC). MIC was determined using two
109 methods: a) the automatic system VITEK 2 (bioMérieux SA, 69280 Marcy-l'Etoile, France)
110 and b) the standard broth dilution method according to guidelines of the Clinical Laboratory
111 Standards Institute (CLSI)[15]. The antimicrobials included were those of importance in the
112 clinical practice: ampicillin, coamoxiclav, cefuroxime, cefotaxime, gentamicin, imipenem,
113 cotrimoxazole, ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin.

114 The strains producing biofilms were further tested for their antimicrobial susceptibility by
115 determination of the Minimal Inhibitory Concentration for Bacterial Regrowth from the biofilm
116 (MICBR) using a modified broth macrodilution method according to the guidelines of the
117 Clinical laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) [15].

118 Silicone disks coated with the biofilm forming *Salmonella* strains were prepared in tubes as
119 described above, omitting the last step (air-drying). Serial dilutions of the antimicrobials in

Mueller – Hinton broth, corresponding to the concentrations used for the MIC determination regarding the planktonic bacteria, were prepared and poured into the silicone disk containing tubes. The antimicrobial containing tubes were then incubated at 35° C for 24 h. The growth of planktonic bacteria was visualized by the development of turbidity in the medium. The MICBR was defined as the lowest concentration inhibiting the growth in the medium as observed by a complete clarity. An aliquot of the medium from the tubes with the lowest antimicrobial concentration showing a turbidity indicating bacterial growth, was subcultured in blood and Mc Conkey agar medium in order to check the purity of the grown *Salmonella* population.

The statistical analysis was performed using the statistical package SPSS for Windows (version 15.0) in order to disclose any significant differences between the percentages of antimicrobial susceptibility of the planktonic and the biofilm bacterial forms. The analysis was done by applying an appropriate hypothesis test concerning the difference between the proportions of two samples. The normal approximation to the binomial distribution was used.

Results and Discussion

The distribution of serotypes among the *S. enterica* isolates and their respective ability to form biofilms are shown in table 1. Biofilm formation was detected in 109 out of 194 *Salmonella* strains (56%) included in the study. For all the positive strains the difference in weight before and after incubation of the silicone disk was >50 mg, while in the negative strains the absence of biofilm formation was indicated by differences of less than 1 mg.

The antimicrobial resistance rates of the planktonic and the biofilm bacteria are given in table 2. The biofilm forms showed increased antimicrobial resistance versus the planktonic bacteria. The highest resistance rates of the biofilm bacteria were observed with respect to gentamicin (89.9%) and ampicillin (84.4%) and the lowest rates with respect to ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin (2.8% for both).

Since the P-value for all antimicrobials was less than 1%, all the differences were assumed to be statistically significant at 99.0% (at least) confidence level (table 2).

A remarkable shift of the MIC₅₀ and MIC₉₀ toward resistance was observed in the biofilm forms as compared to the respective planktonic forms (table 3). The MICBR₅₀ lay in the upper limit corresponding to susceptibility only for cefotaxime, imipenem and the two quinolones (ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin), while the MICBR₉₀ was above this limit (intermediate or resistant) for all the antimicrobials tested.

In the present study a significant difference in antimicrobial susceptibility was found between the planktonic and biofilm forms of the *S. enterica* strains isolated from clinical cases with gastroenteritis, the biofilm forms showing increased resistance rates. Despite this statistically significant increase in resistance, quinolones and the broad spectrum β -lactams cefotaxime and imipenem showed the best antimicrobial activity against the biofilm forms, having MICBR₅₀s in the level of susceptibility (table 3). Although the methodology followed regarding the antimicrobial susceptibility testing of the biofilm bacteria is not a standardized consensus one, the results arising are clear and more or less in agreement with previous reports, referring to *Salmonella*, as well as to other bacterial species (*Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*) using in-house biofilm formation and biofilm antimicrobial susceptibility detection methods [9, 16-19]. However the detection of biofilm formation as such, does not predict in all cases a possible clinical therapeutic failure (or clinical resistance). According to the hitherto reports, this phenomenon seems not to pertain to all bacterial species [9]. In veterinary infections caused by *Pasteurella multocida*, *Mannheimia haemolytica* and *Haemophilus somnus* no difference in susceptibility was found between the planktonic and the biofilm forms, and the treated animals responded well to most antimicrobials. This diversity in biofilm response to antimicrobials demonstrates the complexity in prediction of the therapeutic outcome, the latter probably depending on a variety of factors conditioned by the nature of the antimicrobial, the bacterial species properties and the specific biofilm features.

In the present report *Salmonella enterica* served practically as a very good model for the study of biofilm formation and antimicrobial susceptibility, first because about half of the strains (56%) were biofilm producers in vitro, and second because most of the strains in their planktonic forms bore antimicrobial susceptible phenotypes (table 2), thus giving conspicuous differences in the biofilm phenotypes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

182 Soon after the beginning of the “golden” antibiotic era in 1940, the emergence of the
183 antimicrobial resistance arose, which incited intensive research and major developments in
184 the field of the antimicrobial chemotherapy. However, despite the progress in the revelation of
185 most of the antimicrobial resistance mechanisms, the discovery of new drugs and the
186 improvement and standardization of the antimicrobial susceptibility testing using consensus
187 methodologies, the problem of the antimicrobial “clinical resistance” resulting in many cases
188 in therapeutic failure is still of major concern.

189 In clinical practice the MIC assay is the gold standard and the best way to select potentially
190 effective antimicrobial agents for the rational treatment of infections [4, 20]. The setting of the
191 antimicrobial breakpoints taking into consideration the pharmacokinetic – pharmacodynamic
192 properties of the drugs, besides clinical trials, is based on the use of planktonic bacterial
193 forms, a fact that does not correspond to the in vivo infectious disease pathogenesis, as in
194 some cases other factors like the formation of biofilms might be involved.

195 In all the hitherto published antimicrobial susceptibility studies dealing with biofilm bacterial
196 forms, the applied methodology varies, because standardized techniques have not yet been
197 established. However, all reported results are completely in agreement with each other,
198 indicating that human pathogenic biofilm forming bacteria bear significantly increased
199 antimicrobial resistance properties, compared to their corresponding planktonic forms. In the
200 present study, testing of antimicrobial susceptibility (or resistance) referred to the ability of
201 already formed biofilms to grow and generate planktonic forms. In other reports, biofilm
202 resistance was found to be related to the low growth rates within the biofilm mass [21-24].
203 This versatile reaction of biofilms against the antimicrobials is noticeably impeding the search
204 for novel anti-biofilm acting antimicrobial agents [25].

205 The development of new consensus methods for the determination of the antimicrobial
206 susceptibility of biofilm forms in biofilm forming bacteria seems to be a major research
207 challenge in infectious disease therapeutics for the management of infections that are difficult
208 to treat. The present study involving *S. enterica*, a biofilm forming microorganism, was
209 conducted to demonstrate the ability of bacterial biofilms to escape in vitro the action of the
210 commonly used antimicrobial agents. Further studies are warranted to elucidate the biofilm

211 antimicrobial resistance mechanisms and their contribution to therapeutic failure in infections
 212 with in vitro susceptible bacteria.

213

214

215

216 **References**

217

218 1. Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of

219 persistent infections. *Science* 1999 May 21;284(5418): 1318-322. Review.

220 2. Rosser BT, Taylor PA, Cix PA, Cluland R (1987) Methods for evaluating antibiotics on

221 bacterial biofilms. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 31: 1502-1506.

222 3. Mah T-FC, O'Toole GA. Mechanisms of biofilm resistance to antimicrobial agents

223 (2001) *Trends Microbiol* 9: 34-39.

224 4. Costerton JW, Lewandowski Z, Caldwell DE, Korber DR, Lappin-Scott HM (1995)

225 Microbial biofilms. *Ann Rev Microbiol* 49: 711-745.

226 5. Kunin CM, Steele C. Culture of the surfaces of urinary catheters to sample urethral

227 flora and study the effect of antimicrobial therapy. *J Clin Microbiol* 1985 Jun; 21(6):

228 902-8.

229 6. Nickel JC, Ruseska I, Wright JB, Costerton JW (1985) Tobramycin resistance of

230 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* cells growing as a biofilm on urinary catheter materials.

231 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 27: 619-624.

232 7. Gristina AG, Hobgood CD, Webb LX, Myrvik QN. Adhesive colonisation of

233 biomaterials and antibiotic resistance. *Biomaterials* 1987; 8: 423-426.

234 8. Costerton JW, Khoury AE, Ward KH, Anwar H (1993) Practical measures to control

235 device-related bacterial infections. *Int J Artif Org* 16: 765-770.

236 9. Olson ME, Ceri H, Morck DW, Buret AG, Read RR. Biofilm bacteria: formation and

237 comparative susceptibility to antibiotics (2002) *Can J Vet Res* 66: 86-92.

238 10. Fierer J, Swancutt M. Non-typhoid *Salmonella*: a review (2000) *Curr Clin Top Infect*

239 *Dis* 20: 134-157.

11. Majtánová L, Majtán V (2009) Molecular characterization of the multidrug-resistant phage types *Salmonella enterica* serovar typhimurium DT104, DT20A and DT120 strains in the Slovakia. *Microbiol Res* 164:157-162/ Epub 2007.
12. Zogaj X, Nimtz M, Rohde M, Bokranz W, Romling U (2001) The multicellular morphotypes of *Salmonella typhimurium* and *Escherichia coli* produce cellulose as the second component of the extracellular matrix. *Mol Microbiol* 39: 1452-1463.
13. Prouty AM, Schewesinger WH, Gunn JS (2002) Biofilm formation and interaction with the surfaces of gallstones by *Salmonella* spp. *Infect Immun* 70: 2640-2649.
14. Chandra J, Kuhn DM, Mukherjee PK, Hoyer L.L, McCormick T, Ghannoum MA (2001) Biofilm formation by the fungal pathogen *Candida albicans*: development, architecture, and drug resistance. *J Bacteriol* 183: 5385-5394.
15. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Methods for dilution Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria That Grow Aerobically- Eighth edition: Approved Standard M7-A8; 29:2. CLSI, Wayne, PA, USA, 2009.
16. Ashby MJ, Neale JE, Knott SJ, Critchley IA (1994) Effect of antibiotics on non-growing cells and biofilms of *Escherichia coli*. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 33:443-452.
17. Duguid IG, Evans E, Brown MR, Gilbert P. Effect of biofilm culture upon the susceptibility of *Staphylococcus epidermidis* to tobramycin. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 1992 Dec;30(6): 803-10.
18. Evans DJ, Brown MR, Allison DG, Gilbert P. Susceptibility of bacterial biofilms to tobramycin: role of specific growth rate and phase in the division cycle. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 1990 Apr; 25(4): 585-91.
19. Evans DJ, Brown MRW, Allison DG, Gilbert P. Susceptibility of *Escherichia coli* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilms to ciprofloxacin: effect of specific growth rate (1991) *J Antimicrob Chemother* 27: 177-184.
20. Prescott JF, Bagott JD. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing and antimicrobial drug dosage (1985) *J Am Vet Med Assoc* 187: 363-368.
21. Gilbert P, Das J, Foley I. Biofilm susceptibility to antimicrobials (1997) *Adv Dent Res* 11; 160-167.

- 269 22. Brown MRW, Allison DG, Gilbert P (1988) Resistance of bacterial biofilms to
270 antibiotics: A growth rate related effect. J Antimicrob Chemother 22: 777-789.
- 271 23. Gilbert P, Collier PJ, Brown MRW. Influence of growth rate on susceptibility to
272 antimicrobial agents: biofilms, cell cycle and dormancy, and stringent response.
273 Antimicrob Agents Chemother.1990 Oct; 34(10): 1865-8.Review.
- 274 24. Prosser BT, Taylor B, Dix BA, Cleeland R. Method of evaluating effects of
275 antimicrobials upon bacterial biofilms (1987). Antimicrob Agents Chemother 31: 1502-
276 1506.
- 277 25. Gilbert P, Brown MRW. Screening for novel antimicrobial activity/compounds in the
278 pharmaceutical industry. In: Microbial quality assurance: a guide towards relevance
279 and reproducibility of inocula. Brown MRW, Gilbert P, editors. Boca Raton, FL: CRC
280 Press 1995; pp. 247-260.
- 281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298

Table 1. Distribution of serovars and biofilm production among the *Salmonella enterica* strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis.

<i>Salmonella enterica</i> serovar	number of strains	biofilm positive
<i>S. enteritidis</i>	143	78
<i>S. typhimurium</i>	27	17
<i>S. abony</i>	3	0
<i>S. oranienburg</i>	3	3
<i>S. II</i>	2	1
<i>S. muenchen</i>	1	1
<i>S. montevideo</i>	1	1
<i>S. lagos</i>	1	1
<i>S. goldcoast</i>	1	0
<i>S. blockley</i>	1	1
<i>S. thompson</i>	1	1
<i>S. newport</i>	1	1
<i>S. virchow</i>	1	1
<i>S. bardo</i>	1	0
<i>S. stanley</i>	1	0
<i>S. miami</i>	1	1
<i>S. haifa</i>	2	1
<i>S. bovismorbificans</i>	1	0
<i>rough strains</i>	1	0
<i>total</i>	194	109

Table 2. Antimicrobial resistance rates of planktonic and biofilm forms of *Salmonella enterica* strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis. P-values refer to the results of performing a hypothesis test concerning the difference between the two proportions (using normal approximation).

Antimicrobial	Planktonic	Biofilm	P
Ampicillin	12,8%	84,4%	0.000
Gentamicin	0%	89,9%	0.000
Coamoxiclav	0%	51,4%	0.000
Cotrimoxazole	0,9%	63,3%	0.000
Cefuroxime	7,4%	63,3%	0.000
Cefotaxime	0,9%	23,8%	0.000
Imipenem	0%	7,3%	0.004
Ciprofloxacin	0%	2,8%	0.008
Moxifloxacin	0%	2,8%	0.008

Table 3. MIC₅₀ and MIC₉₀ of the antimicrobials for the planktonic and MICBR₅₀ and MICBR₉₀ of the biofilm forms of *Salmonella enterica* isolates.

Antimicrobial	mg/l		mg/l		Breakpoints (susceptible)
	planktonic MIC ₅₀	biofilm MICBR ₅₀	planktonic MIC ₉₀	biofilm MICBR ₉₀	
Ampicillin	≤ 2	≥ 64	≥ 32	≥ 64	≤ 8
Coamoxiclav	≤ 2	32	4	64	≤ 8
Cefuroxime	4	32	8	64	≤ 8
Cefotaxime	≤ 1	8	≤ 1	64	≤ 8
Gentamicin	≤ 1	16	≤ 1	32	≤ 4
Imipenem	≤ 1	4	≤ 1	8	≤ 4
Cotrimoxazole	≤ 20	160	≤ 20	320	≤ 40
Ciprofloxacin	≤ 0,25	1	≤ 0,25	2	≤ 1
Moxifloxacin	≤ 0,25	1	1	2	≤ 1