Published in final edited form as:

J Appl Microbiol. 2012 May ; 112(5): 998–1006. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2012.05264.x.

Development and Application of a Polymicrobial *in vitro* Wound Biofilm Model

Jeremy Woods, Laura Boegli, Kelly R. Kirker*, Alessandra M. Agostinho, Amanda M. Dorch, Elinor deLancey Pulcini, Philip S. Stewart, and Garth A. James

Center for Biofilm Engineering, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana

Abstract

Aims—The goal of this investigation was to develop an *in vitro*, polymicrobial, wound biofilm capable of supporting the growth of bacteria with variable oxygen requirements.

Methods and Results—The strict anaerobe *Clostridium perfringens* was isolated by cultivating wound homogenates using the drip-flow reactor, and a three-species biofilm model was established using methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *C. perfringens* in the colony-drip-flow reactor model. Plate counts revealed that MRSA, *P. aeruginosa*, and *C. perfringens* grew to 7.39 ± 0.45 , 10.22 ± 0.22 , and 7.13 ± 0.77 log CFU per membrane, respectively. The three-species model was employed to evaluate the efficacy of two antimicrobial dressings, Curity™ AMD and Acticoat™, compared to sterile gauze controls. Microbial growth on Curity™ AMD and gauze were not significantly different, for any species, whereas Acticoat™ was found to significantly reduce growth for all three species.

Conclusions—Using the Colony-DFR, a three-species biofilm was successfully grown, and the biofilms displayed a unique structure consisting of distinct layers that appeared to be inhabited exclusively or predominantly by a single species.

Significance and Impact of Study—The primary accomplishment of this study was the isolation and growth of an obligate anaerobe in an *in vitro* model without establishing an artificially anaerobic environment.

Keywords

polymicrobial; model; biofilm; chronic wounds; *Clostridium perfringens* *Staphylococcus aureus*; *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

INTRODUCTION

Chronic wounds such as diabetic foot ulcers, venous leg ulcers, and pressure ulcers affect approximately 6.5 million patients in the United States and represent \$25 billion in annual health care costs (Sen et al. 2009). This burden is rapidly increasing due to escalating health care costs, an aging population, and the rising incidence of diabetes and obesity (Sen et al. 2009). Chronic wounds are often open for a prolonged period of time, (Wolcott and Rhoads 2008), which increases the possibility of bacterial infection. The wound bed is an ideal surface for bacterial growth (Falanga 2004), and the deleterious effects of microbial infection on wound healing have been recognized (James et al. 2008). Therefore, controlling

*Corresponding author: Kelly R. Kirker, Montana State University, Center for Biofilm Engineering, 366 EPS Building, Bozeman, MT 59717, Phone: (406) 994-4770, Fax: (406) 994-6098, Kelly.Kirker@biofilm.montana.edu.

and identifying wound bioburden is an important aspect of wound management (James et al. 2008).

Microorganisms colonize chronic wounds as biofilms, and despite the prevalence of biofilms in chronic wounds, their role in chronic wound pathogenesis is not well understood. To that end, many investigators have developed biofilm models to begin to elucidate the effects of biofilms on host tissue (Kirker et al. 2009b; Secor et al. 2011), the efficacy of antibiotics on biofilms (Wolcott et al. 2010; Hammond et al. 2011), or the effect of wound dressings on biofilm growth (Lipp et al. 2010) and viability (Ammons et al. 2009; Thorn and Greenman 2009; Kostenko et al.; Ammons et al. 2011a). To keep the complexity of the study to a minimum, these models were utilized with a single species biofilm; however, most chronic wounds are colonized with multiple species of bacteria, including several anaerobic genera (Dowd et al. 2008a; Dowd et al. 2008b; James et al. 2008; Thomsen et al. 2010).

The literature is beginning to illustrate the importance of anaerobic bacteria in chronic wound pathogenic biofilms (Dowd et al. 2008a), but their identification is seldom achieved in traditional, clinical microbiological analysis due to the difficulty of culturing strict anaerobes (Bowler et al. 2001). Furthermore, the isolation of strict anaerobes from chronic wound samples requires specialized techniques, equipment, and environments to encourage anaerobiosis. Therefore, the investigation described herein was designed to isolate obligate anaerobes from chronic wound samples without establishing an artificially anaerobic environment, to establish an *in vitro*, polymicrobial, model wound biofilm capable of supporting bacteria with variable oxygen requirements, and to demonstrate the utility of the established biofilm model.

MATERIALS and METHODS

Anaerobic Microorganism Isolation and Identification

The development of the polymicrobial model began with the identification and isolation of anaerobic microorganisms from chronic wound samples. Pressure ulcer (PU) wound specimens were collected from patients at the Southwest Regional Wound Care Center in Lubbock, TX under a protocol approved by the Montana State University and Western Institutional Review Boards. After collection, tissue samples were immediately placed in Port-A-CulTM transport jars (Becton, Dickinson and Company) and shipped to the Center for Biofilm Engineering (CBE). The PU specimens received by the CBE were subsequently homogenized under anaerobic conditions and the homogenate derived from each specimen was used to inoculate an individual channel of a drip flow reactor (DFR) (Xu et al. 1998; Desrosiers et al. 2007). The DFR model provides a low shear and high gas transfer environment for growing biofilms on a microscope slide and is an ASTM E2647-08 Standard Test Method (Buckingham-Meyer et al. 2007). The DFR was maintained at 37 °C and fed with 100%-strength BHI broth supplemented with 5% v/v adult bovine serum (ABS) at 5 ml hr⁻¹ per channel. After three days, the channels were reinoculated with the appropriate homogenate and the DFR was operated for an additional four days for a total of seven days.

After seven days of growth, the biofilms were scraped into 10 ml of phosphate buffered saline (PBS), vortexed for 30 seconds, sonicated for 2 minutes, followed by an additional 30 seconds of vortexing, and plated on agar media, including BHI agar, Anaerobe Colistin-Naladixic Acid (CNA) agar with 5% Sheep Blood, Anaerobe Neomycin 5% Sheep Blood Agar, Phenylethyl Alcohol Agar with 5% Sheep Blood, and TrypticaseTM Soy Agar with 5% Sheep Blood (TSA IITM) (all from Becton, Dickinson and Company). The plates were incubated anaerobically for 24 hours to two weeks at 37 °C using an anaerobic chamber with a

BBL Gas Pak™ (Becton, Dickinson and Company). Unique colonies were then streaked on two blood agar plates, one of which was incubated anaerobically and one aerobically. Colonies demonstrating only anaerobic growth were isolated and identified to the species level using 16S-based molecular amplification.

DNA was extracted from the isolated colonies using MO-BIO Microbial DNA Isolation Kit (MO-BIO Laboratories Inc, Carlsbad, CA). The DNA was PCR amplified using 16S primers 8 F (3'-AGA GTT TGA TCC TGG CTC AG-5') and 1492 R (3'-GGT TAC CTT GTT ACG ACT T-5'). Primer reactions and DNA amplification was performed using the following parameters: 94 °C for 2 minutes, 15 cycles of 94 °C for 45 seconds, 55 °C for 45 seconds, 72 °C for 45 seconds with a final extension step of 72 °C for 7 minutes. Verification of the presence of DNA was assessed in 1.5% agarose gels. PCR products were cloned using the TOPO TA Cloning Kit (Invitrogen Corporation, Carlsbad, CA). Plasmids were extracted and isolated from selected white colonies on LB agar plates containing X-gal and ampicillin using the QIA-prep Spin Mini-prep Kit (Qiagen, Germantown, MD). Plasmids were sent to Laragen, Inc (Culver City, CA) for sequencing. Sequences returned to CBE were queried by a Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST) search to identify bacterial species.

Cryopreservation of Anaerobic Bacteria

Frozen stocks of the isolated strict anaerobes were produced and maintained for further experimental use. Specifically, stock cultures were made using a non-traditional cryopreservation media. A planktonic culture (10 ml) of the isolated microorganism was centrifuged at 3000 × g for 10 minutes. The supernatant was then removed while the precipitate was re-suspended in 3 ml of sterile skim milk with 9% peptone and 0.45% thioglycollate. Aliquots (1 ml) of stock solutions were maintained at -70 °C until a stationary phase culture was required. For the experiments described below, stationary phase cultures were obtained by adding 1 ml of the frozen stock to 10 ml of 100%-strength BHI broth and incubating anaerobically for 24 hrs at 37 °C.

Development of Three-species *in vitro* Biofilm Model

The model system used in this investigation, the Colony-DFR, was developed to be a practical method of growing *in vitro* biofilms in a manner that more closely mimics a chronic wound environment (Lipp et al. 2010; Agostinho et al. 2011). The Colony-DFR utilizes the standard DFR with a slide containing a 2.5 cm in diameter absorbent pad over which a 0.2 µm sterile polycarbonate membrane of the same dimensions is placed. The membranes are inoculated and fresh, flowing nutrients are supplied. The nutrients are wicked upwards through the pad, feeding the microorganisms on the membrane, and eventually producing a biofilm.

Isolating a clinical strain of *C. perfringens* using the DFR provided a source of an anaerobic clinical isolate. Using clinical isolates of methicillin-resistance *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and the *C. perfringens*, a three-species biofilm model that included a facultative anaerobe, a strict aerobe, and strict anaerobe, was attempted. MRSA and *P. aeruginosa* were obtained from a chronic wound using methods previously described (James et al. 2008) and in accordance with a protocol approved by the Montana State University Institutional Review Board. Frozen stocks of MRSA and *P. aeruginosa* were stored in Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB) with 20% glycerol in 1 ml aliquots and stored at -70 °C. For experiments described below, stationary phase cultures were obtained by adding 1 ml of the frozen stock to 10 ml of 100%-strength Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) broth (Becton, Dickinson and Company, Franklin Lakes, NJ) and incubated for 24 hrs at 37 °C.

To initiate the three-species biofilm growth, individual stationary phase cultures of MRSA, *P. aeruginosa*, and *C. perfringens* were derived from frozen stocks as described. Next, 1 ml each of the MRSA and *C. perfringens* cultures were mixed with 1 ml of a 1:10 dilution of the *P. aeruginosa* culture. The membranes were then inoculated with 10 μ l of the mixture and allowed to dry for 15 minutes. The reactor was then placed in a 37 °C incubator and attached to the medium reservoir. The medium (100%-strength BHI broth supplemented with 5% v/v ABS) was pumped through the system at 5 ml hr⁻¹ per channel. After three days, each membrane and the associated biofilm was then either sampled for plate-count enumeration or cryopreserved for microscopy. Three-species biofilm growth was repeated multiple times using separate inoculum mixtures (n=7).

Plate Counting

Viable cell counts for each species within the original inoculum mixture and in the established biofilms were determined using selective agar. The inoculum mixture was serially diluted in PBS and drop-plated (Herigstad et al. 2001) on Staphylococcus Medium 110TM, Pseudomonas Isolation AgarTM, and SFP Agar BaseTM with 370 μ g ml⁻¹ D-cycloserine (<http://www.corn.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/VIII-A.pdf>, 2010) (all from Becton, Dickinson and Company) to isolate and enumerate MRSA, *P. aeruginosa*, and *C. perfringens*, respectively. The Pseudomonas Isolation and Staphylococcus Medium agar plates were incubated in standard aerobic incubator, while the SFP agar plates were incubated anaerobically using described methods. All plates were incubated at 37 °C for 24 hours. Afterwards, the plates were counted and the number of colony forming units (CFU) in the original inoculum mixture was calculated for each microorganism.

After three days of growth, the membrane biofilms were aseptically placed into 50 ml conical vials containing 10 ml PBS, vortexed for 30 seconds, sonicated for 2 minutes, and vortexed for an additional 30 seconds. The biofilm suspension was then serially diluted in PBS and drop-plated on selective agar as described. After 24 hours, the plates were counted and the number of CFU per membrane was calculated for each microorganism.

Light Microscopy

Microscopy was utilized to determine the location of each species within the biofilm. Imaging of the biofilms was accomplished by Gram-staining frozen biofilm sections. To begin, the membranes and their associated biofilms were embedded in Optimum Cutting Temperature (OCT, Sakura Finetek, Torrance, CA), frozen on dry ice, and stored at -70 °C in preparation for cryosectioning. The samples were then sliced into 5 μ m cross-sections using the Leica CM 1850 Cryostat (Leica, Wetzlar, Germany), placed on Superfrost Plus slides (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburg, PA), stained using the Thermo Scientific Richard-Allan Scientific Gram Stain Tissue Kit (Fisher Scientific), and examined using a Nikon Eclipse E800 microscope with Nikon (Melveill, NY) objectives. Images were taken with an Olympus Q-color 5 camera (Olympus, Center Valley, PA). A minimum of two biofilm samples were analyzed by light microscopy and representative images are presented.

Evaluation of Dressings using the Three-species Biofilm Model

The three-species biofilm model was used to evaluate the efficacy of wound dressings. Stationary phase cultures of the individual three species were prepared and mixed as described. The membranes were inoculated with 10 μ l of the mixed species solution, allowed to dry for 15 minutes, and then a 2cm $\times$ 2cm piece of CurityTM AMD gauze, (Covidien, Mansfield, MA), ActicoatTM Absorbent dressing (Smith & Nephew, London, UK), or sterile gauze (control dressing) was placed on top of the dried inoculum. The reactor was placed in a 37 °C incubator and attached to the medium reservoir. The medium (100%-strength BHI broth supplemented with 5% v/v ABS) was pumped through the system at 5 ml

hr⁻¹ per channel. After three days of growth, the membrane biofilm and the associated wound dressing were removed together, placed in 10 ml of Difco Dey/Engley (D/E) Neutralizing Broth™ (Becton, Dickinson and Company), disaggregated, diluted, and plated on the three selective agars using the described methods. The number of CFU per sample for each microorganism was then determined. A minimum of 10 dressing samples of each type was tested.

Statistical Analysis

Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation (s.d.). Statistical analysis for significance was determined using an ANOVA with a Tukey's HSD post-hoc test with $\alpha=0.5$ and $p\leq 0.05$ considered to be significant.

RESULTS

Anaerobic Microorganism Isolation and Identification

A unique approach to isolating anaerobic bacteria was taken in this investigation. A DFR was inoculated with wound tissue homogenates and supplied with nutrients to encourage natural flora of the specimen to propagate. After three days, biofilm growth was evident, and a second inoculation was performed in an effort to isolate anaerobic bacteria that might have required an established biofilm for integration. After 7 days of growth, gaseous, mucoid, and multi-colored biofilms developed (Figure 1A). The biofilms, which exhibited copious amounts of extracellular polymeric substance (EPS), grew to the size of the glass slide within the reactor (2.5 cm × 7.5 cm). Disaggregating and plating the biofilms on to several selective media led to the isolation of several, unique, anaerobic colonies. PCR amplification yielded long segments of DNA that covered conserved and variable regions of 16S rDNA and allowed for species-level identification of bacteria. The unique colonies were identified with 100% matching sequences as *Bacteroides thetaiotamicron* (GenBank: AE015928.1), *Clostridium clostridioforme* (GenBank: HM008264.1), *Clostridium bolteae*, (GenBank: NR025567.1), and *Clostridium perfringens* (GenBank: CP000246.1). Additional clones returned as uncharacterized *Bacteroides* spp.

Three-species *in vitro* biofilm model

Clinical isolates of MRSA, *P. aeruginosa*, and *C. perfringens* were chosen as the components of the three-species model for their different aerotolerances and common prevalence in chronic wounds (Bowler 1998; Bowler et al. 2001; Dowd et al. 2008a; Thomsen et al. 2010). The Colony-DFR model was selected for the development of the three-species model because it more closely mimics the environmental conditions of the chronic wound by growing the biofilms at a liquid/solid/air interface (Figure 1B). Furthermore, nutrients are wicked from below to feed the biofilm, much like a chronic wound.

The biofilms were inoculated with a solution containing a mixture of all three species. The mixture was comprised of 1 ml each of the MRSA and *C. perfringens* stationary-phase cultures, and a 1 ml of a 1:10 dilution of the *P. aeruginosa* stationary-phase culture. Previous investigations demonstrated that if the inoculum of *P. aeruginosa* was higher (undiluted in a 1:1:1 ratio with the other species), it resulted in a biofilm dominated by *P. aeruginosa* with little to no recovery of the other species (data not shown), an occurrence also observed by other investigators (Dalton et al. 2011). The experimental inoculum was 5.54 ± 0.18 log CFU per membrane for MRSA, 4.22 ± 0.79 log CFU per membrane for *C. perfringens*, and 4.54 ± 0.03 log CFU per membrane for *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 2). After inoculation, the biofilms were fed continuously for 72 hours with 100%-strength BHI broth supplemented with 5% ABS at 5 ml hr⁻¹ per channel. Media formulas with a lower

concentration of BHI (10% and 50%-strength) proved to be insufficient for the growth of *C. perfringens* within the mixed species biofilm. The resulting biofilms were slightly mucoid and with multiple gas bubbles (Figure 1B). Drop-plate counts of the disaggregated biofilms allowed for the quantification of the number of viable cells of each bacterial species within the biofilm. MRSA grew to 7.39 ± 0.45 log CFU per membrane and *C. perfringens* grew to 7.13 ± 0.77 log CFU per membrane. *P. aeruginosa* consistently had the highest cell count with 10.22 ± 0.22 log CFU per membrane (Figure 2).

Light Microscopy

The location of each species within the biofilm was investigated using light microscopy. Transmitted light microscopy of Gram-stained cryosections revealed a number of distinct architectural features within the biofilms (Figure 3A). The biofilms displayed a unique structure consisting of distinct layers that appeared to be inhabited exclusively or predominantly by a single species. The topmost layer (air interface) consisted of a layer that was spongy in appearance and appeared to be inhabited exclusively by Gram-negative bacilli consistent in appearance with *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 3B). In the middle of the biofilm was a central and highly dense layer of putative extracellular polymeric substance (EPS) without distinguishable cells (Figure 3C). A specific stain for EPS was not used. The deepest layer of the biofilm, where the biofilm grew on the membrane, seemed to be the interface between MRSA and *C. perfringens* (Figure 3D). The facultative anaerobe MRSA was expected to be distributed throughout the biofilm. However, MRSA appeared to be located only in a discrete band near the bottom of the biofilm at an interface with *C. perfringens*.

The most striking microscopic features of the biofilms studied were the projections and associated interstitial voids found extending top to bottom within the biofilms. Such projections and interstitial voids were most prevalent in the thick middle portion of the biofilms, and *C. perfringens* was located on the bottom and lower sides of these projections (Figure 3A–D).

Evaluation of Dressings Using the Three-species Biofilm Model

The final objective for this study was to utilize the three-species model to test various wound treatments. Therefore, the efficacy of two types of antimicrobial dressings, Curity™ AMD and Acticoat™, against biofilm growth was evaluated and compared to a control dressing, gauze. After three days, only the Acticoat™ dressing was able to significantly prevent biofilm growth compared to the other dressings (Figure 4). Despite inconsistent results of the Acticoat™ dressing for both *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa*, the counts were still significantly lower than the Curity™ AMD dressing ($p < 0.0001$) and gauze ($p < 0.0001$). However, the Acticoat™ results were constant for *C. perfringens*, with no growth was detected. This result was also significantly different from both the Curity™ AMD dressing and gauze, ($p < 0.0001$). The limit of detection in this experiment was one CFU ml⁻¹. After accounting for the initial dilution of the dressing sample and taking the log transformation, the limit of detection was 1 log CFU per sample. The results from the Curity™ AMD dressing were statistically equivalent to the gauze for all three microorganisms: $p = 0.963$ for MRSA, $p = 0.9994$ for *P. aeruginosa*, and $p = 0.8313$ for *C. perfringens*.

DISCUSSION

The primary accomplishment of the experiments described herein was the isolation and growth of an obligate anaerobe in an *in vitro* model without establishing an artificially anaerobic environment. The role of strict anaerobes has been overlooked in chronic wounds because they are difficult to culture, which is likely due to the need for specific

environmental and nutritional conditions that are poorly understood and not provided with traditional culture methods. The utilization of the DFR in combination with wound homogenates allowed for the innate flora of the sample to thrive and to establish a biofilm. From those, gaseous, mucoid, and multicolored biofilms (Figure 1A), a few strict anaerobes were isolated and identified: *B. fragilis*, *B. thetaiotaomicron*, *C. boltei* and *C. perfringens*. The ability to culture some pathogenic anaerobes without the use of anaerobic chambers represented not only an increase in convenience but also a more successful approach. Previous attempts to cultivate anaerobes from chronic wound specimens using standard microbiology techniques were unsuccessful.

Although wounds are often colonized by polymicrobial biofilm communities (Dowd et al. 2008a; Dowd et al. 2008b; James et al. 2008; Thomsen et al. 2010), much wound microbiology research has focused on single species of bacteria. The second goal of this investigation was to develop a mixed species biofilm composed of three species of bacteria, one facultative anaerobe, one aerobe, and one strict anaerobe. The three microorganisms selected for this investigation were clinical isolates of *S. aureus*, *P. aeruginosa*, and *C. perfringens*. *S. aureus* is a facultative anaerobe and is a predominant component of chronic wound biofilms (Bowler 1998; Dowd et al. 2008a; Thomsen et al. 2010). In addition, *S. aureus* has one of the highest incidence rates in traumatic, surgical, burn, and other wound infections (Bowler et al. 2001). *P. aeruginosa* is an obligate aerobe commonly found in chronic wound biofilms (Bowler 1998; Dowd et al. 2008a; Thomsen et al. 2010) and burn wounds (Rezaei et al. 2011). *Clostridium* spp are common anaerobic wound pathogens (Dowd et al. 2008a), and *C. perfringens* is the most the common cause of gas gangrene infections.

Using the Colony-DFR, a three-species biofilm was successfully established (Figure 1B), and the presence of each microorganism was verified using plate counts and microscopy. After three days of growth, *P. aeruginosa* was consistently found to have the highest cell count, followed by MRSA and *C. perfringens* (Figure 2). Microscopic analysis of the three-species biofilms demonstrated that each species appears to inhabit a distinct niche within the biofilm. The layer at the air interface was inhabited exclusively by *P. aeruginosa*, while the deepest layer of the biofilm, the side closest to the membrane, was the interface between MRSA and *C. perfringens* (Figure 3A–D). Such observations suggested that the biofilms had discrete microenvironments, which accommodated the individual oxygen requirements of the three species. Microelectrode investigations have demonstrated that oxygen is only able to penetrate microns into biofilms, resulting in highly reduced microenvironments capable of harboring strict anaerobes (Rasmussen and Lewandowski 1998). Therefore, in this model, oxygen consumption in upper layers of the biofilm by *P. aeruginosa* likely contributed to the establishment of anaerobic microenvironments found at the bottom of the biofilm, which were inhabited by MRSA and *C. perfringens*. The ability of *C. perfringens* to sporulate may have also contributed to its ability to survive at the ambient atmosphere until a reduced environment could be established. This survival pattern may also be relevant to chronic wound pathogenesis. Wounds initially infected with aerobic bacteria may form a biofilm of significant thickness to produce an anaerobic environment within the wound bed. The biofilm could then be secondarily infected with a strict anaerobe such as *C. perfringens*. Another remarkable feature of the model wound biofilm was the presence of interstitial voids that extended the entire thickness of the biofilm (Figure 3A–D). The interstitial voids were likely formed by the production of gases by the *C. perfringens*, which is known to produce copious amounts of H₂ and CO₂ (Shimizu et al. 2002).

Finally, the three-species model was used to evaluate common wound dressings, a principal component of wound care. Many modern wound dressings possess a variety of attributes that are designed to create a supportive wound healing environment, including absorbing

exudate, providing optimum moisture balance at the wound surface, preventing maceration of surrounding tissue, and controlling bacterial colonization (Lipp et al. 2010). Recent *in vitro* studies illustrated that bacteria can grow unchallenged within a traditional dressing environment; however, an antimicrobial dressing can limit bacterial growth (Ammons et al. 2009; Kirker et al. 2009a; Lipp et al. 2010; Ammons et al. 2011a). The dressings in those investigations were challenged using only a single species, and most chronic wounds are contaminated with multiple species of bacteria (Dowd et al. 2008a; James et al. 2008; Thomsen et al. 2010). Therefore, in this investigation, two common antimicrobial dressings, Curity™ AMD gauze and Acticoat™ Absorbent, were challenged using the three-species biofilm model and compared a traditional dressing, gauze.

Curity™ AMD gauze sponges are treated with 0.2% polyhexamethylene biguanide (PHMB). PHMB is broad spectrum antimicrobial agent used in a variety of products, including contact lens cleaning solutions, skin disinfectant solutions, and wound dressings. The antimicrobial activity of PHMB is attributed to its disruption of the bacterial cell wall; it reacts with acidic membrane lipids and induces aggregation, leading to increased membrane fluidity and permeability, and eventual organism death (Kirker et al. 2009a). PHMB has also been reported to bind bacterial DNA, alter its transcription, and cause lethal DNA damage (Allen et al. 2006). The efficacy of the PHMB dressings against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria as well as yeast and fungi has been demonstrated in several *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies (Cazzaniga et al. 2002; Lee et al. 2004; Motta et al. 2004; Gallant-Behm et al. 2005; Kirker et al. 2009b).

Acticoat™ Absorbent dressing is a calcium alginate dressing with a nanocrystalline silver coating. The biocidal activity of silver is attributed to the silver ion (Ag^+), which reacts strongly with molecules containing sulfur, nitrogen, or oxygen (Schierholz et al. 1998). Upon reaction with the silver cation, the molecules are rendered nonfunctional, thereby depriving the bacteria of the necessary molecules and eventually leading to death. The silver cation also binds to DNA, preventing replication and transcription. The antimicrobial effects of silver have been used for centuries; however, only recently has silver been used in wound dressings and its efficacy is summarized elsewhere (Leaper 2006; Vermeulen et al. 2007; Lo et al. 2009).

Populations within the three-species biofilms were found to have differing tolerances to the dressing treatments (Figure 4). Acticoat™ was found to be effective against *C. perfringens*. In fact, no *C. perfringens* growth was detected in biofilms that were treated with Acticoat™. The Acticoat™ dressing consists of an absorbent alginate coated with nanocrystalline silver, and a number of phenomena could account for the potency of silver ions against biofilm *C. perfringens*. The low G+C content of *C. perfringens* DNA (28.6%) may make this organism particularly susceptible to the destabilizing effect of silver ions on DNA (Shimizu et al. 2002). It may also be possible that silver ions have a particularly deleterious effect upon enzymatic activity within *C. perfringens* (Guggenbichler et al. 1999). While not as consistent, Acticoat™ also had an inhibitory effect on *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa* as well (Figure 4). This result is consistent with a previous investigation (Ammons et al. 2011b).

Surprisingly, the Curity™ AMD gauze and the gauze control performed equivalently (Figure 4). Previous investigations demonstrated that PHMB-based antimicrobial dressings successfully inhibited the growth of gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria as well as yeast and fungi (Cazzaniga et al. 2002; Lee et al. 2004; Motta et al. 2004; Gallant-Behm et al. 2005; Kirker et al. 2009b); however, these experiments were conducted with one individual species. Perhaps the complexity of the three-species biofilm limited the efficacy of the PHMB.

Chronic wounds colonized with polymicrobial biofilms are especially tolerant to treatment. This may be due to varied microenvironments within the biofilm and the range of bacterial oxygen requirements. Additionally, the EPS of biofilms may provide a physical barrier to antimicrobials, mechanical removal, and the immune response. To better understand the increased resistance of wound biofilms, it is imperative to conduct *in vitro* studies that simulate the conditions found within a chronic wound. This investigation describes the development of a polymicrobial biofilm wound model composed of microorganisms with different oxygen requirements. Such a model will allow for investigations into the complex interactions between the differing bacterial species, the different microenvironments, and the varying antimicrobial tolerances found within chronic wound biofilms. The care of chronic wounds poses enormous material and patient costs. If a fraction of these cases stem from biofilm infection, identifying and understanding the wound bioburden may have a significant impact on wound care.

Acknowledgments

FUNDING

The project described was supported by grant number 1P20GM078445-01 from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS). The contents of this project are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIGMS.

References

- Agostinho A, Hartman A, Lipp C, Parker A, Stewart P, James G. An in vitro model for the growth and analysis of chronic wound MRSA biofilm. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. 2011; 111:1275–1282. [PubMed: 21883733]
- Allen MJ, White GF, Morby AP. The response of *Escherichia coli* to exposure to the biocide polyhexamethylene biguanide. *Microbiology*. 2006; 152:989–1000. [PubMed: 16549663]
- Ammons MC, Ward LS, Dowd S, James GA. Combined treatment of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilm with lactoferrin and xylitol inhibits the ability of bacteria to respond to damage resulting from lactoferrin iron chelation. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2011a; 37:316–323. [PubMed: 21377840]
- Ammons MC, Ward LS, Fisher ST, Wolcott RD, James GA. In vitro susceptibility of established biofilms composed of a clinical wound isolate of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* treated with lactoferrin and xylitol. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2009; 33:230–236. [PubMed: 18977641]
- Ammons MC, Ward LS, James GA. Anti-biofilm efficacy of a lactoferrin/xylitol wound hydrogel used in combination with silver wound dressings. *Int Wound J*. 2011b
- Bowler PG. The anaerobic and aerobic microbiology of wounds: A review. *Wounds*. 1998; 10:170–178.
- Bowler PG, Duerden BI, Armstrong DG. Wound microbiology and associated approaches to wound management. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2001; 14:244–269. [PubMed: 11292638]
- Buckingham-Meyer K, Goeres DM, Hamilton MA. Comparative evaluation of biofilm disinfectant efficacy tests. *J Microbiol Methods*. 2007; 70:236–244. [PubMed: 17524505]
- Cazzaniga AL, Serralta V, Davis S, Orr R, Eaglstein WH, Mertz PM. The effect of an antimicrobial gauze dressing impregnated with 0.2-percent polyhexamethylene biguanide as a barrier to prevent *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* wound invasion. *WOUNDS*. 2002; 14:169–176.
- Dalton T, Dowd SE, Wolcott RD, Sun Y, Watters C, Griswold JA, Rumbaugh KP. An in vivo polymicrobial biofilm wound infection model to study interspecies interactions. *PLoS One*. 2011; 6:e27317. [PubMed: 22076151]
- Desrosiers M, Myntti M, James G. Methods for removing bacterial biofilms: in vitro study using clinical chronic rhinosinusitis specimens. *Am J Rhinol*. 2007; 21:527–532. [PubMed: 17883887]
- Dowd SE, Sun Y, Secor PR, Rhoads DD, Wolcott BM, James GA, Wolcott RD. Survey of bacterial diversity in chronic wounds using pyrosequencing, DGGE, and full ribosome shotgun sequencing. *BMC Microbiol*. 2008a; 8:43. [PubMed: 18325110]

- Dowd SE, Wolcott RD, Sun Y, McKeehan T, Smith E, Rhoads D. Polymicrobial nature of chronic diabetic foot ulcer biofilm infections determined using bacterial tag encoded FLX amplicon pyrosequencing (bTEFAP). *PLoS One*. 2008b; 3:e3326. [PubMed: 18833331]
- Falanga V. The chronic wound: impaired healing and solutions in the context of wound bed preparation. *Blood Cells Mol Dis*. 2004; 32:88–94. [PubMed: 14757419]
- Gallant-Behm CL, Yin HQ, Liu S, Hegggers JP, Langford RE, Olson ME, Hart DA, Burrell RE. Comparison of in vitro disc diffusion and time kill-kinetic assays for the evaluation of antimicrobial wound dressing efficacy. *Wound Repair Regen*. 2005; 13:412–421. [PubMed: 16008731]
- Guggenbichler JP, Boswald M, Lugauer S, Krall T. A new technology of microdispersed silver in polyurethane induces antimicrobial activity in central venous catheters. *Infection*. 1999; 27(Suppl 1):S16–23. [PubMed: 10379438]
- Hammond AA, Miller KG, Kruczek CJ, Dertien J, Colmer-Hamood JA, Griswold JA, Horswill AR, Hamood AN. An in vitro biofilm model to examine the effect of antibiotic ointments on biofilms produced by burn wound bacterial isolates. *Burns*. 2011; 37:312–321. [PubMed: 21130579]
- Han A, Zenilman J, Melendez J, Shirtliff M, Agostinho A, James G, Stewart P, Mongodin E, Rao D, Rickard A, Lazarus G. The importance of a multifaceted approach to characterizing the microbial flora of chronic wounds. *Wound Repair and Regeneration*. 2011; 19:532–541. [PubMed: 22092791]
- Herigstad B, Hamilton M, Heersink J. How to optimize the drop plate method for enumerating bacteria. *J Microbiol Methods*. 2001; 44:121–129. [PubMed: 11165341]
- James GA, Swogger E, Wolcott R, Pulcini E, Secor P, Sestrich J, Costerton JW, Stewart PS. Biofilms in chronic wounds. *Wound Repair Regen*. 2008; 16:37–44. [PubMed: 18086294]
- Kirker KR, Fisher ST, James GA, McGhee D, Shah CB. Efficacy of Polyhexamethylene Biguanide-containing Antimicrobial Foam Dressing Against MRSA Relative to Standard Foam Dressing. *WOUNDS*. 2009a; 21:229–233.
- Kirker KR, Secor PR, James GA, Fleckman P, Olerud JE, Stewart PS. Loss of viability and induction of apoptosis in human keratinocytes exposed to *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilms in vitro. *Wound Repair Regen*. 2009b; 17:690–699. [PubMed: 19671124]
- Kostenko V, Lyczak J, Turner K, Martinuzzi RJ. Impact of silver-containing wound dressings on bacterial biofilm viability and susceptibility to antibiotics during prolonged treatment. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2010; 54:5120–5131. [PubMed: 20855737]
- Leaper DJ. Silver dressings: their role in wound management. *Int Wound J*. 2006; 3:282–294. [PubMed: 17199764]
- Lee WR, Tobias KM, Bemis DA, Rohrbach BW. In vitro efficacy of a polyhexamethylene biguanide-impregnated gauze dressing against bacteria found in veterinary patients. *Vet Surg*. 2004; 33:404–411. [PubMed: 15230846]
- Lipp C, Kirker K, Agostinho A, James G, Stewart P. Testing wound dressings using an in vitro wound model. *J Wound Care*. 2010; 19:220–226. [PubMed: 20551862]
- Lo SF, Chang CJ, Hu WY, Hayter M, Chang YT. The effectiveness of silver-releasing dressings in the management of non-healing chronic wounds: a meta-analysis. *J Clin Nurs*. 2009; 18:716–728. [PubMed: 19239539]
- Motta GJ, Milne CT, Corbett LQ. Impact of antimicrobial gauze on bacterial colonies in wounds that require packing. *Ostomy Wound Management*. 2004; 50:48–62.
- Rasmussen K, Lewandowski Z. Microelectrode measurements of local mass transport rates in heterogeneous biofilms. *Biotechnol Bioeng*. 1998; 59:302–309. [PubMed: 10099341]
- Rezaei E, Safari H, Naderinasab M, Aliakbarian H. Common pathogens in burn wound and changes in their drug sensitivity. *Burns*. 2011; 37:805–807. [PubMed: 21388742]
- Schierholz JM, Lucas LJ, Rump A, Pulverer G. Efficacy of silver-coated medical devices. *J Hosp Infect*. 1998; 40:257–262. [PubMed: 9868616]
- Secor PR, James GA, Fleckman P, Olerud JE, McInnerney K, Stewart PS. *Staphylococcus aureus* Biofilm and Planktonic cultures differentially impact gene expression, mapk phosphorylation, and cytokine production in human keratinocytes. *BMC Microbiol*. 2011; 11:143. [PubMed: 21693040]

- Sen CK, Gordillo GM, Roy S, Kirsner R, Lambert L, Hunt TK, Gottrup F, Gurtner GC, Longaker MT. Human skin wounds: a major and snowballing threat to public health and the economy. *Wound Repair Regen.* 2009; 17:763–771. [PubMed: 19903300]
- Shimizu T, Ohtani K, Hirakawa H, Ohshima K, Yamashita A, Shiba T, Ogasawara N, Hattori M, Kuhara S, Hayashi H. Complete genome sequence of *Clostridium perfringens*, an anaerobic flesh-eater. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2002; 99:996–1001. [PubMed: 11792842]
- Thomsen TR, Aasholm MS, Rudkjobering VB, Saunders AM, Bjarnsholt T, Givskov M, Kirketerp-Moller K, Nielsen PH. The bacteriology of chronic venous leg ulcer examined by culture-independent molecular methods. *Wound Repair Regen.* 2010; 18:38–49. [PubMed: 20082680]
- Thorn RM, Greenman J. A novel in vitro flat-bed perfusion biofilm model for determining the potential antimicrobial efficacy of topical wound treatments. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2009; 107:2070–2079. [PubMed: 19548886]
- Vermeulen H, van Hattem JM, Storm-Versloot MN, Ubbink DT. Topical silver for treating infected wounds. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2007;CD005486. [PubMed: 17253557]
- Wolcott RD, Rhoads DD. A study of biofilm-based wound management in subjects with critical limb ischaemia. *J Wound Care.* 2008; 17:145–148. 150–142, 154–145. [PubMed: 18494432]
- Wolcott RD, Rumbaugh KP, James G, Schultz G, Phillips P, Yang Q, Watters C, Stewart PS, Dowd SE. Biofilm maturity studies indicate sharp debridement opens a time- dependent therapeutic window. *J Wound Care.* 2010; 19:320–328. [PubMed: 20852503]
- Xu KD, Stewart PS, Xia F, Huang CT, McFeters GA. Spatial physiological heterogeneity in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilm is determined by oxygen availability. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 1998; 64:4035–4039. [PubMed: 9758837]

Figure 1. Images of multispecies biofilms. (A) Image of two chambers of a DFR inoculated with wound tissue homogenates and cultivated for 7 days. (B) Image of a three-species biofilm grown using the colony-DFR.

Figure 2.
Log CFU per sample for the three-species biofilm growth on the colony-DFR. Data represented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation.

Figure 3. Light microscopy images of a three-species biofilm cross-sectioned and Gram-stained. (A) Full cross-section of three-species biofilm, scale bar=175 μm ; (B) Magnified view of the top of the biofilm, scale bar=15 μm ; (C) Magnified view of the middle of the biofilm, scale bar=15 μm ; (D) Magnified view of the bottom of the biofilm, scale bar=15 μm .

Figure 4.

Log CFU per sample for the membrane/dressing pair. Counts for each species on each type of dressing are shown. Data represented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation. (*) Significantly different from the other dressings at $p < 0.0001$.