



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/117539/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Pouran, H.M., Banwart, S.A. and Romero-Gonzalez, M. (2017) Effects of synthetic iron and aluminium oxide surface charge and hydrophobicity on the formation of bacterial biofilm. *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, 19. pp. 622-634. ISSN: 2050-7887

<https://doi.org/10.1039/C6EM00666C>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 **Effects of synthetic iron and aluminium oxide surface charge**
2 **and hydrophobicity on the formation of bacterial biofilm**

3
4 Hamid M. Pouran^{*a}, Steve A. Banwart^b, Maria Romero-Gonzalez^c

5
6 ^a *LMEI, SOAS, University of London, UK*, ^b *School of Earth and Environment, University of*
7 *Leeds, UK*, ^c *Department of Geography, University of Sheffield, UK*

8
9
10 ***Corresponding author:** Dr Hamid M. Pouran: Tel.: +44 (0)7930 342062

11 Email: hamidpouran@gmail.com

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

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

Abstract

In this research, bacterial cell attachments to hematite, goethite and aluminium hydroxide were investigated. The aim was to study the effects of these minerals' hydrophobicity and pH-dependent surface charge on the extent of biofilm formation using six genetically diverse bacterial strains: *Rhodococcus* spp. (RC92 & RC291), *Pseudomonas* spp. (Pse1 & Pse2) and *Sphingomonas* spp. (Sph1 & Sph2), which had been previously isolated from contaminated environments. The surfaces were prepared in a way that was compatible with the naturally occurring coating process in aquifers: deposition of colloidal particles from the aqueous phase. The biofilms were evaluated using a novel, in situ and non-invasive technique developed for this purpose. A manufactured polystyrene 12-well plate was used as the reference surface to be coated with synthesized minerals by deposition of their suspended particles through evaporation.

Planktonic phase growth indicates that it is independent of the surface charge and hydrophobicity of the studied surfaces. The hydrophobic similarities failed to predict biofilm proliferation. Two of the three hydrophilic strains formed extensive biofilms on the minerals. The third one, Sph2, showed anomalies contrary to the expected electrostatic attraction between the minerals and the cell surface. Further research showed how the solution's ionic strength affects Sph2 surface potential and shapes the extent of its biofilm formation; reducing the ionic strength from ≈ 200 mM to ≈ 20 mM led to a tenfold increase in the number of cells attached to hematite. This study provides a technique to evaluate biofilm formation on metal-oxide surfaces, under well-controlled conditions, using a simple yet reliable method. The findings also highlight that cell numbers in the planktonic phase do not necessarily show the extent of cell attachment, and thorough the physicochemical characterization of bacterial strains, substrata and the aquifer medium are fundamental to successfully implementing any bioremediation projects.

Keywords: Interface interactions; Hematite; Goethite; Aluminium hydroxide; Coating; Microorganism; Planktonic growth; Hydrophobicity, Electrostatic interactions; Biofilm formation; Cell adhesion; *Rhodococcus* spp., *Pseudomonas* spp., *Sphingomonas* spp.,

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

1. Introduction

Biodegradation, utilizing the capability of microorganisms to transform pollutants into new compounds, ¹⁻³ is a key process in planning management strategies for contaminated soils and aquifers. It is known that in a groundwater environment microbial communities form biofilms, which play a predominant role in the biodegradation process. ^{1,4}

Bacterial adhesion to metal oxides has been a subject of research for many years, either for its positive effect, e.g. its role in bioremediation, or negative impact on industrial process efficiency, e.g. engineering costs because of biofouling (undesirable growth and accumulation of bacterial cells on the surfaces of engineering structures). ^{5,6} Although understanding biofilm formation requires a multidisciplinary research approach, ⁶ we often see that this necessity has been undermined when studying bacterial adhesion on mineral surfaces. Available studies on biofilm formation on metal oxides indicate that the dominant technique to prepare these surfaces is often based on precisely engineered methods, e.g. chemical vapour deposition (CVD). ^{7,8}

This paper aims to provide a better understanding of biofilm formation via the use of some bacterial strains capable of participating in the bioremediation process on the most common metal-oxide surfaces in aquifers. The results will improve our perception of the interfacial forces governing bacterial cell attachment and our ability to speculate on the extent of biofilm formation and consequently biodegradation efficiency in diverse geological media. ^{1,3,9-11} It is worth mentioning that biofilm formations using selected model strains have been evaluated in other published studies, namely their attached growth on quartz and polystyrene surfaces. ^{4,9}

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

Biofilm formation begins with the adhesion of a small quantity of cells.^{3,12,13} Figure 1 is a schematic representation of the main steps involved in the biofilm formation process,^{13–15} In engineered bioremediation, the traditional assumption is that stimulating a naturally occurring microbial population and/or adding specific microorganisms to a contaminated aquifer will enhance the biodegradation of a targeted compound.^{4,14,16} This is based on the concept that deploying these techniques eventually improves biofilm formation and consequently the bioremediation process. For this purpose, planktonic phase growth and variations in cell numbers in this phase are often used to infer bacterial activity, while the success of the bioremediation process depends on effective bacterial colonization and subsequent biofilm formation.⁴

Mineral surface properties can influence both cell attachment and biofilm formation.^{4,10,17} The role of surface hydrophobicity and the charge of both the cell surface and the substrate in cell adhesion and attached growth have been studied before and discrepancies between the expected extent of biofilm formation and observed attachment patterns have been found.^{4,9,11} This research tests the hypothesis that the surface charge and hydrophobicity of mineral surfaces, specifically metal oxides, determine the extent of biofilm formation. This study differentiates itself from other research by performing tests on metal-oxide surfaces that were synthesized, fully characterized and deposited on reference surfaces in a way compatible with the deposition process that occurs in aquifers,^{18–20} e.g. hematite-coated quartz, in contrast to precisely engineered surfaces, e.g. metal-oxide thin films, such as those prepared through chemical vapour deposition (CVD).^{10,21,22} Also, this research relies on a novel, in situ and non-invasive technique that uses a water-dipping objective to evaluate biofilm formation on the minerals studied. This imaging method was developed for this

1 study, and it provides a better way to evaluate and quantify biofilms compared to using
2 crystal violet assay, which is a method frequently used for this purpose.⁹

3 Metal oxides are an important group of soil minerals, in particular because of their
4 wide presence and the variety of geochemical reactions that occur on their surfaces.¹⁸
5 Hematite, goethite and aluminium hydroxide are some of the most common soil minerals,
6 they often appear in the form of coatings on other mineral surfaces, such as quartz.^{10,19,20} In
7 addition, they have a relatively high point of zero charge (PZC), a specific pH value at which
8 the surface charge is neutral, which makes their surfaces positively charged in the pH range
9 of natural environments.^{10,18} These metal oxides were selected as model minerals to evaluate
10 the effects of their surface charge and hydrophobicity on the biofilm formation of specific
11 bacterial strains. Studying these metal oxides also allows building up a more comprehensive
12 picture of how complex surfaces, e.g. aluminosilicates and binary metal oxides, can affect
13 attached microbial growth.

14 Similar to metal oxides, bacterial cells also carry a pH-dependent surface charge at
15 the cell-water interface.^{10,23} This surface charge stems from associated functional groups on
16 the surface of the cell wall, which through protonation/ deprotonation processes generates a
17 pH-dependent surface charge.^{24,25} Nevertheless, most of the available information indicates
18 that bacterial surfaces dominantly exhibit an overall negative charge in the pH range of
19 natural environments.²⁶⁻²⁹ Hence, attraction between the opposite surface charges of
20 bacterial cell and metal-oxide surfaces with pH values like natural environments is expected.
21 Here, we report the results of studying the biofilm formation of specific environmental
22 isolates on hematite, goethite and aluminium hydroxide, which was performed under well-
23 controlled experimental conditions and in a reproducible manner.

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Experimental section

1. Materials and Methods

2.1 Chemicals

In the experiments, certified ACS reagents, chemicals that meet or exceed the latest ACS specifications, were supplied by Fisher Scientific (UK) and used without further purification. Ultra-high quality water (UHQ, conductivity 18.2 MΩ/cm at 25°C) was used throughout the experiments. All chemicals were prepared in Pyrex glass vessels.

2.2 Surface preparation – synthesis, coating and characterization

Hematite was prepared by heating an acidic solution of FeCl₃.^{10,30} Goethite was synthesized by heating an alkaline solution of Fe(NO₃)₃ in a polyethylene flask for 60 hours at 70°C.^{10,31} The aluminium hydroxide synthesis method was based on adding aluminium nitrate to an alkaline solution.^{10,32}

A STOE STADI P X-ray powder diffractometer and a Perkin Elmer Spectrum Spotlight FTIR imaging system for Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) were used to analyze the synthesized materials. For XRD analysis, copper K alpha was the radiation source; a range of 10–70 degrees and a step size of 0.02 degrees were the test parameters. In FTIR experiments, the spectrum resolution was 4 cm⁻¹, covering the range of 4,000-400 cm⁻¹ wave numbers, and 150 scans were collected for each sample.

To determine the point of zero charge (PZC) of the synthetic metal oxides, potentiometric titration was done. An automated potentiometric titrator (Metrohm, 718 STAT, Titrino) was used. During titrations, acid (HCl, 0.1M) and base (NaOH, 0.1M) were added by a computer-controlled micro-burette with a dispensing volume of 0.01 ml. The titrator was

1 adjusted to add successive acid or base when the absolute value of the potential drift was
2 equal to or less than 5 mV/min. The sample suspensions were purged with N₂ gas to remove
3 carbon dioxide from the system for approximately two hours before titration, which was
4 performed in an N₂ atmosphere.¹⁰ In these tests, a magnetic stirrer provided continuous
5 stirring and the suspension temperature was kept at 25°C during the titration period. Surface
6 hydrophobic/ hydrophilic properties of the synthetic minerals were obtained by measuring the
7 water-drop contact angle in air. Contact angles were obtained using the sessile drop method
8 and a KRÜSS DSA 100 drop-shape analysis system. An aliquote of 3µl of UHQ water was
9 added to the mineral surfaces at room temperature.¹⁰ The contact angle between the surface
10 and a tangent drawn on the drop surface, passing through the triple point of atmosphere-
11 liquid-solid, was measured. Iron and aluminium oxides' hydrophilic nature stems from their
12 surface hydroxyl groups.³³ In general, surfaces with a water-drop contact angle of less than
13 90 degrees are hydrophilic; nevertheless, for the surfaces studied, the expected water-drop
14 contact angles were considerably less.³⁴⁻³⁷ The MATH, Microbial Adhesion to Hydrocarbon
15 Test, is an established method to quantify microbial cell surface hydrophobicity via their
16 attachment to hydrocarbon droplets;³⁸⁻⁴⁰ this technique has been performed on selected
17 model strains in other published studies.

18 The coating process involved the direct deposition of mineral particles from an
19 aqueous suspension by evaporation, which has been explained in detail in a previous
20 publication.¹⁰ After this step, the coated polystyrene surfaces were assessed using optical
21 microscopy (Zeiss, Axiovision), direct imaging and contact-angle measurements to determine
22 their hydrophobicity (as described above). The ATR-FTIR, attenuated total reflection-Fourier
23 transform infrared, technique using a Specac Silver Gate Essential Single Reflection ATR
24 System and XPS, and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (KRATOS-Axis 165) were also used

1 to compare the chemical properties of altered surfaces with those of reference polystyrene
2 and mineral surfaces¹⁰ – please see supporting information (SI).

3 **2.3 Bacterial strains, growth conditions and sample preparation**

4 Six bacterial strains were isolated for bacterial-adhesion and attached-growth studies.
5 *Rhodococcus* spp., RC92 and RC291, both Gram-positive, were isolated from soil samples
6 from a polluted gasworks site in northeast England. The bacteria *Pseudomonas* spp. (Pse1
7 and Pse2) and *Sphingomonas* spp. (Sph1 and Sph2) were isolated from groundwater at a
8 phenol-contaminated site in the West Midlands (England). The strains Pse1, Pse2, Sph1 and
9 Sph2 are Gram-negative. They have been classified using comparative 16S rRNA
10 sequencing.^{4,9} All strains were maintained on a solid R2A medium (Oxoid).⁴¹

11 The bacterial strains were grown in an AB10 medium,⁴² which is a defined medium
12 with known exact chemical composition – please see supporting information (SI). The carbon
13 source was 2 mM of glucose, and the incubation time was 96 hours at 20°C on a shaker at
14 150 rpm. After incubation, cells were harvested by centrifugation in an early stationary phase
15 and washed in 10 ml of sterile 0.9% NaCl solution. Samples of washed and resuspended
16 strains (in 0.9% NaCl), with an optical density (OD) of 0.01 at $\lambda = 600$ nm, were resuspended
17 in the AB10 medium with different carbon-source treatments. Two variations of carbon
18 sources, 2 mM of glucose and 2 mM of potassium acetate (KAc), were used to evaluate
19 whether there was a difference between these two carbon sources in the extent of biofilm
20 formation; in addition, the same medium with no carbon source was used as a control.
21 Previous studies indicate that these environmental isolates can metabolize glucose and
22 potassium acetate, and similar growth media have been used in the past to study biofilm
23 formation on model substrata with different surface properties.^{4,9} The aim of this study was
24 to perform experiments, including bacterial cell growth and attachment, in a well-controlled
25 environment. A similar incubation method and growth medium (defined medium AB10⁴²), in

1 addition to studying the attachment morphologies of these individual environmental isolates
2 to polystyrene, have been reported in other publications;^{1,4,9–11,43,44} these were used to cross-
3 compare with this research. Extending this study to conditions more compatible with natural
4 environments should be part of future studies.

5

6 **2.4 Biofilm formation studies**

7 Six strains, four different surfaces, two carbon sources and one experimental control
8 (AB10 medium with no carbon source) were analyzed in triplicate to assay biofilm formation
9 for a total of 216 samples. In these experiments, reference polystyrene plates were prepacked
10 and radiation-sterilized. The mineral-coated polystyrene plates¹⁰ were sterilized by
11 immersion in a 70% ethanol medium for one hour prior to incubation and dried under aseptic
12 conditions in a laminar flow cabinet.

13 Non-invasive, in situ direct imaging using Syto9 stain (green fluorescent nucleic acid
14 stain, supplied by Invitrogen) was used as the primary technique to assay biofilm.^{45,46} The
15 reference polystyrene and metal-oxide coated polystyrene well-plates, each with 12 wells and
16 a nominal culture area of 3.82 cm² for each well,⁴⁷ were used as substrata for biofilm
17 formation studies. Samples of bacteria suspension were prepared at an optical density (OD)
18 of 0.01 at $\lambda = 600$ nm using AB10 medium, pH \approx 6.5, with glucose, potassium acetate and no
19 carbon source. Then, 2 ml of prepared medium was added to each micro-well. The 12 well-
20 plates were incubated for 96 hours at 20°C (Fig. 2); then, 200 μ l of each of the bacterial
21 samples, from their planktonic phase, was transferred to a 96-micro well-plate and the OD
22 was measured at $\lambda=630$ nm to determine planktonic phase growth. To assess the planktonic
23 phase of individual environmental isolates, the measured optical density (OD) at $\lambda= 630$ nm
24 was calibrated against the number of colony-forming units (CFU) for each strain. This
25 calibration was used to compare growth in the planktonic phase for each individual strain.

1 The rest of the planktonic phase was discarded and each well was gently washed three times
2 by adding 5ml of 0.9% sterile NaCl solution that was slowly added to the well wall and
3 bottom intersection, using a pipette tip, to remove cells in the planktonic phase and ensure
4 that only bacterial cells which had attached to the surface were present.

5 Each well of the reference polystyrene and coated plates was stained by adding 0.5
6 ml of Syto 9, which was diluted 500x. The thickness of the added stain layer that formed on
7 the bottom of the well was approximately 1.25 mm (the surface area of each well was 3.82
8 cm²). The stained wells were directly imaged in situ using a 100x magnification Zeiss
9 Achroplan water-dipping objective (Fig. 2). For imaging, a Zeiss AxioVision epifluorescence
10 microscope with automated Z-height focusing (Z-stacking) was used for extended depth and
11 field imaging. With this technique a series of images are acquired at different focus positions,
12 which allows imaging through a thick section or of a rough surface (Fig. 2). Images were
13 captured with an AxioCam black & white camera using a 450-490 nm narrow-band pass filter.
14 For each sample, 15 images were captured and then analyzed using AxioVision 4.6 and
15 Image J software. From these digital images, direct cell counts were obtained and reported as
16 cells/cm² (since each experiment was conducted in triplicate, each data point represents an
17 average of 45 data points). The microscope water-dipping objective had restricted lateral
18 motion, due to the well's sides, which confined the imaging area (Fig. 2). Images to study
19 bacterial cell attachment on the substrate, at the bottom of each well, were taken from a
20 circular accessible surface with a diameter of 11mm located at the centre of the wells. As
21 mentioned earlier, microscope Z-stacking provided the option of acquiring images at different
22 focus positions. This technique was used to determine biofilm depth when the cells had
23 formed dense biofilms.

24

25 **3. Results and Discussion**

3.1 Surface coating and characterization

XRD and FTIR analysis showed that the synthetic materials matched the expected metal oxides. Detailed surface analysis, including ATR-FTIR, XPS and water-drop contact angle measurements, confirmed the compatibility of the coated reference plate's surface properties with pure mineral phases¹⁰ – please see supporting information (SI) section.

Mineral surfaces' PZC was obtained at the common intersection point of more than one potentiometric titration curve at different ionic strengths. The PZC of polystyrene was considered to be neutral.⁴ The PZC for hematite, goethite and aluminum hydroxide was 7.5, 8.5 and 8.9, respectively, indicating a positive charge on the surface at the pH of the adhesion experiments. The contact angle values for polystyrene (90°) and hematite ($\approx 45^\circ$) demonstrate that both surfaces are hydrophobic. In the case of goethite and aluminium hydroxide, the contact angle value was lower than 10°, indicating that these surfaces are hydrophilic;¹⁰ – for further details and related images please see supporting information (SI) section.

The relative hydrophobicity of the bacterial species studied in this research has been determined before in independent experiments^{1,4,9} that suggest that RC92, RC291 and Sph1 are hydrophobic, while Pse1, Pse2 and Sph2 are hydrophilic strains, after incubation in both AB10 with glucose and potassium acetate carbon sources.

The PZC of bacterial cells is typically between 3.5 and 5.0.^{5,10,23,24,48} Since the pH of the experiments, approximately 6.5, was higher than the environmental isolates' expected PZC, the overall surface charge of the cells was anticipated to be negative under the experiment's conditions.

With respect to hydrophobicity, RC92, RC291 and Sph1 were hydrophobic, like the reference polystyrene surface, while Pse1, Pse2 and Sph2 were hydrophilic, similar to the hematite, goethite and aluminium hydroxide coated well-plates. Considering electrostatic

1 interactions, the PZC values of the bacterial strains and the metal oxide surfaces were,
2 respectively, below and above the experiments' pH (6.5); therefore, electrostatic attraction
3 was expected to drive cell adhesion and subsequent biofilm growth on the mineral surfaces.
4

5 **3.2 Biofilm studies**

6 Figure 3. shows the total number of cells calculated in the planktonic phase for the
7 studied strains and surfaces. These data relate to the growth medium, AB10, when glucose
8 was the carbon source. As seen in the planktonic phase cell numbers, for each strain, these
9 were within the same range and compatible, regardless of the study surface. Similar patterns
10 were observed when the AB10 carbon source was potassium acetate (KAc) – please see
11 supporting information (SI). The bacterial strains did not grow on the AB10 medium with no
12 added carbon source. The results suggest that the strains thrive better in a medium with a
13 glucose carbon source compared to potassium acetate. More importantly, the level of cell
14 growth in the planktonic phase seems to be independent of the surface charge and
15 hydrophobicity of the growing environment's surface. As Figure 3 indicates, the numbers of
16 RC92 and RC291, *Rhodococcus* spp., in the planktonic phase are less than *Pseudomonas* spp.
17 (Pse1 & Pse2), and *Sphingomonas* spp. (Sph1 & Sph2). This can be attributed to the surface
18 properties of the *Rhodococcus* species that encourage cell aggregation in an aqueous medium.
19 ^{49,50} Prior to measuring the planktonic phase, the samples were vortexed to disperse flocs of
20 these strains.

21 Based on the hydrophobic properties of the cells and surfaces, the expected pattern is
22 to see more cell attachment of the hydrophobic strains, RC92, RC91 and Sph1, on
23 polystyrene, and more biofilm on the hydrophilic reference mineral surfaces formed by Pse1,
24 Pse2 and Sph2.

1 Figures 4–6 show the bacterial strain adhesion patterns of the reference polystyrene
2 and mineral surfaces in the AB10 medium with a glucose carbon source. The biofilms formed
3 on polystyrene are similar to those previously reported in other research, using the same
4 variables.^{4,9}

5 RC92 had overall poor attachment on the studied surfaces. The attached growth
6 colonies of this strain on the reference polystyrene formed different groups of cells that
7 aligned to shape and split and relatively short chain-type cell arrangements, while for the
8 mineral surfaces attached individual and separated cells were observed (Figs 4a–4d). RC291
9 is a Gram-positive, hydrophobic bacterial strain like RC92, with comparable attachment
10 morphologies for minerals, but different colony forms on the reference polystyrene surface.
11 As shown in Figure 4h, RC291 forms proliferated, with dense and highly structured biofilm
12 on the reference polystyrene.

13 Pse1 and Pse2 are Gram-negative and hydrophilic. As seen in Figure 5 (a–d), Pse1
14 forms cell clusters on all surfaces; however, the numbers and sizes of these clusters are
15 considerably higher for biofilms attached to metal oxides. The biofilms on polystyrene are
16 sparse and shape small micro-colonies (Fig. 5d), while they are notably denser on mineral
17 surfaces. Pse2 shows the same biofilm formation phenotype on metal oxides, Figure 5 (e–g),
18 but for the polystyrene the attached cells are more aggregated and show discrete micro-
19 colonies (Fig. 5h).

20 In these experiments, Sph1 was the only Gram-negative strain with hydrophobic
21 surface properties. As Figure 6 (a–c) displays, Sph1 cells attached to mineral surfaces show
22 poor adhesion, while biofilms formed on reference polystyrene are extensive and abundant
23 (Fig. 6d). Sph2 is a Gram-negative strain with hydrophilic surface properties. Negligible
24 attachment to metal oxide surfaces (Fig. 6 e–g), in contrast to the notable biofilm formation
25 on reference polystyrene, compatible with Sph1, was the dominant morphology for attached

1 cells. The results are striking, as hydrophobic Sph1 and hydrophilic Sph2 show matching
2 biofilm formation patterns on the studied surfaces. Table 1 summarizes the biofilm
3 morphologies of attached cells on the studied mineral and polystyrene surfaces.

4 The observed morphologies for attached cells using KAc as the carbon source were
5 similar to AB10 with glucose – please supporting information (SI) for details.

6 Figure 7 shows the numbers of attached cells based on a direct count of cell numbers
7 from captured images. As seen, Pse1 and Pse2 are the strains with the highest numbers of
8 attached cells to metal oxides. The cell numbers for RC92 and RC291 are significantly higher
9 for the reference polystyrene compared to mineral surfaces. Similarly, the numbers of Sph1
10 and Sph2 attached cells are notably higher for the reference polystyrene compared to the
11 metal oxides.

12 Comparing the numbers of attached cells on the studied surfaces (Fig. 7) with their
13 respective planktonic phase growth (Fig. 3) suggests that a high number of cells in the
14 planktonic phase does not necessarily correspond to extensive cell attachment and biofilm
15 formation.

16 The hydrophobic nature of the *Rhodococcus* strains, RC92 and RC291, is a likely
17 reason for their negligible attachment to hydrophilic minerals. Nevertheless, hydrophobicity
18 does not fully explain their attachment pattern to the hydrophobic reference polystyrene
19 surface and the clear differences in biofilm morphology seen between these two strains (Figs
20 6 d, h). A previous study ⁴ suggests that lipophilic macromolecules of RC92 and RC291 cell
21 walls play a key role in their attachment to hydrophobic polystyrene surfaces. These
22 macromolecules associate differently with cells, which consequently influences cell
23 attachment and biofilm proliferation on hydrophobic surfaces. For RC291, polar and non-
24 polar lipids are closely associated with the cells that facilitate cell attachment to hydrophobic
25 surfaces and cell-cell interactions. In contrast, although RC92 produces large numbers of

1 diverse extracellular lipophilic molecules, these materials are not closely associated with the
2 cells and can be detached and released to the medium. Therefore, the ability to retain
3 extracellular lipophilic materials is a likely element that shapes the attachment phenotypes of
4 RC92 and RC291.⁴

5 Pse1 and Pse2, despite similarities in their genetics, attach differently to polystyrene.
6 They show similar attachment morphologies, but the number of cells attached to the
7 polystyrene surface is notably higher for Pse1. The difference in the extent of attachment to
8 the studied surfaces, and the considerable biofilm formation of these hydrophilic strains on
9 the hydrophobic polystyrene surface, can be attributed to their specific physiological features.
10 ⁵¹ Other studies,^{4,44} using microscopic and spectroscopic analyses in addition to studying cell
11 attachments under treatment with D-Nase1, have revealed that for the *Pseudomonas* species
12 the extracellular DNA (eDNA) determines the difference between Pse1 and Pse2 attachment
13 patterns. The presence of eDNA enhances Pse1 adhesion to a hydrophobic surface.

14 The *Sphingomonas* strains' adhesion patterns to hydrophobic polystyrene and
15 hydrophilic mineral surfaces are compatible. The *Sphingomonas* species has Gram-negative
16 strains, these are unique compared to other Gram-negatives. Instead of lipopolysaccharide
17 (LPS) *Sphingomonaceae spp.*, bacterial strains have glycosphingolipids (GSL), which are a
18 subgroup of glycolipids (lipids that are linked to a carbohydrate chain). They contain the
19 sphingosine, an amino alcohol, moiety. These chemical structures are amphiphilic, having
20 both hydrophobic and hydrophilic parts, the molecules generally have similarities to the
21 physicochemical and functional properties of lipopolysaccharides.^{52,53} The amphiphilic
22 characteristi of these *Sphingomonas spp.* Cell-surface molecules can probably facilitate the
23 attachment of these strains to both hydrophobic and hydrophilic surfaces. Similar biofilm
24 formation patterns of Sph2 on a polystyrene surface have been reported before.^{4,9} However,
25 this characteristic does not explain the poor Sph2 attachment to mineral surfaces. The

1 polystyrene surface charge is neutral,¹⁰ so electrostatic interactions can only play a negligible
2 role in Sph2 attachment to this surface. Unlike hydrophobic polystyrene, mineral surfaces are
3 hydrophilic with a positive surface charge¹⁰ in pH of the experiment. The expected PZC of
4 Sph2 under the experimental condition, pH 6.5, is negative and attractive cell-mineral
5 electrostatic interaction is anticipated to support cell attachment and biofilm formation. This
6 is contrary to the observed pattern. To investigate these discrepancies further, additional
7 experiments were performed to determine if medium ionic strength affects the electrostatic
8 interactions between two hydrophilic entities.

9 Sph2 zeta potential was measured using a zeta potential analyzer (Zeta Plus,
10 Brookhaven Instruments, Huntsville, NY). Zeta potential can be defined as the electrical
11 potential difference when there is interference between a bulk aqueous medium and a static
12 fluid attached to a bacterial cell.⁵⁴

13 Figure 8a shows zeta potential values for a Sph2 strain suspended in 1 mM of KCl. As
14 can be seen, this bacterial strain shows negative surface potential at circa neutral pH values.
15 This agrees with previously published research indicating that bacterial cells often have a
16 relatively low PZC and carry a negative surface charge in natural media.^{5,10,23,24,48}
17 Nevertheless, this result cannot explain the attachment behaviour of Sph2 on positively
18 charged metal-oxide surfaces.

19 In this research, cell attachments were evaluated after 96 hours of incubation. During
20 this time, bacterial cells, immersed in an AB10 medium, were exposed to metal oxides and
21 polystyrene surfaces. To evaluate the effect of incubation time on cell surface charge, Sph2
22 cells were harvested from the planktonic phase of hematite plates at the end of incubation and
23 their PZC were measured in 1mM of KCl (pH \approx 6.5). The result was consistent with previous
24 zeta potential measurement and was approximately -20 ± 3 mV. This test could not be

1 successfully performed for cells attached to a hematite surface as sampling these cells was
2 not feasible without removing the hematite coating deposited.

3 The AB10 medium is relatively high in ionic content and has an ionic strength (IS)
4 value of 196.08 mM. Different studies show that increasing ionic strength leads to shrinkage
5 of the diffuse double layer length around a charged colloidal particle, consequently
6 hampering the effects of electrostatic interaction within a specific distance from the surface.
7 Chen and Walker (2007)⁵⁴ showed that changing the ionic strength from 1 mM to 100 mM
8 using KCl as the electrolyte caused considerable changes in bacterial cell surface potential.
9 Considering this possibility, the zeta potential of Sph2 (planktonic) was measured in a
10 suspension of AB10 medium with lower levels of ionic strength. NaCl has the highest
11 concentration in this medium (please see supporting information (SI)), and reducing the
12 original ionic strength, from 196.08mM to 98.8 mM and 19.06mM, was achieved by
13 changing this electrolyte concentration in the AB10.

14 The results of this experiment are shown in Figure 8b. As seen, there was an
15 approximately 20 mV difference between the measured zeta potential for a cell suspension in
16 AB10 medium (identical to the attached growth experimental conditions) and an Sph2 cell
17 suspension in 1mM of KCl. The cell surface charge was less negative and close to zero in the
18 AB10 medium compared to 1mM of KCl. This result may explain the notable attachment of
19 Sph2 to the polystyrene surface. The attraction forces due to electrostatic interactions might
20 have made a negligible contribution to attachment, since the surface charge of the polystyrene
21 and the effective surface charge of the bacterial strain were close to zero under the
22 experiment's conditions. Therefore, attachment was probably governed by hydrophobicity.
23 This case is supported by the fact that the outer cell-wall components of Sph2 are amphiphilic
24 in nature, and this allows bacterial cells to attach and form a biofilm on a hydrophobic
25 surface. This might also have been reinforced by the complexation of the charged groups on

1 the outer cell wall macromolecules, due to the presence of positively charged ions in the
2 AB10, leading to conformational changes in the macromolecules. As a result, hydrophobic
3 moieties might be more exposed to the ambient environment and facilitate adhesion to a
4 hydrophobic surface.

5 This finding underlines the role of the growth medium's ionic strength. It also sheds
6 light on the anomalies observed when studying Sph2 attachment to minerals and why cell-
7 adhesion patterns are not consistent with the expected electrostatic attraction that should exist
8 between Sph2 and metal-oxide surfaces. Considering the aforementioned facts, changing the
9 ionic strength and consequently Sph2 surface potential should lead to different attachment
10 behaviour. Reducing the ionic strength and altering the Sph2 surface potential (from close to
11 neutral to $\approx -20\text{mV}$) should cause a considerable increase in the number of cells attaching to
12 positively charged metal oxides. Figure 9 shows the biofilm formation of Sph2 on a hematite
13 surface in three different ionic strength conditions (pH = 6.5). Figure 10 shows the numbers
14 of Sph2 cells attached to a hematite surface after 96 hours of incubation at three different
15 ionic strengths. As can be seen, when the ionic strength was reduced by a factor of ten, the
16 number of the cells attached to the hematite increased approximately tenfold. The difference
17 in Sph2 surface potential under these two conditions is approximately -20mV , which
18 reinforces the electrostatic attraction between positively charged hematite and a negatively
19 charged Sph2 surface.

20 In this research, biofilm formations on synthetic mineral surfaces of iron and
21 aluminium oxides were studied under controlled laboratory conditions. The coating method,
22 deposition of metal oxide colloidal particles from a suspension onto a cell-culture polystyrene
23 surface, proved to be a simple but reliable approach for this purpose. This technique can be
24 used in future studies to create multi-component surfaces that better represent the complexity
25 of available mineral surfaces in nature. The novel imaging method developed for this

1 research also indicates that direct, non-invasive and in situ imaging using a water-dipping
2 objective and Syto9 stain is a good alternative to crystal violet assay that is frequently used
3 for studying biofilm formation.

4 The planktonic phase of environmental isolates suggest that these were not affected
5 by the surface properties of hematite, goethite, aluminium hydroxide or model polystyrene.
6 Planktonic-phase growth was better in the medium with a glucose-carbon source treatment
7 compared to potassium acetate.

8 The experimental results suggest that cell-adhesion predictions based on the effects of
9 electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions are likely to show discrepancies when compared to
10 real attachment behaviour. In natural environments, the available surfaces for cell adhesion
11 and biofilm formation, and the bacterial cell surface itself, are not pristine but affected by the
12 ionic composition of the media, e.g. marine and groundwater environments. The dramatic
13 increase in the number of Sph2 attached cells to the hematite surface, by changing the
14 solution ionic strength, is a prime example of this effect; reducing the growth medium's ionic
15 strength from ≈ 200 mM to ≈ 20 mM resulted in ten times more attached cells

16 This research also demonstrates that the presence of a high number of bacterial cells
17 in the planktonic phase does not necessarily represent extensive cell attachment and biofilm
18 formation on surfaces. This finding is significant because in engineered bioremediation a
19 high number of bacterial cells in the planktonic phase is often considered to be a good
20 indication of the extent of biofilm formation in aquifers. The results suggest that when
21 engineered solutions are planned, realistic predictions of bioremediation are only possible if
22 the physicochemical properties of bacterial cells and mineral surfaces and the ionic strength
23 of aquifer media are thoroughly characterized.

24

25

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

Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version. Potentiometric titration of synthetic minerals, water-drop contact-angle measurements and XRD and FTIR spectra of synthetic minerals are available in this section. In addition, XPS spectra of the reference polystyrene and metal-oxide coated surfaces, details of the AB10 growth medium's ionic content, the planktonic growth and biofilm formation of RC92, RC291, Pse1, Pse2, Sph1 and Sph2 bacterial strains when incubated under a KAc carbon source treatment are provided.

References

- (1) Elliott, D. R.; Scholes, J. D.; Thornton, S. F.; Rizoulis, A.; Banwart, S. A.; Rolfe, S. A. Dynamic changes in microbial community structure and function in phenol-degrading microcosms inoculated with cells from a contaminated aquifer. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **2010**, *71* (2), 247–259.
- (2) Fingerman, M. *Bioremediation of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems*; CRC Press, 2016.
- (3) Kanematsu, H.; Barry, D. M. Environmental Problems: Soil and Underground Water Treatment and Bioremediation. In *Biofilm and Materials Science*; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2015; pp 117–123.
- (4) Andrews, J. S.; Rolfe, S. A.; Huang, W. E.; Scholes, J. D.; Banwart, S. A. Biofilm formation in environmental bacteria is influenced by different macromolecules depending on genus and species. *Environ. Microbiol.* **2010**, *12*, 2496–2507.
- (5) Ojeda, J. J.; Romero-Gonzalez, M. E.; Bachmann, R. T.; Edyvean, R. G. J.; Banwart, S. A.; Building, F. M.; Uni, T.; Street, M.; Sheffield, S.; Kingdom, U. Characterization of the cell surface and cell wall chemistry of drinking water bacteria by combining XPS, FTIR spectroscopy, modeling, and potentiometric titrations. *Langmuir* **2008**, *24* (8), 4032–4040.
- (6) Karunakaran, E.; Mukherjee, J.; Ramalingam, B.; Biggs, C. A. “Biofilmology”: a multidisciplinary review of the study of microbial biofilms. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2011**, *90* (6), 1869–1881.
- (7) Salerno, M. B.; Logan, B. E.; Velegol, D. Importance of molecular details in predicting bacterial adhesion to hydrophobic surfaces. *Langmuir* **2004**, *20*, 10625–10629.
- (8) Kwon, K. D.; Vadillo-Rodriguez, V.; Logan, B. E.; Kubicki, J. D. Interactions of biopolymers with silica surfaces: Force measurements and electronic structure calculation studies. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **2006**, *70*, 3803–3819.
- (9) Geoghegan, M.; Andrews, J. S.; Biggs, C. A.; Eboigbodin, K. E.; Elliott, D. R.; Rolfe, S.; Scholes, J.; Ojeda, J. J.; Romero-Gonzalez, M. E.; Edyvean, R. G. J.; et al. The polymer physics and chemistry of microbial cell attachment and adhesion. *Faraday Discuss* **2008**, *139*, 28–85–420.
- (10) Pouran, H. M.; Banwart, S. a.; Romero-Gonzales, M.; Romero-Gonzalez, M.; Romero-Gonzales, M. Coating a polystyrene well-plate surface with synthetic hematite, goethite and aluminium hydroxide for cell mineral adhesion studies in a controlled environment. *Appl. Geochemistry* **2014**, *42* (1986), 60–68.

- 1 (11) Rizoulis, A.; Elliott, D. R.; Rolfe, S. A.; Thornton, S. F.; Banwart, S. A.; Pickup, R. W.;
2 Scholes, J. D. Diversity of planktonic and attached bacterial communities in a phenol-
3 contaminated sandstone aquifer. *Microb Ecol* **2013**, *66* (1), 84–95.
- 4 (12) Crawford, R.; Webb, H.; Truong, V.; Hasan, J. Surface topographical factors influencing
5 bacterial attachment. *Adv. colloid* **2012**.
- 6 (13) Zhang, X.; Zhang, Q.; Yan, T.; Jiang, Z. Quantitatively Predicting Bacterial Adhesion Using
7 Surface Free Energy Determined with a Spectrophotometric Method. *Sci. Technol.* **2015**.
- 8 (14) Lyon, D.; Vogel, T. Bioaugmentation for groundwater remediation: an overview.
9 *Bioaugmentation Groundw. Remediat.* **2013**.
- 10 (15) Scow, K. M.; Hicks, K. A. Natural attenuation and enhanced bioremediation of organic
11 contaminants in groundwater. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* **2005**, *16* (3), 246–253.
- 12 (16) Shephard, J. J.; Savory, D. M.; Bremer, P. J.; McQuillan, A. J. Salt Modulates Bacterial
13 Hydrophobicity and Charge Properties Influencing Adhesion of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*
14 (PA01) in Aqueous Suspensions. *Langmuir* **2010**, *26*, 8659–8665.
- 15 (17) and, L.-C. X.; Logan*, B. E. Interaction Forces Measured Using AFM between Colloids and
16 Surfaces Coated with Both Dextran and Protein. **2006**.
- 17 (18) Stumm, W.; Morgan, J. J. Aquatic chemistry, chemical equilibria and rates in natural waters.
18 **1996**.
- 19 (19) Dixon, J. B.; Weed, S. B. Minerals in Soil Environment. *SSSA B. Ser.* **1992**.
- 20 (20) Huang, P. M.; Li, Y.; Sumner, M. E. (Malcolm E. . *Handbook of soil sciences : properties and*
21 *processes*; CRC Press, 2012.
- 22 (21) Li, B.; Logan, B. E. Bacterial adhesion to glass and metal-oxide surfaces. **2004**, *36*, 81–90.
- 23 (22) Moradi, M.; Song, Z.; Nie, X.; Yan, M.; Hu, F. Q. Investigation of bacterial attachment and
24 biofilm formation of two different *Pseudoalteromonas* species: Comparison of different
25 methods. *Int. J. Adhes. Adhes.* **2016**, *65*, 70–78.
- 26 (23) Ojeda, J. J.; Romero-Gonzalez, M. E.; Pouran, H. M.; Banwart, S. a.; Romero-Gonzales, M.
27 E.; Lane, B. In situ monitoring of the biofilm formation of *Pseudomonas putida* on hematite
28 using flow-cell ATR-FTIR spectroscopy to investigate the formation of inner-sphere bonds
29 between the bacteria and the mineral. *Mineral. Mag.* **2008**, *72* (1), 101–106.
- 30 (24) Claessens, J.; van Lith, Y.; Laverman, A. M.; Van Cappellen, P. Acid-base activity of live
31 bacteria: Implications for quantifying cell wall charge. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **2006**, *70*,
32 267–276.
- 33 (25) Lalonde, S. V.; Smith, D. S.; Owtrim, G. W.; Konhauser, K. O. Acid-base properties of
34 cyanobacterial surfaces I: Influences of growth phase and nitrogen metabolism on cell surface
35 reactivity. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **2008**, *72*, 1257–1268.
- 36 (26) Yee, N.; Benning, L. G.; Phoenix, V. R.; Ferris, F. G. Characterization of metal-cyanobacteria
37 sorption reactions: A combined macroscopic and infrared spectroscopic investigation. *Env. Sci*
38 *Technol* **2004**, *38*, 775–782.
- 39 (27) Vijayaraghavan, K.; Yun, Y. S. Bacterial biosorbents and biosorption. *Biotechnol. Adv.* **2008**,
40 *26*, 266–291.
- 41 (28) Kapetas, L.; Ngwenya, B. T.; Macdonald, A. M.; Elphick, S. C. Kinetics of bacterial
42 potentiometric titrations: The effect of equilibration time on buffering capacity of *Pantoea*
43 *agglomerans* suspensions. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2011**, *359*, 481–486.
- 44 (29) French, S.; Puddephatt, D.; Habash, M.; Glasauer, S. The dynamic nature of bacterial surfaces:
45 Implications for metal–membrane interaction. *Crit. Rev. Microbiol.* **2013**, *39* (2), 196–217.
- 46 (30) Penners, N. H. G.; Koopal, L. K. Preparation And Optical-Properties Of Homodisperse
47 Hematite Hydrosols. *Colloids And Surfaces* **1986**, *19*, 337–349.
- 48 (31) Schwertmann, U.; Cornell, R. M.; Wiley InterScience (Online service). *Iron oxides in the*
49 *laboratory : preparation and characterization*; Wiley-VCH, 2008.
- 50 (32) Tang, B.; Ge, J. C.; Zhuo, L. H.; Wang, G. L.; Niu, J. Y.; Shi, Z. Q.; Dong, Y. B. A facile and
51 controllable synthesis of gamma-Al₂O₃ nanostructures without a surfactant. *Eur. J. Inorg.*
52 *Chem.* **2005**, 4366–4369.
- 53 (33) Cornell, R. M.; Schwertmann, U. The Iron Oxides: Structure, Properties, Reactions,
54 Occurrences and Uses Second, Completely Revised and Extended Edition. **2003**.
- 55 (34) Costanzo, P. M.; Wu, W.; Giese, R. F.; Vanoss, C. J. Comparison Between Direct-Contact

- 1 Angle Measurements And Thin-Layer Wicking On Synthetic Monosized Cuboid Hematite
2 Particles. *Langmuir* **1995**, *11*, 1827–1830.
- 3 (35) Costanzo, P. M.; Wu, W.; Giese, R. F. Comparison between Direct Contact Angle
4 Measurements and Thin Layer Wicking on Synthetic Monosized Cuboid Hematite Particles.
5 **1996**, No. 7, 1827–1830.
- 6 (36) Lu, H. B.; Liao, L.; Li, J. C.; Shuai, M.; Liu, Y. L. Hematite nanochain networks: Simple
7 synthesis, magnetic properties, and surface wettability. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2008**, *92*, 19–21.
- 8 (37) Förch, R.; Schönherr, H.; Jenkins, A. T. A. *Surface design : applications in bioscience and
9 nanotechnology*; Wiley-VCH, 2009.
- 10 (38) Rosenberg, M.; Gutnick, D.; Rosenberg, E. Adherence Of Bacteria To Hydrocarbons - A
11 Simple Method For Measuring Cell-Surface Hydrophobicity. *Fems Microbiol. Lett.* **1980**, *9*,
12 29–33.
- 13 (39) Busscher, H. J.; Belt-Gritter, B. van de; Mei, H. C. van der. Implications of microbial adhesion
14 to hydrocarbons for evaluating cell surface hydrophobicity - 1. Zeta potentials of hydrocarbon
15 droplets. *Colloids Surfaces B Biointerfaces* **1995**, *3–4* (5), 111–116.
- 16 (40) Pablos, C.; van Grieken, R.; Marugán, J.; Chowdhury, I.; Walker, S. L. Study of bacterial
17 adhesion onto immobilized TiO₂: Effect on the photocatalytic activity for disinfection
18 applications. *Catal. Today* **2013**, *209*, 140–146.
- 19 (41) CM0906, R2A Agar | Oxoid - Product Detail
20 http://www.oxoid.com/UK/blue/prod_detail/prod_detail.asp?pr=CM0906.
- 21 (42) Tolker-nielsen, T. I. M.; Brinch, U. C.; Ragas, P. C.; Andersen, J. B. O.; Jacobsen, C. S.;
22 Molin, S. Development and dynamics of Pseudomonas sp biofilms. *J. Bacteriol.* **2000**, *182*
23 (22), 6482–6489.
- 24 (43) Elliott, D. R.; Scholes, J. D.; Thornton, S. F.; Rizoulis, A.; Banwart, S. A.; Rolfe, S. A.
25 Dynamic changes in microbial community structure and function in phenol-degrading
26 microcosms inoculated with cells from a contaminated aquifer. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **2009**,
27 *71* (2).
- 28 (44) Andrews, J. S.; Pouran, H. M.; Scholes, J.; Rolfe, S. A.; Banwart, S. A. Multi-factorial
29 analysis of surface interactions in single species environmental bacteria and model surfaces.
30 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **2009**, *73*, A44–A44.
- 31 (45) Acid, N.; Sampler, S. SYTO ® Green-Fluorescent Nucleic Acid Stains. **2008**, *33342*, 1–7.
- 32 (46) Suwarno, S. R.; Hanada, S.; Chong, T. H.; Goto, S.; Henmi, M.; Fane, A. G. The effect of
33 different surface conditioning layers on bacterial adhesion on reverse osmosis membranes.
34 *Desalination* **2016**, *387*, 1–13.
- 35 (47) Falcon Polystyrene Microplates 12-well; Standard tissue culture; Flat-bottom;
36 <https://www.fishersci.com/shop/products/falcon-tissue-culture-plates-12-well-standard-tissue-culture-flat-bottom-growth-area-3-8cm2-well-volume-6ml-1-tray/0877229>.
- 37 (48) Leone, L.; Ferri, D.; Manfredi, C.; Persson, P.; Shchukarev, A.; Sjoberg, S.; Loring, J.
38 Modeling the acid-base properties of bacterial surfaces: A combined spectroscopic and
39 potentiometric study of the gram-positive bacterium Bacillus subtilis. *Env. Sci Technol* **2007**,
40 *41*, 6465–6471.
- 41 (49) Bouchez-Naitali, M.; Vandecasteele, J. P.; Vandecasteele, Æ. J.; Bouchez-nai, M.
42 Biosurfactants, an help in the biodegradation of hexadecane? The case of Rhodococcus and
43 Pseudomonas strains. *World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2008**, *24*, 1901–1907.
- 44 (50) Bouchez-nai, M.; Blanchet, D.; Bouchez-Naitali, M.; Blanchet, D.; Bardin, V.; Vandecasteele,
45 J. P. Evidence for interfacial uptake in hexadecane degradation by Rhodococcus equi: the
46 importance of cell flocculation. *Microbiology-Sgm* **2001**, *147*, 2537–2543.
- 47 (51) Huang, W.; Andrews, J.; Wang, Y. Ultrasonic DNA Transfer to Gram-Negative and Gram-
48 Positive Bacteria. *Abstr. Gen. Meet. Am. Soc. Microbiol.* **2008**, *108*, 548.
- 49 (52) Kawahara, K.; Moll, H.; Knirel, Y. A.; Seydel, U.; Zahringer, U. Structural analysis of two
50 glycosphingolipids from the lipopolysaccharide-lacking bacterium Sphingomonas capsulata.
51 *Eur. J. Biochem.* **2000**, *267*, 1837–1846.
- 52 (53) Pruet, S. T.; Bushnev, A.; Hagedorn, K.; Adiga, M.; Haynes, C. A.; Sullards, M. C.; Liotta, D.
53 C.; Merrill, A. H. Biodiversity of sphingoid bases ("sphingosines") and related
54 amino alcohols. *J. Lipid Res.* **2008**, *49* (8), 1621–1639.
- 55

1 (54) Chen, G. X.; Walker, S. L. Role of solution chemistry and ion valence on the adhesion kinetics
2 of groundwater and marine bacteria. *Langmuir* **2007**, *23*, 7162–7169.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 **Legends to Figures**

2 **Figure 1.** Schematic representation of the main mechanisms involved in biofilm formation.

3 **Figure 2.** Schematic representation of incubating polystyrene and mineral-coated 12-well
4 plates and directly imaging the strains attached to the studied surfaces. (a) Depicts confined
5 lateral movements of the water-dipping objective due to the well's sides. As seen, a circle of
6 diameter 11 mm located at the centre of each well's base was imaged for the studied
7 substrata. (b) Shows direct imaging of the aluminium hydroxide-coated plates. (c) Illustrates
8 the function of Z-height focusing, Z stacking, used in evaluating biofilm formation. This
9 method was used for dense biofilms to better assess the numbers of cells attached to
10 polystyrene and mineral surfaces.

11

12 **Figure 3.** Total numbers of cells in the planktonic phase for mineral-coated and reference
13 polystyrene plates after 96 hours of incubation in AB10 medium with a glucose carbon
14 source.

15

16 **Figure 4.** RC92 and RC291 attachments to mineral and polystyrene surfaces, a–d refer to
17 RC92 and e–h refer to RC291 adhesion to hematite, goethite, aluminium hydroxide and
18 polystyrene, respectively (AB10 medium with glucose carbon sources, ionic strength =
19 196.08mM, pH= 6.5).

20 **Figure 5.** Pse1 and Pse2 attachment to mineral and polystyrene surfaces, a–d refer to Pse1
21 and e–h refer to Pse2 adhesion to hematite, goethite, aluminium hydroxide and polystyrene,
22 respectively (AB10 medium with glucose carbon sources, ionic strength = 196.08mM, pH=
23 6.5).

24 **Figure 6.** Sph1 and Sph2 attachment to mineral and polystyrene surfaces, a–d refer to Sph1
25 and e–h refer to Sph2 adhesion to hematite, goethite, aluminium hydroxide and polystyrene,
26 respectively (AB10 medium with glucose carbon sources, ionic strength = 196.08mM, pH=
27 6.5).

28 **Figure 7.** Total number of bacterial cells attached to mineral-coated polystyrene and
29 polystyrene surfaces after 96 hours of incubation in AB10 medium with a glucose carbon
30 source.


31 **Figure 8.** (a) Zeta potential of Sph2 strain suspended in 1 mM of KCl at different pH values.
32 (b). Variations of the zeta potential of Sph2 strain in AB10 medium at different ionic
33 strengths.

34 **Figure 9.** Attachment of Sph2 to a hematite surface under different ionic strengths (a; IS
35 =196.08 mM, b; IS = 98.08 mM, c; IS = 19.06 mM).

36 **Figure 10.** Quantified number of cells attached to hematite after 96 hours of incubation under
37 different ionic strength (IS) conditions.





1 **Table 1.** Summarizes bacterial strains; RC92, RC291, Pse1, Pse2, Sph1 and Sph2 adhesion
2 morphologies to polystyrene and mineral surfaces.

3
4
5



6
7 **Figure 1**

8
9
10



1
2 **Figure 2**

3





Figure 3


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

1




2
3

Figure 4




1
2 **Figure 5**



1
2 **Figure 6**

1





2

3


Figure 7

4




1
2 **Figure 8**

3
4
5
6
7
8
9



1
2 **Figure 9**

3



4
5 **Figure 10**

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1
2
3
4

Table 1

Attachment Surface Bacterial Strain	Hematite Hydrophilic PZC=7.5	Goethite Hydrophilic PZC=8.5	Aluminum Hydroxide Hydrophilic PZC=8.9	Polystyrene Hydrophilic Neutral
RC92 Hydrophobic, PZC<6.5	Negligible cell attachment	Negligible cell attachment	Negligible cell attachment	Dispersed chain-shape biofilm
RC291 Hydrophobic, PZC<6.5	Negligible cell attachment	Negligible cell attachment	Negligible cell attachment	Highly structured biofilm
Pse1 Hydrophilic, PZC<6.5	Extensive cell clusters	Extensive cell clusters	Extensive cell clusters	Sparse micro-colonies
Pse2 Hydrophilic, PZC<6.5	Extensive cell clusters	Extensive cell clusters	Extensive cell clusters	Sparse micro-colonies
Sph1 Hydrophobic, PZC<6.5	Poor, dispersed single-cell attachment	Poor, dispersed single-cell attachment	Poor, dispersed single-cell attachment	Extensive cell attachment
Sph2 Hydrophilic, PZC<6.5	Poor, dispersed single-cell attachment	Poor, dispersed single-cell attachment	Poor, dispersed single-cell attachment	Extensive cell attachment

5
6
7