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INTRODUCTION

A biofilm is a community of microbes embedded in an organic polymer matrix, adhering to a surface (1).

Virtually any surface—animal, mineral, or vegetable—(i.e. biotic or abiotic) is fair game for bacterial colonization and biofilm formation, including ship hulls, dairy and petroleum pipelines, rocks in streams, and medical implants, such as catheters, prosthetic heart valves and joint replacements. Biofilms can also form on the surface of containers used for disinfectants, cleaning buckets, wash-hand basins, contact lenses, thermometers, sutures and dental prosthetics (1, 2).

A diverse number of microorganisms are capable of generating biofilms. *Staphylococcus epidermidis, Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Candida albicans* are important pathogens causing nosocomial infections that produce slime substance and form biofilms in appropriate conditions.

Bacteria in biofilms are phenotypically different from planktonic or suspended cells, notably as they resist killing by antibiotics, biocides, and disinfectants (2, 3).

In some extreme cases, the concentrations of antibiotics required to achieve bactericidal activity against adherent organisms can be three to four orders of magnitude higher than for planktonic bacteria, depending on the species-drug combination (1).

In view of previous findings, the purpose of this study was to compare the activities of disinfectants on biofilms and planktonic cells.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Microorganisms

Clinical isolates of *C. albicans* (*n*=1), coagulase-negative *Staphylococcus* (CoNS) (*n*=1) and *P. aeruginosa* (*n*=1) were used in the experiments. All three isolates were producing slime.

Slime production

Slime production was determined by using a modification of the tube adherence method (4). Sabouraud broth supplemented with glucose (final concentration, 8%) (5) for *C. albicans* and Tr-ypptic soy broth supplemented with glucose (final concentration, 2%) (6, 7) for CoNS and *P. aeruginosa* were prepared to promote adhesion and slime production.

A loopful of organisms was inoculated into a tube containing 10 ml of broth and it was incubated aerobiocically at 37 °C for 48 h. Then the cultures were aspirated. The tubes were washed twice with sterile demineralized water and then stained with 0.25% saf-ranin (8). The tubes were examined for the presence of a viscid
slime layer. A continuous film on the surface of the glass tube was considered positive. Strong slime producing organisms were chosen for the experiments.

**Biofilm formation**

Broth medium for each organism, prepared for slime production as described above, was used for biofilm growth. A standardized inoculum ($1 \times 10^5$ to $5 \times 10^5$ CFU/ml) of each microorganism prepared in broth medium and 10 ml of broth were aliquoted into sterile glass tubes. Small polystyrene coupons (surface area, 1 cm²) were submerged in growth medium in the tubes and then incubated aerobically at 37 °C for 72 h (9). The growth medium was discarded and fresh medium added every 12 h (6).

**Disinfectants and neutralization medium**

The disinfectants used in this study were 10% polyvinylpyrrolidone iodine (PVP) (Adeka), 5% sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) (Sigma) and 2% glutaraldehyde (Antiseptica), and 0.5% sodium thiosulfate (Merck) and 2% glycine (Serva) were used as neutralization medium.

**Treatment of biofilms with disinfectants**

After biofilm formation, the medium was aspirated and polystyrene coupons were removed from the tubes. Non-adherent cells were removed by gently washing the coupons in sterile demineralized water. Then the coupons were submerged in 1 ml of disinfectant in glass tubes and incubated for 5 min at room temperature. After the incubation period, 9 ml of neutralization medium was added to each tube and they were incubated for another 5 min. Then the coupon, which was still in the liquid, was smeared with a cotton swab on both sides, and the tube containing the swab and the coupon was vortexed at full speed for 60 s to remove all biofilm cells from the swab and the surface (9). A 40-fold dilution of the neutralized suspension was made in sterile demineralized water, and 20 μl of the suspension was plated on Tryptic soy agar (TSA) immediately after dilution (9).

**Sensitivity of planktonic cells to disinfectants**

For evaluation of the activities of disinfectants against planktonic cells, 1 ml of bacterial and yeast suspension, which was adjusted to 0.5 McFarland, was added to 9 ml of disinfectant mixture. The mixture was transferred to 9 ml of neutralization medium and allowed to remain in contact for 5 min. A 10-fold dilution was made in sterile demineralized water, and 20 μl of the suspension was plated on TSA immediately after dilution (10).

All experiments were performed in duplicate. Sterile demineralized water was used instead of disinfectant in the control tests. The culture plates were incubated aerobically at 37 °C for 48 h. After incubation, the colonies of the control and assayed microorganisms were counted.

**RESULTS**

We investigated the activities of glutaraldehyde, NaOCl and PVP on planktonic cells and biofilms of slime producing C. albicans, P. aeruginosa and CoNS.

The mean numbers of viable cells, measured by colony formation on TSA plates after removing attached microorganisms from the coupons, were $1.25 \times 10^5$ CFU/cm² for C. albicans, $1.3 \times 10^6$ CFU/cm² for P. aeruginosa, and $3.2 \times 10^7$ CFU/cm² for CoNS. The initial mean densities of cells in the planktonic cell suspensions were $2.5 \times 10^7$ CFU/ml for C. albicans, $2.3 \times 10^8$ CFU/ml for P. aeruginosa, and $1.3 \times 10^8$ CFU/ml for CoNS.

The reduction rates after treatment with disinfectants for 5 min were evaluated as log reduction values. The log reduction was calculated by subtracting the assayed log density from the control log density (10). The log reduction values of tested disinfectants on planktonic cells and biofilms are given in Table 1.

Bacterial exopolysaccharides are the main component of the biofilm glycocalyx, which has also been named the slime layer (1). The glycocalyx provides a certain degree of protection for its inhabitants against certain environmental threats, including biocides, antibiotics, antibodies, surfactants, bacteriophages, and foraging predators such as free-living amoebae and white blood cells (1).

At least three mechanisms have been proposed to account for the increased resistance of biofilms to antimicrobial agents. The first is that the glycocalyx prevented the perfusion of biocides to cellular targets, while the second is that the nearly dormant growth pattern of bacterial populations in the bio-
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**Table 1: Log10 reduction values of tested disinfectants on planktonic cells and biofilms.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. albicans</th>
<th>P. aeruginosa</th>
<th>Staphylococcus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planktonic</td>
<td>Biofilm</td>
<td>Planktonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glutaraldehyde</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaOCl</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVP</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Log10 value for the control–log10 value for the assayed sample*
films rendered organisms indifferent to antibiotic activity. The third is that the microenvironment of the biofilm adversely affected the activity of the antimicrobials (1).

Glutaraldehyde is an important dialdehyde that has found usage as a disinfectant and sterilant, in particular for low-temperature disinfection and sterilization of endoscopes and surgical equipment. The mechanism of action of glutaraldehyde involves a strong association with the outer layers of bacterial cells, specifically with unprotonated amines on the cell surface, possibly representing the reactive sites.

Chlorine- and iodine-based compounds are the most significant microbial halogens used in the clinic, and they have been traditionally used for both antiseptic and disinfectant purposes. Despite being widely studied, the mechanism of action of chlorine-releasing agents (CRAs) is not fully known. CRAs are highly active oxidizing agents and thereby destroy the cellular activity of proteins. Similar to chlorine, the antimicrobial action of iodine is rapid. Iodine rapidly penetrates into microorganisms and attacks key groups of proteins (in particular the free sulfur amino acids cysteine and methionine), nucleotides, and fatty acids, culminating in cell death (11).

In order to prove disinfectant efficiency, there has to be a 5-log reduction in initial cell concentrations. Nevertheless, although this is true for suspension tests, some modifications may be needed for other tests.

Luppens et al. reported that a disinfectant that resulted in more than a 4-log reduction in of biofilm cell concentration (4 × 10^7 to 1.3 × 10^8 CFU/cm^2) should be considered an effective agent on biofilms (9). Wirtanen proposed that for a biofilm test only a 3-log reduction was necessary, but Luppens et al. pointed out that a 3-log reduction is too small for biofilms that can contain up cells to 1.3 × 10^9 CFU/cm^2 (9, 10, 12).

In the present study, all tested disinfectants had high bactericidal activity (>5 logs) on planktonic cell suspensions of the tested microorganisms.

Glutaraldehyde resulted in more than a 5-log reduction on biofilms of all the tested microorganisms. PVP had no effect on C. albicans biofilms and resulted in a 2-log reduction on P. aeruginosa, and a 1-log reduction on CoNS biofilms. However, NaOCl achieved a 3-log reduction on C. albicans (initial cell concentration, 2.5 × 10^8 CFU/cm^2) and P. aeruginosa (initial cell concentration, 2 × 10^8 CFU/cm^2) biofilms. These data indicate that a 3-log reduction was not enough for this NaOCl to prove its efficiency on biofilms of C. albicans and P. aeruginosa according to Luppens et al. (9).

Campanac et al. showed that P. aeruginosa biofilms were resistant, while planktonic cells were sensitive to six quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs) tested, and they noted that the factors involved in biofilm resistance to QACs vary according to the bacterial modifications induced by the formation of a biofilm. They underlined the involvement of the exopolysaccharide and particularly the three-dimensional structure of P. aeruginosa biofilm (10). In addition, biofilms of P. aeruginosa also showed resistance to different antibiotics. Coquet et al. reported that biofilms of P. aeruginosa showed much more resistance to tobramycin and imipenem than planktonic cultures (13). In our study, although high levels of bactericidal activity (>5 logs) were observed against planktonic cells of P. aeruginosa with PVP, NaOCl and glutaraldehyde, bactericidal activity was only obtained with glutaraldehyde against biofilms of this bacterium.

Oie et al. showed that benzalkonium chloride (0.1%) and alkyl-diaminoethyl glycin (0.1%) were ineffective for the eradication of biofilm cells of methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus even after 1 h, but were effective for the eradication of planktonic cells within 20 s. Sodium hypochlorite (0.01%) was also ineffective for the eradication of biofilm cells even after 30 min, but was lethal to planktonic cells within 20 s (14). In agreement with these findings, our results reveal that 5% NaOCl and 10% PVP were ineffective for the eradication of CoNS biofilm but showed bactericidal activity on planktonic cells after 5 min. However, Merritt et al. found that 10% NaOCl was effective on S. epidermidis cells adhered to polystyrene. They reported that 10% NaOCl reduced the number of microorganisms by at least 4-5 logs (15).

Lamfon et al. reported that C. albicans biofilms were ≥1000-fold more resistant to fluconazole and miconazole and eight-fold more resistant to chlorhexidine than the planktonic cells of the same organism (16). Barnabe et al. showed that the combination of coconut soap and 5% NaOCl was effective in controlling C. albicans and Streptococcus mutans denture biofilms (17). Chandra et al. found that MIC values of fluconazole for biofilm-grown C. albicans were 128 times greater than those for planktonic cultures. They stated that it was unclear whether the increase in the drug resistance of C. albicans biofilms was due to the production of extracellular material or to genetic and biochemical alterations in fungal cells; they also proposed an alternative explanation for antifungal resistance in biofilms, namely metabolic quiescence of cells (18).

Standard culture collection strains are more suitable for repeating disinfection tests and obtaining reliable results. However, microorganisms that cause nosocomial infections show much more resistance to antibiotics and antiseptics than the standard strains. The aim of disinfection, especially in hospitals, is to eradicate mostly these resistant microorganisms. Therefore, we preferred to use clinically isolated strains in the disinfectant efficacy tests.

On the basis of these experiments, we conclude that glutaraldehyde is more effective than PVP and NaOCl on biofilms of C. albicans, P. aeruginosa and CoNS. It is plausible to use glutaraldehyde for disinfection of medical devices that have a risk of biofilm formation. NaOCl had little effect and this agent and PVP are not suitable for the disinfection of biofilms.

Different mechanisms can play a role in the resistance of biofilms. Further studies on the disinfection of biofilms and factors promoting biocide resistance will be useful.
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