

A panel of bioluminescent whole-cell bacterial biosensors for the screening for new antibacterial substances from natural extracts



Emmi Poikulainen^{a,*}, Jenni Tienaho^{a,b}, Tytti Sarjala^b, Ville Santala^a

^a Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Tampere University, Hervanta campus, Korkeakoulunkatu 8, 33720 Tampere, Finland

^b Natural Resources Institute Finland, Kaironiementie 15, 39700 Parkano, Finland

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Antibacterial
Bioluminescence
Biosensor cells
High-throughput screening
Natural extracts
Drosera rotundifolia

ABSTRACT

Whole-cell bacterial biosensors can be applied for the screening of antibacterial properties of extracts. We constructed a biosensor panel consisting of four different bacterial biosensor strains: *Escherichia*, *Staphylococcus*, *Acinetobacter* and *Pseudomonas* for expanded screening potential. The functionality of the panel was first evaluated with known antibacterial compounds: ethanol, naphthoquinones (juglone, lawsone, plumbagin) and a flavonoid (quercetin). Natural extracts comprise a vast source of potential new antibacterials for diverse functional purposes. To demonstrate the utilization of the panel for screening of a demanding sample material, round-leaved sundew (*Drosera rotundifolia*) extracts were used as an example. Differences between field- and laboratory originating sundew extracts could be detected. This demonstrates the efficiency of the developed biosensor panel in the rapid screening of the antibacterial properties of plant extracts.

1. Introduction

New antibacterial agents from sustainable and renewable natural sources are globally needed for variable purposes like preservatives in cosmetics, technochemicals, food or feed to replace synthetic preservatives. Furthermore, multi-drug resistant bacteria such as *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* are becoming more serious global problem (Nair et al., 2016; De Bonis et al., 2016; Dhawan et al., 2017; Tenaillon et al., 2010), which emphasizes the need to find novel sources for potential pharmaceutical purposes. To combat these challenges, efficient methods are needed to screen nature-based sources for new antibacterial extracts and compounds.

Bacterial whole-cell biosensors can be used for screening antimicrobial effects. The bacterial biosensors can be constructed by genetic engineering to enhance the usability, for example by adding DNA elements to help recognize antibacterial activities. (Galluzzi and Karp, 2006). One example of the DNA elements is a bacterial luciferase (*luxABCDE*) operon. However, using a single bacterial biosensor strain may give limited information about the antibacterial efficiency, as the activity might differ between bacterial species. Therefore, a biosensor panel consisting of multiple different bacterial biosensor strains can expand the screening potential.

Under normal conditions, the biosensor cells express *luxABCDE* and

produce bioluminescence in a luciferase catalyzed reaction (Vesterlund et al., 2004). Bioluminescence is a useful detection method for the assays, as the light production is specific and detectable using very sensitive equipment. To estimate the sample toxicity, the degree of inhibition of a 'normally on' activity is measured in "lights-off" biosensor assays (Belkin, 2003). When the biosensor cells are cultivated with a cytotoxic compound, the gene transcription and protein translation become less active than without the cytotoxic compounds. As the toxicity increases, the inhibition escalates as well, lowering the intensity of the bioluminescent signal (Cui et al., 2018).

Natural extracts are a vast source of potential new antibacterials. A natural extract can comprise of up to 15,000 diverse metabolites, including both primary and secondary metabolites (Wolfender et al., 2015). Because of the complexity of natural extracts, testing the antimicrobial potential with just one bacterial species reveals only limited information about the full potential. Some previous studies have been made to determine antimicrobial effects of plant extracts on a panel of different bacteria (Rauha et al., 2000; Bacha et al., 2016). However, the methods used in these studies include disc diffusion and broth dilution assays, which are more labor- and time-intensive than using whole-cell bacterial biosensors.

Here, we developed a panel of bioluminescent "lights-off" bacteria and demonstrated its functionality with demanding sample matrices, sundew (*Drosera rotundifolia*) extracts. The panel contained four non-

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: emmi.poikulainen@tuni.fi (E. Poikulainen).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2020.106083>

Received 27 May 2020; Received in revised form 1 October 2020; Accepted 7 October 2020

Available online 14 October 2020

0167-7012/ © 2020 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Table 1
Bacterial strains used in this study.

Strain	Plasmid*	Reference**
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> RN4220	pAT19	Vesterlund et al., 2004
<i>Escherichia coli</i> K12	pCGLS11	Vesterlund et al., 2004
<i>Acinetobacter baylyi</i> ADP1	pBAV1K-T5-LUX	Santala et al., 2016
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i>	pBAV1K-T5-LUX	This study

* The plasmid carrying a bacterial luciferase operon.

** Reference for the construction of biosensor strain.

pathogenic bacterial strains: Gram negative species *E. coli*, *Acinetobacter baylyi*, *Pseudomonas putida* and Gram positive *S. aureus*.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Chemicals

Labema, Finland supplied tryptone and yeast extract. NaCl, KH₂PO₄ were from Merck, USA. Kanamycin was purchased from Janssen, USA; erythromycin from TCI, Japan. K₂HPO₄ was from VWR International, USA. Glycerol, ampicillin sodium salt, juglone, lawsone, plumbagin, quercetin and Murashige-Skoog basal medium were purchased from Sigma Aldrich, USA.

2.2. Bacterial strains

2.3. Cultivation

The bacterial strains (Table 1) were cultivated on lysogeny agar (LA) plates containing tryptone 10 g/L; yeast extract 5 g/L; NaCl 10 g/L, 100 mM PB (phosphate buffer; pH 7.0; total K₂HPO₄ 9.3 g/L; KH₂PO₄ 6.3 g/L) and agar 15 g/L. *A. baylyi* and *P. putida* strain were grown on media supplemented with 50 µg/mL kanamycin, *E. coli* on ampicillin (100 µg/mL) and *S. aureus* on erythromycin (5 µg/mL) to maintain plasmids. *A. baylyi*, *P. putida* and *E. coli* were cultivated in 30 °C and *S. aureus* in 37 °C.

New cultivation plates were prepared weekly and liquid cultivations daily. For liquid cultivations, similar lysogeny broth (LB) media was used, but without agar and without PB for *P. putida*. A single colony was inoculated into each of the sterile tubes containing the described media. The liquid cultivations were incubated overnight in 30 °C and 300 rpm shaking.

2.4. Construction of *P. putida* biosensor strain

The plasmid pBAV1k-T5-LUX was a kind gift from Ichiro Matsumura (Addgene plasmid # 55800, Bryksin and Matsumura, 2010).

P. putida (DSM 291) was cultivated on LA plates (16 h, 30 °C) and in LB medium for overnight culture (30 °C, 300 rpm). The previously described transformation protocol (Meinhardt, 2002) was used with modifications. In brief, LB was used for cultivation. The cells (optical disturbance at 600 nm [OD] 0.7) were harvested by centrifugation (11,200 xg, 2 min) and washed three times with ice cold glycerol (10%). The *P. putida* cells were electroporated with BIO-RAD Micropulser™ (Bio-Rad Laboratories Inc., USA). Prewarmed LB was added after the electroporation, the cells were revived for 90 min in 30 °C and plated for cultivation on selective LA plates.

2.5. Sundew propagation and extraction

Field-grown sundews were collected from two peatlands (Peatland 1; Lehtolamminneva N 62°6.01' E 22°57.22', and Peatland 2; Kivineva N 61°57.77' E 23°23.98') in Western Finland. The vegetatively

reproduced sundew tissue was initiated from a small sundew seedling which was multiplied on half-strength Murashige-Skoog nutrient agar medium (Murashige and Skoog, 1962). It was stored in freezer until extraction. Sundew plants and tissues were extracted with 100% ethanol (EtOH; 0.15 g fresh weight plant tissue/mL EtOH) after grounding in a mortar.

The extracts were air- and N₂ dried. The extracts were left to evaporate in open vials in a fume hood in room temperature for 6 days. To speed the drying process, N₂ gas was led into the vials using a separate outlet for each vial for 4–6 h, until all EtOH was removed. The dried extracts were stored in –20 °C and dissolved into sterile double distilled water (DDW). The sample dilutions were stored in –20 °C between the test runs and new dilutions prepared weekly.

2.6. Test assay runs

For the validation of the developed biosensor cell panel, the effects of EtOH, naphthoquinones and quercetin were tested. Concentrations of 0.33, 1.7, and 17 v/v-% (volume percentage) per well were used, prepared by diluting EtOH in DDW. DDW was used as a blank control sample. For juglone, the tested concentrations per well were 3.1, 6.3, 13, 25 µg/mL; for lawsone 43, 85, 170, 340 µg/mL; for plumbagin 0.13, 0.26, 0.52, 1.0 µg/mL; and for quercetin 5.0, 10, 20, 100 µg/mL. Fresh dilutions of naphthoquinones and quercetin were prepared weekly. The sundew extracts were tested in concentrations with 0.2, 0.4, and 0.8 mg/mL of plant material dry weight per well.

An aliquot of 50 µL of the samples were pipetted in triplicate into the wells of a 96-well, opaque white plate (Corning, USA). Liquid cultivation (OD 1.3–2.0 depending on the species), diluted 1:1 in fresh LB (100 µL) was added to the wells. The bioluminescence measurement was started immediately. A new measurement was done every 5 min until 90 min of incubation time had passed with Fluoroskan Ascent FL (Thermo Scientific, USA) microplate reader (room temperature).

The results are represented in Figs. 1–3 as inhibition-% (inhibition percentages). They were calculated as the percentage change of the sample wells' average from the average of blank wells after an incubation time, here 50 min. Negative change indicates an increase of signal in sample wells compared to the blank wells, whereas positive inhibition-% indicates a decrease in signal. The error bars in Figs. 1–3 represent the CV-% (coefficient of variation) of the sample wells. The SNR (signal-to-noise-ratios) were calculated by dividing the highest




Fig. 1. Inhibition percentages (%) for biosensor panel strains incubated with EtOH after 50 min of incubation. Error bars represent CV-%, v/v-% is percentage by volume.




Fig. 2. Inhibition percentages (-%) caused by naphthoquinones and quercetin after 50 min of incubation. A) Juglone. B) Lawsone. C) Plumbagin. D) Quercetin. Error bars represent CV-%.




Fig. 2. (continued)

signal of microplate at 50-min measurement by previously determined average signal of two medium-only samples (data not shown).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Initial validation of panel

First, it was confirmed that all strains produce a measurable light signal. The SNRs in increasing order were *S. aureus* (8.78), *P. putida* (99.9), *A. baylyi* (1685) and *E. coli* (5996), indicating the order of their ranges as well. Although the pAT19 plasmid carrying bacterial luciferase operon is optimized for *S. aureus* (Vesterlund et al., 2004), the other strains produced clearly higher SNRs in the studied conditions.

Then, the functionality of the biosensor strains was tested with EtOH. Based on the time resolved data (Supplementary Figs. S1–S4), the time point of 50 min incubation was chosen to ensure adequate reaction time for the different species. As expected, the inhibition response was dose-dependent, as increasing ethanol concentrations caused increasing inhibition (Fig. 1, showing results after 50 min of




Fig. 2. (continued)




Fig. 2. (continued)

incubation).

The inhibition-% of *E. coli* and *A. baylyi* biosensors caused by 0.3% and 1.7% EtOH were 0.5, 3.4, -0.7 and 4.2% respectively. For example, *A. baylyi* can utilize EtOH as a carbon source and 0.38% concentration has been used for cultivations (Salcedo-Vite et al., 2019). However, *S. aureus* and *P. putida* were more sensitive towards ethanol: both sensors showed approximately 30 inhibition-% after 50 min of incubation with 0.3%.

3.2. Testing the panel with pure plant metabolites

The panel was used to measure inhibition caused by plant metabolites, which have previously demonstrated antibacterial effects. The metabolites included both naphthoquinones and quercetin (Paper et al., 2005; Jaisinghani, 2017), a flavonoid. The tested naphthoquinones were juglone, lawsone and plumbagin (Mahapatra et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2016; Rahmoun et al., 2012; Paiva et al., 2003). Previously reported minimal inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of the metabolites are found in Supplementary Table S1.

Our biosensor panel gave a comparable result with the reported MIC value for juglone (Fig. 2A), where 25 µg/mL inhibited *S. aureus* by 86%.




Fig. 3. Inhibition percentages (-%) caused by *Drosera rotundifolia* extracts for biosensor panel strains after 50 min of incubation. Error bars represent CV-%. A) *S. aureus*. B) *E. coli*. C) *A. baylyi*. D) *P. putida*.




Fig. 3. (continued)




Fig. 3. (continued)




Fig. 3. (continued)

However, differences are seen in lawsone (Fig. 2B) tests, for example *E. coli* sensor was inhibited 91% by only 170 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ of lawsone, suggesting that less than 512 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ is needed to fully inhibit the cellular processes of *E. coli*. On the other hand, 1.0 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ of plumbagin (Fig. 2C) and 20 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ of quercetin (Fig. 2D), comparable concentrations to the previously reported MICs, only inhibited *S. aureus* in our panel by approximately 50%. However, it should be noted that MIC tests measure the lowest concentration that inhibits bacterial growth (Wiegand et al., 2008), while the developed panel measures the toxicity effects towards the bioluminescence production.

Each of the bacterial strains in the panel showed a unique response to the pure plant metabolites. This could be caused by various factors, such as the cell wall differences, which affect for example the transfer of substances into the cells. A G+ (Gram positive) species, *S. aureus*, has two cell wall layers, as opposed to one layer of G- (Gram negative) bacteria (Vollmer and Seligman, 2010). Thus, the biosensor panel helps in the assessment and differentiation of the substances' effects on the bacteria.

3.3. Demonstrating the panel's functionality with sundew extracts

As a proof of concept, antibacterial effects of sundew (*Drosera rotundifolia*) extract, which is known to contain antibacterial flavonoids such as quercetin (Paper et al., 2005), were tested by the biosensor panel. The biosensor strains reacted differently to the sundew extracts (Fig. 3).

No significant differences ($P > 0.1$, Student's unpaired *t*-test for mean of all concentrations) could be detected with *P. putida* biosensor between the sundew extracts from the two peatlands (Fig. 3D). The extract from vegetatively propagated sundew tissue showed lower inhibition-% than Peatland 1 ($P < 0.05$ for all concentrations) and Peatland 2 ($P < 0.01$ for all concentrations). The effects of peatland sundew extracts were dose dependent in the whole panel, except of the effect on *S. aureus* (Fig. 3A) at 0.42 mg/mL. The most sensitive species to field-grown sundew extracts was *E. coli* (Fig. 3B) as even 0.21 mg/mL inhibited the growth approximately by 80%. *P. putida* was not inhibited but stimulated by 0.21 mg/mL and was also overall the most tolerant of the G- bacteria.

The extracts of laboratory grown sundew caused a different response compared to the field-originating extracts. *A. baylyi* (Fig. 3C) showed dose dependent inhibition to the laboratory sundew extracts, but 0.83 mg/mL caused approximately as much inhibition as 0.21 mg/mL of the peatland sundew extract (40%). *S. aureus* was stimulated to produce light by all tested concentrations. *P. putida* and *E. coli* were stimulated by 0.21 mg/mL. The luminescent light signal of those *P.*

putida wells was over 2-fold compared to that of the blank sample (0.0 mg/mL). With extract sample dilution, the inhibitory compounds are also diluted, which gives the bacteria a chance to benefit from the sugars and other nutrients potentially present in the extracts. Sequentially, this can cause higher light signal than in the control wells with no extract.

4. Conclusion

Our study demonstrates that a panel of bioluminescent bacterial whole-cell biosensors can be used to find species specific antibacterial responses to plant extracts, which are not revealed when using only one species for screening. Differences between *S. aureus* and the G- strains were detected both in the performance and the response to sundew extracts. Although both *A. baylyi* and *P. putida* are soil bacteria, *P. putida* was more tolerant to the sundew extracts and juglone. This highlights the benefits of a panel of bacterial biosensor strains for the screening of antimicrobial substances. The panel proposed here suggests a combination of bacteria, which are suitable for high-throughput screening of plant extracts using 96-well plate format, with a rapid test protocol of under 2 h. If a need arises to study other pathogens, they could easily be applied to the panel by introducing the bioluminescence operon. The panel presents an efficient, new method for future studies to screen potential antibacterial substances and plant extracts.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank docent Niko Silvan for collecting the peatland originating sundew samples. Furthermore, we thank Anneli Käenmäki and Eeva Pihlajaviita for their technical assistance in *in vitro* propagation of round-leaved sundew and the extractions. This work was supported by Maa- ja vesitekniiikan tuki ry [grant number 39372] and Suoviljelysyhdistys ry, Finland.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2020.106083>.

References

- Bacha, K., Tariku, Y., Gebreyesus, F., Zerihun, S., Mohammed, A., Weiland-Bräuer, N., Schmitz, R.A., Mulat, M., 2016. Antimicrobial and anti-quorum sensing activities of selected medicinal plants of Ethiopia: implication for development of potent antimicrobial agents. *BMC Microbiol.* 16 (1), 139.
- Belkin, S., 2003. Microbial whole-cell sensing systems of environmental pollutants. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* 6 (3), 206–212.
- Bryksin, A.V., Matsumura, I., 2010. Rational design of a plasmid origin that replicates efficiently in both gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria. *PLoS One* 5 (10), e13244.
- Cui, Z., Luan, X., Jiang, H., Li, Q., Xu, G., Sun, C., Zheng, L., Song, Y., Davison, P.A., Huang, W.E., 2018. Application of a bacterial whole cell biosensor for the rapid detection of cytotoxicity in heavy metal contaminated seawater. *Chemosphere* 200, 322–329.
- De Bonis, P., Lofrese, G., Scoppettuolo, G., Spanu, T., Cultrera, R., Labonia, M., ... Pompucci, A., 2016. Intraventricular versus intravenous colistin for the treatment of extensively drug resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* meningitis. *European journal of neurology* 23 (1), 68–75.
- Dhawan, S.R., Vaidya, P.C., John, J.J., Saikia, B., Samujh, R., Saxena, A., Singhi, P.D., 2017. Necrotizing fasciitis of scalp and neck in neonates. *APSPJ. Case Rep.* 8 (3), 23.
- Galluzzi, L., Karp, M., 2006. Whole cell strategies based on lux genes for high throughput applications toward new antimicrobials. *Comb. Chem. High Throughput Screen.* 9 (7), 501–514.
- Jaisinghani, R.N., 2017. Antibacterial properties of quercetin. *Microbiol. Res.* 8 (1).
- Mahapatra, A., Mativandale, S.P., Binneman, B., Fourie, P.B., Hamilton, C.J., Meyer, J.J.M., ... Lall, N., 2007. Activity of 7-methyljuglone derivatives against *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and as subversive substrates for mycothiol disulfide reductase. *Bioorganic & medicinal chemistry* 15 (24), 7638–7646.
- Meinhardt, F., 2002. *Pseudomonas putida* Transformation Protocol, Protocol No. 4308 915.529, Multiporator/Eppendorf Eporator.
- Murashige, T., Skoog, F., 1962. A revised medium for rapid growth and bio assays with tobacco tissue cultures. *Physiol. Plant.* 15 (3), 473–497.
- Nair, S.V., Baranwal, G., Chatterjee, M., Sachu, A., Vasudevan, A.K., Bose, C., ... Biswas, R., 2016. Antimicrobial activity of plumbagin, a naturally occurring naphthoquinone from *Plumbago rosea*, against *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Candida albicans*. *Int. J. Med. Microbiol.* 306 (4), 237–248.
- Paiva, S.R.d., Figueiredo, M.R., Aragão, T.V., Kaplan, M.A.C., 2003. Antimicrobial activity *in vitro* of plumbagin isolated from *Plumbago* species. *Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz* 98 (7), 959–961.
- Paper, D.H., Karall, E., Kremser, M., Krenn, L., 2005. Comparison of the antiinflammatory effects of *Drosera rotundifolia* and *Drosera madagascariensis* in the HET-CAM assay. *Phytother. Res.* 19 (4), 323–326.
- Rahmoun, N.M., Boucherit-Otmani, Z., Boucherit, K., Benabdallah, M., Villemain, D., Choukchou-Braham, N., 2012. Antibacterial and antifungal activity of lawsone and novel naphthoquinone derivatives. *Med. Mal. Infect.* 42 (6), 270–275.
- Rauha, J., Remes, S., Heinonen, M., Hopia, A., Kähkönen, M., Kujala, T., Pihlaja, K., Vuorela, H., Vuorela, P., 2000. Antimicrobial effects of Finnish plant extracts containing flavonoids and other phenolic compounds. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 56 (1), 3–12.
- Salcedo-Vite, K., Sigala, J., Segura, D., Gosset, G., Martinez, A., 2019. *Acinetobacter baylyi* ADP1 growth performance and lipid accumulation on different carbon sources. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 103 (15), 6217–6229.
- Santala, V., Karp, M., Santala, S., 2016. Bioluminescence-based system for rapid detection of natural transformation. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* 363 (13).
- Tenaillon, O., Picard, B., Denamur, E., Skurnik, D., 2010. The population genetics of commensal *Escherichia coli*. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 8 (3), 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2298>.
- Vesterlund, S., Paltta, J., Lauková, A., Karp, M., Ouwehand, A.C., 2004. Rapid screening method for the detection of antimicrobial substances. *J. Microbiol. Methods* 57 (1), 23–31.
- Vollmer, W., Seligman, S.J., 2010. Architecture of peptidoglycan: more data and more models. *Trends Microbiol.* 18 (2), 59–66.
- Wang, J., Cheng, Y., Wu, R., Jiang, D., Bai, B., Tan, D., Yan, T., Sun, X., Zhang, Q., Wu, Z., 2016. Antibacterial activity of juglone against *Staphylococcus aureus*: from apparent to proteomic. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 17 (6), 965.
- Wiegand, I., Hilpert, K., Hancock, R.E., 2008. Agar and broth dilution methods to determine the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of antimicrobial substances. *Nat. Protoc.* 3 (2), 163.
- Wolfender, J., Marti, G., Thomas, A., Bertrand, S., 2015. Current approaches and challenges for the metabolite profiling of complex natural extracts. *J. Chromatogr. A* 1382, 136–164.