Effect of Exposure Time, Cell Concentration and Culture Age on the Microbial Adhesion of *Staphylococcus Aureus and Saccharomyces Cerevisiae* on the Glass Surface

RAUDHAH BINTI AHMAD SHUPI

FACULTY OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING & NATURAL RESOURCES
(BIOTECHNOLOGY)
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

Thesis Access Form

No_____Location_____

Author : ………………………………

Title : ………………………………

Status of access OPEN / RESTRICTED / CONFIDENTIAL

Moratorium period:_____ years, ending_____ /_____200_____

Conditions of access proved by (CAPITALS): <u>DR WAN SALWANIS BT WAN MD ZAIN</u>

Supervisor (Signature)………………………………………………

Faculty: ………………………………

Author's Declaration: *I agree the following conditions:*

OPEN access work shall be made available (in the University and externally) and reproduced as necessary at the discretion of the University Librarian or Head of Department. It may also be copied by the British Library in microfilm or other form for supply to requesting libraries or individuals, subject to an indication of intended use for non-publishing purposes in the following form, placed on the copy and on any covering document or label.

*The statement itself shall apply to **ALL** copies:*

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Restricted/confidential work: All access and any photocopying shall be strictly subject to written permission from the University Head of Department and any external sponsor, if any.

Author's signature……………………………………..Date: ………………………………

users declaration: for signature during any Moratorium period (Not Open work): *I undertake to uphold the above conditions:*			
Date	Name (CAPITALS)	Signature	Address

Effect of Exposure Time, Cell Concentration and Culture Age on the Microbial Adhesion of *Staphylococcus Aureus and Saccharomyces Cerevisiae* on the Glass Surface

RAUDHAH BINTI AHMAD SHUPI

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Bachelor of Chemical Engineering (Biotechnology)

**FACULTY OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING & NATURAL RESOURCES
(BIOTECHNOLOGY)
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG**

JANUARY 2014

SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have checked this thesis and in my opinion, this thesis is adequate in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Bachelor of Chemical Engineering (Biotechnology).

Signature   :

Name of main supervisor   : Dr Wan Salwanis Binti Wan Md Zain

Position   : SENIOR LECTURER

Date   :

STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is my own except for quotations and summaries which have been duly acknowledged. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted for award of other degree.

Signature   :
Name   : RAUDHAH BINTI AHMAD SHUPI
ID Number   : KE10014
Date   :

Dedication

In The Name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

Special dedicated to…

My beloved parents: Ahmad Shupi Bin Zakaria and Salasiah Binti Ahmad,

My lovely siblings, and also my truly best friends,

Those who has influenced my life on the right course,

Thank you so much

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude for the Almighty who has made all this possible for me.

I would also want to express my sincere appreciation especially to my supervisor, Dr Wan Salwanis Binti Wan Md Zain for her supervision, support, advice and patience during my study. Her encouragement and kind words helped me endure the hard times throughout my study.

I am also thankful to all the laboratory's technicians of Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources (FKKSA), University Malaysia Pahang involved during my research for their useful advices, training, experience and knowledge sharing.

My gratitude goes to my colleagues, Nasuha Ibrahim and Zaidatul Akmal for the help, company and support which have been valuable and much appreciated.

Heartiest gratitude goes to my mum and my dad Ahmad Shupi Zakaria and Salasiah Ahmad, not to forget my siblings, for their endless prayers and support.

Last but not least, a token of appreciation is extended to University Malaysia Pahang (UMP) for the opportunity given to complete my degree here.

ABSTRACT

This paper reveals the behaviour of the adhesion of *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (*S. cerevisiae*) on the glass surface with respect to the exposure time, the cell concentration and culture age. Therefore, this study was carried out to investigate the mechanism of microbial adhesion based on the exposure time, cell concentration and culture age, so that further measures can be taken either to influence or to prevent the adhesion of microorganism. In order to investigate effect of exposure time on the adhesion process, the experiments were carried out for 24 hours and sampling was done at 4 h, 8 h, 12 h and 24 h of intervals. At each sampling time, glass slide was examined under the light microscope for determination of the numbers of cell attached per square area. Besides that, the absorbance and the colony forming unit (CFU) were also measured. Based on the result obtained, the absorbance for *S. cerevisiae* and *S. aureus* decreased with increasing exposure time with lowest OD reading was obtained at 24 hours, 0.911 and 0.827, respectively indicating a reduction by 8.9 % and 17.3 % from initial reading of 1.000. The OD reduction of cell suspension occurred because the bacteria were attached on glass surfaces and the degree of attachment increased with exposure time. This reading was supported by analysis of the colony forming unit (CFU) count, where the initial reading of CFU for *S. cerevisiae* was at 16 x10^{11} CFU/ml and dropped to 10.3 x10^{11} CFU/ml at the end of the experiment whereas for *S. aureus* the CFU reading reduced from 317 x 10^{11} CFU/ml to 115.7 x 10^{11} CFU/ml. On the other hand, the effect of varying the cell concentration on the degree of adhesion was compared by using cell concentration at 0.8 and 1.2 of absorbance. The results showed that at 24 hour of exposure at 0.8 and 1.2 of absorbance gave higher degree of adhesion at higher cell concentration. The adhesion of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* on the glass increased by 2.45 % and 2.36 % respectively, at higher cell concentration. Lastly, both *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* gave higher percentage of adhesion at stationary phase compared to exponential phase. The percentage of adhesion at exponential state were only 22.9 % and 10.9 % for *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* respectively while at stationary state the adhesion were 31.8 % and 21.3 % for respectively.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini mendedahkan kelakuan lekatan *Staphylococcus aureus (S. aureus)* dan *Saccharomyces cerevisiae (S. cerevisiae)* pada permukaan kaca yang berkaitan dengan masa pendedahan , kepekatan sel dan umur. Oleh itu, kajian ini telah dijalankan untuk menyiasat mekanisme lekatan mikrob berdasarkan masa pendedahan, kepekatan sel dan umur budaya, supaya langkah-langkah selanjutnya boleh diambil sama ada untuk mempengaruhi atau untuk mencegah lekatan mikroorganisma. Untuk mengkaji kesan masa pendedahan mengenai proses lekatan , eksperimen telah dijalankan selama 24 jam dan persampelan diambil pada selang 4 , 8 , 12 dan 24 jam . Pada setiap kali pensampelan, slaid kaca telah diperiksa di bawah mikroskop cahaya untuk menentukan bilangan sel dilampirkan setiap persegi . Di samping itu, kuantiti dan unit membentuk koloni (CFU) juga telah dikira. Berdasarkan keputusan yang diperolehi, bacaan OD *S. cerevisiae* dan *S. aureus* menurun dengan peningkatan masa pendedahan dengan paling rendah membaca OD telah diperolehi pada 24 jam, 0.911 dan 0,827 masing-masing menunjukkan penurunan sebanyak 8.9% dan 17.3% daripada bacaan awal 1.000 . Pengurangan OD berlaku kerana bakteria telah melekat pada permukaan kaca dan pelekatan meningkat dengan masa pendedahan. Bacaan ini disokong oleh kiraan CFU , di mana bacaan awal CFU untuk *S. cerevisiae* adalah sebanyak 16 x10^{11} CFU / ml dan jatuh kepada 10.3 x10^{11} CFU / ml pada akhir eksperimen manakala bagi *S . aureus* yang CFU bacaan berkurangkan daripada 317 x 10^{11} CFU / ml kepada 115.7 x 10^{11} CFU / ml. Sebaliknya , kesan manipulasi kepekatan sel pada pelekatan telah dibandingkan dengan menggunakan kepekatan sel pada 0.8 dan 1.2 OD . Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa pada 24 jam pendedahan pada 0.8 dan 1.2 OD kedua-dua *S. aureus dan S. cerevisiae* memberikan pelekatan lebih tinggi pada kepekatan sel yang lebih tinggi dengan 2.45 % and 2.36 % masing-masing . Akhir sekali, kedua-dua *S. aureus* dan *S. cerevisiae* memberikan peratusan yang lebih tinggi lekatan pada fasa pegun berbanding dengan fasa eksponen. Peratusan lekatan pada keadaan eksponen hanya 22.9 % dan 10.9 % *S. aureus* dan *S. cerevisiae* manakala pada keadaan pegun lekatan adalah 31.8 % dan 21.3 % masing-masing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Motivation and statement of problem

Bacteria tend to adhere to different kinds of surfaces, ranging from surfaces in the human body, and plants and clays, to plastics and metals. Once bacteria are attached to a surface, a multi-step process starts, resulting in a complex adhering microbial community called a 'biofilm' (Escher & Characklis, 1990). Biofilms can be beneficial, such as in wastewater treatment (Nicolella & Van Loosdrecht, 2000) but they may also have hazardous consequences. For instance, in water distribution systems, they may cause contamination of drinking water with pathogens such as *Legionella spp.* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (Szewzyk *et al*, 2000). Biofilm formation in food-processing equipment is known to cause contamination, resulting in spoilage or disease (Kumar & Anand, 1998) while on ship hulls, biofilms are responsible for increased fuel consumption. To avoid the formation of marine biofilms, environmentally harmful antimicrobial paints have been used (Yebra *et al.,* 2004), but these have recently been banned internationally, requiring the development of non-toxic antifouling surfaces. In the medical field, the formation of biofilms on devices such as catheters and orthopaedic implants frequently constitutes a reason for device failure and removal (Gristina, 1987).

Bacterial adhesion is influenced by properties of both the bacterial and the substratum surface. Bacterial characteristics known to influence adhesion are hydrophobicity, zeta potential (Bos *et al.,* 1999) motility (Kogure *et al.,* 1998), and release of extracellular substances, such as polysaccharides (Azeredo *et al.*, 1999), proteins (Dufrene *et al*, 1996) and biosurfactants (Van Hoogmoed *et al*, 2000) .Relevant properties of the substratum surface are hydrophobicity, zeta potential (Bos *et al.,* 1999), and surface texture (Desai *et al.* , 1992; Holland *et al.*, 1998). The influence of the surface free energies of the substratum and the bacterium can be modelled using a thermodynamic approach (Bos *et al*., 1999). The extended-DLVO (Derjaguin, Landau, Verwey, Overbeek) theory accounts for Lifshitz–Van der Waals, electrostatic, and short range acid–base interaction energies between the surface and the bacterium as a function of their separation distance (Van Oss *et al.* , 1986). The mechanistic knowledge of bacterial adhesion obtained from the extended-DLVO theory provides guidelines for the development of surface coatings exhibiting minimal adhesion of bacteria.

In conclusion, it is predominated by many factors such as microbe's characteristic, surface properties and environmental conditions. This study was carried out to investigate the mechanism of microbial adhesion based on the exposure time, cell concentration and culture age, so that further measures can be taken either to influence or to prevent the adhesion of microorganism.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of this research are as follow:

1. To study the adhesion of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* on glass surface.

2. To study the effect of physical properties on the microbial surface adhesion.

1.3 Scope of this research

The study has been divided into several scopes in order to achieve the objectives, which are:

   i.   Maintenance of pure culture.

   ii. Microbial characterization based on the morphology, size and affinity of the microbes.

   iii. Effect of physical properties on adhesion.

         a) Time

         b) Cell Concentration

         c) Culture age

1.4   Thesis Layout

The structure of this thesis was outlined as follow:

Chapter 2 details the literature review on microorganisms used, mechanism of biofilms and physical and environmental effects on adhesion.

Chapter 3 details all the general and repetitive materials and methods that were carried out throughout the study, including the preparation of culture, SEM and light microscope analysis, and the adhesion test.

Chapter 4 discusses thoroughly the effects of the physical conditions that affected the metabolic behaviour of the suspended cells towards the glass surface by varying the exposure time, the cell concentration and also the culture age.

Chapter 5 discusses the overall conclusions from the results of this study. The conclusions were derived from the results obtained during this study and the recommendations have partly highlighted some significant findings that can contribute to future improvement.

2   LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   *Staphylococcus aureus*

Staphylococci family are Gram-positive bacteria with diameter of $0.5 - 1.5$ μm as seen in Figure 2.1 and was characterized by individual *cocci* which divide in more than one plane to form grape-like cluster. Until now, there are 32 species and 8 subspecies in the genus of *Staphylococcus*. However, *S.aureus* and *S.epedermis* are the two most characterized and studied strains. They are non-motile, non- spore forming anaerobes that grow either by aerobic respiration or fermentation. *S.aureus* is more virulent compared to *S.epedermis* despite their phylogenic similarities. The cell wall of *S.aureus* is a tough protective coat which is relatively amorphous in appearance, about 20-40 nm thick. The growth and survival of bacteria is dependent on the cell ability to adapt to environmental changes. *S.aureus* has evolved many mechanisms to overcome these changes. In fact, *S.aureus* has been found to be a common cause of various infections on biomaterial surfaces. Biomaterial surfaces usually have a negative charge and initially repel the negatively charged bacteria. However, at a distance of around 15 nm, van der Waals and hydrophobic forces are exerted and repulsion is overcome (Harris, 2002).

Figure 2 - 1   Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM)'s image of *Staphylococcus aureus* (Carr, 2007)

2.2   Saccharomyces cerevisiae

Yeast or scientifically *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is widely used in production of ethanol. *S.cerevisiae* is a unicellular microorganism which belongs to the fungi group. Typically *S.cerevisiae* is either spherical or oval in shape, with clear internal cell structures. Most of them are unicellular and their size can vary from 3-5 μm in diameter, although some can reach 7 μm. Normally *S.cerevisiae* grows by budding (the common *S.cerevisiae*), but very rarely can multiply by binary fission. The surface is normally negatively charged and easily immobilised on solid surfaces. Yeast in general is hydrophobic therefore it prefers hydrophobic surfaces, and attaches weakly to hydrophilic surfaces such as on glass. However, stronger adhesion of the yeast-surfaces can be achieved by introducing electrostatic interaction between the yeast and the solid surfaces (Norton & D'Amore, 1994)

S.cerevisiae is well built with vacuole, mytochondria, cytoplasm and nucleus, and the outer membrane is made of glucan and polysaccharides. The surface is covered with protein and peptidoglycan, which gives it hydrophobic properties. The surface protein also results in a negatively charged surface in *S.cerevisiae*, but can vary significantly depending on the environment (medium types), pH and ionic strength. The surface charge of the yeast is also dependant on the age, and normally loses its negativity as it enters the stationary phases. The dead cells of yeast are generally neutral in charge (Zain, 2012).

Figure 2 - 2   Differential   interference   contrast   (DIC)   microscopy   image   of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Masur, 2010)

2.3   Microbial Activity

Compared to algae and fungi, bacteria regarded as more versatile because they are not limited by the need for light or a consumable substrate. Besides, due to differences in properties of cell surface, there is considerable variation among bacteria (Consterton *et al*, 1978). Bacteria attached to a surface appear to be metabolically different from their planktonic or 'free swimming' counterparts (Fletcher, 1992). Meanwhile, fungi require a fixed organic source of carbon. Their rigid cell walls limit them to being saprophytic on organic substrates or as parasites on animal. Moreover, fungi may be found on any solid that provides an organic substrate, provided that the local conditions are satisfactory (Bott, 2006).

Microbial cells are surrounded by a cell wall, which retain the cell contents and is the primary barrier between the cell surface and the environment in which it exist. The quality of cell wall in terms of selective permeability, maintains the necessary levels of nutrients, trace elements and cell internal pH. The cell membrane is the site of transfer process: water is able to pass through this membrane, in or out the cell depending on the trust of the osmotic pressure. The chemistry of the cell wall affects its properties in terms of surface electric charge and the availability of binding ions (Bott, 2006).

The rigidity of cell wall allows the development of structure that may be beneficial in the maintenance of a coherent biofilm. Microbes produce extracellular materials such as slimes of polysaccharides and mucilage, which may help to maintain attachment on solid surfaces, provide sources of nutrients in case of nutrients availability decline or enhance protection of the cells. Clearly, the availability of nutrient determines the development of a biofilm (Bott, 2006).

2.4   Biofilms

In nature, bacterial cells are most frequently found in close association with surfaces and interfaces, in the form of multicellular aggregates embedded in an extracellular matrix generally referred to as biofilms (Donlan, 2002). Biofilms are usually heterogeneous; in that they contain more than one type of bacterial species, but they can be homogeneous in cases such as infections and medical implants (O'toole *et al.*, 2000). Microbial biofilms pose a challenge in clinical and industrial setting especially in food

processing environments where they act as a potential source of microbial contamination of foods that may lead to spoilage and transmission of foodborne pathogens (Houdt & Michiels, 2010); (Adetunji & Isola, 2011). They can also compromise the cleanliness of food contact surfaces and environmental surfaces by spreading detached individual microorganisms into the surrounding environment (Milanov *et al.*, 2009). Environmental conditions in food production areas including the presence of moisture, nutrients, and inoculum of microorganisms from the raw materials might favour the formation of biofilm. Furthermore, when food processing equipment are not easily cleaned due to its design and food particles not completely removed, the particles aid in the formation of biofilms by providing a coat that not only provides the biofilm with nutrients but also a surface to which it can easily stick on (Kamila & Katarzyna, 2011). Once biofilms have formed on food processing surfaces, they are hard to eliminate often resulting in persistence and endemic population. Biofilms offer their member cells several benefits, including channelling nutrients to the cells and protecting them against harsh environments.

In particular, it has been noted that cells within biofilms are more resistance to antibiotics, disinfectants, and to host immune system clearance than their planktonic counterparts (Houdt & Michiels, 2010); (Morikawa, 2006). Several mechanisms account for this increased antibiotic resistance, including the physical barrier formed by exopolymeric substances, a proportion of dormant bacteria that are inert toward antibiotics, and resistance genes that are uniquely expressed in biofilms (Kavanaugh & Ribbeck, 2012). Outbreaks of pathogens associated with biofilms have been related to the presence of species *of Listeria, Yersinia, Campylobacter, Salmonella, Staphylococcus,* and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. These bacteria are of special significance in ready-to-eat and minimally processed food products, where microbiological control is not conducted in the terminal processing step (Kamila & Katarzyna, 2011).

2.5   Formation of Biofilms

Adhesion of bacteria will form a colony (biofilm) consisting prokaryotes cells, surrounded by matrix of biomolecules secreted by the cells. In the creation of biofilm, even though the structure and function is different for different bacteria, this same four step always been followed. Firstly, small molecules, initially water and salt ions will absorb to the surface. Hence, the substrate surface will be covered with a single layer of small molecules or proteins that present in the medium. Conditioning film consists of mixture of water, ions and proteins are always present before the first microorganisms arrive at the surface. The second step is characterized by the initially reversible adsorption of microorganisms to the conditioning film. Then will be the arrival of microbes either by Brownian motion, gravitation, diffusion or intrinsic motility. They may adhere to each other forming microbial aggregates before absorbing to the conditioning film. Since microbes adhere to conditioning film and not the surface itself, the strength depends on the structure of the conditioning film. The initially reversible adsorption becomes irreversible, mainly through the secretion of exopolymeric substances by the adsorbed microorganisms in step three. These substances will incorporate in the conditioning film and strengthen its cohesiveness. Finally, the number of microorganisms in the biofilm accumulates mainly through in situ cell growth (T. Boland, 2000).

2.6   Effect of Physical Properties

2.6.1   Effect of Temperature

Besides, each microorganism has their own optimum temperature where when sufficient nutrients are available, the growth is maximum. The optimum temperature is different to different species on account of various metabolic characteristics ranging from 20–50 ⁰C with mainly between 35-40 ⁰C (Bott, 2006). Nutrient metabolism is directly related and dependent on presence and reaction rates of enzymes. Thus, temperature and reaction rates of enzymes do correlates. At optimum temperature, the bacteria give healthy population growth while temperature far from optimum reduces the growth efficiency due to reduction in reaction rate of enzymes (Trevor *et al*., 2008).

On the other hand, the physical properties of the compounds within and surrounding the cells were also affected by the environmental temperature. Findings showed that a decrease in temperature reduced the adhesive properties of a marine Pseudomonad (Fletcher , 1977). He believed that the effect was due to a decrease in the bacterial surface polymer at lower temperatures as well as effects such as reduced surface area. However, Herald & Zottola, 1988 observed that the presence of bacterial surface appendages was dependent on temperature. At 35 $^{\circ}$C cells were shown to have a single flagellum whilst at 21 $^{\circ}$C they had two to three flagella and at 10 $^{\circ}$C, cells exhibited several flagella.

2.6.2   Effect of pH

pH changes can significantly affect bacterial growth and frequently exploited in the production of detergents and disinfectants used to kill bacteria. Bacteria possess membrane-bound proton pumps which extrude protons from the cytoplasm to generate a transmembrane electrochemical gradient which called the proton motor force (Rowland, 2003). The passive influx of protons in response to the proton motive force can be a problem for cells attempting to regulate their cytoplasmic pH (Booth, 1985). Large variations in external pH can overwhelm such mechanisms and have a biocidal effect on the microorganisms. Bacteria respond to changes in internal and external pH by adjusting the activity and synthesis of proteins associated with many different cellular processes (Olsen, 1993). Research has shown that a gradual increase in acidity increases the chances of cell survival in comparison to a sudden increase by rapid addition of HCl (Li, 2001). This suggests that bacteria contain mechanisms in place which allow the bacterial population to adapt to small environmental changes in pH. However, there are cellular processes which do not adapt to pH fluctuations so easily. One such process is the excretion of exopolymeric substances (polysaccharides). Optimum pH for polysaccharide production depends on the individual species, but it is around pH 7 for most bacteria (Oliveira,*et al.*, 1994).

2.6.3 Effect of Bulk Water Velocity

Basically, the effect of bulk water velocity is twofold. Velocities are proportional to turbulence in the bulk flow and inversely proportional to thickness of the boundary layer adjacent to the biofilm residing on the solid surface. As the velocities increases, the availability of nutrients at certain concentration, to the biofilm increases because of the lower resistance to mass transfer of nutrients to the biofilm. However, as the velocity increases, the attendant shear forces acting on the biofilm also increases. This explained the reduction of biofilm accumulation. Thus, it was proven that the increase growth rate was because of greater nutrient availability and the removal of biofilm by the increased velocity (Grant & Bott, 2005).

2.7 Effect of Surface Characteristics

2.7.1 Effect of Surface Hydrophobicity

During the adhesion process, bacteria firmly adhere to the biomaterial surface through physicochemical interactions. These comprise cell surface hydrophobicity and charge as well as the hydrophobicity, charge, roughness, and chemical composition of the biomaterial surface itself. Surface hydrophobicity, in particular, has been described as one of the most important properties involved in the adhesion phenomenon. According to van Oss and Giese, in biological systems, hydrophobic interactions are normally the strongest of the long-range non-covalent interactions and can be defined as the attraction among apolar, or slightly polar, cells or other molecules themselves, when immersed in an aqueous solution (Sousa, *et al.*, 2009).

In the course of the short-term phase of microbial adhesion surface properties of bacteria and substrata (-potential and hydrophobicity) together with the composition of the liquid medium have been recognized as determining whether adhesion will be effective or not. Primarily there is much evidence on the crucial role of degree of wettability of substrata. In the same way, microorganisms can be separated roughly into three categories: (a) hydrophobic (having water contact angle ϕ_w, $> 90^{\circ}$); (b) moderately hydrophobic (ϕ_w, $= 40\text{-}90^{\circ}$) and (c) hydrophilic (ϕ_w, $< 400^{\circ}$). The following general features were identified: (1) Hydrophobic bacteria adhere to hydrophobic surfaces irreversibly in the so-called primary minimum even at strong electrostatic repulsion. (2)

Moderately hydrophobic bacteria adhere reversibly in the so-called secondary minimum and, when the surfaces are hydrophobic, again irrespective of the electrostatic interaction. (3) Hydrophilic bacteria adhere to both hydrophilic as well as hydrophobic surfaces in the secondary minimum. Adhesion of these bacteria (as well as of any bacteria to hydrophilic surfaces) is relatively weak and reversible and mostly requires electrostatic attraction (Skvarla, 1993).

Besides, Makin & Beveridge, 1996 were able to show that cell surface hydrophobicity was the primary mediator of adhesion of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains to hydrophobic surfaces, whereas for hydrophilic cells, surface charge played a major role. Like most microorganisms, the species used in our study were all negatively charged. It was therefore expected that they would preferentially adhere to surfaces with a positive charge. Though the adhesion of *S. wolfei* cells was indeed significantly increased on Fe31-coated surfaces, adhesion of the other species was less or not at all affected. Based on cell surface hydrophobicity measurements (by both HIC and BATH testing) we expected increased adhesion of *Desulfovibrio* sp. strain G11 and *D. tiedjei* cells on hydrophobic surfaces. However, siliconecoated surfaces inhibited adhesion of all the strains, including the relatively hydrophobic *D. tiedjei* cells. Such discrepancies are difficult to explain, but gross measurement of surface properties such as charge and hydrophobicity does not always consistently correlate with attachment or transport through porous media (Kjelleberg & Hermansson, 1984)

2.7.2 Effect of Surface Roughness

Biomaterial surface roughness is another property relevant for the bacterial adhesion process, with the irregularities of the polymeric surfaces normally promoting bacterial adhesion and biofilm accumulation. This is due to the increased surface area and depressions that provide more favourable and additional sites for colonization, as such crevices protect bacterial cells from the shear forces. However, the accumulation of bacteria in such locations depends largely on their size, cell dimension, and division mode. In fact, according to some authors, a linear relation of bacterial adhesion with surface roughness is not always verified. A small increase in roughness can lead to a significant increase in bacterial adhesion, while a larger increase in roughness can have no significant effect on cellular attachment (Sousa, *et al.*, 2009).

2.7.3 Effect of Surface Topography

The results of Hsu's work clearly show that substrate surface topography at the micro- and nanoscale affects bacterial attachment. Cells seem to try to maximize contact area with the surfaces, presumably to achieve a stronger and more stable attachment, which results in a specific alignment of the cells depending on the arrangement of the topographical details. Moreover, surface topography appears to induce the expression of different types of appendages that might mediate attachment. Better understanding of the way in which bacterial cells attach to surfaces with controlled topography in the micro- and nanoscale will allow the design and fabrication of materials able to effectively control bacterial adhesion, with a large number of potential biomedical and industrial applications (Hsu, *et al.*, 2013).

2.8 Glass

Glasses are a type of ceramic materials presenting vitreous structures derived from silica, which are formed by the bonding of the Si–O tetrahedrons or other ionic groups, in order to produce a non-crystalline but solid lattice structure. The basic building block of silicate structures is the SiO_4 tetrahedron, exhibiting linkages with a strong covalent character (White, 2003). In addition to oxides of silicone, glass can be obtained by other kind of oxides such as B_2O_3 or Al_2O_3, both of them known as glass precursors. There are also other oxides which can be added to the glasses, called modifiers. Among these elements, alkali and alkaline earth oxides are commonly used to reduce its viscosity and thus enhance process ability properties and ease of shaping of the final material. It is necessary to point that the unit structure of silicate tetrahedral is maintained in the crystal, regardless the oxides that could be added in order to modify its properties.

A typical borosilicate glass microscope slides will be used in this research as these slides are widely available. Borosilicate glass is a type of glass with the main glass-forming constituents' silica and boron oxide. Borosilicate glasses are known for having very low coefficients of thermal expansion ($\sim3 \times 10^{-6}$ /°C at 20°C), making them resistant to thermal shock, more so than any other common glass. Such glass is less subject to thermal stress and is commonly used for the construction of reagent bottles.

Borosilicate glass is sold under such trade names as Suprax, Kimax, Pyrex, Endural, Schott, or Refmex.

3   MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1   Chemicals

Glucose, bactopeptone, yeast extract, nutrient agar, sulphuric acid, NaoH, K_2HPO, KH_2PO_4, KCl, $MgSO_4$, NaCl and glutaraldehyde were obtained from FKKSA Laboratory, UMP.

3.2   Preservation of Culture

Saccharomyces cerevisiae and *Staphylococcus aureus* were obtained from the Centre Laboratory of Universiti Malaysia Pahang. For long term preservation, the culture was kept in agar plates and agar slants, in a freezer at 4 ^{o}C. For use in subsequent microbial work, the yeast and *S. aureus* stock was stored in the chiller at 4-6 ^{o}C, transferred to an agar plate and incubated for 24 h at 30 ^{o}C.

3.3   Media Preparation

3.3.1   Preparation of Nutrient Broth

8 g of nutrient broth powder which made up of 20 g/L glucose, 20 g/L bactopeptone and 10 g/L yeast extract, and adjusted to pH 5.5 using 0.1 M sulphuric acid and 0.1 M NaOH solution was weighted. The powder then added to 1L of distilled or deionized water in a 1 L Schott bottle. The powder was dissolved completely in the water. It is finally autoclaved at 121 °C for 20 minutes.

3.3.2   Preparation of Nutrient Agar

20 g of nutrient agar powder containing 20 g/L glucose, 1.5% (w/v) agar powder, 20 g/L bactopeptone and 10 g/L yeast extract, and adjusted to pH 5.5 using 0.1 M sulphuric acid and 0.1 M NaOH solution was weighed out. 1 L of distilled or deionized water in a 1 L Schott bottle was added. It is finally autoclaved at 121 °C for 20 minutes and cooled to 50 °C before pouring into the petri dish.

3.3.3 Preparation of Agar Plates

15-20 mL of a warm sterile nutrient agar was poured per petri plate. The nutrient agar then allowed to solidify at room temperature in sterile environment and kept in 4 °C until further use.

3.3.4 Preparation of Phosphate Buffer Saline (PBS) Solution

PBS solution was prepared according to the specific composition to get 7.0 of desired pH. The solution was autoclaved at 121 ^{o}C for 20 minutes prior to use.

Table 3 - 1   Composition of PBS solution

Material	Amount
1M K_2HPO_4	0.802 mL
1M KH_2PO_4	0.198 mL
5M KCl	1.0 mL
0.1M $MgSO_4$	1.0 mL
Distilled water	97.0 mL
NaCl	0.85

3.4 Culture Preparation

3.4.1 Germination of Stock Culture and Inoculum

A loopful of refrigerated stock culture was transferred onto a petri dish containing medium agar and incubated at 30 ^{o}C. After 24 hours of incubation, a colony of germinated cells was transferred to a 250 mL shake flask containing 30 mL of growth medium (without agar), then placed in an orbital shaker at 180 rpm, for 16 hours. The cells were then centrifuged at 5000 rpm for 5 minutes, washed once with 0.85 % (w/v) NaCl, and re-centrifuged for 3 minutes (Jamai *et al*., 2001). The supernatant was discarded and the pellet was suspended in saline solution by vortexing. The total cell

concentration was adjusted to an absorbance of approximately ~1.0 at 600 nm using a UV-Vis spectrophotometer.

3.4.2   Preparation of Seed Culture

About a plate of microbes samples are taken transferred into 100 mL nutrient broth. The broth then allowed to be incubated for 16 h, 18 h and 66 h depending on the type of experiments.

3.5   The characterization of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae*

3.5.1   Viewing Cell using Light Microscope

Samples at exponential and stationary state were smeared on the glass slides and images were viewed through light microscope in FKKSA laboratory, UMP. The images were captured and characteristics were examined using Dino-Eye Piece camera attached to a computer.

3.5.2   Viewing Cell Using Scanning Electron Microscope

The same samples used in light microscopy were also sent to Central Laboratory; UMP to be examined using SEM analysis which later used for comparison of both methods.

3.5.3   Cell Surface Hydrophobicity/Microbial Adhesion to Solvents (CSH/MATS)

The characteristics of the cells have been reported to be influenced by the cells' age and density/concentration. Cell suspensions were prepared from the 16 h and 66 h cultures to study the cells' surface characteristics during the exponential and stationary phase. Four types of solvents were used to determine the electron donor/acceptor properties of the cells. 4 ml solvent was added to the 4 ml of cell suspension with the optical density fixed at 1.000, read at 600 nm with a UV spectrophotometer. The mixture was then mixed and vortexed for 60 seconds and allowed to separate at room temperature for 15 minutes. Finally the optical density of the cell suspension (aqueous phase) was measured against a blank (distilled water). All measurements were carried out in triplicate and the results presented were the average values.

3.6   Cell – Surface Adhesion Experiment

3.6.1   Adhesion Tests

The adhesion test was carried out in a glass container containing a baby cradle-like holder for holding the glass slides in the upright-vertical position. The glass slides were suspended in the bacterial solution and shake at 100 rpm for 24 h. Samples were taken at 4 h, 8 h, 12 h and 24 h of intervals and each glass slide was examined under the light microscope to determine the numbers of cell attached per square area. Besides that, the absorbance and the colony forming unit (CFU) was also measured. Next, best contact time which gives highest OD difference from the time manipulation will be used for the study on the effect of cell concentration on the microbial adhesion. The effect of cell concentration was carried out at absorbance of 0.8 and 1.2 while effect of culture age was done at 16 h and 66 h of culture age.

3.7   Analysis

3.7.1   Cell Concentration Measurement (Optical Density)

80 mL of the seed culture was taken out and centrifuged at 10000 g for 10 minutes. Then, the supernatant was pipetted out and the same amount of NaCl solution was added to be vortex. This step was repeated three times. Next, 200 mL of fresh PBS buffer was added to the cell pellets and the optical density was checked at 600 nm. The cell solution must be was adjusted until it reach at 1.0 absorbance. The same procedure was carried out for preparation of cell concentration with OD fixed at 0.8 and 1.2 of absorbance. After the desired absorbance was obtained, the mixture was poured into a glass container until all the glass slides were fully immersed in the bacterial solution. The experimental rig was shake at 100 rpm for 24 h and sampling were done at 4 h, 8 h, 12 h and 24 h of intervals, 1 mL of sample is taken for OD reading while 10 μL are for CFU procedure.

3.7.2   Colony Forming Unit (CFU)

10 μL of samples were put into a microcentrifuge tube and was added with 990 μL of sterile distilled water for 10^2 dilutions. The same step was repeated for 10^4 dilution and for 10^5 dilution, 100 μL of sample from previous dilution was added with 900 μL of sterile distilled water. Finally, 1 μL of sample from the 10^5 dilution was spread on agar

plates and incubated at 37^0C for 24 h. The forming colony was counted as CFU/mL. The equation used was shown below;

$$\frac{CFU}{mL} = Count \times \frac{10^8}{0.001mL} \tag{3.1}$$

$$= count \times 10^8 \ CFU/mL \tag{3.2}$$

3.7.3 Counting and Morphological Observation of Adhered Microorganism using Light Microscope

Slides culture was used to observe the attachment of bacterial cells at real time or directly on the glass (An & Friedman, 1997). Slides cultures, composed of microscopic glass slides were suspended in PBS solution containing cell suspension for 24 h and the slides were taken out at every 4 h, 8 h, 12 h and 24 h of intervals. It was examined under light microscope at 100x magnification using oil immersion lenses. Each slide was divided into 8 parts and images were captured at each part of the slide. The adhered microbes were counted and the average was divided by per square area. All images were viewed and captured using Dino Eye-Piece Camera attached to a computer. The data was calculated using equation below;

$$Cell \ count \ per \ \mu m2 = \frac{count}{606.48}\mu m2 \tag{3.3}$$

4   RESULT & DISCUSSION

4.1   The characteristics of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae*

The shape of both microbes was found to be similar which were in spherical shape. Based on image from SEM analysis (Figure 4 - 1), the diameter of *S. aureus* was found to be 1 µm while *S. cerevisiae* was observed to be 0.7 µm in diameter at exponential phase. The diameter of *S. aureus* was similar to the theoretical diameter which is 0.5-1.0 µm (Harris, 2002) while *S. cerevisiae* was found to be too far from the theoretical diameter which is 3-5 µm (Norton & D'Amore, 1994).


Figure 4 - 1   (a) Image of *S. cerevisiae* and *S. aureus* (b), from 18 h of culture viewed using scanning electron microscopy (EVO 50)

However, result from light microscopy images in Table 4 - 1 indicated that the radius for *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* were 3.30 ± 0.12 µm and 2.53 ± 0.22 µm respectively at exponential phase whereas at stationary phase the radius were 2.53 ± 0.34 µm and 1.79 ± 0.21 µm respectively. *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* were proven to be Gram's positive

and Gram's negative type, respectively. Images captured in Figure 4 - 2 from the light microscope under 100 x magnifications and oil immersion showed that *S.aureus* was stained in purple while *S. cerevisiae* was stained in pink colour.


Figure 4 - 2   Image of Gram's stained *S. aureus* a) at 16 h and (b) at 66 h of culture age and Gram's stained *S. cerevisiae* c) at 16 h and d) at 66 h of culture age viewed using x100 magnification light microscope

Table 4 - 1   Size of microbes at exponential and stationary phase

Microorganism	Radius at exponential phase (µm)	Radius at stationary phase (µm)
S. aureus	3.30 ± 0.12	2.53 ± 0.34
S. cerevisiae	2.53 ± 0.22	1.79 ± 0.21

Adherence of *S. aureus* and *S.cerevisiae* grown at 16 h and 66 h to various hydrocarbons is presented in Table 4 - 2 and 4 - 3. *S. aureus* in the stationary phase exhibit a low affinity towards solvents (less that 30%). The affinity of *S. aureus* and *S.*

cerevisiae toward solvents was shown in Figure 4 - 3, 4 - 4, 4 - 5 and 4 - 6 below. *S. aureus* possesses weak electron accepting capacity, since the affinity towards ethyl acetate was slightly lower than dodecane in both the exponential and the stationary phase. These results suggest that the strain used in the study was probably hydrophilic, because of its lower affinity towards n-hexane in the stationary phase (4.2 %).

On the other hand, the affinity towards ethyl acetate and n-hexane was similar in exponential state but significantly reduced towards n-hexane in stationary phase while ethyl acetate only gave small reduction. However, the affinity of *S. aureus* towards dodecane was the lowest in both exponential and stationary state. It can be concluded that the hydrophobicity of both microbes declined significantly in the stationary phase which contradict to (Werne-Washburne *et al*., 1993) which stated that cells in the stationary phase are generally more hydrophobic due to the alteration of the wall and cell composition. The statement do not comply with this research maybe because of the cells observed from SEM and Gram's staining showed that they form cluster in stationary phase thus prevent them to be attracted to the solvents.


Figure 4 - 3   *S. aureus* affinity towards a) n-Hexane b) Dodecane c) Ethyl acetate at 16 h of culture age

Figure 4 - 4   *S. aureus* affinity towards a) n-Hexane b) Dodecane c) Ethyl acetate at 66 h of culture age

Figure 4 - 5   *S. cerevisiae* affinity towards a) n-Hexane b) Dodecane c) Ethyl acetate at 16 h of culture age

Figure 4 - 6   *S. cerevisiae* affinity towards a) n-Hexane b) Dodecane c) Ethyl acetate at 66 h of culture age

Table 4 - 2   Cell Surface Hydrophobicity at exponential phase (16 h of culture age)

Type of solvent	*S. aureus*	*S. cerevisiae*
	Adhesion (%)	Adhesion (%)
n-Hexane	28.6 ± 0.06	4.2 ± 0.04
Ethyl acetate	41.93 ± 0.16	12.56 ± 0.08
Dodecane	46.7 ± 0.03	14.5 ± 0.01

Table 4 - 3   Cell Surface Hydrophobicity at stationary phase (66 h of culture age)

Type of solvent	*S. aureus*	*S. cerevisiae*
	Adhesion (%)	Adhesion (%)
n-Hexane	27.3 ± 0.12	0.5 ± 0.05
Ethyl acetate	17.6 ± 0.17	12.76 ± 0.02
Dodecane	6.16 ± 0.03	1.23 ± 0.14

As a conclusion, *S. aureus* was found to be spherical in shape, Gram's positive type and hydrophobic while *S. aureus* was also spherical in shape, Gram's negative type and hydrophobic. The summary of both microbes' characteristics was tabulated below.

Table 4 - 4   Summarized characteristics of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae*

Microorganism	*S. aureus*		*S. cerevisiae*	
	Exponential	Stationary	Exponential	Stationary
Gram's type	Negative		Positive	
Radius (µm)	3.30 ± 0.12	2.53 ± 0.22	2.53 ± 0.34	1.79 ± 0.21
Shape	Spherical		Spherical	
CHS-MATS	Hydrophobic		Hydrophobic	

4.2   Growth Analysis

The batch fermentation for both *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* was carried out to study the microbial activity during 24 h of fermentation. Studies on growth was conducted using optimized conditions initial temperature of 30 ℃, inoculum size of 10 % (v/v) and agitation speed set at 180 rpm. The fermentation was performed in 250 mL conical flask. The composition of medium used for the fermentation contained 20 g/L glucose, 20 g/L bactopeptone and 10 g/L yeast extract in 1 L of distilled water. The growth profiles for both microbes in batch culture are illustrated in Figure 4 - 7 and Figure 4 - 8.

Figure 4 - 7   Growth curve based on absorbance for both *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* in 24 h of fermentation at 30 ⁰C and 180 rpm


Figure 4 - 8   Growth curve based on CFU for both *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* in 24 hour of fermentation at 30 ⁰C and 180 rpm

The growth curve with lag, log and stationary phase was observed for *S. aureus* Figure 4 - 7 and 4 - 8. Apparently there was almost no significant lag phase was observed for both microorganisms. Both microorganisms directly started with log phase at 2 h of fermentation. The log phase occurred due to doubling of microbes with sufficient nutrients available. This explained the increased of colony formed in Figure 4 - 7. For *S. aureus* log phase was going on from 2 h to 10 h and continue with stationary phase from

12 h to 14 h. *S. aureus* was observed to enter death phase starting from 16 h. While for *S. cerevisiae*, the log phase was prolong until the 6 h of fermentation then proceed with stationary throughout the fermentation. It can summarize that *S. cerevisiae* was still in stationary phase in 24 h fermentation.

4.3 Effect of Exposure time on Adhesion

The adhesion of *S. aureus* on the glass surfaces was explained in Table 4 - 5. *S. aureus* showed a similar adhesion trend to that *S. cerevisiae* but with a slightly higher percentage of adhesion. The image and CFU plating of *S. aureus* at 4 h, 8 h, 12 h and 24 h was shown below.


Figure 4 - 9   Images of *S. aureus* attached on glass at a) 4 h, b) 8 h, c) 12 h and 24 h at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

Figure 4 - 10   Images of CFU at a) 4 h and 8 h b) 12 h and 24 h at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

Table 4 - 5   Result for adhesion test of *S. aureus*

| Time (hour)	Optical Density (Abs)	Bacteria Count on Glass (Per µm²)	Colony Forming Unit (CFU/mL) ×10^{11}	Percentage of adhesion (%)
0	1.000 ± 0.046	0	317.0 ± 0.14	0 ± 0.046
4	0.980 ± 0.001	1.74 ± 0.39	288.7 ± 0.54	2 ± 0.001
8	0.851 ± 0.001	3.33 ± 0.45	208.3 ± 0.32	14.9 ± 0.001
12	0.830 ± 0.001	4.00 ± 0.52	167.7 ± 0.09	17 ± 0.001
24	0.827 ± 0.003	5.39 ± 0.47	115.7 ± 0.22	17.3 ± 0.003

Figure 4 - 11   Percentage of adhesion of both microbes on glass surface at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

Figure 4 - 11 showed that adhesion of *S. cerevisiae* increased with increasing exposure time. Yeast count on glass in Figure 4 - 9 showed that the attachment of yeast on glass rose with time thus explained the reduction of colony in CFU plating in Figure 4 - 10. This result was explained by (Castelain *et al.* , 2007) whose stated that yeast population adhering to the glass increased with contact time.


Figure 4 - 12   Images of yeast attached on glass at a) 4 h, b) 8 h, c) 12 h and 24 h

Figure 4 - 13   Images of CFU at a) 0 h and 4 h b) 8 h and 12 h and c) 24 h

Table 4 - 6   Result for adhesion test of *S. cerevisiae*

Time (hour)	Optical Density (Abs)	Yeast Count on Glass (Per μm^2)	Colony Forming Unit (CFU/mL) $\times 10^6$	Percentage of adhesion (%)
0	1 ± 0.002	0	16 ± 0.03	0 ± 0.002
4	0.987 ± 0.001	1.09 ± 0.44	13 ± 0.02	1.3 ± 0.001
8	0.945 ± 0.001	1.36 ± 0.46	12.66 ± 0.03	5.5 ± 0.001
12	0.941 ± 0.002	1.99 ± 0.58	12.33 ± 0.02	5.9 ± 0.002
24	0.911 ± 0.002	2.95 ± 0.71	10.33 ± 0.05	8.9 ± 0.002

According to Cunliffe *et al.* (1999) said that there was a considerable difference in the attachment of different bacteria to the hydrophilic surface. Van Hoogmoed (2000) in his study reported that the adhesion of *S. aureus* was higher to the hydrophilic substrate than to the hydrophobic surface. Comparison of the percentage of adhesion of both microbes on glass were plotted in Figure 4 - 14. Speedy increased of the adhesion rate of *S.aureus* was observed in the first 8 h of exposure, and reached maximum at t=12 hours (17 %) with no futher increased until the end of fermentation. On the other hand, the adhesion of *S.cerevisiae* speed up in between 4-8 h of incubation, with gradual increased up to 24 h with maximum adhesion observed at 8.9 %. Along with the increase of adhesion, the attachment on the glass is gradually increase until maximum value of 2.95 ± 0.71 µm. The CFU count proved the increased in attachment on glass by

reduction in the counts. However, the results showed that the maximum adhesion was achieved by *S. aureus* was 8.4 % higher than the maximum adhesion achieved by *S.cerevisiae*. This phenomenon may be caused by the different properties in both microorganisms. The images from the Gram's staining showed that the size of *S. aureus* is bigger compared to *S. cerevisiae* which may contributed to higer surface area that encourage adhesion of *S. aureus* on glass. This statement was explained by Werner (n.d.) which stated increased in the surface area thus enhancing the contact area between surface and coating.


Figure 4 - 14   Percentage of adhesion of both microbes on glass surface at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

4.4   Effect of Cell Concentration on Adhesion

The results from Table 4 - 7 showed that at 24 h of exposure at 0.8 and 1.2 of absorbance gave higher degree of adhesion in comparison to OD 1.0 by 7.1 % and 10.55 % respectively for *S. aureus* and 5.47 % and 7.84 % respectively for *S. cerevisiae*. Low adhesion at 1.0 absorbance may be due to sampling done every 4 h, 8 h, 12 h and 24 h compared to only one sampling for 0.8 and 1.2 of absorbance. This was because the volume of cell suspension is lower because 1.5 mL sample was taken for OD reading for each sampling plus 10 µL for CFU plating. The attachment of cells to the glass slides which removed after the sampling also contributed to the low percentage of adhesion.

Figure 4 - 15   Images of *S. aureus* at a) 0.8 and b) 1.2 OD and *S. cerevisiae* at c) 0.8 and d) 1.2 OD at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ℃ and 180 rpm

Figure 4 - 16   Images of CFU of *S. aureus* at a) 0.8 and 1.2 OD and *S. cerevisiae* at b) 0.8 and 1.2 OD at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

Table 4 - 7   Result for adhesion test at different cell concentration at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

Micoorganism	OD (Abs)	Adhesion (%)	Cell count (per μm^2)	CFUx 10^{11} (CFU/ml)
S. aureus	0.8 ± 0.002	25.4 ± 0.002	0.38 ± 0.61	87.66 ± 0.10
	1 ± 0.003	17.3 ± 0.003	0.75 ± 0.47	115.66 ± 0.22
	1.2 ± 0.002	27.85 ± 0.002	0.51 ± 0.46	124 ± 0.08
S. cerevisiae	0.8 ± 0.003	14.37 ± 0.003	0.12 ± 0.20	10 ± 0.10
	1 ± 0.002	8.9 ± 0.002	0.41 ± 0.71	10.33 ± 0.05
	1.2 ±0.004	16.73 ± 0.004	0.18 ± 0.14	12 ± 0.10

Despite, the percentage of adhesion of *S. aureus* at high cell concentration is higher compared to *S. cerevisiae* as can be seen in Figure 4 - 17. The adhesion of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* on the glass increased by 2.45 % and 2.36 % respectively at higher cell concentration. Based on (Fan & Karino, 2008) study, they found that the number of cells adherent increased with an increase in the concentration in the medium. It can be concluded that the adhesion increased with concentration. The cells at high concentration tend to form cluster thus make them attach easily on the glass surface.

Figure 4 - 17   Percentage of adhesion versus cell concentration at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ⁰C and 180 rpm

4.5   Effect of Culture Age

Table 4 - 8 showed that the adhesion of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* at exponential state was 31.8 ± 0.001 % and 21.50 ± 0.005 % respectively and at stationary state were 29.7 ± 0.003 % and 12.10 ± 0.004 % respectively. The adhesion decreased with an increase of culture age which supported by the reduction of cell counts. The CFU counts were not available due to contamination. Figure 4 - 19 proved that *S. aureus* gives higher adhesion compared to S. cerevisiae at both exponential and stationary state by 10.3 % and 17.6 % respectively. However, (McEldowney & Fletcher, 1988) discussed that adhesion was not related to growth rate or adhesion incubation time. The different levels of bacterial adhesion occurring with changes in growth rate and phase were probably due to surface changes and not directly dependent on physiological activity, particularly since the adhesion did not decrease with death phase cells. Growth phase has been shown to influence the surface charge characteristics, hydrophobicity and the adhesion ability of different species. Similarly, bacterial adhesion, surface charge and hydrophobicity, and extracellular polymer production have been influenced by growth rate (Fletcher, 1977).

Figure 4 - 18   Images of *S. aureus* of a) 16 h and b) 66 h of cultures and *S.cerevisiae* of c) 16 h and d) 66 h of cultures at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

Table 4 - 8   Result for adhesion test at different culture age at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{o}C and 180 rpm

| Culture age (h)	*S. aureus*			*S. cerevisiae*		
	Optical density (Abs)	Adhesion (%)	Cell count on glass (per μm^2)	Optical density (Abs)	Adhesion (%)	Cell count on glass (per μm^2)
16	0.682 ± 0.001	31.8 ± 0.001	0.33 ± 0.60	0.823 ± 0.005	21.50 ± 0.005	0.13 ± 0.14
66	0.771 ± 0.003	29.7 ± 0.003	0.28 ± 0.17	0.892 ± 0.004	12.10 ± 0.004	0.10 ± 0.10

Figure 4 - 19   The percentage of adhesion for Adhesion at different culture age at 24 h of fermentation at 30 ^{0}C and 180 rpm

5   CONCLUSION

5.1   Conclusion

As a conclusion, the objectives of this research were achieved. *S. cerevisiae* was found to be spherical in shape and Gram's positive type while *S. aureus* was also spherical in shape and Gram's negative type .The diameter of both microorganisms were decreased at stationary phase while at the same time, the hydrophobicity reduced. The adhesion of both *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* increased with exposure to time by which *S. aureus* gave 8.4 % higher adhesion compared to *S.cerevisiae*. The increment of cell concentration in adhesion was also encouraging the percentage of adhesion of both microbes. The adhesion of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* on the glass increased by 2.45 % and 2.36 % respectively, at higher cell concentration. However, for culture age, the adhesion decreases with increase of age culture. The adhesion of *S. aureus* and *S. cerevisiae* decreased by 2.1 % and 9.4 % respectively at stationary phase. In addition, the adhesion of *S. cerevisiae* is slightly lower than *S. aureus* due to their differences in properties. All these data can then be further manipulated either to prevent or to encourage adhesion in the future study.

5.2   Recommendation for Future Works

In order to get better result in the future, adherence of bacteria to the surface should be varied with temperature to obtain optimum adherence condition on the surface. Yet, the agitation of the incubation of bacteria should be varied to study the effect of shear stress on the adherence of bacteria to the surface. Shear stress plays a crucial role in deposition of bacteria from the surface.

REFERENCES

Adetunji, V. O., & Isola, T. O. (2011). Crystal Violet Binding Assay For Assessment Of Biofilm Formation By Listeria Monocytogenes And Listeria Spp On Wood, Steel And Glass Surfaces. *Global Veterinaria, 6*(1), 6-10.

An, Y. H., & Friedman, R. J. (1997). Laboratory Methods For Studies Of Bacterial Adhesion. *Journal Of Microbiological Methods, 30*, 141–152.

Azeredo, J., Visser, J., & Oliveira, R. (1999). Exopolymers In Bacterial Adhesion: Interpretation In Terms Of DLVO And XDLVO Theories. *Coll Surf B, 14*, 141–148.

Booth, I. (1985). Regulation Of Cytoplasmic Ph In Bacteria. *Microbiol Rev, 45*, 359–78.

Bos, R., Van Der Mei, H. C., & Busscher, H. J. (1999). Physicochemistry Of Initial Microbial Adhesive Interactions – Its Mechanisms And Methods For Study. *FEMS Microbiol Rev, 23*, 179–230.

Bott, T. R. (2006). Biofilms. *Encyclopedia Of Chemical Processing*, 110-120.

Carr, J. (2007). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved From Http://En.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/Centers_For_Disease_Control_And_Prevention: Http://En.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/File:Staphylococcus_Aureus_01.Jpg

Castelain, M., Frédéric Pignon, A., Piau, J.-M., & Magnin, A. (2007). Removal Forces And Adhesion Properties Of Saccharomyces Cerevisiae On Glass Substrates Probed By Optical Tweezer. *The Journal Of Chemical Physics*, 135104.

Consterton, J., Geesey, G., & Cheng, K. (1978). How Bacteria Stick. *Sci. Am., 238*(1), 86-96.

Cunliffe, D., Smart, C. A., Alexander, C., & Vulfson, E. N. (1999). Bacterial Adhesion At Synthetic Surfaces. *Applied And Environmental Microbiology, 65*(11), 4995–5002.

Desai, N. P., Hossainy, S. F., & Hubbell, J. A. (1992). Surfaceimmobilized Poly(Ethylene Oxide) For Bacterial Repellance. *Biomaterials, 13*, 417–420.

Dufrene, Y. F., Vermeiren, H., Van Der Leyden, J., & Rouxhet, P. G. (1996). Direct Evidence For The Involvement Of Extracellular Proteins In The Adhesion Of Azospirillum Brasilense. *Microbiology, 142*, 855–865.

Escher, A., & Characklis, W. G. (1990). In Biofilms. In W. G. Characklis (Ed.).

Fan, L.-J., & Karino, T. (2008). Effect Of Serum Concentration On Adhesion Of Monocytic THP-1 Cells Onto Cultured EC Monolayer And EC-SMC Co-Culture*. *Journal Of Zhejiang University SCIENCE B, 9*(8), 623-629.

Fletcher, M. (1977). The Effects Of Culture Concentration And Age, Time, And Temperature On Bacterial Attachment To Polystyrene. *Can J Microbiol, 27*, 1–6.

Fletcher, M. (1992). Bacterial Metabolism In Biofilms. *Biofilms-Science And Technology*, 113-124.

Grant, D., & Bott, T. (2005). Biocide Dosing Strategies For Biofouling Control. *Heat Transfer Engineering, 24*(1), 44-50.

Gristina, A. G. (1987). Biomaterial-Centered Infection: Microbial Adhesion Versus Tissue Integration. *Science, 237*, 1588–1595.

Harris, L. (2002). An Introduction To Staphylococcus Aureus, And Techniques For Identifying And Quantifying S. Aureus Adhesins In Relation To Adhesion To Biomaterials: Review. *Europian Cells And Materials, 4*, 39 - 60.

Herald, P., & Zottola, E. (1988). Attachment Of Listeria Monocytogenes To Stainless Steel Surfaces At Various Temperatures And Ph Values. *J Food Sci, 53*, 1549–52.

Holland, N. B., Qiu, Y. X., & Marchant, R. E. (1998). Biomimetic Engineering Of Non-Adhesive Glycocalyx-Like Surfaces Using Oligosaccharide Surfactant Polymers. *Nature, 392*, 799–801.

Houdt, R. V., & Michiels, C. W. (2010). Biofilm Formation And The Food Industry, A Focus On The Bacterial Outer Surface. *Journal Of Applied Microbiology, 109*(4), 1117–1131.

Hsu, L. C., Fang, J., Borca-Tasciuc, D. A., Worobo, R. W., & Morarua, C. I. (2013). Effect Of Micro- And Nanoscale Topography On The Adhesion Of Bacterial Cells To Solid Surfaces. *Applied And Environmental Microbiology, 79*(8), 2703–2712.

Kjelleberg, S., & Hermansson, M. (1984). Starvation-Induced Effect On Bacterial Surface Characteristics. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol, 48*, 497–503.

Kogure, K., Ikemoto, E., & Morisaki, H. (1998). Attachment Of Vibrioalginolyticus To Glass Surfaces Is Dependent On Swimming Speed. *J Bacteriol, 180*, 932–937.

Kumar, C. G., & Anand, S. K. (1998). Significance Of Microbial Biofilms In Food Industry: A Review. *Int J Food Microbiol, 42*, 9–27.

Li, Y. (2001). Cell Density Modulates Acid Adaption In Streptococcus Mutans. *J Bacteriol, 183*, 84-6875.

Makin, S. A., & Beveridge, T. J. (1996). The Influence Of A-Band And B-Band Lipopolysaccharide On The Surface Characteristics And Adhesion Of Pseudomonas. *Microbiology, 142*, 299–307.

Masur. (2010, January). *Wikipedia.* Retrieved From Http://En.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/File:S_Cerevisiae_Under_DIC_Microscopy.Jpg

Mceldowney, S., & Fletcher, M. (1988). Effect Of Ph, Temperature, And Growth Conditions On The Adhesion Of A Gliding Bacterium And Three Nongliding Bacteria To Polystyrene. *Microb Ecol, 16*, 183-195.

Milanov, D., Asanin, R., Vidic, B., & Plavsa, V. K. (2009). Examination Of The Capabilities Of Attachment And Biofilm Formation Of Different Listeria Monocytogenes Strains,. *Biotechnology In Animal Husbandry, 25*(5), 1255–1265.

Morikawa, M. (2006). Beneficial Biofilm Formation By Industrial Bacteria Bacillus Subtilis And Related Species. *Journal Of Bioscience And Bioengineering, 101*(1), 1-8.

Nicolella, C., & Van Loosdrecht, M. C. (2000). Wastewater Treatment With Particulate Biofilm Reactors. *J Biotechnol, 80*, 1–33.

Norton, S., & D'Amore, T. (1994). Physiological Effects Of Yeast Cells Immobilization: Application For Brewing. *Enzyme And Microbial Technology, 16*, 365-375.

O'toole, G., Kaplan, H. B., & Kolte, R. (2000). Biofilm Formation As Microbial Development. *Annual Review Of Microbiology,, 54*(4), 49–79.

Oliveira, R., Melo, L., & Oliveira, A. (1994). Polysaccharide Production And Biofilm Formation By Pseudomonas Fluorescens: Effects Of Ph And Surface Material. *Colloids Surf B: Biointerf, 2*, 6-41.

Olsen, E. (1993). Influence Of Ph On Bacterial Gene Expression. *Mol Microbiol, 8*, 5-14.

Rowland, B. (2003). Bacterial Contamination Of Dental Unit Waterlines:What Is Your Dentist Spraying Into Your Mouth? *Clin Microbiol Newslett, 25*, 7-73.

Skvarla, J. (1993). A Physico-Chemical Model Of Microbial Adhesion. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans., 89*(15), 2913-2921.

Sousa, Claudia, Teixeira, Pilar, Oliveira, & Ros'ario. (2009). Influence Of Surface Properties On The Adhesion Of Staphylococcus Epidermidis To Acrylic And Silicone. . *International Journal Of Biomaterials*.

Szewzyk, U., Szewzyk, R., Manz, W., & Schleifer, K. H. (2000). Microbiological Safety Of Drinking Water. *Annu Rev Microbiol, 54*, 81–127.

T. Boland, R. A. (2000). Molecular Basis Of Bacterial Adhesion. (Y. H. Friedman, Ed.). *Handbook Of Bacterial Adhesion: Principles, Methods, And Applications.*

Trevor, R., Manmohan, B., & Zhibing, Z. (2008). Bacterial Adhesion And Biofilms On Surfaces. *Progress In Natural Science, 18*, 1049–1056.

Van Hoogmoed, C. G., Kuijl-Booij, M., Van Der Mei, H. C., & Busscher, H. J. (2000). Inhibition Of *Streptococcus* Mutans NS Adhesion To Glass With And Without A Salivary Conditioning Film By Biosurfactant-Releasing *Streptococcus Mitis* Strains. *Appl Environ Microbiol, 66*, 659–663.

Van Oss, C. J., Good, R. J., & Chaudhury, M. K. (1986). The Role Of Van Der Waals Forces And Hydrogen Bonds In Hydrophobic Interactions Between Biopolymers And Low Energy Surfaces. *J Coll, 111*, 378–390.

Werner, E. (N.D.). Improvement Of Adhesion On Polymer Film, Foil And Paperboard By Flame Treatment. *Flame Treatment Of Foils, Films And Paperboards*. Germany: Arcotec.

Werne-Washburne, M., Braun, E. J., G.C., & Singer, R. (1993). *Stationary Phase In The Yeast Saccharomycess Cerevisiae. Microbiological Reviews.*

White, W. (2003). Basic Science Of Advanced Ceramics. *Handbook Of Advanced Ceramics*, 21-30.

Yebra, D. M., Kiil, S., & Dam-Johansen, K. (2004). Antifouling Technology − Past, Present And Future Steps Towards Efficient And Environmentally Friendly Antifouling Coatings. *Prog Org Coat, 50*, 75–104.

Zain, W. S. (2012). *Bioprocess Intensification: Production Of Bioethanol From Saccharomyces Cerevisiae W303 In Monolithic Microreactor.* Newcastle University, School Of Chemical Engineering & Advanced Materials.