OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

ISSN: 2327-5073
Clinical Microbiology: Open Access

Short Communication

Biofilm Formation and Its Relevance to Clinical Infections

Markus Spettel*

Department of Medicine I, Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Austria

DESCRIPTION

Biofilm formation represents a critical factor in the pathogenesis and persistence of many clinical infections. Biofilms are complex communities of microorganisms that attach to surfaces and are encased in a self-produced extracellular matrix. This essay search into the process of biofilm formation, its relevance to clinical infections, the challenges it poses to treatment, and potential strategies to combat biofilm-associated infections.

Biofilm formation: An overview

Biofilm formation is a multi-step process involving initial attachment, microcolony formation, maturation, and dispersion.

Initial attachment: The process begins when free-floating (planktonic) bacteria adhere to a surface. This attachment is facilitated by bacterial adhesins, which are proteins or polysaccharides that bind to specific receptors on the surface [1]. Factors like surface roughness, hydrophobicity, and the presence of conditioning films (organic molecules that coat surfaces) influence this initial adherence.

Microcolony formation: After attachment, bacteria proliferate and form microcolonies [2]. This stage is characterized by the production of Extracellular Polymeric Substances (EPS), which include polysaccharides, proteins, lipids, and DNA. EPS acts as a scaffold, holding the cells together and anchoring them to the surface.

Maturation: The biofilm matures as the microcolonies grow and the EPS matrix develops. Channels form within the biofilm, facilitating nutrient and waste transport. During this phase, the biofilm exhibits a high degree of structural and functional heterogeneity, with different regions exhibiting varied metabolic activities and resistance profiles.

Clinical relevance of biofilms

Biofilms are implicated in a wide range of clinical infections, particularly chronic and device-related infections.

Chronic infections: Biofilms are well-knowingly difficult to eradicate and are responsible for chronic infections such as chronic otitis media, chronic wounds, and chronic urinary tract infections [3,4]. In these conditions, biofilms protect bacteria from the host immune system and antibiotics, leading to persistent and recurrent infections.

Device-related infections: Medical devices, including catheters, prosthetic joints, and heart valves, provide ideal surfaces for biofilm formation. *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Staphylococcus epidermidis* are common culprits in these device-related infections. Once established, biofilms on medical devices can seed the bloodstream, causing bacteremia and sepsis.

Challenges posed by biofilms

Biofilms present several challenges in clinical settings:

Antibiotic resistance: Biofilms exhibit a high degree of antibiotic resistance [5,6]. The EPS matrix acts as a physical barrier, preventing antibiotics from penetrating the biofilm. Additionally, the slow-growing or dormant cells within the biofilm (persister cells) are less susceptible to antibiotics, which typically target actively dividing cells.

Immune evasion: Biofilms protect bacteria from the host immune system. The EPS matrix shields bacteria from phagocytosis by immune cells, and biofilm-associated bacteria can modulate the host immune response, promoting chronic inflammation without effective clearance of the infection.

Strategies to combat biofilm-associated infections

Several strategies are being explored to address the challenges posed by biofilms:

Preventive measures: Preventing biofilm formation on medical devices is critical [7,8]. Strategies include coating devices with antimicrobial agents or materials that inhibit bacterial adhesion. For example, silver-coated catheters have shown promise in reducing biofilm formation.

Correspondence to Markus Spettel, Department of Medicine I, Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Austria; E-mail: smarkus@gmail.com

Received: 14-Jun-2024; Manuscript No. CMO-24-26153; **Editor assigned:** 17-Jun-2024; Pre QC. No. CMO-24-26153 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 02-Jul-2024; QC. No. CMO-24-26153; **Revised:** 09-Jul-2024; Manuscript No. CMO-24-26153 (R); **Published:** 16-Jul-2024, DOI: 10.35248/ 2327-5073.24.13.398

Citation: Spettel M (2024) Biofilm Formation and Its Relevance to Clinical Infections. Clin Microbiol. 13:398.

Disrupting biofilms: Enzymatic treatments that degrade the EPS matrix, such as DNase or dispersin B, can disrupt biofilms and enhance antibiotic penetration. Additionally, physical methods like ultrasound or electric fields (bioelectric effect) can disrupt biofilm structure.

Novel therapeutics: Developing new antibiotics and antimicrobial agents that are effective against biofilms is a priority [9,10]. Anti-biofilm peptides, quorum-sensing inhibitors, and phage therapy are areas of active research. Quorum sensing inhibitors disrupt bacterial communication, preventing biofilm formation and maintenance.

CONCLUSION

Biofilm formation is a critical factor in the pathogenesis and persistence of many clinical infections, posing significant challenges to treatment and eradication. Understanding the mechanisms of biofilm formation and developing effective strategies to prevent and disrupt biofilms are necessity for improving clinical outcomes. Advances in preventive measures, novel therapeutics, and combination therapies offer hope for better management of biofilm-associated infections, ultimately enhancing patient care and reducing the burden of chronic and device-related infections.

REFERENCES:

1. Sanchez CJ, Mende K, Beckius ML, Akers KS, Romano DR, et al. Biofilm formation by clinical isolates and the implications in chronic infections. BMC Infect Dis. 2013;13:1-2.
2. Akers KS, Cardile AP, Wenke JC, Murray CK. Biofilm formation by clinical isolates and its relevance to clinical infections. Adv Exp Med Biol: Volume I. 2014:1-28.
3. Percival SL. Importance of biofilm formation in surgical infection. Br J Surg. 2017;104(2):e85-94.
4. Hall-Stoodley L, Stoodley P. Evolving concepts in biofilm infections. Cell Microbiol. 2009;11(7):1034-1043.
5. Arciola CR, Campoccia D, Speziale P, Montanaro L, Costerton JW. Biofilm formation in Staphylococcus implant infections. A review of molecular mechanisms and implications for biofilm-resistant materials. Biomaterials. 2012;33(26):5967-5982.
6. Kwiecinski JM, Jacobsson G, Horswill AR, Josefsson E, Jin T. Biofilm formation by Staphylococcus aureus clinical isolates correlates with the infection type. Infect Dis (Lond). 2019;51(6): 446-451.
7. Hall MR, McGillicuddy E, Kaplan LJ. Biofilm: Basic principles, pathophysiology, and implications for clinicians. Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2014;15(1):1-7.
8. Mohamed JA, Huang DB. Biofilm formation by enterococci. J Med Microbiol. 2007;56(12):1581-1588.
9. Jamal M, Ahmad W, Andleeb S, Jalil F, Imran M, Nawaz MA,et al. Bacterial biofilm and associated infections. J Chin Med Assoc. 2018;81(1):7-11
10. Holmberg A, Lood R, Mörgelin M, Söderquist B, Holst E, Collin M, et al. Biofilm formation by Propionibacterium acnes is a characteristic of invasive isolates. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2009;15(8):787-795.