Int. J. Adv. Res. MicroBiol. Immunol.
Volume 2, Issue 1 - 2020, Pg. No. 26-30
Peer Reviewed & Open Access Journal

Review Article

Antimicrobials Resistance and Challenging in Infectious Disease Targeting - A Critical Review

K Purna Kishore, B Vinod Kumar, R Karthikeyan

Vignan Pharmacy College, Vadlamudi, Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh, India.

I N F O

Corresponding Author:
R Karthikeyan, Vignan Pharmacy College, Vadlamudi, Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh, India.
E-mail Id:
rkcognosy@gmail.com
Orcid Id:
https://orcid.org/0000000189541361
How to cite this article:
Kishore KP, Kumar BV, Karthikeyan R. Antimicrobials Resistance and Challenging in Infectious Disease Targeting - A Critical Review. *Int J Adv Res MicroBiol Immunol* 2020; 2(1): 26-30.

Date of Submission: 2020-05-08
Date of Acceptance: 2020-05-22

A B S T R A C T

Infectious diseases, biotechnological and environmental procedures are thoroughly fitted to the power of microorganisms to form biofilms. Biofilms demarcated as the organized communities of bacteria lead to developing a microbial various styles of living, team up among themselves and subsistence devoted to an inert or living surface accommodate in a self-generated polymeric matrix finished chiefly of exopolysaccharide. Due to The structural arrangement of these films and features of the sessile cells, produce immunity against the antimicrobial agents, leading to a protected environment in contrast to adverse conditions and the host´s defenses. Regardless of years of research, very tiny is acknowledged about the molecular pathways of antibiotic resistance in biofilms. Although various theories have been anticipated, the specific mechanism of how this understanding is altered has unmoving not been illuminated. Still, it is probable to discrete these mechanisms into inherent and extrinsic resistance impacts to biofilms. Yet, because of the changed nature of biofilms, it is prospective that multiple mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance ensue. However, supplementary mechanisms must also present to be gifted to account for enlarged biofilm antibiotic resistance. Although procedures to identify biofilm-budding bacteria have already been established, their medical significance round the prophecy of clinically fruitful therapies still look headlong to endorsement.

Keywords: Biofilms, Antimicrobial Agents, Mechanism of Action

Introduction

These are the microorganisms which stick to to moist exteriors in freshwater ecosystems[1] coined by the team of Dr. Costerton as “biofilms” in 1978. Widely approved description of biofilms done by Donald 2002[2]. Bacteria present in two principal forms, as free-moving planktonic imitating cells, besides in biofilms. Microbiologists, owing to antique reasons, have conventionally concentrated on the outcomes of empirical research work on free-floating microorganisms growing in suspension in a liquid growth medium. However, it is now commonly known that the major partition of microbial cells on earth are existing in 3 dimensional numerous communities, referred to as biofilms, a type in which they act very dissimilarly. It is here and now proved that 99% of all bacteria present in biofilms, with only 1 percent dynamic in the planktonic state. As it has been projected that 65% of microbial poisons are allied with biofilms,[3-4] this is now one of the trending topics in microbiology.[5] Microbial multicellular way of living established biofilms and are termed as communities by means of the order of bacteria, work composed among themselves and being loyal to an slothful or living outward contained in a self-produced polymeric

matrix made primarily of exopolysaccharide.[2] This matrix consists of many types of carbohydrates, proteins and genes originating from microbes and the bacterial consortium contains one or more species living in a sociomicrobiological way. Direct structural examination of biofilms has shown that their component micro-colonies, which are composed of cells embedded in matrix material, are bisected by ramifying the water channels that carry the bulk fluid into the community by convective flow.[6-7] This creates cells to engender enduring links, communicate with each added and create metabolic care. Biofilms can be placid of a population advanced from a one kind of species or a community-derived of various microbial species. Hypothesis about the ecological advantages of forming biofilms embrace fortification from the environment, nutrient accessibility, metabolic cooperation, and the procurement of new genetic traits.[8] Microbial multicellular populations or biofilms are of different magnitudes and shapes, with utmost prevalent types comprehending mushroom-like, pillar-like, hilly, or flat many cellular assemblies, which permit cells to form established affairs, intermingle with one other and start metabolic backing.[8-9] The bacteria interaction with an outward and the progress of a biofilm can be perceived as a living mechanism, with bacteria attaining nutrients and protection from biocides acts as a advantageous mechanism. In conditions of opposing circumstances such as osmotic shock, withering, or contact to deadly mixtures, UV radiation or predators, the microbial community can provide shield. In addition, biofilms are also spots where genetic material is simply switched due to closeness of the cells, thus sustaining a large DNA segment pool.

Stages of Biofilm Development

Adhesion of pioneer bacteria is the initiation step by some of the planktonic or free-floating bacteria and they move towards the surface (live or alive) and attached to the "boundary layer" which is the inactive zone at the surface where the flow velocity falls to zero. Some of these cells strike and are adsorbed to the surface for only a finite time, before being de-adsorbed, in a process called "reversible adsorption".[10] This preliminary accessory is constructed on electrostatic pull and physical forces, but not due to any chemical attachments. Some kind of these reversibly adsorbed cells begin to formulate for a lengthy stay by forming structures which may then always bind then to the superficial within the succeeding few hours, the pioneer cells continue to reproduce and the daughter cells, which form very small colonies on the surface and intiate to generate a polymer medium around the microcolonies,[11] in an irreversible steps. Subsequently, in the next stage focal areas of the biofilm dissolve and the liberated bacterial cells are then able to spread to other locations where new biofilms can be formed, and the mature biofilm may contain water-filled channels and thereby resemble primitive, multicellular organisms and the attachment is mediated by extracellular polymers that extend outward from the bacterial cell wall. This polymeric material possess charged and neutral polysaccharides groups that not only provide attachment but also act as an ion-exchange system for concentrating trace nutrients from the overlying water and for tricking.

Biofilms are saturated at all stages by a trap of channels over which water, nutrients, enzymes, bacterial garbage, metabolites and oxygen move back and forth with gradients of ions and chemicals sandwiched between macrozones providing the supremacy to jolt the substances surrounding the biofilms.[12] Oxygen may be worn-out in the interior only 30-40 m of the biofilm/ water boundary. Although the exact penetration of the oxygen gradient in the biofilm fluctuates based on the oxygen contented in the bulk water, water flow, and water temperature, this gives a coarse idea of how far oxygen can longwinded. Some common features of biofilm contaminations in humans interrelated with critical planktonic infections are publicized beneath:[13]

- Masses of bacteria entrenched in a self-formed polymer atmosphere
- Lenient to mutually adaptive and inborn immune responses
- Open-minded to clinically dose up of antibiotics inspite vulnerability of planktonic cells
- Lingering contagions

Biofilms and Protection from Antibiotics

In the traditional antibiotic resistance of planktonic bacteria, usually involves inactivation of the antibiotic, modification of targets, and exclusion of the antibiotic.[14] These actions typically require the acquisition of specific genetic factors, such as genes for beta-lactamase or efflux pumps. Bacterial biofilm formation crucial feature is the resistance improvement of the integral microbes to antibiotics and other stressors, The characteristics of the sessile cells, produce resistance towards the antimicrobial agents, leading to a protected environment against adverse conditions and the host´s defenses is due to the structural arrangement of these films.[15]

Innate Resistance Factors to Biofilms

The inborn factors of immunity are galvanized as part of the biofilm developmental pathway, which are vital parts of the biofilm structure and physiology resultant from translation to a biofilm routine. Factors affecting microbial resistance have been acknowledged and it is owing to quite a lot of diverse intrinsic biofilms. For example: matrix of these biofilms might act as a diffusion barrier; small and specialized environment of biofilms can be established inside; some kinds of bacteria within the biofilms may differentiate into persisters which are also within the

bacterial population; an increased production of oxidative stress causes might change in the physiology of bacteria; and an antagonist of antibiotics and degradation mechanisms may be active in some parts of the biofilms.[16,17]

Diffusion Barrier

Biofilms to prevent antibiotics from reaching their goals can act as bodily diffusion barriers. Antibiotic was shown to be able to penetrate these structures through a thick mixture of exopolysaccharide, DNA, and protein to reach the targets.[18] However, this mixture was not able to achieve an effective concentration in some all parts due to the physical and/or chemical properties of the matrix, which resulted in an apparent increase in resistance. Still, restricted antibiotic diffusion does not seem to be a widespread feature joint by fully biofilms and, there is contradictory statistics about whether the biofilm matrix is a key underwriting factor persuading biofilm resistance. A decreased dispersion and dissemination of antimicrobials over the biofilm matrix has been publicized to influence biofilm subsistence in nearly cases. For occurrence, at sub-MIC emphases of beta-lactam antibiotics, an augmented alginate unification in P. aeruginosa biofilms was tempted and enrichment of the biofilm milieu of some slime-fabricating coagulase-negative staphylococci.

Microenvironments within biofilms

The nutrients and oxygen within biofilms lessening might lead to a rehabilitated metabolic activity and established leisurely development of the bacteria. Numerous revisions have illustrated oxygen restriction and the attendance of hypoxic regions cavernous within biofilms, with nutrient diffusion over biofilms being circumscribed.[19] Inspection of vitro biofilms as well as environmental has designated that the oxygen concentration may be tall at the surface, but narrow in the center of the biofilm where anaerobic conditions may be existing. Similarly, protein synthesis, growth, and metabolic activity are stratified in biofilms, for illustration, there is a high level of movement at the surface then a low level in the center, follow-on in slow or no progress. This datum is solitary of the descriptions put frontward for the condensed vulnerability of biofilms to antibiotics.[20]

Differentiation into Persister Cells

Persisted cells are either nongrowing or slow-growing and have a greatly reduced susceptibility to antibiotics.[21] In the persister's theory, these small subpopulations of bacteria can survive extreme antibiotic treatment and have been assumed to be the product of phenotypic differences rather than due to stable genetic changes these can be found within the biofilms differentiate into dormant cells.

Increased Production of Oxidative Stress

Oxidative stress is caused by an imbalance between the production of oxidants, such as the free radicals, peroxide and nitric oxide, with the levels of antioxidant defenses. A disturbance in the prooxidant-antioxidant balance in favor of the overproduction of Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) can result in damage to the cellular components, including the matrix, DNA, proteins, and lipids.[22,23] Diverse stresses, including nutrient availability, low oxygen, high osmolarity, ethanol and sub-inhibitory antibiotic concentrations, can alter the cellular functions associated with the oxidative metabolism,[24] thereby stimulating the production of ROS and the highly reactive hydroxyl radicals (HO), which are generated by the presence of hydrogen peroxide (H^2O^2) and iron (Fenton reaction) either by the superoxide anion (O^2-) or by the superoxide anion, hydrogen peroxide and a metal catalyst (Haber-Weiss reaction).[25] In the antioxidant defense system, the main enzymes involved in the detoxification of ROS are Superoxide Dismutase (SOD) and catalase (CAT), among others.[26] However, in oxidative imbalance with due to an overproduction of ROS, a reduction in the oxidative defenses is insufficient to remove the free radicals, and therefore, the antioxidant system plays a very important role in the control of this process.[27] The increased production of oxidative stress causes changes in the physiology of bacteria, with specific phenotypic alterations occurring and we have observed that biofilm development is influenced by the balance between the production of oxidants (ROS and NO) and the levels of antioxidant defenses (SOD), which can be significantly affected by different environmental stresses. Antagonist action of antibiotics and degradation mechanisms active in some parts of biofilms Microenvironments exits that can antagonize the action of antibiotics and the degradation mechanisms active in some parts of biofilms may also be involved. Sociomicrobiology is defined as the relation existing between quorum sensing (QS) and biofilms. Bacteria communicate using synthesizing and reacting on signal molecules to sense when a concentration of bacteria is present in a limited space in the environment and then respond by activating certain genes that produce, for example, virulence factors such as enzymes or toxins. The most well-described QS molecules in Gram-negative bacteria are the N-acyl-l-homoserine lactones and in many Gram-positive bacteria, the QS molecules are small peptides. QS Can regulate the production of virulence factors such as extracellular enzymes and cellular lysins, which are important for the pathogenesis of infections, where the bacteria functions as a protective shield against phagocytes.[28] QS May also influence the development of the biofilm and determine the tolerance of biofilms to antibiotic therapy and the innate inflammatory response.[29]

Conclusion

During their evolution, bacteria have been able to develop successful strategies for survival, which include an

attachment to surfaces and the development of protective biofilms where bacteria behave very differently to the free-floating types. These efficacious tactics made it grim to regulate biofilm progress, with a biofilm so long as bacteria with a 10- to 1,000- fold rise in antibiotic struggle equated to unrestricted ones. Due to the assorted nature of biofilms, it is likely that manifold mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance are essential to explain biofilm subsistence in quite a lot of cases, the result of an elaborate blend of extrinsic and intrinsic reasons due to antibiotic resistance. Much more research is looked-for to divulge supplementary and/or advanced antibiotic-induced factors in biofilms, as the multifactorial landscape of biofilm antibiotic resistance has stuck the credentials of these paths, with much still being unskilled approximately the induced reasons in biofilm resistance. Detection of these factors should lead to better and new treatments for biofilm-linked infections. Innovative approaches are dynamic to overpowering biofilm antibiotic resistance by over the expansion of pioneering therapies meant at slaughter the fundamental bacteria & unsettling biofilms, with the supervision of intrinsic and extrinsic resistance pathways providing much aptitude for impending behavior of biofilm contagions.

Acknowledgment

The authors are thankful to the management of vignan Pharmacy College for providing the facility to do such a mini review.

Conflict of Interest: None

References

1. Costerton JW, Geesey GG, Cheng GK. How bacteria stick. *Sci Am* 1978; 238: 86-95.
2. Donald RM. Biofilms: Microbial life on surfaces. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2002; 8(9): 881-890.
3. Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent infections. *Science* 1999; 284: 1318-1322.
4. Wilson M. Microbial Inhabitants of Humans: Their Ecology and Role in Health and Disease. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2005.
5. Potera C. Biofilms invade microbiology. *Science* 1996; 273(5283): 1795-1797.
6. Costerton JW, Cheng KJ, Geesey GG et al. Bacterial biofilms in nature and disease. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 1987; 41: 435-464.
7. Geesey GG, Lewandowski Z, Flemming HC. Biofouling and Biocorrosion in Industrial WaterSystems. Lewis Publishers, Ann Arbor; 1994.
8. Pamp SJ, Gjermansen M, Tolker-Nielsen T. The biofilm matrix-A sticky framework. In: Kjelleberg S, Givskov M, eds. The Biofilm Mode of Life. Norfolk: Horizon Bioscience; 2007; 37-6.
9. Costerton JW, Cheng KJ, Geesey GG et al. Bacterial biofilms in nature and disease. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 1987; 41: 435-464.
10. Wilson M. Microbial Inhabitants of Humans: Their Ecology and Role in Health and Disease. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2005.
11. Mayette DC. The existence and significance of biofilms in water. Waterview Water Quality Research Council, Lisle.
12. Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent infections. *Science* 1999; 284: 1318-1322.
13. Davey ME, O'Toole GA. Microbial biofilms: From ecology to molecular genetics. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 2000; 64(4): 847-867.
14. Patel R. Biofilms and antimicrobial resistance. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005: 41-47.
15. Stoodley P, Sauer K, Davies DG, Costerton JW. Biofilm as complex differentiated communities. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 2002; 56: 187-209.
16. Stewart PS, Costerton JW. Antibiotic resistance of bacteria in biofilms. *Lancet* 2001; 358: 135-138.
17. Albesa I, Becerra MC, Battan PC et al. Oxidative stress involved in the antibacterial action of different antibiotics. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* 2004; 317: 605-609.
18. Donlan RM, Costerton JW. Biofilms: survival mechanisms of clinically relevant microorganisms. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2002; 15: 167-193.
19. Dunne WM Jr. Bacterial adhesion: seen any good biofilms lately? *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2001; 15: 155-166.
20. Keren I, Kaldalu N, Spoering A. Persister cells and tolerance to antimicrobials. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 2004; 230: 13-18.
21. Lewis K. Persister cells and the riddle of biofilm survival. *Biochemistry* 2005; 70: 267-274.
22. Becerra MC, Paez PL, Larovere LE et al. Lipids and DNA oxidation in Staphylococcus aureus as a consequence of oxidative stress generated by ciprofloxacin. *Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry* 2006; 285: 29-34.
23. Baronetti JL, Angel Villegas N, Paraje MG et al. Nitric oxide-mediated apoptosis in rat macrophages subjected to Shiga toxin 2 from Escherichia coli. *Microbiol Immunol* 2011; 55: 231-238.
24. Arce Miranda JE, Sotomayor CE, Albesa I et al. Oxidative and nitrosative stress in Staphylococcus aureus biofilm. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 2011; 315(1): 23-29.
25. Aiassa V, Baronetti JL, Paez PL et al. Increased advanced oxidation of protein products and enhanced total

antioxidant capacity in plasma by action of toxins of Escherichia coli STEC. *Toxicol In Vitro* 2011; 25: 426-431.
26. Becerra MC, Paez PL, Larovere LE et al. Lipids and DNA oxidation in Staphylococcus aureus as a consequence of oxidative stress generated by ciprofloxacin. *Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry* 2006; 285: 29-34.
27. Sardesai VM. Role of antioxidants in health maintenance. *Nutr Clin Pract* 1995; 10: 19-25.
28. Alhede M, Bjarnsholt T, Jensen PØ et al. Pseudomonas aeruginosa recognizes and responds aggressively to the presence of polymorphonuclear leukocytes. *Microbiology* 2009; 155(Pt 11): 3500-3508.
29. Bjarnsholt T, Jensen P-Ø, Burmølle M et al. Pseudomonas aeruginosa tolerance to tobramycin, hydrogen peroxide and polymorphonuclear leukocytes is quorum-sensing dependent. *Microbiology* 2005; 151: 373-83.