Supporting Information

Bottom-Up Biofilm Eradication Using Bacteriophage-Loaded Magnetic

Nanocomposites: A Computational and Experimental Study

Pingfeng Yu^{1,2,*}, Zijian Wang², Mariana Marcos-Hernandez^{1,3}, Pengxiao Zuo², Danning Zhang^{1,2}, Camilah Powell^{1,4}, Aaron Y. Pan², Dino Villagrán^{1,3}, Michael S. Wong^{1,2,4}, and Pedro J.J. Alvarez^{1,2,4*}

¹Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Nanotechnology-Enabled Water Treatment.

²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Rice University, Houston, Texas, USA

³Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, The University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, USA

⁴Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Rice University, Houston, Texas, USA

*Corresponding authors: pingfeng.yu@rice.edu (P. Yu); alvarez@rice.edu (P. Alvarez).

The supplementary information includes:

Materials and Methods

1. Numerical model construction and calibration.

Figures

Fig. S1. Phage biofilm diffusion assays.

Fig. S2. Influence of CNCs on bacterial growth and biofilm formation.

Fig. S3. Distribution of PNCs at the bottom of simulated biofilm.

Fig. S4. Physical disruption of biofilm by different sized PNCs.

Fig. S5. Biofilm disruption due to PNCs movement in vertical or horizontal directions.

Fig. S6. Influence of phage loading number on PNCs biofilm removal.

Fig. S7. Simulated phage infection patterns by free phages and different sized PNCs.

Tables

Table S1. The values and sources of the basic parameters.

Table S2. The parameters of different sized PNCs in the model.

Supplementary reference

Numerical model construction and calibration.

The biofilm cross-section was represented by a two-dimensional checkerboard (100 grids width × 12 grids height) (Fig. 5A). In each layer the ratio of *E. coli* (red grid) to *P. aeruginosa* (green grid) was set as 2:1 to reflect the measured ratio. The numerical model considers the major phage activities in biofilm including phage infection (Eqn. 1), phage diffusion (Eqn. 2), and phage degradation/trap (Eqn.3). Bacterial proliferation was not considered since the growth of tested bacteria was negligible at biofilm in PBS medium within the treatment time (6 h). After successful infection phages replicate by burst size (β) in latent period (τ) and then diffuse in vertical or horizontal directions.

α determination: The infection rate coefficient (*α*) was calculated based on empirical formula as a function of phage adsorption rate coefficient (Egn. S1). ¹ The adsorption rate coefficient (η) of phage towards *E. coli* and *P. aeruginosa* were measured by phage adsorption tests. ²

$$\frac{\alpha}{\alpha_0} = \frac{exp(-\eta T/L_{box}^3)}{exp(-\eta_0 T/L_{box}^3)}$$
(Eqn. S1)

where α_0 is infection rate coefficient of phage P1 to host *E. coli*, η_0 is adsorption rate coefficient of phage P1, T is the time period of phage adsorption, and L_{box} is the limit of phage distribution in the model (L_{box} = 30 µm).¹

 λ determination: The horizontal diffusion rate coefficient (λ_H) used diffusion coefficient of carboxylated nanoparticles with similar hydrodynamic radius in biofilm.³

$$\frac{D_{bio}}{D_0} = B \exp\left(-A \cdot R_h^2\right)$$
(Eqn. S2)

Where D_{bio} is the diffusion coefficient in the biofilm, D_0 is the diffusion coefficient in water, R_h is the hydrodynamic radius of the particle, B and A are the structural constant related to the heterogeneity of the biofilm network (A = 50 μ m⁻², B = 0.73).³

 $F_{\delta} = N_{\delta} \times \frac{D_N}{L}$

δ determination: The horizontal phage degradation/trap rate coefficient (δ_H) was the degradation rate ensuring the coexistence of biofilm and phage.^{1, 4, 5} Since the dual species biofilm and free phage PEB1 coexisted in 6 h, the horizontal phage degradation/trap rate coefficient (δ_H) was set as the maximum degradation rate coefficient (Eqn. S3) ensuring the coexistence of biofilm and phage.^{4, 6}

$$\delta_{max} = \log \left[\log (\beta (1 - exp^{(0)}) - \lambda \Delta t)) \right] \frac{1}{\Delta t}$$
(Eqn. S3)

Where β is phage burst size, λ is phage diffusion rate coefficient, and Δ t is time step. 6

PNCs physically disrupted the biofilm when penetrating the biofilm (Fig. S4), which facilitated phage propagation in vertical direction (Fig. S1B). We herein defined a facilitation coefficient (F) to increase phage diffusion rate coefficient (Eqn. S4) and decrease phage trap rate coefficient (Eqn. S5) in vertical directions according to Fick's law.⁷

$$F_{\lambda} = N_{\lambda} \times \frac{D_{N}}{L}$$
(Eqn. S4)
(Eqn. S5)

 N_{λ} is diffusion normalizing coefficient, N_{δ} is degradation normalizing coefficient, D_N is the hydrodynamic radius of accumulative space excavated by PNCs, and L is the length of unit grid.

The biofilm width (L₁) was set as 50 μ m and the initial free phage number (N₀) was set as 304 by fitting the biofilm removal efficiency of free phages after 2, 4 and 6 h. The large PNCs had the same number of phages loaded evenly onto each particle. The numbers of phages onto each sized PNCs were based experimental results. The other sized PNCs were set to have the same surface area for phage loading. The PNC parameters were summarized in Table 2.



Figure S1. Phage biofilm diffusion assays. (A) Schematic illustration of phage biofilm diffusion assay. One dual species biofilm of *E. coli* and *P. aeruginosa* was established on the 0.45 μ m membrane for 48 hours. (B) PEB1 and PEB2 propagated through the biofilm with and without CNCs disruption. The CNCs added on the biofilm were 0.1 μ g. CNCs with larger sizes more significantly facilitate phage propagation through the biofilm.



Figure S2. Influence of CNCs on bacterial growth and biofilm formation. The CNCs alone at the tested condition $(1.0 \ \mu g/mL)$ had no noticeable bactericidal or antifouling effects based on (A) bacterial growth curves and (B) crystal violet biofilm assay.

A (Small PNCs)
B (Middle PNCs)
C (Large PNCs)

Figure S3. Distribution of PNCs at the bottom of simulated biofilm. PNCs are randomly dispersed at the biofilm bottom layers following one-dimensional normal distribution.



Figure S4. Physical disruption of biofilm by different sized PNCs. Large PNCs produced more holes in the biofilm when penetrating the biofilm under magnetic field compared with small PNCs. Scale bar is $1 \mu m$.



Figure S5. Biofilm disruption due to PNCs movement in vertical or horizontal directions. (A) Intact biofilm surface without PNCs disruption (control), (B) Undamaged biofilm surface after PNCs horizontal movement in biofilm, and (C) Disrupted biofilm surface after PNCs vertical movement from biofilm surface to bottom. Scale bar is 1 µm.



Figure S6. Influence of phage loading number on PNCs biofilm removal. Increased phage loading onto large PNCs did not resulted in more biofilm removal efficiency when phage counts exceeded more than 20 phages per particle.



Figure S7. Simulated phage infection patterns by free phages and different sized PNCs. Free phages follow from top to bottom infection pattern while PNCs penetrate the biofilm and initiate infection from the bottom. SPNCs with more infectious centers effectively de-anchor the biofilm within six hours while LPNCs resulted in larger biofilm disruption in the vertical direction.

Symbol	Definition	Values	Sources	
L	Unit length of each grid	0.5 µm	Literature ⁴	
-	Latent time in E. coli	45 min	Mangurad	
ι	Latent time in P. aeruginosa	50 min	Ivicasuicu	
ß	Burst size in E. coli	80 PFU	Maggurad	
ρ	Burst size in P. aeruginosa	100 PFU	Wiedsureu	
D_N	Width of excavated channel	$0-0.5 \mu m$	Claculated	
Bio%	Biofilm composition of <i>E. coli</i> and <i>P. aeruginosa</i>	2/3 in <i>E. coli</i>	Measured	
		1/3 in P. aeruginosa		
N_{δ}	Phage degradation adjusting parameter	0.1, 1.5, 5.0	Calibrated	
N_λ	Phage diffusion adjusting parameter	0.69	Literature ³	

Table S1. The values and sources of the semi-empirical model parameters.

NPs Size (nm)	NPs number per biofilm section	Phage loaded per NP	Total phages on PNCs
150	89	4	356
250	32	12	384
500	8	38	304

Table S2: Parameters of different sized PNCs considered by the numerical model

References

- 1. R. S. Eriksen, S. L. Svenningsen, K. Sneppen and N. Mitarai, A Growing Microcolony Can Survive and Support Persistent Propagation of Virulent Phages, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2018, **115**, 337.
- 2. P. Yu, J. Mathieu, M. Li, Z. Dai and P. J. J. Alvarez, Isolation of Polyvalent Bacteriophages by Sequential Multiple-Host Approaches, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 2016, **82**, 808.
- 3. T.-O. Peulen and K. J. Wilkinson, Diffusion of Nanoparticles in a Biofilm, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2011, **45**, 3367-3373.
- 4. S. Heilmann, K. Sneppen and S. Krishna, Coexistence of Phage and Bacteria on the Boundary of Self-Organized Refuges, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2012, **109**, 12828.
- 5. R. Gallet, Y. Shao and I.-N. Wang, High Adsorption Rate is Detrimental to Bacteriophage Fitness in A Biofilm-Like Environment, *BMC Evol. Biol.*, 2009, **9**, 241.
- 6. S. Heilmann, K. Sneppen and S. Krishna, Sustainability of Virulence in a Phage-Bacterial Ecosystem, *J. Virol.*, 2010, **84**, 3016.
- 7. H. Brenner, Effect of Finite Boundaries on the Stokes Resistance of An Arbitrary Particle, *J. Fluid Mech.*, 1962, **12**, 35-48.