

Understanding biofilm formation in intravascular device-related infections

Christophe Beloin, Nuria Fernández-Hidalgo, David Lebeaux

▶ To cite this version:

 $\label{eq:christophe} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{Beloin, Nuria Fernández-Hidalgo, David Lebeaux. Understanding biofilm formation in intravascular device-related infections. Intensive Care Medicine, 2016, 10.1007/s00134-016-4480-7. pasteur-01377078 \end{array}$

HAL Id: pasteur-01377078 https://pasteur.hal.science/pasteur-01377078

Submitted on 6 Oct 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

"Understanding biofilm formation in intravascular device-related infections" 1 2 3 Christophe Beloin¹*, Nuria Fernández-Hidalgo² and David Lebeaux^{3,4} 4 ¹: Institut Pasteur, Unité de Génétique des Biofilms, Département de Microbiologie, Paris, France 5 6 ²: Servei de Malalties Infeccioses. Hospital Universitari Vall d'Hebron. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Barcelona, Spain. 7 8 ³: Service de Microbiologie, Unité Mobile de Microbiologie Clinique, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, Paris, France. 9 10 ⁴: Université Paris Descartes, Paris, France. 11 12 * corresponding author: Christophe Beloin, christophe.beloin@pasteur.fr 13 14

15

17

16 Introduction

18 The use of indwelling devices is constantly increasing in modern medicine. Although they improve 19 patients' care, it is recognised that their use is associated with the risk of infection. Device-related 20 infections represent a significant part of hospital-acquired infections and are due to device 21 contamination by microorganisms subsequently forming biofilms. These biofilms can be defined as 22 sessile communities encased in a self-produced matrix that protects them from external insults 23 including the host immune system and antimicrobial agents. Historically the first description of the 24 involvement of biofilms in a device-related infection was provided in 1982 by the observation of a 25 pacemaker colonised by Staphylococcus aureus [1]. Since then, formation of biofilms has been 26 described in all indwelling devices and is especially problematic in intensive care units (ICU) where intravascular (including intracardiac) devices are extensively used. Among them, intravascular 27 28 catheters are used for different purposes in ICU including infusion, haemodialysis, parenteral nutrition, 29 hemodynamic monitoring or support such as during extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) or 30 extracorporeal life support (ECLS). In part because of their repeated manipulation, the use of such 31 devices is associated with infection incidence densities ranging from 0.8 to 3.7 episodes per 1000 32 catheter-days, depending on ICU units [2]. Main microorganisms responsible for intravascular catheter 33 colonisation and subsequent infections depend on local epidemiology and type of ICU but mostly 34 include Staphylococcus spp, Gram-negative rods and yeasts. Most of the time, clinical symptoms of 35 intravascular catheter-related infections are unspecific, such as fever, chills or hypotension, and local 36 cutaneous signs such as redness or pain are seen in ~20% of the cases.

Here we will describe the different steps of bacterial biofilm formation on intravascular catheters and strategies that can be developed to avoid or reduce their clinical consequences (Figure 1). Such a physiopathologic scheme can also be applied to the formation of biofilm on other intravascular devices such as cardiac prosthetic valves or pacemakers.

41 42 Targeting early steps of colonisation

While initial contamination of intravascular catheters can occur through bacterial translocation from the gut (typically in critically ill and oncology patients) or bloodstream infection (BSI) from another infectious source (Figure 1A), the main route of contamination is the patient's skin bacterial flora or healthcare workers' hand manipulating the catheter hub (Figure 1B and C, respectively). In this case, contamination occurs mainly because of suboptimal aseptic measures and can lead to intra- or extraluminal colonisation [3].

49 Initial events of adhesion on abiotic surfaces such as intravascular catheters that will further lead to 50 colonisation are dependent on electrostatic interactions between bacteria and surfaces as well as 51 more specific interactions between bacterial surface appendages and host proteins that can rapidly 52 cover the implanted material (Figure 1D). These interactions are mediated through different types of 53 adhesins both in Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria such as flagella, homo- or hetero-54 polymeric fimbriae and large adhesins [4]. In Gram-negative bacteria, many of these biofilm-promoting 55 factors are activated by cyclic-di-GMP (c-di-GMP), an allosteric activator controlling free-swimming to 56 sessile lifestyle transition [5].

57 The best prevention approach comes with hand hygiene and skin antisepsis for catheter insertion and 58 handling. Skin disinfection with chlorhexidine-alcohol has been proven to be the more active [6]. If 59 incidence of catheter-related infections is still high, other prophylactic strategies can be proposed 60 including chlorhexidine-impregnated sponges or microbiocides-impregnated catheters such as those 61 containing minocycline-rifampin [7]. While not in clinic yet, devices coated with natural or synthetic 62 antimicrobial peptides might provide in the future novel preventive solutions [8]. In the setting of ICU, 63 as catheters are continuously used, preventive lock therapies are of limited help. The principle of such 64 locks is to inject a small volume of highly concentrated antibiotics in the catheter lumen in order to 65 prevent or eradicate biofilm. One trial demonstrated that a short-course ethanol lock did not prevent 66 dialysis catheter-related infections [9]. Furthermore, the use of such ethanol locks may be associated 67 with catheter clotting and should therefore be carefully used. An alternative to biocidal treatment might 68 be translated in the future into the clinic by the use of anti-adhesive molecules avoiding initial 69 attachment such as coating of catheters with polymers like poly-ethylene-glycols or polysaccharides 70 (methyl-cellulose [10], ulvans) [11], or by interfering with the transition from free-swimming to sessile 71 lifestyle using c-di-GMP inhibitors (for example [12]). 72

73 Targeting mature biofilms

74 After initial attachment, maturation of biofilm essentially relies on communication between bacteria 75 through "guorum-sensing" (QS) molecules and the production of the biofilm matrix. The latter is 76 composed essentially of water and is structured by various macromolecules such as extra-cellular 77 DNA, polysaccharides and proteins (Figure 1E). This matrix not only governs biofilm architecture but 78 also provides protection against both the immune system and antimicrobial agents by reducing their 79 diffusion. At that stage, pieces of biofilms can shed in the bloodstream, leading to sepsis, septic 80 thrombophlebitis, or distant infections such as infective endocarditis or bone and joint infections 81 (Figure 1F). Growth of biofilms in the lumen of the catheter can also be responsible for catheter 82 clotting limiting its use.

The presence of the matrix within mature biofilms imposes gradients of nutrients, oxygen and waste products leading to an important chemical heterogeneity [13] and thus promotes emergence, at a low frequency, of phenotypic variants including the so-called persisters. Persisters, unlike most of the cells composing the biofilms, can survive to extremely high levels of antimicrobial agents, and are thus considered the main cause of biofilm antibiotic tolerance and of chronic and recurrent infections [14].

- The diagnosis of catheter-related BSI (C-RBSI) is established when the same microorganism grows in percutaneous blood cultures and on the catheter tip. It can also be made without removing the catheter by means of the differential time to positivity or quantitative blood cultures techniques [15]. In the last, blood samples from all catheters lumens must be cultured in order to increase sensitivity [16].
- 92 Catheter withdrawal and systemic antimicrobials are the cornerstones of C-RBSI treatment. Antibiotic 93 lock therapy plus systemic antimicrobials is an effective and safe strategy to treat uncomplicated C-94 RBSI without catheter removal but should be restricted to long-term central venous catheters in stable
- 95 patients. As a consequence, it cannot be recommended routinely in ICU patients [17].
- 96 In the future, however, some promising approaches might translate into the clinics. For example, 97 together with a systemic treatment, antibiotic adjuvants that destroy or destabilise the matrix and thus 98 weaken the biofilms such as enzymes (DispersinB, DNasel) or cations chelators (EDTA [18]), or 99 molecules that directly target persister cells (sugars, ADEP4, antimicrobial peptides, etc) [19], could be 100 used as short-course catheter locks for catheter salvage.

102 Conclusion and future challenges.

103 Intravascular catheter-related infections remain a major health issue especially in the ICU. Despite 104 promising approaches developed in research laboratories, in part because of molecule development 105 cost issues, limited relevance of some *in vitro* and *in vivo* animal models and the severity of patients, 106 the physicians in ICU still have very little options when facing such infections.

- 107 108 When an ICU patient suffers from a C-RBSI, the safest option today remains removal of the colonised 109 catheter. Rapid improvements will probably come from preventive strategies firstly based on enhanced 110 hygiene. The next challenges for researchers will be to develop novel strategies to improve early 111 detection of biofilm formation before any symptoms are visible and to increase knowledge and 112 mitigation of polymicrobial biofilm infections that are now often detected in intravascular catheters and, 113 especially, intracardiac devices.
- 114

Figure 1. Schematic view of biofilm formation on the surface of a central venous catheter.

a Microbial contamination can come from a bloodstream infection (defining an hematogenous contamination) but must most frequently originates from the patient's skin (because of a lack of skin antisepsis) (**b**) or from the catheter hub (**c**). These last two routes of contamination lead to extraluminal and endoluminal colonisation, respectively. After contamination, reversible and irreversible adhesion allow the microorganism to stick to the surface of the catheter (**d**). Microorganisms multiply, form a microcolony and then evolve to mature biofilm (**e**) through matrix production and quorum-sensing signals. **f** Lastly, dispersal of biofilm pieces or individual cells is responsible for bloodstream infection and subsequent infection dissemination.



127 **Conflicts of interest.** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

129130 References

128

- 1321.Marrie TJ, Nelligan J, Costerton JW, (1982) A scanning and transmission electron microscopic133study of an infected endocardial pacemaker lead. Circulation 66: 1339-1341
- Dudeck MA, Horan TC, Peterson KD, Allen-Bridson K, Morrell G, Anttila A, Pollock DA,
 Edwards JR, (2013) National Healthcare Safety Network report, data summary for 2011,
 device-associated module. American journal of infection control 41: 286-300
- 1373.Pronovost P, Needham D, Berenholtz S, Sinopoli D, Chu H, Cosgrove S, Sexton B, Hyzy R,138Welsh R, Roth G, Bander J, Kepros J, Goeschel C, (2006) An intervention to decrease139catheter-related bloodstream infections in the ICU. The New England journal of medicine 355:1402725-2732
- 1414.Chagnot C, Zorgani MA, Astruc T, Desvaux M, (2013) Proteinaceous determinants of surface142colonization in bacteria: bacterial adhesion and biofilm formation from a protein secretion143perspective. Frontiers in microbiology 4: 303
- 1445.Valentini M, Filloux A, (2016) Biofilms and Cyclic di-GMP (c-di-GMP) Signaling: Lessons from145Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Other Bacteria. The Journal of biological chemistry 291:14612547-12555
- Mimoz O, Lucet JC, Kerforne T, Pascal J, Souweine B, Goudet V, Mercat A, Bouadma L, Lasocki S, Alfandari S, Friggeri A, Wallet F, Allou N, Ruckly S, Balayn D, Lepape A, Timsit JF, investigators Ct, (2015) Skin antisepsis with chlorhexidine-alcohol versus povidone iodinealcohol, with and without skin scrubbing, for prevention of intravascular-catheter-related infection (CLEAN): an open-label, multicentre, randomised, controlled, two-by-two factorial trial. Lancet 386: 2069-2077
 Schwebel C, Lucet JC, Vesin A, Arrault X, Calvino-Gunther S, Bouadma L, Timsit JF, (2012)
- Schwebel C, Lucet JC, Vesin A, Arrault X, Calvino-Gunther S, Bouadma L, Timsit JF, (2012)
 Economic evaluation of chlorhexidine-impregnated sponges for preventing catheter-related
 infections in critically ill adults in the Dressing Study. Critical care medicine 40: 11-17
- 1568.Batoni G, Maisetta G, Esin S, (2016) Antimicrobial peptides and their interaction with biofilms157of medically relevant bacteria. Biochimica et biophysica acta 1858: 1044-1060
- Souweine B, Lautrette A, Gruson D, Canet E, Klouche K, Argaud L, Bohe J, Garrouste-Orgeas M, Mariat C, Vincent F, Cayot S, Cointault O, Lepape A, Guelon D, Darmon M, Vesin A, Caillot N, Schwebel C, Boyer A, Azoulay E, Bouadma L, Timsit JF, (2015) Ethanol lock and risk of hemodialysis catheter infection in critically ill patients. A randomized controlled trial. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine 191: 1024-1032
- 163
 10. Chauhan A, Bernardin A, Mussard W, Kriegel I, Esteve M, Ghigo JM, Beloin C, Semetey V,
 164
 165
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
 169
- 16611.Junter GA, Thebault P, Lebrun L, (2016) Polysaccharide-based antibiofilm surfaces. Acta
biomaterialia 30: 13-25
- 168
 12. Sambanthamoorthy K, Luo C, Pattabiraman N, Feng X, Koestler B, Waters CM, Palys TJ,
 (2014) Identification of small molecules inhibiting diguanylate cyclases to control bacterial
 biofilm development. Biofouling 30: 17-28
- 171 13. Stewart PS, Franklin MJ, (2008) Physiological heterogeneity in biofilms. Nature reviews
 172 Microbiology 6: 199-210
- 173 14. Lebeaux D, Ghigo JM, Beloin C, (2014) Biofilm-related infections: bridging the gap between clinical management and fundamental aspects of recalcitrance toward antibiotics.
 175 Microbiology and molecular biology reviews : MMBR 78: 510-543
- Mermel LA, Allon M, Bouza E, Craven DE, Flynn P, O'Grady NP, Raad, II, Rijnders BJ,
 Sherertz RJ, Warren DK, (2009) Clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and
 management of intravascular catheter-related infection: 2009 Update by the Infectious
 Diseases Society of America. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the
 Infectious Diseases Society of America 49: 1-45
- 18116.Planes AM, Calleja R, Bernet A, Campins-Marti M, Almirante B, Pumarola T, Fernandez-182Hidalgo N, (2016) Evaluation of the usefulness of a quantitative blood culture in the diagnosis183of catheter-related bloodstream infection: Comparative analysis of two periods (2002 and1842012). Enfermedades infecciosas y microbiologia clinica
- 185 17. Fernandez-Hidalgo N, Almirante B, (2014) Antibiotic-lock therapy: a clinical viewpoint. Expert
 186 review of anti-infective therapy 12: 117-129

- 187 188 189 190 191 18. Chauhan A, Lebeaux D, Ghigo JM, Beloin C, (2012) Full and broad-spectrum in vivo eradication of catheter-associated biofilms using gentamicin-EDTA antibiotic lock therapy. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy 56: 6310-6318
- 19. Beloin C, Renard S, Ghigo JM, Lebeaux D, (2014) Novel approaches to combat bacterial biofilms. Current opinion in pharmacology 18: 61-68