

SPECIAL ISSUE ARTICLE

Artificial dry surface biofilm models for testing the efficacy of cleaning and disinfection

K. Ledwoch^{1,2}, J. Said¹, P. Norville^{1,2} and J.-Y. Maillard¹

¹ School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

² GAMA Healthcare Ltd, Watford, UK

Significance and Impact of the Study: The widespread presence of biofilms on dry surfaces in healthcare settings has been recently documented. These dry surface biofilms (DSB) present an unprecedented challenge to cleaning and disinfection processes. Here, we describe a practical efficacy protocol based on an *in vitro* *Staphylococcus aureus* DSB model. The protocol measures reduction in viability, transferability and biofilm regrowth post-treatment to provide altogether a practical assessment of product efficacy against dry surface biofilms.

Keywords

cleaning, disinfection, dry surface biofilm, efficacy test, sodium hypochlorite, test protocol.

Correspondence

Jean-Yves Maillard, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Cardiff University Redwood Building, King Edward VII Avenue, Cardiff CF10 3NB, UK.

E-mail: MaillardJ@cardiff.ac.uk

2018/2175: received 15 November 2018, revised 22 January 2019 and accepted 22 January 2019

doi:10.1111/lam.13143

Abstract

Dry surface biofilms (DSB) harbouring pathogens are widespread in healthcare settings, are difficult to detect and are resistant to cleaning and disinfection interventions. Here, we describe a practical test protocol to palliate the lack of standard efficacy test methods for DSB. *Staphylococcus aureus* DSB were produced over a 12-day period, grown with or without the presence of organic matter, and their composition and viability were evaluated. Disinfectant treatment was conducted with a modified ASTM2967-15 test and reduction in viability, transferability and biofilm regrowth post-treatment were measured. Dry surface biofilms produced over a 12-day period had a similar carbohydrates, proteins and DNA content, regardless of the presence or absence of organic matter. The combination of sodium hypochlorite (1000 ppm) and a microfiber cloth was only effective against DSB in the absence of organic load. With the increasing concerns of the uncontrolled presence of DSB in healthcare settings, the development of effective intervention model in the presence of organic load is appropriate for the testing of biocidal products, while the use of three parameters, log₁₀ reduction, transferability and regrowth, provides an accurate and practical measurement of product efficacy.

Introduction

Biofilms are microbial communities embedded in self-secreted extracellular polymeric substances (EPS). Biofilms are significantly more tolerant to antimicrobials when compared to their planktonic equivalents (Akinbobola *et al.* 2017). The vast majority of studies on biofilm resistance to disinfection concerns hydrated biofilms formed and consistently grown in liquid environments or in the presence of high level of moisture (Francolini and Donelli 2010; Bridier *et al.* 2011; Otter *et al.* 2015). Not much attention has been paid to 'dry' biofilms colonizing

surfaces with the presence of desiccated micro-organisms, limited moisture and nutrient resource (Vickery *et al.* 2012; Almatroudi *et al.* 2015) despite their widespread presence on healthcare surfaces (Vickery *et al.* 2012; Hu *et al.* 2015; Ledwoch *et al.* 2018).

There is no standardized efficacy test against biofilm published by the European Norm. In the United States, disinfectant efficacy tests against biofilms concern the treatment of hydrated biofilms (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2013). Among common test protocols the Calgary device enables the measurement of the minimal biofilm eradication concentration (MBEC) which

corresponds to the lowest concentration of a biocide or biocidal formulation that kill a monospecies bacterial (hydrated) biofilm (Ceri *et al.* 1999; Ali *et al.* 2006; Azeredo *et al.* 2017); The CDC reactor model and drip flow reactor model have also been used successfully to measure the efficacy of antimicrobials against hydrated biofilms (Schwartz *et al.* 2010; Almatroudi *et al.* 2015). Other nonstandardized biofilm efficacy methods have also been described (Pierce *et al.* 2008; Millhouse *et al.* 2014; Sherry *et al.* 2016). There are, however, no standard protocols to measure the efficacy of biocidal formulations against dry surface biofilms (DSB).

This paper proposes such a test and establishes test parameters to ensure the appropriate control of DSB in practice following cleaning/disinfection interventions.

Results and discussion

Dry surface biofilms are widespread on various surfaces in healthcare facilities (Vickery *et al.* 2012; Almatroudi *et al.* 2015), although their impact on healthcare associated infections has not been yet established. *Bacillus* spp. and *Staphylococcus aureus* were recently identified as the species most commonly associated with DSB formed on hospital surfaces (Ledwoch *et al.* 2018). Furthermore, Vickery *et al.* (2012) showed that DSB can persist on surfaces despite effective cleaning. In their study, samples isolated from ICU unit harboured pathogens including multidrug resistant micro-organisms following terminal cleaning with neutral detergent followed by chlorine 500 ppm disinfection. Equipment and furnishing retrieved from hospital were also positive for the presence of VRE and MRSA (Vickery *et al.* 2012).

Here, we report the development of artificial mono-species DSB grown in the presence of organic load or not, for biocidal product testing. To date there are no such tests reported in the literature and limited existing protocols refer to testing against hydrated biofilms. The number of bacteria recovered from CL-DSB or OL-DSB was the same after the formation of DSB (Fig. 1). There was no statistically significant difference (Two-way ANOVA, $P = 0.08821$) in viable count of bacteria (\log_{10} CFU per ml = 7.60 ± 0.60) recovered from each disc between 20 environmental DSB replicates. The average bacterial concentration in CL- and OL-DSB was 7.38 ± 0.58

and $7.89 \pm 0.60 \log_{10}$ CFU per ml, respectively. *Staphylococcus aureus* DSB composition consisted mainly of proteins ($96 \pm 1\%$) with some carbohydrates ($4 \pm 1\%$), with overall little DNA (Fig. 2). No lipids were detected by the colorimetric sulfo-phospho-vanillin method suggesting lipid level was below the detection limit of $35 \mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ (Anschau *et al.* 2017). The amount of proteins and carbohydrates remains constant throughout the dry surface biofilm cycles with 95–97% of proteins and 3–5% carbohydrates in both CL and OL-DSB. Surprisingly the addition of BSA during the OL-DSB production did not impact on the composition of the biofilm (Fig. 2). Indeed, there was no statistical difference ($P = 0.5317$) between the carbohydrate and proteins ratio of CL- and OL-DSB. More DNA (ANOVA; $P < 0.05$) was extracted from DSB grown in the presence of organic load (21 ± 7 ng per disc) compared to without BSA (17 ± 9 ng per disc). Hydrated *S. aureus* biofilms are also mostly composed of proteins, although carbohydrate concentration is higher. Abdallah *et al.* (2014) reported *S. aureus* 24 and 48 h hydrated biofilms formed on stainless steel coupons were composed of 70 and 78% proteins and 30 and 22% of carbohydrates, respectively.

The composition, appearance and viability of our dry surface biofilms were homogeneous (Fig. 3) with $8.0 \pm 0.6 \log_{10}$ CFU per cm^2 after the 12 days process. Abdallah *et al.* (2014) reported similar findings with hydrated *S. aureus* biofilms following 24 and 48 h incubation, 8.4 ± 0.2 and $8.2 \pm 0.2 \log_{10}$ CFU per cm^2 , respectively. After the first dry phase, the majority of bacteria were viable (90 and 98% of all bacteria in CL- and OL-DSB, respectively) (Fig. 3). However, in the course of growth and after sequential dry phases, the number of dead bacteria increased (Fig. 3). At the end of dry surface biofilm formation cycle, 42 and 75% of bacteria were viable in CL- and OL-DSB, respectively. SEM of 12-day DSB showed homogenous cluster of bacteria embedded in a matrix and separated by channels. OL-DSB appeared to contain more matrix (Fig. 4). Although uniformity is a positive attribute for reproducibility, these biofilms differ somewhat to DSB isolated from healthcare surfaces. Indeed, environmental DSB form clusters of unevenly scattered bacteria through the colonized surface, thus making disinfectant testing using *in situ* dry surface biofilms inappropriate (Ledwoch *et al.* 2018).




Figure 1 Scheme of dry surface biofilm formation and growth. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]




Figure 2 Composition of clean (CL; left) and organic load (OL; right) DSB. DNA: ■, Carbohydrates: ■, Proteins: ■. Time "0" indicates planktonic bacteria. No lipids were recovered with the protocol used in this study. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]




Figure 3 Live (green)/dead (red) fluorescence images of Syto 9/propidium iodide stained clean dry biofilm (CL, top) and Syto 9/propidium iodide stained organic load dry biofilm (OL, bottom) after 4, 8 and 12 days of cultivation. $\times 63$ magnification, Zeiss LSM880 Airscan Confocal Microscope. Representative images from three fields of two samples. CL-DSB after 4 (a), 8 (b) and 12 (c) days; OL-DSB after 4 (d), 8 (e) and 12 (f) days. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]




Figure 4 Scanning electron microscope images of clean (CL) dry biofilm and organic load (OL) dry biofilm, $\times 2000$ and $\times 5000$ magnifications. Images presented are representative for the whole disc surface. CL-DSB at $\times 2000$ (a) and $\times 5000$ (b) magnification, OL-DSB at $\times 2000$ (c) and $\times 5000$ (d) magnification. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

Considering potential product usage in practice (Sattar and Maillard 2013), it seemed appropriate to combine the use of the wiperator (ASTM26987-15, 2015) with our DSB. The ASTM2697-15 (2015) was preferred to the EN16615-15 (2015) protocol, as it was recently shown to be a more stringent protocol (Wesgate *et al.* 2018). To provide a sensible and useful measurement of product efficacy against DSB, we decided to measure several criteria indicative of product efficacy: (i) reduction in viability as a result of bactericidal activity or/and removal of bacteria from the surface, (ii) transferability of bacteria post-wiping and (iii) DSB regrowth indicating the frequency of product application needed to render the surface safe. Using such an approach we first identified that DSB produced in the presence of OL, were more difficult to control than those produced in the absence of organic load, despite that NaOCl (1000 ppm) in combination with the microfiber cloth decreased *S. aureus* number in DSB by $>4 \log_{10}$ (Table 1). More bacteria within DSB could be

removed/killed when the biofilm was grown in the absence of organic load. Almost 6 \log_{10} reduction was achieved which could be compared to results showed by Almatroudi *et al.* (2016) where more than 7 \log_{10} of bacteria in DSB were removed/killed by treatment with 1000 ppm NaOCl. Although, NaOCl treatment significantly lowered (Two-way ANOVA; $P < 0.05$) the transfer of bacteria from dry surface biofilms compared to the absence of treatment, it was significantly less effective when DSB were formed in the presence of organic load (Table 1). Likewise, time for regrowth post NaOCl exposure was much shorter in the presence of organic load (Table 1). Hence, measuring additional parameters to the traditional viability one, provide additional stringency. Transferability post-treatment is particularly important to consider notably in relation to hand hygiene compliance. Indeed, DSB have been shown to be widespread in health-care settings (Hu *et al.* 2015; Ledwoch *et al.* 2018), acting as a potential transmission reservoir. As median hand

Table 1 Effectiveness of NaOCl (1000 ppm) on clean (CL) and organic load (OL)- DSB. Impact of disinfectant on reduction in bacteria, transferability and regrowth

	NaOCl 1000 ppm	No treatment
Log ₁₀ reduction in bacteria (CFU per cm ²) ± SD		
CL-DSB	5.83 ± 1.25	–
OL-DSB	4.26 ± 1.26	–
Transferability (%) ± SD		
CL-DSB	1 ± 2	95 ± 8
OL-DSB	68 ± 37	100 ± 0
Regrowth (days)		
CL-DSB	5.4 ± 3.3	1 ± 0
OL-DSB	2.8 ± 0.8	1 ± 0

hygiene rate from 96 empirical studies is only 40% (Erasmus *et al.* 2010), the risk of transmitting pathogens from DSB is high. It is thus conceivable that, despite the reduction in viability following, here, exposure to NaOCl (1000 ppm), bacteria embedded in a dry surface biofilm can still be easily transferred. Chowdhury *et al.* (2018) also reported on the persistent nature of DSB; in their study, treatment with neutral detergent had a little effect on bacterial transferability from DSB. The regrowth parameter, although linked somewhat to a reduction in viability, provides information on how long the surface would be biofilm-free post-treatment. We are proposing that the dry surface biofilm model formed and grown in the presence of organic load, as well as the parameters investigated, are suitable to measure the efficacy of cleaning and/or disinfectant treatments.

Materials and methods

Bacterial growth and maintenance

Staphylococcus aureus NCTC10788 was propagated in tryptone soya broth (TSB; Oxoid Limited, Hampshire, UK) at 37°C overnight and washed in tryptone sodium chloride following centrifugation at 1400g. Tryptone sodium chloride was prepared by mixing 1 g of tryptone (Oxoid Limited) and 8.5 g of sodium chloride (Sigma-Aldrich®, Dorset, UK) in 1 l of distilled water followed by autoclaving. The bacterial suspension was adjusted to 1 × 10⁶ CFU per ml.

Dry biofilm models

The bacterial growth approach in our DSB model is based on alternating hydrated (growth) phases with desiccation phases as described by Almatroudi *et al.* (2015). In our model we utilized a sedimentation protocol to form and grow DSB, as described below. Bacteria were initially cultured in normal

hydrated conditions to allow initial adherence and biofilm formation. This was followed by cycles of dry and hydrated phases for a total duration of 12 days (Fig. 1).

Stainless steel discs AISI 430 (0.7 ± 0.07 mm thickness; 10 ± 0.5 mm diameter, Goodfellow Cambridge Limited, Huntington, UK) were used as a support. Sterile discs were placed in Corning™ Costar™ flat bottom cell culture plates (Fisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK), and each well was inoculated with 1 ml of TSB containing 5% anhydrous D-glucose (Fisher Scientific) with 10⁶ CFU per ml washed *S. aureus* suspension. Bacteria were first allowed to attach and form a biofilm on the disc surface over 2 days period at 25°C under gentle agitation using an Orbit P4 plate rocker (Labnet International, Edison); i.e. the hydrated phase. The solution was then drained from the wells and plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 h. Following this dry phase, 1 ml of TSB was added into each well containing stainless steel disc and a new 'hydrated phase' began for 48 h. Hydrated and dry phases alternate every 48 h for a period of 12 days, ending with biofilm in a dry phase (Fig. 1).

Two models of *S. aureus* dry surface biofilms were developed: (i) a clean (CL) DSB grown in TSB only, and (ii) an organic load (OL) DSB grown in 3 gl⁻¹ bovine serum albumin (BSA; Sigma® Life Science, Dorset, UK). BSA was added to each wet phase during the 12 days period.

Biofilm composition

Carbohydrate

Carbohydrate content in DSB models was measured by dinitrosalicylic (DNS; Fisher Scientific Ltd) colorimetric assay (Miller 1959). Briefly, disc containing biofilm was placed in McCartney bottle with 1 g of glass beads and 3 ml of sterile water. The disc was vortexed with Fisher-brand® vortex shaker (Fisher Scientific) for 10 min prior to the analysis. Two gl⁻¹ of phenol (Fisher Scientific Ltd) was added to DNS reagent to intensify the colour density and increase the sensitivity of the method. Three ml of DNS reagent was added directly to vortexed culture or directly to an overnight planktonic suspension of *S. aureus* and covered with lid to prevent liquid evaporation. The mixture was heated for 15 min at 90°C in Fisher-brand water bath (Fisher Scientific) until the colour developed. Colour was stabilized by adding 1 ml of 40% potassium sodium tartrate solution (Fisher Scientific Ltd). Absorbance at 575 nm was read after the mixture cooled down to the room temperature and compared against the standard curve to evaluate carbohydrates content.

Protein analysis

Discs with *S. aureus* DSB were placed in sterile 30 ml capacity flat bottom glass bottles containing 1 g of glass beads and 2 ml of sterile water and vortexed for 10 min.

The suspensions were then centrifuged in Biofuge Primo R centrifuge (Heraeus, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Newport, UK) at 1400g and 20°C for 10 min. The supernatant was then discarded, and the remaining bacterial pellets were weighted. Proteins were extracted using the Total Protein Extraction Kit (Chemicon®, Millipore Limited, Watford, UK). Briefly, 2.5 ml TM buffer was added to 1 g of the pellet and put on ice for 5 min. Bacterial cells were homogenized three times by vortexing for 20 s and incubation on dry ice for 15 s. The mixture was then centrifuged at 11 000g at 4°C for 20 min using Avanti™ J-20 XP centrifuge (Beckman Coulter, High Wycombe, UK). Collected supernatant was quantified for proteins content. Quantification was carried out with Folin–Ciocalteu reagent (Lowry *et al.* 1951) by using Pierce™ Modified Lowry Protein Assay (Thermo Scientific™, Loughborough, UK). One ml of Modified Lowry Reagent was added to each tube containing 0.2 ml of supernatant. The mixture was well homogenized with vortex shaker (Fisherbrand®, Fisher Scientific Ltd) and incubated at room temperature for 10 min. One hundred µl of 1X Folin–Ciocalteu Reagent was then added and the sample vortexed for 5 s. Sample was covered and incubated for 30 min at room temperature. The absorbance at 750 nm was measured and the amount of the proteins in the sample was evaluated by using standard curve prepared according to manufacturer instructions using diluted albumin (BSA) standards.

Lipid analysis

Lipids were extracted with the chloroform-free Lipid Extraction Kit (Abcam®, Cambridge, UK). Discs with *S. aureus* DSB were vortexed for 10 min in McCartney bottles containing 1 g of glass beads and 2 ml of sterile water. The suspensions were then centrifuged at 1000g at 20°C for 5 min. Supernatant was discarded, and the pellets were washed and resuspended in 25 µl of phosphate buffer saline (PBS; 8 g of sodium chloride (Sigma-Aldrich®), 0.2 g of potassium chloride (Fisher BioReagents®, Fisher Scientific Ltd), 1.44 g of sodium phosphate dibasic heptahydrate (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and 0.24 g of potassium phosphate monobasic (Thermo Fisher Scientific) in up to 1 l water). pH was adjusted to 7.4. Five hundred µl of Abcam extraction buffer containing 60% hexane and 40% isopropanol (Abcam®) was added to the samples which were vortexed for 2 min. The mixture was agitated on Orbit P4 plate rocker (Labnet International) at room temperature for 20 min. The tubes were centrifuged for 5 min at 10 000g and the supernatant was collected and weighted. The tube with supernatant was dried overnight in Thermo Heraeus Herasafe™ safety cabinet (Thermo Fisher Scientific) at 37°C. The analysis of lipids was carried out following the colorimetric sulfo-phospho-vanillin (SPV; Fisher Scientific Ltd) method (Cheng *et al.* 2011). One ml of

chloroform: methanol solvent was added per 15 mg of sample followed by 100 µl of sulphuric acid (Fisher Scientific Ltd). Samples were heated at 90°C for 10 min on a stirring hotplate (Fisher Scientific Ltd) and then placed on ice to cool them down to room temperature. One hundred µl vanillin-phosphoric acid reagent was added to the sample to develop the colour. Absorbance at 540 nm was measured after 5 min to determine the lipid content.

DNA analysis

Discs with DSB were placed in 30 ml capacity flat bottom glass bottle with 1 g glass beads and 0.5 ml TSB and vortexed for 10 min to remove the biofilm from disc surface. 0.5 ml of 4 mol l⁻¹ guanidine isothiocyanate (UltraPure™, Thermo-Fisher Scientific, Newport, UK) was added to the sample and further vortexed for 1 min. One ml of mixture was transferred to a 2 ml tube with cap and Fisherbrand® O-ring (Fisher Scientific) with 1 g of 0.1 mm diameter zirconia/silica beads (Thistle Scientific, Glasgow, UK) and homogenized in bead bug (Benchmark Scientific, Cole-Parmer®, St Neots, UK) at 2800 rev min⁻¹. DNA amplification was carried out with Maxwell® 16 Instrument (Promega, Southampton, UK). The amount of extracted DNA was quantified with Quibit® 3.0 fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) imaging

Staphylococcus aureus DSB samples were prepared by overnight incubation of discs in 2.5% glutaraldehyde solution (Fisher Scientific) followed by immersion in successive concentrations of 10, 25, 50, 70, 90 and 100% ethanol (Honeywell, Fisher Scientific Ltd) for 10 min each. Prior to SEM scanning, samples were coated with 20 nm AuPd coating with sputter coater (SC500, Biorad, UK). Secondary electron images were acquired with a beam energy of 5 kV using an in-lens detector on a Sigma HD Field Emission Gun Scanning Electron Microscope (Carl Zeiss Ltd., Cambridge, UK) at ×2000 and ×5000 magnification and 5–7 mm working distance.

Live/dead staining

Staining of dry surface biofilm was carried out with LIVE/DEAD® BacLight™ bacterial viability kit (Invitrogen, Thermo Fisher Scientific) with Syto 9 and propidium iodide in 1 : 1 ratio. Prior to staining, each disc was mildly washed with 1 ml sterile water for 5 s to remove any planktonic or loosely adhered cells. Stained discs were imaged with Zeiss LSM880 Airscan Confocal Microscope (Carl Zeiss Ltd., Cambridge, UK).

LIVE/DEAD cells ratios were evaluated using BioFilmAnalyzer ver. 1.0 software with the procedure developed by Bogachev *et al.* (2018). Prior to analysis, nonhomogenous colour

distribution of obtained images in the studied colour channels was resolved by preliminary image colour normalization using GNU Image manipulation program (GIMP 2.8).

ASTM E2967-15 test

The effectiveness of sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl 1000 ppm; Fisher Scientific Ltd) combined with Rubbermaid® HYGEN™ disposable microfiber cloth (Rubbermaid Products, Surrey, UK) allowing 2.5 ml of disinfectant per 1 g of wipe was evaluated against CL- and OL-DSB controls consisted of untreated samples. Disinfection tests were performed according to a modified ASTM E2967 test (2015). The surface of the disc was wiped with the Wiperator (Filtaflex Ltd, Ontario, Canada) from both sides using separate wipes. Dry surface biofilms were wiped for 10 s under 500 g pressure, left at room temperature for 2 min, and then the wiped discs neutralized by placing each disc into 1 ml Dey-Engley (DE) neutralizing broth (Neogen® Corporation, Ayr, UK) for 2 min. Inoculated broth was then incubated overnight at ambient temperature. Transfer of viable bacteria from used wipes to clean a sterile disc was not performed.

*Log*₁₀ reduction in bacteria embedded in DSB

Reduction in bacterial viability (*Log*₁₀ reduction in CFU per ml) gave the number of bacteria that were removed or and killed following wiping. Following wiping, samples were placed in a solution containing 1 g of glass beads (Fisher Scientific), 2 ml DE neutralizing broth and 100 µg ml⁻¹ proteinase K (Fisher Bioreagents™) for 1 h at 37°C. After incubation, samples were vortexed for 2 min, serially diluted and 3 × 10 µl drops of each dilution plated onto tryptone soya agar (TSA; Oxoid, Thermo Fisher Scientific). *Log*₁₀ reduction was calculated as the difference between the number of bacteria recovered from untreated (control) and treated samples.

Transferability test following disinfection

Transfer test was conducted to investigate the transferability of surviving bacteria from the dry surface biofilm following wiping. The test was designed to imitate the touch of a finger onto treated surface. Following wiping and 2 min contact time, discs were pressed 36 separate times with 100 g pressure on the surface of DE agar. Following the transfer test, DE agar was incubated overnight at 37°C. Positive growth/adpression was recorded and transferability calculated as the number of positive contact/number of adpressions.

Dry surface biofilm regrowth test following treatment

Regrowth measures the time needed for the DSB to recover following treatment. Wiped samples were placed

in 30 ml capacity flat bottom glass bottle with 2 ml of DE neutralizing broth (Acumedia®, Neogen® LabM, Lancashire, UK). The number of days for the DE broth colour to change from purple to yellow indicative of bacterial growth was recorded.

Statistical analysis

Statistical significance of data sets was evaluated with GraphPad PRISM® (ver. 7.04) using two-way ANOVA. All measurements, if not stated otherwise, were performed in triplicates. The sample standard deviation was evaluated with Bassel's correction.

Acknowledgements

Authors thank Dr D.D. Muir (School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK) for his help in obtaining SEM images.

Funding

This work was funded by GAMA Healthcare though Cardiff University.

Conflict of Interest

K. Ledwoch is employed by GAMA Healthcare on a part time basis.

References

- Almatroudi, A., Gosbell, I.B., Hu, H., Jensen, S.O., Espedido, B.A., Tahir, S., Glasbey, T.O., Legge, P., Whiteley, G., Deva, A. and Vickery, K. (2016) *Staphylococcus aureus* dry-surface biofilms are not killed by sodium hypochlorite: implications for infection control. *J Hosp Infect* **93**, 263–270.
- Abdallah, M., Chataigne, G., Ferreira-Theret, P., Benoliel, C., Drider, D., Dhulster, P. and Chihib, N.-E. (2014) Effect of growth temperature, surface type and incubation time on the resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilms to disinfectants. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* **98**, 2597–2607.
- Akinbobola, A.B., Sherry, L., McKay, W.G., Ramage, G. and Williams, C. (2017) Tolerance of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in in-vitro biofilms to high-level peracetic acid disinfection. *J Hosp Infect* **97**, 162–168.
- Ali, L., Khambaty, F. and Diachenko, G. (2006) Investigating the suitability of the Calgary Biofilm device for assessing the antimicrobial efficacy of new agents. *Bioresour Technol* **97**, 1887–1893.
- Almatroudi, A., Hu, H., Deva, A., Gosbell, I.B., Jacombs, A., Jensen, S.O., Whiteley, G., Glasbey, T. *et al.* (2015) A new dry-surface biofilm model: an essential tool for efficacy

- testing of hospital surface decontamination procedures. *J Microbiol Methods* **117**, 171–176.
- Anschau, A., Caruso, C.S., Kuhn, R.C. and Franco, T.T. (2017) Validation of the sulfo-phosphovanillin (spv) method for the determination of lipid content in oleaginous microorganisms. *Braz J Chem Eng* **34**, 19–27.
- ASTM International 26987-15 (2015) *Standard Test Method for Assessing the Ability of Pre-wetted Towelettes to Remove and Transfer Bacterial Contamination on Hard, Non-Porous Environmental Surfaces Using the Wiperator*. ASTM International: West Conshohocken, PA.
- Azeredo, J., Azevedo, N.F., Briandet, R., Cerca, N., Coenye, T., Costa, A.R., Desvaux, M., Di Bonaventura, G. et al. (2017) Critical review on biofilm methods. *Crit Rev Microbiol* **43**, 313–351.
- Bogachev, M.I., Volkov, V.Y., Markelov, O.A., Trizna, E.Y., Baydamshina, D.R., Melnikov, V., Murtazina, R.R., Zelenikhin, P.V. et al. (2018) Fast and simple tool for the quantification of biofilm-embedded cells sub-populations from fluorescent microscopic images. *PLoS ONE* **13**(5), 1–24.
- Bridier, A., Briandet, R., Thomas, V. and Dubois-Brissonnet, F. (2011) Resistance of bacterial biofilms to disinfectants: a review. *Biofouling* **27**, 1017–1032.
- Ceri, H., Olson, M.E., Stremick, C., Read, R.R., Morck, D. and Buret, A. (1999) The Calgary biofilm device: new technology for rapid determination of antibiotic susceptibilities of bacterial biofilms. *J Clin Microbiol* **37**, 1771–1776.
- Cheng, Y.S., Zheng, Y. and Vanderghenst, J.S. (2011) Rapid quantitative analysis of lipids using a colorimetric method in a microplate format. *Lipids* **46**, 95–103.
- Chowdhury, D., Tahir, S., Legge, M., Hu, H., Prvan, T., Johani, K., Whiteley, G.S., Glasbey, T.O. et al. (2018) Transfer of dry surface biofilm in the healthcare environment: the role of healthcare workers' hands as vehicles. *J Hosp Infect* **100**, e85–e90.
- EN16615-15. (2015) *Chemical Disinfectants and Antiseptics - Quantitative Test Method for the Evaluation of Bactericidal and Yeastcidal Activity on Non-Porous Surfaces with Mechanical Action Employing Wipes in the Medical Area (4-Field Test) - Test Method and Requirements (Phase 2, Step 2)*. London: British Standard Institute.
- Erasmus, V., Daha, T.J., Brug, H., Richardus, J.H., Behrendt, M.D., Vos, M.C. and van Beeck, E.F. (2010) Systematic review of studies on compliance with hand hygiene guidelines in hospital care. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* **31**, 283–294.
- Francolini, I. and Donelli, G. (2010) Prevention and control of biofilm-based medical-device-related infections. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol* **59**, 227–238.
- Hu, H., Johani, K., Gosbell, I.B., Jacombs, A.S., Almatroudi, A., Whiteley, G.S., Deva, A.K., Jensen, S. et al. (2015) Intensive care unit environmental surfaces are contaminated by multidrug-resistant bacteria in biofilms: combined results of conventional culture, pyrosequencing, scanning electron microscopy, and confocal laser microscopy. *J Hosp Infect* **91**, 35–44.
- Ledwoch, K., Dancer, S.J., Otter, J.A., Kerr, K., Roposte, D., Rushton, L., Weiser, R., Mahenthalingam, E. et al. (2018) Beware biofilm! Dry biofilms containing bacterial pathogens on multiple healthcare surfaces; a multi-centre study. *J Hosp Infect* **100**, e47–e56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2018.06.028>
- Lowry, O.H., Rosebrough, N.J., Farr, A.L. and Randall, R.J. (1951) Protein measurement with the folin phenol reagent. *J Biol Chem* **193**, 265–275.
- Miller, G.L. (1959) Use of dinitrosalicylic acid reagent for determination of reducing sugar. *Anal Chem* **31**, 426–428.
- Millhouse, E., Jose, A., Sherry, L., Lappin, D.F., Patel, N., Middleton, A.M., Pratten, J., Culshaw, S. et al. (2014) Development of an in vitro periodontal biofilm model for assessing antimicrobial and host modulatory effects of bioactive molecules. *BMC Oral Health* **14**, 1–11.
- Otter, J.A., Vickery, K., Walker, J.D., deLancey Pulcini, E., Stoodley, P., Goldenberg, S.D., Salkeld, J.A., Chewins, J. et al. (2015) Surface-attached cells, biofilms and biocide susceptibility: implications for hospital cleaning and disinfection. *J Hosp Infect* **89**, 16–27.
- Pierce, C.G., Uppuluri, P., Tristan, A.R., Wormley, F.L. Jr, Mowat, E., Ramage, G. and Lopez-Ribot, J.L. (2008) A simple and reproducible 96 well plate-based method for the formation of fungal biofilms and its application to antifungal susceptibility testing. *Nature Prot* **3**, 1494–1500.
- Sattar, S.A. and Maillard, J.-Y. (2013) The crucial role of wiping in decontamination of high-touch environmental surfaces: review of current status and directions for the future. *Am J Infect Control* **41**, S97–S104.
- Schwartz, K., Stephenson, R., Hernandez, M., Jambang, N. and Boles, B.R. (2010) The use of drip flow and rotating disk reactors for *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilm analysis. *J Vis Exp* **46**, 1–5.
- Sherry, L., Lappin, G., O'Donnell, L.E., Millhouse, E., Millington, O.R., Bradshaw, D.J., Axe, A.S., Williams, C. et al. (2016) Viable compositional analysis of an eleven species oral polymicrobial biofilm. *Front Microbiol* **7**, 1–13.
- US Environmental Protection Agency. (2013) Standard Operating Procedure for Single Tube Method for Measuring Disinfectant Efficacy Against Biofilm Grown in the CDC Biofilm Reactor. SOP No. MB-20-01.
- Vickery, K., Deva, A., Jacombs, A., Allan, J., Valente, P. and Gosbell, I.B. (2012) Presence of biofilm containing viable multiresistant organisms despite terminal cleaning on clinical surfaces in an intensive care unit. *J Hosp Infect* **80**, 52–55.
- Wesgate, R., Robertson, A., Barrell, M., Teska, P. and Maillard, J.-Y. (2018) Impact of test protocols and material binding on the efficacy of antimicrobial wipes. *J Hosp Infect*, pii: S0195-6701(18)30507-3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2018.09.01>