# Effect of a Carbon Nanotube Composite in the Development and Architecture of Marine Cyanobacterial Biofilms

Maria Romeu<sup>1,2</sup>, Marta Lima<sup>1,2</sup>, Luciana Gomes<sup>1,2</sup>, Ed. de Jong<sup>3</sup>, João Morais<sup>4</sup>, Vítor Vasconcelos<sup>4,5</sup>, Manuel Pereira<sup>2,6</sup>, Olívia Soares<sup>2,6</sup>, Jelmer Sjollema<sup>3</sup> and Filipe J. Mergulhão<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>LEPABE - Laboratory for Process Engineering, Environment, Biotechnology and Energy, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Portugal; <sup>2</sup>ALiCE - Associate Laboratory in Chemical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Portugal; <sup>3</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Groningen, University Medical Centre Groningen, The Netherlands; <sup>4</sup>CIIMAR - Interdisciplinary Centre of Marine and Environmental Research, University of Porto, Portugal; <sup>5</sup>Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, University of Porto, Portugal; <sup>6</sup>LSRE–LCM - Laboratory of Separation and Reaction Engineering–Laboratory of Catalysis and Materials, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Portugal

#### INTRODUCTION

Marine biofouling, which consists of accumulation of biological matter on submerged surfaces, causes severe economic, environmental, and ecological impacts<sup>1</sup>. The development of novel, non-toxic antifouling coatings is of great significance for marine applications. Carbon nanotubes (CNTs) have demonstrated antimicrobial and anti-adhesive properties<sup>2</sup>, although their mechanism of action is still not clear. While the attachment by macrofoulers is responsible for the main consequences of marine biofouling, the prevention of biofilm development by microfoulers, such as cyanobacteria, reduces the progression of biofouling to the next stages. Therefore, a deeper knowledge of biofilm behavior may enable the development of efficient methodologies to control biofouling. However, few studies focus on longer assays for assessing the effects of CNTs on marine biofilm formation<sup>3</sup>. This work analysed the potential of CNT-modified surfaces to delay long-term cyanobacterial biofilm development in conditions that mimic the hydrodynamics of marine environments<sup>4</sup>.

## EXPERIMENTAL/THEORETICAL STUDY

1. Surface preparation - CNTs were incorporated into a commercially available polymer coating, epoxy resin (3 wt%); 2. Surface characterization - surfaces were analyzed by Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) and Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM); 3. Biofilm formation - biofilm formation by a filamentous cyanobacterial strain occurred over 7 weeks at an average shear rate of 40 s<sup>-1</sup>; 4. Biofilm analysis - biofilms were analyzed by Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT) and SEM.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From AFM and SEM analyses, the CNT composite was the roughest surface, presenting CNT agglomerates that form small elevations on the material. Over the 7 weeks, cyanobacterial biofilm growth was more evident on the epoxy resin (control) than on the CNT composite. As in the early stages of biofilm formation, biofilm wet weight, thickness, and biovolume were similar between the surfaces, the results suggest that the CNT composite surface may have a greater antifouling effect on the maturation stage of these cyanobacterial biofilms. Moreover, differences in average roughness seemed to be responsible for the differences registered in the later stages of biofilm development. Consequently, an antimicrobial effect rather than an anti-adhesive effect may explain the impact of CNT-modified surfaces in long-term biofilm layers, since cell-to-cell adhesion, cell reproduction, and production of extracellular polymeric substances may be hampered if cells in the initial layers are damaged<sup>5</sup>.

#### **CONCLUSION**

CNT-modified surfaces delayed cyanobacterial biofilm development. These biofilms showed reduced wet weight, thickness and biovolume, and were smoother and less porous than those formed on the control surface.

### REFERENCES

- 1. Salta et al, Environ. Microbiol. 15, 2879–2893 (2013)
- 2. Al-Jumaili et al, Materials 10, 1066 (2017)
- 3. Sousa-Cardoso et al, Antibiotics 11, 1102 (2022)
- 4. Romeu et al, Environ. Microbiol. 21, 4411–4424 (2019)
- 5. Romeu et al, Polymers 14, 4410 (2022)

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This work was funded by LA/P/0045/2020 (ALiCE), UIDB/00511/2020 and UIDP/00511/2020 (LEPABE) and project PTDC/CTM-COM/4844/2020, funded by national funds through FCT/MCTES (PIDDAC); project HealthyWaters (NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000069), supported by Norte Portugal Regional Operational Programme (NORTE 2020), under the PORTUGAL 2020 Partnership Agreement, through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF); project EMERTOX (grant 734748), funded by H2020-MSCA-RISE 2016; Strategic Funding UIDB/04423/2020 and UIDP/04423/2020 through national funds provided by the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in the framework of the program PT2020; and project SurfSAFE supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no. 952471. M.J.R., L.C.G. and O.S.G.P.S. thank FCT for the financial support of SFRH/BD/140080/2018, CEECIND/01700/2017 and CEECINST/00049/2018, respectively. Support from the EURO-MIC COST Action (CA20130) is acknowledged.