Comparison of three-dimensional motion of bacteria with and without wall accumulation

Md Elius¹,¹ Kenneth Boyle,² Wei-Shun Chang,³ Pia H. Moisander¹,² and Hangjian Ling^{1,*}

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747, USA

²Department of Biology, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747, USA

³Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747, USA

(Received 13 February 2023; accepted 1 July 2023; published 28 July 2023)

A comparison of the movement characteristics between bacteria with and without wall accumulation could potentially elucidate the mechanisms of biofilm formation. However, authors of previous studies have mostly focused on the motion of bacteria that exhibit wall accumulation. Here, we applied digital holographic microscopy to compare the three-dimensional (3D) motions of two bacterial strains (*Shewanella japonica* UMDC19 and *Shewanella* sp. UMDC1): one exhibiting higher concentrations near the solid surfaces, and the other showing similar concentrations in near-wall and bulk regions. We found that the movement characteristics of the two strains are similar in the near-wall region but are distinct in the bulk region. Near the wall, both strains have small velocities and mostly perform subdiffusive motions. In the bulk, however, the bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation have significantly higher motility (including faster swimming speeds and longer movement trajectories) than the one showing no wall accumulation. Furthermore, we found that bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation slowly migrate from the bulk region to the near-wall region, and the hydrodynamic effect alone is insufficient to generate this migration speed. Future studies are required to test if the current findings apply to other bacterial species and strains.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.108.014409

I. INTRODUCTION

Numerous bacterial species show initial accumulation near solid surfaces prior to the formation of a biofilm [1], a matrixenclosed bacterial population adherent to each other and/or to surfaces [2]. Biofilms impact human activities via issues such as marine biofouling [3-8], persistence of pathogenic infections [9–13], and food contamination [14–17]; therefore, it is crucial to understand the mechanisms of biofilm formation and resilience. Wall accumulation of bacteria serves as an initial, important step to biofilm formation, but the mechanisms are currently not well constrained. In the past several decades, the understanding of wall accumulation has been greatly improved by experimental and theoretical studies of bacterial movement near solid surfaces. Early microscopy imaging showed a strong increase of cell concentration near solid surfaces [18–20]. Later, three-dimensional (3D) bacterial tracking, by techniques such as digital holography microscopy [21-23], revealed that, when approaching a wall, bacteria may reduce their swimming speed [24-26], switch to circular motion [27,28], change body orientation [25,27,29], and reduce the tumble rate [26]. Furthermore, various theoretical models, based on disparate physical factors such as hydrodynamic interactions [30-33], Brownian motion [34-37], electrostatic and van der Waals interactions [18,19,38], or stochastic run-tumbling motions [39,40], have been developed and successfully predicted the wall accumulation. For example, models based on hydrodynamic

Despite extensive studies on bacteria-wall interactions, authors of previous studies mostly focused on the movement characteristics of bacteria that exhibit wall accumulation. Authors of few studies have directly compared the 3D movement of different bacterial species or strains that show different degrees of wall accumulation [57]. A direct comparison of the movement statistics of bacteria with and without wall accumulation could provide insights into the mechanistic or behavioral processes proceeding biofilm formation. Here, we employ digital holographic microscopy (DHM) and study the 3D movement of two Shewanella sp. strains: one showing higher-density distribution near solid walls than the bulk region and the other having similar density distribution in near-wall and bulk regions. We analyze and compare the movement velocity and mean square displacement between the two bacterial species and investigate which movement characteristics are correlated to the wall accumulation. We will test the hypothesis that bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation have larger swimming velocities and longer movement trajectories, according to previous studies in which authors have demonstrated the importance of motility on the biofilm formation [58–60]. Our results and approach are useful for the development and validation of theoretical models for understanding the mechanisms of bacterial wall accumulation.

2470-0045/2023/108(1)/014409(9)

interactions showed that swimming microorganisms near a no-slip solid boundary create a flow field that reorients and attracts cells to the wall [29,41]. Recently, authors of some studies have revealed that near-wall behaviors of bacteria and biofilm growth can be regulated by changing surface properties (e.g., surface stiffness) [42–48], by introducing flow shear [49–51] or an electric field [52–56].

^{*}hling1@umassd.edu



FIG. 1. (a) Optical setup of digital holographic microscopy (DHM) for imaging the three-dimensional (3D) motion and growth of bacteria in a closed glass cuvette (the inner walls of the cuvette are located at z = 0 and 200 µm, and bacteria are located at 0 < z < 200 µm). (b) Sample hologram of one bacterium located at 34 µm away from the hologram plane. Intensity distributions in the center of the bacteria in (c) the *y*-*z* plane and (d) the *x*-*y* plane obtained by reconstruction of the hologram shown in (b).

II. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The optical configuration of DHM for recording the growth and 3D motion of bacteria is shown in Fig. 1(a). A continuous He-Ne laser with a wavelength of $\lambda = 633$ nm (Thorlab, model #HNL100RB, 10 mW) was used as a light source. The laser beam was attenuated by a neutral density filter, filtered by a spatial filter made up of a 25 µm pinhole and a 10× objective, and collimated into a 5 mm diameter before illuminating the bacterial sample. The bacterial sample was placed in a closed glass cuvette (FireflySci, lightpath 200 µm). The light scattered from the sample as well as the unscattered light were recorded by a CMOS camera (FLIR, model #GS3-U3-41C6M-C, 2048 × 2048 pixels, 5.5 µm pixel size). To achieve high magnification, a $10 \times$ objective (Edmund, model #46-144, infinity-corrected) and a $2 \times$ tube lens (Edmund, model #56-863, focal length 400 mm) were inserted before the camera. The calibrated magnification of the imaging system was $19.2 \times$. By precisely translating the glass cuvette along the optical axis, the focal plane of the imaging system (i.e., hologram plane) was located at 30 µm away from the inner wall of the cuvette. Thus, all bacteria were located on one side of the hologram plane. We used a Cartesian coordinate system where x and y stand for the two in-plane directions and z for the out-of-plane direction. We defined z = 0 at the inner wall of the glass container, and the bacterial cells are distributed at $0 < z < 200 \,\mu\text{m}$. The sample volume had a size of $590 \times 590 \times 200 \,\mu\text{m}$ (or $0.07 \,\text{mm}^3$).

Two strains of marine bacteria *Shewanella* sp. (strains UMDC1 and UMDC19) were used in this paper. The bacteria were originally isolated from marine biofilms in Northwestern Atlantic Ocean. For determining the 16S rRNA gene sequence, the cultures were grown overnight, and the DNA was extracted using a phenol-chloroform method [61]. The amplification was conducted using 341F/785R primers [62], and the PCR conditions were as previously described [63]. The amplification products were cloned using pGEM-T in

Escherichia coli and sequenced at the Massachusetts General Hospital sequencing core. The primers were trimmed off from the sequences, and Blastn search was conducted on the NCBI database to identify the sequences. The best NCBI database matches for the strain UMDC1 were *Shewanella basaltis* and *S. ulleungensis* (99.77–100% nucleotide identity); here, we refer to this strain as *Shewanella* sp., while the strain UMDC19 has a 100% nucleotide identity with *S. japonica*. Pairwise alignment of the 16S rRNA gene of UMDC1 and UMDC19 showed a nucleotide identity of 94.64%. Based on this dissimilarity, the two strains represent different species of the *Shewanella* genus. The 16S rRNA gene sequences are under NCBI accession numbers OQ034696-OQ034698.

To prepare the bacterial suspension for DHM experiments, a monoclonal culture was aseptically inoculated from a glycerol stock into sterile, 0.2 μ m filtered Marine Broth (Difco Laboratories) and grown for 24 h at 27 °C in slow motion. The culture was diluted to a concentration where the optical density (OD) at 600 nm was ~0.05. The diluted bacterial suspension was then transferred into the glass cuvette for observations. We recorded data at 50 fps in the first 40 s at each hour and ran the experiments for a duration of 4 h. A total of 10 000 holograms were collected for each bacterial strain. The number of bacteria increased by 4 to 12 times during the 4 h experiments.

To calculate the 3D movement trajectories of bacteria from the recorded holograms, we used the following data analysis procedure. First, the background noise (e.g., signals from the dirt particles on glass windows and optical lenses) was removed by subtracting a background image obtained when there were no bacteria presented in the sample volume. The intensity distribution on the holograms after the background subtraction is denoted as I_H . Then following previous work [64,65], a 3D intensity field, denoted as I(x, y, z), was reconstructed from the hologram by using the following equation:

$$I(x, y, z) = \|[I_H - \|R\|^2] \otimes h(x, y, z)\|,$$
(1)

where $||R||^2$ is the amplitude of the reference wave (here, $||R||^2$ is a constant since the reference wave is a plane wave), $h = zexp\{ik(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)^{0.5}\}/[i\lambda(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)]$ is the Rayleigh-Sommerfeld diffraction kernel, $k = 2\pi/\lambda$, and \otimes represents a convolution. Since the intensity of the scattered light from the bacteria is much smaller than that of the reference light, we approximated $||R||^2$ using the average intensity of I_H . Figure 1(b) shows a sample hologram of one bacterium, and Figs. 1(c) and 1(d) are the intensity distributions reconstructed from this hologram. Consistent with our previous work [64,65], the bacterium appears to be an axially elongated bright trace in the 3D intensity field reconstructed based on Eq. (1). The elongation in the axial direction (i.e., z direction) is known as the depth-of-focus issue in inline digital holography [66].

After obtaining the 3D intensity field, we detected the position of bacteria in 3D space following a 3D image segmentation technique used in our previous works [67,68]. We first chose a global intensity threshold based on the intensities of the in-focus bacteria to discriminate between the background and the bacteria. Although a local threshold based on local standard deviation [69] could be used to improve the detection of cells with relatively low intensity, we found a global threshold was sufficient to detect >90% of the cells. After individual cell features were identified from the 3D volume, the cell position was calculated based on the intensity-weighted centroid of the 3D trace. Finally, we linked the 3D locations belonging to the same cell across different time frames based on a three-frame predictive particle tracking algorithm [70]. We applied a Gaussian smoothing and differentiating kernel [71] to the 3D trajectories to obtain accurate velocities and accelerations. The three velocity components were denoted as (u_x, u_y) , and u_z). For each bacterium, we also calculated the magnitude of the velocity component parallel to the wall as: $u_{\parallel} = (u_x^2 + u_y^2)^{0.5}$. By definition, u_{\parallel} was always positive. The velocity component normal to the wall was u_z , which can be either positive or negative. The symbol $\langle \rangle$ was used to denote an ensemble average over all bacteria.

Figure 2 shows sample trajectories for UMDC1 and UMC19 obtained by the above data analysis procedure. The average observation time of cell trajectories was 2.7 and 1.7 s for UMDC1 and UMDC19, respectively, much shorter than the observation time (40 s). This is partially because individual bacteria were not successfully detected at every frame. Due to the small size and nearly transparent nature of bacterial cells, the signal generated by bacteria on the holograms was very weak. As a result, detecting bacteria at every frame in DHM is a challenge, especially in a dense solution. One potential method to solve this challenge is by using dye to color the cells [72].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First, we examined the time variation of the number of bacteria (i.e., growth of bacteria) in the sample volume. Figures 3(a), 3(b) and 4(a), 4(b) show sample holograms at the



FIG. 2. Sample three-dimensional (3D) trajectories for (a) UMDC1 and (b) UMDC19 obtained at t = 4 h. The number of trajectories shown in (a) and (b) are 742 and 688, respectively.

beginning (t = 0) and end (t = 4 h) of the experiments for the two bacterial strains, UMDC1 and UMDC19, respectively. Clearly, for both species, the number of bacteria observed on the holograms increases over time, indicating the growth of bacterial populations via cell division. Figures 3(c) and 4(c) show the time variations of the number of bacteria obtained by processing the holograms. For both species, the number of bacteria in the 0.07 mm³ sample volume remains nearly constant until the first 2 h of the experiment and subsequently experiences an exponential increase. At t = 4 h, the number of bacteria had increased by ~4 times for UMDC1 (from 90 to 360 cells) and 12 times for UMDC19 (from 40 to 500 cells). Based on the growth curves in Figs. 3(c) and 4(c), we found a doubling time of 0.57 and 0.70 h at the fast-growing stage (3 h < t < 4 h) for UMDC19 and UMDC1, respectively.

We then analyzed the spatial distributions of the bacteria in the chamber to determine the presence of wall accumulation. Figures 3(d), 4(e) and 4(d), 4(e) show the spatial distribution of bacteria in the chamber at t = 0 and 4 h for the two species, respectively. Figures 3(f) and 4(f) show the histogram of the bacterial abundance with respect to distance from the wall at t = 4 h. Interestingly, for UMDC1, the densities of bacteria in the near-wall region and in the free-swimming region were very similar. In contrast, for UMDC19 at t = 4 h, the density of bacteria was much higher in the near-wall region than in the free-swimming region. The density of UMDC19 cells at t = 3 h (when the number of bacteria increased by same ratio compared to UMDC1 at t = 4 h) was also higher at the nearwall region than the bulk region (see Supplemental Material, Fig. S1 [73]). Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 5, we found the density distributions of UMDC19 has a good agreement with the model proposed by Berke et al. [29]. These results indicate that UMDC19 exhibits wall accumulation, while UMDC1 growth occurs uniformly across the entire chamber.

To understand which movement behavior contributes to the wall accumulation, we next analyzed the movement statistics. First, we compared the swimming velocities of the two bacterial species. Figures 6(a) and 6(b) plot the magnitudes of velocities in the direction parallel to the solid walls $(\langle u_{\parallel} \rangle)$ and in the direction normal to the wall $(\langle |u_{z}| \rangle)$,



FIG. 3. Growth statistics for bacteria UMDC1 with no wall accumulation: Sample holograms recorded at the (a) beginning (t = 0) and (b) end (t = 4h) of the experiments (only a small portion of the entire hologram is shown). (c) Number of bacteria as a function of time. Spatial distributions of bacteria in the chamber at the (d) beginning (t = 0) and (e) end (t = 4h) of the experiments (the two walls of the chamber are at z = 0 and 200 µm). (f) Histogram of bacteria position in z direction.



FIG. 4. Growth statistics for bacteria UMDC19 with wall accumulation: Sample holograms recorded at the (a) beginning (t = 0) and (b) end (t = 4 h) of the experiments (only a small portion of the entire hologram is shown). (c) Number of bacteria as a function of time. Spatial distributions of bacteria in the chamber at the (d) beginning (t = 0) and (e) end (t = 4 h) of the experiments (the two walls of the chamber are at z = 0 and 200 µm). (f) Histogram of bacteria position in z direction.



FIG. 5. A comparison between the measured density distributions of bacteria and the prediction based on a model proposed by Berke *et al.* [29].

respectively. Clearly, for both bacterial species, the magnitudes of $\langle u_{\parallel} \rangle$ and $\langle |u_z| \rangle$ were on the same order, indicating that the bacterial motions were not confined in one particular direction. In the bulk region ($20 < z < 180 \,\mu$ m), the magnitudes of $\langle u_{\parallel} \rangle$ and $\langle |u_z| \rangle$ for bacteria with wall accumulation were much larger than those for the bacteria without wall accumulation (average swimming speed of 55 µm/s for UMDC19 vs average swimming speed of 14 µm/s for



FIG. 6. Spatial distributions of velocity as a function z for the two types of bacteria (UMDC1 and UMDC19). (a) $\langle u_{\parallel} \rangle$, (b) $\langle |u_z| \rangle$, and (c) $\langle u_z \rangle$. Results shown are based on the data recorded at t = 4 h. Induced velocity by hydrodynamic interaction with p = 1.4 pN μ m is also plotted in (c) for comparison.

UMDC1). This result suggests a correlation between wall accumulation and swimming speed, consistent with the previous studies in which authors showed that bacteria with a higher motility are more likely to create biofilm [58–60]. However, in this paper, we did not prove a causal relationship between wall accumulation and swimming speed since the data were collected from two different bacterial strains. A future study comparing bacteria with and without movement pathways (such as flagellum synthesis) mutagenetically impaired will be informative in testing whether the wall accumulation is directly caused by large swimming velocity or whether other mechanisms are involved. Moreover, for bacteria with wall accumulation (UMDC19), both $\langle u_{\parallel} \rangle$ and $\langle |u_{\tau}| \rangle$ significantly reduced when the cells approached the wall ($0 < z < 20 \,\mu m$ and $180 < z < 200 \,\mu\text{m}$), indicating the wall entrapment. The reduction of bacterial swimming speed when approaching the wall is consistent to previous experimental [18,20,25] and theoretical [30] studies.

Figure 6(c) compares the velocity components normal to the solid walls $(\langle u_z \rangle)$ between the two bacterial species. Since u_7 can be either positive or negative, once averaged over all bacteria, the magnitude of $\langle u_z \rangle$ is much smaller than $\langle u_{\parallel} \rangle$ and $\langle |u_z| \rangle$. For bacteria showing no wall accumulation (UMDC1), $\langle u_z \rangle$ is nearly a constant zero across the entire chamber. However, for bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation (UMDC19), $\langle u_z \rangle$ is negative on left half of the chamber ($0 < z < 100 \,\mu\text{m}$) and positive on the right half of the chamber (100 < z < z)200 µm). The magnitude of $\langle u_z \rangle$ has a maximum of 1.2 µm/s at $\sim 20 \,\mu\text{m}$ away from the solid surfaces and reduces to zero near the walls and the center of the chamber. This result indicates that there exists a long-range attraction force between the highly mobile bacteria and the solid walls. This attraction force might depend on or influence the swimming speed and appears bacterial strain specific: It is very weak for UMDC1 which swims slowly and stronger for UMDC19 which swims faster. Moreover, this result implies that the wall accumulation is because of the migration of cells from the bulk region to the near-wall region, rather than faster cell growth in near-wall region.

To understand whether the long-range attraction between UMDC19 and solid walls is originated from the hydrodynamic interaction, we next calculate the hydrodynamically induced wall-normal velocity u_z by a cell moving parallel to a no-slip solid wall as [29]:

$$u_z = -\frac{3p}{64\pi\mu} \left[\frac{1}{z^2} - \frac{1}{(H-z)^2} \right],$$
 (2)

where p is the force dipole strength (the cell is approximated as a force dipole), μ is the viscosity of the liquid, and H is the distance between two parallel walls. The force dipole is on the order of the drag force times the cell size, $p \sim \mu UL^2$, where L is the cell size and U is the swimming speed. For UMDC19, we estimate $p = 1.4 \text{pN} \,\mu\text{m}$, by assuming $\mu = 1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg/m/s}$ (viscosity of water), $U = 55 \,\mu\text{m/s}$ and $L = 5 \,\mu\text{m}$. Figure 6(c) also plots u_z predicted by Eq. (2) with $p = 1.4 \text{pN} \,\mu\text{m}$. The result shows that, in the bulk region, the velocity induced by the hydrodynamic interactions is much smaller than the observed velocity for UMDC19. Therefore, in addition to the hydrodynamic effect, there are other mechanisms (e.g., the stochastic run-tumbling behavior)



FIG. 7. Sample time-variations of z position of UMDC19, showing cell migration from the bulk region to the walls located at (a) z = 0 and (b) $z = 200 \,\mu\text{m}$.

that drive the cells to migrate from the bulk region to the near-wall region. Further studies are required to understand which mechanisms contribute to this large migration speed.

To further seek evidence on cell migration from the bulk region to the near-wall regions, we plotted the time variations of the z position for a few bacteria UMDC19, as shown in Fig. 7. Clearly, some bacteria initially located in the bulk region (50 μ m < z < 150 μ m) migrated to one of the walls at z = 0 and 200 μ m, and remained on the walls for >2 s.

Lastly, we compared the 3D movement trajectories of the two strains of bacteria in the bulk ($50 < z < 150 \,\mu\text{m}$) and near-wall ($0 < z < 10 \,\mu\text{m}$ and $190 < z < 200 \,\mu\text{m}$) regions.

We classified the trajectories by first calculating the mean square displacement (Δr^2) and then fitting Δr^2 with respect to time lag (Δt) as $\Delta r^2 = \alpha \Delta t^K$, where K is the power exponent and α is a constant. Based on the measured value of K, the trajectories were divided into two categories: subdiffusive (or inactive) motion for K < 1 and superdiffusive (or active) motion for K > 1. Note, to obtain meaningful K, we only selected the trajectories whose lengths were >1 s for analysis. Changing this minimal length requirement from 1 to 2 s did not alter the conclusion (see Supplemental Material, Fig. S2 [73]). In addition, we calculated Δr^2 based on the bacterial displacements in x and y directions, instead of the bacterial displacements in all three directions. The reason is that the measurement uncertainty of the z position of bacteria is relatively larger than that in x and y directions due to the inherent limitation of digital holography [65]. A comparison of Δr^2 based on bacterial displacement in all three directions and bacterial displacement in x and y directions can be found in Supplemental Material, Fig. S3 [73]. Sample profiles of Δr^2 based on the bacterial displacements in x and y directions and power-law fittings can be found in Supplemental Material, Fig. S4 [73].

Figures 8(a) and 8(b) show sample bacteria trajectories in the bulk region for UMDC1 and UMDC19, respectively. Figure 8(c) shows the probability density distributions of *K* in the bulk region. Clearly, for bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation



FIG. 8. (a) and (b) Sample movement trajectories of bacteria in the bulk region ($50 < z < 150 \mu m$; dots denote the position of the bacteria, and lines are the trajectories. All trajectories are projected to the *x*-*y* plane). (c) Probability distribution of *K* for bacteria in the bulk region. (d) and (e) Sample movement trajectories of bacteria in the near-wall region ($0 < z < 10 \mu m$ and $190 < z < 200 \mu m$). (f) Probability distribution of *K* for bacteria in the near-wall region. (a) and (d) correspond to UMDC1. (b) and (e) correspond to UMDC19. Results shown are based on the data recorded at *t* = 4 h. The numbers of cells in (c) are 1041 for UMDC1 and 1398 for UMDC19. The numbers of cells in (f) are 149 for UMDC1 and 943 for UMDC19.

(UMDC19), *K* has a peak value close to K = 2. However, for bacteria showing no wall accumulation (UMDC1), *K* has two peaks located near K = 1 and 2, respectively. This result further indicates that bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation have higher motility. Figures 8(d) and 8(e) show sample bacteria trajectories in the near-wall region for UMDC1 and UMDC19, respectively. Figure 8(f) shows the probability density distributions of *K* in the near-wall region. For both bacterial strains, the percentages of trajectories showing sub-diffusive motions were ~50%, larger than those in the bulk region. The increase of subdiffusive motions in near-wall regions is mainly due to the constrain of solid walls, consistent with previous studies [24–26].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, by using DHM, we tracked and compared the 3D motions of two bacterial species of the same genus (Shewanella sp. UMDC1 and S. japonica UMDC19). UMDC19 had higher density distribution near the walls, while UMDC1 showed similar density distributions in the near-wall and the bulk regions. We found that the bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation have much higher motility than the ones showing no wall accumulation. The high motility presents in the forms of greater swimming speeds and distinct superdiffusive trajectories. Furthermore, we found that bacteria exhibiting wall accumulation slowly migrate from the bulk region to the near-wall region, with a velocity normal to the surface reaching to a maximum of 1.2 µm/s at 20 µm away from the walls. This result suggests the existence of a long-range attraction force between the bacteria and the solid surface and that the wall accumulation is due to the migration of cells from bulk region to near-wall region. We also found that the hydrodynamic interaction alone is insufficient to produce the migration speed, suggesting the

- H.-C. Flemming and S. Wuertz, Bacteria and archaea on Earth and their abundance in biofilms, Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 17, 247 (2019).
- [2] J. W. Costerton, Z. Lewandowski, D. E. Caldwell, D. R. Korber, and H. M. Lappin-Scott, Microbial biofilms, Annu. Rev. Microbiol. 49, 711 (1995).
- [3] M. E. Callow and J. E. Callow, Marine biofouling: A sticky problem, Biologist (London) 49, 1 (2002).
- [4] J. Bannister, M. Sievers, F. Bush, and N. Bloecher, Biofouling in marine aquaculture: A review of recent research and developments, Biofouling 35, 631 (2019).
- [5] R. Venkatesan, J. Kadiyam, P. SenthilKumar, R. Lavanya, and L. Vedaprakash, Marine biofouling on moored buoys and sensors in the Northern Indian Ocean, Mar. Technol. Soc. J. 51, 22 (2017).
- [6] P. Priyanka, A. B. Arun, C. C. Young, and P. D. Rekha, Prospecting exopolysaccharides produced by selected bacteria associated with marine organisms for biotechnological applications, Chin. J. Polym. Sci. 33, 236 (2015).
- [7] I. Fitridge, T. Dempster, J. Guenther, and R. de Nys, The impact and control of biofouling in marine aquaculture: A review, Biofouling 28, 649 (2012).

migration is due to active bacterial movement toward the inert surface. Future studies are required to explain the origin of the long-range attraction force and the migration speed.

In this paper, we only considered two different bacterial strains. Future works are required to test if our results can be generally applied to other bacterial species. In this paper, we only showed a correlation, not a causal relation between wall accumulation and motility. To prove the impact of motility on wall accumulation, future work is required to compare the 3D motion of the same bacteria with and without motility. Nevertheless, holographic microscopy as demonstrated here is a powerful tool in describing bacterial swimming behavior and speed as well as wall accumulation.

We provide 10 movies showing sample holograms for two bacterial species UMDC1 and UMDC19, five for each recorded at every 1 h. We also provide 10 MATLAB data files that include the 3D tracking results corresponding to the recorded holograms for two bacterial species and five time steps. These movies and datafiles are available online [74]. The bacterial strains are available from the authors upon request.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Abhishek Naik for isolating the UMDC1 strain and UMass Dartmouth's Marine and Undersea Technology (MUST) Research Program funded by the Office of Naval Research (ONR) under Grant No. N00014-20-1-2170.

H.L., P.H.M., and W.S.C. designed the methodology; M.E., K.B., and H.L. collected the data; M.E. and H.L. analyzed the data and led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

We declare we have no competing interests.

- [8] K. E. Cooksey and B. Wigglesworth-Cooksey, Adhesion of bacteria and diatoms to surfaces in the sea: A review, Aquat. Microb. Ecol. 09, 87 (1995).
- [9] J. W. Costerton, P. S. Stewart, and E. P. Greenberg, Bacterial biofilms: A common cause of persistent infections, Science 284, 1318 (1999).
- [10] Z. Khatoon, C. D. McTiernan, E. J. Suuronen, T.-F. Mah, and E. I. Alarcon, Bacterial biofilm formation on implantable devices and approaches to its treatment and prevention, Heliyon 4, e01067 (2018).
- [11] M. Habash and G. Reid, Microbial biofilms: Their development and significance for medical device-related infections, J. Clin. Pharmacol. 39, 887 (1999).
- [12] M. M. Mihai, A. M. Holban, C. Giurcaneanu, L. G. Popa, R. M. Oanea, V. Lazar, M. C. Chifiriuc, M. Popa, and M. I. Popa, Microbial biofilms: Impact on the pathogenesis of periodontitis, cystic fibrosis, chronic wounds and medical device-related infections, Curr. Top. Med. Chem. 15, 1552 (2015).
- [13] S. Häussler and M. R. Parsek, Biofilms 2009: New perspectives at the heart of surface-associated microbial communities, J. Bacteriol. 192, 2941 (2010).

- [14] J. Miao, Y. Liang, L. Chen, W. Wang, J. Wang, B. Li, L. Li, D. Chen, and Z. Xu, Formation and development of *Staphylococcus* biofilm: With focus on food safety, J. Food Saf. **37**, e12358 (2017).
- [15] C. Darby, J. W. Hsu, N. Ghori, and S. Falkow, Plague bacteria biofilm blocks food intake, Nature (London) 417, 243 (2002).
- [16] K. Myszka and K. Czaczyk, Bacterial biofilms on food contact surfaces—A review, Pol. J. Food Nutr. Sci. 61, 173 (2011).
- [17] G. M. Abebe, The role of bacterial biofilm in antibiotic resistance and food contamination, Int. J. Microbiol. 2020, e1705814 (2020).
- [18] P. D. Frymier, R. M. Ford, H. C. Berg, and P. T. Cummings, Three-dimensional tracking of motile bacteria near a solid planar surface, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 92, 6195 (1995).
- [19] M. A. Vigeant and R. M. Ford, Interactions between motile *Escherichia coli* and glass in media with various ionic strengths, as observed with a three-dimensional-tracking microscope, Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **63**, 3474 (1997).
- [20] P. D. Frymier and R. M. Ford, Analysis of bacterial swimming speed approaching a solid-liquid interface, AIChE J. 43, 1341 (1997).
- [21] S. Bianchi, F. Saglimbeni, G. Frangipane, D. Dell'Arciprete, and R. D. Leonardo, 3D dynamics of bacteria wall entrapment at a water-air interface, Soft Matter 15, 3397 (2019).
- [22] S. M. Vater, S. Weiße, S. Maleschlijski, C. Lotz, F. Koschitzki, T. Schwartz, U. Obst, and A. Rosenhahn, Swimming behavior of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* studied by holographic 3D tracking, PLoS One 9, e87765 (2014).
- [23] M. Heydt, M. E. Pettitt, X. Cao, M. E. Callow, J. A. Callow, M. Grunze, and A. Rosenhahn, Settlement behavior of zoospores of *Ulva linza* during surface selection studied by digital holographic microscopy, Biointerphases 7, 33 (2012).
- [24] M. Qi, X. Gong, B. Wu, and G. Zhang, Landing dynamics of swimming bacteria on a polymeric surface: Effect of surface properties, Langmuir 33, 3525 (2017).
- [25] S. Bianchi, F. Saglimbeni, and R. Di Leonardo, Holographic Imaging Reveals the Mechanism of Wall Entrapment in Swimming Bacteria, Phys. Rev. X 7, 011010 (2017).
- [26] M. Molaei, M. Barry, R. Stocker, and J. Sheng, Failed Escape: Solid Surfaces Prevent Tumbling of *Escherichia Coli*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 068103 (2014).
- [27] E. Lauga, W. R. DiLuzio, G. M. Whitesides, and H. A. Stone, Swimming in circles: Motion of bacteria near solid boundaries, Biophys. J. 90, 400 (2006).
- [28] R. Di Leonardo, D. Dell'Arciprete, L. Angelani, and V. Iebba, Swimming with an Image, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 038101 (2011).
- [29] A. P. Berke, L. Turner, H. C. Berg, and E. Lauga, Hydrodynamic Attraction of Swimming Microorganisms by Surfaces, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 038102 (2008).
- [30] M. Ramia, D. L. Tullock, and N. Phan-Thien, The role of hydrodynamic interaction in the locomotion of microorganisms, Biophys. J. 65, 755 (1993).
- [31] D. Giacché, T. Ishikawa, and T. Yamaguchi, Hydrodynamic entrapment of bacteria swimming near a solid surface, Phys. Rev. E 82, 056309 (2010).
- [32] G.-J. Li and A. M. Ardekani, Hydrodynamic interaction of microswimmers near a wall, Phys. Rev. E 90, 013010 (2014).
- [33] K. Schaar, A. Zöttl, and H. Stark, Detention Times of Microswimmers Close to Surfaces: Influence of Hydrodynamic Interactions and Noise, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 038101 (2015).

- [34] G. Li, L.-K. Tam, and J. X. Tang, Amplified effect of Brownian
- motion in bacterial near-surface swimming, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **105**, 18355 (2008).
- [35] G. Li and J. X. Tang, Accumulation of Microswimmers near a Surface Mediated by Collision and Rotational Brownian Motion, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 078101 (2009).
- [36] G. Li, J. Bensson, L. Nisimova, D. Munger, P. Mahautmr, J. X. Tang, M. R. Maxey, and Y. V. Brun, Accumulation of swimming bacteria near a solid surface, Phys. Rev. E 84, 041932 (2011).
- [37] A. Ahmadzadegan, S. Wang, P. P. Vlachos, and A. M. Ardekani, Hydrodynamic attraction of bacteria to gas and liquid interfaces, Phys. Rev. E 100, 062605 (2019).
- [38] M. A.-S. Vigeant, R. M. Ford, M. Wagner, and L. K. Tamm, Reversible and irreversible adhesion of motile *Escherichia coli* cells analyzed by total internal reflection aqueous fluorescence microscopy, Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 68, 2794 (2002).
- [39] B. Ezhilan, R. Alonso-Matilla, and D. Saintillan, On the distribution and swim pressure of run-and-tumble particles in confinement, J. Fluid Mech. 781, R4 (2015).
- [40] J. Elgeti and G. Gompper, Run-and-tumble dynamics of selfpropelled particles in confinement, Europhys. Lett. 109, 58003 (2015).
- [41] K. Drescher, J. Dunkel, L. H. Cisneros, S. Ganguly, and R. E. Goldstein, Fluid dynamics and noise in bacterial cell-cell and cell-surface scattering, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 108, 10940 (2011).
- [42] M. Qi, Q. Song, J. Zhao, C. Ma, G. Zhang, and X. Gong, Threedimensional bacterial behavior near dynamic surfaces formed by degradable polymers, Langmuir 33, 13098 (2017).
- [43] Q. Peng, X. Zhou, Z. Wang, Q. Xie, C. Ma, G. Zhang, and X. Gong, Three-dimensional bacterial motions near a surface investigated by digital holographic microscopy: Effect of surface stiffness, Langmuir 35, 12257 (2019).
- [44] D. Campoccia, L. Montanaro, and C. R. Arciola, A review of the biomaterials technologies for infection-resistant surfaces, Biomaterials 34, 8533 (2013).
- [45] L. C. Hsu, J. Fang, D. A. Borca-Tasciuc, R. W. Worobo, and C. I. Moraru, Effect of micro- and nanoscale topography on the adhesion of bacterial cells to solid surfaces, Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 79, 2703 (2013).
- [46] C. Díaz, P. L. Schilardi, R. C. Salvarezza, and M. Fernández Lorenzo de Mele, Have flagella a preferred orientation during early stages of biofilm formation? AFM study using patterned substrates, Colloids Surf. B Biointerfaces 82, 536 (2011).
- [47] F. Song, M. E. Brasch, H. Wang, J. H. Henderson, K. Sauer, and D. Ren, How bacteria respond to material stiffness during attachment: A role of *Escherichia coli* flagellar motility, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 9, 22176 (2017).
- [48] F. Song and D. Ren, Stiffness of cross-linked poly(dimethylsiloxane) affects bacterial adhesion and antibiotic susceptibility of attached cells, Langmuir 30, 10354 (2014).
- [49] M. Molaei and J. Sheng, Succeed escape: Flow shear promotes tumbling of *Escherichia colinear* a solid surface, Sci. Rep. 6, 35290 (2016).
- [50] A. Chengala, M. Hondzo, and J. Sheng, Microalga propels along vorticity direction in a shear flow, Phys. Rev. E 87, 052704 (2013).
- [51] J. T. Locsei and T. J. Pedley, Run and tumble chemotaxis in a shear flow: The effect of temporal comparisons, persistence,

rotational diffusion, and cell shape, Bull. Math. Biol. **71**, 1089 (2009).

- [52] H. Kang, S. Shim, S. J. Lee, J. Yoon, and K. H. Ahn, Bacterial translational motion on the electrode surface under anodic electric field, Environ. Sci. Technol. 45, 5769 (2011).
- [53] T.-K. Lim, T. Murakami, M. Tsuboi, K. Yamashita, and T. Matsunaga, Preparation of a colored conductive paint electrode for electrochemical inactivation of bacteria, Biotechnol. Bioeng. 81, 299 (2003).
- [54] A. J. van der Borden, P. G. M. Maathuis, E. Engels, G. Rakhorst, H. C. van der Mei, H. J. Busscher, and P. K. Sharma, Prevention of pin tract infection in external stainless steel fixator frames using electric current in a goat model, Biomaterials 28, 2122 (2007).
- [55] A. J. van der Borden, H. C. van der Mei, and H. J. Busscher, Electric-current-induced detachment of Staphylococcus epidermidis strains from surgical stainless steel, J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B 68, 160 (2004).
- [56] S. H. Hong, J. Jeong, S. Shim, H. Kang, S. Kwon, K. H. Ahn, and J. Yoon, Effect of electric currents on bacterial detachment and inactivation, Biotechnol. Bioeng. 100, 379 (2008).
- [57] A. L. Hook, J. L. Flewellen, J.-F. Dubern, A. M. Carabelli, I. M. Zaid, R. M. Berry, R. D. Wildman, N. Russell, P. Williams, and M. R. Alexander, Simultaneous tracking of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* motility in liquid and at the solid-liquid interface reveals differential roles for the flagellar stators, mSystems 4, e00390 (2019).
- [58] L. A. Pratt and R. Kolter, Genetic analysis of *Escherichia coli* biofilm formation: Roles of flagella, motility, chemotaxis and type I pili, Mol. Microbiol. **30**, 285 (1998).
- [59] J. C. Conrad, Physics of bacterial near-surface motility using flagella and type IV pili: Implications for biofilm formation, Res. Microbiol. 163, 619 (2012).
- [60] T. K. Wood, A. F. González Barrios, M. Herzberg, and J. Lee, Motility influences biofilm architecture in *Escherichia coli*, Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. **72**, 361 (2006).
- [61] K. M. Shoemaker and P. H. Moisander, Seasonal variation in the copepod gut microbiome in the subtropical North Atlantic Ocean, Environ. Microbiol. 19, 3087 (2017).

- [62] A. Klindworth, E. Pruesse, T. Schweer, J. Peplies, C. Quast, M. Horn, and F. O. Glöckner, Evaluation of general 16S ribosomal RNA gene PCR primers for classical and next-generation sequencing-based diversity studies, Nucleic Acids Res. 41, e1 (2013).
- [63] K. M. Shoemaker, S. Duhamel, and P. H. Moisander, Copepods promote bacterial community changes in surrounding seawater through farming and nutrient enrichment, Environ. Microbiol. 21, 3737 (2019).
- [64] M. Shangraw and H. Ling, Separating twin images in digital holographic microscopy using weak scatterers, Appl. Opt. 60, 626 (2021).
- [65] M. Shangraw and H. Ling, Improving axial localization of weak phase particles in digital in-line holography, Appl. Opt. 60, 7099 (2021).
- [66] J. Katz and J. Sheng, Applications of holography in fluid mechanics and particle dynamics, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. 42, 531 (2010).
- [67] H. Ling, Three-dimensional measurement of a particle field using phase retrieval digital holography, Appl. Opt. 59, 3551 (2020).
- [68] M. Elius and H. Ling, Effect of hologram plane position on particle tracking using digital holographic microscopy, Appl. Opt. 61, 9415 (2022).
- [69] J. Sheng, E. Malkiel, and J. Katz, Digital holographic microscope for measuring three-dimensional particle distributions and motions, Appl. Opt. 45, 3893 (2006).
- [70] N. T. Ouellette, H. Xu, and E. Bodenschatz, A quantitative study of three-dimensional Lagrangian particle tracking algorithms, Exp. Fluids 40, 301 (2006).
- [71] N. Mordant, A. M. Crawford, and E. Bodenschatz, Experimental Lagrangian acceleration probability density function measurement, Physica D 193, 245 (2004).
- [72] J. L. Nadeau, Y. B. Cho, J. Kühn, and K. Liewer, Improved tracking and resolution of bacteria in holographic microscopy using dye and fluorescent protein labeling, Front. Chem. 4, 17 (2016).
- [73] See Supplemental Material at http://link.aps.org/supplemental/ 10.1103/PhysRevE.108.014409 for Figs. S1–S4.
- [74] https://figshare.com/s/c9ef39ac6e9a85c4cd0b.