



Effects of irradiation and pH on fluorescence properties and flocculation of extracellular polymeric substances from the cyanobacterium *Chroococcus minutus*



Wenjuan Song^a, Chenxi Zhao^c, Shuyong Mu^a, Xiangliang Pan^{a,*}, Daoyong Zhang^{a,b,**}, Fahad A. Al-Misned^d, M. Golam Mortuza^{d,e}

^a Xinjiang Key Laboratory of Environmental Pollution and Bioremediation, Xinjiang Institute of Ecology and Geography, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Urumqi 830011, China

^b State Key Laboratory of Environmental Geochemistry, Institute of Geochemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guiyang 550002, China

^c Xinjiang Academy of Environmental Protection Sciences, Urumqi, Xinjiang 830011, China

^d Department of Zoology, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia

^e Department of Zoology, Faculty of Life and Earth Science, Rajshahi University, Rajshahi 6205, Bangladesh

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 August 2014

Received in revised form 3 February 2015

Accepted 9 February 2015

Available online 16 February 2015

Keywords:

Cyanobacteria

EEM fluorescence spectroscopy

Fluorophores

Heavy metals

Nutrient cycles

ABSTRACT

Microbial extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) may flocculate or be decomposed when environmental factors change, which significantly influences nutrient cycling and transport of heavy metals. However, little information is available on the stability of EPS in natural environments. Fluorescence and flocculation properties of EPS from *Chroococcus minutus* under different irradiation and pH conditions were studied. Two aromatic protein-like fluorescence peaks and one tyrosine protein-like peak were identified from the excitation–emission–matrix (EEM) fluorescence spectra of EPS. UVB (ultraviolet B) and solar irradiation increased the fluorescence intensity of all the three peaks while UVC (ultraviolet C) irradiation had little effect. EPS formed unstable flocs after exposure to UV (ultraviolet) irradiation and formed stable flocs under solar irradiation. EPS were prone to flocculation under highly acidic conditions and minimal fluorescence of peaks was observed. The fluorophores in EPS were relatively stable under neutral and alkaline conditions. These findings are helpful for understanding the behavior of EPS in aquatic environments and their role in biogeochemical cycles of the elements.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Microbial extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) are one of the important types of dissolved organic matter in natural environments and can exert a significant influence on the cycling of nutrient elements such as carbon and nitrogen [1,2]. EPS is mainly composed of polysaccharides, proteins, humic substances and nucleic acids [3,4]. EPS has important cellular functions, including the accumulation of nutrients, formation of a barrier against toxins and in the construction and stability of biofilms [5,6].

EPS can form flocs with various suspended solids such as kaolin clay particles, MgO and Al₂O₃ [7]. The properties and functions of EPS vary with changing temperature, salinity and irradiation [8–10].

Cyanobacteria are important photosynthetic microorganisms in both aquatic and terrestrial environments. They can produce large amounts of EPS, which leads to a better survival capacity than many other phototrophic microorganisms [11]. The protein-like fluorescent substances in EPS from cyanobacteria have significant impact on the speciation and mobility of heavy metals [12–14]. EPS acts as an effective buffering zone between living cells and the ambient environment and can alleviate adverse effects from the ambient environment. Algal EPS can be decomposed by heterotrophic microbial populations [15,16]. Aluwihare and Repeta [15] observed selective microbial degradation and flocculation of EPS from a marine strain of *Thalassiosira weissflogii*. The selective microbial degradation of EPS might enhance the adhesion properties of EPS and promote the formation of transparent exopolymeric particles and aggregates [16]. The decomposition of EPS can

* Corresponding author at: Xinjiang Key Laboratory of Environmental Pollution and Bioremediation, Xinjiang Institute of Ecology and Geography, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Urumqi 830011, China. Tel.: +86 991 7823156; fax: +86 991 7823156.

** Corresponding author at: State Key Laboratory of Environmental Geochemistry, Institute of Geochemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guiyang 550002, China. Tel.: + 86 851 5890483; fax: + 86 851 5890483.

E-mail addresses: panxl@ms.xjb.ac.cn (X. Pan), zhang-daoyong@163.com (D. Zhang).

therefore affect migration of elements such as carbon and nitrogen, as well as the release of heavy metals which have been adsorbed by the EPS.

Elevated UV (ultraviolet) radiation is one of the most detrimental environmental factors for photosynthetic organisms in arid zones [9]. A few studies have shown that EPS protects the cells against the damage from UV irradiation [17,18]. UVB (ultraviolet B) irradiation can decompose humic substances to small molecular weight substances in river water [1]. 96% of freshwater chromophoric dissolved organic matter and 41% of dissolved organic carbon were decomposed under solar irradiation [19]. pH is another important environmental factor that might influence the yield, structure and chemical properties of EPS [20,21]. Because of the competition for binding sites between protons and metal cations in natural environments, pH is usually thought to be one of the most important factors which affects adsorption of heavy metal ions to EPS [22,23]. The metal binding sites in EPS from activated sludge increased with increasing pH [24]. Therefore, the stability of EPS under different pH conditions might affect the behavior and fate of metal ions.

Despite the important protective role of EPS toward cellular function, there is little information on the decomposition and stability of EPS under different pH and irradiation conditions. In the present study, the typical cyanobacterium *Chroococcus minutus* was chosen as a model organism to examine the effect of irradiation and pH on the composition, fluorescence and flocculation properties of EPS.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Organism and culture conditions

The *C. minutus* was isolated from a soil sample. Cyanobacterial cells were grown in BG-11 medium [25] at 30 °C under 55 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ PAR (photosynthetically active radiation) with a 12 h/12 h light/dark cycle. After 1 week of incubation, the cells were harvested to extract the EPS.

2.2. EPS extraction

EPS was extracted using a cation exchange resin (001 \times 7, Shanghai) [26]. The culture was centrifuged at 5500 rpm for 10 min at 4 °C and then washed twice with Milli-Q water. The supernatant was discarded and the cyanobacterial cells were re-suspended in Milli-Q water. The cell suspension was mixed with some resin and shaken at 120 rpm and 30 °C for 8 h. The mixture was then centrifuged at 16,000 rpm for 10 min at 4 °C. The supernatant, i.e., the raw EPS solution, was filtered through a 0.22 μm membrane and purified using a dialysis membrane (3500 Dalton) at 4 °C for 24 h.

2.3. Determination of the biochemical composition of EPS

The total organic carbon (TOC) content of EPS solution was measured with a TOC analyzer (TOC-4100, Shimadzu, Japan). The polysaccharide content was measured by the phenolsulfuric acid method [27]. Protein content was determined by the Bradford-method [28]. Turbidity of the EPS solution was measured using a light-scattering photoelectric turbidity meter (HACH-2100P, Shanghai). 15 mL of EPS sample was put in a clean sample cell, which was capped with a thin film of silicone oil over the entire surface. The turbidity of the sample was determined using the automatic range for the equipment.

2.4. Irradiation treatment

EPS solutions in Petri dishes were irradiated with UVB light, UVC (ultraviolet C) light and simulated solar light with a background illumination of 55 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ PAR supplied by white fluorescent light. UVB irradiation was supplied by an ultraviolet irradiation lamp (EB-160C/FE, USA) with a peak emission at 312 nm. UVC irradiation was generated by an ultraviolet irradiation lamp (SW-CJ-1FD, Shanghai) with a peak emission at 253.7 nm. Simulated solar light was produced by an iodine-tungsten lamp. The irradiation intensity of UVB, UVC and simulated solar light on the surface of EPS was adjusted to 70 $\mu\text{W cm}^{-2}$. All lamps were turned on 30 min prior to irradiation tests to allow for stable output of the irradiation. The irradiation time for each treatment was 120 min.

2.5. EEM (Excitation–emission-matrix) fluorescence spectroscopy

EEM spectra of EPS solutions were recorded with a fluorescence spectrophotometer (F-7000, Hitachi, Japan) equipped with one 1.0 cm quartz cell and a thermostatic bath [14]. EEM spectra were collected from 200 to 550 nm of emission wavelength every 2 nm and from 200 to 400 nm of excitation wavelength every 5 nm. The width of the excitation/emission slit and the scanning speed were set to 5.0 nm and 1200 nm min^{-1} , respectively. The spectrum of Milli-Q water was subtracted from the fluorescence spectra of EPS. The three-dimensional EEM spectra were plotted using the software Sigmaplot 10.0 (Systat, US).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. The yield and biochemical composition of EPS

The EPS solution was pH 5.8. The yield of EPS was 60.7 mg g^{-1} dry weight cells. The TOC content was 2.0 mg L^{-1} . There were much more proteins (0.69 mg L^{-1}) present than polysaccharides (0.11 mg L^{-1}) in the EPS.

3.2. The fluorescence property of EPS

The EEM fluorescence spectra of EPS are shown in Fig. 1. Two aromatic protein-like fluorescence peaks (peak A at Ex/Em = 230/302 nm and peak B at Ex/Em = 235/352 nm) and one tyrosine protein-like peak (peak C at Ex/Em = 265/372 nm) were identified from the EEM spectra of EPS [14,18,29]. This result indicates that protein-like substances were the dominant fluorescent




Fig. 1. The EEM fluorescence spectrum of EPS from *C. minutus*.




Fig. 2. The fluorescence intensity of peaks for EPS irradiated with UVB, UVC and simulated solar light for 2 h (the error bars refer to standard deviation, $n=3$).

components in the EPS from *C. minutus*. Our previous studies showed that protein-like substances are the major fluorescent components in EPS from activated sludge, algal-bacterial biofilms and cyanobacteria [14,29–32].

3.3. Effects of irradiation on the fluorescence properties and flocculation of EPS

3.3.1. Effect of irradiation on the fluorescence properties of EPS

The fluorescence peaks did not drift under irradiation with various light wavelengths. The fluorescence intensities of fluorescence peaks in EPS after irradiation with UVB, UVC and simulated solar light for 120 min are shown in Fig. 2.

The fluorescence intensity of peak A was much higher than that of peak C, indicating that the aromatic protein-like substances were the main fluorophores in EPS. Changes in environmental factors may lead to a change in morphology or the conformation of EPS [20]. Change of fluorescence intensity of EPS under various irradiation regimes can be interpreted as a response of EPS to irradiation. As shown in Fig. 2, the fluorescence intensity of all the peaks increased after treatment with UVB and simulated solar irradiation. This might be attributed to expansion of the hidden fluorophores in EPS under excitation of UVB and simulated solar irradiation. However, the fluorescence intensity of all the fluorescence peaks was little affected by UVC irradiation.

3.3.2. Effect of irradiation on the flocculation of EPS

Microbial EPS might be decomposed or flocculated when environmental factors change. Turbidity, expressed as NTU, was used to describe flocculation of the EPS solution [7]. The turbidity of EPS solution exposed to increasing irradiation times of UVB, UVC and simulated solar irradiation is shown in Fig. 3.

The turbidity of the EPS solution increased rapidly after irradiation by the various light sources during the first 10 min after irradiation commenced. The turbidity then changed little up to 60 min for UV treatment and thereafter decreased to near initial values. This implies that short-time UV irradiation led to the formation of flocs from EPS and the flocs were decomposed again with increasing irradiation time. The turbidity increased much more significantly (from 11.2 to 22.3 NTU) under solar irradiation than UV irradiation during the first 10 min, changed little up to 30 min, and decreased slightly thereafter. This indicates that EPS is prone to the formation of more stable flocs under solar light.




Fig. 3. Turbidity of EPS solution after treatment with various irradiation sources (the error bars refer to standard deviation, $n=3$).




Fig. 4. Fluorescence intensity of EPS under different pH conditions (the error bars refer to standard deviation, $n=3$).

3.4. Effects of pH on the fluorescent properties and flocculation of EPS

3.4.1. Effect of pH on the fluorescence properties of EPS

The number and position of fluorescence peaks (peaks A, B and C) from EEM spectra of EPS did not change significantly under various pH conditions, indicating the quantity and type of fluorophores in EPS were not affected by pH. This was a different finding from other studies. Sheng and Yu [20] showed that fluorescence peaks' locations of the EPS from activated sludge shifted slightly (about 3–11 nm) with changing pH. This difference might be attributed to the different sources of EPS used in the different studies.

The fluorescence intensity of peaks with increasing pH is illustrated in Fig. 4. A change of pH can lead to rearrangement of the main structure of EPS and this might lead to unfolding or masking of the fluorophores in EPS [21]. Laser scattering analysis revealed that the deprotonated or protonated states of functional groups resulted in a more dense and compact structure of EPS at a lower pH value [33]. In this study, minimal fluorescence intensity was observed under strongly acidic conditions. The significant decrease of intensity might be attributed to changes in fluorescence characteristics of the acidic functional groups in the organic macromolecular structure, as well as changes in their own molecular configuration with




Fig. 5. Turbidity of EPS under different pH conditions (the error bars refer to standard deviation, $n=3$).

pH [33–35]. The fluorescence intensity fluctuated slightly as pH increased from pH 5 to 11, indicating that the fluorophores contained in EPS are relatively stable over this pH range.

3.4.2. Effect of pH on flocculation of EPS

The turbidity of EPS under various pH conditions is shown in Fig. 5. Generally, the turbidity of EPS solution showed a decreasing trend with increasing pH and the maximum and the minimum values were observed at pH 3 and pH 11, respectively. This suggests that EPS can easily form flocs under highly acidic conditions. The change of turbidity is consistent with the change of fluorescence intensity. Similarly, Wang et al. [33] reported that the strongest flocculation of EPS from *Bacillus megaterium* TF10 was achieved at pH 4.8. The flocculation of EPS might result in the shielding of some fluorophores so that fluorescence intensity was weaker under strongly acidic conditions.

4. Conclusions

Two aromatic protein-like fluorescence peaks and one tyrosine protein-like peak were identified from the EEM spectra of EPS from *C. minutus*. The fluorescence intensity of all the peaks increased under UVB and simulated solar irradiation but was little affected by UVC irradiation. Short-time UV irradiation might lead to the flocculation of EPS but the flocculate was decomposed again with increasing irradiation time. However, EPS can form stable flocculation under exposure to simulated solar irradiation. The fluorophores in EPS might be relatively stable under neutral and alkaline conditions. EPS is prone to flocculation under strongly

acidic conditions. These findings are helpful for understanding the geochemical behavior of EPS in natural environments and its impact on nutrient and element cycles.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the West Light Foundation of Chinese Academy of Science (XBBS201304), National Natural Science Foundation of China (U1120302, 21177127 and 41203088), and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation Funded Project (131622 Funded Project (131622)). Partial funding for this research was also received from the Visiting Professor Program at King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

References

- [1] V. Lepane, T. Persson, M. Wedborg, *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 56 (2003) 161.
- [2] X.L. Pan, *Res. J. Biotechnol.* 5 (2010) 3.
- [3] H. Liu, H.P. Fang, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 80 (2002) 806.
- [4] D.Y. Zhang, J.L. Wang, X.L. Pan, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 138 (2006) 589.
- [5] A.W. Decho, *Oceanogr. Mar. Biol.* 28 (1990) 73.
- [6] C.A. Mancuso Nichols, J. Guezennec, J.P. Owman, *Mar. Biotechnol.* 7 (2005) 253.
- [7] W.W. Li, W.Z. Zhou, Y.Z. Zhang, J. Wang, X.B. Zhu, *Bioresour. Technol.* 99 (2008) 689.
- [8] L.J. Stal, W.E. Krumbein, *Bot. Mar.* 28 (1985) 351.
- [9] T.J. Painter, *Carbohydr. Polym.* 20 (1993) 77.
- [10] M.A. Bowker, S.C. Reed, J. Belnap, S.L. Phillips, *Microb. Ecol.* 43 (2002) 13.
- [11] R.F. Helm, Z. Huang, D. Edwards, H. Leeson, W. Peery, M. Potts, *J. Bacteriol.* 182 (2000) 974.
- [12] C.S. Freire-Nordi, A.A. Henriques Vieira, O.R. Nascimento, *Process Biochem.* 40 (2005) 2215.
- [13] B. Kiran, A. Kaushik, *Biochem. Eng. J.* 38 (2008) 47.
- [14] D.Y. Zhang, X.L. Pan, M.G. Mostofa Khan, X. Chen, G.J. Mu, F.C. Wu, J. Liu, W.J. Song, Y.J. Yang, Y.L. Liu, Q.L. Fu, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 175 (2010) 359.
- [15] L.I. Aluwihare, D.J. Repeta, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 186 (1999) 105.
- [16] D. Giroldo, A.A.H. Vieira, *J. Phycol.* 39 (2003) 1109.
- [17] H.Y. Wang, X.L. Jiang, H.J. Mu, X.T. Liang, H.S. Guan, *Microbiol. Res.* 162 (2007) 124.
- [18] W. Chen, P. Westerhoff, J.A. Leenheer, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 37 (2003) 5701.
- [19] V.V. Anssi, G.W. Robert, *Mar. Chem.* 89 (2004) 313.
- [20] G.P. Sheng, H.Q. Yu, *Water Res.* 40 (2006) 1233.
- [21] I. Dogsa, M. Kriechbaum, D. Stopar, P. Laggner, *Biophys. J.* 89 (2005) 2711.
- [22] W. Stumm, *Chemistry of the Solid–Water Interface: Processes at the Mineral–Water and Particulate–Water Interface in Natural Systems*, 1992.
- [23] C. Lamelas, M. Benedetti, K.J. Wilkinson, V.I. Slaveykova, *Chemosphere* 65 (2006) 1362.
- [24] S. Comte, G. Guibaud, M. Baudu, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 151 (2008) 185.
- [25] R.Y. Stanier, R. Kunisawa, M. Mandel, G. Cohenbaz, *Bacteriol. Rev.* 35 (1971) 171–205.
- [26] T. Janette, T.N. Bryne, J.W. Fred, *Chem. Geol.* 247 (2008) 1.
- [27] M. Dubois, K.A. Gilles, J.K. Hamilton, P.A. Rebers, F. Smith, *Anal. Chem.* 28 (1956) 350.
- [28] M. Bradford, *Anal. Biochem.* 72 (1976) 248.
- [29] W.J. Song, G.J. Mu, D.Y. Zhang, X.L. Pan, *Afr. J. Biotechnol.* 9 (2010) 7667.
- [30] X.L. Pan, J. Liu, D.Y. Zhang, W.J. Song, F.C. Wu, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* 345 (2010) 442.
- [31] X.L. Pan, J. Liu, D.Y. Zhang, *Colloids Surf. B* 80 (2010) 103.
- [32] D.Y. Zhang, D.J. Lee, X.L. Pan, *J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Eng.* 43 (2012) 450.
- [33] L.L. Wang, L.F. Wang, X.M. Ren, X.D. Ye, W.W. Li, S.J. Yuan, M. Sun, G.P. Sheng, H.Q. Yu, X.K. Wang, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 46 (2012) 737.
- [34] J.J. Mobed, S.L. Hemmingsen, J.L. Autry, L.B. McGown, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 30 (1996) 3061.
- [35] N. Patel-Sorrentino, S. Mounier, J.Y. Benaim, *Water Res.* 36 (2002) 2571.