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**Abstract** **-** The aim of this research was to explore the interaction between ultrasound-activated microbubbles (MBs) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilms, specifically the effects of MB concentration, ultrasound exposure, and substrate properties on bactericidal efficacy. Biofilms were grown using a Centre for Disease Control bioreactor on polypropylene or stainless-steel coupons as acoustic analogues for soft and hard tissue, respectively. Biofilms were treated with different concentrations of phospholipid-shelled MBs (107-108 MB/mL), a sub-inhibitory concentration of gentamicin (4 *µ*g/mL), and 1 MHz ultrasound with a continuous or pulsed (100 kHz PRF, 25% duty cycle, 0.5 MPa peak-to-peak pressure) wave. The effect of repeated ultrasound exposure with intervals of either 15- or 60-minutes was also investigated. With polypropylene coupons, the greatest bactericidal effect was achieved with 2×5-minutes of pulsed ultrasound separated by 60-minutes and 5×107 MB/mL. A 0.76 log (83%) additional reduction in the number of bacteria was achieved compared to using the antibiotic alone. With stainless-steel coupons, a 67% (0.46 log) reduction was obtained under the same exposure conditions, possibly due to enhancement of a standing wave field which inhibited MB penetration in the biofilm. These findings demonstrate the importance of treatment parameter selection in antimicrobial applications of MBs and ultrasound in different tissue environments.
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## Introduction

Bacterial biofilms present a serious threat to our ability to treat infections (Lebeaux *et al.*, 2014). They can drastically reduce the effectiveness of antibiotics, primarily by inhibiting drug penetration (Singh *et al.*, 2017). For a large proportion of bacteria inside the biofilm this means that the concentration of antibiotic that reaches them will not be high enough to kill them, which gives them greater opportunity to develop and express further resistance mechanisms. Combining antibiotics with drug delivery methods that increase their penetration and absorption capabilities, thus has great potential to counteract this ever-growing threat to public health. Biofilms in chronic wounds are a key focus of research in this area, as they pose a significant risk of morbidity and even mortality. A chronic wound can be broadly classified as any wound that exhibits poor healing. They are typically associated with recalcitrant infections, ischaemia, and a prolonged or arrested inflammatory phase (Wolcott *et al.*, 2008). Diabetic foot ulcers (DFUs) are a severe complication observed in 15% of neuropathic diabetic patients, making it one of the most prevalent examples of a chronic wound worldwide (Alexiadou and Doupis, 2012). There is a pronounced heterogeneity associated with bacterial colonisation of wounds, which has an intrinsic effect on morphology, mechanical properties, and development of biofilms in chronic wounds (Thomson, 2011). A comparative study of the foot microbiome demonstrated that, when compared to a non-diabetic, the diabetic foot was host to substantially more opportunistic pathogens such as *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (Jneid *et al.*, 2017). Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that a typical wound can consist of multiple genera, with 12-20 different aerobic and anaerobic species of pathogenic bacteria dominating the commensal microflora in some cases (Omar *et al.*, 2017). Although studies have specifically implicated the microbial burden of DFUs in delayed wound healing (Attinger and Wolcott, 2012; Bjarnsholt, 2013), there must also be consideration of the species present in the pathophysiology of chronic wounds (Gardner *et al.*, 2013). The experimental work carried out here has utilised a single-species *P. aeruginosa* biofilm, as it is an extensively used model organism for opportunistic Gram-negative infections (LaBauve and Wargo, 2012) andis one of the most commonly isolated pathogens in chronic wounds (Banu *et al.,* 2015).

The longest established method of biofilm eradication from chronic wounds is debridement (Yazdanpanah *et al.*, 2015), which has been shown to expedite wound healing and reduce the overall size of a wound (Rhoads *et al.*, 2008). However, complete wound healing requires multiple invasive treatments, typically carried out over a period of months (Harris *et al.*, 2018; Michailidis *et al.*, 2018). Although the efficacy of debridement can be increased with the use of chemicals such as hydrogen peroxide or certain enzymes (Watters *et al.*, 2016), failure to remove biofilm persister cells from the wound bed is a common cause of recalcitrance (Percival *et al.*, 2011). A commonly overlooked requirement of debridement is the prolonged after-care, including cleaning and redressing the treated area over the course of weeks. In addition to the physical and emotional trauma associated with DFU management, there is an undeniable economic burden (Walsh *et al.*, 2016). A recent cohort study by Guest et al. (2020) demonstrated that the 2017/2018 annual cost of wound management to the UK National Health Service (NHS) was £8.3 billion. It is notable that of this, £5.6 billion was associated with the management of unhealed wounds. It is evident that the currently available therapeutic options for the treatment of biofilms in wounds, are limited in their effectiveness.

A potential solution to this issue is the use of ultrasound-activated gas-filled microbubbles (MBs). The dynamic response of MBs to relatively low intensity ultrasound can cause perturbation of the biofilm and potentiate the effect of administered antibiotics. The breadth of research surrounding the therapeutic use of ultrasound-activated MBs has been steadily expanding over the last decade (Unger *et al.*, 2004; Sirsi and Borden, 2009). However, the application of this treatment modality to bacterial biofilms, has only more recently begun to see an increase in research focus. Although more extensively reviewed elsewhere (LuTheryn *et al.*, 2019; Kooiman *et al.*, 2020; Lattwein *et al.*, 2020), the biophysical effects of oscillating MBs have been shown to have a direct impact on biofilm architecture and permeability.

Since first being reported in 2011, it has been clearly demonstrated that the combination of ultrasound and MBs promotes bactericidal activity in both planktonic and biofilm cultures (Ikeda-Dantsuji *et al.*, 2011). Cavitating MBs are known to cause the development of pores in the biofilm architecture, which inevitably enhances the permeability and thus susceptibility of biofilms to antibiotics (Zhu *et al.*, 2014). These denoted ‘sonobactericide’ studies are a continually growing area of essential research, which have reported on the effects of MB-driven microstreaming for biofilm removal (Kooiman *et al.*, 2014), and the use of shock waves to drive antibiotic penetration and disrupt the biofilm architecture (Gnanadhas *et al.*, 2015). Many studies on the effects of ultrasound and MBs for drug delivery in biofilms, utilise substrates such as standard polystyrene tissue culture well-plates and disks or glass coverslips (Han *et al.*, 2007; Ronan *et al.*, 2016). In some of these studies, the possibility of standing waves occurring accidentally due to reflection of ultrasound in the apparatus has been noted (Lattwein *et al.*, 2020). However, in this research the intentional utilisation of an acoustically reflective substrate, provides valuable insight into the potential of applying this methodology near hard surfaces - such as bone - *in vivo,* which are likely to elicit standing waves (Ferri *et al.*, 2019). In summary, the aim of this research was to explore the interaction between ultrasound-activated MBs and *P. aeruginosa* biofilms in order to elucidate the effects of MB concentration, ultrasound exposure regimes and substrate acoustic properties on bactericidal efficacy.

**Materials and Methods**

*Biofilm on coupon system: design rationale and construction*

A compact system was designed to expose *P. aeruginosa* biofilms to a MB suspension and antibiotic solution, which can subsequently be exposed to an ultrasound field. **Figure 1** shows both cross-sectional and exploded three-dimensional (3D) schematics of the system, which allows experiments to be performed with 2 mL of an antibiotic-MB formulation. In order to suppress reflected and standing waves from the sidewalls and base of the biofilm on coupon system (BOCS), a layer of an acoustically absorbing material (Aptflex F48, 10 mm thick, Precision Acoustics, Dorchester, UK) was used. *P. aeruginosa* biofilms were grown on Centre for Disease Control (CDC) bioreactor coupons, 12.7 mm in diameter and 3 mm thick, which were made of either polypropylene or stainless-steel. A coupon holder was fabricated from an Ibidi™ dish with a polymer coverslip bottom (35 mm in diameter and 12 mm high, Ibidi™, Martinsried, Germany). The volume of the dish was filled with a 10 mm thick layer of polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS), which contained a 3 mm deep recess to hold the coupon in a fixed position. After placing the coupon in the recess of the holder, the dish was sealed with a removable 8 mm thick PDMS lid, which was manufactured as described by Carugo et al. (2015). The lid also contained inlet and outlet ports for injection and removal of liquid samples, respectively. PDMS was selected for constructing the coupon holder and lid, as loss of transmission through this material layer at 1 MHz is low. Ultrasound is therefore able to pass through the lid and coupon holder without significant distortion (Carugo *et al.*, 2015), to stimulate MBs and interact with the coupon substrate. The coupon holder and the transducer (1 MHz, narrowband, 15 mm diameter active area, Camasonics, Wiltshire, UK) were held at a set distance of 40 mm, by two 3D-printed polylactic acid (PLA) mounting pieces, secured by nuts on three equidistant threaded rods.

## *Calibration of BOCS acoustic field*

The acoustic pressure field was characterised using a needle hydrophone (2 mm diameter needle, Precision Acoustics, Dorchester, UK), with the BOCS submerged in a tank filled with filtered and degassed water. To quantify the acoustic pressure field over specific regions of interest, automated position-control software (UMS2, Precision Acoustics, Dorchester, UK) was employed to control the hydrophone’s position. Signals were acquired with an oscilloscope (Waverunner 64Xi, Teledyne LeCroy, Geneva, Switzerland). Drive voltage (PP007-WR, LeCroy) and current (4100, Pearson Electronics, Palo Alto, CA, ultrasound) probes were monitored to allow subsequent calculation of electrical impedance.

Calibration data were processed in Matlab (version 7.10.0, Natick, Massachusetts, The MathWorks Inc., 2010) using the following steps: (i) application of a high pass filter to remove DC offset, (ii) calculation of the hydrophone’s output sound intensity level *A(f,x,y,z)* and drive voltage *V(f)* Fourier transforms, and (iii) calculation of the transmitting voltage response (*TVR*) at each frequency (*f*) and scan grid point *(x,y,z): TVR(f,x,y,z) = A(f,x,y,z)/(V(f)S(f))*, where *S(f)* is the hydrophone sensitivity given by manufacturer calibration. Water temperature was monitored with a glass thermometer, where resulting values were used to calculate the sound speed for use in estimating the hydrophone’s position.

Two tests were performed: (1) the voltage dependence of the acoustic peak-to-peak pressure in the target plane at the transducer resonant frequency (1 MHz), in order to identify drive voltages able to create acoustic pressure amplitudes suitable for MB stimulation; and (2) a planar scan of the acoustic pressure in the target plane, to spatially characterise the ultrasound field to which bacteria and MBs were exposed. The target plane in this study corresponded to the location where biofilms were present; moreover, calibration tests were performed in the presence of the PDMS lid to account for potential ultrasound attenuation through the lid.

## *Microbubble production protocol*

The MB shell constituents were 1,2-distearoyl-*sn*-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DSPC) (850365P Avanti, Sigma-Aldrich) and polyoxyethylene (40) stearate (PEG40s) (P3440, Sigma-Aldrich). They were initially dissolved in chloroform at stock concentrations of 25 and 10 mg/mL respectively, and were combined in a 9:1 or 9:5 molar ratio in a 20 mL capacity and 23 mm diameter glass vial (15394769, Fisherbrand™, Fisher Scientific), using a 1 mL Luer lock glass syringe (1MR-GT, S.G.E Gas Tight Syringe, Supelco). The lipid solution was covered with Parafilm® that was pierced a number of times with a needle, then placed in a fume hood to allow the solvent to evaporate overnight at ambient temperature (~23 °C ± 2 °C). The dry lipid film obtained was rehydrated with 5 mL of degassed 0.01 M sterile phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (P4417, Sigma-Aldrich), leaving a final lipid concentration of 4 mg/mL. A magnetic stirring bar was added to the vial before it was capped and placed on a stirring hotplate (Fisherbrand™, Isotemp™) for 30 minutes at 700 rpm and a temperature of 90 °C (which is above the transition temperature for DSPC). Using a 120 W, 3.175 mm diameter tip sonicator (20 kHz, Fisher Scientific FB120, Pittsburgh) the DSPC:PEG40s suspension was homogenously dispersed for 150 seconds at 40% power (48 W), with the sonicator tip fully immersed in the liquid. MBs were formed in a second sonication step by placing the tip sonicator at the liquid-air interface of the homogenised lipid suspension for 30 seconds at 70% power (84 W). Upon completion of the second sonication, the vial was placed immediately into an ice bath to rapidly cool the MB suspension. MBs were always prepared < 3 hours before being utilised in experiments and stored at ~4 °C during the intervening period. The microbubble formulations investigated in the present study had an air-filled core. Since this research ultimately aims at developing an ultrasound-mediated therapy for the topical treatment of infections in chronic wounds, it is anticipated that the stability of a microbubble formulation for this application would not suffer from the same challenges as for formulations administered intravenously, where microbubbles are exposed to greater temperatures and mechanical forces, and can also be destabilised by their interaction with blood constituents. Moreover, whilst the diameter of microbubbles administered intravascularly should be < ~10 *µ*m to minimise the risk of microvascular occlusion (Stride and Saffari, 2003), the size of microbubbles administered topically is not so constrained. Therefore, it was deemed suitable to initially evaluate the potential of a cost-effective air-filled formulation, as an alternative to heavier and less water-soluble gases that are more commonly used as the microbubble core constituent (such as sulphur hexafluoride or perfluorocarbons) (Qin et al., 2009).

## *Characterisation of microbubble stability*

The stability of MBs stored at ~4 °C was assessed by pipetting a 10 *µ*L sample of the MB suspension onto a Neubauer haemocytometer, with a 0.17 mm thick cover slip placed on top. Using bright field microscopy (Olympus, IX71) with a 50× objective (Olympus, LMPLFLN), 100 images were acquired from randomly selected locations using a CCD camera (Hamamatsu ORCA-ER, C4742-80). The images were processed using ImageJ following a protocol previously reported (Schneider *et al.*, 2012), and the process was repeated at time intervals of 0, 1, 2, 5 and 24 hours.

## *Biofilm growth*

An overnight culture of *P. aeruginosa* (NCTC 13359) was prepared by inoculating three colonies into 3 mL of tryptone soy broth (TSB), which was then grown at 37 °C with shaking at 200 rpm. The optical density (OD600) of the overnight culture was adjusted to a concentration of 1 × 108 CFU/mL, in a final volume of 2 mL. Biofilms were generated by inoculating 400 mL of sterile TSB with the 2 mL of adjusted *P. aeruginosa* culture, which was added to a sterile CDC bioreactor containing up to 8 rods that each hold three 12.7 mm polypropylene or stainless-steel coupons. The top of the bioreactor was sealed with foil and placed on a stirring hotplate (Fisherbrand™, Isotemp™) at 37 °C with a rotational speed of 200 rpm for 24 hours.

## *Ultrasound-stimulated microbubbles for antibiotic delivery to P. aeruginosa biofilms*

*P. aeruginosa* biofilm-covered coupons were individually placed into the PDMS coupon holders using tweezers; controls that were exposed to antibiotic alone were handled in the same way but not exposed to MBs and/or ultrasound. A MB suspension was combined with a sub-inhibitory concentration of gentamicin (4 *µ*g/mL final concentration) to attain antibiotic:MB volumetric ratios of 1:1, 1:5 or 1:10. For experiments conducted in the absence of gentamicin, the MB suspension was diluted in the same volumetric ratios with sterile PBS. A 3 mL syringe (Thermo Scientific™ S7510-3) was used to draw up 2 mL of the antibiotic-microbubble (AB-MB) formulation and injected through the PDMS lid of the coupon holder dish. Injection was performed slowly at a 45° angle, until no air spaces were visible in the dish; the inlet and outlet ports of the lid were then sealed. The coupon holder was mounted onto the 3D printed holder, and submerged in water in the fully assembled BOCS. Both sides of the bioreactor coupon were exposed to the same test parameters; these included either (i) a 15-minute priming period with the AB-MB formulation before a single ultrasound exposure, or (ii) a 5-minute priming period before an initial ultrasound exposure, followed by either a 15- or 60-minute antibiotic-MB priming period before a repeated ultrasound exposure. It was hypothesised that the introduction of a rest period between ultrasound exposures would provide time for the antibiotic to further diffuse through the biofilm, thus potentially enhancing the effect of the mechanical perturbation generated by MB cavitation. Moreover, previous studies on mammalian cell lines have reported on a priming effect caused by the constituents of lipid-based MB formulations, resulting in changes in cell membrane fluidity and permeability to bioactive compounds (Carugo *et al.*, 2017; Aron *et al.*, 2019). A maximum rest period of 60-minutes was selected in this study, in order not to excessively prolong the overall duration of the treatment protocol, in view of potential future translation.

Both continuous and pulsed ultrasound exposure regimes were created using a signal generator (Rigol, DG1022A). The signal was fed to a power ampliﬁer (55 dB gain, T&C Power Conversion Inc., AG1020), which then output the signal to the transducer at 200 Vpp to create a 0.5 MPa peak-to-peak acoustic pressure amplitude at 1 MHz (see Supplementary Information for the acoustic field calibration data). The exposure time was 5 minutes, and for the pulsed exposures there was a 100 kHz pulse repetition frequency (PRF) at 25% duty cycle. These exposure conditions are comparable to the ones employed in previous *in-vitro* studies reporting on the treatment of bacterial biofilms using combinations of US-activated microbubbles and antibiotics (He *et al.*, 2011; Dong *et al.*, 2013, 2017). During BOCS assembly in water, care was always taken to ensure that no exogenous air bubbles were trapped in the sound path. After ultrasound exposure, the coupon was removed from the holder and placed into a sterile bioreactor rod. The rods containing post-treatment coupons were stored upright in Falcon tubes containing 50 mL of sterile TSB and 4 *µ*g/mL gentamicin, before being sealed with foil and incubated at 37 °C for 24 hours.

After incubation, the viable cells from the biofilm were enumerated using the Miles-Misra method (Miles *et al.*, 1938). To remove any residual planktonic cells from the coupons, each rod was washed by being gently rinsed in a Falcon tube containing 40 mL of sterile PBS. The coupons were then removed from the rod and individually placed into 15 mL Falcon tubes containing 10 mL of sterile TSB. To detach the biofilm from each coupon, the tubes were sealed and agitated at 2000 rpm for 10 minutes on a benchtop shaker. For each coupon, three 10 *µ*L samples of the TSB containing extricated biofilm were taken; each sample was placed into 90 *µ*L of sterile PBS on a 96-well plate and serially diluted to 10-8. For each serial dilution, three 10 *µ*L droplets were dispensed onto a sterile tryptone soy agar plate; the droplets were allowed to dry before the plate was inverted and incubated overnight at 37 °C. After incubation, all clearly visible individual colonies were counted; one dilution factor was selected for each coupon in order to scale the number of visible colonies to gain an estimate of the number of colony forming units (CFU) per coupon.

## *Data analysis*

To facilitate data analysis, biological repeats of experiments were normalised to the mean of the antibiotic-only control coupon. All data processing was carried out with MATLAB (version 7.10.0, Natick, Massachusetts, The MathWorks Inc., 2010). The values displayed on the graphs in **Figures 2 and 3** are log reduction. This is a base-10 logarithm representation of the number of bacteria removed from the biofilm with respect to the antibiotic-only control (which achieved a 0.4 log reduction in the number of bacteria). It can be calculated as *LR = log10(NB/NA)*, where *NB* represents the bacteria numbers before treatment and *NA* represents bacteria numbers after treatment. A 1-log reduction represents a 10-fold decrease in bacteria numbers (i.e. 90%), while a 2-log reduction represents a 100-fold reduction (i.e. 99%). For a more in-depth statistical analysis of distribution and significance, each value of any tested condition was normalised with respect to the mean value of the antibiotic-only control. This includes other controls, as well as any tested condition. The data could thus all be pooled together and compared as distributions. Each coupon represented one sample. For each experimental condition, at least three independent bioreactors were employed, which means a minimum of 9 samples per condition tested. The Jarque-Bera normality test was carried out on the data distribution; it was determined that data didn’t follow a normal distribution but could instead be fit with an inverse exponential function. Therefore, significance between data distributions was assessed using the Mann-Whitney U-test (with a p-value of < 0.01) instead of the more commonly used Student’s T-test. Because the antibody-MB treatments were expected to perform better than the antibiotic-only control, a one-tailed version of the test was employed.

# Results and Discussion

## *Microbubble stability*

The mean concentration of MBs at the time of production was 1.19 × 108 MB/mL, which reduced to 5.97 × 107 MB/mL in the interval of 2 hours before the experiment began. Over this time, the mean MB diameter increased from 2.9 ± 2.4 *µ*m to 3.97 ± 4.1 *µ*m. Assessment of MB concentration and diameter by microscopy was carried out at room temperature of approximately 20 °C (± 1 °C), with the MB suspensions stored in an ice bath during the interim period. The size and concentration of MBs here is comparable to commercially available lipid-based MB preparations such as SonoVue®, where post-production diameter and concentration are typically in the ranges of 1.5 – 2.5 *µ*m and 1 – 5 x 108 MB/mL respectively (Sirsi and Borden, 2009; Sennoga *et al.*, 2012). As described earlier, air-filled microbubbles were investigated in this study as a potential US-responsive formulation for the topical treatment of biofilm infections. It should be noted that the measured increase in MB mean diameter over a period of 2 hours may be greater than the one observed for similar lipid-shelled MB formulations containing less soluble gases (such as perfluorocarbons) (Pouliopoulos *et al.*, 2020). This inevitably had an impact on the observed MB acoustic response, and further optimisation of the ultrasound exposure conditions - relative to the MB size distribution - could be carried out in future investigations. The observed reduction in MB concentration (and the corresponding increase in MB diameter) could be attributed to either gas diffusion from the MB core into the surrounding medium, leading to MB dissolution; or to coalescence *via* Ostwald ripening. Both of these processes will typically be more pronounced for smaller MBs in a suspension, as their gaseous core is subject to greater pressure compared to the larger MBs (because of surface tension and curvature effects) (Abou-Saleh et al. 2016; Epstein et al. 1950). The greater driving force for gas transport in smaller MBs is therefore a contributing factor behind the observed increase in mean MB diameter over time. Previous studies have also shown that MB dissolution time inversely correlates with gas diffusivity and solubility in the suspension medium, as well as gas permeability through the MB coating layer. This explains why air-filled lipid-shelled microbubbles undergo faster dissolution compared to those containing other clinically-approved gases, such as perfluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride (Sarkar *et al.*, 2009).

## *Experimental controls*

To ensure the validity of control data for the biofilm samples, all coupons were subject to the same handling processes. The control conditions assessed included: sub-inhibitory (4 *µ*g/mL) antibiotic only, MBs only, MB shell constituents only, and ultrasound only. The controls laid out here were important to establish if any bactericidal activity could be attributed to any single experimental condition, or if the treatment outcome was subject to a specific combination of parameters. The effect of MB shell constituents on biofilm samples was assessed, as previous research has indicated that constituents such as PEG have innate bactericidal properties (Feshitan *et al.*, 2009; Shi *et al.*, 2016; Owen *et al.*, 2018).

To compare between bioreactors the controls were normalised with respect to the antibiotic control, to demonstrate the efficacy of the methodology using a sub-inhibitory concentration of antibiotic. Microbubble suspensions were separated into three volumetric ratios of PBS to MB of 1:1, 1:5, and 1:10. The same concentrations were used with the bubble constituent controls (MBCs). In the absence of ultrasound, MBs alone and MB constituents alone applied to biofilms did not exhibit any identifiable bactericidal or anti-biofilm activity when directly compared to antibiotic alone (**Figure 2**). The investigated MB formulation and its constituents alone, at the concentrations tested, show no significant bactericidal properties and consequently post-exposure, the biofilm cells continue growing and this results in a net increase in cells over time compared to an antibiotic treated control. Similarly, in the absence of MBs, the ultrasound parameters alone had no effect on bacteria numbers recovered from exposed biofilms (**Figure 2**). In the ultrasound-only control, where no antibiotic or MBs were applied to the biofilm, there was a non-significant reduction in bacteria numbers equivalent to < 23%.

## *Acoustic properties of substrates used for biofilm growth*

To approximate acoustic exposure conditions of biofilms on soft tissues (such as skin) as well as proximal to hard tissues (such as bone), CDC bioreactor coupons were selected with contrasting acoustic impedance and speed of sound. Since the range of materials that CDC bioreactor coupons are made from is limited, it was not possible to achieve a perfect match with tissue properties unfortunately, but the focus of the study was on the effect of a large difference in substrate properties. Polypropylene was chosen as a soft tissue analogue, as it facilitates efficient transmission. Soft tissues such as skin have a mean characteristic acoustic impedance of 1.63 MRayl, with a sound velocity of 1540 m/s and density of 1.06 g/cm3 (Ludwig, 2005). Polypropylene has a characteristic acoustic impedance of 2.36 MRayl, with a sound velocity of 2660 m/s and density of 0.89 g/cm3 (ONDA, 2003). For modelling hard tissue, stainless-steel coupons were selected. Stainless-steel has a much higher mean acoustic impedance (45.7 MRayl) than bone (7.71 MRayl) (Saïed *et al.*, 2008); however, the sound velocity of bone is between 3700 and 4400 m/s (Sievänen *et al.*, 2001) while that of stainless-steel is 5790 m/s (ONDA, 2003). Despite these differences in acoustic impedance and velocity, it was deemed that stainless-steel coupons would still provide valuable insight into the potential application of MBs proximal to highly acoustically reflective surfaces. In particular, it is anticipated that the more reflective steel coupon would favour the onset of a stronger ultrasonic standing wave field, and that the resulting acoustic radiation forces may potentially drive microbubbles away from the target surface and also cause microbubbles to aggregate (Lazarus *et al.*, 2017; Jin *et al.*, 2021). Differences in substrate properties may also impact on the amplitude of MB oscillation during cavitation, and affect the probability and direction of resulting micro-jetting or microstreaming events. Moreover, differences in the pressure wave field within the solid substrate may cause additional convective effects at the solid-liquid interface, the characteristics of which would likely be different between polypropylene and stainless-steel substrates.

## *Continuous ultrasound exposure*

A group of experiments explored the effect of bubble concentration on the overall bacteria number reduction, upon exposure to continuous-wave ultrasound (see the left shaded area in **Figure 3**). In these experiments, biofilms were grown on polypropylene coupons. Only one of the three concentrations (1:5) was able to partially reduce bacteria numbers more than the antibiotic-only controls; however, while the change was statistically significant (p = 0.008), it doesn’t represent a considerable reduction. The application of continuous-wave ultrasound to MBs in the context of achieving bactericidal or anti-biofilm activity is largely uncommon; as comprehensively reviewed by Lattwein et al. (2020) pulsed wave ultrasound is by far more common, likely due to the lower associated thermal effects compared to continuous-wave US fields. In a recent study by Fu et al. (2019) that utilised continuous-wave ultrasound (1 MHz, 3 W/cm2, 5 minutes), an inhibitory effect of insonified MBs on *Acinetobacter baumannii* biofilms was reported to be more effective than antibiotic alone. However, this effect was discernibly less effectual than other agents applied in the study to the same biofilms, confirmed in scanning electron microscopy images that showed very little disruption to the biofilm architecture (Fu *et al.*, 2019). The negligible effect of continuous-wave ultrasound and MBs applied in this research, could be linked to MB concentration within the confined space of the fluidic chamber where biofilms are contained. High density MB clouds may scatter and absorb the incident ultrasound field and prevent it from pushing MBs to the biofilm surface, while at the same time creating a secondary shockwave if driven at the bubble cloud’s resonance (Matsumoto and Yoshizawa, 2005; Brujan *et al.*, 2011). Consequently, this can create a complicated ultrasound-MB interaction, whereby a potential outcome is trapping and cavitation of MBs ineffectually away from the biofilm surface. Given the limited efficacy of MBs upon exposure to continuous-wave ultrasound, this treatment regime was not applied against biofilms grown on stainless-steel coupons.

## *Pulsed ultrasound exposure*

In a second group of experiments (**Figure 3**, central unshaded area), the effect of pulsing the ultrasound transducer (at 25% duty cycle) was evaluated. It was hypothesised that this would reduce aggregation and coalescing of MBs due to secondary Bjerknes forces (Leighton, 1997). Pulsing produced an overall improvement in bactericidal effect with all three MB concentrations. Using a pulsed exposure, the greatest additional reduction in bacteria number was attained by an antibiotic-MB suspension at a 1:10 ratio, which caused a substantial decrease in the number of bacteria (0.7 log, or 80%), with a significance of p = 0.005. The significant improvement in bactericidal efficacy of pulsed over continuous wave ultrasound in this research is promising, with strong evidence that pulsed wave ultrasound and MBs have the ability to potentiate the effect of a sub-inhibitory concentration of antibiotic against biofilms. It has been reported that the synergy observed between pulsed wave ultrasound and antibiotic potentiation is related to temporal peak intensity, rather than the temporal average intensity of the ultrasound (Cai *et al.*, 2017). Consequently, since greater skin damage is correlated with higher average ultrasound intensities, the utilisation of pulsed wave ultrasound may prove essential in achieving clinically viable translations that utilise MBs and ultrasound for therapy.

## *Repeated ultrasound exposures after a rest period*

As shown in other research, it is possible that repeated exposures to MBs and ultrasound can facilitate the opening of pores that expose deeper layers of the biofilm (Dong *et al.*, 2013; Zhu *et al.*, 2014). Consequently, when coupled with a prolonged rest period between ultrasound exposures, biofilm cells at deeper layers have time to be exposed to higher levels of oxygen, nutrients, and antibiotic. This would invariably result in a greater level of metabolic activity in sessile cells that previously may have been dormant, which are renowned for being far more tolerant to antibiotic treatment (LuTheryn *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, it is possible that additional exposures could reduce the bacteria numbers even further, with each additional exposure increasing the time available for the antibiotic to penetrate and kill increasingly metabolically active cells. Adding a 15-minute priming period prior to ultrasound exposure and a 15-minute rest interval before a repeated exposure, resulted in a significant improvement in treatment efficacy compared to antibiotic alone. The effect is demonstrated here with the 1:5 antibiotic-MB suspension, where the additional reduction in bacterial cells recovered from biofilms improved from 0.3 log to 0.6 log (52% to 76%), in the absence and presence of a rest period respectively (**Figure 3**). Moreover, when the rest interval between exposures was increased to 60 minutes, the reduction in bacteria number was further increased to 0.76 log (83%) (**Figure 3**, right shaded area). The significance of these tests was p ˂ 0.001 (15-minute rest period) and p = 0.0095 (60-minute rest period). A similar result was obtained by Koibuchi et al. (2021), who explored the effect of continuous (1 MHz) and pulsed (1 MHz, 30 mW/cm2, 20% duty cycle) ultrasound on *Staphylococcus epidermidis* biofilms in the absence of MBs. To obtain a similar inhibition of biofilm formation required 24 hours of continuous irradiation, whilst pulsed wave achieved a significant reduction after two 20-minute intervals. Importantly in this previous study it was shown that - as in this research - the introduction of a second ultrasound exposure increased the treatment efficacy by almost double that of a single exposure (Koibuchi *et al.*, 2021).

## *Effect of altering the acoustic properties of biofilms growth substrate*

When polypropylene coupons were exchanged for stainless-steel ones, the reduction in viable count was lowered to only 0.5 log greater than antibiotic alone (p = 0.0009) (**Figure 3**, right shaded area). This is however still a significant improvement over using antibiotic alone. Given that stainless-steel is an acoustically reflective substrate, it is inevitable that a stronger standing wave field is generated from the interaction between the incident and reflected waves (Baresch and Garbin, 2020). The population of MBs will have a wide size distribution, such that some are pushed toward the pressure anti-nodes whilst others are pushed toward the nodes. At sub-resonance excitation conditions, MBs can be pushed by acoustic radiation forces towards the pressure nodes of a standing wave field (i.e. away from a target surface) (LaBauve and Wargo, 2012). At a mean MB size of 3.97 ± 4.1 *µ*m (at the time of administration) with a resonant frequency of approximately 1 MHz, it is expected that the majority of MBs in this study will be pushed towards the pressure anti-node, which would be located close to the surface of the steel coupon. However, clustering of MBs is very likely to occur, whereby the larger MB clusters could in turn be directed towards the pressure nodes (i.e. away from the surface) (Lazarus *et al.*, 2017). The behaviour of MBs in a standing wave field is therefore complex to characterise and may result in undefined MB dynamics (Wiklund, 2012); it is a task for future studies to elucidate this further. Despite this, pulsed wave ultrasound applied to biofilms grown on stainless-steel was still approximately 67% (0.47 log) more effective when compared to using antibiotic alone (**Figure 3**).

# Conclusion

This research has demonstrated the efficacy of ultrasound and air-filled MBs to potentiate the effect of sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotic, against *P. aeruginosa* biofilms grown on substrates with physiologically relevant acoustic properties. Importantly, this work shows the utility of this method in being adapted to coincide with clinical treatment timescales, where the minimally invasive administration of ultrasound and MBs could achieve a reduction in biofilm bacteria of 80% in approximately 60 minutes or less. The efficacy of this method was found to be reduced when applied to biofilms on highly acoustically reflective substrates, potentially due to the formation of a stronger acoustic standing wave field. Further study is required in this area to elucidate these phenomena in greater detail. The results from this study suggest that ultrasound and microbubbles provide improvements over more traditional methods of biofilm treatment, by enabling sub-inhibitory antibiotic concentrations to attain an equal or better level of bactericidal activity despite interactions with acoustically attenuating substrates. For such a method to become clinically viable in the future, the treatment efficacy should be improved further to achieve a reduction in viable bacterial cells of at least 3-log (i.e. 99.9%). This may be attained by optimising the ultrasound exposure parameters and/or utilising microbubbles with greater stability, such as those containing gases with lower diffusivity and solubility.

With further optimisation and development, this approach may contribute towards reducing the overall clinical burden imposed by the presence of biofilms and lowering the impact of antimicrobial resistance. Furthermore, the local and topical administration of antimicrobial agents that can be potentiated with this method, has potential to eliminate the need for long term systemic antimicrobial therapy which can have additional negative clinical outcomes consequences for patient health and recovery.
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# Figure Captions List

**Figure 1.** (A) The schematic cross section and (B) expanded 3D model of BOCS used to deliver ultrasound to a MB-antibiotic suspension, proximal to a biofilm grown on a polypropylene or stainless-steel CDC bioreactor coupon. The transducer and coupon holder are held in place by 3D printed components, with a proprietary ultrasound absorbing material lateral to the transducer and basal to the sample to prevent reflection of acoustic waves. The device components are all aligned using threaded steel rods, and held in place with nuts. (C) Photograph of fully assembled BOCS within a compact water tank, with key features indicated (base 15 × 15 cm, and height of 20 cm).

**Figure 2.** The log reduction of bacteria numbers for single element controls, with antibiotic (AB) only, ultrasound (US) only, and MBs or MB constituents (MBCs) alone in volumetric ratios of 1:1, 1:5 and 1:10 prepared in PBS. While the results show averaged data, it is important to note that all of the controls are compared to 3 coupons from the same bioreactor for the antibiotic control. To compare between bioreactors the controls were normalised with respect to the antibiotic control, to demonstrate the efficacy of the methodology against a sub-inhibitory concentration of antibiotic. The control experiments for sub-inhibitory gentamicin only, attained an average reduction in bacteria of 58% (0.4 log). Positive log values represent a reduction of bacterial cells, which in treatment conditions is achieved in addition to the baseline reduction established by the antibiotic alone. Negative log values compared to the AB only control, demonstrate continued bacterial growth after administration of MBs or constituents to biofilms. The bubbles or constituents alone show no significant bactericidal activity and consequently post-exposure, the biofilm cells continue growing and this results in a net increase in cells over time compared to an antibiotic treated control. Data is representative of three independent biological repeats, with error bars for standard deviation: \* (P = < 0.05), \*\* (P = < 0.01), \*\*\* (P = 0.005).

**Figure 3.** Data was normalised to the antibiotic-treated biofilm. Ultrasound was applied in both continuous wave (left shaded area) and pulsed wave (centre unshaded area), to antibiotic-MB suspensions in volumetric ratios of 1:1, 1:5 and 1:10. The input voltage was 200 Vpp which produced a maximum peak-to-peak pressure of 0.5 MPa at the biofilm location. The frequency of the ultrasound was 1 MHz, and every exposure was 5 minutes long. In case of pulsed ultrasound, the wave was pulsed at 25% duty cycle with a 100 kHz PRF. The right shaded area denoted as ‘rest’, shows the effect of adding a 15-minute or 60-minute interval between the first and second sonication, using a 1:5 antibiotic-MB suspension with pulsed wave. The final column labelled ‘steel’ shows the effect of a 1:1 antibiotic-MB suspension with pulsed wave ultrasound and 15-minute rest interval, but the polypropylene substrate has been exchanged for stainless-steel. All data presented was compared to a sub-inhibitory gentamicin alone control (58%, 0.4 log), which was applied to biofilms without MBs or ultrasound. For continuous wave US only, the 1:5 antibiotic-MB suspension was able to attain a reduction in bacteria numbers, corresponding to an additional reduction of 32% (0.17 log) compared to the control. Using pulsed wave US there was a consistent additional reduction in bacteria numbers compared to the control; for 1:1, 1:5 and 1:10 this corresponded to 64% (0.44 log), 52% (0.32 log) and 80% (0.7 log), respectively. The incorporation of a rest period between repeated pulsed wave ultrasound exposures, showed a further reduction of 76% (0.62 log) and 83% (0.76 log) for a 15-minute and 60-minute interval, respectively. Changing the biofilm substrate to steel resulted in a 66% (0.47 log) additional reduction in bacteria numbers, compared to the control. Data is representative of three independent biological repeats, with error bars for standard deviation. All conditions assessed with the exception of continuous wave ultrasound for a 1:1 antibiotic-MB suspension, were statistically significantly different from the sub-inhibitory antibiotic alone control: \* (P = < 0.05), \*\* (P = < 0.01), \*\*\* (P = 0.005).