Label-Free Identification of Bacterial Microcolonies Via Elastic Scattering
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ABSTRACT: Label-free microcolony identification via elastic light scattering was investigated for three different genera: Salmonella enterica serovar Montevideo, Listeria monocytogenes F4244, and Escherichia coli DH5α. Microcolonies were defined as bacterial colonies in their late-lag phase to early-exponential phase with the diameter range of 100–200 μm. To link biophysical characteristics with corresponding scattering patterns, a phase contrast microscope and a confocal displacement meter were used to measure the colony diameter and its 3D height profile. The results indicated that the growth characteristics of microcolonies were encoded in their morphologies which correlated to the characteristic diffraction patterns. Proposed methodology was able to classify three genera based on comprehensive phenotypic map which incorporated growth speed, ring count, and colony diameter. While the proposed method illustrated the possibility of discriminating microcolonies in their early growth stage, more thorough biophysical understanding is needed to expand the technology to other species.
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Introduction

A series of recent outbreaks demands more rapid, reliable, and sensitive analytical methods in monitoring pathogenic microorganisms such as Salmonella (Heaton and Jones, 2008; Van Duynhoven et al., 2009), Escherichia coli (Heaton and Jones, 2008; King et al., 2009), and Listeria (Cumming et al., 2009; Shetty et al., 2009; Swaminathan and Gerner-Smidt, 2007) to name a few. Since contaminations could happen from harvest to distributions, it is critical to provide accurate and rapid identification and classification of pathogens to monitor and react to any possible outbreak situations. A number of conventional methodologies used in bacterial identification include morphological observations (Stechini et al., 2000; Tetz et al., 1993), serological tests (Gehring et al., 2006), proteomics (Cash, 2009; Cash and Hecker, 2003), and genomics (Jaradat et al., 2002). Among these, morphological methods sought phenotypic characteristics of a bacterial species to differentiate from other species. Traditionally, these methods relied on observable characteristics of the individual colony, such as: Color, shape, and growth rate. Since Wyatt (Wyatt, 1969), light scattering has been widely used to provide fast, accurate, and non-disruptive interrogation of biological samples (Bronk et al., 1992, 2001; Jones et al., 1998; Kottmeier et al., 2009; Samorski et al., 2005). While these examples mostly dealt with cells in liquid state, our group introduced a new concept of using laser to interrogate the bacterial colonies to generate unique scattering patterns which worked as an individual “fingerprint” for each bacterial kind (Bae et al., 2007, 2009, 2010). This technology provided label-free, fast, and reliable identification of bacterial species via comparing the scattering patterns with the previously recorded image database. Even though the proposed system provided faster identification than the conventional plating method, the throughput was limited by the incubation time of the individual colony to reach a certain diameter. For example, Listeria required 24–30 h while E. coli and Salmonella needed 12 h to satisfy the diameter criterion (Bae et al., 2008; Banada et al., 2009). This growth time imposes a bottle-neck to the first responders of the outbreak situation and government/corporate laboratories operating on 8 h shift could not obtain the identification within one work-shift.

Recently, a new research field has been highlighted for providing identification in the early stage of bacterial growth. If we define the traditional diameter regime as a...
macrocolony, the new area of interest shall be called microcolonies when the bacterial colonies are within 100–200 μm in diameter. Colonies at this stage possess various biochemical and biophysical differences compared to the macrocolonies. First, in the viewpoint of the conventional Sigmoidal growth curve (lag-exponential-stationary phase), we were interested in the end of the lag phase or the start of the exponential phase. Second, bacteria colonies were in their earlier growth stage and rapidly growing, so a tight control of the measurement window was required compared to the bacterial colonies at the stationary phase. Third, as the colony diameter became smaller, the instrument had to accommodate the change in the colony diameter to deliver effective and distinctive scattering patterns. Raman and FTIR (Choo-Smith et al., 2001; Goodwin et al., 2006) were applied to investigate the homogeneity and heterogeneity of one species as the colony grew. The result indicated that microcolonies were quite homogeneous and thus, their spectra could be used as references to construct a database across different species, while macrocolonies showed spatial heterogeneities. Some researchers provided an automatic enumeration system for the microcolonies of approximately 50 μm (Wang et al., 2007). However, to capture the images of microcolonies, they had to stain the bacteria with SYBR Green II. Other researchers have used similar techniques to count the viable bacteria within contaminated platelet concentrates using both fluorescent staining and morphological characteristics (Motoyama et al., 2008). These techniques were also applied for identifying beer-spoilage lactic acid bacteria within microcolony size regime (Asano et al., 2009). These image-based detection systems, in order to detect and differentiate the bacteria at their early stages, commonly needed fluorescent dyes or staining agents to provide for a sufficient contrast from the surrounding environment and to achieve specific recognition. In this paper, the microcolony identification system was presented as a label-free means to interrogate the bacterial colonies within microcolony regime. Here, the elastic scattering technique was used to generate unique scattering patterns among different genera which were correlated with the independent colony morphology measurements. Three different genera, Salmonella Montevideo, Escherichia coli DH5α, and Listeria monocytogenes F4244 were investigated to correlate their microcolony morphology and the scattering patterns.

Materials and Methods

Sample Preparation

The S. Montevideo, L. monocytogenes F4244, and E. coli DH5α cultures were selected to be inoculated in brain heart infusion (BHI) broth and incubated at 37°C overnight. The culture was then diluted (10-fold dilution to 10^-6) in phosphate buffer saline. The 100 μL of appropriated concentration was thoroughly spread on BHI agar and cultivated at 37°C in the incubator. To accommodate the different growth rate to reach the target microcolony size, incubation times were controlled differently. Six plates were prepared for each species. After the first six and a half hour incubation for E. coli DH5α and S. Montevideo and 10 h incubating for L. monocytogenes, one plate per species was taken out every half an hour with five samples selected from each plate to be measured by a phase contrast microscope. This process was repeated four times to give a total number of twenty samples at each time interval. It took approximately 7 and 9 h for S. Montevideo and E. coli DH5α to grow into our targeting diameter range (100–200 μm). Since L. monocytogenes is slowly growing organism, it took 12 h to reach the designated diameter range.

System Description

In the microcolony experiment via forward scattering, it was critical to control the beam diameter comparable to that of the microcolony (Siegman, 1986). When the colony diameter was larger than the laser beam there was an un-interrogated area that could possibly provide critical phenotypic information about the colony, while in the opposite case, the incident laser signal dominated the forward scattering signature and saturated the detector. To avoid both situations, we designed the scatterometer with a biconvex lens which rendered the beam waist of 100–200 μm within the Raleigh range (Siegman, 1986) and the estimated depth of field was sufficiently larger than the colony thickness (∼10–20 μm). The optical setup consisted of a diode laser with wavelength of 635 nm (coherent 0221-698-01 REV B, CA), with the output beam diameter of 1 mm with a divergence of 1.3 mrad. A single bi-convex lens (BK7 H32-717, Edmund Optics, Barrington, NJ) with a focal length of 150 mm was used to reduce the size of the laser beam spot. The motion control part consisted of X–Y motorized stages to move the petri dish in the X–Y plane to align the laser with the center of each selected bacterial colony and a linear translation stage (Edmund Optics) along the vertical Z-axis to adapt the laser beam size to the bacterial colony size within the Raleigh range. The X–Y stages were translated by two linear motors (850G-HS, Newport, Irvine, CA) connected to the multi-axis closed-loop controller (ESP300, Newport) with the specification of a 42 mm maximum stroke and a 0.1 μm minimum step size. A monochromatic IEEE1394 CMOS array (PixelINK, Ottawa, ON, Canada) with a 1280 × 1024 resolution and at 6.7 × 6.7 μm² for each pixel was integrated as the imaging sensor.

Phase Contrast Microscope and Confocal Displacement Meter

The phase contrast microscope (PCM; Leica, McHenry, IL) was used to measure the diameters of the microcolonies and to observe microstructures, such as spokes, dots, and cracks within the colonies. This, however, does not provide any quantitative information about the physical profiles of the bacterial colonies. Therefore, the confocal displacement meter (CDM; Keyence LT9010, NJ) was integrated with the

X–Y motorized stages to obtain the profile of each individual bacterial colony to provide comparisons among the different species (Fig. 1b). Since bacterial colonies were semi-transparent objects, the probing laser was reflected back from multiple surfaces where conventional laser triangulation sensor did not provided reliable results (data not shown). To effectively measure the profile of semi-transparent samples, confocal principle was integrated to actively select the reflected lights from in-focus surface and reject the out-of-focus lights. This instrument implemented a high accuracy surface scanning method by using a 670 nm laser light source with the spot size of 2 μm and the vertical reference distance of 6 mm and a scanning resolution up to 0.01 μm (Keyence-Corporation 2006).

After the diameter measurement by the PCM, the plate was taken to the CDM for profile characterization. The instrument operated in a profile mode with a scanning width of 1100 μm and a scanning interval of 5 μm along the X direction. Along the Y direction, the stage was translated with a 5 μm resolution and a 200 μm length to capture the complete profile of the colony. It took approximately 15–20 min for a complete measurement on single colony.

Results

Scattering Patterns

Figure 2 displays a series of scattering patterns with varying colony diameters (measured with the PCM) which were recorded after different incubation time for each genus (7, 9, and 12 h for S.Montevideo, E. coli DH5α, and L. monocytogenes F4244). One interesting feature was that the number of rings of scattering patterns increased as the diameter of the colony grew. For example, S.Montevideo (124 μm) and L. monocytogenes F4244 (134 μm) generated approximately six diffraction rings while E. coli DH5α (129 μm) generated only four rings. In addition, fast growing bacteria (S.Montevideo and E. coli DH5α) displayed irregular shaped ring patterns which arise from rugged colony edges, while L. monocytogenes F4244, which grew slower than the other two genera, generated smoother ring patterns.

Figure 2. A series of forward scattering patterns of microcolonies for three genera (left) S.Montevideo, (center) L. monocytogenes F4244, and (right) E. coli DH5α. The diameter ranges from 96 to 145 μm, 94 to 157 μm, and 79 to 136 μm for these three genera, respectively.
Morphology of Microcolonies

Since the observations of Scattering Patterns Section were related to the amplitude and phase modulation of the microcolonies (Bae et al., 2007), it was critical to accurately measure the profile of the individual colony to both understand and correlate the colony shape to the forward scattering patterns. Figure 3 displays the morphology of the microcolonies for the three bacteria with PCM (Fig. 3a) and CDM (Fig. 3b). E. coli DH5α was measured to be 183 μm in diameter with the peak height of 9.3 μm, while the image for L. monocytogenes F4244 showed two closely located bacterial colonies with the smaller one measured to be at 72 μm with a 7 μm peak height. Finally, S. Montevideo demonstrated a 140 μm diameter with 14.5 μm in peak height. It is noteworthy to address that the aspect ratio (diameter/peak height) of the bacterial colony to reach a similar diameter is quite different for different genus under the same growth conditions.

Theoretical Modeling of Scattering From Microcolony

As reported in previous research, bacterial colony shape was assumed to be a Gaussian shape which enabled us to model the colony scattering response with two main parameters: The central thickness ($H_0$) and 1/e² radius ($w_b$). Therefore, the experimentally measured profile data of each individual colony were fitted with Gaussian curves to estimate the two parameters. Subsequently, scalar diffraction theory was used to predict the forward scattering pattern generated by the colony. The coordinate system was defined in Figure 4a and the colony was treated as an optical phase $\Phi'(x_a,y_a)$ and amplitude $t(x_a,y_a)$ modulator with the fitted Gaussian cross-section as below (Bae et al., 2007, 2008, 2010):

$$E_2(x_i,y_i) \approx C_2 \int \int t(x_a,y_a) \exp \left[-\frac{(x_i^2 + y_i^2)}{w^2(z_1)}\right] \exp[\imath k\Phi'(x_a,y_a)]$$

$$\times \exp[-\imath 2\pi(f_x x_a + f_y y_a)] \, dx_a \, dy_a$$

(1)

where $(x_a,y_a)$ represented the aperture plane coordinates, $(x_i,y_i)$ represents the image plane coordinates, $w$ was the Gaussian beam waist of the incoming laser, $z_1$ was the distance from the source plane to the aperture plane, $z_2$ was the distance from the aperture plane to the detection plane, $E_2$ was the electrical field distribution on the detection.
plane, $C_z$ was a constant, and $f_x$ and $f_y$ was defined as $f_x = x_l/\lambda z_2$, $f_y = y_l/\lambda z_2$. To accurately model the phase modulation generated by a colony, we consolidated three optical phase contributions as:

$$
\phi'(x, y) = \left[ \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2} \left( \frac{1}{R(z_1)} + \frac{1}{z_2} \right) + (n_1-1) H_0 \left( \exp \left( -\frac{x^2 + y^2}{w_0^2} \right) \right) \right]
$$

(2)

where $H_0$ was the center thickness, $w_0$ was the $1/e^2$ radius, $n$ was the refractive index of the colony, and $w(z)$ and $R(z)$ were the radius of the incoming Gaussian beam and its radius of curvature. First term represented the quadratic phase factor contributing from the incoming laser beam while the second term was from the Gaussian shaped bacterial colony. The amount of amplitude and phase modulation was estimated based on the profile information and a bacteria-stack-layer model with the assumption of homogeneous refractive index distribution within the colony. Figure 4b–e displays the experimental measurement and theoretical prediction of scattering patterns based on parameters estimated from the CDM data. Simulation was computed with $z = 30$ mm, $\lambda = 635$ nm, and $w = 45 \mu$m. The ($H_0$, $w_0$) were set to (14.46 and 42.8 $\mu$m) and (9.94 and 43.4 $\mu$m), respectively. [Color figure can be seen in the online version of this article, available at wileyonlinelibrary.com.]

**Morphology and Scattering Pattern Correlation**

To quantitatively correlate colony shape with the forward scattering patterns, 1D cross-sections of the representative height profiles were compared. Figure 5a shows the aspect ratio comparison for three genera. The profile of *E. coli* DH5α (red-solid line) measured at approximately 200 $\mu$m in diameter with a 9.3 $\mu$m peak value, which provided an approximate 20:1 aspect ratio while *S. Montevideo* (blue-dotted line) and *L. monocytogenes* F4244 (green-dashed line) showed approximately 10:1 ratio. To further support our understanding, Figure 5b displays the aspect ratio distribution of ten microcolonies for each genus. The result clearly indicates a trend of 10:1 aspect ratio for *S. Montevideo* and *L. monocytogenes* F4244, while *E. coli* DH5α showed more of a “less raised” colony shape for this diameter regime. To understand the overall phenotypic characteristics of these three bacteria, we have plotted the three major characteristics in three dimensional space: Colony diameter ($X$-axis), number of rings ($Y$-axis), and incubation time ($Z$-axis). Figure 6 displays that each genus can be grouped separately to provide differentiations considering all the three phenotypic characteristics. *L. monocytogenes* F4244 was the slowest growing species, which separated itself from the...
Figure 5. Profile comparison for three different bacteria: (a) 1D height profiles across the peak locations for S. Montevideo (blue-dotted line), L. monocytogenes F4244 (green-dashed line), and E. coli DH5α (red-solid line); (b) the aspect (diameter/height) ratio distributions with a 10:1 ratio line; (c) 2D contour plots of the 3D profile data used in (a) for plotting the cross section views. [Color figure can be seen in the online version of this article, available at wileyonlinelibrary.com.]

Figure 6. Representation of the phenotypic characteristics in three dimensional space for E. coli DH5α (9 h), S. Montevideo (7 h), and L. monocytogenes (12 h): (a) displays that these three bacteria can be differentiated based on colony diameter (X), number of rings (Y), and incubation time (Z); (b) is the projection plot on the XY plane to show the correlation between the colony diameter and the number of rings. Mean ring count of E. coli DH5α (4.3) is smaller than that of the S. Montevideo (6.1) and L. monocytogenes F4244 (5.9) which can be explained similarly as the aspect ratio of the colony (Fig. 5b). [Color figure can be seen in the online version of this article, available at wileyonlinelibrary.com.]
other two, while the number of rings generates sufficient separation between *S*.Montevideo and *E*. coli DH5α.

**Discussion**

The two major variations of the scattering patterns of Figure 2 are: (1) the number of rings was increasing as the colony diameter increased and (2) there were ring circularity differences among bacterial species. The first observation can be attributed to the phase modulation effect, φ, arising from the increasing optical path length difference (OPD). Since OPD is defined as:

\[ \phi = knL \]  

(3)

where \( k \) is the wavevector, \( n \) is the refractive index, and \( L \) is the physical path length, if we define the bacterial colony as a convex Gaussian profile, then the OPD can be modeled as:

\[ \Delta \phi = (n-1)H_0 \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{w_0^2}\right) + H_0. \]  

(4)

This suggests that the OPD was proportional to the peak height which increased as the colony grows. The correlation of phase modulation and the observed diffraction rings was also commented in the Nematic liquid crystal research (Bloisi et al., 1988; Chen et al., 1998; Khoo et al., 1987; Ogunu et al., 1996). The authors pointed out the relationship of the phase modulation and the number of diffraction rings as:

\[ N_{\text{ring}} \propto \frac{\Delta \phi}{2\pi}. \]  

(5)

If we apply Eq. (5) for *S*.Montevideo (124 μm) assuming the 10:1 ratio, the expected number of rings is 6.8, where the actual ring count from the scattering pattern was 6 (assuming the bright central spot as a single ring count). Similarly, for *E*. coli DH5α (129 μm) the assumption of a 20:1 ratio resulted in 3.8 ring counts, while the experiment showed four rings.

The aspect ratio of *E*. coli DH5α was lower than the other two species, and this resulted in a fewer number of ring counts in the scattering patterns (Fig. 6b) at the same experimental conditions (mean ring count: *E*. coli DH5α (4.3), *S*.Montevideo (6.1), and *L*. monocytogenes F4244 (5.9)). In addition, the growth time to reach the designated diameter range also played an important role in differentiating bacteria species. This information was traditionally known to the microbiologist by experience, but we proposed to explore this parameter in a quantitative and holistic manner to be leveraged in microcolony identification. The scattering patterns for microcolonies showed less distinctive characteristics among different genera, compared to the previous results for macrocolonies (~1–1.3 mm), which showed diverse scattering patterns such as radial spokes, diffuse speckle, and secondary bright rings which were critical in the discrimination process. These features could be attributed to the complex microstructures and phase domains formed by extracellular polymeric substance excreted by bacteria and the role differentiation of bacteria within the colony during its formation and maturing process. However, in microcolonies, their morphology differences are more subtle, which requires a more thorough understanding of the growth and phenotypic characteristics and their correlations with the forward scattering patterns. Therefore, the proposed method demonstrates both promises and challenges for expanding this elastic scattering technique to microcolony differentiation. Further research will extend the current method to species level differentiation.

**Conclusion**

Microcolony differentiation via elastic light scattering was investigated for three different genera: *S*.Montevideo, *L*. monocytogenes F4244, and *E*. coli DH5α. To accurately correlate the colony morphology to the scattering pattern, the CDM was used to measure the 3D height profiles of colonies at different diameters. The results indicate that growth characteristics of microcolonies are encoded in their shapes which can be extracted from the number of ring counts in the scattering patterns. Overall three morphological characteristics parameters (growth time, colony diameter, and ring count) were sufficient to differentiate the tested microcolonies in genus level.
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