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ABSTRACT

*Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* is an important opportunistic nosocomial pathogen that shows intrinsic resistance to many antibiotics. This often limits treatment options and can cause lengthy hospital stays. Combination treatments are often used to combat resistance and using natural compounds such as polyphenols could give increased treatment options and even the reuse of antibiotics to which high levels of resistance have been observed. A checkerboard assay was used to determine if any synergy exists between ampicillin and the polyphenol theaflavin against 9 clinical isolates and one control isolate (NCTC 13014) of *S. maltophilia*. It was discovered that significant synergy (P ≤ 0.05) does exist between theaflavin and ampicillin, reducing the mean MIC of ampicillin from 12.5-22.9 µg/mL, in liquid culture, to 3.125-6.25 µg/mL. The FIC index was calculated to be 0.22-0.35 confirming synergy. From these results, significant potential for medical applications can be seen and further investigation is recommended.
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout the world, pathogens are increasingly exhibiting resistance to clinically available antibiotics (Karchmer, 2004). Bacterial resistance to antibiotics has been described as a natural phenomenon resulting from selective pressure due to continued exposure to their presence (Guillemot, 1999). There are five major mechanisms that underlie bacterial resistance: target site modification, enzyme-catalyzed inactivation, metabolic by-pass, efflux or prevention of antibiotic entry into cells (Alanis, 2005). All groups of antibiotics have associated resistance and in some cases manufacturers have been forced to modify their structures in an attempt to reverse this. Despite modifications, resistance to the modified drugs can rapidly arise.

*Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* is an opportunistic pathogen, which can readily colonise epithelial cells in the human respiratory tract often leading to pneumonia in immune-compromised patients, individuals with cystic fibrosis and those on respirators (Alonso and Martinez, 1997; Looney, et al., 2009). This bacterium possesses intrinsic resistance to important clinical antibiotics (San Gabriel et al., 2004) and combination therapy can be required to treat infections.

The use of antibiotic formulations containing two or more active agents has its basis in successful therapy and is particularly valuable in preventing future emergence of antibiotic resistance. However, this would not be the case for resistance genes acquired by bacteria, through horizontal gene transfer. Beyond the traditional antibiotic cocktails it is likely that there are many antibacterial mixtures yet to be identified. Combining clinical antibiotics with non-traditional antibacterial agents could provide treatments that are more effective than using the antibiotic alone (Cushine and Lamb, 2011).

Natural compounds such as the polyphenols found in tea may provide promising additions to the armoury of conventional drugs, in order to meet the urgent requirement for new antimicrobial therapies to help combat the resistance problem. For example, the polyphenol theaflavin, found in black tea has been shown to possess antimicrobial activity against bacteria including *Bacillus cereus* and *Shigella* spp. (Vijaya et al., 1995; Friedman et al., 2006). Both *Acinetobacter baumannii* and *S. maltophilia* have been shown to be susceptible to the green tea polyphenol epigallocatechin gallate (Osterburg et al., 2009; Gordon and Wareham, 2010).

The possible synergies between tea-derived compounds and other antibiotics have important implications and potential applications. Investigations into the synergies of
flavanols with other compounds such as ascorbic acid (Hatano et al., 2008) and polyphenols (Betts et al., 2011) have proven to be successful by enhancing or prolonging the antibacterial action. Previously the green tea polyphenol epicatechin gallate was shown to reverse the resistance of Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) to oxacillin (Anderson et al., 2005). Also, epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG) showed synergy with the macrolide antibiotic clarithromycin (Yanagawa et al., 2003). Flavanoids, including epicatechin from tea, reduced the minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of isoniazid in Mycobacterium smegmatis (Lechner et al., 2008). Some conflicting research suggests that a gallate group must be present for any synergy to be shown (Stapleton et al., 2004).

Very little research has been published to provide evidence of synergy between theaflavin and antibiotics. Previous research (Neyestani et al., 2007) has shown that black tea extracts cause synergistic and antagonistic effects when applied with various antibiotics against Streptococcus pyogenes. However, this research used a crude black tea mixture and did not identify the specific compounds responsible for the observed effects. Previous research (Tiwari et al., 2005) has also found synergy between black tea extracts and antibiotics such as chloramphenicol and gentamicin against various pathogens including Shigella dysenteriae and Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium. This work also suggested that the synergy results from the exploitation of dual binding sites on the surface of the bacteria. Although like previous research (Neyestani et al., 2007) mixed tea extracts were used and the active chemical components were not purified. The rationale of using polyphenols with antibiotics is the possibility of effectively reusing antibiotics such as Beta-lactams, in the treatment of bacterial infections, where resistance has previously shown them to be ineffective.

The objective of the preliminary research described in this paper was to assess whether any synergistic effects exist between ampicillin with theaflavin against clinical isolates of Stenotrophomonas maltophilia.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Clinical and control isolates

Nine strains of S. maltophilia were isolated over three months from sputum samples of respiratory patients at the Hull Royal Infirmary, UK. All isolates were cultured on blood and MacConkey agar (Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK) and identified using Gram staining, BSAC
antibiotic susceptibility testing (Andrews, 2007) and biochemical profiling with API 20E testing kits (BioMérieux, France). A control strain of *S. maltophilia* (NCTC 13014) was purchased from the Heath Protection Agency Cultures Collections, Porton Down, UK.

**Culture media, antibiotics and tea polyphenols**

Ampicillin (AMP) powder was purchased as ampicillin sodium salt from Sigma-Aldrich, UK. All media and ampicillin discs were purchased from Oxoid, UK. Ampicillin was selected as previous laboratory testing had shown that 25 μg discs containing ampicillin produced no zones of inhibition against *S. maltophilia* (Betts et al., 2012) and therefore resistance was concluded. All media and materials were autoclaved before their use. Theaflavin (TF) with purity ≥ 95 was donated by Unilever, Shanghai, China.

**Ampicillin susceptibility testing**

All isolates were inoculated onto IsoSensitest agar (Oxoid, UK) using the method standardised by Moodsdeen, Williams and Secker (1988). Ten IsoSensitest agar plates (6 mm in depth) were poured and inoculated with the control strain and each of the 9 clinical isolates. Discs were added containing ampicillin (25 μg). All isolates were incubated at 30°C for 20 h, in accordance with the BSAC methods (BSAC, 2012) of susceptibility testing for *S. Maltophilia* (Andrews, 2007). At the end of the incubation period, for each test disc the diameter of the disc plus zone of inhibition was measured (mm) and recorded. Each experimental plate was replicated six times to check for consistency.

**Checkerboard assay**

Stock solutions of theaflavin and ampicillin were initially made up in 0.5 mL of 100% DMSO based on the method by Gordon and Wareham (2010), for ease of solubility. Stock solutions were then diluted into 19.5 mL of ISO-sensitive broth leaving DMSO concentrations of 2.5%. To a standard 96-well round-bottomed microtitre plate, 50 μL of the theaflavin and ampicillin solutions were pipetted into each well, so that each row and column contained a fixed amount of one antimicrobial agent and increasing concentrations of the other. This gave final well
concentrations of 3.125-800 µg/mL of theaflavin and 3.25-100 µg/mL of ampicillin (Figure 1). To inoculate each well with *S. maltophilia*, a 100 µL volume of a 0.5 MacFarland suspension of was pipetted (Andrews, 2001). This procedure was replicated for each isolate tested. All microtitre plates were incubated at 30°C for 24 h. Control wells were also prepared using theaflavin in 2.5% DMSO (3.125-800 µg/mL), ampicillin in 2.5% DMSO (3.25-100 µg/mL) and 2.5% DMSO only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theaflavin concentration (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Ampicillin concentration (µg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1** Organisation of the checkerboard assay showing well concentration of theaflavin and ampicillin. C1 = Ampicillin alone (no bacterial inoculant), C2 = Ampicillin (in 2.5% DMSO) + *S. maltophilia*, C3 = DMSO only + *S. maltophilia*, C4 = Theaflavin (in 2.5% DMSO) + *S. maltophilia* and C5 = theaflavin alone (no bacterial inoculant).

At the end of the incubation period, each well was observed for signs of visible turbidity. The lowest concentration not showing visible turbidity was taken as the MIC. The fractional inhibitory concentrations (FIC) were determined based on the method described by Hall, Middleton and Westmacott (1983) whereby the FICa = MIC of compound a + compound b/MIC of compound a, the FICb = MIC of compound b + compound a/MIC of compound b and the FICs = FICa + FICb. If the FICs index was equal to 0.5 or less, a synergistic effect was recorded. A value > 0.5 – 4.0 was taken as an additive effect and a value > 4.0 was counted as antagonistic effect between theaflavin and ampicillin. Six-fold replication of all checkerboard assays check for consistency and enabling the results to be provided as mean values. Significant differences between data sets for each combination of
polyphenols were determined using the Wilcoxon Mann–Whitney test, and results showing P ≤ 0.05 were considered as significant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results from the susceptibility testing using 25 µg ampicillin discs, showed that all isolates of *S. maltophilia* presented resistance to ampicillin. However, from the checkerboard assay it was observed that in a liquid culture *S. maltophilia* isolates were susceptible to ampicillin at concentrations of 12.5 µg/mL and above, with mean MICs being 12.5-22.9 µg/mL depending on the isolate (See table 1). The MIC of ampicillin was dramatically reduced when used in combination with theaflavin. With the mean theaflavin additions of 6.25-11.46 µg/mL the mean ampicillin MICs against all *S. maltophilia* were significantly (P < 0.05) reduced to 3.125-6.25 µg/mL. The FIC indexes of ampicillin and theaflavin combinations against each *S. maltophilia* isolate was calculated to be between 0.22 and 0.35 confirming that a synergistic, not an additive relationship exists between theaflavin and ampicillin. No antimicrobial effects were produced from DMSO alone and no synergy was observed between DMSO and ampicillin.

From the results presented, the differences can be seen between the disc diffusion and microtitre assays as methods of showing susceptibility of *S. maltophilia* to ampicillin. This difference confirms previous literature, which mentions the difficulties of accurately determining antibiotic susceptibility of *S. maltophilia* and the unreliability of the disc diffusion method (*Tatman-Otkun et al., 2005*). It has been shown in this study that the microtitre assay is more accurate and far more easily standardised, in than it does not rely on the slow diffusion of chemical agents into agar, which are highly affected by temperature and pH.
Table 1 Mean (± standard deviation) minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC) and the fractional inhibitory concentration indexes (FICIs) of ampicillin and theaflavin against clinical isolates of *S. maltophilia*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolate no.</th>
<th>MIC (µg/mL)</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>AMP + TF</th>
<th>FIC index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (0)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>3.125 (0) + 6.25 (0)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6 (10.4)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>3.125 (0) + 6.25 (0)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (0)</td>
<td>400 (0)</td>
<td>3.125 (0) + 11.46 (5.2)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (0)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>3.65 (2.6) + 6.25 (0)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.9 (10.4)</td>
<td>400 (0)</td>
<td>6.25 (0) + 11.46 (5.2)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6 (10.4)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>4.17 (2.08) + 6.25 (0)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (0)</td>
<td>400 (0)</td>
<td>5.21 (2.1) + 12.5 (0)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6 (8.3)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>3.125 (0) + 6.25 (0)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (0)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>3.65 (2.6) + 11.46 (5.2)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (0)</td>
<td>200 (0)</td>
<td>3.125 (0) + 9.38 (3.13)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amp = ampicillin, TF = theaflavin, Control = *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* NCTC 10258.

The results presented confirm previous results regarding the antibacterial activity of theaflavin against *S. maltophilia* (Betts et al., 2012). More importantly, the work demonstrates that significant synergy (P ≤ 0.05) exists between theaflavin and ampicillin against all isolates of *S. maltophilia* used in this investigation. The research here refutes the findings of other research (Stapleton et al., 2004), which suggest that a gallate group must be present for synergy to occur, and instead supports work which indicates that with some antibiotics an interaction can exist (Martins et al., 2011). The mechanism for this is likely to involve an interaction with β-lactamase, possibly disabling the enzyme and allowing ampicillin to again disrupt peptidoglycan synthesis. This result supports previous polyphenol and antibiotic work (Zhao et al., 2001) where the addition of epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG) reversed resistance to penicillin by *Staphylococcus aureus*. Previous studies have proposed that the mechanisms for polyphenol synergy and activity involves modulating the activity of intrinsic β-lactamases (Zhao et al., 2002) and also the destabilisation of the bacterial cytoplasmic membrane via by production of hydrogen peroxide (Wang, Wang and Xie, 2010). However, the modes of action require further investigation as other research has suggested that the mechanism behind the antibacterial action of polyphenols is the result of cell aggregation (Cushnie and Lamb, 2011). This mechanism would lead to decreased cell
surface area and result in reduced nutrient uptake and oxygen consumption. As a consequence less energy and materials would be available to produce/maintain elements that they rely on for their defence against antibiotics, such as β-lactamases and efflux pumps. With these resistance mechanisms suppressed, antibiotics such as ampicillin might again become a viable option to treat infections caused by multidrug resistant bacteria.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion this is believed to be the first report providing evidence of synergistic properties of theaflavin when used in combination with ampicillin against clinical isolates of S. maltophilia. These results could lead to further work investigating the use of ampicillin in the treatment of S. maltophilia infections, an antibiotic normally not used against the bacterium. This work highlights the potential use of natural compounds such as polyphenols in a clinical setting to help combat resistance. The use of conventional antibiotics with polyphenols could increase future treatment options and result in the reuse of many antibiotics to which high levels of resistance have previously been observed. Further work is recommended to investigate the specific mechanisms and underlying interactions between theaflavin and β-lactam antibiotics and its wider effectiveness against resistant bacterial pathogens.
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