CLINICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF BACTERIAL BIOFILMS AND LABORATORY METHODS FOR THEIR DETECTION

Axmedova Dildarxon Kobilovna

Andijan State Medical Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract

Bacterial biofilms are communities of cells embedded in an extracellular polymeric matrix, often attached to biological or artificial surfaces. They are particularly relevant to the laboratory interpretation of device-associated infections, including those involving implants and catheters, as well as certain chronic infections. This narrative review aims to systematize the biological basis of biofilm formation, compare the capabilities and limitations of diagnostic methods, and describe laboratory approaches appropriate to different clinical specimens. Scientific publications, the ESCMID guideline, and the IDSA/ASM guidance on microbiological diagnosis were examined through a qualitative review. Biomass quantification, microscopic visualization, culture, sonication of removed implants, and molecular detection were found to address different diagnostic questions. Although crystal violet measurement in microtiter plates is useful for in vitro models, it cannot independently confirm a biofilm-associated infection in a patient. Laboratory findings must be interpreted together with clinical manifestations, specimen origin, and the risk of contamination. This article presents no new patient observations or original experimental data collected by the author.

Keywords: bacterial biofilm, extracellular matrix, microtiter plate, crystal violet, confocal microscopy, sonication, implant-associated infection, microbiological diagnosis.

Introduction

In natural environments and within the human body, bacteria do not exist exclusively as free-floating, or planktonic, cells. They may adhere to surfaces, form multicellular structures, or occur as cellular aggregates within tissues. The biofilm polymeric matrix

contains water, polysaccharides, proteins, extracellular DNA, and other components, creating microenvironments characterized by local gradients of nutrients and oxygen. This organization increases the functional heterogeneity of bacterial cells [1–3].

The concept of biofilm helps explain clinical problems associated with orthopedic prostheses, vascular and urinary catheters, dental devices, chronic wounds, and certain respiratory tract infections. Nevertheless, neither every positive bacterial culture nor surface colonization indicates an active biofilm-associated infection. Diagnostic interpretation must take into account the anatomical source of the specimen, the clinical syndrome, signs of inflammation, and repeated isolation findings [5, 9, 10].

Aim of the Review

To summarize the stages of bacterial biofilm formation and their clinical characteristics, compare the diagnostic value of microscopic, culture-based, and instrumental detection methods, and formulate evidence-informed principles for interpreting laboratory findings from different types of clinical specimens.

Materials and Methods

This article was prepared as a narrative literature review. Key studies indexed in PubMed, reviews devoted to biofilm methodology, the ESCMID guideline on biofilm infections, the 2024 IDSA/ASM document on the use of the microbiology laboratory, and a contemporary clinical review published in 2026 were examined selectively [5, 7, 9, 10]. Search terms included “bacterial biofilm”, “biofilm diagnosis”, “sonication”, “crystal violet assay”, “confocal microscopy”, and “implant infection”.

Sources were compared in terms of the biological definition of biofilms, specimen collection, the laboratory feature measured, reproducibility of results, and criteria for clinical interpretation. This work is not presented as a systematic review or meta-analysis; search comprehensiveness and risk of bias were not formally assessed. No human participants were enrolled, clinical isolates were not retested in a laboratory, and no artificial statistical estimates were generated.

Results and Discussion

Biological Basis of Biofilm Formation

Biofilm development is commonly described in conceptual stages: initial adhesion, irreversible attachment, microcolony formation, matrix maturation, and dispersal of cells. The duration and characteristics of these stages depend on bacterial species, surface properties, flow conditions, and nutrient availability. Therefore, no single laboratory model can represent all clinical infections equally well [1, 3].

Cells in the inner layers of a biofilm do not necessarily share the same physiological state as those in its outer layers. Nutrient and oxygen limitation can lead to slow growth in some cells, reduced metabolic activity, and altered stress responses. The matrix may restrict the diffusion of certain compounds, but it is incorrect to assume that it acts as a uniform barrier to every antibiotic. Biofilm-associated tolerance should be distinguished from genetically inherited antimicrobial resistance [2–4].

Different organisms, including Staphylococcus aureus, coagulase-negative staphylococci, and Pseudomonas aeruginosa, may participate in biofilm-associated processes in specific clinical settings. Interactions within single-species and multispecies communities, host tissues, and the material of the medical device are important in this context. A list of microorganisms alone provides insufficient evidence for predicting biofilm severity or clinical prognosis [5, 10].

Biofilms and Antimicrobial Activity: Distinguishing Key Concepts

Standard antimicrobial susceptibility testing is generally performed under conditions that support planktonic growth. The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) is the lowest concentration that inhibits bacterial growth under defined conditions; it does not automatically quantify the elimination of a biofilm-associated structure. Research studies may use measures such as the minimum biofilm eradication concentration (MBEC), but these depend on the specimen and methodology and cannot be directly substituted for routine antimicrobial susceptibility results [4, 7].

A diminished response of biofilms to antimicrobial agents should not be attributed solely to genetic resistance. Slow-growing subpopulations, gradients within the matrix, stress-response mechanisms, and certain surviving cells may facilitate subsequent regrowth. However, the detection of a biofilm does not independently justify selecting a particular drug or increasing its dose; such decisions depend on the clinical condition and applicable treatment guidelines [4, 5].

Scope of Laboratory Detection Methods

The microtiter-plate crystal violet assay permits semiquantitative comparison of total adherent biomass formed under laboratory conditions. The stain may bind not only live bacteria but also dead cells and components of the extracellular matrix. Results are sensitive to the initial inoculum, growth medium, incubation conditions, washing procedures, and optical-density measurement. Consequently, describing an isolate as a “strong biofilm producer” in vitro does not demonstrate that a biofilm is present in a patient's clinical specimen [6, 7].

Confocal laser scanning microscopy, combined with fluorescent labeling, can visualize the spatial organization and thickness of biofilms and certain cellular characteristics. Scanning electron microscopy provides high-resolution images of surface topography and cell arrangement, although specimen preparation can alter the appearance of the matrix. Imaging techniques are valuable for research and selected complex diagnostic situations but require specialized equipment and trained personnel [7, 10].

Conventional bacterial culture remains essential for isolating viable microorganisms, identifying species, and assessing antimicrobial susceptibility. Nevertheless, growth in culture does not, by itself, confirm biofilm architecture or attachment to tissue. Conversely, a negative culture, particularly following prior antimicrobial treatment, does not fully exclude a biofilm-associated process [5, 9].

Table 1. Comparative characteristics of laboratory methods used in biofilm assessment

Method	Parameter assessed	Main interpretive limitation
Microtiter-plate crystal violet assay	Total surface-adherent biomass formed in vitro	Does not distinguish live cells from matrix material or confirm clinical infection
Confocal microscopy	Three-dimensional biofilm organization and fluorescent signals	Requires specialized equipment, dyes, and image-interpretation criteria
Electron microscopy	Surface and microbial morphology	Specimen-preparation artifacts; limited routine clinical use
Culture-based examination	Isolation and identification of viable pathogens	Growth does not automatically confirm the presence of a biofilm
Sonication of an implant	Recovery in culture of organisms detached from a device surface	Applicable only to suitable devices under validated clinical protocols
Molecular detection	Microbial DNA/RNA and selected targets	Does not independently establish viability, exclude contamination, or prove clinical causation

The table was compiled from sources [5–10] and does not represent the results of a new diagnostic experiment.

Examination of Implant and Tissue Specimens

For medical-device-associated infections, appropriate specimen selection is as important as the laboratory method. Diagnostic material may include tissue adjacent to an implant, biological fluid, or the device itself when its removal is clinically indicated. Treating findings from superficial swabs as equivalent to the etiology of deep tissue infections may lead to errors. The microbiology laboratory should document specimen origin and transport conditions [5, 9].

Sonication is a technique intended to dislodge cells adhering to a removed implant through controlled ultrasonic exposure. In their study of prosthetic joint infections,

Trampuz and colleagues showed that culture of sonication fluid may increase diagnostic sensitivity relative to tissue culture in certain circumstances. This finding cannot be applied as a fixed estimate to all implants, laboratories, or patients. The technique requires sterile handling and measures to prevent contamination [8].

Polymerase chain reaction and broad-range sequencing may provide additional information in selected cases where culture is negative. However, the presence of microbial DNA does not establish that an organism is viable. Therefore, the interpretation of molecular-positive and culture-negative results should consider whether the specimen was collected from a sterile site, previous antimicrobial exposure, background microbiota, and the method's contamination controls [9, 10].

A Practical Sequence for Interpreting Clinical Findings

Existing evidence supports a three-level approach to laboratory reasoning. The first level is to collect an adequate specimen appropriate to the suspected clinical syndrome and anatomical site. The second is to perform culture, microscopy, and, when indicated, additional processing of device-associated material. The third is to relate findings back to their clinical context by assessing whether the recovered organism is a plausible cause, whether findings recur, and whether specimen contamination is possible. This sequence is an analytical synthesis proposed in the present review, not a newly validated diagnostic algorithm [5, 9].

Use of the phrase “biofilm detected” in a laboratory report may require direct morphological evidence or specific validated criteria. Such a definitive conclusion should not be based on a crystal violet assay, a positive culture, or a single molecular marker alone. A more appropriately qualified statement is that “the possibility of a biofilm-associated infection should be assessed using clinical and microbiological evidence” [5, 10].

Limitations of the Review

The review includes selectively chosen sources and does not comprehensively cover all diseases or biofilm models. Some foundational studies are of historical importance. No

new clinical samples were collected from medical institutions in Andijan or elsewhere in Uzbekistan, and no local estimates of diagnostic sensitivity were calculated. The conclusions are therefore intended to support practical laboratory reasoning and should not be interpreted as local epidemiological evidence.

Conclusion

A bacterial biofilm arises from dynamic interactions among cells, the polymeric matrix, and local microenvironments. Its clinical importance can be particularly pronounced in device-associated and persistent infections. In vitro biomass assays, microscopy, culture, sonication, and molecular detection address distinct questions; no single method serves as a universal stand-alone criterion across all clinical settings.

An evidence-informed laboratory approach relies on selecting appropriate specimens, applying validated methods, controlling contamination, and interpreting results in collaboration with the treating clinician. Future work should focus on standardizing biofilm-related testing in local settings and independently evaluating its clinical utility.

References

1. Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent infections. Science. 1999;284(5418):1318–1322. doi:10.1126/science.284.5418.1318.

2. Donlan RM, Costerton JW. Biofilms: survival mechanisms of clinically relevant microorganisms. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2002;15(2):167–193. doi:10.1128/CMR.15.2.167-193.2002.

3. Flemming HC, Wingender J, Szewzyk U, et al. Biofilms: an emergent form of bacterial life. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2016;14(9):563–575. doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2016.94.

4. Stewart PS, Costerton JW. Antibiotic resistance of bacteria in biofilms. Lancet. 2001;358(9276):135–138. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05321-1.

5. Høiby N, Bjarnsholt T, Moser C, et al. ESCMID guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of biofilm infections 2014. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2015;21(Suppl 1):S1–S25. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2014.10.024.

6. O'Toole GA. Microtiter dish biofilm formation assay. J Vis Exp. 2011;(47):2437. doi:10.3791/2437.

7. Azeredo J, Azevedo NF, Briandet R, et al. Critical review on biofilm methods. Crit Rev Microbiol. 2017;43(3):313–351. doi:10.1080/1040841X.2016.1208146.

8. Trampuz A, Piper KE, Jacobson MJ, et al. Sonication of removed hip and knee prostheses for diagnosis of infection. N Engl J Med. 2007;357(7):654–663. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa061588.

9. Miller JM, Binnicker MJ, Campbell S, et al. Guide to Utilization of the Microbiology Laboratory for Diagnosis of Infectious Diseases: 2024 Update by the IDSA and ASM. Clin Infect Dis. 2024;ciae104. doi:10.1093/cid/ciae104.

10. Domouchtsidou A, Ioannou P, Lianou A, et al. Biofilms in clinical infection: pathophysiology, diagnosis, and the evolving therapeutic landscape. J Clin Microbiol. 2026;64(3):e01042-25. doi:10.1128/jcm.01042-25.

11. Rustamov M.M. Use of modern methods in teaching "information technology" in medical education. Science and Innovation. 2023;2(A7):30–33.

12. Rustamov M.M. Improving the methodology of teaching the subject "information technologies and modeling of technological processes" in an innovative educational environment. Science and Innovation. 2023;2(B7):58–61.

13. Rustamov M.M. Enhance students' knowledge and skills with multimedia tools in an innovative educational environment. Science and Innovation. 2023;2(B10):43–45.

14. Rustamov M.M. Tibbiy ta'limda innovatsion ta'lim metodlari va ta'lim vositalaridan foydalanishning afzalliklari (Axborot texnologiyalari va jarayonlarni matematik modellashtirish faniga tatbiqi misolida). News of the NUUz. 2024;1(1.5.1):197–199.

15. Teshaboyeva G.M. Biofizika fanini o'qitishda zamonaviy pedagogik dasturiy vositalardan foydalanish. Ustozlar uchun. 2025;83(1):88–91.

16. Teshaboyeva G.M. Biofizika fanida simulyatsion va VR texnologiyalaridan foydalanish. Ustozlar uchun. 2025;83(1):92–94.

17. Teshaboyeva G.M. Pedagogical and methodological opportunities for designing an adaptive learning environment in biophysics education using artificial intelligence technologies and learning analytics. Society and Innovations. 2026;7(5/S):159–165. doi:10.47689/2181-1415-vol7-iss5/s-pp159-165.