



Q2 Native and dry-heated lysozyme interactions with membrane lipid
 2 monolayers: Lipid packing modifications of a phospholipid mixture,
 Q3 model of the *Escherichia coli* cytoplasmic membrane

Q4 Melanie Derde ^{a,b,*}, Françoise Nau ^{a,b}, Catherine Guérin-Dubiard ^{a,b}, Valérie Lechevalier ^{a,b}, Gilles Paboeuf ^c,
 5 Sophie Jan ^{a,b}, Florence Baron ^{a,b}, Michel Gautier ^{a,b}, Véronique Vié ^c

6 ^a Agrocampus Ouest, UMR1253 Science et technologie du lait et de l'œuf, F-35042 Rennes, France

7 ^b INRA, UMR1253 Science et technologie du lait et de l'œuf, F-35042 Rennes, France

8 ^c Université de Rennes 1, Institut de physique de Rennes, UMR6251, CNRS, F-35042 Rennes, France

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

11 Received 25 September 2014

12 Received in revised form 5 January 2015

13 Accepted 11 January 2015

14 Available online xxxx

Keywords:

16 Dry-heating

Q7 Monolayer membrane model

18 Cytoplasmic membrane

19 *Escherichia coli*

20 Antimicrobial protein

ABSTRACT

Antimicrobial resistance is currently an important public health issue. The need for innovative antimicrobials 21 is therefore growing. The ideal antimicrobial compound should limit antimicrobial resistance. Antimicrobial 22 peptides or proteins such as hen egg white lysozymes are promising molecules that act on bacterial membranes. 23 Hen egg white lysozymes have recently been identified as active on Gram-negative bacteria due to disruption 24 of the outer and cytoplasmic membrane integrity. Furthermore, dry-heating (7 days and 80 °C) improves the 25 membrane activity of lysozymes, resulting in higher antimicrobial activity. These *in vivo* findings suggest interactions 26 between lysozymes and membrane lipids. This is consistent with the findings of several other authors who 27 have shown lysozyme interaction with bacterial phospholipids such as phosphatidylglycerol and cardiolipin. 28 However, until now, the interaction between lysozyme and bacterial cytoplasmic phospholipids has been in 29 need of clarification. This study proposes the use of monolayer models with a realistic bacterial phospholipid 30 composition in physiological conditions. The lysozyme/phospholipid interactions have been studied by surface 31 pressure measurements, ellipsometry and atomic force microscopy. Native lysozyme has proved able to absorb 32 and insert into a bacterial phospholipid monolayer, resulting in lipid packing reorganization, which in turn has 33 lead to lateral cohesion modifications between phospholipids. Dry-heating of lysozymes has increased insertion 34 capacity and ability to induce lipid packing modifications. These *in vitro* findings are then consistent with the 35 increased membrane disruption potential of dry heated lysozyme *in vivo* compared to native lysozyme. More- 36 over, an eggPC monolayer study suggested that lysozyme/phospholipid interactions are specific to bacterial 37 cytoplasmic membranes. 38

© 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V. 39

1. Introduction

45 The discovery of new antimicrobial molecules is greatly necessary
 46 as a means to counterbalance the prominent public health problem
 47 of antimicrobial resistance [1]. In order to limit the development of
 48 bacterial resistance, peptides or proteins which target the bacterial cell

49 membranes should be considered as relevant antimicrobial molecules. 49
 50 These antimicrobial peptides or proteins generally permeate the bacte- 50
 51 rial outer and/or cytoplasmic membranes and their movement leads to 51
 52 bacterial cell death [2]. 52

53 The hen egg white lysozyme is one of the antimicrobial proteins 53
 54 that has been widely used in pharmaceutical applications. This protein 54
 55 is historically known for its enzymatic hydrolysis of peptidoglycan, 55
 56 causing its antimicrobial activity on Gram-positive bacteria [3]. However, 56
 57 this protein is more than just an enzyme; it is also able to disrupt the 57
 58 bacterial membranes, to inhibit the synthesis of DNA or RNA and to 58
 59 induce autolysin production [4–7]. Hence, lysozyme is active against 59
 60 both Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria [4,7]. In particular, it 60
 61 has been recently established that lysozyme permeates both the outer 61
 62 and inner membranes of *Escherichia coli*, respectively with and without 62
 63 perforations [6,7]. Moreover, lysozyme depolarizes the cytoplasmic 63
 64 membrane and causes cytosol leakage [7]. However, the antimicrobial 64
 65 effect of lysozymes on Gram-negative species remains limited [4,7]. 65

Q6 Abbreviations: AMP, antimicrobial peptide or protein; CA, cardiolipin; CMEC, *Escherichia coli* cytoplasmic phospholipid mixture; DH-L, dry-heated lysozyme; DOPE, 1,2-di-(9Z-octadecenoyl)-sn-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine; DOPG, 1,2-di-(9Z-octadecenoyl)-sn-glycero-3-phospho-(1'-rac-glycerol); DPPE, 1,2-dihexadecanoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine; DPPG, 1,2-dihexadecanoyl-sn-glycero-3-phospho-(1'-rac-glycerol); EggPC, hen egg L- α -phosphatidylcholine; HEPES, 4-(2-hydroxyethyl)-1-piperazine-ethanesulfonic acid; LC, liquid condensed; LE, liquid expanded; N-L, native lysozyme

* Corresponding author at: Agrocampus Ouest, UMR1253 STLO, 65, rue de St-Brieuc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France.

E-mail address: melanie.derde@agrocampus-ouest.fr (M. Derde).

Dry-heating, a common practice to decontaminate pharmaceutical products, has been shown to improve lysozyme antimicrobial activity on *E. coli* [7–9]. A higher membrane disruption potential is at the basis of this improvement. Increased protein–membrane interactions are due to the more favorable physicochemical characteristics of dry-heated lysozymes [7]. Dry-heating lysozymes result in succinimide derivatives, making dry-heated lysozymes more basic and more flexible; these chemical modifications also induce higher surface hydrophobicity [10–13].

These *in vivo* findings thus indicate that lysozymes interact with bacterial membrane lipids. To investigate lysozyme–lipid interactions and the impact thereof on the bacterial membrane, *in vitro* models such as lipid monolayers can be used. Interfacial monolayers are considered as good models to evaluate protein–lipid interactions, since the initial lateral lipid pressure can be controlled and multiple lipid compositions can be used [14,15]. In this context, our group had previously investigated the lysozyme–lipopolysaccharide interactions in order to have a better understanding of the lysozyme outer membrane disruption. We established that it was possible to insert lysozymes into LPS monolayers, a model for the *E. coli* outer membrane, and reorganize this lipid film laterally and vertically [16]. In this study, the aim is to investigate lysozyme interactions with bacterial cytoplasmic membrane phospholipids. Previous studies established that the lysozyme–phospholipid interactions are highly dependent on the pH, ionic strength and lipid nature [17–20]. To obtain a maximal significance from the results, environmental conditions and phospholipid composition should be as close as possible to the natural situation. In particular, the use of a complex lipid mixture is key, due to the complexity of electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions between the different phospholipids, and due to the impact of the lipid geometry and structure on the later lipid packing [21]. Thus, lysozyme interactions with bacterial cytoplasmic lipids were studied here for the first time in physiological conditions (pH 7 and ionic strength of 155 mM) using a phospholipid monolayer constituted of a lipid mixture close to the natural *E. coli* K12 composition as described by Lugtenberg et al. (1976) [22].

Since electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions are considered as the major interactive forces between lysozyme and the phospholipids [18,19], the comparison between native and dry-heated lysozymes could possibly reveal interesting differences. Indeed, dry-heating of lysozymes induces physicochemical modifications as mentioned above. These modifications should enhance lysozyme–phospholipid interactions such as protein adsorption and insertion, explaining the increased membrane depolarization and ion channel formation observed *in vivo* after dry-heating [7].

In this study, interactions between lysozymes and the phospholipid monolayer membrane model were investigated using biophysical tools such as ellipsometry, surface pressure measurements and atomic force microscopy (AFM).

2. Material and methods

2.1. Proteins and lipids

Native lysozyme (N-L) powder (pH 3.2) was obtained from Liot (Annezin, 62-France). It was heated for 7 days at 80 °C in hermetically closed glass tubes to obtain dry-heated lysozyme (DH-L). Lysozyme (N-L or DH-L) was solubilized (around 0.5 g/L) in 5 mM 4-(2-hydroxyethyl)piperazine-1-ethanesulfonic acid (HEPES) buffer (Sigma Aldrich, Saint-Quentin, France) pH 7.0 with 150 mM NaCl (Fluka, Saint-Quentin, France). The concentration of the lysozyme stock solution was precisely determined by absorbance at 280 nm (extinction coefficient = $2.6 \text{ g}^{-1} \cdot \text{L}$) [23]. The protein solution was then diluted in the HEPES buffer to obtain the desired lysozyme concentration.

A mixture of different lipids (Avanti Polar Lipids, Alabaster, USA) was prepared in order to obtain a composition close to the natural one present in the cytoplasmic membrane of *E. coli* as detected by

Lugtenberg et al. [22]; it contained 2.6% 1,2-di-(9Z-octadecenoyl)-sn-glycero-3-phospho-(1'-rac-glycerol) (DOPG), 3.9% 1,2-dihexadecanoyl-sn-glycero-3-phospho-(1'-rac-glycerol) (DPPG), 11.8% cardiolipin (CA), 32.3% 1,2-di-(9Z-octadecenoyl)-sn-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine (DOPE) and 49.4% 1,2-dihexadecanoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine (DPPE). This lipid mixture (CMEC) was prepared in 2:1 chloroform/methanol mixture at 0.25 mM. Hen egg L- α -phosphatidylcholine (eggPC) (Avanti Polar Lipids, Alabaster, USA) was also prepared in 2:1 chloroform/methanol mixture at 1 mM.

2.2. Lipid/protein monolayers

The experiments were performed in a homemade TEFLON® trough of 8 mL at 21 °C. Before each use, the trough was thoroughly and successively cleaned with warm tap water, ethanol and ultra-pure water, then boiled for 15 min in ultra-pure water. After cooling the TEFLON® trough, it was filled with an 8 mL HEPES buffer. The CMEC was spread with a high precision Hamilton microsyringe at the clean air/liquid interface to obtain an initial surface pressure of 20 ± 1 or 30 ± 1 mN/m. The eggPC was spread as described for the CMEC to obtain an initial surface pressure of 30 mN/m. After 15 min, *i.e.* a duration necessary to allow solvent evaporation and lipid organization, 50 μL N-L or DH-L solution was injected into the subphase with a Hamilton syringe in order to obtain a final protein subphase concentration between 0.02 and 3 μM .

2.3. Surface pressure measurements

The surface pressure was measured following a Wilhelmy method using a 10 mm \times 22 mm filter paper as plate (Whatman, Velizy-Villacoublay, France) connected to a microelectronic feedback system (Nima PS4, Manchester, England). The surface pressure (π) was recorded every 4 s with a precision of ± 0.2 mN/m. The measured surface pressure was the result of the surface tension of water minus the surface tension of the lipid film.

2.4. Ellipsometry

Measurements of the ellipsometric angle value were carried out with an in-house automated ellipsometer in a “null ellipsometer” configuration [24,25]. A polarized He-Ne laser beam ($\lambda = 632.8$ nm, Melles Griot, Glan-Thompson polarizer) was reflected on the liquid surface. The incidence angle was 52.12° , *i.e.* Brewster angle for the air/water interface minus 1° . After reflection on the liquid surface, the laser light passed through a $\lambda/4$ retardation plate, a Glan-Thompson analyzer, and a photomultiplier. The analyzer angle, multiplied by two, yielded the value of the ellipsometric angle (Δ), *i.e.* the phase difference between parallel and perpendicular polarization of the reflected light. The laser beam probed the 1 mm² surface with a depth in the order of 1 μm . Initial values of the ellipsometric angle (Δ_0) and surface pressure (π_0) of buffer solutions were recorded for at least half an hour to assure that the interface was clean. Only in the case of a stable and minimal signal were experiments performed. Values of Δ were recorded every 4 s with a precision of $\pm 0.5^\circ$.

2.5. AFM sample preparation and AFM imaging

Experiments were performed with a computer-controlled and user-programmable Langmuir TEFLON®-coated trough (type 601BAM) equipped with two movable barriers and of total surface 90 cm² (Nima Technology Ltd., England). Before starting the experiments, the trough was cleaned successively with ultrapure water (Nanopure-UV), ethanol, and finally ultrapure water. The trough was filled with a 5 mM HEPES buffer pH 7 with 150 mM NaCl. CMEC was spread over the clean air/liquid interface at a surface pressure of 20 ± 1 mN/m. The solvent was then left to evaporate for 15 min. Then, a Langmuir–

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10796725>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/10796725>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)