Broad spectrum antibacterial photodynamic and photothermal therapy achieved with indocyanine green loaded SPIONs under near infrared irradiation

1 **Kubra Bilici^{1,‡}, Nazlı Atac^{2,‡}, Abdullah Muti^{3,‡}, Işinsu Baylam⁴, Ozlem Dogan², Alphan**
2 **Sennaroglu^{3,4}, Fusun Can^{2*} and Havva Yagci Acar^{1,4*}**

3 ¹Koç University, Department of Chemistry, Rumelifeneri Yolu, Sariyer, Istanbul 34450,
4 Turkey

5 ²Koç University School of Medicine, Department of Infectious Diseases and Clinical
6 Microbiology, Topkapı, Istanbul, Turkey

7 ³Koç University, Departments of Physics and Electrical-Electronics Engineering,
8 Rumelifeneri Yolu, Sariyer 34450, Istanbul, Turkey

9 ⁴KUYTAM, Koç University Surface Science and Technology Center, 34450 Istanbul, Turkey

10 **‡ KB, NA, AM are equally contributing first authors.**

11

12 *** Corresponding authors:**

13 Prof. Havva Yagci Acar: fyagci@ku.edu.tr

14 Prof. Füsun Can: fcan@ku.edu.tr

15

16 **Keywords: Indocyanine green, SPION, photothermal therapy, photodynamic therapy,**
17 **combined therapy, biofilm.**

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Abstract

Background: Antimicrobial photodynamic therapy (aPDT) and antimicrobial photothermal therapy (aPTT) are promising local and effective alternative therapies for antibiotic resistant bacterial infections and biofilms. Combination of nanoparticles and organic photosensitizers offer a great opportunity to combine PDT and PTT for effective eradication of both planktonic bacteria and their biofilms. In this work, photo-induced antibacterial activity of indocyanine green (ICG), 3-aminopropylsilane coated superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles (APTMS@SPION) and ICG loaded APTMS@SPION were evaluated on planktonic cells and biofilms of gram-negative (*E.coli*, *K.pneumoniae*, *P.aeruginosa*) and gram-positive (*S.epidermis*) bacteria.

Results: A relatively low dose of ICG (25 µg/mL) and SPIONs (0.425 µg/mL nanoparticle) in combination with a single, short (10 min) laser irradiation at 808 nm with 1150 mW of power were used in this study. No dark toxicity of the agents or antibacterial effect of the laser irradiation were observed. The charge of the particles did not provide a significant difference in their penetration to gram-negative versus gram-positive bacterial strains or their biofilms. APTMS@SPION/laser treatment completely eliminated *P.aeruginosa* and provided 7-log reduction in the colony forming unit (CFU) of *E.Coli*, but was not effective on the other two bacteria. This is the first example for antibacterial phototoxicity of this nanoparticle. ICG/laser and ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser treatments provided complete killing of all planktonic cells. Successful eradication of all biofilms were achieved with ICG/laser (3.2-3.7 log reduction in CFU) or ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser treatment (3.3-4.4 log reduction in CFU). However, an exceptionally high, 6.5-log reduction as well as a dramatic difference between ICG versus ICG/APTMS@SPION treatment was observed in *K.pneumoniae* biofilms with ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser treatment. Investigation of the ROS production and increase in the local temperature of the biofilms that were subjected to phototherapy suggested a combination of aPTT and aPDT mechanisms for phototoxicity, exhibiting a synergistic effect when ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser was used.

Conclusions: This approach opens an exciting and novel avenue in the fight against drug resistant infections by successfully utilizing the antimicrobial and antibiofilm activity of low dose FDA approved optically traceable ICG and a relatively low cost clinically acceptable iron oxide nanoparticle to enable effective aPDT/aPTT combination, induced via short-duration laser irradiation at a near-infrared wavelength.

Introduction

Antibiotic resistance has become a significant threat due to the emergence of multidrug resistant pathogens and limited therapy options [1]. Multidrug resistant pathogens are subject of concern because of high fatality rates due to infections in health care settings. The multidrug resistance rates were reported as 59% in *E.coli* [2], 50% in *K.pneumoniae* [3], 31.4% in *S.epidermidis* [4], and 20.6% in *P.aeruginosa* [5]. Biofilm production of these bacteria also increases the risk of treatment failure. Antibiotics cannot efficiently penetrate through the biofilm matrix [6] and thus result in persistence of bacteria, promote positive selection, and spread of antimicrobial resistance [7].

Rapidly increasing antibiotic resistance and high mortality rates lead to an urgent need for new alternatives in infection therapy. Light based local therapies such as photodynamic therapy (PDT) and photothermal therapy (PTT) emerged as alternative and complementary therapeutic methods in cancer [8-10]. Anti-microbial photodynamic therapy (aPDT) has been reported since early 1990s as an alternative therapeutic approach or as a complimentary method to antimicrobial drugs [11-13]. It was reported that aPDT does not cause any resistance to drugs or to aPDT and is not influenced by the drug resistance status of the microbial cells [12]. aPDT is a promising approach in the inactivation of biofilms, as well [14]. In aPDT, irradiation of a photosensitizer, which is usually a small molecule, generates reactive oxygen species (ROS), which then attack proteins, lipids, nucleic acids, etc, in the vicinity to kill the bacterial cell and may damage the biofilm matrix [15].

In recent years, photothermal therapy (PTT) has attracted a great deal of attention, following the development of photosensitive inorganic nanoparticles that cause local heating upon irradiation especially near infrared wavelength (NIR), s. This provides a deeper penetration of light and local temperature increase causes thermal ablation of the occupied malignant tissue.

Antimicrobial PTT (aPTT) has been recently shown as a promising approach in the elimination of planktonic cells and biofilms [16-19]. Disruption of the biofilm integrity via aPTT enhances penetration of antibacterial drugs into the biofilms, in addition to the thermal ablation of the bacteria [20, 21].

Indocyanine green (ICG), a FDA approved NIR organic dye, is used for intraoperative optical imaging in the clinic [22, 23] and for dental imaging [24]. It is under investigation for image-guided PDT and, most recently, as a photosensitizer for combined PDT-PTT upon irradiation at 808 nm [25]. Long wavelength absorption of ICG and safety in the absence of light irradiation are quite attractive. However, there are some major challenges in ICG based phototherapy, including rapid clearance from the body, instability in aqueous solutions, and photobleaching [26, 27]. Numerous studies have been performed to combine nanoparticles and ICG into one system that can overcome these issues [28-30].

Superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles (SPIONs) are well-known for magnetic resonance imaging [31], magnetic hyperthermia, and for drug delivery [32, 33]. Recently, they have also been recognized as effective PTT agents under NIR laser irradiation [34, 35]. This is quite exciting since SPIONs are considered biocompatible and there are several SPION compositions that are FDA approved. Recently, we have shown the combined PTT-PDT potential of the ICG loaded 3-aminopropyltrimethoxysilane (APTMS) coated SPIONs on MCF7 and HT29 cancer cell lines by employing a single laser treatment wavelength at 795 nm, and demonstrated a 2-fold increase in ROS generation, resulting in nearly complete cell death [36]. This approach together with the material choice is very promising for bacterial infections as well, especially for biofilms which are difficult to penetrate through. SPIONs have been used to deliver bactericidal agents previously or to cause dark bactericidal effect which required quite high doses and/or toxic coating materials which may pose serious risks in clinic transition [37-39].

In this study, we investigated the bactericidal effect of ICG, APTMS@SPION, and ICG loaded APTMS@SPION on planktonic cells and biofilms of gram-negative *E.coli*, *K.pneumoniae*, *P.aeruginosa* as well as gram-positive *S.epidermidis*, with and without NIR laser irradiation. NIR laser irradiation at 808 nm was applied at a clinically safe power level (1150 mW) and over a practically short duration (10 minutes) . Our study focuseed on the influence of the charge of the photosensitizers on their internalization by gram-negative and gram-positive bacteria and their biofilms, as well as ROS generation, and hyperthermia generated by the short irradiation of treated biofilms to evaluate the sensitivity of different bacterial strains. Our experiments indicate that a combination of ICG and SPIONs has the potential to provide an enhanced treatment of antibiotic resistant bacteria and their biofilms via a dual aPDT/aPTT mechanism.

Results

Synthesis and characterization of ICG-APTMS@SPIONs

APTMS@SPIONs and ICG-APTMS@SPIONs were prepared as described by Bilici et al. [36]. APTMS@SPIONs were produced in small hydrodynamic size and with strong positive surface charge (38 mV) (see Table 1). Electrostatic binding of ICG to APTMS@SPIONs were achieved with 14 % EE and 1.4 % LE. This reversed the surface charge (-44 mV) and increased the hydrodynamic size of nanoparticles to 35 nm, which is still considered as ultrasmall (Table 1). SPIONs lack strong specific absorbance in the NIR, but ICG has two absorbance peaks at 710 nm and 780 nm (Figure 1). ICG-APTMS@SPIONs exhibited two strong peaks at 810 nm and 710 nm, supporting ICG binding to SPIONs.

131

Table 1. Properties of the nanoparticles

Sample Name	Hydrodynamic size (nm)	ζ potential (mV)
APTMS@SPIONs	18	38
ICG-APTMS@SPIONs	35	-44

132

133

134 **Fig. 1** UV-vis-absorption spectra of free ICG, APTMS@SPIONs and ICG-APTMS@SPIONs.

135 ICG concentration of ICG-APTMS@SPION and free ICG are identical (10 μ g ICG/mL).

136 Antibacterial activity on planktonic cells

137 In the planktonic cells of all bacterial types treated with free ICG, APTMS@SPION, and ICG-
 138 APTMS@SPION, growth inhibition was not observed in the absence of laser irradiation
 139 (Figure 2). Colony counts of controls (without nanoparticle and laser) were found to be
 140 1.19×10^{12} CFU/ml for *E.coli*, 9.67×10^{11} CFU/ml for *K.pneumoniae*, 1.67×10^{12} CFU/ml for
 141 *P.aeruginosa*, and 1.23×10^{10} CFU/ml for *S.epidermidis*. When combined with laser treatment,
 142 cationic APTMS@SPION caused complete inhibition of growth of *P.aeruginosa*, 7-log

reduction in *E.coli* and no significant inhibition of *K.pneumoniae* and *S.epidermidis* planktonic cells. ICG alone or ICG-APTMS@SPION combined with laser treatment totally inhibited planktonic cells of all bacterial types. Killing activity of free ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION under laser treatment was significantly higher than that of APTMS@SPION ($p<0.0001$) in all cases except *P.aeruginosa*.

Fig. 2 Measured effect of APTMS@SPION, ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION on growth of planktonic cells with and without laser irradiation. Control: Planktonic cells were only treated with laser irradiation.

Antibacterial activity on biofilms

Untreated biofilms (no laser, no photosensitizer) were used as controls. The mean growth of biofilm controls were 9.93×10^8 CFU/ml, 2.36×10^9 CFU/ml, 1.32×10^{10} CFU/ml, and 3.97×10^9 CFU/ml for *E.coli*, *K.pneumoniae*, *P.aeruginosa* and *S.epidermidis*, respectively. No significant inhibition was observed on biofilms treated with the APTMS@SPION, ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION without laser treatment as in case of planktonic cells (Figure 3). APTMS@SPION/laser significantly reduced *P.aeruginosa* biofilm (2.7-log reduction), but showed no significant inhibition on other bacterial biofilms. It was most influential on *P.aeruginosa* biofilm in line with the results observed in the planktonic cells (Figure 2). Free ICG/laser combination inhibited biofilms of *E.coli*, *K.pneumoniae*, *P.aeruginosa* and

S. epidermidis with 3.2, 3.7, 3.6 and 3.6-log reductions, respectively. The ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser reduced biofilms in amounts comparable to ICG/laser again with 3.3, 3.4, 4.4-log reductions in *E. coli*, *P. aeruginosa* and *S. epidermidis*, respectively. Combination of dye and the nanoparticle in phototherapy was most effective on *K. pneumoniae* biofilm with 6.5-log growth reduction. The reduction of biofilm with ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser was always more effective than SPION@APTMS/laser, except in *P. aeruginosa*, wherein the difference in the growth inhibition of biofilms was not statistically significant between ICG (3.6-log), APTMS@SPION (2.7-log) and APTMS@SPION/ICG (3.4-log).

Fig. 3 Measured effect of APTMS@SPION, ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION particles on growth of bacterial biofilms with and without laser irradiation. Control: Biofilms were only treated with laser irradiation.

Cellular uptake

The quantitative uptake of APTMS@SPIONs and ICG-APTMS@SPIONs by the biofilms and planktonic cells treated with these nanoparticles at 425 µg/mL [Fe] concentration for 24 h was determined with ICP-MS. Untreated cells were used as controls. Most planktonic cells internalize about 85% of the cationic APTMS@SPIONs and 98% of the anionic ICG-APTMS@SPIONs (Figure 4a,b,d), except *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 4c) where these values are

about 70% and 80%, respectively. This may be due to impermeable outer cell membrane of this bacteria, preventing penetration of nanoparticles more than others. Interestingly, these bacterial strains did not differentiate particles based on their surface charge in case of planktonic cells. The largest difference between the APTMS@SPIONs and ICG-APTMS@SPIONs was ca 10% in case of *K.pneumoniae* favoring the latter. ICG seems to enhance internalization of nanoparticles by both gram-negative and gram-positive bacteria.

Internalization of these NPs by biofilms were lower as expected (Figure 4). Surprisingly, both NPs penetrate into biofilms of *P.aeruginosa* in the highest amount reaching 8 and 48% for APTMS@SPION and ICG-APTMS@SPION, respectively. This was followed by *S. epidermis* biofilms, which is the only gram-positive strain, with about 18 % internalization of both NPs. Penetration of nanoparticles to *K.pneumoniae* and *E. coli* biofilms is relatively poor: below 10 % and 5 %, respectively.

Fig. 4 Intracellular quantification of APTMS@SPIONs and ICG-APTMS@SPIONs in a) *E.coli*, b) *K.pneumoniae*, c) *P.aeruginosa* and d) *S. epidermis*.

Confocal microscope images showed no attachment of ICG or ICG loaded NPs on *E.coli* but only few NP aggregates between the bacterial cells (Figure 5a,b). On the other hand, few bacterial cells seem to be in interaction with the free ICG (Figure 5c), but a significant enhancement in the interaction of ICG-APTMS@SPION with *K.pneumoniae* biofilm was observed (Figure 5d), which supports ICP-MS results. Actually, these microscopy images also demonstrate the ability of optical detection of the photosensitizer, which allows image-guided selection of the area for irradiation. In addition, free ICG or ICG-APTMS@SPION exposure without laser treatment did not cause any morphological changes in *E.coli* and *K.pneumoniae* biofilms which can be seen from the SEM images of the biofilms (Figure S1).

Fig. 5 Confocal microscope images of bacterial biofilms **a)** *E.coli* biofilm with ICG, bacteria only **b)** *E.coli* biofilm with ICG-APTMS@SPION bacteria only **c)** *K.pneumoniae* biofilm with ICG, nanoparticles slightly attached on bacterial cells **d)** *K.pneumoniae* biofilm with ICG-APTMS@SPION, nanoparticles attached on bacterial cells. Blue: Bacteria stained with DAPI ; Red: Nanoparticles ; 63X Magnification

Temperature increase in the laser treated biofilms

Local temperature increase (ΔT) during laser irradiation of biofilms treated with APTMS@SPION, ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION was recorded with a thermal camera as described above. Untreated cells were used as the control and the temperature differences of treated cells with respect to control are displayed in Figure 6. APTMS@SPION/laser treatment caused the highest temperature increase by 20 °C in *S.epidermidis* which internalized more APTMS@SPION (ca 18 %) in comparison with others. The least uptake was detected in *E.coli* (ca 0.4 %) and the corresponding observed ΔT was 7.5 °C. *K.pneumoniae* picked up 2.6 % of the nanoparticles and experienced 25 °C temperature increase, while *P.aeruginosa* picked up 8.4 % of the particles and experienced 12 °C temperature increase.

ICG/laser treatment caused higher temperature increases than APTMS@SPION (18-25 °C), except in *S.epidermidis* (8 °C). ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser showed significantly higher ΔT values than its components: ca 50, 29, 42, 64 °C for *E.coli*, *K.pneumoniae*, *P.aeruginosa* and *S.epidermidis*, respectively. The highest uptake of ICG-APTMS@SPION was observed in *P.aeruginosa* (48 %) but the highest temperature increase was observed in *S.epidermidis* which had about 14 % nanoparticle uptake. This shows that different microbial strains respond to laser treatment differently.

Fig. 6 Measured increase in the temperature (ΔT) of biofilms treated with 808 nm laser (10 min, 1150 mW) with respect to control (no treatment) as detected with a thermal camera.

ROS generation in biofilms upon laser irradiation

ROS levels for APTMS@SPION, ICG, and ICG-APTMS@SPION treated biofilms with/without laser irradiation are shown in Figure 7. None of these photosensitizers causes significant ROS generation without laser irradiation. After laser treatment, when compared with control, all of the photosensitizers caused significantly higher ROS generation in *E. coli* biofilms with ROS levels around 12.8% with APTMS@SPION ($p=0.001$), 35.6% with ICG ($p<0.0001$), and 32.0% with ICG-APTMS@SPION ($p<0.0001$). Indeed, APTMS@SPION/laser caused significant ROS generation only in *E. coli* biofilms. In *K. pneumoniae* biofilms, significant ROS generation was observed with ICG/laser (30.9%) and ICG@APTMS/laser (31.3%) ($p<0.0001$), while in *P. aeruginosa* biofilms, only ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser caused a significantly increased (26.6%) ROS production ($p<0.0001$). In *S. epidermidis* biofilms, ICG/laser caused 26.7% increase in ROS ($p<0.0001$), while ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser caused 14.7% ($p=0.0072$).

Fig. 7 Measured ROS levels of bacterial biofilms before and after 10 minutes of laser irradiation with 1150 mW.

Discussions

Rapid increase of resistance to current antibiotics is a global threat and causes inefficient treatment especially for biofilm related infections [1]. As a result of limited therapy against resistant bacteria in biofilms, an urgent need for alternative options to antibiotics has risen. PDT and PTT were considered as a promising alternative and complementary therapy for some chemotherapy resistant cancers [40, 41]. In recent years, adaptation of PDT and PTT for the treatment of multidrug resistant infections showed quite successful results [42-44].

In this study, we investigated the antimicrobial and antibiofilm effects of PDT/PTT combination using APTMS@SPION, ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION nanoparticles and 10 min laser irradiation at 808 nm (output power of 1150 mW). We used three clinically important biofilm producing gram negative bacteria (*K.pneumoniae*, *E.coli*, *P.aeruginosa*) and one gram positive, strong biofilm producing bacteria, *S.epidermidis*, to assess the influence of surface charge on internalization of nanoparticles as well as the spectrum of PDT/PTT in different bacterial types.

We did not observe a significant antimicrobial effect in the planktonic cells of these bacteria types by any of these three photosensitizers in the absence of laser treatment. This indicates no

dark toxicity related to these agents, but significant phototoxic effect was detected after a single, 10-minute irradiation of the treated cells at 808 nm. Overall, according to Figure 2, after laser application: (1) *P.aeruginosa* and *E.coli* planktonic cells can be completely eliminated with any of these three agents, (2) APTMS@SPION/laser treatment showed a strong bactericidal effect but only on *P.aeruginosa* (with 11-log reduction of growth) and *E.coli* (7-log reduction), (3) complete killing of *K.pneumoniae* and *S.epidermidis* planktonic cells was achieved with ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION. This clearly shows that antimicrobial activity is not dependent on gram-negative or gram-positive cell wall nature of the bacteria when these photosensitizers are used. Cell internalization studies also indicate no strong dependence of this result on intracellular nanoparticle loading.

In a similar study, Topaloglu et al. reported dose dependent bactericidal effect of ICG based PDT performed with 809 nm laser on *P.aeruginosa* and *S.aureus* planktonic cells and achieved complete killing of *P.aeruginosa* with 125 µg/mL of ICG and 252 J/cm² of light dose. In the case of *S. aureus*, 84 J/cm² and 4 µg/mL ICG was sufficient for complete killing. Hence, they have suggested that highly anionic cell-wall of gram negative bacteria limited the interaction of anionic ICG with *P.aeruginosa* [45]. However, we have not seen a dramatic difference between the uptake of cationic APTMS@SPION or the anionic ICG loaded nanoparticles by gram-negative or gram-positive bacteria in this study, except in *S.epidermidis* (gram-positive) which slightly favored anionic nanoparticles (Figure 4). Omar et al. reported effective killing activity of ICG on planktonic cells of *P.aeruginosa*, *S. pyogenes* and *S.aureus* under 808 nm irradiation [46]. *S. pyogenes* and *S.aureus* treated with 25 µg ml⁻¹ ICG and exposed to 411 J/cm² (1.37 W/cm²) of light intensity provided a 4.7-log and 5.5-log reduction in the viable cell count. However, 200 µg/ml ICG provided only a 2-log (99.1%) reduction in the viable cell count of *P.aeruginosa*. They have also reported no increase in the temperature of the bacterial suspensions, which is quite usual for such laser doses, hence attributed the cell killing to PDT

effect of ICG. Jijie et al. achieved complete killing of *E.coli* (6-log reduction) using 6 μ M ICG loaded to Au nanoparticles and 3-log reduction with ICG free Au nanoparticles after 60 min irradiation of the bacterial cells with 810 nm laser irradiation ($1\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$) [47]. Overall, the growth reduction obtained in our study is much higher compared to these reports and low doses of the agents were used.

Here, we have achieved a complete killing of all planktonic cell types, both gram-negative and gram-positive, with only 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ ICG or ICG loaded nanoparticles and irradiation at 808 nm (10 min) with 1150 mW (total energy of 690 J over 10 minutes) of laser power or $3\text{ W}/\text{cm}^2$ (total fluence of $1793\text{ J}/\text{cm}^2$ over 10 minutes) of irradiation fluence, which is strong enough to provide effective aPDT and aPTT. Also, we have achieved complete killing of *E.coli* and *P.aeruginosa* using APTMS@SPION (425 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ Fe) under identical conditions. It is important to point out that in the absence of laser treatment, these agents did not cause any antimicrobial activity. Interestingly, Niemirowicz et al. reported 75%, 26% and 99% growth inhibition of *E.coli*, *P.aeruginosa*, *S.aureus* and *Candida albicans* when they treated the microorganisms with 2.5 mg/mL APTMS coated SPIONs for 24h with no laser irradiation [48]. However, this is a quite high SPION dose compared to what was used here (425 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$) and they have indeed used these nanoparticles to aggregate in the presence of such microorganism to be separated from body fluids. There is no current study that combined APTMS@SPION and laser treatment, hence such significant killing activity of APTMS@SPION with NIR laser treatment on *P.aeruginosa* and *E.coli* is unique. Indeed, combination of these two findings may provide important guidelines and pave the way to diverse applications in the field of antimicrobial therapy.

Biofilms are much more difficult to treat due to limited penetration of therapeutic agents into the biofilm matrix. In this study, ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION combination with laser

312 treatment showed similar activity in all biofilms with 3.4-3.7-log reduction in colony counts,
313 except in *S.epidermidis* and *K.pneumoniae*, where a 4.4 log and a dramatic 6.5-log reductions
314 were observed with the ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser. Similar to planktonic cells,
315 APTMS@SPION/laser showed the highest antimicrobial activity in *P.aeruginosa* (2.7-log
316 reduction), but no significant effect on other biofilms.

317 In order to elucidate the contribution of aPTT and aPDT, photogenerated ROS and local
318 temperature increase were determined in irradiated biofilms which were treated with each
319 photosensitizer. ROS generation of ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION upon laser treatment were
320 similar in all biofilms, except in *P.aeruginosa*, where free ICG did not increase the ROS level
321 significantly. In this biofilm, local temperature increase was 25 and 42 °C during ICG/laser and
322 ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser treatment, respectively. ICG-SPION@APTMS/laser did not
323 produce significant amount of ROS in this biofilm, but resulted in a 12 °C temperature increase,
324 which was enough for 2.7-log reduction in CFU. Therefore, these data suggest that,
325 *P.aeruginosa* is quite heat sensitive and the major bactericidal effect is due to aPTT in
326 *P.aeruginosa*.

327 APTMS@SPION/laser produced significant amount of ROS only in *E.coli*, led to a 7.5 °C local
328 temperature increase but did not cause any antimicrobial effect. Hence, this combination was
329 ineffective for antimicrobial activity in *E.coli* biofilms. On the other hand, ICG/laser and ICG-
330 APTMS@SPION/laser treatments produced similar ROS amounts in *E.coli* biofilms, leading
331 to ca 18 °C versus 50 °C temperature increase, respectively, and a resulting 3.2-3.3 log
332 reduction in CFU. These may suggest that *E.coli* is more sensitive to aPDT rather than aPTT
333 and relatively high levels of ROS is needed for effective eradication of *E.coli* biofilms.
334 However, since we observed a quite high reduction in biofilm for both cases, it is not possible
335 to have a clear verdict on such differentiation between the killing mechanisms.

In *K.pneumoniae* biofilms, ΔT recorded for APTMS@SPION/laser was 25 °C with no accompanying ROS production, which resulted in no killing effect. ICG/laser and ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser treatments increased the temperature of the biofilms by 19 °C and 29 °C with comparable ROS amounts, but caused 3.7 and 6.5-log reduction, respectively. These suggest that only aPTT is not enough for successful eradication of this biofilm but ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser provides a dramatic bactericidal effect due to synergistic combination of aPTT/aPDT in *K.pneumoniae* biofilms. Compared to *P.aeruginosa* biofilm, *K.pneumoniae* seems to be more heat resistant since no significant killing effect was observed by 25 °C temperature increase without ROS production in the latter, while only 12 °C increase provided 2.7-log reduction in the former. Probably, the thick polysaccharide capsule of this bacterium may cause some heat resistance. Increase of the local temperature may make the polysaccharide capsule more permeable and/or reduce the resistance of the bacteria to ROS, causing such enhanced antimicrobial effect in combined aPTT/aPDT.

In *S. epidermidis* biofilms, strong antimicrobial activity was observed with ICG/laser and ICG-APTMS@SPION/laser, leading to 8 °C and 64 °C temperature increase and 35-25% ROS production, and causing 3.6- and 4.4-log reduction in CFU, respectively. This indicates enhanced bacteriocidal effect due to the combination of aPDT/aPTT. However, despite the 20°C increase in temperature observed with APTMS@SPION/laser, neither a significant ROS generation nor an accompanying antimicrobial activity was observed, suggesting that *S. epidermidis* is not very heat sensitive.

Conclusion

In this study, the bactericidal effect of PDT/PTT (808 nm, 1150 mW, 10 min) generated by excitation of free ICG, APTMS@SPION, and ICG-APTMS@SPION was investigated on both planktonic cells and biofilms of *P.aeruginosa*, *E.coli*, *K.pneumoniae* and *S.epidermidis*. We

prepared small, stable and biocompatible cationic APTMS@SPIONs using co-precipitation method and loaded ICG onto these cationic nanoparticles via electrostatic interactions to develop anionic ICG-APTMS@SPIONs. Preparation of these nanoparticles is quite simple and relatively inexpensive. None of these agents showed a bactericidal activity without laser irradiation at 25 µg/mL ICG dose, corresponding to a Fe concentration of 425 µg/mL. In the absence of these agents, laser irradiation did not cause antimicrobial effect either. These prove that the laser treatment is safe and what we observe is aPDT/aPTT. A short-duration, single-wavelength laser treatment of the planktonic cells treated with ICG or ICG-APTMS@SPION caused complete killing of the bacteria. But APTMS@SPION/laser showed a significant dependence on bacterial type and provided a strong killing activity only on *P.aeruginosa* and *E.Coli*. This is the first report on such antibacterial phototoxicity of APTMS@SPION. This is quite valuable since these nanoparticles are usually well-known in the literature as functional SPIONs. Cell internalization studies indicate no strong dependence of the results on intracellular nanoparticle loading or surface charge of the nanoparticles.

Combined aPDT/aPTT provided more bactericidal effect in planktonic cells than biofilms, as expected. Overall, 3.3-log to 4.4-log reductions in CFU were obtained after short-duration and single-wavelength laser treatment of ICG or ICG-APTMS@SPION treated biofilms. *S.epidermidis* biofilms appeared more vulnerable to aPDT requiring high ROS levels for effective eradication of biofilms. Here synergistic effect of aPTT was not observed. *P.aeruginosa* biofilms were quite heat sensitive and were probably treated mostly with aPTT. In the case of *K.pneumoniae* biofilms, both aPTT and aPDT seems to be effective and the combination of both provided the complete eradication with 6.5-log reduction, which is the highest value among all, a quite high reduction ratio in the present literature as well.

Lastly, we point out that aPDT/aPTT combination may be quite an effective alternative and local therapeutic method against resistant microbial infections even in the absence of an antibiotic agent. Besides, considering the current efforts in the development of new photosensitizer molecules and nanoparticles, we would like to point out that using existing well-known nanoparticles such as SPIONs and FDA approved ICG, which also enables image-guidance for the therapy, may shorten the path to clinical trials. Similar to “drug repurposing”, there may be opportunities to re-purpose the dyes and nanoparticles that the community is familiar with.

Materials and methods

Materials

Iron (II) chloride, iron (III) chloride, suprapur nitric acid (65%) and suprapur sulphuric acid (96%) were purchased from Merck (purity levels 99%, Darmstadt, Germany). 3-Aminopropyltrimethoxysilane (APTMS) was purchased from Alfa Aesar (MA, USA). Cardiogreen (indocyanine green) was obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (MO, USA). Vivaspin 20 centrifugal filters (5 kDa MW cut-off) were obtained from Sartorius (Goettingen, Germany). In all experiments, only ultra-pure water was used (18.2 MΩ, Reophile Bioscience and Technology, Shanghai, China).

Preparation of ICG loaded APTMS@SPIONs

ICG loaded APTMS coated SPIONs were prepared as described in our previous work.⁷ Briefly, cationic APTMS@SPIONs were synthesized by a co-precipitation method from iron salts at Fe³⁺/Fe²⁺ of 2/1 (mol ratio) using NH₄OH in the presence of APTMS at 85 °C under Ar flow. Produced APTMS@SPIONs were washed with DI water several times using centrifugal filters (5 kDa MW cutoff) and stored at room temperature.

To prepare ICG-APTMS@SPIONs, ICG was added dropwise to nanoparticle solution (5 mg/mL, 10 mL) at a concentration of 0.5 mg/mL and then mixed at 750 rpm for 2 h at room temperature. Then, it was washed from centrifugal filters (10kDa MWCO). The loaded ICG amount was calculated based on the unbound ICG that was removed by the washing process using the absorbance of ICG at 780 nm and a calibration curve created with free ICG. ICG encapsulation efficiency (EE) and loading efficiency (LE) were calculated as follows:

$$EE (\%) = [\text{Weight of loaded ICG} / \text{Weight of ICG input}] \times 100$$

$$LE (\%) = [\text{Weight of loaded ICG} / \text{Weight of ICG loaded SPIONs}] \times 100$$

Characterization methods

Absorbance measurements were performed with a Shimadzu UV-VIS-NIR spectrophotometer. Malvern Zetasizer NanoZS was used to determine the hydrodynamic size and surface charge of nanoparticles. The inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometer (Agilent 7700X ICP-MS) was used to determine the iron content of nanoparticles. Samples were etched with nitric acid (65%) and sulphuric acid (96%) for the ICP-MS measurements. Nanoparticle internalization by planktonic cells and biofilms were determined by ICP-MS after cells/biofilms were washed with fresh phosphate buffered saline (PBS) and treated with acid as explained below.

Antimicrobial activity and antibiofilm assays

Bacterial isolates

Escherichia coli ATCC® 25922™, *Klebsiella pneumoniae* ATCC® 700831™, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC® 700829™ and *Staphylococcus epidermidis* ATCC® 35984™ were used in the experiments.

Antibacterial activity on planktonic bacteria

428 A single colony of bacteria from overnight cultures was inoculated in Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB,
429 BD™ Bacto™) and incubated overnight at 37°C-135 rpm. ICG, APTMS@SPION and ICG-
430 APTMS@SPION were added to cell suspension in a final concentration of 25 µg/ml ICG and
431 425 µg Fe/mL. TSB was added for control culture. Cultures were incubated at 37°C overnight.
432 Survival of bacteria was determined by colony counting after serial ten-fold dilutions. At least
433 2-log (99%) growth reduction in mean CFU/ml values was considered as significant inhibition.
434 All studies were performed in triplicate.

435 *Anti-biofilm activity*

436 Biofilms were produced in 96-well plates with a protocol described by Meritt et al. [49]. Then,
437 media were gently removed from wells and fresh TSB-glucose or ICG, APTMS@SPION and
438 ICG-APTMS@SPION were added into wells at 25 µg/ml ICG and 425 µg Fe/mL dose.
439 Following overnight incubation at 37 °C, survival of bacteria was determined by colony
440 counting as described above. At least 2-log growth reduction in mean CFU/ml values was
441 considered as significant inhibition. All studies were performed with three replicates.

442 **Laser irradiation protocol**

443 During laser irradiation experiments, 96-well plates were irradiated from the bottom of the
444 plates by using a fiber-coupled 808-nm diode laser which was operated up to an output power
445 of 1150 mW. The laser beam emerging from the fiber bundle (diameter=1550 µm) was imaged
446 with the help of two convex lenses (L1 and L2 in Figure 8 with focal lengths of f1=4 mm and
447 f2=50 mm) with an adjustable separation, so that the spot size can be matched with the diameter
448 of each well (7 mm). The irradiation fluence of the laser could be varied up to 3 W/cm². The
449 samples were kept inside a plexiglass box whose temperature was maintained at 37 °C with a
450 closed-loop heater. During laser irradiation experiments, the temperature rise of each well was

monitored with a thermal camera which was positioned above the plexiglass box. Since plexiglass is not transparent at infrared (IR) wavelengths (8-10 μm) radiated from an object at temperatures of 37 °C and above, a circular hole with a diameter of 64 mm was punched on the top panel of the plexiglass box to capture the IR signal with the camera. For the same reason, the polystyrene well-plate cover was replaced with a GaAs wafer which is transparent in this wavelength range. The IR transmission of the GaAs wafer was further taken into account to obtain calibrated temperature measurements.

Fig. 8 A schematic of the experimental setup which was used during the laser irradiation of bacteria

Laser treatment of bacteria

Both planktonic bacteria and biofilms grown in well-plates were irradiated with a near infrared laser (808 nm) with 1150 mW output power for 10 minutes from the bottom of the plates. Following the laser treatment, planktonic cells and biofilms were incubated at 37 °C for 24 hours and survival of both planktonic and biofilm cells was evaluated by using the same protocol as described above.

467 ***Intracellular ROS detection***

468 Bacterial biofilms were produced as described above, treated with APTMS@SPION, ICG,
469 ICG-APTMS@SPION for 24 hours, separately, and exposed to 808 nm laser with 1150 mW of
470 power for 10 minutes. Non-treated biofilms were used as control. Hundred microliters of
471 bacterial biofilms were scraped and homogenized in 100 µl PBS. All homogenized samples
472 were incubated with 1 µl 200-X ROS orange dye for 1 hour at 37 °C (Cellular ROS Assay kit
473 (orange), ab186028). ROS was measured by flow cytometry (BD, Accuri C6). ROS levels were
474 normalized with unstained biofilms and data were presented in percentage (%).

475 ***Confocal microscopy and SEM imaging***

476 Biofilms were formed on 12-mm glass slides with the biofilm protocol mentioned above. For
477 confocal microscopy, biofilms were fixed with 3.5% formaldehyde and mounted with DAPI
478 (Mounting Medium with DAPI - Aqueous, Fluoroshield (ab104139)). Images were taken with
479 a Leica DMI8 SP8 CS/DLS Microscope at 63X magnification. The excitation and emission
480 wavelengths were 782 nm and 800 nm.

481 For SEM imaging, biofilms were fixed with 2.5% glutaraldehyde and followed by gradual
482 alcohol dehydration. Samples were covered with gold for 15 seconds after being exposed to
483 vacuum. Images were taken by Zeiss Evo LS15 Microscope at 2000 and 10000X magnification.

484 ***Quantification of nanoparticle uptake***

485 Internalization of nanoparticles was determined by a quantitative method based on the Fe
486 content measured by ICP-MS. Planktonic cell cultures were treated with APTMS@SPION and
487 ICG-APTMS@SPION with above mentioned protocol. In order to remove free nanoparticles,
488 bacterial suspensions were centrifuged and washed with 1X PBS. All liquid media were

removed by gentle heating. Following the heating step, 1 ml of H₂SO₄:HNO₃ (1:9) mixture was added to flasks and flasks were kept for 1 week for digestion.

Biofilms with APTMS@SPION and ICG-APTMS@SPION were prepared in sterile polystyrene 6-well plates and after overnight incubation, biofilms were washed with 1X PBS and then transferred to 10 ml flasks after scraping for 20 seconds. Once transferred to flasks, protocol used for planktonic culture was adopted to prepare ICP samples. All samples were prepared as five replicates. Non-treated bacteria were included as control group.

Statistical analysis

For statistical analysis, one-way ANOVA test was used by Graphpad Prism Software (Graphpad Prism8). Free ICG and ICG-APTMS@SPION were compared with APTMS@SPION in terms of bacterial growth reduction and growth reduction was considered as statistically significant if $p < 0.05$.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

No animals, human participants, human data, or human tissues were used in this study.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supporting information file.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Financial support from TUBITAK (Project no. 118S547) is gratefully acknowledged.

515

516 **Author contributions**

517 AS, FC and HYA conceived and designed the study, supervised the experimental work and
518 edited the manuscript. KB synthesized and characterized the nanoparticles, contributed to the
519 conception of the idea. NA and ÖD performed bacteria experiments. AM and IB performed
520 laser experiments. AM and AS designed the laser system for the study. All authors contributed
521 to experimental design and data analysis. KB, NA, ÖD, AM, IB wrote the manuscript. All
522 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

523

524 **Acknowledgements**

525 The authors would like to thank Dr. Barış Yağcı (KUYTAM, Koç University Surface Science
526 and Technology Center), Dr. Berna Morova (KUTTAM, Koç University Research Center for
527 Translational Medicine) and Nesligül Yüksel Şentürk (KUTTAM, Koç University Research
528 Center for Translational Medicine) for their help in various measurements and for recording
529 microscope images.

530

531 **References**

- 532 1. Chatterjee A, Modarai M, Naylor NR, Boyd SE, Atun R, Barlow J, Holmes AH,
533 Johnson A, Robotham JV: Quantifying drivers of antibiotic resistance in humans: a
534 systematic review. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2018, 18:e368-e378.
- 535 2. Atac N, Kurt-Azap O, Dolapci I, Yesilkaya A, Ergonul O, Gonen M, Can F: The role
536 of AcrAB–tolC efflux pumps on quinolone resistance of *E. coli* ST131. *Current*
537 *microbiology* 2018, 75:1661-1666.
- 538 3. Isler B, Keske Ş, Aksoy M, Azap ÖK, Yilmaz M, Yavuz SŞ, Aygün G, Tigen E,
539 Akalın H, Azap A: Antibiotic overconsumption and resistance in Turkey. *Clinical*
540 *Microbiology and Infection* 2019, 25:651-653.
- 541 4. Lee JY, Monk IR, da Silva AG, Seemann T, Chua KY, Kearns A, Hill R, Woodford
542 N, Bartels MD, Strommenger B: Global spread of three multidrug-resistant lineages of
543 *Staphylococcus epidermidis*. *Nature microbiology* 2018, 3:1175-1185.
- 544 5. Buford VR, Kumar V, Kennedy BR: Relationship of various infection control
545 interventions to the prevalence of multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* among
546 US hospitals. *American journal of infection control* 2016, 44:381-386.
- 547 6. Flemming H, Wingender J: The biofilm matrix. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8: 623–633. 2010.

- 548 7. Iredell J, Brown J, Tagg K: Antibiotic resistance in Enterobacteriaceae: mechanisms
549 and clinical implications. *Bmj* 2016, 352:h6420.
- 550 8. Agostinis P, Berg K, Cengel KA, Foster TH, Girotti AW, Gollnick SO, Hahn SM,
551 Hamblin MR, Juzeniene A, Kessel D: Photodynamic therapy of cancer: an update.
552 *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* 2011, 61:250-281.
- 553 9. Dolmans DE, Fukumura D, Jain RK: Photodynamic therapy for cancer. *Nature*
554 *reviews cancer* 2003, 3:380-387.
- 555 10. Jaque D, Maestro LM, Del Rosal B, Haro-Gonzalez P, Benayas A, Plaza J, Rodriguez
556 EM, Sole JG: Nanoparticles for photothermal therapies. *nanoscale* 2014, 6:9494-9530.
- 557 11. Tedesco AC, Primo FL, de Jesus PdCC: Antimicrobial Photodynamic Therapy
558 (APDT) Action Based on Nanostructured Photosensitizers. In *Multifunctional*
559 *Systems for Combined Delivery, Biosensing and Diagnostics*. Elsevier; 2017: 9-29
- 560 12. Hamblin MR: Antimicrobial photodynamic inactivation: a bright new technique to kill
561 resistant microbes. *Current opinion in microbiology* 2016, 33:67-73.
- 562 13. Pérez-Laguna V, Pérez-Artiaga L, Lampaya-Pérez V, García-Luque I, Ballesta S,
563 Nonell S, Paz-Cristobal MP, Gilaberte Y, Rezusta A: Bactericidal effect of
564 photodynamic therapy, alone or in combination with mupirocin or linezolid, on
565 *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Frontiers in microbiology* 2017, 8:1002.
- 566 14. De Melo WC, Avci P, De Oliveira MN, Gupta A, Vecchio D, Sadasivam M, Chandran
567 R, Huang Y-Y, Yin R, Perussi LR: Photodynamic inactivation of biofilm: taking a
568 lightly colored approach to stubborn infection. *Expert review of anti-infective therapy*
569 2013, 11:669-693.
- 570 15. Hu X, Huang Y-Y, Wang Y, Wang X, Hamblin MR: Antimicrobial photodynamic
571 therapy to control clinically relevant biofilm infections. *Frontiers in microbiology*
572 2018, 9:1299.
- 573 16. Li W, Geng X, Liu D, Li Z: Near-Infrared Light-Enhanced Protease-Conjugated Gold
574 Nanorods As A Photothermal Antimicrobial Agent For Elimination Of Exotoxin And
575 Biofilms. *International Journal of Nanomedicine* 2019, 14:8047.
- 576 17. Castillo-Martínez JC, Martínez-Castañón GA, Martínez-Gutierrez F, Zavala-Alonso
577 NV, Patiño-Marín N, Niño-Martinez N, Zaragoza-Magaña V, Cabral-Romero C:
578 Antibacterial and antibiofilm activities of the photothermal therapy using gold
579 nanorods against seven different bacterial strains. *Journal of Nanomaterials* 2015,
580 2015.
- 581 18. Xu J-W, Yao K, Xu Z-K: Nanomaterials with a photothermal effect for antibacterial
582 activities: an overview. *Nanoscale* 2019, 11:8680-8691.
- 583 19. Al-Bakri AG, Mahmoud NN: Photothermal-induced antibacterial activity of gold
584 nanorods loaded into polymeric hydrogel against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* biofilm.
585 *Molecules* 2019, 24:2661.
- 586 20. Ibelli T, Templeton S, Levi-Polyachenko N: Progress on utilizing hyperthermia for
587 mitigating bacterial infections. *International Journal of Hyperthermia* 2018, 34:144-
588 156.
- 589 21. Chen B, Sun Y, Zhang J, Chen R, Zhong X, Wu X, Zheng L, Zhao J: In vitro
590 Evaluation of Photodynamic Effects Against Biofilms of Dermatophytes Involved in
591 Onychomycosis. *Frontiers in microbiology* 2019, 10.

- 592 22. Malicka J, Gryczynski I, Geddes CD, Lakowicz JR: Metal-enhanced emission from
593 indocyanine green: a new approach to in vivo imaging. *Journal of biomedical optics*
594 2003, 8:472.
- 595 23. Maarek J-MI, Holschneider DP, Harimoto J: Fluorescence of indocyanine green in
596 blood: intensity dependence on concentration and stabilization with sodium
597 polyaspartate. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology* 2001, 65:157-
598 164.
- 599 24. Li Z, Yao S, Xu J: Indocyanine-green-assisted near-infrared dental imaging-the
600 feasibility of in vivo imaging and the optimization of imaging conditions. *Scientific*
601 *reports* 2019, 9:1-8.
- 602 25. An F, Yang Z, Zheng M, Mei T, Deng G, Guo P, Li Y, Sheng R: Rationally assembled
603 albumin/indocyanine green nanocomplex for enhanced tumor imaging to guide
604 photothermal therapy. *Journal of nanobiotechnology* 2020, 18:1-11.
- 605 26. Saxena V, Sadoqi M, Shao J: Degradation kinetics of indocyanine green in aqueous
606 solution. *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences* 2003, 92:2090-2097.
- 607 27. Kirchherr A-K, Briel A, Mäder K: Stabilization of indocyanine green by encapsulation
608 within micellar systems. *Molecular pharmaceutics* 2009, 6:480-491.
- 609 28. Saxena V, Sadoqi M, Shao J: Enhanced photo-stability, thermal-stability and aqueous-
610 stability of indocyanine green in polymeric nanoparticulate systems. *Journal of*
611 *Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology* 2004, 74:29-38.
- 612 29. Li W, Zhang H, Guo X, Wang Z, Kong F, Luo L, Li Q, Zhu C, Yang J, Lou Y: Gold
613 nanospheres-stabilized indocyanine green as a synchronous photodynamic-
614 photothermal therapy platform that inhibits tumor growth and metastasis. *ACS applied*
615 *materials & interfaces* 2017, 9:3354-3367.
- 616 30. Xue P, Yang R, Sun L, Li Q, Zhang L, Xu Z, Kang Y: Indocyanine green-conjugated
617 magnetic prussian blue nanoparticles for synchronous photothermal/photodynamic
618 tumor therapy. *Nano-micro letters* 2018, 10:74.
- 619 31. Lee N, Hyeon T: Designed synthesis of uniformly sized iron oxide nanoparticles for
620 efficient magnetic resonance imaging contrast agents. *Chemical Society Reviews*
621 2012, 41:2575-2589.
- 622 32. Zhang J, Rana S, Srivastava R, Misra R: On the chemical synthesis and drug delivery
623 response of folate receptor-activated, polyethylene glycol-functionalized magnetite
624 nanoparticles. *Acta Biomaterialia* 2008, 4:40-48.
- 625 33. Sun C, Lee JS, Zhang M: Magnetic nanoparticles in MR imaging and drug delivery.
626 *Advanced drug delivery reviews* 2008, 60:1252-1265.
- 627 34. Zhou Z, Sun Y, Shen J, Wei J, Yu C, Kong B, Liu W, Yang H, Yang S, Wang W:
628 Iron/iron oxide core/shell nanoparticles for magnetic targeting MRI and near-infrared
629 photothermal therapy. *Biomaterials* 2014, 35:7470-7478.
- 630 35. Chu M, Shao Y, Peng J, Dai X, Li H, Wu Q, Shi D: Near-infrared laser light mediated
631 cancer therapy by photothermal effect of Fe₃O₄ magnetic nanoparticles. *Biomaterials*
632 2013, 34:4078-4088.
- 633 36. Bilici K, Muti A, Sennaroğlu A, Acar HY: Indocyanine green loaded APTMS coated
634 SPIONs for dual phototherapy of cancer. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology*
635 *B: Biology* 2019, 201:111648.

- 636 37. Niemirowicz K, Surel U, Wilczewska AZ, Mystkowska J, Pikel E, Gu X, Namiot Z,
637 Kułakowska A, Savage PB, Bucki R: Bactericidal activity and biocompatibility of
638 ceragenin-coated magnetic nanoparticles. *Journal of nanobiotechnology* 2015, 13:32.
- 639 38. Armijo LM, Wawrzyniec SJ, Kopciuch M, Brandt YI, Rivera AC, Withers NJ, Cook
640 NC, Huber DL, Monson TC, Smyth HD: Antibacterial activity of iron oxide, iron
641 nitride, and tobramycin conjugated nanoparticles against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*
642 biofilms. *Journal of Nanobiotechnology* 2020, 18:1-27.
- 643 39. Arakha M, Pal S, Samantarrai D, Panigrahi TK, Mallick BC, Pramanik K, Mallick B,
644 Jha S: Antimicrobial activity of iron oxide nanoparticle upon modulation of
645 nanoparticle-bacteria interface. *Scientific reports* 2015, 5:14813.
- 646 40. Liu B, Li C, Chen G, Liu B, Deng X, Wei Y, Xia J, Xing B, Ma Pa, Lin J: Synthesis
647 and optimization of MoS₂@ Fe₃O₄-ICG/Pt (IV) nanoflowers for MR/IR/PA
648 bioimaging and combined PTT/PDT/chemotherapy triggered by 808 nm laser.
649 *Advanced Science* 2017, 4:1600540.
- 650 41. Jian W-H, Yu T-W, Chen C-J, Huang W-C, Chiu H-C, Chiang W-H: Indocyanine
651 green-encapsulated hybrid polymeric nanomicelles for photothermal cancer therapy.
652 *Langmuir* 2015, 31:6202-6210.
- 653 42. Valenzuela-Valderrama M, González IA, Palavecino CE: Photodynamic treatment for
654 multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacteria: perspectives for the treatment of
655 *Klebsiella pneumoniae* infections. *Photodiagnosis and photodynamic therapy* 2019.
- 656 43. Beltes C, Sakkas H, Economides N, Papadopoulou C: Antimicrobial photodynamic
657 therapy using Indocyanine green and near-infrared diode laser in reducing
658 *Enterococcus faecalis*. *Photodiagnosis and photodynamic therapy* 2017, 17:5-8.
- 659 44. Qing G, Zhao X, Gong N, Chen J, Li X, Gan Y, Wang Y, Zhang Z, Zhang Y, Guo W:
660 Thermo-responsive triple-function nanotransporter for efficient chemo-photothermal
661 therapy of multidrug-resistant bacterial infection. *Nature communications* 2019, 10:1-
662 12.
- 663 45. Topaloglu N, Gulsoy M, Yuksel S: Antimicrobial photodynamic therapy of resistant
664 bacterial strains by indocyanine green and 809-nm diode laser. *Photomedicine and*
665 *laser surgery* 2013, 31:155-162.
- 666 46. Omar GS, Wilson M, Nair SP: Lethal photosensitization of wound-associated
667 microbes using indocyanine green and near-infrared light. *BMC microbiology* 2008,
668 8:111.
- 669 47. Jijie R, Dumych T, Chengnan L, Bouckaert J, Turcheniuk K, Hage C-H, Heliot L,
670 Cudennec B, Dumitrascu N, Boukherroub R: Particle-based photodynamic therapy
671 based on indocyanine green modified plasmonic nanostructures for inactivation of a
672 Crohn's disease-associated *Escherichia coli* strain. *Journal of Materials Chemistry B*
673 2016, 4:2598-2605.
- 674 48. Niemirowicz K, Swiecicka I, Wilczewska AZ, Markiewicz KH, Surel U, Kułakowska
675 A, Namiot Z, Szynaka B, Bucki R, Car H: Growth arrest and rapid capture of select
676 pathogens following magnetic nanoparticle treatment. *Colloids and Surfaces B:*
677 *Biointerfaces* 2015, 131:29-38.
- 678 49. Merritt J, Kadouri D, O'Toole G: Current protocols in microbiology. Growing and
679 Analyzing Static Biofilms John Wiley & Sons 2005.

680

681