
***Haemophilus influenzae* survival and biofilm formation in a complex physical, chemical and multi-species environment**

Alexandra Tikhomirova

(B.Sc. (Biomedical Science) Hons.)

*A thesis submitted in the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Adelaide*

(May, 2016)

*Discipline of Microbiology and Immunology
Faculty of Science*

School of Biological Sciences

The University of Adelaide

Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Declaration	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Abstract	ix
List of publications	xi
Lis of Abbreviations	xii
List of Figures	xiv
List of Tables	xix

Chapter 1	Background and Introduction	2
1.1.1	<i>H. influenzae</i> exists in a complex multi-species environment	3
1.1.2	Co-existence within the multi-species biofilm as a mode of bacterial persistence	6
1.1.3	The NTHi and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> multi-species biofilm: The basis for the chronicity of OM	9
1.1.4	The <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> biofilm lifestyle	10
1.1.5	Mutual protection and stability in the multi-species biofilm	13
1.1.6	Biocide production : an antagonistic interactions, or for the greater common good?	14
1.1.7	Competition for nutrients, attachment space and optimal conditions	15
1.1.8	Exploiting the host immune system to out-compete a competitor	17
1.1.9	The EPS matrix and inter-species interactions	18
1.1.10	Molecular factors of the communication: intra/inter-species interplay	19
1.1.11	<i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> working together to avoid the host immune response	23
1.1.12	The multi-species biofilm and future therapeutic approaches	24
1.2	Aims of this Thesis	26

Chapter 2 Materials and Methods 27

2.1	Bacterial strains used	28
2.2.	Growth media used for bacterial growth and biofilm formation assays throughout experimental procedures	31
2.3	Bacterial growth and storage conditions	32
2.4	<i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation screening assay	32
2.5	Batch culture growth assay : Determining bacterial planktonic and biofilm cell numbers by CFU/ml	33
2.6	Biofilm formation assays in the presence of DNaseI	34
2.7	Screening the <i>H. influenzae</i> isolates for the presence of <i>pilA</i>	34
2.8	Chromosomal inactivation of <i>nikQ</i> and <i>gloA</i> from 86-028NP	35
2.9	Cell aggregation assay	36
2.10	Metal content in <i>H. influenzae</i> strains	37
2.11	Determination of the surface charge: zeta potential	37
2.12	Urease assays	38
2.13	Twitching motility assays	39
2.14	Strains used for co-culture assays	39
2.15	Construction of a <i>blpY</i> gene knock-out strain in <i>S. pneumoniae</i> D39	39
2.16	Pre-culture conditions used for co-culture assays	40
2.17	Co-culture growth analysis in batch culture	41
2.18	Co-culture growth in the flow cell system	42
2.19	Statistical analysis	43
2.20	RNA extraction	43
2.21	Transcriptomics analysis	44
2.22	Scanning electron microscopy	45

Chapter 3 Biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* is determined by a combination of strain-specific factors and environmental conditions **46**

3.1	Introduction	47
3.1.1	The role of environmental stress in <i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation	47
3.1.2	The role of the EPS matrix in the biofilm formation of <i>H. influenzae</i>	49
3.1.3	The role of nickel in <i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation	50
3.2	Results	52
3.2.1	Biofilm formation is strain-dependent and related to the growth medium utilised	52
3.2.2	The presence of formaldehyde stress can enhance or reduce biofilm formation in a strain and growth medium-dependent manner	56
3.2.3	The presence of H ₂ O ₂ stress can enhance or reduce biofilm formation in a strain and growth medium dependent manner	60
3.2.4	The presence of methylglyoxal can enhance or reduce biofilm formation in a strain and growth medium dependent manner	64
3.2.5	<i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation is dependent on eDNA	68
3.2.6	The genetics of type IV pili in <i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation	71
3.2.7	The role of nickel transport in <i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation	73
3.3	Discussion	88

Chapter 4 The strain specificity of *H. influenzae* biofilm formation and survival in co-culture is related to subtle genetic and transcriptomics differences pertaining to the strain's adaptation to environmental conditions
100

4.1	Introduction	101
4.2	Results	102
4.2.1	The growth of different strains of <i>H. influenzae</i> with changing pH	102
4.2.2	The formation of biofilm by <i>H. influenzae</i> as a consequence of changing pH	103

4.2.3	Transcriptional analyses of Eagan and R3264 under different pH	105
4.2.4	Strain variation does not significantly alter the ability of <i>H. influenzae</i> to survive in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> at pH 7.4	112
4.2.5	Strain variation displays differences in the ability of <i>H. influenzae</i> isolates to survive in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> at pH 8.6	114
4.2.6	The <i>nikQ</i> gene is required for the ability of <i>H. influenzae</i> to survive in the presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i>	119
4.3.	Discussion	121
 Chapter 5 The outcome of <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> inter-species interactions depends on pH, nutrient availability and growth phase		127
5.1	Introduction	128
5.2	Results and Discussion	131
5.2.1	<i>H. influenzae</i> survival in co-culture depends on growth phase	131
5.2.2	<i>H. influenzae</i> survival in co-culture depends on pH	134
5.2.3	<i>H. influenzae</i> survival in co-culture does not depend on H ₂ O ₂	140
5.2.4	<i>H. influenzae</i> survival in co-culture does not depend on a soluble secreted factor	142
5.2.5	There are transcriptomic changes in <i>H. influenzae</i> in co-culture compared to mono-culture at pH 8.0	144
5.2.6	At pH 7.4 in co-culture, <i>H. influenzae</i> enters a non-culturable state and alters its gene expression compared to mono-culture	148
5.2.7	<i>S. pneumoniae</i> alters its transcriptional profile at pH 7.4 in co-culture	151
5.2.8	<i>H. influenzae</i> displays phenotypic changes in co-culture at pH 8.0 and 7.4	156
5.2.9	<i>H. influenzae</i> survives in co-culture in a flow cell system	158
5.2.10	There are changes in the cell morphology of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> and <i>H. influenzae</i> in the flow cell system	160
5.2.11	In the flow cell, <i>H. influenzae</i> alters its gene expression in mono-culture and in co-culture	165

5.2.12	In the flow cell, <i>S. pneumoniae</i> alters its transcriptome in mono-culture and in co-culture	171
5.3	Concluding remarks	181

Chapter 6 Nutrient source and growth dynamics determine the *S. pneumoniae* cell phenotype and the outcome of its interactions with *H. influenzae*

183

6.1.1	Abstract	184
6.1.2	Importance	185
6.1.3	Introduction	185
6.2	Results	188
6.2.1	<i>S. pneumoniae</i> is unable to survive when grown in continuous culture in CDM with glucose in mono-culture, but develops distinct temporal and phenotypic states when in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i>	188
6.2.2	<i>S. pneumoniae</i> is unable to survive when grown in continuous culture in CDM with lactose in mono-culture, but after 288 h forms phenotypically distinct variants in co-culture	195
6.2.3	<i>S. pneumoniae</i> SCVs have an improved ability to survive in a flow cell with glucose in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i> , and are able to grow in mono-culture	200
6.2.4	In a CDM with glucose environment, <i>H. influenzae</i> alters its transcriptome in the presence of wild-type <i>S. pneumoniae</i> , but does not undergo transcriptional changes in the presence of persister and SCV <i>S. pneumoniae</i>	204
6.2.5	The presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> causes subtle time-dependent transcriptomics events to occur in <i>H. influenzae</i> in a flow cell, in a CDM with glucose environment	206
6.2.6	The presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> causes subtle nutrient-dependent transcriptomics events to occur in <i>H. influenzae</i> in a flow cell, in a CDM with glucose environment	219
6.2.7	There are time-dependent transcriptomics events occurring in <i>S. pneumoniae</i> during continuous culture in CDM with glucose	236
6.2.8	Specific transcriptomics changes pertaining to media nutrient composition in <i>S. pneumoniae</i>	248
6.2.9	Co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> SCVs does not restore <i>H. influenzae</i> culturability in	

a HI media batch model	249
6.2.10 <i>S. pneumoniae</i> growth in batch co-culture in CDM with lactose media does not affect <i>H. influenzae</i> culturability, but results in a reduction of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> culturability	250
6.2.11 <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 has a reduced culturability in co-culture, but enhances <i>H. influenzae</i> culturability in co-culture, in CDM with glucose medium batch culture	252
6.2.12 Transcriptomics changes in <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> in the CDM+glucose flow cell - Summary	253
6.3 Discussion	254
Chapter 7 Discussion and Conclusions	265
7.1 The <i>H. influenzae</i> biofilm formation is a complex response to environmental factors	266
7.2 There are subtle transcriptomics and genetic elements affecting <i>H. influenzae</i> adaptation to environmental conditions	268
7.3 The outcome of <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> inter-species interactions depends on pH, nutrient availability and growth phase	270
7.4 Nutrient source and growth dynamics determine the <i>S. pneumoniae</i> cell phenotype, and outcome of its interactions with <i>H. influenzae</i>	273
7.5 Conclusions	276
Chapter 8	281
Appendix 1	281
Appendix 2	287
List of References	293

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to **Alexandra Tikhomirova** and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Alexandra Tikhomirova,

Adelaide, May, 2016.

Acknowledgements

Most importantly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Stephen Kidd, for his support throughout the past 4 years, for his inspirational and creative approach to science, his advice and guidance, and consistent confidence, both in me, and in a project which seemed so difficult to accomplish. I would like to also thank him also for introducing me to the world of microbiology, and being a life-long inspiration in this area.

Secondly, I would like to thank my co-supervisor Prof. James Paton for his assistance, with the project – a contribution without which it could not be accomplished.

I would also like to thank Dr. Peter Zilm for his help with assembling and manufacturing the flow cell apparatus, and for his timely advice related to methodologies and practical approaches to technical issues.

I am also very grateful to Long Bui, for being a great friend in the lab and always helping out when problems arose, to Donald Jiang, for helping out in the beginning stages of the project, and to all the past lab members for their assistance, company and friendship: Nadiah Ishak, Gregory Sequeira, Tamara Alhamami, and DeeKang Ren.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all research officers in James Paton's Lab, Renato's Lab and Chris's Lab: firstly to Dr. Claudia Trappetti for her enormous help in the most difficult times, and to Dr. Lauren McAllister for her vast knowledge and help with the most difficult aspects of bioinformatics and the many technical issues arising in this, as well as Dr. Adam Potter, Dr. David Ogunniyi, Dr. Layla Mahdi, Dr. Richard Harvey, Dr. Alistair Standish, Dr. Elizabeth Tran, Dr. Miranda Ween and my lab friends Pratiti Nath, Mabel Lum, Min Teh, Broke Herdman, Zarina Amin, and Victoria Lewis who were always very nice to work alongside and willing to share their experiences.

I would also like to acknowledge the Channel 7 Children's Research Foundation for providing extensive support, which made it possible to expand this project and perform deeper investigations than would otherwise have been possible.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family, my friends and those closest to me, for always being there.

Abstract

H. influenzae is an opportunistic human pathogen capable of occupying a range of niches in the respiratory tract. Both during health and disease processes, *H. influenzae* must adapt to the conditions present in the microniches it encounters and correspondingly alter its lifestyle in the presence of non-optimal conditions. The niches encountered by *H. influenzae* in the human host include the presence of chemical stress such as ROS and RCS compounds, as well as a diverse range of pH conditions ranging from pH 7-9, and the presence of other members of the microflora, such as *Streptococcus pneumoniae*.

In this thesis, we have identified that there are strain-specific components related to the adaptation of *H. influenzae* to specific conditions. We have identified that different *H. influenzae* isolates employ different mechanisms to adapt to the presence of diverse, and often stress-inducing conditions. One adaptation mechanisms employed by *H. influenzae* is the adoption of a sessile biofilm lifestyle. We have shown that there is a strain-specific response of *H. influenzae* isolates in their biofilm formation to the presence of different nutrient conditions, and to the presence of ROS and RCS such as formaldehyde, methylglyoxal and H₂O₂. We have also shown that in different nutrient conditions, there is a different requirement for eDNA in the EPS matrix of individual strains.

In addition, we have identified a role of the nickel import system *nikKLMQO-nimR* of *H. influenzae* in its biofilm formation. We have shown that when this system is absent, or when *H. influenzae* is in a nickel limited environment, the *H. influenzae* cells display an increased biofilm formation. This biofilm formation response was accompanied by a global transcriptomics response, which displayed global changes in metabolic pathways.

Further to these findings, we have shown that there are strain-specific differences in *H. influenzae* adaptation to different pH conditions. These differences were expressed both as differences in biofilm formation, and differences on the transcriptomics level.

Another significant finding was that the pH played an important role in the inter-species interactions of *H. influenzae* and *S. pneumoniae*. In a batch culture system in stationary phase at a lower initial pH of 7.4, *S. pneumoniae* was able to convert *H. influenzae* into a VBNC

state. However, *H. influenzae* was able to survive in a culturable state in co-culture in log phase, or when a higher initial pH was used. We have also shown that in co-culture, there were significant transcriptomics changes both in *H. influenzae* and *S. pneumoniae*, including an induction of stress response genes in *H. influenzae*, and a down-regulation of sugar utilisation genes in *S. pneumoniae*.

Importantly, we have shown that in a continuous flow cell system, *H. influenzae* and *S. pneumoniae* exist in a different lifestyle and different transcriptomics profile than in a batch culture system, both in mono- and co-culture. In this system, the 2 species were able to co-exist without the reduction in culturability in either of the species. We have also shown that the transcriptomic profile in co-culture in a flow cell system is different to what was observed in the batch system, with one of the major findings being the up-regulation of sugar utilisation genes in *S. pneumoniae*, suggesting the potential metabolic relationship between *H. influenzae* and *S. pneumoniae*.

We have investigated this finding further, and have indeed demonstrated that nutrient availability and carbon source impact the *H. influenzae*/*S. pneumoniae* interactions. In a flow cell system containing a nutrient-limited CDM media with glucose, *H. influenzae* was able to survive equally in mono- and co-culture. However, *S. pneumoniae* was unable to grow in mono-culture, and in co-culture displayed 3 phenotypes: a wild-type phenotype at 24 h, an undetectable state until 336 h, and a small colony variant state at 336 h. *S. pneumoniae* did not significantly impact the *H. influenzae* transcriptome in co-culture in either the undetected or SCV state, but did subtly modify the *H. influenzae* transcriptome upon transition to different time-points of growth, or different nutrient conditions. We have also preliminarily identified transcriptomic changes in *S. pneumoniae* at 64 h and 336 h, which correspond to a persister-cell like state observed in other bacterial species.

Overall, we have identified that environmental factors significantly impact the ability of *H. influenzae* to survive and to adopt lifestyles pertaining to these environments, in a strain-specific manner. We have shown that these adaptations are often accompanied by global transcriptomics changes. We have also identified that the inter-species interactions between *H. influenzae* and *S. pneumoniae* are highly complex and their outcome depends on a multitude of environmental conditions.

List of Publications

The work presented in this thesis has contributed to a range of publications listed below.

- **Tikhomirova A**, Kidd SP. The outcome of *Haemophilus influenzae* and *Streptococcus pneumoniae* inter-species interactions depends on pH, nutrient availability and growth phase. *International Journal of Medical Microbiology*. *In Press*.
- **Tikhomirova A**, Jiang D, Kidd SP. A new insight into the intracellular nickel levels for the stress response, surface properties and twitching motility by *Haemophilus influenzae*. 2015. *Metallomics*. 8:650-61.
- Ishak N, **Tikhomirova A**, Bent SJ, Ehrlich GD, Hu FZ, Kidd SP. There is a specific response to pH by isolates of *Haemophilus influenzae* and this has a direct influence on biofilm formation. 2014. *BMC Microbiology*. 14:47
- **Tikhomirova A**, Kidd SP. *Haemophilus influenzae* and *Streptococcus pneumoniae*: living together in a biofilm. 2013. *Pathogens and Disease*. 69:114-26

List of Abbreviations

CDM	chemically defined medium
CFU	colony forming unit
COM	chronic otitis media
COPD	chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
CV	crystal violet
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid
eDNA	extracellular DNA
EPS	extracellular polymeric substance matrix
h	hour(s)
HI	heart infusion
H ₂ O ₂	hydrogen peroxide
LB	Luria-Bertani
LOS	lipooligosaccharide
min	minute(s)
ml; µl	milliliter; microlitre
mRNA	messenger RNA
NET	neutrophil extracellular trap
NTHi	non-typeable <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i>
OD	optical density
OM	otitis media
PCR	polymerase chain reaction
RCS	Reactive Carbonyl Species

RNA	ribonucleic acid
ROS	Reactive Oxygen Species
RNASeq	RNA sequencing
rpm	revolutions per minute
SCVs	small colony variants
SEM	scanning electron microscopy
Tfp	type IV (four) pili
VBNC	viable but non-culturable
v/v	volume/volume
WT	wild-type
w/v	weight/volume

List of Figures

Chapter 1

- Fig 1.1 The expected stages of *Haemophilus influenzae* and *Streptococcus pneumoniae* multi-species biofilm development 5

Chapter 3

- Fig. 3.1. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* is strain-dependent in CDM 53
- Fig. 3.2. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* is strain-dependent in HI media 54
- Fig. 3.3. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* strains in CDM is induced or repressed by formaldehyde in a strain-specific manner 57
- Fig. 3.4. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* is induced or repressed by formaldehyde in a strain dependent manner in HI media 58
- Fig. 3.5. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* in CDM is induced or repressed by H₂O₂ in a strain-dependent manner 61
- Fig. 3.6. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* in HI media is induced or repressed by the presence of H₂O₂ in a strain-dependent manner 62
- Fig. 3.7. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* strains in CDM is induced or repressed by methylglyoxal in a strain-dependent manner 65
- Fig. 3.8. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* does not appear to be significantly induced or repressed by methylglyoxal in HI media 66
- Fig. 3.9. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* in HI media is reduced by the presence of DNaseI in a strain-dependent manner 69
- Fig. 3.10. The biofilm formation of *H. influenzae* in CDM media is reduced by the presence of DNaseI in a strain-dependent manner 70

Fig. 3.11. <i>H. influenzae</i> isolates possess the <i>pilA-pilB</i> gene segment encoding the type IV pilus major subunit	72
Fig. 3.12. <i>H. influenzae</i> isolates 1181, 1207, 1231, and NP do not possess the <i>pilA-pilB</i> gene segment encoding the type IV pilus major subunit	72
Fig. 3.13. A growth defect in the <i>H. influenzae</i> 86-028NP <i>nikQ</i> mutant strain can be specifically restored by nickel	79
Fig. 3.14. <i>H. influenzae</i> 86-028NP <i>nikQ</i> cells are more negatively charged than their wild-type counterparts	81
Fig. 3.15. The <i>H. influenzae</i> 86-028NP <i>nikQ</i> strain displays an enhanced cell-cell aggregation phenotype	82
Fig. 3.16. The intracellular nickel in <i>H. influenzae</i> 86-028NP is linked to the cell's biofilm formation	83
Fig. 3.17. The <i>H. influenzae</i> 86-028NP strain imports nickel for urease activity and other functions in stress response	84
Fig. 3.18. <i>H. influenzae</i> motility is influenced by nickel concentrations	86
Chapter 4	
Fig. 4.1. The effect of pH on the A) growth and B) biofilm formed by <i>H. influenzae</i> isolates Eagan and R3264	104
Fig. 4.2. An overview of RNASeq results for <i>H. influenzae</i> strains Eagan and R3264 grown at pH 6.8 and 8.0.	105
Fig. 4.3. The pathway uniquely induced in <i>H. influenzae</i> Eagan at pH 8.0	108
Fig. 4.4. <i>H. influenzae</i> strains Rd KW20, 86028NP, Eagan and R3264 are all non-culturable in the presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> (at pH 7.4)	113
Fig. 4.5. <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 has comparable growth in mono-culture and in the presence of <i>H. influenzae</i> strain Rd KW20, 86-028NP, Eagan and R3264 (at pH 7.4)	114
Fig. 4.6. <i>H. influenzae</i> strain Rd KW20, 86-028NP, R3264, Eagan have equal abilities to survive in the presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> , while strains BS139 and BS171 display lower levels of growth and greater adaptation to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> co-culture (at pH 8.6)	115
Fig. 4.7. <i>H. influenzae</i> strains RdKW20, 86-028NP, R3264, Eagan and BS171 are reduced in their ability to form biofilm in the presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> , while the biofilm forming ability of BS139 remains unaffected (at pH 8.6)	117
Fig. 4.8. The planktonic growth and biofilm formation is not significantly different for	

<i>S. pneumoniae</i> growth in mono-culture or in co-culture with various <i>H. influenzae</i> isolates at pH 8.6	118
Fig. 4.9. <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 <i>nikQ</i> - (<i>nik</i> -) is non-culturable in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> at pH 7.4 and 8.0	120
Chapter 5	
Fig. 5.1. Planktonic growth of <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> D39	131
Fig. 5.2. <i>H. influenzae</i> is present in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> at 6 h, but not at 14 h	132
Fig. 5.3. <i>H. influenzae</i> clinical isolates 86-028NP and R3157 are not present in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> at 14 h	133
Fig. 5.4. <i>H. influenzae</i> can survive in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> at 14 h when there is an initial pH of 8.0	135
Fig. 5.5. The presence of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> causes the drop in pH of the <i>H. influenzae</i> / <i>S. pneumoniae</i> co-culture	136
Fig. 5.6. <i>H. influenzae</i> reduction in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> is not caused by intracellular components of lysed <i>S. pneumoniae</i> cells	138
Fig. 5.7. <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 can grow and survive in a range of pH conditions in mono-culture, retaining viability	139
Fig. 5.8. <i>H. influenzae</i> was not present in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> D39 <i>spxB</i> and <i>glpO</i> H ₂ O ₂ deficient mutants at 14 h of growth	141
Fig. 5.9. The presence of spent supernatants from <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20, <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 or their co-culture did not reduce <i>H. influenzae</i> culturability in mono-culture	143
Fig. 5.10. Deletion of the <i>blpY</i> gene in <i>S. pneumoniae</i> D39 does not alter the <i>H. influenzae</i> culturability in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i>	155
Fig. 5.11. Morphological changes occur in <i>H. influenzae</i> as a result of its existence in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> of in the flow cell environment	156
Fig. 5.12. Planktonic growth (CFU/ml) and end-point pH remain constant for both <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 in mono- and co-culture, when grown in a flow cell system	159
Fig. 5.13. Extracellular matrix formation and cell co-aggregation occurs in mono- and co-cultures of <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> in the flow cell system at various time-points; filamentation of <i>H. influenzae</i> occurs at various time-points in the flow cell system	161
Fig. 5.14. <i>H. influenzae</i> cell filamentation occurs in a flow cell system in mono- and co-culture	

at various time-points 163

Chapter 6

- Fig. 6.1. *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 adopts 3 distinct growth phenotypes in co-culture in a flow cell containing CDM+glucose media and does not affect *H. influenzae* culturability 189
- Fig. 6.2. SCV variants of *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 have a reduced size compared to wild-type *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 cells 190
- Fig. 6.3. Field emission scanning microscopy (SEM) of *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 mono-culture and *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 and *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 co-culture grown in the flow cell system containing CDM+glucose medium 191
- Fig. 6.4. Field emission scanning microscopy of *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 mono-culture and *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 and *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 co-culture grown in a flow cell system containing CDM+glucose 193
- Fig. 6.5. *S. pneumoniae* adopts 2 distinct phenotypes in co-culture in a flow cell containing CDM+lactose media, and does not affect *H. influenzae* culturability 195
- Fig. 6.6. Field emission scanning microscopy imaging of *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 mono-culture and *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 and *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 co-culture grown in the flow cell system containing CDM+lactose media 197
- Fig. 6.7. Field emission scanning microscopy of *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 mono-culture and *H. influenzae*/*S. pneumoniae* co-culture grown in the flow cell system containing CDM+lactose media 199
- Fig. 6.8. *S. pneumoniae* SCVs are culturable in co-culture in CDM+glucose media, and do not affect *H. influenzae* culturability 201
- Fig. 6.9. At 336 h *S. pneumoniae* SCVs become culturable in mono-culture in a flow cell containing CDM+glucose media, and remain culturable in co-culture 202
- Fig. 6.10. Field emission scanning microscopy imaging of *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 and *S. pneumoniae* SCV co-culture grown in a flow cell containing CDM+glucose media for 64 h 203
- Fig. 6.11. SCVs do not restore the *H. influenzae* culturability phenotype in batch culture 250
- Fig. 6.12. *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 is reduced in its culturability with *H. influenzae* Rd KW20 in batch culture containing CDM+lactose media, but does not affect *H. influenzae* culturability 251
- Fig. 6.13. *S. pneumoniae* strain 11 has a reduced culturability in co-culture but enhances *H. influenzae* culturability in co-culture in CDM+glucose medium batch culture 252

Fig. S6.1. A summary of up- and down-regulated genes in *H. influenzae* and *S. pneumoniae* in the CDM+glucose flow cell system presented in Tables 6.1-6.11. 253

Appendix 1

Fig. S1 Nickel limitation in the urease negative *H. influenzae* R2866 strain affects lifestyle 286

Appendix 2

Fig. S 2.1. Plantkonic growth of *H. influenzae* at pH 6.8 (A), 7.4 (B) and 8.0 (C) is comparable for 11 *H. influenzae* isolates. 288

Fig. S 2.2. The growth rates of *H. influenzae* strains under different pH 289

Fig. S2.3. Viable cell counts of different *H. influenzae* strains grown under pH 6.8, 7.4 and 8.0 290

Fig. S2.4. Scatter plots of \log_2 fold change against normalized counts for each of the genes identified from mRNAseq 291

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Table 1.1. The systems with an increased expression in the biofilm state compared to the planktonic state for <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> mono-species biofilms and in the co-culture biofilms where increased expression compared the expression of genes in the co-culture biofilms to the mono-species biofilms	8
--	---

Chapter 2

Table 2.1. Complete list of wild-type and modified <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strains used in this study, including information about capsular type, disease source and genetic modification of strains	28
--	----

Chapter 3

Table 3.1. Showing strains with high biofilm formation in CDM/HI media in the absence of stress, and the strain origins and capsular types of these strains	55
---	----

Table 3.2. Showing strains which increased or decreased biofilm formation in the presence of formaldehyde in CDM or HI media, and the capsular type and strain origin of these strains	59
--	----

Table 3.3. Showing strains which increased or decreased biofilm formation in the presence of H ₂ O ₂ in CDM or HI media, and the capsular type and strain origin of these strains	63
---	----

Table 3.4. Showing strains which increased or decreased biofilm formation in the	
--	--

presence of methylglyoxal in CDM or HI media, and the capsular type and strain origin of these strains	67
Table 3.5. Key genes differentially expressed in Rd KW20 <i>nikQ</i> - compared to Rd KW20	75
Table 3.6. Intracellular metal concentrations in <i>H. influenzae</i> 86-028NP compared to its <i>nikQ</i> mutant	78
Table 3.7. The electrophoretic mobility (EM) and subsequently calculated zeta potential for 86-028NP and the <i>nikQ</i> mutant grown in HI broth and HI broth with nickel added	80
Chapter 4	
Table 4.1. Genes differentially expressed in <i>H. influenzae</i> Eagan at pH 8.0 compared to pH 6.8	106
Table 4.2. Genes differentially expressed in <i>H. influenzae</i> R3264 at pH 8.0 compared to pH 6.8	110
Chapter 5	
Table 5.1. Up- and down-regulated <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 genes after growth in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at pH 8.0 in a batch culture model, compared to mono-culture growth in batch culture	145
Table 5.2. Up- and down-regulated <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 genes after growth in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at pH 7.4 in a batch culture model, compared to mono-culture growth at a pH of 7.4 in a batch culture model	149
Table 5.3. Up- and down-regulated <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 genes during growth in co-culture at pH 7.4 with <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 during batch culture growth compared to mono-culture growth at pH 7.4	151
Table 5.4. Up- and down-regulated <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 genes when grown in a flow cell in mono-culture at 64 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> grown in batch mono-culture at a pH of 7.4.	165
Table 5.5. Up- and down-regulated <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 genes when grown in a flow cell system in mono-culture at 168 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> grown in batch mono-culture at pH 7.4.	166
Table 5.6. Up- and down-regulated genes of <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 when grown in	

co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 in a flow cell system for 64 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> grown in mono-culture in a flow cell system for 64 h.	168
Table 5.7. Up- and down-regulated genes of <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 when grown in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 in a flow cell system for 168 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> grown in mono-culture in a flow cell system for 168 h.	169
Table 5.8. Up- and down-regulated genes of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 grown in mono-culture in a flow cell at 64 h compared to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> grown in mono-culture in batch culture at a pH of 7.4	171
Table 5.9. Up- and down-regulated genes of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 grown in mono-culture in a flow cell at 168 h compared to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> grown in mono-culture in batch culture at a pH of 7.4	175
Table 5.10. Up- and down-regulated <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 genes when grown in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i> in a flow cell at 64 h compared to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> grown in mono-culture in a flow cell at 64 h.	177
Table 5.11. Up- and down-regulated genes of <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 when grown in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i> in a flow cell system at 168 h compared to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> grown in mono-culture in a flow cell system at 168 h	179

Chapter 6

Table 6.1. Up- and down-regulated genes at 24 h in <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 in a CDM flow cell with glucose compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 in mono-culture, in CDM media flow cell with glucose	205
Table 6.2. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 in mono-culture in a CDM with glucose flow cell at 64 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 in mono-culture in a CDM with glucose flow cell at 24 h.	207
Table 6.3. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 in co-culture at 64 h in a flow cell with CDM media with glucose compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 in co-culture at 24 h in a flow cell with CDM media with glucose	210
Table 6.4. Up- and down- regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 at 336 h in mono-culture in a flow cell system in CDM media with glucose, compared to	

<i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 in mono-culture in a flow cell system with CDM media with glucose at 24 h	212
Table 6.5. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 in a CDM with glucose flow cell in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at 336 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at 24 h in a CDM with glucose flow cell.	216
Table 6.6. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 grown in a flow cell with CDM with glucose medium in mono-culture at 64 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 grown in a flow cell with HI medium in mono-culture at 64 h.	220
Table 6.7. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 when grown in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> in a flow cell with CDM with glucose media for 64 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> RdKW20 grown in co-culture with <i>S. pneumoniae</i> in a flow cell with in HI media for 64 h	223
Table 6.8. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 when grown in mono-culture in a flow cell with CDM with glucose for 336 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 grown in a flow cell with HI media in mono-culture for 164 h	227
Table 6.9. Up- and down- regulated genes in <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 when grown in a flow cell with CDM with glucose in co-culture for 336 h compared to <i>H. influenzae</i> Rd KW20 grown in a flow cell with HI media in co-culture for 164 h	232
Table 6.10. Up- and down-regulated genes in <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at 64 h (in the undetected state) in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i> in a CDM with glucose flow cell compared to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at 24 h (wild-type) in co-culture in a CDM with glucose flow cell	237
Table 6.11. Up- and down- regulated genes in <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 at 336 h in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i> in a flow cell with CDM with glucose (SCV phenotype), compared to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> strain 11 in co-culture with <i>H. influenzae</i> in a flow cell system with CDM with glucose at 24 h (wild-type phenotype)	243

Appendix 1

Table S1. The complete list of genes differentially expressed in Rd KW20 *nikQ*

compared to Rd KW20 listed in order of the values of the fold change 282

Appendix 2

Table S2.1. Growth rates of *H. influenzae* isolates grown at different pH values 292