Modeling and Analyzing Hydrodynamic and Physicochemical



Effects in Bacterial Deposition on Surfaces

Bharat Govil, Matan Haller and Michael Sprintson Mentors: M.Sc candidate Roi Bar-On, Assoc. Prof. Viatcheslav Freger Faculty of Chemical Engineering





Introduction

When bacteria flow through a fluid medium such as water, it tends to accumulate on any available surfaces. In most cases, bacterial deposition on surfaces inflicts damage and causes rapid degradation. This problem is present on ship hulls, measuring instruments, medical devices etc., and is known as biofouling.

Understanding physical the phenomena leading bacterial to deposition is necessary in order to biofouling. offset Current models describe mathematical bacterial deposition inside a parallelplate flow chamber (PPFC) (Fig.1), an engineering instrument used for particles and bacteria deposition analysis. However, these models have insufficient accuracy. Smoluchowski-The benchmark Levich (S-L) approximation shows decreasing flux of bacteria with distance from inlet (Fig. 2a), in total contradiction to the experimental results of Li et al. 2012 (Fig. 2b) [2].



Sliding Velocity – A Novel Mechanism

 \succ The novelty of this research can be a mechanism called sliding velocity i.e. the drift of bacteria along the channel surface, which we believe is responsible for bacterial increment in flux and density along the channel [3]. > In order to get the bacterial density along the channel's surface, the following continuity equation must be coupled to Eq. (1):

$$\frac{\partial \rho(x,t)}{\partial t} = J(x,t,y=0), \tag{5}$$

 \blacktriangleright Adding the mean sliding velocity \bar{v}_{slide} to Eq. (5) will result in:

$$\frac{\rho(x,t)}{\partial t} + \bar{v}_{slide} \frac{\partial \rho(x,t)}{\partial x} = J(x,t,y=0), \quad (6)$$

 \blacktriangleright A typical sliding velocity value of $6.67 \cdot 10^{-8} \frac{m}{2}$ was used in this simulation.

Research Goals

Present Model

We assume a fully developed Poiseuille flow in the channel (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3: A 2D cut-plane of the PPFC with a parabolic velocity profile [1]. The general mass-conservation partial differential equation (PDE) solved in the $\mathcal{I}_{\frac{\partial U}{\partial t}} = -\nabla \cdot J = -\nabla \cdot \left[-D\nabla C + \frac{DC}{k} F + UC \right]$ model is: ∂C (1)

Our goals in this research are to:

- Refine a mathematical model and obtain reliable simulation results describing the deposition of bacteria on the top and bottom plates of a PPFC by adding the bacterial sliding velocity as a parameter.
- Solve the model numerically using COMSOL Multiphysics software.
- Compare our model to present experimental results (Li et al. 2012).

Results and Conclusions

- Solving Eq. (1) numerically for the bottom plate in COMSOL gives the flux as a function of both time and distance from the inlet (Fig. 5). The model was solved for different values of K_{dep} (Fig. 6).
- > Incorporating Eq. (6) in the model yields the numerical solution for bacterial density along the channel's bottom plate for different time periods (Fig. 7).
- \succ It can be clearly seen in Figs. 5, 6 and 7 that the bacterial flux and density increase with distance from inlet, time and K_{dep} .
- \succ The resultant trends match those of Li et al. 2012.
- \succ From this simulation we saw that the accumulation term from Eq. (1)



In order to solve the PDE, boundary conditions must be set on the channel walls. Those conditions are given by:

$$J_{y=0,H} = K_{dep} [C_s - C(y=0)] r,$$
(4)

Where r is the unit vector normal to the wall, C_s is the solution concentration in equilibrium with the surface (taken to be 0), and K_{dep} is the fitting kinetic parameter which describes interactions between the bacteria and the wall [1].

contributes the same effect as sliding velocity does in the stationary model.

> Future researches may also consider adhesion forces, non-laminar flow etc.



distance from inlet for different time and K_{dep} values.

Fig. 5: Bacterial flux on the PPFCs bottom plate as a function of time and distance from inlet.

tlseci

*inlet mmj

 $s \cdot m^2$



Fig. 7: Bacterial density vs. distance from inlet for different time values.

Acknowledgements

- > We would like to thank M.Sc candidate Roi Bar-On and Assoc. Prof. Viatcheslav Freger for hosting and guiding us through our research in his laboratory.
- > We would also like to thank the foundations and donors for their generous support of the SciTech Program.



[1] Eli Margalit, Alexander Leshansky & Viatcheslav Freger (2013) Modeling and analysis of hydrodynamic and physico-chemical [3] Li J, Busscher HJ, van der Mei HC, Norde W, Krom BP, Sjollema J. 2011. Analysis of the contribution of sedimentation to bacterial

effects in bacterial deposition on surfaces, Biofouling, 29:8, 977-989, DOI: 10.1080/08927014.2013.823483

[2] Li J, Busscher HJ, Norde W, Sjollema J. 2011. Analysis of the contribution of sedimentation to bacterial mass transport in a

parallel plate flow chamber. Colloids Surf, B. 84:76–81. Fitridge, I., Dempster, T., Guenther, J., & de Nys, R. (2012). The impact

and control of biofouling in marine aquaculture: a review. Biofouling, 28(7), 649–69.

mass transport in a parallel plate flow chamber: part II: use of fluorescence imaging. Colloids Surf, B. 87:427–432.