

Saprophytic, Symbiotic and Parasitic Bacteria: Importance to Environment, Biotechnological Applications and Biocontrol

Francis Soares Gomes¹, Emmanuel Viana Pontual¹, Luana Cassandra Breitenbach Barroso Coelho¹, and Patrícia Maria Guedes Paiva^{1*}

¹ Departamento de Bioquímica, Centro de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Avenida Moraes Rego, S/N, Cidade Universitária, Recife-PE, 50670-420, Brazil.

ABSTRACT

Microbial communities have a vast importance to the ecosystem being of use by humans for health or industrial purposes. Most bacteria can be distinguished into three groups: saprophytic; symbiotic and parasitic. Saprophytic bacteria, which are the major decomposers of organic matter, can be applied in treatment of metalliferous mine, radioactive environmental wastes, biodiesel production, among others. Symbiotic bacteria live in a mutually beneficial association with other organisms providing essential nutrients to their host organisms. However, some bacteria are able to cause diseases (i.e, parasitic bacteria also referred to as pathogens). To control the growth of these parasitic bacteria, antimicrobial peptides and polypeptides such as lectins are promising raw materials for the production of new antibiotics. Lectins are able to interact with carbohydrates in bacterial cell walls and promote antibacterial activity. The aim of this review was to describe the importance of bacteria to environments, their use as biological control agents and the application of lectins to control pathogenic bacteria.

Keywords: environmental, bacteria, saprophytic, symbiotic, parasitic, biocontrol, lectins


1. INTRODUCTION

Bacteria are single-celled microorganisms classified as prokaryotes. There are over 3.6 billion years bacteria are present on Earth, colonizing almost every possible occurrence of life. This long co-evolution enabled bacteria to develop several beneficial relationships with the environment since they form part of this system. The number of bacterial species that have been described is low (~7,000) in relation to the millions of bacteria that have been predicted to reside on Earth [1].

Microbial communities have vast importance to the ecosystem. They are important components of the forest ecosystem since they facilitate organic matter decomposition and nutrient cycling in the soil [2]. Free-living bacteria are of importance in agriculture as they abound in the rhizosphere (i.e, the region around the root) and have more than one mechanism of accomplishing increased plant growth, such as the production of enzymes, bioactive factors, antibiotics, metabolites as well as growth promoters [3].

Bacteria in terms of their morphology are classified as bacilli (rods), cocci (spherical), spiral and many others (Figure 1). The bacillus is rod-shaped and found as isolated bacilli, diplobacilli or streptobacilli. A coccus is circular and can be isolated as diplococcus, tetracoccus, sarcina micrococcus, streptococcus or staphylococcus. Other bacterial shapes

38 of low occurrence include spirillum (*Treponema pallidum*), vibrio (*Vibrio cholerae*),
 39 transitional forms such as coccobacillus and involution forms, a survival mechanism to
 40 adverse environmental conditions such as spores [4].
 41



42 **Fig. 1: Types and shapes of bacteria (cyanobacteria, cocci, bacilli, spiral). Source:**
 43 **photo courtesy of Dr. Rosiely Felix Bezerra.**
 44
 45

46 Most bacteria are unable to manufacture their own organic food and hence, are dependent
 47 on external sources (i.e., are heterotrophic). These bacteria can be distinguished into three
 48 groups: 1) saprophytic; 2) symbiotic and 3) parasitic. Many bacteria that are associated with
 49 plants are actually saprophytic and do not harm the plant itself. However, a small number,
 50 around 100 species can cause plant diseases and thereby promoting losses in agriculture
 51 [5].

52 Microorganisms may be beneficial to human microbiota, complex infective bacteria that
 53 inhabit sites in and on the human body such as gut, skin, and oral cavity. Special situations
 54 as in patients whose normal innate defenses fail to function properly can lead to an
 55 imbalance of an individual species that are pathogens in the classical sense such as
 56 *Enterobacter sp.*, *Escherichia coli* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, among others [6].

57 The control of bacteria grown is a way to avoid ecosystem imbalance and disease caused by
 58 some of these microorganisms. However, massive use of antibiotics for this purpose has led
 59 to bacterial resistance, generated by selection processes including increase in the frequency
 60 of resistance bacterial genes [7]. As an alternative, antimicrobial polypeptides such as lectins
 61 have been isolated and characterized from tissues and organisms from every kingdom and
 62 phylum [8]. The complete understanding of mechanisms of action from new alternatives to
 63 biological control may provide models and strategies for developing novel antimicrobial
 64 agents that may also increase immunity, restore potency or amplify the mechanisms of
 65 conventional antibiotics, and minimize antimicrobial resistance mechanisms among
 66 pathogens.
 67

1. Saprophytic bacteria

The saprophytic bacteria are the major decomposers of organic matter (Figure 2), breaking down complex mixtures such as cellulose, hemicelluloses, lignin and proteins into simple soluble forms (catabolic reactions) and freeing their atoms to be re-used by other bioprocesses (anabolic reactions) [9]. The biological relevance of saprophytic bacteria to the environment has been used in several biotechnological applications. The ability of some acidophilic bacteria to withstand raised concentrations of certain metals through biological oxi-reduction reactions has been applied in a variety of industrial fields such as treatment of metalliferous mine wastes, acid mine waters and sulphurous flue gases [10, 11]. The Matsuo Mine in Japan applied this biological treatment system using *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans* to treat 28m³/min of mine water at pH 2.5 oxidising more than 95 % of soluble ferrous iron [10]. Microbial systems can detoxify the metal ions by either extracellular biomineralization, biosorption, complexation, precipitation or intracellular bioaccumulation. The cell wall reductive enzymes or soluble secreted enzymes can be involved in the reductive process of metal ions by bacteria [11].

Some environmental factors such as availability of iron, sulphide and a micro-aerobic environment are important for proliferation of the magnetotactic bacteria such as *Magnetospirillum magneticum*. Magnetic minerals produced by these bacteria such as greigite and biogenic magnetite form a post-depositional remnant magnetization that is indicative of rapid local environmental change [12]. Archeologists to establish the chronology and environmental history of a place use these biomarkers. Linford. [12] discovered bacterial magnetosomes at the village of Yarranton (Oxford, UK) suggesting a transformation of the previously dry river valley to an active flood plain.

Radiation-resistant microorganisms have been used in the treatment of highly radioactive environmental wastes due to their ability to transform, detoxify, or immobilize a variety of metallic and organic pollutants [13, 14] and used for decontamination of acid mine drainage waters through anaerobic degradation [15]. The techniques traditionally applied for the treatment of radioactive environmental residuals have been based on chemical methods of neutralization and precipitation [13-15]. These quick and effective techniques have several disadvantages, such as the need for building additional plant treatments, the high cost of the chemical reagents used and the generation of an important volume of sludges that need to be relocated [15].

Some bacteria, when subjected to any form of environmental stress, produce a signal transduction cascade in which certain promoters are induced, leading to expression of proteins that adjust to the ecological impact of altering the environment [16, 17]. Bioluminescent bacteria have being used as tools to detect some special compounds that are toxic and/or are of current interests as inorganic and organic pollutants of water, soil and air, as well as to monitor the level of toxicity of the effluents from industries into urban wastewaters, effluents from plant treatments, and water [16, 17]. Recombinant bioluminescent bacterial strains are increasingly receiving attention as environmental biosensors due to their advantages, such as high sensitivity and selectivity, low costs, ease of use and short measurement times. Exposure of a recombinant *E. coli* strain, containing a fusion of a promoter to the *Vibrio fischeri lux* genes (Ecolum-5), to a toxic or lethal condition (DNA, superoxide or protein/membrane damage) results in a decrease in bioluminescence [16]. The toxicity of benzene in air was determined using the Ecolum-5 [17].

Biodiesel production is been stimulated because of search for renewable fuels. The transesterification of vegetable oils or animal fats, with ethanol or methanol generates glycerol as the main byproduct. With the increasing production of biodiesel, glycerol is becoming of great environmental and economical concern due to its toxicity to aquatic organisms [18]; fermentation processes of this byproduct can result in value-added products, such as 1,3-propanediol (1,3-PD) and ethanol. The 1, 3-PD has many applications in polymers, cosmetics, foods, adhesives, lubricants, laminates, solvents, antifreeze, and in

medicine; ethanol could be used in the esterification of biodiesel. Several bacterial strains have been isolated and characterized for their ability to convert this raw glycerol into 1, 3-propanediol (1, 3-PD) and ethanol [19, 20]. Rossi. [21] showed that a *Klebsiella pneumoniae* strain was able to simultaneously produce up to 9.4 g/L of 1,3-PD with yields of 0.41 mol product mol⁻¹ glycerol and 6.1 g/L of ethanol with yields of 0.14 mol product mol⁻¹ glycerol.

2. Symbiotic bacteria

Symbiotic bacteria live in a mutually beneficial association with other organisms. Such bacteria derive the essential nutrients (proteins, carbohydrates and lipids) from their host organisms and in return, help the host through some of their biological activities. Plant growth-promoting bacteria can positively provide the plant with compounds which are synthesized by the bacteria or by facilitating the uptake of nutrients from the environment by the plant [22, 23]. Nitrogen-fixing bacteria of *Rhizobium* genus can fix atmospheric nitrogen and supply it to plants (Figure 2). Most of biological nitrogen fixation (80%) is carried out by diazotrophic bacteria, such as the *Rhizobium* genus, in symbiosis with legumes. Moreover, some bacteria which are free-living in soil (e.g., cyanobacteria, *Pseudomonas*, *Azospirillum*, and *Azotobacter*) may fix significant amounts of nitrogen [22].




Figure 2: Importance of saprophytic and symbiotic bacteria to the nitrogen cycle.
Source: authors.

Other bacteria can synthesize many compounds with positive effect on plants such as siderophores, chelating agents which has more affinity to metals than plant siderophores and can solubilize and sequester iron from the soil providing it to plant cells; antibiotics, which antagonize phytopathogenic fungi and pathogenic bacteria; phytohormones, including

147 auxins and cytokinins, enhancing various stages of plant growth; and enzymes that can
148 modulate plant growth and development [23, 24, 25].
149 Bacteria may be beneficial when they go into association with other organisms (plants and
150 animals) in the removal of contaminants from the environment, a process called
151 bioremediation [26]. Glick. [23] reported that the symbiotic association of the bacterium
152 *Enterobacter cloacae* in the roots of the plant *Brassica campestris* led to an increase in the
153 number of seeds that germinated and the amount of biomass that the plant was able to
154 attain due to reduction in the level of ethylene, an inhibitor of root elongation. Furthermore,
155 the bacterium synthesized antibiotics which inhibited the proliferation and invasion of
156 phytopathogens.
157 Additionally, bacteria can remove from the environment many potentially toxic compounds
158 like metals, organic compounds (such as petroleum hydrocarbons and pesticides), inorganic
159 compounds (such as compounds of arsenate, sodium, nitrate, ammonia or phosphate) as
160 well as radioactive compounds of uranium, cesium or strontium [23]. The bacterium *Kluyvera*
161 *ascorbata* protects *B. campestris* against high levels of nickel in the soil, which produce
162 siderophores [27].
163 A group of bacteria called microbial flora (Figure 3) are able to affect beneficially the host
164 animal with contributions to nutrition, health and development. Microbial flora can secrete
165 vitamins; participate in the synthesis of proteins and nucleic acids; and act in the digestion of
166 carbohydrates. The genera present in the intestinal tract (probiotic bacteria) generally seem
167 to be those from the environment or the diet. Furthermore, microbial flora prevent
168 colonization by pathogens by competing for attachment sites or for essential nutrients in the
169 oral cavity, intestine, skin, and vaginal epithelium. Probiotics in aquaculture of genus
170 *Lactobacillus* can prevent pathogens proliferating in the intestinal tract, on the superficial
171 structures, or in the water [28].
172




Fig. 3: Benefits of human microbiote. Source: authors.

Probiotics can be used as biological control agents of other bacteria and fungi [29, 30]. This function has been reported with lactic acid bacteria (*Lactobacillus* and *Pediococcus* genus) as biocontrol agents against the phytopathogenic and spoilage bacteria and fungi [31]. A bacterial strain (*Alteromonas haloplanktis*) isolated from the gonads of Chilean scallop displayed *in vitro* inhibitory activity against the pathogens *V. ordalii*, *V. parahaemolyticus*, *V. anguillarum*, *V. alginolyticus*, and *Aeromonas hydrophila* [32]. The exact modes of action of the probiotics are not well understood, but it is suggested that microbial populations may release chemical substances such as antibiotics, lysozymes, proteases, hydrogen peroxide and organic acids that have a bactericidal or bacteriostatic effects on other microbial populations. Rouse [33] reported that the lactic acid bacteria *Pediococcus pentosaceus* produced antifungal peptides (not completely characterized), with potential applications in the food industry to prevent fungal spoilage of food. Other modes of action are by competition for nutrients as iron or adhesion sites on gut or other tissue surfaces, or by enhancement of the immune systems of animals against infections by viruses, bacteria, fungi, and parasites [29].

Some bacteria may play an important role in the control of harmful algae blooms. Bacteria such as *Pedobacter* spp can act on many species of microalgae of red tide plankton such as, for example, *Microcystis aeruginosa* [34]. Further studies will provide new insights into its role in water environment with prospects to use these algicidal bacteria as microbial pesticides.

Bacteria of microflora from mollusks such as bivalve are important in the digestive process, metabolism and metamorphosis [35]. Bacteria in the aquatic environment are used as food by adults and larvae of bivalve, providing nitrogen and carbon and recycling organic and mineral matter released by these aquatic organisms. Furthermore, marine bacteria, such as

200 cyanobacteria, excrete various substances, including amino acids, carbohydrates, and
201 vitamin B₁₂. Prieur. [36] isolated cellulolytic bacteria from the digestive tract of the bivalve
202 *Teredo navalis* that had the ability to degrade mannose and galactose. Belkin. [37] showed
203 that certain bacteria can associate with the gill tissues of a mussel in deep ocean -
204 *Bathymodiolus thermophilus* and help to fix CO₂ and thus aid autotrophic metabolism.
205 Bivalve bacteria that live in sulphide-enriched habitats are important in the degradation of the
206 organic matter through anaerobic metabolism [36].
207 Among the environmental factors that induce or influence metamorphosis of many marine
208 invertebrates, the occurrence of bacterial films and organic particles trapped within the films
209 could also be used as food by larvae ready to metamorphose. Alternatively, bacteria living in
210 the biofilms could synthesize certain compounds such as low and high molecular weight
211 polysaccharides, low molecular weight peptides and neurotransmitters, diffusible into the
212 environment, which could induce metamorphosis. Water-soluble chemical compounds
213 produced by the biofilms of two bacterial strains *Macrococcus* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. induced
214 larval settlement of the green-lipped mussel, *Perna canaliculus* [38].
215

216 4. Parasitic bacteria

217
218 Parasitic bacteria occur in the body of animals and plants and obtain their organic food or
219 release poisonous secretions called toxins. Many of these toxins act specifically on some
220 organisms. Thus, the majority of bacterial pathogens are highly specialized for a limited
221 number of eukaryotic host organisms. Plant pathogenic bacteria (Figure 4) are responsible
222 for some of the most devastating losses of major agricultural crops and vital fruit trees, at a
223 cost price of millions of dollars annually [39]. *Ralstonia solanacearum* is a soil borne
224 bacterium, capable of inducing disease on more than 250 plant species by invading their
225 roots, colonizing the xylem vessels and causing a lethal wilting known as bacterial wilt
226 disease [40]. Seeds of cashew, cocoa, coffee, pumpkin and tomato are protected from this
227 bacterial phytopathogen because they produce oligo- and poly-saccharides that block the
228 pathogen lectins from binding to xylem cell wall glycans [41].
229
230




Fig. 4. Diseases caused by phytopathogenic bacteria. Bacterial canker of grapevine caused by *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *viticola* (A); blotch of melon caused by *Acidovorax citrulli*, showing reddish-brown lesions on leaves (B); rooting of *Brassica pekinensis* by *Pectobacterium carotovorum* subsp. *carotovorum* (C); tomato wilt disease caused by *Ralstonia solanacearum*, showing colonization of xylem vessels (D). **Source: photo courtesy of Prof. Dr. Elineide Barbosa de Souza, from the Laboratório de Fitobacteriologia, Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Recife.**

Bacterial canker is another disease caused by a phytopathogen that has negative economic impact. Bacterial canker of grapevine caused by *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *viticola* can manifest in various parts of the plant. In leaves, the symptoms are small, dark and angular leaf spots that may coalesce and dry up, causing necrotic areas and leaf blight. Cankers were often observed on petioles, stems and rachis and were also observed in grapes [42]. Blackleg, a major bacterial disease of potato, is caused by bacterial organism - *Pectobacterium carotovorum* subsp. *carotovorum*. This bacterium can cause rotting of potato tubers (soft rot) during storage. Control of potato blackleg is hampered by the absence of effective tools and strategies and by the dispersing ability of the bacterium, being spread via surface and rain water, by aerosols and also, by insects [43].

Acidovorax citrulli is the bacterial causal agent of bacterial fruit blotch, a devastating disease of melon (*Cucumis melo*) and other plants from the same family. Its destructive potential stems from the fact that, under favorable conditions to bacterial growth, infection spreads rapidly throughout the field [44]. Symptoms of bacterial fruit blotch including water-soaking

and coalescing reddish-brown lesions on cotyledons and reddish-brown lesions on leaves that developed along the venation [45].

Among pathogenic bacteria to humans, there is *Staphylococcus aureus*, which is a coccus (spherical) microorganism usually with irregular distribution in clusters like bunches of grapes that is responsible for many infections in humans such as endocarditis, acute hematogenous osteomyelitis, meningitis or pulmonary infection. *E. coli*, which is a rod-shaped (a bacillus) organism, is part of the normal flora but can opportunistically cause diseases (such as urinary tract infection, diarrhea, meningitis and septicemia). *P. aeruginosa*, a mobile aerobic bacillus organism widely distributed in nature, is found in small groups of normal intestinal flora and on human skin. *P. aeruginosa* rarely causes disease in a healthy immune system, but in individuals with compromised immune systems, this bacterium infects the respiratory tract, urinary tract, burns, and also causes other blood infections [4].

5. Antibacterial lectins

Antimicrobial peptides and polypeptides are promising candidates for use as raw materials for producing new antibiotics. The carbohydrate recognizing proteins known as lectins are noteworthy since they are able to interact with carbohydrates on bacterial cellular walls [46-48]. Lectins can agglutinate cells and precipitate polysaccharides, glycoproteins or glycolipids, without structural modifications [49]. The presence of lectins in a sample can be evaluated in a microtiter plate through incubation with erythrocytes. The linkage between lectins and glycoconjugates from erythrocyte surface maintains the cells agglutinated and suspended in solution.

Gomes. [50] isolated an antimicrobial chitin-binding-lectin from the leaves of the medicinal plant *Schinus terebinthifolius*. The authors reported that this lectin showed antibacterial activity against *E. coli* (MIC, minimal inhibitory concentration, of 28.5 µg/ml; MBC, minimal bactericidal concentration, of 115 µg/ml), *K. pneumoniae* (MIC of 3.59 µg/ml; MBC of 115 µg/ml), *Proteus mirabilis* (MIC of 3.59 µg/ml; MBC of 14.37 µg/ml), *P. aeruginosa* (MIC of 1.79 µg/ml; MBC of 14.37 µg/ml), *Salmonella enteritidis* (MIC of 0.45 µg/ml; MBC of 115 µg/ml), and *S. aureus* (MIC of 1.79 µg/ml; MBC of 7.18 µg/ml).

Lectins can also promote agglutination of bacterial cells [47]. Figure 5 shows the agglutination of *S. aureus* promoted by *S. terebinthifolius* leaf lectin (SteLL) in assay tubes. The agglutination occurs through linkage between the carbohydrate binding sites of lectin and glycoconjugates from bacterial surface as schematized in Figure 5A. The bacterial agglutination was inhibited in the presence of the carbohydrate inhibitor of SteLL (N-acetylglucosamine) as shown in Figure 5B. The inhibition of bacterial agglutination by lectins after incubation with free carbohydrates or glycoconjugates ensures that the binding of lectins to bacteria involves the carbohydrate-binding sites.




Fig. 5: (A) Agglutination of *Staphylococcus aureus* by incubation with the *Schinus terebinthifolius* leaf lectin (SteLL). (B) Inhibition of agglutination in the presence of the carbohydrate inhibitor of SteLL (N-acetyl-glucosamine). The circles show schematizations of the phenomena occurring in the assay tubes. Source: authors

Oliveira. [51] isolated an antibacterial lectin from *Eugenia uniflora* seeds (EuniSL), which inhibited the growth of *S. aureus*, *P. aeruginosa* and *Klebsiella* spp with MIC of 1.5 µg/ml. Additionally, EuniSL also inhibited the growth of *Bacillus subtilis*, *Streptococcus* spp and *E. coli*, although less efficiently (MIC of 16.5 µg/ml). The authors also showed that EuniSL was able to agglutinate *S. aureus*, *Streptococcus* spp, *Klebsiella* spp and *P. aeruginosa*.

MuHL, a chitin-binding-lectin isolated from *Myracrodruon urundeuva* heartwood, was able to inhibit the growth and agglutinate the gram-positive bacterium *S. aureus* (MIC of 0.58 µg/ml; MAC, minimal agglutinating concentration, of 2.34 µg/ml), *Enterococcus* (*Streptococcus*) *faecalis* (MIC of 2.34 µg/ml; MAC of 4.68), *B. subtilis* (MIC of 2.34 µg/ml; MAC of 4.68 µg/ml), and *Corynebacterium callunae* (MIC of 1.17 µg/ml; MAC of 4.68 µg/ml), as well as the gram-negative bacteria *E. coli* (MIC of 9.37 µg/ml; MAC of 9.37 µg/ml), *K. pneumoniae* (MIC of 9.37 µg/ml; MAC of 9.37 µg/ml) and *P. aeruginosa* (MIC of 4.68 µg/ml; MAC of 9.37 µg/ml) [52]. *M. urundeuva* heartwood is very resistant to the deteriorative biological agents and the authors pointed out that antibacterial activity of MuHL may be involved in this resistance.

A lectin isolated from the leaf of *Phthirusa pyrifolia* also showed antibacterial potentials being active against gram-positive bacteria such as *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, *Enterococcus* (*Streptococcus*) *faecalis* and *B. subtilis* and the gram-negative bacterium, *K. pneumoniae* with the MIC values ranging from 250 µg/ml to >2000 µg/ml [53]. WSMoL, a water-soluble lectin purified from seeds of *Moringa oleifera*, reduced the growth of *S. aureus* and *E. coli* and was also active against ambient lake water bacteria [54].

Antimicrobial lectins have also been isolated from animals. Nunes. [55] purified a lectin from *Bothrops leucurus* snake venom, which inhibited the growth of the gram-positive bacteria *S. aureus*, *E. faecalis* and *B. subtilis* with MIC of 31.25, 62.25 and 125 µg/ml, respectively. Table 1 lists antibacterial lectins and species against which they are active.

Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of lectins.

Lectins	Sources	Antibacterial activities
Lectins from plants		
EuniSL	Seeds of <i>E. uniflora</i>	<i>S. aureus</i> , <i>P. aeruginosa</i> and <i>Klebsiella</i> sp

MuHL	Heartwood of <i>M. urundeuva</i>	<i>S. aureus</i> , <i>E. faecalis</i> , <i>B. subtilis</i> , <i>C. callunae</i> , <i>E. coli</i> , <i>K. pneumoniae</i> and <i>P. aeruginosa</i>
PpyLL	Leaves of <i>P. pyrifolia</i>	<i>S. epidermidis</i> , <i>E. faecalis</i> , <i>B. subtilis</i> and <i>K. pneumonia</i>
WSMoL	Seeds of <i>M. oleifera</i>	<i>S. aureus</i> , <i>E. coli</i> and bacteria from ambient lake water
SteLL	Leaves of <i>S. terebinthifolius</i>	<i>E. coli</i> , <i>K. pneumonia</i> , <i>P. mirabilis</i> , <i>P. aeruginosa</i> , <i>S. enteritidis</i> and <i>S. aureus</i>

Lectin from animal

BIL	<i>B. leucurus</i> snake venom	<i>S. aureus</i> , <i>E. faecalis</i> and <i>B. subtilis</i>
-----	--------------------------------	--

References: [50-52, 54, 55].

Moura. [56] overviewed the processes involved in biofilm formation and in biocorrosion of pipes used for oil transportation, which occurs due to fixation of bacteria that release metabolites and form biofilms thus inducing or accelerating corrosion. The authors highlighted five groups of bacteria (EPS-producing bacteria, acid-producing bacteria, sulfur-oxidizing bacteria, iron-precipitating bacteria and sulfate-reducing bacteria) as promoters of biocorrosion. In addition, authors pointed out the use of biocides, protective coatings (antifouling) and corrosion inhibitors as the main methods applied by industries to prevent corrosive bacteria from spreading. It was then suggested that plant compounds, including lectins should be used for controlling biocorrosion.

6. Bacteria as biological control agents

Pesticides are used to control organisms that are considered harmful [57]. However, the main problem with the use of chemical pesticides is the development of resistance, resulting in reduced efficiency of the product and increased environmental risk. Pesticides are one of the causes of water pollution, and some pesticides are persistent organic pollutants which contribute to soil contamination [58].

Bacteria have been studied as safer and more eco-friendly alternatives for the control of postharvest decays caused by fungi. The bacteria used for this purpose usually act as antagonistic microorganisms probably through competition for nutrients and space as well as by production of antibiotics, direct parasitism, and possibly induced resistance in the harvested commodity. *B. subtilis* has been used as an antagonist for phytopathogenic fungi that attack fruits [59].

Investigations carried out by Yoshiyama and Kimura [60] showed that seven bacterial strains belonging to *Bacillus* genus, isolated from the digestive tract of the Japanese honeybee (*Apis cerana japonica*), inhibited the development of the gram-positive bacterium *Paenibacillus larvae*, the causal agent of American foulbrood. This disease is contagious and affects the larval and pupal stages of honeybees. The authors suggested that these *Bacillus* strains can be used for control of this disease by acting as antagonists of *P. larvae*. An alternative is the use of *Bacillus thuringiensis*, a bacterium that produces toxins with hemolytic and cytolytic activities. This versatile pathogen is capable of infecting protozoans, nematodes, flatworms, mites and insects [61]. *B. thuringiensis* is characterized by the production of crystals composed of proteins known as deltaendotoxins that are toxic to insect pests [62].

B. thuringiensis (Bt), before 1976, was used exclusively for the control of insect pests in agriculture. The discovery of a pathogenic strain against Diptera, called Bt israelensis (Bti) initiated the use of this bacterium in the control of the vector disease.

Insects such as *Aedes aegypti* (of the Culicidae family) - vector of dengue and yellow fever- and *Simulium* spp. (of Simuliidae family), transmitters of filariasis, are included in the Diptera order. The use of bacteria for biological control of insect larvae from Culicidae and Simuliidae family has been highlighted by having more kinds of formulation (granules, powder or liquid), genetic stability, not toxic to humans, besides being more advantageous considering social and environmental costs of using non-selective insecticides in aquatic ecosystems [63].

A strategy used in Brazil as part of the National Program of Dengue Control is the biological control with *Bacillus thuringiensis* serovar *israelensis* (Bti). The endotoxin Cry1AC, produced during Bti sporulation, is digested by enzymes of larvae midgut releasing larvicidal toxins; tablet containing spore and crystals (15%, w/w) of *B. thuringiensis* was able to cause 100 % mortality of larvae and was suggested for use in programs to control dengue vector [64]. Cry1AC has an *N*-acetylgalactosamine-specific lectin domain that binds glycoconjugates at insect midgut [65, 66]. Another example of larvicidal protein produced by bacterial strains is that from *Bacillus sphaericus*, which was lethal to the 3rd instar larvae of *Culex pipiens*, the vector of the West Nile fever and the Rift Valley fever [67].

7. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this review was to re-evaluate the biological importance of bacteria to the environments, how they are used as biological control agents and the importance of lectins in controlling pathogenic bacteria that affect animals (including humans) and plants. Moreover, this review re-emphasizes biotechnological applications of bacteria in many areas of human interest. This review was motivated by the lack of adequate knowledge about the ecology of bacteria and use of plant lectins as antimicrobial agents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their gratitude to the *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico* (CNPq) for research grants and fellowships (L.C.B.B. Coelho and P.M.G. Paiva), *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior* (CAPES), *Fundação de Amparo à Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de Pernambuco* (FACEPE) and the *Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação* (MCTI) for research grants. F.S. Gomes would like to thank FACEPE for doctoral scholarship; E.V. Pontual acknowledges CAPES and FACEPE for post-doctoral fellowship. Authors are grateful to Dr. Rosiely Felix Bezerra (Figure 1); also to Prof. Dr. Elineide Barbosa de Souza, from the Laboratório de Fitobacteriologia, Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Recife, for some pictures of plant diseases.

COMPETING INTEREST

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- [1] Philippot L, Andersson SG, Battin TJ, Prosser JI, Schimel JP, Whitman WB, et al. The ecological coherence of high bacterial taxonomic ranks. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 2010; 8(7): 523-529.
- [2] Hynes HM, Germida JJ. Impact of clear cutting on soil microbial communities and bioavailable nutrients in the LFH and Ae horizons of Boreal Plain forest soils. *Forest Ecol Manag.* 2013; 306: 88-95.
- [3] Babalola OO. Beneficial bacteria of agricultural importance. *Biotechnol lett.* 2010; 32(11): 1559-1570.

418
419 [4] Trabulsi LR, Alterthum F. Microbiologia, 4th ed. São Paulo: Atheneu; 2004. Portuguese.
420
421 [5] Siddiqui ZA, Nesha R, Singh N, Alam S. Interactions of Plant-Parasitic Nematodes and
422 Plant-Pathogenic Bacteria. In: Maheshwari DK editor. Bacteria in Agrobiolgy: Plant
423 Probiotics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 251-267; 2012.
424
425 [6] Rogers GB, Hoffman LR, Carroll MP, Bruce KD. Interpreting infective microbiota: the
426 importance of an ecological perspective. Trends Microbiol. 2013; 21(6): 271-276.
427
428 [7] El-Baky RMA, Ahmed HR, Gad GFM. Prevalence and conjugal transfer of vancomycin
429 resistance among clinical isolates of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Adv Res. 2014; 2(1): 12-23
430
431 [8] Yeaman, M R and Yount, N Y. Mechanisms of antimicrobial peptide action and
432 resistance. Pharmacol Rev. 2003; 55(1): 27-55.
433
434 [9] Deyn GB, Quirk H, Bardgett RD. Plant species richness, identity and productivity
435 differentially influence key groups of microbes in grassland soils of contrasting fertility.
436 Biology lett. 2011; 7(1): 75-78.
437
438 [10] Smith FE. The Treatment of Metalliferous Industrial Effluents in Japan. In Proceedings
439 of Sudbury, 95: 915-924; 1995.
440
441 [11] He S, Guo Z, Zhang Y, Zhang S, Wang J, Gu N. Biosynthesis of gold nanoparticles
442 using the bacteria *Rhodopseudomonas capsulata*. Mater Lett. 2007; 61(18): 3984-3987.
443
444 [12] Linford N, Linford P, Platzman E. Dating environmental change using magnetic bacteria
445 in archaeological soils from the upper Thames Valley, UK. J Archaeol Sci. 2005; 32(7):
446 1037-1043.
447
448 [13] Daly MJ. Engineering radiation-resistant bacteria for environmental biotechnology. Curr
449 Opin Biotech. 2000; 11(3): 280-285.
450
451 [14] Fredrickson JK, Gorby YA. Environmental processes mediated by iron-reducing
452 bacteria. Curr Opin Biotech. 1996; 7(3): 287-294.
453
454 [15] Garcia C, Moreno DA, Ballester A, Blazquez ML, Gonzalez F. Bioremediation of an
455 industrial acid mine water by metal-tolerant sulphate-reducing bacteria. Miner Eng. 2001;
456 14(9): 997-1008.
457
458 [16] Lee JH, Mitchell RJ, Kim BC, Cullen DC, Gu MB. A cell array biosensor for
459 environmental toxicity analysis. Biosens Bioelectron. 2005; 21(3): 500-507.
460
461 [17] Girotti S, Ferri EN, Fumo MG, Maiolini, E. Monitoring of environmental pollutants by
462 bioluminescent bacteria. Anal Chim Acta. 2008; 608(1): 2-29.
463
464 [18] Ding Z, Hao A, Wang Z. Water-in-gasoline microemulsions stabilized by polyglycerol
465 esters. Fuel. 2007; 86(4): 597-602.
466
467 [19] Chen X, Xiu Z, Wang J, Zhang D, Xu P. Stoichiometric analysis and experimental
468 investigation of glycerol bioconversion to 1, 3-propanediol by *Klebsiella pneumoniae* under
469 microaerobic conditions. Enzyme Microb Tech. 2003; 33(4): 386-394.
470

471 [20] Metsoviti M, Paramithiotis S, Drosinos EH, Galiotou-Panayotou M, Nychas GJE, Zeng
472 AP et al. Screening of bacterial strains capable of converting biodiesel-derived raw glycerol
473 into 1, 3-propanediol, 2, 3-butanediol and ethanol. *Eng Life Sci.* 2012; 12(1): 57-68.
474

475 [21] Rossi DM, da Costa JB, de Souza EA, Peralba MDCR, Ayub MAZ. Bioconversion of
476 residual glycerol from biodiesel synthesis into 1, 3-propanediol and ethanol by isolated
477 bacteria from environmental consortia. *Renew Energ.* 2012; 39(1): 223-227.
478

479 [22] Orr CH, James A, Leifert C, Cooper JM, Cummings SP. Diversity and activity of free-
480 living nitrogen-fixing bacteria and total bacteria in organic and conventionally managed soils.
481 *Appl Environ Microb.* 2011; 77(3): 911-919.
482

483 [23] Glick BR. Phytoremediation: synergistic use of plants and bacteria to clean up the
484 environment. *Biotechnol Adv.* 2003; 21(5): 383-393.
485

486 [24] Sokolova MG, Akimova GP, Vaishlya OB. Effect of phytohormones synthesized by
487 rhizosphere bacteria on plants. *Appl Biochem Microb.* 2011; 47(3): 274-278.
488

489 [25] Schalk IJ, Hannauer M, Braud A. New roles for bacterial siderophores in metal transport
490 and tolerance. *Environ Microbiol.* 2011; 13(11): 2844-2854.
491

492 [26] Guo H, Luo S, Chen L, Xiao X, Xi Q, Wei W et al. Bioremediation of heavy metals by
493 growing hyperaccumulaor endophytic bacterium *Bacillus* sp. L14. *Bioresource Technol.*
494 2010; 101(22): 8599-8605.
495

496 [27] Ma W, Zalec K, Glick BR. Effects of the bioluminescence-labeling of the soil bacterium
497 *Kluyvera ascorbata* SUD165/26. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol.* 2001; 35: 137-44.
498

499 [28] Cho I, Blaser MJ. The human microbiome: at the interface of health and disease. *Nat*
500 *Rev Genet.* 2012; 13(4): 260-270.
501

502 [29] Verschuere L, Rombaut G, Sorgeloos P, Verstraete W. Probiotic bacteria as biological
503 control agents in aquaculture. *Microbiol Mol Biol R.* 2000; 64(4): 655-671.
504

505 [30] Dalié DKD, Deschamps AM, Richard-Forget F. Lactic acid bacteria–Potential for control
506 of mould growth and mycotoxins: A review. *Food Control.* 2010; 21(4): 370-380.
507

508 [31] Trias R, Bañeras L, Montesinos E, Badosa, E. Lactic acid bacteria from fresh fruit and
509 vegetables as biocontrol agents of phytopathogenic bacteria and fungi. *Int Microbiol.* 2010;
510 11(4): 231-236.
511

512 [32] Riquelme, C Araya R, Vergara N, Rojas A, Guaita M, Candia M. Potential probiotic
513 strains in the culture of the Chilean scallop *Argopecten purpuratus* (Lamarck, 1819).
514 *Aquaculture.* 1997; 154(1): 17-26.
515

516 [33] Rouse S, Harnett D, Vaughan A, van Sinderen D. Lactic acid bacteria with potential to
517 eliminate fungal spoilage in foods. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2008; 104:915-923.
518

519 [34] Yang L, Maeda H, Yoshikawa T, Zhou GQ. Algicidal effect of bacterial isolates of
520 *Pedobacter* sp. against cyanobacterium *Microcystis aeruginosa*. *Water Sci Eng.* 2012; 5(4):
521 375-382.
522

523 [35] Betcher MA, Fung JM, Han AW, O'Connor R, Seronay R, Concepcion GP et al.
524 Microbial distribution and abundance in the digestive system of five shipworm species
525 (Bivalvia: Teredinidae). PLoS One. 2012; 7 (9): e45309
526

527 [36] Prieur D, Mevel G, Nicolas JL, Plusquellec A, Vigneulle M. Interactions between bivalve
528 molluscs and bacteria in the marine environment. Oceanogr. Mar. Biol. Annu. Rev. 1990; 28:
529 277-352.
530

531 [37] Belkin S, Wirsén CO, Jannasch HW. A new sulfur-reducing, extremely thermophilic
532 eubacterium from a submarine thermal vent. Appl Environ Microb. 1986; 51(6): 1180-1185.
533

534 [38] Alfaro AC, Young T, Ganesan AM. Regulatory effects of mussel (*Aulacomya maoriana*
535 Iredale 1915) larval settlement by neuroactive compounds, amino acids and bacterial
536 biofilms. Aquaculture. 2011; 322: 158-168.
537

538 [39] Nadarasah G, Stavrinides J. Insects as alternative hosts for phytopathogenic bacteria.
539 FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2011; 35(3): 555-575.
540

541 [40] N'Guessan CA, Brisse S, Roux-Nio ACL, Poussier S, Koné D, Wicker, E. Development
542 of variable number of tandem repeats typing schemes for *Ralstonia solanacearum*, the agent
543 of bacterial wilt, banana Moko disease and potato brown rot. J Microbiol Meth. 2013; 92:
544 366-374.
545

546 [41] Rachmaninov O, Zinger-Yosovich KD, Gilboa-Garber N. Preventing *Ralstonia*
547 *solanacearum* adhesion with glycans from cashew, cocoa, coffee, pumpkin, and tomato
548 seed extract. Can J Microbiol. 2012; 58(7): 856-862.
549

550 [42] Nascimento AR, Michereff SJ, Mariano RDL, Gomes, AM. Elaboração e validação de
551 escala diagramática para cancro bacteriano da videira. Sum Phytopathol. 2005; 31(1): 59-
552 64. Portuguese
553

554 [43] Czajkowski R, Grabe GJ, Van der Wolf JM. Distribution of *Dickeya* spp. and
555 *Pectobacterium carotovorum* subsp. *carotovorum* in naturally infected seed potatoes. Eur J
556 Plant Pathol. 2009; 125(2): 263-275.
557

558 [44] Walcott RR, Gitaitis, RD. Detection of *Acidovorax avenae* subsp. *citrulli* in watermelon
559 seed using immunomagnetic separation and the polymerase chain reaction. Plant Dis, 2000;
560 84(4): 470-474.
561

562 [45] Walcott RR, Fessehaie A, Castro AC. Differences in pathogenicity between two
563 genetically distinct groups of *Acidovorax avenae* subsp. *citrulli* on cucurbit hosts. J
564 Phytopathol. 2004; 152(5): 277-285.
565

566 [46] Gaidamashvili M, Van Staden J. Interaction of lectin-like proteins of South African
567 medicinal plants with *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Bacillus subtilis*. J Ethnopharmacol. 2002;
568 80(2): 131-135.
569

570 [47] Ratanapo S, Ngamjunyaporn W, Chulavatnatol M. Interaction of a mulberry leaf lectin
571 with a phytopathogenic bacterium, *P. syringae* pv *mori*. Plant Sci. 2001; 160(4): 739-744.
572

573 [48] Tasumi S, Yang WJ, Usami T, Tsutsui S, Ohira T, Kawazoe I et al. Characteristics and
574 primary structure of a galectin in the skin mucus of the Japanese eel *Anguilla japonica*. Dev
575 Comp Immunol. 2004; 28(4): 325-335.

576
577 [49] Paiva PMG, Pontual EV, Napoleão TH, Coelho LCBB. Effects of plant lectins and
578 trypsin inhibitors on development, morphology and biochemistry of insect larvae. In: Pourali,
579 H.; Raad, V.N (Eds.). *Larvae: Morphology, Biology and Life Cycle*. Nova Science Publishers,
580 Inc., New York, 37–55; 2012.

581
582 [50] Gomes FS, Procópio TF, Napoleão TH, Coelho LCBB, Paiva PMG. Antimicrobial lectin
583 from *Schinus terebinthifolius* leaf. *J Appl Microbiol*. 2013; 114(3): 672-679.

584
585 [51] Oliveira MDL, Andrade CAS, Santos-Magalhães NS, Coelho LCBB, Teixeira JA,
586 Carneiro-da-Cunha MG et al. Purification of a lectin from *Eugenia uniflora* L. seeds and its
587 potential antibacterial activity. *Lett Appl Microbiol*. 2008; 46(3): 371-376.

588
589 [52] Sá RA, Gomes FS, Napoleão TH, Santos ND, Melo CM, Gusmão NB et al. Antibacterial
590 and antifungal activities of *Myracrodruon urundeuva* heartwood. *Wood Sci Technol*
591 2009; 43(1-2): 85-95.

592
593 [53] Costa RMPB, Vaz AFM, Oliva MLV, Coelho LCBB, Correia MTS, Carneiro-da-Cunha
594 MG. A new mistletoe *Phthirusa pyrifolia* leaf lectin with antimicrobial properties. *Process*
595 *Biochem*. 2010; 45(4): 526-533.

596
597 [54] Ferreira RS, Napoleão TH, Santos AF, Sá RA, Carneiro-da-Cunha MG, Morais MMC et
598 al. Coagulant and antibacterial activities of the water-soluble seed lectin from *Moringa*
599 *oleifera*. *Lett Appl Microbiol*. 2011; 53(2): 186-192.

600
601 [55] Nunes EDS, de Souza MAA, Vaz AFM, Santana GMS, Gomes FS, Coelho LCBB et al.
602 Purification of a lectin with antibacterial activity from *Bothrops leucurus* snake venom. *Comp*
603 *Biochem Phys B*. 2011; 159(1): 57-63.

604
605 [56] Moura MC, Pontual EV, Paiva PMG, Coelho LCBB. An Outline to Corrosive Bacteria. In:
606 Microbial pathogens and strategies for combating them: science, technology and education.
607 Formatex Research Centre, Badajoz. 2013: (in press).

608
609 [57] Hasheesh WS, Mohamed RT. Bioassay of two pesticides on *Bulinus truncatus* snails
610 with emphasis on some biological and histological parameters. *Pestic Biochem Phys*. 2011;
611 100(1): 1-6.

612
613 [58] Fu JM, Mai BX, Sheng GY, Zhang G, Wang XM, Peng P et al. Persistent organic
614 pollutants in environment of the Pearl River Delta, China: an overview. *Chemosphere*. 2003;
615 52: 1411–1422.

616
617 [59] Sharma RR, Singh D, Singh R. Biological control of postharvest diseases of fruits and
618 vegetables by microbial antagonists: A review. *Biol control*. 2009; 50(3): 205-221.

619
620 [60] Yoshiyama M, Kimura K. Bacteria in the gut of Japanese honeybee, *Apis cerana*
621 *japonica*, and their antagonistic effect against *Paenibacillus larvae*, the causal agent of
622 American foulbrood. *J Invertebr Pathol*. 2009; 102(2): 91-96.

623
624 [61] Khan MQ, Abbasi MW, Zaki MJ, Khan SA. Evaluation of *Bacillus thuringiensis* isolates
625 against root-knot nematodes following seed application in okra and mungbean. *Pak. J. Bot*.
626 2010; 42(4): 2903-2910.

627

- 628 [62] Khedher SB, Zouari N, Messaddeq N, Schultz P, Jaoua S. Overproduction of delta-
629 endotoxins by sporeless *Bacillus thuringiensis* mutants obtained by nitrous acid
630 mutagenesis. Curr Microbiol. 2011; 62(1): 38-43.
631
- 632 [63] Stevens MM, Hughes PA, Mo J. Evaluation of a commercial *Bacillus thuringiensis* var.
633 *israelensis* formulation for the control of chironomid midge larvae (Diptera: Chironomidae) in
634 establishing rice crops in south-eastern Australia. J Invertebr Pathol. 2013; 112: 9–15
635
- 636 [64] Araújo AP, de Melo-Santos MAV, Carlos SDO, Rios EMMM, Regis L. Evaluation of an
637 experimental product based on *Bacillus thuringiensis* sorovar. *Israelensis* against *Aedes*
638 *aegypti* larvae (Diptera: Culicidae). Biol Control, 2007; 41(3): 339-347.
639
- 640 [65] Gill SS, Cowles EA, Pietrantonio PV. The mode of action of *Bacillus thuringiensis*
641 endotoxins. Annu Rev Entomol, 1992; 37(1): 615-634.
642
- 643 [66] Burton SL, Ellar DJ, Li J, Derbyshire DJ. *N*-acetylgalactosamine on the putative insect
644 receptor aminopeptidase N is recognised by a site on the domain III lectin-like fold of a
645 *Bacillus thuringiensis* insecticidal toxin. J Mol Biol. 1999; 287(5): 1011-1022.
646
- 647 [67] Rashad FM, Saleh WD, Nasr M, Fathy HM. Identification of mosquito larvicidal bacterial
648 strains isolated from north Sinai in Egypt. AMB Express. 2012; 2(1): 1-15.