

Correspondence

Aromatic alcohols and their effect on Gram-negative bacteria, cocci and mycobacteria

S. Fraud¹, E. L. Rees¹, E. Mahenthiralingam², A. D. Russell^{1*} and J.-Y. Maillard^{1†}

¹Welsh School of Pharmacy and ²School of Molecular and Medical Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff CF10 3XF, UK

Keywords: aromatic alcohols, mycobacteria, Gram-positives, Gram-negatives

*Corresponding author. Tel: +44-2920-875812;
Fax: +44-2920-874149; E-mail: russellD2@cardiff.ac.uk
†Present address. School of Pharmacy and Biomolecular Sciences, University of Brighton, Brighton BN2 4GJ, UK

Sir,
Phenethyl alcohol (2-phenylethanol; PEA, mol. wt 122.17) inhibits a range of Gram-negative bacteria, but not *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, at a concentration of 0.2% (2000 mg/L), whereas Gram-positive cocci, such as *Staphylococcus aureus* are inhibited at 0.5% w/v (5000 mg/L), with *Enterococcus faecalis* requiring still higher concentrations.¹ PEA-containing media had earlier been suggested as a means of selecting for Gram-positive bacteria in mixed flora.² Interestingly, *Mycobacterium smegmatis* and *Mycobacterium phlei* were also inhibited at 0.2%, suggesting that the solubility of PEA in lipids could play a major role in its selective action.¹ However, Wilson *et al.*³ reported that PEA was only slightly less inhibitory to *Staphylococcus aureus* than *Escherichia coli*, and that the MIC for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was 0.46% (4600 mg/L).

As part of comprehensive studies of the responses to biocides of mycobacteria, other Gram-positive bacteria and Gram-negative organisms, it was decided to investigate the effects of PEA and of another, significantly more hydrophobic, aromatic alcohol (5-phenyl-1-pentanol; 5-PP, mol. wt 164.25) on some strains of *Mycobacterium chelonae*, *M. smegmatis* and *Burkholderia cepacia*. *B. cepacia* K56-2 triclosan- and chlorhexidine-susceptible mutants were isolated using a Tn5-pOT182 random mutagenesis system. Strain K56-2 is a genetically amenable clone of the genome sequencing strain J2315. A single strain used in disinfectant testing [EN 1276 (1997)] of each of *E. coli*, *P. aeruginosa* and *S. aureus* was included for comparative purposes.

M. chelonae NCTC 946 is a glutaraldehyde-susceptible control, whereas *M. chelonae* strains Epping and Harefield are glutaraldehyde resistant but *ortho*-phthalaldehyde susceptible.⁴ *M. smegmatis* LIMP7 is a derived mutant of *M. smegmatis* mc²155 with an altered cell envelope permeability. This mutant has a defective *impA1* (inositol monophosphate phosphatase) gene, leading to a dramatic decrease in lipoarabinomannan synthesis.

MIC determinations were undertaken in triplicate by means of the Denley multipoint inoculator with an inoculum size of ~10⁵ cfu in 1 µL delivered. Incubation temperature was at 30°C (*M. chelonae* strains) for 3–4 days, 37°C (*M. smegmatis* mc²155 for 3–4 days, *S. aureus* and Gram-negative bacteria for 2 days) and 42°C (LIMP7 for 3–4 days). At 37°C, the LIMP7 mutant reverts to the parental strain due to the genomic insertion of a temperature-sensitive transposon.

MICs of PEA and 5-PP for Gram-positive and -negative bacteria are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. As noted previously, PEA was less active against *S. aureus* than against *E. coli* or mycobacteria, and its MIC for *P. aeruginosa* was also high. Glutaraldehyde-resistant mycobacteria (strains Epping and Harefield) had the same response to both PEA and 5-PP as the susceptible strain (NCTC 946). This is an interesting observation, because some *M. chelonae* strains trained in the laboratory to high glutaraldehyde resistance are believed to show alterations in the mycoylarabinogalactan complex of the cell wall.⁵ All of the *B. cepacia* strains showed the same order of response to PEA, whereas two strains (ER10-11 and ER17-15, especially the former) were more susceptible than the other strains to 5-PP. The LIMP7 mutant

Table 1. MIC ranges of PEA and 5-PP for Gram-positive bacteria

Organism	MIC range (mg/L)	
	PEA	5-PP
<i>S. aureus</i> ATCC 6538 ^a	4000–4050	450–475
<i>M. chelonae</i>		
NCTC 946	2250–2300	250–275
Epping	2250–2300	250–275
Harefield	2250–2300	250–275
<i>M. smegmatis</i>		
mc ² 155	2650–2700	325–350
LIMP7	1500–1550	275–300

^aEN 1276 (1997) test strain.

Correspondence

Table 2. MIC ranges of PEA and 5-PP for Gram-negative bacteria

Organism	MIC range (mg/L)	
	PEA	5-PP
<i>E. coli</i> ATCC 10536 ^a	2300–2350	425–450
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> ATCC 15442 ^a	4050–4100	>1700 ^b
<i>B. cepacia</i>		
K56-2 (wild-type)	1100–1200	340–360
ER10-11 (triclosan susceptible)	1000–1100	100–140
ER17-15 (triclosan susceptible)	1100–1200	250–300
R3-33 (CHX susceptible)	1100–1200	340–360
R14-37 (CHX susceptible)	1100–1200	340–360
R11-27 (CHX susceptible)	900–1000	340–360
Jz-1 (Tn5 control)	1100–1200	340–360
J2315 (sequencing strain) ^c	1100–1200	380–390

CHX, chlorhexidine.

^aEN 1276 (1997) test strain.

^bNo activity at maximum solubility.

^cThis strain has been the subject of a genome sequence initiative (http://www.sanger.ac.uk/Projects/B_cepacia/) and will become the Type strain for the new species *Burkholderia cenocepacia* (E. Mahenthiralingam, unpublished data).

strain was more susceptible than the wild-type to PEA, but this could be due, at least partly, to the increase in incubation temperature potentiating the activity of this alcohol. 5-PP was considerably more effective than PEA against any strain, although with *P. aeruginosa* no inhibition was achieved at its maximum solubility. The log (p) [*n*-octanol/water] value (Crippen's fragmentation) of PEA is +1.74 and of 5-PP is +2.99.

In conclusion: (i) apart from *P. aeruginosa*, PEA shows greater activity against Gram-negative bacteria and mycobacteria than against the *S. aureus* strain; (ii) at its maximum solubility, 5-PP does not inhibit the growth of *P. aeruginosa*;

(iii) inhibitory concentrations of PEA and 5-PP are ~1.5–2.6 and 1.4–1.75 times higher, respectively, against *S. aureus* than against mycobacteria (Table 1); (iv) on a molar basis, inhibitory concentrations of PEA (Table 2) are ~7.2 times higher than 5-PP against *E. coli* and ~3.7–4.2 times greater against *B. cepacia* strains, except for ER10-11 (11.8 times) and ER17-15 (5.6 times); and (v) 5-PP appears to be taken up to a greater extent than PEA against all bacteria (except *P. aeruginosa*, for which no comparison can be made), probably because of its greater lipophilicity and damage to the cytoplasmic membrane.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank ASP Biocides, Irvine, CA, USA and the Welsh School of Pharmacy, Cardiff, UK for research studentships (to S.F. and E.L.R., respectively).

References

1. Berrah, G. & Konetzka, W. A. (1962). Selective and reversible inhibition of the synthesis of bacterial deoxyribonucleic acid by phenethyl alcohol. *Journal of Bacteriology* **83**, 738–44.
2. Lilly, B. O. & Brewer, J. H. (1953). The selective antibacterial action of phenylethyl alcohol. *Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association* **42**, 6–8.
3. Wilson, J. R. J., Lyall, J., McBride, R. J., Murray, J. B. & Smith, G. (1981). Partition coefficients of some aromatic alcohols in an *n*-heptane/water system and their relationship to minimum inhibitory concentration against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Journal of Clinical and Hospital Pharmacy* **6**, 63–6.
4. Fraud, S., Maillard, J.-Y. & Russell, A. D. (2001). Comparison of the mycobactericidal activity of *ortho*-phthalaldehyde, glutaraldehyde and other dialdehydes by a quantitative suspension test. *Journal of Hospital Infection* **48**, 214–21.
5. Manzoor, S. E., Lambert, P. A., Griffiths, P. A., Gill, M. J. & Fraise, A. P. (1999). Reduced glutaraldehyde susceptibility in *Mycobacterium chelonae* associated with altered cell wall polysaccharides. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* **43**, 759–65.