Control of *Escherichia coli* Growth by $CO₂$

R. REPASKE' AND M. A. CLAYTON

National Institute ofAUergy and Infectious Diseases, Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Received for publication 5 June 1978

Escherichia coli B dependence on $CO₂$ for growth was demonstrated. At suboptimal $CO₂$ concentrations the rate of growth was controlled by $CO₂$ concentration.

Many techniques used to minimize the lag period preceding culture growth were described in the early microbiological literature, whereas others are a part of the legacy of unpublished observations from many laboratories. The appearance of a lag period after successive transfers of cultures in the same medium always was an enigma that has been subject to a number of theories, but each hypothesis was unable to account for some experimental observations. While determining conditions to obtain reproducible growth of the obligate autotrophic aerobe, Alcaligenes eutrophus, we found that a specific concentration of one component, bicarbonate, produced immediate growth without the customary lag period (6). This prompted a comparative study with an organism at the opposite end of the nutritional scale. Anaerobically grown Streptococcus sanguis responded in the same way, but $CO₂$ was the active species (7). In this report we show that growth of a washed stationary-phase inoculum of the facultative aerobe, Escherichia coli, also will grow without a lag period if a suitable concentration of $CO₂$ is provided. With all three organisms the initial and subsequent exponential growth rate was controlled solely by the concentration of $CO₂$ or bicarbonate. These findings indicate that the effect of CO₂ or bicarbonate on the conventional lag period and on the growth rate is not an unusual phenomenon and suggest that $CO₂$ or bicarbonate may have the same regulatory function in all microorganisms.

Carbon dioxide or its hydrated form, bicarbonate, has been a recognized requirement for cell growth since Valley and Rettger (8) performed an extensive survey and demonstrated that none of the more than 100 microorganisms tested would grow if CO₂ were excluded. More recently the basis for the $CO₂$ requirement by heterotrophic microorganisms was established; C02-fixing enzymes were isolated and their functions in various metabolic pathways are now known. The qualitative $CO₂$ requirement for growth is not the subject of this report. We wish

to emphasize the fundamental physiological effect of $CO₂$ concentration on regulation of the growth rate. The lag period appears to be the initial manifestation of the same effect.

Walker (9) first showed that added $CO₂$ shortened the lag period of E. coli, and Neidhardt et al. (5) recently reported that the lag period was virtually eliminated when bicarbonate was incorporated in the medium. Quantitative demonstration of the effect of $CO₂$ on growth requires a minimal medium and a system for accurately maintaining low concentrations of $CO₂$. Small incremental increases in $CO₂$ concentration must be tested to assure detection of the optimum, for the optimum may span a narrow range of concentrations (6, 7).

A vessel with ^a 1-liter working capacity was designed to receive three separate gases (N_2, Q_2, Q_3) and $CO₂$) which were mixed in the vessel to form an atmosphere of any desired composition (6, 7). Gas flow rates were individually regulated by calibrated flow meters. A maximum flow rate of 10 liters/min and vigorous impeller action decreased equilibration time and minimized retention of metabolic $CO₂$. The incubation temperature was 37° C. E. coli B (ATTC 11303), used in these experiments, was grown aerobically in glucose-minimal medium (1). The inocula for the test cultures were grown at 37° C in a water bath shaker for 8 to 9 h at which time they were in stationary phase for 2 to 3 h. The cultures were then stored at 4°C overnight.

An aliquot of the culture to be used as inoculum was washed twice in 0.001 M phosphate buffer (pH 6.0), resuspended in the same buffer, bubbled with N_2 to remove CO_2 , and added to the culture vessel containing medium equilibrated with the starting gas mixture. Growth was measured continuously by optical density at 660 nm (OD_{660}), by cell count and size distribution (Coulter Counter), and by total protein (4).

The $CO₂$ requirement for growth is shown in Fig. 1. A stored and washed stationary-phase inoculum, which would exhibit a lag in ordinary shaken cultures, immediately grew when $CO₂$ was included in the gas atmosphere (Fig. 1, curve A); however, the same inoculum did not grow without added $CO₂$ when metabolic $CO₂$ was not permitted to accumulate (Fig. 1, curve B). The lag ended abruptly with addition of $CO₂$, and a constant exponential growth rate was rapidly established. This rate was maintained only as \log as $CO₂$ was provided; growth ceased again when $CO₂$ was eliminated from the gas mixture.

In the experiments illustrated in Fig. 1, a saturating concentration of $CO₂$ was used. The rate of growth was a function of $CO₂$ concentration between 0.0025% (the lowest concentration tested) and 0.03 to 0.04% CO₂ where saturation occurred. Direct control of the rate of growth can be exercised by control of the $CO₂$ concentration as shown in Fig. 2. The unambiguous responses to changes in the low concentrations of $CO₂$ and the facility with which a given growth rate can be selected and maintained in batch culture is evident.

Growth rates determined with limiting $CO₂$ concentrations at different pH values established that $E.$ coli responded to $CO₂$ concentration, not to bicarbonate ion concentration (6, 7).

The data in Fig. 3 validate the use of optical density as a measure of culture growth under these experimental conditions. It also illustrates the effect of CO₂ on protein synthesis. Changes in net protein paralleled changes in OD that were influenced by the presence or absence of C02. Total protein and OD increased in tandem whereas cell counts initially remained essentially unchanged; later, when $CO₂$ addition was discontinued, OD and protein increases stopped whereas the cell count continued to increase for a time. Cell size distribution analyses reflected the consequences anticipated under these circumstances. Small cells in the stationary-phase inoculum increased in size before cell division occurred (2, 3). A constant cell size was then maintained as cell numbers increased exponentially, but after $CO₂$ was removed, the average cell size decreased again as cells continued to divide in the absence of net protein synthesis.

 $E.$ coli requires $CO₂$ for growth. When a saturating concentration was present at the time of inoculation, growth proceeded at the maximum rate (Fig. ¹ and 3). Limiting concentrations of C02 restrict the rate of growth in proportion to the concentration of $CO₂$ present (Fig. 2). It follows that a freshly inoculated aerobic medium equilibrated with atmospheric $CO₂$ (approximately 0.02%) would be limiting in $CO₂$ and would support a submaximum growth rate. As metabolic $CO₂$ increased the effective $CO₂$ concentration in the medium, a period of increasing growth rates, i.e., a lag period, would be observed. There are obvious factors which would

FIG. 1. E. coli B growth requirement for $CO₂$. Stored and washed stationary-phase cells were inoculated into a glucose-minimal medium (1) equilibrated with a gas atmosphere created by adjusting the relative flow rates (to 10 liters/min of total flow) of individual cylinder gases $(N_2, O_2, and CO_2)$ to provide the proportions desired. $O₂$ was maintained at 4%. Curve A, A 0.075% $CO₂$ final concentration was present throughout. Curve B, No $CO₂$ was present at zero time, but 0.3% CO₂ (final concentration) was added where indicated and was deleted again after the interval shown. The $CO₂$ concentrations used in both experiments were not limiting for growth. Doubling times were 55 min. Incubation temperature was 37°C; pH 6.4.

FIG. 2. Regulation of E. coli B growth rates in minimal medium by control of $CO₂$ concentration. Washed stationary-phase cells were inoculated into glucose-minimal medium equilibrated with 4% O₂ and no $CO₂$. Control of the gas atmosphere was as in Fig. 1. At times indicated, $CO₂$ was added to the other flowing gases to produce the final concentration shown or it was deleted $(CO₂$ off). Doubling times were: 245 min before 0.005% CO₂ was added, and 115 min after addition; 295 min after $CO₂$ was deleted, and 75 min in the presence of 0.01% $CO₂$. Incubation temperature was 37°C; pH 6.4.

FIG. 3. Growth responses of a stationary-phase E. coli B inoculum to $CO₂$. Treatment of stationary-phase inoculum and culture conditions as described in Fig. 1. Initial CO_2 concentration was 0.3%; the O_2 concentration was 4%. Samples for cell count and size distribution (Coulter Counter) and net protein were chilled immediately and analyzed. Incubation temperature was 37°C; pH 6.4.

accelerate or delay establishing a saturating $CO₂$ concentration. A large inoculum, ^a metabolically active inoculum, and a "rich" medium would favor a short lag period, whereas excessive aeration by shaking or sparging would tend to dissipate metabolic $CO₂$ and extend the lag period. These effects have been observed by most microbiologists, but the cause has not been attributed to the effect of $CO₂$ concentration on control of growth.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. Davis, B. D., and E. S. Mingioli. 1950. Mutants of Escherichia coli requiring methionine or vitamin B_{12} . J. Bacteriol. 60:17-28.
- 2. Donachie, W. D. 1968. Relationship between cell size and time of DNA replication. Nature (London) 219: 1077-1079.
- 3. Kjeldgaard, N. O., O. Maaløe, and M. Schaechter. 1958. The transition between different physiological states during balanced growth of Salmonella typhimurium. J. Gen. Microbiol. 19:607-619.
- 4. Lowry, 0. H., N. J. Rosebrough, A. L Farr, and R. J. Randall. 1951. Protein measurement with the Folin phenol reagent. J. Biol. Chem. 193:265-275.
- 5. Neidhardt, F. C., P. L. Block, and D. F. Smith. 1974. Culture medium for enterobacteria. J. Bacteriol. 119:736-747.
- 6. Repaske, R., C. A. Ambrose, A. C. Repaske, and M. L. De Lacy. 1971. Bicarbonate requirement for elimination of the lag period of Hydrogenomonas eutropha. J. Bacteriol. 107:712-717.
- 7. Repaske, R., A. C. Repaske, and R. D. Mayer. 1974. Carbon dioxide control of lag period and growth of Streptococcus sanguis. J. Bacteriol. 117:652-659.
- 8. Valley, G., and L. F. Rettger. 1927. The influence of carbon dioxide on bacteria. J. Bacteriol. 14:101-137.
- 9. Walker, H. H. 1932. Carbon dioxide as a factor affecting the lag in bacterial growth. Science 76:602-604.