

Direct measurement of cell wall stress-stiffening and turgor pressure in live bacterial cells

Yi Deng,¹ Mingzhai Sun,² and Joshua W. Shaevitz^{1,2,*}

¹*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

²*Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

(Dated: April 20, 2019)

The mechanical properties of gram-negative bacteria are governed by a rigid peptidoglycan (PG) cell wall and the turgor pressure generated by the large concentration of solutes in the cytoplasm. The elasticity of the PG has been measured in bulk and in isolated sacculi and shown to be compliant compared to the overall stiffness of the cell itself. However, the stiffness of the cell wall in live cells has not been measured. In particular, the effects that pressure-induced stress might have on the stiffness of the mesh-like PG network have not been addressed even though polymeric materials often exhibit large amounts of stress-stiffening. We study bulging *Escherichia coli* cells using atomic force microscopy to separate the contributions of the cell wall and turgor pressure to the overall cell stiffness. We find strong evidence of power-law stress-stiffening in the *E. coli* cell wall, with an exponent of 1.07 ± 0.25 , such that the wall is significantly stiffer in live cells ($E \sim 32 \pm 10$ MPa) than in unpressurized sacculi. These measurements also indicate that the turgor pressure in *E. coli* is 26 ± 4 kPa.

Many cellular-scale processes in biology, such as cell growth, division and motility, necessarily involve mechanical interactions. Recent theoretical work in bacteria has led to a number of physically-realistic models of bacterial cells [1–3]. However, in many instances, precise, direct measurements of the mechanical properties of cellular components in live cells are lacking.

The cell envelope in most bacteria is made of one or two layers of membrane and a rigid cell wall consisting of a network of peptidoglycan (PG) polymers. These two materials serve different cellular functions. The semi-permeable plasma membrane maintains a chemical separation between the cell interior and the surrounding medium. The large concentration of solutes in the cytoplasm generates an osmotic pressure, termed turgor pressure, that pushes the plasma membrane against the cell wall. The cell wall, on the other hand, defines the cell shape and constrains the volume under turgor.

The magnitude of the turgor pressure under physiological conditions has been estimated using several techniques: by collapsing gas vesicles in rare species of bacteria [4], by AFM indentation [5, 6], and by calculating the total chemical content of the cytoplasm [7]. The estimated pressure values vary by more than an order of magnitude, from 10^4 to 3×10^5 Pa. While mechanical experiments, such as AFM indentation, are the most direct probes, separating the mechanical contributions of the wall and pressure has not been previously possible and thus these experiments may only provide an upper bound on the true turgor pressure.

Similarly, the elasticity of the cell wall has been difficult to probe in live, pressurized cells. All previous mechanical measurements on the cell wall have been performed using chemically isolated walls, termed sacculi, that may be altered from the native state. Yao *et al.* reported an anisotropic elasticity of 25 MPa and 45 MPa

in the axial and circumferential directions relative to a cell’s rod-shape using single flattened *E. coli* sacculi [8]. Thwaites and coauthors probed the elastic modulus of macroscopic threads of many *Bacillus subtilis* sacculi in humid air and found that the modulus varied from 10 to 30 MPa depending on the humidity and salt concentration [9–11].

In addition, because the PG material is essentially a cross-linked polymer mesh, it is expected to exhibit a substantial amount of stress-stiffening [12–16]. Unpressurized sacculi thus provide a poor platform for estimating the wall elasticity in live cells. Boulbitch *et al.* modeled the cell wall as a deformable hexagonal mesh and predicted a load-dependent elasticity with a stress-stiffening exponent of ~ 1 [17]. Thwaites and coauthors found about an order of magnitude change in the thread modulus upon loading, although it is unclear how to interpret measurements from these very large, multi-sacculus objects performed in air [9–11].

Mechanical indentation of live cells is likely the most direct method for probing these sorts of mechanical properties. Under external perturbation, however, the cell wall and turgor pressure have mixed contributions to the response, making it hard to independently estimate these two quantities. By studying a bulging strain of *E. coli*, we are able to simultaneously determine both the wall elasticity and the turgor pressure and reveal their dependence. Briefly, we first obtain the turgor pressure of individual bulging cells from the membrane bulge radius and indentation stiffness using AFM and fluorescence microscopy. Then, from the size and stiffness of the cell body, we are able to extract the elasticity of the cell wall under tension. Repeated measurements on many bulging and non-bulging cells give the load-dependent elasticity, as well as the turgor pressure and wall modulus of *E. coli* under physiological conditions.

The bulging *E. coli* strain we use is derived from the K12 wild-type strain and contains a mutation, *imp4213*, that increases the outer membrane permeability to allow small molecules to enter the periplasmic space [18, 19]. We then use vancomycin, a drug that inhibits PG subunits from forming peptide cross-links, to generate a small number of local fractures in the cell wall. Under turgor pressure, the cytoplasm pushes the inner membrane through the fracture and forms a membrane bulge outside the cell wall [Fig. 1(a), (c-e)]. In addition to the *imp4213* mutation, we knocked out genes that encode external cellular appendages that interfere with the AFM tip (*fliC* and *fimA*). Cells also carry plasmid pWR20 which encodes for a moderate level of expression of the fluorescent protein EGFP and kanamycin resistance.

Cells are grown in LB medium containing 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ kanamycin at 37°C to OD 0.3, followed by the addition of vancomycin to a final concentration of 20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ and a 10 minute incubation. Cells are then immobilized on poly-l-lysine (PL) coated glass coverslips in the same growth media with vancomycin. In the presence of the drug, cells stochastically form bulges along the cell cylinder. We probe the stiffness of the cell and bulge with a custom-built AFM/fluorescence microscope which operates at 21°C [Fig. 1(a)].

Mechanical stiffness is measured by comparing the slope of indentation on the cell, bulge and glass surface [5]. To exclude the effect of viscosity on the stiffness, we have tested the stiffness at several indentation speeds and concluded that viscoelasticity does not play a major role. All measurements shown here were taken with an indentation speed of 3 $\mu\text{m}/\text{s}$. The cantilever has a pyramidal tip and a stiffness of 11 pN/nm calibrated using the thermal deflection spectrum [20]. The cell radius is obtained from the AFM tip contact height of the highest point on the cell, and the bulge radius is obtained from fluorescence microscopy by detecting the radius of the circular region along the cytoplasmic image contour [Fig. 1(c)].

Several lines of evidence indicate that the cell wall in bulged cells is not significantly different than in non-bulged cells. First, bulging is a discrete event that occurs within a few seconds. Second, the cell stiffness remains constant in the presence of vancomycin until the sudden bulging event when the stiffness drops dramatically [Fig. 1(f)].

EGFP fluorescence indicates that the cytoplasm is continuous between the bulge and the cell interior [Fig. 1(c)]. Therefore, one universal turgor pressure can be found everywhere in the cytoplasm for each individual bulging cell. We calculate this pressure from the stiffness of the bulge by modeling the bulge as a liquid vesicle and the shape of the AFM tip as a cone. For an indentation force F at the top of a bulge of radius R_b and pressure P , the shape of the part of the bulge not in contact with the




FIG. 1. (a) Schematic cartoon illustrating the bulging *E. coli* and AFM stiffness measurement. The blown up figure shows the details of the inner membrane (IM), peptidoglycan (PG) network and the outer membrane (OM). (b) Typical force-indentation traces obtained by indenting a cell and bulge. (c) Image of cytoplasmic GFP shows both the cell and bulge and supports connectivity of the cytoplasm. (d) FM4-64 membrane stain labels the outer membrane. (e) Overlay of the cytoplasmic GFP and membrane stain. Scale bar is 1 μm . (f) Cell stiffness shows little variation before the bulging event (arrow) before dropping suddenly.

indenter, in cylindrical coordinates, satisfies

$$P\pi r^2 + 2\pi r\sigma \sin \theta = F \quad (1)$$

where θ is the elevation angle [Fig. 2(a)]. For an indenter half-conical angle α , the total deformation is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta h &= h_{global} + h_{dent} + h_{cone}; \\ h_{global} &= R_b - \frac{\sigma}{P} [1 + I(\pi/2, a)]; \\ h_{dent} &= \frac{\sigma}{P} [1 - \sin \alpha - I(\pi/2 - \alpha, a)]; \\ h_{cone} &= \frac{\sigma}{P} [(\sqrt{\cos^2 \alpha + a} - \cos \alpha) \cot \alpha]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the surface tension $\sigma = PR_b/2 - F/2\pi R_b$, $a = PF/\pi\sigma^2$, and $I(\xi, a) = \int_0^\xi \sin^2 \zeta (a + \sin^2 \zeta)^{-1/2} d\zeta$. The total indentation, Δh , has a nearly linear dependence on indentation force [Fig. 2(b)]. Under experimental conditions where $\alpha = \pi/12$, $R_b \sim 0.5 \mu\text{m}$, $P \sim 1 \text{ kPa}$ and $F \sim 0.01 - 0.1 \text{ nN}$, the dimensionless spring constant k_b/PR_b varies from 0.35 to 0.38 [Fig. 2 (b) inset].

For each bulging cell, we measure $\Delta h/R_b$ and use the model to obtain the reduced stiffness k/PR_b as shown in the inset of Fig. 2(b). From the mechanical measurements of the bulge stiffness and radius, we then calculate the turgor pressure P and use this value to estimate the circumferential surface tension experienced by the cell wall, $\sigma = PR_c$, where R_c is the cell radius.

Figure 3 shows the cell radius and stiffness, k_c , as a function of σ . Both radius and stiffness are positively correlated with the surface tension. We further determined the size and stiffness of non-bulging cells to be




FIG. 2. Model of a fluidic membrane bulge under a force F exerted by a conical indenter. (a) The total deformation of the bulge consists of a global deformation, h_{global} , a local dent h_{dent} and the contact height h_{cone} . The dashed line is a sphere of radius equal to the bulge waist. (b) The dimensionless force-indentation relation is nearly linear. Inset: dimensionless stiffness vs. indentation.

$0.55 \pm 0.02 \mu\text{m}$ and $0.017 \pm 0.002 \text{ N/m}$, respectively. Furthermore, the size and stiffness of a similar strain of *E. coli* that does not carry the *imp4213* mutation was within 10% of the values for the *imp-* strain, indicating that increased outer membrane permeability does not have a large effect on the turgor pressure or cell wall elasticity.




FIG. 3. Bulging cell radius and indentation stiffness are plotted against cell surface tension. Data from 72 bulged cells are binned in 11 logarithmically-spaced bins using weights from the relative error estimates of the individual indentation traces and fluorescent images (blue filled circles). Data from 42 non-bulged cells are plotted as black open squares. Red lines indicate the best fit to the binned data and the intact cell measurement and confidence interval.

The indentation stiffness of the cell wall is governed by terms associated with stretching and bending the PG and the surface tension. While the bending energy of the wall has been shown to be negligibly small [5], we cannot ignore the stretching energy of the PG network and thus analysis of the cell indentation data is more complicated than for bulge indentation. To address this problem, we used finite-element calculations of the force-indentation relation for an inflated cylindrical shell. We adopt the convention of natural, or engineering, stress and strain to define the Young's modulus E and set the poisson ratio to zero. The dimensionless quantity PR_c/Et describes the magnitude of inflation under pressure. The reduced stiffness, k/PR_c , depends only on PR_c/Et and follows a

universal relationship as can be found from scaling arguments. Therefore, measurement of k, P, R_c and t allows us to calculate the cell wall Young's modulus.

In our simulation, the cell wall is modeled as a tube with $2 \mu\text{m}$ length, and terminated with spherical endcaps (Fig. 4 inset). The elastic modulus is set to 20 MPa, the thickness to 6 nm, the uninflated cell radius to 500 nm and the cone angle of the indenter to $\pi/12$ with a spherical tip of radius 7.5 nm. The turgor pressure is chosen to be the independent variable, and the indentation stiffness is obtained from the force required to create an indentation of $1/20$ of the cell radius. We find that the reduced stiffness monotonically decreases as the capsule is inflated due to the relative magnitudes of surface tension and shell bending (Fig. 4 green line).




FIG. 4. Simulated value of reduced stiffness k/PR_c against the reduced inflation magnitude PR_c/Et . Both isotropic shell elasticity (green solid line) and orthotropic elasticity are simulated at various ratios of the stretching stiffness on axial direction and the circumferential direction E_y/E_{xz} . Inset shows one simulation result with color labeling the displacement on the indentation direction. The black wireframe shows the undeformed capsule.

In order to model stress-stiffening in the cell wall, we describe the nonlinear elasticity of the PG network as a power law in the tension, $E = E_0(\sigma/\sigma_0)^\beta$, where β is the stress-stiffening exponent. We fixed σ_0 at a value of $2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ N/m}$, approximately in the middle of the measured range of tensions, and used E_0 and β as free parameters to define the nonlinear elasticity. Stress stiffening causes an extra complication due to the elastic anisotropy inherent in a cylindrical geometry. The surface tension in the circumferential and axial directions of a cylinder are different by a factor. Under stress-stiffening, this causes the Young's moduli in the two different directions to differ by a factor of 2^β .

It is not possible to calculate the effects of anisotropy for each value of β . Therefore, we calculated k/PR_c in our simulations for five different magnitudes of the elastic anisotropy and used numerical interpolation on a logarithmic scale (Fig 4). For a given surface tension $\sigma = PR_c$ and stress-stiffening relation $E(\sigma)$, PR_c/Et

and the anisotropy correction factor are calculated numerically. Using the $k/PR_c \sim PR_c/Et$ relation shown in figure 4, the indentation stiffness $k(\sigma; E_0, \beta, R_c)$ can then be found.

Given $E(\sigma; E_0, \beta) = E_0(\sigma/\sigma_0)^\beta$ and $dR_c/R_c = d\sigma/Et$, the radial expansion can be written as $R_c(\sigma; E_0, \beta, R_0) = R_0 \exp\left[\frac{\sigma_0}{E_0 t(1-\beta)}((\sigma/\sigma_0)^{1-\beta} - 1)\right]$ for $\beta \neq 1$ and $R_c(\sigma; E_0, \beta, R_0) = R_0 \sigma^{\sigma_0/E_0 t}$ for $\beta = 1$, where R_0 is the cell radius at tension $\sigma_0 = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ N/m. We performed a global fit of the functions $R_c(\sigma; E_0, \beta, R_0)$ and $k(\sigma; E_0, \beta, R_c)$ to the experimental data shown in Fig. 3 with fitting parameters R_0 , E_0 and β . We also included the measured radius and indentation stiffness from non-bulging cells in the fit with one additional fitting parameter, the turgor pressure P . The best fit of the model gives a turgor pressure of 26 ± 4 kPa and a stiffening exponent $\beta = 1.07 \pm 0.25$. At the turgor pressure, the estimated cell wall Young's modulus is $E = 32 \pm 10$ MPa.

Previous work using AFM indentation on bacteria has been used to quantify turgor pressure and cell wall elasticity [5, 6]. In that work, the relationship between linear indentation and surface tension was established, but the stretching of the cell wall was neglected or at most underestimated. Our study, which independently measures the turgor pressure and cell stiffness, suggests that cell wall stretching and surface tension contribute similar amounts to the indentation stiffness. This is most evident in the difference in the k/PR ratio for membrane bulges, ~ 0.36 , and cells, ~ 0.9 . This difference arises from the fluidity of lipid membranes; while the bulge can redistribute material to minimize stress, the rigid cell wall can not. For the cell wall, therefore, the overall stiffness depends on stretching even in a tension-dominated regime.

Polymer networks often exhibit a nonlinear stress-strain relation due to intrinsic geometric nonlinearities and a potential nonlinear force-extension relation of the individual polymers at finite temperature [12]. Boulbitch *et al.* modeled the PG network as a hexagonal mesh jointed by rigid glycan subunits oriented on average in the circumferential direction and linear-elastic peptide cross-links oriented along the axial direction. This model predicts a power-law relationship between the axial elastic modulus and stress with a stiffening exponent of ~ 1 [17]. We find a stiffening exponent of 1.07 ± 0.25 in the *E. coli* cell wall in quantitative agreement with the model and similar to observations of gram-positive *Bacillus* sacculus threads [10].

To summarize, we used AFM and fluorescent microscopy to probe the elastic properties of live *E. coli* cells using a system that allows us to separately probe pressure and elasticity. Our results indicate that the turgor pressure in live cells is 26 ± 4 kPa, or ~ 0.3 atm. This value is significantly lower than previous chemical estimates of the pressure but similar to other mechanical

measurements of turgor pressure. Our data further indicate that the *E. coli* cell wall stress-stiffens such that in live cells the modulus is $E \sim 32 \pm 10$ MPa. Stress-stiffening affords a unique mechanical advantage to cells by preventing abrupt cell shape changes during changes in external pressure or osmolarity while maintaining a relatively compliant cell elasticity under normal conditions.

This research was supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts and NSF Award PHY-0844466. We gratefully thank Natacha Ruiz and Tom Silhavy for help in constructing cell strains.

* shaevitz@princeton.edu

- [1] L. Furchtgott, N. S. Wingreen, and K. Huang, *Molec. Microbiol.* (in press).
- [2] S. X. Sun, S. Walcott, and C. W. Wolgemuth, *Current Biology* **20**, R649 (2010).
- [3] H. Jiang and S. X. Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 028101 (2010).
- [4] D. P. Holland and A. E. Walsby, *Journal of Microbiological Methods* **77**, 214 (2009).
- [5] M. Arnoldi, M. Fritz, E. Buerlein, M. Radmacher, E. Sackmann, and A. Boulbitch, *Phys Rev E Stat Phys Plasmas Fluids Relat Interdiscip Topics* **62**, 1034 (2000).
- [6] X. Yao, J. Walter, S. Burke, S. Stewart, M. H. Jericho, D. Pink, R. Hunter, and T. J. Beveridge, *Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces* **23**, 213 (2002).
- [7] D. S. Cayley, H. J. Guttman, and M. T. Record, *Biophys J* **78**, 1748 (2000).
- [8] X. Yao, M. Jericho, D. Pink, and T. Beveridge, *J Bacteriol* **181**, 6865 (1999).
- [9] J. J. Thwaites and N. H. Mendelson, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **82**, 2163 (1985).
- [10] J. J. Thwaites and N. H. Mendelson, *Int J Biol Macromol* **11**, 201 (1989).
- [11] N. H. Mendelson and J. J. Thwaites, *J Bacteriol* **171**, 1055 (1989).
- [12] M. L. Gardel, J. H. Shin, F. C. MacKintosh, L. Mahadevan, P. Matsudaira, and D. A. Weitz, *Science* **304**, 1301 (2004).
- [13] G. H. Koenderink, M. Atakhorrami, F. C. MacKintosh, and C. F. Schmidt, *Phys Rev Lett* **96**, 138307 (2006).
- [14] R. Tharman, M. M. A. E. Claessens, and A. R. Bausch, *Phys Rev Lett* **98**, 088103 (2007).
- [15] C. P. Broedersz, C. Storm, and F. C. MacKintosh, *Phys Rev Lett* **101**, 118103 (2008).
- [16] T. Kim, W. Hwang, H. Lee, and R. D. Kamm, *PLoS Comput Biol* **5**, e1000439 (2009).
- [17] A. Boulbitch, B. Quinn, and D. Pink, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5246 (2000).
- [18] U. S. Eggert, N. Ruiz, B. V. Falcone, A. A. Branstrom, R. C. Goldman, T. J. Silhavy, and D. Kahne, *Science* **294**, 361 (2001).
- [19] K. C. Huang, R. Mukhopadhyay, B. Wen, Z. Gitai, and N. S. Wingreen, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **105**, 19282 (2008).
- [20] J. E. Sader, J. W. M. Chon, and P. Mulvaney, *Review of Scientific Instruments* **70**, 3967 (1999).