

A NOVEL WHOLE CELL BIOSENSOR INCORPORATING *Haematococcus pluvialis* FOR
PESTICIDE DETECTION IN WATER

ANNA VICTORINE AZIE

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
BACHELOR OF BIOTECHNOLOGY (HONOURS)

FACULTY OF HEALTH AND LIFE SCIENCES
INTI INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
PUTRA NILAI, MALAYSIA

2017

NON-PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

By this letter I declare that I have written this proposal completely by myself, and that I have used no other sources or resources than the ones mentioned.

I have indicated all quotes and citations that were literally taken from publications, or that were in close accordance with the meaning of those publications, as such. All sources and other resources used are stated in the references.

Moreover I have not handed in a thesis similar in contents elsewhere.

In case of proof that the proposal has not been constructed in accordance with this declaration, the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences (FHLS) has the right to consider the research proposal as a deliberate act that has been aimed at making correct judgment of the candidate's expertise, insights and skills impossible.

I acknowledge that the assessor of this item may, for the purpose of assessing this item,

- reproduce this assessment item and provide a copy to another member of the University; and/or,
- communicate a copy of this assessment item to a plagiarism checking service (which may then retain a copy of the assessment item on its database for the purpose of future plagiarism checking).

In case of plagiarism the examiner has the right to fail me and take action as prescribed by the rules regarding Academic Misconduct practiced by INTI International University.

Anna Victorine Azie

Name

I14006657

I.D.Number



Signature

05/05/2017

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to take this golden opportunity to show God my sincere gratitude in guiding me through my degree years. I want to express my deepest gratitude towards everyone who has been present and helped me in one way or another. I want to especially thank my supervisor Dr. Ling Shing Wong who has supported me patiently, helped me to improve my scientific writing skills and provided me aspiration and motivation to go forward and to go for big. Thank you Dr. Wan Hee Cheng for having shown great kindness in helping me in the laboratory. A special thank you to my parents and my little brother for their continuous support and love throughout the years. I want to thank Dr. Geeta Selvarajah and Ms. Emily Quek who greatly helped me in my thesis writing through their workshop done on referencing. Thanks to Dr. Ghim Hock Ong, who with the collaboration of other lecturers organized a workshop for assisting students with performing statistical analysis. Lastly, I would also like to thank my laboratory colleagues Suzan Nakayiza, Albert Ong, Nur Diyana and Fan Wei Jiong who helped me build my team spirit and even more.

ABSTRACT

There are major environmental and health concerns associated with pesticide presence in water. Conventional detection methods are expensive and laboratory based inadequate for *in situ* and real time monitoring of the pollutants. As such this research was focused on integrating *Haematococcus pluvialis* in a novel whole cell biosensor using *de novo* astaxanthin production as bioreporter for the detection of the pesticides atrazine, diuron and methyl parathion in water. The microalga was cultured over 29 days and the growth pattern was successfully determined. The chlorophyll and astaxanthin cell contents were also determined spectrophotometrically. Immobilization of the cells was done in agarose gel and the response of the cells was measured in terms of percentage change in astaxanthin level by recording OD readings from a spectrophotometer with wavelength set at 482 nm before and after the exposure of the cells to the pesticide analyte. Optimum response of the biosensor towards the pesticides was 15 minutes after the exposure using day-3 cell culture at 2.50×10^5 cells/cuvette as cell density. The biosensor was exposed to different 0.0010 mg/L, 0.0025 mg/L, 0.0050 mg/L, 0.0100 mg/L, 0.1000 mg/L, 1.0000 mg/L, 5.0000 mg/L and 10.0000 mg/L of each of the pesticides at the optimized pH 7.0. The biosensor showed high sensitivity to the range of concentration of the three pesticides used in this experiment with highest response recorded at pesticide concentration lower than 0.0010 mg/L. Therefore, the biosensor can be used as a screening system for environmental samples to indicate the presence of pesticides and at the same time serves as a water safety warning system.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this proposal is my own except for quotations and summaries which have been duly acknowledged, and completed under the supervision of Dr. Wong Ling Shing.

ANNA VICTORINE AZIE

I14006657

08/05/2017

Dr. LING SHING WONG

(SUPERVISOR)

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
NON-PLAGIARISM DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
DECLARATION	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 PESTICIDES	4
2.2 PESTICIDES AND THEIR EFFECTS	6
2.2.1 Atrazine	6
2.2.2 Diuron	7
2.2.3 Methyl Parathion	8
2.2.4 Atrazine, Diuron and Methyl Parathion Mechanism of Action	9
2.3 <i>Haematococcus Pluvialis</i>	10
2.4 ASTAXANTHIN PROPERTIES AND APPLICATIONS	12
2.4.1 Astaxanthin	12
2.4.2 Astaxanthin Biosynthesis to Oxidative Stress	15
2.5 BIOSENSOR	16
2.5.1 Whole Cell Biosensor	18
2.5.2 Microalgal Biosensor	19
3 MATERIALS AND METHODS	20
3.1 CULTURE OF <i>H. pluvialis</i>	20
3.2 DETERMINATION OF CELL DENSITY AND GROWTH PATTERN	20
3.3 IMMOBILIZATION OF <i>H. pluvialis</i>	22
3.4 THE EFFECT OF EXPOSURE TIME, CELL AGE, CELL DENSITY AND pH TO THE RESPONSES OF <i>H. pluvialis</i> TO PESTICIDE	23
3.5 PREPARATION OF PESTICIDES STOCK SOLUTIONS AND	23

	DILUTIONS	
3.6	EXPOSURE OF IMMOBILIZED <i>H. pluvialis</i> CELLS TO PESTICIDES	24
3.7	DATA ANALYSIS	24
4	RESULTS	26
4.1	GROWTH CURVE OF <i>H. pluvialis</i>	26
4.2	THE EFFECT OF EXPOSURE TIME, CELL AGE, CELL DENSITY AND pH TO TH RESPONSES OF <i>H. pluvialis</i> TO PESTICIDE	29
4.3	RESPONSE OF <i>H. pluvialis</i> TO PESTICIDE	33
4.3.1	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> to Atrazine	33
4.3.2	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> to Diuron	34
4.3.3	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> to Methyl Parathion	35
5	DISCUSSION	36
5.1	GROWTH CURVE OF <i>H. pluvialis</i>	36
5.2	THE EFFECT OF EXPOSURE TIME, CELL AGE, CELL DENSITY AND pH TO TH RESPONSES OF <i>H. pluvialis</i> TO PESTICIDE	37
5.3	RESPONSE OF <i>H. pluvialis</i> TO PESTICIDE	39
5.3.1	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> to Atrazine	40
5.3.2	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> to Diuron	41
5.3.3	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> to Methyl Parathion	41
6	CONCLUSIONS	43
	REFERENCES	44
	APPENDICES	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	The taxonomy of <i>Haematococcus pluvialis</i> .	11

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Photos of the life cycle of <i>H. pluvialis</i> (Shah et al., 2016).	12
2.2	Astaxanthin chemical structure (Dose et al., 2016).	13
2.3	Superior placement of asthaxanthin in the human cell membrane (Ambati et al., 2014).	14
2.4	A simplified carotenoid pathway biosynthesis in <i>H. pluvialis</i> (Grünewald et al., 2001).	16
2.5	A schematic diagram of a biosensor and it's components (Bhalla et al., 2016).	17
4.1	Growth profile of <i>H. pluvialis</i> over a 29 days cultivation period as measured using direct cell counting mehod with 3 replicates (n=3).	26
4.2	Growth pattern of <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells over 29 days of cultivation based on OD measurements at 700 nm with 3 replicates (n=3).	27
4.3	Correlation between cell density and OD measured at 700 nm for <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells cultured for 29 days.	28
4.4	OD measurements of astaxanthin level in <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells at 482 nm cultured for 29 days with 3 replicates (n=3).	28
4.5	Correlation between OD measured at 482 nm and OD measured at 700 nm for <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells cultured for 29 days.	29
4.6	Response of biosensor immobilized with cells of different age to 0.001 mg/L atrazine for 90 minutes exposure.	30
4.7	Response of biosensor with cells of different cell age exposed to 0.001 mg/L atrazine for 15 minutes with 3 replicates (n=3).	31
4.8	Response of biosensor with day-3 cells with different cell density (cells/cuvette) exposed to 0.001 mg/L atrazine for 15 minutes with 3 replicates (n=3).	32
4.9	Response of biosensor with day-3 cells with 2.50×10^5 cells/cuvette exposed to 0.001 mg/L atrazine of different pH for 15 minutes with 3 replicates (n=3).	32
4.10	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells to different concentration (mg/L) of atrazine for 15 minutes exposure after recording astaxanthin level at OD _{482nm} , using 3 replicates (n=3).	34
4.11	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells to different concentration (mg/L) of diuron for 15 minutes exposure after recording astaxanthin level at OD _{482nm} , using 3 replicates (n=3).	35
4.12	Response of <i>H. pluvialis</i> cells to different concentration (mg/L) of methyl parathion for 15 minutes exposure after recording astaxanthin level at OD _{482nm} , using 3 replicates (n=3).	35

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

°C	degrees Celsius
µl	Microlitre
CaCl ₂ .2H ₂ O	Calcium Chloride Dihydrate
Co(NO ₃) ₂ .6H ₂ O	Cobalt(II) Nitrate Hexahydrate
Cu	Copper
CuSO ₄ .5H ₂ O	Copper(II) Sulfate Pentahydrate
EDTA	Ethylenediamine-N,N,N ,N -tetraacetic Acid
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FeSO ₄ .7H ₂ O	Iron(II) Sulfate Heptahydrate
FDA	Food And Drug Administration
h	Hour
H ₃ BO ₃	Boric Acid
<i>H. pluvialis</i>	<i>Haematococcus pluvialis</i>
H ₂ SO ₄	Sulfuric Acid
K ₂ HPO ₄	Dipotassium Hydrogen Phosphate
KH ₂ PO ₄	Monopotassium Phosphate
KOH	Potassium Hydroxide
IUPAC	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry
L	Litre
mg/L	Milligrams per litre
MgSO ₄ .7H ₂ O	Magnesium sulfate heptahydrate
MnCl ₂ .4H ₂ O	Manganese(II) Chloride Tetrahydrate
min	Minutes
mL	Millilitre
MoO ₃	Molybdenum(VI) Oxide
NaCl	Sodium Chloride
NaNO ₃	Sodium Nitrate

nm	Nanometre
OD	Optical density
Pb	Lead
psi	Pound per square inch
ROS	Reactive oxygen species
rpm	Revolutions per minute
t	Time
Zn	Zinc
ZnSO ₄ .7H ₂ O	Zinc Sulfate Heptahydrate

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Pesticides are chemical or biological substances use for killing or slowing growth of pests such as insects and weeds which hinders the growth of crops (Bhadekar, Pote, Tale, & Nirichan, 2011). Their application is primordial in the agricultural industries since one third of all agro products worldwide are produced using pesticides (Zhang, Jiang, & Ou, 2011). Pesticide application increase crop productivity, lowering labor cost and protecting crops from pathogens and vector borne diseases (Bhadekar et al., 2011).

These chemicals can move from treated agricultural areas to non-target regions. This leads to problems like less efficient pest control and environment contamination (Tiryaki & Temur, 2010). To attain sufficient leaf coverage to prevent pest attack farmers use pesticides excessively and cause them economic loss (Ben-Zur, Hake, Hassoon, Bulatov, & Schechter, 2011). Water pollution happens when pesticides from agricultural fields end up in rivers, lakes, ground water or sea through leaching, run offs or atmospheric depositions. Ingestion or dermal contacts with such water are routes how human get exposed to the pollutants (Briggs, 2003). The acute and chronic diseases that might arise include kidney failure, nervous system damage, cancer, diarrhea, vomiting and gastroenteritis (Mashhood & Arsalan, 2011). These pesticides have detrimental effect on the environment as they can bioaccumulate in the food chain (DeLorenzo, Scott, & Ross, 2001b). Other consequences include development of resistant pests, intoxication of aquatic animals like the endangered river dolphin (Aktar, Sengupta, & Chowdhury, 2009). Thus, it is important to detect their presence in water.

Conventional ways of pesticide detection comprise of high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), gas chromatography (GC), mass spectrometry (MS), X-ray diffraction and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR).They have high sensitivity and reliability (Bhadekar et al., 2011). Nevertheless, their common limitations include

complexity of operation thereby requiring highly skilled technician. Extensive pretreatment of samples needed is time consuming and unsuitable for *in situ* detection (Kumar, Upadhyay, Wasit, Singh, & Kaur, 2013; Ben-Zur et al., 2011).

Biosensors are deemed alternatives because of their high sensitivity, inexpensive instrumentation, room for instrument miniaturization and portability. The instrument is composed of a biological recognition element coupled with a transducer (Bhadekar et al., 2011). The signal transduction is made through optical, mass-based and electrochemical means used singly or in combinations. Examples of bioreceptor used include nucleic acids, enzymes, antibodies, microorganisms and whole cells (Buonasera, Pezzotti, Pezzotti, Cano, & Giardi, 2015). Whole cells like cyanobacteria, yeast, plant cells, fungi and algae cells are preferred because they are bioindicators which respond when the biosensor is exposed to toxicants (Teo & Wong, 2014). Microalgae have been used as they are easily cultured, immobilized and reproduce fast. They can detect the presence of pollutants because upon their intake, the pollutants interfere in their enzymatic reactions and effect in the photosynthetic electron transport pathways (Buonasera, Lambrea, Rea, Touloupakis, & Giardi, 2011). These changes can be detected via spectrophotometry, colorimetry, bioluminescence, fluorometry, optical or conductometry transducer (Sanchez-Ferandin, Leroy, Bouget, & Joux, 2013; Durrieu et al., 2006).

Many other algae species have been reported suitable for detecting pollutants but none studied the microalgae *Haematococcus pluvialis*. This microorganism is the best for naturally producing astaxanthin (Shah, Liang, Cheng, & Daroch, 2016). *Haematococcus pluvialis* accumulates astaxanthin under stress conditions notably nitrogen or phosphate deprivation, high/low temperature, increased salinity and combinations of these conditions (Collins et al., 2011; Tripathi, Sarada, & Ravishankar, 2002). In this research, the *in vivo* astaxanthin response of the cells will be noted using a spectrophotometer in the view of using astaxanthin as a bioreporter for the detection of the pesticides atrazine, diuron and methyl parathion.

The aims of this study were:

1. To determine *H. pluvialis* growth pattern.
2. To determine the conditions for optimum response of the algae cells.
3. To determine the response of the biosensor to atrazine, diuron and methyl parathion.

CHAPTER 2

LITTERATURE REVIEW

2.1 PESTICIDES

Pesticides are highly needed in agriculture since crop loss is estimated to be 14% caused by insects, 13% by plant pathogens and another 13% as a result of weeds. Crop loss in turn means economic loss to planters (Aktar et al., 2009). This is the reason why nearly one third of all agricultural products are results of pesticides application. It is thus undeniable that pesticide application result into higher crop yield and better food produced (Damalas & Eleftherohorinos, 2011; Hellar & Kishimba, 2005). It is estimated that crop lost due to pest will be 78% for fruits, 54 % for vegetables and 32% for cereals without pesticide application (Zhang et al., 2011). The top worldwide pesticide utilizer is Europe seconded by Asia. The top pesticide manufacturers/utilizers are France, the United States of America, Japan, Brazil and China (Zhang et al., 2011). Most vector borne diseases are controlled by killing the vectors thus pesticides help to keep disease outbreaks like malaria under control (Aktar et al., 2009).

Synthetic pesticides are commonly classified into three groups; based on the mode of action, the composition or the target pest (Zacharia, 2011). Based on mode of action, the pesticide can bring its effects in a systemic or non-systemic way. The former is when the pesticides penetrate plant tissues and is circulated round the plant through the vascular tissues for effecting. The latter effect on insects only upon contact without requiring transport throughout the pests. Systemic pesticides include glyphosate and 2, 4-D (Zacharia, 2011). Classification based on target pests is where the pesticides are named after the pests they act against, for instance insecticides and herbicides act on insects and weeds respectively (Zacharia, 2011). Pesticides categorized based on their chemical composition are subdivided into four main groups notably; carbamates, organochlorines,