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Applications of the three principal light scattering techniques of turbidimetry, differential light scattering, and quasi-elastic light scattering to systems of microorganisms are reviewed. The relation between the three techniques is demonstrated and it is shown how these techniques can yield basic structural, optical, and even hydrodynamic properties for a wide range of microorganisms, with particular emphasis on changes in such properties. Such applications include antibiotic susceptibility testing, the effects of inhibitors on trypanosome motility, spore structure, virus self-assembly, and bacterial motility on the surface of fermentation reactors.


1. INTRODUCTION

For four decades light scattering techniques have been powerful, though difficult to use, tools for elucidating the conformation of biomolecular systems in solution. Such techniques, involving the elastic or quasi-elastic scattering of visible radiation have been applied mainly to the study of the mass and the gross conformation of biological macromolecules in solution. For example, a widely used light scattering experiment has been the “Zimm plot” method which has been used to determine the molecular weight, radius of gyration, and second virial coefficient of a wide range of biopolymers (see, e.g., Ref. (1))

The theory which describes scattering by larger particles (i.e., those whose maximum dimension is of the same order as the wavelength of the incident light)—such as macromolecular assemblies—is more complex, because of intramolecular interference effects. On the other hand, precisely because of such interference, it is (in principle at least) possible to obtain more detailed information about the gross morphology and internal structure of such assemblies. Large particle scattering also affords the advantage of greater signal to noise ratios: this means that difficulties caused by the presence (and removal) of dust and other particles in macromolecular suspensions are not so serious, and in addition that a sufficient signal can be obtained in shorter time intervals.
The intention of this review is to alert biochemists and microbiologists to recent advances in light scattering techniques and to illustrate recent and potential applications to microbiological systems: such applications are as diverse as the study of bacteriophage self-assembly, heat resistance of bacterial spores, trypanosome motility, biological wastewater monitoring, and fermenter contaminations. It is not the intention of this review to provide a complete treatise on the theory of light scattering—such material can be found in the many standard texts available (see, e.g., Refs. (2-8)) and reviews (9-14).

The first collection of laser light scattering papers devoted exclusively to biological and medical applications appeared in 1982 ("Biomedical Applications of Laser Light Scattering," Sattelle et. al., eds., Elsevier). More recently, an excellent series of short papers, describing applications of laser light scattering to a range of biochemical systems, has appeared in Biochemical Society Transactions 1984, 12, 623-627. Nevertheless, as far as I am aware no review to date has focused exclusively on the applications of a range of light scattering techniques to microbiology.

A limited amount of the relevant theory is given here, sufficient to demonstrate to the biochemist or microbiologist how turbidimetry, differential light scattering (DLS), and quasi-elastic light scattering (QLS) are related and how they can provide complementary information on a particular system of microorganisms. This review will not cover the application of related techniques, such as electric birefringence, electrophoretic light scattering, or the circular dichroism of light scatterers: examples of the application of these techniques to microbiology can be found elsewhere (15-17).

2. TURBIDIMETRY

This is perhaps the simplest type of light scattering measurement to be made since to determine the "turbidity" of a suspension the total loss of intensity is measured through scattering of the incident beam, using a conventional spectrophotometer: it can be regarded therefore as a "zero scattering angle" measurement. If the refractive index increment can also be measured (by using for example a differential refractometer), turbidity then provides a convenient way for measuring the relative molecular mass, $M_r$, of macromolecular assemblies (with $M_r \geq 10^6$) (17, 18) including viruses (19, 20, 22) and bacteria (21).

The turbidity of a suspension is defined as the fractional loss of intensity $I$ of an incident beam by scattering per unit pathlength ($x$) of the suspension:

$$\tau = -\frac{(dI/dx)}{I}.$$  \hspace{1cm} [1]

$\tau$ can be related to the "optical density" (OD) via

$$\tau = 2.303 \cdot \text{(OD)}. \hspace{1cm} [2]$$

The turbidity is normally measured relative to the suspending medium or solvent and can be related to the $M_r$ of the scatterer via

---

1 Abbreviations used: DLS, differential light scattering; QLS, quasi-elastic light scattering; OD, optical density; RGD, Rayleigh–Gans–Debye; TYMV, turnip yellow mosaic virus; BAC, bromo-acetyl carnitine; TMV, tobacco mosaic virus.
\[ \tau = M_r \cdot c \cdot H \cdot Q(\lambda) \]  \[ H = 32\pi^3(\partial n/\partial c)^2/3N_A \lambda_0^3. \]

In these equations \( c \) is the concentration (g/ml), \( n \) the refractive index, \( N_A \) Avogadro’s number, \( \lambda_0 \) the wavelength in vacuo, and \( Q \) the particle dissipation factor (17); that is, a dimensionless number between 0 and 1 which depends on the dimensions of the scattering particle relative to the wavelength through the medium, \( \lambda \):

\[
Q = \frac{3}{8} \int_0^\infty P(\theta)(1 + \cos^2 \theta)\sin \theta d\theta
\]

where \( \theta \) is the scattering angle and \( P(\theta) \) is the ratio of the actual scattered intensity of a particle to the scattered intensity without interference. The \( P(\theta) \) values—and hence \( Q \) values for a wide range of particle shapes—have been worked out by Doty and Steiner (17) based on the assumption that contributions from \( P(\theta) \) are solely from intraparticle interference effects and that there are no significant changes in phase of the light passing through the particle (this is known as the Rayleigh-Gans-Debye (RGD) approximation). Camerini-Otero and Day (22) have used a series expansion for \( P(\theta) \) given by Debye (18) to produce a general expression for \( Q \) for any shape of scatterer

\[
Q = 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \cdot q_{2n} \left( \frac{4\pi d^2}{\lambda} \right)^{2n}
\]

where \( d \) is its “principal dimension” (viz., length for a rod, radius for a sphere, or the root mean square end-to-end distance for a random coil) and the coefficients \( q_{2n} \) have been tabulated, enabling simple computer evaluations of \( Q \).

When the shape of a scatterer is not known an estimate for \( Q \) can be obtained from the wavelength dependence of the turbidity (17, 19):

\[
\frac{-d \log \tau}{d \log \lambda_0} = 4 - \beta
\]

where \( \beta = (d \log Q/d \log \lambda_0) \). \( \beta \) can therefore be estimated from a double logarithmic plot of \( \tau \) vs \( \lambda_0 \). Once \( \beta \) is determined, \( Q \) can be obtained from the tables of Doty and Steiner (17). The assumption is of course made that loss of intensity is due to scattering and not absorbance. This method of determining the molecular weight after allowance for intraparticle interference (via \( Q \)) is only rigorous in the absence of interparticle interference effects: strictly speaking the “apparent \( M_r \)” measured at a finite concentration needs to be extrapolated to infinite dilution, which is why Eq. [3] is often rewritten in the form

\[
\frac{1}{M_r} = HQ \lim_{c \to 0} \left( \frac{c}{\tau} \right).
\]

### 2.1 Application to Viruses

Although, as a means of determining molecular weights of most macromolecules of biological interest, turbidimetry has been of limited use (because of the relatively low scattering), for particles of \( M_r \gg 10^6 \)—which includes viruses—it provides a valu-
TABLE I
Molecular Weights of Viruses Determined by Turbidimetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus</th>
<th>Turbidimetry</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>3.86 ± 0.37</td>
<td>3.80 ± 0.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64 ± 0.18&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98 ± 0.19&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.02 ± 0.17&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2</td>
<td>45.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>214&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>51.2 ± 3.1</td>
<td>234&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMV</td>
<td>42.0 ± 2.0</td>
<td>220&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>249 ± 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>213 ± 18</td>
<td>192 ± 6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>119 ± 9.5</td>
<td>109.2 ± 4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values obtained using other techniques are also given for comparative purposes.
<sup>a</sup>Differential Light Scattering.
<sup>b</sup>Sedimentation equilibrium.
<sup>c</sup>Sedimentation velocity.
<sup>d</sup>Sedimentation–diffusion.

able, albeit under-used, probe. Table I gives a comparison of molecular weights obtained by turbidimetry, compared with other methods. For example, Bahls and Bloomfield (20) have applied the technique to a range of bacteriophages (T2, T4, T5, and λ). After extrapolating the turbidities to zero concentration (to eliminate interparticle interference and thermodynamic nonideality effects) (Fig. 1) and assum-

![Fig. 1. Plots of c/τ, versus c (where τ is the turbidity and c the concentration) at 436 nm for bacteriophages T5 (O), T2 (●), λ (□), and T4 (■). Redrawn from (20).](image)
ing that most of the scattering was due to the heads (which were assumed to be spherical) they obtained values for molecular weights to a precision and accuracy better than ±10%, and in reasonable agreement with values from other techniques. Camerini-Otero et al. (22) claimed accuracies of up to ±5% for the viruses PM2, T7, R17, and TMV. (Both sets of measurements were obtained prior to the availability of the series method for obtaining $Q$.) Turbidimetry has also been used to investigate the behavior of TMV in mixed biopolymer systems (23). The accuracy by which molecular weights can be obtained is also dependent on the extent to which the particular spectrophotometer used will accept scattered light at low values of $\theta$, which creates error. However, given the simplicity of measurement and the availability of spectrophotometers in biochemical laboratories it is surprising that the technique has not been more widely applied. It is to be hoped that the method will be used more frequently as the ease with which $Q$ values can now be determined becomes more widely known.

2.2 Application to Bacteria

Turbidimetry has been applied to both the vegetative cells (21, 27) and spores of bacteria (24, 25), with the aim of (i) estimating the concentrations of microorganisms and (ii) estimating their masses. It is a particularly simple and useful technique for monitoring changes in numbers and masses.

Although bacteria normally scatter more strongly than viruses, theoretical interpretation of the data is more difficult since the limits of the RGD approximation—which assumes that phase changes of the scattered light are negligible—may be exceeded. This approximation is valid provided that the following condition is met:

$$\frac{4\pi nd}{\lambda_0} \left( \frac{n}{n_0} - 1 \right) \ll 1$$  \[9\]

where $d$ is the maximum dimension of the particle, $n$ its refractive index, and $n_0$ the refractive index of the suspending medium. However, Koch (21) has pointed out that for vegetative bacterial cells this criterion may not be satisfied, because of the high refractivity of the outer membrane, and for bacterial spores, the dehydrated protoplast. However, the major influence of the phase-shift is to the direction in which scattered wavelets most strongly interfere without influencing the total amount of interference and hence the turbidity (21). For bacteria, an equation equivalent to Eq. [3] and [4] has been used:

$$\text{(OD)} = \frac{\tau}{2.303} = \frac{32\pi^2(\partial n/\partial c)^2}{3\lambda_0^4}[q^2\nu]Q$$  \[10\]

where $\nu$ is the number concentration of particles (ml$^{-1}$), $q$ is the anhydrous mass of a single particle (g), and $q^2\nu = M_c/c/N_A$. For near-spherical bacteria, $Q$ has been taken to be unity (21). This equation proves the truth of the general impression among bacteriologists (see, e.g., Ref. (26)) that turbidity is a more sensitive measure of the total mass or volume of bacteria in a sample than the number concentration. Thus it provides a very useful technique for monitoring the growth of bacteria. For example, Chung et al. (27) have used related techniques to study the effects of antibiotics on the growth of Escherichia coli.
Although the generalized treatment (which includes phase changes) known as the “Lorenz-Mie” theory is formidable—particularly for nonspherical particles—other approximations are available, such as that of Jobst (for large spheres only).

Koch (21) has used the RGD approximation to predict what the wavelength dependence ratio, $-d(OD)/d \log \lambda_0$, would be for *E. coli*, based on a prolate ellipsoid of revolution of aspect ratio 4:1. His calculated value is in excellent agreement with the experimental value of $2.28 \pm 0.02$. Change in optical density with time has been widely used as a monitor for the extent of bacterial spore germination (see, e.g., (28, 29, 24, 25)). For dormant bacterial spores of *Bacillus subtilis*, Harding and Johnson (24) have shown that $-d\log(OD)/d\log \lambda_0 = 0.89$ which is clearly lower than the value predicted by the RGD theory for a spore of modest asymmetry ($\approx 2:1$ aspect ratio). Thus the applicability of Eq. [10] was taken only tentatively and has so far been used only to give a qualitative indication of changes in mass of spores upon germination (24). This is consistent with the observation of Wyatt (personal communication) that Koch’s treatment can only be modestly applied (1) to a single strain in a single growth medium (making it virtually impossible for comparing growth of different strains) and (2) when the culture is not a multiple scattering medium (i.e., for particle concentrations $\leq 10^7$ ml$^{-1}$).

Finally Chernyak (60) has described how turbidity measurements can be used to study bacterial chemotaxis, in terms of the effects of attractants and repellents on concentrated suspensions of *E. coli*.

3. DIFFERENTIAL LIGHT SCATTERING

Although measurement of the total intensity loss through scattering of an incident beam can be relatively easy, much more valuable information can be obtained by examining the angular dependence of the amount of scattered light. This is most conveniently termed “differential light scattering.” A typical light scattering photometer constructed for this purpose and the use of a laser light source have been described by Johnson and McKenzie (30). The advantages of lasers over traditional light sources are very high intensity, high collimation, and narrow spread of wavelength, which give much improved angular resolution in intensity envelopes (31): it is fair to say that in general the use of lasers has revolutionized the application of light scattering methods.

Interpretation of the scattering envelopes is largely dictated by the size of the particle. For example, most virus particles of $M_t$ between $\approx 10^6$ and $10^8$ are large enough for intraparticle interference effects between wavelets scattered from different points in the particle to be significant, yet small enough for there to be very little difference in phase between the wavelets scattered from the various points: hence the RGD approximation is valid.

3.1. Viruses

The basic equation for angular dependence of light scattering is written

$$\frac{Kc}{R_\theta} = \frac{1}{P(\theta)} \left\{ \frac{1}{M_t} + Bc \right\}$$

where $K = 2\pi^2 n_0^2(\partial n/\partial c)^2/N_A \lambda_0^4$; $R_\theta$ is the “Rayleigh ratio” and is given by $R_\theta$.
\[ P(\theta) = 1 - \frac{16\pi^2}{3\lambda^2} R_g^2 \sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) + o(\theta^2). \]

\( R_g \) is almost ubiquitously referred to in the literature as an operational “Radius of Gyration,” although this differs from its usage in a Classical Mechanical sense, where it is defined with respect to a fixed axis of rotation. However, providing its usage is consistent, no errors are introduced. This equation is the basis of the widely used biaxial extrapolation procedure of Zimm (32), and Fig. 2 shows an example of such a plot for vaccinia virus (35). Evidently to obtain \( M_r \) it is not only necessary to perform an extrapolation to zero concentration (as with turbidimetry) but also to zero angle. The slopes of both extrapolations (assuming they are linear) can be used to obtain respectively the second thermodynamic virial coefficient, \( B \), and the radius of gyration, \( R_g \). The common intercept gives \( 1/M_r \): a variety of virus molecular weights
and radii of gyration have been determined in this way (Table II). A general approach is now available (34) whereby both $R_g$ and $B$ information can be used as a means of determining the triaxial dimensions of viruses and other macromolecules using a general ellipsoid model. This method does not require an estimate for particle solvation, nor an initial estimate of the dimensions from, for example, electron microscopy. Finally, an interesting demonstration of the application of DLS to polydisperse virus systems has been given by Wilzius (36), who showed that the particle length distributions of TMV using DLS agreed with electron microscopy.

3.2 Application to Bacteria

From the nature of the scattering envelope, particularly including features at high scattering angles (up to $180^\circ$), information concerning internal structure—in terms of refractive index profiles—can be obtained by appropriate modeling of the form factor $P(\theta)$—in terms of either RGD or generalized Mie scattering theory. The “Zimm plot” method—based on the RGD approximation—has been successfully applied to a bacterium (Serratia marcescens), but only by increasing the wavelength of the radiation used into the infrared region (37).

Much of the theory for handling the DLS of large particles has been developed for spherical scatterers (38), oriented ellipsoidal scatterers (39)—including the case of variable refractive index (40)—ellipsoids in random orientations (41) and also polydisperse suspensions of ellipsoids (42). Despite these significant theoretical developments there are two major problems in attempting to use DLS for refractive index profiling of vegetative cells or spores of bacteria:

1. Heterogeneity, viz., polydispersity/aggregation phenomena. This tends to obscure any structural features in the angular intensity envelope making refractive index modeling impossible (43). This problem has been illustrated for suspensions of B. subtilis spores by Harding and Johnson (24).

2. Asymmetry. Even if isolated particles can be examined, unless particles are spherical the nature of the scattering profile will depend on particle orientation. Random orientations of a suspension of monodisperse but asymmetric particles will also tend to smooth out any structural features (44); this has also contributed to the obscuring of structural features in Fig. 4 of Ref. (24).

---

**TABLE II**

Molecular Weights (Weight Averages) and Radii of Gyration for Various Microorganisms Obtained Using Differential Light Scattering (e.g., by the “Zimm Plot” Technique)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microorganism</th>
<th>$M_\text{r}$ (g/mol)</th>
<th>Mass (g)</th>
<th>$R_g$ (nm)</th>
<th>Hydrodynamic diameter (nm)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R17 virus</td>
<td>$3.86 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMV</td>
<td>$39 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>144 ± 2</td>
<td>373 ± 4</td>
<td>(113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccinia virus</td>
<td>$(2.7 \pm 2) \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$(4.5 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serratia marcescens</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{11}$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Infra-red radiation used.
Considerable progress in tackling the problem of polydispersity was made by Wyatt and Phillips (44). An aerosol technique was used to suspend single particles in the laser beam, with the result that structural features in the intensity envelopes could be clearly seen (e.g., Fig. 3). The disadvantages are clear, however: (i) The relatively large refractive index difference between the cell and its nonaqueous environment means that the simple RGD theory is almost certainly not applicable, and hence Mie theory must be applied if refractive index profiles are to be modeled. (ii) Even for bacterial spores which have a rigid peptidoglycan cortex and which are already in a highly dehydrated state, the nonaqueous environment will lead to a refractive index profile that may be nonrepresentative of the spore in an aqueous environment. (iii) Vegeta-
tive forms are not in such a dehydrated state, have only a relatively thin peptidoglycan wall and no spore coat and hence the technique is not applicable.

More recently, however, significant progress has been made with a single particle solution differential photometer (45). Ulanowski et al. (46) have successfully modeled profiles for the “spherical” spores of Bacillus sphaericus. “Coated sphere” models were used, in which the radii of the outer spore coat and the inner radius of the cortex were used as variables; using generalized Mie theory for coated spheres they were able to model the internal structure for several spores of B. sphaericus; agreement between each individual spore examined was very good (Fig. 4). The application of this technique to more typical ellipsoidal spore particles will depend on the ability to orient the particle in the laser beam.

The theory developed for employing DLS techniques has found considerable application in antibiotic susceptibility testing: for rapidly determining the sensitivity of bacteria to drugs, and equipment has been specifically designed for this purpose (47–49). Recent applications to a wide range of bacterial systems have been described by Murray et al. (50) and Hukins et al. (51). Bateman (52) had earlier described how a fixed angle photometer could be used to monitor environmentally induced changes in bacteria, and McKie et al. (54) have applied this to determine the minimum inhibitory concentrations of antimicrobial agents.

4. QUASI-ELASTIC LIGHT SCATTERING (QLS)

This is probably a more difficult technique to apply than DLS, and the equipment is more expensive (primarily because of the cost of “autocorrelators”) but directly yields information about the basic hydrodynamic properties (such as diffusion) of a system of microorganisms, and in particular changes that may occur therein. We have mentioned before how the specific properties of high intensity, high collimation, and narrow spread of wavelength of laser light sources have greatly enhanced the resolution of the scattering intensity profiles in DLS. However, it is the property of high coherence of laser radiation that has had the most significant impact, and this property has led to the rapid expansion of QLS techniques over the last decade. The basic principle is that, because of translational or rotational motions of particles in a suspension, the scattered intensity in a given direction will fluctuate with time. These intensity fluctuations can either be represented by a power spectrum $S(w)$ (this can be thought of as a “Doppler broadening” of the incident radiation) or more commonly in terms of an autocorrelation function $g^2(t)$. The dependence of $g^2(t)$ with time (or alternatively the dependence of $S(w)$ upon the wave number $w$) can be used to obtain (i) translational (or rotational) Brownian diffusion coefficients, (ii) an estimate for the polydispersity (through the “z-average variance” (125, 126), or, (iii) in the case of motile microorganisms, the distribution of particle velocities.

Godfrey et al. (55) have described how a conventional differential light scattering apparatus can be modified for QLS. An even fuller description of how such an apparatus can be constructed has been given by Sattelle and co-workers (127). The principal feature is an autocorrelator: a purpose-built digital computer which performs products of the intensity (as measured by the number of photons, $n$, received by a multiplier) at a time $t$ with that at a succession of other times $t + b\tau$, typically for 128 or 256 values of $b$; $\tau$ is the sample time (not to be confused with the same symbol used for turbidity). The correlator evaluates the intensity autocorrelation function $g^2(t)$,
defined by $g^2(t) = \langle n(t)n(t + b\tau)\rangle/\langle n \rangle^2$ as a function of time, $t$, where the angled brackets denote an average over times long compared with $\tau$. Commercial autocorrelators (62) which are integral with a microcomputer and software for many of the necessary analyses are now available. Alternatively, the data from the correlator may be stored and then transferred to a mainframe computer for full data analysis (24).

4.1. Application to Viruses

For dilute Brownian systems and where the effects of rotational diffusion are negligible in comparison with translational diffusion (such as for spherical viruses) $g^2(t)$ is related to the translational diffusion coefficient $D_T$ by

$$\ln [g^2(t) - 1] = -D_T k^2 t$$

where $k$ is the Bragg wave vector defined by

$$k = (4\pi n_0/\lambda_0)\sin \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right).$$

Thus $D_T$ can be found from a plot of $\ln [g^2(t) - 1]$ versus $t$. Figure 5 gives such a plot for a dilute suspension of Turnip Yellow Mosaic virus (TYMV). $D_T$ values for other viruses obtained in this way are given in Table III. The sensitivity of QLS to virus structure has been clearly demonstrated by Baran and Bloomfield (56) who showed the effect of decreasing numbers of tail fibers on the $D_T$ values of T4D bacteriophage. In further studies (57–60) Bloomfield and co-workers have taken advantage of the sensitivity of QLS measurements to analyze the kinetics of the T4 assembly process and the isomerization of T2L. Ohbayashi et al. (61) have also analyzed the T4 assembly process. Changes in the hydrodynamic properties associated with the onset of translation have been detected for Southern Bean Mosaic Virus by Brisco et al. (128).

A scattering angle of 90° is normally chosen for many QLS measurements, since stray scattering from dust particles, etc., become more of a problem at lower angles...
### TABLE III
Translational Diffusion Coefficient ($D_T$) Values for Microorganisms Determined by QLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microorganism</th>
<th>Temp ($^\circ$C)</th>
<th>$D_T$ (cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Hydrodynamic diameter (nm)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. subtilis spore</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(5.10 ± 0.09) x 10$^{-9}$</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(4.20 ± 0.07) x 10$^{-9}$</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B megaterium spore</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(5.01 ± 0.10) x 10$^{-9}$</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(4.10 ± 0.08) x 10$^{-9}$</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XF virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.53 ± 0.06) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fd virus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(2.58 ± 0.04) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMV</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato virus X (PVX)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.6 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13 virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.6 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF1 virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2L$^a$ bacteriophage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.13 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2L$^b$ bacteriophage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.12 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2L$^a$ bacteriophage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.53 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2L$^b$ bacteriophage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.05 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4D bacteriophage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.94 ± 0.05) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ NS11 virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(5.70 ± 0.03) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4D (Heads)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(3.60 ± 0.06) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(58, 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4D (Tails)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.0 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPNV (Infectious Pancreatic Neurosis virus)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7 x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesicular stomatis virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.69 ± 0.10) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Indiana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesicular stomatis virus (NJ)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.68 ± 0.10) x 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYMV</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(1.42 ± 0.01) x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17 virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.44 x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.54 x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>(122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuLV virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.96 ± 0.12) x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>145 ± 7</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuLV virus (in sucrose solvent)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.78 ± 0.05) x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>154 ± 3</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMV virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(3.19 ± 0.07) x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>144 ± 3</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMV virus (in sucrose solvent)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(3.11 ± 0.09) x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>138 ± 4</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2 virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(1.54 ± 0.03) x 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>(123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy moth virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>176 ± 9</td>
<td>(124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European pine sunflower virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>126 ± 6</td>
<td>(124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipula iridescent virus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>212 ± 10</td>
<td>(124)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Values quoted are not necessarily "infinite dilution" values.

$^a$ Slow form—tail fibers stretched.

$^b$ Fast form—tail fibers folded back.

(56): clarification of solutions using appropriate ultrafilters is generally a necessity, especially for more asymmetric scatterers, where extrapolation to zero angle (to compensate for rotational diffusion effects) is necessary.

Although $D_T$ values can be measured up to an accuracy of ±0.2% in this way, the value obtained directly from a plot of the form of Fig. 5 will be an apparent value because of the effects of thermodynamic nonideality. Extrapolation to zero concen-
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Fig. 6. Effect of solvent conditions on the concentration dependence of the apparent diffusion coefficient for TYMV. (i) pH 7.8, \( I = 0.10 \), (ii) pH 6.0, \( I = 0.10 \), (iii) pH 4.75, \( I = 0.10 \), (iv) pH 6.8, \( I = 0.20 \). All buffers phosphate–NaCl except (iii) (acetate).

For heterogeneous systems the diffusion coefficient so found will be a \( z \)-average diffusion coefficient. It can be combined in the standard way with the sedimentation coefficient (weight average) to yield a weight average \( M_r \) (see, e.g., Ref. (66)).

For nonspheroidal particles, rotational diffusion effects are no longer negligible and must be taken into consideration. In addition, Wilcoxon and Schurr (67) have pointed out that the anisotropy of the translational diffusion coefficient should be taken into account, and have offered this as an explanation of earlier discrepancies between QLS and other physicochemical measurements.

The relation corresponding to Eq. [13] for rod shape particles viz., when rotational effects are present, is (68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus</th>
<th>Temp (^{\circ})C</th>
<th>( D_R ) ( (s^{-1}) )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4B phage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>258 ± 12</td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7 phage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4528 ± 100</td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMV</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>323 ± 17</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ g^2(t) = 1 + A[1 + 2(B_2/B_0)\exp(-6D_Rt) + \cdots]\exp(-2D_Tk^2t) \quad [14] \]

where \( D_R \) is the rotational diffusion coefficient. A more general form for any optically anisotropic particle possessing cylindrical symmetry has been given by Aragon and Pecora (69) (see also Ref. (58)). Newman et al. (70) have pointed out that the ratio \( B_2/B_0 \) in Eq. [14], which depends on the rod length \( L \) (and hence the contribution from \( D_R \)), is negligible when \( kL \to 0 \); i.e., when \( D_T \) values obtained from Eq. [13] are extrapolated to zero angle as well as zero concentration. Alternatively \( D_R \) can be measured using some other suitable technique and then included in Eq. [14] from which \( D_T \) can be obtained without having to extrapolate to zero angle. This procedure has been adopted for \( X_f \) virus (71). One difficulty of this approach is that in Eq. [14] \( D_T \) will be an apparent diffusion coefficient, and hence the effective \( D_R \) at that concentration should be used.

\( D_R \) values themselves can be determined using QLS although this is in general extremely difficult; it has nonetheless been attempted for several viruses (Table IV) most notably TMV (72) and the filamentous \( fd \) virus (73). This has been achieved by curve fitting to equations of the form of Eq. [14]. \( D_R \) values for TMV have been determined using a cross-correlation technique by Kam and Rigler (75) using two detectors (see also Ref. (76)). Hopman et al. (74) have correctly pointed out the problem of double scattering effects in determining rotational diffusion coefficients (from the zero angle depolarization autocorrelation functions), and have provided a method for its minimization. They were able to obtain values for \( D_R \) of \( 4528 \pm 100 \) s\(^{-1}\) and \( 255 \pm 28 \) s\(^{-1}\) for bacteriophages T7 and T4B, respectively. The real disadvantages in QLS for obtaining rotational diffusion coefficients (as compared with transient electric birefringence) are that (i) the curve fitting procedures for equations of the form of Eq. [14] make it virtually impossible to take into consideration concentration dependence effects, which may not be negligible (77). (ii) In addition, for extended particles that are not strict rods, there will be up to three rotational diffusion coefficients (corresponding to rotation about the three principal axes in the particle). Electric birefringence decay can now be used to allow for this multiplicity of \( D_R \), especially if other hydrodynamic data are used as constraints (78, 79). As a technique for measuring \( D_R \) values, QLS does possess the advantage, however, that the method is non-perturbative because high strength electric fields are not required (with the resulting requirement for low ionic strength solutions to minimize heating effects). It is also now possible to take into consideration flexibility effects in representing the observed correlation functions (Ref. (80) for \( fd \) virus).

4.2. Bacterial Spores

Knowledge of the structural factors responsible for the heat resistance of bacterial spores is of enormous commercial importance since all UHT and canning processes are designed to kill spores. Despite this urgent requirement and over 60 years of research the exact mechanisms which spores use to achieve such resistance remains to be determined. One of the problems is that most of the probes used hitherto (chemical, genetic, electron microscopy) have been destructive, viz., have perturbed the structure being investigated, or the structure has been masked (as with NMR). The value of QLS as a nondestructive probe has recently been demonstrated by application to dormant and germinating spores of \( B. subtilis \) (24) and \( Bacillus megaterium \).
Fig. 7. Plot of diffusion coefficient (measured at a scattering angle of 90°) for *B. megaterium* spores, as a function of time after addition of germinant (L-alanine). The different symbols correspond to different runs. The continuous line represents a corresponding plot of turbidity (expressed in absorbance units at 580 nm) versus time. The temperature was 34.7°C and the concentration was 6 × 10⁷ particles ml⁻¹ (25).

(25). Apparent $D_T$ values were determined for the dormant spore (Table III) and found to correspond to Stokes radii consistent with those found from electron microscopy. Little change in diffusion coefficient (and hence volume) was observed at the onset of germination (Fig. 7), apparently consistent with the Ellar theory (81) of spore heat resistance—that is, neither an expanded nor a contracted cortex is required for the onset of spore dehydration and resistance during dormancy. At longer times swelling of the protoplast occurred, again consistent with the observations of others using different techniques (28). Although QLS primarily gives information concerning the gross morphology, when combined with DLS measurements it can, in principle at least, be used to model the internal structure, based on "scaling profiles" of

Fig. 8. Scaling plots for dormant (a) and germinated (b) spores of *B. megaterium*. The different symbols correspond to different scattering angles ranging from 8°–90°. The better scaling of (b) is probably ascribable to a reduction in asymmetry of the germinated spore (25).
autocorrelation functions (40). This has already been applied to spores of B. megaterium (25) to give qualitative information about conformation changes during germination. The improved superposition of autocorrelation functions as a function of scattering angle \( \theta \) of germinated spores (Fig. 8) can either be interpreted as the particles becoming less asymmetric or a greater homogeneity of the internal structure.

4.3. Motile Microorganisms

Besides being Brownian diffusers, many microorganisms (such as bacteria, ciliates, and flagellates) possess motility, driven by their own metabolism. One of the greatest successes of QLS has been its use as a rapid, noninvasive technique for the characterization of the velocity distributions of a wide range of microorganisms, from motile bacteria such as E. coli (82–87), spermatozoa (88–101) through to parasitic microorganisms such as Trypanosoma brucei (102, 103).

The general equation describing the intensity autocorrelation function of motile organisms of velocity \( V \) and velocity distribution \( P(V) \) is

\[
[g^2(t) - 1]^{1/2} = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-k \cdot v_i} \cdot P(V) d^3V.
\]

The particular form of this integral has been worked out for several types of distribution (see Refs. (81, 104, 105)). Expressions can be unwieldy but a particularly simplified form has been given by Chen and Hallett (104) for the case of particles with an isotropic Maxwellian distribution of velocities:

\[
[g^2(t) - 1]^{1/2} = (1 - B)e^{-D_T k^2t} + B e^{-k^2v_{rms}^2/6}
\]

where \( B \) is the fraction of organisms that are motile and \( v_{rms} \) the root mean square velocity. \( D_T, v_{rms}, \) and \( B \) are normally obtained by nonlinear least-square fitting procedures to equations of the form of Eq. [16]. For helical motion, the instantaneous tangential speed is given by \( V_T = (V_0^2 + \omega^2 R)^{1/2} \), where \( V_0 \) is the “progressive” speed and \( \omega \) the helical angular velocity at a radius \( R \).

It should be pointed out that for many systems the assumption of isotropy in deriving Eq. [16] may be a poor one. An indication of the applicability is given by a
### TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Type of microorganism examined</th>
<th>What is measured experimentally</th>
<th>Other information required</th>
<th>Information obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turbidimetry</td>
<td>(i) Any</td>
<td>Total loss in intensity through scattering</td>
<td>Refractive index increment</td>
<td>Molecular weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Motile</td>
<td>Total loss in intensity through scattering</td>
<td>Refractive index increment</td>
<td>Effects of environmental conditions on motility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential light scattering</td>
<td>(i) Virus</td>
<td>Angular dependence of scattered intensity</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Molecular weight, radius of gyration, 2nd virial coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Spore</td>
<td>Angular dependence of scattered intensity</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Refractive index profile of internal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-elastic light scattering</td>
<td>(i) Virus</td>
<td>Time resolved intensity fluctuations (TRIF)</td>
<td>Sedimentation coefficient.</td>
<td>Molecular weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Spore</td>
<td>Time resolved intensity fluctuations (TRIF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translational diffusion coefficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Motile micro-organisms</td>
<td>TRIF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translational diffusion coefficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angular dependence of TRIF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asymmetry, internal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Velocity distribution: effects of environmental conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"scaling procedure" developed by Stock (106)—viz., autocorrelation functions plotted versus $k \tau$ for various values of $k$ will superimpose for isotropic Maxwellian scatterers. In this way Stock has demonstrated scaling for Salmonella typhimurium. For typical "nonscalers" Chen and Hallett (104) have attempted a model to fit progressive rotational and helical movements.

From scalers of one sort to scalers—viz., bacterial scale contamination in fermentation reactors—in a more chemical engineering sense, Slater et al. (107) have used the technique to investigate the ability of Bacillus cereus to migrate counter to a hydrodynamic gradient. Using equations of the form of Eq. [16] and assuming an isotropic velocity distribution they obtained values of $D_T$ of $(4.6 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-9}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$ for nonmotile bacteria and a mean value of $(3.6 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-6}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$ for motile bacteria.

---

3 This is analogous to scaling plots for pure Brownian diffusion (Fig. 8) where $k^2 \tau$ is used.
QLS has been widely applied to the study of sperm motility measurements (88-101) and has permitted the testing of a range of media for their capacity to support sperm activity in vitro (cf. Sattelle et al. (101)).

Another interesting example of motility analysis has been to illustrate the effect of bromo-acetyl carnitine (BAC) on the motility of *T. brucei* (102, 103), a single-celled parasite that causes sleeping sickness in humans. Klein and co-workers were able to monitor the effects of BAC by following the dramatic changes in velocity distribution as a function of time after its addition (Fig. 9).

This latter application of a particular type of light scattering technique—QLS—would therefore appear somewhat related to the use of another type of measurement—DLS—for antibiotic susceptibility testing (47-52). A combined approach would therefore be fruitful for studies on similar systems in the future. Indeed, the three techniques described in this review—turbidimetry, DLS, and QLS—can give complementary information on a particular microbial system, whether it be on bacteria, bacterial spores, or virus structure (Table V); for example, the studies on bacterial spores (24, 25) and the work of Brisco *et al.* on the kinetics of swelling of southern bean mosaic virus (128). The latter study demonstrates the significance of recording turbidity, translational diffusion coefficient, and polydispersity information simultaneously (Fig. 10). However, in general it is fair to say that such a “combined” light scattering approach has not been frequently adopted. Nonetheless, it is my opinion that the way forward is to apply more than one of the light scattering methods to a
particular microbial system, in conjunction with other techniques such as electron microscopy, electric birefringence, and analytical ultracentrifugation, wherever appropriate.
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