

CALIFORNIA STATE SCIENCE FAIR 2015 PROJECT SUMMARY

| Name(s) | Project Number |
|---|----------------------------|
| Ray C. Huang | |
| | |
| | |
| | 35234 |
| Project Title | |
| Toward a Strategy for Extending Antibiotic Effectiveness Indefinitely | |
| Introducing Antibacterial Bio-Restriction | |
| Introducing Antibacterial Dio-Kestriction | |
| | |
| Objectives/Goals Abstract | |
| The objective is to see if antibacterial bio-restriction (a combination of conjuga | tion in ubition bacterial |
| interference, and antibiotic) will inhibit the proliferation of the model resistant | athogen (E. coli TOP10F' |
| tetR). | |
| Methods/Materials | \checkmark |
| With TOP10F' (tetR donor) as the model resistant pathogen and TOP10 + pVR model symbiotic, these two strains were co-cultured at an initial fath of 1.1000 | ampR recipient) as the |
| model symbiotic, these two strains were co-cultured at an initial ratio of 1000 | (F':pVIB). In this media |
| was also 25% MIC of Ampiciliin and non-lytic phage M13 (independent variab | ble). This culture was |
| incubated for 24 hours, and then a 2 μ L inoculation was added into a fresh ned | ia with all the same |
| additional compounds (excluding cells). This process continued over 4 days. S | selective plating was used |
| to calculate number of transconjugant, donor, and recipient cells. The different CONTROL and EXPERIMENTAL was the addition of phage M13. In a pilot | lating factor between |
| no significant lytic effect on the model pathogen (TOP10F'). | study, phage M15 showed |
| Results | |
| In the EXPERIMENTAL, the model symbiotic grew to an astounding 3.02 x 10^11 cells/mL while the | |
| In the EXPERIMENTAL, the model symbiotic grew to an astorniding 3.02 x 10^11 cells/mL while the model pathogen lowered to negligible levels after just 2 days. In the CONTROL, the model symbiotic only grew to 1.98 x 10^11 cells/mL, while the model pathogen and transconjugant grew to about 2.2 x | |
| only grew to 1.98 x 10^11 cells/mL, while the model pathogen and transconjugant grew to about 2.2 x | |
| 10^{7} cells/mL and were still on the rise. | - |
| Conclusions/Discussion | |
| The greatest danger of antibiotic resistance is the proliferation of resistant pathogens caused by selective pressure. Unlike previous therapies, the new strategy of antibacterial bio-restriction holds the hopes of extending antibiotic effectiveness indefinitely due to the fact that it targets the amount of space/ nutrients | |
| pressure. Unlike previous therapies, the new strategy of antibacterial bio-restriction holds the hopes of | |
| available for pathogen growth, a factor that pathogens have limited evolutionary control over despite | |
| natural selection. In addition, there are ramify ations that may make this approach revitalizable if | |
| resistance was ever to occur. However, while only time can tell how "indefinite" this strategy may be, I | |
| believe that it's worth a try. | |
| | |
| The results suggest that bip restriction may be feasible and was effective within | a controlled environment. |
| Note that the model resistant pathogen wasn't targeted by any direct bactericida | l compounds, but rather |
| most likely died due to competition for nutrients. | |
| | |
| Summary Statement | |
| By rethinking antibiotic resistance through the use of a combination of antibacterial methods, extending | |
| the effectiveness of antibiotic indefinitely may be within reach. | |
| | |
| Help Received | |
| Universal Biopharma Research Laboratory supplied materials and minor troubleshooting assistance for | |
| the experiment. | |
| | |