

# JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

**Scardino, Andrew J. (2006) *Biomimetic fouling control*. PhD thesis, James Cook University.**

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/2091>



# **Biomimetic Fouling Control**

**Thesis submitted by**

**Andrew John Scardino BSc (Hons) *UNSW***

**in September, 2006**

**for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Marine Biology &  
Aquaculture, James Cook University**

## **STATEMENT OF ACCESS**

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Theses network, for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and; I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this work.

ANDREW J SCARDINO

07/03/07

Signature

Date

## **STATEMENT OF SOURCES**

### **DECLARATION**

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

ANDREW J SCARDINO

07/03/07

Signature

Date

**ELECTRONIC COPY**

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

ANDREW J SCARDINO

07/03/07

Signature

Date

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor Rocky de Nys. Rocky has taught me to enjoy science and research, though most importantly to believe in myself. His patience, encouragement and friendly manner has made my candidature extremely enjoyable.

The members of the de Nys lab at JCU have been fantastic. I have found them to be valuable friends as well as supporting colleagues. So, thank you Jana Guenther, Ray Bannister, Piers Ettinger-Epstein, Matt Fraser, Leo Nanvervis, Stevie Whalan, Dan Loudon, Mikey Horne and Odette Ison for three memorable years in NQ. Other members of the Aquaculture department have also been very helpful and friendly including Brad Evans, Dean Jerry, Paul Southgate, Hector Acosta-Salmon and Erika Martinez. Wade Sherbrooke, a visiting academic, was a good friend and colleague in 2004.

John Lewis from Defence Science & Technology Organisation enabled this project to be undertaken. He has been extremely supportive for the duration of my candidature and has shown considerable patience during the final write up stage.

Kevin Blake was immensely helpful with analytical techniques, particular SEM.

Zhongxiao Peng and Des Hudleston proved to be excellent collaborators. They provided valuable insight into surface characterisation techniques which were crucial for chapters 2 & 3.

Hua Zhang and Rob Lamb also turned out to be wonderful collaborators. They introduced me to superhydrophobic surfaces and chapter 7 has been the result of this fruitful partnership.

Thanks also to Andrew Stone, Rick Barber and Erol Harvey from MiniFAB for the microtextured surfaces which were used in chapters 4 and 5.

Peter Steinberg kindly allowed me to use bench space and resources at the Centre for Marine Biofouling & Bioinnovation, UNSW.

Nick Paul was extremely helpful with statistical advice.

Kevin Ness provided time and assistance with surface pressure quantification.

The School of Marine Biology & Aquaculture and the Graduate Research School at JCU have been particularly encouraging of my work. For the many opportunities you have afforded me I sincerely thank you.

CRC Reef and the Institute of Marine Engineering, Science & Technology have also been supporters of my research.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family. To my wife, Lauren, parents Roy & Frances, and siblings, David & Pauline – thanks for all your love and support, you have made my life very enjoyable and my candidature has seemed infinitely easier because of this.

## ABSTRACT

Any man-made structure immersed in the marine environment rapidly becomes fouled, with significant economic consequences. Solutions to fouling have generally used toxic paints or coatings which have damaging effects on marine life. The subsequent phasing out of these antifoulants has sparked a search for non-toxic antifouling alternatives, including the development of technologies based on natural biofouling defence models (biomimicry). The biomimetic approach to antifouling is the focus of this thesis, with an emphasis on physical fouling defence mechanisms in molluscs. Surface microtextures have been identified as potential fouling deterrent mechanisms in molluscs and have been recorded on the blue mussels *Mytilus galloprovincialis* and *M. edulis*. The aim of this thesis is to develop biomimetic fouling control using marine molluscs as a natural model.

To determine physical defences the surface texture of a range of marine bivalves and gastropods from the Great Barrier Reef was characterised and many unique microtopographical patterns discovered. Laser scanning confocal microscopy was used to quantify the surface roughness parameters for 36 selected species. This is the first example of the characterisation of natural marine surfaces in terms of mean roughness and waviness profiles, skewness, anisotropy and fractal dimension. The wettability of the selected species was also determined. Subsequently, the 36 species were assessed for fouling resistance over three months and fouling resistance and removal was correlated with the surface roughness parameters generated. Key roughness parameters, in particular skewness, fractal dimension and hydrophobicity, were identified for species specific fouling resistance and also fouling removal. Total fouling cover was positively correlated to fractal dimension and negatively correlated to skewness. Algal cover was negatively correlated to hydrophobicity, Spirorbid tubeworm cover was positively correlated to fractal dimension, and percent fouling removal was positively correlated with mean waviness.

To establish the role of surface microtexture in fouling deterrence, biomimics were created for three bivalves, *Mytilus galloprovincialis* and *Tellina plicata*, which have differing microtopographical patterns, and *Amusium balloti*, which has a smooth



surface. Smooth biomimics were significantly more fouled than microtextured biomimics. The fouling resistance of microtextured biomimics diminished after 6-8 weeks, in contrast to natural shells which maintained their fouling resistant properties for 3 months. The extended fouling resistance of natural shells supports a multiple defence strategy of the surface-bound periostracum, with the proteinaceous nature of the coating providing a defence against microfouling. A theory is proposed that microtextured biomimics only deters macrofouling larvae and that microfoulers that are smaller than the size of the microtexture fill the textures and negate its effects.

This theory is termed 'attachment point theory', whereby larval attachment is influenced by the number of attachment points with settling larvae preferring the maximum number of attachment points to enhance successful adhesion and recruitment. To test attachment point theory, microtextured films of varying texture widths (2-512  $\mu\text{m}$ ) were developed and attachment to the microtextures by a range of micro- and macro-fouling organisms was determined. Diatoms attached in significantly higher numbers on textures smaller than the width of the diatom cell. In contrast attachment was reduced on textures slightly smaller than the cell width, clearly supporting attachment point theory. Attachment by macrofouling larvae and algal spores to microtextures also supported the theory. Larvae and spores generally settled in higher number on the texture larger than the spore/larval size. Attachment points for settling larvae are identified as important mechanisms in fouling deterrence, or attachment, with the critical factor being the ratio of the width of settling organism to that of the microtexture.

The findings of fouling resistance on micro-rough surfaces were explored further to incorporate nano-scale surface roughness. This novel antifouling mechanism combines micro- and nano-scale roughness to a hydrophobic surface to create superhydrophobicity. A range of surfaces incorporating micro- with nano-scale roughness, and nano-scale roughness alone, were tested against a range of micro- and macro- fouling organisms. Nano-rough surfaces alone significantly deterred all tested organisms. In contrast micro-scale with nano-scale roughness either attracted or repelled larvae. From the mixed preferences recorded on the choice bioassays, factors other than hydrophobicity play a significant role in the selection of a surface on. All coatings were superhydrophobic ( $> 155^\circ$ ) but differed in roughness and produced very

different settlement responses. The consistently high level of deterrence by the nano-scale surface supports a theory of nano-bubbles at the surface of these coatings as an antifouling mechanism. The confirmation of this theory requires further collaborative investigation between physicists, chemists and biologists, but is a significant outcome.

Overall, the research presented has elucidated a number of novel approaches to biomimetic fouling control and developed novel theories for the mechanisms of action of natural surface-mediated fouling defences. These results also contribute to the development of promising alternatives to toxic antifouling technologies and provide unique approaches to significant new developments in micro- and nano-surface technologies in the field.

# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Title page	1
Statement of access	2
Statement on sources declaration	3
Electronic copy declaration	4
Acknowledgements	5
Abstract	7
Contents	10
List of tables	13
List of figures	14
<b>CHAPTER ONE - General introduction: Biomimetic antifouling surfaces</b>	
1.1 Biofouling defined and the biofouling sequence	17
1.2 Past solutions to biofouling	18
1.3 Non-toxic solutions to biofouling	20
1.4 Biomimetic antifouling approaches	21
1.4 Chapter summaries	31
<b>CHAPTER TWO - Surface characterisation of bivalves and gastropods from the Great Barrier Reef</b>	
2.1 Introduction	34
2.2 Methods	
2.2.1 Study sites	36
2.2.2 Collections of bivalves and gastropods	36
2.2.3 Surface characterisation	37
2.2.4 Roughness parameters	39
2.2.5 Surface wettability	44
2.2.6 Correlations of surface parameters	44
2.2.7 Univariate analyses	44
2.3 Results	
2.3.1 Surface roughness parameters shell surfaces	48
2.3.2 Surface wettability: contact angles	62

2.3.3 Correlations of surface parameters	63
2.4 Discussion	65

**CHAPTER THREE - Antifouling resistance of selected mollusc shells with quantified roughness properties**

3.1 Introduction	68
3.2 Methods	
3.2.1 Selection of species	69
3.2.2 Experimental design and measurements	69
3.2.3 Antifouling paint trial	70
3.2.4 Fouling resistance experiments	71
3.2.5 Fouling adhesion and removal	71
3.2.6 Statistical analysis	72
3.3 Results	
3.3.1 Antifouling paint trial	73
3.3.2 Fouling resistance of 36 species	78
3.3.3 Surface roughness and fouling cover correlations	90
3.3.4 Fouling adhesion and removal	93
3.4 Discussion	98

**CHAPTER FOUR - Fouling deterrence on natural bivalve surfaces: a physical phenomenon?** (Scardino & de Nys, 2004)

4.1 Introduction	103
4.2 Methods	
4.2.1 Organisms and study site	105
4.2.2 Production of biomimics	105
4.2.3 Treatments	106
4.2.4 Surface characterisation of biomimics and controls	106
4.2.5 Field exposure trials	108
4.2.6 Statistical analysis	108
4.3 Results	
4.3.1 Surface characterisation of biomimics and controls	109
4.3.2 Species diversity on treatments	109
4.3.3 Total fouling cover	110

4.3.4 Spirorbid tubeworm	111
4.3.5 <i>Diplosoma</i> sp.	112
4.3.6 <i>Bugula neritina</i>	113
4.4 Discussion	114

**CHAPTER FIVE - Testing attachment point theory: Diatom attachment to microtextured polyimide biomimics – (Scardino et al. 2006)**

5.1 Introduction	118
5.2 Methods	
5.2.1 Culture of diatom species	120
5.2.2 Production of microtextured surfaces	120
5.2.3 Bioassays procedures	122
5.3 Results	
5.3.1 Cell sizes and numbers of attachment points to microtexture	122
5.3.2 <i>Fallacia carpentariae</i> assay	124
5.3.3 <i>Nitzschia paleacea</i> assay	124
5.3.4 <i>Navicula jeffreyi</i> assay	125
5.3.5 <i>Amphora</i> sp. assay	126
5.4 Discussion	127

**CHAPTER SIX - Attachment point theory: the fouling response to a microtextured matrix**

6.1 Introduction	130
6.2 Methods	
6.2.1 Ablation of polymers	131
6.2.2 Surface characterisation	132
6.2.3 Collection of organisms	133
6.2.4 Bioassay procedures	134
6.2.5 Statistical analysis	136
6.3 Results	
6.3.1 Cell, propagule and larval sizes	136
6.3.2 <i>Amphora</i> sp. assay	137
6.3.3 <i>Ulva rigida</i> assay	138
6.3.4 <i>Centroceras clavulatum</i> assay	138

6.3.5 <i>Polysiphonia sphaerocarpa</i> assay	139
6.3.6 <i>Bugula neritina</i> assay	140
6.4 Discussion	142
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN - Micro and nano-scale surfaces with extreme hydrophobicities</b>	
7.1 Introduction	146
7.2 Methods	
7.2.1 Preparation of super-hydrophobic surfaces	148
7.2.2 Surface characterisation of super-hydrophobic surfaces	149
7.2.3 Collection and culture of organisms	151
7.2.4 Bioassay procedures	152
7.2.5 Statistical methods	153
7.3 Results	
7.3.1 <i>Amphora</i> sp. assay	154
7.3.2 <i>Ulva rigida</i> assay	154
7.3.3 <i>Polysiphonia sphaerocarpa</i> assay	155
7.3.4 <i>Bugula neritina</i> assay	156
7.3.5 <i>Balanus amphitrite</i> assay	157
7.4 Discussion	158
<b>CHAPTER EIGHT - General discussion</b>	163
<b>REFERENCES</b>	169
<b>Appendix One</b>	181
Post-hoc multiple pair-wise comparisons for roughness parameters from Chapter 2	
<b>List of Tables</b>	
Chapter 2	
<b>Table 2.1</b> Molluscs collected from the Great Barrier Reef...	37
<b>Table 2.2</b> LSCM settings configuration...	40
<b>Table 2.3</b> The 6 surface roughness parameters and hydrophobicity...	49
<b>Table 2.4</b> Surface roughness parameter correlations for the 36 species...	65

Chapter 3	
<b>Table 3.1</b> Surface pressure delivered from...	72
<b>Table 3.2.</b> Two way blocked ANOVA for fouling recruits...	75
<b>Table 3.3.</b> Two way blocked ANOVA for percent fouling cover...	77
<b>Table 3.4</b> The 36 species used for fouling resistance...	79
<b>Table 3.5</b> Correlations between surface roughness...	91
<b>Table 3.6</b> Correlations between % fouling removal and species specific...	96
<b>Table 3.7</b> Correlations between % fouling removal and roughness ...	97
<b>Table 3.8</b> Summary of significant interactions...	98
Chapter 4	
<b>Table 4.1</b> Surface microtextures measured on the eight treatments....	107
Chapter 5	
<b>Table 5.1</b> Cell sizes and the number of attachment points to polyimide...	123
Chapter 6	
<b>Table 6.1</b> Summary of surface characterisation of microtexture...	133
<b>Table 6.2</b> Cell, propagule and larval sizes of fouling organisms used ...	137
<b>Table 6.3</b> Summary of attachment to microtextured polycarbonate...	141
Chapter 7	
<b>Table 7.1</b> The roughness profiles of the 4 SHCs and glass...	151
<b>Table 7.2</b> Summary of the fouling response to SHCs and glass...	159
<b>List of Figures</b>	
Chapter 2	
<b>Figure 2.1</b> Map of North Queensland collection sites...	37
<b>Figure 2.2</b> Original surface profiles of <i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> ...	42
<b>Figure 2.3</b> Scanning electron microscopy photos of 36 species...	46
<b>Figure 2.4</b> Mean roughness between a) Classes b) Families...	50
<b>Figure 2.5</b> Mean waviness values between a) Classes b) Families...	52
<b>Figure 2.6</b> Rsk roughness between a) Classes b) Families...	54

<b>Figure 2.7</b> Wsk waviness values between a) Classes b) Families...	56
<b>Figure 2.8</b> Str values between a) Classes b) Families...	58
<b>Figure 2.9</b> Fractal dimension values between a) Classes b) Families...	60
<b>Figure: 2.10</b> Hydrophobicity values between a) Classes b) Families...	62

### Chapter 3

<b>Figure 3.1</b> <i>Amusium balloti</i> and <i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> shells after 6 weeks...	74
<b>Figure 3.2</b> Number of recruits on <i>A. balloti</i> shells...	75
<b>Figure 3.3</b> Number of recruits on <i>M. galloprovincialis</i> ...	75
<b>Figure 3.4</b> Percent cover of fouling organisms on <i>A. balloti</i> ...	77
<b>Figure 3.5</b> Percent cover of fouling organisms on <i>M. galloprovincialis</i> ...	77
<b>Figure 3.6</b> Species specific fouling cover on...	79
<b>Figure 3.7</b> Total fouling cover between: a) classes b) families	80
<b>Figure 3.8</b> <i>Bugula neritina</i> fouling cover between: a) classes	82
<b>Figure 3.9</b> Colonial ascidian fouling cover between: a) classes	84
<b>Figure 3.10</b> Spirorbidae fouling cover between: a) classes	86
<b>Figure 3.11</b> Algal fouling cover between: a) classes...	87
<b>Figure 3.12</b> Encrusting bryozoan fouling cover...	89
<b>Figure 3.13</b> Scatter plots of significant correlations between...	92
<b>Figure 3.14</b> Total fouling removal between: a)...	94
<b>Figure 3.15</b> Scatter plot of means of algal cover versus percent...	96
<b>Figure 3.16</b> Scatter plot of means of waviness profiles (Rw)...	97

### Chapter 4

<b>Figure 4.1</b> Scanning Electron Microscopy of...	106
<b>Figure 4.2</b> The mean number ( $\pm$ one S.E.) of species occurring...	110
<b>Figure 4.3</b> Mean percent total fouling cover...	111
<b>Figure 4.4</b> Mean percent fouling by a Spirorbid tubeworm...	112
<b>Figure 4.5</b> Mean percent fouling by <i>Diplosoma</i> sp....	113
<b>Figure 4.6</b> Mean percent fouling by <i>Bugula neritina</i> on...	114

### Chapter 5

<b>Figure 5.1</b> Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) images...	121
<b>Figure 5.2</b> A schematic illustrations of theoretical attachment points...	123



<b>Figure 5.3</b> Mean cell settlement by <i>Fallacia carpentariae</i> ...	124
<b>Figure 5.4</b> Mean cell settlement by <i>Nitzschia cf. paleacea</i> ...	125
<b>Figure 5.5</b> Mean cell settlement by <i>Navicula jeffreyi</i> ...	126
<b>Figure 5.6</b> Mean cell settlement by <i>Amphora</i> sp....	127
Chapter 6	
<b>Figure 6.1</b> The arrangement of microtextured squares...	132
<b>Figure 6.2</b> The proportion of <i>Amphora</i> sp. cells attached...	137
<b>Figure 6.3</b> The proportion of <i>Ulva rigida</i> spores attached...	138
<b>Figure 6.4</b> The proportion of attached <i>Centroceras clavulatum</i> spores...	139
<b>Figure 6.5</b> Numbers of <i>Polysiphonia sphaerocarpa</i> spores attached...	140
<b>Figure 6.6</b> Proportions of attached <i>Bugula neritina</i> larvae...	141
Chapter 7	
<b>Figure 7.1</b> Scanning Electron Microscopy images for SHCs...	150
<b>Figure 7.2</b> Proportion of <i>Amphora</i> sp. cells settled...	154
<b>Figure 7.3</b> Proportion of <i>Ulva rigida</i> gametes settled...	155
<b>Figure 7.4</b> Proportion of <i>Polysiphonia sphaerocarpa</i> spores...	156
<b>Figure 7.5</b> Proportion of <i>Bugula neritina</i> larvae settled...	157
<b>Figure 7.6</b> Proportion of <i>Balanus amphitrite</i> cyprids settled...	158