

Testing the effect of simulated microgravity on the growth and biofilm development of bacteria using the EagleStat, a 2D microgravity analog.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose

Hypotheses

1.
2.
3.

Results

| Specie | Absorbance (260 nm) |              | Cell count (CFU/mL) |              | Biofilm (550 nm) |              |
|--------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
|        | Gravity             | Microgravity | Gravity             | Microgravity | Gravity          | Microgravity |
|        |                     |              |                     |              |                  |              |
|        |                     |              |                     |              |                  |              |
|        |                     |              |                     |              |                  |              |
|        |                     |              |                     |              |                  |              |

Compare the absorbance and biofilm biomass, separately, among the different species using a bar graph.

## **Conclusions**

1. Do your results support one or more of your hypotheses?
2. How can you explain the different response observed among the different species, if any, to simulated microgravity?

## Questions

1. What is the composition of the microbiological media used for the different species?
2. Give three biological processes that bacteria regulate when they grow under microgravity conditions, either at the ISS or using a microgravity analog. Make sure you cite your sources.
3. Explain the use microgravity analogs for biological models other than bacteria (e.g. animals, plants, etc.)

4. Explain a non-space application for simulated microgravity research.