The chemotherapeutic drug methotrexate selects for antibiotic resistance

Jónína S. Gudmundsdóttir[1*], Elizabeth G. A. Fredheim[1], Catharina I. M. Koumans[2], Joachim

Hegstad[1,3], Po-Cheng Tang[4], Dan I. Andersson[4], Ørjan Samuelsen[1,5] and Pål J. Johnsen[1*]

[1]Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Health Sciences, UiT The Arctic University of Norway,

Tromsø, Norway.

[2]Institute of Biology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.

[3]Research and Development Division, Department of Microbiology and Infection Control,

University Hospital of North Norway, Tromsø, Norway.

[4]Department of Medical Biochemistry and Microbiology, Uppsala University, Uppsala,

Sweden.

[5]Norwegian National Advisory Unit on Detection of Antimicrobial Resistance, Department of

Microbiology and Infection Control, University Hospital of North Norway, Tromsø, Norway.

*Correspondence to: jonina.gudmundsdottir@uit.no or paal.johnsen@uit.no

Keywords

Chemotherapeutic drugs, *E. coli,* antibiotic resistance, methotrexate, resistance evolution

Abstract

Understanding drivers of antibiotic resistance evolution is fundamental for designing optimal treatment strategies and interventions to reduce the spread of antibiotic resistance. Various cytotoxic drugs used in cancer chemotherapy have antibacterial properties, but how bacterial populations are affected by these selective pressures is unknown. Here we test the hypothesis that the widely used cytotoxic drug methotrexate affects the evolution and selection of antibiotic resistance through the same mechanisms as the antibiotic trimethoprim. We show that methotrexate can select for trimethoprim resistance determinants located on the chromosome or a plasmid in clinical strains of *Escherichia coli*. Additionally, methotrexate can co-select for virtually any antibiotic resistance determinant when present together with trimethoprim resistance on a multidrug-resistance clinical plasmid. These selective effects occur at concentrations 40- to >320-fold below the methotrexate minimal inhibitory concentration for *E. coli,* suggesting a selective role of methotrexate chemotherapy for antibiotic resistance in patients that strongly depend on effective antibiotic treatment.

Significance statement

The presented data show that methotrexate has the potential to select for virtually any given antibiotic resistance gene when genetically linked to trimethoprim resistance. This study highlights the need for increased awareness of the presence of acquired antibiotic resistance determinants in the gut of patients with impaired immunity undergoing methotrexate treatment to preserve the effects of downstream antibiotic treatments.

Introduction

Antibiotic resistance is a major risk factor for patients with impaired immunity, such as cancer patients, and often a patient's survival depends on antibiotic treatment to reduce the risk for hospital-acquired infections during chemotherapy[1,2]. Several cytotoxic drugs used in cancer chemotherapy are known to both elevate bacterial mutation rates and have direct antimicrobial properties[3,4]. It has been proposed that cancer chemotherapy may drive *de novo* antibiotic resistance evolution through SOS induced mutagenesis[5], and some reports have provided support for this hypothesis[6,7]. Recently, the effects of non-antibacterial drugs on bacteria typically found in the human gut were thoroughly explored and cytotoxic drugs were reported to cause the most severe alterations of the microbiota[8]. Taken together, these studies suggest that cytotoxic drugs affect survival of human gut commensals, they may increase the evolvability of bacterial populations, and lead to reduced susceptibility towards drugs used to

treat cancer in bacteria. How bacterial populations respond to selective and co-selective

pressures exerted by individual cytotoxic drugs and the implications for antibiotic resistance

selection and spread is unknown. Thus, there is an urgent need to understand these potential

collateral effects of cancer chemotherapy to ensure effective antibiotic treatment for a large

group of immunocompromised patients. Moreover, cytotoxic drugs may constitute a previously

unrecognized target for intervention to limit the selection and spread of antibiotic resistance.

Methotrexate (MTX) is widely used in treatments including but not limited to; cancer

of the breast, skin, head, neck, and lung as well as many inflammatory diseases, such as

rheumatoid arthritis[9]. We specifically targeted resistance towards trimethoprim (TMP), since

both drugs act through inhibiting the dihydrofolate reductase enzyme in bacteria and eukaryotic

cells, central in DNA synthesis[10]. TMP in combination with sulfamethoxazole is among the

most frequently used antibiotics in the treatment of urinary tract infections and is recommended

as first line treatment internationally[11]. Our target organism in this study is *Escherichia coli*,

the most common agent of nosocomial infections world-wide[12]. *E. coli* is known to display

intrinsic resistance towards methotrexate through AcrAB-TolC mediated efflux[13], however

TMP is not a substrate for this efflux system.

Previous studies have focused on the abilities of MTX and other non-antibiotics to

inhibit bacterial growth[8]. These approaches have provided valuable insights on the effects of

non-antibiotics as modulators of the intestinal flora but lacked the necessary resolution to detect

more subtle selective effects on acquired antibiotic resistance determinants.

Here, we hypothesize that despite the demonstrated *E. coli* intrinsic MTX resistance[13],

MTX can affect antibiotic resistance evolution in *E. coli,* due to the shared molecular target

with TMP. We show that MTX selects for acquired bacterial TMP resistance (TMP[R]) and co-

selects for other antibiotic resistance determinants when co-residing on a mobile genetic

element. Exposure to a wide concentration range of MTX selects for mutations identical to

those emerging during TMP selection in clinical isolates of *E. coli*. Moreover, we show that the

minimum selective concentrations (MSCs) of MTX and positive selection for chromosomal

and plasmid-mediated TMP[R] determinants occurs at concentrations 40- and >320-fold below

the MTX minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs), respectively.

Methods

Bacterial strains and growth conditions: Bacterial strains used in this study and their

assigned reference numbers are listed in Table S1. Most strain constructs were derived from

the *E. coli* K-12 strain MG1655 (DA4201/DA5438), or for cloning purposes from *E. coli* DH5α

(MP18-09). Two isogenic pairs of clinical *E. coli* strains, where one strain is trimethoprim

susceptible (TMP^S) and the other is TMP^R, were used for fitness measurements. In the first pair,

TMP^R in *E. coli* K56-2 (MP06-01) is caused by one intragenic point mutation T>A (W30R) in

the *folA* gene, and one in its promotor region (P$_{folA}$, C>T 58 base pairs (bp) upstream of the

gene)[14,15] (MP06-05). In the second pair, *E. coli* K56-75 (MP06-41) harbouring the pG06-VIM-

1 multi-drug resistance plasmid represents the TMP^R counterpart (MP05-31). This plasmid

encodes, amongst seven other antibiotic resistance genes, two different *dfrA* genes (*dfrA1* and

dfrA12) as putative TMP^R determinants as well as a carbapenem resistance determinant (*bla*$_{VIM-}$

$_1$)[16]. For accurate MSC measurements we constructed pairs of fluorescently tagged (*yfp* and

bfp) *E. coli* MG1655 strains containing the same resistance markers as described above. For

details concerning growth conditions, susceptibility testing and strain constructions see

protocols in supplementary information (SI).

Fitness measurements: Growth rates were determined using a BioscreenC MBR reader (Oy

Growth Curves Ab, Ltd). The growth rate calculations were done using the Bioscreen Analysis

Tool BAT 2.1[17] (see SI for detailed protocol). Competition experiments were performed in six

biological replicates, including dye swaps, using the fluorescently tagged strain pairs described

above, containing *folA* or pG06-VIM-1 mediated TMP^R. Both competition experiments, MSC

calculations and competitions performed at different starting ratios were done as previously

described in[18] (see SI for detailed protocols).

Experimental evolution: To examine the effect of MTX presence on TMP^R evolution, strain

K56-2 (MP06-01) was serially passaged in liquid cultures with MTX supplemented at a

concentration slightly above the estimated MSC. Initially, ten independent overnight cultures

were started from independent colonies on separate agar plates. From the original overnight

cultures, ~10^3 cells were used to start ten independent lineages in 1 mL batch cultures

containing 400 μg/mL MTX (lineages 1-10). Every 12 h for 25 days, the lineages were serially

passaged by 1,000-fold dilution, allowing for ~500 generations of growth. Every ~50

generations the populations were frozen down at –80°C for downstream analysis. For detailed

protocols concerning experimental evolution, selective plating on high concentrations of MTX

and whole genome sequencing see SI.

Results

Methotrexate selects for pre-existing trimethoprim resistance determinants

We determined the MICs of MTX in clinical and laboratory strains of *E. coli* (Table S1). Initial
experiments revealed variable, but high MTX MICs (Table S2) consistent with previous reports
demonstrating that *E. coli* displays intrinsic resistance towards MTX due to AcrAB-TolC
mediated efflux[8,13]. We also observed that the MTX MIC was dependent on the presence of
TMP[R] determinants. All isolates with a functional TMP resistance determinant and increased
TMP MIC showed consistently higher MTX MICs (>32 mg/mL) than TMP susceptible isolates
(4-32 mg/mL), indicating possible co-selective abilities of the two drugs.

Antibiotic resistance selection and co-selection have traditionally been assumed to
occur between the MICs of susceptible and resistant isolates within a bacterial population
(known as the selective window)[18]. However, several reports unequivocally show that antibiotic
resistance selection and co-selection can occur at concentrations several hundredfold below the
MIC of a susceptible isolate (known as sub-MIC)[18-20]. To test how sub-MICs of MTX affect
bacterial fitness, we measured exponential growth rates for two pairs of clinical isogenic TMP[R]
and TMP[S] *E. coli* across a wide MTX concentration span. One pair with TMP[R] located on the
chromosome (two mutations associated with *folA*)[14] and one pair with TMP[R] (*dfrA*) located on
the MDR plasmid pG06-VIM-1[16]. TMP[S] strains displayed sharply declining growth rates
between 1 and 2 mg/mL of MTX, whereas the TMP[R] strains remained unaffected (Figure S1).
These results suggest a selective benefit during MTX exposure for TMP[R] strains at
concentrations below the observed MTX MIC of the TMP[S] clinical isolates.
The MSC describes pharmacodynamically the lowest concentration where selection for
resistance occurs[18]. To determine the MSC for MTX, we constructed a fluorescently tagged
pair of *E. coli* MG1655 strains to enable accurate separation between the two in mixed
populations. In these backgrounds, we introduced TMP[R], either through SNPs (*folA*) using
genome engineering or through the pG06-VIM-1 plasmid. The isogenic TMP[R] and TMP[S] strain
pairs were competed head-to-head by serial passage for 30 generations and the ratio of
TMP[R]:TMP[S] was determined over time using flow cytometry. From this data the MSC was
estimated (Tables S3-S5)[18]. *E. coli* with chromosomal *folA* mutations had an MSC of 200
μg/mL (1/40 of the MIC of MTX) whereas those harboring the plasmid were close to the
detection limit of the assay[18] and we conservatively estimated the MSC to be <25 μg/mL (less
than 1/320 of the MIC of MTX) (Figure 1). Taken together, our data strongly suggest that
selection for TMP[R] occurs at MTX concentrations far below the estimated MTX MIC.

Figure 1: Selection coefficients as functions of MTX concentrations from competition experiments between TMP^R and TMP^S isogenic strains. The MSC is defined as the concentration where the selection coefficient equals zero. The MSC of *E. coli* MG1655 harboring **(A)** two chromosomal *folA* mutations (MP18-04 and MP18-07) is set to 200 μg/mL, and **(B)** the MDR pG06-VIM-1 plasmid encoding *dfrA12* (MP18-05 and MP18-08) is conservatively set at 25 μg/mL. Dashed lines represent the set MSC, bullets the average selection coefficients and error bars the standard deviations.

Sub-MICs of methotrexate promotes invasion of trimethoprim resistance determinants even when rare in *E. coli* populations

Exploring MTX-selective dynamics further, we asked if TMP^R determinants could invade the population at lower initial densities to exclude potential bias from the 1:1 ratio in the competition experiments. We started competition experiments from frequencies as low as 10^{-4} of the TMP^R strains, at concentrations slightly above the estimated MSC of MTX (400 μg/mL for *folA* mediated resistance and 75 μg/mL for pG06-VIM-1 mediated resistance) and followed the change in ratios over 30 generations of growth (Figure 2). Both chromosomal and plasmid mediated TMP^R determinants were able to invade, even when initially rare in their respective populations, strongly suggesting that the MTX selective effects are independent on initial frequencies of resistant and susceptible strains during competition experiments.

Figure 2: Competition experiments during sub-MIC MXT exposure at different initial

frequencies of TMP^R strains. The change in TMP^R:TMP^S ratios over 30 generations of growth

at MTX concentrations slightly above the MSCs where *E. coli* MG1655 harbors **(A)** two *folA*

mutations (MP18-07), and **(B)** the pG06-VIM-1 plasmid (MP18-08) were competed against a

differently tagged, isogenic susceptible strain (DA56507) at 1:1, 1:10^{-2}, 1:10^{-3} and 1:10^{-4}

starting ratios. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the average ratio.

Methotrexate co-selects for resistance determinants on a multi-drug resistance plasmid

The *dfr*-genes represent a common TMP^R mechanism in *E. coli* and these genes are frequently

located on mobile genetic elements such as integrons and plasmids. Given that MTX selects for

dfr-mediated TMP^R, co-selection of other genetically linked resistance genes is likely. To show

this, we used the MDR pG06-VIM-1 plasmid harboring *dfrA1* and *dfrA12* along with multiple

resistance determinants including four aminoglycoside resistance genes and the *bla*$_{\text{VIM-1}}$

carbapenemase gene conferring resistance to broad-spectrum β-lactams including

carbapenems[16]. To assess the stability of pG06-VIM-1 in our strains competing in the presence

of MTX, *E. coli* K56-75 harboring the plasmid (MP05-31) was serially passaged in batch

cultures with 400 μg/mL MTX supplemented for 50 generations. The lineages were then plated

on non-selective agar and 100 colonies from each lineage tested for reduced susceptibility

towards ampicillin, TMP, streptomycin and spectinomycin. The results revealed complete

phenotypic stability across all three lineages, confirming MTX mediated co-selection of

plasmid mediated MDR.

To verify that the TMP^R determinants on the MDR pG06-VIM-1 plasmid is the primary

mediators of MTX resistance and selection (Table S2), both *dfrA1* and *dfrA12* were isolated

from the plasmid and cloned onto an expression vector and the effects of the individual genes

measured. Of the two genes, only *dfrA12* was shown to give the same resistance pattern for

TMP as well as MTX as the pG06-VIM-1 plasmid (Figure 3), and the lack of detectable phenotype for *dfrA1* (MP18-11) is likely due to a start codon frameshift mutation[16].

Figure 3: MTX and TMP MIC of *E. coli* DH5α expressing *dfrA1* or *dfrA12*. The MTX **(A)** and TMP **(B)** MIC for the wild type (WT) *E. coli* DH5α (MP18-09) compared to the strain harboring the empty pBAD30 (MP18-10) expression vector as well as strains with pBAD30 with different *dfrA* genes expressed under the inducible expression control by the pBAD promotor (MP18-11 and MP18-12). The detection limit of the assay is 64 μg/mL for TMP and 32 mg/mL for MTX. For both drugs, the MIC of *E. coli* DH5α expressing *dfrA*12 (MP18-12) exceeded the detection limit whereas the strain expressing *dfrA1* (MP18-11) has the same MICs as the WT strain. Showing that MTX and TMP resistance conferred by the pG06-VIM-1 plasmid is caused by the *dfrA12* gene.

Methotrexate selects for *de novo* trimethoprim resistance

We further examined whether exposure to MTX could lead to *de novo* TMP^R evolution. We selected spontaneous mutants from overnight cultures with and without exposure to MTX, plated on selective agar at high MTX concentrations and tested for TMP cross-resistance (Figure S2, Table S6). *E. coli* K56-2 isolated at 16 and 32 mg/mL MTX (MP18-17 to MP18-28) displayed increased MICs of TMP close to or above the clinical breakpoint[21], clearly demonstrating selection for TMP^R by MTX. DNA sequencing of the resistant isolates revealed

two different mutations in the *folA* promoter, previously reported to result in TMP[R22], as well
as a single mutation in the *marR* gene (Table S6-S11).
Finally, we asked if exposure to sub-MICs of MTX close to the estimated MSCs would
select for *de novo* TMP[R] mutations in a susceptible *E. coli* population. Starting from 1,000 cells
to minimize the probability of pre-existing mutants, we grew ten independent lineages of the
E. coli K56-2 strain at 400 µg/mL MTX for 500 generations. The frequency of TMP[R] was
determined every 50 generations. TMP[R] ascended in frequency in 2/10 lineages at different
rates and time-points during the first 250 generations before they were outcompeted by a
different set of mutants with reduced susceptibility to MTX and no cross-resistance to TMP
(Figure 4, Table S12). These experiments show that MTX exposure can select for *de novo*
TMP[R], both at high and sub-MIC concentrations.

Figure 4: Evolution of TMP^R during MTX exposure for 500 generations. (A) Sub-MIC
evolution experimental set-up. Ten biological replicates of K56-2 (MP06-01) were evolved for
~500 generations with 400 μg/mL MTX and three biological replicates without drug. All
lineages were screened for TMP^R every 50 generations. After 500 generations all end-point
populations were plated on 32 mg/mL MTX. All populations were able to grow at 32 mg/mL
MTX, but not a single clone isolated conferred TMP^R, strongly suggesting that reduced
susceptibility to MTX with no cross-resistance to TMP evolved in the endpoint populations.
(B) Fractions of TMP^R *folA* mutants isolated every 50 generations from the lineages where
these were detected. The detection limit of the assay was ~2x10^-9. Solid lines represent the two
lineages where TMP^R emerged and ascended in frequency whereas dotted lines indicate
spontaneous mutants.

Pharmacokinetic approximations

To assess pharmacokinetic relevance, we attempted to estimate the MTX concentration range
likely to be found in the intestine of patients undergoing MTX treatment. Limited information
is available on gut MTX concentrations following intravenous administration during cancer
treatment, as pointed out by others[8]. Pharmacokinetic data reveal that up to 90% of administered
MTX is renally excreted[23] and we assume that the remaining ~10% of the dose constitutes the
upper limit of the concentration range present in the human intestine. The lower limit is set to
2% of the dose based on the mean ^{3}H labelled MTX concentrations measured in stool samples
from nine patients receiving MTX intravenously[24]. From this, we set a 24 hour transition time
in a total volume of 0.6 L [8] and calculated the dose (*d*) required to achieve MSC in the human
intestine from:

261
$$\frac{d}{0.6L} \; x \; (0.1 \; or \; 0,02) = MSC$$

Estimated doses needed to reach intestinal MSCs assuming 2% and 10% fecal MTX
concentrations were from 0.15g to 0.75g for plasmid-mediated TMP^R and from 1.2g to 6g for
chromosomal *folA* mutations. Thus, assuming close to 2m^2 body surface in grown-up patients[25]
estimates of MSC for plasmid-mediated TMP^R translates to dosing regimens from 75-375
mg/m^2 and from 0.6-3 g/m^2 for the chromosomal *folA* mutations. These approximations indicate
that our MSC estimates are relevant for patients receiving high dose MTX treatment (1-12
g/m^2)[26]. A recent study used a different approach estimating gut MTX concentrations following
oral administration during treatment of rheumatoid arthritis[27]. Their data suggested MTX
concentrations as high as 100 μg/mL are found in the gut, suggesting that our estimated MSC

for plasmid-mediated antibiotic resistance determinants (25 μg/mL) is well within this
concentration range.

Discussion

Here we show that exposure to the cytotoxic drug MTX affects selection and evolution of TMP[R]
determinants at clinically relevant concentrations. Notably, MTX can mediate selection of any
antibiotic resistance determinant when TMP[R] is co-localized on a mobile genetic element across
a wide concentration gradient. Arguably, this potentially important side-effect of MTX
treatment has been previously unrecognized, as studies on the effects of non-antibiotic drugs,
including MTX, have either focused on bacterial growth inhibition or used drug concentrations
around the MIC[8,28-30], with a few exceptions[19,31]. Using the approaches outlined here, including
high resolution mixed culture competition experiments, allow determination of the true MTX
selective window ranging from the MSC to the MIC[18]. This is particularly relevant for non-
antibiotics for which bacteria display reduced susceptibility. In *E. coli,* MTX is a substrate for
the AcrAB-TolC efflux pump[13] and selective effects as those demonstrated here would not have
been detected in classical susceptibility and/or growth assays in bacterial monocultures. This
was recently supported in an *E. coli* chemical genetic screen where clear growth inhibitory
effects of MTX, as well as for a range of other non-antibiotics, were only demonstrated in a
tolC knock-out mutant (i.e. in a mutant lacking the intrinsic mechanism of resistance)[8].

Given that many cytotoxic drugs are structurally similar to antibiotics (e.g.
doxorubicin/tetracyclines), or target similar key processes as the major antibiotic groups (e.g.
DNA/protein synthesis) it is possible that cancer chemotherapy may lead to increased levels of
antibiotic resistance in a vulnerable patient group that very often rely on efficient antibiotic
treatment for survival. To acquire a deeper understanding of the evolutionary potential of novel,
non-antibiotic drivers of antibiotic resistance the approaches presented here are essential. These
approaches need to be combined with an improved understanding of the intestinal
pharmacokinetics of MTX and other cytotoxic drugs, possible effects of co-administered drugs
such as leucovorin mediated MTX rescue[32], and their interactions with the human microbiome.
Such knowledge could allow identification of antibiotic + non-antibiotic drug combinations
that should be avoided to preempt resistance evolution.

Recent studies have showed that non-antibiotics can increase mutation rates[6,7] and
promote horizontal gene transfer[31,33]. Taken together with the data presented here it is clear that
non-antibiotic drugs have the potential to affect the evolution, selection, and spread of antibiotic
resistance determinants. It is also clear that without a better understanding of these potential

drivers of antibiotic resistance, interventions including those targeting human consumption of
antibiotics may be negatively affected.

Acknowledgments: We thank: Fredrik Sund, MD at The University Hospital North Norway
for valuable input on medical aspects of MTX. Ass. Prof. Daniel Rozen, Leiden University for
valuable discussions. Prof. Natasa Skalko-Basnet and Ass. Prof. Ann Mari Holsæter, UiT The
Arctic University of Norway, for training in handling of cytostatic drugs. Funding: PJJ was
supported by a joint grant from UiT The Arctic University of Norway and the Northern Norway
Regional Health Authority (A23270). DIA was supported by the Swedish Research Council
(grant 2017-01527).

Author contributions: The study was designed by JSG, EGAF, ØS and PJJ. Strain
constructions were done by PT and JSG. Experiments were conducted by JSG, EGAF and
CIMK. WGS analysis was done using a bioinformatic pipeline designed by JH. WGS data was
verified by JH and JSG. Experimental data was verified by JSG and PJJ. Formal data analysis
and data visualization was done by JSG. The first draft of the manuscript was written by JSG
and revised by PJJ. All authors revised subsequent version and provided key edits to the
manuscript. Funding acquisition and resources were provided by PJJ and DIA.

Competing Interests: The authors declare no competing interests. **Data availability:** WGS
data are available at NCBI (BioProject PRJNA677979).

References:

1.   Teillant A, Gandra S, Barter D, Morgan DJ, Laxminarayan R. Potential burden of
antibiotic resistance on surgery and cancer chemotherapy antibiotic prophylaxis in the USA:
a literature review and modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2015; **15**(12): 1429-
37.
2.   Danai PA, Moss M, Mannino DM, Martin GS. The Epidemiology of Sepsis in Patients
With Malignancy. *Chest* 2006; **129**(6): 1432-40.
3.   Nakamura S-i, Oda Y, Shimada T, Oki I, Sugimoto K. SOS-inducing activity of chemical
carcinogens and mutagens in *Salmonella typhimurium* TA1535/pSK1002: examination with
151 chemicals. *Mutation Research Letters* 1987; **192**(4): 239-46.

4.   Foley GE, Mc CR, Binns VM, et al. A comparative study of the use of microorganisms

in the screening of potential antitumor agents. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*

1958; **76**(3): 413-38; discussion 38-41.

5.   Papanicolas LE, Gordon DL, Wesselingh SL, Rogers GB. Not Just Antibiotics: Is Cancer

Chemotherapy Driving Antimicrobial Resistance? *Trends in Microbiology* 2018; **26**(5): 393-

400.

6.   Meunier A, Nerich V, Fagnoni-Legat C, et al. Enhanced emergence of antibiotic-

resistant pathogenic bacteria after *in vitro* induction with cancer chemotherapy drugs.

Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 2019; **74**(6): 1572-7.

7.   Hobson CA, Bonacorsi S, Hocquet D, et al. Impact of anticancer chemotherapy on the

extension of beta-lactamase spectrum: an example with KPC-type carbapenemase activity

towards ceftazidime-avibactam. *Scientific Reports* 2020; **10**(1): 589.

8.   Maier L, Pruteanu M, Kuhn M, et al. Extensive impact of non-antibiotic drugs on

human gut bacteria. *Nature* 2018; **555**: 623-8.

9.   Jolivet J, Cowan KH, Curt GA, Clendeninn NJ, Chabner BA. The Pharmacology and

Clinical Use of Methotrexate. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1983; **309**(18): 1094-104.

10.   Mauldin RV, Carroll MJ, Lee AL. Dynamic dysfunction in dihydrofolate reductase

results from antifolate drug binding: modulation of dynamics within a structural state.

Structure 2009; **17**(3): 386-94.

11.   Bergstrom P, Holm S, Grankvist K, Henriksson R. Interaction between antibiotics and

antineoplastic drugs on antibacterial activity *in vitro*: Estramustine phosphate sensitizes

pneumococci to amikacin. *International Journal of Oncology* 1994; **4**(2): 435-9.

12.   Struelens MJ, Denis O, Rodriguez-Villalobos H. Microbiology of nosocomial infections:

progress and challenges. *Microbes and Infection* 2004; **6**(11): 1043-8.

13.   Kopytek SJ, Dyer JC, Knapp GS, Hu JC. Resistance to methotrexate due to AcrAB-

dependent export from *Escherichia coli*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 2000;

44(11): 3210-2.

14.   Podnecky NL, Fredheim EGA, Kloos J, et al. Conserved collateral antibiotic

susceptibility networks in diverse clinical strains of *Escherichia coli*. *Nature Communications*

2018; **9**(1): 3673.

15.   Kahlmeter G. The ECO.SENS Project: a prospective, multinational, multicentre

epidemiological survey of the prevalence and antimicrobial susceptibility of urinary tract

pathogens--interim report. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* 2000; **46 Suppl 1**: 15-

22; discussion 63-5.

16.   Di Luca MC, Samuelsen Ø, Starikova I, et al. Low biological cost of carbapenemase-

encoding plasmids following transfer from *Klebsiella pneumoniae* to *Escherichia coli. Journal*

of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 2016; **72**(1): 85-9.

17.   Thulin M. "BAT: an online tool for analysing growth curves". 2018. (Available from:

http://www.mansthulin.se/bat/2019).

18.   Gullberg E, Cao S, Berg OG, et al. Selection of Resistant Bacteria at Very Low

Antibiotic Concentrations. *PLOS Pathogens* 2011; **7**(7): e1002158.

19.   Gullberg E, Albrecht LM, Karlsson C, Sandegren L, Andersson DI. Selection of a

Multidrug Resistance Plasmid by Sublethal Levels of Antibiotics and Heavy Metals. *mBio*

2014; **5**(5): e01918-14.

20.   Westhoff S, van Leeuwe TM, Qachach O, Zhang Z, van Wezel GP, Rozen DE. The

evolution of no-cost resistance at sub-MIC concentrations of streptomycin in *Streptomyces*

coelicolor. *The ISME Journal* 2017; **11**(5): 1168-78.

21.   The European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing "Breakpoint tables

for interpretation of MICs and zone diameters, Version 10.0". EUCAST, 2020.

22.   Eliopoulos GM, Huovinen P. Resistance to Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole. *Clinical*

Infectious Diseases 2001; **32**(11): 1608-14.

23.   Seideman P, Beck O, Eksborg S, Wennberg M. The pharmacokinetics of methotrexate

and its 7-hydroxy metabolite in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *British Journal of Clinical*

Pharmacology 1993; **35**(4): 409-12.

24.   Henderson ES, Adamson RH, Oliverio VT. The metabolic fate of tritiated

methotrexate. II. Absorption and excretion in man. *Cancer Research* 1965; **25**(7): 1018-24.

25.   Sacco JJ, Botten J, Macbeth F, Bagust A, Clark P. The Average Body Surface Area of

Adult Cancer Patients in the UK: A Multicentre Retrospective Study. *PLOS ONE* 2010; **5**(1):

e8933.

26.   Howard SC, McCormick J, Pui C-H, Buddington RK, Harvey RD. Preventing and

Managing Toxicities of High-Dose Methotrexate. *Oncologist* 2016; **21**(12): 1471-82.

27.   Nayak RR, Alexander M, Deshpande I, et al. Methotrexate impacts conserved

pathways in diverse human gut bacteria leading to decreased host immune activation. *Cell*

Host Microbe 2021.

28.   Kruszewska H, Zareba T, Tyski S. Antimicrobial activity of selected non-antibiotics -

Activity of methotrexate against *staphylococcus aureus* strains; 2000.

29.   Moody MR, Morris MJ, Young VM, Moyé LA, Schimpff SC, Wiernik PH. Effect of Two

Cancer Chemotherapeutic Agents on the Antibacterial Activity of Three Antimicrobial

Agents. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 1978; **14**(5): 737-42.

30.   Nyhlén A, Ljungberg B, Nilsson-Ehle I, Odenholt I. Bactericidal Effect of Combinations

of Antibiotic and Antineoplastic Agents against *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli*.

Chemotherapy 2002; **48**(2): 71-7.

31.   Wang Y, Lu J, Mao L, et al. Antiepileptic drug carbamazepine promotes horizontal

transfer of plasmid-borne multi-antibiotic resistance genes within and across bacterial

genera. *The ISME Journal* 2019; **13**(2): 509-22.

32.   Van der Beek JN, Oosterom N, Pieters R, de Jonge R, van den Heuvel-Eibrink MM, Heil

SG. The effect of leucovorin rescue therapy on methotrexate-induced oral mucositis in the

treatment of paediatric ALL: A systematic review. *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology*

2019; **142**: 1-8.

33.   Wang Y, Lu J, Engelstädter J, et al. Non-antibiotic pharmaceuticals enhance the

transmission of exogenous antibiotic resistance genes through bacterial transformation. *The

ISME Journal* 2020; **14**(8): 2179-96.

419