Exploration of BAY 11-7082 as a novel antibiotic

Victoria E. Coles[a,b], Patrick Darveau[c], Xiong Zhang[a], Hanjeong Harvey[a,b], Brandyn D. Henriksbo[b],

Angela Yang[a,b], Jonathan D. Schertzer[b], Jakob Magolan[a,b,c], and Lori L. Burrows[a,b] *

[a]*Department of Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street W.*

Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4K1, Canada

[b]*Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Infectious Disease Research, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street*

W. Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4K1, Canada

[c]*Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street W. Hamilton,*

Ontario, L8S 4L8, Canada

*Email: lori.burrows@mcmaster.ca

Abstract

Exposure of the Gram-negative pathogen *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* to sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics increases formation of biofilms. We exploited this phenotype to identify molecules with potential antimicrobial activity in a biofilm-based high-throughput screen. The anti-inflammatory compound BAY 11-7082 induced dose-dependent biofilm stimulation, indicative of antibacterial activity. We confirmed that BAY 11-7082 inhibits growth of *P. aeruginosa* and other priority pathogens, including methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). We synthesized 27 structural analogues, including a series based on the related scaffold 3-(phenylsulfonyl)-2-pyrazinecarbonitrile (PSPC), 10 of which displayed increased anti-*Staphylococcal* activity. Because the parent molecule inhibits the NLR Family Pyrin Domain Containing 3 (NLRP3) inflammasome, we measured the ability of select analogues to reduce IL-1β production in mammalian macrophages, identifying minor differences in the structure-activity relationship for the anti-inflammatory and antibacterial properties of this scaffold. Although we could evolve stably resistant MRSA mutants with cross resistance to BAY 11-7082 and PSPC, their lack of shared mutations suggested that the two molecules could have multiple targets. Finally, we showed that BAY 11-7082 and its analogues potentiate the activity of penicillin G against MRSA, suggesting that this scaffold may serve as an interesting starting point for the development of antibiotic adjuvants.

Keywords:

Methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; biofilm; antibiotics; drug discovery

Introduction

The overuse and misuse of antibiotics has selected for resistant bacteria, increasing the prevalence of drug-resistant infections. As resistance renders standard treatment options less effective, there is a need for the development of novel pharmaceuticals to treat those infections, particularly those caused by the ESKAPE (*Enterococcus faecium*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Acinetobacter baumannii*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Enterobacter* species) pathogens.[1,2] Despite this urgent need, approval of new antimicrobials by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has decreased in recent decades, with only nine new antibiotics approved between 1998-2002.[3] The rate of approval increased slightly within the last ten years, with eight new antibiotics approved between 2010-2015; however, of these, only three are active against ESKAPE pathogens and only one has a novel mechanism of action, with the rest belonging to established antibiotic classes.[4]

Development of novel antimicrobials with potent activity against the ESKAPE pathogens – including

methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) – is crucial. Since strains of MRSA are extensively β-lactam

resistant, treatment options are scarce. They include vancomycin, daptomycin, linezolid, tetracyclines,

and rifampin, though rifampin is given only in combination therapies due to high rates of resistance

development.[5] MRSA isolates resistant to vancomycin, daptomycin, and linezolid have already been

observed in the clinic,[6–8] and high rates of adverse reactions to linezolid further complicate treatment.[9]

There is therefore a need for safe, orally available anti-MRSA compounds with novel antimicrobial

mechanisms to which resistance has not yet been observed.

Traditional methods for identifying new antibiotics include screening libraries of compounds for growth

inhibition, but frequently fail to produce promising hits.[10] Heavily-exploited historic techniques including

screening soil extracts for natural products rarely uncover novel molecules, while high-throughput

screening using *in vitro* targets often fails to produce hits with significant activity in whole-cell assays.[11,12]

One way to increase the likelihood of uncovering hit compounds is by using bioactive molecules,

including drugs approved for non-antibiotic indications, since hit rates are significantly higher.[13] To

increase our chances of identifying new antimicrobials, we developed a biofilm-based assay for high-

throughput screening of previously-approved drugs and compounds with known bioactivity. Formation of

P. aeruginosa biofilms – surface-associated communities of bacteria encased in a self-produced

extracellular matrix – acts as a sensitive proxy for detecting antimicrobial activity, since it is stimulated in

a dose-dependent manner by sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics.[14] The biofilm stimulation

phenotype allows us to screen compounds for growth inhibition at a low concentration of 10 µM, while

alerting us to compounds that may have antibiotic activity above this concentration. Compounds with

weaker antibiotic activity can then be improved through medicinal chemistry optimization, ensuring we

miss fewer potential hits.

Using a biofilm stimulation screen, we identified the anti-inflammatory BAY 11-7082 as having

antibacterial activity against multiple species, including MRSA. BAY 11-7082 is a synthetic anti-

inflammatory that inhibits the nuclear factor-κB (NF-κB) pathway and the NLR Family Pyrin Domain

Containing 3 (NLRP3)/caspase-1 inflammasome.[15,16] It is proposed to act by blocking IκB-α

phosphorylation but may have alternate cellular targets, and its exact mechanism of action remains

unknown.[15,17] BAY 11-7082 has also been proposed to act on mammalian protein tyrosine phosphatases

(PTPs), which are involved in numerous cellular processes.[18] We re-synthesized BAY 11-7082 and began

a medicinal chemistry effort to optimize its anti-*Staphylococcal* activity and determine the compound's

structure-activity relationship (SAR). We ultimately transitioned to a related scaffold, 3-(phenylsulfonyl)-

2-pyrazinecarbonitrile (PSPC) and identified 10 analogues with improved anti-MRSA activity, validating

the utility of biofilm stimulation as a tool for novel antibiotic discovery.

Results

BAY 11-7082 stimulates *P. aeruginosa* biofilm formation and has potent anti-MRSA activity

Using a previously described biofilm assay,[19,20] we screened a library of 3,921 FDA approved or

biologically active compounds. Compounds were screened in duplicate at 10 µM against *P. aeruginosa*

PAO1 in a dilute media comprising 10% lysogeny broth (LB), 90% phosphate buffered saline (PBS)

(hereafter 10% LB). The screen yielded 60 compounds that inhibited *P. aeruginosa* growth to less than

50% of the vehicle (DMSO) control, 8 that inhibited biofilm formation to less than 50% of the control,

and 60 that stimulated biofilm formation above 200% of the control.[20] One of these biofilm stimulators

was the anti-inflammatory BAY 11-7082 **1** (Figure 1A), which we further explored due to its previously

unreported antibacterial activity. Using a dose-response assay (Figure 1B), we confirmed that BAY 11-

7082 stimulated *P. aeruginosa* biofilm formation at low concentrations and inhibited growth at higher

concentrations.

To explore its antibacterial potency and spectrum of activity, we determined the minimal inhibitory

concentration (MIC) in 10% LB for *P. aeruginosa* plus six other model and priority pathogens: *A.*

baumannii, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Escherichia coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, and two strains of MRSA (*S. aureus*

15981 and USA300) (Figure 1C). While BAY 11-7082 displayed modest activity against *P. aeruginosa*

(MIC: 100 µM, 20.73 µg/mL) and other Gram-negatives, it was particularly potent against Gram-

positives, including MRSA (MIC: 0.78 µM, 0.16 µg/mL), leading us to focus our efforts on developing

BAY 11-7082 as an anti-*Staphylococcal* agent. We also determined the MIC in two standard nutrient-rich

growth media, LB and Mueller-Hinton Broth (MHB) (Supplementary Figure 1). Based on the MIC in

MHB, we selected *S. aureus* 15981 over *S. aureus* USA300 as the strain of choice for comparing

synthetic analogues, since the lower baseline MIC would allow us to see a greater range of activities.

To test whether BAY 11-7082 has activity against drug-resistant strains, we exploited its modest activity

against *E. coli* to test it against the Antibiotic Resistance Platform (ARP),[21] a collection of

hyperpermeable efflux deficient *E. coli* BW25113 Δ*bamB*Δ*tolC* strains carrying genes that confer

resistance to a wide variety of antibiotics. A subset of the ARP was pinned onto Mueller Hinton Agar

(MHA) containing BAY 11-7082 at 25, 50, or 100 µM (Supplementary Figure 2). None of the *E. coli*

hyperpermeable strains were able to grow at concentrations as low as 25 µM (5.18 µg/mL), indicating

that BAY 11-7082 is an effective antibiotic even in the presence of common resistance elements.

Figure 1. BAY 11-7082 **1** stimulates biofilm formation and has broad-spectrum antibacterial activity. (A)

Structure of BAY 11-7082. (B) BAY 11-7082 stimulates biofilm formation (absorbance of crystal violet

at 600 nm as a percent of the DMSO control) and decreases planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm

as a percent of the DMSO control) of *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 in 10% LB. (C) BAY 11-7082 inhibits

planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm as a percent of the DMSO control) of seven bacterial species

in 10% LB. Heatmap represents an average of three independent experiments performed in triplicate.

Synthesis and antibacterial activity of analogues

To improve potency and better understand the molecule's SAR, we synthesized a series of 15 informative

structural analogues (Figure 2) and evaluated them for anti-MRSA activity. Analogues **5-18** were

synthesized following General Procedure A (Supplementary Information), where a sodium sulfinate **2**

was combined with 2,3-dibromopropane nitrile, carboxamide or methyl ester **3** to allow for installation of

the alkene and the nitrile, or an alternate electron withdrawing group, on the right side of the molecule.

Analogues were designed with modifications to the left and/or right sides, including those with alternate

heterocycles or alternate substituents on the benzene ring on the left side (**5-8**, **10-16**, **18**, **19**) and those

with alternate electron withdrawing groups on the right side (**7**, **9-11**, **13-18**). Included in this group of

analogues is BAY 11-7085 **6** which, like BAY 11-7082, has reported anti-inflammatory activity.[15] To

determine if the alkene is essential for antimicrobial activity, which would suggest the mechanism

requires irreversible binding to a target at that position, we synthesized **19** through hydrogenation over

palladium on carbon of the potent analogue **5**.

Only **5** and **6** had improved potency against MRSA compared to BAY 11-7082. Moving from a methyl

group to the fluorine **5** or tert-butyl **6** increased potency. Similarly, **8**, which lacked substituents on the

benzene ring, was less potent than BAY 11-7082. With the surprising exception of **7**, analogues with
substituents larger than a tert-butyl group, including the bicyclic heterocycles, had reduced potency,
potentially due to steric hinderance at the molecular target(s). All other analogues with a non-nitrile group
on the right side of the molecule were less active, leading us to conclude the nitrile is necessary for potent
antimicrobial activity. As expected, **19** lacked antimicrobial activity up to the highest concentration tested
of 100 µM.

Figure 2. Synthesis (top) and antibacterial activity (bottom) of BAY 11-7082 **1** and its analogues **5**-**19**.
Structures are arranged in order of increasing MIC values, reported in µM for *S. aureus* 15981 grown in
MHB.

To further explore the molecule's SAR, we transitioned to a similar scaffold with an additional ring,
offering new sites for diversification. We selected 3-(phenylsulfonyl)-2-pyrazinecarbonitrile (PSPC) **20**
due to its structural similarities to BAY 11-7082 and its reported *in vivo* activity against MRSA in a
Caenorhabditis elegans nematode infection model.[22] This scaffold also had the advantage of lacking the
αβ-unsaturated sulfone in BAY 11-7082 that could lead to toxicity. We first confirmed that PSPC
stimulated *P. aeruginosa* biofilm formation and had a similar spectrum of antibacterial activity, including
potent activity against MRSA (Supplementary Figure 3), then synthesized the analogues **24**-**34** following
General Procedure B (Supplementary Information), where a chlorocarbonitrile pyrazine or pyridine **21**
was combined with a sulfonyl chloride **22** (Figure 3). PSPC differs from BAY 11-7082 by the addition of
a pyrazine between the sulfone and the nitrile. While all analogues retain the nitrile group, some have a
pyridine instead of a pyrazine (**33**, **34**). Capitalizing on our success with the fluorine analogue **5**, we
designed analogues with halogen substituents at the para position of the benzene (**24**, **25**, **28**, **33**, **34**), as

well as **30** with a meta fluorine, three analogues with two fluorine substituents at differing positions (**27**, **31**, **32**), and **26** with a para trifluoromethyl group. We also explored a nitrile group (**29**) as an example of a non-halogen para electron withdrawing substituent.

Figure 3. Synthesis (top) and antibacterial activity (bottom) of PSPC **20** and its analogues **24-34**. Structures are arranged in order of increasing MIC values reported in µM for *S. aureus* 15981 grown in MHB.

Analogues **24-31** all exhibited increased anti-MRSA activity relative to BAY 11-7082 and their parent compound PSPC, with MICs as low as 0.78 µM. Similar to our results with the first series of analogues, the addition of a halogen or other relatively small electron withdrawing substituent on the benzene ring increased potency, though the number or position of these groups had little impact. Pyridine analogues **33** and **34** lack antibacterial activity up to the highest concentration tested of 100 µM, indicating that while the pyrazine itself is not necessary for antibacterial activity – as in BAY 11-7082 and analogues **5-14** – the addition of a more basic heterocycle abrogates activity.

Evolving mutants resistant to BAY 11-7082 and PSPC

To understand BAY 11-7082 and PSPC's mechanism of action (MOA) and determine whether the two scaffolds shared a common target, we attempted to evolve resistant mutants of *S. aureus* 15981. While we

initially isolated colonies grown on MHA using supra-MIC (6X and 8X MIC) concentrations of BAY 11-

7082, those colonies did not grow when re-streaked on fresh MHA containing the compounds. We were

similarly unable to develop spontaneous resistance in *E. coli* or *A. baumannii*. We had more success

developing resistant mutants by serially passaging *S. aureus* 15981 cultures in liquid media containing

~0.5X, ~1X MIC, or ~2X MIC concentrations of BAY 11-7082 or PSPC for 14 days. After purification of

resistant mutants on MHA, six colonies were selected for further evaluation, all of which displayed a 4-

fold increase in MIC compared to the parent strain (Figure 4A). Mutants selected using BAY 11-7082

displayed cross-resistance to PSPC and vice versa, suggesting that these two compounds act via a

conserved antibacterial mechanism (Figure 4B). To test whether resistance was retained in the absence of

selective pressure, the six mutants were serially passaged in MHB for five days and the compounds' MIC

was recorded each day. Over five days there was no decrease in MIC, indicating resistance is stably

inherited (Figure 4C). In growth experiments, all six mutants showed shorter lag times and increased final

optical density over 16 hours compared to the unpassaged parent strain (p <0.0001) (Figure 4D), perhaps

due to a general increase in fitness resulting from passage. To ensure these mutants did not have elevated

antibiotic tolerance in general, we determined the MICs to tetracycline and piperacillin, and both were

unchanged in the mutants compared to the parent strain (Supplementary Figure 4). To identify the genetic

changes responsible for these mutants' resistance to BAY 11-7082 and PSPC, we purified and sequenced

genomic DNA from the parent strain *S. aureus* 15981 and the six mutants. Unexpectedly, the mutants

lacked shared genetic changes that could be associated with the acquisition of resistance (Supplementary

Table 1), forcing us to pursue other strategies to better understand the antibacterial MOA.

Figure 4. Mutants resistant to BAY 11-7082 and PSPC. (A) Planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm

as a percent of the DMSO control) of *S. aureus* 15981 and BAY 11-7082- (top) or PSPC-resistant

(bottom) mutants grown with increasing concentrations of the compound used for selection. (B)

Planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm as a percent of the DMSO control) of *S. aureus* 15981 and

BAY 11-7082- (top) or PSPC-resistant (bottom) mutants grown with increasing concentrations of the

other compound. (C) MIC values for *S. aureus* 15981 or resistant mutants determined each day for five

days during serial passage in the absence of compound. (D) Planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm)

of *S. aureus* 15981 or resistant mutants over 16 h. **** p<0.0001.

Exploring inhibition of TAT secretion as a potential mechanism

BAY 11-7082 was previously identified as a hit in a screen for inhibitors of the *P. aeruginosa* twin

arginine translocase (TAT) system, a Sec-independent protein export system responsible for transporting

folded proteins across the cytoplasmic membrane.[23] While TAT is not essential,[24,25] we were curious

whether BAY 11-7082 would inhibit the *S. aureus* TAT system and if this would provide insight into its

antibacterial mechanism. The TAT system is broadly conserved in prokaryotes but its protein composition

varies between species, with the *P. aeruginosa* TAT system comprising three genes (*tatA*, *tatB*, and *tatC*)

while the *S. aureus* system comprises two (*tatA* and *tatC*), with *tatA* and *tatC* essential for protein

translocation in both species.[26,27] We determined the potency of BAY 11-7082 and PSPC against *tatC*

transposon mutants of *P. aeruginosa* PA14, from the PA14NR Set transposon mutant library,[28] and *S.*
aureus USA300, from the Nebraska transposon mutant library,[29] and saw a 2-fold increase in sensitivity
to BAY 11-7082 and PSPC relative to wild type only for *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 5). This was consistent
with the fact that we saw no genetic changes in TAT-related genes in the BAY 11-7082 and PSPC-
resistant mutants of MRSA and allowed us to rule out involvement of the TAT system or proteins
exported by the system in the compounds' MOA.

Figure 5. Planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm as a percent of the DMSO control) of the parent
strain *P. aeruginosa* PA14 and a *tatC* transposon mutant grown in 10% LB (top) or the parent strain *S.*
aureus USA300 and a *tatC* transposon mutant grown in MHB (bottom) in the presence of increasing
concentrations of BAY 11-7082.

Insight into BAY 11-7082's uptake and effect on the proton motive force
Given the challenges of isolating BAY 11-7082- and PSPC-resistant mutants and our inability to isolate
mutants with greater than a 4-fold increase in MIC, plus the lack of consistent genetic changes in the
mutants isolated, we wondered if BAY 11-7082 and PSPC had a more general MOA, such as perturbation
of the proton motive force (PMF). The PMF has two components, a proton gradient (ΔpH) and an electric
potential ($\Delta\psi$), which the cell coordinates to control the electrochemical gradient across the membrane.[30]
To test this idea, we determined the MIC of BAY 11-7082 and PSPC against *S. aureus* 15981 in pH
adjusted MHB (Figure 6A). Both BAY 11-7082 and PSPC displayed reduced potency in more basic
conditions and increased potency in more acidic conditions, similar to tetracycline, which is taken up via

the ΔpH component,[31] suggesting that BAY 11-7082 and PSPC may also experience ΔpH-dependent

uptake across the cytoplasmic membrane.

To determine if BAY 11-7082 and PSPC affected the PMF, we used 3,3'-dipropylthiadicarbocyanine

iodide (DiSC$_3$(5)), a fluorescent dye sensitive to PMF perturbations (Figure 6B). The dye is taken up and

transported to the cytoplasm via the Δψ component, where it accumulates and self-quenches fluorescence.

If Δψ is inhibited, dye does not accumulate, resulting in increased fluorescence, while if ΔpH is inhibited,

the cell compensates by increasing flux through Δψ, resulting in decreased fluorescence. Valinomycin,

nigericin, and carbonyl cyanide m-chlorophenyl hydrazine (CCCP) all dissipate the PMF and were used

as positive controls. Unlike the controls (p<0.0001), neither BAY 11-7082 nor PSPC significantly altered

DiSC$_3$(5) fluorescence (p>0.9999), confirming that while their uptake is PMF-dependent, they themselves

do not destabilize the PMF.

Figure 6. (A) Planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm as a percent of the DMSO control) of *S.*

aureus 15981 grown in pH adjusted MHB with increasing concentrations of BAY 11-7082 (left), PSPC

(center), or tetracycline (right). Y-axis indicates pH of the media. (B) DiSC$_3$(5) fluorescence in relative

fluorescence units of *S. aureus* USA300 in the presence of the vehicle DMSO, BAY 11-7082, PSPC, or

the membrane active controls nigericin, CCCP, or valinomycin. **** p<0.0001.

BAY 11-7082 synergizes with multiple classes of antibiotics

We next looked at whether BAY 11-7082 and its analogues could act as adjuvants to potentiate the activity of other antibiotics. We conducted checkerboard experiments using the clinically-relevant MRSA strain *S. aureus* USA300. It should be noted that the MIC for BAY 11-7082 and its analogues were ~4-fold higher for *S. aureus* USA300 than the MICs for *S. aureus* 15981 reported in Schemes 2 and 3. Using the fractional inhibitory concentration index (FICI), where values < 0.5 represent synergy and values > 4 represent antagonism,[32] we determined that BAY 11-7082 synergized with the β-lactam antibiotics penicillin G and piperacillin, the RNA polymerase inhibitor rifampin, and the translation inhibitor thiostrepton (Figure 7A). BAY 11-7082 did not affect the activity of antibiotics dependent on the PMF for uptake, including tetracycline (ΔpH-dependent) and gentamicin (Δψ-dependent) (Figure 7A), consistent with our observations that it does not alter the PMF. BAY 11-7082 did not synergize with the glycopeptide cell wall synthesis inhibitor vancomycin or the β-lactam methicillin, to which *S. aureus* USA300 is intrinsically resistant (Figure 7A). Given that we saw the strongest synergy between BAY 11-7082 and penicillin G, we tested some of our more potent analogues in combination with that β-lactam. We selected the BAY 11-7082 para-fluorine analogue **5** (MIC for *S. aureus* USA300: 12.5 µM) and the para-bromine and para-trifluoromethyl PSPC analogues **25** and **26** (MICs for *S. aureus* USA300: 6.25 µM); both potentiated penicillin G activity to the same degree as BAY 11-7082 (FICI: 0.19) (Figure 7B).

Figure 7. Checkerboards of *S. aureus* USA300 planktonic growth (optical density at 600 nm as a percent of the DMSO control) grown in MHB with increasing concentrations of BAY 11-7082 (A) or its analogues **5**, **25**, or **26** (B) with antibiotics of different classes. Synergy (FICI<0.5) is represented in blue text while indifference (FICI>0.5) is represented in red. Checkerboards represent an average of at least three independent experiments.

Anti-inflammatory properties of BAY 11-7082 and its analogues

Since the original BAY 11-7082 compound has anti-inflammatory activity, we tested whether alterations to the scaffold would allow us to separate its anti-inflammatory and antimicrobial properties. We treated mouse bone marrow-derived macrophages with *E. coli* O111:B4 lipopolysaccharide (LPS) and nigericin and measured IL-1β production, a key effector cytokine produced by priming and activating the NLRP3/caspase-1 inflammasome, in the presence or absence of BAY 11-7082 and four analogues (**5**, **12**, **17**, and **19**) (Figure 8). As expected, treatment with BAY 11-7082 at 1 and 2.5 µM significantly reduced (p<0.0001) IL-1β production compared to the no-treatment control. The potent antimicrobial **5** caused a similar reduction in IL-1β production at both 1 (p=0.0057) and 2.5 (p<0.0001) µM, as did the weaker antimicrobials **12** (p<0.0001) and **17** (p<0.0001). As expected, there was no significant difference in IL-

1β production between treatment with **19** – which lacks antimicrobial activity due to the reduction of the alkene – at 2.5 µM versus the no-treatment control (p=0.5600), while treatment with 1 µM resulted in a significant increase in IL-1β production (p=0.0061), supporting our notion that covalent binding is required for the scaffold's anti-inflammatory activity. Surprisingly, treatment with **17**, which has an MIC 4-fold higher than that of BAY 11-7082, resulted in a greater, though not significant (p>0.9999), reduction in IL-1β production at 2.5 µM compared to BAY 11-7082, indicating the terminal nitrile is not required for anti-inflammatory potency. This result suggests that while it may not be possible to develop a potent antimicrobial that does not also target the inflammasome, there may be room to develop a potent anti-inflammatory compound with a reduced impact on the microbiome.

Figure 8. Production of IL-1β by bone marrow-derived macrophages stimulated with 200 ng/mL LPS and 10 µM nigericin in the presence or absence of BAY 11-7082, or the analogue **5**, **12**, **17**, or **19** at 1 or 2.5 µM. Control cells did not receive stimulation with LPS and nigericin. ND (not detected) indicates IL-1β levels for that condition were below the level of detection based on a standard curve generated for IL-1β concentration. ** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001

Discussion

Biofilm stimulation occurs in response to exposure to sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics, independent of their MOA,[14,33] making it a useful tool with advantages over traditional growth assays. The biofilm assay does not rely on growth inhibition at an arbitrary screening concentration, alerting us to hits with potential MICs above the test concentration. Our previous work showed that *P. aeruginosa* biofilm production is a useful proxy for antimicrobial activity, both for narrow spectrum anti-*Pseudomonal* compounds and for broad range molecules like the antibiotic thiostrepton.[20] Here we confirmed that *P. aeruginosa* biofilm stimulation by the anti-inflammatory BAY 11-7082 at 10 µM signalled its antimicrobial activity against a variety of species, including MRSA.

BAY 11-7085 **6**, another anti-inflammatory and structural analogue of BAY 11-7082, was recently identified as an antimicrobial with activity against *S. aureus* and *Candida albicans*.[34] Similar to our findings, BAY 11-7085 lacked activity against *P. aeruginosa* and *K. pneumoniae* strains up to 276.7 µM, and Escobar *et al*. were unable to isolate BAY 11-7085-resistant mutants of *S. aureus*. Using vancomycin-resistant *S. aureus* VRS1, they found an MIC of 16 µM in MHB and showed that BAY 11-7085 inhibited cell surface attachment and biofilm formation and eradicated established biofilms in brain heart infusion broth media with 0.1% glucose. Interestingly, they did not report biofilm stimulation in response to sub-MIC concentrations of BAY 11-7085.

When initially describing BAY 11-7082 and BAY 11-7085's anti-inflammatory activity, Pierce *et al*. suggested they act via preventing IκB-α phosphorylation initiated by cytokines like tumor necrosis factor-α (TNF-α), resulting in lower NF-κB activation and nuclear translocation, where it regulates transcription of κB sequences with various roles in immunity, cell survival, and apoptosis. Pierce *et al*. proposed BAY 11-7082 and BAY 11-7085 could inhibit a protein tyrosine kinase upstream of IκB-α but did not propose a specific target. Subsequent work showed that BAY 11-7082 binds and irreversibly inhibits mammalian PTPs through nucleophilic attack by a cysteine in the enzyme's active site,[18] suggesting that BAY 11-7082's antibacterial target could be a PTP. In bacteria, classical PTPs play roles in virulence and host immune evasion, while low-molecular-weight PTPs are primarily involved in polysaccharide transport.[35] *S. aureus* contains two low molecular weight PTPs, PtpA and PtpB, both of unknown function.[36] We also considered the TAT system as a target, as BAY 11-7082 was previously identified as a *P. aeruginosa* TAT inhibitor, where it was also suggested to bind a nucleophilic cysteine.[23] However, another study reported that BAY 11-7082 failed to inhibit protein export via the *E. coli* TAT system.[37] Further, loss of the TAT system in these species is not lethal,[24,25] incongruent with the antimicrobial activity of BAY 11-7082, nor was its activity different in a *S. aureus* TAT mutant (Figure 3). Finally, we saw no insertions,

deletions, or single nucleotide polymorphisms in PTP or TAT-related genes in mutants with increased

resistance to BAY 11-7082 or PSPC (Supplementary Table 1), consistent with our conclusion that BAY

11-7082's antibacterial MOA is unrelated to either of these systems. Given our inability to identify a

molecular target for BAY 11-7082, we suggest that its mechanism is likely complex. While this may be

due in part to the potential promiscuity conferred by BAY 11-7082's αβ-unsaturated sulfonyl, this moiety

is absent in PSPC, suggesting it does not play a role in the compound's MOA.

The αβ-unsaturated center, characteristic of highly-reactive Michael acceptors, makes BAY 11-7082 an

unlikely drug candidate. Michael acceptors have traditionally been considered problematic in drug

development due to concerns that the compounds could irreversibly bind off-target proteins. However,

views on the suitability of Michael acceptors and other covalent modifiers as drugs are changing –

particularly in the anticancer space – with several recent examples of αβ-unsaturated carbonyls under

development.[38–41] Such compounds work best when the αβ-unsaturated carbonyl binds a known and

biologically-uncommon target, reducing the likelihood of irreversible covalent off-target binding. Despite

our efforts, we were unable to identify a specific molecular target for BAY 11-7082, suggesting the

compound enacts its antibacterial effect via multiple mechanisms. We were also unable to identify an

analogue of BAY 11-7082 lacking anti-inflammatory activity but retaining antibiotic potency. While dual

antibiotic-anti-inflammatory compounds are an interesting concept and, indeed, many antibiotics have

been shown to affect the inflammasome,[42] this raises concern for potential side effects. Research from the

Taunton lab aimed at developing reversible cysteine residue inhibitors showed that positioning a nitrile

group on olefins increases thiol reactivity reversibility, as does positioning electron withdrawing groups

at the α or β position of acrylonitriles.[43,44] It is important to note that with the exploration of PSPC and the

development of analogues **24-31**, we showed that the αβ-unsaturated center is not required for potent anti-

MRSA activity.

Beyond its anti-inflammatory activity, BAY 11-7082 has anticancer, anti-diabetes, and neuroprotective

properties.[45–48] It is thus noteworthy that its potent activity against Gram-positive species could prove

problematic should the compound be developed for one of these indications, as it has potential to impact

the microbiome. This is not uncommon among drugs with human targets. Indeed, a recent study found

24% of all human-directed drugs tested inhibited growth of at least one bacterial species common to the

microbiome.[49] We found that analogue **17**, a weak anti-*Staphylococcal*, maintains strong anti-

inflammatory activity, suggesting it could be possible to separate the activities through careful design.

Due to its potential off-target effects, perhaps a better use of this antibacterial scaffold would be as a lead
for adjuvants used in combination with β-lactams to treat MRSA infections. Although BAY 11-7082 did
not re-sensitize MRSA strain USA300 to methicillin, at 1.56 µM it reduced the MIC of penicillin G from
3.74 µM to 0.23 µM – a 16-fold reduction. This concentration of BAY 11-7082 is well below the 10 µM
reported IC_{50} for inhibition of IκB-α phosphorylation,[15] but above the concentration that significantly
reduced inflammation in our macrophage model (Figure 6) and the K_i for some mammalian PTPs,[18]
suggesting that even at the low concentrations afforded by combination therapy, using this scaffold may
result in off-target effects. The BAY 11-7082 analogue **5** and the PSPC analogues **25** and **26** also
synergized with penicillin G and can be used at even lower concentrations (0.78 µM for **7** and 0.39 µM
for **25** and **26**) than BAY 11-7082 to achieve the same 0.23 µM MIC for penicillin G. Both **25** and **26**
have the advantage of lacking the αβ-unsaturated center found in BAY 11-7082 and **5**, making them the
most promising candidates for development of antibacterial combination therapies.
408

Conclusion

A high-throughput screen using *P. aeruginosa* biofilm stimulation as an indicator of antibacterial activity
led to identification of BAY 11-7082 as a broad-spectrum antimicrobial, with activity against multiple
priority pathogens, including MRSA. This work confirms biofilm stimulation as a useful screening
method for identifying compounds with broad activity. We were able to improve upon the potency of
BAY 11-7082 by switching to a new chemical scaffold based on the molecule PSPC, which lacks the αβ-
unsaturated center that may be associated with off-target effects and toxicity. Our analogues **25** and **26**
potentiate the activity of β-lactams like penicillin G to reduce the concentration needed to inhibit the
growth of MRSA. These two compounds therefore represent an interesting starting point for the
development of an antibacterial adjuvant for the treatment of MRSA.
419

Methods

Bacterial strains, culture conditions, and chemicals
Bacterial strains used in this study include *P. aeruginosa* PAO1[50], *S. aureus* 15981,[51] *B. subtilis* 168,[52] *E.*
coli K-12 W3110[53], *A. baumannii* ATCC 17987[20], and *K. pneumoniae* MKP103.[54] *P. aeruginosa* PA14
and the Δ*tatC* transposon mutant were from the PA14NR Set transposon mutant library[28] and *S. aureus*
USA300 and the Δ*tatC* transposon mutant was from the Nebraska transposon mutant library.[29] Bacterial
cultures were grown in lysogeny broth (LB), 10% LB (10% LB, 90% 1X phosphate buffered saline), or
Mueller-Hinton broth (MHB). Solid media was solidified with 1.5% agar. Compounds **1**, **7-22**, and **26-37**
were synthesized for this work. One hundred mM stock solutions were made in DMSO and stored at -

20°C. Stock solutions of tetracycline (EMD Millipore), piperacillin (Sigma, 40 mg/mL stock solution),

penicillin G (Fluka Analytica), rifampin (Sigma, 1 mg/mL stock solution prepared in DMSO),

thiostrepton (Sigma, 5 mM stock solution prepared in DMSO), methicillin (Cayman Chemicals),

gentamicin (BioShops), and vancomycin (Sigma, stock solution prepared in DMSO) were prepared at 10

mg/mL in sterile de-ionized H_2O except where noted and stored at -20°C.

Compound screening

436 The McMaster Bioactive compound collection was screened using a biofilm modulation assay, as

437 previously described.[20]

Inhibitory concentration assays

All bacterial strains were inoculated from -80°C glycerol stocks into 5 mL media, and incubated with

shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C for 16 h. Cultures were sub-cultured in a 1:500 dilution, grown for 4 h, and

diluted in fresh media to an OD_{600} of ~ 0.1, then diluted 1:500. Minimal inhibitory concentration values

were determined in 96-well plates (Nunc) using compounds serially diluted in DMSO. Each well had a

final volume of 150 µL. Sterile control wells contained 148 µL of corresponding broth and 2 µL DMSO

while vehicle control wells contained 148 µL dilute bacterial culture and 2 µL DMSO. Plates were sealed

in a container and incubated with shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C, 16 h. The OD_{600} of plates was read using a

Multiscan GO (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and used to calculate the inhibitory concentration. All MIC

values presented in Scheme 1 and Scheme 2 were conducted with *S. aureus* 15981 grown in MHB and are

based on experiments performed in duplicate. All other inhibitory concentration data was conducted in

media as specified and is based on at least three independent experiments performed in triplicate. MIC

values were defined as < 20% of the vehicle control, where growth is no longer visible.[20] Where

specified, media was pH-adjusted using 6 N sodium hydroxide and 6 M hydrogen chloride.

Biofilm modulation assays

Biofilm assays were performed as previously described.[20] Briefly, *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 was inoculated

from -80°C glycerol stocks into 5 mL 10% LB, and incubated with shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C for 16 h.

Cultures were sub-cultured in a 1:500 dilution, grown for 4 h, and diluted in fresh media to an OD_{600} of ~

0.1, then diluted 1:500. Plates were set up as for the inhibitory concentration assays. Biofilms were

formed on the polystyrene pegs of MicroWell lids (Nunc), which were placed on assay plates prior to 16

h incubation with shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C. Following incubation, lids were removed and planktonic

growth (OD_{600}) was measured. Lids were immersed in 1X phosphate buffered saline and washed for 10

min, then biofilms adhering to the lids were stained in 0.1% crystal violet for 15 min. Excess crystal

violet was removed by immersing the lids in deionized water for 5 min, then repeating this wash step four

additional times. Lids dried for 1 h then were transferred to a new 96-well plate containing 200 μL 33.3%

acetic acid per well for 5 min to solubilize the crystal violet. The absorbance (Abs_{600}) of the 96-well plates

was read using a Multiscan GO (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Three independent experiments were

performed in triplicate and technical triplicates were averaged. The mean and standard error of the

independent biological replicates are shown.

Liquid serial passage assays

S. aureus 15981 was taken from -80°C stocks, inoculated into 5 mL MHB, and grown with shaking, 200

rpm, 37°C for 24 h. One hundred μL culture was inoculated into fresh MHB supplemented with BAY 11-

7082 or PSPC at 1 (B13, B16, and P11), 3 (B36, P3M), or 6 (P6M) μM and grown with shaking 200 rpm,

37°C for 24 h. One hundred μL culture was inoculated into fresh MHB supplemented with BAY 11-7082

or PSPC at the same concentration as the previous day. This serial liquid passage continued for 14 days,

at which point cultures were purified on MHA with or without compound.

Genome assembly and identification of SNPs

Genomic DNA was purified using the Wizard Genomic DNA purification kit (Promega) then sequenced

via Illumina sequencing. Quality control and trimming of sequencing reads was accomplished using

Galaxy through FASTQC for quality control, FASTQC Groomer to reformat reads, Trimmomatic to trim

poor quality reads, FASTQC Interlacer to reorder reads, and FASTQC De-Interlacter. Contigs were

assembled for the *S. aureus* 15981 genome using SPAdes and genomes were mapped to reference

genomes of two closely related species, *S. aureus* USA300 and USA500, using BreSeq.

Growth Curves

S. aureus 15981 and the six BAY 11-7082- or PSPC-resistant mutants (B13, B16, B36, P11, P3M, P6M)

were taken from -80°C stocks, inoculated into 2 mL MHB, and grown with shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C for

16 h. Overnight cultures were sub-cultured in a 1:500 dilution, grown for 4 h, and diluted in fresh media

to an OD_{600} of ~ 0.1, then diluted 1:500. Three replicates of 150 μL of each sample was added to a 96-

well plate and incubated with moderate shaking at 37°C (BioTek Synergy 4 Plate Reader) and the OD_{600}

was measured at 30 min intervals for 16 h. Technical replicates were averaged and the experiment was

repeated at least three times for each strain. The mean and standard error of the independent biological

replicates are shown. P-values were calculating using a one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple

comparison test.

DiSC₃(5) assays

The DiSC$_3$(5) assay was performed in accordance with modifications by Farha *et al*[55] to a method by Epand *et al*[56], with some modifications. Briefly, *S. aureus* USA300 was taken from -80°C stock, inoculated into 5 mL MHB, and grown with shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C for 16 h. Cultures were sub-cultured in a 1:500 dilution and grown for 4 h. Cells were pelleted and washed three times in buffer (10 mM potassium phosphate, 5 mM MgSO4, and 250 mM sucrose, pH 7.0), then resuspended in buffer to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.1. DiSC$_3$(5) was added at 1 μM and allowed to stabilize at room temperature in the dark for 20 minutes. BAY 11-7082, PSPC, valinomycin, nigericin, and CCCP were diluted in DMSO and added in triplicate to a white, clear-bottom, 96-well plate (Costar, Corning Inc), along with cells. Vehicle control wells contained 2 μL DMSO and 148 μL bacteria suspended in buffer with dye. Fluorescence was measured (BioTek Synergy 4 Plate Reader) at an excitation wavelength of 620 nm and an emission wavelength of 685 nm at the start time, then every 50 s for 10 min and every 5 min for the next 30 min. The mean and standard error of three technical replicates for each condition are plotted at the start time. P-values were calculating using a one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparison test.

Checkerboard assays

Checkerboard assays were set up identically to inhibitory concentration assays, except compounds were added to an 8x8 section of a 96-well plate with increasing concentrations of one compound across the X-axis and increasing concentrations of the other compound across the Y-axis. Plates were incubated with shaking, 200 rpm, 37°C, 16 h. The OD$_{600}$ of plates was read using a Multiscan GO (Thermo Fisher Scientific). At least three biological replicates were averaged for each checkerboard. Synergy was determined using the following formular for fractional inhibitory concentration index (FICI), where values < 0.5 represent synergy and values > 4 represent antagonism[32]:

$$\frac{MIC_{Compound\ A\ in\ combination}}{MIC_{Compound\ A\ alone}} + \frac{MIC_{Compound\ B\ in\ combination}}{MIC_{Compound\ B\ alone}}$$

NLRP3 inflammasome assays

In-house male wild type C57BL/6 J mice (Jackson Laboratory) aged four to twelve weeks were humanely sacrificed to generate bone marrow derived macrophages (BMDMs), as previously described.[57] Briefly, bone marrow was isolated by flushing the marrow cavity of the femur with sterile saline. Cells recovered from femur flushes were propagated in tissue culture flasks at 1×10^6 cells/mL in L929 differentiation media at 37°C for four days. Additional L929 media was added and cells were transferred to 24-well plates and incubated for another 5-7 days to allow for maturation of BMDMs. L929 media was removed from BMDMs, wells were washed with PBS, and Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) (600

µL) was added. BMDMs were treated with BAY 11-7082 or analogues at a final concentration of 1 and

2.5 µM and *E. coli* O111:B4 LPS diluted in endotoxin-free ultra pure water at a final concentration of 200

ng/mL and incubated at 37°C for 3 h. Nigericin diluted in DMEM was added at a final concentration of

10 µM and cells were incubated for an additional 45 min. Each condition was tested in at least six

biological replicates in BMDMs from a single mouse. Two hundred and fifty µL of media was removed

from each well and frozen until IL-1β secretion could be measured by ELISA, (DuoSet ELISA, Mouse

1L-1β/IL-1F2, R&D Systems), as previously described.[58] Media was diluted in a 1:10 ratio in ELISA

reagent dilute (1% BSA in PBS) for the LPS and nigericin condition and all test conditions. Media from

the control condition, which lacked LPS, nigericin, or the analogues, was diluted in a 1:1 ratio in ELISA

reagent dilute. Absorbance at 450 and 570 nm of the 96-well plate following ELISA was read and values

at 570 nm were subtracted from values at 450 nm to correct for optical imperfections. IL-1β levels

corresponding to the subtracted absorbance values were determined by interpolating from a standard

curve generated using IL-1β concentrations ranging from 0 pg/mL to 1000 pg/mL. The mean and

standard error for at least six independent biological replicates is shown. P-values were calculating using

a one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparison test.

Supporting Information

547   Antibacterial activity of BAY 11-7082 in rich media; activity of BAY 11-7082 against a collection of

548   bacterial strains containing common resistance elements; antibacterial and antibiofilm activity of PSPC;

549   growth of BAY 11-7082- and PSPC-resistant mutants in the presence of tetracycline and piperacillin;

550   synthetic schemes and characterization data (1H NMR, C13 NMR, and HRMS) for compounds 1, **5-20**,

551   and **24-34**.

Corresponding Author Information

554   Lori L. Burrows

555   lori.burrows@mcmaster.ca

556   MDCL 2238 – 1280 Main St. West,

557   Hamilton, ON L8S4K1 Canada

Author Contributions

560   VEC and HH completed antibacterial susceptibility testing. PD, XZ, and VEC completed chemical

561   synthesis, supervised by JM. VEC and BDH conducted the NLRP3 inflammasome assays, supervised by

562   JDS. VEC and AY compiled genetic data related to the resistant mutants. All other experiments were

563   performed by VEC. VEC and LLB wrote the paper, with input from JM and JDS.

Acknowledgements

We thank Gerry Wright for access to the Antibiotic Resistance Platform, Derek Chan and Kara Tsang for

their assistance with BreSeq, and Meghan Fragis for determining exact masses of the compounds. This

work was supported by grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC)

RGPIN-2016-06521 and Ontario Research Fund RE07-048 to LLB and a seed grant from the David

Braley Centre for Antibiotic Discovery to LLB and JM. The NMR machine was purchased with funding

from a Canada Foundation for Innovation grant. VEC was supported by a Summer Studentship from the

David Braley Centre for Antibiotic Discovery and a CIHR Canadian Graduate Scholarship – Master's

Award.

Abbreviations Used

576   ARP, Antibiotic Resistance Platform; CCCP, carbonyl cyanide m-chlorophenyl hydrazine; $DiSC_3(5)$,

577   3,3'-dipropylthiadicarbocyanine iodide; FICI, fractional inhibitory concentration index; LB, lysogeny

578   broth; MHA, Mueller-Hinton agar; MHB, Mueller-Hinton broth; PMF, proton motive force; PSPC, 3-

579   (phenylsulfonyl)-2-pyrazinecarbonitrile; PTP, protein tyrosine phosphatase; TAT, twin arginine

580   translocase

References

583   (1)   Rice, L. B. Federal Funding for the Study of Antimicrobial Resistance in Nosocomial Pathogens:

584   No ESKAPE. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2008**, *197* (8), 1079–1081. https://doi.org/10.1086/533452.

585   (2)   Boucher, H. W.; Talbot, G. H.; Bradley, J. S.; Edwards, J. E.; Gilbert, D.; Rice, L. B.; Scheld, M.;

586   Spellberg, B.; Bartlett, J. Bad Bugs, No Drugs: No ESKAPE! An Update from the Infectious

587   Diseases Society of America. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2009**, *48* (1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1086/595011.

588   (3)   Spellberg, B.; Powers, J. H.; Brass, E. P.; Miller, L. G.; Edwards, J. E. Trends in Antimicrobial

589   Drug Development: Implications for the Future. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2004**, *38* (9), 1279–1286.

590   https://doi.org/10.1086/420937.

591   (4)   Deak, D.; Outterson, K.; Powers, J. H.; Kesselheim, A. S. Progress in the Fight Against Multidrug-

592   Resistant Bacteria? A Review of U.S. Food and Drug Administration–Approved Antibiotics,

593   2010–2015. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **2016**, *165* (5), 363–372. https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-0291.

594   (5)   Liu, C.; Bayer, A.; Cosgrove, S. E.; Daum, R. S.; Fridkin, S. K.; Gorwitz, R. J.; Kaplan, S. L.;
595   Karchmer, A. W.; Levine, D. P.; Murray, B. E.; Rybak, M. J.; Talan, D. A.; Chambers, H. F.
596   Clinical Practice Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America for the Treatment of
597   Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Infections in Adults and Children. *Clin. Infect. Dis.*
598   **2011**, *52* (3), e18–e55. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciq146.

599   (6)   Nannini, E.; Murray, B. E.; Arias, C. A. Resistance or Decreased Susceptibility to Glycopeptides,
600   Daptomycin, and Linezolid in Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Curr. Opin.*
601   *Pharmacol.* **2010**, *10* (5), 516–521. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coph.2010.06.006.

602   (7)   Tsiodras, S.; Gold, H. S.; Sakoulas, G.; Eliopoulos, G. M.; Wennersten, C.; Venkataraman, L.;
603   Moellering, R. C.; Ferraro, M. J. Linezolid Resistance in a Clinical Isolate of *Staphylococcus*
604   *aureus*. *The Lancet* **2001**, *358* (9277), 207–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05410-1.

605   (8)   Boucher, H. W.; Sakoulas, G. Perspectives on Daptomycin Resistance, with Emphasis on
606   Resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2007**, *45* (5), 601–608.
607   https://doi.org/10.1086/520655.

608   (9)   Bishop, E.; Melvani, S.; Howden, B. P.; Charles, P. G. P.; Grayson, M. L. Good Clinical
609   Outcomes but High Rates of Adverse Reactions during Linezolid Therapy for Serious Infections:
610   A Proposed Protocol for Monitoring Therapy in Complex Patients. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.*
611   **2006**, *50* (4), 1599–1602. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.50.4.1599-1602.2006.

612   (10)   Silver, L. L. Challenges of Antibacterial Discovery. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2011**, *24* (1), 71–109.
613   https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00030-10.

614   (11)   Lewis, K. The Science of Antibiotic Discovery. *Cell* **2020**, *181* (1), 29–45.
615   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.02.056.

616   (12)   Lewis, K. Platforms for Antibiotic Discovery. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **2013**, *12* (5), 371–387.
617   https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3975.

618   (13)   Sateriale, A.; Bessoff, K.; Sarkar, I. N.; Huston, C. D. Drug Repurposing: Mining Protozoan
619   Proteomes for Targets of Known Bioactive Compounds. *J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc.* **2014**, *21* (2),
620   238–244. https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2013-001700.

621   (14)   Ranieri, M. R.; Whitchurch, C. B.; Burrows, L. L. Mechanisms of Biofilm Stimulation by
622   Subinhibitory Concentrations of Antimicrobials. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **2018**, *45*, 164–169.
623   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2018.07.006.

624   (15)   Pierce, J. W.; Schoenleber, R.; Jesmok, G.; Best, J.; Moore, S. A.; Collins, T.; Gerritsen, M. E.
625   Novel Inhibitors of Cytokine-Induced IκBα Phosphorylation and Endothelial Cell Adhesion
626   Molecule Expression Show Anti-Inflammatory Effects in Vivo. *J. Biol. Chem.* **1997**, *272* (34),
627   21096–21103. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.272.34.21096.

628   (16)   Juliana, C.; Fernandes-Alnemri, T.; Wu, J.; Datta, P.; Solorzano, L.; Yu, J.-W.; Meng, R.; Quong,
629   A. A.; Latz, E.; Scott, C. P.; Alnemri, E. S. Anti-Inflammatory Compounds Parthenolide and Bay
630   11-7082 Are Direct Inhibitors of the Inflammasome. *J. Biol. Chem.* **2010**, *285* (13), 9792–9802.
631   https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M109.082305.

632   (17)   Lee, J.; Rhee, M. H.; Kim, E.; Cho, J. Y. BAY 11-7082 Is a Broad-Spectrum Inhibitor with Anti-
633   Inflammatory Activity against Multiple Targets. *Mediators Inflamm.* **2012**.
634   https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/416036.

635   (18)   Krishnan, N.; Bencze, G.; Cohen, P.; Tonks, N. K. The Anti-Inflammatory Compound BAY-11-
636   7082 Is a Potent Inhibitor of Protein Tyrosine Phosphatases. *FEBS J.* **2013**, *280* (12), 2830–2841.
637   https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.12283.

638   (19)   Wenderska, I. B.; Chong, M.; McNulty, J.; Wright, G. D.; Burrows, L. L. Palmitoyl-Dl-Carnitine
639   Is a Multitarget Inhibitor of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Biofilm Development. *ChemBioChem* **2011**,
640   *12* (18), 2759–2766. https://doi.org/10.1002/cbic.201100500.

641   (20)   Ranieri, M. R. M.; Chan, D. C. K.; Yaeger, L. N.; Rudolph, M.; Karabelas-Pittman, S.; Abdo, H.;
642   Chee, J.; Harvey, H.; Nguyen, U.; Burrows, L. L. Thiostrepton Hijacks Pyoverdine Receptors To
643   Inhibit Growth of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **2019**, *63* (9).
644   https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00472-19.

645   (21)   Cox, G.; Sieron, A.; King, A. M.; Pascale, G. D.; Pawlowski, A. C.; Koteva, K.; Wright, G. D. A
646   Common Platform for Antibiotic Dereplication and Adjuvant Discovery. *Cell Chem. Biol.* **2017**,
647   *24* (1), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chembiol.2016.11.011.

648   (22)   Rajamuthiah, R.; Jayamani, E.; Majed, H.; Conery, A. L.; Kim, W.; Kwon, B.; Fuchs, B. B.;
649   Kelso, M. J.; Ausubel, F. M.; Mylonakis, E. Antibacterial Properties of 3-(Phenylsulfonyl)-2-
650   Pyrazinecarbonitrile. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **2015**, *25* (22), 5203–5207.
651   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmcl.2015.09.066.

652   (23)   Vasil, M. L.; Tomaras, A. P.; Pritchard, A. E. Identification and Evaluation of Twin-Arginine
653   Translocase Inhibitors. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **2012**, *56* (12), 6223–6234.
654   https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01575-12.

655   (24)   Biswas, L.; Biswas, R.; Nerz, C.; Ohlsen, K.; Schlag, M.; Schäfer, T.; Lamkemeyer, T.; Ziebandt,
656   A.-K.; Hantke, K.; Rosenstein, R.; Götz, F. Role of the Twin-Arginine Translocation Pathway in
657   *Staphylococcus*. *J. Bacteriol.* **2009**, *191* (19), 5921–5929. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00642-09.

658   (25)   Ochsner, U. A.; Snyder, A.; Vasil, A. I.; Vasil, M. L. Effects of the Twin-Arginine Translocase on
659   Secretion of Virulence Factors, Stress Response, and Pathogenesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2002**, *99*
660   (12), 8312–8317. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.082238299.

(26)   Yen, M.-R.; Tseng, Y.-H.; Nguyen, E. H.; Wu, L.-F.; Saier, M. H. Sequence and Phylogenetic

Analyses of the Twin-Arginine Targeting (Tat) Protein Export System. *Arch. Microbiol.* **2002**, *177*

(6), 441–450. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00203-002-0408-4.

(27)   Dilks, K.; Rose, R. W.; Hartmann, E.; Pohlschröder, M. Prokaryotic Utilization of the Twin-

Arginine Translocation Pathway: A Genomic Survey. *J. Bacteriol.* **2003**, *185* (4), 1478–1483.

https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.185.4.1478-1483.2003.

(28)   Liberati, N. T.; Urbach, J. M.; Miyata, S.; Lee, D. G.; Drenkard, E.; Wu, G.; Villanueva, J.; Wei,

T.; Ausubel, F. M. An Ordered, Nonredundant Library of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Strain PA14

Transposon Insertion Mutants. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2006**, *103* (8), 2833–2838.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0511100103.

(29)   Fey, P. D.; Endres, J. L.; Yajjala, V. K.; Widhelm, T. J.; Boissy, R. J.; Bose, J. L.; Bayles, K. W. A

Genetic Resource for Rapid and Comprehensive Phenotype Screening of Nonessential

Staphylococcus aureus Genes. *mBio 4* (1), e00537-12. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00537-12.

(30)   Kashket, E. R. The Proton Motive Force in Bacteria: A Critical Assessment of Methods. *Annu.*

Rev. Microbiol. **1985**, *39* (1), 219–242. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.mi.39.100185.001251.

(31)   Yamaguchi, A.; Ohmori, H.; Kaneko-Ohdera, M.; Nomura, T.; Sawai, T. Delta pH-Dependent

Accumulation of Tetracycline in *Escherichia coli*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **1991**, *35* (1),

53–56. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.35.1.53.

(32)   Odds, F. C. Synergy, Antagonism, and What the Chequerboard Puts between Them. *J. Antimicrob.*

Chemother. **2003**, *52* (1), 1–1. https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkg301.

(33)   Townsley, L.; Shank, E. A. Natural-Product Antibiotics: Cues for Modulating Bacterial Biofilm

Formation. *Trends Microbiol.* **2017**, *25* (12), 1016–1026.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2017.06.003.

(34)   Escobar, I. E.; Possamai Rossatto, F. C.; Kim, S. M.; Kang, M. H.; Kim, W.; Mylonakis, E.

Repurposing Kinase Inhibitor Bay 11-7085 to Combat *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Candida*

albicans Biofilms. *Front. Pharmacol.* **2021**, *12*, 675300.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2021.675300.

(35)   Böhmer, F.; Szedlacsek, S.; Tabernero, L.; Östman, A.; Hertog, J. den. Protein Tyrosine

Phosphatase Structure–Function Relationships in Regulation and Pathogenesis. *FEBS J.* **2013**, *280*

(2), 413–431. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-4658.2012.08655.x.

(36)   Soulat, D.; Vaganay, E.; Duclos, B.; Genestier, A.-L.; Etienne, J.; Cozzone, A. J. *Staphylococcus*

aureus Contains Two Low-Molecular-Mass Phosphotyrosine Protein Phosphatases. *J. Bacteriol.*

2002, *184* (18), 5194–5199. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.184.18.5194-5199.2002.

(37)   Bageshwar, U. K.; VerPlank, L.; Baker, D.; Dong, W.; Hamsanathan, S.; Whitaker, N.;

Sacchettini, J. C.; Musser, S. M. High Throughput Screen for *Escherichia coli* Twin Arginine

Translocation (Tat) Inhibitors. *PLOS ONE* **2016**, *11* (2), e0149659.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149659.

(38)   Jackson, P. A.; Widen, J. C.; Harki, D. A.; Brummond, K. M. Covalent Modifiers: A Chemical

Perspective on the Reactivity of α,β-Unsaturated Carbonyls with Thiols via Hetero-Michael

Addition Reactions. *J. Med. Chem.* **2017**, *60* (3), 839–885.

https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jmedchem.6b00788.

(39)   Singh, J.; Petter, R. C.; Baillie, T. A.; Whitty, A. The Resurgence of Covalent Drugs. *Nat. Rev.*

Drug Discov. **2011**, *10* (4), 307–317. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3410.

(40)   Bauer, R. A. Covalent Inhibitors in Drug Discovery: From Accidental Discoveries to Avoided

Liabilities and Designed Therapies. *Drug Discov. Today* **2015**, *20* (9), 1061–1073.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2015.05.005.

(41)   Potashman, M. H.; Duggan, M. E. Covalent Modifiers: An Orthogonal Approach to Drug Design.

J. Med. Chem. **2009**, *52* (5), 1231–1246. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm8008597.

(42)   Labro, M. T. Anti-Inflammatory Activity of Macrolides: A New Therapeutic Potential? *J.*

Antimicrob. Chemother. **1998**, *41* (suppl_2), 37–46. https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/41.suppl_2.37.

(43)   Krishnan, S.; Miller, R. M.; Tian, B.; Mullins, R. D.; Jacobson, M. P.; Taunton, J. Design of

Reversible, Cysteine-Targeted Michael Acceptors Guided by Kinetic and Computational Analysis.

J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2014**, *136* (36), 12624–12630. https://doi.org/10.1021/ja505194w.

(44)   Serafimova, I. M.; Pufall, M. A.; Krishnan, S.; Duda, K.; Cohen, M. S.; Maglathlin, R. L.;

McFarland, J. M.; Miller, R. M.; Frödin, M.; Taunton, J. Reversible Targeting of Noncatalytic

Cysteines with Chemically Tuned Electrophiles. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **2012**, *8* (5), 471–476.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.925.

(45)   White, D. E.; Burchill, S. A. BAY 11-7082 Induces Cell Death through NF-KB-Independent

Mechanisms in the Ewing's Sarcoma Family of Tumours. *Cancer Lett.* **2008**, *268* (2), 212–224.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2008.03.045.

(46)   García, M. G.; Alaniz, L.; Lopes, E. C.; Blanco, G.; Hajos, S. E.; Alvarez, E. Inhibition of NF-KB

Activity by BAY 11-7082 Increases Apoptosis in Multidrug Resistant Leukemic T-Cell Lines.

Leuk. Res. **2005**, *29* (12), 1425–1434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leukres.2005.05.004.

(47)   Kolati, S. R.; Kasala, E. R.; Bodduluru, L. N.; Mahareddy, J. R.; Uppulapu, S. K.; Gogoi, R.;

Barua, C. C.; Lahkar, M. BAY 11-7082 Ameliorates Diabetic Nephropathy by Attenuating

Hyperglycemia-Mediated Oxidative Stress and Renal Inflammation via NF-KB Pathway. *Environ.*

Toxicol. Pharmacol. **2015**, *39* (2), 690–699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2015.01.019.

(48)   Goffi, F.; Boroni, F.; Benarese, M.; Sarnico, I.; Benetti, A.; Spano, P. F.; Pizzi, M. The Inhibitor of

IkappaBalpha Phosphorylation BAY 11-7082 Prevents NMDA Neurotoxicity in Mouse

Hippocampal Slices. *Neurosci. Lett.* **2005**, *377* (3), 147–151.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2004.11.088.

(49)   Maier, L.; Pruteanu, M.; Kuhn, M.; Zeller, G.; Telzerow, A.; Anderson, E. E.; Brochado, A. R.;

Fernandez, K. C.; Dose, H.; Mori, H.; Patil, K. R.; Bork, P.; Typas, A. Extensive Impact of Non-

Antibiotic Drugs on Human Gut Bacteria. *Nature* **2018**, *555* (7698), 623–628.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25979.

(50)   Cavallari, J. F.; Lamers, R. P.; Scheurwater, E. M.; Matos, A. L.; Burrows, L. L. Changes to Its

Peptidoglycan-Remodeling Enzyme Repertoire Modulate β-Lactam Resistance in *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **2013**, *57* (7), 3078–3084.

https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00268-13.

(51)   Nguyen, U. T.; Wenderska, I. B.; Chong, M. A.; Koteva, K.; Wright, G. D.; Burrows, L. L. Small-

Molecule Modulators of *Listeria monocytogenes* Biofilm Development. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*

2012, *78* (5), 1454–1465. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.07227-11.

(52)   Kunst, F.; Ogasawara, N.; Moszer, I.; Albertini, A. M.; Alloni, G.; Azevedo, V.; Bertero, M. G.;

Bessières, P.; Bolotin, A.; Borchert, S.; Borriss, R.; Boursier, L.; Brans, A.; Braun, M.; Brignell, S.

C.; Bron, S.; Brouillet, S.; Bruschi, C. V.; Caldwell, B.; Capuano, V.; Carter, N. M.; Choi, S.-K.;

Codani, J.-J.; Connerton, I. F.; Cummings, N. J.; Daniel, R. A.; Denizot, F.; Devine, K. M.;

Düsterhöft, A.; Ehrlich, S. D.; Emmerson, P. T.; Entian, K. D.; Errington, J.; Fabret, C.; Ferrari,

E.; Foulger, D.; Fritz, C.; Fujita, M.; Fujita, Y.; Fuma, S.; Galizzi, A.; Galleron, N.; Ghim, S.-Y.;

Glaser, P.; Goffeau, A.; Golightly, E. J.; Grandi, G.; Guiseppi, G.; Guy, B. J.; Haga, K.; Haiech, J.;

Harwood, C. R.; Hénaut, A.; Hilbert, H.; Holsappel, S.; Hosono, S.; Hullo, M.-F.; Itaya, M.; Jones,

L.; Joris, B.; Karamata, D.; Kasahara, Y.; Klaerr-Blanchard, M.; Klein, C.; Kobayashi, Y.; Koetter,

P.; Koningstein, G.; Krogh, S.; Kumano, M.; Kurita, K.; Lapidus, A.; Lardinois, S.; Lauber, J.;

Lazarevic, V.; Lee, S.-M.; Levine, A.; Liu, H.; Masuda, S.; Mauël, C.; Médigue, C.; Medina, N.;

Mellado, R. P.; Mizuno, M.; Moestl, D.; Nakai, S.; Noback, M.; Noone, D.; O'Reilly, M.; Ogawa,

K.; Ogiwara, A.; Oudega, B.; Park, S.-H.; Parro, V.; Pohl, T. M.; Portetelle, D.; Porwollik, S.;

Prescott, A. M.; Presecan, E.; Pujic, P.; Purnelle, B.; Rapoport, G.; Rey, M.; Reynolds, S.; Rieger,

M.; Rivolta, C.; Rocha, E.; Roche, B.; Rose, M.; Sadaie, Y.; Sato, T.; Scanlan, E.; Schleich, S.;

Schroeter, R.; Scoffone, F.; Sekiguchi, J.; Sekowska, A.; Seror, S. J.; Serror, P.; Shin, B.-S.; Soldo,

B.; Sorokin, A.; Tacconi, E.; Takagi, T.; Takahashi, H.; Takemaru, K.; Takeuchi, M.; Tamakoshi,

A.; Tanaka, T.; Terpstra, P.; Tognoni, A.; Tosato, V.; Uchiyama, S.; Vandenbol, M.; Vannier, F.;

Vassarotti, A.; Viari, A.; Wambutt, R.; Wedler, E.; Wedler, H.; Weitzenegger, T.; Winters, P.;

Wipat, A.; Yamamoto, H.; Yamane, K.; Yasumoto, K.; Yata, K.; Yoshida, K.; Yoshikawa, H.-F.; Zumstein, E.; Yoshikawa, H.; Danchin, A. The Complete Genome Sequence of the Gram-Positive Bacterium *Bacillus subtilis*. *Nature* **1997**, *390* (6657), 249–256. https://doi.org/10.1038/36786.

(53)   Yao, Z.; Valvano, M. A. Genetic Analysis of the O-Specific Lipopolysaccharide Biosynthesis Region (Rfb) of *Escherichia coli* K-12 W3110: Identification of Genes That Confer Group 6 Specificity to Shigella Flexneri Serotypes Y and 4a. *J. Bacteriol.* **1994**, *176* (13), 4133–4143. https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.176.13.4133-4143.1994.

(54)   Snitkin, E. S.; Zelazny, A. M.; Thomas, P. J.; Stock, F.; Program, N. C. S.; Henderson, D. K.; Palmore, T. N.; Segre, J. A. Tracking a Hospital Outbreak of Carbapenem-Resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* with Whole-Genome Sequencing. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **2012**, *4* (148), 148ra116-148ra116. https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.3004129.

(55)   Farha, M. A.; Verschoor, C. P.; Bowdish, D.; Brown, E. D. Collapsing the Proton Motive Force to Identify Synergistic Combinations against *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Chem. Biol.* **2013**, *20* (9), 1168–1178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chembiol.2013.07.006.

(56)   Epand, R. F.; Pollard, J. E.; Wright, J. O.; Savage, P. B.; Epand, R. M. Depolarization, Bacterial Membrane Composition, and the Antimicrobial Action of Ceragenins. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **2010**, *54* (9), 3708–3713. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00380-10.

(57)   Henriksbo, B. D.; Lau, T. C.; Cavallari, J. F.; Denou, E.; Chi, W.; Lally, J. S.; Crane, J. D.; Duggan, B. M.; Foley, K. P.; Fullerton, M. D.; Tarnopolsky, M. A.; Steinberg, G. R.; Schertzer, J. D. Fluvastatin Causes NLRP3 Inflammasome-Mediated Adipose Insulin Resistance. *Diabetes* **2014**, *63* (11), 3742–3747. https://doi.org/10.2337/db13-1398.

(58)   Henriksbo, B. D.; Tamrakar, A. K.; Xu, J.; Duggan, B. M.; Cavallari, J. F.; Phulka, J.; Stampfli, M. R.; Ashkar, A. A.; Schertzer, J. D. Statins Promote Interleukin-1β–Dependent Adipocyte Insulin Resistance Through Lower Prenylation, Not Cholesterol. *Diabetes* **2019**, *68* (7), 1441–1448. https://doi.org/10.2337/db18-0999.

793   **For Table of Contents only:**