Title

The evolution of antimicrobial peptide resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is severely

constrained by random peptide mixtures

Authors

B. Antunes[1,2,*], C. Zanchi[1,*], B. Maron[2], C. Witzany[3], R. Regoes[3], Z. Hayouka[2,#] and J. Rolff[1, #]

[1] Freie Universität Berlin, Evolutionary Biology, Königin-Luise-Straße 1-3, 14195 Berlin, Germany.

[2] Institute of Biochemistry, Food Science and Nutrition, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,

Rehovot, Israel.

[3] Institute of Integrative Biology, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

* Co-first authors.

[#] Corresponding authors: Zvi Hayouka (zvi.hayouka@mail.huji.ac.il) and Jens Rolff (jens.rolff@fu-

berlin.de).

Abstract

The prevalence of antibiotic-resistant pathogens has become a major threat to public health,

requiring swift initiatives for discovering new strategies to control bacterial infections. Hence,

antibiotic stewardship and rapid diagnostics, but also the development, and prudent use, of novel

effective antimicrobial agents are paramount. Ideally, these agents should be less likely to select

for resistance in pathogens than currently available conventional antimicrobials. The usage of

antimicrobial Peptides (AMPs), key components of the innate immune response, and combination

therapies, have been proposed as strategies to diminish the emergence of resistance.

Herein, we investigated whether newly developed random antimicrobial peptide mixtures (RPMs)

can significantly reduce the risk of resistance evolution *in vitro* to that of single sequence AMPs,

using the ESKAPE pathogen *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (*P. aeruginosa*) as a model Gram-

negative bacterium. Infections of this pathogen are difficult to treat due the inherent resistance to

many drug classes, enhanced by the capacity to form biofilms. *P. aeruginosa* was experimentally

evolved in the presence of AMPs or RPMs, subsequentially assessing the extent of resistance

evolution and cross-resistance/collateral sensitivity between treatments. Furthermore, the fitness

costs of resistance on bacterial growth were studied, and whole-genome sequencing used to

investigate which mutations could be candidates for causing resistant phenotypes. Lastly,

changes in the pharmacodynamics of the evolved bacterial strains were examined.

Our findings suggest that using RPMs bears a much lower risk of resistance evolution compared

to AMPs and mostly prevents cross-resistance development to other treatments, while

maintaining (or even improving) drug sensitivity. This strengthens the case for using random

cocktails of AMPs in favour of single AMPs, against which resistance evolved *in vitro*, further

providing an alternative to classic antibiotics worth pursuing.

Introduction

The prevalence of antibiotic-resistant pathogens has become a major threat to public health, with

an estimated 4.95 million deaths associated with drug-resistant bacteria in 2019 (1). Although

resistance is a natural development, misuse and overuse of antibiotics has accelerated

evolutionary selection and resistance, decreasing the efficiency of available antibiotics (2, 3).

Hence, there is a strong incentive to discover new strategies to control bacterial infections, such

as antibiotic stewardship and rapid diagnostics, but also the development, and prudent use, of

novel effective antimicrobial agents (4, 5). An important and desirable feature of such agents

would be a much lower risk to select for drug resistance in pathogens than currently available

conventional antimicrobials. This would make the use of such drugs much more sustainable.

Antimicrobial Peptides (AMPs) form an important component of the innate immune response in

multicellular organisms and have been frequently proposed as new antimicrobial drug candidates

(6). These peptides usually have spatially explicit hydrophobic and cationic residues, which

promote their ability to disrupt bacterial membranes (7, 8). Fundamentally, while hydrophobic

residues interact with the hydrophobic interior of the lipid bilayer, their high net cationic charge

selects prokaryotic membranes over eukaryotic cells (9, 10). AMPs range across the tree of life,

showing a surprising diversity and variety in size and form (11). Moreover, while resistance has

been shown to evolve against these antimicrobial agents, it evolves at a much slower rate than

conventional antibiotics (12-14). Interestingly, for colistin, an AMP of bacterial origin that has been

used for more than sixty years (15), it took around fifty years between the introduction and the

spread of resistance (16).

In the current antibiotic crisis, bacterial pathogens are increasingly resistant to the available monotherapeutical antibiotic drugs, often evolved through redundant mechanisms and to multiple antibiotics in the same organism (17). This situation has been exacerbated by misuse and lack of innovation in the discovery of new, and effective, antibiotic agents (18). Hence, combination therapies have been explored and shown, by multitarget engagement, to diminish the emergence of spontaneous resistance (19, 20). Among novel strategies under scrutiny is the usage of newly developed random antimicrobial peptide mixtures (RPMs) (21, 22).

The broad molecular diversity of AMPs suggests that their prokaryotic-selective activity does not depend on specific features of amino acid sequence or peptide conformation (8). Hence, research groups have developed novel approaches to synthesize RPMs, using a solution containing defined concentrations of hydrophobic and cationic amino acids (21, 23). This results in 2^n peptide sequences (where n is the number of coupling steps and the chain length of the peptides). These random peptide libraries, composed of hydrophobic and cationic amino acids, have shown strong antimicrobial activity against multiple gram-negative and positive bacteria, including multi-drug resistant (MDR), methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), vancomycin-resistant *Enterococci* (VRE), *Listeria monocytogenes* and several plant pathogenic bacteria (24-27). Moreover, some attention has been given to a subfamily of AMPs with strong antimicrobial activity – lipopeptides. Lipopeptides are produced non-ribosomally in bacteria and fungi, consisting of a short linear or cyclic peptide sequence to which a fatty acid moiety is covalently attached at the N-terminus (28). Synthetic ultrashort lipopeptides have shown broad antimicrobial activity towards human pathogenic yeast, fungi and bacteria, as well as plant pathogenic fungi and bacteria (29, 30). RPMs of synthetic lipopeptides have also been studied by Topman-Rakover et al., displaying broad antimicrobial activity against gram-negative and gram-positive bacteria, without causing cytotoxicity to mammalian cells or plants (25, 26).

Here, we studied whether a treatment strategy based on the usage of RPMs and lipo-RPMs, can significantly reduce the risk of resistance evolution *in vitro*, compared to AMPs. We used the ESKAPE pathogen *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (*P. aeruginosa*) as a model gram-negative bacterium (31). This opportunistic pathogen is involved in chronic respiratory infections, particularly those associated with cystic fibrosis, as well as hospital-acquired infections (32). *P. aeruginosa* infections are difficult to treat due the inherent resistance to many drug classes,

enhanced by the capacity to form sessile microcolonies that stick to a surface and each other,

eventually forming biofilms (33, 34). Resistance associated *P. aeruginosa* deaths were estimated

around 300 thousand in 2019 (1).

We allowed *P. aeruginosa* to experimentally evolve in the presence of AMPs or RPMs. The

selection covered 4 weeks, which is consistent with treatment regimens of *P. aeruginosa*

infections (35). At the end of the experimental evolution course, we measured the extent of

resistance evolution and whether the evolved strains showed cross-resistance/collateral

sensitivity to the AMPs and RPMs. We also assessed the fitness costs of resistance on bacterial

growth, and used whole-genome sequencing to investigate which mutations could be candidates

for causing resistant phenotypes. Finally, we investigated changes in the pharmacodynamics of

the evolved bacterial strains (12, 36, 37).

The usage of random peptide libraries (i.e. RPMs) instead of homogeneous peptides (i.e. one

sequence, one chain length and one stereochemistry) offers some practical advantages, as the

chemical synthesis of sequence-specific oligomers is more difficult and expensive than

copolymerization (21). Hence, this study aims not only to provide in-depth insight on RPMs as

novel alternatives to classical antibiotics, but also to how they fare in comparison to single

sequence AMPs. Our findings suggest that using RPMs results in a much lower probability of

resistance evolution and mostly prevents cross-resistance development to other treatments, while

maintaining (or even increasing) drug sensitivity.

Results

1. <u>RPMs slow down resistance evolution.</u>

The evolution of resistance in *P. aeruginosa 14* (PA14) was investigated against nine

antimicrobials: 6 single sequence AMPs and 3 RPMs, with diverse modes of action, all active

against PA14 (by standard MIC assays; Table S1). The level of resistance was determined based

on the change of the MIC of the evolved strains in comparison to the previously determined MIC

of the ancestor strain ("MIC fold-change"; Table S1). The selection regime was found to influence

MIC fold-changes across the different evolved strains ($X^2_{17.88}=565.4$; p<0.0001; Fig. 1 and S5).

We found that all AMPs select for resistance when compared to their respective control (i.e. MIC

fold-change is significantly different from the MIC fold-change of the control, when exposed to the

same AMP). Among the RPMs, only p-FdK5 20/80 showed a significant difference compared to

the control. The magnitude of the difference between evolved and control is much lower for the 3

RPMs compared to all the single sequence AMPs.

Figure 1 – Resistance evolves slower in RPMs, when compared with single sequence AMPs. Resistance
determined by MIC assay of each evolved strain towards the corresponding peptide ("T" represents
　　treated groups and "C" the control exposed to the respective treatment). Results shown as log2 fold-
126　*change of the ancestor MICs. The boxes span the range between the 25th and 75th percentile, while the*
　　horizontal line inside represents the median value. The vertical bars extend to the minimum and
127　*maximum score, excluding outliers (n=6; $X^2_{17,88}$ = 565,4; p<0.0001). The results represent two*
　　independent experiments.

Additionally, under this experimental setting, the resistance to Cecropin P1 seems to evolve

readily, as the control strain showed a significantly higher MIC fold-change when exposed to

Cecropin P1 than in any other AMPs/RPMs-exposed control. The opposite effect can be seen in

the FK20 treatment, in which the control strain shows the lowest MIC fold-change.

Overall, FK20 out-performed all the other peptides in hindering resistance evolution, including

both 5-mer lipo-RPMs p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80. Among single sequence AMPs, PA-13 and

SLM1 performed best, leading to a lower MIC fold-change compared to the other AMPs. *Post hoc*

analysis shows that RPMs reduce resistance evolution better than single sequence AMPs (Fig.

S5), particularly evident for FK20-evolved strains.

2.　Most evolved strains display collateral sensitivity to FK20.

In the case of cross-resistance, evolution of resistance to one drug can increase bacterial fitness

to other drugs, while the opposite is known as collateral sensitivity (38, 39). To investigate this in

our experimentally evolved strains, they were exposed to the other antimicrobials of our panel

(Fig. 2). Across the board, strains evolved against Melittin, Pexiganan, Cecropin P1 and PA13

retained sensitivity to FK20, as did strains evolved in the presence of FK20. Furthermore,

Cecropin P1-evolved strains, despite being resistant to Cecropin P1, did not show cross-

resistance towards Melittin, Pexiganan and PA-13. On the other hand, strains evolved in the

presence of Melittin and Pexiganan, PA13 and FK 20 were cross-resistant to Cecropin P1, the

most resistant strains being the ones evolved in the presence of Melittin and Pexiganan.

Figure 2 – Cross-resistance evolved frequently against Cecropin P1, but collateral sensitivity steadily
       evolved towards FK20. A standard MIC assay was performed to evaluate the cross-resistance and
       collateral sensitivity. In each experiment, the evolved strains were exposed to different AMPs/RPMs,
149   *using the selected AMP/RPM as control. The MIC values are represented as the mean fold-change (log2)*
       of the ancestor's MIC. The results represent two independent experiments (n=6). Red colour represents
cross-resistance and green indicates collateral sensitivity.

Cross-resistance/collateral sensitivity of bacterial strains evolved in the presence of lipopeptides

against other lipopeptides of our panel (SLM1, SLM3 and lipo-RPMs p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/20)

was also evaluated. We detected no observable collateral sensitivity towards the remaining

palmitic acid-modified peptides (Fig. 2). Nonetheless, despite great amino acid sequence

similarity between peptides (Table S1), only moderate levels of cross-resistance were observed

for lipo-AMPs/-RPMs. Nonetheless, the level of cross-resistance between palmitic acid modified

peptides is of far lesser magnitude than the level of cross-resistance towards Cecropin P1

exhibited by strains selected for other peptides.

3. <u>Lower resistance evolution leads to extended lag time.</u>

The fitness cost associated with the evolution of PA14 in presence, or absence, of AMP/RPMs

was investigated and the parameters, lag time and maximum growth rate (Vmax), were

normalised to those of the ancestor strain (i.e. fold-change; Fig. S1). There was a significant effect

of the selection regime on the lag time fold-change (Fig. S1-A; $X^2_{9,40}$ = 44,31; p<0.0001), namely,

Pexiganan-, PA-13-, SLM3- and FK20-evolved strains display significantly increased lag times,

compared to control strains (Fig. S1-A and S6). There was, however, no effect of the experimental

evolution regime on the maximum growth rate (Vmax) of the strains (Fig. S1-B; $X^2_{9,40}$ = 11,9;

p=0.22).

4. Mutations evolved in all treatments.

To better understand the mechanisms responsible for resistance evolution (or absence thereof),

the genomic DNA of evolved strains was sequenced and compared to the assembled genome of

the ancestor strain of PA14. A heat-map summary of the emerged mutations in evolved strains

(including control) can be found in Fig. S2. Sequencing revealed that the majority of occurring

SNPs were present in five genes (84%): *lasR*, *phoQ*, *tpbB*, *oprL* and *wbpA* (Fig. 3; strains without

mutations were also plotted for comparison). In this section, cross-resistance/collateral sensitivity

data was used to explore whether the SNPs in these 5 genes were associated with resistance to

the panel of tested antimicrobials. Specifically, we tested whether presence/absence of a SNP, in

each of the 5 genes, explained MIC fold-changes towards individual antimicrobial treatments,

among the bacterial strains of all selection regimes. Interestingly, among these 5 genes, *tpbB* and

oprL presented SNPs in only 1 of the 2 replicates of the experiment. Additionally, the software tool

Provean was used to predict whether an amino acid substitution, or indel, affected the biological

function of the target protein (40).

Figure 3 – Representation of the resistance evolution (MIC fold-changes) in relation to the
presence/absence of mutations in the 5 most frequently mutated genes. Results shown as log2 fold-
185 *change of the ancestor MICs; Each dot represents the mean of triplicates (values beside the dots*
represent the MIC value). The x-axis displays individual strains per treatment and the respective
186 *mutations (or absence of) are portrayed underneath. The results represent two independent*
experiments. Evolved mutations against FK20 did not result in resistant strains.

TpbB is a diguanylate cyclase which is directly involved in the formation small colony variants

(SCVs) in P. aeruginosa (41). A single type of SNPs was found in the *tpbB* gene, resulting in an

amino acid substitution (valine to alanine in position 40), deemed not to affect protein function by

Provean. *TpbB* gene mutations only evolved in the strains of the first replicate of the experiment,

but across most of them (22 out of 27 sequenced strains), and across all treatments, including

the control. Within the 1st replicate of the experiment, the presence of this SNP in *tpbB* did not

explain MIC fold-change towards any of the tested antimicrobials (Fig. S8 and Table S3).

On the other hand, SNPs in the *oprL* gene, a membrane lipoprotein which plays an important role

in the interaction of *P. aeruginosa* with the environment (42), evolved only in strains of the second

replicate of the experiment. SNPs in *tpbB*, in the *orpL* gene they were found in most strains (20

out of 27), and across all treatments including the control. Unlike *tpbB*, however, SNPs found in

oprL (leucine replaced by a phenylalanine in position 43) are predicted to impair protein function.

Thus, the presence of this SNP increased MIC fold-change towards Melittin, Pexiganan and

Cecropin P1 (Fig. S9 and Table S3).

LasR is a transcriptional regulator that controls the expression of virulence factors and biofilm

formation in *P. aeruginosa* (43). In our experiments, we found a high number of different SNPs in

the *lasR* gene, for most selection regimes, accounting for 27 different SNPs across 29 strains.

SNPs in *lasR* were also present in 3 out of the 6 control strains. Among these 27 different SNPs,

only 6 were deemed not to affect protein function by Provean, whereas the rest were deleterious.

Despite this feature, the presence, or absence, of SNPs in the *lasR* gene is not associated with

fold-changes in MIC towards any of the tested antimicrobials (Fig. S10 and Table S3).

We also found SNPs in several members of the *wbp* pathway leading to the synthesis of the B-

band O-antigen of the Lipopolysaccharide (LPS) in *P. aeruginosa* (44). The most commonly found

SNP was a frameshift variant of *wbpA,* while the second most commonly found was a missense

mutation in *wbpA*, leading to the replacement of a valine in position 32 by a glycine. The 3 SNPs

found in *wbpL* also caused frameshifts, as did the 4 SNPs present in the *wbpI* gene. According to

Provean, all these SNPs were deleterious, thus inactivating the products of the respective genes.

It has been shown that any missing member of this pathway led to a loss of the B-band O-Antigen

of LPS in *P. aeruginosa* (45). Since, *wbp* SNPs found herein were deemed deleterious, we

consider these together as inactivating the *wbp* pathway (named "*wbp* genes" in the figures; Fig.

S11). Nonetheless, we did not find these deleterious SNPs to affect MIC fold-change towards any

of the tested antimicrobials (Fig. S11 and Table S3). Additionally, given that such SNPs were

present in all treatments, including the control, once again indicates that they were unlikely to

have been selected by our antimicrobials.

Among the 5 majorly found gene mutations, only *phoQ* did not show any SNPs in the control

group. The *phoQ* gene codes for a Mg^{2+} sensor which is part of a two-component system that

controls several pathogenic properties in Gram-negative bacteria (46). In our experiments, the

most represented SNP in *phoQ* (in 28 strains out of 29) leads to a replacement of a valine in

position 260 by a glycine, which was previously associated to colistin resistance in *P. aeruginosa*

isolates (47). All SNPs were deemed deleterious by Provean.

The *phoQ* gene mutation was, in fact, the most frequently observed mutation (present in 29

different strains), although its distribution was not consistent throughout all the evolved strains.

While SNPs were present in all the strains evolved in the presence of PA13, SLM1 and p-FdK5

20/80, in 4 out of 6 of the p-FdK5 and FK20-selected strains and in 3 out of 6 of Pexiganan-

selected strains, they were absent from Melittin and Cecropin P1-selected strains, as well as the

control strains. Moreover, the presence of this SNP in *phoQ* is associated to a higher MIC fold-

change towards PA13, SLM1, SLM3, p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80 (Fig. S12 and Table S3).

There were only 3 strains in which no SNPs were detected compared to the ancestor PA14: 1 in

the Melittin, 1 in the Cecropin P1 and 1 in the control selection regimes (Fig. 3 and S4). However,

both the Melittin- and Cecropin P1-evolved strains showed a higher resistance towards Melittin

and Cecropin P1 respectively. Moreover, it would have perhaps been expected to find more than

just one mutation-less strain in the control group, as it was evolved absent of AMP/RPMs.

Nonetheless, naturally occurring mutations result of continuous culturing are expected (48, 49),

and, in fact, wild-type PA14 was shown to have a 6.12×10^{-4} spontaneous mutation rate per

genome (50).

5.   <u>The Hill coefficient evolves with the MIC.</u>

The steepness of the pharmacodynamic curves (i.e. the Hill coefficient, kappa; κ) generated from

time-kill curves provide information about the width of the mutant selection window (i.e the

concentration range where resistant mutants are selected for; MSW), as a higher kappa results

in a narrower MSW (Fig. 4). Therefore, we analysed kappa evolution for the most resistant strains,

in each selection regime, by correlating it with their respective MIC fold-change (Fig. 5). The

kappa value of the most resistant evolved strains was normalised to that of the ancestor, for each

AMP/RPM. Six out of eight AMP/RPMs can be found in the lower-right quadrant of MIC fold-

change and kappa fold-change correlation (Fig. 5), therefore not only evolving resistance to PA14,

but also generating a lower kappa than that of the ancestor strain. Indeed, a Spearman's

correlation shows an inverse relationship between MIC and kappa fold-change (ρ= -0.8743; p-

value=0.0045), where a lower kappa correlates to a higher MIC, except for p-FdK5-evolved

strains.

265 *Figure 4 – Schematic illustration of the four parameters predicted by the Hill function: zMIC, ψ_{max}, ψ_{min},*
266 *and κ. The zMIC is estimated by the lowest concentration that inhibits the growth of the whole treated bacterium population. While ψ_{max} represents the maximal growth rate of bacteria (i.e. in absence of*
267 *antimicrobials), ψ_{min} represents the minimal bacterial growth rate, or maximal killing rate of the antimicrobial treatment. The Hill coefficient, κ, predicts the shape and slope of the pharmacodynamic*
268 *curve; the higher κ is, the steeper the pharmacodynamic curve. Pharmacodynamic curves are represented in different colours (i.e. red, black and green) to portray the change in slope and MIC values.*

Figure 5 – The MIC and Hill coefficient (κ) of selected strains seem to evolve in correlational fashion. Graphic representing the correlation between evolution of resistance evolution and kappa (ρ=-0,8743; p-value=0,0045). Resistance determined by MIC assay of each strain toward the corresponding peptide, shown as log2 fold-change of the ancestor MICs. Evolution of kappa determined by Hill function-based Rstan model, shown as fold-change of the ancestor's kappa. Each dot represents the mean of triplicates.

Using p-FdK5 20/80, despite evolving resistance, generated a slightly higher κ compared to that

of the ancestor strain, therefore maintaining the sensitivity towards the evolved strains. As

previously seen (Fig. 1), only under FK20 selection could resistance evolution not be observed,

during the 4 weeks under selection, yet it resulted in a higher kappa compared to the that of the

ancestor (Fig. 5).

Discussion

The present work was primarily motivated by a growing necessity and interest in exploring novel

alternatives to conventional antibiotics. By using a combined approach of experimental evolution,

pharmacodynamic modelling and genome re-sequencing, we show how novel random peptide

libraries compare to single AMPs in respect to antimicrobial resistance evolution. AMPs have

been gaining attention for their potential as antimicrobial agents, partly because of the low

probability of resistance evolution (7, 8, 10, 51). In fact, the WHO reported that 15.2% of

antibacterials in the preclinical pipeline are AMPs (52), a notable increase from 10.7% reported

in the previous review (53). Our hypothesis was that RPMs, as a cocktail of multiple AMPs, would

represent an increased set of challenges for bacteria to overcome compared to single AMPs,

potentially delaying resistance evolution.

Having selected a broad array of AMPs and RPMs, shown to be active against PA14 *via* MIC

determination (Table S1), we saw that resistance evolved against the great majority (2 to 128-fold

MIC increase; Fig. 1). These observations are consistent with previous evidence showing that

despite lower probability of resistance evolution against AMPs compared to conventional

antibiotics, *in vitro* resistance evolution towards AMPs can evolve (13, 54, 55). Conversely, it was

observed that random peptide libraries (RPMs), based on cationic and hydrophobic moieties, can

significantly delay, or avoid, resistance evolution when compared to single sequence AMPs (Fig.

1 and S5). While palmitic acid-modified RPMs, p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80, were able to greatly

reduce the magnitude of resistance evolution, FK20 was the only one effectively escaping it within

the context of our experimental setting (Fig. 1). The selection setting herein used covered 4

weeks, which is consistent with treatment regimens of *P. aeruginosa* infections (35).

Random peptide libraries encase a cocktail of AMPs. Whereas FK20, a 20-mer, can produce over

1 million AMP combinations (2^{20}), p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80, although modified with palmitic acid

for increased hydrophobicity, being 5-mers, provide less AMP combination possibilities (32 and

less, respectively) (21, 22, 26). Hence, the availability of a cocktail of multiple AMPs seems to

favour the usage of RPMs, as it creates an increased set of challenges for bacteria to overcome,

which can potentially delay resistance evolution. However, drug combinations (including AMPs)

should be carefully planned, to avoid the risk of leading to formulations that are inferior to using

single agents. Pena-Miller et al. make an interesting case when trying to achieve optimal

synergistic effects in drug combinations (56): synergy can exert strong selection for resistance,

leading to consistent antagonistic emergence. Thus, unless super-inhibitory doses are applied

until the pathogen is successfully cleared, synergistic antibiotics could have the opposite effect

and lead to increased pathogen load.

Analysis of the cross-resistance/collateral sensitivity results (Fig. 2) revealed some interesting

patterns. Cecropin P1-evolved strains show collateral sensitivity to Pexiganan, PA-13 and FK20.

Conversely, Pexiganan, PA-13 and FK20-evolved strains show cross-resistance to Cecropin P1.

Remarkably, all evolved strains show collateral sensitivity to FK20, which could potentially lead to

a positive impact on single AMPs if combined with FK20. In fact, several studies have proposed

collateral sensitivity as a promising strategy to slow down the resistance evolution process and

even reverse the pre-existing resistance (39, 57-59). Imamovic and collaborators demonstrated

that resistance evolution to *P. aeruginosa* for antibiotics used in cystic fibrosis patients caused

collateral sensitivity to other antibiotics (39). The study showed that the optimized drug treatment,

based on the collateral sensitivity interactions, effectively eradicated the resistant subpopulation

from the patient's lungs.

In line with previous studies, growth parameters lag time and maximum growth rate (Vmax) were

used to estimate cost of resistance evolution (14, 60). Our investigation revealed that strains

evolved in the presence of Pexiganan, PA-13, SLM3 and FK20 displayed a fitness cost, resulting

in significantly increased lag times compared to control (Fig. S1-A). This result is surprising in the

case of FK20-evolved strains, which did not evolve resistance. There were no differences

between the lag time of the ancestor and the procedural controls after selection (Fig. S1-A), thus

adaptation to the experimental conditions did not affect this aspect of the bacterial fitness. Ward

and associates (61) have shown that, clinically isolated MDR strains of *P. aeruginosa* frequently

have similar fitness in the absence of antibiotics. Therefore, under certain circumstances, using

AMP formulations against which resistance evolution is more costly, might be more effective in

preventing resistance evolution, though the relationship between cost and resistance is not

always strong (62).

No selection regime significantly affected Vmax compared to control, however, the Vmax of the

control groups was higher than that of the ancestor (Fig. S1-B). Faster growth rates than that of

the ancestor strain have been shown to result from adaptation to a serial passaging environment

(63, 64), due to an enhanced ability to acquire, or more efficiently utilize available nutrients during

post-exponential growth. On the other hand, no significant differences in Vmax were found

between experimentally evolved strains, in either treated or control regimes (Fig. S1-B). A study

that induced bacterial resistance to Tachyplesin I (including in *P. aeruginosa*) similarly revealed

that resistance acquisition did not markedly affect Vmax, in comparison to the control, but did

extend the lag phase (65). The authors argue that AMP resistance might compromise bacterial

fitness in different ways, not necessarily affecting the maximum growth rate.

We further studied which mutations evolved in our experimental selection treatments. By finding

new mutations that emerge in parallel, independently propagated lines of bacterial strains

exposed to antibiotics in controlled environments, are likely the cause of new heritable resistant

genotypes (66). Among the five genes comprising most of the SNPs in our dataset, *phoQ* was the

only one for which SNPs did not evolve in the control lines, suggesting that it evolved as a

response to a selection pressure exerted by some of the antimicrobials of our panel. This SNP

results in the substitution of a valine by a glycine in position 260 (Histidine kinase A domain),

which was deemed to abolish protein function by Provean. This same SNP has also been

previously reported to lead to loss-of-function of the PhoQ protein, leading to an increased

resistance to colistin in *P. aeruginosa* by Lee and Ko (47).

In *P. aeruginosa*, adaptive resistance to cationic AMPs is known to occur in response to limiting

extracellular concentrations of Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} cations (67, 68). This adaptation is controlled by

two-component regulators PhoP-PhoQ and PmrA-PmrB which upregulate the expression of the

arnBCADTEF lipopolysaccharide (LPS) modification operon (68). The products of these *arn*

genes lead to reducing the net negative charge of LPS, limiting the interaction and self-promoted

uptake of polycationic antibiotics (e.g. AMPs and aminoglycosides). *PhoQ* expression allows for

the integration of environmental cues when bacterial density is high and nutritional resources are

rarefied (69). Inactivation of *phoQ* ultimately lead to constitutive LPS modifications which have

been shown to confer *P. aeruginosa* colistin resistance (70).

PhoQ SNPs were present in all evolved treatments, except Melittin and Cecropin P1-selected

strains. Moreover, the presence of this SNP in *phoQ* is associated to a higher MIC fold-change

towards PA13, SLM1, SLM3, p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80 (Fig. S12). Interestingly, given that *phoQ*

SNPs were not found in Melittin and Cecropin P1-evolved strains, the only antimicrobial-selected

group with the *phoQ* mutation, which was not associated with higher MIC fold-change is FK20.

Therefore, FK20 is the only selection regime in which the presence of this SNP in the *phoQ* gene

was not associated to a higher MIC fold-change.

SNPs found in the 4 other genes (*lasR*, *wbp-* genes, *tpbB* abd *oprL*) were also detected in the

strains of the control selection regime, which means that antimicrobials are unlikely to have

selected for their emergence in our bacterial strains.

We found a high number of different SNPs in the *lasR* gene (mostly predicted to be deleterious)

in the bacterial strains, although the presence of these SNPs did not affect MIC fold-change

towards any of the tested antimicrobials in our experimental setting (Fig. S10). LasR has been

shown to play an important role in resistance evolution as part of P. aeruginosa quorum sensing

(QS) (71). The *P. aeruginosa* QS circuitry is comprised of at least two complete systems, LasR–

LasI and RhlR–RhlI (72). Here, the transcriptional regulator LasR controls the expression of

virulence factors, such as elastase LasB17, exotoxin A, pyocyanin and EPS, important players

for resistance evolution in *P. aeruginosa* (73). Notably, polymorphic populations of *P. aeruginosa*

comprising various mutants for *lasR* are selected first in patients with chronic obstructive

pulmonary disease (74). Yet, despite this crucial involvement in resistance, accumulation of SNPs

in the *lasR* gene have been shown to be widespread in *P. aeruginosa* isolated from various

environments, and in the absence of a distinct selection pressure (75). These previous findings

are confirmed in our present study. Interestingly, however, SNPs in *lasR* were absent from strains

evolved in the presence of PA13 and FK20, which might indicate a constraint on quorum sensing

function imposed by these 2 antimicrobials during evolution.

The biosynthesis of the B-band O-antigen of LPS is product of genes in the *wbp* pathway, among

which are *wbpA*, *wbpI* and *wbpL* (76). The loss of one gene product in this pathway leads to loss-

of-function of the B-band O-antigen at the cell surface (45). We found all SNPs in *wbpA*, *wbpI* and

wbpL (named "*wbp* genes") to be deleterious, thus it is likely that in our experiments the bacterial

strains presenting such a SNP do not possess the B-band O-antigen of LPS. This molecule has

been shown to play a critical role in host colonization, providing resistance to both serum

sensitivity and phagocytosis (77-79), whereas mutants of *P. aeruginosa* deficient in O-antigen

synthesis, are sensitive to the killing effects of human serum-mediated lysis (80).

With the emergence of mucoid *P. aeruginosa* within the lungs of CF patients, there are cell surface

changes with respect to LPS phenotype, characterized by minor expression or complete lack of

B-band O-antigen, while the level of A-band is maintained (78). Once *P. aeruginosa* has colonized

the lungs, these LPS modifications are probably beneficial for evasion of host defences (A band

is less immunogenic) and for alteration of susceptibility to antibiotics, since loss of B-band O-

antigen confers resistance to aminoglycosides (81). Thus, given that we found *wbp* pathway

SNPs in every evolved treatment, including the control, and that they do not explain MIC fold-

change, one could propose that these gene mutations resulted from an adaptation to a biofilm

environment, rather than from selection by the panel of antimicrobials tested.

We found a SNP in the tpbB gene (also called yfiN), coding for a diguanylate cyclase which

regulates the output of messenger cyclic-di-GMP (c-di-GMP) (82), in only 1 of the 2 experimental

blocks. (Fig. S8). Several *Pseudomonas* strains (including PA14) undergo phenotypic

diversification while adapting to the biofilm environment, forming small colony variants (SCVs)

(82). Strong evidence has linked SCVs formation to elevated levels of messenger cyclic-di-GMP

(c-di-GMP), associated with sessile phenotypes, expressing biofilm formation and attachment

factors (83). Resistant *P. aeruginosa* SCVs phenotype have been shown to inactivate *yfiR* and

tpbA, negative regulators of *tpbB*, leading to increased biofilm production (84). In our

experimentally evolved strains, the SNP in *tpbB* was found to be neutral, which might explain why

no effect of this SNP on the MIC-fold change was detected towards any of the tested

antimicrobials (Fig. S8).

SNPs in the *oprL* gene were also present in all selection regimes, but only in the second replicate

of the experiment. They consist of a leucine substitution by a phenylalanine in position 43, leading

to protein inactivation. OprL is the second most abundant outer membrane protein in *P.*

aeruginosa, equivalent of the *E. coli* peptidoglycan-associated lipoprotein (85). Together with

small lipoprotein OprI, OprL interacts with peptidoglycans, maintaining cell integrity (85), offering

protection from oxidative stress (86), and contributing to antibiotic resistance mechanisms in *P.*

aeruginosa by adjusting membrane permeability and multidrug efflux pumps, which secrete the

drugs directly out of the cell (87). In the experimentally evolved strains of this study, the presence

of this deleterious SNP in the *oprL* gene correlated with a higher MIC fold-change towards Melittin-

, Pexiganan- and Cecropin P1- evolved strains (Fig. S9).

Altogether, our data points to the efficiency of FK20 to slow down, or prevent, the magnitude of

resistance evolution of *P. aeruginosa*. A rationale to consider is that FK20 is a random peptide

library of over 1 million sequences, making it very difficult to evolve resistance and hence

resistance evolution against FK20 was not discovered within the four-week selection time span

in our experiment. In fact, the goal of using multiple antimicrobials would be to achieve a combined

effect, leading to killing efficacy and/or resistance avoidance, superior to the sum of their individual

counterparts (i.e. synergistic interaction) (37). Synergy between AMPs is common, leading to

increased killing efficacy, while constraining resistance evolution, which could explain their

combinational occurrence in nature (6, 88, 89). The molecular mechanisms of interactions of

AMPs are still largely unknown (6), although it has been suggested that synergism resulting of

combined AMPs can form a "supermolecule" and more stable pores (90). Furthermore, pore-

forming peptides can also assist other coapplied transmembrane AMPs to quickly invade bacterial

cells and substantially interrupt the metabolism (91).

Insight on why antimicrobial resistance against AMPs evolves with low probabilities, or in the case

of FK20 with extremely low probabilities, relies on the molecular mechanisms of killing, but also

on the investigation of pharmacodynamics *in vitro*, such as the one portrayed herein and by others

(6, 92) and *in vivo* (93). Our study revealed that AMP resistance evolution in *P. aeruginosa*

resulted in increased MICs, except for FK20, but also that the Hill coefficient, kappa, evolves as

well (36). Kappa (κ) describes how sensitive the bacterial populations net growth rate is to

changes in antimicrobial concentration. High κ values represent steeper pharmacodynamic

curves (i.e. for concentrations close to the MIC, a small increase in concentration leads to a big

decrease in net growth). Therefore, for high κ values a given antibiotic substance (e.g. random

peptide libraries or AMP combinations) has a narrower range of concentrations exerting selection

on resistant bacteria over susceptible ones (6, 37). This leads to the idea that kappa might relate

to the probability of resistance evolution against AMPs (12).

A negative correlation between MIC fold-change and kappa fold-change revealed that, generally,

lower resistance evolution led to steeper pharmacodynamic curves (i.e. kappa; Fig. 6). Similarly,

El Shazely et al. have previously shown a proof-of-concept study illustrating that kappa evolves

in *S. aureus* (92). How kappa and the actual AMP-membrane interactions are related in our

examples, and in fact in most, requires further study. Work by Srinivasan et al. has studied and

summarized possible mechanisms including cooperativity, oligomerization and aggregation of

AMP molecules (94).

Yu and colleagues have shown that MIC and kappa significantly varied between single AMPs and

AMP combinations (6). As numbers of AMPs increased in combination, the MIC of the

combinations decreased and, reversibly, kappa increased. Random peptide libraries are

combinations of multiple random AMP sequences, a feature that might be crucial and hold

potential for outperforming combinations of a few single AMPs.

The mutant selection window (MSW) is defined as the range of antimicrobial concentrations

where the resistant mutants are selectively favoured over susceptible strains (95). The upper

bound is given by the MIC of the resistant mutant, the lower bound, also known as the minimal

selective concentration (96), is reached when the net growth rates of the resistant and susceptible

strains are equal. By using random peptide libraries, such as FK20, that lead to higher kappa

values, in comparison to single AMP-evolved strains, could narrow the range of concentrations

selecting resistance (i.e. the MSW).

Conclusions

This work reinforced the idea of combinational therapy as a path for tackling antibiotic resistance,

highlighting the potential therapeutical capacity of random peptide libraries. Herein, a 20-mer

random peptide library, FK20, was shown to avoid resistance and remain sensitive after selection,

despite evolving mutations and fitness costs. Our findings suggest that *P. aeruginosa* detects the

presence of these antimicrobial agents, but for the duration of our *in vitro* selection protocol (i.e.

four weeks), were not able to evolve effective resistance mechanisms. Additionally, these cationic

and hydrophobic AMP cocktails can be synthesized affordably and have shown to be non-toxic

and non-haemolytic in a mouse model (21, 22).The findings herein depicted strengthen the case

for favouring the usage of random cocktails of AMPs over single AMPs, against which resistance

evolved *in vitro*.

In the past, promising studies have claimed novel antibiotics "resistance-proof", able to stay

effective at killing their target pathogens, such as the case of Teixobactin (97), being later refuted

(98). Thus, despite the positive findings herein evidenced for FK20, one should side with caution.

Moreover, further studies should be conducted concerning the interaction of these RPMs with the

host innate immunity. The usage of AMPs/RPMs that strongly synergize with host innate immune

response should be favoured, as it could lead to an overall reduction in dosage, hence reducing

potential side effects (99). A synergistic strategy involving random peptide libraries and the host

immune response holds potential to be a cost-efficient way to reduce bacterial loads and avoid

resistance evolution.

Materials & Methods

<u>Bacterial strains and growth conditions</u>

All experiments were performed with the *P. aeruginosa* 14 strain (PA14; kindly provided by Yael

Helman) (100). This strain is defined as the ancestor strain. Prior to each experiment, strains were

plated on Mueller-Hinton (MH) agar plates (HiMedia), and individual colonies were picked and

grown in MH broth overnight at 37°C. All bacterial cells used in this study were stored in 25%

glycerol at -80°C.

<u>Synthesis of antimicrobial peptides</u>

Six different AMPs and three RPMs were selected for experimental evolution (Table S1). In

addition to the peptides developed in house (i.e. SLM1, SLM3, p-FdK5, p-FdK5 20/80 and FK20;

(22, 25, 26)), four additional AMPs were selected. Melittin is the major protein component of the

venom of the European honeybee (*Apis mellifera*) (101). Pexiganan is a synthetic analog of

magainin peptides, isolated from the skin of the African clawed frog (102). Cecropin P1 was the

first found mammalian cecropin, isolated from pig small intestine (103), presenting extensive

homology to earlier discovered insect cecropins (104). PA-13 is a short synthetic a-helical hybrid

peptide, inspired by cathelicidin and aurein (105). While SLM1 and SLM3 are specific palmitic

acid-modified 5-mer peptides, composed of L-Lysine and/or L-Phenylalanine, part of a 32-peptide

library, p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80 are randomized 5-mers, using L-Phenylalanine and D-Lysine

(to the ratios of 1:1 and 1:4, respectively; Fig. S1) (25, 26). Lastly, FK20 was synthetized as

random peptide of L-Phenylalanine and L-Lysine (1:1 ratio) (22).

All peptides were synthesized by 9-fluorenylmethoxy carbonyl (Fmoc) solid-phase peptide

synthesis (SPPS), using a peptide synthesizer (Liberty Blue; CEM, USA). To generate lipo-RPMs

and SLMs, acylation was produced by bounding palmitic acid to the N-terminus of the desired

peptide/RPM, using the same Fmoc chemistry, albeit that overnight shaking, at room temperature,

was used instead of microwave irradiation (26). Upon synthesis completion, peptides were,

sequentially, cleaved from the resin (95% trifluoroacetic acid [TFA], 2.5% water, and 2.5%

triisopropylsilane [TIPS]), resuspended in double distilled water (DDW), frozen and lyophilized.

The resulting crude peptide was dissolved in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) and purified by

semipreparative reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography (RP-HPLC), while

matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization–time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF-MS)

was utilized for verification of the peptide mass and purity. RPMs containing phenylalanine and

lysine (FK20, pFdK5, pFdK5 20/80) were synthesized as previously described (21).

<u>Minimum Inhibition Concentration (MIC) determination</u>

MIC values were determined following a standard serial dilution protocol, as described elsewhere

(27). Briefly, PA14 cells were grown overnight in MH broth, at 37°C and 200 rpm. Subsequently,

cells were diluted 1:100 in MH broth and grown until reaching an optical density at 595 nm (OD_{595})

of 0.1. Then, 100 μL of 5×10^5 CFU/mL were inoculated into each well in 96-well plates that

contained a serial dilution of AMPs or RPMs. Each plate contained 3 replicate lines per peptide.

The MICs were defined as the lowest concentration at which there was inhibition of bacterial

growth by at least 90%, after 24h, by measuring the OD_{595}.

The MIC was determined on 3 occasions: 1) prior to the experiment, to determine the

concentration of our focal peptides to be used at the start of the experimental evolution (i.e. MIC

of the ancestor strain); 2) at the end of the experimental evolution, detect an increase, or

decrease, in the resistance of the experimentally evolved strains to our peptides of interest; 3) to

evaluate whether the experimental evolution of a certain treatment was accompanied by an

increase, or decrease, in resistance or sensitivity to another antimicrobial (i.e. cross-resistance or

collateral-sensitivity).

For time containment reasons, the design of the cross-resistance/collateral sensitivity

experiments are not full factorial, instead, we focussed on comparisons we found most relevant:

1) we exposed strains evolved in the presence of the AMPs Melittin, Pexiganan, Cecropin P1 and

PA13, and the RPM FK20 to each other; 2) we then exposed strains evolved in the presence of

palmitic acid-modified peptides to peptides of the same family, namely SLM1-, SLM3- and p-

FdK5-evolved strains to SLM1, SLM3, p-FdK5 and p-FdK5 20/80.

The MIC of evolved strains was divided by MIC of the ancestor to determine the respective fold-

change in comparison to the ancestor (see "Statistical Analysis" section).

<u>Experimental evolution procedure</u>

Prior to evolution with AMPs/RPMs, a PA14 colony was transferred from an MH agar plate into

5 mL MH broth in a 50 mL tube and incubated overnight, at 37°C and 200 rpm. Subsequently, this

starter culture was diluted 20-fold into a 1.5mL Eppendorf tube containing 850 µL MH broth, to

maintain the same headspace ratio of 96-well plates, used in the experimental evolution

procedure, and incubated, overnight, under the same conditions (37°C and 200 rpm). This

process was repeated for 7 transfers to adapt the bacteria to the experimental conditions.

The experimental evolution procedure was designed to exert selective pressure while avoiding

extinction of bacterial lines, as previously described (27). Each line was exposed to 4

concentrations of AMP/RPMs, according to their MIC, as follows: 1.5x, 1x, 0.5x, and 0.25x (Table

S1). Experiments were performed in 96-well plates, and each AMP/RPM had 3 parallel replicates

(sharing the same ancestral inoculum). Each plate included 8 wells with bacteria absent of

AMPs/RPMs, as a positive control, as well as 4 wells with just medium, as negative control. Daily,

10 µL of the previous plate was transferred into 190 µL of fresh medium and AMPs. Every 4 days,

bacteria from the highest concentration of AMP/RPM were selected and transferred into 4

concentrations in the new plate. MIC was doubled when growth was observed in 4 out of 6 lines

at the MIC or higher. The experimental evolution was carried out for 27 transfers (approx. 114

generations). Before every selection or MIC increment, samples were taken for fossil record in

25% glycerol stocks and preserved at -80°C to avoid line extinction. Spot plating was performed

on MH agar, containing 5 µg/mL tetracycline, to confirm growth before selection. Experimental

evolutions were performed twice, yielding 6 replicates per selection regime over 2 replicates of

the experiment.

<u>Fitness cost of evolved strains</u>

Bacterial cells were grown overnight in MH broth and then diluted to an OD_{595} of 0.1. For each

strain, 200µL of culture were transferred into 96-well plates, with 3 technical replicates. Optical

density (OD595) was measured every 15 min for 24 h using an Epoch 2 microplate reader

(BioTek). Lag time and Vmax were assessed using the plate reader software (Gen5). The values

measured in the experimentally evolved strains were divided by the values of their respective

ancestors and expressed as lag time fold-change and Vmax fold-change (see 'Statistical Analysis'

section).

<u>DNA Isolation</u>

Genomic DNA for whole genome sequencing was isolated using GeneMATRIX Bacterial and

Yeast genomic DNA purification kit (Roboklon, Germany) following manufacturer's instructions.

Four µl of 10 mg/ml freshly prepared lysozyme and lysostaphin (both from Sigma) each were

added into bacterial lysate. The DNA quantity and quality were estimated by measuring the optical

density at A260/280 using the Nanodrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific) and the Qubit™

4 Fluorometer (Thermo Scientific).

<u>Sequencing</u>

At the end of each replicate of the experimental evolution experiment, 10 µL of the content of

each well was plated on MH agar and incubated overnight. One single colony was picked per

plate/well to be re-sequenced. As a reference genome, we used a *de novo* assembly of a single

colony of PA14 taken from our frozen stock (after overnight culture).

The library of the ancestor strain was sequenced on a minion (Oxford Nanopore Technologies,

Oxford), at 400 bps translocation speed, using a kit 14 chemistry flowcell, and the resulting raw

sequencing data were basecalled using Guppy model dna_r10.4.1_e8.2_400bps_sup.

Sequencing reads were adaptor trimmed using porechop (106) and filtered using filtlong (107) to

retain approximately 150-fold coverage comprising reads of at least 1000 bp. The filtered reads

were assembled using flye (108), which produced a single circular contig that was further polished

using medaka consensus (109). The remaining errors were corrected using illumina reads

together with polypolish (110). Finally, the start position of the assembly was adjusted to begin at

dnaA using circlator (111). The result was annotated with prokka (112).

Endpoint re-sequencing of the evolved strains was done on an Illumina HiSeq2000 with 100bp

paired-end reads (Wellcome Trust Centre for Human Genetics, Oxford, UK). The sequencing data

had a mean depth of 35.9x and a mean coverage of 76.4% at 30x depth. Sequencing Adaptors

were trimmed with trimmomatic (113). Snippy (114) was used to call variants using by default

parameters, with the annotated assembly described above as a reference sequence. The

Provean software tool was used to predict the effect of SNPs on the function of their target protein,

namely amino acid substitution or indels (40).

<u>Killing Curves</u>

AMP/RPM-selected strains were serially diluted (two-fold concentration gradient), starting from

10x MIC, in 96-well plates. Approximately, $2–3 \times 10^6$ log-phase bacteria were added to a total

volume of 100 ml. The plates were incubated at 37°C. As it is known that AMP-mediated killing is

quick (115, 116), dose-response was monitored within 60 min (6). To do so, 10 µL of bacterial

suspension were sampled after 5, 10, 20, 40 and 60 min., then immediately diluted in 90µL PBS

and plated on square solid MHA plates. These solid agar plates were transferred into a 37°C

incubator and incubated for 24h before counting CFUs. The same procedure was followed to

assess killing curves for the sensitive ancestor PA14 strain. The assays were performed in

triplicates.

<u>Modelling killing curves – Pharmacodynamics</u>

Pharmacodynamics capture the functional relationship between drug dosage and bacterial growth

or death. To model the killing curve, discribing the relationship between the concentration of

AMPs/RPMs and the killing and/or growth rate of the exposed bacteria, the Hill function was used

(36). This function estimates four parameters: zMIC, κ, ψ_{min}, and ψ_{max} (Fig. 4). The zMIC is the

MIC estimated by fitting; κ, the Hill coefficient, depicts the steepness of the curve relating bacterial

growth to drug concentration; ψ_{min}, and ψ_{max} represent the minimum and maximum growth rates

of bacteria, respectively (see Hill function equations in supplementary methods). Growth rate and

killing rate of bacteria are estimated from the time-kill curves as the change of CFU over time by

using generalized linear regression. The data for CFU were all log transformed. The starting point

of linear regression was the first measurement. We then fitted the growth rate and killing rate with

equation 4 (see supplementary methods), based on the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

method and generated the pharmacodynamic curves. Pharmacodynamic parameters of the most

resistant experimentally evolved strains and ancestor were estimated and a summary can be

found in Table S2.

<u>Statistical analysis</u>

All the data was analysed using the R software (117) and figures were produced using GraphPad

Prism, version 9 for Windows, GraphPad Software, Boston, Massachusetts USA.

We normalized the MICs of the different evolved strains generated in this series of experiments

(as well as the control strain) by dividing them with the MIC of their respective ancestors, which

represents the MICs before applying the selection regime. The resulting variable is a fold-change

in MIC ("MIC fold-change") at the end of the experimental evolution compared to the beginning.

Similarly, we normalized both fitness readouts duration of the lag phase (lag time) and maximum

slope of the bacterial growth curve (Vmax) to the readouts of the ancestor of the given evolved

strain by dividing the values of the evolved strains to that of their respective ancestors. The

resulting variable is a fold-change in Vmax and lag time during experimental evolution: Vmax fold-

change and lag time fold-change.

These response variables are therefore ratios, which are non-integer despite representing count

data. They showed the dispersion typical of count data, as well as a heterogeneity in the variances

between treatments. MIC fold-changes had a maximum of 3 digits after the comma. They were

multiplied by 1000 to analyse them with models fitted for a negative binomial distribution (see

details below), since this distribution assumes a positive and integer response variable. We

multiplied the lag time fold-change by 100 and rounded it up according to the value of the third

digit after the comma to perform a similar analysis. However, such was not the case for the Vmax

fold-change data which satisfied the assumptions of a Linear Mixed Model and did not require to

be multiplied and rounded.

We then analysed the MIC and lag time fold-change of single sequence AMPs and RPMs strains,

generated by experimental evolution, with a Generalised Linear Mixed-Effect Model (GLMM),

fitted for a negative binomial distribution, according to the selection regime. Since the MIC fold-

change was always assessed towards the antimicrobial used, as a selection pressure during

experimental evolution, there was no further need to include the antimicrobial towards which the

MIC was measured with as an explanatory variable. Since the whole experiment was replicated

in 2 experimental blocks, we included this experimental block as a random factor. We used the

'glmmTMB' function of th 'glmmTMB' package (118). As stated above, we analysed the Vmax

fold-change of the resulting strains with a Linear Mixed effect Model (LMM, 'lmer' function of the

'lme4' package) (119), including Vmax fold-change as a response variable according to the

selection regime and the experimental block as a random factor.

Pairwise comparisons between selection regimes can be performed by eye, as previously

reported (120, 121): the difference between two selection regimes is deemed significant when the

95% confidence intervals (95CI) do not overlap more than half of their length. Effect plots for post-

hoc comparison between different selection regimes (estimates of the models with the

corresponding 95CIs) are displayed in the Supplementary Material figures S5 to S7, which were

generated with the 'effects' package (122, 123).

We next used the cross-resistance/collateral sensitivity dataset to analyse whether the presence,

or absence, of SNPs in the 5 genes which concentrated most of the SNPs (*lasR*, *wbp* genes,

phoQ, *tpbB* and *oprL*) affected the MIC fold-changes in the bacterial strains. We built the following

model for each gene/antimicrobial combination: MIC fold-change x1000 as a response variable

explained by presence/absence of SNP in a gene, and the experimental block as a random factor

('glmmTMB' function of the 'glmmTMB' package). Since SNPs in *tpbB* and *oprL* only emerged in

strains from 1 of the 2 experimental blocks, we performed this analysis only in the replicate in

which SNPs were present, using the 'glm.nb' function of the 'MASS' package (124). We

considered all bacterial strains, regardless of their selection regime of origin, since the selection

regime, which affects the presence, or absence, of SNPs in the strains, would have been colinear

with the latter.

Correlation between kappa fold-change and MIC fold-change was assessed using Spearman's

test (ρ), which estimates a rank-based measure of association, through the 'cor.test' function

included in the 'stats' package (125).

Pharmacodynamics analyses were performed using Rstan (126).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank P.R. Johnston for the assistance in whole-genome sequencing analysis, E.

Bittermann for the input and assistance in setting up samples for whole-genome sequencing and

Ronan Murphy for critically reading the manuscript and helping with data interpretation.

Funding

This work was funded by the Joint Berlin-Jerusalem Postdoctoral Fellowship Program offered by

the Freie Universität Berlin (FUB) and Hebrew University of Jerusalem (HUJI). The project was

further supported by a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation (grant no. 96517).

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1.   Antimicrobial Resistance C. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019:
a systematic analysis. Lancet. 2022;399(10325):629-55.
2.   Qiu D, Ke M, Zhang Q, Zhang F, Lu T, Sun L, et al. Response of microbial antibiotic
resistance to pesticides: An emerging health threat. Sci Total Environ. 2022;850:158057.
3.   Lepore C, Silver L, Theuretzbacher U, Thomas J, Visi D. The small-molecule antibiotics
pipeline: 2014-2018. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2019;18(10):739.
4.   Organization WH. The evolving threat of antimicrobial resistance: options for action:
World Health Organization; 2012.
5.   Czaplewski L, Bax R, Clokie M, Dawson M, Fairhead H, Fischetti VA, et al. Alternatives to
antibiotics-a pipeline portfolio review. Lancet Infect Dis. 2016;16(2):239-51.
6.   Yu G, Baeder DY, Regoes RR, Rolff J. Combination Effects of Antimicrobial Peptides.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2016;60(3):1717-24.
7.   Zasloff M. Antimicrobial peptides of multicellular organisms. Nature.
2002;415(6870):389-95.
8.   Rathinakumar R, Walkenhorst WF, Wimley WC. Broad-spectrum antimicrobial peptides
by rational combinatorial design and high-throughput screening: the importance of interfacial
activity. J Am Chem Soc. 2009;131(22):7609-17.
9.   Axelsen PH. A chaotic pore model of polypeptide antibiotic action. Biophys J.
2008;94(5):1549-50.
10.   Hancock RE. Cationic peptides: effectors in innate immunity and novel antimicrobials.
Lancet Infect Dis. 2001;1(3):156-64.
11.   Rodriguez-Rojas A, Nath A, El Shazely B, Santi G, Kim JJ, Weise C, et al. Antimicrobial
Peptide Induced-Stress Renders Staphylococcus aureus Susceptible to Toxic Nucleoside
Analogs. Front Immunol. 2020;11:1686.
12.   Yu G, Baeder DY, Regoes RR, Rolff J. Predicting drug resistance evolution: insights from
antimicrobial peptides and antibiotics. Proc Biol Sci. 2018;285(1874).
13.   Perron GG, Zasloff M, Bell G. Experimental evolution of resistance to an antimicrobial
peptide. Proc Biol Sci. 2006;273(1583):251-6.

14.   Spohn R, Daruka L, Lazar V, Martins A, Vidovics F, Grezal G, et al. Integrated
evolutionary analysis reveals antimicrobial peptides with limited resistance. Nat Commun.
2019;10(1):4538.
15.   Bian X, Qu X, Zhang J, Nang SC, Bergen PJ, Tony Zhou Q, et al. Pharmacokinetics and
pharmacodynamics of peptide antibiotics. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2022;183:114171.
16.   Liu YY, Wang Y, Walsh TR, Yi LX, Zhang R, Spencer J, et al. Emergence of plasmid-
mediated colistin resistance mechanism MCR-1 in animals and human beings in China: a
microbiological and molecular biological study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2016;16(2):161-8.
17.   Tacconelli E, Carrara E, Savoldi A, Harbarth S, Mendelson M, Monnet DL, et al.
Discovery, research, and development of new antibiotics: the WHO priority list of antibiotic-
resistant bacteria and tuberculosis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2018;18(3):318-27.
18.   Laxminarayan R, Duse A, Wattal C, Zaidi AK, Wertheim HF, Sumpradit N, et al. Antibiotic
resistance-the need for global solutions. Lancet Infect Dis. 2013;13(12):1057-98.
19.   Tyers M, Wright GD. Drug combinations: a strategy to extend the life of antibiotics in
the 21st century. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2019;17(3):141-55.
20.   Roemhild R, Bollenbach T, Andersson DI. The physiology and genetics of bacterial
responses to antibiotic combinations. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2022;20(8):478-90.
21.   Hayouka Z, Chakraborty S, Liu R, Boersma MD, Weisblum B, Gellman SH. Interplay
among subunit identity, subunit proportion, chain length, and stereochemistry in the activity
profile of sequence-random peptide mixtures. J Am Chem Soc. 2013;135(32):11748-51.
22.   Hayouka Z, Bella A, Stern T, Ray S, Jiang H, Grovenor CRM, et al. Binary Encoding of
Random Peptide Sequences for Selective and Differential Antimicrobial Mechanisms. Angew
Chem Int Ed Engl. 2017;56(28):8099-103.
23.   Siriwardena TN, Gan BH, Kohler T, van Delden C, Javor S, Reymond JL.
Stereorandomization as a Method to Probe Peptide Bioactivity. ACS Cent Sci. 2021;7(1):126-34.
24.   Stern T, Zelinger E, Hayouka Z. Random peptide mixtures inhibit and eradicate
methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus biofilms. Chem Commun (Camb).
2016;52(44):7102-5.
25.   Topman S, Tamir-Ariel D, Bochnic-Tamir H, Stern Bauer T, Shafir S, Burdman S, et al.
Random peptide mixtures as new crop protection agents. Microb Biotechnol. 2018;11(6):1027-
36.
26.   Topman-Rakover S, Malach E, Burdman S, Hayouka Z. Antibacterial lipo-random
peptide mixtures exhibit high selectivity and synergistic interactions. Chem Commun (Camb).
2020;56(80):12053-6.
27.   Maron B, Rolff J, Friedman J, Hayouka Z. Antimicrobial Peptide Combination Can Hinder
Resistance Evolution. Microbiol Spectr. 2022;10(4):e0097322.
28.   Makovitzki A, Avrahami D, Shai Y. Ultrashort antibacterial and antifungal lipopeptides.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2006;103(43):15997-6002.
29.   Makovitzki A, Viterbo A, Brotman Y, Chet I, Shai Y. Inhibition of fungal and bacterial
plant pathogens in vitro and in planta with ultrashort cationic lipopeptides. Appl Environ
Microbiol. 2007;73(20):6629-36.
30.   Brotman Y, Makovitzki A, Shai Y, Chet I, Viterbo A. Synthetic ultrashort cationic
lipopeptides induce systemic plant defense responses against bacterial and fungal pathogens.
Appl Environ Microbiol. 2009;75(16):5373-9.
31.   Pendleton JN, Gorman SP, Gilmore BF. Clinical relevance of the ESKAPE pathogens.
Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther. 2013;11(3):297-308.
32.   Stover CK, Pham XQ, Erwin AL, Mizoguchi SD, Warrener P, Hickey MJ, et al. Complete
genome sequence of Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1, an opportunistic pathogen. Nature.
2000;406(6799):959-64.
33.   Livermore DM. Multiple mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa: our worst nightmare? Clin Infect Dis. 2002;34(5):634-40.

34.   Ben Hur D, Kapach G, Wani NA, Kiper E, Ashkenazi M, Smollan G, et al. Antimicrobial
Peptides against Multidrug-Resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa Biofilm from Cystic Fibrosis
Patients. J Med Chem. 2022;65(13):9050-62.
35.   Reynolds D, Kollef M. The Epidemiology and Pathogenesis and Treatment of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa Infections: An Update. Drugs. 2021;81(18):2117-31.
36.   Regoes RR, Wiuff C, Zappala RM, Garner KN, Baquero F, Levin BR. Pharmacodynamic
functions: a multiparameter approach to the design of antibiotic treatment regimens.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2004;48(10):3670-6.
37.   Witzany C, Rolff J, Regoes RR, Igler C. The pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic
modelling framework as a tool to predict drug resistance evolution. Microbiology (Reading).
2023;169(7).
38.   Pál C, Papp B, Lázár V. Collateral sensitivity of antibiotic-resistant microbes. Trends in
Microbiology. 2015;23(7):401-7.
39.   Imamovic L, Sommer MO. Use of collateral sensitivity networks to design drug cycling
protocols that avoid resistance development. Sci Transl Med. 2013;5(204):204ra132.
40.   Choi Y, Sims GE, Murphy S, Miller JR, Chan AP. Predicting the functional effect of amino
acid substitutions and indels. PLoS One. 2012;7(10):e46688.
41.   Ueda A, Wood TK. Connecting quorum sensing, c-di-GMP, pel polysaccharide, and
biofilm formation in Pseudomonas aeruginosa through tyrosine phosphatase TpbA (PA3885).
PLoS Pathog. 2009;5(6):e1000483.
42.   Lim A, De Vos D, Brauns M, Mossialos D, Gaballa A, Qing D, et al. Molecular and
immunological characterization of OprL, the 18 kDa outer-membrane peptidoglycan-associated
lipoprotein (PAL) of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Microbiology (Reading). 1997;143 (Pt 5):1709-
16.
43.   Gambello MJ, Iglewski BH. Cloning and characterization of the Pseudomonas
aeruginosa lasR gene, a transcriptional activator of elastase expression. J Bacteriol.
1991;173(9):3000-9.
44.   Burrows LL, Charter DF, Lam JS. Molecular characterization of the Pseudomonas
aeruginosa serotype O5 (PAO1) B-band lipopolysaccharide gene cluster. Mol Microbiol.
1996;22(3):481-95.
45.   Larkin A, Imperiali B. Biosynthesis of UDP-GlcNAc(3NAc)A by WbpB, WbpE, and WbpD:
enzymes in the Wbp pathway responsible for O-antigen assembly in Pseudomonas aeruginosa
PAO1. Biochemistry. 2009;48(23):5446-55.
46.   Fields PI, Groisman EA, Heffron F. A Salmonella locus that controls resistance to
microbicidal proteins from phagocytic cells. Science. 1989;243(4894):1059-62.
47.   Lee JY, Ko KS. Mutations and expression of PmrAB and PhoPQ related with colistin
resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa clinical isolates. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis.
2014;78(3):271-6.
48.   Heurlier K, Denervaud V, Haenni M, Guy L, Krishnapillai V, Haas D. Quorum-sensing-
negative (lasR) mutants of Pseudomonas aeruginosa avoid cell lysis and death. J Bacteriol.
2005;187(14):4875-83.
49.   Perfeito L, Fernandes L, Mota C, Gordo I. Adaptive mutations in bacteria: high rate and
small effects. Science. 2007;317(5839):813-5.
50.   Dettman JR, Sztepanacz JL, Kassen R. The properties of spontaneous mutations in the
opportunistic pathogen Pseudomonas aeruginosa. BMC Genomics. 2016;17:27.
51.   Mookherjee N, Anderson MA, Haagsman HP, Davidson DJ. Antimicrobial host defence
peptides: functions and clinical potential. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2020;19(5):311-32.
52.   Organization WH. Antibacterial agents in clinical and preclinical development: an
overview and analysis. World Health Organization; 2021.
53.   Organization WH. Antibacterial agents in preclinical development: an open access
database. World Health Organization; 2019.

54.   Dobson AJ, Purves J, Kamysz W, Rolff J. Comparing selection on S. aureus between
antimicrobial peptides and common antibiotics. PLoS One. 2013;8(10):e76521.
55.   Habets MG, Brockhurst MA. Therapeutic antimicrobial peptides may compromise
natural immunity. Biol Lett. 2012;8(3):416-8.
56.   Pena-Miller R, Laehnemann D, Jansen G, Fuentes-Hernandez A, Rosenstiel P,
Schulenburg H, et al. When the most potent combination of antibiotics selects for the greatest
bacterial load: the smile-frown transition. PLoS Biol. 2013;11(4):e1001540.
57.   Baym M, Stone LK, Kishony R. Multidrug evolutionary strategies to reverse antibiotic
resistance. Science. 2016;351(6268):aad3292.
58.   Lazar V, Martins A, Spohn R, Daruka L, Grezal G, Fekete G, et al. Antibiotic-resistant
bacteria show widespread collateral sensitivity to antimicrobial peptides. Nat Microbiol.
2018;3(6):718-31.
59.   Barbosa C, Beardmore R, Schulenburg H, Jansen G. Antibiotic combination efficacy
(ACE) networks for a Pseudomonas aeruginosa model. PLoS Biol. 2018;16(4):e2004356.
60.   Makarova O, Johnston P, Rodriguez-Rojas A, El Shazely B, Morales JM, Rolff J. Genomics
of experimental adaptation of Staphylococcus aureus to a natural combination of insect
antimicrobial peptides. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):15359.
61.   Ward H, Perron GG, Maclean RC. The cost of multiple drug resistance in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa. J Evol Biol. 2009;22(5):997-1003.
62.   Igler C, Rolff J, Regoes R. Multi-step vs. single-step resistance evolution under different
drugs, pharmacokinetics, and treatment regimens. Elife. 2021;10.
63.   Somerville GA, Chaussee MS, Morgan CI, Fitzgerald JR, Dorward DW, Reitzer LJ, et al.
Staphylococcus aureus aconitase inactivation unexpectedly inhibits post-exponential-phase
growth and enhances stationary-phase survival. Infect Immun. 2002;70(11):6373-82.
64.   LaCroix RA, Palsson BO, Feist AM. A Model for Designing Adaptive Laboratory Evolution
Experiments. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2017;83(8).
65.   Hong J, Hu J, Ke F. Experimental Induction of Bacterial Resistance to the Antimicrobial
Peptide Tachyplesin I and Investigation of the Resistance Mechanisms. Antimicrob Agents
Chemother. 2016;60(10):6067-75.
66.   Santos-Lopez A, Fritz MJ, Lombardo JB, Burr AHP, Heinrich VA, Marshall CW, et al.
Evolved resistance to a novel cationic peptide antibiotic requires high mutation supply. Evol
Med Public Health. 2022;10(1):266-76.
67.   Macfarlane EL, Kwasnicka A, Ochs MM, Hancock RE. PhoP-PhoQ homologues in
Pseudomonas aeruginosa regulate expression of the outer-membrane protein OprH and
polymyxin B resistance. Mol Microbiol. 1999;34(2):305-16.
68.   McPhee JB, Lewenza S, Hancock RE. Cationic antimicrobial peptides activate a two-
component regulatory system, PmrA-PmrB, that regulates resistance to polymyxin B and
cationic antimicrobial peptides in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Mol Microbiol. 2003;50(1):205-17.
69.   Groisman EA. The pleiotropic two-component regulatory system PhoP-PhoQ. J
Bacteriol. 2001;183(6):1835-42.
70.   Miller AK, Brannon MK, Stevens L, Johansen HK, Selgrade SE, Miller SI, et al. PhoQ
mutations promote lipid A modification and polymyxin resistance of Pseudomonas aeruginosa
found in colistin-treated cystic fibrosis patients. Antimicrob Agents Chemother.
2011;55(12):5761-9.
71.   Li Y, Xia L, Chen J, Lian Y, Dandekar AA, Xu F, et al. Resistance elicited by sub-lethal
concentrations of ampicillin is partially mediated by quorum sensing in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa. Environ Int. 2021;156:106619.
72.   Gilbert KB, Kim TH, Gupta R, Greenberg EP, Schuster M. Global position analysis of the
Pseudomonas aeruginosa quorum-sensing transcription factor LasR. Mol Microbiol.
2009;73(6):1072-85.
73.   Sakuragi Y, Kolter R. Quorum-sensing regulation of the biofilm matrix genes (pel) of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Bacteriol. 2007;189(14):5383-6.

74. Zhao K, Yang X, Zeng Q, Zhang Y, Li H, Yan C, et al. Evolution of lasR mutants in
polymorphic Pseudomonas aeruginosa populations facilitates chronic infection of the lung. Nat
Commun. 2023;14(1):5976.

75. Ciofu O, Mandsberg LF, Bjarnsholt T, Wassermann T, Hoiby N. Genetic adaptation of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa during chronic lung infection of patients with cystic fibrosis: strong
and weak mutators with heterogeneous genetic backgrounds emerge in mucA and/or lasR
mutants. Microbiology (Reading). 2010;156(Pt 4):1108-19.

76. Miller WL, Wenzel CQ, Daniels C, Larocque S, Brisson JR, Lam JS. Biochemical
characterization of WbpA, a UDP-N-acetyl-D-glucosamine 6-dehydrogenase involved in O-
antigen biosynthesis in Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1. J Biol Chem. 2004;279(36):37551-8.

77. Hancock RE, Mutharia LM, Chan L, Darveau RP, Speert DP, Pier GB. Pseudomonas
aeruginosa isolates from patients with cystic fibrosis: a class of serum-sensitive, nontypable
strains deficient in lipopolysaccharide O side chains. Infect Immun. 1983;42(1):170-7.

78. Rocchetta HL, Burrows LL, Lam JS. Genetics of O-antigen biosynthesis in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 1999;63(3):523-53.

79. Joiner KA. Studies on the mechanism of bacterial resistance to complement-mediated
killing and on the mechanism of action of bactericidal antibody. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol.
1985;121:99-133.

80. Dasgupta T, de Kievit TR, Masoud H, Altman E, Richards JC, Sadovskaya I, et al.
Characterization of lipopolysaccharide-deficient mutants of Pseudomonas aeruginosa derived
from serotypes O3, O5, and O6. Infect Immun. 1994;62(3):809-17.

81. Kadurugamuwa JL, Lam JS, Beveridge TJ. Interaction of gentamicin with the A band and
B band lipopolysaccharides of Pseudomonas aeruginosa and its possible lethal effect.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 1993;37(4):715-21.

82. Wang D, Dorosky RJ, Han CS, Lo CC, Dichosa AE, Chain PS, et al. Adaptation genomics of
a small-colony variant in a Pseudomonas chlororaphis 30-84 biofilm. Appl Environ Microbiol.
2015;81(3):890-9.

83. Malone JG, Jaeger T, Spangler C, Ritz D, Spang A, Arrieumerlou C, et al. YfiBNR mediates
cyclic di-GMP dependent small colony variant formation and persistence in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa. PLoS Pathog. 2010;6(3):e1000804.

84. Pu M, Wood TK. Tyrosine phosphatase TpbA controls rugose colony formation in
Pseudomonas aeruginosa by dephosphorylating diguanylate cyclase TpbB. Biochem Biophys
Res Commun. 2010;402(2):351-5.

85. Remans K, Vercammen K, Bodilis J, Cornelis P. Genome-wide analysis and literature-
based survey of lipoproteins in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Microbiology (Reading). 2010;156(Pt
9):2597-607.

86. Panmanee W, Gomez F, Witte D, Pancholi V, Britigan BE, Hassett DJ. The peptidoglycan-
associated lipoprotein OprL helps protect a Pseudomonas aeruginosa mutant devoid of the
transactivator OxyR from hydrogen peroxide-mediated killing during planktonic and biofilm
culture. J Bacteriol. 2008;190(10):3658-69.

87. Ghazaei C. Antibiotic Resistance Profiles of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Isolates
Containing Virulence Genes. Research in Molecular Medicine. 2021;9(4):245-52.

88. Marxer M, Vollenweider V, Schmid-Hempel P. Insect antimicrobial peptides act
synergistically to inhibit a trypanosome parasite. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.
2016;371(1695).

89. Rolff J, Schmid-Hempel P. Perspectives on the evolutionary ecology of arthropod
antimicrobial peptides. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2016;371(1695).

90. Matsuzaki K, Mitani Y, Akada KY, Murase O, Yoneyama S, Zasloff M, et al. Mechanism of
synergism between antimicrobial peptides magainin 2 and PGLa. Biochemistry.
1998;37(43):15144-53.

91. Brogden KA. Antimicrobial peptides: pore formers or metabolic inhibitors in bacteria?
Nat Rev Microbiol. 2005;3(3):238-50.

92.   El Shazely B, Yu G, Johnston PR, Rolff J. Resistance Evolution Against Antimicrobial
Peptides in Staphylococcus aureus Alters Pharmacodynamics Beyond the MIC. Front Microbiol.
2020;11:103.
93.   Zanchi C, Johnston PR, Rolff J. Evolution of defence cocktails: Antimicrobial peptide
combinations reduce mortality and persistent infection. Mol Ecol. 2017;26(19):5334-43.
94.   Srinivasan S, Waghu FH, Idicula-Thomas S, Venkatesh KV. A steady-state modeling
approach for simulation of antimicrobial peptide-cell membrane interaction. Biochim Biophys
Acta Biomembr. 2020;1862(4):183242.
95.   Lazzaro BP, Zasloff M, Rolff J. Antimicrobial peptides: Application informed by
evolution. Science. 2020;368(6490).
96.   Gullberg E, Cao S, Berg OG, Ilback C, Sandegren L, Hughes D, et al. Selection of resistant
bacteria at very low antibiotic concentrations. PLoS Pathog. 2011;7(7):e1002158.
97.   Ling LL, Schneider T, Peoples AJ, Spoering AL, Engels I, Conlon BP, et al. A new antibiotic
kills pathogens without detectable resistance. Nature. 2015;517(7535):455-9.
98.   Lloyd DG, Schofield BJ, Goddard MR, Taylor EJ. De Novo Resistance to Arg(10)-
Teixobactin Occurs Slowly and Is Costly. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2020;65(1).
99.   Johnston PR, Makarova O, Rolff J. Inducible defenses stay up late: temporal patterns of
immune gene expression in Tenebrio molitor. G3 (Bethesda). 2013;4(6):947-55.
100.   He J, Baldini RL, Deziel E, Saucier M, Zhang Q, Liberati NT, et al. The broad host range
pathogen Pseudomonas aeruginosa strain PA14 carries two pathogenicity islands harboring
plant and animal virulence genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2004;101(8):2530-5.
101.   Habermann E, Neumann W. Characterization of the effective components of snake
venoms. Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch Exp Pathol Pharmakol. 1954;223(5):388-98.
102.   Fuchs PC, Barry AL, Brown SD. In vitro antimicrobial activity of MSI-78, a magainin
analog. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 1998;42(5):1213-6.
103.   Lee JY, Boman A, Sun CX, Andersson M, Jornvall H, Mutt V, et al. Antibacterial peptides
from pig intestine: isolation of a mammalian cecropin. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
1989;86(23):9159-62.
104.   Hultmark D, Steiner H, Rasmuson T, Boman HG. Insect immunity. Purification and
properties of three inducible bactericidal proteins from hemolymph of immunized pupae of
Hyalophora cecropia. Eur J Biochem. 1980;106(1):7-16.
105.   Klubthawee N, Adisakwattana P, Hanpithakpong W, Somsri S, Aunpad R. A novel,
rationally designed, hybrid antimicrobial peptide, inspired by cathelicidin and aurein, exhibits
membrane-active mechanisms against Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Sci Rep. 2020;10(1):9117.
106.   Wick R. Porechop: adapter trimmer for Oxford Nanopore reads. 2018.
107.   Wick RR, Menzel P. Filtlong. 2018.
108.   Kolmogorov M, Yuan J, Lin Y, Pevzner PA. Assembly of long, error-prone reads using
repeat graphs. Nat Biotechnol. 2019;37(5):540-6.
109.   Nanoporetech. Medaka: Sequence correction provided by ONT research. GitHub 2019
[Available from: https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka.
110.   Wick RR, Holt KE. Polypolish: Short-read polishing of long-read bacterial genome
assemblies. PLoS Comput Biol. 2022;18(1):e1009802.
111.   Hunt M, Silva ND, Otto TD, Parkhill J, Keane JA, Harris SR. Circlator: automated
circularization of genome assemblies using long sequencing reads. Genome Biol. 2015;16:294.
112.   Seemann T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics.
2014;30(14):2068-9.
113.   Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence
data. Bioinformatics. 2014;30(15):2114-20.
114.   Seemann T. Snippy: fast bacterial variant calling from NGS reads. 2015.
115.   Sochacki KA, Barns KJ, Bucki R, Weisshaar JC. Real-time attack on single Escherichia coli
cells by the human antimicrobial peptide LL-37. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2011;108(16):E77-81.

116.   Rangarajan N, Bakshi S, Weisshaar JC. Localized permeabilization of E. coli membranes
by the antimicrobial peptide Cecropin A. Biochemistry. 2013;52(38):6584-94.
117.   Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria;
2020.
118.   Brooks ME, Kristensen K, Van Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, et al.
glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized linear
mixed modeling. The R journal. 2017;9(2):378-400.
119.   Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using
lme4. Journal of Statistical Software. 2015;67(1):1 - 48.
120.   Cumming G, Finch S. Inference by eye: confidence intervals and how to read pictures of
data. Am Psychol. 2005;60(2):170-80.
121.   Cumming G. Inference by eye: reading the overlap of independent confidence
intervals. Stat Med. 2009;28(2):205-20.
122.   Fox J. Effect Displays in R for Generalised Linear Models. Journal of Statistical Software.
2003;8(15):1 - 27.
123.   Fox J, Weisberg S. An R companion to applied regression: Sage publications; 2018.
124.   Venables WN, Ripley BD. Modern applied statistics with S. 4th ed: Springer, New York;
2002.
125.   Best DJ, Roberts DE. Algorithm AS 89: The Upper Tail Probabilities of Spearman's Rho.
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C (Applied Statistics). 1975;24(3):377-9.
126.   Team SD. RStan: The R interface to Stan. R package version 2.17. 3. Online: http://mc-
stanorg. 2018.