Biofilm-dependent evolutionary pathways to antibiotic resistance

Alfonso Santos-Lopez*[1], Christopher W. Marshall*[1], Michelle R. Scribner[1], Daniel

Snyder[1,2] and Vaughn S. Cooper[1,2,3]

[1]*Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, and Center for Evolutionary*

Biology and Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA.

[2]*Microbial Genome Sequencing Center, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh,*

Pennsylvania, USA.

[3]*Center for Evolutionary Biology and Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh,*

Pennsylvania, USA.

*A.S-L. and C.W.M. contributed equally to this manuscript

Abstract

Many opportunistic pathogens live in surface-attached communities called biofilms that

generate ecological structure and can increase stress tolerance. Theory suggests that

bacterial populations evolving in biofilms may harbor greater genetic diversity and

become resistant to antibiotics by different pathways than in well-mixed environments.

We used experimental evolution and whole genome sequencing to test how the mode of

growth influences dynamics and mechanisms of antibiotic resistance in *Acinetobacter*

baumannii populations. Biofilm and planktonic populations were propagated under

conditions lacking antibiotics, under constant sub-inhibitory concentrations of

ciprofloxacin, or under steadily increasing concentrations of this drug. As predicted, both

the evolutionary dynamics and the identities of selected mutations differed between

treatments and lifestyle. Planktonic populations exposed to ciprofloxacin underwent

sequential selective sweeps of single mutations including the primary drug targets, *gyrA*

and *parC*. In contrast, biofilm-adapted populations diversified by multiple contending

mutations in regulators of efflux pumps. Mutants isolated from both lifestyles exhibited

a trade-off between fitness and resistance level, wherein biofilm-adapted clones were less

resistant but more fit in the absence of drug. Further, biofilm-adapted populations evolved

collateral sensitivity to cephalosporins whereas the planktonic populations displayed

cross-resistance with several classes of antibiotics. This study demonstrates that growth

in biofilms, arguably the predominant bacterial lifestyle, may substantially alter the

routes, dynamics, and consequences of the evolution of antibiotic resistance and is

therefore an important consideration when treating infections.

Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is one of the main challenges facing modern medicine. The emergence and rapid dissemination of resistant bacteria is decreasing the effectiveness of antibiotics and it is estimated that 700,000 people die per year due to AMR-related problems (1). AMR, like all phenotypes, is an evolved property, either the ancient product of living amidst other microbial producers of antimicrobials (2), or the recent product of strong selection by human activities for novel resistance-generating mutations (3). AMR can be acquired via two principal routes: horizontally, when AMR genes are acquired from other bacteria; or vertically, where the resistance mechanism originates by *de novo* mutation and is inherited by the progeny. These vertically inherited, novel evolved resistance mechanisms are the focus of this study. Here, we study the evolutionary dynamics and effects of new resistance mutations in the opportunistic nosocomial pathogen *Acinetobacter baumannii*, which is often intrinsically resistant to antibiotics or has been reported to rapidly evolve resistance to them (4). This pathogen is categorized as one of the highest threats to patient safety (5), partly due to its ability to live on inanimate surfaces in biofilms, which are surface-attached communities protected from external stresses by secreted polymers (6).

The biofilm lifestyle is central to AMR (7-9). Microbes that are surface-bound and encased in secreted polymers are less susceptible to compounds that fail to penetrate the matrix or can persist through the lower metabolic rate of biofilm residents (7, 8, 10). But what is less understood or appreciated is that the physical and ecological heterogeneity of biofilms can influence the evolutionary dynamics of microbial populations in multiple ways. First, the protective effect of biofilms could reduce the strength of selection for resistance by reducing the effective antibiotic concentration. This would modify the rate of adaptation to a particular drug since it has been observed that subinhibitory

concentrations of antibiotic may select for multiple mutations with low fitness costs (11,

12). Second, the spatial structure of subpopulations within biofilms may facilitate greater

genetic diversity (13-16), either by the effect of structure alone allowing independent

lineages of varied fitness to coexist, or by adaptive diversification to inhabit discrete

niches in the heterogeneous biofilm environment (17). For example, bacteria or yeasts

evolving in biofilms became more diverse than in planktonic cultures (15, 18) which

could improve the capacity of these populations to respond to new selective forces (19).

Third, life in biofilms may align selective forces on traits that were formerly opposed and

increase the efficiency of adaptation (20, 21). For example, bacteria growing in a

planktonic environment may experience selection for rapid growth, and this can make

these cells more susceptible to antimicrobials that are more effective on metabolically

active cells. However, bacteria dwelling in biofilms experience selection for life in

crowded, resource-limited conditions, and adaptation to slow growth may actually also

generate antimicrobial resistance by limiting the availability of molecular drug targets.

Therefore, in biofilms, growth and resistance may become aligned traits that can jointly

improve, and the transition from planktonic growth to biofilms can theoretically change

the form of pleiotropy between resistance and fitness (22).

The potential for different evolutionary dynamics in biofilms is clinically significant.

Biofilm-associated bacteria are particularly challenging in chronic infections (23, 24),

where biofilm adaptations increase virulence and resistance (6, 25). Yet with few

exceptions (9, 16, 26) most of the research on the evolution of AMR has been conducted

in well-mixed populations [see review (27)] or on agar plates (28), conditions that cannot

simulate the effects of biofilms on the evolution of AMR.

We experimentally propagated populations of *A. baumannii* exposed either to

subinhibitory or increasing concentrations of ciprofloxacin (CIP) over 12 days in biofilm

or planktonic conditions to ascertain whether these lifestyles select for different

mechanisms of AMR. Rather than focusing on the genotypes of single isolates, which can

limit the scope of an analysis, we conducted whole-population genomic sequencing over

time to define the dynamics of adaptation and the fitness of certain resistance alleles

compared to others in the experiment. We then identified clones with specific genotypes

that we linked to fitness and resistance phenotypes. This approach sheds new light on the

ways that pathogens adapt to antibiotics while growing in biofilms and has implications

for treatment decisions.

Results and Discussion

1. Experimental evolution

Replicate cultures of the susceptible *A. baumannii* strain ATCC 17978 (29, 30) were

established under planktonic or biofilm conditions in one of three treatments: i) no

antibiotics, ii) sub-inhibitory concentration of the antibiotic ciprofloxacin (CIP) and iii)

evolutionary rescue (31) in which CIP concentrations were increased every 72 hours from

subinhibitory concentrations to four times the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC)

(Figure 1A). CIP was chosen because of its clinical importance in treating *A. baumannii*

(4, 32, 33), its ability to penetrate the biofilm matrix (34) allowing similar efficacy in well

mixed and structured populations (35), and because it is not known to stimulate biofilm

formation in *A. baumannii* (36). Planktonic populations were serially passaged by daily

1:100 dilution while biofilm populations were propagated using a bead model simulating

the biofilm life cycle (13, 17, 37). This model selects for bacteria that attach to a 7mm

polystyrene bead, form a biofilm, and then disperse to colonize a new bead each day. The

transfer population size in biofilm and in planktonic cultures was set to be nearly

equivalent at the beginning of the experiment (approximately 1×10^7 CFU/ml), because

population size influences mutation availability and the response to selection (38, 39).

The mutational dynamics of three lineages from each treatment were tracked by whole-

population genomic sequencing (Figure 1A). We also sequenced 49 single clones isolated

from 22 populations at the end of the 12-day experiment to determine mutation linkage.

2. Evolution of CIP resistance

Passaging bacterial populations in the presence of antibiotics will select for fitter, more

resistant mutants if the populations do not go extinct. The rate and extent of evolved

resistance depends on the strength of antibiotic selection (12, 40), the distribution of

fitness effects of mutations that increase resistance to the drug (41), and the population

size of replicating bacteria (38, 39). The mode of bacterial growth may alter each of these

three variables, in theory generating different dynamics and magnitudes of AMR. In the

populations exposed to the increasing concentrations of CIP (the evolutionary rescue),

the magnitude of evolved CIP resistance differed substantially between planktonic and

biofilm populations. Planktonic populations became approximately 160x more resistant

on average than the ancestral clone while the biofilm populations became only 6x more

resistant (Figure 1B and Table S1). Planktonic populations also evolved resistance much

more rapidly, becoming 10x more resistant after only 24 hours of growth in sub-inhibitory

CIP. This level of resistance would have been sufficient for surviving the remainder of

the experiment, but MICs continued to increase at each sampling (Figure 1B). The

evolution of resistance far beyond the selective requirement indicates that mutations

conferring higher resistance also increased fitness in planktonic populations exposed to

CIP.

In contrast, biofilm-evolved populations evolved under the evolutionary rescue regime

acquired much lower levels of resistance (*ca.* 3– 7x the ancestral MIC) and primarily in

a single step between days 3 and 4 (Figure 1B). In one notable exception, the MIC of

biofilm population B2 increased ~50x after 3 days of selection in subinhibitory

concentrations of CIP (Figure 1B), but then the resistance of this population declined to

only 6x higher than the ancestral strain. This dynamic suggested that a mutant conferring

high-level resistance rose to intermediate frequency but was replaced by a more fit, yet

less resistant, mutant (this possibility is evaluated below).

Lower levels of resistance were observed in populations selected at subinhibitory

concentrations of CIP. Biofilm populations were 4x more resistant than the ancestor and

planktonic populations were 20x more resistant (Table S1). We can infer that biofilm

growth does not select for the high-level resistance seen in planktonic populations, instead

favoring mutants that would barely survive at their selected CIP concentration if not

grown in biofilms. It is important to note that these MIC measurements were made in

planktonic conditions according to the clinical standards (42) and that these values

increased greater than 100x when measured in biofilm (Table S2). Our results correspond

with studies of clinical isolates in which those producing more biofilm (and likely having

adapted in biofilm conditions) were less resistant than non-biofilm-forming isolates (43).

However, growth and context-dependent MIC measurements are important (35, 44, 45)

and the biofilm environment at least partially protects cells from antibiotic exposure

(Table S2). Furthermore, these results demonstrate that exposing bacteria to low levels of

antibiotic risks selection for high levels of resistance that can make future treatment more

difficult (11).

3. Evolutionary dynamics under CIP treatment

In large bacterial populations ($>10^5$ cells) growing under strong selection, adaptive

mutations conferring beneficial traits (such as antibiotic resistance) will dominate

population dynamics (38, 46). Therefore, if a single mutation renders the antibiotic

ineffective and provides the highest fitness gain, it would be expected to outcompete all

other less fit mutations. Further, the stronger the selection for resistance, the greater the

probability of genetic parallelism – or the repeated evolution of the same gene, domain,

or even residue providing the best adaptation – among replicate populations (47). Under

the conditions of these experiments, approximately 10^6 mutations occur in the first growth

cycle and roughly 10^7 mutations arise over the 12 days of selection, leading to a

probability of 0.98 that every site in the 4Mbp *A. baumannii* genome experiences a

mutation at least once over the course of the 12 day experiment (see Table S3 for details

of these calculations). The dramatic differences in the evolved resistance levels of

planktonic and biofilm populations suggested distinct genetic causes of resistance

resulting from different selective forces in these treatments. We also predicted to observe

greater genetic diversity in the biofilm treatments than in the planktonic cultures. Whereas

in well-mixed populations one or few genotypes outcompetes the other genotypes and

quickly achieves fixation (48), in structured environments like biofilms, multiple

beneficial mutations may arise to high frequency and persist, with potentially none fixing

owing to spatial structure and niche differentiation (13).

We conducted whole-population genomic sequencing of three replicates per treatment to

identify all contending mutations above a detection threshold of 5% (see Methods). The

spectrum of mutations from CIP-treated populations are consistent with expectations

from strong positive selection on altered or disrupted coding sequences (see Table 1 for

day-12 results and Table S4 for dynamics across the experiment). High nonsynonymous

to synonymous mutation ratios were observed in both lifestyles (8.5 in planktonic and 9.7

in biofilm). 43% of the total mutations in planktonic and 34% in biofilm were insertions

or deletions, which is vastly enriched over typical mutation rates of ~10 SNPs/indel under

neutral conditions (49, 50). Roughly 30% of the mutations in CIP-treated populations of

either lifestyle occurred in intergenic regions (30% in planktonic-propagated populations

and 32% in biofilm ones). Of the intergenic mutations, 72% of the planktonic mutations

and 18% of the biofilm mutations occurred in promoters, 5' untranslated regions, or in

putative terminators (51).

As expected from theory, in CIP-selected planktonic populations one or two mutations

rapidly outcompeted others and fixed (Figure 2). Selection in biofilms, however,

produced fewer selective sweeps and maintained more contending mutations, especially

at lower antibiotic concentrations. Overall, across all treatments and timepoints, biofilm-

adapted populations were significantly more diverse than the planktonic-adapted

populations (Shannon index; Kruskal Wallis, chi-squared = 7.723, p = 0.005), particularly

at subinhibitory concentrations of CIP (Figure S1A). Notably, increasing drug

concentrations eliminated the differences in diversity between treatments (Figure S1B).

Consistent with theory, the spatial structure in biofilms generated more initial standing

diversity for selection to act upon. This higher standing diversity is important when

considering dosing and when antibiotic exposure may be low (*e.g.* in the external

environment or when bound to tissues) (52, 53) because biofilms with more allelic

diversity have a greater chance of survival to drug and immune attack (19).

In contrast with the data observed in the populations evolving under CIP pressure, drug-

free control populations contained no mutations that achieved high frequency during the

experiment (Figures 2C and 2D). These results suggest that the ancestral starting clone

was already well-adapted to our experimental conditions, perhaps because we had

previously propagated the *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978 clone under identical drug-free

conditions for 10 days. This preadaptation phase led to the fixation of mutations in three

genes (Table S5).

4. Lifestyle determines the selected mechanisms of resistance

A. baumannii clinical samples acquire resistance to CIP by two principal mechanisms: modification of the direct antibiotic targets — gyrase A or B and topoisomerase IV — or by the overexpression of efflux pumps reducing the intracellular concentrations of the antibiotic (4). To directly associate genotypes with resistance phenotypes, we sequenced 49 clones isolated at the end of the experiment, the majority of which were selected to delineate genotypes in the evolutionary rescue populations (Figures 2F and S2).

Both the genetic targets and mutational dynamics of selection in planktonic and biofilm environments differed. Mutations disrupting three negative regulators of efflux pumps evolved in parallel across populations exposed to CIP, but mutations in two of these (*adeL* and *adeS*) were nearly exclusive to biofilm clones (Figure 2F). The most common and highest frequency mutations observed in the biofilm populations were in the repressor gene *adeL* (Figures 2F, S2, and Table S6)*,* which regulates AdeFGH, one of three resistance-nodulation-division (RND) efflux pump systems in *A. baumannii* (54-56). In the planktonic lines, the predominant mutations were found in *adeN,* which is a negative regulator of AdeIJK and were mainly IS701 insertions that disrupted the gene (57).

In biofilm lines, different contending *adeL* mutations were detected in each replicate after 24 hours then eventually fixed as CIP concentrations increased (green lines in Figure 2B), sometimes along with a secondary *adeL* mutation. This pattern suggests that altering efflux via *adeL* generates adaptations to the combination of CIP and biofilm. Further, mutants with higher resistance than necessary were evidently maladaptive in the biofilm treatment. For example, *adeN* (found more often in planktonic culture) and *adeS* mutations found simultaneously on day 3 in population B2 (Figure 2) led to a spike in

resistance at that timepoint (Figure 1), but these alleles were subsequently outcompeted

by *adeL* mutants that were evidently more fit despite lower resistance.

In contrast to the biofilm populations, all planktonic populations with increasing

concentrations of CIP eventually acquired a single high frequency mutation in *gyrA*

(S81L), the canonical ciprofloxacin-resistant mutation in DNA gyrase. These *gyrA*

mutations evolved in the genetic background containing either an *adeN* mutant or a *pgpB*

mutant. *pgpB* is gene that encodes a putative membrane associated lipid phosphatase that

is co-regulated by *adeN* (58). Other mutations associated with high levels of resistance

affected *parC,* encoding topoisomerase IV, and regulatory regions of two putative

transporters, ACX60_RS15145 and ACX60_RS1613, the latter being co-transcribed with

the multidrug efflux pump *abeM* (59). Few other mutations exceeded 10% of the total

population in the planktonic lines. The rapid fixation of *adeN* and *adeN*-regulated alleles

in the planktonic CIP-exposed populations indicate that *adeN* conferred higher fitness

than other CIP-resistant mutations at low drug concentrations, as the population size is

sufficiently large that these other mutations occurred in the populations (38, 60) and their

absence implies they were less fit. Subsequently, at increased concentrations of CIP, on-

target mutations in *gyrA* were favored.

Together, our results demonstrate that bacterial lifestyle influences the evolutionary

dynamics and targets of selection of AMR. Loss-of-function mutations in regulators of

the *adeFGH* and *adeABC* RND efflux pumps that increased CIP resistance ~4-fold in

biofilm populations treated with CIP. Adaptation by planktonic populations exposed to

CIP proceeded first by altering the *adeN*-controlled *adeIJK* efflux pump and then by

directly altering the targets of the fluoroquinolone, *gyrA* and *parC*, leading to much higher

levels of resistance.

5. Evolutionary consequences of acquiring resistance

The large population sizes ($10^7 - 10^9$ cells) and number of generations (~100) in all

evolved lines mean that similar mutations very likely arose in each replicate regardless of

treatment, meaning that the success of some mutations over others reflects their greater

fitness in that condition (Table S3) (38). Yet *de novo* acquired antibiotic resistance is

often associated with a fitness cost in the absence of antibiotics (61). The extent of this

cost and the ability to compensate for it by secondary mutations (compensatory evolution)

is a key attribute determining the spread and maintenance of the resistance mechanism

(41, 61-63). A negative correlation between CIP resistance and fitness of resistant

genotypes in the absence of antibiotics has been previously described in *Escherichia coli,*

suggesting a trade-off between these traits (64-66).

To determine the relationship between resistance and fitness in the absence of antibiotics

in our experiment, we chose 10 clones (5 each from biofilm and planktonic populations,

Figures 2F and S2) with different genotypes and putative resistance mechanisms and

measured their resistance and fitness phenotypes in both planktonic and biofilm

conditions (Figure 3). As expected from the populations (Figure 1B), the biofilm clones

much were less resistant in planktonic conditions than those evolved planktonically [MIC

= 0.58 mg/L (SEM = 0.13) vs. MIC = 8.53 mg/L (SEM = 1.96), two-tailed t-test: p < 0.05,

t = 4.048, df = 80]. However, biofilm-evolved clones were more fit relative to the

ancestral strain than the planktonic-evolved clones in the absence of antibiotic (two-tailed

t-test: p = 0.008, t = 2.984 df = 18) (Figure 3). Importantly, these fitness measurements

were made in both planktonic and biofilm conditions, demonstrating that even in the

lifestyle selection environment they evolved in, the planktonic selected clones were less

fit as a result of antibiotic resistance trade-offs. However, one planktonic-evolved clone

with mutations in both *gyrA* and *parC* exhibited no significant fitness cost and high levels

of resistance. This suggests that, as in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, the *parC* mutation may

compensate for the cost imposed by *gyrA* mutation (67), an example of sign epistasis (68).

Overall, mutants selected in biofilm-evolved populations were less resistant than mutants

selected in planktonic populations (Figure 1B) but produced more biofilm (Figure S3)

and paid little or no fitness cost in the absence of antibiotics (Figures 3). This cost-free

resistance implies that these subpopulations could persist in the absence of drug, limiting

the treatment options and demanding new approaches to treat high fitness, resistant

pathogens (69).

6. Evolutionary interactions with other antibiotics

When a bacterium acquires resistance to one antibiotic, the mechanism of resistance can

also confer resistance to other antibiotics (cross-resistance) or increase the susceptibility

to other antibiotics (collateral sensitivity) (70). We tested the MIC of the evolved

populations to 23 different antibiotics. We observed changes in susceptibilities to 13 of

the 23 antibiotics tested, and these changes were growth mode dependent (Figure 4). For

example, planktonic populations exhibited cross resistance to cefpodoxime and

ceftazidime but biofilm populations evolved collateral sensitivity to these cephalosporins.

Cross-resistance was associated genetically with *adeN, adeS, gyrA* or *pgpB* mutations,

and collateral sensitivity was associated with *adeL* mutations. Selection in these

environments evidently favors the activation of different efflux pumps or modified targets

that have different pleiotropic consequences for multidrug resistance (71).

The mechanisms leading to collateral sensitivity are still poorly understood but they

depend on the genetic background of the strain, the nature of the resistance mechanisms

(72, 73), and the specific physiological context of the cells (74). In *A. baumannii*, each

RND efflux pump is specific for certain classes of antibiotics (74-76). Similar to our

results (Figure 4), Yoon and collaborators demonstrated that efflux pumps AdeABC and

AdeIJK, regulated by *adeS* and *adeN* respectively, increased the resistance level to some

beta-lactams when overexpressed (77). However, production of AdeFGH, the efflux

pump regulated by *adeL,* decreased resistance to some beta-lactams and other families of

antibiotics or detergents by an unknown mechanism (74, 77). Even with the previously

demonstrated relationship between active proton pumps and the increase of sensitivity to

beta-lactams in *P. aeruginosa* (78), a clearer understanding of the physiological basis of

collateral sensitivity is important for using these features to control AMR evolution.

Nevertheless, treatments that exploit collateral sensitivity have been proposed to

counteract the evolution of resistant populations both in bacteria (79-81) and in cancer

(82). Here, we show that bacterial lifestyle influences these selective pressures and that

biofilm growth, commonly thought to broaden resistance, may actually generate collateral

sensitivity during treatment with CIP and potentially other fluoroquinolones.

7. Clinical relevance

Our results demonstrate that the mode of growth determines both the mechanism of

evolved resistance and the spectrum of sensitivity to other families of antibiotics.

Additionally, we argue that the mutations selected in our experimental conditions also

play an important role in clinical samples, as fluoroquinolone resistance mediated by

plasmids in *A. baumannii* appears to be rare (83). The mutations S81L in *gyrA* and S80L

in parC acquired by the sensitive ATCC 17978 strain used in this study have been

reported worldwide as the primary mechanism conferring high levels of resistance to

fluorquinolones in clinical isolates (84-86).

In addition to the on-target mechanisms of resistance through gyrase or topoisomerase

mutations, *A. baumannii* isolates acquire comparatively moderate levels of

fluoroquinolone resistance by modifications in the RND efflux pumps. These RND efflux

pumps have overlapping yet differing substrate profiles and may act synergistically in

increasing the resistance level (Table S7) (54, 55, 87, 88). In our experiment, all biofilm

and planktonic populations and nearly all clones isolated had acquired mutations in at

least one of the three regulators of the RND efflux pumps (*adeL, adeS, adeN*) or in a gene

regulated by one of these regulators (*pgpB*). Mutations in *adeL* upregulate the expression

of the RND efflux pump AdeFGH (Figure 2, Table S7), leading to a multidrug resistant

phenotype in clinical isolates (54-56, 74). Further, AdeL-AdeFGH has been previously

described as a clinically-relevant resistance factor and the genes are often highly

expressed in clinical isolates, indicating possible adaptation to the biofilm lifestyle (54,

55). Relevant to the selective conditions in our biofilm treatment, overexpression of *adeG*

is predicted to enhance transport of acylated homoserine lactones, including quorum-

sensing autoinducers, increasing both drug resistance and biofilm formation (89, 90).

However, in clinical isolates, overexpression of the AdeFGH pump is less common than

the AdeIJK efflux pump that is regulated by *adeN* (77, 88). Interestingly, AdeIJK

contributes to resistance to biocides, hospital disinfectants, and to both intrinsic and

acquired antibiotic resistance in *A. baumannii* (87, 88) and may decrease biofilm

formation (77). Perhaps more importantly, this study demonstrates that the

overexpression of RND efflux pumps may produce little fitness cost in *A. baumannii*, as

has previously been demonstrated in both *P. aeruginosa* and *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* (91,

92).

Conclusions

We used experimental evolution of the opportunistic pathogen *A. baumannii* in both well-

mixed and biofilm conditions to examine how lifestyle influences the dynamics, genetic

mechanisms, and direct and pleiotropic effects of resistance to a common antibiotic.

Experimental evolution is a powerful method of screening naturally arising genetic

variation for mutants that are the best fit in any condition (38, 93, 94). When population

sizes are large and reproductive rates are rapid, as they were here, the probability that all

possible single-step mutations that can increase both resistance and fitness occurred in

each population becomes nearly certain. The enrichment of the few mutations reported

here as well as their ordering with increasing CIP concentrations demonstrates that these

are the best such mutations in this *A. baumannii* strain and set of environmental

conditions, and the prevalence of some of these mutations in clinical samples illustrates

that they too may have been exposed to selection in biofilms. Likewise, the absence of

other mutations reported in shotgun mutant screens of resistance in *A. baumannii* (95)

means that these missing mutants engendered less resistance, fitness, or both.

Experimental evolution can be used in a wide variety of conditions, including in

susceptible hosts, to identify the most probable mutants that would be selected for under

antibiotic treatment and ultimately to enable forecasting of treatment outcomes, including

the diversification of the pathogen population and the likelihood of collateral sensitivity

or cross-resistance. Furthermore, knowledge of the prevailing lifestyle of the pathogen

population may be critically important for treatment design. Most infections are likely

caused by surface-attached populations (23, 24), and some treatments include cycling

antibiotics that promote biofilm as a primary response. For example, tobramycin is used

for treating *P. aeruginosa* in cystic fibrosis patients (96) and promotes biofilm formation

(97, 98), wherein the evolution of antibiotic resistance without a detectable fitness cost

may arise during treatment. But the more diverse, biofilm-adapted lineages in our

experiments revealed a striking vulnerability to cephalosporins, which could provide a

new strategy for treatment. Broader still, conventional wisdom has long held that the

relationship between resistance and fitness is antagonistic, and that the efficacy of many

antimicrobials is aided by a severe fitness cost of resistance (27, 61, 69). This study

demonstrates that the form of the relationship between fitness and resistance can be

altered by the mode of growth, whereby biofilms can align resistance and fitness traits.

Therefore, a clearer picture of how the fitness landscape of various resistance pathways

depends on the environment, including both drug type and growth mode, and could be a

valuable forecasting tool in our armament to stem the rising AMR tide.

Methods

Experimental evolution

Before the start of the antibiotic evolution experiment, we planktonically propagated one

clone of the susceptible *A. baumannii* strain ATCC 17978-mff (29, 30) in a modified M9

medium (referred to as M9$^+$) containing 0.37 mM CaCl$_2$, 8.7 mM MgSO$_4$, 42.2 mM

Na$_2$HPO$_4$, 22 mM KH2PO$_4$, 21.7mM NaCl, 18.7 mM NH$_4$Cl and 0.2 g/L glucose and

supplemented with 20 mL/L MEM essential amino acids (Gibco 11130051), 10 mL/L

MEM nonessential amino acids (Gibco 11140050), and 10 mL each of trace mineral

solutions A, B, and C (Corning 25021-3Cl). This preadaptation phase was conducted in

the absence of antibiotics for 10 days (*ca.* 66 generations) with a dilution factor of 100

per day.

After the ten days of preadaptation to M9$^+$ medium, we selected a single clone and

propagated for 24 hours in M9$^+$ in the absence of antibiotic. We then subcultured this

population into twenty replicate populations. Ten of the populations (5 planktonic and 5

biofilm) were propagated every 24 hours in constant subinhibitory concentrations of CIP,

0.0625 mg/L, which corresponds to 0.5x the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC).

After 72 hours under subinhibitory concentrations of CIP, the populations were exposed

to two different antibiotic regimes for 9 more days, either constant subinhibitory

concentrations of CIP or increasing concentrations of CIP (called the evolutionary

rescue). For the latter, we doubled the CIP concentrations every 72 hours until 4x MIC.

As a control, the 20 remaining populations were propagated in the absence of CIP (Figure

1).

We propagated the populations into fresh media every 24 hours as described by Turner *et*

al. 2018 (37). For planktonic populations, we transferred a 1:100 (50 µl into 5 ml of M9$^+$)

dilution, which corresponded to 6.64 generations per day. For biofilm populations, we

transferred a polystyrene bead (Polysciences, Inc., Warrington. PA) to fresh media

containing three sterile beads. We rinsed each bead in PBS before the transfer, therefore

reducing the transfer of planktonic cells. Each day we alternated between black and white

marked beads, ensuring that the bacteria were growing on the bead for 24 hours, which

corresponds to approximately 6 to 7.5 generations/day (13, 37). For the experiment with

increasing concentrations of antibiotics, we froze a sample of each bacterial population

on days 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12. In the experiment with constant exposure to

subinhibitory concentrations of antibiotics, we froze the populations on days 1, 3, 4, 9,

and 12. We froze the control populations at days 1, 4, 9, and 12. For planktonic

populations, we froze 1 mL of culture with 9% of DMSO. For freezing the biofilm

populations, we sonicated the beads in 1 mL of PBS with a probe sonicator and

subsequently froze with 9% DMSO.

Phenotypic characterization: antimicrobial susceptibility and biofilm formation

We determined the MIC of CIP of the whole population by broth microdilution in M9$^+$

according to the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute guidelines (42), in which

each bacterial sample was tested to 2-fold-increasing concentration of CIP from 0.0625

to 64 mg/L. To obtain a general picture of the resistance profiles we determined the MIC

to 23 antibiotics (amikacin, ampicillin, ampicillin/sulbactam, aztreonam, cefazolin,

cefepime, cephalothin, meropenem, ertapenem, cefuroxime, gentamicin, CIP,

piperacillin/tazobactam, cefoxitin, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole, cefpodoxime,

ceftazidime, tobramycin, tigecycline, ticarcillin/clavulanic acid, ceftriaxone and

tetracycline) by broth microdilution in commercial microtiter plates following the

instructions provided by the manufacturers (Sensititre GN3F, Trek Diagnostics Inc.,

Westlake, OH). We tested the MIC at days 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12 for the populations

propagated under increasing concentrations of antibiotic, and at days 1 and 12 for the

subinhibitory and non-antibiotic treatments. For the CIP-MICs, we used *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa PAO1 in Mueller Hinton broth as a control. No differences in the MICs were

found between Mueller Hinton and M9$^+$ or if measuring the MIC in 96 well-plate or in 5

ml tubes, which are the experimental conditions. Each MIC was performed in triplicate.

The CIP was provided by Alfa Aesar (Alfa Aesar, Wardhill, MA).

We estimated the biofilm formation of the selected clones using a modification of the

previously described protocol (99). We resurrected each clone in 5 mL of M9$^+$ containing

0.5 mg/L of CIP and grew them for 24 hours. For each strain, we transferred 50 µl into

15 ml of M9$^+$. We tested 200 µl of the previous dilution of each clone to 4 different

subinhibitory CIP concentrations (0 mg/L, 0.01 mg/L, 0.03 mg/L and 0.0625 mg/L). After

24 hours of growing at 37ºC, we measured population sizes by optical density (OD) at

590nm (OD$_{Populations}$). Then, we added 250 µl of 0.1% crystal violet and incubated at room

temperature for 15 minutes. After washing the wells and drying for 24 hours, we added

250 µl 95% EtOH solution (95% EtOH, 4.95% dH2O, 0.05% Triton X-100) to each well

and incubated for 15 minutes and biofilm formation was measured by the OD at 590nm

(OD$_{Biofilm}$). Biofilm formation was corrected by population sizes (OD$_{Biofilm}$/OD$_{Population}$).

Results are the average of three experiments (Figure S3).

Fitness measurement

We selected 5 biofilm and 5 planktonic clones at the end of the evolutionary rescue

experiment (Figure 2) and determined the fitness by directly competing the ancestral

strain and the evolved clone variants both in planktonic and in biofilm conditions (Figure

3) (37). We revived each clone from a freezer stock in M9$^+$ for 24 hours. We maintained

the same evolutionary conditions to revive the clones, adding 3 beads and/or CIP to the

broth when required. After 24 hours, we added equal volume of the clones and the

ancestors in M9$^+$ in the absence of antibiotics. For planktonic populations, we mixed 25

µl of each competitor in 5 ml of M9$^+$. For biofilm competitions, we sonicated one bead

per competitor in 1 ml of PBS and mixed in 5 ml of M9$^+$ containing 3 beads. The mix

was cultured at 37ºC for 24 hours. We plated at time zero and after 24 hours. For each

competition, we plated aliquots onto nonselective tryptic soy agar and tryptic soy agar

containing CIP. Selection rate (r) was calculated as the difference of the Malthusian

parameters for the two competitors: r = (ln(CIP resistant$_{d=1}$/CIP resistant$_{d=0}$))/(ln(CIP

susceptible$_{d=1}$/CIP susceptible$_{d=0}$))/day (100). Susceptible populations were calculated as

the difference between the total populations (number of colonies/mL growing on the

nonselective plates) and the resistant fraction (number of colonies/mL growing on the

plates containing CIP). As a control for calculating the correct ratio of susceptible vs.

resistant populations, we replica plated 50 to 100 colonies from the nonselective plates

onto plates containing CIP as previously described (101). Results are the average of three

to five independent experiments.

Genome sequencing

We sequenced whole populations of three evolving replicates per treatment. We

sequenced the populations at days 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 of the populations under

increasing concentrations of CIP (hereafter populations P1, P2, P3 and B1, B2, B3 for

planktonic and biofilm populations) and at days 1, 4, 9, and 12 of the populations under

subinhibitory concentration and no antibiotic treatments. In addition, we selected 49

clones for sequencing at the end of the experiment (Figure 2F). 12 of the clones were

recovered from the populations propagated in the absence of the antibiotic, 12 clones

from the subinhibitory concentrations of CIP treatment and 25 were isolated from the

increasing concentrations of antibiotic. We revived each population or clone from a

freezer stock in the growth conditions under which they were isolated (*i.e.* the same CIP

concentration which they were exposed to during the experiment) and grew for 24 hours.

DNA was extracted using the Qiagen DNAeasy Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen, Hiden,

Germany). The sequencing library was prepared as described by Turner and colleagues

(37) according to the protocol of Baym *et al.* (102), using the Illumina Nextera kit

(Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA) and sequenced using an Illumina NextSeq500 at the

Microbial Genome Sequencing center (http://micropopbio.org/sequencing.html).

Data processing

All sequences were first quality filtered and trimmed with the Trimmomatic software v0.36 (103) using the criteria: LEADING:20 TRAILING:20 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20 MINLEN:70. Variants were called with the breseq software v0.31.0 (104) using the default parameters and the -p flag when required for identifying polymorphisms in populations. The reference genome used for variant calling was downloaded from the NCBI RefSeq database using the 17-Mar-2017 version of *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978-mff complete genome (GCF_001077675.1). In addition to the chromosome NZ_CP012004 and plasmid NZ_CP012005 sequences, we added two additional plasmid sequences to the reference genome that are known to be present in our working strain of *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978-mff: NC009083, NC_009084. Mutations were then manually curated and filtered to remove false positives. Mutations were filtered if the gene was found to contain a mutation when the ancestor sequence was compared to the reference genome or if a mutation never reached a cumulative frequency of 10% across all replicate populations. Diversity measurements were made in R using the Shannon index considering the presence, absence, and frequency of alleles. Significant differences between biofilm and planktonic populations were determined by the Kruskal Wallis test. Filtering, mutational dynamics, and plotting were done in R v3.4.4 (www.r-project.org) with the packages ggplot2 v2.2.1 (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggplot2), dplyr v0.7.4 (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr), and vegan v2.5-1 (https://github.com/vegandevs/vegan).

Data Availability

R code for filtering and data processing can be found here:

https://github.com/sirmicrobe/U01_allele_freq_code. All sequences were deposited into

NCBI under the Biosample accession numbers SAMN09783599-SAMN09783682.

Acknowledgments

We thank Caroline B. Turner for helpful discussions and proofreading of the paper and

Allison L. Welp for laboratory assistance. This research was supported by NIH

U01AI124302-01.

Figure 1. Experimental design (A) and dynamics of evolved resistance levels

during the evolutionary rescue experiment (B).

A) A single clone of *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978 was propagated both in biofilm and

planktonic conditions for 12 days under no antibiotics (top), subinhibitory concentrations

of CIP (0.0625 mg/L = 0.5x MIC) (middle) or in increasing concentrations of CIP

(bottom). For the latter, termed evolutionary rescue, the concentration of CIP was doubled

from 0.5 x MIC to 4.0 x MIC every 72 hours. As a control, five populations of *A.*

baumannii ATCC 17978 were propagated in biofilm and five in planktonic in the absence

of antibiotics. We estimated the MICs to CIP and froze the populations for sequencing

before and after doubling the antibiotic concentrations (red stars). B) MICs (mg/L) of CIP

were measured for replicate populations during the evolutionary rescue. The red and blue

points represent the MICs of three populations propagated in planktonic or biofilm,

respectively, with the 95% CI represented by the error bars. The red and blue lines

represent the grand mean of the three planktonic and biofilm populations, respectively,

with the upper 95% CI indicated by the grey shaded area. Horizontal dashed line indicates

the highest CIP exposure during the experiment (4x MIC) and vertical lines indicate time

when CIP concentration was doubled.

**Figure 2. Lifestyle-dependent mutations and dynamics under increasing CIP
selection.**

Mutation frequencies in planktonic (A and C) and biofilm populations (B and D) over

time as determined by population-wide whole genome sequencing. A) and B) show the

mutation frequencies obtained under increasing concentrations of CIP. From left to right:

P1, P2 and P3 in A) and B1, B2 and B3 in B). C) and D) show the mutation frequencies

obtained under the subinhibitory (top) and no antibiotic (bottom) treatments. Mutations

in the same gene share a color. Blue: *adeN* or genes regulated by *adeN*; green: *adeL*; gold:

MFS putative transporter ACX60_RS15145; purple: *adeS*; pink: *sohB*; red: *gyrA;* and

orange: *parC*. Grey and brown colors indicate genes potentially unrelated to adaptation

to CIP. F) Mutated genes in the sequenced clones. Each column represents one clone.

Grey shading of populations indicates whole population sequencing and N1 and N2

indicate populations where only clones were sequenced. Grey shaded clones were used

for MIC and fitness estimations. Blue and red indicate SNPs in biofilm and planktonic

growing populations respectively. For all SNPs identified in the 49 clones, see Figure S2

and Table S6. G) The genetic organization of the RND efflux pumps is shown on the left.

MFP and OMP denote membrane fusion protein and outer membrane protein

respectively. All mutations found in the RND regulators are shown on the right.

Figure 3. Evolved trade-off between resistance level and fitness.

Relative fitness (average ± SEM) of 10 evolved clones from the evolutionary rescue experiment compared to the ancestor and their MICs (mg/L) to CIP. Fitness was measured in both planktonic (squares) and biofilm (circles) conditions. Biofilm-evolved mutants were more fit than the ancestor in the absence of CIP, either in planktonic (two-tailed t-test: p = 0.1675, t = 1.518 df = 8) or in biofilm conditions (two-tailed t-test: p = 0.1674, t = 1.519 df = 8). MICs were estimated in planktonic conditions. Black dot represents the ancestral clone. *Denotes the clone with *gyrA* and *parC* mutations.

Figure 4. Collateral sensitivities and cross resistances to various antibiotics.

Heat map showing the relative changes in antimicrobial susceptibility to 13 of the 23 antibiotics tested in the evolved populations (those not shown had no changes). Results shown are the median values of the fold change in the evolved populations compared to the ancestral strain. For subinhibitory and no-antibiotic treatments, only day 12 is shown.

	Increasing concentrations		Subinhibitory concentrations	
	Planktonic	Biofilm	Planktonic	Biofilm
Total mutations	30	40	6	16
Nonsynonymous/Synonymous[b]	8.5	9.67	2/0	6
Intergenic	8	11	0	4
Nonsynonymous	9	13	2	6
Percent intergenic mutations[b]	0.32	0.29	0	0.25

596 **Table 1. Mutation spectrum of different selective environments.** Attributes of the

597 contending mutations during the 12 days of the evolution experiment. [a]Results from the

598 last day of the experimental evolution. [b]Accounting for all unique mutations detected after

599 filtering (see methods). For mutation dynamics over time, see Table S3.

References

1. O´Neill J (2016) TACKLING DRUG-RESISTANT INFECTIONS GLOBALLY: FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS. *Review on Antimicrobal Resistance.*

2. Martínez JL (2008) Antibiotics and Antibiotic Resistance Genes in Natural Environments. *Science* 321(5887):365-367.

3. Ventola CL (2015) The antibiotic resistance crisis: part 1: causes and threats. *P T* 40(4):277-283.

4. Doi Y, Murray GL, & Peleg AY (2015) Acinetobacter baumannii: evolution of antimicrobial resistance-treatment options. *Semin Respir Crit Care Med* 36(1):85-98.

5. Asif M, Alvi IA, & Rehman SU (2018) Insight into Acinetobacter baumannii: pathogenesis, global resistance, mechanisms of resistance, treatment options, and alternative modalities. *Infect Drug Resist* 11:1249-1260.

6. Eze EC, Chenia HY, & El Zowalaty ME (2018) Acinetobacter baumannii biofilms: effects of physicochemical factors, virulence, antibiotic resistance determinants, gene regulation, and future antimicrobial treatments. *Infect Drug Resist* 11:2277-2299.

7. Hoiby N, Bjarnsholt T, Givskov M, Molin S, & Ciofu O (2010) Antibiotic resistance of bacterial biofilms. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 35(4):322-332.

8. Olsen I (2015) Biofilm-specific antibiotic tolerance and resistance. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 34(5):877-886.

9. Ahmed MN, Porse A, Sommer MOA, Hoiby N, & Ciofu O (2018) Evolution of antibiotic resistance in biofilm and planktonic P. aeruginosa populations exposed to sub-inhibitory levels of ciprofloxacin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*.

10. Walters MC, 3rd, Roe F, Bugnicourt A, Franklin MJ, & Stewart PS (2003) Contributions of antibiotic penetration, oxygen limitation, and low metabolic activity to tolerance of Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms to ciprofloxacin and tobramycin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 47(1):317-323.

11. Wistrand-Yuen E*, et al.* (2018) Evolution of high-level resistance during low-level antibiotic exposure. *Nat Commun* 9(1):1599.

12. Andersson DI & Hughes D (2014) Microbiological effects of sublethal levels of antibiotics. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 12(7):465-478.

13. Traverse CC, Mayo-Smith LM, Poltak SR, & Cooper VS (2013) Tangled bank of experimentally evolved Burkholderia biofilms reflects selection during chronic infections. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 110(3):E250-259.

14. Cooper VS, Staples RK, Traverse CC, & Ellis CN (2014) Parallel evolution of small colony variants in Burkholderia cenocepacia biofilms. *Genomics* 104(6 Pt A):447-452.

15. Ellis CN, Traverse CC, Mayo-Smith L, Buskirk SW, & Cooper VS (2015) Character displacement and the evolution of niche complementarity in a model biofilm community. *Evolution* 69(2):283-293.

16. France MT, Cornea A, Kehlet-Delgado H, & Forney LJ (2019) Spatial structure facilitates the accumulation and persistence of antibiotic-resistant mutants in biofilms. *Evolutionary Applications* 12(3):498-507.

17. Poltak SR & Cooper VS (2011) Ecological succession in long-term experimentally evolved biofilms produces synergistic communities. *ISME J* 5(3):369-378.

18. Frenkel EM*, et al.* (2015) Crowded growth leads to the spontaneous evolution of semistable coexistence in laboratory yeast populations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112(36):11306-11311.

19. Fux CA, Costerton JW, Stewart PS, & Stoodley P (2005) Survival strategies of infectious biofilms. *Trends Microbiol* 13(1):34-40.

20. Arnold SJ (1992) Constraints on phenotypic evolution. *Am Nat* 140 Suppl 1:S85-107.

21. Pavlicev M & Cheverud JM (2015) Constraints Evolve: Context Dependency of Gene Effects Allows Evolution of Pleiotropy. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 46(1):413-434.

22. Saltz JB, Hessel FC, & Kelly MW (2017) Trait Correlations in the Genomics Era. *Trends Ecol Evol* 32(4):279-290.

23. Wolcott RD (2017) Biofilms cause chronic infections. *J Wound Care* 26(8):423-425.

24. Wolcott RD, *et al.* (2010) Chronic wounds and the medical biofilm paradigm. *J Wound*
Care 19(2):45-46, 48-50, 52-43.
25. Geisinger E & Isberg RR (2015) Antibiotic modulation of capsular exopolysaccharide
and virulence in Acinetobacter baumannii. *PLoS Pathog* 11(2):e1004691.
26. Ridenhour BJ, *et al.* (2017) Persistence of antibiotic resistance plasmids in bacterial
biofilms. *Evol Appl* 10(6):640-647.
27. Hughes D & Andersson DI (2017) Evolutionary Trajectories to Antibiotic Resistance.
Annu Rev Microbiol.
28. Baym M, *et al.* (2016) Spatiotemporal microbial evolution on antibiotic landscapes.
Science 353(6304):1147-1151.
29. Piechaud M & Second L (1951) [Studies of 26 strains of Moraxella Iwoffi]. *Annales de*
l'Institut Pasteur 80(1):97-99.
30. Baumann P, Doudoroff M, & Stanier RY (1968) A study of the Moraxella group. II.
Oxidative-negative species (genus Acinetobacter). *J Bacteriol* 95(5):1520-1541.
31. Bell G & Gonzalez A (2009) Evolutionary rescue can prevent extinction following
environmental change. *Ecol Lett* 12(9):942-948.
32. Lopes BS & Amyes SG (2013) Insertion sequence disruption of adeR and ciprofloxacin
resistance caused by efflux pumps and gyrA and parC mutations in Acinetobacter
baumannii. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 41(2):117-121.
33. Ardebili A, Lari AR, & Talebi M (2014) Correlation of ciprofloxacin resistance with
the AdeABC efflux system in Acinetobacter baumannii clinical isolates. *Annals of*
laboratory medicine 34(6):433-438.
34. Tseng BS, *et al.* (2013) The extracellular matrix protects Pseudomonas aeruginosa
biofilms by limiting the penetration of tobramycin. *Environ Microbiol* 15(10):2865-
2878.
35. Kirby AE, Garner K, & Levin BR (2012) The relative contributions of physical
structure and cell density to the antibiotic susceptibility of bacteria in biofilms.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother 56(6):2967-2975.
36. Aka ST & Haji SH (2015) Sub-MIC of antibiotics induced biofilm formation of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa in the presence of chlorhexidine. *Braz J Microbiol* 46(1):149-
154.
37. Turner CB, Marshall CW, & Cooper VS (2018) Parallel genetic adaptation across
environments differing in mode of growth or resource availability. *Evolution Letters*
2(4):355-367.
38. Cooper VS (2018) Experimental Evolution as a High-Throughput Screen for Genetic
Adaptations. *mSphere* 3(3).
39. Salverda MLM, Koomen J, Koopmanschap B, Zwart MP, & de Visser J (2017)
Adaptive benefits from small mutation supplies in an antibiotic resistance enzyme. *Proc*
Natl Acad Sci U S A 114(48):12773-12778.
40. Oz T, *et al.* (2014) Strength of selection pressure is an important parameter contributing
to the complexity of antibiotic resistance evolution. *Mol Biol Evol* 31(9):2387-2401.
41. Maclean RC, Hall AR, Perron GG, & Buckling A (2010) The evolution of antibiotic
resistance: insight into the roles of molecular mechanisms of resistance and treatment
context. *Discov Med* 10(51):112-118.
42. CLSI (2017) CLSI. Clinical and Laboratory Standars Institute. Performance Standards
for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing-Seventeenth edition: Approved Standar M100-
S17. (CLSI, Wayne, PA, USA).
43. Wang Y-C, *et al.* (2018) Biofilm formation is not associated with worse outcome in
Acinetobacter baumannii bacteraemic pneumonia. *Scientific Reports* 8(1):7289.
44. Borriello G, *et al.* (2004) Oxygen limitation contributes to antibiotic tolerance of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa in biofilms. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 48(7):2659-2664.
45. Hill D, *et al.* (2005) Antibiotic Susceptibilities of Pseudomonas aeruginosa
Isolates Derived from Patients with Cystic Fibrosis under Aerobic, Anaerobic, and
Biofilm Conditions. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 43(10):5085-5090.

46.   Barrick JE & Lenski RE (2013) Genome dynamics during experimental evolution.
757   *Nature reviews. Genetics* 14:827-839.
758   47.   Bolnick DI, Barrett RDH, Oke KB, Rennison DJ, & Stuart YE (2018) (Non)Parallel
759   Evolution. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 49(1):303-330.
760   48.   Barrick JE*, et al.* (2009) Genome evolution and adaptation in a long-term experiment
761   with Escherichia coli. *Nature* 461:1243-1247.
762   49.   Dillon MM, Sung W, Sebra R, Lynch M, & Cooper VS (2017) Genome-Wide Biases in
763   the Rate and Molecular Spectrum of Spontaneous Mutations in Vibrio cholerae and
764   Vibrio fischeri. *Mol Biol Evol* 34(1):93-109.
765   50.   Lynch M*, et al.* (2016) Genetic drift, selection and the evolution of the mutation rate.
766   *Nature Reviews Genetics* 17:704.
767   51.   Kröger C*, et al.* (2018) The primary transcriptome, small RNAs and regulation of
768   antimicrobial resistance in Acinetobacter baumannii ATCC 17978. *Nucleic Acids Res*
769   46(18):9684-9698.
770   52.   Khan GA, Berglund B, Khan KM, Lindgren PE, & Fick J (2013) Occurrence and
771   abundance of antibiotics and resistance genes in rivers, canal and near drug formulation
772   facilities--a study in Pakistan. *PLoS One* 8(6):e62712.
773   53.   Baquero F, Negri MC, Morosini MI, & Blazquez J (1998) Antibiotic-selective
774   environments. *Clin Infect Dis* 27 Suppl 1:S5-11.
775   54.   Coyne S, Rosenfeld N, Lambert T, Courvalin P, & Perichon B (2010) Overexpression
776   of resistance-nodulation-cell division pump AdeFGH confers multidrug resistance in
777   Acinetobacter baumannii. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 54(10):4389-4393.
778   55.   Fernando D, Zhanel G, & Kumar A (2013) Antibiotic resistance and expression of
779   resistance-nodulation-division pump- and outer membrane porin-encoding genes in
780   Acinetobacter species isolated from Canadian hospitals. *Can J Infect Dis Med*
781   *Microbiol* 24(1):17-21.
782   56.   Pournaras S, Koumaki V, Gennimata V, Kouskouni E, & Tsakris A (2016) In Vitro
783   Activity of Tigecycline Against Acinetobacter baumannii: Global Epidemiology and
784   Resistance Mechanisms. *Adv Exp Med Biol* 897:1-14.
785   57.   Li X-Z, Elkins CA, & Zgurskaya HI (2016) *Efflux-Mediated Antimicrobial Resistance*
786   *in Bacteria: Mechanisms, Regulation and Clinical Implications* (Springer).
787   58.   Hua X, Chen Q, Li X, & Yu Y (2014) Global transcriptional response of Acinetobacter
788   baumannii to a subinhibitory concentration of tigecycline. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*
789   44(4):337-344.
790   59.   Su XZ, Chen J, Mizushima T, Kuroda T, & Tsuchiya T (2005) AbeM, an H+-coupled
791   Acinetobacter baumannii multidrug efflux pump belonging to the MATE family of
792   transporters. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 49(10):4362-4364.
793   60.   Desai MM & Fisher DS (2007) Beneficial mutation selection balance and the effect of
794   linkage on positive selection. *Genetics* 176(3):1759-1798.
795   61.   Vogwill T & MacLean RC (2015) The genetic basis of the fitness costs of antimicrobial
796   resistance: a meta-analysis approach. *Evol Appl* 8(3):284-295.
797   62.   Moore FB, Rozen DE, & Lenski RE (2000) Pervasive compensatory adaptation in
798   Escherichia coli. *Proc Biol Sci* 267(1442):515-522.
799   63.   Zhao X & Drlica K (2002) Restricting the selection of antibiotic-resistant mutant
800   bacteria: measurement and potential use of the mutant selection window. *J Infect Dis*
801   185(4):561-565.
802   64.   Marcusson LL, Frimodt-Moller N, & Hughes D (2009) Interplay in the selection of
803   fluoroquinolone resistance and bacterial fitness. *PLoS Pathog* 5(8):e1000541.
804   65.   Huseby DL*, et al.* (2017) Mutation Supply and Relative Fitness Shape the Genotypes of
805   Ciprofloxacin-Resistant Escherichia coli. *Mol Biol Evol* 34(5):1029-1039.
806   66.   Basra P*, et al.* (2018) Fitness tradeoffs of antibiotic resistance in extra-intestinal
807   pathogenic Escherichia coli. *Genome Biol Evol*.
808   67.   Kugelberg E, Lofmark S, Wretlind B, & Andersson DI (2005) Reduction of the fitness
809   burden of quinolone resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *J Antimicrob Chemother*
810   55(1):22-30.

68. Sackman AM & Rokyta DR (2018) Additive Phenotypes Underlie Epistasis of Fitness
Effects. *Genetics* 208(1):339-348.
69. Baym M, Stone LK, & Kishony R (2016) Multidrug evolutionary strategies to reverse
antibiotic resistance. *Science* 351(6268):aad3292.
70. Pal C, Papp B, & Lazar V (2015) Collateral sensitivity of antibiotic-resistant microbes.
Trends Microbiol 23(7):401-407.
71. Podnecky NL, *et al.* (2018) Conserved collateral antibiotic susceptibility networks in
diverse clinical strains of Escherichia coli. *Nature Communications* 9(1):3673.
72. Yen P & Papin JA (2017) History of antibiotic adaptation influences microbial
evolutionary dynamics during subsequent treatment. *PLoS Biol* 15(8):e2001586.
73. Barbosa C, *et al.* (2017) Alternative Evolutionary Paths to Bacterial Antibiotic
Resistance Cause Distinct Collateral Effects. *Mol Biol Evol* 34(9):2229-2244.
74. Leus IV, *et al.* (2018) Substrate specificities and efflux efficiencies of RND efflux
pumps of Acinetobacter baumannii. *J Bacteriol*.
75. Li XZ, Elkins CA, & Zgurskaya HI (2016) *Efflux-Mediated Antimicrobial Resistance in*
Bacteria: Mechanisms, Regulation and Clinical Implications (Springer International
Publishing).
76. Coyne S, Courvalin P, & Perichon B (2011) Efflux-mediated antibiotic resistance in
Acinetobacter spp. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 55(3):947-953.
77. Yoon EJ, *et al.* (2015) Contribution of resistance-nodulation-cell division efflux
systems to antibiotic resistance and biofilm formation in Acinetobacter baumannii.
MBio 6(2).
78. Azimi L & Rastegar Lari A (2017) Collateral sensitivity between aminoglycosides and
beta-lactam antibiotics depends on active proton pumps. *Microb Pathog* 112:122-125.
79. Kim S, Lieberman TD, & Kishony R (2014) Alternating antibiotic treatments constrain
evolutionary paths to multidrug resistance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 111(40):14494-
14499.
80. Imamovic L & Sommer MO (2013) Use of collateral sensitivity networks to design
drug cycling protocols that avoid resistance development. *Science translational*
medicine 5(204):204ra132.
81. Nichol D, *et al.* (2019) Antibiotic collateral sensitivity is contingent on the repeatability
of evolution. *Nature Communications* 10(1):334.
82. Dhawan A, *et al.* (2017) Collateral sensitivity networks reveal evolutionary instability
and novel treatment strategies in ALK mutated non-small cell lung cancer. *Sci Rep*
7(1):1232.
83. Yang H, Hu L, Liu Y, Ye Y, & Li J (2016) Detection of the plasmid-mediated
quinolone resistance determinants in clinical isolates of Acinetobacter baumannii in
China. *J Chemother* 28(5):443-445.
84. Adams-Haduch JM, *et al.* (2008) Genetic basis of multidrug resistance in Acinetobacter
baumannii clinical isolates at a tertiary medical center in Pennsylvania. *Antimicrob*
Agents Chemother 52(11):3837-3843.
85. Warner WA, *et al.* (2016) Molecular characterization and antimicrobial susceptibility of
Acinetobacter baumannii isolates obtained from two hospital outbreaks in Los Angeles
County, California, USA. *BMC Infect Dis* 16:194.
86. Dahdouh E, *et al.* (2017) Clonality, virulence determinants, and profiles of resistance of
clinical Acinetobacter baumannii isolates obtained from a Spanish hospital. *PLoS One*
12(4):e0176824.
87. Damier-Piolle L, Magnet S, Bremont S, Lambert T, & Courvalin P (2008) AdeIJK, a
resistance-nodulation-cell division pump effluxing multiple antibiotics in Acinetobacter
baumannii. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 52(2):557-562.
88. Rosenfeld N, Bouchier C, Courvalin P, & Perichon B (2012) Expression of the
resistance-nodulation-cell division pump AdeIJK in Acinetobacter baumannii is
regulated by AdeN, a TetR-type regulator. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 56(5):2504-
2510.

89. He X, *et al.* (2015) Biofilm Formation Caused by Clinical Acinetobacter baumannii
Isolates Is Associated with Overexpression of the AdeFGH Efflux Pump. *Antimicrob*
Agents Chemother 59(8):4817-4825.
90. Alav I, Sutton JM, & Rahman KM (2018) Role of bacterial efflux pumps in biofilm
formation. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 73(8):2003-2020.
91. Olivares Pacheco J, Alvarez-Ortega C, Alcalde Rico M, & Martínez JL (2017)
Metabolic Compensation of Fitness Costs Is a General Outcome for Antibiotic-
Resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa Mutants Overexpressing Efflux Pumps.
mBio 8(4):e00500-00517.
92. Warner DM, Folster JP, Shafer WM, & Jerse AE (2007) Regulation of the MtrC-MtrD-
MtrE efflux-pump system modulates the in vivo fitness of Neisseria gonorrhoeae. *J*
Infect Dis 196(12):1804-1812.
93. Elena SF & Lenski RE (2003) Evolution experiments with microorganisms: the
dynamics and genetic bases of adaptation. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 4:457.
94. Van den Bergh B, Swings T, Fauvart M, & Michiels J (2018) Experimental Design,
Population Dynamics, and Diversity in Microbial Experimental Evolution.
Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews 82(3):e00008-00018.
95. Geisinger E, *et al.* (2018) The landscape of intrinsic and evolved fluoroquinolone
resistance in Acinetobacter baumannii includes suppression of drug-induced prophage
replication. *bioRxiv*:442681.
96. Hamed K & Debonnett L (2017) Tobramycin inhalation powder for the treatment of
pulmonary Pseudomonas aeruginosa infection in patients with cystic fibrosis: a review
based on clinical evidence. *Therapeutic advances in respiratory disease* 11(5):193-209.
97. Linares JF, Gustafsson I, Baquero F, & Martinez JL (2006) Antibiotics as
intermicrobial signaling agents instead of weapons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
103(51):19484-19489.
98. Hoffman LR, *et al.* (2005) Aminoglycoside antibiotics induce bacterial biofilm
formation. *Nature* 436(7054):1171-1175.
99. O'Toole GA & Kolter R (1998) Initiation of biofilm formation in Pseudomonas
fluorescens WCS365 proceeds via multiple, convergent signalling pathways: a genetic
analysis. *Mol Microbiol* 28(3):449-461.
100. Lenski RE (1991) Quantifying fitness and gene stability in microorganisms.
Biotechnology 15:173-192.
101. Santos-Lopez A, *et al.* (2017) A Naturally Occurring Single Nucleotide Polymorphism
in a Multicopy Plasmid Produces a Reversible Increase in Antibiotic Resistance.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother 61(2).
102. Baym M, *et al.* (2015) Inexpensive multiplexed library preparation for megabase-sized
genomes. *PLoS One* 10(5):e0128036.
103. Bolger AM, Lohse M, & Usadel B (2014) Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 30(15):2114-2120.
104. Deatherage DE & Barrick JE (2014) Identification of mutations in laboratory-evolved
microbes from next-generation sequencing data using breseq. *Methods Mol Biol*
1151:165-188.

908