Combining antibiotics with antivirulence compounds is effective and can

reverse selection for antibiotic resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

Chiara Rezzoagli[1,2], Martina Archetti[1,2], Michael Baumgartner[3], Rolf Kümmerli[1,2*]

[1]Department of Quantitative Biomedicine, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

[2]Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

[3] Institute for Integrative Biology, Department of Environmental Systems Science,

ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Short title: Antibiotic-antivirulence combination therapy against bacterial pathogens

Corresponding author: Rolf Kümmerli, Department of Quantitative Biomedicine,

University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland.

Email: rolf.kuemmerli@uzh.ch / Phone: +41 44 635 48 01.

Abstract

Antibiotics are losing efficacy due to the rapid evolution and spread of resistance. Treatments targeting bacterial virulence factors have been considered as alternatives because they target virulence instead of pathogen viability, and should therefore exert weaker selection for resistance than conventional antibiotics. However, antivirulence treatments rarely clear infections, which compromises their clinical applications. Here, we explore the potential of combining antivirulence drugs with antibiotics against the opportunistic human pathogen *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. We combined two antivirulence compounds (gallium, a siderophore-quencher, and furanone C-30, a quorum sensing-inhibitor) together with four clinically relevant antibiotics (ciprofloxacin, colistin, meropenem, tobramycin) in 9x9 drug concentration matrices. We found that drug-interaction patterns were concentration dependent, with clinically interesting levels of synergies occurring at intermediate drug concentrations for certain drug pairs. We then tested whether antivirulence compounds are potent adjuvants, especially when treating antibiotic resistant clones. We found that the addition of antivirulence compounds to antibiotics could restore growth inhibition for most antibiotic resistant clones, and even reverse selection for resistance in three drug combination cases. Molecular analyses suggest that selection reversal occurs when resistance mechanisms involve restoration of protein synthesis, but not when efflux pumps are upregulated. Altogether, our work provides a first systematic analysis of antivirulence-antibiotic combinatorial treatments and suggests that such combinations have a high potential to be both effective in treating infections and in limiting the spread of antibiotic resistance.

Introduction

Scientists together with the World Health Organization (WHO) forecast that the rapid evolution and spread of antibiotic resistant bacteria will lead to a world-wide medical crisis [1–3]. Already today, the effective treatment of an increasing number of infectious diseases has become difficult in many cases [4,5]. To avert the crisis, novel innovative approaches that are both effective against pathogens and robust to the emergence and spread of resistance are urgently needed [6,7]. One such approach involves the use of compounds that disarm rather than kill bacteria. These so-called 'antivirulence' treatments should exert weaker selection for resistance compared to classical antibiotics because they simply disable virulence factors but are not supposed to affect pathogen viability [8–10]. However, a downside of antivirulence approaches is that the infection will not necessarily be cleared. This could be particularly problematic for immuno-compromised patients (AIDS, cancer, cystic fibrosis and intensive-care unit patients), whose immune system is conceivably too weak to clear even disarmed pathogens.

One way to circumvent this problem is to combine antivirulence compounds with antibiotics to benefit from both virulence suppression and effective pathogen removal [6,11]. While a few studies have already considered such combinatorial treatments [12–18], we currently have no comprehensive understanding of how different types of antibiotics and antivirulence drugs interact, whether interactions are predominantly synergistic or antagonistic, and how combinatorial treatments affect the spread of antibiotic resistance. Here, we tackle these open issues by combining four different classes of antibiotics with two antivirulence compounds, in 9x9 drug concentration

matrixes, as treatments against the opportunistic human pathogen *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa.

P. aeruginosa is one of the ESKAPE pathogens with multi-drug resistant strains

spreading worldwide and infections becoming increasingly difficult to treat [19,20]. In

addition to its clinical relevance, *P. aeruginosa* has become a model system for

antivirulence research. Several antivirulence compounds targeting either the species'

quorum sensing (QS) [21–23] or siderophore-mediated iron uptake systems [24–27]

have been proposed. While QS is a cell-to-cell communication system that controls

the expression of multiple virulence factors including exo-proteases, biosurfactants

and toxins, siderophores are secondary metabolites important for the scavenging of

iron from host tissue. For our experiments, we chose antivirulence compounds that

target these two different virulence mechanisms: furanone C-30, an inhibitor of the

LasR QS-system [12,21], and gallium, targeting the iron-scavenging pyoverdine and

iron-metabolism [24,26,28–32].

Furanone C-30 is a synthetic, brominated furanone, which includes the same lactone

ring present in the acylhomoserine lactones (AHL) QS molecules of *P. aeruginosa*

[33]. As a consequence, it can disrupt QS-based communication by antagonistically

competing with the AHLs molecules for binding to the main QS (LasR) receptor [34].

Gallium is an iron mimic whose ionic radius and coordination chemistry is

comparable to ferric iron, although its redox properties are different. Specifically,

gallium cannot be reduced and thereby irreversibly binds to siderophores and hinders

siderophore-mediated iron uptake [24,26].

We combined the two antivirulence compounds with four clinically relevant antibiotics

(ciprofloxacin, colistin, meropenem, and tobramycin), which are widely used against

P. aeruginosa [35]. In a first step, we measured treatment effects on bacterial growth

and virulence factor production for all eight drug combinations for 81 concentration

combinations each. In a second step, we applied the Bliss independence model to

calculate the degree of synergy or antagonism to obtain comprehensive interaction

maps for all combinations both for growth and virulence factor production. Next, we

selected for antibiotic resistant clones and tested whether the addition of

antivirulence compounds as adjuvants can re-potentiate antibiotics and reverse

selection for resistance. Finally, we sequenced the genomes of the evolved antibiotic

resistant clones to examine the genetic basis that drive the observed patterns of

cross-resistance and resistance reversal.

Results

PAO1 dose-response curves to antibiotics and antivirulence compounds

In a first experiment, we determined the dose-response curve of PAO1 to each of the

four antibiotics (Figure 1) and the two anti-virulence compounds (Figure 2) in our

experimental media. We found that the dose-response curves for antibiotics followed

sigmoid functions (Figure 1), characterised by (i) a low antibiotic concentration range

that did not inhibit bacterial growth, (ii) an intermediate antibiotic concentration range

that significantly reduced bacterial growth, and (iii) a high antibiotic concentration

range that completely stalled bacterial growth.

Similar dose-response curves were obtained for gallium (quenching pyoverdine) and

furanone C-30 (inhibiting protease production) in the respective media where the two

virulence factors are important for growth (Figure 2). Crucially, the dose-response

curves shifted to the right (extending phase (i)) when we repeated the experiment in

media, where the virulence factors are not needed for growth (i.e. iron-rich media for

pyoverdine, and protein digest media for proteases). This shows that there is a

window of concentrations where growth inhibition is caused by virulence factor

quenching alone. Conversely, high concentrations of antivirulence compounds seem

to have additional off-target effects curbing growth.

Interaction maps of antibiotic-antivirulence drug combinations

General patterns. From the dose-response curves, we chose 9 concentrations for

each drug to cover the entire trajectory, from no to intermediate to high growth

inhibition. We then combined antibiotics with antivirulence compounds in a 9x9

concentration matrix and measured the dose-response curve for every single drug

combination for both growth and virulence factor production (Figure 3). At the

qualitative level, independent drug effects would cause a symmetrical downshift of

the dose-response curve with higher antivirulence compound concentrations

supplemented. We indeed noticed symmetrical downshifts for many dose-response

curves (Figure 3), but there were also clear cases of non-symmetrical shifts,

indicating synergy or antagonism between drugs. When using the Bliss model to

quantify these effects, we found patterns of synergy and antagonism for both growth

and virulence factor inhibition across the concentration matrices for all drug

combinations (Figure 4).

Gallium-antibiotic combinations. Gallium combined with ciprofloxacin or colistin had

mostly independent effects on bacterial growth (i.e. weak or no synergy/antagonism)

(Figures 4A+B). With regard to the inhibition of pyoverdine production, both drug

combinations showed a tendency towards stronger synergy at intermediate drug

concentrations (Figure 4E+F). For gallium-meropenem combinations, we observed

mostly independent interactions for growth and pyoverdine inhibition, with small

hotspots of antagonism (for growth) and synergy (for siderophore inhibition) existing

at intermediate drug concentrations (Figure 4C+G). Finally, for gallium-tobramycin

combinations there were relatively strong synergistic interactions for both growth

(Figure 4D) and pyoverdine inhibition (Figure 4H) at intermediate drug

concentrations.

Furanone-antibiotic combinations. For furanone-ciprofloxacin combinations, we found

relatively strong antagonistic interactions with regard to growth inhibition (Figure 4I),

whereas effects on protease inhibition were mostly independent (Figure 4M). In

contrast, for furanone-colistin combinations we observed strong synergistic drug

interactions especially for intermediate and higher concentrations of the antivirulence

compound for growth and protease inhibition (Figure 4J+N). Furanone-meropenem,

on the other hand, interacted mostly antagonistically with regard to growth and

protease inhibition (Figure 4K+O). Conversely, for furanone-tobramycin combinations

there were pervasive patterns of synergy across the entire drug combination range

for growth and virulence factor inhibition (Figure 4L+P).

Do the degrees of synergy for growth and virulence factor inhibition correlate? As the

combinatorial treatments affect both growth and virulence factor production, we

examined whether the degrees of synergy correlate between the two traits

(Supplementary Figure S1). For gallium-antibiotic combinations, we found no

correlations for ciprofloxacin and meropenem, but positive associations for colistin

and tobramycin (Pearson correlation coefficient; ciprofloxacin: $r = 0.09$, $t_{79} = 0.85$, $p =$

0.394; colistin: $r = 0.69$, $t_{79} = 8.51$, $p < 0.001$; meropenem: $r = 0.17$, $t_{79} = 1.53$, $p =$

0.130; tobramycin: $r = 0.58$, $t_{79} = 6.39$, $p < 0.001$). For furanone-antibiotic

combinations, there were strong positive correlations between the levels of synergy

for the two traits for all drug combinations (ciprofloxacin: $r = 0.34$, $t_{79} = 3.22$, $p =$

0.002; colistin: $r = 0.96$, $t_{79} = 32.50$, $p < 0.001$; meropenem: $r = 0.87$, $t_{79} = 15.48$, $p <$

0.001; tobramycin: $r = 0.75$, $t_{79} = 10.16$, $p < 0.001$).

Antivirulence compounds can restore growth inhibition of antibiotic resistant

strains

In a next step, we asked whether antivirulence compounds could be used as

adjuvants to suppress the growth of antibiotic resistant clones. To address this

question, we first experimentally selected and isolated antibiotic resistant clones

(AtbR, see methods for details). We then subjected these AtbR clones to antibiotic

and combinatorial treatments and compared their growth relative to the ancestral

antibiotic-sensitive wildtype. As expected, AtbR clones grew better than the wildtype

under antibiotic treatment alone (two-sample t-tests, $-25.9 \leq t_{7-16} \leq -2.27$, $p < 0.05$ for

all treatments). When adding anti-virulence compounds to the antibiotics, we found

that growth inhibition of the AtbR clones was restored in seven out of eight drug

combinations (Figure 5A). Overall, there were four different inhibition patterns: the

addition of antivirulence compounds either (i) did not affect the growth of the

antibiotic resistant strain (one case: ciprofloxacin-furanone); (ii) only fully restored

growth inhibition at higher anti-virulence compound concentration (five cases: all four

combinations with gallium and colistin-furanone); (iii) restored growth inhibition at low

but not high anti-virulence compound concentration (one case: meropenem-

furanone); or (iv) inhibited growth more than in the antibiotic sensitive wildtype (one

case: tobramycin-furanone).

Specific drug combinations can reverse selection for antibiotic resistance

We then investigated whether the addition of an antivirulence compound to an

antibiotic treatment can influence the spread of AtbR clones in populations of

susceptible cells (Figure 5B). Our competition assays revealed that AtbR clones lost

against the susceptible wildtype in the absence of antibiotics, confirming that

antibiotic resistance is costly (one sample t-tests, $-54.16 \leq t_7 \leq -2.36$, $p \leq 0.050$ for all

comparisons). Conversely, AtbR clones always experienced a significant fitness

advantage compared to the wildtype under antibiotic treatment (one sample t-test,

$3.05 \leq t_7 \leq 12.80$, $p < 0.01$ for all combinations). The addition of antivirulence

compounds to the antibiotic treatment had variable and combination-specific effects

on the fitness of AtbR clones, which included: (i) three cases where anti-virulence

compound addition did not affect the fitness advantage of the AtbR clones

(ciprofloxacin-gallium, ciprofloxacin-furanone and colistin-furanone); (ii) two cases

where the antivirulence adjuvant further potentiated the spread of AtbR clones

(colistin-gallium and meropenem-furanone); and (iii) three cases where the adjuvant

reversed selection for antibiotic resistance and thereby hindered the spread of AtbR

clones (meropenem-gallium, tobramycin-gallium and tobramycin-furanone). Detailed

information on statistical analysis for Figure 5B is reported in Supplementary Table

S1.

Drug synergy does not predict selection against antibiotic resistance

We examined whether drug interactions, ranging from antagonism to synergy (Figure

4) correlate with the relative fitness of the AtbR clones in competition with the

antibiotic sensitive wildtype. However, we found no support for such associations

(Supplementary Figure S2, ANOVA, growth: $F_{1,48} = 0.65$, p = 0.422; virulence factor:

$F_{1,48} = 3.10$, p = 0.082), but instead observed that variation in fitness patterns was

explained by specific drug combinations (antivirulence-antibiotic interaction: $F_{3,48} =$

15.76, p < 0.0001).

Genetic bases of experimentally evolved antibiotic resistance

The whole-genome sequencing of the experimentally evolved AtbR clones revealed

a small number of SNPs and INDELs, which are known to be associated with

resistance to the respective antibiotics (Table 1). The AtbR clone resistant to

ciprofloxacin had mutations in *gyrB*, a gene encoding the DNA gyrase subunit B, the

direct target of the antibiotic [36]. In addition, we identified an 18-bp deletion in the

mexR gene, encoding a multidrug efflux pump repressor [37]. The two AtbR clones

resistant to colistin had different mutations in the same target gene *phoQ* (a non-

synonymous SNP in one clone versus a 1-bp insertion in addition to a non-

synonymous SNP in the other clone). PhoQ is a regulator of the LPS modification

operon and mutations in this gene represent the first step in the development of high-

level colistin resistance [38]. One AtbR clone resistant to meropenem had a non-

synonymous SNP in the coding sequence of *mpl.* This gene encodes a murein

tripeptide ligase, which contributes to the overexpression of the beta-lactamase

precursor gene *ampC* [39]. The other AtbR clone resistant to meropenem had

mutations in three different genes, which can all be linked to antibiotic resistance

mechanisms: we found (i) one non-synonymous SNP in *parR*, which encodes a two

component response regulator involved in several resistance mechanisms, including

drug efflux, porin loss and LPS modification [40]; (ii) 7 mutations in the *PA1874* gene,

which encodes an efflux pump [41]; (iii) one non-synonymous SNP in *nalD*, encoding

the transcriptional regulator NalD, which regulates the expression of drug-efflux

systems [42,43]. Both AtbR clones resistant to tobramycin had non-synonymous

SNPs in *fusA1*. This gene encodes the elongation factor G, a key component of the

translational machinery. Although aminoglycosides do not directly bind to the

elongation factor G and the complete resistance mechanisms is still unknown,

mutations in *fusA1* are associated with high resistance to tobramycin and are often

found in clinical isolates [44,45].

Discussion

In this study, we systematically explored the effects of combining antibiotics with

antivirulence compounds as a potentially promising strategy to fight susceptible and

antibiotic resistant opportunistic human pathogens. Specifically, we combined four

different antibiotics (ciprofloxacin, colistin, meropenem, tobramycin) with two

antivirulence compounds (gallium targeting siderophore-mediated iron uptake and

furanone C-30 targeting the quorum sensing communication system) in 9x9 drug

interaction matrices against the bacterium *P. aeruginosa* as a model pathogen. Our

heat maps reveal drug-combination specific interaction patterns. While colistin and

tobramycin primarily interacted synergistically with the antivirulence compounds,

independent and antagonistic interactions occurred for ciprofloxacin and meropenem

in combination with the antivirulence compounds (Figures 3+4). We then used

antivirulence compounds as adjuvants and observed that they can restore growth

inhibition of antibiotic resistant clones in seven out of eight cases (Figure 5A). Finally,

we performed competition assays between antibiotic resistant and susceptible strains

under single and combinatorial drug treatments and found that antivirulence

compounds can reverse selection for antibiotic resistance in three out of eight cases

(Figure 5B). Our results identify antibiotic-antivirulence combinations as a potentially

powerful tool to efficiently treat infections of troublesome nosocomial pathogens such

as *P. aeruginosa*. Particularly, tobramycin-antivirulence combinations emerged as

the top candidate treatments because: (i) drugs interacted synergistically both with

regard to growth and virulence factor inhibition; (ii) the antivirulence compounds re-

potentiated tobramycin when treating antibiotic resistant clones; and (iii) antivirulence

compounds reversed selection for tobramycin resistance.

Drug synergy is desirable from a clinical perspective because it allows to use lower

drug concentrations, thereby minimizing side effects while maintaining treatment

efficacy [46,47]. In this context, a number of studies have examined combinations of

antibiotics and antivirulence compounds targeting various virulence factors including

quorum sensing, iron uptake, and biofilm formation in *P. aeruginosa* [12,13,15–

18,22,48–51]. While these studies typically used a handful of concentration

combinations and used qualitative measures of synergy, we here present a

comprehensive quantitative interaction maps for these two classes of drugs. A key

insight of these interaction maps is that specific drug combinations cannot simply be

classified as either synergistic or antagonistic. Instead, drug interactions are

concentration dependent with most parts of the interaction maps being characterized

by independent effects interspersed with hotspots of synergy or antagonism. The

strongest effects of synergy and antagonism are often observed at intermediate drug

concentrations, which is, in the case of synergy, ideal for developing combinatorial therapies that maximise treatment efficacy while minimizing toxicity for the patient.

While drug antagonism is considered undesirable from a clinical perspective, work on antibiotic combination therapies has revealed that antagonistic interactions can inhibit the spread of antibiotic resistance [52–54]. The reason behind this phenomenon is that when two drugs antagonize each other, becoming resistant to one drug will remove the antagonistic effect on the second drug, such that the combination treatment will be more effective against the resistant clones [52]. We suspected that such effects might also occur for antagonistic antibiotic-antivirulence treatments. While we indeed observed that combination therapy can reverse selection for resistance in certain cases (Figure 5B), there was no evidence that this effect correlated with the type of drug interaction (Supplementary Figure S2). A possible explanation for the lack of any association is that the antagonism between antibiotics and antivirulence compounds was quite moderate. In contrast, previous work used an extreme case of antagonism, where the effect of one drug was almost completely suppressed in the presence of the second drug [52,54].

We propose that it is rather the underlying molecular mechanism and not the direction of drug interaction that determines whether selection for antibiotic resistance is reversed or potentiated. For instance, any resistance mechanism that reduces antibiotic entry or increases its efflux could conceivably induce cross-resistance to antivirulence compounds, which should in turn potentiate and not reverse selection for antibiotic resistance. This phenomenon could explain the patterns observed for furanone in combination with ciprofloxacin, colistin and

meropenem, where our sequencing analysis revealed mutations in genes regulating

efflux pumps, porins and membrane lipopolysaccharide modifications (Table 1).

Since furanone needs to enter the cells to become active, these mutations, known to

confer resistance to antibiotics [37,38,41], likely also induce resistance to furanone

[55].

Alternatively, competitive interactions between resistant and sensitive pathogens

over common resources could compromise the spread of drug resistance, as shown

for malaria parasites [56]. In our case, it is plausible to assume that antibiotic

resistant clones are healthier than susceptible cells and might therefore produce

higher amounts of pyoverdine and proteases under antivirulence treatment. Since

these virulence factors are secreted and shared between cells, antibiotic resistant

clones take on the role of cooperators: they produce costly virulence factors that are

then shared with and exploited by the susceptible cells [26,57,58]. This scenario

could apply to tobramycin-gallium/furanone combinations, where resistant clones had

mutations in *fusA1* known to be associated with the restoration of protein synthesis

[44]. Similar social effects could explain selection reversal in the case of meropenem-

gallium combination. Here, the meropenem resistant clone has mutation in *mpl*,

which can trigger the overexpression of the β-lactamase *ampC* resistance

mechanism [39]. Since β-lactamase enzyme secretion and extracellular antibiotic

degradation is itself a cooperative behaviour [59], it could together with the virulence

factor sharing described above compromise the spread of the resistant clone.

Clearly, all these explanations remain speculative and further studies are required to

understand the molecular and evolutionary basis of reversed selection for resistance.

In summary, drug combination therapies are gaining increased attention as more

sustainable strategies to treat infections, limiting the spread of antibiotic resistance

[60–63]. They are already applied to a number of diseases, including cancer [64],

HIV [65] and tuberculosis infections [66]. Here we probed the efficacy and

evolutionary robustness of antibiotics combined with anti-virulence compounds. This

is an interesting combination because antibiotic treatments alone face the problem of

rapid resistance evolution, whereas antivirulence drugs are evolutionarily more

robust but can only disarm and not eliminate pathogens. Combinatorial treatments

seem to bring the strengths of the two approaches together: efficient removal of

bacteria by the antibiotics combined with disarming and increased evolutionary

robustness of the antivirulence compounds. While our findings are promising and

could set the stage for a novel class of combinatorial treatments, there are still many

steps to take to bring our approach to the clinics. First, it would be important to

quantify the rate of resistance evolution directly under the combinatorial treatments to

test whether drug combination itself slows down resistance evolution [60]. Second,

the various antibiotic-antivirulence combinations must be tested in relevant animal

host models, as host conditions including the increased spatial structure inside the

body can affect the competitive dynamics between strains, potentially influencing the

outcome of the therapy [67,68]. Finally, the observed patterns of drug synergy and

reversed selection for resistance are concentration dependent (Figure 4-5), thus

requiring detailed research on drug delivery and the pharmacodynamics and

pharmacokinetics of combination therapies [54].

Materials and methods

Bacterial strains

For all our experiments, we used *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 (ATCC 15692). In addition to

the wildtype PAO1, we further used two isogenic variants tagged with either a

constitutively expressed GFP or mCherry fluorescent protein. Both fluorescently

tagged strains were directly obtained from the wildtype PAO1 using the miniTn7-

system to chromosomally integrate a single stable copy of the marker gene, under

the strong constitutive Ptac promoter, at the *att*Tn7 site [69]. The gentamycin

resistance cassette, required to select for transformed clones, was subsequently

removed using the pFLP2-encoded recombinase [69]. Antibiotic resistant clones

used for competition assays were generated through experimental evolution and are

listed in Table 1 together with their respective mutations.

Media and growth conditions

For all experiments, overnight cultures were grown in 8 ml Lysogeny broth (LB,

Sigma Aldrich, Switzerland) in 50 ml Falcon tubes, incubated at 37°C, 220 rpm for 18

hours. We washed overnight cultures with 0.8% NaCl solution and adjusted them to

$OD_{600} = 1$ (optical density at 600 nm). Bacteria were further diluted to a final starting

$OD_{600} = 10^{-3}$ for all experiments. We used two different media, where the targeted

virulence factors (pyoverdine or protease) are important. For pyoverdine, we used

iron-limited CAA (CAA+Tf) [0.5% casamino acids, 5 mM $K_2HPO_4 \cdot 3H_2O$, 1 mM

$MgSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$], buffered at neutral pH with 25 mM HEPES buffer and supplemented

with 100 µg/ml human apo-transferrin to chelate iron and 20 mM $NaHCO_3$ as a co-

factor. As an iron-rich control medium, we used CAA supplemented with 25 mM

HEPES and 20 µM $FeCl_3$, but without apo-transferrin and 20 mM $NaHCO_3$ to create

conditions that do not require pyoverdine for growth [70].

For QS-regulated proteases, we used casein medium (CAS) [0.5% casein, 5 mM

$K_2HPO_4 \cdot 3H_2O$, 1 mM $MgSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$], supplemented with 25 mM HEPES buffer and

0.05% CAA. In this medium, proteases are required to digest the casein. A small

amount of CAA was added to allow cultures to have a growth kick start prior to

protease secretion [71]. As a control, we used CAA supplemented with 25 mM

HEPES buffer, a medium in which proteases are not required. All chemicals were

purchased from Sigma Aldrich, Switzerland. The CAS medium is intrinsically turbid

due to the poor solubility of casein, which can interfere with the growth kinetics

measured via optical density (Supplementary Figure S3A). To solve this issue, we

used mCherry fluorescence intensity as a reliable proxy for growth in CAS

(Supplementary Figure S3B-C).

Single drug growth and virulence factor inhibition curves

To determine the activity range of each antibiotic (ciprofloxacin, colistin, meropenem,

tobramycin) and antivirulence drug (gallium as $GaNO_3$ and furanone C-30), we

subjected PAO1 bacterial cultures to two different 7-step serial dilutions for each

antibacterial. Ciprofloxacin: 0-4 µg/ml; colistin: 0-0.4 µg/ml in CAA+Tf and 0-20 µg/ml

in CAS; meropenem: 0-14 µg/ml; tobramycin: 0-8 µg/ml; gallium: 0-200 µM; furanone

C-30: 0-390 µM. All antibacterials were purchased from Sigma Aldrich, Switzerland.

Overnight cultures were prepared and diluted as explained above and then added

into 200 µl of media on 96-well plates with six replicates for each drug concentration.

Plates were incubated statically at 37°C and growth was measured either as OD_{600}

(in CAA+Tf) or mCherry fluorescence (excitation 582 nm, emission 620 nm in CAS)

after 48 hours using a Tecan Infinite M-200 plate reader (Tecan Group Ltd.,

Switzerland). Control experiments (Supplementary Figure S4) confirmed that

endpoint OD_{600} or mCherry measurements showed strong linear correlations (0.858

< R^2 < 0.987) with the growth integral (area under the growth curve), which is a good

descriptor of the overall inhibitory effects covering the entire growth period [72].

At this time point, we further quantified pyoverdine production through its natural

fluorescence (excitation 400 nm, emission 460 nm) and protease production in the

cell-free supernatant using the protease azocasein assay (adapted from [73]

shortening incubation time to 30 min). The two metals, gallium and bromine (in

Furanone C-30), alter the fluorescence levels of pyoverdine and mCherry in a

concentration dependent manner. To account for this effect, we established

calibration curves and corrected all fluorescence measures accordingly (as described

in Supplementary Figure S5).

Antibiotic-antivirulence combination assays

From the single drug dose-response curves, we chose for each drug nine

concentrations (including no drugs) to cover the entire activity range in each medium

including no, intermediate and strong inhibitory growth effects on PAO1.

(Supplementary Table S2). We then combined these drug concentrations in a 9x9

matrix for each of the eight antibiotic-antivirulence pairs, and repeated the growth

experiment for all combinations in six-fold replication, exactly as described above.

After 48 hours of incubation, we measured growth and virulence factor production

following the protocols described above.

Synergy degree of drug-combinations

We used the Bliss independence model to calculate the degree of synergy (S), for

both growth and virulence factor inhibition, for each of the antibiotic-antivirulence

combinations [74–76]. We used the formula $S = f_{X,0} \cdot f_{0,Y} - f_{X,Y}$, where $f_{X,0}$ is the

growth (or virulence factor production) level measured under antibiotic exposure at

concentration X; $f_{0,Y}$ is the growth (or virulence factor production) level measured

under antivirulence exposure at concentration Y; and $f_{X,Y}$ is the growth (or virulence

factor production) level measured under the combinatorial treatment at

concentrations X and Y. If $S = 0$ then the two drugs act independently. Conversely,

$S < 0$ indicates antagonistic drug interactions, while S > 0 indicates synergy.

Experimental evolution under antibiotic treatment

To select for antibiotic resistant clones, we exposed overnight cultures of PAO1

wildtype (initial $OD_{600} = 10^{-4}$) to each of the four antibiotics in LB medium (antibiotic

concentrations, ciprofloxacin: 0.15 µg/ml; colistin: 0.5 µg/ml; meropenem: 0.8 µg/ml;

tobramycin: 1 µg/ml) in six-fold replication. These antibiotic concentrations initially

caused a 70-90% reduction in PAO1 growth compared to untreated cultures,

conditions that imposed strong selection for the evolution of resistance. The evolution

experiment ran for seven days, whereby we diluted bacterial cultures and transferred

them to fresh medium with the respective treatment with a dilution factor of 10^{-4},

every 24 hours. At the end of each growth cycle, we measured growth (OD_{600}) of the

evolving lineages using a SpectraMax® Plus 384 plate reader (Molecular Devices,

Switzerland).

Phenotypic and genetic characterization of resistance

Following experimental evolution, we screened the evolved lines for the presence of

antibiotic resistant clones. For each antibiotic we plated four evolved lines on LB

plates and isolated single clones, which we then exposed in liquid culture to the

antibiotic concentration they experienced during experimental evolution. Among

those that showed growth restoration (compared to the untreated wildtype), we

picked two random clones originating from different lineages per antibiotic for further

analysis. We had to adjust our sampling design in two cases. First, only one

population survived our ciprofloxacin treatment and thus only one resistant clone

could be picked for this antibiotic. Second, clones evolved under colistin treatment

grew very poorly in CAS medium and therefore we included an experimentally

evolved colistin resistant clone from a previous study, which did not show

compromised growth in CAS (see [73] for a description on the experimental

evolution). Altogether, we had seven clones for which we re-established the drug-

response curves (Supplementary Figure S6) in either CAA+Tf or CAS (one clone per

antibiotic was allocated to one of the two media, except for ciprofloxacin).

We further isolated the genomic DNA of the selected evolved antibiotic resistant

clones and sequenced their genomes. We used the GenElute Bacterial Genomic

DNA kit (Sigma Aldrich) for DNA isolation. DNA concentrations were assayed using

the Quantifluor dsDNA sample kit (Promega, Switzerland). Samples were sent to the

Functional Genomics Center Zurich for library preparation (TruSeq DNA Nano) and

sequencing on the Illumina MiSeq platform with v2 reagents and pair-end 150 bp

reads. In a first step, we mapped the sequences of our ancestral wildtype PAO1

strain (ENA accession number: ERS1983671) to the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

PAO1 reference genome (NCBI accession number: NC_002516) with snippy

(https://github.com/tseemann/snippy) to obtain a list with variants that were already present at the beginning of the experiment. Next, we quality filtered the reads of the evolved clones with trimmomatic [77], mapped them to the reference genome and called variants using snippy. Detected variants were quality filtered and variants present in the ancestor strain were excluded from the dataset using vcftools [78]. The mapping files generated in this study are deposited in the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA) under the study accession number PRJEB32766.

Competition experiments between sensitive and resistant clones

To examine the conditions under which antibiotic resistant clones can spread, we competed the sensitive wildtype PAO1 (tagged with GFP) against the experimentally evolved antibiotic resistant clones (Table 1) under five different conditions: (i) no drug treatment; (ii) antibiotic alone; (iii)-(v) antibiotic combined with three different concentrations of the antivirulence compound. Antibiotic concentrations are listed in the Supplementary Table S3, while antivirulence concentrations were as follows, gallium: 1.56 µM (low), 6.25 µM (medium), 12.5 µM (high); furanone: 6.3 µM (low), 22.8 µM (medium), 51.4 µM (high). Bacterial overnight cultures were prepared and diluted as described above. Competitions were initiated with a mixture of 90% sensitive wildtype cells and 10% resistant clones to mimic a situation where resistance is still relatively rare. Mixes alongside with monocultures of all strains were inoculated in either 200 µl of CAA+Tf or CAS under all the five treatment regimes. We used flow cytometry to assess strain frequency prior and after a 24 hours competition period at 37°C static (Supplementary Figure S7). Specifically, bacterial cultures were diluted in 1X phosphate buffer saline (PBS, Gibco, ThermoFisher, Switzerland) and frequencies were measured with a LSRII Fortessa cell analyzer (BD

Bioscience, Switzerland. GFP channel, laser: 488 nm, mirror: 505LP, filter: 530/30;

side and forward scatter: 200 V threshold; events recorded with CS&T settings) at

the Cytometry Facility of the University of Zurich. We recorded 50'000 events before

competitions and used a high-throughput sampler device (BD Bioscience) to record

all events in a 5 µl-volume after competition. Since antibacterials can kill and thereby

quench the GFP signal in tagged cells, we quantified dead cells using the propidium

iodide (PI) stain (2 µl of 0.5 mg/ml solution) with flow cytometry (for PI fluorescence:

laser: 561 nm, mirror: 600LP, filter: 610/20).

We used the software FlowJo (BD Bioscience) to analyse data from flow cytometry

experiments. We followed a three-step gating strategy: (i) we separated bacterial

cells from media and noise background by using forward and side scatter values as a

proxy for particle size; (ii) within this gate, we then distinguished live from dead cells

based on the PI staining; (iii) finally, we separated live cells into either GFP positive

and negative populations. Fluorescence thresholds were set using appropriate

control samples: isopropanol-killed cells for PI positive staining and untagged-PAO1

cells for GFP-negative fluorescence. We then calculated the relative fitness of the

antibiotic resistant clone as $\ln(v) = \ln\{[a_{24}\times(1-a_0)]/[a_0\times(1-a_{24})]\}$, where a_0 and a_{24} are

the frequencies of the resistant clone at the beginning and at the end of the

competition, respectively [79]. Values of $\ln(v) < 0$ or $\ln(v) > 0$ indicate whether the

frequency of antibiotic resistant clones decreased or increased relative to the

sensitive PAO1-GFP strain. To check for fitness effects caused by the fluorescent

tag, we included a control competition, where we mixed PAO1-GFP with the

untagged PAO1 in a 9:1 ratio for all treatment conditions. We noted that high drug

concentrations significantly curbed bacterial growth, which reduced the number of

events that could be measured with flow cytometry. This growth reduction increased noise relative to the signal, leading to an overestimation of the GFP-negative population in the mix. To correct for this artefact, we established calibration curves (described by asymptotic functions, Supplementary Table S2) for how the relative fitness of PAO1-untagged varies as a function of cell density in control competitions with PAO1-GFP.

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed with RStudio v. 3.3.0 [80]. We fitted individual dose response curves with either log-logistic or Weibull functions using the drc package [81], while dose response curves under combination treatment were fitted using spline functions. We used Pearson correlation coefficients to test for significant associations between the degree of synergy in growth and virulence factor inhibition. We used Welch's two-sample t-test to compare growth between the sensitive wildtype PAO1 and the resistant clones under antibiotic treatment. To compare the relative fitness of resistant clones to the reference zero line, we used one sample t-tests. Finally, we used analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare: (a) the growth of sensitive and resistant clones across combination treatments; (b) the relative fitness of evolved clones across treatments, and (c) whether the outcome of the competition experiment is associated with the degree of synergy of the drug combinations. Where necessary, p-values were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the false discovery rate method.

Acknowledgments

We thank Roland Regös and Désirée Bäder for advice on the Bliss model; Alex Hall, Roland Regös and Frank Schreiber for comments on the manuscripts; Ingrid Mignot and David Wilson for experimental support; Selina Niggli, Priyanikha Jayakumar and the Flow Cytometry Facility (University of Zurich) for support with flow cytometry experiments; and the Functional Genomics Center Zurich for technical support with the strain sequencing.

Funding

This project has received funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant no. 31003A_182499 to RK) and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 681295 to RK).

Competing Interests

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

References

1. Rossolini GM, Arena F, Pecile P, Pollini S. Update on the antibiotic resistance

crisis. Curr Opin Pharmacol. Elsevier Ltd; 2014;18: 56–60.

doi:10.1016/j.coph.2014.09.006

2. World Health Organization (WHO). Antimicrobial resistance: Global Health

Report on Surveillance [Internet]. Bulletin of the World Health Organization.

2014. doi:10.1007/s13312-014-0374-3

3. O'Neill J. Antimicrobial Resistance: Tackling a crisis for the health and wealth

of nations. Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. London; 2014.

doi:10.1038/510015a

4. 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. Elsevier;

2018;18: 318–327. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30753-3

5. Laxminarayan R, Matsoso P, Pant S, Brower C, Rottingen J-A, Klugman K, et

al. Access to effective antimicrobials: a worldwide challenge. Lancet. England;

2016;387: 168–175. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00474-2

6. Dickey SW, Cheung GYC, Otto M. Different drugs for bad bugs: antivirulence

strategies in the age of antibiotic resistance. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2017;16: 1–

15. doi:10.1038/nrd.2017.23

7. Brown D. Antibiotic resistance breakers: can repurposed drugs fill the antibiotic

discovery void? Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2015;14: 821–832. doi:10.1038/nrd4675

8. Allen RC, Popat R, Diggle SP, Brown SP. Targeting virulence: can we make

evolution-proof drugs? Nat Rev Microbiol. 2014;12: 300–308.

doi:10.1038/nrmicro3232

9. Vale PF, Fenton A, Brown SP. Limiting Damage during Infection: Lessons from
Infection Tolerance for Novel Therapeutics. PLOS Biol. 2014;12.
doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001769

10. Vale PF, McNally L, Doeschl-Wilson A, King KC, Popat R, Domingo-Sananes
MR, et al. Beyond killing. Evol Med Public Heal. 2016;2016: 148–157.
doi:10.1093/emph/eow012

11. Ternent L, Dyson RJ, Krachler AM, Jabbari S. Bacterial fitness shapes the
population dynamics of antibiotic-resistant and -susceptible bacteria in a model
of combined antibiotic and anti-virulence treatment. J Theor Biol. Elsevier;
2015;372: 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.02.011

12. Hentzer M, Wu H, Andersen JB, Riedel K, Rasmussen TB, Bagge N, et al.
Attenuation of Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence by quorum sensing
inhibitors. EMBO J. 2003;22: 3803–3815. doi:10.1093/emboj/cdg366

13. Banin E, Lozinski A, Brady KM, Berenshtein E, Butterfield PW, Moshe M, et al.
The potential of desferrioxamine-gallium as an anti-*Pseudomonas* therapeutic
agent. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105: 16761–16766.
doi:10.1073/pnas.0808608105

14. Zeng Z, Qian L, Cao L, Tan H, Huang Y, Xue X, et al. Virtual screening for
novel quorum sensing inhibitors to eradicate biofilm formation of Pseudomonas
aeruginosa. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol. 2008;79: 119–126. doi:10.1007/s00253-
008-1406-5

15. Jakobsen TH, Van Gennip M, Phipps RK, Shanmugham MS, Christensen LD,
Alhede M, et al. Ajoene, a sulfur-rich molecule from garlic, inhibits genes
controlled by quorum sensing. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2012;56: 2314–
2325. doi:10.1128/AAC.05919-11

16.   Michaud G, Visini R, Bergmann M, Salerno G, Bosco R, Gillon E, et al.

Overcoming antibiotic resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms using

glycopeptide dendrimers. Chem Sci. 2016;7: 166–182. doi:10.1039/c5sc03635f

17.   Goss CH, Kaneko Y, Khuu L, Anderson GD, Ravishankar S, Aitken ML, et al.

Gallium disrupts bacterial iron metabolism and has therapeutic effects in mice

and humans with lung infections. Sci Transl Med. 2018;10: eaat7520.

18.   Kirienko DR, Kang D, Kirienko N V. Novel Pyoverdine Inhibitors Mitigate

Pseudomonas aeruginosa Pathogenesis. Front Microbiol. 2019;9: 3317.

19.   Breidenstein EBM, de la Fuente-Núñez C, Hancock REW. *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa: all roads lead to resistance. Trends Microbiol. 2011;19: 419–426.

doi:10.1016/j.tim.2011.04.005

20.   Gellatly SL, Hancock REW. Pseudomonas aeruginosa: New insights into

pathogenesis and host defenses. Pathog Dis. 2013;67: 159–173.

doi:10.1111/2049-632X.12033

21.   Hentzer M, Riedel K, Rasmussen TB, Heydorn A, Andersen JB, Parsek MR, et

al. Inhibition of quorum sensing in Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilm bacteria

by a halogenated furanone compound Inhibition of quorum sensing in

Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilm bacteria by a halogenated furanone

compound. Microbiology. 2002;148: 87–102. doi:10.1099/00221287-148-1-87

22.   Rasmussen TB, Bjarnsholt T, Skindersoe ME, Hentzer M, Kristoffersen P, Köte

M, et al. Screening for Quorum-Sensing Inhibitors (QSI) by Use of a Novel

Genetic System, the QSI Selector. J Bacteriol. 2005;187: 1799 LP-1814.

doi:10.1128/JB.187.5.1799-1814.2005

23.   Defoirdt T. Quorum-Sensing Systems as Targets for Antivirulence Therapy.

Trends   Microbiol.   Elsevier   Ltd;   2018;26:   313–328.

doi:10.1016/j.tim.2017.10.005

24. Kaneko Y, Thoendel M, Olakanmi O, Britigan BE, Singh PK. The transition

metal gallium disrupts *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* iron metabolism and has

antimicrobial and antibiofilm activity. J Clin Invest. 2007;117: 877–888.

doi:10.1172/JCI30783

25. Smith DJ, Lamont IL, Anderson GJ, Reid DW. Targeting iron uptake to control

Pseudomonas aeruginosa infections in cystic fibrosis. Eur Respir J. 2013;42:

1723–36. doi:10.1183/09031936.00124012

26. Ross-Gillespie A, Weigert M, Brown SP, Kümmerli R. Gallium-mediated

siderophore quenching as an evolutionarily robust antibacterial treatment. Evol

Med Public Heal. 2014;2014: 18–29. doi:10.1093/emph/eou003

27. Imperi F, Massai F, Facchini M, Frangipani E, Visaggio D, Leoni L, et al.

Repurposing the antimycotic drug flucytosine for suppression of *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa pathogenicity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110: 7458–63.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1222706110

28. DeLeon K, Balldin F, Watters C, Hamood A, Griswold J, Sreedharan S, et al.

Gallium Maltolate Treatment Eradicates *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Infection in

Thermally Injured Mice. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2009;53: 1331–1337.

doi:10.1128/AAC.01330-08

29. Kelson AB, Carnevali M, Truong-Le V. Gallium-based anti-infectives: targeting

microbial iron-uptake mechanisms. Curr Opin Pharmacol. 2013;13: 707–716.

doi:10.1016/j.coph.2013.07.001

30. Bonchi C, Imperi F, Minandri F, Visca P, Frangipani E. Repurposing of gallium-

based drugs for antibacterial therapy. BioFactors. 2014;40: 303–312.

doi:10.1002/biof.1159

31. Hijazi S, Visca P, Frangipani E. Gallium-Protoporphyrin IX Inhibits
Pseudomonas aeruginosa Growth by Targeting Cytochromes. Front Cell Infect
Microbiol. 2017;7: 1–15. doi:10.3389/fcimb.2017.00012

32. Hijazi S, Visaggio D, Pirolo M, Frangipani E, Bernstein L, Visca P. Antimicrobial
activity of gallium compounds on ESKAPE pathogens. Front Cell Infect
Microbiol. 2018;8: 316.

33. Manny AJ, Kjelleberg S, Kumar N, de Nys R, Read RW, Steinberg P.
Reinvestigation of the sulfuric acid-catalysed cyclisation of brominated 2-
alkyllevulinic acids to 3-alkyl-5-methylene-2 (5H)-furanones. Tetrahedron.
Elsevier; 1997;53: 15813–15826.

34. Manefield M, de Nys R, Kumar N, Read R, Givskov M, Steinberg P, et al.
Evidence that halogenated furanones from Delisea pulchra inhibit acylated
homoserine lactone (AHL)-mediated gene expression by displacing the AHL
signal from its receptor protein. Microbiology. 1999;145 (Pt 2: 283–291.

35. Bassetti M, Vena A, Croxatto A, Righi E, Guery B. How to manage
Pseudomonas aeruginosa infections. Drugs Context. England; 2018;7: 212527.
doi:10.7573/dic.212527

36. Rehman A, Patrick WM, Lamont IL. Mechanisms of ciprofloxacin resistance in
pseudomonas aeruginosa: New approaches to an old problem. J Med
Microbiol. 2019;68: 1–10. doi:10.1099/jmm.0.000873

37. Poole K, Neshat S, Heinrichs DE, Zhao Q, Tetro K, Bianco N. Expression of
the multidrug resistance operon mexA-mexB-oprM in Pseudomonas
aeruginosa: mexR encodes a regulator of operon expression. Antimicrob
Agents Chemother. 2018;40: 2021–2028. doi:10.1128/aac.40.9.2021

38. Jochumsen N, Paulander W, Jensen RL, Folkesson A, Molin S, Jelsbak L, et

al. The evolution of antimicrobial peptide resistance in Pseudomonas

aeruginosa is shaped by strong epistatic interactions. Nat Commun. 2016;7:

13002. doi:10.1038/ncomms13002

39. Tsutsumi Y, Tomita H, Tanimoto K. Identification of Novel Genes Responsible

for Overexpression of ampC in Pseudomonas aeruginosa PAO1 . Antimicrob

Agents Chemother. 2013;57: 5987–5993. doi:10.1128/aac.01291-13

40. Muller C, Plésiat P, Jeannot K. A Two-Component Regulatory System

Interconnects Resistance to Polymyxins, Aminoglycosides, Fluoroquinolones,

and beta-Lactams in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob Agents

Chemother. 2011;55: 1211–1221. doi:10.1128/AAC.01252-10

41. Zhang L, Mah TF. Involvement of a novel efflux system in biofilm-specific

resistance to antibiotics. J Bacteriol. 2008;190: 4447–4452.

doi:10.1128/JB.01655-07

42. Quale J, Bratu S, Gupta J, Landman D. Interplay of efflux system, ampC, and

oprD expression in carbapenem resistance of Pseudomonas aeruginosa

clinical isolates. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2006;50: 1633–1641.

doi:10.1128/AAC.50.5.1633-1641.2006

43. Pan Y ping, Xu Y hong, Wang Z xin, Fang Y ping, Shen J lu. Overexpression of

MexAB-OprM efflux pump in carbapenem-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa.

Arch Microbiol. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2016;198: 565–571.

doi:10.1007/s00203-016-1215-7

44. Bolard A, Plesiat P, Jeannot K. Mutations in gene fusA1 as a novel mechanism

of aminoglycoside resistance. 2017; 33–3. doi:10.1128/AAC.01835-17

45. López-Causapé C, Rubio R, Cabot G, Oliver A. Evolution of the *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa Aminoglycoside Mutational Resistome In Vitro and in the Cystic

Fibrosis Setting. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2018;62: e02583-17.

doi:10.1128/AAC.02583-17

46. Acar JF. Antibiotic synergy and antagonism. Med Clin North Am. 2000;84:

1391–1406. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-7125(05)70294-7

47. Lehár J, Krueger AS, Avery W, Heilbut AM, Johansen LM, Price ER, et al.

Synergistic drug combinations tend to improve therapeutically relevant

selectivity. Nat Biotechnol. 2009;27: 659–666. doi:10.1038/nbt.1549

48. Alkawash MA, Soothill JS, Schiller NL. Alginate lyase enhances antibiotic

killing of mucoid Pseudomonas aeruginosa in biofilms. Apmis. 2006;114: 131–

138. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0463.2006.apm_356.x

49. Moreau-Marquis S, O'Toole GA, Stanton BA. Tobramycin and FDA-approved

iron chelators eliminate Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms on cystic fibrosis

cells. Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol. 2009;41: 305–313. doi:10.1165/rcmb.2008-

0299OC

50. Moreau-Marquis S, Coutermarsh B, Stanton BA. Combination of

hypothiocyanite and lactoferrin (ALX-109) enhances the ability of tobramycin

and aztreonam to eliminate Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms growing on

cystic fibrosis airway epithelial cells. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2015;70: 160–

166. doi:10.1093/jac/dku357

51. Luo J, Dong B, Wang K, Cai S, Liu T, Cheng X, et al. Baicalin inhibits biofilm

formation, attenuates the quorum sensing-controlled virulence and enhances

Pseudomonas aeruginosa clearance in a mouse peritoneal implant infection

model. PLOS One. 2017;12: 1–32.

52. Chait R, Craney A, Kishony R. Antibiotic interactions that select against

resistance. Nature. 2007;446: 668–671. doi:10.1038/nature05685

53. Hegreness M, Shoresh N, Damian D, Hartl D, Kishony R. Accelerated

evolution of resistance in multidrug environments. Proc Natl Acad Sci. National

Academy   of   Sciences;   2008;105:   13977–13981.

doi:10.1073/PNAS.0805965105

54. Baym M, Stone LK, Kishony R. Multidrug evolutionary strategies to reverse

antibiotic resistance. Science. 2016;351. doi:10.1126/science.aad3292

55. Maeda T, García-Contreras R, Pu M, Sheng L, Garcia LR, Tomás M, et al.

Quorum quenching quandary: resistance to antivirulence compounds. ISME J.

2012;6: 493–501. doi:10.1038/ismej.2011.122

56. Wale N, Sim DG, Jones MJ, Salathe R, Day T, Read AF. Resource limitation

prevents the emergence of drug resistance by intensifying within-host

competition.   Proc   Natl   Acad   Sci.   2017;   201715874.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1715874115

57. Mellbye B, Schuster M. The sociomicrobiology of antivirulence drug resistance:

a proof of concept. MBio. 2011;2: e00131-11. doi:10.1128/mBio.00131-11

58. Gerdt JP, Blackwell HE. Competition Studies Confirm Two Major Barriers That

Can Preclude the Spread of Resistance to Quorum-Sensing Inhibitors in

Bacteria. ACS Chem Biol. 2014;9: 2291–2299. doi:10.1021/cb5004288

59. Vega NM, Gore J. Collective antibiotic resistance: Mechanisms and

implications. Curr Opin Microbiol. Elsevier Ltd; 2014;21: 28–34.

doi:10.1016/j.mib.2014.09.003

60. Fischbach MA. Combination therapies for combating antimicrobial resistance.

Curr   Opin   Microbiol.   Elsevier   Ltd;   2011;14:   519–523.

doi:10.1016/j.mib.2011.08.003

61. Silver LL. Challenges of Antibacterial Discovery. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2011;24:

71–109. doi:10.1128/CMR.00030-10

62. Tepekule B, Uecker H, Derungs I, Frenoy A, Bonhoeffer S. Modeling antibiotic

treatment in hospitals: A systematic approach shows benefits of combination

therapy over cycling, mixing, and mono-drug therapies. PLOS Comput Biol.

2017;13: 1–22. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005745

63. Tyers M, Wright GD. Drug combinations: a strategy to extend the life of

antibiotics in the 21st century. Nat Rev Microbiol. Springer US; 2019;17: 141–

155. doi:10.1038/s41579-018-0141-x

64. Bayat Mokhtari R, Homayouni TS, Baluch N, Morgatskaya E, Kumar S, Das B,

et al. Combination therapy in combating cancer. Oncotarget. United States;

2017;8: 38022–38043. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.16723

65. Cihlar T, Fordyce M. Current status and prospects of HIV treatment. Curr Opin

Virol. 2016;18: 50–56. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coviro.2016.03.004

66. Ginsberg AM, Spigelman M. Challenges in tuberculosis drug research and

development. Nat Med. United States; 2007;13: 290–294.

doi:10.1038/nm0307-290

67. Zhou L, Slamti L, Nielsen-LeRoux C, Lereclus D, Raymond B. The Social

Biology of Quorum Sensing in a Naturalistic Host Pathogen System. Curr Biol.

Cell Press; 2014;24: 2417–2422. doi:10.1016/J.CUB.2014.08.049

68. Rezzoagli C, Granato E, Kuemmerli R. In vivo microscopy reveals the impact

of Pseudomonas aeruginosa social interactions on host colonization. ISME J.

2019;

69. Choi K-H, Schweizer HP. mini-Tn7 insertion in bacteria with single attTn7 sites:

example *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Nat Protoc. 2006;1: 153–161.

doi:10.1038/nprot.2006.24

70.   Kümmerli R, Jiricny N, Clarke LS, West SA, Griffin AS. Phenotypic plasticity of
a cooperative behaviour in bacteria. J Evol Biol. 2009;22: 589–598.
doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01666.x

71.   Özkaya Ö, Balbontín R, Gordo I, Xavier KB. Cheating on Cheaters Stabilizes
Cooperation in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Curr Biol. 2018;26: 2070–2080.
doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.04.093

72.   Ocampo PS, Lázár V, Papp B, Arnoldini M, Zur Wiesch PA, Busa-Fekete R, et
al. Antagonism between bacteriostatic and bactericidal antibiotics is prevalent.
Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014;58: 4573–4582. doi:10.1128/AAC.02463-
14

73.   Rezzoagli C, Wilson D, Weigert M, Wyder S, Kümmerli R. Probing the
evolutionary robustness of two repurposed drugs targeting iron uptake in
Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Evol Med Public Heal. 2018;1: 246–259.
doi:10.1093/emph/eoy026

74.   Morones-Ramirez JR, Winkler JA, Spina CS, Collins JJ. Silver Enhances
Antibiotic Activity Against Gram-Negative Bacteria. Sci Transl Med. 2013;5: 1–
12.

75.   Baeder DY, Yu G, Hozé N, Rolff J, Regoes RR. Antimicrobial combinations:
Bliss independence and Loewe additivity derived from mechanistic multi-hit
models. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci. 2016;371. Available:
http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/371/1695/20150294.abstract

76.   Barbosa C, Beardmore R, Schulenburg H, Jansen G. Antibiotic combination
efficacy (ACE) networks for a Pseudomonas aeruginosa model. PLOS Biol.
2018;16: 1–25.

77.   Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence   data.   Bioinformatics.   2014;30:   2114–2120.

doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

78. Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, et al. The

variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics. 2011/06/07. Oxford University

Press; 2011;27: 2156–2158. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr330

79. Ross-Gillespie A, Gardner A, West SA, Griffin AS. Frequency dependence and

cooperation: theory and a test with bacteria. Am Nat. 2007;170: 331–342.

doi:10.1086/519860

80. R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical

computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria; 2013.

81. Ritz C, Baty F, Streibig JC, Gerhard D. Dose-Response Analysis Using R.

PLOS One. 2015;10: 1–13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0146021

82. Higgins PG, Fluit AC, Milatovic D, Verhoef J, Schmitz FJ. Mutations in GyrA,

ParC, MexR and NfxB in clinical isolates of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Int J

Antimicrob Agents. 2003;21: 409–413. doi:10.1016/S0924-8579(03)00009-8

83. 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: 5761–5769. doi:10.1128/AAC.05391-

11

84. Lee JY, Park YK, Chung ES, Na IY, Ko KS. Evolved resistance to colistin and

its loss due to genetic reversion in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Sci Rep. Nature

Publishing Group; 2016;6: 1–13. doi:10.1038/srep25543

85. Barrow K, Kwon DH. Alterations in two-component regulatory systems of

phoPQ and pmrAB are associated with polymyxin B resistance in clinical

850   isolates of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2009;53:

851   5150–5154. doi:10.1128/AAC.00893-09

852 86. Sanz-garcía F, Hernando-amado S, Martínez L. Mutation-Driven Evolution of

853   Pseudomonas aeruginosa in the Presence of either Ceftazidime or

854   Ceftazidime-Avibactam. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2018;62: e01379-18.

855 87. Winsor GL, Griffiths EJ, Lo R, Dhillon BK, Shay JA, Brinkman FSL. Enhanced

856   annotations and features for comparing thousands of Pseudomonas genomes

857   in the Pseudomonas genome database. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015;44: D646–

858   D653. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv1227

859 88. Kahm M, Hasenbrink G, Ludwig J. grofit: Fitting Biological Growth Curves with

860   R. J Stat Softw. 2010;33: 1–21. doi:10.18637/jss.v033.i07

Figures

Figure 1. Antibiotic dose response curves for *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 populations.
We exposed PAO1 to all four antibiotics in two experimental media: CAA+Tf (iron-
limited casamino acids medium with transferrin) and CAS (casein medium). Except for
meropenem, higher concentrations of antibiotics were required to inhibit PAO1 in CAS
compared to CAA+Tf. Dots show means ± standard error across six replicates. All
data are scaled relative to the drug-free treatment. Data stem from two independent
experiments using different dilution series. The red dots indicate the highest
concentration used for the respective experiments, from which 7-serial dilution steps
were tested. Curves were fitted with either log-logistic functions (in CAA+Tf) or with
three-parameter Weibull functions (in CAS).

Figure 2. Antivirulence dose response curves for *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 populations (growth and virulence factor production). We exposed PAO1 to the antivirulence compounds gallium (inhibiting pyoverdine-mediated iron uptake) and furanone C-30 (blocking quorum sensing response including protease production) both in media where the targeted virulence factors are expressed and required (iron-limited CAA+Tf medium for gallium and CAS medium for furanone) and in control media where the targeted virulence factors are not required (iron-supplemented CAA+Fe medium for gallium and protein digested CAA for furanone). (**A**) Dose-response curves for growth show that both antivirulence compounds reduced bacterial growth, but more so in media where the targeted virulence factor is expressed. This demonstrates that there is a concentration window where the antivirulence compounds have no toxic effects on bacterial cells and just limit growth due to virulence factor quenching. (**B**) Dose-response curves for virulence factor production show that gallium and furanone C-30 effectively inhibit pyoverdine and protease production, respectively, in a concentration-dependent manner. Dots show means ± standard errors across six replicates. All data are scaled relative to the drug-free treatment. Data stem from two independent experiments using different dilution series. The red dots indicate the highest concentration used for the respective experiments, from which 7-serial dilution steps were tested. Curves were fitted with either log-logistic functions (in CAA+Tf) or with three-parameter Weibull functions (in CAS).

Figure 3. Dose response curves for *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 populations under antibiotic-antivirulence combination treatments. Dose-response curves for growth and virulence factor production for PAO1 were assessed for 9x9 drug concentration matrixes involving the four antibiotics combined with either gallium (**A**) or furanone C-30 (**B**). Experiments were carried out in media where the corresponding virulence factors are required for growth (pyoverdine: CAA+Tf; protease: CAS). Growth and virulence factor production were measured after 48 hours. All values are scaled relative to the untreated control, and data points show the mean across 12 replicates from two independent experiments. We used spline functions to fit the dose-response curves.

Figure 4: Drug interaction heatmaps for antibiotic-antivirulence combination treatments. We used the Bliss independence model to calculate the degree of synergy for every single drug combination with regard to growth suppression and virulence factor quenching shown in Figure 3. Heatmaps, depicting variation in drug interactions ranging from antagonism (blue) to synergy (red), are shown for gallium-antibiotic combinations (**A-D** for growth; **E-H** for pyoverdine production) and furanone-antibiotic combinations (**I-L** for growth; **M-P** for protease production). All calculations are based on 12 replicates from two independent experiments.

Figure 5: Effect of combination treatment on the fitness of antibiotic resistant clones. (**A**) Test of whether the addition of antivirulence compounds can restore growth suppression in antibiotic resistant clones (AtbR, in orange) relative to the susceptible wildtype (WT, in black). Under antibiotic treatment and in the absence of antivirulence compounds, all AtbR strains grow significantly better than the WT, a result that holds for both scaled (as shown above) and absolute growth. In the presence of antivirulence compounds (gray shaded area), growth suppression was restored in seven out of eight drug combinations (except for the furanone-ciprofloxacin combo). Antivirulence compound concentrations used for gallium: 1.56 µM (combo

low), 6.25 µM (combo medium), 12.5 µM (combo high); for furanone C-30: 6.1 µM (combo low), 22.8 µM (combo medium), 51.4 µM (combo high). Important to note is that all antivirulence compound concentrations do not or only mildly affect pathogen growth when applied as single treatments (Figure 2). All cell density values (measured with flow cytometry as number of events detected in 5 µl of culture, after 24 hours) are scaled relative to the untreated control. (**B**) Test of whether the addition of antivirulence compounds can revert selection for antibiotic resistance during competition between AtbR and WT, starting at a 1:9 ratio. The dashed lines denote fitness parity, where none of the competing strains has a fitness advantage. With no treatment, all AtbR strains showed a fitness disadvantage (fitness values < 0) compared to the WT. When treated with antibiotics alone, all AtbR strains experienced significant fitness advantages. When antivirulence compounds were added as adjuvants, this fitness advantage was lost for three drug combinations: meropenem-gallium, tobramycin-gallium, tobramycin-furanone C-30, thus showing reversal of AtbR selection. All data are shown as means ± standard errors across a minimum of eight replicates from two to three independent experiments. Significance levels are based on ANOVAs: n.s. = non-significant; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$. See Supplementary Table S3 for details on statistical analysis.

Table 1. List of mutations in the antibiotic resistant clones

AtbR clone[a,b]	Combination with	Gene[c]	Description	Mutation type[b]	Reference	Variant	Position[d]	Reference
CpR_1	Gallium Furanone C-30	*gyrB*	DNA gyrase subunit B	INDEL	CCCAGGAG	CG	5671	[36]
		mexR	Multidrug resistance operon repressor	INDEL	ATCAGTGCCT TGTCGCGGCA	AA	471547	[37,82]
CoR_1	Gallium	*phoQ*	Two-component sensor PhoQ	SNP	T	G	1279140	[38,83–85]
CoR_2	Furanone C-30	*phoQ*	Two-component sensor PhoQ	INDEL	T	TC	1279085	[38,83–85]
				SNP	T	C	1279089	
		PA1327	Probable protease	INDEL	CA	C	1440622	
MeR_1	Gallium	*mpl*	UDP-N-acetylmuramate:L-alanyl-gamma-D-glutamyl-meso-diaminopimelate ligase	SNP	T	G	4499740	[39,86]
MeR_2	Furanone C-30	*parR*	Two-component response regulator, ParR	SNP	C	T	1952257	[40]
		PA1874	Hypothetical protein (efflux pump)	COMPLEX	ACCGGG	CCCGTC	2039326	[41]
				SNP	A	G	2039485	
				SNP	C	T	2039494	
				SNP	T	C	2039512	
				SNP	G	A	2039517	
				SNP	T	C	2039524	

				COMPLEX	CGGG	TGGC	2039530	
		nalD	Transcriptional regulator NalD	SNP	A	C	4006981	[42,43]
TbR_1	Gallium	*fusA1*	Elongation factor G	SNP	C	T	4769121	[44]
				SNP	T	G	5253694	
TbR_2	Furanone C-30	*fusA1*	Elongation factor G	SNP	T	C	4770785	[44]
		pscP	Translocation protein in type III secretion system	INDEL	TG(TTGGCG)$_{x11}$	TG(TTGGCG)$_{x12}$	1844903	
		PA4132	Conserved hypothetical protein	SNP	A	C	4621443	

948 [a]The antibiotic resistant strains are referred to as AtbR throughout the text.

949 [b]Abbreviations: Atb: antibiotic; Cp: ciprofloxacin; Co: colistin; Me: meropenem; Tb: tobramycin; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism;

950 INDEL: insertion or deletion; COMPLEX: multiple consecutive SNPs .

951 [c]Mutations in the ancestor wildtype background compared to the reference PAO1 genome are reported in [73].

952 [d]Position on PAO1 reference genome [87].