Combining antibiotics with antivirulence compounds can have synergistic

effects and reverse selection for antibiotic resistance in *Pseudomonas*

aeruginosa

Chiara Rezzoagli[1,2,*], Martina Archetti[1,2,*], Ingrid Mignot[1], 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

[*] contributed equally to this work.

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 promising 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 abrogate or reverse selection for resistance in five drug combination cases. Molecular analyses suggest that selection against resistant clones 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 growth and the spread of antibiotic resistant strains. Such knowledge is, however, essential if such therapies are supposed to make their way into the clinics, as drug interactions and their effects on antibiotic resistance evolution will determine both the efficacy and

sustainability of treatments. Here, we tackle these open issues by combining four

different classes of antibiotics with two antivirulence compounds as treatments against

the opportunistic human pathogen *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, to test the nature of drug

interactions, and the usefulness of antivirulence compounds as adjuvants to combat

antibiotic sensitive and resistant strains.

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 [21]. Several antivirulence compounds targeting either the

species' quorum sensing (QS) [22–24] or siderophore-mediated iron uptake systems

[25–28] 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 [12,22], and gallium, targeting the iron-scavenging

pyoverdine and iron-metabolism [25,27,29–33].

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* [34].

As a consequence, it can disrupt QS-based communication by antagonistically

competing with the AHLs molecules for binding to the main QS (LasR) receptor in a

concentration dependent manner [12,35]. 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 [25,27]. Pyoverdine is

controlled in complex ways involving information on cell density and feedbacks from

iron uptake rates [36,37]. Gallium interferes with these regulatory circuits, whereby

cells intermittently upregulate pyoverdine production at low gallium concentrations to

compensate for the increased level of iron limitation, and down-regulate pyoverdine

production at higher gallium concentrations because iron uptake via this pathway is

unsuccessful [27]. Importantly, gallium drastically reduces pyoverdine availability at the

population level in a concentration-dependent manner [25,38].

We combined the two antivirulence compounds with four clinically relevant antibiotics

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

aeruginosa [39]. 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 restores growth inhibition and affects selection for antibiotic

resistance. Finally, we sequenced the genomes of the evolved antibiotic resistant

clones to understand the genetic basis that drive the observed effects on pathogen

growth and selection for or against antibiotic resistance.

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 (Fig 1) and the two anti-virulence compounds (Fig 2) in our experimental media. We found that the dose-response curves for antibiotics followed sigmoid functions (Fig 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. Since antibiotics curbed growth, they congruently also reduced the availability of virulence factors at the population level (S1 Fig).

Similarly shaped dose-response curves for growth (Fig 2A) and virulence factor production (Fig 2B) 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. Under such conditions, the reduced availability of virulence factors immediately feeds back on growth by inducing iron starvation (gallium) or the inability to degrade proteins (furanone). Crucially, the dose-response curves for growth 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

140 factor quenching alone. Conversely, high concentrations of antivirulence compounds

141 seem to have additional off-target effects reducing 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 (Fig 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 (Fig 3), but there were also

clear cases of non-symmetrical shifts, indicating synergy or antagonism between

drugs. We then used the Bliss model, representing the adequate model for drugs with

independent modes of actions, 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 (Fig 4), with many of these interactions being

significant (S2 Fig).

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

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

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

combinations showed significant levels of synergy at intermediate drug concentrations

(Fig 4E+F, S2 Fig). 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 (Fig 4C+G). Finally, for gallium-tobramycin combinations there were relatively strong significant synergistic interactions for both growth and pyoverdine inhibition at intermediate drug concentrations (Fig 4D+H, S2 Fig). Interestingly, we observed synergy with regard to pyoverdine inhibition for all drug combinations, indicating that the combination of low cell density induced by the antibiotics and gallium-mediated pyoverdine quenching is a successful strategy to repress this virulence factor.

Furanone-antibiotic combinations. For furanone-ciprofloxacin combinations, we found relatively strong significant antagonistic interactions with regard to growth inhibition (Fig 4I), whereas effects on protease inhibition were mostly independent (Fig 4M). In contrast, for furanone-colistin combinations we observed strong and significant synergistic drug interactions especially for intermediate and higher concentrations of the antivirulence compound for growth and protease inhibition (Fig 4J+N, S2 Fig). Furanone-meropenem, on the other hand, interacted mostly antagonistically with regard to growth and protease inhibition (Fig 4K+O). Conversely, for furanone-tobramycin combinations there were pervasive significant patterns of synergy across the entire drug combination range for growth and virulence factor inhibition (Fig 4L+P, S2 Fig).

Do the degrees of synergy for growth and virulence factor inhibition correlate? As the combination treatments affect both growth and virulence factor production, we examined whether the degrees of synergy correlate between the two traits (S3 Fig). 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: $r = 0.75$, $t_{79} = 10.16$, $p < 0.001$).

Antibiotic resistance can lead to collateral sensitivity and cross-resistance to

antivirulence compounds

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, isolated, and analyzed antibiotic resistant clones (AtbR). We

aimed for one clone per antibiotic and medium. In the end, we examined seven clones,

as only one selection line survived the ciprofloxacin selection regime (see methods for

details). We then assessed the dose-response curve of these clones for the respective

antibiotics to confirm and quantify their level of resistance (S4 Fig). We further

established the dose-response curves of all AtbR clones for the two antivirulence

compounds to test for collateral sensitivity and cross-resistance. Here, we compared

the IC50 (half maximal inhibitory concentration) values between the AtbR and wildtype

strain (Fig S5), and found evidence for weak but significant collateral sensitivity

between colistin and gallium and relatively strong collateral sensitivity between

tobramycin and furanone. Conversely, we found that resistance to ciprofloxacin,

colistin and also to some extent to meropenem can confer cross-resistance to furanone

(all statistical analyses are shown in S5 Fig).

Based on these experiments, we picked two concentrations for gallium (low: 1.56 µM;

intermediate: 6.25 µM) and furanone (low: 6.3 µM; intermediate: 22.8 µM) as adjuvants

in combination with antibiotics to test whether antivirulence compounds can restore

growth inhibition of and alter selection for AtbR clones.

Antivirulence compounds as adjuvants can restore growth inhibition of

antibiotic resistant strains

In a first set of experiments, we subjected all AtbR clones and the antibiotic-sensitive

wildtype to antivirulence treatments alone and to combination treatments with

antibiotics (Fig 5). For gallium, we observed that the wildtype and AtbR clones

responded almost identically to the antivirulence compounds in the absence of

antibiotics, showing that AtbR clones are still sensitive to gallium (Fig 5A). When

treated with antibiotics, we observed that the addition of anti-virulence compounds

consistently reduced growth of all AtbR clones (Fig 5A). The level of synergy between

drugs is similar for wildtype and AtbR clones, with the effects being close to zero

(varying between weak antagonism and weak synergy) in most cases. Altogether,

these findings indicate that gallium acts independently to all the tested antibiotics and

is still able induce iron starvation and thus reduce growth in AtbR clones. Important to

note is that gallium has a stronger growth inhibitory effect in this experiment compared

to the dose-response curve analysis (S5 Fig, collected after 48 hours), because this experiment run for 24 hours only.

For furanone, the patterns were more diverse (Fig 5B). There were two cases of full cross-resistance (ciprofloxacin and meropenem), where the addition of furanone no longer had any effect on bacterial growth. In these cases, we observed a change from weak drug synergy (for the wildtype) to strong drug antagonism (for the AtbR clones). In contrast, we found a strong shift from weak antagonism (for the wildtype) to strong drug synergy (for the AtbR clone) when furanone was combined with colistin. In this case, furanone re-potentiated the antibiotic. Note that we initially also observed a certain level of cross-resistance for this drug combination (S5 Fig), however only at much higher furanone concentrations than those used here. Finally, the pattern between tobramycin and furanone was driven by collateral sensitivity, where the addition of furanone to the AtbR clone completely restored growth inhibition.

Antivirulence as adjuvants can abrogate or reverse selection for antibiotic resistance

We then investigated whether antivirulence compounds alone or in combination with antibiotics can influence the spread of AtbR clones in mixed populations with susceptible wildtype cells (Fig 6). First, we competed the AtbR clones against the susceptible wildtype in the absence of any treatment and observed that AtbR clones consistently lost the competitions (one sample t-tests, $-13.50 \le t_{15\text{-}26} \le -2.62$, $p \le 0.050$ for all comparisons). This confirms that antibiotic resistance is costly and is selected against in the absence of treatment. We then added the antivirulence drug alone using the same concentrations as for the monoculture experiments (Fig 5). We found that

the AtbR clones did not experience a selective advantage in 14 out 16 cases, with the exception being one colistin resistant clone that slightly increased in frequency (Fig 6). This analysis shows that the cost of AtbR resistance is largely maintained in the presence of antivirulence compounds. Next, we exposed the mixed cultures to the antibiotics alone and observed that, as expected, AtbR clones always experienced a significant fitness advantage under treatment (one sample t-test, $4.54 \leq t_{19\text{-}26} \leq 13.41$, $p < 0.001$ for all combinations).

When combining antivirulence compounds with antibiotics, three different relative fitness patterns emerged for AtbR clones. In three cases (colistin-gallium, ciprofloxacin-furanone and meropenem-furanone), AtbR clones experienced large fitness advantages and were selectively favored regardless of whether the antivirulence compound was present or not. In four cases (ciprofloxacin-gallium, meropenem-gallium, tobramycin-gallium, colistin-furanone), the addition of antivirulence compounds gradually reduced the relative fitness of the AtbR clones, whereby in two cases (meropenem-gallium, tobramycin-gallium) the selective advantage of AtbR clones was completely abrogated. Finally, in one case (tobramycin-furanon) selection for AtbR clones was even reversed and AtbR clones lost the competition.

Drug synergy does not predict selection against antibiotic resistance

We examined whether drug interactions, ranging from antagonism to synergy for both AtbR clones and the wildtype (Fig 5) correlate with their relative fitness in competition under combination treatments. However, we found no support for such associations (S6 Fig, ANOVA, AtbR: $F_{1,65} = 0.88$, $p = 0.353$; WT: $F_{1,65} = 1.85$, $p = 0.179$, but instead

observed that variation in fitness patterns was explained by specific drug combinations

(antivirulence-antibiotic interaction, AtbR: $F_{3,65} = 37.45$, $p < 0.001$, WT: $F_{3,65} = 14.50$, p

< 0.001).

Genetic basis 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 [40]. In addition, we identified an 18-bp deletion in the *mexR* gene, encoding

a multidrug efflux pump repressor [41]. 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 [42]. 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* [43]. 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 [44]; (ii)

7 mutations in the *PA1874* gene, which encodes an efflux pump [45]; (iii) one non-

synonymous SNP in *nalD*, encoding the transcriptional regulator NalD, which regulates

the expression of drug-efflux systems [46,47]. 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 [48,49].

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 (Fig 3+4). We then used antivirulence

compounds as adjuvants and observed that they can restore growth inhibition of

antibiotic resistant clones in six out of eight cases (Fig 5). Finally, we performed

competition assays between antibiotic resistant and susceptible strains under single

and combinatorial drug treatments and found that antivirulence compounds can reduce

(two cases), abrogate (two cases) or even reverse (one case) selection for antibiotic resistance (Fig 6).

Our results identify antibiotic-antivirulence combinations as a potentially powerful tool to efficiently treat infections of troublesome nosocomial pathogens such as *P. aeruginosa*. From the eight combinations analyzed, 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 restored growth inhibition of antibiotic resistant clones, and even re-potentiated tobramycin in the case of furanone; and (iii) antivirulence compounds either abrogated (for gallium) or even reversed (for furanone) selection for tobramycin resistance, due to collateral sensitivity in the latter case. Meropenem-gallium emerged as an additional promising combination, as this combination also restored growth inhibition of the antibiotic resistant clone and abrogated its selective advantage, despite this drug combination showing slight but significant antagonistic effects.

Drug synergy is desirable from a clinical perspective because it allows to use lower drug concentrations, thereby minimizing side effects while maintaining treatment efficacy [50,51]. 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* [12,13,15–18,23,52,53]. While some of these studies have used a few specific concentration combinations to qualitatively assess synergy, we here present 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 (Fig 4, S2 Fig). 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 maximize treatment efficacy while minimizing toxicity for the patient. A

crucial next step would be to test whether the same type of drug interactions can be

recovered in animal host models.

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 [54–56]. 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 [54]. We suspected that such effects might

also occur for antagonistic antibiotic-antivirulence treatments, and indeed the

meropenem-gallium combination discussed above matches this pattern. However,

when comparing across all the eight combinations, we found no evidence that the

selection for or against antibiotic resistant clones correlates with the type of drug

interaction (S6 Fig). A possible explanation for the overall absence of an 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 [54,56].

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

compromised or maintained. For instance, any resistance mechanism that reduces

antibiotic entry or increases its efflux could conceivably confer cross-resistance to

antivirulence compounds, which should in turn maintain or even potentiate and not

reverse selection for antibiotic resistance. This phenomenon could explain the patterns

observed for furanone in combination with ciprofloxacin and meropenem, where in both

cases our sequencing analysis revealed mutations in genes regulating efflux pumps

(Table 1). Since furanone needs to enter the cells to become active, these mutations,

known to confer resistance to antibiotics [41,42,45], likely also confer resistance to

furanone [57]. In contrast, efflux pumps upregulation cannot work as a cross-resistance

mechanism against gallium, which binds to secreted pyoverdine and thus acts outside

the cell [38].

Alternatively, competitive interactions between resistant and sensitive pathogens over

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

malaria parasites [58]. 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 [27,59,60]. 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 [48]. Similar social effects could explain selection abrogation in the case of meropenem-gallium combination. Here, the meropenem resistant clone has a mutation in *mpl*, which can trigger the overexpression of the β-lactamase *ampC* resistance mechanism [43]. Since β-lactamase enzyme secretion and extracellular antibiotic degradation is itself a cooperative behaviour [61], 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 abrogated and 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 [62–65]. They are already applied to a number of diseases, including cancer [66], HIV [67] and tuberculosis infections [68]. 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 [62]. The level of evolutionary robustness of the

antivirulence compound would be of particular importance here, as it is known to vary

across compounds [27,38]. For example, previous studies showed that resistance to

furanone can arise relatively easily [57] while gallium seems to be more evolutionarily

robust [38]. 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 [69,70]. Relevant in this context

would also be tests that closely examine the toxicity of the antivirulence compounds

for mammalian cells, an aspect that has received little attention so far [17,71]. Third,

our findings suggest that the beneficial effects of combination therapy depend on the

specific antibiotic resistance mechanism involved. This hypothesis should be tested in

more detail by using sets of mutants that are resistant to the same antibiotic but through

different mechanisms. Finally, the observed patterns of drug synergy and reversed

selection for resistance are concentration dependent (Fig 4-5). Thus, detailed research

on drug delivery and the pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics of combination

therapies would be required [56], especially to determine the drug interaction patterns

within patients.

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 [72]. The gentamycin resistance cassette, required to select for transformed clones, was subsequently removed using the pFLP2-encoded recombinase [72]. 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

FeCl₃, but without apo-transferrin and 20 mM NaHCO₃ to create conditions that do not

require pyoverdine for growth [36].

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 [73]. 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 (S7A Fig). To solve this issue, we used mCherry fluorescence intensity as a

reliable proxy for growth in CAS (S7B-C Fig).

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 GaNO₃ 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 OD₆₀₀ (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 (S8 Fig) 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 [74].

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

fluorescence (excitation 400 nm, emission 460 nm, a readout that scales linearly with

pyoverdine concentration in the medium) and protease production in the cell-free

supernatant using the protease azocasein assay (adapted from [38] 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 S9 Fig).

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. (S2 Table).

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 [75–77]. The Bliss model has been suggested as the best model of

choice for drugs with different modes of actions and targets [76], as it is the case for

antibiotics and antivirulence compounds. 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 [38] for a

description on the experimental evolution). Altogether, we had seven clones (one clone

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

of these clones, we re-established the drug-response curves in either CAA+Tf or CAS

and quantified the IC50 values (S4 Fig). For all cases, the IC50 of the AtbR clones was

significantly higher than the ones of the antibiotic-sensitive wildtype (-187.30 ≤ t ≤ -

3.10, p < 0.01 for all AtbR clones; S4 Fig). Furthermore, we examined whether

resistance to antibiotics can lead to collateral sensitivity or cross-resistance to

antivirulence compounds, and that is why also established the dose-response curves

for all the seven AtbR clones for the respective antivirulence compounds. As before,

we exposed the clones and the wildtype PAO1 to a range of gallium (0-50 µM) or

furanone (0-390 µM) concentrations in CAA+Tf or CAS, respectively, and compared

their IC50 values.

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 [78], 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 [79]. The

mapping files generated in this study are deposited in the European Nucleotide Archive

(ENA) under the study accession number PRJEB32766.

Monoculture and competition experiments between sensitive and resistant

clones

To examine the effects of combination treatments on the growth and the relative fitness

of antibiotic resistant clones, we subjected the sensitive wildtype PAO1 (tagged with

GFP) and the experimentally evolved antibiotic resistant clones (Table 1), alone or in

competition, to six different conditions: (i) no drug treatment; (ii) antibiotics alone; (iii-

iv) two concentrations of antivirulence compounds alone and (v-vi) the same two

concentrations of antivirulence compounds combined with antibiotics. Antibiotic

concentrations are listed in the S2 Table, while antivirulence concentrations were as

follows, gallium: 1.56 µM (low), 6.25 µM (intermediate); furanone: 6.3 µM (low), 22.8

µM (intermediate). 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 six treatment regimes. We used flow cytometry to assess strain

frequency prior and after a 24 hours competition period at 37°C static (S10 Fig).

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 [80]. 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 for each individual experimental replicate

for how the relative fitness of PAO1-untagged varies as a function of cell density in

control competitions with PAO1-GFP. Coefficients of the asymptotic functions used for

the correction are available together with the raw dataset.

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed with RStudio v. 3.3.0 [81]. We fitted individual

dose response curves with either log-logistic or Weibull functions, and estimated and

compared IC50 values using the drc package [82], 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 one-sample t-tests to compare the degree of

synergy of each combination of concentrations represented in Fig 4 to zero. 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 test whether the addition of antivirulence

compounds to antibiotics affected the relative fitness of AtbR clones, and 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; 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. Rezzoagli C, Granato ET, Kümmerli R. Harnessing bacterial interactions to
manage infections: A review on the opportunistic pathogen Pseudomonas
aeruginosa as a case example. J Med Microbiol. 2020;69: 147–161.
doi:10.1099/jmm.0.001134

22. 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

23. 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

24.   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

25.   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

26.   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

27.   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

28.   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

29.   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

30.   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

31.   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

32.   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

33.   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.

34.   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.

35.   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.

36.   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

37.   Visca P, Imperi F, Lamont IL. Pyoverdine siderophores: from biogenesis to

biosignificance. Trends Microbiol. 2007;15: 22–30.

doi:10.1016/j.tim.2006.11.004

38.   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

39.   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

40.   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

41.   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

42.   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

43.   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

44.   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

45.   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

46.   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

47.   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

48.   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

49.   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

50.   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

51.   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

52.   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

53.   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.

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

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

55.   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

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

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

57.   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

58.   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

59.   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

60.   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

61.   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

62.   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

63.   Silver LL. Challenges of Antibacterial Discovery. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2011;24:
71–109. doi:10.1128/CMR.00030-10

64.   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

65.   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

66.   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

67.   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

68.   Ginsberg AM, Spigelman M. Challenges in tuberculosis drug research and
development. Nat Med. United States; 2007;13: 290–294. doi:10.1038/nm0307-
290

69.   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

70.   Rezzoagli C, Granato E, Kuemmerli R. In vivo microscopy reveals the impact of
Pseudomonas aeruginosa social interactions on host colonization. ISME J.

2019;

71.   Proctor CR, McCarron PA, Ternan NG. Furanone quorum-sensing inhibitors with

898   potential as novel therapeutics against Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Med

899   Microbiol. 2020;69: 195–206. doi:10.1099/jmm.0.001144

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

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

902   doi:10.1038/nprot.2006.24

903   73.   Özkaya Ö, Balbontín R, Gordo I, Xavier KB. Cheating on Cheaters Stabilizes

904   Cooperation in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Curr Biol. 2018;26: 2070–2080.

905   doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.04.093

906   74.   Ocampo PS, Lázár V, Papp B, Arnoldini M, Zur Wiesch PA, Busa-Fekete R, et

907   al. Antagonism between bacteriostatic and bactericidal antibiotics is prevalent.

908   Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014;58: 4573–4582. doi:10.1128/AAC.02463-

909   14

910   75.   Morones-Ramirez JR, Winkler JA, Spina CS, Collins JJ. Silver Enhances

911   Antibiotic Activity Against Gram-Negative Bacteria. Sci Transl Med. 2013;5: 1–

912   12.

913   76.   Baeder DY, Yu G, Hozé N, Rolff J, Regoes RR. Antimicrobial combinations: Bliss

914   independence and Loewe additivity derived from mechanistic multi-hit models.

915   Philos   Trans   R   Soc   B   Biol   Sci.   2016;371.   Available:

916   http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/371/1695/20150294.abstract

917   77.   Barbosa C, Beardmore R, Schulenburg H, Jansen G. Antibiotic combination

918   efficacy (ACE) networks for a Pseudomonas aeruginosa model. PLOS Biol.

919   2018;16: 1–25.

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

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

doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

79. 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

80. 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

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

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

82. 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

83. 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

84. 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

85. 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

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

and pmrAB are associated with polymyxin B resistance in clinical isolates of

Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2009;53: 5150–

5154. doi:10.1128/AAC.00893-09

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

Pseudomonas aeruginosa in the Presence of either Ceftazidime or Ceftazidime-

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

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

annotations and features for comparing thousands of Pseudomonas genomes

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

D653. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv1227

 Figures legends

Fig 1. Antibiotic dose response curves for *P. aeruginosa* PAO1. 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).

Fig 2. Antivirulence dose response curves for *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 (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).

Fig 3. Dose response curves for *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 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.

Fig 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 Fig 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.

Fig 5: Effect of combination treatment on growth of antibiotic resistant clones.
Test of whether the addition of gallium (**A**) or furanone (**B**) 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 grew significantly better than the WT (two-sample t-tests, -
26.63 ≤ $t_{21\text{-}40}$ ≤ -3.03, p < 0.01 for all treatment combinations; n.s. = non-significant; * p
<0.05; ** p <0.01; *** p <0.001), a result that holds for both scaled (as shown above)
and absolute growth. In the presence of antivirulence compounds (upper series of
panels without antibiotics (-Atb); lower series of panels with antibiotics (+Atb)), growth
suppression was restored in six out of eight cases. The exceptions were the
ciprofloxacin-furanone and meropenem-furanone combinations. The bottom series of
panels shows the degree of drug synergy for the wildtype and the AtbR clones. 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. All data are shown
as means ± standard errors across a minimum of 16 replicates from 4 to 6 independent
experiments.

1025

Fig 6: Effect of combination treatment on the relative fitness of antibiotic resistant clones. Test of whether antivirulence compounds alone or in combination with antibiotics can abrogate or revert selection for antibiotic resistance. All AtbR clones were competed against the susceptible wildtype (WT) for 24 hours, starting at a 1:9 ratio. The dashed lines denote fitness parity, where none of the competing strains has a fitness advantage. In the absence of any treatment, all AtbR clones showed a fitness disadvantage (fitness values < 0) compared to the WT, demonstrating the cost of resistance. When treated with antivirulence compounds alone, the AtbR clones did not experience any selective advantage in 14 out of 16 cases (exception: colistin-gallium combinations). When treated with antibiotics alone, all AtbR clones experienced significant fitness advantages (fitness values > 0), as expected. When antivirulence compounds were added as adjuvants to antibiotics, the fitness advantage of AtbR clones was reduced, abrogated or reversed for six out of eight drug combinations. All data are shown as means ± standard errors across a minimum of 16 replicates from 4 to 7 independent experiments. Significance levels are based on t-tests or ANOVAs: n.s. = non-significant; * p <0.05; ** p <0.01; *** p <0.001. See Table S1 for full details on the statistical analyses.

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	[40]
		mexR	Multidrug resistance operon repressor	INDEL	ATCAGTGCCT TGTCGCGGCA	AA	471547	[41,83]
CoR_1	Gallium	*phoQ*	Two-component sensor PhoQ	SNP	T	G	1279140	[42,84–86]
CoR_2	Furanone C-30	*phoQ*	Two-component sensor PhoQ	INDEL	T	TC	1279085	[42,84–86]
				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	[43,87]
MeR_2	Furanone C-30	*parR*	Two-component response regulator, ParR	SNP	C	T	1952257	[44]
		PA1874	Hypothetical protein (efflux pump)	COMPLEX	ACCGGG	CCCGTC	2039326	[45]
				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	[46,47]
TbR_1	Gallium	*fusA1*	Elongation factor G	SNP	C	T	4769121	[48]
				SNP	T	G	5253694	
TbR_2	Furanone C-30	*fusA1*	Elongation factor G	SNP	T	C	4770785	[48]
		pscP	Translocation protein in type III secretion system	INDEL	TG(TTGGCG)$_{x11}$	TG(TTGGCG)$_{x12}$	1844903	
		PA4132	Conserved hypothetical protein	SNP	A	C	4621443	

1046

1047 [a]The antibiotic resistant strains are referred to as AtbR throughout the text.

1048 [b]Abbreviations: Atb: antibiotic; Cp: ciprofloxacin; Co: colistin; Me: meropenem; Tb: tobramycin; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism;

1049 INDEL: insertion or deletion; COMPLEX: multiple consecutive SNPs .

1050 [c]Mutations in the ancestor wildtype background compared to the reference PAO1 genome are reported in [38].

1051 [d]Position on PAO1 reference genome [88].

1052