1 Resistance against natural antimicrobial peptides

2

3 **Genomic signature of experimental adaptation of *Staphylococcus***
 4 ***aureus* to a natural combination of insect antimicrobial peptides**

5

6 Olga Makarova^{*,1,2}, Paul Johnston^{*,1,3,4}, Alexandro Rodriguez-Rojas¹, Baydaa el-Shazely^{1,5},
 7 Javier Moreno Morales¹, Jens Rolff^{1,3,6#}

8

9 ¹. Evolutionary Biology, Institut für Biologie, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany; ².
 10 Institute for Animal Hygiene and Environmental Health, Centre for Infection Medicine,
 11 Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany; ³. Berlin Center for Genomics in Biodiversity
 12 Research, Berlin, Germany; ⁴. Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland
 13 Fisheries (IGB), Berlin, Germany; ⁵. Zoology Department, Alexandria University, Egypt, ⁶.
 14 Berlin-Brandenburg Institute of Advanced Biodiversity Research (BBIB), Berlin,
 15 Germany

16 *the authors contributed equally to this work

17 #corresponding author: Jens Rolff

18

19 Jens Rolff

20 Evolutionary Biology

21 Institute for Biology

22 Free University of Berlin

23 Königin-Luise-Strasse 1-3

24 D-14195 Berlin

25 Germany

26 jens.rolff@fu-berlin.de

27 T; ++49 (0)30 838 54893

28

29 Subject category: Evolutionary Genetics

Abstract

Antimicrobial peptides are highly conserved immune effectors across the tree of life and are employed as combinations. In the beetle *Tenebrio molitor*, a defensin and a coleopteracin are highly expressed *in vivo* after inoculation with *S. aureus*. The defensin displays strong *in vitro* activity but no survival benefit *in vivo*. The coleopteracin provides a survival benefit *in vivo*, but no activity *in vitro*. To investigate this paradox we experimentally evolved *S. aureus* to increased resistance against the defensin and a combination of the defensin and coleopteracin. Genome re-sequencing showed that resistance was associated with mutations in either the *ytr* or *nsa* operons, in both AMP treatments. Strains with these mutations show longer lag phases, slower Vmax and *nsa* mutants reach lower final population sizes. Mutations in *rpoB* were showed a further increase in the lag phase in *nsa* mutants but not in *ytr* mutants. In contrast, final MICs do not segregate by mutation. All resistant lines display AMP but not antibiotic cross-resistance. Costly resistance against AMPs readily evolves for an individual AMP as well as a naturally occurring combination *in vitro* and provides broad protection against AMPs. Such non-specific resistance could result in strong selection on host immune systems that rely on cocktails of AMPs.

Introduction

In antibiotic treatments, often single drugs are successfully used to clear infections. Yet, in innate immune systems, infections typically result in the expression and release of cocktails of antimicrobial peptides ¹⁻³, even though individual antimicrobial peptides can be very potent ⁴. Possible evolutionary explanations are physiological cost savings, for example, if immune effectors synergize and hence reduce the total amount of effectors required for clearance. Other possible explanations are that resistance evolution has a lower probability if bacteria are under selection from multiple antimicrobials ⁵, or a high probability of mixed infections.

Bacteria have evolved a number of resistance mechanisms that provide protection against ubiquitous AMPs. As most AMPs target the cell envelope and are often cationic, most described resistance mechanisms are related to changes in the cell wall such as altering the net cell surface charge ⁶. In the case of *S. aureus*, the antimicrobial peptide sensing system GraRS ⁷ regulates the *dlt* operon, which controls D-alanylation of the wall teichoic acids ⁸ and *mprF* expression, which is responsible for peptidoglycan lysinylation⁶ as well as the Bce-type ABC transporter vreFG which confers broad-spectrum AMP resistance. Two additional Bce-type ABC transporters, BraDE and vraDE, are under the control of the nisin susceptibility-associated two-component system NsaSR (also known as BceS/BceR ⁹ and BraS/BraR ¹⁰)

In a recent experimental evolution study investigating *S. aureus* resistance evolution against three different AMPs from different organisms (melittin, pexiganan and iseganan ¹¹), we found a range of mutations associated with resistance ¹². These mutations did not segregate by AMP.

An interesting observation is that during an infection antimicrobial peptides are expressed that have no known activity against the agent of infection. This is surprising, given that insects for example have different receptors that can distinguish between classes of infectious microbes such as fungi or bacteria ¹³ and energetic costs of protein synthesis are considered to be high³. Moreover, recent studies, for example in bumble bees, have also shown pathogen strain specific responses on the level of the transcriptome ¹⁴. In the mealworm beetle *Tenebrio molitor* experimental infection with *S. aureus* induces the expression of at least ten antimicrobial peptides for a week ³. A proteomic analysis shows that the majority of these inducible antimicrobial peptides remain elevated in the haemolymph after three weeks ¹⁵. While some of them such as Tenecin 1, a defensin, show high activity against *S. aureus in vitro*, other abundant AMPs such as Tenecin 2, a coleopteracin, display no activity against *S. aureus* ¹⁶. This is contrasted by studies using a gene knock-down approach *in vivo* ¹⁷. While the knock-down of *tenecin 1* did not change host survival, the knock-down of *tenecin 2* led to highly increased mortality of *T. molitor* 3 days after *S. aureus* infection. This clearly indicates that Tenecin 2 has an unknown role or activity *in vivo*.

Here we explore antimicrobial peptide resistance evolution *in vitro* against a pair of naturally co-expressed AMPs in *T. molitor*. Using an experimental evolution protocol, we selected *S. aureus* for resistance against the *T. molitor* defensin Tenecin 1, either alone or in combination with Tenecin 2. We then investigated if resistance evolution results in fitness costs and if the presence of Tenecin 2 changes the outcome of resistance evolution against the potent Tenecin 1. The resulting strains were re-sequenced to identify mutations associated with AMP resistance and to study the degree of parallel evolution.

103 **Materials and Methods**

104 **Bacterial strains and culturing conditions**

105 *Staphylococcus aureus* strain SH1000 and *Escherichia coli* strain MG1655 were used in
106 the experiments. Bacterial cultures were grown in non-cation adjusted Mueller Hinton
107 Broth (MHB) (Panreac Applichem GmbH) at 37°C with mild shaking and plated on
108 Mueller Hinton Agar (MHA), unless stated otherwise.

109 **Antimicrobial peptides**

110 Mealworm *Tenebrio molitor* antimicrobial peptides Tenecin 1
111 (VTCDILSVEAKGVKLNDAAACAAHCLFRGRSGGYCNGKRVCVCR) and Tenecin 2
112 (SLQPGAPSFPQNGGWSVNPSVGRDERGNTRTNVEVQHKGDHDFNAGWGKVIKKE
113 KGSPTWHVGGSEFRF) were chemically synthesised by Peptide Protein Research Ltd
114 (Funtley, UK). To avoid multiple freeze-thaw cycles and prevent binding of the peptides
115 to the vials during storage, peptides were re-suspended in sterile water to the final
116 peptide concentration of 5 mg/ml and glycerol concentration 50% and stored at -20°C
117 in sterile glass vials, which were pre-treated with “Piranha” solution (3 parts of
118 concentrated sulfuric acid and 1 part of 30% hydrogen peroxide solution).

119 **Selection experiment**

120 Prior to selection, bacteria were pre-adapted to the experimental conditions (following
121 ^{18,19}). For this, three randomly selected clones of *S. aureus* strain SH1000 were picked
122 from a Tryptic Soy agar plate, inoculated individually into 10 ml MHB and incubated
123 overnight with shaking at 37°C. To mimic experimental conditions, the cultures were
124 then diluted 1:1000 and incubated at 37°C without agitation in 50 ml polypropylene
125 Falcon tubes containing 3.7 ml MHB. The specific volume of MHB used for pre-
126 adaptation was calculated to ensure the same surface-area-to-volume ratio as in 96-well
127 plates that were used in the evolution experiment. Pre-adaptation was carried out as
128 described above by serial passage every 24 hours (to allow for approximately 36
129 doublings) for 8 days, with daily measurements of optical density at 600 nm,

contamination checks by plating out on MHA and cryopreservation of culture aliquots at -80°C in 12% glycerol solution. One “ancestor” line was used to establish the initial MIC value for Tenecin 1.

For the selection protocol, five independent parallel selection lines (numbered 1 to 5) were founded by plating the pre-adapted “ancestor” line on MHA and isolating five random colonies. The experiment was performed at 37°C without shaking in a microplate reader (Synergy 2, Biotek). We used flat bottom polypropylene non-binding 96-well plates (Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Germany) to avoid attachment of the peptides to the plastic surfaces covered with clear polystyrene lids with condensation rings (Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Germany). The plates were filled with MHB, with the total volume of 200 µl per well. Growth curves were generated by taking measurements of OD₆₀₀ every 30 minutes (preceded by a brief shaking for 10 seconds) for 23 hours. For each of the five replicate lines there were two experimental conditions – Tenecin 1 or a combination of Tenecin 1 + Tenecin 2, as well as four controls - negative control (culture medium control), two glycerol controls - for each AMP treatment - to account for the increasing concentrations of glycerol at higher concentrations of peptides, in which they were stored, and a non-selected control. The serial passage started at 1/2 x MIC, which corresponded to 4 µg/ml for Tenecin 1 and 8 µg/ml for Tenecin 2. To inoculate the treatment wells and the respective control wells, overnight cultures of the five replicate lines were diluted 1:100 and sub-cultured until OD₆₀₀ 0.5 (corresponding to 1x10⁸ cfu/ml), then 10 µl of these cultures were inoculated into each treatment and control (except NTC) wells resulting in the final total volume of 200 µl and bacterial density of approximately 1x10⁶ cfu per well. If the OD₆₀₀ values in the AMP treatment wells were at least half that of the respective non-selected controls after 23 hours of incubation, 2 µl (1:100) from each treatment and control well were transferred using a multichannel pipette to a fresh 96 well plate and the concentration of AMPs was doubled. Twenty µl of the remaining cultures were added to 180 µl of sterile 0.9% NaCl and then serially

diluted (typically from 10^{-1} to 10^{-5}) and checked for contamination and viable counts by plating 5 μ l of each dilution on MH-agar using the drop plate method and incubating the plates overnight at 30°C. Glycerol was added to the rest of the cultures to the final concentration of 12% and the plates were stored at -80°C. The selection experiment continued for 7 passages, in each of which the concentration of AMPs was doubled reaching 256 μ g/ml for Tenecin 1 and 512 μ g/ml Tenecin 2 on the last day of the experiment (day 7). When the volume of added peptide started to exceed 5% of the total volume of medium per well, 2-fold concentrated MHB was used to prepare stock solutions of the desired concentration to alleviate the possible effects of nutrients depletion. The resulting resistant lines were used for subsequent assays (MIC, growth curves) and sequencing both as populations and colonies.

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing

Minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) was determined using a broth micro-dilution method²⁰. Briefly, 5 μ l (1×10^5 cfu/ml) of the mid-exponential phase bacterial culture diluted 1:100 were inoculated into the wells of polypropylene V-bottom 96-well plates (lids with condensation rings 656171, both from Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Germany, Germany) containing two-fold serial dilutions of AMPs or antibiotics in the total volume of 100 μ l MHB per well. Each assay was performed in triplicate. The plates were incubated at 37°C in a humidity chamber. The MIC was defined as the lowest concentration that inhibited visible bacterial growth after 24 hours of incubation. This standard method was used to determine the initial MIC of Tenecin 1 for the pre-adapted “ancestor” line and mutant lines and antibiotics. Because Tenecin 2 is mostly active against gram-negative bacteria, *Escherichia coli* strain MG1655 was used to determine the activity of this peptide.

To determine the MICs of Tenecins immediately after the selection experiment, we scaled-down the assays to the total volume of 40 μ l per well because of the high number

of bacterial lines and the limited amount of the antimicrobial peptide available. For this, we used flat-bottom 384-well polypropylene plates (Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Germany) and clear polystyrene lids (Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Germany). We determined MIC as the lowest concentration at which OD₆₀₀ readings were indistinguishable from those of the NTC wells. As a method control, we compared the MIC determined using the standard and the small-volume protocol, and found no differences. The MICs were determined for populations and individual colonies derived from the selection lines.

Growth curves

Growth curve assays were performed by monitoring the changes in turbidity at OD₆₀₀ of the selected mutant lines, non-selected controls and ancestor in un-supplemented MHB using a microtitre plate reader. For this, bacterial lines (populations and colonies) were grown until OD₆₀₀ 0.5, diluted 1:10 and 20 µl of the resulting cell suspension were inoculated into 180 µl MHB. Each assay had four replicates. The measurements were taken at 20 minutes intervals during 16 hours of incubation at 37°C inside the microtitre plate reader, with 10 seconds shaking before each reading. Growth parameters such as final and maximum OD, Vmax and lag time were calculated with Gen5 software (Biotek).

DNA isolation

Genomic DNA for whole genome sequencing was isolated using GeneMATRIX Bacterial and Yeast genomic DNA purification kit (Roboklon, Germany) following manufacturer's instructions. Four µl of 10 mg/ml freshly prepared lysozyme and lysostaphin (both from Sigma) each were added into bacterial lysate. The DNA quantity and quality were estimated by measuring the optical density at A260/280 using the Nanodrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific) and agarose gel electrophoresis.

Genome re-sequencing

TruSeq DNA PCR-free libraries were constructed according to the manufacturers instructions and sequenced for 600 cycles using a MiSeq at the Berlin Center for Genomics in Biodiversity Research. Sequence data are available from the NCBI SRA under BioSample accession xxxxxxxx.

The genetic differences between strain SH1000 and other members of the 8325 lineage have been described using array-based resequencing ²¹, and de novo genome sequencing²². The differences comprise: the excision of three prophages from 8325 (Φ 11, 12, 13), 13 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs; two synonymous, 11 nonsynonymous), a 63-bp deletion in the spa-sarS intergenic region, and an 11-bp deletion in rsbU ²². To account for these differences we first assembled reads from SH1000 using SPAdes ²³, and used the resulting contigs to correct the three phage excision sites in the 8325 reference genome. SH1000 reads were then mapped to the resulting sequence and bcftools consensus ²⁴ was used to correct the remaining 13 SNPs and two indels.

The haploid variant calling pipeline snippy²⁵ was used to identify mutations in the selection lines. Snippy uses bwa²⁴ to align reads to the reference genome and identifies variants in the resulting alignments using FreeBayes (Garrison and Marth 2012). All variants were independently verified using a second computational pipeline, breseq ²⁶.

Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.4.1. Growth parameters (Vmax, duration of lag phase, and final OD600) were analysed by using the nlme package ²⁷ to fit linear mixed-effects models specifying line as a random effect. We also used visreg ²⁸ and lsmeans ²⁹. Permutational analyses of Jaccard distance were performed using the vegan package³⁰.

237

238 **Results**

239 **Resistance evolves readily**

240 Over the course of selection all replicates of both treatments (single and combination of
241 AMPs) readily evolved a high level of resistance. All lines were able to grow in the
242 presence of 256 µg/ml Tenecin 1 and 512 µg/ml Tenecin 2 , resulting in an increase in
243 MIC for Tenecin 1 ($T=-9.98$, $df=35$, $p<0.0001$, Fig. 1A).

244

245 **Reduced fitness in AMP-resistant mutants**

246 When comparing bacterial growth curves of the mutants with those of non-selected
247 controls and ancestors, we found consistently slower growth rates in the exponential
248 phase for both Tenecin 1 ($T = -6.8$, $df = 56$, $p = <0.0001$, Fig. 1B) and Tenecin 1+Tenecin
249 2-selected lines ($T = -7.17$, $df = 56$, $p = <0.0001$, Fig. 1B) and also extended lag phases
250 (Tenecin 1: $T = 9.4$, $df = 56$, $p = <0.0001$, Tenecin 1+Tenecin 2: $T = 9.1$, $df = 56$, $p =$
251 <0.0001 , Fig. 1B), Tenecin 1 and Tenecin 1+Tenecin 2 lines did not differ ($T = -0.67$, $df =$
252 56 , $p = 0.5042$, Fig. 1AB). This suggests that AMP resistance incurs fitness costs
253 irrespective of the type of selection.

254

255 **Cross-Resistance to other AMPs but not antibiotics**

256 We tested for cross-resistance against commercially available AMPs, colistin, pexiganan
257 and melittin. We found 2-8-fold cross-resistance of all AMP-selected strains against the
258 AMPs Mellitin, Pexiganan and Colistin (table S1). The selected strains showed no cross-
259 resistance against Vancomycin, a drug of last resort for staphylococcal infections with
260 multiple resistances. There was no relationship between the AMP cross-resistance and
261 the resistance mutations (see table S2). We also tested the evolved strains against a
262 panel of eight antibiotics (see table S2) but detected no cross-resistance.

263

Genome re-sequencing reveals mutations in a limited number of loci

Whole genome sequencing of the selected mutants and the respective controls (at the population and single colony levels) showed differences both between treatments and between replicate lines within treatments. In each resistant strain one mutation was identified in either *ytrA*, *ytrB*, *nsaS*, or *nsaR* gene, all of which are known to be involved in envelope stress tolerance (see also table S3 for a full list of mutations). In case of the *ytrA* mutations, there were examples of missense, frameshifts, and stop gains. For *ytrB*, *nsaS*, *nsaR*, *rpoB*, and *rpoC* mostly missense mutations were found. Interestingly, we found the same *ytrA* stop-gain mutation (c.14T>A p.Leu5*) in at least 11 strains, which has previously been described for melittin-selected *S. aureus* lines (Johnston et al 2016). Additionally we also identified an *nsaS* missense mutation (A₂₀₈E) in 4 strains which has been shown to be responsible for nisin resistance in SH1000³¹, the same strain as used here. The final MICs achieved did not segregate by mutation (T=0.25, df=32, p=0.8, Fig 2).

Reduced fitness in relation to resistance mutations.

Fitness reduction, as measured by the increased lag phase, did not segregate by mutation (T = 0.93, df = 56, p = 0.3576, Fig. 3A). Vmax differed between *nsa* and *ytr* mutations, with *nsa* mutants showing a lower growth rate than *ytr* mutants (T = 2.7, df = 56, p = 0.0092) and both mutants grow significantly slower than the controls (*ytr*: T = -6.46, df = 56, p = <0.0001, *nsa*: T = -8.16, df = 56, p = <0.0001, Fig.3B). In the presence of a second mutation *rpo*, *nsa* mutants show a further extension of the lag phase (T = 4.21, df = 54, p = 1e-04, Fig.3B).

291

292

293 **Parallel evolution**

294 Using the Jaccard distance to calculate the degree of parallel evolution, we did not find
 295 evidence for parallel evolution at the operon level. Selection treatment (T1 or T1T2) did
 296 not affect the mean proportion of shared mutated operons (permutational analysis of
 297 multivariate homogeneity of group dispersion $F = 0.1925$, $p = 0.625$) or the mean
 298 number of shared mutations (permutational multivariate analysis of Jaccard distance
 299 matrix, $F = 1.063$, $p = 0.347$, Fig. 4). Yet, as reported above, all AMP selected lines
 300 showed either a mutation in *nsa* or in *ytr* operons, but never in both (table 2).

301

302 **Discussion**

303 Our study was one of the first to explore the evolution of resistance to AMPs that are
 304 part of the same immune system. We find that all populations under antimicrobial
 305 peptide selection evolve resistance quickly and to a similar degree irrespective of the
 306 presence of one or two AMPs. In all cases resistant strains possessed a mutation in
 307 either in the *ytr* or *nsa* operons. Mutations in these operons were not found together.

308 We have previously shown that evolution of resistance towards the AMP melittin in *S.*
 309 *aureus* JLA513 is associated with nonsense mutations in *ytrA*. Here we find that the most
 310 frequent *ytrA* mutation is identical to the stop-gain mutation described in *S. aureus*
 311 JLA513¹². In *S. aureus*, the *ytr* operon is induced by cationic AMPs³² and encodes a
 312 putative GntR-family repressor (YtrA) as well as two ABC transporters. In *Bacillus*
 313 *subtilis*, *ytr* repression requires *ytrA* and null mutations lead to constitutive *ytr*
 314 expression. This raises the possibility that the *ytr* mutations observed here may mediate
 315 Tenecin 1 resistance via derepression of *ytr*.

The nisin susceptibility-associated (*nsa*) two-component system was independently discovered three times^{9,10,31} as being responsible for resistance to nisin and bacitracin. In the presence of its substrate NsaSR activates transcription of the Bce-AB type ABC transporters BraDE and VraDE which are involved in sensing and detoxification respectively¹⁰. Strikingly, in 4 strains we identified the same *nsaS* mutation (A₂₀₈E) which was shown to confer increased nisin resistance in SH1000³¹.

In general antimicrobial resistance is costly³³. While this is a consistent finding for antibiotics, the patterns for AMPs are less clear^{19,34}. Here we find clear evidence for costly resistance as measured in growth rate and lag phase. With the exception of the double mutation *nsa/rpoB*, which displays the longest lag phase the costs in our experiments do not segregate by mutation. *rpoB* mutations in AMP-resistant *S. aureus* have been found before³⁵. At the moment it is not clear why the more costly double-mutation evolves, given that there is no difference in MICs between *nsa* and *nsa/rpoB* mutants. Limited costs in *S. aureus* selected for resistance against the human AMP LL-37 were reported³⁵, but the same study found reduced growth rates in AMP-resistant strains. Antibiotic resistance evolution resulting in extended lag phases has been frequently reported (e.g. ³⁶) and also has been proposed as a mechanism explaining antibiotic tolerance³⁷ even in the absence of *bona fide* resistance.

Lack of parallel evolution

While we do find strong evidence for parallel evolution at the level of the resistance phenotype, all populations under selection evolve resistance at a comparable speed to a similar level (MIC), we do not find evidence for parallel evolution at the level of the operons and treatments. This contrasts with findings reported in *Pseudomonas fluorescens* under antibiotic selection³⁸, which found a higher degree of parallel

evolution, albeit in more complex environments. A low level of parallelism has been observed in other studies of bacterial antibiotic resistance evolution^{36,39}. While our assessment is based on the Jaccard-Distance, it is noteworthy that all strains have one of two resistance-associated mutations. This is much lower than the variation observed in a previous study in *S. aureus* against a panel of antimicrobial peptides originating from different organisms¹².

Cross-resistance

Despite the limited number of resistance mutations, both our experimentally evolved Tenecin 1 and Tenecin 1+Tenecin 2-selected strains, display cross-resistance against colistin, pexiganan and melittin. All of these antimicrobial peptides have a different origin (from *Paenibacillus polymixa*, the African clawed frog and the honey bee, respectively) and belong to distinct AMP families. This underlines that AMP resistance mechanisms can be relatively nonspecific. In gram-positive bacteria resistance is mostly achieved by modifications to the physico-chemical properties of the cell envelope⁶. Cross-resistance between AMPs has been reported before^{19,34} and might constitute a risk for the application of AMPs in medical treatments⁴⁰. In the context of natural immune defenses it is likely that the resistance evolution to one AMP possibly results in resistance also against AMP cocktails. This could constitute a strong selection pressure for those innate immune systems that are strongly dependent on AMPs. Finally, while we did not find indications for cross-resistance against antibiotics, cross-resistance against human AMPs and the peptide antibiotic daptomycin, which targets the cell membrane, has been reported in MRSA⁴¹. It hence seems possible that resistance against AMPs comes with the risk of cross-resistance against new potential antibiotics such as teixobactin⁴² that target the cell surface.

Acknowledgements and funding information

We thank Vitali Laba for support in the lab. This work was supported by the European Research Council (grant 260986, OM, PJ, JR) the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB 973, C5, ARR, JR) the German Academic exchange service (personal stipend to BES) and ERASMUS (personal stipend to JMM). Accession number for Genome Data: PRJNA399645.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

1. Westerhoff, H., Zasloff, M., Rosner, J., Hendler, R, de Waal, A. , Vaz Gomez, A. *et al.* Functional synergism of the magainins PGLa and magainin-2 in Escherichia coli, tumor cells and liposomes. *Eur. J. Biochem.* **228**, 257–64 (1995).
2. Zasloff, M. Antimicrobial peptides of multicellular organisms. *Nature* **415**, 389–395 (2002).
3. Johnston, P. R., Makarova, O. & Rolff, J. Inducible Defenses Stay Up Late: Temporal Patterns of Immune Gene Expression in *Tenebrio molitor*. *G3 (Bethesda)*. **4**, 1–9 (2013).
4. Fjell, C. D., Hiss, J. A., Hancock, R. E. W. & Schneider, G. Designing antimicrobial peptides: form follows function. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **11**, 37–51 (2012).
5. Rolff, J. & Schmid-Hempel, P. Perspectives on the evolutionary ecology of arthropod antimicrobial peptides. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150297. (2016).
6. Joo, H.-S., Fu, C. & Otto, M. Bacterial Strategies of Resistance to Antimicrobial Peptides. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150295 (2016).

- 396 7. Yang, S. J. , Bayer, A., Mishra, N., Meehl, M., Ledala, N., Yeaman, R.f *et al.* The
397 Staphylococcus aureus two-component regulatory system, grars, senses and
398 confers resistance to selected cationic antimicrobial peptides. *Infect. Immun.* **80**,
399 74–81 (2012).
- 400 8. Koprivnjak, T. & Peschel, A. Bacterial resistance mechanisms against host defense
401 peptides. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* **68**, 2243–54 (2011).
- 402 9. Yoshida, Y., Matsuo, M., Oogai, Y., Kato, F., Nakamura, N. Sugai, M., *et al.* Bacitracin
403 sensing and resistance in Staphylococcus aureus. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **320**, 33–
404 39 (2011).
- 405 10. Hiron, A., Falord, M., Valle, J., Débarbouillé, M. & Msadek, T. Bacitracin and nisin
406 resistance in Staphylococcus aureus: A novel pathway involving the BraS/BraR
407 two-component system (SA2417/SA2418) and both the BraD/BraE and
408 VraD/VraE ABC transporters. *Mol. Microbiol.* **81**, 602–622 (2011).
- 409 11. Dobson, A. J., Purves, J. & Rolff, J. Increased survival of experimentally evolved
410 antimicrobial peptide-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in an animal host. *Evol.*
411 *Appl.* <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/eva.12184> (2014).
- 412 12. Johnston, P. R., Dobson, A. J. & Rolff, J. Genomic signatures of experimental
413 adaptation to antimicrobial peptides in Staphylococcus aureus. *G3*
414 *Genes/Genomes/Genetics* **6**, 1535–1539 (2015).
- 415 13. Kounatidis, I. & Ligoxygakis, P. Drosophila as a model system to unravel the
416 layers of innate immunity to infection. *Open Biol.* **2**, 120075 (2012).
- 417 14. Barribeau, S. M., Sadd, B. M., du Plessis, L. & Schmid-Hempel, P. Gene expression
418 differences underlying genotype-by-genotype specificity in a host-parasite
419 system. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **111**, 3496–3501 (2014).
- 420 15. Makarova, O. *et al.* Antimicrobial defence and persistent infection in insects
421 revisited. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150296 (2016).
- 422 16. Roh, K.-B., Kim, C., Lee, H., Kwon, H., Par, J. Kurokawa, K., *et al.* Proteolytic cascade

423 for the activation of the insect toll pathway induced by the fungal cell wall
 424 component. *J. Biol. Chem.* **284**, 19474–81 (2009).

425 17. Zanchi, C., Johnston, P. R. & Rolff, J. Evolution of defence cocktails: antimicrobial
 426 peptide combinations reduce mortality and persistent infection. *Mol. Ecol.* 1–10
 427 (2017).

428 18. Perron, G. G., Zasloff, M. & Bell, G. Experimental evolution of resistance to an
 429 antimicrobial peptide. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **273**, 251–6 (2006).

430 19. Dobson, A. J., Purves, J., Kamysz, W. & Rolff, J. Comparing Selection on *S. aureus*
 431 between Antimicrobial Peptides and Common Antibiotics. *PLoS One* **8**, e76521
 432 (2013).

433 20. Wiegand, I., Hilpert, K. & Hancock, R. E. W. Agar and broth dilution methods to
 434 determine the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of antimicrobial
 435 substances. *Nat. Protoc.* **3**, 163–75 (2008).

436 21. O'Neill, A. J. *Staphylococcus aureus* SH1000 and 8325-4: Comparative genome
 437 sequences of key laboratory strains in staphylococcal research. *Lett. Appl.*
 438 *Microbiol.* **51**, 358–361 (2010).

439 22. Bæk, K. T., Frees, D., Renzoni, A., Barras, C., Rodriguez, N. Manzano, , C. *et al.*
 440 Genetic Variation in the *Staphylococcus aureus* 8325 Strain Lineage Revealed by
 441 Whole-Genome Sequencing. *PLoS One* **8**, 1–16 (2013).

442 23. Bankevich, A., Nurk, S., Antipov, D., Gurevich, A., Dvorkin, M., Kulikov, A., *et al.*
 443 SPAdes: A New Genome Assembly Algorithm and Its Applications to Single-Cell
 444 Sequencing. *J. Comput. Biol.* **19**, 455–477 (2012).

445 24. Li, H. & Durbin, R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler
 446 transform. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1754–60 (2009).

447 25. Seemann, T. Seemann T. snippy: fast bacterial variant calling from NGS reads.
 448 2015; 503 <https://github.com/tseemann/snippy>. (2015).

449 26. Barrick, D. E. D. E. in *Methods in Molecular Biology* 165–188 (2014).

- 450 27. Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S. & Sarkar, D. NLME: Linear and nonlinear mixed
451 effects models. *R Packag. version 3.1-122*, [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme)
452 [project.org/package=nlme](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme) Version 3., 1–336 (2013).
- 453 28. Breheny, P. & Burchett, W. Visualization of regression models using visreg. *R*
454 *package* 1–15 (2013).
- 455 29. Lenth, R. V. Least-Squares Means: The *R* Package **lsmeans**. *J. Stat. Softw.* **69**,
456 (2016).
- 457 30. Oksanen, J., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., O'Hara, B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., *et al.*
458 *vegan*: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.4---3. (2017).
- 459 31. Blake, K. L., Randall, C. P. & O'Neill, A. J. In vitro studies indicate a high resistance
460 potential for the lantibiotic nisin in *Staphylococcus aureus* and define a genetic
461 basis for nisin resistance. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **55**, 2362–2368 (2011).
- 462 32. Li, M., Cha, D., Lai, Y., Villaruz, A. Sturdevant, D. & Otto. M. The antimicrobial
463 peptide-sensing system aps of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Mol. Microbiol.* **66**, 1136–
464 1147 (2007).
- 465 33. Andersson, D. I. & Hughes, D. Antibiotic resistance and its cost: is it possible to
466 reverse resistance? *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **8**, 260–71 (2010).
- 467 34. Habets, M. G. J. L. & Brockhurst, M. Therapeutic antimicrobial peptides may
468 compromise natural immunity. *Biol. Lett.* **8**, 416–8 (2012).
- 469 35. Kubicek-Sutherland, J. Z. Lofton, H., Verstergaard, M., Hjort, K., Ingmer, H.,
470 Andersson, D.I.. Antimicrobial peptide exposure selects for *Staphylococcus*
471 *aureus* resistance to human defence peptides. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **72**,
472 dkw381 (2016).
- 473 36. Barbosa, C., Trebosc, V., Kemmer, C., Rosenstiel, P., Beardmore, R., Schulenburg, H.
474 *et al.* Alternative evolutionary paths to bacterial antibiotic resistance cause
475 distinct collateral effects. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 1–16 (2017).
476 doi:10.1093/molbev/msx158

37. Fridman, O., Goldberg, A., Ronin, I., Shores, N. & Balaban, N. Q. Optimization of lag time underlies antibiotic tolerance in evolved bacterial populations. *Nature* **513**, 418–421 (2014).
38. Bailey, S. F., Rodrigue, N. & Kassen, R. The effect of selection environment on the probability of parallel evolution. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **32**, 1436–1448 (2015).
39. Vogwill, T., Kojadinovic, M., Furió, V. & Maclean, R. C. Testing the role of genetic background in parallel evolution using the comparative experimental evolution of antibiotic resistance. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **31**, 3314–3323 (2014).
40. Bell, G. Arming the enemy: the evolution of resistance to self-proteins. *Microbiology* **149**, 1367–1375 (2003).
41. Mishra, N. N., Bayer, A. S., Moise, P. , Yeaman, M. R. & Sakoulas, G. Reduced susceptibility to host-defense cationic peptides and daptomycin coemerge in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* from daptomycin-naïve bacteremic patients. *J. Infect. Dis.* **206**, 1160–7 (2012).
42. Ling, L. L., Schneider, T., Peoples, A., Spoering, A., Engles, I., Conlone, B. *et al.* A new antibiotic kills pathogens without detectable resistance. *Nature* (2015).

Fig 1. (A) Increase in MIC in *S. aureus* selected under either Tenecin (Defensin) or combined Tenecin 1 and Tenecin 2 (Coleopterecin) (mean + 95% CI). (B) Growth parameters of experimentally evolved AMP-resistant *S. aureus* in relation to treatment (Vmax, lag phase, maximal OD) .

Fig 2. Fold change in MICs for resistant strains separated by mutations compared to procedural controls.

Fig. 3. Fitness costs over mutation/operon (a) and in the presence or absences of a second mutation (b) . Fitness of mutations (c) in relation to the selective environment.

Fig. 4. Parallel evolution as assessed by Jaccard Distance for operons (1=no shared evolution).

Fig 1a, b

513

514 Figure 2

Fig 3 a,b,c

515

516 Figure 3

517

518 Figure 4