

# The spectrum of antibacterial activity of human defensins and cathelicidin against gram-positive and gram-negative bacterial strains isolated from hospitalized patients

Albert Bolatchiev<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Stavropol State Medical University, Russian Federation

Corresponding Author:

Albert Bolatchiev<sup>1</sup>

Mira Street 310, Stavropol, 355000, Russian Federation

Email address: bolatalbert@gmail.com

## Abstract

**Background.** To date, there is a spread of resistance of microorganisms to antibiotics. To solve this problem, the search and development of new drugs with antibacterial activity is necessary. Antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) have pronounced antibacterial activity and may be promising candidates for the role of new drugs. Besides, AMPs can be used to overcome conventional antibiotics resistance due to the possible synergistic effect. In this work, the combined effect of some AMPs (human defensins, HNP-1, hBD-1, hBD-3 and cathelicidin, LL-37) with conventional antibiotics (vancomycin and imipenem) against gram-positive (*Enterococcus faecalis*; *Staphylococcus aureus*, methicillin-sensitive, MSSA, and methicillin-resistant, MRSA) and gram-negative (*Escherichia coli*; *Klebsiella pneumoniae*; *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*) bacterial strains was investigated.

**Methods.** Bacterial strains were isolated from hospitalized patients of the intensive care unit. Commercially available AMPs (HNP-1, hBD-1, hBD-3, LL-37 by Cloud-Clone Corp., USA) and antibiotics, vancomycin (Sandoz, Slovenia) and imipenem (Merck Sharp and Dohme, USA) were used. Antibiotic resistance phenotypes of isolated bacterial strains were carried out using the disk diffusion method. The standard checkerboard assays were used to study minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC) of antimicrobials. The combined microbicidal effect of two substances (AMP+conventional antibiotic) was assessed by the fractional inhibitory concentration index (FICI). If  $FICI \leq 0,5$ , then it was considered that two substances showed synergism of action; if  $0.5 < FICI < 4$  – no interaction; if  $FICI > 4$  – antagonism.

**Results.** All studied AMPs had antibacterial activity against the studied strains. hBD-3 showed the lowest MICs compared to other AMPs. MIC of hBD-3 against *S. aureus* (MSSA and

39 MRSA), *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae* was the same – 0.5 mg/L, and against *P. aeruginosa* it was 2  
40 mg/L. The combinations HNP-1+vancomycin (against *E. faecalis*) and hBD-3+imipenem  
41 (against *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, *P. aeruginosa*) according to FICI values have shown the  
42 synergistic effect. The results of this study can be used to develop novel antibiotics based on  
43 AMPs. Also, in some cases, AMPs can help to overcome resistance to conventional antibiotics.

## 44 **Introduction**

45 Currently, there is a rapid and ubiquitous increase in antibiotic resistance, which is a severe  
46 problem and a challenge to modern medicine (Martinez, 2014). The threat of growing antibiotic  
47 resistance and ways to combat it are actively discussed at the level of the World Health  
48 Organization. According to WHO's Global action plan on antimicrobial resistance, the key tasks  
49 in combating this problem are antimicrobials use optimization and new drug development  
50 ("Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance," 2015). A decrease in the sensitivity of  
51 microorganisms to antimicrobials leads to a decrease in the effectiveness of antimicrobial  
52 therapy and, as a result, an increase in the duration of treatment, an increase in mortality and  
53 treatment financial costs (Fair & Tor, 2014; Rolain et al., 2016). So, in the USA, 19 thousand  
54 people die every year from infections caused by methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*.  
55 Moreover, the financial costs associated with the treatment of this infection annually amount to \$  
56 3 billion (Fischbach & Walsh, 2009). According to a recent report by the Center for Disease  
57 Control and Prevention (USA), the financial burden associated with growing microbial resistance  
58 is about \$ 20 billion and 8 million extra bed days (Frieden, 2013). According to experts, by 2050,  
59 more than 10 million people will die from infections caused by resistant microbial strains every  
60 year. By this time, the world economy will lose about \$ 100 trillion due to this problem (O'Neill,  
61 2015).

62 The formation of antibiotic resistance is due to various reasons and mechanisms. It is known that  
63 this is a natural evolutionary process of adaptation of microorganisms to constant contact with  
64 substances with antimicrobial properties (Martinez et al., 2009). The ubiquity of antibiotic  
65 resistance is due to two factors - mutations and horizontal gene transfer (Martinez & Baquero,  
66 2000).

67 The human body is continuously in contact with many non-pathogenic and pathogenic  
68 microorganisms. In the process of evolution, defense mechanisms have been formed that allow  
69 first to identify the pathogen and then, if necessary, provide adequate control of its further  
70 penetration and spread. The fulfillment of these tasks is realized through the system of innate  
71 immunity, which is able (unlike the adaptive immune system) to immediately recognize and  
72 destroy infectious agents of different natures (Iwasaki & Medzhitov, 2015). One of the essential  
73 components of innate immunity is antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) with a length of 5 to ~100  
74 amino acid residues. These peptides have a broad spectrum of antimicrobial activity against  
75 various infectious agents: bacteria, viruses, fungi, and protozoa. Among the six kingdoms  
76 (bacteria, archaea, protists, fungi, plants, and animals), more than 3,000 AMPs are currently  
77 identified (Wang, Li & Wang, 2016).

78 Among AMPs, human defensins (human neutrophil peptide-1, HNP-1; human beta-defensin-1,  
79 hBD-1; human beta-defensin-3, hBD-3) and human cathelicidin (LL-37) are of great interest,  
80 since they have a broad spectrum of antimicrobial activity (Pachón-Ibáñez et al., 2017). AMPs  
81 mechanism of action relates to its direct effect on microbial membranes, i.e., pore formation, cell  
82 leakage, and successive bacterial lysis. It is considered that the specific destruction of a microbial  
83 wall is due to the electrostatic attraction of positively charged AMPs and negatively charged  
84 membranes (Kagan et al., 1990). The spectrum of defensins and LL-37 activity is well studied  
85 (Pachón-Ibáñez et al., 2017). However, there is insufficient data on the effect of these peptides  
86 concerning bacterial strains isolated in a real clinical setting. Besides, it is crucial to study the  
87 combined antimicrobial effect of AMPs and antibacterial drugs that have long been used in the  
88 clinic.

89 This study aimed to determine the antibacterial activity of HNP-1, hBD-1, hBD-3, LL-37 in  
90 combination with conventional antibiotics (vancomycin and imipenem) against bacterial strains  
91 (*Enterococcus faecalis*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*,  
92 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*) isolated from hospitalized patients.

## 93 **Materials & Methods**

### 94 **Bacterial strains**

95 *E. faecalis*, *S. aureus* (methicillin-sensitive, MSSA, and methicillin-resistant, MRSA), *E. coli*, *K.*  
96 *pneumoniae*, and *P. aeruginosa* strains were isolated from hospitalized patients of intensive care  
97 department of Stavropol State Regional Clinical Hospital (Russian Federation). Identification of  
98 microorganisms and their antibiotic resistance studies were carried out by EUCAST (European  
99 Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing) protocols using the disk diffusion method  
100 (Matuschek, Brown & Kahlmeter, 2014) in The Department of Clinical Microbiology of The  
101 Center of Clinical Pharmacology and Pharmacotherapy (Stavropol, Russian Federation).

102 According to EUCAST guidelines, the resistance of *S. aureus* to cefoxitin was considered as a  
103 marker for *mecA*-mediated methicillin resistance (Matuschek, Brown & Kahlmeter, 2014).

### 104 **Antimicrobial peptides and conventional antibiotics**

105 Recombinant peptides: HNP-1 (purity  $\geq 92\%$ ), hBD-1 (purity  $\geq 95\%$ ), hBD-3 (purity  $\geq 98\%$ ),  
106 LL-37 (purity  $\geq 95\%$ ) (Cloud-Clone Corp., USA; peptides were expressed in *E. coli*) and  
107 conventional antibiotics: vancomycin (Sandoz, Slovenia) and imipenem (Merck Sharp and  
108 Dohme, USA) were used for checkerboard method. The amino acid sequences of the  
109 recombinant peptides are shown in *Table 1*.

110  
111 **Table 1. Amino acid sequences of recombinant antimicrobial peptides used in this study.**

| Peptide | Sequence (one-letter code)  |
|---------|---|
| HNP-1   | EPLQARADEVAAAPEQIAADIPEVVVSLAWDESLAPKHGPGSRKNMACYCR<br>IPACIAGERRYGTCTIYQGRLWAFCC |
| hBD-1   | GNFLTGLGHRSDHYNCVSSGGQCLYSACPIFTKIQTGTCYRGKAKCCK                                  |

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| hBD-3 | GIINTLQKYYCRVRGGRC AVL SCLPKEEQIGKCSTRGRKCCRRKK   |
| LL-37 | QVLSYKEAVLRAIDGINQRSSDANLYRLLDLDPRPTMDGDPDTPKPV SFTV<br>KETVCPRTTQQSPEDCDFKKGDLVKRCMGTVTLNQARGSFDISCDKDNKR<br>FALLGDFFRKSKEKIGKEFKRIVQRIKDFLRNLVPRTES |

112

113 **Study of the minimum inhibitory concentrations and synergistic effects of AMPs with**  
114 **vancomycin/imipenem**

115 The standard checkerboard assays were used (White et al., 1996; Orhan et al., 2005). In brief,  
116 pure bacterial cultures were cultivated on solid nutrient medium (Mannitol Salt Agar, BioMedia  
117 LLC, Russian Federation) for 18-24 hours, 37°C. From a fresh morning culture, a suspension  
118 was prepared in a sterile saline solution that corresponded to 0.5 McFarland turbidity; the  
119 resulting suspension had an approximate bacteria concentration of  $1.5 \times 10^8$  CFU/mL. Then, 0.1  
120 mL of this suspension was dissolved in 9.9 mL of 2.1% Mueller-Hinton broth (SIFIN Institut für  
121 Immunpräparate und Nährmedien GmbH, Germany) and eventually a solution was obtained –  
122 inoculum – containing approximately  $5 \times 10^5$  CFU/mL, which corresponds to the standard  
123 EUCAST protocol (Pfaller et al., 2011).

124 After that, 100 µl of inoculum was administered into each well of 96-well microdilution plates  
125 (Medpolimer OJSC, Russian Federation). Then, serial twofold dilutions of each antimicrobial  
126 agent (AMP or vancomycin or imipenem, 50 µl per well) were administered into the wells. A  
127 quadruple control was performed – three wells in each microdilution plate contained: 1) only  
128 Mueller-Hinton broth; 2) only bacterial inoculum; 3) only AMPs at maximal concentrations  
129 without inoculum; 4) only vancomycin (for *E. faecalis* and *S. aureus*) or imipenem (for gram-  
130 negative bacteria) at maximal concentrations without inoculum.

131 For checkerboard assays, the following combinations of antimicrobials were chosen: for *E.*  
132 *faecalis* and *S. aureus* – AMP (HNP-1 or hBD-1 or hBD-3 or LL-37)+vancomycin; for *E. coli*,  
133 *K. pneumoniae*, and *P. aeruginosa* – AMP (HNP-1 or hBD-1 or hBD-3 or LL-37)+imipenem.  
134 AMPs and antibiotics were dissolved in 2.1% Mueller-Hinton broth. Vancomycin and imipenem  
135 had a dilution range from 0 mg/L to 5 mg/L. AMPs had a dilution range from 0 mg/L to 32  
136 mg/L. The plates with the lids closed (to prevent drying) were incubated in a thermostat  
137 overnight at 37°C after adding bacterial inoculum and antimicrobials. In 20 hours, the presence  
138 or absence of growth was visually evaluated. MIC is the lowest concentration of an anti-infective  
139 agent, at which there was no visible growth of microorganisms (Milly, Toledo & Ramakrishnan,  
140 2005).

141 The combined microbicidal effect of two substances (A and B) was assessed by the fractional  
142 inhibitory concentration index (FICI) (Milly, Toledo & Ramakrishnan, 2005; Ruden et al.,  
143 2009):  $FICI = (A/MIC A) + (B/MIC B)$ , where A and B are such concentrations of antimicrobial  
144 agents in their mixture that inhibit the growth of bacteria; MIC A and MIC B, respectively, the  
145 minimum inhibitory concentrations of substances A and B (not in combination with each other).  
146 Depending on the FICI, there are three types of mutual influence of the two investigated

147 antimicrobials on bacteria: 1)  $FICI \leq 0,5$  – synergism of action; 2)  $0.5 < FICI < 4$  – no  
 148 interaction; 3)  $FICI > 4$  – antagonism (Odds, 2003).

## 149 Results

150 Antibiotic susceptibility of isolated bacterial strains was determined using the disk diffusion  
 151 method; results are presented in *Table 2*.

152

### 153 Table 2. Antibiotic resistance phenotypes of isolated bacterial strains.

154 FOX, cefoxitin; AMP, ampicillin; AMC, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid; CFX, cefotaxime; CFZ,  
 155 ceftazidime; CPT, ceftaroline; IMP, imipenem; CFS, cefoperazone-sulbactam; CIP,  
 156 ciprofloxacin; LVX, levofloxacin; DOX, doxycycline; ERY, erythromycin; GEN, gentamicin;  
 157 AMN, amikacin; LZD, linezolid; VAN, vancomycin; R, resistant; S, susceptible; n/a,  
 158 susceptibility to this antibiotic has not been determined.

| Antibiotic | Isolate            |      |      |                |                      |                      |
|------------|--------------------|------|------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|            | <i>E. faecalis</i> | MSSA | MRSA | <i>E. coli</i> | <i>K. pneumoniae</i> | <i>P. aeruginosa</i> |
| FOX        | n/a                | S    | R    | n/a            | n/a                  | n/a                  |
| AMP        | S                  | n/a  | n/a  | R              | R                    | R                    |
| AMC        | S                  | n/a  | n/a  | R              | R                    | R                    |
| CFX        | n/a                | S    | R    | R              | R                    | R                    |
| CFZ        | n/a                | n/a  | n/a  | R              | R                    | R                    |
| CPT        | n/a                | S    | S    | n/a            | n/a                  | n/a                  |
| IMP        | S                  | S    | R    | S              | S                    | S                    |
| CFS        | n/a                | n/a  | n/a  | S              | S                    | R                    |
| CIP        | S                  | R    | R    | R              | S                    | R                    |
| LVX        | S                  | n/a  | n/a  | R              | S                    | R                    |
| DOX        | R                  | S    | S    | R              | R                    | R                    |
| ERY        | R                  | S    | R    | n/a            | n/a                  | n/a                  |
| GEN        | R                  | S    | R    | R              | R                    | R                    |
| AMN        | n/a                | n/a  | n/a  | S              | S                    | R                    |
| LZD        | S                  | S    | S    | n/a            | n/a                  | n/a                  |
| VAN        | S                  | S    | S    | n/a            | n/a                  | n/a                  |

159

160 The efficacy of AMPs against bacterial strains isolated from hospitalized patients of the intensive  
 161 care department has been investigated *in vitro*.

162 *Table 3* presents the results of the MICs study. Based on the data obtained, hBD-3 had the lowest  
 163 MICs against all the bacteria studied. Moreover, it is interesting that this AMP had the same MIC  
 164 (0.5 mg/L) against *S. aureus* (MSSA and MRSA), *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae*.

165 Combined antimicrobial effect of AMPs with conventional antibiotics has been studied using the  
 166 checkerboard method (*Table 4* and *Tables S1-S24*).

167 The following combinations have shown a synergistic effect ( $FICI \leq 0,5$ ): HNP-1+vancomycin  
 168 against *E. faecalis*, hBD-3+imipenem against *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, and *P. aeruginosa*.

169

170 **Table 3. Minimum inhibitory concentrations of AMPs, vancomycin, and imipenem against**  
 171 **isolated bacterial strains.**

172 VAN, vancomycin; IMP, imipenem; n/a, MIC of this antibiotic has not been determined.

| Isolate              | MIC (mg/L) |       |       |       |       |                     |
|----------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------------|
|                      | HNP-1      | hBD-1 | hBD-3 | LL-37 | VAN   | IMP                 |
| <i>E. faecalis</i>   | 1          | 8     | 1     | 16    | 0.5   | n/a <sup>175</sup>  |
| MSSA                 | 2          | 0.5   | 0.5   | >32   | 0.125 | n/a <sup>176</sup>  |
| MRSA                 | 2          | 0.5   | 0.5   | >32   | 1     | n/a <sup>177</sup>  |
| <i>E. coli</i>       | 16         | 4     | 0.5   | 8     | n/a   | 0.25 <sup>178</sup> |
| <i>K. pneumoniae</i> | 16         | 8     | 0.5   | 4     | n/a   | 2.5 <sup>179</sup>  |
| <i>P. aeruginosa</i> | 4          | >32   | 2     | 16    | n/a   | 1 <sup>180</sup>    |

181

182 **Table 4. Fractional inhibitory concentration indexes (FICI) of AMPs in combination with**  
 183 **vancomycin or imipenem against isolated bacterial strains.**

184 \* – synergistic combinations.

| Isolate              | Antibiotic | FICI   |       |        |                   |
|----------------------|------------|--------|-------|--------|-------------------|
|                      |            | HNP-1  | hBD-1 | hBD-3  | LL-37             |
| <i>E. faecalis</i>   | vancomycin | 0.375* | 2     | 1      | 2 <sup>187</sup>  |
| MSSA                 | vancomycin | 2      | 2     | 2      | >2 <sup>188</sup> |
| MRSA                 | vancomycin | 2      | 2     | 2      | >2 <sup>189</sup> |
| <i>E. coli</i>       | imipenem   | 2      | 1     | 0.5*   | 2 <sup>190</sup>  |
| <i>K. pneumoniae</i> | imipenem   | 2      | 0.9   | 0.45*  | 2 <sup>191</sup>  |
| <i>P. aeruginosa</i> | imipenem   | 1      | >2    | 0.375* | 2 <sup>192</sup>  |

## 193 Discussion

194 It was shown that AMPs might be effective against the studied bacterial strains *in vitro*. hBD-3  
 195 had the lowest MIC. Moreover, this peptide showed a synergistic effect in combination with the  
 196 beta-lactam antibiotic imipenem against all studied gram-negative bacteria. Besides, HNP-1, in  
 197 combination with vancomycin, also showed a similar outcome against *E. faecalis*. It should be  
 198 noted that a lot of research is devoted to studying the spectrum of activity and the prospects for  
 199 the use of AMPs. (Pachón-Ibáñez et al., 2017). The data obtained in this study are not a  
 200 breakthrough in this area. However, it seemed important to investigate the effectiveness of  
 201 AMPs in a clinical setting – that is, against bacterial strains isolated from severe patients being  
 202 treated in the intensive care unit. Currently, defensins and LL-37 are considered promising  
 203 candidates for the role of new antibiotics (Pachón-Ibáñez et al., 2017). However, the  
 204 effectiveness of these AMPs varies considerably among studies and against different strains of

205 the same species (Ganz et al., 1985; Turner et al., 1998; Schröder, 1999; Sahly et al., 2003; Dürr,  
206 Sudheendra & Ramamoorthy, 2006; Wilmes et al., 2011; Xhindoli et al., 2016). It has to be  
207 noted, that there is still no standard that defines breakpoints (criteria) of the susceptibility or  
208 resistance of specific types of bacteria to specific AMP. Although, on the other hand, perhaps  
209 this is not necessary since native AMPs are most likely not to be introduced into clinical practice.  
210 The problem of AMPs using is associated with their rapid degradation by enzymes (Lauta, 2000;  
211 Steckbeck, Deslouches & Montelaro, 2014) – this significantly affects pharmacokinetics. To  
212 solve this problem, it is necessary to modify the AMPs to increase their stability and extend the  
213 period of action.

214 Cases of AMPs synergy with beta-lactam antibiotics or vancomycin were shown previously  
215 (Giacometti et al., 2000; Sánchez-Gómez et al., 2011; Feng et al., 2014). Combinations of AMPs  
216 with antibiotics might be a useful tool against multidrug-resistant bacterial strains, including  
217 carbapenem-resistant gram-negative bacteria (Zharkova et al., 2019). The nature of the  
218 synergism is most likely since AMPs lead to membrane permeabilization, but conventional  
219 antibiotics usually bind to a specific target in the bacterial cell (Zharkova et al., 2019). Thus,  
220 AMPs and antibiotics have a different mechanism of action, but this does not always lead to a  
221 potentiation of the effect (Bolatchiev et al., 2020). Perhaps this is because AMPs have an  
222 alternative, unknown mechanism of action. However, it should be noted that *in vivo* AMPs  
223 exhibit different biological effects. AMPs directly stimulate the migration of immune cells,  
224 promote the release of pro-inflammatory cytokines and activate antigen-presenting cells via Th1-  
225 immune response – thus, AMPs are an effective link between innate and adaptive immunity  
226 (Suarez-Carmona et al., 2015). In this regard, it is crucial to study the effectiveness of AMPs *in*  
227 *vivo* since they not only have a direct antimicrobial effect but also stimulate the immune  
228 response.

## 229 **Conclusions**

230 All studied antimicrobial peptides (HNP-1, hBD-1, hBD-3, LL-37) have shown antibacterial  
231 activity against *E. faecalis*, *S. aureus* (MSSA and MRSA), *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, and *P.*  
232 *aeruginosa* strains isolated from patients of intensive care unit. hBD-3 had the lowest values of  
233 the minimum inhibitory concentration in comparison with other studied peptides. Also, hBD-3  
234 demonstrated a synergistic effect in combination with a beta-lactam antibiotic imipenem against  
235 gram-negative strains. The combination of HNP-1 with vancomycin showed a similar effect  
236 against enterococci. The results obtained can be used to develop new antibiotics based on  
237 antimicrobial peptides. Moreover, the data collected may allow developing strategies to  
238 overcome resistance to conventional antibiotics through the additional use of antimicrobial  
239 peptides. Further, *in vivo* studies are needed to confirm this hypothesis.

## 240 **Funding**

241 **This work was funded by Russian Foundation for Basic Research according to the research**  
242 **project No. 18-315-00081**

243

## 244 **Acknowledgements**

245 Many thanks to Professor Vladimir Baturin for constructive comments about the manuscript.  
246 Thanks to Dr. Elena Kunitsina for providing bacterial strains. Big thanks to the directorship of  
247 Stavropol State Medical University represented by the rector Professor Vladimir Koshel and the  
248 vice-rector Professor Evgeny Shchetinin for providing excellent facilities for research.

## 249 **References**

- 250 Bolatchiev A, Baturin V, Bazikov I, Maltsev A, Kunitsina E. 2020. Effect of antimicrobial  
251 peptides HNP-1 and hBD-1 on *Staphylococcus aureus* strains in vitro and in vivo.  
252 *Fundamental and Clinical Pharmacology* 34:102–108. DOI: 10.1111/fcp.12499.
- 253 Dürr UHN, Sudheendra US, Ramamoorthy A. 2006. LL-37, the only human member of the  
254 cathelicidin family of antimicrobial peptides. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta -*  
255 *Biomembranes* 1758:1408–1425. DOI: 10.1016/j.bbmem.2006.03.030.
- 256 Fair RJ, Tor Y. 2014. Antibiotics and bacterial resistance in the 21st century. *Perspectives in*  
257 *medicinal chemistry* 6:25–64. DOI: 10.4137/PMC.S14459.
- 258 Feng Q, Huang Y, Chen M, Li G, Chen Y. 2014. Functional synergy of  $\alpha$ -helical antimicrobial  
259 peptides and traditional antibiotics against Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria in  
260 vitro and in vivo. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*  
261 34:197–204. DOI: 10.1007/s10096-014-2219-3.
- 262 Fischbach MA, Walsh CT. 2009. Antibiotics for Emerging Pathogens. *Science* 325:1089–1093.  
263 DOI: 10.1126/science.1176667.
- 264 Frieden T. 2013. Antibiotic resistance threats in the United States. *Centers for Disease Control*  
265 *and Prevention*:114. DOI: CS239559-B.
- 266 Ganz T, Selsted ME, Szklarek D, Harwig SS, Daher K, Bainton DF, Lehrer RI. 1985. Defensins.  
267 Natural peptide antibiotics of human neutrophils. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*  
268 76:1427–1435. DOI: 10.1172/JCI112120.
- 269 Giacometti A, Cirioni O, Barchiesi F, Scalise G. 2000. In-vitro activity and killing effect of  
270 polycationic peptides on methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and interactions with  
271 clinically used antibiotics. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* 38:115–118.  
272 DOI: 10.1016/S0732-8893(00)00175-9.
- 273 Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance. 2015. *Microbe Magazine* 10:354–355. DOI:  
274 10.1128/microbe.10.354.1.
- 275 Iwasaki A, Medzhitov R. 2015. Control of adaptive immunity by the innate immune system.  
276 *Nature Immunology* 16:343–353. DOI: 10.1038/ni.3123.
- 277 Kagan BL, Selsted ME, Ganz T, Lehrer RI. 1990. Antimicrobial defensin peptides form voltage-  
278 dependent ion-permeable channels in planar lipid bilayer membranes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U*  
279 *S A* 87:210–214. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.87.1.210.
- 280 Lautau VM. 2000. Pharmacological elements in clinical application of synthetic peptides.  
281 *Fundamental and Clinical Pharmacology* 14:425–442. DOI: 10.1111/j.1472-  
282 8206.2000.tb00425.x.
- 283 Martinez JL. 2014. General principles of antibiotic resistance in bacteria. *Drug Discovery Today:*  
284 *Technologies* 11:33–39. DOI: 10.1016/j.ddtec.2014.02.001.
- 285 Martinez JL, Baquero F. 2000. Mutation frequencies and antibiotic resistance. *Antimicrobial*  
286 *Agents and Chemotherapy* 44:1771–1777. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.44.7.1771-1777.2000.
- 287 Martinez JL, Fajardo A, Garmendia L, Hernandez A, Linares JF, Martínez-Solano L, Sánchez  
288 MB. 2009. A global view of antibiotic resistance. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* 33:44–65.  
289 DOI: 10.1111/j.1574-6976.2008.00142.x.
- 290 Matuschek E, Brown DFJ, Kahlmeter G. 2014. Development of the EUCAST disk diffusion

- 291 antimicrobial susceptibility testing method and its implementation in routine microbiology  
292 laboratories. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 20:O255–O266. DOI: 10.1111/1469-  
293 0691.12373.
- 294 Milly PJ, Toledo RT, Ramakrishnan S. 2005. Determination of minimum inhibitory  
295 concentration of liquid smoke fractions. *Journal of Food Science* 70:5–16. DOI:  
296 10.1111/j.1365-2621.2005.tb09040.x.
- 297 O'Neill J. 2015. Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. Tackling a Global Health Crisis: Rapid  
298 Diagnostics □: Stopping Unnecessary Use of Antibiotics. *Independent Review on AMR*:1–  
299 36.
- 300 Odds FC. 2003. Synergy, antagonism, and what the chequerboard puts between them. *Journal of*  
301 *Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 52:1–1. DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkg301.
- 302 Orhan G, Bayram A, Zer Y, Balci I. 2005. Synergy tests by E test and checkerboard methods of  
303 antimicrobial combinations against *Brucella melitensis*. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*  
304 43:140–143. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.43.1.140-143.2005.
- 305 Pachón-Ibáñez ME, Smani Y, Pachón J, Sánchez-Céspedes J. 2017. Perspectives for clinical use  
306 of engineered human host defense antimicrobial peptides. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*  
307 41:323–342. DOI: 10.1093/femsre/fux012.
- 308 Pfaller MA, Espinel-Ingroff A, Boyken L, Hollis RJ, Kroeger J, Messer SA, Tendolkar S,  
309 Diekema DJ. 2011. Comparison of the broth microdilution (BMD) method of the European  
310 Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing with the 24-hour CLSI BMD method  
311 for testing susceptibility of *Candida* species to fluconazole, posaconazole, and voriconazole  
312 by use of ep. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 49:845–850. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.02441-10.
- 313 Rolain J-M, Abat C, Jimeno M-T, Fournier P-E, Raoult D. 2016. Do we need new antibiotics?  
314 *Clinical microbiology and infection □: the official publication of the European Society of*  
315 *Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 22:408–415. DOI:  
316 10.1016/j.cmi.2016.03.012.
- 317 Ruden S, Hilpert K, Berditsch M, Wadhvani P, Ulrich AS. 2009. Synergistic interaction  
318 between silver nanoparticles and membrane-permeabilizing antimicrobial peptides.  
319 *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 53:3538–3540. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.01106-08.
- 320 Sahly H, Schubert S, Harder J, Rautenberg P, Ullmann U, Schröder J, Podschun R. 2003.  
321 *Burkholderia* is highly resistant to human beta-defensin 3. *Antimicrobial Agents and*  
322 *Chemotherapy* 47:1739–1741. DOI: 10.1128/AAC.47.5.1739-1741.2003.
- 323 Sánchez-Gómez S, Japelj B, Jerala R, Moriyón I, Alonso MF, Leiva J, Blondelle SE, Andrá J,  
324 Brandenburg K, Lohner K, De Tejada GM. 2011. Structural features governing the activity  
325 of lactoferricin-derived peptides that act in synergy with antibiotics against *Pseudomonas*  
326 *aeruginosa* in vitro and in vivo. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 55:218–228. DOI:  
327 10.1128/AAC.00904-10.
- 328 Schröder JM. 1999. Epithelial antimicrobial peptides: Innate local host response elements.  
329 *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences* 56:32–46. DOI: 10.1007/s000180050004.
- 330 Steckbeck JD, Deslouches B, Montelaro RC. 2014. Antimicrobial peptides: new drugs for bad  
331 bugs? *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy* 14:11–14. DOI:  
332 10.1517/14712598.2013.844227.
- 333 Suarez-Carmona M, Hubert P, Delvenne P, Herfs M. 2015. Defensins: “Simple” antimicrobial  
334 peptides or broad-spectrum molecules? *Cytokine and Growth Factor Reviews* 26:361–370.  
335 DOI: 10.1016/j.cytogfr.2014.12.005.
- 336 Turner J, Cho Y, Dinh NN, Waring AJ, Lehrer RI. 1998. Activities of LL-37, a cathelin-

- 337 associated antimicrobial peptide of human neutrophils. *Antimicrobial Agents and*  
338 *Chemotherapy* 42:2206–2214. DOI: 10.1128/aac.42.9.2206.
- 339 Wang G, Li X, Wang Z. 2016. APD3: The antimicrobial peptide database as a tool for research  
340 and education. *Nucleic Acids Research* 44:D1087–D1093. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkv1278.
- 341 White RL, Burgess DS, Manduru M, Bosso JA. 1996. Comparison of three different in vitro  
342 methods of detecting synergy: Time-kill, checkerboard, and E test. *Antimicrobial Agents*  
343 *and Chemotherapy* 40:1914–1918.
- 344 Wilmes M, Cammue BPA, Sahl HG, Thevissen K. 2011. Antibiotic activities of host defense  
345 peptides: More to it than lipid bilayer perturbation. *Natural Product Reports* 28:1350–1358.  
346 DOI: 10.1039/c1np00022e.
- 347 Xhindoli D, Pacor S, Benincasa M, Scocchi M, Gennaro R, Tossi A. 2016. The human  
348 cathelicidin LL-37 - A pore-forming antibacterial peptide and host-cell modulator.  
349 *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Biomembranes* 1858:546–566. DOI:  
350 10.1016/j.bbamem.2015.11.003.
- 351 Zharkova MS, Orlov DS, Golubeva OY, Chakchir OB, Eliseev IE, Grinchuk TM, Shamova O V.  
352 2019. Application of antimicrobial peptides of the innate immune system in combination  
353 with conventional antibiotics-a novel way to combat antibiotic resistance? *Frontiers in*  
354 *Cellular and Infection Microbiology* 9. DOI: 10.3389/fcimb.2019.00128.