Journal of Advanced Research 31 (2021) 165-175

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Advanced Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jare

Review

Virulence alterations in staphylococcus aureus upon treatment with the sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics



Juan Chen^a, Huyue Zhou^a, Jingbin Huang^a, Rong Zhang^{a,*}, Xiancai Rao^{b,*}

^a Department of Pharmacy, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Army Medical University, Chongqing 400037, PR China ^b Department of Microbiology, College of Basic Medical Sciences, Army Medical University, Key Laboratory of Microbial Engineering under the Educational Committee in Chongqing, Chongqing 400038, PR China

нісніснтя

- Sub-MICs of antibiotics cause deformed *S. aureus* cells.
- Antibiotics at sub-MICs affect the expression of *S. aureus* virulence factors.
- Sub-MICs of antibiotics impact on the adhesion and invasion of *S. aureus*.
- Sub-MICs of antibiotics moderate *S. aureus* biofilm formation.
- Antibiotics at sub-MIC levels affect SCV production of *S. aureus*.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 8 September 2020 Revised 9 January 2021 Accepted 12 January 2021 Available online 23 January 2021

Keywords: Staphylococcus aureus Virulence Sub-MICs Antibiotics

G R A P H I C A L A B S T R A C T



ABSTRACT

Background: The treatment of patients with *Staphylococcus aureus* infections mainly relies on antistaphylococcal regimens that are established with effective antibiotics. In antibiotic therapy or while living in nature, pathogens often face the sub-inhibitory concentrations (sub-MICs) of antibiotics due to drug pharmacokinetics, diffusion barriers, waste emission, resistant organism formation, and farming application. Different categories of antibiotics at sub-MICs have diverse effects on the physiological and chemical properties of microorganisms. These effects can result in virulence alterations. However, the mechanisms underlying the actions of antibiotics at sub-MICs on *S. aureus* virulence are obscure.

Aim of review: In this review, we focus on the effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on *S. aureus* virulence from the aspects of cell morphological change, virulence factor expression, bacterial adherence and invasion, staphylococcal biofilm formation, and small-colony variant (SCV) production. The possible mechanisms of antibiotic-induced *S. aureus* virulence alterations are also addressed.

Key scientific concepts of review: Five main aspects of bacterial virulence can be changed in *S. aureus* exposure to the sub-MIC levels of antibiotics, resulting in deformed bacterial cells to stimulate abnormal host immune responses, abnormally expressed virulence factors to alter disease development, changed bacterial adhesion and invasion abilities to affect colonization and diffusion, altered biofilm formation to potentate material-related infections, and increased SCV formation to achieve persistent infection and recurrence. These advanced findings expand our knowledge to rethink the molecular signaling roles of antibiotics beyond their actions as antimicrobial agents.

© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of Cairo University. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

* Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: xqpharmacylab@126.com (R. Zhang), raoxiancai@126.com (X. Rao).

Introduction

The escalating crisis of antimicrobial resistance due to the extensive and indiscriminate use of antibiotics and their leakage

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2021.01.008

2090-1232/© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of Cairo University.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

into the environment has garnered appeal. The antibiotic resistance of a certain bacterium is phenotypically determined by minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs), which are defined as the lowest antibiotic concentrations that can inhibit the growth of pathogens in a medium after 18-24 h of culture in vitro. During antibiotic therapy or while living in nature, however, pathogens may encounter the sub-inhibitory concentrations (sub-MICs) of antibiotics due to several situations [1,2]. First, antibiotic concentrations decrease to sub-MICs over time after administration as a result of the pharmacokinetics of antibiotics [3]. Second, the occurrence of antibiotic sub-MICs in tissues or the internal milieu of bacterial biofilms is attributed to physical and chemical barriers to antibiotic penetration, as well as to drug-drug interactions in sites other than in the blood where pathogens are in direct contact with antibiotics [4-8]. Third, antibiotic sub-MICs may be generated after waste emissions from hospitals and other treatment facilities or pharmaceutical manufacturers. Fourth, antibiotic sub-MICs can occur owing to bacterial evolution and drug-resistant organism formation [1]. Lastly, in stock farming, antimicrobial drugs used at sub-MICs are still allowed in some countries to promote animal production or prevent bacterial infections [9]. The important effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on the morphology, biofilm formation, and virulence expression of Gram-positive and Gramnegative bacteria are of interest and have been intensively investigated in the last decade [10].

Staphylococcus aureus is a representative of Gram-positive bacteria and the culprit pathogen of human beings; this bacterium causes a variety of infections ranging from local suppurative infections to fetal pneumonia, pseudomembranous enteritis, pyelonephritis, pericarditis, sepsis, and brain abscess [11]. The co-infections of S. aureus with other prevalent pathogens, such as Pseudomonas aeruginosa, human immunodeficiency virus, and SARS-CoV-2, have been reported [12-14]. The pathogenicity of S. aureus mainly depends on the expression of multiple virulence factors, such as hemolytic toxins, including α -, β -, γ -, and δ -toxins, that can damage platelets, destroy lysosomes, and cause local ischemia and necrosis: Panton-Valentine leucocidin (PVL), a poreforming toxin that destroys white blood cells and macrophages: eight serotypes of enterotoxins, namely, A, B, C₁, C₂, C₃, D, E, and F; toxic shock staphylococcal toxin 1 (TSST-1), coagulase, and staphylococcal protein A (SpA) [11]. In addition, the factors responsible for bacterial adherence, motility, and biofilm formation are associated with the virulence of S. aureus. Accumulated studies have demonstrated that S. aureus can develop genetic and phenotypic variations and alter its virulence expression to adapt to stress environments with the sub-MICs of antibiotics [1,2].

The effect of antibiotics at sub-MIC concentrations on S. aureus was first investigated in 1940 by Gardner, who observed the morphological changes of S. aureus upon exposure to 1/4 MIC of penicillin in vitro [15]. Different categories of antibiotics may have diverse effects on bacterial morphology and virulence production. However, some research results are contradictory, and the mechanisms underlying antibiotic actions at sub-MICs remain obscure. The sub-MICs of β -lactams have been shown to enhance the expression of S. aureus exotoxins and adhesion factors positively [16,17]. By contrast, the production of *S. aureus* toxins is significantly suppressed under exposure to the sub-MICs of antimicrobial agents, such as lincosamides and oxazolidinones, which target microbial ribosomes [18]. The most studies concerning the effects of antibiotics at sub-MIC concentrations on the virulence of S. aureus have been conducted in vitro, and the in vivo researches are rare and encouraging [1,4,5,18]. In this review, we summarized the in vitro effects of the sub-MICs of antibiotics on the virulence of S. aureus from the aspects of morphology, virulence expression, bacterial adherence and invasion, biofilm formation, and smallcolony variant (SCV) production. The in vivo effects of antibiotics at sub-MICs on the virulence of *S. aureus* were also addressed in a separate section.

Effects of the sub-MICs of antibiotics on the morphology of *S. aureus*

In general, intact bacteria are rod-shaped (bacilli), spherical (cocci), and spiral-shaped (spirilla). Bacilli are most common, followed by cocci, and spirilla are relatively rare. S. aureus is spherical. When cultured in agar plates, S. aureus colonies present round and swollen shapes, smooth surfaces, and neat edges with or without golden yellow pigments. Treatment with antibiotics at sub-MICs can cause three main types of morphological changes in *S. aureus*, specifically, cell morphology deformation, cell wall component changes, and cell wall breakdown [19-21]. For example, enlarged or damaged methicillin-resistant S. aureus (MRSA) subsp. aureus USA300_FPR3757 and methicillin-susceptible S. aureus (MSSA) subsp. aureus Rosenbach American Type Culture Collection (ATCC[®]) 25923[™] cells with reduced adhesiveness, double cells attached to each other, or S. aureus cells with emerging holes are observed upon exposure to the 1/2 to 1/8 MIC of dicloxacillin, cefodizime, cefotaxime, or ceftriaxone [19,20]. A 1/2 MIC concentration of cefodizime presents the greatest effect on the damage of S. aureus $ATCC^{\text{B}} 25923^{\text{TM}}$, and the morphological changes are also observed at 1/4 and 1/8 MIC concentration of cefodizime but to a lesser extent [20]. The ciprofloxacin (CFX) at 1/2 MIC (64 μ g/mL) and its membrane-targeting-modified derivatives CFX-ester-PPh3 $(1/2 \text{ MIC} = 5.56 \ \mu\text{g/mL})$ and CFX-amide-PPh3 $(1/2 \text{ MIC} = 1.39 \ \mu\text{g/})$ mL) can induce dramatically morphological changes, such as thinned and irregular deformation, membrane disruption, loss of cell contents in the MRSA strain 5016 [22]. The cell membrane permeability increases in a dose-dependent manner in MRSA252 treated with berberine at sub-MICs (1/8 to 1/2 MIC), as a result, the doughnut shaped cells appear under the transmission electron microscope observation [23]. Juma et al. reported that a combination of 20% MIC of sophorolipid biosurfactant (0.4%, v/v) and 80% MIC of tetracycline (0.4 µg/mL) can result in significantly morphological changes in MRSA ATCC[®] 43300[™] with larger cell diameters (from 758 \pm 75 to 1276 \pm 220 nm, P < 0.01) and increased bacterial core stiffness (from 205 ± 46 to 396 ± 66 mN/m, P < 0.01) compared with those in bacteria treated with tetracycline alone [24]. When exposure to 1/4 MIC of thioridazine (4 µg/mL), MRSA USA300_FPR3757 cells present thickened and irregular cell walls with a shortage of intracellular amino acids [19]. The 1/2 MIC of ceftaroline (0.25 µg/mL) can cause cell wall breakdown and cellshape deformation in MRSA strains 06/1483 and 05/3291 [25]. Treatment with 1.5 µM of the membrane-active lipopeptide compound C10OOC12O, MRSA USA300 cells exhibit sustained mild membrane damages, and Hershkovits et al. speculated that such damaged bacterial membrane may not yet damaged enough at sub-MIC concentration of lipopeptide to the leakage of larger chemical molecules, such as ATP, which indeed happens at the MIC concentration of C1000C120 (12.5 µM in Luria Bertani medium) [26].

Different antibiotics at sub-MIC concentrations may have different effects on the morphology of *S. aureus* cells. The 1/2 MIC of desleucyl-oritavancin (10 µg/mL) can cause cell wall disorders with reduced cell wall cross-linking efficiencies and increased *N*deacetylated muropeptides in *S. aureus* ATCC[®] 6538P^{IM} [27], whereas the sub-MICs (1/2 to 1/32 MIC) of ciprofloxacin and amikacin have no effects on the morphology of a clinical *S. aureus* isolate [28]. In principle, the sub-MICs of certain antibiotics can weaken *S. aureus* cell walls through binding to penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs), such as methicillin and cefoxitin [29]. Moreover, some antimicrobial agents, such as vancomycin, may change peptidoglycan cross-linking via binding to the D-alanyl-D-alanine moieties of lipid II, a precursor of cell wall biosynthesis [27,30]. Others, such as tunicamycin at sub-MICs of 2.5 and 5 µg/mL, can promote cell deformation by targeting and altering the cell wall teichoic acid in *S. aureus* strains ATCC[®] 29213[™], ATCC[®] 43300[™], ATCC[®] 25923[™], and PRI 4656 [31]. Still others, like oritavancin, may cause cell wall disorders by binding to cross-linked peptidoglycans in cell walls to interfere with cell wall maturation [27]. All these possible mechanisms are summarized and presented in Fig. 1.

Although the effects of the sub-MICs of antibiotics on *S. aureus* morphology may exhibit strain-to-strain differences, three main effects are exerted after the formation of deformed S. aureus upon treatment with the sub-MICs of antibiotics. First, in combination with antibiotics, S. aureus cell deformations may hinder antibiotic resistance or facilitate death, thus resulting in sub-MIC concentration of drug-induced antibiotic sensitivity. Thorsing et al. reported that 1/4 MIC of thioridazine can be able to sensitize MRSA USA300 to the antimicrobial effect of dicloxaillin by reduction of the cell viability by 3 log10 CFU/mL compared with that under dicloxaillin-treatment alone [19]. The combination of sub-MIC concentrations of sodium new houttuyfonate and berberine chloride offers a synergistic action against MRSA strains ATCC® 43300[™] and ATCC[®] 33591[™], as well as a vancomycinintermediate S. aureus strain Mu50 [32]. Second, S. aureus with poorly cross-linked cell walls after treatment with antibiotics at sub-MICs may release a large number of toxins and other pathogenic factors to aggravate the inflammatory response in the host [33]. Lastly, changes in S. aureus cell wall components after sub-MICs of antibiotic treatment may affect the adhesion and aggregation capabilities of staphylococcal cells, resulting in decreased colonization [19,21]. However, whether and how antimicrobial susceptibility, host immune response, and bacterial pathogenicity in deformed S. aureus bacteria are changed upon exposure to sub-MICs of antibiotics remain largely unknown, and further investigations are suggested to illustrate these points.

Effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on the expression profiles of *S. aureus* virulence factors

Bacterial virulence refers to the degree of the pathogenicity of a certain pathogen to its host. Increasing data have shown that the sub-MICs of antimicrobial agents can alter the expression levels of bacterial toxins and those of factors responsible for colonization and invasion. Recently, Hodille *et al.* reviewed the effects of the diverse categories of antibiotics on *S. aureus* toxin production and host immune response [10]. They concluded that treatment with the sub-MICs of ribosome-targeting antibiotics and cell wall-active agents result in opposing manifestations of *S. aureus* virulence factor expression, with the former resulting in decreased production and the latter increasing expression. Such information is important for the establishment of valuable therapeutic regimens to improve patient outcomes in case of *S. aureus* infections. Table 1 lists the effects of the sub-MICs of different antibiotics on the expression of virulence factors in *S. aureus*.

The effects of antimicrobial agents on *S. aureus* virulence factor expression are commonly investigated by reporter fusion assays for specific gene promoters of interest, the mRNA quantitation of virulence factors, transcriptomic profiling, and the measurement of certain virulence proteins and proteomic profiles [10]. The effect of antibiotics on the production of α -toxin. a major virulence factor that contributes to staphylococcal disease, was first explored by Kernodle et al. [44]. They found that nafcillin-nonsusceptible and -susceptible *S. aureus* strains display increased α -toxin expression when treated with 0.006 to 0.1 μ g/mL of nafcillin compared with the untreated bacteria. Further studies confirmed that α -toxin expression increases upon β-lactam exposure, and such βlactams seemingly induce increased α -toxin production in MRSA by up to 30-fold relative to that in MSSA strains [45]. Other investigations have shown that α -toxin expression reduces after treatment with the sub-MICs of fusidic acid, erythromycin, or aminoglycosides (Table 1).

PVL is another *S. aureus*-produced pore-forming toxin that contributes to bacterial pathogenesis. The sub-MICs (ranging from 1/8 to 1/2 MIC) of β-lactams, including oxacillin and nafcillin, can induce an increase in the production of PVL against diverse *S. aureus* backgrounds (ST1, ST8, ST80, and ST59) [16,17,39], whereas other antibiotics, such as tedizolid and linezolid at 1/16 MIC, result in decreased PVL production in MRSA 1560, and the decreased mRNA levels of PVL are also observed in MRSA USA300 after treatment with sub-MICs (1/8 to 1/2 MIC) of clindamycin, linezolid, and tigecycline [2,39]. Studies have demonstrated that the antibiotics active in protein synthesis inhibition exert varied effects on TSST-1 production with the most remarkable inhibitory effects (Table 1). Most recently, our group revealed that only the sub-MICs of β-lactam antibiotics, such as oxacillin, methicillin, cefox-



Cell-enlarged or membrane damage

Fig. 1. The potential mechanisms underlying the formation of S. aureus deformation cells upon treatment with antibiotics at sub-MICs.

J. Chen, H. Zhou, J. Huang et al.

Table 1

The expression levels of virulence factors in S. aureus cultured in the presence of sub-MICs of antibiotics compared with those in S. aureus without antibiotic-treatment.

Antibiotics	Hla	PVL	TSST-1	PSM	SPA	Coagulase	Enterotoxins A and B	References
Penicillin	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	↑	Ν	Ν	[10]
Methicillin	Î	Ν	N	Ν	<u> </u>	-	Ν	[34,35]
Oxacillin	N	Î	N	Ļ	Î	Ν	Ν	[10]
Nafcillin	Î	Î	N	N	N	Ν	Ν	[2,10]
Imipenem	N	Î	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	[10]
Gentamicin	Ν	N	Ļ	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	[10]
Erythromycin	Ļ	Ν	N	Î	Ν	Ν	Ν	[10]
Flucloxacillin	N	Ν	\downarrow	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	[10]
Roxithromycin	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[35]
Enoxacin	\downarrow	Ν	Ν	Ν	-	-	Ν	[34,35]
Ciprofloxacin	\downarrow	Ν	Ν	Ν	-	-	Ν	[35]
Azithromycin	\downarrow	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	[36]
Lincomycin	Ν	Ν	N	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[34]
Clindamycin	\downarrow	Ļ	\downarrow	\downarrow	Ļ	\downarrow	Ν	[10,34,36,37]
Fosfomycin (FOM)	\downarrow	Ν	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	[38]
Tigecycline	\downarrow	Ļ	\downarrow	Ν	Ļ	Ν	Ν	[10,39]
Vancomycin	Ν	-	-	Ν	-	Ν	Ν	[39]
Daptomycin	Ν	-	N	Ν	-	Ν	Ν	[39]
Linezolid	\downarrow	Ļ	\downarrow	Î	Ļ	Ν	\downarrow	[10,39]
Tedizolid	\downarrow	Ļ	\downarrow	\downarrow	Ν	Ν	Ν	[2]
Mupirocin	Ļ	N	N	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	[37]
Costus oil	Ļ	N	Ļ	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	[21]
Fusidic acid	Ļ	N	N	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	[40]
C1000c120	\downarrow	Ν	N	N	Ν	N	N	[26]
LP5	\downarrow	Ν	N	N	Î	N	\downarrow	[41]
Thymol	\downarrow	Ν	N	N	Ν	N	\downarrow	[21]
Chlorogenic Acid	Ļ	Ν	N	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[21]
Sclareol	Ļ	Ν	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	[42]
L-NPDNJ	\downarrow	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	[43]

"1", the expression level increased; "1", the expression level decreased; "-", comparable in the expression level; N, not determined.

itin, imipenem, and meropenem, but not vancomycin, chloramphenicol, erythromycin, and kanamycin, can promote the expression of a cluster of lipoprotein-like genes (*sa2275-sa2273*) encoding important virulence factors that contribute to MRSA pathogenicity [29]. A natural terpenoid (+)- nootkatone at a sub-MIC of 50 µg/mL suppresses the expression levels of *sarA*, *agrA*, *RNAIII*, and *spa*, which regulate the expression of toxins, in both MRSA strain SJTUF 20758 and MSSA strain ATCC[®] 25923[™] [46].

The mechanisms underlying the actions of antibiotics at sub-MICs on *S. aureus* virulence expression are multifaceted. Antibiotics at sub-MICs can not only regulate the expression of toxins (e.g., α toxin, PVL, SpA, PSM, and enterotoxins) through quorum sensing systems; two-component systems; or other regulators, such as SaeRS, SarA, Rot, and CcpA, but also directly bind to some amino acids of toxin proteins to affect their functions. For example, fosfomycin inhibits the activity of *S. aureus* α -toxin by binding to its Lys154 and Asp108 [38]. Furthermore, antibiotics targeting the 50S ribosome of bacteria can impair bacterial transcription and result in the accumulation of mRNA and transcription complex intermediates, thereby resulting in the accumulation of toxin mRNA [47].

Virulence factors implement their pathogenic roles either by host cell destruction or cell regulation pathway utilization. For example, *S. aureus* α -toxin may promote host inflammatory necrosis through the MAPK-associated signaling pathway or inflammasome-mediated inflammation [38]. An *et al.* reported that fosfomycin at a sub-MIC concentration (4 µg/mL) reduces the expression of α -toxin in *S. aureus* 8325–4, and the phosphorylation levels of p38, ERK, and JNK are remarkably decreased in THP-1 cells infected by fosfomycin-treated *S. aureus* relative to the untreated strain [38]. They also revealed that fosfomycin treatment can downregulate inflammasome-NLRP3-mediated inflammation in macrophages infected by α -toxin-positive *S. aureus*. These data are highly consistent with those of Morikawa *et al.*, who observed that the sub-MICs of fosfomycin can greatly diminish IL-1 β levels in LPS-treated human monocytes [48].

Effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on the adhesion and invasion of *S. aureus*

The pathogenesis of *S. aureus* is closely associated with its capacity to adhere directly to host cells or to the extracellular matrix (ECM) [49]. Bacterial adhesion is the first step in the invasion of host cells and the formation of biofilms. A repertoire of adhesive molecules, including staphylococcal Fn-binding proteins A and B, clumping factors A and B, serine aspartate repeat-containing protein D, serine-rich adhesin for platelets, and staphylococcal autolysin, are responsible for *S. aureus* adhesion [50]. The effects of the sub-MIC levels of antibiotics on *S. aureus* adhesion and invasion may vary depending on the bacterial strain and host cell model used.

The overall roles of certain antibiotics at the sub-MICs in S. aureus adhesion and invasion are summarized in Table 2. Maioli et al. reported that the role of ceftibuten, a third-generation cephalosporin, at sub-MICs (1/4 MIC to 1/2 MIC) in the clinical treatment of bacterial infection is mainly attributed to its antiadherence characteristics [72]. Sasso *et al.* demonstrated that the fluoroquinolone agent gemifloxacin at the 1/32 MIC concentration significantly reduces the adhesiveness of S. aureus ATCC[®] 25923[™] to primary human mucosal epithelial cells [3]. The strain-dependent modulatory effects of antibiotics at sub-MICs on the adhesion capabilities of S. aureus have been observed. Lázaro-Díez et al. revealed that the 1/2 to 1/4 MIC levels of ceftaroline can enhance bacterial adhesion of MRSA clinical isolates 06/1483 and 05/3291, whereas MRSA strain 05/2369 presents a reduced adhesive capability at the sub-MICs of ceftaroline tested [25]. The expression levels of adhesion-associated genes (fnbA, fnbB, clfA, clfB, and icaD) increase by more than 5-fold in S. aureus strain CCARM 3080 exposed to a half MIC of levofloxacin [51]. The relative expression levels of *clfB* and fnbB increase in S. aureus strain KACC 10778 treated with oxacillin (>3-fold), whereas those of *icaA* and *icaD* genes are downregulated by more than 5-fold under 1/2 MIC of levofloxacin or oxacillin treatment. When S. aureus ATCC[®] 15564[™] is used, how-

J. Chen, H. Zhou, J. Huang et al.

Table 2

The biofilm formation, bacterial adherence, invasion, and SCV production of *S. aureus* cultured in the presence of sub-MICs of antibiotics compared with those in *S. aureus* without antibiotic-treatment.

DocalilianININII	Antibiotics	Adhesion	Invasion	Biofilm formation	SCVs	Reference
MethicillinNNN-[54]AmpicillinNNN55]AmoxicillinNNN25]CefateinNNN25]CefateinNNN20]CefateinNNN20]CefatrianceJNN20]CefatrianceNNN20]CefatrianceNNN20]CefatrianceNNN20]CentamicinNNN56]Amikacin-1N56]CamilozacinNNN50]ZeithromycinNNN50]CatifoxacinNNN50]CiprofoxacinNNN52]CatifoxacinNNN52]CatifoxacinNNN53]CatifoxacinNNN53]CatifoxacinNNN53]CatifoxacinNNN53]MunocyclinNNN53]CatifoxacinNNN53]CatifoxacinNNN53]MunocyclinNNN53]CatifoxacinNNN53]MunocyclinNNN53]MunocyclinNNN53]MunocyclinNNN <t< td=""><td>Oxacillin</td><td>Î</td><td>Ν</td><td></td><td>Ν</td><td>[51-53]</td></t<>	Oxacillin	Î	Ν		Ν	[51-53]
Anpoillin-1NN51AmoxicilinoNN-54CertaroineNNTN25CedakinNNN20CedakinoINN20CedakinoINN20CedakinoINN20CentinonNNN20CentinonNNN55Gemifloxacin-TN56Amikacin-TN50CentinoxacinNNI50ErythomycinNNI50ErythomycinNNI51CathromycinNNN51ErythomycinNNI52CatificoxacinNNN52CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinINN53CatificoxacinNNI<	Methicillin	N	Ν	Ň	-	[54]
AmbachlinNNN-14CeflatolineINTN251CeflatolineINTN201CeflatolineINN201CeflatonineINN201CeflatonineINN201CeflatonineNNN201CeflatonineNNN201CentanicinNNN201KananycinNNN201CambaccinNNN201CentinkacinNNN201CentinkacinNNN201CentinkacinNNN201CiprofloxacinNNI201CiprofloxacinNNN201CiprofloxacinNNN201CatifloxacinINN201CatifloxacinINN201CatifloxacinNNS01201CatifloxacinNNS01201CatifloxacinNNS01201CatifloxacinNNS01201MusicyclineNNS01201MusicyclineNNS01201MusicyclineNNS01201MusicyclineNNS01201MusicyclineNNS01201 <td>Ampicillin</td> <td>-</td> <td>↑.</td> <td>Ν</td> <td>Ν</td> <td>[55]</td>	Ampicillin	-	↑.	Ν	Ν	[55]
Ceflacian Ceflacian CeflacianNN1N25Ceflacian CeflacianeINNN20CeflacianeINN20CeflacianeINN20CentanucinNNN20CentanucinNNN20CentanucinNNN55CentanucinINN55CentanucinINN55CentanucinNNI100AmilacinNNI50AuthromycinNNI50EgrithomycinNNI50EgrithomycinNNI56MontifoxacinNNN55EgrithomycinNNN55EgrithomycinINN10EgrithomycinINN57MontifoxacinINN57RuffoxacinINN56CindamycinNNN56CindamycinNNI10CindamycinNNI10LincovidNNI10LincovidNNI10LincovidNNI10LincovidNNI10LincovidNNI10LincovidNN	Amoxicillin	Ν	Ň	Ν	_	[54]
Celatizani N I N N S1 Celofizione I N N N 201 Certanicio N N N N 201 Centanicio N N N 1 541 Kananycin N N N 1 551 Genifoxacin I N N 131 Telthromycin N N 1 N 1501 Certanicio N N 1 N 151 Genifoxacin N N 1 N 1501 Erythomycin N N N 1 - 122,541 Enrofoxacin N N N N 1 521 Gatifoxacin I N N N 531 Kulloxacin I N N - 54,561 Chadibaxcin I N N - 54,561	Ceftaroline	 ↑	N	↑.	Ν	[25]
CerdinizineINNN201GertinizionNNN1N201GentinicinNNN1N561AnanycinNNNS51561Amilacin-TNN551GernifloxacinINNS01501YathromycinNNIN501FeythomycinNNI-524GiorofloxacinNNI-524EirofloxacinNNNN521BiofloxacinINNN521HatloxacinINNN521RufloxacinINNN521RufloxacinINNN521MuscloxacinNNN1-54561ClindamycinNNN1-54561ClindamycinNNN1-54561ClindamycinNNN11522-541MuscloxinNNN11561ClindamycinNNN11561LinezviciNNIN561LinezviciNNIN561LinezviciNNIN561LinezviciNNIN561Linezvi	Cefalexin	Ň	N	↑ ↑	N	[35]
CertrixoneINNNP0GentamicinNNN154KananycinNN1NS5GentifioacinINNN55GentifioacinNNNS1TelthronycinNNNS9ZathronycinNNINS9ZathronycinNNI-S9ErythronycinNNNS9S9ErythronycinNNN-S9ErythronycinNNN-S9KathronycinNNN-S9ErythronycinNNNS1S9MoxifloxacinINNNS9ClafithronycinNNNS9S6MoxifloxacinINNS9S6ClafithronycinNNN-S456ClafithronycinNN-S6S6MinocycineNNI-S6UnaptomycinNNINS9VanconycinNNINS6LinezolidNNINS6UnaptomycinNNINS6PisaforNNINS6RisinINNIS6RisinNNI <td< td=""><td>Cefodizime</td><td>1</td><td>N</td><td>Ň</td><td>N</td><td>[20]</td></td<>	Cefodizime	1	N	Ň	N	[20]
GentamicinNNNISelKananycinNINSelAmilacin-TNNSelGenillozacinINNNSelCelintonycinNNINSelAzithronycinNNINSelErythronycinNNI-SelCiproflozacinNNI-SelCiproflozacinNNINSelCatifloxacinINNSelSelCatifloxacinINNSelSelCatifloxacinINNNSelCatifloxacinINNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNNSelSelCatifloxacinNNN	Ceftriaxone	ľ	Ν	Ν	Ν	[20]
KnamycinNNIN66Amikacin-TNN55GemilkozainINN31TeithromycinNNIN50AzithromycinNNIN50ErythromycinNNI-22,54)ErythromycinNNNS656Moxifkozcin1NNS656Moxifkozcin1NNS256Gatifkozcin1NNS857Kufkozcin1NNS857ClindkorpcinNNN5356Clindkorpcin1NN5356Clindkorpcin1NN5356Clindkorpcin1NN5356Clindkorpcin1NN5356Vanconycin1NN5356MupiconNN1-54,561Linezold-NN1-52,54,59DaptomycinNN1N56FusidicacidNN1N56MupiconNN1N56Inezold-NN1N56EystincinNN1N56FusidicacidNN1N56Fusidicacid </td <td>Gentamicin</td> <td>Ň</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>1</td> <td>[54]</td>	Gentamicin	Ň	N	N	1	[54]
Anikacin-1NNS1GemilfoxacinINNN3I clithromycinNNIN90AzithromycinNNIN90AzithromycinNNIN90ErythromycinNNI-52,54CiprofloxacinNNI-22,54ErofloxacinNNIN56MosifloxacinTNNN52CatifloxacinINNN57RufloxacinINNN58Tetracyclin,NNN-54,4ClindamycinNN-52,54,34MinocyclineNN-52,54,34DaptomycinNN1-52,54,94UnizordinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56Inezolid1152,54,59MupirocinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56EvadordinNNIN56EvadordinNN <td>Kanamycin</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td></td> <td>Ň</td> <td>[56]</td>	Kanamycin	N	N		Ň	[56]
Genificaccin I N N N 1 Telithromycin N N N J N 501 Zathromycin N N J N 501 Eryfhonycin N N N - 541 Ciprofoxacin N N N - 523 Enroffoxacin N N N N 551 Gariffoxacin 1 N N N 551 Gariffoxacin 1 N N N 551 Tetracyclin, N N N - 541 Cindramycin N N - 542 561 Cindramycin N N - 52.54 501 501 Linezolid - N N - 52.54 501 Linezolid - 1 N 501 51 51 Linezolid -	Amikacin	-	 ↑	Ň	N	[55]
Tetitomycin N N I N S0 Azithromycin N N N N S0 Azithromycin N N N S0 Ciprofloxacin N N N - S2,4] Ciprofloxacin N N I - S2,5] Brafloxacin I N N N S2 Gatifloxacin I N N N S2 Gatifloxacin I N N N S3 Tetracyclin, N N N - S4,50 Clarithromycin N N - S4,50 S0,54 Minocycline N N - S0 S0,54 Minocycline N N - S0 S0,54 Mupirocin N N - S0 S0 Linezolid - N I N S0	Gemifloxacin	1	Ň	N	N	[3]
Azithromycin N I N I N I N I I ID Erythromycin N N N I - [54] Ciprofloxacin N N I N Set [52] Gatfloxacin 1 N N N [52] Gatfloxacin 1 N N N [52] Gatfloxacin 1 N N [53] Tetracyclin, N N N [54] Clindamycin 1 N [55] [55] Vancomycin - [54] [55] [55] Vancomycin - N I - [55] Vancomycin - N N [52] [52] Daptomycin N N I - [54,60] Lincomycin N N I N [52] Mupitocin N N I	Telithromycin	↓ N	N		N	[50]
Erythromycin N N N N I Ist of the second seco	Azithromycin	N	N	↓ I	N	[50]
Chronychn N N I P P Ciprofloxacin N N N I N [22,54] Enrofloxacin T N N I N [56] Gatfloxacin I N N N [57] Kufloxacin I N N N [53] Tetracyclin, N N N - [54] Clarithromycin T N I - [54] Clarithromycin T N I - [54] Minocycline N N - [52] [50] Muprocin N N N [50] [50] Lincoolid - N N [50] [51] Mupirocin N N I N [56] Pusidic acid I N N [56] Braberine N N I N	Frythromycin	N	N	↓ N	-	[54]
International N I N I N I N I N I I N I I N I I N I I N I I N N I I I N N N I <thi< th=""> I I <t< td=""><td>Ciproflovacin</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td></td><td>_</td><td>[22 54]</td></t<></thi<>	Ciproflovacin	N	N		_	[22 54]
Introduction I N N N N Description Gatifloxacin I N N N S2 Gatifloxacin I N N N S3 Rufloxacin I N N N S5 Tetracyclin, N N N - [54] Clarithromycin N N I - [54] Clindamycin 1 N I - [54] Clindamycin - N N - [52]-54] Daptomycin - N N S2 [54] Daptomycin N N N [52] [54] Mupirocin N N I N [56] Fusidic acid I N I N [31] Colistin sulfate N N I N [61] Nisin I N N I	Enrofloxacin	N	N	↓ 	N	[56]
Maximoselin I N N N N [24] Gatifoxacin I N N N S7 Rufloxacin I N N N S8 TetracyClin, N N N - [54] Clarithromycin N N I - [54] Clarithromycin N N I - [55] Minocycline N N - [55] [50] Muprocin N N I - [56] Lineconycin N N I - [56] Fusicia caid I N N [40] [56] Fusicia caid I I I [56] [56] Fusicia caid I I I [56] [56] Fusicia caid N N I S6] [56] Fusicia caid N N I N<	Moviflovacin	î¶ ↑	N	↓ N	N	[50]
Gambachin I N N N P Rufloxacin I N N N S8] Tetracyclin, N N N - [54] Clarithromycin N N I - [54] Clindamycin ↑ N N I 38] Minocycline N N - N [59] Vancomycin - N N S2] Minocycline N N [50] Linezolid N N N N [51] [54,60] Linezolid N N N [56] [54,60] Linezolid N N I N [40] Rifampicin - - 1 [56] [56] Reforme N N I N [61] Rifampicin - N I N [61] Rifampicin -	Catifloyacin		N	N	N	[52]
Numachi I N N N I </td <td>Buflovacin</td> <td>↓ I</td> <td>IN N</td> <td>N</td> <td>IN N</td> <td>[57]</td>	Buflovacin	↓ I	IN N	N	IN N	[57]
Introduction N N N - [54]-6 Clarithromycin T N I - [54]-65 Clindamycin T N I T [56]-56 Minocycline N N - [52]-54 Daptomycin - N I - [52]-54 Daptomycin N N I N [52]-1 Mupirocin N N I - [54]-60 Linecolid - N N [52]-1 Mupirocin N N I - [54]-60 Linecolid N N I N [56] Fusidic acid I N N [40] [56] Rifampicin - - T [56] [56] RP557 N N N I N [66] Nisin I N N I N [66] <td>Totroquelin</td> <td>↓ NI</td> <td>IN NI</td> <td>N</td> <td>IN</td> <td>[50]</td>	Totroquelin	↓ NI	IN NI	N	IN	[50]
Clinkumurguin N I <	Clarithromycin	IN NI	IN NI	IN .	-	[54]
ClinatifyClin I I I I I ISO,20,34] Minocycline N N - N S9] Vancomycin N V I N S9] Daptomycin N N I N S0] Linezolid - N N S2] Mupirocin N N I N S2] Lincomycin N N I N S2] Inicamycin - - I S2] S3 Rifampicin - - I S2 S4,60] Inicamycin I N N I S5 Colistin sulfate N N I S5 S6 Berberine N N I N S6 RP557 N N N I S6 Glyceryl trinitrate N N I N I Garboxymethyl chitosan N N I N I Lugenol	Clindamycin	ÎN A	IN NI	↓ ↓	–	[34,30]
MinocyclineNN-NJNJSJDaptomycinNNI- $52-54$ DaptomycinNNIN 50 Linczolid-NNN 52 MupirocinNNIN 52 LincomycinNNIN 52 LincomycinNNIN 56 Fusidic acidININ 40 RifampicinT $52,54,59$ TunicamycinIIIN 31 Colistin sulfateNNIN 56 BerberineNNIN 56 RP557NNIN 62 Glyceryl trinitrateNNIN 64 Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIN 66 Chiorogenic acidINNI 66 LeugenolNNIN 67 IMD0554NNIN 68 L-NPDNJNNIN 47 ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN 47 ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN 69 Chitosan(CS)NNIN 69	Minequeline	N	IN N	\downarrow	N	[50,50,54]
Validon (Chi)-NI-DDDaptomycinNNINS2]Linezolid-NNS2]MupirocinNNI-S4.60]LincomycinNNINS6]Fusidic acidININ40]RifampicinfS2.54.59]TunicamycinIIINS6]BerberineNNINS6]BerberineNNIS6]BerberineNNIS6]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIS6]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIS6]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIS6]EugenolNNINS6]Plantaricin G21-27NNINS6]IMD354NNINS6]I-NPDNJNNINS6]I-NPONJNNINS6]I-NPONJNNINS6]I-NotakatoneNNINS6]Syph-1NNINS6]Syph-1NNINS6]Syph-1NNINS6]Syph-1NNINS6]Syph-1NNINS6]<	Minocycline	IN	IN N	-	IN	[59]
Datomycin N N I N N [50] Linezolid - N N N [52] Mupirocin N 1 - [54,60] Linezolid N I N [56] Fusidic acid I N I N [40] Rifampicin - - 1 [55] [56] Tunicamycin I I I N [31] Colistin sulfate N N I N [56] Berberine N N I N [56] RP557 N N I N [61] Nisin I N I62] [63] [64] Glyceryl trinitrate N N I64] [64] [64] Carboxymethyl chitosan N N I01 [65] [66] Eugenol N N I N [66] <td>Vancomycin</td> <td>-</td> <td>N</td> <td>Ļ</td> <td>- N</td> <td>[52-54]</td>	Vancomycin	-	N	Ļ	- N	[52-54]
Lineound Mupirocin-NNN $[2]$ MupirocinN \uparrow -56]LincomycinN \downarrow N56]Fusidic acid \downarrow N \downarrow N40]Rifampicin \uparrow \uparrow 52,54,59]Tunicamycin \downarrow \downarrow N56]BerberineNN \downarrow N56]BerberineNN \downarrow N56]RP557NN \downarrow N56]Nisin \downarrow N \downarrow N63]AlpiniapurpuratalectinNN \downarrow N66]Curlosquic acid \downarrow N \downarrow N66]EugenolNN \downarrow N21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNN \downarrow N66]Plantaricin GZ1-27NN \downarrow N68]I-ND0354NN \downarrow N68](+)-NootkatoneNN \downarrow N43](+)-NootkatoneN \downarrow N43]Chitosan(CS)NN \downarrow N66]Syph-1NN \downarrow N66]Syph-1NN \downarrow N66]ColorationNN \downarrow N66]ColorationNN \downarrow N66]Chitosan(CS)NN \downarrow N66]ColorationNN <t< td=""><td>Daptomycin</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>↓ NI</td><td>IN N</td><td>[50]</td></t<>	Daptomycin	N	N	↓ NI	IN N	[50]
Muprocin LincomycinNNI-54,60Fusidic acidNNIN56Rifampicin \uparrow \uparrow 52,54,59TunicamycinJJJN31Colistin sulfateNN1N56BerberineNNJN56RF557NNJN61NisinJNJN63AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNJ63AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNJ66Chlorogenic acidNNJ166Chlorogenic acidNN1NIMD0354NNJN68L-NPDNJNNJN43(+)-NootkatoneNNJN43(Chlorogenic CS)NNJN47ZnO-Ag NPSNNJN69Syph-1NNJN70	Linezolid	-	IN N	ÎN Î	IN	[52]
LincomycinNNINSelFusidic acidININIdRifampicin \uparrow \uparrow S2.54.59TunicamycinIIINS6BerberineNNINS6BerberineNNINS6BrystorNINS6BisinININS6Glyceryl trinitrateNINS6Garbaymethyl chitosanNINS6EugenolNNIS6Chlorogenic acidINNS6Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIS6IMD0354NNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNIS6L-NPDNJNNINChitosan(CS)NNINSyph-1NNINNININSyph-1NNINNININSyph-1NNINSymb-1NNIN <td>Mupirocin</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>T.</td> <td>-</td> <td>[54,60]</td>	Mupirocin	N	N	T.	-	[54,60]
ruside acidININ[40]RifampicinIIIIS2,54,59)TunicamycinIINS2,54,59)Colistin sulfateNNINS6]BerberineNNINS6]RP557NNNIS6]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIS6]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIS6]AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNIS6]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIS6]Chlorogenic acidINNS6]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNINIMD0354NNIS6]L-NPDNJNNIS6](+)-NotkatoneNNINZnO-Ag NPsNNINChitosan(CS)NNINSyph-1NNINSyph-1NNINSyph-1NNINSyph-1NNINSyph-1NNINNNININNININNININNININNININNININNINI <t< td=""><td>Lincomycin</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>Ļ</td><td>N</td><td>[56]</td></t<>	Lincomycin	N	N	Ļ	N	[56]
Ritampicinfff52,54,59Tunicamycin \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow NS1Colistin sulfateN \downarrow NS6BerberineNN \downarrow NS6RP557NN \downarrow NS6Glyceryl trinitrate \downarrow N \downarrow N61Glyceryl trinitrateN \downarrow N63AlpiniapurpuratalectinNN \downarrow N65EugenolNN \downarrow N66Chlorogenic acid \downarrow NN56Plantaricin GZ1-27NN \uparrow N56IMD0354N \downarrow N681L-NPDNJNN \downarrow N43(+)-NotkatoneN \downarrow N431ZnO-Ag NPsN \downarrow N7070Syph-1NN \downarrow N71	Fusidic acid	Ļ	N	\downarrow	N	[40]
Inncamycin↓↓N[31]Colistin sulfateNN↓N[56]BerberineNN↓N[56]RP557NN↓N[61]Nisin↓N↓N[62]Glyceryl trinitrateNN↓N[63]AlpiniapurpuratalectinNN↓N[64]Carboxymethyl chitosanNN↓N[66]EugenolNN↓N[66]Chlorogenic acid↓NN[21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNN↓N[56]Plantaricin GZ1-27NN↓N[67]IMD0354NN↓N[43](+)-NootkatoneNN↓N[43](+)-NootkatoneNN↓N[69]Chitosan(CS)NN↓N[70]Syph-1NN↓N[71]	Rifampicin	-	-	Î	Î	[52,54,59]
Colistin sulfateNNINSetBerberineNNINSetBerberineNNINSetRP557NNNSetSetNisinINNSetSetGlyceryl trinitrateNNINSetAlpiniapurpuratalectinNNISetSetCarboxymethyl chitosanNNISetSetEugenolNNISetSetSetChorogenic acidINNSetSetPlantaricin GZ1-27NNISetSetIMD0354NNINSetSetL-NPDNJNNINISetZnO-Ag NPsNNINSetSetChitosan(CS)NNINSetSetSyph-1NNINII	Tunicamycin	Ļ	\downarrow	\downarrow	N	[31]
BerberineNNIN[56]RP557NNIN[61]NisinININ[62]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIN[63]AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNIN[64]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIN[65]EugenolNNIN[66]Chlorogenic acidINN[66]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIS6]IMD0354NNIN[68]L-NPDNJNNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[70]Syph-1NNIN[71]	Colistin sulfate	N	N	Ļ	N	[56]
RP557NNIN[61]NisinININ[62]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIN[63]AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNII[64]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNII[65]EugenolNNII[66]Chlorogenic acidINN[61]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNNI[66]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIS[67]IMD0354NNIN[67]IMD0354NNII[47](+)-NootkatoneNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[71]	Berberine	N	N	\downarrow	N	[56]
NisinININ[62]Glyceryl trinitrateNNIN[63]AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNIN[64]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIN[65]EugenolNNIM[66]Chlorogenic acidINN[61]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNNI[66]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIS6]IMD0354NNIN[67]IMD0354NNIN[68]L-NPDNJNNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[71]	RP557	N	N	Ļ	N	[61]
Glyceryl trinitrateNNIN[63]AlpinapurpuratalectinNNIN[64]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIN[65]EugenolNNIM[66]Chiorogenic acidJNN[21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNNI[56]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIS6]IMD0354NNIN[67]IMD0354NNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNNIN[43](2nO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[70]Syph-1NNIN[71]	Nisin	\downarrow	N	Ļ	N	[62]
AlpiniapurpuratalectinNNIN[64]Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIN[65]EugenolNNIN[66]Chlorogenic acidJNN[21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNNI[56]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNI[67]IMD0354NNIN[68]L-NPDNJNNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[70]Syph-1NNIN[71]	Glyceryl trinitrate	N	N	\downarrow	N	[63]
Carboxymethyl chitosanNNIN[65]EugenolNNIN[66]Chlorogenic acidINN[21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNN \uparrow N[56]Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIN[67]IMD0354NNIN[68]L-NPDNJNNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[70]Syph-1NNIN[71]	Alpiniapurpuratalectin	N	N	\downarrow	N	[64]
EugenolNN \downarrow N[66]Chlorogenic acid \downarrow NNN[21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNN \uparrow N[56]Plantaricin GZ1-27NN \downarrow N[67]IMD0354N \downarrow N[68]L-NPDNJNN \downarrow N[43](+)-NootkatoneNN \downarrow N[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNN \downarrow N[69]Chitosan(CS)NN \downarrow N[70]Syph-1NN \downarrow N[71]	Carboxymethyl chitosan	N	N	\downarrow	N	[65]
Chlorogenic acidINNN[21]Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNN \uparrow N[56]Plantaricin G21-27NNIN[67]IMD0354NIN[68]L-NPDNJNNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNIN[69]Chitosan(CS)NNIN[70]Syph-1NNIN[71]	Eugenol	N	N	\downarrow	N	[66]
Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrateNN \uparrow N[56]Plantaricin GZ1-27NN \downarrow N[67]IMD0354N \downarrow N[68]L-NPDNJN \downarrow N[43](+)-NootkatoneN \downarrow N[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNN \downarrow N[69]Chitosan(CS)NN \downarrow N[70]Syph-1NN \downarrow N[71]	Chlorogenic acid	Ļ	N	N	N	[21]
Plantaricin GZ1-27NNIN[67]IMD0354NNIN[68]L-NPDNJNNIN[43](+)-NootkatoneNIN[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNNI[69]Chitosan(CS)NNINSyph-1NNIN	Acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrate	N	N	Î	N	[56]
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Plantaricin GZ1-27	N	N	\downarrow	N	[67]
L-NPDNJNN \downarrow N[43](+)-NootkatoneNN \downarrow N[47]ZnO-Ag NPsNN \downarrow N[69]Chitosan(CS)NN \downarrow N[70]Syph-1NN \downarrow N[71]	IMD0354	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[68]
	L-NPDNJ	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	N	[43]
ZnO-Ag NPsNN (69) Chitosan(CS)NN (70) Syph-1NN (71)	(+)-Nootkatone	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[47]
Chitosan(CS)NN \downarrow N[70]Syph-1NN \downarrow N[71]	ZnO-Ag NPs	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[69]
Syph-1 N N [71]	Chitosan(CS)	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[70]
	Syph-1	Ν	Ν	\downarrow	Ν	[71]

"↑", increased; "↓", decreased; "-", comparable (no effects); N, not determined.

ever, most adhesion-related genes are slightly upregulated in S. aureus cultured with levofloxacin or oxacillin at 1/2 MIC [51]. Sasso et al. showed that 1/32 and 1/64 MIC of gatifloxacin remarkably inhibits the adhesiveness of S. aureus ATCC[®] 25923[™] to human epithelial cells [57]. Moreover, S. aureus may display an antibiotic-specific adhesion reaction under treatment with the sub-MICs of antimicrobial agents. Using fibronectin-coated microplates and human osteoblasts, Rasigade et al. observed that treatment with 1/2 MIC of oxacillin (0.125 μ g/mL), linezolid (0.5 μ g/ mL), or moxifloxacin (0.06 μ g/mL) results in a hyperadhesive phenotype of S. aureus reference strain 8325-4 with an increase in fnbA/B transcription. As a result, oxacillin-treated S. aureus cells present greatly increased adhesion capability (682% ± 374%) compared with the untreated strain (256% ± 128%) in the infection of osteoblastic MG-63 cells [52]. By contrast, exposure to 1/2 MIC of rifampin (0.003 µg/mL) decreases fibronectin adhesion in *S. aureus* 8325-4 and five clinical S. aureus isolates DU5883, SST2008 1028, ST2008 0563, HT2000 0594, and HT2001 0390. Gentamicin and

vancomycin treatment exerts no effect on fibronectin binding or *fnbA/B* expression levels in *S. aureus* [52]. Braga *et al.* demonstrated that 1/2 MIC concentration of cefodizime or cefotaxime exhibits the greatest inhibitory effect on the adhesion of *S. aureus* ATCC[®] 25923TM, with a gradual reduction from 1/2 to 1/16 MIC [20].

S. aureus can invade and propagate in mammalian cells [36]. After adhesion, subsequent invasion may occur during the infection of suitable host cells by *S. aureus*. However, few studies have been performed to investigate the effects of the sub-MICs of antibiotics on *S. aureus* invasion partially because bacterial invasion is a dynamic process and difficult to observe. Hu *et al.* found that 1/2 MIC of clindamycin (0.1 µg/mL) but not azithromycin (1 µg/mL) results in the loss of the invasive capacity of *S. aureus* ATCC[®] 51650TM to enter primary human nasal epithelial cells; the infection rate of antibiotic-treated bacteria is $6.3\% \pm 0.76\%$, whereas that of bacteria without antibiotic treatment is $49\% \pm 9.8\%$ [36]. In some cases, the sub-MICs of antibiotics that promote *S. aureus* adhesion capacity do not correlate well with bacterial invasion capability.

Rasigade *et al.* observed that 1/2 MIC (0.125 µg/mL) of oxacillintreated *S. aureus* strain 8325–4 presents increased bacterial adhesion to cultured osteoblasts, whereas oxacillin-treated bacteria exhibits comparable bacterial invasion capacity for osteoblast cells (9.2% ± 4.1%) relative to untreated *S. aureus* (6.0% ± 5.1%) [52]. These results imply that the relevance of *S. aureus* adhesion and invasion regulation during infections with or without antibiotic treatment remains unclear and requires further investigation.

Effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on S. aureus biofilm formation

The biofilm is a microbial community that forms as microorganisms adhere to each other and grow on biotic or abiotic surfaces, such as artificial heart valves and catheters [73]. The developmental cycle of a biofilm usually includes four steps: (i) the attachment of microbial cells to a surface: (ii) the assembly of the attached cells into a microcolony; (iii) the growth of microbial cells into a mature biofilm; and (iv) the detachment of the fully developed biofilm [74,75]. In addition to microbial cells, a typical biofilm contains microorganism-secreted adhesive ECM, which constitutes 90% of the biofilm volume [76]. The constituent of the biofilm ECM may vary depending on microbial species. The ECM of S. aureus comprises polysaccharides, extracellular DNA, and proteins and can protect pathogens from inactivation by antimicrobial agents, including antibiotics and chemical disinfectants [77,78]. Killing pathogenic cells in biofilms with appropriate antibiotics is 1000fold more difficult than killing planktonic cells [79]. Thus, pathogen-formed, biofilm-associated infections are commonly persistent and become a tremendous health burden in our world [80-82]. At least 65% of all chronic bacterial infections are related to biofilms, which can cause a wide variety of disease manifestations, including endocarditis, urinary tract infections, and catheter infections [83-86]. The sub-MICs of antibiotics may affect biofilm formation by interfering with certain developmental steps, and many exploratory findings on the effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on biofilm formation are crucial for setting up new options to treat biofilm-related *S. aureus* infections [87].

The effects of antibiotics at sub-MIC concentrations on S. aureus biofilm formation can vary depending on the tested strain, associated biofilm stage, and antibiotic used. The sub-MICs of most antibiotics inhibit the development of S. aureus biofilm, whereas those of several antibiotics, such as oxacillin, ceftaroline, mupirocin, and rifampicin (Table 2), can promote staphylococcal biofilm formation [25,59,60]. Sritharadol et al. compared the effects of sub-MICs of mupirocin with those of cefazolin, levofloxacin, gentamicin, and erythromycin on the biofilm formation of MRSA and MSSA [60]. Confocal laser microscopy revealed that the biofilm structure, cell viability, and cell density of the mupirocin-treated groups increase compared with those of untreated MRSA strains USA300 and ATCC[®] 43300[™], and MSSA strain ATCC[®] 29213[™]. The expression level of the RNAIII gene in biofilms of MRSA USA300 displays the highest increase upon initial exposure (3 h) to mupirocin at 1/6 MIC level (0.17 mg/mL), and is then downregulated (6 h), whereas the expression levels of the other two biofilm formation-related regulatory genes, agrA and sarA, in strain USA300 shows no obvious difference in the presence or absence of mupirocin [60]. These findings indicate that sub-MICs of mupirocin can promote the strain-dependent biofilm formation of S. aureus and that the RNAIII gene may play important roles in the early attachment stage of staphylococcal biofilm formation. However, the exact function of RNAIII factor and the mechanism underlying S. aureus biofilm promotion remains unknown and is of great interest for later investigations.

The sub-MIC levels of the macrocyclic antibiotic rifampicin greatly promotes biofilm formation in seven out of 10 *S. aureus* iso-

lates that are nonbiofilm producers in common tryptic soy broth (TSB) [59]. Multiplex PCR detection revealed that *icaA* and *icaB* genes are present in all 10 investigated S. aureus strains. The role of the *ica* operon, which encodes enzymes in rifampicin-induced S. aureus biofilm production, has yet to be elucidated given that biofilm formation by S. aureus can be mediated by either icaADBCindependent or -dependent pathways [88]. Haddadin et al. showed that a wide range of the sub-MICs (2.81%-45%) of cefalexin has great potential to induce the formation of S. aureus National Collection of Type Cultures (NCTC) 11962 biofilm [35]. The authors proposed that cephalexin-induced S. aureus biofilm formation is associated with bacterial hydrophobicity. Owing to its inhibitory role in cell wall synthesis, cefalexin at 1/16 MIC can increase the hydrophobicity of the cell surface of S. aureus strain NCTC 11962; this effect may lead to increased cell adhesion during biofilm formation [35].

Except for a few antibiotics with biofilm-promoting potential. most antistaphylococcal agents show inhibitory effects on S. aureus biofilm formation. Jo and Ahn evaluated the biofilm-forming capacity of S. aureus strains KACC 10778, ATCC[®] 15564[™], and CCARM 3080 grown in the presence of oxacillin and levofloxacin at sub-MICs and found that the number of the biofilm-forming S. aureus strain KACC 10778 cells decrease by approximately 2 log10 CFU/mL under oxacillin treatment, whereas those of strains ATCC[®] 15564[™] and CCARM 3080 decrease by 0.5-1 log10 CFU/ mL under levofloxacin and oxacillin treatment [51]. The biofilm of MRSA strain ATCC[®] 43300[™] treated with plantaricin GZ1-27 at 1/2 and 1/4 MIC decreases by 55.3% and 40.2%, respectively, accompanying with reduction of cell to cell connections [67]. Kang et al. showed that 1/2 MIC of CFX or CFX-PPh3 inhibits the biofilm formation of MSSA strain ATCC[®] 29213[™] and MRSA strains 5016, 5013, and 3416 by 43.9% to 89.5% relative to the untreated strains [22]. Escober *et al.* demonstrated that the nuclear factor-kappa B inhibitor N-[3,5-Bis(trifluoromethyl) phenyl]-5-chloro-2-hydroxy benzamide at sub-MIC of 0.0313 μ g/mL can inhibit the initial cell attachment and biofilm formation of vancomycin-resistant S. aureus strain VRS1 in a dose-dependent manner [68]. The sub-MICs of other antimicrobial compounds, such as N-nonvloxypentyl-L-DNJ, N4-benzyl-N-2-phenylquinazoline-2,4-diamine, terpenoid (+)-nootkatone, chitosan, marine steroid siphonocholin, zinc oxide, and silver nanoparticles, are found to be able to inhibit the biofilm formation of diverse S. aureus strains [43,46,69-71,89].

S. aureus polysaccharide intercellular adhesin, the major component of biofilm ECM, is synthesized by ica operon enzymes, and their related regulators can be affected by certain antibiotics at sub-MICs. For example, Zheng et al. revealed that the 1/4 MIC of telithromycin is greatly superior to that of azithromycin and clindamycin, as well as that of vancomycin or daptomycin, in the inhibition of S. aureus biofilm formation; this antibiotic acts by downregulating the RNA expression levels of sigB, agrA, clfA, and icaA in MSSA and MRSA isolates [50]. The eDNA also plays important roles in the adhesion and maturation stages of biofilmforming S. aureus. Andre et al. revealed that sub-MIC bacteriocin nisin effectively inhibits S. aureus biofilm by reducing eDNA amounts and polysaccharide compositions without significantly changing protein contents [62]. Exposure to the sub-MICs of tunicamycin (0.25–0.5 μ g/mL) greatly reduces the biofilm-forming capability of *S. aureus* by decreasing eDNA levels [31].

In addition to polysaccharides and eDNA, many exoproteins secreted by *S. aureus* contribute to biofilm formation; these exoproteins include accumulation-related, biofilm-associated, fibronectin-binding, extracellular-adhesive, and ECM proteins; iron-regulated surface determinant protein C; and clumping factors [50]. Antibiotics at sub-MICs may influence the formation of *S. aureus* biofilms through direct or indirect moderation of exoprotein expression. Schilcher *et al.* showed that clindamycin at the

sub-MIC levels can trigger a transcriptional stress response in tested S. aureus strains via SigB and increases the expression levels of biofilm-associated genes, including *fnbA*, *fnbB*, *atlA*, *irgA*, *psm*, and agrA [90]. The effects of the sub-MIC levels of seven antimicrobial agents (kanamycin, enrofloxacin, lincomycin, clarithromycin, acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrate, colistin sulfate, and berberine) on biofilm formation by S. aureus were investigated in a recent study, and the results showed that all antibiotics tested, except for acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrate, can inhibit the biofilm formation of S. aureus clinical strain Hb0206 effectively [56]. RT-qPCR determination revealed that all antibiotics remarkably reduce the expression levels of six S. aureus biofilm-associated genes (fnbA, rbf, eno, lrgA, cidA, and sarA). However, acetylisovaleryltylosin tartrate promotes these genes. Taken together, antibiotics at the sub-MICs can affect S. aureus biofilm formation through directly regulating biofilm-associated exoprotein genes and global modulatory genes, such as *sigB*, *sarA*, and *agrA*, which then participate in biofilm formation regulation (Fig. 2). For example, SarA can induce the formation of S. aureus USA300 biofilms through promoting the synthesis of polymeric N-acetyl-glucosamine (PNAG), the major polysaccharide intercellular adhesions of staphylococcal ECM [60].

Although strain-to-strain differences can exist upon exposure to antibiotics at sub-MICs, several antibiotics do not exert effects on *S. aureus* biofilm formation. Examples of this phenomenon include the sub-MICs of minocycline on five clinical and five nonclinical *S. aureus* isolates [59], sub-MICs of rifampicin on nonclinical *S. aureus* H01 [59], and sub-MICs of ceftaroline on *S. aureus* clinical strain 05/3291 [25]. Providing a full explanation for the variable responses of biofilm formation by *S. aureus* strains to antibiotics at sub-MICs is difficult. *S. aureus* strains, including patient-derived clinical isolates and healthy volunteer-isolated strains, maintain heterogeneous biofilm producer phenotypes. Despite the existence of the *ica* operon, some *S. aureus* strains, such as clin-

ical isolate C39, do not change their weak-biofilm producer phenotypes when exposed to sub-MICs of rifampicin but instead display increased biofilm production in medium supplemented with 1.0% glucose [59]. A clear understanding of the multiple biofilm production responses of *S. aureus* strains in the presence of antibiotics at sub-MIC levels may be established through the accumulation of additional exploratory data by using different strains, various antibiotics, and unified culture conditions.

Effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on S. aureus SCV formation

Bacterial SCVs are characterized as subpopulations of bacteria that display slow growth rates and atypical colonies (nearly 1/10 of the wild-type strain) and possess unusual metabolic pathways (decreased oxidative phosphorylation, deficient electron transport, or insufficient thymidine biosynthesis) [91]. S. aureus SCVs were first investigated in 1951 by Dr. Hale, who described a mutant of S. aureus that requires carbon dioxide for normal growth [92]. Thereafter, S. aureus SCVs with deficiency of menaquinone-, heme-, thiamine-, and thymidine-biosynthetic pathways were identified, and such SCVs formed mainly due to the antibioticinduced or spontaneous mutation of certain metabolic genes, including har, hemB, ctaA, and thyA [91,93-95]. Currently, increasing evidence has demonstrated that S. aureus SCVs are of medical importance for facilitating clinically persistent and recurrent infections [54]. Approximately 70% of patients who underwent longterm antibiotic treatment exhibit S. aureus SCV infection [94].

Studies have shown that *S. aureus* SCVs can be induced from their parental strains by exposure to various antibiotics *in vitro* [54,96]. Zhang *et al.* conducted an induction experiment wherein the capability of 11 antibiotics to stimulate SCVs in 66 clinical *S. aureus* isolates was investigated. They found that 26 out of 66 (33.3%) clinical strains grow small colonies (<1 mm) after 24 h



Fig. 2. The mechanisms of the effects of the sub-MICs of antibiotics on the biofilm formation of *S. aureus*. Antibiotics at sub-MIC levels affect the formation of *S. aureus* biofilms through directly modulating biofilm-associated genes or global regulatory genes, including *sigB*, *sarA*, and *agrA*, which then take part in the biofilm formation regulation. PNAG, polymeric N-acetyl-glucosamine.

of culture in TSB agar plates with the sub-MICs of gentamicin and that seven out of 66 (10.6%) strains display mixed populations containing large and small colonies [54]. Zhang *et al.* revealed that the reference S. aureus strain ATCC[®] 51650[™] can switch to the SCV phenotype after 1 h of culture under treatment with 1/2 MIC of gentamicin, whereas other antibiotics can not induce S. aureus SCVs at short incubation times [54]. Moreover, high clindamycin and rifampicin concentrations induce S. aureus SCVs after 24 h of culture, whereas clarithromycin, ciprofloxacim, amoxicillin, methicillin, tetracyclin, erythromycin, vancomycin, and mupirocin may not participate in S. aureus SCV induction. Further studies showed that aminoglycoside gentamicin-induced S. aureus SCVs exhibit hemin-auxotrophic phenotypes [94]. Weaver et al. showed that S. aureus can rapidly increase resistance to rishexylaminomelamine-trisphenylguanide via the selection of a menaguinone-auxotroph SCV, which became an exclusively SCV phenotype after continuous cell passage in media with increasing drug concentrations [97]. By using skin fibroblast and lung epithelial cell infection models, Häffner et al. demonstrated that S. aureus agr mutants present a higher percentage of SCV formation in comparison with their wild-type strain 6850 [98].

The *in vivo* effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on *S. aureus* virulence

In contrast to in vitro studies, the in vivo investigations of roles of antibiotics at sub-MICs in the virulence alterations of S. aureus are rare [38,61,68]. The reasons may be ascribed to the limitation of detection methods for S. aureus in vivo, the dynamic variation of sub-MICs of antibiotics administered, and the complicated internal physiological and chemical environments. Using an otitis media-rat model, Song et al. showed the effect of a sub-MIC concentration of the phyto-compound eugenol on S. aureus colonization in vivo [66]. The authors found that 1/2 MIC of eugenol is able to decrease 88% of *S. aureus* ATCC[®] 29213[™] colonization in the middle ear of rat. Scanning electron microscopy observed that the whole middle ears of the only S. aureus treated rats are coated with bacterial biofilms, which are not visible in the middle ears of rats treated with S. aureus and the eugenol at a half MIC, however, the alteration of virulence factor expression in S. aureus of the infected rat model was not determined [66].

In patients under long-term antibiotic treatment, S. aureus SCVs are commonly isolated [99,100]. Loss et al. illustrated the evolution of a SCV from its wild-type strain in a patient fitted with a prosthetic joint and experiencing S. aureus infection relapse and rifampicin treatment [101]. Lånnergard et al. isolated menadioneauxotrophic S. aureus SCVs and their isogenic wild-type strains from three patients suffering from chronic osteomyelitis and receiving long-term antibiotic therapy [102]. Other studies reported thymidine-auxotrophic S. aureus SCVs from patients with cystic fibrosis and receiving trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole therapy [103,104]. Kussmann et al. demonstrated the emergence of dalbavancin- nonsusceptible and teicoplanin-resistant S. aureus SCVs in a patient with cardiac device-related endocarditis undergoing long-term dalbavancin treatment [105]. Their findings implied the existence of a new lipoglycopeptide resistance mechanism because the in vivo induced S. aureus SCVs are formed in the absence of lipopeptide- or glycopeptide-antibiotic treatment. Such a mechanism requires further investigation.

Concluding remarks

In addition to their antimicrobial functions, the signal induction roles of antibiotics at sub-MICs have gained increasing interest in recent years. The major *in vitro* effects of the sub-MIC levels of antibiotics on the virulence of the important pathogen *S. aureus* include five aspects: (i) inducing bacterial cell deformation to stimulate abnormal host immune responses; (ii) modulating the expression levels of *S. aureus* virulence factors to alter disease development; (iii) regulating strain-specified adhesion and invasion capabilities to affect bacterial colonization and diffusion; (iv) altering *S. aureus* biofilm formation to potentate implantation material-related infections; and (v) influencing bacterial SCV formation to achieve persistent infection and recurrence. However, whether these *in vitro* effects of antibiotic sub-MICs on *S. aureus* virulence can be expected to present *in vivo* is unclear, and would be a fruitful research area for additional investigation.

The manifestations of the overall effects of antibiotics at sub-MIC concentrations on S. aureus virulence are dependent on strains and vary by antibiotic types, and inconsistent effects have been observed when a certain antimicrobial agent is used against different *S. aureus* strains or the same strain is treated with various types of antibiotics. The antibiotic susceptibility, virulence profile, growth stage, and culture condition of S. aureus and the time of antibiotic application may work independently or synergistically to contribute to divergent results. Mechanically, antibiotics at sub-MICs affect S. aureus virulence through direct binding to certain molecules, such as cell wall synthetic factors PBP1 and PBP2 and virulence factor PVL, and/or via modulating global regulators, including sigB, sarA, and agrA, which form a regulatory network to control S. aureus virulence. Therefore, modern omics technologies, such as proteomics, transcriptomics, metabonomics, and interactomics, should be applied to explore the complex effects of sub-MICs of antibiotics on S. aureus virulence. Hopeful findings should help construct novel therapeutic strategies that facilitate the treatment of infections caused by S. aureus in the future.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declared that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82071857).

Author contributions

Xiancai Rao and Rong Zhang proposed the idea for the article. Juan Chen and Huyue Zhou did the literature search and data analysis. Juan Chen drafted the work. Xiancai Rao, Jingbin Huang and Rong Zhang critically revised the manuscript.

References

- Yang H, Xu S, Huang K, Xu X, Hu F, He C, et al. Anti-staphylococcus antibiotics interfere with the transcription of leucocidin ED gene in *Staphylococcus aureus* strain Newman. Front Microbiol 2020;11:265.
- [2] Katahira EJ, Davidson SM, Stevens DL, Bolz DD. Subinhibitory concentrations of tedizolid potently inhibit extracellular toxin production by methicillinsensitive and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Med Microbiol 2019;68(2):255–62.
- [3] Sasso MD, Culici M, Bovio C, Braga PC. Gemifloxacin: Effects of sub-inhibitory concentrations on various factors affecting bacterial virulence. Int J Antimicrob AG 2003;21(4):325–33.
- [4] Hogan D, Kolter R. Why are bacteria refractory to antimicrobials?. Curr Opin Microbiol 2002;5:472–7.
- [5] Fux CA, Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Stoodley P. Survival strategies of infectious biofilms. Trends Microbiol 2005;13(1):34–40.
- [6] Thiele-Bruhn S. Pharmaceutical antibiotic compounds in soils a review. J Plant Nutr Soil S 2003;166:145–67.
- [7] Kümmerer K. Antibiotics in the aquatic environment A review Part I. Chemosphere 2009;75(4):417–34.
- [8] Chander Y, Kumar K, Goyal SM, Gupta SC. Antibacterial activity of soil-bound antibiotics. J Environ Qual 2005;34(6):1952–7.

- [9] Hao H, Cheng G, Iqbal Z, Ai X, Hussain H, Huang L, et al. Benefits and risks of antimicrobial use in food-producing animals. Front Microbiol 2014;5:288.
- [10] Hodille E, Rose W, Diep BA, Goutelle S, Lina G, Dumitrescu O. The role of antibiotics in modulating virulence in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Clin Microbiol Rev 2017;30(4):887–917.
- [11] Zheng Y, Shang W, Peng H, Rao Y, Zhao X, Hu Z, et al. Virulence determinants are required for brain abscess formation through *Staphylococcus aureus* infection and are potential targets of antivirulence factor therapy. Front Microbiol 2019;10:68.
- [12] Limoli DH, Hoffman LR. Help, hinder, hide and harm: what can we learn from the interactions between *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus aureus* during respiratory infections?. Thorax 2019;74(7):684–92.
- [13] Hsu YY, Wu D, Hung CC, Huang SS, Yuan FH, Lee MH, et al. Methicillinresistant *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal colonization among HIV-infected patients in Taiwan: prevalence, molecular characteristics and associated factors with nasal carriage. BMC Infect Dis 2020;20(1):254.
- [14] Adeiza SS, Shuaibu AB, Shuaibu GM. Random effects meta-analysis of COVID-19/S. aureus partnership in co-infection. GMS Hyg. Infect Control 2020;15: Doc29.
- [15] Gardner AD. Morphological effects of penicillin on bacteria. Nature 1940;146 (3713):837–8.
- [16] Stevens DL, Ma YS, Salmi DB, McIndoo E, Wallace RJ, Bryant AE. Impact of antibiotics on expression of virulence-associated exotoxin genes in methicillin-sensitive and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Infect Dis 2007;195:202–11.
- [17] Dumitrescu O, Choudhury P, Boisset S, Badiou C, Bes M, Benito Y, et al. Betalactams interfering with PBP1 induce Panton-Valentine leukocidin expression by triggering sarA and rot global regulators of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2011;55(7):3261–71.
- [18] Nau R, Eiffert H. Modulation of release of proinflammatory bacterial compounds by antibacterials: potential impact on course of inflammation and outcome in sepsis and meningitis. Clin Microbiol Rev 2002;15 (1):95–110.
- [19] Thorsing M, Klitgaard JK, Atilano ML, Skov MN, Kolmos HJ, SrR Filipe, et al. Thioridazine induces major changes in global gene expression and cell wall composition in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* USA300. PLoS ONE 2013;8(5). e64518.
- [20] Braga PC, Sasso MD, Maci S. Cefodizime: effects of sub-inhibitory concentrations on adhesiveness and bacterial morphology of *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli*: comparison with cefotaxime and ceftriaxone. J Antimicrob Chemoth 1997;39(1):79–84.
- [21] Li G, Qiao M, Guo Y, Wang X, Xu Y, Xia X. Effect of subinhibitory concentrations of chlorogenic acid on reducing the virulence factor production by *Staphylococcus aureus*. Foodborne Pathog Dis 2014;11 (9):677–83.
- [22] Kang S, Sunwoo K, Jung Y, Hur JK, Park KH, Kim JS, et al. Membrane-targeting triphenylphosphonium functionalized ciprofloxacin for Methicliin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). Antibiotics 2020;9(11):758.
- [23] Zhang X, Sun X, Wu J, Wu Y, Wang Y, Hu X, et al. Berberine damages the cell surface of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Front Microbiol 2020;11:621.
- [24] Juma A, Lemoine P, Simpson ABJ, Murray J, O'Hagan BMG, Naughton PJ, et al. Microscopic investigation of the combined use of antibiotics and biosurfactants on Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Front Microbiol 2020;11:1477.
- [25] Lázaro-Díez M, Remuzgo-Martínez S, Rodríguez-Mirones C, Acosta F, Icardo JM, Martínez-Martínez L, et al. Effects of subinhibitory concentrations of ceftaroline on methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) biofilms. PLoS ONE 2016;11(1). e0147569.
- [26] Hershkovits AS, Pozdnyakov I, Meir O, Mor A. Sub-inhibitory membrane damage undermines *Staphylococcus aureus* virulence. Biochim Biophys Acta, Biomembr 2019;1861(6):1172–9.
- [27] Chang JD, Foster EE, Thadani AN, Ramirez AJ, Kim SJ. Inhibition of *Staphylococcus aureus* cell wall biosynthesis by desleucyl-oritavancin: a quantitative peptidoglycan composition analysis by mass spectrometry. J Bacteriol 2017;199(15):e00278–e317.
- [28] Wojnicz D, Klak M, Adamski R, Jankowski S. Influence of subinhibitory concentrations of amikacin and ciprofloxacin on morphology and adherence ability of Uropathogenic strains. Folia Microbiol 2007;52 (4):429–36.
- [29] Shang W, Rao Y, Zheng Y, Yang Y, Hu Q, Hu Z, et al. β-Lactam antibiotics enhance the pathogenicity of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* via SarA-controlled lipoprotein-like cluster expression. mBio 2019;10(3): e00880–19.
- [30] Kim SJ, Matsuoka S, Patti GJ, Schaefer J. Vancomycin derivative with damaged D-Ala-D-Ala binding cleft binds to cross-linked peptidoglycan in the cell wall of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Biochemistry 2008;47(12):3822–31.
- [31] Zhu X, Liu D, Singh AK, Drolia R, Bai X, Tenguria S, et al. Tunicamycin mediated inhibition of wall teichoic acid affects *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Listeria monocytogenes* cell morphology, biofilm formation and virulence. Front Microbiol 2018;9:1352.
- [32] Li X, Wang P, Hu X, Zhang Y, Lu X, Li C, et al. The combined antibacterial effects of sodium new houttuyfonate and berberin chloride against growing and persistent Methicillin-Resistant and Vancomycin-Intermediate *Staphylococcus aureus*. BMC Microbiol 2020;20(1):317.

- [33] Muller S, Wolf AJ, Iliev ID, Berg BL, Underhill DM, Liu GY. Poorly cross-linked peptidoglycan in MRSA due to mecA induction activates the inflammasome and exacerbates immunopathology. Cell Host Microbe 2015;18(5):604–12.
- [34] Doss SA, Tillotson GS, Amyes SG. Effect of sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics on the virulence of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Appl Bacteriol 1993;75 (2):123–8.
- [35] Haddadin RNS, Saleh S, Al-Adham IDSI, Buultjens TEJ, Collier PJ. The effect of subminimal inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics on virulence factors expressed by *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilms. J Appl Microbiol 2010;108 (4):1281–91.
- [36] Hu H, Ramezanpour M, Hayes AJ, Liu S, Psaltis AJ, Wormald PJ, et al. Sub-Inhibitory clindamycin and azithromycin reduce *S. aureus* exoprotein induced toxicity, inflammation, barrier disruption and invasion. J Clin Med 2019;8 (10):1617.
- [37] Jin Y, Li M, Shang Y, Liu L, Shen X, Lv Z, et al. Sub-Inhibitory concentrations of mupirocin strongly inhibit alpha-toxin production in high-level mupirocinresistant MRSA by down-regulating *agr*, *saeRS*, and *sarA*. Front Microbiol 2018;9:993.
- [38] An Y, Wang Y, Zhan J, Tang X, Shen K, Shen F, et al. Fosfomycin protects mice from *Staphylococcus aureus* pneumonia caused by alpha-hemolysin in extracellular vesicles by inhibiting MAPK-regulated NLRP3 inflammasomes. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 2019;9:253.
- [39] Otto MP, Martin E, Badiou C, Lebrun S, Bes M, Vandenesch F, et al. Effects of subinhibitory concentrations of antibiotics on virulence factor expression by community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Antimicrob Chemother 2013;68(7):1524–32.
- **[40]** Liu L, Shen X, Yu J, Cao X, Zhan Q, Guo Y, et al. Subinhibitory concentrations of fusidic acid may reduce the virulence of *S. aureus* by down-regulating *sarA* and *saeRS* to reduce biofilm formation and α-toxin expression. Front Microbiol 2020;11:25.
- [41] Gottschalk S, Ingmer H, Thomsen LE. The lysine-peptoid hybrid LP5 maintain activity under physiological conditions and affects virulence gene expression in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Peptides 2016;78:24–9.
- [42] Ping O, Sun M, He X, Wang K, Yin Z, Fu H, et al. Sclareol protects *Staphylococcus aureus*-induced lung cell injury via inhibiting alphahemolysin expression. J Microbiol Biotechn 2017;27(1):19–25.
- [43] Gregorio ED, Esposito A, Vollaro A, Fenza MD, D'Alonzo D, Miglicaccio A, et al. N-Nonyloxypentyl-l-Deoxynojirimycin inhibits growth, biofilm formation and virulence factors expression of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Antibiotics 2020;9(6):362.
- [44] Kernodle DS, McGraw PA, Baarg NL, Menzies BE, Voladri RKR, Harshman S. Growth of *Staphylococcus aureus* with nafcillin *in vitro* induces alpha-toxin production and increases the lethal activity of sterile broth filtrates in a murine model. J Infect Dis 1995;172(2):410–9.
- [45] Ohlsen K, Ziebuhr W, Koller KP, Hell W, Wichelhaus TA, Hacker J. Effects of subinhibitory concentrations of antibiotics on alpha-toxin (*hla*) gene expression of methicillin-sensitive and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1998;42(11):2817–23.
- [46] Farha AK, Yang Q, Kim G, Zhang D, Mavumengwana V, Habimana O, et al. Inhibition of multidrug-resistant foodborne *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilms by a natural terpenoid (+)-nootkatone and related molecular mechanism. Food Control 2020;112. 107154.
- [47] Bryant AE, Gomi S, Katahira E, Huang DB, Stevens DL. The effects of iclaprim on exotoxin production in methicillin-resistant and vancomycinintermediate *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Med Microbiol 2019;68(3):456–66.
- intermediate *Staphylococus aureus*. J Med Microbiol 2019;68(3):456–66.
 [48] Morikawa K, Watabe H, Araake M, Morikawa S. Modulatory effect of antibiotics on cytokine production by human monocytes *in vitro*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1996;40(6):1366–70.
- [49] Josse J, Laurent F, Diot A. Staphylococcal adhesion and host cell invasion: fibronectin-binding and other mechanisms. Front Microbiol 2017;8:2433.
- [50] Zheng JX, Tu HP, Sun X, Xu GJ, Chen JW, Deng QW, et al. *In vitro* activities of telithromycin against *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilms compared with azithromycin, clindamycin, vancomycin and daptomycin. J Med Microbiol 2020;69(1):120–31.
- [51] Jo A, Ahn J. Phenotypic and genotypic haracterization of multiple antibioticresistant *Staphylococcus aureus* exposed to subinhibitory levels of oxacillin and levofloxacin. BMC Microbiol 2016;16(1):170.
- [52] Rasigade JP, Moulay A, Lhoste Y, Tristan A, Bes M, Vandenesch F, et al. Impact of sub-inhibitory antibiotics on fibronectin-mediated host cell adhension and invasion by *Staphylococcus aureus*. BMC Microbiol 2011;11(1):263.
- [53] Mirani ZA, Jamil N. Effect of sub-lethal doses of vancomycin and oxacillin on biofilm formation by vancomycin intermediate resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Basic Microb 2011;51(2):191–5.
- [54] Zhang G, Zhao Y, Hayes AJ, Psaltis AJ, Wormald PJ, Vreugde S. *Staphylococcus aureus* small colony variants: Prevalence in chronic rhinosinusitis and induction by antibiotics. Allergy 2018;73(12):2403–5.
- [55] Selan L, Vrenna G, Ettorre E, Papa R, Artini M. Virulence of MRSA USA300 is enhanced by sub-inhibitory concentration of two different classes of antibiotics. J Chemother 2018;30(6–8):384–8.
- [56] Yang B, Lei Z, Zhao Y, Ahmed S, Wang C, Zhang S, et al. Combination susceptibility testing of common antimicrobials *in vitro* and the effects of Sub-MIC of antimicrobials on *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilm formation. Front Microbiol 2017;8:2125.
- [57] Sasso MD, Bovio C, Culici M, Braga PC. Interference of sub-inhibitory concentrations of gatifloxacin on various determinants of bacterial virulence. J Chemother 2002;14(5):473–82.

- [58] Braga PC, Piatti G. Favourable effects of sub-MIC rufloxacin concentrations in decreasing the pathogen-host cell adhesion. Pharmacol Res 1993;28 (1):11–20.
- [59] Lima-E-Silva AA, Silva-Filho RG, Fernandes HMZ, Saramago GSM, Viana AS, Souza MS, et al. Sub-Inhibitory concentrations of rifampicin strongly stimulated biofilm production in *S. aureus*. Open Microbiol J 2017;11:142–51.
- [60] Sritharadol R, Hamada M, Kimura S, Ishii Y, Srichana T, Tateda K. Mupirocin at subinhibitory concentrations induces biofilm formation in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Microb Drug Resist 2018;24(9):1249–58.
- [61] Woodburn KW, Jaynes JM, Clemens LE. Evaluation of the antimicrobial peptide, RP557, for the broad-spectrum treatment of wound pathogens and biofilm. Front Microbiol 2019;10:1688.
- [62] Andre C, Pimentel-Filho NDJ, Costa PMDA, Vanetti MCD. Changes in the composition and architecture of staphylococcal biofilm by nisin. Braz J Microbiol 2019;50(4):1083–90.
- [63] Abbas HA, Elsheerbini AM, Shaldam MA. Glyceryl trinitrate blocks staphyloxanthin and biofilm formation in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Afr Health Sci 2019;19(1):1376–84.
- [64] Ferreira GRS, Brito JS, Procópio TF, Santos NDL, Lima BJRC, Coelho LCBB, et al. Antimicrobial potential of Alpinia purpurata lectin (ApuL): Growth inhibitory action, synergistic effects in combination with antibiotics, and antibiofilm activity. Microb Pathogenesis 2018;124:152–62.
- [65] Gonçalves RC, Silva DP, Signini R, Naves PLF. Inhibition of bacterial biofilms by carboxymethyl chitosan combined with silver, zinc and copper salts. Int J Biol Macromol 2017;105:385–92.
- [66] Yadav MK, Chae SW, Im GJ, Chung JW, Song JJ. Eugenol: A phyto-compound effective against methicillin-resistant and methicillin-sensitive *Staphylococcus aureus* clinical strain biofilms. PLoS ONE 2015;10(3). e0119564.
- [67] Du H, Zhou L, Lu Z, Bie X, Zhao H, Niu Y, et al. Transcriptomic and proproteomic profiling response of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) to a novel bacteriocin, plantaricin GZ1-27 and its inhibition of biofilm formation. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 2020;104(18):7957–70.
- [68] Escobar IE, White A, Kim W, Mylonakis E. New Antimicrobial Bioactivity against Multidrug-Resistant Gram-Positive Bacteria of Kinase Inhibitor IMD0354. Antibiotics 2020;9(10):665.
- [69] Ali S, Delaramsadat R, Farzaneh R, Maria K, Sholoufeh MO, Seyed-Alireza E, et al. Evaluate the effect of zinc oxide and silver nanoparticles on biofilm and icaA gene expression in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from burn wound infection. Journal of Burn Care & Research 2020;6 (41):1253–9.
- [70] Hemmati F, Salehi R, Ghotaslou R, Kafil HS, Hasani A, Gholizadeh P, et al. The assessment of antibiofilm activity of chitosan-zinc oxide-gentamicin nanocomposite on *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Biological Macromolecules 2020;163:2248–58.
- [71] Alam P, Alqahtani AS, Husain FM, Rehman MT, Alajmi MF, Noman OM, et al. Siphonocholin isolated from red sea sponge *Siphonochalina siphonella* attenuates quorum sensing controlled virulence and biofilm formation. Saudi Pharmaceutical J 2020;28(1):1383–91.
- [72] Maioli E, Marchese A, Roveta S, Cagnacci S, Cavallini F, Cassanelli C, et al. *In vitro* activity of ceftibuten at sub-inhibitory concentrations in comparison with other antibiotics against respiratory and urinary tract pathogens. J Chemother 2007;19(2):152–60.
- [73] Rao Y, Shang W, Yang Y, Zhou R, Rao X. Fighting mixed-species microbial biofilms with cold atmospheric plasma. Front Microbiol 2020;11:1000.
- [74] Boles BR, Horswill AR. Staphylococcal biofilm disassembly. Trends Microbiol 2011;19(9):449–55.
- [75] Foster TJ, Geoghegan JA, Ganesh VK, Höök M. Adhesion, invasion and evasion: the many functions of the surface proteins of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Nat Rev Microbiol 2014;12(1):49–62.
- [76] Flemming HC, Wingender J. The biofilm matrix. Nat Rev Microbiol 2010;8 (9):623–33.
- [77] Rice SA, Wuertz S, Kjelleberg S. Next-generation studies of microbial biofilm communities. Microb Biotechnol 2016;9(5):677–80.
- [78] Davey ME, O'Toole GA. Microbial biofilms: from ecology to molecular genetics. Microbiol Mol Biol R 2000;64(4):847-67.
- [79] Gilbert P, Das J, Foley I. Biofilm susceptibility to antimicrobials. Adv Dent Res 1997;11(1):160-7.
- [80] Andersson DI, Hughes D. Evolution of antibiotic resistance at non-lethal drug concentrations. Drug Resist Update 2012;15(3):162–72.
- [81] Wang S, Yang Y, Zhao Y, Zhao H, Bai J, Chen J, et al. Sub-MIC tylosin inhibits Streptococcus suis biofilm formation and results in differential protein expression. Front Microbiol 2016;7:384.
- [82] Jacobsen SM, Shirtliff ME. *Proteus mirabilis* biofilms and catheter-associated urinary tract infections. Virulence 2011;2(5):460–5.
- [83] Van Laar TA, Chen T, You T, Leung KP. Sublethal concentrations of carbapenems alter cell morphology and genomic expression of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* biofilms. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2015;59(3):1707–17.
- [84] Cairns J, Becks L, Jalasvuori M, Hultunen T. Sublethal streptomycin concentrations and lytic bacteriophage together promote resistance evolution. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol 2017;372:1712.
- [85] Westhoff S, Leeuwe TM, Qachach O, Zhang Z, Wezel GP, Rozen DE. The evolution of no-cost resistance at sub-MIC concentrations of streptomycin in *Streptomyces coelicolor*. ISME J 2017;11(5):1168–78.
- [86] Weiser J, Henke HA, Hector N, Both A, Chritner M, Büttner H, et al. Subinhibitory tigecycline concentrations induce extracellular matrix binding

protein Embp dependent *Staphylococcus epidermidis* biofilm formation and immune evasion. Int J Med Microbiol 2016;306(6):471–8.

- [87] Gullberg E, Cao S, Berg OG, Ilback C, Sandegren L, Hughes D, et al. Selection of resistant bacteria at very low antibiotic concentrations. PLoS Pathog 2011;7 (7). e1002158.
- [88] McCarthy H, Rudkin JK, Black NS, Gallagher L, O'Neill E, O'Gara JP. Methicillin resistance and the biofilm phenotype in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 2015;5:1.
- [89] Reis SV, Ribeiro NS, Rocha DA, Fortes IS, Trentin DS, Andrade SF, et al. N₄benzyl-N₂-phenylquinazoline-2,4-diamine compound presents antibacterial and antibiofilm effect against *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Staphylococcus epidermidis*. Chem Biol Drug Des 2020;96(6):13745.
- [90] Schilcher K, Andreoni F, Dengler Haunreiter V, Seidl K, Hasse B, Zinkernagel AS. Modulation of *Staphylococcus aureus* biofilm matrix by subinhibitory concentrations of clindamycin. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2016;60:5957–67.
- [91] Proctor RA, Eiff C, Kahl BC, Becker K, McNamara P, Herrmann M, et al. Small colony variants a pathogenic form of bacteria that facilitates persistent and recurrent infections. Nat Rev Microbiol 2006;4:295–305.
- [92] Hale JH. Studies on *Staphylococcus* mutation: a naturally occurring "G" gonidial variant and its carbon requirements. Br J Exp Pathol 1951;32 (4):307–13.
- [93] Sherris JC. Two small colony variants of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated in pure culture from closed infected lesions and their carbon dioxide requirements. J Clin Pathol 1952;5(4):354-5.
- [94] Melter O, RadojeviČ D. Small colony variants of Staphylococcus aureus-Review. Folia Microbiol 2010;55(6):548–58.
- [95] Tuchscherr L, Löffler B, Proctor RA. Persistence of *Staphylococcus aureus*: Multiple metabolic pathways impact the expression of virulence factors in small-colony variants (SCVs). Front Microbiol 2020;11:1028.
- [96] Tuchscherr L, Kreis C, Hoerr V, Flint L, Hachmeister M, Geraci J, et al. Staphylococcus aureus develops increased resistance to antibiotics by forming dynamic small colony variants during chronic osteomyelitis. J Antimicrob Chemother 2015;71(2):438–48.
- [97] Weaver AJ, Peters TR, Tripet B, Van Vuren A, Rakesh Lee RE, et al. Exposure of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* to low levels of the antibacterial THAM-3ΦG generates a small colony drug-resistant phenotype. Sci Rep 2018;8(1):9850.
- [98] Häffner N, Bär J, Dengler HV, Mairpady SS, Seidl K, Crosby HA, et al. Intracellular environment and agr system affect colony size heterogeneity of *Staphylococcus aureus*. Front Microbiol 2020;11:1415.
- [99] Kahl BC, Becker K, Löffler B. Clinical significance and pathogenesis of staphylococcal small colony variants in persistent infections. Clin Microbiol Rev 2016;29(2):401–27.
- [100] Lin YT, Tsai JC, Yamamoto T, Chen HJ, Hung WC, Hsueh PR, et al. Emergence of a small colony variant of vancomycin-intermediate Staphylococcus aureus in a patient with septic arthritis during long-term treatment with daptomycin. J Antimicrob Chemother 2016;71(7):1807–14.
- [101] Loss G, Simões PM, Valour F, Cortês MF, Gonzaga L, Bergot M, et al. Staphylococcus aureus small colony variants (SCVs): News from a chronic prosthetic joint infection. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 2019;9:363.
- [102] Lannergård J, von Eiff C, Sander G, Cordes T, Seggewiss J, Peters G, et al. Identification of the genetic basis for clinical menadione-auxotrophic smallcolony variant isolates of *S. aureus*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2008;52 (11):4017–22.
- [103] Besier S, Smaczny C, von Mallinckrodt C, Krahl A, Ackermann H, Brade V, et al. Prevalence and clinical significance of *Staphylococcus aureus* small-colony variants in cystic fibrosis lung disease. J Clin Microbiol 2007;45(1):168–72.
- [104] Chatterjee I, Kriegeskorte A, Fischer A, Deiwick S, Theimann N, Proctor RA, et al. In vivo mutations of thymidylate synthase (encoded by thyA) are responsible for thymidine dependency in clinical small-colony variants of *Staphylococcus aureus*. | Bacteriol 2008;190(3):834–42.
- [105] Kussmann M, Karer M, Obermueller M, Schmidt K, Barousch W, Moser D, et al. Emergence of a dabavancin induced glycopeptide/lipoglycopeptide non-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* during treatment of a cardiac devicerelated endocarditis. Emerg Microbes Infect 2018;7(1):202.



Ms. Juan Chen, works as experimenters in Department of Pharmacy, the Second Affiliated Hospital of Army Medical University. Her master degree was received from the Chinese Academy of Sciences with zoology. After graduation, she has been engaged in scientific research for 4 years. She has been engaged in the screening and mechanism research of small molecule compounds of anti-tumor cell activity. Now, she is mainly engaged in the research of vancomycinintermediate *Staphylococcus aureus* and membrane vesicle of *Staphylococcus aureus* vaccine. She has published a total of eight papers as the first author or co-

author, and involved in writing the chapters 16 and 18 of book "De Mandal – Recent Advancements in Microbial Diversity"

J. Chen, H. Zhou, J. Huang et al.



Ms. Huyue Zhou was born in 1994 in Chongqing, China. She is studying for a master's degree at the Army Medical University in China. Her area of interest mainly focuses on the mechanism of bacterial drug resistance.



Journal of Advanced Research 31 (2021) 165-175

Dr. Rong Zhang is working as a chief pharmacist and professor in Army Medical University. She currently serves as the director of Department of Pharmacy, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Army Medical University. She is the vice chairman of Clinical Pharmacy Branch of Military Pharmaceutical Committee and the associate editor of "China Pharmacy". Prof. Zhang has long been specializing in the research of Hospital Pharmacology. Recent years, she has hosted 11 research projects, 14 issued patents and published 14 scientific articles as first or corresponding author. Meanwhile, she has been honored the Third Prize of Military Science and Technology Progress.



Dr. Jingbin Huang is working as an assistant professor at Department of Pharmacy, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Army Medical University, China. He received his Ph.D from The Second Military Medical University in 2014. His research interests focus on designing biomimetic nanomedicine or targeted drug delivery systems for cancer therapy or infection diseases. His researches have been supported by several projects form the National Natural Science Foundation of China and Outstanding Talent Fund of Army Medical University. He also has published seven peer-reviewed articles and holds five issued patents.



Dr. Xiancai Rao obtained his Ph.D from Third Military Medical University of China in 2002, and then worked as a Postdoc at Boston University Medical Center and Louisiana State University of United States. He is currently a Professor and Head of Department of Microbiology, Army Medical University (Third Military Medical University) of China. His broad research interests concern drug resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus*, pathogenicity of *Chlamydia trachomatis*, and vaccine development of Dengue virus. He has published more than 100 peer reviewed research articles and received three patents.