

Antibiotic persister cells in *Acinetobacter baumannii* : overview of molecular mechanisms and removal strategies

Delphine Vergoz¹, Emmanuelle Dé¹, Corinne Loutelier-Bourhis¹, and Stéphane ALEXANDRE¹

¹Univ Rouen Normandie

February 14, 2025

Abstract

Acinetobacter baumannii is a bacterium classified as priority 1 by the World Health Organization due to the rapid development of antibiotic resistance leading to many therapeutic failures. However, the existence of dormant bacterial subpopulations, like persister cells, may also partly explain these therapeutic failures. Persister cells are a bacterial subpopulation that may survive to high concentrations of antibiotics compared to isogenic individuals. This temporary and reversible phenotype may eventually lead to the development of new antibiotic resistance or to the recurrence of infection. Persister cells are often studied, but the mechanisms involved in their selection / formation are complex and often poorly described (toxin/antitoxin; second messengers; SOS response; phenyl acetic catabolic pathway; membranes). The mechanisms involved in the selection of persister cells are complex, and some appear to be species- or strain-specific. For example, some systems, such as antitoxin toxin, are described by others as directly involved in the formation of these cells. In fact, *A. baumannii* presents a great diversity of systems of antitoxin toxin. This review focuses on current advances in knowledge concerning the molecular mechanisms involved in the physiology of persister cells in *A. baumannii*, and the eradication strategies developed to combat this dormant subpopulation.

1. Introduction

Acinetobacter baumannii is a pathogen responsible for infections that are extremely problematic in hospitals. It has no typical virulence factors such as toxins to explain its pathogenicity [1]. Therefore, this pathogen has been referred to have a "persist and resist" virulence strategy [2]. This means that it is capable of surviving in very hostile environments [3]. More particularly, this bacterium is well known for its resistance to desiccation, its ability to form a biofilm to protect itself from external stresses and also its capacity to develop easily antibiotic resistances, notably to the carbapenem class [4], [5], [6]. The difficulty of eradicating this bacterium makes it particularly dangerous when found in a hospital environment [7]. Consequently, it has been classified in the "Priority 1" pathogen group by the World Health Organization in 2017 - this status was confirmed in 2024 - to prioritize the development of new antibacterial agents [W1]. This phenomenon of multi-resistance, becoming increasingly widespread, is the root of many therapeutic failures [8], [9]. Persister cells in bacteria were first described by Hobby in 1942 and Joseph Bigger in 1944 [10], [11]. Persister cells are a bacterial subpopulation able of surviving to high concentrations of antibiotics compared to isogenic individuals [12], [13]. Recently, it was shown that phages also produce a subpopulation of persister cells similar to those generated/selected by antibiotics [14].

This recalcitrant phenotype is reversible and thus temporary since persister cells are able to regrow after the removal of selection pressure, to reform a population similar to the original, *i.e.* susceptible to antibiotics [13]. Persister cells are generally characterized by a growth arrest. However, it seems that this feature is neither necessary nor sufficient to enter into persistence [15]. Two types of persister cells have been described (Figure 1) [12]. One is the result of a spontaneous formation and are cells, very poorly represented in a population, which do not present a response to any particular stress but which can enter into a very

slow multiplication phase even under favorable conditions (Figure 1A) [16]. The other type, the triggered persister, formerly called type I [16] is generated by an environmental stressor like a late stationary phase starvation [17], a high cell density [18], or an antibiotic exposure [12] (Figure 1B). It should be noticed that the viable but non-culturable cells (VBNC) could sometimes be considered as persister exhibiting a longer latency [19]. The VBNC remain intact and metabolically active after exposure to an antibiotic, but unlike persister cells, they can not resume growth after antibiotic removal [20]. However, it has been shown that under certain conditions, some VBNC could regrow with a transcriptomic profile very similar to the one of persister [19]. Two main methodologies are available for studying persister cells: the study at individual cell level using microfluidics, growth reporters and ScanLag as examples or the study of the subpopulation level *via* genetic screens, evolution of whole genome sequencing, -omics techniques or mathematical modeling ..etc [21], [22], [23], [24]. These have been used to highlight some mechanisms involved in the formation or in the selection or that may play a role in the physiology of persister cells, like the toxin-antitoxin systems, some second messengers activating specific transcription factors, the activation of the SOS response, the oxidative stress response and the membrane modifications. It is still difficult to determine whether these mechanisms are directly or indirectly involved, whether they are a cause or a consequence, but they play a role in the physiology of persister cell.

It is admitted that persister cells can represent up to 10 % of the cells living in biofilm mode and <1 % of the cells in planktonic growth mode [25]. As they might be partly responsible for the recurrence of chronic infections [26], [27], [28] and could also promote resistance mechanisms development [29], [30], the “persister” field of research is increasingly being explored. In this review, we bring together the main findings about the molecular mechanisms by which persister cells of *A. baumannii* could appear or that are involved in their physiology, and which molecules may be used to prevent their appearance or destroy them.

Hosted file

image1.emf available at <https://authorea.com/users/892074/articles/1269090-antibiotic-persister-cells-in-acinetobacter-baumannii-overview-of-molecular-mechanisms-and-removal-strategies>

Figure 1 : Persister cells selection by antibiotics . Triggered persister cells, on the other hand, are induced by an environmental change such as an antibiotic shock. (Adapted from [12], [31]).

2. Molecular mechanisms of *A. baumannii* involved in the physiology of persister cells

Factors influencing the level of persister cells

Several studies have investigated the formation of persister cells by *A. baumannii*. The study by Bart et al., (2013) was the first investigation on this type of cells in *A. baumannii*. Thirty-seven clinical strains from the hospital of Porto Alegre (Brazil), isolated from January to September 2012, were tested for persister cell formation with two antibiotics, polymyxin B and tobramycin (Table 1) [32]. This study showed the proportion of persister cells strongly depended on the strain and varied between 0.0007% to 10.1% and 0.0003 % to 11.84 % of the total population, for polymyxin B and tobramycin respectively [32]. However, for the majority of isolates, the most likely proportion was about 1.2% for polymyxin B and 0.5% for tobramycin.

In another study about the same hospital [33] twenty other clinical isolates were classified according to their ability to form biofilms. As known, the proportion of persister cells in biofilm mode was much higher than in planktonic mode but surprisingly, strong biofilm producers had some of the lowest persister levels (Table 1). Persister levels show a higher heterogeneity (0.2 to 7.2%) for isolates producing low biofilm compared with those producing more biofilm. Among the isolates, 5 were tested in planktonic mode at different concentrations (15 to 200 times the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of meropenem). The proportion of persisters did not vary as a function of antibiotic concentration. The authors suggested that this persister level heterogeneity could have four distinct and non-exclusive origins: the individual ability to produce persistence stochastically, specific regulatory mechanisms, the metabolic structure of each isolate and the influence of other previous stresses.

Persister cells were also observed after ciprofloxacin treatment of non multidrug resistance (MDR) strong biofilm former clinical isolates [34]. This treatment also rose the level of ciprofloxacin resistance in regrown planktonic cells suggesting a link between biofilm, persistence and resistance (Table 1).

Treatments by aminoglycosides and tobramycin in particular were also shown to promote persister formation (Table 1) [35], the level of which was modulated by oxygenation level and composition of the culture medium [35], [36]. This modulation *via* nutriment availability was also observed on persister levels obtained after ciprofloxacin treatment (Table 1) [36]. The growth phase is another factor that was shown to strongly influence the proportion of persister cells [37], but this has not yet been demonstrated for *A. baumannii*. Thus, if the level of persister formation depend weakly on the culture parameters or on the antibiotic used, it was suggested to be essentially related to the strain in *A. baumannii*. Indeed, the diversity of the *A. baumannii* genomes reflects a high degree of diversity in the strains themselves (Table 1) [38]. In fact, out of the 2 500 *A. baumannii* genomes, only 2 221 genes are shared between each strain (core genome), out of the 19 272 that correspond to the pangenome. Strain diversity may be a main explanation for the difference in persister formation levels.

Toxin/antitoxin systems related to the formation of persister cells

The toxin/antitoxin (TA) systems are composed of a stable toxin and an unstable antitoxin, which neutralizes the activity of the toxin. TA systems are currently grouped into five types (types I to V) according to the nature of the antitoxin and the mode of interaction between toxin and antitoxin. In all cases, toxins are proteins, while an antitoxin may be either RNA or protein [39].

Initially presented as a plasmid maintenance system [40], new advances have shown that these systems act also on the physiology of the bacteria. Indeed, they allow slowing down bacterial growth in response to a stress factor, *promoting thus* an entry into bacterial persister state [41]. The involvement of “high persistence” genes (*hipA/hipB* TA operon) in the persister phenomenon was discovered in 1983 in *E. coli* K12 [42]. This system is the most documented for its involvement in persister cell formation. Under unfavorable conditions, a cascade of reactions activates the TA system. Indeed, the presence of stress induces activation of the stringent response, leading to 5'-diphosphate 3'-diphosphate (ppGpp) accumulation. Although not essential, ppGpp accumulation leads to the formation of polyphosphate (polyP) by the polyphosphate kinase (PPK) [43]. This polyP then interacts with the protease complex Lon, activating a complex polyP - Lon that promotes protein degradation of the HipB antitoxin from the TA. HipA toxin is thus released and inhibits protein synthesis *via* an inhibition of the glutamyl-tRNA synthetase [44]. This leads to an accumulation of uncharged tRNAGlu in the cell and results in failure of protein biosynthesis. The TA systems remain partially described in *A. baumannii* and present, as already described, a significant variability depending on the strain [45], [46], [47].

The study of 476 genomes of *A. baumannii* isolates predicted 15 different TA systems. They were detected either on the strain genome or on their plasmids (ACICU, AYE, SDF, MDR-ZJ06, p3ABAYE...) [45]. The authors subcloned the toxins and expressed them in *E. coli* under an inducible promoter. They then investigated the toxic effect of the protein and whether it was functional. In this group, five of them appear to be functional (Table 1). These five TA systems are all type II. Three of these TA are orthologs of the bacterial and archaeal systems RelB/RelE, HicA/HicB and HigB/HigA, and two are unique TA modules, AbkA/AbkB (also called SplT/SplA) and CheT/CheA [45], [48], [49].

AbkA/AbkB : Among these five potential TA systems, the AbkA/AbkB system was the only system studied for its involvement in persister formation in *A. baumannii*. It is mainly carried by plasmid but does not appear to be directly involved in plasmid maintenance [50], [51], [52]. The toxin AbkB is an endoribonuclease that inhibits translation, and AbkA as its cognate antitoxin [50]. The genes *abkA/abkB* were over-expressed (2.7 fold change) in persister cells under antibiotic treatment (10 × MIC of imipenem) [53]. The strains overexpressed AbkA and presented a high proportion of persister while a drastic decrease was observed in the other strains without this system. It is also interesting to note that a significant correlation was observed between the presence of *abkA* and *blaOXA-24* genes in carbapenem-resistant isolates obtained from patients

in Iran [48]. In this case, it was suggested a potential role for these systems as plasmid stabilization systems, contributing to the evolution of antibiotic resistance in *A. baumannii* [45], [49].

Concerning the other TA systems, their function was hypothesized regarding their identity with already described TA systems in different bacteria.

HigA/B : Indeed, for HigB/HigA, no link has been yet established for its involvement in *A. baumannii* persisters. However, in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* it is involved in stress response [54]. In *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, the toxin HigB regulates virulence factor production (*e.g* pyocyanin production, pyochelin, swarming mobility) and promote biofilm formation where a high proportion of cells are known to persist [55], [56]. HigA antitoxin represses the expression of a key transcriptional regulator of the virulence systems by directly binding to their promoter regions, and it controls pyocyanin synthesis, type III secretion system (T3SS), and type VI secretion system (T6SS) expression [56]. In *A. baumannii*, the HigB2/HigA2 system was found on the 11kb plasmid pAB120 also carrying genes for resistance to carbapenems [57]. The hetero-oligomer has a feedback control on its expression. It was also modulate by environmental stresses and was shown to be overexpressed in stationary phase or under iron deficiency [57]. Both HigB/HigA and AbkA/AbkB are the most abundant systems, and only detected to be carried by plasmids up to now. They are predominantly present in isolates from the international clones one and two (IC-I and IC-II) [45], [48], [57], [58], [59].

CheT/CheA : Regarding *A. baumannii* CheT/CheA system, CheA presented 25 % identity with the *E. coli* DinJ antitoxin, and has 37 % identity with an N-acetyltransferase superfamily [48]. . The predicted structure of the protein seems to show that CheA possesses helix-turn-helix (HTH) domains characteristic of DinJ. In *E. coli* , DinJ/YafQ system is involved in the formation of persister cells [60]. Kill-rescue assays on *A. baumannii* isolates showed that CheT/CheA served as a TA module: the HTH domain of the protein CheT acted as a toxin and the GNAT domain of CheA protein neutralized the HTH effect acting thus as an antitoxin [48].

RelB/RelE : The RelB/RelE system is detected at genomic level in some *A. baumannii* clinical strains (AC1633, ACICU, MDR-ZJ06, TCDC-AB0715, TYTH1 or AB 5075) [38], [45], [46], [61]. In *E. coli* , the target of the RelB toxin is the A ribosomal site. The blockage of this site promotes the cleavage of the messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) during translation [62]. This allows a translation stop and thus a stop of protein production[62].

HicA/B: The last TA system *hicA/hicB* was shown to be overexpressed in *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978 upon ciprofloxacin treatment ($50 \times$ MIC), suggesting an involvement of this system in the response of bacteria to antibiotic shocks [63]. In *E. coli* K12, the toxin HicA cleaves mRNA and also the tRNA in a ribosome-independent manner and HicA is reported to be inactivated by HicB [64]. In *Burkholderia pseudomallei* , this system was suggested to be involved in the formation of persister cells [65].

Finally, a Zeta/Epsilon system has been predicted and detected in the plasmids p2ABTCDC, pAbSK-OXA-82, pABTJ1 and pACICU2 [45]. Zeta toxins are notably larger (360 amino acids) than their currently known functional orthologs (270 amino acids). The Zeta toxin in *A. baumannii* could block cell wall biosynthesis by phosphorylation of the peptidoglycan precursor uridine diphosphate-N-acetylglucosamine (UNAG) [66]. Indeed, Zeta would form an ATP-UNAG-Zeta complex. This complex will block the action of MurA, responsible for peptidoglycan biosynthesis [67], which is the initial step in membrane biosynthesis [66]. Zeta then appears to have a strong implication in cell multiplication and would be an interesting target, as it stops bacteria to grow rapidly. Although not an antitoxin-toxin system, PPK kinase is also involved in protein degradation, particularly in antitoxin degradation. A study in *A. baumannii* investigated the effect of polyP *via* a mutant of PPK [68]. In this study, ATCC 17978 strains deficient in PPK1 (Dppk1::Apr) and supplemented with PPK1 (Dppk1::Apr/PJL02-ppk1) were studied. As expected, the authors showed that PPK1 is essential for polyP formation *in vivo* . The PPK1 mutant had a reduced motility by a destabilisation of the pili structure, inhibited biofilm formation and decreased persister under antibiotic ($40 \times$ MIC of Ampicillin) but also under other stresses such as H₂O₂, heat shock and starvation stress. These phenotypes were restored by complementation. Interestingly, metabolomics analysis revealed that PPK1 was associated

with glycerophospholipid metabolism and fatty acid biosynthesis. The authors suggested thus alteration of glycerophospholipid metabolism could alter the membrane charge, resulting in a resistance of bacteria to the tested stresses [68].

2.3 Second Messengers

The second messengers, (p)ppGpp and cyclic dimeric diguanosine monophosphate (*c*-di-GMP), are main signal molecules, the level of which determines the entry in persister state [69], [70], [71].

(p)ppGpp : Indeed, in *E. coli*, (p)ppGpp is clearly a major player in induction of persister state [72]. Increased levels of (p)ppGpp induce transcription of RpoS and RpoE [73]. ppGpp inhibits deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) primase [74], and ribosomal ribonucleic acid (rRNA) transcription [75], deregulates an early step in lipopolysaccharide (LPS) formation [76], and binds to ribonucleic acid (RNA) polymerase [77]. ppGpp could directly inhibit the negative DNA supercoiling [78], and indirectly induces transcription of ribosomal modulation factor (Rmf) and hibernation promotion factor (Hpf), which plays a role in ribosome dimerization (90S and 100S) [79]. In *A. baumannii* it was shown that the formation of (p)ppGpp, is mediated by RelA (ABUW_3302) (Table1) [80]. RelA is a monofunctional protein only contributing to pppGpp synthesis. Moreover, the reduction of pppGpp into ppGpp is mediated by SpoT, a monofunctional (p)ppGpp hydrolase [81]. *ThereLA* deletion resulted in the formation of 4-fold less persister cells than in WT AB5075 strain under $50 \times$ MIC colistin or $80 \times$ MIC rifampin treatments. The mutant *relA* underwent also variations of its motility, morphology or colony morphology [80]. In other strains like ATCC 17978, it was shown that a mutant deficient in (p)ppGpp production ($\Delta A1S_{0579}$) is 2- to 4-fold more susceptible to antibiotics, *i.e.* MICs are reduced by a factor of 1 to 4 compared to wide type (WT) or complemented strain [82]. The authors suggest this susceptibility could be due to the under-expression of efflux transporters (*AdeI*, *AdeJ* and *AdeK*) and, less obviously, to the over-expression of certain proteins belonging to the transporter systems, such as AetA, AdeB and AdeM [82], [83].

c-di-GMP : It was already shown that this second messenger molecule increases the proportion of persister cells in *E. coli* [84]. It also influences virulence factors in many bacteria [85], [86], [87]. In *P. aeruginosa*, HigB decreases the intracellular level of *c*-di-GMP, which is responsible for the increased expression of the T3SS genes and the repression of biofilm formation [88]. It is worth noting that the enzymes, diguanylate cyclases, involved in *c*-di-GMP synthesis contain a catalytic site with a GGDEF/EAL motif [89]. In *A. baumannii* ATCC 17978 strain, several diguanylate cyclases were identified and characterized but their involvement in persister cells has never been studied [90].

2.4 SOS response in persister cells

The SOS pathway is an inducible DNA damage repair system that is pivotal for bacterial adaptation, pathogenesis, and diversification of population. The SOS response activates systems to carry out adaptation processes to face hostile or even toxic environments. These systems can contribute to growth arrest, DNA repair, repair of replication errors or mobilization of mobile genetic elements (transposons and insertion sequences) [91], [92], [93]. Activation of the SOS response in persister cells could explain the appearance of adaptative mutations, especially in the presence of antibiotics inducing reactive oxygen species (ROS) production leading therefore to DNA damages [94]. Persister could thus be a key stage in the course of genetic resistance development [95]. The SOS response seems to be a key player in persister physiology, for both maintaining DNA integrity and remodeling it [96]. However, DNA damage response is a multifactorial response that appear to be species-specific and may have a major influence on the development of new capabilities of the species [97].

The DNA damages induced by ROS can be produced by antibacterial molecules and leads to an SOS response [98]. This response is mediated by RecA, which binds to single-stranded DNA and protects it from degradation. In many bacteria, LexA is the transcriptional repressor of RecA and of all SOS response genes. It is cleaved by RecA if the latter is bound to a single strand of DNA activating the transcription of SOS genes. In *Acinetobacter*, the mechanism seems different, as the genome lacks the *lexA* gene [99], [100]. Indeed, the error-prone reserve polymerase UmuD (polymerase V) is recruited during SOS response. *UmuD*

is repressed by UmuDAb, itself repressed by DdrR. *DdrR* overexpression represses the DNA repair genes [101].

It was shown that, after 1h tobramycin treatment at $10 \times \text{MIC}$, *umuD* and *ddrR* of ATCC 17978 strain were over-expressed [102]. The transcriptomics of ATCC 17978 persisters selected by treatment of $50 \times \text{MIC}$ of ciprofloxacin, showed overexpression of different systems, like the DNA repair system, the phenylacetic acid degradation pathway, the leucine catabolism, HicAB toxin-antitoxin system and ROS response (Table 1) [63]. Several genes displayed significant changes like *pare* (A1S_3359); *recA* (A1S_1962); *umuC* (A1S_2008); *umuD* (A1S_1174, A1S_1389); *ddrR* (A1S_1388); *ruvB* (A1S_2588); *recB* (A1S_0356) and *repA* (A1S_0663). The construction of deletion mutants of *recA* (A1S_1962) and *umuD* homolog (A1S_1389) was performed. The *umuD* mutant formed fewer persister cells than the WT strain, when the *recA* mutant did not form any persister cells after 3 hour (h) of antibiotic treatment [63]. These results suggested that these proteins (*umuD* and *recA*) are involved in persister formation. It should be also noticed that RecA is involved in resistance to some β -lactam antibiotics and contributes to survival after ultraviolet (UV) treatment, and to virulence in macrophages *in vitro* and in mice *in vivo* [103], [104].

Other transcriptomic analyses on ATCC 19606 and two clinical strains treated by 10 mg/L of ciprofloxacin and 10 mg/L of imipenem for 6 h were also performed [105]. They showed similarly that the three strains overexpressed *dam*, *recC*, *umuD*, *phoU*, and *glpD*. The methyltransferase Dam, when subcloned under the control of an inducible promoter, positively regulated *recC*, *umuD*, *phoU*, and *glpD* genes. Consequently, the percentage of persister cells was more abundant in the Dam-overexpressing mutant. The RecC overexpressing-mutant presented also an increased rate of persister cell formation (Table 1) [105].

Antibiotic shock treatment frequently leads to the generation of ROS [106], [107], [108], [109]. As seen previously, ROS may damage DNA leading to the SOS response [96]. However, the bacteria may also activate some other mechanisms to face the ROS stress and maintain the cell integrity. These mechanisms are essential for a rapid adaptation or the bacterial survival. This response is indirectly involved in the state of persister cells [110]. As an example, pyocyanin generates ROS in *A. baumannii*. It was shown ROS production leads to catalase and Sod increased expression in order to eliminate ROS [111]. Clearance of *A. baumannii* polymyxin B persister by Rifampicin was shown to be related to a significant down regulation of *sodB* and therefore to an enhanced generation of ROS (Table 1) [112]. Additionally, it was shown that a SodB *A. baumannii* mutant was more sensitive to antibiotics and generated less persister cells [112].

2.5 The phenyl acetic catabolic pathway

In ATCC 19606 strain under a ceftazidime ($50 \times \text{MIC}$) antibiotic shock, the aromatic compound degradation (PAA) genes were overexpressed in persister cells (Table 1) [113]. The authors suggest that the degradation of the aromatic ring of antibiotics was used by *A. baumannii* under conditions of nutrient limitation. In ATCC 17978, under antibiotic subinhibitory concentrations, the PAA operon was shown to be overexpressed while Csu pilus expression and biofilm formation were repressed [114]. This suggests that this pathway may participate to the regulatory network used in response to antibiotic treatment.

2.6 Changes at membrane level in persister cells

The next section of this review which deals with therapeutics, will show that the membrane is considered to be a main target for anti-persister cell agent development [115].

However, few studies have investigated the lipidome of persister cells (Table 1). In *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* dormant cells, an accumulation of triacylglycerol (TG) linked to the membrane or as inclusion bodies [116], [117] was highlighted [118]. TG could be involved in energy storage used during hibernation [119], [120] and used to reduce the toxic burden of free fatty acids causing a reductive stress [121]. It could also contribute to antibiotic tolerance by redirecting cellular carbon fluxes away from the tricarboxylic acid cycle [122]. In addition, genes encoding TG biosynthetic enzymes were found predominantly in virulent *M. tuberculosis* strains, suggesting a potential role of these genes in the infection [118]. In *A. baumannii*, the lipidome of persister cells under ciprofloxacin treatment ($100 \times \text{MIC}$) was analyzed using LC-MS (Table 1) [123]. It was demon-

trated that membranes of persister cells displayed specific lipids like lyso-1-phosphatidyl-2-acyl-glycerol-3-phosphoethanolamines (LPAGPE) and 1-phosphatidyl-2-acyl-glycerol-3-phosphoethanolamines (PAGPE). These specific lipids may compensate a repulsive effect of the phosphate negative charges due to an increase in cardiolipin abundance. Moreover, the acyl chains of their lipids were modified by hydroxylation or di-unsaturations. The presence of di-unsaturation and hydroxylation could contribute to a change in membrane fluidity. In persister cells, a rigidification of the membrane could allow bacteria to modify the permeability of their membranes in order to survive, and may accompany to the bacterial growth arrest. Finally, the persister cells were shown to accumulate particular wax esters (WE) composed of two fatty acids and a fatty diol. These uncommon WE could be a specific metabolic key for *A. baumannii* to store energy during growth arrest and used for rapid regrowth? [123].

Concerning membrane proteins, genes coding for OmpA and OmpW were shown overexpressed by a factor of 5.5 and 10.5 respectively, in $15 \times$ MIC meropenem persisters of the Acb-1 strain (Table 1) [124]. In agreement with this, virulence assays on *Galleria mellonella* indicated that these persisters were more virulent than control cells [124]. On the contrary, *ompW* was under-expressed in tobramycin persisters. [63] Its expression in persisters may thus be drug-dependent. The authors suggest that over-expression can help *A. baumannii* survive exposure to meropenem by increasing drug efflux.

Finally, it was already shown that *A. baumannii* persister cells underwent morphological changes. Indeed, a study on persisters generated by $100 \times$ MIC meropenem showed that cells had a spherical shape with a reduced permeability (Table 1) [125]. These morphological changes were also observed for the ATCC 17978 strain under a $6 \mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ meropenem treatment [126]. Furthermore, images of persister cells under tobramycin ($10 \text{ mg}/\text{L}$) or meropenem ($15 \text{ mg}/\text{L}$) treatment by transmission and scanning electron microscopies showed the presence of a division septa at the cell midpoint [35]. The presence of this septum was intriguing. It was suggested that the persister cells could still be in a multiplying state to maintain a balance between multiplication and cell death, as also suggested in *Mycobacterium smegmatis* [127].

Table 1 : Molecular mechanisms involved in *A. baumannii* persister cells physiology .

Mechanisms	Antibiotic of selection	Str
TA systems		
<i>abkA/abkB</i>	-Imipenem ($10 \times$ MIC) -Imipenem combined with chlorhexidine ($0.25 \times$ MIC)	Ref
<i>RelB/RelE</i>		
<i>HigB_{Ab}/HigA_{Ab}</i>	-Ceftazidime ($50 \times$ MIC)	Ref
<i>hicA/hicB</i>	-Ciprofloxacin ($50 \times$ MIC)	Ref
<i>PPK</i>	-Ampicillin ($40 \times$ MIC)	Ref
Secondary messenger		
<i>(p)ppGpp relA</i>	-Colistin ($50 \times$ MIC) -Rifampin ($80 \times$ MIC)	Clin
SOS response	-Ciprofloxacin ($50 \times$ MIC) -Ciprofloxacin ($10 \text{ mg}/\text{L}$) -Imipenem ($10 \text{ mg}/\text{L}$)	Ref
ROS	-Amikacin ($2 \times$ MIC) -Carbenicillin ($5 \times$ MIC)	clin
Membrane changes	-Ciprofloxacin ($100 \times$ MIC) -Meropenem ($15 \times$ MIC) -Meropenem ($100 \times$ MIC + $10 \times$ MIC)	Ref
PAA operon	-Ceftazidime ($50 \times$ MIC)	Ref

3. Strategies against *A. baumannii* persister cells

Two main approaches can be used to fight against persister cells: i) the prevention approach that uses antibacterial compounds that do not form persister cells. In this approach, the use of antibacterial agents' combination is very useful. ii) the development of direct killing agents that do not generate persister cells itself or that are able to kill persister specifically. In this approach, the most effective strategy for eliminating persister cells is to take growth arrest into account and find a target not linked to multiplication activity [128]. Most effective anti-persister agents take often the bacterial membrane as a primary target. In *A. baumannii*, combination of treatments strategies and direct killing have been explored and will be presented

in this section [128], [129].

3.1 Preventing approach: combination of treatments

Combining antibiotics to prevent the formation of persister cells is a strategy that generally uses antibiotics with radically different targets, the membrane being one of the preferred targets. Thus, most of the studies combine the use of the polymyxin B or colistin with β -lactams.

Recently, it has been shown that meropenem or carbenicillin treatments resulted in the appearance of a particular cell phenotype that survive: round, metabolically active cells that have lost their cell wall [126]. A modification of their envelope leads to a susceptibility to treatment with β -lactam (ampicillin and carbenicillin) with an increase in the killing power from 100 to 1000 fold [126]. These results suggest that antibiotic treatment can cause a modification of the envelope, making the bacteria more sensitive to another antibiotic targeting the membrane. Another study focused on three clinical strains (Acb-1, Acb-8 and Acb-2) and determined the level of persister cells generated by polymyxin B and meropenem, tested at different concentrations alone or in combination [130]. Mono-treatment with these antibiotics at 5, 10 or 15 mg/L, induced between 0.0031 to 0.9743 % of persisters depending on the choice of antibiotics. However, these antibiotics in combination did not produce persister cells. This study highlighted and confirmed the useful effects of combined therapy.

Synergistic effects were also observed with other antibiotic combinations: 30 μ g/mL carbenicillin with 2 μ g/mL colistin or 200 μ g/mL ampicillin with 2 μ g/mL colistin. They increased the killing efficiency on two clinical isolates [126]. These combinations provide a two-log increase in bacterial eradication.

Colistin has also been tested in combination with other antibiotics, *e.g.* colistin plus tobramycin, rifampicin or colistin [131]. These authors show that these combinations eradicate all cells. Sequential antibiotic combinations were also examined [132]. It was demonstrated that treatment by colistin followed by amikacin eradicated the entire population, when the reverse sequence did not. Even though no high antibiotic concentration was used to select persisters, this study clearly shows that sensitization by a membranolytic agent is highly effective. Colistin in combination with the econazole, an imidazole derivative, was also tested [133]. This combination showed a synergic effect with a reduction of MIC colistin by 128 fold with 10 μ g/mL econazole.

The combination of an antimicrobial agent with a phage cocktail to control or limit biofilm formation has also been investigated [134]. Combinations of four temperate bacteriophages (SA1, Eve, Ftm and Gln) and different antibiotics (ampicillin/sulbactam, meropenem and colistin) enhanced biofilm inhibition and degradation on thirty extensively drug-resistant (XDR) strains of *A. baumannii*. Moreover, it has been shown that a combination of Paride and meropenem can sterilize deep-dormant cultures *in vitro* and greatly reduce a resilient bacterial infection of a tissue cage implant in mice [135]. In this context, it would be interesting to test these phage/antibiotic combinations on persister cells.

3.2 Persister eradication approach

In *A. baumannii*, the first bactericidal agent used to eradicate persister cells was Art-175 from the Artily sine family [136]. Art-175 is a phagic endolysin which degrades peptidoglycan, fused with specific peptides that destabilize the outer membrane [136]. The specificity between peptidoglycan and endolysin results from the long and intense coevolution between phages and bacteria. Art-175 (60 μ g/ml) was highly effective at 1 h and eradicated all strains after 24 h of treatment. Persister selected with tobramycin and treated with 30 \times MIC Art-157 on the RUH134 strain led to a drastic population reduction in just 20 min. It took only 120 min to reach the limit of bacteria detection.

The effect of molecules with an aromatic core (1-BC or 2-NC), an L-lysine moiety (K), and a variable lipophilic chain (8, 10, 12 carbon chain) were also tested on *E. coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *P. aeruginosa* and *A. baumannii* persister cells [137]. NCK-10 and BCK-12 activity on *A. baumannii* clinical isolates (MTCC 1425, R676 and R674) showed lytic activity between 1.5 and 9 μ M. NCK-10 (8 \times MIC) did not induce resistance even after 20 cycles in *E. coli*. NCK-10 appears to depolarized and permeabilize the membranes of *E. coli*

persister cells (induced by 300 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ of ampicillin for 3 h). NCK-10 was burn-tested on female Balb/c mice infected with *A. baumannii* at concentrations of 17.5 mg/kg and did not induce any toxic effects. Moreover, this compound significantly reduced the bacterial load after a 7-day application.

Squalamine, a polycationic aminosterol isolated from the shark *Squalus acanthias* with antibacterial properties, was tested on persister cells generated by ciprofloxacin [36]. This molecule contains a polyamine tail, which is known to be able to lead to a fast membrane depolarization and disruption [138]. In this study, unlike those presented above, the methodology is slightly different. The authors generated persister cells using an antibiotic (ciprofloxacin $1000 \times \text{MIC}$). They first characterized the selected population to determine the proportion of persister cells and VNBCs. Then the authors tested squalamine, the molecule of interest, with colistin as the control for cell lysis. Squalamine and colistin were able to eradicate persister cells at 100 mg/L ($50 \times \text{MIC}$) and 500 mg/L ($100 \times \text{MIC}$) within 9 and 12 h respectively. Colistin concentrations ($100 \times \text{MIC}$) are higher than those of squalamine ($50 \times \text{MIC}$), and require more time to eradicate the persistent population, which underlines the efficacy of squalamine. It was mentioned that squalamine was used at concentrations below the minimum hemolytic concentration ($\text{IC}_{50} > 66 \text{ mg}/\text{L}$ [139]) demonstrating a poor toxicity.

Carvacrol, Eugenol, and Thymol are compounds approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), having a GRAS (generally recognized as safe) status [125]. They can be used as food additives. These compounds were tested on persister cells selected with meropenem ($100 \times \text{MIC}$). Thymol used alone at its MIC concentration lead to a complete eradication of meropenem induced persisters. In combination with meropenem, it completely eradicated persisters at lower concentration ($0.5 \times \text{MIC}$). It allowed also the total eradication of 48 h mature biofilm at concentration $1 \times \text{MIC}$. Concerning eugenol and carvacrol, they eradicated biofilm persisters but at much higher concentrations than thymol. Thymol treatment significantly inhibited meropenem persisters of MDR *A. baumannii* isolates, both as monotherapy and co-therapy. Thymol was also effective on rifampicin, tigecycline and polymyxin B persisters at concentrations equal to or less than $1 \times \text{MIC}$. Thymol was demonstrated to induce a membrane depolarization and permeability, as well as an increased ROS production. It inhibited proton motive force (PMF) and multiple drug efflux pumps.

Recently, it has been shown that phages can have an effect on dormant cells [140]. The action of the phage Paride on dormant cells of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* has been studied. This study showed that this phage has an active lytic cycle on *P. aeruginosa* cells in deep dormancy [135]. To our knowledge, phages with an effective lytic cycle on persistent *A. baumannii* cells have not yet been studied.

Table 2 : Therapeutic investigation for anti- persister cells in *A. baumannii*

Molecule	Concentration
Membranolytic agent associated with antibacterial agents	
Meropenem, ampicillin + carbenicillin	Combination of 30 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ carbenicillin with 2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ of meropenem
Polymyxin B + Meropenem	5, 10 and 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$
Colistin + tobramycin or rifampicin	10, 20 or $40 \times \text{MIC}$
Colistin then amikacin or <i>vice versa</i>	Colistin $5 \times \text{MIC}$
Colistin + econazole	Econazole 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$
Art-175	Tobramycin $30 \times \text{MIC}$
Persister eradication strategy	
Squalamine Colistine	Squalamine $50 \times \text{MIC}$ Colistine $100 \times \text{MIC}$
Carvacrol, Eugenol, Thymol	Thymol $1 \times \text{MIC}$ Meropenem $100 \times \text{MIC}$.

4. Conclusion

Persister formation in *A. baumannii* is highly dependant on bacterial strain and culture conditions. This physiological complexity potentially involves various molecular determinants, currently under investigation. Among them, toxin-antitoxin systems could modulate the formation of these persistent cells (Abka...).

Other systems involved in persister cell formation for other bacteria are still poorly explored in *A. baumannii* : second messengers, the SOS response and PAA. Membrane modifications appear to be an important factor in the physiology of *A. baumannii* . Further research into the physiology of this particular bacterial population is required. This could lead to the identification of specific biomarkers and, consequently, to new therapeutic targets.

Current approaches to eradicating persisters focus on different strategies: the use of molecules that inhibit persister formation, such as naturally-occurring compounds like Art-175, phages and squalamine, or the combination of antibiotics, one of which acts mechanistically on the bacterial membrane.

Many questions relating to this physiology remain unanswered, particularly with regard to its fundamental understanding and the identification of effective therapeutic targets. The development of strategies targeting persister cells could make a significant contribution to limiting the development of new bacterial resistances.

Acknowledgements

This work has been partially supported by University of Rouen Normandy, INSA-Rouen Normandy, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), SésAD research network, France.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Web reference

[W1] World Health Organization WHO publishes list of bacteria for which new antibiotics are urgently needed. <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/376776/9789240093461-eng.pdf>

References

- [1] M. Lucidi *et al.* , “Pathogenicity and virulence of *Acinetobacter baumannii*: Factors contributing to the fitness in healthcare settings and the infected host,” *Virulence* , vol. 15, 2024, doi: 10.1080/21505594.2023.2289769.
- [2] C. M. Harding, S. W. Hennon, and M. F. Feldman, “Uncovering the mechanisms of *Acinetobacter baumannii* virulence,” 2018. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro.2017.148.
- [3] S. Zeidler and V. Müller, “Coping with low water activities and osmotic stress in *Acinetobacter baumannii*: significance, current status and perspectives,” *Environ Microbiol* , vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 2212–2230, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.14565.
- [4] A. K. Cain, I. D. 1, M. Hamidian, and I. D. 2, “Portrait of a killer: Uncovering resistance mechanisms and global spread of *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1011520.
- [5] J. M. Farrow, G. Wells, and E. C. Pesci Id, “Desiccation tolerance in *Acinetobacter baumannii* is mediated by the two-component response regulator BfmR,” 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0205638.
- [6] A. Gedefie Id, A. Id, O. Mohammed, G. Mesfin Bamboid, S. S. Kebede, and B. Kebede, “Prevalence of biofilm producing *Acinetobacter baumannii* clinical isolates: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0287211.
- [7] S. Fahy, J. A. O’Connor, B. Lucey, and R. D. Sleator, “Hospital Reservoirs of Multidrug Resistant *Acinetobacter* Species-The Elephant in the Room!,” *Br J Biomed Sci* , vol. 80, 2023, doi: 10.3389/BJBS.2023.11098.
- [8] M. Fauvart, V. N. De Groote, and J. Michiels, “Role of persister cells in chronic infections: clinical relevance and perspectives on anti-persister therapies,” *J Med Microbiol* , vol. 60, pp. 699–709, 2011, doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.030932-0.

- [9] J. Wainwright, G. Hobbs, and I. Nakouti, “Persister cells: formation, resuscitation and combative therapies,” Dec. 01, 2021, *Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH* . doi: 10.1007/s00203-021-02585-z.
- [10] G. L. Hobby, K. Meyer, and E. Chaffee, “Observations on the Mechanism of Action of Penicillin.’,” *at MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY on* , no. 2, p. 1942, 1942.
- [11] Joseph Bigger, “Treatment of Staphylococcal infection with penicillin,” *the lancet* , pp. 497–500, Oct. 1944.
- [12] N. Q. Balaban *et al.* , “Definitions and guidelines for research on antibiotic persistence,” *Nat Rev Microbiol* , 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41579-019-0196-3.
- [13] K. Lewis, “Persister cells,” Oct. 13, 2010. doi: 10.1146/annurev.micro.112408.134306.
- [14] L. Fernández-García *et al.* , “Phages produce persisters,” *Microb Biotechnol* , vol. 17, no. 8, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.1111/1751-7915.14543.
- [15] M. A. Orman and M. P. Brynildsen, “Dormancy Is Not Necessary or Sufficient for Bacterial Persistence,” *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* , vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 3230–3239, 2013, doi: 10.1128/AAC.00243-13.
- [16] N. Q. Balaban, J. Merrin, R. Chait, and L. Kowalik, “Bacterial Persistence as a Phenotypic Switch,” 2004.
- [17] A. Gutierrez, S. Jain, P. Bhargava, M. Hamblin, M. A. Lobritz, and J. J. Collins, “Understanding and Sensitizing Density-Dependent Persistence to Quinolone Antibiotics,” *Mol Cell* , vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 1147-1154.e3, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2017.11.012.
- [18] N. M. Vega, K. R. Allison, A. S. Khalil, and J. J. Collins, “Signaling-mediated bacterial persister formation,” *Nat Chem Biol* , vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 431–433, 2012, doi: 10.1038/nchembio.915.
- [19] R. A. Bamford, A. Smith, J. Metz, G. Glover, R. W. Titball, and S. Pagliara, “Investigating the physiology of viable but non-culturable bacteria by microfluidics and time-lapse microscopy,” *BMC Biol* , vol. 15, no. 1, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1186/S12915-017-0465-4.
- [20] K. Dong *et al.* , “Induction, detection, formation, and resuscitation of viable but non-culturable state microorganisms,” *Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf* , vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 149–183, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1111/1541-4337.12513.
- [21] M. M. K. Hansen and L. S. Weinberger, “Post-Transcriptional Noise Control,” *BioEssays* , vol. 41, no. 7, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1002/BIES.201900044.
- [22] R. Arbel-Goren *et al.* , “Effects of post-transcriptional regulation on phenotypic noise in *Escherichia coli*,” *Nucleic acid research* , vol. 41, no. 9, pp. 4825–4834, 2013, doi: 10.1093/nar/gkt184.
- [23] H. H. Mcadams and A. Arkin, “Stochastic mechanisms in gene expression,” *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* , vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 814–819, Feb. 1997, doi: 10.1073/PNAS.94.3.814.
- [24] P. S. Swain, “Efficient attenuation of stochasticity in gene expression through post-transcriptional control,” *J Mol Biol* , vol. 344, no. 4, pp. 965–976, Dec. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.jmb.2004.09.073.
- [25] J. Yan and B. L. Bassler, “Surviving as a community: antibiotic tolerance and persistence in bacterial biofilms,” *Cell Host Microbe* , vol. 10, no. 26, pp. 15–21, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2019.06.002.
- [26] D. J. Cabral, J. I. Wurster, and P. Belenky, “Antibiotic persistence as a metabolic adaptation: Stress, metabolism, the host, and new directions,” Mar. 01, 2018, *MDPI AG* . doi: 10.3390/ph11010014.
- [27] R. A. Fisher, B. Gollan, and S. Helaine, “Persistent bacterial infections and persister cells,” Aug. 01, 2017, *Nature Publishing Group* . doi: 10.1038/nrmicro.2017.42.

- [28] J. E. Gomez and J. D. McKinney, “M. tuberculosis persistence, latency, and drug tolerance,” *Tuberculosis* , vol. 84, no. 1–2, pp. 29–44, 2004, doi: 10.1016/J.TUBE.2003.08.003.
- [29] I. Levin-Reisman, I. Ronin, O. Gefen, I. Braniss, N. Shoresh, and N. Q. Balaban, “Antibiotic tolerance facilitates the evolution of resistance,” *Science (1979)* , vol. 355, no. 6327, pp. 826–830, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1126/science.aaj2191.
- [30] J. Liu, O. Gefen, I. Ronin, M. Bar-Meir, and N. Q. Balaban, “Effect of tolerance on the evolution of antibiotic resistance under drug combinations,” *Antibiotic resistance* , vol. 367, pp. 200–204, 2020, doi: 10.1126/science.aay3041.
- [31] S. S. Grant and D. T. Hung, “Persistent bacterial infections, antibiotic tolerance, and the oxidative stress response,” 2013, *Taylor and Francis Inc.* doi: 10.4161/viru.23987.
- [32] V. C. Barth *et al.* , “Heterogeneous persister cells formation in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *PLoS One* , vol. 8, no. 12, Dec. 2013, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0084361.
- [33] S. W. Gallo, B. K. Donamore, V. E. Pagnussatti, C. A. S. Ferreira, and S. D. De Oliveira, “Effects of meropenem exposure in persister cells of *Acinetobacter calcoaceticus-baumannii*,” *Future Microbiol* , vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 131–140, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.2217/fmb-2016-0118.
- [34] A. M. Shenkutie, M. Z. Yao, G. K. H. Siu, B. K. C. Wong, and P. H. M. Leung, “Biofilm-induced antibiotic resistance in clinical *acinetobacter baumannii* isolates,” *Antibiotics* , vol. 9, no. 11, pp. 1–15, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.3390/antibiotics9110817.
- [35] B. K. Donamore, S. W. Gallo, P. M. A. Ferreira, C. A. S. Ferreira, and S. D. De Oliveira, “Levels of persisters influenced by aeration in *Acinetobacter calcoaceticus–baumannii*,” *Future Microbiol* , vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 209–219, 2018, doi: 10.2217/fmb-2017-0153.
- [36] M. Nicol *et al.* , “Anti-persister activity of squalamine against *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *Int J Anti-microb Agents* , vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 337–342, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.IJANTIMICAG.2018.11.004.
- [37] T. K. Wood, S. J. Knabel, and B. W. Kwan, “Bacterial Persister Cell Formation and Dormancy,” 2013, doi: 10.1128/AEM.02636-13.
- [38] E. L. Mangas *et al.* , “Pangenome of *Acinetobacter baumannii* uncovers two groups of genomes, one of them with genes involved in CRISPR/Cas defence systems associated with the absence of plasmids and exclusive genes for biofilm formation,” *Microb Genom* , vol. 5, 2019, doi: 10.1099/mgen.0.000309.
- [39] C. F. Schuster and R. Bertram, “Toxin-antitoxin systems are ubiquitous and versatile modulators of prokaryotic cell fate,” *FEMS Microbiol Lett* , vol. 340, pp. 73–85, 2013, doi: 10.1111/1574-6968.12074.
- [40] F. Hayes, “Toxins-Antitoxins: Plasmid Maintenance, Programmed Cell Death, and Cell Cycle Arrest,” *Science (1979)* , vol. 301, no. 5639, 2003, [Online]. Available: <http://about.jstor.org/terms>
- [41] D. Jurėnas, N. Fraikin, F. Goormaghtigh, and L. Van Melderen, “Biology and evolution of bacterial toxin–antitoxin systems,” *Nature Reviews Microbiology 2022 20:6* , vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 335–350, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1038/s41579-021-00661-1.
- [42] H. S. Moyed and K. P. Bertrand, “hipA, a Newly Recognized Gene of *Escherichia coli* K-12 That Affects Frequency of Persistence After Inhibition of Murein Synthesis,” 1983.
- [43] M. J. Gray, V. J. Dirita, and J. A. Org, “Inorganic Polyphosphate Accumulation in *Escherichia coli* Is Regulated by DksA but Not by (p)ppGpp,” 2019, doi: 10.1128/JB.00070-19.
- [44] E. Germain, D. Castro-Roa, N. Zenkin, and K. Gerdes, “Molecular Mechanism of Bacterial Persistence by HipA,” *Mol Cell* , vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 248–254, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2013.08.045.

- [45] M. Jurenaite, A. Markuckas, and E. Sužiedeliene, “Identification and characterization of type II toxin-antitoxin systems in the opportunistic pathogen acinetobacter baumannii,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 195, no. 14, pp. 3165–3172, 2013, doi: 10.1128/JB.00237-13.
- [46] M. F. Al Marjania, E. Kouhsari, F. S. Ali, and S. H. Authman, “Evaluation of type II Toxin-Antitoxin Systems, Antibiotic Resistance Profiles, and Biofilm Quorum Sensing Genes in Acinetobacter Baumannii Isolates in Iraq,” *Infect Disord Drug Targets* , vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 180–186, May 2020, doi: 10.2174/1871526520666200525170318.
- [47] B. Shin, C. Park, and W. Park, “Stress responses linked to antimicrobial resistance in Acinetobacter species,” Feb. 01, 2020, *Springer* . doi: 10.1007/s00253-019-10317-z.
- [48] A. Japoni-Nejad *et al.* , “Identification and characterization of the type II toxin-antitoxin systems in the carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii,” *Microb Pathog* , vol. 158, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.micpath.2021.105052.
- [49] S. S. Lean, C. C. Yeo, Z. Suhaili, and K. L. Thong, “Comparative genomics of two ST 195 carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii with different susceptibility to polymyxin revealed underlying resistance mechanism,” *Front Microbiol* , vol. 6, no. JAN, 2016, doi: 10.3389/FMICB.2015.01445/ABSTRACT.
- [50] S. S. Lean and C. C. Yeo, “Small, enigmatic plasmids of the nosocomial pathogen, Acinetobacter baumannii: Good, bad, who knows?,” *Front Microbiol* , vol. 8, no. AUG, Aug. 2017, doi: 10.3389/FMICB.2017.01547/ABSTRACT.
- [51] N. Mosqueda *et al.* , “Characterization of plasmids carrying the blaOXA-24/40 carbapenemase gene and the genes encoding the AbkA/AbkB proteins of a toxin/antitoxin system,” *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* , vol. 69, no. 10, pp. 2629–2633, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1093/JAC/DKU179.
- [52] S. Tsuneda *et al.* , “The higBA Toxin-Antitoxin Module From the Opportunistic Pathogen Acinetobacter baumannii – Regulation, Activity and Evolution,” 2018, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.00732.
- [53] L. Fernández-García *et al.* , “Relationship between Tolerance and Persistence Mechanisms in Acinetobacter baumannii Strains with AbkAB Toxin-Antitoxin System,” *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* , vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 1–7, 2018, doi: 10.1128/AAC.
- [54] D. Sharma *et al.* , “HigB1 Toxin in Mycobacterium tuberculosis Is Upregulated During Stress and Required to Establish Infection in Guinea Pigs,” 2021, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.748890.
- [55] T. L. Wood and T. K. Wood, “The HigB/HigA toxin/antitoxin system of Pseudomonas aeruginosa influences the virulence factors pyochelin, pyocyanin, and biofilm formation,” *Microbiologyopen* , vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 499–511, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1002/mbo3.346.
- [56] Y. Song *et al.* , “Type II Antitoxin HigA Is a Key Virulence Regulator in Pseudomonas aeruginosa,” *American Chemical Society* , vol. 7, pp. 2930–2940, 2021, doi: 10.1021/acsinfedis.1c00401.
- [57] J. Armalyte, D. Jurenas, R. Krasauskas, A. Čepauskas, and E. Sužiedeliene, “The higBA toxin-antitoxin module from the opportunistic pathogen Acinetobacter baumannii - Regulation, activity, and evolution,” *Front Microbiol* , vol. 9, no. APR, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.3389/FMICB.2018.00732/FULL.
- [58] J. Povilonis *et al.* , “Spread of carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii carrying a plasmid with two genes encoding OXA-72 carbapenemase in Lithuanian hospitals,” *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* , vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 1000–1006, May 2013, doi: 10.1093/jac/dks499.
- [59] S. Shahbazi *et al.* , “Zinc oxide nanoparticles impact the expression of the genes involved in toxin-antitoxin systems in multidrug-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii,” *J Basic Microbiol* , pp. 1–9, 2022, doi: 10.1002/jobm.202200382.
- [60] I. Keren, D. Shah, A. Spoering, N. Kaldalu, and K. Lewis, “Specialized persister cells and the mechanism of multidrug tolerance in Escherichia coli,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 186, no. 24, pp. 8172–8180, Dec. 2004, doi:

10.1128/JB.186.24.8172-8180.2004.

[61] A. Ghazi Alattraqchi *et al.* , “Complete Genome Sequencing of *Acinetobacter baumannii* AC1633 and *Acinetobacter nosocomialis* AC1530 Unveils a Large Multidrug-Resistant Plasmid Encoding the NDM-1 and OXA-58 Carbapenemases,” 2021, doi: 10.1128/mSphere.01076-20.

[62] K. Pedersen, A. V. Zavialov, M. Y. Pavlov, J. Elf, K. Gerdes, and M. Ns Ehrenberg, “The Bacterial Toxin RelE Displays Codon-Specific Cleavage of mRNAs in the Ribosomal A Site small its concentration will dwindle and free and active RelE toxins will appear in the cytoplasm (Christensen *et al.*, 2001),” *Cell* , vol. 112, pp. 131–140, 2003.

[63] S. Kashyap, P. Sharma, and N. Capalash, “Potential genes associated with survival of *Acinetobacter baumannii* under ciprofloxacin stress,” *Microbes Infect* , vol. 23, no. 9–10, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.micinf.2021.104844.

[64] M. G. Jørgensen, D. P. Pandey, M. Jaskolska, and K. Gerdes, “HicA of *Escherichia coli* defines a novel family of translation-independent mRNA interferases in bacteria and archaea,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 191, no. 4, pp. 1191–1199, Feb. 2009, doi: 10.1128/JB.01013-08/FORMAT/EPUB.

[65] A. Butt *et al.* , “The HicA toxin from *Burkholderia pseudomallei* has a role in persister cell formation,” *Biochemical Journal* , vol. 459, no. 2, pp. 333–344, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.1042/BJ20140073.

[66] A. Karthika *et al.* , “Molecular dynamics simulation of Toxin-Antitoxin (TA) system in *Acinetobacter baumannii* to explore the novel mechanism for inhibition of cell wall biosynthesis: Zeta Toxin as an effective therapeutic target,” *J Cell Biochem* , vol. 122, no. 12, pp. 1832–1847, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1002/jcb.30137.

[67] A. Sonkar, H. Shukla, R. Shukla, J. Kalita, T. Pandey, and T. Tripathi, “UDP-N-Acetylglucosamine enol-pyruvyl transferase (MurA) of *Acinetobacter baumannii* (AbMurA): Structural and functional properties,” *Int J Biol Macromol* , vol. 97, pp. 106–114, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.IJBIOMAC.2016.12.082.

[68] H. Lv *et al.* , “Polyphosphate Kinase Is Required for the Processes of Virulence and Persistence in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *Microbiol Spectr* , Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1128/SPECTRUM.01230-22.

[69] K. Syal, N. RS, and M. V. N. J. Reddy, “The extended (p)ppGpp family: New dimensions in Stress response,” *Curr Res Microb Sci* , vol. 2, p. 100052, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.CRMICR.2021.100052.

[70] D. A. D’argenio and S. I. Miller, “Cyclic di-GMP as a bacterial second messenger,” *Microbiology (N Y)* , vol. 150, pp. 2497–2502, 2004, doi: 10.1099/mic.0.27099-0.

[71] U. Jenal and J. Malone, “Mechanisms of Cyclic-di-GMP Signaling in Bacteria,” *Annu. Rev. Genet.* , vol. 40, pp. 385–407, 2006, doi: 10.1146/annurev.genet.40.110405.090423.

[72] O. Pacios *et al.* , “(p)ppGpp and its role in bacterial persistence: New challenges,” *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* , vol. 64, no. 10, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1128/AAC.01283-20.

[73] M. Hirsch and T. Elliott, “Role of ppGpp in rpoS stationary-phase regulation in *Escherichia coli*,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 184, no. 18, pp. 5077–5087, Sep. 2002, doi: 10.1128/JB.184.18.5077-5087.2002.

[74] M. Macia, M. Kochanowska, and R. Ly, “ppGpp inhibits the activity of *Escherichia coli* DnaG primase,” 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.plasmid.2009.11.002.

[75] Y. Zuo, Y. Wang, and T. A. Steitz, “The Mechanism of *E. coli* RNA Polymerase Regulation by ppGpp is suggested by the structure of their complex,” *Mol Cell* , vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 430–436, May 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2013.03.020.

[76] S. Brückner *et al.* , “(p)ppGpp and moonlighting RNases influence the first step of lipopolysaccharide biosynthesis in *Escherichia coli*,” vol. 4, pp. 1–18, 2023, doi: 10.1093/femsml/uqad031.

- [77] D. Chatterji, N. Fujita, and A. Ishihama, “The mediator for stringent control, ppGpp, binds to the β -subunit of Escherichia coli RNA polymerase,” *Genes to Cells*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 279–287, 1998, doi: 10.1046/J.1365-2443.1998.00190.X.
- [78] J. A. Kraemer, A. G. Sanderlin, and M. T. Laub, “The stringent response inhibits DNA replication initiation in E. Coli by modulating supercoiling of oric,” *mBio*, vol. 10, no. 4, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1128/MBIO.01330-19/FORMAT/EPUB.
- [79] Y. Maki and H. Yoshida, “Ribosomal hibernation-associated factors in escherichia coli,” *Microorganisms*, vol. 10, no. 1, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.3390/MICROORGANISMS10010033.
- [80] M. Pérez-Varela, A. R. P. Tierney, J. S. Kim, A. Vázquez-Torres, and P. Rather, “Characterization of RelA in acinetobacter baumannii,” *J Bacteriol*, vol. 202, no. 12, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1128/JB.00045-20.
- [81] H. Tamman *et al.*, “nature chemical biology Structure of SpoT reveals evolutionary tuning of catalysis via conformational constraint,” *Nature Chemical Biology*, vol. 19, pp. 334–345, 2022, doi: 10.1038/s41589-022-01198-x.
- [82] H. W. Jung, K. Kim, M. M. Islam, J. C. Lee, and M. Shin, “Role of ppGpp-regulated efflux genes in Acinetobacter baumannii,” *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, vol. 75, no. 5, pp. 1130–1134, May 2020, doi: 10.1093/jac/dkaa014.
- [83] N. Kim, J. H. Son, K. Kim, H. J. Kim, M. Shin, and J. C. Lee, “Dksa modulates antimicrobial susceptibility of acinetobacter baumannii,” *Antibiotics*, vol. 10, no. 12, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3390/antibiotics10121472.
- [84] H. Liao *et al.*, “Cyclic di-GMP as an Antitoxin Regulates Bacterial Genome Stability and Antibiotic Persistence in Biofilms,” *Microbiology and Infectious Disease*, 2024, doi: 10.7554/eLife.99194.1.
- [85] H. Antelmann, S. Rice, M. B. Poulin, and L. L. Kuperman, “Regulation of Biofilm Exopolysaccharide Production by Cyclic Di-Guanosine Monophosphate,” 2021, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.730980.
- [86] C. L. Hall and V. T. Lee, “Cyclic-di-GMP regulation of virulence in bacterial pathogens,” *WIREs RNA*, vol. 9, p. 1454, 2018, doi: 10.1002/wrna.1454.
- [87] M. Valentini and A. Filloux, “Multiple Roles of c-di-GMP Signaling in Bacterial Pathogenesis,” *Annu. Rev. Microbiol*, vol. 73, pp. 387–406, 2019, doi: 10.1146/annurev-micro-020518.
- [88] Y. Zhang *et al.*, “HigB Reciprocally Controls Biofilm Formation and the Expression of Type III Secretion System Genes through Influencing the Intracellular c-di-GMP Level in Pseudomonas aeruginosa,” *Toxins (Basel)*, vol. 10, pp. 1–12, 2018, doi: 10.3390/toxins10110424.
- [89] K. M. Dahlstrom and G. A. O’toole, “A Symphony of Cyclases: Specificity in Diguanylate Cyclase Signaling,” 2017, doi: 10.1146/annurev-micro-090816.
- [90] I. Ahmad, E. Nygren, F. Khalid, S. L. Myint, and & Bernt Eric Uhlin, “A cyclic-di-GMP signalling network regulates biofilm formation and surface associated motility of Acinetobacter baumannii 17978,” 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-58522-5.
- [91] K. H. Maslowska, K. Makiela-Dzbenska, and I. J. Fijalkowska, “The SOS system: A complex and tightly regulated response to DNA damage,” *Environ Mol Mutagen*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 368–384, May 2019, doi: 10.1002/EM.22267.
- [92] N. Fornelos, D. F. Browning, and M. Butala, “The Use and Abuse of LexA by Mobile Genetic Elements,” 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2016.02.009.
- [93] M. A. Lima-Noronha, D. L. H Fonseca, R. S. Oliveira, R. R. Freitas, J. H. Park, and R. S. Galhardo, “Sending out an SOS-the bacterial DNA damage response,” *Genet Mol Biol*, vol. 45, no. 1, p. 20220107, 2022, doi: 10.1590/1678-4685-GMB-2022-0107.

- [94] L. M. Jara, P. Cortés, G. Bou, J. Barbé, and J. Aranda, “Differential roles of antimicrobials in the acquisition of drug resistance through activation of the SOS response in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* , vol. 59, no. 7, pp. 4318–4320, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1128/AAC.04918-14.
- [95] M. D. Norton, A. J. Spilikia, and V. G. Godoy, “Antibiotic resistance acquired through a DNA damage-inducible response in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 195, no. 6, pp. 1335–1345, Mar. 2013, doi: 10.1128/JB.02176-12.
- [96] M. Tomas, J. Carlos Alonso, S. N. Claudia H Marques, D. Žgur Bertok, and Z. Podlesek, “The DNA Damage Inducible SOS Response Is a Key Player in the Generation of Bacterial Persister Cells and Population Wide Tolerance,” 2020, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.01785.
- [97] J. M. Hare, J. A. Bradley, C.-L. Lin, and T. J. Elam, “Diverse responses to UV light exposure in *Acinetobacter* include the capacity for DNA damage-induced mutagenesis in the opportunistic pathogens *Acinetobacter baumannii* and *Acinetobacter ursingii*,” 2012, doi: 10.1099/mic.0.054668-0.
- [98] V. Tiwari, M. Tiwari, and D. Biswas, “Rationale and design of an inhibitor of RecA protein as an inhibitor of *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *J Antibiot (Tokyo)* , vol. 71, pp. 522–534, 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41429-018-0026-2.
- [99] M. D. F. B. V. C. K. D. C. J. M. H. Deborah Cook, “The DdrR Coregulator of the *Acinetobacter baumannii* Mutagenic DNA Damage Response Potentiates UmuDab Repression of Error-Prone Polymerases,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 204, no. 11, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1128/jb.00220-22.
- [100] B. Candra, D. Cook, and J. Hare, “Repression of *Acinetobacter baumannii* DNA damage response requires DdrR-assisted binding of UmuDab dimers to atypical SOS box ,” *J Bacteriol* , Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1128/jb.00432-23.
- [101] A. Pavlin, G. Bajc, N. Fornelos, D. F. Browning, and M. Butala, “The Small DdrR Protein Directly Interacts with the UmuDab Regulator of the Mutagenic DNA Damage Response in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://journals.asm.org/journal/jb>
- [102] S. Kashyap, P. Sharma, and N. Capalash, “Tobramycin Stress Induced Differential Gene Expression in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *Curr Microbiol* , vol. 79, no. 3, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s00284-022-02788-7.
- [103] J. Aranda *et al.* , “*Acinetobacter baumannii* reca protein in repair of DNA damage, antimicrobial resistance, general stress response, and virulence,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 193, no. 15, pp. 3740–3747, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.1128/JB.00389-11.
- [104] L. Lin, D. Ringel, A. Vettiger, L. Dürr, and B. Marek, “DNA Uptake upon T6SS-Dependent Prey Cell Lysis Induces SOS Response and Reduces Fitness of *Acinetobacter baylyi* In Brief,” *Cell Rep* , vol. 29, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2019.09.083.
- [105] H. Kim, J. Hong Kim, H. Cho, and K. Soo Ko, “Overexpression of a DNA Methyltransferase Increases Persister Cell Formation in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” 2022, doi: 10.1128/spectrum.02655-22.
- [106] H. Van Acker and T. Coenye, “The Role of Reactive Oxygen Species in Antibiotic-Mediated Killing of Bacteria,” *Trends Microbiol* , vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 456–466, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.TIM.2016.12.008.
- [107] M. Herb, M. Schramm, and S. Filosa, “Functions of ROS in Macrophages and Antimicrobial Immunity,” 2021, doi: 10.3390/antiox10020313.
- [108] M. M. Masadeh, K. H. Alzoubi, S. I. Al-Azzam, O. F. Khabour, and A. M. Al-Buhairan, “Ciprofloxacin-induced antibacterial activity is attenuated by pretreatment with antioxidant agents,” *Pathogens* , vol. 5, no. 1, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.3390/PATHOGENS5010028.
- [109] J. H. Yeo, J. Q. Low, N. Begam, W.-T. Leow, and A. L.-H. Kwa, “Can flow cytometric measurements of reactive oxygen species levels determine minimal inhibitory concentrations and antibiotic susceptibility

testing for *Acinetobacter baumannii*?,” *PLoS One* , vol. 19, no. 6, p. e0305939, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0305939.

[110] E. Kouhsari *et al.* , “Bacterial Persister Cells: Mechanisms of Formation, Control, and Eradication,” *Infect Disord Drug Targets* , vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 17–28, 2023, doi: 10.2174/1871526523666230511142054.

[111] N. Bhargava, P. Sharma, and N. Capalash, “Pyocyanin stimulates quorum sensing-mediated tolerance to oxidative stress and increases persister cell populations in *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *Infect Immun* , vol. 82, no. 8, pp. 3417–3425, 2014, doi: 10.1128/IAI.01600-14/FORMAT/EPUB.

[112] V. Dubey, R. Gupta, and R. Pathania, “Targeting superoxide dismutase confers enhanced reactive oxygen species-mediated eradication of polymyxin b-induced acinetobacter baumannii persisters,” *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* , vol. 65, no. 5, May 2021, doi: 10.1128/AAC.02180-20.

[113] R. Alkasir *et al.* , “Characterization and transcriptome analysis of acinetobacter baumannii persister cells,” *Microbial Drug Resistance* , vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 1466–1474, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1089/mdr.2017.0341.

[114] A. J. Hooppaw *et al.* , “The Phenylacetic Acid Catabolic Pathway Regulates Antibiotic and Oxidative Stress Responses in *Acinetobacter*,” *mBio* , vol. 13, no. 3, 2022, doi: 10.1128/mbio.01863-21.

[115] C. L. Schrank, I. K. Wilt, C. Monteagudo Ortiz, B. A. Haney, and W. M. Wuest, “Using membrane perturbing small molecules to target chronic persistent infections,” *RSC Med Chem* , vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 1312–1324, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1039/D1MD00151E.

[116] R. Bansal-Mutalik and H. Nikaido, “Mycobacterial outer membrane is a lipid bilayer and the inner membrane is unusually rich in diacyl phosphatidylinositol dimannosides,” 2014, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1403078111.

[117] H. Christensen, N. J. Garton, R. W. Horobin, D. E. Minnikin, and M. R. Barer, “Lipid domains of mycobacteria studied with fluorescent molecular probes,” 1999, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2958.1999.01304.x.

[118] S. Canaan, E. V. Nazarova, J. Daniel, M. Y. Krishnan, R. Kumar Maurya, and S. Bharti, “Triacylglycerols: Fuelling the Hibernating *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*,” *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology* | *www.frontiersin.org* , vol. 1, p. 450, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2018.00450.

[119] J. Daniel *et al.* , “Induction of a novel class of diacylglycerol acyltransferases and triacylglycerol accumulation in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* as it goes into a dormancy-like state in culture,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 186, no. 15, pp. 5017–5030, Aug. 2004, doi: 10.1128/JB.186.15.5017-5030.2004.

[120] K. L. Low *et al.* , “Triacylglycerol Utilization Is Required for Regrowth of In Vitro Hypoxic Nonreplicating *Mycobacterium bovis* Bacillus Calmette-Guerin,” *J Bacteriol* , vol. 191, no. 16, pp. 5037–5043, 2009, doi: 10.1128/JB.00530-09.

[121] M. P. Weir, W. H. R. Langridge, and R. W. Walker, “Relationships Between Oleic Acid Uptake and Lipid Metabolism in *Mycobacterium smegmatis*,” 1972.

[122] S.-H. Baek, A. H. Li, and C. M. Sasseti, “Metabolic Regulation of Mycobacterial Growth and Antibiotic Sensitivity,” *PLoS Biol* , vol. 9, no. 5, p. 1001065, 2011, doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001065.

[123] D. Vergoz *et al.* , “Lipidome of *Acinetobacter baumannii* antibiotic persister cells,” *BBA-Molecular and Cell Biology of Lipids* , vol. 1869, p. 159539, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.bbalip.2024.159539.

[124] B. L. Schmitt *et al.* , “Increased ompW and ompA expression and higher virulence of *Acinetobacter baumannii* persister cells,” *BMC Microbiol* , vol. 23, no. 1, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s12866-023-02904-y.

[125] T. Bhando, A. Casius, S. R. Uppalapati, and R. Pathania, “Unravelling mechanisms of meropenem induced persistence facilitates identification of GRAS compounds with anti-persister activity against 2 *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *bioRxiv* , 2020.

- [126] J. Zou *et al.* , “Non-walled spherical *Acinetobacter baumannii* is an important type of persister upon β -lactam antibiotic treatment,” *Emerg Microbes Infect* , vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1149–1159, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1080/22221751.2020.1770630.
- [127] Y. Wakamoto *et al.* , “Dynamic persistence of antibiotic-stressed mycobacteria,” *Science (1979)* , vol. 339, no. 6115, pp. 91–95, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1126/science.1229858.
- [128] V. Defraigne, M. Fauvart, and J. Michiels, “Fighting bacterial persistence: Current and emerging anti-persister strategies and therapeutics,” *Drug Resistance Updates* , vol. 38, pp. 12–26, May 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.DRUP.2018.03.002.
- [129] F. Khan, D. T. N. Pham, N. Tabassum, S. F. Oloketuyi, and Y. M. Kim, “Treatment strategies targeting persister cell formation in bacterial pathogens,” Nov. 01, 2020, *Taylor and Francis Ltd.* doi: 10.1080/1040841X.2020.1822278.
- [130] S. W. Gallo, C. Alexandre, S. Ferreira, and S. D. De Oliveira, “Combination of polymyxin B and meropenem eradicates persister cells from *Acinetobacter baumannii* strains in exponential growth,” *J Med Microbiol* , vol. 66, pp. 1257–1260, 2017, doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.000542.
- [131] S. Kashyap, S. Kaur, P. Sharma, and N. Capalash, “Combination of colistin and tobramycin inhibits persistence of *Acinetobacter baumannii* by membrane hyperpolarization and down-regulation of efflux pumps,” *Microbes Infect* , vol. 23, no. 4–5, May 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.MICINF.2021.104795.
- [132] E. S. Chung and K. S. Ko, “Eradication of persister cells of *Acinetobacter baumannii* through combination of colistin and amikacin antibiotics,” *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* , vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 1277–1283, May 2019, doi: 10.1093/jac/dkz034.
- [133] M. Xie, K. Chen, E. Wai-Chi Chan, and S. Chen, “Synergistic Antimicrobial Effect of Colistin in Combination with Econazole against Multidrug-Resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* and Its Persisters,” 2022, doi: 10.1128/spectrum.00937-22.
- [134] S. Rastegar *et al.* , “Synergistic effects of bacteriophage cocktail and antibiotics combinations against extensively drug-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” *BMC Infect Dis* , vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1186/S12879-024-10081-0/FIGURES/9.
- [135] E. Maffei *et al.* , “Phage Paride can kill dormant, antibiotic-tolerant cells of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* by direct lytic replication,” *Nat Commun* , vol. 15, no. 175, 2024, doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-44157-3.
- [136] V. Defraigne *et al.* , “Efficacy of Artilysin Art-175 against Resistant and Persistent *Acinetobacter baumannii*,” 2016, doi: 10.1128/AAC.00285-16.
- [137] C. Ghosh *et al.* , “Aryl-alkyl-lysines: Membrane-Active Small Molecules Active against Murine Model of Burn Infection,” 2015, doi: 10.1021/acsinfecdis.5b00092.
- [138] M. Blanchet *et al.* , “Claramines: A New Class Of Broad-Spectrum Antimicrobial Agents With Bimodal Activity,” *ChemMedChem* , vol. 13, pp. 1018–1027, 2018, doi: 10.1002/cmdc.201800073.
- [139] D. Vergoz *et al.* , “6-Polyaminosteroid Squalamine Analogues Display Antibacterial Activity against Resistant Pathogens,” *Int J Mol Sci* , vol. 24, no. 8568, 2023, doi: 10.3390/ijms24108568.
- [140] V. Sanchez-Torres, J. Kirigo, and T. K. Wood, “Implications of lytic phage infections inducing persistence,” 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.mib.2024.102482.

List of used abbreviations

c-di-GMP : cyclic dimeric diguanosine monophosphate

DNA : deoxyribonucleic acid

FDA : Food and Drug Administration

h : hour

c-di-GMP : cyclic dimeric diguanosine monophosphate

IC-I : international clones one
IC-II : international clones two
LPAGPE : lyso-1-phosphatidyl-2-acyl-glycerol-3-phosphoethanolamines
LPS : lipopolysaccharide
MDR : multidrug resistance
MIC : minimum inhibitory concentration
mRNA : messenger ribonucleic acid
PAA : aromatic compound degradation
PAGPE : 1-phosphatidyl-2-acyl-glycerol-3-phosphoethanolamines
PMF : proton motive force
polyP : polyphosphate
ppGpp : guanosine 5'-diphosphate 3'-diphosphate
PPK : polyphosphate kinase
RNA : ribonucleic acid
ROS : reactive oxygen species
rRNA : ribosomal ribonucleic acid
T3SS : type III secretion system
T6SS : type VI secretion system
TA : toxin/antitoxin
TG : triacylglycerol
UNAG : uridine diphosphate-N-acetylglucosamine
UV : ultraviolet
VBNC : viable but non-culturable cells
WE : wax esters
XDR : extensively drug-resistant
