Review article

The Unique Challenge: Why Microbes Struggle to Develop Resistance to Antimicrobial Peptides

Abouelhag H. A.

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, National Research Centre (NRC), 33 Bohouth St., Dokki, Cairo, Egypt.

Corresponding author:*Abouelhag H. A.* **E-mail:**drabouelhag5@gmail.com

Received: 29-08-2025 **Accepted:** 24-09-2025 **Published online:** 30-10-2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33687/ricosbiol.03.10.85

Abstract

The escalating crisis of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) threatens to unravel a century of medical progress. Conventional antibiotics, with their specific, single-target mechanisms, are increasingly rendered ineffective, necessitating the urgent development of novel therapeutic strategies. Antimicrobial Peptides (AMPs), fundamental components of the innate immune system across all kingdoms of life, have emerged as promising candidates. A pivotal advantage of AMPs over traditional antibiotics is the perceived difficulty for microbes to develop robust resistance against them. This review delves into the mechanistic underpinnings of this phenomenon, exploring the unique mode of action of AMPs, the fitness costs associated with resistance mechanisms, and the evolutionary trade-offs that constrain microbial adaptation. While acknowledging that resistance is not impossible, we argue that the inherent properties of AMPs present a significantly higher and more complex barrier for resistance development compared to conventional drugs.

Keywords: antimicrobial peptides, antimicrobial resistance, drug development, membrane disruption, fitness cost, innate immunity, host defense peptides, evolutionary trade-offs.

Introduction

The AMR Crisis and the Promise of AMPs

The discovery of antibiotics revolutionized medicine, but their widespread and often indiscriminate use has selected for resistant pathogens, creating a global health emergency (World Health Organization, 2024). Conventional antibiotics typically inhibit specific, essential bacterial processes, such as cell wall synthesis (e.g., β-lactams), protein synthesis (e.g., macrolides), or DNA replication (e.g., fluoroquinolones). A single point mutation in the target gene can often confer high-level resistance, which can be rapidly disseminated through horizontal gene transfer (Blair *et al*., 2015).

In this landscape, Antimicrobial Peptides (AMPs) offer a paradigm shift. These small, typically cationic and amphipathic molecules are ubiquitous in nature, serving as first-line defenders in plants, animals, and humans (Zasloff, 2002). Their potential as next-generation therapeutics lies not only in their potent, broad-spectrum activity but, crucially, in the formidable challenges they pose to the evolution of resistance.

1. The Mechanistic Basis: A Multi-Pronged Attack Unlike Any Other

The primary reason for the low propensity for resistance is the fundamental difference in the mechanism of action between AMPs and traditional antibiotics.

1.1. Membrane Disruption: The Primary, Non-Specific Assault

Most AMPs exert their initial effect through electrostatic interactions. Bacterial membranes are rich in anionic phospholipids (e.g., phosphatidylglycerol, cardiolipin), attracting the cationic regions of AMPs. Upon binding, AMPs integrate into the membrane, often assembling into pores (e.g., by "barrel-stave," "carpet," or "toroidal-pore" models) that disrupt the membrane's integrity. This leads to rapid ion efflux, collapse of the proton motive force, and ultimately, cell lysis (Brogden, 2005).

- The Resistance Challenge: This mechanism is non-specific. It does not involve a single protein receptor or enzyme. For a bacterium to develop resistance, it would need to alter the fundamental physicochemical properties of its entire cytoplasmic membrane a task that is far more genetically and energetically demanding than modifying a single enzyme (Melo *et al*., 2009).

1.2. Intracellular Targets: A Secondary, Lethal Complication

Many AMPs, even those known for membrane disruption, can translocate into the cell without causing immediate lysis. Once inside, they can interfere with vital intracellular processes, including:

- Inhibiting cell wall synthesis
- Binding to DNA/RNA
- Inactivating essential enzymes
- Modulating the immune response of the host (Hale and Hancock, 2007)

This multi-target intracellular activity means that even if a microbe manages to partially fortify its membrane against an AMP, it may still succumb to the peptide's secondary intracellular actions (Lei *et al*., 2019).

2. The High Cost of Defense: Fitness Trade-Offs for Microbes

When bacteria do evolve countermeasures against AMPs, these adaptations often come with significant fitness costs, making resistant strains less competitive in natural environments.

2.1. Common Microbial Resistance Strategies and Their Drawbacks (table. 1)

Table (1): Mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance

Resistance Mechanism	Description	Associated Fitness Cost
Membrane Modification	Altering membrane fluidity or charge to reduce AMP binding. This can involve adding positive groups (e.g., lysinylation of phosphatidylglycerol) or incorporating more saturated fatty acids to stiffen the membrane (Ernst and Peschel, 2011).	**High.** Altered membrane transport, reduced nutrient uptake, impaired respiration, and decreased virulence. A stiffer membrane may also hinder the function of essential membrane proteins (Koprivnjak and Peschel, 2011).
Efflux Pumps	Upregulation of efflux systems (e.g., MDR pumps) to expel AMPs from the cell (Shafer *et al*., 1998).	**High.** Energetically expensive (ATP-dependent). Can lead to auto-intoxication by expelling essential metabolites and can reduce fitness in the absence of the AMP (Piddock, 2006).
Proteolytic Degradation	Production of extracellular proteases or peptidases that degrade AMPs (Schmidtchen *et al*., 2002).	**Moderate to High.** Producing and secreting proteases is energetically costly. Furthermore, host proteases inhibitors can neutralize this strategy.
Biofilm Formation	Encasing the microbial community in a protective extracellular matrix that physically blocks AMP penetration (Batoni *et al*., 2016).	**Context-dependent.** While protective in a niche, biofilms can limit dispersal and nutrient access, and the biofilm lifestyle is metabolically distinct and often slower-growing.
Capture and Sequestration	Secretion of proteins or polysaccharides that bind and neutralize AMPs before they reach the membrane (Gupta *et al*., 2017).	**Moderate.** Production cost of the secreted molecules; can alter the cell surface properties and interaction with the host.

2.2. The Evolutionary Trade-Off

In a natural setting, such as the human body, bacteria face a multitude of challenges beyond a single therapeutic AMP. They must compete with other microbes, acquire nutrients, and evade the full arsenal of the host immune system. A strain that invests heavily in AMP resistance (e.g., by profoundly altering its membrane) may become "over-specialized" and vulnerable. For instance, a membrane with a reduced negative charge might resist AMPs but could also impair the function of membrane-bound enzymes involved in respiration or nutrient import, rendering the bacterium less fit in a complex, competitive environment (Andersson and Hughes, 2010).

3. The Host-AMP Synergy: An Insurmountable Hurdle?

The therapeutic use of AMPs is not envisioned as a monotherapy in isolation. The human body itself produces a plethora of AMPs (e.g., defensins, cathelicidins) as part of the innate immune response. The evolutionary pressure from these host-derived AMPs has already shaped microbial populations for millennia (Nizet, 2006). Introducing a therapeutic AMP does not represent a novel challenge but rather an intensification of an ancient, ongoing evolutionary arms race in which the host (and its AMPs) has maintained a strategic upper hand.

Furthermore, some AMPs possess immunomodulatory functions, such as recruiting immune cells to the site of infection or suppressing excessive inflammation. This means their efficacy is not solely dependent on their direct microbicidal activity but is augmented by the power of the host's own adaptive immune system (Hancock and Sahl, 2006).

4. Caveats and Considerations: Resistance is Not Impossible

Despite the significant barriers, it is crucial to acknowledge that resistance to AMPs can and has been observed in laboratory settings and in certain clinical isolates. Notable examples include:

- ***Staphylococcus aureus*** modifying its membrane charge via the MprF gene (Peschel *et al*., 2001).
- ***Neisseria gonorrhoeae*** using efflux pumps to expel human defensins (Shafer *et al*., 1998).
- ***Salmonella enterica*** regulating lipid A acylation to resist cationic AMPs (Guo *et al*., 1998).

These examples prove that microbial adaptability should never be underestimated. However, these resistance mechanisms are often strain-specific, unstable, and come with the fitness costs described above, limiting their widespread dissemination compared to the plasmid-borne, high-level resistance seen against conventional antibiotics (Andersson and Hughes, 2010).

5. Conclusion and Future Perspectives

The difficulty microbes face in developing resistance to Antimicrobial Peptides stems from a confluence of factors: a non-specific, membrane-targeting primary mechanism, multi-pronged intracellular attacks, and the severe fitness trade-offs associated with any attempted resistance. This makes AMPs a highly attractive class for the development of new anti-infectives.

Future efforts should focus on:

1. **Engineering Synergistic Peptides:** Designing AMP cocktails or hybrid molecules that attack the membrane through different mechanisms, making simultaneous resistance even more unlikely (Fox, 2013).

2. **Leveraging Immunomodulation:** Prioritizing the development of AMPs where the immunomodulatory function is a primary therapeutic goal, reducing selective pressure for direct resistance (Hancock and Sahl, 2006).

3. **Prudent Use Strategies:** Implementing stewardship programs from the outset to ensure that any clinical use of AMPs minimizes unnecessary selective pressure, preserving their long-term efficacy.

In the relentless battle against AMR, Antimicrobial Peptides represent not just a new weapon, but a new strategy, one that exploits the fundamental vulnerabilities of the microbial world in a way that is inherently harder to overcome. While vigilance against resistance must remain paramount, the unique properties of AMPs offer a beacon of hope for a future beyond the current antibiotic crisis.

References

Andersson, D. I., and Hughes, D. (2010). Antibiotic resistance and its cost: is it possible to reverse resistance? *Nature Reviews Microbiology, 8*(4), 260–271. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2319

Batoni, G., Maisetta, G., and Esin, S. (2016). Antimicrobial peptides and their interaction with biofilms of medically relevant bacteria. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Biomembranes, 1858*(5), 1044–1060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbamem.2015.10.013

Blair, J. M. A., Webber, M. A., Baylay, A. J., Ogbolu, D. O., and Piddock, L. J. V. (2015). Molecular mechanisms of antibiotic resistance. *Nature Reviews Microbiology, 13*(1), 42–51. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3380

Brogden, K. A. (2005). Antimicrobial peptides: pore formers or metabolic inhibitors in bacteria? *Nature Reviews Microbiology, 3*(3), 238–250. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1098

Ernst, C. M., and Peschel, A. (2011). MprF-mediated daptomycin resistance. *International Journal of Medical Microbiology, 301*(8), 642–645. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmm.2011.08.015

Fox, J. L. (2013). Antimicrobial peptides stage a comeback. *Nature Biotechnology, 31*(5), 379–382. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2572

Guo, L., Lim, K. B., Gunn, J. S., Bainbridge, B., Darveau, R. P., Hackett, M., and Miller, S. I. (1998). Regulation of lipid A modifications by Salmonella typhimurium virulence genes phoP-phoQ. *Science, 276*(5310), 250–253. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.276.5310.250

Gupta, S., Kapoor, P., Chaudhary, K., Gautam, A., Kumar, R., and Raghava, G. P. S. (2017). Peptide toxicity prediction. In *Computational Peptidology* (pp. 143-157). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-6798-8_8

Hale, J. D., and Hancock, R. E. (2007). Alternative mechanisms of action of cationic antimicrobial peptides on bacteria. *Expert Review of Anti-infective Therapy, 5*(6), 951–959. https://doi.org/10.1586/14787210.5.6.951

Hancock, R. E. W., and Sahl, H.-G. (2006). Antimicrobial and host-defense peptides as new anti-infective therapeutic strategies. *Nature Biotechnology, 24*(12), 1551–1557. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1267

Koprivnjak, T., and Peschel, A. (2011). Bacterial resistance mechanisms against host defense peptides. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences, 68*(13), 2243–2254. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00018-011-0716-4

Lei, J., Sun, L., Huang, S., Zhu, C., Li, P., He, J., Mackey, V., Coy, D. H., and He, Q. (2019). The antimicrobial peptides and their potential clinical applications. *American Journal of Translational Research, 11*(7), 3919–3931.

Melo, M. N., Ferre, R., and Castanho, M. A. R. B. (2009). Antimicrobial peptides: linking partition, activity and high membrane-bound concentrations. *Nature Reviews Microbiology, 7*(3), 245–250. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2095

Nizet, V. (2006). Antimicrobial peptide resistance mechanisms of human bacterial pathogens. *Current Issues in Molecular Biology, 8*(1), 11–26.

Peschel, A., Jack, R. W., Otto, M., Collins, L. V., Staubitz, P., Nicholson, G., Kalbacher, H., Nieuwenhuizen, W. F., Jung, G., Tarkowski, A., van Kessel, K. P., and van Strijp, J. A. (2001). Staphylococcus aureus resistance to human defensins and evasion of neutrophil killing via the novel virulence factor MprF is based on modification of membrane lipids with l-lysine. *The Journal of Experimental Medicine, 193*(9), 1067–1076. https://doi.org/10.1084/jem.193.9.1067

Piddock, L. J. V. (2006). Multidrug-resistance efflux pumps? not just for resistance. *Nature Reviews Microbiology, 4*(8), 629–636. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1464

Schmidtchen, A., Frick, I. M., Andersson, E., Tapper, H., and Björck, L. (2002). Proteinases of common pathogenic bacteria degrade and inactivate the antibacterial peptide LL-37. *Molecular Microbiology, 46*(1), 157–168. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2958.2002.03146.x

Shafer, W. M., Qu, X., Waring, A. J., and Lehrer, R. I. (1998). Modulation of Neisseria gonorrhoeae susceptibility to vertebrate antibacterial peptides due to a member of the resistance/nodulation/division efflux pump family. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 95*(4), 1829–1833. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.4.1829

World Health Organization. (2024, April 23). *Antimicrobial resistance*. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antimicrobial-resistance

Zasloff, M. (2002). Antimicrobial peptides of multicellular organisms. *Nature, 415*(6870), 389–395. https://doi.org/10.1038/415389a