1 Table S1. Mortality reduction, average APEC load reduction, and average lesion severity

QSIs	Mortality rate % (Nr.)	Average APEC load (Log CFU/g of tissue)			Average lesion severity				
		Liver	Lung	g Heart	Kidney	Liver	Lung	Heart	Airsac
QSI-1	50 (3/6)	5.30	5.92	5.63	6.28	2.17	0.50	3.00	1.83
QSI-2	33.3 (2/6)	4.20	5.15	4.87	5.07	1.00	0.17	1.67	0.92
QSI-5	0 (0/6)	0.72	0.75	0.58	0.67	0.33	0.17	0.33	0.17
QSI-6	66.6 (4/6)	4.62	5.17	4.87	5.35	0.83	0.50	1.50	1.17
QSI-7	66.6 (4/6)	5.95	6.10	6.13	6.13	1.33	0.17	1.33	1.00
QSI-8	33.3 (2/6)	3.48	4.60	3.60	3.65	0.50	0.17	0.50	0.50
QSI-10	16.6 (1/6)	2.50	3.08	2.50	2.47	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.17
РС	66.6 (4/6)	5.95	6.83	5.98	6.81	1.75	1.25	2.25	2.00

2 reduction in QSIs treated chickens

PC; positive control group (chickens infected with APEC and treated with 0.05% of DMSO). Lesions were scored as: air sacs, (1) slight opaque and/or thickened membranes ± slight amount of fibrin, (2) moderate opaque and/or thickened membranes ± moderate amount of fibrin, (3) severe opaque and/or thickened membranes ± severe amount of fibrin ± moderate to severe vascularization); Lung, (1) single small lesion, locally restricted (1/5 of the organ), (2) multiple, locally restricted small lesions and/or one bigger lesion (2/5 of the organ), (3) lesions cover about 1/2 of the organ, (4) lesions cover about 1/2 of the organ, (5) complete organ covered with lesions; Heart, (1) vascularization, opacity, (2) excessive or cloudy fluid in the pericardial cavity, (3) thickened pericardium, acute pericarditis; Liver, (1) decolorization and/or slight amounts of fibrinous exudates, (2) marked perihepatitis with high amounts of fibrinous exudates. The clinical signs and the daily mortality were recorded for 8 DPI.

- 12 13
- 13
- 14
- 15 16

Table S2. Mortality reduction, average APEC load reduction and average lesion severity reduction
in QSI-5 treated chickens at 1 mg/L, 5 mg/L, 10 mg/L, 20 mg/L.

QSI-5 dose	Mortality rate %	Average APEC load (Log CFU/ g of tissue)				Average lesion severity				
	(Nr.)	Liver	Lung	Heart	Kidney	Liver	Lung	Heart	Airsac	
1 mg/L	37.5 (3/8)	5.33	5.68	5.71	5.06	1.25	0.33	1.63	1.38	
5 mg/L	66.6 (6/9)	6.03	5.86	6.09	6.10	1.33	0.38	1.89	1.33	
10 mg/L	44.4 (4/9)	5.84	6.37	7.32	6.20	2.11	0.78	2.44	2.33	
20 mg/L	66.6 (6/9)	6.53	6.58	6.69	6.56	1.22	0.44	2.11	1.67	
PC	88.9 (8/9)	8.46	7.93	8.37	7.84	2.11	1.11	2.78	3.11	

19 PC; positive control group (chickens infected with APEC and treated with 0.05% of DMSO). Lesions were scored as: 20 air sacs, (1) slight opaque and/or thickened membranes \pm slight amount of fibrin, (2) moderate opaque and/or 21 thickened membranes \pm moderate amount of fibrin, (3) severe opaque and/or thickened membranes \pm severe amount 22 of fibrin \pm moderate to severe vascularization); Lung, (1) single small lesion, locally restricted (1/5 of the organ), (2) 23 24 multiple, locally restricted small lesions and/or one bigger lesion (2/5 of the organ), (3) lesions cover about 1/2 of the organ, (4) lesions cover about 1/2 of the organ, (5) complete organ covered with lesions; Heart, (1) vascularization, 25 opacity, (2) excessive or cloudy fluid in the pericardial cavity, (3) thickened pericardium, acute pericarditis; Liver, (1) 26 decolorization and/or slight amounts of fibrinous exudates, (2) marked perihepatitis with high amounts of fibrinous 27 exudates. The clinical signs and the daily mortality were recorded for 8 DPI.

- 28
- 29

30

31

Table S3. Mortality reduction, average APEC load reduction and average lesion severity reduction 33 in OSL-5 treated chickens compared to sulfadimethoxine (SDM)

	viortality rate% (Nr)	Average	of tissue)			Average lesion severity			
	1 att /0 (111.)	Liver	Lung He	9 art Ki	dnev L	iver L	ing Heart	A	
QSI-5	12.7 (8/63)	4.95 4	1.93 5.46	5.0	6 1	.68 0	21 1.93		
SDM	29.2 (19/65)	5.05 6	5.17 5.69	5.3	3 2	2.03 1	17 2.83		
PC	45.6 (31/68)	7.24	7.68 7.92	7.7	3 2	2.52 1	.85 3.58		
PC; positive con	ntrol group (chicken	s infected wi	th APEC and	l treated w	rith 0.05%	of DMS0	D). Lesions w	ere sc	
air sacs, (1) sl	ight opaque and/or	thickened 1	nembranes ±	slight an	nount of t	fibrin, (2)) moderate oj	paque	
thickened mem	branes \pm moderate a	mount of fib	rin, (3) sever	e opaque	and/or thi	ckened m	embranes \pm so	evere	
of fibrin $\pm \mod 0$	erate to severe vascu	ilarization);	Lung, (1) sin	gle small	lesion, loc	ally restri	$\frac{1}{5}$ of the	ie org	
multiple, locally	y restricted small les	1000000000000000000000000000000000000	one bigger le	sion (2/5 o	of the orga	n), (3) les	ions cover ab	out I	
organ, (4) lesion	ns cover about 1/2 c	d in the pari	(5) complete	corgan co	vered will	n lesions;	Heart, (1) va	scula	
decolorization s	essive of cloudy flui	a in the perio	s exudates	(2) marked	d perihena	ardium, a	high amounts	us; L	
evudates. The m	and/of slight amount	d daily until	the end of th	(2) marked	ent $(12 da)$	unis wini vs.of.age)	Fach group 1		
number of chicl	kens as the weak chi	ickens were	removed from	e experim m each ar	un after a	ys of age)	the experime	nt an	
administering th	he first treatment	ickens were		II cacil git	Sup after s	setting up	the experime	in an	
administering ti	ie mst treatment.								
Table S4: W	eekly and overal	l BWG in	treated and	l control	groups.				
Groups	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Weeł	$\frac{3}{5}$ We	eek 6	Overall BV	VG*	
OSI-5	106.12	454.27	519.41	668.9	96 91	0.3	2659.1 (P=0).85)	
SDM	105.1	307.3	454.4	610.	3 9	31	2408.1 (P=0).46)	
PC	121.9	383.5	458.2	496.	2 85	53.0	2312.8 (P=0).09)	
NC	157.8	489.9	490.1	610.	8 75	52.7	2501.2		
test) compared t	to NC group.								
test) compared t									
test) compared t Table S5: W Groups	eekly and overal Week 2	l FCR in ti Week 3	reated and Week 4	control g Veek 5	groups. Week 6	Overa	III FCR*		
Table S5: W Groups QSI-5	eekly and overal Week 2 2.5	<u>l FCR in tr</u> Week 3 0.7	reated and Week 4 V	control g Veek 5	groups. Week 6 1.9	Over 2 1.48 (III FCR* P=0.94)		
Table S5: W Groups QSI-5 SDM	eekly and overal Week 2 2.5 2.5	<u>l FCR in tr</u> Week 3 0.7 0.7	reated and Week 4 1 1.3 1.4	<u>control g</u> <u>Week 5</u> 1.0 1.0	groups. Week 6 1.9 1.6	Over 2 1.48 (1.49 (HI FCR* P=0.94) P=0.64)		
Table S5: W Groups QSI-5 SDM PC	eekly and overal Week 2 2.5 2.5 2.2	<u>l FCR in tr</u> Week 3 0.7 0.7 0.9	<u>reated and</u> <u>Week 4</u> 1.3 1.4 1.9	<u>control g</u> <u>Week 5</u> 1.0 1.0 1.3	groups. Week 6 1.9 1.6 1.4	Over a 1.48 (1.49 (1.51(HI FCR* P=0.94) P=0.64) P=0.43)		
Table S5: W Groups QSI-5 SDM PC NC	eekly and overal <u>Week 2</u> 2.5 2.5 2.2 2.0	l FCR in tr Week 3 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.7	reated and Week 4 V 1.3 1.4 1.9 1.4 1.9	<u>control g</u> <u>Week 5</u> <u>1.0</u> 1.0 1.3 <u>1.1</u>	groups. Week 6 1.9 1.6 1.4 2.0	Overa 1.48 (1.49 (1.51(1	HI FCR* P=0.94) P=0.64) P=0.43) .45		
Table S5: W Groups QSI-5 SDM PC NC * FCR was calc (SDM) and PC	eekly and overal Week 2 2.5 2.5 2.2 2.0 ulated by using form groups was statistica	I FCR in tr Week 3 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.7 nula: average ally non-sign	reated and Week 4 V 1.3 1.4 1.9 1.4 e overall feed ificant (Stud	control g Week 5 1.0 1.3 1.1 l intake/av ent's t-test	Week 6 1.9 1.6 1.4 2.0 Perage BW t) compare	Overa 1.48 (1.49 (1.51(1.51(1.51(2.52)) 2.52) 2.52) 3.52) 3.52) 3.52) 4.52) 4.52) 4.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52) 5.52)	HI FCR* P=0.94) P=0.64) P=0.43) .45 n QSI-5, sulfa group	adime	
Table S5: W Groups QSI-5 SDM PC NC 'FCR was calc (SDM) and PC	week 2 2.5 2.5 2.2 2.0 ulated by using form groups was statistica	l FCR in tr Week 3 0.7 0.7 0.9 0.7 nula: average ally non-sign	reated and Week 4 V 1.3 1.4 1.9 1.4 e overall feed ificant (Stud	control g Week 5 1.0 1.3 1.1 l intake/av ent's t-test	week 6 1.9 1.6 1.4 2.0 rerage BW t) compare	Overa 1.48 (1.49 (1.51(1.51(1.51(1.51)) 7G. FCR i ed to NC	HI FCR* P=0.94) P=0.64) P=0.43) .45 n QSI-5, sulfa group	adime	

Supplemental Figure Legends

Figure S1: The survival rate of the chickens after treatment with; 1) different quorum sensing inhibitors, 2) different doses of QSI-5 (the best quorum sensing inhibitor), and 3) QSI-5 and compare its efficacy with the currently used antibiotic (sulfadimethoxine; SDM) in field-simulated conditions.

Figure S2: Principal component analysis (PCA) of metabolites clustering in serum of; **(A)** QSI-5 (PC3=6.78%, PC5=3.5%), and **(B)** QSI-8, and QSI-10 (PC1=30.5%, PC7=3.97%) treated chickens compared to non-infected and non-treated (NC) and DMSO treated and infected (PC) chicken groups.

Figure S3: (A) Shannon's diversity index showing the microbial richness and evenness in QSIs treated groups compared to PC group. QSIs caused no significant differences in the richness and evenness of cecal microbiota compared to PC group. *P<0.05, Kruskal-Wallis test. (B) Impact of QSIs treatment on beta diversity of cecal microbiota of chickens. Beta diversity was evaluated using principal coordinates analysis of unweighted uniFrac values. There was no spatial separation observed in the cecal microbiota of the treated groups compared to PC and NC groups. Each dot represents cecum sample from each treatment groups.

Figure S4: Synthesis of QSI- 5 (1-(4-methylbenzyl)-4-(3-phenylpropyl)piperazine) using reductive amination. 1-(4-Methylbenzyl)piperazine (50 mg, 0.26 mmol) and 3-phenylpropionaldehyde (35 mL, 0.26 mmol) were dissolved in DMF (1.32 mL) at room temperature with stirring. Acetic acid (15 mL, 0.26 mmol) was added to the mixture, followed by sodium triacetoxyborohydride (111.5 mg, 0.526 mmol). The resulting solution was allowed to stir for an additional 2.5 hours and then quenched with H₂O. The mixture was extracted three times with EtOAc and the combined layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude mixture was then purified using silica gel column chromatography (95:5 – 90:10 gradient, dichloromethane:methanol) to provide 36 mg (0.12 mmol, 44%) of the desired product. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, MeOD) δ 7.27 – 7.10 (m, 9H), 3.47 (s, 2H), 2.61 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 2.49 (s, 8H), 2.39 – 2.33 (m, 2H), 2.31 (s, 3H), 1.86 – 1.76 (m, 2H); ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, MeOD) δ 141.76, 136.81, 133.63, 129.34, 128.51, 128.00, 127.96, 125.47, 62.21, 57.66, 52.41, 52.11, 33.27, 27.92, 19.72.

Figure S5: Calibration standard curves for determining the concentration of; A) QSI-5 and B) SDM in chicken's blood using LC-MS. For standard calibration, solutions of 0.0, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, and 5 μ g/mL of QSI-5 and SDM were used.

Figure S6: Calibration standard curves for determining the bioaccumulation of QSI-5 and SDM in chicken's; A) Kidney and B) liver and muscle using LC-MS.







В



Α







Α







В

Α



