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Table S1. The statistical parameters of CoMFA.

| PLS Statistics | Calibration Set |
| :---: | :---: |
| R squared $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0.993 |
| Q squared $^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 0.589 |
| $N^{\mathrm{c}}$ | 7 |
| Standard error of estimate $^{\mathrm{d}}$ | 0.065 |
| $F^{\text {value }} \mathrm{e}$ | 214.234 |


#### Abstract

Statistical parameters of partial least square (PLS) analysis. The PLS method was applied to generate 3D-SAR models. The PLS algorithm with the leave-one-out cross-validation method was employed to choose the optimum number of components and assess the statistical significance of each model; ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Correlation coefficient squared of PLS statistics. The correlation coefficient between the calculated and experimental activities of non-cross validated value ( $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ ) of 0.993 indicates that the fitness of analyzed results is $99 \%$ compared to experimental results, which is better when itisapproachingto1; ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Leave-one out cross-validated PLS analysis. Q squared ( $\mathrm{q}^{2}$ ) can evaluated the predictive ability of CoMFA models; models are considered to be good predictive power when $q^{2}$ is $>0.5$; ${ }^{c}$ Optimum number of components obtained from cross-validated PLS analysis, which is better when it is $>5$; ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ It is better when it is lower; ${ }^{\mathrm{e}} F$ value indicates the significant difference between the effective samples, which are better when it was between 100 and 600.


Table S2. The information on drugs and antibiotics were used in this study.

| Drugs and Antibiotics | Abbreviation | Company | Company Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ampicillin | AMP | Genview | Beijing, China |
| Cefpiramide | CPA | Guangzhou Baiyun Mountain Pharmaceutical | Guangzhou, China |
| Oxacillin | OXA | Southwest Pharmaceutical Limited by Share Ltd. | Chongqing, China |
| Piperacillin | PIP | Runze Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. | Suzhou, China |
| Gatifloxacin | GAT | Luo Xin Pharmaceutical Group Co., Ltd. | Shandong, China |
| Azithromycin | AZI | Pfizer Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | NY, USA |
| Tazobactam | TZB | Sigma | MO, USA |
| Phe-Arg $\beta$-naphthylamide | PA $\beta$ N | Sigma | MO, USA |
| Injectable artesunate | AS | Guilin No.2 Factory | Guangxi, China |
| Dihydroartemisinin 7 | DHA7 | Synthesized by the present group | Chongqing, China |

Table S3.Surex dock scores (kcal/mol) of 22 derivatives.

| Comp. | Total_Score $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Crash $^{\mathbf{b}}$ | Polar $^{\mathrm{c}}$ | D_Score $^{\mathrm{d}}$ | PMF_Score $^{\mathrm{e}}$ | G_Score $^{\mathrm{f}}$ | Chem-Score $^{\mathrm{g}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AS | 6.2796 | -0.5519 | 1.2656 | -126.4052 | 27.1845 | -211.0594 | -13.1069 |
| DHA7 | 6.4801 | -0.7569 | 1.1956 | -113.6589 | 26.6443 | -213.1945 | -12.3003 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 5.5392 | -0.7392 | 1.0363 | -128.8579 | 48.8487 | -227.5580 | -11.2945 |
| 2 | 6.5472 | -2.1289 | 1.0052 | -133.8129 | 53.6052 | -264.8193 | -18.5962 |
| 3 | 5.6351 | -0.8576 | 0.9578 | -136.0724 | 39.6413 | -251.7083 | -11.8375 |
| 4 | 7.1389 | -1.2385 | 1.1308 | -125.4045 | 27.2729 | -252.9736 | -13.8301 |
| $\underline{\mathbf{5}}$ | 7.4427 | -0.9113 | 1.1125 | -132.4229 | 50.5110 | -236.8362 | -15.5238 |
| 6 | 5.6872 | -2.5676 | 3.3082 | -143.0767 | 60.6718 | -260.4081 | -14.0520 |
| 7 | 8.2818 | -2.1528 | 1.0461 | -157.3601 | 63.4364 | -298.3658 | -21.1956 |
| 8 | 6.5239 | -0.9137 | 3.0655 | -100.9698 | 32.4657 | -159.0269 | -11.3432 |
| 9 | 4.8809 | -1.7189 | 2.2861 | -129.3709 | 12.7769 | -203.3223 | -11.7440 |
| 10 | 6.6730 | -1.1369 | 2.3830 | -120.7153 | 4.0765 | -229.6481 | -11.2000 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 6.8374 | -0.9227 | 1.0169 | -129.6429 | 70.2738 | -216.2878 | -10.5319 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 6.9131 | -1.4056 | 2.0906 | -120.1748 | 60.5831 | -201.3377 | -12.3554 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 7.0232 | -0.6907 | 2.0110 | -111.6907 | 38.6349 | -176.7910 | -9.0069 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 6.9304 | -1.3128 | 3.0584 | -121.9317 | 48.9783 | -240.1601 | -14.0234 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 7.0360 | -2.3959 | 0.3376 | -149.0298 | 49.3567 | -279.2221 | -14.3946 |
| 16 | 7.1538 | -0.9684 | 1.2451 | -123.1439 | 27.9912 | -215.4057 | -10.5446 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 7.3183 | -0.7987 | 1.0366 | -105.3284 | 31.8395 | -186.6331 | -9.2670 |
| 18 | 7.3700 | -1.6393 | 2.9500 | -123.0859 | 49.1846 | -221.6328 | -7.1051 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 7.4870 | -1.8642 | 1.6572 | -154.0849 | 50.9602 | -240.9163 | -7.1970 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 8.2178 | -0.9082 | 1.1268 | -155.4337 | 34.8473 | -281.2133 | -16.7161 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 6.4989 | -1.0150 | 2.3142 | -133.1558 | 41.7465 | -213.2861 | -21.8276 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 5.2221 | -2.6124 | 2.2555 | -145.5035 | 73.2220 | -272.4852 | -6.4815 |

Compounds (abbreviated as Comp.) with underlines were chosen to be synthesized; ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Total Score (Consensus Score) integrates a number of popular scoring functions for ranking the affinity of ligands bound to the active site of a receptor; ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Crash score revealing the inappropriate penetration into the binding site. Crash scores close to 0 are favorable. Negative numbers indicate penetration; ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Polar indicating the contribution of polar interactions to the total score; ${ }^{\text {d }} \mathrm{D}$-score for charge and van der Waals interactions between the protein and the ligand; e PMF-score indicating Helmholtz free energies of interactions for protein-ligand atom pairs (potential of mean force, PMF); ${ }^{f} \mathrm{G}$-score showing hydrogen bonding, complex (ligand-protein), and internal (ligand-ligand) energies; g Chem-score points for H-bonding, lipophilic contact, and rotational entropy, along with an intercept term.



Figure S1. Synthetic routes and yields of DHA25-DHA28.

$12 \beta$-(2-(4-Methyl-1H-imidazol-1-yl) ethoxy) dihydroartemisinin (DHA25): Yield: 64.05\%; Yellow oily; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \mathrm{ppm}: 0.91-0.94(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{H}-13, \mathrm{H}-14), 1.42$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-15$ ), 1.24-2.04 ( $10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-2, \mathrm{H}-3, \mathrm{H}-4, \mathrm{H}-7, \mathrm{H}-9$ and H-10), $2.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-1), 2.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-11), 3.48-3.5(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$, H-16), 3.75-3.77 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-12$ ), 4.08-4.11 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ and H-17), $4.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-17), 5.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, $\mathrm{H}-5), 5.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-20), 7.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-18)$; HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{7}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})+423.2228$, found 423.2221.

$12 \beta$-(2-(2-ethyl-4-Methyl-1H-imidazol-1-yl) ethoxy) dihydroartemisinin (DHA26): Yield: 40.28\%; Yellow oily; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ ppm: $0.83(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{H}-14), 0.95(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{H}-13), 1.42(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, H-15), 1.24-2.04 (10 H, m, H-2, H-3, H-4, H-7, H-9 and H-10), 2.72 (3 H, s, H-23), 2.34-2.36 (1 H, m, $\mathrm{H}-1), 2.56(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-11), 3.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16), 3.77-3.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-12), 4.08-4.12(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ and H-17), $4.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-17), 5.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-5), 5.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-20), 6.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-21), 7.25$ (3 H, d, H-22); HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})+421.2384$, found 421.2386 .


$12 \beta$-(2-(1H-thiazole-1-yl) ethoxy) dihydroartemisinin (DHA27):Yield: 32.65\%; yellow oil; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ ppm: $0.83-0.95(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{H}-13, \mathrm{H}-14), 1.42(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-15), 1.23-2.04(10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-2$, $\mathrm{H}-3, \mathrm{H}-4, \mathrm{H}-7, \mathrm{H}-9$ and $\mathrm{H}-10)$, $2.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-1), 2.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-11), 3.50-3.51(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16)$, 3.76-3.78 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-12$ ), $4.03(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ and $\mathrm{H}-17), 4.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-12), 5.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-5), 6.58-6.59$ ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-19$ ), 7.03 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-18$ ), $7.46\left(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-20\right.$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \mathrm{ppm}: 128.9$ (C-20), 128.6 (C-19), 123.1 (C-18), 104.2 (C-4), 102.0 (C-12), 88.2 (C-5), 81.2 (C-6), 68.2 (C-16), 52.6 (C-1), 44.3 (C-7), 37.4 (C-11), 36.4 (C-10), 34.7 (C-3), 31.4 (C-17), 30.9 (C-9), 26.1 (C-8), 24.6 (C-15), 24.4 (C-2), 20.4 (C-14), $13.0(\mathrm{C}-13)$; HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \mathrm{~S} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})+399.5721$, found 399.5726.

(A)
$12 \beta$-(2-(2-Phenyl-1H-imidazol-1-yl) ethoxy) dihydroartemisinin (DHA28): Yield: 48.88\%; Yellow oily; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ ppm: $0.89-0.96(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{H}-13, \mathrm{H}-14), 1.41(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-15), 1.24-2.04$ ( $10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-2, \mathrm{H}-3, \mathrm{H}-4, \mathrm{H}-7, \mathrm{H}-9$ and $\mathrm{H}-10$ ), $2.33-2.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-1), 2.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-11), 3.48-3.5$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ ), 3.75-3.77 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-12$ ), 4.07-4.11 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ and H-17), 4.81 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-17$ ), 5.49 (1 H, s, H-5), $7.13(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-19, \mathrm{H}-20), 7.29-7.89(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{Ar})$; HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})+454.5832$, found 454.5835 .

$12 \beta$-(2-(1H-thiazole-1 yl) ethoxy) dihydroartemisinin monohydrochloride (DHA27 hydrochloride): Yield: $85.9 \%$; white crystal; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \mathrm{ppm}: 0.91-0.94(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{H}-13, \mathrm{H}-14), 1.42$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-15$ ), 1.23-2.04 ( $10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-2, \mathrm{H}-3, \mathrm{H}-4, \mathrm{H}-7, \mathrm{H}-9$ and H-10), 2.35 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-1$ ), 2.61 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$, H-11), 3.49-3.51 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ ), 3.76-3.78 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-12$ ), 4.08-4.11 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-16$ and $\mathrm{H}-17$ ), 4.83 ( 1 H, s, H-12), 5.47 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-5$ ), 6.57-6.59 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-19$ ), $7.03(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-18)$, 7.46 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-20$ ). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{5} S \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})+436.0784$, found 436.0776 .

Figure S2. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$-NMR of DHA25-28 and DHA27 hydrochloride. (A) ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}$ of DHA25-28 (B) ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ of DHA27 hydrochloride.


Figure S3. Effect of DHA27 alone and in combination with AMP against E. coli ATCC 35218. E. coli ATCC35218 was inoculated into 10 mL of LB broth and was divided into five groups containing broth, 5\% DMSO, ampicillin (AMP) alone, DHA27 alone, and DHA27 in combination with ampicillin. Bacteria were cultivated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a heated and shaking environmental chamber for 24 h . Bacterial liquid was smeared in the culture dishes at regular time points at $0,4,8,12$, and 24 h . Culture dishes were cultivated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a heated environmental chamber, and bacterial colony growth was observed.
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Figure S4. Comparison of the binding sites of DHA27, PA $\beta$ N, MBX2319, DOX and MIN in AcrB. Surflex-Dock that adopted an empirical scoring function was employed for molecular docking. The crystal structure of AcrB (PDB ID, 2DRD) was obtained from Protein Data Bank. The molecular docking results were analyzed and represented in the PyMOL 1.3 visualization software. Proteins are shown in green. The compounds are shown as thick sticks colored according to the compound structure and the atom type. (A) Cartoon view of DHA27 and PA $\beta$ N docked with AcrB; (B) Cartoon view of DHA27 and MBX2319 docked with AcrB; (C) Cartoon view of DHA27 and DOX docked with AcrB; (D) Cartoon view of DHA27 and MIN docked with AcrB. DHA27 are red in all pictures.


Figure S5. Effect of DHA27 on nile red accumulation within E. coli ATCC 35218. E. coli ATCC35218 were inoculated into 10 mL of LB broth and cultured for 6 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a heated and shaking environmental chamber. Cells were harvested, and washed in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) $(0.2 \mathrm{mM}, \mathrm{pH} 7.2) 2$ times and resuspended in the same buffer to OD 600 of 1 . CCCP $(10 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L})$ was added to the cells. After cultured for 20 min at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, DHA27 $(128 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ and $\mathrm{Pa} \beta \mathrm{N}(256 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ were added and cultured for another 20 min at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Nile Red was finally added to a final concentration of $5 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L}$ and cultured for 30 min at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The bacteria cells were centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 5 min to harvest the bacterial pellet and resuspended in the PBS, 0.2 mL of this cell suspension was transferred to a plate reader and fluorospectrophotometry was used to observe. The excitation was at 550 nm , emission was at 640 nm . The fluorescence of the cell suspension was followed for 100 s , after which Nile Red efflux was triggered by rapid energization with $50 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ glucose. Fluorescence was monitored for another 200 s .


Figure S6. Effect of DHA27 on the permeability of the bacterial membrane within E. coli ATCC 35218. E. coli ATCC 35218 with constitutive expression of chromosomal $\beta$-lactamase were grown in LB broth, harvested, and washed in $50 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ potassium phosphate buffer. The cells were subsequently resuspended in the same buffer to OD 600 of 0.5 . The cell suspension was treated with CCCP $(10 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L})$.And then, different concentrations of DHA27 $(32,64,128 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ and PA $\beta \mathrm{N}$ $(256 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ were added, respectively. Nitrocefin was then added to a final concentration of $32 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Hydrolysis of nitrocefin was tested by measuring the change of absorbance at 490 nm with a plate reader.
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| (A) |  | (B) |  | (C) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Template | Donor Atomic | Acceptor Atom | Residues | Mode | Bond Length |
| 2 DRD | N | OH | Thr44 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $2.3 \AA$ |
|  | O | OH | Ser46 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $2.1 \AA$ |
|  | S | OH | Ser134 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $3.1 \AA$ |
| 2 J 8 S | N | OH | Thr44 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $2.2 \AA$ |
|  | O | OH | Ser46 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $2.0 \AA$ |
|  | S | OH | Ser134 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $5.1 \AA$ |
| $4 \mathrm{DX5}$ | N | OH | Thr44 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $3.1 \AA$ |
|  | O | OH | Ser46 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $2.1 \AA$ |
|  | S | OH | Ser134 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $5.3 \AA$ |
|  | O | NH | Arg620 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{acc}$ | $1.8 \AA$ |

## (D)

Figure S7. Molecule docking of DHA27 binding to AcrB. The crystal structure of AcrB (PDB ID 2DRD, 2J8S and 4DX5) were obtained from Protein Data Bank. The molecular docking results were analyzed and represented in the PyMOL 1.3 visualization software. Proteins are shown in gray and green. The compound is shown as thick sticks colored according to the atom type (red, oxygen; cyan, carbon; white, hydrogen; dark blue, nitrogen; yellow, sulfur), and residues are shown in bluish violet and marked. (A) Cartoon view of DHA27 docked with AcrB when PDB ID 2DRD was used; (B) Cartoon view of DHA27 docked with AcrB when PDB ID 2J8S was used; (C) Cartoon view of DHA27 docked with AcrB when PDB ID 4DX5 was used; (D) Details of DHA27 docking with 3 different template of AcrB .


Figure S8. Structures of known AcrB inhibitors.

