Efficacy and safety evaluation of artificial intelligence-identified antimicrobial peptides for

use against avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* in the poultry industry

Emre Demirsoy[†,‡,§,*], Teagan I. Parkin[#,*], Shaeleen E. Mihalynuk[#], Anna H. Dema[#], Lorissa
Corrie[#], Marika E. Heilker[#], Haley N. Kuecks-Winger[#], Anat Yanai[‖,††], Uluc B. Birol[††], Michael
McIlwee[‡‡], Kay de Wet[‡‡], Mathijs Knipscheer[‡‡], Victoria Bowes[‡‡], Vanessa Tuytel[‡‡], Liam
Ritchie[‡‡], Wolfgang Köster[§§], Emil Berberov[§§], William R. Cox[††], Monica Kotkoff[‖], Vanessa C.
Thompson[#], Rene L. Warren[†], Erin Fraser[##,※], Linda M.N. Hoang[‡,*], Fraser Hof[⁑], Fatih Birol[††],
Caren C. Helbing[#], Inanc Birol[‡,§,‖,††,⚘,1]
12

[†] BC Cancer, Vancouver, BC V5Z 1L3, Canada
[‡] British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Public Health Laboratory, Vancouver, BC
V6Z R4R, Canada
[§] Genome Science and Technology Graduate Program, University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada
[#] Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC,
V8P 5C2, Canada
[‖] Canada's Michael Smith Genome Sciences Centre at BC Cancer, Vancouver, BC V5Z
4S6, Canada
[††] Amphoraxe Life Sciences Inc., BC V6L 3C9, Canada
[‡‡] SJ Ritchie Research Farms, Abbotsford, BC V4X 2N4 Canada
[§§] Vaccine and Infectious Disease Organization (VIDO), University of Saskatchewan,
SK, S7N 5E3, Canada
[##] Communicable Disease Prevention and Response, British Columbia Centre for Disease
Control, Vancouver, BC V6Z R4R, Canada
[※] School of Population and Public Health, The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z3, Canada
[*] Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada
[⁑] Department of Chemistry, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, V8P 5C2, Canada
[⚘] Department of Medical Genetics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T
1Z3, Canada
35
36   [1]Corresponding author: inanc.birol@ubc.ca

37   [*]These authors contributed equally to this work.

ABSTRACT

The overuse of antibiotics in both veterinary and human medicine has resulted in the emergence

of antibiotic-resistant bacteria, prompting a search for effective alternatives. Antimicrobial

peptides (AMP) are short, often cationic, peptide-based molecules with antimicrobial and

immunomodulatory activity, which makes them promising alternatives to conventional

antibiotics in poultry production. From a prior machine-learning-guided screen of 875 candidate

AMP, 62 exhibited activity against avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* (APEC) and low in vitro

hemolytic and cytotoxic activity. We selected three lead AMP from this list (named TeRu4,

TeBi1, and PeNi4), and evaluated their in vitro and in vivo efficacy, safety, and

immunomodulatory potential for use in poultry farming. In animal experiments, AMP were

administered via in ovo injection on day 18 of embryonic development. In APEC challenge

trials, yolk sacs were inoculated with APEC post-hatch to assess early chick mortality, while in

pen trials, birds were raised in a commercial production setting for 35 days. For challenged birds,

TeBi1 (10 µg/egg) significantly reduced bacterial detection in the air sac and pericardium,

increased body weight by 50% and reduced cytokine transcript levels by 10-30% on day 7 post

hatch. In HD11 chicken macrophage-like cultured cells, TeRu4 (16 µg/mL) suppressed

lipopolysaccharide (LPS)-induced pro-inflammatory cytokine transcript levels. In pen trials,

TeRu4 (20 µg/egg) increased the survival probability of female birds by 4.9%, while TeBi1

(20 µg/egg) increased the survival probability of all birds by 4.4%, by day 35. Gene expression

analysis revealed AMP- and sex-specific cytokine responses. In pen trials, no significant

differences were observed in mean weights, feed conversion ratio (FCR), and flock uniformity

on day 35. These findings demonstrate that the three selected AMP are safe antibiotic

62 alternatives that improve survival, modulate immune responses, and maintain normal growth

63 performance in broiler chickens.

65 Key words: Antimicrobial peptide, APEC, broiler chicken, efficacy, safety
66

INTRODUCTION

Avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* (**APEC**) is a Gram-negative bacterium that poses a

severe threat to the poultry industry. APEC infections induce fatal bacterial septicemia and early

chick mortality (**ECM**), a significant cause of mortality and morbidity across multiple poultry

commodities (Cuperus et al., 2016; Allan et al., 2018; Rezaee et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2021;

Sarfraz et al., 2022; Hu et al., 2022). Antibiotics have been used to treat bacterial infections since

the early 20th century. In the poultry industry, antibiotics have been used as growth promoters

and prophylactic agents since the 1950s (Bean-Hodgins and Kiarie, 2021). However,

unnecessary or overuse of antibiotics has contributed to the rise of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in

both veterinary and human medicine (Bean-Hodgins and Kiarie, 2021; Richter et al., 2022). To

address this growing challenge, regulatory, veterinary, and poultry industry policy changes in

Canada and in other jurisdictions have been instituted to limit the use of antimicrobials for

growth promotion purposes and, also, to limit the use of medically important antimicrobials

(Bean-Hodgins and Kiarie, 2021; Wallinga et al., 2022; Schmerold et al., 2023). This has

resulted in fewer antimicrobial options being available to control pathogens in poultry flocks

(Bean-Hodgins and Kiarie, 2021). The One Health approach recognizes the linkages between

human, animal, and environmental health, and highlights the urgency of addressing antibiotic

resistance as a global crisis (Destoumieux-Garzón et al., 2018). Unfortunately, novel antibiotics

are not approved at a pace sufficient to combat developing antibiotic-resistant bacteria (Richter

et al., 2022). Moreover, the last classes of antibiotics to be discovered, including lipopeptides

(daptomycin) and oxazolidinones (linezolid), were identified during the 1980s (Durand et al.,

2019). Consequently, there is growing interest in alternative antimicrobial strategies, such as

antimicrobial peptides (**AMP**), to address this therapeutic gap.

AMP are peptide-based biomolecules composed of 5 to 100 amino acids and are typically

cationic (Bahar and Ren, 2013). In nature, they are produced by the innate immune system and

act as the first line of defense against infections in a wide variety of organisms, including

humans, animals, and plants (Bahar and Ren, 2013; Durand et al., 2019). Most conventional

antibiotics have specific cellular targets, including cellular machinery involved in DNA and

protein synthesis and components of bacterial cell walls (Bahar and Ren, 2013). In contrast,

AMP primarily cause rapid cell death by binding to anionic bacterial cell membranes and

disrupting their integrity, leading to cell lysis (Bahar and Ren, 2013; Durand et al., 2019). AMP

typically do not target eukaryotic cells, as their membranes usually have low anionic charge

(Bahar and Ren, 2013). However, at higher concentrations, some AMP may exhibit cytotoxic

effects on eukaryotic cells (Bahar and Ren, 2013). Therefore, rigorous safety evaluation of AMP

is essential before regulatory approval, including in vitro assays, such as hemolysis and

cytotoxicity tests, as well as in vivo experiments.

AMP exert less selective pressure on bacteria than conventional antibiotics due to their

nonspecific targets and diverse mechanisms of action, thus reducing the development of

antimicrobial resistance (Zasloff, 2002; Hancock and Sahl, 2006; Fjell et al., 2012; Richter et al.,

2022). In addition to their direct antimicrobial activity, some AMP demonstrate

immunomodulatory properties, recruiting immune cells or regulating cytokine levels to enhance

the host response to infection (Rima et al., 2021; Richter et al., 2022). Cytokines are important

signaling molecules that facilitate the growth, differentiation, activation of immune cells (Garcia

et al., 2021). In the present study, the effect of AMP on the expression of the following cytokines

was investigated: Interleukin (**IL**)-1β, IL-8, IL-6, IL-10, interferon regulator factor 4 (**IRF-4**),

and interferon gamma (**IFN-γ**). IL-1β, IL-8, and IL-6 are associated with activation of

inflammation in chickens (Kogut, 2002; Garcia et al., 2021). Furthermore, IL-8 recruits

heterophils to the infection site (Kogut, 2002). Conversely, IL-10 plays a role in tissue repair,

angiogenesis, and attenuation of the inflammatory response and is an inducible feedback

regulator of the immune response in chickens (Rothwell et al., 2004; Wu et al., 2016; Garcia et

al., 2021). The roles of IRF-4 and IFN-γ are not well-characterized in chickens; however, there is

evidence that IRF-4 plays a critical role in B cell development and maturation, similar to its

mammalian counterpart (Yu et al., 2021), while IFN-γ generally functions to bridge the adaptive

and innate immune systems (Yuk et al., 2016; Santhakumar et al., 2017).

Previously, we screened 875 AMP candidates, identified using our artificial intelligence

(**AI**) based prediction tools: AMPlify (Li et al., 2022), rAMPage (Lin et al., 2022), and AMPd-

Up (Li et al., 2024), and used in vitro assays to characterize their antibacterial, hemolytic, and

cytotoxic properties. In this study, we selected three lead AMP (named TeBi1, TeRu4, and

PeNi4) for further testing, due to their high antimicrobial activity and low toxicity. The three

AMP were tested in vivo as a prophylactic treatment prior to APEC inoculation (challenge

trials). Immunomodulatory effects of these AMP were tested in tissue harvested from animals

involved in the challenge trials and in HD11 cells, a chicken macrophage-like cell line. Lastly,

the AMP were tested for their safety in a commercial production setting (pen trials). Overall,

TeBi1 and TeRu4 showed efficacy in challenge trials and cell culture while maintaining safety in

commercial production settings, supporting their potential for future translational studies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In Silico Peptide Selection

Candidate AMP sequences were predicted using three machine-learning-based software programs developed by our team: AMPlify, rAMPage, and AMPd-Up (Li et al., 2022, 2024; Lin et al., 2022). Candidate AMP were evaluated for potential cytotoxicity using tAMPer (Ebrahimikondori et al., 2024), a machine-learning-based toxicity prediction tool, and those predicted to be cytotoxic were excluded from further evaluation.

Peptide Synthesis

All AMP for this study were purchased from GenScript (Piscataway, NJ, USA). AMP purity of ≥85% was verified using analytical HPLC. For in vitro assays and APEC challenge trials, AMP were synthesized in 80 μg aliquots, while AMP selected for pen trials were synthesized in 125, 250, or 500 mg aliquots.

Bacterial Species and Growth.

APEC strain EC317 (Allan et al., 1993) (clinical turkey isolate, obtained from VIDO-InterVac, Saskatchewan, CA), was used as the bacterial target for AMP. Glycerol stocks were stored at -80°C. The primary streaks were done by plating the stocks on 5% Columbia blood agar (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) and incubating for 20-24 hours at 37°C under aerobic conditions, as described by Richter et al. (Richter et al., 2022). The secondary streaks were done by transferring 2-3 colonies from the primary streak on a new 5% Columbia blood agar plate. Colonies from the secondary streak were used for downstream analysis. Bacterial growth medium was prepared by dissolving 10.5 g Mueller Hinton Broth (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis. MO, USA) powder in 500 ml distilled water and autoclaving for sterility.

In Vitro Lead Peptide Selection

Minimum inhibitory concentrations (**MICs**) of candidate AMP were determined in vitro

against EC317, using ASTs as previously described (Richter et al., 2022). For the selection

process, candidate AMP with MICs ≤ 32 µg/mL against EC317 were designated as hit AMP and

selected for further in vitro testing. Following the protocol by Richter et al. (Richter et al., 2022),

hemolytic activities of hit AMP were evaluated in porcine red blood cells (**RBCs**). Those with

low hemolytic activity (HC_{50} ≥ 128 µg/mL, where HC_{50} is the AMP concentration that lyses

50% RBCs) were subsequently tested for cytotoxicity in human kidney HEK293 cells according

to the protocol described (Richter et al., 2022). AMP with CC_{50} ≥ 128 µg/mL (CC_{50}, the AMP

concentration that reduces cell viability to 50%) were designated as lead AMP (Table 1).

Care and Use of Animals

All animal experiments were approved by the University of Saskatchewan and University

of Victoria Animal Care Committees (Protocols #19940213 and AE-23-012, respectively) and

conducted in accordance with the Canadian Council on Animal Care.

APEC Challenge Trials

On day 18 of incubation (trial day -3), 50-57 fertilized Ross broiler chicken eggs per

treatment were injected with either 1, 5, 10, or 20 µg of AMP, or PBS control. When the birds

hatched on day 21 post-fertilization (trial day 0), they were neck-tagged with unique

identification numbers and co-housed on Biofresh bedding (Early's Farm and Garden, Saskatoon,

Canada), with a light:dark cycle of 23L:1D. Egg hatchability rates and average bird weights were

recorded for each treatment group. One day after hatch, the birds were challenged with 5×10^4

cfu EC317.

Before inoculation, APEC was cultured overnight at 37 °C in LB broth (Difco, Becton

Dickinson, Sparks, MD, USA) in a shaking incubator (Model No: 1570, Sheldon Manufacturing,

Inc., Cornelius, OR, USA) at 240 rpm. This culture was sub-cultured to a pre-determined OD_{600}

of 0.7, at which time the bacteria were harvested by centrifugation, resuspended in phosphate-

buffered saline (**PBS**) at the desired concentration, and administered to the birds by yolk sac

injection.

The birds were given food (Masterfeeds, Humboldt, SK, Canada) and water *ad libitum*.

Four days after hatch, approximately half of the birds (between 8-17) were euthanized. The

remaining birds were euthanized seven days after hatch. Birds were monitored two to four times

per day for symptoms, and birds reaching a humane intervention point were euthanized. Only the

birds euthanized on schedule on days four and seven were included in the analyses. Bird survival

was also tracked.

All analyzed birds were weighed after death, and swabs were taken aseptically from the air

sac and pericardium and streaked on MacConkey agar (Difco, Becton Dickinson, Sparks, MD,

USA) for a semi-quantitative assessment of APEC growth. Plates were scored from 0-3,

representing no, low, medium, and severe levels of growth, respectively. Samples from the air

sacs, cecal tonsils, and spleens of birds euthanized on scheduled days were preserved in

RNALater (Thermo Fisher Scientific) at –20 °C for analysis by quantitative PCR (**qPCR**).

Immunomodulatory Activity Assays with HD11 Cells

The effects of AMP on in vitro cytokine production were assessed using an HD11 chicken

semi-adherent macrophage-like cell line (Obtained from VIDO-InterVac). HD11 cells were

cultured in RPMI medium with 1X Glutamax and 10% FBS (Thermo Fisher Scientific) at 41°C

(normal chicken body temperature) and 5% CO_2 and were routinely passaged every two days.

Cell Plating. HD11 cells were plated for experimentation between passages three to twelve.

Suspended cells were collected with the growth medium, and adherent cells were obtained after

washing with PBS and trypsinization with 0.25% Trypsin-EDTA in PBS (both from Thermo

Fisher Scientific). The cells were centrifuged at 200 g for seven minutes and the pellet was

resuspended in fresh medium. Trypan Blue (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was added to a sample of

cells and live cells were counted on a Hausser Scientific Bright-Line Phase Hemacytometer

(Fisher Scientific, Hampton, NH, USA). HD11 cells were plated at 2.5×10^4 cells per well on

Nunclon Delta 96-well plates (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and incubated overnight.

HD11 Experiment Overview. In all experiments, HD11 growth medium was used to resuspend

and dilute AMP and other reagents, and all incubations were carried out at 41°C and 5% CO_2.

All experiments included a medium-only control and a lipopolysaccharide (**LPS**)-only control

(final concentration of 25 ng/mL). In all experiments other than the AMP-only Screen, 8 μg/mL

Polymyxin B sulfate (**PB**) was used as a positive control as it is known to attenuate the LPS-

triggered inflammatory response (Schromm et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2024). Prior to treatment,

the supernatant was removed from the wells, therefore only the adherent cell monolayer was

used during the experiments.

Four experimental approaches were devised to investigate the immunomodulatory activity

of AMP. First, HD11 cells were treated solely with AMP (AMP-Only Screen). Second, cells

were treated with a range of AMP concentrations followed by treatment with LPS from *E. coli*

O111:B4 (Sigma-Aldrich), to test if the AMP could modulate the immune response triggered by

LPS (AMP Preincubation Screen). If an AMP showed immunomodulatory activity in the AMP

Preincubation Screen, it was then tested in the AMP Preincubation with Wash Step and the AMP

and LPS Coaddition experiments.

AMP-Only Screen. HD11 cells were treated with 100 µL 16 µg/mL PeNi4, TeBi1, or TeRu4 and

incubated for 6 h.

AMP Preincubation Screen. HD11 cells were treated with 100 µL of 1, 2, 4, 8, or 16 µg/mL

PeNi4, TeBi1, or TeRu4 and incubated for 3 h. After the incubation, 100 µL LPS (50 ng/mL)

was administered to the cells, resulting in a final concentration of 25 ng/mL LPS. The cells were

incubated for an additional 3 h.

AMP Preincubation with Wash Step. The cells were treated identically to the AMP

Preincubation Screen but with the addition of a wash step prior to the addition of LPS. Briefly,

after the first 3 h incubation, the medium (containing the AMP or PB) was removed from the

wells and the cell monolayer was washed three times using fresh medium. One hundred µL LPS

(25 ng/mL) was administered, and the cells were incubated for an additional 3 h.

AMP and LPS Coaddition. AMP was resuspended and diluted to prepare a 2X concentration

curve of 32, 16, 8, 4, and 2 µg/mL. PB and LPS were prepared at 2X concentrations of 16 µg/mL

and 50 ng/mL, respectively. At regular time intervals, 2X AMP or 2X PB was added in equal

volume to 2X LPS to yield a 1X mixture of AMP or PB, and LPS. Mixtures were vortexed for

one min and incubated for 30 min prior to being administered to cells at regular time intervals in

the order in which they were made. The cells were incubated for 3 h.

Cell Harvest and RNA Isolation. Supernatant was removed from HD11 cells after the final

incubation. Buffer RLT from the miRNeasy Micro Kit (Qiagen, Mississauga, ON, Canada) with

2M DL-dithiothreitol (Sigma-Aldrich) was added to lyse adherent cells at a volume of 260 µL

across technical replicates, with each technical replicate comprising two wells in the 96-well

plate. HD11 cells in lysis buffer were disrupted by pipetting up and down, vortexed, and stored

at -80 °C until RNA isolation. In total, three technical replicates per treatment were collected for

RNA isolation and qPCR analysis.

Commercial Pen Trials

Each pen trial examined the efficacy against ECM and the safety of a single AMP. Cobb

500 or Ross 308AP broiler chicken breeds were used in pen trials (Supplementary Table S1). All

breeds were sourced from a commercial hatchery (Abbotsford, BC, Canada), and the specific

breed used in each trial is summarized in Supplementary Table S1. For pen trials, birds were

sourced from older breeder flocks (a different flock for each trial) and separated by sex and

treatment into individual mini pens following hatching.

AMP were solubilized in 400 mL sterile diluent (**SD**) bags, obtained from the hatchery, to

reach a concentration of 0.4 or 0.2 mg/mL, except in the 20μg TeRu4 trial where PBS was used

instead. An AMP-free SD bag was used for control. The AMP and control solutions were then

taken to the hatchery, for in ovo injections on day 18 post-fertilization, where 50 μL AMP or SD

solution was injected into the air sac of 1,680 to 2,352 eggs using the Embrex Inovoject injection

machine (Zoetis Inc., Parsippany, NJ, USA). After the injections, eggs were incubated for three

days. On the hatching day (day 0), pips, culls, late-stage embryo mortalities (deaths occurring

between day 15 and 21 of incubation), post-hatch mortalities, and nonviable eggs/embryos (total

of pips, culls, late-stage embryo mortalities, and post-hatch mortalities) were counted and

recorded.

The birds were then transferred to SJ Ritchie Research Farms (Abbotsford, BC, Canada)

where they were cloacally sexed by professionals and then separated by sex and treatment. A

total of 24 mini pens, within six blocks, were set up. The birds were weighed individually, then

50 birds were placed into each mini pen according to their sex and treatment, with each block

containing each of the four experimental groups in a random order. Birds were provided *ad*

libitum access to water and an all-vegetable, raised without antibiotic (**RWA**) feed (Trouw

Nutrition, Chilliwack, BC, Canada). A step-down lighting program was implemented: from day

0 to day 21, birds experienced 6 h darkness per 24 h cycle; from day 21 to 28, 4 h darkness; and

from day 28 to the end of the trial, 1 h darkness per day. Number of birds in each mini-pen was

reduced to 12 on day 10 to prevent overcrowding of the mini-pens. Birds were checked three

times per day throughout the trial and were weighed individually on days 10, 21, and 35. Any

mortality during the pen trial was noted.

qPCR Analyses

Multiplex qPCR assays were designed and separately validated for three chicken tissues:

air sac, cecal tonsil, and spleen; and for the HD11 macrophage-like cell line. Primers and probes

were designed for the normalizer genes *ribosomal protein L8* (*rpl8*) and *ribosomal protein S10*

(*rps10*); the cytokine genes *IL-1β, IL-6, IL-8, IL-10,* and *IFN-γ;* and the gene for the transcription

factor *IRF-4*. The primer and probe sequences are reported in Supplementary Table S2.

RNA was extracted from tissues with the miRNeasy Tissue/Cells Advanced Mini Kit and

Qiavac vacuum manifold (Qiagen). Tissue samples were homogenized in 450 μL buffer RLT

reduced with DTT, loaded on the RNeasy mini spin column, washed on the Qiavac vacuum

manifold, and eluted in 50 μL RNAse-free water. RNA was extracted from HD11 cells using the

using the QIAGEN miRNeasy Tissue/Cells Advanced Micro Kit, per the manufacturer's

instructions, except for the final elution, where 11.2 μL RNase-free water was added to the

column, centrifuged, collected, added back to the column, and centrifuged again.

The concentration of RNA from tissue samples was measured by NanoDrop (NanoDrop

1000 3.8.1; Thermos Fisher Scientific) and diluted to a concentration of approximately 100

ng/µL before complementary DNA (**cDNA**) synthesis, while RNA from HD11 cells was used

neat due to the low concentration. All RNA samples were converted to cDNA using the Applied

Biosystems High-Capacity cDNA Reverse Transcription Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific), per the

manufacturer's instructions.

cDNA from HD11 cells and chicken tissues was diluted 1/20 after synthesis and analysed

by their respective qPCR assays with reaction conditions outlined in Supplementary Table S3.

All samples and controls were run in technical quadruplicates, and all plates included a non-

template (negative) control and inter-plate standard as a positive control. Standard deviations

between the Cycle Threshold (**Ct**) values of technical replicates were computed. If any deviation

was greater than 0.5 cycles, the outlier value in that set of replicates was removed. Normalizer

stability was verified by BestKeeper (Pfaffl et al., 2004). Mean values between technical

replicates were taken into the next stage of analysis. Data was normalised against the geometric

mean of rpl8 and rps10, and fold change was calculated using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method, as previously

described (Livak and Schmittgen, 2001). Final relative fold changes for each sample and

cytokine were determined by comparing to the relevant control: median of the PBS-treated birds

from day 4 (for challenge trials), median of the PBS-treated female birds (for pen trials), or the

median of medium-treated HD11 cells (for cell culture experiments).

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses of the qPCR results were conducted in R version 3.6.3 (R Core Team,

2024). The data were tested for normality by the Shapiro–Wilk and Levene's tests. They were

then subjected to pairwise analyses by the Kruskal-Wallis and Wilcoxon rank-sum tests for non-

parametric data with a significance threshold of $\alpha = 0.1$. For the challenge and pen trials, this

significance cut off was selected due to the high variability of in vivo data. For the HD11

experiments, this threshold was appropriate as the smallest p-value achievable using a rank-sum

test with n = 3 was approximately 0.08.

The rest of the challenge trial data was analyzed in R version 4.4.0 and 4.5.1(R Core Team,

2024). Hatchability rates of treated eggs compared to control eggs, as well as rates of bacterial

detection in the birds' air sacs and pericardia, were evaluated using the Fischer's exact test.

Cumulative weight gain of birds euthanized on days four and seven was evaluated using a

Wilcoxon rank-sum test, and survival was graphed and evaluated using the log-rank test and the

"survminer" package (Kassambara et al., 2016). Other graphs were constructed using the

packages "tidyverse," "readr," "janitor," "superb," "ggsignif," "rstatix,", "DescTools", and

"ggpubr" (Signorell, 2014; Wickham et al., 2015b; a, 2019; Kassambara, 2016, 2019; Firke,

2016; Ahlmann-Eltze and Patil, 2017; Cousineau, 2021).

An additional analysis was conducted to compare the relative cytokine abundance in bird

air sacs to the air sac bacterial load scores of the same birds. The difference in cytokine

abundance for each bacterial level (light, moderate, severe) was compared to the cytokine

abundance for no growth using a Wilcoxon rank-sum test, and additionally, a correlation

coefficient was determined using Spearman's Rho.

Statistical analyses of hatchability, survival, mean weights, feed conversion ratio, and flock

uniformity in pen trials were conducted using R (version 4.1.3) and the packages: "survival",

"survminer", "openxlsx", "readxl", "tidyverse, "zoo", "car", "ggplot2", "ggsignif", and

"MHTdiscrete" (Fox et al., 2001; Therneau, 2001; Zeileis et al., 2004; Wickham et al., 2007,

2019; Schauberger and Walker, 2014; Wickham and Bryan, 2015; Kassambara et al., 2016;

Yalin Zhu, Wenge Guo, 2016; Ahlmann-Eltze and Patil, 2017). For pen trials, statistical

comparisons between treatment and control groups used Wilcoxon rank-sum tests (hatchability

and production parameters) and log-rank tests (survival), with production and survival analyzed

separately by sex. P-values were corrected for multiple comparisons using the Šidák method.

RESULTS

In Vitro Peptide Selection

The 875 candidate AMP identified by rAMPage (Lin et al., 2022), AMPlify (Li et al.,

2022), and AMPd-Up (Li et al., 2024) were previously tested for antimicrobial activity and

cellular toxicity in vitro (Richter et al., 2022). Of these, 331 with MICs ≤ 32 μg/mL against

EC317 were designated as hit AMP. Among hit AMP, 275 exhibited minimal hemolytic activity

($HC_{50} \geq 128$ μg/mL) against porcine RBCs. Of these, 62 also demonstrated minimal cytotoxicity

($CC_{50} \geq 128$ μg/mL) in HEK293 cells. These were classified as lead AMP. Three representative

lead AMP (TeRu4, TeBi1, and PeNi4) were selected for further experiments. TeRu4 and TeBi1

demonstrated lower MIC values than PeNi4. The physiochemical properties of these AMP and

their in vitro activities are summarized in Table 1. These AMP were evaluated in vitro using

HD11 cells and in vivo using APEC challenge trials and pen trials.

qPCR Primer Design and Validation

The sequences of the qPCR primers and probes, reaction conditions, and assay efficiencies

are reported in Supplementary Tables S2-4. Primer efficiencies ranged from 93-108% in the air

sac, 92-107% in the cecal tonsil, 87-107% in the spleen, and 84-101% in HD11 cells.

APEC Challenge Trials

To assess the prophylactic efficacy of TeBi1, TeRu4, and PeNi4 in chickens, fertilized

eggs were injected in ovo at day 18 of incubation with either 1, 5, 10, or 20 μg AMP, or a PBS

control. One day after hatch, the birds were challenged with 5×10^4 cfu APEC strain EC317 by

yolk sac injection.

Egg hatchability was between 90-98% in all treatment groups, with no significant

differences between treated birds and control birds (data not shown). Notably, when birds were

treated with 20 µg AMP (Supplementary Figure S1), treated birds appeared to die faster than

untreated birds within the first few days post-infection, though there were no significant

differences in overall survival. The spleens of birds treated with 20 µg AMP were analyzed by

qPCR, and some differences were observed, suggesting that the peptides were bioactive, but the

qPCR results were not conclusive (data not shown), and subsequent challenge trials tested the

AMP on a dose curve at 1, 5, or 10 µg. In the latter trials, there were no significant differences in

survival probability with any dose of AMP ($\leq$10 µg) compared to control (Supplementary Figure

S2).

Birds treated with TeBi1 had significantly higher weights on day 7 than control birds

(Figure 1a). Birds treated with 1 or 5 µg of TeBi1 were approximately 25% heavier than control

birds (p = 0.03 and p = 0.07, respectively), and birds treated with 10 µg TeBi1 were

approximately 50% heavier than control birds (p = 2×10^{-4}). There were no significant

differences in weight gain in birds treated with TeRu4 or PeNi4 (Supplementary Figure S3).

On day 7, birds treated with 10 µg TeBi1 had significantly lower rates of infection in both

the air sac (p = 0.01) (Figure 1b) and pericardium (p = 0.03) (Figure 1c). There were no

significant differences in bacterial detection rates in the air sacs and pericardia of birds treated

with TeRu4 or PeNi4 (Supplementary Figure S4).

Increased bacterial load in the air sac was correlated with increased levels of transcript

abundance of certain cytokines in the air sac (Figure 2). Across all three challenge trials, birds

with light, moderate or heavy levels of active APEC infection in their air sacs had significantly

higher relative abundance of *IL-1β* transcripts (p = 2×10^{-4}, 1×10^{-6}, and 7×10^{-13}, respectively)

than birds with no bacterial growth in their air sacs (Figure 2a). They are also positively

correlated by Spearman's rho, with ρ = 0.58 and p = 1×10^{-19}. The same trend, though weaker, is

observed with *IL-8*. While ρ = 0.32 (p = 3×10^{-6}) overall, birds with light, moderate, or heavy

levels of APEC infection also had significantly higher relative abundance of *IL-8* transcripts (p =

0.03, 3×10^{-6}, and 5×10^{-6}, respectively) than birds with no bacterial growth in their air sacs

(Figure 2b).

In the cecal tonsil (Supplementary Figure S5), qPCR results show minimal changes due to

treatment with PeNi4, with only a 2-fold increase in the inflammatory cytokine *IL-8* in the 10 μg

group on day 4 (p = 0.1); and with TeRu4, a 2-fold decrease in *IL-8* in the 1 μg group on day 4 (p

= 0.1). In contrast, there are numerous changes due to treatment with TeBi1, including a 2.4-fold

increase in *IL-8* transcripts in the 5 μg group on day 4 (p = 0.1), and a 5-fold decrease in *IL-8*

transcripts in the 10 μg group on day 7 (p = 0.06). *IFN-γ* expression increased 1.4-fold (p = 0.03)

and 2.5-fold (p = 0.03) in the 5 and 10 μg groups, respectively, on day 4, but decreased 1.4-fold

(p = 0.03) and 1.1-fold (p = 0.09) in the 1 and 10 μg groups, respectively, on day 7. With respect

to *IL-1β,* on day 7, the TeBi1 5 μg group showed a 5-fold decrease (p = 0.07). For the anti-

inflammatory transcript *IL-10,* there is a 2.5-fold decrease (p = 0.07) with 5 μg TeBi1 on day 7.

Finally, TeBi1 treatment was also associated with changes in *IRF-4* transcripts: the 10 μg group

was associated with a 1.7-fold increase on day 4 (p = 0.04), and the 5 μg group was associated

with a 1.5-fold increase on day 7 (p = 0.1).

In the spleen (Supplementary Figure S6), fewer responses are observed. For TeRu4, there

is a 2-fold decrease in *IL-8* transcripts on day 7 (p = 0.1) after treatment with 1 μg. For PeNi4,

there is a 5-fold increase in *IL-10* transcripts on day 7 (p = 0.09) after treatment with 5 µg. For

TeBi1, while there are no differences in the inflammatory cytokines *IFN-γ, IL1β,* or *IL-8*, there is

a 3-fold increase in *IL-10* transcripts on day 4 (p = 0.03) after treatment with 10 µg. There are

also multiple increases in *IRF-4* transcripts: on day 4, a 2-fold increase after treatment with 1 µg

(p = 0.1), a 3-fold increase after treatment with 5 µg (p = 0.1); and on day 7, a 1.3-fold decrease

after treatment with 1 µg (p = 0.1).

In the air sac (Figure 3), all observed changes are on day 7, after treatment with 10 µg

TeBi1 relative to the PBS control. There is a 10-fold decrease in *IFN-γ* transcripts (p = 0.1), a 3-

fold decrease in *IL-1β* transcripts (p = 0.07), and a 5-fold decrease in *IL-8* transcripts (p = 0.02).

Additionally, there is a 50-fold decrease in *IL-10* transcripts (p = 0.1), and a 10-fold decrease in

IRF-4 transcripts (p = 0.1).

HD11 Experiments

In addition to challenge trials, the ability of TeRu4, TeBi1, and PeNi4 to influence the

cellular immune response was tested in an HD11 cell model system. In all HD11 experiments

(n=21), the LPS induction control resulted in a wide-ranging, but consistent increase in relative

fold change compared to the medium control for *IL-1β* (14 - 677), *IL-8* (8 - 249), and *IL-6* (55 -

3,284) (Figure 4 and Supplementary Figures S7 and S8). Therefore, all experimental

manipulations with AMP were compared with their experimentally paired LPS controls. The

induction of cytokine transcripts by LPS was significantly attenuated by PB in all but a single

experiment (n=15), with fold change decreases compared to LPS alone ranging from 6-166 for

IL-1β, 2-34 for *IL-8*, and 11-335 for *IL-6* (Figure 4 and Supplementary Figure S8). While only

one representative graph is shown for each experiment, the preincubation, preincubation with

wash step, and coaddition experiments were performed in biological triplicate, and the AMP-

only experiments in biological duplicate. Only data consistently reproduced across all replicates

are highlighted, unless otherwise stated.

Induction of Inflammatory Cytokines in HD11 cells by TeRu4, TeBi1, and PeNi4. To assess

the ability of AMP alone to induce cytokine production in HD11 cells, cells were incubated with

16 µg/mL of each AMP or 8 µg/mL PB. Treatment with TeRu4 resulted in a 2-fold increase in

IL-1β (in one of two biological replicates) and *IL-8,* while TeBi1 lead to a 4-fold decrease in *IL-6*

(Supplementary Figure S7). Treatment with PeNi4 did not significantly alter the abundance of

any of the three cytokines, while TeBi1 had no significant effect on *IL-1β* and *IL-8,* and TeRu4

had no significant effect on *IL-6* (Supplementary Figure S7). Treatment with PB alone did not

significantly or consistently change *IL-1β, IL-8*, and *IL-6* levels (Supplementary Figure S7).

Preincubation Screen of TeRu4, TeBi1, and PeNi4. To examine if AMP affect HD11 response

to LPS, cells were preincubated with AMP or PB (positive control), followed by treatment with

LPS. Here and in subsequent experiments, medium only and LPS only served as negative and

positive controls, respectively. A significant 2.8-fold decrease was observed for *IL-1β* and *IL-6*

following preincubation with 8 µg/mL TeRu4 compared to the LPS control (Supplementary

Figure S8). Preincubation with 16 µg/mL TeRu4 led to a significant reduction in *IL-1β, IL-8*, and

IL-6 levels by 13.6-fold, 2.9-fold, and 22.0-fold, respectively, compared to LPS only control

(Supplementary Figure S8). Similarly, treatment with 8 µg/mL PB significantly decreased *IL-1β*,

IL-8 (in 2 of 3 biological replicates), and *IL-6* abundance relative to LPS alone by 8.8-fold, 3.4-

fold, and 20.4-fold, respectively (Supplementary Figure S8). While a significant 2.8-fold

increase was observed for *IL-8* at 4 µg/mL TeRu4 compared to the LPS control, this observation

was only seen in two of three biological replicates (Supplementary Figure S8). Preincubation

with TeBi1 and PeNi4 did not consistently induce a significant change in *IL-1β, IL-6*, and *IL-8*

transcript levels compared to the LPS control across biological replicates (Supplementary Figure

S8). The attenuation of LPS-induced responses of *IL-1β, IL-8*, and *IL-6* transcripts after TeRu4

preincubation prompted further investigation via the subsequent experiments to provide some

insight into possible mechanisms of action.

Preincubation Experiment with Wash Step. The effects on HD11 cells of transient exposure to

TeRu4, followed by its removal and the addition of LPS, was examined. A significant decrease

in *IL-1β, IL-8,* and *IL-6* transcripts relative to the LPS control remained after preincubation with

8 µg/mL PB (21-, 5-, and 80-fold respectively) and 16 µg/mL TeRu4 (3-, 2-, and 4-fold,

respectively) (Figure 4). Preincubation with 8 µg/mL TeRu4 induced a significant decrease in

IL-1β levels by 2.0-fold and *IL-6* by 1.9-fold in two of three biological replicates relative to the

LPS only control (Figure 4). Unlike in the previous preincubation experiment (without a wash

step), treatment with 1 and 2 µg/mL TeRu4 followed by the wash step, frequently (but not

consistently in all biological replicates) resulted in a significant increase in *IL-1β* (1.3- and 1.7-

fold respectively) and *IL-8* (1.3- and 1.6-fold respectively) transcript levels relative to the LPS

only control (Figure 4). The significant increase in *IL-6* (2-fold for relative to LPS only) at these

low concentrations was consistent across all three biological replicates (Figure 4).

Coincubation of TeRu4 and LPS. The impact of co-incubating TeRu4 and LPS prior to treating

HD11 cells on cytokine transcript expression was assessed. Coaddition of LPS with either PB or

TeRu4 (at concentrations ranging from 4 to 16 µg/mL) resulted in significant decreases in all

cytokine transcripts compared to the LPS control across all three biological replicates (Figure

10). Specifically, co-treatment with PB and LPS led to reductions of 101-fold for *IL-1β*, 27-fold

for *IL-8*, and 260-fold for *IL-6* (Figure 4). Similarly, co-treatment with 16 µg/mL TeRu4 and

LPS decreased *IL-1β* abundance by 75-fold, 20-fold for *IL-8*, and 409-fold for *IL-6* (Figure 4).

LPS and 8 µg/mL TeRu4 reduced *IL-1β* transcripts by 97-fold, *IL-8* by 23-fold, and *IL-6* by 368-

fold compared to LPS alone (Figure 4). LPS and 4 µg/mL TeRu4 resulted in reductions of 15-

fold for *IL-1β*, 6-fold for *IL-8*, and 47-fold for *IL-6* compared to LPS alone (Figure 4). For *IL-6*,

4-16 µg/mL TeRu4 repressed the LPS induction so much that it was indistinguishable from the

medium only negative control (observed in two of three replicates at 4 µg/mL) (Figure 4). Like

what was observed in the previous experiment, 1 and 2 µg/mL of TeRu4 resulted in significantly

increased transcript abundance in *IL-1β* (2-fold), *IL-8* (2-fold), and *IL-6* (3-fold) relative to the

LPS control, but unlike the previous experiment, these results were consistent across three

biological replicates (Figure 4).

Commercial Pen Trials

Pen trials were designed to test the efficacy against ECM and the safety of treating

chickens with TeBi1, TeRu4, and PeNi4 in a commercial production setting. Late-stage viability

(viable embryos from day 15 of incubation until placement in pens) was between 88 and 98% in

all pen trials. No statistically significant differences were detected between the treatment and

control groups (Supplementary Figure S9). There were no significant differences between the

treatment and control groups for post-hatch mortality, culls, pips, and late embryo mortality.

For the first 10 days, there were no statistical differences between the survival probability

of males and females (Supplementary Figure S10). Thus, the sexes were combined for

subsequent analyses. No significant differences in survival probability were detected between

treatment and control groups for any AMP during the first 10 days of the pen trials, indicating

that the tested AMP had no measurable impact on ECM (Supplementary Figure S11). However,

for the full duration of the pen trials (35 days), sex-specific differences in survival probabilities

were observed for TeRu4 at 20 µg and TeBi1 at 10 µg (Supplementary Figure S12). For these

two pen trials, the sexes were kept separate for analysis (Figure 5, Supplementary Figure S13).

Notably, TeRu4 at 20 µg significantly increased the survival probability of female birds

compared to the controls by approximately 4.9 % by day 35 (p = 0.04). Moreover, TeBi1 at 20

µg significantly increased the survival probability of the birds compared to the control by

approximately 4.4% by day 35 (p = 0.02). There was no other difference in survival probabilities

between the treatment and control groups by day 35. In the 10 µg TeRu4 and TeBi1 trials,

survival curves for both sexes closely overlapped (Supplementary Figure S13).

Significant differences in mean weight between treatment and control groups were

observed only in the 20 µg TeBi1 trial (Supplementary Figure S14). Notably, on day 0, mean

weights in the treatment groups were approximately 2.8% lower in males and 2.4% lower in

females compared to controls (p = 0.02 and 0.03). However, on day 10, no significant difference

in mean weights were observed. Moreover, in the 10 µg TeRu4 trial, numerous birds of both

sexes exhibited lower body weights on days 21 and 35, particularly in the treatment group,

although this difference was not statistically significant. This observation may suggest

subclinical effects of TeRu4 at lower doses, high biological variability among individual birds,

or environmental effects, all of which warrant further investigation. By day 35, no significant

differences in mean weight were detected (Supplementary Figure S14).

No statistically significant differences were detected between FCR of the treatment and

control groups on day 35, suggesting that the tested AMP did not exhibit measurable growth-

promoting properties (Supplementary Figure S15). Of interest, there were occasions where FCR

values were below 1 (Supplementary Figure S15). One was observed between days 0 and 10, in

the 10 µg TeBi1 trial (FCR = 0.997). Further, in the 20 µg TeRu4 trial, two FCR values were

below 1 (FCR = 0.923 and 0.961) in the second interval, between days 11 and 21. Overall, the

mean FCR values were consistently the lowest in the first interval, and the highest in the last

interval, between days 21 and 35, for both sexes. These findings suggest that AMP did not

significantly alter FCR under the tested conditions, and observations during the first interval of

certain pen trials warrant further investigation.

Coefficient of variation (**CV**) percentages were calculated as a measure of flock

uniformity. There was no significant difference in the CV percentages of the treatment and

control groups on day 35 (Supplementary Figure S16). Among males, on day 10 in the 20 µg

TeBi1 trial, the treatment group had an approximately 2.8% lower CV compared to the control

group, but this difference did not reach statistical significance ($p = 0.07$) (Supplementary Figure

S16). Moreover, the birds in the 10 µg TeRu4 trial exhibited greater variability in flock

uniformity on days 21 and 35, with CV values exhibiting greater range than those in the control,

consistent with the presence of birds with low body weight.

The qPCR results were analyzed with sexes separated, and significant differences are

reported for both comparisons between birds in the same sex group that received different

treatments, and for birds in the same treatment group with differences between sexes. As there

were some significant differences in transcript abundance between male and female birds in the

same treatment groups, the results are shown with sexes separated in Figure 6.

After treatment with 10 µg of TeRu4, female birds had a 1.8-fold increase ($p = 0.1$) in *IFN-*

γ transcripts relative to (female) control birds, and in that trial, male controls birds had a 1.2-fold

increase ($p = 0.1$) in *IRF-4* transcripts relative to female control birds. After treatment with 20 µg

of TeRu4, male birds had a 1.3-fold increase ($p = 0.08$) in *IRF-4* transcripts relative to control

birds.

After treatment with 20 μg PeNi4, female birds had a 1.4-fold increase (p = 0.02) in *IRF-4*

transcripts relative to control birds. Additionally, in that trial, male control birds had a 1.3-fold

increase (p = 0.01) in *IRF-4* transcripts and a 1.6-fold increase (p = 0.04) in *IL-8* transcripts

relative to female control birds.

When considering the sexes separately, there were no significant differences in transcript

abundance in birds treated with 10 μg TeBi1 (Figure 6). As there were no significant differences

between sexes in this trial, qPCR results from that trial were also combined (Supplementary

Figure S17). Here, a 1.2-fold increase (p = 0.1) in *IL-1β* transcripts was observed. Examination

of the transcript abundances in birds treated with 20 μg TeBi1 revealed numerous differences

relative to PBS controls.

After treatment with 20 μg TeBi1, male birds had a 2-fold decrease in *IFN-γ* and *IRF-4*

transcripts (p = 0.02 for both), and a 3-fold decrease in *IL-10* and *IL-8* transcripts (p = 0.03 and

0.02, respectively) relative to control birds. In that trial, male control birds had higher abundance

of all tested transcripts than female control birds: 2-fold more *IFN-γ* transcripts (p = 0.1), 3-fold

more *IL-10* transcripts (p = 0.06), 1.7-fold more *IL-1β* transcripts (p = 0.008), 3-fold more *IL-8*

transcripts (p = 0.01), and 2-fold more *IRF-4* transcripts (p = 0.1). Additionally, male birds

treated with 20 μg TeBi1 had significantly lower abundance of certain transcripts than female

birds in the same treatment group, a 1.3-fold decrease in both *IFN-γ* and *IRF-4* transcripts (p =

0.09 for both).

562   **DISCUSSION**

This study demonstrates that antimicrobial peptides can improve early health outcomes in

broiler chickens while maintaining production performance under commercial conditions. Across

complementary in vivo and in vitro assays, two of the three lead AMP, TeBi1 and TeRu4,

showed efficacy and immunomodulatory activity consistent with their intended roles as

antibiotic alternatives for preventing APEC-associated disease. Here, AI-assisted discovery is

relevant for enabling large-scale candidate generation and triage that would be impractical by

hand. All outcome data from the in vivo and in vitro assays were analyzed using nonparametric

methods, Kruskal–Wallis for omnibus comparisons and Wilcoxon rank-sum for pairwise

contrasts. Given the inherent variability of in vivo data and the exploratory nature of this study, a

significance threshold of $\alpha = 0.1$ was used, as specified in the methods.

First, in controlled challenge trials, pre-hatch administration of TeBi1 was associated

with reduced post-hatch bacterial burden and improved early growth. At 10 µg per egg, TeBi1

significantly lowered culture detection of APEC in the air sac and pericardium by day 7 and

yielded an approximate 50% increase in body weight relative to controls at the same time point.

These findings support a direct antibacterial contribution in vivo and align with TeBi1's

favorable in vitro profile (Lin et al., 2022). Concordant decreases in pro-inflammatory cytokine

transcripts in air sac tissue at day 7 (Figure 3) further suggest that limiting bacterial load

mitigates downstream inflammatory responses. In contrast, TeRu4 and PeNi4 did not

reproducibly reduce organ-specific bacterial detection in the challenge setting at tested doses up

to 10 µg, indicating peptide-specific differences in in vivo antibacterial activity despite their

performance in in vitro experiments. Consistent with this, positive correlations between air sac

bacterial loads and *IL-1β* ($\rho = 0.58$) and *IL-8* ($\rho = 0.32$) expression (Figure 2) both support the

validity of the infection model and indicate that AMP-mediated reductions in bacterial burden

translate to dampened inflammatory signaling.

Second, the HD11 macrophage-like cell experiments demonstrate the potential for TeRu4

to attenuate the effects of LPS. Preincubation with TeRu4 and its coaddition with LPS elicited

robust and dose-dependent attenuation of *IL-1β*, *IL-6*, and *IL-8* transcripts, with effects at higher

exposures of TeRu4 that were comparable in direction and magnitude to PB. While the

persistence of attenuation throughout the experiments (Figure 4) may indicate that TeRu4 can

interact both with LPS and with HD11 cells to mitigate inflammation, further study is required to

confirm these mechanisms. Notably, a biphasic pattern was observed: attenuation of *IL-1β, IL-6,*

and *IL-8* at higher exposures of TeRu4, but mild potentiation at sub-threshold doses. Taken

together, these data support an immunomodulatory profile for TeRu4 that could help contain

excessive inflammation induced by LPS, even when direct antibacterial effects are limited in

vivo.

Third, pen trials provide critical evidence of field-relevant safety and performance. In ovo

administration of TeBi1 or TeRu4 at 10 or 20 μg per egg did not adversely affect hatchability,

FCR, or flock uniformity through day 35. Importantly, survival probabilities improved modestly

but significantly in two settings: a 4.9% increase in females with 20 μg TeRu4 and a 4.4%

increase in all birds with 20 μg TeBi1 by day 35. Although effect sizes were small, they are

operationally meaningful at commercial scale and were achieved without detectable adverse

effects in growth or efficiency. These findings support a favorable benefit-risk profile for both

peptides when delivered through standard in ovo automation.

Together, the in vivo and in vitro data outline complementary roles for these leads. TeBi1

appears to act primarily through direct antibacterial activity in the immediate post-hatch period,

reducing tissue colonization and the associated inflammatory response. TeRu4 shows consistent

anti-inflammatory activity in a macrophage model and over 35 days translates to a survival

advantage in females at higher dose, suggesting that immunomodulation can contribute to

resilience under farm conditions. These sex-specific responses may reflect differences in immune

system maturation rates or hormone-immune interactions, as male broilers typically show

different growth and immune development patterns than females (Leitner et al., 1989; Younis et

al., 2023). The patterns observed in both survival and cytokine transcript baselines warrant

additional investigation into sex-dependent pharmacodynamics (**PD**), immune set-points, and

potential interactions with breeder age and genetics.

While the results presented here are encouraging, this study also has several limitations.

First, the challenge trials used a single APEC strain and a prophylactic in ovo regimen. Broader

pathogen panels, additional exposure routes, and therapeutic or peri-hatch dosing schedules

should be evaluated to define the generalizability and optimal use cases. Second, although this

study shows safety and performance neutrality in pens, pharmacokinetics (**PK**), peptide stability

in the embryonic and early post-hatch milieu, and residue depletion profiles remain to be

established. Third, gene expression endpoints were measured at discrete time points and in a

single cell line or selected tissues. High-resolution temporal profiling, including protein-level

cytokine measurements and cellular phenotyping in multiple cell lines and tissues, would

sharpen mechanistic inference and help explain biphasic responses at lower TeRu4

concentrations. Further, some FCR values below 1.0 in early trial periods likely reflect

measurement artifacts related to initial hydration status rather than true feed conversion,

highlighting the importance of standardized weighing protocols in early post-hatch periods.

Finally, while the analyses used conservative non-parametric tests and multiple-comparison

corrections, some findings were near the chosen α threshold of 0.1, reflecting expected

variability in vivo and underscoring the need for replication across flocks and sites.

The results have practical implications for poultry health programs. The in ovo delivery

method offers multiple advantages: it integrates cleanly into existing hatchery workflows, avoids

post-hatch handling, and ensures uniform exposure across flocks. This delivery approach,

combined with a demonstrated safety profile, minimizes barriers to commercial adoption. From

an economic perspective, even modest survival improvements translate to substantial numbers at

commercial scale, while early bacterial control reduces the need for subsequent therapeutic

interventions. The complementary mechanisms of TeBi1 (direct antibacterial) and TeRu4

(immunomodulatory) suggest potential for combination strategies that leverage both activities.

Future work should benchmark these AMP against current animal husbandry standards and

evaluate alternative delivery formats, such as water supplementation during high-risk periods, to

optimize protection throughout the production cycle.

In conclusion, AI-discovered AMP TeBi1 and TeRu4 show complementary efficacy and

safety signals in broilers when administered in ovo. TeBi1 reduces early APEC burden and

inflammation and improves early growth, whereas TeRu4 attenuates macrophage inflammatory

responses and improves survival under commercial conditions without compromising

performance. These findings support advancement to dose-optimization, PK and residue studies,

expanded pathogen panels, and multi-site validation, with an eye toward integrated antimicrobial

stewardship in poultry production.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

Inanc Birol is a founder, Chief Scientific Officer, and equity holder of Amphoraxe Life

Sciences Inc., which has licensed intellectual property related to antimicrobial peptides described

in this manuscript. The following authors are named inventors on related intellectual property:

Caren C. Helbing, Erin Fraser, Fraser Hof, Lorissa Corrie, René L. Warren, Vanessa C.

Thompson, Anat Yanai, Inanc Birol, and Linda M. N. Hoang. Monica Kotkoff is also a

stakeholder on the IP. Emre Demirsoy, Teagan I. Parkin, and Anna H. Dema received internship

funding from Amphoraxe through Mitacs. Amphoraxe contributed to aspects of the work,

including study design for selected experiments, resource allocation, collaborative experimental

activities, internship support, and participation in manuscript preparation. The authors retained

control over data collection, analysis, interpretation, and the decision to submit the manuscript

for publication. All other authors declare no competing interests.

665   **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

666   The authors thank Genome Canada and Genome British Columbia for financial support

through the large scale applied projects program (#291PEP) to IB, CCH, LMNH, EF, and FH.

Additional funding was provided by Chicken Farmers of Canada, Canadian Hatching Egg

Producers, Investment Agriculture Foundation of British Columbia (INV106, INV247), and

Amphoraxe Life Sciences Inc. Partial support for trainees were provided by Mitacs (IT28945,

IT43363), University of Victoria, University of British Columbia, and Amphoraxe Life Sciences

Inc.

674   **REFERENCES**

675   Ahlmann-Eltze, C., and I. Patil. 2017. ggsignif: Significance Brackets for "ggplot2." :0.6.4
676   Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggsignif (verified 4 July 2025).

677   Allan, B. J., J. V. van den Hurk, and A. A. Potter. 1993. Characterization of Escherichia coli
678   isolated from cases of avian colibacillosis. Can. J. Vet. Res. Rev. Can. Rech. Veterinaire
679   57:146–151.

Allan, B., C. Wheler, W. Köster, M. Sarfraz, A. Potter, V. Gerdts, and A. Dar. 2018. In Ovo
Administration of Innate Immune Stimulants and Protection from Early Chick Mortalities
due to Yolk Sac Infection. Avian Dis. 62:316–321.

Bahar, A. A., and D. Ren. 2013. Antimicrobial peptides. Pharm. Basel Switz. 6:1543–1575.

Bean-Hodgins, L., and E. G. Kiarie. 2021. Mandated restrictions on the use of medically
important antibiotics in broiler chicken production in Canada: implications, emerging
challenges, and opportunities for bolstering gastrointestinal function and health — a
review. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 101:602–629.

Cousineau, D. 2021. superb: Summary Plots with Adjusted Error Bars. :0.95.19 Available at
https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=superb (verified 4 July 2025).

Cuperus, T., A. van Dijk, M. G. R. Matthijs, E. J. A. Veldhuizen, and H. P. Haagsman. 2016.
Protective effect of in ovo treatment with the chicken cathelicidin analog D-CATH-2
against avian pathogenic E. coli. Sci. Rep. 6:26622.

Destoumieux-Garzón, D., P. Mavingui, G. Boetsch, J. Boissier, F. Darriet, P. Duboz, C. Fritsch,
P. Giraudoux, F. Le Roux, S. Morand, C. Paillard, D. Pontier, C. Sueur, and Y. Voituron.
2018. The One Health Concept: 10 Years Old and a Long Road Ahead. Front. Vet. Sci. 5
Available at https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/veterinary-
science/articles/10.3389/fvets.2018.00014/full (verified 6 February 2025).

Durand, G. A., D. Raoult, and G. Dubourg. 2019. Antibiotic discovery: history, methods and
perspectives. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 53:371–382.

Ebrahimikondori, H., D. Sutherland, A. Yanai, A. Richter, A. Salehi, C. Li, L. Coombe, M.
Kotkoff, R. L. Warren, and I. Birol. 2024. Structure-aware deep learning model for
peptide toxicity prediction. Protein Sci. 33:e5076.

Firke, S. 2016. janitor: Simple Tools for Examining and Cleaning Dirty Data. :2.2.1 Available at
https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=janitor (verified 4 July 2025).

Fjell, C. D., J. A. Hiss, R. E. W. Hancock, and G. Schneider. 2012. Designing antimicrobial
peptides: form follows function. Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 11:37–51.

Fox, J., S. Weisberg, and B. Price. 2001. car: Companion to Applied Regression. :3.1-3
Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=car (verified 5 September 2025).

Garcia, P., Y. Wang, J. Viallet, and Z. Macek Jilkova. 2021. The Chicken Embryo Model: A
Novel and Relevant Model for Immune-Based Studies. Front. Immunol. 12:791081.

Hancock, R. E. W., and H.-G. Sahl. 2006. Antimicrobial and host-defense peptides as new anti-
infective therapeutic strategies. Nat. Biotechnol. 24:1551–1557.

Hu, J., D. J. A. Afayibo, B. Zhang, H. Zhu, L. Yao, W. Guo, X. Wang, Z. Wang, D. Wang, H.
Peng, M. Tian, J. Qi, and S. Wang. 2022. Characteristics, pathogenic mechanism,

zoonotic potential, drug resistance, and prevention of avian pathogenic Escherichia coli
(APEC). Front. Microbiol. 13:1049391.

Kassambara, A. 2016. ggpubr: "ggplot2" Based Publication Ready Plots. :0.6.1 Available at
https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr (verified 4 July 2025).

Kassambara, A. 2019. rstatix: Pipe-Friendly Framework for Basic Statistical Tests. :0.7.2
Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rstatix (verified 4 July 2025).

Kassambara, A., M. Kosinski, and P. Biecek. 2016. survminer: Drawing Survival Curves using
"ggplot2." :0.5.0 Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survminer (verified 4
July 2025).

Kogut, M. H. 2002. Dynamics of a protective avian inflammatory response: the role of an IL-8-
like cytokine in the recruitment of heterophils to the site of organ invasion by Salmonella
enteritidis. Comp. Immunol. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 25:159–172.

Leitner, G., E. Dan Heller, and A. Friedman. 1989. Sex-related differences in immune response
and survival rate of broiler chickens. Vet. Immunol. Immunopathol. 21:249–260.

Li, C., D. Sutherland, S. A. Hammond, C. Yang, F. Taho, L. Bergman, S. Houston, R. L.
Warren, T. Wong, L. M. N. Hoang, C. E. Cameron, C. C. Helbing, and I. Birol. 2022.
AMPlify: attentive deep learning model for discovery of novel antimicrobial peptides
effective against WHO priority pathogens. BMC Genomics 23:77.

Li, C., D. Sutherland, A. Richter, L. Coombe, A. Yanai, R. L. Warren, M. Kotkoff, F. Hof, L. M.
N. Hoang, C. C. Helbing, and I. Birol. 2024. De novo synthetic antimicrobial peptide
design with a recurrent neural network. Protein Sci. 33:e5088.

Lin, D., D. Sutherland, S. I. Aninta, N. Louie, K. M. Nip, C. Li, A. Yanai, L. Coombe, R. L.
Warren, C. C. Helbing, L. M. N. Hoang, and I. Birol. 2022. Mining Amphibian and
Insect Transcriptomes for Antimicrobial Peptide Sequences with rAMPage. Antibiotics
11:952.

Livak, K. J., and T. D. Schmittgen. 2001. Analysis of Relative Gene Expression Data Using
Real-Time Quantitative PCR and the $2-\Delta\Delta CT$ Method. Methods 25:402–408.

Nguyen, T. T. T., B. Allan, C. Wheler, W. Köster, V. Gerdts, and A. Dar. 2021. Avian
antimicrobial peptides: in vitro and in ovo characterization and protection from early
chick mortality caused by yolk sac infection. Sci. Rep. 11:2132.

Pfaffl, M. W., A. Tichopad, C. Prgomet, and T. P. Neuvians. 2004. Determination of stable
housekeeping genes, differentially regulated target genes and sample integrity:
BestKeeper – Excel-based tool using pair-wise correlations. Biotechnol. Lett. 26:509–
515.

R Core Team. 2024. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical   Computing. Available at
https://www.R-project.org/.

Rezaee, M. S., D. Liebhart, C. Hess, M. Hess, and S. Paudel. 2021. Bacterial Infection in
752   Chicken Embryos and Consequences of Yolk Sac Constitution for Embryo Survival. Vet.
753   Pathol. 58:71–79.

754   Richter, A., D. Sutherland, H. Ebrahimikondori, A. Babcock, N. Louie, C. Li, L. Coombe, D.
755   Lin, R. L. Warren, A. Yanai, M. Kotkoff, C. C. Helbing, F. Hof, L. M. N. Hoang, and I.
756   Birol. 2022. Associating Biological Activity and Predicted Structure of Antimicrobial
757   Peptides from Amphibians and Insects. Antibiot. Basel Switz. 11:1710.

758   Rima, M., M. Rima, Z. Fajloun, J.-M. Sabatier, B. Bechinger, and T. Naas. 2021. Antimicrobial
759   Peptides: A Potent Alternative to Antibiotics. Antibiotics 10:1095.

760   Rothwell, L., J. R. Young, R. Zoorob, C. A. Whittaker, P. Hesketh, A. Archer, A. L. Smith, and
761   P. Kaiser. 2004. Cloning and Characterization of Chicken IL-10 and Its Role in the
762   Immune Response to *Eimeria maxima*. J. Immunol. 173:2675–2682.

763   Santhakumar, D., D. Rubbenstroth, L. Martinez-Sobrido, and M. Munir. 2017. Avian Interferons
764   and Their Antiviral Effectors. Front. Immunol. 8 Available at
765   http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fimmu.2017.00049/full (verified 26 June
766   2025).

767   Sarfraz, M., T. T. T. Nguyen, C. Wheler, W. Köster, V. Gerdts, and A. Dar. 2022.
768   Characterization of Dosage Levels for In Ovo Administration of Innate Immune
769   Stimulants for Prevention of Yolk Sac Infection in Chicks. Vet. Sci. 9:203.

770   Schauberger, P., and A. Walker. 2014. openxlsx: Read, Write and Edit xlsx Files. :4.2.8
771   Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=openxlsx (verified 5 September 2025).

772   Schmerold, I., I. Van Geijlswijk, and R. Gehring. 2023. European regulations on the use of
773   antibiotics in veterinary medicine. Eur. J. Pharm. Sci. 189:106473.

774   Schromm, A. B., L. Paulowski, Y. Kaconis, F. Kopp, M. Koistinen, A. Donoghue, S. Keese, C.
775   Nehls, J. Wernecke, P. Garidel, E. Sevcsik, K. Lohner, S. Sanchez-Gomez, G. Martinez-
776   de-Tejada, K. Brandenburg, M. Brameshuber, G. J. Schütz, J. Andrä, and T. Gutsmann.
777   2021. Cathelicidin and PMB neutralize endotoxins by multifactorial mechanisms
778   including LPS interaction and targeting of host cell membranes. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.
779   118:e2101721118.

780   Signorell, A. 2014. DescTools: Tools for Descriptive Statistics. :0.99.60 Available at
781   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DescTools (verified 12 September 2025).

782   Therneau, T. M. 2001. survival: Survival Analysis. :3.8-3 Available at https://CRAN.R-
783   project.org/package=survival (verified 5 September 2025).

784   Wallinga, D., L. A. M. Smit, M. F. Davis, J. A. Casey, and K. E. Nachman. 2022. A Review of
785   the Effectiveness of Current US Policies on Antimicrobial Use in Meat and Poultry
786   Production. Curr. Environ. Health Rep. 9:339–354.

Wickham, H., M. Averick, J. Bryan, W. Chang, L. McGowan, R. François, G. Grolemund, A.
Hayes, L. Henry, J. Hester, M. Kuhn, T. Pedersen, E. Miller, S. Bache, K. Müller, J.
Ooms, D. Robinson, D. Seidel, V. Spinu, K. Takahashi, D. Vaughan, C. Wilke, K. Woo,
and H. Yutani. 2019. Welcome to the Tidyverse. J. Open Source Softw. 4:1686.

Wickham, H., and J. Bryan. 2015. readxl: Read Excel Files. :1.4.5 Available at https://CRAN.R-
project.org/package=readxl (verified 5 September 2025).

Wickham, H., W. Chang, L. Henry, T. L. Pedersen, K. Takahashi, C. Wilke, K. Woo, H. Yutani,
D. Dunnington, and T. Van Den Brand. 2007. ggplot2: Create Elegant Data
Visualisations Using the Grammar of Graphics. :3.5.2 Available at https://CRAN.R-
project.org/package=ggplot2 (verified 4 July 2025).

Wickham, H., L. Henry, T. L. Pedersen, T. J. Luciani, M. Decorde, and V. Lise. 2015a. svglite:
An "SVG" Graphics Device. :2.2.1 Available at https://CRAN.R-
project.org/package=svglite (verified 15 September 2025).

Wickham, H., J. Hester, and J. Bryan. 2015b. readr: Read Rectangular Text Data. :2.1.5
Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr (verified 4 July 2025).

Wu, Z., T. Hu, L. Rothwell, L. Vervelde, P. Kaiser, K. Boulton, M. J. Nolan, F. M. Tomley, D.
P. Blake, and D. A. Hume. 2016. Analysis of the function of IL-10 in chickens using
specific neutralising antibodies and a sensitive capture ELISA. Dev. Comp. Immunol.
63:206–212.

Yalin Zhu, Wenge Guo. 2016. MHTdiscrete: Multiple Hypotheses Testing for Discrete Data.
:1.0.1 Available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MHTdiscrete (verified 4 July
2025).

Yang, S., H. Wang, D. Zhao, S. Zhang, and C. Hu. 2024. Polymyxins: recent advances and
challenges. Front. Pharmacol. 15:1424765.

Younis, M. E. M., F. A. Jaber, K. A. Majrashi, H. A. Ghoneim, M. Shukry, M. E. Shafi, N. M.
Albaqami, M. E. Abd El-Hack, and M. M. Abo Ghanima. 2023. Impacts of synthetic
androgen and estrogenic antagonist administration on growth performance, sex steroids
hormones, and immune markers of male and female broilers. Poult. Sci. 102:102244.

Yu, Y., L. Cheng, Z. Xu, Y. Zhang, C. Ou, Q. Wang, P. Gao, and J. Ma. 2021. Tissue
distribution and developmental changes of interferon regulatory factors in chickens and
effects of infectious bursal disease virus infection. Microb. Pathog. 152:104601.

Yuk, S.-S., D.-H. Lee, J.-K. Park, E.-O. Tseren-Ochir, J.-H. Kwon, J.-Y. Noh, J.-B. Lee, S.-Y.
Park, I.-S. Choi, and C.-S. Song. 2016. Pre-immune state induced by chicken interferon
gamma inhibits the replication of H1N1 human and H9N2 avian influenza viruses in
chicken embryo fibroblasts. Virol. J. 13:71.

Zasloff, M. 2002. Antimicrobial peptides of multicellular organisms. Nature 415:389–395.

Zeileis, A., G. Grothendieck, and J. A. Ryan. 2004. zoo: S3 Infrastructure for Regular and
Irregular Time Series (Z's Ordered Observations). :1.8-14 Available at https://CRAN.R-
project.org/package=zoo (verified 5 September 2025).

826
827
828
829

TABLES

Table 1. Physiochemical properties and in vitro activities of three lead antimicrobial peptides

(AMP) TeRu4, TeBi1, and PeNi4. Listed for each AMP are their sequence length, net charge,

and amino acid sequence. Each AMP was synthesized as the C-terminal carboxylic acid. In vitro

activities include the antimicrobial activity against avian pathogenic *E. coli* (APEC) EC317

(minimum inhibitory concentration, MIC), the hemolytic activity against porcine red blood cells

(RBCs) (hemolytic concentration 50%, HC50), and cytotoxicity towards HEK293 human cells

(cytotoxic concentration 50%, CC50).

AMP	Sequence length	Net charge (+)	Amino acid sequence	EC317 MIC (μg/mL)	RBC HC50 (μg/mL)	HEK293 CC50 (μg/mL)
TeRu4	30	8	SWLSKSVKKLVNKKNYTRLEKLAKKKLFNE	1.3	>128	>128
TeBi1	23	6	KIKIPWGKVKDFLVGGMKAVGKK	1.75	>128	128
PeNi4	15	3	GLLGKVLGVGKKVLC	32	>128	>128

FIGURES

Figure 1: a) Weight gain of TeBi1 treated birds between day 4 and 7. Birds, euthanized on

schedule, were weighed individually, and values shown are median ± median absolute deviation

(MAD). On day 7, birds treated with 1 or 5 µg TeBi1 were approximately 25% heavier than

control birds, and birds treated with 10 µg TeBi1 were approximately 50% heavier than control

birds. Significance (p ≤ 0.05) relative to the phosphate buffered saline (PBS) control is indicated

by an asterisk. b/c) Percent of TeBi1 treated birds infected by avian pathogenic *E. coli* (APEC) at

on day 4 and 7 post-hatch in the b) air sacs and c) pericardia. Birds were euthanized as scheduled

and aseptic swabs were taken from the tissues and streaked onto MacConkey agar. The

percentage of birds in each treatment group that resulted in bacterial growth is shown ± a 90%

Wilson confidence interval. Each treatment group was compared to the PBS control by Fisher's

Exact Test. Significance (p ≤ 0.05) relative to the PBS control is indicated by an asterisk. On day

7, there were significantly fewer birds with detectable bacteria in the 10 µg TeBi1 treatment

group than the control group, in both tissues.

863
864

Figure 2. Relative transcript abundance of a) *Interleukin (IL)-1β* and b) *IL-8* in the air sacs of

birds treated with ≤10 μg TeRu4, TeBi1, or PeNi4. Each data point represents the air sac of a

single bird. The light, moderate, and heavy infection groups were compared to the non-infected

group (none) using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. Significance (p ≤ 0.05) relative to non-infected

group is indicated by an asterisk.

Figure 3. Relative fold change values of cytokine transcripts in the air sac of avian pathogenic *E.*

coli (APEC) challenged birds treated before hatch with 1, 5, or 10 μg antimicrobial peptide

(AMP). Birds were euthanized on day 4 or 7 after hatch, and all significance comparisons are

relative to the phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) on their respective days. Asterisks indicate

significance at p ≤ 0.1. *IFN*, interferon; *IL,* interleukin; *IRF*, interferon regulatory factor.

Figure 4. Relative fold change of *Interleukin (IL)-1β*, *IL-8*, and *IL-6* from HD11 cells as

determined by qPCR in the "preincubation with wash step" (left column) and "AMP and LPS

coaddition" experiments (right column). In the preincubation with wash step experiment, cells

were incubated for 3 h with medium, a range of 2-fold serially diluted antimicrobial peptide

(AMP; 1 to 16 μg/mL TeRu4), or 8 μg/mL polymyxin B sulfate (PB), followed by three washes

prior to the addition of 25 ng/mL lipopolysaccharide (LPS) for an additional 3 h. In the

coaddition experiment, cells were incubated for 3 h with medium, or with 25 ng/mL LPS mixed

with a range of 2-fold serially diluted AMP (1 to 16 μg/mL TeRu4), or 8 μg/mL PB. A

significant difference from the medium control is indicated by "*", and "#" indicates a

significant difference from LPS treatment (p-value < 0.1, Mann-Whitney-U test). Open circles

represent the fold change of one technical replicate relative to the medium control. The

horizontal lines represent the median of the three technical replicates within each treatment

892 condition, the boxes show the interquartile range, and the vertical whiskers represent the

893 minimum and maximum values. Shown are representative experiments of three biological

894 replicates.

Figure 5. Kaplan-Meier curves depicting the survival probabilities of experimental groups

during pen trials across different antimicrobial peptides (AMP) and dosages. Columns represent

AMP at specific dosages and each AMP–dosage combination corresponds to a separate pen trial.

Sex-specific differences in survival probabilities were observed in the TeRu4 (20 µg) and TeBi1

(10 µg) trials. For these trials, males and females were analyzed separately, and each panel is

labeled with "F" for females or "M" for males in the top right corner to indicate the sex of the

birds included in the analysis. P-values, as determined by Log-rank tests, are displayed in the

bottom-left corner of each panel.

Figure 6. Relative fold change values of cytokine transcripts in the spleens of pen trial birds (no

pathogen challenge) treated with 10 or 20 µg TeRu4, TeBi1, or PeNi4. Birds were euthanized 10

days after hatch. Asterisks indicate significance at $p \leq 0.1$. F, female birds; M, male birds.

Additional details are available in the Figure 5 legend.