

Supplementary material

Table S1. Bacterial adhesion to A549 lung alveolar monolayers and coefficients of determination r^2 of the calibration curves obtained for all rhodococci tested. The adhesion percentage was calculated as ratio between fluorescence of adherent bacteria and fluorescence of bacteria inoculated (1×10^7 bacterial cells).

Bacteria	Adherence (mean % $\pm$ S.D.)	r^2	Bacteria	Adherence (mean % $\pm$ S.D.)	r^2
Re1	2.5 $\pm$ 1.2	0.9955 – 0.9998	Re21	2.5 $\pm$ 0.7	0.9992 – 0.9993
Re2	2.2 $\pm$ 0.9	0.9825 – 0.9994	Re22	2.1 $\pm$ 0.4	0.9992 – 0.9994
Re3	2.0 $\pm$ 0.9	0.997 – 0.9999	Re23	1.5 $\pm$ 0.3	0.9962 – 0.9992
Re4	2.3 $\pm$ 1.4	0.9979 – 0.9998	Re24	1.9 $\pm$ 0.6	0.9963 – 0.9998
Re5	1.8 $\pm$ 0.5	0.9985 – 0.9997	Re25	2.3 $\pm$ 0.7	0.9953 – 0.9981
Re6	2.3 $\pm$ 0.9	0.9947 – 0.9997	Re26	2.0 $\pm$ 1.0	0.997 – 0.9989
Re7	2.7 $\pm$ 1.6	0.9979 – 0.9999	Re27	2.1 $\pm$ 0.5	0.9911 – 0.9998
Re8	1.8 $\pm$ 0.8	0.9988 – 0.9997	Re28	2.7 $\pm$ 2.5	0.9948 – 0.999
Re9	2.7 $\pm$ 1.4	0.9995	Re29	2.6 $\pm$ 2.0	0.9798 – 0.9993
Re10	3.3 $\pm$ 1.7	0.9961 – 0.9994	Re30	5.0 $\pm$ 1.5	0.998 – 0.9998
Re11	1.8 $\pm$ 0.5	0.9978 – 0.9993	Re31	4.9 $\pm$ 1.5	0.9988 – 0.9997
Re12	1.8 $\pm$ 0.2	0.9992 – 0.9997	Re32	5.0 $\pm$ 1.3	0.9997 – 0.9999
Re13	1.5 $\pm$ 0.5	0.9917 – 0.9996	Re33	4.7 $\pm$ 1.0	0.9993 – 0.9994
Re14	2.7 $\pm$ 1.4	0.98 – 0.9997	Re34	4.7 $\pm$ 1.5	0.9996 – 0.9998
Re15	2.0 $\pm$ 0.3	0.9941 – 0.9995	Re35	4.7 $\pm$ 1.4	0.9986 – 0.9998
Re16	2.3 $\pm$ 0.5	0.9977 – 0.9999	Re36	4.5 $\pm$ 1.8	0.9984 – 0.9996
Re17	2.4 $\pm$ 0.9	0.9984 – 0.9993	Re37	4.3 $\pm$ 2.2	0.9995 – 0.9996
Re18	2.2 $\pm$ 1.0	0.9987 – 0.9997	Re38	4.4 $\pm$ 1.3	0.9996 – 0.9998
Re19	1.7 $\pm$ 0.3	0.9937 – 0.9989	Re39	4.8 $\pm$ 0.9	0.9986 – 0.9994
Re20	1.7 $\pm$ 0.8	0.9992 – 0.9996	33701	2.6 $\pm$ 1.0	0.9993 – 0.9997

Table S2. Percentage biofilm residual mass after 24, 48 and 72 h dissolving treatment with the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and 10xMIC of azithromycin (AZM), rifampicin (RIF) and AZM/RIF combination at a ratio of 2:1. AZM and RIF were tested alone also at the MIC value acquired in combination (MIC_{in combination}). Post-hoc ANOVA was applied for comparing the treatment groups at 95% significance level. P < 0.05 * vs Untreated, ^a vs AZM MIC, ^b vs AZM 10xMIC, ^c vs AZM MIC_{in combination}, ^d vs AZM 10xMIC_{in combination}, ^e vs RIF MIC, ^f vs RIF 10xMIC, ^g vs RIF MIC_{in combination}, ^h vs RIF 10xMIC_{in combination}, ^m vs AZM/RIF 2:1 MIC, ⁿ vs AZM/RIF 2:1 10xMIC.

	Time (h)	Re1	Re9	Re4	Re19	Re24	33701
AZM MIC	24	86.7	95.5	87.2	94.6	83.1	99.1
	48	51.8*	72.2	84.7	78.6	86.7	80.9
	72	54.2*	66.9*	67.7* ^g	75.8	72.7	67.1
AZM 10xMIC	24	72.7	93.7	86.4	86.4	82.4	91.9
	48	49.5* ^g	69.5	75.6	75.3	75.3	68.2
	72	54.8*	64*	67.6* ^g	66.8	65.8	52.9*
AZM MIC_{in combination}	24	85.4	100	-	95.8	86.7	98.8
	48	72.9	88.5	-	97.5	85.9	87.9
	72	75.6	81.6	-	80.7	95.7	78
AZM 10xMIC_{in combination}	24	85.8	95.1	-	93.1	83	92.3
	48	55.9*	66.7	-	77.5	83.4	72.7
	72	72.4*	63.5*	-	69.2	68.7	52.6*
RIF MIC	24	93.5	95.8	92.5	98.8	93.4	99.4
	48	71.4	90.9	82.7	84.2	92.2	91.4
	72	81.6	90.9	84.3	84.9	94.4	70.2
RIF 10xMIC	24	78.5	93.4	88.1	85	94	97.8
	48	62.8*	82.2	66.1	75.9	84.4	75.3
	72	59.7*	70.4*	64.5* ^g	77.9	87	66
RIF MIC_{in combination}	24	95.5	98.1	95.5	95.2	93.6	101.5
	48	83.1	91.7	98.2	84.4	95.6	93.1
	72	80.7	89.6	95.7 ^{a,b,f, m,n}	84.8	92.8	72.5
RIF 10xMIC_{in combination}	24	83.2	94.9	97.7	87.9	93.7	96.8
	48	70.5	85.2	97.9	82.5	84.7	74.7
	72	76.8	76.4	95.1	85	84.9	66
AZM/RIF 2:1 MIC	24	87.4	100	90.6	88.3	89	101
	48	70.8	73.5	75.3	76.2	86.7	75.7
	72	65.1*	77.9	60.1* ^g	80.2	86.3	50.2*
AZM/RIF 2:1 10xMIC	24	78	86.5	87.5	89	80	89.8
	48	54.5*	66.7	76.7	70	71.1	75
	72	63.6*	62.7*	60.1* ^g	58.1*	69.6	50.3*