# Tuberculosis resistance acquisition in space and time: an analysis of globally diverse $\boldsymbol{M}$. tuberculosis whole genome sequences 

Yasha Ektefaie ${ }^{1}$, Avika Dixit ${ }^{2,3}$, Luca Freschi ${ }^{2}$, Maha Farhat ${ }^{2,4}$<br>${ }^{1}$ University of California Berkeley, Berkeley CA, ${ }^{2}$ Harvard Medical School, Boston MA, ${ }^{3}$ Boston Children's Hospital, Boston MA, ${ }^{4}$ Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA<br>Yasha Ektefaie<br>Affiliations: University of California Berkeley, Berkeley CA<br>Address: 120 Sproul Hall, Berkeley CA 94720, USA<br>Avika Dixit, MBBS MPH MBI<br>Affiliations: Boston Children's Hospital, Boston MA; Harvard Medical School, Boston MA<br>Address: 300 Longwood Ave, Mailstop 3103, Boston MA 02115, USA<br>Luca Freschi, PhD MSc<br>Affiliations: Harvard Medical School, Boston BA<br>Address: 10 Shattuck St, Boston MA 02115, USA<br>Maha R. Farhat, MD MSc<br>Affiliations: Harvard Medical School, Boston MA; Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston MA<br>Address: 10 Shattuck St, Boston MA 02115, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Maha R. Farhat
10 Shattuck St, Boston MA 02130, USA
Email: maha farhat@hms.harvard.edu

## Research in context

## Evidence before this study

Acquisition and spread of drug-resistance by Mycobacterium tuberculosis (MTB) varies across countries. Local factors driving evolution of drug resistance in MTB are not well studied.

## Added value of this study

We applied molecular dating to 6,099 global MTB patient isolates and found the order of resistance acquisition to be consistent across the countries examined, i.e. acquisition of isoniazid resistance first followed by rifampicin and streptomycin followed by resistance to other drugs. In all countries with data available there was evidence for transmission of resistant strains from patient-to-patient and in the majority for extended periods of time (>20 years). Countries with lower gross wealth indices were found to have more recent resistance acquisition to the drug rifampicin. Based on the resistance patterns identified in our study we estimate that commercial diagnostic tests vary considerably in sensitivity for second-line resistance diagnosis by country.

## Implications of all available evidence

The longevity of resistant MTB in many parts of the world emphasizes its fitness for transmission and its continued threat to public health. The association between country wealth and recent resistance acquisition emphasizes the need for continued investment in TB care delivery and surveillance programs. Geographically relevant diagnostics that take into account a country's unique distribution of resistance are necessary.


#### Abstract

Background: Mycobacterium tuberculosis (MTB) whole genome sequencing data can provide insights into temporal and geographic trends in resistance acquisition and inform public health interventions.

Methods: We curated a set of clinical MTB isolates with high quality sequencing and culturebased drug susceptibility data spanning four lineages and more than 20 countries. We constructed geographic and lineage specific MTB phylogenies and used Bayesian molecular dating to infer the most-recent-common-susceptible-ancestor age for 4,869 instances of resistance to 10 drugs.

Findings: Of 8,550 isolates curated, 6,099 from 15 countries met criteria for molecular dating. The number of independent resistance acquisition events was lower than the number of resistant isolates across all countries, suggesting ongoing transmission of drug resistance. Ancestral age distributions supported the presence of old resistance, $\geq 20$ years prior, in the majority of countries. A consistent order of resistance acquisition was observed globally starting with resistance to isoniazid, but resistance ancestral age varied by country. We found a direct correlation between country wealth and resistance age ( $R^{2}=0.47$, P -value $=0.014$ ). Amplification of fluoroquinolone and second-line injectable resistance among multidrug-resistant isolates is estimated to have occurred very recently (median ancestral age 4.7 years IQR 1.9-9.8 prior to sample collection). We found the sensitivity of commercial molecular diagnostics for second-line resistance to vary significantly by country ( P -value $<0.0003$ )

Interpretation: Our results highlight that both resistance transmission and amplification are contributing to disease burden globally but are variable by country. The observation that wealthier nations are more likely to have old resistance suggests that programmatic improvements can reduce resistance amplification, but that fit resistant strains can circulate for decades subsequently.

Funding: This work was supported by the NIH BD2K grant K01 ES026835, a Harvard Institute of Global Health Burke Fellowship (MF), Boston Children's Hospital OFD/BTREC/CTREC Faculty Career Development Fellowship and Bushrod H. Campbell and Adah F. Hall Charity Fund/Charles A. King Trust Postdoctoral Fellowship (AD).
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## Introduction

Tuberculosis (TB) defines a global epidemic that takes more lives than any other infection due to a single pathogen ${ }^{1}$. The emergence of multidrug-resistant (MDR) and extensively drug-resistant (XDR) resistant TB presents a major hurdle to efforts in accelerating TB decline. Halting the transmission of drug-resistant (DR) TB has been a major focus of studies addressing this hurdle ${ }^{2}$. But the epidemic is ultimately defined by local factors that remain understudied in many parts of the world ${ }^{3}$. The study of geographic and temporal heterogeneity of the DR-TB epidemic can provide insights into these local factors as key drivers of MDR-TB prevalence and persistence in the community, including programmatic and bacterial factors. This understanding is key to future disease control and prevention of antibiotic resistance development.
Over the past decade, increased uptake of molecular and whole genome sequencing (WGS) technologies, and their application to Mycobacterium tuberculosis (MTB) clinical isolates has offered novel insights into pathogen biology and diversity in the context of human infection ${ }^{4-7}$. The application of WGS has allowed us to better understand the genetic determinants of drug resistance (DR) within $M T B^{8}$. The detection of these genetic determinants using molecular technologies that include WGS is now increasingly adopted for TB resistance diagnosis in many parts of the world ${ }^{9}$ and is beginning to replace the more biohazardous and time consuming culture based drug susceptibility tests (DST). The study of isolates sampled from epidemiological outbreaks or from the same host over time has allowed the estimation of MTB's molecular clock rate, or temporal rate of accumulation of fixed genome-level variation ${ }^{10,11}$. The application of this rate to new WGS data from isolates collected for surveillance has helped improve transmission inference and molecular dating of specific evolutionary events such as resistance acquisition or lineage divergence ${ }^{10,12-13}$.
We sought to use a large clinical collection of MTB WGS and resistance phenotype data to study how, when, and where resistance was acquired on a global scale. Using a Bayesian implementation of coalescent theory, we estimate and compare dates of resistance acquisition for MDR/XDR isolates across 15 different countries. We use the recency of resistance acquisition as a measure of fitness of the circulating strains in their respective environments and study the effect of country wealth, as a proxy for TB control programme funding, on the recency of resistance acquisition at a macro level. We also assess the distribution of unexplained MTB phenotypic resistance across 20 countries, to evaluate the accuracy and geographic heterogeneity of molecular detection of common MTB genetic resistance determinants, and discuss implications for DR-TB control.

## Methods

Further details available in the supplementary material.
Data and quality control
We compiled a 10,299 MTB WGS dataset with culture based DST (phenotypic) data using public databases (Patric ${ }^{14}$, ReSeqTB ${ }^{15}$ ) and literature curation ${ }^{11-13,16-26}$. A summary table with the phenotypic data is available online at https://github.com/farhat-lab/resdata.

## Genomic analysis/variant calling

We used a previously validated genomic analysis pipeline for MTB described by Ezewudo et al. ${ }^{27}$ with modifications as detailed in the supplement.

## Drug resistance definitions

Drugs were labelled as follows: isoniazid (INH), ethambutol (EMB), rifamycins (rifampicin or rifabutin) (RIF), streptomycin (STR), pyrazinamide (PZA), fluoroquinolones (FLQ) (includes moxifloxacin, ciprofloxacin, ofloxacin), second-line injectables (SLIs) (includes kanamycin, amikacin, capreomycin), ethionamide/prothionamide (ETH), and cycloserine (CYS). Paraaminosalicylic acid was not analysed due to the paucity of data. Isolates not tested for susceptibility to both INH and RIF were excluded from the assessment of DR frequency by country and lineage. Isolates resistant to both INH and RIF were labelled MDR. Those resistant to INH, RIF, FLQ and SLIs were labelled XDR.

## Estimating resistance acquisition dates

Isolates were separated into 179 groups corresponding to a single drug, lineage and source country, referred to hereafter as a 'group'. Genetic diversity was computed as the average pairwise genetic distance within a group. To accurately date resistance acquisition, a drug-geography-lineage group was analysed only if it consisted of at least 10 isolates, $\geq 20 \%$ of isolates were susceptible and $\geq 1$ isolate was resistant. To exclude isolates that only represent outbreak settings and didn't carry more long-term information about resistance, we excluded groups with a genetic diversity score <1 standard deviation from the mean genetic diversity score measured across all groups. Supplementary methods detail the phylogeny construction and the estimation of the age of the most recent susceptible common ancestor (MRSCA) in years prior to isolation of the clinical sample(s).

## Distribution of Resistance Mutations

We compared the expected sensitivity and specificity of mutations captured by commercial diagnostics (summarized from the literature in Table S9) and those based on more extensive lists of mutations in DR genes that can be captured using targeted or whole genome sequencing. We used three mutations lists for the latter (1) a set of 267 common resistance-associated mutations that we previously determined using randomForests ${ }^{28}$ designated "RF-select WGS test", (2) a set of mutations determined using direct association ${ }^{29}$ designated "DA-select WGS test", and (3) any non-synonymous mutation or noncoding mutation in known DR regions (Table S10) in a "all WGS test". We excluded previously described neutral/lineage associated mutations ${ }^{9}$.

Code
All code used in the analysis is publically accessible at https://github.com/farhat-lab/geo dist tb.

## Results

## Data and global lineage distribution

Of the 10,299 MTB clinical isolates with WGS and culture-based DST data available, 9,385 passed sequence quality criteria and of these 8,550 had country of origin data (Figure 1). The four major MTB lineages, 1-4, were well represented. A relatively high proportion, 42\%, of United Kingdom (UK) isolates ( $n=1873$ ) belonged to Lineages-1 \& 3 (Figure 2A). Overall, the non-Europe-America-Africa Lineages-1,3, and 2, comprised 40\% of European isolates ( $\mathrm{n}=3956$ ) and $7 \%$ of North and South American isolates ( $\mathrm{n}=1297$ ).

## Phenotypic resistance distribution

Of the 8,550 isolates, 568 isolates lacked either INH or RIF DST data. Out of the remaining 7,909 isolates, 5,022 were pan-susceptible, 2887 were resistant to one or more drugs (DR) and of these 1937 were resistant to INH and RIF (MDR) and 288 were MDR and resistant to an SLI and a FLQ (XDR). The 8,550 isolates originated from 52 countries. Of these, 23 countries were represented by >10 isolates with resistance data, 21/23 were found to have MDR isolates and 9/21 had XDR (Figure 2B). We compared the MDR frequency in our WGS based sample with the WHO reported MDR/RIF resistance (RR) rates for the latest year available ${ }^{30}$. Out of the 21 countries, the confidence interval for the MDR-TB proportion in our sample overlapped with that of the WHO in 4 (19\%) countries, was higher in 14 (67\%) and lower in 3 (14\%) of countries (Table S4). MDR rates by lineage were 3\% for Lineage-1 ( $n=439$ ), 48\% for Lineage-2 ( $n=1085$ ), 4\% for Lineage-3 ( $n=760$ ) and $23 \%$ for Lineage-4 ( $n=3358$ ).

## Molecular dating of Resistance Acquisition

Of the 8,550 isolates, 2,451 isolates appeared in groups that did not meet our dating requirements (Methods). The remaining 6,009, included 1,547 isolates resistant to one or more drugs and were grouped into 179 country/lineage/drug combinations. We estimated 4,869 MRSCA dates for 10 drugs across these 179 groups. The number of independent resistance acquisition events i.e. unique MRSCA dates, was consistently lower than the total number of dated resistance isolates suggesting ongoing transmission of drug resistant isolates (Table S11). We estimated a lower bound on the burden of resistance due to transmission ranging by country from $\geq 14 \%$ to $\geq 52 \%$ pooled across drugs (Methods, Table S11). The proportion of INH or RIF resistance attributed to transmission was the highest among the 10 drugs at $\geq 43 \%$ and $\geq 46 \%$ respectively pooled across countries (pooled from Table S11).

We examined the relative order of phenotypic resistance acquisition on a global scale. For INH, we found that resistance to INH on average developed before resistance to other drugs (Figure 3A-B). Median MRSCA for INH was 11.4 years prior to isolation (IQR 6.3-16.2) vs. 7.6 years (IQR 3.0 - 16.0) for RIF, Wilcoxon P-value <10 ${ }^{-14}$. Median MRSCA ages for RIF and STR resistance ( 7.6 years, IQR 3.0 - 16.0 and 7.7 years, IQR $3.4-13.0$ respectively) were second oldest and not statistically significant from each other (Wilcoxon P-value 0.31). The dating supported that EMB resistance followed the acquisition of RIF (Wilcoxon P-value $<10^{-6}$ ) at a median MRSCA age of 5.0 years prior (IQR 2.1 - 12.5), and that this was followed by resistance to PZA, ETH, FLQ, SLIs, or CYS (Figure 3A), amongst which MRSCA ages did not significantly differ (Figure 3B). We found no significant correlation between the median MRSCA dates and
the drug's date of introduction into clinical use with $R^{2}=0.04$ (F-test with 1 DF P-value $=0.60$, Table S12).
We assessed the frequency of recent resistance amplification to PZA, EMB, FLQs and SLIs among MDR, i.e. to pre-XDR/XDR, within five years of sample isolation. Among the 11 countries with both MDR and pre-XDR/XDR isolates, we identified four countries (Peru, Russia, Sierra Leone, South Africa) with recent resistance amplification to PZA and EMB ( $>1 \%$ of MDR). The rates of recent amplification ranged from 2\% (95\% CI 1\% - 4\%) for PZA in Russia to 33\% (95\% $\mathrm{Cl} 26 \%-41 \%$ ) for EMB in South Africa (Figure 5). Peru, Romania and South Africa were also measured to have recent resistance amplification to FLQs and SLIs (Figure 5). The median MRSCA age for FLQ or SLI resistance acquisition among MDR isolates was 4.7 years (IQR 1.99.8) prior to sample collection.

We found RIF to have the highest proportion of old resistance (MRSCA >20 years prior to isolation) at $17 \%, 197 / 1184$ out of the total dated RIF resistance acquisition events. Old resistance was well distributed geographically and for RIF occurred in 9 of 12 countries with available dating data (Figure 4). Old FLQ resistance constituted 8\% (24/311) of total dated isolates and spanned 6 of the 7 countries with available data.

We compared the geographic distribution of MRSCA ages restricting to four key drug classes, namely INH, RIF, SLIs and FLQs, and the five countries with the largest number of resistant isolates (Figure 4). MRSCA ages did not differ between the UK and China across all four drug classes. These two countries had the oldest median MRSCA across the five countries and four drug classes except for INH. MRSCA ages in the UK were a median of 13.0 years (IQR 10.719.0) for RIF, a median of 10.6 years (IQR 7.3-11.2) for SLIs and a median of 8.4 years (IQR 6.718.4) for FLQs (Figure 4). South Africa most consistently had the youngest median MRSCA for the four drug classes, but its MRSCA distribution was not significantly different from that of Peru (for FLQs and SLIs) and Russia (for SLIs) (Table S3). A similar geographic/age pattern was observed for the drugs PZA and EMB across these five countries (Table S3).

We examined if the geographic resistance age differences correlated with resources available for TB control programs using the gross domestic product per capita as a proxy. We found GDP to correlate significantly with an older RIF MRSCA date with $R^{2}=0.47$ (F-test with 1 DF P-value= 0.014) (Figure 6 \& Table S8).

## Distribution of Resistance Mutations:

We assessed the frequency of 267 resistance mutations previously determined to be important for resistance prediction ${ }^{28}$ and their geographic distribution among the 8,550 isolates with country of origin and WGS data meeting quality criteria (Figure 1). Resistance mutation prevalence varied significantly by country. The most frequent INH causing mutation ${ }^{31}$, katG S315T was more frequent among phenotypically INH resistant isolates by DST (pheno-R) in Russia ( $84 \%, \mathrm{n}=526$ ) than in Peru ( $67 \%, \mathrm{n}=760$ ) (Fisher P-value $1 \times 10^{-12}$ ). The second most common INH resistance mutation -15 C>T fabG1/inhA promoter was more prevalent among INH pheno-R Peruvian isolates (20\%) than in Russian isolates (8\%) (Fisher P-value $7 \times 10^{-9}$ ). Twenty four of the 267 resistance mutations (9\%) varied geographically to a larger extent than the mutation fabG/inhA promoter $-15 \mathrm{C}>$ T (standard deviation $11 \%$, frequency range $0-39 \%$, Table S13). The mutation 1491F was recently described to be common in Estawini ${ }^{32}$ and is not detectable by line-probe or

GeneXpert commercial molecular diagnostics. In our sample that did not contain data from Estawini, we calculated a standard deviation of $1 \%$ for the global frequency of I491F (range 0\% 4\%) among RIF pheno-R isolates.

We calculated the proportion of pheno-R isolates that can be captured by the Hain Line-probe or GeneXpert commercial molecular diagnostics due to the presence of one or more mutations in their pooled target regions for the drugs INH, RIF, SLIs, and FLQ (Tables 1 and S14). Sensitivity was highest for RIF ( $90 \%$ of 2624 ) and lowest for FLQs ( $51 \%$ of 854 ). Specificity was consistently high (lowest for SLIs at 86\%) (Table 1). Second-line sensitivity of commercial diagnostics differed significantly across countries (Table S14). FLQ sensitivity in Peru was $38 \%$ ( $n=121$ ) and $77 \%$ in South Africa ( $n=111$ ) (Fisher $P$-value $1 \times 10^{-6}$ ). A similarly low sensitivity for SLI resistance was seen in Peru compared with South Africa (Fisher P-value $3 \times 10^{-4}$ ) (Table S14).

We examined if expanding the resistance mutation list to variants previously characterized in diverse global MTB genomic datasets using direct association ${ }^{29}$ or random forests ${ }^{28}$ can improve sensitivity and specificity in a "select WGS test." The select WGS test improved sensitivity slightly for INH and SLIs with relatively preserved specificity (Table 1). In addition select WGS test allowed for prediction of resistance to other drugs not tested by commercial diagnostics: PZA, EMB and Streptomycin. For comparison, we assessed if including any nonsilent variant in the resistance regions (excluding a select number of known lineage markers) was indeed inferior to the more informed 'select WGS test" reported previously. We found that this "all WGS test" only modestly improved sensitivity and at the expense of a larger decrease in specificity (Figure 7).

## Discussion

Using 8,550 clinical MTB sequences with culture-based DST, we examined geographic trends in the DR-TB epidemic. Geographically, MTB lineages $1-4$ were each represented in the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa providing evidence of disease spread across borders, likely driven by human migration ${ }^{30}$. We found MDR-TB in nearly every country represented by more than 10 isolates. XDR isolates were found in half of these countries and spanning all five major continents. Lineage-2 had the highest percentage of MDR isolates in our sample followed by Lineages-4, 3 and 1. Using this diverse sample we dated more than 4869 resistance phenotypes across 4 lineages and 15 countries.

We found a consistent order of resistance acquisition globally among drug classes. The development of INH resistance was previously found to be a sentinel event heralding the development of $\mathrm{MDR}^{33}$. Our results corroborate these findings using phenotypic resistance data and across a larger geographically diverse sample. After INH, we find that MTB acquires resistance to RIF/STR then EMB followed by PZA, ETH, FLQ, SLIs, or CYS. We found no correlation between the age of resistance acquisition and the year of clinical introduction of the drug but there may be multiple other causes for the observed order of resistance acquisition. Differences in mutation rates across drug targets or resistance genes have been postulated but shown to be an unlikely explanation for INH resistance arising first ${ }^{34,35}$. Pharmacokinetic difference may result in higher risk for under-dosing ${ }^{36}$ for some drugs and earlier resistance acquisition. Bacterial fitness costs are also variable across resistance mutations. For INH
resistance, mutations like katG S315T carry a low fitness cost and likely contribute to resistance arising earliest for this drug ${ }^{33,37,38}$. The order of drug administration can explain dating differences between first-line (INH, RIF, EMB, PZA) and second (ETH, FLQ, SLIs) or third-line (CYS) resistance, as second-line drugs are usually only administered after resistance to firstline drugs is ascertained. Acquisition of resistance to INH first then RIF may also relate to their use for treatment of latent TB infection, leading to more exposure and selection pressure overall. However, because adoption of INH preventative therapy for latent TB remains low in many parts of the world, we expect it to be a lesser contributor to INH and RIF resistance rates ${ }^{39}$. Lastly, the observation of contemporaneous acquisition of RIF and STR resistance is likely best explained by the effects of Category II TB treatment initially recommended in $1991^{40}$. Category II is no longer recommended by the WHO but consists of adding streptomycin to the first-line drug regimen after treatment failure. Our dating supports that streptomycin resistance amplified among patients failing due to recent RIF resistance and/or MDR acquisition.

Published evidence supports that most resistant cases of MTB result from recent resistance acquisition in the host or are related to transmission ${ }^{41}$. Reactivation of resistant MTB disease acquired remotely (>2 years prior) is much less likely ${ }^{42}$. Thus the identification of isolates with old resistance suggests high fitness for continued transmission between human hosts. Most countries with available data had isolates with resistance dated more than 20 years prior. This is also supported by our phylogenetic assessment where we estimate a lower bound of TB resistance due to transmission to range between $14-52 \%$ across countries with available data. As our approach cannot distinguish between resistance importation through human migration after transmission outside of the country and new resistance acquisition, these figures are underestimates of the true resistance burden due to transmission. Mathematical models of TB rates have previously predicted transmission to be a major driver of observed resistance rates ${ }^{43}$, we present here WGS based evidence of the high burden of resistance transmission. Mathematical models have also emphasized that drug resistant strain fitness is a key parameter that dictates how the resistance epidemic will unfold. Our results support that $>14-52 \%$ of isolates are fit and successfully transmitting patient-to-patient and in most countries there have been uninterrupted chains of resistance transmission for >20 years. These data emphasize the need to contain resistance transmission through improved diagnosis, treatment and other preventative strategies such as infection control and vaccine development.

In addition to transmission, we find evidence for recent resistance amplification, especially to second-line drugs mediating the transition from MDR to XDR-TB. XDR has considerably worse treatment outcome than susceptible TB and incurs more than 25 times the cost ${ }^{44}$. We estimate that half of FLQ and SLI resistant isolates had acquired resistance within 4.7 years of isolation despite the promotion of directly-observed-therapy (DOT) by the WHO since 1994. As most FLQ and SLI resistant isolates are also MDR, our results also emphasize the need for better regimens to treat MDR that can prevent resistance amplification. By country, we found a significant correlation between the estimated age of resistance acquisition and per capita GDP, with more affluent countries having older ages of resistance. This unexpected correlation is likely driven by a combination of factors but the routine use of DST and close patient monitoring in the more well-resourced health systems are likely important contributors. Specifically, we found the UK and China to have the oldest resistance ages across the drugs. The Chinese national TB program budget was increased from $\$ 98$ million in 2002 to $\$ 272$ million in $2007^{45}$
and a new policy for free TB diagnostics tests and drug use was introduced in 2004 ${ }^{58,46}$. This increased investment can explain the observed low rates of recent resistance acquisition in China ${ }^{30,47}$.

Likely due to geographic differences in MTB lineage, transmission and resistance acquisition rates, we find $10 \%$ of assayed resistance mutations to have high geographic variance. We also found commercial diagnostics to vary in sensitivity for second-line drugs. Given recent reports about the accuracy of WGS for confirming susceptibility of MTB ${ }^{29}$, we measured improvements in resistance sensitivity offered by including mutations outside of regions targeted by commercial diagnostics through direct association. This offered modest improvements in sensitivity with little to no change in specificity. We found a considerable number of indeterminate mutations in resistance regions, that when included with simple direct association improve sensitivity but at the expense of loss of specificity. The study of these variants through statistical models will likely further inform their diagnostic use in the future ${ }^{28,48}$.

Our study has several limitations including the oversampling of DR isolates as evidenced by our comparison with WHO reported MDR rates. We tried to control for this by dating only in countries with at least $20 \%$ susceptible isolates and limiting dating of low diversity samples that represent unique outbreak settings and lack long term information about resistance acquisition. This may have resulted in underestimation of rates of recent resistance acquisition but despite this we were able to document recent resistance acquisition in many countries. Molecular dating is also reliant on the accurate estimation of the phylogenetic tree of MTB isolates and the molecular clock assumption. We thus used a rigorous approach to phylogenetic estimation and dating despite its computational and time cost ${ }^{49}$. Our analysis also assumes the accuracy of culture based phenotypic DST, even though test to test variability is known to exist. We justify this as our data was curated from ReseqTB ${ }^{15}$ and studies were phenotypic testing was performed in national or supranational laboratories with rigorous quality control.
Overall, our results support that DR rates are fuelled by both recent resistance acquisition and ongoing transmission, and suggest the need for better detection, treatment and health system investment. In the future, reassessment of these patterns will be enabled by the sharing of systematically collected isolate data, data that is increasingly generated as by-products of TB surveillance and resistance diagnosis ${ }^{29}$.

Figures and Tables
Figure 1: Flow diagram showing process of identification and exclusion of genomic data included in the study. WGS: Whole genome sequencing, QC: Quality control.


Figure 2: Global Distribution of $\boldsymbol{M}$. tuberculosis in the study sample. Counts from countries represented by fewer than 10 isolates $(n=75)$ not shown. A: Lineage distribution ( $n=8477$ ). Pie charts represent the proportion of each lineage among isolates available from each country. Size of the pie is proportional to the number of isolates from each country. Detailed counts are in Table S1. B: Drug resistance distribution ( $n=7834$ ). Pie charts provide the distribution of resistance patterns (S: Susceptible, MDR: Multidrug-resistant, XDR: Extensively drug resistant, INH Mono: mono resistant to isoniazid, STR Mono: mono resistant to streptomycin, Other R: resistance other than defined categories) by country. 75 isolates originated Pie size is proportional to the number of isolates in each country (Table S2).
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2B:

|  | INH | RIF | EMB | PZA | STR | FLQ | SLIs | ETH | CYS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| INH |  | $5 \mathrm{E}-16$ | $2 \mathrm{E}-29$ | $3 \mathrm{E}-46$ | $1 \mathrm{E}-17$ | $1 \mathrm{E}-31$ | $1 \mathrm{E}-59$ | $1 \mathrm{E}-23$ | $5 \mathrm{E}-6$ |
| RIF |  |  | $2 \mathrm{E}-6$ | $1 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 0.3 | $4 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $9 \mathrm{E}-21$ | $2 \mathrm{E}-8$ | $9 \mathrm{E}-4$ |
| EMB |  |  |  | $1 \mathrm{E}-3$ | $5 \mathrm{E}-4$ | 0.01 | $1 \mathrm{E}-4$ | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| PZA |  |  |  |  | $5 \mathrm{E}-12$ | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.08 |
| STR |  |  |  |  |  | $5 \mathrm{E}-8$ | $2 \mathrm{E}-16$ | $6 \mathrm{E}-6$ | $3 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| FLQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| SLIs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| ETH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |
| CYS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 3A: MRSCA distribution by drug ( $\mathbf{n}=4844$ ). Boxplots showing range of MRSCA distribution globally for nine anti-tubercular drugs (MRSCA: Most recent susceptible common ancestor, INH: isoniazid, RIF: rifampicin, EMB: ethambutol, PZA: pyrazinamide, STR: streptomycin, FLQ: fluoroquinolones, SLIs: second-line injectables, ETH: ethionamide, CYS: cycloserine)


Figure 3B: Pairwise Wilcoxon rank sum tests comparing MRSCA ages by drug category. Dark red indicates P-value $<0.001$ (Bonferroni threshold); pink indicates P-value $<0.01$; white indicates $P$-value $\geq 0.01$.

Figure 4: Box and whisker plots summarizing the MRSCA distribution per country. (Blue vertical line indicates year when drug was introduced (Table S5))
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Figure 5: Proportion of MDR isolates with recent amplification of resistance to ethambutol (EMB), pyrazinamide (PZA), fluoroquinolones (FLQ) or second-line injectables (SLIs) by country (MRSCA age estimate $<5$ years ago). The legend lists the number of multidrug-resistant isolates analysed from each country. Error bars indicate 95\% confidence intervals. Full data given in Supplementary Table 3. Four countries displayed a measurable proportion of recent FLQ and SLI amplification ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ does not include 0) - South Africa, Peru, Romania and China.


Figure 6: Median Rifamycin (RIF) most-recent-common-susceptible-ancestor (MRSCA) date vs Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita for 12 countries. Data plotted is provided in Supplementary Table 7 and includes other drugs than RIF. ( $R^{2}=0.47$, F-test P-value (1 DF) $=0.014$ ).

## Median MRSCA RIF vs GDP per capita



Table 1: Sensitivity and Specificity of commercial and WGS based tests for resistance diagnosis. Abbreviations defined in "drug resistance definitions" section of methods.

| Drug | commercial test |  | RF-select WGS test |  | DA-select WGS test |  | all WGS test* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivty | Specificty |
| INH | 83\% (2759/3306) | 93\% (4834/5201) | 88\% (2900/3306) | 92\% (4780/5201) | 89\% (2956/3306) | 92\% (4776/5201) | 92\% (3029/3306) | 64\% (3314/5201) |
| RIF | 90\% (2354/2624) | 93\% (5361/5786) | 91\% (2385/2624) | 92\% (5341/5786) | 91\% (2395/2624) | 92\% (5338/5786) | 92\% (2405/2624) | 89\% (5178/5786) |
| FLQ | 53\% (452/854) | 94\% (2626/2790) | 51\% (439/854) | 95\% (2637/2790) | 51\% (440/854) | 95\% (2641/2790) | 57\% (488/854) | 86\% (2406/2790) |
| SLI | 56\% (517/921) | 86\% (2179/2547) | 58\% (535/921) | 84\% (2136/2547) | 57\% (524/921) | 86\% (2185/2547) | 64\% (594/921) | 80\% (2027/2547) |
| PZA |  |  | 65\% (862/1324) | 95\% (4660/4907) | $75 \%$ (996/1324) | 91\% (4485/4907) | 78\% (1030/1324) | 89\% (4384/4907) |
| EMB |  |  | 79\% (1476/1863) | 86\% (4702/5441) | 75\% (1389/1863) | 88\% (4772/5441) | 85\% (1589/1863) | 74\% (4042/5441) |
| STR |  |  | 76\% (1601/2112) | 86\% (3204/3726) | $77 \%$ (1627/2112) | 87\% (3223/3726) | 91\% (1928/2112) | $71 \%(2657 / 3726)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * | classifying FLQ and SLI as susceptible if no INH and no RIF resistance mutation found |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sensitivity | Percent of resistant isolates classified as resistant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specificity | Percent of susceptible isolates classified as susceptible |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Supplementary Methods:

## Data curation and quality control:

The isolate metadata including their geographic locations were downloaded using metatools_ncbi (https://github.com/farhat-lab/metatools ncbi). We also performed literature curation to fill the gaps in the NCBI geographic location data. The resulting table of the geographic locations of the isolates is available in Supplementary File 1. We excluded isolates that did not meet WGS quality control criteria as detailed below, had no geographic information or were not tested for phenotypic resistance to one or more drugs.

## Genomic analysis/variant calling:

Briefly, reads were trimmed using PRINSEQ ${ }^{1}$ setting average phred score threshold to 20 . Raw read data was confirmed to belong to MTB complex using Kraken ${ }^{2}$. Isolates with $<90 \%$ mapping were excluded. Reads were aligned to H37Rv (GenBank NC000962.3) reference genome using BWA MEM ${ }^{3}$. Duplicate reads were removed using PICARD ${ }^{4}$. We excluded any isolates with coverage $<95 \%$ of known drug resistance regions (katG, inhA \& its promoter, $r p o B, e m b A, e m b B, e m b C \& e m b B$ promoter, $e t h A, g y r A$ and $g y r B, r r s, r p s L, g i d, p n c A, r p s A$, eis promoter) at 10 x or higher. Variants were called using Pilon ${ }^{5}$ that uses local assembly to increase indel (insertions and deletions) call accuracy. This deviates from Ezewudo et al. that uses Samtools for variant calling ${ }^{6}$. The reference allele was implied if allele frequency was $<75 \%$ or the Pilon filter was not PASS. Low confidence coordinates were filtered from all strains if $>95 \%$ of strains did not have coverage of (trimmed reads) at least 10 x at that site. Isolate lineage belonging to one of the seven main MTB lineages was confirmed using the Coll et al. SNP barcode ${ }^{7}$.

Drug resistance definitions and comparison with WHO reported resistance proportions:
The 'Mono' resistant designation was given to isolates that were resistant to only one specific drug and susceptible to all others that were tested, with the exception of the INH-mono resistant category that encompassed any isolates that were resistant to INH and/or STR but not to others that were tested. The 'Other-R' category was reserved for isolates that were resistant to some drugs but were neither INH or STR mono resistant, nor MDR or XDR. Isolates were labelled susceptible if they were susceptible to all drugs tested.

To compute exact binomial confidence intervals for MDR proportions by country we used the python library statsmodel ${ }^{8}$. To assess overlap with World Health Organization (WHO) estimates we determined whether the confidence intervals of our proportion intersected with that of the WHO. We labelled our estimate as high if our confidence interval was higher than the WHO, low if it was lower, and the same if they intersected.

## Estimating resistance acquisition dates and lower bounds of resistance transmission:

A maximum likelihood tree was generated for each group via RAxML 8.2.11 ${ }^{9}$ with H 37 Rv (NC000962.3) as the outgroup, starting from a neighbour-joining seed tree and assuming a generalized time reversible (GTR) nucleotide substitution model with the $\Gamma$ distribution used to model site rate heterogeneity ${ }^{10}$. We bootstrapped the maximum likelihood tree 1000 times. The maximum likelihood tree was dated using BEAST v1.10.4 ${ }^{11}$ assuming a relaxed molecular clock with a log normal distribution and a mean rate of 0.5 SNP per genome per year based on prior published data ${ }^{12}$. Sumtrees.py from the DendroPy library ${ }^{13}$ was then used to combine the output from the bootstrap analysis and that of BEAST to get our final dated phylogenetic tree with nodal bootstrap support.

We dated the most recent common ancestor between all the resistant isolates and their most closely related susceptible isolate. Accordingly, the dates of resistance acquisition will be referred to as the estimated age of the most recent susceptible common ancestor (MRSCA) in years prior to isolation of the clinical sample(s) throughout the text. We excluded resistant isolates with MRSCAs inferred at nodes with less than 50 bootstrap support.

We calculated the number of phylogenetically inferred resistance acquisition events ( $N_{a q}$ ) per country and lineage as the number of unique MRSCAs identified. This was compared with the total resistant isolates that could be dated $\left(N_{t d}\right)$. Phylogenetically inferred unique resistance acquisition events for a particular country may be related to either in host evolution of new resistance or due to human migration/importation from another country with the latter still possibly related to transmission elsewhere. Thus, the following quantity represents a lower bound on the burden of resistance due to transmission for a particular country:

$$
\left(N_{t d}-N_{a q}\right) / N_{t d}
$$

To estimate the order of resistance acquisition for different drugs we pooled the MRSCA dates by drug across countries and lineages. We compared the medians of the MRSCA distributions and performed pairwise Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests to assess for statistical significance, correcting for multiple testing using the Bonferroni approach. Interquartile ranges were calculated using the python package numpy ${ }^{14}$.

We correlated the median MRSCA date per drug pooled across countries against the date of drug introduction using linear regression as implemented in Microsoft Excel version 16.25.

## Distribution of resistance mutations

We measured resistance mutations' geographic variance by calculating the proportion of resistant isolates with the resistance mutation per country, excluding countries with less than 10 resistant isolates for a particular drug. We computed the standard deviation of this distribution of proportions across countries. To test cross-country differences in the proportion of INH phenotypically resistant isolates that contained specific mutations, we used a Fisher-test using the python library scipy ${ }^{15}$.

## GDP/Programmatic Spending

To correlate countries' gross domestic product (GDP) per capita against resistance acquisition dates, GDP per capita data for 2019 was gathered from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) ${ }^{16}$ and plotted against the median MRSCA date for RIF using Microsoft Excel version 16.25. F-value and significance was calculated via Anova ${ }^{17}$ in Excel.

## Supplementary Material

## Supplementary Table 1 Global Lineage Distribution

|  | Lineage-1 | Lineage-2 | Lineage-3 | Lineage-4 | Lineage-5 | Lineage-6 | Lineage-7 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belarus | 0 | 87 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| China | 0 | 132 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 |
| Germany | 0 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 857 |
| India | 5 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Iran | 0 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Malawi | 208 | 10 | 162 | 945 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1427 |
| Mali | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Moldova | 0 | 16 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Netherlands | 7 | 19 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Peru | 0 | 82 | 0 | 869 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1098 |
| Portugal | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Romania | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Russia | 0 | 525 | 1 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 868 |
| Sierra Leone | 3 | 2 | 0 | 41 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 79 |
| South Africa | 8 | 144 | 23 | 427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 974 |
| South Korea | 0 | 37 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Sweden | 2 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Thailand | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Uganda | 2 | 3 | 18 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| United Kingdom | 222 | 102 | 560 | 716 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1873 |
| United States of America | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 |
| Unknown | 37 | 81 | 35 | 792 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1749 |
| Total | 495 | 1344 | 814 | 4411 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 10226 |

## Supplementary Table 2 Global Resistance Distribution and Other Resistance Count

Abbreviations: Susceptible (S), Multi-drug Resistant (MDR), Extensively Drug Resistant (XDR), Isoniazid Mono Resistant (INH_MONO), Streptomycin Mono Resistant (STR_MONO), Other Resistant (OTHER_R), Sum With Data (SUM_W_DATA)

| country | S | MDR | XDR | INH_MONO | STR_MONO | OTHER_R | NO_DATA | SUM | SUM_W_DATA | MDR/OTHER_R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belarus | 28 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 135 | 30 | NA |
| Canada | 163 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 165 | NA |
| China | 46 | 117 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 170 | 163 | NA |
| Germany | 749 | 13 | 0 | 40 | 34 | 14 | 7 | 857 | 850 | 0.928571429 |
| India | 22 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 52 | 39 | NA |
| Iran | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 21 | NA |
| Malawi | 1302 | 7 | 0 | 90 | 1 | 3 | 24 | 1427 | 1403 | 2.333333333 |
| Mali | 20 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 37 | 35 | NA |
| Moldova | 38 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 51 | 40 | NA |
| Netherlands | 68 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 5 | 98 | 93 | NA |
| Not Provided | 179 | 646 | 138 | 90 | 6 | 109 | 719 | 1749 | 1030 | 5.926605505 |
| Peru | 94 | 674 | 86 | 34 | 5 | 134 | 157 | 1098 | 941 | 5.029850746 |
| Romania | 0 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | NA |
| Russia | 261 | 420 | 42 | 80 | 17 | 76 | 14 | 868 | 854 | 5.526315789 |
| Sierra Leone | 41 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 79 | 79 | 0.8 |
| South Africa | 612 | 172 | 102 | 34 | 8 | 56 | 92 | 974 | 882 | 3.071428571 |
| South Korea | 16 | 25 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 80 | 41 | NA |
| Swaziland | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 1 |
| Thailand | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 16 | NA |
| Turkmenistan | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0.333333333 |
| Uganda | 10 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 80 | 58 | 22.5 |
| United Kingdom | 1525 | 83 | 4 | 187 | 5 | 50 | 23 | 1873 | 1850 | 1.66 |
| ited States of Ameri | 0 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 34 | 30 | 29 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 263 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 265 | 265 | 263 |
| Total | 5201 | 2583 | 426 | 583 | 112 | 460 | 1246 | 10185 | 8939 | 5.615217391 |

Abbreviations: RIF (Rifamycin), ETH (Ethionamide), FQ (Fluoroquinolones), SLIS (Second Line Injectable), "," (AND-EX: RIF_ISONIAZID_ETH = Isolate resistant to Rifamycin, Isoniazid, and Ethionamide)


## Supplementary Table 3 Pairwise Country MRSCA date comparison

Dark red indicates P-value $<0.001$ (Bonferroni threshold); pink indicates P-value $<0.01$; white indicates P -value $\geq 0.01$. ${ }^{*}$ No PZA resistance phenotypes was available on Chinese isolates.

| INH | Peru | South Africa | China | UK | Russia |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peru |  | 6E-9 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 9 E-5 |
| South Africa |  |  | 7 E-29 | 2 E-32 | 3 E-7 |
| China |  |  |  | 0.2 | $4 \mathrm{E}-17$ |
| UK |  |  |  | $5 \mathrm{E}-15$ |  |
| Russia |  |  |  |  |  |


| FLQ | Peru | South <br> Africa | China | UK | Russia |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peru |  | 0.3 | $6 \mathrm{E}-10$ | 1 E-6 | $1 \mathrm{E}-4$ |
| South Africa |  |  | $2 \mathrm{E}-19$ | $1 \mathrm{E}-15$ | 2 E-7 |
| China |  |  |  | 0.04 | 0.6 |
| UK |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |
| Russia |  |  |  |  |  |


| SLIs | Peru | South Africa | China | UK | Russia |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peru |  | 0.4 | 1 E-8 | 2 E-5 | 0.2 |
| South Africa |  |  | $5 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $9 \mathrm{E}-8$ | 0.5 |
| China |  |  |  | 0.8 | $2 \mathrm{E}-4$ |
| UK |  |  |  |  | 1 E-3 |
| Russia |  |  |  |  |  |



## Supplementary Table 4 MDR Frequency Comparison:

Comparison of MDR Frequency between our estimate based on WGS data (WGS MDR Frequency) and estimate based on WHO data (WHO MDR Frequency). Number of isolates with resistance data per country is provided in the "Total Number of Isolates" column.

|  | WGS MDR Frequency | WHO MDR Frequency | Total Number of Isolates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belarus | $0.03 \pm 0.07$ | 0.71(0.67-0.75) | 30 |
| Canada | 0 | 0.01(0.01-0.02) | 165 |
| China | $0.72 \pm 0.07$ | 0.08(0.07-0.09) | 163 |
| Germany | $0.02 \pm 0.01$ | 0.03(0.02-0.05) | 850 |
| India | $0.33 \pm 0.15$ | 0.05(0.04-0.06) | 39 |
| Iran | $0.29 \pm 0.19$ | 0.02(0.01-0.02) | 21 |
| Malawi | $0.01 \pm 0.01$ | 0.01(0.01-0.02) | 1403 |
| Mali | $0.26 \pm 0.14$ | 0.03(0.02-0.04) | 35 |
| Moldova | $0.05 \pm 0.07$ | 0.34(0.31-0.36) | 40 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0.02 (<0.01-0.01) | 93 |
| Not Provided | $0.63 \pm 0.03$ |  | 1030 |
| Peru | $0.70 \pm 0.03$ | 0.09 (0.09-0.1) | 941 |
| Romania | 1 | 0.05(0.05-0.06) | 33 |
| Russia | $0.49 \pm 0.03$ | 0.43(0.43-0.44) | 854 |
| Sierra Leone | $0.10 \pm 0.07$ | 0.03(0.02-0.04) | 79 |
| South Africa | $0.20 \pm 0.03$ | 0.04(0.04-0.05) | 882 |
| South Korea | $0.61 \pm 0.15$ | 0.04(0.03-0.04) | 41 |
| Swaziland | $0.10 \pm 0.19$ | 0.1 (0.09-0.11) | 10 |
| Thailand | $0.94 \pm 0.12$ | 0.03(0.03-0.04) | 16 |
| Turkmenistan | $0.10 \pm 0.17$ | 0.22(0.19-0.24) | 11 |
| Uganda | $0.78 \pm 0.11$ | 0.02(0.02-0.03) | 58 |
| United Kingdom | $0.04 \pm 0.01$ | 0.02(0.01-0.02) | 1850 |
| United States of America | $0.97 \pm 0.06$ | 0.02(0.01-0.02) | 30 |
| Uzbekistan | $0.99 \pm 0.01$ | 0.33(0.29-0.34) | 265 |

Supplementary Table 5 Dates Drugs Introduced

| Drug | Year Introduced |
| :---: | :---: |
| Isoniazid ${ }^{18}$ | 1952 |
| Rifampicin ${ }^{18}$ | 1965 |
| Pyrazinamide ${ }^{19}$ | 1952 |
| Streptomycin ${ }^{18}$ | 1944 |
| Ethambutol ${ }^{18}$ | 1965 |
| Ethionamide ${ }^{18}$ | 1960 |
| Kanamycin/amikacin ${ }^{18}$ | 1958 |
| Cycloserine ${ }^{18}$ | 1955 |
| Capreomycin ${ }^{18}$ | 1967 |
| PAS ${ }^{18}$ | 1944 |
| Ofloxacin ${ }^{20}$ | 1985 |
| Moxifloxacin ${ }^{20}$ | 1999 |
| Ciprofloxacin ${ }^{20}$ | 1986 |

## Supplementary Table 6 Resistance Mutation Counts Per Country and Per Isolate Phenotype

Amikacin (AMK) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to AMK, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to AMK, resistant = how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to AMK

| country | AMK_SNP_N_1472359_A514C_rrs | AMK_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_rrs | AMK_othersnp | AMK_rrs_A906G_u | AMK_rrs_C517T_u | AMK_rrs_G1484T_u | AMK_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | , | 0 |
| Belarus | 20 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colombia | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |
| Guinea | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 39 | 160 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 100 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 14 | 110 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Russia | 17 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 15 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | 83 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| South Korea | 2 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 16 | 8 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | 13 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AMK_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_rrs | 639 | 208 | 45 | 386 |
| AMK_SNP_N_1472359_A514C_rrs | 223 | 84 | 38 | 101 |
| AMK_unknown | 213 | 0 | 0 | 213 |
| AMK_rrs_C517T_u | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| AMK_rrs_G1484T_u | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| AMK_rrs_A906G_u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| AMK_rrs_C513T_u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| AMK_rrs_A1461G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_A908C_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_C1105G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_C1402T_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_C799A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_C905A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_C905G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AMK_rrs_G878A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Capreomycin (CAP) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to CAP, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to CAP, resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to CAP

| country | CAP_SNP_N_1472753_A908C_rrs | CAP_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_rrs | CAP_othersnp | CAP_rrs_A514C_u | CAP_rrs_C517T_u | CAP_rrs_G1484T_u | CAP_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\square 0$ | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| Colombia | 0 | $\square$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 2 | 160 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 53 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 3 | 110 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Russia | 1 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 20 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| South Africa | 0 | 164 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| South Korea | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| United Kingdom | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 46 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CAP_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_rrs | 639 | 167 | 127 | 345 |
| CAP unknown | 208 | 0 | 0 | 208 |
| CAP_rrs_C517T_u | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| CAP_SNP_N_1472753_A908C_rrs | 11 | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| CAP_rrs_A514C_u | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| CAP_rrs_G1484T_u | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| CAP_rrs_A906G_u | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| CAP_rrs_C513T_u | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| CAP_rrs_C1402T_u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| CAP_rrs_C1105G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_C1390T_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_C1402A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_C239A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_C905A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_T1322G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_T16A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_T16C_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_rrs_T556C_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAP_SNP_N_1473109_T1264G_rrs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CAP_SNP_N_1473160_G1315A_rrs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CAP_SNP_N_1473343_G1498T_rrs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Ciprofloxacin (CIP) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to CIP, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to CIP, resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to CIP

| country | CIP_SNP_CN_7570_CT_gyrA_A90V | CIP_SNP_CN_7572_TC_gyrA_S91P | CIP_SNP_CN_7581_GT_gyrA_D94Y | CIP_SNP_CN_7582_AC_gyrA_D94A | CIP_SNP_CN_7582_AG_gyrA_D94G | CIP_othersnp | CIP_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | - | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 23 | -6 | 3 | 11 | 21 | 2 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 11 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| Colombia | , | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Morocco | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 57 | 36 | 13 | 25 | 86 | 11 | 6 |
| Pakistan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 20 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 29 | 7 | 0 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 2 | 0 | , | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Russia | 10 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| Rwanda | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | 78 | 4 | 6 | 21 | 44 | 1 | 0 |
| South Korea | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4 | 22 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 7 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 2 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIP_SNP_CN_7582_AG_gyrA_D94G | 286 | 249 | 1 | 36 |
| CIP SNP CN_7570 CT_gyrA A90V | 229 | 201 | 12 | 16 |
| CIP_SNP_CN_7582_AC_gyrA_D94A | 94 | 92 | 2 | 0 |
| CIP_SNP_CN_7572_TC_gyrA_S91P | 69 | 63 | 2 | 4 |
| CIP_SNP_CN_7581_GT_gyrA D94Y | 34 | 28 | 0 | 6 |
| CIP_unknown | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| CIP_SNP_CN_6735_AC_gyrB_N538T | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| CIP_SNP_CN_7566_GA_gyrA_D89N | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| CIP_gyrA_A74S_u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CIP_gyrA D 94 N u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CIP_gyrB_A471V_u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CIP gyrB S 486 F _u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CIP gyrB_T539N_u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CIP gyrA_A288D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CIP_gyrA_D94H_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Ethambutol (EMB) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to EMB, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to EMB , resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to EMB

| country | EMB_SNP_CN_4242182_GT_embC_A774S | EMB_SNP_CN_4247429_AG_embB_M 306 V | EMB_SNP_CN_4247431_GA_embB_M3061 | EMB_SNP_CN_4247431_GC_embB_M3061 | EMB_SNP_CN_4247431_GT_embB_M3061 | EMB_othersnp | EMB_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladesh | $\bigcirc 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| Belarus | $\square 0$ | 16 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 30 |  |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| China | 0 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 45 |  |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |  | 0 |  |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Estonia | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |
| Germany | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 12 |  |
| Guinea | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| India | 0 | 4 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Iran | 0 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 |  |
| Mali | 0 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| Moldova | 0 | 5 |  | 5 |  | 11 |  |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Not Provided | 54 | 203 | 135 | 135 | 135 | 280 | 34 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Peru | 220 | 139 | 178 | 178 | 178 | 367 | 121 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 |  | , |  | 0 |  |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | $\square 1$ | 0 |  |
| Romania | 0 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 17 |  |
| Russia | 0 | 93 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 232 | 46 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Sierra Leone | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  |
| South Africa | 0 | 139 | 132 | 132 | 132 | 56 |  |
| South Korea | 0 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 16 |  |
| Spain | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |  |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 1 |  |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\square$ | 0 |  |
| Uganda | 1 | 7 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |  |
| United Kingdom | 10 | 21 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 31 |  |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 115 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 60 |  |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
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Ethionamide (ETH) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to ETH, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to ETH, resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to ETH

| country | ETH_SNP_CN_1674263_TC_ inhA_121T | ETH_SNP_CN_1674481_TG_inhA_S94A | ETH_SNP_CN_436333_CG_ethA_A381P | ETH_SNP_P_1673423_GT.17_fabG1.inhA | ETH_SNP_P_1673425_CT. 15 _fabG1.inh | ETH _othersnp | ETH_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 |  | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 |  | 0 |  | $\square$ | 0 | 0 |
| China | - 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 15 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 1 | $\square$ | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\square 1$ | 0 | 0 |
| Germany |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia |  | 0 | 0 |  | , | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |  |
| Mali | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |  |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Nigeria | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 12 | 98 | 12 | 14 | 573 | 51 | 46 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Peru | 33 | 20 | 1 | 27 | 178 | 100 | 76 |
| Philippines |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Russia |  | 4 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 0 |  |
| Rwanda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - 1 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | , | 2 | 76 | 37 | 113 | 11 | 6 |
| South Korea | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 10 |
| Spain | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | - 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 4 | 0 | 1 |
| United Kingdom | 2 | - 4 | 1 | 6 | 76 | 1 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | , | 0 | 1 |
| Vietnam |  |  | $\square$ |  | - 1 | 0 |  |
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| resistance mutation | counts | no data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETH SNP P 1673425_CT. 15 fabG1.inhA | 1138 | 716 | 157 | 265 |
| ETH unknown | 158 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| ETH SNP CN 1674481 TG inhA S94A | 148 | 52 | 13 | 83 |
| ETH SNP CN 4326333 CG ethA A381P | 90 | 21 | 35 | 34 |
| ETH SNP P P 1673423_GT. 17 fabG1.inhA | 89 | 32 | 38 | 19 |
| ETH SNP CN 1674263 TC inhA I21T | 57 | 18 | 10 | 29 |
| ETH SNP CN 4326116 GA ethA T453I | 35 | 6 | 14 | 15 |
| ETH SNP CN 4327380 AC ethA Y Y32D | 15 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| ETH upstream intergenic-fabG1-inhA T8A u | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| ETH DEL F 4326184 d1289G ethA | 12 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| ETH SNP CN 4327416 CA ethA A20S | 12 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| ETH ethA P378L u | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| ETH INS F F 4326722_i751C ethA | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| ETH SNP CN 4326305 GA ethA S390F | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| ETH SNP CN_ 4326713_TG_ethA Q254P | 6 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| ETH upstream intergenic-fabG1-inhA T8C_u | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| ETH upstream intergenic-fabG1-inhA T8G_u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| ETH ethA S266R u | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| ETH ethA C403R u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| ETH ethA E400D u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| ETH ethA F302L u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| ETH ethA S 110 W u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| ETH ethA Y50C u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| ETH SNP CN 4327311 AG ethA S55P | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ETH ethA A76V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA F320S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA F 431 V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G139C_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G139S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G139V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G182S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G423R _ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G43C u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA G450D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA H166P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA L134P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA L194P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA L205P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA L374R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA L397R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA N379D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA P P149S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA P257A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA P257S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA P51H u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA P51L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA P51S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA Q206E u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA Q246R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA R38P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA_ R 404 L _ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA R54S_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA S18R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA S S208P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA S 57 F - u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA T189K u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA T342K u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA T383P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA T392R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA T44P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA T61M u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH ethA Y235D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH fabG1 L85V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH inhA I194T u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH inhA I21V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH inhA 195 L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH upstream intergenic-fabG1-inhA C34T u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ETH INS F 4326141 i1332C ethA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ETH SNP CN 1673449 AC fabG1 T4P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ETH SNP CN 1674434 TG inhA V78G | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ETH SNP CN 4326278 GT ethA S399. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ETH SNP CN 4326600_GA ethA R292. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ETH SNP CN 4326714 GA ethA Q254. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ETH SNP CN 4327148_CT ethA W109. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Isoniazid (INH) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to INH , susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to INH , resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to INH

| country | INH_SNP_CN_1674481_TG_inhA_S94A | INH_SNP_CN_2155168_CG_katG_S315T | INH_SNP_CN_2518919_GA_kasA_G269S | INH_SNP_CN_409569_GA_iniB_A70T | INH_SNP_P_1673425_CT.15_fabG1.inhA | INH_othersnp | INH_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | , |  |  |  | , |  | 0 |
| Bangladesh | , | $\square 1$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| Belarus | , | 101 | 23 | 0 | 30 | 43 | 1 |
| Brazil | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |  | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 |  | 0 |
| China | 1 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 4 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | $\square 1$ | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 3 | 43 | 24 | 2 | 21 | 4 | 4 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 11 | 50 | 24 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 12 |
| Mali | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 43 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Nigeria | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 98 | 539 | 120 | 27 | 573 | 102 | 82 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 20 | 593 | 299 | 88 | 178 | 80 | 40 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Portugal | 0 | $\square 1$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Romania | 0 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| Russia | 4 | 470 | 61 | 0 | 50 | 20 | 49 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| Sierra Leone | 1 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| South Africa | 2 | 299 | 98 | 0 | 113 | 57 | 13 |
| South Korea | 2 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| Spain | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $\square 1$ | - | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | $\square 0$ | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 35 | 1 | 0 | - 4 | , | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 4 | 173 | 34 | 0 | 76 | 26 | 13 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 226 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 24 | 5 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
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| resistance mutation | counts | no data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INH SNP CN 2155168 CG katG S 315 T | 2790 | 210 | 310 | 2270 |
| INH SNP P 1673425 CT. 15 fabG1.inhA | 1138 | 424 | 100 | 614 |
| INH SNP CN 2518919 GA kasA G269S | 707 | 58 | 248 | 401 |
| INH unknown | 241 | 0 | 0 | 241 |
| INH SNP CN_1674481_TG _inhA S94A | 148 | 25 | 10 | 113 |
| INH_SNP_CN 409569_GA _niB_A70T | 117 | 19 | 9 | 89 |
| INH SNP P 1673432 TC. 8 fabG1.inhA | 102 | 33 | 36 | 33 |
| INH SNP P 1673423 GT. 17 fabG1.inhA | 89 | 8 | 12 | 69 |
| INH SNP CN 2155168 CT katG S 315 N | 58 | 5 | 5 | 48 |
| INH SNP CN 2155167 GT katG S S 15 R | 56 | 3 | 5 | 48 |
| INH SNP P P 1673432 TG. 8 fabG1.inhA | 10 | 0 | 1 |  |
| INH _inh _ I21T_u | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_G279D_u | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG R R 104 Q u | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG S 315 G u | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ W161R u | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D735Y u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG L141F u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_L141S_u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_N138H_u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ W191R u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG Y 337 C u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG Y413C u | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH ahpC P44R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH inhA K118E u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH iniB_A222T_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH inib_G131R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH iniB_G171D_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| INH iniB G386D u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH inib S249R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH kasA A45S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH kasA R161S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG A109V u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_Al39P_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_A162E_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG A614E u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ DI42G u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D163N u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D189A u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D259Y u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_D282G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_ D 419 H u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ D487N u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D656A u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D695A u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG D94G u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH KatG_ F408L u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_G120S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_G182R_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_G273S_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG G285S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG G297V u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG G299S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG G630R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ G699 - u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_G99R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_K537E_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG L159F u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG L159P u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG L598F u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG L76P u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG N138D u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG P232R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG P P225S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG Q461P u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG R 571 Hu | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG S S 02 R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG S 315 I u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG T180K u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG T2711 u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG T475I u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG V 320 L u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG V423I u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG V442A u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG V626E u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG V633A u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG W191G u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG W300C u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ W300R u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ W300S u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_ W328L u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_W341G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_W438G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_W90R_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_Y413H_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH_katG_Y608F_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH katG_Y98C_u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| INH upstream _intergenic-fabG1-inhA_G102A u | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| (l) ${ }^{\text {INH }}$ upstream_intergenic-fabG1-inhA T8A u | $\underline{1}$ | 0 | 0 |  |

Kanamycin (KAN) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to KAN, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to KAN, resistant = how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to KAN

| country | KAN_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_rrs | KAN_othersnp | KAN_rrs_A514C_u | KAN_rrs_A906G_u | KAN_rrs_C513T_u | KAN_rrs_G1484T_u | KAN_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 14 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Colombia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 160 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 53 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 110 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 59 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Russia | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rwanda | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | 164 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| South Korea | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Uzbekistan | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KAN_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_rrs | 639 | 208 | 83 | 348 |
| KAN unknown | 165 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| KAN_rrs_A514C_u | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| KAN_rrs_C513T_u | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| KAN_rrs_G1484T_u | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| KAN_rrs_A906G_u | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| KAN_rrs_C517T_u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| KAN_rrs_C905A_u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| KAN_rrs_A365G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_rrs_A514T_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_rrs_A908C_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_rrs_A908G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_rrs_C1105G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_rrs_C1402A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_rrs_G878A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| KAN_SNP_CN_1918745_AG_tlyA_269W | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Levofloxacin (LEVO) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to LEVO, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to LEVO, resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to LEVO

| country | LEVO_SNP_CN_7570_CT_gyrA_A90V | LEVO_SNP_CN_7572_TC_gyrA_S91P | LEVO_SNP_CN_7581_GA_gyrA_D94N | LEVO_SNP_CN_7582_AC_gyrA_D94A | LEVO_SNP_CN_7582_AG_gyrA_D94G | LEVO_othersnp | LEVO_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 23 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 21 | 5 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 11 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 4 | 0 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 57 | 36 | 12 | 25 | 86 | 19 | 10 |
| Pakistan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 20 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 29 | 10 | 3 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Russia | 10 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 31 | 4 | 0 |
| Rwanda | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | 78 | 4 | 6 | 21 | 44 | 12 | 0 |
| South Korea | 13 | 3 | 2 | $\xrightarrow{2}$ | 14 | 1 | 0 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 7 | 7 | 2 | $\square 1$ | 30 | 1 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEVO_SNP CN_7582_AG_gyrA D94G | 286 | 270 | 0 | 16 |
| LEVO_SNP_CN_7570_CT_gyrA_A90V | 229 | 214 | 2 | 13 |
| LEVO_SNP CN_7582_AC gyrA D94A | 94 | 91 | 0 | 3 |
| LEVO_SNP_CN_7572_TC gyrA S91P | 69 | 66 | 0 | 3 |
| LEVO_SNP_CN_7581_GA gyrA D94N | 41 | 39 | 0 | 2 |
| LEVO_SNP_CN_7581_GT_gyrA_D94Y | 34 | 33 | 0 | 1 |
| LEVO unknown | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| LEVO SNP_CN_6735_AC gyrB N N538T | 10 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| LEVO_SNP_CN_7563_GT_gyrA_G88C | 8 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| LEVO_SNP_CN_7566_GA gyrA D89N | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| LEVO_gyrA_R128K_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Ofloxacin (OFLX) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to OFLX, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to OFLX, resistant = how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to OFLX

| country | OFLX_SNP_CN_7570_CT_gyrA_A90V | OFLX_SNP_CN_7581_GA_gyrA_D94N | OFLX_SNP_CN_7582_AC_gyrA_D94A | OFLX_SNP_CN_7582_AG_gyrA_D94G | OFLX_gyrA_S91P_u | OFLX_othersnp | OFLX_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Bangladesh | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 23 | 2 | 11 | 21 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 11 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 13 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | , | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |
| Iran | 3 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 57 | 12 | 25 | 86 | 26 | 49 | 97 |
| Pakistan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 20 | 8 | 9 | 29 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Russia | 10 | 7 | 12 | 31 | 5 | 11 | 57 |
| Rwanda | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | 78 | 6 | 21 | 44 | 1 | 22 | 16 |
| South Korea | 13 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 7 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OFLX SNP CN 7582 AG gyrA D94G | 286 | 89 | 30 | 167 |
| OFLX SNP CN_7570 CT gyrA A90V | 229 | 62 | 75 | 92 |
| OFLX unknown | 195 | 0 | 0 | 195 |
| OFLX SNP CN 7582 AC gyrA D94A | 94 | 19 | 23 | 52 |
| OFLX SNP CN_7581_GA gyrA D94N | 41 | 14 | 5 | 22 |
| OFLX gyrA S91P u | 39 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| OFLX gyrA D94Y u | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| OFLX_SNP_CN_7581_GC gyrA_D94H | 14 | 3 | 5 | 6 |
| OFLX SNP CN_6735_AC_gyrB N538T | 10 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| OFLX gyrA G88C u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| OFLX gyrB D500N u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| OFLX gyrB V340L u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| OFLX gyrA Q613E u | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| OFLX gyrB D500H u | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| OFLX gyrA A 74 S u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OFLX gyrA N 282 K u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OFLX gyrA T267I u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OFLX gyrB E540D u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OFLX gyrB P P133L_u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OFLX gyrB S486F u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| OFLX gyrA A288D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA_A463S_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA A90G u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA D829E u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA D89N u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA D94V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA E214D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA G88A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA P472S_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA R292G u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA R 382 L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX_gyrA_R448H_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA_R592S_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrA T135S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB A471V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB A543T_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB H350Y u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB I39V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB N538D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB N538Y u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB P439R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB R 485 C u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB T539N_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB V496L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OFLX gyrB V600A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Para-aminosalicylic acid (PAS) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to PAS, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to PAS, resistant = how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to PAS

| country | PAS_SNP_CN_3073852_TC_thyA_H207R | PAS_SNP_CN_3074182_TC_thyA_Q97R | PAS_SNP_CN_3074449_AT_thyA_L8Q | PAS_inter-thyX-hsdS.1_G228A_u | PAS_othersnp | PAS_thyA_T202A_u | PAS_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 18 | 5 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Russia | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| South Korea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 3 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAS thyA T202A u | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| PAS SNP CN 3073852 TC thyA H207R | 16 | 14 | 0 | 2 |
| PAS_unknown | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| PAS_upstream_intergenic-thyX-hsdS.1_G228A u | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| PAS SNP CN 3074449 AT thyA L8Q | 8 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS SNP CN 3074182 TC thyA Q97R | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS folC R49Q u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| PAS folC R 49 W u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| PAS upstream intergenic-thyX-hsdS. 1 C235T u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| PAS upstream intergenic-thyA G24A_u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| PAS_folC_E153G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS folC I43S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS folC I43T u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS folC 143 V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS folC S98G u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS upstream intergenic-thyX-hsdS. 1 C226A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS_upstream_intergenic-thyX-hsdS.1_G240A_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS upstream intergenicr-thyA T117C u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS_upstream_intergenic-thyA d49CCGCAGCGACTCGCCGCCAAACAAACCCAGCGGGCGATCGCAAGCGCGGCGAAGCCG_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA A262V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA D6G u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA D81A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA E137G_u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA E58V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA F152V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA P145L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS thyA T22P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PAS SNP P 3074479 AG. 157 thyA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Pyrazinamide (PZA) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to PZA, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to PZA, resistant = how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to PZA

| country | PZA_SNP_CN_2289090_TC_pncA_H51R | PZA_SNP_CN_2289099_TG_pncA_K48T | PZA_SNP_CN_2289213_TC_pncA_Q10R | PZA_SNP_CN_2289213_TG_pncA_Q10P | PZA_othersnp | PZA_promoter-pncA_T11C_u | PZA_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan |  | - 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |
| China | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | $\square 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 10 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 260 | 15 | 78 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 79 | 35 | 45 | 9 | 296 | 8 | 150 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Russia | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 121 | 6 | 71 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| South Africa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 112 | 0 | 66 |
| South Korea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 24 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Uganda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 10 |
| United Kingdom | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 2 | 19 |
| Uzbekistan | , | 0 | 2 | 39 | 69 | 17 | 40 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
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| PZA SNP CN 2288742 GA prca ti67 | under aCe-br-NC-ND 4.0 inter |  | mise. $\quad 1$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PZA SNP CN 2288818 TG pncA T142P |  | 1 |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288826 AC prca V139G |  | 0 | ${ }_{0}$ |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288869 CA pncA V125F |  | 0 |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288887 AC prca W119G |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288919 CT prcA G108E |  |  |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288925 AG prcA F106S |  |  |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288964 AC prna V93G |  | 0 |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289009 CA prcA G78V |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289030 TG prcA H71P |  |  | $\square$ | - |
| PZA SNP CN 2289046 AG pncA 666 |  |  |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288090 TG prca HSIP |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289091 GA pncA HSIY |  | 2 | 0 | , |
| PZA SNP CN 22889095 GC Prica d49E |  |  | $\square$ |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289212 CG pncA 010 H |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA SNP CN 2289216 AC pnca ${ }^{\text {V9G }}$ |  | 1 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289228 AG prca IST |  | 0 |  |  |
| PZA pncA A A6V u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA D 63 H u |  | 0 | $0_{0}$ |  |
| PZA pnca D8A u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA F94L u |  | 0 |  |  |
| PZA pncA G97C u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ | , |
| PZA pncA H710 ${ }^{\text {u }}$ |  | ${ }^{0}$ | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA A71Y $u$ |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prcA H82D u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA 16 M u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pnca K48E u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA L3SR u |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA pnca M175V u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA P62L u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pnca P69R u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA S104R u |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PRA prca V130M u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prcA V15SM u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA prcA V44Gu |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA pnca Y 103 C u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prca Y95S u |  | 0 | 0 | , |
| PZA upstream interenenc.prca A7G u |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| PZA INS F 22888355 i406T pncA |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 288899 Ac prca Li 22 W |  | 1 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288730 GA prca Al71V |  | 1 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288817 GA prca Tli4M |  | 1 | - 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288847 CT pncA Gi32D |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288835 AG Prich 103 Cl |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289042 GC prica S67W |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288969 AC prca Fs8C |  | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289186 AG prca LI9P |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PRA prcA Al02T u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prct Al46P u |  | 0 | - | , |
| PZA prcA Al7le u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA prcA Al77T u |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA PncA A AE u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prcA A46E u |  | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| PZA prcA A A6P u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pric Cli4w u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PRA prca Di29Y u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pnca di2Nu |  | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| PZA prca di3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 0 |  |  |
| PZA prcA D49Gu |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prncA Fi3l u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prca Fs8s u |  | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| PZA pncA F81C u |  | 0 |  |  |
| PZA prcA Giosd u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA Pnca GIosk u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA G132A u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA G162D u |  | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| PZA pncA G17D u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA prcA (224D u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prcA G78C u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA prcA G785 u |  | 0 | 0 | - |
| PZA pncA G97R u |  | 0 | - 0 |  |
| PZA prca H43P u |  | 0 | $\square$ | , |
| PZA pncA 1133 S u |  | 0 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA prcA K96R u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prcA L151S u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prca L1560 u |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |
| PZA pncA Lis9V u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA L8SR u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pncA M1751 u |  | 0 | - ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA M175K u |  | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| PZA pncA Mll u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pnca P62R u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PRA pra R 154 G u |  | 0 | - $0_{0}$ |  |
| PZA prace S S 104 Gu |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA pncA S 32 l u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA prcA T100A u |  | , | 0 |  |
| PZA pnca Tll 4 Pu |  | ${ }_{0}$ | ${ }_{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA T160P u |  | 0 | - 0 |  |
| PZA pncA T168P u |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA pncA V139Lu |  | 0 | $0^{0}$ |  |
| PZA prcA V155A u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA pnca V163A u |  | $1-0$ | - 0 |  |
| PRA prca VF u |  | $0_{0}$ | $0_{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA W119R u |  | 0 | - 0 | 0 |
| PZA pnca W68C u |  | 10 | - 0 |  |
| PZA pnca W68Lu |  | $1-0$ | ${ }_{0}^{0}$ |  |
| PZA pncA Y64D u |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA upstram intergenic-prcA Tl1A u |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| PZA upstram intergenic-prcA TISC u |  | 0 | - 0 |  |
| PZA upstram intergenic-pncA Tli6C u |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA upstram intergenic-prcA il ilT u |  | 0 | - 0 |  |
| PZA DEL F 2288697 d 544 AACT prca |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA DEL F 22289060 d181GTGCCGGA pncA |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA DEL N 2288942 d299GGTGTA pncA |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2288853 AT prcA V130E |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PRA SNP CN 2288878 GA Prca Q122. |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| $\frac{\text { PZA SNP CN } 2288933 \text { GC pnca Y } 103 .}{\text { PZA SNP CN } 228856 \text { TG pncA } 960}$ |  | $0_{0}^{0}$ |  |  |
| PZA SNP CN 2289042 GT pncA S67. |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PRA SNP CN 2289050 AT prca Y64. |  | 0 | - 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA SNP CN 2289214 GA pncA Q10. |  | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | , |
| PZA SNP P 2289245 TA. 37 prcA |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PZA SNP P P 2289251 AC. 31 pncA |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| PRA SNP P 2289252 TC. 30 pncA | - 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Rifamycin (RIF) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to RIF, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to RIF, resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to RIF

| country | RIF_SNP_CN_761109_GT_rpoB_D435Y | RIF_SNP_CN_761110_AT_rpob_D435V | RIF_SNP_CN_761139_CT_rpoB_H445Y | RIF_SNP_CN_761155_CT_rpob_S450L | RIF_SNP_CN_761161_TC_rpoB_L452P | RIF_othersnp | RIF_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| Belarus | 3 | 0 | 1 | 77 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Brazil | , |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Burma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 3 | 4 | 11 | 57 | 9 | 36 | 5 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | , |
| Georgia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Mali | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Moldova | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Nepal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Provided | 42 | 73 | 49 | 515 | 18 | 123 | 57 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 22 | 134 | 28 | 491 | 10 | 110 | 57 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Portugal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 6 | 4 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Russia | 6 | 7 | 3 | 350 | 6 | 28 | 74 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Sierra Leone | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| South Africa | 10 | 55 | 15 | 188 | 62 | 36 | 8 |
| South Korea | 4 | 3 | 2 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 1 | 3 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 14 | 4 |
| United Kingdom | 3 | 5 | 7 | 54 | 6 | 65 | 3 |
| Uzbekistan | 3 | 8 | 7 | 213 | 4 | 18 | 13 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| resistance mutation | counts | no_data | susceptible | resistant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIF SNP CN 761155 CT rpoB S450L | 2126 | 232 | 228 | 1666 |
| RIF SNP CN 761110 AT rpoB D435V | 309 | 19 | 27 | 263 |
| RIF unknown | 232 | 0 | 0 | 232 |
| RIF SNP CN 761139 CT rpoB H445Y | 131 | 16 | 10 | 105 |
| RIF SNP CN 761161 TC rpoB L452P | 123 | 5 | 75 | 43 |
| RIF SNP CN 761109 GT rpoB D435Y | 106 | 18 | 22 | 66 |
| RIF SNP CN 761139 CG rpoB H445D | 99 | 21 | 10 | 68 |
| RIF SNP CN 761140 AG rpoB H445R | 59 | 9 | 3 | 47 |
| RIF SNP CN 761155 CG rpoB S450W | 50 | 3 | 15 | 32 |
| RIF SNP CN 761140 AT rpoB H445L | 40 | 7 | 4 | 29 |
| RIF SNP CN 761095 TC rpoB L430P | 37 | 3 | 20 | 14 |
| RIF SNP CN 761140 AT rpoB I491F | 36 | 8 | 18 | 10 |
| RIF SNP CN 761277 AT rpoB I491F | 36 | 8 | 18 | 10 |
| RIF SNP CN 760314 GT rpoB V170F | 29 | 13 | 1 | 15 |
| RIF rpoB S 450 Pa | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| RIF rpoB Q432P u | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| RIF rpoB S441L u | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| RIF rpob D 435 G u | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| RIF rpoB Q432 ${ }^{\text {u }}$ | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| RIF rpoB R 4488 Q u | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| RIF rpoB E250G u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| RIF rpoB H445N u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| RIF rpoB V695L u | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| RIF rpoB P454L u | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| RIF rpoB Q432L u | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| RIF rpoB D 435 Nu | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| RIF rpoB H445P u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| RIF rpoB L494P u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| RIF rpoB M434I u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| RIF rpoB Q432E u | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| RIF rpoB A451G u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB D435A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB G675D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB G981D u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpob H835Q u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB H835R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB 1925 V u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB K $446 \mathrm{Q}_{\text {u }}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpob L430R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB L443W u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpob M 707 T u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB P280L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB P439S u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpob S428R u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB S 441 T u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB T400A u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB T400P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB T444P u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpoB V113I u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF rpob V469L u | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RIF SNP CN 761102 AC rpoB Q432H | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RIF SNP CN 761155 CA rpoB S450. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Streptomycin (STR) Data, Abbreviations: counts = how many isolates had this mutation, no_data = how many isolates had this mutation but no data on whether they were phenotypically resistant or not to RIF, susceptible = how many isolates had this mutation but were phenotypically susceptible to STR, resistant $=$ how many isolates had this mutation but were resistant to STR

| country | STR_SNP_CN_4407967_AG_gid_L79S | STR_SNP_CN_781687_AG_rpsL_K43R | STR_SNP_CN_781822_AG_rpsL_K88R | STR_SNP_N_1472359_A514C_rrs | STR_SNP_N_1472362_C517T_rrs | STR_othersnp | STR_unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Azerbaijan | - 0 | 0 | - 0 | - 0 | - 1 | , | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Belarus | 0 | 63 | 6 | 20 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| Brazil | 0 | 1 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Burma | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| China | 0 | 46 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| Colombia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estonia | , | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Georgia | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 3 | 29 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 38 | 11 |
| Guinea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| India | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Indonesia | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iran | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Kazakhstan | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 |
| Mali | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Moldova | 0 | 13 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Nepal | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Not Provided | 15 | 239 | 29 | 39 | 20 | 244 | 50 |
| Pakistan | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 2 | 71 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 340 | 96 |
| Philippines | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Portugal | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 0 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 |
| Russia | 0 | 221 | 43 | 17 | 184 | 19 | 47 |
| Rwanda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Sierra Leone | - | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 |
| South Africa | 74 | 72 | 15 | 83 | 7 | 9 | 15 |
| South Korea | , | 12 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Spain | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Swaziland | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | , | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 9 |
| United Kingdom | 5 | 53 | 10 | 16 | 5 | 55 | 5 |
| Uzbekistan | 0 | 212 | 12 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 5 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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| STR gid G34W u | under aCC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 Int | ational lice | . | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STR gid G71R u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid H48D u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 | $\square$ |
| STR gid H480 u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid H48R_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | $\square 1$ |
| STR gid Ill N u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid II162S u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid I81R u |  | 1 | , | - 0 |  |
| STR gid 181T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid L108P u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR gid L142W u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid L160P u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid L79F u |  | 1 | , | - 0 |  |
| STR gid L86R u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid L91P u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid M150R u |  | 1 | , | - 0 |  |
| STR gid P78L u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 | $\square$ |
| STR gid P93L u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid P930 u |  | , | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid P93R u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid R116W u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid R118C u |  | 1 | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| STR gid R118L u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR_gid_R137L_u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid R175P u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid R20P u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid R21W u |  | , | 0 | , |  |
| STR gid R33P u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid R47G_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid R47P u |  | 1 | , | , |  |
| STR_gid_R64W_u |  | 1 | 0 | , | $\square$ |
| STR gid R83P u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid R96 u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid S131T u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid S70N u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid T981 u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR gid V105E u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid V115G u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid V203L u |  | 1 | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| STR gid V41I u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR gid V66A u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR gid V88A u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR_gid V89G_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR gid Y195C u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR gid Y22S u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR rpsL E70A u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR rpsL E E76A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris A 1012 Gu |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR mis A 1223 Gu |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR_ris_A1325C_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris Al70G u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris A 504 C u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR _ris A 700 T u |  | 1 | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| STR Irs A 703 Ga |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR _ris A 753 T - |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris A 907 Cu |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR_rrs_A907T_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR [ris A908G_u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR rrs A948T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 | $\square$ |
| STR rrs C1067T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR mis C1199Gu |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR mir C1402T u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR rrs C239A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris C244T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR ris C270T u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris C 332 T u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR ris C397T u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR_rr_C414A_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris C499T u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR _ris C546T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR [ris C692T u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR rrs C708T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 | $\square$ |
| STR _ris C897T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR rrs C 9050 Gu |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR_rrs_C936T_u |  | 1 | 0 | , | 1 |
| STR mis G1042C u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR mis G1072 u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR mis G1415T u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR ris G319A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR _rs G G395 u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR ris G407A u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR_rrs_G408T_u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris G537A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris G544A u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR mis G685A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris_G749 u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR_rrs_ G771A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR mis G878A u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR rrs G887T u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR ris G909T u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR ris T 1206 Cu |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR ris T1208Au |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR mis T1217A u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR_rrs_T16C_u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR ris T327C u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR mis T411A u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR mrs T529Gu |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR mrs T545A u |  | 1 | 0 | , |  |
| STR rrs T T580C u |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR mis T672A u |  | 1 | 0 | - 0 |  |
| STR_rrs_T696G_u |  | 1 | 0 | $\square$ | 1 |
| STR DEL F 4408023 d179T gid |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STR DEL F 4408116 d86G gid |  | 0 | 0 | $\square$ |  |
| STR SNP CN 4408091 GT gid P38T |  | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |
| STR SNP I 1473637 A. 21 rrs.r.r1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| STR SNP N 1473109 T1264G_rrs |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STR SNP N 1473343 G1498T ms |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Supplementary Figure 7 Distribution of resistance mutations for six drugs ( $\mathbf{n = 9 3 8 5}$ ). Pie chart size is proportional isolate number from each country. Mutations listed in order of frequency. Full data provided in Supplementary Table 6.


## Supplementary Table 8 GDP Per Capita Verses Median MRSCA date for INH, RIF, SLIs, and FLQ.

| Countries | GDP per capita | Median MRSCA Date INH (Years Ago) | Median MRSCA Date RIF (Years Ago) | Median MRSCA Date SLIs (Years Ago) | Median MRSCA Date FLQ (Years Ago) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| China | 10150 | 16.18 | 16.11 | 9.88 | 12.8 |
| Peru | 7140 | 19.04 | 6.52 | 2.61 | 2.39 |
| Russia | 11190 | 9.26 | 5.71 | 3.02 | 12.22 |
| South Africa | 6330 | 5.58 | 4.63 | 4.01 | 2.06 |
| United Kingdom | 42310 | 14.76 | 13.02 | 10.61 | 8.36 |
| Uzbekistan | 1480 |  |  | 2.45 |  |
| Romania | 12510 |  |  | 11.74 | 10.19 |
| Mali | 933.88 | 4.97 | 3.4 |  |  |
| Netherlands | 53020 | 11.59 |  |  |  |
| Moldova | 3400 |  | 3.83 |  |  |
| Malawi | 366.53 | 9.72 | 6.62 |  |  |
| South Korea | 31940 |  | 17.66 | 16.08 | 11.95 |
| Sierra Leone | 516.76 | 6.85 | 5.24 |  |  |
| Germany | 47790 | 12.48 | 13.86 |  |  |
| India | 2200 |  | 11.27 |  |  |






Supplementary Table 9 Commercial Diagnostics ${ }^{21,22,23,24,25}$ :

| Drug | Gene | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Isoniazid | katG codon | 315 |
| Isoniazid | inhA promoter | $-15,-16,-8$ |
| Rifamycin | rpoB codons | $424-454$ |
| Aminoglycosides | rrs | 1401,1402 |
| Aminoglycosides | eis | -10 to -14, -37 |
| Fluoroquinolones | gyrA | $89-94$ |
| Fluoroquinolones | gyrB | $500-541$ |
| *E-coli 505-534 |  |  |

*E-coli 505-534

## Supplementary Table 10 Genes Searched Per Drug.

Genes searched for resistant mutations in "All WGS Test" (AMK: amikacin, PAS: para-aminosalicylic acid, EMB: ethambutol, CAP: capreomycin, KAN: kanamycin, CIP: ciprofloxacin, INH: isoniazid, STR: streptomycin, RIF: rifampicin, LEVO: levofloxacin, ETH: ethionamide, OFLX: ofloxacin, PZA: pyrazinamide)

| Drug | Genes Searched |
| :---: | :---: |
| AMK | rrs |
| PAS | thyA, inter-thyA-Rv2765, folC, inter-thyX-hsdS.1 |
| EMB | embA, embB, embC, iniB, inter-embC-embA |
| CAP | rrs, tlyA |
| KAN | rrs, inter-eis-Rv2417c |


| CIP | gyrB, gyrA |
| :---: | :---: |
| INH | inhA, iniB, embB, inter-Rv1482c-fabG1, ahpC, inter-oxyR'-ahpC, inter- <br> embC-embA, kasA, katG, fabG1 |
| STR | gid, rpsL, rrs, inter-rrs-rrl |
| RIF | rpoB |
| LEVO | gyrB, gyrA |
| ETH | inhA, inter-Rv1482c-fabG1, ethA, inter-ethA-ethR |
| OFLX | gyrB, gyrA |
| PZA | inter-pncA-Rv2044c, pncA, rpsA |

Supplementary Table 11 Transmission rate estimates and association with GDP by country. Transmission rate $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y}$ indicates X unique MRSCA dates/Y number of MRSCA dates for a specific country and drug. Legend: Unique $=$ number of unique MRSCA dates for drug and country, total $=$ total number of dated resistant isolates for drug and country, Lower Bound $(\mathrm{LB})=($ total-unique $) /$ total, Note: Data for country fewer than 10 resistant isolates per drug not shown.




Supplementary Table 12 MRSCA age is not associated with the earliest date of drug introduction into clinical use.

| Drug | Median MRSCA | Date Introduced Years ago |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| INH | 11.4 | 67 |
| RIF | 7.61 | 54 |
| PZA | 3.56 | 67 |
| FLQ | 4.81 | 34 |
| STR | 7.67 | 75 |
| SLIs | 4.02 | 61 |
| EMB | 5.01 | 54 |
| ETH | 4.01 | 59 |
| CYS | 2.05 | 64 |



Supplementary Table 13 Geographic variance of resistance mutations
A: katG S315T mutation prevalence among INH resistant isolates in Russia verses Peru (Fisher P-value 1*10º ${ }^{12}$ )

|  | Russia | Peru |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Mutation | 444 | 510 |
| No Mutation | 82 | 250 |

## B: fabG/inh $A$-15 C $>$ T mutation prevalence among INH resistant isolates in Russia verses Peru (Fisher P-

 value $7 * 10^{-9}$ )|  | Russia | Peru |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Mutation | 43 | 149 |
| No Mutation | 483 | 611 |

C: $\mathbf{2 5}$ mutations that varied geographically to a larger extent than the mutation fabG/inh $A$ promoter -15C $>\mathbf{T}$ (SD 10\%, Range 0\%-39\%), their standard deviations, and ranges.

| Mutation | Standard Deviation | Range of observed frequency <br> across countries |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| INH_SNP_CN_2155168_CG_kat <br> G_S315T | $12.49 \%$ | $54.55 \%-93.75 \%$ |
| INH_SNP_CN_4247429_AG_em <br> bB_M306V | $12.03 \%$ |  |
| INH_SNP_CN_4247431_GA_em <br> bB_M306I | $11.88 \%$ | $0.0 \%-43.56 \%$ |
| INH_SNP_CN_4247431_GC_em <br> bB_M306I | $11.88 \%$ | $0.0 \%-42.63 \%$ |
| PZA_SNP_CN_2289073_GC_pnc <br> A_H57D | $15.07 \%$ | $0.0 \%-42.63 \%$ |
| EMB_SNP_CN_4247429_AG_e <br> mbB_M306V |  | $12.48 \%$ |


| EMB_SNP_CN_4247431_GT_em bB_M306I | 11.95\% | 9.02\%-49.58\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_CN_781687_AG_rpsL } \\ & \text { _K43R } \end{aligned}$ | 21.03\% | 0.0\%-81.85\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_N_1472359_A514C_rr } \\ & \mathrm{s} \end{aligned}$ | 12.00\% | 0.0\%-50.4\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_ } \\ & \text { rrs } \end{aligned}$ | 17.90\% | 0.0\%-60.0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_CN_4407927_TG_gid } \\ & \text { _E92D } \end{aligned}$ | 31.17\% | 0.0\%-87.95\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_N_1472362_C517T_rr } \\ & \text { s } \end{aligned}$ | 11.32\% | 0.0\%-38.89\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_CN_4407967_AG_gid } \\ & \text { _L79S } \end{aligned}$ | 20.81\% | 0.0\%-72.73\% |
| ETH_SNP_P_1673425_CT.15_fa bG1.inhA | 14.48\% | 27.78\%-62.5\% |
| ETH_SNP_CN_4326333_CG_eth A_A381P | 19.24\% | 0.0\%-48.44\% |
| ETH_SNP_CN_1674481_TG_inh A_S94A | 11.89\% | 0.0\%-31.46\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { KAN_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G } \\ & \text { _rrs } \end{aligned}$ | 14.83\% | 45.65\%-85.71\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAP_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G_ } \\ & \text { rrs } \end{aligned}$ | 19.62\% | 23.08\%-85.84\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AMK_SNP_N_1473246_A1401G } \\ & \text { _rrs } \end{aligned}$ | 20.11\% | 46.43\%-100.0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AMK_SNP_N_1472359_A514C_ } \\ & \text { rrs } \end{aligned}$ | 20.90\% | 0.0\%-64.0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CIP_SNP_CN_7582_AG_gyrA_ } \\ & \text { D94G } \end{aligned}$ | 26.57\% | 16.67\%-78.26\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFLX_SNP_CN_7582_AG_gyrA } \\ & \text { _D94G } \end{aligned}$ | 12.60\% | 8.33\%-50.0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFLX_SNP_CN_7570_CT_gyrA } \\ & \text { _A90V } \end{aligned}$ | 11.83\% | 5.45\%-46.15\% |

D: Six mutations that varied by lineage to a larger extent than the mutation fabG/inh $A$ promoter -15C $>$ T (SD $\mathbf{9 . 3} \%$, Range $\mathbf{8 . 8 \% - 3 3 \%}$ ), their standard deviations, and ranges.

| Mutation | Standard Deviation | Range of observed frequency across lineages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INH_SNP_CN_2155168_CG_kat G_S315T | 16.00\% | 40.28\%-84.23\% |
| INH_SNP_CN_2518919_GA_kas A_G269S | 11.11\% | 0.0\%-25.66\% |
| PZA_SNP_CN_2288952_CT_pnc A_G97D | 11.74\% | 0.0\%-27.27\% |
| EMB_SNP_CN_4247429_AG_e mbB_M306V | 13.65\% | 18.87\%-53.85\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_CN_781687_AG_rpsL } \\ & \text { _K43R } \end{aligned}$ | 20.23\% | 4.76\%-57.36\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR_SNP_CN_4407927_TG_gid } \\ & \text { _E92D } \end{aligned}$ | 43.23\% | 0.0\%-99.83\% |

Supplementary Table 14 Sensitivity and Specificity of commercial tests for INH, RIF, SLIS, and FLQ in five countries with the largest number of phenotyped strained: Russia, South Africa, Peru, Uzbekistan, and United Kingdom

Legend: Sensitivity=Percent of resistant isolates classified as resistant, Specificity=Percent of susceptible isolates classified as susceptible

| Drug | commercial test-Peru |  | commercial test-Russia |  | commercial test-South Africa |  | commercial test-Uzbekistan |  | commercial test-UnitedKingdom |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivity | Specificity | Sensitivity | Specificity |
| INH | 84\% (641/760) | 90\% (151/168) | 87\% (459/526) | 91\% (281/310) | 88\% (168/190) | 72\% (444/619) | 90\% (238/264) | NA 0/0 | 87\% (245/283) | 99\% (1559/1567) |
| RIF | 90\% (623/692) | 89\% (209/236) | 82\% (347/425) | 88\% (363/412) | 95\% (158/166) | 70\% (433/616) | 95\% (248/262) | 50\% (1/2) | 91\% (86/95) | 99\% (1742/1750) |
| FLQ | 38\% (46/121) | 98\% (788/801) | 38\% (51/133) | 94\% (275/292) | 77\% (86/111) | 87\% (510/585) | 0\% (0/7) | 100\% (213/213) | 90\% (26/29) | 98\% (295/301) |
| SLI | 47\% (101/214) | 98\%(692/708) | 77\% (63/82) | 48\%(163/343) | 77\% (101/131) | 91\%(486/536) | 79\% (44/56) | 66\% (109/164) | 90\% (9/10) | 100\%(83/83) |
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