



## How a PCR Sequencing Strategy Can Bring New Data to Improve the Diagnosis of Ethionamide Resistance

Thomas Maitre, Florence Morel, Florence Brossier, Wladimir Sougakoff, Jérémy Jaffre, Sokleaph Cheng, Nicolas Veziris, Alexandra Aubry

### ► To cite this version:

Thomas Maitre, Florence Morel, Florence Brossier, Wladimir Sougakoff, Jérémy Jaffre, et al.. How a PCR Sequencing Strategy Can Bring New Data to Improve the Diagnosis of Ethionamide Resistance. *Microorganisms*, 2022, 10 (7), pp.1436. <10.3390/microorganisms10071436>. <hal-03805391>

**HAL Id: hal-03805391**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03805391v1>**

Submitted on 7 Oct 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

## How a PCR- sequencing strategy can bring new data to improve the diagnosis of ethionamide resistance

Thomas Maitre<sup>1,2,3 μ</sup>, Florence Morel<sup>1,2μ</sup>, Florence Brossier<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Wladimir Sougakoff<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Jérémy Jaffre<sup>1,2</sup>, Sokleaph Cheng<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Veziris<sup>1,2,4</sup>, Alexandra Aubry<sup>1,2, #</sup>, on behalf of the NRC-MyRMA

1 APHP. Sorbonne-Université, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, Centre National de Référence des Mycobactéries et de la Résistance des Mycobactéries aux Antituberculeux, F-75013 Paris, France,

2 Sorbonne Université, INSERM, U1135, Centre d'Immunologie et des Maladies Infectieuses, Cimi-Paris, F-75013, Paris, France

3 Department of Pneumology and Thoracic Oncology, Reference Centre for Rare Lung Diseases, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, Tenon Hospital, Paris, France.

4 APHP. Sorbonne-Université, Hôpital Saint-Antoine, Département de Bactériologie, F-75012 Paris, France.

μ Both authors contributed equally to the work

\* Deceased

# Correspondence: alexandra.aubry@sorbonne-universite.fr; Tel.: (+33) 1 40 77 97 68

The members of the CNR MyRMA (French National Reference Center for Mycobacteria) are: Isabelle Bonnet, Emmanuelle Cambau, Faiza Mougari, Vichita Ok, Jérôme Robert

**Abstract:** Ethionamide (ETH) is a second line antituberculosis drug. ETH resistance (ETH-R) is mainly related to mutation of the mono-oxygenase activating ETH (EthA), the ETH target (InhA) and inhA promoter. Nonetheless, diagnosing ETH-R is still challenging. We assessed the strategy used for detecting ETH-R at the French National Reference Center for Mycobacteria in 497 MDR-TB isolates received from 2008 to 2016. Genotypic ETH's resistance detection was performed by sequencing ethA, ethR, ethA-ethR intergenic region, and inhA promoter in 497 multidrug resistant isolates whereas the phenotypic ETH susceptibility testing (PST) was performed by the reference proportion method. Mutations were found in up to 76% of the 387 resistant isolates and in up to 28% of the 110 susceptible isolates. Our results do not support the role of ethR mutations in ETH resistance. Altogether, the positive predictive value of our genotypic strategy to diagnose ETH-R was improved when considering only the variants included in the WHO catalogue and in other databases, such as TB-profiler. Therefore, our work will help to update the list of mutations that could be graded as associated to resistance for improving ETH-R diagnosis.

**Keywords:** Ethionamide, Tuberculosis, Resistance, Molecular diagnosis

## 1. Introduction

The emergence of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB), i.e. resistant to at least rifampin and isoniazid (INH) further threatens TB control worldwide [1]. MDR-TB remains challenging to treat, requiring second-line antiTB drugs such as ethionamide (ETH).

Over the past several years, molecular techniques have been developed for the rapid detection of resistance to antituberculous agents since quick detection of drug resistance is crucial for designing appropriate antituberculosis drug regimens, preventing treatment failure and/or relapse, and reducing the spread of drug-resistant isolates. Molecular assays for the detection of mutations related to resistance have been increasingly used and lead to shorten the time to detection of resistance to one working day [2].

Ethionamide (ETH) is a derivative of isonicotinic acid structurally similar to INH. ETH and INH are pro-drugs requiring activation by different pathways: the KatG catalase-peroxidase for INH, and the EthA monooxygenase (negatively regulated by EthR) for ETH [3]. ETH and INH have a common target: the enoyl-ACP reductase InhA. EthA is a NADPH-specific flavin adenine dinucleotide-containing monooxygenase, a Baeyer–Villiger monooxygenase, involved in cell wall biosynthesis [4,5]. Previous studies reported that mutations of ethA and inhA are the main mutations reported in ETH-R strains : ethA mutations caused 37% to 100% of ETH-R in *M. tuberculosis*, mutations in inhA caused 25% to 100% of ETH-R in *M. tuberculosis* whereas mutations in EthR and inhA promoter, were less frequent [6,7].

The increasing use of genotypic diagnosis of resistance in tuberculosis management requires an extensive study and classification of mutations identified in genes involved in drug resistance, i.e. genotypic/phenotypic correlation. For ETH, only 24 mutations were confidently graded by WHO as associated with resistance in ethA, inhA and the promoter region of inhA, stressing out the need to add new data enabling to update that list (without taking into account the mutations graded as “uncertain significance” listed in the extended catalogue [8]).

Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate the prevalence of mutations in ethA, ethR, the inhA gene, and the promoter region of inhA associated with independent resistance to ethionamide (ETH-R) in *M. tuberculosis* isolates based on a prospective genotyping strategy used at the French National Reference Center (NRC) for Mycobacteria to diagnose ETH-R.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1 Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex clinical isolates

A total of 497 MDR *M. tuberculosis* complex isolates from TB cases diagnosed in France and received at the French National Reference Center for Mycobacteria were collected over a 9-year (2008-2016) period. On the basis of the results of DST, the 497 MDR isolates were classified as ETH-R (n = 387) or susceptible to ETH (ETH-S) (n = 110) (Table 1).

## 2.2 Phenotypic drug susceptibility testing and quality controls

DST was performed on Löwenstein-Jensen medium using the reference standard proportion method [9] and concentrations of 40 mg/liter for ETH [10,11]. Resistance to ETH was defined as a proportion of resistant mutants  $\geq 1\%$  at 40 mg/liter [10,11]. Quality controls were performed for each new batch of LJ containing ETH by using the reference strain *M. tuberculosis* H37Rv. The laboratory underwent external quality validation through the External Quality Assurance (EQA) systems ensuring accurate diagnosis of TB and drug-resistant TB through the European TB reference laboratory network (ERLTB-Net) organized by INSTAND.

## 2.3 DNA sequencing of genes associated with ethionamide resistance

For all MDR-TB isolates received at the French NRC, the entire *ethA*, *ethR* genes, the *ethA-ethR* intergenic region were prospectively sequenced and mutations in the *inhA* promoter region was determined by using the Genotype MTBDRplus test (Hain Lifescience GmbH, Nehren, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions. For isolates for which wild-types *ethA* and *inhA* promoter were observed, the entire *inhA* gene and its promoter was sequenced in ETH-R isolates retrospectively. *EthA*, *ethR*, *ethA/ethR* intergenic region, *inhA* and its promoter were amplified and sequenced using the primers previously described [6]. Genomic DNA was isolated from bacteria grown on Löwenstein-Jensen medium. A loop of culture was resuspended in water (500  $\mu$ l) and inactivated by heating at 95°C for 15 min. DNA (5  $\mu$ l) obtained by heat shock extraction (1 min at 95°C and 1 min in ice, repeated five times) was used for PCR amplification with the following steps: denaturation of 5 min at 95°C, followed by 35 cycles of 1 min at 95°C, 1 min at the primer-dependent annealing temperature ( $T_a$ ), and 1 min at 72°C, and final extension step of 7 min at 72°C. The PCR products were purified by filtration with Microcon 100 microconcentrators (Amicon Inc., Beverly, MA), and the PCR for Sanger sequencing was done by using a BigDye Terminator cycle sequencing ready kit (Applied Biosystems, Courtaboeuf, France).

## 2.4 Databases.

The impact of the mutations on ETH-R was evaluated by looking for those graded as associated with resistance in the WHO catalogue. For those not graded as associated to ETH-R in the catalogue, we checked if they were listed in other published databases, as TB-profiler [12,13], PhyResSE [14] and the one published by Manson et al. [15].

## 2.5 Statistical analysis

The proportion of ETH-R and ETH-S isolates with the different mutations was compared using Fisher's exact test. P values were two-tailed, and P values of  $\leq 0.05$  were considered significant. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value of the prospective genotypic strategy used at the French NRC were determined considering the phenotypic DST as the reference standard. Since the entire *inhA* gene was only sequenced retrospectively in ETH-R isolates displaying wild-types *ethA* and *inhA* promoter, it is not considered as part of the prospective genotypic strategy.

### 3. Results

Among the 497 MDR-TB isolates, 78% (n=387) were classified as ETH-R and 22% (n=110) as ETH-S by phenotypic DST (Tables 1 and 2). A total of 123 mutations were evidenced in *ethA*, *ethR*, *ethA/ethR* intergenic region, *inhA* and its promoter.

Most of the alterations observed had never been reported, whatever the susceptibility to ETH [6,16–19], and only 6 (5%) were cited as associated with resistance in the WHO catalogue [20] and 20 additional mutations among the 123 (17%) were cited in published databases of drug resistance mutations (Table 1 and 2). Altogether, among the 387 ETH-R isolates, 294 (76%) had at least one mutation in *ethA/ethR/ethA-ethR* intergenic region, *inhA* promoter, and 93 (24%) had no mutation; whereas, among the 110 ETH-S isolates, 79 (72%) had no mutations in *ethA/ethR/ethA-ethR* intergenic region, *inhA* promoter, and 31 (28%) had at least one mutation ( $p < 10^{-5}$ ) (Table 1).

Among the 123 mutations evidenced in *ethA*, *ethR*, *ethA/ethR* intergenic region, *inhA* and its promoter, 4 corresponded to phylogenetic SNPs : G124D, S266R and 768<sub>del\_g</sub> in *EthA* and V78A in *InhA* (Table 3) [21], and therefore have no impact on ETH susceptibility.

Among the 123 mutations, 112 (91%) were evidenced only in ETH-R strains. Among these 112 mutations, after exclusion of known polymorphisms, 61 (54%) were the only mutation evidenced, no other mutation was found in the candidate genes. Among the 112 different mutations only observed in ETH-R strains, almost half (n=57,5%) are reported as associated with ETH-R in the WHO catalogue and/or other databases (Table 1).

Interestingly, the mutations suspected to have an important impact on protein function (i.e introduction of stop codon and large deletions) were not evidenced at all in ETH-S strains (Table 2).

By comparing the proportions of mutated strains in the ETH-R and ETH-S strains per gene, the difference was statistically significant for *ethA* (197/387 (51%) versus 28/110 (25%),  $p < 10^{-5}$ ), *inhA* promoter (139/387 (36%) versus 2/110 (2%),  $p < 10^{-5}$ ) and *ethA-ethR* intergenic region (15/387 (4%) versus 0/110 (0%),  $p = 0.035$ ), but not for *ethR* (13/387 (3%) versus 3/110 (3%),  $p = 0.74$ ) (Table 1 and 2).

By using the phenotypic data as the reference, the genotyping strategy used in the French National Reference Center (NRC) for Mycobacteria, had 78.8% of sensitivity to diagnose ETH-R, 76.4% of specificity, 92.0% of positive predictive value (PPV) and 49.4% of negative predictive value (NPV) (with the exclusion of known phylogenetic SNPs). Modifying this strategy by deleting *ethR* mutations whose role in ETH-R is unclear [6,22,23] did not modify its performances (Table 3), whereas considering only the mutations mentioned in the WHO catalogue dramatically increased the PPV performances [20]. Interestingly, when combining the interpretation of the impact of the mutations and the published databases to the WHO catalogue, the sensitivity increased dramatically (36.7 vs 52.9) but the PPV of the genotyping strategy used to predict ETH-R only slightly increased at the expense of the NPV value (Table 3).

Table 1. Mutations in *ethA*, *inhA* and its promoter, *ethR*, and *ethA-ethR* intergenic region for the 387 ETH-R MDR-TB isolates

N° of isolates	Sequencing results <sup>a</sup>				
	<i>ethA</i>	<i>inhA</i> promoter	<i>inhA</i>	<i>ethR</i>	<i>ethA-ethR</i> intergenic region
1	<b>M1R</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
2	G11S	wt	np	wt	wt
2	S15P	<b>c-15t</b>	np	wt	wt
1	A19V	<b>g-17t</b>	np	wt	wt
1	<b>H22P</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<b>H22P</b>	<b>c-15t</b>	np	wt	wt
3	<b>H22P</b>	<b>c-15t</b>	np	<b>F110L</b>	wt
1	C27W	wt	np	wt	wt
1	C27W	<b>g-17t</b>	np	wt	wt
1	G36D	wt	np	wt	wt
1	G42V, P334A	wt	np	wt	wt
1	F48S	wt	np	wt	wt
1	Y50C	wt	np	wt	wt
1	S55C	wt	np	wt	wt
1	F66L, G299D	wt	np	wt	wt
1	G78D	<b>c-15t</b>	np	wt	wt
1	A89E, <i>S266R</i>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	A89E, R99Q, <i>S266R</i>	wt	np	wt	a-9g
1	D95N	wt	np	wt	wt
1	D95N	<b>c-15t</b>	<b>S94A</b>	wt	wt
1	D95N	<b>c-15t</b>	np	wt	wt
1	W109!	wt	np	wt	wt
1	G124D	wt	np	wt	wt
2	L136R	<b>t-8a</b>	np	wt	wt
2	C137R	wt	np	wt	wt
1	G139D	wt	np	wt	wt
2	Y140!	wt	np	wt	wt

1	Y141C, 1367_ins_7nt	wt	np	M142I, Q143K	wt
1	<b><u>Y147I</u></b>	wt	np	wt	wt
6	<b>Q165P</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
2	W167G	wt	np	wt	wt
1	S183R	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	P192S	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	P192T	wt	np	wt	wt
1	V202G	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<b>Q206I</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
2	S208I	wt	np	wt	wt
1	Y211S	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	<b>E223K</b>	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	N226D	wt	np	wt	wt
3	V238G	wt	np	wt	wt
1	R239L	wt	np	wt	wt
1	Q254P	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	W256I	wt	np	wt	wt
4	P257S	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
3	<i>S266R</i>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<i>S266R</i>	wt	np	D23G	wt
9	<b>Q269I</b>	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	<b>Q269I</b>	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	a-9g
1	<b>L272P</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
4	H281P	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	C294Y	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	I305N	wt	np	wt	wt
2	T314I	wt	np	wt	wt
2	T314I	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	T314I	<b><u>t-8c</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	I337V	WT	V78A	wt	wt
3	<b>I338S</b>	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	<b>T342K</b>	wt	np	wt	wt

1	M372R	wt	np	wt	wt
2	N379D	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<b>G385D</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
2	C403R	wt	np	wt	wt
2	P422L	wt	np	wt	wt
2	L440P	wt	np	wt	wt
1	Q449R	wt	np	wt	wt
1	D464G	wt	np	wt	wt
1	R471P	<u>c-15t</u>	np	wt	wt
1	R483T	wt	np	wt	wt
1	32_del_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	57_ins_4nt	<u>t-8c</u>	np	wt	wt
1	109_del_a	<u>t-8c</u>	np	wt	wt
19	<b>110_del_a</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<b>110_del_a</b>	<u>t-8c</u>	np	wt	wt
1	137_del_a	<u>t-8c</u>	np	wt	wt
1	328_ins_t	wt	np	wt	wt
1	373_ins_a	<u>c-15t</u>	np	wt	wt
1	390_del_c	wt	np	wt	wt
1	437_ins_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	477_del_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	509_del_a	wt	np	M102T	wt
1	522_del_c	wt	np	wt	wt
1	537-790_del	wt	np	wt	wt
1	626_del_cc	wt	np	wt	wt
3	<b>639_del_gt</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
5	<b>703_del_t</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	751_del_a	wt	np	wt	wt
1	752_ins_g	wt	np	wt	wt
9	<b>768_del_g</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	778_del_a	<u>c-15t</u>	np	wt	wt
2	831-837_del	<u>c-15t</u>	np	wt	wt



4	<b>884_del_t</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	935_ins_t	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1010_del_t	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1034_del_a	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<b>1054_del_g</b>	<b><u>t-8c</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	1061_ins_c	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	1222_del_t	wt	np	wt	wt
6	<b>1242_del_t</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1281_ins_a	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1292_del_t	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1292_del_t	wt	np	wt	a-9g
1	1343_del_a	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	1391_ins_a	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
1	1431_ins_t	WT	np	wt	wt
1	1466_del_tt	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
5	1470_del_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	<b>933-1737_del</b>	wt	np	wt	a-40g
3	<b>large deletion</b>	wt	np	<b>large deletion</b>	<b>large deletion</b>
1	<b>large deletion</b>	wt	np	wt	wt
1	wt	wt	<b><u>S94A</u></b>	wt	wt
1	wt	wt	<b><u>S94A</u></b>	wt	wt
1	wt	wt	<b><u>S94A</u></b>	wt	wt
8	wt	wt	wt	wt	a-68g
1	wt	wt	wt	T149A	wt
1	wt	wt	wt	S131R	wt
1	wt	wt	wt	M142I, Q143K	wt
1	wt	wt	wt	P195L	wt
82	wt	<b><u>c-15t</u></b>	np	wt	wt
93	wt	wt	WT	wt	wt

Mutations are indicated as amino-acid for all proteins encoded by the corresponding genes except for the inhA promoter and the ethA-ethR intergenic region for which mutations are indicated in nucleotide.

Mutations reported in the WHO catalogue as associated with ETH-R are bolded and underlined.

Mutations not listed in the WHO catalogue but mentioned in other published databases are bolded.

Phylogenetic SNPs are indicated in italics.

Stop codon is mentioned by “!”.

a wt: wild-type; mut: mutated, np: not performed

*Table 2. Mutations in ethA, inhA and its promoter, ethR, and ethA-ethR intergenic region for the 110 ETH-S MDR-TB isolates*

N° of isolates	Sequencing results <sup>a</sup>				
	<i>ethA</i>	<i>inhA</i> promoter	<i>inhA</i>	<i>ethR</i>	<i>ethA-ethR</i> intergenic region
2	I9T	wt	np	wt	wt
1	G11D	wt	np	wt	wt
2	D95N, 768_del_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	C131Y	wt	np	wt	wt
2	W167S, S266R	wt	np	S131R	wt
1	I178S	wt	np	wt	wt
3	S266R	wt	np	wt	wt
1	C294Y	wt	np	wt	wt
1	T314I	wt	np	wt	wt
1	P334A	wt	np	wt	wt
1	N379D	wt	np	wt	wt
1	I110_del_a	wt	np	wt	wt
1	382_ins_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	626_del_cc	wt	np	wt	wt
3	703_del_t	wt	np	wt	wt
2	768_del_g	wt	np	wt	wt
1	851_ins_c	wt	np	wt	wt
1	935_ins_t	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1034_del_a	wt	np	wt	wt
1	1242_del_t	wt	np	wt	wt
1	wt	wt	np	65_ins_cg	wt
2	wt	<u>c-15t</u>	np	wt	wt
79	wt	wt	np	wt	wt

Mutations are indicated as amino-acid for all proteins encoded by the corresponding genes except for the *inhA* promoter and the *ethA-ethR* intergenic region for which mutations are indicated in nucleotide.

Mutations reported in the WHO catalogue as associated with ETH-R are bolded and underlined.

Mutations not listed in the WHO catalogue but mentioned in other published databases are bolded.

Phylogenetic SNPs are indicated in italics.

Stop codon is mentioned by “!”.

a wt: wild-type; mut: mutated, np: not performed

*Table 3. Performances of the sequencing strategy used to diagnose ETH-R (i.e. PCR-sequencing of *ethA*, *inhA* and its promoter, *ethR*, and *ethA-ethR* intergenic region) regarding the criteria used to interpret the results, compared to the phenotypic DST as a gold standard.*

Criteria used to interpret the mutations	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV <sup>a</sup>	NPV <sup>b</sup>
<i>none</i> <sup>c</sup>	78.6	71.8	90.7	48.8
<i>none</i> , <i>ethR</i> mutations excluded	74.9	72.7	90.6	45.2
<i>none</i> , polymorphisms excluded	77.8	76.4	92	49.4
<i>none</i> , polymorphisms and <i>ethR</i> mutations excluded	75.2	76.4	91.8	46.7
WHO catalogue only	36.7	98.2	98.6	30.6
WHO catalogue + databases	53.2	98.2	99.0	37.4
WHO catalogue + databases ( <i>ethR</i> mutation excluded)	52.9	98.2	99.0	37.2

a PPV, positive predictive value; bNPV, negative predictive value, c all mutations are taking into account

#### 4. Discussion

The old antibiotic ETH, used for a long time to treat drug resistant TB [1], is benefiting from a renewal since the development of new compounds boosting its activity *in vivo* [24,25] are currently assessed in phase 1 trial (ClinicalTrials.gov n° NCT04654143).

The increase in the proportion of ETH-R isolates among the MDR-TB isolates received at the French NRC from 2008-2009 (44%) to 2010-2016 (77%) represents a challenge to the existing health care facilities in the management of MDR-TB and XDR-TB who follow programmatic regimens and underscores the need of reliable methods for ETH DST [26].

The previously published studies aiming at deciphering the molecular bases of resistance to ETH [6,27–32] have some limitations: Firstly, most of the studies were performed on retrospectively chosen isolates, either ETH-R isolates exclusively or in a high prevalence of ETH-R isolates. Secondly no study included the sequencing of all the main genes described as implicated in ETH-R (i.e. *ethA*, *ethR*, *ethA-ethR* intergenic region, *inhA* and its promoter). Therefore, our study prospectively

evaluating the performances of a genotypic strategy based on the sequencing of the main genes known as involved in ETH-R to diagnose ETH-R, brings useful light into the field, especially as whole genome sequencing becomes widely used, making even more complex the diagnosis of resistance for a drug such as ETH.

Overall, the performances of our genotypic strategy to diagnose ETH-R has suboptimal performances (Table 3). Interestingly, the performances of our genotypic strategy were enhanced by combining the interpretation of the mutations based on the data from the WHO catalogue and other databases (Table 3), as illustrated by the improvement of the specificity (76.4 vs. 98.2%), and the PPV (92.0 vs. 99.0 %). Since the role of *ethR* mutations in ETH-R is doubtful, we propose to avoid taking into account these mutations to diagnose ETH-R [6,22,23]. Our genotypic strategy, taking into account or not the *ethR* mutations, did not modify the diagnostic performances, confirming the probable lack of involvement in resistance of *ethR* mutations (Table 3).

In light of these results, analyzing carefully the strains without genotypic/phenotypic correlation is of great interest. The 26 ETH-S isolates with at least one alteration, phylogenetic SNPs excluded (Table 2)) may be explained by the fact that (i) the genetic alteration observed is not implicated in ETH-R, (ii) the strains have a low level of ETH-R which is not detected by the phenotypic DST or (iii) compensatory mutations restore ETH susceptibility. Other flavin monooxygenases such as *EthA2* or *MymA* are involved in ETH activation [24,33]. These alternative activation pathways may compensate the impact of mutations in *EthA* suspected to provide a loss of protein function (i.e. deletion or insertion) by restoring susceptibility to ETH despite the presence of an *EthA* mutation (Table 2). It is worth noticing that no mutation suspected to provide an important loss of protein function (stop codon and large deletions) was observed in ETH-S strains (Table 2). The 96 ETH-R isolates without any mutation (phylogenetic SNPs excluded) may be explained by the fact that (i) mutations are present in genes other than those studied (*mshA*, *Rv3083*, *ndh*, *Rv0565c* [38,39]), (ii) the strains were wrongly classified as resistant by the phenotypic DST (see below).

Overall, both false results questioned the ability of genotyping, but also phenotypic DST, to properly classify strains as susceptible or resistant. The challenges associated to *M. tuberculosis* DST are well known, especially for ETH. First, the drug is thermolabile, which makes DST difficult [34]. Secondly, discriminating ETH-resistant and -susceptible strains can be a challenge since the distribution of their Minimum Inhibitory Concentrations (MICs) overlap partially [35]. This is similar to what has been described for ethambutol, supporting the idea that the reporting of strains with MICs close to the ECOFF could be affected by reproducibility issues, as the classification into susceptible or resistant highly depends on methodological variation [35]. Third, ETH DST has shown poor concordance and reproducibility compared to other drugs [36,37]. As previously suggested, creating an intermediate susceptibility classification for ETH-S strains with gene alteration, supported by the unfavorable pharmacodynamic indices, could be warranted to increase reproducibility and account for methodological variation [35].

Most of the alterations described in our study (about half of the mutations exclusively found in ETH-R strains) had never been described before and little is currently known about the effects of the different mutations found in *ethA*, *ethR* and the *ethA-ethR* intergenic region. Therefore, we provide here new data which can contribute to enrich the listed mutations associated to ETH-R in the WHO catalogue and other databases.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, F.B. and A.A.; Methodology, TM, FM, FB, WS, JJ. Soft-ware, TM, FM, FB.; Validation TM, FM, FB, WS, JJ, SC, NV, AA.; Formal Analysis, FM, FB, WS, AA.; Investigation, TM, FM, FB, WS, JJ, SC, NV, AA.; Resources, NV, AA.; Data Curation, TM, FM, AA.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, TM, FM, WS, FB, NV, AA.; Writing – Review & Editing, TM, FM, JJ, SC, NV, AA.; Visualization, TM, FM, FB, WS, JJ, SC, NV, AA.; Supervision, AA.; Project Administration, AA.; Funding Acquisition, TM, NV, AA.

Funding: This work was supported by grants from the Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM), and annual grants from Santé Publique France and Sorbonne Université.

Acknowledgments: We wish to honor the memory of our colleagues, Florence Brossier and Wladimir Sougakoff. We thank all the technicians working at the French NRC for their dedication to this work.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. World Health Organization WHO Consolidated Guidelines on Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis Treatment. Geneva, Switzerland 2019.
2. Brossier, F.; Sougakoff, W.; French National Reference Center for Mycobacteria(b) Molecular Detection Methods of Resistance to Antituberculosis Drugs in Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Med Mal Infect* 2017, 47, 340–348, doi:10.1016/j.medmal.2017.04.008.
3. Baulard, A.R.; Betts, J.C.; Engohang-Ndong, J.; Quan, S.; McAdam, R.A.; Brennan, P.J.; Loch, C.; Besra, G.S. Activation of the Pro-Drug Ethionamide Is Regulated in Mycobacteria. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2000, 275, 28326–28331, doi:10.1074/jbc.M003744200.
4. Dover, L.G.; Alahari, A.; Gratraud, P.; Gomes, J.M.; Bhowruth, V.; Reynolds, R.C.; Besra, G.S.; Kremer, L. EthA, a Common Activator of Thiocarbamide-Containing Drugs Acting on Different Mycobacterial Targets. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2007, 51, 1055–1063, doi:10.1128/AAC.01063-06.
5. Quémard, A.; Lanéelle, G.; Lacave, C. Mycolic Acid Synthesis: A Target for Ethionamide in Mycobacteria? *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 1992, 36, 1316–1321, doi:10.1128/aac.36.6.1316.
6. Brossier, F.; Veziris, N.; Truffot-Pernot, C.; Jarlier, V.; Sougakoff, W. Molecular Investigation of Resistance to the Antituberculous Drug Ethionamide in Multidrug-Resistant Clinical Isolates of Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2011, 55, 355–360, doi:10.1128/AAC.01030-10.
7. DeBarber, A.E.; Mdluli, K.; Bosman, M.; Bekker, L.G.; Barry, C.E. Ethionamide Activation and Sensitivity in Multidrug-Resistant Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 2000, 97, 9677–9682.

8. World Health Organization Target Product Profile for Next-Generation Drug-Susceptibility Testing at Peripheral Centres; World Health Organization: Geneva, 2021; ISBN 978-92-4-003236-1.
9. Canetti, G.; Rist, N.; Grosset, J. [Measurement of sensitivity of the tuberculous bacillus to antibacillary drugs by the method of proportions. Methodology, resistance criteria, results and interpretation]. *Rev Tuberc Pneumol (Paris)* 1963, 27, 217–272.
10. Barrera, L.; Cooreman, E.; de Dieu Iragena, J.; Drobniowski, F.; Duda, P.; Havelkova, M.; Hoffner, S.; Kam, K.M.; Kim, S.J.; Labelle, S.; et al. Policy Guidance on Drug-Susceptibility Testing (DST) of Second-Line Antituberculosis Drugs; WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review Committee; World Health Organization: Geneva, 2008;
11. Kam, K.M.; Sloutsky, A.; Yip, C.W.; Bulled, N.; Seung, K.J.; Zignol, M.; Espinal, M.; Kim, S.J. Determination of Critical Concentrations of Second-Line Anti-Tuberculosis Drugs with Clinical and Microbiological Relevance. *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.* 2010, 14, 282–288.
12. Phelan, J.E.; O’Sullivan, D.M.; Machado, D.; Ramos, J.; Oppong, Y.E.A.; Campino, S.; O’Grady, J.; McNerney, R.; Hibberd, M.L.; Viveiros, M.; et al. Integrating Informatics Tools and Portable Sequencing Technology for Rapid Detection of Resistance to Anti-Tuberculous Drugs. *Genome Med* 2019, 11, 41, doi:10.1186/s13073-019-0650-x.
13. Coll, F.; McNerney, R.; Preston, M.D.; Guerra-Assunção, J.A.; Warry, A.; Hill-Cawthorne, G.; Mallard, K.; Nair, M.; Miranda, A.; Alves, A.; et al. Rapid Determination of Anti-Tuberculosis Drug Resistance from Whole-Genome Sequences. *Genome Med* 2015, 7, 51, doi:10.1186/s13073-015-0164-0.
14. Feuerriegel, S.; Schleusener, V.; Beckert, P.; Kohl, T.A.; Miotto, P.; Cirillo, D.M.; Cabibbe, A.M.; Niemann, S.; Fellenberg, K. PhyResSE: A Web Tool Delineating Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Antibiotic Resistance and Lineage from Whole-Genome Sequencing Data. *J Clin Microbiol* 2015, 53, 1908–1914, doi:10.1128/JCM.00025-15.
15. Manson, A.L.; Cohen, K.A.; Abeel, T.; Desjardins, C.A.; Armstrong, D.T.; Barry, C.E.; Brand, J.; TBResist Global Genome Consortium; Chapman, S.B.; Cho, S.-N.; et al. Genomic Analysis of Globally Diverse Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Strains Provides Insights into the Emergence and Spread of Multidrug Resistance. *Nat Genet* 2017, 49, 395–402, doi:10.1038/ng.3767.
16. Vilchèze, C.; Jacobs, W.R. Resistance to Isoniazid and Ethionamide in Mycobacterium Tuberculosis: Genes, Mutations, and Causalities. *Microbiol Spectr* 2014, 2, MGM2-0014–2013, doi:10.1128/microbiolspec.MGM2-0014-2013.
17. Leung, K.L.; Yip, C.W.; Yeung, Y.L.; Wong, K.L.; Chan, W.Y.; Chan, M.Y.; Kam, K.M. Usefulness of Resistant Gene Markers for Predicting Treatment Outcome on Second-Line Anti-Tuberculosis Drugs. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 2010, 109, 2087–2094, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2010.04840.x.
18. Coll, F.; Phelan, J.; Hill-Cawthorne, G.A.; Nair, M.B.; Mallard, K.; Ali, S.; Abdallah, A.M.; Alghamdi, S.; Alsomali, M.; Ahmed, A.O.; et al. Genome-Wide Analysis of Multi- and Extensively Drug-Resistant Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Nat Genet* 2018, 50, 307–316, doi:10.1038/s41588-017-0029-0.

19. Islam, M.M.; Tan, Y.; Hameed, H.M.A.; Liu, Z.; Chhotaray, C.; Liu, Y.; Lu, Z.; Cai, X.; Tang, Y.; Gao, Y.; et al. Detection of Novel Mutations Associated with Independent Resistance and Cross-Resistance to Isoniazid and Prothionamide in Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Clinical Isolates. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2019, 25, 1041.e1-1041.e7, doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2018.12.008.
20. WHO Catalogue of Mutations in Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Complex and Their Association with Drug Resistance 2021.
21. Coll, F.; McNerney, R.; Guerra-Assunção, J.A.; Glynn, J.R.; Perdigão, J.; Viveiros, M.; Portugal, I.; Pain, A.; Martin, N.; Clark, T.G. A Robust SNP Barcode for Typing Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Complex Strains. *Nat Commun* 2014, 5, 4812, doi:10.1038/ncomms5812.
22. Engohang-Ndong, J.; Baillat, D.; Aumercier, M.; Bellefontaine, F.; Besra, G.S.; Locht, C.; Baulard, A.R. EthR, a Repressor of the TetR/CamR Family Implicated in Ethionamide Resistance in Mycobacteria, Octamerizes Cooperatively on Its Operator. *Mol. Microbiol.* 2004, 51, 175–188.
23. Dover, L.G.; Corsino, P.E.; Daniels, I.R.; Cocklin, S.L.; Tatituri, V.; Besra, G.S.; Fütterer, K. Crystal Structure of the TetR/CamR Family Repressor Mycobacterium Tuberculosis EthR Implicated in Ethionamide Resistance. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 2004, 340, 1095–1105, doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2004.06.003.
24. Blondiaux, N.; Moune, M.; Desroses, M.; Frita, R.; Flipo, M.; Mathys, V.; Soetaert, K.; Kiass, M.; Delorme, V.; Djaout, K.; et al. Reversion of Antibiotic Resistance In Mycobacterium Tuberculosis by Spiroisoxazoline SMART-420. *Science* 2017, 355, 1206–1211, doi:10.1126/science.aag1006.
25. Flipo, M.; Frita, R.; Bourotte, M.; Martínez-Martínez, M.S.; Boesche, M.; Boyle, G.W.; Derimanov, G.; Drewes, G.; Gamallo, P.; Ghidelli-Disse, S.; et al. The Small-Molecule SMART751 Reverses Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Resistance to Ethionamide in Acute and Chronic Mouse Models of Tuberculosis. *Sci Transl Med* 2022, 14, eaaz6280, doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aaz6280.
26. Centre national de référence des Mycobactéries et de la résistance des mycobactéries aux antituberculeux Rapport Annuel d'activité Available online: [http://cnrmyctb.free.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport-CNR-MyRMA-2019b\\_web.pdf](http://cnrmyctb.free.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport-CNR-MyRMA-2019b_web.pdf) (accessed on 16 July 2021).
27. Coll, F.; Preston, M.; Guerra-Assunção, J.A.; Hill-Cawthorn, G.; Harris, D.; Perdigão, J.; Viveiros, M.; Portugal, I.; Drobniewski, F.; Gagneux, S.; et al. PolyTB: A Genomic Variation Map for Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 2014, 94, 346–354, doi:10.1016/j.tube.2014.02.005.
28. Boonaiam, S.; Chaiprasert, A.; Prammananan, T.; Leechawengwongs, M. Genotypic Analysis of Genes Associated with Isoniazid and Ethionamide Resistance in MDR-TB Isolates from Thailand. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 2010, 16, 396–399, doi:10.1111/j.1469-0691.2009.02838.x.
29. Lee, H.; Cho, S.N.; Bang, H.E.; Lee, J.H.; Bai, G.H.; Kim, S.J.; Kim, J.D. Exclusive Mutations Related to Isoniazid and Ethionamide Resistance among Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Isolates from Korea. *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.* 2000, 4, 441–447.
30. Malinga, L.; Brand, J.; Jansen van Rensburg, C.; Cassell, G.; van der Walt, M. Investigation of Isoniazid and Ethionamide Cross-Resistance by Whole Genome Sequencing and Association with

Poor Treatment Outcomes of Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis Patients in South Africa. *Int J Mycobacteriol* 2016, 5 Suppl 1, S36–S37, doi:10.1016/j.ijmyco.2016.11.020.

31. Morlock, G.P.; Metchock, B.; Sikes, D.; Crawford, J.T.; Cooksey, R.C. EthA, InhA, and KatG Loci of Ethionamide-Resistant Clinical Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Isolates. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2003, 47, 3799–3805.

32. Rueda, J.; Realpe, T.; Mejia, G.I.; Zapata, E.; Roza, J.C.; Ferro, B.E.; Robledo, J. Genotypic Analysis of Genes Associated with Independent Resistance and Cross-Resistance to Isoniazid and Ethionamide in Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Clinical Isolates. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 2015, 59, 7805–7810, doi:10.1128/AAC.01028-15.

33. Grant, S.S.; Wellington, S.; Kawate, T.; Desjardins, C.A.; Silvis, M.R.; Wivagg, C.; Thompson, M.; Gordon, K.; Kazanskaya, E.; Nietupski, R.; et al. Baeyer-Villiger Monooxygenases EthA and MymA Are Required for Activation of Replicating and Non-Replicating Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Inhibitors. *Cell Chem Biol* 2016, 23, 666–677, doi:10.1016/j.chembiol.2016.05.011.

34. Lefford, M.J.; Mitchison, D.A. Comparison of Methods for Testing the Sensitivity of Mycobacterium Tuberculosis to Ethionamide. *Tubercle* 1966, 47, 250–261, doi:10.1016/s0041-3879(66)80003-x.

35. Schön, T.; Juréen, P.; Chryssanthou, E.; Giske, C.G.; Sturegård, E.; Kahlmeter, G.; Hoffner, S.; Angeby, K.A. Wild-Type Distributions of Seven Oral Second-Line Drugs against Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.* 2011, 15, 502–509, doi:10.5588/ijtld.10.0238.

36. Lakshmi, R.; Ramachandran, R.; Syam Sundar, A.; Rehman, F.; Radhika, G.; Kumar, V. Optimization of the Conventional Minimum Inhibitory Concentration Method for Drug Susceptibility Testing of Ethionamide. *Int J Mycobacteriol* 2013, 2, 29–33, doi:10.1016/j.ijmyco.2012.11.005.

37. Kaniga, K.; Cirillo, D.M.; Hoffner, S.; Ismail, N.A.; Kaur, D.; Lounis, N.; Metchock, B.; Pfyffer, G.E.; Venter, A. A Multilaboratory, Multicountry Study To Determine MIC Quality Control Ranges for Phenotypic Drug Susceptibility Testing of Selected First-Line Antituberculosis Drugs, Second-Line Injectables, Fluoroquinolones, Clofazimine, and Linezolid. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 2016, 54, 2963–2968, doi:10.1128/JCM.01138-16.

38. Hicks, N.D.; Carey, A.F.; Yang, J.; Zhao, Y.; Fortune, S.M. Bacterial Genome-Wide Association Identifies Novel Factors That Contribute to Ethionamide and Prothionamide Susceptibility in Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *MBio* 2019, 10, doi:10.1128/mBio.00616-19.

39. Grau, T.; Selchow, P.; Tigges, M.; Burri, R.; Gitzinger, M.; Böttger, E.C.; Fussenegger, M.; Sander, P. Phenylethyl Butyrate Enhances the Potency of Second-Line Drugs against Clinical Isolates of Mycobacterium Tuberculosis. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2012, 56, 1142–1145, doi:10.1128/AAC.05649-11.