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Highlights
- Multi-drug resistant tuberculosis is a significant global health problem
- Person-to-person transmission is a more important driver of drug-resistance than acquisition
- Increased efforts to directly address multi-drug resistant tuberculosis are urgently needed

Abstract

Objectives. Multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) is a threat to TB control. To guide TB control, it is essential to understand the extent to which and the circumstances in which MDR-TB will replace drug-susceptible TB (DS-TB) as the dominant phenotype. We examined the issue by presenting evidence from genomics, pharmacokinetics and epidemiology studies. We then synthesised this evidence into a mathematical model.

Methods. Our model consider two TB strains, one with and one without MDR phenotype. We allowed that intrinsic transmissibility may be different between the two strains, as may the control response including detection rate, treatment failure and default rates. We explored the outcomes in terms of incidence of MDR-TB and time until MDR-TB surpasses DS-TB as the dominant strain.
**Results and conclusions.** The ability of MDR-TB to dominate DS-TB was highly sensitive to the relative transmissibility of the resistant strain; however, MDR-TB could dominate even when its transmissibility was modestly reduced (to between 50% and 100% as transmissible as DS-TB strain). Our model suggest that it may take decades or more for strain replacement to occur. We also found that while amplification of resistance is the early cause of MDR-TB, this will rapidly give way to person-to-person transmission.

**Keywords:** antibiotic resistance, mathematical modelling, communicable disease control, tuberculosis

1. **Introduction**

*Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (*M. tb*) is now the most lethal infectious pathogen, causing 9.6 million cases of tuberculosis (TB) and killing 1.5 million people worldwide in 2014. An alarming proportion of these cases can be attributed to drug-resistant strains of *M. tb* which present an ever growing threat to global TB control.

Serial introduction of single anti-mycobacterial agents in the 1940s (streptomycin), 1950s (isoniazid) and 1960s (rifampicin) saw the emergence of drug-resistant isolates, particularly when these agents were used alone or intermittently. Between 1970 and 1990, there were numerous outbreaks of drug-resistant TB involving strains resistant to two or more drugs. This phenomenon necessitated the use of multi-drug combination therapies, with strong health programs; the Directly Observed Treatment Short-Course (DOTS) strategy. DOTS, as it was originally implemented, focused on drug susceptible (DS) TB. Its aim was to increase successful treatment outcomes and reduce drug resistance by ensuring all TB patients were treated with multiple agents for at least six months.
Despite these measures, since 1985, the world has seen a constant rise in the levels of multidrug-resistant (MDR) TB - defined as *M. tb* with in vitro resistance to at least isoniazid and rifampicin, the two most potent first-line anti-TB drugs. The most recent report suggests that these isolates accounted for at least 480,000 incident cases and 210,000 attributed deaths worldwide in 2014.\(^1\) Extensively drug-resistant (XDR) strains, which are MDR-TB strains with additional resistance to fluoroquinolones and a second-line injectable agent (kanamycin, amikacin or capreomycin), have now been found in every region of the world.\(^1\)

Initially, public health agencies looked at the soundness of the DS-TB control programs as a means to fix the problem: “While it is important, on a clinical basis and epidemiologically in some contexts, to care optimally for patients with MDR-TB, it is more important to address the cause of MDR-TB and to fix the program generating MDR-TB”.\(^8\) However, a new paradigm has gradually emerged in MDR-TB control, with greater acknowledgement that MDR-TB must be addressed directly. This paper examines why this shift in thinking is necessary to control MDR-TB, and the consequences of neglecting the need to address directly the problem of MDR-TB. We review evidence from genomics, pharmacokinetics (PK) and epidemiology. We then use mathematical modelling to synthesise the evidence into scenarios in which MDR-TB and drug-susceptible DS-TB vie for dominance.

2. **Genomics**

In the last decades, major advances in molecular biology have increased our knowledge of the mechanisms of resistance to the main anti-TB drugs, with the identification of specific gene mutations which are associated with drug resistance.\(^9\) This also allowed detailed mapping of *M. tb* transmission pathways, indicating that drug-resistant strains of *M. tb* demonstrate typical epidemic spread in most settings where this has been evaluated.\(^10\)
Unlike other bacteria, in which acquired drug resistance is generally mediated through horizontal transfer of mobile genetic elements, *M.tb* acquires drug resistance through spontaneous chromosomal mutation, typically resulting in a fitness cost seen as a reduced growth rate in vitro.\textsuperscript{11} However, this fitness cost varies depending on the specific drug resistance-conferring mutations, and mutations associated with no fitness cost have also been described.\textsuperscript{12-14} Indeed, other processes, such as compensatory evolution and genetic co-selection, complicate the picture. As an example, the genetic background of each strain in which a specific resistance-conferring mutation occurs can modulate the fitness impact of this mutation, such interaction between genes being called epistasis.\textsuperscript{12}

Resistance to rifampicin is the most pressing concern in TB management, because it necessitates very long, expensive and relatively toxic drug schedules and leads to poorer outcomes. Identification of specific compensatory mutations among clinical strains of *M.tb* has improved our understanding of drug resistance and fitness\textsuperscript{15-17}. Rifampicin resistance is nearly always caused by one of several possible point mutations to the *rpoB* gene, which encodes a small part of the β-subunit of RNA polymerase close to the catalytic center of the enzyme.\textsuperscript{9, 18, 19} The so-called rifampicin-resistance-determining-region (RRDR) covers 81 base pairs encoding for the amino acids 507 to 533 in the β-subunit. Compensatory mutations that ameliorate the fitness costs of the common rifampicin-resistance mutation, *rpoB* R529C, have been described in *rpoA*, *rpoB* and *rpoC* genes, coding for different subunits of RNA polymerase (α, β- and β' subunits respectively). Some clinical rifampicin-resistant *M.tb* isolates have mutations outside the detection regions (leading to false negative RPO-β tests), while other isolates reveal no rpo-β mutation at all. Two efflux pumps (Rv2936 and Rv0783) overexpressed in the resistant isolates are postulated to cause the rifampicin-resistance phenotype in these *M.tb* strains.\textsuperscript{20}
3. Pharmacokinetic variability

Drug resistance in *M. tb* is now recognised to result from complex drivers, rather than simply from weak programs and inadequate adherence to therapy. Recent evidence suggests that the emergence of drug resistance can occur despite better than 98% treatment completion.\(^{21}\)

There is increasing evidence that variability in PK profiles between individuals (i.e. inter-individual variability) is a more likely cause of the emergence of drug resistance than non-completion of treatment.\(^{22, 23}\) Previous studies have shown that the PK of first-line anti-TB drugs including isoniazid\(^{24}\), pyrazinamide\(^{25}\), rifampicin\(^{26}\) and ethambutol\(^{27}\) exhibit marked inter-individual variability. Such variability in PK occurs as a result of demographic characteristics such as gender, age, ethnicity and body weight, comorbidities, drug interactions and genetic polymorphisms affecting drug absorption, metabolism and elimination. PK variability in return may lead to inadequate drug exposure at the site of infection, facilitating the emergence of drug resistance.\(^{21, 22}\) For example, Calver et al.\(^{21}\) found in their clinical study that low drug exposure (as measured by area under the concentration time curve [AUC] and peak concentrations [C\(_{\text{max}}\)]) was the main driver of drug resistance despite meticulous DOTS. Similarly, Srivastava et al.\(^{22}\) predicted that 1% of patients with perfect adherence would develop MDR-TB due to suboptimal drug exposure as a manifestation of PK variability alone.

4. Epidemiology

MDR-TB has emerged independently in many parts of the globe with early discovery in South Africa and rapid rise in Eastern Europe with the collapse of Soviet Public Health systems.\(^{28}\) MDR-TB is now found in most countries around the world and the proportion of new TB cases showing MDR-TB is increasing. Currently, the highest absolute numbers of MDR-TB cases occur in the most populous countries: India and China.\(^1\) In contrast, the highest proportion of isolates showing drug resistance is found in Eastern Europe with 32%
and 76% of new and previously treated cases respectively found to be MDR-TB in Belarus.\textsuperscript{29} However, the true global incidence of MDR-TB is unknown, the proportion of new cases tested for drug susceptibility is only 12% globally\textsuperscript{1} and MDR-TB is spreading in countries with the poorest surveillance systems; for example, incidence of MDR-TB may be as high as 1,000 per 100,000 population in Daru, Papua New Guinea.\textsuperscript{30}

On the basis of early evidence of variable and slow emergence of MDR, decades after the introduction of therapy, many argued that MDR-TB would not replace DS-TB.\textsuperscript{31} However, epidemiology studies now provide evidence to the contrary. For example, studies show that transmission of drug-resistant strains (i.e. primary resistance) rather than amplification from susceptible strains (acquisition of resistance-conferring mutations, i.e. acquired resistance) is the dominant source of MDR-TB.\textsuperscript{32} Children are an indicator of strains being transmitted within communities; a recent study in China showed that children presenting with their first episode of TB frequently have MDR.\textsuperscript{33}

Drug-resistant \textit{M.\textit{tb}} strains have several survival advantages owing to the way in which TB is managed globally. Firstly, because only a fraction of new cases in the world are tested for resistance\textsuperscript{1}, MDR-TB has the opportunity to spread in the community before detection. Universal use of geneXpert for new cases is being advocated to improve detection of resistant cases and hence inhibit their spread. Additionally in many countries MDR-TB treatment has a large backlog of patients, delaying specific therapy.\textsuperscript{34} Finally after treatment has begun, the treatment regimen is toxic, slower to reduce bacterial burden\textsuperscript{35}, and less successful, leading to treatment failures and withdrawals giving further opportunity for MDR-TB to spread.\textsuperscript{36} For this reason, it is possible to speculate (and we will show with mathematical modelling) that all else being equal, MDR-TB is likely to take over from DS-TB.
It is now possible to estimate the likely contribution of the various pathways to MDR-TB, i.e. (1) primary transmission of MDR-TB resulting in new or retreatment cases, or (2) the development of drug resistance in patients infected with DS-TB following inadequate drug exposure. Global MDR-TB rates and available modelling data suggest that primary transmission of MDR-TB strains from person to person has become more frequent than acquisition following treatment.\textsuperscript{32}

If MDR-TB were not transmissible, its emergence would pose at worst a small increased cost for health systems. MDR-TB transmissibility, the relative likelihood of person-to-person transmission, is an important determinant of whether it will come to dominate over DS-TB. The early hypothesis that resistance was always associated with a loss of bacterial fitness, and hence led to lower case fatality rates and decreased transmission of such strains, has been disproved.\textsuperscript{6} Indeed, some isolates of MDR \textit{M.tbc} appear to have no fitness cost.

Observations and simple calculations show that most MDR-TB is transmitted not mutated from pre-existing DS strains. Figure 1 gives a simplified summary of the sources of MDR-TB found in new and pre-treated cases. Much is often made of the high ratio of MDR-TB isolates in retreated cases (global estimate >20%) compared with new cases (global estimate 3.3%) of TB.\textsuperscript{1} However the ratio does not necessarily indicate high rates of amplification, as illustrated in Figure 1.

[Figure 1 about here]

These arguments combined provide a framework to consider MDR-TB as an infection that can arise whenever first line agents are used against DS-TB. Although amplification of resistance is made worse by poor programs, even well-functioning programs should expect some MDR-TB as a result of natural variability in population PK. Once MDR-TB has emerged, its potential to displace DS-TB as the dominant phenotype, depends on features
other than those that drive the original amplification. These may depend on the transmission
rates in the community, and detection and cure rates of the TB program. The following
section uses mathematical models to explore these ideas and elicit the key drivers of MDR-
TB dominance.

5. Modelling drivers of MDR-TB burden

Despite the evidence presented above, there remains considerable debate as to the key drivers
of the emerging drug-resistant TB epidemic. Mathematical modelling can illuminate this
discussion by simulating the transmission dynamics in high-risk communities and identifying
the primary factors that most strongly contribute to incidence and prevalence of drug-resistant
strains. In this section, we examine the conditions under which one would expect MDR-TB to
become dominant and the time taken to transition to the dominant type.

For this purpose we use the two-strain TB transmission model introduced by Trauer et al.\textsuperscript{37}
The two-strain model allows for a modified transmissibility, and detection rate, of the MDR-
TB strain relative to the transmissibility and detection rate of the DS-TB strain. Additionally,
the model allows for different treatment failure rates according to resistance profile. The
diagram of the model, along with the ordinary differential equations and all parameter values
used, is reproduced in the appendix.

We have chosen baseline parameters for the model to simulate high prevalence conditions, in
which TB is always endemic regardless of the values of the modifiable parameters. In doing
this we aimed to capture transmission dynamics seen in global hotspots\textsuperscript{37} but we have not
specifically calibrated the model to a particular country; hence we aim to make general
qualitative and semi-quantitative conclusions about model outcomes, rather than specific
quantitative predictions.
In the model structure, we include an amplification pathway, representing acquired resistance, so that as long as DS-TB exists and is treated, it will continue to supply MDR-TB patients. The resultant equilibrium scenarios are one of two possibilities: either both DS-TB and MDR-TB remain in circulation (this represents DS being the dominant driver of TB transmission); or MDR-TB outcompetes DS-TB, driving the latter to extinction.

The results, displayed in Figure 2, show incidence of MDR-TB and time to replacement of DS-TB with MDR-TB as a function of the relative transmissibility and relative detection rate of MDR-TB compared with DS-TB (we define time of replacement as the point at which the incidence of MDR-TB exceeds the incidence of DS-TB). Predictably, the higher the transmissibility of the isolate (moving along the X-axis from zero to twice as fit as DS-TB), the higher the incidence of MDR-TB at equilibrium and the faster its progress to replace DS-TB strains as the dominant strain population. In this model, the MDR-TB burden depends more sensitively on the relative strain transmissibility than it does on the relative detection rate. Figure 2 indicates a clear delineation, such that if the relative transmissibility of MDR-TB is more than ~80% of DS-TB, MDR-TB always comes to dominate, regardless of the relative detection rate. Conversely, if the relative transmissibility of MDR-TB is less than ~50%, DS-TB remains dominant regardless of the relative detection rate.

Relative detection rate does influence the incidence and dominance of MDR-TB in the interval in which MDR-TB transmits 50% to 80% as efficiently as DS-TB. A detection rate of MDR-TB equal to that of DS-TB (as may be expected when geneXpert is first line diagnostic), would lead to very low levels of MDR-TB, whereas no MDR-TB detection would lead to high incidence levels (Figure 2).
In Figure 3 we record the equilibrium MDR-TB incidence and replacement time respectively, as functions of the unsuccessful live outcome rate (i.e. default or failure) and the relative detection rates. In these graphs we do not consider the impact of changes in transmissibility (relative transmissibility is set at a fixed value of 70%). The upper left-hand corner of each panel in Figure 3 - corresponding to the best case control scenario - finds DS-TB dominates however, as we move towards the lower right-hand corner, MDR-TB begins to dominate. Surprisingly, in this case, the MDR-TB burden is more sensitive to the relative detection rate than it is to the treatment outcome. However, as the relative detection rate increases, treatment outcome becomes more important. We mention briefly that we repeated this calculation for a relative transmission fitness of 100% and found that MDR-TB dominates under all conditions, except zero treatment.

Laboratory findings suggest that compensatory mutations occur in some isolates of MDR-TB M.tuberculosis that potentially allow the growth and transmissibility fitness cost to be minimised or completely overcome.\(^3^8\) Furthermore, modelling suggests that strain replacement can occur even if the basic reproduction number of the MDR-TB strain is less than that of the DS strain; that is, even when there is a fitness cost to drug resistance.\(^3^7\) Therefore, we cannot dismiss the growing risk of the MDR-TB epidemic by assuming that the relative fitness of the mutant strains is diminished, which in itself may not be a valid assumption.

The shortest time period for MDR-TB to overcome the more resistant co-circulating strain is of the order of decades. Given this, it would be possible to mistake slow emergence of the resistant strain for absence of significant burden at equilibrium. This may help to explain the historical assumption that MDR-TB was a temporary phenomenon resulting directly from non-completion of therapy in individual patients, rather than a persistent challenge to global
control. Moreover, as the replacement time is of the order of centuries under most proposed conditions (Figures 2 and 3), this could also explain the observation that some countries have very low rates of MDR-TB while others have extremely high rates, at 50 years following introduction of the antibiotics.

In Figure 4 we measure our model output of the proportion of MDR-TB that arises through transmission from person to person as a fraction of all incident MDR-TB. We see that initially, all MDR-TB arises through amplification, as would be expected, given that starting conditions are that there is no MDR-TB. After 10 years, the proportion of MDR-TB is nearing its equilibrium state and depends on the relative transmissibility of the MDR-TB.

In this model, amplification of MDR-TB from DS-TB serves as a trigger, bringing MDR into existence, while fitness cost and the favourable conditions for replacement inadvertently brought about by control programs determine whether MDR will dominate. Factors that drive MDR-TB replacement include low levels of detection of MDR compared with DS-TB and higher default/failure rates of MDR-TB than DS-TB. However, relative detection rates are much more influential than relative default/failure rates.

[Figure 4 about here]

Earlier models, such as those from Espinal and Dye, had similar structure but did not explore as broad a parameter space. In fact, they did not allow that MDR-TB may be harder to detect than DS-TB, or be more likely to fail therapy, effectively only exploring the top left corner of the heat maps in Figures 2 and 3. As can be seen this is not a very interesting part of the parameter space and one in which the MDR-TB transmission environment is unfavourable.
Further modelling work defining the conditions under which strain replacement may occur will be very useful in determining the risk of additional or accumulated resistance, for example, emergence of XDR-TB and resistance to newer agents such as bedaquiline and delaminid.

6. Conclusion

Modelling demonstrates that TB with a resistant phenotype may thrive even in the presence of some transmissibility fitness cost; a concerning possibility that needs to be appreciated by public health policy makers. Current surveillance and reporting systems are inadequate to estimate the extent of MDR-TB, and the reporting requirements tend to obscure the magnitude of primary transmission of drug-resistant TB; a critical methodological flaw that needs to be addressed urgently. Without a renewed focus on prevention, early diagnosis and effective treatment of MDR-TB cases, we are likely to witness MDR-TB epidemic replacement in the coming decades, which could derail progress towards global TB control and ultimate elimination.
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The system of ordinary differential equations governing the model is given by:

\[ \frac{dS_A}{dt} = (1 - i)\pi N - (\lambda + \lambda_m + \mu)S_A \]

\[ \frac{dS_B}{dt} = i\pi N + \varphi T + \varphi_m T_m - (\lambda_d + \lambda_{dm} + \mu)S_B \]

\[ \frac{dL_A}{dt} = \lambda S_A + \lambda_d(S_B + L_B + L_{Bm}) - (\varepsilon + \kappa + \mu)L_A \]
\[
\frac{dL_{Am}}{dt} = \lambda_m S_A + \lambda_{dm}(S_B + L_B + L_{Bm}) - (\varepsilon + \kappa + \mu)L_{Am}
\]
\[
\frac{dL_B}{dt} = \kappa L_A + \gamma I - (\lambda_d + \lambda_{dm} + \nu + \mu)L_B
\]
\[
\frac{dL_{Bm}}{dt} = \kappa L_{Am} + \gamma I_m - (\lambda_d + \lambda_{dm} + \nu + \mu)L_{Bm}
\]
\[
\frac{dI}{dt} = \varepsilon L_A + \nu L_B + (1 - \eta)\omega T - (\gamma + \delta + \mu_i)I
\]
\[
\frac{dI_m}{dt} = \varepsilon L_{Am} + \nu L_{Bm} + \eta \omega T + \omega T_m - (\gamma + \delta_m + \mu_i)I_m
\]
\[
\frac{dT}{dt} = \delta I - (\varphi + \omega + \mu_t)T
\]
\[
\frac{dT_m}{dt} = \delta_m I_m - (\varphi_m + \omega + \mu_t)T_m
\]

Where:

\[
\lambda = \beta \rho (I + oT)/N
\]
\[
\lambda_d = \chi \beta \rho (I + oT)/N
\]
\[
\lambda_m = \beta_m \rho (I_m + oT_m)/N
\]
\[
\lambda_{dm} = \chi \beta_m \rho (I_m + oT_m)/N
\]
\[
N = S_A + S_B + L_A + L_B + L_{Am} + L_{Bm} + I + I_m + T + T_m
\]
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Figure 1. Diagram illustrating several mechanisms for a greater proportion of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) in retreatment cases (right) by comparison to new cases (left), highlighting that resistance amplification through treatment non-completion is not the only cause of the discrepancy (red pathway). Other explanations include: (1) lower rates of treatment success for appropriately treated MDR-TB patients by comparison to drug-susceptible tuberculosis (DS-TB), such that more retreatment episodes will be MDR-TB (brown pathway); (2) lower rates of testing for drug-resistance at first presentation, such that many patients with transmitted MDR-TB will not be recognised as such until representation (orange pathway) and (3) a lower denominator, due to high treatment success rates at the first treatment episode.
Figure 2. (Left) Equilibrium multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) incidence as a function of relative transmissibility and relative treatment detection rate. (Right) Time taken for MDR-TB incidence to overtake drug-susceptible tuberculosis DS-TB incidence, as a function of relative transmissibility and relative treatment detection rate. The simulations were terminated at 1000 years, hence dark blue colour represents no replacement of DS-TB with MDR-TB.
Figure 3. (Left) Incidence of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) as a function of proportion default/failure rate as a fraction of all cases of active TB treated (X-axis) and relative detection rate of MDR-TB compared to drug-susceptible tuberculosis (DS-TB) (Y-axis). (Right) Time to replacement of DS-TB with MDR-TB as a function of the same variables. Replacement time is shown on a logarithmic scale. The simulations were terminated at 1000 years, hence dark blue colour represents no replacement of DS-TB with MDR-TB.
**Figure 4.** Ratio of multi-drug resistant (MDR) cases of tuberculosis (TB) that are transmitted versus acquired as a function of time (X-axis) and relative transmission (Rel. Trans.).
Appendix 1

Model used for the modelling section of this paper; derived from Trauer et al.\textsuperscript{37}

\textbf{Figure A1.} Model structure: Red compartments with m subscripts, population infected with multi drug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB); thick blue arrow, infection with drug-susceptible TB (DS-TB) in fully susceptible persons (λ); thin blue arrows, infection with DS-TB in partially immune persons (λ\textsubscript{d}); thick red arrow, infection with MDR-TB in fully susceptible persons (λ\textsubscript{m}); thin red arrow, infection with MDR-TB in partially immune persons (λ\textsubscript{dm}). Susceptible compartments (S) are divided into fully susceptible (subscript A) and partially immune (subscript B), while latent compartments (L) are divided into early (subscript A) and late (subscript B) latency.
The parameter values used in the model and Figures 2, 3 and 4 are shown in Table A1 below.

**Table A1. Parameter values and their definitions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed disease parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>Early progression</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Transition to late latency</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>Reactivation</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Spontaneous recovery</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_i$</td>
<td>TB-specific death rate</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_t$</td>
<td>Treated TB-specific death rate</td>
<td>$0.5 \times \mu_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>Amplification</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Treatment modification of infectiousness</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi$</td>
<td>Partial immunity</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>Drug-susceptible treatment rate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB treatment rate</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed epidemiological parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi$</td>
<td>Birth rate</td>
<td>Varied to population-wide death-rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>TB-free mortality</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>Infectious proportion</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modifiable parameters (baseline values)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>BCG vaccination rate</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>Detection rate</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB detection rate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>Default rate</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Effective contact rate</td>
<td>$38^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB effective contact rate</td>
<td>$0.7\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameters modified for Figure 2</strong></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB detection rate</td>
<td>$0 - \delta$ (i.e. 0 – 0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB effective contact rate</td>
<td>$0 - 2\beta$ (i.e. 0 – 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameters modified for Figure 3</strong></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB detection rate</td>
<td>$0 - \delta$ (i.e. 0 – 0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>Default rate</td>
<td>$0 - \phi$ (i.e. 0 – 0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameters modified for Figure 4</strong></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_m$</td>
<td>MDR-TB effective contact rate</td>
<td>$0 - \beta$ (i.e. 0 – 38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Iteratively adjusted to match incidence rate of 400 to 450 per 100,000 per year.