Supplementary Table 1 Comparison between Drug Susceptibility Testing and Whole Genome Sequencing drug resistance predicition

	Beijing_A (N=140)	Beijing_B (N=80)	Beijing_C (N=224)	Beijing_D (N=32)	Beijing_E (N=153)	Beijing_F (N=80)	Ural_A (N=219)	Ural_B (N=92)	Ural_C (N=20)	Overall (N=1040)
Rifampin										
Agree	136 (97.1%)	75 (93.8%)	217 (96.9%)	32 (100%)	147 (96.1%)	77 (96.3%)	216 (98.6%)	91 (98.9%)	20 (100%)	1011 (97.2%)
Disagree	4 (2.9%)	5 (6.3%)	7 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	6 (3.9%)	3 (3.8%)	3 (1.4%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	29 (2.8%)
	Beijing_A (N=135)	Beijing_B (N=76)	Beijing_C (N=214)	Beijing_D (N=30)	Beijing_E (N=141)	Beijing_F (N=78)	Ural_A (N=203)	Ural_B (N=87)	Ural_C (N=20)	Overall (N=984)
Isoniazid										
Agree	132 (97.8%)	74 (97.4%)	206 (96.3%)	30 (100%)	136 (96.5%)	76 (97.4%)	202 (99.5%)	86 (98.9%)	19 (95.0%)	961 (97.7%)
Disagree	3 (2.2%)	2 (2.6%)	8 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (3.5%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (5.0%)	23 (2.3%)

N denotes the number of tests performed per clade

	Beijing MDR (N=394)	Beijing Non-MDR (N=410)	Ural MDR (N=256)	Ural Non-MDR (N=164)	Overall (N=1224)
Rifampin					
No	0 (0%)	406 (99.0%)	1 (0.4%)*	163 (99.4%)	570 (46.6%)
Yes	394 (100%)	4 (1.0%)	255 (99.6%)	1 (0.6%)	654 (53.4%)
Isoniazid					
No	0 (0%)	345 (84.1%)	0 (0%)	127 (77.4%)	472 (38.6%)
Yes	394 (100%)	65 (15.9%)	256 (100%)	37 (22.6%)	752 (61.4%)
Pyrazinamide					
No	105 (26.6%)	408 (99.5%)	188 (73.4%)	163 (99.4%)	864 (70.6%)
Yes	289 (73.4%)	2 (0.5%)	68 (26.6%)	1 (0.6%)	360 (29.4%)
Ethambutol					
No	40 (10.2%)	385 (93.9%)	17 (6.6%)	160 (97.6%)	602 (49.2%)
Yes	354 (89.8%)	25 (6.1%)	239 (93.4%)	4 (2.4%)	622 (50.8%)
Streptomycin					
No	2 (0.5%)	327 (79.8%)	1 (0.4%)	153 (93.3%)	483 (39.5%)
Yes	392 (99.5%)	83 (20.2%)	255 (99.6%)	11 (6.7%)	741 (60.5%)

Supplementary Table 2 *In silico* drug resistance profiles for MDR and non-MDR strains

*low-coverage, likely hetero-resistance at this site

Supplementary Table 3 Results of the genome wide association study

	B	eijing	Ural			
	MDR	non-MDR	MDR	non-MDR		
<i>rpoB</i> S450L	88.58%	0.73%	91.41%	0%		
<i>katG</i> S315T	99.49%	15.65%				
<i>rpsL</i> K43R	84.26%	18.10%				

Supplementary Table 4 Demographic make-up of time-based clades

	Beijing_A (N=159)	Beijing_B (N=87)	Beijing_C (N=252)	Beijing_D (N=36)	Beijing_E (N=163)	Beijing_F (N=87)	Ural_A (N=263)	Ural_B (N=95)	Ural_C (N=21)	Overall (N=1163)
Sex										
Male	128 (80.5%)	65 (74.7%)	196 (77.8%)	24 (66.7%)	125 (76.7%)	71 (81.6%)	193 (73.4%)	73 (76.8%)	17 (81.0%)	892 (76.7%)
Female	31 (19.5%)	22 (25.3%)	56 (22.2%)	12 (33.3%)	38 (23.3%)	16 (18.4%)	70 (26.6%)	22 (23.2%)	4 (19.0%)	271 (23.3%)
Age										
Mean (SD)	43.3 (12.4)	40.0 (14.1)	42.8 (13.7)	45.0 (12.7)	43.3 (12.4)	43.9 (14.2)	40.7 (12.3)	42.2 (13.3)	42.7 (9.47)	42.4 (13.0)
Median [Min, Max]	42.0 [1.00, 79.0]	37.0 [3.00, 71.0]	41.0 [6.00, 86.0]	45.0 [18.0, 68.0]	44.0 [15.0, 80.0]	44.0 [11.0, 80.0]	39.0 [8.00, 81.0]	41.5 [14.0, 86.0]	46.0 [26.0, 59.0]	41.0 [1.00, 86.0]
Missing	2 (1.3%)	2 (2.3%)	3 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.3%)	6 (2.3%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	16 (1.4%)
Homeless										
No	136 (85.5%)	74 (85.1%)	223 (88.5%)	30 (83.3%)	137 (84.0%)	71 (81.6%)	223 (84.8%)	86 (90.5%)	19 (90.5%)	999 (85.9%)
Yes	20 (12.6%)	9 (10.3%)	22 (8.7%)	6 (16.7%)	18 (11.0%)	8 (9.2%)	30 (11.4%)	6 (6.3%)	2 (9.5%)	121 (10.4%)
Missing	3 (1.9%)	4 (4.6%)	7 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	8 (4.9%)	8 (9.2%)	10 (3.8%)	3 (3.2%)	0 (0%)	43 (3.7%)
Previously_Incarcerated										
No	99 (62.3%)	72 (82.8%)	191 (75.8%)	30 (83.3%)	139 (85.3%)	74 (85.1%)	193 (73.4%)	82 (86.3%)	18 (85.7%)	898 (77.2%)
Yes	39 (24.5%)	8 (9.2%)	31 (12.3%)	2 (5.6%)	13 (8.0%)	4 (4.6%)	29 (11.0%)	3 (3.2%)	3 (14.3%)	132 (11.4%)
Missing	21 (13.2%)	7 (8.0%)	30 (11.9%)	4 (11.1%)	11 (6.7%)	9 (10.3%)	41 (15.6%)	10 (10.5%)	0 (0%)	133 (11.4%)



Supplementary Figure 1 Time phylogeny divided into clades based on structured

populations Timed phylogenetic trees of Ural (A) and Beijing (B) strains used in the study. Branches are colored by structured population clade designations estimated with *TreeStructure*, and the position of MDR (dark blue) and non-MDR (light blue) strains shown in the colored bar.



Supplementary Figure 2 Local branching index and case counts for all lineage 2 and lineage 4 strains detected in Moldova (A) Local branching index (LBI) estimates for all lineage 2 and lineage 4 sub-lineages present in Moldova during the study period, separated by MDR and non-MDR strain status. (B) Case counts of sequences collected during the study period of each lineage2 and lineage 4 sub-lineage, separated by MDR and non-MDR strain status.



Supplementary Figure 3 Maximum likelihood phylogeny with Ural strains from Moldova and Georgia A maximum likelihood phylogeny of all Ural lineage 4.2 isolates collected in Moldova and Georgia. The tips are annotated by the country of isolation and the resistance genotype (MDR and non-MDR) at the tips illustrated by the colored band. The cluster of nine Georgian MDR strains sharing the SNPs found only in MDR strains in the Moldova dataset is indicated by the grey arrow.



Supplementary figure 4 Time-based phylogeny and effective population size estimates for Ural strains (A) Timed phylogenetic tree of Ural strains reconstructed using a lower mutation rate of 0.3 SNPs/genome/year, compared to 0.5 SNPs/genome/year in the main analysis, with MDR status and new time-based clade designation shown. (B) Effective population size estimates for each new time-based clade, inferred using *SkyGrowth*, showing the rapid growth of a majority MDR Ural clade (Ural 26), which corresponds to the Ural A clade in the main analysis. The line represents the mean estimate and the shaded area represents the 95% credible interval.



Supplementary Figure 5 Multitype Birth Death Model results after resampling Ural

sequences The effective reproduction number (R_e) of MDR (light red) and non-MDR (dark red) randomly down-sampled Ural strains inferred using a multi-type birth death model in *BEAST2*.