A computational method for predicting the most likely
evolutionary trajectories in the stepwise accumulation of
resistance mutations

R. Charlotte Eccleston[a,1], Emilia Manko[a], Susana Campino[a], Taane G. Clark[a,b], Nicholas
Furnham[a]
[a]Department of Infection Biology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London,
United Kingdom; [b]Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene
and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
[1]R. Charlotte Eccleston
Email: charlotte.eccleston@lshtm.ac.uk

Author Contributions: R.C.E., S.C., T.G.C. and N.F. conceived and designed the study. E.M.
performed the bioinformatic processing of the raw sequencing data. R.C.E performed the
research. R.C.E. analyzed the data. R.C.E. wrote the first draft of paper. All authors commented
on and edited the manuscript and approved the final version. R.C.E. compiled the final
manuscript.
Competing Interest Statement: None.
Classification: Major: Biological Sciences, Minor: Biophysics and Computational Biology,
Evolution
Keywords: Antimicrobial resistance, epistasis, pathogen evolution

This PDF file includes:
Main Text
Figures 1 to 4
Table 1
24

Abstract

Pathogen evolution of drug resistance often occurs in a stepwise manner via accumulation of

multiple mutations that in combination have a non-additive impact on fitness, a phenomenon

known as epistasis. Epistasis complicates the sequence-structure-function relationship and

undermines our ability to predict evolution. Here we test how well Rosetta Flex ddG is able to

estimate epistasis between resistance mutations and observe good agreement with experimental

data. By using these predictions to parameterize an existing mechanistic model of molecular

evolution, we also investigate how well such a model is able to capture evolution to resistance

where the order of fixation is influenced by epistasis. We apply this method to predict evolutionary

trajectories to known quadruple mutations associated with resistant phenotypes for malaria.

Resistance to the combination drug sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine (SP) in malaria-causing species

Plasmodium falciparum (Pf) and *Plasmodium vivax (Pv)* has arisen via the accumulation of

multiple point mutations in the DHFR and DHPS genes. The evolution of resistance in the DHFR

genes of *Pf* and *Pv* has been studied extensively. Four known *Pf*DHFR pyrimethamine resistance

mutations are highly prevalent in field-isolates and multiple studies have shown epistatic

interactions between these mutations determine the accessible evolutionary trajectories to the

highly resistant quadruple mutation N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L. We simulated the possible

evolutionary trajectories to this quadruple *Pf*DHFR mutation as well as the homologous *Pv*DHFR

mutations. In both cases, the most probable pathways agreed well with those determined

experimentally. This method can be applied to any drug-target system where the drug acts by

binding to the target.

Significance Statement

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a major public health threat, resulting from the overuse and

misuse of antimicrobial drugs. Our ability to monitor emerging resistance and direct the most

appropriate treatment strategy (stewardship) would be strengthened by the development of

methods to accurately predict the mutational pathways to resistance. Here, we present a

computational method to predict the most likely pathways to resistance that result from

combinations of mutations that alter drug binding affinity. We utilized the Rosetta Flex ddG

protocol to parameterize a thermodynamic evolutionary model to predict the order of fixation of

each mutation in the pathway. This approach accurately captures known resistance trajectories

and can be applied to any system where resistance arises via drug binding affinity changes.

Main Text

Add in arguments from presentation

Introduction

The development of new antimicrobial therapeutics and the design of more successful drug

deployment strategies to reduce the prevalence of resistance, requires an understanding of the

underlying molecular evolution. Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) poses a huge global health threat

through a wide range of mechanisms [1-3]. One of the major routes to resistance, and the focus

of the work presented here, is genomic variation within protein coding regions. Of particular

significance are single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in the antimicrobial target gene that

alter the protein structure and prevent efficient binding of the antimicrobial drug. Provided these

SNPs do not prevent the target from carrying out its function, the resistant strains will proliferate

within the population [4].

The evolution of resistance is affected by the interplay between selection for resistance, selection

for protein function, drug concentration and mutational bias, and it is also influenced by a

phenomenon known as epistasis [5-7].

Epistasis between mutations within the same protein arises due to energetic interactions between

the amino acids, where the impact of a mutation depends upon the protein sequence [8]. When

epistasis occurs between two or more mutations, their combined impact on protein fitness or a

physical trait such as stability or binding affinity, does not equal the sum of their independent

impacts. Epistasis been observed in the evolution of many pathogens [9-11], including the

evolution of resistance in *Plasmodium falciparum* [6, 12] and *Plasmodium vivax* [7] . Epistasis

can influence the evolution of resistance because it determines the order of fixation of mutations

and the accessibility of evolutionary trajectories to resistance phenotypes [5, 13]. It may also have

important consequences for the success of AMR management strategies that aim to reduce

resistance via the cessation of use of a particular drug. In theory, stopping the use of a drug

should result in reversion of resistance mutations, because most resistance mutations incur a

large fitness cost in the absence of drug [14, 15]. However, the success of this strategy has been

mixed, and in some cases bacterial populations remained resistant [16-18], which may be the

result of compensatory mutations (a type of epistasis), which mitigate the deleterious impact of

resistance mutations, allowing them to remain in a population and thus retain resistance even in

the absence of drug selection pressures [19].

Fragment-based drug discovery (FBDD) and AMR surveillance strategies require methods to

predict evolutionary trajectories to resistance. For example, by identifying mutations involved in

resistance trajectories that might impact the effectiveness of an antimicrobial drug, specific

regions of a target molecule can be exploited or avoided, thus creating 'evolution proof' drugs.

Therefore, understanding how epistasis arises and predicting which mutations will interact, is

important for anticipating future mutations, designing new drugs and developing strategies to

minimize resistance.

Evolution towards drug-resistant phenotypes in malaria species *P. falciparum* and *P. vivax* has

been shown to occur in a stepwise manner, due to epistatic interactions between mutations, and

the most likely trajectories to resistance phenotypes have been predicted using experimental

measures of resistance [6, 7, 12].

P. falciparum and *P. vivax* parasites cause the majority of malaria infections and have evolved

strong resistance to many antimalarial drugs, including pyrimethamine [12] and sulfadoxine [20].

There were an estimated 241 million new cases of malaria world-wide in 2020, resulting in

approximately 627,000 deaths predominately among children under 5 years of age [21]. *P.*

falciparum malaria has been treated with the combination drug sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine (SP)

since 1970s, which targets the folate metabolic pathway. Numerous resistance mutations have

arisen within its genome as a result of SNPs in *P. falciparum* dihydrofolate reductase (*Pf*DHFR)

and dihydropteroate synthase (*Pf*DHPS) genes, which are the targets of pyrimethamine and

sulfadoxine respectively [20, 22]. Although SP is not usually used to treat *P. vivax*, co-infections

with *P. falciparum* have meant SP resistance mutations have also arisen in the *P. vivax* genome

[23]. The enzymes of the folate pathway are largely conserved across *Plasmodium* species, and

so polymorphisms in equivalent positions have been observed in *P. vivax* DHFR (*Pv*DHFR) and

DHPS (*Pv*DHPS) and are thought to confer resistance to SP [24, 25].

The DHFR gene encodes an enzyme that uses NADPH to synthesize tetrahydrofolate, a co-

factor in the synthesis of amino acids [26], and pyrimethamine acts to disrupt this process,

thereby blocking DNA synthesis and slowing down growth. Stepwise acquisition of multiple

mutations leading to resistance to pyrimethamine has been observed in both *Pf*DHFR [6, 12] and

*Pv*DHFR [7].

Resistance In *Pf*DHFR has been studied extensively and a combination of four mutations – Asn-

51 to Ile (N51I), Cys-59 to Arg (C59R), Ser-108 to Asn (S108N) and Ile-164 to Leu (I164L) – has

been reported to result in resistance to pyrimethamine [27] by altering the binding pocket and

reducing the affinity for the drug [28]. Epistasis in both pyrimethamine binding free energy and the

concentration required to inhibit cell growth by 50% (IC50) has been observed experimentally for

combinations of these four mutations [6, 12]. This means that mutations which on their own are

not associated with a resistance phenotype, can be when in combination with other mutations.

Epistasis between these mutations has been shown to determine the evolutionary trajectories to

the quadruple mutation N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L, which is strongly associated with

pyrimethamine resistance [6].

A similar investigation was conducted into the homologous set of *Pv*DHFR mutations – Asn-50 to

Ile (N50I), Ser-59 to Arg (S58R), Ser-117 to Asn (S117N) and Ile-173 to Leu (I173L) - and the

accessible evolutionary trajectories to the quadruple mutation [7], some combinations of which

have been observed to result in pyrimethamine resistance both *in vivo* and *in vitro* [25, 29].

Evolutionary simulations accounting for growth rates, IC50 measurements for increasing

concentrations of pyrimethamine and nucleotide bias predicted the most likely pathways to the

quadruple mutation for different drug concentrations. The observed trajectories at each

concentration were influenced by epistasis between the mutations and the adaptive conflict

between endogenous function and acquisition of drug resistance. These studies, along with other

investigations [5, 30] have highlighted the prevalence of epistasis among resistance mutations

and the importance of considering epistatic interactions between mutations when predicting

evolutionary trajectories to drug resistance.

The predictability of evolution is a central topic in biology of interest to experimentalists and

theorists alike [31-34] (for a review of the topic see [35]). By using experimentally measured

values to characterize the empirical fitness landscapes and simulate evolutionary trajectories, the

work in [6] and [7] is determining the predictability of evolution in these landscapes by assessing

which trajectories are accessible and the level of determinism associated with the evolution.

Whilst such experimental methods have been successful in capturing epistasis, characterizing

evolutionary landscapes and predicting evolutionary trajectories, they are expensive and time

consuming.

The development of computational methods to predict resistance trajectories would enable fast

and efficient predictions and would be more widely accessible than lab-based methods.

Computational tools could help narrow down the pool of mutations to be studied experimentally

and would also be applicable to difficult to study targets. Some target-specific computational tools

to predict individual resistance mutations have been developed [36, 37]. However, such tools are

target specific and so not generalizable. Furthermore, they only consider independent mutations

on a single structure and so ignore epistasis between resistance mutations. Therefore, they are

not suitable for predicting evolutionary trajectories to resistance.

To determine a generalizable computational method to predict evolutionary trajectories to

resistance, we need to consider the main determinants of resistance. Rodrigues et al. (2016) [38]

investigated three mutations in *Escherichia coli* DHFR associated with trimethoprim resistance

and considered activity, binding affinity, fold stability, and intracellular abundance. They found

that whilst resistance is a trade-off between these factors, binding affinity is the single most

predictive trait of resistance, especially at later points in evolution. Therefore, we decided to

investigate if predictions of binding affinity change can be used to predict the order of fixation of

resistance mutations involved in evolutionary trajectories to resistance.

Rosetta Flex ddG [39] is the current state-of-the art method for predicting changes in protein-

protein and protein-ligand binding free energy. Rosetta is a software suite for macromolecular

modelling and design that uses all-atom mixed physics- and knowledge-based potentials, and

provides a diverse set of protocols to perform specific tasks, such as structure prediction,

molecular docking and homology modelling [40]. The Flex ddG protocol has been found to

perform better than machine learning methods and comparably to molecular dynamics methods

when tested on a large dataset of ligand binding free energy changes upon protein mutation [41,

42]. However, its ability to capture epistasis has not yet been tested. Therefore, we investigated

how well Flex ddG can capture epistasis between resistance mutations in *Pf*DHFR and observed

a good agreement with experimental data.

Next, we used the Flex ddG predictions to parameterize a fitness function and applied this fitness

function in an existing model of molecular evolution. We used this method to predict evolutionary

trajectories to known resistant quadruple mutants in both *Pf*DHFR and *Pv*DHFR, where the

evolutionary trajectories have been studied experimentally [6, 7]. Good agreement was observed

between the most likely trajectories to the quadruple mutations predicted by our model and those

predicted experimentally.

The main advantage of this approach is that it does not require access to an experimental 'wet'

lab and can be carried out by anyone with access to a high-performance computer (to run the

Flex ddG predictions). It is generalizable to any antimicrobial drug that acts by binding to its target

and can be easily applied to any drug-target complex for which there is an available structure.

Therefore, it can be used to study complexes and systems that might be problematic

experimentally. It enables accurate assessment of the predictability of the evolutionary

landscape, in other words it can predict whether we would expect to see constrained evolutionary

trajectories on a fitness landscape as a result of epistatic interactions in drug binding free energy.

In addition, we analyzed if evolutionary pathways can be inferred from the frequency of mutations

found in isolate data. We determined the frequency of mutations in *Pf*DHFR and *Pv*DHFR, and

inferred the most likely evolutionary pathways under the assumption that the most likely mutation

at each step corresponds to the most frequent mutation. We carried out this analysis first upon a

combined set of global isolates from all regions and then upon isolates from each region

individually. In general, the most likely pathways inferred from the global isolate data agreed

remarkably well with both the experimentally determined pathways and the pathways predicted

by our computational method. When considering geographical regions separately, the inferred

pathways from several regions agreed well with the experimental pathways and our predicted

pathways, however the most likely pathways inferred in some regions differed from the main

pathways, highlighting the importance of considering the evolution in different regions separately.

Results

Rosetta Flex-ddG accurately predicts binding free energy changes and captures epistasis

We investigated if Flex ddG predictions agree with experimentally measured binding free energy

and if these predictions can be used to calculate the non-additivity in binding free energy

(interaction energy), which for a double mutant defines the epistasis between the two mutations

and, for a triple mutant or higher, captures the level of epistatic interactions. We calculated the

interaction energy by finding the difference between the predicted change in binding free energy

of a multiple mutation and the sum of the predictions of their independent binding free energy

changes. A positive value of the interaction energy indicates the sum of the independent impacts

is more destabilizing than the impact of the multiple mutation and a negative value indicates the

sum is less destabilizing than the combined impact.

The change in binding free energy was predicted using Rosetta Flex ddG for the combinatorically

complete set of the four *Pf*DHFR pyrimethamine resistance mutations N51I, C59R, S108N and

I164L. (Note on notation: lists of single mutations are written X, Y, Z, multiple mutations are

written X,Y,Z (i.e. no space between the commas and the mutations) and pathways are written

X/Y/Z to denote the order of fixation).

We compared the predictions to the data from [12] in which they present the binding free energy

changes for a subset of the possible combinations of mutations, the sum of the independent

mutations (calculated for multiple mutants to compare to the experimentally determined binding

free energy changes of multiple mutants) and the interaction energy of the multiple mutants

(Table 1). In Table 1, a positive $\Delta\Delta G$ value indicates a destabilising mutation and a negative $\Delta\Delta G$

value indicates a stabilising mutation (Note: Rosetta Flex ddG calculates the change in binding

free energy as $\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{mut} - \Delta G_{WT}$, whereas [12] calculated the change as the reverse, $\Delta\Delta G =$

$\Delta G_{WT} - \Delta G_{mut}$, where *WT* indicates the wild-type free energy and *mut* indicates the mutant free

energy. Therefore, in [12], a mutation that destabilized the binding corresponded to a negative

$\Delta\Delta G$, whilst here we have reversed the signs of their data to enable comparison with our

predictions).

The authors of the Flex ddG protocol suggest conducting a minimum of 35 runs and to take the

average of the distribution as the prediction for that mutation [39]. To determine the optimum

number of runs per mutation, we ran predictions for 35 (Figure S1, Table S1) and 150 (Figure S2,

Table 1) runs and a single prediction at 300 runs (Figure S3), and concluded 150 runs provides

the best trade-off between accuracy and efficiency (see Supplementary text for detailed

discussion). Therefore, we will be discussing the predictions for n=150 going forward

Examining the distributions of the predicted change in binding free energy for each of the

mutations considered in [12] (Figure S2) we can see that the distributions are not Gaussian but

have a defined peak, and so the average of the distribution may not be the best summary metric

to use to compare to the data. We therefore chose the peak of the distribution as the summary

metric of each prediction. We compared the predictions for 150 runs and the data from [12]

(Table 1) and observed a correlation of 0.635 between for the binding free energy data, 0.435 for

the sum of the independent predictions for multiple mutants and 0.765 for the interaction energy.

We found 8/9 binding free energy predictions were correctly classified, 4/5 of the sum of the

independent predictions were correctly classified and 4/5 of the interaction energies were

correctly classified.

Mutation S108N was the only single mutation to destabilize pyrimethamine binding in both the

experimental data and the Flex ddG predictions. However, in the experimental data the double

mutation N51I,S108N is more destabilizing to binding than single mutation S108N, but the peak

of the Flex ddG distribution was stabilizing. The triple mutation C59R,S108N,I164L was found

experimentally to be the most destabilizing of the triple mutations, however the peak of the Flex

ddG distribution predicted it to be only mildly destabilizing and the least destabilizing of the triple

mutations. Furthermore, the quadruple mutation was found experimentally to have the most

destabilizing impact out of all combinations of single and multiple mutations, however, Flex ddG

predicted it to be less destabilizing than the double mutation C59R,S108N.

Considering the interaction energy, the incorrectly classified mutation was again N51I,S108N,

where the interaction energy was predicted to be positive, but found experimentally to be

negative, because the sum of the individual predictions was destabilizing but the double mutation

itself was predicted to have a stabilizing impact. Both the experimental data and our predictions

found that the quadruple mutation had the largest magnitude interaction energy reflecting the

greatest difference between the stabilizing impact of the sum of the individual mutations and the

destabilizing impact of the quadruple mutation itself.

The triple mutation C59R,S108N,I164L was found to have a large positive interaction energy in

both the experimental data and our predictions, where the triple mutation was found to be

destabilizing whilst the sum of the individual impacts was stabilizing to pyrimethamine binding.

We also observed large negative interaction energy between S108N and C59R, where C59R is

stabilizing in the wildtype background but destabilizing in the background of S108N, an example

of sign epistasis and in agreement with the observations of both [12] and [6]. However, whilst the

interaction energy of the triple mutation N51I,C59R,S108N was positive for both the experimental

data and predictions, in our predictions its magnitude was much smaller compared to the data.

Both single mutations N51I and C59R were predicted to be only marginally stabilizing – almost

neutral - to pyrimethamine binding, whilst in the experimental data both mutations have a large

stabilizing impact. Furthermore, the triple mutation was predicted to be only marginally more

destabilizing than single mutation S108N, resulting in the small negative interaction energy.

We use these predictions in the following sections to parameterize an evolutionary model to

determine if the predicted evolutionary trajectories agree with experimentally determined

evolutionary trajectories.

A thermodynamic evolutionary model predicts the most likely evolutionary trajectories to quadruple mutations in both *Pf*DHFR and *Pv*DHFR

We simulated the evolutionary trajectories to the quadruple mutants described above for the genes *Pf*DHFR and *Pv*DHFR using an evolutionary model, adapted from previous studies [43-45]. In this model, selection acts to reduce the binding affinity between target protein and the antimalarial drug with which the mutations have been associated with resistance. Briefly, starting from the wild-type protein, we randomly sample a value from the Flex ddG distributions for each of the four single mutations and calculate the fitness of the mutated protein (Eq. 1), and the fixation probability (Eq. 2). A mutation is then chosen with a probability proportional to the fixation probability and this is repeated until the quadruple mutation is reached. If the set of sampled mutations at a step all have a fixation probability of zero, the algorithm terminates at that point in the pathway and begins the next run at the single mutation step. Therefore, it is not guaranteed that a run will reach the quadruple mutation. We carried out 10,000 runs and determined i) the number of runs that reached a single, double, triple or the quadruple mutation before the run ended (files ending '_endpoint_numbers.csv'), ii) the frequency of the observed trajectories up to the quadruple mutation, including trajectories that terminated before the quadruple mutation (files ending '_pathway_endpoints.csv'), iii) the frequency at which a mutational step was chosen in all runs (files ending '_total_pathway_probabilities.csv) and iv) the most likely trajectories to the quadruple mutation predicted by our simulations (see files ending '_quadruple_pathways.csv').

To determine how well our simulations reflect the evolutionary process to the *Pf*DHFR quadruple mutation N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L, we compared our results to experimentally determined evolutionary trajectories as presented by [6]. In our simulations, the quadruple mutation was reached in approximately 12% of runs (see file 'PfDHFR_endpoint_numbers.csv' in the Supplementary data). The majority of the runs (75%) terminated at a double mutation, with S108N/C59R the most likely trajectory over all. The algorithm was often unable to proceed passed S108N/C59R in many runs because the Flex ddG distribution for C59R,S108N is concentrated around large destabilizing values (Figure S2f) whilst the distributions of the two

possible next steps, N51I,C59R,S108N and C59R,S108N,I164L, are concentrated around lower

destabilizing values (Figures S2g and h). Therefore, in many instances, the change in binding

free energy caused by the next step in the pathway were predicted to be stabilizing, and thus

were not be chosen by the algorithm. This demonstrates the dependence of the method upon the

accuracy of the Flex ddG. In contrast, the majority of runs in the simulations based on IC50

measurements presented in [6] reached the quadruple mutation (see Figure 2 in [6]).

However, since we are interested in how epistasis influences the order of fixation of mutations in

an evolutionary trajectory to a high-resistance quadruple mutation, we compared the most likely

trajectories to the quadruple mutation predicted by our simulations to the most likely trajectories

to the quadruple mutation predicted in [6] and observed remarkable agreement. The top two most

likely trajectories predicted by our model to the *Pf*DHFR quadruple mutation were

S108N/C59R/N51I/I164L, S108N/C59R/I164L/N51I, respectively (Figure 1a) and these pathways

correspond to the top two most likely pathways to the quadruple determined in [6]. The third most

likely trajectory to the quadruple mutation in [6] was predicted to be S108N/N51I/C59R/I164L,

however this pathway was predicted to be very unlikely in our simulations, due to the fact that the

distribution of Flex ddG predictions for double mutation N51I,S108N was mostly stabilizing to

pyrimethamine binding (Figure S2e), whereas all of the S108N distribution was destabilizing to

pyrimethamine binding, so this step was unlikely to be chosen by the evolutionary algorithm.

Considering the frequency at which the single mutations were chosen as the first step in all

simulated pathways (see file 'PfDHFR_total_pathway_probabilities.csv'), S108N was the most

likely single mutation and C59R was the second most likely single mutation, in agreement with

the two most likely first steps in the pathways predicted in [6]. In our simulations, N51I was the

third most likely single mutation and I164L has zero probability of being chosen as the first

mutation, due to the fact that all 150 predicted binding affinity changes were stabilizing to

pyrimethamine binding. The most likely pathway to a double mutation realized in all trajectories in

both our simulations and the simulations in [6] is S108N/C59R. Similarly, the most likely pathway

to a triple mutation realized in all our simulations and in [6] was S108N/C59R/N51I.

To simulate the evolutionary pathways for *Pv*DHFR, we also carried out predictions of binding

free energy changes for the homologous set of four mutations in *Pv*DHFR, (N50I, S58R, S117N

and I173L). As described in the previous section, we carried out 150 Flex ddG runs per mutation.

Unfortunately, there is no binding affinity data available for the mutations in *Pv*DHFR to compare

to the Flex ddG predictions. However, Jiang et al. (2013) [7] predicted pathways to the *Pv*DHFR

quadruple mutation for four pyrimethamine concentrations using simulations informed by both

drug resistance and catalytic activity, to which we can compare our simulations. In their

simulations, the quadruple mutation fixed in 99.8% of runs for the highest pyrimethamine

concentration, but it did not fix for the three lower concentrations. In our simulations, the

quadruple mutation was reached in 47% of runs (see file 'PvDHFR_endpoint_numbers.csv'),

whilst 48% of runs terminated at a double mutation. The most likely pathway endpoint overall in

our simulations was S58R/I173L, which occurred in 29% of runs, however this path was not a

frequent trajectory observed in the simulations in [7]. The double mutation S58R,I173L was

predicted by Flex ddG to have a large destabilizing impact on pyrimethamine binding, with all

runs predicted to be destabilizing and many predicted to have a medium to large impact.

However, the triple mutation S58R,S117N,I173L was predicted to have a smaller destabilizing

impact than S58R,S117N, making pathway S58R/I173L/N50I unlikely, whilst N50I,S58R,I173L

was predicted to be stabilizing to pyrimethamine in all Flex ddG runs and therefore pathway

S58R/I173L/N50I had a zero probability of occurring in the simulations. This resulted in many

runs terminating at step S58R/I173L.

Considering the order of fixation of mutations in the quadruple mutation, if we compare the most

likely evolutionary trajectories to the quadruple mutation predicted by our simulations (see file

'PvDHFR_quadruple_pathways.csv') to the most likely evolutionary trajectories to the quadruple

mutation presented in [7], we observed good agreement for the largest of the four concentrations

they considered. The most likely pathway to the quadruple mutation predicted by our simulations

was S58R/S117N/I173L/N50I (Figure 1b) which corresponds to the second most likely pathway to

the quadruple mutation predicted in [7] for the highest pyrimethamine concentration. Our second

most likely pathway to the quadruple mutation (S58R/S117N/N50I/I173L) corresponds to the first

most likely pathway predicted in [7] for the highest pyrimethamine concentration. There were two

other possible pathways to the quadruple at the highest concentration, S117N/N50I/S58R/I173L

and N50I/S117N/S58R/I173L, which correspond to the sixth and seventh most likely pathways to

the quadruple in our simulations.

The first step in the evolutionary trajectories determined in [7] for the highest concentration was

S58R whereas for the three lower concentrations it was S117N. The most likely first step in all

pathways predicted by our simulations was S58R (Figure 1b), whilst S117N was the second most

likely first step (see 'PvDHFR_total_pathway_probabilities.csv'). Analyzing the Flex ddG

distributions, the S58R predictions are mostly destabilizing to pyrimethamine and it is the only

single mutation to reduce the binding affinity when considering both the average and the peak of

the distribution (Figure S4). A large proportion of the Flex ddG predictions for single mutation

S117N are mildly stabilizing to pyrimethamine and whilst the average is mildly destabilizing, the

peak of the distribution is a mild stabilizing effect (Figure S5).

To quantify the predictability of an evolutionary landscape, previous studies have calculated the

Gibbs-Shannon entropy distribution of the path weights [34, 35], namely $S = -\sum P_i \ln P_i$, where P_i

is the probability of the ith pathway and the value of S ranges from 0 to $\ln(n)$ for n equally likely

pathways. The lower the value of S the higher the predictability of the evolution i.e. most of the

probability is concentrated around a small number of pathways, which suggests epistasis is

influential in constraining the accessible trajectories. The value of S when considering the

probability distribution of all realized evolutionary in the simulations was 1.29 for *Pf*DHFR and

2.56 for *Pv*DHFR (both simulations have an equal number of possible pathways because they

have an equal number of mutations, so the values of S are comparable and the maximum value

of S for both simulations is 4.16). This means the evolutionary trajectories were more constrained

in the *Pf*DHFR simulations than in the *Pv*DHFR simulations and suggests that epistasis between

the mutations plays a greater role in constraining the trajectories in the evolution of *Pf*DHFR

resistance. Unfortunately, the probabilities of all possible pathways determined in [6] and [7] are

not made available (the data is represented in pathway diagrams, the probabilities of a step are

indicated by line thickness and only the probabilities of the most likely pathways annotated),

therefore we cannot calculate the corresponding values of S for these distributions for

comparison.

The frequency of mutations in isolate data can be used to infer evolutionary trajectories to

multiple resistance mutations

It was noted in [6] that their most likely pathways to the *Pf*DHFR quadruple mutation were

consistent with combinations of these four mutations observed in high frequencies in worldwide

surveys of *P. falciparum* polymorphisms. To expand on this idea, we analyzed the frequency of

the possible combinations the mutations in *Pf*DHFR and *Pv*DHFR found in our isolate data to

identify if there is agreement between these frequencies, the experimentally determined

trajectories and our predicted trajectories and if, therefore, isolate frequency data may be used to

infer evolutionary trajectories. We inferred evolutionary trajectories from the frequency data by

assuming if a specific mutation was found in high frequency (and is part of the combinatorically

complete set of four mutations found in the four genes) then it is likely to be part of the

evolutionary trajectory towards the quadruple mutation. To infer the first step in the most likely

trajectory, we considered the frequency of single mutations of the set of four mutations

considered for each gene and selected the most frequent mutation. To infer subsequent steps in

the trajectory, we considered the frequency of only those mutations that contain the previous

mutation and another of the set of four mutations in some combination and chose the most

frequent mutation at each step. We also inferred alternative pathways which from the frequency

data are less likely than the main pathway, but still a possibility due to the occurrence of

intermediate mutations in the isolate data. To do this, we considered each step in the most likely

trajectory and identified any other high frequency mutations that would enable alternative

pathways from the double mutation onwards. If there were no alternative pathways, we began the

process again but chose the second most frequent single mutation (if applicable) and built the

pathway from there. In the event of multiple alternative pathways, we are unable to determine

their relative likelihoods, only that they are less likely than the most likely pathway.

Considering the total frequency of each mutation in the set of four *Pf*DHFR mutations (N51I,

C59R, S108N and I164L) in the isolate data (Figure 2a), S108N was the most frequent single

mutation (72/6762 isolates), C59R,S108N the most frequent double mutation (496/6762 isolates)

and N51I,C59R,S108N the most frequent triple mutation (3714/6762 isolates). The quadruple

mutation N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L was found in 1439/6762 isolates. This suggests the pathway

proceeds in the order S108N/C59R/N51I/I164L, in agreement with the most likely pathway to the

quadruple mutation from both our evolutionary simulations and those using experimental data [6].

460
Triple mutation C59R,S108N,I164L was found in 101/6762 isolates, suggesting that the second

most likely pathway to the quadruple from our simulations and experimental data,

S108N/C59R/I164L/N51I, is a possible less likely trajectory to the quadruple mutation. Double

mutation N51I,S108N was the second most frequent double mutation in the isolate data

(198/6762 isolates), allowing for a third most likely pathway S108N/N51I/C59R/I164L. This

agrees with the third most likely pathway presented by [6], however it was the fifth most likely

pathway to the quadruple in our simulations.

Single mutations C59R and N51I were the second and third most prevalent single mutations in

our isolate data, found in 5/6762 and 1/6762 of isolates, respectively. They were also the second

and third most likely first step in our pathway predictions (see file

'PfDHFR_total_pathway_probabilities.csv'). Single mutation I164L was absent from the isolate

data and had a zero probability of being selected as the first step of our evolutionary trajectories.

Considering the set of four *Pv*DHFR mutations (N50I, S58R, S117N and I173L), in our isolate

data, the mutations S58R and S117N are fixed at these locations and the wild-type alleles are

now considered to have an Arginine at codon 58 and Asparagine at codon 117. However in [7]

they consider the wild-type allele to have a Serine at codons 58 and 117 and therefore we have

changed our definition of the wild-type allele to agree with [7] for ease of comparison with their

evolutionary pathways and our own.

The most frequent single mutation was S117N (70/847 isolates), the most frequent double

mutation was S58R,S117N (237/847) and the only observed triple mutation was

S58R,S117N,I173L (2/847) (Figure 2b). The quadruple mutation N50I,S58R,S117N,I173L was

not observed in our isolate data, and has not been reported in the literature either. By considering

the frequency of the possible combinations of mutations, we inferred the evolution towards triple

mutation S58R,S117N,I173L most likely occurs via pathway S117N/S58R/I173L. This

corresponds to the third most likely pathway to a triple mutation when considering all pathways

observed in our simulations, however this pathway is not observed in any of the most frequent

pathways at any of the four concentrations studied in [7].

Single mutation S58R was the second most frequent single mutation in our isolate data (20/847).

This supports the predicted first evolutionary steps in [7] which were predicted to be S58R for the

highest pyrimethamine concentration and S117N for three lower concentrations of

pyrimethamine, which suggests both single mutations are possible, but S117N is more likely for a

lower pyrimethamine concentrations. An alternative pathway to the triple mutation could therefore

be S58R/S117N/I173L, which may be more likely under higher pyrimethamine concentrations.

This corresponds to the most likely pathway to a triple mutation in our simulations and is part of

the second most likely pathway to the quadruple mutation at the highest pyrimethamine

concentration considered in [7].

Analysis of geographical distribution of mutations found in our isolate data reveals

alternative pathways to resistance

The analysis in the previous section inferred evolutionary trajectories using the frequency data of

mutations found in worldwide isolate data. We next considered the evolutionary trajectories by

geographical location to determine if there are any differences in the inferred trajectories

compared to the global trajectories, and which areas agree with the trajectories predicted by our

simulations. The *P. falciparum* isolates were grouped in to seven geographical regions, as

defined by the United National Statistics Division: South America (Brazil, Colombia and Peru),

West Africa (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Gambia,

Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria and Senegal), Central Africa (Congo [DRC]), East

Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda), South Asia

(Bangladesh), Southeast Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam)

and Melanesia (Papua New Guinea). The *P. vivax* isolates were grouped into seven broad

geographical regions, as defined by the United Nations Statistics Division: Central America

(Mexico), South America (Brazil, Colombia, Guyana, Panama, Peru), East Africa (Ethiopia,

Eritrea, Madagascar, Sudan, Uganda), South Asia (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Sri

Lanka), Southeast Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand

and Vietnam), East Asia (China) and Melanesia (Papua New Guinea). The mutation frequency

data discussed in this section for each country can be found in Supplementary data folders

'PfDHFR/IsolateMutationFrequency' and 'PvDHFR/IsolateMutationFrequency'. For an analysis of

the frequencies and inferred pathways per country per region, as well as information on additional

mutations found in the data, see Supplementary text.

As in the previous section, we inferred the most likely pathway by assuming the most frequent

mutation at each step corresponds to the most likely evolutionary trajectory. Considering the

frequency of mutations found in *Pf*DHFR isolates from the different geographical regions (Figure

3), the most likely evolutionary pathway to the quadruple mutation N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L was

inferred to agree with the main pathway, S108N/C59R/N51I/I164L, predicted by our evolutionary

model and the data presented in [6], as well as the most likely pathway inferred by considering

the frequency of all worldwide *Pf*DHFR isolate data in West Africa (S108N: 31/2594;

C59R,S108N: 211/2594; N51I,C59R,S108N: 1739/2594; N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L: 1/2594),

South Asia (S108N: 2/86; C59R,S108N: 39/86; N51I,C59R,S108N: 15/86;

N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L: 17/86) and Southeast Asia (S108N: 3/2650; C59R,S108N: 186/2650;

N51I,C59R,S108N: 920/2650; N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L: 1419/2650).

This main pathway to the quadruple was also inferred to be a possible alternative pathway in East

Africa (S108N: 3/904; C59R,S108N: 31/904; N51I,C59R,S108N: 782/904,

N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L: 2/904). Additionally, S108N/C59R/I164L/N51I was inferred to be an

alternative in South Asia (C59R,S108N,I164L: 11/86) and Southeast Asia (C59R,S108N,I164L:

90/2650), corresponding to the second most likely pathway to the quadruple predicted by our

simulations, the data in [6] and total frequency data.

However, in East Africa S108N/N51I/C59R/I164L was the most likely pathway to the quadruple

mutation (S108N,N51I: 67/904), which corresponds to the fifth most likely pathway to the

quadruple in our simulations and the third most likely pathway presented in [6] and inferred from

the total frequency data. This was also an alternative pathway in West Africa (S108N,N51I:

32/2594) .

Furthermore, the quadruple mutation was not observed in the isolate data from Central Africa,

South America, and Melanesia. In Central Africa, evolution up to the triple mutation

N51I,C59R,S108N was observed and the most likely inferred pathway to this mutation was

S108N/N51I/C59R (S108N: 6/359; N51I,S108N: 86/359; N51I,C59R,S108N: 258/359), with an

alternative less likely pathway of S108N/C59R/N51I (C59R,S108N: 6/359), corresponding to the

fifth and first most likely trajectories to a triple mutation in our simulations, respectively. In South

America, evolution up to the triple mutation N51I,S108N,I164L was observed in the isolate data

and was inferred to follow the pathway S108N/N51I/I164L (S108N: 26/50, N51I,S108N: 12/50;

N51I,S108N,I164L: 4/50), however this pathway was very unlikely in our simulations. In

Melanesia, evolution up to the double mutation C59R,S108N was observed in the isolate data

and was inferred using the frequency data to have followed the pathway S108N/C59R (S108N:

1/119; C59R,S108N: 23/119), which corresponds to the most likely pathway of all our

evolutionary runs.

Next, we considered the frequency of combinations of the four PvDHFR mutations N50I, S58R,

S117N and I173L in different geographical regions and used these frequencies to infer

evolutionary trajectories (Figure 4). As mentioned previously, the quadruple mutation is not

observed in the isolate data and so we will infer trajectories up to triple mutant combinations of

the four mutations where possible, and compare to the most likely pathways to triple mutations in

our simulations and in the experimental data. The triple mutation S58R,S117N,I173L was the only

triple mutant combination observed in the isolate data and was only found in South America.

Analyzing the frequency of the constituent mutations (S117N: 34/257; S58R,S117N: 74/257;

S59R,S117N,I173L: 2/257), the most likely inferred pathway to this mutation is

S117N/S58R/I173L. This was the third most likely triple mutation pathway in our simulations,

however it was not an observed pathway in [7]. There are two other possible pathways inferred

from the frequency data to this triple mutation: S117N/I173L/S58R (S117N,I173L: 1/257), and

S58R/S117N/I173L (S58R: 9/257). Pathway S117N/I173L/S58R was the fourth most likely

pathway to a triple mutation in our simulations when considering all possible pathways but was

not observed in the simulations in [7] and S58R/S117N/I173L the most likely pathway to a triple

mutation in our simulations and was observed as part of the second most likely pathway to the

quadruple mutation at the highest pyrimethamine concentration considered in [7].

Evolution only up to double mutation S58R,S117N was found in Southeast Asia, East Africa and

Melanesia and S117N/S58R was the most fixation order in East Africa, whilst S58R/S117N was

the most likely fixation order in Southeast Asia and Melanesia. Pathways S58R/S117N and

S117N/S58R were the second and third most frequently observed double mutation pathways

observed in our simulations when considering all possible pathways observed. In South Asia

evolution up to double mutations S58R,S117N and N50I,S117N was observed, following

pathways S117N/S58R and S117N/N50I, respectively. In East Asia, evolution only up to single

mutation S58R was observed and in Central America no steps in the evolutionary pathway

including combinations of these four mutations were found.

Discussion

593
We have presented a method for predicting the most likely evolutionary trajectories to multiple

mutants by parameterizing thermodynamic evolutionary model using Flex ddG predictions. The

most likely pathways predicted by our model to the pyrimethamine-resistant quadruple *Pf*DHFR

mutant correspond well to those predicted in [6], generated using experimentally determined IC50

values of *Pf*DHFR pyrimethamine binding. The two most likely pathways based on experimental

IC50 values were found in the top two most likely pathways to the quadruple mutation based on

our simulations using predictions of binding free energy. Whilst our simulations disagreed with the

simulations in [6] in terms of which were the most frequently realized pathways out of the total

number of runs, where a realized pathway does not necessarily have to reach the quadruple

mutation, our model is able to capture the most likely order of fixation of mutations leading to a

particular multiple mutant in general agreement with the simulations in [6].

We also simulated the most likely evolutionary trajectories to the *Pv*DHFR quadruple mutation

N50I,S58R,S117N,I173L and compared our results to those predicted in [7]. They considered the

relative growth rates of the different alleles at different drug concentrations when simulating

evolutionary trajectories, which incorporate both change in pyrimethamine binding affinity (K_i) and

catalytic activity (k_{cat}). Our top two most likely pathways to the quadruple correspond to their top

two most likely pathways for the highest pyrimethamine concentration they consider, albeit in

reverse order. At high pyrimethamine concentrations, it is likely mutations that significantly reduce

binding affinity will be selectively favoured even if there is a slight reduction in catalytic activity.

Indeed, Rodrigues et al. (2016) [38] observed a clear tradeoff between catalytic activity and

binding affinity for increased drug resistance and found that whilst many molecular features affect

drug resistance, drug binding affinity was the key determinant of drug resistance in later stages of

evolution. This may be why our predictions agree well their predictions for high pyrimethamine

concentration, but not for low-to-middle pyrimethamine concentrations, because even though

ligand concentration is included in our equation for protein fitness (Eq. 1), our model cannot

account for adaptive conflict between K_i and k_{cat}. This highlights a limitation of our method as it

only accounts for changes in binding affinity and does not account for changes in protein function.

As previously mentioned, DHFR catalyzes the reduction of substrate DHF via oxidation of

cofactor NADPH. Therefore, in the case of the DHFR enzyme, a future iteration of the model

could include the impact resistance mutations have on binding of these two ligands, as a proxy

for changes to enzyme function. However, this would require a much more complex model of

protein fitness and would be much more computationally expensive.

A further limitation of the evolutionary model used here is that it operates in the weak mutation

regime, in which the mutation rate is so low that mutations appear and fix in isolation. However,

this assumption breaks down when considering large microbial populations where clonal

interference means that mutations can arise simultaneously and compete for fixation [46]. This

can lead to a process known as 'greedy adaptation', in which the mutation of larger beneficial

effect is fixed with certainty [47]. Clonal interference has been shown to emerge rapidly in

laboratory cultivated *P. falciparum,* where the parasite cycles through only asexual stages,

suggesting it may influence the dynamics of the emergence of resistance [48]. The evolutionary

model used here may therefore overestimate the fixation probability of mutations with milder

beneficial effects and underestimate the fixation probability of mutations with larger beneficial

effects [35]. Future iterations of this work could be improved by making using a fixation probability

that models of clonal interference such as the work of Gerrish and Lenski (1998) [46] and

Campos et al. (2004) [49]. However, such models are more difficult to implement as they can

require species-specific derivations for certain functions.

Mutations occurring at a drug-binding site may also reduce the protein's thermodynamic stability

[50] and therefore may not be selected for, even if they improve the resistance phenotype.

Therefore, our model may also be improved by including selection for mutations that do not

reduce thermodynamic stability relative to the wild-type enzyme. However, it must also be noted

that most proteins are marginally stable [51, 52], a property which may have evolved either as an

evolutionary spandrel [53, 54] (a characteristic that arises as a result of non-adaptive processes

which is then used for adaptive purposes [55]) or due to selection for increased flexibility to

improve certain functionalities [56, 57]. Therefore, the model would also have to account for the

fact that a resistance mutation that increases protein stability relative to the wild-type stability may

also result in a reduction in fitness.

Despite the limitations of our computational method to predict evolutionary trajectories by only

considering the impact on drug binding, it is able to accurately predict the most likely order of

fixation of mutations in a trajectory in general agreement with trajectories determined using

experimental values such as IC50 or more complex fitness landscapes informed by multiple

parameters including drug concentration and growth rates. This supports the findings in [38], that

drug binding is a major determinant of resistance, especially at later stages of evolution. It also

suggests evolution in such landscapes is more predictable than might be expected, since

trajectories can be predicted considering only the impact on binding affinity.

We also inferred evolutionary pathways from the total frequency in worldwide clinical isolate data

as well as from different geographical regions. This analysis suggests evolutionary pathways may

be inferred from the frequency of mutations found in isolate data, however it requires a large

number of isolates to properly sample the mutations in the population. Furthermore, this method

can only be used to predict trajectories once resistance has emerged in a population, whereas

the computational method presented here can predict evolutionary trajectories before of a new

drug.

This analysis also suggested that different regions often follow different evolutionary trajectories

and that the most likely evolutionary trajectories predicted by our model, and experimental

trajectories, are not always the most prevalent. Geographical differences in the distribution of

resistant alleles may be the result of drug regimens and gene flow in parasite populations.

Combination drug SP was first used in 1967 to treat *P. falciparum* in Southeast Asia, and

resistance was first noted that same year on the Thai-Cambodia and Thai-Myanmar borders [58].

In Africa, SP was first used in the 1980s, with resistance occurring later that decade. However,

analysis of *Pf*DHFR genotypes and microsatellite haplotypes surrounding the DHFR gene in

Southeast Asia and Africa suggest a single resistant lineage that appeared in Southeast Asia

accumulated multiple mutations, including the triple N51I,C59R,S108N [59, 60], migrated to Africa

and spread throughout the continent [61-63]. Variation in the frequency of *Pf*DHFR mutants

across Africa occurs because of differences in the timing of chloroquine withdrawal and

introduction of SP, as well as continued use of SP for intermittent preventive treatment (IPTp) in

pregnant women residing in areas of moderate to high malaria transmission intensity [64, 65].

Pyrimethamine resistance increased in West Papua in the early 1960s following the introduction

of mass drug administration [66]. Microsatellite haplotype analysis suggests C59R,S108N in

Melanesia has two lineages, one of which originated in Southeast Asia whilst the other evolved

indigenously [60].

Pyrimethamine resistance in South America looks surprisingly different from the distributions in

Africa and Southeast Asia. SP was introduced in South America and low-level resistance was first

noted in Colombia in 1981 [67]. Microsatellite haplotype analysis suggests pyrimethamine

resistance evolved indigenously in South America, with at least two distinct lineages detected. A

triple mutant lineage (C50I,N51I,S108N) was identified in Venezuela that possibly evolved from

double mutant N51I,S108N [62]. A second triple mutant lineage (N51I,S108N,I164L) was

identified in Peru and Bolivia which also possibly evolved from a distinct double mutant

(N51I,S108N) lineage [68].

In general, the *Pv*DHFR gene is much more polymorphic than *Pf*DHFR gene, with over 20 alleles

observed in a limited geographical sampling [29], whereas fewer *Pf*DHFR alleles have been

observed despite much more extensive surveillance with non-synonymous changes and

insertions/deletions occurring rarely [69]. It also appears that the origin of *Pv*DHFR

pyrimethamine resistance mutation is much more diverse than *Pf*DHFR. Hawkins et al. (2008)

[70] investigated isolates from Colombia, India, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka,

Thailand and Vanuatu. They found multiple origins of the double *Pv*DHFR mutant 58R,117N and

three independent origins of triple mutant 58R,61M,117T and quadruple mutants

57I,61M,117T,173F and 57L,58R,61M,117T in Thailand, Indonesia and Papua New

Guinea/Vanuatu. Shaukat et al. (2021) [71] assessed the evolutionary origin of *Pv*DHFR

pyrimethamine resistance mutations in Punjab, Pakistan and found multiple origins of single

mutation S117N and a common origin of double mutant 58R,S117N and triple mutants

57L,58R,117N, 58R,61M,117N and 58R,118N,I173L. This is in contrast to the evolutionary origin

of pyrimethamine resistance in *Pf*DHFR, where mutations in Africa shared a common origin with

a resistance lineage from Asia.

This highlights the need to distinguish between geographical regions and account for existing

resistance alleles within that region and trace their lineages when attempting to predict the next

step in evolutionary trajectories to highly resistant multiple mutants. Given the current dominant

resistance allele from a specific region, our method could be used to predict the most likely next

steps from a subset of likely mutations.

We have presented a computational method for predicting the most likely evolutionary trajectories

that has demonstrated good agreement with trajectories predicted experimentally and has the

advantage of being much quicker and more cost-effective than laboratory-based methods. This

method can be applied to any system in which a drug binds to a target molecule, provided a

structure of the complex exists or can be produced via structural modelling. Given the threat

antimicrobial resistance poses, methods to accurately and efficiently predict future trajectories are

vital and can inform treatment strategies and aid drug development.

731
732 **Materials and Methods**

733
Homology modelling

Homology modelling was carried out in Modeller [72] to produce complete structures of the target

proteins bound to their drug molecules. Several crystal structures of *Pf*DHFR exist in the Protein

Data Bank (PDB). The entry 3QGT provides the crystal structure of wild-type *Pf*DHFR complexed

with NADPH, dUMP and pyrimethamine, however residues in the ranges 86-95 and 232-282 are

missing from the structural model. Homology modelling was used to complete the structure using

a second wild-type *Pf*DHFR structure PDB entry 1J3I along with a wild-type *Pv*DHFR structure

PDB entry 2BLB.

To produce a complete structural model of *Pv*DHFR, PDB entry 2BLB was used as a template,

which provides the X-ray crystal structure of wild-type *P. vivax* DHFR in complex with

pyrimethamine. This structure was only missing a loop section between residues 87-105 and so

Modeller was used to build this missing loop.

Flex ddG binding free energy predictions

The Rosetta Flex ddG protocol was used to estimate the change in binding free energy upon

mutation, $\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{mut} - \Delta G_{WT}$, for each step in all possible mutational trajectories for a set of

stepwise resistance mutations (see supplementary data 'Flex_ddG' folder for examples of a

Rosetta script, resfile and command line. The protein-ligand structure files and ligand parameter

files can be found in the folders named for the specific targets). To predict the change in binding

free energy for a single or multiple mutation, we used the structure of the target protein with the

drug molecule bound as input to Flex ddG and ran the protocol for 150 times per mutation to

produce a distribution of predictions of the change in the free energy of binding. We then found

the peak of the distribution to produce a single estimate of the change in the binding free energy

for the mutation, denoted $\Delta\Delta G_X^*$ for mutation X.

To predict the stepwise evolutionary trajectories, we must consider the interactions between the

mutations in the pathway. The interaction energy (or epistasis) in the binding free energy between

two mutations X and Y, can be written $\varepsilon_{XY} = \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y} - (\Delta\Delta G_X + \Delta\Delta G_Y)$. This quantifies by how

much the change in binding free energy of the double mutant X,Y deviates from additivity of the

single mutants, where each are calculated with respect to the wild-type. Therefore, the change in

binding free energy when mutation Y occurs in the background of mutation X can be written

$\Delta\Delta G_{X/Y} = \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y} - \Delta\Delta G_X$, where $\Delta\Delta G_{X/Y} = \Delta\Delta G_Y + \varepsilon_{XY}$.

For a third mutation, Z, occurring in the background of double mutation X,Y, the interaction

energy between Z and X,Y is $\varepsilon_{XY,Z} = \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y,Z} - (\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y} + \Delta\Delta G_Z)$. The quantity $\varepsilon_{XY,Z}$ is not the

same as the third order epistasis between mutations X, Y, and Z, or the interaction energy $\varepsilon_{XYZ} =$

$\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y,Z} - (\Delta\Delta G_X + \Delta\Delta G_Y + \Delta\Delta G_Z)$, as it does not account for the interaction between X and Y,

rather it only quantifies the interaction between Z and the two mutations X and Y..

Therefore, the change in binding free energy when mutation Z occurs in the background of

double mutant X,Y can be calculated as $\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y/Z} = \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y,Z} - \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y}$, where $\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y/Z} = \Delta\Delta G_Z +$

$\varepsilon_{XY,Z}$.

To estimate the change in binding free energy when mutation Y occurs in the background of

mutation X, $\Delta\Delta G_{X/Y}$ for stepwise pathway X/Y, we subtracted the predictions $\Delta\Delta G_X^i$ for the first

mutation X, from the predictions for the double mutation X,Y, $\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y}^i$, to create a set of 150

'predictions' for the change in binding free energy when Y occurs in the background of X, $\Delta\Delta G_{X/Y}^i$

i.e. $\Delta\Delta G_{X/Y}^i = \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y}^i - \Delta\Delta G_X^i$ for $i = \{1, \dots, 150\}$. To estimate the change in binding free energy

when mutation Z occurs in the background of mutations X and Y we calculated. $\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y/Z}^i =$

$\Delta\Delta G_{X,Y,Z}^{i} - \Delta\Delta G_{X,Y}^{i}$. We applied a similar method for the quadruple mutations, so that we had a set

of 'predictions' for each step in the possible evolutionary trajectories.

Simulating Evolutionary Trajectories

The Rosetta energy function is a mix of a combination of physic-based and statistics-based

potentials and so raw predictions using this function don't up match up with physical energy units

(e.g. kcal/mol or kJ/mol). However, the authors of Flex ddG applied a generalized additive model

(GAM)-like approach to the Rosetta energy function to reweight its terms and to fit experimentally

known values (in kcal/mol). The resulting nonlinear reweighting model reduced the absolute error

between the predictions and experimental values and so improved the agreement with

experimentally determined interface $\Delta\Delta G$ values. They found that by doing this the Flex ddG

predictions of binding free energy changes were in a similar range as experimental binding free

energy changes and observed improved correlation and classification of mutations as stabilising

or destabilising (Barlow et al. 2018 [39]). Therefore, we assume Flex ddG can provide

approximate predictions of binding free energy changes comparable to experimental changes in

kcal/mol and can therefore be used to parameterize a thermodynamic model.

To predict the most likely evolutionary trajectories to reach a quadruple mutant we used a model

based in thermodynamics and statistical mechanics where the fitness of a protein is determined

by the probability it would not be bound to a ligand, $P_{unbound}$. We consider a two-state system in

which the protein can either be bound or unbound and do not explicitly account for if the protein is

folded or unfolded in either the bound or unbound state. For ligand concentration $[L]$ it can be

shown that the probability a protein is unbound is

806
$$P_{unbound} = \frac{1}{\frac{[L]}{K_d} + 1} \tag{1}$$

where K_d is the protein-ligand dissociation constant and can be calculated as $c_0 e^{\Delta G/kT}$ where c_0 is

a reference ligand concentration (set here arbitrarily to 1M), ΔG is the protein-ligand binding free

energy, k is the Boltzmann constant and T is the temperature in Kelvin.

Starting from the wild-type protein, with binding free energy ΔG_{WT} and fitness $P_{unbound}^{WT}$, we extract

one sample i from the 150 values of the predicted binding affinity changes for the single

mutations to determine the binding free energy after mutation X, $\Delta G_X^i = \Delta G_{WT} + \Delta\Delta G_X^i$, and

calculate the fitness of each single mutant protein $P_{unbound}^{X(i)}$. We can calculate the probability the

mutation will fix in the population using the Kimura fixation probability for a haploid organism

816
$$p_{fix} = \frac{1 - e^{-2s}}{1 - e^{-2sN_e}} \tag{2}$$

where N_e is the effective population size (set to 10^6 as previous models in [43, 44]) and s is the

selection coefficient $s = (P_{unbound}^{X,i} - P_{unbound}^{WT})/P_{unbound}^{WT}$. We also took in to account the mutational

bias of *Plasmodium falciparum* using the nucleotide mutation matrix calculated in [6]. The

probabilities of fixation for each mutation were normalised by the sum of the probabilities of

fixation for all possible mutations at that step in the trajectory. A mutation is then chosen with a

probability proportional to this normalised probability of fixation.

Once a single mutation is chosen, the binding free energy is set to ΔG_X^i of the chosen mutation,

and a value is sampled from the distribution of each of the possible next steps, *X/Y* in the

trajectory i.e. $\Delta\Delta G_{X/Y}^i$. This continues until the end of the trajectory is reached. If the fixation

probabilities of all mutations sampled at a step are effectively zero, no mutation is chosen at that

step and the algorithm begins again by choosing a single mutation. Therefore, not all of the runs

produce a complete trajectory and some will terminate before reaching the quadruple mutation.

The algorithm was written in R.

We calculate the probabilities, P_i, of each realized pathway (even those which don't reach the

quadruple mutation) by dividing the total number of times that specific pathway occurs by the

number of runs. We calculate the probability of a particular step by dividing the number of times

that step occurs in all realized pathways by the total number of runs.

SNP data

P. falciparum and *P. vivax* data was obtained from publicly available raw sequence data from

European Nucleotide Archive. These data include Illumina raw sequences from the MalariaGEN

Community Project for *P. falciparum [73]* and *P. vivax [74]. P. vivax* data additionally includes the

Public Health England Malaria Reference Laboratory isolates from returning travelers to UK from

regions where malaria is endemic (study accession number ERP128476) [75]. Data was filtered

and processed to SNP data with the methodology described in the recent publications [64] and

[75] respectively. In this study, we analysed genotype data for 6,762 high-quality isolates from 32

countries across regions of Africa, South East Asia, Oceania and South America to identify the

genetic diversity in the *PfDHFR* gene. A similar analysis was carried out on 847 *P. vivax* isolates

spanning 25 countries across East Africa, South Asia, South East Asia, Southern South East Asia

and South America to identify genetic diversity in *PvDHFR* gene. SNPs occurring in non-unique,

low quality or low coverage regions were discarded, and those with a missense effect in the

candidate genes were analysed. Functional annotation was done with *SnpEff* (version 5.0) [76]

with the following options: *-no-downstream -no-upstream*.

852
853

Acknowledgments

R.C.E and N.F. are funded by the Medical Research Council UK (Grant no. MR/T000171/1).

T.G.C is funded by the Medical Research Council UK (Grant no. MR/M01360X/1, MR/N010469/1,

MR/R025576/1, MR/R020973/1 and MR/T000171/1) and BBSRC (Grant no. BB/R013063/1). S.C

is funded by Medical Research Council UK grants (MR/M01360X/1, MR/R025576/1, and

MR/R020973/1) and Bloomsbury SET. E.M is funded by a Newton Institutional Links Grant

(British Council, no. 261868591. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and

analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. R.C.E would like to thank

Tanushree Tunstall (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine) for the helpful

discussions. R.C.E would also like to thank Professor Richard Goldstein (University College

London) for introducing her to the evolutionary algorithm used in this paper.

865
866 **Data Availability**

867
868 Supplementary data can be found at 10.5281/zenodo.6670770
869
870 **References**
871

1. Sun, D., et al., *Editorial: Horizontal Gene Transfer Mediated Bacterial Antibiotic*
Resistance. Frontiers in microbiology, 2019. **10**: p. 1933-1933.
2. Davies, J. and D. Davies, *Origins and evolution of antibiotic resistance.* Microbiology and
molecular biology reviews : MMBR, 2010. **74**(3): p. 417-433.
3. Levy, S.B. and B. Marshall, *Antibacterial resistance worldwide: causes, challenges and*
responses. Nature Medicine, 2004. **10**(12): p. S122-S129.
4. Blair, J.M.A., et al., *Molecular mechanisms of antibiotic resistance.* Nature Reviews
Microbiology, 2015. **13**(1): p. 42-51.
5. Weinreich, D.M., et al., *Darwinian Evolution Can Follow Only Very Few Mutational Paths*
to Fitter Proteins. Science, 2006. **312**(5770): p. 111.
6. Lozovsky, E.R., et al., *Stepwise acquisition of pyrimethamine resistance in the malaria*
parasite. Proc Natl Acad Sci, U. S. A., 2009. **106**(29): p. 12025-12030.
7. Jiang, P.-P., et al., *Accessible Mutational Trajectories for the Evolution of Pyrimethamine*
Resistance in the Malaria Parasite Plasmodium vivax. Journal of Molecular Evolution,
2013. **77**(3): p. 81-91.
8. Starr, T.N. and J.W. Thornton, *Epistasis in protein evolution.* Protein science : a
publication of the Protein Society, 2016. **25**(7): p. 1204-1218.
9. Khan, A.I., et al., *Negative epistasis between beneficial mutations in an evolving*
bacterial population. Science, 2011. **332**(6034): p. 1193-1196.
10. Gong, L.I., M.A. Suchard, and J.D. Bloom, *Stability-mediated epistasis constrains the*
evolution of an influenza protein. eLife, 2013. **2**: p. e00631.
11. Sanjuán, R., et al., *Epistasis and the adaptability of an RNA virus.* Genetics, 2005. **170**: p.
1001-1008.
12. Sirawaraporn, W., et al., *Antifolate-resistant mutants of Plasmodium falciparum*
dihydrofolate reductase. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 1997. **94**: p. 1124-1129.
13. Weinreich, D.M., R.A. Watson, and L. Chao, *Perspective: Sign epistasis and genetic*
constraint on evolutionary trajectories. Evolution, 2005. **59**(6): p. 1165-74.
14. Melnyk, A.H., A. Wong, and R. Kassen, *The fitness costs of antibiotic resistance*
mutations. Evol, Appl, 2015. **8**(3): p. 273-283.
15. Vogwill, T. and R.C. MacLean, *The genetic basis of the fitness costs of antimicrobial*
resistance: a meta-analysis approach. Evolutionary applications, 2015. **8**(3): p. 284-295.
16. Costelloe, C., et al., *Effect of antibiotic prescribing in primary care on antimicrobial*
resistance in individual patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ, 2010. **340**:
p. c2096.
17. Enne, V.I., *Reducing antimicrobial resistance in the community by restricting prescribing:*
can it be done? Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy, 2010. **65**(2): p. 179-182.
18. Sundqvist, M., et al., *Little evidence for reversibility of trimethoprim resistance after a*
drastic reduction in trimethoprim use. J. Antimicrob Chemother, 2010. **65**: p. 350-360.
19. Andersson, D.I., *Persistence of antibiotic resistant bacteria.* Curr Opin Microbiol., 2003.
6: p. 452-456.
20. Wang, P., et al., *Sulfadoxine resistance in the human malaria parasite Plasmodium*
falciparum is determined by mutations in dihydropteroate synthetase and an additional
factor associated with folate utilization. Mol Microbiol., 1997. **23**(5): p. 979-986.
21. *World Malaria Report: 2021*. 2021, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

22.   Brooks, D.R., et al., *Sequence variation of the hydroxymethyldihydropterin*
pyrophosphokinase: dihydropteroate synthase gene in lines of the human malaria
parasite, Plasmodium falciparum, with differing resistance to sulfadoxine. Eur, J.
Biochem, 1994. **224**(2): p. 397-405.
23.   Snounou, G. and N.J. White, *The co-existence of Plasmodium: sidelights from falciparum*
and vivax malaria in Thailand. Trends in Parasitology, 2004. **20**(7): p. 333-339.
24.   Korsinczky, M., et al., *Sulfadoxine resistance in Plasmodium vivax is associated with a*
specific amino acid in dihydropteroate synthase at the putative sulfadoxine-binding site.
Antimicrob Agents, Chemother, 2004. **48**(6): p. 2214-2222.
25.   Hastings, M.D., et al., *Dihydrofolate Reductase Mutations in Plasmodium vivax from*
Indonesia and Therapeutic Response to Sulfadoxine plus Pyrimethamine. The Journal of
Infectious Diseases, 2004. **189**(4): p. 744-750.
26.   Kompis, I.M., R.L. Islam K Fau - Then, and R.L. Then, *DNA and RNA synthesis: antifolates.*
Chem, Rev, 2005. **105**(2): p. 593-620.
27.   Ferlan, J.T., et al., *Mutagenesis of dihydrofolate reductase from Plasmodium falciparum:*
analysis in Saccharomyces cerevisiae of triple mutant alleles resistant to pyrimethamine
or WR99210. Mol Biochem, Parasitol, 2001. **113**(0166-6851 (Print)): p. 139-150.
28.   Yuthavong, Y., et al., *Malarial (Plasmodium falciparum) dihydrofolate reductase-*
thymidylate synthase: structural basis for antifolate resistance and development of
effective inhibitors. Parasitology,, 2005. **130**(0031-1820 (Print)): p. 249-259.
29.   Hawkins, V.N., et al., *Antifolates can have a role in the treatment of Plasmodium vivax.*
Trends, Parasitol, 2007. **25**(5): p. 213-222.
30.   Tamer, Y.T., et al., *High-Order Epistasis in Catalytic Power of Dihydrofolate Reductase*
Gives Rise to a Rugged Fitness Landscape in the Presence of Trimethoprim Selection.
Molecular Biology and Evolution, 2019. **36**(7): p. 1533-1550.
31.   Achaz, G., et al., *The reproducibility of adaptation in the light of experimental evolution*
with whole genome sequencing. Adv Exp Med Biol, 2014. **781**: p. 211-31.
32.   Lobkovsky, A. and E. Koonin, *Replaying the Tape of Life: Quantification of the*
Predictability of Evolution. Frontiers in Genetics, 2012. **3**.
33.   Palmer, M.E., A. Moudgil, and M.W. Feldman, *Long-term evolution is surprisingly*
predictable in lattice proteins. Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 2013. **10**(82): p.
20130026.
34.   Szendro Ivan, G., et al., *Predictability of evolution depends nonmonotonically on*
population size. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2013. **110**(2): p. 571-
576.
35.   de Visser, J.A.G.M. and J. Krug, *Empirical fitness landscapes and the predictability of*
evolution. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2014. **15**(7): p. 480-490.
36.   Karmakar, M., et al., *Structure guided prediction of Pyrazinamide resistance mutations in*
pncA. Scientific Reports, 2020. **10**(1): p. 1875.
37.   Portelli, S., et al., *Prediction of rifampicin resistance beyond the RRDR using structure-*
based machine learning approaches. Scientific Reports, 2020. **10**(1): p. 18120.
38.   Rodrigues, J.V., et al., *Biophysical principles predict fitness landscapes of drug resistance.*
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2016. **113**(11): p. E1470.
39.   Barlow, K.A., et al., *Flex ddG: Rosetta Ensemble-Based Estimation of Changes in Protein–*
Protein Binding Affinity upon Mutation. The Journal of Physical Chemistry B, 2018.
122(21): p. 5389-5399.
40.   Alford, R.A.-O., et al., *The Rosetta All-Atom Energy Function for Macromolecular*
Modeling and Design. J. Chem Theory Comput, 2017. **13**: p. 3031-3048.

41. Aldeghi, M., V. Gapsys, and B.L. de Groot, *Accurate Estimation of Ligand Binding Affinity*
Changes upon Protein Mutation. ACS central science, 2018. **4**(12): p. 1708-1718.
42. Aldeghi, M., V. Gapsys, and B.L. de Groot, *Predicting Kinase Inhibitor Resistance: Physics-*
Based and Data-Driven Approaches. ACS Central Science, 2019. **5**(8): p. 1468-1474.
43. Eccleston, R.C., D.D. Pollock, and R.A. Goldstein, *Selection for cooperativity causes*
epistasis predominately between native contacts and enables epistasis-based structure
reconstruction. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2021. **118**(16): p.
e2010057118.
44. Pollock, D.D., G. Thiltgen, and R.A. Goldstein, *Amino acid coevolution induces an*
evolutionary Stokes shift. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2012.
109(21): p. E1352.
45. Pollock, D.D., et al., *Mechanistic Models of Protein Evolution*, in *Evolutionary Biology:*
Self/Nonself Evolution, Species and Complex Traits Evolution, Methods and Concepts, P.
Pontarotti, Editor. 2017, Springer International Publishing: Cham. p. 277-296.
46. Gerrish, P.J. and R.E. Lenski, *The fate of competing beneficial mutations in an asexual*
population. Genetica, 1998. **102**(0): p. 127.
47. Jain, K., J. Krug, and S.-C. Park, *EVOLUTIONARY ADVANTAGE OF SMALL POPULATIONS*
ON COMPLEX FITNESS LANDSCAPES. Evolution, 2011. **65**(7): p. 1945-1955.
48. Jett, C., A. Dia, and I.H. Cheeseman, *Rapid emergence of clonal interference during*
malaria parasite cultivation. bioRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.03.04.977165.
49. Campos, P.R.A., C. Adami, and C.O. Wilke, *Modelling Stochastic Clonal Interference*, in
Modelling in Molecular Biology, G. Ciobanu and G. Rozenberg, Editors. 2004, Springer
Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg. p. 21-38.
50. Wang, X., G. Minasov, and B.K. Shoichet, *Evolution of an antibiotic resistance enzyme*
constrained by stability and activity trade-offs. J Mol Biol, 2002. **320**(1): p. 85-95.
51. Vogl, T., et al., *Thermodynamic Stability of Annexin V E17G: Equilibrium Parameters*
from an Irreversible Unfolding Reaction. Biochemistry, 1997. **36**(7): p. 1657-1668.
52. Ruvinov, S., et al., *Engineering the Independent Folding of the Subtilisin BPN'*
Prodomain: Analysis of Two-State Folding versus Protein Stability. Biochemistry, 1997.
36(34): p. 10414-10421.
53. Taverna, D.M. and R.A. Goldstein, *Why are proteins marginally stable?* Proteins:
Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics, 2002. **46**(1): p. 105-109.
54. Goldstein, R.A., *The evolution and evolutionary consequences of marginal*
thermostability in proteins. Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics, 2011.
79(5): p. 1396-1407.
55. Gould, S.J., et al., *The spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian paradigm: a critique*
of the adaptationist programme. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B.
Biological Sciences, 1979. **205**(1161): p. 581-598.
56. Závodszky, P., et al., *Adjustment of conformational flexibility is a key event in the*
thermal adaptation of proteins. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 1998.
95(13): p. 7406.
57. Tsou, C.L., *Active site flexibility in enzyme catalysis.* Ann N Y Acad Sci, 1998. **864**: p. 1-8.
58. Björkman, A. and P.A. Phillips-Howard, *The epidemiology of drug-resistant malaria.*
Transactions of The Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 1990. **84**(2): p. 177-
180.
59. Roper, C., et al., *Intercontinental spread of pyrimethamine-resistant malaria.* Science,
2004. **305**(5687): p. 1124.

60. Mita, T., et al., *Independent Evolution of Pyrimethamine Resistance in Plasmodium*
falciparum Isolates in Melanesia. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, 2007. **51**(3):
p. 1071-1077.
61. Maïga, O., et al., *A Shared Asian Origin of the Triple-Mutant dhfr Allele in Plasmodium*
falciparum from Sites across Africa. The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2007. **196**(1): p.
165-172.
62. McCollum Andrea, M., et al., *Common Origin and Fixation of Plasmodium falciparum*
dhfr and dhps Mutations Associated with Sulfadoxine-Pyrimethamine Resistance in a
Low-Transmission Area in South America. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy,
2007. **51**(6): p. 2085-2091.
63. McCollum Andrea, M., et al., *Hitchhiking and Selective Sweeps of Plasmodium*
falciparum Sulfadoxine and Pyrimethamine Resistance Alleles in a Population from
Central Africa. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, 2008. **52**(11): p. 4089-4097.
64. Turkiewicz, A., et al., *Genetic diversity of the Plasmodium falciparum GTP-cyclohydrolase*
1, dihydrofolate reductase and dihydropteroate synthetase genes reveals new insights
into sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine antimalarial drug resistance. PLoS Genet, 2020. **16**(12):
p. e1009268.
65. Ravenhall, M., et al., *Characterizing the impact of sustained sulfadoxine/pyrimethamine*
use upon the Plasmodium falciparum population in Malawi. Malar J, 2016. **15**(1): p. 575.
66. Verdrager, J., *Epidemiology of the emergence and spread of drug-resistant falciparum*
malaria in South-East Asia and Australasia. J Trop Med Hyg, 1986. **89**(6): p. 277-89.
67. Espinal, T.C.A., et al., *Sensitivity of Plasmodium Falciparum to Antimalarial Drugs in*
Colombia. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 1985. **34**(4): p. 675-
680.
68. Zhou, Z., et al., *Decline in sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine-resistant alleles after change in*
drug policy in the Amazon region of Peru. Antimicrob Agents Chemother, 2008. **52**(2): p.
739-41.
69. Gregson, A. and C.V. Plowe, *Mechanisms of Resistance of Malaria Parasites to*
Antifolates. Pharmacological Reviews, 2005. **57**(1): p. 117.
70. Hawkins, V.N., et al., *Multiple origins of resistance-conferring mutations in Plasmodium*
vivax dihydrofolate reductase. Malaria Journal, 2008. **7**(1): p. 72.
71. Shaukat, A., et al., *Phylogenetic analysis suggests single and multiple origins of*
dihydrofolate reductase mutations in Plasmodium vivax. Acta Trop, 2021. **215**: p.
105821.
72. Webb, B. and A. Sali, *Comparative Protein Structure Modeling Using MODELLER.* Curr
Protoc Bioinformatics, 2016. **54**: p. 5.6.1-5.6.37.
73. Ahouidi, A., et al., *An open dataset of Plasmodium falciparum genome variation in 7,000*
worldwide samples. Wellcome Open Res, 2021. **6**: p. 42.
74. Adam, I., et al., *An open dataset of Plasmodium vivax genome variation in 1,895*
worldwide samples. Wellcome Open Res, 2022. **7**: p. 136.
75. Benavente, E.D., et al., *Distinctive genetic structure and selection patterns in*
Plasmodium vivax from South Asia and East Africa. Nat Commun, 2021. **12**(1): p. 3160.
76. Cingolani, P., et al., *A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single*
nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of Drosophila melanogaster
strain w1118; iso-2; iso-3. Fly (Austin), 2012. **6**(2): p. 80-92.

1056

Figures and Tables

1057

1058

1059 **Table 1. Correlation between Flex-ddG predictions for 150 runs and experimental data for**
1060 *Pf*DHFR pyrimethamine resistance mutations

Mutation	$\Delta\Delta G_{exp}$*(kcal/mol)	Exp. Sum**	Exp. I.E.***	$\Delta\Delta G_{Flex\,ddG}$†(kcal/mol)	Sum‡	I.E.§
N51I	-0.783			-0.065		
C59R	-0.184			-0.055		
S108N	1.297			0.275		
I164L	-0.351			-0.65		
N51I,S108N	1.89	0.514	1.376	-0.13	0.21	-0.34
C59R,S108N	2.29	1.113	1.177	0.575	0.22	0.355
N51I,C59R,S108N	2.595	0.33	2.265	0.225	0.155	0.07
C59R,S108N,I164L	3.283	0.762	2.521	0.025	-0.43	0.455
N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L	3.761	-0.021	3.782	0.425	-0.495	0.92
Pearson correlation				0.635	0.435	0.765
Correctly classified				8/9	4/5	4/5

1061

*Experimentally measured *Pf*DHFR-pyrimethamine binding free energy change data from [12]
**Sum of experimental values of binding free energy change for independent mutations
***Interaction energy calculated as the difference between experimentally measured values of
binding free energy change of multiple mutant compared to the sum of the independent mutations
involved.
† Change in *Pf*DHFR-pyrimethamine binding free energy predicted by Flex ddG calculated as the
average of the distribution of runs. Free energy predictions from Rosetta are in Rosetta Energy
Units, however the authors of Flex ddG applied a generalized additive model to reweight the
predictions and make the output more comparable to units of kcal/mol [39].
‡Sum of Flex ddG predictions for independent mutations
§Interaction energy calculated as the difference between Flex ddG predicted binding free energy
change of multiple mutant compared to the sum of the independent mutations.
1074
1075

1076
Figure 1: The probability of simulated evolutionary pathways to quadruple mutations a)
N51I,C59R,S108N,I164L in *Pf*DHFR and b) N50I,S58R,S117N,I173L in *Pv*DHFR. Line thickness
indicates the total probability of a mutation when considering all pathways it can occur in,
determined from the frequency of that step in all realized mutational pathways from all runs.
Dotted lines indicate zero probability of a mutation at that step. The most likely pathway in total is
denoted by a red star. The most likely pathway to the quadruple mutation is highlighted in dark
red and the second most likely pathway to the quadruple mutation is highlighted in light red. The
probabilities corresponding to these plots can be found in Supplementary files
'PfDHFR_total_pathway_probabilities.csv' and 'PvDHFR_total_pathway_probabilities.csv' for a)
and b), respectively.

<div align="center">(a)   (b)</div>

Figure 2: The total frequency of the combinations of mutations found in our isolate data for sets of four mutations a) N51I, C59R, S108N and I164L in *Pf*DHFR, and b) N50I, S58R, S117N and I173L in *Pv*DHFR. The frequencies are also given as the percentage of the total number of isolates, which for *Pf*DHFR is 6762 and *Pv*DHFR is 847.

Figure 3. The *Pf*DHFR isolate data was grouped into seven geographical areas: South America, West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia and Melansia. The bar charts display the frequency (log scale) of the combinations of the four mutations N51I, C59R, S108N and I164L. The frequency data has been multiplied by a factor of 10 to enable clear identification of those mutations occurring in one isolate only. The most likely evolutionary trajectory inferred from the frequency of combinations are included above the corresponding frequency chart from which the pathways were inferred indicated by mutations separated by dark red arrows. Alternative pathways are indicated by mutations separated by light red arrows. Where only single mutations are present a pathway is not inferred. (See Supplementary Text for further explanation and see Supplementary data folder 'PfDHFR/IsolateMutationFrequency' for the frequency of all mutations found in the isolate data from these regions).

Figure 4. The *Pv*DHFR isolate data was grouped into seven geographical areas: Central America, South America, East Africa, South Asia, East Asia, Southeast Asia and Melansia. The bar charts display the frequency (log scale) of the combinations of the four mutations N50I, S58R, S117N and I173L. The frequency data has been multiplied by a factor of 10 to enable clear identification of those mutations occurring in one isolate only. The most likely evolutionary trajectory inferred from the frequency of combinations are included above the corresponding frequency chart from which the pathways were inferred indicated by mutations separated by dark red arrows. Alternative pathways are indicated by mutations separated by light red arrows. Where only single mutations are present a pathway is not inferred. (See Supplementary Text for further explanation and see Supplementary data folder 'PvDHFR/IsolateMutationFrequency' for the frequency of all mutations found in the isolate data from these regions).