Evaluation of parameters affecting performance and reliability of machine learning-based antibiotic susceptibility testing from whole genome sequencing data

Allison L. Hicks[1],[*] Nicole Wheeler[2], Leonor Sánchez-Busó[3], Jennifer L. Rakeman[4], Simon R. Harris[3], Yonatan H. Grad[1,5,*]

1 Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

2 Centre for Genomic Pathogen Surveillance, Wellcome Sanger Institute, Wellcome Genome Campus, Hinxton, Cambridgeshire, UK

3 Pathogen Genomics, Wellcome Sanger Institute, Wellcome Genome Campus, Hinxton, Cambridgeshire, UK

4 Public Health Laboratory, Division of Disease Control, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York City, New York 10016

5 Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

* Corresponding authors: allison_hicks@g.harvard.edu, ygrad@hsph.harvard.edu

Abstract:

Prediction of antibiotic resistance phenotypes from whole genome sequencing data by machine learning methods has been proposed as a promising platform for the development of sequence-based diagnostics. However, there has been no systematic evaluation of factors that may influence performance of such models, how they might apply to and vary across clinical populations, and what the implications might be in the clinical setting. Here, we performed a meta-analysis of seven large *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* datasets, as well as *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* datasets, with whole genome sequence and antibiotic susceptibility phenotypes using set covering machine classification, random forest classification, and random forest regression models to predict resistance phenotypes from genotype. We demonstrate how model performance varies by drug, dataset, resistance metric, accuracy metric, and species, reflecting the complexities of generating clinically relevant conclusions from machine learning-derived models. Our findings underscore the importance of incorporating relevant biological and epidemiological knowledge into model design and assessment and suggest that doing so can inform tailored modeling for individual drugs, pathogens, and clinical populations. We further suggest that continued comprehensive sampling and incorporation of up-to-date whole genome sequence data, resistance phenotypes, and treatment outcome data into model training will be crucial to the clinical utility and sustainability of machine learning-based molecular diagnostics.

Introduction:

At least 700,000 deaths annually can be attributed to antimicrobial resistant (AMR) infections, and, without intervention, the annual AMR-associated mortality is estimated to climb to 10 million in the next 35 years[1]. As most patients are still treated based on empirical diagnosis rather than confirmation of the causal agent or its drug susceptibility profile, development of improved, rapid diagnostics enabling tailored therapy represents a clear actionable intervention[1]. The Cepheid GeneXpert MTB/RIF assay, for example, has been widely adopted for rapid point-of-care detection of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (TB) and rifampicin (RIF) resistance[2], and the SpeeDx ResistancePlus GC assay used to detect both *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* and ciprofloxacin (CIP) susceptibility was recently approved for marketing as an *in vitro* diagnostic in Europe.

Molecular assays offer improved speed compared to gold-standard phenotypic tests and are of particular interest because of their promise of high accuracy for the prediction of AMR phenotype based on genotype[2,3]. Approaches for predicting resistance phenotypes from genetic features include direct association (i.e., using the presence or absence of genetic variants known to be associated with resistance to infer a resistance phenotype) and the application of predictive models derived from machine learning (ML) algorithms. Direct association approaches can offer simple, inexpensive, and often highly accurate resistance assays for some drugs/species[2] and may even provide more reliable predictions of resistance phenotype than phenotypic testing[4-6]. However, these approaches are limited by the availability of well-curated and up-to-date panels of resistance variants, as well as the diversity and complexity of resistance mechanisms. ML strategies can facilitate modeling of more complex, diverse, and/or under-

characterized resistance mechanisms, thus outperforming direct association for many

drugs/species[7-9]. With the increasing speed and decreasing cost of sequencing and

computation, ML approaches can be applied to genome-wide feature sets[8,10-18], ideally

obviating the need for comprehensive *a priori* knowledge of resistance loci.

While prediction of antibiotic resistance phenotypes from ML-derived models

based on genomic features has become increasingly prominent as a promising diagnostic

tool[8,11-15,17], there has been no systematic evaluation of factors that may influence

performance of such models and their implications in the clinical setting. The extent to

which ML model accuracy varies by antibiotic is unclear, as is the impact of sampling bias

on model performance. It is further unclear what the most relevant resistance metric (i.e.,

minimum inhibitory concentration [MIC] or categorical report of susceptibility) for such a

diagnostic might be, how models derived from different methods should be evaluated,

and how amenable different species might be to genotype-to-phenotype modeling of

antibiotic resistance.

We used set covering machine (SCM)[19] and random forest (RF)[20] classification as

well as RF regression algorithms to build and test predictive models with seven

gonococcal datasets for which whole genome sequences (WGS) and ciprofloxacin (CIP)

and azithromycin (AZM) MICs were available. AZM is currently part of the recommended

treatment regimen for gonococcal infections, and with the development of resistance

diagnostics, CIP may represent a viable treatment option[21-23]. While the majority of CIP

resistance in gonococci can be attributed to *gyrA* mutations, AZM resistance is associated

with more diverse and complex resistance mechanisms[23,24], offering an opportunity to

evaluate ML methods across drugs with distinct pathways to resistance. The range of

datasets and sampling frames enables assessment of sampling bias on model reliability.

Further, the availability of MICs, as well as distinct EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints, for

these drugs allows for evaluation of predictive models based on different resistance

metrics and of the implications of different model performance metrics in the clinical

setting. Finally, extension of these analyses to *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *Acinetobacter*

baumannii datasets for which WGS and CIP MICs were available allows for assessment

of model performance for the same drug in species with open pangenomes.

Our results demonstrate that using ML to predict antibiotic resistance phenotypes

from WGS data yields variable results across drugs, datasets, resistance metrics, metrics

of model performance, and species. Ultimately, we suggest that tailored modeling for

individual drugs, species, and clinical populations may be necessary to successfully

leverage these ML-based approaches as diagnostic tools. We further suggest that

continuing surveillance, isolate collection, and reporting of WGS, MIC phenotypes, and

treatment outcomes will be crucial to the sustainability of any such molecular diagnostics.

Methods:

Isolate selection and dataset preparation

See **Table 1** for details of the datasets assessed. All gonococcal datasets contained a

minimum of 200 isolates with WGS (Illumina MiSeq, HiSeq, or NextSeq) and MICs

available for both CIP and AZM (by agar dilution and/or Etest). Isolates lacking CIP and

AZM MIC data were excluded. MIC testing methods varied within datasets, as reported[10-

13,17,18,25].

K. pneumoniae and *A. baumannii* datasets were selected based on the availability

of isolates collected during a single survey that were tested for CIP susceptibility and

whole genome sequenced using consistent platforms (in both cases, the BD-Phoenix

system and either Illumina MiSeq or NextSeq).

MIC data were obtained from the associated publications, except in the cases of

dataset 1 (NCBI Bioproject PRJEB10016; see **Supplementary Table 1**) and dataset 9,

which were obtained from the NCBI BioSample database

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/biosample). Raw sequence data were downloaded from

the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra). Genomes were

assembled using SPAdes[26] with default parameters, and assembly quality was assessed

using QUAST[27]. Contigs <200 bp in length and/or with <10x coverage were removed.

Isolates with assembly N50s below two standard deviations of the dataset mean were

removed.

Evaluation of known resistance variants

Previously identified genetic loci associated with reduced susceptibility to CIP or AZM in

gonococci are indicated in **Supplementary Tables 2** and **3**, respectively. The sequences

of these loci were extracted from the gonococcus genome assemblies using BLAST[28]

followed by MUSCLE alignment [29] to assess the presence or absence of known

resistance variants. The presence or absence of quinolone resistance determining

mutations in *gyrA* was similarly assessed in *K. pneumoniae* and *A. baumannii*

assemblies. Presence or absence of gonococcal AZM resistance mutations in the multi-

copy 23S rRNA gene was assessed using BWA-MEM[30] to map raw reads to a single 23S

rRNA allele from the NCCP11945 reference isolate (NGK_rrna23s4), the Picard toolkit

(http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard) to identify duplicate reads, and Pilon[31] to determine

the mapping quality-weighted percentage of each nucleotide at the sites of interest.

ML-based prediction of resistance phenotypes

Predictive modeling was carried out using SCM and RF algorithms, implemented in the

Kover[11,12] and ranger[32] packages, respectively. K-mer profiles used for model training

and prediction were generated from the assemblies using the DSK k-mer counting

software[33] with k=31, a length commonly used in bacterial genomic analysis[11,12,34,35]. For

each SCM binary classification analysis (using S/NS phenotypes based on the two

different breakpoints for each drug), the best conjunctive and/or disjunctive model was

selected using five-fold cross-validation, testing the suggested broad range of values for

the trade-off hyperparameter of 0.1, 0.178, 0.316, 0.562, 1.0, 1.778, 3.162, 5.623, 10.0,

and   999999.0   to   determine   the   optimal   rule   scoring   function

(http://aldro61.github.io/kover/doc_learning.html) with default parameters. In order to

assess binary classification across multiple methods, RF was also used to build binary

classifiers (RF-C) using S/NS phenotypes. Further, to compare performance of binary

classifiers to MIC prediction models, RF was used to build multi-class classification (RF-

mC) and regression (RF-R) models based on $\log_2$(MIC) data. For all RF analyses, forests

were grown to 1000 trees of unlimited depth using node impurity to assess variable

importance using default parameters.

The set of SCM and RF analyses performed are indicated in **Supplementary**

Tables 4 and **5.** For each of the seven individual gonococcal datasets, as well as the

aggregate gonococcal dataset and the *K. pneumoniae* and *A. baumannii* datasets,

training sets consisted of random sub-samples of two-thirds of isolates from the dataset

indicated (maintaining proportions of each resistance phenotype from the original

dataset), while the remaining isolates were used to test performance of the model. Each

set of analyses (for each combination of dataset/drug/resistance metric/ML algorithm)

was performed on 10 replicates, each with a unique randomly partitioned training and

testing set. For all gonococcal datasets, separate models were trained and tested using

the EUCAST[36] and CLSI[37] breakpoints for non-susceptibility (NS) to CIP. Four of the *N.*

gonorrhoeae datasets had insufficient (<15) NS isolates by the CLSI breakpoint for AZM

non-susceptibility[37] and thus were only assessed at the EUCAST AZM breakpoint. CIP

MICs for the *K. pneumoniae* isolates were not available in the range of the EUCAST

breakpoint (0.25 μg/mL), and thus only the CLSI breakpoint for NS was assessed. For *A.*

baumannii, the EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints for ciprofloxacin NS are the same (>1

μg/mL). Due to the very limited range of MICs within the BD-Phoenix testing thresholds

and thus the CIP MICs available for *K. pneumoniae* and *A. baumannii*, predictive models

based on MICs were not generated for these species.

Model performance was assessed by sensitivity (1 – very major error [VME] rate),

specificity (1 – major error [ME] rate), and the aggregate balanced accuracy (bACC). For

MIC prediction models, the percentage of isolates with predicted MICs exactly matching

the phenotypic MICs (rounding to the nearest doubling dilution, in the case of regression

models), as well as the percentage of isolates with predicted MICs within one doubling

dilution of phenotypic MICs (1-tier accuracy), were also assessed. Mean and 95%

confidence intervals for all metrics were calculated across the 10 replicates for each

analysis. Differential model performance between datasets or methods was evaluated by

comparing mean bACC between sets of replicates by two-tailed t-tests (α=0.05).

Relationships between MIC prediction accuracy and bACC and between dataset

imbalance and model performance were assessed by Pearson correlation (α=0.05).

Results:

Accuracy of ML-based prediction of resistance phenotypes varies by antibiotic.

Given the distinct MIC distributions and distinct pathways to resistance for CIP and AZM

in gonococci, these two drugs enable evaluation of drug-specific performance of ML-

based resistance prediction models. CIP MICs in surveys of clinical gonococcal isolates

are bimodally distributed, with the majority of isolates having MICs well above or below

the NS breakpoints, while the majority of reported AZM MICs in gonococci are closer to

the NS breakpoints (https://mic.eucast.org/Eucast2). These trends were recapitulated in

the gonococcal isolates assessed here (**Fig. 1a-b**). Further, the vast majority of CIP

resistance in gonococci observed to date is explained by mutations in *gyrA* and *parC* and

has spread predominantly through clonal expansion, generally resulting in MICs ≥ 1

μg/mL[23,38]. In contrast, AZM resistance in gonococci has arisen many times *de novo*

through multiple pathways, many of which remain under-characterized and are

associated with lower-level resistance[23,38,39]. As expected, the GyrA S91F mutation alone

predicts NS to CIP by both EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints in the aggregate gonococcal

dataset assessed here with ≥98% sensitivity and ≥99% specificity (**Supplementary Table**

2). AZM NS showed lower values for these metrics, indicating it was not as well explained

by known resistance variants, with extensive contributions from uncharacterized

mechanisms and/or multifactorial interactions (**Supplementary Table 3**).

We next trained and evaluated ML-based predictive models for CIP and AZM

resistance in gonococci (**Supplementary Table 4**). By all ML methods and breakpoints,

CIP NS was predicted with significantly higher bACC than AZM NS in the aggregate

gonococcal dataset ($P < 0.0001$, **Fig. 1c-d**), as well as in individual gonococcal datasets

($P < 0.0001$, **Supplementary Tables 6-7**). While CIP NS was predicted with mean bACC

$\geq$96% across all methods, breakpoints, and datasets, mean bACC for AZM NS

classification ranged from 62% to 92%, varying by method, breakpoint, and dataset. As

variable model performance across different drugs has previously been attributed to

variations in representation of susceptible (S) or NS isolates[7,14,15], it is worth nothing that

by the EUCAST breakpoints, the aggregate gonococcal dataset, as well as some of the

individual datasets, had nearly identical proportions of S and NS isolates between CIP

and AZM, demonstrating that variable representation of S or NS isolates alone cannot

explain reduced performance of AZM models compared to CIP.

Sampling bias in training and testing data skews resistance model performance.

The diversity of resistance mechanisms for AZM in gonococci offers an opportunity to

evaluate the effects of sampling bias on model performance. The sampling frames for the

seven gonococcal datasets ranged geographically from citywide to international and

temporally from a single year to >20 years (**Table 1**), and several datasets were enriched

for AZM resistance[11,25]. The distributions of both AZM MICs and known resistance

mechanisms across datasets (**Fig. 1b, Supplementary Table 3**) and the variable

performance of AZM resistance models across datasets (**Supplementary Table 7**)

suggest that AZM resistance mechanisms are differentially distributed across the

sampled clinical populations. To assess the impact of sampling on model reliability, the

performance of RF classifiers in prediction of AZM NS phenotypes were compared across

multiple training and testing sets. These include classifiers trained on subsamples of

isolates from a single dataset, classifiers trained on the aggregate gonococcal dataset,

and classifiers trained on the aggregate gonococcal dataset excluding isolates from the

same dataset as the testing set (**Supplementary Table 5**). Given the low representation

of AZM NS strains by the CLSI breakpoint in many datasets, these analyses were only

performed using the EUCAST breakpoint.

While it may be assumed that increased availability of paired genomic and

phenotypic resistance data from a broader range of clinical populations will facilitate more

accurate and reliable modeling[40], our results demonstrate that in predicting AZM

resistance phenotypes for isolates from most datasets (with the exception of datasets 2

and 5), performance of classifiers trained on the aggregate dataset was not significantly

better than performance of classifiers trained only on isolates from the dataset from which

the test isolates were derived (P < 0.0001 and P = 0.002 for datasets 2 and 5,

respectively, P = 0.019 for dataset 3, where the classifiers trains on the aggregate dataset

had lower bACC than classifiers trained only on isolates from dataset 3, and P > 0.25 for

all other datasets, **Fig. 2a**). Further, there was substantial variation in performance of

models trained on the aggregate dataset across testing sets, with models achieving

significantly higher bACC for strains from datasets 3 and 4 than for strains from datasets

2 and 5 (P < 0.004, **Fig. 2a**), perhaps reflecting enrichment for AZM NS in these datasets

(**Table 1**). Additionally, with the exception of dataset 5, performance of AZM resistance

classifiers trained only on isolates from the dataset from which the test isolates were

derived was significantly higher than performance of classifiers trained on the aggregate

dataset excluding isolates from the test dataset (P = 0.392 for dataset 5, $P < 0.01$ for all

other datasets, **Fig. 2a**).

Performance of RF classifiers trained and tested on dataset 2 was limited by low

specificity, which was improved in models trained on the aggregate dataset (**Fig. 2b**). The

low specificity achieved by RF classifiers trained and tested on this dataset is likely due

to the low representation of S strains, most of which were within one doubling dilution of

the NS breakpoint (**Fig. 2c**), and thus the more comprehensive representation of negative

(S) data in the aggregate training set was associated with improved specificity.

Conversely, performance of RF classifiers trained and tested on dataset 5 was more

limited by low sensitivity, which was improved in models trained on the aggregate dataset

(**Fig. 2b**). This dataset had a low representation of strains with high AZM MICs (**Fig. 2d**),

and thus the more comprehensive representation of positive (NS) data in the aggregate

training set was associated with improved sensitivity in predicting AZM NS for these

strains. Low representation of strains with higher AZM MICs was also observed in other

datasets (i.e., datasets 1, 6, and 7) and was similarly reflected in the sensitivity-limited

performance of RF classifiers trained and tested on these datasets (**Supplementary**

Table 7). However, AZM NS prediction accuracy for strains from these datasets was not

improved by training classifiers on the aggregate dataset. These results demonstrate that

resistance model performance may be strongly associated with the distributions of both

resistance phenotypes and genetic features and thus can be highly population-specific.

269 **ML prediction models of antibiotic susceptibility / non-susceptibility outperform**

270 **MIC models**

271 Gonococcal CIP and AZM MICs were dichotomized by both EUCAST and CLSI

272 breakpoints to assess the impact of variation in MIC breakpoints on model performance.

273 As the EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints for CIP in gonococci are within a single doubling

274 dilution and the vast majority of isolates have much lower or higher CIP MICs (**Fig. 1a**),

275 >99% of isolates in the aggregate dataset were consistently S or NS by both breakpoints.

276 Of the 23 isolates with MICs between the two breakpoints, 18 had MICs derived from

277 Etests of 0.032 μg/mL or 0.047 μg/mL, making their classification relative to the EUCAST

278 breakpoint of 0.03 μg/mL ambiguous. In contrast, the EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints for

279 AZM in gonococci are separated by two doubling dilutions, and for many isolates, the

280 AZM MIC was within this range (**Fig. 1b**). As such, only 67% of isolates in the aggregate

281 dataset were consistently S or NS by both breakpoints. CIP NS classifier performance

282 was either identical or nearly identical for both breakpoints in the aggregate and most

283 individual gonococcal datasets (**Fig. 3a**). In contrast, the bACC of AZM NS prediction by

284 both SCM and RF classifiers based on the CLSI breakpoint was significantly higher than

285 for those based on the EUCAST breakpoint across all gonococcal datasets assessed by

286 both breakpoints (P < 0.0001, **Fig. 3b**).

287 To assess the performance of MIC prediction models relative to binary S/NS

288 resistance phenotype classifiers, RF-mC and RF-R models were trained and evaluated

289 for CIP and AZM MIC prediction in gonococci. Average exact match rates between

290 predicted and phenotypic MICs ranged from 63-86% and 53-77% by RF-mC and RF-R,

291 respectively, for CIP, and from 22-58% and 44-64%, respectively, for AZM

(**Supplementary Tables 6-7**). Average 1-tier accuracies were substantially higher but

similarly varied widely across datasets and between the two MIC prediction methods.

There was no consistent or significant relationship across the different datasets between

MIC prediction accuracy (exact match or 1-tier accuracy) and bACC for either drug by

either MIC prediction method (**Fig. 3c-f**). Further, for both drugs by both breakpoints in

the aggregate gonococcal dataset, binary RF-C models had equivalent or significantly

higher bACC than RF-mC and RF-R MIC prediction models (P = 0.513 for CIP NS by the

CLSI breakpoint by RF-C compared to RF-R, P = 0.201 for AZM NS by the CLSI

breakpoint by RF-C compared to RF-R, P < 0.0006 for all others, **Supplementary Tables**

6-7).

Model performance varies substantially across performance metrics

Success in the predictive accuracy of ML models varies not only by antibiotic, dataset,

and ML method, but also by metrics used to assess model performance[7-12,14,15,17,25,41]. To

assess the advantages and limitations of model performance metrics and their

implications for diagnostics, we examined the performance of predictive models for AZM

resistance in gonococci across multiple metrics. Specifically, we evaluated accuracy (1 -

error rate) compared to the bACC across all models for AZM S/NS based on the EUCAST

breakpoint, and bACC was further compared to individual metrics of sensitivity (1 – VME

rate) and specificity (1 – ME rate). Given the low representation of AZM NS strains by the

CLSI breakpoint in most datasets, comparison of performance metrics was limited to

models based on the EUCAST breakpoint.

Model accuracy was significantly higher than bACC for SCM and RF-C AZM

resistance models in all gonococcal datasets ($P < 0.0001$), except the aggregate dataset

and dataset 6 ($P > 0.40$), with a particularly marked discordance in datasets with

unbalanced representation of S and NS phenotypes (**Fig 4a-c**). For example, in dataset

2, there were almost 5x as many AZM NS strains as S strains by the EUCAST breakpoint

(**Fig. 4a**, **Supplementary Table 7**). While the mean error rate across the SCM replicates

for this dataset based on this breakpoint was 15% (accuracy = 85%), this obscures the

low specificity, which is better reflected in the mean bACC of 62%. However, even

normalized aggregate metrics, such as bACC, can fail to reflect differences in sensitivity

vs. specificity across models (**Fig. 4d-e**). For example, models trained and tested on

dataset 1 had significantly higher bACC across both ML methods than models from

dataset 2 ($P < 0.0001$), while the models from the dataset 2 had 38-47% higher sensitivity.

For both SCM and RF-C AZM resistance models, there was a significant positive

correlation between the ratio of model sensitivity to model specificity and the ratio of NS

to S strains in the dataset (Pearson r > 0.98, $P < 0.0001$ for both SCM and RF-C, **Fig.**

4f).

Species with large accessory genomes pose challenges to ML-based antibiotic

resistance prediction

Increasing pangenome size, or increasing ratio of genomic features to observations, may

present an additional challenge for ML-based prediction of antibiotic resistance[12]. To

investigate the impact of pangenome size on ML-based antibiotic resistance prediction,

SCM and RF-C were used to model CIP NS in *K. pneumoniae* and *A. baumannii*, two

species with pangenomes several times that of gonococci (**Fig. 5a-b**). SCM classifiers

trained on and used to predict CIP NS for *K. pneumoniae* and *A. baumannii* achieved

significantly lower or roughly equivalent accuracy, respectively, as the gonococcal

datasets ($P < 0.0001$ and $P > 0.06$ for *K. pneumoniae* and *A. baumannii*, respectively,

Fig. 5c), and the performance of RF-C models was significantly lower for both *K.*

pneumoniae and *A. baumannii* ($P < 0.0001$, **Fig. 5d**). Direct association based on GyrA

codon 83 mutations (equivalent to codon 91 in gonococci) alone predicted CIP NS in *K.*

pneumoniae with 86% sensitivity and 99% specificity, and thus had a marginally higher

bACC (92.5%) than for the SCM classifiers and a substantially higher bACC than the RF

classifiers. Similarly, for *A. baumannii*, GyrA codon 81 mutations (equivalent to codon 91

in gonococci) alone predicted CIP NS in with 97% sensitivity and 98% specificity, and

thus with a roughly equivalent bACC (97.5%) to the SCM classifiers and a substantially

higher bACC than the RF classifiers.

Discussion

ML offers an opportunity to leverage WGS data to aid in development of rapid molecular

diagnostics, but multiple factors affect model performance, reliability, and interpretability.

Our results affirmed that drugs associated with complex and/or diverse resistance

mechanisms present challenges to ML-based prediction of resistance phenotypes, and

sampling frame can substantially affect performance of such predictive models. We

demonstrated significant variability in performance and potential clinical utility of

predictive models based on different resistance metrics, as well as in the information

provided by, and thus the clinical applicability of, commonly used metrics of model

performance. We further showed that the capacity to model antibiotic resistance may be

highly variable across different species.

Variable performance of ML-based resistance prediction models by antibiotic

Genotype-based resistance diagnostics have largely focused more on evaluating

the presence of resistance determinants and less on predicting the susceptibility profile

of a given isolate[8]. However, in clinical settings where the empirical presumption is of

resistance, prediction that an isolate is susceptible to an antibiotic may be more important

in guiding treatment decisions. As such, the clinical utility of a genotype-based resistance

diagnostic may be determined by its capacity to accurately predict susceptibility

phenotype for multiple drugs.

While variable performance of ML-based predictive models has been observed

across different drugs[7,8,10,11,14,15], it has often been attributed to dataset size and/or

imbalance[7,14,15]. Further, while it is more difficult to predict resistance phenotypes from

genotypes for drugs that are associated with unknown, multifactorial, and/or diverse

resistance mechanisms than for drugs for which resistance can largely be attributed to a

single variant[14,25], this caveat has been presented specifically as a limitation of models

based on known resistance loci in comparison to unbiased machine learning-based MIC

prediction using genome-wide feature sets[14]. However, by comparing performance of

predictive models based on genome-wide feature sets between CIP and AZM across

multiple gonococcal datasets, we showed that even with relatively large and

phenotypically balanced datasets, ML algorithms cannot necessarily be expected to

successfully model complex and/or diverse resistance mechanisms, particularly given

that the representation of these resistance mechanisms in training datasets is *a priori*

unknown.

Impact of demographic, geographic, and timeframe sampling bias on ML model

predictions of antibiotic resistance

Sampling bias presents a substantial challenge in any predictive modeling, and

sampling from limited patient demographics or during limited time periods may have

considerable effects on the distributions of resistance phenotypes and resistance

mechanisms[42,43]. For example, in TB, the RpoB I491F mutation that has been associated

with failure of commercial RIF resistance diagnostic assays, including the GeneXpert

MTB/RIF assay, reportedly accounted for <5% of TB RIF resistance in most countries,

but, in Swaziland was found to be present in up to 30% of MDR-TB[44]. Further, as the

focus with statistical classifiers is building models from feature sets that can accurately

predict an outcome, rather than understanding the association between each of the

features and the outcome, potential confounding effects from factors such as population

structure[35,45,46] or correlations among resistance profiles of different drugs[13] are rarely

considered.

By comparing performance of AZM NS classifiers across multiple training and

testing sets, we showed significant variation in performance of classifiers trained on a

large and diverse global collection across testing sets from different sampling frames. In

some cases of imbalanced datasets, models trained on datasets with a more

comprehensive representation of resistance phenotypes improve prediction accuracy.

However, our results suggest that heavier sampling across more geographic regions

cannot necessarily be expected to significantly improve model performance. This,

together with decreased performance when excluding isolates from the dataset from

which the isolates being tested were derived, suggests that factors such as population-

specific resistance mechanisms, genetic divergence at resistance loci, and/or

confounding effects may constrain model reliability across populations.

ML resistance prediction model performance varies by NS breakpoints and by

categorical vs MIC-based resistance metrics

While measurement of MICs is vital for surveillance and investigation of resistance

mechanisms, resistance breakpoints that relate *in vitro* MIC measurements to expected

treatment outcomes inform clinical decision-making. However, standard breakpoints for

NS to a given drug in a given species are often informed less by treatment outcome data,

but rather factors such as pharmacokinetics and MIC distributions that can fail to account

for a variety of intra-host conditions that could influence drug efficacy[47-50]. Recent studies

have shown that isolates that are classified as susceptible by standard breakpoints but

have higher MICs are associated with a greater risk of treatment failure than isolates with

lower MICs[51]. Further, resistance breakpoints and testing protocols can vary across

different organizations, and thus incongruence across phenotypic information included in

the training data may introduce additional sources of error in predictive modeling. By

comparing performance of predictive models of CIP and AZM non-susceptibility based on

EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints, we demonstrated breakpoint-specific performance of

models. For CIP, such breakpoint-specific performance is likely largely attributable to

variations in MIC testing protocols and thus ambiguous classification of some strains by

the EUCAST breakpoint. On the other hand, the substantially lower performance of all

AZM models based on the EUCAST breakpoint compared to those based on the CLSI

breakpoint suggests that many isolates with AZM MICs between the two breakpoints lack

genetic signatures that contribute to high model performance. While the clinical relevance

of AZM MICs between these two breakpoints in gonococci is unclear, these isolates may

be more likely to be associated with AZM treatment failure than isolates with lower MICs,

and thus evaluation of classifiers using only higher breakpoints may misrepresent their

diagnostic value, particularly in the absence of sufficient treatment outcome data.

Models that predict MICs provide more refined output than a binary classifier but

generally achieve low rates of exact matches between phenotypic and predicted MICs

and even fairly variable 1-tier accuracies[14,15,25]. Given the noise in phenotypic MIC

testing[52] and the potential lack of discriminating genetic features between isolates with

MICs separated by 1-2 doubling dilutions[14], MIC prediction models may be unlikely to

provide much better resolution than binary S/NS classifiers. Further, even if MIC

predictions could provide additional resolution, the most important criterion of such a

diagnostic would likely still be its ability to correctly predict resistance phenotypes relative

to a clinically relevant breakpoint. Thus, performance of MIC prediction models with

respect to breakpoints may be the biggest determinant of their diagnostic utility. By

building MIC prediction models for CIP and AZM in gonococci, we observed low rates of

exact matches between phenotypic and predicted MICs and variable 1-tier accuracies,

with no relationship between 1-tier accuracy and categorical agreement (i.e., prediction

accuracy relative to NS breakpoints). Further, binary classifiers performed equivalently or

better than MIC prediction models.

The choice of model performance metrics can obscure shortcomings of

resistance prediction models

While performance can vary substantially across resistance prediction models built

by different ML methods[7,12,53], criteria for selecting a model with the greatest potential

diagnostic value are seldom addressed. Performance assessments for resistance

prediction models are frequently presented in terms of aggregate metrics, including

accuracy (or error rate), area-under-the-ROC-curve (AUC), and 1-tier accuracy, and/or in

terms of individual VME and ME rates (or the sensitivity and specificity, respectively)[7-

12,14,15,17,25,41]. Aggregate metrics can be useful in providing a single intuitive measure of

model performance. However, as previously noted, metrics such as 1-tier accuracy may

not reflect model performance relative to utility as a diagnostic (i.e., what proportion of

discrepancies between phenotypic and predicted MICs result in a VME or ME). Further,

some of these metrics, such as accuracy (or error rate) and AUC, may provide skewed

representations of model performance in the case of imbalanced datasets[54].

Comparisons of AZM NS classifier accuracy to bACC across each of the gonococcal

datasets demonstrated that accuracy obscures performance deficiencies. However, even

normalized aggregate metrics such as bACC can fail to capture potentially important

differences in sensitivity vs. specificity (or VME vs. ME rates). Individual metrics of

sensitivity and specificity provide more detailed information about the likelihood of

different kinds of prediction failures, the differential importance of which is reflected in the

FDA guidelines for AMR diagnostics[55]. However, our results also illustrate that model

sensitivity and specificity can be strongly influenced by dataset imbalance, ultimately

suggesting that multiple metrics may be necessary to evaluate a model's clinical utility

and that both comprehensive sampling and dataset pruning may be necessary to optimize

model performance.

ML antibiotic resistance prediction model success varies by bacterial pangenome

size

Bacterial species with open pangenomes present further challenges to ML-based

prediction of antibiotic resistance. Increased resistance mechanism complexity and

greater inter-isolate variation in resistance mechanisms require more intensive sampling

to capture a significant portion of the resistome[56]. On the technical side, even for heavily

sampled species, when using whole genome feature sets, the number of genetic features

(e.g., k-mers or SNPs) will always be much larger than the number of observations

(isolates), increasing the risk of overfitting[12]. This can be particularly problematic in

species with open pangenomes, as the ratio of genetic features to the number of genomes

is larger and the number of unique genetic features per number of genomes does not

plateau, even with heavy sampling. By comparing classifier performance in predicting CIP

NS across gonococci, *K. pneumoniae*, and *A. baumannii*, we show that classifiers

generally did not perform as well for species with open genomes (*K. pneumoniae* or *A.*

baumannii) as for gonococci. Further, while a single GyrA mutation could explain the

majority of CIP NS across all species evaluated here, unlike in gonococci and *A.*

baumannii where this mutation explained ≥97% of CIP NS, 14% of CIP NS in *K.*

pneumoniae could not be explained by this mutation, suggesting increased CIP

resistance mechanism diversity and/or complexity in this species. While increased

sampling, different methods, and/or finer tuning of hyperparameters may yield increased

prediction accuracy for drug resistance in species with open genomes (e.g., Nguyen et

al., 2018 reported a mean bACC of 98.5% using a decision tree-based extreme gradient

boosting regression model to predict CIP MICs for the *K. pneumoniae* strains assessed

here[14]), our results demonstrate clear variation in potential limitations of genotype-to-

resistance-phenotype models across different species.

Given the biological and epidemiological disparities associated with resistance to

different drugs in different clinical populations and bacterial species, and their evident

impact on performance of predictive models, successful implementation of genotype-

based resistance diagnostics will likely require sustained comprehensive sampling,

customized modeling, and incorporation of feedback mechanisms based on treatment

outcome data. Further evaluation of additional ML methods and datasets may reveal

more quantitative requirements and limitations associated with the application of

genotype-to-resistance-phenotype predictive modeling in the clinical setting.

514
Acknowledgements

ALH and YHG are supported by the Richard and Susan Smith Family Foundation

(http://www.smithfamilyfoundation.net/) and a National Institutes of Health R01 AI132606

(https://www.nih.gov/). This work was also supported by Wellcome (grant 098051 to the

Wellcome Sanger Institute). NEW was funded through National Institutes of Health grant

U01CA207167. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,

decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. Its contents are solely the

responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the

National Institutes of Health. We thank Jung-Eun Shin, Mark Labrador, and members of

the Grad Lab for helpful discussion, and Julie Schillinger and Preeti Pathela for assistance

identifying, selecting, and characterizing the isolates from New York City.

Author contributions

ALH and YHG conceived of the study. ALH performed the analyses, and ALH and YHG

drafted the manuscript. JLR provided samples, including culturing specimens, isolating

DNA, and testing antibiotic susceptibility. ALH, YHG, LSB, and NW interpreted the data.

All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript.

References:

1   The Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. 2016. Tackling drug-resistant infections

globally: final report and recommendations. London, United Kingdom.

2   Zumla, A. *et al.* Rapid point of care diagnostic tests for viral and bacterial

respiratory tract infections--needs, advances, and future prospects. *Lancet Infect*

Dis **14**, 1123-1135, doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(14)70827-8 (2014).

3   Didelot, X., Bowden, R., Wilson, D. J., Peto, T. E. A. & Crook, D. W. Transforming

clinical microbiology with bacterial genome sequencing. *Nat Rev Genet* **13**, 601-

612, doi:10.1038/nrg3226 (2012).

4   Walker, T. M. *et al.* Whole-genome sequencing for prediction of Mycobacterium

tuberculosis drug susceptibility and resistance: a retrospective cohort study.

Lancet Infect Dis **15**, 1193-1202, doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(15)00062-6 (2015).

5   Rigouts, L. *et al.* Rifampin resistance missed in automated liquid culture system

for Mycobacterium tuberculosis isolates with specific rpoB mutations. *J Clin*

Microbiol **51**, 2641-2645, doi:10.1128/JCM.02741-12 (2013).

6   Mason, A. *et al.* Accuracy of Different Bioinformatics Methods in Detecting

Antibiotic Resistance and Virulence Factors from Staphylococcus aureus Whole-

Genome Sequences. *J Clin Microbiol* **56**, doi:10.1128/JCM.01815-17 (2018).

7   Yang, Y. *et al.* Machine learning for classifying tuberculosis drug-resistance from

DNA sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 1666-1671,

doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx801 (2018).

8   Pesesky, M. W. *et al.* Evaluation of Machine Learning and Rules-Based

Approaches for Predicting Antimicrobial Resistance Profiles in Gram-negative

Bacilli from Whole Genome Sequence Data. *Front Microbiol* **7**, 1887,

doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01887 (2016).

9   Li, Y. *et al.* Validation of beta-lactam minimum inhibitory concentration predictions

for pneumococcal isolates with newly encountered penicillin binding protein (PBP)

sequences. *BMC Genomics* **18**, 621, doi:10.1186/s12864-017-4017-7 (2017).

10   Bradley, P. *et al.* Rapid antibiotic-resistance predictions from genome sequence

data for Staphylococcus aureus and Mycobacterium tuberculosis. *Nat Commun* **6**,

10063, doi:10.1038/ncomms10063 (2015).

11   Drouin, A. *et al.* Predictive computational phenotyping and biomarker discovery
using reference-free genome comparisons. *BMC Genomics* **17**, 754,
doi:10.1186/s12864-016-2889-6 (2016).

12   Drouin, A. *et al.* Interpretable genotype-to-phenotype classifiers with performance
guarantees. *bioRxiv*, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/388348 (2018).

13   Davis, J. J. *et al.* Antimicrobial Resistance Prediction in PATRIC and RAST. *Sci*
Rep **6**, 27930, doi:10.1038/srep27930 (2016).

14   Nguyen, M. *et al.* Developing an in silico minimum inhibitory concentration panel
test for Klebsiella pneumoniae. *Sci Rep* **8**, 421, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-18972-w
(2018).

15   Nguyen, M. *et al.* Using machine learning to predict antimicrobial minimum
inhibitory concentrations and associated genomic features for nontyphoidal
Salmonella. *J Clin Microbiol*, doi:10.1101/380782 (2018).

16   Santerre, J. W., Davis, J. J., Xia, F. & Stevens, R. Machine Learning for
Antimicrobial Resistance. *arXiv e-prints*, doi:arXiv:1607.01224 (2016).

17   Moradigaravand, D. *et al.* Prediction of antibiotic resistance in Escherichia coli from
large-scale pan-genome data. *PLoS Comput Biol* **14**, e1006258,
doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006258 (2018).

18   Gordon, N. C. *et al.* Prediction of Staphylococcus aureus antimicrobial resistance
by whole-genome sequencing. *J Clin Microbiol* **52**, 1182-1191,
doi:10.1128/JCM.03117-13 (2014).

19   Marchland, M. & Shawe-Taylor, J. The set covering machine. *Journal of Machine*
Learning Research **3**, 723-746 (2002).

20 Breiman, L. Random forests. *Machine Learning* **45**, 5-32 (2001).

21 Hemarajata, P., Yang, S., Soge, O. O., Humphries, R. M. & Klausner, J. D.

Performance and Verification of a Real-Time PCR Assay Targeting the gyrA Gene

for Prediction of Ciprofloxacin Resistance in Neisseria gonorrhoeae. *J Clin*

Microbiol **54**, 805-808, doi:10.1128/JCM.03032-15 (2016).

22 Siedner, M. J. *et al.* Real-time PCR assay for detection of quinolone-resistant

Neisseria gonorrhoeae in urine samples. *J Clin Microbiol* **45**, 1250-1254,

doi:10.1128/JCM.01909-06 (2007).

23 Grad, Y. H. *et al.* Genomic Epidemiology of Gonococcal Resistance to Extended-

Spectrum Cephalosporins, Macrolides, and Fluoroquinolones in the United States,

2000-2013. *J Infect Dis* **214**, 1579-1587, doi:10.1093/infdis/jiw420 (2016).

24 Wadsworth, C. B., Arnold, B. J., Sater, M. R. A. & Grad, Y. H. Azithromycin

Resistance through Interspecific Acquisition of an Epistasis-Dependent Efflux

Pump Component and Transcriptional Regulator in Neisseria gonorrhoeae. *MBio*

9, doi:10.1128/mBio.01419-18 (2018).

25 Eyre, D. W. *et al.* WGS to predict antibiotic MICs for Neisseria gonorrhoeae. *J*

Antimicrob Chemother **72**, 1937-1947, doi:10.1093/jac/dkx067 (2017).

26 Bankevich, A. *et al.* SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and its

applications to single-cell sequencing. *J Comput Biol* **19**, 455-477,

doi:10.1089/cmb.2012.0021 (2012).

27 Gurevich, A., Saveliev, V., Vyahhi, N. & Tesler, G. QUAST: quality assessment

tool for genome assemblies. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 1072-1075,

doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btt086 (2013).

28   Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E. W. & Lipman, D. J. Basic local

611   alignment search tool. *J Mol Biol* **215**, 403-410, doi:10.1016/S0022-

612   2836(05)80360-2 (1990).

613   29   Edgar, R. C. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high

614   throughput. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**, 1792-1797, doi:10.1093/nar/gkh340 (2004).

615   30   Li, H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-

616   MEM. *arXiv e-prints*, doi:arXiv:1303.3997 (2013).

617   31   Walker, B. J. *et al.* Pilon: an integrated tool for comprehensive microbial variant

618   detection and genome assembly improvement. *PLoS One* **9**, e112963,

619   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112963 (2014).

620   32   Wright, M. N. & Ziegler, A. ranger: A Fast Implementation of Random Forests for

621   High Dimensional Data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical Software* **77**, 1-17,

622   doi:doi:10.18637/jss.v077.i01 (2017).

623   33   Rizk, G., Lavenier, D. & Chikhi, R. DSK: k-mer counting with very low memory

624   usage. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 652-653, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btt020 (2013).

625   34   Earle, S. G. *et al.* Identifying lineage effects when controlling for population

626   structure improves power in bacterial association studies. *Nat Microbiol* **1**, 16041,

627   doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.41 (2016).

628   35   Lees, J. A. *et al.* Sequence element enrichment analysis to determine the genetic

629   basis of bacterial phenotypes. *Nat Commun* **7**, 12797, doi:10.1038/ncomms12797

630   (2016).

36   The European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. *Breakpoint*

tables for interpretation of MICs and zone diameters. Version 8.1, 2018. URL:

http://www.eucast.org/.

37   Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. CLSI M100: Performance Standards

for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing, 29th Edition (2019).

38   Harris, S. R. *et al.* Public health surveillance of multidrug-resistant clones of

Neisseria gonorrhoeae in Europe: a genomic survey. *Lancet Infect Dis* **18**, 758-

768, doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(18)30225-1 (2018).

39   Yahara, K. *et al.* Genomic surveillance of Neisseria gonorrhoeae to investigate the

distribution and evolution of antimicrobial-resistance determinants and lineages.

Microb Genom **4**, doi:10.1099/mgen.0.000205 (2018).

40   Demczuk, W. *et al.* Genomic Epidemiology and Molecular Resistance

Mechanisms of Azithromycin-Resistant Neisseria gonorrhoeae in Canada from

1997 to 2014. *J Clin Microbiol* **54**, 1304-1313, doi:10.1128/JCM.03195-15 (2016).

41   Niehaus, K. E., Walker, T. M., Crook, D. W. & Clifton, T. E. A. P. A. in *IEEE-EMBS*

International Conference on Biomedical and Health Informatics (BHI)   618-621

(2014).

42   Olesen, S. W. *et al.* Azithromycin susceptibility in Neisseria gonorrhoeae and

seasonal macrolide use. *J Infect Dis* **jiy551** (2018).

43   Unemo, M. & Shafer, W. M. Antibiotic resistance in Neisseria gonorrhoeae: origin,

evolution, and lessons learned for the future. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **1230**, E19-28,

doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06215.x (2011).

44 Andre, E. *et al.* Novel rapid PCR for the detection of Ile491Phe rpoB mutation of

Mycobacterium tuberculosis, a rifampicin-resistance-conferring mutation

undetected by commercial assays. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **23**, 267 e265-267 e267,

doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2016.12.009 (2017).

45 Zhou, X. & Stephens, M. Genome-wide efficient mixed-model analysis for

association studies. *Nat Genet* **44**, 821-824, doi:10.1038/ng.2310 (2012).

46 Farhat, M. R. *et al.* Genomic analysis identifies targets of convergent positive

selection in drug-resistant Mycobacterium tuberculosis. *Nat Genet* **45**, 1183-1189,

doi:10.1038/ng.2747 (2013).

47 Prideaux, B. *et al.* The association between sterilizing activity and drug distribution

into tuberculosis lesions. *Nat Med* **21**, 1223-1227, doi:10.1038/nm.3937 (2015).

48 Tamma, P. D. *et al.* Outcomes of children with enterobacteriaceae bacteremia with

reduced susceptibility to ceftriaxone: do the revised breakpoints translate to

improved patient outcomes? *Pediatr Infect Dis J* **32**, 965-969,

doi:10.1097/INF.0b013e31829043b3 (2013).

49 Bhat, S. V. *et al.* Failure of current cefepime breakpoints to predict clinical

outcomes of bacteremia caused by gram-negative organisms. *Antimicrob Agents*

Chemother **51**, 4390-4395, doi:10.1128/AAC.01487-06 (2007).

50 Tam, V. H. *et al.* Outcomes of bacteremia due to Pseudomonas aeruginosa with

reduced susceptibility to piperacillin-tazobactam: implications on the

appropriateness of the resistance breakpoint. *Clin Infect Dis* **46**, 862-867,

doi:10.1086/528712 (2008).

51   Colangeli, R. *et al.* Bacterial Factors That Predict Relapse after Tuberculosis

Therapy. *N Engl J Med* **379**, 823-833, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1715849 (2018).

52   Humphries, R. M. *et al.* CLSI Methods Development and Standardization Working

Group Best Practices for Evaluation of Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests. *J Clin*

Microbiol **56**, doi:10.1128/JCM.01934-17 (2018).

53   Chen, M. L. *et al.* Deep Learning Predicts Tuberculosis Drug Resistance Status

from   Whole-Genome   Sequencing   Data.   *bioRxiv*,

doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/275628 (2018).

54   Jeni, L. A., Cohn, J. F. & De La Torre, F. in *2013 Humaine Association Conference*

on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction   245-251 (2013).

55   FDA. Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Antimicrobial Susceptibility

Test (AST) Systems; Guidance for Industry and FDA (Food and Drug

Administration, Rockville, MD, 2009).

56   Jeukens, J. *et al.* Genomics of antibiotic-resistance prediction in Pseudomonas

aeruginosa. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*, doi:10.1111/nyas.13358 (2017).

57   De Silva, D. *et al.* Whole-genome sequencing to determine transmission of

Neisseria gonorrhoeae: an observational study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **16**, 1295-1303,

doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30157-8 (2016).

58   Demczuk, W. *et al.* Whole-genome phylogenomic heterogeneity of Neisseria

gonorrhoeae isolates with decreased cephalosporin susceptibility collected in

Canada   between   1989   and   2013.   *J   Clin   Microbiol*   **53**,   191-200,

doi:10.1128/JCM.02589-14 (2015).

59 Lee, R. S. *et al.* Genomic epidemiology and antimicrobial resistance of Neisseria

gonorrhoeae in New Zealand. *J Antimicrob Chemother* **73**, 353-364,

doi:10.1093/jac/dkx405 (2018).

60 Lesho, E. P. *et al.* The antimicrobial resistance monitoring and research (ARMoR)

program: the US Department of Defense response to escalating antimicrobial

resistance. *Clin Infect Dis* **59**, 390-397, doi:10.1093/cid/ciu319 (2014).

704
705 **Tables and Figures:**
706
707 **Table 1.** Summary of datasets.

Species	Dataset	SRA Study ID/Reference	$N_{samples}$	Temporal range	Geographic range	Sampling approach
N. gonorrhoeae	1	ERP011192	886	2011-2015	New York, NY (US)	Survey from citywide clinics
	2	ERP008891, ERP001405, ERP000144 [23]	1102	2000-2013	National (US)	Survey from nationwide clinics; male patients only; enriched for CFX resistance
	3	SRP065041, ERP008891, SRP072971 [25]	671	2004-2014	International (UK, Canada, US)	Surveys from Brighton, UK [57] and nationwide sites in Canada [40,58] and the US [23]; Canadian samples enriched for CRO and AZM resistance; US samples enriched for CFX resistance; US samples from male patients only
	4	SRP050190, SRP065041 [40,58]	383	1989-2014	National (Canada)	Surveys from nationwide sites in Canada; enriched for CRO and AZM resistance
	5	ERP010312 [38]	714	2013	International (Europe)	Survey from clinics and hospitals across 21 European countries
	6	DRP004052 [39]	204	2015	National (Japan)	Survey from clinics in Kyoto and Osaka; male patients only

	7	SRP111927 [59]	398	2014-2015	National (New Zealand)	Survey from nationwide diagnostic labs
K. pneumoniae	8	SRP102664, SRP110988, SRP116139 [14]	1560	2011-2017	Houston, TX (US)	Survey from citywide hospital system; enriched for β-lactam resistance
A. baumannii	9	SRP065910 [60]	702	2000-2012	National (US)	Survey from clinics and hospitals within the US military healthcare system

708 CFX, cefixime; CRO, ceftriaxone; AZM, azithromycin
709

Figure 1. Differential performance of machine learning-based prediction models for

ciprofloxacin and azithromycin resistance in gonococci. Histograms showing the

distributions of **(a)** ciprofloxacin (CIP) and **(b)** azithromycin (AZM) MICs in the gonococcal

isolates assessed here. Bar color indicates the study or studies associated with the

isolates. Dashed lines indicate the **(a)** EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints for non-

susceptibility (NS, >0.03 μg/mL and >0.06 μg/mL, respectively) for CIP and the **(b)**

EUCAST and CLSI breakpoints for non-susceptibility (>0.25 μg/mL and >1 μg/mL,

respectively) for AZM. Mean balanced accuracy (bACC) with 95% confidence intervals of

predictive models for **(c)** CIP NS and **(d)** AZM NS trained and tested on the aggregate

gonococcal dataset. SCM, set covering machine; RF-C, random forest classification; RF-

mC, random forest multi-class classification; RF-R, random forest regression.

723
Figure 2. Differential performance of random forest classifiers trained on different

datasets. (a) Mean balanced accuracy (bACC) with 95% confidence intervals of

predictive models for gonococci (GC) azithromycin (AZM) non-susceptibility based on the

EUCAST breakpoint. **(b)** Mean sensitivity and specificity with 95% confidence intervals of

predictive models for GC AZM non-susceptibility in datasets 2 and 5. Histograms showing

the distributions of AZM MICs in **(c)** dataset 2 and **(d)** dataset 5. Symbol colors in **(a)** and

(b) indicate the dataset from which the testing set was derived, while symbol shape in **(a)**

and **(b)** indicates the dataset from which the training set was derived. Hatching in **(c)** and

(d) indicates MICs within one doubling dilution of the EUCAST breakpoint (designated by

dashed lines).

735
Figure 3. Differential performance of machine learning-based prediction models

based on different resistance metrics in gonococci. Mean balanced accuracy (bACC)

with 95% confidence intervals of predictive models for **(a)** ciprofloxacin non-susceptibility

(CIP NS) across all datasets and **(b)** azithromycin (AZM) NS for all datasets for which

both NS breakpoints were evaluated. Scatter plots comparing the mean 1-tier accuracy

to the mean bACC for each gonococcal dataset derived from **(c-d)** CIP and **(e-f)** AZM

MIC prediction models by **(c,e)** random forest multi-class classification and **d,f** random

forest regression. Symbol colors in **(a-b)** indicate the datasets from which the training and

testing sets were derived. Symbol shapes in **(a-f)** indicate the NS breakpoint. The line of

best fit for each of the breakpoints is indicated in **(c-f)**. SCM, set covering machine; RF-

C, random forest binary classification; RF-mC, random forest multi-class classification;

RF-R, random forest regression.

 Figure 4. Differential performance of predictive models of resistance across

different performance metrics. (a) Distribution of azithromycin (AZM) susceptible (S)

and non-susceptible (NS) strains by the EUCAST breakpoint in each gonococcal dataset.

Mean accuracy and balanced accuracy (bACC) with 95% confidence intervals achieved

by **(b)** set covering machine (SCM) and **(c)** random forest classification (RF-C) models

for AZM NS by the EUCAST breakpoint across gonococcal datasets. Mean bACC,

sensitivity, and specificity with 95% confidence intervals achieved by **(d)** SCM and **(e)** RF-

756 C models for AZM NS by the EUCAST breakpoint across gonococcal datasets. **(f)** Scatter

757 plot showing the relationship between the ratio of NS strains to S strains in each dataset

758 and the ratio of sensitivity to specificity achieved by SCM and RF-C methods.

Figure 5. *K. pneumoniae* **and** *A. baumannii* **datasets are associated with higher genetic diversity and lower performance of resistance prediction models.** Number of **a)** strains and **b)** unique 31-mers in each dataset. Mean balanced accuracy (bACC) with 95% confidence intervals achieved by **c)** set covering machine and **d)** random forest classification models for ciprofloxacin (CIP) NS by the CLSI breakpoints across gonococci, *K. pneumoniae,* and *A. baumannii* datasets.