Antibiotic	CFU/ml				
	WT	$\Delta rel_{ m Msm}$	<i>rel</i> Comp	$\Delta dcpA$	<i>dcpA</i> Comp
			_	_	
Ampiciliin	8.83*10^5	1.336*10 <sup>^7</sup>	2.156* 10^ <sup>6</sup>	1.79* 10^ <sup>7</sup>	$2.4*\ 10^{6}$
Amoxicillin	102000	103000	104400	102600	114200
Rifampicin	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Streptomycin	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Erythromycin	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Tetracycline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Norfloxacin	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

**Table S1** An aliquot of culture from the wells with highest concentration of antibiotics or the wells in which color of the resazurin did not change was plated to detect any surviving CFUs

 ND: Not detected



**Figure S1** Comparison of the growth profiles of the WT and the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$ . Comparison of the AUCs of the WT and the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  using PM parametric software results in a red-green-yellow display in which phenotypes that are unchanged are yellow in color, phenotypes that are gained are green in color and phenotype that are lost are red in color. Plate PM11 is on the top left corner, while plate PM20 was is at bottom right corner. For most of the wells, the AUCs for the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  are higher than those for the WT indicating that the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  has gained phenotypes for those compounds. Number of phenotypes lost or gained is mentioned in Table 2 in the main text

and the list of compounds for which phenotype is lost or gained is mentioned in supplementary dataset1. The PM analysis of the WT and the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  was carried out at least four times .

¢	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 12	12 F01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 F	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12	14 F01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 15	P01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12
٨	·	* *	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	**	
B	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	B		B A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	A11100-1501
D		D		D	
E .		E		E / / / / / / / / / E	and a second
F .	····	F	and the second s	F F	a de la companya de la compa
н		н	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	н	
16 FC	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 17	17 P01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 18 F	01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12	19 F01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 20	101 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12
A .		A A		^^ <b></b>	
С		c c	**************************************	c c	
D		D D	×		
F		E E		F	
G	a state of the sta	G	1.1.4	G	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
H		H H		H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H	
40 0	01 02 03 04 05 05 01 08 03 10 11 12 4	40 01 02 03 04 05 06 01 08 03 10 11 12 40	01 02 03 04 05 05 01 08 09 10 11 12	40 01 02 03 04 05 05 07 08 03 10 11 12 40	01 02 03 04 05 06 01 08 09 10 11 12

**Figure S2** Comparison of the growth profiles of the WT and the  $\Delta dcpA$ . For most of the wells, AUCs for the  $\Delta dcpA$  are higher than those for the WT indicating that the  $\Delta dcpA$  has gained phenotypes for those compounds. Number of phenotypes lost or gained is mentioned in Table 2 in the main text and the list of compounds for which phenotype is lost or gained is mentioned in supplementary dataset1. The PM analysis of the WT and the  $\Delta dcpA$  was carried out at least four times.



**Figure S3** Comparison of the growth profiles of the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  strain against the *rel*Comp strain. For most of the wells, the AUCs for the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  are higher than those for the *rel*Comp indicating that the  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  has gained phenotypes for those compounds. Number of phenotypes lost or gained is mentioned in Table 2 in the main text and the list of compounds for which phenotype is lost or gained is mentioned in supplementary dataset1. The PM analysis of  $\Delta rel_{Msm}$  was carried out at least four times and that of *rel*Comp twice.



**Figure S4** Comparison of growth profiles of the  $\Delta dcpA$  against the dcpAComp . For most of the wells, the AUCs for the  $\Delta dcpA$  are higher than those for the dcpAComp indicating that the  $\Delta dcpA$  has gained phenotypes for those compounds. Number of phenotypes lost or gained is mentioned in Table 2 in the main text and the list of compounds for which phenotype is lost or gained is mentioned in supplementary dataset1. The PM analysis of  $\Delta dcpA$  was carried out at least four times and that of dcpAComp twice.



**Figure S5** Comparison of growth profiles the *rel*Comp against the WT strain. Phenotypes lost by the *rel*Comp are red in color while gained are green in color. Number of phenotypes lost or

gained is mentioned in Table 2 in the main text and the list of compounds for which phenotype is lost or gained is mentioned in supplementary dataset1.



**Figure S6** Comparison of growth the profiles of the *dcpA*Comp strain against the WT. Phenotypes lost by the *dcpA*Comp are red in color while gained are green in color. Number of phenotypes lost or gained is mentioned in Table 2 in the main text and the list of compounds for which phenotype is lost of gained is mentioned in supplementary dataset1.



Figure S7 Assessment of biofilm formation on sauton's medium supplemented with 2% glucose.



Figure S8 Thin layer chromatogram of mycolic acids methyl esters.



Figure S9 2D- Thin layer chromatogram of apolar lipids. First dimension was developed in

chloroform-methanol (96:4) and the second dimension in toluene-acetone (80:20).



Figure S10 MALDI-TOF mass spectrum of all five deacetylated GPL bands visible on TLC

plate.

Band no.	$[M+Na]^+$ (m/z) in Daltons
1	1189.711
2	1175.686
3	1175.70
4	1161.648
5	1137.833