

In the original published paper, the identities of the 14 novel antigens used were not revealed. Their identities are now available to supplement Table 1 in the original paper, as listed in Table S1, which also includes the names of the corresponding M. tuberculosis and M. bovis orthologs. In Table S2 the sequences of the novel antigens are listed and Table S3 presents sequences of primers.
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