

1 **Effectiveness of a multifaceted prevention programme for melioidosis in diabetics**
2 **(PREMEL): a stepped-wedge cluster-randomised controlled trial**

4 **Short title: Prevention of melioidosis in diabetics (PREMEL)**

6 Pornpan Suntornsut MSc, Prapit Teparrukkul MD, Gumphol Wongsuvan MSc, Wipada

7 Chaowagul MD, Susan Michie DPhil, Nicholas PJ Day FRCP, Direk Limmathurotsakul PhD

9 Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol

10 University, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand (P.S., N.P.J.D., D.L.)

11 Department of Medicine, Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, 34000, Thailand

12 (P.T., W.C.)

13 Centre for Behaviour Change and Department of Clinical, Educational and Health

14 Psychology, University College of London, London, WC1E 7HB, United Kingdom (S.M.)

15 Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine,

16 University of Oxford, OX3 7FZ, United Kingdom (N.P.J.D., D.L.)

17 Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,

18 Bangkok, Thailand (D.L.)

20 **Corresponding author:** Assoc. Prof. Direk Limmathurotsakul, Faculty of Tropical

21 Medicine, Mahidol University, 420/6 Rajvithi Road, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand. Tel: +66 2

22 203 6333, Fax: +66 2 354 9169, e-mail: direk@tropmedres.ac

24 **Word count:** Abstract 300; Text 4,050

25 **Reference:** 32, **Figure:** 2, **Table:** 3, **Supporting Information:** 1

26 ABSTRACT

27

28 Background

29 Melioidosis, an often-fatal infectious disease caused by the environmental Gram-negative
30 bacillus *Burkholderia pseudomallei*, is endemic in tropical countries. Diabetes mellitus and
31 environmental exposure are important risk factors for melioidosis acquisition. We aim to
32 evaluate the effectiveness of a multifaceted prevention programme for melioidosis in
33 diabetics in northeast Thailand.

34

35 Methodology/Principal Findings

36 From April 2014 to December 2018, we conducted a stepped-wedge cluster-randomized
37 controlled behaviour change trial in 116 primary care units (PCUs) in Ubon Ratchathani
38 province, northeast Thailand. The intervention was a behavioural support group session to
39 help diabetic patients adopt recommended behaviours, including wearing rubber boots and
40 drinking boiled water. We randomly allocated the PCUs to receive the intervention starting in
41 March 2016, 2017 and 2018. All diabetic patients were contacted by phone yearly, and the
42 final follow-up was December 2018. Two primary outcomes were hospital admissions
43 involving infectious diseases and culture-confirmed melioidosis. Of 9,056 diabetics enrolled,
44 6,544 (72%) received a behavioural support group session. During 38,457 person-years of
45 follow-up, we observed 2,195 (24%) patients having 3,335 hospital admissions involved
46 infectious diseases, 80 (0.8%) melioidosis, and 485 (5%) deaths. In the intention-to-treat
47 analysis, implementation of the intervention was not associated with primary outcomes. In
48 the per-protocol analysis, patients who received a behavioural support group session had
49 lower incidence rates of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases (incidence rate
50 ratio [IRR] 0.89; 95%CI 0.80-0.99, $p=0.03$) and of all-cause mortality (IRR 0.54; 95%CI

51 0.43-0.68, $p < 0.001$). There was a borderline evidence of a lower incidence rate of overall
52 melioidosis in those who received a behavioural support group session (IRR 0.57; 95%CI
53 0.31-1.08, $p = 0.09$).

54

55 **Conclusions/Significance**

56 Receiving the multifaceted prevention programme of melioidosis could reduce the rate of
57 hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and mortality. Policy makers in
58 melioidosis-endemic areas should consider implementing a melioidosis prevention
59 programme in diabetes and continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme.

60

61

62 **Author summary**

63 Melioidosis, an infectious disease caused by environmental bacterium *Burkholderia*
 64 *pseudomallei*, is endemic in tropical countries. Diabetes mellitus is the most important risk
 65 factor, and routes of infection include skin inoculation, ingestion and inhalation. Prevention
 66 guidelines recommend that residents, rice farmers and visitors should wear protective gear
 67 such as rubber boots when in direct contact with soil and environmental water, and consume
 68 only boiled or bottled water. Here, we conducted a cluster randomized controlled trial to
 69 evaluate effectiveness of a multifaceted prevention programme of melioidosis in diabetic
 70 patients in northeast Thailand. We enrolled 9,056 diabetic patients in 2014. We randomly
 71 allocated primary care units as the unit of randomization to receive the intervention starting in
 72 March 2016, 2017 and 2018. All diabetic patients were contacted by phone yearly. We found
 73 that diabetic patients who received a behavioural support group session had lower incidence
 74 rates of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and of all-cause mortality. We
 75 found a borderline evidence of a lower incidence rate of melioidosis in those who received
 76 the intervention. We propose that policy makers in melioidosis-endemic countries should
 77 consider implementing a melioidosis prevention programme.

78

79

80

81

82

83 INTRODUCTION

84 Melioidosis is an often-fatal infection caused by the environmental Gram-negative bacillus
 85 *Burkholderia pseudomallei*, found in soil and water. The disease is considered highly
 86 endemic [1-3] and an increasing number of melioidosis cases are increasingly reported in
 87 other tropical regions including South Asia, Africa and Central and South America [4-7]. A
 88 recent modelling study estimated that there were 165,000 melioidosis cases per year
 89 worldwide, of which 54% die [8]. Diabetes mellitus is the most important risk factor for
 90 melioidosis [1-3]. About half of melioidosis patients have underlying diabetes, and diabetic
 91 patients have a 12-fold higher risk of melioidosis after adjusting for age, sex and other risk
 92 factors [9, 10]. Skin inoculation, ingestion and inhalation are all important routes of infection
 93 from environmental *B. pseudomallei* [1]. Patients commonly present with sepsis and septic
 94 shock with or without localized or disseminated organ involvement such as pneumonia,
 95 urinary tract infection, and central nervous system infection [1-3]. Culture positive for *B.*
 96 *pseudomallei* from any clinical specimens is the gold standard for diagnosis [1].

97

98 There is a strong need for interventions to prevent melioidosis with proven effectiveness,
 99 particularly for high-risk populations such as diabetic patients in tropical countries [1]. No
 100 melioidosis vaccine is currently available, and effectiveness of the recommendations for
 101 melioidosis prevention has not been evaluated to date [1]. In Thailand, evidence-based
 102 guidelines recommend that residents, rice farmers and visitors should wear protective gear
 103 such as rubber boots when in direct contact with soil and environmental water, and consume
 104 only boiled or bottled water [11]. Only a small proportion of people follow such
 105 recommendations, even though the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) Thailand has
 106 consistently recommended them [11]. In a previous focus group study, we identified barriers
 107 to adopting recommended preventive behaviours [11]. The main barriers are categorized into

five domains: (i) knowledge, (ii) beliefs about consequences, (iii) intention and goals, (iv) environmental context and resources, and (v) social influence [11]. People have little knowledge of melioidosis, believe that there is little or no harm in not adopting the recommended preventive behaviours, and are not inclined to use boots while working in muddy rice fields [11]. Using the Theoretical Domains Framework [12, 13] and the Behaviour Change Wheel [14, 15], we previously identified intervention options and modes of delivery, and developed a multifaceted prevention programme aimed at changing behaviour to prevent melioidosis, based on the local context in Thailand [16]. We also reported the protocol and feasibility of the programme in a pilot group of diabetics in northeast Thailand [17].

Here, we reported the outcomes of the PREMEL study, aiming to evaluate whether a multifaceted prevention programme in diabetics would reduce hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and culture-confirmed melioidosis infections. A cluster-randomized design was selected because the intervention was the behavioural support group session. A step-wedge design was selected because of the recommendation of the ethical committees to provide the intervention to all participants, and inability to achieve the target power and follow the recommendation of the ethical committees in a parallel design.

METHODS

Trial design and participants

From April 2014 to December 2018, we conducted a stepped-wedge cluster-randomized controlled behaviour change trial in Ubon Ratchathani province, northeast Thailand, where there were one provincial public hospital (Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital), three general public

hospitals, 22 district hospitals and 317 Tambon Health Promoting Hospitals (THPHs). All hospitals also acted as primary care units (PCUs) that provide health promotion, prevention and medical treatment, including diabetic clinics, for communities. Clusters consisted of 116 PCUs in the province.

Diabetic patients aged from 18 to 65 years old presenting at diabetic clinics were invited to participate. Diabetes was defined as having fasting plasma glucose ≥ 126 mg/dl, HbA1c $\geq 6.5\%$, 2-hour plasma glucose (PG) ≥ 200 mg/dl during an oral glucose tolerance test, or classic symptoms of hyperglycaemia with a random PG ≥ 200 mg/dl. Patients who had been diagnosed with melioidosis and had not completed oral-eradication treatment for melioidosis were excluded. All participants provided individual written consent before enrollment. The trial was approved by the Institute for the Development of Human Research Protections, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand (ref 189/2557) and Oxford Tropical Research Ethics Committee, University of Oxford, United Kingdom (ref 06-14). This trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT02089152.

Randomisation

Diabetic patients were approached individually. Those consenting to enrollment in the study were asked for blood samples to test for HbA1c. We informed them that they would be randomly assigned to a group intervention lasting about 50-60 minutes once during the study period and that the aim was to prevent infectious diseases. Participants were not given the name of the target disease (melioidosis) or details of the intervention before the intervention. We randomly allocated the PCUs to receive the intervention starting in March 2016, 2017 and 2018 (defined as group 1, 2 and 3, respectively; Figure 1 and 2). After the completion of

enrollment, an independent statistician generated the randomization code and assigned clusters to sequences.

Procedures

The intervention was a multifaceted prevention programme of melioidosis developed using two behavioral frameworks: Theoretical Domains Framework [12, 13] and the Behaviour Change Wheel [14, 15]. Details of the intervention have been published [17]. The programme was a small-group intervention, in which 6 to 20 diabetic patients at a time attended a behavioural support group session conducted by the study team. Each session lasted about 50 to 60 minutes. The aim was to deliver the intervention from March to May of each year, prior to the start of rainy season and rice farming in June in northeast Thailand. Each diabetic patient was contacted by a member of the study team who gave them the date and the venue of their behavioural support group session. As diabetic patients came early in the morning for fasting blood glucose (FBG) testing, we delivered the behavioural support group after patients had breakfast (after FBG testing) and while they were waiting to see the doctors. When necessary, we delivered the group session after patients saw the doctors.

The objective of the intervention was to increase the frequency of the two recommended preventive behaviours: wearing boots while working in rice fields and drinking boiled or bottled water. The multifaceted prevention programme included 13 behaviour change techniques identified by a focus group study conducted in 2012 [16, 17]. The behaviour change techniques include information about health consequences (e.g. explaining that not wearing boots while working in rice fields and that drinking untreated water can lead to an often fatal infectious disease called melioidosis), credible source (e.g. a high status professional in the government giving a speech that emphasises the importance of melioidosis

prevention), adding objects to the environment (e.g. providing baby powder and long socks to alleviate the problem of discomfort due to heat and humidity when wearing boots), reconstructing the physical environment, instruction on how to perform a behaviour, demonstration of the behaviour, commitment, prompts/cues, self-monitoring of behaviour, goal setting, feedback on behaviour, feedback on outcome(s) and social support.

The intervention package included six short videos, three pamphlets, and a calendar with a space for participants' individual photographs and self-pledge. The materials are publicly available online (<https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5734155>) [17]. Each participant also received a pair of long socks and a bottle of baby powder (to reduce uncomfortable feelings while wearing boots) and a 2-litre plastic ice bucket (commonly used to store boiled water to drink while working in rice fields). In each behavioural support group, participants received an introduction by a moderator, watched a series of brief videos, and had short group discussions at the end of each video. Participants then had a session in which they tried out multiple kinds of boots to identify the ones which would be most comfortable for wearing. Next, the study team took a photograph of each participant while wearing their boots and holding a kettle and gave participants their printed photographs. Finally, participants made their own calendar to act as a reminder tool for the recommended preventive behaviours. We asked participants to attach their individual photograph to the calendar and write their own pledge on the calendar themselves. Participants were asked to hang their calendar in their house. The moderator also stimulated group discussion before and after as well as during the sessions. Additionally, we provided social support by giving information to nurses, doctors, participants' relatives and village health volunteers in each participating PCU about the intervention and its potential benefits. We asked them to encourage participants to continue with the recommended behaviours.

207

208 **Outcomes**

209 Two primary outcomes were hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and culture-
 210 confirmed melioidosis. Hospital admissions involving infectious diseases were determined
 211 using the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems,
 212 10th Revision, Thailand Modification (ICD-10-TM)[18] or final diagnoses made by attending
 213 physicians including the terms fever, febrile, infected, infection, abscess, pus, diarrhea,
 214 sepsis, pneumonia, cellulitis or diabetic foot. Secondary outcomes were all-cause mortality,
 215 and overall melioidosis (culture-confirmed melioidosis plus clinical melioidosis defined by
 216 attending physicians). We excluded continuing treatment from previous admissions, hospital-
 217 acquired infections and healthcare-associated infections by not including admissions
 218 occurring within 30 days of the discharge date of previous admissions. Culture-confirmed
 219 melioidosis was defined as the symptoms and signs of infection in association with at least
 220 one culture from any site positive for *B. pseudomallei*.

221

222 All diabetic patients were contacted by phone yearly. For diabetic patients who were admitted
 223 to hospitals, hospital admission data together with microbiology laboratory results were
 224 obtained from hospitals in the province. To determine outcomes of participants up to 31
 225 December 2018, we conducted the last phone contact on every participant from 1 January to
 226 30 June 2019. To investigate whether deaths were associated with infectious diseases, we
 227 used ICD-10-DM, microbiology laboratory results and final diagnoses made by attending
 228 physicians for admissions occurring within 30 days prior to death. We also used cause of
 229 death informed by relatives via phone contact.

230

231 **Statistical analysis**

The PREMEL study power calculation was performed with the assumption that, among diabetes, incidence rates of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases were 50 per 1,000 persons per year [19, 20] and incidence rates of culture-confirmed melioidosis were 240 per 100,000 persons per year [10]. Using an alpha error of 0.05, a power of 0.8 and an intra-cluster correlation coefficient of 0.15, we calculated that we needed at least 9,000 diabetics from 30 diabetic clinics (300 diabetics per clinic). This design and sample size gave us 85% power to show a 30% reduction in incidence rates of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and a 35% reduction in incidence rates of culture-confirmed melioidosis. During the enrollment period, we found that the number of diabetic patients we could enroll at each PCU was lower than we expected. Therefore, during the enrollment period, we adjusted and enrolled diabetic patients from 116 PCUs in the province.

We used both intention-to-treat (ITT) and per-protocol analyses. For the primary outcome of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases, we used multilevel mixed-effects negative binomial regression models adjusted for calendar time, and with a random effect for PCU and a random effect for repeated measures on the same diabetic patients [21, 22]. This approach was recommended by Hemming et al [21, 22] to allow for correlations between individuals in the same cluster and the dependence between individual measurements over the course of the study. In the ITT analysis, 1st March was set as the time of the intervention for the randomized clusters of those years. Patients were considered at risk from the enrollment until 31 Dec 2018. In the per-protocol analysis, participants who received a behavioural support group session for melioidosis prevention were defined as having received the intervention.

For the melioidosis and mortality outcomes we used multilevel mixed-effects Poisson regression models, adjusted for calendar time, with a random effect for PCU. This was

because the multilevel mixed-effects negative binomial model did not converge [21, 22]. In all models we performed interaction tests to evaluate whether treatment effects change over time [21, 22].

We ran sensitivity analyses to evaluate whether the effectiveness of the intervention changed after adjusting for gender, age, diabetes duration and HbA1c level at enrollment using a multivariable regression model. We *ad hoc* evaluated the potential cost-effectiveness of the prevention programme by using the previously published cost-effectiveness models for melioidosis vaccination in Thailand [23]. All analyses were performed using STATA version 14.2 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

Data and Resource Availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Patient and public involvement

No patients or members of the public were involved in the design or conduct of our research. However, Ubon Ratchathani Provincial Public Health Office contributed to the planning stages. Our research uptake strategy included widespread engagement with key stakeholder groups; including Diabetes Association of Thailand and other melioidosis-endemic countries.

RESULTS

From April 2014 to November 2014, we enrolled 9,075 diabetic patients in 116 PCUs, representing the clusters, into the study (Figure 1). After enrollment, we excluded 19 patients

from the study because we found that they were older than 65 years old (n=8), were not diabetic patients (n=7), were being treated with oral eradication treatment for melioidosis on enrollment (n=2) and did not provide written consent (n=2).

Baseline characteristics of the 9,056 diabetic patients included in the study are summarised in Table 1, stratified by group. Their baseline characteristics were similar between groups. Overall, 73% were female, the median age was 55 years (IQR 49-60), 41% had known diabetes duration less than 5 years, 79% were taking only oral medication for their diabetes and 30% had poor diabetic control (HbA1c >9.0%) on enrollment.

A total of 39, 39 and 38 PCUs were randomized to groups 1, 2 and 3, in which the intervention was given from March to July in 2016, 2017 and 2018, respectively (Figure 2). Of 9,056 diabetic patients, 6,544 (72%) received a behavioural support group session. The study team delivered a total of 522 sessions, of which 177 (34%) had fewer than six participants per session, 237 (45%) had 6 to 20 participants, and 108 (21%) had more than 20 participants. Of 522 sessions, 408 (78%) were conducted from March to May, 94 (18%) in June, and 20 (4%) in July. The proportion of diabetic patients who received a behavioural support group session was highest in the group 1 clusters (81%) than those in group 2 clusters (68%) and group 3 clusters (67%) ($p<0.001$). Participants who received a behavioural support group session were older and had a higher proportion of female, lower proportion of insulin therapy (16% vs 22%) and lower proportion of poor diabetic control (29% vs 33%) compared with those who did not receive a behavioural support group session (Table 2).

Of 2,512 diabetic patients who did not receive a behavioural support group session, 1,696 (68%) did not meet the study team, but received details of the behavioural support group by

phone and received materials by delivery via village health volunteers. Another 386 (15%) diabetic patients met the study team, received the materials and details of the behavioural support group personally, but declined to attend a behavioural support group session. The most frequent reasons for declining were that they did not want to wait for the session (while a session was already running), feared that they would miss their place in the queue for the doctor, wanted to go back home immediately (for cases that had already seen a doctor, and could attend a session after that), and unknown reasons. The other 250 (10%) diabetic patients died prior to the intervention period and 180 (17%) diabetic patients could not be contacted.

As of the end of December 2018, 8,495 (94%) patients survived, 485 (5%) died, and 76 (1%) could not be contacted. Of 76 patients who could not be contacted, six (0.1%) withdrew consent during the study period and data up to the last follow-up were used in the analyses. Total duration of follow-up period was 38,457 person-years.

For the primary outcome, 3,335 hospital admissions involving infectious diseases occurred in 2,195 patients. The most common diagnoses were acute gastroenteritis (582 admissions), pneumonia (364 admissions), post-traumatic wound infection (302 admissions), urinary tract infection (287 admissions), cellulitis (251 admissions) and unspecified fever (241 admissions; Supplementary Table 1). The rate of hospital admission involving infectious diseases was 87 (95%CI 84-90) admissions per 1,000 person-years. In the ITT analysis, the intervention was not associated with the incidence rate of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases ($p=0.79$; Table 3). In the per-protocol analysis, diabetic patients who received a behavioural support group session had 11% lower incidence rate of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases (incidence rate ratio [IRR] 0.89; 95%CI 0.80-0.99,

p=0.03). The primary outcome of culture-confirmed melioidosis occurred in 58 patients. Fifty-seven patients admitted to hospitals and one patient had localized melioidosis infection of their hand with pus culture positive for *B. pseudomallei*. The patient was treated successfully as an outpatient case with cotrimoxazole-sulphamethoxazole as the oral eradication treatment. In both ITT and per-protocol analyses, the intervention was not associated with the incidence of culture-confirmed melioidosis (p=0.30 and p=0.66, respectively).

The secondary outcome of all-cause mortality occurred in 485 patients. 15 of 58 (26%) patients with culture-confirmed melioidosis and none of 22 (0%) patients with clinical melioidosis died within 30 days of the hospital admissions of melioidosis. Of 485 deaths, 213 (44%) occurred within the hospitals, 198 (41%) occurred within 30 days after the last hospital admission and 74 (15%) occurred at home without hospital admission within 30 days prior to death. Of 198 who died within 30 days after the last hospital admission, 101 (51%) died on the hospital discharge date, 49 (25%) died within 1 to 7 calendar days after the hospital discharge, and 48 (24%) died within 8 to 30 calendar days after the hospital discharge. We found that 217 (45%) of 485 deaths were possibly related to infectious diseases, including septic shock recorded by attending physicians in 94 deaths (19%) (Supplementary Table 2). In the ITT analysis, implementation of the intervention was not associated with mortality (p=0.85). In the per-protocol analysis, patients who received the multifaceted prevention programme had 46% lower rate of mortality (IRR 0.54; 95%CI 0.43-0.68, p<0.001). As we adjusted for calendar time, we observed that the rate of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and mortality rose over time.

The secondary outcome of overall melioidosis occurred in 80 patients (58 culture-confirmed melioidosis and 22 clinical melioidosis). In the ITT analysis, implementation of the intervention was not associated with the incidence rate of melioidosis ($p=0.37$). In the per-protocol analysis, there was borderline evidence suggesting that patients who received the multifaceted prevention programme had 43% lower incidence rate of melioidosis (IRR 0.57; 95%CI 0.31-1.08, $p=0.09$).

In a sensitivity analysis, using per-protocol analysis and multivariable regression models, we found that male gender, older age, longer known diabetes duration and higher HbA1c levels on enrollment were associated with incidence of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases (Supplementary Table 3) and mortality (Supplementary Table 4). Male gender, longer known diabetes duration and higher HbA1c level on enrollment were also associated with overall melioidosis (Supplementary Table 5). We estimated that the intervention would be deemed cost-effective in Thailand, assuming that policy makers were willing to pay \$7,000 for an additional quality adjusted life year gained (Supplementary Table 6).

CONCLUSIONS

This is the first trial of a behavioural intervention to prevent melioidosis to the authors' knowledge. It shows that diabetic patients who receive a behavioural support group session for melioidosis prevention have lower rates of hospital admissions related to infectious diseases and all-cause mortality. There is also borderline evidence of a lower rate of overall melioidosis. Our study did not observe an intervention effect in the ITT analyses. This is probably because only the patients who received a behavioural support group session adopted the recommended behaviours in significant numbers [16]. Providing information and

materials without attending a behavioural supportive group probably only had a minimal effect on behaviour [14, 15]. We also estimated that the intervention is likely to be cost-effective in melioidosis-endemic countries such as Thailand.

The absence of an intervention effect on culture-confirmed melioidosis could be due to statistical power. The study had a high proportion of female diabetic patients, while male diabetic patients are at a higher risk of melioidosis [1-3]. The reason for this could be that we met less male diabetic patients as males are more likely than females to miss appointments at diabetic clinics [24, 25]. In addition, based on our experience, males are more likely to decline invitations to participate in studies than females. A high proportion of female diabetic patients in prospective studies (ranging from 58% to 75%) is also observed in other prospective studies in diabetics in Thailand [26]. Nonetheless, both male and female diabetic patients are primary targets for interventions directed at melioidosis prevention. This suggests that the invitation for the intervention and prevention programme may need to be more proactive and persuasive for male diabetic patients.

Our findings suggest that wearing protective gear and drinking boiled water have a wide impact on infectious diseases and overall health; however, the observed size of effect (e.g. IRR 0.54 for all-cause mortality) could also be attributed to other confounding factors. For example, diabetic patients may also improve their glycemic control and diabetes self-management [27], on top of wearing boots and drinking boiled water, after receiving a behavioural support group session. This may result from hearing information about the consequence of melioidosis and its association with diabetes and poor diabetic control from credible sources, and stories from relatives of fatal cases in the videos which were part of the behavioural support group session. It is also possible that diabetic patients who received a

behavioural support group session might have better self-care behaviour or expose themselves less often to risky environments than those who did not receive the intervention.

We show that poor diabetic control (HbA1c >9.0%) and longer known diabetic duration at enrollment are significantly associated with hospital admissions related to infectious diseases, overall melioidosis and all-cause mortality. The association between poor diabetic control and all-cause mortality is consistent with previously published studies [28]. Infection-related deaths as a proportion of all-cause mortality estimated in our study (45%) was much higher than previous reports, ranging from 4 to 15% from the cohort in the U.S. [29] and 16% in the U.K. [30]. It is likely that the proportion of infection-related deaths in diabetes is higher in low and middle-income countries, where the burden of sepsis is estimated to be highest [31]. The difference could also be associated with the difference in training for International Statistical Classification of Diseases coders and limited data on cause of death in Thailand.

The proportion of diabetic patients with poor diabetic control in our study (30%) is relatively higher than the previous reports in Thailand [26, 32] This could be because we tested HbA1c in 100% of the diabetic patients on enrollment. Previous studies in Thailand found that only 50% to 78% of diabetic patients had HbA1c tested and diabetic patients with repeatedly high fasting blood glucose may not be tested for HbA1c levels [25, 26] The findings of increasing rate of hospital admission involving infectious diseases and mortality as the study period progressed (i.e. a rising tide phenomenon [21, 22]) is consistent with our expectation that those events would occur more often as diabetic patients age and have a longer duration of living with diabetes.

This study has several strengths: the large sample size; the large number of PCUs; and the use of two behavioral frameworks: Theoretical Domains Framework [12, 13] and the Behaviour Change Wheel [14, 15] for the development of the intervention [16, 17]. Strong support from PCUs and village healthcare volunteers, and the high rate of follow-up via phone contact, increased the reliability of hospital admissions and mortality endpoints over the study period. Limitations include the impossibility of blinding the intervention after unmasking, and the inability to record the data of non-responders to an invitation to the study, to repeat HbA1c, and to measure recommended behaviours. Due to pragmatic reasons, we could not ensure the number of participants per session were always between six to 20.

In conclusion, receiving the multifaceted prevention programme of melioidosis could reduce the rate of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases and mortality. We propose that policy makers in melioidosis-endemic areas should consider implementing a melioidosis prevention programme in diabetes and continue the evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme.

Acknowledgements

We thank all patients, their relatives, staff of all PCUs who participated in the study, and the Independent Trial Steering Committee, including Prof Ploenchan Chetchotisakd from Khon Kaen University, Thailand; Prof Sarah Walker from University College of London, United Kingdom; Dr Rungrueng Kitphati and Dr Saowapak Hinjoy from Ministry of Public Health, Thailand; Alisa Suphan, Yaowaluck Phokalataweeping and Supaporn Paerwong from Public Health Office, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand. We thank our study team (Wilasinee Thongklang, Thidarat Phosri, Mere Chuenjit, Jirawat Narerat, Santipong Grophthong, Jiraporn Mungmai, Chompunoot Suwannasala, Boodsayakorn Malai, Mayura Malasit, Rungthiwa Chaken, Suphaporn Saennam, Puthara Kontong, Piyapong Sangsai, Sudarat Galaboot, Nusara Patichai and Jirawan Bunthow) the laboratory team (Areeya Faosap, Yaowaret Dokket, Sukhumal Pewla-orng, Malinee Oyuchua and Premjit Amornchai) and the operation team (Jintana Suwannapruek, Papachaya Phuangsombat and Maliwan Hongsuwan) of Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit at Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand. We also thank Viriya Hantrakun, Noppawan Lumjarungsimalert, Pasathorn Sirithiranont, Thatsanun Ngernseng, Prapass Wannapini, Cherry Lim, Apiraya Ammarapal, Nantawat Sriwattana and Chutporn Tutsanawiwat for their technical support.

Contributions

DL conceptualized the study. PS, PT, WC, SM, NPJD and DL designed the methodology. SM had oversight of the methodology of behaviour change techniques. GW coordinated the data collection from microbiology laboratories. PS, PT, WC, ND and DL coordinated the trial. PS and DL collected and curated the data, performed the analyses and wrote the first draft of the report. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the report. DL is

470 the guarantor of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and takes
471 responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

472

473 **Competing interests**

474 We declare that we have no conflicts of interest.

475

476 **Funding**

477 The study was funded by the Wellcome Trust (101103/Z/13/Z).

478

References

1. Wiersinga WJ, Virk HS, Torres AG, Currie BJ, Peacock SJ, Dance DAB, et al. Melioidosis. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2018;4:17107. Epub 2018/02/02. doi: 10.1038/nrdp.2017.107.
2. Hantrakun V, Kongyu S, Klaytong P, Rongsumlee S, Day NPJ, Peacock SJ, et al. Clinical Epidemiology of 7126 Melioidosis Patients in Thailand and the Implications for a National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2019;6(12):ofz498. Epub 2020/02/23. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofz498.
3. Currie BJ, Ward L, Cheng AC. The epidemiology and clinical spectrum of melioidosis: 540 cases from the 20 year Darwin prospective study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010;4(11):e900. Epub 2010/12/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000900.
4. Mukhopadhyay C, Shaw T, Varghese GM, Dance DAB. Melioidosis in South Asia (India, Nepal, Pakistan, Bhutan and Afghanistan). Trop Med Infect Dis. 2018;3(2). Epub 2018/10/03. doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed3020051.
5. Steinmetz I, Wagner GE, Kanyala E, Sawadogo M, Soumeya H, Teferi M, et al. Melioidosis in Africa: Time to Uncover the True Disease Load. Trop Med Infect Dis. 2018;3(2). Epub 2018/10/03. doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed3020062.
6. Sanchez-Villamil JI, Torres AG. Melioidosis in Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. Trop Med Infect Dis. 2018;3(1). Epub 2018/05/22. doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed3010024.
7. Torres AG, Montufar FE, Gee JE, Hoffmaster AR, Elrod MG, Duarte-Valderrama C, et al. Melioidosis is in the Americas: A Call to Action for Diagnosing and Treating the Disease. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2018;99(3):563-4. Epub 2018/07/18. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.18-0418.
8. Limmathurotsakul D, Golding N, Dance DA, Messina JP, Pigott DM, Moyes CL, et al. Predicted global distribution of *Burkholderia pseudomallei* and burden of melioidosis. Nat Microbiol. 2016;1:15008. Epub 2016/08/31. doi: 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2015.8.
9. Currie BJ, Jacups SP, Cheng AC, Fisher DA, Anstey NM, Huffam SE, et al. Melioidosis epidemiology and risk factors from a prospective whole-population study in northern Australia. Trop Med Int Health. 2004;9(11):1167-74. Epub 2004/11/19. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2004.01328.x.
10. Limmathurotsakul D, Wongratanacheewin S, Teerawattanasook N, Wongsuvan G, Chaisuksant S, Chetchotisakd P, et al. Increasing incidence of human melioidosis in

512 Northeast Thailand. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2010;82(6):1113-7. Epub 2010/06/04. doi:
513 10.4269/ajtmh.2010.10-0038.

514 11. Limmathurotsakul D, Kanoksil M, Wuthiekanun V, Kitphati R, deStavola B, Day NP,
515 et al. Activities of daily living associated with acquisition of melioidosis in northeast
516 Thailand: a matched case-control study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7(2):e2072. Epub
517 2013/02/26. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002072.

518 12. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for
519 use in behaviour change and implementation research. *Implementation science.* 2012;7:37.
520 Epub 2012/04/26. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-37.

521 13. Mazza D, Chapman A, Michie S. Barriers to the implementation of preconception
522 care guidelines as perceived by general practitioners: a qualitative study. *BMC health*
523 *services research.* 2013;13:36. Epub 2013/02/02. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-36.

524 14. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for
525 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implement Sci.* 2011;6:42.
526 Epub 2011/04/26. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-6-42.

527 15. Michie S, Atkins L, West R. *The Behaviour Change Wheel: a guide to designing*
528 *Interventions.* London: Silverback 2014.

529 16. Suntornsut P, Wongsuwan N, Malasit M, Kitphati R, Michie S, Peacock SJ, et al.
530 Barriers and recommended interventions to prevent melioidosis in Northeast Thailand: A
531 Focus Group Study Using the Behaviour Change Wheel. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
532 2016;10(7):e0004823. Epub 2016/07/30. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004823.

533 17. Suntornsut P, Chaowagul W, Thongklang W, Phosri T, Day NPJ, Michie S, et al.
534 Feasibility and initial outcomes of a multifaceted prevention programme of melioidosis in
535 diabetic patients in Ubon Ratchathani, northeast Thailand. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
536 2018;12(9):e0006765. Epub 2018/09/07. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006765.

537 18. Strategy and Planning Division, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. *International*
538 *Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision, Thailand*
539 *Modification 2016.*

540 19. Tatsanavivat P, Thavornpitak Y, Pongchaiyakul C. Comparative effectiveness of three
541 national healthcare schemes in Thailand: in-hospital medical expenses for diabetes and
542 hypertension in 2010. *J Med Assoc Thai.* 2012;95 Suppl 7:S254-61. Epub 2012/11/08.

543 20. Promprasert W, Upakdee N, Pannarunothai S. Hospitalizations of Diabetes
544 Ambulatory Care Sensitive Condition - Universal Coverage Scheme at a Referral Hospital in

545 Bangkok, Thailand: Five-Year Cross-Sectional Study. *J Med Assoc Thai*. 2016;99(8):949-55.
546 Epub 2016/08/01.

547 21. Hemming K, Taljaard M, Forbes A. Analysis of cluster randomised stepped wedge
548 trials with repeated cross-sectional samples. *Trials*. 2017;18(1):101. Epub 2017/03/06. doi:
549 10.1186/s13063-017-1833-7.

550 22. Hemming K, Haines TP, Chilton PJ, Girling AJ, Lilford RJ. The stepped wedge
551 cluster randomised trial: rationale, design, analysis, and reporting. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h391.
552 Epub 2015/02/11. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h391.

553 23. Peacock SJ, Limmathurotsakul D, Lubell Y, Koh GC, White LJ, Day NP, et al.
554 Melioidosis vaccines: a systematic review and appraisal of the potential to exploit biodefense
555 vaccines for public health purposes. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2012;6(1):e1488. Epub
556 2012/02/04. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0001488.

557 24. Tino S, Wekesa C, Kamacooko O, Makhoba A, Mwebaze R, Bengo S, et al.
558 Predictors of loss to follow up among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus attending a
559 private not for profit urban diabetes clinic in Uganda - a descriptive retrospective study. *BMC*
560 *Health Serv Res*. 2019;19(1):598. Epub 2019/08/25. doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-4415-4.

561 25. Low SK, Khoo JK, Tavintharan S, Lim SC, Sum CF. Missed Appointments at a
562 Diabetes Centre: Not a Small Problem. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 2016;45(1):1-5. Epub
563 2016/04/28.

564 26. Shivashankar R, Kirk K, Kim WC, Rouse C, Tandon N, Narayan KM, et al. Quality
565 of diabetes care in low- and middle-income Asian and Middle Eastern countries (1993-2012):
566 20-year systematic review. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2015;107(2):203-23. Epub 2014/12/23.
567 doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2014.11.004.

568 27. Funnell MM, Brown TL, Childs BP, Haas LB, Hosey GM, Jensen B, et al. National
569 standards for diabetes self-management education. *Diabetes Care*. 2010;33 Suppl 1:S89-96.
570 Epub 2010/01/29. doi: 10.2337/dc10-S089.

571 28. Arnold LW, Wang Z. The HbA1c and all-cause mortality relationship in patients with
572 type 2 diabetes is J-shaped: a meta-analysis of observational studies. *Rev Diabet Stud*.
573 2014;11(2):138-52. Epub 2014/11/15. doi: 10.1900/RDS.2014.11.138.

574 29. Bertoni AG, Saydah S, Brancati FL. Diabetes and the risk of infection-related
575 mortality in the U.S. *Diabetes Care*. 2001;24(6):1044-9. Epub 2001/05/26. doi:
576 10.2337/diacare.24.6.1044.

577 30. Critchley JA, Carey IM, Harris T, DeWilde S, Hosking FJ, Cook DG. Glycemic
578 Control and Risk of Infections Among People With Type 1 or Type 2 Diabetes in a Large

579 Primary Care Cohort Study. Diabetes Care. 2018;41(10):2127-35. Epub 2018/08/15. doi:
580 10.2337/dc18-0287.

581 31. Rudd KE, Johnson SC, Agesa KM, Shackelford KA, Tsoi D, Kievlan DR, et al.
582 Global, regional, and national sepsis incidence and mortality, 1990-2017: analysis for the
583 Global Burden of Disease Study. Lancet. 2020;395(10219):200-11. Epub 2020/01/20. doi:
584 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32989-7.

585 32. Reutrakul S, Deerochanawong C. Diabetes in Thailand: Status and Policy. Curr Diab
586 Rep. 2016;16(3):28. Epub 2016/02/20. doi: 10.1007/s11892-016-0725-7.

587

588 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics at enrollment**

Characteristics	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Total
Total no. of clusters	39	39	38	116
Total no. of participants	3169	2976	2911	9056
Sex, female	2285 (72%)	2194 (74%)	2158 (74%)	6637 (73%)
Age				
18 - <50 years	872 (28%)	829 (28%)	778 (27%)	2479 (27%)
50 - <60 years	1453 (46%)	1308 (44%)	1311 (45%)	4072 (45%)
60 - 65 years	844 (27%)	839 (28%)	822 (28%)	2505 (28%)
Known diabetes duration				
<5 years	1292 (41%)	1235 (41%)	1168 (40%)	3695 (41%)
5 - <10 years	956 (30%)	879 (30%)	844 (29%)	2679 (29%)
≥10 years	921 (29%)	862 (29%)	899 (31%)	2682 (30%)
Diabetic control				
No medication	115 (4%)	115 (4%)	113 (4%)	343 (4%)
Only oral medication	2503 (79%)	2369 (80%)	2264 (78%)	7136 (79%)
Insulin therapy	551 (17%)	492 (17%)	534 (18%)	1577 (17%)
HbA1C level				
<7.0 %	706 (22%)	698 (23%)	664 (23%)	2068 (23%)
7.0 - 8.0%	898 (28%)	800 (27%)	819 (28%)	2517 (28%)
>8.0 - 9.0%	603 (19%)	565 (19%)	565 (19%)	1733 (19%)
>9.0%	962 (30%)	913 (31%)	863 (30%)	2738 (30%)
History of co-morbidities				
Hypertension	1999 (63%)	1920 (65%)	1728 (59%)	5647 (62%)

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Dyslipidemia	1800 (57%)	1665 (56%)	1702 (58%)	5167 (57%)
Kidney diseases	176 (6%)	152 (5%)	235 (8%)	563 (6%)

589

590 **Table 2: Characteristics of participants who received a behavioural support group**
591 **session for melioidosis prevention**

Characteristics	Received the intervention (n=6544)	Did not receive the intervention (n=2512)	P value
Groups			
Group 1	2572 (39%)	597 (24%)	<0.001
Group 2	2020 (31%)	956 (38%)	
Group 3	1952 (30%)	959 (38%)	
Sex, female	4998 (76%)	1639 (65%)	<0.001
Age			
18 - <40 years	1713 (26%)	766 (30%)	<0.001
40 - <55 years	2972 (45%)	1100 (44%)	
55 – 65 years	1859 (28%)	646 (26%)	
Diabetes duration			
<5 years	2645 (40%)	1050 (42%)	0.14
5 - <10 years	1974 (30%)	705 (28%)	
≥10 years	1925 (29%)	757 (30%)	
Diabetic control			
No medication	248 (4%)	95 (4%)	<0.001
Only oral medication	5263 (80%)	1873 (75%)	
Insulin therapy	1033 (16%)	544 (22%)	
HbA _{1c} level			
<7.0 %	1523 (23%)	545 (22%)	<0.001

7.0 - 8.0%	1841 (28%)	676 (27%)	
>8.0 - 9.0%	1283 (20%)	450 (18%)	
>9.0%	1897 (29%)	841 (33%)	
History of co-morbidities			
Hypertension	4125 (63%)	1522 (61%)	0.03
Dyslipidemia	3767 (58%)	1400 (56%)	0.10
Kidney diseases	362 (6%)	201 (8%)	<0.001

592

593 Data are n (%) or median (interquartile range).

594

Table 3. Outcomes of the study

	Adjusted (for time) incidence rate ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted (for time and other risk factors*) incidence rate ratio (95% CI)
Intention-to-treat analysis		
Primary outcomes		
Hospital admissions involving infectious diseases	0.98 (0.87-1.11)	0.98 (0.87-1.10)
Culture-confirmed melioidosis	0.65 (0.29-1.47)	0.66 (0.29-1.50)
Secondary outcomes		
Overall melioidosis	0.73 (0.37-1.44)	0.74 (0.38-1.45)
Mortality	0.97 (0.74-1.28)	0.98 (0.74-1.29)
Per-protocol analysis **		
Primary outcomes		
Hospital admissions involving infectious diseases	0.89 (0.80-0.99)	0.90 (0.81-1.00)
Culture-confirmed melioidosis	0.85 (0.41-1.76)	0.96 (0.46-1.99)
Secondary outcomes		
Overall melioidosis	0.57 (0.31-1.08)	0.65 (0.35-1.22)
Mortality	0.54 (0.43-0.68)	0.56 (0.44-0.71)

596

597 CI=confidence interval

598 * Adjusted for age, sex, known diabetes duration and HbA1c level

599 ** Participants who received a behavioural support group session for melioidosis prevention

600 were defined as received the intervention per protocol.

601

602 **Figure legends**

603

604 **Figure 1. Trial profile**

605

606 **Figure 2. Schematic of the PREMEL stepped-wedge cluster-randomised controlled trial**

607

608 **Footnote of Figure 2.** PREMEL= multifaceted PREvention programme of MELioidosis in
609 diabetics. No group received the intervention at baseline. Period 1 was the enrollment period,
610 and period 2 was the baseline period. Clusters were randomly assigned to three groups that
611 crossover to receive the intervention in March 2016, 2017 and 2018. Participants (diabetic
612 patients enrolled) in each cluster group received a multi-faceted prevention programme once
613 from March to July 2016, 2017 and 2018, respectively.

614



