

Capturing recent *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* infection by tuberculin skin test vs. interferon-gamma release assay

Jesús Gutierrez^{1*}, Mary Nsereko², LaShaunda L. Malone³, Harriet Mayanja-Kizza², Hussein Kisingo², W. Henry Boom³, Charles M. Bark^{4¶}, Catherine M. Stein^{1,3¶}

¹Department of Population and Quantitative Health Science, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, United States

²Uganda-CWRU Research Collaboration and Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

³Department of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University and University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, OH, United States

⁴Division of Infectious Diseases, MetroHealth Medical Center, Cleveland, OH, United States

* Corresponding author

E-mail: jesus.gutierrez@case.edu (JG)

¶ These authors contributed equally as senior authors of this work.

Abstract

Reductions in tuberculosis (TB) incidence and mortality require identification of individuals at high risk of developing active disease, such as those with recent *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Mtb) infection. Current tests used for Mtb infection cannot distinguish recent from remote infection. Using a longitudinal, prospective household contact (HHC) study in Kampala, Uganda, we diagnosed new Mtb infection using both the tuberculin skin test (TST) and interferon-gamma release assay (IGRA) to determine if these tests differentiated or added value as measures of recent Mtb infection. We identified 13 HHCs who only converted the IGRA (QFT-only converters), 39 HHCs who only converted the TST (TST-only converters), and 24 HHCs who converted both tests (QFT/TST converters). Univariate analysis revealed that TST-only converters were older than the other groups. This result was confirmed by our logistic regression model where increased odds of TST-only conversion was associated with age ($p=0.02$), in addition to crowdedness ($p=0.025$). The odds of QFT conversion increased with a higher epidemiologic risk score ($p=0.038$), which suggests it is a better measure of Mtb exposure and infection. QFT/TST converters had higher QFT quantitative values at conversion than QFT-only converters and a bigger change in TST quantitative values at conversion than TST-only converters. Collectively, these data indicate that TST conversion alone likely overestimates Mtb infection. Its correlation to older age suggests boosting of BCG responses and/or longer environmental mycobacterial exposure. This result also suggests that QFT/TST conversion may be associated with a more robust immune response, which should be considered when planning vaccine studies.

Introduction

Tuberculosis (TB) continues to be a major public health problem globally. In 2019, approximately 10 million people became ill with TB and over 1.4 million succumbed to the disease. The WHO's End TB Strategy aims to achieve a 95% reduction in TB mortality and an 90% reduction in the TB incidence rate by 2035 (1). Although some regions in the world are on track to achieve these milestones, the African continent has fallen behind (2). Moreover, 2020 marked the first year that TB deaths increased worldwide due to the COVID-19 pandemic (3). Faster reductions in TB incidence and deaths require improvements in multiple facets, including identification of those at risk of progressing to TB. Several studies have demonstrated that of those with latent *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (*Mtb*) infection (LTBI) who progress to TB, most do so within the first two years post-infection (4). Furthermore, individuals with a recent *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (*Mtb*) exposure and conversion of their tuberculin skin test (TST) and/or interferon-gamma release assay (IGRA) have a higher risk for progression to TB (5-7). Identifying and treating individuals with recent *Mtb* infection could be an important step in preventing TB.

Today, we rely on the TST or IGRA to diagnose *Mtb* infection. These tests have important limitations. First, the tests only infer the presence of *Mtb* based on a person's T-cell response to *Mtb* antigens and are poor predictors of progression to TB (8). Also, given that both tests use different stimuli and measure different immunologic responses, discordance rates are substantial (9). Since T-cell responses persist, a positive result cannot distinguish between recent vs. remote *Mtb* infection (10, 11), and some with a remote infection may have cleared the infection (4, 7, 10). Lately, the IGRA has become the preferred test of choice to diagnose LTBI over the TST due to improved specificity and requiring only one visit to perform the test (12-16). In a meta-analysis, the pooled sensitivity for the QFT reached 78% and the specificity among BCG-vaccinated and non-BCG-vaccinated persons was 96% and 99%, respectively (15). This preference is

demonstrated in the recommendations of many national TB programs in low-endemic countries (15, 17) and has expanded to clinical TB research (18, 19).

Despite the increased specificity for *Mtb* of IGRA, TST is still widely used in TB endemic areas for cost and simplicity reasons in the evaluation of latent *Mtb* infection (LTBI). Longitudinal studies (9), such as household contact (HHC) studies, with at least 6 months of follow-up and repeat testing can capture recent and/or new *Mtb* infection and offer a unique opportunity to evaluate both tests of sensitization to *Mtb* antigens (20). In this study, we aimed to determine if the TST adds additional information and/or value to the characterization of IGRA converters. Optimal characterization of converters could help maximize the capture of recent *Mtb* infection as well as the design of clinical studies to prevent new and treat recent *Mtb* infection (21). Given the discordance between TST and IGRA, understanding the impact of this discordance in the identification of recent or new *Mtb* infection, i.e., TST/IGRA converters is important. Finally, if identification of recent converters is practical, focused preventive drug treatment could impact the incidence of TB.

Materials and methods

Study setting

The study is set in the greater Kampala metropolitan area, Uganda. The prevalence of active TB in Uganda is high with recent estimates reaching 401 per 100,000 for individuals 15 years of age and older (22). The prevalence in Kampala has been estimated to be even higher at 764 per 100,000 (23).

Study population

Individuals suspected to have active pulmonary TB at participating health centers in Kampala were referred to the Uganda-Case Western Reserve University Research Collaboration

clinic starting in 2015. The referred TB suspects underwent counseling and consent for a standard TB assessment under a separately approved protocol for ongoing TB studies within the Collaboration. Diagnosis of TB for the index case was established through a standard assessment, based on chest radiograph, history, physical examination, and sputum smear for acid-fast bacilli (AFB) or MTB/RIF GeneXpert® testing. If the assessment confirmed disease, these individuals with pulmonary TB (“index cases”) were asked for permission to approach their household contacts (HHCs) who were at least 15 years old to determine their interest in study participation. Index cases were not enrolled in this study. Upon receiving documented permission from the TB index case, HHCs were contacted to undergo informed consent within 28 days (or 3 months of HIV+ HHCs) of the confirmed TB diagnosis of the index case. Consenting HHCs who met eligibility criteria (see below) were enrolled if the index case of their household was sputum smear positive for AFB, and subsequently confirmed to have active TB by sputum culture or MTB/RIF GeneXpert® positivity. Recruitment for this study occurred from June 29th, 2016 until March 10th, 2020.

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by The Uganda National Council on Science and Technology, and the institutional review board at the University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center. Written consent was obtained from all participants ages 18 and older. Assent was obtained prior to screening from individuals ages 15 to 17, as well as written informed consent from their parent or guardian.

Inclusion criteria

In order to be enrolled in the study as a HHC, potential participants needed to meet the following criteria: 1. Informed Consent or assent (where indicated) 2. Adults and minors aged 15 years of age and older; 3. Individuals living in the same building (house, hut, or apartment), or a portion of the building, as the index case, thereby sharing air-space with the index case, for at least one week during the three-month period immediately preceding the diagnosis of TB in the

index case; 4. Negative urine pregnancy test in women of child-bearing potential. Breastfeeding women were permitted to enroll in this study.

Exclusion criteria

In addition, potential participants were excluded from the study due to the following criteria:

1. TB or other febrile illness or uncontrolled disease; 2. Peripheral blood CD4 lymphocyte count < 200/mm³ for HIV+ participants; 3. Chest radiograph consistent with TB; 4. Expected to be unavailable for the 12-month follow-up period.

Study design

This is an ongoing prospective longitudinal cohort study with a household contact design. HHCs age 15 years and older who were living with the index cases and met eligibility criteria as outlined above were enrolled. At baseline, each HHC underwent TB symptom screening, HIV testing, a pregnancy test for females, an IGRA test and TST placement to be checked within 3 days (S1 Fig). The IGRA test used was the QuantiFERON®-TB Gold (QFT) or the QuantiFERON®-TB Gold Plus (QFT-Plus), depending on availability during study follow-up. The QFT and QFT-Plus results were interpreted according to the manufacturer's recommendations. The TST test was performed by the Mantoux method (5 tuberculin units per 0.1 ml of purified protein derivative, Tubersol; Connaught Laboratories Limited, Willowdale, Ontario Canada). TST positivity was defined by a maximum induration of 10 mm or greater, or an induration of 5 mm or greater in HIV+ individuals. In addition, each HHC underwent an individual risk assessment, a review of medical history, a complete physical examination, and a chest radiograph. Households were evaluated to determine if the house was a muzigo (the traditional muzigo in Uganda is a one-room dwelling in which all activities are done apart from cooking) (24), whether the cooking took place inside or outside the house, number of inhabitants, number of rooms, and number of windows. All HHC were followed for twelve months. Initially, follow-up visits occurred at 3, 6, and 12 months after enrollment. Subsequently, a 9-month visit was added to the protocol. During each follow-up visit,

HHCs underwent a health check, a TB symptom screening, and a repeat IGRA test for HHCs who had not become pregnant. A repeat TST was performed at 12 months for those HHCs who had a negative TST at enrollment. Data collection and management for this paper was performed using OpenClinica open-source software, version 3.16. Copyright OpenClinica LLC and collaborators, Waltham, MA, USA, www.OpenClinica.com.

Definitions

Once the HHCs completed follow-up, they were classified based on the following definitions (Fig 1):

Fig 1. CONSORT diagram for this study. Out of 383 household contacts enrolled in our study, 69 were excluded. 314 household contacts were classified using both TST and QFT. Those who were defined as concordant LTBI (both TST and QFT results were consistently positive) and discordant “resisters” (either 2 negative TST or all negative QFT) were excluded from analysis (n=166). The remaining 148 household contacts were defined as follows: 39 TST-only converters (negative baseline TST with positive TST at 12 months), 13 were QFT-only converters (negative QFT at baseline followed by positive QFT during follow-up), 24 were QFT/TST converters (negative baseline TST and QFT followed by positive TST and QFT during follow-up), and 72 were concordant short-term “resisters” (all TST and QFT tests remained negative).

- A person with LTBI was defined as a HHC with all positive QFT and TST results.
- A “short-term” resister (“resister”) was defined as a HHC with all negative QFT and TST results throughout the course of the study.
- A QFT-only conversion was based on at least 3 QFT results, requiring a negative QFT at baseline followed by at least one positive QFT result during follow-up, accompanied by TST results that did not change throughout the study.

- A TST-only conversion was based on two TST results (baseline and month 12) and was defined as an original TST of <10 mm (or <5 mm for HIV+ individuals) followed by a TST reaction of ≥10 mm (or ≥5 mm for HIV+ individuals) on subsequent testing with an increase of ≥6 mm (25), accompanied by QFT results that remained positive or negative throughout the study.
- A QFT/TST conversion is defined as a conversion of both the QFT and TST as described above. There were 6 QFT converters (5 QFT/TST converters and one QFT-only converter) who had just one positive QFT result because it occurred at month 12.

Those HHCs with indeterminate or inconsistent QFT results were classified by consensus into one of these categories based on the preponderance of the data, when possible. Otherwise, these HHCs were excluded from the statistical analyses described below. There were also 5 individuals with one positive QFT in the middle of the observation period who were excluded from the analysis. Based on a single QFT result, it is unclear if these reflect a reversion event vs. a false-positive QFT. Serial and consistent QFT results are required to reliably detect definite conversion events, i.e., recent *Mtb* infection. Variability in QF responses over time has been observed in another study (26).

Statistical analyses

First, we examined the similarity between subjects classified using only TST results or only QFT results to illustrate the impact of discordance between the two tests. This analysis included all classified HHCs.

Second, we aimed to illustrate how TST and QFT would define conversion differently among HHCs. This analysis only included the three types of converter groups (QFT-only converters, TST-only converters, and QFT/TST converters) and the “resister” group (HHCs who remained QFT negative and TST negative during 12-month follow-up despite a high-level exposure to an infectious TB index case). “Resisters” were included in this analysis since they

are known to have unique and robust immune responses (27), making them an appropriate control group. Comparisons were first made at the univariate level. Analysis focused on the following variables: epidemiological risk score (ERS), HIV status, body mass index (BMI), BCG status, quantitative IGRA values, quantitative TST values, type of housing (a marker of socioeconomic status), and clinical characteristics of the index case that have been associated with higher risk of transmission. The ERS consists of variables indicative of risk for *Mtb* exposure and infection and has been previously used in other studies examining the risk of LTBI (28, 29). Further details on the ERS can be found in the Supplement. Comparisons were done using the chi-square test, student's t-test, analysis of variance, Mann-Whitney test, and the Kruskal-Wallis test. Chi-square was used for categorical variable comparison, while other tests were used to examine continuous variables. Significance was assessed using a 0.05 alpha cut-off, using the Bonferroni correction to correct for multiple comparisons. When an omnibus comparison was significant, a pairwise comparison was done to determine which pair differences were contributing to this result. This univariate analysis was then repeated combining QFT-only converters and QFT/TST converters into a single category, QFT converters.

Third, a cluster analysis of all available variables using Gower distance was performed to determine if the subject clustering obtained was similar to the predetermined conversion groups. The purpose of this analysis was to examine whether clinical and epidemiological variables could better define subgroups of HHCs and if these groupings aligned with a TST and/or QFT-based definition. Additional details are found in the Supplement.

Fourth, we evaluated the difference between TST-only conversion and QFT-conversion using a logistic regression model, where the dependent variable was a TST-only conversion event versus a QFT conversion event. The independent variables that were initially included were chosen based on the results of the univariate and cluster analyses described above. Once these were chosen, we proceeded to formulate our logistic regression models by using two different methods. The first model contained all of the chosen independent variables. The second model

was obtained using an automated backwards elimination process. The two models were compared using the Akaike information criterion (AIC) method and the one with the lowest AIC was chosen.

Finally, since previous studies have suggested different cut-off values for positivity (especially for the IGRA), we examined the quantitative changes in both the QFT and TST tests to better quantify changes associated with each of our conversion definitions. All analyses were performed using R (30).

Results

Differences in classification among all classified HHCs by type of test

This first comparison was performed on the 314 individual HHCs enrolled by January 2022 that could be defined as converter, LTBI or “resister” (Fig 1). We focused on how similarly subjects could be classified by TST or QFT. Table 1 shows that if classification was based on TST, there would be 63 converters. By QFT, the number of converters would be 37. If both tests are used, there would be only 24 converters. The conversion rate for TST-only converters was 27.7% (39 out of 141 TST negatives at baseline) and for QFT-only converters, it was 9.7% (13 out of 134 QFT negatives at baseline). The conversion rate for QFT/TST converters was 22.2% (24 out of 108 TST and QFT negatives at baseline). The concordance rate QFT and TST is lowest for converters (64.9%) compared to LTBI and “resisters” (82.8% and 74.2%, resp.). These analyses were restricted to subjects with consistent QFT and TST results according to our definitions.

Table 1. Cross-tabulation table of the discordance between QFT-only and TST-only classifications of converters, LTBI and “resisters”.

TST-based Classification	QFT-based Classification				
	N (%)	Converter	LTBI	“Resister”	Total
	Converter	24 (64.9%) ^a	27 (15.0%) ^b	12 (12.4%) ^b	63 (20.1%)
	LTBI	11 (29.7%) ^c	149 (82.8%) ^d	13 (13.4%) ^d	173 (55.1%)
	“Resister”	2 (5.4%) ^c	4 (2.2%) ^d	72 (74.2%) ^e	78 (24.8%)
	Total	37 (100%)	180 (100%)	97 (100%)	314 (100%)

Of the 314 HHCs, 166 were excluded from the analysis, 39 were QFT-only converters, 13 were TST-only converters, and 24 were QFT/TST converters. In addition, 72 “resisters” were used as a control group.

^aThese participants were classified as QFT/TST converters (n=24)

^bThese participants were classified as QFT-only converters (n=39)

^cThese participants were classified as TST-only converters (n=13)

^dThese participants were excluded from the analysis (n=166)

^eThese participants were classified as concordant “resisters” (n=72)

Individual, household and TB index characteristics of TST-only, QFT-only and TST/QFT converters

The main analysis was performed on the three converter groups and “resisters” (Fig 1). Table 2 summarizes the characteristics and comparisons for each converter group with “resisters”. Converter groups did not differ in terms of sex, HIV positivity, BMI, presence of BCG scar, ERS, and smoking history. They did differ in age ($p = 0.04$). TST-only converters were older than “resisters”: median age 32 [20-47] vs. 23 [19.9-36.5], respectively, $p = 0.006$). TST-only converters also appeared older than the other two converter groups, however, this difference did not reach statistical significance.

275 **Table 2. Univariate analysis comparing QFT-onl, TST-only and QFT/TST converters based on individual and household**
276 **characteristics.**

	QFT-only converters	TST-only converters	QFT/TST converters	“Resisters”	<i>p</i>-value (test)	Relevant pairwise <i>p</i>-value
N	13	39	24	72	NA	NA
Individual Characteristics						
Age	26 [20-36]	32 [20-47]	26.5 [23-39.3]	23 [19.8-36.5]	0.04* (KW test)	TST-only vs. “Resister”: 0.006*
Sex (female)	8 (61.5%)	21 (53.8%)	19 (79.2%)	43 (59.7%)	0.23 (Fisher’s)	NA
BCG scar present	12 (92.3%)	31 (81.6%)	14 (58.3%)	53 (75.7%)	0.08 (Fisher’s)	NA
HIV positive	0 (0%)	3 (7.7%)	3 (12.5%)	4 (5.6%)	0.57 (Fisher’s)	NA
BMI	22.2 [19.6-28.3]	23.6 [19.5-27.0]	22.5 [20.5-28.1]	22.8 [21.0-25.2]	0.93 (KW test)	NA
TB Risk score	7 [6-8]	6 [6-7]	7 [6-7]	6 [6-7]	0.15 (KW test)	NA
Quantitative IGRA values at conversion	2.0 [0.9–3.8]	3.4 [0.3-9.3]	4.1 [1.7-10]	NA	0.15 (KW test)	NA
No history of smoking	12 (92.3%)	37 (94.9%)	23 (95.8%)	61 (84.7%)	0.09 (Fisher’s)	NA
Spouse to	4 (30.8%)	7 (17.9%)	5 (20.8%)	8 (11.1%)	0.26 (χ^2)	NA

Index						
Household Characteristics						
Living in Muzigo	9 (69.2%)	20 (51.3%)	9 (37.5%)	21 (29.2%)	0.02* (Fisher's)	QFT-only vs. "Resister": 0.01* TST-only vs. "Resister": 0.04*
Cooking inside home	1 (7.7%)	10 (25.6%)	11(45.8%)	28 (38.9%)	0.05* (Fisher's)	QFT-only vs. QFT/TST: 0.03* QFT-only vs. "Resister": 0.03*
Number of windows	1 [0-2]	1 [1-3]	2.5 [1-6]	3 [1-4]	0.007* (KW test)	QFT-only vs. QFT/TST: 0.003* QFT-only vs. "Resister": 0.003*
People per room	2.5 [2-3]	2 [1.33-3]	1.67 [1-2.25]	2 [1.3-2.67]	0.08 (KW test)	NA
Sleeping in same room	11 (84.6%)	21 (53.8%)	15 (62.5%)	33 (45.8%)	0.053 (X^2)	NA
Sleeping in same bed	5 (38.5%)	6 (15.4%)	6 (25%)	12 (16.7%)	0.23 (X^2)	NA

277 Counts (percentages) or median [quartiles]

278 ERS: Epidemiologic risk score

279 KW: Kruskal-Wallis

280 X^2 : Chi-square test

281 * Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

In comparing household characteristics by conversion group (Table 2), a greater proportion of QFT-only converters (69.2%) live in muzigos. A higher proportion of QFT-only converters (92.3%) cook outside the home when compared to the other groups. QFT-only converters lived in homes with fewer windows (1 window [0-2]) when compared to QFT/TST converters (2.5 windows [1-6]) and “resisters” (3 windows [1-4]) ($p = 0.003$ and $p = 0.003$, respectively). There were no differences in a measure of crowdedness (people per room) and sleeping location (sleeping in the same room or the same bed).

Next, we examined the characteristics of the index case for the different converter groups (Table 3). Index cases of TST-only converters had more advanced lung disease (61.5%) when compared to those of QFT-only converters (23.1%) ($p = 0.04$). Index cases of TST-only converters had a longer duration of cough than those of QFT/TST converters: 90 days [60-142.5] vs 52.5 days [30-60] ($p = 0.007$). In contrast QFT/TST converters had a higher proportion of index cases with hemoptysis (33.3%) than index cases of TST-only converters (10.3%) ($p = 0.04$).

295 **Table 3. Univariate analysis comparing QFT-only, TST-only and QFT/TST converters based on index case characteristics.**

	QFT-only converters	TST-only converters	QFT/TST converters	“Resisters”	<i>p</i>-value (test)	Relevant pairwise <i>p</i>-value
Sex (female)	8 (61.5%)	20 (51.3%)	17 (70.8%)	35 (48.6%)	0.26 (Fisher’s)	NA
BCG scar present	10 (76.9%)	30 (76.9%)	17 (73.9%)	36 (56.3%)	0.10 (Fisher’s)	NA
HIV positive	1 (10.0%)	4 (12.9%)	0 (0%)	12 (18.8%)	0.14 (Fisher’s)	NA
BMI	19 [17-21]	18.5 [17-21]	18 [17-20]	19 [18-20]	0.42 (KW test)	NA
Cavitary lesions present	11 (84.6%)	32 (82.1%)	22 (91.7%)	43 (60.6%)	0.006* (Fisher’s)	TST-only vs. “Resister”: 0.03* QFT/TST vs. “Resister”: 0.005*
Advanced lung disease	3 (23.1%)	24 (61.5%)	14 (58.3%)	25 (35.2%)	0.01* (Fisher’s)	TST-only vs. QFT-only: 0.04* TST-only vs. “Resister”: 0.01*
Positive Smear	8 (88.9%)	29 (100%)	20 (100%)	55 (100%)	0.08 (Fisher’s)	NA
Positive GeneXpert	13 (100%)	39 (100%)	24 (100%)	71 (98.6%)	1.00 (Fisher’s)	NA
Coughing	13 (100%)	39 (100%)	24 (100%)	71 (100%)	1.00 (Fisher’s)	NA
Cough duration	60 [60-90]	90 [60-142.5]	52.5 [30-60]	60 [30-90]	0.03* (KW)	TST-only vs. QFT/TST: 0.007*

(days)					test)	TST-only vs. "Resister": 0.017*
Fever	9 (69.2%)	30 (76.9%)	19 (79.2%)	54 (76.1%)	0.92 (χ^2)	NA
Fever duration (days)	42 [14-75]	60 [30-90]	30 [27.8-60]	30 [14-56.3]	0.10 (KW test)	NA
Productive sputum	13 (100%)	36 (92.3%)	24 (100%)	68 (95.8%)	0.55 (Fisher's)	NA
Productive sputum duration (days)	30 [30-90]	60 [30-120]	30 [27.8-60]	30 [30-60]	0.11 (KW test)	NA
Purulent sputum	6 (46.2%)	22 (56.4%)	14 (58.3%)	37 (52.9%)	0.89 (χ^2)	NA
Purulent sputum duration (days)	45 [30-60]	52.5 [30-120]	30 [23.3-60]	30 [15-90]	0.25 (KW test)	NA
Hemoptysis	1 (7.7%)	4 (10.3%)	8 (33.3%)	7 (10.0%)	0.04* (Fisher's)	QFT/TST vs. "Resisters": 0.02* QFT/TST vs. TST-only: 0.04*
Hemoptysis duration (days)	14 [14-14]	5 [2.5-12.8]	2 [1.5-5]	7 [2.5-10.5]	0.58 (KW test)	NA
Dyspnea	6 (46.2%)	20 (52.6%)	10 (41.7%)	38 (53.5%)	0.77 (Fisher's)	NA
Dyspnea duration (days)	60 [37.5-60]	90 [30-160]	60 [37.5-90]	30 [30-82.5]	0.18 (KW test)	NA
Weight loss	12 (92.3%)	33 (84.6%)	18 (75%)	59 (83.1%)	0.62 (Fisher's)	NA

Weight loss duration (days)	60 [27.8-78.8]	60 [30-90]	52.5 [30- 71.3]	30 [30-82.5]	0.20 (KW test)	NA
--------------------------------	----------------	------------	--------------------	--------------	-------------------	----

296 Counts (percentages) or median [quartiles]

297 ERS: Epidemiologic risk score

298 KW: Kruskal-Wallis

299 χ^2 : Chi-square test

300 * Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

When all QFT converters were compared to TST-only converters and “resisters”, no new significant associations were identified (Supp Table 1 and Supp Table 2).

Identifying predictors of QFT and TST conversion

Next, we conducted a logistic regression analysis of QFT conversion vs. TST-only conversion to determine how they might differ epidemiologically (Table 4). Included variables were based on the univariate analyses in tables 2 and 3. We also included variables that were most influential in the cluster analysis using Gower distance (S2 Fig). Based on backwards elimination, we arrived at a model containing six predictors including age of the household contact, presence of cavitory lesions in the chest x-ray of the index case, extent TB lung disease in index cases by chest x-ray, duration of index case cough in days, ERS, and number of people per room.

Table 4. Logistic regression model of predictors of TST-only conversion vs. QFT conversion.

COVARIATES	N	ODDS RATIO	95% CI	p-VALUE
Age (years)	NA	1.05	1.01 – 1.10	0.020*
Presence of cavitory lesions				
NO	11	(Ref.)	(Ref.)	(Ref.)
YES	65	0.29	0.055 – 1.310	0.118
Index cough duration (days)	NA	1.01	1.000 – 1.018	0.099
Epidemiologic risk score	NA	0.61	0.375 – 0.956	0.038*
People per room	NA	1.559	1.085 – 2.404	0.025*
Advanced lung disease				
NOT FAR ADVANCED	35	(Ref.)	(Ref.)	(Ref.)
FAR ADVANCED	41	2.58	0.818 – 8.866	0.115

* Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

CI: Confidence interval

We found that the odds of undergoing TST-only conversion increased by 5% (95% CI [.01-.10]) for each additional year of age. The odds of TST-only conversion also increased by 55.9% (95% CI [.08-1.4]) for each additional person per room. On the other hand, the odds of TST

conversion decreased by 39% (95% CI [0.38-0.96]) for each point increase on the ERS. Based on an AUC of 0.81, this logistic regression model provided good discriminatory power (Table 4).

Quantitative QFT and TST values for TST, QFT and TST/QFT converters

Next, we compared QFT quantitative values at the time of QFT conversion (Fig 2). This showed that QFT-only converters had lower IFN-gamma secretion values at conversion than QFT/TST converters (2.03 IU [0.92-3.82] vs. 4.14 IU [1.73 vs. 10.0], $p=0.03$). We also compared quantitative TST values (Fig 3). At baseline, QFT/TST converters had a median zero mm baseline TST (range 0-0 mm), while TST-only converters had a higher median 2 mm baseline TST (range 0-8 mm) ($p=0.001$). By month 12, these 2 groups were indistinguishable: median: 15.6 mm vs. 14.6 mm ($p=0.25$).

Fig 2. Quantitative QFT values of QFT/TST converters and QFT-only converters before and after QFT-conversion. Red dotted line indicates 0.35 IU cut-off. If QFT plus was used, the highest value was used for this analysis. QFT-only converters had a lower value at conversion when compared to QFT/TST converters (2.03 [0.92-3.82] vs. 4.14 [1.73-10.0], $p=0.03$).

Fig 3. Quantitative TST values of QFT/TST converters and TST-only converters at baseline and at month 12 of follow-up. Red dotted line indicates 10 mm. cut-off. At baseline, TST-only converters had a higher TST value compared to QFT/TST converters (2.0 [0.0-8.0] vs. 0.0 [0.0-0.0], $p=0.001$). By month 12, this difference had disappeared (14.6 [12.2-16.3] vs. 15.6 [13.9-17.6], $p=0.25$).

Discussion

The goal of this study was to determine the advantages of using both the TST and IGRA tests in assessing recent *Mtb* infection. Although the results do not provide a clear differentiation between TST vs. IGRA converters, they do highlight the following important conclusions.

When examining TST-only converters, we observe that they are more numerous than IGRA-only converters. This result is similar to what was seen in a 2014 HHC study from Brazil (31). While this could be the result of BCG cross-reactivity, BCG cross-reactivity is minimal when vaccination occurs during infancy and the TST is performed at least 10 years after (32). Given that all our HHCs were at least 15 years of age and that the median age of our TST-only converters is 32, BCG cross-reactivity is unlikely to be the only reason behind the higher TST conversion rate. TST-only converters also appear to be older than the other converter groups. This association is present in the univariate analysis and confirmed by our logistic regression model. The positive association between TST positivity and age has been detected in previous studies across different populations and age groups (33-38). All of these studies, however, were cross-sectional in nature and could not differentiate between recent TST conversion and long-standing *Mtb* infection. Therefore, our study is the first one to identify an association between recent TST conversion and increasing age that could be possibly linked to longer environmental exposure to non-tuberculosis mycobacteria (NTM) in the setting of a BCG-primed immune response to cross-reactive mycobacterial antigens.

Furthermore, the use of the TST in conjunction with the QFT allowed us to identify converters who appear to have distinct immunologic reactions at the time of conversion. When we examine QFT/TST converters, we see that the QFT/TST converters have a higher change in QFT quantitative values at the time of QFT conversion than QFT-only converters. This difference of values is maintained at month 12, though this result did not attain statistical significance. Similarly, change in TST increment is larger in QFT/TST converters than in TST-only converters. Overall, these results are indicative of a more robust immunologic response in HHCs who convert both tests. This idea is supported by studies in Senegal and South Africa that found that a combination of both a positive TST and a positive IGRA appeared better at predicting TB than either response alone (39, 40). Indeed, the predictive value of TB for TST and IGRAs has been the focus of several studies and continues to be a controversial subject. Some studies have found

no difference between these two tests with respect to predictive ability (40-43). On the other hand, other studies have found that IGRAs were better at predicting subsequent TB (44, 45). In the end, it is unclear if the TST or the QFT on their own may offer an adequate predictive value for subsequent TB disease. However, the significance of the more robust immunologic response by combined QFT/TST converters is not clear and is deserving of further investigation or development of a better biomarker for recent and/or new Mtb infection.

Our analysis suffered from some limitations. First, our small sample size limited the power of the study. Second, although we obtained IGRA results at different points during the follow-up, TST was only obtained at the beginning and at the end of the follow-up.

In conclusion, our findings indicate that TST converters are older. If this association is due to ongoing exposure to environmental mycobacteria, as we have speculated, then vaccine design studies that only use the TST to assess endpoints will likely overestimate Mtb infection. Second, our results indicate that other epidemiological variables do not distinguish TST from IGRA converters and therefore, cannot help define “true” conversion. Third, combined QFT/TST converters appear to have a more robust immune response. Consequently, neither the TST nor IGRA alone may be sufficient to provide an adequate understanding of conversion/recent infection. Future studies using both of these tests will be needed to elucidate whether dual conversion is a useful endpoint for clinical and immunological studies.

387 **Acknowledgements**

388 We want to acknowledge the contributions made by senior physicians, medical officers, health
389 visitors, laboratory and data personnel: Prof. Moses Joloba, Dr. Brenda Okware, Dr. Timothy
390 Muwanguzi, Dorcas Lamunu, Joan Tusabe, Saidah Menya, Veronica Kizza, Druscillah Ssekandi,
391 Joan Nassuna, Ann Ritah Namuganga, Sophie Nalukwago, Michael Odie, Henry Kawoya, Keith
392 Chervenak, and Dr. Bonnie Thiel. The data collection and management for this paper was
393 performed using the OpenClinica open source software, version 3.16. Copyright OpenClinica LLC
394 and collaborators, Waltham, MA, USA, www.OpenClinica.com. This study would not be possible
395 without the generous participation of the Ugandan patients and families.

References

1. World Health Organization. Implementing the end TB strategy: the essentials. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016.
2. World Health Organization. Global tuberculosis report 2020. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.
3. Bagcchi S. WHO's Global Tuberculosis Report 2022. *Lancet Microbe*. 2023;4(1):e20.
4. Behr MA, Kaufmann E, Duffin J, Edelstein PH, Ramakrishnan L. Latent Tuberculosis: Two Centuries of Confusion. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2021;204(2):142-8.
5. Reichler MR, Khan A, Sterling TR, Zhao H, Chen B, Yuan Y, et al. Risk Factors for Tuberculosis and Effect of Preventive Therapy Among Close Contacts of Persons With Infectious Tuberculosis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;70(8):1562-72.
6. Sloot R, Schim van der Loeff MF, Kouw PM, Borgdorff MW. Risk of tuberculosis after recent exposure. A 10-year follow-up study of contacts in Amsterdam. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2014;190(9):1044-52.
7. Behr MA, Edelstein PH, Ramakrishnan L. Revisiting the timetable of tuberculosis. *BMJ*. 2018;362:k2738.
8. Zellweger JP, Sotgiu G, Corradi M, Durando P. The diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI): currently available tests, future developments, and perspectives to eliminate tuberculosis (TB). *Med Lav*. 2020;111(3):170-83.
9. Stein CM, Mayanja-Kizza H, Hawn TR, Boom WH. Importance of Study Design and Phenotype Definition in Ongoing Studies of Resistance to Latent *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* Infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2020;221(6):1025-6.

- 418 10. Behr MA, Edelstein PH, Ramakrishnan L. Is Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection life
419 long? BMJ. 2019;367:l5770.
- 420 11. Boom WH, Schaible UE, Achkar JM. The knowns and unknowns of latent
421 Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection. J Clin Invest. 2021;131(3).
- 422 12. Ewer K, Deeks J, Alvarez L, Bryant G, Waller S, Andersen P, et al. Comparison of T-
423 cell-based assay with tuberculin skin test for diagnosis of Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection
424 in a school tuberculosis outbreak. Lancet. 2003;361(9364):1168-73.
- 425 13. Lalvani A, Pathan AA, McShane H, Wilkinson RJ, Latif M, Conlon CP, et al. Rapid
426 detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection by enumeration of antigen-specific T cells.
427 Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2001;163(4):824-8.
- 428 14. Brock I, Weldingh K, Lillebaek T, Follmann F, Andersen P. Comparison of tuberculin
429 skin test and new specific blood test in tuberculosis contacts. Am J Respir Crit Care Med.
430 2004;170(1):65-9.
- 431 15. Pai M, Zwerling A, Menzies D. Systematic review: T-cell-based assays for the diagnosis
432 of latent tuberculosis infection: an update. Ann Intern Med. 2008;149(3):177-84.
- 433 16. Lalvani A. Diagnosing tuberculosis infection in the 21st century: new tools to tackle an
434 old enemy. Chest. 2007;131(6):1898-906.
- 435 17. Drobniewski F, Cobelens F, Zellweger JP, Workshop KNE. Use of Gamma-interferon
436 assays in low- and medium-prevalence countries in Europe: a consensus statement of a Wolfheze
437 Workshop organised by KNCV/EuroTB, Vilnius Sept 2006. Euro Surveill. 2007;12(7):E070726
438 2.

- 439 18. Chang PC, Wang PH, Chen KT. Use of the QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube Test in the
440 Diagnosis and Monitoring of Treatment Efficacy in Active Pulmonary Tuberculosis. *Int J*
441 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2017;14(3).
- 442 19. Moses MW, Zwerling A, Cattamanchi A, Denkinger CM, Banaei N, Kik SV, et al. Serial
443 testing for latent tuberculosis using QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube: A Markov model. *Sci Rep*.
444 2016;6:30781.
- 445 20. Stein CM, Hall NB, Malone LL, Mupere E. The household contact study design for
446 genetic epidemiological studies of infectious diseases. *Front Genet*. 2013;4:61.
- 447 21. Garcia-Basteiro AL, White RG, Tait D, Schmidt AC, Rangaka MX, Quaife M, et al. End-
448 point definition and trial design to advance tuberculosis vaccine development. *Eur Respir Rev*.
449 2022;31(164).
- 450 22. Aceng JR. The Uganda National Tuberculosis Prevalence Survey, 2014 - 2015.
451 Kampala2016.
- 452 23. Sekandi JN, List J, Luzze H, Yin XP, Dobbin K, Corso PS, et al. Yield of undetected
453 tuberculosis and human immunodeficiency virus coinfection from active case finding in urban
454 Uganda. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2014;18(1):13-9.
- 455 24. Reporter RM. The Deluxe "Muzigo" - Single Bedroom House: Real Muloodi News
456 Network; 2021 [Available from: [https://realmuloodi.co.ug/the-deluxe-muzigo-single-bedroom-](https://realmuloodi.co.ug/the-deluxe-muzigo-single-bedroom-houses/)
457 [houses/](https://realmuloodi.co.ug/the-deluxe-muzigo-single-bedroom-houses/)].
- 458 25. Menzies D. Interpretation of repeated tuberculin tests. Boosting, conversion, and
459 reversion. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1999;159(1):15-21.
- 460 26. Kroon EE, Kinnear CJ, Orlova M, Fischinger S, Shin S, Boolay S, et al. An observational
461 study identifying highly tuberculosis-exposed, HIV-1-positive but persistently TB, tuberculin

462 and IGRA negative persons with M. tuberculosis specific antibodies in Cape Town, South
463 Africa. EBioMedicine. 2020;61:103053.

464 27. Lu LL, Smith MT, Yu KKQ, Luedemann C, Suscovich TJ, Grace PS, et al. IFN-gamma-
465 independent immune markers of Mycobacterium tuberculosis exposure. Nat Med.
466 2019;25(6):977-87.

467 28. Mandalakas AM, Kirchner HL, Lombard C, Walzl G, Grewal HM, Gie RP, et al. Well-
468 quantified tuberculosis exposure is a reliable surrogate measure of tuberculosis infection. Int J
469 Tuberc Lung Dis. 2012;16(8):1033-9.

470 29. Ma N, Zalwango S, Malone LL, Nsereko M, Wampande EM, Thiel BA, et al. Clinical
471 and epidemiological characteristics of individuals resistant to M. tuberculosis infection in a
472 longitudinal TB household contact study in Kampala, Uganda. BMC Infect Dis. 2014;14:352.

473 30. R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
474 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2010.

475 31. Ribeiro-Rodrigues R, Kim S, Coelho da Silva FD, Uzelac A, Collins L, Palaci M, et al.
476 Discordance of tuberculin skin test and interferon gamma release assay in recently exposed
477 household contacts of pulmonary TB cases in Brazil. PLoS One. 2014;9(5):e96564.

478 32. Farhat M, Greenaway C, Pai M, Menzies D. False-positive tuberculin skin tests: what is
479 the absolute effect of BCG and non-tuberculous mycobacteria? Int J Tuberc Lung Dis.
480 2006;10(11):1192-204.

481 33. Hemmati M, Ghadiri K, Rezaei M. Tuberculin Reactivity in School Age Children; Five-
482 year Follow-up in Iran. Iran J Pediatr. 2011;21(1):39-44.

483 34. Pong AL, Anders BJ, Moser KS, Starkey M, Gassmann A, Besser RE. Tuberculosis
484 screening at 2 San Diego high schools with high-risk populations. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.
485 1998;152(7):646-50.

486 35. Martinez L, Arman A, Haveman N, Lundgren A, Cabrera L, Evans CA, et al. Changes in
487 tuberculin skin test positivity over 20 years in periurban shantytowns in Lima, Peru. Am J Trop
488 Med Hyg. 2013;89(3):507-15.

489 36. Saito M, Bautista CT, Gilman RH, Bowering A, Levy MZ, Evans CA. The value of
490 counting BCG scars for interpretation of tuberculin skin tests in a tuberculosis hyperendemic
491 shantytown, Peru. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2004;8(7):842-7.

492 37. Mori T, Leung CC. Tuberculosis in the global aging population. Infect Dis Clin North
493 Am. 2010;24(3):751-68.

494 38. Chan-Yeung M, Dai DL, Cheung AH, Chan FH, Kam KM, Tam CM, et al. Tuberculin
495 skin test reaction and body mass index in old age home residents in Hong Kong. J Am Geriatr
496 Soc. 2007;55(10):1592-7.

497 39. Lienhardt C, Fielding K, Hane AA, Niang A, Ndao CT, Karam F, et al. Evaluation of the
498 prognostic value of IFN-gamma release assay and tuberculin skin test in household contacts of
499 infectious tuberculosis cases in Senegal. PLoS One. 2010;5(5):e10508.

500 40. Mahomed H, Hawkrigde T, Verver S, Abrahams D, Geiter L, Hatherill M, et al. The
501 tuberculin skin test versus QuantiFERON TB Gold(R) in predicting tuberculosis disease in an
502 adolescent cohort study in South Africa. PLoS One. 2011;6(3):e17984.

503 41. Bakir M, Millington KA, Soysal A, Deeks JJ, Efee S, Aslan Y, et al. Prognostic value of
504 a T-cell-based, interferon-gamma biomarker in children with tuberculosis contact. Ann Intern
505 Med. 2008;149(11):777-87.

42. Harstad I, Winje BA, Heldal E, Oftung F, Jacobsen GW. Predictive values of QuantiFERON-TB Gold testing in screening for tuberculosis disease in asylum seekers. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2010;14(9):1209-11.
43. Kik SV, Franken WP, Mensen M, Cobelens FG, Kamphorst M, Arend SM, et al. Predictive value for progression to tuberculosis by IGRA and TST in immigrant contacts. *Eur Respir J*. 2010;35(6):1346-53.
44. Diel R, Loddenkemper R, Niemann S, Meywald-Walter K, Nienhaus A. Negative and positive predictive value of a whole-blood interferon-gamma release assay for developing active tuberculosis: an update. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2011;183(1):88-95.
45. Leung CC, Yam WC, Yew WW, Ho PL, Tam CM, Law WS, et al. T-Spot.TB outperforms tuberculin skin test in predicting tuberculosis disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2010;182(6):834-40.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Study protocol for the Kampala household contact study.

S2 Fig. Visualization of cluster model based on partitioning around medoids using two clusters.

S1 Table. Univariate analysis comparing QFT-only, TST-only and QFT/TST converters based on individual and household characteristics. For this comparison, QFT-only converters and QFT/TST converters were combined into a single category, QFT converters.

S2 Table. Univariate analysis comparing QFT-only, TST-only and QFT/TST converters based on index case characteristics. For this comparison, QFT-only converters and QFT/TST converters were combined into a single category, QFT converters.

Fig 1. CONSORT diagram for this study. Out of 383 household contacts enrolled in our study, 69 were excluded. 314 household contacts were classified using both TST and QFT. Those who were defined as concordant LTBI (both TST and QFT results were consistently positive) and discordant "resisters" (either 2 negative TST or all negative QFT) were excluded from analysis (n=166). The remaining 148 household contacts were defined as follows: 39 TST-only converters (negative baseline TST with positive TST at 12 months), 13 were QFT-only converters (negative QFT at baseline followed by positive QFT during follow-up), 24 were QFT/TST converters (negative baseline TST and QFT followed by positive TST and QFT during follow-up), and 72 were concordant short-term "resisters" (all TST and QFT tests remained negative).




Fig 1

Fig 2. Quantitative QFT values of QFT/TST converters and QFT-only converters before and after QFT-conversion. Red dotted line indicates 0.35 IU cut-off. If QFT plus was used, the highest value was used for this analysis. QFT-only converters had a lower value at conversion when compared to QFT/TST converters (2.03 [0.92-3.82] vs. 4.14 [1.73-10.0], $p=0.03$).




Fig 2

Fig 3. Quantitative TST values of QFT/TST converters and TST-only converters at baseline and at month 12 of follow-up. Red dotted line indicates 10 mm. cut-off. At baseline, TST-only converters had a higher TST value compared to QFT/TST converters (2.0 [0.0-8.0] vs. 0.0 [0.0-0.0], $p=0.001$). By month 12, this difference had disappeared (14.6 [12.2-16.3] vs. 15.6 [13.9-17.6], $p=0.25$).




Fig 3