

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

3

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

5

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

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

8

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.)

19

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

23

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

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

118

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

126

127

128 **METHODS**

129 **Trial design and participants**

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

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

137

138 Diabetic patients aged from 18 to 65 years old presenting at diabetic clinics were invited to
139 participate. Diabetes was defined as having fasting plasma glucose ≥ 126 mg/dl, HbA1c
140 $\geq 6.5\%$, 2-hour plasma glucose (PG) ≥ 200 mg/dl during an oral glucose tolerance test, or
141 classic symptoms of hyperglycaemia with a random PG ≥ 200 mg/dl. Patients who had been
142 diagnosed with melioidosis and had not completed oral-eradication treatment for melioidosis
143 were excluded. All participants provided individual written consent before enrollment. The
144 trial was approved by the Institute for the Development of Human Research Protections,
145 Ministry of Public Health, Thailand (ref 189/2557) and Oxford Tropical Research Ethics
146 Committee, University of Oxford, United Kingdom (ref 06-14). This trial is registered with
147 ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT02089152.

148

149 **Randomisation**

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

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

159

160 **Procedures**

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

173

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

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

187

188 The intervention package included six short videos, three pamphlets, and a calendar with a
189 space for participants' individual photographs and self-pledge. The materials are publicly
190 available online (<https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5734155>) [17]. Each participant also
191 received a pair of long socks and a bottle of baby powder (to reduce uncomfortable feelings
192 while wearing boots) and a 2-litre plastic ice bucket (commonly used to store boiled water to
193 drink while working in rice fields). In each behavioural support group, participants received
194 an introduction by a moderator, watched a series of brief videos, and had short group
195 discussions at the end of each video. Participants then had a session in which they tried out
196 multiple kinds of boots to identify the ones which would be most comfortable for wearing.
197 Next, the study team took a photograph of each participant while wearing their boots and
198 holding a kettle and gave participants their printed photographs. Finally, participants made
199 their own calendar to act as a reminder tool for the recommended preventive behaviours. We
200 asked participants to attach their individual photograph to the calendar and write their own
201 pledge on the calendar themselves. Participants were asked to hang their calendar in their
202 house. The moderator also stimulated group discussion before and after as well as during the
203 sessions. Additionally, we provided social support by giving information to nurses, doctors,
204 participants' relatives and village health volunteers in each participating PCU about the
205 intervention and its potential benefits. We asked them to encourage participants to continue
206 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**

232 The PREMEL study power calculation was performed with the assumption that, among
233 diabetes, incidence rates of hospital admissions involving infectious diseases were 50 per
234 1,000 persons per year [19, 20] and incidence rates of culture-confirmed melioidosis were
235 240 per 100,000 persons per year [10]. Using an alpha error of 0.05, a power of 0.8 and an
236 intra-cluster correlation coefficient of 0.15, we calculated that we needed at least 9,000
237 diabetics from 30 diabetic clinics (300 diabetics per clinic). This design and sample size gave
238 us 85% power to show a 30% reduction in incidence rates of hospital admissions involving
239 infectious diseases and a 35% reduction in incidence rates of culture-confirmed melioidosis.
240 During the enrollment period, we found that the number of diabetic patients we could enroll
241 at each PCU was lower than we expected. Therefore, during the enrollment period, we
242 adjusted and enrolled diabetic patients from 116 PCUs in the province.

243

244 We used both intention-to-treat (ITT) and per-protocol analyses. For the primary outcome of
245 hospital admissions involving infectious diseases, we used multilevel mixed-effects negative
246 binomial regression models adjusted for calendar time, and with a random effect for PCU and
247 a random effect for repeated measures on the same diabetic patients [21, 22]. This approach
248 was recommended by Hemming et al [21, 22] to allow for correlations between individuals in
249 the same cluster and the dependence between individual measurements over the course of the
250 study. In the ITT analysis, 1st March was set as the time of the intervention for the
251 randomized clusters of those years. Patients were considered at risk from the enrollment until
252 31 Dec 2018. In the per-protocol analysis, participants who received a behavioural support
253 group session for melioidosis prevention were defined as having received the intervention.

254

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

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

260

261 We ran sensitivity analyses to evaluate whether the effectiveness of the intervention changed
262 after adjusting for gender, age, diabetes duration and HbA1c level at enrollment using a
263 multivariable regression model. We *ad hoc* evaluated the potential cost-effectiveness of the
264 prevention programme by using the previously published cost-effectiveness models for
265 melioidosis vaccination in Thailand [23]. All analyses were performed using STATA version
266 14.2 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

267

268 **Data and Resource Availability**

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

271

272 **Patient and public involvement**

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

277

278

279 **RESULTS**

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

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

285

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

291

292 A total of 39, 39 and 38 PCUs were randomized to groups 1, 2 and 3, in which the
293 intervention was given from March to July in 2016, 2017 and 2018, respectively (Figure 2).
294 Of 9,056 diabetic patients, 6,544 (72%) received a behavioural support group session. The
295 study team delivered a total of 522 sessions, of which 177 (34%) had fewer than six
296 participants per session, 237 (45%) had 6 to 20 participants, and 108 (21%) had more than 20
297 participants. Of 522 sessions, 408 (78%) were conducted from March to May, 94 (18%) in
298 June, and 20 (4%) in July. The proportion of diabetic patients who received a behavioural
299 support group session was highest in the group 1 clusters (81%) than those in group 2 clusters
300 (68%) and group 3 clusters (67%) ($p<0.001$). Participants who received a behavioural support
301 group session were older and had a higher proportion of female, lower proportion of insulin
302 therapy (16% vs 22%) and lower proportion of poor diabetic control (29% vs 33%) compared
303 with those who did not receive a behavioural support group session (Table 2).

304

305 Of 2,512 diabetic patients who did not receive a behavioural support group session, 1,696
306 (68%) did not meet the study team, but received details of the behavioural support group by

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

316

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

321

322 For the primary outcome, 3,335 hospital admissions involving infectious diseases occurred in
323 2,195 patients. The most common diagnoses were acute gastroenteritis (582 admissions),
324 pneumonia (364 admissions), post-traumatic wound infection (302 admissions), urinary tract
325 infection (287 admissions), cellulitis (251 admissions) and unspecified fever (241
326 admissions; Supplementary Table 1). The rate of hospital admission involving infectious
327 diseases was 87 (95%CI 84-90) admissions per 1,000 person-years. In the ITT analysis, the
328 intervention was not associated with the incidence rate of hospital admissions involving
329 infectious diseases ($p=0.79$; Table 3). In the per-protocol analysis, diabetic patients who
330 received a behavioural support group session had 11% lower incidence rate of hospital
331 admissions involving infectious diseases (incidence rate ratio [IRR] 0.89; 95%CI 0.80-0.99,

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

339

340 The secondary outcome of all-cause mortality occurred in 485 patients. 15 of 58 (26%)
341 patients with culture-confirmed melioidosis and none of 22 (0%) patients with clinical
342 melioidosis died within 30 days of the hospital admissions of melioidosis. Of 485 deaths, 213
343 (44%) occurred within the hospitals, 198 (41%) occurred within 30 days after the last hospital
344 admission and 74 (15%) occurred at home without hospital admission within 30 days prior to
345 death. Of 198 who died within 30 days after the last hospital admission, 101 (51%) died on
346 the hospital discharge date, 49 (25%) died within 1 to 7 calendar days after the hospital
347 discharge, and 48 (24%) died within 8 to 30 calendar days after the hospital discharge. We
348 found that 217 (45%) of 485 deaths were possibly related to infectious diseases, including
349 septic shock recorded by attending physicians in 94 deaths (19%) (Supplementary Table 2).
350 In the ITT analysis, implementation of the intervention was not associated with mortality
351 (p=0.85). In the per-protocol analysis, patients who received the multifaceted prevention
352 programme had 46% lower rate of mortality (IRR 0.54; 95%CI 0.43-0.68, p<0.001). As we
353 adjusted for calendar time, we observed that the rate of hospital admissions involving
354 infectious diseases and mortality rose over time.

355

356 The secondary outcome of overall melioidosis occurred in 80 patients (58 culture-confirmed
357 melioidosis and 22 clinical melioidosis). In the ITT analysis, implementation of the
358 intervention was not associated with the incidence rate of melioidosis ($p=0.37$). In the per-
359 protocol analysis, there was borderline evidence suggesting that patients who received the
360 multifaceted prevention programme had 43% lower incidence rate of melioidosis (IRR 0.57;
361 95%CI 0.31-1.08, $p=0.09$).

362

363 In a sensitivity analysis, using per-protocol analysis and multivariable regression models, we
364 found that male gender, older age, longer known diabetes duration and higher HbA1c levels
365 on enrollment were associated with incidence of hospital admissions involving infectious
366 diseases (Supplementary Table 3) and mortality (Supplementary Table 4). Male gender,
367 longer known diabetes duration and higher HbA1c level on enrollment were also associated
368 with overall melioidosis (Supplementary Table 5). We estimated that the intervention would
369 be deemed cost-effective in Thailand, assuming that policy makers were willing to pay
370 \$7,000 for an additional quality adjusted life year gained (Supplementary Table 6).

371

372

373 **CONCLUSIONS**

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

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

384

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

396

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

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

408

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

419

420 The proportion of diabetic patients with poor diabetic control in our study (30%) is relatively
421 higher than the previous reports in Thailand [26, 32] This could be because we tested HbA1c
422 in 100% of the diabetic patients on enrollment. Previous studies in Thailand found that only
423 50% to 78% of diabetic patients had HbA1c tested and diabetic patients with repeatedly high
424 fasting blood glucose may not be tested for HbA1c levels [25, 26] The findings of increasing
425 rate of hospital admission involving infectious diseases and mortality as the study period
426 progressed (i.e. a rising tide phenomenon [21, 22]) is consistent with our expectation that
427 those events would occur more often as diabetic patients age and have a longer duration of
428 living with diabetes.

429

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

439

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

445

446 **Acknowledgements**

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

463

464 **Contributions**

465 DL conceptualized the study. PS, PT, WC, SM, NPJD and DL designed the methodology.
466 SM had oversight of the methodology of behaviour change techniques. GW coordinated the
467 data collection from microbiology laboratories. PS, PT, WC, ND and DL coordinated the
468 trial. PS and DL collected and curated the data, performed the analyses and wrote the first
469 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

479 **References**

- 480 1. Wiersinga WJ, Virk HS, Torres AG, Currie BJ, Peacock SJ, Dance DAB, et al.
481 Melioidosis. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2018;4:17107. Epub 2018/02/02. doi:
482 10.1038/nrdp.2017.107.
- 483 2. Hantrakun V, Kongyu S, Klaytong P, Rongsumlee S, Day NPJ, Peacock SJ, et al.
484 Clinical Epidemiology of 7126 Melioidosis Patients in Thailand and the Implications for a
485 National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System. *Open Forum Infect Dis*.
486 2019;6(12):ofz498. Epub 2020/02/23. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofz498.
- 487 3. Currie BJ, Ward L, Cheng AC. The epidemiology and clinical spectrum of
488 melioidosis: 540 cases from the 20 year Darwin prospective study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*.
489 2010;4(11):e900. Epub 2010/12/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000900.
- 490 4. Mukhopadhyay C, Shaw T, Varghese GM, Dance DAB. Melioidosis in South Asia
491 (India, Nepal, Pakistan, Bhutan and Afghanistan). *Trop Med Infect Dis*. 2018;3(2). Epub
492 2018/10/03. doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed3020051.
- 493 5. Steinmetz I, Wagner GE, Kanyala E, Sawadogo M, Soumeiya H, Teferi M, et al.
494 Melioidosis in Africa: Time to Uncover the True Disease Load. *Trop Med Infect Dis*.
495 2018;3(2). Epub 2018/10/03. doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed3020062.
- 496 6. Sanchez-Villamil JI, Torres AG. Melioidosis in Mexico, Central America, and the
497 Caribbean. *Trop Med Infect Dis*. 2018;3(1). Epub 2018/05/22. doi:
498 10.3390/tropicalmed3010024.
- 499 7. Torres AG, Montufar FE, Gee JE, Hoffmaster AR, Elrod MG, Duarte-Valderrama C,
500 et al. Melioidosis is in the Americas: A Call to Action for Diagnosing and Treating the
501 Disease. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2018;99(3):563-4. Epub 2018/07/18. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.18-
502 0418.
- 503 8. Limmathurotsakul D, Golding N, Dance DA, Messina JP, Pigott DM, Moyes CL, et
504 al. Predicted global distribution of *Burkholderia pseudomallei* and burden of melioidosis. *Nat*
505 *Microbiol*. 2016;1:15008. Epub 2016/08/31. doi: 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2015.8.
- 506 9. Currie BJ, Jacups SP, Cheng AC, Fisher DA, Anstey NM, Huffam SE, et al.
507 Melioidosis epidemiology and risk factors from a prospective whole-population study in
508 northern Australia. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2004;9(11):1167-74. Epub 2004/11/19. doi:
509 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2004.01328.x.
- 510 10. Limmathurotsakul D, Wongratanacheewin S, Teerawattanasook N, Wongsuvan G,
511 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

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

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

595 **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

116 primary care units (PCUs)
9075 diabetic patients enrolled
from Apr 2014 to Nov 2014

19 patients excluded
8 older than 65 years old
7 not diabetes
2 did not complete melioidosis treatment
2 written consent not obtained

116 PCUs randomized
(9056 diabetic patients)



