medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.21.21265356; this version posted October 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# Household contact tracing with intensified tuberculosis and HIV screening in South Africa: a cluster randomised trial

**Running title:** Intensive household TB/HIV screening in South Africa

6 Neil A Martinson<sup>1,2</sup>, Limakatso Lebina<sup>1</sup>, Emily L Webb<sup>3</sup>, Andrew Ratsela<sup>4</sup>, Ebrahim Varavia<sup>1,5</sup>,

Anthony Kinghorn<sup>1</sup>, Sanjay G Lala<sup>1,6</sup>, Jonathan E. Golub<sup>2</sup>, Zama Bosch<sup>1</sup>, Kegaugetswe P Motsomi<sup>1</sup>,
 Peter MacPherson<sup>7,8,9</sup>.

#### 9 10 Affiliations

3

13

14

15

- Perinatal HIV Research Unit (PHRU), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South
   Africa
  - 2. Johns Hopkins University Center for TB Research, Baltimore, MD.
  - 3. MRC International Statistics and Epidemiology Group, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK
- 16 4. Department of Internal Medicine, University of Limpopo, Polokwane, South Africa
- Department of Internal Medicine. Klerksdorp Tshepong Hospital Complex, North West
   Provincial Department of Health, and University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.
- 19 6. Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa
- 20 7. Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, UK
- 21 8. Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Programme, Malawi
- 22 9. Clinical Research Department, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

# 23 Corresponding Author

- 24 Dr Peter MacPherson
- 25 Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
- 26 Pembroke Place
- 27 Liverpool
- 28 United Kingdom, L3 5QA
- **29** <u>44 151 705 3100</u>
- 30 peter.macpherson@lstmed.ac.uk
- 31

# 32 Alternate Corresponding Author

- 33 Prof Neil Martinson
- 34 Perinatal HIV Research Unit
- 35 Chris Baragwanath Hospital,
- 36 Soweto,
- 37 South Africa
- **38** <u>+27 11 989 9700</u>
- 39 <u>Martinson@phru.co.za</u>
- 40

# 41 Keywords

- 42 Tuberculosis, HIV, screening, diagnosis, contract tracing, randomised controlled trials
- 43

# 4445 Author Su

- 45 Author Summary
  46 In South Africa, household contacts of TB cases received referral letters or home-tracing with
- 40 In South Africa, nousehold contacts of TB cases received referral fetters of nome-tracing with
- 47 intensified TB/HIV screening. At 15-months, the cumulative incidence of TB or death did not differ
- 48 between the intensive screening (93/3230, 2.9%) and SOC (80/2600, 3.1%) arms.
- 49

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

#### 50 Abstract

## 51 Background

Household contact tracing for tuberculosis (TB) may facilitate TB diagnosis and identify individuals
who may benefit from TB preventive therapy (TPT). In this cluster-randomised trial, we investigated
whether household contact tracing and intensive TB/HIV screening would improve TB-free survival.

55

## 56 Methods

- 57 Household contacts of index TB patients in two Provinces of South Africa were randomised to home
- 58 tracing and intensive HIV/TB screening (sputum Xpert and culture; HIV testing with treatment
- 59 linkage; and TPT, if eligible), or standard of care (SOC, clinic referral letters). The primary outcome
- 60 was incident TB or death at 15-months. Secondary outcomes included tuberculin skin test (TST)
- 61 positivity in children  $\leq 14$  years and undiagnosed HIV. (<u>ISRCTN16006202</u>).

62

### 63 Results

- From December 2016-March 2019, 1,032 index patients (4,459 contacts) and 1,030 (4,129 contacts)
- 65 were randomised to the intervention and SOC arms. 3.2% (69/2166) of intervention arm contacts had
- 66 prevalent microbiologically-confirmed TB. At 15-months, the cumulative incidence of TB or death
- did not differ between the intensive screening (93/3230, 2.9%) and SOC (80/2600, 3.1%) arms
- 68 (hazard ratio: 0.90, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.66-1.24). TST positivity was higher in the
- 69 intensive screening arm (38/845, 4.5%) compared to the SOC arm (15/800, 1.9%, odds ratio: 2.25,
- 70 95% CI: 1.07-4.72). Undiagnosed HIV was similar between arms (41/3185, 1.3% vs. 32/2543, 1.3%;
- 71 odds ratio: 1.02, 95% CI: 0.64-1.64).

72

## 73 Conclusions

74 Household contact tracing with intensive screening and referral did not reduce incident TB or death.

- 75 Providing referral letters to household contacts of index patients is an alternative strategy to home
- 76 visits in high TB/HIV-prevalence settings.

77 70	Introduction
78 79	Contact tracing of people with tuberculosis (TB) has been advocated as part of TB control for many
80	years [1-3] because it facilitates early diagnosis and treatment of infectious individuals and identifies
81	those who could benefit from TB preventive treatment (TPT) [4]. Although World Health
82	Organization (WHO) and numerous national guidelines recommend household TB contact tracing,
83	these have not been widely implemented in high TB burden countries because of limited effectiveness
84	data [5,6]. The COVID-19 pandemic has severely impacted TB care and prevention programmes in
85	sub-Saharan Africa [7], and may have reversed recent improvements in TB diagnosis and treatment
86	[8,9].
87	
88	Previous randomised trials have investigated the effectiveness of TB household contact tracing
89	interventions on screening completion, community TB prevalence, and TB notification, showing
90	mixed results [10-13]. Evidence suggests more intensive TB screening approaches increase
91	diagnostic yield and could reduce transmission by identifying and treating people with subclinical
92	infectious TB earlier [5,14,15]. Moreover, universal HIV testing with immediate initiation of
93	antiretroviral therapy (ART) together with TPT, reduces morbidity, mortality, and incident TB disease
94	among people living with HIV [16–18].
95	
96	We hypothesized that household contact tracing with intensive screening for TB and HIV with
97	supported linkage to treatment and home initiation of TPT could result in earlier TB and HIV
98	diagnosis and treatment, and reduce TB transmission.
99	

100 101	Methods
101	Study design and participants
103	We conducted an open two-arm cluster randomised trial of household contact tracing and intensive
104	TB/HIV screening in South Africa ( <u>ISRCTN16006202</u> ). Methods have been described previously (S1
105	Protocol) [19]. In brief, we recruited index TB patients diagnosed at two South African sites with
106	large differences in annual TB incidence and HIV prevalence (Mangaung, Free State [20]; Capricorn,
107	Limpopo [21,22]). During the study period there were few programmatic attempts made to identify
108	and screen household contacts for TB.
109	
110	Study teams identified consecutive eligible index TB patients at government clinics and hospitals
111	within boundaries of study sites. We included TB patients of any age, but required those $\geq$ 7 years to
112	have laboratory-confirmed pulmonary TB, whereas those <7 years could have physician-diagnosed
113	TB of any organ, with or without laboratory confirmation. We additionally included TB patients who
114	died within eight weeks of TB diagnosis. We excluded institutionalized TB patients and withdrew
115	participants whose households we could not locate or from where no household member could be
116	recruited. A list of household contacts was obtained at enrollment.
117	
118	Randomisation, allocation and blinding
120	Index cases and their households were block-randomised to either intervention or standard of care
121	(SOC) in a 1:1 ratio, stratified by district. Investigator blinding was maintained until after the final
122	participant household follow-up was completed.

# 123 Procedures

124 In the intervention group, research fieldworkers visited households within 14 days of index TB patient

125 enrollment (maximum three attempts), obtaining written individual or parental consent for adults and

126 children under 18 years, respectively, with assent from older children. A questionnaire was

administered to each household member (S2 Questionnaires), and sputum specimens obtained where

128 possible (but not required from children <5 years) and were tested using Xpert and Mycobacterial

129	Growth Indicator Tube (MGIT) culture. Household contacts received TST (from a variety of sources
130	due to global shortages), administered and read within 72 hours [23]. Study nurses dispensed the first
131	month of TPT (six months of daily isoniazid) to: (i) HIV-positive participants who tested negative for
132	TB, (ii) HIV-negative participants with positive TST (≥10mm), and (iii) children under five years.
133	Subsequent TPT was obtained from local clinics.
134	
135	For household members without a confirmed HIV diagnosis, rapid point-of-care HIV testing was
136	offered to participants ≥18 months, and PCR on dried blood spot for children <18 months whose
137	maternal HIV status was unknown or positive. Participants with HIV had a CD4 count and were
138	referred to their nearest clinic for assessment and initiation of ART.
139	
140	Intervention households were visited approximately three months after enrollment to support
141	treatment linkage.
142	
143	In the SOC arm, index TB patients (or their representative, if deceased or a child) were given referral
144	letters for every household member by the recruiting team at the health facility, recommending that
145	each household contact should take their letter to their local clinic and be screened for TB and HIV.
146	
147	Outcomes
148	At 15-months after randomisation, study teams visited all households, updated the household
149	membership list and recorded episodes of incident TB and death. We investigated household members
150	for HIV (if untested) and TB (if symptomatic). All children ≤14 years old had TST placed, read at 48-
151	72 hours.
152	
153	The primary outcome was time to TB or death, measured among all household members included in
154	the household census at baseline, from one month after randomisation through the final 15-month
155	ascertainment visit. Primary analysis included all incident TB diagnoses, irrespective of diagnostic
156	method; sensitivity analyses included only bacteriologically-confirmed incident cases of TB.

is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 Inte	rnational	license
--	-----------	---------

1	5	7
_	ີ	1

158	Secondary outcomes were: prevalence of TB infection (TST induration ≥10mm) at month-15 among
159	household children ≤14 years; time to initiation of TB treatment; and prevalence of undiagnosed or
160	untreated HIV at month-15. Primary analyses for all outcomes were restricted to household contacts
161	resident at baseline enumeration; supplementary analyses included all household contacts regardless
162	of baseline residency. In protocol-specified subgroup analysis, we compared outcomes by trial site,
163	and TST positivity by household contact age (<5 years, $\geq$ 5 years).
164	
165	Ethical approval was granted by the University of Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics Committee
166	(Medical), and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.
167	
168	Statistical Methods
169	Assuming mean household size 5.5, 1,200 index cases per site (total 2,400), provided 80% power to
170	detect a 30% overall difference in the primary outcome between groups with alpha 0.05 and
171	intracluster correlation coefficient 0.3. All statistical analysis used Stata v16 (StataCorp, College
172	Station, US). Analysis was done on an intention-to-treat basis.
173	
174	This study is reported following CONSORT guidelines for cluster randomised trials (S3 Checklist).
175	We summarised baseline index and household characteristics by trial arm. For the primary outcome,
176	follow-up time began one month after randomisation (to avoid counting prevalent TB cases) and
177	ended at the month-15 visit, or the date of TB or death. Cox proportional hazards regression with
178	robust standard errors was used to assess the impact of the intervention on the primary outcome, with
179	a time-by-treatment interaction term fitted to assess the proportionality assumption. Logistic
180	regression with generalised estimating equations was used to assess the impact of the intervention on
181	binary outcomes. Interaction terms were fitted to assess effect modification in planned subgroup
182	analyses.

183 Results

Between December 2016 and March 2019, we approached 2,393 potentially eligible TB index
patients, of whom 2,062 were randomised (Figure 1). Characteristics of index cases were balanced
between arms (Table 1). There were 4,459 household contacts identified in the intervention arm and
4,192 in the SOC arm (Table 2).
A total of 974 (94%) and 977 (95%) of households randomised to the intervention and SOC arms,
respectively, took part in final outcome assessments, with vital status information available for 4,242
(95%) and 3,961 (96%) household contacts captured in baseline censuses. In households with
outcome assessments, an additional 119 (intervention) and 171 (SOC) individuals moved into the
household after the baseline census. Supplementary analysis was therefore based on a total of 4,361
household contacts in the intervention arm and 4,132 in the SOC arms, of whom 3,301 (76%), and

195 2,723 (66%) respectively were interviewed directly at the 15 month visit and had both TB and HIV

196 outcomes ascertained.

197

Of households randomised to the intervention arm, 923/1032 (89%) received the intervention, 516
(96%) in Mangaung and 407 (82%) in Capricorn. In the 923 households where the intervention was
provided, a total of 2,993 household contacts consented, and then received the intervention (median 3
per household, IQR: 2-4). The prevalence of microbiologically-confirmed TB among intervention arm
household contacts who provided sputum was 3% (69/2166). Overall, 13% (368/2752) had positive
TST results; 763 initiated TPT.

204

205 The primary outcome, incident TB or death among household contacts present at baseline

enumeration, was similar between the household intervention (93/3230, 3%) and SOC arms (80/2600,

207 3%, hazard ratio [HR]: 0.90, 95% CI: 0.66-1.24, p=0.54, Table 3). There was some evidence that the

208 proportional hazards assumption was violated, with cumulative hazard curves crossing at

approximately the target follow-up time of 15 months (Figure 2). Allowing the hazard ratio to vary,

there was no effect of the intervention either in the first 15 months of follow-up or had their outcome

visit beyond 15 months (HR 1.01, 95% CI: 0.72-1.42, p=0.95 and 0.45, 95% CI: 0.19-1.05, p=0.07,
respectively).

213

Protocol-specified sensitivity analyses for the primary outcome, including those who had entered the
household after the baseline census, and based on only bacteriologically-confirmed cases of TB,
showed similar results (S4 Table). In protocol-specified subgroup analysis (S5 Table), there was no
difference in the composite primary outcome of incident TB or death at either trial site (Mangaung,
HR 1.26, 95% CI: 0.81-1.97; Capricorn, HR: 0.63, 95% CI: 0.40-1.00), but death was lower among
household contacts in Capricorn in the intervention arm compared to the SOC arm (HR: 0.56, 95%)

- 220 CI: 0.32-0.97).
- 221

In the intervention arm, a total of 51/3188 (2%) individuals without TB in the baseline census had an
episode of incident TB, compared to 31/2551 (1%) in the SOC arm. Approximately half of the
individuals diagnosed with incident TB had biological confirmation (45% in the intervention arm,

52% in the SOC arm) and 3 (4%) incident TB diagnoses were diagnosed at the final outcome visit (2

in intervention arm, 1 in SOC arm). Incidence of TB was 1.24 and 0.92 per 100 person-years among

intervention and SOC household contacts, respectively (HR: 1.33, 95% CI: 0.83-2.16, p=0.24).

228

Overall, 69 participants were diagnosed with TB through trial screening: 24 by Xpert alone, 22 by
culture alone, 9 by smear alone and 14 by more than one test. Of 69 diagnosed with TB, by the three
month visit 37 (54%) were successfully referred for, and initiated TB treatment. The median time
between date of sample being taken and patient initiating TB treatment was 3 days (IQR: 0-13), and
was somewhat higher in the intervention arm compared to the control arm (median: 4 days, IQR: 0-28
versus median 3 days, IQR: 0-4, p=0.04).

235

A total of 91 deaths were ascertained among household contacts in the baseline census population,
42/4,242 (1%) in the intervention group and 49/3,961 (1%) in the SOC group. Incidence of mortality

was 0.68 and 0.94 per 100 person-years among intervention arm and SOC household contacts,

239 respectively (HR: 0.72, 95% CI: 0.47-1.10, p=0.13).

240

241 New HIV diagnoses at month-15 occurred with similar frequency in both arms (intervention arm

242 11/3185, 0.4% versus standard arm 22/2543, 0.9%). At the month-15 visit 31 HIV-positive

243 participants in the intervention arm and 11 participants in the SoC arm were not taking ART. Thus,

the prevalence of undiagnosed or untreated HIV at the final visit was comparable between trial arms

245 (both 1%, OR 1.02, 95% CI: 0.64-1.64, p=0.92).

246

A total of 2,271 household contacts seen in person were aged 14 years or younger at the time of the

final visit. Of these, 1,664 (73%) had TST placed (857 in the intervention arm, 807 in the SOC arm),

and 1,645 had the result recorded with 38 (5%) in the intervention arm and 15 (2%) in the SOC arm

testing positive (odds ratio: 2.25, 95% CI: 1.07-4.72, p=0.03). In protocol-specified subgroup analysis

251 (S6 Table), TST positivity was higher in the intervention arm compared to the SoC arm among

252 participants aged  $\geq$ 5 years, but not among participants aged <5 years. At 15-months, of those

assessed, 73% of household contacts in the intervention arm reported having taken 6-months of TPT,

with 14% taking 1 month or less.

#### 256 Discussion

In this trial, a strategy of household contact tracing and intensive screening for TB and HIV did not
affect the composite outcome of incident TB or death and was equivalent to providing clinic referral
letters to TB index patients. Moreover, we found no difference in prevalence of undiagnosed HIV
between arms. A greater proportion of children in the intensive arm had latent TB infection by TST
testing compared to the SOC arm. Overall household tracing and intensive investigation of household
contacts for TB and HIV does not offer sustained benefit beyond the initial screening episode, despite
relatively high rates of detection of prevelant undiagnosed HIV and TB.

264

265 Our trial differs from previous randomised trials of household contact tracing for TB. In the 266 ZAMSTAR Study, conducted in South Africa and Zambia, household contacts received TB symptom 267 screening, followed by sputum smear microscopy if symptomatic, and HIV testing and TPT [11]. 268 There was weak evidence that household interventions reduced TB prevalence and childhood TB 269 transmission. In Uganda, intervention households received HIV testing and linkage to care, and TB 270 symptom screen followed by smear microscopy or Xpert, and with SMS-supported linkage to care 271 [12]. Completion of TB investigation and yield of TB diagnosis were not different between trial arms. 272 In contrast, in a cluster-randomised trial in Vietnam household contacts of TB patients were invited 273 for clinic-based screening, comprising symptom assessment and chest radiography, followed by 274 smear microscopy and culture if positive [10]. In that trial, there was a 2.5-fold increase in TB 275 treatment registrations in the household contact screening arm compared to the passive case detection 276 arm. In a cluster-randomised trial in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, supplementing the WHO DOTS strategy 277 with more intensive interventions for household contacts (symptom screening, chest X-ray, TST) 278 resulted in reductions in TB case notification rates [13].

279

280 Whereas these previous trials limited microbiological investigation to household contacts with a

281 positive symptom screen or abnormal chest x-ray, we evaluated the provision of microbiological

testing on household contacts who could provide a sample, prompted by evidence that a substantial

283 fraction of community members with microbiologically-confirmed TB have minimal or no symptoms

284 [14,15]. We successfully obtained sputum samples from 92% of intervention arm adults  $\geq$ 15 years. 285 Compared to previous studies, which mostly used smear microscopy, we used the more sensitive 286 Xpert platform with MGIT culture for sputum testing, and made a home visit to intervention arm households to prompt linkage to care [24,25]. Despite this, a high percentage of household contacts 287 288 with microbiologically-confirmed TB did not initiate TB treatment, emphasising that new approaches to improving linkage are needed. Our HIV testing strategy intended to identify the anticipated small 289 290 proportion of people with undiagnosed HIV, and link promptly to ART initiation and TPT, thereby 291 reducing the risk of incident TB disease and death.

292

293 Despite achieving high intervention coverage and follow-up, we saw no difference in TB-free survival 294 between arms. There are a number of possible explanations for this. We anticipated that a letter 295 prompting clinic-based screening for household contacts in the SOC arm would be insufficient to 296 achieve satisfactory levels of screening completion and treatment linkage [26]. However, the 297 percentage of household contacts initiating TB treatment was only slightly higher in the intervention 298 arm (1.6%) compared to the SOC arm (1.2%), perhaps reflecting high motivation for TB screening 299 among household contacts receiving letters. It is also possible that in intervention households, TB 300 transmission had already occurred at the time of the intervention. Finally, as the majority of TB 301 transmission is thought to occur outside households, [27] high forces of infection within South African 302 communities may overcome the benefits of interventions targetting households. Indeed, in Capricorn, 303 a relatively low annual TB incidence area (for South Africa), there was a suggestion that the 304 intervention was effective in reducing mortality.

305

306 Our findings suggest that household contact tracing with home visits and intensive screening for TB 307 and HIV is unlikely to be considered for implementation by National TB Programmes in low-308 resourced, high TB burden settings. Although household contact tracing of index TB patients is 309 widely recommended, implementation is often poor due to the substantial resource requirements. Cost 310 studies will be reported separately, but we anticipate resource implications of household visits to be 311 substantial. Conversely, the strategy of providing referral letters for household contacts to take to their

312 local clinics to prompt facility attendance for TB/HIV screening and care is affordable and

313 implementable at scale, but requires further implementation research and evaluation.

314

315 We found that, in the intervention arm, prevalence of latent TB (defined by TST) was 13%,

316 comparable to previous household contact tracing studies from the region [26], and with strong age-

and site-specific dependency [28]. At 15-months, TST positivity in children was higher in the

318 intervention arm than the SOC arm. One possible explanation is differential rates of acceptance of

319 TST between the intervention and SOC arms by site: in the intervention arm in Mangaung,

320 completion of TST was 77% compared to 55% in Capricorn; in the SOC arm, completion was 84% at

both sites. We did not record data on reasons for refusal of the TST but it may be that those with a

322 strong response previously were reluctant to be retested: in Capricorn, children who had baseline TST

done were less likely to have the month-15 TST done (baseline TST done: 214/485, 44% vs. baseline

**324** TST not done: 167/205, 81%).

325

326 The study had several limitations. The planned sample size was reduced due to budget constraints; 327 follow-up time in 14% of households was reduced in anticipation of South African COVID-19 328 pandemic-related lockdown (S7 Checklist) [29]. The study was at a time when South African 329 preventive treatment guidelines were in flux, initially requiring a positive TST to initiate TPT and 330 with restrictions on people who could receive TPT. This likely reduced the proportion of HIV-331 negative individuals older than five years who continued TPT beyond the initial study-dispensed 332 month. Not all households allocated to the intervention arm received interventions, mainly due to 333 difficulties locating households.

334

In conclusion, an intensive household contact tracing and TB/HIV screening intervention did not
reduce incident TB or death when compared to a referral letter intervention. TB programme managers
and policy makers should carefully consider benefits and costs before implementing similar
household contact tracing and TB screening interventions. The provision of referral letters to index

- patients at the time of their TB diagnosis should be the preferred strategy to link household contacts to
- 340 care in low-resourced high-TB burden settings.
- 341

## 342 Funding

- 343 This work was supported by the UK/South Africa Medical Research Council Newton Fund
- 344 (006Newton TB) and Wellcome (200901/Z/16/Z to PM). For the purpose of open access, the authors
- 345 have applied a CC-BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising
- 346 from this submission.
- 347

## 348 Acknowledgements

- 349 We acknowledge the expert oversight and advice from the members of the Data and Safety
- 350 Monitoring Board (Derek Sloan, Yunus Moosa, and Locadiah Kuwanda).

351

#### 353 References

354

- Grzybowski S, Barnett GD, Styblo K. Contacts of cases of active pulmonary tuberculosis. Bull Int
   Union Tuberc 1975; 50:90–106.
- 357 2. Rieder HL. Contacts of tuberculosis patients in high-incidence countries. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis
  358 2003; 7:S333-336.
- 359 3. World Health Organization. Systematic screening for active tuberculosis: principles and
  360 recommendations. 2013. Available at: https://www.who.int/tb/tbscreening/en/. Accessed 6
  361 December 2019.
- 4. Velen K, Shingde RV, Ho J, Fox GJ. The effectiveness of contact investigation among contacts of
  tuberculosis patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur Respir J 2021;
- 364 5. Little KM, Msandiwa R, Martinson N, Golub J, Chaisson R, Dowdy D. Yield of household contact
  365 tracing for tuberculosis in rural South Africa. BMC Infectious Diseases 2018; 18:299.
- 366 6. Claassens M, van Schalkwyk C, den Haan L, et al. High prevalence of tuberculosis and insufficient
  367 case detection in two communities in the Western Cape, South Africa. PLoS One 2013;
  368 8:e58689.
- 369 7. World Health Organization. Global Tuberculosis Report 2021. Geneva: 2021. Available at:

370 https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-programme/tb-reports. Accessed 20 October
371 2021.

- 8. Soko RN, Burke RM, Feasey HRA, et al. Effects of Coronavirus Disease Pandemic on
  Tuberculosis Notifications, Malawi. Emerg Infect Dis 2021; 27:1831–1839.
- 9. Inzaule SC, Ondoa P, Loembe MM, Tebeje YK, Ouma AEO, Nkengasong JN. COVID-19 and
- 375 indirect health implications in Africa: Impact, mitigation measures, and lessons learned for
- 376 improved disease control. PLOS Medicine 2021; 18:e1003666. Available at:

- 377 https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1003666. Accessed 29
  378 August 2021.
- 379 10. Fox GJ, Nhung NV, Sy DN, et al. Household-Contact Investigation for Detection of
  380 Tuberculosis in Vietnam. New England Journal of Medicine 2018; 378:221–229.
- 381 11. Ayles H, Muyoyeta M, Du Toit E, et al. Effect of household and community interventions on
- the burden of tuberculosis in southern Africa: the ZAMSTAR community-randomised trial.
  Lancet 2013; 382:1183–94.
- 384 12. Davis JL, Turimumahoro P, Meyer AJ, et al. Home-based tuberculosis contact investigation in
- 385 Uganda: a household randomised trial. ERJ Open Res 2019; 5. Available at:
- 386 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6661318/. Accessed 4 January 2021.
- 387 13. Cavalcante SC, Durovni B, Barnes GL, et al. Community-randomized trial of enhanced DOTS
  388 for tuberculosis control in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2010; 14:203–209.
- 389 14. Frascella B, Richards AS, Sossen B, et al. Subclinical tuberculosis disease a review and
- analysis of prevalence surveys to inform definitions, burden, associations and screening
- 391 methodology. Clin Infect Dis Available at: https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-
- **392** article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1402/5906549. Accessed 29 September 2020.
- 393 15. Dowdy DW, Basu S, Andrews JR. Is passive diagnosis enough? The impact of subclinical
  394 disease on diagnostic strategies for tuberculosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2013; 187:543–
  395 551.
- 16. TEMPRANO ANRS 12136 Study Group, Danel C, Moh R, et al. A Trial of Early
- Antiretrovirals and Isoniazid Preventive Therapy in Africa. N Engl J Med **2015**; 373:808–822.
- **398** 17. The INSIGHT START Study Group. Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy in Early
- Asymptomatic HIV Infection. New England Journal of Medicine 2015; 373:795–807.

- 400 18. Ross JM, Badje A, Rangaka MX, et al. Isoniazid preventive therapy plus antiretroviral therapy
- 401 for the prevention of tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual
- 402 participant data. Lancet HIV 2021; 8:e8–e15.
- 403 19. MacPherson P, Webb EL, Variava E, et al. Intensified household contact tracing, prevention and
- 404 treatment support versus enhanced standard of care for contacts of tuberculosis cases in South
- 405 Africa: study protocol for a household cluster-randomised trial. BMC Infect Dis 2019; 19:839.
- 406 20. Massyn N, Barron P, Day C, Ndlovu N, Padarath A. District Health Barometer 2018/19.
  407 Durban: Health Systems Trust, 2020.
- 408 21. National Department of Health, NICD. The 2017 National Antenatal Sentinel HIV Survey,
  409 South Africa. 2017.
- 410 22. National Department of Health, NICD. The 2015 National Antenatal Sentinel HIV & Syphilis
  411 Survey, South Africa. 2019.
- 412 23. Sokal JE. Editorial: Measurement of delayed skin-test responses. N Engl J Med 1975; 293:501–
  413 502.
- 414 24. Naidoo P, Theron G, Rangaka MX, et al. The South African Tuberculosis Care Cascade:
  415 Estimated Losses and Methodological Challenges. J Infect Dis 2017; 216:S702–S713.
- 416 25. Shapiro AE, Variava E, Rakgokong MH, et al. Community-based targeted case finding for
- 417 tuberculosis and HIV in household contacts of patients with tuberculosis in South Africa. Am J
- 418 Respir Crit Care Med 2012; 185:1110–6.
- 419 26. Fox GJ, Barry SE, Britton WJ, Marks GB. Contact investigation for tuberculosis: a systematic
  420 review and meta-analysis. Eur Respir J 2013; 41:140–156.
- 421 27. Yates TA, Khan PY, Knight GM, et al. The transmission of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in high
  422 burden settings. Lancet Infect Dis 2016; 16:227–238.

423	28.	MacPherson P.	Lebina L	Motsomi K	et al. Prevalence	and risk factors	for latent tuberculosis
120	20.	much nerson r	, Leonia L		, or an 110 anomo	und more increase	

- 424 infection among household contacts of index cases in two South African provinces: Analysis of
- 425 baseline data from a cluster-randomised trial. PLoS ONE **2020**; 15:e0230376.
- 426 29. Orkin AM, Gill PJ, Ghersi D, et al. Guidelines for Reporting Trial Protocols and Completed
- 427 Trials Modified Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and Other Extenuating Circumstances: The
- 428 CONSERVE 2021 Statement. JAMA 2021; 326:257–265.

429

#### 431 Table 1: Characteristics of index patients randomised, by site and trial arm

	St	udy site	Tria	l arm
Characteristic	Mangaung	Capricorn (n=988)	Standard of care	Intervention
	(n=1074)		(n=1030)	(n=1032)
Age (years), median (IQR)	37 (28, 48)	38 (29, 48)	37 (28, 48)	37 (28, 48)
Age group (years)				
<8	19 (2%)	26 (3%)	25 (2%)	20 (2%)
8-14	9 (1%)	11 (1%)	14 (1%)	6 (1%)
15-19	55 (5%)	36 (4%)	48 (5%)	43 (4%)
20-29	249 (23%)	179 (18%)	211 (20%)	217 (21%)
30-39	323 (30%)	337 (34%)	325 (32%)	335 (32%)
40-49	191 (18%)	209 (21%)	200 (19%)	200 (19%)
50+	228 (21%)	190 (19%)	207 (20%)	211 (20%)
Sex, male	666 (62%)	573 (58%)	618 (60%)	621 (60%)
Employment				
Currently employed	254 (24%)	113 (11%)	179 (17%)	188 (18%)
Not employed	715 (67%)	679 (69%)	712 (69%)	682 (66%)
Student/child	81 (8%)	93 (9%)	86 (8%)	88 (9%)
Other	24 (2%)	103 (10%)	53 (5%)	74 (7%)
Income type				
Salary	216 (20%)	136 (14%)	162 (16%)	190 (18%)
Wage	70 (7%)	41 (4%)	50 (5%)	61 (6%)
Grant	235 (22%)	215 (22%)	226 (22%)	224 (22%)
No income	553 (51%)	596 (60%)	592 (57%)	557 (54%)
Sputum Xpert				
Positive	1053 (98%)	849 (86%)	952 (92%)	950 (92%)
Negative	3 (0.3%)	14 (1%)	6 (1%)	11 (1%)
Not done	18 (2%)	125 (13%)	72 (7%)	71 (7%)
Sputum smear				
Positive	11 (1%)	295 (30%)	148 (14%)	158 (15%)
Negative	8 (1%)	52 (5%)	32 (3%)	28 (3%)
Not done	1055 (98%)	641 (65%)	850 (83%)	846 (82%)
Sputum culture				
Positive	0 (0%)	59 (6%)	22 (2%)	37 (4%)
Negative	4 (0.4%)	6 (1%)	7 (1%)	3 (0.3%)
Not done	1070 (99.6%)	923 (93%)	1001 (97%)	992 (96%)
TB diagnosis				
Microbiologically confirmed	1054 (98%)	939 (95%)	990 (96%)	1003 (97%)
Not microbiologically confirmed	20 (2%)	49 (5%)	40 (4%)	29 (3%)
HIV status (self-reported)				
Positive	590 (55%)	521 (53%)	555 (54%)	556 (54%)
Negative	421 (39%)	442 (45%)	434 (42%)	429 (42%)
Unknown	63 (6%)	25 (3%)	41 (4%)	47 (5%)
On ART				
Yes	345 (58%)	381 (73%)	364 (66%)	362 (65%)
No	245 (42%)	140 (27%)	191 (34%)	194 (35%)
<b>BMI</b> (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), mean (SD)	19 (5)	20 (5)	19 (5)	20 (5)
Karnofsky score, median (IQR)	80 (70, 90)	80 (70, 95)	80 (70, 90)	80 (70, 90)
Smoking (among 15+ years old)				
Current	254 (24%)	113 (12%)	176 (18%)	191 (19%)
Previous	268 (26%)	216 (23%)	238 (24%)	246 (24%)
Never	524 (50%)	622 (65%)	577 (58%)	569 (57%)
Alcohol use (among 15+ years old)	340 (33%)	223 (24%)	263 (27%)	300 (30%)

432 IQR: Interquartile range, TB: tuberculosis, HIV: human immunodeficiency virus, ART: antiretroviral therapy, BMI: body

433 mass index.

434 Karnofsky score is a measure of participants' ability to undertake activities of daily living, and ranges from 0 (dead), to 100

435 (normal; no complaints; no evidence of disease).

#### 437 Table 2: Characteristics of baseline household contacts of index patients, by site and 438 trial arm

	Si	ite	Trial	arm
Characteristic	Mangaung	Capricorn	Standard of care	Intervention
	(n=4,202)	(n=4,386)	(n=4,129)	(n=4,459)
Age (years), median (IQR)	19 (9, 38)	19 (9, 36)	19 (9, 37)	19 (9, 37)
Sex, male	1,778 (42%)	1,913 (44%)	1,812 (44%)	1,879 (42%)
Relationship to index case				
Spouse	363 (9%)	258 (6%)	288 (7%)	333 (7%)
Child	1,129 (27%)	1,035 (24%)	1,066 (26%)	1,098 (25%)
Sibling	682 (16%)	919 (21%)	752 (18%)	849 (19%)
Parent/parent-in-law	439 (10%)	509 (12%)	475 (11%)	473 (11%)
Grandparent	165 (4%)	101 (2%)	140 (3%)	126 (3%)
Grandchild	390 (9%)	357 (8%)	363 (9%)	384 (9%)
Other	1,034 (25%)	1,207 (28%)	1,045 (25%)	1,196 (27%)
Joined household, past 15 months	398 (9%)	144 (3%)	279 (7%)	263 (6%)
Has TB symptoms	567 (14%)	406 (9%)	453 (11%)	520 (12%)
If TB symptoms, on treatment	31 (5%)	36 (9%)	40 (9%)	27 (5%)
On ART		* *	. ,	. ,
Yes	354 (8%)	142 (3%)	206 (5%)	290 (7%)
No	3,783 (90%)	4,194 (96%)	3,861 (94%)	4,116 (92%)
Don't know	60 (1%)	42 (1%)	53 (1%)	49 (1%)

439 <sup>1</sup>Missing values: age (n=30), entered household in past 15 months (n=17), TB symptoms (n=39), ART (n=13) 440

#### 442 Table 3: Effect of intervention versus standard of care on trial outcomes, among

#### 443 household contacts who were present at baseline list of household contacts

Outcome	Standard of care	Household Intervention	
Primary outcome			Hazard ratio (95% CI)
Contacts diagnosed with TB	31/2551 (1.2%)	51/3188 (1.6%)	1.33 (0.83, 2.16)
Contact deaths	49/3961 (1.2%)	42/4242 (1.0%)	0.72 (0.47, 1.10)
TB or death	80/2600 (3.1%)	93/3230 (2.9%)	0.90 (0.66, 1.24)
Secondary outcomes			Odds ratio (95% CI)
Prevalence of TST positivity ( $\geq 10$ mm) among children $\leq 14$ years	15/800 (1.9%)	38/845 (4.5%)	2.25 (1.07, 4.72)
Prevalence of undiagnosed or untreated HIV infection	32/2543 (1.3%)	41/3185 (1.3%)	1.02 (0.64, 1.64)

444 Hazard ratios and odds ratios were calculated with the standard of care arm as the reference group; intracluster

445 correlation coefficients (ICC) were TB (0.04), death (0.004), TB or death (0.02), TST positivity (0.86),

undiagnosied/untreated HIV (0.08) 446

#### 448 Figure 1: Consort Diagram of Cluster Randomised Trial



- 453 Figure 2: Cumulative hazard of incident TB or death among household contacts of TB patients by trial arm
- 454

455





458 A: Primary trial outcome of incident TB diagnosis or death between months 1 and 15. Inset: y-axis truncated to show range of data; B) Incident TB diagnosis 459 between months 1 and 15. Inset: y-axis truncated to show range of data; C) Mortality between months 1 and 15. Inset: y-axis truncated to show range of data.

## Supplemental material

- S1 Protocol: Study protocol (version 5)
- S2 Questionnaires: Study questionnaires
- S3 Checklist: CONSORT extension for cluster randomised trials checklist
- S4 Table: Effect of intervention versus standard of care on primary trial outcome, sensitivity analyses
- S5 Table: Subgroup analyses of primary and secondary outcomes by study site
- S6 Table: Subgroup analyses of prevalence of TST positivity, by age of child
- S7 Checklist: CONSERVE- CONSORT Checklist