

# 1 **Diagnostic accuracy of chest ultrasound scan in the diagnosis** 2 **of childhood tuberculosis**

3 Geoffrey Erem<sup>1,2 $\alpha$ \*</sup>, Caroline Otike<sup>3 $\alpha$</sup> , Maxwell Okuja<sup>1 $\beta$</sup> , Faith Ameda<sup>1 $\alpha$</sup> , Dorothy Irene  
4 Nalyweyiso<sup>4 $\beta$</sup> , Aloysius Gonzaga Mubuuke<sup>1 $\alpha$</sup>  and Michael Kakinda<sup>3 $\alpha$</sup> .

5 1- Department of Radiology, School of Medicine, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

6 2- Department of Radiology, St Francis Hospital Nsambya, Kampala, Uganda

7 3- Directorate of Clinical Services, Joint Clinical Research Center, Kampala, Uganda

8 4- Department of Radiology, Mulago National Referral Hospital, Kampala, Uganda

9 \* – corresponding author,

10 Email: [dreremgeoffrey@gmail.com](mailto:dreremgeoffrey@gmail.com)

11

12

13  <sup>$\alpha$</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

14  <sup>$\beta$</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

15

16

17

18

## 19 **Abstract**

20 Chest Ultrasound Scan (CUS) has been utilized in place of CXR in the diagnosis of adult  
21 pneumonia with similar or higher sensitivity and specificity to CXR. However, there is a paucity  
22 of data on the use of CUS for the diagnosis of childhood TB. This study aimed to determine the  
23 diagnostic accuracy of CUS for childhood TB.

24 This cross-sectional study was conducted at the Mulago National Referral Hospital in Uganda.  
25 Eighty children up to 14 years of age with presumptive TB were enrolled. They all had CUS and  
26 CXR performed and interpreted independently by radiologists. The radiologist who performed the  
27 CXR was blinded to the CUS findings, and vice versa. Radiologists noted whether TB was likely  
28 or unlikely. A two-by-two table was developed to compare the absolute number of children as  
29 either TB likely or TB unlikely on CXR or CUS. This was used to calculate the sensitivity and  
30 specificity of CUS when screening for TB in children, with a correction to accommodate the use  
31 of CXR as a reference test.

32 The sensitivity of CUS was 64% (95% CI 48.5%-77.3%), while its specificity was 42.7% (95%  
33 CI 25.5%-60.8%). Both the CUS and CXR found 29 children with a likelihood of TB, and 27  
34 children unlikely to have TB.

35 CUS met the sensitivity target set by the WHO TPP for Triage, and it had a sensitivity and  
36 specificity comparable to that of CXR.

37

## 38 **Introduction**

39 Globally, of the estimated 1.1 million children who develop TB annually, only around 399,000  
40 (36.5%) are notified to the National TB Programs (NTPs) [1]. The remaining patients are either  
41 not reported or never diagnosed. TB in children is underdiagnosed mainly because the signs and  
42 symptoms of TB in children, namely fever, cough, night sweats, weight loss or poor weight gain,  
43 visible neck swelling, and reduced activity, are not extremely specific and tend to overlap with  
44 other common pediatric conditions, such as pneumonia, HIV-associated lung disease, and  
45 malnutrition [2].

46 This is further complicated by the inability to confirm the disease, especially in younger children  
47 who cannot voluntarily expectorate sputum, which is the standard specimen used to confirm the  
48 disease. Therefore, invasive methods, such as gastric aspiration and sputum induction, have been  
49 used [3]. When a sample is obtained, the paucibacillary nature (low bacterial load) of sputum in  
50 children compromises the diagnostic yield [4]. Hence, CXR is often used alongside clinical  
51 symptoms to make a presumptive diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis (PTB) in the absence of  
52 bacteriological confirmation [5].

53 Despite the proven utility of CXR, their hardware is expensive, with limited availability and  
54 accessibility in many low-resource settings with a high TB burden [6]. Owing to the scarcity of  
55 both equipment and skilled radiological staff to operate and interpret the images, the WHO recently  
56 recommended the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-assisted interpretation of radiographs, which  
57 would potentially reduce the requirement of skilled staff [7]. Despite this, however, AI is still  
58 underdeveloped in low-resource settings due to the high costs involved, and yet these settings have  
59 a high TB burden in children.

60 By contrast, Chest Ultrasound Scan (CUS) equipment is relatively inexpensive, portable, and  
61 accessible, does not use ionizing radiation, and may not require radiological staff [8,9]. This is  
62 because health workers can be trained to perform basic point-of-care chest ultrasonography  
63 (POCUS) to aid in the diagnosis of TB. Ultrasound has been previously used to diagnose several  
64 diseases in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [10], notably with the focused assessment  
65 with sonography for HIV-associated extra-pulmonary TB (FASH) protocol [11,12]. CUS has also  
66 been successfully used in the diagnosis of adult pneumonia with a previous meta-analysis  
67 suggesting that it had similar or higher sensitivity and specificity to CXR [13-15]. Some studies  
68 on the use of CUS for the diagnosis of childhood TB have been conducted in high-income settings.  
69 However, there is a paucity of data on the use of CUS to diagnose TB among children in low-  
70 resource settings, which even have a higher TB burden when compared to high-income settings.  
71 The purpose of this study, therefore, was to determine the diagnostic accuracy of CUS in  
72 diagnosing TB in children using CXR as a reference test.

## 73 **Methods and methods**

### 74 **Study design and settings**

75 This cross-sectional study was conducted at the Acute Care Unit (Pediatric Medical Emergency  
76 Ward), Ward 16C (Pediatric Respiratory Ward), Ward 11 (Infectious Diseases and Neonatology  
77 Ward), and the Malnutrition Unit (*Mwanamugimu*) at Mulago National Referral Hospital in  
78 Kampala, Uganda, East Africa. This study was conducted between December 2020 and May 2021.  
79 These wards are the main diagnostic and treatment units for pediatric tuberculosis at the Mulago  
80 National Referral Hospital. On average, 12 children were diagnosed with TB monthly [16]. These  
81 children were diagnosed based on the clinical signs and symptoms, with a review of a CXR if

82 available, and Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra testing if a sputum sample could be obtained according to the  
83 national guidelines [17].

## 84 **Study population**

85 This study was conducted among children aged 0-14 years with cough for more than 2 weeks weeks  
86 and the following symptoms: weight loss or failure to thrive over the last three months, persistent  
87 fever for >2 weeks not responding to anti-malarial treatment and having been in contact with  
88 someone with confirmed Pulmonary Tuberculosis (PTB). Children were excluded from the study  
89 if they were already on TB treatment or TB prophylaxis for > 72 hours. Respondents were enrolled  
90 using simple random sampling in preselected wards. All the study participants were de-identified  
91 and given unique study numbers.

## 92 **Sample size estimation**

93 To determine the diagnostic accuracy of CUS in Pediatric TB. The formula for the sample size for  
94 diagnostic accuracy is as follows:

$$95 \quad N = \frac{Z^2_{\alpha/2} S_N (1 - S_N)}{d^2 \times prevalence}$$

96  $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$ , the standard normal value corresponding to a 5% level of significance

97  $S_N = 0.76$ , Assuming a sensitivity of Chest Ultrasound in the detection of TB of 76%.

98  $d = 0.1$ , precision

99  $P = 0.89$ , Prevalence of pulmonary TB among children under 15 (18)

100 We get a sample size of  $N=80$  participants.

101 A sample size of 80 participants was considered in this.

## 102 **Measurements of variables**

103 All study respondents had a CUS and a CXR. CXR was used as the reference test. They were  
104 independently interpreted by two radiologists, and if there was a discrepancy, a third radiologist  
105 was used as a tiebreaker. The radiologists who performed the chest ultrasound scans were blinded  
106 to the chest radiograph findings.

## 107 **Detecting TB using CUS**

108 A portable, low-cost, greyscale ultrasound machine (Edan, Model U60) with a bandwidth of 5.0  
109 to 10.0 MHz linear probes was used to scan the chest of the children in this study. The study  
110 radiologist was responsible for methodologically scanning all study children. The younger children  
111 were scanned from the mother or caretaker's lap and the older children were scanned in the sitting  
112 position to examine the lungs and pleura. The chest was divided into ten regions namely: left and  
113 right, supramammary, inframammary, lateral, suprascapular, and infrascapular. All regions were  
114 scanned in longitudinal and transverse (intercostal) planes. Mediastinal ultrasound was performed  
115 through the suprasternal notch. The child was placed in the supine position with the neck slightly  
116 extended to improve access to the suprasternal notch, and transverse and oblique views were  
117 obtained. All the cine clips were saved.

118 On CUS, the radiologist looked out for pleural effusions, an increased pleural gap, an interrupted  
119 pleural line, greater than 3-B lines, lymph nodes, consolidation, pericardial effusion, and any other  
120 relevant findings. Radiologists performing ultrasonography recorded the findings in a standardized  
121 form. Eventually noting if TB was likely or unlikely.

## 122 **Reference test-CXR**

123 CXR was used as a reference test. To ensure the highest achievable quality of CXR reports, the  
124 posterior-anterior or anteroposterior views for younger children and lateral CXRs were  
125 independently reviewed by the study radiologists reporting on a standardized record sheet for  
126 consolidations, nodular opacities, hilar or paratracheal nodes, pleural effusion, and radiological  
127 diagnosis of TB likely or unlikely.

128 In cases of disagreement regarding the final diagnosis, a third radiologist was used as the tie-  
129 breaker. All the images were digitally achieved.

## 130 **Data analysis**

131 Study characteristics were summarized using mean and standard deviation (SD) for normally  
132 distributed numerical data and median with interquartile range (IQR) for non-normally distributed  
133 numerical data. Categorical data are summarized using frequencies and proportions.

134 A two-by-two table was developed to compare the absolute numbers of study participants who  
135 were identified as likely to have TB on both the CUS and CXR. Those unlikely to have TB on  
136 both CUS and CXR and those that were likely to have TB on CUS but not CXR, and vice versa.

137 The sensitivity and specificity of CUS for diagnosing TB in children were calculated using CXR  
138 as a reference test. The sensitivity and specificity of ultrasound scans for diagnosing TB in children  
139 were corrected using the Staquet et al correction method below (19)

$$140 \text{ CUS } S_n = \frac{eS_n\text{CXR} + b(1-S_p\text{CXR})}{eS_n\text{CXR} + f(1-S_p\text{CXR})} \quad (19)$$

$$141 \quad eS_n\text{CXR} + f(1-S_p\text{CXR})$$

142  $CUS Sp = \frac{c(1-Sn)CXR + dSpCXR}{e(1-Sn)CXR + fSpCXR}$  (19)

143

144 Where  $S_n$ =Sensitivity

145  $S_p$ =Specificity

146 And a, b, c, d, e, and f are defined in the table below.

	CXR		
CUS	TB Likely	TB Unlikely	Total
TB Likely	A	b	a+b=g
TB Unlikely	C	d	c+d=h
Total	a+c = e	b+d =f	a+b+c+d=N

147 **Ethical considerations**

148 This study was approved by the Makerere University School of Medicine Research Ethics  
149 Committee (REC REF 2020-138). Informed parental/caregiver consent was obtained for all  
150 children below 8 years of age, while informed parental consent and child assent were obtained for  
151 all children above 8 years of age, in line with ethical research guidelines in Uganda. The study was  
152 conducted following the relevant guidelines and regulations of the Declaration of Helsinki. There  
153 was confidentiality regarding the medical information collected. The CXR and CUS investigations  
154 performed were already part of the routine standard of care.



## 155 **Results**

### 156 **Patient characteristics**

157 Table 1 presents the characteristics of the study participants. Eighty children underwent CUS and  
158 CXR examination (See Fig 1); of these, 42 (52.5%) were male. Their mean age in months was  
159 42.9 (1-144). Most of the children (50.0% (40/80)) were between the ages of 1 and <5 years, with  
160 21.3% (17/80) being less than one year. In contrast, 15.0% (12/80) and 13.7% (11/80) were aged  
161 5–< 10 years and 10–15 years, respectively.

162 CUS found that 61.3% (49/80) of the children were likely to have TB with a mean age of 48.2 (2-  
163 144) months compared to 34.5 (1-144) months for those who were found unlikely to have TB on  
164 CUS. More females (57.1% (28/49)) were likely to have TB on CUS. Those unlikely to have TB  
165 on CUS were mostly male (67.7%, 21/31).

166 On CXR, 41.3% (33/80) of patients were likely to have TB. Their mean age in months was 39.8  
167 (3-144) compared to 45.0 (1-144) for those unlikely to have TB. Among those likely to have TB  
168 on CXR, there was an equal distribution among males (48.5% (16/33)) and females (51.5%  
169 (17/33)). Those unlikely to have TB on CXR were more likely to be male (61.9% (26/47)).

170

171

172

173


174

175

176

177

178 **Fig 1:** Follow Diagram for the Diagnostic Accuracy of Chest Ultrasound Scan in Diagnosis of Childhood TB



### 193 **Diagnostic accuracy of CUS in the diagnosis of childhood TB**

194 Table 2 shows a two-by-two table with children who were either likely to have TB or unlikely to  
195 have TB on CUS or CXR. The CUS agreed with the CXR that twenty-nine children were likely to

196 have TB while twenty-seven children were unlikely to have TB. However, there was a  
197 disagreement between the two modalities whereby twenty-four children with CXR found four  
198 children with a likelihood of having TB, but CUS disagreed. While CUS identified 20 children  
199 with a likelihood of TB, CXR did not. Using this information, we corrected for an imperfect  
200 reference standard. The sensitivity of CUS was 64% (95% CI 48.5%-77.3%). The specificity was  
201 42.7% (95% CI 25.5% -60.8%).

## 202 **Discussion**

203 This study aimed to determine the diagnostic accuracy of CUS when screening for Childhood TB.  
204 The sensitivity of CUS was 64% (95% CI 48.5%-77.3%), while its specificity was 42.7% (95%  
205 CI 25.5%-60.8%).

206 The CUS had a sensitivity of 64% (95% CI 48.5%-77.3%) and a specificity of 42.7% (95% CI  
207 25.5% -60.8%). The sensitivity and specificity of CUS are comparable to those of CXR  
208 ((Sensitivity-67% & Specificity-48%) [20,21]. Ultrasound scanning devices are relatively  
209 inexpensive, portable, more accessible, and do not result in exposure to ionizing radiation (6). We  
210 recommend screening for childhood TB using CUS as an alternative to CXR.

211 CUS meets the 66% (60%-77%) minimum requirement set for the sensitivity of a target product  
212 profile (TPP) for a triage tool. But its specificity (42.7%) falls short [22]. However, a CUS is a  
213 point-of-care test with a turnaround turn of 6 minutes compared to the 2.3 days for CXR [9]. We  
214 recommend adopting CUS as a triage or screening tool for TB, where those with suggestive  
215 features go ahead to have a confirmatory test. This is very important in low-resource settings where  
216 a CXR is not easily accessible, especially in remote areas, where ultrasound equipment is available.  
217 Thus, ultrasound is an invaluable initial investigative modality to aid patient management.

218 This study had several strengths. We used CXR as a reference standard, which is the most common  
219 imaging technique for the diagnosis of PTB, especially in low-resource settings, and few studies  
220 of a similar nature have been conducted from low-resource settings, yet these settings have a high  
221 burden of childhood TB. Thus, this study presents the diagnostic accuracy of CUS in this context.  
222 The CXR is not a gold standard for the diagnosis of PTB and has many limitations with wide  
223 interobserver variability in interpretation [9]. However, the use of CXR may be useful to  
224 investigate which tool is better to use as a first-line imaging modality for the diagnosis of PTB.

225 In this study, it was observed that CUS had comparable sensitivity to CXR in diagnosing childhood  
226 TB. This study was conducted in a low-resource setting with a high burden of TB and HIV, a  
227 situation similar to many other low-resource settings in LMICs. Therefore, there is a need to adopt  
228 the routine use of CUS in such children as a form of screening investigation to identify children  
229 who may need further investigation or those who need immediate clinical management. The  
230 significance of CUS is amplified by the fact that ultrasound equipment is relatively accessible in  
231 many remote settings and many health workers have been trained to use the equipment. Therefore,  
232 using CUS in these children would not only quicken clinical management, but also reduce  
233 unnecessary expenditure for referring patients to tertiary hospitals, yet they would easily have been  
234 managed. Many LMICs can thus utilize the findings from this study to think of adopting the use  
235 of CUS as a preliminary investigation for children with presumed PTB.

236 Our study did have some limitations. CUS is supposed to be a point-of-care bedside diagnostic  
237 test; however, in our study, CUS was performed by a radiologist. This was mainly because there  
238 is limited expertise in performing ultrasound scans among clinicians, but the next logical step  
239 would be to train clinicians and compare their performance with that of radiologists. Indeed, in  
240 many countries, point-of-care chest ultrasound is performed by non-imaging healthcare workers.

241 In this study, we did not confirm the disease in children found to have TB on CUS. However, there  
242 is no perfect gold standard for the diagnosis of TB, Culture, which is supposed to be the “gold  
243 standard” despite having good specificity, has a sensitivity of only 60% (95% CI 46%-76%) [23].  
244 Therefore, this study contributes to the validation process of using CUS in diagnosing childhood  
245 TB and provides a basis upon which many other studies can be conducted.

## 246 **Conclusion**

247 The sensitivity and specificity of the CUS were 64% and 42.7%, respectively. CUS has a  
248 sensitivity and specificity comparable to that of CXR but has other advantages such as not  
249 exposing children to ionizing radiation. Unlike CXR, CUS can also be performed at the bedside  
250 by any attending health worker if trained. Since ultrasound is also widely available and relatively  
251 more accessible in low-resource settings, we recommend the use of CUS as a first-line imaging  
252 modality in children with presumptive TB in settings where access to other imaging techniques is  
253 limited.

## 254 **Declarations**

255 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** This study was approved by  
256 the Makerere University School of Medicine Research Ethics Committee (REC REF 2020-138).  
257 Informed parental/caregiver consent was obtained for all children below 8 years of age, while  
258 informed parental consent and child assent were obtained for all children above 8 years of age, in  
259 line with ethical research guidelines in Uganda. The study was conducted following the relevant  
260 guidelines and regulations of the Declaration of Helsinki. There was confidentiality regarding the

261 medical information collected. The CXR and CUS investigations performed were already part of  
262 the routine standard of care.

263 **Consent for publication:** N/A

264 **Availability of data and materials:** All data and materials are available in this  
265 document.

266 **Competing interests:** None

267 **Funding:** This study is self-funded.

268 **Authors' contributions:** GE, CO, FA, AGM and MK: conceptualized, concept  
269 development, proposal writing, data collection, data analysis and final report writing. DIN:  
270 Concept development, proposal writing, data analysis and final report writing: MO proposal  
271 writing, data collection, data analysis and final report writing.

272 **Acknowledgements:** I would also like to thank my TEAM members for all the  
273 tremendous contribution towards this work. Our gratitude to the staff of the department of  
274 Radiology at Mulago National Referral hospital for offering the conducive environment to conduct  
275 this study. Our final gratitude goes to our research participants, the children without which this  
276 study would not have been possible together with their parents or caretakers.

## 277 **References**

- 278 1. WHO. WHO consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis. Module 5: management of  
279 tuberculosis in children and adolescents. Geneva. 2022.
- 280 2. Vonasek B, Ness T, Takwoingi Y, Kay AW, van Wyk SS, Ouellette L, et al. Screening  
281 tests for active pulmonary tuberculosis in children. Cochrane Database of Systematic  
282 Reviews. 2021(6).
- 283 3. Graham SM, Cuevas LE, Jean-Philippe P, Browning R, Casenghi M, Detjen AK, et al.  
284 Clinical Case Definitions for Classification of Intrathoracic Tuberculosis in Children: An  
285 Update. Clin Infect Dis. 2015;61Suppl 3(Suppl 3):S179-87.
- 286 4. Dunn JJ, Starke JR, Revell PA. Laboratory Diagnosis of Mycobacterium tuberculosis  
287 Infection and Disease in Children. J Clin Microbiol. 2016;54(6):1434-41.
- 288 5. WHO. Chest radiography in tuberculosis detection—summary of current WHO  
289 recommendations and guidance on programmatic approaches. 2016.
- 290 6. Bigio J, Kohli M, Klinton JS, MacLean E, Gore G, Small PM, et al. Diagnostic accuracy  
291 of point-of-care ultrasound for pulmonary tuberculosis: A systematic review. PLoS One.  
292 2021;16(5):e0251236.
- 293 7. WHO. Rapid communication on systematic screening for tuberculosis. Geneva: World  
294 Health Organization; 2020.

- 295 8. Montuori M, Casella F, Casazza G, Franzetti F, Pini P, Invernizzi C, et al. Lung  
296 ultrasonography in pulmonary tuberculosis: A pilot study on diagnostic accuracy in a high-  
297 risk population. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2019;66:29-34.
- 298 9. Heuvelings CC, B elard S, Andronikou S, Lederman H, Moodley H, Grobusch MP, et al.  
299 Chest ultrasound compared to chest X-ray for pediatric pulmonary tuberculosis. *Pediatr*  
300 *Pulmonol.* 2019;54(12):1914-20.
- 301 10. Tran TT, Hlaing M, Krause M. Point-of-Care Ultrasound: Applications in Low- and  
302 Middle-Income Countries. *Curr Anesthesiol Rep.* 2021;11(1):69-75.
- 303 11. Van Hoving DJ, Griesel R, Meintjes G, Takwoingi Y, Maartens G, Ochodo EA. Abdominal  
304 ultrasound for diagnosing abdominal tuberculosis or disseminated tuberculosis with  
305 abdominal involvement in HIV-positive individuals. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.*  
306 2019;9(9):Cd012777.
- 307 12. Heller T, Wallrauch C, Goblirsch S, Brunetti E. Focused assessment with sonography for  
308 HIV-associated tuberculosis (FASH): a short protocol and a pictorial review. *Crit*  
309 *Ultrasound J.* 2012;4(1):21.
- 310 13. Chavez MA, Shams N, Ellington LE, Naithani N, Gilman RH, Steinhoff MC, et al. Lung  
311 ultrasound for the diagnosis of pneumonia in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
312 *Respir Res.* 2014;15(1):50.
- 313 14. Ye X, Xiao H, Chen B, Zhang S. Accuracy of Lung Ultrasonography versus Chest  
314 Radiography for the Diagnosis of Adult Community-Acquired Pneumonia: Review of the  
315 Literature and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(6):e0130066.



- 316 15. Llamas-Álvarez AM, Tenza-Lozano EM, Latour-Pérez J. Accuracy of Lung  
317 Ultrasonography in the Diagnosis of Pneumonia in Adults: Systematic Review and Meta-  
318 Analysis. *Chest*. 2017;151(2):374-82.
- 319 16. Wobudeya E, Lukoye D, Lubega IR, Mugabe F, Sekadde M, Musoke P. Epidemiology of  
320 tuberculosis in children in Kampala district, Uganda, 2009-2010; a retrospective cross-  
321 sectional study. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:967.
- 322 17. MOH. National Tuberculosis and Leprosy Program. Management of tuberculosis in  
323 children: a health worker guide. Uganda Ministry of Health; 2015.
- 324 18. Wobudeya E, Lukoye D, Lubega IR, Mugabe F, Sekadde M, Musoke P. Epidemiology of  
325 tuberculosis in children in Kampala district, Uganda, 2009-2010; a retrospective cross-  
326 sectional study. *BMC public health*. 2015;15:967-.
- 327 19. Umemneku Chikere CM, Wilson KJ, Allen AJ, Vale L. Comparative diagnostic accuracy  
328 studies with an imperfect reference standard – a comparison of correction methods. *BMC*  
329 *Medical Research Methodology*. 2021;21(1):67.
- 330 20. Berteloot L, Marcy O, Nguyen B, Ung V, Tejiokem M, Nacro B, et al. Value of chest X-  
331 ray in TB diagnosis in HIV-infected children living in resource-limited countries: the  
332 ANRS 12229-PAANTHER 01 study. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2018;22(8):844-50.
- 333 21. Seddon JA, Padayachee T, Du Plessis AM, Goussard P, Schaaf HS, Lombard C, et al.  
334 Teaching chest X-ray reading for child tuberculosis suspects. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*.  
335 2014;18(7):763-9.

336 22. WHO. High priority target product profiles for new tuberculosis diagnostics: report of a  
337 consensus meeting, 28-29 April 2014, Geneva, Switzerland. Geneva: World Health  
338 Organization; 2014. Contract No.: WHO/HTM/TB/2014.18.

339 23. Schumacher SG, van Smeden M, Dendukuri N, Joseph L, Nicol MP, Pai M, et al.  
340 Diagnostic Test Accuracy in Childhood Pulmonary Tuberculosis: A Bayesian Latent  
341 Class Analysis. Am J Epidemiol. 2016;184(9):690-700.

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354 **Table 1. Characteristics of the study participants**

Characteristic	Total Participants (n=80)	CXR findings		CUS findings	
		TB Likely (n=33)	TB Unlikely PTB (n=47)	TB Likely (n=49)	TB Unlikely PTB (n=31)
<b>Sex, n (%)</b>					
<b>Male</b>	42 (52.5)	16 (48.5)	26 (61.9)	21 (42.8)	21 (67.7)
<b>Female</b>	38 (47.5)	17 (51.5)	21 (44.7)	28 (57.1)	10 (32.3)
<b>Mean Age in months</b>	42.89	39.82	45.04	48.22	34.45
<b>Age Ranges, n (%)</b>					
<b>&lt; 1 year</b>	17 (21.3)	7 (41.2)	10 (58.8)	8 (47.1)	9 (52.9)
<b>1-&lt;5 yrs.</b>	40 (50.0)	17 (42.5)	23 (57.5)	25 (62.5)	15 (37.5)
<b>5 yrs. -&lt;10 yrs.</b>	12 (15.0)	6 (50.0)	6 (50.0)	7 (58.3)	5 (41.7)
<b>10 yrs.-&lt;15 yrs.</b>	11 (13.7)	3 (27.3)	8 (72.7)	9 (81.8)	2 (18.2)

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

**Table 2. Two by two table of chest ultrasound scan and chest radiography**

	CXR		
CUS	TB Likely	TB Unlikely	Total
TB Likely	29	20	49
TB Unlikely	4	27	31
Total	33	47	80

371