

Higher loss of livelihood and impoverishment in households affected by tuberculosis compared to non-tuberculosis affected households in Zimbabwe: a cross-sectional study

Authors and affiliations

Collins Timire¹⁻³

Rein MGJ Houben⁴

Debora Pedrazzoli⁴

Rashida Abbas Ferrand^{1,3}

Claire J Calderwood^{1,3}

Virginia Bond^{5,6}

Fredrick Mbiba³

Katharina Kranzer^{1,3,7,8}

¹ Department of Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

² AIDS & TB Department, Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe

³ The Health Research Unit, Biomedical Research & Training Institute, Harare, Zimbabwe

⁴ Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK

⁵ Department of Global Health and Development, Faculty of Public Health and Policy London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

⁶ Social Sciences Unit, Zambart, Lusaka, Zambia

⁷ Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, University Hospital, LMU Munich

⁸ German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), Munich

Corresponding author details:

Collins Timire

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK

Clinical Research Department, Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, UK

Collins.Timire@LSHTM.ac.uk +263777 687328 /+447719721145

Alternative corresponding author details:

Katharina Kranzer

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK

Clinical Research Department, Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, UK

Katharina.Kranzer@LSHTM.ac.uk +263774795737

Paper contents: Abstract=**300** words; Main text=**3834** words; References=**62**; Tables/Figures = **7**.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

40 **Key words:** Financial catastrophe; poverty; impoverishment; deprivation; MDR-TB.

41 **Running title:** Impact of tuberculosis on livelihoods in Zimbabwe.

43 **ORCID numbers**

44 Collins Timire <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0997-9799>

45 Rein MGJ Houben <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4132-7467>

46 Debora Pedrazzoli <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6434-4457>

47 Rashida A Ferrand <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7660-9176>

48 Virginia Bond <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6815-4239>

49 Katharina Kranzer <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5691-7270>

50 Claire Calderwood <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1926-7464>

51

52 **Abstract**

53 **Introduction:** Tuberculosis (TB) disproportionately affects poor people, leading to income
54 and non-income losses. Measures of socioeconomic impact of TB, e.g. impoverishment and
55 patient costs are inadequate to capture non-income losses. We applied impoverishment and a
56 multidimensional measure on TB and non-TB affected households in Zimbabwe.

57 **Methods:** We conducted a cross-sectional study in 270 households: 90 non-TB; 90 drug-
58 susceptible TB (DS-TB), 90 drug-resistant TB (DR-TB) during the COVID-19 pandemic
59 (2020-2021). Household data included ownership of assets, number of household members,
60 income and indicators on five capital assets: financial, human, social, natural and physical.
61 We determined proportions of impoverished households for periods 12 months prior and at
62 the time of the interview. Households with incomes below US\$1.90/day were considered to
63 be impoverished. We used principal component analysis on five capital asset indicators to
64 create a binary outcome variable indicating loss of livelihood. Log-binomial regression was
65 used to determine associations between loss of livelihood and type of household.

66 **Results:** TB-affected households reported higher previous episodes of TB and household
67 members requiring care than non-TB households. Households that were impoverished 12
68 months prior to the study were: 21 non-TB (23%); 40 DS-TB (45%); 37 DR-TB (41%). The
69 proportions increased to 81%, 88% and 94%, respectively by the time of interview. Overall,
70 56% (152/270) of households sold assets: 44% (40/90) non-TB, 58% (52/90) DS-TB and
71 67% (60/90) DR-TB. Children's education was affected in 31% (56/180) of TB-affected
72 compared to 13% (12/90) non-TB households. Overall, 133(50%) households experienced
73 loss of livelihood, with TB-affected households twice as likely to experience loss of
74 livelihood; adjusted prevalence ratio (aPR=2.02 (95%CI:1.35-3.03)). The effect of TB on
75 livelihood was most pronounced in poorest households (aPR=2.64, (95%CI:1.29-5.41)).

76 **Conclusions:** TB-affected households experienced greater socioeconomic losses compared to
77 non-TB households. Multidimensional measures of TB are crucial to inform multisectoral
78 approaches to mitigate impacts of TB and other shocks.

79 **Introduction**

80 Tuberculosis (TB) disproportionately affects socioeconomically deprived people and leads to
81 income and non-income losses.[1] While TB diagnostic tests and treatment services are
82 usually provided free-of-charge, other medical costs such as hospitalisations, radiology
83 services and blood tests are often not covered.[2] Households also incur social costs (stigma,
84 social exclusion, deterioration of relations with neighbours and landlords) and substantial
85 non-medical costs related to travel, accommodation and food, in addition to loss of income
86 before, during and even post-treatment.[3]–[8] This, coinciding with reductions in household
87 income, leads to severe socioeconomic burden.[9]

88 The impact of TB on households is even more pronounced in the context of drug resistant TB
89 (DR-TB).[1] DR-TB treatment is longer than treatment for drug susceptible TB (DS-TB).
90 Historically, people with DR-TB have been hospitalised (e.g. for injectable medications), and
91 often experienced severe disease (in part due to treatment delays), complications and post-TB
92 disability. Treatment delays may result from delayed health seeking or people being
93 incorrectly started on DS-TB regimens before drug resistance is identified and people are
94 switched to effective regimens.[10] Consequently, people with DR-TB experienced more
95 direct and indirect costs than people with DS-TB.

96 Estimating the socioeconomic impact of TB on households is fraught with challenges. The
97 most commonly employed measures of impact of TB are impoverishment and/or patient
98 costs. The former determines the proportion of households that are pushed further into
99 poverty by TB by comparing per capita income per day against a threshold, usually the
100 international poverty line of United States Dollar (US\$) 1.90 per person per day.[11] Patient
101 costs surveys (PCS) broadened the scope for measuring impact of TB on households by
102 collecting data on direct medical (consultations, ancillary medicines), direct non-medical
103 (food, transport) and indirect costs (income loss).[12], [13] If the fraction of total costs (direct
104 medical, direct non-medical and indirect costs) that are incurred by households as a fraction
105 of a household's annual income prior to TB exceeds 20%, the household is considered to
106 have experienced catastrophic costs.[14] Global estimates of catastrophic costs, as measured
107 through nationally representative PCS have revealed higher pooled prevalence of catastrophic
108 costs in DR-TB affected households (82%) compared to DS-TB affected households
109 (39%).[15]–[19] While PCS have provided valuable data on the socioeconomic impact of TB,
110 their outcome measure (catastrophic costs) is benchmarked against income. This may lead to

111 overestimation of the impact of TB among poor people who are likely to have unstable
112 employment and income.

113 TB affects all facets of human wellbeing, leading to both income and non-income related
114 losses. The sustainable livelihood framework (SLF),[20] is a useful framework to inform
115 multidimensional and holistic estimates of socioeconomic impacts of TB. The framework
116 conceptualises that households live in a vulnerability context characterised by various shocks,
117 such as TB, and they make use of five available capital assets (human, financial, social,
118 physical and natural capital) and various livelihood (coping) strategies in order to mitigate
119 impacts of such shocks.[20] The livelihood strategies are either accumulative (households
120 amassing assets in times of plenty to create buffers against future shocks) or coping (survival)
121 strategies in order to survive shocks.[21]–[23] The coping strategies may be either harmful or
122 non-harmful to livelihoods. Households may adopt short-term, non-harmful coping strategies
123 e.g. spending savings, borrowing.[24] However, prolonged and/or sudden shocks may force
124 households to expend resources rapidly and to adopt harmful coping strategies e.g. borrowing
125 at exploitative interest rates and sale of productive assets.[24]–[26] The coping strategies that
126 are adopted determine the five capital assets that are available in households, and whether
127 households are resilient or vulnerable to shocks.[26]

128 Quantitative measures based on the SLF have been used to study the impact of shocks on
129 household livelihoods in the context of agroforestry and climate change.[20], [27], [28] A
130 similar approach could be used to measure the impact of TB.[29]

131 This study applies impoverishment and a SLF-based measure we previously proposed,[29] to
132 assess the socioeconomic impact of TB on households overall, and stratified by DR-TB or
133 DS-TB, compared to non-TB affected households in the same communities.

134

135 **Methods**

136 *Study Setting*

137 This study was conducted in four provinces of Zimbabwe: Harare and Bulawayo (both
138 predominantly urban), Masvingo (urban and rural) and Matabeleland South (predominantly
139 rural) (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Zimbabwe, a southern African country, had an estimated
140 TB and DR-TB incidence of 190/100,000 population and 4.9/100,000 population in
141 2021.[30], [31] Treatment success (completion and cure) was 83% for people with DS-TB
142 and 54% among people with DR-TB.[32]–[34] The prevalence of TB/HIV co-infection was
143 50%. The prevalence of HIV in the general adult population is estimated at 12.9%, but is
144 much higher (17.6%) in Matabeleland South province.[35] Zimbabwe has experienced
145 socioeconomic challenges in the past two decades, with unemployment as high as 90% in
146 2015.[36] In 2020, the Human Development Index was only 0.571, placing it 150th out of 189
147 countries.[37] About 72% of Zimbabwean population live below the poverty line of US\$1.90
148 per day.[36]

149 This study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic (October 2020-March 2021) and
150 as a result there were several COVID-19 waves and various degrees of national lockdowns
151 during the study period. Zimbabwe recorded the first case of COVID-19 in March 2020,
152 resulting in lockdowns where businesses were shut and health workers were reassigned to
153 COVID-19 related work.[38], [39] The government’s social protection scheme, the
154 Harmonised Social Cash Transfer, initially meant for food insecure households,[40] was
155 activated to cushion vulnerable households during lockdowns. The highest disbursement was
156 US\$25 per household per month. However this was converted to local currency equivalent at
157 prevailing interbank rates which are often much lower than the black market rates on which
158 most retail operates. Consequently, the US\$25 disbursement was in fact worth very little:
159 enough to buy five kilogrammes of maize flour which could feed a household of five people
160 with their staple carbohydrate for at most a week.

161 *Management of TB in Zimbabwe*

162 TB treatment in Zimbabwe is decentralised to primary health facilities. TB molecular
163 diagnostics, e.g Xpert MTB/Rif assay (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA, USA), and treatment are
164 provided free-of-charge. However, costs incurred prior to diagnosis, including clinic fees,
165 hospitalisation costs, radiology investigations and laboratory tests are not covered. Radiology
166 and many laboratory tests are mostly unavailable in public facilities and are usually accessed
167 from private health providers, resulting in significant out-of-pocket costs. An all-oral 9-

168 month DR-TB treatment regimen was introduced in 2021, replacing the longer 18-24 month
169 injection-based regimen.[41] People on DR-TB treatment are eligible for non-contributory
170 social protection in the form of conditional cash transfers (CCTs). Once registered, they
171 receive US\$25 per month till treatment completion, death or loss-to-follow up, whichever
172 comes first. However, the cash transfer is subject to delays, unpredictable disbursements and
173 has modest coverage.[42]

174 *Study design and population*

175 In this cross-sectional study, adults (≥ 18 years) who were alive and on treatment for DR-TB
176 and DS-TB at 35 selected health facilities (**Supplementary Figure 1**) during the study period
177 were eligible for inclusion. Health facilities were selected based on DR-TB caseloads in
178 2018. For each person with DR-TB, an age (within 5 year age-bands) and sex-matched
179 person with DS-TB was identified from the same health facility's TB register.

180 In each facility, data, including age, sex, date of treatment initiation, treatment regimen and
181 mobile phone numbers were extracted from TB registers. Prospective participants were called
182 by the study team who briefly described the purpose and procedures of the study and how the
183 contact details for prospective participants had been obtained. Face-to-face meetings were
184 arranged with those who expressed interest in the study. Those who were willing to
185 participate were asked for written informed consent.

186 Community control households within 500 metres of the DR-TB affected households were
187 selected. Hereafter, these households are referred to as 'non-TB households'. These people
188 and their households were also matched for age and sex with those affected by DR-TB and
189 DS-TB in the ratio 1:1:1. To protect confidentiality, five households neighbouring DR-TB
190 affected households on the same street in either direction were not approached for
191 participation.

192 *Data collection*

193 Data were collected using interviewer administered paper-based individual and household
194 questionnaires. If the person with TB was the head of household, a household questionnaire
195 was also administered, otherwise consent was sought from the head of household to
196 administer a household questionnaire. Individual questionnaires captured socioeconomic
197 details, experiences of stigma, duration from onset of TB symptoms to diagnosis of TB, past
198 medical history, money spent on travel and medical expenses, income 12 months before the
199 interview, income at time of interview, receipt of any social protection (only for people with

200 DR-TB), any relocation and physical fitness. Stigma was measured using the scale adapted
201 by Marangu et al.[43] The scale has 13 items capturing internalised stigma (4 items),
202 perceived stigma (4 items) and general stigma (5 items). Each item was measured on a Likert
203 scale ranging from 0-4: 0 indicating “Never”; 1 “Rarely”; 2 “Occasionally”; 3 “Regularly”
204 and 4 indicating “Always”. Household questionnaires included questions on household asset
205 ownership, current and past income, size of household, sale of assets (including selling and
206 market prices of assets), borrowing, failure to repay loans, pledging crops or cattle, spending
207 savings, withdrawal of children from school or transfers to cheaper schools, changes in social
208 relations, changes of head of household and deaths in the household. The variables in the
209 household questionnaire were informed by the SLF,[20] variables in patient cost surveys,[44]
210 and indicators adapted from a study investigating livelihood in the context of HIV in
211 Zimbabwe.[45] The SLF indicators are presented in **Supplementary Table 1**. All interviews
212 were held in private locations suggested by participants.

213 *Data analysis*

214 Data were entered in EpiData v3.1 (EpiData Association, Odense, Denmark) and were
215 exported to Stata version 13 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) for cleaning and
216 analysis. The exposure of interest was type of household: non-TB affected or TB affected
217 household. TB affected households were further categorised into DS-TB and DR-TB
218 households. Categorical variables were summarised using frequencies and proportions.
219 Differences in proportions were compared using the chi-square test. Continuous variables
220 were summarised using medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs) and differences were
221 compared using the Mann-Whitney-U test. Some variables were derived during analysis.
222 These include effect on education of children (which was a composite of withdrawal of
223 children from school or transferring children to cheaper schools or both); loss of household
224 income (binary variable (yes/no) was determined when income at time of study was lower
225 than income 12 months before the interview); dissavings (sale of assets, spending savings,
226 taking loans); and changes in social relations comparing 12 months before and at the time of
227 the interview based on self-reports by participants using Likert scales ranging from 1-10. A
228 reduction in score was reflective of deteriorating social relations. To calculate
229 impoverishment, we divided monthly household income by 30.5 and by the number of
230 household members to determine income per person per day and classified households as
231 impoverished when income per capita was below the poverty line of US\$1.90 per day.[46]
232 Monetary values reported in South African Rand (commonly used in Masvingo and

233 Matabeleland South provinces) were converted to US\$ for calculations using the Oanda
234 currency converter (<http://www.oanda.com>). Total stigma was calculated by averaging the
235 scores for the 13 scale items and individuals were considered to have experienced stigma
236 when the average score was ≥ 2 . We calculated mean scores for each of the five capital
237 indicators and presented results as spider diagrams. We used principal component analysis
238 (PCA) to categorise households into tertiles (poorest, poor and not-so-poor) based on
239 household asset ownership and to reduce data on the five capital assets and coping strategies
240 into a dichotomous outcome variable indicating loss of livelihood as previously
241 described.[29] Details of the PCA are described in the **Supplement file**. Log binomial
242 regression was used to test associations between loss of livelihood and type of household. We
243 adjusted the analysis for previous TB episode (an indicator of previous shock for a
244 household) in a multivariable Poisson regression, excluding matching variables (age, sex and
245 province), and presented results as prevalence ratios (PRs) and adjusted PRs.

246 *Ethics*

247 Ethical approval was obtained from the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
248 Research Ethics Committee (22579), the Biomedical Research and Training Institute
249 Institutional Review Board (AP160/2020) and the Medical Research Council Zimbabwe
250 (MCRZ/A/2645).

251

252 **Results**

253 We approached 285 people, of whom 270 (95%) people (and all corresponding heads of
254 households) consented to take part in the study. Non-TB affected participants were less likely
255 to be living with HIV, to report hospitalisations and to have relocated 12 months prior the
256 study compared to TB-affected participants. People on DR-TB treatment incurred 2.7 times
257 higher TB-related costs than people on DS-TB treatment ($p < 0.001$). Of the 62/90 people with
258 DR-TB who registered for CCTs, only 40 (65%) reported receiving any cash disbursement.
259 TB stigma was experienced by 22 (24%) of people with DR-TB compared to 12 (13%)
260 people with DS-TB ($p = 0.06$) (**Table 1**).

261 Across the three strata, households were similar with respect to sex of head of household,
262 socioeconomic status, education of head of household and the percentage having experienced
263 a death in the household over the past 12 months. A higher proportion of TB-affected
264 households had experienced TB before and reported that a household member had needed to
265 be taken care of 12 months prior to the interview, compared to non-TB households (**Table 2**).

266 Twelve months prior to the study, the number (percentage) of non-TB, DS-TB and DR-TB
267 households that were impoverished was 21 (23%), 40 (45%) and 37 (41%) ($p = 0.01$). At the
268 time of interview, the proportions increased to 81%, 88% and 94%, respectively ($p = 0.02$).

269 TB-affected households experienced higher dissavings (borrowing, selling assets, spending
270 savings) as compared to community households (**Table 2**). Overall, 56% (152/270) of
271 households sold assets: 44% (40/90), 58% (52/90), 67% (60/90) of non-TB, DS-TB and DR-
272 TB households, respectively ($p = 0.01$). Median TB-related costs were higher among DR-TB
273 households compared to DS-TB and non-TB households (DR-TB: US\$400 [IQR:244-728] vs
274 DS-TB: US\$150 [IQR:100-275], $p < 0.001$; **Table 2**) Almost a third of TB-affected
275 households ($n = 56$, 31%) reported that the education of children was negatively affected
276 compared to one in eight ($n = 12$, 13%) of non-TB households. Heads of households in 83
277 (92%) DR-TB and 63 (70%) DS-TB households reported their livelihoods were severely
278 affected in the past 12 months compared to 32 (36%) heads of non-TB households.

279 Huge impacts on financial, human and social capitals were experienced in TB-affected
280 compared to non-TB households (**Figure 1**). Overall, 133 (50% [95% confidence interval
281 (CI): 44%-56%]) of households experienced loss of livelihood. Loss of livelihood was higher
282 in DR-TB (62%) and DS-TB (60%) affected households compared to non-TB households
283 (27%). TB affected households were two times more likely to experience loss of livelihood as

284 compared to non-TB households, after adjustments for socioeconomic tercile and history of
285 TB in the household (adjusted prevalence ratio [aPR]=2.02 [95%CI: 1.35-3.03]). There were
286 no differences in loss of livelihood comparing DR-TB and DS-TB households (aPR=0.99,
287 95%CI:0.79-1.24; **Table 3**). The proportion of households experiencing loss of livelihood
288 was 60% in the poorest households compared to 33% in the not-so-poor households (**Table**
289 **3**). The effect of TB on loss of livelihood was worst in poorest households (aPR=1.81
290 [95%CI:1.29-2.54]) compared to the not-so-poor households. Comparisons between loss of
291 livelihood and impoverishment at the time of the interview revealed a 58% (95% CI: 52-
292 64%) concordance. The concordance was 51% (95% 45-57%) for the period 12 months prior
293 to the interview (**Table 4**).
294

296 Discussion

297 We used impoverishment and a multidimensional measure to investigate socioeconomic
298 impacts of TB on households. We found that TB-affected households experience greater
299 impoverishment and loss of livelihood than non-TB households. There was no difference in
300 loss of livelihood between DR-TB and DS-TB affected households. Socioeconomic status
301 was an effect modifier, and the effect of TB on loss of livelihood was worst in poorest
302 households.

303 These results are in line with studies conducted in Ghana and the Philippines showing that the
304 proportion of impoverished households is higher among TB-affected compared to non-TB
305 households.[4], [47] Importantly, we also collected data on income 12 months prior to the
306 interview. The proportion of TB affected households living under the poverty line 12 months
307 prior to the interview was almost double (43%) that of non-TB affected households (23%)
308 highlighting that TB disproportionately affects the poorest.[1] Also, there was a marked
309 increase in impoverishment across all households from 12 months prior to the interview to
310 the time of interview. In the 6 months prior to the interviews COVID-19 lockdowns affected
311 businesses, public transport systems, employment opportunities, household incomes, food
312 security and resulted in substantial impoverishment in Zimbabwe and sub-Saharan
313 Africa.[39] Hence, impoverishment observed in this study at the time of the interview was
314 also attributable to shocks other than TB. These finding also highlight the limitations of
315 cross-sectional surveys which cannot account for reverse causality i.e. poor households being
316 more likely affected by TB.

317 The concordance between loss of livelihood and impoverishment was 58% with the
318 proportion impoverished being higher than the proportion which lost livelihood. This is not
319 surprising. Impoverishment is benchmarked against income and tends to overestimate
320 socioeconomic impact of TB among poor people, who are likely to have unstable
321 employment or live in contexts where employment is informal and/or jobs are seasonal.(22)
322 Income is difficult to measure, especially when the majority of the population is informally
323 employment.[48] Furthermore, impoverishment is unable to capture the role of social support
324 networks in mitigating socioeconomic impact of TB despite loss of income.

325 Most studies on socioeconomic impact of TB rely on measuring income or costs.[4], [5], [11]
326 Our study shows that financial capital (income, spending of savings to cover TB associated
327 costs) is not the only livelihood capital that is affected by TB. The impact of TB was found to

328 be more pronounced on human, social and financial capitals while physical and natural
329 capital assets remained relatively stable across all households. Natural capital is setting-
330 specific and likely more relevant in rural areas, whilst disposal of physical capital or
331 dilapidation of physical capital as a result of reduced maintenance may be a strategy of last
332 resort and only employed when shocks become chronic.

333 Household coping strategies evolve from short term e.g. dissavings (spending savings,
334 borrowing) to long term coping strategies (withdrawal of children from school, sale of
335 assets). As a result, cross sectional studies, especially those in which data are collected during
336 the intensive phase of treatment (i.e. shortly after diagnosis), may not capture long-term
337 coping strategies. The exception may be in extremely vulnerable households, which are likely
338 to exhaust short-term coping strategies quickly and proceed to selling assets and/or abandon
339 treatment.[25], [49] Long-term coping strategies are the most harmful to livelihoods, with
340 greater, long-lasting impacts. This may force households into financial catastrophes and inter-
341 generational poverty.[50], [51] Socioeconomic impacts of TB persist even after completing
342 treatment as households continue to borrow and pledge their assets.[7], [52], [53] Livelihood
343 is therefore dynamic since households experience shocks continuously and are actively
344 utilising various coping strategies in their quest to maintain well-being.[20] For this reason,
345 longitudinal studies including the post-TB treatment period are recommended as they are
346 likely to provide more accurate estimates of the impact of TB on households.[54]

347 Until recently, DS-TB and DR-TB treatment were different with regards to duration and
348 toxicities. However, with roll out of shorter and all oral DR-TB regimens,[55], [56] the
349 differences are less pronounced. This may explain the lack of difference in loss of livelihood
350 between DS-TB and DR-TB households. Also, more DR-TB than DS-TB affected
351 households reported a history of TB. People and families who previously experienced TB
352 may be more likely to identify signs of TB early and to seek healthcare for themselves, or
353 encourage others to do so.[10], [57] Thus it is possible that people affected by DR-TB sought
354 care earlier, and went directly to TB clinics, resulting in fewer costs. Nevertheless, DR-TB
355 affected households were more likely to report severe impacts of TB and other shocks on
356 their livelihoods compared to DS-TB. This is despite no difference in the proportion
357 experiencing loss of livelihood.

358 The strengths of our study include recruitment of participants across four provinces in
359 Zimbabwe, including both urban and rural sites, and investigating socioeconomic impact of
360 TB using a multidimensional measure which is not benchmarked against income. In parallel,

361 we used a more conventional measure (i.e. impoverishment) allowing direct comparisons
362 between these two. The study was undertaken during the COVID-19 pandemic, a time of
363 extreme socioeconomic vulnerability, and provides insight into the interaction between TB
364 and other generalised socioeconomic shocks. This has important implications for pandemic
365 preparedness policies,[58] as it highlights the long-term impacts of pandemic responses on
366 socioeconomic vulnerability and need to support TB-affected households especially during
367 times of crisis.

368 Our cross-sectional design made it impossible to capture changes in livelihood across all
369 phases of TB treatment. Hence, there is potential underestimation of loss of livelihood,
370 especially among people who were interviewed during early stages of TB treatment. We
371 relied on self-reports of coping strategies and income. While coping strategies are unlikely to
372 be influenced by recall bias, income often is. Income is difficult to reliably estimate
373 especially in contexts characterised by informal/seasonal jobs.[48] We potentially
374 underestimated loss of livelihood by enrolling people who were alive and on treatment,
375 excluding those who died of TB or were lost to follow-up prior to the study. TB-related
376 deaths result in huge costs of up to 15 times the monthly household income.[24] People who
377 died or were lost to follow-up are likely to have experienced greater loss of livelihood than
378 those who were alive and on treatment. Further, we cannot rule out possible overmatching of
379 community controls because people who live in the same area as TB-affected households
380 often have a similar socioeconomic background. However, it is notable that the proportion of
381 households living under the poverty line 12 months prior to the interview was significantly
382 lower among non-TB compared to TB-affected households. Lastly, our study was conducted
383 during the COVID-19 pandemic and both impoverishment and loss of livelihood due to TB
384 are likely to be overestimated as concurrent shocks may have contributed to the effects seen.

385 Despite these limitations, our study has implications for policy and practice. Firstly, in a time
386 of huge socioeconomic vulnerability (i.e. COVID-19), TB was associated with worse
387 socioeconomic situation, especially in the poorest households. Hence, poorest households
388 should be prioritised for multisectoral social protection to reduce the incidence and impacts
389 of TB. People in the poorest households are more likely to experience food insecurity and
390 malnutrition. Malnutrition increases risk of i) infection by *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, ii)
391 severe TB and iii) mortality.[59] Recent studies have shown that social protection in the form
392 of a nutritional intervention reduces TB mortality and averts TB diseases by 40-50%.[60],
393 [61] Secondly, this study highlights the importance of multidimensional measures to

394 adequately capture income and non-income impacts of TB, including the effect of TB on
395 schooling and ownership of assets, for programmatic action.[10], [62]

396 **Conclusion**

397 TB affected households experienced greater loss of livelihood than households currently not
398 affected by TB. The effect of TB is most profound among the poorest households.
399 Multisectoral approaches to support these poorest households are crucial to mitigate the
400 impact of TB and other shocks prevailing in communities.

401 **Conflicts of interest**

402 None declared

403 **Funding statement**

404 CT was supported by the Fogarty International Centre of the National Institutes of Health
405 (NIH; Bethesda, MD, USA) under Award Number (D43 TW009539). The content is solely
406 the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the
407 National Institutes of Health. CJC (203905/Z/16/Z) and RAF (206316/Z/17/Z) are supported
408 by the Wellcome Trust.

409 **Author contributions**

410 Conceptualised the study: CT and KK

411 Collected data: CT, FM

412 Wrote the first draft: CT with support from KK, DP, VB and RH

413 Critically reviewed the first draft: CT, KK, DP, RH, VB, FM, CJC, RAF.

414 Critically reviewed final draft: CT, KK, DP, RH, VB, FM, CJC, RAF.

415 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

416 **Data availability statement**

417 Data supporting this manuscript can be accessed from the corresponding author upon request.

418 **Ethics statement**

419 This study was approved by the Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe. All participants
420 provided written informed consent to take part in the study.

421 **Acknowledgements**

422 The authors would like to thank the participants who took part in this study. Special thanks
423 goes to Health Services Departments (City of Harare and City of Bulawayo) as well as
424 Provincial Medical Directorates of Masvingo and Matabeleland South.

425

426 References

- 427 [1] University Research Co. LLC, “Providing Comprehensive Patient-Centred Care: A
428 conceptual framework for social support for TB patients,” Bethesda, USA, 2014.
429 [Online]. Available: [www.urc-chs.com/sites/default/files/Providing Comprehensive
430 Care.pdf](http://www.urc-chs.com/sites/default/files/Providing%20Comprehensive%20Care.pdf).
- 431 [2] D. Pedrazzoli, M. Lalli, D. Boccia, R. Houben, and K. Kranzer, “Can tuberculosis
432 patients in resource-constrained settings afford chest radiography?,” *Eur. Respir. J.*,
433 vol. 49, p. 1601877, 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01877-2016>.
- 434 [3] C. Timire *et al.*, “Catastrophic costs among tuberculosis affected households in
435 Zimbabwe: a national health facility-based survey,” *Trop. Med. Int. Heal.*, vol. 26, no.
436 10, pp. 1248–1255, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13647>.
- 437 [4] D. Pedrazzoli *et al.*, “How affordable is TB care? Findings from a nationwide TB
438 patient cost survey in Ghana,” *Trop. Med. Int. Heal.*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 870–878, 2018,
439 doi: [10.1111/tmi.13085](https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13085).
- 440 [5] A. Fuady, T. A. J. Houweling, M. Mansyur, and J. H. Richardus, “Catastrophic total
441 costs in tuberculosis- affected households and their determinants since Indonesia ’ s
442 implementation of universal health coverage,” *Infect. Dis. Poverty*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1–
443 14, 2018, doi: [10.1186/s40249-017-0382-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-017-0382-3).
- 444 [6] K. N. Ukwaja, I. Alobu, S. Abimbola, and P. C. Hopewell, “Household catastrophic
445 payments for tuberculosis care in Nigeria : incidence , determinants , and policy
446 implications for universal health coverage,” *Infect. Dis. Poverty*, vol. 2, no. 21, pp. 1–
447 9, 2013, [Online]. Available: <http://www.idpjournals.com/content/2/1/21>.
- 448 [7] J. Meghji *et al.*, “The long term effect of pulmonary tuberculosis on income and
449 employment in a low income, urban setting,” *Thorax*, vol. 76, pp. 387–395, 2021, doi:
450 [10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215338](https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215338).
- 451 [8] STOP TB Partnership, “The Paradigm Shift, Global Plan to End TB:2018-2022,”
452 Geneva, Switzerland, 2019.
- 453 [9] STOP TB Partnership, “The paradigm shift 2016-2020: Global plan to End TB,”
454 Geneva, Switzerland, 2015. [Online]. Available:
455 <http://www.stoptb.org/global/plan/plan2/>.
- 456 [10] C. Timire *et al.*, “Coping with drug resistant tuberculosis alongside COVID-19 and
457 other stressors in Zimbabwe: A qualitative study,” *PLoS Glob. Public Heal.*, vol. 3,
458 no. 8, pp. 1-18 (e0001706), 2023, [Online]. Available:
459 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0001706>.
- 460 [11] Y. Liu *et al.*, “Out-of-pocket payments and economic consequences from tuberculosis
461 care in eastern China: income inequality,” *Infect. Dis. Poverty*, vol. 9, no. 14, pp. 1–10,
462 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-020-0623-8>.
- 463 [12] S. Erlinger *et al.*, “Tuberculosis patients with higher levels of poverty face equal or
464 greater costs of illness,” *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 1205–1212,
465 2019, [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.5588/ijtld.18.0814](https://doi.org/10.5588/ijtld.18.0814).
- 466 [13] D. Pedrazzoli, J. Borghi, K. Viney, R. M. G. J. Houben, and K. Lönnroth, “Measuring
467 the economic burden for TB patients in the End TB Strategy and Universal Health
468 Coverage frameworks,” *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 5–11, 2019, doi:

- 469 10.5588/ijtld.18.0318.
- 470 [14] World Health Organization, “Tuberculosis patient cost surveys: a handbook,” Geneva,
471 Switzerland, 2018.
- 472 [15] A. M. Kilale *et al.*, “Economic burden of tuberculosis in Tanzania: a national survey of
473 costs faced by tuberculosis-affected households.,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 22, no. 1,
474 p. 600, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s12889-022-12987-3.
- 475 [16] Ministry of Health and Child Care, “Catastrophic costs due to TB in Zimbabwe,”
476 Harare, Zimbabwe, 2018.
- 477 [17] R. Tadokera, S. Huo, G. Theron, C. Timire, S. Manyau-Makumbirofa, and J. Z.
478 Metcalfe, “Health care seeking patterns of rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis patients in
479 Harare, Zimbabwe: A prospective cohort study.,” *PLoS One*, vol. 16, no. 7, p.
480 e0254204, 2021, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0254204.
- 481 [18] World Health Organisation, “Global TB Report 2022: National surveys of costs faced
482 by TB patients and their households.” [https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-](https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-programme/tb-reports/global-tuberculosis-report-2022/uhc-tb-determinants/6-2-national-surveys-of-costs-faced-by-tb-patients-and-their-households)
483 [programme/tb-reports/global-tuberculosis-report-2022/uhc-tb-determinants/6-2-](https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-programme/tb-reports/global-tuberculosis-report-2022/uhc-tb-determinants/6-2-national-surveys-of-costs-faced-by-tb-patients-and-their-households)
484 [national-surveys-of-costs-faced-by-tb-patients-and-their-households](https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-programme/tb-reports/global-tuberculosis-report-2022/uhc-tb-determinants/6-2-national-surveys-of-costs-faced-by-tb-patients-and-their-households) (accessed Jul. 07,
485 2023).
- 486 [19] R. M. Ghazy, H. M. El Saeh, S. Abdulaziz, E. A. Hammouda, A. M. Elzorkany, and H.
487 Khidr, “OPEN A systematic review and meta - analysis of the catastrophic costs
488 incurred by tuberculosis patients,” *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 12, no. 558, pp. 1–16, 2022, doi:
489 10.1038/s41598-021-04345-x.
- 490 [20] Department for International Development (DFID), “Sustainable livelihoods guidance
491 sheets,” 1999.
492 <https://www.livelihoodscentre.org/documents/114097690/114438878/Sustainable+live>
493 [lihoods+guidance+sheets.pdf/594e5ea6-99a9-2a4e-f288-](https://www.livelihoodscentre.org/documents/114097690/114438878/Sustainable+live)
494 [cbb4ae4bea8b?t=1569512091877](https://www.livelihoodscentre.org/documents/114097690/114438878/Sustainable+live) (accessed May 12, 2023).
- 495 [21] C. Rakodi, “A Capital Assets Framework for Analysing Household Livelihood
496 Strategies: Implications for Policy,” *Dev. Policy Rev.*, vol. 17, pp. 315–342, 1999, doi:
497 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7679.00090>.
- 498 [22] I. Scoones, “Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis, IDS Working
499 Paper 72,” 1998.
- 500 [23] R. Chambers and G. R. Conway, “Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for
501 the 21st Century, IDS Discussion Paper 296,” 1991.
- 502 [24] V. Bond, M. Chileshe, C. Sullivan, and B. Magazi, “The Converging Impact of
503 Tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, and Food Insecurity in Zambia and South Africa. Renewal
504 Working Paper,” London, UK, 2009.
- 505 [25] S. Russell, “Ability to pay for healthcare: concepts and evidence,” *Health Policy Plan.*,
506 vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 219–237, 2014, doi: 10.1093/heapol/11.3.219.
- 507 [26] V. Diwakar, “From pandemics to poverty: the implications of coronavirus for the
508 furthest behind,” 2018. [https://odi.org/en/insights/from-pandemics-to-poverty-the-](https://odi.org/en/insights/from-pandemics-to-poverty-the-implications-of-coronavirus-for-the-furthest-behind/)
509 [implications-of-coronavirus-for-the-furthest-behind/](https://odi.org/en/insights/from-pandemics-to-poverty-the-implications-of-coronavirus-for-the-furthest-behind/) (accessed May 05, 2022).
- 510 [27] A. Quandt, “Measuring livelihood resilience: The Household Livelihood Resilience

- 511 Approach (HLRA),” *World Dev.*, vol. 107, pp. 253–263, 2018, [Online]. Available:
512 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.02.024>.
- 513 [28] R. Pandey, S. K. Jha, J. M. Alatalo, K. M. Archie, and A. K. Gupta, “Sustainable
514 livelihood framework-based indicators for assessing climate change vulnerability and
515 adaptation for Himalayan communities,” *Ecol. Indic.*, vol. 79, pp. 338–346, 2017,
516 [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.03.047%0D>.
- 517 [29] C. Timire *et al.*, “Use of a sustainable livelihood framework-based measure to estimate
518 socioeconomic impact of tuberculosis on households,” *Clin. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 77, no.
519 5, pp. 761–77, 2023, doi: 10.1093/cid/ciad273.
- 520 [30] World Health Organisation©., “Global Tuberculosis Report 2022. Tuberculosis
521 profile: Kyrgyzstan,” 2022.
522 https://worldhealthorg.shinyapps.io/tb_profiles/?_inputs_&entity_type=%22country%22&lan=%22EN%22&iso2=%22KG%22 (accessed May 04, 2023).
- 524 [31] World Health Organisation., “Global TB Report 2020: Country profiles,” Geneva,
525 Switzerland, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/hq-tuberculosis/global-tuberculosis-report-2020/country-profile-2020-final-web-min.pdf?sfvrsn=b4137a1c_0.
- 528 [32] World Health Organisation, “Global TB Report 2016,” Geneva, Switzerland, 2016.
529 [Online]. Available: WHO/HTM/TB/2016.13.
- 530 [33] World Health Organisation, “Global Tuberculosis Report 2017,” Geneva, Switzerland,
531 2017. [Online]. Available: WHO/HTM/TB/2017.23.
- 532 [34] World Health Organisation, “Global Tuberculosis Report 2018,” Geneva, Switzerland,
533 2018. doi: WHO/CDS/TB/2018.20.
- 534 [35] Columbia University, “Zimbabwe Population-based HIV Impac Assessment
535 (ZIMPHIA) 2020,” New York, USA, 2020. [Online]. Available:
536 <https://phia.icap.columbia.edu/zimbabwe-2020-summary-sheet/>.
- 537 [36] Ministry of Health and Child Care, “Zimbabwe National Health Financing Policy:
538 resourcing pathway to universal health coverage,” Harare, Zimbabwe, 2015.
- 539 [37] The Global Economy.com, “Business and economic data for 200 countries.”
540 https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/Zimbabwe/human_development/ (accessed Jun.
541 23, 2023).
- 542 [38] Worldometer, “Zimbabwe COVID - Coronavirus Statistics.”
543 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/zimbabwe/> (accessed Jun. 23,
544 2023).
- 545 [39] N. Haider *et al.*, “Lockdown measures in response to COVID-19 in nine sub-Saharan
546 African countries,” *BMJ Glob. Heal.*, vol. 5, no. 10, p. e003319, Oct. 2020, doi:
547 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003319.
- 548 [40] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill., “Zimbabwe’s Harmonised Social Cash
549 Transfer Programme Endline Impact Evaluation Report. April 2018.,” North Carolina,
550 USA. [Online]. Available: https://transfer.cpc.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/HSCT-Endline-Report_Final-v2.pdf.
- 552 [41] Ministry of Health and Child Care, “National Tuberculosis Control Programme:

- 553 Programmatic Management of Drug Resistant Tuberculosis Guidelines,” Harare,
554 Zimbabwe, 2014.
- 555 [42] C. Timire *et al.*, “Coverage and effectiveness of conditional cash transfer for people
556 with drug resistant tuberculosis in Zimbabwe: a mixed methods study,” *PLoS Glob.*
557 *Public Heal.*, vol. 2, no. 12, p. e0001027, 2022, doi:
558 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0001027>.
- 559 [43] D. Marangu *et al.*, “Adapting a stigma scale for assessment of tuberculosis-related
560 stigma among English/Swahili speaking patients in an African setting,” *Stigma Heal.*,
561 vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 1–24, 2018, doi: 10.1037/sah0000056.ADAPTING.
- 562 [44] World Health Organisation, “Tuberculosis patient cost surveys: a handbook,” Geneva,
563 Switzerland, 2017.
- 564 [45] Food and Agricultural Organisation, “Measuring impacts of HIV/AIDS on rural
565 livelihoods and food security,” 2003. [Online]. Available:
566 http://www.fao.org/sd/2003/PE0102a_en.htm.
- 567 [46] World Bank, “Understanding poverty.” [https://www.worldbank.org/en/understanding-](https://www.worldbank.org/en/understanding-poverty)
568 [poverty](https://www.worldbank.org/en/understanding-poverty) (accessed Jun. 10, 2023).
- 569 [47] J. L. Florentino *et al.*, “Expansion of social protection is necessary towards zero
570 catastrophic costs due to TB: The first national TB patient cost survey in the
571 Philippines,” *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. e0264689, 2022, doi:
572 [10.1371/journal.pone.0264689](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0264689).
- 573 [48] S. Sweeney, R. Mukora, S. Candfield, L. Guinness, D. A. Grant, and A. Vassall,
574 “Measuring income for catastrophic cost estimates: Limitations and policy
575 implications of current approaches,” *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 215, pp. 7–15, 2018, [Online].
576 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.041>.
- 577 [49] L. Vanleeuw, W. Zembe-Mkabile, and S. Atkins, “‘I’m suffering for food’: Food
578 insecurity and access to social protection for TB patients and their households in Cape
579 Town, South Africa,” *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1–16, 2022, doi:
580 [10.1371/journal.pone.0266356](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0266356).
- 581 [50] T. Tanimura, E. Jaramillo, D. Weil, M. Raviglione, and K. Lönnroth, “Financial
582 burden for tuberculosis patients in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic
583 review,” *Eur. Respir. J.*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1763–1775, 2014, doi:
584 [10.1183/09031936.00193413](https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00193413).
- 585 [51] T. K. Burki, “The Global Cost of Tuberculosis,” *Lancet Respir. Med.*, vol. 6, no. 1, p.
586 13, Jan. 2018, doi: [10.1016/S2213-2600\(17\)30468-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(17)30468-X).
- 587 [52] S. Chatterjee, P. Das, A. Shikhule, R. Munje, and A. Vassall, “Journey of the
588 tuberculosis patients in India from onset of symptom till one-year post-treatment,”
589 *PLOS Glob. public Heal.*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. e0001564, Feb. 2023, doi:
590 [10.1371/journal.pgph.0001564](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0001564).
- 591 [53] B. Allwood, M. van der Zalm, G. Makanda, K. Mortimer, and Steering Committee of
592 the First International Post-Tuberculosis Symposium, “The long shadow post-
593 tuberculosis,” *Lancet. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 1170–1171, 2019, doi:
594 [10.1016/S1473-3099\(19\)30564-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30564-X).
- 595 [54] D. Benguey *et al.*, “Comparing cross-sectional and longitudinal approaches to

- 596 Tuberculosis Patient Cost Surveys using Nepalese data,” *Health Policy Plan.*, vol.
597 czad037, 2023, [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czad037>.
- 598 [55] B.-T. Nyang’wa *et al.*, “A 24-Week, All-Oral Regimen for Rifampin-Resistant
599 Tuberculosis.,” *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 387, no. 25, pp. 2331–2343, Dec. 2022, doi:
600 10.1056/NEJMoa2117166.
- 601 [56] World Health Organisation., “WHO announces landmark changes in treatment of
602 drug-resistant tuberculosis.” [https://www.who.int/news/item/15-12-2022-who-](https://www.who.int/news/item/15-12-2022-who-announces-landmark-changes-in-treatment-of-drug-resistant-tuberculosis)
603 [announces-landmark-changes-in-treatment-of-drug-resistant-tuberculosis](https://www.who.int/news/item/15-12-2022-who-announces-landmark-changes-in-treatment-of-drug-resistant-tuberculosis) (accessed
604 Jul. 15, 2023).
- 605 [57] D. T. Wademan *et al.*, “‘TB is a disease which hides in the body’: Qualitative data on
606 conceptualisations of tuberculosis recurrence among patients in Zambia and South
607 Africa,” *Glob. Public Health*, pp. 1–15, 2021, doi: 10.1080/17441692.2021.1940235.
- 608 [58] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control., “Why is pandemic preparedness
609 planning important?” [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/seasonal-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/seasonal-influenza/preparedness/why-pandemic-preparedness)
610 [influenza/preparedness/why-pandemic-preparedness](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/seasonal-influenza/preparedness/why-pandemic-preparedness) (accessed Oct. 25, 2023).
- 611 [59] M. van Lettow, W. W. Fawzi, and R. D. Semba, “Triple Trouble: The Role of
612 Malnutrition in Tuberculosis and Human Immunodeficiency Virus Co-infection.,”
613 *Nutr. Rev.*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 81–90, 2003.
- 614 [60] A. Bhargava *et al.*, “Nutritional support for adult patients with microbiologically
615 confirmed pulmonary tuberculosis: outcomes in a programmatic cohort nested within
616 the RATIONS trial in Jharkhand, India.,” *Lancet Glob. Heal.*, no. Aug 7:S2214-
617 109X(23)00324-8, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00324-8.
- 618 [61] P. Sinha and S. Mehta, “Food: the tuberculosis vaccine we already have.,” *Lancet*,
619 Aug. 2023, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)01321-1.
- 620 [62] B. Hatherall, J. N. Newell, N. B. Emmel, S. C. Khan, and M. Amir, “‘Who Will Marry
621 a Diseased Girl?’ Marriage, Gender, and Tuberculosis Stigma in Asia,” *Qual. Health*
622 *Res.*, vol. 29, no. 8, pp. 1109–1119, 2019, [Online]. Available:
623 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318812427>.
- 624

626 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics of participants (individual-level questionnaire) who were
627 enrolled in the study.

Characteristic		Non-TB	DS-TB	DR-TB	p-value
		N=90	N=90	N=90	
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Men		50 (56%)	50 (56%)	50 (56%)	1.00
Age category	≤24	7 (8%)	12 (13%)	12 (13%)	0.64
	25-34	27 (30%)	30 (33%)	24 (27%)	
	35-44	33 (37%)	33 (37%)	36 (40%)	
	45-54	14 (16%)	12 (13%)	10 (12%)	
	55+	9 (10%)	3 (3%)	7 (8%)	
Education of person	Primary	8 (9%)	17 (19%)	25 (28%)	0.03
	Secondary	72 (80%)	66 (73%)	59 (65%)	
	Tertiary	10 (11%)	7 (8%)	6 (7%)	
HIV ¹ positive		27 (30%)	58 (64%)	60 (67%)	<0.001
History of TB		14 (16%)	10 (11%)	26 (29%)	0.01
Phase of TB treatment	Intensive	N/A	51 (57%)	17 (19%)	<0.001
	Continuation	N/A	39 (43%)	73 (81%)	
Experienced TB stigma	Yes	N/A	12 (13%)	22 (24%)	0.06
Interval from symptoms to diagnosis (weeks)		N/A	9 (6-22)	13 (5-24)	0.29
Hospitalization in the past 12 months		2 (2%)	18 (20%)	30 (41%)	<0.001
Loss of income in the past 12 months		46 (51%)	74 (82%)	79 (88%)	<0.001
Changed residency in the past 12 months		8 (9%)	29 (32%)	33 (37%)	<0.001
TB related costs (USD)	Median (IQR)	N/A	150 (100-275)	400 (244-728)	<0.001

628 SES=Socioeconomic status; HH=Household; DS-TB=drug susceptible tuberculosis; DR-TB=drug
629 resistant tuberculosis; IQR = interquartile range; USD = United States Dollar, ¹ 1=unknown

630 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics of study households that were enrolled in the study

Characteristic		Type of household			p-value
		Non-TB N=90	DS-TB N=90	DR-TB N=90	
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Head of household	Male	58 (64%)	54 (60%)	62 (69%)	0.46
Province	Harare	22 (24%)	22 (24%)	22 (24%)	1.00
	Bulawayo	24 (27%)	24 (27%)	24 (27%)	
	Matabeleland South	24 (27%)	24 (27%)	24 (27%)	
	Masvingo	20 (22%)	20 (22%)	20 (22%)	
Place of residency	Urban	50 (56%)	60 (67%)	55 (61%)	0.31
	Rural	40 (44%)	30 (33%)	35 (39%)	
SES at baseline (n=258)	Poorest	31 (38%)	28 (32%)	34 (39%)	0.46
	Poor	22 (27%)	27 (30%)	30 (35%)	
	Not so poor	29 (35%)	34 (38%)	23 (26%)	
Age of head of household	≤24	3(3%)	4(4%)	5 (6%)	0.76
	25-34	31(35%)	21(24%)	19 (21%)	
	35-44	30 (33%)	37 (42%)	40 (44%)	
	45-54	16 (18%)	20 (22%)	17 (19%)	
	55+	10 (11%)	7 (8%)	9 (10%)	
Education (head of household)	≤Primary	11 (12%)	18 (20%)	23 (25%)	0.29
	Secondary	69 (77%)	64 (71%)	61 (68%)	
	Tertiary	10 (11%)	8 (9%)	6 (7%)	
History of TB in household		28 (31%)	35 (39%)	45 (50%)	0.03
Death in HH past 12mo		15 (16%)	17 (19%)	20 (22%)	0.64
HH member requiring care*		20 (22%)	60 (67%)	70 (78%)	0.001
<i>Coping strategies</i>					
Withdrew/transferred children to cheaper schools		12 (13%)	28 (31%)	28 (31%)	0.01
▪ Withdrew children from schools		3 (3%)	18 (20%)	23 (26%)	
▪ Moved children to cheaper schools		12 (13%)	14 (16%)	9 (10%)	
Sold assets		40 (44%)	52 (58%)	60 (67%)	0.01
Spent savings		49 (54%)	68 (76%)	64 (71%)	0.01
Borrowed		49 (54%)	68 (76%)	64 (71%)	0.02
Experienced income loss		48 (53%)	74 (82%)	81 (90%)	0.001
Failed to repay loans		16 (18%)	37(41%)	49 (54%)	0.001
Perceived impact of shocks on HH during the past 12 months	Severe	32 (36%)	63 (70%)	83 (92%)	<0.001
	Moderate	28 (31%)	21 (23%)	6 (7%)	
	Little/no impact	30 (33%)	6 (6%)	1 (1%)	
<i>Living under the poverty line§</i>					
▪ 12 months prior to the study		21 (23%)	40 (45%)	37 (41%)	0.01
▪ At the time of the study		73 (81%)	78 (88%)	85 (94%)	0.02
Experienced worsening social relations		23 (26%)	43 (48%)	45 (50%)	0.001

631 SES=Socioeconomic status; HH=household; DS-TB=drug susceptible tuberculosis; DR-TB=drug resistant
632 tuberculosis; *during the past 12 months; § income less than US\$1.90 per person per day.

Table 3: Loss of livelihood in DS-TB, DR-TB affected households and non-TB households.

Characteristic	Experienced loss of livelihood		PR 95% CI	aPR 95% CI	
	Total	Yes (%) ‡			
Total	268	133 (50)			
Type of household	DR-TB	90	56 (62)	2.31 (1.58-3.37)	2.02 (1.35-3.03)
	DS-TB	89	53 (60)	2.21 (1.51-3.24)	2.06 (1.38-3.07)
	Non-TB	89	24 (27)	Reference	Reference
History of TB in household	Yes	109	57 (52)	1.38 (1.07-1.78)	1.06 (0.84-1.33)
	No	160	76(48)	Reference	Reference
Socioeconomic status	Poorest	93	56 (60)	1.81 (1.28-2.55)	1.81 (1.29-2.54)
	Poor	89	45 (51)	1.71 (1.19-2.44)	1.66 (1.16-2.36)
	Not so poor	84	28 (33)	Reference	Reference

‡ =Row percentages; PR=prevalence ratio; aPR=adjusted prevalence ratio; CI=confidence interval; DS-TB=drug susceptible tuberculosis ; DR-TB=drug resistant tuberculosis.

Table 4: Concordance between impoverishment and loss of livelihood during the periods 12 months before the study and during the study.

Impoverishment		Experienced loss of livelihood		Totals	Concordance	95% CI
		Yes	No			
12 months before interview	Yes	86	85	171	51%	(45%-57%)
	No	47	49	96		
		133	134	267		
At the time of interview	Yes	128	107	235	58%	(52%-64%)
	No	5	27	32		
		133	134	267		

CI=Confidence interval.

Figure 1: Spider-plots showing the five households capital assets following shocks such as TB and COVID-19

Figure 1A: All households	Figure 1B: Stratified by type of household

DS-TB=drug susceptible TB ; DR-TB=Drug resistant TB.

A fully resilient households has a score of 1 in all the five capital assets. It covers the whole area of the pentagon. A vulnerable household has lower scores in most or all the five capital assets. Accordingly the area covered is small. Non-TB affected households have more capital assets (cover more area of the pentagon) than TB affected households (DR-TB and DS-TB).

Supplement table 1: Indicators contributing to the livelihood variable.

Livelihood capital	Indicators
Financial capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of assets.‡ • Spending savings.‡ • Failure to repay loans. • Pledging future crops/cattle/livestock‡ • Borrowing at exorbitant interest rates‡ • Reduction in household income.
Physical capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of productive assets.‡ • Failure to replace productive assets.
Social capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in relationship with neighbours for the worse. • Changes in relationship with family members for the worse. • Received support from neighbours/family.
Natural capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in land that is farmed (idle land/leasing). • Sale of land/cattle to finance TB.
Human capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in head of household (death/abandonment by spouse/family). • Physical debility resulting in loss of labour for household. • Insufficient food. • Education of children affected†

†=A derived variable obtained from either moving children to cheaper schools and/or withdrawing children from school; ‡=Coping strategies.

Supplementary Figure 1: Study sites

Supplementary file: Creating a binary variable for loss of livelihood

Use of a sustainable livelihood framework-based measure to create a dichotomous outcome variable for loss of livelihood (Yes/No).

Authors and institutions

Collins Timire, ¹⁻³ Rein Houben, ⁴ Debora Pedrazzoli, ⁴ Rashida Abbas Ferrand, ^{1,3} Claire Calderwood, ^{1,3} Virginia Bond, ^{5,6} Fredrick Mbiba, ³ Katharina Kranzer ^{1,3,7,8}

¹ Department of Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

² AIDS & TB Department, Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe

³ The Health Research Unit, Biomedical Research & Training Institute, Harare, Zimbabwe

⁴ Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

⁵ Department of Global Health and Development, Faculty of Public Health and Policy LSHTM, London, UK

⁶ Social Sciences Unit, Zambart, Lusaka, Zambia

⁷ Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, University Hospital, LMU Munich

⁸ German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Munich

Corresponding author details:

Collins Timire

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK

Clinical Research Department, Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, UK

Collins.Timire@LSHTM.ac.uk +263777 687328 /+447719721145

Alternative corresponding author details:

Katharina Kranzer

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK

Clinical Research Department, Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, UK

Katharina.Kranzer@LSHTM.ac.uk +263774795737

Household questionnaire

The household questionnaire was interviewer administered to heads of households in 180 TB affected and in 90 non-affected households. The questionnaire was administered in local language by CT (the PI) and FM (Research Assistant). The development of the questionnaire was informed by the variables in the patient cost surveys, the five capital assets on the sustainable livelihood framework, the pilot study in HIV programming in Zimbabwe, and researchers' field experiences in Zimbabwe. Some of which were derived during analysis. Data from the paper-based questionnaires were entered in EpiData entry software for cleaning and were exported to Stata version 13.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) for analysis.

Variables in the household questionnaire

The outcome variable, loss of livelihood was derived from five capital assets. Variables were derived from each of the five capital assets. The variables that were included in the model are listed below.

Table S1: Variables included in the model to come up with an indicator for loss of livelihood

Capital asset	Definition	Questions	Variable name	Coding
Human	Ability to work now or in the future and acquire skills	i. Was child transferred to a cheaper school?	N/A	[Yes=1/No=0]
		ii. Was child withdrawn from school?	N/A	
		iii. Was education of child affected? [<i>derived from i and ii</i>]	educaffect	
		iv. During the past month, did you worry that your household had insufficient food?	insufood	[Yes=1/No=0]
Financial	Refers to cash, stock and savings. It may take the form of savings, earnings (whether regular wages or one-off payments), access to loans, or money stored in saleable property such as livestock.	i. Did your household spend savings?	spendsaving	[Yes=1/No=0]
		ii. Did your household borrow some money	borrow	[Yes=1/No=0]
		iii. Did your household pledge future crops or livestock?	pledged	[Yes=1/No=0]
		iv. Did your household fail to repay loans?	failrepay	[Yes=1/No=0]
		v. Income of household 12 months prior the interview	N/A	
		vi. Income of household at the time of interview	N/A	
		household income loss [<i>derived from v and vi</i>]	hhincomlos	[Yes=1/No=0]
Physical	Refers to assets such as buildings, machinery and equipment.	i. Did your household sell any assets?	soldassets	[Yes=1/No=0]
Social	Are relations which are based on exchange, trust and reciprocity that households depend on.	i. Relationship with family 12 months before interview on a scale of [0-10], where 0 is worst, and 10 is excellent]	N/A	N/A
		ii. Relationship with family at the time of interview on a scale of [0-10], where 0 is worst, and 10 is excellent]	N/A	N/A
		iii. Change in relations with family for the worse [<i>derived variable from i and ii</i>]	frelchange	[Yes=1/No=0]
		iv. Relationship with neighbours 12 months before interview on a scale of [0-10], where 0 is worst, and 10 is excellent]	N/A	N/A
		v. Relationship with neighbours at the time of interview on a scale of [0-10], where 0 is worst, and 10 is excellent]	N/A	N/A
		vi. Change in relations with neighbours for the worse [<i>derived from i & ii</i>]	nrelchange	[Yes=1/No=0]
		vii. Did your household receive social support (food/ cash?)	socspt	[Yes=1/No=0]
Natural	Include land and livestock	i. Did your household sell productive assets?	sold assets	[Yes=1/No=0]
		ii. Did your household fail to replace the productive assets that were sold?	failrestock	[Yes=1/No=0]

Creating a binary variable for loss of livelihood (Yes/No) from the 13 variables.

First, a global list of all the 13 variables was created using the syntax below.

```
global xlist1 soldassets hhincomlos insufood spendsaving borrow failrepay prodasset  
educareffect pledged socspt nrelchange frelchange  
global id uniqueid
```

Second, the variables were correlated. Since the variables are binary (Yes/No), the tetrachoric approach was applied. The correlations were presented in a correlation matrix (**Table S1**).

Correlations among variables

```
tetrachoric $xlist1, posdef  
adj-corr soldassets hhincomloss spendsavinggg prodasset educareffect pledged failrepay  
insufood borrow failrestock frelchange nrelchange socspt
```

Table S1: Correlation matrix of the variables included in the factor analysis.

	soldassets	hhincomloss	insufood	spendsaving	Borrow	failrepay	prodasset	eduaffected	pledge	socspt	nrelchange	frelchange	failrestock
soldassets	1.00												
hhincomloss	0.4458	1.00											
insufood	0.3337	0.4188	1.00										
spendsaving	0.1097	0.3449	0.0420	1.00									
borrow	0.4254	0.3508	0.2906	0.3424	1.00								
failrepay	0.4403	0.4707	0.4959	0.2173	0.8812	1.00							
prodasset	0.3952	0.1733	0.2170	0.1473	0.0735	0.0951	1.00						
eduaffected	0.4802	0.4274	0.4322	0.1629	0.4443	0.4953	0.1778	1.00					
pledge	0.4017	0.8477	0.1225	0.2995	0.3999	0.4087	0.2829	0.0534	1.00				
socspt	-0.0684	-0.1206	-0.0748	-0.0983	0.0894	0.0052	0.1186	-0.1858	0.0740	1.00			
nrelchange	0.4024	0.4656	0.0925	0.2216	0.2116	0.4529	0.2365	0.3718	0.3130	-0.3065	1.00		
frelchange	0.3294	0.2734	0.0573	0.1675	0.1873	0.4171	-0.0017	0.4196	0.0640	0.0322	0.5987	1.00	
failrestock	0.3748	0.1685	0.1930	0.1449	0.0403	0.0696	0.9930	0.1812	0.2632	0.0986	0.2896	0.0295	1.00

Measure of sampling adequacy


The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was used as the measure of sampling adequacy. The following syntax was used.

```
pca $xlist1, components (1)
  screeplot, yline(1) ci(het)
  estat kmo
```

<i>pca \$xlist1, components (1)</i>				
<i>Principal components correlation</i>				
			Number of obs	267
			Number of comp	1
			Trace	13
			Rho	0.2293
Component	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
<i>Comp1</i>	2.98083	1.11858	0.2293	0.2293
<i>Comp2</i>	1.86225	0.677627	0.1433	0.3725
<i>Comp3</i>	1.18463	0.103454	0.0911	0.4637
<i>Comp4</i>	1.08117	0.0321132	0.0832	0.5468
<i>Comp5</i>	1.04906	0.127538	0.0807	0.6275
<i>Comp6</i>	0.921523	0.0336749	0.0709	0.6984
<i>Comp7</i>	0.887848	0.153076	0.0683	0.7667
<i>Comp8</i>	0.734772	0.0480941	0.0565	0.8232
<i>Comp9</i>	0.686678	0.0714222	0.0528	0.8761
<i>Comp10</i>	0.615256	0.0875471	0.0473	0.9234
<i>Comp11</i>	0.527709	0.0981294	0.0406	0.9640
<i>Comp12</i>	0.429579	0.390895	0.0330	0.9970
<i>Comp13</i>	0.0386842	.	0.0030	1.0000

<i>Principal components (eigenvectors)</i>		
Variable	Comp1	Unexplained
<i>soldassets</i>	0.3569	0.6202
<i>hincmloss</i>	0.3187	0.6972
<i>spendsaving</i>	0.1883	0.8943
<i>prodasset</i>	0.2859	0.7564
<i>educareffect</i>	0.3131	0.7077
<i>pledged</i>	0.1739	0.9098
<i>failrepay</i>	0.3695	0.5929
<i>insufood</i>	0.2272	0.8461
<i>borrow</i>	0.3062	0.7205
<i>failrestock</i>	0.2843	0.7591
<i>frelchange</i>	0.2450	0.8211
<i>nrelchange</i>	0.3169	0.7006
<i>socspt</i>	-0.0474	0.9933

Screeplot



The KMO measure shows that xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Variable	KMO
soldassets	0.8621
hhincomlos	0.7968
spendsaving	0.7098
prodasset	0.5313
educareffect	0.8401
pledged	0.7655
failrepay	0.7223
insufood	0.7395
borrow	0.6967
failrestock	0.5296
frelchange	0.6947
nrelchange	0.7017
socspt	0.4720
Overall	0.6588

KMO measure	Interpretation
$KMO \geq 0.90$	Marvellous
$0.80 \leq KMO < 0.90$	Meritorious
$0.70 \leq KMO < 0.80$	Average
$0.60 \leq KMO < 0.70$	Mediocre
$0.50 \leq KMO < 0.60$	Terrible
$KMO < 0.50$	Unacceptable

PCA: Factor analysis, pcf

```
factor $xlist1, pcf factors(1)
```

Creating binary index

```
xtile lol=lol_index, nq(2)
```

Creating the index for loss of livelihood as a continuous variable.

```
gen lol_index = .
```

```
factor $xlist1, pcf factors(1)
```

Creating a Kernel density estimate to check the distribution of loss of livelihood index.

```
gen lol_index = .
```


```
factor $xlist1, pcf factors(1)
```

```
predict temp // SPECIFY REGRESSION OR BARTLETT OPTION
```

```
replace lol_index = temp
```

```
drop temp
```

```
kdensity lol_index
```



Creating the binary variable for loss of livelihood

```
gen lol=.
```

```
xtile temp=lol_index, nq(2)
```

```
replace lol = temp
```

```
drop temp
```


```
label define lol 1 "Yes" 2 "No"
```

```
label var lol "Loss of livelihood"
```


```
labelvalues lol lol
```

```
ta lol
```

Experienced loss of livelihood	Number	(%)
Yes	134	(50.2)
No	133	(49.8)



Figure



Figure