

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Full Title

Impact of a pilot mHealth intervention on treatment outcomes of TB patients seeking care in the private sector
using Propensity Scores Matching – Evidence collated from New Delhi, India

Short Title

mHealth intervention and treatment outcomes of TB patients

Authors: *Ridhima Sodhi^{1¶*}, Vindhya Vatsyayan^{1¶}, Vikas Panibatla^{2&}, Khasim Sayyad^{2&}, Jason Williams^{3&}, Theresa Pattery^{3&}, Arnab Pal^{1&}*

1. William J Clinton Foundation, New Delhi, India
2. TB Alert India, New Delhi, India
3. Disease Management Programs, Global Public Health at Johnson & Johnson

* Corresponding author

E-mail: ridhimasodhi@gmail.com (RS)

¶These authors contributed equally to this work

&These authors also contributed equally to this work

31 **Abstract**

32 Mobile health applications called Digital Adherence Technologies (DATs) are increasingly used for improving
33 treatment adherence among Tuberculosis patients to attain cure, and/or other chronic diseases requiring long term
34 and complex medication regimens. These DATs are found to be useful in resource limited settings because of their
35 cost efficiency in reaching out to vulnerable groups (providing pill & clinic visit reminders, health information and
36 awareness on the disease along with motivational messages and support to be retained in care) or those staying in
37 remote or rural areas. Despite their growing ubiquity, there is very limited evidence on how they improve healthcare
38 outcomes. We analyze the uptake of such an intervention in an urban setting (DS-DOST, powered by Connect for
39 Life™, Johnson & Johnson) among different patient groups accessing TB services in New Delhi, India, and
40 subsequently assess its impact in improving patient engagement and treatment outcomes. This study aims to
41 understand the uptake patterns of a digital adherence technology and its impact in improving follow ups and treatment
42 outcomes among TB patients. Propensity choice modelling was used to create balanced treated and untreated patient
43 datasets, before applying simple ordinary least square and logistic regression methods to estimate the causal impact of
44 the intervention on the number of follow ups made with the patient and treatment outcomes.

45
46 After controlling for potential confounders, it is found that patients who installed and utilized DS-DOST
47 application received an average of 6.4 (95% C.I. [5.32 to 7.557]) additional follow-ups, relative to those who did not
48 utilize the application. This translates to a 58% increase. They also had 245% higher likelihood of a treatment
49 success (Odds ratio: 3.458; 95% C.I. [1.709 to 6.996]). Descriptive results indicate that young females, and those
50 suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis have a slightly higher propensity to use the Cfl™ app, and benefit through
51 their treatment duration.

52 **Author Summary**

53 The research tries to understand the impact of using cost-effective digital adherence tools, in improving treatment
54 outcomes among patients diagnosed with drug-sensitive Tuberculosis (TB). As the treatment duration for TB is fairly
55 long (at least 6 months) and complicated (multiple drugs, typically given in two distinct phases), there are challenges
56 associated with ensuring treatment adherence. The research finds that digital tools such as a mobile application – can
57 be a useful aid, albeit only when they are used in conjunction with the support of a healthcare worker. The digital tool
58 analyzed, while sending medication reminders to patients, also enabled healthcare workers in tracking adherence for
59 their assigned patients. The latter, as the research finds, ensured that they follow up with their patients to ensure
60 adherence, resulting in increased odds of their getting a favourable treatment outcome. Further, the study underscores
61 that a digital intervention used in isolation might not draw a favourable impact among patients – highlighting the role

62 of healthcare workers and tailored interventions. In conclusion, digital adherence technologies can act as cost-effective
63 measures in empowering healthcare workers to support their patients, and subsequently improve treatment outcomes.

64

65 **Introduction/Background**

66 Digital adherence technologies (DATs) have increasingly evolved over time, and yet, evidence evaluating their
67 impact on intended treatment or patient management outcomes is limited [1]–[3]. A previous study outlines
68 multiple approaches of evidence generation for evaluating the efficacy of a mHealth solution, while also
69 highlighting the inherent challenges associated [4]. One critical challenge highlighted here is the rapid pace of
70 development of technologies, which could potentially entail the developers to improve or modify the
71 intervention, thus making it difficult to accurately assess the impact of the mHealth intervention. Of the
72 multiple approaches suggested to evaluate interventions, RCTs or randomized controlled evaluations were
73 deemed to be the most common but far too long [5-7 years] in typical scenarios [4]. Another recommended
74 approach called CEEBIT (Continuous Evaluation of Evolving Behavioural Interventions) discussed assessing
75 multiple technologies, while continually removing inferior technologies from the competitive race [4], [5].

76

77 Notwithstanding the challenges, multiple studies have emphasized a need for evaluating DATs, and a
78 simultaneous lack of the same [2], [6]–[8]. A systematic evaluation evaluating the role of mobile health
79 interventions in enhancing interventions PPM (public- private mix) for TB care illustrated the increasing
80 universe of such solutions [9]. However, none of the studies were found to evaluate the precise impact of such
81 technologies on patient management (encompassing one or all aspects of pill reminders, patient follow ups,
82 monitoring adherence, empowering patients with messages on disease awareness, side effects and health
83 information) along with treatment outcomes. Even in more general studies documenting the usage of such
84 technologies in TB care, there is a lack of quantitative evidence detailing the precise impact of such
85 technologies on improving disease management or behaviour modification [1], [2].

86

87 Our study is aimed at closing this gap, by assessing the impact of a pilot intervention with Connect for
88 Life™(CfL), a mobile-based digital adherence technology on patient management and treatment outcomes.
89 The study utilizes propensity choice modelling to balance the test and control group, thus enabling precise
90 estimates of the impact on treatment outcomes. The natural limitation of this method is that the test and
91 control groups can only be balanced for the covariates on which the data is available. However, the magnitude

92 and significance of results obtained, across different model specifications, render confidence to the inferences
93 gathered.

94 **Methods**

95 ***Ethical Approval***

96 CHAI's Scientific and Ethical Review Committee (SERC) waived informed consent as anonymized
97 programmatic data was utilized for the study. Additionally, all the individuals who enrolled in the CfL
98 pilot did give an informed consent prior to enrolment in the pilot, through a written statement, and
99 also gave consent via IVRS. In case of patients who were below 18 years of age, parents/guardians
100 were primary participants, who provided written consent.

101 ***DS-TB care services under Project JEET***

102 The Joint Effort for Elimination of Tuberculosis (Project JEET) began in 2018 and is a large-scale private health
103 sector engagement initiative for TB [10]. The services offered through the program are intended to reduce
104 challenges which limit the Indian healthcare system in arresting TB transmission, facilitating access to
105 appropriate TB care, and supporting TB patients throughout their treatment. As part of JEET, treatment
106 coordinators facilitate the notification of newly diagnosed TB patients in a digital government tracking system
107 called Nikshay, by liaising with private providers. This notification helps in tracking diagnosed patients and
108 offering them a package of services provided by the National Tuberculosis Elimination program (NTEP). The
109 patients also get regular counselling support by a designated treatment coordinator by way of in-person and
110 telephonic follow ups, along with quality assured diagnostic services (Xpert Testing) and access to free
111 government sponsored FDC (Fixed Dose Combination) drugs. The services are provided in close coordination
112 with the treating physician, and as deemed appropriate by them. The program helps in limiting the onward
113 transmission of disease through the combination of support described. At the time of initiation of the CfL pilot
114 (November 2019), approximately 900 private providers in New Delhi were engaged with Project JEET as part of
115 the Patient Provider Support Agency (PPSA) managed by the William J. Clinton Foundation (WJCF).

116 ***Pilot Set up***

117 The pilot was initiated in the month of November 2019, in three private care facilities in New Delhi, India,
118 namely, Vinod Karhana Hospital, Ganga Ram Hospital, and St. Stephens hospital. The patients under this
119 intervention were notified through Project JEET. The intervention was done in collaboration between William J

120 Clinton Foundation (WJCF), TB Alert, India & Johnson & Johnson (J&J), wherein the latter developed and
121 customized Connect for Life™, a mobile application built to help treatment providers and healthcare workers
122 in patient management. The digital intervention was voluntary in nature, wherein newly diagnosed TB patients
123 (or/and their caregivers) were informed about the CfL application and were asked for consent to being a part
124 of this program. New patients were enrolled in the pilot between 26th November 2019 and 15th March 2020.
125 Patients who consented were provided with digital support offered by the CfL mobile application and a
126 designated treatment coordinator, in addition to the standard services provided to patients managed under
127 Project JEET. Two key elements of the pilot are described below:

128 1) **Connect for Life™**: This is a mobile, feature or smartphone-based health application system which
129 utilizes a combination of IVRS (Interactive Voice Response System) and SMS (short messaging service)
130 to help patients in remembering to take their medications, provide reminders for visiting the clinic for
131 planned check-ups and medication refills, while also giving them health tips covering topics such as
132 nutrition, significance of adherence, stigma, and community transmission. As of 2021, CfL is an Open-
133 Source Platform [11] and can be downloaded and used by any organization or country. Some key
134 features of the mHealth application include:

- 135 a) Facility to enrol both the patient and the caregiver
- 136 b) The user could modify the frequency of the pill/health-tip reminders between
137 daily/weekly/monthly, and could also set up a preferred time during the day for receiving
138 reminders
- 139 c) The adherence captured through the application were pulled in a dashboard, which could then
140 be viewed by the treatment coordinator. This allowed the treatment coordinator to monitor
141 patient's adherence and follow up as needed
- 142 d) Option to opt out of service at any time during the treatment

143
144 2) **Treatment Coordinators**: Three healthcare workers were engaged for the pilot, each one responsible
145 for patient management of the enrolled patients in one of the three private facilities. While all patients
146 under Project JEET are assigned a treatment coordinator, these three treatment coordinators were also
147 given training on how to use the mobile application and explain its functions and utilities to the
148 patients/caregivers. Once patients consented to participate in the pilot, the treatment coordinator
149 helped patients by activating their mobile telephone number with a unique password and explained
150 how to use the phone and/or text messaging functionalities. A key differentiator of these treatment

151 coordinators was that they had access to the CfL visualization dashboard, which enabled them to
152 monitor the self-recorded medication adherence by patients using the application. This helped them in
153 providing differentiated counselling to the patients, by optimizing the counselling and follow-ups based
154 on the analytics provided by the dashboard. This potentially helped reduce the burden of patient
155 management for the treatment coordinators.

156 **Training of the treatment coordinators:** The three treatment coordinators engaged for the pilot were
157 trained by the WJCF staff. They worked very similar to the treatment coordinators working under
158 Project JEET, following the same counselling guides and protocols. Like other treatment coordinators
159 (which are not employed specifically for this intervention), they were also responsible for updating
160 patient's demographic and treatment information in Nikshay.

161 ***Study design***

162 The quasi-experimental study compared the follow up regimen and treatment outcomes of patients who were
163 part of the CfL pilot (test dataset), with patients who were not part of the pilot, but were notified during the
164 same time period in the same three facilities (control dataset). Both test & control datasets were matched
165 using propensity scores for ensuring robust measures.

166 ***Data source(s)***

167 There are two data sources utilized for this study. The first is data obtained from the CfL application, which
168 consisted of information on 476 patients who were signed up for the pilot. The other source is programmatic
169 data collected as part of the services rendered under Project JEET. The data collected as part of regular JEET
170 operations included 1) TB patients demographic characteristics such as age, sex, and diagnosing district, 2) TB
171 diagnostic and treatment information, including type of diagnostic test performed, pulmonary or
172 extrapulmonary diagnosis, whether free drugs were provided, patients' treatment outcome, and 3) number of
173 follow-up contacts made by treatment coordinators. The data collected by the pilot intervention included
174 information on utilization of the CfL application. This consisted of multiple metrics such as the preferable time
175 for health tips delivery for each patient, whether or not they recorded the adherence, and the number of
176 times they interacted with the IVRS for various services. It also had information on which of the 476 patients
177 provided consent (or not) and if a patient stayed engaged with the CfL pilot through the course of their
178 treatment.

179 **Data Selection (Inclusion & Exclusion criteria)**

180 We considered data for patients that were enrolled in one of the three facilities where the pilot was conducted
181 and were diagnosed of drug sensitive TB between 1st October 2019 and 31st March 2020. This also represents
182 patients who were diagnosed before the COVID-19 pandemic started impacting health services operations in
183 India (the first nation-wide lockdown in India was implemented on 24th of March 2020). Among these, only those
184 patients were considered who had had a treatment outcome assigned to them at the time this study was
185 conducted. The selection criteria are described in more detail in Table 1 & 2. A total of 989 patients were
186 enrolled, of which 276 enrolled in the CfL application, provided consent and utilized it through their treatment.

187

188

189 **Table 1**

190 CfL Test dataset: Selection criteria pathway

Reason for inclusion/exclusion	#Patients	Patients
	Excluded	retained
Patients enrolled	(+) 476	476
Consent required	(-) 138	338
Patients opted out of the application after using	(-) 18	320
Patient died before treatment initiation	(-) 1	319
Patients transferred/migrated to a different facility	(-) 35	284
Treatment outcome is pending	(-) 7	277
Treatment outcome should be one of cured, complete, death or treatment failure	(-) 1	276

191

192

193 **Table 2**

194 Control dataset: Selection criteria pathway

Reason for inclusion/exclusion	#Patients	Patients
	Excluded	retained
Patients notified in New Delhi between October 2019 and March 2020		9478
Patients who were engaged with the CfL application	(-) 333	9145
Patients notified at one of the 3 facilities	(-) 8407	738
Treatment outcome is pending	(-) 13	725


195

196 Model Theory

197 We fit multiple statistical models to understand how the CfL engagement impacted patients and their
198 treatment outcomes. Our findings suggest that the combination of features provided by the CfL application
199 contributed to the patient being more engaged with their treatment. Routine health tips, along with
200 medication reminders, customized to be received at a chosen time of patient's preference helped prevent
201 challenges to continued treatment adherence, and encouraged the patient to stay connected with their
202 treatment coordinator. Simultaneously, treatment coordinators utilized the platform to monitor patients'
203 adherence, and increased follow ups if and when the patients were found to lag behind in medication
204 adherence. These factors then contribute to better treatment adherence, leading to better treatment
205 outcomes (Figure 1). The study attempts to develop a precise estimate of the treatment effect of CfL on
206 patients' follow-ups and treatment outcome by using a combination of regression methods on a matched
207 dataset built through propensity choice modelling.

208

Figure 1: CfL Patient Care Cascade



209

210 Outcomes of Interest

211 The study has two primary outcomes, 1) patient follow-ups and 2) treatment outcomes. Patient follow ups refers
212 to the number of times a patient spoke to or met with a treatment coordinator, and acts as a proxy for patient
213 management. Treatment outcomes are analyzed as a binary variable in the study. Five outcomes are considered

214 1) treatment complete, 2) cured, 3) treatment failure, 4) death, or 5) lost to follow-up. The first two correspond
215 to a successful outcome, and the last three correspond to an unsuccessful one. These outcomes are further
216 described with clinical definitions in Appendix 1 [12].

217 **Propensity Choice Modelling**

218 Effectively, all diagnosed TB patients who visited the three facilities during the pilot initiation were offered to
219 enrol for the CfL intervention, meaning the data collected as part of this study was not randomized. This makes
220 it difficult to access the average treatment effect (ATE) of the intervention on the outcomes of interest. While
221 randomized experiments are a preferred choice to understand the causal effect of a treatment, running such an
222 experiment is often cost intensive and consists of multiple ethical issues (primarily with respect to who receives
223 the intervention), especially in studies concerning welfare and healthcare treatment effects [13]. Several studies
224 have acknowledged the usage of matching methods to infer causal insights from observational data, specifically
225 in the field of health care assessment [14], [15]. It is documented that creating a dataset which is matched on
226 choice attributes provides an opportunity to estimate the average effect of the treatment as if it were a
227 randomized experiment, which means if the access to CfL was randomly assigned to individual patients [16].

228 We utilized propensity score modelling to create a matched dataset comprised of treated patients (enrolled in
229 the CfL) and untreated patients (not enrolled), which also included data on potential confounders for each
230 individual [14], [17]–[20]. The propensity score refers to the conditional probability of a patient being enrolled
231 in the pilot, given the values of all potential confounder [18]. This score was estimated for each patient in the
232 full analytical dataset. These scores were then used to create comparable groups of people who were part of
233 the pilot engagement (treated) and those who did not ever engage (untreated). The scores were adequate
234 predictors of whether or not a patient enrolled in the pilot, illustrated in Appendix 2 (Figure SF1, Table S2, S3).

235 We identified pairs of observations that have very similar propensity scores, but that differed in their treatment
236 status (CfL or not), and employed the full matching algorithm, first developed by Rosenbaum (1991) [21] and
237 illustrated by Hansen (2004) [22]. It uses all available individuals in the data by grouping the individuals into a
238 series of matched sets (subclasses), with each matched set containing at least 1 treated individual (who received
239 the treatment of interest) and at least 1 comparison individual (who did not). Full matching forms these matched
240 sets in an optimal way, such that treated individuals who have many comparison individuals who are similar (on
241 the basis of the propensity score) will be grouped with many comparison individuals, whereas treated individuals
242 with few similar comparison individuals will be grouped with relatively fewer comparison individuals. The
243 method is thus more flexible than traditional k:1 matching, in which each treated individual is required to be

244 matched with the same number of comparison individuals (k), regardless of whether each individual actually has
245 k good matches [23]. To counter any bias, we adopted two measures. First, we employed a calliper width of 0.2
246 for the age and district variables using nearest neighbour matching, meaning the matched pairs were a
247 maximum of 0.2 standard deviations away from each other, which is described as ideal by previous studies [24].
248 Second, we employed exact matching on four variables: 1) proportion of males, 2) proportion of extra pulmonary
249 cases, 3) proportion of patients diagnosed using Xpert testing, and 4) access to free drugs.

250 **Statistical modelling**

251 Using the matched dataset, we fit fixed-effects ordinary least squares (OLS) regression and fixed-effects logistic
252 regression models to estimate the impact of CfL engagement on the number of follow-ups made with the
253 patient and the likelihood of a successful treatment outcome, respectively. As covariates in the OLS regression
254 model, we fitted a series of models, sequentially including CfL engagement, diagnosing facility, sex, age
255 category (0 to 5, 6 to 15, 16 to 19, 20 to 45, 46 to 65, and ≥ 66 years), TB type (pulmonary or extra pulmonary),
256 whether Xpert diagnostics were used, access to free drugs, and the quarter in which the diagnosis was made.
257 The logistic regression model was fit to assess the likelihood of a patient receiving a successful outcome at the
258 culmination of treatment. The same covariates went into the logistic regression model.
259 Diagnosing quarter was included in the model OLS and logistic regression models to control for seasonal
260 program-related influences of patient care and adherence to treatment. Interaction effects on diagnosing
261 facility and diagnosing quarter were considered in both models to account for the simultaneous effect of these
262 two variables on the dependent variables [25].
263 To establish the linkage between follow ups and treatment outcomes, a logistic model was fit with follow ups
264 as an additional dependent variable, while including for the status of CfL engagement and other covariates.

265 **Sensitivity Analysis**

266 Multiple sensitivity analyses were conducted to understand the impact of the CfL engagement on follow ups
267 and treatment outcomes. These are illustrated in the forest plots (Figures 6 and 7), tabular results of which are
268 provided in Appendix 5. Our results were robust to specifications which excluded cases where treatment
269 outcome resulted in lost to follow up, or when we ran facility specific models. The results were also robust to
270 alternative matching methods, wherein we utilized nearest neighbor matching, along with exact matching for
271 selected variables (Appendix 6). The latter resulted in 204 matched pairs.

272 **Statistical software**

273 Analysis was conducted in R 2022.07.01. `MatchIt` package [26], [27] was used for the propensity score
274 matching procedure, `broom`, `cobalt`, and `gtsummary` packages were used for visualizing fitted and residual
275 values, generating balance plots from propensity choice modelling, and generating summary statistics,
276 respectively. Packages used for data cleaning, preparing the analytical datasets, measuring skewness, and
277 visualizing results were `dplyr`, `tidyr`, `moments`, and `ggplot2`.

278 **Results**

279 Tables 3 provides the demographic and clinical profiles of patients in the analytical dataset (989 patients) and
280 matched dataset (944 patients). Table 4 further provides this information, albeit segregated by the pilot
281 engagement status. The matching process using propensity scores brought the standardized propensity score
282 difference between the treated and control group from 0.28 to 0, while balancing the mean difference
283 between other covariates (Appendix 3). Within the matched dataset, 56% patients were male, 20% of patients
284 were diagnosed using Xpert testing, 56% patients had extra pulmonary TB, and 88% of patients had a
285 successful treatment outcome recorded.

286

287

288 **Table 3**

289 *Summary statistics for dataset before and after matching*

	Analytical Dataset	Matched dataset
Number of patients	989	944
Males	554 (56%)	530 (56%)
Age Category		
1. 0-5	9 (0.9%)	9 (1.0%)
2. 6-15	67 (6.8%)	65 (6.9%)
3. 16-19	91 (9.2%)	85 (9.0%)
4. 20-45	490 (50%)	477 (50%)
5. 46-65	246 (25%)	226 (24%)
6. >65	86 (8.7%)	82 (8.7%)

Age

Median (IQR)	35 (23, 53)	35 (23, 53)
Mean	38	38
Free drugs	117 (12%)	91 (9.6%)
Xpert Testing	221 (22%)	185 (20%)
Extra Pulmonary	545 (55%)	528 (56%)
Follow Ups	13 (6, 18)	13 (6, 18)
Median	13 (6, 18)	13 (6, 18)
Mean	12	12
Unknown	215	199
Facility		
sir ganga ram	529 (53%)	519 (55%)
st stephens	282 (29%)	256 (27%)
vinod karhana	178 (18%)	169 (18%)
Treatment Outcome		
complete	867 (88%)	829 (88%)
cured	3 (0.3%)	3 (0.3%)
died	91 (9.2%)	85 (9.0%)
failure	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
lost	27 (2.7%)	26 (2.8%)
Successful Treatment Outcome	870 (88%)	833 (88%)

Note: 1) The table showcases the numbers segregated by CfL status and within group percentages for them; 2) the p value for testing difference of means in groups with and without CfL; 3) n (%); Median (IQR) is given for continuous variables (age & follow ups)

290

291 **Table 4**


292 *Summary statistics for dataset before and after matching; segregated by the CfL™ pilot engagement status*

	Analytical Dataset			Matched dataset		
	(N = 989)		p-value	(N = 944)		p-value
Pilot engagement	no CfL	CfL		no CfL	CfL	

Number of patients	713	276		694	250	
Males	406 (57%)	148 (54%)	0.3	398 (57%)	132 (53%)	0.2
Age Category						
1. 0-5	6 (0.8%)	3 (1.1%)		6 (0.9%)	3 (1.2%)	
2. 6-15	45 (6.3%)	22 (8.0%)		45 (6.5%)	20 (8.0%)	
3. 16-19	51 (7.2%)	40 (14%)		51 (7.3%)	34 (14%)	
4. 20-45	336 (47%)	154 (56%)		334 (48%)	143 (57%)	
5. 46-65	200 (28%)	46 (17%)		186 (27%)	40 (16%)	
6. >65	75 (11%)	11 (4.0%)		72 (10%)	10 (4.0%)	
Age			<0.001			<0.001
Median (IQR)	38 (24, 56)	30 (20, 42)		37 (24, 56)	30 (20, 42)	
Mean	40	33		40	33	
Free drugs	48 (6.7%)	69 (25%)	<0.001	41 (5.9%)	50 (20%)	<0.001
Xpert Testing	105 (15%)	116 (42%)	<0.001	88 (13%)	97 (39%)	<0.001
Extra Pulmonary	408 (57%)	137 (50%)	0.031	402 (58%)	126 (50%)	0.040
Follow Ups						<0.001
Unknown	185	30		173	26	
Median (IQR)	11 (4, 16)	18 (13, 20)	<0.001	11 (4, 16)	18 (13, 20)	
Mean	10	16		10	16	
Facility			<0.001			<0.001
sir ganga ram	454 (64%)	75 (27%)		447 (64%)	72 (29%)	
st stephens	153 (21%)	129 (47%)		143 (21%)	113 (45%)	
vinod karhana	106 (15%)	72 (26%)		104 (15%)	65 (26%)	
Successful treatment outcome	608(85%)	262(95%)	<0.001	595 (86%)	237 (95%)	<0.001

Notes: 1) The table showcases the numbers segregated by Cfl status, and within group percentages for them; 2) For binary/character variables, values represent the number of patients enrolled, and value in parentheses represents share or %; 3) For continuous values, the number represents the median, and the values in parentheses represents the Interquartile Range; 4) Pearson's Chi-squared test and Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test is conducted for p value

Figure 2: Box plot showing the difference in follow ups made with patients; based



Note: The diamond dot represents mean, and the box boundary represents the inter-

293

294 ***Follow-ups with patients***

295 Within the matched dataset, patients with the CfL™ engagement received more follow-ups from treatment
 296 coordinators (Mean=16.3, Median (IQR): 18 (13,20)) than patients who were not engaged with the pilot (Mean
 297 = 10.3, Median (IQR): 11 (4, 16)). These are also illustrated in Figure 2 by way of a box plot distribution.

298 We fit a series of five regression models that progressively added patient-level covariates, fixed-effects for
 299 facility, patient level covariates, fixed-effects for quarter of diagnosis, and an interaction between facility and
 300 quarter of diagnosis (Table 6). All five models revealed statistically significant effect of the pilot engagement on
 301 follow-ups, with Model E controlling for all available potential confounders and an interaction term on
 302 diagnosing facility and quarter. Here, an average treatment effect (ATE) in terms of 6.4 additional follow-ups
 303 (95% C.I. = 5.295 to 7.540) was found for patients enrolled in the pilot relative to those who were not. This is
 304 equivalent to a 62% increase in mean follow-ups (58% increase if we compare median values).

305

306 **Table 5**

307 *OLS regression results showing impact of the pilot CfL engagement on number of follow-ups with patients using*
 308 *matched dataset; N = 745*

	Model A	Model B	Model C	Model D	Model E
CfL Engagement	5.995	6.128	6.131	5.943	6.417
95% C.I.	(4.986, 7.003)	(5.070, 7.185)	(4.963, 7.298)	(4.768, 7.119)	(5.295, 7.540)
+ Facility fixed effects		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

+ Additional Covariates		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
+ Diagnosing Quarter fixed effects				Yes	Yes
+ Facility by Diagnosing quarter interaction					Yes
Observations	745	745	745	745	745
R ²	0.150	0.154	0.176	0.180	0.216
Adjusted R ²	0.148	0.151	0.162	0.166	0.200
Residual Std. Error	6.561 (df = 743)	6.552 (df = 741)	6.507 (df = 732)	6.494 (df = 731)	6.359 (df = 729)
F Statistic	130.748 (df = 1; 743)	45.098 (df = 3; 741)	13.026 (df = 12; 732)	12.374 (df = 13; 731)	13.417 (df = 15; 729)
	(df = 1; 745)	(df = 3; 743)	(df = 12; 734)	(df = 13; 733)	(df = 15; 731)

Note: a) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; b) All models were fitted on matched dataset; c) *p<0.1;

p<0.05; *p<0.01

309

310 **Treatment Outcomes**

311 A series of fixed-effects logistic regression models (Table 7) revealed a statistically significant greater likelihood
 312 of a successful treatment outcome for patients who was enrolled in the CfL pilot, relative to those who were
 313 not. Model E includes controls for all available covariates and reveals 242% higher odds (OR = 3.415; 95% C.I.
 314 [1.701 to 6.857]) of a successful outcome for patients who was enrolled in the pilot relative to others.

315

316 **Table 6**

317 *Logistic regression results showing impact of the pilot CfL engagement on treatment outcomes using matched*
 318 *dataset; N = 944*

	Model A	Model B	Model C	Model D	Model E
CfL Engagement	3.033***	4.631***	3.54***	3.589***	3.415***
95% C.I.	(1.668,5.517)	(2.483,8.635)	(1.776,7.056)	(1.809,7.12)	(1.701,6.857)
+ Facility fixed effects		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
+ Additional Covariates			Yes	Yes	Yes
+ Diagnosing Quarter fixed effects				Yes	Yes

+ Facility by Diagnosing quarter interaction Yes

Observations	944	944	944	944	944
Log Likelihood	-335.455	-319.634	-288.460	-288.411	-286.184
Akaike Inf. Crit.	674.911	647.268	602.920	604.823	604.368

Note: a) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; b) All models were fitted on matched dataset; c) *p<0.1;

p<0.05; *p<0.01; d) Treatment outcome is equal to success (=1) if treatment is completed or cured.

Unsuccessful outcome refers to lost to follow up, death or treatment failure

319

320 **Link between CfL, follow ups, and treatment outcomes**

321 Including follow ups as a covariate in the logistic model reduces the size and significance of the coefficient on
322 CfL (Table 7.1). It also reveals a statistically significant coefficient on the follow ups, estimating a 24% increased
323 likelihood of a successful outcome, for every unit increase in follow ups with the patient. Results from this
324 specification (Table 7.1), along with the model revealing a significant impact of CfL drugs on follow ups (Table
325 6), lead us to conclude that the CfL engagement is leading to better treatment outcomes, primarily through
326 their impact on the number of follow ups made with the patient.

327

328 **Table 6.1**


329 *Logistic regression results showing impact of CfL on treatment outcomes using matched dataset; N = 745;*
330 *including follow ups as a covariate*

	Model A (Odds Ratio)	95% C.I.
CfL	0.444	(0.181, 1.088)
Follow ups	1.242***	(1.174, 1.313)
All Covariates	Yes	
Diagnosing Quarter FE	Yes	
District FE	No	
Treatment Coordinator FE	Yes	
Observations	745	
Log Likelihood	-156.047	
Akaike Inf. Crit.	346.093	

Note: a) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; b) The model was fitted on the matched dataset; c)

* $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$


Figure 3: Forest Plot for OLS Regression; Impact of CfL on follow Ups



Note: 1) LTFU refers to Lost to follow up; 2) Dotted line at X = 0 helps in visualizing the sub populations which reveal a significant impact (or not) of CfL on follow ups outcomes; 3) All facility specific models are fitted on the

331

Figure 4: Forest Plot; Sensitivity Analysis



Note: 1) OR Ratios are displayed along with 95% C.I.; 2) Dotted line at X = 1 illustrates the sub-populations which reveal a significant impact of CfL on treatment outcomes (to the right) or not (to the left) 3) LTFU refers

332

333
334
335
336
337
338
339

340 **Discussion**

341 To our knowledge, this is the first study assessing the impact of a DAT intervention on TB patients seeking care
342 in the Indian private sector using a quasi-experimental approach. Our findings illustrate that patients who used
343 the CfL application had a significantly higher likelihood of completing their treatment successfully, likely caused
344 by an increase in follow ups associated with the usage of the application. The results stay robust after
345 employing robust propensity score matching methods and a series of sensitivity analysis.

346

347 While digital adherence technologies (DATs) have been increasingly used for improving patient behaviours
348 across the globe, their particular usage in India has remained underutilized, in part due to a lack of proper
349 regulation and implementation [28]. Additionally, in-person or telephonic follow ups, though a gold standard
350 to improve all aspects of patient management, can be burdensome for developing countries such as India
351 because of high patient load, stagnant workforce and high number of patients living in rural and remote areas
352 [29]. A study in Uganda illustrated the role played by such DATs where face to face counselling and social
353 support is expensive because of a lack of financial resources and difficulties in transportation [30]. Wider usage
354 of digital applications has the potential to mitigate these challenges [3]. Studies have highlighted the role of
355 effective communication through mHealth technologies in India, which could bridge the gap between patient
356 and medical staff interaction [31]. Treatment for tuberculosis is particularly complex and long drawn, which
357 further intensifies the need for different novel methods to ensure patients adhere to the treatment through
358 different challenges[32]. A modelling analysis estimates that such DATs, if employed in the public sector alone,
359 can potentially reduce TB incidence by 7.3% over a course of 10 years, and by 16% if also deployed in the
360 private sector, albeit under idealized settings [33]. Another study conducted in Bengaluru, India highlighted
361 the role of an mHealth application (Kill TB) in using reminders to improve patient adherence [34].

362

363 Earlier examples of digital interventions to manage adherence include 99DOTS [35], Video Directly Observed
364 therapy (VDOT) or Video Observed therapy (VOT) and Event Monitoring device for medication support (EMM)
365 [36]. The current landscape is still an evolving one, and evolving iterations of these devices and solutions are
366 being piloted for understanding their use cases. Recent evaluations of the Medical Event Reminder Monitor
367 (MERM) box [37] and TMEAD [38], both applications of EMM, has found favourable outcomes among patients
368 using these solutions, albeit stating challenges with respect to the actual usability [37]–[41].

369
370 Previous studies have recommended these DATs to be used to support a larger patient-management system,
371 wherein differentiated counselling or switching to DOT can be possible options in case of non-adherence [42]–
372 [44]. While all of these interventions included a dashboard solution to enable patient monitoring by healthcare
373 workers, most evaluative studies have not specifically evaluated the impact thereof [2], [45]. In our study, we
374 find that patients enrolled in the CfL intervention received a higher number of follow ups. Earlier studies have
375 highlighted the role of enabling differentiated care [46] and the importance of human-interactions in
376 improving success from DATs [47]–[49]. A previous systematic review talks about using such DATs to enable
377 differentiated care, and more intensive face-to-face engagement as and when required [3]. With a significant
378 amount of mixed evidence around the impact of DATs, results from this analysis suggests that digital
379 technologies might show little impact if used in isolation. This follows from the fact that medication non-
380 adherence is a complex issue with multiple contributing factors [50], [51], and a tailored intervention is
381 required to draw positive impact from any singular technological solution [3].

382 **Conclusions**

383 The results from this analysis are significant in illustrating the impact of the CfL solution in improving the ability
384 of healthcare workers to counsel patients effectively, while simultaneously improving a patient’s engagement
385 with their treatment by providing a combination of services (health tips delivery, drug medication reminders,
386 clinic visit reminders). Digital interventions such as these serve as a low-cost method to improve patient
387 behaviours with respect to continuing treatment. They help reach out to population groups who do not have
388 easy access to a clinic, and may be living at far-off remote, rural, or hard to reach areas which make
389 transportation costs a huge barrier in accessing clinician services. They also help reduce stigma and generate
390 awareness among patients and caregivers, potentially improving patient attitudes to treatment and care.
391 Similar interventions, which help optimize patient care, could also have the potential to reduce the
392 psychological burden borne by healthcare workers in resource-constrained settings. Future scaled

393 deployments of such technologies need to consider the importance of a multi-faceted intervention, combining
394 the elements of technology and human-centred approach in order to improve treatment outcomes for
395 patients.

396 **Limitations**

397 Our analysis, while strongly suggesting the impact of the CfL intervention, has several limitations which
398 warrant further research. **First**, our analysis does not investigate the specific implementation challenges
399 witnessed by the program team, which would be essential to initiating a scale up of the same across a wider
400 geography or/and a greater number of facilities. Some of the impediments noted by the program staff
401 included a) disruptions in internet/telephone-network at the home location of patients, and b) patients
402 complaining about redundant or repetitive content in health tip deliveries, and c) lengthy process to record
403 their adherence into the system. It is worth noting that broadly, the CfL application was flexible to individual
404 patients' needs. For instance, a patient or caregiver could modify the frequency of their reminders, set up a
405 preferred time for the same, while also selecting the topics on which they would require nudges (pill
406 reminders, doctor visit reminders, adherence report, nutrition, and plausible side effects, among other
407 things.). Nevertheless, quickly responding to similar challenges within a built-in software solution can be
408 cumbersome, especially if deployed across a larger patient group. Notwithstanding the plausible challenges,
409 several of the commonly found difficulties with using such solutions (application crash, data recording errors,
410 erroneous or harmful information in terms of health tips) [52] were not reported from patients or the program
411 staff using this application. **Second**, while the results are accompanied by a facility-level sensitivity analysis, our
412 research does not attempt to find reasons for heterogeneity in results obtained or delve into the specifics of
413 implementation in these different facilities. It is worth noting that Vinod Karhana is a relatively smaller facility,
414 with respect to the number of patients catered to, when compared with Sir Ganga Ram hospital and St.
415 Stephens hospital. Both Sir Ganga Ram and St. Stephens are situated in central Delhi, making it relatively easier
416 for patients to access them by various forms of public transportation. A more detailed, and perhaps qualitative
417 narrative of how such interventions might impact patients visiting such diverse facilities is warranted. The
418 same can help inform differential enrolment and investment strategies, which can be more efficient in utilizing
419 such DATs for TB, as well as other diseases involving long and complicated treatment regimens. **Third**, while
420 we investigate the impact of the intervention on treatment outcomes, we do not compare the adherence
421 recorded among patients, where the latter is the primary indicator being measured by the CfL application. Our
422 reservation against measuring the adherence stems from the fact that it is self-reported by the patient and is

423 likely to have some bias. Our analysis adopted a more outcomes-based approach, by directly evaluating the
424 impact on the number of follow ups made, and the likelihood of successful treatment completions. However,
425 research assessing medication adherence could be worthwhile in understanding more specific barriers to
426 patient engagement and the successful deployment of such interventions. **Fourth**, we use a derived
427 dichotomous outcome variable to understand the impact of the intervention on treatment outcomes. Here,
428 unsuccessful outcomes include treatment failure, death, and lost to follow-up, and each of these outcomes
429 may have their own risk profiles. All patients who had a treatment interruption greater than one month in
430 duration are considered as being lost to follow-up. However, it cannot be determined if patients continued the
431 treatment later, and if so, whether they were able to complete the treatment with a positive outcome. Hence,
432 including lost to follow-up has the potential to bias these results. Some previous studies have not included lost
433 to follow-up in their analyses for similar reasons [53]. However, we remain conservative and followed the
434 baseline criteria of including patients who were under the active management of a treatment coordinator, and
435 had their outcomes reported at least a month after the date of diagnosis. Additionally, in our particular
436 analysis, lost to follow-up makes up 2.7% and 2.8% of our analytical and matched datasets, respectively.
437 Including lost to follow-up in analysis where these cases make less than <5% of the overall population
438 generally leads to little bias [54]. Sensitivity analysis excluding patients with lost to follow up as a treatment
439 outcome (Appendix 6) supported the primary findings with high statistical significance. Regardless, further
440 research is warranted to fully understand the differential risk profile of private sector TB patients, including the
441 drivers of lost to follow-up and treatment failure. **Lastly**, majority of patients reported treatment completion
442 which was based on the provider declaring that patient need not take any more medications. Since cure rates
443 are low due to lack of smear testing in the private sector, the metric of successful treatment completion itself
444 has certain limitations.

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455 **List of abbreviations**

456 DAT – Digital Adherence Technology

457 ATE – Average treatment effect

458 CI – Confidence interval

459 FDC – Fixed dose combination

460 IQR – Interquartile range

461 JEET – Joint Effort for Elimination of Tuberculosis

462 OLS – Ordinary least squares

463 PPSA – Private Provider Support Agency

464 TB – Tuberculosis

465 NTEP – National Tuberculosis Elimination Program

466 NSP – National Strategic Plan for Elimination of Tuberculosis

467

468 **Appendix**

469 ***Appendix 1 –Definition of treatment outcomes***

470

471 **Table S1**

472 *Definitions of treatment outcomes for drug susceptible TB patients [12]*

Treatment outcome	Definition	Study outcome	Considered for the study
Cured	Microbiologically confirmed TB patients at the beginning of treatment who was smear or culture negative at the end of the complete treatment	Successful treatment	Yes
Treatment complete	Completed treatment without evidence of failure or clinical deterioration but with no record that the smear or culture results of biological specimen in the last month of treatment was negative		

Lost to follow up	Treatment was interrupted for one consecutive month or more	Unsuccessful treatment	No
Died	Died during the course of anti-TB treatment		
Treatment failure	Biological specimen is positive by smear or culture at end of treatment		
Not evaluated	Patients for whom no treatment outcome is assigned; also includes former transfer outs	Other outcomes (not considered)	
Treatment regimen changed	A TB patient who is on first line regimen and has been diagnosed as having DR TB and switched to drug resistant TB regimen prior to being declared as failed		
Wrongly diagnosed	A patient who is wrongly diagnosed of TB		
Transferred	A patient who has transferred to another facility or state, prior to the outcome being declared		

473 **Appendix 2 – Estimating propensity scores**

474 We utilized propensity score modelling [18]–[20] to create a matched dataset comprised of treated patients
 475 (CfL) and untreated patients (no CfL), by means of a logistic regression model, including all available potential
 476 confounders. The exact model results from the same are given in Table S4, and Table S5 displays the mean
 477 propensity scores between patients who actually received CfL or not. The accuracy of the model is 7
 478 77% with a specificity rate of 19%. Figure SF1 shows the distribution of propensity scores visually, segregated
 479 by whether or not the patient was on the CfL program.

480

481 **Table S2**
 482 *Estimating propensity score using logistic regression; N = 989*

Dependent Variable: CfL	
male	0.955 (0.622, 1.288)
Age: 6-15	0.612 (-1.036, 2.259)
Age: 16-19	0.817 (-0.794, 2.428)
Age: 20-45	0.735 (-0.817, 2.288)
Age: 46-65	0.338 (-1.248, 1.924)

Age: > 65	0.240 (-1.466, 1.945)
Xpert Testing	2.539 (2.111, 2.968)
Free drugs	11.113 (10.594, 11.632)
Extra Pulmonary status	1.027 (0.675, 1.379)
Facility: St Stephens	6.075 (5.585, 6.564)
Facility: Vinod Karhana	8.295 (7.795, 8.794)
Diag Qtr: 2020 Q1	2.708 (2.370, 3.047)
Constant	0.069 (-1.539, 1.678)

Observations	989
Log Likelihood	-440.605
Akaike Inf. Crit.	907.209

Note: a) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; b) *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01; c) 95% C.I.

displayed alongside results

483


484 **Table S3**

485 *Propensity Score estimated by whether or not a patient was on CfL*

enrolled in CfL	N	Mean score	Median score
No	713	0.20	0.12
Yes	276	0.48	0.49

486

Figure SF1: Histograms of the estimated propensity scores by treatment status



487

488

489 **Appendix 3 – Propensity Score Matching**

490

491 **Table S4**

492 *Summary of balance for the dataset, before and after matching*

493


	Analytical Dataset					Matched Dataset				
	Means Treated	Means Control	diff	Std. Mean Diff.	Var. Ratio	Means Treated	Means Control	diff	Std. Mean Diff.	Var. Ratio
Diff	0.48	0.20	0.28	1.25	1.37	0.44	0.44	0.00	0.00	1.00
Age: 0-5	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02		0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	
Age: 6-15	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.06		0.08	0.06	0.02	0.09	
Age: 16-19	0.14	0.07	0.07	0.21		0.14	0.11	0.03	0.07	
Age: 20-45	0.56	0.47	0.09	0.17		0.57	0.61	-0.03	-0.07	
Age: 46-65	0.17	0.28	-0.11	-0.31		0.16	0.16	0.00	0.00	
Age: >65	0.04	0.11	-0.07	-0.33		0.04	0.06	-0.02	-0.09	
Male	0.54	0.57	-0.03	-0.07		0.53	0.53	0.00	0.00	
Xpert Testing	0.42	0.15	0.27	0.55		0.39	0.39	0.00	0.00	
Free drugs	0.25	0.07	0.18	0.42		0.20	0.20	0.00	0.00	
Facility: sir ganga ram	0.27	0.64	-0.37	-0.82		0.29	0.28	0.01	0.02	
Facility: st stephens	0.47	0.21	0.25	0.51		0.45	0.45	0.01	0.01	
Facility: vinod karhana	0.26	0.15	0.11	0.26		0.26	0.27	-0.01	-0.03	
Diag Qtr: 2019 Q4	0.36	0.52	-0.16	-0.34		0.38	0.38	0.00	-0.01	
Diag Qtr: 2020 Q1	0.64	0.48	0.16	0.34		0.62	0.62	0.00	0.01	
Extra Pulmonary	0.50	0.57	-0.08	-0.15		0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	

494

495

496


Figure SF2: Propensity Scores, before and after the matching, in the



497

498

Figure SF3: Results from balancing the covariates after the matching procedure



Note: The red dots indicate the differences between standardized means of covariates in the matched and treated groups for the analytical or the unmatched dataset. The green dots indicate

499

500 **Appendix 4 –Full Model Results; OLS Model; Matched Dataset**

501

502 **Table S5**

503 *Results from the full OLS model on matched dataset; N = 747*

Dependent Variable: Follow Ups	
CfL	6.438*** (0.600)
Xpert Testing	-0.785 (0.762)
Free drugs	-0.972 (0.931)
Age: 6-15	-0.315 (2.291)
Age: 16-19	-0.687 (2.257)

Age: 20-45	-0.328 (2.150)
Age: 46-65	-1.786 (2.182)
Age: > 65	-3.217 (2.303)
Male	-0.375 (0.476)
Extra Pulmonary	0.861* (0.507)
Facility: st stephens	2.663*** (0.971)
Facility: vinod karhana	4.679*** (0.977)
Diag Qtr: 2020 Q1	3.988*** (0.731)
Facility: st stephens * Diag Qtr 2020 Q1	-4.597*** (1.165)
Facility: vinod karhana * Diag Qtr 2020 Q1	-6.818*** (1.239)
Constant	8.185*** (2.251)
<hr/>	
Observations	747
R	0.217
Adjusted R	0.201
Residual Std. Error	6.352 (df = 731)
F Statistic	13.526 (df = 15; 731)

Note: a) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; b) *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01; c) Model was fitted on the matched dataset; d) We have only 747 observations as 199 patients did not have a recorded value for the number of follow ups conducted

504

505 **Appendix 5 –Full Model Results; Logistic Model; Matched Dataset**

506

507 **Table S6**

508 *Logistic Regression; Impact of CfL on Treatment Outcomes; N = 946*

Dependent Variable: Binary Treatment Outcome (Successful=1, Unsuccessful = 0)	
CfL	1.241*** (0.578, 1.904)
Xpert Testing	0.393*** (-0.271, 1.057)
Free drugs	1.604 (-0.434, 3.642)
Age: 6-15	0.149 (-2.155, 2.453)
Age: 16-19	2.390 (-0.523, 5.303)
Age: 20-45	0.320 (-1.838, 2.479)
Age: 46-65	-0.614 (-2.778, 1.551)

Age: > 65	-1.340 (-3.536, 0.856)
Male	-0.508* (-0.968, -0.048)
Extra Pulmonary	0.192 (-0.259, 0.643)
Facility: st stephens	-1.810*** (-2.639, -0.980)
Facility: vinod karhana	-1.959*** (-2.790, -1.128)
Diag Qtr: 2020 Q1	-0.516 (-1.209, 0.177)
Facility: st stephens * Diag Qtr 2020 Q1	0.475 (-0.528, 1.478)
Facility: vinod karhana * Diag Qtr 2020 Q1	1.152 (-0.002, 2.306)
Constant	3.063** (0.818, 5.307)
Observations	946
Log Likelihood	-288.016
Akaike Inf. Crit.	608.032

Note: a) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; b) *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01; c) Model was fitted on the matched dataset

509

510 **Appendix 6 –Sensitivity Analysis; Results from Simple OLS & Logistic Models; Matched and**

511 **Unmatched (observational) datasets**

512

513 **Table S9**

514 *Sensitivity analysis for OLS regression modelling the impact of CfL engagement on number of follow-ups*

	Coefficient	95% C.I.		Number of observations
Observational	6.423***	5.32	7.525	774
Matched	6.417***	5.295	7.54	745
Matched; alternative	5.757***	4.359	7.155	333
Sir Ganga Ram (only)	5.083***	3.291	6.876	377
St Stephens (only)	7.297***	5.255	9.338	203
Vinod Karhana (only)	6.434***	4.48	8.389	165
Observational; removed LTFU	6.001***	4.89	7.111	747
Matched; removed LTFU	6.003***	4.874	7.132	719
Matched; alternative; removed LTFU	5.329***	3.922	6.736	319

Note: a) All models control for all potential confounders; b) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; c) LTFU refers to patient who were lost to follow-up, d) All facility wise models are fitted on the matched dataset; e) Matched (alternative) refers to a matched dataset which was created by matching using a combination of nearest neighbor (age, free drugs, facility, diagnosing quarter) and exact matching (Xpert testing, gender, extra pulmonary status) methods; f) * $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

515

516

517 **Table S10**

518 *Sensitivity analysis for logistic regression, modelling the impact of the CfL engagement on treatment outcomes*

519

	Odds Ratio (OR)	95% C.I. (OR)		Number of observations
Observational	1.255***	1.788	6.888	989
Matched	1.228***	1.701	6.857	944
Matched; alternative	1.181***	1.563	6.791	408
Sir Ganga Ram (only)	0.425	0.349	6.702	519
St Stephens (only)	1.250***	1.405	8.677	256
Vinod Karhana (only)	1.562***	1.145	19.856	169
Observational; removed LTFU	1.319***	1.687	8.294	962
Matched; removed LTFU	1.319***	1.626	8.606	918
Matched; alternative; removed LTFU	1.229***	1.391	8.405	394

Note: a) All models control for all potential confounders; b) 95% C.I. based on robust standard errors; c) LTFU refers to patient who were lost to follow-up, d) All facility wise models are fitted on the matched dataset; e) Matched (alternative) refers to a matched dataset which was created by matching using a combination of nearest neighbor (age, free drugs, facility, diagnosing quarter) and exact matching (Xpert testing, gender, extra pulmonary status) methods; f) * $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

520 **Appendix 7 –Alternative Matching method**

521 Multiple different matching specifications were run to test for the robustness of the model. We report results
 522 for one such alternative matching specification. In this alternative specification, we used the nearest neighbor
 523 algorithm to match four covariates, 1) age category, 2) free drug status, 3) facility of diagnosis and 4) diagnosing
 524 quarter, and exact matching for 1) proportion of males, 2) proportion of extra pulmonary cases, and 3)

525 proportion of patients diagnosed using Xpert testing. The caliper width used was 0.2. This particular matching
 526 resulted in 204 pairs (408 observations), relative to 944 observations obtained by way of full matching. The
 527 matching resulted in a more similar set of covariates for the two groups, as observed by the p-values obtained
 528 for testing difference between two groups (Table S11).

529

530 **Table S11**

531 *Comparison of descriptive statistics between matched datasets (full matching vs nearest neighbor)*

Pilot engagement	Matched (Full)			Matched (Nearest Neighbor)		
	(N = 944)		<i>p</i> - <i>value</i>	(N = 408)		<i>p</i> - <i>value</i>
	no CfL	CfL		no CfL	CfL	
Number of patients	694	250		694	250	
Males	398 (57%)	132 (53%)	0.2	109 (53%)	109 (53%)	>0.9
Age Category						0.3
1. 0-5	6 (0.9%)	3 (1.2%)		2 (1.0%)	3 (1.5%)	
2. 6-15	45 (6.5%)	20 (8.0%)		12 (5.9%)	15 (7.4%)	
3. 16-19	51 (7.3%)	34 (14%)		19 (9.3%)	32 (16%)	
4. 20-45	334 (48%)	143 (57%)		121 (59%)	106 (52%)	
5. 46-65	186 (27%)	40 (16%)		35 (17%)	38 (19%)	
6. >65	72 (10%)	10 (4.0%)		15 (7.4%)	10 (4.9%)	0.2
Age	37 (24, 56)	30 (20, 42)	<0.001	29 (22, 45)	29 (20, 45)	>0.9
Free drugs	41 (5.9%)	50 (20%)	<0.001	39 (19%)	40 (20%)	>0.9
Xpert Testing	88 (13%)	97 (39%)	<0.001	70 (34%)	70 (34%)	>0.9
Extra Pulmonary	402 (58%)	126 (50%)	0.040	101 (50%)	101 (50%)	<0.001
Follow Ups	11 (4, 16)	18 (13, 20)	<0.001	12 (4, 17)	18 (13, 21)	
Unknown	173	26		53	22	0.9
Facility			<0.001			
sir ganga ram	447 (64%)	72 (29%)		62 (30%)	64 (31%)	
st stephens	143 (21%)	113 (45%)		84 (41%)	87 (43%)	
vinod karhana	104 (15%)	65 (26%)		58 (28%)	53 (26%)	
Successful treatment outcome	595 (86%)	237 (95%)	<0.001	170 (83%)	192 (94%)	<0.001

Notes: 1) The table showcases the numbers segregated by CfL status, and within group percentages for them; 2) For binary/character variables, values represent the number of patients enrolled, and value in parentheses represents share or %; 3) For continuous values, the number represents the median, and the values in parentheses represents the Interquartile Range; 4) Pearson's Chi-squared test and Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test is conducted for p value

532

533

534

535

536

537 **References**

538 [1] B. K. Ngwatu *et al.*, “The impact of digital health technologies on tuberculosis
539 treatment: a systematic review,” *Eur. Respir. J.*, vol. 51, no. 1, p. 1701596, Jan. 2018, doi:
540 10.1183/13993003.01596-2017.

541 [2] A. Ridho *et al.*, “Digital Health Technologies to Improve Medication Adherence and
542 Treatment Outcomes in Patients With Tuberculosis: Systematic Review of Randomized
543 Controlled Trials,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 24, no. 2, p. e33062, Feb. 2022, doi:
544 10.2196/33062.

545 [3] R. Subbaraman *et al.*, “Digital adherence technologies for the management of
546 tuberculosis therapy: mapping the landscape and research priorities,” *BMJ Glob. Health*, vol.
547 3, no. 5, p. e001018, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001018.

548 [4] S. Kumar *et al.*, “Mobile Health Technology Evaluation,” *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 45,
549 no. 2, pp. 228–236, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2013.03.017.

550 [5] D. C. Mohr, K. Cheung, S. M. Schueller, C. Hendricks Brown, and N. Duan,
551 “Continuous Evaluation of Evolving Behavioral Intervention Technologies,” *Am. J. Prev.*
552 *Med.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 517–523, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2013.06.006.

553 [6] M. S. Marcolino, J. A. Q. Oliveira, M. D’Agostino, A. L. Ribeiro, M. B. M. Alkmim,
554 and D. Novillo-Ortiz, “The Impact of mHealth Interventions: Systematic Review of

- 555 Systematic Reviews,” *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. e23, Jan. 2018, doi:
556 10.2196/mhealth.8873.
- 557 [7] J. Needamangalam Balaji *et al.*, “A Scoping Review on Accentuating the Pragmatism
558 in the Implication of Mobile Health (mHealth) Technology for Tuberculosis Management in
559 India,” *J. Pers. Med.*, vol. 12, no. 10, p. 1599, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.3390/jpm12101599.
- 560 [8] C. M. Denkinger, J. Grenier, A. K. Stratis, A. Akkihal, N. Pant-Pai, and M. Pai,
561 “Mobile health to improve tuberculosis care and control: a call worth making [Review
562 article],” *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 719–727, Jun. 2013, doi:
563 10.5588/ijtld.12.0638.
- 564 [9] W. Tumuhimbise and A. Musiimenta, “A review of mobile health interventions for
565 public private mix in tuberculosis care,” *Internet Interv.*, vol. 25, p. 100417, Sep. 2021, doi:
566 10.1016/j.invent.2021.100417.
- 567 [10] “Joint Effort for Elimination of Tuberculosis.” Accessed: Jun. 28, 2022. [Online].
568 Available: <https://www.projectjeet.in/>
- 569 [11] “Connect for Life™ (powered by Johnson & Johnson Global Public Health);
570 <https://wiki.openmrs.org/display/docs/Connect+for+Life+Distribution>.”
- 571 [12] Central TB Division, “Treatment Outcomes for drug susceptible TB patients,” in
572 *Technical and Operational Guidelines for TB Control in India*, 2016, p. 65. [Online].
573 Available: <https://tbcindia.gov.in/showfile.php?lid=3220>
- 574 [13] C. G. Victora, J.-P. Habicht, and J. Bryce, “Evidence-Based Public Health: Moving
575 Beyond Randomized Trials,” *Am J Public Health*, vol. 94, pp. 400–5, 2004.
- 576 [14] M. S. Ali, D. Prieto-Alhambra, L. C. Lopes, D. Ramos, N. Bispo, and M. Y. Ichihara,
577 “Propensity Score Methods in Health Technology Assessment: Principles, Extended
578 Applications, and Recent Advances,” *Front Pharmacol*, vol. 10, no. 973, 2019.
- 579 [15] A. Cois and R. Ehrlich, “Problem drinking as a risk factor for tuberculosis: a
580 propensity score matched analysis of a national survey,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 13, no.
581 871, 2013.

- 582 [16] P. C. Austin, “An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects
583 of Confounding in Observational Studies,” *Multivar. Behav Res*, vol. 46, pp. 399–424, 2011.
- 584 [17] M. Caliendo and S. Kopeinig, “Some Practical Guidance for the Implementation of
585 Propensity Score Matching,” *J Econ. Surv.*, vol. 22, pp. 31–72, 2008.
- 586 [18] P. R. Rosenbaum and D. B. Rubin, “The central role of the propensity score in
587 observational studies for causal effects,” *Biometrika*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 41–55, 1983, doi:
588 10.1093/biomet/70.1.41.
- 589 [19] W. C. Winkelmayr and T. Kurth, “Propensity scores: help or hype?,” *Nephrol. Dial.
590 Transplant.*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 1671–1673, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfh104.
- 591 [20] C. Heinrich, A. Maffioli, and G. Vázquez, “A Primer for Applying Propensity-Score
592 Matching,” Inter-American Development Bank, Office of Strategic Planning and
593 Development Effectiveness (SPD), SPD Working Paper 1005, Aug. 2010. Accessed: Aug.
594 12, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/idbspdwps/1005.htm>
- 595 [21] P. R. Rosenbaum, “A Characterization of Optimal Designs for Observational
596 Studies,” *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Methodol.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 597–610, 1991, doi:
597 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2345589>.
- 598 [22] B. B. Hansen, “Full Matching in an Observational Study of Coaching for the SAT,” *J.
599 Am. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 99, no. 467, pp. 609–618, Sep. 2004, doi:
600 10.1198/016214504000000647.
- 601 [23] K. Ming and P. R. Rosenbaum, “Substantial Gains in Bias Reduction from Matching
602 with a Variable Number of Controls,” *Biometrics*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 118–124, Mar. 2000,
603 doi: 10.1111/j.0006-341X.2000.00118.x.
- 604 [24] P. C. Austin, “Optimal caliper widths for propensity-score matching when estimating
605 differences in means and differences in proportions in observational studies,” *Pharm Stat*,
606 vol. 10, pp. 150–61, 2011.
- 607 [25] H. O. Balli and B. E. Sørensen, “Interaction effects in econometrics,” *Empir. Econ.*,
608 vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 583–603, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1007/s00181-012-0604-2.

- 609 [26] Q.-Y. Zhao, J.-C. Luo, Y. Su, Y.-J. Zhang, G.-W. Tu, and Z. Luo, “Propensity score
610 matching with R: conventional methods and new features,” *Ann. Transl. Med.*, vol. 9, pp.
611 812–812, 2021.
- 612 [27] D. Ho, K. Imai, G. King, and S. E. A. MatchIt, “Nonparametric Preprocessing for
613 Parametric Causal Inference,” *J. Stat. Softw.*, vol. 42, pp. 1–28, 2011.
- 614 [28] S. Selvaraj, K. Karan, S. Srivastava, N. Bhan, and I. Mukhopadhyay, “India Health
615 System Review.” World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia, 2022.
616 [Online]. Available: <https://apo.who.int/publications/i/item/india-health-system-review>
- 617 [29] R. Danasekaran, T. Raja, and B. Kumar M, “mHealth: A Newer Perspective in
618 Healthcare through Mobile Technology,” *J. Compr. Health*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 67–68, Dec.
619 2019, doi: 10.53553/JCH.v07i02.012.
- 620 [30] A. Musiimenta *et al.*, “Mobile Health Technologies May Be Acceptable Tools for
621 Providing Social Support to Tuberculosis Patients in Rural Uganda: A Parallel Mixed-
622 Method Study,” *Tuberc. Res. Treat.*, vol. 2020, pp. 1–8, Jan. 2020, doi:
623 10.1155/2020/7401045.
- 624 [31] I. Margineanu *et al.*, “Patients and Medical Staff Attitudes Toward the Future
625 Inclusion of eHealth in Tuberculosis Management: Perspectives From Six Countries
626 Evaluated using a Qualitative Framework,” *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 11, p.
627 e18156, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.2196/18156.
- 628 [32] A. I. Latif, E. L. Sjattar, and K. A. Erika, “Models and benefits of mobile health
629 application to support patient with tuberculosis: A literature review,” *Enferm. Clínica*, vol.
630 30, pp. 163–167, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.enfcli.2019.07.069.
- 631 [33] N. Arinaminpathy *et al.*, “Modelling the potential impact of adherence technologies
632 on tuberculosis in India,” *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 526–533, May 2020,
633 doi: 10.5588/ijtld.19.0472.

- 634 [34] S. B. Nagaraja *et al.*, “‘Kill-TB’ Drug Reminder Mobile Application for Tuberculosis
635 Patients at Bengaluru, India: Effectiveness and Challenges,” *J. Tuberc. Res.*, vol. 08, no. 01,
636 pp. 1–10, 2020, doi: 10.4236/jtr.2020.81001.
- 637 [35] S. Oberoi, V. K. Gupta, N. Chaudhary, and A. Singh, “99 DOTS Mini Review,”
638 *ICJMR*, 2016, [Online]. Available:
639 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315542622_99_DOTS_MINI-REVIEW
- 640 [36] World Health Organization, *Handbook for the use of digital technologies to support*
641 *tuberculosis medication adherence*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2017. Accessed:
642 Feb. 01, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/259832>
- 643 [37] X. Liu *et al.*, “Usability of a Medication Event Reminder Monitor System (MERM)
644 by Providers and Patients to Improve Adherence in the Management of Tuberculosis,” *Int. J.*
645 *Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 14, no. 10, p. 1115, Sep. 2017, doi:
646 10.3390/ijerph14101115.
- 647 [38] S. Saha *et al.*, “Tuberculosis Monitoring Encouragement Adherence Drive (TMEAD):
648 Toward improving the adherence of the patients with drug-sensitive tuberculosis in Nashik,
649 Maharashtra,” *Front. Public Health*, vol. 10, p. 1021427, Dec. 2022, doi:
650 10.3389/fpubh.2022.1021427.
- 651 [39] B. E. Thomas *et al.*, “Acceptability of the Medication Event Reminder Monitor for
652 Promoting Adherence to Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis Therapy in Two Indian Cities:
653 Qualitative Study of Patients and Health Care Providers,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 23, no.
654 6, p. e23294, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.2196/23294.
- 655 [40] T. Manyazewal, Y. Woldeamanuel, D. P. Holland, A. Fekadu, and V. C. Marconi,
656 “Effectiveness of a digital medication event reminder and monitor device for patients with
657 tuberculosis (SELFTB): a multicenter randomized controlled trial,” *BMC Med.*, vol. 20, no.
658 1, p. 310, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s12916-022-02521-y.
- 659 [41] D. Drabarek, N. T. Anh, N. V. Nhung, N. B. Hoa, G. J. Fox, and S. Bernays,
660 “Implementation of Medication Event Reminder Monitors among patients diagnosed with

- 661 drug susceptible tuberculosis in rural Viet Nam: A qualitative study,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 14,
662 no. 7, p. e0219891, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0219891.
- 663 [42] J. Acosta, P. Flores, M. Alarcón, M. Grande-Ortiz, L. Moreno-Exebio, and Z. M.
664 Puyen, “A randomised controlled trial to evaluate a medication monitoring system for TB
665 treatment,” *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 44–49, Jan. 2022, doi:
666 10.5588/ijtld.21.0373.
- 667 [43] A. Cross *et al.*, “99DOTS: a low-cost approach to monitoring and improving
668 medication adherence,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Information
669 and Communication Technologies and Development*, Ahmedabad India: ACM, Jan. 2019, pp.
670 1–12. doi: 10.1145/3287098.3287102.
- 671 [44] D. Thakkar, K. Piparva, and S. Lakkad, “A pilot project: 99DOTS information
672 communication technology-based approach for tuberculosis treatment in Rajkot district,”
673 *Lung India*, vol. 36, no. 2, p. 108, 2019, doi: 10.4103/lungindia.lungindia_86_18.
- 674 [45] N. Alipanah *et al.*, “Adherence interventions and outcomes of tuberculosis treatment:
675 A systematic review and meta-analysis of trials and observational studies,” *PLOS Med.*, vol.
676 15, no. 7, p. e1002595, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002595.
- 677 [46] X. Liu *et al.*, “Effectiveness of Electronic Reminders to Improve Medication
678 Adherence in Tuberculosis Patients: A Cluster-Randomised Trial,” *PLOS Med.*, vol. 12, no.
679 9, p. e1001876, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001876.
- 680 [47] P. Thekkur *et al.*, “Outcomes and implementation challenges of using daily treatment
681 regimens with an innovative adherence support tool among HIV-infected tuberculosis
682 patients in Karnataka, India: a mixed-methods study,” *Glob. Health Action*, vol. 12, no. 1, p.
683 1568826, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1080/16549716.2019.1568826.
- 684 [48] N. K. Jose, C. Vaz, P. R. Chai, and R. Rodrigues, “The Acceptability of Adherence
685 Support via Mobile Phones for Antituberculosis Treatment in South India: Exploratory
686 Study,” *JMIR Form. Res.*, vol. 6, no. 5, p. e37124, May 2022, doi: 10.2196/37124.

- 687 [49] R. Sodhi, M. J. Penkunas, and A. Pal, “Free drug provision for tuberculosis increases
688 patient follow-ups and successful treatment outcomes in the Indian private sector: A quasi
689 experimental study using propensity score matching,” In Review, preprint, Jan. 2023. doi:
690 10.21203/rs.3.rs-2448126/v1.
- 691 [50] Z. Shubber *et al.*, “Patient-Reported Barriers to Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy:
692 A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis,” *PLOS Med.*, vol. 13, no. 11, p. e1002183, Nov.
693 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002183.
- 694 [51] S. A. Munro, S. A. Lewin, H. J. Smith, M. E. Engel, A. Fretheim, and J. Volmink,
695 “Patient Adherence to Tuberculosis Treatment: A Systematic Review of Qualitative
696 Research,” *PLoS Med.*, vol. 4, no. 7, p. e238, Jul. 2007, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0040238.
- 697 [52] S. J. Iribarren, R. Schnall, P. W. Stone, and A. Carballo-Diéguez, “Smartphone
698 Applications to Support Tuberculosis Prevention and Treatment: Review and Evaluation,”
699 *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. e25, May 2016, doi: 10.2196/mhealth.5022.
- 700 [53] D. J Carter *et al.*, “The impact of a cash transfer programme on tuberculosis treatment
701 success rate: a quasi-experimental study in Brazil,” *BMJ Glob. Health*, vol. 4, no. 1, p.
702 e001029, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001029.
- 703 [54] D. L. Sackett, Ed., *Evidence-based medicine: how to practice and teach EBM*, 2nd
704 ed., Reprinted. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 2001.