

1 **Impact of active case finding for tuberculosis with mass chest X-ray screening in Glasgow,**
2 **Scotland, 1950-1963: an epidemiological analysis of historical data**

3
4 **Short title: Mass chest X-ray screening for tuberculosis in Glasgow**

5
6 Peter MacPherson^{1,2,4}, Helen R Stagg³, Alvaro Schwalb^{3,4}, Hazel Henderson⁵, Alice E Taylor⁵,
7 Rachael M Burke², Hannah M Rickman^{2,6}, Cecily Miller⁷, Rein MGJ Houben³, Peter J Dodd^{8*},
8 Elizabeth L Corbett^{2*}

- 9
10 1. School of Health & Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, UK
11 2. Clinical Research Department, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK
12 3. Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical
13 Medicine, UK
14 4. Instituto de Medicina Tropical Alexander von Humboldt, Universidad Peruana Cayetano
15 Heredia, Peru
16 5. Public Health Scotland, UK
17 6. Public Health Group, Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme, Malawi
18 7. World Health Organization, Global tuberculosis Programme, Switzerland
19 8. School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, UK
20

21 *These authors contributed equally.

22
23 **Corresponding Author:**

24 Peter MacPherson
25 School of Health & Wellbeing
26 Room 365, Clarice Pears Building,
27 University of Glasgow,
28 Byers Road,
29 Glasgow G12 8TA
30 Scotland
31 Peter.MacPherson@glasgow.ac.uk
32

33
34 **Keywords:** tuberculosis, active case finding, screening, epidemiology, interrupted time series.

35
36 **Sources of funding:** AS and RMGJH were supported by the US National Institutes of Health
37 [grant number 104046ED]. HMR was funded by Wellcome [grant number: 225482/Z/22/Z]. For
38 the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any
39 Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

40
41 **Conflicts of interest:** PM is an Academic Editor at PLOS Medicine.
42
43

44 **Abstract**

45 *Background*

46 Community active case finding for tuberculosis was widely implemented in Europe and North
47 America between 1940-1970, when incidence was comparable to many present-day high-
48 burden countries. Using an interrupted time series analysis, we analysed the effect of the 1957
49 Glasgow mass chest X-ray campaign to inform contemporary approaches to screening.

50 *Methods and findings*

51 Case notifications for 1950-1963 were extracted from public health records and linked to
52 demographic data. We fitted Bayesian multilevel regression models to estimate annual relative
53 case notification rates (CNR) during and after a mass screening intervention implemented over
54 five weeks in 1957 compared to the counterfactual scenario where the intervention had not
55 occurred. We additionally estimated case detection ratios and incidence. From 11/3/1957-
56 12/4/1957, 714,915 people (622,349 of 819,301 [76.0%] resident adults ≥ 15 years) were
57 screened with miniature chest X-ray; 2,369 (0.4%) were diagnosed with tuberculosis. Pre-
58 intervention (1950-1956), pulmonary CNRs were declining at 2.3% per year from a CNR of
59 222/100,000 in 1950. With the intervention in 1957, there was a doubling in the pulmonary CNR
60 (RR: 1.95, 95% uncertainty interval [UI]: 1.80-2.11), and 36% decline in the year after (RR: 0.64,
61 95%UI: 0.59-0.71). Post-intervention (1958-1963) annual rates of decline (5.4% per year) were
62 greater (RR: 0.77, 95%UI: 0.69-0.85), and there were an estimated 4,656 (95%UI: 3,670-5,725)
63 pulmonary case notifications averted due to the intervention. Effects were consistent across all
64 city wards and notifications declined substantially in young children (0-5 years) with the
65 intervention.

66 *Conclusions*

67 A single, rapid round of mass screening with chest X-ray (probably the largest ever conducted)
68 resulted in a major and sustained reduction in tuberculosis case notifications. Contemporary
69 high-burden settings may achieve similar benefits with high-intensity screening.

70 Introduction

71 Tuberculosis has been a scourge of humankind for millennia¹. From the late 18th to the early 20th
72 centuries, improvements in housing, nutrition, and air quality² – as well as progressive
73 improvements in tuberculosis care, treatment, and prevention³ – yielded substantial reductions
74 in incidence and mortality in countries such as the United Kingdom⁴.

75

76 By the 1940s, it was recognised that additional measures would be required to stem the source
77 of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* infections and prevent tuberculosis disease⁵. In line with other
78 European and American cities in the 1940-60s⁶, Scotland implemented active case finding
79 (ACF) in communities through mass chest X-ray screening campaigns⁷. To our knowledge, the
80 largest single site tuberculosis ACF intervention ever implemented globally was in Glasgow,
81 Scotland, in 1957⁶. By the end of the Second World War, Glasgow had extremely high levels of
82 social deprivation and nearly one out of every thousand people resident in Glasgow died of
83 pulmonary tuberculosis annually⁸. Whereas incidence of tuberculosis and mortality had
84 declined substantially in other major UK cities, progress in Glasgow had lagged considerably
85 behind⁹.

86

87 In 1974 the World Health Organization (WHO) recommended “*the policy of indiscriminate*
88 *tuberculosis case finding by mobile mass radiography should now be abandoned*” due to the
89 declining diagnostic yield from screening programmes¹⁰. Yet currently many countries in Africa
90 and Asia have tuberculosis epidemiological indicators similar to those of Europe and North
91 America in the 1940s and 1950s¹¹. This suggests that the experiences of ACF in cities like
92 Glasgow are highly informative for the modern day. Indeed, the WHO made a conditional
93 recommendation in favour of ACF for communities where the prevalence of undiagnosed
94 pulmonary tuberculosis was >1,000 per 100,000 in 2013¹², lowering this threshold to a
95 prevalence of >500 per 100,000 in 2021¹³.

96

97 Action is needed to implement high-impact interventions that can change the trajectory of

98 tuberculosis epidemics in high-burden nations. Despite renewal of interest in ACF¹⁴ – and more

99 recent trial evidence^{15,16} – there remains considerable uncertainty over how and where ACF

100 should be implemented, and what effects can be expected to be achieved¹⁷. Using

101 comprehensive historical records, we therefore set out to estimate the impact of the 1957

102 Glasgow mass tuberculosis screening intervention to inform contemporary approaches to ACF

103 in high tuberculosis burden countries.

104

105 **Methods**

106 *Mass miniature X-ray screening intervention*

107 The Glasgow mass X-ray campaign was coordinated by the Corporation of Glasgow, the Western
108 Regional Hospital Board, the Scottish Information Office, and the Department of Health for
109 Scotland, and X-ray screening took place between the 11th of March and 12th April 1957¹⁸. A total
110 of 37 mobile miniature X-ray units with radiographers were seconded from cities across the UK,
111 and the campaign was supported by ~12,000 Glasgow volunteers. Across the city, screening
112 activities were divided into six sections that aligned with five geographical city divisions plus a
113 further section focused on activities within the city centre and business area.

114

115 Prior to the campaign substantial publicity and public engagement was undertaken, including:
116 house-to-house visits within each city ward to distribute X-ray invitation cards; press and
117 cinema advertising; poster displays; church services; distribution of leaflets, banners and
118 stickers; loudspeaker vans and an illuminated tramcart; pavement stencils; aeroplane banner
119 advertising; two specially-commissioned campaign songs that were played on the radio and at
120 football matches; and information printed on municipal letterheads.

121

122 All people who underwent chest X-ray received a badge, and randomly selected people wearing
123 badges within Divisions received small gifts such as chocolates, chickens, and cigarettes.

124 During each week of the campaign, larger gifts (refrigerators, televisions, washing machines,
125 holidays, furniture, a car) were distributed by selecting X-ray cards at random, and the 100,000th
126 200,000th and 250,000th person X-rayed received additional gifts.

127

128 Mobile X-ray units were situated in department stores, churches, schools, and other municipal
129 buildings. People aged 15 years or older were invited to receive chest X-ray, regardless of the
130 presence or absence of symptoms, with miniature films interpreted by medical officers. Where

131 there was “significant radiological abnormality requiring further investigation or supervision”,
132 people were recalled for a large film at a central X-ray site, and assessment/further investigation
133 by physicians at five city hospitals chest clinics (one per Division, including microbiological
134 testing of sputum) and tuberculosis treatment (if required).

135

136 *Setting and Population*

137 For this analysis, we used the municipal boundaries of Glasgow City as defined in 1951. Wards
138 are electoral boundaries used in UK national parliamentary elections, and Glasgow City was
139 divided into 37 wards within five divisions (North, East, Central, South-East, South-West). To
140 obtain spatial boundaries, we digitised a scale 1951 Post Office Directory map held in the City of
141 Glasgow Archives using QGIS software (Supplemental Figure S1).

142

143 We extracted overall city and ward-specific annual population estimates as reported in Medical
144 Officer of Health reports for Glasgow between 1950 and 1963¹⁹. In reports, population estimates
145 were based on national censuses (1951 and 1961), updated annually by the Medical Officer of
146 Health based on linear projections of ratios of census populations to registered voters. For this
147 analysis, we used two population denominators available: a) *total population* (all people
148 identified as usually resident within the City of Glasgow, including people in long-term
149 institutional care and sailors stationed on ships of the Royal Navy at sea or in ports abroad); and
150 b) *the population excluding people in institutional care or shipping*. In reports, population
151 denominators were adjusted for each year to account for city-wide and ward-specific trends.
152 Population estimates stratified by age and sex were not available for each ward.

153

154 *Tuberculosis notifications*

155 For each year between 1950 and 1963, we extracted from annual Medical Officer of Health
156 Reports for the City of Glasgow¹⁹ overall numbers of tuberculosis notifications (stratified by

157 pulmonary and extra-pulmonary status, and separately by age group and sex), and the ward-
158 specific notifications (stratified by pulmonary and extra-pulmonary status, and sex). In 1962 and
159 1963, extra-pulmonary cases were not reported by ward due to small numbers.

160

161 *Statistical methods*

162 We calculated the annual pulmonary and extra-pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rate
163 for the City of Glasgow using overall numbers of notifications and the *total population*
164 denominator and scaled these data per 100,000 people. We additionally calculated the ward-
165 specific pulmonary and extrapulmonary case notification rates using the *population excluding*
166 *people in institutional care or shipping* as the denominator, as cases occurring among
167 institutionalised people or in shipping were not allocated to wards.

168

169 To investigate the impact of the 1957 active case finding intervention, we constructed multi-
170 level Bayesian interrupted time series regression models (Supplemental Equation 1) to estimate
171 annual pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rates and extra-pulmonary tuberculosis
172 notification rates. Models included terms for a “level-change” in 1957 to capture the immediate
173 effect of the intervention and a “slope change” to estimate changing rates before and after the
174 intervention. To account for over-dispersion, we used the negative binomial distributional
175 family; priors were weakly informative and assessed by inspecting plots of joint prior
176 distributions. Models were fit using the `brms` interface to Stan in R²⁰, and model convergence
177 was assessed using \hat{R} statistics, effective sample size measures, trace plots of chains, and
178 posterior predictive plots comparing observed data to simulated data from the empirical
179 cumulative distribution function.

180

181 We drew 4000 samples from model posteriors and summarised these (using means and
182 quantile-based 95% uncertainty intervals [UI]). To investigate the impact of the ACF intervention

183 overall and by ward, we predicted counterfactual case notification rates for 1958-1963 based on
184 a linear projection of trends from the pre-ACF period (1950-1956) under the scenario where the
185 ACF intervention had not happened. We then estimated: i) the relative case notification rate in
186 1957 compared to the counterfactual for the same year (“*peak effect*”); ii) the “*level effect*”
187 (relative rate in 1958 vs. counterfactual for 1958); and iii) the “*slope effect*” (relative annual
188 change in case notifications in 1958 to 1963 compared to the counterfactual scenario). Pairwise
189 correlations between posterior draws for the peak effect, step effect, and slope effect were
190 plotted overall, and by ward. Using model predictions, we calculated the number of
191 tuberculosis case notifications that were averted in the post-ACF period (1958-1963) compared
192 to that predicted by the counterfactual scenario. We additionally investigated whether the
193 impact of the ACF intervention differed by age and sex by fitting a model to estimate the annual
194 counts of pulmonary tuberculosis case notifications using a Poisson distribution, and
195 summarised as above. All analysis was conducted using R version 4.2.3 (R Core Team, Vienna).

196

197 *Estimates of case detection and incidence*

198 We estimated the incidence and case detection ratio (CDR; percentage of estimated new
199 pulmonary TB cases notified annually) for each ward using an equilibrium competing hazards
200 model and the assumption that the excess notified cases ($N_{during} - N_{pre}$) were prevalent during the
201 intervention, and detected with a coverage (cov) taken to be 76% based on screening uptake
202 (Supplemental Methods, Page 4).

203

$$204 \quad odds(CDR) = \frac{T \times cov}{\left(\frac{N_{during}}{N_{pre}} - 1 \right)}$$

205 Here, T is the average duration of tuberculosis disease in the absence of detection and
206 treatment, taken to be 3 years²¹. We examined the empirical correlations across wards between

207 CDR, pre-ACF incidence, and ACF impact quantified as relative decrease in notifications
208 pre/post-ACF.

209

210 *Ethical statement and data availability*

211 Ethical approval was not required for this analysis. Data and code to reproduce analysis are
212 available at <https://github.com/petermacp/glasgow-cxr>.

213

214 **Results**

215 *Population*

216 The total population of Glasgow City was 1.1 million in 1950, declining to just over 1 million by
217 1963 (Table 1). Ward populations ranged from 16,321 people (Knightswood) to 44,595
218 (Dalmarnock) in 1950. There was considerable variation in the change in population by 1963,
219 with some wards having substantial population increases (Provan: +312%), and others declining
220 (Exchange: -57%) (Supplemental Figure S2). Between 1950 and 1963, we included a total of
221 14,649,693 person-years of follow-up (*population excluding people in institutional care or*
222 *shipping*) in regression models.

223

224
225

Table 1: Population, and tuberculosis notifications in Glasgow City, 1950-1963

Year	Total estimated population*	Pulmonary tuberculosis notifications	Pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rate (per 100,000)	Extra-pulmonary tuberculosis notifications	Extra-pulmonary tuberculosis notification rate (per 100,000)	Total tuberculosis notifications	Total tuberculosis case notification rate (per 100,000)	Percent of tuberculosis notifications that were pulmonary
1950	1,100,000	2,446	222.4	369	33.5	2,815	255.9	86.9%
1951	1,089,767	2,207	202.5	355	32.6	2,562	235.1	86.1%
1952	1,086,800	2,264	208.3	301	27.7	2,565	236.0	88.3%
1953	1,085,000	2,368	218.2	295	27.2	2,663	245.4	88.9%
1954	1,084,700	2,201	202.9	241	22.2	2,442	225.1	90.1%
1955	1,085,100	2,181	201.0	278	25.6	2,459	226.6	88.7%
1956	1,083,500	2,024	186.8	193	17.8	2,217	204.6	91.3%
1957 [†]	1,079,800	3,925	363.5	172	15.9	4,097	379.4	95.8%
1958	1,078,400	1,340	124.3	167	15.5	1,507	139.7	88.9%
1959	1,075,800	1,159	107.7	120	11.2	1,279	118.9	90.6%
1960	1,064,700	1,092	102.6	109	10.2	1,201	112.8	90.9%
1961	1,053,100	1,021	97.0	137	13.0	1,158	110.0	88.2%
1962	1,044,500	927	88.8	117	11.2	1,044	100.0	88.8%
1963	1,029,147	863	83.9	116	11.3	979	95.1	88.2%

*Total populations and case notifications, including those in institutional care and shipping

[†]Mass miniature X-ray campaign in 1957

226
227
228

229 Across each year in Glasgow City, there was a greater number of females than males, with the
230 sex ratio slightly declining from 1:1.10 in 1950 to 1.08 in 1963. The difference in population sex
231 ratio was driven by fewer men compared to women aged 45 years or older (Supplemental Figure
232 S3).

233

234 *The Glasgow mass miniature chest X-ray campaign*

235 Between 11th March and 12th April 1957, a total of 714,915 people underwent miniature chest X-
236 ray in the campaign. Of these, 19,466 (2.7%) were <15 years, and 73,100 (10.2%) were not
237 resident in Glasgow, leaving 622,349 adult Glasgow-resident participants, 76.0% of the
238 estimated 819,301 adult resident population. A greater percentage of female adult residents
239 (340,474/437,588, 77.8%) than male (281,875/381,713, 73.8%) underwent chest X-ray, and
240 uptake was highest in younger age groups (Supplemental Figure S4). A total of 30,506 people
241 (4.3% of all X-rayed) were recalled for full film, with 652, (2.1%) not attending; 13,900 (45.6%)
242 were subsequently assessed at chest clinics. In total, 2,565 participants were diagnosed as
243 having new active tuberculosis requiring treatment, with 33 of these <15 years and 196 non-
244 resident, resulting in 2,369/622,349 (0.4%) Glasgow resident cases detected; approximately
245 65% were treated as outpatients. A further 1,556 people of all ages were notified with
246 tuberculosis through routine systems during 1957, meaning that the ACF campaign accounted
247 for 60% of all notifications in that year. Of the 2,369 adult Glasgow residents diagnosed with
248 tuberculosis due to screening, 58.5% (1,387) were male, and prevalence was highest in older
249 age groups; 523 (22%) were bacteriologically-confirmed by isolation of *M. tuberculosis*. In the
250 year of the campaign, tuberculosis notifications were lower in young children (0-5 years)
251 compared to the years before, and a greater percentage of TB cases were in older age groups;
252 this was maintained in the post-ACF period (Supplemental Figure S5). A substantial burden of
253 other disease was identified through the miniature chest X-ray campaign, including lung cancer
254 (n=327), pulmonary fibrosis (n=1,279), and cardiac abnormalities (n=1,072).


255

256 *Tuberculosis case notifications prior to active case finding intervention*

257 In 1950, a total of 2,815 people were notified with tuberculosis in Glasgow City, giving a case
258 notification rate of 255.9 per 100,000. Of these 87% were pulmonary notifications (n=2,446,
259 case notification rate: 222.4 per 100,000), and 13% were extra-pulmonary (n=369, case
260 notification rate: 33.5 per 100,000). Pulmonary tuberculosis case notifications rates varied by
261 ward, with the highest case notification rate in 1950 in Provan ward (68/19,297, 352.4 per
262 100,000), and the lowest in Camphill ward (16/23,630, 67.8 per 100,000) – Figure 1.

263

264 **Figure 1: Pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rates in Glasgow City, 1950-1963**



265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276

A Pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rates (per 100,000 population), by Glasgow City ward. ward names can be seen in Supplemental Figure S1. **B** Empirical (points) and modelled (pink and blue bands) pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rates (per 100,000 population), with counterfactual of no ACF intervention (grey bands). The mass miniature X-ray active case finding campaign occurred between dashed lines (11th March-12th April 1957). Points are empirical data based on total population estimates and numbers of pulmonary tuberculosis notifications reported to the Glasgow Medical Officer of Health in 1950-1963. Coloured bands are 95% uncertainty intervals, estimated from a Bayesian negative binomial interrupted time-series regression model. ACF: active case finding. CNR: case notification rate.

277 Between 1950 and 1956 (pre-ACF period), there was a slow linear decline in pulmonary
278 tuberculosis case notification rates overall (equivalent to a 2.3% per year reduction), and in
279 most wards (Figure 1). Wards in the Central and East Districts tended to have higher notification
280 rates than other parts of the city, with some wards showing a flat, or increasing, trend
281 (Supplemental Figure S6).

282

283 *Impact of active case finding campaign on pulmonary tuberculosis notifications*


284 Inspection of trace plots and model diagnostics showed regression models converged well
285 (Supplemental Figure S7 and Table S1).

286

287 In 1957, when the mass miniature X-ray active case finding intervention was undertaken, there
288 was a doubling in the case notification rate for Glasgow City as a whole, increasing from 186.8
289 per 100,000 in 1956 to 363.5 per 100,000 in 1957. In the interrupted time series regression
290 model, comparing 1957 (ACF intervention year) to the counterfactual scenario there was a 1.95-
291 times (95% UI: 1.80 to 2.11) increase in the pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rate
292 across the city (*'peak effect'*). At the ward level, there were substantial increases in the
293 pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rate in all wards, with relative rates ranging from 1.73
294 (95% UI: 1.38 to 2.05) in Gorbals to 2.23 (95% UI: 1.81 to 2.85) in Camphill (Figure 2).

295

296 **Figure 2: Impact of mass chest X-ray screening on pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rates, overall, and by ward**



297

298 **A1** Mean posterior relative pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rate in 1957 vs. counterfactual (“peak effect”). **A2** Mean posterior relative pulmonary tuberculosis case
 299 notification rate in 1958 vs. counterfactual (“level effect”). **A3** Mean posterior pulmonary tuberculosis relative rate of change in case notification rates 1958-1963 vs. counterfactual
 300 (“slope effect”). **A2** ward specific and overall (red) “peak effect”, with 95% uncertainty interval. **B2** ward specific and overall (red) “level effect”, with 95% uncertainty interval. **A3** ward
 301 specific and overall (red) “slope effect”, with 95% uncertainty interval. UI: uncertainty interval.

302 There was an overall substantial decline in the pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rate in
303 the year following in the ACF intervention (1958). Comparing 1958 to counterfactual trends, we
304 estimate a 36% relative reduction in the Glasgow City case notification rate (relative rate: 0.64,
305 95% UI: 0.59 to 0.71), with consistent effects across wards (Figure 2). There was a positive
306 correlation between the “peak effect” (increase in case notification rate in 1957 vs.
307 counterfactual) and the “level effect” (decrease in case notification rate in 1958 vs.
308 counterfactual), implying that greater increase in case detection in 1957 was associated with a
309 smaller reduction in case notification in the immediate post-ACF year - Supplemental Figure S8.

310

311 In the post-ACF period (1958-1963), the rate of reduction in pulmonary tuberculosis case
312 notification rates was greater than in the pre-ACF period. Overall, across Glasgow City during
313 this six-year period, there was an annual rate of change of -5.4%, compared to -2.3% in the pre-
314 ACF period. All wards had a markedly greater reduction in pulmonary tuberculosis case
315 notification rates (“slope effect”) in the post-ACF period compared to the pre-ACF period (Figure
316 2). There was a positive correlation between greater “peak effect” of ACF, and lower relative
317 reductions in the rate of change post-ACF (“slope effect”). There was no correlation between
318 the “level effect” and the “slope effect” - Supplemental Figure S8.

319

320 In our extra-pulmonary tuberculosis model, the ACF intervention had little discernible peak (RR:
321 0.89, 95% UI: 0.72-1.09), level (RR: 0.85, 95% UI: 0.69-1.04), or slope effect (RR: 1.13, 95% UI:
322 0.76-1.64), either across the city, or at ward level (Supplemental Figures S9 and S10).

323

324 *Estimates of case detection*

325 Assuming a 76% ACF coverage (as estimated from the total number screened and the estimated
326 adult resident population), we estimated ward case detection ratios ranging from 60% to 92%,
327 with a median (IQR) of 78% (72%-82%). Across wards, we found pre-ACF tuberculosis case

328 notification rate and case detection ratios were positively correlated (corr=0.76), and case
 329 detection ratios were negatively correlated with ACF impact measured as pre/post notification
 330 ratio (corr= -0.55) – Supplemental Figure S11.

331

332 *Cases averted compared to counterfactual scenario*

333 Across the City of Glasgow between 1958 and 1963, we estimate that, compared to the
 334 counterfactual scenario where the ACF intervention had not happened, there were 4,656 (95%
 335 UI: 3,670 to 5,725) pulmonary tuberculosis notifications averted, equivalent to a 43.1% (37.3%
 336 to 48.8%) reduction (Table 2).

337

338 **Table 2: Impact of mass screening intervention in post-ACF period (1958-1963) compared to**
 339 **counterfactual scenario**

340

	Year	Difference in case notification rate (per 100,000 py, 95% UI)	Relative case notification rate (95% UI)	Tuberculosis notifications averted (95% UI)	Percentage difference in cases (95% UI)
PTB	1958	-64.8 (-79.4 to -50.9)	0.64 (0.59 to 0.71)	682.1 (535.2 to 835.2)	-35.5% (-41.0% to -29.5%)
PTB	1959	-69.7 (-84.9 to -55.3)	0.61 (0.56 to 0.67)	731.6 (580.6 to 891.5)	-38.9% (-44.2% to -33.2%)
PTB	1960	-74.0 (-90.5 to -58.6)	0.58 (0.52 to 0.64)	768.1 (608.0 to 939.9)	-42.0% (-47.5% to -36.3%)
PTB	1961	-77.8 (-96.0 to -61.3)	0.55 (0.49 to 0.61)	799.5 (629.3 to 985.9)	-45.0% (-50.8% to -39.0%)
PTB	1962	-81.3 (-100.9 to -63.3)	0.52 (0.46 to 0.59)	828.6 (645.2 to 1,029.0)	-47.9% (-54.0% to -41.4%)
PTB	1963	-84.3 (-105.8 to -64.9)	0.49 (0.43 to 0.56)	846.7 (651.5 to 1,063.0)	-50.6% (-57.1% to -43.7%)
PTB	Overall (1958-1963)			4,656.5 (3,670.1 to 5,724.7)	-43.1% (-48.8% to -37.3%)
EPTB	1958	-2.5 (-5.5 to 0.6)	0.85 (0.69 to 1.04)	0.7 (-0.2 to 2.0)	-14.9% (-31.2% to 4.1%)
EPTB	1959	-2.0 (-4.9 to 0.7)	0.87 (0.71 to 1.05)	0.6 (-0.2 to 1.8)	-13.2% (-29.1% to 5.2%)
EPTB	1960	-1.6 (-4.6 to 1.1)	0.89 (0.71 to 1.09)	0.5 (-0.3 to 1.7)	-11.4% (-29.5% to 9.5%)
EPTB	1961	-1.3 (-4.5 to 1.7)	0.91 (0.69 to 1.17)	0.4 (-0.5 to 1.6)	-9.3% (-31.4% to 16.6%)
EPTB	Overall (1958-1963)			77.5 (-33.2 to 196.3)	-12.5% (-29.0% to 6.4%)

341 All estimates are compared to counterfactual scenario where active case finding intervention had not been
 342 implemented. PTB: Pulmonary tuberculosis; EPTB: Extra-pulmonary tuberculosis; py: person-years.

343


344

345 *Impact of active case finding by age group and sex*

346 In the pre-intervention period, there were differences in pulmonary tuberculosis case
 347 notification trajectories by age group and sex, with in general declining rates in younger age
 348 groups, higher numbers of notifications among older men than women, and older men in

349 particular having an upwards trend in notifications, compared to other groups (Supplemental
350 Figure S12). With the intervention, there was a reduction in case notifications in young children
351 (0-5 years) (Figure 3). The greatest difference between men and women in cases averted was in
352 older age groups.

353 **Figure 3: Impact of active case finding on case notifications by age group and sex, Glasgow City: 1950-1963**



354 **A** “Peak effect” on case notifications (1957 vs. counterfactual). **B** “Level effect” on case notifications (1958 vs. counterfactual). **C** “Slope effect” on case notifications (1958-1963 vs.
 355 counterfactual). **D** Numbers of pulmonary tuberculosis notifications averted during 1958-1963, compared to counterfactual scenario. UI: Uncertainty interval.
 356

357 **Discussion**

358 The Glasgow mass miniature X-ray campaign for tuberculosis in 1957 was probably the largest
359 single community-based active case finding intervention ever undertaken, with more than
360 715,000 people (622,349 adult Glasgow residents; 76% of the entire adult resident population)
361 screened with miniature chest X-ray over just 5 weeks, equating to nearly 150,000 people
362 screened per week of the campaign. In our analysis using modern epidemiological methods, we
363 found that the mass screening intervention had a substantial immediate impact – doubling case
364 notifications – and resulted in more rapid reductions in the citywide notification rate (5.4% per
365 year) post intervention compared to the pre-intervention period (2.3%), with an estimated 4,656
366 notified pulmonary tuberculosis case notifications averted between 1958 and 1963 compared
367 to the counterfactual scenario. Consistency in intervention effect across City wards gives
368 confidence that the impact can be attributed to the intervention. By mostly omitting historical
369 evidence of the impact of well-conducted mass X-ray screening programmes in global guideline
370 development and contemporary discourse, it is likely that the potential impact of intensive,
371 high-coverage ACF interventions to change epidemic trajectories has been under-estimated.

372
373 Neither systematic reviews of historical ACF interventions^{14,22,23} nor WHO guidelines for
374 systematic tuberculosis screening^{12,13} have included these data from Glasgow in evidence
375 synthesis. A review of historical mass miniature X-ray screening interventions from the 1930s to
376 late 1960s identified 18 published reports from North America, Europe, and India⁶. Synthesising
377 these data *Golub et al* concluded that mass miniature X-ray screening was highly effective at
378 increasing case detection, particularly when programmes were well supported by community
379 and health system engagement⁶. Likewise, *Miller et al* emphasised the importance of logistics
380 at large scale to ACF programme success²⁴. During the late 1950s however, several large cities
381 in the UK – including Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Liverpool, as well as many cities and countries
382 internationally (Brazil, Japan, Spain, Italy, Sweden) undertook mass miniature X-ray screening

383 for tuberculosis. However, to the best of our knowledge evidence from these programmes have
384 mostly not been collated, possibly because data reside only in municipal public health reports,
385 rather than in more accessible scientific publications. Moreover, data included in both sets of
386 WHO guidance for community-based systematic screening (2013¹² and 2021¹³) include only a
387 small number of historical studies. This represents a missed opportunity: many high
388 tuberculosis burden countries have tuberculosis epidemiological characteristics similar to
389 Europe and North American in the 1950s. By omitting historical evidence, there a danger that
390 previous lessons learned are forgotten.

391

392 Only a small number of contemporary studies have investigated the impact of ACF for
393 tuberculosis on case notification rates, with the large majority following up communities only in
394 the period before and during the intervention¹⁴, and with nearly all showing large increases in
395 case detection during implementation. In non-randomised studies, following up communities
396 for prolonged periods after the ACF intervention is critical to identify effects that are temporary
397 or short lived; our analysis here provides compelling evidence that a single intervention with
398 high coverage can change epidemic trajectory. Two contemporary randomised trials of
399 community-based active case finding (ACT3¹⁵ and TREATS¹⁶) have shown mixed results, with the
400 more intensive ACT3 study in Vietnam resulting in a substantial reduction in prevalent
401 pulmonary tuberculosis following universal sputum testing with Xpert, whereas no effect was
402 identified from the less-intensive symptom- and chest X-ray based screening approach in
403 TREATS. However, uptake of screening was low in these two trials, with only 45% of eligible
404 participants screened by sputum Xpert in the best performing year of ACT3. We speculate that
405 the very high coverage of chest X-ray screening achieved in Glasgow in 1957 was a major
406 contributor to epidemiological impact, and potentially identified people with early and
407 subclinical tuberculosis, rapidly reducing transmission.

408

409 Critically important to achieving high population coverage of tuberculosis screening was a
410 programme of mass community engagement and mobilisation, supported by more than 12,000
411 volunteers. A recent qualitative synthesis of the community views of participating in ACF
412 programmes emphasises that local ownership and leadership, ongoing support for people
413 screened, and health systems strengthening to support the increased healthcare demands
414 generated by mass screening are important determinants of intervention success²⁵; The
415 Glasgow mass screening campaign exemplified these principles, and we argue that community
416 and health systems support within contemporary ACF programmes are often insufficient, and
417 delivered in a “top-down” – rather than community-responsive – fashion, likely contributing to
418 lower than anticipated participation and effectiveness.

419

420 The post-war period between 1948 and 1960 was a period of tremendous social change, and
421 the 1957 Glasgow mass tuberculosis screening campaign needs to be contextualised alongside
422 progressive improvements in living conditions, healthcare, and tuberculosis care and
423 prevention. In Glasgow, “Slum clearances” commenced in the mid-1950s, particularly in wards
424 in the centre and South of the city such as Camphill, Gorbals, Cowcaddens, and Govan, with
425 new residential schemes established on the peripheries of the city. These changes in ward
426 demographics can be seen in our supplementary figures. However, whilst the reduction in
427 crowding and removal of dwellings in the worst condition is likely to have beneficial effects for
428 reducing tuberculosis transmission, the slow improvements in social and housing conditions
429 themselves are unlikely to account for the rapid and large changes in tuberculosis notifications
430 that occurred immediately with and in the period after the mass screening campaign. Future
431 studies may attempt to investigate associations between the numbers of dwellings demolished
432 in slum clearances, change in other markers of social deprivation, and magnitude of impact of
433 the intervention.

434

435 We found strong evidence that the impact of the ACF intervention differed by age group and sex.
436 In young children (<5 years, who themselves weren't eligible for screening, although a small
437 number of children <15 years did undergo chest X-ray), case notification rates decreased during
438 the intervention year in contrast to other age groups which saw large increases; we speculate
439 that this may indicate evidence of ACF shortening infectious duration and providing early
440 beneficial impact on transmission. For adults, contemporary data from high tuberculosis
441 burden countries show that men have twice the prevalence of undiagnosed pulmonary
442 tuberculosis than women²⁶. Men are less likely to participate in prevalence surveys in Africa²⁷
443 and Asia²⁸, and in active case finding trials^{15,16,29}, prompting calls to target interventions towards
444 men¹⁷. However, if tuberculosis prevalence was indeed higher in men than women in Glasgow in
445 the 1950s, our analysis suggests that rapid delivery of high coverage of high sensitivity screening
446 (with chest X-ray) – rather than interventions targeted specifically at men – may achieve benefits
447 for all groups, but especially those where disease burden is likely to have been highest. We
448 found no effect on extrapulmonary tuberculosis; this is to be expected, as extrapulmonary
449 tuberculosis notification rates were already low by the time the intervention started, and mass
450 chest X-ray screening targets pulmonary tuberculosis. Importantly, our analysis could only
451 investigate population-level effects on case notifications; previous reviews have emphasised
452 the dearth of information on the individual-level benefits and harms of participating in
453 community tuberculosis screening³⁰. There was little description available of microbiological
454 testing results or treatment outcomes, and it is possible that there was over-treatment of
455 tuberculosis in people screened, or indeed treatment of people with very early subclinical TB
456 which would not have usually been detected and treated. Future ACF trials should
457 systematically record individual-level benefits and harms.
458
459 Despite the high-quality data available and the rigorous epidemiological methods used, there
460 are some limitations to this analysis. We assumed a linear trend in tuberculosis case

461 notification rates in the pre-ACF period, and projected this forward for the counterfactual
462 scenario in the post-ACF period. It is possible however that – in the absence of the intervention –
463 the rate of decline may have accelerated downwards in the late 1950s to early 1960s, leading us
464 to over-estimate impact. We relied on available census data and official ward population
465 estimates from government and municipal sources; however, the population of Glasgow
466 changed rapidly in the late 1950s, and these may have over- or under-estimated population
467 denominators, particularly for some wards. We did not have comprehensive data on
468 microbiological results or treatment outcomes for notified cases throughout the study period,
469 nor for participants in the intervention; a post-intervention study of prevalence was not done.
470 Finally, while the rapidity, magnitude, and consistency of impact across wards strongly support
471 of a direct causal effect, other factors (“slum clearances”, mobility, general improvements in
472 living conditions, access to healthcare and air quality) may have contributed to improvements
473 in tuberculosis epidemiology.

474
475 In conclusion, rapid mass miniature chest X-ray screening of over 715,000 people in Glasgow,
476 Scotland (76% of the entire adult city population within 5 weeks) resulted in an accelerated and
477 sustained reduction in tuberculosis case notification rates in Glasgow, with an estimated 4,656
478 pulmonary tuberculosis case notifications averted in the six years following the intervention,
479 and potentially evidence of an intervention effect on reducing transmission to young children.
480 Previous attempts to synthesise data from tuberculosis mass screening programmes have
481 mostly ignored examples from the 1950-1960s held in municipal health departments, with the
482 consequence that our understanding of the population benefit of ACF has likely been
483 underestimated. Cities in today’s high tuberculosis burden countries may benefit from mass
484 chest X-ray screening supported by high levels of health system and community engagement,
485 alongside improvements in living conditions.

486

487 **Acknowledgements**

488

489 We gratefully acknowledge the staff of the Special Collections at the City of Glasgow Archives

490 for facilitating access to historical reports and maps. We also acknowledge Callan T

491 MacPherson and Isabella L MacPherson for assistance in data extraction from historical

492 records.

493

494 **References**

495

496 1 Barberis I, Bragazzi NL, Galluzzo L, Martini M. The history of tuberculosis: from the first historical
497 records to the isolation of Koch's bacillus. *J Prev Med Hyg* 2017; **58**: E9–12.

498 2 McKeown T, Record RG. Reasons for the Decline of Mortality in England and Wales during the
499 Nineteenth Century. *Population Studies* 1962; **16**: 94–122.

500 3 Vynnycky E, Fine PEM. The annual risk of infection with Mycobacterium tuberculosis in England and
501 Wales since 1901. *The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 1997; **1**: 389–96.

502 4 Lienhardt C, Glaziou P, Uplekar M, Lönnroth K, Getahun H, Raviglione M. Global tuberculosis
503 control: lessons learnt and future prospects. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2012; **10**: 407–16.

504 5 Medical Research Council National Tuberculin Survey 1949-1950. *The Lancet* 1952; **259**: 775–85.

505 6 Golub JE, Mohan CI, Comstock GW, Chaisson RE. Active case finding of tuberculosis: historical
506 perspective and future prospects. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 2005; **9**: 1183–203.

507 7 Radiography and Preventing TB on the NHS. People's History of the NHS. 2016; published online
508 Dec 13. <https://peopleshistorynhs.org/galleries/radiography-and-preventing-tb-on-the-nhs/>
509 (accessed March 25, 2024).

510 8 McFarlane NM. Tuberculosis in Scotland, 1870-1960. 1990.
511 <https://eleanor.lib.gla.ac.uk/record=b1365269> (accessed March 25, 2024).

512 9 City of Glasgow. Report of the Medical Officer of Health, Glasgow. Glasgow, 1954.

513 10 WHO Expert Committee on Tuberculosis. Ninth report. *World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser*
514 1974; : 1–40.

515 11 World Health Organization. Global Tuberculosis Report. Geneva, 2023
516 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240083851> (accessed Dec 8, 2023).

517 12 World Health Organization. Systematic screening for active tuberculosis: principles and
518 recommendations. 2013 <https://www.who.int/tb/tbscreening/en/> (accessed Dec 6, 2019).

519 13 World Health Organization. WHO consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis. Model 2:
520 screening. Systematic screening for tuberculosis disease. Geneva, 2021
521 <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/340255/9789240022676-eng.pdf> (accessed
522 March 24, 2021).

523 14 Burke RM, Nliwasa M, Feasey HRA, *et al*. Community-based active case-finding interventions
524 for tuberculosis: a systematic review. *The Lancet Public Health* 2021; **0**. DOI:10.1016/S2468-
525 2667(21)00033-5.

526 15 Marks GB, Nguyen NV, Nguyen PTB, *et al*. Community-wide Screening for Tuberculosis in a
527 High-Prevalence Setting. *N Engl J Med* 2019; **381**: 1347–57.

528 16 Klinkenberg E, Floyd S, Shanaube K, *et al*. Tuberculosis prevalence after 4 years of population-
529 wide systematic TB symptom screening and universal testing and treatment for HIV in the HPTN
530 071 (PopART) community-randomised trial in Zambia and South Africa: A cross-sectional survey
531 (TREATS). *PLOS Medicine* 2023; **20**: e1004278.

- 532 17 MacPherson P, Shaunabe K, Phiri MD, *et al.* Community-based active-case finding for
533 tuberculosis: navigating a complex minefield. *BMC Global and Public Health* 2024; **2**: 9.
- 534 18 Cowan K Sir. Glasgow's X-ray campaign against tuberculosis 11th March-12th April, 1957.
535 Glasgow: Printed by Glasgow Corporation Printing and Stationery Department, 1957
536 <https://go.exlibris.link/6SMMP9kp>.
- 537 19 Wellcome. The Medical Officer of Health reports. [https://wellcomelibrary.org/moh/about-](https://wellcomelibrary.org/moh/about-the-reports/about-the-medical-officer-of-health-reports/)
538 [the-reports/about-the-medical-officer-of-health-reports/](https://wellcomelibrary.org/moh/about-the-reports/about-the-medical-officer-of-health-reports/) (accessed March 25, 2024).
- 539 20 Bürkner P-C. brms: An R Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models Using Stan. *Journal of*
540 *Statistical Software* 2017; **80**: 1–28.
- 541 21 Tiemersma EW, Werf MJ van der, Borgdorff MW, Williams BG, Nagelkerke NJD. Natural
542 History of Tuberculosis: Duration and Fatality of Untreated Pulmonary Tuberculosis in HIV Negative
543 Patients: A Systematic Review. *PLOS ONE* 2011; **6**: e17601.
- 544 22 Kranzer K, Afnan-Holmes H, Tomlin K, *et al.* The benefits to communities and individuals of
545 screening for active tuberculosis disease: a systematic review. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 2013; **17**: 432–
546 46.
- 547 23 Mhimbira FA, Cuevas LE, Dacombe R, Mkopi A, Sinclair D. Interventions to increase
548 tuberculosis case detection at primary healthcare or community-level services. *Cochrane Database*
549 *of Systematic Reviews* 2017. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD011432.pub2.
- 550 24 Miller C, Lonroth K, Sotgiu G, Migliori GB. The long and winding road of chest radiography
551 for tuberculosis detection. *European Respiratory Journal* 2017; **49**. DOI:10.1183/13993003.00364-
552 2017.
- 553 25 Taylor M, Medley N, Wyk SS van, Oliver S. Community views on active case finding for
554 tuberculosis in low- and middle-income countries: a qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane*
555 *Database of Systematic Reviews* 2024. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD014756.pub2.
- 556 26 Horton KC, MacPherson P, Houben RMGJ, White RG, Corbett EL. Sex Differences in
557 Tuberculosis Burden and Notifications in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review
558 and Meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2016; **13**: e1002119.
- 559 27 Law I, Floyd K, African TB Prevalence Survey Group. National tuberculosis prevalence surveys
560 in Africa, 2008-2016: an overview of results and lessons learned. *Trop Med Int Health* 2020; **25**:
561 1308–27.
- 562 28 Onozaki I, Law I, Sismanidis C, Zignol M, Glaziou P, Floyd K. National tuberculosis prevalence
563 surveys in Asia, 1990–2012: an overview of results and lessons learned. *Tropical Medicine &*
564 *International Health* 2015; **20**: 1128–45.
- 565 29 Feasey HRA, Khundi M, Nzawa Soko RH, *et al.* Impact of active case-finding for tuberculosis
566 on case-notifications in Blantyre, Malawi: a community-based cluster-randomised trial (SCALE).
567 *PLOS Global Public Health* (In press).
- 568 30 Telisinghe L, Ruperez M, Amofa-Sekyi M, *et al.* Does tuberculosis screening improve
569 individual outcomes? A systematic review. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **40**: 101127.

570

571 **Supplemental Material**

572

573 **Impact of active case finding for tuberculosis with mass chest X-ray screening in Glasgow,**
574 **Scotland, 1950-1963: a population cohort study**

575

576 Peter MacPherson^{1,2,4}, Helen R Stagg³, Alvaro Schwalb^{3,4}, Hazel Henderson⁵, Alice E Taylor⁵,
577 Rachael M Burke², Hannah M Rickman^{2,6}, Cecily Miller⁷, Rein MGJ Houben³, Peter J Dodd^{8*},
578 Elizabeth L Corbett^{2*}

579

580 1. School of Health & Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, UK

581 2. Clinical Research Department, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK

582 3. Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical
583 Medicine, UK

584 4. Instituto de Medicina Tropical Alexander von Humboldt, Universidad Peruana Cayetano
585 Heredia, Peru

586 5. Public Health Scotland, UK

587 6. Public Health Group, Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme, Malawi

588 7. World Health Organization, Global tuberculosis Programme, Switzerland

589 8. School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, UK

590

591 *These authors contributed equally.


592

593

594

595
596
597

Supplemental Figure S1: Divisions and Wards of the City of Glasgow, 1951



598
599
600
601
602

Red box in inset map of Scotland shows location of the main figure (City of Glasgow). Ward boundaries obtained from a scale 1951-1952 Post Office Directory map drawn by John Bartholomew FRSG held within the City of Glasgow Archive Special Collections (item PSI-52), digitalised using QGIS 3.34.1.

603 **Supplemental equation 1**

604

605 Annual tuberculosis case notification rates are estimated using the following model:

606

607
$$C_i \sim \text{NegBin}(m_i, \phi)$$

608
$$\log(m_i) = \log(N_i) + (\beta_{ACF(i)} + Z_{w(i),ACF(i)}) + (\alpha_{ACF(i)} + U_{w(i),ACF(i)})y_i$$

609
$$V = [Z \ U] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 6}$$

610
$$V \sim \text{MVN}(\mu, \Sigma)$$

611
$$\mu \sim N(0,1)$$

612
$$\Sigma \sim \text{diag}(\tau) \Omega \text{diag}(\tau)$$

613
$$\Omega \sim \text{LKJ}(4)$$

614
$$\beta_j \sim N(0,1)$$

615
$$\alpha_j \sim N(0,1)$$

616
$$\tau_k \sim \text{Exp}(1)$$

617
$$\phi \sim \text{Gamma}(0.01, 0.01)$$

618


619 Where i ranges over $1, \dots, N$ indexing each row/datapoint; $w()$ maps each row onto its ward (of
620 which there are K); $ACF()$ maps each row onto its time period: one of 'pre', 'during', 'post'

621

622 **Supplemental Methods**

623

624 *Estimates of incidence and case detection*



625

626

627

628 We used a simple competing hazard model of TB detection. Incident TB disease is the inflow to the prevalent
 629 pool; competing hazards of detection/notification (δ) and deaths/self-cure (ω) apply to the prevalent pool. The
 630 inverse of the rate of death/self-cure represents the mean duration of TB in the absence of treatment:

631

632

$$T = \omega^{-1} \approx 3 \text{ y,}$$

633

634 the estimate of a 3 years duration based on Tiemersma et al.

635

636 Under an equilibrium assumption, we can write down formulae for the case detection ratio (CDR), and in terms
 637 of prevalence (P) and notifications (N):

638

639

$$\delta = \frac{N}{P}$$

640

$$CDR = \frac{\delta}{\delta + \omega} \Rightarrow \text{odds}(CDR) = T \times \delta \Rightarrow \text{odds}(CDR) = T \times N/P \quad [*]$$

641

642

643 Under the assumption that the increase in notifications ($N_{acf} - N_{pre}$) from just before (N_{pre}) to during ACF
 644 (N_{acf}) represents a coverage fraction cov of the prevalent pool being found:

645

646

$$(N_{acf} - N_{pre}) = P \times cov$$

647

648

649

647 We can use this together with equation for CDR above to find

$$\text{odds}(CDR) = \frac{T \times cov}{(N_{acf}/N_{pre} - 1)}$$

650

651

651 The incidence prior to ACF (I_{pre}) can then be estimated as:


652

653

$$I_{pre} = \frac{N_{pre}}{CDR}$$

654


655 **Supplemental Figure S2: Glasgow City population by ward**
 656



657
658


Mid-year estimates
 Mass miniature X-ray campaign period between dashed lines (11th March-12th April 1957)

659 **Supplemental Figure S3: Glasgow City population pyramids by year**
 660



661
 662
 663

664 **Supplemental Figure S4: Uptake of tuberculosis screening by age and sex**
 665




666
 667

Sex	Age group	X-rayed	Resident population	Screening uptake (%)
Male	15-24	58,716	75,063	78.2%
Male	25-34	58,953	77,021	76.5%
Male	35-44	55,329	76,923	71.9%
Male	45-59	71,700	91,592	78.3%
Male	60+	37,059	61,114	60.6%
Female	15-24	70,854	86,836	81.6%
Female	25-34	64,431	82,228	78.4%
Female	35-44	66,257	82,930	79.9%
Female	45-59	88,065	105,945	83.1%
Female	60+	50,690	79,559	63.7%


668
 669

670 **Supplemental Figure S5: Distribution of pulmonary tuberculosis cases by age group and**
671 **sex in Glasgow by study period**
672
673




674
675 ACF: active case finding

Supplemental Figure S6: Pulmonary tuberculosis case notification rates by Glasgow Ward, 1950-1963



Empirical and modelled case notification rates (per 100,000 population) by ward, with counterfactual of no active case finding intervention. The mass miniature X-ray active case finding campaign occurred between dashed lines (11th March-12th April 1957). CNR: case notification rate. ACF: active case finding.

1 **Supplemental Figure S7: Rank plots of Markov chain Monte Carlo draws from pulmonary**
2 **tuberculosis model**



3
4

5 **Supplemental Table S1: Summary of posterior draws from pulmonary TB model**
6

Variable	Mean	Median	SD	q5	q95	rhat	ess_bulk	ess_tail
b_Intercept	-6.14	-6.14	0.05	-6.22	-6.06	1	1,002.29	1,503.05
b_y_num	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	1	3,452.84	2,946.98
b_acf_periodb.acf	0.03	0.03	0.99	-1.56	1.62	1	3,856.86	3,040.75
b_acf_periodc.postMacf	0.04	0.04	0.11	-0.13	0.22	1	4,109.37	3,148.10
b_y_num:acf_periodb.acf	0.08	0.08	0.12	-0.12	0.28	1	3,855.44	3,090.09
b_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	-0.05	-0.05	0.01	-0.07	-0.04	1	3,997.75	2,938.20
sd_ward_Intercept	0.25	0.25	0.03	0.2	0.31	1	1,676.31	2,545.37
sd_ward_y_num	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	1	909.65	767.17
sd_ward_acf_periodb.acf	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.14	1	1,538.63	1,540.81
sd_ward_acf_periodc.postMacf	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.01	0.22	1	791.97	1,493.26
sd_ward_y_num:acf_periodb.acf	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.02	1	1,534.36	1,834.39
sd_ward_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.02	1	585.71	1,243.07
cor_ward_Intercept_y_num	-0.45	-0.48	0.19	-0.73	-0.1	1	2,105.02	1,928.08
cor_ward_Intercept_acf_periodb.acf	-0.23	-0.25	0.29	-0.66	0.28	1	3,192.33	2,501.13
cor_ward_y_num_acf_periodb.acf	-0.05	-0.05	0.27	-0.48	0.41	1	5,900.33	3,315.59
cor_ward_Intercept_acf_periodc.postMacf	-0.14	-0.15	0.24	-0.52	0.29	1	3,998.37	2,876.98
cor_ward_y_num_acf_periodc.postMacf	0.1	0.11	0.26	-0.33	0.52	1	3,392.94	3,029.11
cor_ward_acf_periodb.acf_acf_periodc.postMacf	0.07	0.07	0.28	-0.39	0.51	1	2,091.54	2,824.18
cor_ward_Intercept_y_num:acf_periodb.acf	-0.24	-0.27	0.28	-0.66	0.27	1	3,638.83	3,062.98
cor_ward_y_num_y_num:acf_periodb.acf	-0.05	-0.05	0.27	-0.49	0.41	1	5,688.40	3,326.55
cor_ward_acf_periodb.acf_y_num:acf_periodb.acf	-0.05	-0.05	0.28	-0.5	0.42	1	4,612.02	2,835.09
cor_ward_acf_periodc.postMacf_y_num:acf_periodb.acf	0.07	0.08	0.27	-0.37	0.51	1	3,872.58	3,333.05
cor_ward_Intercept_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	-0.02	-0.03	0.25	-0.43	0.4	1	5,667.05	3,340.72
cor_ward_y_num_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	-0.03	-0.04	0.28	-0.47	0.44	1	2,983.47	2,512.36
cor_ward_acf_periodb.acf_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	0.06	0.06	0.27	-0.41	0.49	1	2,562.35	2,754.50
cor_ward_acf_periodc.postMacf_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	-0.07	-0.07	0.29	-0.54	0.41	1	2,465.79	2,876.07
cor_ward_y_num:acf_periodb.acf_y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf	0.04	0.05	0.28	-0.43	0.5	1	2,347.11	3,061.39
shape	92.69	90.1	20.8	64.44	130.36	1	3,627.48	2,971.74
r_ward[Anderston,Intercept]	0.19	0.19	0.09	0.03	0.33	1	2,497.80	2,846.41
r_ward[Calton,Intercept]	0.28	0.28	0.09	0.12	0.43	1	2,822.76	3,464.65
r_ward[Camphill,Intercept]	-0.61	-0.61	0.12	-0.81	-0.43	1	2,911.54	2,987.42
r_ward[Cathcart,Intercept]	-0.23	-0.23	0.1	-0.4	-0.07	1	2,736.45	3,391.33

r_ward[Cowcaddens,Intercept]	0.26	0.26	0.09	0.1	0.42	1	2,458.05	2,704.35
r_ward[Cowlairs,Intercept]	-0.05	-0.05	0.1	-0.2	0.1	1	2,575.19	3,169.71
r_ward[Craigton,Intercept]	-0.26	-0.26	0.09	-0.41	-0.11	1	2,650.05	3,144.98
r_ward[Dalmarnock,Intercept]	-0.06	-0.06	0.09	-0.22	0.08	1	2,673.27	3,213.00
r_ward[Dennistoun,Intercept]	-0.15	-0.14	0.09	-0.3	0.01	1	2,895.91	2,936.43
r_ward[Exchange,Intercept]	0.31	0.31	0.1	0.14	0.47	1	2,871.10	3,250.14
r_ward[Fairfield,Intercept]	-0.02	-0.02	0.1	-0.18	0.14	1	3,088.42	3,110.46
r_ward[Gorbals,Intercept]	0.29	0.29	0.09	0.14	0.44	1	2,208.60	2,892.25
r_ward[Govan,Intercept]	-0.01	-0.01	0.09	-0.16	0.14	1	2,606.25	3,387.18
r_ward[Govanhill,Intercept]	-0.31	-0.31	0.1	-0.48	-0.15	1	2,752.55	2,956.65
r_ward[Hutchesontown,Intercept]	0.08	0.08	0.09	-0.07	0.23	1	2,817.44	3,423.49
r_ward[Kelvinside,Intercept]	-0.45	-0.45	0.11	-0.64	-0.27	1	3,531.14	3,608.92
r_ward[Kingston,Intercept]	-0.02	-0.01	0.1	-0.18	0.14	1	2,952.50	2,830.65
r_ward[Kinning.Park,Intercept]	-0.08	-0.08	0.1	-0.25	0.08	1	2,538.94	2,886.23
r_ward[Knightswood,Intercept]	0.16	0.15	0.1	-0.01	0.33	1	2,290.97	2,857.67
r_ward[Langside,Intercept]	-0.46	-0.45	0.11	-0.65	-0.27	1	2,795.35	3,301.76
r_ward[Maryhill,Intercept]	-0.04	-0.04	0.1	-0.2	0.12	1	3,048.27	2,826.20
r_ward[Mile-End,Intercept]	0.06	0.06	0.09	-0.08	0.21	1	2,418.44	3,050.29
r_ward[North.Kelvin,Intercept]	-0.27	-0.27	0.1	-0.44	-0.11	1	2,837.76	2,569.84
r_ward[Park,Intercept]	0.03	0.03	0.1	-0.13	0.19	1	2,763.78	2,679.55
r_ward[Parkhead,Intercept]	0.04	0.04	0.1	-0.12	0.2	1	3,134.26	2,882.12
r_ward[Partick.(East),Intercept]	-0.27	-0.27	0.11	-0.44	-0.09	1	3,236.19	3,028.83
r_ward[Partick.(West),Intercept]	-0.01	-0.01	0.1	-0.17	0.15	1	2,169.75	2,968.02
r_ward[Pollokshaws,Intercept]	0.11	0.11	0.09	-0.03	0.26	1	2,066.06	2,544.64
r_ward[Pollokshields,Intercept]	-0.01	-0.01	0.09	-0.16	0.14	1	2,878.53	2,895.15
r_ward[Provan,Intercept]	0.34	0.34	0.1	0.18	0.5	1	2,151.64	3,060.61
r_ward[Ruchill,Intercept]	0.29	0.29	0.09	0.15	0.45	1	1,969.28	2,727.32
r_ward[Shettleston.and.Tollcross,Intercept]	0.08	0.08	0.09	-0.06	0.23	1	2,379.23	3,089.00
r_ward[Springburn,Intercept]	0.25	0.24	0.1	0.09	0.4	1	1,607.77	2,428.37
r_ward[Townhead,Intercept]	0.32	0.32	0.09	0.17	0.47	1	1,739.78	2,875.68
r_ward[Whiteinch,Intercept]	-0.11	-0.11	0.1	-0.28	0.05	1	2,913.13	2,664.53
r_ward[Woodside,Intercept]	0.1	0.1	0.09	-0.05	0.26	1	2,840.97	2,727.00
r_ward[Yoker,Intercept]	-0.03	-0.03	0.1	-0.2	0.12	1	2,422.78	2,711.39
r_ward[Anderston,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	3,592.39	3,196.26
r_ward[Calton,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.03	1	4,008.78	3,181.96
r_ward[Camphill,y_num]	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.05	1	2,617.24	3,222.91
r_ward[Cathcart,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	3,035.87	2,953.46

r_ward[Cowcaddens,y_num]	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.01	1	3,322.38	2,883.20
r_ward[Cowlairs,y_num]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.03	0.02	1	3,824.67	2,994.26
r_ward[Craigton,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.02	1	4,900.76	3,067.03
r_ward[Dalmarnock,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.04	1	3,237.54	2,998.50
r_ward[Dennistoun,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.02	1	4,494.57	2,890.46
r_ward[Exchange,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	3,635.56	3,171.04
r_ward[Fairfield,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.02	1	3,259.76	2,464.92
r_ward[Gorbals,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	2,694.51	3,101.95
r_ward[Govan,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.02	1	3,928.91	3,131.40
r_ward[Govanhill,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.04	1	3,036.06	3,217.78
r_ward[Hutchesontown,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.03	1	4,195.43	2,767.42
r_ward[Kelvinside,y_num]	0	0	0.02	-0.02	0.03	1	3,448.97	3,198.33
r_ward[Kingston,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	2,951.41	3,006.36
r_ward[Kinning.Park,y_num]	0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.04	1	2,520.24	2,963.12
r_ward[Knightswood,y_num]	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.02	1	1,443.73	2,236.19
r_ward[Langside,y_num]	0.02	0.02	0.02	0	0.05	1	1,998.60	2,678.65
r_ward[Maryhill,y_num]	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	3,710.33	3,140.26
r_ward[Mile-End,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.03	1	3,651.70	2,906.13
r_ward[North.Kelvin,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.04	1	2,461.53	2,719.28
r_ward[Park,y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.04	1	3,183.43	3,326.01
r_ward[Parkhead,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.02	1	4,213.60	2,944.10
r_ward[Partick.(East),y_num]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.04	1	3,185.24	3,299.90
r_ward[Partick.(West),y_num]	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.04	0	1	2,051.62	2,834.17
r_ward[Pollokshaws,y_num]	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.04	0	1	2,657.39	2,881.45
r_ward[Pollokshields,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.02	1	3,786.05	2,669.20
r_ward[Provan,y_num]	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.05	0	1	1,762.68	1,949.85
r_ward[Ruchill,y_num]	-0.03	-0.03	0.01	-0.05	0	1	2,217.87	1,804.36
r_ward[Shettleston.and.Toilcross,y_num]	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	3,329.87	2,924.83
r_ward[Springburn,y_num]	-0.03	-0.02	0.02	-0.05	0	1	1,222.85	2,044.17
r_ward[Townhead,y_num]	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.05	0	1	1,943.66	2,879.13
r_ward[Whiteinch,y_num]	0	0	0.01	-0.03	0.02	1	3,311.96	3,050.93
r_ward[Woodside,y_num]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	3,693.06	2,748.50
r_ward[Yoker,y_num]	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.02	1	2,226.67	2,360.78
r_ward[Anderston,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.04	-0.02	0.08	-0.19	0.05	1	3,307.94	3,199.34
r_ward[Calton,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.04	-0.02	0.08	-0.18	0.06	1	3,340.97	3,390.51
r_ward[Camphill,acf_periodb.acf]	0.06	0.04	0.1	-0.05	0.25	1	2,466.04	2,948.37
r_ward[Cathcart,acf_periodb.acf]	0.04	0.02	0.08	-0.05	0.19	1	2,802.12	2,934.38
r_ward[Cowcaddens,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.02	-0.01	0.07	-0.15	0.07	1	4,820.07	3,317.47

r_ward[Cowlairs,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.07	0.15	1	4,057.03	3,293.71
r_ward[Craigton,acf_periodb.acf]	0.03	0.02	0.07	-0.06	0.16	1	3,349.92	2,940.78
r_ward[Dalmarnock,acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.06	-0.09	0.11	1	5,167.96	2,905.02
r_ward[Dennistoun,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.07	0.15	1	4,986.62	3,140.81
r_ward[Exchange,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.06	-0.03	0.09	-0.22	0.05	1	3,249.74	3,456.34
r_ward[Fairfield,acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.06	-0.11	0.1	1	4,366.88	2,924.79
r_ward[Gorbals,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.06	-0.03	0.09	-0.23	0.04	1	3,068.89	3,378.51
r_ward[Govan,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.06	-0.12	0.1	1	5,361.71	2,971.73
r_ward[Govanhill,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.08	0.15	1	3,607.95	3,146.21
r_ward[Hutchesontown,acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.07	-0.11	0.11	1	5,312.84	3,290.73
r_ward[Kelvinside,acf_periodb.acf]	0.05	0.03	0.09	-0.05	0.23	1	3,053.79	3,354.79
r_ward[Kingston,acf_periodb.acf]	0.01	0	0.06	-0.09	0.12	1	4,231.17	3,542.68
r_ward[Kinning.Park,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.08	0.16	1	4,230.00	3,293.01
r_ward[Knightswood,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	-0.01	0.07	-0.14	0.09	1	3,308.77	3,208.28
r_ward[Langside,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.08	-0.08	0.16	1	4,311.65	3,155.24
r_ward[Maryhill,acf_periodb.acf]	0.01	0.01	0.07	-0.09	0.13	1	5,543.90	2,947.71
r_ward[Mile-End,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.02	-0.01	0.06	-0.13	0.08	1	5,574.98	3,246.58
r_ward[North.Kelvin,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.08	0.14	1	3,731.03	2,650.01
r_ward[Park,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.07	-0.13	0.09	1	4,690.75	3,134.42
r_ward[Parkhead,acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.06	-0.11	0.11	1	6,001.00	3,212.37
r_ward[Partick.(East),acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.07	-0.11	0.12	1	4,612.20	3,120.79
r_ward[Partick.(West),acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.09	0.14	1	5,018.79	2,662.35
r_ward[Pollokshaws,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.02	-0.01	0.06	-0.14	0.08	1	4,803.70	2,970.78
r_ward[Pollokshields,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.06	-0.08	0.13	1	5,084.23	3,551.19
r_ward[Provan,acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.07	-0.11	0.12	1	5,593.42	3,423.77
r_ward[Ruchill,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.02	-0.01	0.07	-0.15	0.08	1	4,578.20	3,366.53
r_ward[Shettleston.and.Toilcross,acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.06	-0.1	0.1	1	5,291.39	3,331.84
r_ward[Springburn,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.03	-0.02	0.08	-0.18	0.07	1	2,659.24	2,884.34
r_ward[Townhead,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.03	-0.01	0.07	-0.16	0.07	1	3,483.88	2,904.74
r_ward[Whiteinch,acf_periodb.acf]	0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.08	0.16	1	3,640.97	3,104.90
r_ward[Woodside,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.06	-0.11	0.09	1	4,937.81	3,164.29
r_ward[Yoker,acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.07	-0.12	0.09	1	3,697.02	2,828.66
r_ward[Anderston,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.03	-0.02	0.1	-0.22	0.12	1	3,709.73	3,082.15
r_ward[Calton,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.1	-0.17	0.17	1	4,437.98	3,373.57

r_ward[Camphill,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.13	0.1	0.15	-0.05	0.4	1	1,535.33	2,896.78
r_ward[Cathcart,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.04	0.03	0.11	-0.11	0.24	1	3,100.87	2,566.24
r_ward[Cowcaddens,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.02	-0.01	0.1	-0.2	0.13	1	4,767.84	3,566.87
r_ward[Cowlairs,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.01	0	0.1	-0.17	0.15	1	4,880.35	3,255.35
r_ward[Craigton,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.01	0	0.1	-0.17	0.15	1	4,553.45	3,228.97
r_ward[Dalmarnock,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.02	0.02	0.1	-0.13	0.18	1	4,474.14	2,993.51
r_ward[Dennistoun,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.1	-0.16	0.15	1	4,939.09	3,211.68
r_ward[Exchange,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.03	0.02	0.11	-0.13	0.22	1	3,563.00	3,209.54
r_ward[Fairfield,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.08	0.05	0.11	-0.07	0.29	1	1,974.28	3,081.08
r_ward[Gorbals,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.08	0.06	0.12	-0.08	0.29	1	1,743.83	2,238.94
r_ward[Govan,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.01	0.01	0.1	-0.14	0.18	1	3,763.87	3,129.70
r_ward[Govanhill,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.07	0.05	0.11	-0.09	0.27	1	2,270.57	2,548.79
r_ward[Hutchesontown,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.04	0.02	0.1	-0.11	0.21	1	4,034.13	3,538.42
r_ward[Kelvinside,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.06	-0.04	0.12	-0.28	0.12	1	2,633.29	3,303.10
r_ward[Kingston,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.06	0.04	0.11	-0.09	0.24	1	2,101.67	2,871.58
r_ward[Kinning.Park,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.04	0.03	0.11	-0.12	0.23	1	2,742.90	2,909.59
r_ward[Knightswood,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.1	-0.08	0.13	-0.33	0.07	1	1,212.85	2,543.68
r_ward[Langside,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.07	0.05	0.12	-0.1	0.27	1	2,625.25	2,963.50
r_ward[Maryhill,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.03	-0.02	0.1	-0.2	0.13	1	3,917.87	3,083.45
r_ward[Mile-End,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.1	-0.15	0.17	1	4,424.00	3,103.39
r_ward[North.Kelvin,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.1	0.07	0.12	-0.06	0.32	1	1,757.00	3,151.71
r_ward[Park,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.05	0.04	0.1	-0.09	0.24	1	2,646.17	3,529.59
r_ward[Parkhead,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.03	-0.02	0.1	-0.22	0.11	1	3,457.10	2,842.22
r_ward[Partick.(East),acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.06	0.04	0.11	-0.09	0.26	1	2,800.79	3,171.12
r_ward[Partick.(West),acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.05	-0.04	0.11	-0.25	0.11	1	2,152.04	3,128.67
r_ward[Pollokshaws,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.02	-0.01	0.1	-0.19	0.13	1	4,154.22	2,948.16
r_ward[Pollokshields,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.03	-0.02	0.1	-0.21	0.11	1	3,783.05	3,381.31
r_ward[Provan,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.08	-0.06	0.11	-0.28	0.07	1	1,974.61	2,960.47
r_ward[Ruchill,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.04	-0.03	0.1	-0.23	0.1	1	3,325.21	3,198.66
r_ward[Shettleston.and.Tollcross,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.02	0.01	0.09	-0.12	0.19	1	4,310.45	3,225.13
r_ward[Springburn,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.16	-0.14	0.15	-0.42	0.03	1	963.93	2,292.81
r_ward[Townhead,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.07	-0.05	0.11	-0.28	0.08	1	2,327.87	3,064.96
r_ward[Whiteinch,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.08	-0.06	0.12	-0.3	0.08	1	1,866.37	3,388.19
r_ward[Woodside,acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.03	0.02	0.1	-0.12	0.2	1	3,941.47	2,974.24


r_ward[Yoker,acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.11	-0.08	0.12	-0.34	0.04	1	1,275.57	2,389.06
r_ward[Anderston,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	2,989.55	3,604.80
r_ward[Calton,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,196.09	3,399.30
r_ward[Camphill,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	2,682.53	3,136.99
r_ward[Cathcart,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0.01	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	2,702.00	3,093.68
r_ward[Cowcaddens,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	4,096.04	3,686.11
r_ward[Cowlairs,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,000.75	3,194.56
r_ward[Craigton,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,606.68	3,204.35
r_ward[Dalmarnock,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,899.61	3,424.30
r_ward[Dennistoun,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,294.86	3,410.86
r_ward[Exchange,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	2,989.89	3,396.39
r_ward[Fairfield,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,627.09	3,247.32
r_ward[Gorbals,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0	1	2,490.06	3,319.96
r_ward[Govan,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,382.11	3,359.86
r_ward[Govanhill,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,450.62	3,184.23
r_ward[Hutchesontown,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,470.50	3,178.44
r_ward[Kelvinside,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0.01	0	0.01	-0.01	0.03	1	2,915.30	3,158.89
r_ward[Kingston,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,603.56	3,609.28
r_ward[Kinning.Park,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,859.13	3,474.13
r_ward[Knightswood,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,889.86	3,260.31
r_ward[Langside,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,900.78	3,168.12
r_ward[Maryhill,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,756.41	3,380.54
r_ward[Mile-End,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	4,243.98	3,348.36
r_ward[North.Kelvin,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,069.62	3,268.18
r_ward[Park,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	4,084.62	2,836.34
r_ward[Parkhead,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,334.06	3,064.31
r_ward[Partick.(East),y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,427.95	3,061.25
r_ward[Partick.(West),y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,064.80	3,659.70
r_ward[Pollokshaws,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	4,053.45	2,676.66
r_ward[Pollokshields,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	5,050.25	3,412.15
r_ward[Provan,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,379.52	3,071.32
r_ward[Ruchill,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	4,340.69	3,461.13
r_ward[Shettleston.and.Toilcross,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	4,507.94	3,356.56

r_ward[Springburn,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	2,836.91	3,107.49
r_ward[Townhead,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,517.37	3,138.97
r_ward[Whiteinch,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,875.54	3,234.08
r_ward[Woodside,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	5,000.60	3,176.00
r_ward[Yoker,y_num:acf_periodb.acf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	5,065.15	3,271.13
r_ward[Anderston,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,924.24	3,014.06
r_ward[Calton,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,840.33	2,906.87
r_ward[Camphill,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	2,467.57	2,518.69
r_ward[Cathcart,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	2,437.88	2,663.05
r_ward[Cowcaddens,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,305.02	2,933.76
r_ward[Cowlairs,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,759.79	2,642.01
r_ward[Craigton,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,891.99	2,301.29
r_ward[Dalmarnock,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,261.04	2,822.35
r_ward[Dennistoun,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,533.06	3,013.92
r_ward[Exchange,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,148.61	2,608.49
r_ward[Fairfield,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	2,222.07	2,971.33
r_ward[Gorbals,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,034.82	2,401.51
r_ward[Govan,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,147.52	2,622.76
r_ward[Govanhill,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	1,960.08	2,009.79
r_ward[Hutchesontown,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	4,478.58	2,856.40
r_ward[Kelvinside,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	2,340.63	2,528.82
r_ward[Kingston,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0.01	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	1,981.68	2,749.02
r_ward[Kinning.Park,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	2,765.47	2,658.78
r_ward[Knightswood,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.04	0	1	806.95	1,967.32
r_ward[Langside,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,302.47	2,312.39
r_ward[Maryhill,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,679.65	2,476.82
r_ward[Mile-End,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,629.00	2,257.12
r_ward[North.Kelvin,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	2,446.04	2,735.01
r_ward[Park,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	2,725.41	2,513.04
r_ward[Parkhead,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,871.89	2,366.24
r_ward[Partick.(East),y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,334.86	2,512.84
r_ward[Partick.(West),y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	2,085.93	2,569.37
r_ward[Pollokshaws,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.01	1	3,674.58	2,529.25

r_ward[Pollokshields,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,348.74	3,046.63
r_ward[Provan,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	2,798.09	2,570.00
r_ward[Ruchill,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	3,055.43	2,452.45
r_ward[Shettleston.and.Tollcross,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,415.87	3,097.59
r_ward[Springburn,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	1,274.15	2,311.14
r_ward[Townhead,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	2,461.89	2,523.16
r_ward[Whiteinch,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.02	0.01	1	1,967.37	2,989.05
r_ward[Woodside,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	0	0	0.01	-0.01	0.02	1	3,298.70	2,669.67
r_ward[Yoker,y_num:acf_periodc.postMacf]	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.03	0.01	1	1,472.89	2,407.51


7
8

9 **Supplementary Figure S8: Posterior distributions of, and correlations between “peak**
10 **effect”, “level effect”, and “slope effect” of active case finding intervention**
11




12
13
14

15 **Supplemental Figure S9: Impact of active case finding intervention on extra-pulmonary**
16 **tuberculosis case notification rates, Glasgow City**
17




18
19
20 Empirical and modelled case notification rates (per 100,000 population) by ward, with counterfactual of no active
21 case finding intervention. The mass miniature X-ray active case finding campaign occurred between dashed lines
22 (11th March-12th April 1957). CNR: case notification rate. ACF: active case finding.

23 **Supplemental Figure S10: Impact of active case finding intervention on extra-pulmonary**
 24 **tuberculosis case notification rates, ward-level**
 25




26
 27
 28 Empirical and modelled case notification rates (per 100,000 population) by ward, with counterfactual of no active
 29 case finding intervention. The mass miniature X-ray active case finding campaign occurred between dashed lines
 30 (11th March-12th April 1957). CNR: case notification rate. ACF: active case finding.
 31

32 **Supplemental Figure S11: Correlation between estimated case detection active case**
 33 **finding impact**
 34



35
 36
 37 Points are Ward specific values. CDR: Case detection rate; RR.level: Mean posterior relative pulmonary
 38 TB case notification rate in 1958 vs. counterfactual (“level effect”); lpre: mean estimated incidence per
 39 100,000 in pre-ACF period; Npre: mean case notification rate per 100,000 in pre-ACF period; prev:
 40 estimated prevalence per 100,000; pdens: population density (1000 people per square kilometre).
 41

42 **Supplemental Figure S12: Impact of active case finding intervention on pulmonary**
 43 **tuberculosis by age and sex**
 44



Mass miniature X-ray campaign period between dashed lines (11th March-12th April 1957)

45
 46
 47 Empirical and modelled case notification rates (per 100,000 population) by ward, with counterfactual of no active
 48 case finding intervention. The mass miniature X-ray active case finding campaign occurred between dashed lines
 49 (11th March-12th April 1957). CNR: case notification rate. ACF: active case finding.