

1 **Equity, cost and disability adjusted life years of tuberculosis treatment supported by digital**
2 **adherence technologies and differentiated care in Ethiopia: a trial-based distributional**
3 **cost-effectiveness analysis**

4

5 Nicola Foster^{1,2}, Amare W Tadesse¹, Mahilet Belachew³, Mamush Sahlie³, Christopher Finn McQuaid¹,
6 Lara Goscé¹, Ahmed Bedru³, Tofik Abdurhman³, Demekch. G Umeta³, Amanuel Shiferaw³, Gedion T
7 Weldemichael³, Taye Letta Janfa⁴, Norma Madden⁵, Salome Charalambous⁶, Job van Rest⁵, Kristian
8 van Kalmthout⁵, Degu Jerene⁵, Katherine L Fielding^{1,7}

9

10

11 ¹Tuberculosis Centre, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene &

12 Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

13 ²UCL Respiratory, University College London, London, United Kingdom

14 ³KNCV Tuberculosis Plus, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

15 ⁴National Tuberculosis Control Program, Ethiopian Ministry of Health, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

16 ⁵KNCV Tuberculosis Plus, The Hague, the Netherlands

17 ⁶Aurum Institute, Johannesburg, South Africa

18 ⁷School of Public Health, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

19

20 Corresponding author:

21 Nicola Foster,

22 London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,

23 Keppel St WC1E 7HT

24 London, UK

25 nicola.foster@lshtm.ac.uk

26 ORCID: 0000-0003-4630-6243

27

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Summary**

31 **Background**

32 Evidence of the cost-effectiveness of digital adherence technologies (DATs) for supporting
33 tuberculosis treatment has been inconclusive and primarily omitted patient-incurred costs. We
34 aimed to assess the societal costs, equity impact and cost-effectiveness of DATs and differentiated
35 care compared to routine care in Ethiopia.

36 **Methods**

37 We conducted a distributional cost-effectiveness analysis using data from the cluster randomised
38 trial that evaluated the implementation of labels and pillbox followed by differentiated care to
39 support tuberculosis treatment adherence in 78 health facilities in Ethiopia. We estimated the costs,
40 cost per disability-adjusted life year (DALYs) averted and equity impact of the implementation of the
41 DATs interventions. Costs and DALYs were estimated at a participant level based on patient events
42 collected during the trial and the trial endpoints for intention-to-treat population. Uncertainty in
43 cost-effectiveness estimates were assessed by plotting cost-effectiveness acceptability frontiers. The
44 trial is registered with Pan African Clinical Trial Registry (PACTR) PACTR202008776694999, registered
45 on 11 August 2020 at <https://pactr.samrc.ac.za/TrialDisplay.aspx?TrialID=12241> and has been
46 completed.

47 **Findings**

48 The mean total societal treatment cost per trial participant was US\$507 (95%CI: 458; 555) in the SOC,
49 US\$196 (95%CI: 190; 218) in the labels and US\$206 (95%CI: 167; 213) in the pillbox study arms. We
50 estimated that there was a 49-56% probability that the implementation of the DAT interventions,
51 would improve the cost-effectiveness of tuberculosis treatment at a cost-effectiveness threshold of
52 US\$100. There was no difference in DALYs between socio-economic position groups ($p=0.920$),
53 however, patient costs were less concentrated among those relatively poor in the intervention arms
54 – labels (illness concentration index [ICI]=0.03 (95%CI: 0.01; 0.05)) and pillbox (ICI=0.01 (95%CI: -0.01;
55 0.02)); compared to the SOC (ICI=-0.05 (95%CI: -0.07; -0.02)). Between group comparison ($p<0.001$).

56 **Interpretation**

57 DAT interventions were cost-saving and reduced the inequitable distribution of patient costs
58 compared to the SOC. This highlights the potential value of interventions that reduce health service
59 visits in improving the equitable distribution of health services.

60 **Funding**

61 Unitaid (Grant Agreement Number: 2019-33-ASCENT).

62

64 **Research in context**

65 **Evidence before this study**

66 In November 2022, we searched PubMed and MedRxiv for English-language studies published
67 between January 2000 and current, using the terms “tuberculosis” AND “cost” AND (“Digital
68 Adherence Technologies” OR “DATS” OR “99DOTS” OR “Pillbox”). This search was repeated as part of
69 a systematic review in April 2023 followed by an update in May 2024. Twenty-nine relevant studies
70 have been identified, estimating the costs of DATS, though many did not assess the full economic
71 costs of implementation. Only two studies included an assessment of patient-incurred costs, and
72 none considering the equity distribution of costs or outcomes using an asset-based index.

73 **Added value of this study**

74 The ASCENT study provides robust evidence using a comprehensive economic evaluation framework,
75 that DATs decreased the cost of tuberculosis treatment in Ethiopia for a cohort of adults with
76 pulmonary tuberculosis. There was a 49-56% probability of DATs improving the cost-effectiveness of
77 tuberculosis treatment and there was no significant difference in disability adjusted life years (DALYs)
78 between study arms. The implementation of DATs did not change the distribution of costs or DALYs
79 between people with tuberculosis (PWTB) of different household socio-economic position, however
80 it did reduce the magnitude of patient costs among PWTB in the lower socio-economic position (SEP)
81 quintile.

82 **Implications of all the available evidence**

83 While there is limited evidence of the effectiveness of Digital Adherence Technologies (DATs), this
84 study is the first to show what impact the DATs may have on the costs of treatment, by reducing the
85 number of healthcare visits leading to cost savings. There is further evidence that DATs may reduce
86 the burden of patient costs on those who are least wealthy. We recommend that future investments
87 in DATs for tuberculosis treatment support consider how healthcare providers integrate DATs for
88 tuberculosis treatment support in the health facility workflow and how this translates to cost savings.

89

90 **Key words**

91 Digital adherence technology; Tuberculosis; Treatment adherence; Equity; Ethiopia

92

93 Word count 4497

94 **Introduction**

95

96 The 2018 World Health Assembly on Digital Health highlighted the potential of digital technologies to
97 advance universal health coverage, while cautioning that contributions should be carefully assessed
98 to ensure investments do not divert resources from alternative, more cost-effective non-digital
99 approaches [1]. Tuberculosis, a notifiable disease of public health importance, requiring adherence
100 to treatment schedules of 6 months or more, may benefit from innovation to support treatment
101 adherence. In 2022, 7.5 million people globally started treatment for tuberculosis, and with an
102 estimated 1.3 million deaths, it remains one of the deadliest infectious diseases [2]. In Ethiopia the
103 tuberculosis incidence rate is 126 (85-176) cases per 100,000 population compared to the global
104 average of 133. Disease risk factors include undernourishment, HIV, alcohol use disorders, diabetes,
105 and smoking. Of individuals newly started on tuberculosis treatment in 2021, 87% successfully
106 completed. Current treatment options for drug-susceptible tuberculosis (DS-TB) include a six-month
107 course of treatment or a 6-20-month course for rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis (RR-TB).
108 Intermittent dosing of tuberculosis medication as is observed with suboptimal dosing is possible due
109 to the post-antibiotic effect of drugs included in first-line treatment. However, the treatment
110 regimen will be less bacteriostatic when dosing do not coincide with the metabolic activity of semi-
111 dormant persistent tubercle bacilli [3]. Consistent adherence is therefore recommended to reduce
112 the risk of treatment failure, relapse and acquired drug resistance, especially among persons with
113 initial pulmonary cavitation or HIV disease .

114

115 Historically, directly observed therapy short course (DOTS) was used to achieve high rates of
116 treatment success, necessitating persons with TB (PWTB) attending the health facility daily to be
117 observed when taking their medication. Digital solutions for adherence monitoring has made
118 community-based, patient-centered treatment adherence support possible. A range of digital
119 adherence technologies (DATs) have been assessed with limited evidence of improvements in end of
120 treatment outcomes [4–6] and cost-effectiveness [7–10]. Interventions range from video-supported
121 therapy and digital pillboxes to SMS-based interventions. The use of these interventions may be
122 dependent on PWTB’s access to digital devices, and concerns have been raised about equity
123 implications [11]. Since lower household socio-economic position (SEP) increases individuals’ risk of
124 contracting tuberculosis disease [12], simultaneously increasing the risk for suboptimal treatment
125 adherence and poor health outcomes, it is important to assess the equity implications of digital
126 interventions. As part of the adherence support coalition to end tuberculosis (ASCENT) project, a

127 pragmatic cluster randomised trial was conducted to assess the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness
128 of digital pillboxes (pillbox) and medication labels (labels) with daily monitoring using a web-based
129 platform to inform differentiated care, in reducing a composite unfavourable outcome, including
130 tuberculosis recurrence in Ethiopia. The trial did not find evidence of a difference in the composite
131 unfavourable outcomes between the labels (adjusted odd ratio [aOR]=1.14; 95%CI:0.83-1.61; $p=0.62$)
132 or pillbox study arms (aOR=1.04; 95%CI:0.74-1.45; $p=0.95$) when compared against the standard of
133 care (SOC) [13]. We conducted a trial-based distributional cost-effectiveness analysis to assess the
134 equity impact, costs and cost-effectiveness of digital adherence technologies with differentiated care
135 compared to the SOC in Ethiopia.

136

137

138 **Methods**

139

140 *Study design and population.*

141

142 We conducted a trial-based distributional cost-effectiveness analysis using participant-level data,
143 following a pre-specified health economics analysis plan [14]. Costs and outcomes were assessed
144 from a societal perspective. ASCENT was a three-arm pragmatic cluster randomised trial of digital
145 adherence technologies (DATs) for tuberculosis treatment support, followed by differentiated care
146 compared to the standard of care (SOC) in Ethiopia. The unit of randomisation was health facilities,
147 with 78 facilities (26 per study arm) in the Addis Ababa and Oromia regions of Ethiopia enrolled.
148 Clusters were randomised (1:1:1) using stratified restricted randomisation, based on province and TB
149 notifications to provide either SOC, medication labels (labels), or digital pillboxes (pillbox;
150 EvriMed1000). 3,858 individuals ≥ 18 years of age, with pulmonary DS-TB were enrolled and
151 followed up 12 months after treatment initiation to determine outcomes. Two trial endpoint
152 measures were collected, (i) end-of-treatment outcome recorded in the facility TB treatment register,
153 and (ii) for all participants with bacteriologically confirmed tuberculosis who had either a cured or
154 completed end of treatment outcome, self-reported TB retreatment. For participants able to provide
155 a sputum sample, culture was done six months after the end of treatment to measure disease
156 recurrence. Data on patient events and trial endpoints were collected for all trial participants.
157 Provider – and patient costs were collected from the same sample of 15 health facilities (5 per study
158 arm), and 10 participants per facility (total of 150 observations).

159

160

161 *Ethics*

162

163 The study received ethics approval from LSHTM Ethics Committee, UK (19120–1); WHO Ethical
164 Review Committee, Switzerland (0003297); the Addis Ababa City administration health bureau
165 public emergency and health research directorate institutional review board (A/A/H/B/947/227);
166 and the Oromia Regional Health Bureau public emergency and health research directorate
167 institutional review board (BEFO/HBTFH/1–16/10322), Ethiopia. Written informed consent were
168 sought from individuals enrolled in the study.

169

170 *Interventions*

171

172 Two DAT interventions, pillbox and labels, were introduced to health facilities randomised to the
173 intervention arms (one DAT per intervention arm). Health facilities assigned to the SOC study arm
174 continued routine practice. TB focal staff providing tuberculosis care in each of the health facilities,
175 received training from trial staff in tuberculosis treatment adherence monitoring and the use of the
176 DATs. Each dose taken by participants was logged on the platform either automatically when the
177 participant opened the pillbox to take their medication, or when the participant texted a code on
178 the dose label to the dedicated toll-free number. Participants receiving care in facilities randomised
179 to labels, who did not have a phone were offered a pillbox. DATs were linked to an online platform
180 for daily monitoring of participant engagement with the DAT. Automated SMS reminders were sent
181 to all participants who did not open their pillbox or had not sent a text by 11:00 each day. Doses not
182 recorded were considered missed and the TB focal person started a differentiated response based
183 on data on the platform. The response included a phone call to the patient if 1-2 doses are missed;
184 home visits by a community healthcare provider if there is evidence of persistent missed doses (>5
185 consecutive doses); and a switch to DOT was considered if >14 doses were missed.

186

187 *Assessment of household socio-economic position, cost and outcomes*

188

189 Between May 2021 and August 2022, adults receiving tuberculosis treatment at participating health
190 facilities were offered enrolment into the trial. Participants were followed up for 12 months until
191 August 2023. Patient events were collected at enrolment, from treatment registers and at the 12-
192 month follow-up [14]. Household socio-economic position (SEP) as a relative measure of poverty was
193 estimated by calculating an asset index through principal component analysis of 27 multi-
194 dimensional poverty indicators collected using a survey at enrolment (table S2). Using this index,

195 participants were divided into quintiles of relative wealth. Costs and outcomes were compared
196 between quintiles using concentration index-based indices [15]. Illness concentration curves were
197 constructed by plotting the cumulative percentage of illhealth against the proportion of the
198 population ranked by household SEP. The standard illness concentration index (ICI) derived from the
199 curve was defined as twice the area between the concentration curve and the line of equality on the
200 graph [16].

201

202 Cost categories included technology, network – and support costs, health service costs of treatment,
203 and patient-incurred costs. Technology costs included the cost of the devices, accounting for cluster-
204 level re-use rates for pillboxes. Network costs for labels was the costs of two-way SMS’ and monthly
205 hosting costs of the web-based platform for both technologies. Support costs include the cost of
206 training, support visits to health facilities, and 0.5 full-time equivalent of a technical officer to
207 support the implementation and integration of the intervention. Provider costs were estimated at
208 facility level for 13 health facilities. The cost of staff time was estimated using timesheets completed
209 by tuberculosis focal staff (table S3). A separate log kept by trial staff was used to record the number
210 of support visits, telephone calls and travel to health facilities. Time spent was valued using the
211 average wage rate for health care workers in Ethiopia. The number of visits to health facilities were
212 recorded prospectively for each participant, on a facility log and multiplied by the provider unit costs
213 to calculate total costs. Costs valued before 2023 were inflated using the average annual consumer
214 inflation rate in Ethiopia over the previous five years (22.2% per annum). For the cost of
215 hospitalisation, diagnostic tests and RR-TB treatment, we used secondary data on unit costs
216 multiplied by the number of events collected for each participant [17]. Data on patient-incurred costs
217 such as transport and other out-of-pocket costs were collected by surveying 10 trial participants in
218 each of the 15 health facilities (5 per study arm). Costs reported in Ethiopian Birr were converted to
219 2023 United States Dollars using the average annual exchange rate (1 EB = 0.018 USD).

220

221 We estimated participant-level disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) based on participants’ gender,
222 age, and trial endpoint. DALYs are the product of years of life lost, and years lived disabled due to
223 tuberculosis. Years of life lost due to premature mortality were based on age- and gender-stratified
224 expected life expectancy for Ethiopia, if the participant died during treatment or prior to 12-month
225 follow-up. Years lived disabled were calculated based on time spent on treatment (including
226 recurrence or drug-resistant tuberculosis) multiplied by the global burden of disease disability weight
227 for tuberculosis disease (Eq S6) [18].

228

229 *Statistical analyses*

230

231 Cluster-level mean provider costs from 15 health facilities were singly imputed to the 78 trial health
232 facilities by province (Addis/Oromia) and study arm. Patient costs, socio-economic position and
233 DALYs at 12 months were jointly imputed for participants with missing values using multi-level
234 multiple imputation by chained equations, generating 50 imputed datasets. For each of the imputed
235 datasets, costs and DALYs were jointly modelled using bivariate Bayesian hierarchical models and log-
236 normal distributions with random effects to allow for cluster-level variances. Data were fitted using
237 Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling to obtain posterior simulations. The results of the imputed
238 models were pooled by combining the posterior draws for all 50 imputed models. Total costs and
239 DALYs in each study arm were estimated by summing participant- level costs and DALYs. The mean
240 differences in costs and DALYs were calculated group-wise by subtracting the arithmetic mean cost in
241 each of the intervention groups from those in the SOC arm. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio
242 (ICER) was calculated by the differences in costs divided by the difference in DALYs averted between
243 the intervention arms and the SOC study arm (Eq S7). The distributional incremental cost-
244 effectiveness ratio (dICER) was calculated as the ratio of net health benefit divided by the difference
245 in the illness concentration indices (ICI) between the intervention and SOC study arms (Eq S11). ICERs
246 were compared against a cost-effectiveness threshold for Ethiopia of \$100 per DALY averted [19].

247

248 Prespecified sensitivity analyses were used to assess how changes in the analysis may affect the
249 results of our study; including (i) changing the number of healthcare visits in the SOC to the number
250 of visits observed under guidelines circumstances; (ii) increasing the cost of the intervention; (iii) only
251 including the costs and outcomes incurred during the treatment of trial participants until the end of
252 the trial; (iv) valuing participant time using the average wage rate of government employees in
253 Ethiopia; and (v) varying the discount rate used for costs and effects from 0% to 10%. Variance in the
254 posterior draws of the model compared against a range of thresholds were used to quantify the
255 uncertainty in our estimates in a cost-effectiveness acceptability frontier for the probabilistic
256 sensitivity analysis. Data were analysed using Stata 18 and R statistical software. The study is
257 reported using the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022
258 checklist.

259

260 *Governance*

261

262 The study was funded by UNITAID (2019-33-ASCENT) through the Adherence Support Coalition to
263 End TB (ASCENT) project. The funder had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis or
264 interpretation or the writing of the manuscript. The trial had independent oversight from a Technical
265 Advisory Group (TAG) with representatives from all five ASCENT countries, as well as a Community
266 Advisory Group (CAB) including representatives from people affected by tuberculosis in Ethiopia. The
267 Ethiopian National TB Programme was involved in the design of the economic evaluation and
268 received regular updates. The trial is registered with Pan African Clinical Trial Registry (PACTR)
269 PACTR202008776694999, registered on 11 August 2020 at
270 <https://pactr.samrc.ac.za/TrialDisplay.aspx?TrialID=12241>.

271

272

273 **Results**

274

275 Between May 2021 and August 2022, 3885 adults (≥ 18 years) starting DS-TB treatment were
276 enrolled, with follow-up visits completed in August 2023 (figure S1). Participants were excluded if
277 their diagnosis changed to “not TB” or if they were diagnosed with RR-TB treatment less than 28
278 days before treatment start or were re-enrolled leaving 1295 participants in the standard of care
279 (SOC), 1305 in the Labels -, and 1258 in the Pillbox arms of the study in the intention-to-treat
280 population. Participants were analysed in the based on DAT received, leaving 1295 in SOC, 1152 in
281 labels and 1411 in pillbox (table S1). Baseline characteristics of the clusters and trial participants are
282 shown in Table 1.

283 Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the enrolled population by study arm participants received.

	Standard of care	Labels	Pillbox
Characteristics of the clusters/ health facilities			
Number of clusters	26	26	26
Region			
Addis Ababa	12 (46%)	12 (46%)	12 (46%)
Oromia	14 (54%)	14 (54%)	14 (54%)
Area			
Urban	24 (92%)	24 (92%)	25 (96%)
Rural	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
Median number of individuals per cluster (IQR)	48 (41, 59)	50 (36, 65)	45 (39, 50)
Baseline characteristics of the enrolled population			
Number of trial participants	1 295	1 152	1 411
Mean age in years (SD)	35.5 (14.7)	32.4 (13.5)	34.3 (14.1)
Female	496 (38%)	487 (42%)	584 (41%)
Bacteriologically confirmed tuberculosis	806 (62%)	756 (66%)	936 (66%)
Previous tuberculosis treatment	112 (9%)	63 (5%)	81 (6%)
HIV status			
Negative	1 134 (88%)	1 012 (88%)	1 218 (86%)
Positive, not on ART	2 (0%)	4 (0%)	9 (1%)
Positive, on ART	157 (12%)	133 (12%)	182 (13%)
Unknown	2 (0%)	3 (0%)	2 (0%)
Educational level			
None (Illiterate)	198 (15%)	114 (10%)	220 (16%)
Less than primary	73 (6%)	65 (6%)	119 (8%)
Primary	635 (49%)	571 (50%)	647 (46%)
Secondary or Higher	376 (29%)	394 (34%)	419 (30%)
Unknown	13 (1%)	8 (1%)	6 (0%)
Mean number of people per room of the house (SD)	2.6 (1.7)	2.6 (1.6)	2.5 (1.5)
Relationship status and living arrangements as a proxy for social capital			
Single	309 (24%)	313 (27%)	218 (15%)
Single (independent)	193 (15%)	211 (18%)	321 (23%)
Married or cohabitating	621 (48%)	528 (46%)	146 (10%)
Separated or widowed	158 (12%)	93 (8%)	52 (4%)
Unknown	14 (1%)	7 (1%)	6 (0%)
Frequency of income received			
No income	277 (21%)	266 (23%)	324 (23%)
Irregularly	198 (15%)	127 (11%)	286 (20%)
Seasonally	243 (19%)	245 (21%)	291 (21%)
Monthly	563 (43%)	507 (44%)	504 (36%)
Unknown	14 (1%)	7 (1%)	6 (0%)
Household socio-economic position			

Poorest	253 (20%)	211 (18%)	263 (19%)
Less poor	258 (20%)	187 (16%)	280 (20%)
Middle	227 (18%)	209 (18%)	289 (20%)
More wealthy	239 (18%)	238 (21%)	249 (18%)
Wealthiest	211 (16%)	260 (23%)	257 (18%)
Unknown	107 (8%)	47 (4%)	73 (5%)

284 All data shown are n(%) or mean (SD) or n/N(%). IQR=interquartile range. ART=antiretroviral therapy. SD=standard
 285 deviation. Each health facility is one cluster.

286

287

288 Baseline characteristics were similar between study arms. 62% (806/1295) of participants in the SOC,
 289 compared to 66% (756/1152) in the labels and 66% (936/1411) in the pillbox arms had
 290 bacteriologically confirmed tuberculosis. Slightly more participants in the SOC arm had a history of
 291 previous tuberculosis disease at 9% (112/1295) compared to 5% (63/1152) in the labels and 6%
 292 (81/1411) in the pillbox arms. Considering the variables describing household socio-economic
 293 position (SEP), similar proportions of participants in the SOC 21% (277/1295) compared to the labels
 294 23% (266/1152) and pillbox 23% (324/1411) arms of the study reported no individual income.
 295 Participants in the SOC arm were less wealthy (20% classified as lowest wealth quintile) compared to
 296 the labels and pillbox arms (18% and 19% respectively). Participants in the labels study arm were
 297 wealthier (43% (498/1152) in the two wealthiest quintiles) than those in the SOC (35% (450/1295))
 298 and pillbox (36% (506/1411)) study arms. The number of health facility visits per treatment episode
 299 compared between study arms are shown in table S4. Compared to the SOC, there was a reduction
 300 in the mean number of visits to health facilities in the pillbox and labels study arms throughout the
 301 treatment period; labels compared to SOC by -20.2 (95%CI: -26.3; -14.1; $p<0.001$) and pillbox
 302 compared to SOC -20.4 (95%CI: -26.5;-14.3; $p<0.001$) (table S4). Cohort level patient events during
 303 treatment compared between study arms are summarised in table S5. There were more home visits
 304 in the labels (77), and pillbox (58) compared to the SOC (5) study arms. Similarly nights in hospital
 305 was greater in the labels (648) and pillbox arms (310) compared to the SOC (135). This was partly
 306 explained by one healthfacility in the labels arm that admitted more people to hospital, and may also
 307 be as a result of more intensive follow-up because of monitoring using the DATs. A total of 22
 308 participants required a second course of tuberculosis treatment in the SOC, compared to 24 in the
 309 labels and 31 in the pillbox study arms. With 4 participants in the SOC, 1 in labels and 2 in the pillbox
 310 study arms starting rifampicin resistant tuberculosis treatment. The economic costs of treatment are
 311 summarised in Table 2.

312

313 Table 2. Total and per-patient costs (2023 USD) incurred for trial participants, by cost categories and study arm.

	Standard of Care (n=1295)		Labels (n=1152)		Pillbox (n=1411)	
	Total costs [95%CI]	Cost/patient [95%CI]	Total costs [95%CI]	Cost/patient [95%CI]	Total costs [95%CI]	Cost/patient [95%CI]
Technology	N/A	N/A	\$806 [fixed]	\$0.70 [fixed]	\$11,006 [10,752; 11,161]	\$7.80 [7.62; 7.91]
Network costs	N/A	N/A	\$12,534 [fixed]	\$10.88 [fixed]	\$9,665 [fixed]	\$6.85 [fixed]
Support and training	\$1,334 [1,308; 1,373]	\$1.03 [1.01; 1.06]	\$1,140 [1,117; 1,175]	\$0.99 [0.97; 1.02]	\$1,270 [1,242; 1,298]	\$0.90 [0.88; 0.92]
Sub-total intervention costs	\$1,334 [1,308; 1,373]	\$1 [1; 1]	\$14,481 [14,135; 14,826]	\$13 [12; 13]	\$21,941 [21,419; 22,364]	\$16 [15; 16]
Health facility visits	\$472,675 [448,070; 498,575]	\$365 [346; 385]	\$78,336 [76,032; 79,488]	\$68 [66; 69]	\$88,893 [87,482; 91,715]	\$63 [62; 65]
Drug sensitive tuberculosis treatment	\$45,325 [44,030; 45,325]	\$35 [34; 35]	\$40,320 [39,168; 40,320]	\$35 [34; 35]	\$45,325 [47,974; 49,385]	\$35 [34; 35]
Smear microscopy tests	\$75,110 [75,110; 76,405]	\$58 [58; 59]	\$66,816 [66,816; 67,968]	\$58 [58; 59]	\$81,838 [81,838; 83,249]	\$58 [58; 59]
Hospitalisation	\$1,036 [376; 1,645]	\$0.80 [0.29; 1.27]	\$4,712 [2,684; 6,751]	\$4.09 [2.33; 5.86]	\$2,300 [1,242; 3,344]	\$1.63 [0.88; 2.37]
Treatment for recurrence (drug-sensitive) or multi-drug resistance tuberculosis	\$41,440 [6,475; 76,405]	\$32 [5; 59]	\$19,584 [1,152; 40,320]	\$17 [1; 35]	\$28,220 [1,411; 55,029]	\$20 [1; 39]
Sub-total provider costs.	\$635,586 [574,061; 698,355]	\$491 [443; 539]	\$209,768 [185,852; 234,847]	\$182 [177; 204]	\$246,576 [219,947; 282,722]	\$178 [156; 200]
Patient incurred costs ¹	\$10,360 [10,360; 10,360]	\$8 [8; 8]	\$10,368 [9,216; 10,368]	\$9 [8; 9]	\$9,877 [8,466; 9,877]	\$7 [6; 7]
Productivity costs ²	\$10,360 [10,360; 10,360]	\$8 [8; 8]	\$6,475 [6,475; 6,475]	\$5 [5; 5]	\$7,055 [7,055; 8,466]	\$5 [5; 6]
Sub-total patient-incurred costs	\$20,720 [20,720; 20,720]	\$16 [15; 16]	\$16,843 [15,691; 16,843]	\$14 [13; 14]	\$16,932 [15,521; 18,343]	\$12 [11; 13]
Total societal costs	\$657,640 [596,089; 720,447]	\$507 [458; 555]	\$241,091 [215,678; 266,516]	\$196 [190; 218]	\$285,449 (256,887; 323,429)	\$206 [167; 213]

314 All costs are shown as the mean costs in 2023 USD. ¹Based on single imputation. ²Productivity costs are based on the value of individuals' time spent travelling to health facilities or waiting at the facility. 95%CI=95%
315 confidence interval. Technology and network costs are fixed costs per patient as primarily purchased from third party providers at a fixed rate of cost per patient, except in the technology costs for pillbox where
316 there is variability because of differences in cluster-level device re-use rates.

Intervention costs were \$13 (95%CI: 12; 13) per patient in the Labels compared to \$16 (95%CI: 15; 16) in the Pillbox arm, with an empirically derived pillbox reuse rate of 2.16 (95%CI: 1.58; 2.85) included in the calculation. Per patient provider costs were much higher in the SOC \$491 (95%CI: 443; 539) compared to the Labels \$182 (95%CI: 177; 204) and pillbox study arms \$178 (95%CI: 156; 200), driven by the larger number of health care visits in the SOC. The cost of medication, diagnostic tests, hospitalisation, and further treatment were similar between study arms. Patient-incurred costs are similar between study arms at \$16 (95%CI 15; 16) per person in the SOC, \$14 (95%CI: 13; 14) and \$12 (95%CI: 11; 13) in the labels and pillbox arms respectively despite the large difference in the number of health facility visits in the intervention arms. The distributions of DALYs, health facility visits, patient – and provider costs by household socio-economic position (SEP) are shown in Figure 1.

[FIGURE 1]

Figure 1. illness concentration indices for (A) Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs); (B) Number of health facility visits; (C) Patient costs in 2023 USD; and (D) Provider costs in 2023 USD.

The concentration index (ICI) assesses if there is a within study arm difference in the outcome by ranked by household socio-economic position (SEP). Clustering was taken into account in estimating 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). A negative concentration index means that the outcome, here a negative consequence, is concentrated among less wealthy households. Conversely, a positive index value means that the outcome is concentrated among relatively wealthier households. We compared the difference in the distribution in outcome between SEP groups, where the *p*-value represents the likelihood of any observed difference between the groups being by chance.

1
2 The equity impact of the interventions in four domains, namely DALYs, health facility visits, patient-
3 incurred costs and provider costs are shown in figure 1, figure s2 and table S6. The illness
4 concentration indices (ICIs) for DALYs were -0.06 (95%CI: -0.24; 0.11) in SOC; -0.02 (95%CI: -0.17;
5 0.14) in labels and -0.02 (95%CI: -0.16; 0.12) in pillbox study arms, with no evidence of differences in
6 the distribution of DALYs within or between study arms ($p=0.920$). The number of health facility visits
7 were concentrated among the comparatively poor in the SOC -0.07 (95%CI: -0.10; -0.05) and pillbox -
8 0.08 (95%CI: -0.09; -0.06) arms but not in the labels arm 0.01 (95%CI: -0.00; 0.02). Patient costs were
9 concentrated among those relatively poor in the SOC arm -0.05 (95%CI: -0.07; -0.02), while
10 concentrated among the wealthy in the labels arm 0.03 (95%CI: 0.01; 0.05) and pillbox 0.01 (95%CI: -
11 0.01; 0.02) with evidence of differences between study arms ($p<0.001$). Provider costs were
12 concentrated among the relatively wealthy, suggesting that the wealthy most benefits from public
13 health expenditure, in the SOC 0.13 (95%CI: 0.08; 0.18); labels 0.07 (95%CI: 0.05; 0.08) and pillbox
14 0.07 (95%CI: 0.04; 0.10) arms, though there was insufficient evidence ($p=0.225$) of a difference
15 between study arms. The cost-effectiveness and distributional cost-effectiveness of the interventions
16 compared to the SOC are summarised in Table 3.

17 Table 3. Incremental cost-effectiveness from the provider – and societal perspectives.

	Simple imputation of the means		Multilevel multiple imputation		Group-level summary metrics	
	Incremental costs per patient [95% CI]	DALYs averted [95% CI]	Incremental costs per patient [95% CI]	DALYs averted [95% CI]	Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio [95% CI]	Incremental distributional cost-effectiveness ratio [95% CI]
	Mean difference [95% CI]	Mean difference [95% CI]	Mean difference [95% CI]	Mean difference [95% CI]		
<u>Provider perspective</u>						
Labels versus SOC	-309 [-266; -335]	-0.46 [-2.07; 1.17]	7 [-191; 189]	0.04 [-1.93; 1.93]	672 [14; 1420]	18.53 [4.16; 31.85]
Pillbox versus SOC	-313 [-287; -339]	-0.32 [-1.61; 0.97]	-1 [-190; 183]	-0.01 [-1.93; 1.93]	978 [-54; 1626]	19.80 [8.88; 30.73]
<u>Societal perspective</u>						
Labels versus SOC	-311 [-268; -337]	-0.46 [-2.07; 1.17]	7 [-191; 189]	0.04 [-1.93; 1.93]	676 [17; 1435]	18.68 [4.30; 31.99]
Pillbox versus SOC	-301 [-291; -342]	-0.32 [-1.61; 0.97]	-1 [-190; 183]	-0.01 [-1.93; 1.93]	941 [-53; 1652]	18.96 [9.16; 30.94]

18 *Costs reported based on multiple multi-level imputation. In a separate analysis, we estimated costs using single imputation where the means of patient costs were used from the subsample –
 19 the findings of this analysis are summarised in the appendix along with a detailed report of the costs estimated. The current estimates suggest that the cost-effectiveness threshold (CET) for
 20 Ethiopia is between \$10 and \$255 (we used an average of \$93) per DALY averted. For the comparison, we use \$100 as an estimate within the range. LTFU: lost to follow-up. ^fMean age at death
 21 was 48.6 (SD: 18.6) years in the Standard of Care arm; 43.9 (SD: 17.8) years in the Labels - and 41.2 (SD: 14.7) in the pillbox arm. DALYs: Disability adjusted life years. SD: standard deviation.
 22 95%CI: 95% Confidence Interval. The distributional cost-effectiveness ratio was estimated, with the efficiency impact being the net monetary benefit calculated as the change in effectiveness
 23 multiplied by the CET minus the change in costs (EqS8); and the equity impact being the difference in health inequality measured as the difference in the illness concentration indices between
 24 study arms. The distributional cost-effectiveness ratio is then a ratio of incremental efficiency/ equity impact (EqS12).
 25

26 The difference in societal costs, using multiple imputation, was a reduction by \$299 per patient in the
27 Labels and \$298 in the Pillbox arms when compared against the SOC. The societal cost per DALY
28 averted was \$676 (95%CI 17; 1435) in the Labels and \$941 (95%CI -53; 1652) in the Pillbox study
29 arms.

30

31 [FIGURE 2]

32

33 Figure 2. Cost-effectiveness planes

34 Scatter plot of the estimated joint density of incremental costs and incremental DALYs averted, showing uncertainty in the
35 ICER estimate obtained from the analysis models. The dots represent the findings of a probabilistic sensitivity analysis.

36

37 When plotted on cost-effectiveness planes, we find that the ICERs are crossing the axes but slightly
38 concentrated in the bottom left hand quadrant suggesting that DATs are less costly and less effective
39 than the standard of care. ICERs in this quadrant are interpreted as cost-effective if they fall below
40 the cost-effectiveness threshold. Using the outcomes of the probabilistic sensitivity analysis, plotted
41 on the cost-effectiveness acceptability frontier, the probability that each of the interventions would
42 be cost-effective compared against a range of cost-effectiveness thresholds (CETs) are shown in
43 figure S3. Using a range of US\$5 to US\$900 per DALY averted for the CETs, we find that the
44 interventions have a 56% probability (labels) and 49% probability (pillbox) of being cost-effective
45 compared to SOC at a CET of US\$100. The results of the distributional cost-effectiveness analysis
46 estimates the distributional cost-effectiveness ratio at 18.68 for labels and 18.96 for pillbox. We
47 compare this finding against a relative health inequality aversion parameter of 5.66. In the absence
48 of empirical research on the level of inequality aversion by policymakers in Ethiopia, we used an
49 estimate previously derived for decisions in Ethiopia [20]. As the value of the inequality aversion
50 parameter increases, it suggests that there is a greater willingness to achieve fewer health
51 improvements to reduce inequality in health or other outcomes. Our distributional cost-effectiveness
52 ratio estimated (18.68 and 18.96) exceeds the parameter used for previous decisions in Ethiopia for
53 vaccines (5.66) suggesting that policy makers would need to be more averse to inequality than in
54 previous decisions, to recommend the implementation of DATs based on health equity.

55

56 In the sensitivity analyses (table S7), we found that more visits in the SOC increased potential cost-
57 savings from implementing the interventions. If we assumed an increased cost of the pillbox, for
58 example in setting where reuse rate is low, the cost savings compared to the SOC reduced by 16%.
59 Removing the costs and DALYs associated with recurrence reduces cost savings and has minimal
60 effect on the DALYs averted. Valuing participants using an average wage rate increases the cost
61 savings to patients. Main study findings, however, remained similar under sensitivity analysis.

62 Discussion

63

64 In health facilities implementing DATs, trial participants made 20 fewer visits per treatment episode
65 compared to the standard of care (SOC), substantially reducing the cost to providers. We didn't find
66 evidence of differences in poor health outcomes (DALYs) between study arms or their distribution
67 between socio-economic position (SEP) groups. However, there was a reduction in patient-incurred
68 costs among the least wealthy households in the intervention compared to SOC study arms. When
69 assessing uncertainty, the 95% confidence intervals of the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios
70 (ICERs) were wide, suggesting substantial uncertainty that DATs would be cost-effective when
71 compared to the SOC. We estimated that the labels and pillbox arms have a 49-56% probability of
72 improving the cost-effectiveness of tuberculosis treatment compared to SOC at a cost-effectiveness
73 threshold of \$100 per DALY averted. Our study follows the work of other cluster randomised trials
74 evaluating the effectiveness and costs of Digital Adherence Technologies (DATs) in China [5,10], South
75 Africa [21], Uganda [7] and Ethiopia [22], by including a detailed analysis of human resources, patient
76 costs and equity in addition to costs and cost-effectiveness.

77

78 Differences in provider costs between the SOC and intervention arms of the study were primarily
79 driven by the number of healthfacility visits per treatment episode. In a separate analysis, we
80 showed that health care workers spent more time with PWTB per visit in the intervention arms than
81 when they were attending more frequently in the SOC arm [23]. This increase in time spent
82 remained lower than the cumulative time of multiple visits in the SOC. Our evaluation of cost of
83 treatment included above service-level costs. These costs were highly variable, particularly between
84 urban and rural health facilities where fewer people with tuberculosis (PWTB) were accessing
85 services. Given that we had overhead costs from only 12 clusters, single imputation of provider costs
86 has likely resulted in larger variability than if we had collected data for all 78 clusters. Provider costs
87 reported in this study were broadly similar to the costs estimated by Terefe et al's comprehensive
88 assessment of the cost of tuberculosis care in Ethiopia, though we used a micro-costing approach
89 [17]. Our total cost estimate, includes costs incurred by all participants who received the intervention
90 irrespective of whether they completed treatment (ITT population). Provider costs incurred through
91 diagnostic tests, hospitalisation and subsequent treatment episodes were similar between study
92 arms, and differences in treatment costs were predominantly driven by the reduction in the number
93 of health facility visits.

94

95 Patient costs were similar in the intervention - compared to the SOC arms of the study, despite large
96 differences in facility visits. This is explained by lower transport costs per visit reported in the SOC
97 where there are more frequent visits compared to the intervention study arms. Furthermore, we
98 used the human capital approach for valuing time spent seeking care, whereby individual self-
99 reported income is used to value people's time. This likely does not fully captured the full cost of
100 time spent. Approximately 35% of participants reported no- or irregular income with consequently
101 no cost allocated to their time spent. Furthermore, we collected self-reported income data at
102 enrolment into the trial when people were on treatment and already had suffered disease-
103 associated income loss. A recent meta-analysis of patient costs associated with tuberculosis in
104 Ethiopia, found that pre-diagnosis costs were more than double post-diagnosis costs US\$97.6 (56.4-
105 184.3) versus US\$45.1 (-119.1-209.37) [28]. Differences in time spent between study arms due to a
106 reduction in number of visits, would therefore only have a marginal effect on productivity costs. We
107 quantified this potential bias by conducting a sensitivity analysis estimating the productivity costs for
108 each of the study arms by valuing all participants' time equally.

109

110 Our study is the first to empirically demonstrate that DATs could be cost saving by reducing the
111 number of health facility visits. This observed difference is dependent on the frequency of health
112 facility visits in the SOC. At the time of our study, PWTB were attending health facilities on average
113 30 times per treatment episode, our findings may therefore not hold in settings where less frequent
114 facility visits are already routine practice. Furthermore, the observed difference between study arms
115 would have been more pronounced prior to COVID-19, when visits to health facilities were more
116 frequent [25]. Other studies evaluating the economic costs of DATs found them to be more costly and
117 effect-neutral [7,8,10]. In Uganda, the provider cost of 99DOTS was estimated to be \$59 (range: \$50-
118 \$70) per participant successfully treated [7]. Similarly, in Morocco, the cost-effectiveness of a digital
119 pillbox from a provider perspective was found to be \$434 per DALY averted among MDR-TB patients.
120 This was a model-based analysis where the number (and cost) of health facility visits were assumed
121 to be the same between study arms [8]. A study in China, considering the societal perspective, found
122 digital pillbox to be more costly and effect neutral with an ICER of \$3,668.59 per DALY averted. Data
123 for assessing number of health facility visits was limited (n=120) and did not fully assess differences
124 in practice between studyarms [10].

125

126 Strengths of our study include it being a trial-based cost-effectiveness analysis with detailed data
127 collection of patient events, healthfacility visits and rigorous assessment of trial endpoints
128 embedded within a randomised study where the SOC reflects routine practice in Ethiopia. We

129 furthermore went beyond the traditional cost-effectiveness framework to analyse the equity impact
130 of the interventions. Study limitations include, the trial follow-up period was not long enough to
131 capture all health and economic consequences of the interventions – particularly tuberculosis
132 transmission. This question was addressed in a transmission modelling study following this study
133 [26]. The number of health facility visits were recorded prospectively, and patient event data
134 (including hospitalisations) collected at the 12 month follow-up. Self-reported patient events would
135 not be available for patients who died or became LTFU during treatment episode and we
136 underestimate the cost associated with care-seeking prior to death or LTFU. Given the
137 representativeness of the sample, imputed costs would undervalue true costs. Our DALY estimates
138 are likely to be conservative, because we only include DALYs for the current and identified future
139 treatment episodes and not for any longer-term sequelae of tuberculosis disease [27]. Our estimates
140 are similarly likely to underestimate the full costs and economic losses incurred because our
141 analytical time horizon, restricted to the current tuberculosis event, includes costs incurred once
142 participants started treatment and not during the diagnostic phase. We could only assess the equity
143 distribution impact of the intervention among those already accessing care, and expecting to live in
144 the health facility’s catchment area for the duration of treatment. We may therefore be
145 underestimating the value of the intervention among more marginalised groups. Nevertheless, we
146 expect the findings to be representative of adults who are accessing care at public health clinics in
147 Ethiopia.

148

149 We used relative SEP based on multi-dimensional poverty assessment, to incorporate equity in the
150 decision framework [29]. Alternative approaches are based on estimates of individual income to
151 assess inequality [30]. Measures of income-based inequality would correctly ascertain immediate
152 ability to respond to a health shock, but would fail to account for resource-sharing within families,
153 saving ability, and non-monetary assets that are important in assessing poverty in rural areas. Multi-
154 dimensional poverty metrics include locally-relevant assets such as land, livestock, social capital and
155 education that individuals may draw on in the event of a health shock. Our evaluation as part of the
156 trial, was not powered to compare outcomes between SEP groups within study arms, but sufficient
157 to evaluate how the concentration of the outcome between those relatively wealthy and relatively
158 poor varies between study arms.

159

160 In conclusion, we found the implementation of DATs to be effect-neutral but cost-saving due to a
161 marked reduction in healthfacility visits. These savings would only be fully realised if healthcare
162 providers have other productive tasks to fill their time previously spent on DOTS, or in contexts

163 where routine care is not daily facility-based DOTS. We found limited evidence of differences in
164 DALYs averted between study arms and estimate a 49-56% probability that DATs will improve the
165 cost-effectiveness of tuberculosis treatment at a CET of \$100 per DALY averted. The implementation
166 of DATs reduced the inequitable burden of patient-incurred costs.

167

168 **Authors' contributions**

169

170 NF, KLF, AWT and CFM designed this study. The trial was designed by KLF, KvK, JvR and DJ. All authors
171 have contributed to the study design. KLF provided statistical expertise in clinical trial design and
172 analysis. NF conducted the analysis and provided health economics expertise in design and analysis.
173 AWT, MB, MS, AB, TA, NM, KvK and JvR implemented the study. All authors contributed to the
174 interpretation of the findings and revision of the final manuscript. The authors read and approved
175 the final manuscript.

176

177 **Acknowledgements**

178

179 The authors acknowledge the contributions of the participants who enrolled in the study, the
180 Ethiopian tuberculosis focal persons implementing the digital adherence technologies and the
181 National Tuberculosis Program at the Ministry of Health Ethiopia without whom this study would not
182 have been possible. We acknowledge the oversight and inputs of the ASCENT Technical Advisory
183 Group.

184

185 **Data availability**

186

187 Data analysed in this study are part of the ASCENT Consortium Trials data. A minimal dataset
188 required to reproduce the findings and the survey materials is available from
189 <https://doi.org/10.17037/DATA.00003721> and analysis code from <https://github.com/nicolacfoster>.
190 The minimal dataset is available for non-commercial use upon request, after signing a data sharing
191 agreement, to studies approved by an ethics committee. Any publications arising from the shared
192 data must acknowledge the investigators who collected the data, the institutions involved, and the
193 funding sources by citing the data record and including a standard acknowledgement statement
194 provided.

195

196 References


197

- 198 1. World Health Organisation. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health
199 system strengthening. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2019.
- 200 2. World Health Organisation. Global Tuberculosis Report 2023. World Health Organisation; 2023.
201 Available: [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/373828/9789240083851-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/373828/9789240083851-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
202 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/373828/9789240083851-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- 203 3. Chang KC, Leung CC, Grosset J, Yew WW. Treatment of tuberculosis and optimal dosing
204 schedules. *Thorax*. 2011;66: 997–1007. doi:10.1136/thx.2010.148585
- 205 4. Liu X, Thompson J, Dong H. Digital adherence technologies to improve tuberculosis treatment
206 outcomes in China: a cluster-randomised superiority trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2023;11: 693–
207 703.
- 208 5. Wei X, Hicks JP, Zhang Z, Haldane V, Pasang P, Li L, et al. Effectiveness of a comprehensive
209 package based on electronic medication monitors at improving treatment outcomes among
210 tuberculosis patients in Tibet: a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2024;
211 S0140673623022705. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02270-5
- 212 6. Cattamanchi A. Digital adherence technology for tuberculosis treatment supervision: A stepped-
213 wedge cluster-randomized trial in Uganda. *PLoS Medicine*. 2021;18: 1–15.
214 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003628.
- 215 7. Thompson RR, Kityamuwesi A, Kuan A, Oyuku D, Tucker A, Ferguson O, et al. Cost and Cost-
216 Effectiveness of a Digital Adherence Technology for Tuberculosis Treatment Support in Uganda.
217 *Value Health*. 2022;25: 924–930. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.12.002
- 218 8. Yang J, Kim H-Y, Park S, Sentissi I, Green N, Oh BK, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a medication event
219 monitoring system for tuberculosis management in Morocco. *PLoS One*. 2022;17: e0267292.
220 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0267292
- 221 9. Nsengiyumva NP. Evaluating the potential costs and impact of digital health technologies for
222 tuberculosis treatment support. *Eur Respir J*. 2018;52.
- 223 10. Sweeney S, Fielding K, Liu X, Thompson JA, Dong H, Jiang S, et al. Unit costs and cost-
224 effectiveness of a device to improve TB treatment adherence in China. *IJTLDP OPEN*. 2024;1: 299–
225 305. doi:10.5588/ijtlpopen.23.0451
- 226 11. Saunders MJ, Wingfield T, Tovar MA, Herlihy N, Rocha C, Zevallos K, et al. Mobile phone
227 interventions for tuberculosis should ensure access to mobile phones to enhance equity - a
228 prospective, observational cohort study in Peruvian shantytowns. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2018;23:
229 850–859. doi:10.1111/tmi.13087
- 230 12. Oxlade O, Murray M. Tuberculosis and poverty: why are the poor at greater risk in India? *PLoS*
231 *One*. 2012;7: e47533. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0047533
- 232 13. Tadesse AW, Sahile M, Foster N, McQuaid CF, Weldemichael GT, Abdurhman T, et al. Cluster-
233 randomized trial of digital adherence technologies and differentiated care to reduce poor end-
234 of-treatment outcomes and recurrence among adults with drug-sensitive pulmonary TB in
235 Ethiopia. 2024. doi:10.1101/2024.05.09.24307117


- 236 14. Foster N, Tadesse AW, McQuaid CF, Gosce L, Abdurhman T, Assefa D, et al. Evaluating the equity
237 impact and cost-effectiveness of digital adherence technologies with differentiated care to
238 support tuberculosis treatment adherence in Ethiopia: protocol and analysis plan for the health
239 economics component of a cluster randomised trial. *Trials*. 2023;24: 292. doi:10.1186/s13063-
240 023-07289-x
- 241 15. Contoyannis P, Hurley J, Walli-Attaei M. When the technical is also normative: a critical
242 assessment of measuring health inequalities using the concentration index-based indices. *Popul*
243 *Health Metrics*. 2022;20: 21. doi:10.1186/s12963-022-00299-y
- 244 16. Erreygers G, Van Ourti T. Measuring socioeconomic inequality in health, health care and health
245 financing by means of rank-dependent indices: A recipe for good practice. *Journal of Health*
246 *Economics*. 2011;30: 685–694. doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2011.04.004
- 247 17. Minwyelet Terefe M, Eyob H, Letta T, Nadew E, Assefa T, Hailu B, et al. Efficiency of TB service
248 provision in the public and private health sectors in Ethiopia. *int j tuberc lung dis*. 2022;26:
249 1128–1136. doi:10.5588/ijtld.21.0481
- 250 18. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi M, Abbasifard M. Global burden of 369 Diseases and
251 Injuries in 204 Countries and Territories, 1990-2019: a Systematic Analysis for the Global Burden
252 of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*. 2020;396: 1204–1222. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)
- 253 19. Ochalek J, Lomas J, Claxton K. Cost per DALY averted thresholds for low- and middle-income
254 countries: evidence from cross country data.
- 255 20. Dawkins BR, Mirelman AJ, Asaria M, Johansson KA, Cookson RA. Distributional cost-effectiveness
256 analysis in low- and middle-income countries: illustrative example of rotavirus vaccination in
257 Ethiopia. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2018;33: 456–463. doi:10.1093/heapol/czx175
- 258 21. Charalambous S, Maraba N, Jennings L, Rabothata I, Cogill D, Mukora R, et al. Treatment
259 Adherence and Clinical Outcomes Amongst Drug-Susceptible TB Persons Using Medication
260 Monitor and Differentiated Care Approach in South Africa: Results from a Cluster Randomized
261 Trial. *SSRN*; 2024. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4756469
- 262 22. Manyazewal T, Woldeamanuel Y, Fekadu A, Holland DP, Marconi VC. Effect of Digital Medication
263 Event Reminder and Monitor-Observed Therapy vs Standard Directly Observed Therapy on
264 Health-Related Quality of Life and Catastrophic Costs in Patients With Tuberculosis: A Secondary
265 Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5: e2230509.
266 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.30509
- 267 23. Belachew M, Sahile M, Gadissa D, Abdurhman T, Bedru A, McQuaid CF, et al. Effect of
268 implementing digital adherence technologies on the use of health care providers' time and the
269 human resource cost of tuberculosis treatment adherence support in Ethiopia. *Infectious*
270 *Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2024 Mar. doi:10.1101/2024.03.14.24304331
- 271 24. Whitehead M. The concepts and principles of equity and health. *International journal of health*
272 *services*. 1992.
- 273 25. Khan MS, Rego S, Rajal JB, Bond V, Fatima RK, Isani AK, et al. Mitigating the impact of COVID-19
274 on tuberculosis and HIV services: A cross-sectional survey of 669 health professionals in 64 low
275 and middle-income countries. Di Gennaro F, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2021;16: e0244936.
276 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0244936

- 277 26. Goscé L, Tadesse AW, Foster N, Van Kalmthout K, Van Rest J, van der Wal J, et al. Modelling the
278 epidemiological and economic impact of digital adherence technologies with differentiated care
279 for tuberculosis treatment in Ethiopia. *TBC*. 2024.
- 280 27. Menzies NA, Quaife M, Allwood BW, Byrne AL, Coussens AK, Harries AD, et al. Lifetime burden of
281 disease due to incident tuberculosis: a global reappraisal including post-tuberculosis sequelae.
282 *The Lancet Global Health*. 2021;9: e1679–e1687. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00367-3
- 283 28. Assefa DG, Dememew ZG, Zeleke ED, Manyazewal T, Bedru A. Financial burden of tuberculosis
284 diagnosis and treatment for patients in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC*
285 *Public Health*. 2024;24: 260. doi:10.1186/s12889-024-17713-9
- 286 29. Cookson R, Griffin S, Norheim OF, Culyer AJ. *Distributional cost-effectiveness analysis:
287 quantifying health equity impacts and trade-offs*. Oxford; 2021.
- 288 30. Verguet S, Laxminarayan R, Jamison DT. Universal Public Finance of Tuberculosis Treatment in
289 India: An Extended Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *Health Econ*. 2015;24: 318–332.
290 doi:10.1002/hec.3019
- 291


Illness concentration index of DALYs ranked by SEP




Illness concentration index of visits ranked by SEP



Illness concentration index of patient costs ranked by SEP



Illness concentration index of provider costs ranked by SEP



2025 USD.

DALYs); (B) Nu

sts in




Figure 2. Cost-effectiveness planes.

