

Modelling the epidemiological and economic impact of digital adherence technologies with differentiated care for tuberculosis treatment in Ethiopia

Lara Goscé^{1,2,3}, Amare W Tadesse¹, Nicola Foster¹, Kristian van Kalmthout⁴, Job van Rest⁴, Jense van der Wal⁴, Martin J Harker^{1,2}, Norma Madden⁴, Tofik Abdurhman⁵, Demekech Gadissa⁵, Ahmed Bedru⁵, Tanyaradzwa Nicolette Dube⁶, Jason Alacapa⁷, Andrew Mganga⁸, Natasha Deyanova⁹, Salome Charalambous⁶, Taye Letta¹⁰, Degu Jerene⁴, Richard G White^{1,2}, Katherine L Fielding^{1,11}, Rein MGJ Houben^{1,2}, Christopher Finn McQuaid^{1,2}

¹Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

²TB Modelling Group, TB Centre, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London UK

³Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK

⁴KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation, The Hague, the Netherlands

⁵KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

⁶The Aurum Institute, Johannesburg, South Africa

⁷KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation, Makati City, Metro Manila, Philippines

⁸KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

⁹Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH), Kyiv, Ukraine

¹⁰National Tuberculosis Control Program, Ethiopian Ministry of Health, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

¹¹School of Public Health, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

Abstract

Background

Digital adherence technologies (DATs) with associated differentiated care are potential tools to improve tuberculosis (TB) treatment outcomes and reduce associated costs for both patient and healthcare providers. However, the balance between epidemiological and economic benefits remains unclear. Here, we used data from a large trial (PACTR202008776694999) to estimate the potential *long-term* epidemiological and economic impact of DAT interventions in Ethiopia.

Methods

We developed a compartmental transmission model for TB, calibrated to Ethiopia and parameterised with patient and provider costs. We compared the epidemiological and economic impact of two DAT interventions, a digital pillbox and medication labels, to the current standard of care, assuming each was introduced at scale in 2023. We projected *long-term* TB incidence, mortality and costs to 2035, and conducted a threshold analysis to identify the maximum possible epidemiological impact of a DAT intervention by assuming 100% treatment completion for patients on DAT.

Findings

We estimated small and uncertain epidemiological benefits of the pillbox intervention compared to the standard of care in Ethiopia, with a difference of -0.4% ($-1.1; +2.0$) incident TB episodes and -0.7% ($-2.2; +3.6$) TB deaths. However, our analysis also found large total provider and patient cost savings [\$163 (\$118; \$211) and \$3 (\$1; \$5) million respectively over 2023–2035], translating to a 50.2% (35.9%; 65.2%) reduction in total cost of treatment. Results were similar for the medication label intervention. The maximum possible epidemiological impact a theoretical DAT intervention could achieve over the same timescale would be a 3% (1.4; 5.5%) reduction in incident TB and a 8.2% (4.4; 12.8) reduction in TB deaths.

Interpretation

DAT interventions, while showing limited epidemiological impact, could substantially reduce TB treatment costs for both patients and the healthcare provider.

Key Messages

Recent empirical epidemiological evidence on digital adherence technologies (DATs) is contradictory, with different studies and settings showing a mixture of both positive impact and no impact of DAT interventions on TB treatment outcomes.

This is the first modelling study to use direct trial results or to estimate long-term epidemiological and economic outcomes. We used results from the ASCENT trial and modelled two DAT interventions in Ethiopia.

Results showed limited epidemiological impact of DATs in Ethiopia, but substantial reductions in TB treatment costs for both patients and the healthcare provider.

Estimated savings over a 12-year time frame indicate that DATs could have important budgetary implications from the provider side. In 2023 alone, these savings would have been equivalent to ~10-11% of Ethiopia's annual TB budget.

Introduction

Tuberculosis (TB) is the 13th leading cause of death worldwide, and world's top infectious killer, despite being largely treatable [1]. Effective first-line therapy for TB is widely available [2], however standard treatment is six months, and often requires that patients make frequent visits to the healthcare facility for supervised treatment. This can make supporting treatment adherence both challenging and costly, especially in resource-constrained settings [3-6].

Digital adherence technologies (DATs), include such tools as phone-based technologies, digital pillboxes and video-supported therapy. These, combined with associated differentiated care, are one potential tool to provide more patient-centred treatment support [7]. Through improved treatment support, these tools could reduce missed doses [8-10], and as a consequence could potentially improve treatment outcomes [11], therefore reducing population-level TB incidence and mortality [12]. DAT interventions could also reduce the number of visits a patient needs to make to the healthcare facility, reducing costs for both patients and healthcare providers, allowing the latter to focus on those patients requiring additional support [13]. They could contribute to the End TB goal of reducing TB-associated catastrophic costs, i.e. costs due to a TB disease episode of >20% of the annual household income [14].

Recent empirical epidemiological evidence, however, is contradictory, with different studies and settings showing a mixture of both positive impact and no impact of DAT interventions on TB treatment outcomes [15, 16]. Some studies have shown DAT interventions lead to a reduction in risk of on-treatment death, loss to follow-up, or treatment failure [17, 18], or an increase in treatment completion and cure rates [19] compared to the standard of care. However, others have shown no statistically significant impact [10, 20-24]. Meanwhile, some economic analyses agree that DAT interventions are likely to reduce catastrophic costs [25] and may be a cost-effective tool for TB treatment support [26-29].

The ASCENT project in Ethiopia was a cluster randomized trial which implemented and assessed the effectiveness of two DAT interventions (digital pillboxes and medication labels) compared to the standard of care (SoC), for drug-susceptible pulmonary TB [30]. The participants in the intervention arms were linked to a web-based adherence platform for daily adherence monitoring and differentiated response to participant adherence for those who missed doses [30, 31]. The primary outcome comprised on-treatment death, loss to follow-up, treatment failure, switch to drug-resistant tuberculosis treatment, or recurrence 6 months after the end of treatment; secondary outcomes included loss to follow-up. Effectiveness results showed that neither the pillbox (adjusted OR 1.04, 95% CI: 0.74-1.45) nor the label (adjusted OR 1.14, 95%CI: 0.83-1.61) interventions reduced the risk of the primary composite outcome. However, a reduction of loss to follow-up (adjusted OR 0.37, 95%CI: 0.15 to 0.95) was observed in the label arm [32]. The within-trial health economic analysis found that the labels and pillbox arms had a 60-70% likelihood of being cost-effective when compared against the standard of care, at a cost-effectiveness threshold of up to \$100 per DALY averted – largely driven by the effect neutral finding and human resources time saving [33].

Ethiopia is one of the 30 high TB burden countries, with an estimated incidence of 126 TB episodes per 100,000 in 2022 [34]. Ethiopia is also one of only seven countries to have reached the first milestone of the WHO End TB Strategy, with a reduction of 20% in estimated TB incidence and 35% reduction in TB deaths in 2020 compared to 2015 [35]. However, it is unknown if future End TB targets, of 90% and 95% reductions in incidence and deaths respectively and no people with TB facing catastrophic costs, will be met. Key indicators for monitoring implementation of the End TB Strategy at global and national levels include TB treatment coverage and treatment success rates,

with recommended target levels of at least 90% for both. Most recent estimates show that Ethiopia attains a treatment coverage of 73% and a treatment success rate of 86% [34, 35], leaving limited room for epidemiological improvement, but unclear economic opportunities.

Here we used results from the ASCENT trial to model the long-term epidemiological and economic impact of these DAT interventions, and their prospective contribution to achieving Ethiopia's End TB Strategy targets.

Methods

We built a deterministic, age-structured, compartmental model for the transmission of *M.tb* infection in Ethiopia, to study the impact of DAT interventions on TB incidence, mortality and costs. The model's structure was informed by the care cascade in Ethiopia, including compartments for individuals with TB infection (early and late), undiagnosed active TB, diagnosed TB undergoing treatment, and on-treatment lost to follow-up (LTFU). The model included transmission of infection to healthy individuals, reinfection of already infected individuals, reinfection of cured individuals, reactivation, and relapse. Due to the young age of Ethiopia's population, two age groups were considered in the model: 0–14 years, and ≥15 years. The model did not explicitly consider HIV co-infection, nor drug resistance, as individuals with drug-resistant TB were excluded from the ASCENT trial. BCG vaccination in the younger age group was included by assuming a constant coverage of 70% [34].

The model was initialised to Ethiopia's 2010/2011 TB prevalence [36], calibrated to Ethiopia's estimates of TB incidence and mortality from 2011 to 2019 using World Health Organization Global TB reports [37], and parametrised using trial data [32] to inform treatment outcomes. The model was coded using R (v4.1.2) and calibration was performed through the History Matching and Emulation (hmer) package [38, 39], which uses Bayes Linear emulation and history matching. We obtained ~700 parameter sets that fitted all targets, and for each set we sampled 10 times from the uncertainty around intervention parameters, thus obtaining ~7,000 parameter sets for each intervention. Full parametrisation, as well as model schematic, equations and calibration, can be found in supplementary document S1.

Costs per patient in Ethiopia by treatment outcome (treatment completed, LTFU or died) are reported in supplementary document S1. These were estimated as the sum of treatment costs and intervention costs (for pillbox and label scenarios). Treatment costs include staff salaries, hospitalisations and drug regimen costs and were collected during the trial for a sub-sample of participants, where a full cost breakdown can be found in the within-trial health economic analysis [33]. Intervention costs include technology, network and training costs and were instead estimated in a post-trial scenario for Ethiopia as 16.56 USD and 4.12 USD for pillbox and label respectively. The same was done for four additional countries for comparison: Tanzania, South Africa, Philippines and Ukraine (see supplementary document S2 for full intervention cost breakdown for the five countries). Data for these countries were collected during similar trials (but with slightly different design) under ASCENT [40].

Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) were estimated using modelled incident TB and deaths occurring every year from 2023 to 2035, in order to estimate years of life lost and years of life lived with disability. A 3% yearly discount was applied to both costs and health gains. Probabilistic sensitivity analysis (PSA) was also performed by running the model 1,000 times, estimating means and uncertainty intervals (UI). Results were reported in the form of incremental costs and DALYs

averted for each of the two DAT interventions compared to the standard of care, estimating incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) where appropriate.

We conducted three main analyses for Ethiopia: (i) epidemiological impact, (ii) cost-effectiveness analysis, (iii) epidemiological threshold analysis.

Epidemiological analysis

We modelled the standard of care compared to the ASCENT interventions between 2023 and 2035, estimating long-term projections of TB incidence and deaths. Outcomes were expressed in the form of cumulative and incremental (intervention vs standard of care) incidence and mortality from 2023 to 2035. We compared our results to the End TB Strategy targets.

Cost-effectiveness analysis

We estimated incremental costs and DALYs averted for the two DAT interventions against the standard of care between 2023 and 2035, and compared against an estimated cost-effectiveness threshold (CET) range for Ethiopia [41].

Epidemiological thresholds analysis

We varied the intervention treatment outcomes (i.e. treatment completion, LTFU, relapse and on-treatment death, setting different poor treatment outcomes to zero) to identify the maximum possible impact an intervention to improve treatment outcomes such as a DAT could achieve. We investigated four different scenarios by considering a hypothetical DAT which: (i) minimised relapse; or (ii) minimised on-treatment mortality; or (iii) minimised LTFU; or (iv) all of the above, i.e. maximised successful treatment completion.

Results

Epidemiological impact

Results of modelling projections to 2035 are reported in Table 1. All three scenarios (standard of care, pillbox and labels) led to similar rates of incidence and mortality in 2035, approximately 88 per 100,000 and 16 per 100,000 respectively, suggesting limited to no epidemiological impact of the DAT interventions compared to standard of care.

We estimated small and uncertain benefits of the pillbox intervention compared to the standard of care, with 11,000 (95% uncertainty interval -57,000; 32,000) incident TB episodes and 3,700 (-19,000; 11,000) TB deaths averted, i.e. a difference of -0.4% (-1.1; +2.0) and -0.7% (-2.2; +3.6) respectively. Results were similar for the medication label intervention.

	SoC Value (95% uncertainty interval)	Pillbox Value (95% uncertainty interval)	Labels Value (95% uncertainty interval)
Epidemiological outcomes			
TB incidence in 2035, per 100,000 persons	89.30 (47.93; 140.56)	88.07 (46.71; 138.50)	86.97 (45.05; 136.94)
Difference vs SoC in number of TB episodes over 2023-2035		-10,963 (-31,629; 56,550)	-22,104 (-73,566; 20,750)
Percentage difference vs SoC in TB episodes over 2023-2035		-0.4% (-1.1; 2.0)	-0.8% (-0.7; 2.6)
TB mortality in 2035 per 100,000 persons	16.20 (8.47; 24.09)	15.85 (8.21; 23.62)	15.88 (8.22; 23.75)
Difference vs SoC in number of TB deaths over 2023-2035		-3,665 (-11,353; 18,81)	-1,382 (-14,273; 6,76)
Percentage difference vs SoC in TB deaths over 2023-2035		-0.7% (-2.2; 3.6)	-0.3% (-2.7; 3.2)
DALYs averted, million		0.068 (-1.12; 1.28)	0.002 (-1.25; 1.30)
Economic outcomes			
Patient costs, million USD	12.06 (10.43; 13.57)	9.20 (8.034; 10.38)	9.03 (7.76; 10.20)
Incremental patient costs, USD*		-2.87 (-0.94; -4.85)	-3.04 (-1.07; -5.06)
Percentage change in patient costs		-23.8% (-7.8; -40.2)	-25.2% (-8.9; -41.9)
Provider costs, million USD	317.69 (275.84; 357.56)	154.89 (135.32; 174.90)	137.24 (117.81; 154.75)
Incremental provider costs, million USD		-162.80 (-118.08; -209.64)	-180.45 (-134.88; -225.02)
Percentage change in provider costs		-51.2% (-37.2; -66.0)	-56.8% (-42.5; -70.8)
Total costs, million USD	329.69 (286.27; 370.24)	164.07 (143.12; 184.94)	146.24 (125.78; 164.59)
Incremental total costs, million USD		-165.62 (-118.29; -214.87)	-183.44 (-135.76; -228.66)
Percentage change in total costs		-50.2% (-35.88; -65.2)	-55.6% (-41.20; -69.40)

Table 1. Modelling projections of TB incidence, mortality and costs of treatment for standard of care (SoC), pillbox intervention and label intervention. Whole national population, 2023–2035 timeframe.

For both interventions, when offered from 2023-2035 to all adults with pulmonary TB, 68% of model runs showed a cumulative reduction in TB incidence compared to the standard of care (Figure 1). Similarly, 82% of runs showed a reduction in mortality for the pillbox intervention compared to the standard of care, and 57% of runs for the label intervention (Figure 1). However, although fewer cumulative incident TB episodes and deaths can be seen in the intervention arms compared to the standard of care, these translate to only a 0.4% and 0.8% reduction in TB episodes for the pillbox and labels interventions respectively compared to the standard of care. Similarly, only a 0.7% and 0.3% reduction in mortality was seen for the pillbox and labels interventions respectively compared to the standard of care. Wide uncertainty intervals suggest that there is no evidence for an epidemiological effect of the interventions.




Figure 1. Difference in cumulative (a) incidence and (b) mortality for the pillbox and label interventions compared to the standard of care.

Health economic impact

Results of the cost analysis can be found in Table 1. When associating costs to these epidemiological projections, implementing either the pillbox or the label intervention from 2023 to 2035 leads to a cumulative reduction of 25% of patient costs when compared to the standard of care. In terms of provider costs, the pillbox intervention is more expensive than the label intervention due to the cost of purchasing the boxes, but both are considerably cheaper than the standard of care due to a reduction in human resources requirements, with the pillbox intervention leading to a reduction of 51% of provider costs, and the label intervention to a 57% reduction.

Overall, the pillbox intervention leads to 165.62 (118.29; 214.87) million USD (i.e. 50.2%) cost savings compared to the standard of care, and to 68,000 (-1.12; 1.28 million) DALYs averted. The label intervention leads to 183.44 (135.76; 228,66) million USD (i.e. 55.6%) cost savings compared to the standard of care, and to 2,000 (-1.25; 1.30 million) DALYs averted. These results indicate that while the interventions show no improved effectiveness, they are always cost saving. Additionally, when compared to a CET of 27–36% GDP (i.e. 277-370\$ [41]), the probability of the intervention being cost-effective was 79–85% for the pillbox intervention and 76–84% for the label intervention (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Cost-effectiveness planes showing incremental costs vs disability adjusted life years (DALYs) averted of pillbox and label interventions compared to standard of care (SoC), and CET (27–36% Ethiopian GDP [41]). Each dot represents one of the 1,000 model runs performed during probabilistic sensitivity analysis, with red and blue dots representing the mean cost per DALY averted for pillbox and label interventions respectively.

Epidemiological thresholds

Results of the threshold analysis are shown in Figure 3. We found that by 2035 a ‘perfect’ intervention, which improved treatment success to 100%, was able to reduce incidence and mortality by 3% (1.4; 5.5%) and 8.2% (4.4; 12.8) respectively compared to the standard of care. This was equivalent to an overall reduction 84,100 (39,700–153,000) fewer TB episodes and 37,800 (23,300; 67,100) fewer TB deaths by 2035, or a 43.5% (27.9; 64.2) reduction in incident TB episodes and a 54.9% (37.8; 73.1%) reduction in deaths compared to 2015. Cumulatively by 2035 possible reductions in incidence are driven by reductions in relapse, closely followed by LTFU. In comparison, reductions in overall TB deaths are mainly driven by reductions in death on treatment.





Figure 3. The maximum impact a digital adherence technology (DAT) intervention could have on TB incidence and mortality in Ethiopia, showing the cumulative (a) TB episodes and (b) TB deaths averted in four hypothetical intervention scenarios minimising poor treatment outcomes compared to the standard of care. Percentages indicate percentage of reduction of incidence and mortality of a 'perfect' intervention (i.e. an intervention minimising relapse, on-treatment death and loss to follow up [LTFU]) compared to standard of care.

Discussion

We estimated small and uncertain benefits of the pillbox intervention compared to the standard of care between 2023 and 2035, with 11,000 (95% uncertainty interval -57,000; 32,000) incident TB episodes and 3,700 (-19,000; 11,000) TB deaths averted, i.e. a difference of -0.4% (-0.8; +3.1) and -0.7% (-1.6; +5.4) respectively, demonstrating that DAT interventions will not contribute to reaching the End TB targets of a 90% decrease in incidence and a 95% in mortality compared to 2015. However, large total provider and patient cost savings [162,800,000\$ (118,000,000; 210,643,000\$) and 2,900,000\$ (936,000; 4,851,000\$) respectively over 2023–2035] were also observed. This translated to a 50.2% (35.88; 65.2) reduction in total cost of treatment (excluding pre-diagnosis costs). Results were similar for the medication label intervention. When compared to estimated cost-effectiveness thresholds, both interventions were cost-effective in most cases, with a probability of 79–85% and 76–84% for the pillbox and label interventions respectively.

Our economic results require careful interpretation. Differences in costs between the interventions and the standard of care are mostly a consequence of fewer visits to the healthcare facility required when using DAT [33]. From the provider perspective, these costs may not be saved if human resource time is not allocated to different tasks. Our results align with the in-trial cost-effectiveness analysis, albeit showing an increased probability of cost-effectiveness of the interventions. This difference is driven by two main factors; different cost-effectiveness thresholds used, and a small reduction in point estimates of disease burden due to transmission, as a result of the longer time horizon, which affects the amount of costs saved.

The limited epidemiological impact estimated by the model in our main analysis is a direct result of the null impact observed in the trial. However, threshold analysis showed that the maximum possible epidemiological impact a theoretical DAT intervention could achieve over the same timescale would be a 43.5% (27.9; 64.2) reduction in incident TB episodes and a 54.9% (37.8; 73.1%) reduction in deaths compared to 2015; still far from reaching the End TB target of a 90% reduction in TB incidence and 95% reduction in TB deaths in 2035 compared to 2015. This suggests that additional measures focusing on aspects of the TB care cascade beyond treatment (such as large-scale case-finding activities, improved diagnostics, preventive therapy and vaccination) are needed.

Our study has several limitations. First, we do not take HIV co-infection into account, where this could increase the overall success of treatment (as treatment success is lower in people living with HIV [34]) and cost of monitoring, potentially in addition to cost-savings. Further, if DAT were used differentially based on HIV status, it is possible that the intervention could have had an effect on TB incidence and mortality. Second, we did not model the possible impact of DAT interventions when used for TB preventive treatment or treatment of drug-resistant TB, as these were outside the scope of the trial, which may lead to an underestimation of both effectiveness (due to non-completion being higher for preventing treatment) as well as possible costs saved. Third, we did not consider the

impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Ethiopia's TB burden here, although given the intervention is focused on treatment this is unlikely to have affected results. Finally, our model is only calibrated to Ethiopia, where treatment success in standard of care is already high compared to other settings.

Our study has also several strengths. Firstly, literature on the modelling of DAT in TB is scarce, and to our knowledge, only two other modelling studies of DAT interventions exist in literature, neither of which were able to use direct trial results or to estimate economic outcomes. The first modelled several combinations of intervention scenarios, including medication monitoring during TB treatment in China, by assuming an improvement in drug-susceptible TB treatment success from 82% to 90% [42]. The second modelled the potential epidemiological impact of DAT interventions in India, showing that such interventions could reduce cumulative incidence and mortality by up to 16% and 15% respectively between 2020 and 2030 [12]. However, this study also made strong assumptions about treatment outcomes, assuming treatment completion increased from 50% in the private sector and 86% in the public sector to 100%. In comparison, our threshold analysis (which took a similar approach) suggested much more limited reductions in incidence and mortality were likely, driven by the already-high rates of treatment success in Ethiopia, which is 87%, closer to the global average of 88% [34]. In contrast to these two previous studies, our results, based directly on trial estimates, instead show no epidemiological impact of DAT on TB in Ethiopia, suggesting a possible overestimation in the literature of what DAT could achieve.

Using a transmission model allowed us to look beyond the time restrictions of the trial and study the long-term health economic impact of the interventions. We estimated savings over a 12-year time frame, which could have important budgetary implications from the provider side, as results indicate that in 2023 alone, these savings would be equivalent to ~10-11% of Ethiopia's annual TB budget [43]. From the patient perspective, a significant reduction in patient costs has important implications for the affordability of TB treatment, and could contribute to reaching End TB targets aimed at the reduction of catastrophic costs.

In conclusion, DAT interventions, despite showing limited epidemiological impact, could help save substantial TB treatment costs, and are therefore highly likely to be cost-effective in Ethiopia.

Acknowledgements

RGW is funded by the Wellcome Trust (218261/Z/19/Z), NIH (1R01AI147321-01, G-202303-69963, R-202309-71190), EDTCP (RIA208D-2505B), UK MRC (CCF17-7779 via SET Bloomsbury), ESRC (ES/P008011/1), BMGF (INV-004737, INV-035506), and the WHO (2020/985800-0).

1. World Health Organisation. *Tuberculosis: Key Facts*. 2023; Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/tuberculosis>.
2. Iseman, M., *Tuberculosis therapy: past, present and future*. *European Respiratory Journal*, 2002. **20**(36 suppl): p. 87S-94S.
3. Barter, D.M., et al., *Tuberculosis and poverty: the contribution of patient costs in sub-Saharan Africa—a systematic review*. *BMC public health*, 2012. **12**: p. 1-21.
4. Laurence, Y.V., U.K. Griffiths, and A. Vassall, *Costs to health services and the patient of treating tuberculosis: a systematic literature review*. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 2015. **33**: p. 939-955.
5. Nezenega, Z.S., L. Perimal-Lewis, and A.J. Maeder, *Factors influencing patient adherence to tuberculosis treatment in Ethiopia: a literature review*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2020. **17**(15): p. 5626.

6. Long, Q., et al., *Patient medical costs for tuberculosis treatment and impact on adherence in China: a systematic review*. BMC public health, 2011. **11**: p. 1-9.
7. Subbaraman, R., et al., *Digital adherence technologies for the management of tuberculosis therapy: mapping the landscape and research priorities*. BMJ global health, 2018. **3**(5): p. e001018.
8. Velen, K., et al., *The effect of medication event reminder monitoring on treatment adherence of TB patients*. The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 2023. **27**(4): p. 322-328.
9. Burzynski, J., et al., *In-person vs electronic directly observed therapy for tuberculosis treatment adherence: A randomized noninferiority trial*. JAMA network open, 2022. **5**(1): p. e2144210-e2144210.
10. Liu, X., et al., *Digital adherence technologies to improve tuberculosis treatment outcomes in China: a cluster-randomised superiority trial*. The Lancet Global Health, 2023. **11**(5): p. e693-e703.
11. Imperial, M.Z., et al., *A patient-level pooled analysis of treatment-shortening regimens for drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis*. Nature medicine, 2018. **24**(11): p. 1708-1715.
12. Arinaminpathy, N., et al., *Modelling the potential impact of adherence technologies on tuberculosis in India*. The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 2020. **24**(5): p. 526-533.
13. Ngwatu, B.K., et al., *The impact of digital health technologies on tuberculosis treatment: a systematic review*. European Respiratory Journal, 2018. **51**(1).
14. McQuaid, C.F., et al., *Digital adherence technology for TB: focus on livelihoods as well as lives*. The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 2021. **25**(5): p. 416-417.
15. Ridho, A., et al., *Digital health technologies to improve medication adherence and treatment outcomes in patients with tuberculosis: systematic review of randomized controlled trials*. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 2022. **24**(2): p. e33062.
16. Mohamed, M.S., et al., *The impact of digital adherence technologies on health outcomes in tuberculosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.01.31.24302115.
17. Yoeli, E., et al., *Digital health support in treatment for tuberculosis*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2019. **381**(10): p. 986-987.
18. Wei, X., et al., *Effectiveness of a Comprehensive Package Based on Electronic Medication Monitors at Improving Treatment Outcomes Among Tuberculosis Patients in Tibet: A Multi-Centre Randomised Controlled Trial*.
19. Iribarren, S., et al., *TextTB: a mixed method pilot study evaluating acceptance, feasibility, and exploring initial efficacy of a text messaging intervention to support TB treatment adherence*. Tuberculosis research and treatment, 2013. **2013**.
20. Cattamanchi, A., et al., *Digital adherence technology for tuberculosis treatment supervision: A stepped-wedge cluster-randomized trial in Uganda*. PLoS medicine, 2021. **18**(5): p. e1003628.
21. Bediang, G., et al., *SMS reminders to improve adherence and cure of tuberculosis patients in Cameroon (TB-SMS Cameroon): a randomised controlled trial*. BMC public health, 2018. **18**: p. 1-14.
22. Belknap, R., et al., *Self-administered versus directly observed once-weekly isoniazid and rifapentine treatment of latent tuberculosis infection: a randomized trial*. Annals of internal medicine, 2017. **167**(10): p. 689-697.
23. Johnston, J.C., et al., *The effect of text messaging on latent tuberculosis treatment adherence: a randomised controlled trial*. European Respiratory Journal, 2018. **51**(2).
24. Ali, A.O.A. and M.H. Prins, *Mobile health to improve adherence to tuberculosis treatment in Khartoum state, Sudan*. Journal of Public Health in Africa, 2019. **10**(2).

25. Manyazewal, T., et al., *Effect of digital medication event reminder and monitor-observed therapy vs standard directly observed therapy on health-related quality of life and catastrophic costs in patients with tuberculosis: a secondary analysis of a randomized clinical trial*. JAMA Network Open, 2022. **5**(9): p. e2230509-e2230509.
26. Thompson, R.R., et al., *Cost and cost-effectiveness of a digital adherence technology for tuberculosis treatment support in Uganda*. Value in Health, 2022. **25**(6): p. 924-930.
27. Yang, J., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of a medication event monitoring system for tuberculosis management in Morocco*. Plos one, 2022. **17**(4): p. e0267292.
28. Bahrainwala, L., et al., *Drones and digital adherence monitoring for community-based tuberculosis control in remote Madagascar: A cost-effectiveness analysis*. Plos one, 2020. **15**(7): p. e0235572.
29. Nsengiyumva, N.P.P., et al., *Costs of digital adherence technologies for tuberculosis treatment support*. medRxiv, 2023: p. 2023.03. 18.23287420.
30. Tadesse, A.W., et al., *Evaluation of implementation and effectiveness of digital adherence technology with differentiated care to support tuberculosis treatment adherence and improve treatment outcomes in Ethiopia: a study protocol for a cluster randomised trial*. BMC infectious diseases, 2021. **21**: p. 1-11.
31. Foster, N., et al., *Evaluating the equity impact and cost-effectiveness of digital adherence technologies with differentiated care to support tuberculosis treatment adherence in Ethiopia: protocol and analysis plan for the health economics component of a cluster randomised trial*. Trials, 2023. **24**(1): p. 1-12.
32. Tadesse, A.W., et al., *Cluster-randomized trial of digital adherence technologies and differentiated care to reduce poor end-of-treatment outcomes and recurrence among adults with drug-sensitive pulmonary TB in Ethiopia*. medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.05. 09.24307117.
33. Foster Nicola, et al., *Equity, cost and disability adjusted life years (DALYs) of tuberculosis treatment supported by digital adherence technologies and differentiated care in Ethiopia: a trial-based distributional cost-effectiveness analysis*. medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.07.28.24310767.
34. World Health Organisation. *Global Tuberculosis Report 2022*. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/363752>.
35. World Health Organisation. *Global Tuberculosis Report 2021*. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/346387>.
36. Kebede, A., et al., *The first population-based national tuberculosis prevalence survey in Ethiopia, 2010-2011*. The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 2014. **18**(6): p. 635-639.
37. World Health Organisation. *Global Tuberculosis Programme*. 2022; Available from: <https://www.who.int/teams/global-tuberculosis-programme/data>.
38. Iskauskas, A., et al., *Emulation and History Matching using the hmer Package*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05265, 2022.
39. Scarponi, D., et al., *Demonstrating multi-country calibration of a tuberculosis model using new history matching and emulation package-hmer*. Epidemics, 2023. **43**: p. 100678.
40. Jerene, D., et al., *Effectiveness of digital adherence technologies in improving tuberculosis treatment outcomes in four countries: a pragmatic cluster randomised trial protocol*. BMJ open, 2023. **13**(3): p. e068685.
41. Ochalek, J., J. Lomas, and K. Claxton, *Estimating health opportunity costs in low-income and middle-income countries: a novel approach and evidence from cross-country data*. BMJ global health, 2018. **3**(6): p. e000964.
42. Menzies, N.A., et al., *Cost-effectiveness and resource implications of aggressive action on tuberculosis in China, India, and South Africa: a combined analysis of nine models*. The Lancet global health, 2016. **4**(11): p. e816-e826.

43. Ministry of Health Ethiopia, *Tuberculosis and Leprosy National Strategic Plan (TBL-NSP) July 2021 – June 2026*. 2020.