

1 **Timing and Predictors of Tuberculosis Incidence among Contacts**

2 Michael Asare-Baah^{1,2}; Michael Lauzardo^{1,2}; Lori Johnston³; Lina Dominique³; Marie Nancy
3 Séraphin^{1,2*}

4 **Authors Affiliations**

5 ¹Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida, 2055 Mowry Road, PO Box 100009, Gainesville, FL
6 32610, United States

7 ²Division of Infectious Diseases and Global Medicine, University of Florida, College of Medicine, 2055
8 Mowry Road, PO Box 103600, Gainesville, FL 32610, United States

9 ³Florida Department of Health, Bureau of Tuberculosis Control, 4052 Bald Cypress Way, Bin A-20,
10 Tallahassee, FL 32399, United States

11 *Corresponding author: Marie Nancy Séraphin (Nancy.Seraphin@medicine.ufl.edu; +1 (352) 273-9584)

12 **Keywords:** *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, TB incidence, LTBI, TB transmission, TB contacts

13 **Abstract**

14 Contact investigations are crucial for tuberculosis (TB) control, yet the temporal dynamics of
15 disease progression among exposed contacts remain poorly understood. Here, we analyzed a
16 retrospective cohort of 44,106 contacts of 6,243 TB cases identified through the Florida
17 Department of Health surveillance system (2009-2023). During the 15-year follow-up period, 454
18 individuals within this cohort developed active TB disease. Using survival analysis and mixed-
19 effect Cox proportional hazards models, we determined that the median time to TB disease onset
20 was 11 months following the initial contact investigation. The risk of progression to TB disease
21 varied markedly by age and immune status. Children aged 0-5 years showed nearly seven times
22 higher risk of TB disease progression compared to adults 65 years and older (aHR = 6.66, 95%
23 CI: 1.33-33.27). HIV-positive contacts demonstrated a five-fold increased risk (aHR = 4.75, 95%
24 CI: 2.43-9.30) relative to HIV-negative individuals. These findings indicate that the risk of TB
25 transmission and disease progression persists beyond initial contact investigation activities and
26 varies significantly across demographic and clinical subgroups, suggesting the need for extended
27 contact monitoring and age-specific preventive strategies, particularly for young children and
28 immunocompromised individuals.

29 **Introduction**

30 Tuberculosis (TB) remains a formidable global health challenge, affecting not just those
31 initially infected but also their close contacts. These contacts are crucial in the transmission chain
32 and are key targets for preventive measures [1]. Individuals in close contact with active pulmonary
33 TB cases represent a high-risk group for subsequent infection and disease development [2]. This
34 vulnerability stems from their heightened exposure to *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (MTB), the
35 causative agent, transmitted via airborne droplets [3].

36 Contact investigations remain a crucial strategy for controlling TB disease among
37 contacts, especially in low-incidence settings [4]. These investigations allow for the identification
38 of both active TB disease and latent TB infection (LTBI) among exposed contacts, facilitating
39 prompt treatment and thereby interrupting further transmission [5]. Early detection and
40 treatment of LTBI are critical for preventing progression to active disease, while rapid
41 identification and treatment of active TB cases minimize ongoing spread [1]. This process typically
42 involves a comprehensive approach, including clinical assessments, chest radiography,
43 microbiological evaluation of sputum, and tests for LTBI such as tuberculin skin tests (TST) or
44 interferon- γ release assays (IGRA) [6],[7].

45 Contacts of confirmed TB cases are typically defined as individuals sharing the same
46 airspace with an infectious individual for a significant period, often quantified as more than 15
47 hours per week for one or more weeks or accumulating over 180 hours during the infectious
48 period [8]. These contacts may reside in the same household, share social settings, or be linked
49 through workplace or school environments. Factors including the infectiousness of the index case,
50 proximity and duration of exposure, and the inherent susceptibility of the contact influence the
51 risk of infection among contacts [9],[6],[10].

52 The incidence of new TB cases among contacts following exposure is not uniform over
53 time. It is markedly elevated during the first year post-exposure, gradually declining but

54 remaining persistently above baseline for at least five years [6],[11],[8]. Several factors have been
55 identified as increasing the risk of TB disease progression among contacts. These include younger
56 age (especially children under 5), older age (individuals over 65) [12], HIV infection, inadequate
57 antiretroviral therapy in HIV-positive individuals, a history of prior TB treatment, low
58 socioeconomic status, certain ethnicities, comorbidities such as diabetes, specific host genetic
59 polymorphisms, and the intensity and duration of exposure to the index case [13].

60 Understanding the temporal dynamics and risk factors associated with TB progression
61 among contacts is crucial for developing targeted and effective public health interventions. By
62 identifying those at highest risk and the critical time windows for intervention, resources can be
63 more efficiently allocated, and preventive measures can be tailored to maximize impact. This
64 knowledge gap forms the rationale for our study, which aims to investigate the time to TB disease
65 onset and the specific risk factors influencing disease incidence among contacts of confirmed TB
66 cases.

67 **Methods**

68 **Study design and population**

69 We conducted a retrospective cohort study analyzing data from the Florida Department of
70 Health (FDOH) contact investigation database. The study population comprised 44,106
71 individuals identified as contacts of 6,243 index TB cases and investigated by the FDOH between
72 January 1, 2009, and December 31, 2023. Of these contacts, 454 subsequently developed TB
73 during the study period and were included in this analysis.

74 **Data Sources**

75 We utilized two primary data sources: the FDOH Contact Investigation Database and the
76 Florida TB Registry. The Contact Investigation Database contains comprehensive information on
77 contacts identified, screened, and diagnosed with LTBI or active TB. The Florida TB Registry

78 captures demographic, clinical, and epidemiological data for all reported TB cases, as documented
79 in the Report of Verified Case of Tuberculosis (RVCT) form [14].

80 **Measures**

81 *Outcome definitions*

82 The primary outcome of interest was the development of active TB among contacts,
83 categorized as either incident or co-prevalent cases. We defined incident cases as contacts
84 diagnosed with TB disease more than 30 days after the initiation of the contact investigation. Co-
85 prevalent cases were defined as contacts diagnosed with TB disease either prior to or within 30
86 days of initiating the contact investigation. TB disease diagnosis was confirmed based on positive
87 culture results for MTB or, in culture-negative cases, clinical and radiographic findings consistent
88 with active TB as determined by a board-certified pulmonologist or infectious disease specialist.
89 The 30-day threshold was chosen based on previous epidemiological studies [8] and accounts for
90 the typical time required for diagnostic procedures and reporting.

91 *Follow-up*

92 We calculated the time to disease onset as the months elapsed between the contact
93 investigation start date for the index case and the date the contact was diagnosed or reported as
94 having TB. The follow-up period for each contact began on the date of the initial contact
95 investigation for the corresponding index case. The endpoint was defined as either the date of TB
96 diagnosis for contacts who developed active disease or the end of the study period (December 31,
97 2023) for those who remained disease-free. Time to disease onset was calculated as the interval
98 between the contact investigation start date and the TB diagnosis date, measured in months.
99 Contacts lost to follow-up or who died from causes unrelated to TB were censored at their last
100 known assessment date.

101 *Predictor variables*

102 We examined a comprehensive set of risk factors for TB incidence among contacts,
103 categorized into demographic, clinical, and social variables. Demographic factors included: Age,
104 stratified into five groups: 0-15, 16-24, 25-44, 45-64, and ≥ 65 years, Sex (male/female), Birth
105 origin (U.S.-born/non-U.S.-born), Race (White, Black, Asian), and Ethnicity (Hispanic/non-
106 Hispanic). Clinical factors comprised: HIV co-infection status (positive/negative), determined by
107 serological testing, Presence of drug resistance (yes/no), based on phenotypic drug susceptibility
108 testing, and MTB strain lineage, categorized as East Asian (Lineage 2), Euro-American (Lineage
109 4), or Indo-Oceanic (Lineage 1), defined using whole-genome sequencing. Social factors included
110 self-reported history within the past year for Recreational drug use (yes/no), Alcohol use (yes/no),
111 and Homelessness (yes/no). Additional variables assessed included contact relationship to the
112 index case (immediate family, coworker, social contact, other) and MTB clustering status
113 (yes/no), determined by spoligotyping and 24-locus MIRU-VNTR analysis.

114 **Statistical Analysis**

115 We performed a comprehensive statistical analysis to examine the characteristics and risk
116 factors associated with TB progression among contacts. Differences in sample characteristics
117 between incident and co-prevalent cases were assessed using Pearson's chi-square test for
118 categorical variables and Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables,
119 depending on their distribution. We conducted a time-to-event analysis to evaluate the risk of
120 progression to active TB among contacts. Kaplan-Meier survival curves were constructed to
121 estimate the probability of TB disease-free survival over time, stratified by key risk factors. Log-
122 rank tests were used to compare survival distributions between groups.

123 To assess the individual and combined effects of various risk factors on TB incidence, we
124 fitted univariable and multivariable mixed-effect Cox proportional hazards models. These models
125 accounted for the clustering of contacts within index cases by including a random effect for the

126 index case. The proportional hazards assumption was tested using Schoenfeld residuals and log-
127 log plots [15]. Hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were reported for each
128 predictor variable. All statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.1.0 [16], with a two-
129 sided α of 0.05 considered statistically significant.

130 **Results**

131 *Characteristics of TB Contacts Who Progressed to Active Disease (Table 1)*

132 Of the 454 contacts who progressed to active disease, 56.6% were co-prevalent cases, while
133 43.4% were incident cases. Age distribution differed significantly between co-prevalent and
134 incident cases ($p = 0.005$). Most contacts were aged 45-64 years with a higher proportion of
135 incident cases (40.1%) than co-prevalent cases (31.5%). Sex distribution was relatively balanced,
136 with males comprising 59.0% of the total sample, and no significant difference observed between
137 the two groups ($p = 0.968$). Racial distribution varied significantly ($p = 0.031$), with White
138 contacts overrepresented among incident cases (55.6%) than co-prevalent cases (47.7%).
139 Conversely, Asian contacts were more common in co-prevalent cases (9.4%) compared to incident
140 cases (3.6%). Although not statistically significant, Hispanic ethnicity was overrepresented among
141 co-prevalent cases (30.0%) than incident cases (23.4%) ($p = 0.143$). Birth origin emerged as a
142 significant factor ($p = 0.001$), with incident cases showing a higher proportion of US-born
143 contacts (70.1%) compared to co-prevalent cases (54.9%). HIV status did not differ significantly
144 between the groups, with the majority (82.4%) being HIV-negative ($p = 0.475$). Drug resistance,
145 while not reaching statistical significance ($p = 0.086$), was more common among incident cases
146 (8.1%) than co-prevalent cases (3.9%). MTB lineage distribution was similar between the groups
147 ($p = 0.219$), with the Euro-American lineage (L4) predominating (88.5%). There were notable
148 differences in behavioral risk factors with recreational drug use significantly higher among
149 incident cases (23.9%) compared to co-prevalent cases (12.8%; $p = 0.003$). Similarly, past-year
150 alcohol use was more prevalent in incident cases (30.5%) than in co-prevalent cases (21.8%; $p =$

151 0.047). Past-year homelessness, while not statistically significant, was more common among
152 incident cases (13.2%) than co-prevalent cases (8.6%; $p = 0.15$). Case clustering was significantly
153 more prevalent among co-prevalent cases (92.6%) compared to incident cases (86.3%; $p = 0.04$).
154 The type of contact relationship with index cases showed a trend towards significance ($p = 0.063$),
155 with immediate family contacts more common among co-prevalent cases (58.0%) than incident
156 cases (46.7%). These findings highlight important distinctions between co-prevalent and incident
157 TB cases, particularly in terms of age, race, birthplace, substance use, and clustering patterns.

Table 1: Characteristics of TB Contacts Who Progressed to Active Disease

Study Variables	Study Sample N (%)	Co-prevalent TB Disease N (%)	Incident TB Disease N (%)	P - value
Total Sample	454	257	197	
Age groups in years (%)				0.005
0-15	35 (7.7)	28 (10.9)	7 (3.6)	
16-24	66 (14.5)	31 (12.1)	35 (17.8)	
25-44	157 (34.6)	98 (38.1)	59 (29.9)	
45-64	160 (35.2)	81 (31.5)	79 (40.1)	
65+	36 (7.9)	19 (7.4)	17 (8.6)	
Sex = Male (%)	268 (59.0)	151 (58.8)	117 (59.4)	0.968
Race (%)				0.031
Asian	31 (6.9)	24 (9.4)	7 (3.6)	
Black	190 (42.0)	110 (43.0)	80 (40.8)	
White	231 (51.1)	122 (47.7)	109 (55.6)	
Hispanic = Yes (%)	123 (27.1)	77 (30.0)	46 (23.4)	0.143
Born In US = Yes (%)	279 (61.5)	141 (54.9)	138 (70.1)	0.001
HIV Positive (%)				0.475
No	374 (82.4)	207 (80.5)	167 (84.8)	
Yes	46 (10.1)	28 (10.9)	18 (9.1)	
Unknown	34 (7.5)	22 (8.6)	12 (6.1)	
Any Drug Resistance = Yes (%)	26 (5.7)	10 (3.9)	16 (8.1)	0.086
Genotyping Lineage (%)				0.219
East Asian (L2)	24 (7.9)	15 (10.1)	9 (5.8)	
Euro American (L4)	269 (88.5)	127 (85.2)	142 (91.6)	
Indo Oceanic (L1)	11 (3.6)	7 (4.7)	4 (2.6)	
Recreational Drug Use = Yes (%)	80 (17.6)	33 (12.8)	47 (23.9)	0.003
Past Year Alcohol Use = Yes (%)	116 (25.6)	56 (21.8)	60 (30.5)	0.047
Past Year Homelessness = Yes (%)	48 (10.6)	22 (8.6)	26 (13.2)	0.15
Clustered = Yes (%)	408 (89.9)	238 (92.6)	170 (86.3)	0.04
Contact Relationship Type (%)				0.063
Coworker	16 (3.5)	6 (2.3)	10 (5.1)	
Immediate family	241 (53.1)	149 (58.0)	92 (46.7)	
Social Contact	89 (19.6)	44 (17.1)	45 (22.8)	
Other	108 (23.8)	58 (22.6)	50 (25.4)	

158 *Risk Factors Associated with Being an Incident TB Case Among Contacts (Table 2).*

159 Age was significantly associated with TB disease incidence among contacts. In unadjusted
160 analysis, children aged 0-15 years had over four times higher risk of developing TB compared to
161 adults 65 years and older (HR = 4.21, 95% CI: 1.70-0.83, p = 0.002). This association
162 strengthened after adjustment for confounders, with children showing nearly seven times higher
163 risk (aHR = 6.66, 95% CI: 1.33-33.27, p = 0.021). Other age groups showed no significant
164 difference in TB risk compared to the reference group in either unadjusted or adjusted analyses,
165 though point estimates suggested slightly elevated risk among younger adults. HIV-positive
166 individuals showed a substantially higher risk of developing incident TB (aHR: 4.75, 95% CI: 2.43-
167 9.30, p = 0.0001). Interestingly, several factors often associated with TB risk in other contexts
168 showed no significant associations in our adjusted analysis. These included sex, race, Hispanic
169 ethnicity, US birthplace, drug resistance, recreational drug use, alcohol use, homelessness, MTB
170 strain lineage, type of contact relationship with index cases, and contacts association with
171 clustered cases.

172 **Table 2: Risk factors associated with being an incident TB case among contacts**

Study Variables	Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	HR (95% CI)	P - value	HR (95% CI)	P - value
Age groups in years (%)				
65+	1.00		1.00	
0-15	4.21 (1.70, 0.83)	0.002	6.66 (1.33, 33.27)	0.021
16-24	1.52 (1.70, 0.83)	0.174	1.69 (0.81, 3.53)	0.160
25-44	1.23 (1.70, 0.83)	0.465	1.05 (0.54, 2.05)	0.879
45-64	1.25 (1.70, 0.83)	0.424	1.12 (0.57, 2.17)	0.747
Sex = Male (%)	0.97 (0.73, 1.29)	0.833	0.98 (0.66, 1.48)	0.939
Race (%)				
Asian	1.00		1.00	
Black	2.29 (0.98, 0.71)	0.056	3.13 (0.71, 13.90)	0.133
White	1.65 (0.98, 0.71)	0.242	2.64 (0.58, 11.95)	0.208
Hispanic = Yes (%)	0.98 (0.70, 1.36)	0.889	0.74 (0.41, 1.34)	0.320
Born In US = Yes (%)	1.01 (0.74, 1.38)	0.929	0.71 (0.44, 1.14)	0.151
HIV Positive (%)				
No	1.00		1.00	1.00
Yes	4.25 (0.76, 2.49)	0.0001	4.75 (2.43, 9.30)	0.0001
Unknown	1.37 (0.76, 2.49)	0.296	1.23 (0.49, 3.09)	0.654
Any Drug Resistance = Yes (%)	0.69 (0.40, 1.21)	0.198	0.83 (0.43, 1.60)	0.588
Genotyping Lineage (%)				
East Asian (L2)	1.00		1.00	
Euro American (L4)	0.95 (0.48, 0.13)	0.875	0.76 (0.36, 1.59)	0.466
Indo Oceanic (L1)	0.50 (0.48, 0.13)	0.309	0.89 (0.15, 5.38)	0.903
Recreational Drug Use = Yes	1.04 (0.75, 1.45)	0.798	1.22 (0.77, 1.93)	0.395
Past Year Alcohol Use = Yes (%)	0.85 (0.60, 1.18)	0.326	0.83 (0.51, 1.35)	0.451
Past Year Homelessness = Yes	1.38 (0.91, 2.09)	0.135	1.32 (0.75, 2.32)	0.334
Clustered = Yes (%)	1.00 (0.67, 1.51)	0.986	1.22 (0.68, 2.19)	0.511
Contact Relationship Type (%)				
Coworker	1.00		1.00	
Immediate family	0.84 (0.43, 0.46)	0.598	0.68 (0.28, 1.64)	0.391
Social Contact	0.80 (0.43, 0.46)	0.523	0.73 (0.30, 1.78)	0.494
Other	0.92 (0.43, 0.46)	0.800	0.81 (0.34, 1.93)	0.635

173 **Figure 1.** Temporal distribution of TB disease onset following contact investigation initiation.
174 The histogram depicts the number of contacts diagnosed with TB over time (months). The Red
175 dashed line indicates the median time to disease onset (11 months).

176 **Figure 2.** Disease-free survival curves for TB contacts stratified by age group. Log-rank test $p =$
177 0.018 indicates significant overall differences in disease-free survival across age groups with older
178 age groups demonstrating a protective effect compared to children 0-15 years.

179 **Figure 3:** Disease-free survival curve stratified by HIV status. The graph illustrates the
180 significant impact of HIV status on disease-free outcomes over time following the initiation of
181 contact investigations, with HIV-positive individuals showing markedly worse disease-free
182 probabilities, dropping rapidly within the first 12 months and approaching zero by 24 months
183 compared to HIV-negative and unknown status groups.

184 **Discussion**

185 In this statewide cohort study utilizing 15 years of data, we investigated the timing and risk
186 factors associated with TB disease progression among contacts of confirmed TB cases in Florida.
187 Our analysis reveals distinct patterns in disease onset and identifies key demographic and clinical
188 factors that influence TB risk. The median time to TB disease onset of 11 months post-initiation
189 of contact investigations observed in our study represents a critical window for surveillance and
190 intervention. This finding aligns with previous studies that have documented similar temporal
191 patterns in TB disease progression among contacts of infectious index cases
192 [17],[18],[19],[5],[20]. The extended timeframe observed in the incident of TB among contacts
193 has important implications for TB control programs. First, it reveals potential delays in diagnosis
194 and treatment that may contribute to sustained transmission risks. Second, it demonstrates that
195 contact susceptibility to TB infection and disease progression persists well beyond initial
196 exposure, necessitating prolonged monitoring strategies. While the concentration of cases within
197 the first year should guide resource allocation for TB control programs, our findings suggest that

198 surveillance cannot be limited to the immediate post-exposure period. Extended follow-up,
199 particularly for high-risk contacts, remains crucial for capturing late-onset cases and preventing
200 subsequent transmission. These results emphasize the need to reevaluate current contact
201 investigation protocols, which may need to maintain active surveillance for at least 12 months
202 post-exposure to effectively identify and treat incident TB cases.

203 Our findings revealed distinct demographic and clinical features associated with TB
204 disease risk among contacts, with age and HIV status emerging as critical determinants. Children
205 aged 0-5 years demonstrated significantly higher susceptibility to TB compared to older age
206 groups, consistent with previous studies [21],[22],[18]. This heightened risk likely reflects their
207 immature immune system which is less capable of containing TB infections compared to older
208 adults. The rapid manifestation of TB within 90 days post-exposure in children 0-5 years [23],
209 underscores the acute vulnerability of this demographic group and the urgency for targeted
210 preventive interventions. Interestingly, older adults (≥ 65 years) demonstrated lower relative risk
211 compared to children, possibly due to broader acquired immunity and different exposure
212 patterns. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously, considering the limited sample
213 size for these age groups in our study and potential confounders such as immunosenescence and
214 comorbidities that could modify TB susceptibility. The absence of significant associations for
215 other traditional risk factors suggests that TB progression dynamics among contacts may differ
216 from those in the general population.

217 HIV co-infection emerged as another major risk factor for TB disease progression. HIV-
218 positive contacts showed substantially increased TB risk, reflecting the impact of compromised
219 immunity on TB susceptibility [24]. This association is particularly concerning given the elevated
220 mortality risk observed in TB-HIV co-infected children and adolescents [25]. The challenges in
221 accurately detecting LTBI using interferon-gamma release assays in both immunocompromised
222 and pediatric populations further complicate early intervention efforts [26].

223 These results have important implications for TB control strategies. They argue for age-
224 specific approaches, particularly intensified surveillance and prophylaxis for young children and
225 HIV-positive contacts. Additionally, they support extending contact monitoring periods to
226 address the prolonged window of TB disease risk, integrating active case-finding with sustained
227 surveillance to promptly identify and treat incident cases.

228 **Declarations**

229 **Human Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate Statement:** This study received
230 approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Florida (approval number
231 IRB201700445) and the Florida Department of Health (FDOH) TB Program. It was conducted as
232 part of program evaluations and projects aimed at improving the clinical and public health
233 services offered by state and local TB programs in Florida (SOW21-473; 6.1.11). The approval
234 authorities waived the requirement for informed consent, as the research used existing records
235 and did not involve direct interaction with participants.

236 **Consent for Publication:** Not Applicable.

237 **Availability of Data and Materials:** The dataset analyzed in this study includes sensitive
238 patient information extracted from the Report of the Verified Case of Tuberculosis form. To
239 protect patient privacy and maintain confidentiality, this dataset cannot be made publicly
240 available. However, qualified researchers may access the dataset upon reasonable request,
241 provided they adhere to appropriate data use agreements with the relevant institutional
242 authorities that oversee the protection of this information.

243 **Competing Interests Statement:** The authors declare that they have no competing financial
244 or non-financial interests.

245 **Funding:** MNS is funded by career development grant 1K01AI153544. The funding source did
246 not influence the study's design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, manuscript preparation,
247 or publication decision.

248 **Author Contributions:** MAB, MNS, and ML contributed to the study's conceptualization and
249 design. MAB and MNS performed statistical analyses and drafted the manuscript. LJ and LD
250 contributed to data generation, extraction, and contextual interpretation of results. All authors
251 critically reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

252 **Acknowledgments:** We sincerely thank the Florida Department of Health for supplying de-
253 identified TB surveillance data used in this analysis.

254 **References**

- 255 [1] T. D. Filardo, P.-J. Feng, R. H. Pratt, S. F. Price, and J. L. Self, "Tuberculosis — United
256 States, 2021," *MMWR. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*, vol. 71, no. 12, pp. 441–446, Mar. 2022,
257 doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7112a1.
- 258 [2] C. F. Hanrahan *et al.*, "Household- Versus Incentive-Based Contact Investigation for
259 Tuberculosis in Rural South Africa: A Cluster-Randomized Trial," *Clin. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 76,
260 no. 7, pp. 1164–1172, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1093/CID/CIAC920.
- 261 [3] C. Greenaway, M. Palayew, and D. Menzies, "Yield of casual contact investigation by the
262 hour," *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 7, no. 12 SUPPL. 3, 2003.
- 263 [4] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Self-Study Modules 8: Contact Investigations
264 for Tuberculosis," 2014. Accessed: May 01, 2024. [Online]. Available:
265 <http://www.cdc.gov/tb/education/ssmodules/pdfs/module8.pdf>
- 266 [5] M. R. Reichler *et al.*, "Duration of Exposure Among Close Contacts of Patients With
267 Infectious Tuberculosis and Risk of Latent Tuberculosis Infection," *Clin. Infect. Dis.*, vol.

- 268 71, no. 7, pp. 1627–1634, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1093/CID/CIZ1044.
- 269 [6] G. J. Fox, S. E. Barry, W. J. Britton, and G. B. Marks, “Contact investigation for
270 tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Eur. Respir. J.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 140–
271 156, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1183/09031936.00070812.
- 272 [7] M. Velleca *et al.*, “The yield of tuberculosis contact investigation in low- and middle-income
273 settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 21, no. 1, Dec. 2021,
274 doi: 10.1186/S12879-021-06609-3.
- 275 [8] M. R. Reichler *et al.*, “Risk and Timing of Tuberculosis Among Close Contacts of Persons
276 with Infectious Tuberculosis,” *J. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 218, no. 6, pp. 1000–1008, Aug. 2018,
277 doi: 10.1093/INFDIS/JIY265.
- 278 [9] A. Fok, Y. Numata, M. Schulzer, and M. J. FitzGerald, “Risk factors for clustering of
279 tuberculosis cases: A systematic review of population-based molecular epidemiology
280 studies,” *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 480–492, 2008.
- 281 [10] World Health Organisation, *Global Tuberculosis Report. WHO.s.l: WHO 2019*. 2019.
282 [Online]. Available: http://www.who.int/tb/publications/global_report/en/
- 283 [11] Y. Du *et al.*, “Declining incidence rate of tuberculosis among close contacts in five years
284 post-exposure: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 23, no. 1, Dec.
285 2023, doi: 10.1186/s12879-023-08348-z.
- 286 [12] S. Godoy *et al.*, “Risk of tuberculosis among pulmonary tuberculosis contacts: the
287 importance of time of exposure to index cases,” *Ann. Epidemiol.*, vol. 91, pp. 12–17, Mar.
288 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2024.01.004.
- 289 [13] P. P. Gounder *et al.*, “Risk for Tuberculosis Disease Among Contacts with Prior Positive
290 Tuberculin Skin Test: A retrospective Cohort Study, New York City,” *J. Gen. Intern. Med.*,

- 291 vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 742–748, Jun. 2015, doi: 10.1007/s11606-015-3180-2.
- 292 [14] CDC, “2020 Report of Verified Case of Tuberculosis (RVCT) Instruction Manual,” 2020.
- 293 [15] UCLA, “Testing the proportional hazard assumption in Cox models,” *Statistical Consulting*
294 *Group*, 2024. [https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/other/examples/asa2/testing-the-proportional-](https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/other/examples/asa2/testing-the-proportional-hazard-assumption-in-cox-models/)
295 [hazard-assumption-in-cox-models/](https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/other/examples/asa2/testing-the-proportional-hazard-assumption-in-cox-models/) (accessed Oct. 15, 2024).
- 296 [16] R Core Team, “R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.,” *R Foundation*
297 *for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.*, 2022. <https://www.r-project.org/> (accessed
298 Nov. 20, 2023).
- 299 [17] J. Singh *et al.*, “Incidence and Prevalence of Tuberculosis among Household Contacts of
300 Pulmonary Tuberculosis Patients in a Peri-Urban Population of South Delhi, India,” *PLoS*
301 *One*, vol. 8, no. 7, Jul. 2013, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0069730.
- 302 [18] G. J. Fox, S. E. Barry, W. J. Britton, and G. B. Marks, “Contact investigation for
303 tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Eur. Respir. J.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 140–
304 156, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1183/09031936.00070812.
- 305 [19] L. Otero *et al.*, “A prospective longitudinal study of tuberculosis among household contacts
306 of smear-positive tuberculosis cases in Lima, Peru,” *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 16, no. 1, Jun.
307 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12879-016-1616-x.
- 308 [20] S. Y. Park *et al.*, “Risk of active tuberculosis development in contacts exposed to infectious
309 tuberculosis in congregate settings in Korea,” *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Jan. 2020,
310 doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-57697-1.
- 311 [21] S. Chauhan, P. Gahalaut, and A. K. Rathi, “Tuberculin skin test, chest radiography and
312 contact screening in children ≤ 5 Y: Relevance in revised national tuberculosis control
313 programme (RNTCP),” *Indian J. Pediatr.*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 276–280, Apr. 2013, doi:

314 10.1007/s12098-012-0792-y.

315 [22] C. Pasqualini, L. Cohen, E. Le Roux, M. Caseris, and A. Faye, “Tuberculosis in 0–5-year-
316 old children following TB contact investigations: a retrospective study in a low burden
317 setting,” *Front. Pediatr.*, vol. 11, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.3389/fped.2023.1145191.

318 [23] L. Martinez *et al.*, “The risk of tuberculosis in children after close exposure: a systematic
319 review and individual-participant meta-analysis,” *Lancet*, vol. 395, no. 10228, pp. 973–
320 984, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30166-5.

321 [24] N. Li *et al.*, “Incident tuberculosis and risk factors among HIV-infected children in
322 Tanzania,” *AIDS*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1273–1281, May 2013, doi:
323 10.1097/QAD.ob013e32835ecb24.

324 [25] Z. Huang *et al.*, “CRISPR detection of circulating cell-free *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*
325 DNA in adults and children, including children with HIV: a molecular diagnostics study,”
326 *The Lancet Microbe*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. e482–e492, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1016/S2666-
327 5247(22)00087-8.

328 [26] A. T. Gray *et al.*, “Treatment for radiographically active, sputum culture-negative
329 pulmonary tuberculosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *PLoS One*, vol. 18, no. 11
330 November, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0293535.

331

Timing of TB Disease Onset after initiating contact investigations

Median Time to Onset: 11 months




Figure 1

Disease-free Survival Curve by Age Group

Age Group — 0-15 — 16-24 — 25-44 — 45-64 — 65+




Figure 2

Disease-free Survival Curve by HIV Status

HIV Status — No — Unknown — Yes




Figure 3