

Supplementary Appendix

Supplement to:

Understanding non-adherence to tuberculosis medications in India using urine drug metabolite testing: a cohort study

Ramnath Subbaraman, Beena E. Thomas, J. Vignesh Kumar, Kannan Thiruvengadam, Amit Khandewale, S. Kokila, Maya Lubeck-Schricker, M. Ranjith Kumar, Gunjan Rahul Gaurkhede, Apurva Shashikant Walgude, J. Hephzibah Mercy, Jagannath Dattatraya Kumbhar, Misha Eliasziw, Kenneth H. Mayer, Jessica E. Haberer

Correspondence: Beena E. Thomas, Department of Social and Behavioural Research, ICMR- National Institute for Research in Tuberculosis, No. 1, Mayor Sathiyamoorthy Road, Chetpet, Chennai – 600 031, India (beenaelli09@gmail.com). Phone: +91-44-2836-9525

Methods

Patient recruitment and data collection




Figure S1: Patients screened, enrolled, and home visits completed in the study cohort. Patients with unsuccessful home visits were only classified as such after three unsuccessful home visit attempts by the research team.

Addressing multicollinearity in the regression analyses

When conducting regression diagnostics, HIV status was observed to have a high degree of multicollinearity (variance inflation factor >5) with mode of transport, money spent collecting medication refills, and time spent collecting medication refills. By removing mode of transport and money spent collecting medication refills from the model, we were able to reduce multicollinearity and retain HIV status and time spent collecting medication refills, which is the structural barrier with the strongest association with non-adherence. Similarly, given high multicollinearity between alcohol and tobacco use, we removed tobacco use from our model, because alcohol use seemed more likely to contribute to behavioral changes (e.g., inebriation, inattention, etc.) that could contribute to non-adherence.

Analysis of the association between non-adherence and treatment outcomes – description of the two data sources

Treatment card outcomes were collected directly from the paper-based treatment cards maintained by TB staff at DOT centers. These are standardized cards that include basic demographic information about the patients, information on medication refills collected, and treatment outcomes. Possible treatment outcomes recorded on treatment cards are cure, treatment completion, loss to follow-up (formerly default), death, treatment regimen change, transferred out, and still on treatment (Table S1).

Patient outcomes from treatment cards are then entered into Nikshay, the NTEP's electronic medical record, at a later date, usually by personnel at a centralized location such as a district or city TB office. Because data from paper treatment cards are sometimes entered into Nikshay weeks or

months later, we waited to obtain data from Nikshay until September 2020. Possible treatment outcomes recorded in the Nikshay database are cure, treatment completion, loss to follow up, death, treatment regimen change, treatment failure, null, not evaluated, and closed due to inactivity (Table S1). We interpreted the last three of these outcomes (i.e., null, not evaluated, and closed due to inactivity) as representing missing data on treatment outcomes in Nikshay.

Table S1. Comparison of treatment card and Nikshay data sources

	Treatment card outcomes	Nikshay outcomes
Description of data source	Standardized paper-based cards maintained by TB staff at DOT centers that include basic demographic information about the patients, information on medication refills collected, and treatment outcomes.	Patient outcomes from treatment cards entered into Nikshay, the NTEP’s electronic medical record, at a later date, usually by personnel at a centralized location such as a district or city TB office.
Possible treatment outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cure • Treatment completion • Loss to follow-up • Death • Treatment regimen change • Transferred out • On treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cure • Treatment completion • Loss to follow-up • Death • Treatment regimen change • Treatment failure • Null • Not evaluated • Closed due to inactivity
Limitations of data source	Research team was not able to collect final outcomes from treatment cards for patients who were still on treatment when the study ended in February 2019.	Treatment outcomes were missing in Nikshay for 133 (21%) patients in our cohort. If available, we substituted outcomes collected from paper treatment cards for the missing data. Four (0.6%) patients had treatment outcomes in Nikshay that were discordant with what was reported on patients’ treatment cards. In these cases, Nikshay outcomes were substituted with treatment card outcomes.
Approach to handling missing outcomes	For the 269 (41%) patients who were still on treatment, the category of “on treatment” was included as a treatment outcome in the regression analysis.	For 69 (11%) patients with remaining missing treatment outcomes, these patients were excluded from the patient sample and therefore were not included in the regression analysis.

Our research team collected treatment outcomes directly from the paper treatment cards through the end of February 2019, when our field research ended. Because our research team was able to collect this information directly from the paper-based records on which patient information is

initially recorded, we believe that the treatment card-based outcomes are highly accurate. However, a limitation of the treatment card data is that we were not able to collect final outcomes from treatment cards for 269 (41%) patients, because they were still on treatment when the study ended (Table S1).

Due to this limitation of the treatment card data, we also conducted analyses using data from Nikshay, which recorded patient treatment outcomes beyond the end of our field research. Unfortunately, as of September 2020, treatment outcomes were not entered in Nikshay for 133 (20.5%) patients in our cohort. For these patients, we substituted outcomes collected from paper treatment cards, if available. Notably, 69 (10.6%) patients still had missing outcomes and were excluded from our analysis using Nikshay data. In rare cases when outcomes reported on the treatment cards conflicted with the Nikshay data, we substituted the outcome recorded by Nikshay with the treatment card outcome, because we believe the treatment card data were less likely to be incorrect due to data entry errors. Only 4 (0.6%) patients had treatment outcomes in Nikshay that were discordant with what was reported on patients' treatment cards (Table S1).

Results

Factors associated with non-adherence to TB medications – univariable analysis findings

In univariable analyses with non-adherence as the outcome, individuals who were 25-34 years old, laborers on daily wages, unemployed, smear-positive pulmonary TB patients, HIV co-infected, taking public transportation to collect medications, spending 50 or more rupees to collect medications, taking 30 or more minutes to collect medications, using cigarettes or beedis, and using alcohol were at significantly increased odds of being non-adherent. Patients with a household monthly income 15,000 or more rupees were at significantly decreased odds of being non-adherent (main manuscript, Table 1).

Factors associated with suboptimal adherence to TB medications – univariable analysis findings and table with findings from univariable and multivariable analyses

In univariable analyses with suboptimal medication adherence as the outcome, patients who are 25-34 years old, laborers on daily wages, housewives or students, divorced/separated/widowed, take public transportation to collect their medications, spend 50 or more rupees to collect their medication, take 30 or more minutes to collect their medication, and use alcohol are statistically significantly more likely to be sub-optimally adherent. Patients with an income quartile greater than 15,000 rupees and who completed 7-12 years of education are significantly less likely to be sub-optimally adherent (Table S2). Findings of the multivariable analysis are shown in Table S2 and described in the main text of the manuscript.

Table S2. Factors associated with suboptimal adherence to TB medications (N=650)

Covariates	Descriptive Statistics	Univariable findings		Multivariable findings	
	Proportion of suboptimal adherence ^a n (%)	Odds ratio (confidence interval)	p-value	Odds ratio (confidence interval)	p-value
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS					
Gender					
Female	49 (18.1)	Ref		Ref	
Male	67 (17.7)	1.0 (0.6–1.5)	0.90	0.9 (0.5–1.6)	0.71
Age					
18-24	20 (12.8)	Ref		Ref	
25-34	36 (24.8)	2.2 (1.2–4.1)	0.01*	1.2 (0.6–2.5)	0.56
35-44	30 (17.0)	1.4 (0.8–2.6)	0.28	0.4 (0.2–0.9)	0.04*
≥45	30 (17.3)	1.4 (0.8–2.6)	0.26	0.4 (0.2–1.0)	0.04*
Income quartiles					
<5,000	35 (35.7)	Ref		Ref	
5000–9,999	40 (17.9)	0.7 (0.4–1.2)	0.18	0.8 (0.4–1.4)	0.38
10,000–14,999	24 (12.9)	0.7 (0.4–1.3)	0.26	1.3 (0.6–2.6)	0.49
≥15,000	17 (11.9)	0.4 (0.2–0.8)	0.01*	0.7 (0.3–1.6)	0.44
Level of Education					
No formal education	33 (28.4)	Ref		Ref	
6 or fewer years	29 (19.6)	0.9 (0.5–1.5)	0.61	1.0 (0.5–1.9)	0.96
7 to 12 years	25 (13.9)	0.6 (0.3–1.0)	0.06	0.7 (0.3–1.3)	0.20
Higher secondary completed or college	29 (14.1)	0.4 (0.2–0.8)	0.004*	0.5 (0.2–1.0)	0.06
Occupation					
Self employed	18 (13.1)	Ref		Ref	
Employed in government or private sector	19 (14.6)	1.1 (0.6–2.3)	0.73	1.6 (0.8–3.4)	0.21
Laborer on daily wages	23 (27.4)	2.5 (1.3–5.0)	0.01*	2.9 (1.4–6.1)	0.006*
Unemployed	33 (24.8)	2.2 (1.2–4.1)	0.02*	1.8 (0.9–3.8)	0.10
Housewife or student	23 (13.9)	1.1 (0.5–2.1)	0.86	1.5 (0.6–3.5)	0.37
Marital Status					
Never married	25 (14.8)	Ref		Ref	
Married or unmarried but living with partner	73 (17.8)	1.2 (0.8–2.0)	0.39	1.4 (0.8–2.6)	0.23
Divorced, separated, or widowed	18 (25.7)	2.0 (1.0–4.0)	0.048*	1.6 (0.7–3.7)	0.30
CLINICAL FACTORS					
Phase of Therapy					
Intensive phase	39 (18.0)	Ref		Ref	
Continuation phase	77 (17.8)	1.0 (0.6–1.5)	0.95	1.2 (0.8–1.9)	0.42
Category of TB					
New	87 (17.3)	Ref		Ref	
Previously treated	29 (19.9)	1.2 (0.7–1.9)	0.47	1.3 (0.8–2.2)	0.33

Type of TB					
Extrapulmonary	32 (15.8)	Ref		Ref	
Smear-negative pulmonary	67 (87.0)	1.2 (0.7—1.9)	0.50	1.4 (0.7—2.9)	0.36
Smear-positive pulmonary	17 (4.6)	1.5 (0.8—2.9)	0.22	1.1 (0.7—1.9)	0.66
HIV co-infection					
No	43 (12.4)	Ref		Ref	
Yes	73 (24.1)	2.2 (1.5—3.4)	<0.001*	2.0 (0.9—4.5)	0.10
STRUCTURAL FACTORS					
Mode of transport to treatment site					
Walking or bicycle	26 (11.1)	Ref			
Motorcycle or car	6 (13.6)	1.3 (0.5—3.3)	0.63		
Autorickshaw or taxi	22 (16.8)	1.6 (0.9—3.0)	0.13		
Public transportation	62 (25.7)	2.8 (1.7—4.6)	<0.001*		
Money spent to collect medications					
0—24	30 (12.9)	Ref			
25—49	15 (13.5)	1.1 (0.5—2.1)	0.87		
50—75	24 (21.6)	1.9 (1.0—3.4)	0.04*		
>75	47 (24.1)	2.1 (1.3—3.6)	0.003*		
Time spent to collect medication					
<30 minutes	4 (3.6)	Ref		Ref	
30 to 59 minutes	32 (16.8)	5.3 (1.8—15.5)	0.002*	5.7 (1.9—17.1)	0.002*
>=60 minutes	80 (22.9)	7.9 (2.8—22.1)	<0.001*	6.4 (1.9—21.4)	0.003*
PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS					
Current tobacco use					
No	93 (17.2)	Ref			
Smokeless tobacco use only	7 (13.7)	0.8 (0.3—1.8)	0.53		
Cigarettes or beedi use	16 (27.1)	1.8 (1.0—3.3)	0.07		
Probable alcohol use					
No alcohol use	96 (16.2)	Ref		Ref	
Any alcohol use	20 (33.9)	2.6 (1.5—4.7)	0.001*	2.1 (1.1—4.1)	0.03*

INR=Indian rupees.

*Proportion represents the number of participants with suboptimal adherence in a given category; for example, 49/271 females were suboptimally-adherent.

Patient-reported reasons for non-adherence: details on reasons patients ran out of pills and medication adverse effects experienced

Among 35 patients who reported non-adherence because they ran out of pills, 12 (34.3%) reported that this was related to difficulties in picking up medication refills (e.g., transportation challenges, illness), 8 (22.9%) forgot to pick up their medication refills, 6 (17.1%) went to pick up a refill but found that the healthcare provider was absent or the clinic was out of stock of medications, 5 (14.3%) went to pick up a refill but found the clinic was closed due to a holiday, 2 (5.7%) could not pick up medications due to travel out of town, and 2 (5.7%) reported other personal barriers to picking up medication refills. Among 29 patients who reported non-adherence due to fear of medication side effects, 10 (34.5%) had experienced nausea, 5 (17.2%) had experienced fatigue, 3 (10.3%) had experienced rash, 7 (24.1%) experienced other side effects (e.g., jaundice, giddiness, fever), and 4 (13.8%) reported a general concern that TB medications are “harmful.”

Association between non-adherence to medications and treatment card-recorded TB treatment outcomes

Using the treatment outcomes collected on treatment cards, 381 (58.6%) patients in the cohort had treatment outcomes available, while 269 (41.4%) patients were still on treatment at the time data collection ended for the study. Patients who were lost to follow-up had statistically significantly higher odds of being non-adherent (Table S3). The outcome of death was also associated with increased odds of non-adherence, although this did not achieve statistical significance.

Table S3. Association between treatment outcomes recorded on treatment cards and medication non-adherence (N=650)

Treatment outcomes	Descriptive statistics		Univariable findings	
	Proportion of overall sample in given category ^a	Proportion of medication non-adherence ^b (negative urine INH test result)	Odds ratio (95% confidence interval)	p-value
	N (%)	n (%)		
Treatment success (cure or treatment completed)	332 (51.1%)	35 (10.5%)	Ref	
On treatment	269 (41.4%)	27 (10.0%)	0.95 (0.56-1.61)	0.84
Lost to follow-up	20 (3.1%)	8 (40.0%)	5.66 (2.16-14.79)	<.001*
Died	15 (2.3%)	4 (26.7%)	3.09 (0.93-10.21)	0.065
Treatment regimen changes or transfer of care out of district	3 (3.9%)	3 (100.0%)	2.31 (0.62-8.70)	0.214

^aProportion represents the number of participants in a category divided by the overall cohort sample; for example, 332/650 participants experienced treatment success.

^bProportion represents the number of participants with non-adherence in a given category; for example, 35/332 participants with treatment success were non-adherent.