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Abstract

Background

Drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis patients notified and treated under national tuberculosis program, China

Methods

We conducted a cross-sectional study in six provinces in 2017 to assess the burden and distribution of health expenditure costs among tuberculosis-affected households and analyze related risk factors. The data was collected through face-to-face questionnaire survey. Intensity of financial burden was the median positive overshoot beyond a threshold that defined as annual total (direct and indirect) costs exceeding 20% of the pre-TB annual household income.

Results

Of 1147 patients, median (interquartile range) total costs due to tuberculosis care were US$965.5(461.8, 2059.3). Costs due to pre-treatment care accounted for 46.3% and direct costs accounted for 82.5% for total costs. Median (interquartile range) intensity of catastrophic costs was 32%(11%, 88%). Living below poverty line, household size less than four, employment in informal sector, receiving treatment from tuberculosis dispensary and hospitalization were independent predictors of associated with higher financial burden.

Conclusion

Despite free tuberculosis care services, the health expenditure due to tuberculosis were high among tuberculosis-affected households.

Trial registration

The Ethics Committee of Chinese Center of Disease Control and Prevention approved the study (No.201625, dated 22 November 2016).

Background

The End TB strategy targets that, by 2020, no TB-affected household should face catastrophic costs due to TB.¹ This is in line with policy to move health systems closer to universal health coverage (UHC).²

The World Health Organization (WHO) issued TUBERCULOSIS PATIENT COST SURVEYS: A HAND BOOK³ to guide patient cost survey in TB high burden counties. Following the manual, Viet Nam, Ghana and Myanmar carried out their national-wide survey and reported that six in ten households affected by TB or
multidrug-resistant TB incurred catastrophic costs due to TB care.\textsuperscript{4–6} Indonesia and Philippines reported that more than three in ten households incurred catastrophic costs.\textsuperscript{6,7}

China accounts for 8.6\% of the global TB burden and 50\% of the burden in Western Pacific region.\textsuperscript{6} Despite free TB care services, and the availability of public-funded insurance systems, TB patients in China bear heavy financial burden.\textsuperscript{8} The information in China about the extent and determinants of catastrophic costs due to TB in TB-affected households was limited.\textsuperscript{8–11} This information is vital to monitor the progress towards achieving End TB targets.

We report the intensity of financial burden due to TB care (pre-treatment and treatment phases) in TB affected households and related factors in China in 2017.

\textbf{Methods}

\textbf{Study design}

This was a cross-sectional study involving primary data collection.

\textbf{Setting}

\textit{Health financing in China}

China is a developing country with a per capita gross national product of 7,941 US\$ in 2016. The total expenditure on health in 2016 was six percent of the gross national product.\textsuperscript{12} The health care delivery system is “mixed” with a dominant role for public sector institutions.\textsuperscript{13}

Public funded health insurance schemes (urban employee basic medical insurance (UEBMI), urban resident basic medical insurance (URBMI), and new rural cooperative medical scheme (NCMS) cover more than 95\% of the population.\textsuperscript{14} There is limited cost coverage for outpatient care.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{National TB Programme (NTP)}

The prevalence of TB in the western region is 1.7 times and 3.2 times that of the middle and eastern region, respectively.\textsuperscript{16} The National center for tuberculosis control and prevention (NCTB), which belongs to China center for disease control (CDC), manages the NTP. TB management units are established at provincial, prefecture and county levels (basic management units (BMU) at county level). One authorized TB designated medical facility (TB designated hospital, TB dispensary or CDC) is responsible for TB diagnosis and treatment at each BMU level.

TB patients are provided free chest radiography, sputum smear test and first-line drugs in TB designated medical facilities. TB care services at referral hospitals and other general hospitals may be charged.

\textbf{Patient population}
The TB patient cost survey was conducted between March and June 2017, in line with the WHO recommended methodology.\textsuperscript{3} Drug-susceptible pulmonary TB patients who had received at least two weeks of intensive phase therapy under NTP were included.

**Sample size**

Assuming 30\% TB patients' total annual direct and indirect costs exceeding 20\% of the household's annual pre-TB income,\textsuperscript{17} relative precision as 0.2 and \(\alpha\) error as 0.05, average cluster (defined at county level) size of 50, between-cluster variation of 0.4, design effect of 4.36 and anticipating a non-response rate of 10\%, the final sample size was 1086, to be sampled from 22 clusters. (see *Suppl Annex I, Figure I*)

**Sampling methodology**

We adopted multi-stage stratified cluster sampling. The stratifying factors were region and residence (see *Suppl Annex II* for the per capita GNP of the six provinces sampled). The steps followed in sampling have been summarized in *Suppl Annex III*.

**Data collection and Management**

**Data collection**

The face-to-face interview (at BMU in county) was done by trained investigators using a structured questionnaire (see *Suppl Annex IV*). Patients presented health insurance card and treatment fee documents if available. Baseline characteristics were collected at diagnosis. Costs related information was collected from symptom onset up to the day of interview.

**Data management and analysis**

Data were double entered and validated using EpiData (version 3.1 EpiData Association, Odense, Denmark) during July to December 2017. The analysis was conducted using STATA (version 12.1, copyright 1985-2011 StataCorp LP USA).

The calculated average monthly direct medical cost, direct non-medical costs and indirect costs during treatment were used to impute treatment costs of patients within the county for the remainder of treatment (six months for new and eight months for previously treated patients).

The analysis was weighted for multi-stage design and weighted results are presented.\textsuperscript{18} The analysis (described below) was done separately for the pre-TB treatment phase (from symptom onset to treatment start), treatment phase (from treatment start to completion) and TB care overall (pre-TB treatment phase and treatment phase combined). Costs were described using the median and interquartile range (IQR). Intensity of catastrophic costs was measured as the median positive overshoot beyond the 20\% threshold (subtracting 20\% from the total costs expressed as a proportion of annual pre-TB household income).\textsuperscript{19} Operational definitions used in this study have been summarized in *Box*. \textsuperscript{3}
Generalized linear model (Poisson regression) was built using forward stepwise method for factors associated with intensity of catastrophic costs. Age, gender and variables with unadjusted p value <0.20 were added. Decision to retain a variable in the model at each step was taken based on LR test (yes if \( p < 0.05 \)). In the final model, adjusted prevalence ratios (0.95 CI) were used to summarize (infer) the association.

**Results**

**Patient profile**

Of 1147 patients, 811 (70.7%) were male, their mean age was 51 years (range 12-89 years) and 364 (31.7%) patients were interviewed during the intensive phase. New TB patients accounted for 91.6% of all the respondents and 414 (36.1%) reported at least one episode of hospitalization. The median (IQR) monthly income per capita was US$190 (46,243). The incomes of 223 (19.4%) households were below the poverty line. The mean (standard deviation) family size was 3.5 (1.9). The patient was the prime income earner in 684 (59.7%) households. NCMS covered 864 (75.3%) of the patients (Table I).

**TB care costs**

The median (IQR) direct, indirect and total costs due to TB care were US$812.1 (398.3, 1691.1), US$70.4 (24.6, 296.2) and US$965.5 (461.8, 2059.3) respectively (Table II). The direct costs accounted for 82.5% of the total cost, while the direct medical costs accounted for 64.6% of total costs (Table III). Of the total costs, 46.3% was incurred during the pre-treatment stage.

**Intensity and factors associated with of catastrophic costs due to TB care**

The median (IQR) intensity of catastrophic costs due to pre-TB treatment, TB treatment and TB care overall were 27% (10%, 68%), 22% (8%, 60%) and 32% (11%, 88%), respectively (Figure II).

Family size less than four and living below the poverty line were associated with high catastrophic costs due to pre-treatment, treatment and TB care overall. Hospitalization as well as working in informal sector was associated with catastrophic costs due to treatment and TB care overall. Registration at a TB dispensary was an independent predictor for catastrophic costs due to pre-treatment care and TB care overall. Registration at CDC and age more than 65 years were independent predictors for catastrophic costs due to pre-treatment care only. Patients from middle region were less likely to incur catastrophic costs due to pre-treatment care when compared to east and west (Table IV).

**Discussion**

This was a TB patient cost survey from China based on the WHO recommended methodology. Data quality was ensured through double data entry and validation, standard data cleaning and management
procedures at various levels. The data analysis was robust accounting for sampling weight and post-stratification adjustment weight.

Our key findings were that patients incurred high costs for both diagnosis and treatment despite the free TB care policy. Direct medical costs accounted for more than three-fifths of the total costs. The intensity of catastrophic costs for TB-affected households during diagnosis and treatment were high. Risk factors for catastrophic costs were also identified.

**Limitations**

The data was collected through face-to-face questionnaire survey. Some patients may not accurately remember the exact costs incurred. We attempted to minimize recall limitation by surveying patients still on treatment and imputing costs to the entire episode assuming that all patients complete treatment. This might overestimate the costs considering some patients may fail treatment or be lost to follow up. On the other hand, as we did not include multidrug resistant tuberculosis patients, our results could be an underestimate.

Most patients could not provide the breakdown of direct medical costs (>60% of total costs). Therefore, detailed information on components of direct medical costs is not presented.

**Interpretation of key findings**

**High absolute costs**

The median costs that TB patients incurred in China (US$966) were lower when compared with Viet Nam (US$1054), higher than the results in the systematic review by Tanimura et al (US$379), Ghana (US$429.6), Indonesia (US$133) and a previous study conducted by Zhou et al. of China (US$637) in 2012. However, it is hard to directly compare our findings with previous studies in China considering the different costs definitions adopted.

The most significant driver of costs was direct medical costs (65% of total costs) which was much higher than Viet Nam (44%) and Ghana (18.2%). High direct medical costs pointed towards prescription of high-end investigations (besides sputum examination and radiography which are free) and unnecessary treatment (besides free TB drugs). These costs are paid out-of-pocket by the patients. The high direct medical costs also indicated that the TB service package and reimbursement rates of insurance schemes did not significantly reduce the financial burden of TB patients.

Nearly half of the costs was spent before treatment initiation, which was higher than in Ghana (7%) and Indonesia (11%), but was consistent with findings from the systematic review by Tanimura et al and Nigeria. This suggests that TB patients incurred substantial costs before they reach TB designated medical facilities. The high pre-treatment costs may be due to poor TB awareness among patients as well as general hospitals (that are not authorized to diagnose and treat TB). This might had delayed TB care
seeking and transfer out to TB designated medical facilities. Many patients, especially migrants, were notified and probably managed for a significant period of time at a referral hospital before possible transfer out to TB designated medical facilities. This might had contributed to the high direct costs.

**High intensity of catastrophic costs**

Our study calculated median intensity of catastrophic costs based on WHO’s TB-specific catastrophic cost definition. Intensity of catastrophic costs based on different definitions (catastrophic cost defined as direct cost exceeding 10% of household income) has been reported elsewhere, such as China (40.8%), Nigeria (8.3%) and Benin (14.8%). Our finding showed higher intensity of catastrophic costs than Nigeria and Benin, apart from the different definition, there usually was some international or domestic special funding support for TB care in other TB high burden countries.

**Risk factors for catastrophic costs**

Family size less than four and poverty were predictors for catastrophic costs (pre-treatment, treatment and overall) which was consistent with other studies in China and Indonesia. Households with four or more members were less likely to incur catastrophic costs because in larger families, the total household income might be higher than smaller size families, thus reducing the impact of costs incurred towards TB care of one person on the household. In our study, the proportion of TB patients living below the poverty line was greater than in the general population (19.4% vs. 3.1%), and was also a significant factor associated with catastrophic costs in all stages. Poverty suggests low capacity to pay, even lesser costs might be catastrophic.

About 36% of the TB cases reported at least one episode of hospitalization for TB care. Hospitalization was a significant predictor of catastrophic costs during treatment and care overall. The higher reimbursement rate of inpatients in insurance schemes might lead to the high rate of hospitalization, even as high as 55%, thus leading to high costs and catastrophic costs.

When compared to TB designated hospitals, receiving treatment at CDC and TB dispensary were risk factors for catastrophic costs due to pre-treatment care. TB designated hospitals are specific general hospitals that are authorized to manage TB. Majority of people reach CDC and TB dispensary after seeking diagnostic care in other general hospitals (not designated for TB management).

As found in other studies, economic situation is related to catastrophic costs. Our study also found that not working in formal sector (unemployed or working in informal sector) was associated with catastrophic costs due to TB treatment. High indirect costs due to loss of wages are common in informal sector.

**Policy implications**
The high proportion of direct medical costs among total costs hints that moving towards universal health coverage is much likely to reduce the number of households incurring catastrophic costs in China. Expanding the benefit package for patients with TB and increasing reimbursement rate for outpatient care among insurance schemes may also help in reducing catastrophic costs during TB treatment. 15

Indirect medical costs and indirect costs also account for considerable amount of the total costs. Some provinces in China have implemented nutritious breakfast and travel allowance for TB patients, which can be expanded nationwide. Countries like India have implemented a TB-specific cash transfer scheme,29,30 China may consider the same, at least among those living below poverty line.

Reducing the high pre-treatment costs requires strengthening of TB health promotion to improve TB awareness, training the health staff of general hospitals to identify and refer presumptive TB patients to BMU and issue regulations to general hospitals to transfer TB patients to TB designated medical facilities at BMU.

**Conclusion**

Despite TB diagnosis and treatment being provided free of cost in China, TB patients still incur substantial costs, which hints that the current TB care policy and package are not sufficient. High direct medical costs and high prevalence of catastrophic costs, both during diagnosis and treatment, show that UHC and social protection need to be reinforced urgently, if China is to meet the End TB targets of zero catastrophic costs due to TB care by 2020.1
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**Tables**

Box. Operational definitions used in nationally representative TB* patient cost survey in China (2017)³

| Direct medical costs | Out of pocket medical expenditures associated with TB diagnosis, treatment and treatment seeking (i.e. costs for outpatient registration, hospitalization, investigations, medicines etc.); and co-payments |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Direct non-medical costs | Out-of-pocket costs for transportation, accommodation and food of the patients and family members |
| Direct costs | Direct medical + direct non-medical costs |
| Indirect costs | Productivity and economic costs of a patient or household incurred as a result of TB health care visits and hospitalization during the TB episode. Indirect costs are estimated total period of absence in hours multiplied by the hourly wage rate of the absent worker. |
| Total costs | Direct + indirect costs. |
| Catastrophic costs due to TB | Total annual costs due to TB (TB diagnosis, TB treatment and TB care overall) exceeding 20% of pre-TB annual household income. (if the duration of TB care exceeded one year, total costs were annualized while calculating catastrophic costs) |
| Pre-TB treatment | Between symptom onset and treatment initiation |
| TB treatment | From treatment initiation up to treatment completion |
| TB care | Pre-TB treatment and treatment phases combined |

*TB- drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis*

Table I. Demographic and socio-economic profile of patients enrolled in China’s TB* patient cost survey (2017)
| Variable                        | N    | (%)   |
|--------------------------------|------|-------|
| Total                          | 1147 | (100) |
| Demographic                    |      |       |
| Age group in years             |      |       |
| <15                            | 6    | (0.5) |
| 15-44                          | 352  | (30.7)|
| 45-64                          | 497  | (43.3)|
| ≥65                            | 292  | (25.5)|
| Gender                         |      |       |
| Male                           | 811  | (70.7)|
| Female                         | 336  | (29.3)|
| Marital status                 |      |       |
| Married                        | 157  | (13.7)|
| Unmarried                      | 653  | (56.9)|
| Divorced                       | 34   | (3.0 )|
| Widowed                        | 84   | (7.3 )|
| Missing                        | 219  | (19.1)|
| Region                         |      |       |
| East                           | 422  | (36.8)|
| Middle                         | 322  | (28.1)|
| West                           | 403  | (35.1)|
| Residence                      |      |       |
| Urban                          | 407  | (35.5)|
| Rural                          | 740  | (64.5)|
| Family size [mean (SD)]        | 3.5  | (1.9 )|
| Migrant status (Yes)**         | 89   | (7.8 )|
| Socio-economic                 |      |       |
| Education                      |      |       |
| Illiterate or not completed primary school | 194 | (16.9)|
| Completed primary school       | 330  | (28.8)|
| Completed middle school        | 374  | (32.6)|
| Completed high school          | 176  | (15.3)|
| Completed college and above    | 73   | (6.4 )|
| Economic activity              |      |       |
| Formal sector (regular salary) | 288  | (25.1)|
| Informal sector (irregular earning) | 501 | (43.7)|
| Category                                      | Value | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Economically inactive                        | 358   | (31.2)     |
| Monthly income per capita in US$ (Median (IQR))*** | 190   | (46, 243)  |
| Below poverty line (Yes)****                 | 223   | (19.4)     |
| Prime income earner (Yes)                    | 684   | (59.7)     |
| Insurance                                    |       |            |
| None                                         | 40    | (3.5)      |
| Urban employee basic medical insurance        | 114   | (9.9)      |
| Urban residence basic medical insurance       | 116   | (10.1)     |
| New rural cooperative medical scheme          | 864   | (75.3)     |
| Others                                       | 13    | (1.1)      |
| Clinical                                     |       |            |
| TB Category                                  |       |            |
| New                                          | 1051  | (91.6)     |
| Previously treated                           | 96    | (8.4)      |
| Place of registration                        |       |            |
| TB designated hospital                       | 730   | (63.6)     |
| CDC hospital                                 | 219   | (19.1)     |
| TB dispensary                                | 198   | (17.3)     |
| Sputum status at diagnosis                   |       |            |
| Positive                                     | 352   | (30.7)     |
| Negative                                     | 743   | (64.8)     |
| Unknown                                      | 52    | (4.5)      |
| Hemoptysis at diagnosis                      |       |            |
| Yes                                          | 144   | (12.6)     |
| No                                           | 860   | (75.0)     |
| Unknown                                      | 143   | (12.5)     |
| Weight loss at diagnosis                     |       |            |
| Yes                                          | 200   | (17.4)     |
| No                                           | 804   | (70.1)     |
| Unknown                                      | 143   | (12.5)     |
| HIV                                          |       |            |
| Positive                                     | 12    | (1.0)      |
| Negative                                     | 379   | (33.0)     |
| Unknown                                      | 756   | (65.9)     |
| Comorbidity                                  |       |            |
| Diabetes Mellitus                            | 117   | (10.2)     |
| Chronic liver diseases       | 34  | (3.0) |
|----------------------------|-----|-------|
| Chronic renal disease       | 20  | (1.7) |
| Anemia                     | 37  | (3.2) |
| Hypertension               | 132 | (11.5) |
| None                       | 668 | (58.2) |
| Hospitalization during pre-treatment or treatment (Yes) | 414 | (36.1) |

SD – standard deviation; IQR – interquartile range; US$ – United States Dollars; CDC – centre for disease control; HIV – human immunodeficiency virus

*drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis;

***A currency exchange rate of Chinese RMB 687 Yuan to US$100 Yuan (December 2018);

****Poverty line in China is Annual per capita household income less than US$ 430

Table II. Costs due to TB care incurred by patients enrolled in China’s TB* patient cost survey (2017) [N=1147]

|                      | Pre-TB treatment | TB treatment | TB care overall |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
|                      | Median            | (IQR)        | Median          | (IQR)          | Median          | (IQR)          |
| Direct costs**       | 233.8            | (37.2, 764.2)| 354.3          | (198.3, 788.4)| 812.1          | (398.3, 1691.1)|
| Direct medical costs | 177.2            | (17.5, 607.1)| 257.5          | (114.2, 579.2)| 608.7          | (286.1, 1301.8)|
| Direct non-medical costs | 35.5          | (2.9, 130.9) | 84.2         | (42.8, 167.2) | 160.5         | (74.4, 315.2)  |
| Transport            | 4.4              | (0.0, 17.5)  | 14.1          | (8.2, 28.2)   | 24.2          | (11.7, 54.4)   |
| Food                 | 5.4              | (0.1, 72.7)  | 14.1          | (9.4, 37.1)   | 47.7          | (13.7, 149.8)  |
| Accommodation        | 0.0              | (0.0, 1.5)   | 12.5          | (7.1, 23.2)   | 15.7          | (8.1, 36.5)    |
| Nutritional supplement| 0.0             | (0.0, 6.7)   | 0.0           | (0.0, 50.4)   | 0.0           | (0.0, 60.4)    |
| Indirect costs (wages / income lost) | 7.5         | (0.0, 108.4) | 37.0          | (17.9, 91.7)  | 70.4          | (24.6, 296.2)  |
| Total costs          | 283.5            | (41.8, 945.7)| 413.1         | (231.9, 927.8)| 965.5         | (461.8, 2059.3)|
IQR – interquartile range

*TB – drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis;

**A currency exchange rate of Chinese RMB 687 Yuan to US$100 Yuan (December 2018)

Table III. Contribution of each component of costs due to TB care as a proportion of total costs among patients enrolled in China’s TB* patient cost survey (2017) @ [N=1147]

|                      | Pre-TB treatment@%  | TB treatment@%  | TB care overall@% |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Direct costs         |                     |                |                  |
| Direct medical costs | 68.1                | 61.5           | 64.6             |
| Direct non-medical costs | 15.2              | 20.2           | 17.9             |
| Transport            | 2.4                 | 3.7            | 3.1              |
| Food                 | 7.9                 | 8.1            | 8                |
| Accommodation        | 1.7                 | 3.1            | 2.5              |
| Nutrition supplement | 3.2                 | 5.3            | 4.3              |
| Indirect costs (wages / income lost) | 16.7              | 18.3           | 17.5             |

*TB – drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis

Table IV. Factors associated with catastrophic costs due to TB care (in pre-treatment phase, treatment phase and both phases combined) among TB affected households enrolled in China’s TB patient cost survey (2017) @ [N=1147]
| Variables*          | Pre-treatment  | Treatment  | TB care overall# |
|---------------------|----------------|------------|------------------|
|                     | aPR (95% CI)   | aPR (95% CI)| aPR (95% CI)     |
| Total               |                |            |                  |
| Age in years        |                |            |                  |
| <15                 | 1.60 (0.38-6.80) | 1.58 (0.64-3.92) | 1.63 (0.66-4.07) |
| 15-44               | ref            | ref        | ref              |
| 45-64               | 1.30 (0.92-1.84) | 1.14 (0.92-1.43) | 1.14 (0.91-1.43) |
| ≥65                 | 1.57 (1.05-2.34) ^ | 1.19 (0.92-1.54) | 1.19 (0.92-1.55) ^ |
| Marital status      |                |            |                  |
| Married             | ref            | -          | -                |
| Unmarried           | 1.11 (0.71-1.72) | -          | -                |
| Divorced            | 1.35 (0.68-2.69) | -          | -                |
| Widowed             | 1.00 (0.56-1.78) | -          | -                |
| Missing             | 0.65 (0.34-1.23) | -          | -                |
| Region              |                |            |                  |
| East                | ref            | -          | -                |
| Middle              | 0.21 (0.08-0.54) ^ | -          | -                |
| West                | 1.02 (0.74-1.41) | -          | -                |
| Residence           |                |            |                  |
| Urban               | ref            | -          | -                |
| Rural               | 1.02 (0.76-1.37) | -          | -                |
| Family size         |                |            |                  |
| Less than 4         | 1.37 (1.07-1.75) ^ | 1.28 (1.08-1.51) ^ | 1.24 (1.05-1.47) ^ |
| ≥4                  | ref            | ref        | ref              |
| Migrant status      |                |            |                  |
| Yes                 | -              | -          | 0.87 (0.60-1.25) |
| No                  | -              | -          | ref              |
| Education           |                |            |                  |
| Illiterate          | ref            | ref        | ref              |
| Event                        | Completed primary school | Completed middle school | Completed high school | Completed college | Economic activity | Formal sector | ref | ref | Informal sector | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Economic activity            |                          |                         |                       |                   | Economic activity | Formal sector | ref | ref | Informal sector | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Economic activity            |                          |                         |                       |                   | Economic activity | Formal sector | ref | ref | Informal sector | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Below poverty line           | Yes                      | 1.91 (1.48-2.48)        | 1.68 (1.39-2.02)       | 1.68 (1.39-2.02)  | No               | ref           | ref | ref | ref |
| No                           |                          | ref                     | ref                   | ref               | ref              | ref           | ref | ref | ref |
| Insurance                    | None                     | 1.23 (0.58-2.64)        | -                     | -                 | -                | -             | -   | -   | -              |
| NCMS                         |                          | 1.30 (0.86-1.97)        | -                     | -                 | -                | -             | -   | -   | -              |
| Other insurance              | ref                      | -                       | -                     | -                 | -                | -             | -   | -   | -              |
| Place of registration        | TB designated hospital   | ref                     | -                     | ref               | ref              | ref           | ref | ref | ref |
| CDC                          | 5.86 (2.09-16.4)         | -                       | 1.00 (0.81-1.22)      | -                 | -                | -             | -   | -   | -              |
| TB dispensary                | 1.88 (1.32-2.68)         | -                       | 1.24 (1.01-1.52)      | -                 | -                | -             | -   | -   | -              |
| Comorbidity                  | Yes                      | -                       | 1.09 (0.92-1.28)       | 1.10 (0.93-1.30)  | No               | ref           | ref | ref | ref |
| No                           |                          | -                       | ref                   | ref               | ref              | ref           | ref | ref | ref |
| Hospitalization              | Yes                      | -                       | 1.79 (1.52-2.09)       | 1.72 (1.47-2.02)  | No               | ref           | ref | ref | ref |
| No                           |                          | -                       | ref                   | ref               | ref              | ref           | ref | ref | ref |

TB – drug-susceptible pulmonary tuberculosis; aPR – adjusted prevalence ratio; CI – confidence interval; NCMS - New rural cooperative medical scheme; CDC – centre for disease control
analysis was weighted for the multi-stage design and weighted results have been presented; 

*Generalized linear model (Poisson regression) built using forward stepwise method: one model each for pre-TB treatment, TB treatment and TB care overall (total three models). Age, sex and variables with unadjusted p<0.2 were considered. aPR of variables retained in the model are presented; variables not included in this table either had unadjusted p>0.2 or were considered but not retained in all three models; # pre-treatment and treatment phase combined; ^statistically significant
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