scientific reports



OPEN Cost-effectiveness of newer technologies for the diagnosis of Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection in Brazilian people living with HIV

Ricardo E. Steffen^{1,2[∞]}, Marcia Pinto³, Afranio Kritski⁴ & Anete Trajman^{1,4,5}

Tuberculosis is the leading cause of death among people living with HIV (PLH). Preventive tuberculosis therapy reduces mortality in PLH, especially in those with a positive tuberculin skin test (TST). New, more specific technologies for detecting latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI) are now commercially available. We sought to analyse the cost-effectiveness of four different strategies for the diagnosis of LTBI in PLH in Brazil, from the Brazilian public health care system perspective. We developed a Markov state-transition model comparing four strategies for the diagnosis of LTBI over 20 years. The strategies consisted of TST with the currently used protein purified derivative (PPD RT 23), two novel skin tests using recombinant allergens (Diaskintest [Generium Pharmaceutical, Moscow, Russia] and EC [Zhifei Longcom Biologic Pharmacy Co., Anhui, China]), and the QuantiFERON-TB-Gold-Plus (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). The main outcome was cost (in 2020 US dollars) per quality-adjusted life years (QALY). For the base case scenario, the Diaskintest was dominant over all other examined strategies. The cost saving estimate per QALY was US \$1375. In sensitivity analyses, the Diaskintest and other newer tests remained cost-saving compared to TST. For PLH, TST could be replaced by more specific tests in Brazil, considering the current national recommendations.

Tuberculosis is the leading cause of death from an infectious disease globally, including in people living with HIV¹. The single most important strategy to control the epidemics is prevention of the disease through treatment of latent tuberculosis infection². In people living with HIV, latent tuberculosis infection treatment reduces by 64% the risk of developing active disease for those with a positive TST³. The use of antiretroviral treatment has additive benefits to latent tuberculosis infection treatment in reducing both the incidence of active disease and overall mortality, with a lasting protective effect of 5 years^{4,5}. The 2018 declaration of the United Nations high-level meeting⁶ on the fight against tuberculosis, the first dedicated to one disease, commits to providing treatment for latent tuberculosis infection to at least 6 million people living with HIV by 2022. While less than 18% of the overall population needing treatment for latent tuberculosis infection complete it—mainly through losses in several steps of the cascade-of-care of latent tuberculosis infection⁷—the number of people living with HIV that were provided with treatment for latent tuberculosis infection has increased recently, from 1.8 million in 2018 to 3.5 million in 2019¹. Nevertheless, measures to minimize the impact of losses at each stage of care are important. Among the reasons identified across different countries and settings, pre-treatment losses, such as access to diagnostic tests for latent tuberculosis infection detection are an important bottleneck⁷.

Recognizing the high risk for tuberculosis among people living with HIV, the World Health Organization (WHO), since 2018⁸, recommends treatment of latent tuberculosis infection for people living with HIV in tuberculosis high-burden countries regardless of testing results. However, in Brazil, guidelines are different from WHO's recommendations. In 2018, the Ministry of Health has adopted a distinctive policy regarding treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in people living with HIV: those with CD4+ cell counts 350 cells/µl or less should

¹Instituto de Medicina Social, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. ²Departamento de Medicina, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. ³Instituto Nacional de Saúde da Mulher, da Criança e do Adolescente Fernandes Figueira, Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. ⁴Programa de Pós-Graduação em Clínica Médica, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. ⁵TB International Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. [™]email: ricardo.steffen@gmail.com

start treatment immediately and those with counts over 350 cells/ μ l should be tested for latent tuberculosis infection⁹. The current standard for latent tuberculosis infection diagnosis in the public health system is TST with PPD RT 23. This policy is based on systematic reviews and large studies^{3,5,10,11} that have repeatedly shown that benefit from treatment is higher in those with a positive tuberculin skin test (TST) compared with those with a negative TST result. Although more recent isolated studies in people living with HIV suggest that those with negative test results might be at greater risk of developing tuberculosis, and might also benefit from tuberculosis preventive therapy^{4,12,13}, testing is still recommended for this high risk population in Brazil and other countries.

Currently, the TST with purified protein derivative (PPD RT 23) is the routine diagnostic test in most tuberculosis high burden countries, where 80% of cases are concentrated. Intermittent shortage of PPD¹⁴, the low specificity of the test in Bacille Calmette-Guérin (BCG) vaccinated populations¹⁵ and the cumbersome training necessary for TST has highlighted the need for adoption of newer, more specific tests. However, for the incorporation of new technologies to the public health system, local assessments of feasibility, acceptability, and cost-effectiveness are necessary¹⁶. We aimed to analyze the cost-effectiveness of newer latent tuberculosis infection diagnostic tests with the standard of care for diagnosing latent tuberculosis infection in people living with HIV in Brazil.

Methods

Setting and current policies. Brazil, a high-medium income country with the largest universal public health service, has one of the 30 highest tuberculosis and tuberculosis-HIV burden¹. The tuberculosis and HIV programs provide diagnosis and treatment at no cost to patients. In 2018, data from the HIV care cascade in Brazil showed an estimate of 900,000 PLH, 66% of these on ART. There are no official or published data on the percentage of those who have completed one course of LTBI treatment but data from 2005 to 2009, from the THRio study, show that 48% have a CD4 cell count greater or equal to 350 cells/ μ l¹⁷. LTBI regimens currently recommended is 9 months of isoniazid or, for children under 15 years of age, adults over 50 years of age and those with liver disease, 4 months of rifampin. Three months of weekly doses of rifapentine and isoniazid has recently been approved but is not yet available in the public health system.

Strategies. Four strategies were considered in this study. Three were based on skin tests, two using the recombinant ESAT-6 and CFP10 immunogens (Diaskintest [Generium Pharmaceutical, Moscow, Russia] and EC [Zhifei Longcom Biologic Pharmacy Co., Anhui, China]), and one using the tuberculin PPD RT 23 (Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark). The Diaskintest is currently used in Russia and commercially available in Russia, Kazakhstan and Ukraine¹⁸ and the EC immunogen is produced in China¹⁹. By substituting PPD with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* specific antigens, they combine the operational advantages of the TST with the specificity of interferon-gamma release assays (IGRAs)²⁰. The fourth strategy consists of an IGRA, the QuantiF-ERON-TB Gold Plus (QFT-Plus) test (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany)²¹. All new strategies were compared with TST, the standard care.

Model structure. A state-transition Markov model was created, simulating a cohort of people living with HIV with a CD4⁺ cell count of 350 cells/ μ l or greater, for a time horizon of 20 years (20 annual cycles). The health states considered were (1) no latent tuberculosis infection, untested; (2) latent tuberculosis infection, untested; (3) active tuberculosis; (4) active tuberculosis, treated; (5) no latent tuberculosis infection, treated; (6) no latent tuberculosis infection, untreated; (7) latent tuberculosis infection, treated; (8) latent tuberculosis infection, untreated and (9) dead. The model was constructed using the software TreeAge Pro 2020 (Williamstown, MA).

The Markov model simulates long-term outcomes related to the natural history of latent tuberculosis infection. Progression to active tuberculosis, reinfection, treatment of latent tuberculosis infection and mortality from tuberculosis or other causes were considered. A proportion of people living with HIV with active tuberculosis are hospitalized and at increased risk of death. Screening for latent tuberculosis infection is offered to people living with HIV with a CD4⁺ cell count of 350 cells/ μ l or greater. Those with a positive test result are invited for a chest radiograph. Treatment is then recommended for those with latent tuberculosis infection. Latent tuberculosis infection is defined as contacts with a normal chest radiograph and a positive test result in the absence of signs or symptoms of active tuberculosis infection, following medical evaluation. When screening with a skin test, an individual may or may not return to have the test results interpreted (skin test not read). When screening with QFT-Plus, the result might be indeterminate. Treatment for latent tuberculosis infection was modeled as 9 months of isoniazid. During treatment, drug-induced liver injury may develop. Utility scores during tuberculosis treatment, development of drug-induced liver injury and post-tuberculosis treatment are decreased.

Outcome. We calculated the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) as incremental costs per qualityadjusted life year (QALY) gained for the three strategies compared to TST, discounting future costs and QALYs at 5% per year²². Costs and QALYs are accrued by individuals according to the length of time that they spend in each state of the model.

Testing procedures and interpretation. The skin test procedure consists of using two tuberculin units of PPD RT 23 (TST) or recombinant tuberculin (Diaskintest or EC) on the volar aspect of the forearm, according to the Mantoux method²³. The result is considered positive if there is an induration $\geq 5 \text{ mm } 48-72$ h after inoculation. The QFT-Plus procedure is based on the manufacturer's instructions using 1 ml aliquots of whole blood, incubated overnight with an antigen-free negative control, a phytohaemagglutinin-positive control and antigens to ESAT-6 and CFP-10²⁴. When the result is indeterminate, the test is repeated once.

Model parameters. *Effectiveness data.* The accuracy of QFT-Plus and PPD-based TST was estimated from meta-analyses^{15,25,26}. The sensitivity and specificity of the two recombinant tuberculin proteins were considered to be similar to QFT-Plus, as the same antigens are used and head-to-head studies show similar test-positivity rates^{19,27,28}. Although no studies have been performed comparing the tests on people living with HIV, this similarity is likely to be maintained.

Utility valuations were based on previously published studies from other countries^{29–31}. Utilities were measured using SF-6D or a disease specific tool which may have been obtained using either standard gamble or time trade off techniques. Quality of life of people living with HIV and latent tuberculosis infection was 0.76, assuming no opportunistic infections. Quality of life with treatment-related adverse events was 0.25 during the period with drug-induced liver injury or severe allergic reactions and 0.62 with active tuberculosis^{32–34}. Age-specific all-cause mortality rates in people living with HIV were taken from Brazilian specific data³⁵, with increasing mortality rates as the cycle stages progressed.

Cost data. Costs were estimated from the perspective of the Brazilian Unified Health System (SUS) and from secondary sources³⁶. The economic analysis included the following costs: diagnostic tests, outpatient visits, blood work, including liver function tests in case of drug-induced liver injury, chest radiograph, treatment of latent tuberculosis infection with 9 months of isoniazid, treatment of tuberculosis with isoniazid, rifampicin, pyrazinamide, and ethambutol, hospitalization due to tuberculosis and drug-induced liver injury leading to hospitalization. Costs were estimated from SUS National Procedures Table published elsewhere³⁶. Hospitalization costs were based on the hospital reimbursement system used in Brazil, a process akin to diagnosis-related group reimbursement systems, for tuberculosis or drug-induced liver injury. Consumables costs for the diagnostic tests were based on the standard test procedures and from previous studies³⁷. Costs of test kits were based on market value provided by the manufacturer, adjusted to 2020 Brazilian reais (R\$) and then converted to 2020 US dollars using the annual average rate (US\$ [rate US\$1 = R\$4.50]), according to the method described by Turner³⁸. Societal costs (indirect costs, loss of productivity or cost of death) were not included.

Sensitivity analyses. One-way sensitivity analysis was carried out on all model inputs. Two-way sensitivity analysis was carried out on specific inputs with greatest impact on the one-way sensitivity analysis. To account for parameter uncertainty, we also performed a probabilistic sensitivity analysis in a Monte Carlo simulation with 10,000 iterations. The uncertainty in clinical probabilities and accuracies were assumed to have a beta distribution and a gamma distribution for costs. The generated distributions around costs, QALYs and the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio are shown using median and 95% uncertainty ranges (UR).

Willingness to pay threshold. A cost-effectiveness acceptability curve was constructed, displaying the probability that the intervention is cost-effective from a range of willingness to pay threshold values. As Brazil does not have a willingness to pay threshold, a value of US \$7544 per QALY, as proposed by Woods et al.³⁹, was considered.

Model assumptions. A number of assumptions were required to develop a feasible model. The cohort undergoes the routine procedures for people living with HIV according to national guidelines. All people being assessed for latent tuberculosis infection are people living with HIV with a CD4⁺ cell count of 350 cells/µl or greater. Those with a negative result will retest within 6-12 months. Those with a positive test result are then screened for active tuberculosis and undergo chest radiography and physical examination. The chest radiograph and physical examination are 100% accurate when ruling out the initial diagnosis of active tuberculosis. Individuals with a second indeterminate result on the QFT-Plus test are at the same risk of developing active tuberculosis as those with a negative result. All people with initial active tuberculosis accept treatment. Patients who complete tuberculosis treatment are considered cured. People who do not adhere to treatment for latent tuberculosis infection do not develop drug-induced liver injury. Treatment for latent tuberculosis infection without development of drug-induced liver injury did not decrease quality of life. Nonadherence to treatment due to adverse reactions occurred in the first month and conferred no partial protection. No health-related quality of life loss is experienced by people with latent tuberculosis infection. Progression from latent tuberculosis infection to active tuberculosis was simulated assuming a constant activation rate over time. Individuals with resolved active tuberculosis have an annual probability of relapse, with subsequent activation having the same probability as the initial episode. To account for waste in cost estimates, we considered the stability of newer recombinant allergens to be equal to that of PPD RT 23.

Results

Model parameters for the base-case scenario are shown in Table 1. The base-case results show that (Table 2), compared with TST, all tests were cost-saving (Fig. 1a–c). The Diaskintest was cost saving at US \$41 with an incremental gain of 0.03 QALYs, or US \$1360 per QALY (95% UC \$978–1948). The EC and QFT-Plus strategies were also cost saving at US \$1283 (95% UC 904–2746) and US\$771 (95% UC US \$339–1336) per QALY, respectively. Overall, the TST strategy was dominated by all other strategies, since it had the highest cost, US \$925, and a gain of 8.35 QALYs (Table 2). While Diaskintest strategy was the most cost saving, the result was sensitive to variations in the probabilistic sensitivity analysis (Fig. 2). Considering all strategies simultaneously, the Monte Carlo simulations show that, at a willingness to pay threshold of US \$7544 per QALY, the Diaskintest had the highest net benefit in 50.4% of simulations, followed by the EC skin test (42.7%) and QFT-Plus (6.7%) (Fig. 3). Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves for each of the treatment strategies, showing the proportion of simulations where each strategy has the highest net benefit at different willingness to pay thresholds are also shown in Fig. 3.

ImageNombNombNombCRACESeriesSeriesSeriesSeriesPrealence of ITB0.840.740.74Beta0.74Probabily of atran to TS ranging0.840.740.74BetaSeriesProbabily of atrans ITB ratement (Ponothy)0.800.800.80BetaSeriesSeriesProbabily of atrans the formation of the formati			Range						
Clinical optical parametervier set		Base-case	Low	High	PSA probability distribution	Source			
Prevence of LTBI0.270.110.44Beta140Probability of reurn to TST reading0.880.670.70Beta1Probability of attring LTM reatment0.800.740.70Beta1Affnerence to LTM treatment0.0000.00000.0000Beta0.80Probability of attratine (9 month)0.0000.00000.0000Beta1Probability of attratine (9 month)0.00000.00000.0000Beta1Probability of attratine (9 month)0.00000.00000.0000Beta1Probability of attratine (9 month)0.00000.00000.0000Beta1Probability of attratine (9 month)0.00000.00000.00000.00000.00000.0000Probability of attratine (9 month)0.00000.00000.00000.00000.00000.00000.0000Probability of attratine (9 month)0.00000.00000.00000.00000.00000.00000.0000Dakance sensitivity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta11Dakance sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta22Opt-Prilas specificity in PLH0.610.600.800Beta22Opt-Prilas specificity in PLH0.610.600.0000.00000.00000.00000.0000Opt-Prilas specificity in PLH0.610.500.66GammaMotH/SGTAPProbability of ductor pLT specifici	Clinical and epidemiological parameters			-					
Probability of runn to TS reaking688666970Beta9Probability of starting LTB treatment0.820.840.86Beta3.57Biffacery of LTB treatment (mounh)0.90.000.000Beta8.75Probability OT Lindea to LTB treatment0.0000.0000Beta8.75Probability of Lindea to TDB treatment0.0000.0000Beta9.72Probability of Lindea to TDB treatment0.00000.0000Beta9.72Probability of Lindea to TDB treatment0.00000.0000Beta9.72Probability of Lindea to TDB treatment0.00000.0000Beta9.72Probability of Lindea to TDB treatment0.6400.82Beta9.72Probability of Lindea to TDB treatment0.6400.8600.8600.8600.8600.860Dakinter specificity in PLH0.6100.500.8600.8600.8600.8600.860Der Probassenity in PLH0.6100.500.8600.8600.8600.8600.860Probability of Intermate QPT Plus0.6100.500.8600.8600.8600.860Probability of Intermate QPT Plus0.6100.500.8600.8600.8600.860Probability of Intermate QPT Plus0.6100.500.8600.8600.8600.8600.860Probability of Intermate QPT Plus0.6100.500.8600.8600.8600.8600.8600.8600.8600.860 <td< td=""><td>Prevalence of LTBI</td><td>0.27</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.34</td><td>Beta</td><td>17,48</td></td<>	Prevalence of LTBI	0.27	0.11	0.34	Beta	17,48			
Probabily of saring TBI reatment9.830.749.79Relat9.439.43Adherence ITBI tratument (9 month)0.800.800.80Relat4.53Probabily of Dila teated to TBI reatment0.0000.000Relat9.20Probabily of Augustation due to TII0.00010.00000.000Relat9.20Probabily of Augustation due to TII0.00010.00000.000Relat9.20Probabily of Augustation due to TII0.0000.0000Relat9.20Probabily of Augustation due to TII0.0000.000Relat9.20Probabily of Augustation due to TII0.0000.000Relat9.20Probabily of Augustation TII0.0100.500.66Relat9.20Diakinost escuticity in PLH0.500.66Relat9.209.20Diakinost escuticity in PLH0.610.500.68Relat9.20Celdin est specificity in PLH0.610.600.60Relat9.20OFT-Phasencificity in PLH0.610.600.60Relat9.20Celdin est specificity in PLH0.610.600.60Relat9.20OFT-Phasencificity in PLH0.610.600.60Relat9.20Celdin est specificity in PLH0.610.600.60Relat9.20OFT-Phasencificity in PLH0.610.600.60Relat9.20Celdin est specificity in PLH0.610.60Relat9.20	Probability of return to TST reading	0.88	0.65	0.97	Beta	51			
Addresse b CTB treatment (9 month)6.630.830.86Bela9-40Efficacy of LTB treatment (9 month)0.900.0000.000Bela8-27Poolability of Longatilazian due to DI110.00010.0000Bela9Probability of Longatilazian due to DI110.00010.0000Bela9Poolability of Longatilazian due to DI110.00010.0000Bela9Probability of Longatilazian due to DI110.00010.0000Bela9TST (PPD-FR23) sensitivity in PLH0.510.54Bela9Daskinst sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Bela9Daskinst sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Bela2Catin test sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Bela2Probability of inderminato QPT-IPM0.300.860.86Bela2QPT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.70Torngola2Probability of inderminato QPT-IPM0.300.860.86Bela2QPT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.70Torngola2Probability of inderminato QPT-IPM0.700.70Torngola2Catin test sensitivity in PLH0.610.70Torngola2QPT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.70Torngola2Catin test sensitivity in PLH0.710.70Torngola2QPT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.710.70Torngola2C	Probability of starting LTBI treatment	0.82	0.74	0.97	Beta	52			
Efficor of ITRI treatment0.906.630.93Reta%**Probability of constribution due to ITRI treatment0.0000.00000.0000Reta%**Probability of constribution due to ITRI to TR, no treatment0.00000.0000Reta%**Probability of constribution due to treatment0.00000.0000Reta%**Propersion from ITRI to TR, no treatment0.610.500.66Reta%**TST (PPD-RT23) sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.66Reta%**Daskinets sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.66Reta%**Cakin to treatment vity in PLH0.610.660.66Reta%**Cakin to treatment vity in PLH0.610.660.66Reta%**Cakin to treatment vity in PLH0.610.660.66Reta%**Cakin to treatment vity in PLH0.610.66Reta%**Cakin to treatment vity in PLH0.610.66Reta%**Cakin to treatment vity in PLH0.610.60GammaMOH/SIGTA*Cakin to tre	Adherence to LTBI treatment (9 months)	0.63	0.38	0.86	Beta	53-55			
Probability of DILI related to LTBI treatment0.0020.0010.0000Beta9Probability of adaptialization due to DILI0.00010.00000.00000.0003Beta9Probability of adaptialization due to DILI0.0010.00030.0003Beta99Probability of adaptialization due to DILI0.0010.00030.0003Beta99TST (PPD-RT23) sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta99Diskinet sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta99Diskinet sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta99Ci dia test sensitivity in PLH0.930.8600.98Beta99Ci dia test sensitivity in PLH0.930.98Beta999Ci dia test sensitivity in PLH0.9	Efficacy of LTBI treatment (9 months)	0.9	0.63	0.93	Beta	56,57			
Probability of Acady0,00010,00000,0003Beta9Probability of Acady by DILI0,00000,0003Beta9Progression from TBI Lo TB, no trement0,00000,0003Beta9Terparameters50,800Beta9TST (PPD-RT23) specificity in PLH0,6100,5008,680Beta9Daskinets sensitivity in PLH0,6100,5008,680Beta9Daskinets sensitivity in PLH0,6100,5008,680Beta7Cakin test sensitivity in PLH0,9100,8000,800Beta7Cakin test sensitivity in PLH0,9100,8000,800Beta7QFT-Plue sensitivity in PLH0,8000,800Beta88QFT-Plue sensitivity in PLH0,8000,800GammaMOH/SIGTAPCheat adlograph6,2201,8106,300GammaMOH/S	Probability of DILI related to LTBI treatment	0.002	0.001	0.005	Beta	55			
Probability of dath by DILI0.000010.000010.0003Rea9Progressior from LTR It or R, no treatment0.000000.010Refa9Progressior from LTR It or R, no treatment0.500.60Refa9TST (PPD-ST23) sensitivity in PLH0.6100.500.66Refa9Diakinster sensitivity in PLH0.6100.600.68Refa9Diakinster sensitivity in PLH0.6100.800.80Refa9Cels in rest sensitivity in PLH0.6100.89Refa9Cels in rest sensitivity in PLH0.6100.800.80Refa9QFT-Phus sensitivity in PLH0.6100.80Refa98QFT-Phus sensitivity in PLH0.6100.70Tringlar99Probability of indeterminate QFT-Phus0.6400.0100.70Tringlar9Probability of indeterminate QFT-Phus0.6400.700.7070.70Cost extrements0.700.710.710.710.71Cost extrements0.700.710.710.710.71Cost extrements0.720.710.710.710.71Cost extrements0.700.710.710.710.71Cost extrements0.700.710.710.710.71Cost extrements0.710.750.710.710.71Cost extrements0.710.750.710.710.710.71 <tr< td=""><td>Probability of hospitalization due to DILI</td><td>0.00015</td><td>0.00010</td><td>0.00020</td><td>Beta</td><td>58</td></tr<>	Probability of hospitalization due to DILI	0.00015	0.00010	0.00020	Beta	58			
Pergession from LTB1 to TB, no treatment0.080.040.11Beta9"TST TST (PPD-RT2) specificity nPLH0.610.500.80Beta10Daskinster specificity nPLH0.610.500.80Beta10Diskinster specificity nPLH0.610.500.80Beta10Diskinster specificity nPLH0.610.500.80Beta70CS kin test specificity nPLH0.300.800.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.800.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.800.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.800.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.860.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.860.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.860.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.300.860.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.310.860.80Beta70QFT-Plas specificity nPLH0.310.860.80Beta70Dial medical visit6.221.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.221.129.30GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal dangraph0.412.206.66Gamma80Plat dangraph0.415.700.10Gamma80Cotar dan	Probability of death by DILI	0.00001	0.000001	0.0003	Beta	58			
Net parametersvvvTST (PP)-RT23) sensitivity nPLH0.610.500.66Beta97Diaskinest sensitivity nPLH0.610.500.86Beta97Diaskinest sensitivity nPLH0.610.500.86Beta77EC skin test sensitivity nPLH0.930.860.98Beta77EC skin test sensitivity nPLH0.910.500.86Beta27CFT-bus sechicity nPLH0.610.500.86Beta27CFT-bus sechicity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta27Probability of indeterminate QFT-Pus0.040.010.07Triangular77COTContrastic Sector20040.026.66GammaMOH/SIGTAPChattana (n 2020 US)15.390200415.3902004Cot sector15.4015.400.00GammaMOH/SIGTAPChattangingh6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPCot sector15.402.026.	Progression from LTBI to TB, no treatment	0.08	0.04	0.11	Beta	59			
TST (PPD-RT2) sensitivity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta?TST (PPD-RT3) specificity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta?Diaskinst esensitivity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta?EC kin test specificity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta?QFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta?QFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.50.86Beta?QFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.600.70Taingular?Probabily of indereminate QFT-Plus0.610.60Taingular?Opt-Plushity indereterminate QFT-Plus0.610.60GarmaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.221.119.33GarmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.265.30GarmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.265.319.33GarmaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smar6.223.119.33GarmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.406.702.10GarmaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smar3.141.774.71GarmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.406.702.16GarmaMOH/SIGTAPCost of bospitalization83.632.621.63GarmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.406.702.16GarmaMOH/SIGTAPCost of bospitalization81.641.641.643.64GarmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.711.6	Test parameters		1	1	I				
TST (PPD-RT2) specificity in PLH0.590.460.82Beta19Daskintest sensitivity in PLH0.510.500.86Beta46EC skin test sensitivity in PLH0.510.860.88Beta7CFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.510.860.88Beta7QFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta7QFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.610.500.86Beta7Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.940.100.70Trangular28Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.440.100.70Trangular18Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.440.130.60GammaMOH/SIGTAPCostermates (incompto1.400.511.53GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph4.041.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph6.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph6.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph6.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChart adograph6.141.52Gamma	TST (PPD-RT23) sensitivity in PLH	0.61	0.5	0.86	Beta	25			
Diakintest sensitivity in PI.H0.610.500.86leta9'Diakintest specificity in PLH0.310.860.90Reta7'EC kin test sensitivity in PLH0.810.800.80Reta8''QTF-Plus sensitivity in PLH0.810.800.80Reta8''OPT-Plus sensitivity in PLH0.810.800.80Reta8''OPT-Plus sensitivity in PLH0.810.800.80Reta8''OPT-Plus sensitivity in PLH0.810.800.80Reta8''OPT-Plus specificity in PLH0.810.818''Rama8'''Costerinates (ID 2002)0.818'''RamaMOH/SIGTAPCosterinates (ID 2002)1.821.119.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal6.221.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChet radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smear6.221.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smear6.231.109.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smear6.241.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smear1.3406.702.10Gamma8''Total1.3406.702.11GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum smear1.3406.702.14GammaMOH/SIGTAPCost fospitalization4.281.646.702.14A'''Modei dout1.251.28 </td <td>TST (PPD-RT23) specificity in PLH</td> <td>0.59</td> <td>0.46</td> <td>0.82</td> <td>Beta</td> <td>15</td>	TST (PPD-RT23) specificity in PLH	0.59	0.46	0.82	Beta	15			
Diskintest specificity in PLH0.930.860.98Beta9EC kin test specificity in PLH0.510.860.86Beta27QFT-Phus specificity in PLH0.310.860.98Beta23.5QFT-Phus specificity in PLH0.310.860.98Beta23.5Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.040.0270Triangular23.6Cost estimation in 2020 USS)Cost estimation in 2020 USS606GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.243.131.59Cost estimation in 20.0MOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.243.119.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.243.119.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.442.026.66GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph1.441.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph1.441.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal1.406.702.11GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph1.441.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal1.406.702.11GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph1.441.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal1.441.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph1.441.54GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal1.441.54GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiogr	Diaskintest sensitivity in PLH	0.61	0.5	0.86	Beta	19			
EC skin test sensitivity in PLH0.610.510.86Beta??CG str test specificity in PLH0.510.860.98Beta??QFT-Plas sensitivity in PLH0.310.520.860.89Beta??Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plas0.040.010.77Triangular??Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plas0.040.010.77Triangular??Cot settimates (in 2020 USS)USSUSSUSSMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.203.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.213.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.420.216.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smear1.402.026.06Gamma@Total1.3406.702.01amma@Orug induced liver injury1.531.50Gamma@Torug induced liver injuryUSS1.50GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplex blood count4.321.6464.93GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal1.710.53S.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPConstra fibration4.321.26GammaMOH/SIGTAPConstro fibratization4.321.26GammaMOH/SIGTAPConstro fibratization1.321.26GammaMOH/SIGTAP<	Diaskintest specificity in PLH	0.93	0.86	0.98	Beta	16			
EC skin test specificity in PLH0.930.860.840.840.840.84QFT-Plus sensitivity in PLH0.610.600.60Beta8OPFrobility of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.440.600.7Triangular3Porbability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.440.7Triangular3Construction Carbon1.203.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPTest diagonsi6.213.119.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.213.149.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatter Strain6.223.149.31GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatter Stratement with DOT8.332.62.016.00Gamma2Total1.531.63.0Gamma26.0016.00Conscriptizization453.02.64.06.94.2GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPConscriptizization453.02.64.06.94.2GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdver and production1.700.61.2GammaMOH/SIGTAPConscriptizization42.001.20GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdver and production1.201.20GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdver and production1.201.20GammaMOH/SIGTAP	EC skin test sensitivity in PLH	0.61	0.5	0.86	Beta	27			
QFT-Plus sensitivity in PLM0.640.50.86Beta253QFT-Plus specificity in PLM0.930.860.98Beta36Probability of indetrminate QFT-Plus0.940.080.97Triangular37Protestitity of indetrminate QFT-Plus0.223.100.30GammaMOH/SIGTAPCost estimation6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph0.400.205.30GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph0.400.205.30GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph0.401.724.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph0.411.724.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatum snear3.141.724.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal1.3406.702.18Gamma0.60GammaTIBI treatment with DOP8.362.62128.05Gamma0.60Drug-inducel liver injury1.710.812.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet Bodo count2.521.283.44GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical viait6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdegraph4.28.01.28GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet Bodo count2.521.28GammaMOH/SIGTAPUser and the statistion4.22.11.28GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdegraph1.431.644.9.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdegraph </td <td>EC skin test specificity in PLH</td> <td>0.93</td> <td>0.86</td> <td>0.98</td> <td>Beta</td> <td>27</td>	EC skin test specificity in PLH	0.93	0.86	0.98	Beta	27			
QFT-Plus specificity in PLM0.930.860.98BetaPerbability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.040.000.77Triangular25Consentates (in 2020 USS)USTBI diagnosisUSTBI diagnosisUSTBI diagnosisOnto a 10.205.139.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPOnto a 10.205.1315.39Consumales (MOH/SIGTAP)Active TB diagnosisUSTBI diagnosisUSTBI diagnosisUSTBI diagnosisOnto a 10.402.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSpatian Sing colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPSpatian Sing colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPTotal14.00OpticationOpticationMOH/SIGTAPMOH/SIGTAPMOH/SIGTAPSpatian Sing colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPOpticationOpticationOpticationOpticationOpticationMOH/SIGTAP <td>QFT-Plus sensitivity in PLH</td> <td>0.61</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.86</td> <td>Beta</td> <td>25,26</td>	QFT-Plus sensitivity in PLH	0.61	0.5	0.86	Beta	25,26			
Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus0.040.010.07Triangular2 ³ Costeximates (in 2020 USS)UTEN constant constants (in 2020 USS)Unital medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4">Colspan="4">MOH/SIGTAPColspan="4">Colspan="4" <colspan="4">Colspan="4"</colspan="4">	QFT-Plus specificity in PLH	0.93	0.86	0.98	Beta	26			
Cost estimates (in 2020 USS)LTBI diagnosisInitial medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.265.1315.39International MOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.042.02GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.046.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.7020.1International9Constrained in yoonthis13.63426.82128.0.5Gamma0Ortagined in yoonthis13.63426.82128.0.5GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.88216.4464.9.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.88216.4464.9.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.88216.4464.9.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization423.8721.883.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.8821.6464.9.22GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.8821.6464.9.23GammaMOH/SIGTAP <td>Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>Triangular</td> <td>25</td>	Probability of indeterminate QFT-Plus	0.04	0.01	0.07	Triangular	25			
LTBI diagnosisLTBI diagnosisInitial medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph10.265.30CammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.265.30GammaMOH/SIGTAPActive TB diagnosis5.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.702.10Gamma%Turg-Inducedive injury10.703.010.0Gamma%Drug-inducedive injury5.25128.45GammaMOH/SIGTAPCost of hospitalization42.8816.4464.93GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPCongle blood count2.621.189.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPIvier enzymes1.710.585.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPGri-Plus1.710.6467.02ImageMOH/SIGTAPGymen source ¹⁰ 1.710.710.0GammaMOH/SIGTAPGupment1.710.710.72GammaMOH/SIGTAPGupment1.811.311.97GammaMarket valueGort-Plus1.811.311.97GammaMarket valueGupment2.121.84	Cost estimates (in 2020 US\$)								
Initial medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.265.1315.39Active TB diagnosis5.3015.39GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph6.023.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputun smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.702.01Active TB Treatment with DOTP853.63426.821280.45Gamma@Drug-induced liver injury53.5160.5GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPConsplet blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.68667.62Dial43.3721.6867.62Consplet blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet blood count2.501.311.93GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.6867.62Gorsplatization1.507.555.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet blood count2.541.895.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPGorsplatization1.311.311.97Gamma	LTBI diagnosis								
Chest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal10.265.1315.39Total10.265.1315.39Active TB diagnosis9.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPInitial medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smar3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.7020.1Active TB Treatment with DOP85.6342.62128.05Gamma@Drug-induced liver injury62.23.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPCost of hospitalization43.2821.6464.9.2GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPIdenarymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests2.541.845.43GammaMOH/SIGTAPQFT-plus1.811.311.90Gamma4.2Gurymenton1.071.60Gamma4.2QFT-Plus test kit1.611.811.311.9Gamma4.2Gurymenton1.071.60GammaMarket valueSkin test1.721.485.67Gamma4.2 <t< td=""><td>Initial medical visit</td><td>6.22</td><td>3.11</td><td>9.33</td><td>Gamma</td><td>MOH/SIGTAP</td></t<>	Initial medical visit	6.22	3.11	9.33	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Total10.265.1315.39InternationalActive TB diagnosisActive TB diagnosisUnital medical visit6.203.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum snear3.1401.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.702.01ImmaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.702.01Gamma0Active TB Treatment with DOP83.6326.82128.04Gamma0Drug-induced liver injuryUnitsGammaMOH/SIGTAPCost of hospitalization42.8221.4464.9.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes15.0312.843.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes12.8412.8464.932GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes15.907.565.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes12.9414.872.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes12.9414.812.54GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes12.9414.812.54GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes12.9412.846.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPIden carymes12.9412.846.13GammaMoH/SIGTAPIden cary	Chest radiograph	4.04	2.02	6.06	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Active TB diagnosisInitial medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.7020.1Active TB Treatment with DOP85.30426.821280.45Gamma69LTBI Treatment (9 months)10753.5160.5Gamma69Drug-induced liver injury649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.88216.44649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal443.3721.68667.62ImmaMOH/SIGTAPIngenostic tests2.241.482.54GammaMarket valueQFT-plus1.710.855.13GammaMarket valueQFT-plus test kit15.907.9523.85GammaMarket valueConsumables'1.811.311.97GammaMarket valueKin tests1.811.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.430.672.01GammaMarket valueConsumables'1.311.911.97GammaMarket value <td>Total</td> <td>10.26</td> <td>5.13</td> <td>15.39</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Total	10.26	5.13	15.39					
Initial medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPChest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.7020.1Camma0Total13.405.7020.1Famma0Active TB Treatment with DOT*83.63426.821280.45Gamma0LTBI Treatment (9 months)1075.30160.5Gamma0Drug-induced liver injury5.20GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.88216.44649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPJaganostic tests1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPOFT-plus1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPJuganostic tests1.710.752.543.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPOFT-plus test kit1.911.97Gamma3'3'Consumables'1.811.311.97Gamma4'Skin test1.711.60GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.721.842.54GammaMarket valueConsumables'1.811.311.97GammaMar	Active TB diagnosis								
Chest radiograph4.042.026.06GammaMOH/SIGTAPSputum smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.7020.1Gamma%Total853.63426.821280.45Gamma%LTBI Treatment with DOP853.63426.821280.45Gamma%Drug-induced liver injury6.223.50160.5GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.2821.686762GammaMOH/SIGTAPUser enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.686762CommaMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests5.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPSOFT-Plus5.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPMOH/SIGTAPIty enzymes1.241.482.54GammaMoH/SIGTAPQFT-Plus test kit15.907.952.385GammaMarke valueConsumables'1.811.311.97GammaMarke valueSkin test5.75GammaMarke valueMarke valueDiaskintest1.430.672.14GammaMarke valueDiaskintest1.430.67GammaMarke valueConsumables1.31	Initial medical visit	6.22	3.11	9.33	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Sputum smear3.141.574.71GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal13.406.7020.1ImmaImmaImmaActive TB Treatment with DOP853.63426.821280.45GammaImmaImmaLTB Treatment (9 months)1075.5160.5GammaImmaImmaDrug-induced liver injury5.5160.5GammaMOH/SIGTAPCosts of hospitalization432.88216.4649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit2.561.283.44GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.44GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal443.3721.6867.62ImmaMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests5.751.68GammaImmaQFT-Plus1.482.54GammaImmaImmaGonsmables'1.811.311.70GammaImmaQFT-Plus test kit1.811.482.54GammaImmaGonsumables'1.811.482.54GammaImmaGonsumables'1.411.811.81ImmaImmaPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.781.895.67GammaImmaGonsumables1.311.311.31GammaImmaEC6.003.009.00GammaImmaGonsumables1.311.31 <td< td=""><td>Chest radiograph</td><td>4.04</td><td>2.02</td><td>6.06</td><td>Gamma</td><td>MOH/SIGTAP</td></td<>	Chest radiograph	4.04	2.02	6.06	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Total13.406.7020.1InternationInternationActive TB Treatment with DOP853.63426.821280.45Gamma60LTB I Treatment (9 months)10753.5160.5Gamma53Drug-53.5160.5Gamma5353Drug-53.5160.5Gamma53Drug-53.5160.5GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.6867.62TornationMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests67.62TornationMOH/SIGTAPQFT-Plus1.812.54GammaMoH/SIGTAPGensumables'1.507.952.385GammaMarketalueGonsumables'1.811.311.97Gamma34Sin tests1.811.81GammaMarketalueDiaskintest1.321.482.54GammaMarketalueDiaskintest1.311.311.97GammaMarketalueDiaskintest1.311.311.97GammaMarketalueDiaskintest1.311.311.97GammaMarketalueDiaskintest1.311.311.97GammaMarketalue	Sputum smear	3.14	1.57	4.71	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Active TB Treatment with DOP853.63426.821280.45Gamma@LTBI Treatment (9 months)10753.50160.5Gamma\$3Drug-induced liver injuryCosts of hospitalization432.88216.44649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.700.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.700.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.700.81.70GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.700.81.60GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.700.81.60GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.708.64.80GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.708.67.80GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.708.67.80GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal0.81.702.16.80GammaMOH/SIGTAPPTPINS1.59.007.552.38.50GammaMarketvaleConsumables'1.81.001.97.00GammaMarketvaleGupinent1.61.701.60.70GammaMarketvalePD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.78.008.67GammaMarketvaleEquipment0.61.009.00GammaMarketvaleConsumables1.43.001.97GammaMarketvaleEquipment0.61.000.00Gamma<	Total	13.40	6.70	20.1					
ITBI Treatment (9 months)10753.5160.5GammastartDrug-induced liver injuryCosts of hospitalization432.88216.44649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplet blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.6867.62CommaMOH/SIGTAPDisposit cests2.441.8167.62CommaMOH/SIGTAPQFT-Plus1.432.44S.454GammaMorecomeQFT-Plus test kit15.907.952.355GammaMorecomeConsumables'1.811.91GammaMorecome34PD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml1.811.482.54GammaMaret valueGammantesources's1.121.485.47GammaMaret valueDiskintest1.131.97GammaMaret valuePD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.781.895.67GammaMaret valueGammantesources's1.140.67GammaMaret valueDiskintest1.311.97GammaMaret valueConsumables1.311.91GammaMaret valueTo react solution1.311.311.97GammaMaret valueDiskintest corts1.311.311.43GammaMaret valueTo react solution1	Active TB Treatment with DOT ^a	853.63	426.82	1280.45	Gamma	60			
Drug-induced liver injuryCosts of hospitalization432.88216.44649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal443.37216.89667.62IMOH/SIGTAPTotal443.37216.89667.62IMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests5.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPMOH/SIGTAPQFT-Plus5.141.812.54Gamma37QFT-Plus test kit15.907.9523.85Gamma41Consumables'1.811.311.97Gamma94Stirets1.811.97Gamma941.91Stirets1.811.91Gamma411.91PDP RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.781.895.67GammaMarket valueDiakinets1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97Gamma41Consumables1.311.311.97Gamma1.91Diakinets1.931.94GammaMarket valueDiakinets1.911.91GammaMarket valueDiakinets1.911.91GammaMarket valueDiakinets1.911.91GammaMarket valueDiakinets1.911.91 <td< td=""><td>LTBI Treatment (9 months)</td><td>107</td><td>53.5</td><td>160.5</td><td>Gamma</td><td>52</td></td<>	LTBI Treatment (9 months)	107	53.5	160.5	Gamma	52			
Costs of hospitalization432.88216.44649.32GammaMOH/SIGTAPMedical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.6867.62InternetMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests21.6867.62InternetMOH/SIGTAPGFT-Plus21.6867.62GammaMOH/SIGTAPQFT-Plus2.241.482.54GammaMoret valueGensumables'1.5907.9523.85GammaMoret valueGonsumables'1.811.311.97GammaMoret valueGuipment2.121.482.54GammaMoret valueStriets1.311.311.97GammaMoret valueJupmentsonces'2.121.482.54GammaMoret valueDiakinets1.211.482.54GammaMoret valueGuipment2.121.482.54GammaMoret valueDiakinet3.781.311.97GammaMoret valueDiakinet1.430.672.14GammaMoret valueDiakinet1.311.311.97GammaMoret valueDiakinet1.311.311.97GammaMoret valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMoret valueDi	Drug-induced liver injury								
Medical visit6.223.119.33GammaMOH/SIGTAPComplete blood count2.561.283.84GammaMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal44.3721.6867.62Image (Construction)MOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests51.30GammaMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic testsSeriesSeriesMOH/SIGTAPQFT-plusV51.4067.62GammaMotextapeDiagnostic testsMotextapeQFT-Plus test kit15.907.9523.85GammaMarket valueConsumables15.907.9523.85GammaMotextapeGuipment10.701.071.60Gamma4Ski tests1.071.071.60GammaMarket valueDiaskintest2.121.482.54GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.130.672.14GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.430.672.10GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueGuipment0.042.01GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest costs1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest costs1.311.311.43GammaM	Costs of hospitalization	432.88	216.44	649.32	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Complete blood count2.561.283.84GamanMOH/SIGTAPLiver enzymes1.710.855.13GamanMOH/SIGTAPTotal43.3721.6867.62GamanMOH/SIGTAPDiagnostic tests5.1367.62GamanSDQFT-plus2.241.482.54GamanMarket valueQGT-Plus test kit1.5907.952.385GamanMarket valueConsumables1.811.311.97GamanMarket valueGuipment1.071.071.60GamanMarket valueSkit tests1.211.482.54GamanMarket valuePD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.781.97GamanMarket valueDiakintest1.311.97GamanMarket valueConsumables1.311.97GamanMarket valueDiakintest1.430.672.10GamanMarket valueDiakintest1.311.311.97GamanMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GamanMarket valueDiakintest costs1.311.311.97GamanMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GamanMarket valueDiakintest costs1.311.311.97GamanMarket valueDiakintest costs1.311.311.97GamanMarket valueDiakintest costs1.311.311.34GamanMarket value <td>Medical visit</td> <td>6.22</td> <td>3.11</td> <td>9.33</td> <td>Gamma</td> <td>MOH/SIGTAP</td>	Medical visit	6.22	3.11	9.33	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Liver enzymes1.710.855.13GammaMOH/SIGTAPTotal443.3721.6867.62Diagnostic tests521.68667.62 </td <td>Complete blood count</td> <td>2.56</td> <td>1.28</td> <td>3.84</td> <td>Gamma</td> <td>MOH/SIGTAP</td>	Complete blood count	2.56	1.28	3.84	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Total443.37221.68667.62Indente termDiagnostic testsQFT-plusHuman resourcesb2.241.482.54Gamna37QFT-Plus test kit15.907.952.385GamnaMarket valueConsumablesc1.811.311.97Gamna34Equipment1.071.071.00Gamna34Skin tests1.121.482.54Gamna44PD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml2.121.482.54GamnaMarket valueDiakintest1.430.672.01GamnaMarket valueConsumables1.430.672.01GamnaMarket valueDiakintest1.311.311.97Gamna34Consumables0.043.009.00Gamna4Consumables0.311.311.97Gamna34Equipment0.441.311.97Gamna4Dovent Lett costs1.311.311.97Market valueTST PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml7.263.811.43GamnaMarket valueDiakintest4.812.467.36GamnaMarket valueDiakintest9.474.741.42GamnaMarket value	Liver enzymes	1.71	0.85	5.13	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP			
Diagnostic testsQFT-plusHuman resourcesb2.241.482.54Gamma37QFT-Plus test kit15.907.9523.85GammaMarket valueConsumablesc1.811.311.97Gamma4Equipment1.071.071.60Gamma34Skin tests1.482.54Gamma4PD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.781.895.67GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.430.672.01GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.430.672.01GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest costs1.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest costs1.311.97GammaMarket valueDiaskintest costs1.311.43GammaMarket valueDiaskintest4.812.467.36GammaMarket valueDiaskintest9.474.7414.22GammaMarket value	Total	443.37	221.68	667.62					
QFT-plus Human resources ^b 2.24 1.48 2.54 Gamma ³⁷ QFT-Plus test kit 15.90 7.95 23.85 Gamma Market value Consumables ^c 1.81 1.31 1.97 Gamma ³⁴ Equipment 1.07 1.07 1.60 Gamma ³⁴ Skin tests State	Diagnostic tests								
Human resources ^b 2.24 1.48 2.54 Gamma ³⁷ QFT-Plus test kit 15.90 7.95 23.85 Gamma Market value Consumables ^c 1.81 1.31 1.97 Gamma ³⁴ Equipment 1.07 1.07 1.60 Gamma ³⁴ Skin tests 1.22 1.48 2.54 Gamma ³⁴ PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml 2.12 1.48 2.54 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 3.78 1.89 5.67 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 1.43 0.67 2.01 Gamma Market value EC 6.00 3.00 9.00 Gamma Market value Gonsumables 1.31 1.31 1.97 Gamma Market value Overall diagnostic test costs 0.04 1.97 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 7.26 3.81 1.43 Gamma Market value Diask	QFT-plus								
QFT-Plus test kit 15.90 7.95 23.85 Gamma Market value Consumables' 1.81 1.31 1.97 Gamma 34 Equipment 1.07 1.07 1.60 Gamma 34 Skin tests	Human resources ^b	2.24	1.48	2.54	Gamma	37			
Consumables ^c 1.81 1.31 1.97 Gamma ³⁴ Equipment 1.07 1.07 1.60 Gamma ³⁴ Skin tests	QFT-Plus test kit	15.90	7.95	23.85	Gamma	Market value			
Equipment1.071.60Gamma34Skin testsHuman resourcesb2.121.482.54Gamma34PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml3.781.895.67GammaMarket valueDiaskintest1.430.672.01GammaMarket valueEC6.003.009.00GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97Gamma34Equipment0.04I1111Overall diagnostic test costs7.263.8111.43GammaMarket valueDiaskintest4.812.467.36GammaMarket value	Consumables ^c	1.81	1.31	1.97	Gamma	34			
Skin tests Human resources ^b 2.12 1.48 2.54 Gamma ³⁴ PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml 3.78 1.89 5.67 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 1.43 0.67 2.01 Gamma Market value EC 6.00 3.00 9.00 Gamma Market value Equipment 0.04 1.31 1.97 Gamma Market value Overall diagnostic test costs 5.26 S.81 1.43 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 0.42 2.42 S.81 1.97 Gamma Market value Equipment 0.04 1.31 1.97 Gamma Market value Overall diagnostic test costs 5.26 S.81 1.43 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 4.81 2.46 7.36 Gamma Market value	Equipment	1.07	1.07	1.60	Gamma	34			
Human resources ^b 2.12 1.48 2.54 Gamma ³⁴ PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml 3.78 1.89 5.67 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 1.43 0.67 2.01 Gamma Market value EC 6.00 3.00 9.00 Gamma Market value Consumables 1.31 1.31 1.97 Gamma 34 Qverall diagnostic test costs 0.04 2.01 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 7.26 3.81 1.43 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 4.81 2.46 7.36 Gamma Market value	Skin tests								
PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml 3.78 1.89 5.67 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 1.43 0.67 2.01 Gamma Market value EC 6.00 3.00 9.00 Gamma Market value Consumables 1.31 1.31 1.97 Gamma 34 Equipment 0.04 1.61 1.61 Gamma Market value Overall diagnostic test costs 5.26 3.81 1.43 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 7.26 3.81 1.43 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 4.81 2.46 7.36 Gamma Market value	Human resources ^b	2.12	1.48	2.54	Gamma	34			
Diaskintest1.430.672.01GammaMarket valueEC6.003.009.00GammaMarket valueConsumables1.311.311.97Gamma34Equipment0.0400100100Overall diagnostic test costs7.263.8111.43GammaMarket valueDiaskintest4.812.467.36GammaMarket valueEC skin test9.474.7414.22GammaMarket value	PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml	3.78	1.89	5.67	Gamma	Market value			
EC 6.00 3.00 9.00 Gamma Market value Consumables 1.31 1.31 1.97 Gamma ³⁴ Equipment 0.04 Image: Construction of the state stat	Diaskintest	1.43	0.67	2.01	Gamma	Market value			
Consumables 1.31 1.31 1.97 Gamma ³⁴ Equipment 0.04 I	EC	6.00	3.00	9.00	Gamma	Market value			
Equipment0.04Image: Constraint of the second	Consumables	1.31	1.31	1.97	Gamma	54			
Overall diagnostic test costsTST PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml7.263.8111.43GammaMarket valueDiaskintest4.812.467.36GammaMarket valueEC skin test9.474.7414.22GammaMarket value	Equipment	0.04							
TST PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml 7.26 3.81 11.43 Gamma Market value Diaskintest 4.81 2.46 7.36 Gamma Market value EC skin test 9.47 4.74 14.22 Gamma Market value	Overall diagnostic test costs		1	1	_				
Diaskintest4.812.467.36GammaMarket valueEC skin test9.474.7414.22GammaMarket value	TST PPD RT23 2UT/1.5 ml	7.26	3.81	11.43	Gamma	Market value			
EC skin test 9.47 4.74 14.22 Gamma Market value	Diaskintest	4.81	2.46	7.36	Gamma	Market value			
	EC skin test	9.47	4.74	14.22	Gamma	Market value			

		Range				
	Base-case	Low	High	PSA probability distribution	Source	
QFT-Plus	21.02	10.51	31.53	Gamma	Market value	
Cost of death ^d	365.8	216.44	650.59	Gamma	MOH/SIGTAP	
Discount rate	0.05	0	0.07	Triangular	22	
Utility scores						
Latent TB infection, no opportunistic infection	0.76	0.57	0.91	Beta	32-34	
HIV-infected, with active TB	0.62	0.45	0.75	Beta	32-34	
Drug-induced liver injury	0.25	0.125	0.375	Beta	32-34	
HIV-infected, recovered after TB treatment	0.76	0.38	1	Beta	32-34	

Table 1. Model parameters. *TB* tuberculosis; *PLH* people living with HIV; *TST* tuberculin skin test; *DILI* drug-induced liver injury; *QFT-Plus* QuantiFERON TB Gold Plus; *DOT* directly observed therapy; *MOH* Ministry of Health; *SIGTAP* table of procedures, medications, and orthotics, prosthetics, and special materials from the SUS; *PPD* purified protein derivative. ^aDOT costs based on of 5 weekly visits during the intensive phase (first 2 months) and twice weekly during the continuation phase (remaining 4 months). ^bNursing staff time (for TST only), laboratory technician time (for QFT-Plus only). ^cGloves, cotton, alcohol, syringes with needles, box for syringes, thermic box and ice bag. ^dCost of death by based on hospitalization costs for pulmonary diseases.

Strategy	Cost	Incremental cost	QALY	Incremental QALY	ICER	C/E
Diaskintest	884.70		8.386			105.50
EC skin test	886.60	1.90	8.386	0	(Undefined)	105.73
QFT-Plus	902.10	17.40	8.385	-0.00055	-31,415.80	107.59
TST PPD RT 23	925.50	40.80	8.356	-0.02967	-1,375.09	110.76

Table 2.Strategy rankings—all referencing common baseline (in US\$ 2020). QALY quality-adjusted life year,ICER incremental cost-effectiveness ratio, QFT-Plus QuantiFERON TB Gold Plus, TST tuberculin skin test,PPD RT 23 purified protein derivative, C/E cost effectiveness, US\$ US dollars.

The results of the univariate sensitivity analyses are summarized in Table 3 and shown in the tornado diagram (see Supplementary Fig. S1). The impact of drug-induced liver injury risk on the final outcomes was negligible, based on the results of the univariate sensitivity analysis. When compared only with the Diaskintest strategy, QFT-Plus was cost-effective 17.5% of the time, at a willingness to pay of US \$7544 (Fig. 4).

Discussion

This study compared the cost-effectiveness of newer, allegedly more specific skin tests (Diaskintest and EC) and an interferon-gamma release assay (QFT-Plus) against TST for the diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection in people living with HIV. The main finding is that the Diaskintest is cost saving. QFT-Plus was more costly and equally effective. The TST was dominated by all the other strategies, since it identifies more subjects as eligible for preventive treatment (false positive test results), a result of the low specificity of TST¹⁵. The resulting loss effectiveness is driven by reduction in QALYs of more subjects developing drug-induced liver injury overall. Despite the greater number of people TST identifies as eligible for treatment, it predicts the same number of progressors (highest number needed to treat) as all the other strategies. A similar Markov simulation study⁴⁰, performed in rheumatoid arthritis patients undergoing latent tuberculosis infection screening before starting tumor necrosis factor alpha antagonist therapy, found that in the base case analysis, QuantiFERON Gold In-Tube screening was less costly and more effective than the TST in populations regardless of BCG vaccination.

In the absence of a highly specific diagnostic test for latent tuberculosis infection in a population with a high risk of progression, safe and inexpensive treatment is necessary so that a larger proportion of tested people can accept and finish treatment. The choice of a low specificity for TST, however, might not be applicable to our setting, since it is based on a general misconception that BCG vaccination has a high impact on TST false positive results⁴¹. While this is true when subjects are vaccinated after 2 years of age, it is unlikely that a TST-positive test in a person living with HIV contact, BCG-vaccinated at birth, results from the vaccination rather than from latent tuberculosis infection. To account for this uncertainty in TST specificity, sensitivity analysis was performed with scenarios where TST had a higher specificity. The uncertainty surrounding other parameters, particularly modest differences in test costs and accuracy, coupled with the small incremental gains in QALYs, however, rendered the Diaskintest and EC skin tests as the favorable option. Additionally, when compared only with the Diaskintest, QFT-Plus was a cost-effective option 17.5% of the time in the Monte Carlo simulations (Fig. 3). Given the assumed similar sensitivity and specificity of the new tests, final effectiveness measures do not differences in modest incremental QALYs. In the sensitivity analyses, the main drivers of differences in



Figure 1. (**a**–**c**) Incremental cost effectiveness scatter plot of (**a**) Diaskintest vs. TST; (**b**) QFT-Plus vs. TST; (**c**) EC skin test vs. TST. Costs in 2020 US\$ and effectiveness in QALYs. The graphs show the scatter plot of the resulting incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of 10,000 Monte Carlo simulations for the different strategies compared with tubeculin skin test. The diagonal line represents the willingness to pay threshold of US \$7544. Values on the right lower quadrant are cost saving (less costly and more effective). The X-axis is scaled from -0.1 to 0.1 QALY and Y-axis from -100 to 100 US\$. *TST* tuberculin skin test, *QFT-Plus* QuantiFERON-TB Gold Plus.





.....

effectiveness between QFT-Plus and the skin tests were the probability of the patient returning for the skin test follow-up reading and the rate of indeterminate QFT-Plus results.

The modest incremental QALYs are common in cost-effectiveness analyses of strategies for the diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection⁴². This is usually a result of the high number of persons needed to treat to avoid one case of tuberculosis, compounded by the small loss in QALY due to tuberculosis treatment and the risk of drug-induced liver injury. Other cost-effectiveness studies of testing and treatment for latent tuberculosis infection using simulation models have estimated an incremental QALYs of 0.0010 for TST and 0.0017 for IGRA, when compared to no testing⁴².

A recent meta-analysis⁴³ has found that the incidence rate ratio of tuberculosis for people with a positive result versus negative result was 11-fold among people living with HIV, both for IGRA and TST. Given their similar predictive abilities, the adoption of latent tuberculosis infection diagnostic tests should consider other aspects, such as feasibility of adoption, costs with training, laboratory and clinical infrastructure needs, dependency on foreign suppliers for reagents and test kits, among others. Although the WHO recommends the treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in people living with HIV regardless of testing in resource-limited settings (WHO), the cost-effectiveness of this strategy was not included, since in Brazil testing is still recommended for those with a CD4⁺ cell count of 350 cells/µl or greater⁴⁴. Additionally, the main focus of this study was to compare different, novel diagnostic strategies to the standard diagnostic procedure. Therefore, the evaluation of inexpensive, more specific alternatives to TST, are welcome. Access to a reliable supply of newer, more specific recombinant skin tests requiring little infrastructure to implement could provide important alternatives to testing this high risk population. Given the limited number of studies on the accuracy and predictive value of the newer skin tests, it is reasonable to infer that their predictive value will be similar to IGRAs, based on what we know about tests that use ESAT-6 and CFP-10 antigens^{28,45}. Still, more validation studies and studies on their predictive ability are necessary, particularly in high risk populations. Also, at a national level, budget impact analysis and implementation studies are critical if scale-up and impact are to be considered²².

Although the Diaskintest was cost-saving over all other interventions, its net savings relies heavily on their final costs, which in turn is largely susceptible to fluctuations in exchange rates and optimization of supply chains for reagents. Aspects such as storage requirements, number of doses per vial and stability of reagents after opening the vials can have great impact on final test costs and, consequently, its cost-effectiveness. We considered the stability of newer recombinant reagents to be equal to that of PPD RT 23. Additionally, the incorporation of these tests into latent tuberculosis infection treatment programs could provide a stimulus for the local development of novel tuberculin skin tests and foster competition to supply regional demands. Another advantage over IGRAs is the lack of implementation costs, since it has been the standard practice in Brazil for years. The results of this study contrast with the results of previous studies in the Brazilian scenario^{36,37}, where TST was found to have lower costs when compared with QFT-GIT. The outcome considered, however, was the number of tuberculosis



Figure 3. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves (CEACs) of the different diagnostic strategies for latent tuberculosis infection. Cost effectiveness acceptability curves using the net-monetary benefit approach (10,000 Monte Carlo iterations) represent the probability (y-axis) that each strategy is more cost effective compared at the range of willingness to pay thresholds (US\$ per quality-adjusted life-year [QALY]) on the x-axis. The curve is generated by repeating the procedure for various thresholds, with the threshold on x-axis and the probability to be cost effective on y-axis. Acceptability curves are presented here taking into account direct costs only. *CEAC* cost-effectiveness acceptability curve, *QALY* quality-adjusted life year, *QFT-Plus* QuantiFERON TB Gold Plus, *TST* tuberculin skin test, *US\$* US dollars.

Variable description	Variable low	Base	Variable high	Impact	Low	High
Prevalence LTBI	0.11	0.22	0.33	Increase	2575.60	0
Probability of returning to TST reading	0.71	0.88	0.97	Increase	-2016.46	0
TST with PPD RT 23 specificity	0.72	0.59	0.91	Decrease	- 2256.90	-1428.58
Cost per Diaskintest	9.48	4.82	15.56	Increase	- 1218.05	-1013.16
Probability of starting LTBI treatment	0.55	0.82	0.95	Increase	-1480.34	-1345.55
Cost per TST with PPD RT 23	6.95	7.26	9.53	Decrease	- 1451.59	-1364.64
Diaskintest specificity	0.86	0.93	0.98	Increase	-1396.41	-1364.55

Table 3. Summary of univariate sensitivity analyses (TST with PPD RT 23 versus Diaskintest). *LTBI* latenttuberculosis infection, *TST* tuberculin skin test, *PPD RT 23* purified protein derivative.

.....

cases averted, and did not take into account the loss in QALYs due to additional patients undergoing latent tuberculosis infection treatment. Also, the time horizon considered was only 2 years, and the population had significantly lower risk of progressing to active disease, since they were not immunocompromised. Additionally, costs of IGRA test kits are significantly lower today than they were at the time of previous studies.

The use of QFT-Plus, however, provides some additional advantages. Given that it is also cost saving when compared with TST, if implemented along a structured HIV treatment program, the operational advantages could make it an attractive option. Among the well-established advantages of QFT-Plus are: (1) it does not require an additional visit for test reading; (2) it provides an objective result, eliminating the interrater variability of skin tests; and (3) it can be implemented along with other routine blood test collection (i.e. CD4⁺ cell count) among people living with HIV in antiretroviral treatment follow-up visits.

This study has a few limitations. First, it assumed that testing for latent tuberculosis infection in people living with HIV is already cost-effective when compared to no screening, so the cost-effectiveness of the alternate



Figure 4. Scatter plot of QFT-Plus versus Diaskintest incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) in costs (in 2020 US dollars [US\$]) per quality-adjusted life years (QALYs). This scatter plot shows 10,000 Monte Carlo iterations results of ICER of QFT-Plus versus Diaskintest. The diagonal line represents the willingness to pay threshold of US \$7544. The elliptical line represents the 95% confidence interval. Values on the left upper quadrant are dominated. Values on the right upper quadrant are most costly and more effective. Values to the left of the diagonal line are above the willingness to pay threshold value. *QFT-Plus* QuantiFERON TB Gold Plus.

strategy of tuberculosis symptom screening with no latent tuberculosis infection testing—as recommended by WHO—was not included. Previous studies have already established that targeted testing in this population^{36,46–48} is highly cost-effective in different settings. In addition, secondary tuberculosis transmission was not considered, due to the significant uncertainty that this variable can bring to the model when a 20-year time horizon is considered. Drug resistant tuberculosis strains were also not considered due to its modest prevalence in Brazil, despite the high treatment default rates⁴⁹. Utility values were derived from studies performed in different settings and sensitivity analyses were performed to account for this uncertainty. The generalization of the study to other countries is limited, since health system structure, financing and salaries as well as other important parameters such as latent tuberculosis prevalence and annual risk of infection are widely variable. Finally, not all spectrum of TB was considered (incipient and sub-clinical disease)⁵⁰, as there are currently no testing or treatment implications for other TB status.

One of the key strengths of the study is that it clearly shows that all the other strategies are dominant over the TST PPD RT 23 strategy, already shown to be cost-effective in this population^{37,47}. It is also the only study, as far as we know, that has considered the costs and effectiveness of newer recombinant skin test, along with QFT-Plus, compared to the traditional TST. Additionally, this study used QALYs as an outcome measure which can capture not only loss in quality of life due to adverse events during the treatment for latent tuberculosis infection, but also years of life gained. This study also considered parameters comparable to previous studies evaluating the cost utility of screening high-risk populations for latent tuberculosis infection⁴⁷. Finally, it provides additional alternatives to the QFT-Plus, namely the recombinant skin tests, which could combine the advantages of the traditional TST and the accuracy of QFT-Plus.

Health decision makers do not base their decisions exclusively on economic analyses. Other aspects, such as ease of implementation, equity, easy access to supplies and possibility of scale-up, are equally important.

Conclusion

While the Diaskintest was the dominant strategy, this conclusion is still based on several assumptions. In the Brazilian scenario, considering the current recommendations, using any of the newer skin tests (Diaskintest or EC) or QFT-Plus is cost saving when compared to TST. Having additional options for the diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection should contribute to eliminating the PPD RT 23 shortages, increase the competition among skin test manufacturers, decrease prices and foster innovation in latent tuberculosis infection diagnostics. However, additional studies, including budget impact analysis and implementation studies in Brazil, would be needed to recommend the incorporation of these new technologies.

Data availability

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article (and its "Supplementary Information" files).

Received: 20 June 2020; Accepted: 27 November 2020 Published online: 11 December 2020

References

- 1. World Health Organization. Global Tuberculosis Report 2020 (World Health Organization, Geneva, 2020).
- Dye, C., Glaziou, P., Floyd, K. & Raviglione, M. Prospects for tuberculosis elimination. Annu. Rev. Public Health 34, 271–286. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114431 (2013).
- Akolo, C., Adetifa, I., Shepperd, S. & Volmink, J. Treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in HIV infected persons. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000171.pub3 (2010).
- The TEMPRANO ANRS 12136 Study Group. A trial of early antiretrovirals and isoniazid preventive therapy in Africa. N. Engl. J. Med. 373, 808–822. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1507198 (2015).
- Gupta, R. K. et al. Discovery and validation of a personalized risk predictor for incident tuberculosis in low transmission settings. Nat. Med. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1076-0 (2020).
- 6. United Nations General Assembly. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 10 October 2018: Political declaration of the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on the fight against tuberculosis. A/RES/73/3. Available from: https://www.who. int/publications/m/item/political-declaration-of-the-un-general-assembly-high-level-meeting-on-the-fight-against-tuberculos is (2018). Accessed 4 December 2020.
- Alsdurf, H., Hill, P. C., Matteelli, A., Getahun, H. & Menzies, D. The cascade of care in diagnosis and treatment of latent tuberculosis infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 16, 1269–1278. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30216 -X (2016).
- 8. World Health Organization. Latent TB infection: Updated and consolidated guidelines for programmatic management (World Health Organization, Geneva, 2018).
- 9. Ministério da Saúde, Secretaria de Vigilância em Saúde, Departamento de Vigilância das Doenças Transmissíveis. Protocolo de vigilância da infecção latente pelo Mycobacterium tuberculosis no Brasil. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde, Secretaria de Vigilância em Saúde, Departamento de Vigilância das Doenças Transmissíveis (2018).
- Samandari, T. *et al.* Tuberculosis incidence after 36 months' isoniazid prophylaxis in HIV-infected adults in Botswana: A posttrial observational analysis. *AIDS* 29, 351–359. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0000000000535 (2015).
- Wilkinson, D. Drugs for preventing tuberculosis in HIV infected persons. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. https://doi. org/10.1002/14651858.CD000171 (2000).
- Rangaka, M. X. et al. Isoniazid plus antiretroviral therapy to prevent tuberculosis: A randomised double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 384, 682–690. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(14)60162-8 (2014).
- Ayele, H. T., Mourik, M. S., Debray, T. P. & Bonten, M. J. Isoniazid prophylactic therapy for the prevention of tuberculosis in HIV infected adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *PLoS ONE* 10, e0142290. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0142290 (2015).
- Nationwide Shortage of Tuberculin Skin Test Antigens. CDC recommendations for patient care and public health practice. MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 68, 552–553. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6824a4 (2019).
- Pai, M., Zwerling, A. & Menzies, D. Systematic review: T-cell-based assays for the diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection: An update. Ann. Intern. Med. 149, 177–184. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-149-3-200808050-00241 (2008).
- Guimaraes, R. Technological incorporation in the Unified Health System (SUS): The problem and ensuing challenges. *Cien. Saude. Colet.* 19, 4899–4908. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-812320141912.04642014 (2014).
- Chaisson, L. H. *et al.* CD4+ cell count stratification to guide tuberculosis preventive therapy for people living with HIV. *AIDS* 34, 139–147. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0000000002398 (2020).
- Kiselev, V. I. et al. [Clinical trials of the new skin test Diaskintest for the diagnosis of tuberculosis]. Probl. Tuberk. Bolezn. Legk. 11–16. Russian. (2009).
- Li, F. et al. Recombinant fusion ESAT6-CFP10 immunogen as a skin test reagent for tuberculosis diagnosis: An open-label, randomized, two-centre phase 2a clinical trial. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 22(889), e889–889.e816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2016.07.015 (2016).
- 20. Farhat, M., Greenaway, C., Pai, M. & Menzies, D. False-positive tuberculin skin tests: What is the absolute effect of BCG and non-tuberculous mycobacteria?. *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.* **10**, 1192–1204 (2006).
- Petruccioli, E. et al. Analytical evaluation of QuantiFERON-Plus and QuantiFERON-Gold In-tube assays in subjects with or without tuberculosis. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 106, 38–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2017.06.002 (2017).
- 22. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Ciência, Tecnologia e Insumos Estratégicos. Departamento de Ciência e Tecnologia. Diretrizes metodológicas : Diretriz de Avaliação Econômica/Ministério da Saúde, Secretaria de Ciência, Tecnologia e Insumos Estratégicos, Departamento de Ciência e Tecnologia, 2nd edn. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde. (2014).
- 23. La Mantoux, M. C. voie intradermique en tuberculinothérapie. Presse Med. 20, 146-148 (1912).
- QIAGEN. QuantiFERON*-TB Gold Plus (QFT*-Plus) ELISA Package Insert Rev. 01. April 2019. Available from: https://www.quant iferon.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/L1083163-R06-QF-TB-Gold-Plus-ELISA-IFU-CE.pdf. Accessed 4 December 2020.
- Cattamanchi, A. *et al.* Interferon-gamma release assays for the diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection in HIV-infected individuals: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr.* 56, 230–238. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e3182 0b07ab (2011).
- Sotgiu, G. *et al.* QuantiFERON TB Gold Plus for the diagnosis of tuberculosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J. Infect. 79, 444–453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2019.08.018 (2019).
- Nikitina, I. Y. *et al.* Comparative performance of QuantiFERON-TB Gold versus skin test with tuberculosis recombinant allergen (Diaskintest) among patients with suspected pulmonary tuberculosis in Russia. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 86, 18–24. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ijid.2019.06.014 (2019).
- Krutikov, M. et al. 51st World Conference on Lung Health of the International Union against tuberculosis and lung disease. Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis. Virtual. Event. 24, S249-250 (2020).
- 29. Guo, N. et al. Health state utilities in latent and active tuberculosis. Value Health 11, 1154–1161. https://doi.org/10.111 1/j.1524-4733.2008.00355.x (2008).
- Awan, M. S., Waqas, M., Aslam, M. A. & Sarwar, M. Measurement of SF-6D utility among patients with active tuberculosis. *Glob. J. Health Sci.* https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v3n1p203 (2011).
- Dowdy, D. W. *et al.* Quality of life among people treated for tuberculosis and human immunodeficiency virus in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis.* 17, 345–347. https://doi.org/10.5588/ijtld.12.0123 (2013).
- Bell, J. C., Rose, D. N. & Sacks, H. S. Tuberculosis preventive therapy for HIV-infected people in sub-Saharan Africa is cost-effective. AIDS 13, 1549–1556. https://doi.org/10.1097/00002030-199908200-00016 (1999).

- Holtgrave, D. R. & Pinkerton, S. D. Updates of cost of illness and quality of life estimates for use in economic evaluations of HIV prevention programs. J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr. Hum. Retrovirol. 16, 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1097/00042560-199709010-00009 (1997).
- Rose, D. N. Short-course prophylaxis against tuberculosis in HIV-infected persons. A decision and cost-effectiveness analysis. Ann. Intern. Med. 129, 779–786. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-129-10-199811150-00005 (1998).
- 35. da Silva Escada, R. O. *et al.* Mortality in patients with HIV-1 and tuberculosis co-infection in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil—Associated factors and causes of death. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 17, 373. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-017-2473-y (2017).
- Loureiro, R. B. *et al.* Cost-effectiveness of QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube versus tuberculin skin test for diagnosis and treatment of Latent Tuberculosis Infection in primary health care workers in Brazil. *PLoS ONE* 14, e0225197. https://doi.org/10.1371/journ al.pone.0225197 (2019).
- Steffen, R. E. et al. Cost-effectiveness of Quantiferon(R)-TB Gold-in-Tube versus tuberculin skin testing for contact screening and treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in Brazil. PLoS ONE 8, e59546. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059546 (2013).
- Turner, H. C., Lauer, J. A., Tran, B. X., Teerawattananon, Y. & Jit, M. Adjusting for inflation and currency changes within health economic studies. *Value Health* 22, 1026–1032. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2019.03.021 (2019).
- Woods, B., Revill, P., Sculpher, M. & Claxton, K. Country-level cost-effectiveness thresholds: Initial estimates and the need for further research. Value Health 19, 929–935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.02.017 (2016).
- Kowada, A. Cost effectiveness of interferon-gamma release assay for tuberculosis screening of rheumatoid arthritis patients prior to initiation of tumor necrosis factor-alpha antagonist therapy. *Mol. Diagn. Ther.* 14, 367–373. https://doi.org/10.2165/11586190-000000000-00000 (2010).
- Menzies, D. What does tuberculin reactivity after bacille Calmette-Guerin vaccination tell us?. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 31(Suppl 3), S71-74. https://doi.org/10.1086/314075 (2000).
- Tasillo, A. *et al.* Cost-effectiveness of testing and treatment for latent tuberculosis infection in residents born outside the United States with and without medical comorbidities in a simulation model. *JAMA Intern. Med.* 177, 1755–1764. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jamainternmed.2017.3941 (2017).
- Campbell, J. R., Winters, N. & Menzies, D. Absolute risk of tuberculosis among untreated populations with a positive tuberculin skin test or interferon-gamma release assay result: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 368, m549. https://doi.org/10.1136/ bmj.m549 (2020).
- 44. Brasil. Presidência da República. Decreto no 7.646, de 21 de dezembro de 2011. Dispõe sobre a Comissão Nacional de Incorporação de Tecnologias no Sistema Único de Saúde e sobre o processo administrativo para incorporação, exclusão e alteração de tecnologias em saúde pelo Sistema Único de Saúde. Diário Oficial da União. Seção 1. 22/12/2011. p. 3. Available from: http://www.planalto.gov.br/CCIVIL_03/_Ato2011-2014/2011/Decreto/D7646.htm (2011). Accessed on 11 November 2020.
- 45. Pai, M. & Sotgiu, G. Diagnostics for latent TB infection: Incremental, not transformative progress. *Eur. Respir. J.* 47, 704–706. https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01910-2015 (2016).
- Burgos, J. L. et al. Targeted screening and treatment for latent tuberculosis infection using QuantiFERON-TB Gold is cost-effective in Mexico. Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis. 13, 962–968 (2009).
- Campbell, J. R., Sasitharan, T. & Marra, F. A systematic review of studies evaluating the cost utility of screening high-risk populations for latent tuberculosis infection. *Appl. Health Econ. Health Policy* 13, 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-015-0183-4 (2015).
- Shrestha, R. K. et al. Cost-utility of tuberculosis prevention among HIV-infected adults in Kampala, Uganda. Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis. 11, 747–754 (2007).
- Bastos, M. L. *et al.* Treatment outcomes of MDR-tuberculosis patients in Brazil: A retrospective cohort analysis. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 17, 718. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-017-2810-1 (2017).
- Drain, P. K. et al. Incipient and subclinical tuberculosis: A clinical review of early stages and progression of infection. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00021-18 (2018).
- de Perio, M. A., Tsevat, J., Roselle, G. A., Kralovic, S. M. & Eckman, M. H. Cost-effectiveness of interferon gamma release assays vs tuberculin skin tests in health care workers. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 169, 179–187. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2008.524 (2009).
- Azadi, M. et al. Cost-effectiveness of tuberculosis screening and isoniazid treatment in the TB/HIV in Rio (THRio) Study. Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis. 18, 1443–1448. https://doi.org/10.5588/ijtld.14.0108 (2014).
- Golub, J. E. *et al.* Long-term protection from isoniazid preventive therapy for tuberculosis in HIV-infected patients in a mediumburden tuberculosis setting: the TB/HIV in Rio (THRio) study. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 60, 639–645. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu849 (2015).
- Menzies, D. et al. Four months of rifampin or nine months of isoniazid for latent tuberculosis in adults. N. Engl. J. Med. 379, 440–453. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1714283 (2018).
- Ronald, L. A. et al. Treatment with isoniazid or rifampin for latent tuberculosis infection: Population-based study of hepatotoxicity, completion and costs. Eur. Respir. J. https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.02048-2019 (2020).
- Comstock, G. W. How much isoniazid is needed for prevention of tuberculosis among immunocompetent adults?. Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis. 3, 847–850 (1999).
- International Union Against Tuberculosis Committee on Prophylaxis. Efficacy of various durations of isoniazid preventive therapy for tuberculosis: Five years of follow-up in the IUAT trial. Bull. World Health Organ. 60, 555–564 (1982).
- Kopanoff, D. E., Snider, D. E. Jr. & Caras, G. J. Isoniazid-related hepatitis: A US Public Health Service cooperative surveillance study. Am. Rev. Respir. Dis. 117, 991–1001. https://doi.org/10.1164/arrd.1978.117.6.991 (1978).
- Linas, B. P., Wong, A. Y., Freedberg, K. A. & Horsburgh, C. R. Jr. Priorities for screening and treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in the United States. Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 184, 590–601. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201101-0181OC (2011).
- Steffen, R. *et al.* Patients' costs and cost-effectiveness of tuberculosis treatment in DOTS and non-DOTS facilities in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *PLoS ONE* 5, e14014. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0014014 (2010).

Author contributions

All authors made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the study. R.E.S., A.T., and M.P. were responsible for the acquisition of data. R.E.S. and M.P. were responsible for the analysis and R.E.S., M.P., and A.T. for interpretation of results. All authors reviewed the final draft of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-78737-w.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to R.E.S.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2020