# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

**Open Access** 



# Treatment outcomes and factors affecting unsuccessful outcome among new pulmonary smear positive and negative tuberculosis patients in Anqing, China: a retrospective study

Yufeng Wen<sup>1\*†</sup>, Zhiping Zhang<sup>2†</sup>, Xianxiang Li<sup>2</sup>, Dan Xia<sup>1</sup>, Jun Ma<sup>1</sup>, Yuanyuan Dong<sup>1</sup> and Xinwei Zhang<sup>1</sup>

# Abstract

**Background:** Monitoring the treatment outcomes of tuberculosis and determining the specific factors associated with unsuccessful treatment outcome are essential to evaluate the effectiveness of tuberculosis control program. This study aimed to assess treatment outcomes and explore the factors associated with unsuccessful outcomes among new pulmonary smear positive and negative tuberculosis patients in Anqing, China.

**Methods:** A nine-year retrospective study was conducted using data from Anqing Center for Diseases Prevention and Control. New pulmonary tuberculosis patients treated with two six-month regimens were investigated. Non-conditional logistic regression was performed to calculate odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for factors associated with unsuccessful outcomes.

**Results:** Among 22,998 registered patients (16,939 males, 6059 females), 64.54% were smear-positive patients. The treatment success rates was 95.02% for smear-positive patients and 95.00% for smear-negative patients. Characteristics associated with an higher risk of unsuccessful treatment among smear-positive patients included aged above 35 years, treatment management model of self-medication, full-course management and supervision in intensive phase, unchecked chest X-ray, cavity in chest X-ray, and miliary shadow in chest X-ray, while normal X-ray was negative factor. Unsuccessful treatment among smear-negative patients was significantly associated with age over 45 years, treatment management model of full-course management, unchecked chest X-ray, presence of miliary shadow in chest X-ray and delay over 51 days.

**Conclusions:** Tuberculosis treatment in Anging area was successful and independent of treatment regimens. Special efforts are required for patients with unsuccessful outcomes.

Keywords: New pulmonary tuberculosis, Unsuccessful treatment outcomes, Retrospective study

\* Correspondence: wyf@wnmc.edu.cn; wyf2015w@sina.com

<sup>†</sup>Equal contributors

<sup>1</sup>School of Laboratory Medicine, Wannan Medical College, 22 West Wenchang Road, Wuhu, Anhui Province 241002, People's Republic of China Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s). 2018 **Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

# Background

Tuberculosis (TB) remains a serious public health problem across the world. Treatment outcome is an important indicator of TB control programs. Patients failed the TB treatment are more likely to develop acquired drug resistant tuberculosis (DR-TB) [1]. Therefore, it is important to understand the factors associated with poor treatment outcome of TB and take appropriate measures.

Factors contributing to poor treatment outcome of TB are likely to vary depending on the local settings of populations. Studies among Chinese TB patients found that patients who were younger, lacking of cavitation, complying with treatment, supervised by health workers, living at study site, having higher income and receiving home visiting service from health workers had higher treatment success rates [2, 3]. Previous reports emphasized that in Ethiopia, factors independently associated with increased risk of unsuccessful TB treatment outcome were older age, habitation in rural areas, lack of contact person, sputum smear negative treatment category at initiation of treatment, smear positive sputum test result at second month after initiation treatment, retreatment cases and HIV positive status [4–6]. In a study in European area showed that the risk of unsuccessful treatment was significantly higher among male patients of foreign origin and increasing age, who were multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) cases [7]. In addition, unemployment [8], longer duration of TB symptoms [9], lower educational level [10] and diabetes [11] were also risk factors for unsuccessful treatment outcome.

China is one of the world's 22 countries with the highest burden of TB. There were an estimated 918,000 people infected with TB in China in 2015 [12]. In addition, 6.6% of new cases and 30% of previously treated cases were MDR-TB in 2015, much higher than the global level [12]. The treatment success rates varied significantly from 74.5% in Shandong Province [2], to 88% in Guangzhou [3] and up to 94.3% in north-west China [13]. However, treatment outcomes for TB patients in Anhui Province, a high TB incidence region, have not been evaluated so far.

Two types of 6-month treatment regimens are available for new smear-positive and new smear-negative TB patients in China. Regimen 1  $(2H_3R_3Z_3E_3/4H_3R_3)$  is ethambutol (E), isoniazid (H), rifampicin (R) and pyrazinamide (Z) once-everyother-day for 2 months, followed by 4 months of once-everyother-day R and H. Regimen 2 (2HRZE/4HR) is daily E, H, R and Z for 2 months followed by 4 months of daily R and H. However, the impact of these two anti-TB regimens on treatment outcomes in Anhui Province has not been assessed.

Therefore, we conducted this study to assess the treatment outcomes of new pulmonary tuberculosis (PTB) patients and to explore factors associated with unsuccessful TB treatment outcomes among new pulmonary smear positive and negative tuberculosis patients in Anqing area, southwest Anhui Province.

# Methods

# Study area

Anqing area is situated at Southwest Anhui Province, covering 13.59 thousand square kilometers with a population of 5.32 million. In 2013, the rural population was 3.16 million and the per capita gross domestic product (GDP) was 26,657.89 RMB. Anqing area was selected not only for its high proportion of farming population and high TB prevalence but also because it is a typical rural area in Central China. Thus the results of this study can represent Central China to a significant extent.

## Study design and data collection

A retrospective study was conducted among new PTB patients who were registered at the Center for Diseases Prevention and Control (CDC) in Anqing city from 2005 to 2013. PTB patients were diagnosed on the basis of clinical manifestation, sputum smear and culture results, and radiological findings on chest X-ray. In our study, only new PTB cases aged 15 years-or-above who started standardized anti-TB treatment with regimen 1  $(2H_3R_3Z_3E_3/4H_3R_3)$  and regimen 2 (2HRZE/4HR) directly after registration were selected for analysis. After excluding patients below 15 years old, retreatment patients, patients with extra-pulmonary tuberculosis (EPTB) and patients not treated with regimen 1 and regimen 2, the final sample size was 22,998.

Data were collected from the national TB epidemic Reporting System of Anqing CDC. The characteristics and clinical data of patients included: age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, bacteriology results, chest X-ray findings, ways of discovering patients, treatment management models, onset of symptom (such as cough, expectoration, etc.), information on the first care-seeking visit at any health system (i.e., health centers, hospitals or TB treatment centers), the initiation of anti-tuberculosis treatment and treatment outcomes.

## **Operational definition**

According to the standard definitions of the Guidelines for Implementing the National Tuberculosis Control Program in China (2008) [14] and WHO guideline [12], the following clinical case and treatment outcome operational terms were used:

- New PTB patient. A patient never took anti-TB drugs, receiving irregular TB treatment for less than 1 month (excluding the use of anti-TB drugs due to other diseases).
- (2) Smear-positive PTB (PTB+). A patient with two positive direct smear microscopy results, or one positive direct smear microscopy result and one positive sputum culture for Mycobacterium tuberculosis (MTB), or one positive direct smear

microscopy result and radiographic abnormalities consistent with active PTB as determined by a clinician.

- (3) Smear-negative PTB (PTB-). A patient with three negative sputum smear results, chest imaging showing lesions of active PTB and one of the following: (a) suspected PTB symptom as cough, expectoration and hemoptysis; (b) strongly positive purified protein derivative (PPD) reaction; (c) positive anti-MTB antibody response; (d) lesions of TB confirmed by histopathological examination of extra-pulmonary tissues. In addition, a patient with positive sputum culture for MTB but negative sputum smear result is also a PTB- case.
- (4) Treatment outcomes

According to WHO guideline [12], treatment outcomes were categorized into: successful outcome (cured and completed treatment) and unsuccessful outcome (death, failure, defaulted and transferred out).

# Cured

PTB+ patients who have completed full course of treatment and have two consecutive negative smear results including one after completion of therapy.

### Completed treatment

PTB- patients who completed the prescribed course of treatment and have a negative sputum smear microscopy result or do not receive smear examination after completion of therapy; and PTB+ patients who completed the prescribed course of treatment, and do not receive smear examination after completion of therapy, but but the latest sputum smear result was negative.

# Death

PTB patients who died from any cause during treatment.

# Failure

PTB+ patients with positive sputum smear or culture results at month five or later during treatment; and PTB-patients with conversion to sputum smear positive during treatment.

### Defaulted

Patients whose treatments were interrupted for two consecutive months or more.

# Transferred out

Patients whose treatment results were unknown due to transfer to another health facility.

(5) Total delay: Total delay was defined as the time interval between the onset of any tuberculosis symptom and the initiation of anti-TB treatment.

# Statistical analysis

IBM SPSS for Windows Version 18.0 was used for statistical analyses. Data are presented with frequencies and percentages or median and interquartile range for sociodemographic, clinical characteristics and treatment outcomes. The proportions were compared using Chisquare. To evaluate the potential predictor variables of unsuccessful treatment outcome, we compared sociodemographic and clinical variables between the successful and unsuccessful treatment outcome groups, using univariate and multivariate logistic regression model. Variables with a *P*-value < 0.20 in the univariate analysis were included in the multivariate logistic regression model. In constructing regression model procedures, stepwise backward selection methods based on wald test were used to select statistically significant variables for unsuccessful treatment outcome, and the goodness of fit and collinearity of the model were tested with Hosmer-Lemeshow and Tolerance methods (without giving the results). The final multivariate logistic regression model included all the indicators of the significant variables by using the enter option in SPSS. P-value < 0.05 was taken as indicative of statistically significant difference.

# Results

# General characteristics of the study population

There were 25,014 PTB patients registered in Anqing CDC between 2005 and 2013. Among the 22,998 new PTB patients included in our study, 64.54% (14,842/22998) were PTB+ patients, 73.65% were males, and the median age was 51 years (interquartile range: 35–64). Most patients were farmers (76.12%) and treated with 2H3R3Z3E3/4H3R3 (76.45%). A majority of patients had abnormal X-ray manifestations (97.60%), and only 13.96% and 0.73% patients had cavity and miliary shadow in X-ray, respectively. There were significant differences in sex, age, occupation, X-ray, cavity and treatment regimen between PTB+ and PTB- patients (Table 1).

# Outcomes of treatment of the patients

The treatment success rate was not significantly different between PTB+ and PTB- patients (95.02% vs. 95.00%, P = 0.94) (Table 2). The nine-year trend in treatment success rate of PTB patients was steady (94.16% to 96.20%). The cure rate decreased markedly from 88.23% in 2005 to 36.10% in 2013, while completed treatment increased dramatically from 6.38% in 2005 to 58.41% in 2013. Generally, the rates of failure, death and transfers did not follow a definite pattern, but they presented falling tendencies. Moreover, the rate of default rose from 0.25% in 2005 to 2.27% in 2013. In addition, regimen 2 was used to treat PTB in 2008 and widely used since 2011 (Table 3).

Variables		Total ( <i>n</i> = 22,998)	PTB+ (n = 14,842)	PTB- (n = 8156)	$\chi^2$	Р
Sex	Female	6059 (26.35)	3793 (25.56)	2266 (27.78)	13.46	< 0.001
	Male	16,939 (73.65)	11,049 (74.44)	5890 (72.22)		
Age	15~ 24	3197 (13.90)	1960 (13.21)	1237 (15.17)	54.30	< 0.001
	25~ 34	2281 (9.92)	1567 (10.56)	714 (8.75)		
	35~ 44	3601 (15.66)	2412 (16.25)	1189 (14.58)		
	45~ 54	3615 (15.72)	2340 (15.77)	1275 (15.63)		
	55~ 65	5013(21.80)	3269 (22.03)	1744 (21.38)		
	≥65	5291 (23.01)	3294 (22.19)	1997 (24.49)		
Ethnicity	Han	22,960 (99.83)	14,819 (99.85)	8141 (99.82)	0.27	0.61
	Other	38 (0.17)	23 (0.15)	15 (0.18)		
Occupation	Student	1414 (6.15)	807 (5.44)	607 (7.44)	115.29	< 0.001
	Official staff	356 (1.55)	190 (1.28)	166 (2.04)		
	Service	437 (1.90)	277 (1.87)	160 (1.96)		
	Worker	1897 (8.25)	1214 (8.18)	683 (8.37)		
	Farmer	17,507 (76.12)	11,567 (77.93)	5940 (72.83)		
	Retired staff	433 (1.88)	261 (1.76)	172 (2.11)		
	Unemployment	338 (1.47)	198 (1.33)	140 (1.72)		
	Other	616 (2.68)	328 (2.21)	288 (3.53)		
X-Ray	Normal	408 (1.77)	286 (1.93)	122 (1.50)	14.35	< 0.001
	Abnormal	22,447 (97.60)	14,447 (97.34)	8000 (98.09)		
	Unchecked	143 (0.62)	109 (0.73)	34 (0.42)		
Cavity	Yes	3210 (13.96)	2527 (17.03)	683 (8.37)	328.07	< 0.001
	No	19,788 (86.04)	12,315 (82.97)	7473 (91.63)		
Miliary shadow	Yes	169 (0.73)	99 (0.67)	70 (0.86)	2.64	0.10
	No	22,829 (99.27)	14,743 (99.33)	8086 (99.14)		
Regimen	Regimen1 <sup>a</sup>	17,581 (76.45)	12,470 (84.02)	5111 (62.67)	1332.81	< 0.001
	Regimen 2 <sup>b</sup>	5417 (23.55)	2372 (15.98)	3045 (37.33)		

Table 1 Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of new pulmonary tuberculosis patients in Anging, China, 2005–2013 (n = 22,998)

PTB+: Smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients PTB-: Smear-negative pulmonary tuberculosis patients

<sup>a</sup>2H3R3Z3E3/4H3R3. R = rifampicin; H = isoniazid; Z = pyrazinamide; E = ethambutol. It means once-every-other-day HRZE for 2 months followed by 4 months of once-every-other-day HR <sup>b</sup>2HRZE/4HR. It means daily HRZE for 2 months followed by 4 months of daily HR.

Table 2 Treatment outcomes of new pulmonary tuberculosis patients registered for treatment between 2005 and 2013, An	qing,
China ( <i>n</i> = 22.998)	

Treatment outcome	Total (N = 22,998)	PTB+(N = 14,842)	PTB- (N = 8156)	x <sup>2</sup>	Р
Successful	21,851 (95.01)	14,103 (95.02)	7748 (95.00)	0.01	0.94
Cured	14,003 (60.89)	14,003 (94.35)	0		
Treatment completed	7848 (34.12)	100 (0.67)	7748 (95.00)		
Unsuccessful	1147 (4.99)	739 (4.98)	408 (5.00)		
Failure	126 (0.55)	108 (0.73)	18 (0.22)		
Death	157 (0.68)	111 (0.75)	46 (0.56)		
Default	330 (1.43)	189 (1.27)	141 (1.73)		
Transferred out	534 (2.32)	331 (2.23)	203 (2.49)		

PTB+: Smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients

PTB-: Smear-negative pulmonary tuberculosis patients

Variables	2005 (n = 1631)	2006 (n = 1576)	2007 (n = 1870)	2008 (n = 3267)	2009 ( <i>n</i> = 3134)	2010 ( <i>n</i> = 3499)	2011 (n = 2739)	2012 ( <i>n</i> = 2861)	2013 (n = 2421)
Successful	1543 (94.60)	1484 (94.16)	1799 (96.20)	3111 (95.22)	2992 (95.47)	3307 (94.51)	2619 (95.62)	2708 (94.65)	2288 (94.51)
Cured	1439 (88.23)	1255 (79.63)	1248 (66.74)	2350 (71.93)	2107 (67.23)	2106 (60.19)	1572 (57.39)	1052 (36.77)	874 (36.10)
Treatment completed	104 (6.38)	229 (14.53)	551 (29.47)	761 (23.29)	885 (28.24)	1201 (34.32)	1047 (38.23)	1656 (57.88)	1414 (58.41)
Unsuccessful	88 (5.40)	92 (5.84)	71 (3.80)	156 (4.78)	142 (4.53)	192 (5.49)	120 (4.38)	153 (5.35)	133 (5.49)
Failure	18 (1.10)	12 (0.76)	6 (0.32)	12 (0.37)	20 (0.64)	26 (0.74)	6 (0.22)	10 (0.35)	16 (0.66)
Death	22 (1.35)	14 (0.89)	14 (0.75)	18 (0.55)	16 (0.51)	21 (0.60)	18 (0.66)	18 (0.63)	16 (0.66)
Default	4 (0.25)	10 (0.63)	7 (0.37)	41 (1.25)	38 (1.21)	70 (2.00)	47 (1.72)	58 (2.03)	55 (2.27)
Transferred out	44 (2.70)	56 (3.55)	44 (2.35)	85 (2.60)	68 (2.17)	75 (2.14)	49 (1.79)	67 (2.34)	46 (1.90)
Regimens									
Regimen 1ª	1631	1576	1870	2864 (87.66)	3005 (95.88)	3448 (98.54)	1837 (67.07)	692 (24.19)	658 (27.18)
Regimen 2 <sup>b</sup>	0	0	0	403 (12.34)	129 (4.12)	51 (1.46)	902 (32.93)	2169 (75.81)	1763 (72.82)
Patients type									
PTB+	1526 (93.56)	1348 (85.53)	1 298 (69.41)	2488 (76.16)	2203 (70.29)	2252 (64.36)	1660 (60.61)	1128 (39.43)	939 (38.79)
PTB-	105 (6.44)	228 (14.47)	572 (30.59)	779 (23.84)	931 (29.71)	1247 (35.64)	1079 (39.39)	1733 (60.57)	1482 (61.21)
PTB+: Smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients PTB-: Smear-negative pulmonary tuberculosis patients	ary tuberculosis patie ary tuberculosis patie	ents ents							

# Multivariate analysis to identify independent factors associated with unsuccessful outcome

Based on a multivariate analysis, factors found to be associated with unsuccessful treatment outcome among PTB+ patients included age groups of 35-44 years (Odds ratio [OR] = 1.56, 95% Confidence interval [CI]: 1.00-2.42, *P* = 0.049); 45–54 years (OR = 2.12, 95% CI:1.38–2.60, *P* < 0.001); 55-64 years (OR = 2.32, 95% CI: 1.52-3.53, P <0.001) and 65 years-and-above (OR = 3.08, 95% CI: 2.03-4.68, P < 0.001). Others include treatment management model of self-medication (OR = 70.38, 95% CI: 12.97-381.85, P < 0.001), full-course management (OR = 16.45, 95% CI: 11.17–24.22, P < 0.001), and supervision in intensive phase (OR = 10.86, 95% CI: 7.91–14.91, *P* < 0.001); normal and unchecked chest X-ray (OR = 0.09, 95% CI: 0.01–0.63, *P* = 0.016 and OR = 2.70, 95%CI: 1.41–5.16, *P* = 0.003), cavity in chest X-ray (OR = 1.42, 95% CI: 1.18–1.73, P < 0.001), and miliary shadow in chest X-ray (OR = 3.39, 95% CI 1.87–6.13, P < 0.001) (Table 4).

Factors associated with unsuccessful treatment outcome among PTB- patients were age groups of 45–54 years (OR = 1.79, 95% CI: 1.04–3.09, P = 0.04) and 65 years-and-above (OR = 2.57, 95% CI: 1.52–4.35, P < 0.001). others are treatment management model of full-course management (OR = 2.54, 95% CI: 1.70–3.81, P < 0.001), unchecked chest X-ray (OR = 3.77, 95% CI: 1.50–9.45, P = 0.005), miliary shadow in chest X-ray (OR = 2.43, 95% CI: 1.12–5.25, P = 0.02) and delay of over 51 days (OR = 1.40, 95% CI: 1.06–1.85, P = 0.019) (Table 5).

# Discussion

In this retrospective study, we assessed treatment outcomes and the associated factors for unsuccessful treatment among new PTB patients between 2005 and 2013 in Anging area. Most patients (73.65%) were males, which was consistent with other studies in Southern Ethiopia [5], Uzbekistan [9]and Penang, Malaysia [10]. This finding also follows the epidemiological trend of TB in China [12, 15]. The reasons for the higher rates in males may be due to the differential susceptibility to TB caused by biological mechanisms, lower notification in females caused by socioeconomic and cultural barriers in accessing health services and higher risk of exposure to TB through social interactions in males [16]. In addition, 44.81% new PTB patients were aged above 55 years. This is different from the data in studies in Uzbekistan [8] and Southern Ethiopia [5] where most patients were in the productive age group (15–55 years). However, older patients in our study might make TB control more complex and difficult, because they had lower treatment success rates than younger patients [17].

The treatment success rate was 95.01% in our study, which is consistent with summarized treatment success rate of 93.9% among new TB cases in the mainland of

China [18] and data from studies elsewhere [13, 19–21]. Moreover, the treatment success rate obtained here is relatively higher than the values of 85.2% in southern Ethiopia [5]; 83% in Uzbekistan [8]; 78% in the European Union and European Economic Area [7] and 67.26% in Penang, Malaysia [10]. It is also higher than reported rates in other areas in China, in which treatment success rates ranging from 74.5% to 94.3% were reported [2, 3, 13, 22]. The comparably more successful treatment outcome reported in this study demonstrates the success and promising performance of TB control in the study area.

The unsuccessful treatment rate in this study was comparably lower than 14.8% in Southern Ethiopia [5] and 16.4% in Arsi Zone, Central Ethiopia [4]. The differences could be ascribed to the fact that we did not include EPTB patients and retreatment cases in our study. EPTB patients are more likely to have unsuccessful treatment outcome than PTB+ patients [5], and retreatment cases have much lower treatment success rate than PTB+ cases [4]. The transferred-out cases in this study comprised a major portion of the unsuccessful outcome, which is in agreement with findings in similar studies in western Ethiopia [23, 24]. Incidence of default, death and failure were significantly different from data from other researches in other parts of the world [5, 8, 10, 19, 24–26].

Trends in treatment success rate remained relatively stable over the nine-year period. However, the trend in default was significantly increased from 0.25% in 2005 to 2.27% in 2013. Therefore, specific measures are needed to improve treatment compliance among PTB patients in Anqing area. In addition, the proportion of PTB- patients increased over the period (from 6.44% in 2005 to 61.21% in 2013). Previous studies in San Francisco showed that a smear-negative TB patient contributed to 17% (95% CI: 12–24%) of TB transmission [27]. Thus more attention should be paid to PTB- patients and more efforts should be made to improve their treatment outcomes.

A deeper understanding of factors associated with unsuccessful treatment outcomes can lead to appreciation of appropriate interventions for reducing morbidity and mortality. The present study indicates that the risk of unsuccessful TB treatment increases with the increasing age among new TB patients (whether PTB+ or PTB-) aged above 45 years. This is supported by other reports [3, 4, 7, 28]. Unsuccessful treatment among older TB patients was mainly due to higher default rates and deaths [22]. Lefebvre et al. reported that advancing age was the most significant determinant of death among TB patients [29]. Furthermore, atypical clinical manifestations in older TB patients and other concomitant age-related diseases can affect the diagnosis of TB, leading to increased mortality among the elderly [30]. Therefore, specific strategies are needed to quickly address TB management among TB patients aged above 45 years in this study area.

Site         Differential         Differential <thdifferential< th="">         Differential</thdifferential<>	Variables		Total ( $n = 14,842$ )	Unsuccessful ( <i>n</i> = 739)	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
Forelis         373,65.56         177,46.7         1         1           1         15-44         100,17,44         6.25,5.09         1.09,092,1.30         0.30           1         15-44         160,10.36         49,131         1.09,092,1.30         0.30         1.31,0431           25-44         150,10.35         87,3.01         1.9,00.44,135         0.30         1.31,0432           55-44         240,177         113,4433         230,104,213         0.30         213,143,430           55-64         280,67,30         284,073         181,653         234,073,330         0.03         236,003,240           55         25-64         280,67,30         284,073         284,073         286,073         234,073,330         0.03         236,033,469           600         243         236,073         284,073         284,073         284,073,330         0.03         282,033,469           601         243         234,013         244,453         214,004,233         0.03         282,033,469           601         243         27,013         244,453         214,004,233         0.03         0.03         0.03         292,013,349           601         246,017         212,001         212,001					OR (95% CI)	Ρ	OR (95% CI)	Ρ
Mele         110-97 (344)         562 (50)         109 (92, 130)         0.30 $124$ 1960 (137)         45 (45)         19 (10, 212)         13 (10, 212) $234$ 247 (1050)         87 (51)         1-9 (10, 212)         0.32         15 (103, 211) $344$ 230 (137)         13 (433)         1-9 (10, 212)         0.32         15 (103, 211) $544$ 230 (157)         13 (433)         20 (137)         13 (433)         0.32         15 (103, 211) $564$ 230 (157)         13 (433)         20 (137)         13 (433)         0.32         15 (103, 211) $5-64$ 230 (127)         13 (433)         20 (137)         13 (433)         0.32         15 (103, 211) $5-64$ 230 (127)         13 (433)         20 (127)         13 (433)         20 (127)         13 (433) $5-64$ 230 (129)         13 (43)         20 (129)         13 (423)         20 (123)         15 (103, 213) $5-64$ 231 (12, 233)         1         20 (137)         13 (423)         20 (137)         20 (137) $5-64$ 231 (12, 233)         1         20 (137)         21 (13, 20, 230)         20 (13, 20) </td <td>Sex</td> <td>Female</td> <td>3793 (25.56)</td> <td>177 (4.67)</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Sex	Female	3793 (25.56)	177 (4.67)	-			
15-24 $1660(121)$ $66(24)$ $1$ $1$ $2-34$ $1567(056)$ $6(13)$ $129.086(133)$ $0.22$ $13(681,210)$ $25-44$ $2470(157)$ $1567(056)$ $87(54)$ $1490(02,13)$ $0.22$ $13(681,24)$ $55-64$ $2400(157)$ $1123(33)$ $2207(3,234)$ $0.02$ $121(03,24)$ $55-64$ $2304(121)$ $123(55)$ $2207(3,234)$ $0.02$ $121(03,24)$ $55-64$ $2304(21)9$ $2607(39)$ $2307(3,24)$ $0.03$ $230(20,468)$ $56-64$ $23013$ $0$ $230(12)$ $230(12)$ $230(20,468)$ $230(20,468)$ $1000000000000000000000000000000000000$		Male	11,049 (74.44)	562 (5.09)	1.09 (0.92, 1.30)	0.30		
3-34 $157$ ( $1056$ ) $63$ ( $13$ ) $129$ ( $106$ , $13$ ) $129$ ( $106$ , $13$ ) $123$ ( $108$ , $121$ ) $3-44$ $240$ ( $577$ ) $13$ ( $463$ ) $232$ ( $132$ , $323$ ) $0.03$ $156$ ( $100$ , $242$ ) $454$ $229$ ( $1577$ ) $113$ ( $433$ ) $220$ ( $137$ , $323$ ) $0.03$ $156$ ( $100$ , $242$ ) $5-64$ $229$ ( $125$ ) $220$ ( $127$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $123$ , $467$ ) $220$ ( $126$ , $230$ ) $167$ $600$ $230$ ( $123$ ) $0$ $1$ $120$ ( $126$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $126$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $137$ , $400$ ) $120$ ( $137$ , $400$ ) $120$ ( $137$ , $400$ ) $120$ ( $137$ , $400$ ) $120$ ( $137$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ ) $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ $120$ ( $127$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ , $230$ ,	Age	15~24	1960 (13.21)	48 (2.45)	1		_	
35-44 $247$ ( $16,25$ ) $87$ ( $361$ ) $196$ ( $106,213$ ) $156$ ( $100,243$ ) $45-54$ $2360$ ( $1577$ ) $113$ ( $483$ ) $223$ ( $173,239$ ) $200$ $212$ ( $133,360$ ) $55-64$ $2360$ ( $2203$ ) $182$ ( $557$ ) $233$ ( $173,239$ ) $200$ $232$ ( $233,460$ ) $266$ $230$ ( $129$ ) $260789$ $241$ ( $2.04,307$ ) $6000$ $223$ ( $123,333$ ) $266$ $230$ ( $139$ ) $260789$ $234$ ( $120,9465$ ) $2400$ $230$ ( $1230$ ) $223$ ( $123,346$ ) $148$ $1999885$ $739(499$ $6310$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $663$ $6233$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $663$ $6234$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $663$ $6637$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $667$ $6001$ $212$ ( $133,263$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6637$ $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $667$ $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,231$ ) $6001$ $121$ ( $104,21$ )		25~34	1567 (10.56)	49 (3.13)	1.29 (0.86, 1.93)	0.22	1.31 (0.81, 2.11)	0.28
45-54         2340 (577)         113 (483)         202 (143, 280)         212 (133, 360)           55-64         3289 (2203)         182 (557)         235 (170, 324)         <0001		35~44	2412 (16.25)	87 (3.61)	1.49 (1.04, 2.13)	0.03	1.56 (1.00, 2.42)	0.049
55-64         236 (2.03)         18 (5.7)         235 (7.0, 2.4)         6.001         222 (1.52, 3.53)           265         234 (2.19)         260 (7.8)         3.41 (2.50, 4.67)         <0.001		45~54	2340 (15.77)	113 (4.83)	2.02 (1.43, 2.85)	< 0.001	2.12 (1.38, 3.60)	< 0.001
265         3294 (2.1)(2.0)         260 (7.8)(2.0)         3.4 (1.2.0, 4.6)         < 0.001         3.08 (2.0.3, 4.6)           Han         (4.81)(9.985)         739 (4.99)         -         0.63         0.03         3.08 (2.0.4, 6.0)         3.08 (2.0, 2.0.0)         3.08 (2.0, 2.0.0)         3.08 (2.0, 2.0.0)         3.08 (2.0, 2.0.0)         3.00 (2.0)         3.00 (2.		55~64	3269 (22.03)	182 (5.57)	2.35 (1.70, 3.24)	< 0.001	2.32 (1.52, 3.53)	< 0.001
Han         (4819(958))         739 (499)          063           Other         23 (0.15)         0         1         6           Student         807 (5.44)         21 (2.60)         1         6           Other         190 (1.28)         6 (3.16)         1/2 (0.4) (3.0)         067           Student         190 (1.28)         6 (3.16)         1/2 (0.4) (2.0)         067           Service         11/5 (7.13)         9 (3.25)         1/2 (0.4) (2.0)         067           Vocket         11/5 (7.7) (3.10)         54 (4.45)         1/2 (0.4) (2.0)         063           Farmer         11/5 (7.7) (3.10)         16 (6.13)         2/4 (1.6, 2.3)         0.03           Unemployment         186 (3.3)         2/3 (1.6)         2/4 (1.6, 2.3)         0.03           Unemployment         196 (1.3)         2/4 (1.6, 2.3)         0.03         0.03           Unemployment         196 (3.3)         2/3 (3.6)         0.03         0.03           Unemployment         196 (3.3)         2/4 (3.5, 3.2)         0.03         0.03           Unemployment         196 (3.3)         2/4 (3.5, 3.2)         0.03         0.03           Unetotion         12 (0.73)         2/4 (3.5, 3.2)         0.03		≥65	3294 (22.19)	260 (7.89)	3.41 (2.50, 4.67)	< 0.001	3.08 (2.03, 4.68)	< 0.001
Other         23 (0.15)         0         1           Student         80' (5.44)         21 (2.60)         1           Student         80' (5.44)         21 (2.60)         1           Official stiff         90 (128)         6 (3.16)         1.22 (0.49, 30')         06'           Student         90 (128)         6 (3.16)         1.22 (0.49, 30')         06'           Service         277 (187)         9 (3.25)         1.24 (1.94, 29')         0.3           Notee         1.1 (56' (7793)         618 (5.34)         2.11 (1.36, 3.28)         0.00           Retired staff         261 (1.76)         16 (613)         2.44 (1.26, 4.76)         0.03           Unemployment         188 (1.33)         7 (3.54)         1.37 (0.53, 3.27)         0.48           Unemployment         188 (1.33)         7 (3.54)         0.37         0.46           Unemployment         188 (1.33)         7 (3.54)         0.37         0.46           Cloncat examination         112 (0.75)         8 (2.44)         0.37 (3.53, 3.21)         0.48           Retired staff         12 (1.76)         1.4 (3.57)         0.44         0.37           Cloncat examination         112 (0.75)         1 (1.64, 3.33)         0.46         0.46	Ethnicity	Han	14,819(99.85)	739 (4.99)	I	0.63		
Student $807$ (5.4) $21 (2.60)$ $1$ Öfficial saff $190 (1.28)$ $6 (3.16)$ $1.22 (0.43, 307)$ $0.67$ Service $277 (1.87)$ $9 (3.25)$ $1.26 (0.57, 27.8)$ $0.57$ Service $277 (1.87)$ $9 (3.25)$ $1.26 (0.57, 27.8)$ $0.57$ Worker $11.567 (77.93)$ $6 (8 (5.3)$ $1.26 (0.57, 27.8)$ $0.67$ Farmer $11.567 (77.93)$ $6 (8 (5.3)$ $2.11 (1.35, 3.28)$ $0.009$ Retired saff $26 (1.76)$ $16 (6.13)$ $2.44 (1.26, 47.6)$ $0.009$ Unemployment $1.98 (1.33)$ $7 (3.54)$ $0.44 (1.2.13)$ $0.87$ Health examination $112 (0.75)$ $4 (3.57)$ $1.37 (0.58, 3.27)$ $0.87$ Unemployment $1.98 (1.33)$ $7 (3.54)$ $0.94 (0.41, 2.13)$ $0.87$ Health examination $112 (0.75)$ $4 (3.57)$ $1.37 (0.58, 3.29)$ $0.68$ Clinic visit due to symptoms $67 (4.52)$ $2.94 (4.33)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Recaral $7137 (48.09)$ $370 (5.18)$ $1.24 (0.45, 3.33)$ $0.68$ Recaral $7137 (48.09)$ $370 (5.18)$ $1.24 (0.45, 3.33)$ $0.68$ Referal $7137 (48.09)$ $370 (5.18)$ $1.46 (0.54, 4.03)$ $0.68$ Referal $7137 (48.09)$ $370 (5.18)$ $1.46 (0.54, 4.03)$ $0.68$ Referal $7137 (48.09)$ $370 (5.18)$ $1.46 (0.55, 6.23, 2.34)$ $0.68$ Referal $7137 (48.09)$ $370 (5.18)$ $1.48 (0.54, 4.03)$ $0.68$ Referal </td <td></td> <td>Other</td> <td>23 (0.15)</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Other	23 (0.15)	0	-			
Official staff190 (1.28)6 (3.16)1.22 (0.49, 3.07)0 67Service $277 (187)$ 9 (3.25) $1.26 (0.57, 2.78)$ $0.57$ Service $277 (187)$ 9 (3.25) $1.74 (1.04, 2.91)$ $0.03$ Vorker $11,567 / 7793$ $618 (5.34)$ $2.11 (1.36, 3.28)$ $< 0.001$ Farmer $11,567 / 7793$ $618 (5.34)$ $2.11 (1.36, 3.28)$ $< 0.001$ Retired staff $261 (1.76)$ $16 (613)$ $2.44 (1.26, 4.76)$ $0.009$ Orher $3.28 (2.21)$ $8 (2.44)$ $0.94 (0.41, 2.13)$ $0.87$ Health examination $112 (0.75)$ $4 (3.57)$ $0.94 (0.41, 2.13)$ $0.87$ Contact examination $12 (0.08)$ $1 (8.33)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Contact examination $12 (0.08)$ $1 (8.33)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.41$ Cinic visit due to symptoms $671 (4525)$ $2.94 (4.38)$ $0.44$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370 (5.18)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Trachog $671 (4.52)$ $2.94 (4.38)$ $0.44$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370 (5.18)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.46$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370 (5.18)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370 (5.18)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370 (5.18)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370 (5.18)$ $2.46 (0.25, 2.3.94)$ $0.44$ Referal $713 (4809)$ $370$	Occupation	Student	807 (5.44)	21 (2.60)	-			
Service $277(187)$ $9(325)$ $1.26(057, 278)$ $0.57$ Worker $11/567(7793)$ $618(534)$ $1.7(104, 291)$ $0.03$ Farmer $11/567(7793)$ $618(534)$ $2.11(1.36, 328)$ $< 0.001$ Retired staff $261(1.76)$ $16(613)$ $2.44(1.26, 476)$ $0.009$ Unemployment $198(133)$ $7(354)$ $2.11(1.36, 328)$ $< 0.001$ Unemployment $198(133)$ $7(354)$ $1.37(0.58, 327)$ $0.48$ Other $2.38(2.1)$ $8(2.44)$ $0.94(0.41, 213)$ $0.87$ Heilth examination $112(0.79)$ $4(357)$ $1$ $1$ Contact examination $12(0.08)$ $1(8.33)$ $2.46(0.25, 23.94)$ $0.44$ Contact examination $12(0.08)$ $1(8.33)$ $2.46(0.57, 23.94)$ $0.44$ Feforal $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.45, 338)$ $0.68$ Recommended due to $204(1.37)$ $17(8.33)$ $0.44$ Tracing $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.45, 338)$ $0.68$ Referal $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.45, 338)$ $0.68$ Tracing $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.45, 338)$ $0.68$ Tracing $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.45, 338)$ $0.68$ Tracing $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.58, 37.70)$ $0.76$ Tracing $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.54, 338)$ $0.68$ Tracing $7137(48.09)$ $370(5.18)$ $1.24(0.87, 4.03)$ $0.76$ <tr< td=""><td></td><td>Official staff</td><td>190 (1.28)</td><td>6 (3.16)</td><td>1.22 (0.49, 3.07)</td><td>0.67</td><td></td><td></td></tr<>		Official staff	190 (1.28)	6 (3.16)	1.22 (0.49, 3.07)	0.67		
Worker         1214 (8.18)         54 (4.45)         1.74 (1.04, 2.91)         0.03           Farmer         11,567 (77.93)         618 (53.4)         2.11 (1.36, 3.28)         6.0001           Retired staff         261 (1.76)         16 (61.3)         2.44 (1.26, 4.76)         0.009           Nemployment         388 (1.33)         7 (3.54)         1.37 (0.58, 3.27)         0.48           Unemployment         388 (1.33)         7 (3.54)         0.34 (1.26, 4.76)         0.009           Other         388 (1.33)         7 (3.54)         1.37 (0.58, 3.27)         0.48           Other         328 (2.1)         8 (2.44)         0.94 (0.41, 2.13)         0.87           Contact examination         12 (0.05)         18 (3.33)         2.46 (0.5, 2.3.94)         0.48           Clinic visit due to symptoms         6716 (45.25)         2.94 (4.38)         0.44         0.44           Referal         1737 (48.09)         17 (8.33)         0.46         0.45         0.44           Nomployment         24 (1.05, 4.23)         0.44         0.44         0.44         0.44         0.44           Filler examination         12 (0.33)         17 (3.43)         1         1.44 (0.54, 4.03)         0.44         1.44           Renommended duet		Service	277 (1.87)	9 (3.25)	1.26 (0.57, 2.78)	0.57		
Farmer $11.567$ $17.53$ $618$ $3.34$ $2.11$ $(1.36, 3.28)$ $< 0001$ Retired staff $261$ $(7.79)$ $16$ $(5.13)$ $2.44$ $(1.26, 4.76)$ $0009$ Unemployment $198$ $(1.3)$ $7$ $7$ $2.44$ $(1.26, 4.76)$ $0.009$ Unemployment $198$ $(1.3)$ $7$ $7$ $2.44$ $(1.26, 4.76)$ $0.009$ Other $328$ $(2.21)$ $8$ $(2.44)$ $0.94$ $0.41$ $2.12$ Health examination $112$ $(0.75)$ $4$ $3.77$ $0.87$ $0.87$ Contact examination $12$ $(0.08)$ $1$ $3.72$ $0.87$ $0.87$ Clinic visit due to symptoms $6716$ $4357$ $1$ $1$ $2.46$ $0.25$ $0.44$ Referal $7137$ $18$ $2.46$ $0.81,748$ $0.11$ $1.78$ $0.14$ Referal $7137$ $17$ $2.34$ $0.86$ $0.72$ $0.89$ Referal $7137$ $17$ $2.46$ $0.81,748$ $0.11$ Tracing $677$ $2.46$ $0.81,748$ $0.11$ Referal $7137$ $17$ $1.78$ $0.86$ Tracing $677$ $1.7833$ $0.68$ $0.75$ Referal $7137$ $10$ $1.78$ $0.94$ Tracing $677$ $0.86$ $0.94$ $0.94$ Tracing $677$ $0.92$ $0.96$ $0.94$ Referal $7137$ $0.92$ $0.96$ $0.93$ Tracin		Worker	1214 (8.18)	54 (4.45)	1.74 (1.04, 2.91)	0.03		
Retired staff $261(1.76)$ $16(613)$ $2.44(1.26, 4.76)$ $0.009$ Unemployment $18(1.33)$ $7(3.54)$ $1.37(0.58, 3.27)$ $0.48$ Unemployment $18(1.33)$ $7(3.54)$ $1.37(0.58, 3.27)$ $0.48$ Other $328(2.21)$ $8(2.44)$ $0.94(0.41, 2.13)$ $0.87$ Health examination $112(0.75)$ $4(3.57)$ $1$ $0.24(0.41, 2.13)$ $0.87$ Contact examination $112(0.75)$ $4(3.57)$ $1$ $1$ $1$ Contact examination $12(0.08)$ $1(8.33)$ $2.46(0.25, 2.394)$ $0.44$ Ginic visit due to symptoms $6716(45.25)$ $294(438)$ $1.24(0.45, 3.38)$ $0.68$ Recommended due to $204(1.37)$ $17(8.33)$ $2.46(0.25, 2.394)$ $0.44$ Tracing $6716(45.25)$ $294(438)$ $1.24(0.45, 3.38)$ $0.68$ Reform $204(1.37)$ $17(8.33)$ $2.46(0.81, 7.48)$ $0.11$ Tracing $677(420)$ $370(518)$ $1.48(0.54, 4.03)$ $0.45$ Cher $24(0.16)$ $1(4.17)$ $1.17(0.13, 11.00)$ $0.89$ Cher $24(0.16)$ $1(4.17)$ $1.17(0.13, 11.00)$ $0.89$ Full-course supervision $14512(9778)$ $675003$ $6772(13.65, 33607)$ $2001$ Full-course supervision $14512(9778)$ $68(3400)$ $11.64(8.5, 1577)$ $0.001$ $10.703(12.97, 381.85)$ Full-course supervision $122(0.82)$ $6(3400)$ $11.64(8.5, 1577)$ $0.001$ $10.703(12.97, 381.85)$ Full-course supervision $122($		Farmer	11,567 (77.93)	618 (5.34)	2.11 (1.36, 3.28)	< 0.001		
Unemployment         198 (133)         7 (3.54)         1.37 (0.58, 3.27)         0.48           Other         328 (2.21)         8 (2.44)         0.94 (0.41, 2.13)         0.87           Health examination         112 (0.75)         4 (3.57)         1         0.44           Contact examination         112 (0.75)         4 (3.57)         1         0.44           Contact examination         12 (0.08)         1 (8.33)         2.46 (0.25, 23.94)         0.44           Clinic visit due to symptoms         6716 (45.25)         2.94 (4.38)         1.24 (0.45, 3.38)         0.68           Recommended due to         204 (1.37)         17 (8.33)         2.46 (0.81, 7.48)         0.11           Reformended due to         204 (1.37)         17 (8.33)         2.46 (0.81, 7.48)         0.11           Reformended due to         2.41 (1.37)         17 (8.33)         2.46 (0.81, 7.48)         0.11           Reformended due to         2.94 (1.37)         1.7 (8.33)         0.68         7.7           Reformended due to         2.37 (4.809)         3.70 (5.18)         0.44         7.34           Reformended due to         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         0.45         7.40 (0.85, 6.77)         0.11           Tracing         637 (4.29)         37		Retired staff	261 (1.76)	16 (6.13)	2.44 (1.26, 4.76)	0.009		
Other         328 (2.21)         8 (2.44)         0.94 (0.41, 2.13)         0.87           Health examination         112 (0.75)         4 (3.57)         1         2         0.44         2           Contact examination         12 (0.08)         1 (8.33)         2.46 (0.25, 23.94)         0.44         2           Cinic visit due to symptoms         6716 (45.25)         294 (4.38)         1.24 (0.45, 3.38)         0.68         2           Recommended due to         2.04 (1.37)         17 (8.33)         2.46 (0.81, 7.48)         0.11         2           Retral         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.78 (0.54, 4.03)         0.68         2           Retral         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45         2           Tracing         637 (4.29)         52 (8.16)         2.40 (0.85, 6.77)         0.10         0           Cher         24 (0.16)         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89         2         0.38 (12.97, 381.85)           Folf-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (7.50.03)         6 (7.51, 10.10)         0.89         1           Full-course supervision         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89         1         1           Full-cours		Unemployment	198 (1.33)	7 (3.54)	1.37 (0.58, 3.27)	0.48		
Health examination112 (0.75)4 (3.57)1Contact examination12 (0.08)1 (8.33)2.46 (0.25, 2.394)0.44Contact examination12 (0.08)1 (8.33)2.46 (0.35, 2.394)0.68Clinic visit due to symptoms6716 (45.25)294 (4.38)1.24 (0.45, 3.38)0.68Recommended due to204 (1.37)17 (8.33)2.46 (0.81, 7.48)0.11Symptoms7137 (48.09)370 (5.18)1.48 (0.54, 4.03)0.45Tracing637 (4.29)52 (816)2.40 (0.85, 6.77)0.10Other24 (0.16)1 (4.17)1.17 (0.13, 11.00)0.89Chedication8 (0.05)6 (7500)367.72 (13.65, 33607)<0.001		Other	328 (2.21)	8 (2.44)	0.94 (0.41, 2.13)	0.87		
Contact examination         12 (0.08)         1 (8.33)         246 (0.25, 23.94)         0.44           Clinic visit due to symptoms         671 (45.25)         294 (4.38)         1.24 (0.45, 3.38)         0.68           Recommended due to symptoms         204 (1.37)         17 (8.33)         246 (0.81, 7.48)         0.11           Referral         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45           Referral         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45           Tracing         637 (4.29)         52 (8.16)         2.46 (0.85, 6.77)         0.10           Other         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45           Inacing         637 (4.29)         52 (8.16)         2.46 (0.85, 6.77)         0.10           Other         24 (0.16)         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89           Antimanagement         Self-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (75.00)3         6 (72.0136, 33.607)         6.001         70.38 (12.97, 381.85)           Antimanagement         Self-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (75.003         6 (72.136, 33.607)         6.001         70.38 (12.97, 381.85)           Full-course supervision         14,512 (97.78)         615 (4.24)	Way of discovering patients	Health examination	112 (0.75)	4 (3.57)	-			
Clinic visit due to symptoms       6716 (45.25)       294 (4.38)       1.24 (0.45, 3.38)       0.68         Recommended due to       204 (1.37)       17 (8.33)       2.46 (0.81, 7.48)       0.11         Referral       7137 (48.09)       370 (5.18)       2.46 (0.81, 7.48)       0.11         Referral       7137 (48.09)       370 (5.18)       1.48 (0.54, 4.03)       0.45         Iracing       637 (4.29)       52 (8.16)       2.40 (0.85, 6.77)       0.10         Other       24 (0.16)       1 (4.17)       1.17 (0.13, 11.00)       0.89         Int management       Self-medication       8 (0.05)       6 (75.00)3       67.72 (13.65, 336.07)       <0.001		Contact examination	12 (0.08)	1 (8.33)	2.46 (0.25, 23.94)	0.44		
Recommended due to symptoms         204 (1.37)         17 (8.33)         2.46 (0.81, 7.48)         0.11           symptoms         Referal         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45           Referal         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45           Tracing         637 (4.29)         52 (8.16)         2.40 (0.85, 6.77)         0.10           Other         24 (0.16)         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89           Int management         Self-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (75.00)3         67.72 (13.65, 336.07)         0.001           Full-course supervision         14,512 (97.78)         615 (4.24)         1         1         1           Full-course supervision         14,512 (97.78)         615 (4.24)         1         1         1           Supervision in intensive         20 (1.35)         68 (34.00)         11.64(8.59, 12.77)         <0.001		Clinic visit due to symptoms	6716 (45.25)	294 (4.38)	1.24 (0.45, 3.38)	0.68		
Referal         7137 (48.09)         370 (5.18)         1.48 (0.54, 4.03)         0.45           Tracing         637 (4.29)         52 (8.16)         2.40 (0.85, 6.77)         0.10           Other         24 (0.16)         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89           Int management         Self-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (75.00)3         67.22 (13.65, 336.07)         7.038 (12.97, 381.85)           Full-course supervision         14,512 (97.78)         615 (4.24)         1         1         1           Full-course management         122 (0.82)         50 (4098)         15.59 (10.84, 22.71)         <0.001		Recommended due to symptoms	204 (1.37)	17 (8.33)	2.46 (0.81, 7.48)	0.11		
Tracing         637 (4.29)         52 (8.16)         2.40 (0.85, 6.77)         0.10           Other         24 (0.16)         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89           Int management         Self-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (75.00)3         67.72 (13.65, 336.07)         70.38 (12.97, 381.85)           Full-course supervision         14,512 (97.78)         615 (4.24)         1         1         1           Full-course management         122 (0.82)         50 (40.98)         15.69(10.84, 22.71)         < 0.001		Referral	7137 (48.09)	370 (5.18)	1.48 (0.54, 4.03)	0.45		
Other         24 (0.16)         1 (4.17)         1.17 (0.13, 11.00)         0.89           ant management         Self-medication         8 (0.05)         6 (75.00)3         67.72(13.65, 336.07)         < 0.001		Tracing	637 (4.29)	52 (8.16)	2.40 (0.85, 6.77)	0.10		
ant management     Self-medication     8 (0.05)     6 (75.00)3     67.72 (13.65, 336.07)     < 0.001     70.38 (12.97, 381.85)       Full-course supervision     14,512 (97.78)     615 (4.24)     1     1     1       Full-course management     122 (0.82)     50 (40.98)     15.69 (10.84, 22.71)     < 0.001		Other	24 (0.16)	1 (4.17)	1.17 (0.13, 11.00)	0.89		
Full-course supervision       14,512 (97.78)       615 (4.24)       1       1       1         Full-course management       122 (0.82)       50 (40.98)       15.69(10.84, 22.71)       < 0.001	Treatment management	Self-medication	8 (0.05)	6 (75.00)3	67.72(13.65, 336.07)	< 0.001	70.38 (12.97, 381.85)	< 0.001
urse management 122 (0.82) 50 (40.98) 15.69(10.84, 22.71) < 0.001 16.45 (11.17, 24.22) vision in intensive 200 (1.35) 68 (34.00) 11.64(8.59, 15.77) < 0.001 10.86 (7.91, 14.91)	models	Full-course supervision	14,512 (97.78)	615 (4.24)	-		<b>—</b>	
vision in intensive 200 (1.35) 68 (34.00) 11.64(8.59, 15.77) < 0.001 10.86 (7.91, 14.91)		Full-course management	122 (0.82)	50 (40.98)	15.69(10.84, 22.71)	< 0.001	16.45 (11.17, 24.22)	< 0.001
		Supervision in intensive phase	200 (1.35)	68 (34.00)	11.64(8.59, 15.77)	< 0.001	10.86 (7.91, 14.91)	< 0.001

Variables		Total ( $n = 14,842$ )	Unsuccessful ( <i>n</i> = 739)	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
				OR (95% CI)	Ρ	OR (95% CI)	Ρ
X-Ray	Normal	286 (1.93)	1 (0.35)	0.07(0.01, 0.47)	0.007	0.09 (0.01, 0.63)	0.016
	Abnormal	14,447 (97.34)	726 (5.03)	-		-	
	Unchecked	109 (0.73)	12 (11.01)	2.34(1.28, 4.28)	0.006	2. 70 (1.41, 5.16)	0.003
Cavity	Yes	2527 (17.03)	154 (6.09)	1.30 (1.08, 1.56)	0.005	1.42 (1.18, 1.73)	< 0.001
	No	12,315 (82.97)	585 (4.75)	-		-	
Miliary	Yes	99 (0.67)	14 (14.14)	3.18 (1.80, 5.63)	< 0.001	3.39 (1.87, 6.13)	< 0.001
	No	14,743 (99.33)	725 (4.92)	-		-	
Regimen	Regimen 1 <sup>a</sup>	12,470 (84.02)	610 (4.89)	-			
	Regimen 2 <sup>b</sup>	2372 (15.98)	129 (5.44)	1.12 (0.92, 1.36)	0.26		
Total delay	≤17	3965 (26.71)	181 (4.56)	-			
	17~33	3632 (24.47)	173 (4.76)	1.05 (0.85, 1.29)	0.68		
	33~66	3594 (24.22)	164 (4.56)	1.00 (0.81, 1.24)	> 0.99		
	> 66	3651 (24.60)	221 (6.05)	1.35 (1.10, 1.65)	0.004		

Ž V ž ž <sup>a</sup>2H3R3Z3E3/4H3R3. R = rifampicin; H = isoniazid; Z = pyrazinamide; E = ethambutol. <sup>b</sup>2HRZE/4HR. It means daily HRZE for 2 months followed by 4 months of daily HR

Variables		Total ( $n = 8156$ )	Unsuccessful outcomes	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
				OR (95% CI)	Ρ	OR (95% CI)	Ρ
Sex	Female	2266 (27.78)	112 (4.94)	-			
	Male	5890 (72.22)	296 (5.03)	1.02 (0.81, 1.27)	0.88		
Age	15~24	1237 (15.17)	36 (2.91)	<b>(</b>		-	
	25~ 34	714 (8.75)	28 (3.92)	1.36 (0.82, 2.25)	0.23	1.34 (0.73, 2.47)	0.34
	35~ 44	1189 (14.58)	43 (3.62)	1.25 (0.80, 1.96)	0.33	1.22(0.69, 2.16)	0.50
	45~ 54	1275 (15.63)	65 (5.10)	1.79 (1.18, 2.71)	< 0.001	1.79 (1.04, 3.09)	0.04
	55~64	1744 (21.38)	87 (4.99)	1.75 (1.18, 2.60)	< 0.001	1.59 (0.93, 2.74)	60.0
	≥65	1997 (24.49)	149 (7.46)	2.69 (1.86, 3.90)	< 0.001	2.57 (1.52, 4.35)	< 0.001
Ethnicity	Han	8141 (99.82)	407 (5.00)	0.74 (0.10, 5.62)	0.54		
	Other	15 (0.18)	1 (6.67)	_			
Occupation	Student	607 (7.44)	19 (3.13)	_			
	Official staff	166 (2.04)	12 (7.23)	2.41 (1.15, 5.08)	0.02		
	Service	160 (1.96)	6 (3.75)	1.21 (0.47, 3.07)	0.69		
	Worker	683 (8.37)	28 (4.10)	1.32 (0.73, 2.39)	0.36		
	Farmer	5940 (72.83)	321 (5.40)	1.77 (1.10, 2.83)	0.02		
	Retired staff	172 (2.11)	13 (7.56)	2.53 (1.22, 5.23)	0.01		
	Unemployment	140 (1.72)	4 (2.86)	0.91 (0.31, 2.72)	0.87		
	Other	388 (3.53)	5 (1.74)	0.55 (0.20, 1.48)	0.23		
Way of discovering	Health examination	165 (2.02)	5 (3.03)	<b>—</b>			
patients	Contact examination	40 (0.49)	2 (5.00)	1.68 (0.32, 9.01)	0.54		
	Clinic visit due to symptoms	3548 (43.50)	175 (4.93)	1.66 (0.67, 4.10)	0.27		
	Recommended due to symptoms	30 (0.37)	1 (3.33)	1.10 (0.12, 9.79)	0.93		
	Referral	3793 (46.51)	197 (5.19)	1.75 (0.71, 4.32)	0.22		
	Tracing	559 (6.85)	27 (4.83)	1.62 (0.62, 4.29)	0.33		
	Other	21 (0.26)	1 (4.76)	1.60 (0.18, 14.39)	0.68		
Treatment management	Self-medication	30 (0.37)	4 (13.33)	2.84 (0.96, 8.41)	0.06	2.95 (0.98, 8.90)	0.055
models	Full-course supervision	1049 (12.86)	54 (5.15)	-		-	
	Full-course management	513 (6.29)	59(11.50)	2.40 (1.63, 3.52)	< 0.001	2.54 (1.70, 3.81)	< 0.001
	Supervision in intensive phase	6564 (80.48)	291 (4.43)	0.86 (0.63, 1.15)	0.30	0.95 (0.70, 1.30)	0.76
X-Ray	Normal	122 (1.50)	0	I	I	< 0.01 (< 0.01, > 999.99)	0.96
	Abnormal	8000 (98.09)	402 (5.03)			_	
	Unchecked	34 (0.42)	6 (17.65)	4.00(1.67–10.00)	0.002	3.77 (1.50, 9.45)	0.005

56)	
china, 2005–2013 ( <i>n</i> = 81	
013	
2005-2013	
a, 200	
, China	
ر م	
nqir	
nts in A	
ents	
sis pati	
0	
ercul	
tube	
ative	
r-negati	
mear-I	
y smear-negative tubercu	
onar	
ul treatment outcomes among new pulmonary sr	
d Ma	
g ne	
mon	
es a	
com	
out	
nent	
eatr	
Ţ	
cess	
nsuc	
th u	
ă M	
ciate	
assoc	
Cors :	
Fact	ed)
le 5	tinue
Tabi	Con

Variables		Total ( $n = 8156$ )	Unsuccessful outcomes	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
				OR (95% CI)	Ρ	OR (95% CI)	Ρ
Cavity	Yes	683 (8.37)	32 (4.69)	0.93 (0.64, 1.34)	0.69		
	No	7473 (91.63)	376 (5.03)	F			
Miliary shadow	Yes	70 (0.86)	8 (11.43)	2.48 (1.18, 5.21)	0.02	2.43 (1.12, 5.25)	0.02
	No	8086 (99.14)	400 (4.95)	F		<b>—</b>	
Regimen	Regimen 1 <sup>a</sup>	5111 (62.67)	278 (5.44)	F			
	Regimen 2 <sup>b</sup>	3045 (37.33)	130 (4.27)	0.78 (0.63, 0.96)	0.02		
Total delay	≤13	2047 (25.10)	94 (4.59)	F		<b>—</b>	
	13~ 27	2054 (25.18)	80 (3.89)	0.84 (0.62, 1.14)	0.27	0.84 (0.62, 1.14)	0.27
	27~51	2046 (25.09)	100 (4.89)	1.07 (0.80, 1.43)	0.66	1.05(0.78, 1.41)	0.74
	> 51	2009 (24.63)	134 (6.67)	1.49 (1.13, 1.95)	0.004	1.40 (1.06, 1.85)	0.019

An inverse relationship between treatment success and delay in diagnosis and treatment of TB was observed in this study. This can be ascribed to the more serious complications, higher mortality [31] and MDR-TB [7, 32] caused by delay in diagnosis and treatment of TB. Measures must be taken to encourage TB patients to seek medical help as early as possible.

In addition, PTB patients with cavitations were 0.69 times less likely to have treatment success outcome than patients without cavitations [3]. This was corroborated among new PTB+ patients in this study. This can be attributed to cavitation associated with higher baseline sputum mycobacterial load [33]. Heavy initial bacillary load is associated with delay in smear conversion at the end of the intensive phase of TB treatment, and delay in smear conversion is independently associated with treatment failure and death [34]. Based on the results of this study, patients are encouraged to have X-ray examination and to pay more attention to abnormal chest X-ray manifestation, especially those having cavitations and miliary shadows.

One additional finding of our study was that PTB patients in treatment management model of full-course supervision and supervision in intensive phase had higher probability of treatment success. This is consistent with the study in China [22], which indicated that absence of a treatment observer was associated with unsuccessful outcome. It is also in conformity with the findings of a study in Brazil, which indicated that patients who did not receive directly observed therapy were more likely to default from anti-TB treatment, die of TB and have unknown treatment outcomes [35]. Our findings suggest that the treatment management model of supervision in intensive phase should be recommended for both new PTB+ and PTB- patients. Furthermore, unlike in other studies [7, 28], we could not find associations between males and unsuccessful treatment. In addition, no association was found between treatment regimens and treatment outcomes, which is inconsistent with the study in Nigeria [28] where 2RHZE/6EH treatment was a predictor of unsuccessful outcome in HIV negative TB patients.

Several limitations of this study must be considered. First, this study only investigated new PTB patients treated with two main regimens, so it cannot represent all TB patients in Anqing. Secondly, this study was conducted retrospectively, based on administrative data, which missed many socioeconomic data of the TB patients, such as lower educational level and lower income, which were reported to be risk factors of unsuccessful outcome [2, 10]. Thirdly, the database does not contain information on other potential factors such as compliance with treatment [3], sputum smear test result at second month after initiation treatment [6], duration of symptoms before treatment [9], co-morbidity [11], HIV status [4] and drug resistance status [7, 11], all of which are known to be associated with TB treatment outcomes. Furthermore, there was no information on patients' TB awareness, duration of the treatment, distance from the treatment centre, or medication side effect. These variables may also affect treatment outcomes. In addition, although there 2.32% TB patients were transferred out, but it maybe not a potential confounding factor to our results, because the rates were not significant different between two treatment regimens and two different TB patients types, and the trend of this rate is remained stable.

# Conclusions

The treatment outcome of new PTB patients in Anqing area was successful. Transfer-out cases were the major unsuccessful treatment outcomes of tuberculosis patients in the study area. The treatment success rate should be maintained, and measures must be taken to reduce barriers to the unsuccessful outcomes. Our study has provided useful insights on factors associated with unsuccessful treatment outcome. These specific populations should be monitored intensively.

### Abbreviations

CDC: Center for Diseases Prevention and Control; EMB: Ethambutol; GDP: Gross domestic product; HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus; INH: Isoniazid; LTBI: Latent tuberculosis infection; MDR-TB: Multidrug-resistant tuberculosis; MTB: Mycobacterium tuberculosis; PPD: Purified protein derivative; PTB: Pulmonary tuberculosis; PTB-: Smear-negative PTB; PTB +: Smear-positive PTB; PZA: Pyrazinamide; RMP: Rifampicin; TB: Tuberculosis; WHO: World Health Organization

### Acknowledgments

Not applicable

### Funding

This work was supported by the College Students' Scientific Research Fund of Wannan Medical College (grant number WK2014S28); University Student Innovative Entrepreneurship Training Project of Anhui Province (grant number 201410368067, 201510368036); Key Research and Development Program of Anhui Province of China (grant number 1704a0802154).

#### Availability of data and materials

The data that support the findings of this study are available from Tuberculosis Prevention and Control Department of Anqing Center for Disease Control and Prevention but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of Tuberculosis Prevention and Control Department of Anqing Center for Disease Control and Prevention.

### Authors' contributions

YF Wen designed the research. ZP Zhang, XX Li, D Xia participated in data collection and analysis and drafted the manuscript. J Ma, YY Dong, XW Zhang helped analyze data and manuscript development. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

# Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was received from the Medical Ethics Committee of Wannan Medical College. This study was based on data from national TB Epidemic Reporting System of Anqing CDC. Therefore, written informed consents from the participants were not required due to the anonymous nature of the data.

### Consent for publication

Not applicable.

#### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

# **Publisher's Note**

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

### Author details

<sup>1</sup>School of Laboratory Medicine, Wannan Medical College, 22 West Wenchang Road, Wuhu, Anhui Province 241002, People's Republic of China. <sup>2</sup>Tuberculosis Prevention and Control Department, Anging Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Anging City, Anhui Province 246003, People's Republic of China.

### Received: 22 November 2016 Accepted: 28 February 2018 Published online: 05 March 2018

### References

- Gao J, Ma Y, Du J, Zhu G, Tan S, Fu Y, et al. Later emergence of acquired drug resistance and its effect on treatment outcome in patients treated with standard short-course chemotherapy for tuberculosis. BMC Pulm Med. 2016;16(1):26.
- Xu L, Gai R, Wang X, Liu Z, Cheng J, Zhou C, et al. Socio-economic factors affecting the success of tuberculosis treatment in six counties of Shandong Province, China. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2010;14(4):440–6.
- Bao QS, Du YH, Lu CY. Treatment outcome of new pulmonary tuberculosis in Guangzhou, China 1993-2002: a register-based cohort study. BMC Public Health. 2007;7:344.
- Hamusse SD, Demissie M, Teshome D, Lindtjørn B. Fifteen-year trend in treatment outcomes among patients with pulmonary smear-positive tuberculosis and its determinants in Arsi zone, Central Ethiopia. Glob Health Action. 2014;7:25382.
- Gebrezgabiher G, Romha G, Ejeta E, Asebe G, Zemene E, Ameni G. Treatment outcome of tuberculosis patients under directly observed treatment short course and factors affecting outcome in southern Ethiopia: a five-year retrospective study. PLoS One. 2016;11(2):e0150560.
- Amante TD, Ahemed TA. Risk factors for unsuccessful tuberculosis treatment outcome (failure, default and death) in public health institutions, eastern Ethiopia. Pan Afr Med J. 2015;20:247.
- Karo B, Hauer B, Hollo V, van der Werf MJ, Fiebig L, Haas W. Tuberculosis treatment outcome in the European Union and European economic area: an analysis of surveillance data from 2002-2011. Euro Surveill. 2015;20(49).
- Gadoev J, Asadov D, Tillashaykhov M, Tayler-Smith K, Isaakidis P, Dadu A, et al. Factors associated with unfavorable treatment outcomes in new and previously treated TB patients in Uzbekistan: a five year countrywide study. PLoS One. 2015;10(6):e0128907.
- Kirenga BJ, Levin J, Ayakaka I, Worodria W, Reilly N, Mumbowa F, et al. Treatment outcomes of new tuberculosis patients hospitalized in Kampala, Uganda: a prospective cohort study. PLoS One. 2014;9(3):e90614.
- Atif M, Sulaiman SA, Shafie AA, Ali I, Asif M, Babar ZU. Treatment outcome of new smear positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients in Penang, Malaysia. BMC Infect Dis. 2014;14:399.
- Choi H, Lee M, Chen RY, Kim Y, Yoon S, Joh JS, et al. Predictors of pulmonary tuberculosis treatment outcomes in South Korea: a prospective cohort study, 2005-2012. BMC Infect Dis. 2014;14:360.
- 12. World Health Organization. Global tuberculosis report 2016. Available online: http://www.searo.who.int/tb/documents/global-tuberculosis-report-2016/en/. Accessed 21 Nov 2016.
- Wang X, Cai J, Wang D, Wang Q, Liang H, Ma A, et al. Registration and management of community patients with tuberculosis in north-West China. Public Health. 2015;129(12):1585–90.
- Department of Disease Control, Department of Medical Administration, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidelines for Implementing the National Tuberculosis Control Program in China (2008) (in Chinese).
- Wang L, Zhang H, Ruan Y, Chin DP, Xia Y, Cheng S, et al. Tuberculosis prevalence in China, 1990-2010; a longitudinal analysis of national survey data. Lancet. 2014;383(9934):2057–64.

- Neyrolles O, Quintana-Murci L. Sexual inequality in tuberculosis. PLoS Med. 2009;6(12):e1000199.
- Oshi DC, Oshi SN, Alobu I, Ukwaja KN. Profile and treatment outcomes of tuberculosis in the elderly in southeastern Nigeria, 2011-2012. PLoS One. 2014;9(11):e111910.
- Li X, Yang Y, Liu J, Zhou F, Cui W, Guan L, et al. Treatment outcomes of pulmonary tuberculosis in the past decade in the mainland of China: a meta-analysis. Front Med. 2013;7(3):354–66.
- Sengul A, Akturk UA, Aydemir Y, Kaya N, Kocak ND, Tasolar FT. Factors affecting successful treatment outcomes in pulmonary tuberculosis: a single-center experience in Turkey, 2005-2011. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2015;9(8): 821–8.
- Kwon YS, Kim YH, Song JU, Jeon K, Song J, Ryu YJ, et al. Risk factors for death during pulmonary tuberculosis treatment in Korea: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. J Korean Med Sci. 2014;29(9):1226–31.
- Jianzhao H, van den Hof S, Lin X, Yubang Q, Jinglong H, van der Werf MJ. Risk factors for non-cure among new sputum smear positive tuberculosis patients treated in tuberculosis dispensaries in Yunnan, China. BMC Health Serv Res. 2011;11:97.
- 22. Ai X, Men K, Guo L, Zhang T, Zhao Y, Sun X, et al. Factors associated with low cure rate of tuberculosis in remote poor areas of Shaanxi Province, China: a case control study. BMC Public Health. 2010;10:112.
- Getahun B, Ameni G, Medhin G, Biadgilign S. Treatment outcome of tuberculosis patients under directly observed treatment in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Braz J Infect Dis. 2013;17(5):521–8.
- Ejeta E, Chala M, Arega G, Ayalsew K, Tesfaye L, Birhanu T, et al. Outcome of tuberculosis patients under directly observed short course treatment in western Ethiopia. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2015;9(7):752–9.
- Endris M, Moges F, Belyhun Y, Woldehana E, Esmael A, Unakal C. Treatment outcome of tuberculosis patients at enfraz health center, Northwest Ethiopia: a five-year retrospective study. Tuberc Res Treat. 2014;2014:726193.
- 26. Sunday O, Oladimeji O, Ebenezer F, Akintunde B, Abiola TO, Saliu A, et al. Treatment outcome of tuberculosis patients registered at DOTS Centre in Ogbomoso, southwestern Nigeria: a 4-year retrospective study. Tuberc Res Treat. 2014;201705.
- 27. Behr MA, Warren SA, Salamon H, Hopewell PC. Ponce de Leon a, Daley CL, et al. transmission of mycobacterium tuberculosis from patients smearnegative for acid-fast bacilli. Lancet. 1999;353(9151):444–9.
- Ukwaja KN, Oshi SN, Alobu I, Oshi DC. Six- vs. eight-month anti-tuberculosis regimen for pulmonary tuberculosis under programme conditions. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2015;19(3):295–301. i-vii
- Lefebvre N, Falzon D. Risk factors for death among tuberculosis cases: analysis of European surveillance data. Eur Respir J. 2008;31(6):1256–60.
- Rajagopalan S. Tuberculosis and aging: a global health problem. Clin Infect Dis. 2001;33(7):1034–9.
- Ward HA, Marciniuk DD, Pahwa P, Hoeppner VH. Extent of pulmonary tuberculosis in patients diagnosed by active compared to passive case finding. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2004;8(5):593–7.
- Liang L, Wu Q, Gao L, Hao Y, Liu C, Xie Y, et al. Factors contributing to the high prevalence of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis: a study from China. Thorax. 2012;67(7):632–8.
- Perrin FM, Woodward N, Phillips PP, McHugh TD, Nunn AJ, Lipman MC, et al. Radiological cavitation, sputum mycobacterial load and treatment response in pulmonary tuberculosis. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2010;14(12):1596–602.
- Djouma FN, Noubom M, Ateudjieu J, Donfack H. Delay in sputum smear conversion and outcomes of smear-positive tuberculosis patients: a retrospective cohort study in Bafoussam, Cameroon. BMC Infect Dis. 2015;15:139.
- Reis-Santos B, Pellacani-Posses I, Macedo LR, Golub JE, Riley LW, Maciel EL. Directly observed therapy of tuberculosis in Brazil: associated determinants and impact on treatment outcome. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2015;19(10):1188–93.