Feasibility of a randomized clinical trial evaluating a community intervention for household tuberculosis child contact management in Cameroon and Uganda

Anca Vasiliu (✉ anca.vasiliu@ird.fr)

IRD: Institut de recherche pour le developpement <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5336-7859>

Georges Tiendrebeogo

IRD: Institut de recherche pour le developpement

Muhammed Mbunka Awolu

Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation

Cecilia Akatukwasa

Epicentre Research Center Mbarara

Boris Youngui Tchakounte

Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation

Bob Ssekyanzi

Epicentre Research Center Mbarara

Boris Kevin Tchounga

Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation

Daniel Atwine

Epicentre Research Center Mbarara

Martina Casenghi

Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation

Maryline Bonnet

IRD: Institut de recherche pour le developpement

CONTACT study group

IRD: Institut de recherche pour le developpement

Research Article

Keywords: pediatric tuberculosis, community intervention, tuberculosis preventive therapy, tuberculosis screening, active contact investigation, feasibility, acceptability, mixed methods, cluster randomized trial, complex intervention

Posted Date: October 22nd, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-970700/v1>

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Pilot and Feasibility Studies on February 11th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-022-00996-3>.

Abstract

Background

One of the main barriers of the management of household tuberculosis child contacts is the necessity for parents to bring healthy children to the facility. We assessed the feasibility of a community intervention for tuberculosis (TB) household child contact management and the conditions for its evaluation in a cluster randomized controlled trial in Cameroon and Uganda.

Methods

We assessed three dimensions of feasibility using a mixed method approach: (1) recruitment capability using retrospective aggregated data from facility registers; (2) acceptability of the intervention using focus group discussions with TB patients and in-depth interviews with healthcare providers and community leaders; and (3) adaptation, integration and resources of the intervention in existing TB services using a survey and discussions with stakeholders.

Results

Reaching the sample size is feasible in all clusters in 15 months with the condition of regrouping 2 facilities in the same cluster in Uganda due to decentralization of TB services. Community health worker (CHW) selection and training and simplified tools for contact screening, tolerability and adherence of preventive therapy were key elements for the implementation of the community intervention. Healthcare providers and patients found the intervention of child contact investigations and TB preventive treatment management in the household acceptable in both countries due to its benefits (competing priorities, transport cost) as compared to facility-based management. TB stigma was present, but not a barrier for the community intervention. Visit schedule and team conduct were identified as key facilitators for the intervention.

Conclusions

This study shows that evaluating a community intervention for TB child contact management in a cluster randomized trials is feasible in Cameroon and Uganda.

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT03832023. Registered on February 6th 2019

Key Messages Regarding Feasibility

1) What uncertainties existed regarding the feasibility?

We were uncertain about the possibility to recruit the necessary sample size from the study clusters in 12 months. We did not know if a community intervention for tuberculosis screening and preventive therapy management would be acceptable by providers, beneficiaries and their communities. We wanted to better

integrate this complex intervention into existing tuberculosis services in order to facilitate its programmatic scale-up at the end of the research study.

2) What are the key feasibility findings?

We found that we would need to extend the recruitment period to 15 months in order to reach the sample size. Discussions with patients, health staff and community showed that the community intervention is acceptable as long as confidentiality is respected, counseling is provided and the staff delivering the intervention is well trained. Findings from the tuberculosis services survey allowed us to better adapt and integrate study activities into existing services.

3) What are the implications of the feasibility findings for the design of the main study?

We used the findings of the feasibility study to fine-tune the community intervention in order to implement it and evaluate it in a manner which is respectful to the local context and can easily be scaled-up

Background

Tuberculosis (TB) is a preventable and curable disease. Nonetheless, the World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that more than one million children develop TB disease every year, representing 12% of the global TB burden(1). Africa carries a high burden of TB disease, with 25% of global new cases occurring in this region. The majority (80%) of children dying from TB are younger than five years old(2), and mathematical models show that 96% of them die before treatment mainly because they were not diagnosed with TB (2). One of the main transmission pathways for children takes place in the household, usually from a caregiver or another adult present in the household(3, 4). When infected, children progress more rapidly towards TB disease and often present with severe forms of TB, especially if they are young (less than 5 years) or HIV-positive (5, 6).

To increase early detection, WHO recommends for all children living in the same household with a bacteriologically confirmed adult TB patient, to be screened using at least a symptom-based screening. Those with a negative TB screening, with a priority given to young or HIV-positive children could then be initiated on tuberculosis preventive therapy (TPT) to prevent progression to TB disease(7, 8). Nevertheless, WHO estimates that only 33% of estimated eligible contact children were started on TPT in 2019 (1). Health system and patient-related challenges(9–12) have already been described regarding contact screening and TPT initiation in resource-limited settings. Among them, one major challenge is the necessity for caregivers to bring children who may not have any symptoms to the health facility for TB screening and to bring them back on regular appointments for follow-up if they were initiated on TPT, knowing they are healthy children.

Previous findings from the literature show that community interventions have improved TB treatment outcomes(13, 14) and that involving community healthcare workers (CHW) had a great impact on TB case finding (15–17). Community interventions can also increase the coverage of TB screening and

initiation on TPT among household child contacts. There has not been any randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing the effectiveness of a community intervention for TB screening and TPT management to facility-based intervention. Our research group is conducting a pragmatic cluster RCT (cRCT) evaluating a community intervention for household child-contact management in Cameroon and Uganda. The CONTACT study (**C**ommunity **i**ntervention for **T**B **A**ctive **C**ontact **T**racing and preventive therapy management) is part of the CaP TB Project (Catalyzing Pediatric Tuberculosis Innovations), a multi-country project aimed at improving pediatric TB case finding and access to TPT through a multipronged approach including implementation of decentralized and integrated models of care, capacity building of front line health care workers on management of pediatric TB, improved access to timely and accurate diagnosis and effective treatment for active TB disease and TB prevention(18).

Under the CONTACT study, household child-contacts of bacteriologically confirmed index cases are being screened for TB at the household, and children under 5 years old or HIV-positive are also initiated on TPT if asymptomatic and followed-up in the household by CHW. Only symptomatic children or children facing safety issues with TPT are referred to the facility. More information can be found in the previously published study protocol(19).

Complex interventions are like black boxes more often than not and important processes and decision-making in the early stages of intervention development are seldom reported(20). Before evaluating a complex(21) community intervention, it is crucial to assess the feasibility of the proposed intervention to orient and prepare the investigators for full-scale research (22, 23). This is particularly essential in case of (1) activities needing any sort of community involvement and partnership, (2) when the data available in the literature are scarce regarding a specific technique or intervention, (3) when the population has specific socio-cultural differences and specificities, and (4) when available literature is described in different settings (eg. high-income countries)(23). The first three criteria apply to the proposed community intervention of the CONTACT study.

Therefore, the objective of this study was to assess the feasibility of a community intervention for TB household child contact management and the conditions for its evaluation in a cRCT in two high-burden, resource-limited countries, Cameroon and Uganda.

Methods

Study design

This feasibility study used a convergent design based on concurrent quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, including with focus group discussions (FGD) and in-depth interviews (IDI), retrospective cohort, survey, document review and expert discussions (Table 1). We evaluated three dimensions of feasibility, adapted from Orsmond and Cohn(24): 1) Recruitment capability of study sites, 2) Acceptability of the intervention by beneficiaries and providers of the intervention. 3) Adaptation,

integration and resources of the community intervention in the health system organization in each country.

Data were collected concurrently during the preparation phase of the CONTACT study, 3 months before the start of inclusions from July to September 2019.

Table 1
Description of different dimensions of the feasibility evaluation

	RECRUITMENT CAPABILITY	ACCEPTABILITY	ADAPTATION, INTEGRATION AND RESOURCES
Objective	Evaluating the number of TB B+ per cluster Identifying how many children <5 per household	Assessing the perceptions and opinions of the people receiving and delivering the intervention	Assessing existing pediatric TB activities and possibilities on integration of the intervention Assessing the availability of optimal resources for a successful intervention
Methods	Retrospective cohort Document review	FGD IDI	Cross-sectional survey Expert discussions Document review
Population	TB patients DHS population	TB patients Community leaders, CHW, TB focal persons, health facility managers	Study sites NTP representatives CaP TB stakeholders
Analysis	Descriptive analysis Document data extraction	Axial coding Thematic analysis	Descriptive analysis Document data extraction
<i>TB= tuberculosis, B+ = bacteriologically confirmed, NTP = National TB Program, FGD = focus group discussion, IDI= in-depth interview, CaP TB = Catalyzing Pediatric Tuberculosis Innovations; DHS = demographic health survey; CHW = community health worker</i>			

Study setting

Both countries are high TB burden countries with a TB incidence of 179 and 200/100000 population for Cameroon and Uganda, respectively. The healthcare system and TB service provision are different in the two countries. TB services in Cameroon are delivered mainly in centers for diagnosis and treatment in district or regional hospitals, whereas in Uganda, TB services are decentralized down to primary health centers (PHC). Community activities are common in Uganda for TB patients' treatment follow-up, whereas in Cameroon, TB activities are mainly facility-based and community interventions are mainly on

HIV, family planning and malaria. In Cameroon and Uganda in 2019, there were an estimated 27% and 29% of household contact children <5 years on TPT, respectively (1).

The CONTACT study is implemented in 20 clusters, 10 in each country. A cluster is defined as a health facility being part of the CaP TB Project and its catchment area to ensure the availability of similar diagnostic tools for presumptive TB children across clusters sites. In Cameroon, the clusters are district hospitals identified in 10 districts from two regions (Centre and Littoral) and in Uganda, clusters are 13 PHCs and 2 hospitals (more than one facility per cluster) in 4 districts from one region (South-West). Rural or semi-urban clusters are the main focus of the intervention (19). The primary outcome of the CONTACT study is the proportion of child contacts <5 years of adult bacteriologically confirmed TB cases (TB B+) who initiate and complete TPT with a sample size of 1500 contact children <5 years, which represents a minimum of 75 participants per cluster. Taking into account a cluster size variability of 50%, a minimum of 50 participants per cluster was requested with an objective to complete enrolment in 12 months.

Recruitment capability

In the absence of information about the expected number of contact children < 5 years in the study sites, we chose a proxy for estimating the study population size. The most practical proxy was to estimate the number of children <5 years per adult index case TB B+. We searched the relevant data from the Demographic Health Surveys (DHS)(25, 26) of each country and the relevant literature on TB patients' household sizes(27).

To estimate the number of index cases per cluster, study research assistants (RAs) retrospectively collected aggregated data from the National Tuberculosis Program (NTP) registers from March 2018 to April 2019 in all study cluster facilities using a REDCap data collection tool(28). Information about the type of TB (pulmonary or extrapulmonary), bacteriological confirmation, age of TB patients, their HIV status and their treatment outcomes were collected following a standardized operating procedure, and data was monitored at the end of the activity. We compared these data with aggregated data provided by NTP from 2017 from the same cluster facilities to assess potential variability in TB detection throughout the years.

Acceptability

We conducted a qualitative assessment in 4 clusters of two regions (Centre and Littoral) in Cameroon and 2 clusters of one region (South-West) in Uganda. We used a standardized discussion guide in both countries which was tested before the qualitative activities. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with a minimum of 6 TB patients with household child contacts were conducted separately among women and men. In-depth interviews (IDIs) were conducted with TB focal persons, health facility managers, community leaders and community healthcare workers. FGD participants were randomly selected from the TB registers by the facility TB focal person (TFP) by selecting retrospectively every 5th registered patient until nine (maximum number) participants accepting to come to the health facility for the FGD.

Participation was voluntary and all participants signed an informed consent form before discussions or interviews.

FGDs and interviews were conducted in French in Cameroon, and in English or Runyankole in Uganda. The qualitative research team recorded all discussions and verbatim transcriptions were done for all recordings and validated by a different researcher for consistency against audio files. Data coding and analysis were done using the ATLAS.ti software version 9.0.

Adaptation and integration

TB services and existing tools

Study RAs and CaP TB programmatic officers collected data using a standardized questionnaire about (1) child contact investigation, TB screening and diagnosis in cases of presumptive TB and TPT services (drugs, dosages and mode of delivery), (2) TB/HIV management (integration of services), (3) the referral system between different levels of health care facilities, (4) drug management, and (5) TB case recording tools used under routine and implemented by the CaP TB project (see Additional File 1 for the data collection tool).

Data quality check

To assess if the NTP facility TB registers represent a reliable source of data collection for index cases, we quantified missing data and errors between May 1st 2018 and Oct 31st 2018 on key variables. RA verified the TB register for the following fields: registration date, TB registration number, sex, age, type of TB, type of patient (new/retreatment) and HIV status, using a standardized data collection tool according to a SOP and all data were monitored. Missing data was any field which was not filled in and error was erroneous data after verification of the source of the information in patients' files, treatment cards and laboratory registers.

Resources and Procedures

This part of the feasibility assessment was focused on identifying eventual logistic, programmatic or financial gaps with possible solutions, and then ensuring that all human resources, operational and logistical prerequisites were met for an optimal implementation of the intervention. For procedure development, the team reviewed the National Guidelines on TPT management(29, 30), National TB or pediatric TB guidelines (29, 31), WHO Integrated Management of Childhood Illness guidelines(32), WHO latent TB guidelines(7, 33) and WHO pediatric TB guidelines(8).

Ethics

This feasibility study was part of the main cRCT protocol that has been approved by the WHO Ethics Research Committee, the Advarra Institutional Review Board and by the two local ethics committees: Cameroon National Ethics Committee for Human Health Research and Research Ethics Committee of the Mbarara University of Science and Technology in Uganda. In addition, administrative approvals were

needed from the Direction for Operational Research from the Ministry of Health in Cameroon and the Ugandan National Council for Science and Technology in Uganda.

Results

Recruitment capability

The review of the DHS data(25, 26) in Cameroon identified 16.9% children <5 years per household and a mean of 5 household members, which would represent 0.85 children <5 years per household. In Uganda there are 18% children <5 years per household, with a mean of 4.5 household members, which corresponds to 0.81 children <5 years per household. Yuen et al. has looked into the household composition of TB patients for all countries and estimated 0.83 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.80-0.86) children <5 years per household in Cameroon and 0.93 (0.89-0.96) in Uganda(27). Therefore, the assessment of the cluster facilities' capacity to enroll child contacts <5 was made using data on the number of index cases from TB registers, assuming there was one index case per household and one child contact <5 years per index case.

Figure 1. Retrospective data of tuberculosis bacteriologically confirmed cases in Cameroon and Uganda.

From Figure 1 we observe that the clusters facilities in Cameroon had enough TB patients to meet the minimum number of 50 TB B+ patients per cluster per year to reach the study sample size within 12 months, except for one cluster (cluster 10). In Uganda there were 3 clusters that did not meet the minimum of 50 bacteriologically positive TB patients (cluster 1, cluster 3 and cluster 7). Despite some fluctuations, data were consistent between the 2017 NTP reports and data collected retrospectively from TB registers between April 2018 and March 2019.

Acceptability

The team conducted 11 FGD with 42 men and 32 women. The mean FGD duration was 105 minutes for women and 128.5 minutes for men. One FGD with women in the Littoral region of Cameroon was not done as the required minimum number of 6 participants was not reached. Twenty-four IDI were conducted with providers and community leaders. (Additional Table 3). We discussed contextual and perceived barriers to facility-based TB child contact management, perceived benefits of a community intervention, and prerequisites for its implementation.

Barriers to facility-based TB screening

All TFP in both countries stated they ask TB patients to bring back their children to the health facility for TB screening as requested by national TB guidelines. In their overall assessment based on experience, patients' adherence to such a request is poor. During the FGDs, some TB patients confirmed they were indeed requested to bring their children to the facility for TB screening, among them, few did comply.

Others declared that they were never asked to bring their children to the health facility for screening, stating they might have done so if requested.

The main reasons cited or anticipated by TB patients for not bringing their children to the health facility were financial, sociocultural or stigma-related. As illustrated below, facility-based child contact TB screening carries financial costs that make child-contact screening less financially and geographically accessible, especially transport costs for those living far away from the facility and those who have many children <5 years to bring for screening and more generally, the poor. This is corroborated by health personnel who did understand parents may face challenges when they cannot afford the transport cost and other costs such as buying food for children while waiting for the screening procedures.

"I need to get transport to transport about 8 people to come back and forth. For starters coming here and going back home alone, they take me for 3000 shillings. So I have to spend 3000 for each of the eight people to come here at the health facility and also spend 3000 shillings to transport them back, so transport would strain me" – Male participant, Uganda

"When you ask a parent to transport his 5 kids and bring them to the health center, he's going to ask: "Are you paying for transport?"" – CHW, Cameroon

While these practical and objective facts played a role in parents' non adherence to healthcare providers' recommendations, some FGD participants believed non-adherence was rather a form of child neglect and pointed at the sociocultural aspects such as gender roles in childcare religion that prevent men from attending health centers when a child is sick. Traditional beliefs about diseases and TB causation (witchcraft) associated with mistrust in "modern medicine" or confidence in traditional medicine or religious prayers, negatively and strongly influence help- and health-seeking behaviors and trajectories, as well as treatment itineraries.

"You know, African families really like going to healers in the neighborhood. He [the TB patient] will look for herbs before going to the hospital. We, African families, love the healers." – male participant - Cameroon

"There are some people who think that they have been bewitched especially when that person has a persistent cough. The person may even start to blame the neighbor whom they had a quarrel with for being responsible for the cough" – Community leader, Uganda

Whether associated to HIV or a stand-alone determinant of TB non-disclosure, TB stigma was ever-present in all FGDs and emerged as a barrier to TB health facility-based screening. Overt stigma was of particular concern and played an important role in how patients live with the disease.

"People fear to disclose that they have TB because they might lose their jobs, they might lose their relationships; it may cause people to be isolated" – male participant, Uganda

“They think this [TB] is a shameful disease and that people will mock them” – male participant, Cameroon

“After I was diagnosed with TB, my husband threatened me “I do not want to hear anyone discussing this with anyone.” And I have never told anyone [...] and it hurts me inside” – female participant, Uganda

Healthcare providers shared similar views regarding financial shortcomings, stigma and sociocultural norms. In addition, TFP highlighted the centrality of the initial encounter (or counseling) with the index case in helping patients understand the importance of TB prevention, including the need for child-contact TB screening and TPT. Indeed, provision of TB literacy and the rapport that is built during this initial visit are essential for a good follow-up during treatment. When such initial visit is rushed due to a high workload and patients queuing at the health center, the information is not passed to the patient and in consequence, this important step is overlooked. As explained in one instance by a doctor and facility manager, health worker's priority is to cure patients who present themselves at the facility, not to manage the contacts.

“They [TB patients] are not coming back with the children not because they don't want to, but because maybe they did not understand an important part [of the health education]” – CHW, Cameroon

“The health facility is overwhelmed by the services here. You get here and you find many people here and that means that on that day you will not be attended to and might need to return the following day. That means that you will have lost two days of work, the child has also missed school. And you know many of us earn an income by the day” – male participant, Uganda

Conditions for acceptability of a community intervention

From the patients' perspectives the proposed intervention (19) was acceptable and made sense in both countries, as it will be helpful to many in overcoming the main barriers to facility-based child-contact TB screening, and in particular, transport costs that many TB patients cannot afford.

Besides removing distance and related transport costs, patients noted further benefits of the household visit, including the confirmation of the child's good health (not TB infected) and ensuring through TPT that a parent's TB infection will not be passed to the children.

“I would accept because I had it [TB]... and I need to make sure my children are healthy” – female patient, Cameroon

Additionally, parents get the opportunity to address other health or environmental problems with the CHW that might come up during the home visit discussions.

“Many people cannot afford to go to the health facility. When you go to the home, you can teach many things and they are able to know and understand better rather than spend the whole day at the health facility with a child in the back” – CHW, Uganda

All participants welcomed the community intervention. Only one male TB patient participant in Cameroon stated he preferred taking his children to the health center for TB screening because all investigations are available there as opposed to the limited knowledge or diagnostic means in the community intervention model. Indeed, the discourses of some other participants showed the obstacles they went through from district hospitals to the capital city on their diagnosis itinerary.

Elsewhere, many participants raised concerns about unintended disclosure and subsequent stigma from the other community members following home visits. The proposed approach to home visit did not include enquiries and screening of other children <5 years living in the same compound, participants were ambivalent when asked about the opportunity to also screen such children as the risk of stigma increases. Those who would agree to the screening of children playing together with their own children, preferred to inform their parents themselves based on past positive relationship and their living together experience.

“They [the family of the index case] need to check if the neighbors are not sick. It will be difficult, but if the family has accepted their fate [having TB], they can help the others [the neighbors] accept as well” – CHW, Cameroon

“Some clients do not want their neighbors to know because they know that the moment these know that they are having TB, they will either be chased from their place where they are renting or sometimes they may be isolated” – TB focal person, Uganda

From the providers' points of view, the intervention was coherent and welcome though they questioned its sustainability.

One CHW even highlighted the fact that many research projects test interventions in the communities and when they finish the project and remove the means, there is no benefit left for the community:

“You [implementing organizations] come, you tell us what has to be done, you teach us what to do, it [the project] starts well and after a certain time it stops. And we don't understand why it stopped.” – CHW, Cameroon.

Prerequisites of feasibility of community TB screening and TPT management

Both patients, community leaders and health staff agreed that the cornerstone of this community intervention is the explanation given and the counseling offered by the TFP at the first visit with the index case. During this visit, TB education should be done, rapport should be created through demonstrating empathy, providing options, and ensuring confidentiality.

“During the first visit is when the rapport is created. Once the patient gets to know that you are friendly and you will keep their information, you will not release it to any other person; through my experience, these clients are willing to welcome you to their homes” – TB focal person, Uganda

This was echoed by healthcare personnel, especially in Uganda, where TFP and CHWs stressed successful implementation depends on thorough information given to the index case. Of paramount importance is the quality of the initial counseling, and therefore on CHWs' training, experience and acquired legitimacy.

"I think that if we explain very well to the patient, it will be acceptable. [...] when it is well explained, the patient understands the benefit [of the community intervention] from the explanation" – health facility manager, Cameroon

"At the beginning I told you, if you give them information on the initiation day, if you give them the information, they can give the medicine [to their children]." – TB focal person, Uganda

The opinions of the patients converged towards their need to be informed well in advance of the timing of the home visit so that they can ensure that their children are at home at the time of the visit or that they have informed their partner -if they have not yet done so- or relevant people based on need-to-know. These conditions provided, the team is welcome to come and perform the screening and even take time to discuss other family health needs or concerns.

Creating rapport was also essential for CHW and they should be trained on this subject. The legitimacy and training of a CHW was also an important determinant of feasibility according to patients and stakeholders. Some respondents and interviewees were skeptical regarding the implication of CHWs because of past negative experiences with careless CHWs who would spread information about people they visit, which shows a lack of confidentiality.

Generally, FGD participants preferred trained CHWs who are polite and explain well all activities that will take place. There was no preference for gender, as long as the person is well trained.

"The most important thing is if you send a health worker with the expertise in whatever he or she is going to do. It does not matter if it is a doctor or a nurse, as long as they have the expertise in whatever they are going to do. It does not matter whether the health worker is male or female" – male participant, Uganda

Even with the best intentions in mind, unintentional disclosure cannot be totally ruled out due to the specific local context, and some participants expressed their concern. Others were not at all worried about disclosure and subsequent consequences.

"They [the neighbors] will maybe spread this [the information] everywhere. "Oh, she has this, she has that". It's difficult, it's very difficult [to disclose]" – female participant, Cameroon

"For me it's not a problem. It's my house, my family" – female participant, Cameroon

An essential point discussed only by the health staff and community leaders is the CHWs' motivation. This is a term historically referring to money used to compensate CHWs for their time and transport.

Motivation is always requested when doing any kind of research activity in both countries as highlighted by the qualitative assessment:

“If we have enough staff and there are [financial] resources, it [TB screening] can be improved” – community leader, Uganda

“If there is motivation, they [the CHW] will do the work” – community leader, Cameroon

Adaptation and integration

TB services and available tools

In all cluster facilities contact investigation was done by a health care worker (nurse, clinician), for children <5 years in both countries. HIV-positive contact children were also screened in Uganda. Both countries had registers recording child contacts initiated on TPT and their TPT outcome. At the time of assessment, National TB Programs were about to introduce in both countries a contact screening register to record all household contacts per index cases with the results of their TB screening. None of the two countries had tools to monitor TPT adherence and tolerability. In Uganda, TB contact screening could be done at community level by the facility TFP. In practice, this activity was done only with support from implementing partners to cover transport cost. At the time of the site assessment, no registered data were available about the number nor age of household child contacts in both countries.

Six months isoniazid prophylaxis was used in all facilities and was delivered monthly at the facility by the TFP. All study facilities were expecting to introduce the 3 months isoniazid rifampicin (3RH) TPT under the CaP TB Project. TB screening, clinical and microbiological diagnosis for children with presumptive TB and drugs and treatment monitoring were free of charge. Families had to pay for further TB investigations like chest X-ray. Drug-resistant cases and complicated cases were referred to higher-level health facilities.

HIV testing was provided at the health facility in all study sites, in close collaboration but in separate units of the same department in Cameroon with the exception of two clusters facilities where TB and HIV services were fully integrated, and integrated in the same department in Uganda.

In all study sites TB drugs were stored at the TB clinic at room temperature in a locked cabinet and in two health facilities at the facility pharmacy.

A reference and counter-reference system between the CHW and the PHC staff or higher-level health facilities was set in the Ugandan clusters but almost inexistent or not functional in the Cameroon clusters.

Table 2 below summarizes practices and available tools under the standard of care in the two countries.

Table 2
Practices and tools in the routine system

Activity	Cameroon	Uganda
Index case identification	By the TFP at the health facility using the TB register	By the TFP at the health facility using the TB register
Contact investigation	At the health facility. Contact tracing register about to be introduced	Possibility of household contact investigation by the TFP Contact register about to be introduced
Symptom screening	At the health facility, no tool	Possibility of household screening, intensified case finding tool (checklist)
HIV testing of child contacts	Only medical personnel at the health facility	Possibility of HIV testing by CHWs or healthcare staff
TPT initiation	6H, at the health facility, recorded in the TPT register by the TFP	6H, at the health facility, recorded in the TPT register by the TFP
TPT follow-up: adherence and tolerability	Adherence and tolerability not assessed. No tool for TPT adherence. TPT register used for follow-up at the health facility	Adherence and tolerability not assessed. No tool for TPT adherence. TPT register used for follow-up at the health facility
Safety management	At facility. No tool for safety evaluation	At facility. No tool for safety evaluation
PT outcome assessment	According to national TB guideline: completed, death, lost to follow-up. At the health facility by the TFP	According to national TB guideline: completed, death, lost to follow-up. At the health facility by the TFP
TB diagnosis	TB investigations at the health facility or referral at a higher-level facility Available tools: CXR, sputum collection, NPA, XpertMTB/RIF testing Laboratory results in the lab register	TB investigations at the health facility or referral at a higher-level facility Available tools: CXR, sputum collection, XpertMTB/RIF testing. Laboratory data collected in the lab register
<i>TFP = tuberculosis focal person, CXR = chest radiography, NPA = nasopharyngeal aspirate, H = isoniazid; TB = tuberculosis</i>		

Checking data quality

A total of 1091 TB patients, out of which 708 were B+, have been registered between May 1st, 2018, and Oct 31st, 2018, in the TB registers of the cluster sites. The overall median rate of missing data was 0.3% (interquartile range (IQR) [0%-3%]) in Cameroon, ranging from 0 to 8.6% and 0.4% (IQR [0%-0.6%]) in Uganda, ranging from 0 to 1.4%. The median error rate was 1.1% (IQR [0.6%-1.4%]) in Cameroon, ranging from 0.3–3.6% and 0.0% (IQR [0%-0%]) in Uganda. The biggest rate of missing data was for the registration date, with a maximum of 8.2% in cluster 6. The biggest rate of errors was for the type of TB, with a maximum of 2.1% in cluster 5. (see Additional Tables 1 and 2).

Resources and procedures for the community intervention

The type of human resources at facility level was similar in the two countries. The community intervention involved mainly TFP and in addition, one clinician was identified as a safety monitor for referred children with TPT tolerability concerns and was trained for safety assessment. Regarding CHWs, in Uganda, village health team were already involved in TB activities at facility level within the CaP TB project (called Linkage facilitators). It was proposed to identify CHW for the community intervention among the linkage facilitators. In Cameroon, since there was no CHW involved in TB activities, they were identified among existing CHW involved in other community health activities (COSA - Comité de Santé (health committee)). Based on literature review of community interventions, findings of the acceptability survey and discussion with stakeholders in both countries, a procedure for selection of the CHW was proposed including the following criteria: having experience with community work, living in the same community, medium level of education, time to perform the tasks, accepted and respected by the communities. In Cameroon there were 3 CHW per intervention site, with a total of 15 CHW and in Uganda there were 2 CHW per intervention site for HC IV and one CHW for HC III, with a total of 12 CHW. In both countries, it was proposed that CHW will report to the facility TFP.

Taking into consideration the absence of research experience of CHW, to guaranty good quality of data and to ensure that a clear distinction could be made between activities related to the intervention and activities related to research, it was proposed that RAs will accompany CHWs to households and will be in charge of the informed consent procedure for contacts and data entry in the electronic case report form (eCRF) from source documents filled by the CHW.

Transport cost for the community activities was identified as a barrier by both TB patients and providers in the acceptability survey and by stakeholder during study preparation. It was proposed that the study will cover the transport cost but that existing public transport will be used as much as possible to ensure the sustainability of the intervention and avoid stigmatization. Good communication between facility TFP and CHW was also identified as a very important factor justifying the allowance of small budget for communication (airtime). Therefore, to ensure sustainability and to comply with existing practices, it was proposed that CHWs will not receive a salary, but will be compensated for their time and transport.

Finally, working with CHW on a new intervention implied to develop simple tools and check lists for TB symptom screening, adherence and tolerability assessment. These tools were developed in coordination with country TB stakeholders (see Additional Table 4 for symptom screening checklist). These tools were incorporated in simple standard operating procedures used for the training of the CHWs. CHWs were also trained to recognize potential severe symptoms or signs that would justify urgent reference of the child to the facility that could be related to other disease than TB. Although the initial aim of the study was that CHW will initiate child contact on TPT in the household, both National TB Programs of Cameroon and Uganda requested that initiation be done by a nurse in the household and that the CHW will be in charge of the follow-up on his own. They also requested a more frequent follow-up by the CHW, one and two weeks after initiation instead of 4 weeks as done at facility by TFP.

In Cameroon, due to national guidelines, HIV testing could only be performed by a nurse, therefore HIV testing in the community was done by a nurse. Cascade training was organized by country research team in each cluster facility sites followed by supervision by the RAs.

Discussion

Main results and implications for implementation

The qualitative results showed that community activities were well accepted by beneficiaries and healthcare providers alike in both countries. The emerging barriers to health facility TB contact investigation and TPT management were coherent with the literature findings and support the proposed community intervention(10, 35, 36). A study conducted in Uganda identified the following barriers to TB contact investigation: stigma, limited knowledge about TB among contacts, insufficient time and space in clinics for counselling, mistrust of health center staff among index patients and contacts, and high travel costs(36). Our qualitative assessment identified similar barriers for child TB contact investigation. Stigma and disclosure play an essential role firstly in the diagnosis of TB patients and secondly in the acceptability of the community intervention. Stigma and disclosure influence how TB patients accept a team coming to their household for TB contact investigation.

Both beneficiaries and providers insisted on the importance of proper selection, training and support of CHW in charge of the household visits and how important it is to build confidence with beneficiaries. Although CHW have been involved in TB community activities, their involvement in the TPT management was quite unique in the CONTACT study (37) (15).

A deductive approach for acceptability based on the acceptability framework proposed by Sekhon et al (34) combined with inductive theorizing can be used to propose a model which is specific for community TB investigation and TPT management, as illustrated in Figure 2. This framework contains 7 concepts: burden, affective attitude, ethicality, intervention coherence, opportunity cost, effectiveness and self-efficacy. Concepts like TB stigma and disclosure that emerged from the discussions relate to the affective attitude, burden and ethicality components of acceptability. TB knowledge and experience with other community activities influence the affective attitude of the participants towards the intervention and reveals the coherence of the community intervention. Nevertheless, through experience from other community activities, participants anticipate the burden this kind of intervention could represent. TB patients anticipated the added health benefit of a community intervention through the possibility of discussing other health problems, which are related to the intervention coherence and the opportunity cost. Initial counseling and TB education for the index case is essential for acceptability and in the proposed framework these aspects influence the affective attitude of the participants, the opportunity cost and the effectiveness of the intervention. Finally, CHW legitimacy and training have a role to play in the effectiveness of the intervention and in the self-efficacy component of acceptability.

Figure 2. Acceptability components and emerging themes

The findings of the qualitative assessment were used to formulate recommendations on recruitment of CHWs, training curricula for CHWs, adapt team transportation for field visits and concentrate efforts on key elements that were important to the participants (like preparing the initial visit). Financial and non-financial means are known to improve performance of CHWs for the community activities (38), and close attention is paid to CHW competence and training. Kok et al identified the specific activities that led to a better performance of CHWs and frequent supervision and continuous training were main influencers(39). The CONTACT study ensured both these elements by close supervision of the CHWs by the RAs and TFPs and job mentorship by TFPs. It was indeed very important to ensure good communication and linkages between CHW and TFP and empowering CHWs in performing their activities, as dully noted in the Astana declaration on primary health care: “Investment must encompass the empowerment of individuals and communities, with recognition of the importance of skills, local context and health needs”(40). Although incentives were not provided per se, transport and communication costs were covered by the study. This is an important aspect to be taken into account for sustainability purposes, as CHW transportation needs to be ensured in order for this type of community project to succeed(40).

Community intervention evaluated in the CONTACT study

Under the CONTACT study, all study drugs are kept at the health facilities under the responsibility of the TFP who prepares the necessary drug packages before each study visit. CHWs ensure the delivery of the drugs prepared and packed by the TFP to the contact children, according to the study visit procedures. The research team assessed TB services in the standard of care and the existing tools to ensure a smooth integration of study activities and source documents into current practice and to avoid disruption of routine activities by the CONTACT study. This part of the feasibility study is crucial to the sustainability of the proposed intervention beyond the end of the CONTACT study. It is challenging to integrate both the intervention and tools to evaluate the outcome of the intervention in a health system that may be weakened by lack of resources, turnover of personnel and high workload. The burden that the proposed intervention is putting on the health providers is an essential element of knowledge to practice translation. This feasibility assessment allowed us to identify which existing tools could serve as source documents and which additional tools will need to be introduced, keeping an adaptation to each country’s specificities. Integrating research and practice is a core element of translating the proposed intervention, if proven effective, into current practice. Selecting sites from the CaP TB Project is an asset for the study because of capacity reinforcement for pediatric TB case management and improvement of data collection tools. Also, distinguishing intervention activities from research activities and ensuring that these last ones will be covered by RA and not routine facility personnel or CHW was very important for the sustainability of the intervention and was emphasized by the WHO ethics research committee at the time of first protocol submission.

Table 3 presents the activities included in the intervention following the feasibility assessment and adapted to each country context.

Table 3
Activities proposed in the intervention model of care per country

Activity	Place	Cameroon	Uganda
Index case identification	Facility	TB register (NTP tool)	TB register (NTP tool)
Contact investigation	Community	Contacts table (study tool) by CHW	Contact tracing register is used (NTP tool) by CHW
Symptom screening	Community	Screening form (study tool) by CHW	Screening form (study tool) by CHW
HIV testing of child contacts	Community	1st test done by community nurse. Confirmatory test at facility	Done by CHW
TPT initiation	Community	TPT initiation form (study tool) filled by community nurse	TPT initiation form (study tool) filled by TFP
TPT follow-up	Community	TPT follow-up form (study tool) by CHW	TPT follow-up form (study tool) by CHW
Adherence	Community	TPT card (study tool) filled by care giver	TPT card (study tool) filled by care giver
Safety management	Community	Tolerability checklist (study tool) filled by CHW	Tolerability checklist (study tool) filled by CHW
	Facility after referral	Safety form (study tool) filled by clinician	Safety form (study tool) filled by clinician
TPT outcome assessment	Community	TPT outcome form (study tool) by community nurse	TPT outcome form (study tool) by TB focal person
TB diagnosis	Facility after referral	Cap TB pediatric form filled by TFP	Cap TB pediatric form filled by TFP
Referral	Community	Referral form (study tool) filled by CHW	Referral form (study tool) filled by CHW
<i>NTP = National Tuberculosis Program, CHW = community health worker; TFP = Tuberculosis focal person; TPT = Tuberculosis preventive therapy</i>			

In the context of few available cluster sites within the CaP TB Project, the retrospective data collection of bacteriologically-confirmed TB cases and comparison with NTP reports was extremely useful in informing the study team on potential problematic sites and adjusting the recruitment period from 12 to 15 months. This step was essential for activity planning and budget review(41).

Limitations

TB services have been assessed through a survey and discussions with health providers, nevertheless, there was no observation of practices by the research team. Indeed, collecting data through a survey

could induce a declaration bias of the person filling in the survey. However, conducting observations would have been limiting for the feasibility study as some health facilities have very low patient flows, meaning the events to be observed would be rare. In addition, it is well known that observations could induce the Hawthorne effect, when subjects perform better because they know they are observed(42).

It is worth mentioning that during the qualitative assessment, participants could have been inclined to declare that they did certain activities because of social desirability bias, meaning they wanted to be perceived in a positive way by the researchers(43). The team tried to minimize this bias by always reassuring the participants that there is no right or wrong answer, that the discussions were not part of an evaluation by their hierarchy and by using the technique of indirect questioning (i.e. “Why don’t people in general bring children back to the health facility for TB screening”).

Conclusion

This study has identified a feasible community intervention for TB screening and TPT management for further evaluation in the context of two high TB burden and resource –limited countries. Being able to implement community activities is highly important due to the positive impact these interventions could make on the communities by bringing the needed TB prevention services at their doorstep. In addition, the health system could benefit of the CHW structure already in place and ensures that other these activities are integrated with other community activities.

All activities occurring after the start of inclusions in October 2019 are assessed under an undergoing process evaluation that will support the interpretation of the CONTACT study effectiveness. Capturing what is delivered in practice, with close reference to the theory of the intervention, can enable the researchers to distinguish between the adaptations made to fit different contexts and changes that undermine intervention fidelity altogether(44). In addition, a qualitative assessment of post-intervention acceptability by child contact parents, facility personnel, CHWs and stakeholders will be repeated at the end of the study.

Abbreviations

CaP TB = Catalyzing Pediatric Tuberculosis Innovations, CHW = community health worker, CXR = chest radiography, DHS = demographic health survey, FGD = focus group discussion, H = isoniazid, IDI = in-depth interview, NPA = nasopharyngeal aspirate, NTP= National Tuberculosis Program, TB = tuberculosis, TB B+ = bacteriologically confirmed tuberculosis, TFP = tuberculosis focal person, TPT = tuberculosis preventive therapy, WHO = World Health Organization

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This feasibility study was part of the main cRCT protocol approved by the WHO Ethics Research Committee, the Advarra Institutional Review Board and by the two local ethics committees: Cameroon National Ethics Committee for Human Health Research and Research Ethics Committee of the Mbarara University of Science and Technology in Uganda. In addition, administrative approvals were needed from the Direction for Operational Research from the Ministry of Health in Cameroon and the Ugandan National Council for Science and Technology in Uganda.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. The survey used for TB services is found in the Additional File 1.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Funding

The CONTATC study is funded by Unitaid and the sponsor is Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation. The funding body had no role in data collection, analysis, interpretation, nor in writing the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

AV and MB conceptualized the feasibility study. GT conceptualized the pre-intervention qualitative assessment. AV, GT, MMA and CA collected qualitative data, MMA and CA transcribed the qualitative data, AV coded the qualitative data and analyzed it with input from GT. BKT, DA, BYT and BS coordinated and supervised data collection for the retrospective cohort and the survey. AV analyzed the retrospective cohort and the survey data. MC coordinated linkage with CaP TB activities, MB coordinated all study activities. AV wrote the manuscript with valuable input from MB, GT, MC, BKT and DA.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants of the qualitative assessment for their opinions and perspectives which helped shape the CONTACT study.

We thank the Scientific Advisory Committee members: Annemieke Brands, Anne Detjen, Malgosia Gremiska, Katherine Fielding, Troy Jacobs, Anna Mandalakas, Ben Marais, Moorine Sekkade, Sabine Eva Verkuijl.

CONTACT study group: Maryline Bonnet, Anca Vasiliu, Savine Chauvet, Elisabete de Carvalho, Sayouba Ouedraogo, Georges Tiendrebeogo (University of Montpellier, IRD, INSERM, TransVIHMI, Montpellier,

France); Martina Casenghi (Elizabeth Glaser Pediatrics AIDS Foundation, Geneva, Switzerland), Jennifer Cohn (Elizabeth Glaser Pediatrics AIDS Foundation, Geneva, Switzerland and Infectious Diseases, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania); Boris K Tchounga, Boris Y Tchakounté, Collette Sih, Rogacien Kana, Eric Youm, Patrice Tchengu, Léonie Simo, Paul W Manguelle, Paul Bindzi, Marie-Louise A Ndongo, Doline Ndjang Kombou, Jinette L Guedem Nekame, Narcisse Sitamze Kaptue, Philippe N Tsigaing, Muhamed M Awolu, Leticia G Seuleu Ndjamakou, Naomi Chi Ndum (Elizabeth Glaser Pediatrics AIDS Foundation, Yaoundé, Cameroon) ; Daniel Atwine, Bob Ssekyanzi, Rinah Arinaitwe, David Otai, Cecilia Akatukwasa, Joanita B Tebulwa, Hamidah Kamanzi, Agnes Natukunda, Eva Natukunda, Rose Kyarimpa, Doreen Kyomuhendo, Scovia Sanyu, John Ssemanya (Epicentre Research Center Mbarara, Uganda) ; Richard Okello (Elizabeth Glaser Pediatrics AIDS Foundation, Uganda) ; Albert Kuate Kuate (National Tuberculosis Control Program, Cameroon) ; Stavia Turyahabwe (National Tuberculosis and Leprosy Program, Uganda ; Stephen M. Graham (Centre for International Child Health, University of Melbourne and Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia, and International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease (The Union), Paris, France) ; Peter J. Dodd, Nyashadzaishe Mafirakureva (School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK) ; Sushant Mukherjee (Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation, Washington, United States)

References

1. World Health Organization. Global Tuberculosis Report. 2020.
2. Dodd PJ, Yuen CM, Sismanidis C, Seddon JA, Jenkins HE. The global burden of tuberculosis mortality in children: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2017 Sep 1;5(9):e898–906.
3. Beyers N, Gie RP, Schaaf HS, Van Zyl S, Talent JM, Nel ED, et al. A prospective evaluation of children under the age of 5 years living in the same household as adults with recently diagnosed pulmonary tuberculosis. 1997.
4. Martinez L, Cords O, Horsburgh CR, Andrews JR, Pediatric TB. Contact Studies Consortium. The risk of tuberculosis in children after close exposure: a systematic review and individual-participant meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2020 21;395(10228):973–84.
5. Marais BJ, Gie RP, Schaaf HS, Hesselink AC, Obihara CC, Starke JJ, et al. The natural history of childhood intra-thoracic tuberculosis: a critical review of literature from the pre-chemotherapy era. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2004 Apr;8(4):392–402.
6. Fox GJ, Barry SE, Britton WJ, Marks GB. Contact investigation for tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Respir J*. 2013 Jan;41(1):140–56.
7. World Health Organization. Guidelines on the management of latent tuberculosis infection. 2015.
8. World Health Organization. Guidance for national tuberculosis programmes on the management of tuberculosis in children. 2014.

9. Hall C, Sukijthamapan P, dos Santos R, Nourse C, Murphy D, Gibbons M, et al. Challenges to delivery of isoniazid preventive therapy in a cohort of children exposed to tuberculosis in Timor-Leste. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2015 Jun;20(6):730–6.
10. Cattamanchi A, Miller CR, Tapley A, Haguma P, Ochom E, Ackerman S, et al. Health worker perspectives on barriers to delivery of routine tuberculosis diagnostic evaluation services in Uganda: a qualitative study to guide clinic-based interventions. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2015 Jan 22;15. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4307676/>.
11. Szkwarko D, Hirsch-Moverman Y, Du Plessis L, Du Preez K, Carr C, Mandalakas AM. Child contact management in high tuberculosis burden countries: A mixed-methods systematic review. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2017 Aug 1;12(8). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5538653/>.
12. van Wyk SS, Reid AJ, Mandalakas AM, Enarson DA, Beyers N, Morrison J, et al. Operational challenges in managing Isoniazid Preventive Therapy in child contacts: A high-burden setting perspective. *BMC Public Health*. 2011 Jul 8;11:544.
13. Zhang H, Ehiri J, Yang H, Tang S, Li Y. Impact of Community-Based DOT on Tuberculosis Treatment Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One*. 2016 Feb;5(2):e0147744. 11(.
14. Burke RM, Nliwasa M, Feasey HRA, Chaisson LH, Golub JE, Naufal F, et al. Community-based active case-finding interventions for tuberculosis: a systematic review. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021 Mar;22(5):e283–99. 6(.
15. Vo LNQ, Forse RJ, Codlin AJ, Vu TN, Le GT, Do GC, et al. A comparative impact evaluation of two human resource models for community-based active tuberculosis case finding in Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam. *BMC Public Health*. 2020 Jun 15;20:934.
16. Lorent N, Choun K, Thai S, Kim T, Huy S, Pe R, et al. Community-Based Active Tuberculosis Case Finding in Poor Urban Settlements of Phnom Penh, Cambodia: A Feasible and Effective Strategy. *PLoS One*. 2014 Mar;27(3):e92754. 9(.
17. Datiko DG, Lindtjørn B. Health Extension Workers Improve Tuberculosis Case Detection and Treatment Success in Southern Ethiopia: A Community Randomized Trial. *PLoS One*. 2009 May 8;4(5):e5443.
18. CaP TB. Implementation and Integration of TB Care & Treatment Models - EGPAF [Internet]. Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation. [cited 2021 Jun 29]. Available from: <https://www.pedaids.org/resource/catalyzing-pediatric-tuberculosis-innovations-cap-tb-implementation-integration-new-tb-care-treatment-models/>.
19. Vasiliu A, Eymard-Duvernay S, Tchounga B, Atwine D, de Carvalho E, Ouedraogo S, et al. Community intervention for child tuberculosis active contact investigation and management: study protocol for a parallel cluster randomized controlled trial. *Trials*. 2021 Mar 2;22(1):180.
20. Hoddinott P. A new era for intervention development studies. *Pilot Feasibility Studies*. 2015 Oct;26(1):36. 1(.

21. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2008 Sep;29:337:a1655.
22. Medical Research Council. Developing and evaluating complex interventions [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Jan 4]. Available from: <https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/complex-interventions-guidance/>.
23. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How We Design Feasibility Studies. *Am J Prev Med*. 2009 May;36(5):452–7.
24. Orsmond GI, Cohn ES. The Distinctive Features of a Feasibility Study: Objectives and Guiding Questions. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*. 2015 Jul 1;35(3):169–77.
25. The DHS Program - Cameroon. Standard DHS, 2011 Dataset [Internet]. [cited 2020 Feb 18]. Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/data/dataset/Cameroon_Standard-DHS_2011.cfm?flag=0.
26. The DHS Program - Uganda. Standard DHS, 2016 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Feb 18]. Available from: <https://dhsprogram.com/what-we-do/survey/survey-display-504.cfm>.
27. Yuen CM, Jenkins HE, Chang R, Mpunga J, Becerra MC. Two methods for setting child-focused tuberculosis care targets. *Public Health Action*. 2016 Jun 21;6(2):83–96.
28. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) - A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009 Apr;42(2):377–81.
29. Programme National de Lutte contre la Tuberculose Cameroun. Guide technique pour les personnels de santé. Ministère de la Santé, République du Cameroun; 2018.
30. Uganda Ministry of Health. National Tuberculosis and Leprosy Control Programme. Manual for management and control of tuberculosis and leprosy.
31. Uganda Ministry of Health. National clinical guidelines on the management of tuberculosis in children. 2016.
32. World Health Organization. IMCI integrated management of childhood illness. 2005.
33. World Health Organization. Latent tuberculosis infection: updated and consolidated guidelines for programmatic management. 2018.
34. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2017 Jan 26 [cited 2018 Jun 11];17. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5267473/>.
35. Biermann O, Lönnroth K, Caws M, Viney K. Factors influencing active tuberculosis case-finding policy development and implementation: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Dec 11;9(12):e031284.
36. Ayakaka I, Ackerman S, Ggita JM, Kajubi P, Dowdy D, Haberer JE, et al. Identifying barriers to and facilitators of tuberculosis contact investigation in Kampala, Uganda: a behavioral approach. *Implement Sci* [Internet]. 2017 Mar 9 [cited 2021 Jun 21];12. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5343292/>.
37. Garg T, Bhardwaj M, Deo S. Role of community health workers in improving cost efficiency in an active case finding tuberculosis programme: an operational research study from rural Bihar, India.

38. Kigozi G, Heunis C, Engelbrecht M. Community health worker motivation to perform systematic household contact tuberculosis investigation in a high burden metropolitan district in South Africa. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020 Sep;18:20:882.
39. Kok MC, Dieleman M, Taegtmeyer M, Broerse JE, Kane SS, Ormel H, et al. Which intervention design factors influence performance of community health workers in low- and middle-income countries? A systematic review. Health Policy and Planning. 2015 Nov 1;30(9):1207–27.
40. World Health Organization. Report of the Global Conference on Primary Health Care: from Alma-Ata towards universal health coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals. 2019.
41. Huang GD, Bull J, Johnston McKee K, Mahon E, Harper B, Roberts JN. Clinical trials recruitment planning: A proposed framework from the Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative. Contemporary Clinical Trials. 2018 Mar;1:66:74–9.
42. McCambridge J, Witton J, Elbourne DR. Systematic review of the Hawthorne effect: New concepts are needed to study research participation effects. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014 Mar;67(3):267–77.
43. Bergen N, Labonté R. “Everything Is Perfect, and We Have No Problems”: Detecting and Limiting Social Desirability Bias in Qualitative Research. Qual Health Res. 2020 Apr 1;30(5):783–92.
44. Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Cooper C, et al. Process evaluation in complex public health intervention studies: the need for guidance. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2014 Feb;68(2)(1):101–2.

Figures

The red line marks the minimum of 50 bacteriologically confirmed TB cases necessary for sample size
NTP = National Tuberculosis Program, TB B+ = bacteriologically confirmed tuberculosis

Figure 1

Retrospective data of tuberculosis bacteriologically confirmed cases in Cameroon and Uganda.

Figure 2

Acceptability components and emerging themes

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [AdditionalFile1.docx](#)
- [AdditionalFile2Tables.docx](#)
- [CONSORTextensionforPilotandFeasibilityTrialsChecklist.doc](#)