International Journal of Infectious Diseases 101 (2020) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Infectious Diseases



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijid

Delay in the diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in The Gambia, West Africa: A cross-sectional study



Olumuyiwa A. Owolabi^a, Alpha O. Jallow^a, Momodou Jallow^a, Gambia Sowe^a, Rohey Jallow^a, Monica D. Genekah^a, Simon Donkor^a, Alieu Wurrie^b, Beate Kampmann^{a,c}, Jayne Sutherland^a, Toyin Togun^{a,d,*}

^a Medical Research Council Unit The Gambia at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (MRCG at LSHTM), Atlantic Boulevard, Fajara, Gambia

^b The Gambia National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme (NLTBCP), Kanifing Municipal, Serrekunda, Gambia

^c The Vaccine Centre, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), Keppel Street, London, United Kingdom

^d Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), Keppel Street, London, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 12 June 2020 Received in revised form 10 September 2020 Accepted 11 September 2020

Keywords: Tuberculosis Diagnostic delay Care-seeking The Gambia

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To investigate the pattern of tuberculosis (TB) care initiation and risk factors for TB diagnostic delay in The Gambia.

Methods: In this cross-sectional study, adult patients diagnosed with pulmonary TB (pTB) in public facilities in the Greater Banjul Area of The Gambia were consecutively recruited from October 2016 to March 2017. Diagnostic delay was defined as >21 days from the onset of at least one symptom suggestive of pTB to diagnosis. Logistic regression analyses were used to investigate risk factors for diagnostic delay. *Results:* Overall, 216 pTB patients were included in the study; the median (Interquartile Range (IQR)) age was 30 (23–39) years and 167 (77%) were male patients. Of the 216 patients, 110 (50.9%) of them initiated care-seeking in the formal and informal private sector and 181/216 (83.8%) had TB diagnostic delay. The median (IQR) duration from the onset of symptoms to TB diagnosis was 34 (28–56) days. Age groups 18–29 years (aOR 3.2; 95% CI 1.2–8.8 [p = 0.02]) and 30–49 years (aOR 5.1; 95% CI 1.6–16.2 [p = 0.006]) and being employed (aOR 4.2; 95% CI 1.7–10.5 [p = 0.002]) were independent risk factors for TB diagnostic delay.

Conclusion: There is considerable TB diagnostic delay in The Gambia, and this is likely to be worsened by the COVID-19 pandemic.

© 2020 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of International Society for Infectious Diseases. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

Globally, tuberculosis (TB) is the leading cause of death from a single infectious disease (Boggiano et al., 2017). An estimated 10 million new cases of TB and 1.5 million TB deaths were reported in 2018 (World Health Organization (WHO), 2019). The current public health strategy for the control of TB in high-burden settings is geared towards the early detection of infectious TB patients, mostly through passive, as opposed to active, case detection, followed by the prompt initiation of treatment (Sreeramareddy et al., 2014). In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) with high TB burden, the focus has been on passive case detection of TB in national health systems (Fuge et al., 2018). Passive TB case

* Corresponding author at: Clinical Research Department, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, LSHTM, Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT, United Kingdom. *E-mail address*: Toyin.Togun@lshtm.ac.uk (T. Togun). detection is influenced by several factors, including the subject's perception of the severity of the illness, awareness of the likely cause of their symptoms, stigma, access to health facilities well-equipped to screen for TB and on the level of TB symptoms recognition that will trigger an investigation by the care provider at the time of first presentation by the patients (Shewade et al., 2019). However, this approach has been less effective in LMICs where there is poor access to health care facilities with appropriate diagnostic tools, poor TB symptom awareness and inadequate community and social mobilisation to support effective passive case finding (Shewade et al., 2019). This has resulted in considerable TB diagnostic delay that negatively impacts the whole cascade of care, fuelling the increasing number of missed cases of TB each year, presently estimated globally at 3 million (World Health Organization (WHO), 2019).

There is growing interest in the quality of TB care in TB endemic settings (Satyanarayana et al., 2015). The provision of high quality of care for TB patients, with emphasis on rapid and accurate

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.029

^{1201-9712/© 2020} The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of International Society for Infectious Diseases. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

diagnosis and on patient-centred outcomes, is one of the cardinal objectives of the End TB Strategy of the WHO (Uplekar et al., 2015). Surva et al. reported that 75% of TB patients in Indonesia initiated TB care in the private sector lacking appropriate diagnostic facilities for TB (Surva et al., 2017). A combined patients pathway analysis (PPA) from 13 countries, which included six African countries with the highest TB burden on the continent, reported that about 60% of all TB patients initiated care from the private sector, and less than 50% of estimated TB patients had documented treatment success (Chin and Hanson, 2017). A cascade of TB patient care analysis in South Africa reported that only 53% of TB patients in South Africa were diagnosed and successfully treated (Naidoo et al., 2017). Taken together, the current public health approach for the control of TB in high-burden countries is characterised by TB diagnostic delay as well as delay in the initiation of effective treatment with poor rates of treatment success, all of which are considered surrogates for the quality of TB care (Cazabon et al., 2017).

The diagnosis of TB and initiation of treatment in The Gambia is based primarily on passive case detection (Lienhardt et al., 2001). Therefore, we aimed to investigate the pattern of TB care initiation and the risk factors associated with TB diagnostic delay, among newly diagnosed adult pulmonary TB (pTB) patients in The Gambia.

Methods

Settings, sites and study participants

In The Gambia, the incidence rate of TBis 174 cases/100,000 population (World Health Organization (WHO), 2019), while the prevalence of HIV infection among adults aged 15–49 years is 1.6% (Gambian Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, 2016). Also, 7% of newly diagnosed TB patients in The Gambia are HIV positive (Stop TB Partnership, 2018).

This exploratory cross-sectional study was conducted in the Greater Banjul Area (GBA) of The Gambia between October 2016 and March 2017, using the TB Case-Contact (TBCC) platform at the Medical Research Council Unit The Gambia at LSHTM (MRCG at LSHTM) (Hill and Ota, 2010). Ethical approval was obtained from the Gambia Government/MRC joint ethics committee. The GBA is a mixed urban, peri-urban and rural setting, with an approximate population of 700,000 (Egere et al., 2016), where an estimated 70% of all TB cases in The Gambia are notified (Gambian National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme (NLTP), 2012).

Our study population were consecutive adult subjects (age \geq 18 years) who were newly diagnosed with sputum smear positive pTB disease at either of three health centres (Brikama, Fajikunda and Serrekunda Health Centres) or the MRC Gambia TB clinic in the GBA. Sputum smear microscopy is still the first and only tool for routine diagnosis of TB in most public health facilities providing comprehensive primary health care, including TB diagnosis, in The Gambia. GeneXpert test is additionally available at the MRC Gambia at entry point for potential research participants in the TBCC cohort. The TB clinics in these four public health facilities collectively account for approximately 80% of all TB diagnosis in the GBA annually (Gambian National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme (NLTP), 2012; Lienhardt et al., 2001).

Study participants were interviewed by trained nurse/field workers within one week of their TB diagnosis. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data on the sociodemographic characteristics, symptoms at presentation and health care seeking behaviours of the study participants (see supplementary material). All study participants were initiated on standard anti-TB treatment by direct observation according to the Gambian National TB Guidelines (Gambian National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme (NLTP), 2012). Health care providers are persons consulted by patients for their ailments with the aim of obtaining advice or prescription, as previously described (Lienhardt et al., 2001).

Data analysis and statistical methods

TB diagnostic delay was defined as more than 21 days from the onset of at least one symptom of TB before diagnosis, according to the WHO (World Health Organization (WHO), 1997). Participants' characteristics were summarised using numbers (percentages) for categorical variables and median (interquartile range [IQR]) for quantitative variables. We investigated factors associated with TB diagnostic delay by univariate and multivariable logistic regression analysis. Age, sex and variables with p-value < 0.20 in the univariate analysis were included in the multivariable analysis. All analyses were performed by using the STATA version 16 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas, United States). p-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

All the 216 subjects diagnosed with sputum smear positive pTB in the four public facilities over the study period agreed to participate in the study. The median (IQR) age of the study participants was 30 (23–39) years, and all of them were HIV negative. One hundred and sixty-seven (77.3%) were male patients and 106 (49.1%) were unemployed (Table 1). Cough (214 [99.1%])

Table 1

Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of study participants (N = 216).

Variables	n (%)
Age (years) 18-29 30-49 ≥50	102 (47.2) 83 (38.4) 31 (14.4)
Sex Male Female	167 (77.3) 49 (22.7)
Marital status Married Unmarried	91 (421) 125 (57.9)
Formal education Yes None	196 (90.7) 20 (9.3)
Tribe Mandinka Wolof Fula Jola Others	71 (32.9) 36 (16.7) 45 (20.8) 31 (14.3) 33 (15.3)
Employment status Employed Unemployed	110 (50.9) 106 (49.1)
Symptoms Cough Fever Weight loss Malaise Loss of appetite Drenching night sweat Haemoptysis	214 (99.1) 196(90.7) 211 (97.7) 214 (99.1) 194 (89.8) 131(60.6) 30(14.0)
Care Provider Pattern Public facility only Mixed public and private	57 (26.4) 159 (73.6)

and malaise (214 [99.1%]) were the most frequent symptoms at presentation, followed by weight loss (211 [97.7%]), fever (196 [90.7%]), loss of appetite (194 [89.8%]), drenching night sweat (131 [60.6%]) and haemoptysis (30 [14.0%]).

TB care-seeking pattern

Of the 216 patients with pTB, 110 (50.9%) initiated TB careseeking in the formal and informal private sector, comprising (traditional healers (n = 9), dispensaries (n = 8), pharmacy shops (n = 49) and private clinics (n = 44). (Figure 1). The median (IQR) number of visits to health facilities before TB diagnosis were 3 (2– 4) visits. The median (IQR) duration from the onset of at least one symptom suggestive of TB to diagnosis was 34 (28 and 56) days, and 181 patients (83.8%) had more than 21 days from the onset of TB symptoms to diagnosis. One hundred and fifty-nine (73.6%) out of all the newly diagnosed participants with pTB in this analysis reported that they had sought care at both private and public health care facilities before diagnosis.

Factors associated with TB diagnosis delay

In the univariate analysis, we found that pTB patients aged 30–49 years (crude OR 5.2; 95% CI 1.8–15.2 [p = 0.003]) and those employed (crude OR 3.6; 95% CI 1.6–8.2 [p = 0.001]) had significantly higher odds of TB diagnostic delay relative to patients aged \geq 50 years and those with no employment, respectively. Sex, marital status, tribe, having formal education and the care provider pattern were not associated with TB diagnosis delay (Table 2).

The multivariable logistic regression model, with the inclusion of age group categories, sex and variables in the univariate analysis with p-value < 0.20 as covariates, showed that age groups 18–29 years (aOR 3.2: 95% CI 1.2–8.8 [p = 0.02]) and 30–49 years (aOR 5.1: 95% CI 1.6–16.2 [p = 0.006]), and being employed (aOR 4.2: 95% CI 1.7–10.5 [p = 0.002]) were strong, significant and independent risk factors of TB diagnostic delay.

Discussion

Our study reports on the care-seeking pattern and diagnostic delay among newly diagnosed adult patients with pTB in The Gambia, West Africa, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. We found that half of all newly diagnosed adult pTB patients in the GBA initiated care in the formal or informal private sector, and approximately 84% had delays to their TB diagnosis as defined by the WHO i.e. more than 21 days from the onset of symptoms



Figure 1. Initiation of TB care: Distribution of the facilities at which newly diagnosed patients with pTB first sought care in the Greater Banjul Area of The Gambia (N = 216).

suggestive of TB to diagnosis (World Health Organization (WHO), 1997). Also, the odds of TB diagnostic delay were, at least, three times higher in patients younger than 50 years of age and those who were employed than in older-aged patients or those who were unemployed. In The Gambia, sputum smear microscopy is still the first and only diagnostic test for TB in the routine public health system. The diagnosis of TB and provision of anti-TB drugs are only available in public health facilities (Gambian National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme (NLTP), 2012), Although 49% of our study participants initiated care-seeking in public facilities, the finding that more than 80% of all participants in this study had TB diagnostic delay and our finding of no significant difference in the odds of TB diagnostic delay between participants who sought care in public facilities only and those who had sought care in both public and private facilities before TB diagnosis, highly suggest that there could be delays in testing and missed opportunities for early TB diagnosis even in the public health facilities where TB diagnostic tests are available. The recognised limitations of sputum smear microscopy as the only TB diagnostic test available in routine public health system in The Gambia could have contributed to this delay. Thus, the findings further highlight the need for sputum smear microscopy replacement with WHO-endorsed rapid diagnostic tests (World Health Organization (WHO), 2020), and the potential for scaling up of molecular diagnostic tests for TB in The Gambia.

Furthermore, we found that TB patients made an average of three visits to health care providers while almost three-quarters sought care at both private and public health care facilities before diagnosis of TB was made. Our finding that TB patients made an average of three visits to health care facilities before diagnosis is similar to that of a systematic review of 23 studies from different parts of India in which patients made an average of three visits to health care providers before diagnosis (Sreeramareddy et al., 2014). This finding, however, seems to be an improvement over the finding in a previous study conducted in The Gambia that TB patients visited an average of four health care providers, and possibly even greater number of actual visits, before TB diagnosis (Lienhardt et al., 2001). However, another study from Italy, a high-income country, reported that TB patients had an average of two visits before diagnosis (Peri et al., 2018).

Approximately 51% of the adult TB patients in our study initiated care in the formal and informal private sector where studies in LMICs have shown that such providers often lack the knowledge of TB symptoms, and TB diagnostic facilities are frequently unavailable (Cazabon et al., 2020; Daniels et al., 2019; Das et al., 2015). This finding is comparable to the report of a combined PPA from 13 high TB burden countries in Africa and Southeast Asia, where about 60% of all TB patients initiated care in the private sector (Chin and Hanson, 2017).

The median duration from the onset of TB symptoms to diagnosis in our study was 34 days, which is comparable to the 30 days reported from a study in Ethiopia (Fuge et al., 2018). This duration in our study is, however, shorter than durations in the excess of 45 days reported from studies in Angola, Tunisia and Brazil (Ben Amar et al., 2016; Machado et al., 2011; Segagni Lusignani et al., 2013). In contrast to our study, these studies included patients with smear-negative TB, extra-pTB and culture-positive TB disease, which could explain the longer duration from the onset of TB symptoms to diagnosis.

Our study showed that age <50 years and being employed were strong and independent risk factors for TB diagnosis delay. These probably reflect the socio-economic realities of subjects battling ill-health in the low-income setting of The Gambia, where the need for economic survival trumps health care seeking. Older aged patients are probably retired and/or fully dependent on relatives for care. However, in contrast to our report, a systematic review of

Table 2

Determinants of TB diagnostic delay.

Reference 2049Dop 200327(12-8.8) 27(12-8.0) 51 (16-16.2)Dop 0006Ser Markerence PenaleReference 0.001Reference 1.0.0.5.3.1Dop 0.005Ser Markerence Marrence Marrence Marrence Marrence Marrence Marrence 3.0 (0.1.12)Reference 0.001Reference 0.001Dop 0.001Ser Marrence Marrence No 0.001.1.2Reference 0.001.0.1.2Reference 0.001.0.1.2Dop 0.002Former No <th>Variables</th> <th>Crude OR (95% Cl^a)</th> <th>Crude p</th> <th>Adjusted OR (95% Cl^a)</th> <th>Adjusted p</th>	Variables	Crude OR (95% Cl ^a)	Crude p	Adjusted OR (95% Cl ^a)	Adjusted p
18-29 22 (0.9-5.5) 0.09 32 (1.2-8.8) 0.02 2-30 Reference 0.001 31 (1.2-18.2) 0.002 So Reference 0.001 13 (0.5-31) 0.002 So 0.004 13 (0.5-31) 0.59 Marital stars Reference 0.52 0.59 Marital stars Reference 0.001 13 (0.5-31) 0.59 Marital stars Reference 0.001 10 (0.1-12) 0.07 Marital stars 3.6 (1.6-27) 0.52 0.001 0.01 (0.1-12) 0.07 Employed Reference 0.01 (0.1-12) 0.07 0.002 0.002 Employed Reference 0.001 42 (1.7-10.5) 0.002 0.002 Tribe Reference 0.017 0.101 10 (0.3-30) 0.002 Triba Reference 0.107 0.101 10.012 0.002 Triba Reference 0.107 0.102 0.002 0.002 Triba Reference 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 Ves 0.30 (0.3	Age (years)				
30-49 -25052 (1.8-15.2) Reference0.003 Reference61 (-1.6.2) 	18–29	2.2 (0.9–5.5)	0.09	3.2 (1.2-8.8)	0.02
2>0KetteraceKetteraceSex Male FemaleReference 0.8 (0.4-19)Reference 1.3 (0.5-3.3)0.59Sex Mariel status Marriel status <br< td=""><td>30-49</td><td>5.2 (1.8-15.2)</td><td>0.003</td><td>5.1 (1.6–16.2)</td><td>0.006</td></br<>	30-49	5.2 (1.8-15.2)	0.003	5.1 (1.6–16.2)	0.006
Sec band endedFerrence 10.64Ferrence 10.65.35.9Amaried bandred started started bandredFerrence 10.025.96.7Formation bandred bandred bandred bandred bandredFerrence 10.02Ferrence 10.026.7Formation bandred <td>≥50</td> <td>Reference</td> <td></td> <td>Reference</td> <td></td>	≥50	Reference		Reference	
Nale PenaleReference ReformantReference ReformantReference 	Sex				
Fende0.8 (0.4 - 1.9)0.641.3 (0.5 - 3.3)0.59Maridi status UnmarriedReference 1.3 (0.6 - 2.7)0.52	Male	Reference		Reference	
Martial status MarriedReference 10 (08-27)0.52Romal education No Server ServerReference 0.00 (01-12)0.07Signo Server Server Server Server Serv	Female	0.8 (0.4–1.9)	0.64	1.3 (0.5–3.3)	0.59
Married 13 (0.8-2.7) 0.52 Married 13 (0.8-2.7) 0.52 Married 13 (0.8-2.7) 0.52 Married 13 (0.8-2.7) 0.52 Married 14 (0.1-12) 0.07 Married 14 (0.1-12) 0.07 Married 14 (0.1-12) 0.07 Married 14 (0.1-12) 0.07 Married 14 (0.1-2)	Marital status				
Married Married Nerried Ves In 10.08-2.7) (0.02-2.7) 0.52 Formal education No Ves Reference 0.0 (0.1-12) 0.07 Employed No Ves Reference 3.6 (16-8.2) 0.001 Reference 4.2 (17-10.5) 0.002 Tribe Mandinka Ves Reference 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 0.01 1.00-0.000 Tribe Mandinka Ves Reference 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 0.01 1.00-0.000 Symptoms 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 0.02 1.00-0.000 1.00-0.000 Symptoms 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 0.02 1.00-0.000 1.00-0.000 Symptoms 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 0.02 1.00-0.000 1.00-0.000 Symptoms Reference Station-8.000 0.21 0.21 1.00-0.000 1.00-0.000 Symptoms Reference Station-8.000 0.22 1.00-0.000 0.10 1.00-0.000 Symptoms Reference Station-8.000-0.000 0.24 0.10 0.10 1.00-0.000 0.10 1.00-0.000 0.10 1.00-0.000 0.10 1.00-0.000 1.00-0.000 1.00-0.000 <td>Unmarried</td> <td>Reference</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Unmarried	Reference			
Name Formal education NoReference 0.3 (0.1-1.9)Reference 0.1 (0.1-1.2)0.07Employed No YesReference 3.6 (1.6-8.2)0.0014.2 (1.7-10.5)0.002Employed YesReference 3.6 (1.6-8.2)0.0014.2 (1.7-10.5)0.002Tribe Mandinka Mandinka Los 1.0 (0.7-0.0)0.211.10.7-0.0)0.21Fula Jola 1.0 (0.7-0.0)0.721.10.7-0.0)0.72Symptoms Cough No YesReference 5.3 (0.3-86.7)0.241.10.7-0.0)0.21Symptoms Cough No YesReference 5.3 (0.3-86.7)0.241.10.7-0.0)0.21Symptoms Cough YesReference 5.3 (0.3-86.7)0.241.10.7-0.0)0.12Symptoms Cough YesReference 5.3 (0.3-86.7)0.241.10.7-0.0)0.12Symptoms Cough YesReference 3.6 (0.6-22.4)0.17S.1 (0.7-30.5)0.12Fever YesSolo (0.6-22.4)0.17S.1 (0.7-30.5)0.12Fever YesReference 1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.391.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10	Married	13 (06-27)	0.52		
Formal-ducation YesForeace 0.3 (0.1-1.9)Reference 0.101-1.2)0.07Proyect No SectionReference 3.6 (16-8.2)Reference 0.001Reference 4.2 (17-10.5)0.002Tribe Mandinka 2.1 (0.7-7.0)0.21 0.1070.11 0.1071.17 0.1070.11 0.107Mandinka Difference SectionReference 1.0 (0.7-6.2)0.1021.17 0.1070.102Symptoms Cough Difference No Others1.10 0.107-6.2)0.21 0.1071.17 0.1071.17 0.1071.17 0.1071.17 0.1071.17 0.107-0.1)1.17 0.111.1	Married	1.5 (0.0 2.7)	0.52		
No VesReference 0.3 (0.1-1.9)Reference 0.0 (0.1-1.2)0.07Employed No VesReference 3.6 (1.6-8.2)Reference 0.0014.2 (1.7-10.5)0.002Tribe MandinkaReference 2.1 (0.7-6.4)1.70.0021.007Pula 0.0 terms2.1 (0.7-6.4)0.171.0070.21Pula 0.0 terms1.2 (0.4-3.5)0.721.0070.021Symptoms Cough Ves2.1 (0.7-6.4)0.171.0070.01Symptoms Cough Ves1.2 (0.4-3.5)0.721.0070.01Symptoms Cough Ves3.6 (0.6-22.4)0.175.1 (0.7-39.5)0.12Ves Ves0.9 (0.3-3.3)0.881.0171.0121.012Fever No VesReference 0.9 (0.3-3.3)0.881.0121.012Indemotypis No VesReference 1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.391.0121.012Denching night sweat Ne YesReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.241.0121.012Denching night sweat Ne YesReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.391.0121.012Denching night sweat Ne YesReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.271.0121.012Denching night sweat Ne YesReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.271.0121.012Denching night sweat Ne YesReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.271.0121.012Denching night sweat Ne Ne YesReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.271.0121.012Denching	Formal education				
Yes 0.3 (0.1-1.9) 0.19 0.1 (0.1-1.2) 0.07 Employed No Reference 3.6 (1.6-8.2) Reference 0.001 Reference 4.2 (1.7-10.5) 0.002 Tribe Mandinka Reference 2.1 (0.7-70) 0.21 1.00000 1.000000 1.00000<	No	Reference		Reference	
Employed NoReference 3.6 (16-8.2)Reference 4.2 (1.7-10.5)0.002Tibe MandinkaReference 2.1 (0.7-6.4)0.1Yalo2.1 (0.7-6.4)0.7Jola1.4 (0.5-4.2)0.7Jola1.2 (0.4-3.5)0.21Type No 2.1 (2.4-3.5)0.21WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.21WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.4)0.24WindiffReference 3.6 (0.6-2.4)0.24WindiffReference 	Yes	0.3 (0.1–1.9)	0.19	0.1 (0.1–1.2)	0.07
NoReferenceReferenceYes3.6 (1.6-8.2)0.0014.2 (1.7-10.5)0.002Tribe MandinkaReference1.1 (0.7-7.0)0.21Yolof2.1 (0.7-6.4)0.711.1 (0.5-4.2)0.56Jola1.4 (0.5-4.2)0.561.2 (0.4-3.5)0.24Symptoms Cough NoReference 	Employed				
Yes 36 (1.6-8.2) 0.001 4.2 (1.7-10.5) 0.002 Tribe Mandinka Reference 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 10.02 <td>No</td> <td>Reference</td> <td></td> <td>Reference</td> <td></td>	No	Reference		Reference	
Tribe Wadio Reference 21 (07-70) 0.21 Yulo 2.1 (07-70) 0.21 Jola 1.4 (05-42) 0.56 others 1.2 (04-35) 0.21 Symptoms Grouph 53 (0.3-86.7) 0.24 Weight loss Reference 53 (0.3-86.7) 0.24 Weight loss Seference 3.6 (0.6-22.4) 0.17 No Seference 3.6 (0.6-22.4) 0.17 Symptoms Yes Reference 3.6 (0.6-23.4) 0.17 Symptoms Yes Reference 3.6 (0.6-23.4) 0.17 Symptoms Yes Reference 3.6 (0.6-3.3) 0.88 Symptoms Yes Reference 1.0 (0.3-3.3) 0.88 Symptoms Yes Reference 1.0 (0.3-2.7) 0.39 Haemptysis Yes Reference 1.0 (0.3-2.7) 0.39 Prenching night sweat No Reference 1.0 (0.3-2.6) 0.39 Prenching night sweat No Reference 1.0 (0.7-3.1) 0.21 Care provider pattern No Reference 1.0 (0.7-3.6) 0.39 Prenching night sweat No Reference 1.0 (0.7-3.6) 0.30 Interso (0.5, 0.5, 0.5) 0.75	Yes	3.6 (1.6-8.2)	0.001	4.2 (1.7-10.5)	0.002
Inbe Reference Wolof 21 (07-7.0) 0.21 Pula 21 (07-6.4) 0.17 Jola 14 (0.5-4.2) 0.56 others 12 (0.4-3.5) 0.72 Symptoms 0.21 0.72 Symptoms 0.23 0.72 Symptoms 0.24 0.72 No Reference Reference No Reference 0.24 Weight loss Reference 10.73.5) No Reference 0.17 Yes 3.6 (0.6-22.4) 0.17 5.1 (0.7-39.5) 0.12 Fever No Reference 10.07-39.5) 0.12 Fever No 0.9 (0.3-3.3) 0.88					
Mail of Male Reference Fula 2.1 (0.7-7.0) 0.21 Fula 2.1 (0.7-6.4) 0.17 jola 1.4 (0.5-4.2) 0.56 others 1.2 (0.4-3.5) 0.72 Symptoms Cough	Iribe	Deferrer es			
Votor 2.1 (0.7-6.4) 0.17 Jola 1.4 (0.5-4.2) 0.56 others 1.2 (0.4-3.5) 0.72 Symptoms 0.30 0.72 Symptoms 0.30 0.72 No Reference 1.00, -86, 70 Yes 5.3 (0.3-86, 7) 0.24 Weight loss Reference 1.00, -30, 50 No Reference 1.00, -30, 50 Yes 0.9 (0.6-22.4) 0.17 5.1 (0.7-39.5) 0.12 Fever No Reference 1.00, -30, 50 0.12 Fever No 0.9 (0.3-3.3) 0.88 1.00, -30, 50 0.12 Loss of appetite No Reference 1.00, -4, 70 0.39 1.00, -4, 70 0.39 Haemoptysis No Reference 1.00, -2, 70 0.94 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 1.00, -1, 10 <td>Walaf</td> <td>21(07,70)</td> <td>0.21</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Walaf	21(07,70)	0.21		
Tuta 2.1 (0.7-0.4) 0.7 jala 1.4 (0.5-4.2) 0.56 others 1.2 (0.4-3.5) 0.72 Symptoms Cough	Fula	2.1(0.7-7.0)	0.21		
Jua others14 (0.5-4.2.)0.30Symptoms Cough12 (0.4-3.5)0.72No YesReference 5.3 (0.3-86.7)0.24Weight loss Yes3.6 (0.6-22.4)0.17S.1 (0.7-39.5)0.12Fever No YesReference 0.9 (0.3-3.3)0.88		2.1(0.7-0.4) 14(05 42)	0.17		
Symptoms Cough No Reference Yes 5.3 (0.3–86.7) 0.24 Weight loss No Reference Yes 3.6 (0.6–22.4) 0.17 5.1 (0.7–39.5) 0.12 Fever No Reference Yes 0.9 (0.3–3.3) 0.88 Loss of appetite No Reference Yes 0.9 (0.3–3.3) 0.88 Loss of appetite No Reference Yes 1.6 (0.6–4.7) 0.39 Haemoptysis No Reference Yes 1.0 (0.3–2.7) 0.94 Haemoptysis No Reference Yes 1.5 (0.7–3.1) 0.94	others	1.4(0.3-4.2) 1.2(0.4-3.5)	0.50		
Symptoms Cough No YesReference 5.3 (0.3 - 86.7)0.24Weight loss No YesReference 3.6 (0.6 - 22.4)0.17Reference 5.1 (0.7 - 39.5)0.12Fever No YesReference 0.9 (0.3 - 3.3)0.88	others	1.2 (0.4-5.5)	0.72		
Cough YesReference 5.3 (0.3–86.7)0.24Weight loss No YesReference 3.6 (0.6–22.4)Reference 5.1 (0.7–39.5)0.12Fever No YesReference 0.9 (0.3–3.3)0.88	Symptoms				
No YesReference 5.3 (0.3-86.7)0.24Weight loss No YesReference 3.6 (0.6-22.4)0.17S.1 (0.7-39.5)0.12Fever No YesReference 0.9 (0.3-3.3)0.88Image: Second S	Cough				
Yes 5.3 (0.3-86.7) 0.24 Weight loss Reference Reference No 3.6 (0.6-22.4) 0.17 5.1 (0.7-39.5) 0.12 Fever Reference 0.9 (0.3-3.3) 0.88 0.88 0.90 0.88 0.90	No	Reference			
Weight loss No YesReference 3.6 (0.6-22.4)Reference 5.1 (0.7-39.5)0.12Fever No YesReference 0.9 (0.3-3.3)0.88Loss of appetite No YesReference 1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.39Aaemoptysis No YesReference 1.6 (0.3-2.7)0.94Prenching night sweat No YesReference 1.5 (0.7-3.1)0.27Creptovider pattern Public facility only Mixed public and privateReference 1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75-	Yes	5.3 (0.3-86.7)	0.24		
No YesReference 3.6 (0.6-22.4)Reference 5.1 (0.7-39.5)0.12Fever No YesReference 0.9 (0.3-3.3)0.88Image: Constant of the second o	Weight loss				
Yes 3.6 (0.6–22.4) 0.17 5.1 (0.7–39.5) 0.12 Fever No Reference 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	No	Reference		Reference	
Fever No YesReference 0.9(0.3-3.3)0.88Loss of appetite No YesReference 1.6(0.6-4.7)0.39Haemoptysis No YesReference 1.0(0.3-2.7)0.94Drenching night sweat No YesReference 1.5(0.7-3.1)0.27Care provider pattern Public facility only Mixed public and privateReference 1.1(0.5-2.6)0.75	Yes	3.6 (0.6-22.4)	0.17	5.1 (0.7–39.5)	0.12
NoReferenceYes0.9 (0.3–3.3)0.88Loss of appetiteReferenceNoReferenceYes1.6 (0.6–4.7)0.39HaemoptysisReferenceNoReferenceYes1.0 (0.3–2.7)0.94Drenching night sweatReferenceNoReferenceYes1.5 (0.7–3.1)0.27Care provider pattern	Fever				
NoReferenceNoReferenceNoReferenceNo1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.39HaemoptysisNoReferenceYes1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.94Drenching night sweatNoReferenceNoReferenceYes1.5 (0.7-3.1)0.27Care provider patternPublic facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75	No	Reference			
Loss of appetite No Reference Yes 1.6 (0.6-4.7) 0.39 Haemoptysis No Reference Yes 1.0 (0.3-2.7) 0.94 Drenching night sweat No Reference Yes 1.5 (0.7-3.1) 0.27 Care provider pattern Public facility only Reference Mixed public and private 1.1 (0.5-2.6) 0.75	Ves	(0.9, (0.3, 3.3))	0.88		
Loss of appetiteReferenceNo1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.39HaemoptysisReferenceNo1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.94Drenching night sweatReferenceNoReferenceNoReference1.5 (0.7-3.1)0.27Care provider patternReferencePublic facility onlyReferenceNixed public and private1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75		0.5 (0.5 5.5)	0.00		
NoReferenceYes1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.39Haemoptysis	Loss of appetite				
Yes1.6 (0.6-4.7)0.39HaemoptysisNoReferenceNoReference0.94Drenching night sweatReferenceNoReferenceYes1.5 (0.7-3.1)0.27Care provider patternPublic facility onlyReferencePublic facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75	No	Reference			
Haemoptysis NoReference 1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.94Drenching night sweat No YesReference 1.5 (0.7-3.1)0.27Care provider pattern Public facility only Mixed public and privateReference 1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75	Yes	1.6 (0.6–4.7)	0.39		
NoReferenceYes1.0 (0.3-2.7)0.94Drenching night sweatReferenceNoReferenceYes1.5 (0.7-3.1)0.27Care provider patternPublic facility onlyReferencePublic facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75	Haemoptysis				
Yes1.0 (0.3–2.7)0.94Drenching night sweat NoReference 1.5 (0.7–3.1)0.27Care provider pattern Public facility onlyReference ReferenceNixed public and private1.1 (0.5–2.6)0.75	No	Reference			
Drenching night sweat Reference No Reference Yes 1.5 (0.7–3.1) 0.27 Care provider pattern Public facility only Reference Mixed public and private 1.1 (0.5–2.6) 0.75	Yes	1.0 (0.3–2.7)	0.94		
Drenching night sweat Reference No Reference Yes 1.5 (0.7–3.1) 0.27 Care provider pattern Reference Public facility only Reference Mixed public and private 1.1 (0.5–2.6) 0.75		· ·			
NoReferenceYes1.5 (0.7–3.1)0.27Care provider patternPublic facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5–2.6)0.75	Drenching night sweat				
Yes1.5 (0.7–3.1)0.27Care provider pattern Public facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5–2.6)0.75	No	Reference			
Care provider patternPublic facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75	Yes	1.5 (0.7–3.1)	0.27		
Public facility onlyReferenceMixed public and private1.1 (0.5-2.6)0.75	Care provider pattern				
Mixed public and private 1.1 (0.5–2.6) 0.75	Public facility only	Reference			
	Mixed public and private	1.1 (0.5–2.6)	0.75		

^a 95% CI = (95% confidence interval).

45 studies from Asia reported that older age is strongly associated with delays in TB diagnosis (Cai et al., 2015). We did not find any association between gender, marital status, having formal education and TB diagnostic delay. Other studies had reported that female gender was associated with TB diagnostic delay (Ben Amar et al., 2016; Cai et al., 2015; Ndeikoundam Ngangro et al., 2012; Peri et al., 2018; Saldana et al., 2013).

It is very likely that the care-seeking behaviour and delays in TB diagnosis in The Gambia will be further impacted by the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic. Our recently published review article on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on TB patients and control programmes highlighted the likely grave consequences for existing and undiagnosed TB patients particularly in LMICs where TB is

endemic and health services poorly equipped (Togun et al., 2020). This assertion is supported by another study that modelled the impact of the COVID-19 response on TB in high-burden countries that suggests that the two months of lockdown and of recovery will add an excess of 1.8 million TB cases over the next five years (Stop TB Partnership, 2020).

Our study has limitations: the small sample size might not have allowed sufficient statistical power to detect meaningful differences across strata. Also, the study was conducted in the largely urban Greater Banjul Area of The Gambia, and the findings might not be generalisable to the rural areas of The Gambia. However, the overwhelming majority of TB cases in The Gambia are notified in the densely populated GBA.

Conclusion

This exploratory study has highlighted the considerable delay in the diagnosis of TB in The Gambia, and provides a benchmark against which we can measure efforts to better understand and improve the overall quality of TB care in the country during the COVID-19 pandemic. There is an urgent need for larger prospective studies to better understand TB patients' pathways to care, particularly the roles of age and socio-economic factors in careseeking behaviour of presumed TB patients, and the best modalities for engaging the private sector in the national TB control programme. A standard cascade of TB care analysis is also needed to accurately estimate the proportions of total TB patients evaluated, diagnosed, initiated on treatment and successfully treated, and the losses at each step of the cascade.

Authors contribution

OAO and TT conceptualised and designed the study. OAO, MDG and AW coordinated the recruitment of study subjects. AOJ, MJ, GS and RJ recruited and interviewed study participants. SD coordinated the data management. OAO and TT carried out the data analysis. OAO and TT drafted the first version of the manuscript with input from JS and BK. All authors contributed to the revision and correction on multiple iterations of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the UK Medical Research Council and the UK Department for International Development (DFID, London, UK)under the MRC/DFID Concordant agreement. The sponsors of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Conflicts of interest

None declared.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the MRCG at LSHTM field and clinic teams (Nurses/field assistants, Nurse coordinators, field workers and supervisors, etc.) who facilitated the recruitment, screening and follow-up of the study participants; the National Tuberculosis and Leprosy programme managers and the study participants and their families who participated in the research project.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.029.

References

- Ben Amar J, Hassairi M, Ben Salah N, Charfi R, Tritar F, Fourati R, et al. Pulmonary tuberculosis: diagnostic delay in Tunisia. Med Mal Infect 2016;46(2):79–86.
- Boggiano C, Eichelberg K, Ramachandra L, Shea J, Ramakrishnan L, Behar S, et al. *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*"The impact of immune evasion on protective immunity: implications for TB vaccine design"-meeting report. Vaccine 2017;35(27):3433-40.
- Cai J, Wang X, Ma A, Wang Q, Han X, Li Y. Factors associated with patient and provider delays for tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment in Asia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS One 2015;10(3)e0120088.
- Cazabon D, Alsdurf H, Satyanarayana S, Nathavitharana R, Subbaraman R, Daftary A, et al. Quality of tuberculosis care in high burden countries: the urgent need to address gaps in the care cascade. Int J Infect Dis 2017;56:111–6.

- Cazabon D, Pande T, Sen P, Daftary A, Arsenault C, Bhatnagar H, et al. User experience and patient satisfaction with tuberculosis care in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. J Clin Tuberc Other Mycobact Dis 2020; 19:100154.
- Chin DP, Hanson CL. Finding the missing tuberculosis patients. J Infect Dis 2017;216 (suppl_7):S675–8.
- Daniels D, Kwan A, Pai M, Das J. Lessons on the quality of tuberculosis diagnosis from standardized patients in China, India, Kenya, and South Africa. J Clin Tuberc Other Mycobact Dis 2019;16:100109.
- Das J, Kwan A, Daniels B, Satyanarayana S, Subbaraman R, Bergkvist S, et al. Use of standardised patients to assess quality of tuberculosis care: a pilot, crosssectional study. Lancet Infect Dis 2015;15(11):1305–13.
- Egere U, Sillah A, Togun T, Kandeh S, Cole F, Jallow A, et al. Isoniazid preventive treatment among child contacts of adults with smear-positive tuberculosis in The Gambia. Public Health Action 2016;6(4):226–31.
- Fuge TG, Bawore SG, Solomon DW, Hegana TY. Patient delay in seeking tuberculosis diagnosis and associated factors in Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia. BMC Res Notes 2018;11(1):115.
- Gambian Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. National Health Policy: 2016–2020. Health is Wealth. Banjul: Republic of The Gambia; 2016. p. 1–52.
- Gambian National Leprosy and Tuberculosis Control Programme (NLTP). National Guidelines for The Management of Tuberculosis. Banjul, The Gambia: Department of State for Health, The Gambia; 2012.
- Hill PC, Ota MO. Tuberculosis case-contact research in endemic tropical settings: design, conduct, and relevance to other infectious diseases. Lancet Infect Dis 2010;10(10):723–32.
- Lienhardt C, Rowley J, Manneh K, Lahai G, Needham D, Milligan P, et al. Factors affecting time delay to treatment in a tuberculosis control programme in a sub-Saharan African country: the experience of The Gambia. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2001;5(3):233–9.
- Machado AC, Steffen RE, Oxlade O, Menzies D, Kritski A, Trajman A. Factors associated with delayed diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in the state of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. J Bras Pneumol 2011;37(4):512–20.
- Naidoo P, Theron G, Rangaka MX, Chihota VN, Vaughan L, Brey ZO, et al. The South African tuberculosis care cascade: estimated losses and methodological challenges. J Infect Dis 2017;216(suppl_7):S702–13.
- Ndeikoundam Ngangro N, Chauvin P, Halley des Fontaines V. [Determinants of tuberculosis diagnosis delay in limited resources countries]. Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique 2012;60(1):47–57.
- Peri AM, Bernasconi DP, Galizzi N, Matteelli A, Codecasa L, Giorgio V, et al. Determinants of patient and health care services delays for tuberculosis diagnosis in Italy: a cross-sectional observational study. BMC Infect Dis 2018;18 (1):690.
- Saldana L, Abid M, McCarthy N, Hunter N, Inglis R, Anders K. Factors affecting delay in initiation of treatment of tuberculosis in the Thames Valley, UK. Public Health 2013;127(2):171–7.
- Satyanarayana S, Subbaraman R, Shete P, Gore G, Das J, Cattamanchi A, et al. Quality of tuberculosis care in India: a systematic review. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2015;19 (7):751–63.
- Segagni Lusignani L, Quaglio G, Atzori A, Nsuka J, Grainger R, Palma Mda C, et al. Factors associated with patient and health care system delay in diagnosis for tuberculosis in the province of Luanda, Angola. BMC Infect Dis 2013;13:168.
- Shewade HD, Gupta V, Satyanarayana S, Pandey P, Bajpai UN, Tripathy JP, et al. Patient characteristics, health seeking and delays among new sputum smear positive TB patients identified through active case finding when compared to passive case finding in India. PloS One 2019;14(3)e0213345.
- Sreeramareddy CT, Qin ZZ, Satyanarayana S, Subbaraman R, Pai M. Delays in diagnosis and treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis in India: a systematic review. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2014;18(3):255–66.
- Stop TB Partnership. Tuberculosis Situation in The Gambia. Switzerland, Geneva Available from: http://www.stoptb.org/resources/cd/GMB_Dashboard.html [cited 5 September 2020]. 2018.
- Stop TB Partnership. The Potential Impact of the COVID-19 Response on Tuberculosis in High-Burden Countries: a Modelling Analysis. Geneva, Switzerland. 2020 Available from: http://www.stoptb.org/assets/documents/ news/Modeling%20Report_1%20May%202020_FINAL.pdf [Cited 24 May 2020] 2020.
- Surya A, Setyaningsih B, Suryani Nasution H, Gita Parwati C, Yuzwar YE, Osberg M, et al. Quality tuberculosis care in Indonesia: using patient pathway analysis to optimize public-private collaboration. J Infect Dis 2017;216(suppl_7):S724–32.
- Togun T, Kampmann B, Stoker NG, Lipman M. Anticipating the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on TB patients and TB control programmes. Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob 2020;19(1):21.
- Uplekar M, Weil D, Lonnroth K, Jaramillo E, Lienhardt C, Dias HM, et al. WHO's new end TB strategy. Lancet 2015;385(9979):1799–801.
- World Health Organization (WHO). 2nd ed. Treatment of Tuberculosis: Guidelines for National Programmes, 1997. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1997.
- World Health Organization (WHO). Global Tuberculosis Report 2019. Geneva, Switzerland. 2019 Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/ handle/10665/329368/9789241565714-eng.pdf?ua=1 [Cited 28 March 2020] 2019.
- World Health Organization (WHO). Rapid Communication: Molecular Assays as Initial Tests for the Diagnosis of Tuberculosis and Rifampicin Resistance. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2020 Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/ rest/bitstreams/1264904/retrieve [cited 1 September 2020].