Diagnostic Performance of Universal versus Stratified Computer-Aided Detection Thresholds for Chest X-Ray-Based Tuberculosis Screening

Authors: Joowhan Sung, MD[1,2], Peter James Kitonsa, MBChB[2], Annet Nalutaaya[2], David Isooba[2], Susan Birabwa[2], Keneth Ndyabayunga[2], Rogers Okura[2], Jonathan Magezi[2], Deborah Nantale[2], Ivan Mugabi[2], Violet Nakiiza[2], David W Dowdy, MD[2,3], Achilles Katamba, MBChB[2,4], Emily A Kendall, MD[1,2,3]

[1]Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Baltimore, MD, USA

[2]Walimu, Uganda Tuberculosis Implementation Research Consortium, Kampala, Uganda

[3]Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, Baltimore, MD, USA

[4]Makerere University College of Health Science, Department of Internal Medicine Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics Unit, Kampala, Uganda

Correspondence: Joowhan Sung, Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, 1830 E Monument St 4th Floor, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA. email: jsung21@jhmi.edu

Content: Abstract (298 words), text (3,011 words), 29 references, 2 figures, 3 tables, and supplementary materials

Research in context

Evidence before this study

The World Health Organization (WHO) has endorsed computer-aided detection (CAD) as a screening tool for tuberculosis (TB), but the appropriate CAD score that triggers further diagnostic evaluation for tuberculosis varies by population. The WHO recommends determining the appropriate CAD threshold for specific settings and population and considering unique thresholds for specific populations, including older age groups, among whom CAD may perform poorly. We performed a PubMed literature search for articles published until September 9, 2024, using the search terms "tuberculosis" AND ("computer-aided detection" OR "computer aided detection" OR "CAD" OR "computer-aided reading" OR "computer aided reading" OR "artificial intelligence"), which resulted in 704 articles. Among them, we identified studies that evaluated the performance of CAD for tuberculosis screening and additionally reviewed relevant references. Most prior studies reported area under the curves (AUC) ranging from 0.76 to 0.88 but limited their evaluations to individuals with symptoms or abnormal chest X-rays. Some prior studies identified subgroups (including older individuals and people with prior TB) among whom CAD had lower-than-average AUCs, and authors discussed how the prevalence of such characteristics could affect the optimal value of a population-wide CAD threshold; however, none estimated the accuracy that could be gained with adjusting CAD thresholds between individuals based on personal characteristics.

Added value of this study

In this study, all consenting individuals in the general population of a high-prevalence setting were offered chest X-ray screening, regardless of symptoms, if they were ≥15 years old, not pregnant, and not on TB treatment. A very low CAD score cutoff (qXR v3 score of 0.1 on a 0-1 scale) was used to select individuals for confirmatory sputum molecular testing, enabling the detection of radiographically mild forms of TB and facilitating comparisons of diagnostic accuracy at different CAD thresholds. With this more expansive, symptom-neutral evaluation of CAD, we estimated an AUC of 0.928, and we found that the qXR v3 threshold needed to decrease to near 0.1 to meet the WHO target product profile goal of ≥90% sensitivity and ≥70% specificity. Compared to using the same thresholds for all participants, adjusting CAD thresholds by age and/or sex strata resulted in a 1% to 2% increase in sensitivity without affecting specificity.

Implications of all the available evidence

To obtain high sensitivity with CAD screening in high-prevalence settings, low score thresholds may be needed. However, countries with a high burden of TB often do not have sufficient resources to test all individuals above a low threshold. In such settings, adjusting CAD thresholds based on individual characteristics associated with TB prevalence (e.g., male sex) and those associated with false-positive X-ray results (e.g., old age) can potentially improve the efficiency of TB screening programs.

Abstract

Background: Computer-aided detection (CAD) software analyzes chest X-rays for features suggestive of tuberculosis (TB) and provides a numeric abnormality score. However, estimates of CAD accuracy for TB screening in general populations are hindered by the lack of confirmatory data among people with lower CAD scores, including those without symptoms. Additionally, the appropriate CAD score thresholds for obtaining further testing may vary according to population and client characteristics.

Methods: We screened for TB in Ugandan individuals aged ≥15 years using portable chest X-rays with CAD (qXR v3). Participants were offered screening regardless of their symptoms. Those with X-ray scores above a pre-specified threshold of 0.1 (range, 0 – 1) were asked to provide sputum for Xpert Ultra testing. We estimated the diagnostic accuracy of CAD for detecting Xpert-positive TB when using the same threshold for all individuals (under different assumptions about TB prevalence among people with X-ray scores <0.1), and compared this estimate to age- and/or sex-stratified approaches.

Findings: Of 52,835 participants screened for TB using CAD, 8,949 (16.9%) had X-ray scores ≥0.1. Of 7,219 participants with valid Xpert Ultra results, 382 (5.3%) were Xpert-positive, including 81 with trace results. Assuming 0.1% of participants with X-ray scores <0.1 would have been Xpert-positive if tested, qXR had an estimated AUC of 0.928 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.910-0.943) for Xpert-positive TB. Stratifying CAD thresholds according to age and sex improved accuracy; for example, at 95.4% specificity, estimated sensitivity was 75.0% for a universal threshold (of ≥0.54) versus 77.1% for thresholds stratified by age and sex (p=0.032).

Interpretation: The accuracy of CAD in screening for TB, among general populations irrespective of symptoms, is higher than previously estimated. Stratifying CAD thresholds based on client characteristics such as age and sex could further improve accuracy, enabling a more effective and personalized approach to TB screening.

Funding: National Institutes of Health

Introduction

Over ten million people are estimated to develop tuberculosis (TB) each year, of whom more than 3 million are never reported to public health authorities.[1] Improved case finding strategies are urgently needed to reduce the global burden of TB.[2] Chest X-ray (CXR) is a useful tool for TB screening, with higher sensitivity than symptom-based screening and potential for high throughput at low cost.[3] Computer-aided detection (CAD) systems, which use artificial intelligence (AI) to analyze chest X-rays, have recently emerged as a promising tool for scaling up rapid CXR-based TB screening.

An important point of uncertainty is the most appropriate threshold at which to refer screening participants for further evaluation. CAD products typically generate a score ("X-ray score" or “CAD score”) that correlates with the probability of pulmonary TB. The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends CAD calibration studies[4] to determine the appropriate threshold score for each specific population and context. However, most existing studies have either evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of CAD among symptomatic individuals in clinical triage settings[5-10] or offered sputum testing to symptom-negative people only if they had TB-suggestive X-rays.[11-15] As a result, very limited data exist on the accuracy of CAD – and the optimal CAD score threshold for further evaluation – among people with mildly abnormal chest radiographs and no known symptoms. These data are important given the likely contribution of subclinical TB to transmission of *M. tuberculosis* in communities.[16]

In developing optimal CAD thresholds for screening general populations, ancillary data – such as age and sex – may be particularly important to consider. Most existing evaluations of CAD for TB screening have used a single threshold for all participants,[17-20] thereby ignoring known associations of TB risk with sex (i.e., higher prevalence in men)[21, 22] and age (i.e., higher probability of X-ray abnormalities representing non-TB conditions in older individuals).[23] Therefore, tailoring X-ray score cutoffs based on age and sex may improve performance. We therefore analyzed results from an ongoing TB case-finding study in Uganda to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of CAD in a general population and assess the impact of stratifying CAD thresholds according to participant demographics.

Methods

Systematic TB screening with portable X-ray and CAD

We conducted community-based TB screening using portable digital chest X-ray with CAD as part of an ongoing cluster-randomized trial in Uganda (CHASE-TB, Clinicaltrials.gov: NCT05285202). Participants were recruited to undergo screening in testing tents set up either near district-level health facilities or in neighborhoods and villages believed to have high TB prevalence, in peri-urban and rural areas

surrounding Kampala. All adults or adolescents ≥ 15 years old and not on active TB treatment were eligible for the study, regardless of symptoms. At the health facility sites, recruitment was not limited to patients seeking care at the facilities, but also included companions, staff, and passersby. All consenting participants completed a standard questionnaire that included demographics, smoking history (added five months after study initiation), known TB exposures, 30-day TB symptom history, TB treatment history, and HIV status. All non-pregnant participants were offered screening with digital chest X-ray using a portable X-ray device. Chest radiographs were then read in real-time by CAD software (qXR v3.0, [Qure.ai, India]). Participants whose X-rays were assigned qXR TB scores ("X-ray scores") higher than the prevailing threshold were asked to provide expectorated sputum, which was sent for Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra ("Xpert") testing at a local health facility. The threshold X-ray score for Xpert testing (range: 0-1) was initially set to 0.5 and was adjusted to 0.2 after one month and to 0.1 after four additional months, reflecting the distribution of X-ray scores and desire to utilize available testing capacity for research purposes. The present analysis considers data from all participants who were screened from June 2022 (study start) through March 2024.

Statistical analysis

Participant characteristics were summarized as medians with interquartile ranges [IQRs], or as percentages for categorial variables, and were compared across groups using t-tests and chi-squared tests.

We estimated the performance (sensitivity, specificity, and area under the curve [AUC]) of CAD for detecting Xpert-positive TB among non-pregnant individuals who could provide an expectorated sputum sample. Because some participants with X-ray scores between 0.1 and 0.49 were not asked for sputum during the early months of the study, we used bootstrapping to simulate screening populations of the same size and X-ray score distribution, and to estimate population-level accuracy outcomes and corresponding uncertainty. To achieve this, we first characterized the distribution of X-ray scores in intervals of width 0.1. Then we performed the following bootstrap simulation: Within each X-ray score interval, we estimated the number of participants who would have had valid Xpert results had all participants been asked to provide sputum; we sampled that number of records with replacement (limiting the sampling to those with valid Xpert results for X-ray scores ≥0.1, and imputing an Xpert status based on an assumed Xpert-positive prevalence for X-ray scores <0.1); and finally we combined the sampled records before calculating sensitivities and specificities of various Xpert testing thresholds. We performed this simulation 1,000 times and computed the median estimate and 95% bootstrap confidence intervals[24] (CIs) of each accuracy outcome across the 1,000 simulations.

Considering the estimated 0.3% national prevalence of Xpert-positive TB in Uganda, [25] our primary analysis assumed that 0.1% of participants with X-ray scores <0.1 would be Xpert-positive, with sensitivity analyses for Xpert-positive proportions of 0.3% and 0%.

To derive age- and/or sex-stratified CAD thresholds, we first fitted shape-constrained (monotonically increasing) generalized additive models[26] for each subgroup, using Xpert result as the outcome and X-ray score as the explanatory variable. We then identified, for each age and/or sex subgroup, the score at which the prevalence of Xpert positivity was estimated to be closest to 2.5% (based on an estimated ~2.5% Xpert positivity for a participant with an X-ray score equal to the manufacturer's standard recommended cutoff of 0.5); or, for a sensitivity analysis, closest to 1.0%. We took these scores as the age- and/or sex-stratified CAD thresholds for each age/sex subgroup, and we estimated the overall sensitivity and specificity of CAD when those age- and/or sex-stratified CAD thresholds were used. Then, to compare the performance of a universal strategy against age- and/or sex-stratified approaches, we identified the universal CAD threshold that would match the specificity of each set of stratified thresholds, and we compared sensitivities between the universal and stratified approaches. We considered trace-positive Xpert Ultra results as positive in our primary analyses, but we also performed sensitivity analyses considering them negative. Statistical significance was defined as two-sided $p<0.05$. Analyses were conducted using STATA version 16.1 and R version 4.3.2.

Ethics statement

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and Makerere University School of Public Health. Informed consent (or assent with parental consent) was obtained from all study participants.

Role of the funding source

The funder of the study had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, or writing of the report.

Results

A total of 54,840 individuals aged ≥ 15 years were assessed for study eligibility. Seventy-seven were on TB treatment, 12 did not consent, 1,374 were pregnant and offered sputum testing without X-ray, and 542 eligible individuals did not have an X-ray result documented. Therefore, a total of 52,835 participants were screened for TB using AI-interpreted digital X-rays with valid X-ray scores. The median age was 38 years, 44.6% were male, 6.6% reported known HIV infection, and 1.4% reported a prior history of TB treatment (**Table 1**). About one-third (31.9%) reported cough within the past 30 days.

Of 52,835 screened participants, 43,886 (83.1%) had an X-ray score <0.1, 6,107 (11.6%) had a score between 0.1 and 0.49, 1,616 (3.1%) had a score between 0.5 and 0.89, and 1,226 (2.3%) had a score ≥0.9 (**Figure 1a**). A total of 8,038 (15.2%) were offered sputum testing, of whom 7,239 (90.1%) provided sputum and 7,219 (89.8%) had valid Xpert Ultra results. Of valid Xpert results, 301 (4.2%) were positive at a level greater than trace, and an additional 81 (1.1%) were trace-positive. Younger age, male sex, TB symptoms, and prior TB treatment were associated with positive Xpert results (including trace) **(Supplementary Table 1)**, including among individuals with X-ray scores between 0.1 and 0.5 **(Supplementary Table 2)**.

Figure 1b illustrates the relationship between X-ray scores and Xpert results. Of participants with X-ray scores between 0.1 and 0.2, only 0.8% (17 out of 2,166) had positive (including trace-positive) Xpert results. The prevalence of Xpert positivity increased to 2.5% among participants with scores between 0.4 and 0.59 and reached 23.7% (272 out of 1,148) among those with scores of 0.9 or higher (**Table 2)**. The proportion of study participants found to have Xpert-positive sputum was higher for men (1.2%) than women (0.3%), and was similar between age groups (0.8% if ≥40 years vs. 0.7% if <40 years). However, older participants had a higher prevalence of X-ray abnormalities detected by CAD (X-ray score ≥0.1 in 26.0% vs. 9.0%) **(Supplementary Table 3)**. The estimated X-ray scores corresponding to a 2.5% probability of Xpert positivity were: 0.29 for ages 15-39, 0.64 for ages ≥40, 0.36 for men, 0.84 for women, 0.23 for men aged 15-39, 0.50 for men aged ≥40, 0.51 for women aged 15-39, and 0.88 for women aged ≥40. Among all participants with positive Xpert results, semiquantitative Xpert results were weakly correlated with X-ray scores (Spearman's correlation coefficient=0.28) **(Supplementary Figure 1).**

Assuming that 0.1% of people with X-ray scores below 0.1 would test positive on sputum Xpert, community-based screening using CAD had an estimated AUC of 0.928 (95% CI 0.910-0.943) for Xpert-positive TB **(Figure 2)**. Under this assumption, the manufacturer-recommended universal threshold of 0.5 had an estimated sensitivity of 76.6% (95% CI: 72.3-80.3) and specificity of 95.0% (95% CI 94.9-95.0) (**Supplementary Table 4)**. Lowering the threshold to 0.1 improved sensitivity to 91.1% (95% CI 88.3-93.7) while lowering specificity to 83.3% (95% CI 83.3-83.4). When we assumed a prevalence of Xpert-positive TB among people with X-ray score <0.1 that was similar to that of the general population in Uganda (0.3%), the AUC decreased to 0.850 (95% CI 0.827-0.872), and sensitivity fell to 65.0% (95% CI 60.6-68.9) at a score threshold of 0.5, or 77.3% (95% CI 73.7-80.9) at a score threshold of 0.1.

Compared with a universal threshold of ≥0.53 (chosen to match the aggregate 95.3% specificity of the age- or sex-differentiated thresholds), using a sex-differentiated threshold did not meaningfully improve

sensitivity (76.2% versus 75.7%, p=0.572) (**Table 3**). Stratification by age resulted in a marginal increase in sensitivity (77.0% versus 75.7%, p=0.202). Stratification by both age and sex led to a larger and statistically significant increase in sensitivity (77.1% versus 75.0%, p=0.032). For simultaneous stratification by both age and sex, the selected thresholds resulted in a slightly higher aggregate specificity of 95.4%, so a slightly higher corresponding universal threshold of 0.54 was used, which lowered the sensitivity of the universal threshold being used as a comparator. The sensitivity difference between age- and sex- stratified versus universal thresholds remained similar and statistically significant when higher or lower Xpert positivity were assumed for people with qXR scores <0.1 (84.7% versus 82.3% with 0% prevalence, and 65.6% versus 63.6% with 0.3% prevalence) and when trace-positive results were considered as negative (sensitivities of 80.6% versus 78.4%) (**Supplementary Table 5**). Stratifying by age and/or sex at lower qXR thresholds (at an estimated 1% probability of Xpert positivity) led to a smaller increase in sensitivities (**Supplementary Table 6)**.

Discussion

In this evaluation of an active case-finding program among a general population in Uganda, the accuracy of CAD was substantially higher than has been reported for symptomatic populations, or when restricted to people with high CAD scores. Specifically, if one assumes that no more than 0.1% of people with normal or near-normal X-rays (X-ray score <0.1) have Xpert-positive TB, the AUC for CAD in this context was 0.928, ultimately meeting the WHO TPP goal[27] of ≥90% sensitivity and ≥70% specificity at a threshold of 0.1. This accuracy can be further improved by stratifying the CAD threshold by participant age and sex under reasonable assumptions regarding prevalence. These results speak to the utility of CAD-informed CXR in the population-based screening context and argue for further investigation of liberal CAD thresholds that are stratified by readily measured participant characteristics.

In this population, about 5% of participants had an X-ray score over the manufacturer-recommended threshold of 0.5 and these had the highest probability of a positive Xpert result. However, the additional 12% of participants with an X-ray score between 0.1 and 0.49 still had a >1% risk of having Xpert-positive TB, and excluding them from confirmatory testing limited sensitivity to 84% under even the most optimistic assumptions. Therefore, in the setting of community-based screening, lower CAD thresholds may be necessary to achieve desired sensitivity. Our finding of the wide radiographic spectrum of TB in communities is aligned with a recent CAD analysis of South African prevalence survey participants,[15] where an X-ray score threshold needed to be lowered to 0.18 to achieve 90% sensitivity. As lowering the CAD score threshold can strain limited resources in most high TB-burden areas, the costs and benefits of more sensitive versus more stringent screening strategies should be

weighed when setting thresholds. Formal decision analysis, informed by cost-effectiveness analysis, could help set appropriate thresholds for different populations.

We also demonstrated that tailoring CAD thresholds according to easily identifiable individual characteristics, such as age and sex, could further improve the accuracy of TB screening. Among all study participants, the prevalence of TB was four times higher in male than in female participants. As a result, male participants with X-ray scores ≥0.36 had a comparable TB risk as females with X-ray scores ≥0.84. In contrast, while the prevalence of TB was similar between all participants under and over 40 years old, older individuals were almost three times more likely to have abnormal chest imaging (i.e., X-ray score ≥0.1) compared to younger individuals, likely due to higher prevalence of non-TB lung abnormalities among older adults. Consequently, among individuals who qualified for Xpert testing with abnormal CXR, younger individuals were three times more likely to test positive on Xpert than older individuals, and individuals under 40 years old with an X-ray score ≥0.29 had a comparable risk for TB as those 40 years and older with an X-ray score ≥0.64. Therefore, the use of age- and sex-stratified thresholds could significantly improve the accuracy of CAD for TB screening.

Our finding represents a promising opportunity to offer personalized screening in the context of active case-finding. In clinical settings, multiple factors, such as age, sex, HIV status, exposure history, symptoms, and chest imaging, are all incorporated into the decision-making process when deciding to test for TB. In mass-screening settings, this level of assessment is often not feasible, and simple criteria (such as presence of TB symptoms or abnormal CXR) are frequently used instead to select individuals for further testing. However, the emergence of CAD technology – which provides quantitative outputs that correlate with probability of Xpert positivity – now make it possible to incorporate additional TB risk factors into the screening algorithm. While the increase in sensitivity using age/sex stratification was modest (about 2%) in our study, this could nonetheless be valuable in resource-limited settings where confirmatory testing cannot be offered to all individuals who have CAD scores above a low threshold. Moreover, implementing individualized thresholds using very simple characteristics such as age and sex will likely incur minimal additional costs. If validated prospectively and in other populations, setting stratified thresholds, including lowering thresholds for high-risk individuals, should be considered.

Lastly, we note that our estimates of specificity at a given sensitivity in the systematic TB screening context are high relative to some other studies, due to a difference in methodology. Even at a low threshold of 0.1 (which had a sensitivity of 91.1%), our estimate of specificity remained at 83.3% (well above the TPP goal of ≥70%). Three prior studies[13, 15, 18] that evaluated qXR v3 reported much lower specificities, ranging from under 50% to 62% for X-ray score thresholds providing 90% sensitivity. Those lower estimates resulted from limiting evaluations to participants with valid Xpert results, and

thus to people with symptoms or abnormal CXR. By contrast, by using a low X-ray score threshold and estimating the Xpert prevalence even below that threshold, we estimated accuracy among an entire mass-screening population, including the large segment with negative symptom screens and normal X-rays for whom TB testing is not typically indicated. This inclusion of all screening-eligible individuals in accuracy estimates greatly increases the number of true negatives (i.e., no TB, with low CAD scores) and results in higher specificities of CAD, as reported by studies,[28, 29] including ours, that estimated CAD accuracy at a population level.

Our study has certain limitations. Although we used a low X-ray score threshold, we did not perform Xpert testing for individuals with X-ray scores < 0.1. Since about 80% of our participants fell into this category, our estimates of sensitivity are uncertain. Our findings regarding the AUC of qXR and the added value of stratified thresholds were reasonably robust to sensitivity analysis around the prevalence of TB in this population. Secondly, we evaluated accuracy relative to a pragmatic reference standard of expectorated sputum Xpert (without sputum induction or more sensitive gold-standard testing such as culture). This is typical of the confirmatory testing used in practice for systematic screening, and our estimates therefore reflect the accuracy of CAD in routine implementation. Additionally, our analysis did not include pregnant participants, nor participants who failed to provide expectorated sputum (1.6% of all participants or 10% of those with X-ray score ≥0.1). Finally, we only evaluated one CAD software (qXR v3), and our findings warrant validation with other CAD software.

In summary, we screened over 50,000 individuals for TB in Ugandan communities using portable chest X-ray with CAD and found that, while CAD has overall high accuracy for Xpert-positive TB in this community-screening context, individuals with X-ray scores between 0.1 and 0.5 were still at elevated risk for TB. We showed that using age- and sex- stratified CAD thresholds could further improve the accuracy of CAD for TB screening. While our findings need validation, adopting lower CAD score cutoffs and stratifying thresholds by age and sex should be considered to enable a more effective and personalized approach to TB screening in high burden settings.

Contributors

JS conceptualized the research question, developed the analytic plan, performed the data analysis, and wrote the original draft of the manuscript. PJK coordinated field data collection activities in Uganda and contributed to manuscript preparation. AN contributed to data management and data curation. SB, KN, RO, JM, DN, IM, and VN enrolled participants and collected data in Uganda. DWD and EAK conceptualized the study, acquired funding and resources, supervised the data collection and development of the analytic plan, and critically revised the manuscript. EAK supervised the analysis and verified the underlying data. AK contributed to the study's conception and supervised the data collection process in Uganda. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and accept responsibility for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Data sharing

The de-identified dataset of participant demographics, qXR scores, and Xpert results used for this study and a data dictionary will be available upon a reasonable request. Data sharing will be limited to non-commercial research use only. Requests can be directed to ekendall@jhmi.edu.

Declaration of interests

Authors report no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (grant numbers R01HL138728 [to E.A.K. and D.W.D.], T32 AI007291 and K23AI185268 [to J.S.]). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Table 1: Characteristics of participants aged 15 years and older who received digital chest X-ray based TB screening with computer-aided detection software (qXR)

	X-ray score<0.1 (n=43,886)	**X-ray score 0.1 to 0.49 (n=6,107)**	**X-ray score≥0.5 (n=2,842)**	**Total (n=52,835)**
Age, median years (IQR)	35 (25, 48)	51 (37, 65)	51 (37, 67)	38 (26, 50)
Male, n (%)	18,860 (43.0%)	3,021 (49.5%)	1,705 (60.0%)	23,586 (44.6%)
Known HIV positive*, n (%)	2,726 (6.2%)	457 (7.5%)	295 (10.4%)	3,478 (6.6%)
Prior TB, n (%)	257 (0.6%)	123 (2.0%)	344 (12.1%)	724 (1.4%)
Prior household TB exposure, n (%)	595 (1.4%)	104 (1.7%)	54 (1.9%)	753 (1.4%)
Current smoking[§], n/N (%)	410/12,081 (3.4%)	114/1,501 (7.6%)	79/753 (10.5%)	603/14,335 (4.2%)
Symptoms within 30 days				
Any cough, n (%)	12,945 (29.5%)	2,299 (37.6%)	1,613 (56.8%)	16,857 (31.9%)
Cough ≥ 2 weeks, n (%)	6,681 (15.2%)	1,435 (23.5%)	1,227 (43.2%)	9,343 (17.7%)
Fever, n (%)	8,105 (18.5%)	1,320 (21.6%)	728 (25.6%)	10,153 (19.2%)
Night sweats, n (%)	1,439 (3.3%)	294 (4.8%)	236 (8.3%)	1,969 (3.7%)
Weight loss, n (%)	909 (2.1%)	193 (3.2%)	181 (6.4%)	1,283 (2.4%)
Any TB symptom[†], n (%)	17,876 (40.7%)	2,963 (48.5%)	1,865 (65.6%)	22,704 (43.0%)

Variables with p<0.05 on comparison between Xpert-negative and Xpert-positive participants with qXR score≥0.5 were marked bold.

* Based on self-reporting

[§] Only asked for participants enrolled after November 11, 2023.

[†] any cough, fever, night sweats, or weight loss

Figure 1. X-ray and Xpert results of community-screened adults (≥15 years) in Uganda. Panel (**a**) shows the distribution of qXR TB scores among study participants who received X-ray-based TB screening in Uganda with computer-aided detection software (qXR). Each bar height represents the proportion of participants whose X-ray scores were in the corresponding range. Panel (**b**) illustrates the proportions of participants whose sputum Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra results were positive within each X-ray score increment. Bar coloring differentiates the proportions of positive Ultra were greater than trace (blue) or trace (red).

a)



b)



Table 2. Proportion of participants with positive sputum Xpert Ultra results, by sex, age group, and X-ray score. Shaded cells indicate subgroups with Xpert positive prevalence ≥2.5%.

	Proportion of participants with positive* Xpert results, among those tested				
X-ray score	**Male**	**Female**	**< 40 years old**	**≥ 40 years old**	**All**
0.1–0.19	14/1042 (1.3%)	3/1124 (0.3%)	7/671 (1.0%)	10/1495 (0.7%)	17/2166 (0.8%)
0.2–0.29	8/590 (1.4%)	3/586 (0.5%)	4/299 (1.3%)	7/877 (0.8%)	11/1176 (0.8%)
0.3–0.39	9/367 (2.5%)	7/380 (1.8%)	9/173 (5.2%)	7/574 (1.2%)	16/747 (2.1%)
0.4–0.49	8/250 (3.2%)	3/248 (1.2%)	3/106 (2.8%)	8/392 (2.0%)	11/498 (2.2%)
0.5–0.59	9/240 (3.8%)	3/181 (1.7%)	3/87 (3.5%)	9/334 (2.7%)	12/421 (2.9%)
0.6–0.69	9/198 (4.6%)	3/163 (1.8%)	4/75 (5.3%)	8/286 (2.8%)	12/361 (3.3%)
0.7–0.79	9/168 (5.4%)	1/156 (0.6%)	7/89 (7.9%)	3/235 (1.3%)	10/324 (3.1%)
0.8–0.89	14/198 (7.1%)	7/178 (3.9%)	6/97 (6.2%)	15/279 (5.4%)	21/376 (5.6%)
0.9–1.0	209/789 (26.5%)	63/359 (17.6%)	150/402 (37.3%)	122/746 (16.4%)	272/1,148 (23.7%)
Any X-ray score ≥0.1	289/3,843 (7.5%)	93/3,376 (2.8%)	193/1,999 (9.7%)	189/5,220 (3.6%)	382/7,219 (5.3%)

* Including trace-positive

Figure 2. Diagnostic performance of CAD-based TB screening in Ugandan communities

Panel A shows receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves illustrating diagnostic performance of computer-aided detection software (qXR version 3) for sputum Xpert-positive TB during community-based TB screening in Uganda. The colors of the ROC curves represent different assumptions about the prevalence of TB among people with an X-ray score <0.1 who did not qualify for sputum Xpert testing (red line: 0% prevalence; green line: 0.1% prevalence; blue line: 0.3% prevalence). Bands display 95% confidence intervals. Numeric values are provided in Table S3. **Panel B** shows, for each possible X-ray score threshold between 0.0 and 1.0, the proportion of participants who had X-ray scores greater than or equal to that value who would thus qualify for TB testing at that threshold.

a)



b)

Table 3: Sensitivity and specificity of age- and sex- stratified qXR thresholds for detecting Xpert-positive tuberculosis, compared with universal thresholds of matching specificity

	Assumed TB prevalence when X-ray score <0.1	Sex-stratified threshold* **(Male: ≥0.36; Female: ≥0.84)**	Age-stratified threshold* **(15-39y: ≥0.29; ≥40y: ≥0.64)**	Age- and sex-stratified threshold* **(15-39y M: ≥0.23; ≥40y M: ≥0.50; 15-39y F: ≥0.51; ≥40y F: 0.88)**	Universal threshold **(≥0.53 for all**)**	Universal threshold **(≥0.54 for all†)**
Sensitivity 95% CI	0%	83.7 79.9-87.4	84.5 81.0-88.0	84.7 81.3-88.2	83.1 79.2-86.9	82.3 78.4-85.9
Specificity 95% CI	0%	95.3 95.2-95.4	95.3 95.1-95.4	95.4 95.3-95.6	95.3 95.2-95.3	95.4 95.3-95.5
Sensitivity 95% CI	0.1%	76.2 72.2-80.3	77.0 73.0-80.8	77.1 73.1-81.1	75.7 70.5-78.8	75.0 70.5-78.8
Specificity 95% CI	0.1%	95.3 95.2-95.4	95.2 95.1-95.4	95.4 95.3-95.6	95.2 95.3-95.5	95.4 95.3-95.5
Sensitivity 95% CI	0.3%	64.7 60.4-68.8	65.4 60.9-69.3	65.6 61.1-69.5	64.2 59.7-68.1	63.6 59.2-67.4
Specificity 95% CI	0.3%	95.3 95.2-95.4	95.2 95.1-95.3	95.4 95.3-95.6	95.2 95.2-95.3	95.4 95.3-95.4

*Thresholds correspond to the estimated scores at which approximately 2.5% of participants in each subgroup would test positive.

** Chosen to match the 95.3% aggregate specificity of sex- or age-stratified threshold.

† Chosen to match the 95.4% aggregate specificity of simultaneous age and sex stratification.

References

1. World Health Organization. Global Tuberculosis Report 2023. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2023.
2. 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. The Lancet Public health. 2021;6(5):e283-e99.
3. WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review Committee. WHO consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis: Module 2: screening – systematic screening for tuberculosis disease. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
4. World Health Organization. Determining the local calibration of computer-assisted detection (CAD) thresholds and other parameters: a toolkit to support the effective use of CAD for TB screening2021.
5. Qin ZZ, Sander MS, Rai B, Titahong CN, Sudrungrot S, Laah SN, et al. Using artificial intelligence to read chest radiographs for tuberculosis detection: A multi-site evaluation of the diagnostic accuracy of three deep learning systems. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):15000.
6. Breuninger M, van Ginneken B, Philipsen RH, Mhimbira F, Hella JJ, Lwilla F, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of computer-aided detection of pulmonary tuberculosis in chest radiographs: a validation study from sub-Saharan Africa. PLoS One. 2014;9(9):e106381.
7. Khan FA, Majidulla A, Tavaziva G, Nazish A, Abidi SK, Benedetti A, et al. Chest x-ray analysis with deep learning-based software as a triage test for pulmonary tuberculosis: a prospective study of diagnostic accuracy for culture-confirmed disease. Lancet Digit Health. 2020;2(11):e573-e81.
8. Melendez J, Sánchez CI, Philipsen RH, Maduskar P, Dawson R, Theron G, et al. An automated tuberculosis screening strategy combining X-ray-based computer-aided detection and clinical information. Sci Rep. 2016;6:25265.
9. Muyoyeta M, Maduskar P, Moyo M, Kasese N, Milimo D, Spooner R, et al. The sensitivity and specificity of using a computer aided diagnosis program for automatically scoring chest X-rays of presumptive TB patients compared with Xpert MTB/RIF in Lusaka Zambia. PLoS One. 2014;9(4):e93757.
10. Qin ZZ, Ahmed S, Sarker MS, Paul K, Adel ASS, Naheyan T, et al. Tuberculosis detection from chest x-rays for triaging in a high tuberculosis-burden setting: an evaluation of five artificial intelligence algorithms. Lancet Digit Health. 2021;3(9):e543-e54.
11. Fehr J, Gunda R, Siedner MJ, Hanekom W, Ndung UT, Grant A, et al. CAD4TB software updates: different triaging thresholds require caution by users and regulation by authorities. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2023;27(2):157-60.
12. Kik SV, Gelaw SM, Ruhwald M, Song R, Khan FA, Hest Rv, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of chest X-ray interpretation for tuberculosis by three artificial intelligence-based software in a screening use-case: an individual patient meta-analysis of global data. medRxiv. 2022:2022.01.24.22269730.
13. Codlin AJ, Dao TP, Vo LNQ, Forse RJ, Van Truong V, Dang HM, et al. Independent evaluation of 12 artificial intelligence solutions for the detection of tuberculosis. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):23895.
14. Scott AJ, Perumal T, Hohlfeld A, Oelofse S, Kühn L, Swanepoel J, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Computer-Aided Detection During Active Case Finding for Pulmonary Tuberculosis in Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2024;11(2):ofae020.
15. Qin ZZ, Van der Walt M, Moyo S, Ismail F, Maribe P, Denkinger CM, et al. Computer-aided detection of tuberculosis from chest radiographs in a tuberculosis prevalence survey in South Africa: external validation and modelled impacts of commercially available artificial intelligence software. Lancet Digit Health. 2024.
16. Nguyen HV, Tiemersma E, Nguyen NV, Nguyen HB, Cobelens F. Disease Transmission by Patients With Subclinical Tuberculosis. Clin Infect Dis. 2023;76(11):2000-6.
17. MacPherson P, Webb EL, Kamchedzera W, Joekes E, Mjoli G, Lalloo DG, et al. Computer-aided X-ray screening for tuberculosis and HIV testing among adults with cough in Malawi (the PROSPECT study): A randomised trial and cost-effectiveness analysis. PLoS Med. 2021;18(9):e1003752.

18. Kagujje M, Kerkhoff AD, Nteeni M, Dunn I, Mateyo K, Muyoyeta M. The Performance of Computer-Aided Detection Digital Chest X-ray Reading Technologies for Triage of Active Tuberculosis Among Persons With a History of Previous Tuberculosis. Clin Infect Dis. 2023;76(3):e894-e901.
19. Fehr J, Konigorski S, Olivier S, Gunda R, Surujdeen A, Gareta D, et al. Computer-aided interpretation of chest radiography reveals the spectrum of tuberculosis in rural South Africa. NPJ Digit Med. 2021;4(1):106.
20. Moodley N, Velen K, Saimen A, Zakhura N, Churchyard G, Charalambous S. Digital Chest Radiography Enhances Screening Efficiency for Pulmonary Tuberculosis in Primary Health Clinics in South Africa. Clin Infect Dis. 2022;74(9):1650-8.
21. Horton KC, MacPherson P, Houben RM, White RG, Corbett EL. Sex Differences in Tuberculosis Burden and Notifications in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. PLoS Med. 2016;13(9):e1002119.
22. GBD 2019 Tuberculosis Collaborators. Global, regional, and national sex differences in the global burden of tuberculosis by HIV status, 1990-2019: results from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet Infect Dis. 2022;22(2):222-41.
23. Mungai BN, Joekes E, Masini E, Obasi A, Manduku V, Mugi B, et al. 'If not TB, what could it be?' Chest X-ray findings from the 2016 Kenya Tuberculosis Prevalence Survey. Thorax. 2021;76(6):607-14.
24. Carpenter J, Bithell J. Bootstrap confidence intervals: when, which, what? A practical guide for medical statisticians. Stat Med. 2000;19(9):1141-64.
25. The Republic of Uganda Ministry of Health. The Uganda National Tuberculosis Prevalence Survey, 2014-2015 Survey Report. 2016.
26. Pya N, Wood SN. Shape constrained additive models. Statistics and Computing. 2015;25(3):543-59.
27. World Health Organization. High priority target product profiles for new tuberculosis diagnostics: report of a consensus meeting. 2014.
28. Keter AK, Vanobberghen F, Lynen L, Van Heerden A, Fehr J, Olivier S, et al. Simultaneous alleviation of verification and reference standard biases in a community-based tuberculosis screening study using Bayesian latent class analysis. PLoS One. 2024;19(6):e0305126.
29. Mungai B, Ong'angò J, Ku CC, Henrion MYR, Morton B, Joekes E, et al. Accuracy of computer-aided chest X-ray in community-based tuberculosis screening: Lessons from the 2016 Kenya National Tuberculosis Prevalence Survey. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2022;2(11):e0001272.