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Key recommendations and next steps

- Surveys should be simplified through greater standardization
- Incorporate new technical developments such as the use of GeneXpert MTB/RIF to simplify and streamline the surveys

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving forward/Already in place</th>
<th>Needs further discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Barcodes</td>
<td>• Revised screening algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Digital data collection, management</td>
<td>• Role of CAD4TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporation of Xpert</td>
<td>• Use of Xpert Ultra, OMNI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key recommendations and next steps

- Global Task Force should lead efforts to obtain external input from groups conducting other such large surveys to explore innovations in sampling and analysis that could improve quality and increase efficiency.
- **Ensure participation of laboratory expert(s) in prevalence survey sub-group**
- Use of CAD4TB may benefit from expertise in overall area of computer aided detection of other lung conditions
- Expert(s) in biomarker collection and analysis for population based surveys may also provide insights
Key recommendations and next steps

- Prevalence surveys are expensive with important consequences for policy and funding, and therefore should adhere to Good Clinical Practice (GCP).
  - Establishment of independent oversight is a high priority.
  - Development of proposal for oversight (DSMB-like) entity in process
  - Avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest among TA providers
Key recommendations and next steps

- TB prevalence survey data needs to be used more broadly to provide a better understanding of TB epidemiology and strengthen national and international TB control efforts.
- Need to support NTPs to act on findings:
  - Revised screening algorithms
  - Realignment of resources
  - Investments in laboratory infrastructure
  - Overall improved communication and use of results
Key recommendations and next steps

• Opportunities for synergies with HIV and non-communicable disease programs should be sought to take advantage of the quality sampling and to provide political and financial support for the surveys.
• Several surveys already include questions on smoking behavior
• Need to identify other population based surveys with multiple biomarkers to look at feasibility
• TB/HIV possibility in high prevalence countries – why conduct two separate surveys?
  • Botswana MOH considering possibility
Key recommendations and next steps

• Development and execution of detailed communication strategy, including plans for report writing and wide dissemination and identification of local advocates, should be built into all surveys, and funds should be provided to facilitate more rapid generation of reports and greater dissemination of results to a broader audience.
  • High priority action item
  • This step is often “lost” in the complexity of planning and implementation
  • Specific communications expertise should be included in planning and reporting results
  • Explore CDC model for MMWR and major research?
Key recommendations and next steps

• Funding for the surveys must be closely coordinated to avoid delays, and the timing of surveys should be better synchronized with the Global Fund application process so that funding can be obtained in a timely way to make TB program changes based on survey results.
  • Difficult to implement
  • BUT best practices/lessons learned have been identified and shared by NTPs
  • Next version of Lime Book could highlight lessons learned?
Key recommendations and next steps

• Serial surveys may provide highly useful data to monitor trends and evaluate program activities, but guidelines should be developed outlining under what conditions, and with which frequency, they should be considered.
  • Lower priority (in light of final recommendation, next)
  • Task Force already clear on timing of repeat surveys
  • Less clarity on how to account for different methodologies from one survey to the next
• Continued investments should be made in surveillance, and efforts explored to examine sentinel surveillance as an alternative to periodic surveys.
  • Ongoing investments in surveillance are a priority
  • Would sentinel surveillance be useful in the interim?
  • What countries are likely to move towards direct measurement of incidence?
    • Continued use of standards and benchmarks is critical