Statistical Method to Detect Tuberculosis Outbreaks among Endemic Clusters in a Low-Incidence Setting

Sandy P. Althomsons, Andrew N. Hill, Alexia V. Harrist, Anne Marie France, Krista M. Powell, James E. Posey, Lauren S. Cowan, Thomas R. Navin

We previously reported use of genotype surveillance data to predict outbreaks among incident tuberculosis clusters. We propose a method to detect possible outbreaks among endemic tuberculosis clusters. We detected 15 possible outbreaks, of which 10 had epidemiologic data or whole-genome sequencing results. Eight outbreaks were corroborated.

We previously reported use of data from the National Tuberculosis Genotyping Service in the United States to predict outbreaks among incident clusters of tuberculosis (TB), defined as clusters in which the initial case was preceded by at least 24 months of no genotype-matched cases within a geographic area (*1*). This method cannot be applied to endemic clusters (i.e., reported since current TB genotype surveillance began in 2009 with at least 1 case every 24 months) because the initial case cannot be determined. These endemic clusters may be a combination of cases that are the consequence of reactivation of TB in persons who were previously infected and recent transmission of TB.

In this article, we postulate that a statistically driven method can determine the beginning of a TB outbreak in endemic clusters, referred to here as prevalent clusters. Our method searches for instances of excessive unexpected cluster growth above a background rate. We validated our approach by using a combination of epidemiologic data acquired during field investigations and whole-genome sequencing (WGS), which provides higher resolution of the bacterial genome than current genotyping methods (*2,3*). Our method systematically reviews data collected at the national level and local epidemiologic data when reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

The Study

We used the US National Tuberculosis Surveillance System and the National Tuberculosis Genotyping Service datasets for 2009–2016 for this analysis (*4*). We defined prevalent clusters as having ≥ 1 TB case with a genotype-

matched case also reported in that county during 2009–2010, and subsequent cases reported at least once every 24 months (online Technical Appendix, https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/24/3/17-1613-Techapp1.pdf). Clusters were reviewed during 2011–2013 for cluster growth. Case counts were aggregated by 3-month time periods, or the first through fourth quarters of each calendar year. We fit negative binomial hurdle models to each consecutive group of eight quarter time intervals and calculated the 95th percentile of the resulting fit (online Technical Appendix). Unexpected growth in a prevalent cluster was defined as the earliest quarter where the number of TB cases exceeded the 95th percentile on the basis of fit to the previous 8 quarters (baseline period). For those prevalent clusters identified with unexpected growth, we defined a possible outbreak as a cluster that accrued ≥ 10 cases in excess of the quarterly average number of cases in the baseline period during the 3-year follow-up period after unexpected growth was first identified.

When available, we used epidemiologic data from on-site investigations by CDC scientists in conjunction with local TB programs and WGS results to refute or corroborate our classification of possible outbreaks. Studies of epidemiologically linked pairs have estimated *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* to accumulate ≈ 0.5 single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) differences per genome per year (or 1.5 SNPs per 3-year observation period) and found that divergence rarely exceeds 5 SNPs in 3 years between pairs (*5,6*). As a conservative estimate in this study, we defined isolates with 2 SNP differences within 3 years to indicate recent transmission (online Technical Appendix). We constructed a standard list to meet our definition of an outbreak, consisting of outbreaks investigated by CDC (*7*) and clusters with epidemiologic data and WGS results. Clusters with epidemiologic links or closely related WGS results (i.e., ≤ 2 SNP differences) among $\geq 50\%$ of cases were corroborated as outbreaks.

Of 2,723 clusters determined during 2011–2016, a total of 706 clusters had ≥ 1 TB case in the initial baseline period (2009–2010). Among these 706 prevalent clusters, unexpected growth was identified in 174 (24.6%). Of these clusters, 15 accumulated ≥ 10 cases above the baseline average during the 3-year follow-up period after unexpected growth, meeting our definition of a possible outbreak. Of these clusters, 10 had WGS results and epidemiologic data, of which 8 met our definition of an outbreak, 1 was refuted

on the basis of diverse WGS results, and 1 was marginal in meeting our definition. The remaining 5 clusters were indeterminate because neither WGS results nor epidemiologic data were available to CDC at the time of publication. When we excluded indeterminate clusters, we found that our methods had a positive predictive value of 80%.

Our standard list included 3 outbreaks that were not detected by our method. Two undetected outbreaks were initially reported during the baseline period (2009–2010) and grew quickly, setting a high starting baseline average. Although our method flagged these clusters for unexpected growth, they did not accumulate sufficient cases during the follow-up period to meet our threshold for excessive growth. Our method identified no unexpected growth in the remaining known outbreak.

We provide an epidemiologic curve (Figure 1) of the marginal cluster detected as a possible outbreak with WGS results and epidemiologic links reported. Our method identified unexpected growth in the second quarter of 2011, with 5 cases exceeding the 95th percentile of the hurdle model for the previous 8 quarters, calculating a baseline average of 1.25 cases per quarter. From this time point, we counted the number of cases that exceeded the baseline average: 3.75 in the second and third quarters of 2011, 1.75 in the second quarter of 2012, 0.75 in the fourth quarter of 2012, and 0.75 in the fourth quarter of 2013. The cluster accumulated 10.75 excess cases within 3 years of unexpected growth and met our criteria as a possible outbreak.

WGS results showed that, of the 20 isolates reported 3 years after unexpected growth, a closely related group of 9 isolates were within 2 SNPs of each other (Figure 2). Two additional isolates within the closely related group were outside the unexpected growth time window, and 2 other isolates, 1 reported during and 1 outside the time window, were within 3 SNPs of the closely related group.

Conclusions

This research continues our development of alerting clusters of public health concern (8–10). We describe a statistical method that accurately detected TB outbreaks among endemic clusters. Our method, based on routinely collected surveillance data, can be prospectively implemented to detect possible TB outbreaks. CDC plans to conduct universal WGS for all culture-confirmed TB case specimens, which would provide more precise molecular data for possible outbreaks. Our method will still be helpful in identifying when cluster growth exceeds an expected rate.

Genotype surveillance of TB cases is limited to culture-confirmed cases, which represent 78% of all cases (11). Therefore, we excluded non–culture-confirmed cases. In a similar manner, our validation was limited to epidemiologic data available to CDC. In addition, our approach searches for outbreaks within a single county, but TB transmission can cross county borders.

Our method for determining unexpected growth, based on the 95th percentile for a negative binomial hurdle model, serves only as an initial screening. Although our method can identify excessive unexpected growth, to confirm an outbreak requires epidemiologic investigation and increasingly relies on WGS results. Even with universal WGS, outbreak confirmation requires epidemiologic investigations to distinguish recent transmission from reactivation of remotely acquired TB (12).


Figure 1. Epidemiologic curve showing a prevalent (endemic) outbreak of tuberculosis, by case counts per 3-month period, United States, 2009–2016. Q, quarter.

Figure 2. Whole-genome sequencing results for a prevalent (endemic) cluster detected as a possible tuberculosis outbreak, United States, 2009–2016. Values indicate number of SNPs. Shown is a closely related ($\leq$2 SNPs) group of 11 isolates (lower section of phylogenetic tree). Isolates reported during a 3-year window of unexpected growth are indicated in gray. One isolate reported 1 quarter before and 1 isolate reported 1 quarter after the 3-year window of unexpected growth detection are indicated in white. An additional 2 isolates were 3 SNPs from this closely related group, 1 during (gray) and 1 outside (white) the unexpected growth window. MRCA, most recent common ancestor; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism.

Our methods provide an approach to detect possible outbreaks among prevalent clusters. We expect to incorporate these methods into CDC's existing surveillance system for large outbreaks of TB in the United States (*13*). We will explore additional approaches to evaluate initial cases of unexpected growth in all clusters, incident and prevalent, to develop an algorithm that can predict which clusters are most likely to become outbreaks.

Acknowledgments

About the Author

Ms. Althomsons is an epidemiologist with the Division of Tuberculosis Elimination, National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD, and TB Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA. Her primary research interest is using data for evidence-based decision making.

References

1. Althomsons SP, Kammerer JS, Shang N, Navin TR. Using routinely reported tuberculosis genotyping and surveillance data to predict tuberculosis outbreaks. PLoS One. 2012;7:e48754. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0048754
2. van Soolingen D, Jajou R, Mulder A, de Neeling H. Whole genome sequencing as the ultimate tool to diagnose tuberculosis. Int J Mycobacteriol. 2016;5(Suppl 1):S60–1. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmyco.2016.10.036
3. Guthrie JL, Gardy JL. A brief primer on genomic epidemiology: lessons learned from Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2017;1388:59–77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13273
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Reported tuberculosis in the United States, 2016. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 2017 [cited 2017 Dec 18]. http://www.cdc.gov/tb/statistics/reports/2016/default.htm
5. Walker TM, Ip CL, Harrell RH, Evans JT, Kapatai G, Dedicoat MJ, et al. Whole-genome sequencing to delineate *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* outbreaks: a retrospective observational study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2013;13:137–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(12)70277-3
6. Bryant JM, Schürch AC, van Deutekom H, Harris SR, de Beer JL, de Jager V, et al. Inferring patient to patient transmission of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* from whole genome sequencing data. BMC Infect Dis. 2013;13:110. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-13-110
7. Mindra G, Wortham JM, Haddad MB, Powell KM. Tuberculosis outbreaks in the United States, 2009–2015. Public Health Rep. 2017;132:157–63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033354916688270
8. Mitruka K, Oeltmann JE, Ijaz K, Haddad MB. Tuberculosis outbreak investigations in the United States, 2002–2008. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011;17:425–31. http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1703.101550
9. Kammerer JS, Shang N, Althomsons SP, Haddad MB, Grant J, Navin TR. Using statistical methods and genotyping to detect tuberculosis outbreaks. Int J Health Geogr. 2013;12:15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-12-15
10. Yuen CM, Kammerer JS, Marks K, Navin TR, France AM. Recent transmission of tuberculosis —United States, 2011–2014. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0153728. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0153728
11. Ghosh S, Moonan PK, Cowan L, Grant J, Kammerer S, Navin TR. Tuberculosis genotyping information management system: enhancing tuberculosis surveillance in the United States. Infect Genet Evol. 2012;12:782–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2011.10.013
12. Hatherell H-A, Colijn C, Stagg HR, Jackson C, Winter JR, Abubakar I. Interpreting whole genome sequencing for investigating tuberculosis transmission: a systematic review. BMC Med. 2016;14:21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0566-x
13. Navin TR. Surveillance for large outbreaks of tuberculosis in the United States, 2014 to 2015. Presented at: 20th Annual TB Conference, International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease/National Tuberculosis Controllers Association; February 24–27, 2016; Denver, Colorado, USA.

Address for correspondence: Sandy P. Althomsons, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Rd NE, Mailstop E10, Atlanta, GA 30329-4027, USA; email: salthomsons@cdc.gov

Statistical Method to Detect Tuberculosis Outbreaks among Endemic Clusters in a Low-Incidence Setting

Technical Appendix

Additional Methods

Genotyping was performed by combining results of spoligotyping and 24-locus mycobacterial interspersed repetitive unit–variable number tandem repeat analysis (*1,2*). A tuberculosis cluster was defined as ≥ 2 genotype-matched cases reported from the same county or county-equivalent jurisdiction. (The equivalent of a county is a census area in Alaska and a parish in Louisiana.) Incident clusters were defined as those in which the initial case was preceded by a 24-month period of no reported genotype-matched cases from the same county. Prevalent clusters become eligible to be incident clusters if 24 months elapsed with no cases of the same genotype reported in that jurisdiction. A total of 2,017 incident clusters were excluded from our analysis.

All data were imported into and managed in SAS 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) for analysis, particularly to designate prevalent from incident clusters and to construct a dataset to identify unexpected growth. Three-month time periods corresponded to each quarter in a calendar year (e.g., cases reported during April–June 2012 corresponded to the second quarter of 2012. Aggregate quarterly cases of each cluster were documented in a spreadsheet and saved as a comma-separated values file (.csv) which included the unique cluster identifier, year and quarter date, and case counts. These data were imported to the open source statistical software R, version 3.3.3 (*3*).

Model fits for case counts were performed by using the packages zoo (*4*) for moving window calculations and pscl (*5*) for hurdle regressions. A negative binomial hurdle model was fit to each successive 8-quarter time-window of case counts. If all 8 quarters had cases (no zero quarters), a straight negative binomial model was fit. The negative binomial distribution closely approximates a Poisson when the dispersion parameter is large. Thus, our fitting procedure was sufficiently flexible to accommodate a negative binomial hurdle, a negative binomial, or a Poisson fit for case counts in each consecutive 8-quarter time-window. We calculated 95th percentiles for each fit. Negative binomial models accommodate over-dispersion (i.e., greater variability than expected on the basis of a given statistical model), which typically occurs in count data. Hurdle models (*6*) account for excess zeros in

count data, which is relevant for tuberculosis, given its generally low levels of incidence, even during outbreaks.

Genomic DNA was extracted from *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* strains by using the Quick-DNA Fungal/Bacterial Kit (Zymo Research Corp., Irvine, CA, USA), and 1 ng was used to prepare sequencing libraries by using the NexteraXT Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) according to the package insert. Libraries were sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq instrument to generate 250-bp paired-end reads. The reads were aligned to the reference genome *M. tuberculosis* H37Rv (NC_000962.3) by using Lasergene Genomics Suite (DNASTARar Inc., Madison, WI, USA).

Single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were filtered to produce a list of high-quality, informative SNPs for each genotype-matched cluster. SNPs within repeat regions, insertion sequence elements, and the Pro-Pro-Glu (PPE) and Pro-Glu–polymorphic repetitive sequence class (PE-PRGS) gene families were not included. SNPs were then mapped on to a phylogenetic tree by using the neighbor-joining method in BioNumerics 7.6.2 (Applied Maths, Sint-Martens-Latem, Belgium). We designated isolates as being closely related if they were within 2 SNP differences of each other within 3 years of being reported. Although there is no consensus in the literature regarding how many SNP differences would be considered as standard for likelihood of recent transmission, our designation of 2 SNPs within 3 years is a conservative estimate (*7–9*).

References

1. Supply P, Allix C, Lesjean S, Cardoso-Oelemann M, Rüsch-Gerdes S, Willery E, et al. Proposal for standardization of optimized mycobacterial interspersed repetitive unit-variable-number tandem repeat typing of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis.* J Clin Microbiol. 2006;44:4498–510. PubMed http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01392-06

2. Allix-Béguec C, Fauville-Dufaux M, Supply P. Three-year population-based evaluation of standardized mycobacterial interspersed repetitive-unit-variable-number tandem-repeat typing of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis.* J Clin Microbiol. 2008;46:1398–406. PubMed http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02089-07

3. R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2017 [cited 2017 Sep 12] http://www.R-project.org/

4. Zeileis A, Grothendieck G. Zoo: S3 infrastructure for regular and irregular time series. J Stat Softw. 2005;14:1–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v014.i06

5. Zeileis A, Kleiber C, Jackman S. Regression models for count data in R. Journal of Statistical Software. 2008;27 [cited 2017 Dec 15] http://www.jstatsoft.org/v27/i08/

6. Mullahy J. Specification and testing of some modified count data models. J Econometrics. 1986;33:341–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(86)90002-3

7. Gardy JL, Johnston JC, Ho Sui SJ, Cook VJ, Shah L, Brodkin E, et al. Whole-genome sequencing and social-network analysis of a tuberculosis outbreak. N Engl J Med. 2011;364:730–9. PubMed http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1003176

8. Kato-Maeda M, Ho C, Passarelli B, Banaei N, Grinsdale J, Flores L, et al. Use of whole genome sequencing to determine the microevolution of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* during an outbreak. PLoS One. 2013;8:e58235. PubMed http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0058235

9. Walker TM, Monk P, Smith EG, Peto TE. Contact investigations for outbreaks of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*: advances through whole genome sequencing. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2013;19:796–802. PubMed http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12183