WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant tuberculosis

2016 update

THE END TB STRATEGY

World Health Organization

WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant tuberculosis

2016 update

THIS IS THE FINAL VERSION OF THE WHO POLICY DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE WHO GUIDELINES REVIEW COMMITTEE.

THE FINAL FORMATTED VERSION OF THE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES 4, 5 AND 6 WILL BE AVAILABLE ONLINE IN EARLY JUNE 2016 AT :

www.who.int/tb/areas-of-work/drug-resistant-tb/treatment/resources/

These guidelines were developed in compliance with the process for evidence gathering, assessment and formulation of recommendations, as outlined in the WHO Handbook for Guideline Development (version March 2014; available at http://www.who.int/kms/handbook_2nd_ed.pdf).

WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
WHO Treatment guidelines for drug-resistant tuberculosis – 2016 update.

1.Tuberculosis – diagnosis. 2.Tuberculosis – therapy. 3. Tuberculosis, Multidrug-Resistant. 4.National Health Programs. 5.Guideline. I.World Health Organization

ISBN 978 92 4 154963 9 (NLM classification: < >)

Printed by the < >

Design by Inis Communication – www.iniscommunication.com

WHO/HTM/TB/2016.04

Contents

Abbreviations & acronyms 4

Acknowledgements 5

Declarations of interest 5

Executive summary 9

Methods 14

WHO Policy Recommendations 19

Research priorities 38

References 40

Appendix 1. Agenda for the GDG meeting on the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB – 2016 update*, 9-11 November 2015 46

Appendix 2a. Participants in the GDG meeting on the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB – 2016 update*, 9-11 November 2015 49

Appendix 2b. Members of the External Review Group for the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB – 2016 update* 55

Appendix 3. PICO questions 56

APPENDICES 4, 5 AND 6 ARE <u>ONLY AVAILABLE</u> ONLINE :

www.who.int/entity/tb/areas-of-work/drug-resistant-tb/treatment/MDRTBguidelines_OnlineAppendices.pdf

Abbreviations & acronyms[1]

aDSM	active TB drug safety monitoring and management
aOR	adjusted odds ratios
AE	adverse event
AIDS	acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
aIPD	adult individual patient data
ART	antiretroviral therapy
CDC	United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CL	confidence limits
CNS	central nervous system
DMC	data monitoring committee
DOI	WHO Declaration of Interest
DR-TB	drug-resistant tuberculosis
DSMB	Data and Safety Monitoring Board
DST	drug susceptibility testing
EBA	early bactericidal activity
ERG	External Review Group
GDF	Global Drug Facility
GDG	Guidelines Development Group
GRADE	Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation
GRADEPro	Online tool to create guideline materials (see http://gdt.guidelinedevelopment.org)
GRC	WHO Guidelines Review Committee
GTB	WHO Global TB Programme
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
IPD	individual patient data
KNCV	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
LPA	Line probe assay
LSHTM	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
LTBI	latent TB infection
MDR-TB	multidrug-resistant tuberculosis
MIC	minimum inhibitory concentration
MSF	Médecins sans Frontières
MSH	Management Sciences for Health
NTP	national tuberculosis programme
OR	odds ratio
pIPD	paediatric individual patient data
PLHIV	people living with HIV
PMDT	programmatic management of drug-resistant tuberculosis
RR-TB	rifampicin-resistant TB
SAE	serious adverse event
SIAPS	Systems for Improved Access to Pharmaceuticals and Services
TAG	Treatment Action Group
TB	tuberculosis
TB/HIV	HIV-related tuberculosis
UNION	International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization
XDR-TB	extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis

[1] see also Table 6 for the abbreviations of the names of TB medicines

Acknowledgements

This document summarises the main outcomes of the Guidelines Development Group (GDG) meeting held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 9 to 11 November 2015 to advise the World Health Organization Global TB Programme (WHO/GTB) on the revision of the policies on drug-resistant tuberculosis treatment (Appendix 1). This 2016 revision will thus update several of the evidence-informed recommendations released by WHO in 2011, which will replace those in the 2011 version; until such time as future evidence reviews conducted for the purpose of updating WHO policy guidance show a need for revision, the 2011 recommendations which were not revised in the 2016 update continue to apply (Table 1).

WHO gratefully acknowledges the contributions of Holger Schünemann (Chair & GRADE methodologist) and Charles L Daley (Co-Chair) of the Guidelines Development Group (GDG) and the other experts making up the group, namely Farhana Amanullah, Luis Gustavo do Valle Bastos, José Caminero, Tsira Chakhaia, Daniela Cirillo, Kelly Dooley, Michel Gasana, Agnes Gebhard, Armen Hayrapetyan, Antonia Kwiecien, Sundari Mase, Lindsay McKenna, Nguyen Viet Nhung, Maria Rodriguez, James Seddon, Tom Shinnick, Alena Skrahina, and Carlos Torres-Duque (Appendix 2a). The experts on the External Review Group (Appendix 2b) who provided comments in preparation of the meeting and on the draft document are also acknowledged, namely Chen-Yuan Chiang, Vaira Leimane, Guy Marks, Norbert Ndjeka, Nobuyuki Nishikiori, Lee Reichman, Rohit Sarin, and Dalene von Delft.

The writing of these guidelines was coordinated by Dennis Falzon (WHO/GTB) and Elizabeth Harausz (Consultant) under the guidance and supervision of Ernesto Jaramillo and Karin Weyer, and the overall direction of Mario Raviglione, Director of the Global TB Programme. The authors acknowledge the contribution of other WHO staff in the production of these Guidelines, namely Haileyesus Getahun, Malgorzata Grzemska, Diana Weil, Nathan Ford, Giuliano Gargioni, Avinash Kanchar, Soleil Labelle, Christian Lienhardt, Knut Lönnroth, Fuad Mirzayev, Linh Nhat Nguyen, Fraser Wares, Marco Antonio Vitoria, and Matteo Zignol. It was finalised following an iteration of comments from members of the GDG, the External Review Group (ERG), and the WHO Guidelines Steering Committee, ahead of submission to the Guidelines Review Committee of WHO (GRC) in March 2016 following the WHO internal clearance process.

Funding for the update of the guidelines was made available by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), through the USAID–WHO Consolidated Grant No. GHA-G-00–09–00003/ US-2014–735.

Declarations of interest

i. Guidelines Development Group (GDG)

The scope of the guidelines update, and the composition of the GDG, including their biographies, were made public for comment ahead of the meeting in line with WHO's conflict of interest policy. All GDG members completed the WHO Declaration of Interest (DOI) forms. The completed forms were reviewed by the WHO Guidelines Steering Committee in preparation for the update of the guidelines and the GDG meeting.

The following GDG members declared no interests: Luis Gustavo do Valle Bastos, José A Caminero, Tsira Chakhaia, Michel Gasana, Armen Hayrapetyan, Antonia Kwiecien, Sundari Mase, Nguyen Viet Nhung, Maria Rodriguez, Holger Schünemann, James Seddon, and Alena Skrahina.

The following GDG members declared interests that were judged not to be in conflict with the objects of the meeting:

Farhana Amanullah declared having received funding for consultancies (US$500/day) and travel paid by WHO; and grants from the Global Fund and TB-REACH to cover her salary (10% full time equivalent).

Daniela Cirillo declared having received funding from FIND to conduct evaluation of drug susceptibility testing (DST) for new drugs (US$16,000); from Otsuka to evaluate DST for delamanid(US$25,000); she also declared being the head of a supranational TB reference laboratory (SRL) in Italy involved in country capacity building in DST technologies for second-line drugs (SLD) and new diagnostics for drug-resistant TB; and being a member of the Italian national committee for the use of bedaquiline.

Charles L Daley declared having received funding from Otsuka to serve as chair of the data monitoring committee (DMC) for trials of delamanid (US$47,000 over 7 years – current).

Kelly Dooley declared having received funding to provide expert advice on trial design for TB/HIV ($2000/year paid to the university/employer); she also declared the following activities and roles: co-chair ACTG study assessing bedaquiline and delamanid; principal investigator for APT trial assessing pretomanid (PA-824); and investigator in trials assessing high-dose isoniazid for MDR-TB, rifapentine for pregnant women and children with latent TB infection (LTBI), high-dose rifampicin and levofloxacin for paediatric TB meningitis, bedaquiline and delamanid for children with MDR-TB and HIV infection.

Agnes Gebhard declared she works for KNCV TB Foundation, which has two projects funded by the Eli Lilly and Company Foundation - (i) engaging the private sector in diagnosis and treatment of TB and MDR-TB with quality assured second-line TB drugs, and (ii) the roll-out of QuanTB (a drug forecasting tool) in countries not supported by the Systems for Improved Access to Pharmaceuticals and Services (SIAPS) implemented by Management Sciences for Health. In addition, she declared that KNCV TB Foundation has a collaborative project with Cepheid in two countries (Nigeria, Viet Nam) with KCNV providing services for the installation and initial training on use of GeneXpert machines.

Carlos Torres-Duque declared having received honoraria from Janssen Pharmaceutica for presentations on TB prevention and WHO policy on bedaquiline at a Latin American Meeting on MDR-TB held in 2014 (US$2,000).

Tom Shinnick declared being an employee of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). CDC supports his travel and research related to his work on the laboratory services needed for tuberculosis control. He declared having often represented CDC's positions on laboratory services needed for tuberculosis diagnosis, treatment, and control. The employer may pay a small portion of the travel expenses. As part of his official duties for CDC, he served on the Data and Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) organized by Otsuka for the clinical trial of delamanid. He did not receive any remuneration for serving on the DSMB nor for travel expenses (CDC paid for all travel expenses related to serving on the DSMB). The DSMB has completed its work for the trial.

The following GDG members declared interests that were judged to be in conflict with some of the objects of the meeting and were thus recused from some of the discussions:

1) Lindsay McKenna declared non-commercial support to Treatment Action Group (TAG), her employer, from Stop TB Partnership; Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; the US Department of Veteran Affairs (on behalf of CDC); Janssen Therapeutics for Hepatitis C and HIV projects and the Global Alliance for TB Drug Development (a public-private entity developing new drugs and regimens for TB treatment). She was thus recused from participating in the 9 November 2015 meeting session on PICO Question 1: MDR-TB Regimen Composition for Adults and Children.

2) José A Caminero stated in his biosketch that he is a staff consultant of the International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease (UNION), an agency directly involved in the implementation and evaluation of programmes using shorter MDR-TB regimens. He was therefore recused from the 10 November 2015 meeting session on PICO Question 3 on shorter regimens for MDR-TB.

ii. External Review Group (ERG)

The following External Review Group (ERG) members declared no interest related to the objects of this meeting: Chen-Yuan Chiang, Celine Garfin, Michael Kimerling, Vaira Leimane, Gao Mengqiu, Norbert Ndjeka, Ejaz Qadeer, Lee Reichman, Rohit Sarin, and Irina Vasilyeva.

The following two ERG members declared interests which were judged not to be in conflict with the objects of the guidelines development.

Guy Marks declared research support from AERAS (US$450,000) related to the evaluation of latent TB infection and the rate of recurrence of TB after initial treatment in Viet Nam; he also declared being the Vice-President (and a board member) of the International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease and Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease (for which he receives an Honorarium).

Dalene von Delft declared having received support from TAG, USAID, UNITAID, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, CPTR, AERAS to cover travel costs and accommodation to give presentations/speeches on drug resistant tuberculosis. She declared that in 2011 she received bedaquiline as part of her MDR-TB treatment through a compassionate use access programme.

The following WHO staff from the Regional Offices reviewed the final draft of the guideline document: Masoud Dara (Europe), Mirtha del Granado (Americas), Daniel Kibuga (Africa), Hyder Khursid (South-East Asia), Aziz Mohammed (Eastern Mediterranean), and Nobuyuki Nishikiori (Western Pacific).

iii. Evidence Reviewers

The researchers who undertook the systematic reviews of evidence for this revision were the following:

McGill University, Montréal, Canada [Mayara Bastos, Gregory J Fox, Faiz Ahmad Khan, Richard (Dick) Menzies]

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), London, UK [Katherine Fielding, Rebecca Harris, Mishal Khan, David Moore]

Stellenbosch University, Cape Town, South Africa [Anneke Hesseling]

The evidence reviewers did not participate in the formulation of the policy recommendations.

The following reviewers declared no interest related to the objects of this meeting: Mayara Bastos, Faiz Ahmad Khan, Richard (Dick) Menzies, and Mishal Khan.

The following reviewers declared interests which were judged not to be in conflict with the objects of the meeting:

Gregory J Fox declared having received research and non-monetary support from the UNION (sponsored by Otsuka) valued at about US$5000 to attend the 2015 International Union Conference and to receive the Young Innovator Award (he declares no work for Otsuka nor any relationship of this award with any commercial or research activities with Otsuka).

Katherine Fielding declared that her employer (LSHTM) is recipient of an award from Médecins Sans Frontières (GB£26,890) for the period February-December 2015 to provide statistical support for the TB-PRACTECAL study on which she is co-investigator. The study is a Phase II-III RCT to evaluate the efficacy and safety of shorter MDR-TB regimens for adults.

Rebecca Harris declared she is consulting for a clinical research organisation (Cromsource) working for GlaxoSmithKline vaccines (~GB£90,000 in 2013); current freelance consulting (for Manpower Solutions) on GSK vaccines not related to TB (~GBP 10,000 since 2013).

David Moore declared receiving research support from Wellcome Trust Research Training Fellowship Programme to supervise a PhD student to study MDR-TB in Peru (GB£207,056 in 2014).

Anneke Hesseling declared that her employer (Stellenbosch University) is recipient of an award from Otsuka Pharmaceutical - Otsuka 232.233 (~US$70,000 to date) for her work on the Phase III delamanid clinical trials in children.

Executive summary

In November 2015, the World Health Organization convened a multidisciplinary group of TB and drug-resistant TB experts to act as a Guidelines Development Group (GDG) for the update of policy recommendations on the treatment of drug resistant TB. In deciding the scope of the update of the guidance, the WHO Guidelines Steering Committee and the GDG considered priority questions regarding the treatment and care of patients with drug-resistant TB. The scope thus differed from the one which governed the previous update of the WHO guidelines for the programmatic management of drug-resistant TB in 2011 guidance.

The scope of the 2016 update covers the following:

1. The optimal combination of medicines and approach towards regimen design for TB patients (both adults and children) with isoniazid resistant, rifampicin-resistant (RR-TB), multidrug-resistant (MDR-TB), and extensively drug-resistant (XDR-TB) forms of disease, as well as for patients with *M. bovis* disease.
2. The effectiveness and safety of standardised regimens lasting up to 12 months for the treatment of patients with multidrug-resistant TB ("shorter regimens") when compared with longer conventional treatment.
3. The effect of time to start of treatment on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB.
4. The effect of surgical interventions on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB.

The scope did not cover other aspects of policy guidance on the programmatic management of drug-resistant TB which were of lesser priority or for which no new evidence had emerged since the 2011 revision. These included questions relating to the monitoring of the response to treatment, the duration of conventional MDR-TB regimens, the delay in starting antiretroviral therapy in patients with HIV/MDR-TB, and models of care. The GDG considered that the 2011 recommendations relating to these areas thus continue to apply until future evidence reviews show a need for the revision of current WHO policy.

In preparation for the GDG meeting, systematic reviews for evidence to answer questions on the priority areas were conducted. The treatment regimen recommendations for adults in the current update are based in part on the individual patient data meta-analysis that informed the 2011 guidance, and which included data on 9,153 patients who were nearly all adults. This was supplemented with additional evidence published until August 2015 which was summarised in a study-level meta-analysis.

Treatment regimen recommendations for children are based on a paediatric individual patient data meta-analysis which included data on 974 children in cohorts and studies published up until September 2014. The data for shorter MDR-TB treatment regimens (up to 12 months) came from an analysis of individual patient data and aggregated data from observational studies conducted in Asia and Africa. Surgical recommendations for MDR-TB patients were based on individual patient data analysis and a study-level meta-analysis.

The evidence available on the treatment of isoniazid-resistant TB and on the delay to start of MDR-TB treatment could not address the PICO questions. There were very few published studies on the treatment of *M. bovis* and the regimens differed too much, precluding any attempt at formulating recommendations of clinical use.

The grouping of medicines used in the treatment of RR-/MDR-TB has been reorganised from the one in the last guidance to reflect updated evidence on their efficacy and safety. This reclassification of

medicines has a bearing on the choice of medicines when users will design individualised regimens for patients with RR-/MDR-TB and XDR-TB.

The recommendations that address the other PICO questions are summarised below.

1. Shorter MDR-TB regimen for adults & children

In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB who have not been previously treated with second-line drugs and in whom resistance to fluoroquinolones and second-line injectable agents has been excluded or is considered highly unlikely, a shorter MDR-TB regimen of 9-12 months may be used instead of a conventional regimen (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence).

2. Conventional MDR-TB regimens for adults & children

2a) In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, a regimen with at least five effective TB medicines during the intensive phase is recommended, including pyrazinamide and four core second-line TB medicines - one chosen from group A, one from group B, and at least two from group C[2] (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence). If the minimum of effective TB medicines cannot be composed as above, an agent from group D2 and other agents from D3 may be added to bring the total to five[3].

2b) In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, it is recommended that the regimen be further strengthened with high-dose isoniazid and/or ethambutol (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence).

It is recommended that any patient – child or adult - with rifampicin-resistant TB in whom isoniazid resistance is absent or unknown be treated with a recommended MDR-TB regimen, either a shorter MDR-TB regimen, or if this cannot be used, a conventional MDR-TB regimen to which isoniazid is added.

There is no change in the recommended use of the new TB drugs from those defined by the WHO interim guidance on bedaquiline (2013) and delamanid (2014) (no recommendation for use in children). The two drugs now occupy a unique subgroup within the *Add-on agents* used to treat MDR-TB.

3. Surgical interventions in patients with MDR-TB

In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, elective partial lung resection (lobectomy or wedge resection) may be used alongside a recommended MDR-TB regimen (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence).

[2] Group A=Levofloxacin; Moxifloxacin; Gatifloxacin; Group B=Amikacin, Capreomycin, Kanamycin, (Streptomycin); Group C= Ethionamide (or Prothionamide), Cycloserine (or Terizidone), Linezolid, Clofazimine; in children with non-severe disease Group B medicines may be excluded

[3] Group D2=Bedaquiline, Delamanid; Group D3=*p*-aminosalicylic acid, Imipenem-cilastatin, Meropenem, Amoxicillin-clavulanate, Thioacetazone. There is no recommendation for the use of D2 agents in children.

Main changes to the WHO policy recommendations for the treatment of drug-resistant tuberculosis

These guidelines update the previous evidence-informed recommendations on the treatment of drug-resistant tuberculosis issued by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2011(1). The current priorities in the management of drug-resistant tuberculosis have been reflected in the scope of the current guidance which differs from that of the 2011 version in a number of ways. For the 2016 update, the Guidelines Development Group convened to update the guidelines proposed priority questions focused on the composition of treatment regimens for rifampicin-resistant and multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB), the effectiveness and safety of shorter MDR-TB regimens, the treatment of isoniazid-resistant tuberculosis, the role of surgery, and the impact of delays in starting treatment for rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis. In contrast to the 2011 recommendations the current guidance did not update the means for monitoring response to treatment, the duration of conventional MDR-TB regimens, the delay in starting antiretroviral therapy in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection and MDR-TB, and models of care. For these aspects of the programmatic management of drug-resistant tuberculosis, the 2011 recommendations continue to apply until future evidence reviews conducted for the purpose of updating WHO policy show a need for revision (Table 1).

The main changes in the 2016 recommendations are as follows:

- A shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen is recommended under specific conditions
- Medicines used in the design of conventional MDR-TB treatment regimens are now regrouped differently based upon current evidence on their effectiveness and safety. Clofazimine and linezolid are now recommended as core second-line medicines in the MDR-TB regimen while *p*-aminosalicylic acid is an *Add-on agent*
- MDR-TB treatment is recommended for all patients with rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis, regardless if isoniazid resistance is confirmed or not
- Specific recommendations are made on the treatment of children with rifampicin-resistant or MDR-TB
- Clarithromycin and other macrolides are no longer included among the medicines to be used for the treatment of MDR-TB
- Evidence-informed recommendations on the role of surgery are now included

There is no change in the role of the new drugs – bedaquiline and delamanid – which have now been assigned to a specific subgroup of the *Add-on agents*

Table 1. SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN THE EVIDENCE BASED RECOMMENDATIONS BEWTEEN THE 2011(1) AND 2016 GUIDELINES[4]

2011 guidelines(1)	***2016 guidelines***
Use of rapid diagnostics for rifampicin resistance Rapid drug susceptibility testing (DST) of isoniazid and rifampicin or of rifampicin alone is recommended over conventional testing or no testing at the time of diagnosis of TB, subject to available resources (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence)	UPDATED [from (2)] Rapid drug susceptibility testing (DST) of at least rifampicin is recommended in adults and children over conventional testing or no testing at the time of diagnosis of TB (strong recommendation, high certainty in the evidence)
Use of sputum microscopy and culture to monitor response to treatment The use of sputum smear microscopy and culture rather than sputum smear microscopy alone is recommended for the monitoring of patients with MDR-TB during treatment (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence)	REMAINS VALID[5]
Use of a shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen[6] NO SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION	In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB who have not been previously treated with second-line drugs and in whom resistance to fluoroquinolones and second-line injectable agents has been excluded or is considered highly unlikely, a shorter MDR-TB regimen of 9-12 months may be used instead of a conventional regimen (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence)[6]
Composition of conventional MDR-TB treatment regimens In the treatment of patients with MDR-TB, a fluoroquinolone should be used (strong recommendation, very low quality evidence) In the treatment of patients with MDR-TB, a later-generation fluoroquinolone rather than an earlier-generation fluoroquinolone should be used (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence) In the treatment of patients with MDR-TB, ethionamide (or prothionamide) should be used (strong recommendation, very low quality evidence) In the treatment of patients with MDR-TB, regimens should include at least pyrazinamide, a fluoroquinolone, a parenteral agent, ethionamide (or prothionamide), and either cycloserine or PAS (*p*-aminosalicylic acid) if cycloserine cannot be used (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence)	UPDATED[7] In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, a regimen with at least five effective TB medicines during the intensive phase is recommended, including pyrazinamide and four core second-line TB medicines - one chosen from group A, one from group B, and at least two from group C[8] (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence). If the minimum of effective TB medicines cannot be composed as above, an agent from group D2 and other agents from D3 may be added to bring the total to five[9]. In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, it is recommended that the regimen be further strengthened with high-dose isoniazid and/or ethambutol (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence).

[4] These recommendations need to be read along with the accompanying remarks in the relevant sections of this document, which are critical to their proper implementation

[5] This recommendation continues to apply. It will be revised if a future evidence review conducted for the purpose of updating WHO policy guidance shows such need.

[6] See text for the definition of the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen, and for other conditions which apply when implementing this recommendation

[7] No changes to the WHO interim policies on the use of bedaquiline and delamanid have been made in this update (3),(4)

[8] Group A=Levofloxacin; Moxifloxacin; Gatifloxacin; Group B=Amikacin, Capreomycin, Kanamycin, (Streptomycin); Group C= Ethionamide (or Prothionamide), Cycloserine (or Terizidone), Linezolid, Clofazimine; in children with non-severe disease Group B medicines may be excluded

[9] Group D2=Bedaquiline, Delamanid; Group D3=*p*-aminosalicylic acid, Imipenem-cilastatin, Meropenem, Amoxicillin-clavulanate, Thioacetazone

2011 guidelines(1)	*2016 guidelines*
Composition of conventional MDR-TB treatment regimens (continued) In the treatment of patients with MDR-TB, four second-line anti-tuberculosis drugs likely to be effective (including a parenteral agent), as well as pyrazinamide, should be included in the intensive phase (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence)	UPDATED (as above)
Treatment of patients with rifampicin-resistant TB NO SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION	It is recommended that any patient – child or adult - with rifampicin-resistant TB in whom isoniazid resistance is absent or unknown be treated with a recommended MDR-TB regimen, either a shorter MDR-TB regimen, or if this cannot be used, a conventional MDR-TB regimen to which isoniazid is added.
Duration of conventional MDR-TB treatment regimens In the treatment of patients with MDR-TB, an intensive phase of 8 months is suggested for most patients, and the duration may be modified according to the patient's response to therapy (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence). In the treatment of patients newly diagnosed with MDR-TB (i.e. not previously treated for MDR-TB), a total treatment duration of 20 months is suggested for most patients, and the duration may be modified according to the patient's response to therapy (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence).	REMAINS VALID[5]
Start of antiretroviral therapy with MDR-TB treatment Antiretroviral therapy is recommended for all patients with HIV and drug-resistant TB requiring second-line anti-tuberculosis drugs, irrespective of CD4 cell-count, as early as possible (within the first 8 weeks) following initiation of anti-tuberculosis treatment (strong recommendation, very low quality evidence).	REMAINS VALID[5]
Use of surgery as part of MDR-TB treatment NO SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION	In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, elective partial lung resection (lobectomy or wedge resection) may be used alongside a recommended MDR-TB regimen (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence).
Models of MDR-TB care (ambulatory/hospitalization) Patients with MDR-TB should be treated using mainly ambulatory care rather than models of care based principally on hospitalization (conditional recommendation, very low quality evidence).	REMAINS VALID[5]

Methods

The methods used to prepare for the revision of these guidelines were in accordance with current WHO requirements which govern this process(5).

i. Preparation for revision

The WHO Guidelines Steering Committee of the Global TB Programme met regularly from November 2014 through November 2015 to draft the scope and PICO questions and to follow up the development of the guidelines. An application for the revision of the guidelines was submitted to the GRC in August 2015and received final approval in September 2015.

Seven webinars (using WebEx) were held between May and November (May 20; July 17; August 7; August 28; September 16; October 6; November 5) to discuss with the GDG members the scoping, the PICO questions, the scoring of the outcomes, and progress with the evidence reviews ahead of the meeting. For certain sessions, the groups assessing the evidence were invited to these discussions as resource persons. In between the webinars, discussion was continued via email. Two WebEx discussions were also held with the ERG members (7 September and 29 October), during which they were briefed about their roles and expectations as peer-reviewers.

ii. Scope

The 2016 update of the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant tuberculosis* aimed to update the previous evidence-informed policy recommendations from 2011(1). The scope of the current guidelines differed from the one of the 2011 guidance in a number of ways. In 2011, the scope of the guidelines was broader and included programmatic aspects such as rapid diagnostics, patient monitoring with culture and sputum microscopy during treatment, use of antiretroviral therapy, and ambulatory/inpatient models of care. Recommendations were made also on the intensive phase and total duration of conventional regimens. In deciding the scope of the 2016 update of the guidance, the WHO Guidelines Steering Committee and the GDG considered priority questions at the time of the update (2014-2015). The scope did not cover other aspects of policy guidance on the programmatic management of drug-resistant TB for which no new evidence had been published since the 2011 revision.

The GDG agreed to limit the scope of these guidelines to the following priority area within the current debates on the treatment and care of patients with drug-resistant TB:

1) The optimal combination of medicines and approach towards regimen design for TB patients with isoniazid resistant, rifampicin-resistant (RR-TB), multidrug-resistant (MDR-TB), and extensively drug-resistant (XDR-TB) forms of disease, as well as patients with *M. bovis* disease.
2) The effectiveness and safety of standardised regimens lasting up to 12 months for the treatment of patients with multidrug-resistant TB ("shorter regimens") when compared with longer conventional treatment
3) The effect of time to start of treatment on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB
4) The effect of surgical interventions on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB

Insofar as was possible, the guidelines also aimed to look for evidence, formulate the recommendations and add remarks which would be relevant to patients of all ages, as well as individuals with key comorbidities (e.g. HIV, diabetes) which are relevant and where evidence exists that permits remarks to be made on these subgroups.

The target audience of the guidelines is staff and medical practitioners working in prevention and care of TB, managers implementing the programmatic management of drug-resistant TB (PMDT) within their centres and national programmes, and organizations providing technical and financial support for drug-resistant TB. Although primarily intended for use in resource-limited countries, the recommendations are also applicable in other settings.

iii. Key questions

The PICO questions were grouped into four sets (see full versions in Appendix 3). PICO questions 1 and 2 were devoted to the first area of the guidelines scope (see above); PICO question 3 was devoted entirely to the second area; and PICO question 4 covered both the third and fourth areas.

The outcomes were defined and scored by the GDG (Table 2). The mean scores for the 9 responses received were all in the "Critical" range (7-9).

Table 2. Scoring of outcomes considered relevant by the GDG for the evidence reviews related to the revision of the WHO Treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB*

Outcomes	*Mean score*
Adherence to TB treatment (treatment interruption due to non-adherence)	6.8
Avoiding adverse reactions from TB drugs	7.0
Avoiding the acquisition or amplification of drug resistance	7.9
Cure or successful completion by end of treatment	9.0
Culture conversion by month 6	7.4
Death (survival) by the end of projected treatment	8.1
Treatment failure	8.7
Relapse	7.7

* Relative importance was rated on an incremental scale:
1–3 points: Not important for making recommendations on treatment of drug-resistant TB
4–6 points: Important but not critical for making recommendations on treatment of drug-resistant TB
7–9 points: Critical for making recommendations on treatment of drug-resistant TB

iv. Certainty of evidence and strength of recommendations

The recommendations in these guidelines qualify their strength as well as the certainty in the evidence on which they are based. The text of the recommendation itself should be read along with the accompanying remarks which summarise the evidence upon which the recommendation was made, the anticipated desirable and undesirable effects of the interventions to assess the balance of expected benefits to risks, and other considerations which are important to the implementation of the policy. The WHO GDG also made a statement about the research priorities within the different dimensions covered by each of the PICO questions (see the section on Research Priorities below).

The certainty (quality) of the evidence is categorized into four levels (Table 3). The criteria used by the evidence reviewers to qualify the quality of available evidence are summarised in the GRADE Tables annexed to these guidelines (online Appendix 4). A number of factors may increase or decrease the quality of evidence (see Tables 12.2b and 12.2c in (6)). The highest quality rating is usually assigned to randomized controlled trial (RCT) evidence while evidence from observational studies is usually assigned a low or very low quality value at the start.

Table 3. Certainty in the evidence

Certainty in the evidence	*Definition*
High (⊕⊕⊕⊕)	Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate (⊕⊕⊕◯)	Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the effect and may change the estimate.
Low (⊕⊕◯◯)	Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low (⊕◯◯◯)	Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

A recommendation may be strong or conditional. Apart from the quality of evidence, the strength of a recommendation is determined by the balance between desirable and undesirable effects, values and preferences, and costs or resource allocation(7). For strong recommendations, the WHO GDG is confident that the desirable effects of adherence to the recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects. For conditional recommendations, the WHO GDG considers that desirable effects probably outweigh the undesirable effects. The strength of a recommendation has different implications for the individuals affected by these guidelines (Table 4).

v. Definitions

The term **rifampicin-resistant TB (RR-TB)**, used throughout these guidelines, refers to TB strains which are eligible for treatment with MDR-TB regimens (conventional or shorter) as standard first-line regimens can no longer be used(8). RR-TB strains may be susceptible to isoniazid, or resistant to isoniazid (i.e. multidrug-resistant TB; MDR-TB), or resistant to other medicines from the first-line group (poly-resistant) or from the second-line group (e.g. extensively drug-resistant TB; XDR-TB)(9).

The term **drug-susceptibility testing** refers to *in vitro* testing using either phenotypic methods to determine susceptibility or molecular techniques to detect resistance-conferring mutations to a particular medicine. New policy guidance on the use of line probe assay for the detection of resistance to second-line anti-tuberculosis drugs are now available(10).

A **second-line TB medicine (or agent)** refers to one which is only used to treat drug-resistant TB (see also Section B). For the treatment of RR-/MDR-TB streptomycin is included as a substitute for the second-line injectable agents when aminoglycosides or capreomycin cannot be used and susceptibility is confirmed or highly likely. The **core second-line TB medicines (or agents)** refer to those in Groups A, B or C.

A **shorter MDR-TB regimen** refers to a course of treatment for RR-/MDR-TB lasting 9-12 months, which is largely standardised, and whose composition and duration follows closely the one with documented evidence used in different settings(11),(12),(13). The features and indications of this regimen are further elaborated in Section A of these guidelines.

Conventional MDR-TB regimens are treatments for RR-/MDR-TB which last 18 months or more and which may be standardised or individualised. These regimens are usually designed to include a minimum number of second-line TB medicines considered to be effective based on patient history or drug-resistance patterns(1),(8). The features and indications of these regimens are further elaborated in Section B of these guidelines.

The **treatment outcome** categories used in these guidelines and the term **relapse** were applied according to the definitions agreed for use by programmes, unless otherwise specified(9),(14).

For the purposes of the reviews conducted for these guidelines, a **serious adverse event (SAE)** is defined as one which was classified as Grade 3 (severe) or 4 (life-threatening or disabling)(15), or which led to the medicine being stopped permanently.

Table 4. Implications of the strength of a recommendation for different users (adapted from (7))

Perspective	***Strong recommendation***	***Conditional recommendation***
For patients	Most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action and only a small proportion would not. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individuals make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.	The majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not.
For clinicians	Most individuals should receive the intervention. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guidelines could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator.	Recognize that different choices will be appropriate for individual patients, and that patients must be helped to arrive at a management decision consistent with their values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful in helping individuals to make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
For policy-makers	The recommendation can be adopted as policy in most situations.	Policy-making will require substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders.

vi. Assessment of evidence and its grading

The evidence review teams assessed the evidence for the PICO questions and their outcomes through systematic literature reviews following a standard methodology((6); more details on the methods used in unpublished studies in online Appendix 6 and for published ones in (16) and (17)). Titles, abstracts and full text of potentially relevant literature were screened using key subject words and text words. Authors in the field and members of the Guideline Development Group were contacted to identify missing studies or studies in progress. Individual patient-level data were collected from authors of published studies to address the PICO 1 (children; see also Section B) and PICO 3 (shorter MDR-TB regimens; see Section A). Case-based data were also used to address PICO 1 (adults(16); see Section B) and PICO 4 (use of surgery(17); see Section D).

Relative effects (relative risks or odds ratios of an event) were calculated from pooled data in individual or aggregated format from the studies included. Absolute effects and risk differences were used to express the magnitude of an effect or difference between the intervention and comparator groups. Where possible, adjustments were done to reduce risk of bias and confounding. More details are provided in the notes on the GRADE Tables. GRADE evidence profiles based on the results of the systematic reviews were prepared for each question using GRADEPro software (http://gdt.guidelinedevelopment.org). The quality of evidence was assessed using the following criteria: study design, limitations in the studies (risk of bias), imprecision, inconsistency, indirectness, publication bias, magnitude of effect, dose–effect relations and residual confounding..

The GDG membership represented a broad cross-section of future users of the guidelines as well as affected persons (including the patient). Ahead of the GDG meeting held at the WHO headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, between 9 and 11 November 2015, one or more discussants were identified from among the GDG members to assess the evidence for each of the PICO questions and to present his or her perspective on the implications of the findings during the meeting. Drafts of the review reports were shared with the GDG members ahead of the meeting (online Appendices 4 and 6); during the days of the meeting and in the following weeks additional analyses were shared with the group upon their demand. The GRADE evidence profiles were discussed by the GDG ahead of formulating the recommendations. The group used the "Evidence to Decision" tables via the GRADEPro interface to capture the content of the discussions, to annotate the different considerations, to develop the recommendation wording and strength, and to add the remarks which accompany each recommendation (online Appendix 5).

Apart from the quality of evidence, the strength of a recommendation was determined by the balance between desirable and undesirable effects, values and preferences, considerations on equity, resource use and feasibility. In the preparation of the PICO questions and outcomes, and in the discussions of the evidence before, during and after the meeting, they paid particular attention to the spectrum of values and preferences attached to the recommendations by the different groups. One important factor which lowered the strength of all recommendations made in these guidelines was the variability in values and preferences of those affected by these policies as perceived by the GDG members. Resource use was not assessed by means of formal cost-effectiveness studies, and the GDG assessed it from the perspective of the patient and the health services, in terms of feasibility and opportunity cost. The decision on certainty of evidence, on the choice of wording of a recommendation, the on its strength were largely decided through moderated discussion and any disagreements were resolved by a group decision on an acceptable position. In the case of the recommendation on surgery (part of PICO 4), the final wording was agreed through voting (online Appendix 5). None of the recommendations for these guidelines was deemed strong and all the evidence quality was rated as very low.

vii. External review

The External Review Group commented on the questions during their formulation (in mid-2015) and on a draft text of the guidelines, including recommendations, following comments from the GDG (in February 2016). Six reviewers provided substantive comments on the draft of the guidelines.

viii. Publication, implementation, evaluation and expiry

These guidelines are being published on the WHO Global TB Programme (WHO/GTB) web-site and will be freely downloadable (as .pdf and other electronic formats). The main text of the guidelines will also be made available in print version in late 2016. It is also expected that the evidence reviews as well as the recommendations will be published in peer-reviewed journals to improve dissemination of the main messages. The changes to the

policy guidance will also be reflected in a forthcoming revision of the WHO implementation handbook for PMDT planned later in 2016(8).

WHO will work closely with its regional and country offices, as well as technical and funding agencies and partners, to ensure wide communication of the updated guidance in technical meetings and training activities. WHO/GTB will review and update these guidelines within 4-5 years after their publication, or earlier if new evidence become available (e.g. for bedaquiline and delamanid use) and these changes will also be reflected in the implementation handbook(8).

WHO Policy Recommendations

A. The effectiveness and safety of standardised regimens lasting up to 12 months for the treatment of patients with multidrug-resistant TB when compared with longer conventional treatment

Recommendation

In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB who have not been previously treated with second-line drugs and in whom resistance to fluoroquinolones and second-line injectable agents has been excluded or is considered highly unlikely, a shorter MDR-TB regimen of 9-12 months may be used instead of a conventional regimen (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence)

Justification

The interest in reducing the duration of treatment for MDR-TB has motivated a number of initiatives to treat patients with shorter regimens under programmatic as well as trial conditions(11),(13),(12),(18). Early results from observational studies in Bangladesh, Cameroon and Niger using regimens lasting 12 months or less have shown much higher likelihood of treatment success compared with longer conventional regimens when treating patients with specific inclusion criteria (including lack of previous exposure to second-line anti-TB medications). Given limited experience and lack of data on the use of these shorter MDR-TB regimens, WHO advised in 2012 that such regimens only be used within a context of operational research and under close monitoring for effectiveness and safety during and after the end of treatment(19). In the past few years, results from three studies of patients on shorter regimens have been published and other studies have begun, including both observational cohorts and randomised controlled trials in different settings.

Given the published data and potential impact of shorter regimens on treatment cost and affordability, WHO proceeded with evidence assessment. A PICO question was developed to assess the effectiveness of the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimens lasting up to 12 months and to inform a possible policy change with respect to their use and application (Appendix 3; Q3). The evidence reviewed for this question compared the treatment outcomes of confirmed rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB patients treated with these regimens with those of patients treated with conventional regimens (online Appendix 4). The shorter MDR-TB treatment regimens were standardised in content and duration and split into two distinct parts. Firstly, an intensive phase of 4 months (extended to 6 months in case of lack of sputum smear conversion) was given including the following drugs: gatifloxacin (or moxifloxacin), kanamycin, prothionamide, clofazimine, high-dose isoniazid, pyrazinamide, and ethambutol. This was followed by a continuation phase of 5 months with the following medicines: gatifloxacin (or moxifloxacin), clofazimine, ethambutol, and pyrazinamide (prothionamide was kept in the continuation phase in earlier studies). Patients were placed on these regimens based upon a set of

criteria, and individuals who had prior exposure to second-line TB drugs were excluded from the analysis. No modifications were made to the shorter MDR-TB regimen as a result of the detection of previously unknown drug resistance. The recommendation made in this respect thus applies only to a regimen profile with similar characteristics of the ones studied, given that the substitution or exclusion of one or more of the medicines of this regimen may affect its overall performance which is not possible to predict given the lack of evidence of the impact of such modifications (see also under *Implementation Considerations* below).

All data used to assess the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimens derived from observational studies (see online Appendix 6 for background, methods and summary of findings). Individual patient data from Bangladesh (N=493; supported by the Damien Foundation), Uzbekistan (N=65; supported by Médecins sans Frontières; MSF) and Swaziland (N=24; MSF) as well as aggregated data from Cameroon (N=150)(12), Niger(N=65)(13) and 9 sub-Saharan African countries (N=408; supported by the UNION) were included in the analysis (total number of observations = 1,205, of whom 89 cases were lost to follow-up and were therefore excluded in certain analyses). These were compared with the outcomes of patients without previous exposure to second-line TB drugs who were included in the adult individual patient data (aIPD) analysis (N=7,665)((16); see also Section B below for more details on the aIPD). The standard outcomes used in the intervention and comparator arms largely complied with the standardised outcomes used by TB programmes(9),(14),(20).

The analyses performed for the evidence assessment showed that patients who met specific inclusion criteria for receiving the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimens had a statistically-significant higher likelihood of treatment success than those who received longer conventional regimens (89.9% vs. 78.3% respectively when success was compared with treatment failure/relapse/death (Table 5) and 83.4% vs. 61.7% when compared with treatment failure/relapse/death/loss to follow-up; see also online Appendix 4). The number of relapses was very low, although this may have been as a result of the relatively small number of patients followed up. As expected, the treatment success was lower in patients with additional resistance to pyrazinamide and/or fluoroquinolones on shorter MDR-TB regimens, even if in general it remained high and exceeded that in the patients on individualised, conventional regimens (although the differences were not statistically significant).

Table 5. Treatment success in patients treated with a shorter MDR-TB regimen versus conventional MDR-TB regimens[10]

Resistance pattern	***Shorter MDR-TB regimen***		***Conventional MDR-TB regimen***	
	N	% (95% CI)	N	% (95% CI)
All cases regardless of pyrazinamide and fluoroquinolone susceptibility	1008/1116	*90.3% (87.8%- 92.4%)*	4033/5850	*78.3% (71.2%- 84%)*
Pyrazinamide resistant; fluoroquinolone resistant	19/28	67.9% (47.6%-84.1%)	81/137	59.1% (50.6%-67.1%)
Pyrazinamide resistant; fluoroquinolone susceptible	90/100	88.8% (47.3%-98.6%)	840/1075	81.4% (71.6%-88.4%)
Pyrazinamide susceptible; fluoroquinolone resistant	12/15	80.0% (50.0%-94.1%)	72/120	64.4% (49.6%-76.9%)
Pyrazinamide susceptible; fluoroquinolone susceptible	121/125	96.8% (77.3%-99.6%)	890/1119	83.5% (75.7%-89.2%)

[10] treatment success (cured or treatment completed(14),(9)) versus failure/relapse/death in patients not previously treated with second-line TB medications ; percentages shown have been adjusted when possible (see online Appendix 4 for more details)

Until more evidence is available, WHO recommends that the shorter MDR-TB regimen is not used in patients who have been previously treated with second-line drugs for more than one month or who have documented or likely resistance to medicines in the regimen. Preferably, resistance to at least fluoroquinolones and the injectable agent used in the regimen is excluded before starting treatment by *in vitro* testing. In the absence of such testing, patients who are highly unlikely to be infected with resistant strains based on history of exposure, use of second-line medicines at country level or recent representative surveillance data may also be eligible for the shorter MDR-TB regimen (see also under *Implementation Considerations* below).

Subgroup considerations

RR-TB without MDR-TB

All patients – children or adult - with rifampicin-resistant TB in whom isoniazid resistance is not confirmed may be treated with the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen.

Resistance additional to MDR-TB

In patients infected with strains known or strongly suspected of being resistant to one or more drugs in the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen (e.g. pyrazinamide) it is recommended not to use the shorter regimen until more evidence becomes available about its performance in such a situation.

People living with HIV

People living with HIV need to be given the same consideration for treatment with the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen as people who are HIV seronegative.

Children

Children were generally excluded from studies of the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimens. However, there is no plausible biological reason to believe that these regimens are less effective in children than in adults. As a result, it is recommended that children with confirmed RR-/MDR-TB be given the same consideration for treatment with a shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen as adults.

Pregnant women

Pregnancy was an exclusion criterion for the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen studies. Two of the core components of the shorter MDR-TB regimens – the injectable agent and ethionamide (or prothionamide) – are usually contraindicated in pregnancy(8). Withholding these medicines from the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen could thus seriously compromise its effectiveness. In the case of pregnant females, it is thus recommended that an individualised, conventional regimen is used which can allow the inclusion of four or more effective medicines with no known teratogenic properties (see Section B below).

Extrapulmonary disease

The findings from studies of shorter MDR-TB regimen were limited to patients with pulmonary disease, and they cannot be extrapolated directly to extrapulmonary TB. No recommendation is thus possible at this stage to use the shorter regimen in patients with extrapulmonary MDR-TB.

Implementation considerations

In order to reproduce the high cure rates achieved by the studies included in the reviews for this guidance, all efforts need to be made to avoid the acquisition of additional resistance, through careful selection of patients to be enrolled, and effective patient support to enable full adherence to treatment. It is recommended that patients are tested for susceptibility or resistance to fluoroquinolones and to the second-line injectable agent used in the regimen before being started on a shorter MDR-TB regimen: patients with strains resistant to any of the two groups of medicines are to be transferred to treatment with a conventional MDR-TB regimen (see Section B below).

The availability of reliable and rapid tests would be valuable to decide within a few days which patients would be eligible for shorter MDR-TB regimens - and what modifications to conventional MDR-TB regimens are necessary based on resistance detected. In patients with confirmed rifampicin-resistant TB or MDR-TB, the Genotype MTBDR*sl* line probe assay (21) may be used as an initial direct test, over phenotypic culture-based DST, to detect resistance to fluoroquinolones and to the second-line injectable drugs (conditional recommendation; certainty of evidence low to moderate; see also guidance under this GRC review process (10)). This applies to testing in both children and adults. While resistance-conferring mutations to fluoroquinolones detected by the MTBDR*sl* assay are highly correlated with phenotypic resistance to ofloxacin and levofloxacin, the correlation with moxifloxacin and gatifloxacin is less clear and the inclusion of moxifloxacin or gatifloxacin in a MDR-TB regimen is best guided by phenotypic DST results.

In settings in which laboratory capacity for DST to fluoroquinolones and injectable agents is not yet available, treatment decisions would need to be guided by the likelihood of resistance to these medicines, informed by the patient's clinical history and recent representative surveillance data.

The evidence for the effectiveness and safety of the shorter MDR-TB regimen derives from studies where treatment was administered under fairly standardised conditions with relatively little variation in the content and duration, and with close monitoring. Thus, the recommendation on the use of the shorter MDR-TB regimen is premised on the use of a regimen similar in composition and duration as those used in the observational studies. Any replacement of medicines or any changes to the duration are only to be considered within the parameters applied in these studies (e.g. gatifloxacin replaced by moxifloxacin; prothionamide replaced by ethionamide; intensive phase prolonged up to 6 months in case of no sputum conversion).

Two staples of the regimen, clofazimine and high-dose isoniazid may be difficult to procure in some countries. Moreover, there are no good paediatric formulations of clofazimine and dividing the capsule into smaller doses is almost impossible, making dosing in children uncertain. Given the global shortage in the supply of quality-assured gatifloxacin in recent years, the sites where observational studies have been conducted have had to substitute this agent with high-dose moxifloxacin. This has led to an important increase in the overall price of the regimen, with moxifloxacin typically accounting for about one half of overall drug costs. The implementation of these guidelines at national level needs to ensure that sufficient quantities of these medicines are available to meet the demand and that no stock-outs occur.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Patients who receive a shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen need to be monitored during treatment and after completion using schedules of relevant clinical and laboratory testing which have been successfully applied in the studies under field conditions(20). The WHO framework for active TB drug-safety monitoring and management (aDSM) needs to be applied to ensure appropriate action to monitor and respond promptly to adverse events – alongside the monitoring for treatment outcomes (22),(23).

Continued efforts to reduce MDR-TB treatment duration, both under observational and trial conditions, is ongoing and is expected to increase the knowledge base for the effectiveness/efficacy and safety of the regimens under different field conditions, patient subgroups, and composition – including new drugs.

B. The optimal combination of medicines and approach towards regimen design for TB patients with rifampicin-resistant (RR-TB) and multidrug-resistant (MDR-TB).

As part of the GDG discussion on the design of MDR-TB regimens for adults and children, a regrouping of TB medicines from the one in former use was proposed (1),(8). Table 6 includes medicines used in first-line TB regimens which may also have a role in strengthening MDR-TB regimens. When reclassifying these medicines (formerly categorised as Groups 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5), the GDG assessed the available evidence and the associated level of certainty, as well as other considerations relating to the balance between anticipated desirable and undesirable effects, and feasibility of implementation.

WHO considers that currently only the medicines shown in this Table have a role in the composition of MDR-TB regimens under programmatic conditions[11]

B1. Conventional treatment regimens for rifampicin-resistant TB

The recommendations in this section cover rifampicin-resistant forms of TB, including also patients with strains susceptible to isoniazid, or with additional resistance to isoniazid (i.e. multidrug-resistant TB; MDR-TB), or also resistant to other medicines from the first-line group (poly-resistant) or from the second-line group (e.g. extensively drug-resistant TB; XDR-TB) (online Appendix 4).

Recommendations[12]

a) In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, a regimen with at least five effective TB medicines during the intensive phase is recommended, including pyrazinamide and four core second-line TB medicines - one chosen from group A, one from group B, and at least two from group C[13] (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence). If the minimum of effective TB medicines cannot be composed as above, an agent from group D2 and other agents from D3 may be added to bring the total to five[14].

b) In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, it is recommended that the regimen be further strengthened with high-dose isoniazid and/or ethambutol (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence).

[11] other agents are currently being investigated under trial conditions; for a full list please see Chapter 8 of reference number(24).

[12] No changes to the WHO interim policies on the use of bedaquiline and delamanid have been made in this update (3),(4)

[13] Group A=Levofloxacin; Moxifloxacin; Gatifloxacin; Group B=Amikacin, Capreomycin, Kanamycin, (Streptomycin); Group C= Ethionamide (or Prothionamide), Cycloserine (or Terizidone), Linezolid, Clofazimine; in children with non-severe disease Group B medicines may be excluded

[14] Group D2=Bedaquiline, Delamanid; Group D3=*p*-aminosalicylic acid, Imipenem-cilastatin, Meropenem, Amoxicillin-clavulanate, Thioacetazone

Justification

Treatment of MDR-TB in adults and children with conventional second-line regimens has been known to increase the likelihood of cure and lower the risk of chronicity and death (16), (25). This section refers to conventional MDR-TB treatment regimens which are of longer duration than the shorter MDR-TB regimen outlined above. The composition and duration of convention al regimens are based upon a number of factors, including the combination of sufficient agents considered to be effective, the balance of expected benefit to harms, and the response or reactions to treatment in the individual patient. Recommendations for the design of these regimens have been issued for a number of years and have been implemented in many countries worldwide.

The evidence base for the effectiveness of many of the medicines used in MDR-TB regimens relies heavily on observational studies, with only few having been studied under randomised controlled conditions. As a result, the overall quality of the evidence is graded as low or very low.

Table 6. Medicines recommended for the treatment of rifampicin-resistant and multidrug-resistant TB[1]

A. Fluoroquinolones[2]		Levofloxacin Moxifloxacin Gatifloxacin	Lfx Mfx Gfx
B. Second-line injectable agents		Amikacin Capreomycin Kanamycin (Streptomycin)[3]	Am Cm Km (S)
C. Other core second-line agents[2]		Ethionamide / Prothionamide Cycloserine / Terizidone Linezolid Clofazimine	Eto / Pto Cs / Trd Lzd Cfz
D. Add-on agents (not part of the core MDR-TB regimen)	**D1**	Pyrazinamide Ethambutol High-dose isoniazid	Z E H^h
	D2	Bedaquiline Delamanid	Bdq Dlm
	D3	*p*-aminosalicylic acid Imipenem-cilastatin[4] Meropenem[4] Amoxicillin-clavulanate[4] (Thioacetazone)[5]	PAS Ipm Mpm Amx-Clv (T)

[1] This regrouping is intended to guide the design of conventional regimens; for shorter regimens lasting 9-12 months the composition is usually standardised (See Section A)

[2] Medicines in Groups A and C are shown by decreasing order of usual preference for use (subject to other considerations; see t ext)

[3] Refer to the text for the conditions under which streptomycin may substitute other injectable agents. Resistance to streptomycin alone does not qualify for the definition of extensively drug-resistant TB (XDR-TB)(26)

[4] Carbapenems and clavulanate are meant to be used together; clavulanate is only available in formulations combined with amoxicillin

[5] HIV-status must be tested and confirmed to be negative before thioacetazone is started

Adults

The evidence which informed the adult treatment recommendations is based on two main sources (GRADE Tables in online Appendix 4). Firstly, an individual patient data (aIPD) meta-analysis including data on 9,153 patients (of whom only 76 were under 15 years of age) from studies included in three systematic reviews of multidrug resistant TB treatment outcomes published until 2010(16). Secondly, in supplement, additional evidence published until August 2015 was summarised in a study-level meta-analysis conducted expressly for the revision of the current guidelines (see online Appendix 6 for background, methods and summary of findings). All studies included had to report treatment outcomes, have less than 10% extrapulmonary cases (unless pulmonary and extrapulmonary cases were reported separately), and include at least 25 adult patients with bacteriologically-confirmed MDR-TB.

The best available evidence has been used to construct recommendations for a regimen that has high relapse-free cure rates, reduced likelihood of death and low emergence of additional resistance while minimizing severe adverse events. In the case of high-dose isoniazid, the results from a separate, paediatric individual patient data (pIPD) meta-analysis were extrapolated to adults.

Children

These treatment regimen recommendations are based on the pIPD meta-analysis which included data on 974 children from both published and unpublished data up until September 30, 2014 (GRADE Tables in online Appendix 4; see online Appendix 6 for background, methods and summary of findings). Data sets were eligible if they included a minimum of 3 children (aged <15 years) within a defined treatment cohort who were treated for clinically-diagnosed or bacteriologically-confirmed pulmonary or extrapulmonary MDR-TB, and for whom treatment outcomes were reported, using standard WHO TB case definitions. Eligible study designs included controlled and uncontrolled retrospective and prospective studies and case series; there were no randomized control trials. As a result, the overall quality of the evidence is very low.

Children with XDR-TB were excluded from analysis (n=36) as their treatment regimens were considered not to be comparable with those of other MDR-TB patients and their numbers were too low to analyse independently. Children were divided and analysed in two different cohorts, those that were bacteriologically confirmed as having MDR-TB and those who were clinically diagnosed with MDR-TB. The children with bacteriologically-confirmed MDR-TB were more likely to have severe disease; they had statistically-significantly greater levels of malnutrition, severe disease on chest radiography, severe extrapulmonary disease and were more likely to be HIV positive. When making treatment recommendations, preference was given to the results in the bacteriologically-confirmed cohort, as this cohort had a higher certainty of diagnosis. Where data on children were unavailable, evidence from adults was extrapolated to children. The best available evidence has been used to construct recommendations for a regimen that has high relapse-free cure rates, reduced likelihood of death and low emergence of additional resistance while minimizing severe adverse events.

Remarks

Based on the evidence reviews, it is recommended that the MDR-TB regimen be composed of at least five drugs likely to be effective, including four core second-line drugs plus pyrazinamide. If a minimum of four core second-line TB medicines cannot be reached by using agents from groups A to C alone, drugs from group D2 or, if not possible, from group D3 are added. Pyrazinamide is added routinely unless there is confirmed resistance from reliable DST, or well-founded reasons to believe that the strain is resistant, or risk of significant toxicity. If pyrazinamide is compromised or cannot be used, the regimen may be strengthened with an additional agent from group C or D (preferably D2, or if not possible, from D3). Agents from group D1 are added if they are

considered to add benefit (e.g. high-dose isoniazid in patients without high-level isoniazid resistance). The total number of TB medicines to include in the regimen needs to balance expected benefit with risk of harms and non-adherence when the pill-burden is high.

The recommendations for children are mostly identical to those of adults. However, in children with mild forms of disease (see Section 1 above), the harms associated with the group B medications (second-line injectable agents) outweigh potential benefits and therefore group B medications may be excluded in this group of children. The GDG based this decision upon the observation that treatment success in children with clinically-diagnosed disease (which was associated with less severe clinical or radiological manifestations) was high and not significantly different in patients treated with and without a group B medication (93.5% vs. 98.1% respectively; n=219; see online Appendix 4). Moreover, given that no new data were analysed for the use of bedaquiline and delamanid for the update of these guidelines, there is as yet no recommendation for the use of group D2 agents in children.

WHO recommends that all TB patients – children or adult - diagnosed with strains shown to be resistant to rifampicin should be placed on a MDR-TB treatment regimen. In such cases, isoniazid is added alongside the rest of the MDR-TB regimen until susceptibility results are confirmed. If isoniazid susceptibility cannot be tested, isoniazid may also be added to the regimen unless there are well-founded grounds to consider the drug ineffective. If isoniazid is added to a MDR-TB regimen it is to be administered at a dose of 15–20 mg/kg body weight/day (see also below).

Desirable & undesirable effects

i. Fluoroquinolones

Based on the evidence reviews, the GDG concluded that treatment with later-generation fluoroquinolones (defined for these guidelines as high-dose levofloxacin,[15] moxifloxacin, and gatifloxacin) significantly improves treatment outcomes in adults with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB. This group of drugs is considered to be the most important component of the core MDR-TB regimen and the benefits from their use outweighs potential risks: they should therefore always be included unless there is an absolute contra-indication for their use. The order of preference for the inclusion of the later-generation fluoroquinolones in MDR-TB regimens is as follows: high-dose levofloxacin, moxifloxacin and gatifloxacin. It is recommended that ofloxacin be phased out from MDR-TB regimens and that ciprofloxacin is never used due to the limited evidence for their effectiveness. Although the pIPD had high levels of confounding and insufficient numbers to adequately analyse the treatment effect of high-dose levofloxacin, moxifloxacin and gatifloxacin, data from adults with MDR-TB shows a treatment benefit. Therefore these recommendations have been extrapolated to children.

Fluoroquinolones in general have a good safety profile and considering the seriousness of RR-/MDR-TB, the potential for drug-related harms is offset by the benefits from their use. Although adverse events were poorly recorded, in the study-level meta-analysis, the frequency of SAEs (defined as grade 3-4 adverse events or medicines stopped permanently due to adverse event) attributed to fluoroquinolones was low (1.2%-2.8%; Table 7). Moxifloxacin carries a risk of QT prolongation, a cause for concern when used in combination with medications which have a similar effect (including bedaquiline and delamanid). There are fewer concerns about the cardiotoxicity of levofloxacin and gatifloxacin, an important consideration given that several other second-line drugs have QT-prolonging potential.

[15] For levofloxacin, high-dose is usually defined as 750 mg/day or more. The definition of high-dose will be the subject of discussion of another WHO guidelines development group meeting planned in 2016.

Table 7. Serious adverse events (SAEs) in patients on MDR-TB treatment regimens

Medicine	**Cohorts using the drug and reporting SAEs** (N)	**Patients receiving medicine** (N)	**SAEs attributed to individual medicine**	
			N patients	*% (95%CL)*[i]
Pyrazinamide	19	2023	56	2.8% (2.1%-3.7%)
Ethambutol	16	1325	6	0.5% (0.2%-1.1%)
Second-line injectable agent	19	2538	184	7.3% (6.2%-8.4%)
Ofloxacin or ciprofloxacin	9	1408	40	2.8% (1.9%-4.1%)
Other fluoroquinolones	13	827	10	1.2% (0.6%-2.4%)
Ethionamide/Prothionamide	17	2106	173	8.2% (7.0%-9.6%)
Cycloserine	16	2140	96	4.5% (3.6%-5.5%)
p-amino salicylic acid	16	1706	208	12.2% (10.6%-13.9%)
Linezolid	8	190	28	14.7% (10.0%-20.6%)

i : values from fixed effects meta-analysis

Source: study-level meta-analysis (Menzies R, Bastos M, Lan Z, Cerigo H, Ronald L, Nov 2015); 43/73 studies reported AEs, but only 5/43 studies reported grade 3-4 AEs, and 28/43 studies reported TB drug stopped due to AEs; for linezolid estimate is based on an aggregated analysis of 8 observational studies(27),(28),(29),(30),(31),(32),(33),(34) *(see also online Appendix 4 for the respective GRADE Tables)*

Concerns about dysglycaemia reported in 2006 in patients treated with gatifloxacin for conditions other than TB led the parent company to stop manufacture of the drug(35), and a global shortage in quality-assured formulations of this drug ensued. A trial of a four-month standardised regimen for drug-susceptible TB which included gatifloxacin (400 mg once daily) published in 2014 reported no significant risk of hyperglycaemia associated with exposure to gatifloxacin(36). Although adverse events were poorly recorded the data for this review showed that there was a lower risk of serious adverse events (defined as grade 3-4 adverse events or drugs stopped due to adverse event) in patients taking gatifloxacin (3.6%) than in those who did not, including those receiving no fluoroquinolones (8%; not statistically significant; see online Appendix 4). The frequency of SAEs associated with gatifloxacin was thus comparable to the one associated with fluoroquinolones in the study-level meta-analysis (Table 7).

ii. Second-line injectable agents

Based on the available evidence, second-line injectable agents were associated with an increased likelihood of treatment success when included in a conventional MDR-TB treatment regimen (the small size of the population not receiving an injectable agent in the aIPD limited the power to detect an impact of this class of agents). It is therefore recommended that adults with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB always receive a second-line injectable agent as part of their regimen unless there is an important contraindication. In children with mild forms of disease, however, the harms associated with this group of medications may outweigh potential benefits and therefore injectable agents may be excluded in this group. The GDG based this decision upon the observation that treatment success in children with clinically-diagnosed disease (which was associated with less severe clinical manifestations) was in general high and did not differ significantly between patients who received a group B medication (see above and online Appendix 4). In the case of children with additional resistance to fluoroquinolones, group B medication are best retained.

The choice of which of the three standard agents to use – amikacin, capreomycin or kanamycin – would be determined by the likelihood of effectiveness and by implementation considerations. While streptomycin is not usually included with the second-line drugs it can be used as the injectable agent of the core MDR-TB regimen if none of the three other agents can be used and if the strain can be reliably shown not to be resistant. To note, however, that streptomycin resistance does not play a part in the definition of XDR-TB(26) and that DST results are not considered accurate or reproducible(37).

Adverse effects need to be carefully monitored for while using second-line injectable agents. Hearing loss and nephrotoxicity are among the most frequent and most severe; however, skin rash, hypersensitivity and peripheral nephropathy may also occur. The risk of adverse effects increase with the total cumulative dose of second-line injectable agents, so particular caution should be given to people who have previously received these medications, including streptomycin as part of a regimen for drug-susceptible TB. In children especially, hearing loss can have a profound impact on quality of life, affecting acquisition of language and the ability to learn at school.

Although adverse events are poorly reported, the data for this review found that 7.3% of adult patients (10.1% in children) had serious adverse events attributed to second-line injectable agents (Table 7). In a study focused on hearing loss in children with TB, 24% of children treated for MDR-TB with an injectable agent had hearing loss and 64% of children had progression of hearing loss after finishing it (in this study, 30% of the children were HIV-infected)(38).

iii. Other core second-line gents

When designing the core MDR-TB treatment regimen, two or more of the following four medicines are to be included: **ethionamide** (or **prothionamide**), **cycloserine** (or **terizidone**), **linezolid** and **clofazimine**, usually in this order of preference, unless the balance of benefits-to-harms for the individual patient demands otherwise. Group C agents are included to bring the total of effective second-line TB medicines in the core regimen to at least four during the intensive phase of the regimen; in addition, if pyrazinamide cannot be included or counted upon, another agent is added. Ethionamide can be used interchangeably with prothionamide, and terizidone instead of cycloserine.

Given the lack of reliable DST for drugs in group C, the choice of which ones to include is determined by the balance of desirable to undesirable effects and by implementation considerations. The adult and paediatric IPD meta-analyses showed an increase in the likelihood of treatment success when MDR-TB treatment regimens included cycloserine (marginally statistically-significant) and ethionamide/prothionamide (statistically-significant only in adults; in the pIPD the vast majority of children received ethionamide or prothionamide and significance testing was therefore not always possible for want of a sufficient number of controls). In contrast to cycloserine/terizidone and ethionamide/prothionamide, RCT data from a few recent studies are now available for clofazimine and linezolid(39),(40),(31). Linezolid has shown a statistically-significant treatment benefit in both RCT and in cohort studies in adult patients, with this benefit being most pronounced in patients with additional resistance to fluoroquinolones and with XDR-TB(40). Both the adult and paediatric IPD showed no significant increase in treatment success associated with the use of clofazimine, while linezolid was used too sparingly in the cohorts included to allow a conclusive analysis(16).

Ethionamide and prothionamide cause gastro-intestinal disturbance, in particular vomiting, which can limit tolerability. Hypothyroidism may occur, especially in combination with PAS. Hypothyroidism is reversible upon

cessation of drugs. Although adverse events are poorly reported, the data for this review found that 8.2% of patients had serious adverse events due to ethionamide or prothionamide (Table 7).

Cycloserine has a well-established association with neuropsychiatric adverse effects. However, the aIPD meta-analysis in adults revealed low levels of severe adverse effects, although data on adverse events were poorly reported (4.5% in the study-level meta-analysis conducted for this update). A meta-analysis published in 2013 comparing the adverse effects of cycloserine with terizidone found terizidone had no to little benefit over cycloserine with regard to adverse effects(41).

Adverse effects of linezolid include thrombocytopenia and anaemia. These can be severe and life threatening, although these adverse effects are reversible with cessation of drug or on some occasions with lowering the dose of drug (usually from 600 mg daily to 300 mg daily)(8). Haematologic toxicities are less common with current strategies of once-daily dosing. Peripheral neuropathy may or may not improve with cessation of drug. The outcome of optic neuropathy upon cessation of linezolid is less clear, and should be treated as a medical emergency. Given the potentially serious adverse effects of linezolid – particularly anaemia, thrombocytopenia, lactic acidosis, peripheral neuropathy and optic neuropathy - the decision to use linezolid must balance its risks and benefits and the availability of other TB medicines. Due to the potential for severe adverse events, linezolid use needs to be accompanied by close monitoring for adverse events. Where this is not possible, linezolid would best be reserved for MDR-TB patients who have additional drug resistance, or XDR-TB, or who are intolerant to other components of the core regimen.

Clofazimine probably contributes to the sterilizing function of MDR-TB regimens where pyrazinamide is not effective. The single randomized control trial, although it had serious methodological concerns, showed a statistically significant treatment benefit associated with the use of clofazimine(39). However, much of the evidence for its effect in MDR-TB is based on observational studies, which showed conflicting or inconclusive findings(42). One of the main adverse effects of clofazimine is skin discoloration/darkening, which may be distressing to patients. In the RCT, the adverse events reported were mostly limited to skin conditions and discoloration, and did not lead to discontinuation in the use of the drug. Overall small rates of adverse events were noted in the observational studies. Severe adverse events appear to be relatively uncommon. There has been some evidence that clofazimine may prolong the QT interval, so caution is advised when using this medication in combination with other drugs also known to have the same effect.

iv. Add-on agents

This group of medicines includes drugs which do not form part of the core second-line agents. It is split into three subgroups:

Group D1 consists of **pyrazinamide**, **ethambutol** and **high-dose isoniazid**. These agents are usually added to the core second-line medications, unless the risks from confirmed resistance, pill burden, intolerance or drug-drug interaction outweigh potential benefits.

The aIPD showed improved likelihood of success (vs. treatment failure, relapse or death combined) in patients who had **pyrazinamide** included in their regimens. This effect was significant both statistically and in absolute terms. The pIPD did not show a significant treatment effect with use of pyrazinamide. In many settings, strains with rifampicin-resistant TB frequently have additional resistance to pyrazinamide (in the order of 50-60%). While it would be desirable to avoid giving pyrazinamide to patients whose strains are resistant to the drug, it is acknowledged that reliable DST for pyrazinamide is very often unavailable in resource-constrained settings.

Although adverse events are poorly reported, the data from the study-level meta-analysis showed that 2.8% of patients who received pyrazinamide had serious adverse events attributed to it (Table 7). The balance of desirable to undesirable effects favours the addition of pyrazinamide to the core second-line MDR-TB regimen by default, unless there is confirmed resistance from reliable DST, or well-founded reasons to believe that the strain is resistant, or other contra-indications for its use, particularly risk of significant toxicity. As for the drugs from the core regimen, if pyrazinamide is compromised or cannot be used, more agents from group C and subsequently group D are added until 5 effective drugs are present in the intensive phase of the regimen.

The recommendation for the inclusion of high-dose isoniazid[Error! Bookmark not defined.] in adult MDR-TB regimens is argely based on evidence from the analysis of pIPD. This analysis showed a statistically-significant increased likelihood of treatment success (vs. treatment failure, relapse or death combined) in children with bacteriologically-confirmed MDR-TB, even after adjustment for age, HIV status, sex, TB disease severity and treatment centre (treatment with high-dose isoniazid was almost exclusively done in South African sites). A randomised controlled trial of high-dose isoniazid therapy for multidrug-resistant TB in adults found no increased risk of hepatotoxicity(43). Additionally, high-dose isoniazid was very well tolerated in children with drug susceptible tuberculous meningitis in a large cohort study from the Western Cape(44).

Isoniazid is recommended to be used alongside a full MDR-TB regimen in patients with RR-TB strains confirmed or suspected to be susceptible to isoniazid. High-dose isoniazid is one of the core components of the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen (see Section A above). Strains bearing mutations in the promoter region of the inhA gene may have a minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) to isoniazid which is low enough to be overcome by high-dose isoniazid; in such settings the drug may still add benefit(45). However, this mutation has been associated with high-level ethionamide resistance(46) and therefore, if present, ethionamide (or prothionamide) may have to be replaced in the regimen. In settings with elevated prevalence of high-level isoniazid resistance associated with katG mutations, high-dose isoniazid may be less effective and therefore its routine use may not be warranted. Susceptibility to ethionamide (or prothionamide) is not affected by these mutations and can be used in combination with high-dose isoniazid if the isoniazid resistance mutation is not known.

The aIPD did not show any statistically-significant association between use of ethambutol and likelihood of success. Ethambutol may cause ocular toxicity, which can be difficult to diagnose in young children, although this risk is reduced if the dose does not exceed recommended limits (0.5% of SAEs reported associated with the meta-analysis conducted for this review although the reporting of AE data is often incomplete; Table 7). Special care is needed when renal function is compromised. RR-/MDR-TB strains may also be resistant to ethambutol, particularly in those patients who have been treated with this drug previously; however DST for this drug is not considered reliable and reproducible(37). The potential benefit that ethambutol may add to a core MDR-TB regimen needs to be balanced carefully with the inconvenience of adding another medicine to the regimen and the risks for associated harms.

Group D2 is made up of **bedaquiline** and **delamanid**, two new drugs which have been released in recent years. WHO has issued interim policy on the use of these medicines in 2013 and 2014(3),(4). The current guidelines make no change to the previous recommendations on how bedaquiline and delamanid may be added to a core MDR-TB regimen in adults, and as yet no recommendation for use in children. When the results from the Phase III trials become available the evidence for the effectiveness of these two new drugs will be re-evaluated with respect to the other drugs making up the core MDR-TB regimen.

Group D3 consists of ***p*-aminosalicylic acid (PAS)**, **imipenem-cilastatin, meropenem**, **clavulanate** and **thioacetazone**. These drugs are only to be used when a MDR-TB regimen with at least 5 effective drugs (i.e. primarily 4 core second-line medicines plus pyrazinamide) cannot be otherwise composed.

The aIPD(16), as well as the study-level meta-analysis conducted for the current guidelines revision, found no significant effect of PAS on treatment success. In addition, PAS use is associated with a high frequency of adverse effects (12.2% SAEs in the meta-analysis undertaken for this study). PAS is thus reserved for situations when there is no option to use other drugs.

Carbapenems (imipenem-cilastin or meropenem) appear to be hydrolyzed more slowly by *M. tuberculosis* when combined with clavulanic acid (47),(48). Amoxicillin-clavulanate has shown poor results in *in vitro* studies and in early bactericidal activity (EBA) studies(49),(50),(51). The aIPD showed that patients treated with amoxicillin-clavulanate were more likely to have poor treatment outcomes, although this may be due to confounding by the higher likelihood that patients receiving this drug tended to have more severe disease (not all confounding could be adjusted for in the analysis). WHO recommends that whenever amoxicillin-clavulanate and carbapenems are included in regimens they are always used together. Clavulanate is only available as combination preparations containing amoxicillin. The spectrum of adverse effects associated with amoxacillin-clavulanate and carbapenems is to a large extent identical to that associated with the penicillins(52).

Thioacetazone has been used extensively in the past as part of first-line combination therapy for TB, based on RCT evidence of effectiveness(53). Use of the drug in TB treatment has however been restricted since the early 1990s due to the severe skin reactions it causes, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis (which can lead to death, especially in people living with HIV(54)), and the widespread availability of safer, affordable alternatives for the combination TB regimens. If thioacetazone is being considered as part of a MDR-TB treatment regimen, close monitoring for severe skin reactions is required and it is imperative that the patient be tested for HIV, and that the drug should not be used if the patient is HIV seropositive.

M. tuberculosis is intrinsically resistant to the macrolide class of antibiotics(55). The evidence reviews for the current guidelines showed no evidence for the effectiveness of drugs of this class (clarithromycin, azithromycin)(56), which have at times been included in MDR-TB regimens in both adults and children. In addition, the aIPD showed an increased risk - although not statistically significant - for poor outcomes in patients receiving macrolides although macrolides appeared to be safe in prolonged use. Macrolides are associated with QT prolongation(57), which would be of particular concern if patients are receiving other TB drugs which may have a similar risk such as moxifloxacin, clofazimine, bedaquiline(58) or delamanid(59). WHO therefore recommends that clarithromycin and azithromycin not be included in MDR-TB regimens.

Adverse effects of PAS include gastro-intestinal disturbance and hypothyroidism (in particular when given in combination with ethionamide/prothionamide). Hypothyroidism is reversible upon cessation of the drugs. Although adverse events are poorly reported, the data for this review found that 12.2% of patients had serious adverse events (defined as grade 3-4 adverse events or drugs stopped due to adverse event) attributed to PAS (Table 7). The pIPD showed possibility of treatment harm associated with use of PAS (not statistically-significant). However, PAS is frequently given to children with few other treatment options, and therefore this effect may be due to confounding by indication (sites that had poorer outcomes with PAS also had significantly higher rates of children who were HIV seropositive, malnourished, had severe pulmonary disease and who had additional resistance to fluoroquinolones and the second-line injectable medicines).

Subgroup considerations

RR-/MDR-TB with additional resistance to fluoroquinolones, second-line injectable agents and extensive drug resistance (XDR-TB)

In RR-/MDR-TB patients with confirmed or well-founded belief of resistance to medications from group A (fluoroquinolones) or group B (second-line injectable), substitution of drugs from these classes proceeds as detailed in the beginning of section B1. If any of the components of the regimen – the four core second-line medicines and pyrazinamide – is considered not to be effective, additional agents from groups D2 or D3 are added. This is almost always necessary when resistance to both groups A and B drugs (i.e. XDR-TB) is present. An analysis of individual data collected for the update of the WHO drug-resistant TB treatment guidelines of 2011 concluded that regimens containing more drugs were associated with the highest odds of success for MDR-TB patients who had additional resistance to fluoroquinolones and/or second-line injectable agents (60). The current WHO advice when designing regimens for patients with resistance to fluoroquinolones, second-line injectable medications XDR-TB otherwise continues to apply(8).

Access to rapid diagnostic testing which could reliably identify resistance to fluoroquinolones or injectable medications s would be helpful for clinicians to decide how to modify the conventional MDR-TB regimens. The Genotype MTBDR*s*l line probe assay (21) may now be used as an initial test, over phenotypic culture-based DST, to detect resistance to fluoroquinolones and to the second-line injectable drugs (conditional recommendation; certainty of evidence low to moderate for direct testing; see also guidance under this GRC review process (10)). Genotype MTBDR*s*l can be used in both children and adults and as a direct and indirect test (it could thus be used on extrapulmonary samples). While resistance-conferring mutations to fluoroquinolones detected by the MTBDR*s*l assay are highly correlated with phenotypic resistance to ofloxacin and levofloxacin, the correlation with moxifloxacin and gatifloxacin is less clear and the inclusion of moxifloxacin or gatifloxacin in a MDR-TB regimen is best guided by phenotypic DST results.

TB of the central nervous system

The treatment of tuberculous meningitis related to rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant strains is best guided by drug susceptibility results and the known properties of TB drugs to penetrate the central nervous system (CNS)(8). In patients with RR-/MDR-TB meningitis, it is recommended that the medications selected for the regimen have good CNS penetration properties.

The fluoroquinolones recommended by these guidelines have good CNS penetration(61), as do ethionamide (or prothionamide), cycloserine (or terizidone) and linezolid(62),(63). Pyrazinamide has good CNS penetration, although caution should be exercised as a large percentage of MDR-TB strains may be resistant. Isoniazid penetrates the CNS very well, with higher doses reaching adequate MICs in the cerebrospinal fluid. Due to its good CNS penetration, high-dose isoniazid is recommended to be used as part of the treatment regimen unless high-level resistance is known to exist.

PAS and ethambutol do not penetrate the CNS well and should not be counted upon among the number of effective drugs to treat MDR-TB meningitis. Kanamycin, amikacin and streptomycin only penetrate the cerebrospinal fluid in the presence of meningeal inflammation. There are little data on the CNS penetration of capreomycin, clofazimine, bedaquiline or delamanid.

People living with HIV

The composition of the treatment regimen for MDR-TB does not differ for people living with HIV. However, thioacetazone should not be given to patients who are HIV positive; if it is being considered as part of a treatment regimen HIV infection needs to be reliably excluded in the patient.

Implementation Considerations

The implementation of MDR-TB chemotherapy is feasible under programmatic conditions, as has been amply shown by the global expansion in the use of conventional MDR-TB regimens worldwide, particularly in the last decade(24). Changes made by the current revision to the grouping of the medicines and to the composition of the conventional regimen are not expected to have major impact on their continued use. Most of the fluoroquinolones and the injectable agents, are readily available, as are the majority of the group C and group D agents. The latest WHO Model Lists of Essential Medicines (August 2015) include most of the agents in Table 6 except for gatifloxacin and thioacetazone(64),(65). However, clofazimine, meropenem, imipenem-cilastatin and amoxicillin-clavulanate are listed for indications other than tuberculosis, while bedaquiline and delamanid are only included in the adult list. Other specific factors important for implementation are discussed in the respective sections below.

Where possible a patient's RR-/MDR-TB strain needs to be tested for susceptibility to medicines planned for inclusion in the regimen. The availability of reliable tests for susceptibility to fluoroquinolones and to the second-line injectable drugs which would give results within a few days is valuable to ensure that conventional MDR-TB regimens are strengthened as necessary (reference is made to the 2016 revision on the recommendations on the use of the MTBDR*sl* line probe assay for second-line drugs(10), which has already been discussed above).

Where reliable DST is not an option, proof of the effectiveness of a medicine needs to be based on a careful clinical history of the patient's previous exposure to the medicine, of significant contact with another RR-/MDR-TB patient whose antibiogramme is documented, and from knowledge of the prevalent resistance patterns based on representative drug-resistance surveillance. Both the DST and the individual clinical history should be considered when constructing a treatment regimen. The only reliable laboratory tests for TB drug susceptibility (or resistance) which are widely used today are those for isoniazid, rifampicin, fluoroquinolones and second-line injectable agents.

The recommendations made by the current guidelines envisage a more widespread application of the shorter MDR-TB regimen among RR-/MDR-TB patients. This implies that a larger proportion of the patients for whom the conventional MDR-TB regimen will be reserved would have additional resistance to core second-line medications than is the case today. In such cases care needs to be taken to ensure that regimens are adequately strengthened to ensure the nest possible outcomes for the patients.

The current revision of the guidelines did not re-analyse the optimal duration of treatment (intensive and continuation phases). The recommendations from the 2011 guidelines which were based on the aIPD meta-analysis, thus continue to apply(1). The 2011 guidelines conditionally recommended an intensive phase of 8 months for most MDR-TB patients and total treatment duration of 20 months in patients who had not been previously treated. The duration may need to be modified according to the patient's response to therapy(8). The association between treatment success and the total length of treatment was less clear in patients who had been previously-treated compared with those who had not, although the likelihood of treatment success appeared to peak between 27.6 and 30.5 months. The number of observations was also far fewer than for those who had no previous MDR-TB treatment. As a result no recommendation on total duration was made in the 2011 revision for previously-treated patients. Many of the RR-/MDR-TB patients who will be ineligible for

the shorter MDR-TB regimen and referred for treatment with conventional regimens would have been treated with second-line medication in the past: in these patients uncertainties will remain on the optimal duration of treatment and therefore the length of therapy would need to be guided primarily by the response to therapy.

i. Fluoroquinolones

Both levofloxacin and moxifloxacin are commonly used to treat MDR-TB. Levofloxacin is more widely available than moxifloxacin, which is more expensive although a reduction in its price is expected in the coming years.

Gatifloxacin is an affordable drug and had been commonly used by TB treatment programmes until the concerns about its dysglycaemic effects led to a global shortage in this medicine. If manufacture of quality-assured formulations of the drug restarts, it could substantially lower the costs of regimens by substituting more expensive options in fluoroquinolones.

Moxifloxacin is relatively easy to administer to older children. However, the tablet must be split to accommodate dosing in younger children and it is highly unpalatable once split or crushed. Levofloxacin is available as a suspension.

ii. Second-line injectable agents

These agents present problems to administer intramuscularly or intravenously on a daily basis for several months, often necessitating hospitalization. Giving injections to children and underweight adults is particularly unpleasant and unwelcome.

iii. Other agents

Ethionamide and prothionamide are inexpensive, readily available world-wide and easily administered.

Cycloserine has been one of the standard drugs for the treatment of MDR-TB for several years and therefore experience in its use is widespread. It is inexpensive. Terizidone is less widely used but is available on the GDF Products List.

Clofazimine is inexpensive but it can be difficult to procure. The implementation of these guidelines at national level needs to ensure that sufficient quantities of this medicine are available to meet the demand and that no stock-outs occur. Moreover, given that there are no good paediatric formulations the capsule contents need to be expressed manually and divided into smaller doses, with risks of incorrect dosing in children.

When linezolid is used, there needs to be close monitoring for side effects, particularly anaemia, thrombocytopenia, lactic acidosis, peripheral neuropathy and optic neuropathy, as these can be severe and life threatening. Historically linezolid has been very expensive, however, it has recently come off patent and the availability of generic products has reduced its market price substantially and it may even decrease further.

iv. Add-on agents

Pyrazinamide is inexpensive, readily available and easy to administer.

Isoniazid is inexpensive. It is important to consider the epidemiology of high level versus low level isoniazid mutations in a population before standard treatment regimens including high-dose isoniazid are recommended.

Ethambutol is inexpensive and readily available.

PAS may be difficult to obtain although it is available through the Global Drug Facility (GDF). Otherwise it is relatively inexpensive and easy to administer.

Amoxacillin-clavulanate is inexpensive and easily obtainable. However, the carbapenems are expensive and are difficult to administer as they must be given two or three times per day via an intravenous line.

Thioacetezone is inexpensive but it has limited availability and it is not currently available through the GDF.

Monitoring and Evaluation
Patients on conventional MDR-TB treatment regimens need to be monitored for response to treatment and for safety using reasonable schedules of relevant clinical and laboratory testing(9),(23). Frameworks for the surveillance of bacteriological status, drug-resistance and outcomes have been fairly standardised over the last decade. The systematic monitoring of adverse events during and after the end of treatment is a more recent introduction in TB programmes and experience in their implementation is still developing in many countries; its rationale is largely defined by more frequent use of new and re-purposed medications in MDR-TB treatment regimens in the world, at times in combinations for which there has been very limited experience of use.(22).

B2. Treatment regimens for isoniazid-resistant TB and *M. bovis*

In the review for isoniazid-resistant TB, no cohorts or RCTs were found which included fluoroquinolones as part of standardized combination TB regimens intended primarily for isoniazid-resistant TB. Fluoroquinolones, when used, were individualised: these studies did not allow meaningful pooling. In three recent RCTs investigating the potential for fluoroquinolones to shorten first-line TB regimens (36),(66),(67), over 240 patients with non-MDR, INH-R strains were placed on fluoroquinolone-containing regimens. Data for 66 of these patients enrolled in one of these RCTs showed similar levels of unfavourable outcome (treatment failure/relapse/death/loss to follow-up) in patients on fluoroquinolone-containing 4-month regimens (20.7%) compared with the 2HRZE/4HR regimen (21.6%) ((36); personal communication Merle C). In a second trial, success rates in patients treated with 4-month fluoroquinolone-containing regimens were similar in the sub-groups with isoniazid resistant strains and those with fully susceptible strains ((66); personal communication Gillespie S et al). In conclusion, the evidence reviews of published studies on isoniazid-resistant TB could not address the PICO question.

In the case of *M. bovis,* only 8 studies were identified by the literature search and which provided any information on treatment and treatment outcomes of patients with confirmed *M. bovis* disease. Of these only 3 included 20 or more subjects, a minimum criterion for the review. In the three case series retained, treatment regimens were very different and tended to be individualised. It was thus impossible to group the different case series for pooled analysis.

Owing to the lack of data to address directly the questions no clinically-useful recommendations could be made by the group for these two forms of the disease.

C. *The effect of time to start of treatment on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB*

Global monitoring of the response to RR-/MDR-TB shows that several countries have successfully expanded the diagnostic services for RR-TB without matching it with complementary capacity to enrol patients on adequate treatment(68). This has led to patients with confirmed drug-resistant TB waiting for months or even years to initiate treatment. It is widely held, based largely upon findings from TB patients without drug-resistant disease, that prolonging the time to the initiation of treatment in TB patients is undesirable and predisposes to unfavourable clinical and public health consequences, such as increased disease progression with higher bacillary load in sputum, more lung damage, and continued transmission(69). A PICO question was thus developed to inform any policy recommendation to be made in support of an earlier start of treatment (see Appendix 3, PICO 4). Evidence was reviewed to assess whether starting an adequate treatment regimen within 4 weeks of diagnosis or strong presumption of RR/MDR-TB was associated with positive outcome and to quantify any such effect.

An initial search of the literature yielded 1,978 references of which 64 underwent full text review(70). None of these articles fulfilled the inclusion criteria. A supplementary full text review of the 64 references was undertaken with the explicit aim of determining whether any articles described treatment outcomes in MDR-TB patients stratified by delay to initiation of treatment. The original parameters were subsequently broadened from those in the PICO question to allow for the use of other time delay categorisations and to look for other relevant outcomes such as culture conversion. Sixteen articles were identified from which scant data could be abstracted. None of these articles addressed the independent effect of interval to start of treatment upon treatment outcomes with a meaningful comparator group.

A major obstacle to finding published evidence to support the assumption that shorter delays lead to better outcomes is the lack of studies reporting outcome in which treatment delay could be analysed as dependent variable in groups which were otherwise comparable or in which other covariates could be adjusted for. Differences in time to treatment initiation rarely occur in isolation. Programmatic changes related to delivery of care and modifications in drug regimen are common in the literature reviewed; attribution of variations in delay to treatment outcomes is thus a significant challenge. Even if such data were available, an additional constraint is that the interval from RR-/MDR-TB diagnosis to start of treatment does not account for any delay to diagnosis, the magnitude of which might dominate overall delay and overshadow any benefits that could accrue from reducing the time to start of treatment once the disease is diagnosed.

Despite the absence of a discrete evidence base, it is reasonable to advise national programmes to adhere to the general standard of TB care which promotes an early start of appropriate therapy when RR-TB or MDR-TB are diagnosed or strongly suspected (71). Studies to address this question are not a priority and intentionally withholding or delaying treatment present ethical concerns. Nonetheless, this should not preclude from attempts to quantify the effect of delay using data from studies – observational or otherwise – mounted to answer other questions.

D. The effect of surgical interventions on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB

Recommendation

In patients with rifampicin-resistant or multidrug-resistant TB, elective partial lung resection (lobectomy or wedge resection) may be used alongside a recommended MDR-TB regimen. (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence)

Remarks

Justification

Surgery has been employed in treating TB patients since before the advent of chemotherapy. In many countries it remains one of the treatment options for TB. With the challenging prospect in many settings of inadequate regimens to treat multidrug and extensively drug-resistant TB, and the risk for serious sequelae, the role of pulmonary surgery is being re-evaluated as a means to reduce the amount of lung tissue with intractable pathology, to reduce bacterial load and thus improve prognosis.

The review for this question was based upon both an individual patient-level meta-analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of different forms of elective surgery as an adjunct to combination medical therapy for multidrug resistant TB(17), as well as a study-level systematic review and meta-analysis (online Appendix 4). Demographic, clinical, bacteriology, surgery and outcome data on MDR-TB patients on treatment were obtained from the authors of 26 cohort studies participating in the aIPD(16). The analyses summarized in the GRADE Tables consist of three strata comparing treatment success (cure and completion) with different combinations of treatment failure, relapse, death and loss to follow-up. Two sets of such Tables were prepared for (i) partial pulmonary resection and (ii) pneumonectomy.

In the surgical meta-analysis that examined all forms of surgery together, there was a statistically significant improvement in cure and successful treatment outcomes among patients who received surgery. However, when the aIPD meta-analysis examined patients who underwent partial lung resection and those who had a more radical pneumonectomy, versus patients who did not undergo surgery, those who underwent partial lung resection has statistically significantly higher rates of treatment success. Those patients who underwent pneumonectomy did not have better outcomes than those who did not undergo surgery. Prognosis appeared to be better when partial lung resection was performed after culture conversion. This effect was not observed in patients who underwent pneumonectomy.

There are several important caveats to these data. Substantial bias is likely to be present given that only patients who were judged to be fit for surgery would have been operated upon. No patient with HIV co-infection in the aIPD underwent lung resection surgery. Therefore the effects of surgery among HIV infected patients with MDR-TB could not be evaluated.

Rates of death did not differ significantly between those who underwent surgery versus those who received medical treatment only. However, once more, the outcomes could be biased because the risk of death could have been much higher among patients in whom surgery was prescribed had they not been operated.

Subgroup consideration

The relative benefits of surgery are expected to depend substantially upon the population subgroups who are targeted. The analysis could not provide a refined differentiation of the type of patient who would be best suited to benefit from the intervention or the type of intervention which would bear most benefit. The effect is expected to be moderate in the average patient considered appropriate for surgery.

The odds of success for patients with XDR-TB were found to be statistically-significantly lower when they underwent surgery compared with other patients (aOR 0.4, 0.2-0.9). This effect is likely to be biased given that patients who underwent surgery would have had other factors predisposing to poor outcomes which could not be adjusted for.

Implementation considerations

Partial lung resection for patients with MDR-TB is only to be considered under conditions of good surgical facilities, trained and experienced surgeons and with careful selection of candidates.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The rates of death in the IPD for surgical outcomes did not differ significantly between patients who underwent surgery and those who received medical treatment only.

There were not enough data on adverse events, surgical complications or long term sequelae - some of which may be fatal - to allow a meaningful analysis.

Despite the unknown magnitude of perioperative complications the GDG assumed that overall there is a net benefit from surgery.

Research priorities

In addition to summarising the available evidence, the reviews undertaken for this update revealed a number of gaps in current knowledge about critical areas of the treatment for RR-/MDR-TB. Where evidence was available it was usually assigned a very-low quality rating. This was one of the main reasons why all the recommendations made in this guidelines revision are conditional.

The WHO Guidelines Development Group discussed the research priorities and highlighted a number of priorities. They identified some problem areas which had already been singled out by earlier efforts to define research priorities for MDR-TB treatment, such as preventive therapy for MDR-TB and improving evidence on reduction of regimen duration(1),(72),(73).

The optimal combination of medicines and approach towards regimen-design for TB patients (both adults and children) with isoniazid resistant, rifampicin-resistant (RR-TB), multidrug-resistant (MDR-TB), and extensively drug-resistant (XDR-TB) forms of disease, as well as for patients with M bovis disease.

- A need for more randomized control studies, especially involving the new drugs and regimens, but also for patients with isoniazid-resistant forms of TB who are placed on fluoroquinolone-containing regimens.
- Inclusion and separate reporting of outcomes for key subgroups in such studies, especially children and HIV-positive individuals on treatment
- More complete recording of adverse events and standardized data recording on organ class, seriousness, severity, and certainty of association, to allow reliable comparison of the association between adverse events and exposure to different medicines
- Identification of factors which determine the optimal duration of treatment (e.g. previous treatment history, baseline resistance patterns, site of disease, child/adult)

- Determination of the minimum number of drugs and treatment duration (especially in patients previously treated for MDR-TB)
- Conditions under which injectable-sparing regimens can be used in both children and adults (e.g. surrogates for severity / extent of disease, alternative medication)
- Pharmacokinetic studies to determine optimal drug dosing and safety (especially in pregnancy)
- Improved diagnostics and drug-susceptibility testing methods (e.g. which test for pyrazinamide)
- Randomized controlled trials are necessary to define the benefits and harms of chemoprophylaxis for child and adult contacts of RR-TB (with and without additional resistance patterns). The composition, dosages and duration of the LTBI regimen for MDR-TB need to be optimized and the potential role of newer drugs with good sterilization properties should be investigated. Studies need to examine the adverse effects of the long-term use of fluoroquinolones in preventive treatment (74)
- Palliative and end-of-life care in patients with very advanced resistance patterns

The effectiveness and safety of standardised regimens lasting up to 12 months for the treatment of patients with multidrug-resistant TB ("shorter regimens") when compared with longer conventional treatment

- Future research needs to include the effectiveness/safety of the shorter MDR-TB treatment regimen in subgroups which have been systematically excluded from study protocols (e.g. children, patients with different forms of extrapulmonary disease) and in settings where background resistance to drugs other than fluoroquinolones and 2nd line injectable agents is high (e.g. pyrazinamide or high-level isoniazid resistance)
- Implementation research on the introduction of the shorter MDR-TB regimen
- More studies on cost effectiveness and health-related quality of life

The effect of surgical interventions on treatment outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB

- Better definition of the role of surgery; i.e. decisions about when to operate and the type of surgical intervention, drug-resistance patterns, needs to be better examined
- Improved collection, reporting, standardization of data on surgery including long term survival post-surgery

References

1. Guidelines for the programmatic management of drug-resistant tuberculosis, 2011 Update. (WHO/HTM/TB/2011.6) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2011. Available from: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2011/9789241501583_eng.pdf

2. Automated real-time nucleic acid amplification technology for rapid and simultaneous detection of tuberculosis and rifampicin resistance: Xpert MTB/RIF assay for the diagnosis of pulmonary and extrapulmonary TB in adults and children. Policy Update (WHO/HTM/TB/2013.16) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2013. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/112472/1/9789241506335_eng.pdf

3. The use of bedaquiline in the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Interim policy guidance (WHO/HTM/TB/2013.6) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2013. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/84879/1/9789241505482_eng.pdf

4. The use of delamanid in the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Interim policy guidance (WHO/HTM/TB/2014.23) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2014. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/137334/1/WHO_HTM_TB_2014.23_eng.pdf

5. WHO handbook for guideline development [Internet]. 2nd ed. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2014. Available from: http://www.who.int/kms/handbook_2nd_ed.pdf

6. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2016 Jan 11]. (Version 5.1.0). Available from: http://handbook.cochrane.org/

7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Vist GE, Liberati A, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. BMJ. 2008 May 10;336(7652):1049–51.

8. Companion handbook to the WHO guidelines for the programmatic management of drug-resistant tuberculosis. (WHO/HTM/TB/2014.11) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2014. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/130918/1/9789241548809_eng.pdf

9. Definitions and reporting framework for tuberculosis – 2013 revision (WHO/HTM/TB/2013.2) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2013. Available from: www.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/79199/1/9789241505345_eng.pdf

10. The use of molecular line probe assays for the detection of resistance to second-line anti-tuberculosis drugs. Policy guidance. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2016.

11. Van Deun A, Maug AKJ, Salim MAH, Das PK, Sarker MR, Daru P, et al. Short, highly effective, and inexpensive standardized treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2010 Sep 1;182(5):684–92.

12. Kuaban C, Noeske J, Rieder HL, Aït-Khaled N, Abena Foe JL, Trébucq A. High effectiveness of a 12-month regimen for MDR-TB patients in Cameroon. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis Off J Int Union Tuberc Lung Dis. 2015 May;19(5):517–24.

13. Piubello A, Harouna SH, Souleymane MB, Boukary I, Morou S, Daouda M, et al. High cure rate with standardised short-course multidrug-resistant tuberculosis treatment in Niger: no relapses. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis Off J Int Union Tuberc Lung Dis. 2014 Oct;18(10):1188–94.

14. Laserson KF, Thorpe LE, Leimane V, Weyer K, Mitnick CD, Riekstina V, et al. Speaking the same language: treatment outcome definitions for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis Off J Int Union Tuberc Lung Dis. 2005 Jun;9(6):640–5.

15. National Institutes of Health (National Cancer Institute). Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE). Version 4.0 [Internet]. U.S.DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; 2009. Available from: http://evs.nci.nih.gov/ftp1/CTCAE/CTCAE_4.03_2010-06-14_QuickReference_5x7.pdf

16. Ahuja SD, Ashkin D, Avendano M, Banerjee R, Bauer M, Bayona JN, et al. Multidrug resistant pulmonary tuberculosis treatment regimens and patient outcomes: an individual patient data meta-analysis of 9,153 patients. PLoS Med. 2012;9(8):e1001300.

17. Fox GJ, Mitnick CD, Benedetti A, Chan ED, Becerra M, Chiang C-Y, et al. Surgery as an Adjunctive Treatment for Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis: An Individual Patient Data Metaanalysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2016 Apr 1;62(7):887–95.

18. The evaluation of a standardised treatment regimen of anti-tuberculosis drugs for patients with multi-drug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) [STREAM-TRIAL] [Internet]. [cited 3014 Sep 12]. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4164715/

19. The use of short regimens for treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis [Internet]. [cited 2012 Nov 9]. Available from: http://www.who.int/tb/challenges/mdr/short_regimen_use/en/

20. Research Protocol - Effectiveness of a simplified short regimen for Multidrug Resistant Tuberculosis treatment in Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan - MSF Field Research [Internet]. Available from: http://fieldresearch.msf.org/msf/handle/10144/322296

21. Rapid diagnostics of tuberculosis and its resistances [Internet]. Nehren: Germany: Hain Lifescience GmbH; 2015. Available from: http://www.hain-lifescience.de/uploadfiles/file/produkte/mikrobiologie/mykobakterien/tb_eng.pdf

22. WHO | Active TB drug-safety monitoring and management (aDSM) [Internet]. WHO. [cited 2016 Jan 27]. Available from: http://www.who.int/tb/areas-of-work/drug-resistant-tb/treatment/pharmacovigilance/en/

23. Active tuberculosis drug-safety monitoring and management (aDSM). Framework for implementation.(WHO/HTM/TB/2015.28) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2015. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/204465/1/WHO_HTM_TB_2015.28_eng.pdf

24. Global tuberculosis report 2015 (WHO/HTM/TB/2015.22) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2015. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/191102/1/9789241565059_eng.pdf

25. Seddon JA, Hesseling AC, Godfrey-Faussett P, Schaaf HS. High treatment success in children treated for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis: an observational cohort study. Thorax. 2014 May 1;69(5):458–64.

26. Case definition for extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis. Wkly Epidemiol Rec. 2006 Oct 20;81(42):408.

27. Koh W-J, Kwon OJ, Gwak H, Chung JW, Cho S-N, Kim WS, et al. Daily 300 mg dose of linezolid for the treatment of intractable multidrug-resistant and extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2009 Aug;64(2):388–91.

28. Schecter GF, Scott C, True L, Raftery A, Flood J, Mase S. Linezolid in the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2010 Jan 1;50(1):49–55.

29. Udwadia ZF, Sen T, Moharil G. Assessment of linezolid efficacy and safety in MDR- and XDR-TB: an Indian perspective. Eur Respir J. 2010 Apr;35(4):936-938-940.

30. Singla R, Caminero JA, Jaiswal A, Singla N, Gupta S, Bali RK, et al. Linezolid: an effective, safe and cheap drug for patients failing multidrug-resistant tuberculosis treatment in India. Eur Respir J. 2012 Apr;39(4):956–62.

31. Lee M, Lee J, Carroll MW, Choi H, Min S, Song T, et al. Linezolid for Treatment of Chronic Extensively Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis. N Engl J Med. 2012;367(16):1508–18.

32. De Lorenzo S, Alffenaar JW, Sotgiu G, Centis R, D'Ambrosio L, Tiberi S, et al. Efficacy and safety of meropenem-clavulanate added to linezolid-containing regimens in the treatment of MDR-/XDR-TB. Eur Respir J. 2013 Jun;41(6):1386–92.

33. Jiang H, Tang R-N, Wang J. Linezolid versus vancomycin or teicoplanin for nosocomial pneumonia: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2013 Sep;32(9):1121–8.

34. Padayatchi N, Mac Kenzie WR, Hirsch-Moverman Y, Feng P-J, Villarino E, Saukkonen J, et al. Lessons from a randomised clinical trial for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis Off J Int Union Tuberc Lung Dis. 2012 Dec;16(12):1582–7.

35. Park-Wyllie LY, Juurlink DN, Kopp A, Shah BR, Stukel TA, Stumpo C, et al. Outpatient Gatifloxacin Therapy and Dysglycemia in Older Adults. N Engl J Med. 2006;354(13):1352–61.

36. Merle CS, Fielding K, Sow OB, Gninafon M, Lo MB, Mthiyane T, et al. A Four-Month Gatifloxacin-Containing Regimen for Treating Tuberculosis. N Engl J Med. 2014 Oct 23;371(17):1588–98.

37. Implementing tuberculosis diagnostics: A policy framework (WHO/HTM/TB/2015.11) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2015. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/162712/1/9789241508612_eng.pdf

38. Seddon JA, Thee S, Jacobs K, Ebrahim A, Hesseling AC, Schaaf HS. Hearing loss in children treated for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. J Infect. 2013 Apr;66(4):320–9.

39. Tang S, Yao L, Hao X, Liu Y, Zeng L, Liu G, et al. Clofazimine for the treatment of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis: prospective, multicenter, randomized controlled study in China. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2015 May 1;60(9):1361–7.

40. Tang S, Yao L, Hao X, Zhang X, Liu G, Liu X, et al. Efficacy, safety and tolerability of linezolid for the treatment of XDR-TB: a study in China. Eur Respir J. 2015 Jan;45(1):161–70.

41. Hwang TJ, Wares DF, Jafarov A, Jakubowiak W, Nunn P, Keshavjee S. Safety of cycloserine and terizidone for the treatment of drug-resistant tuberculosis: a meta-analysis. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis Off J Int Union Tuberc Lung Dis. 2013 Oct;17(10):1257–66.

42. Hwang TJ, Dotsenko S, Jafarov A, Weyer K, Falzon D, Lunte K, et al. Safety and availability of clofazimine in the treatment of multidrug and extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis: analysis of published guidance and meta-analysis of cohort studies. BMJ Open. 2014;4(1):e004143.

43. Katiyar SK, Bihari S, Prakash S, Mamtani M, Kulkarni H. A randomised controlled trial of high-dose isoniazid adjuvant therapy for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis Off J Int Union Tuberc Lung Dis. 2008 Feb;12(2):139–45.

44. van Toorn R, Schaaf HS, Laubscher JA, van Elsland SL, Donald PR, Schoeman JF. Short intensified treatment in children with drug-susceptible tuberculous meningitis. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2014 Mar;33(3):248–52.

45. Niehaus AJ, Mlisana K, Gandhi NR, Mathema B, Brust JCM. High Prevalence of inhA Promoter Mutations among Patients with Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Mokrousov I, editor. PLOS ONE. 2015 Sep 2;10(9):e0135003.

46. Banerjee A, Dubnau E, Quemard A, Balasubramanian V, Um KS, Wilson T, et al. inhA, a gene encoding a target for isoniazid and ethionamide in Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Science. 1994 Jan 14;263(5144):227–30.

47. Hugonnet J-E, Blanchard JS. Irreversible inhibition of the Mycobacterium tuberculosis beta-lactamase by clavulanate. Biochemistry (Mosc). 2007 Oct 30;46(43):11998–2004.

48. Solapure S, Dinesh N, Shandil R, Ramachandran V, Sharma S, Bhattacharjee D, et al. In Vitro and In Vivo Efficacy of β-Lactams against Replicating and Slowly Growing/Nonreplicating Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2013 Jun;57(6):2506–10.

49. Chambers HF, Kocagöz T, Sipit T, Turner J, Hopewell PC. Activity of amoxicillin/clavulanate in patients with tuberculosis. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 1998 Apr;26(4):874–7.

50. Donald PR, Sirgel FA, Venter A, Parkin DP, Van de Wal BW, Barendse A, et al. Early bactericidal activity of amoxicillin in combination with clavulanic acid in patients with sputum smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis. Scand J Infect Dis. 2001;33(6):466–9.

51. Gonzalo X, Drobniewski F. Is there a place for β-lactams in the treatment of multidrug-resistant/extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis? Synergy between meropenem and amoxicillin/clavulanate. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2013 Feb;68(2):366–9.

52. Prescott, Jr. WA, DePestel DD, Ellis JJ, Regal RE. Incidence of Carbapenem-Associated Allergic-Type Reactions among Patients with versus Patients without a Reported Penicillin Allergy. Clin Infect Dis. 2004 Apr 15;38(8):1102–7.

53. Isoniazid with thiacetazone (thioacetazone) in the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis in East Africa--fifth investigation. A co-operative study in East African hospitals, clinics and laboratories with the collaboration of the East African and British Medical Research Councils. Tubercle. 1970 Jun;51(2):123–51.

54. Nunn P, Kibuga D, Gathua S, Brindle R, Imalingat A, Wasunna K, et al. Cutaneous hypersensitivity reactions due to thiacetazone in HIV-1 seropositive patients treated for tuberculosis. Lancet. 1991;337(8742):627–30.

55. Andini N, Nash KA. Intrinsic Macrolide Resistance of the Mycobacterium tuberculosis Complex Is Inducible. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2006 Jul 1;50(7):2560–2.

56. Winters N, Butler-Laporte G, Menzies D. Efficacy and safety of World Health Organization group 5 drugs for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis treatment. Eur Respir J. 2015 Nov;46(5):1461–70.

57. Iannini PB. Cardiotoxicity of macrolides, ketolides and fluoroquinolones that prolong the QTc interval. Expert Opin Drug Saf. 2002 Jul;1(2):121–8.

58. BRIEFING PACKAGE Division of Anti-Infective Products Office of Antimicrobial Products CDER, FDA. Sirturo™ (bedaquiline 100 mg tablets) For the treatment of adults (≥ 18 years) as part of combination therapy of pulmonary multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDRTB). Applicant: Janssen Research and Development, L.L.C FDA Anti-Infective Drugs Advisory Committee Meeting Silver Spring, MD Date: November 28, 2012 [Internet]. [cited 2013 Feb 21]. Available from: http://www.fda.gov/downloads/AdvisoryCommittees/CommitteesMeetingMaterials/Drugs/Anti-InfectiveDrugsAdvisoryCommittee/UCM329258.pdf

59. European Medicines Agency Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. Assessment report Deltyba [Internet]. 2013. (Procedure No.: EMEA/H/C/002552). Available from: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Public_assessment_report/human/002552/WC500166234.pdf

60. Falzon D, Gandhi N, Migliori GB, Sotgiu G, Cox H, Holtz TH, et al. Resistance to fluoroquinolones and second-line injectable drugs: impact on MDR-TB outcomes. Eur Respir J. 2013;42(1):156–68.

61. Thwaites GE, Bhavnani SM, Chau TTH, Hammel JP, Torok ME, Van Wart SA, et al. Randomized Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic Comparison of Fluoroquinolones for Tuberculous Meningitis. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2011 Jul 1;55(7):3244–53.

62. Donald PR. The chemotherapy of tuberculous meningitis in children and adults. Tuberculosis. 2010 Nov;90(6):375–92.

63. Sun F, Ruan Q, Wang J, Chen S, Jin J, Shao L, et al. Linezolid Manifests a Rapid and Dramatic Therapeutic Effect for Patients with Life-Threatening Tuberculous Meningitis. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014 Oct 1;58(10):6297–301.

64. WHO Model List of Essential Medicines [Internet]. 19th list. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2015. Available from: http://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/20/EML_2015_FINAL_amended_AUG2015.pdf

65. WHO Model List of Essential Medicines for Children [Internet]. 5th list. Geneva, World Health Organization; 2015. Available from: http://www.who.int/medicines/publications/essentialmedicines/EMLc_2015_FINAL_amended_AUG2015.pdf

66. Gillespie SH, Crook AM, McHugh TD, Mendel CM, Meredith SK, Murray SR, et al. Four-Month Moxifloxacin-Based Regimens for Drug-Sensitive Tuberculosis. N Engl J Med. 2014 Oct 23;371(17):1577–87.

67. Jawahar MS, Banurekha VV, Paramasivan CN, Rahman F, Ramachandran R, Venkatesan P, et al. Randomized clinical trial of thrice-weekly 4-month moxifloxacin or gatifloxacin containing regimens in the treatment of new sputum positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients. PloS One. 2013;8(7):e67030.

68. Global tuberculosis report 2014 (WHO/HTM/TB/2014.08) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2014. Available from: http://www.who.int/tb/publications/global_report/gtbr14_main_text.pdf

69. Virenfeldt J, Rudolf F, Camara C, Furtado A, Gomes V, Aaby P, et al. Treatment delay affects clinical severity of tuberculosis: a longitudinal cohort study. BMJ Open. 2014 Jun 1;4(6):e004818.

70. Harris RC, Grandjean L, Martin LJ, Miller AJP, Nkang J-EN, Allen V, et al. The effect of early versus late treatment initiation after diagnosis on the outcomes of patients treated for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis: a systematic review. BMC Infect Dis [Internet]. 2016 Dec [cited 2016 May 11];16(1). Available from: http://bmcinfectdis.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12879-016-1524-0

71. TB CARE 1. International standards for tuberculosis care [Internet]. 3rd ed. The Hague, The Netherlands; 2014. Available from: http://www.who.int/tb/publications/ISTC_3rdEd.pdf

72. TDR. Priorities for tuberculosis research. A report of the Disease reference group on TB, leprosy and Buruli ulcer [Internet]. Geneva, Tropical Disease Research; 2013. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/85888/1/9789241505970_eng.pdf

73. Mitnick CD, et al. Programmatic Management of Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis: An Updated Research Agenda. PLOS ONE. 2016;in press.

74. Guidelines on the management of latent tuberculosis infection (WHO/HTM/TB/2015.01) [Internet]. Geneva, World Health Organization. 2014. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/136471/1/9789241548908_eng.pdf

Appendix 1. Agenda for the GDG meeting on the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB – 2016 update*, 9-11 November 2015

Chair: Holger Schünemann

Co-chair: Charles L Daley

Day 1

8:30 – 9:00	Registration	
9:00 – 9:15	Welcome & introductions	Karin Weyer
9:15 – 9:30	Meeting objectives and expected outcomes, agenda and working methods Declarations of interest	Ernesto Jaramillo Dennis Falzon
9:30 – 10:00	WHO requirements for evidence-based guidelines, GRADE methodology	Holger Schünemann
10:00 – 10:45	Plenary—Presentation of draft GRADE Tables **PICO 1: MDR-TB REGIMEN COMPOSITION – SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS OF INDIVIDUAL DRUGS**	Dick Menzies, Mayara Bastos
10:45 – 11:00	*Coffee break*	
11:00 – 11:30	Plenary—Presentation of draft GRADE Tables **PICO 1: MDR-TB REGIMEN COMPOSITION – PAEDIATRIC IPD**	Anneke Hesseling
11:30 – 11:40	Plenary—Discussants present their perspectives on the implications of the findings for the approach to the composition and duration of MDR-TB regimens in adults and children	Discussants : Charles L Daley (adults), Farhana Amanullah (children)
11:40 – 13:00	Plenary – Development of decision tables to formulate draft recommendations based on quality of the evidence, and other considerations (balance between desirable and undesirable effects, resources, feasibility, values and preferences).	Facilitated discussion
13:00 – 14:00	*Lunch break*	
14:00 – 15:30	Continued — Development of decision tables to formulate draft recommendations based on quality of the evidence, and other considerations (balance between desirable and undesirable effects, resources, feasibility, values and preferences).	Facilitated discussion
15:30 – 15:45	*Coffee break*	
15:45 – 17:45	Continued — Finalisation of draft recommendations	Facilitated discussion
17:45 – 18:00	Summary of the day	Chair

Day 2

8:30 – 9:15	Plenary—Presentation of draft GRADE Tables **PICO 2: REGIMENS FOR ISONIAZID RESISTANCE & *M. bovis***	Dick Menzies, Mayara Bastos
9:15 – 9:30	Plenary—Discussants present their perspectives on the implications of the findings for the approach to the composition and duration of regimens in adults and children	Discussants : Daniela Cirillo; Carlos Torres (isoniazid-resistant); Jose Caminero; Agnes Gebhard (*M.bovis*)
9:30 – 10:45	Plenary— Development of decision tables to formulate draft recommendations based on quality of the evidence, and other considerations (balance between desirable and undesirable effects, resources, feasibility, values and preferences)	Facilitated discussion
10:45 - 11:00	Coffee break	
11:00 – 13:00	Continued — Finalisation of draft recommendations	Facilitated discussion
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break	
14:00 – 14:45	Plenary—Presentation of Grade Tables **PICO 3: SHORTER REGIMENS FOR MDR-TB**	Dick Menzies, Faiz A Khan
14:45 – 15:00	Plenary—Discussants present their perspectives on the implications of the findings for the treatment of MDR-TB using shorter regimens	Discussants: Sundari Mase, Tsira Chakhaia, Michel Gasana
15:00 – 16:00	Plenary— Development of decision tables to formulate draft recommendations based on quality of the evidence, and other considerations (balance between desirable and undesirable effects, resources, feasibility, values and preferences)	Facilitated discussion
16:00 – 16:15	Coffee break	
16:15 – 17:00	Continued — Finalisation of draft recommendations	Facilitated discussion
17:00 – 17:45	Implications of the findings from reviews of PICO 1 and PICO 3 for the approach to the composition and duration of MDR-TB regimens	Facilitated discussion
17:45 – 18:00	Wrap-up and Summary of the day	Chair

Day 3

8:30 – 9:30	Plenary—Presentation of draft GRADE Tables **PICO 4:** **DELAYS IN STARTING MDR TREATMENT** **THE ROLE OF SURGERY**	Mishal Khan, Rebecca Harris, Greg Fox
9:30 – 9:40	Plenary—Discussant presents perspectives on the implications of the findings for the approach to the management of MDR-TB	Discussant : Armen Hayrapetyan (role of surgery)
9:40 – 10:45	Plenary— Development of decision tables to formulate draft recommendations based on quality of the evidence, and other considerations (balance between desirable and undesirable effects, resources, feasibility, values and preferences)	Facilitated discussion
10:45 - 11:00	Coffee break	
11.00-11.30	Levels of resistance to pyrazinamide and fluoroquinolones	Matteo Zignol
11:30 – 13:00	Review of the recommendations for the four PICOs combined (continued)	Facilitated discussion
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break	
14:00 – 15:00	Research priorities on treatment of DR-TB	Dick Menzies Christian Lienhardt
15:00 – 15:30	Next steps and Closure	Chair & Karin Weyer

Appendix 2a. Participants in the GDG meeting on the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB – 2016 update*, 9-11 November 2015

Guideline Development Group members

1. Dr Farhana Amanullah
Associate Director
Pediatric TB Program Indus Hospital,
IRD 7/2 Zulfiqar Street 11 DHA phase 8 Karachi
Pakistan

2. Dr Luis Gustavo do Valle Bastos
Senior Technical Advisor
Center for Pharmaceutical Management
Management Sciences for Health 4301 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 400 Arlington, VA 22203
USA

3. Dr José Caminero Luna
Coordinator, MDR-TB Unit IUATLD, Paris, France
Assistant Physician of Pneumology General Hospital of Gran Canaria "Dr. Negrin"
Las Palmas de Gran Canaria Spain

4. Dr Tsira Chakhaia
ACSM Advisor, Civil Society Georgia USAID Georgia TB Prevention Project University Research Co., LLC
57 Shartava Street 0178 - Tbilisi
Georgia

5. Dr Daniela Maria Cirillo
Head, Emerging Bacterial Pathogens Unit, San Raffaele del Monte Tabor Foundation (hSR)
San Raffaele Scientific Institute
A4 Dibit 2
Via Olgettina 60
20132 - Milano
Italy

6. Dr Charles L Daley (Co-Chair) Chief
Division of Mycobacterial and Respiratory Infections National Jewish Health
1400 Jackson Street
Denver, CO 80206
USA

7. Dr Kelly Dooley
Associate Professor of Medicine, Pharmacology & Molecular Science
Divisions of Clinical Pharmacology & Infectious Diseases
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
Center for Tuberculosis Research
600 N. Wolfe Street, Osler 527
21287 - Baltimore, MD 21287
USA

8. Dr Michel Gasana
Manager, National TB & Other Respiratory Communicable Diseases Division
Ministry of Health
P.O. Box 7162
Kigali
Rwanda

9. Dr Agnes Gebhard
Senior Consultant, Team Leader of ACCESS Team
Technical Division
KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation PO Box 146
Van Bylandt Huis, Benoordenhoutseweg
46 2596 BC - The Hague Netherlands

10. Dr Armen Hayrapetyan
Director, National TB Control Centre
Ministry of Health
10 Arzni highway
2204 Abovyan city
Armenia

11. Dr Antonia Kwiecien
Senior Technical Advisor
Systems for Improved Access to
Pharmaceuticals and Services Program (SIAPS)
Management Sciences for Health (MSH)
Arlington, VA USA

12. Dr Sundari Mase
Medical Team Lead
Field Services and Evaluation Branch Division of
Tuberculosis Elimination National Center for HIV,
Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Mailstop E-10, 1600 Clifton Road Atlanta, GA -
30333
USA

13. Dr Lindsay McKenna
TB/HIV Project Officer
Treatment Action Group
261 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2110 New York
NY 10016
USA

14. Dr Nguyen Viet Nhung
Director, National Lung Hospital
Manager, Vietnam National
Tuberculosis Control Program 463
Hoang Hoa Tham Street Hanoi,
Ba Dinh District
Viet Nam

15. Dr Maria Rodriguez
Coordinator, MDR-TB National
Technical Unit
Ministry of Health
Ave. Dr. Héctor Romero Hernández
Esq. Tiradentes
Ens. La Fe, Santo Domingo D.N
10514
Dominican Republic

16. Dr Holger Schünemann (Chair)
Chair and Professor
Department of Clinical Epidemiology
& Biostatistics & Michael Gent Chair
in Healthcare Research
Departments of Clinical Epidemiology
& Biostatistics and of Medicine
McGRADE Centre
McMaster University Health Sciences
Centre
1280 Main St. West, MML-417
L8S 4L6 - Hamilton, ON Canada

17. Dr James Seddon
Clinical Lecturer
Department of Paediatrics
Imperial College London
Norfolk Place
London W2 1PG United
Kingdom

18. Dr Thomas Shinnick Associate Director
Global Laboratory Activities Mycobacteriology Laboratory Branch, Division of Tuberculosis Elimination Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
1600 Clifton Road, MS-G35 , N.E. Atlanta, GA 30333
USA

19. Dr Alena Skrahina Scientific Director
Republican Scientific & Practical Center for Pulmonology & Tuberculosis
Belarus Research Institute of Pulmonology and Tuberculosis Per. Prilesny-5
Der. Zatsen Dolginovsky tract 157
220053 – Minsk Belarus

20. Dr Carlos A. Torres Duque Director
Latin American Thoracic Society Fundación Neumológica Colombiana Carrera 13 B No. 161 – 85, Segundo Piso
Bogotá, DC Colombia

Observers

21. Dr J. Peter Cegielski
Team Leader, MDR TB
International Programs and Research Branch, Division of Tuberculosis Elimination
Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (CDC)
Mailstop E-10
1600 Clifton Road, NE Atlanta, Georgia 30333 USA

22. Mrs Janet Kristen Ginnard
Technical Officer
Strategy & Results, UNITAID
Building BIBC III – 8th Floor
Chemin de Blandonnet 10
1214 Vernier
Switzerland

23. Dr Giovanni Battista Migliori
Director
WHO Collaborating Centre for Tuberculosis and Lung Diseases
Fondazione Salvatore Maugeri, IRCCS
Via Roncaccio 16
21049 - Tradate, VA
Italy

24. Dr Payam Nahid
Professor of Medicine
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco General Hospital Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine
1001 Potrero Ave, 5K1 San Francisco, CA 94110 USA

25. Dr Thomas W. Piggott
Resident Physician
McMaster University
1280 Main St. W, HSC 2C2
Hamilton ON
Canada L8S4K1

26. Dr Anna Scardigli
Technical Advice and Partnership
The Global Fund
Chemin de Blandonnet 8
1214 Vernier - Geneva
Switzerland

27. Dr Barbara Seaworth
Division of Tuberculosis Elimination (DTBE)
Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (CDC)
1600 Clifton Road, NE Mailstop E-10
Atlanta, GA 30329 USA

28. Dr Mohammed Yassin
Technical Advisor, Tuberculosis
The Global Fund
Chemin de Blandonnet 8 1214 Vernier - Geneva Switzerland

29. Dr Mukadi Ya Diul
Senior TB Technical Advisor
Infectious Disease Division
Global Health Bureau
US Agency for International Development (USAID)
1300 Pennsylvania Ave, Office 5.7-40 Washington, DC 20523-5900
USA

Resource Persons

30. Dr Philipp Du Cros
Head, Manson Unit / TB Adviser
Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) UK
67-74 Saffron Hill
EC1N 8QX London
United Kingdom

31. Dr Abdul Hamid Salim
Advisor to NTP Bangladesh on Global Fund and MDR-TB
TB Gate, Leprosy hospital Compound Mohakhali, Dhaka 1212
Bangladesh

32. Dr Michael L. Rich
Partners in Health
Harvard Medical School
641 Huntington Avenue Boston,
MA 02115 USA

33. Dr Valérie Schwoebel
International Union Against Tuberculosis & Lung Disease (UNION)
68 boulevard Saint Michel
75006 - Paris
France

34. Dr Francis Varaine
International Medical Coordinator
Médecins sans Frontières - France
8 rue St Sabin
75544 - Paris Cedex 11
France

35. Dr Askar B. Yedilbayev
Program Director for Russia/Medical Officer
888 Commonwealth Avenue, 3d floor
Boston, MA 02115
USA

Evidence Reviewers

36. Dr Greg Fox
University of Sydney
PO Box 651, Spit Junction, NSW 2088
Australia

37. Ms Rebecca Harris
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Keppel Street
London
United Kingdom

38. Dr Anneke Hesseling
Professor in Paediatrics
Director, Paediatric TB Research Program
Desmond Tutu TB Centre Department of Paediatrics and Child Health
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
Stellenbosch University Cape Town
South Africa

39.
Dr Faiz Ahmad Khan
Assistant Professor, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University
Montreal Chest Institute,
McGill University Health Centre
1001 boulevard Décarie, D05.2034
Montreal, Qc H4A 3J1
Canada

40. Dr Mishal Khan
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Keppel Street
London
United Kingdom

41. Dr Mayara Lisboa Soares de Bastos
McGill University
1001 boulevard Décarie, D05.2034
Montreal, Qc H4A 3J1
Canada

42. Dr Dick Menzies
Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Montreal Chest Institute
McGill University Health Centre
1001 boulevard Décarie, D05.2034
Montreal, Qc H4A 3J1
Canada

WHO/Regional Staff

43. **Dr Nobuyuki Nishikiori**, Regional Adviser, TB, WPRO

WHO/HQ Secretariat

44. **Dr Karin Weyer**, Coordinator, LDR/GTB
45. **Dr Haileyesus Getahun**, Coordinator, THC/GTB
46. **Dr Malgorzata Grzemska**, Coordinator, SC/GTB
47. **Mrs Diana Weil**, Coordinator, PSI/GTB
48. **Dr Dennis Falzon**, LDR/GTB
49. **Dr Nathan Ford**, Project Manager, AC/HIV
50. **Dr Ernesto Jaramillo**, DR/GTB
51. **Dr Avinash Kanchar**, HC/GTB
52. **Ms Soleil Labelle**, TSC/GTB
53. **Dr Christian Lienhardt**, PSI/GTB
54. **Dr Knut Lönnroth**, PSI/GTB
55. **Dr Fuad Mirzayev**, LDR/GTB
56. **Dr Linh Nhat Nguyen**, LDR/GTB
57. **Dr Fraser Wares**, LDR/GTB
58. **Dr Marco Antonio Vitoria,** TAC/HIV
59. **Dr Matteo Zignol**, LDR/GTB

WHO Consultant

60. **Dr Elizabeth Harausz**

Appendix 2b. Members of the External Review Group for the *WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant TB – 2016 update*

Name	Affiliation	Constituency
Celine Garfin	Ministry of Health, The Philippines	National programme / end-user
Dalene von Delft	TB Proof, South Africa	Patient representative (www.tbproof.org/)
Michael Kimerling	KNCV, The Netherlands	Technical agency / programme implementation
Guy Marks	International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease (UNION), France	Technical agency / programme implementation
Ejaz Qadeer	Ministry of Health, Pakistan	National TB programme / end-user
Irina Vasilyeva	Central Tuberculosis Research Institute (CTRI) ; Ministry of Health	National programme / end-user
Lee Reichman	Rutgers University, USA	Clinician
Norbert Ndjeka	Ministry of Health, South Africa	National programme / end-user
Rohit Sarin	Ministry of Health, India	National programme / end-user
Vaira Leimane	Ministry of Health, Latvia	National programme / end-user
Chen-Yuan Chiang	International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease (UNION), France	Technical agency / programme implementation
Gao Mengqiu	Ministry of Health, China	National TB programme/end user

Appendix 3. PICO questions[16]

Q1. In patients with rifampicin resistance (RR-TB) or MDR-TB, which individual drugs in the regimens are more or less likely to lead to the outcomes listed below?

Population	**Intervention**	**Comparator**	**Outcomes**
RR-TB only MDR-TB <u>without</u> resistance <u>or</u> severe intolerance to the second line drugs MDR-TB <u>with</u> resistance <u>or</u> severe intolerance to a. Fluoroquinolones b. 2nd line injectables, both classes c. Pyrazinamide d. 2 or 3 Group 4 drugs[17] e. Fluoroquinolones + 2nd line injectables (i.e. XDR-TB +/- other resistance) Children (0-4, 5-14y), persons with HIV, pregnant women, persons with diabetes	A 2nd line regimen[18] which INCLUDES :		• Cured/completed by end of treatment • Culture conversion by 6 months • Failure • Relapse • Survival (or death) • Adverse reactions (severity, type, organ class)
	- pyrazinamide	- no pyrazinamide	
	- injectable agents (Km/Am/Cm)	- no injectable agents (Km/Am/Cm)	
	- prothionamide/ethionamide	- no prothionamide/ethionamide	
	- cycloserine or terizidone	- no cycloserine or terizidone	
	- PAS	- no PAS	
	- later-generation fluoroquinolone[19]	- no later-generation fluoroquinolone[19]	
	- high-dose isoniazid	- no high-dose isoniazid	
	- clofazimine	- no clofazimine	
	- linezolid	- no linezolid	
	- bedaquiline	- no bedaquiline	
	-delamanid	- no delamanid	
	- other individual Group 5[17] drugs	- no other individual Group 5[17] drugs	

[16] PICO = **P**opulation, **I**ntervention, **C**omparator, **O**utcome

[17] <u>Group 4 drugs are</u>: ethionamide, prothionamide, cycloserine, terizidone, PAS

<u>Group 5 drugs are</u>: amoxicillin / clavulanate, bedaquiline, clarithromycin, clofazimine, delamanid, high-dose isoniazid, imipenem / cilastatin, linezolid, meropenem, thioacetazone. For bedaquiline and delamanid, the recommendations are not expected to change from the ones in the WHO Interim policy guidance for these two drugs (2013 & 2014), and definitive recommendations on their role in treatment will only be possible once the results of the Phase III trials become available. However, new data on safety and effectiveness may be considered by the reviewers and the Guidelines Group if made available ahead of the meeting.

[18] data from regimens lasting up to 12 months will not be included in this question but in Question 3

[19] moxifloxacin or gatifloxacin; high-dose levofloxacin may be included but results to be made available separately

Q2. In TB patients with drug-resistance patterns other than RR-/MDR-TB, which drug regimen composition and duration is more or less likely to lead to the outcomes listed below?

Population[20]	**Intervention**[21]	**Comparator**	**Outcomes**
Resistance to Isoniazid[22]	- RZE + FQ[23] for 6-9 months	- HRZE for 6-9 months - RZE for 6-9 months - 8-month FLD retreatment regimen ("Category 2") - 6-month FLD treatment regimen ("Category 1 or 3") - other	• Cured/completed by end of treatment • Culture conversion by 6 months • Failure • Relapse • Survival (or death) • Adverse reactions (severity, type, organ class) • Acquisition (amplification) of drug resistance
	- RZ + FQ[23] for 9-12 months	- 8-month FLD retreatment regimen ("Category 2") - 6-month FLD initial treatment regimen ("Category 1 or 3") - other	
	- 2nd line inj./R/Eto/FQ[23] for 3 months **+** R/Eto/FQ[23] for 15 months	- 8-month FLD retreatment regimen ("Category 2") - 6-month FLD initial treatment regimen ("Category 1 or 3") - other	
Mycobacterium bovis	- 6- or 8-month FLD treatment regimens ("Category 1, 2 or 3")	- other - 2 HRE/7HR	

[20] If data are available the effects will be stratified by key subpopulations : children (0-4, 5-14y), persons with HIV, pregnant women, and people with diabetes

[21] The treatment modalities discussed in the 2015 Companion handbook

[22] Including cases with or without additional resistance to ethambutol and pyrazinamide. The assessment of evidence and recommendations on these resistance patterns will be conditioned by the fact that DST for E & Z is often unreliable, but which may bring about the use of fluoroquinolones when not warranted, and that the evidence may be based on experience from patients who may have been switched to FQ-containing regimens after a period of time on first-line regimens

[23] If data are available the effects will be stratified by the type of fluoroquinolone (early vs. later generation)

Q3. In MDR-TB patients, are treatment regimens lasting up to 12 months more or less likely to lead to the outcomes listed below when compared with those recommended in the WHO guidelines of 2011?

Population	**Intervention**	**Comparator**[21]	**Outcomes**
<u>MDR-TB patients</u> a. Previously treated with 2nd line drugs or not b. severity of disease (mild/extensive radiographic lesions) c. drug resistance patterns (for FLDs and SLDs) d. history of patient use ethambutol or pyrazinamide f. children (0-14y) / adults g. persons with HIV, pregnant women, and people with diabetes	- duration of 9-12 months[24] - injectable agent for 4-6 months - combination of drugs (usually 7 in the intensive phase and 4-5 in the continuation)	- Use of at least 4 effective SLDs plus pyrazinamide - Injectable agent given for about 8 months, at least 4 months after culture conversion - Total treatment for at least 18 months past the date of culture conversion to negative - Injectable agent given until smear conversion and total treatment for at least 12 months after smear conversion	• Cured/completed by end of treatment • Culture conversion by 6 months • Failure • Relapse • Survival (or death) • Adverse reactions (severity, type, organ class) • Acquisition (amplification) of drug resistance • Adherence to treatment (or treatment interruption due to non-adherence)

[24] Regimens lasting >12 and <18 months will not be included in the Intervention or Comparator

Q4. Among patients on MDR-TB treatment, are the following two interventions (timing to start of treatment and elective surgery) more or less likely to lead to the outcomes listed below?

<table>
<tr><th>Population[25]</th><th>Intervention</th><th>Comparator</th><th>Outcome</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Patients on MDR-TB treatment

Patients on XDR-TB treatment

Children (0-14y) / adults

Persons with HIV (on ARVs)

Pregnant women, and people with diabetes</td><td>Start of adequate treatment within 4 weeks of diagnosis (or strong presumption)</td><td>Treatment started beyond 4 weeks of diagnosis (or strong presumption)</td><td rowspan="2">• Cured/completed by end of treatment
• Culture conversion by 6 months
• Failure
• Relapse
• Survival (or death)
• Adverse reactions (severity, type, organ class)
• Adherence to treatment (or treatment interruption due to non-adherence)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Elective surgery (different types / stages of disease)</td><td>No elective surgery</td></tr>
</table>

[25] The populations are expected to differ for the two sub-questions: for instance patients who are surgically operated are more likely to be XDR-TB and persons with HIV who are having ARVs would be particularly important for the first sub-question.

www.who.int/tb/areas-of-work/drug-resistant-tb/treatment/resources