of meningococcal isolates and typing should continue and include sequencing of genes that encode factor H binding protein to monitor the emergence or expansion of any escape variants.

*Muhamed-Kheir Taha, Ala Eddine Deghmane Institut Pasteur, Unit of Invasive Bacterial Infections & National Reference Center for Meningococci, 75724 Paris, Cedex 15, France mktaha@pasteur.fr

- Richmond PC, Marshall HS, Nissen MD, et al. Safety, immunogenicity, and tolerability of meningococcal serogroup B bivalent recombinant lipoprotein 2086 vaccine in healthy adolescents: a randomised, single-blind, placebo-controlled, plase 2 trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012; published online May 7. DOI:10.1016/S1473-3099(12)70087-7
- 2 Murphy E, Andrew L, Lee KL, et al. Sequence Diversity of the factor H binding protein vaccine candidate in epidemiologically relevant strains of serogroup B Neisseria meningitidis. J Infect Dis 2009; 200: 379–89.
- 3 Fletcher LD, Bernfield L, Barniak V, et al. Vaccine potential of the Neisseria meningitidis 2086 lipoprotein. Infect Immun 2004; **72**: 2088–100.
- 4 Rosenstein NE, Perkins BA, Stephens DS, Popovic T, Hughes JM. Meningococcal disease. N Engl J Med 2001; **344:** 1378–88.
- 5 Eckhardt M, Muhlenhoff M, Bethe A, Koopman J, Frosch M, Gerardy-Schahn R. Molecular characterization of eukaryotic polysialyltransferase-1. *Nature* 1995; **373**: 715–18.

- 6 Stephens DS, Greenwood B, Brandtzaeg P. Epidemic meningitis, meningococcaemia, and Neisseria meningitidis. Lancet 2007; 369: 2196–210.
- 7 Holst J, Feiring B, Naess LM, et al. The concept of "tailor-made", protein-based, outer membrane vesicle vaccines against meningococcal disease. Vaccine 2005; 23: 2202–05.
- 8 Caron F, du Chatelet IP, Leroy JP, et al. From tailor-made to ready-to-wear meningococcal B vaccines: longitudinal study of a clonal meningococcal B outbreak. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2011; **11**: 455–63.
- 9 Goldschneider I, Gotschlich EC, Artenstein MS. Human immunity to the meningococcus. I. The role of humoral antibodies. J Exp Med 1969; 129: 1307–26.
- 10 Jiang HQ, Hoiseth SK, Harris SL, et al. Broad vaccine coverage predicted for a bivalent recombinant factor H binding protein based vaccine to prevent serogroup B meningococcal disease. Vaccine 2010; 28: 6086–93.
- 11 Donnelly J, Medini D, Boccadifuoco G, et al. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of meningococcal antigens to evaluate the potential strain coverage of protein-based vaccines. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2010; 107: 19490–95.
- 12 Rappuoli R. Reverse vaccinology, a genome-based approach to vaccine development. Vaccine 2001; **19:** 2688–91.
- 13 Santolaya ME, O'Ryan ML, Valenzuela MT, et al. Immunogenicity and tolerability of a multicomponent meningococcal serogroup B (4CMenB) vaccine in healthy adolescents in Chile: a phase 2b/3 randomised, observer-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Lancet* 2012; **379:** 617–24.
- 14 Gossger N, Snape MD, Yu LM, et al. Immunogenicity and tolerability of recombinant serogroup B meningococcal vaccine administered with or without routine infant vaccinations according to different immunization schedules: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2012; **307:** 573–82.

Tuberculosis control: business models for the private sector

In many countries, the private health-care sector is a major provider of medical care. In India and Pakistan, for example, 70–80% of first contact care happens in the private sector. Private health care in these countries is a heterogeneous mix of qualified and unqualified providers, modern and alternative health systems, and facilities that range from corporate to charitable institutions. Quality of care, therefore, is highly variable.

The private health sector is part of the problem with tuberculosis control: diagnostic and treatment practices are suboptimum in Pakistan and India,¹⁻³ resulting in delays in case identification, irrational or unsupervised therapy, and unnecessary expenditure for patients.⁴ These factors can lead to drug resistance and continued transmission of tuberculosis.⁵ Also, private providers generally do not report or notify tuberculosis cases. However, the private health sector is also part of the solution. In view of their dominant role in tuberculosis care, engagement with private providers is crucial for achievement of tuberculosis control targets.⁶

Attempts to engage private health-care providers in tuberculosis control on a large scale have yielded disappointing results. Although small-scale, publicprivate mix models have worked in many studies,⁷ there are almost no examples of large-scale, successful, sustained engagement of the private health sector in tuberculosis control.

Private sector engagement has been addressed in WHO's Stop TB Strategy⁸ and the International Standards of Tuberculosis Care,⁹ but the reality is that private sector providers are largely uninterested in partnering with national tuberculosis control programmes. Mutual mistrust between public and private sectors, lack of appropriate incentives, poor regulation and accountability, and perverse marketdriven forces are barriers for meaningful partnerships.⁶ Pakistan's national programme has worked to overcome such barriers, and an estimated 25% of all tuberculosis patients are recruited from public-private projects that include social franchising models.¹⁰ In India, despite repeated efforts, private providers are estimated to contribute to less than 5% of case notifications to the national tuberculosis control programme.¹¹

What is the best approach to engage the private sector and improve tuberculosis case detection? Are new technologies the answer? There is widespread excitement about the potential of new diagnostic technologies for improving case detection and reducing



W

Published Online June 14, 2012 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ S1473-3099(12)70122-6 See Articles page 608 tuberculosis transmission. WHO has endorsed several tests and approaches, and efforts are underway to scale up rapid molecular technologies.¹²

Although we share the enthusiasm for new technology, a study by Khan and colleagues¹³ from Karachi, Pakistan, in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, shows that technological innovations alone are not sufficient to engage the private sector. Process innovations with better business and service delivery models could be as important as product innovations.

Khan and colleagues implemented a new, multifaceted approach to tuberculosis screening and case detection in one intervention area of Karachi, and compared case-notification rates with those in an adjacent control area. Interventions included a communications campaign to increase demand for tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment services, involvement of laypeople as screeners in private clinics and hospitals, mobile-phonebased incentives for screeners, and referrals of patients with suspected tuberculosis to a private hospital that offered free tuberculosis care. The investigators reported a substantial increase in case notifications in the intervention area compared with the control area.¹³

This study raises several issues. With multiple interventions, it is not easy to isolate the most important component. Nevertheless, the presence of a large, referral hospital that provided high-quality free tuberculosis care in the intervention area was clearly an important element of the intervention, as shown by the many patients selfreferred to Indus Hospital. The annual case-notification rate was much higher in the intervention area than in the control area, even before the intervention began. If the presence of a private hospital with a dedicated tuberculosis control team contributed to the observed effect, then replicating this public–private model in other parts of Pakistan (or other countries) will be challenging. Then again, perhaps we need more hospitals like Indus to join the fight against tuberculosis.

Another key concern is the cost and sustainability of such projects if external funding cannot be sustained, or if national tuberculosis control programmes are unable to take over and maintain the projects. Donor-funded projects are often unsustainable, which emphasises the importance of using financially viable business models that are market based. National programmes in Pakistan and India are chronically underfunded, and advocacy is needed to convince governments, industries, and high net-worth individuals to invest more resources in tuberculosis control.¹⁴

Despite these concerns, Khan and colleagues' study shows the potential for large-scale engagement of the private sector in improving case finding, and should serve as a useful model for other countries. Although new diagnostics were used in a small proportion of patients, the business model rather than the technology clearly led to effectiveness of the intervention, which engaged laypeople and private providers, and combined communications, incentives, and referral services. The next logical step is to combine innovative technologies with smart business models to better exploit their additive effects.

*Noor Ahmad Baloch, Madhukar Pai

Hamara Healthy Living Centre, Leeds LS8 3EU, UK (NAB); and Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McGill University and Montreal Chest Institute, Montreal, Canada (MP) noorahmad14@hotmail.com

NAB is former manager of the National TB Control Programme (NTP) in Pakistan and is a trustee of Hamara Healthy Living Centre. MP is a consultant for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The Gates Foundation, NTP Pakistan, and Hamara HLC had no involvement in this comment.

- Shah SK, Sadiq H, Khalil M, et al. Do private doctors follow national guidelines for managing pulmonary tuberculosis in Pakistan? East Mediterr Health J 2003; 9: 776–88.
- 2 Jarosawlski S, Pai M. Why are inaccurate tuberculosis serological tests widely used in the Indian private healthcare sector? A root-cause analysis. J Epidemiol Global Health 2012; 2: 39–50.
- 3 Udwadia ZF, Pinto LM, Uplekar MW. Tuberculosis management by private practitioners in Mumbai, India: has anything changed in two decades? PLoS One 2010; 5: e12023.
- 4 Bhargava A, Pinto LM, Pai M. Mismanagement of tuberculosis in India: causes, consequences, and the way forward. *Hypothesis* 2011; **9:** 1–13.
- 5 Udwadia ZF. MDR, XDR, TDR tuberculosis: ominous progression. Thorax 2012; 67: 286–88.
- 6 Uplekar M, Pathania V, Raviglione M. Private practitioners and public health: weak links in tuberculosis control. Lancet 2001; 358: 912–16.
- 7 Dewan PK, Lal SS, Lonnroth K, et al. Improving tuberculosis control through public-private collaboration in India: literature review. BMJ 2006; 332: 574–78.
- Raviglione MC, Uplekar MW. WHO's new Stop TB Strategy. *Lancet* 2006; **367:** 952–55.
- Hopewell PC, Pai M, Maher D, Uplekar M, Raviglione MC. International standards for tuberculosis care. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2006; **6:** 710–25.
- 10 Ahmad N, Mann GH. Situation analysis, public-private partnership models, operational and monitoring and evaluation guidelines for National TB Control Programme, Pakistan. http://www.ntp.gov.pk/downloads/ppm/ Finalreport_ppp_NTP08-09-06-PDF.pdf (accessed May 11, 2012).
- 11 Central TB Division. TB India 2011. Revised National Tuberculosis Control Programme; annual status report. New Delhi, India: Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2011.
- 12 Cobelens F, van den Hof S, Pai M, Squire SB, Ramsay A, Kimerling ME. Which new diagnostics for tuberculosis, and when? J Infect Dis 2012; 205 (suppl 2): 191–98.
- 13 Khan AJ, Khowaja S, Khan F, et al. Engaging the private sector to increase tuberculosis case detection: an impact evaluation study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012; published online June 6. DOI:10.1016/S1473-3099(12)70116-0.
- 14 Pai M. As India grows, tuberculosis control must not be left behind. Lancet Infect Dis 2012; **12:** 263–65.