





Identification of Risk Factors Associated with Tuberculosis in Southwest Iran: A Machine Learning Method

Neda Amoori¹, Bahman Cheraghian², Payam Amini³, Seyed Mohammad Alavi^{1*}

Received: 12 Aug 2023 Published: 17 Jan 2024

Abstract

Background: Tuberculosis is a principal public health issue. Reducing and controlling tuberculosis did not result in the expected success despite implementing effective preventive and therapeutic programs, one of the reasons for which is the delay in definitive diagnosis. Therefore, creating a diagnostic aid system for tuberculosis screening can help in the early diagnosis of this disease. This research aims to use machine learning techniques to identify economic, social, and environmental factors affecting tuberculosis.

Methods: This case-control study included 80 individuals with TB and 172 participants as controls. During January-October 2021, information was collected from thirty-six health centers in Ahvaz, southwest Iran. Five different machine learning approaches were used to identify factors associated with TB, including BMI, sex, age, marital status, education, employment status, size of the family, monthly income, cigarette smoking, hookah smoking, history of chronic illness, history of imprisonment, history of hospital admission, first-class family, second-class family, third-class family, friend, co-worker, neighbor, market, store, hospital, health center, workplace, restaurant, park, mosque, Basij base, Hairdressers and school. The data was analyzed using the statistical programming R software version 4.1.1.

Results: According to the calculated evaluation criteria, the accuracy level of 5 SVM, RF, LSSVM, KNN, and NB models is 0.99, 0.72, 0.97,0.99, and 0.95, respectively, and except for RF, the other models had the highest accuracy. Among the 39 investigated variables, 16 factors including First-class family (20.83%), friend (17.01%), health center (41.67%), hospital (24.74%), store (18.49%), market (14.32%), workplace (9.46%), history of hospital admission (51.82%), BMI (43.75%), sex (40.36%), age (22.83%), educational status (60.59%), employment status (43.58%), monthly income (63.80%), addiction (44.10%), history of imprisonment (38.19%) were of the highest importance on tuberculosis.

Conclusion: The obtained results demonstrated that machine-learning techniques are effective in identifying economic, social, and environmental factors associated with tuberculosis. Identifying these different factors plays a significant role in preventing and performing appropriate and timely interventions to control this disease.

Keywords: Tuberculosis, Classification, Risk factor, Machine Learning

Conflicts of Interest: None declared

Funding: The Vice-Chancellor for Research at Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences provided financial support.

*This work has been published under CC BY-NC-SA 1.0 license. Copyright© Iran University of Medical Sciences

Cite this article as: Amoori N, Cheraghian B, Amini P, Alavi SM. Identification of Risk Factors Associated with Tuberculosis in Southwest Iran: A Machine Learning Method. *Med J Islam Repub Iran*. 2024 (17 Jan);38:5. https://doi.org/10.47176/mjiri.38.5

Introduction

Tuberculosis(TB) is a significant public health concern and is currently recognized as the most fatal treatable infectious disease in the world (1). As per the estimates of the World Health Organization (WHO), in 2020, 9.9 million

Corresponding author: Dr Seyed Mohammad Alavi, alavi_sm@ajums.ac.ir

^{1.} Infectious and Tropical Diseases Research Center, Health Research Institute, Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences, Ahvaz, Iran

^{3.} School of Medicine, Keele University, Staffordshire, UK

individuals were infected with tuberculosis and this disease caused 1.3 million deaths (2). Worldwide, Eastern Mediterranean region, Iran, and Khuzestan province had an inci-

†What is "already known" in this topic:

Numerous studies have investigated the factors affecting tuberculosis based on socio-demographic variables, and each of these studies has identified a few factors.

\rightarrow *What this article adds:*

This study used a machine learning method and investigated economic, social, and environmental factors. Tuberculosis is influenced by 16 main factors, including first-class family, friends, health centers, hospitals, stores, markets, workplaces, history of hospital admission, BMI, sex, age,education, employment status, income, addiction, and history of imprisonment.

Downloaded from mjiri.iums.ac.ir on 2024-07-27

² Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences, Ahvaz, Iran

dence of 132, 114, 16, and 14.5 cases per 100,000 individuals, respectively, in 2020, which has had a relatively slow decline compared to previous years (3, 4).

Because the incidence of TB declines slowly, there is a renewed tendency to identify novel TB control measures. In addition to existing TB drugs, finding vaccines and designing shorter regimens have been some strategies. However, knowing the factors that lead to TB in some people and not in others (risk factors) can help them focus more on finding new TB control strategies in public health (5). Reported risk factors for tuberculosis include male gender, HIV infection, smoking, alcohol consumption, marital status, comorbidities such as diabetes, cancer, the use of immunosuppressive drugs, family history of tuberculosis, overcrowding In different environments and places, and poor socio-economic status. The current effort to find, treat, and cure any person with this disease is not enough (6, 7). There is a need to re-examine the socio-economic and environmental factors and understand the effective factors to adjust TB control policies. Recent studies have revealed that TB can be transmitted in crowded environments among households that are not related. These findings suggest that the transmission of tuberculosis may occur during exposure to infectious cases in social settings (8).

Identifying social sites associated with TB may help monitor public health, increase case findings, and identify areas that may reduce tuberculosis and the risk of transmission due to exposure to environmental interventions, such as UV radiation or improved air conditioning, exposure to the disease (9). The use of totally non-parametric machine learning models is growing in a variety of scientific disciplines. The principal purpose of this model is to determine the influential factors, the relationships between them, and prediction and estimation. This topic plays a substantial role in medicine and health data analysis because of the data type (10). This research aims to use machine learning techniques to identify and investigate economic, social, and environmental factors affecting tuberculosis.

Methods

Study population

Employing a case-control study, the risk factors associated with TB were evaluated. The subjects selected for the study were newly registered pulmonary TB patients with bacteriological confirmation who were over the age of 18 and presented at thirty-six health centers in Ahvaz, southwest Iran, between January and October 2021. The controls were those individuals with health issues other than TB who presented to the same health centers. The cases and controls were matched in age (within 5-year age bands).

The inclusion criteria for the case and control groups were as follows: TB patients over 18 years old with a positive culture of Mycobacterium tuberculosis who had TB treatment records in the health centers under auspicious.Controls were individuals over the age of 18 who did not suffer from tuberculosis. Both groups lived in areas covered by health centers in Ahvaz. The exclusion criteria for both the case and control groups were as follows: individuals under the age of 17 and those who suffered from mental disabilities or severe mobility limitations.

Sample size and sampling method

The sample size of 80 cases and 172 controls was estimated based on the following: the data available in previous studies, using the formula for determining the sample size in analytical studies and taking into account the level of confidence 95% and the power of the test 80%, with a 2:1 control to case ratio, using Stata 13.0 software. The sampling was conducted using an easy non-probability method for both groups. Since the beginning of the study, all the people who met the criteria for entering the study were selected as a sample. This procedure continued until the final size of the study sample was reached.

Data collection

Face-to-face interviews, standard forms, and checklists were the tools for data collection. This study examined factors associated with tuberculosis, including age, sex, BMI, marital status, education, employment status, size of the family, monthly Income, cigarette smoking, hookah smoking, history of chronic illness, history of imprisonment, history of hospital admission, first-class family, second-class family, third-class family, Friend, co-worker, neighbor, market, Store, hospital, health center, workplace, restaurant, park, mosque, basij base, hairdresser and school. The results of this study are included in the thesis, while the other part is published in a different journal (11).

Statistical analysis

We depicted the descriptive properties of the data through the frequency (percentage) and mean (standard error) for categorical and continuous variables, respectively. After checking the normality of data distribution and comparing the mean of observation across the categories of the response, an independent samples t-test was utilized. An independent chi-square was employed to evaluate the independence of categorical variables from the final result.

Classification algorithms are used in Machine Learning to predict the class label of a given data point. The main advantages of using Machine Learning in datasets with a relatively higher number of variables to the sample size are bias reduction due to robustness toward different sets of data, improving accuracy due to cross validation and iterative computations in background, the higher capability of determining complex patterns and correlations in the dataset among the variables, and the ability to make a prediction. It has been widely argued that the application of Machine Learning approaches in small sample data is associated with higher classification accuracy (12, 13).

Five different machine learning approaches were used for classification, including Random Forest(RF), Support Vector Machine(SVM), Least Square Support Vector Machine(LSSVM), K-Nearest Neighborhood (KNN), and Naïve Bayes (NB). In RF, the dataset is subject to sampling to shape the trees through substitution, and random combinations of predictors are selected at the nodes. LSSVM is a theory of statistical learning that takes a linear function from least squares as a function of loss. The KNN classification generally focuses on the Euclidean distance the train samples defined and a test set and it was built based on the need for discriminating where accurate parametric estimates of likelihood densities became uncertain or difficult to evaluate. The well-known Bayes' theorem, which follows a clear, simple, and very fast classifier, is used to create the Naïve Bayes classification model (because of mutually independent attributes assumption) (14).

Numerous metrics, including specificity, sensitivity, negative predictive value (NPV), positive predictive value (PPV), and overall accuracy, were utilized to evaluate the discriminative quality of the computational models. The dataset was divided into test sets (30% of individuals) and train sets (70% of individuals), each containing 176 and 76 individuals, respectively. The assessment criterion was listed as the average of the 500 iterations after we validated each model 500 times.

The statistical programming R software version 4.1.1 (http://www.R-project.org) packages, including random-Forest, naïve Bayes, e1071, rpart, ipred, rminer, caret, adabag, magrittr, qwraps2, CORElearn, MASS, mda, klaR, and MASS were utilized to analyze the data. The type one error was assumed to be 0.05.

Results

The participants were 80 cases and 172 controls. The patients' mean age was 34.1 (\pm 15.3) years old, while the controls' was 32.5 (\pm 12.0) years old. Table 1 depicts that 77.5% of the cases and 51.7% of the controls were male. Primary education was recorded in 51 of the cases (63.8%) and 36 (20.9%) of the controls, and about 38 (47.5%) of the cases and 74 (43%) of the controls had a formal job. Five percent of cases had a monthly income of between \$ 200-100, and 60 (34.9%) of the controls had a monthly income exceeding. Among patients with tuberculosis, 44(55%) and in the control group 22 (12.8%) had a history of hospitalization. The history of addiction and imprisonment was between 24(30%) and 21 (26.3%) in the cases, while in the control group, it was 2 (1.2%) and 1 (0.6%), respectively (Table 1).

In Table 2, five machine learning models, SVM, RF, LSSVM, KNN, and NB, are used to detect 39 factors affecting tuberculosis. As can be seen in this table, the researcher compared these five models in terms of accuracy(ACC), area under the curve(AUC), negative predictive value (NPV), positive predictive value (PPV), specificity, and sensitivity. Except for RF, in other models, the best value is highlighted. Accuracy has been used to compare these models. The four models, SVM, KNN, LSSVM, and NB, had the highest accuracy of 0.99, 0.99, 0.97, and 0.95, respectively.

Table 3 shows the significance of the variables that are most important for tuberculosis according to the Naïve Bayes model. This model showed that among social contacts, first-class family (20.83%) and friend (17.01%) and spatial contacts, health center (41.67%), hospital (24.74%), store (18.49%), market (14.32%), and workplace (9.46%)

Table 1. Patients' characteristics in the case and control groups

Variable		Cases (N=80)	Controls (N=172)	P-value
Age, mean (SD)		34.1 (±15.3)	32.5 (±12.0)	0.080
Sex, n (%)	Male	62 (77.5%)	89 (51.7%)	< 0.001
	Female	18 (22.5)	83 (48.3)	
BMI, n (%)	Underweight	22 (27.5)	9 (5.2)	< 0.001
	Normal	45 (56.3)	114 (66.3)	
	Overweight	9 (11.3)	30 (17.4)	
	Obese	4 (5.0)	19 (11.0)	
Marital status, n (%)	Single	24 (30.0)	47 (27.3)	0.620
· · · ·	Married	49 (61.3)	113 (65.7)	
	Divorced	3 (3.8)	10 (5.8)	
	Widowed	4 (5.0)	2 (1.2)	< 0.001
Educational status, n (%)	Illiterate	16 (20)	2(1.2)	
· · · ·	Read and Write	13 (16.3)	3 (1.7)	
	Up to elementary	23 (28.7)	31 (18.0)	
	Secondary school	15 (18.7)	47 (27.3)	
	College or more	13 (16.3)	89 (51.7)	
Employment Status, n (%)	Employed	38 (47.5)	74 (43.0)	< 0.001
1 2	Unemployed	42 (52.5)	98 (57.0)	
Size of the family, n (%)	< 2	25 (31.2)	21 (12.2)	< 0.001
	2-4	48 (60.0)	133 (77.3)	
	>4	7 (8.8)	18 (10.5)	
Monthly Income, n (%)	Less than \$100	24 (30.0)	21 (12.2)	0.040
	\$100-200	26 (32.5)	59 (34.4)	
	\$200-300	18 (22.5)	32 (18.6)	
	More than \$300	12 (15.0)	60 (34.9)	
Cigarette smoking, n (%)	Yes	34 (42.5)	31 (18.0)	< 0.001
	No	46 (57.5)	141 (82.0)	
Duration of Cigarette smoking (year), n	<1	7 (8.8)	12 (6.9)	< 0.001
(%)	1-3	10 (12.5)	10 (5.8)	
· · /	>3	16 (20.0)	9 (5.2)	
Hookah smoking, n (%)	Yes	10 (12.5)	29 (16.9)	0.372
	No	70 (87.5)	143 (83.1)	
Duration of hookah smoking, n (%)	<1	1 (1.3)	5 (2.9)	0.721
<u> </u>	1-3	2 (2.5)	5 (2.9)	
	>3	8 (10.0)	19 (11.1)	

Identification of Risk Factors Associated with Tuberculosis

Variable		Cases (N=80)	Controls (N=172)	P-value
History of chronic illness, n (%)	Yes	50 (62.5)	54 (31.3)	< 0.001
	No	30 (37.5)	118 (68.6)	
History of addiction, n (%)	Yes	24 (30.0)	2 (1.2)	< 0.001
	NO	56 (70.0)	170 (98.8)	
History of imprisonment, n (%)	Yes	21 (26.3)	1 (0.6)	< 0.001
	No	59 (73.7)	171 (99.4)	
History of hospital admission, n (%)	Yes	44 (55.0)	22 (12.8)	< 0.001
	No	36 (45.0)	150 (87.2)	
Contact Type, n (%)	First-class family	421 (30.0)	667 (29.7)	< 0.001
	Second-class family	245 (17.5)	502 (22.3)	
	Third-class family	85 (6.0)	221 (9.8)	
	Freind	380 (24.5)	410 (20)	
	Co-Worker	215 (14)	480 (24)	
	Neighbor	70 (2.5)	120 (6)	
Place of Contact, n (%)	Market	231 (22.8)	255 (16.6)	< 0.001
	Store	178 (17.6)	254 (16.5)	
	Hospital	51 (5.0)	67 (4.3)	
	Health center	150 (14.8)	277 (17.9)	
	Workplace	201 (19.9)	529 (34.4)	
	Restaurant	30 (2.9)	67 (4.3)	
	Park	26 (2.6)	33 (2.1)	
	mosque	55 (5.4)	96 (6.2)	
	Basij base	12 (1.2)	21 (1.4)	
	Hairdresser's	62 (6.1)	140 (9.0)	
	school	13 (1.3)	54 (3.5)	

Table 2. A comparison of the Five applied Machine Learning techniques using the accuracy measures

Tools	Set			Met	hods				
				Tool (95% confidence interval)					
		Sensitivity	Specificity	Positive predic-	Negative predic-	The area under	Accuracy (ACC)		
				tive value (PPV)	tive value (NPV)	the curve (AUC)	• • • •		
RF	Train	0.80 (0.79-0.80)	0.64 (0.63-0.64)	0.95 (0.94-0.95)	0.28 (0.27-0.29)	0.78 (0.78-0.78)	0.72 (0.71-0.72)		
RF	Test	0.76 (0.75-0.76)	0.66 (0.59-0.74)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)	0.04 (0.03-0.05)	0.75 (0.75-0.76)	0.71 (0.67-0.75)		
SVM	Train	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.98 (0.98-0.99)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)		
SVM	Test	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)		
LSSVM	Train	0.98 (0.96-0.99)	0.97 (0.96-0.98)	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	0.95 (0.92-0.98)	0.98 (0.96-0.99)	0.97 (0.96-0.99)		
LSSVM	Test	0.98 (0.96-0.99)	0.97 (0.96-0.98)	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	0.95 (0.92-0.98)	0.97 (0.96-0.98)	0.97 (0.96-0.98)		
NB	Train	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	0.98 (0.98-0.99)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)	0.99 (0.99-0.99)		
NB	Test	0.97 (0.96-0.97)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	0.97 (0.96-0.98)	0.93 (0.91-0.94)	0.96 (0.95-0.97)	0.95 (0.94-0.97)		
KNN	Train	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)		
KNN	Test	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.99 (0.99-1.00)		

were of the highest importance. Among the demographic and other variables related to tuberculosis, history of hospital admission (51.82%), BMI (43.75%), sex (40.36%), age (22.83%), education (60.59%), employment status (43.58%), income (63.80%), addiction (44.10%), history of imprisonment (38.19%) had the greatest impact on tuberculosis.

Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the risk factors affecting tuberculosis using machine learning techniques. In the statistical analysis of our paper, five classification methods of RF, SVM, LS-SVM, NB, and KNN were compared using Accuracy criteria. Except for RF, other classification methods performed well. In this study, factors such as first-class family, friend, health center, hospital, store, market, workplace, history of hospital admission, BMI, sex, age, educational status, employment status, income, addiction, and history of imprisonment were of the highest importance in relation to tuberculosis.

The high incidence of tuberculosis in many countries can be ascribed to the country's socio-demographic, economic, and environmental characteristics, such as poverty, lack of knowledge, attitudes, and practices, overcrowding in various places, malnutrition, comorbidities, etc (15). A comprehensive understanding of epidemiological factors is crucial in developing national policy and directing health resources to control TB transmission and guarantee improved patient management. Since there is no single factor that can be fully ascribed to the occurrence of tuberculosis and there is a gap in information about the factors affecting the incidence of tuberculosis, it has been tried to examine various demographic, social, economic, and environmental factors in this study. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants showed that the mean age of patients was 34 years old (range 19-49) and also for the control group was 32 (range 20-44). In general, the findings are in accordance with other studies that have documented a rapid

^{4 &}lt;u>http://mjiri.iums.ac.ir</u> Med J Islam Repub Iran. 2024 (17 Jan); 38:5.

Table 3. The importance of variables based on Machine Learning methods

racyGiniportance)tion)Health center0.0062.09441.671.82-0.00Hospital0.0000.47224.741.82-0.00Store0.0010.97018.490.000.005Market-0.0010.64314.320.000.002Hairdresser's0.0000.4827.030.000.002Park0.0000.1430.610.000.002Workplace0.0000.0552.860.000.000Basi0.0000.2576.940.000.000scool0.0000.29620.830.000.000scool0.0010.5400.170.00-0.00First-class family0.0010.5400.170.00-0.00Freind0.0010.4881.700.00-0.00Co-Worker0.0010.4881.750.000.000Neighbor0.0021.07743.750.000.001Sex0.0010.2184.510.000.002Marital status0.0021.65922.830.000.001Gardet stankig0.0020.6296.420.000.002Mortker0.0010.4326.340.000.002Sex0.0010.64528.130.000.001Sex0.0010.64528.130.000.001Sex0.0010.64528.130.000.002 <th>KNN (Attrib- SVM</th> <th>K</th> <th>LSSVM (Stand-</th> <th>Naïve</th> <th>RF Mean</th> <th>RF Mean De-</th> <th>Variable</th>	KNN (Attrib- SVM	K	LSSVM (Stand-	Naïve	RF Mean	RF Mean De-	Variable
Health center 0.006 2.094 41.67 1.82 -0.00 Hospital 0.000 0.472 24.74 1.82 -0.00 Store 0.001 0.970 18.49 0.00 0.003 Market -0.001 0.643 14.32 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.482 7.03 0.00 0.002 Park 0.000 0.007 2.95 0.00 0.000 Workplace 0.000 0.055 2.86 0.00 0.000 msque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.001 0.544 1.13 0.00 0.000 Scoad class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.00 Freind 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.000 Co-Worker 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000	ute Evalua-	ı	ardized Im-	Bayes	Decrease	crease Accu-	
Hospital 0.000 0.472 24.74 1.82 -0.001 Store 0.001 0.970 18.49 0.00 0.005 Market -0.001 0.643 14.32 0.00 0.002 Hairdresser's 0.000 0.482 7.03 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.143 0.61 0.00 0.002 Park 0.000 0.012 2.95 0.00 0.002 Workplace 0.000 0.050 2.86 0.00 0.000 mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.000 0.284 1.13 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.000 Co-Worker 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.000 Sec 0.001 0.272 8.33 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.002 Marital status 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Garcet smoking 0.000 0.277 0.35 0.00 0.000 Garcet smoking (year) 0.000 0.269 6.42 0.00 0.000 Garcet smoking (year) 0.000 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 C	tion)		portance)	•	Gini	racy	
Store 0.001 0.970 18.49 0.00 0.005 Market -0.001 0.643 14.32 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.482 7.03 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.143 0.61 0.00 0.002 Park 0.000 0.007 2.95 0.00 0.000 Workplace 0.000 0.502 2.86 0.00 0.000 Basij base 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 oschool 0.000 0.2351 1.74 0.00 0.000 School 0.000 0.384 1.13 0.00 0.000 School 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.001 Cowdreker 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.000 Cowdreker 0.001 0.488 8.25 0.00 0.000 Rest 0.001 0.477 43.75 0.00 0.000 geg 0.002 1.579 22.83 0.00 0.000 geg 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 Geg 6.42 0.00 0.000 0.000	-0.001 7.47		1.82	41.67	2.094	0.006	Health center
Store 0.001 0.970 18.49 0.00 0.005 Market -0.001 0.643 14.32 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.482 7.03 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.143 0.61 0.00 0.002 Park 0.000 0.007 2.95 0.00 0.000 Basij base 0.000 0.550 2.86 0.00 0.000 mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.2351 1.74 0.00 0.000 School 0.000 0.384 1.13 0.00 0.000 School 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 0.001 First-class family 0.001 0.440 17.01 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.001 0.445 4.51 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.001 0.445 28.13 0.00 0.000 Gage 0.000 0.645 28.13 </td <td>-0.002 0.12</td> <td></td> <td>1.82</td> <td>24.74</td> <td>0.472</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>Hospital</td>	-0.002 0.12		1.82	24.74	0.472	0.000	Hospital
Market -0.001 0.643 14.32 0.00 0.009 Hairdresser's 0.000 0.482 7.03 0.00 0.002 Restaurant 0.000 0.000 0.413 0.61 0.00 0.002 Park 0.000 0.007 2.95 0.00 0.000 Workplace 0.000 0.050 2.86 0.00 0.000 mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.232 1.74 0.00 0.000 School 0.000 0.2384 1.13 0.00 0.000 School 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.488 8.25 0.00 0.000 Co-Worker 0.001 0.488 8.25 0.00 0.000 Neighbor 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.579 22.83 0.00 0.001 Gage 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 Garcett smoking 0.000 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Marial status 0.000 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.000 Gould and status 0.000 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Contract 0.000 0.000 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 <	0.005 8.26		0.00	18.49	0.970	0.001	
Restaurant 0.000 0.143 0.61 0.00 0.002 Park 0.000 0.007 2.95 0.00 0.000 Workplace 0.000 0.050 2.86 0.000 0.000 msque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.256 20.83 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.480 1.701 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.448 1.71 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.001 ge 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 ge 0.001 0.432 63.80 0.001 0	0.009 6.99		0.00		0.643	-0.001	Market
Park 0.000 0.007 2.95 0.00 0.000 Workplace 0.000 0.192 9.46 0.00 0.001 Basij base 0.000 0.550 2.86 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.000 0.232 1.74 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 -0.001 Cowdreer 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.000 Cowdreer 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.002 Educational status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.070 5.90 0.00 0.000 Ligarette smoking 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.071 5.90	0.002 1.05		0.00	7.03	0.482	0.000	Hairdresser's
Workplace 0.000 0.192 9.46 0.00 0.001 Basij base 0.000 0.050 2.86 0.00 0.000 mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.032 1.74 0.00 0.000 First-class family 0.000 0.296 20.83 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 -0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.428 8.25 0.00 0.001 Sex 0.001 0.277 43.35 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 Gate 0.000 0.272 40.36 0.000 0.014 Employment Status 0.008 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.014 Employment Status 0.000 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.624 2.95 0.00 0.000 Lorder 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 0.000 Correct 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 0.000 Correct 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 0.000	0.002 7.01		0.00	0.61	0.143	0.000	Restaurant
Basij base 0.000 0.050 2.86 0.00 0.000 mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.032 1.74 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.000 0.296 20.83 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 -0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.004 Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.001 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 darital status 0.008 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.011 Eductional status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.011 Eductional status 0.000 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Stock 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Charler Enulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13	0.000 4.88		0.00	2.95	0.007	0.000	Park
Basij base 0.000 0.050 2.86 0.00 0.000 mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.032 1.74 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.000 0.296 20.83 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Freind 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 -0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.001 Neighbor 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 Sex 0.001 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Marital status 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361	0.001 0.88		0.00	9.46	0.192	0.000	Workplace
mosque 0.000 0.257 6.94 0.00 0.000 school 0.000 0.032 1.74 0.00 0.000 First-class family 0.000 0.296 20.83 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.000 0.384 1.13 0.00 0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Trind class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.000 Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.000 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.000 age 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.000 Marital status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.001 Educational status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.000 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Itarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 bracter 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 <t< td=""><td>0.000 1.52</td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td>2.86</td><td>0.050</td><td>0.000</td><td></td></t<>	0.000 1.52		0.00	2.86	0.050	0.000	
school 0.000 0.032 1.74 0.00 0.000 First-class family 0.000 0.296 20.83 0.00 0.000 Second class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 -0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.000 Neighbor 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 Gaucational status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.002 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.	0.000 0.50		0.00	6.94	0.257	0.000	
Second class family 0.000 0.384 1.13 0.00 0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.002 Freind 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.488 8.25 0.00 0.004 Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 Educational status 0.008 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 brocke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 brocke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 carcer 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 carcer 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.001 </td <td>0.000 0.47</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	0.000 0.47		0.00				
Second class family 0.000 0.384 1.13 0.00 0.001 Third class family 0.001 0.540 0.17 0.00 -0.002 Freind 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.488 8.25 0.00 0.004 Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.001 Educational status 0.008 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.014 Employment Status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.014 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.000 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.707 5.90 0.00 0.000 brocke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.000	0.000 1.29		0.00	20.83	0.296	0.000	First-class family
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.001 1.50		0.00	1.13	0.384	0.000	
Freind 0.001 0.480 17.01 0.00 0.001 Co-Worker 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.004 Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.003 Marital status 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.000 Educational status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.001 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Stroke 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.003 Diabetes 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Cancer 0.000 0.001 4.77 0.00 0.000 HIV 0.000 0.001 4.77 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.001	-0.003 0.22		0.00	0.17	0.540	0.001	
Co-Worker 0.001 0.458 8.25 0.00 0.004 Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.003 Marital status 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.003 Educational status 0.008 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.014 Employment Status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.001 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 beat statks 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.000 Correr 0.000 0.001 5.90 0.00 0.000 Hird 0.000 0.001 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	0.001 7.52		0.00	17.01	0.480	0.001	
Neighbor 0.000 0.297 8.33 0.00 0.000 BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.000 Barital status 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.001 Educational status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.014 Employment Status 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.432 63.80 0.00 -0.002 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.002 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 <td>0.004 0.09</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	0.004 0.09						
BMI 0.002 1.077 43.75 0.00 0.001 sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.002 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.003 Marital status 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.001 Educational status 0.006 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.014 Employment Status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.432 63.80 0.00 -0.002 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.002 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.000 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 <t< td=""><td>0.000 5.53</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	0.000 5.53						
sex 0.001 0.272 40.36 0.00 0.000 age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.003 Marital status 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.004 Educational status 0.006 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.011 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 -0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.000 Charey failure 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000	0.001 0.30						
age 0.002 1.559 22.83 0.00 0.003 Marital status 0.000 0.218 4.51 0.00 0.006 Educational status 0.008 2.820 60.59 0.00 0.014 Employment Status 0.006 2.102 43.58 0.00 0.001 Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 bracke 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.003 Stroke 0.000 0.102 4.77 0.00 0.000 Charler failure 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Chornic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000	0.000 1.10						
Marital status0.0000.2184.510.000.000Educational status0.0082.82060.590.000.014Employment Status0.0062.10243.580.000.011Size of the family0.0020.6296.420.000.002Monthly Income0.0010.64528.130.000.001Cigarette smoking0.0000.43263.800.00-0.002Duration of Cigarette smoking (year)0.0000.3613.130.000.000beat attack0.0000.0705.900.000.000cistoke0.0000.1656.340.000.003Diabetes0.0000.1656.340.000.001Chronic Pulmonary0.0000.0231.130.000.000HIV0.0000.0004.770.000.000History of addiction0.0081.91744.100.000.011							
Educational status0.0082.82060.590.000.014Employment Status0.0062.10243.580.000.011Size of the family0.0020.6296.420.000.002Monthly Income0.0010.64528.130.000.001Cigarette smoking0.0000.43263.800.00-0.002Duration of Cigarette smoking (year)0.0000.3613.130.000.000heart attack0.0000.0705.900.000.000stroke0.0000.0242.950.000.000Diabetes0.0000.1656.340.000.001Chronic Pulmonary0.0000.0231.130.000.000cancer0.0000.0715.900.00-0.002HIV0.0000.0004.770.000.000History of addiction0.0081.91744.100.000.011	0.000 0.43						6
Employment Status0.0062.10243.580.000.011Size of the family0.0020.6296.420.000.002Monthly Income0.0010.64528.130.000.001Cigarette smoking0.0000.43263.800.00-0.002Duration of Cigarette smoking (year)0.0000.3613.130.000.000heart attack0.0000.0705.900.000.000stroke0.0000.0242.950.000.000Diabetes0.0000.1656.340.000.001Chronic Pulmonary0.0000.0231.130.000.000cancer0.0000.0715.900.00-0.000HIV0.0000.0004.770.000.000History of addiction0.0081.91744.100.000.011	0.014 1.23						
Size of the family 0.002 0.629 6.42 0.00 0.002 Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.432 63.80 0.00 -0.002 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 heart attack 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.003 stroke 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Diabetes 0.000 0.102 4.77 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 Gancer 0.000 0.001 5.90 0.000 -0.001 HIV 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.000 0.011							
Monthly Income 0.001 0.645 28.13 0.00 0.001 Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.432 63.80 0.00 -0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 heart attack 0.000 0.070 5.90 0.00 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 -0.001 HIV 0.000 0.001 4.77 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.000 0.001	0.002 0.34						
Cigarette smoking 0.000 0.432 63.80 0.00 -0.000 Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 heart attack 0.000 0.070 5.90 0.000 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 -0.001 HIV 0.000 0.001 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.000 0.011							
Duration of Cigarette smoking (year) 0.000 0.361 3.13 0.00 0.000 heart attack 0.000 0.070 5.90 0.00 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Kidney failure 0.000 0.102 4.77 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 -0.00 HIV 0.000 0.004 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.004 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	-0.002 0.79		0.00		0.432	0.000	
heart attack 0.000 0.070 5.90 0.00 0.000 stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.001 Kidney failure 0.000 0.102 4.77 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.001 5.90 0.00 -0.001 HIV 0.000 0.004 7.73 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.000 0.011	0.000 0.09						
stroke 0.000 0.024 2.95 0.00 0.000 Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.003 Kidney failure 0.000 0.102 4.77 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.001 5.90 0.00 -0.001 HIV 0.000 0.004 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	0.000 0.13						
Diabetes 0.000 0.165 6.34 0.00 0.003 Kidney failure 0.000 0.102 4.77 0.00 0.001 Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.001 5.90 0.00 -0.00 HIV 0.000 0.004 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	0.000 0.03						
Kidney failure0.0000.1024.770.000.001Chronic Pulmonary0.0000.0231.130.000.000cancer0.0000.0715.900.00-0.00HIV0.0000.0004.770.000.000Hepatitis C0.0000.0147.730.000.000History of addiction0.0081.91744.100.000.011							
Chronic Pulmonary 0.000 0.023 1.13 0.00 0.000 cancer 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 -0.00 HIV 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011							
cancer 0.000 0.071 5.90 0.00 -0.00 HIV 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	0.000 0.07						Chronic Pulmonary
HIV 0.000 0.000 4.77 0.00 0.000 Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	-0.001 0.07						
Hepatitis C 0.000 0.014 7.73 0.00 0.000 History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	0.000 0.35						
History of addiction 0.008 1.917 44.10 0.00 0.011	0.000 0.20						
History of imprisonment 0.003 0.945 38.19 0.00 0.007	0.007 1.80						History of imprisonment
	0.006 1.46						

rise in morbidity and mortality due to TB in this young adult population, mainly between 18 and 51 years old. The elevated probability of infection in this age group is related to the increased number of social contacts in the community during adolescence. This study showed that the majority (55.5%) were male and (45.5%) were female. A similar finding was observed in other studies in which 60.5% and 57.5% of the participants were male and female (16). In this study, a history of addiction and imprisonment were more reported among patients than in the control group. Other studies have reported similar results. In a study by Gabriel et al. in Malaysia, the results showed that the imprisonment history was 88% among patients and 36% among healthy individuals (17). In this study, monthly household income for cases was lower than in the control group, which was consistent with a study by Wondemagegn et al. (16). In developing countries, the majority of impoverished families are confronted with financial constraints that result in poverty, malnutrition, poor health, overcrowding, reduced attitudes toward health care, and the cycle of an agent-host environment that is vicious and increases the risk of infectious diseases such as tuberculosis. Overcrowding in different places can be a strong risk factor for tuberculosis (18).

Patients with a history of previous hospitalization were

more than four times more likely to develop tuberculosis than patients without a history of previous hospitalization. This indicates that visiting health centers is a risk factor for tuberculosis, which suggests the necessity of establishing a robust infection control strategy in health centers. As per a longitudinal study, the hospital-acquired infection incidence rate was 28.15% (95%C.I:24.40, 32.30) per 1000 patient days, whereas the overall prevalence was 19.41% (95%C.I:16.97–21.85), Furthermore, pneumonia and other respiratory tract infections were ranked among the top ten diseases (19). Therefore, the transmission of the infection is common in the hospital, and people with a history of hospitalization have a higher chance of being infected during their stay. People who have been admitted for a longer period or more frequently are at a higher risk (20).

Other results of this study showed that different places such as health centers, hospitals, workplaces, markets, and shops had the highest association with tuberculosis and may be potential sites of transmission. The categorical analysis showed that healthcare locations are the first junctions and are undoubtedly important locations for infection control. Our findings are substantiated by previous studies that have identified healthcare settings as high-risk environments for the transmission of TB. These findings highlight

http://mjiri.iums.ac.ir

Med J Islam Repub Iran. 2024 (17 Jan); 38:5.

opportunities for health ministries to decrease community exposure to transmission risk by implementing environmental improvements, such as enhanced ventilation and UV irradiation at these venues (21). Reducing transmissibility in TB hotspots by targeting environmental interventions in areas where the risk of exposure to the disease is high may have significant community advantages. The workplace has been reported as another important contact point for the community, and possible causes may be poor ventilation, long-term and close exposure to infections. The results of our study are similar to the studies reviewed by Chamie et al. (22). According to the findings, implementing environmental interventions throughout the visited sites and avoiding focus on areas with low risk of TB exposure is necessary (23).

Among social contacts between individuals, family history among first-class relatives and close friends was of the most importance. This is similar to a study by Shimeles et al., the results of which showed that among the sick people who were exposed to patients with active TB, 18.1% were exposed to a family member and 7.3% to friends who were infected with TB (24).

Strength of the study

First, standard checklists are used, and interviews are carefully conducted by the researcher. Second, this study used appropriate statistical tools and techniques to find the relationship and impact of selected demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental factors.

Limitations of this study

First, proxy interviews were required for some participants because they were either very ill or poorly educated. Second, we obtained information from participants about one month before the start of the study. Thus, recall bias is inevitable and potentially affects the results.

Conclusion

This study employed machine learning methods to identify the effective economic, social, and environmental factors in tuberculosis. The researcher used five models, RF, SVM, LS-SVM, NB, and KNN, and except for RF, the rest of the models had the highest accuracy. In the final analysis, the study identified 16 key risk factors for tuberculosis, including BMI, sex, age, educational status, employment status, income, addiction, history of imprisonment, history of hospital admission, as well as contact with first-class family and friends and various places including a health center, hospital, store, market, workplace. Hence, it is essential that TB control efforts incorporate a strategy that prioritizes socio-economic concerns such as overcrowding and poverty. Furthermore, preventing the transmission of TB requires significant measures to control infection at the level of healthcare facilities and other places.

Acknowledgments

We express our gratitude to all the observers who have provided invaluable assistance in the execution of this project.

Ethics approval and Consent to participate

The Ethics Committee of Ahvaz Jundishapure University of MedSciencesences (IR.AJUMS.REC.1400.2 40) approved the present study that was part of a PhD thesis. The relevant guidelines and regulations of the Helsinki Declarations were followed by all methods. All participants were informed and provided with written consent/assent. They were assured that the information gathered would be confidential. Unique study identifiers were used to anonymize all collected data.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

- Khan A, Marks S, Katz D, Morris SB, Lambert L, Magee E, et al. Changes in Tuberculosis Disparities at a Time of Decreasing Tuberculosis Incidence in the United States, 1994–2016. Am J Public Health. 2018;108(S4):S321-S6.
- 2. World Health Organization (2020): Global Tuberculosis Report. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240037021.
- Shaikh MA, Malik NA. Spatial cluster analysis of new and relapsed cases of pulmonary tuberculosis by district: pakistan 2015. J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad. 2019;31(2):293-5.
- 4. Tavakoli A. Incidence and prevalence of tuberculosis in Iran and neighboring countries. Zahedan. J. Res. Med. Sci.. 2017;19(7).
- Arsang-Jang S, Mansourian M, Amani F, Jafari-Koshki T. Epidemiologic Trend of Smear-Positive, Smear-Negative, Extra Pulmonary and Relapse of Tuberculosis in Iran (2001-2015); A Repeated CrossSectional Study. Res J Health Sci. 2017;17(2):380.
- Hagiya H, Koyama T, Zamami Y, Minato Y, Tatebe Y, Mikami N, et al. Trends in incidence and mortality of tuberculosis in Japan: a population-based study, 1997–2016. Epidemiol Infect.2019;147.
- Ohene SA, Bakker MI, Ojo J, Toonstra A, Awudi D, Klatser P. Extrapulmonary tuberculosis: A retrospective study of patients in Accra, Ghana. PloS One. 2019;14(1):e0209650.
- Yates TA, Khan PY, Knight GM, Taylor JG, McHugh TD, Lipman M, et al. The transmission of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in high burden settings. Lancet Infect Dis. 2016;16(2):227-38.
- Yates T, Tanser F, Abubakar I. Plan Beta for tuberculosis: it's time to think seriously about poorly ventilated congregate settings. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2016;20(1):5-10.
- Balogun OS, Olaleye SA, Mohsin M, Toivanen P. Investigating machine learning methods for tuberculosis risk factors prediction: a comparative analysis and evaluation. Proceedings of the 37th Int Bus Manag (IBIMA). 2021.
- Amoori N, Amini P, Cheraghian B, Alavi SM. Investigating the intensity of social contacts associated with tuberculosis: a weighted networks model. BMC Pulm Med. 2023;23(1):1-8.
- Jiang T, Gradus JL, Rosellini AJ. Supervised machine learning: a brief primer. Behav Ther. 2020;51(5):675-87.
- Vabalas A, Gowen E, Poliakoff E, Casson AJ. Machine learning algorithm validation with a limited sample size. PloS one. 2019;14(11):e0224365.
- Witten IH, Frank E, Hall MA, Pal CJ. Data Mining: Practical machine learning tools and techniques: Morgan Kaufmann; 2016.
- Organization WH. WHO global lists of high burden countries for tuberculosis (TB), TB/HIV and multidrug/rifampicin-resistant TB (MDR/RR-TB), 2021–2025: background document. 2021.
- Mulu W, Mekkonnen D, Yimer M, Admassu A, Abera B. Risk factors for multidrug resistant tuberculosis patients in Amhara National Regional State. Afr Health Sci. 2015;15(2):368-77.
- Culbert GJ, Pillai V, Bick J, Al-Darraji HA, Wickersham JA, Wegman MP, et al. Confronting the HIV, tuberculosis, addiction, and incarceration syndemic in Southeast Asia: lessons learned from Malaysia. J NeuroImmune Pharmacol. 2016;11(3):446-55.
- Srivastava K, Kant S, Verma A. Role of environmental factors in transmission of tuberculosis. Dynamics of Human Health. 2015;2(4):12.
- 19. Ali S, Birhane M, Bekele S, Kibru G, Teshager L, Yilma Y, et al. Healthcare associated infection and its risk factors among patients

Downloaded from mjiri.iums.ac.ir on 2024-07-27

admitted to a tertiary hospital in Ethiopia: longitudinal study. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. 2018;7(1):1-9.

- Yallew WW, Kumie A, Yehuala FM. Point prevalence of hospitalacquired infections in two teaching hospitals of Amhara region in Ethiopia. Drug Healthc Patient Saf. 2016;8:71.
- Zelner JL, Murray MB, Becerra MC, Galea J, Lecca L, Calderon R, et al. Identifying hotspots of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis transmission using spatial and molecular genetic data. J Infect Dis. 2016;213(2):287-94.
- 22. Chamie G, Wandera B, Marquez C, Kato-Maeda M, Kamya MR, Havlir DV, et al. Identifying locations of recent TB transmission in rural Uganda: a multidisciplinary approach.Trop Med Int Health. 2015;20(4):537-45.
- 23. Chamie G, Kato-Maeda M, Emperador DM, Wandera B, Mugagga O, Crandall J, et al. Spatial overlap links seemingly unconnected genotypematched TB cases in rural Uganda. PloS one. 2018;13(2):e0192666.
- 24. Yan J, Fan JG, Jing P, Ke W, Zhang PY, Wang HQ, et al. Risk of active pulmonary tuberculosis among patients with coal workers' pneumoconiosis: a case-control study in China. Biomed Environ Sci. 2018;31(6):448-53.