

**Original Article** 

# Risk factors for viral hepatitis in pulmonary tuberculosis patients undergoing treatment: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Ahmad F. Ilham<sup>1,2</sup>, Salsabila R. Andini<sup>1,2</sup>, Hanna L. Afladhia<sup>1,2</sup>, Muhammad ID. Rakasiwi<sup>1,2\*</sup> and Erlina Burhan<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia; <sup>2</sup>Respiratory Programmatic Implementation and Research Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia; <sup>3</sup>Department of Pulmonology and Respiratory Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: muhammad.ilham65@ui.ac.id

# Abstract

Liver injury in tuberculosis patients, associated with noncompliance with treatment, is further exacerbated by viral hepatitis, which not only directly harms the liver but also increases susceptibility to drug-induced liver injury. The aim of this study was to analyze the associated risk factors for viral hepatitis in tuberculosis patients. This systematic review and meta-analysis adhere to the PRISMA 2020 statement, and the protocol has been registered with PROSPERO (CRD42023477241). Screening and selection of articles were carried out according to predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria, utilizing four databases: Embase, Medline, Scopus, and ProQuest. Baseline characteristics and patient-related risk factors from each included study were extracted, followed by a metaanalysis of factors that potentially had significance, with the heterogeneities also being analyzed. Of the 21 included studies out of 6,415 identified records, 12 potential risk factors for hepatitis B and 15 for hepatitis C were subjected to meta-analysis. Some key risk factors included for hepatitis B and C were HIV infection (OR: 3.42; 95%CI: 2.19-5.34 and OR: 6.99; 95%CI: 5.09-9.61, respectively), smoking (OR: 1.55; 95%CI: 1.19-2.02 and OR: 3.06; 95%CI: 1.63-5.75, respectively) and alcohol consumption (OR: 2.38; 95%CI: 1.06-5.37 and OR: 4.32; 95%CI: 2.76-6.78, respectively). Furthermore, metaanalysis indicated that other significant risk factors for hepatitis B and/or C include injecting and non-injecting drug use, multiple sexual partners, tattooing, ear-nose piercing, blood transfusion, dental interventions, homelessness, incarceration, living with prisoners, sexually transmitted diseases, and diabetes mellitus. In conclusion, patients with tuberculosis who have risk factors such as smoking, HIV, or alcohol consumption should be screened for hepatitis B and C to prevent liver injury.

Keywords: Hepatitis B, hepatitis C, liver injury, risk factor, tuberculosis

**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the CC BY-NC 4.0.



T uberculosis cases remain persistently high and continue to be a significant infectious disease that contributes to global mortality [1]. According to the Global Tuberculosis Report 2023, approximately 10.6 million individuals worldwide were diagnosed with tuberculosis in 2022, with an estimated incidence of 133 new cases per 100,000 population [1]. A major concern raised in patients undergoing anti-tuberculous treatment is liver injury, as this is the most important adverse event leading to a lack of adherence to treatment and, consequently, treatment failure, which could potentially elevate the risk of developing drug resistance [2]. Current first-line drugs

Introduction

for tuberculosis, including isoniazid, rifampin, and pyrazinamide, are associated with hepatotoxicity, with the occurrence ranging from 3% to 28% [3].

Viral hepatitis co-infection with tuberculosis leads to a higher risk of drug-induced liver injury in individuals undergoing antituberculosis treatment, a phenomenon commonly observed in clinical practice [4-7]. A meta-analysis estimated the prevalence of hepatitis B co-infection with tuberculosis to be 7.1%, although this prevalence varies by region, ranging from 2.2% to 11.4% [8]. In contrast, the prevalence of hepatitis C co-infection among tuberculosis patients is approximately 7%, with global rates ranging from 7% to 11% [9]. Viral hepatitis infection accelerates liver cell injury, resulting in liver damage and increasing susceptibility to druginduced liver injury [3,10]. Furthermore, viral hepatitis co-infection with tuberculosis is associated with severe forms of the disease, necessitating a higher frequency of retreatment and resulting in poorer treatment outcomes and increased mortality [11]. The aim of this study was to analyze the associated risk factors of viral hepatitis in tuberculosis patients. This study employs a systematic approach to synthesize data from previous studies, comprehensively identifying and analyzing the associated risk factors to provide a clearer understanding of these factors. By identifying viral hepatitis in this population, greater awareness of the risk of hepatic disorders or drug-induced liver injury in individuals with tuberculosis is expected, enabling the implementation of additional interventions.

# Methods

#### **Protocol registration**

This systematic review was conducted in accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 statement [12]. The protocol has been registered with PROSPERO under protocol number CRD42023477241.

#### Search strategy

The literature search for this systematic review was conducted on November 8, 2023, by two independent reviewers (SRA and HLA), with disagreements resolved through discussion with a third reviewer. Literature was obtained from four electronic journal databases: Embase, Medline, Scopus, and ProQuest, using the specific keywords (tuberculosis infection, risk factor, and hepatitis; with synonyms for each term according to MeSH terms) listed in **Underlying data**. Manual searches were additionally performed to ensure the inclusion of all studies relevant to the topic of this systematic review. All identified articles were entered into EndNote X9 software (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, United States), where duplicates were removed. The screening process began with the review of titles and abstracts by two independent reviewers (SRA and HLA), with the third (AFI) involved in cases of discrepancy. Reports that cleared this stage proceeded to full-text retrieval for evaluation of eligibility. Studies meeting the eligibility criteria, including those found through manual searches, were incorporated into the systematic review and meta-analysis.

#### Study quality assessment

The quality of each study was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for cohort and case-control studies [13], with a modified version of the scale applied to cross-sectional studies [14]. Studies scoring 7 or higher were categorized as high quality, those scoring between 5 and 6 as moderate quality, and those scoring 4 or lower as low quality. If any RCT studies were included, the assessment would have been conducted using the revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (ROB 2) [15]. The quality assessment of the studies was conducted independently by two reviewers (SRA and HLA), with two additional reviewers (AFI and MID) acting as a mediator in cases of discrepancy.

#### **Eligibility criteria**

Screening and selection of articles were conducted by applying specific inclusion and exclusion criteria. The included study designs comprised observational studies, including cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies, as well as randomized controlled trials. Participants in the included studies were individuals with tuberculosis who had viral hepatitis. Indicators assessed

included various patient-related risk factors for viral hepatitis among tuberculosis patients, such as biological factors (age, sex, HIV, diabetes mellitus, and chronic kidney disease), behavioral factors (history of smoking, drug use, alcohol, sexual activities, tattooing, piercing), social factors (homelessness, living with prisoner, and incarceration), and procedural factor (blood transfusion, dental intervention). Certain risk factors were excluded, such as those observed in post-mortem patients and after TB treatment completion, as they do not reflect the patient's risk prior to the outcome of anti-TB treatment. Additionally, specific demographics (regions and races) were excluded, considering that these risk factors provide limited importance in this review, which aims to assess the outcome for the general global population. Clinical presentations that primarily reflect the effects of the outcome rather than the risk factors and laboratory findings unrelated to the disease were also excluded. Narrative reviews, case reports, case series, and letters to the editor were excluded.

#### **Data extraction**

Data from the included studies were extracted into result tables, including author and year, country, study design, sample size, mean (SD) or median (range) age of participants, diagnostic criteria for TB, and diagnostic criteria for hepatitis B or hepatitis C. All biological and social patient-related risk factors for hepatitis that met the eligibility criteria were compiled into a separate table, incorporating the odds ratio, confidence interval, and *p*-value.

#### **Statistical analysis**

Review Manager (RevMan) 5.4 software (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, England) was employed for statistical analysis. The meta-analysis results were visualized in a forest plot, displaying the overall odds ratio (OR), 95% confidence interval (CI), and heterogeneity. A random effects model was used for the meta-analysis with heterogeneous data, while a fixed effects model was used for homogeneous data. The distribution of heterogeneous data was determined based on the Q test and  $I^2$  statistics. If the  $I^2$  value was greater than 50% or the *p*-value was less than 0.05, heterogeneity between studies was assumed; otherwise, the data were considered homogeneous. The degree of heterogeneity was estimated based on  $I^2$  (0% to 40%: might not be heterogeneous, 30% to 60%: moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: substantial heterogeneity, and 75% to 100%: considerable heterogeneity) [16].

## Results

#### Literature search results and selection

A total of 6414 studies were identified (**Figure 1**). After duplicates were removed, 3037 articles remained for screening, with 76 proceeding to full-text retrieval. Eligibility criteria were applied during full-text assessment, leading to the exclusion of 56 studies due to irrelevant outcomes, and 20 studies were included in the final analysis. An additional study was identified through manual searching, resulting in a total of 21 studies for inclusion. The results of the critical appraisal identified 10 high-quality studies, 10 medium-quality studies, and 1 low-quality study.

#### **Characteristics of included studies**

A total of 21 studies were included in the present study, covering the period from 2005 to 2023. The study locations were geographically diverse, with four studies conducted in Sudan and Ethiopia representing Africa [5,17-19], eight studies in Brazil and the USA representing the Americas [20-26], seven studies in India, Pakistan, Iraq, and Taiwan representing Asia [10,27-31], and two studies in Georgia and Denmark representing Europe [32,33]. The total sample size from all studies was 20,236 participants, with an overall mean age of 40.7±16.1 years. The hepatitis viruses analyzed included hepatitis B, hepatitis C, or both. All studies evaluated patient-related risk factors for different forms of hepatitis, although variations existed in the population characteristics and specific risk factors assessed. Risk factors that were discussed across multiple studies were subjected to meta-analysis to assess their significance. Detailed characteristics of the included studies are presented in **Table 1**.



Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart showing study selection processes.

#### Criteria for hepatitis C Author, year Country Study design Sample Age (mean±SD or Criteria for tuberculosis Criteria for hepatitis B median (min-max)) size (n) patients Abdallah et Sudan Cross-sectional 98 35.7±13.9 AFB sputum or HBsAg(+)N/A radiological finding (+) al., 2015 [17] Aires *et al.*, Brazil Cross-sectional Diagnosed as TB clinically HBsAg or anti-HBc (+) N/A 402 44.1±15.6 2012 [20] Blal et al., Brazil Cross-sectional AFB smear or culture (+) HepB serological N/A 209 39.7±11.6 marker (+) 2005 [21] Bushnell et United States Case control Diagnosed as TB in the HBsAg, HBeAg, or ELISA antibody test, 9512 N/A medical records nucleic acid (+)RIBA, or nucleic acid al., 2015 [22] of America test (+) Diagnosed as hepatitis C United States Diagnosed as TB in the Campo *et al.*, Case control 1421 48(43-53)N/A 2014 [23] of America medical records in the medical records Anti-HCV or HCV RNA Brazil Cross-sectional Diagnosed based on N/A Costi et al., 138 38.0±12.9 clinical evaluation, chest 2017 [24] (+)radiograph, sputum smear microscopy, and culture Diagnosed as TB and Feleke et al., Ethiopia Prospective cohort HepB serological HepC serological marker 3537 34.5±15.6 underwent DOTS 2020 [5] marker (+) (+)Gedefie *et al.*. Northeast Cross-sectional Diagnosed as TB and HBsAg (+) in blood Anti-HCV(+) 229 34.1±13.0 2023 [18] Ethiopia underwent DOTS Getie *et al.*, Northwest Cross-sectional Diagnosed based on AFB HBsAg (+) in blood Anti-HCV(+) 145 31.6±11.9 2021 [19] Ethiopia microscopy or Xpert MTB/RIF test Hussain *et al.*. North India Cross-sectional N/A Diagnosed as TB and HBV antibodies (+) in N/A 1215 2015 [28] underwent DOTS blood Jørgensena *et* Denmark Retrospective cohort Positive HBV Diagnosed based on HBsAg, HBsAb, HCV-Ab/anti-HCV (+) 110 al., 2021 [32] serology: $53\pm24$ clinical criteria. HBcAb/anti-HBc (+) in in blood. If positive for blood. If positive for radiological HCV-Ab, HCV-RNA was findings and/or culture, HBsAg and/or HBcAb, Negative HBV tested. serology 47±27 PCR test and microscopy the patient was tested results from relevant for HBeAg and HBVmaterial DNA Khan *et al.*. Pakistan N/A Diagnosed as TB and HBsAg, total anti-HBC, Case control 178 N/A 2021 [11] underwent DOTS IgM anti-HBC, anti-HBS, and HBV DNA Positive for HCV South Korea HBsAg(+)Kim *et al.*. Case control 379 Control $(59.3 \pm 17.3)$ , Diagnosed as TB and 2016 [10] Case (HBV 50.0±15.1; underwent treatment antibody HCV 59.9±14.9; HBV+HCV 54.3±9.5) Positive HCV antibody Lomtadze N et USA Prospective cohort 37 (21-92) Sputum smear with AFB or N/A 326 al., 2013 [25] culture positive for M. test tuberculosis

### Table 1. Characteristics of the included studies

| Author, year                                 | Country  | Study design       | Sample<br>size (n) | Age (mean±SD or<br>median (min-max)) | Criteria for tuberculosis patients                                  | Criteria for hepatitis B                     | Criteria for hepatitis C                     |
|--|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Memon <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2021 [29]           | Pakistan | Cross-sectional    | 589                | N/A                                  | Diagnosed based on AFB<br>microscopy or Xpert<br>MTB/RIF test       | HBsAg (+) in blood                           | Anti-HCV (+)                                 |
| Merza <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2016 [30]           | Iraq     | Cross-sectional    | 214                | 40.3±20.3                            | Sputum smear with AFB or<br>culture positive for M.<br>tuberculosis | HBsAg  | Anti-HCV                                     |
| Rehman <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2020 [31]          | Pakistan | Cross-sectional    | 400                | 34.6±17.2                            | Sputum smear with AFB or<br>culture positive for M.<br>tuberculosis | N/A  | Anti-HCV                                     |
| Reis <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2011 [26]            | Brazil   | Cross-sectional    | 402                | 44 (3–86)                            | Diagnosed as TB clinically<br>and currently under<br>treatment      | -  | anti-HCV (+) and HCV<br>RNA (+)              |
| Richards <i>et</i><br><i>al.</i> , 2006 [33] | Georgia  | Case control       | 272                | 35 (18–74)                           | Diagnosed as TB and underwent treatment                             | -  | ELISA, RIBA and HCV<br>PCR tests             |
| Trigo <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2016 [34]           | Brazil   | Prospective cohort | 100                | 43.4±10.3                            | Sputum smear with AFB or<br>culture positive for M.<br>tuberculosis | HBsAg (-) with anti-<br>HBc (+)              | -  |
| Wang <i>et al.</i> ,<br>2011 [7]             | Taiwan   | Prospective cohort | 360                | 57.6±19.6                            | Culture-confirmed<br>pulmonary TB                                   | serological tests for<br>HBV, HBV viral load | serological tests for HCV,<br>HCV viral load |

AFB: acid-fast bacteria; Anti-HBc: hepatitis B core Antibody; Anti-HCV: hepatitis C virus antibody; DNA: deoxyribonucleic acid; DOTS: directly observed treatment, short-course; ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; HBeAg: hepatitis B e-antigen; HBsAb: hepatitis B surface antibody; HBsAg: hepatitis B surface antigen; HBV: hepatitis B virus; HCV: hepatitis C virus; N/A: not available; PCR: polymerase chain reaction; RIBA: recombinant immunoblot assay; RNA: ribonucleic acid; TB: tuberculosis.

Patient-related risk factors for hepatitis B and hepatitis C identified from the literature are presented in **Underlying data**. Several potential risk factors identified in more than one study were considered significant contributors to viral hepatitis and were further analyzed through meta-analysis.

For hepatitis B, factors included sex, age, HIV, smoking, injecting drug use, non-injecting drug use, multiple sexual partners, alcohol consumption, tattooing, ear-nose piercing, history of blood transfusion, and history of dental intervention. The factors analyzed for hepatitis C were similar, with additional factors such as low education, history of homelessness, history of incarceration, living with a prisoner, sexually transmitted infections, and diabetes mellitus.

#### Human-immunodeficiency virus (HIV)

Six studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B, and eight studies for hepatitis C. HIV was found to significantly increase the risk of acquiring hepatitis B, with an OR of 3.42 (95%CI: 2.18–5.34; p<0.00001) and high heterogeneity across studies ( $I^2$ =77%;  $\tau^2$ =0.16;  $\chi^2$ =22.13; p-heterogeneity of 0.0005) (**Figure 2**). Similarly, the presence of HIV markedly elevated the risk of hepatitis C, with an OR of 6.99 (95%CI: 5.09–9.61; p=0.02) and moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =58%;  $\tau^2$ =0.08;  $\chi^2$ =16.82; p-heterogeneity of 0.02).



Figure 2. HIV as a risk factor for hepatitis B (A) and hepatitis C (B).

#### **Injecting drug use (IDU)**

Five studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B, and similarly, five studies for hepatitis C. The history of injecting drug use was associated with an increased risk of hepatitis B (OR: 2.06; 95%CI: 1.38–3.08; p=0.0004), with low heterogeneity across the studies ( $I^2$ =0%;  $\chi^2$ =2.28; p-heterogeneity of 0.68) as presented in **Figure 3**. For hepatitis C, the cumulative OR for injecting drug use was 14.09 (95%CI: 4.09–48.59; p<0.00001), with substantial heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =96%;  $\tau^2$ =1.87;  $\chi^2$ =89.21; p-heterogeneity of 0.00001).

#### Non-injecting drug use (NIDU)

Three studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B, as presented in **Figure 4**. A history of non-injecting drug use has also been identified as a significant risk factor for hepatitis B virus infection, with a total OR of 14.09 (95%CI: 4.09–48.59; p<0.00001), with low heterogeneity across the studies ( $I^2$ =29%;  $\chi^2$ =2.83; p-heterogeneity of 0.24).

| A |                                   | History of | of IDU    | No history                | of IDU    |          | Odds Ratio           | Odds Ratio                       |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|----------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
|   | Study or Subgroup                 | Events     | Total     | Events                    | Total     | Weight   | M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl   | M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl               |
|   | Aires, 2012                       | 10         | 21        | 93                        | 337       | 20.5%    | 2.39 [0.98, 5.80]    |                                  |
|   | Bushnell, 2015                    | 20         | 251       | 330                       | 8886      | 59.7%    | 2.24 [1.40, 3.59]    | -∎-                              |
|   | Getie, 2021                       | 3          | 78        | 2                         | 67        | 7.4%     | 1.30 [0.21, 8.02]    |                                  |
|   | Jørgensena, 2021                  | 1          | 2         | 16                        | 80        | 1.4%     | 4.00 [0.24, 67.47]   |                                  |
|   | Trigo, 2016                       | 10         | 87        | 2                         | 13        | 11.0%    | 0.71 [0.14, 3.70]    |                                  |
|   | Total (95% CI)                    |            | 439       |                           | 9383      | 100.0%   | 2.06 [1.38, 3.08]    | ◆                                |
|   | Total events                      | 44         |           | 443                       |           |          |                      |                                  |
|   | Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = | 2.28, df = | 4 (P = 0  | .68); I <sup>z</sup> = 0% |           |          | H                    |                                  |
|   | Test for overall effect           | Z = 3.52 ( | P = 0.00  | 04)                       |           |          |                      | No history of IDU History of IDU |
| D |                                   |            |           |                           |           |          |                      |                                  |
| В |                                   | History o  | f IDU     | No History                | of IDU    |          | Odds Ratio           | Odds Ratio                       |
|   | Study or Subgroup                 | Events     | Total     | Events                    | Total     | Weight   | M-H, Random, 95% CI  | M-H, Random, 95% Cl              |
|   | Bushnell, 2015                    | 157        | 388       | 243                       | 8799      | 21.2%    | 23.93 [18.83, 30.41] | -                                |
|   | Campo, 2013                       | 14         | 29        | 38                        | 1392      | 19.6%    | 33.26 [15.00, 73.75] |                                  |
|   | Lomtadze, 2013                    | 37         | 47        | 30                        | 266       | 19.6%    | 29.11 [13.14, 64.47] | <b>_</b>                         |
|   | Reis, 2011                        | 11         | 24        | 19                        | 378       | 19.1%    | 15.99 [6.33, 40.36]  |                                  |
|   | Richards, 2006                    | 29         | 106       | 32                        | 166       | 20.4%    | 1.58 [0.89, 2.80]    | + <b>-</b> -                     |
|   | Total (95% CI)                    |            | 594       |                           | 11001     | 100.0%   | 14.09 [4.09, 48.59]  | -                                |
|   | Total events                      | 248        |           | 362                       |           |          |                      |                                  |
|   | Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = | 1.87; Chi² | = 89.21   | df=4 (P ≤ I               | 0.00001); | l² = 96% |                      |                                  |
|   | Test for overall effect:          | Z= 4.19 (F | ° < 0.000 | 01)                       |           |          |                      | No History of IDU History of IDU |

Figure 3. Injecting drug use as a risk factor for hepatitis B (A) and hepatitis C (B).



Figure 4. Non-injecting drug as a risk factor for hepatitis B.

#### Tattooing and ear-nose piercing

Three studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B related to tattooing, and similarly, three studies for hepatitis C. Additionally, two studies were included in the analysis of ear-piercing as a risk factor for hepatitis C. The overall OR for tattooing associated with hepatitis B was 3.62 (95%CI: 1.09–11.95; p=0.03), while for hepatitis C, the OR was 5.49 (95%CI: 3.75–8.04; p<0.00001) as presented in **Figure 5**.

However, significant differences in heterogeneity were observed between the two: hepatitis B demonstrated high heterogeneity ( $I^2=70\%$ ;  $\tau^2=0.73$ ;  $\chi^2=6.69$ ; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.04), whereas hepatitis C showed low heterogeneity ( $I^2=0\%$ ;  $\chi^2=1.20$ ; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.55). Earpiercing was significantly associated only with hepatitis C, with a total OR of 4.53 (95%CI: 1.89–10.88; *p*=0.0007) and low heterogeneity ( $I^2=0\%$ ;  $\chi^2=0.08$ ; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.77).

#### Multiple sexual partners and sexually transmitted infection (STI)

Three studies analyzed multiple sexual partners as a risk factor for hepatitis B, and similarly, three studies analyzed sexually transmitted infections (STIs) as a risk factor for hepatitis B. Multiple sexual partners were identified as a risk factor for hepatitis B with an OR of 2.16 (95%CI: 1.49–3.34; p=0.0005) and low heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =0%;  $\chi^2$ =1.86; p-heterogeneity of 0.39) as presented in **Figure 6**. Additionally, this analysis identified sexually transmitted infections as a risk factor for hepatitis C among patients with tuberculosis, with an OR of 3.78 (95%CI: 2.11–6.75; p<0.00001) and low heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =0%;  $\chi^2$ =0.92; p-heterogeneity of 0.63).



Figure 5. Tattooing as a risk factor for hepatitis B (A) and hepatitis C (B), and ear-nose piercing as a risk factor for hepatitis C (C).



Figure 6. Multiple sexual partners as a risk factor for hepatitis B (A) and sexually transmitted infections as a risk factor for hepatitis C (B).

#### History of blood transfusion

Five studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B, and similarly, five studies for hepatitis C. A history of blood transfusion has been identified as a risk factor for both hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections in patients with tuberculosis, with an OR of 1.66 (95%CI: 1.09–2.55; p=0.02) for hepatitis B and an OR of 2.30 (95%CI: 1.12–4.71; p=0.02) for hepatitis C as presented in **Figure 7**. The analysis demonstrated high heterogeneity among the studies for hepatitis B ( $I^2=0\%$ ;  $\chi^2=3.92$ ; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.42) and hepatitis C ( $I^2=51\%$ ;  $\tau^2=0.30$ ;  $\chi^2=8.12$ ; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.09).



Figure 7. History of blood transfusion as a risk factor for hepatitis B (A) and hepatitis C (B).

#### History of dental intervention

Two studies were included in the analysis. A history of dental interventions has been identified as a risk factor for hepatitis C infection among patients with tuberculosis, with an OR of 15.50 (95%CI: 2.20–109.08; *p*=0.006), as presented in **Figure 8**. The analysis demonstrated low heterogeneity among the studies ( $I^2$ =0%;  $\chi^2$ =0.28; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.60).



Figure 8. History of dental intervention as a risk factor for hepatitis C.

#### Alcohol

Eight studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B, and similarly, eight studies for hepatitis C. Smoking and excessive alcohol consumption were identified as significant risk factors for hepatitis infection, with the OR for excessive alcohol consumption was 2.38 (95%CI: 1.06–5.37; p=0.04) for hepatitis B and 4.32 (95%CI: 2.76–6.78; p<0.0001) for hepatitis C as presented in **Figure 9**. The analysis demonstrated high heterogeneity among the studies for hepatitis B ( $I^2$ =89%;  $\tau^2$ =1.05;  $\chi^2$ =62.41; p-heterogeneity <0.00001) and hepatitis C ( $I^2$ =82%;  $\tau^2$ =0.25;  $\chi^2$ =38.36; p-heterogeneity <0.00001).

#### Smoking

Six studies were included in the analysis for hepatitis B, and four studies for hepatitis C. Smoking was identified as a significant risk factor, with an OR of 1.55 (95%CI: 1.19–2.02; *p*=0.001) for hepatitis B and 3.06 (95%CI: 1.63–5.75; *p*=0.0005) for hepatitis C as presented in **Figure 10**. The analysis demonstrated low heterogeneity among the studies for hepatitis B ( $I^2$ =36%;  $\chi^2$ =7.86; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.16), moderate heterogeneity for hepatitis C ( $I^2$ =53%;  $\tau^2$ =0.20;  $\chi^2$ =6.44; *p*-heterogeneity of 0.09).

#### **History of homelessness**

Two studies were included in the analysis. A history of homelessness was identified as a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection, with an OR of 11.40 (95%CI: 5.09–25.56; p<0.00001), as presented in **Figure 11**. The analysis indicated high heterogeneity among the studies ( $I^2$ =82%;  $\tau^2$ =0.28;  $\chi^2$ =5.76; p-heterogeneity of 0.02).

#### Ilham et al. Narra J 2024; 4 (3): e1242 - http://doi.org/10.52225/narra.v4i3.1242

| Α  |   | Alcohol Consu  | mption   | No Alcohol Cons   | umption   |  | Odds Ratio   | Odds Ratio                            |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 11 | Study or Subgroup   | Events   | Total  | Events  | Total   | Weight   | M-H, Random, 95% Cl  | M-H, Random, 95% Cl                   |
|    | Aires, 2012   | 76   | 232  | 27  | 126   | 15.4%  | 1.79 [1.08, 2.96]  |                                       |
|    | Feleke, 2020  | 171  | 383  | 363   | 3154  | 16.2%  | 6.20 [4.93, 7.80]  | +                                     |
|    | Gedefie, 2023   | 6  | 21   | 11  | 208   | 12.5%  | 7.16 [2.33, 22.06]   |                                       |
|    | Getie, 2021   | 2  | 10   | 3   | 135   | 8.5%   | 11.00 [1.60, 75.50]  |                                       |
|    | Jørgensena, 2021  | 6  | 29   | 11  | 53  | 12.5%  | 1.00 [0.33, 3.04]  |                                       |
|    | Kim, 2016   | 10   | 59   | 77  | 320   | 14.5%  | 0.64 [0.31, 1.33]  |                                       |
|    | Merza, 2016   | 2  | 62   | 2   | 152   | 8.3%   | 2.50 [0.34, 18.16]   |                                       |
|    | Trigo, 2016   | 6  | 46   | 6   | 54  | 12.0%  | 1.20 [0.36, 4.01]  |                                       |
|    | Total (95% CI)  |  | 842  |   | 4202  | 100.0%   | 2.38 [1.06, 5.37]  | -                                     |
|    | Total events  | 279  |  | 500   |   |  |  |                                       |
|    | Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =   | 1.05; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 62.4  | 1, df = 7 (  | P < 0.00001); I <sup>2</sup> =  | 89%   |  |  |                                       |
|    | Test for overall effect:  | Z = 2.10 (P = 0.0  | 4)   |   |   |  |  | U.U1 U.1 1 1U 1UU                     |
|    |   |  |  |   |   |  |  | NO ACONOL ACONOL                      |
|    |   |  |  |   |   |  |  |                                       |
|    |   |  |  |   |   |  |  | 0.11 D.11                             |
| В  | Study of Subgroup   | Alcohol Consu  | Imption  | No Alcohol Cons   | sumption  | Moight   | Odds Ratio   | Odds Ratio                            |
| В  | Study or Subgroup   | Alcohol Consu<br>Events  | Imption<br>Total   | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events   | sumption<br>Total   | Weight   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI  | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015   | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209   | Imption<br>Total<br>1607   | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191  | sumption<br>Total<br>7580   | Weight<br>20.5%  | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013  | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209<br>29   | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157  | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23  | sumption<br>Total<br>7580<br>1264   | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]  | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017   | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209<br>29<br>11   | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18  | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19  | sumption<br>Total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120  | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.28]<br>2.29 [2.94] 4.48]   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020   | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142  | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383   | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470   | total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118  | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%  | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.28]<br>3.32 [2.64, 4.18]<br>0.000 (2000)   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023  | Alcohol Consu<br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1   | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383<br>21   | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>470<br>470   | total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208   | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%  | Odds Ratio<br><u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u><br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.28]<br>3.32 [2.64, 4.18]<br>2.55 [0.27, 23.93]  | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016   | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8  | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383<br>21<br>59   | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37  | sumption<br>Total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320                          | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%<br>12.5%                                     | Odds Ratio<br><u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u><br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.28]<br>3.32 [2.64, 4.18]<br>2.55 [0.27, 23.93]<br>1.20 [0.53, 2.72]   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016<br>Lomtadze, 2013   | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8<br>48  | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383<br>21<br>59<br>166  | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37<br>20  | sumption<br>Total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320<br>160                   | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%<br>12.5%<br>15.9%                            | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.26]<br>3.32 [2.64, 418]<br>2.65 [0.27, 23.93]<br>1.20 [0.53, 2.72]<br>2.85 [1.60, 5.07]  | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016<br>Lomtadze, 2013<br>Merza, 2016  | Alcohol Consu<br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8<br>48<br>48  | Imption<br>Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383<br>21<br>59<br>166<br>62  | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37<br>20<br>0   | <b>sumption</b><br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320<br>160<br>152              | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%<br>12.5%<br>15.9%<br>1.8%                    | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.28]<br>3.32 [2.64, 4.18]<br>2.55 [0.27, 23.93]<br>1.20 [0.53, 2.72]<br>2.85 [1.60, 5.07]<br>7.44 [0.30, 185.12]                                    | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016<br>Lomtadze, 2013<br>Merza, 2016<br>Total (95% CI)  | Alcohol Consu<br>Events<br>209<br>21<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8<br>48<br>48<br>1   | Total           1607           157           18           383           21           59           166           62           2473                      | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37<br>20<br>0   | Total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320<br>160<br>152<br>12922               | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>20.3%<br>20.3%<br>12.5%<br>15.9%<br>15.9%<br>1.8%<br><b>100.0%</b> | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl<br>5.78 [4.71, 7.09]<br>12.22 [6.87, 21.76]<br>8.35 [2.87, 24.28]<br>3.32 [2.64, 4.18]<br>2.55 [0.27, 23.93]<br>1.20 [0.53, 2.72]<br>2.85 [1.60, 5.07]<br>7.44 [0.30, 185.12]<br>4.32 [2.76, 6.78]               | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016<br>Lomtadze, 2013<br>Merza, 2016<br>Total (95% CI)<br>Total events  | Alcohol Consu<br><u>Events</u><br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8<br>48<br>1<br>449   | Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383<br>21<br>59<br>166<br>62<br>2473   | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37<br>20<br>0<br>764                                    | <b>Total</b><br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320<br>160<br>152<br><b>12922</b> | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%<br>12.5%<br>15.9%<br>1.8%<br><b>100.0%</b>   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl<br>5.78 (4.71, 7.09)<br>12.22 (6.87, 21.76)<br>8.35 (2.87, 24.26)<br>3.32 (2.64, 4.18)<br>2.55 (0.27, 23.93)<br>1.20 (0.53, 2.72)<br>2.85 (1.60, 5.07)<br>7.44 (0.30, 185.12)<br>4.32 [2.76, 6.78]               | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016<br>Lomtadze, 2013<br>Merza, 2016<br>Total (95% CI)<br>Total events<br>Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> :                           | Alcohol Consu<br><u>Events</u><br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8<br>48<br>1<br>1<br>= 0.25; Chi <sup>#</sup> = 38.                   | Total           1607           157           18           383           21           59           166           62           2473           36, df = 7 | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37<br>20<br>0<br>764<br>⟨P < 0.00001⟩; P =              | Total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320<br>160<br>152<br>12922<br>82%        | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%<br>12.5%<br>15.9%<br>1.8%<br><b>100.0%</b>   | Odds Ratio<br><u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u><br>5.78 (4.71, 7.09)<br>1.222 (8.67, 21.76)<br>8.35 (2.87, 24.28)<br>3.32 (2.64, 4.18)<br>2.56 (0.27, 23.93)<br>1.20 (0.53, 2.72)<br>2.85 (1.60, 5.07)<br>7.44 (0.30, 185.12)<br><b>4.32 (2.76, 6.78)</b> | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI     |
| В  | Study or Subgroup<br>Bushnell, 2015<br>Campo, 2013<br>Costi, 2017<br>Feleke, 2020<br>Gedefie, 2023<br>Kim, 2016<br>Lomtadze, 2013<br>Merza, 2016<br>Total (95% CI)<br>Total events<br>Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> :<br>Test for overal effect | Alcohol Consu<br><u>Events</u><br>209<br>29<br>11<br>142<br>1<br>8<br>48<br>1<br>= 0.25; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 38.<br>: Z = 6.37 (P < 0.0 | Total<br>1607<br>157<br>18<br>383<br>21<br>59<br>166<br>62<br><b>2473</b><br>36, df = 7<br>00001)  | No Alcohol Cons<br>Events<br>191<br>23<br>19<br>470<br>4<br>37<br>20<br>0<br>764<br>(P < 0.00001);   <sup>p</sup> = | Total<br>7580<br>1264<br>120<br>3118<br>208<br>320<br>160<br>152<br><b>12922</b><br>82% | Weight<br>20.5%<br>15.9%<br>9.7%<br>20.3%<br>3.4%<br>12.5%<br>15.9%<br>1.8%<br><b>100.0%</b>   | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% Cl<br>5.78 (4.71, 7.09)<br>12.22 (6.87, 21.76)<br>8.35 (2.87, 24.26)<br>3.32 (2.64, 418)<br>2.55 (0.27, 23.93)<br>1.20 (0.53, 2.72)<br>2.85 (1.60, 5.07)<br>7.44 (0.30, 185.12)<br>4.32 [2.76, 6.78]                | Odds Ratio<br>M-H, Random, 95% CI<br> |







|  | Homelessne     | ess (+)  | Homelessn | iess (-) |        | Odds Ratio          | Odds Ratio  |  |
|--|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--|
| Study or Subgroup  | Events         | Total    | Events    | Total    | Weight | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | M-H, Random, 95% Cl                               |  |
| Bushnell, 2015   | 75             | 323      | 325       | 8864     | 55.8%  | 7.95 [6.00, 10.52]  |   |  |
| Campo, 2013  | 37             | 202      | 15        | 1219     | 44.2%  | 18.00 [9.67, 33.51] |   |  |
| Total (95% CI)   |                | 525      |           | 10083    | 100.0% | 11.40 [5.09, 25.56] | -   |  |
| Total events   | 112            |          | 340       |          |        |                     |   |  |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.28; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.67, df = 1 (P = 0.02); i <sup>2</sup> = 82% |                |          |           |          |        |                     |   |  |
| Test for overall effect:   | Z= 5.91 (P < 1 | 0.00001) |           |          |        |                     | Homelessness (-) as risk Homelessness (+) as risk |  |

Figure 11. History of homelessness as a risk factor for hepatitis C.

#### History of incarceration and lived with prisoner

The present study includes five studies that identify a history of incarceration as a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection (**Figure 12**), with an OR of 6.32 (95%CI: 3.84–10.41; p<0.00001) and moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =59%;  $\tau^2$ =0.18;  $\chi^2$ =9.80; p-heterogeneity of 0.04).

|                          | Incarcerati                | on (+)    | Incarcerat    | Incarceration (-) |        | Odds Ratio          | Odds Ratio  |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|---|
| Study or Subgroup        | Events                     | Total     | Events        | Total             | Weight | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | M-H, Random, 95% Cl                                 |
| Bushnell, 2015           | 38                         | 187       | 362           | 9000              | 30.3%  | 6.09 [4.20, 8.82]   |   |
| Costi, 2017              | 5                          | 10        | 25            | 128               | 10.3%  | 4.12 [1.11, 15.34]  |   |
| Lomtadze, 2013           | 22                         | 29        | 46            | 297               | 16.5%  | 17.15 [6.93, 42.47] |   |
| Reis, 2011               | 14                         | 101       | 16            | 299               | 19.8%  | 2.85 [1.34, 6.06]   |   |
| Richards, 2006           | 35                         | 66        | 26            | 206               | 22.9%  | 7.82 [4.14, 14.74]  |   |
| Total (95% CI)           |                            | 393       |               | 9930              | 100.0% | 6.32 [3.84, 10.41]  | •   |
| Total events             | 114                        |           | 475           |                   |        |                     |   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau² =    | = 0.18; Chi <sup>2</sup> = | 9.80, df= | = 4 (P = 0.04 | ); l² = 59        | %      |                     |   |
| Test for overall effect: | Z=7.24 (P <                | 0.00001   | )             |                   |        |                     | Incarceration (-) as risk Incarceration (+) as risk |

Figure 12. History of incarceration as a risk factor for hepatitis C.

Two studies were included in the analysis of living with a prisoner as a risk factor for hepatitis C, identifying it as a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection (**Figure 13**), with an OR of 3.40 (95%CI: 2.19–5.28; p<0.00001) and low heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =0%;  $\chi^2$ =0.23; p-heterogeneity of 0.63).

|                                   | lived with priso    | ner (+)                   | lived with pris | oner (-) |        | Odds Ratio         | Odds Ratio                                     |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------|--------|--------------------|--|
| Study or Subgroup                 | Events              | Total                     | Events          | Total    | Weight | M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl | M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl                             |
| Lomtadze, 2013                    | 26                  | 69                        | 42              | 257      | 58.9%  | 3.10 [1.72, 5.58]  |  |
| Richards, 2006                    | 22                  | 49                        | 39              | 223      | 41.1%  | 3.84 [1.99, 7.44]  |  |
| Total (95% CI)                    |                     | 118                       |                 | 480      | 100.0% | 3.40 [2.19, 5.28]  | •  |
| Total events                      | 48                  |                           | 81              |          |        |                    |  |
| Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = | 0.23, df = 1 (P = 0 | 1.63); I <sup>2</sup> = 0 | )%              |          |        |                    |  |
| Test for overall effect:          | Z = 5.47 (P < 0.00  | 0001)                     |                 |          |        |                    | no living as risk factor living as risk factor |

Figure 13. Lived with prisoners as a risk factor for hepatitis C.

#### **Diabetes mellitus**

Two studies identified diabetes mellitus as a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection (**Figure 14**), with an OR of 2.54 (95%CI: 1.50–4.31; p=0.0005) and low heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =0%;  $\chi^2$ =0.52; p-heterogeneity of 0.48).



Figure 14. Diabetes mellitus as a risk factor for hepatitis C.

#### Age and gender

Although some studies report significant associations between sex, older age, and low education with viral hepatitis, the meta-analysis results in this review do not demonstrate a significant influence of these factors (**Figure 15**). The OR for male gender was 0.85 (95%CI: 0.41-1.77) for hepatitis B and 1.45 (95%CI: 0.66-3.23) for hepatitis C. For older age, the OR was 1.05 (95%CI: 0.90-1.23) for hepatitis B and 1.66 (95%CI: 1.01-2.74) for hepatitis C. Low education showed an OR of 1.10 (95%CI: 0.47-2.61) for hepatitis C.

## Heterogeneity analysis

The results of the heterogeneity investigation are presented in **Table 2**. The displayed data are the results of subgroup analyses for each risk factor, particularly for those that exhibited high heterogeneity in data distribution in the meta-analysis. Most of this heterogeneity is believed to stem from differences between studies, such as sample size, diagnostic criteria, study quality, and study design. The results highlight the characteristics that most influence heterogeneity for each risk factor based on the subgroup analyses. The findings from this heterogeneity analysis enhance the value of this review by allowing for a more thorough and detailed assessment of the risk factors for viral hepatitis in tuberculosis patients.

| ٨ |                                     | Mak                        | •                    | Foma              | lo        |            | Odde Datio              | Odda Batio  |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|---|
| A | Study or Subgroup                   | Fuente                     | Total                | Fema              | Total     | Moight     | M II Dandom OFF CL      | Ouus Rauo   |
|   | study of Subgroup                   | Events                     | Total                | Events            | Total     | weight     | Wi-fi, Rahuoffi, 95% Ci | Mi-n, Railuoin, 95% Ci  |
|   | Abdallan, 2015                      | 11                         | 70                   | 4                 | 28        | 6.7%       | 1.12 [0.32, 3.86]       | •   |
|   | Aires, 2012                         | 83                         | 262                  | 20                | 96        | 7.9%       | 1.76 [1.01, 3.08]       |   |
|   | Bushnell, 2015                      | 249                        | 5584                 | 101               | 3553      | 8.2%       | 1.60 [1.26, 2.02]       | -   |
|   | Feleke, 2020                        | 40                         | 1689                 | 494               | 1803      | 8.1%       | 0.06 [0.05, 0.09]       |   |
|   | Gedefie, 2023                       | 5                          | 109                  | 12                | 120       | 7.0%       | 0.43 [0.15, 1.27]       |   |
|   | Getie, 2021                         | 3                          | 90                   | 2                 | 55        | 5.5%       | 0.91 [0.15, 5.65]       |   |
|   | Hussain, 2015                       | 26                         | 945                  | 10                | 270       | 7.6%       | 0.74 [0.35, 1.55]       |   |
|   | Jørgensena, 2021                    | 13                         | 54                   | 4                 | 28        | 6.7%       | 1.90 (0.56, 6.50)       |   |
|   | Khan. 2021                          | 44                         | 85                   | 45                | 93        | 7.9%       | 1.14 (0.64, 2.06)       |   |
|   | Kim 2016                            | 22                         | 132                  | 65                | 247       | 79%        | 0.56 (0.33, 0.96)       |   |
|   | Memon 2021                          | 109                        | 341                  | 89                | 248       | 81%        | 0.84 (0.59, 1.19)       |   |
|   | Merza 2016                          | ,00                        | 136                  | 1                 | 79        | 1 696      | 1 74 [0.00, 1.10]       |   |
|   | Weiza, 2010<br>Trigo, 2016          | 10                         | 70                   |                   | 70        | 4.070      | 1.74 [0.10, 10.33]      |   |
|   | 111g0, 2016                         | 10                         | 79                   | 40                | 21        | 5.9%       | 1.38 [0.28, 6.83]       |   |
|   | vvang, 2011                         | 29                         | 232                  | 13                | 128       | 1.1%       | 1.26 [0.63, 2.53]       |   |
|   | T-1-1/05% OB                        |                            |                      |                   | 0700      | 400.00     | 0.05 10.11.1.77         |   |
|   | Total (95% CI)                      |                            | 9808                 |                   | 6768      | 100.0%     | 0.85[0.41, 1.77]        | -   |
|   | Total events                        | 647                        |                      | 862               |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> :   | = 1.71; Chi                | i <sup>z</sup> = 289 | 1.20, df = 1      | 13 (P < I | 0.00001);  | I <sup>2</sup> = 96%    |   |
|   | Test for overall effect             | t: Z = 0.44 (              | (P = 0.6             | i6)               |           |            |                         | Eemale as risk factor. Male as risk factor                      |
|   |                                     |                            |                      |                   |           |            | Odda Datia              | Odd- R-f-   |
| В |                                     | Male                       |                      | Fema              | lle       |            | Odds Ratio              | Odds Ratio  |
| - | Study or Subgroup                   | Events                     | Total                | Events            | lotal     | weight     | M-H, Random, 95% CI     | M-H, Random, 95% CI   |
|   | Bushnell, 2015                      | 286                        | 5621                 | 114               | 3566      | 9.4%       | 1.62 [1.30, 2.03]       | -   |
|   | Campo, 2013                         | 36                         | 805                  | 16                | 616       | 9.0%       | 1.76 [0.96, 3.19]       | <b>⊢</b>  |
|   | Costi, 2017                         | 24                         | 93                   | 6                 | 45        | 8.3%       | 2.26 [0.85, 6.01]       | +   |
|   | Feleke, 2020                        | 85                         | 1734                 | 527               | 1803      | 9.4%       | 0.12 [0.10, 0.16]       | <b>→</b>  |
|   | Kim, 2016                           | 14                         | 132                  | 31                | 247       | 8.9%       | 0.83 [0.42, 1.62]       |   |
|   | Lomtadze, 2013                      | 65                         | 230                  | 3                 | 96        | 7.8%       | 12.21 [3.73, 39.94]     |   |
|   | Memon, 2021                         | 141                        | 341                  | 107               | 248       | 9.3%       | 0.93 [0.67, 1.29]       |   |
|   | Merza, 2016                         | 1                          | 136                  | 0                 | 78        | 3.7%       | 1.74 [0.07, 43.18]      |   |
|   | Rehman, 2020                        | 19                         | 214                  | 12                | 186       | 8.7%       | 1.41 [0.67, 2.99]       | <b>_</b>  |
|   | Reis, 2011                          | 25                         | 289                  | 5                 | 113       | 8.3%       | 2.05 [0.76, 5.48]       |   |
|   | Richards, 2006                      | 50                         | 197                  | 11                | 75        | 8.8%       | 1.98 [0.97, 4.05]       |   |
|   | Wang, 2011                          | 19                         | 232                  | 5                 | 128       | 8.2%       | 2.19 [0.80, 6.02]       |   |
|   |                                     |                            |                      |                   |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Total (95% CI)                      |                            | 10024                |                   | 7201      | 100.0%     | 1.46 [0.66, 3.23]       |   |
|   | Total events                        | 765                        |                      | 837               |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =   | 1.74; Chi                  | ²= 316.              | 32, df = 1        | 1 (P < 0  | .00001); ( | r²= 97%                 |   |
|   | Test for overall effect:            | Z = 0.92 (F                | P = 0.36             | 5)<br>5)          |           |            |                         | U.U1 U.1 1 1U 1UU<br>Female as risk factor, Male as risk factor |
|   |                                     |                            |                      |                   |           |            |                         | Feilidie as IISK lactor Male as IISK lactor                     |
| C |                                     | Older                      | age                  | Younge            | rade      |            | Odds Ratio              | Odds Ratio  |
| U | Study or Subaroup                   | Events                     | Total                | Events            | Total     | Weight     | M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl      | M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl  |
| - | litron 2012                         | 44                         | 100                  | 60                | 225       | 0.40       | 4 40 00 07 0 041        |   |
|   | Aires, 2012<br>Duchardl, 2017       | 41                         | 123                  | 100               | 235       | 9.4%       | 1.40 [0.87, 2.24]       |   |
|   | Bushnell, 2015                      | 154                        | 4149                 | 196               | 4988      | 56.4%      | 0.94 [0.76, 1.17]       |   |
|   | Gedefie, 2023                       | 6                          | 34                   | 11                | 195       | 0.9%       | 3.58 [1.23, 10.46]      |   |
|   | Getie, 2021                         | 2                          | 101                  | 3                 | 44        | 1.3%       | 0.28 [0.04, 1.71]       |   |
|   | Hussain, 2015                       | 3                          | 81                   | 33                | 1212      | 1.3%       | 1.37 [0.41, 4.58]       |   |
|   | Khan, 2021                          | 19                         | 40                   | 70                | 138       | 5.4%       | 0.88 [0.43, 1.78]       |   |
|   | Memon, 2021                         | 74                         | 187                  | 124               | 402       | 15.7%      | 1.47 [1.02, 2.11]       |   |
|   | Merza, 2016                         | 1                          | 87                   | 3                 | 127       | 0.8%       | 0.48 [0.05, 4.70]       |   |
|   | Trigo, 2016                         | 3                          | 27                   | 9                 | 73        | 1.4%       | 0.89 [0.22, 3.56]       |   |
|   | Wang, 2011                          | 13                         | 151                  | 29                | 209       | 7.3%       | 0.58 (0.29, 1.17)       | <b>_</b>  |
|   |                                     |                            |                      |                   |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Total (95% CI)                      |                            | 4980                 |                   | 7623      | 100.0%     | 1.05 [0.90, 1.23]       | •   |
|   | Total events                        | 316                        |                      | 540               |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Hotorogonoity: Chiž-                | - 16 45 df                 | - 9 (P -             | 040<br>81-780 0 - | - 15%     |            |                         |   |
|   | Tect for everall effect             | - 10.45, ui<br>- 7 - 0.66, | - 3 () ·             | - 0.00), i<br>:0\ | - 45 /0   |            |                         | '0.01 0.1 İ 1'0 100'  |
|   | restion overall ellect              | . 2 - 0.001                | (F = 0.5             | 12)               |           |            |                         | Younger age as risk Older age as risk                           |
| D |                                     | Oldera                     | ade                  | Younge            | rade      |            | Odds Ratio              | Odds Ratio  |
| D | Study or Subgroup                   | Evente                     | Total                | Evente            | Total     | Weight     | M H Random 95% C        | M H Random 95% Cl   |
| - | Duckson 2004                        | 070                        | 1074                 | 404               | 104.0     | 22.00      | 0.07/04/5-0.04          |   |
|   | Bushnell, 2015                      | 276                        | 4271                 | 124               | 4910      | 22.8%      | 2.67 [2.15, 3.31]       |   |
|   | Lomtadze, 2013                      | 34                         | 127                  | 34                | 199       | 18.7%      | 1.77 [1.03, 3.04]       |   |
|   | Memon, 2021                         | 87                         | 187                  | 161               | 402       | 21.4%      | 1.30 [0.92, 1.85]       | I <b>†</b> ∎−   |
|   | Merza, 2016                         | 1                          | 87                   | 0                 | 127       | 2.2%       | 4.42 [0.18, 109.82]     | ]   |
|   | Rehman, 2020                        | 3                          | 34                   | 28                | 366       | 9.6%       | 1.17 [0.34, 4.06]       | ]   |
|   | Reis, 2011                          | 5                          | 136                  | 25                | 266       | 12.4%      | 0.37 [0.14, 0.98]       | ]   |
|   | Wang, 2011                          | 18                         | 151                  | 6                 | 209       | 12.8%      | 4.58 [1.77, 11.83]      | ] – – – –   |
|   |                                     |                            |                      |                   |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Total (95% CI)                      |                            | 4993                 |                   | 6485      | 100.0%     | 1.66 [1.01, 2.74]       | ◆   |
|   | Total events                        | 474                        |                      | 378               |           |            |                         |   |
|   | Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> :   | = 0 27: Chi                | <sup>2</sup> = 27 0  | 95 df= 6          | (P < ∩ ∩  | 001): 17 = | 79%                     |   |
|   | Test for overall effect             | 7 = 1 09/                  | P = 0.0              |                   | . 0.0     |            | . = //                  | 0.01 0.1 1 10 100   |
|   | . Sociol overall ellett             | . 2 - 1.30 (               | , - 0.0              | -,                |           |            |                         | Younger age as risk Older age as risk                           |
| - |                                     | t and the                  |                      | 18-1 - 1          |           |            |                         |   |
| E |                                     | Low educa                  | ation                | High edu          | cation    |            | Odds Ratio              | Odds Ratio  |
| - | Study or Subgroup                   | Events                     | Total                | Events            | Total     | Weight     | M-H, Random, 95% Cl     | M-H, Random, 95% Cl   |
|   | Lomtadze, 2013                      | 51                         | 214                  | 17                | 112       | 33.9%      | 1.75 [0.96, 3.20]       | <b>⊢</b> ■  |
|   | Merza, 2016                         | 1                          | 117                  | 0                 | 97        | 6.1%       | 2.51 [0.10, 62.33]      |   |
|   | Rehman, 2020                        | 12                         | 237                  | 19                | 163       | 31.1%      | 0.40 [0.19, 0.86]       |   |
|   | Richards, 2006                      | 54                         | 229                  | 7                 | 43        | 28.9%      | 1.59 [0.67, 3.77]       |   |
|   | T                                   |                            |                      |                   |           |            |                         |   |
|   | i otal (95% Cl)                     |                            | 797                  |                   | 415       | 100.0%     | 1.10 [0.47, 2.61]       | -   |
|   | Total events                        | 118                        |                      | 43                |           | _          |                         |   |
|   | Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = ( | 0.47; Chi² =               | 10.00,               | df = 3 (P =       | 0.02); l² | = 70%      |                         |   |
|   | lest for overall effect: Z          | 2 = 0.22 (P =              | = 0.82)              |                   |           |            |                         | High education as risk Low education as risk                    |

Figure 15. Male gender as a risk factor for hepatitis B (A) and C (B), older age as a risk factor for hepatitis B (C) and hepatitis C (D), and low education (E) as a risk factor for hepatitis C.

# Table 2. Heterogeneity analysis

| Analyzed risk factor   | Hepatitis type | $I^2$ | Heterogeneity classification | Studies (n) | Heterogeneity analysis   |
|------------------------|----------------|-------|------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Sex (male)             | Hepatitis B    | 96%   | Considerable heterogeneity   | 14          | Criteria for hepatitis B:  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • HBsAg: 0.53 (95%CI: 0.16–1.73); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =2.19; $\chi^2$ =138.67; df=6 ( $p$ <0.00001); $I^2$ =96%  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Anti-HBc: 0.74 (95%CI: 0.35–1.55)  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | <ul> <li>Combination of hepatitis B diagnostic markers: 1.53 (95%CI: 1.27–1.86]; heterogeneity: τ<sup>2</sup>=0.00;</li> </ul>   |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | $\chi^2$ =1.73; df=5 ( <i>p</i> =0.88); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =0%  |
| Age (older)            | Hepatitis B    | 45%   | Moderate heterogeneity       | 10          | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| HIV                    | Hepatitis B    | 77%   | Substantial/considerable     | 6           | Sample size:<br>$(a_1)^{(2)}(a_2)^{(2)}(a_3)^{(2)}(a_4)^{(2)}(a_3)^$ |
|                        |                |       | neterogeneity                |             | • 100–1000: 2.44 (95%CI: 1.45–4.10); neterogeneity: $t^{2}=0.00$ ; $\chi^{2}=1.87$ ; dI=3 ( $p=0.00$ ); $l^{2}=0\%$  |
| Smolting               | Hopotitic P    | 060/  | Homogonous/modorato          | 6           | • >1000: 4.54 (95%): 2.50-8.05); heterogeneity: $1^2$ =0.16; $\chi^2$ =14.53; di=1 ( $p$ =0.0001); $1^2$ =93%  |
| Shloking               | перация в      | 30%   | homogeneity                  | 0           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| Injecting drug use     | Henatitis B    | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 5           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| Non-injecting drug use | Hepatitis B    | 29%   | Homogenous                   | 3           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| Multiple sexual        | Hepatitis B    | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 3           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| partners               | 1              |       | 0                            | 0           | -  |
| Alcohol consumption    | Hepatitis B    | 89%   | Substantial/considerable     | 8           | Criteria for hepatitis B:  |
|                        |                |       | heterogeneity                |             | • HBsAg: 3.59 (95%CI: 1.08–11.97); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =1.48; $\chi^2$ =36.75; df=4 ( <i>p</i> <0.00001); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =89%   |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Combination of hepatitis B diagnostic markers: 1.56 (95%CI: 1.01–2.39); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =0.00;   |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | $\chi^{2=1.08}; df=2 (p=0.58); I^{2}=0\%$  |
| Tattooing              | Hepatitis B    | 70%   | Substantial heterogeneity    | 3           | Criteria for hepatitis B:  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • HBsAg: 6.22 (95%Cl: 2.33-16.59); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =0.00; $\chi^2$ =0.88; df=1 ( <i>p</i> =0.35); <i>l</i> <sup>2</sup> =0%  |
| Den men minute a       | 11             | o 0/  | 11                           |             | • HBsAg + Anti-HBc: 1.56 (95%CI: 0.91–2.69)  |
| Listowy of blood       | Hepatitis B    | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 2           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| transfusion            | перация в      | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 5           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| History of dental      | Henatitis B    | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 2           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| intervention           | rioputito D    | 070   | Itomogeneus                  | -           |  |
| Gender (male)          | Hepatitis C    | 97%   | Considerable heterogeneity   | 12          | Study design:  |
|                        | 1              | 27    | 0,00                         |             | • Cross-sectional: 1.27 (95%CI: 0.86–1.87); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =0.05; $\chi^2$ =5.10; df=4 (p=0.28);  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | I <sup>2</sup> =22%  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Case control: 1.53 (95%CI: 1.15–2.03); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =0.03; $\chi^2$ =4.15; df=3 ( <i>p</i> =0.25); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =28%   |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Cohort: 1.01 (95%CI: 0.08–12.63); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =4.74; $\chi^2$ =56.22; df=2 ( <i>p</i> <0.00001); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =96%  |
| Age (older)            | Hepatitis C    | 79%   | Substantial/considerable     | 7           | Criteria for hepatitis C:  |
|                        |                |       | heterogeneity                |             | • anti-HCV: 1.43 (95%CI: 1.07–1.89); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =0.00; $\chi^2$ =1.46; df=3 ( <i>p</i> =0.69); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> =0%  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • anti-HCV and viral load: 1.72 (95%CI: 0.52–5.65); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.95$ ; $\chi^2=16.56$ ; df=2   |
| <b>x 1</b>             |                | 0.4   |                              |             | $(p=0.0003); I^2=88\%$   |
| Low education          | Hepatitis C    | 70%   | Substantial heterogeneity    | 4           | Study design:  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Cross-sectional: 0.50 (95%CI: 0.16–1.62); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.26$ ; $\chi^2=1.18$ ; df=1 ( $p=0.28$ ); $I^2=15\%$   |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Case control: $1.59$ (95% cl: $0.67 - 3.77$ )  |
| 11177                  | Hopotitic C    | -00/  | Modorato (aubstantia)        | 0           | • Conort: 1.75 (95%CI: 0.96–3.20)  |
| HIV                    | nepatitis C    | 50%   | heterogeneity                | 0           | Quarty of study:<br>Low guelting of (or %CI + 1 or - 6 of)   |
|                        |                |       | neterogeneity                |             | <ul> <li>Low quality. 2.01 (95/001. 1.09-0.21)</li> <li>Moderate quality: 8 02 (05%CF: 6.60-0.77); heterogeneity: r2-0.00; v2-0.41; df-0 (n- 0.40);</li> </ul>   |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • moderate quanty. 0.03 (95/001. 0.00-9.//), neterogeneity. $t^{-0.00}$ , $\chi^{-2.41}$ , $t_{-3}$ ( $p = 0.49$ ), $I^2 = 0.6$  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • High quality: 7 70 (05%CI: 4.18–14.54); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.16$ ; $v^2=4.06$ ; $df=2$ ( $n=0.12$ ); $I^2=51\%$  |
|                        |                |       |                              |             | • Fign quanty: $7.79$ (95%CI: 4.18–14.54); neterogeneity: $7^2$ =0.16; $\chi^2$ =4.06; dI=2 ( $p$ =0.13); $I^2$ =51%   |

| Analyzed risk factor  | Hepatitis type | $I^2$ | Heterogeneity classification | Studies (n) | Heterogeneity analysis   |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------|------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Smoking               | Hepatitis C    | 53%   | Moderate/substantial         | 4           | Study design:  |
|                       |                |       | heterogeneity                |             | • Cross-sectional: 2.39 (95%CI: 1.76–3.26); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.00$ ; $\chi^2=0.29$ ; df=2 ( $p=0.86$ ); $I^2=0$ %            |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | • Cohort: 8.24 (95%CI: 3.20–21.18)   |
| Injecting drug use    | Hepatitis C    | 96%   | Considerable heterogeneity   | 5           | Sample size:   |
| 5 0 0                 | 1              | 2     | 0,00                         | 0           | • 100–1000: 8.85 (95%CI: 1.24–62.92); heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =2.85; $\chi^2$ =40.47; df=2 ( <i>p</i> <0.00001); $I^2$ =95%        |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | • >1000: 24.59 (95%CI: 19.55–30.93); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.00$ ; $\chi^2=0.60$ ; df=1 (p=0.44); $I^2=0\%$                       |
| Alcohol consumption   | Hepatitis C    | 82%   | Substantial/considerable     | 8           | Criteria for hepatitis C:  |
| _                     | -              |       | heterogeneity                |             | • anti-HCV: 2.70 (95%CI: 1.84–3.98); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.06$ ; $\chi^2=5.88$ ; df=4 (p=0.21); $I^2=32\%$                      |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | • anti-HCV and viral load; 5.86 (95%CI; 4.79–7.16); heterogeneity; $\tau^2$ =0.00; $\gamma^2$ =0.44; df=1                          |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | (p=0.51); J <sup>2</sup> =0%   |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | • Medical record: 12.22 (95%CI: 6.87–21.76)  |
| Tattooing             | Hepatitis C    | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 3           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| History of blood      | Hepatitis C    | 51%   | Moderate/substantial         | 5           | Criteria for hepatitis C:  |
| transfusion           |                | 0     | heterogeneity                | 0           | • anti-HCV: 6 10 (05%CI: 0.88-42.31): heterogeneity: $r^2=1.02$ : $y^2=6.30$ : $df=2$ ( $n=0.04$ ): $I^2=68\%$                     |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | anti-HCV and viral load $150(0.5)(1.005-2.67)$ beta rogeneity: $\tau^2=0.00$ , $y^2=0.40$ , $df=1$                                 |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | $(n=0.5), I_2=0\%$   |
| History of            | Henatitis C    | 82%   | Substantial/considerable     | 2           | No subgroup analysis needed to be performed due to the inclusion of only two studies, which differed                               |
| homelessness          | ineputitis e   | 02/0  | heterogeneity                | -           | in sample size and criteria for henatitis diagnosis  |
| History of            | Henatitis C    | 50%   | Moderate/substantial         | 5           | Study design.  |
| incarceration         | ineputitis e   | 39/0  | heterogeneity                | 5           | • Cross-sectional: 2 12 ( $05\%$ Cl·1 62-6 01); heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.00$ ; $v^2=0.22$ ; df=1 ( $n=0.62$ ); $I^2=0\%$           |
| inter controll        |                |       | notorogeneity                |             | • Cross control: 6.40 ( $0.5\%0^{-1}$ , $4.71-8$ , 0.4); hiterogenetic: $1-9.00$ ; $\lambda = 0.25$ , $M=1$ ( $p=0.03$ ); $1-9.06$ |
|                       |                |       |                              |             | • Case on tot. 0.49 (95/001, 4.71–0.94), neterogenerty. $t=-0.00, \chi=-0.47, u=1$ ( $p=0.49$ ), $t=-0.00$                         |
| Lizzad with prices on | Honotitia (    | o.0/  | Homogonous                   | 0           | • Confort: 1/15 (95%CL: 0.93-42.4/)  |
| Sourcelly transmitted | Hepatitis C    | 0%    | Homogenous                   | 2           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| infortion             | nepatitis C    | 0%    | nomogenous                   | 3           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| Disbotos mollitus     | Hopotitic C    | 0%    | Homogonous                   | 0           | Analyzed with the fixed effect model   |
| Diabetes illefiltus   | riepatitis C   | 070   | Homogenous                   | 2           | Analyzeu with the fixed effect model   |

# Discussion

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we identified several patient-related risk factors significantly associated with viral hepatitis in TB patients, derived from an analysis of 21 studies. These factors encompass a range of demographic, behavioral, and medical aspects, highlighting the multifaceted nature of viral hepatitis risks within this population. Notably, conditions such as HIV infection, smoking, and alcohol consumption were found to be significant risk factors. Additionally, behaviors including drug use, tattooing, ear-nose piercing, homelessness, incarceration and living with prisoners, multiple sexual partners, and specific medical interventions further complicate the risk landscape.

This study may serve as a foundation for healthcare providers to identify the risk factors associated with viral hepatitis that contribute to liver injury development in TB patients undergoing treatment [5,19]. By focusing on patients with high susceptibility to hepatitis, clinicians can implement baseline screenings for hepatitis B and C at the time of TB diagnosis and prior to initiating treatment [5,19]. This proactive approach aligns with findings from prior studies, reinforcing the need for early detection and intervention, especially in countries with high hepatitis burden [2,5,19].

HIV was found to significantly increase the risk of acquiring hepatitis B. Similarly, the presence of HIV markedly elevated the risk of hepatitis C. This may be related to the fact that HIV enhances the replication of hepatitis B and C viruses, increasing the risk of reactivation in asymptomatic and chronic hepatitis patients [35,36]. Other than HIV, diabetes mellitus is identified as a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection. Immunosuppression and chronic inflammation in diabetes mellitus increase the risk of tuberculosis and hepatitis C co-infection, with poor metabolic control and additional risk factors further elevating the likelihood of hepatitis C in TB patients [10,18,37].

The shared use of syringes and needles among injecting drug users was associated with an increased risk of hepatitis B and hepatitis C as this facilitates direct blood contact, serving as a primary transmission route for hepatitis B and, particularly, hepatitis C [38,39]. This mechanism also correlates with a history of blood transfusion as a risk factor for hepatitis B and hepatitis C.

Not only injecting drug use but non-injecting drug use has also been identified as a significant risk factor for hepatitis B virus infection. Potential transmission route in non-injecting drug use involves percutaneous or mucosal exposure through drug-use paraphernalia, such as pipes or straws used for smoking, snorting, or sniffing, and a history of risky sexual behavior with individuals in the injecting drug use population or a history of blood transfusion [40,41]. Tattooing and ear-nose piercing are significant risk factors for hepatitis B and C transmission due to amateur artists' practices that may compromise sterility and the varying virucidal properties of various ink brands [42-44]. Notably, ear-piercing was significantly associated only with hepatitis C [44].

Multiple sexual partners were identified as a risk factor for hepatitis B. This mode of transmission is more prevalent among men who have sex with men (MSM). This is due to the increased trauma of anal intercourse, as well as in heterosexual relationships and individuals engaging in sexual activities with sex workers [45-47]. Additionally, this analysis identified STIs as a risk factor for hepatitis C among patients with tuberculosis. The presence of STIs in MSM, including HIV-1, herpes simplex virus type 2 (HSV-2), chlamydia, human papillomavirus (HPV), gonorrhea, and syphilis, impairs the function of dendritic cells in the entry points (anal mucosa, rectum, and sigmoid colon) to capture and retain infectious HCV, thereby elevating the risk of transmission [48,49].

A history of dental interventions has been identified as a risk factor for hepatitis C infection among patients with tuberculosis. The transmission of the Hepatitis C virus during dental interventions can occur directly through blood produced by ultrasonic scalers or other high-speed equipment, through saliva and nasopharyngeal secretions or indirectly via contaminated instruments, operative equipment, and the dental environment. This risk is especially heightened in patients with periodontal disease and poor oral hygiene, as the highest concentrations of Hepatitis B and C viruses are typically found in the gingival sulcus [50,51]. Excessive alcohol consumption poses a significant risk factor for hepatitis B and hepatitis C infection. Individuals with excessive alcohol consumption were more likely to engage in risky behaviors such as unprotected sexual intercourse, which led to a higher risk of transmitting viral hepatitis [5,18]. Smoking was identified as a significant risk factor for both hepatitis B and hepatitis C. Smoking and hepatitis are linked by shared risk factors, particularly substance use disorders, which explains their frequent co-occurrence in affected populations [52].

A history of homelessness was identified as a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection. High-risk behaviors, such as intravenous drug use and needle sharing, increase the likelihood of both tuberculosis and hepatitis C virus transmission among individuals experiencing homelessness [22,23,53]. History of incarceration is also a significant risk factor for hepatitis C infection. This increased risk is driven by substance use, tattooing, and unprotected sexual activity within correctional settings [25,33]. Similarly, living with a prisoner poses a risk for HCV due to shared high-risk behaviors and environments, highlighting the need for targeted interventions to break transmission cycles [25,33].

The strength of this review lies in its rigorous methodology, conducted in accordance with the PRISMA 2020 guidelines. A broad range of relevant studies was included, with appropriate selection criteria, resulting in 21 studies from various continents and countries. As a result, the findings from this systematic review and meta-analysis are likely generalizable, given that systematic reviews provide the highest level of evidence for clinical practice. This review identifies factors contributing to hepatitis in tuberculosis patients, supporting the development of targeted management strategies.

The limitations of this study include the observed heterogeneity in certain risk factors, which warrants caution when interpreting the results. Furthermore, the presence of several studies with medium to low quality may affect the overall strength of the evidence. To address these issues, this study recommends encouraging more high-quality cohort research in the future.

# Conclusion

HIV, smoking, alcohol consumption, drug use, multiple sexual partners, tattooing, piercing, blood transfusions, dental interventions, homelessness, incarceration, living with prisoners, sexually transmitted infections, and diabetes mellitus are significantly associated with hepatitis B and C in tuberculosis patients. Monitoring and addressing these factors are essential to prevent liver injury and complications in tuberculosis treatment, such as non-compliance, bacterial resistance, and increased morbidity.

#### **Ethics approval**

Not required.

#### Acknowledgments

None to be declared.

#### **Competing interests**

All the authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

#### Funding

This study received no external funding.

#### **Underlying data**

Supplementary data of this study can be accessed through DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.27588900.

## How to cite

Ilham AF, Andini SR, Afladhia HL, *et al.* Risk factors for viral hepatitis in pulmonary tuberculosis patients undergoing treatment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Narra J 2024; 4 (3): e1242 -http://doi.org/10.52225/narra.v4i3.1242.

# References

- 1. World Health Organization. Global tuberculosis report 2023. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2023.
- 2. Soedarsono S, Riadi ARW. Tuberculosis drug-induced liver injury. J Respirol 2020;6(2):49-54.
- 3. Van Hest R, Baars H, Kik S, *et al.* Hepatotoxicity of rifampin-pyrazinamide and isoniazid preventive therapy and tuberculosis treatment. Clin Infect Dis 2004;39(4):488-496.
- 4. Anand AC, Seth AK, Paul M, *et al.* Risk factors of hepatotoxicity during anti-tuberculosis treatment. Med J Armed Forces India 2006;62(1):45.
- 5. Feleke BE, Feleke TE, Adane WG, *et al.* Impacts of hepatitis B and hepatitis C co-infection with tuberculosis, a prospective cohort study. Virol J 2020;17(1):113.
- 6. Chien JY, Huang RM, Wang JY, *et al.* Hepatitis C virus infection increases hepatitis risk during anti-tuberculosis treatment. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2010;14(5):616-621.
- 7. Wang JY, Liu CH, Hu FC, *et al.* Risk factors of hepatitis during anti-tuberculous treatment and implications of hepatitis virus load. J Infect 2011;62(6):448-455.
- 8. Wong RJ, Hubbard A, Bagley L, *et al.* Estimating prevalence of hepatitis B virus coinfection among adults with tuberculosis: A systematic review with meta-analysis. J Clin Gastroenterol 2022;56(7):601-617.
- 9. Behzadifar M, Heydarvand S, Behzadifar M, *et al.* Prevalence of hepatitis C virus in tuberculosis patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Ethiop J Health Sci 2019;29(1):945.
- 10. Kim WS, Lee SS, Lee CM, *et al.* Hepatitis C and not hepatitis B virus is a risk factor for anti-tuberculosis drug induced liver injury. BMC Infect Dis 2016;16:50.
- 11. Khan AF, Sajjad A, Mian DA, *et al.* Co-infection with hepatitis B in tuberculosis patients on anti-tuberculosis treatment and the final outcome. Cureus 2021;13(4):e14433.
- 12. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMC 2021;372:n71.
- The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Available from: https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp. Accessed: 4 April 2024.
- 14. Addisu D, Gebeyehu NA, Belachew YY, *et al.* Quality assessment of articles using Newcastle—Ottawa quality assessment Scale (NOS): (Adapted for cross-sectional and cohort studies). PLoS ONE 2023;18(11):e0294052.
- 15. Sterne JAC, Savovic J, Page MJ, *et al.* RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ 2019;366:14898.
- 16. Takeshima N, Sozu T, Tajika A, *et al.* Which is more generalizable, powerful and interpretable in meta-analyses, mean difference or standardized mean difference? BMC Med Res Methodol 2014;14:30.
- 17. Abdallah TM, Idriss MI, Ahmed AM, *et al.* Sero-prevalence of hepatitis B and hepatitis C viruses among tuberculosis patients in Kassala, Eastern Sudan. Glob J Infect Dis Clin Res 2015;1(1):001-003.
- 18. Gedefie A, Seid A, Molla Fenta G, *et al.* Hepatitis B and C virus infections and associated factors among HIV-positive and HIV-negative tuberculosis patients in public health facilities, Northeast Ethiopia: A comparative cross-sectional study. SAGE Open Med 2023;11:20503121231166642.
- 19. Getie B, Ayalew G, Amsalu A, *et al.* Seroprevalence and associated factors of hepatitis B and C virus among pulmonary tuberculosis patients attending health facilities in Gondar Town, Northwest Ethiopia. Infect Drug Resist 2021;14:3599.
- 20. Aires RS, Matos MAD, Lopes CLR, *et al.* Prevalence of hepatitis B virus infection among tuberculosis patients with or without HIV in Goiânia City, Brazil. J Clin Virol 2012;54(4):327-331.
- 21. Blal CA, Passos SRL, Horn C, *et al.* High prevalence of hepatitis B virus infection among tuberculosis patients with and without HIV in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 2005;24(1):41-43.
- 22. Bushnell G, Stennis NL, Drobnik AM, *et al.* Characteristics and TB treatment outcomes in TB patients with viral hepatitis, New York City, 2000-2010. Epidemiol Infect 2015;143(9):1972-1981.
- 23. Campo M, Shrestha A, Oren E, *et al.* Characterization of hepatitis C infection in tuberculosis patients in an urban city in the USA. Epidemiol Infect 2014;142(7):1459.
- 24. Costi C, Grandi T, Halon ML, *et al.* Prevalence of hepatitis C virus and human immunodeficiency virus in a group of patients newly diagnosed with active tuberculosis in Porto Alegre, Southern Brazil. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz 2017;112(4):255.
- 25. Lomtadze N, Kupreishvili L, Salakaia A, *et al.* Hepatitis C virus co-infection increases the risk of anti-tuberculosis druginduced hepatotoxicity among patients with pulmonary tuberculosis. PLoS ONE 2013;8(12):e83892.
- 26. Reis NRS, Lopes CLR, Teles SA, *et al.* Hepatitis C virus infection in patients with tuberculosis in central Brazil. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2011;15(10):1397-1402.

- 27. Khan AF, Sajjad A, Mian DA, *et al.* Co-infection with hepatitis B in tuberculosis patients on anti-tuberculosis treatment and the final outcome. Cureus 2021;13(4):e14433.
- 28. Hussain T, Kulshreshtha KK, Yadav VS, *et al.* Human immunodeficiency virus and hepatitis B virus co-infections among tuberculosis patients attending a model rural health research unit in Ghatampur, North India. Indian J Med Microbiol 2015;33(4):496-502.
- 29. Memon KA, Khan M, Azhar S, *et al.* Prevalence of hepatitis B and C among tuberculosis patients at local community of Sindh, Pakistan. Pak J Med Health Sci 2021;15(7):1794-1797.
- 30. Merza MA, Haji SM, Alsharafani AMH, *et al.* Low prevalence of hepatitis B and C among tuberculosis patients in Duhok Province, Kurdistan: Are HBsAg and anti-HCV prerequisite screening parameters in tuberculosis control program? Int J Mycobacteriology 2016;5(3):313-317.
- 31. Rehman UA, Razzaq A, Butt NI, *et al.* Prevalence of co-infection with hepatitis C among tuberculosis patients presenting at Gulab Devi Hospital, Lahore. PJMHS 2020;14(2):403-404.
- 32. Jørgensen A, Bjørn-Mortensen K, Graff Jensen S, *et al.* Prevalence of hepatitis B and C at a major tuberculosis centre in Denmark. Infect Dis Lond Engl 2021;53(3):196-200.
- 33. Richards DC, Mikiashvili T, Parris JJ, *et al.* High prevalence of hepatitis C virus but not HIV co-infection among patients with tuberculosis in Georgia. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 2006;10(4):396-401.
- 34. Trigo C, do Brasil PEAA, Costa MJM, *et al.* Occult hepatitis B virus infection: Clinical implications in tuberculosis treatment. J Viral Hepat 2016;23(12):1027-1035.
- 35. Sharma V, Ramachandran VG, Mogha NS, *et al.* Hepatitis B & C virus infection in HIV seropositive individuals & their association with risk factors: A hospital-based study. Indian J Med Res 2018;147(6):588-593.
- 36. Cheng Z, Lin P, Cheng N. HBV/HIV coinfection: Impact on the development and clinical treatment of liver diseases. Front Med 2021;8:713981.
- 37. Hammerstad SS, Grock SF, Lee HJ, et al. Diabetes and hepatitis C: A two-way association. Front Endocrinol 2015;6:134.
- 38. Mehta P, Grant LM, Reddivari AKR. Viral hepatitis. In: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024.
- 39. World Health Organization. Guidance on prevention of viral hepatitis B and C among people who inject drugs. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2012.
- 40. Fischer B, Powis J, Cruz MF, *et al.* Hepatitis C virus transmission among oral crack users: Viral detection on crack paraphernalia. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008;20(1):29-32.
- 41. Van Den Berg CHSB, Van De Laar TJW, Kok A, *et al.* Never injected, but hepatitis C virus-infected: A study among selfdeclared never-injecting drug users from the Amsterdam Cohort Studies. J Viral Hepat 2009;16(8):568.
- 42. Behrendt P, Brüning J, Todt D, *et al.* Influence of tattoo ink on hepatitis C virus infectiousness. Open Forum Infect Dis 2019;6(3):ofz047.
- 43. Yang S, Wang D, Zhang Y, *et al.* Transmission of hepatitis B and C virus infection through body piercing: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore) 2015;94(47):e1893.
- 44. Tohme RA, Holmberg SD. Transmission of hepatitis C virus infection through tattooing and piercing: A critical review. Clin Infect Dis 2012;54(8):1167-1178.
- 45. Nijmeijer BM, Koopsen J, Schinkel J, *et al.* Sexually transmitted hepatitis C virus infections: Current trends, and recent advances in understanding the spread in men who have sex with men. J Int AIDS Soc 2019;22 Suppl 6:e25348.
- 46. Inoue T, Tanaka Y. Hepatitis B virus and its sexually transmitted infection anupdate. Microb Cell 2016;3(9):420.
- 47. Lama JR, Agurto HS, Guanira J V, *et al.* Hepatitis B infection and association with other sexually transmitted infections among men who have sex with men in Peru. Am J Trop Med Hyg 2010;83(1):194-200.
- 48. De Jong MAWP, De Witte L, Oudhoff MJ, *et al.* TNF-alpha and TLR agonists increase susceptibility to HIV-1 transmission by human Langerhans cells ex vivo. J Clin Invest 2008;118(10):3440-3452.
- 49. Nijmeijer BM, Sarrami-Forooshani R, Steba GS, *et al.* HIV-1 exposure and immune activation enhance sexual transmission of Hepatitis C virus by primary Langerhans cells. J Int AIDS Soc 2019;22(3):e25268.
- 50. Dahiya P, Kamal R, Sharma V, *et al.* "Hepatitis" Prevention and management in dental practice. J Educ Health Promot 2015;4(1):33.
- 51. Mahboobi N, Porter SR, Karayiannis P, *et al.* Dental treatment as a risk factor for hepatitis B and C viral infection. A review of the recent literature. J Gastrointest Liver Dis 2013;22(1):79-86.
- 52. Shuter J, Litwin AH, Sulkowski MS, *et al.* Cigarette smoking behaviors and beliefs in persons living with hepatitis C. Nicotine Tob Res 2017;19(7):836-844.
- 53. Linton SL, Celentano DD, Kirk GD, *et al.* The longitudinal association between homelessness, injection drug use, and injection-related risk behavior among persons with a history of injection drug use in Baltimore, MD. Drug Alcohol Depend 2013;132(3):457-465.