# APPENDIX FIGURES AND TABLES (FOR ONLINE PUBLICATION)

### **Appendix A. Additional Results**



Figure A1. Technology Presence in Biometric Centers over Time

#### **Table A1: Attrition Checks**

Panel A: Impact on health worker attrition	Treatment	Robust SE	Strata fixed effects	Health worker controls	R- squared	Observ ations	Mean in control group
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Dropped out during intervention	-0.016 -0.003	0.071 0.128	Yes Yes	No Yes	0.213 0.425	85 85	0.273 0.273

Panel B: Attritors and replacements' characteristics												
			Attr	itors					Replace	ments		
	Contro	l group	Treat	ment	P-value	Observ	Contr	ol group	Treat	ment	P-value	2 Observ
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	T=C	ations	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	T=C	ations
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Male	1.000	0.000	0.700	0.483	0.226	22	0.700	0.483	0.700	0.483	1.000	20
Age	29.3	10.9	30.5	8.3	0.738	22	28.7	7.7	26.3	6.3	0.204	20
Caste												
General caste	0.250	0.452	0.400	0.516	0.567	22	0.400	0.516	0.500	0.527	0.717	20
Other Backward Class	0.500	0.522	0.500	0.527	1.000	22	0.300	0.483	0.500	0.527	0.457	20
Scheduled Caste	0.167	0.389	0.000	0.000	0.115	22	0.200	0.422	0.000	0.000	0.162	20
Scheduled Tribe	0.083	0.289	0.100	0.316	0.904	22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-	20
Minority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-	22	0.100	0.316	0.000	0.000	0.248	20
Religion												
Hindu	0.750	0.452	1.000	0.000	0.029	22	0.600	0.516	0.900	0.316	0.126	20
Muslim	0.083	0.289	0.000	0.000	0.260	22	0.100	0.316	0.100	0.316	1.000	20
Other	0.167	0.389	0.000	0.000	0.157	22	0.300	0.483	0.000	0.000	0.023	20
Highest education level achieved												
Class 12 and below	0.636	0.505	0.700	0.483	0.766	21	0.400	0.516	0.700	0.483	0.232	20
Tertiary	0.364	0.505	0.300	0.483	0.766	21	0.600	0.516	0.300	0.483	0.232	20
Other diploma/non-formal education	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-	21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-	20
Work experience												
Any previous work experience	0.750	0.452	0.700	0.483	0.841	22	0.800	0.422	0.700	0.483	0.656	20
Number of years of work experience	9.091	5.166	10.200	4.341	0.571	21	7.200	4.566	8.700	5.293	0.563	20
Any previous working in a job related to TB	0.083	0.289	0.200	0.422	0.381	22	0.300	0.483	0.000	0.000	0.056	20
Any previous experience in the social/NGO sector	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-	21	0.111	0.333	0.100	0.316	0.939	19
Any other income generating activity, in addition to OpASHA	0.000	0.000	0.100	0.316	0.350	22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-	19
Lives in one of the areas covered by the centers	0.545	0.522	0.500	0.527	0.862	21	0.400	0.516	0.222	0.441	0.529	19
Household size	5.6	2.5	5.0	3.2	0.645	22	5.3	2.3	5.9	1.9	0.273	20
Lives alone	0.000	0.000	0.100	0.316	0.350	22	0.100	0.316	0.000	0.000	0.248	20
Assets												
Has electricty	1.000	0.000	0.900	0.316	0.351	21	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	-	20
Has tap water	0.818	0.405	0.700	0.483	0.595	21	0.900	0.316	0.600	0.516	0.191	20
Has a television	0.818	0.405	0.900	0.316	0.634	21	0.900	0.316	1.000	0.000	0.248	20
Has a refrigerator	0.455	0.522	0.600	0.516	0.450	21	0.500	0.527	0.800	0.422	0.185	20
Rents an apartment or house to a third party	0.083	0.289	0.000	0.000	0.358	20	0.100	0.316	0.111	0.333	0.941	19
Owns her house	0.667	0.492	0.400	0.516	0.219	22	0.600	0.516	0.800	0.422	0.269	20
Exposure to technology												
Knows how to use a computer	0.750	0.452	0.600	0.516	0.434	22	0.500	0.527	0.800	0.422	0.131	20
Knows how to use the internet	0 727	0 467	0.600	0 516	0 534	21	0 500	0 527	0 700	0.483	0 330	20
Has an email account	0.583	0.515	0.300	0.483	0.187	22	0.500	0.527	0.700	0.483	0.330	20
Has a social networking account	0 583	0.515	0 300	0 483	0 1 3 9	22	0.500	0.527	0 500	0 527	1 000	20
Days spent in the experiment	138.3	114 3	113.8	108.2	0.638	22	185 1	114 1	218.9	123.0	0.605	20
Reported baseline number of detections per month per area	2 568	2 148	2 770	0 954	0.000	16	105.1	114.1	210.5	125.0	0.005	20
Reported baseline number of defaults per month per area	0.038	0.060	0.014	0.015	0.286	16						
Center onen	0.050	0.000	1 000	0.015	1 000	1/						
Total time center was open	373 1	235 /	259.7	1// 3	0 735	1/						
Health worker present at the center	0 772	0.220	0 722	0.406	0.735	14						
Total time health worker was present at the center	0.772	0.230 66 E	0.733	72 5	0.200	15						
Visit by OnAsba	90.4 0 109	00.3	90.4	0 0 79	0.374	15						
Adherence 1: Patient came to center and took or nicked up nill	0.100	0.102	0.041	0.078	0.400	16						
Adherence 2: Adb. 1 + Pelative came to the center and risked up	0.519	0.279	0.402	0.20/	0.574	16						
the pill, or patient or relative was given pill during a home visit	0.022	0.303	0.076	0.304	0.492	10						

Notes: In Panel A, the unit of observation is the health worker. \*\*\*, \*\*, \* indicate significance at 1, 5, and 10 percent, respectively. We include all health workers who were part of the experiment. Health worker controls as in Table IV.

In Panel B, the means and standard deviations in the control and treatment groups are calculated based on the subsample of attritors (health workers who left the sample over the course of the experiment) and replacements (health workers who entered the sample over the course of the experiment) respectively (col. 1–4 and 7–10). We also report the p-value of the difference with clustered standard errors (col. 5 and 11).

In the last ten lines of Panel B, the unit of observation is the cluster of areas allocated to a health worker. The sample includes all clusters in which the initial health worker attrited. Baseline detection and default outcomes are computed based on six months of OpASHA center-wise data sheets prior to the experiment. Baseline observation days outcomes are computed based on observation days that took place before the beginning of the experiment.

#### Table A2: Availability of Various Data Sources

Panel A: Patient data						
	Entry survey complete	Exit survey complete	Verification data available	At least one observation day	Total number of observation days	
	(source: po	atient surveys)	(source: government registers)	(source: obse	rvation days)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Treatment	0.024	0.007	0.025	-0.006	0.4	
	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.1)**	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Observations	3393	3393	3057	3393	3393	
R-squared	0.476	0.131	0.111	0.064	0.300	
Mean in control group	0.607	0.725	0.946	0.896	3.6	

#### Panel B: Healthworker data

	Baseline survey complete (sou	Midline survey complete rce: healthworker surve	Endline survey complete eys)	Number of months of salary data (source: salary data from OnAsha)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.000	-0.038	0.050	-0.2
		(0.064)	(0.080)	(0.9)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	85	85	85	85
R-squared		0.282	0.181	0.400
Mean in control group	1.000	0.818	0.727	11.1

#### Panel C: Area-level data

	At least one observation day	Total number of observation days	At least one random spot check	Total number of random spot checks	Number of months of program data
	(source: obse	rvation days)	(source: rando	m spot checks)	(source: program data)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Treatment	0.000	0.0	0.011	0.9	-0.3
		(0.7)	(0.009)	(0.4)**	(0.2)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	122	122	122	122	122
R-squared		0.800	0.728	0.600	0.900
Mean in control group	1.000	25.0	0.906	7.1	15.1

*Notes* : Clustered standard errors are in parentheses (\*\*\*, \*\*, \* indicate significance at 1, 5, and 10 percent, respectively). In Panel A, the unit of observation is a verified patient. We use the full sample of verified patients, whether enrolled before or after the beginning of the experiment, and control for a dummy indicating whether the patient was enrolled after the beginning of the experiment. In column 3, we exclude Indore, where we did not obtain access to the TB register. In Panel B, the unit of observation is a healthworker. In Panel C, the unit of observation is a treatment area. While there are 129 areas, the number of observations is 122 because the data for the seven mobile health workers is not area-specific.

Table A3: Impact on Likelihood to Default Predicted Based on Observable	es

Panel A: Multivariate regression of control group patients' defaults on observables

	Default			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Male	0.024	0.022	0.021	0.025
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.016)
Δσε	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Casto dessalt know	(0.001)	0.001	(0.000)	(0.000)
caste. doesn't know	-0.034	(0.013	-0.049	(0.027
	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.054)	(0.043)
Other Backward Class	0.010	0.018	-0.022	-0.003
	(0.027)	(0.022)	(0.028)	(0.020)
Scheduled Caste	-0.001	0.006	-0.019	-0.010
	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.027)	(0.019)
Scheduled Tribe	0.013	0.007	-0.015	0.008
	(0.039)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.033)
Minority	-0.025	0.011	-0.051	0.008
	(0.065)	(0.046)	(0.041)	(0.035)
Muslim	0.014	-0.014	0.003	-0.034
	(0.062)	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.029)
Other religion	-0.091	-0.090	-0.078	-0.018
5	(0.031)***	(0.020)***	(0.023)***	(0.045)
Can read but not write	-0.101	-0.079	-0.119	-0.052
	(0.031)***	(0.036)**	(0.028)***	(0.052)
Can read and write	-0.031	-0.028	-0.056	-0.037
	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.041)	(0.033)
Primary education	0.005	-0.000	0.057	0.033
rinnary education	(0.005	-0.005	(0.037)	(0.032
Consultant advantion	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.038)	(0.037)
Secondary education	-0.001	-0.010	0.049	(0.024
	(0.051)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.037)
Undergraduate and more	-0.005	0.007	0.028	0.017
	(0.057)	(0.052)	(0.045)	(0.043)
Size of the Household	-0.004	0.001	-0.004	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Lives alone	-0.007	-0.035	-0.034	-0.053
	(0.094)	(0.055)	(0.074)	(0.047)
Has tap water	-0.026	-0.036	-0.026	-0.035
	(0.023)	(0.021)*	(0.019)	(0.016)**
Has a television	-0.029	0.009	-0.013	0.011
	(0.033)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.016)
Has a refrigerator	0.039	0.025	0.012	0.015
	(0.041)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.025)
Owns her house	0.011	0.007	0.011	0.003
	(0.027)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.016)
Has lived in the area for more than 6 years (but not always)	-0.038	-0.015	-0.020	-0.007
	(0.023)	(0.028)	(0.019)	(0.021)
Has lived there for less than 5 years	-0.004	-0.013	0.022	0.000
Thas lived there for less than 5 years	(0,020)	(0.015	(0.022)	(0.010)
Is currently working	(0.025)	0.020	0.022)	0.024
is currently working	(0.037	(0.032	(0.029	(0.024
There are no at the second of	(0.027)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.015)
Time to go to the center	-0.001		-0.001	
	(0.002)		(0.001)	
Distance to the center	0.007		0.004	
	(0.003)***		(0.003)	
Including patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	593	965	882	1378
R-squared	0.046	0.023	0.031	0.016

Panel B: Impact on likelihood to default predicted based on observables

	Pre	edicted likeli	hood to defa	ult
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.003	-0.002	0.006	0.000
	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)
Panel A regression includes patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment	No	No	Yes	Yes
Panel A regression includes time to the center and distance to the center	Yes	No	Yes	No
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1374	2210	1374	2210
R-squared	0.109	0.078	0.083	0.103
Mean in control group	0.075	0.079	0.070	0.077

Notes: Clustered standard errors are in parentheses (\*\*\*, \*\*, \* indicate significance at 1, 5, and 10 percent, respectively). The unit of observation is a verified patient.

In Panel A, we regress control group verified patients' likelihood to default on patient-level observables. Col. 1 and 2 use the subsample of verified patients enrolled after the beginning of the experiment and col. 3 and 4 use the full sample of verified patients, whether enrolled before or after the beginning of the experiment. Col. 1 and 3 use all patient-level observables shown in Tables II and IV except for "Has electricity," which is equal to 1 for all patients, and col. 2 and 4 drop variables observed for fewer than 90 percent of patients: time to go to the center and distance to the center. Omitted categories are general caste, Hindu, cannot read or write, pre-primary education, and has always lived in the area.

In Panel B, we predict the likelihood to default of all treatment and control group patients enrolled after the beginning of the experiment, based on the coefficients estimated in Panel A, and using all specifications shown in Panel A in turn.

#### Table A4: Responsiveness of OpAsha Visits to Patients' Treatment Adherence and Health Workers' Presence at the Center

	Visit by OpAsha					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Patient adherence lagged	0.041	0.031				
	(0.027)	(0.023)				
Patient adherence lagged * Treatment	-0.103	-0.079				
	(0.048)**	(0.045)*				
Health worker present at the center lagged			0.032	0.022		
			(0.026)	(0.024)		
Health worker present at the center lagged * Treatment			-0.081	-0.066		
			(0.044)*	(0.047)		
Total time health worker was present at the center lagged					0.007	0.002
					(0.006)	(0.005)
Total time health worker was present at the center lagged * Treatment					-0.004	0.000
					(0.006)	(0.006)
					. ,	. ,
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2692	2692	2776	2776	2773	2773
R-squared	0.024	0.032	0.023	0.033	0.022	0.032
•						

Notes: Clustered standard errors are in parentheses (\*\*\*, \*\*, \* indicate significance at 1, 5, and 10 percent, respectively). The unit of observation is an observation day. All regressions control for the direct influence of Treatment. Health worker controls as in Table IV.

Patient adherence measures average adherence of all the center's patients. Individual patient adherence is equal to 1 if the patient came to the center and took or picked up the pill, their relative came to the center and picked up the pill, or the patient or their relative was given the pill during a home visit (in line with the definition of Adherence 2 in Table III). The total time the health worker was present at the center is computed net of breaks and measured in number of hours. The lagged values of patient adherence, health worker presence at the center, and the total time the health worker was present at the center are computed over the four previous observation days.

### Table A5: Impact on Quality of Reporting on Patient Detection, Baseline

Panel A: Impact on survey	outcomes, individu	al level (sources: prog	ıram data, patient su	rveys)					
Patient verified Survey not S									
	(found and	completed: Patient	completed: Patient	completed: Health	completed: Patient	completed: Other			
	surveyed)	refused to answer	not found	worker warning	death	reasons			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)			
Treatment	-0.025	0.007	0.031	-0.002	-0.005	-0.006			
	(0.030)	(0.014)	(0.028)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.006)			
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Observations	1251	1251	1251	1251	1251	1251			
R-squared	0.027	0.026	0.013	0.055	0.020	0.030			
Mean in control group	0.637	0.081	0.150	0.044	0.058	0.029			

Panel B. Impact on the fraction of patients reported in the government registers which are verified (sources: government registers, patient surveys) Likelihood to find

	the patient in
	government
	registers
	(1)
Treatment	-0.044
	(0.034)
Strata fixed effects	Yes
Observations	950
R squared	0.030
Mean in control group	0.676

*Notes:* Clustered standard errors are in parentheses (\*\*\*, \*\*, \* indicate significance at 1, 5, and 10 percent, respectively). In Panel A, the unit of observation is a patient reported in the program data. We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. Other notes as in Table VIII.

### Table A6: Changes in Impact on Treatment Interruption and Adherence over Time

Panel A: Impact on treatm	<sup>2</sup> anel A: Impact on treatment interruption, or default (source: patient surveys)									
	Treatment	nent complete Treatment ongoing		Def	Default		Died		Outcome unknown	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Treatment	-0.001	-0.003	0.017	0.013	-0.023	-0.022	-0.003	-0.002	0.011	0.014
	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.010)**	(0.010)**	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.012)	(0.011)
Treatment x time	0.003	0.000	0.002	0.003	0.006	0.008	0.002	0.002	-0.013	-0.013
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.009)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802
R squared	0.088	0.107	0.101	0.111	0.020	0.033	0.014	0.025	0.055	0.106
Mean in control group	0.507	0.507	0.299	0.299	0.073	0.073	0.016	0.016	0.105	0.105

Panel B: Impact on treat	ment adheren	ce (source: ol	bservation da	ys)				
	Adherence 1: Patient came to the center and took or picked up the pill		Adherence 2: Adh. 1 + Relative came to the center and picked up the pill, or patient or relative was given pill		Compliance with treatment verified (as per adherence 1)		Compliance with treatment verified (as per adherence 2)	
			during a h	nome visit				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.197	0.186	0.118	0.113	0.034	0.036	0.021	0.022
	(0.045)***	(0.040)***	(0.044)***	(0.037)***	(0.012)***	(0.012)***	(0.014)	(0.013)*
Treatment x time	-0.026	-0.028	-0.020	-0.025	0.004	0.002	0.003	0.001
	(0.018)	(0.016)*	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations R-squared	12844 0.091	12844 0.137	12810 0.109	12810 0.163	3041 0.039	3041 0.056	3043 0.061	3043 0.077 0.078
wican in control group	0.342	0.342	0.052	0.052	0.040	0.040	0.070	0.070

### Panel C: Impact on patient compliance (source: patient surveys)

	Occasion	ally sent	Ever picked up medicine			
	someone els	se to get the	for one we	ek or more		
	pi	lls	during one visit			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
Treatment	-0.227	-0.226	-0.086	-0.086		
	(0.027)***	(0.027)***	(0.024)***	(0.023)***		
Treatment x time	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.006		
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.013)		
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		
Observations	3352	3352	3295	3295		
R-squared	0.130	0.149	0.090	0.103		
Mean in control group	0.367	0.367	0.283	0.283		

Notes: We control for time lapsed between the beginning of the experiment and the patient's treatment start date in Panels A and C as well as Panel B, col. 5–8, and for time lapsed between the beginning of the experiment and the observation date, in Panel B, col. 1–4 (in hundreds of days). We interact treatment with time. Other notes as in Table III.

## Appendix B. Patients Enrolled Before the Beginning of the Experiment

Panel A: Impact on treat	ment interru	ntion or def	nult (source ,	natient surver	/s)			
i unei A. impuct on treut	Treatmen	t complete	Treatmen	it ongoing	''' Def	ault	Outcome	unknown
	(1)	(2)	(3)	( <u>4</u> )	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	-0.026	-0.024	0.046	0.044	-0.016	-0.017	-0.004	-0.002
in cutilitient	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0,006)	(0.007)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	788	788	788	788	788	788	788	788
R squared	0.027	0.068	0.031	0.070	0.030	0.053	0.047	0.077
Mean in control group	0.604	0.604	0.321	0.321	0.065	0.065	0.010	0.010
Panel B: Impact on treat	ment adhere	nce (source:	observation o	lavs)				
	Adher	ence 1:	Adhere	ence 2:	Complia	nce with	Complia	nce with
	Patient ca	me to the	Adh. 1 + Re	lative came	treatment	verified (as	treatment	verified (as
	center ar	nd took or	to the cente	r and picked	per adhe	erence 1)	per adhe	erence 2)
	picked u	p the pill	up the pill.	or patient or	P		p	
	P	le ette lette	relative wa	as given pill				
			during a h	nome visit				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.158	0.162	0.041	0.046	-0.009	-0.005	-0.026	-0.022
	(0.038)***	(0.034)***	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.011)**	(0.011)*
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	1812	1812	1819	1819	634	634	636	636
R-squared	0.086	0.136	0.114	0.176	0.027	0.103	0.079	0.137
Mean in control group	0.539	0.539	0.710	0.710	0.031	0.031	0.055	0.055
Panel C. Impact on patie	ent compliance	e (source: no	ntient surveys	)				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Occasior	nally sent	Ever picked	, up medicine				
	someone el	se to get the	for one we	ek or more				
	pi	ills	during	one visit				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
Treatment	-0.222	-0.215	-0.103	-0.107				
	(0.038)***	(0.038)***	(0.030)***	(0.029)***				
Strata fixed effects Patient controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Observations	770	770	764	764				
R-squared	0.113	0.162	0.080	0.128				
Mean in control group	0.414	0.414	0.291	0.291				

### Table B1: Impact on Treatment Interruption and Adherence (Patients Enrolled Before the Beginning of the Experiment)

*Notes:* We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. In Panel A, we don't report regression results for "Died" because this outcome takes value 0 for all patients in this subsample. Other notes as in Table III.

#### Table B2: Impact on Patients' Health (Patients Enrolled Before the Beginning of the Experiment)

Panel A: Impact on patier	nts' physical l	health (sour	ce: patient sui	rveys)								
	Cured		Patient's ranking of their health		Index of no difficulty in performing activities		Index of health symptoms		Index of severe health symptoms		Index of increased health symptoms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Treatment	0.037 (0.044)	0.042 (0.040)	-0.062 (0.126)	-0.032 (0.114)	-0.046 (0.057)	-0.052 (0.048)	-0.010 (0.034)	-0.004 (0.031)	-0.055 (0.043)	-0.054 (0.040)	-0.007 (0.027)	-0.011 (0.028)
Strata fixed effects Patient controls	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes
Observations	770	770	776	776	782	782	783	783	783	783	782	782
R-squared Mean in control group	0.063	0.101 0.406	0.043 7.178	0.136 7.178								

Panel B: Impact on patients' emotional health (source: patient surveys) Overall somewhat or Overall satisfaction with Thinks that household Has a project to improve Index of emotional situation will improve in their life and their distress very happy their life family's life the future (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) Treatment -0.018 -0.043 -0.045 -0.031 -0.022 -0.019 -0.034 -0.033 -0.282 -0.241 (0.020) (0.039) (0.021) (0.114)\*\* (0.024) (0.024) (0.020) (0.041) (0.022) (0.125)\*\* Strata fixed effects Yes Patient controls Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Observations 686 686 772 772 780 780 774 774 775 775 0.057 0.108 0.182 0.051 0.079 0.209 **R**-squared 0.145 0.081 0.128 0.139 Mean in control group 0.864 0.864 0.947 0.947 7.252 7.252 0.144 0.144 ------

Notes : We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. Other notes as in Table V.

Table B3: Impact on Health Worker Activities as Reported by Patients (Patients Enrolled Before the Beginning of the Experiment)

	Health wo	Health worker gives		Frequency of		Health worker		Health worker	
	advice rela	ated to TB	interacti	ons with	supports	s patient	sometimes or often		
				health worker		during treatment		delivers pills at	
							patient's home		
				(source: patient surveys)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
Treatment	-0.012	-0.013	-0.027	-0.008	-0.017	-0.011	0.076	0.073	
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.100)	(0.101)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.043)*	(0.042)*	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Observations	759	759	730	730	761	761	761	761	
R-squared	0.084	0.114	0.075	0.096	0.421	0.444	0.340	0.363	
Mean in control group	0.915	0.915	1.403	1.403	0.227	0.227	0.448	0.448	

*Notes:* We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. Other notes as in Table VI.

Table B4: Impact on Quality of	<b>Reporting on Default (Patients En</b>	nrolled Before the Beginning of	f the Experiment)
--------------------------------	--	---------------------------------	-------------------

	Actual likeliho	ood to default	Default as reported in the		
			governme	nt registers	
	(source: patient surveys)		(source: govern	ment registers)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Treatment	-0.016	-0.017	0.008	0.007	
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.011)	(0.010)	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes		Yes	
Observations	788	788	643	643	
R-squared	0.030	0.053	0.011	0.053	
Mean in control group	0.065	0.065	0.023	0.023	
Test: Treatment = Treatment(1) (or (2))					
P-value			0.169	0.156	
F-statistic			1.93	2.06	

*Notes:* We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. Other notes as in Table VII.

Table B5: Impact on Patients' Satisfaction with Healthcare Received (Patients Enrolled Before the Beginning of the Experiment)

Satisfied v	with their	Would refer a TB suspect to an OpAsha		
interaction	with their			
health	worker	health	worker	
(	source: pati	ent surveys)		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
0.003	0.005	-0.020	-0.019	
(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.024)	(0.022)	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Yes		Yes	
752	752	778	778	
0.032	0.060	0.393	0.419	
0.965	0.965	0.227	0.227	
	Satisfied v interaction health (1) 0.003 (0.014) Yes 752 0.032 0.965	Satisfied with their   interaction with their   health worker   (source: pati   (1) (2)   0.003 0.005   (0.014) (0.014)   Yes Yes   752 752   0.032 0.060   0.965 0.965	Satisfied with their interaction with their health worker Would results suspect to health (source: patient surveys)   (1) (2) (3)   0.003 0.005 -0.020   (0.014) (0.014) (0.024)   Yes Yes Yes   752 752 778   0.032 0.060 0.393   0.965 0.965 0.227	

*Notes:* We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. Other notes as in Table IX.

### Table B6: Changes in Impact on Treatment Interruption and Adherence over Time (Patients Enrolled Before the Beginning of the Experiment)

Panel A: Impact on treati	ment interrup	ition, or defau	ılt (source: pa	tient surveys)				
	Treatment	t complete	Treatmer	Treatment ongoing		ault	Outcome unknown	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.018	0.018	-0.019	-0.014	0.004	-0.002	-0.004	-0.002
	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.057)	(0.055)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Treatment x time	0.059	0.057	-0.086	-0.078	0.027	0.021	0.000	0.000
	(0.079)	(0.082)	(0.068)	(0.070)	(0.043)	(0.046)	(0.015)	(0.014)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	788	788	788	788	788	788	788	788
R squared	0.027	0.069	0.034	0.072	0.033	0.056	0.053	0.083
Mean in control group	0.604	0.604	0.321	0.321	0.065	0.065	0.010	0.010

Panel B: Impact on treatment adherence (source: observation days)

	Adherence 1: Patient came to the center and took or picked up the pill		Adherence 2: Adh. 1 + Relative came to the center and picked up the pill, or patient or relative was given pill during a home visit		Compliance with treatment verified (as per adherence 1)		Compliance with treatment verified (as per adherence 2)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Treatment	0.210	0.203	0.118	0.121	-0.026	-0.021	-0.059	-0.053
	(0.057)***	(0.055)***	(0.057)**	(0.051)**	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.034)*	(0.032)
Treatment x time	-0.058	-0.048	-0.084	-0.081	-0.026	-0.023	-0.050	-0.046
	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.037)**	(0.033)**	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.044)	(0.044)
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	1812	1812	1819	1819	634	634	636	636
R-squared	0.099	0.148	0.124	0.184	0.045	0.117	0.111	0.164
Mean in control group	0.539	0.539	0.710	0.710	0.031	0.031	0.055	0.055

### Panel C: Impact on patient compliance (source: patient surveys)

	Occasionally sent someone else to get the pills		Ever picked up medicine for one week or more during one visit		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Treatment	-0.297	-0.279	-0.160	-0.156	
	(0.069)***	(0.064)***	(0.065)**	(0.065)**	
Treatment x time	-0.101	-0.086	-0.074	-0.065	
	(0.084)	(0.083)	(0.088)	(0.084)	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes		Yes	
Observations	770	770	764	764	
R-squared	0.115	0.165	0.083	0.129	
Mean in control group	0.414	0.414	0.291	0.291	

*Notes:* We use the subsample of verified patients enrolled before the beginning of the experiment. Other notes as in Table A6.

#### Table C1: Health Worker Summary Statistics (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

	Control	Treatment	P-value
	group	group	Treatment
	mean	mean	= Control
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A. Health workers' characteristics			
Male	0.794	0.710	0.394
Age	33.4	30.4	0.081
Caste			
General caste	0.265	0.516	0.051
Other Backward Class	0.382	0.323	0.700
Scheduled Caste	0.118	0.097	0.828
Scheduled Tribe	0.206	0.032	0.031
Minority	0.029	0.032	0.920
Religion			
Hindu	0.765	0.903	0.128
Muslim	0.176	0.097	0.374
Other	0.059	0.000	0.070
Highest education level achieved			
Class 12 and below	0.688	0.633	0.682
Tertiary	0.281	0.333	0.663
Other diploma/non-formal education	0.031	0.033	1.000
Work experience			
Any previous work experience	0.853	0.645	0.036
Number of years of work experience	9.2	8.7	0.753
Any previous working in a job related to TB	0.147	0.161	0.902
Any previous experience in the social/NGO sector	0.206	0.138	0.536
Any other income generating activity, in addition to OpASHA	0.088	0.129	0.742
Lives in one of the areas she covers	0.545	0.742	0.092
Household size	5.2	6.2	0.262
Lives alone	0.000	0.067	0.188
Assets			
Has electricty	1.000	0.933	0.182
Has tap water	0.594	0.400	0.102
Has a television	0.848	0.933	0.218
Has a refrigerator	0.545	0.467	0.530
Rents an apartment or house to a third party	0.118	0.207	0.210
Owns her house	0.559	0.581	0.934
Exposure to technology			
Knows how to use a computer	0.559	0.516	0.731
Knows how to use the internet	0.424	0.433	0.949
Has an email account	0.412	0.258	0.177
Has a social networking account	0.294	0.258	0.660
Days spent in the experiment	349.1	333.7	0.659
Danal P. On ASHA cantor wice data shacts			
runer D. Opasma center-wise unit Sneets Reported baseling number of detections nor month nor area	2 065	2 202	0.054
Reported baseline fraction of defaults per month per area	0.029	0.039	0.426
reported baseline fraction of defaults per month per alea	0.025	0.035	0.420
Panel C. Observation days			
Center open	0.980	0.989	0.515
Total time center was open	307.4	311.8	0.961
Health worker present at the center	0.769	0.810	0.519
Total time health worker was present at the center, net of breaks	110.9	106.0	0.710
Visit by OpAsha	0.067	0.043	0.333
Adherence 1: Patient came to center and took or picked up pill	0.520	0.517	0.956
Adherence 2: Adh. 1 + Relative came to the center and picked up	0.761	0.758	0.837
the pill, or patient or relative was given pill during a home visit			

*Notes* : We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table I.

	Control	Treatment	P-value
	group mean	group mean	Treatment
	Broup mean	Broup mean	- Control
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Male	0.535	0.576	0.562
Δσρ	34 0	34 3	0.800
льс Caste	5-4.0	57.5	0.000
Does not know	0 040	0.026	0 568
General caste	0.160	0.165	0.628
Other Backward Class	0.376	0.352	0.691
Scheduled Caste	0 229	0 297	0.128
Scheduled Tribe	0.118	0.103	0.210
Minority	0.078	0.058	0.590
Religion	0.070	0.000	0.000
Hindu	0.869	0.903	0.626
Muslim	0.112	0.081	0.696
Other	0.019	0.016	0.577
Literacy			
, Cannot read or write	0.271	0.301	0.469
Can read but not write	0.021	0.026	0.930
Can read and write	0.708	0.673	0.424
Education			
Pre-primary	0.217	0.234	0.756
Primary	0.375	0.390	0.568
Secondary	0.367	0.334	0.526
Undergraduate and more	0.042	0.042	0.926
Household size	5.6	5.4	0.191
Lives alone	0.019	0.016	0.566
Assets			
Has electricty	0.968	0.935	0.042
Has tap water	0.520	0.418	0.524
Has a television	0.826	0.832	0.536
Has a refrigerator	0.276	0.230	0.424
Owns her house	0.716	0.738	0.985
Migration status			
Has always lived in the area	0.570	0.542	0.365
Has lived there for more than 6 years	0.209	0.258	0.050
Has lived there for less than 5 years	0.221	0.200	0.490
Is currently working	0.381	0.406	0.801
Time to go to the center (in minutes)	11.6	12.4	0.844
Distance to the center (in miles)	3.3	3.0	0.732

*Notes* : We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table II.

### Table C3: Impact on Treatment Interruption and Adherence (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on treat	ment interrup	otion, or defo	ult (source: po	atient surveys)						
	Treatmen	t complete	Treatmer	nt ongoing	Def	ault	D	ed	Outcome	unknown
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Treatment	-0.003	-0.007	0.022	0.020	-0.018	-0.015	-0.001	0.000	0.000	0.003
P-value	0.957	0.836	0.490	0.535	0.021	0.045	0.808	0.979	1.000	0.802
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802
Mean in control group	0.507	0.507	0.299	0.299	0.073	0.073	0.016	0.016	0.105	0.105
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Panel B: Impact on treat	ment adherei	nce (source: d	observation da	iys)						
	Adher	ence 1:	Adher	ence 2:	Complia	nce with	Complia	nce with		
	Patient ca	me to the	Adh. 1 + Rela	ative came to	treatment	verified (as	treatment	verified (as		
	center ar	nd took or	the center a	nd picked up	per adhe	erence 1)	per adh	erence 2)		
	picked u	p the pill	the pill, or	r patient or						
			relative wa	as given pill						
			during a	home visit						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)		
Treatment	0.139	0.122	0.073	0.056	0.039	0.038	0.024	0.023		
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.035	0.044	0.002	0.000	0.145	0.154		
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
Observations	12844	12844	12810	12810	3041	3041	3043	3043		
Mean in control group	0.542	0.542	0.692	0.692	0.046	0.046	0.078	0.078		
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000		
Panel C: Impact on patie	nt compliance	e (source: pa	tient surveys)							
	Occasior	nally sent	Ever picked	up medicine						
	someone el	se to get the	for one we	ek or more						
	pi	ills	during	one visit						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)						
Treatment	-0.218	-0.218	-0.079	-0.078						
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.002						
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Patient controls		Yes		Yes						
Observations	3352	3352	3295	3295						
Mean in control group	0.367	0.367	0.283	0.283						
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000						

Notes: We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table III.

### Table C4: Impact on Detections and Patient Selection (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on number of verified detections (source: program data cross-checked with patient surveys)										
	Verified det	tections per								
	center p	er month								
	(1)	(2)								
Treatment	-0.103	-0.159	-							
P-value	0.522	0.527								
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes								
Baseline detection	Yes	Yes								
Health worker controls		Yes								
Observations	1637	1637								
Mean in control group	1.762	1.762								
Number replications	5000	5000								

Panel B: Impact on patient selection (patients enrolled after the beginning of the experiment)

	Control	Treatment	P-value	Number of
	group	group	Treatment	obs.
	mean	mean	= Control	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Male	0.586	0.576	0.463	2598
Age	34.4	33.1	0.171	2597
Caste				
Does not know	0.048	0.053	0.879	2602
General caste	0.181	0.179	0.735	2602
Other Backward Class	0.357	0.352	1.000	2602
Scheduled Caste	0.231	0.267	0.200	2602
Scheduled Tribe	0.078	0.070	0.370	2602
Minority	0.104	0.079	0.542	2602
Religion				
Hindu	0.832	0.870	0.376	2594
Muslim	0.147	0.117	0.498	2594
Other	0.021	0.013	0.257	2594
Literacy				
Cannot read or write	0.304	0.294	0.346	2602
Can read but not write	0.043	0.044	0.637	2602
Can read and write	0.653	0.662	0.510	2602
Education				
Pre-primary	0.247	0.226	0.109	2593
Primary	0.371	0.410	0.092	2593
Secondary	0.333	0.325	0.910	2593
Undergraduate and more	0.049	0.039	0.278	2593
Household size	5.5	5.4	0.234	2593
Lives alone	0.025	0.017	0.109	2602
Assets				
Has electricty	0.970	0.966	0.726	2532
Has tap water	0.562	0.544	0.900	2543
Has a television	0.819	0.822	0.700	2460
Has a refrigerator	0.264	0.258	0.804	2459
Owns her house	0.689	0.679	0.730	2538
Migration Status				
Has always lived in the area	0.507	0.457	0.267	2600
Has lived there for more than 6 years	0.227	0.269	0.118	2600
Has lived there for less than 5 years	0.266	0.274	0.849	2600
Is currently working	0.316	0.321	0.449	2388
Time to go to the center (in minutes)	11.0	11.8	0.314	1812
Distance to the center (in miles)	2.9	3.0	0.652	1998

*Notes:* We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table IV.

Panel A: Impact on patie	ents' physical l	nealth (sourc	e: patient sur	veys)								
	Cu	red	Patients' ranking of their		Index of no	difficulty in	Index o	f health	Index of se	vere health	Index of increased	
			he	alth	performin	performing activities		otoms	symptoms		health symptoms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Treatment	0.015	0.012	0.012	-0.010	-0.022	-0.038	-0.008	0.001	-0.035	-0.026	-0.013	-0.011
P-value	0.568	0.645	0.904	0.912	0.484	0.235	0.840	0.976	0.228	0.320	0.528	0.588
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2395	2395	2430	2430	2458	2458	2459	2459	2459	2459	2458	2458
Mean in control group	0.400	0.400	7.431	7.431								
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Panel B: Impact on patie	ents' emotiona	l health (sou	rce: patient s	urveys)								
	Thinks that	t household	Has a projec	ct to improve	Index of	Index of emotional Overall somewhat or		Overall satisfaction with				
	situation wi	ll improve in	their life	their life and their		distress		very happy		their life		
	the f	uture	famil	y's life								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Treatment	0.000	0.002	-0.017	-0.017	0.010	0.010	-0.019	-0.020	-0.082	-0.086		
P-value	0.996	0.922	0.283	0.287	0.747	0.733	0.195	0.174	0.368	0.344		
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
Observations	2077	2077	2375	2375	2454	2454	2435	2435	2426	2426		
Mean in control group	0.890	0.890	0.120	0.120			0.942	0.942	7.259	7.259		
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000		

### Table C5: Impact on Patients' Health (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

*Notes* : We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table V.

Panel A: Impact on health	worker atter	ndance												
	Cente	er open	Total time or	e center was ben	Health wor at the	rker present center	Total tir worker wa the cent bre	ne health is present at ter, net of eaks	Visit by	OpAsha	Cente	r open	Health wor at the	rker present e center
				(	source: obse	ervation days	;)				(s	ource: rand	om spot chec	:ks)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Treatment	0.000	0.001	-10.7	9.2	0.019	0.045	20.2	22.3	0.033	0.030	0.001	0.005	0.049	0.071
P-value	0.794	0.784	0.448	0.605	0.469	0.110	0.033	0.035	0.011	0.028	0.974	0.850	0.322	0.025
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2,749	2,749	2,414	2,414	3,063	3,063	2,987	2,987	2,855	2,855	916	916	916	916
Mean in Control Group	0.998	0.998	338.9	338.9	0.834	0.834	117.3	117.3	0.054	0.054	0.945	0.945	0.598	0.598
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Panel B: Impact on health worker activities # home visits as % of Intensity of default all patients scheduled activities (index)		of default es (index)	Intensity c activitie	Intensity of detection Health worker gives activities (index) advice related to TB			Frequ interact health	ency of ions with worker	Health worker supports patient during treatment		Health worker sometimes or often delivers pills at			
	(source: o	bservation	(so	urce: health	worker surv	eys)				(source: patient surveys)		)	patient's home	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Treatment	0.037	0.049	0.031	-0.103	-0.065	-0.071	0.014	0.014	-0.051	-0.045	-0.003	-0.004	0.073	0.087
P-value	0.123	0.150	0.662	0.354	0.281	0.352	0.473	0.456	0.483	0.515	0.937	0.911	0.114	0.030
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes								
Baseline control			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Patient controls								Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2341	2341	134	134	134	134	3280	3280	3193	3193	3293	3293	3295	3295
Mean in control group	0.115	0.115					0.894	0.894	1.749	1.749	0.213	0.213	0.454	0.454
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000

### Table C6: Impact on Health Worker Effort (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

*Notes:* We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table VI.

	Actual likeliho	ood to default	Defaults as re	eported in the	Default as reported in the government registers (source: government registers		
	(source: nat	ient surveys)		iii uala			
	(300/02. put)	(2)	(3) $(4)$		(Source: govern	(6)	
Treatment	-0.018	-0.015	0.000	0.001	0.000	0,000	
P-value	0.021	0.045	0.992	0.936	0.969	0.946	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes				Yes	
Baseline outcome			Yes	Yes			
Health worker controls				Yes			
Observations	2802	2802	1832	1832	2913	2913	
Mean in control group	0.073	0.073	0.045	0.045	0.021	0.021	
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	
Test: Treatment = Treatment(1) (or (2))							
P-value			0.159	0.168	0.109	0.142	
F-statistic							

### Table C7: Impact on Quality of Reporting on Default (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

*Notes:* We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Unlike in Table VII, we cannot compare treatment effects on actual likelihood to default and on default as reported in the program data and in the government registers using a seemingly unrelated regressions framework as the covariance matrix stored by the cgmwildboot Stata command cannot be used in any post-estimation inference (see the Stata help file for cgmwildboot). Other notes as in Table VII.

### Table C8: Impact on Quality of Reporting on Patient Detection (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on number of veri	ified and reported detectior	าร		
	Verified o	letections	Reported	detections
	(source: program of with paties)	data cross-checked nt surveys)	(source: pro	gram data)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	-0.103	-0.159	-0.744	-0.795
P-value	0.522	0.527	0.012	0.019
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Baseline outcome	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes
Observations	1637	1637	1832	1832
Mean in control group	1.762	1.762	3.730	3.730
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000
Test: Treatment = Treatment(1) (c	or (2))			
P-value			0.006	0.042
F-statistic				

#### Panel B: Impact on survey outcomes, individual level (sources: program data, patient surveys)

	Patient verified (found and surveyed)	Survey not completed: Patient refused to answer	Survey not completed: Patient not found	Survey not completed: Health worker warning	Survey not completed: Patient death	Survey not completed: Other reasons
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.058	-0.020	-0.011	-0.015	-0.004	-0.008
P-value	0.043	0.010	0.554	0.189	0.621	0.493
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3647	3647	3647	3647	3647	3647
Mean in control group	0.685	0.068	0.106	0.059	0.031	0.049
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000

Panel C. Impact on the fraction of patients reported in the government registers which are verified (sources: government registers, patient surveys)

	Fraction of verified
	patients
	(1)
Treatment	0.075
P-value	0.020
Strata fixed effects	Yes
Observations	2998
Mean in control group	0.697
Number replications	5000

*Notes:* We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Unlike in Table VIII, we cannot compare treatment effects on the number of verified detections and reported detections using a seemingly unrelated regressions framework as the covariance matrix stored by the cgmwildboot Stata command cannot be used in any post-estimation inference (see the Stata help file for cgmwildboot). Other notes as in Table VIII.

### Table C9: Sustainability of the Intervention (Wild Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on health	worker salary	and satisfacti	ion										
	Monthly compensation		Month	Monthly salary		# of challenges faced in # of challenges faced		# of challenges faced in		Excessive workload		Standardized job	
	for detection	on activities			getting a complete cou	ing a patient to detecting patients satis plete treatment course					satisfact	ion index	
	(source: salary data from OpAsha)					(source: health worker surveys)							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	
Treatment	-324.3	-224.9	-428.5	-341.1	-0.220	-0.238	0.013	-0.167	-0.105	-0.199	0.123	0.140	
P-value	0.009	0.074	0.019	0.148	0.211	0.255	0.941	0.465	0.077	0.005	0.231	0.302	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Baseline control					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Observations	693	693	936	936	121	121	117	117	118	118	132	132	
Mean in control group	1321	1321	5791	5791	3.309	3.309	2.746	2.746	0.222	0.222			
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	

Panel B: Impact on patients	' satisfaction	with healthc	are received				
	Satisfied	with their	Would r	efer a TB	# of challenges faced by		
	interaction	n with their	suspect to	an OpAsha	patients to complete		
	health	worker	health	worker	treatment course		
		(source: pati	ent surveys)		(source: he	alth worker	
					surv	eys)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Treatment	0.005	0.003	0.034	0.033	-0.053	-0.212	
P-value	0.704	0.796	0.164	0.169	0.693	0.435	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes		Yes			
Health worker controls						Yes	
Baseline control					Yes	Yes	
Observations	2378	2378	2441	2441	119	119	
Mean in control group	0.957	0.957	0.178	0.178	2.500	2.500	
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	

Panel C. Technology presence over time (source: observation days)										
	Center has biometric equipment		Share of a (fingerpri laptop, pre	all devices nt reader, USB key) sent	Share of all devices (fingerprint reader, laptop, USB key) present and working					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)				
# weeks since beginning	-0.002	-0.002	-0.006	-0.006	-0.006	-0.006				
of the experiment	0.088	0.152	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000				
Center fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes				
Observations	1414	1414	1403	1403	1398	1398				
Mean in first month	0.921	0.921	0.909	0.909	0.899	0.899				
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000				

Notes: We use the wild cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Cameron, Colin, Gelbach, and Miller (2008) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table IX.

### Appendix D. Pairs Cluster Bootstrap Standard Errors

### Table D1: Health Worker Summary Statistics (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

	Control	Treatment	P-value
	group	group	Treatment
	mean	mean	= Control
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A. Health workers' characteristics			
Male	0.794	0.710	0.455
Age	33.4	30.4	0.108
Caste			
General caste	0.265	0.516	0.069
Other Backward Class	0.382	0.323	0.823
Scheduled Caste	0.118	0.097	0.976
Scheduled Tribe	0.206	0.032	0.048
Minority	0.029	0.032	1.108
Religion			
Hindu	0.765	0.903	0.163
Muslim	0.176	0.097	0.464
Other	0.059	0.000	0.157
Highest education level achieved	0.000		0.704
Class 12 and below	0.688	0.633	0.784
Tertiary	0.281	0.333	0.778
Other diploma/non-formal education	0.031	0.033	1.143
Work experience	0.050	0.045	
Any previous work experience	0.853	0.645	0.049
Number of years of work experience	9.2	8.7	0.891
Any previous working in a job related to TB	0.147	0.161	1.051
Any previous experience in the social/NGO sector	0.206	0.138	0.614
Any other income generating activity, in addition to OpASHA	0.088	0.129	0.874
Lives in one of the areas she covers	0.545	0.742	0.103
	5.2	0.067	0.327
Lives alone	0.000	0.067	0.130
Assets	1 000	0 0 2 2	0 1 1 2
Has ten water	1.000	0.955	0.112
Has a tolovicion	0.594	0.400	0.127
Has a refrigerator	0.040	0.955	0.237
Ponts an anartment or bouse to a third party	0.345	0.407	0.013
Nents an apartment of house to a third party	0.110	0.207	1 106
Exposure to technology	0.555	0.501	1.100
Knows how to use a computer	0 559	0 516	0.839
Knows how to use the internet	0.333	0.310	1 1 2 7
Has an email account	0.412	0.155	0.195
Has a social networking account	0.294	0.258	0.752
Days spent in the experiment	349.1	333.7	0.772
bujs spent in the experiment	515.1	555.7	0.772
Panel B. OpASHA center-wise data sheets			
Reported baseline number of detections per month per area	2.965	2.393	0.075
Reported baseline fraction of defaults per month per area	0.029	0.039	0.513
······································			
Panel C. Observation days			
Center open	0.980	0.989	0.611
Total time center was open	307.4	311.8	1.117
Health worker present at the center	0.769	0.810	0.618
Total time health worker was present at the center, net of breaks	110.9	106.0	0.819
Visit by OpAsha	0.067	0.043	0.399
Adherence 1: Patient came to center and took or picked up pill	0.520	0.517	1.124
Adherence 2: Adh. 1 + Relative came to the center and picked up	0.761	0.758	0.982
the pill, or patient or relative was given pill during a home visit			

*Notes* : We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table I.

	Caustinal	<b>T</b>	Duralura
	Control	Treatment	P-value
	group mean	group mean	Treatment
		(2)	= Control
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Male	0.535	0.576	0.640
Age	34.0	34.3	0.940
Caste			
Does not know	0.040	0.026	0.642
General caste	0.160	0.165	0.717
Other Backward Class	0.376	0.352	0.768
Scheduled Caste	0.229	0.297	0.142
Scheduled Tribe	0.118	0.103	0.256
Minority	0.078	0.058	0.703
Religion			
Hindu	0.869	0.903	0.689
Muslim	0.112	0.081	0.774
Other	0.019	0.016	0.658
Literacy			
Cannot read or write	0.271	0.301	0.542
Can read but not write	0.021	0.026	1.034
Can read and write	0.708	0.673	0.494
Education			
Pre-primary	0.217	0.234	0.888
Primary	0.375	0.390	0.647
Secondary	0.367	0.334	0.612
Undergraduate and more	0.042	0.042	1.061
Household size	5.6	5.4	0.245
Lives alone	0.019	0.016	0.649
Assets			
Has electricty	0.968	0.935	0.151
Has tap water	0.520	0.418	0.638
Has a television	0.826	0.832	0.602
Has a refrigerator	0.276	0.230	0.551
Owns her house	0.716	0.738	1.120
Migration status	0.7.20	01100	0
Has always lived in the area	0 570	0 542	0 426
Has lived there for more than 6 years	0 209	0.258	0.066
Has lived there for less than 5 years	0.205	0.200	0.555
Is surrently working	0.221	0.200	0.000
	0.381	0.406	0.929
Time to go to the center (in minutes)	11.6	12.4	0.983
Distance to the center (in miles)	3.3	3.0	0.842

*Notes* : We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table II.

### Table D3: Impact on Treatment Interruption and Adherence (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on treat	tment interrup	otion, or defa	ult (source: po	atient surveys)						
	Treatmen	t complete	Treatmer	nt ongoing	Def	ault	Di	ied	Outcome	unknown
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Treatment	-0.003	-0.007	0.022	0.020	-0.018	-0.015	-0.001	0.000	0.000	0.003
P-value	0.948	0.846	0.510	0.560	0.037	0.068	0.815	0.988	0.993	0.807
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802	2802
Mean in control group	0.507	0.507	0.299	0.299	0.073	0.073	0.016	0.016	0.105	0.105
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Panel B: Impact on treat	tment adherer	nce (source: c	bservation da	iys)						
	Adher	ence 1:	Adher	ence 2:	Complia	nce with	Complia	nce with		
	Patient ca	ame to the	Adh. 1 + Rela	ative came to	treatment	verified (as	treatment	verified (as		
	center ar	nd took or	the center a	nd picked up	per adhe	erence 1)	per adhe	erence 2)		
	picked u	p the pill	the pill, or	r patient or						
			relative wa	as given pill						
			during a	home visit						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)		
Treatment	0.139	0.122	0.073	0.056	0.039	0.038	0.024	0.023		
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.062	0.002	0.002	0.145	0.159		
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
Observations	12844	12844	12810	12810	3041	3041	3043	3043		
Mean in control group	0.542	0.542	0.692	0.692	0.046	0.046	0.078	0.078		
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000		
Panel C: Impact on patie	ent compliance	e (source: pa	tient surveys)							
	Occasior	nally sent	Ever picked	up medicine						
	someone el	se to get the	for one we	ek or more						
	pi	ills	during	one visit						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)						
Treatment	-0.218	-0.218	-0.079	-0.078						
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.005						
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
Patient controls		Yes		Yes						
Observations	3352	3352	3295	3295						
Mean in control group	0.367	0.367	0.283	0.283						

Notes: We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table III.

5000

Number replications

5000

5000

5000

### Table D4: Impact on Detections and Patient Selection (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

with patient surveys)

Panel A: Impact on number of verified detections (source: program data cross-checkea										
Verified detections per										
	center pe	center per month								
	(1)	(2)								
Treatment	-0.103	-0.159								
P-value	0.514	0.551								
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes								
Baseline detection	Yes	Yes								
Health worker controls		Yes								
Observations	1637	1637								
Mean in control group	1.762	1.762								
Number replications	5000	5000								

Panel B: Impact on patient selection (patients enrolled after the beginning of the experiment)

	Control	Treatment	P-value	Number of
	group	group	Treatment	obs.
	mean	mean	= Control	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Male	0.586	0.576	0.475	2598
Age	34.4	33.1	0.168	2597
Caste				
Does not know	0.048	0.053	0.874	2602
General caste	0.181	0.179	0.747	2602
Other Backward Class	0.357	0.352	0.997	2602
Scheduled Caste	0.231	0.267	0.207	2602
Scheduled Tribe	0.078	0.070	0.367	2602
Minority	0.104	0.079	0.505	2602
Religion				
Hindu	0.832	0.870	0.405	2594
Muslim	0.147	0.117	0.523	2594
Other	0.021	0.013	0.269	2594
Literacy				
Cannot read or write	0.304	0.294	0.381	2602
Can read but not write	0.043	0.044	0.652	2602
Can read and write	0.653	0.662	0.527	2602
Education				
Pre-primary	0.247	0.226	0.138	2593
Primary	0.371	0.410	0.094	2593
Secondary	0.333	0.325	0.923	2593
Undergraduate and more	0.049	0.039	0.313	2593
Household size	5.5	5.4	0.224	2593
Lives alone	0.025	0.017	0.106	2602
Assets				
Has electricty	0.970	0.966	0.739	2532
Has tap water	0.562	0.544	0.909	2543
Has a television	0.819	0.822	0.696	2460
Has a refrigerator	0.264	0.258	0.794	2459
Owns her house	0.689	0.679	0.741	2538
Migration Status				
Has always lived in the area	0.507	0.457	0.305	2600
Has lived there for more than 6 years	0.227	0.269	0.145	2600
Has lived there for less than 5 years	0.266	0.274	0.869	2600
Is currently working	0.316	0.321	0.467	2388
Time to go to the center (in minutes)	11.0	11.8	0.330	1812
Distance to the center (in miles)	2.9	3.0	0.651	1998

*Notes:* We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table IV.

Panel A: Impact on patie	ents' physical l	health (sourc	e: patient sur	veys)								
	Cured Patients' ra		Patients' ranking of their Index of		Index of no	difficulty in	Index o	f health	Index of se	vere health	Index of	increased
			he	alth	performing activities		symptoms		symptoms		health symptoms	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Treatment	0.015	0.012	0.012	-0.010	-0.022	-0.038	-0.008	0.001	-0.035	-0.026	-0.013	-0.011
P-value	0.605	0.663	0.912	0.922	0.491	0.247	0.832	0.984	0.233	0.344	0.523	0.601
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2395	2395	2430	2430	2458	2458	2459	2459	2459	2459	2458	2458
Mean in control group	0.400	0.400	7.431	7.431								
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Panel B: Impact on patie	nts' emotiona	l health (sou	rce: patient s	urveys)								
	Thinks that	t household	Has a projec	t to improve	Index of	emotional	Overall somewhat or		Overall satisfaction with			
	situation wi	ll improve in	their life and their		distress		very happy		their life			
	the f	uture	famil	y's life								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Treatment	0.000	0.002	-0.017	-0.017	0.010	0.010	-0.019	-0.020	-0.082	-0.086		
P-value	0.985	0.903	0.294	0.301	0.755	0.742	0.195	0.183	0.365	0.346		
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Patient controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		
Observations	2077	2077	2375	2375	2454	2454	2435	2435	2426	2426		
Mean in control group	0.890	0.890	0.120	0.120			0.942	0.942	7.259	7.259		
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000		

### Table D5: Impact on Patients' Health (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

*Notes* : We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table V.

Panel A: Impact on health	worker atter	ndance												
	Center open		Total time or	center was Den	Health wor at the	rker present center	Total tir worker wa the cent bre	ne health s present at er, net of eaks	Visit by	OpAsha	Cente	r open	Health woi at the	rker present center
				(source: observation days)							(se	ource: rand	om spot chec	ks)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Treatment	0.000	0.001	-10.7	9.2	0.019	0.045	20.2	22.3	0.033	0.030	0.001	0.005	0.049	0.071
P-value	0.929	0.806	0.515	0.631	0.533	0.145	0.044	0.054	0.020	0.047	1.128	0.851	0.403	0.068
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2,749	2,749	2,414	2,414	3,063	3,063	2,987	2,987	2,855	2,855	916	916	916	916
Mean in Control Group	0.998	0.998	338.9	338.9	0.834	0.834	117.3	117.3	0.054	0.054	0.945	0.945	0.598	0.598
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
Panel B: Impact on health worker activities # home visits as % of all patients scheduled		Intensity activitie	of default es (index)	Intensity c activitie	of detection es (index)	Health we advice re	orker gives lated to TB	Freque interact	ency of ions with	Health support	worker s patient	Health sometime	worker es or often	
	(source: o	hservation	(so	urce: health	worker surv	evs)			nearth	(source: nat	patien		's home	
	da	ivs)	100			-,-,				(000.00. pat		,		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Treatment	0.037	0.049	0.031	-0.103	-0.065	-0.071	0.014	0.014	-0.051	-0.045	-0.003	-0.004	0.073	0.087
P-value	0.178	0.189	0.678	0.420	0.292	0.395	0.470	0.454	0.514	0.538	0.948	0.926	0.121	0.036
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes								
Baseline control			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Patient controls								Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	2341	2341	134	134	134	134	3280	3280	3193	3193	3293	3293	3295	3295
Mean in control group	0.115	0.115					0.894	0.894	1.749	1.749	0.213	0.213	0.454	0.454
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000

#### Table D6: Impact on Health Worker Effort (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

*Notes:* We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table VI.

	Actual likeliho	ood to default	Defaults as re progra	eported in the m data	Default as reported in the government registers		
	(source: patient surveys)		(source: pro	gram data)	(source: government registers)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Treatment	-0.018	-0.015	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	
P-value	0.037	0.068	1.001	0.911	0.954	0.973	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes				Yes	
Baseline outcome			Yes	Yes			
Health worker controls				Yes			
Observations	2802	2802	1832	1832	2913	2913	
Mean in control group	0.073	0.073	0.045	0.045	0.021	0.021	
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	
Test: Treatment = Treatment(1) (or (2))							
P-value			0.191	0.229	0.115	0.141	
F-statistic							

### Table D7: Impact on Quality of Reporting on Default (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

*Notes:* We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Unlike in Table VII, we cannot compare treatment effects on actual likelihood to default and on default as reported in the program data and in the government registers using a seemingly unrelated regressions framework as the covariance matrix stored by the clusterbs Stata command cannot be used in any postestimation inference (see the Stata help file for clusterbs). Other notes as in Table VII.

### Table D8: Impact on Quality of Reporting on Patient Detection (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on number of verij	fied and reported detectior	15			
	Verified o	letections	Reported detections		
	(source: program d	data cross-checked	(	anama datal	
	with patie	nt surveys)	(source: program data)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Treatment	-0.103	-0.159	-0.744	-0.795	
P-value	0.514	0.551	0.008	0.032	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Baseline outcome	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes	
Observations	1637	1637	1832	1832	
Mean in control group	1.762	1.762	3.730	3.730	
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	
Test: Treatment = Treatment(1) (o	r (2))				
P-value			0.012	0.057	
F-statistic					

#### Panel B: Impact on survey outcomes, individual level (sources: program data, patient surveys)

	Patient verified (found and surveyed)	Survey not completed: Patient refused to answer	Survey not completed: Patient not found	Survey not completed: Health worker warning	Survey not completed: Patient death	Survey not completed: Other reasons
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Treatment	0.058	-0.020	-0.011	-0.015	-0.004	-0.008
P-value	0.049	0.014	0.541	0.203	0.634	0.493
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3647	3647	3647	3647	3647	3647
Mean in control group	0.685	0.068	0.106	0.059	0.031	0.049
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000

Panel C. Impact on the fraction of patients reported in the government registers which are verified (sources: government registers, patient surveys)

	Fraction of verified
	patients
	(1)
Treatment	0.075
P-value	0.030
Strata fixed effects	Yes
Observations	2998
Mean in control group	0.697
Number replications	5000

*Notes:* We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Unlike in Table VIII, we cannot compare treatment effects on the number of verified detections and reported detections using a seemingly unrelated regressions framework as the covariance matrix stored by the clusterbs Stata command cannot be used in any post-estimation inference (see the Stata help file for clusterbs). Other notes as in Table VIII.

### Table D9: Sustainability of the Intervention (Pairs Cluster Bootstrap)

Panel A: Impact on health	worker salary	and satisfacti	on									
	Monthly co	mpensation	Month	y salary	# of challen	ges faced in	# of challen	ges faced in	Excessive	workload	Standar	dized job
	for detection activities get con			getting a complete cou	getting a patient to detecting patients complete treatment course					satisfaction index		
	(source: salary data from OpAsha)					(source: health worker surveys)						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Treatment	-324.3	-224.9	-428.5	-341.1	-0.220	-0.238	0.013	-0.167	-0.105	-0.199	0.123	0.140
P-value	0.016	0.138	0.024	0.199	0.225	0.302	0.943	0.521	0.106	0.033	0.221	0.328
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Baseline control					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	693	693	936	936	121	121	117	117	118	118	132	132
Mean in control group	1321	1321	5791	5791	3.309	3.309	2.746	2.746	0.222	0.222		
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000

Panel B: Impact on patients	' satisfaction	with healthc	are received:				
	Satisfied interactior	with their n with their	Would r suspect to	efer a TB an OpAsha	# of challenges faced by patients to complete		
	health worker		health	worker	treatment course		
		(source: pati	ient surveys)		(source: health worker		
			surveys)				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Treatment	0.005	0.003	0.034	0.033	-0.053	-0.212	
P-value	0.735	0.818	0.177	0.182	0.728	0.496	
Strata fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Patient controls		Yes		Yes			
Health worker controls						Yes	
Baseline control					Yes	Yes	
Observations	2378	2378	2441	2441	119	119	
Mean in control group	0.957	0.957	0.178	0.178	2.500	2.500	
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	

Panel C. Technology preser	nce over time	(source: obse	rvation days	5)		
	Center has equip	s biometric oment	Share of all devices (fingerprint reader, laptop, USB key) present		Share of all devices (fingerprint reader, laptop, USB key) present and working	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
# weeks since beginning	-0.002	-0.002	-0.006	-0.006	-0.006	-0.006
of the experiment	0.103	0.153	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001
Center fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health worker controls		Yes		Yes		Yes
Observations	1414	1414	1403	1403	1398	1398
Mean in first month	0.921	0.921	0.909	0.909	0.899	0.899
Number replications	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000

*Notes:* We use the pairs cluster bootstrap procedure proposed by Esarey and Menger (2019) to allow for correlation of the error terms at the level of the cluster and report the corresponding p-value. We use 5,000 bootstrap iterations. Other notes as in Table IX.