

1 **Epidemiology of leprosy identified through active case detection in six districts of Nepal**

2 **Ram Kumar Mahato<sup>1\*</sup>, Uttam Ghimire<sup>1</sup>, Madhav Lamsal<sup>1</sup>, Bijay Bajracharya<sup>2</sup>, Mukesh**  
3 **Poudel<sup>1</sup>, Prashanna Naapit<sup>3</sup>, Krishna Lama<sup>4</sup>, Gokarna Dahal<sup>1</sup>, David TS Hayman<sup>5</sup>, Ajit**  
4 **Kumar Karna<sup>6</sup>, Basudev Pandey<sup>7</sup>, Chuman Lal Das<sup>1</sup>, Krishna Prasad Paudel<sup>1\*</sup>**

5 **Affiliations:**

6 <sup>1</sup> Epidemiology and Disease Control Division, Department of Health Services, Ministry of  
7 Health and Population, Kathmandu, Nepal

8 <sup>2</sup> Epidemiology and Disease Control Division- Malaria Program Management Unit- SCI-GF,  
9 Nepal

10 <sup>3</sup> Nepal Academy of Medical Sciences, Kathmandu, Nepal

11 <sup>4</sup> Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital & Service center, Nepal Leprosy Trust, Lalgadh, Nepal

12 <sup>5</sup> Molecular Epidemiology and Public Health Laboratory, Infectious Disease Research Centre,  
13 Hopkirk Research Institute, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

14 <sup>6</sup> Center for Health and Disease Studies-Nepal, Kathmandu, Nepal

15 <sup>7</sup> DEJIMA Infectious Disease Research Alliance, Nagasaki University, 1-12-4, Sakamoto,  
16 Nagasaki, Japan

17

18 **\*Corresponding author**

19 [kpkalyan@gmail.com](mailto:kpkalyan@gmail.com)

20 [mahatoram811@gmail.com](mailto:mahatoram811@gmail.com)

21

22

## 23 **Abstract**

### 24 **Background**

25 Nepal has achieved and sustained elimination of leprosy as a public health problem since 2009,  
26 but 17 districts and 3 provinces have yet to eliminate the disease. Pediatric cases and grade-2  
27 disabilities (G2D) indicate recent transmission and late diagnosis respectively, which necessitate  
28 active and early case detection. This operational research was performed to identify approaches  
29 best suited for early case detection, determine community-based leprosy epidemiology, and  
30 identify hidden leprosy cases early and respond with prompt treatment.

### 31 **Methods**

32 Active case detection was performed by: house-to-house visits among vulnerable populations  
33 ( $n=26,469$ ), contact examination and tracing ( $n=7,608$ ) and screening prison populations  
34 ( $n=4,428$ ) in Siraha, Bardiya, Rautahat, Banke, Lalitpur and Kathmandu districts of Nepal.

### 35 **Results**

36 New case detection rates were highest for contact tracing (250), followed by house-to-house  
37 visits (102) and prison screening (45) per 100,000 population screened. However, cost per case  
38 identified was cheapest for house-to-house visits (Nepalese rupee (NPR) 76,500/case), then  
39 contact tracing (NPR90,286/case) and prison screening (NPR298,300/case). House-to-house and  
40 contact tracing case paucibacillary/multibacillary (PB:MB) ratios were 59:41 and 68:32;  
41 female/male ratios 63:37 and 57:43; pediatric cases 11% in both approaches; and G2D 11% and

42 5% respectively. Developing leprosy was similar among household and neighbor contacts (Odds  
43 ratios ( $OR$ )=1.4, 95% confidence interval (CI), 0.24-5.85) and for contacts of MB versus PB  
44 cases ( $OR$ =0.7, 0.26-2.0). Attack rates were similar among household contacts of MB cases  
45 (0.32%, 0.07-0.94%) and PB cases (0.13%, 0.03-0.73) and neighbor contacts of MB cases  
46 (0.23%, 0.1-0.46) and PB cases (0.48%, 0.19-0.98). BCG vaccination with scar presence had a  
47 significant protective effect against leprosy ( $OR$ =0.42, 0.22-0.81).

## 48 **Conclusions**

49 The most effective case identification approach here is contact tracing, followed by house-to-  
50 house visits in vulnerable populations and screening in prisons, though house-to-house visits  
51 were cheaper. The findings suggest hidden cases, recent transmission, and late diagnosis in the  
52 community exist and highlight the importance of early case detection.

53 **Keywords:** Early case detection, community-based leprosy epidemiology, hidden leprosy cases,  
54 new case detection rates, attack rate, cost per case identified

55

## 56 **Introduction**

57 Leprosy is a contagious, but low pathogenic and chronic infectious disease caused by  
58 *Mycobacterium leprae*. *Mycobacterium leprae* mainly affects peripheral nerves and skin, which  
59 results in progressive physical, psychological and social disability in some cases (1,2). Disability  
60 affects the social and working life of infected people; social stigma is a significant consequence  
61 of leprosy. The first and prime objective of leprosy control programs is to focus on early case  
62 detection so treatment can begin as early as possible after symptoms appear and disability is  
63 prevented (3). In 2019, 202,256 new leprosy cases were reported from 118 countries (26.0 per  
64 million population), in which 16 countries reported more than 1,000 new cases; the World Health  
65 Organization (WHO) South-East Asia Region (SEAR) accounted for 71% of the cases. The new  
66 (0.23/10000 population) and child (7.4%) cases, grade 2 disability (G2D, 5.4%) and female  
67 (39%) case proportions in 2019 indicate ongoing transmission, late diagnosis and under reported  
68 cases in females (4,5).

69 Nepal has maintained leprosy elimination as a public health problem level at the country level  
70 from 2009. However, in 2018, Nepal still reported more than 3,200 cases with a registered  
71 prevalence of 0.99/10,000 population. Seventeen districts and 3 provinces have a registered  
72 leprosy prevalence of >1/10,000 population, with Madhesh Province (40%) and Lumbini  
73 Province (18%) accounting for most cases. The proportion of child, female and G2D cases in  
74 Nepal in 2018 were 7.92%, 42% and 4.75% (6). The pediatric cases indicate recent transmission,  
75 lower female proportions indicate underreporting, and G2Ds suggest late diagnosis, all  
76 threatening the elimination status that Nepal achieved in 2009.

77 The WHO Global Leprosy Strategy 2016–2020 launched in 2016 envisioned accelerated action  
78 towards a leprosy-free world. The indicators for this vision were zero children diagnosed with

79 leprosy and visible deformities, the rate of newly diagnosed leprosy patients with visible  
80 deformities <1 per million, and no countries with legislation allowing discrimination on the basis  
81 of leprosy. The promotion of voluntary self-reporting is crucial to case detection and for  
82 achieving the desired target. The Global Leprosy Strategy 2016–2020 also recommends targeting  
83 high-risk and vulnerable groups with increasing active case detection (7). Active case detection  
84 is a more effective strategy which enables early diagnosis and treatment and prevents disability  
85 and potentially the spread of infection (8,9).

86 Differing approaches are available for different at-risk populations. House-to-house visits of  
87 high-risk and vulnerable populations, such as Dalit, Mushhar and other marginalized  
88 communities in Nepal, could identify hidden cases that might transmit the disease in favorable  
89 conditions. Contact tracing is a recognized form of undertaking active case detection in a group  
90 which is significantly more likely to have leprosy than the general population in high- and low-  
91 endemic disease burden countries. Among different types of contacts, household contacts  
92 reportedly have 3.5 times greater likelihood of having leprosy than social contacts and almost  
93 double that of neighbors; however, even social contacts are 2.5 to 3 times more likely to have  
94 leprosy than the general population (10). Studies suggest the most susceptible populations  
95 include family contacts of multibacillary (MB) cases, followed by neighboring contacts and the  
96 contacts of paucibacillary (PB) cases (11). However, overcrowding within prisons also makes the  
97 prison environment conducive for disease spread. Poor diet, lack of hygiene and physical  
98 inactivity are enabling factors and hence prisoners are more at risk of transmission compared to  
99 general population (12,13). Finally, BCG vaccination, the attenuated *Bacillus Calmette-Guérin*  
100 strain of the related *Mycobacterium bovis* bacteria, also reduces leprosy transmission (14,15).

101 Here, we use three active case detection methods: 1) house-to-house visits of high-risk and  
102 vulnerable populations in Nepali districts with leprosy public health problems; 2) house-to-house  
103 visits and examination of contacts of leprosy cases identified between 2-5 years ago; and 3)  
104 examination of prisoners to identify early cases in a cross-sectional study. The study also  
105 assessed the cost effectiveness of methods to identify active cases and measures of association to  
106 highlight key epidemiological features of leprosy in risk areas relevant for control.

## 107 **Methods**

108 The general study objective is to determine the epidemiology of leprosy with its protective and  
109 risk factors through active and early case detection approach using three active case detection  
110 approaches.

111 *Approach 1.* House-to-house visits in communities with high-risk groups and vulnerable  
112 populations, such as marginalized habitants of Dalit, Mushhar, and Chamar groups, were  
113 undertaken in Rautahat District of Madhesh Province and Banke District of Lumbini Province. In  
114 Rautahat, four rural municipalities (Palika): Dewahi Gonahi, Rajpur, Ishnath and Rajdevi were  
115 selected in close coordination with district health authorities. These municipalities were  
116 considered to have inhabitants from more vulnerable populations. From the four municipalities,  
117 24 sites (wards) covered by 24 health facilities were selected. The same process was followed in  
118 Banke, where 27 sites (wards) covered by 27 health facilities from four municipalities, Baijnath,  
119 Narainapur, Janaki and Nepalgunj, were selected. A total of 60 to 100 households with  
120 inhabitants of marginalized people living in overcrowded houses made of soil or mud, which  
121 favored leprosy transmission, were used for the census. Trained local health workers and local  
122 female community health volunteers (FCHV) visited the selected sites and performed house-to-  
123 house visits, examining all the members present in the household for any signs of leprosy. In

124 total 13,420 and 13,049 individuals were examined respectively in Rautahat and Banke (Table  
125 S1). Local trained health workers examined male and FCHV examined female individuals  
126 present in the household. Simultaneously, demographic, and epidemiological variables were  
127 collected by the trained local health worker.

128 Members of the households were informed 2 days before the survey and asked to be present at  
129 their own household at the time of the survey via the local FCHV. All suspected cases identified  
130 by local health workers and FCHV were invited to health facilities and cases confirmed by a  
131 dermatologist. After diagnosis confirmation, leprosy cases were treated as per the national  
132 protocol.

133 *Approach 2.* Household and neighboring contacts of previously identified confirmed leprosy  
134 cases in the previous 2-5 years were examined in Siraha district of Madhesh Province and  
135 Bardiya of Lumbini Province by trained local health workers. The cases diagnosed between  
136 recent 2-5 years in the respective districts were selected randomly in planning meetings  
137 conducted before the implementation of field work. Local trained health workers and FCHVs  
138 examined 106 and 177 confirmed leprosy case contacts correspondingly in Siraha and Bardiya.  
139 A total of 7608 contacts were screened during the case-contact survey (Table 1).

140 Table 1. Leprosy cases and their contacts screened during a case-contact survey

District	Total index cases	Clinical disease	Index cases	Household contacts*	Neighboring contacts**	Total screened population
Siraha	106	MB	53	327	1353	3170
		PB	53	372	118	
Bardiya	177	MB	107	599	2102	4438

		PB	70	2102	1352	
Total						7608

141 \*Household contacts comprised all members >2 years old residing in the index case household.

142 \*\*Neighboring contacts comprised all individuals >2 years old residing in the nearest 4-6  
143 neighboring houses of index case.

144 *Approach 3.* Siraha ( $n=449$ ), Rautahat ( $n=360$ ), Banke ( $n=826$ ), Bardiya ( $n=319$ ), Lalitpur  
145 ( $n=251$ ) and Kathamandu ( $n=2223$ ) prisons were used as screening sites for active case  
146 detection using convenience sampling among 4428 prisoners to assess the transmission status of  
147 leprosy in prisons. The prisoner population comprised 4229 males and 199 females.

148 The whole study was carried out between October 2020 and December 2021. Except for the  
149 prison population genders, age and gender were only recorded for cases identified.

#### 150 **Informed consent**

151 In all approaches, participants were requested to give verbal informed consent. As this study was  
152 part of regular surveillance of epidemiology and disease control division (EDCD), written  
153 informed consent was not taken. Approval for data publication was obtained from EDCD and  
154 exemption from ethical review (347/2022) was obtained from ethical board of Nepal Health  
155 Research council.

#### 156 **Statistical analysis**

157 Data collected on paper-based questionnaires, developed by the Leprosy Control and Disability  
158 Management Section (LCDMS)/EDCD, were entered in Excel® spreadsheets. Consistency was  
159 checked and data analysis done in IBM SPSS statistics 22 and R version 4.2.0. New case



160 detection rate, attack rate (AR) with respect to different demographic variables and types of  
161 leprosy cases were calculated with 95% confidence intervals (CI) when appropriate, e.g., using  
162 binomial models for the attack rates. Chi-squared tests ( $\chi^2$ ) and odds ratio (OR) with 95% CIs  
163 were calculated for associations between attack rates with respect to different demographic  
164 variables and between BCG scar presence and leprosy. To adjust for screened population at risk  
165 and index cases present in the case-contact survey, we use simple Poisson regression with an  
166 offset for index cases in the population present to assess risk (16), where:

$$\log(E(\text{new cases}_i)) = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{district}}x_i + \log(\text{index cases}_i * \text{population screened}_i)$$

167 We also simply offset this with population alone, where the offset was  
168  $\log(\text{population screened}_i)$  to test the sensitivity of results to this assumption.

## 169 **Cost analyses**

170 The costs for each approach were calculated and comprised expenses related to training,  
171 orientation, health worker per diems, dermatologist's fees, expenses for monitoring and  
172 supervision and data management. The total cost was divided by total number of patients  
173 identified or diagnosed by the approach and derived per unit cost for leprosy case identified.  
174 Finally, for discussion, we converted costs from national currencies to US dollars for  
175 comparison. We used the date in publications and adjust to 25 December 2021 rates using  
176 Google's default currency convertor provided by Morningstar.

## 177 **Results**

### 178 **Comparison of different approaches of active case detection**

179 New leprosy cases were identified during house-to-house visits (n=27), contact tracing (n=19)  
180 and prison screening (n=2) from a total of 38,505 screened people (Table 2). New case detection

181 rates were highest in contact tracing (250 per 100,000 population), followed by house-to-house  
 182 visits (102 per 100,000) and prison screening (45 per 100,000). However, house-to-house visits  
 183 were the cheapest cost per case identified at Nepalese rupee (NPR) 76,500/case, followed by  
 184 contact tracing (NPR 90,286/case) and prison screening (NPR 298,300/case).

185 Just two MB cases were discovered in adult male prisoners. House-to-house and contact tracing  
 186 case PB:MB ratios were 59:41 and 68:32; female/male ratios 63:37 and 57:43; pediatric cases  
 187 11% in both approaches; and G2D 11% and 5% respectively.

188 Table 2: Comparison of different approaches of active case detection

Approach	Screened	Suspected cases	Confirmed cases	New case detection rate (/100,000)	PB:MB (%)	F:M (%)	Pediatric cases (%)	G2D (%)	Cost/case (USD\$)
House-to-house visits	26469	365	27	102	16:11 (59:41)	17:10 (63:37)	3 (11)	3(11)	76,500 (\$654)
Contact tracing	7608	214	19	250	13:6 (68:32)	11:8 (57:43)	2 (11)	1 (5)	90,286 (\$772)
Prison screening	4428	185	2	45	0:2 (0:100)	0:2 (0:100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	298,300 (\$2550)

189 Screened - total numbers screened; PB/MB - paucibacillary/multibacillary ratio; F/M -  
 190 female/male ratio; G2D – Grade 2 deformity

191

192 **Age and gender of leprosy cases**

193 In aggregate, the number of females among confirmed leprosy cases (27/48) was higher than  
194 males, but not significantly different ( $\chi^2 = 1.3$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.25) (Figure 1, Table S2).

### 195 **Attack rate and associations of contacts and leprosy**

196 Individuals with the history of two to five years of proximate contact with leprosy confirmed  
197 cases were examined, in which attack rates were higher among household contacts of MB cases  
198 (0.32%, 95% CI 0.07-0.94) compared to neighboring contacts of the same cases (0.23%, 0.1-  
199 0.46), but this was not significant ( $\chi^2 = 0.07$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.9). Neighboring contacts of the  
200 PB cases were found to have higher attack rate (0.48%, 0.19-0.98) compared to the household  
201 contact (0.13%, 0.03-0.73) of the same cases, but this was again not significant ( $\chi^2 = 0.8$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  
202  $p$ -value = 0.7) (Table S3, Figure S1).

203 Differences in related associations, such as household contacts of MB cases being a case compared to  
204 neighbours ( $OR=1.4$ , 95% CI 0.24-5.85) or PB household cases ( $OR=2.5$ , 95% CI 0.2-129.1) and other  
205 variations of these associations were not significantly different. Further data and tables are provided in  
206 the supplementary information (Table S4, Figure S2).

207 The contact tracing of 106 and 177 leprosy index cases in Siraha ( $n = 3170$ ) and Bardiya ( $n =$   
208 4438) after 2-5 years of proximate contact with index cases identified 14 new cases Siraha (0.13  
209 cases per index case, 0.07-0.21) and 5 in Bardiya (0.03, 0.01-0.06). This was statistically  
210 significant ( $\chi^2 = 9.8$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p$ -value = 0.002), including adjusting for index cases and screened  
211 contacts ( $\beta = 1.9$ , standard error = 0.5,  $p$ -value < 0.001). The result was insensitive to offsetting  
212 to screen population along ( $\beta = 1.4$ , standard error = 0.5,  $p$ -value < 0.01).

### 213 **Gender, case classification and disability**

214 We found no statistical differences between genders and either having advanced (MB) leprosy  
215 ( $OR=0.47$ , 0.11-1.78,  $p$ -value = 0.24) or G2D ( $OR=0.76$ , 0.05-11.4,  $p$ -value = 1) using all 48  
216 new confirmed cases.

### 217 **BCG and leprosy transmission**

218 Among the total participants, 569 visited a health facility for confirmation of leprosy and were  
219 also inspected for a BCG vaccination scar by a dermatologist. Those participants with the  
220 presence of a BCG scar were found to have a significantly lower odds of having leprosy (18 of  
221 341) than without (27 of 201), with an  $OR=0.42$  (0.22 – 0.81,  $p$ -value = 0.007).

### 222 **Discussion**

223 We report 48 new leprosy cases from 38,505 screened people, comprising 29 from house-to-  
224 house screening among vulnerable populations, 19 from case-contact tracing and 2 from prisoner  
225 screening. House-to-house screening and contact tracing discovered 11% pediatric cases in both  
226 approach and 11% and 5% G2D cases respectively, indicating new transmission events and late  
227 diagnosis, highlighting the gaps in leprosy control programs.

228 The new case detection rate was highest in contact tracing (250) followed by house-to-house  
229 visits (102) and prison screening (45) in per 100,000 population screened, whereas the most cost-  
230 efficient approach here was house-to-house visits (NPR 76,500/case), followed by contact  
231 tracing (NPR 90286/case) and prison screening (NPR 298,300/case). These costs per case  
232 detected are similar to those reported for other countries, for example case contact tracing was  
233 approximately US\$529 (vs ~US\$758) in similar study of Nigeria (17), scaled by inflation and  
234 using December 2021 exchange rates. The effectiveness and cost efficiency suggest  
235 implementing both approaches in parallel may be optimal.

236 The epidemiological and clinical features of the identified confirmed cases were not significantly  
237 different. This is possibly because of the small sample of confirmed cases. The PB:MB ratio  
238 differed to the global status (35:65), but greater sample sizes might alter this. Similarly, the  
239 female: male ratio differed but with great sample sizes might change to match the national  
240 (42:58) and global (40:60) ratios. However, if the findings here are true but simply lacking  
241 statistical power due to smaller sample sizes, then these altered ratios could be due to active case  
242 detection versus passive case detection and suggest females with leprosy are often hidden with  
243 passive surveillance (4). However, details on gender and age were only recorded for cases, so  
244 differences in gender and age rates are not available but could be useful for future efforts. Future  
245 efforts should also aim for earlier detection through active case detection and to reduce the  
246 stigma attached to leprosy, so cases are not hidden.

247 The transmission attack rates observed in household (0.32%, 95% CI 0.07-0.94) and neighboring  
248 (0.13%, 95% CI 0.03-0.73) contacts of MB cases, and household (0.23%, 95% CI 0.1-0.46) and  
249 neighboring (0.48%, 95% CI 0.19-0.98) contacts of PB cases were not statistically different. The  
250 rates, however, are lower than some other reports, such as 2% in Brazil in 2008 (15). This  
251 requires additional studies in more districts to confirm, but the lower attack rate in the current  
252 Nepalese situation also indicates progress towards elimination of the disease. The lack of a  
253 significant difference in household contacts of cases developing leprosy compared to  
254 neighboring contacts (0.78, 95% CI 0.19-2.45) differs from other findings where households  
255 contacts may have twice the risk of developing disease compared to neighboring contacts (10).  
256 The reasons for this could be sample size and statistical power, or that other factors are either  
257 reducing the within-household transmission or increasing the neighbor-case transmission. Again,  
258 further work is needed to determine which is occurring, but if reduced within-household

259 transmission, this could be a sign of successful case management. Use of genomic epidemiology  
260 my help elucidate transmission chains (18).

261 The contact tracing of leprosy index cases was conducted after 2-5 years of proximate contact in  
262 both Siraha (Madhesh Province) and Bardiya (Lumbini Province), where more new cases per  
263 index case in Siraha (14, 0.13 cases per index case, 0.07-0.21) than in Bardia (5, 0.013 per case,  
264 0.01-0.06). The difference was significant, including adjusting for index cases and screened  
265 populations. It was reported that leprosy post exposure prophylaxis (LPEP) has been  
266 implemented in Bardia for several years.

267 A further encouraging finding was that BCG vaccination with the presence of a scar has a  
268 significant protective effect against leprosy ( $OR=0.42$ , 95% CI 0.22 – 0.81). The finding is  
269 consistent with other findings, such as in Brazil, where the  $OR=0.27$  (95% CI 0.13-0.59) (15).  
270 The findings suggest BCG immunization programs will successfully contribute to leprosy  
271 elimination. For Nepal, this is encouraging, because BCG is given at birth and national coverage  
272 is high at 97.8% (95% CI 95.8–98.7) for BCG (19,20). However, like all immunization  
273 programs, there are often small pockets of people where there is lower vaccine coverage, and  
274 lower BCG is reported for at risk populations such as Madhesi, Dalit, and some religious  
275 minorities, who were targeted for screening here (21). Future immunization programs should aim  
276 to ensure at risk communities are reached to achieve the leprosy elimination goals.

## 277 **Conclusion**

278 The new case detection rates identified in this study suggest sustained levels of transmission in  
279 the communities screened. The proportion of pediatric cases (>10%) is evidence of recent  
280 transmission and the proportion of G2D confers evidence of late diagnosis and inadequate

281 surveillance in the community. Though not significant, the female: male case ratio being the  
282 reverse of the global and national reports from passive case surveillance systems indicates  
283 hidden cases in the community, suggesting active surveillance is required to hasten leprosy  
284 elimination. The reduced attack rate compared to earlier studies, however, suggest some progress  
285 towards disease elimination and BCG vaccination should be given more attention as a tool for  
286 elimination, as it reduces transmission. Together, active case detection, through house-to-house  
287 visits and contact tracing to detect early and hidden cases, along with the optimal use of BCG,  
288 might help block transmission, prevent disabilities, and move Nepal closer towards elimination.

### 289 **Contributors**

290 RKM conceived and designed the manuscript; RKM, UG, ML, PN, KL KPP, CLD managed and  
291 supervise the data collection; RKM, DTSH analyzed the data; RKM, BB, MKP wrote the  
292 original draft KPP, CLD, DTSH, BP, AKK reviewed the manuscript. All authors read, reviewed,  
293 and approved the final manuscript.

294

### 295 **Declarations of interests**

296 The authors declare that they have no competing interests and views does not represent the  
297 organization's views.

298

### 299 **Funding**

300 This study was supported by Epidemiology and Disease Control Division, Ministry of Health  
301 and Population, Nepal

302

### 303 **Acknowledgements**

304 We are grateful to all the provincial health directors, section chiefs and focal people of the  
305 municipalities, health facilities, health offices, where active case detection was carried out for  
306 their kind cooperation, direct involvement in case screening, monitoring and supervision. We are  
307 more grateful to EDCD LCDMS staff who contributed to coordination and monitoring of the  
308 activities. We sincerely express our gratitude to Dr Amrita Shrestha, Consultant Dermatologist of  
309 Badegaun PHC, Dr Badri Chapagain, Chief Consultant Dermatologist of Nepalgunj Hospital, Dr  
310 Sumit Pandey, Consultant Dermatologist of Nepalgunj Medical college, Dr. Niraj Parajuli, Dr  
311 Mahesh Sah, Senior Consultant Dermatologist of Anandban Hospital, Dr Abhisek Bilash Panta,  
312 Consultant Dermatologist of Janakpur Hospital and Mr Dipak Bam, Leprosy Expert who worked  
313 on the confirmation and validation of suspected cases. This work was supported by grants from  
314 WHO through Red book of the Ministry of Health and Population. We are especially thankful to  
315 Dr Usha Kiran, coordinator of NTDs section of WHO Nepal who continuously supported us in  
316 technical design, and thank Drs Rosemary Barraclough and Jonathan Marshall, Massey  
317 University, for helpful comments. DTSH is funded by New Zealand Royal Society Te Apārangi,  
318 grant number MAU1701 and a Percival Carmine Chair in Epidemiology and Public Health.

319

### 320 **Data availability**

321 The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to  
322 individual privacy of patients could be compromised but are available from the corresponding  
323 author on reasonable request.

324



325 **Ethics approval, consent to participate, and consent for publication.**

326 The data were generated through contact tracing and house to house visits among vulnerable  
327 populations as part of regular program activities by the Epidemiology and Disease Control  
328 Division (EDCD). While conducting the field surveillance, consent from the participants was  
329 taken verbally in the presence of local health authorities and female community health volunteers  
330 (FCHVs). Then all acquired field data were stored at the central database as per the national  
331 surveillance system. For this study selected, anonymized data were used and approved for  
332 analysis and publication by **Ethical Review Board of Nepal Health Research Council**  
333 **(approval number 347/2022 P and approval date: 21 July 2022)** as per the request from  
334 EDCD. All data were anonymized for use in writing preparing this manuscript.

335

336 **Abbreviations**

337 BCG: Bacille Calmette-Guerin

338 CI: Confidence Interval

339 EDCD: Epidemiology and Disease Control Division

340 FCHV: Female Community Volunteer

341 G2D: Grade-2 disabilities

342 LCDMS: Leprosy Control and Disability Management Section

343 LPEP: Leprosy post exposure prophylaxis

344 MB: Multibacillary

345 NPR: Nepalese rupee

346 OR: Odds ratios

347 PB: Paucibacillary

348 SEAR: South- East Asia Region

349 SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

350 WHO: World Health Organization

351 **References**

- 352 1. Bhat RM, Prakash C. Leprosy: An overview of pathophysiology. *Interdiscip Perspect*  
353 *Infect Dis.* 2012;2012.
- 354 2. Joseph GA, Sundar Rao PSS. Impact of leprosy on the quality of life. *Int J Lepr Other*  
355 *Mycobact Dis.* 1999;67(4 SUPPL.):518.
- 356 3. Leprosy/Hansen Disease: Management of reactions and prevention of disabilities.
- 357 4. Harrell GT. Epidemiology of leprosy. *J Am Med Assoc.* 1947;135(11):732.
- 358 5. Strategy GL. Global consultation of National Leprosy Programme managers , partners and  
359 affected persons on Global Leprosy Strategy. 2021.
- 360 6. Department of Health services(DoHS). Annual Report: Department of Health Services  
361 2075/76 (2018/19) [Internet]. Vol. 76, Departement of Health Services, Ministry of Health  
362 and Population, Government of Nepal. 2019. Available from:  
363 [https://publichealthupdate.com/department-of-health-services-dohs-annual-report-2075-](https://publichealthupdate.com/department-of-health-services-dohs-annual-report-2075-76-2018-19/)  
364 [76-2018-19/](https://publichealthupdate.com/department-of-health-services-dohs-annual-report-2075-76-2018-19/)
- 365 7. WHO. Global Leprosy Strategy 2016-2020: accelerating towards a leprosy-free world.

- 366 [Internet]. Vol. 1, Weekly Epidemiological record. 2016. 349–360 p. Available from:  
367 <http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/205149/1/B5233.pdf?ua=1>
- 368 8. Moura MLN, Dupnik KM, Sampaio GAA, Nóbrega PFC, Jeronimo AK, do Nascimento-  
369 Filho JM, et al. Active Surveillance of Hansen’s Disease (Leprosy): Importance for Case  
370 Finding among Extra-domiciliary Contacts. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2013;7(3):1–7.
- 371 9. Tiendrebéogo A, Sow SO, Traore M, Sissoko K, Coulibaly B. Comparison of two  
372 methods of leprosy case finding in the circle of Kita in Mali. *Int J Lepr Other Mycobact*  
373 *Dis*. 1999;67(3):237–42.
- 374 10. WHO. Leprosy/Hansen disease: Contact tracing and post-exposure prophylaxis.
- 375 11. de Campos DCC, Dutra APB, Soares VL, de Carvalho PAC, Camargo LMA. New  
376 strategies for active finding of leprosy cases in the Amazonian region. *Rev Soc Bras Med*  
377 *Trop*. 2015;48(4):488–90.
- 378 12. Vijayakumaran P, Mahipathy P V, Misra RK, Petro TS, Ramanujan R, Karunakaran S, et  
379 al. Hidden cases of leprosy (in prison). *Indian J Lepr* [Internet]. 1997;69(3):271—274.  
380 Available from: <http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/9394177>
- 381 13. Bernardes Filho F, Santana JM, de Almeida RCP, Voltan G, de Paula NA, Leite MN, et  
382 al. Leprosy in a prison population: A new active search strategy and a prospective clinical  
383 analysis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14(2):1–17.
- 384 14. Merle CS, Cunha SS, Rodrigues LC. BCG vaccination and leprosy protection: Review of  
385 current evidence and status of BCG in leprosy control. *Expert Rev Vaccines*.  
386 2010;9(2):209–22.

- 387 15. Goulart IMB, Bernardes Souza DO, Marques CR, Pimenta VL, Gonçalves MA, Goulart  
388 LR. Risk and protective factors for leprosy development determined by epidemiological  
389 surveillance of household contacts. *Clin Vaccine Immunol*. 2008;15(1):101–5.
- 390 16. Tim CE. Epidemiologic programs for computers and calculators: Decision-tree analysis  
391 using a microcomputer. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1986;124(5):843–50.
- 392 17. Ezenduka C, Post E, John S, Suraj A, Namadi A, Onwujekwe O. Cost-Effectiveness  
393 Analysis of Three Leprosy Case Detection Methods in Northern Nigeria. *PLoS Negl Trop*  
394 *Dis*. 2012;6(9).
- 395 18. Cancino-Muñoz I, López MG, Torres-Puente M, Villamayor LM, Borrás R, Borrás-  
396 Máñez M, et al. Population-based sequencing of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* reveals how  
397 current population dynamics are shaped by past epidemics. *Elife*. 2022;11:1–23.
- 398 19. Government of Nepal M of H and P. National Immunization Programme [Internet]. [cited  
399 2022 Jul 18]. Available from: [https://www.mohp.gov.np/eng/program/child-health-](https://www.mohp.gov.np/eng/program/child-health-services/nip)  
400 [services/nip](https://www.mohp.gov.np/eng/program/child-health-services/nip)
- 401 20. Rauniyar SK, Iwaki Y, Yoneoka D, Hashizume M, Nomura S. Age-appropriate  
402 vaccination coverage and its determinants in children aged 12–36 months in Nepal: a  
403 national and subnational assessment. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):1–12.
- 404 21. Shrestha S, Shrestha M, Wagle RR, Bhandari G. Predictors of incompleteness of  
405 immunization among children residing in the slums of Kathmandu valley, Nepal: A case-  
406 control study. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2016;16(1):1–9. Available from:  
407 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3651-3>



