

1 **Healthcare Performance of Leprosy Management in Peripheral Health**

2 **Facilities of Dhanusa and Mahottari, Nepal**

3 **Ram Kumar Mahato^{1*}, Uttam Ghimire¹, Bijay Bajracharya², Binod KC³, Deepak Bam⁴,**
4 **Deepak Ghimire⁵ Uttam Raj Pyakurel¹, David TS Hayman⁶, BasudevPandey⁷, Chuman Lal**
5 **Das¹, Krishna Prasad Paudel^{1*}**

6 **Affiliations:**

7 ¹ Epidemiology and Disease Control Division, Department of Health Services, Ministry of
8 Health and Population, Kathmandu, Nepal

9 ² Epidemiology and Disease Control Division-Program Management Unit- SCI-GF, Nepal

10 ³ Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital & Service center, Nepal Leprosy Trust, Lalgadh, Nepal

11 ⁴ Seti Provincial Hospital, Dhangadhi, Nepal

12 ⁵ Nepal Leprosy Fellowship, Jhapa, Nepal

13 ⁶ Molecular Epidemiology and Public Health Laboratory, Infectious Disease Research Centre,
14 Hopkirk Research Institute, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

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

17 ***Corresponding author**

18 kpkalyan@gmail.com

19 mahatoram811@gmail.com

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background**

22 The global elimination of leprosy transmission by 2030 is a World Health Organization (WHO)
23 target. Nepal's leprosy elimination program depends on early case diagnosis and the
24 performance of health workers and facilities. The knowledge and skills of paramedical staff
25 (Leprosy Focal Person, LFP) and case documentation and management by health facilities is
26 therefore key to the performance of health care services.

27 **Methods**

28 The performance of health workers and facilities was evaluated through a combined cross-
29 sectional and retrospective study approach of 31 health facilities and their LFPs in Dhanusa and
30 Mahottari Districts in Madhesh Province, Nepal. An average of 6 patients (paucibacillary, PB, or
31 multibacillary, MB) per health facility registered within the 2018/2019 fiscal year were also
32 enrolled in the study. LFP knowledge (e.g., of the three cardinal signs) and skills (e.g., nerve
33 palpation) and facility processes (e.g., record keeping) were scored (e.g., 0, 1) and then rescaled
34 to a proportion, where 1 is perfect. Internal benchmarking was used to guide performance
35 management.

36 **Results**

37 Overall LFP knowledge and skill scores ranged from 0.16 to 0.63 (median 0.53, 95% confidence
38 interval (CI), 0.46-0.6). Case documentation scores ranged from 0.15 to 0.87 (median 0.37, 95%
39 CI 0.36-0.38), case management scores from 0.38 to 0.79 (median 0.54, 95% CI 0.53-0.55) and
40 the overall healthcare scores ranged from 0.36-0.62 (median 0.48, 95% CI 0.47-0.49). Leprosy-

41 related training was significantly related to the knowledge and skill of the health workers. All
42 identified cases (n =187) adhered to the complete treatment and release after treatment (RFT)
43 scheme, out of which 84.5% were satisfied with the service they were provided. Leprosy
44 disability and Ear Hand and Feet (EHF) scores were not significantly reduced in treated patients
45 during the study period, but counseling by LFPs significantly improved cases' positive belief and
46 practices regarding self-care.

47 **Conclusion**

48 Overall leprosy care performance was low (43%) and can be improved by evidenced-based
49 training, onsite coaching, monitoring, and supervision to facilitate leprosy transmission
50 elimination. The results highlight many of the challenges facing leprosy elimination programs.

51 **Keywords:** Leprosy Focal Person, Knowledge and skill scores, Documentation
52 score, Case management scores

53 **Introduction**

54 Leprosy is an infectious, pathogenic disease of skin and peripheral nerves, caused by
55 *Mycobacterium lepra* (1). The consequences of leprosy include physical disability and social
56 stigma (2). The global prevalence and grade 2 disability of leprosy was recorded as 22.9 and 1.4
57 per million population in 2019 (3). In the same period, Nepal recorded 69 cases per million
58 population, of which 5.45% (3.8 per million population) are grade 2 disabilities, despite the
59 elimination of leprosy as national public health problem by 2009 (4,5). Nepal was one of the 16
60 counties that reported more than 1000 cases at the end of 2019 (6).

61 Leprosy diagnosis is based on the presence of at least one of three cardinal signs: definite loss of
62 sensation in a pale or reddish skin patch, a thickened or enlarged peripheral nerve with loss of
63 sensation and/or weakness of the muscles supplied by that nerve, and the presence of acid-fast
64 bacilli in a slit-skin smear (7). Multidrug therapy (MDT) is a key strategy to cure and prevent the
65 transmission of leprosy.

66 The World Health Organization (WHO) set a target of leprosy transmission elimination by 2030
67 and cases reduced by 44% between 2005 and 2019 (6). Nepal, in line with the WHO's roadmap
68 to 'zero leprosy'(8), has also set a target to achieve zero new autochthonous cases by 2030
69 (9,10). The elimination rate and early diagnosis of leprosy is associated with case management
70 skills and attitudes of health service providers (11,12). The case management skills of peripheral
71 health workers could be developed and improved by providing them with high quality training
72 (13).

73 Multidrug therapy (MDT) is one of WHO's effective strategies to prevent the transmission, cure
74 leprosy infection, and limit and reverse patients' disability status (14,15). Leprosy elimination
75 programs therefore need high quality documentation to track the progress of cases and the
76 programme (16,17). The Nepali National Leprosy Control Programme sets recording standards and
77 provides the reporting tools in every health facility in a municipality. In order to record a case of
78 leprosy, a health worker completes a Health Service Card (HMIS 1.2), Referral Form (HMIS 1.4),
79 Laboratory Forms and Register (HMIS 5.1/5.2), Leprosy Diagnosis and Treatment Card (HMIS 5.4),
80 Leprosy Treatment Register (HMIS 5.5), Defaulter Form (HMIS 1.5) and Reporting Form (HMIS
81 9.3)(18).

82 Finally, patient self-care is one of the main interventions to improve patient disability over time
83 (19). Client satisfaction is a key performance indicator which improves self-care, drug adherence

84 and recovery (20). Much of the information regarding care provided to leprosy cases is provided
85 by paramedical staff LFP in Nepal.

86 This operational research was carried out in the Nepali context in Dhanusa and Mahottari
87 districts, Nepal, to assess the knowledge and skills of LFPs and health facility overall
88 performances. Metrics assessed include the documentation in health facilities, case diagnosis and
89 management status, improvement in disability post-MDT, self-care practices in disabled people
90 and client satisfaction, which reflects overall leprosy elimination performance. Gaps pertaining
91 to knowledge, skill, documentation, and case management were identified and necessary
92 interventions like strategic basic or refresher training, regular monitoring and supervision and
93 onsite coaching were recommended.

94

95 **Material and methods**

96 **Subjects and type of study**

97 *Location*

98 This study was performed in Dhanusa and Mahottari districts in Madhesh Province, Nepal.
99 Madhesh Province was chosen because it represents 40% of the notified leprosy cases in Nepal
100 from the seven provinces, with Lumbini Province the next highest with 18% of cases.

101 *Study design*

102 A cross-sectional study to assess the knowledge and skills of LFPs was undertaken in 31 health
103 facilities. A retrospective study of documentation and case management performance was
104 undertaken to assess the overall performance of the respective health facilities. Thirty-one health

105 municipalities were selected (17 from Dhanusha and 14 from Mahottari) based on convenience
106 sampling, with just one municipality not sampled from each district (total health municipalities
107 are 18 for Dhanusha and 15 for Mahottari); one health facility was then chosen randomly from
108 each municipality. An LFP from each selected peripheral health facility was interviewed and
109 assessed for their knowledge and skills pertaining to leprosy case management.

110 On average six patients (paucibacillary, PB, or multibacillary, MB) per health facility registered
111 within the fiscal year 2018-19 and who had completed the treatment by the end of fiscal year
112 2019-20, were enrolled in the study. These patients were invited to enroll in the study by LFPs of
113 respective health facilities. MB patients registered within the fiscal year 2018/2019 who had
114 completed MB-MDT (12 blister packs) within 18 months, i.e., by the end of fiscal year 2019-20,
115 were included. Similarly, PB patients registered within the fiscal year 2018-2019 and completed
116 PB-MDT (6 blister packs) within 9 months before and by the fiscal year 2019/20 were included.
117 In total, 187 patients were selected to assess the case management performance of the health
118 facilities based on a sample size estimated to detect and improved performance (see below)
119 among health facilities of 50%, with a precision of $1/7^{\text{th}}$ of 50% ($\pm \sim 7\%$) with 95% confidence.

120 ***Leprosy Focal Person skills and knowledge assessment***

121 LFP knowledge of the 3 cardinal signs and capability to differentiate leprosy and non-leprosy
122 patches was assessed through interviews by giving 12 patches (8 leprosy patches and 4 non-
123 leprosy patches) from the leprosy atlas to all LFPs to identify correctly. An LFP was given 0.25
124 for correctly identifying up to 3 patches, 0.5 for 4-6 patches, 0.75 for 7-9 patches and 1 for 10-12
125 patches. The capability to palpate peripheral nerves (4 peripheral nerves: radial, ulnar, tibial,
126 perineal nerves) was assessed by observation by a leprosy expert. A combined score of

127 knowledge and skills was then given by providing equal weight to all variables, each given 1
128 mark and rescaled converted again to between 0 and 1.

129 *Health facility documentation performance assessment*

130 For the documentation performance, information on the completion and accuracy status of HMIS
131 forms 5.4, 5.5, and 9.3 for the 187 patients from 31 facilities of Dhanusa and Mahottari was
132 collected. Regarding part 1 of HMIS 5.4, a score was given as 0 for no charting at all and
133 unavailability of the forms (hereon, performance), 0.33 for less than 1/3rd performance, 0.67 for 2/3rd
134 performance and 1 for correctly and completely done charting. From parts 2 to 8 of HMIS 5.4, HMIS
135 5.5, HMIS 9.3, the score was calculated after assessing how accurately filled the variables were
136 against the total variables. Similarly, randomly selected 3-month reports for each patient enrolled in
137 the study were examined and given an average score for the documentation performance for each
138 health facilities. Total score documentation was averaged and rescaled to between 0 and 1.

139 *Case management performance assessment*

140 For the case management performance of 187 patients from 31 health facilities, information on
141 diagnosis accuracy, accuracy in classification of leprosy, treatment completion in time, number of
142 doses taken as per the required treatment regime, disability and EHF score (pre- and post-treatment),
143 number of follow-up visits, and counselling provided by the LFP with respect to treatment, self-care,
144 attitude and practice of self-care, treatment outcome, reaction management by the LFP were
145 collected. For all the patients, variables like accuracy in diagnosis, treatment completion in time,
146 correct classification of disability, counselling provided by LFPs, practice of self-care by leprosy
147 affected persons, reaction managed by LFP, completion of follow up visit, treatment outcome were
148 treated as binomial variables; for the true value (i.e. correct classification, completed treatment, etc.),

149 1 mark was given and for the “not true” value, 0 was given. For post-treatment disability and EHF
150 scores, 1 was given for improving, 0.5 for the same performance and 0 for worsening disability and
151 EHF scores, with disability and EHF scores given separately. All post-treatment disability and EHF
152 scores were summed and averaged and rescaled to between 0 and 1. Treated leprosy cases were
153 asked if they were fully satisfied, satisfied or not satisfied with the services provided by the health
154 system (health institution and health worker or LFP).

155 *Performance summary*

156 Finally, performance of health facilities was calculated by averaging the documentation scores and
157 case management performance scores of respective health facilities and analyzing the data as above.

158 **Statistical analysis**

159 Knowledge and skills of LFPs was analyzed by regression (see below) with predictors comprising
160 their job title (Community Medical Assistant (one year training), Auxiliary Nurse Midwifery (1.5
161 years training course), Health Assistant (3-year academic course)), any training like basic leprosy
162 training (BLT) and comprehensive leprosy training (CLT), and time since training taken. Similarly,
163 pre- and post-disability and EHF score of leprosy treatment was analyzed.

164 Scores for the knowledge and skills of LFPs, documentation completion, and case management
165 performance of health facilities were calculated in Microsoft® Excel. Means with 95% CI was
166 calculated by using IBM SPSS 2022. Chi-squared (χ^2) values, p-values and odds ratios with 95%
167 CI were also calculated in SPSS and R version 4.2.0 to determine the association between
168 knowledge and skill scores of LFPs and their leprosy training (BLT or CLT) and for the working
169 designation compared with the knowledge and skill score of LFPs. Mean differences for
170 disability and EHF scores related to leprosy were calculated pre- and post-leprosy treatment to

171 know the impact of MDT in disability. Odds ratios and χ^2 with 95% CIs were calculated for the
172 association between status of regular counselling provided to leprosy cases and attitude and
173 practices of selfcare. Case treatment satisfaction was calculated in terms of simple percentages of
174 each satisfaction score for the service received from peripheral health facilities. Due to small
175 sample sizes, univariate analyses are presented. However, beta regression (R^2) was used to find
176 predictors in variation in knowledge and skill scores of LFPs due to duration gaps after training
177 and other factors. Specifically, knowledge and skills of LFPs were regressed against: training,
178 qualification type and district and, separately, knowledge and skills of LFPs regressed against
179 time from training. These regressions were done on raw data, not quantiles.

180 **Results**

181 **Leprosy Focal Person backgrounds**

182 The study assessed the knowledge and skills of 31 LFPs of selected peripheral health facilities of
183 Dhanusa and Mahottari districts in Nepal. Among the selected 31 LFPs, 18 (58%, 39-75%) were
184 community medical assistants (CMA), auxiliary nurse midwives (ANM) and auxiliary health
185 workers (AHW) and 13 (42%, 25-61%) health assistants (HA). CMAs, ANMs and AHWs are
186 qualified after a one and half year training course, whereas HAs are qualified after 3 years of an
187 academic course. The study showed that more than half of the LFPs (16, 52%, 33-70%) have not
188 taken any specific training. Very few LFPs (6, 19%, 7-37%) had graduate degrees of any
189 discipline (Table S1).

190 **Leprosy Focal Person cardinal sign knowledge and palpation of peripheral nerve skills**


191 Nine (29%, 14-48%) of LFPs knew all 3 cardinal signs, 8 (26%, 12-45%) knew two cardinal
192 signs, 13 (42%, 25-61%) knew just one cardinal sign and 1 (3%, 0.1-17%) had no knowledge of

193 cardinal signs of leprosy (Table S2). Further, 25 (81%, 63-93%) of the LFPs could not palpate
194 any of the targeted 4 peripheral nerves, 4 (13%, 4-30%) of the LFPs could palpate one peripheral
195 nerve, 1 (3%, 0.1-17%) LFPs could palpate 2 peripheral nerves, and just 1 (3%, 0.1-17%) could
196 palpate all targeted peripheral nerves.

197 **Leprosy Focal Person knowledge and skill scores**

198 Overall knowledge and skill scores ranged from 0.16 to 0.63 (median 0.53, 95% CI, 0.46-0.6;
199 interquartile range 0.36-0.59) and the data were not normally distributed with some higher
200 performances and then a spread below 0.5 (Figure 1).

201




202

203 **Figure 1.** The leprosy focal person knowledge and skills and facility healthcare performance
204 scores. Knowledge is the leprosy local person knowledge and skill scores; Healthcare the overall

205 healthcare scores; Management the case management scores, and; documentation the case
206 documentation scores. Box plots with outliers are shown with density plots with overlaid raw
207 data to show the non-normal distributions.

208 Predictors of Leprosy Focal Person knowledge and skill

209 Those who have taken any of the leprosy training courses (BLT or CLT) had significantly higher
210 levels of knowledge and skills (OR = 8.1, 95% CI 1.4-66.3, p-value = 0.01). The level of
211 knowledge and skills of LFPs was not significantly different with respect to their education level,
212 i.e., a one-year training course (CMA or ANM or AHW) versus a 3-year academic course (HA)
213 (p-value = 0.16). Neither 3-year HA qualifications (p-value = 0.82), nor receiving training (p-
214 value = 0.46) significantly increased LFP knowledge and skills in multivariate regression,
215 whereas Mahottari had significantly higher knowledge and skills than Dhanusa ($\beta= 0.63$,
216 standard error (SE) = 0.21, p-value = 0.002) (Figure 2). Further, the time interval since the
217 training was taken was not identified as predictor of knowledge and skills (Table S3; Figure S1,
218 beta regression $\beta=-0.007$, SE=0.024, p-value = 0.78).



219
220 **Figure 2.** The distribution of leprosy focal person knowledge and skills scores by qualification
221 type, training, and district. HA is health assistants (3-years of training); CMA community

222 medical assistants; ANM auxiliary nurse midwives and auxiliary health workers (1-year of
223 training).

224

225 **Health facility performance**

226 All correctly diagnosed cases (N=187) completed treatment in time (N=184) and were released
227 after the treatment (RFT, N=184), as per treatment guidelines. Three cases were under treatment,
228 so they were excluded from the study when appropriate below, specifically the treatment
229 analyses, and included in general analyses (i.e., case documentation and management analyses).

230 *Case documentation*

231 Case documentation scores ranged from 0.15 to 0.87 (Figure 1). The median score was 0.37
232 (95% CI 0.36-0.38; IQR 0.32-0.38) and the data were not normally distributed with 75 (40%,
233 n=187) considered outliers and many scores much higher or lower than this mean. (Figure 1).

234 *Case management scores*

235 Case management scores ranged from 0.38 to 0.79 (Figure 1). The median score was 0.54 (95%
236 CI 0.53-0.55; IQR 0.54-0.63) and again the data were not normally distributed with 5 outliers.

237 **Overall healthcare scores**

238 Overall healthcare scores ranged from 0.36-0.62 (Figure 1). The median score was 0.48 (95% CI
239 0.47-0.49; IQR 0.45-0.5) and again the data were not normally distributed with 5 outliers.

240 **Place of leprosy case diagnosis**

241 More than 3/4 (145, 78%, 71-83%) of the cases were diagnosed in Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital, in
 242 Dhanusa (Table S4). Less than one fifth (32, 17%, 12-23) cases were diagnosed in government
 243 peripheral health facilities. Just nine (5%, 2-9%) of the leprosy cases were diagnosed through
 244 active case detection, i.e., a contact survey by the Leprosy Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (LPEP)
 245 service. One case (<1% cases, <0.1-3%) was diagnosed in India, to which Dhanusa and
 246 Mahottari are bordering districts.

247 **Pre- and post-disability status of MDT treated patients**

248 No statistical improvement in the disability status or EHF score at the time of study in MDT
 249 treated patients compared to the disability and EHF score recorded at the time of registration or
 250 before the treatment was measurable (95% CI -6 to 12) (Table 1; Figure S2).

251 **Table 1. Disability and Ear Hand and Feet (EHF) score in Multidrug therapy treated**
 252 **patients**

Score at the time of treatment		Score at the time of study		Statistics
Disability (grade 1 or 2)				
None	Present	None	Present	
143 (76%, 70-82%)	44 (23%, 18-31%)	148 (79%, 73-85%)	39 (21%, 15-27%)	
EHF				$\chi^2 = 0.39$, df = 1, p-value =
0	>1	0	>1	
143 (76%, 70-	44 (23%, 18-	149 (80%, 73-	38 (20%, 15-	

82%)	31%)	85%)	27%)	0.53; 95% CI change: -6 to 12%
------	------	------	------	-----------------------------------

253

254 **The role of counselling for self-care after RFT in improving disability**

255 Overall, self-care did not significantly improve disability ($\beta=0.25$, $SE=0.26$, $p\text{-value} = 0.34$) or
256 EHF ($\beta=0.45$, $SE = 0.35$, $p\text{-value} =0.21$) scores (Figure S3). However, patients who have been
257 provided counselling for self-care know that self-care can improve disabilities significantly
258 better than those who have not been provided with the counseling for self-care (OR 7.9, 95% CI,
259 1.3-89.1, $p\text{-value} = 0.01$). Moreover, those patients who have not been provided with counselling
260 practice self-care significantly less than those who have been provided with counselling (OR =
261 46 (95% CI, 2.5-867%), $p\text{-value} <0.001$) (Table S5).

262 **Lepra reaction status ever experienced in leprosy treated patients**

263 Most of the patients (172, 92%, 87-95%) had no lepra reaction ever, whereas just 5 (2.7%, 1-6%)
264 had had a type 1 reaction and 10 (5.4%, 3-10%) a type 2 reaction. Of the 15 people with a
265 positive lepra reaction, just one (6.7%, 0.2-32%) was a case being managed by an LFP.

266 **Client satisfaction status in leprosy treated patients**

267 Only 20 (11%, 7-16%) of leprosy treated patients was fully satisfied with the health services, yet
268 more than 4/5 (158, 85%, 78-89%) of the patients were satisfied with the services. Similarly,
269 only a few (9, 5%, 2-8%) were not satisfied with the services.

270

271 **Discussion**

272 The Nepal country roadmap to zero leprosy recommends high levels of expertise to facilitate the
273 early detection and reduction in transmission of leprosy (9,21). Contrary to that, the median
274 score of knowledge and skills of LFPs in Dhanusa and Mahottari was just 0.53. The low
275 documentation score of 0.37 in the study districts is a challenging issue, because high quality
276 documentation is required to assess the progress and validate the elimination of leprosy (22). The
277 exact situation of leprosy elimination in Dhanusa and Mahottari was therefore likely uncertain,
278 as the median case management and median overall performance was just 0.54 and 0.48
279 respectively.

280 Fifty percent of LFPs had knowledge and skills less than 53%, which is low and is in contrast
281 Mohite *et al*'s study in Bangladesh, where 88% of health workers had good knowledge of
282 leprosy (20). The highest scores were just 63%. Similarly, most peripheral health facilities had
283 poor performance scores posing a serious concern for elimination of transmission of leprosy by
284 the year 2030.

285 Ninety six percent of the LFPs knew at least 1 cardinal sign, a more satisfactory result compared
286 to a study in Bangladesh (72%) (23). However, only 19% of LFPs could palpate at least one
287 peripheral nerve, revealing gaps in leprosy diagnosis in Nepal which need addressing. Only 19%
288 (6 out 31) health facilities received a 50% aggregate performance regarding leprosy
289 management, crucial for achieving the goal of elimination of transmission by 2030. The finding
290 that >80% of the LFPs could not palpate any peripheral nerves is comparable to the study
291 conducted by Roy *et al* that showed 83% health workers in parts of India were poorly skilled
292 (13).

293 Those workers who have taken any of the leprosy training (BLT or CLT) had significantly
294 higher levels of knowledge and skill (OR = 8.1, 95% CI, 1.4-66.3, p-value = 0.01), highlighting

295 the importance of training since leprosy is either not included or not prioritized in the academic
296 course of paramedical staff. Other variables including education level and duration of experience
297 were not significant markers of increased knowledge and skills. However, in multivariate
298 regression of the raw scores, Mahottari had significantly higher knowledge and skills than
299 Dhanusa ($\beta = 0.63$, standard error (SE) = 0.21, p-value = 0.002; Figure 2), but not training. This
300 needs to be explored further.

301 Less than 5% (4.8%) of cases were diagnosed through active case detection and the majority of
302 cases (78%) were diagnosed through the Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital, which drew the
303 governments' attention to hidden cases in the community. The cases are diagnosed at the
304 specialty hospitals only after the leprosy cases reach the advanced stage. This means the
305 proportion of the cases diagnosed at the peripheral health facilities should be greater, as people in
306 the early stages of leprosy visit these facilities. In this study, few leprosy cases were diagnosed in
307 the peripheral health facilities. So, early cases could be hidden in community due to the
308 inefficient performance of health worker, unavailability of diagnosis and/or the stigma
309 associated with the disease.

310 Both disability score and EHF score were not significantly improved after full treatment and
311 compliance with MB MDT treatment, which was surprising as comparable studies conducted by
312 Kumar *et al* show as the disability prevalence in non-compliant cases was significantly greater
313 than fully treated patients (15). This may, however, be due to the very small sample size and time
314 frame and requires further investigation. That all cases have completed treatment in time and
315 were released after treatment indicates a well performing health system for those recruited.
316 Moreover, counselling of patients by a LFP had significantly changed the belief of the patient
317 that self-care can improve disability (OR = 7.9, 95% CI, 1.3-89.1, p-value = 0.01). The result

318 was comparable with the studies conducted by Lusli *et al* and Devkota *et al* (24,25), where
319 counselling has a significant role in changing the belief and attitude towards health behaviors.
320 Similarly, counseling significantly improved self-care practice (OR = 46, 95% CI, 2.5-867%, p-
321 value = <0.001).

322 Among the cases monitored, only 8% developed lepra reactions, of which 2.7% (5 patients) and
323 5.4% (10 patients) were type 1 and type 2 reactions respectively. Other studies found 17.9% of
324 leprosy cases developed type 1 reactions and between 1.2% to 15.4% of the leprosy cases
325 developed type 2 reactions (26,27). These are similar trends but likely limited by sample sizes.

326 Regarding the satisfaction from serviced provided from health facilities, 95.2% leprosy cases
327 were satisfied with the services , which is comparable to a study in Brazil, where between 92-
328 100% of patients were satisfied at some level (28).

329 Weaknesses of our study are the convenience sampling of the districts, though this was
330 deliberate due to disease burden, and patient enrolment by the LFPs of respective health
331 facilities. This might have biased the sample and future prospective and randomized control
332 studies might improve this. Moreover, the sample size is low due to low case numbers,
333 potentially preventing more detailed analyses. For example, we used univariate count data
334 analyses where continuous data and multivariate analyses would be beneficial, but we had too
335 many variables for the small sample size. Similarly, we had a large, zero-inflated sample, with
336 many patients having zero disability or EHF score. Zero-inflated beta regression tools exist and
337 could be used, but failed to fit to our data, even using a Bayesian framework (not shown), likely
338 due to too many zeros and prior distribution specification sensitivity. These factors limit some of
339 the conclusions that can be made highlights the need for more comprehensive study.

340 **Conclusion**

341 The overall performance of health care services for leprosy patients was 0.48 (95% CI, 0.47-
342 0.49), in which median knowledge and skill scores of LFPs, documentation scores and case
343 management score of health facilities were 0.53 (0.46-0.60), 0.37 (0.36-0.38) and 0.54 (0.53-
344 0.55) respectively. These low scores likely hinder the elimination of leprosy transmission targets,
345 despite all cases utilizing treatment and being released after treatment and 95.2% of cases being
346 satisfied with the service they were provided. Leprosy-related training was significantly related
347 to knowledge and skill of the health workers, which provides an evidence-base for further
348 training. Disability and EHF scores were not significant reduced in treated patients in the study
349 period, but counseling by LFP has significantly improved positive belief and practices regarding
350 self-care, again offering evidence that training can help cases and potentially will contribute to
351 reducing onward transmission. As the overall performance leprosy care service was 48%, it
352 should be improved by intense evidenced-based training, onsite coaching, monitoring and
353 supervision in order to facilitate elimination of transmission of leprosy by the year of 2030. The
354 compliance should be maintained regularly, and this study provides a benchmark against which
355 progress can be assessed.

356 **Acknowledgments**

357 The authors would like to acknowledge, Dr Krishna Lama, Director of Lalgadh Leprosy
358 Hospital, Mr. Bijay Kumar Jha, Director and Mr. Rajbir Yadav, focal people of the leprosy
359 program from Madhesh Province, as well as chief and LFPs from the health office, Dhanusha
360 and Mahottari, and section chiefs of the selected municipalities, as well as LFPs from all health
361 facilities for their support and valuable inputs, and Drs Rosemary Barraclough and Jonathan
362 Marshall, Massey University, for their useful feedback.

363 **Contributors**

364 RKM conceived and designed the manuscript; RKM, UG, DG, DB, DKC managed and collected
365 the data collection; RKM, DTSH analyzed the data; RKM, BB wrote the original draft, KPP,
366 CLD, URP, DTSH, BDP reviewed the manuscript. All authors read, reviewed, and approved the
367 final manuscript. DTSH is supported by the Percival Carmine Chair in Epidemiology and Public
368 Health and by Royal Society Te Apūrangī RDF-MAU1701

369

370 **Declarations of interests**

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

373

374 **Funding**

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

377

378 **Data availability**

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

382

383 **Ethics approval**

384 The data were generated through monitoring, supervision and surveillance of health care
385 performance as part of regular program activities by the Epidemiology and Disease Control

386 Division (EDCD). While conducting the field surveillance, consent from the participants was
387 taken verbally in the presence of local health authorities. Then all acquired field data were stored
388 at the central database as per the national surveillance system. For this study, anonymized data
389 were used and approved for analysis and publication by **Ethical Review Board of Nepal Health**
390 **Research Council (approval number 349/2022 P and approval date: 21 July 2022)** as per the
391 request from EDCD.

392

393 **Abbreviations**

394 AHW- Auxiliary health worker

395 ANM- Auxiliary nurse midwives

396 BLT- Basic leprosy training

397 CI- Confidence Interval

398 CLT- Comprehensive leprosy training

399 CMA- Community medical assistant

400 EHF- Ear hand and feet

401 HMIS- Health Management Information System

402 LFP- Leprosy focal person

403 LPEP- Post-exposure prophylaxis

404 MB- Multibacillary

405 PB- Paucibacillary

406 RFT- Release after treatment

407 SPSS- Statistical package for the social sciences

408 WHO- World Health Organization

409 **References**

- 410 1. Lastória JC, de Abreu MAMM. Leprosy: Review of the epidemiological, clinical, and
411 etiopathogenic aspects - Part 1. *An Bras Dermatol.* 2014;89(2):205–18.
- 412 2. Joseph GA, Sundar Rao PSS. Impact of leprosy on the quality of life. *Int J Lepr Other*
413 *Mycobact Dis.* 1999;67(4 SUPPL.):518.
- 414 3. World Health Organization (WHO). Leprosy (Hansen ’ s disease) [Internet]. 2021. p. 1–
415 5. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/leprosy>
- 416 4. Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP). Leprosy Control Programme (/ eng / program
417 / communicable [Internet]. 2015. Available from:
418 <https://www.mo hp.gov.np/eng/program/communicable-disease/leprosy-control-program>
- 419 5. Department of Health services(DoHS). Annual Report: Department of Health Services
420 2075/76 (2018/19) [Internet]. Vol. 76, Departement of Health Services, Ministry of Health
421 and Population, Government of Nepal. 2019. Available from:
422 [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/)
423 [76-2018-19/](https://publichealthupdate.com/department-of-health-services-dohs-annual-report-2075-76-2018-19/)
- 424 6. Strategy GL. Global consultation of National Leprosy Programme managers , partners and
425 affected persons on Global Leprosy Strategy. 2021.
- 426 7. Harrell GT. Epidemiology of leprosy. *J Am Med Assoc.* 1947;135(11):732.
- 427 8. WHO. Towards zero leprosy Global Leprosy (Hansen’s disease) Strategy 2021-2030.
428 *Word Heal Organ.* 2021;1–30.
- 429 9. Department of Health services(DoHS). COUNTRY ROADMAP FOR ZERO LEPROSY.

- 430 2021.
- 431 10. National Planning Commission. National Planning Commission, 2015: Sustainable
432 Development Goals, 2016-2030, National (Preliminary) Report. Government of Nepal,
433 National Planning Commission, Kathmandu, Nepal. 2015. 39–52 p.
- 434 11. Pal R, Kar S, Ahmad S. Current knowledge attitudes, and practices of healthcare providers
435 about leprosy in Assam, India. *J Glob Infect Dis.* 2010;2(3):212.
- 436 12. Ukpe I. A study of health workers' knowledge and practices regarding leprosy care and
437 control at primary care clinics in the Eerstehoek area of Gert Sibande district in
438 Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. *South African Fam Pract.* 2006;48(5):16-16e.
- 439 13. Roy R, Shrivastava P, Mitra K, Mondal S. Assessment of Knowledge and Skills of
440 Peripheral Health Workers for Screening and Detection of Early Nerve Damage in
441 Leprosy: A Cross-Sectional Assessment of Knowledge and Skills of Peripheral Health
442 Workers for Screening and Detection of Early Nerve Dam. *J Med Dent Sci.* 2018;17(6):5–
443 9.
- 444 14. World Health Organization. The final push strategy to eliminate leprosy as a public health
445 problem. *Quest answers* [Internet]. 2003;73(3):279–81. Available from:
446 http://www.who.int/lep/resources/Final_Push_QA.pdf
- 447 15. Kumar A, Girdhar A, Kumar Girdhar B. Risk of developing disability in pre and post-
448 multidrug therapy treatment among multibacillary leprosy: Agra MB Cohort study. *BMJ*
449 *Open.* 2012;2(2):1–7.
- 450 16. Department of Health services(DoHS). The Leprosy Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (LPEP)

- 451 programme: Update and interim analysis. *Lepr Rev* [Internet]. 2018;89(2):102–16.
452 Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326231998_The_Leprosy_Post-](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326231998_The_Leprosy_Post-Exposure_Prophylaxis_LPEP_programme_Update_and_interim_analysis)
453 [Exposure_Prophylaxis_LPEP_programme_Update_and_interim_analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326231998_The_Leprosy_Post-Exposure_Prophylaxis_LPEP_programme_Update_and_interim_analysis)
454 [w.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85052234154&partnerID=40&md5=47e0d137909d005f141a14e5d0a31263)
455 [85052234154&partnerID=40&md5=47e0d137909d005f141a14e5d0a31263](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85052234154&partnerID=40&md5=47e0d137909d005f141a14e5d0a31263)
- 456 17. Mori S, Barua S, Suzuki K, Yotsu RR, Ishii N. [Present leprosy situation in the world in
457 2012]. *Nihon Hansenbyo Gakkai Zasshi*. 2013;82(1–2):59–69.
- 458 18. Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP). Health Management Information System
459 Guidelines,2017,. Heal Manag Inf Syst Guidel Teku Kathmandu, Nepal [Internet]. 2017;
460 Available from: <https://dohs.gov.np/hmis-guideline-2017/>
- 461 19. Eze CC, Ekeke N, Alphonsus C, Lehman L, Chukwu JN, Nwafor CC, et al. Effectiveness
462 of self-care interventions for integrated morbidity management of skin neglected tropical
463 diseases in Anambra State , Nigeria. 2021;1–15.
- 464 20. Mohite R V., Mohite VR, Durgawale PM. Patient satisfaction in national leprosy
465 eradication programme. *Bangladesh J Med Sci*. 2013;12(3):305–9.
- 466 21. Subedi M, Engelbrektsson U-B. Factors Contributing to Delay in Diagnosis and Start of
467 Treatment of Leprosy: Analysis of Help-seeking Narratives from a Community Study in
468 Dang District. *Dhaulagiri J Sociol Anthropol*. 2018;12:11–7.
- 469 22. World Health Organization. Defining criteria to declare elimination of leprosy. Report of
470 an informal consultation. 2020. 10–12 p.
- 471 23. Kabir H, Hossain S. Knowledge on leprosy and its management among primary healthcare

- 472 providers in two districts of Bangladesh. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19(1):1–9.
- 473 24. Devkota R, Khan GM, Alam K, Sapkota B, Devkota D. Impacts of counseling on
474 knowledge, attitude and practice of medication use during pregnancy. *BMC Pregnancy*
475 *Childbirth.* 2017;17(1):1–7.
- 476 25. Lusli M, Peters R, van Brakel W, Zweekhorst M, Iancu S, Bunders J, et al. The Impact of
477 a Rights-Based Counselling Intervention to Reduce Stigma in People Affected by Leprosy
478 in Indonesia. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2016;10(12):1–25.
- 479 26. Voorend CGN, Post EB. A Systematic Review on the Epidemiological Data of Erythema
480 *Nodosum Leprosum*, a Type 2 Leprosy Reaction. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7(10).
- 481 27. Rosdiana B, Astari L, Astindari A, Prakoeswa CRS, Zulkarnain I, Damayanti D, et al.
482 Risk factors of type 1 leprosy reaction in leprosy patients attending leprosy division of
483 dermatology and venereology outpatient clinic of dr soetomo general hospital in 2017–
484 2019: A retrospective study. *Open Access Maced J Med Sci.* 2021;9:1359–63.
- 485 28. Ferreira IP, Oliann S, Buhner-Sékula S, De Oliveira MR, Egin F, Gonçalves H de S, Pontes
486 MA, Rac. de A, Penna ML, Uci F, et al. Patient profile and treatment satisfaction of
487 Brazilian leprosy patients in a clinical trial of uniform six-month multidrug therapy (U-
488 MDT/CT-BR). *Lepr Rev.* 2014;85(4):267–74.
- 489

