

1 Full title: Prevalence of plantar ulcer and its risk factors in leprosy: a systematic
2 review and meta-analysis

3

4 Short title: Review on prevalence and risk factors for plantar ulcers in leprosy

5

6 Karthikeyan Govindasamy^{1,2}, Joydeepa Darlong², Samuel I Watson³, Paramjit Gill¹

7 ¹ Warwick Centre for Global Health, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick,
8 Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

9 ²Research Domain, The Leprosy Mission Trust India, New Delhi, India

10 ³ Institute of Applied Health Research, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of
11 Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

12

13

14 * Corresponding author: Karthikeyan Govindasamy, Email: karthikeyan.g@leprosymission.in

15

16 **Abstract**

17 **Background**

18 Plantar ulcers are a leading complication of leprosy that requires frequent visits to hospital
19 and is associated with stigma. The extent of burden of ulcers in leprosy and its risk factors
20 are scant impeding the development of targeted interventions to prevent and promote
21 healing of ulcers. The aim of this review is to generate evidence on the prevalence of plantar
22 ulcer and its risk factors in leprosy.

23 **Methodology/Principal findings**

24 Databases (Medline, Embase, Web of Science, CINAHL, BVS), conference abstracts and
25 reference lists were searched for eligible studies. Studies were included that reported a
26 point prevalence of plantar ulcer and/or its “risk factors” associated with development of
27 ulcers (either causatively or predictively), including individual level, disease related and bio-
28 mechanical factors. We followed PRISMA guidelines for this review. Random-effects meta-
29 analysis was undertaken to estimate the pooled point prevalence of ulcers. Reported risk
30 factors in included studies were narratively synthesised. This review is registered in
31 PROSPERO: CRD42022316726.

32 Overall, 15 studies (8 for prevalence of ulcer and 7 for risk factors) met the inclusion criteria.
33 The pooled point prevalence of ulcer was 34% (95% CIs: 21%, 46%) and 7% (95% CIs: 4%,
34 11%) among those with foot anaesthesia and among all people affected by leprosy,
35 respectively. Risk factors for developing ulcers included: unable to feel 10 grams of
36 monofilament on sensory testing, pronated/hyper-pronated foot, foot with peak plantar
37 pressure, foot with severe deformities, and those with lower education and the
38 unemployed.

39 **Conclusions/Significance**

40 The prevalence of plantar ulceration in leprosy is as high as 34% among those with loss of
41 sensation in the feet. However, the incidence and recurrence rates of ulceration are least
42 reported. The inability to feel 10 grams of monofilament appears to be a strong predictor of
43 those at risk of developing ulcers. However, there is a paucity of evidence on identifying
44 those at risk of developing plantar ulcers in leprosy. Prospective studies are needed to
45 estimate the incidence of ulcers. Identifying individuals at risk of ulcers will help design
46 targeted interventions to minimize risk factors, prevent ulcers and promote ulcer healing.

47

48 **Key words:** Plantar ulcers, leprosy, Prevalence of ulcer, plantar pressure

49

50 **Authors summary**

51 Foot ulcers are a common complication for individuals with loss of foot sensation due to
52 leprosy and are a primary source of stigma. This review found that approximately 34% of
53 those suffering from such sensory loss, and 7% of all those affected by leprosy, have ulcers.
54 These figures can provide a baseline for evaluating ulcer prevention or healing
55 interventions. However, lack of data on the incidence and recurrence of ulcers impedes a
56 comprehensive understanding of the burden of foot ulcer. The underlying process for
57 plantar ulcer development in leprosy remains least studied, restricting the potential for
58 targeted preventative measures. This review noted that males and those of lower socio-
59 economic status afflicted with leprosy are more prone to ulcer development. An inability to
60 perceive a force of 10 grams (touch sensation) on the sole of the foot found to be a sensitive
61 indicator for ulcer development. Inward rolling of the foot while walking, which increases
62 pressure on the foot's inner side, also heightens ulcer risks on these high-pressure areas.
63 Future studies will illuminate the ulcer development process, aiding in identifying individuals
64 at higher risk of developing ulcers.

65

66 Introduction

67 Leprosy is a neglected and often stigmatised disease. It is more prevalent among those of
68 young and middle age [1] and affected individuals may have to live with life-long disability
69 due to the chronic nature of its impairments. Annually, 30% to 40% of newly diagnosed
70 leprosy patients develop disabilities.[2] It is estimated that the prevalence of grade 2
71 disability according to WHO classification of impairments (visible impairments at the time of
72 diagnosis) due to leprosy to be over 1 million worldwide by the year 2020.[3] The Posterior
73 Tibial nerve damage has been reported to be affected in as high as 68% in people affected
74 by leprosy [4] with varying rates among new cases [5-7] leading to loss of sensation in the
75 foot and development of plantar ulcers. The recurrence of such ulcers leads to destruction
76 of the bones of the foot, subsequent amputation [8], and in some squamous cell carcinoma
77 [9]. The presence of ulcer is also associated with stigma [10] and the recurrent nature of
78 ulcers affects participation in social life of the affected person [11]. While plantar ulcers can
79 be prevented with appropriate and timely intervention [12-14], the lack of epidemiological
80 literature describing the incidence, prevalence and factors associated with the plantar ulcer,
81 limits the scope for designing and evaluating preventative interventions[15]. Reliable data
82 on the prevalence and incidence of plantar ulcer will serve as baseline to study the effects of
83 the interventions and compare between the interventions.

84

85 The aetiology of plantar ulcer is multifactorial. The loss of protective sensation in particular
86 (defined as an inability to feel 10 grams of force),[16] foot deformities, and a resulting
87 abnormal pressure distribution in plantar aspect of the foot are some of documented risk
88 factors for ulcer [17, 18]. The role of occupation, activity level and other demographic

89 factors are not known. Better understanding of the prevalence and risk factors for
90 neuropathic ulcer development would help identify those at risk to provide targeted
91 interventions, such as the provision of foot orthoses [19], customized footwear
92 modifications, and self-care interventions at the community level. Therefore, we conducted
93 a systematic review of primary epidemiological studies in people affected by leprosy with
94 the aim of answering the questions: 1) What is the prevalence of plantar ulcer in the foot
95 among people affected by leprosy and 2) What are the risk factors for development of
96 plantar ulcers among people affected by leprosy?
97

98 **Methods**

99 **Protocol and registrations**

100 This review was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022316726) and the protocol is provided in
101 the supplementary information (S1 Text). We adapted the PRISMA guideline [20] for this
102 review [21].

103 **Search strategy and study selection**

104 We performed searches in the following databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of science,
105 CINAHL, and Biblioteca Virtual de Saude. In addition, we looked for unpublished resources
106 like conference abstracts and screened reference lists of identified studies to be included in
107 the review. We contacted the corresponding author of the selected studies to obtain full
108 texts or for obtaining additional data. We used three keywords: ‘leprosy’, ‘ulcers’ and ‘risk
109 factors’, along with related terms, in the search strategies combining medical subject
110 headings (MeSH) and keywords. The search strategy is shown in the Supplementary
111 information (S2 Text).

112

113 We included studies of any design that reported a point prevalence of plantar ulcer among
114 people affected by leprosy. There was no restriction based on geographical location of the
115 studies being carried out. We included studies from 1990 as a focus on disability prevention
116 gained importance during this period after the introduction and success of multi-drug
117 therapy in controlling the disease in 1983. Studies were excluded if they were case reports,
118 editorials, letter to editors, qualitative studies and without available full texts. Articles in
119 foreign languages where an English translation was not available were excluded.

120

121 The results of all searches were saved using reference manager software (Endnote 20) to
122 identify and remove duplicates. Remaining articles were screened for inclusion in the review
123 by screening title and abstract to be included for full text review. Two authors (KG and JD)
124 screened studies and extracted data independently. A third reviewer checked and resolved
125 discrepancies and disagreements.

126 **Quality assessment**

127 The quality of included studies was assessed using the risk of bias tools for prevalence
128 studies recommended by Hoy, Brooks [22]. To assess quality for studies of nonrandomized
129 study designs such as before-after studies, cohort studies and case-control studies (only for
130 risk factor part of the review), we used Risk of Bias Assessment tool for Nonrandomized
131 Studies (RoBANS) [23]. The quality assessment was done independently by two authors (KG
132 and JD) and discrepancies were resolved through consensus. All the eligible studies were
133 included in the final analysis to calculate the pooled prevalence of plantar ulcer. We did not
134 exclude any studies based on assessment of risk of bias but were used to categorize eligible
135 studies as low to moderate risk and high risk to perform a sub-group analysis.

136

137 **Data extraction**

138 Data were extracted into standardized database in MS Excel spreadsheet. For the
139 prevalence of plantar ulcer, the data extraction variable included author name, year of
140 publication, region/country (the area where the study was conducted), study setting
141 (hospital/community), rural area/urban area, study design, sample size, study population,
142 number of participants with loss of sensation in the foot and number of participants with
143 outcome (ulcer). For the risk factors for plantar ulcers, we extracted relevant data for

144 narrative synthesis using quantitative data on risk factor for ulcer development which was
145 categorized as causative and predictive variables as shown in the Table 1.

146

147 Table 1: Risk factors for neuropathic ulcer in leprosy

Variables	Causative	Predictive
Demographic		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Higher age group• Gender• Occupation• Education level
Disease related and bio-mechanical factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of touch sensation in the sole of the foot• Higher vibration perception threshold• Loss of sweating	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Previous ulcer• High plantar pressure• Foot drop• Gross damage to bones of the joint• callus/cracks• non-adherence to wearing footwear / self-care• Duration of disease

148

149 Data synthesis and analysis plan

150 The point prevalence of plantar ulcer in the feet was calculated using number of persons
151 reported in the study with plantar ulcer as numerator. We reported the point prevalence of
152 neuropathic plantar ulcer with two different denominators as 1) among people with loss of
153 sensation in the foot due to leprosy and 2) among all people affected by leprosy. Where
154 only a prevalence is reported and not the numerator or denominator data, we looked for
155 the definition of the denominator population to ascertain. We calculated the 95%
156 confidence intervals using the standard binomial formula. We conducted a random-effects
157 Beta-binomial meta-analysis to estimate the pooled point prevalence of neuropathic ulcer in
158 the two populations (in those with neuropathy and in all patients affected by leprosy). We
159 estimated the I^2 statistic to examine between-study heterogeneity. We presented the

160 pooled analysis as forest plot for all eligible studies and disaggregated based on the risk of
161 bias assessment as low to moderate risk and high risk of bias.

162

163 We conducted a narrative synthesis of quantitative data on risk factors for development of
164 neuropathic plantar ulcer. We anticipated heterogeneity between studies in their
165 methodological, statistical, and clinical approaches. For example, the plantar pressure was
166 reported as continuous variable as peak plantar pressure or as binary/ordinal variables as
167 low, normal, and high as compared to normal foot or foot with loss of sensation but without
168 ulcer. Similarly, the loss of sensation in the foot may be ascertained using monofilament or
169 ball-point pen. These risk factors were examined in heterogeneous patient groups. We
170 stratified and combined the studies based on risk factors, population, and method of
171 analysis. We then narrated the association between these factors with the outcome (ulcer)
172 to synthesise evidence.

173

174 **Results**

175 Our search returned a total of 1,397 studies; of them 1,345 were excluded after removal of
176 duplicates (505) and screening of title and abstract (830), leaving 62 eligible full text articles.

177 We excluded 50 studies (S3 Text), leaving eight articles reporting prevalence of ulcer and

178 seven articles reporting risk factors for ulcer were included in the final review. A detail of


179 eligible studies included in the review are shown in the PRISMA flow chart (Fig 1). The

180 summary of included studies to estimate the prevalence of ulcer is shown in Table 2. All

181 studies included in the review of prevalence of plantar ulcer were hospital-based studies

182 except one from community-based setting.

183



* Studies identified from screening reference lists of included studies for full text review

Figure 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)

flow diagram of the study selection process

202 Table 2: Summary of studies included in the review for prevalence of ulcer

Study	Country	study setting	Rural / Urban	Study design	Number of people affected by leprosy	Study population	number with loss of sensation in the foot	Modality of sensory testing	number with ulcer	Point of assessment
Iyere BB (1990)[24]	Nigeria	Hospital	Mixed	Cross-sectional	410	All leprosy patients reported to hospital	108	Ballpoint pen	65	At diagnosis
Schipper A (1994)[25]	Nepal	Hospital	Mixed	Cross-sectional	260	All leprosy patients reported to hospital	58	10gms	26	At diagnosis
Li J L (2008)[26]	China	Community	Mixed	Cross-sectional	Not available	All those with foot anesthesia in one or both the foot	81	Ballpoint pen	24	After MDT
Sarkar J (2012)[27]	India	Hospital	Mixed	Cross-sectional	244	All leprosy patients reported to hospital	34	Ballpoint pen	17	At diagnosis
Freire de Santana (2018)[28]	Brazil	Hospital	Mixed	Cohort	414	All leprosy patients reported to hospital	152	10gms	21	At diagnosis
							138		9	At completion of MDT
Soomro FR (2008) [29]	Pakistan	Hospital	Mixed	Cross-sectional	100	All leprosy patients reported to hospital	9	Not mentioned	2	Not mentioned
De Sousa GC (2017) [30]	Brazil	Hospital	Mixed	Cross-sectional	276	Patients who are 18 years and	31	Not mentioned	11	Not mentioned


						above with complete neurological assessment				
Geetharani (2018) [31]	India	Hospital	Mixed	Cross-sectional	67	Newly diagnosed multibacillary patients	31	Not mentioned	13	At diagnosis

203

204

205 Prevalence of ulcer


206 Eight studies reported a point prevalence of plantar ulcer among those at risk (with loss of
 207 sensation in the foot). Four out of eight studies included prevalence data collected at the
 208 time of diagnosis of leprosy,[24],[25],[27],[31] one study at both diagnosis and completion
 209 of medical treatment for leprosy[28] and in one study data was collected post completion of
 210 medical treatment.[26] While, in two studies point of data collection was not mentioned
 211 and they included all patients reported to hospital during the study period[29],[30]. The
 212 estimated pooled point prevalence of ulcer among those at risk was 34% (95% CIs 21%,
 213 46%) shown in Fig 2. There was high heterogeneity ($I^2=95\%$, $p\text{-value} < 0.01$). In the sub-
 214 group analysis based on the risk of bias assessment, the pooled prevalence from studies
 215 with low to moderate risk of bias was 34% (95% CIs 16%, 51%) while those studies with high
 216 risk of bias was 36% (95% CIs, 25%, 47%)



217
 218 Figure 2: Prevalence of ulcer among those at risk (with loss of sensation in the foot)

219
 220 To estimate the point prevalence of ulcer among all people affected by leprosy Li J L et al
 221 (2008) study was excluded as their study population comprised only those at risk (with loss

222 of sensation in the foot) identified from the community settings. The estimated pooled
 223 point prevalence of ulcer among all people affected by leprosy was 7% (95% CIs 4%, 11%)
 224 and it is shown in the Fig 3. There was a high heterogeneity $I^2 = 91\%$, p -value = <0.01). In the
 225 sub-group analysis based on the risk of bias assessment, the pooled prevalence from studies
 226 with low to moderate risk of bias was 8% (95% CIs 3%, 12%) while those studies with high
 227 risk of bias was 8% (95% CIs, 0%, 17%).



228
 229 Figure 3: Prevalence of ulcer among all people affected by leprosy
 230

231 Table 3. Summary of studies included for risk factors

Study	Country	study setting	Rural / Urban	Study design	Sample size	Study population	number with loss of sensation in the foot	Modality of sensory testing	number with ulcer	Point of assessment	Risk factors assessed
Mustapha G (2019)[32]	Nigeria	Hospital	Mixed	case-control	124 patients with ulcer and 118 without ulcer	242 patients with leprosy	233 patients	Ballpoint pen	124/242 patients	Mixed	Treatment status, age, gender, occupation, educational status, utilization of footwear, ulcer relapse and knowledge on self-care
Kunst H (2000)[33]	Pakistan	Hospital	Mixed	cross-sectional	55 patients with ulcers	Patients admitted in hospital for ulcer care	55 patients	Wisp of cotton	40/55 patients	Post MDT	Age, gender, duration of leprosy, physical deformity level
Malaviya GN (1997)[34]	India	Hospital	Mixed	cross-sectional	40 patients (80 feet)	People affected by leprosy with loss of sensation in the hands and foot	61 feet	Graded nylon thread	22/240 sites in the foot	Mixed	Touch sensation - monofilament
Birke (2000)[35]	Thailand	Hospital	Mixed	cross-sectional	101 patients, 61 with history of foot ulceration	People affected by leprosy with loss of sensation in the hands and foot	101 patients	Graded nylon thread	Not reported	Mixed	Touch sensation- Monofilament
Feenstra W (2001)[36]	Ethiopia	Hospital	Mixed	case-control	75 patients (43 with history or with ulcer and 32 never had ulcer)	People affected by leprosy with loss of sensation in the foot	75 patients	10 grams monofilament	43/75 with history or with ulcer	Post MDT	Touch sensation, vibration sensation, Ankle ROM, Sub-talar joint position, Great toe extension and walking pattern

Cross H (2007)[37]	Nepal and Philippines	Hospital	Mixed	cross-sectional	144 subjects (69 normal foot, 75 feet with loss of sensation with or without ulcer)	People affected by leprosy with loss of sensation in the foot	75 feet with loss of sensation with or without ulcer (263 foot included in the analysis)	10 grams monofilament	39/110 feet	Mixed	Plantar pressure and Subtalar joint position
Schie van (2013)[38]	Netherlands	Hospital	Urban	cross-sectional	15 with no history of ulcer, 15 with previous ulcer, 9 with current ulcer	People affected by leprosy with loss of sensation in the foot	All 39 patients included in the study	Graded nylon thread	9 patients with ulcer	Post MDT	Barefoot peak pressure, In-shoe peak pressure, daily cumulative forefoot stress, In-shoe forefoot pressure time integral, Daily strides

232

233 **Risk factors for ulcer**

234 Seven studies were included in the final review of risk factors for development of foot
235 ulcers. Five studies were cross-sectional study design and two were case-control studies.
236 Two studies assessed demographic and clinical factors,[32],[33] three studies assessed
237 clinical factors[34],[35],[36] and two studies assessed the bio-mechanical factors.[37],[38].
238 The summary of included studies is given in Table 3.

239 **Demographic factors**

240 The occurrence of ulcer was higher among males, those with advanced age, lack of formal
241 education [29] and unemployed [36].

242 **Clinical factors**

243 **Sensory neuropathy**

244 The loss of touch sensation detected by monofilament (inability to feel 7 grams or more)
245 was associated with risk of plantar ulcers. In a study from Thailand reported that inability to
246 feel 7 grams (filament number 4.19) of monofilament had 97% sensitivity and 100%
247 specificity in identifying foot with ulcerations. The sensitivity and specificity increased to
248 100% when person was inability to feel 10 grams of force.[39] Similarly, a study from India
249 found that none who could feel monofilament of 7 gram force or below had an ulcer. The
250 risk of ulcer increases when the threshold of touch sensation was twice the normal
251 threshold [34]. In a study from Ethiopia noted that about 43% (48/112) of points (part of the
252 foot) where patient was unable to feel 10 grams of force had had ulcer or with ulcer which is
253 lower than those other reports[36].

254

255 One study reported the associated risk when one is not able to feel the vibration sensation.
256 Among different points in foot had had ulcer or with ulcer, only 47% (48/103) points had
257 impaired vibration perception (256Hz)[36].

258 **Foot deformities**

259 Presence of any foot deformities increases the risk of ulcer. The foot deformities and its
260 severity such as claw toes, footdrop, reduced medial arch and bone absorption increased a
261 risk of ulcer as compared to those with only loss of sensation. The severity of foot
262 deformities in turn was associated with the increased age and the duration of the
263 disease.[33]

264 **Bio-mechanical factors**

265 Deviation from the neutral sub-talar joint position was strongly associated with the risk of
266 ulcer. Pronated or hyper-pronated (subtalar joint) increased the risk of ulcer followed by
267 supinated foot as compared to neutral subtalar joint as observed in a standing position. As a
268 result, there was a corresponding increase in the plantar pressure which was associated
269 with the increased risk of ulcer.[37]

270

271 The increase in the peak plantar pressure over vulnerable sites increased the risk of ulcer. It
272 was observed that the barefoot peak plantar pressure was higher for those with ulcer or
273 history of ulcer as compared to those who never had an ulcer. The in-shoe peak plantar
274 pressure was considerably higher for those with ulcer as compared to those without ulcer.
275 The daily cumulative stress over foot was not associated with the risk of ulceration as much
276 as increased peak plantar pressure.[38]

277

278 Discussion

279 Prevalence of plantar ulcer

280 The burden of plantar ulcer in leprosy is always considered high but to the best of our
281 knowledge its magnitude has not been reported and systematically studied. This systematic
282 review summarised the current literature on the prevalence of plantar ulcer. From the eight
283 studies included in the review the pooled prevalence of plantar ulcer among those at risk
284 (loss of sensation in the foot) was 34% and among all people affected by leprosy it was 7%.
285 As we expected, there was high variation between the studies included in the review. In the
286 sub-group analysis based on risk bias, the pooled prevalence almost remained same (Fig 2
287 and 3). However, the confidence interval for the prevalence estimated among those at risk
288 of ulcer was wider in studies with low to moderate risk of bias as compared to studies with
289 high risk of bias. Whereas, in the pooled prevalence of ulcer among all those affected by
290 leprosy, the confidence interval was wider for those studies with high risk of bias as
291 compared to studies with low to moderate risk of bias. The main reason for excluding studies
292 from the review was the lack of reporting of the size of the denominator population, so we
293 could not calculate the prevalence.

294
295 The estimated pooled prevalence of plantar ulcer could perhaps be slightly higher than
296 actual burden in the population as seven out of eight studies included were based in tertiary
297 hospital for leprosy where people with advanced diseases are treated. In one study from
298 Brazil, the prevalence was higher at the time of diagnosis (13%) than at the time of
299 completion of Multi-drug therapy (MDT) within the same cohort (6%), likely because the
300 patients were under supervision while on MDT.[28] However, the prevalence of ulcer was

301 29% when the study sample was drawn from the community among those completed MDT
302 which may reflect the true prevalence in the population[26]. There is a decreasing trend in
303 the prevalence of ulcer over a time based on the included studies. However, the decreasing
304 trend observed may not reflect the actual burden of patients with ulcers in the community
305 which is not known. It is likely that the burden could be considerably higher due to
306 cumulative number of patients over the decades with loss of sensation in the feet would
307 increase the number of patients with ulcer, Also, the recurrent nature of the foot ulcer will
308 further add to the burden. None of the included studies reported incidence of the ulcer or
309 severity of the ulcer in terms of its size. Nevertheless, the estimated prevalence may serve
310 as baseline for studying the effectiveness of the self-care program aimed at reducing the
311 prevalence of the ulcer. Data on severity of ulcer would be an essential component of the
312 evaluation of self-care intervention as it will not only reduce the prevalence of ulcer but also
313 promote healing of ulcer where change in its size will serve as an outcome.[40]

314

315 **Risk factors for developing plantar ulcer**

316 Understanding the factors associated with plantar ulcers in leprosy is an essential step
317 towards identifying those at high risk of ulcers for targeted preventive and curative
318 intervention. The earliest discussions of the development of plantar ulcer emphasized that:
319 1) ulcers are not random and each ulcer has its own patho-mechanics, 2) ulcers start as
320 blisters over areas of necrosis and 3) the ulcers develop because of infection through
321 penetrating wound or infection of deep cracks and because of the stresses over the plantar
322 tissues while walking leading to ulcers.[41-43] The first point demands the better
323 understanding of those at risk of ulcer for the effective intervention. The current literature

324 categorizes risk factors as pre-disposing factors (sensory loss, loss of sweating and foot
325 deformities), pre-ulcerative conditions (corns, callus, fissures, blisters and haematoma) and
326 direct causes (trauma, high shearing stress and high plantar pressure) that lead to plantar
327 ulcers. [44, 45] But this categorization of risk factors does not help identify those at risk of
328 ulcer and provide appropriate intervention to prevent from ulcer development and to
329 promote healing when one develops ulcer. For example, when patient present with loss of
330 sensation (inability to feel 10 grams of force) and pronated foot and increased plantar
331 pressure over medial three meta-tarsal heads, they are likely to develop ulcer over pressure
332 area. For such foot provision of medial arch support would help offload a pressure area and
333 thus prevent from ulcer development. As a result, patients are rarely seen at the early stage
334 of the ulcers in the routine practice. In the past unsuccessfully attempts has been made to
335 determine those at risk of developing plantar.[34-36] In this review we attempted to
336 identify those factor or combination factors that can identify those at risk of developing
337 ulcers.

338

339 Among demographic factors, advanced age appears to be increasing the risk of plantar
340 ulcers. The possible explanation could be that in the advanced age there is an alteration in
341 the foot structure and function with the foot becoming flat and pronated. When coupled
342 with loss of sensation, this could lead to excessive pressure in the forefoot resulting in
343 ulcer.[46] Increased age also was associated with a longer duration of disease /
344 impairments, which could further increase the risk of plantar ulcer.[32]. This observation is
345 consistent with evidence on diabetic foot ulcers, where the occurrence of ulcer was higher
346 among those 50 years and above.[47, 48]

347

348 Men with leprosy disproportionately develop plantar ulcers.[32] The incidence of leprosy is
349 higher among males than females[49], hence the complications including ulcer could be
350 higher among male. The male predisposition is also observed in diabetes foot ulcer.[47, 48,
351 50, 51] Possibly, men do more walking and rigorous physical activity for their social role as
352 earning member as compared to female.[52] Mustapha G et al reported that the
353 unemployment and poor socio-economic status was associated with developing ulcers but
354 their role is not clear.[32] However, their study was the case-control design limiting the
355 inference of causality and it is possible that leprosy and its complications like ulcer can cause
356 stigma and limit ability to work which can lead to poor socio-economic status therefore,
357 here the direction of causality is unclear. Prospective investigation could better explain the
358 role of these factors.

359

360 Among clinical factors, inability to feel monofilament of 7 grams force is found to be a most
361 sensitive (97%) and specific (100%) predictor of ulcer development, the sensitivity increases
362 to 100% when one is unable to feel 10 grams of force. Inability to feel 10 grams of force is
363 considered loss of protective sensation, hence increasing the risk of ulcer. [53] In Feenstra
364 study, only 43% of points (sub-part of the foot) in the foot had impaired sensation according
365 to 10 grams which is too low as compared to other studies.[36] This may be due to taking
366 sub-parts of the foot than whole foot to determine the loss of sensation. It is important to
367 note here that high sensitivity of 7 grams may indicate that many with some amounts of
368 intact protective sensation do develop ulcers and by the time patient's ability to feel 10
369 grams could be too late to prevent ulcers. It is possible that patients may have protective
370 sensation but impaired temperature sensation; unable to feel warm and cold, which could
371 also lead to ulcer. Impaired warm sensation precedes in the sub-section of the people

372 affected by leprosy even before the (touch) sensory loss is clinically evident when tested
373 using monofilaments.[54] Nonetheless, the validity of using a monofilament for sensory
374 testing has been established well in a large cohort study.[7] Leprosy programs still use a
375 ballpoint pen to test the sensation instead of monofilaments in routine leprosy clinics which
376 could be too late to prevent ulceration.[55] The loss of vibration sensation was found to be
377 associated with increased risk for ulcer.[36] The method of determining the vibration
378 perception impairment was qualitative where person is asked if he/she can feel the
379 vibration given using tuning fork, where the actual threshold to perceive the vibration may
380 be lower than the given vibration frequency. Also, in this study, multiple parts of the foot
381 than the whole foot was included in the analysis, which could be a reason for low sensitivity
382 in identifying foot at risk for ulcer.

383

384 Among seven studies included in the review two studies reported biomechanical factors
385 where the pronated or hyper-pronated foot were associated with increased plantar
386 pressure which in turn was associated with ulcer.[37, 38] van Schie et al reported that
387 higher barefoot and in-shoe plantar pressure were associated with the presence of ulcer or
388 history of ulcer. The evidence suggest that increased peak plantar pressures lead to tissue
389 breakdown overtime causing ulcer in both leprosy and diabetic foot ulcers.[56, 57] While
390 cumulative activity level was not associated with the risk of ulcer, indicating that the risk is
391 likely to be a combination of foot structure and function than the activity level. Plantar
392 pressure was measured in the included studies in static (standing) position which may be
393 different from pattern observed while walking. Given the advancement in the technology it
394 is possible to assess during dynamic (while walking) position which will be more accurate
395 than the static position. The simple podiatry assessments [58] can identify foot alignment

396 which can indicate abnormal plantar pressure distribution in the foot.[59] The podiatry
397 assessment can help not only to identify person at risk of ulcer but also help provide
398 podiatric intervention which will reduce the impact of high plantar pressures. [19, 60, 61]
399 The podiatry interventions are found to be effective in reducing the plantar ulcers in
400 diabetes[62] but are least utilised in leprosy . The prospective studies are needed to
401 determine the role of biomechanical factors in identifying person at risk of ulcer for a
402 focused podiatry intervention.

403

404 History of previous ulceration as risk of future ulcers is not reported in leprosy, but found to
405 be a strong predictor of ulcer in diabetes.[63] None reported the duration of disease,
406 lifestyle, body mass index which are likely to contribute along with neuropathy, foot
407 structure and function.

408 It is important note from the included studies that each study looked at specific categories
409 of risk factors, either demographic and/or clinical variables or bio-mechanical factors. The
410 risk of ulcer is likely to be combination various factors that needs to be investigated in a
411 prospective study.

412

413 **Strength and limitations**

414 This review adopted a thorough search strategy. To improve the rigour of the review two
415 independent reviewers were involved in the process of screening of articles, risk of bias
416 assessment and data extraction. A few limitations include that many included studies were
417 from referral hospitals which may over represent those with severe form of disease,
418 therefore, the estimated prevalence of ulcer may be higher than the population value.

419 There was a high heterogeneity as included studies varied in their sample size and study
420 populations included from different geographic locations. The number of studies included
421 for review of risk factor for ulcer are insufficient to calculate risk ratios. Also, studies are
422 either cross-sectional or case-control study which limits the causal inferences of the
423 identified risk factors. We could not study the role of social and lifestyle related
424 determinants for ulcer development which are equally as important as clinical and
425 biomechanical factors. There is a need for a population-based survey to estimate the
426 prevalence of ulcer. Prospective studies on risk factors would help better understand the
427 causation of ulcer and develop targeted interventions.

428 **Conclusions**

429 The prevalence of plantar ulceration in leprosy is as high as 34% among those with loss of
430 sensation in the feet. However, the incidence and recurrence rates of ulceration are least
431 reported. The inability to feel 10 grams of monofilament appears to be a strong predictor of
432 those at risk of developing ulcers. However, there is a paucity of evidence on identifying
433 those at risk of developing plantar ulcers in leprosy. Prospective studies are needed to
434 estimate the incidence and prevalence of ulcers. Identifying individuals at risk of ulcers will
435 help design targeted interventions to minimize risk factors, prevent ulcers and promote
436 ulcer healing.

437 **Supporting information**

438 S1 Text - PROSPERO registration

439 S2 Text – Search strategy

440 S3 Text – List of excluded studies

441 **Acknowledgments**

442 We thank Samantha Johnson, academic support librarian, Warwick Medical School,
443 University of Warwick for her support in developing the search strategy. This review
444 was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) (NIHR200132)
445 and from the UK Government to support global health research and PG is NIHR Senior
446 investigator. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not
447 necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care.
448


449 Reference

- 450 1. Katoch K, Aggarwal A, Yadav VS, Pandey A. National sample survey to assess the new
451 case disease burden of leprosy in India. *Indian J Med Res.* 2017;146(5):585-605.
- 452 2. Lockwood DN. Chronic aspects of leprosy—neglected but important. *Transactions of*
453 *The Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.* 2019;113(12):813-7.
- 454 3. Meima A, van Veen NH, Richardus JH. Future prevalence of WHO grade 2
455 impairment in relation to incidence trends in leprosy: an exploration. *Trop Med Int Health.*
456 2008;13(2):241-6.
- 457 4. Dorairaj A, Reddy R, Jesudasan K. An evaluation of the Semmes-Weinstein 6.10
458 monofilament as compared with 6 nylon in leprosy patients. *Indian journal of leprosy.*
459 1988;60(3):413-7.
- 460 5. Van Brakel WH, Khawas IB. Nerve damage in leprosy: an epidemiological and clinical
461 study of 396 patients in west Nepal--Part 1. Definitions, methods and frequencies. *Leprosy*
462 *review.* 1994;65(3):204-21.
- 463 6. Saunderson P, Gebre S, Desta K, Byass P. The ALERT MDT Field Evaluation Study
464 (AMFES): a descriptive study of leprosy in Ethiopia. Patients, methods and baseline
465 characteristics. *Leprosy review.* 2000;71(3):273-84.
- 466 7. van Brakel WH, Nicholls PG, Wilder-Smith EP, Das L, Barkataki P, Lockwood DNJ, et
467 al. Early Diagnosis of Neuropathy in Leprosy—Comparing Diagnostic Tests in a Large
468 Prospective Study (the INFIR Cohort Study). *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases.*
469 2008;2(4):e212.
- 470 8. Warren AG, editor. *Neuropathic limb care : a practical guide to procedures for*
471 *reducing disabilities and amputations.* Honeysett Press: Westgate; 2018.
- 472 9. Richardus JH, Smith TC. Squamous cell carcinoma in chronic ulcers in leprosy: a
473 review of 38 consecutive cases. *Leprosy review.* 1991;62(4):381-8.
- 474 10. Adhikari B, Kaehler N, Chapman RS, Raut S, Roche P. Factors Affecting Perceived
475 Stigma in Leprosy Affected Persons in Western Nepal. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases.*
476 2014;8(6):e2940.
- 477 11. Gomez LJ, van Wijk R, van Selm L, Rivera A, Barbosa MC, Parisi S, et al. Stigma,
478 participation restriction and mental distress in patients affected by leprosy, cutaneous
479 leishmaniasis and Chagas disease: a pilot study in two co-endemic regions of eastern
480 Colombia. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;114(7):476-82.
- 481 12. Ethiraj T, Antony P, Krishnamurthy P. A study on the effect of patient and community
482 education in prevention of disability programme. *Indian journal of leprosy.* 1995;67(4):435-
483 45.
- 484 13. Chakraborty A, Sundar Rao PSS, Mahato M. Self-care programme to prevent leprosy-
485 related problems in a leprosy colony in Champa, Chattisgarh. *Indian journal of leprosy.*
486 2006;78(4):319-27.
- 487 14. Ebenso J, Muiyiwa LT, Ebenso B. Self care groups and ulcer prevention in Okegbala,
488 Nigeria. *Leprosy review.* 2009;80(2):187-96.
- 489 15. Reinar LM, Forsetlund L, Lehman LF, Brurberg KG. Interventions for ulceration and
490 other skin changes caused by nerve damage in leprosy. *Cochrane Database of Systematic*
491 *Reviews.* 2019(7).
- 492 16. Birke JA, Sims DS. Plantar sensory threshold in the ulcerative foot. *Lepr Rev.*
493 1986;57(3):261-7.

- 494 17. Bhatia M, Patil M. New on-line parameters for analysis of dynamic foot pressures in
495 neuropathic feet of Hansen's disease subjects. *Journal of rehabilitation research and*
496 *development*. 1999;36:264-72.
- 497 18. Sabato S, Yosipovitch Z, Simkin A, Sheskin J. Plantar trophic ulcers in patients with
498 leprosy. *International Orthopaedics*. 1982;6(3):203-8.
- 499 19. Cross H, Sane S, Dey A. The efficacy of podiatric orthoses as an adjunct to the
500 treatment of plantar ulceration in leprosy. *Leprosy review*. 1995;66(2):144-57.
- 501 20. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PG. Preferred Reporting Items for
502 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Medicine*.
503 2009;6(7):e1000097.
- 504 21. Borges Migliavaca C, Stein C, Colpani V, Barker TH, Munn Z, Falavigna M, et al. How
505 are systematic reviews of prevalence conducted? A methodological study. *BMC Medical*
506 *Research Methodology*. 2020;20(1):96.
- 507 22. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in
508 prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement.
509 *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2012;65(9):934-9.
- 510 23. Kim SY, Park JE, Lee YJ, Seo H-J, Sheen S-S, Hahn S, et al. Testing a tool for assessing
511 the risk of bias for nonrandomized studies showed moderate reliability and promising
512 validity. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2013;66(4):408-14.
- 513 24. Iyere BB. Leprosy deformities: experience in Molai Leprosy Hospital, Maiduguri,
514 Nigeria. *Leprosy review*. 1990;61(2):171-9.
- 515 25. Schipper A, Lubbers WJ, Hogeweg M, De Soldenhoff R. Disabilities of hands, feet and
516 eyes in newly diagnosed leprosy patients in eastern Nepal. *Lepr Rev*. 1994;65(3):239-47.
- 517 26. Li J, Mu H, Ke W, Bao X, Wang Y, Wang Z, et al. The sustainability of self-care in two
518 counties of Guizhou Province, Peoples' Republic of China. *Lepr Rev*. 2008;79(1):110-7.
- 519 27. Sarkar J, Dasgupta A, Dutt D. Disability among new leprosy patients, an issue of
520 concern: An institution based study in an endemic district for leprosy in the state of West
521 Bengal, India. *Indian Journal of Dermatology, Venereology and Leprology*. 2012;78(3):328.
- 522 28. de Santana EMF, de Brito KKG, de Almeida Nogueira J, Leadebal ODCP, Costa MML,
523 da Silva MA, et al. Deficiencies and disabilities in leprosy: from the diagnosis to discharge by
524 cure. *Revista Eletrônica de Enfermagem*. 2018;20(v20a15).
- 525 29. Soomro FR, Pathan GM, Abbasi P, Bhatti NS, Hussain J. Deformity and disability index
526 in patients of leprosy in Larkana region. *Journal of Pakistan association of Dermatologists*.
527 2008;18(1):29-32.
- 528 30. Sousa GCd, Vieira FDS, Oliveira DÉP, Costa EDS, Moura MES. Clinical-epidemiological
529 characterization of leprosy cases with physical disabilities. *Revista da Rede de Enfermagem*
530 *do Nordeste*. 2017;18(1):99-.
- 531 31. Geetharani G, Pavithra G, Sathesh P. Clinico-Epidemiological Study of Untreated
532 Multibacillary Leprosy Patients Visiting a Tertiary Care Hospital in Madurai. *Indian J Lepr*.
533 2018;90:197-206.
- 534 32. Mustapha G, Obasanya JO, Adesigbe C, Joseph K, Nkemdilim C, Kabir M, et al. Plantar
535 ulcer occurrence among leprosy patients in Northern Nigeria: A study of contributing
536 factors. *Ann Afr Med*. 2019;18(1):7-11.
- 537 33. Kunst H. Predisposing factors for recurrent skin ulcers in leprosy. *Leprosy review*.
538 2000;71(3):363-8.

- 539 34. Malaviya GN, Husain S, Mishra B, Girdhar A, Girdhar BK. Protective sensibility--its
540 monofilament nylon threshold equivalents in leprosy patients. *Indian J Lepr.* 1997;69(2):149-
541 58.
- 542 35. Birke JA, Charles A. Patout Jr, Foto JG. Factors Associated With Ulceration and
543 Amputation in the Neuropathic Foot. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy.*
544 2000;30(2):91-7.
- 545 36. Feenstra W, Van de Vijver S, Benbow C, Amenu A, Saunderson P. Can people
546 affected by leprosy at risk of developing plantar ulcers be identified? A field study from
547 central Ethiopia. *Leprosy review.* 2001;72(2):151-7.
- 548 37. Cross H, Rendall G. An investigation of common forms of pathomechanical foot
549 function and their association with force related variables and ulceration amongst people
550 with loss of sensation due to leprosy. *British Journal of Podiatry.* 2007;10(4):154-61.
- 551 38. van Schie CH, Slim FJ, Keukenkamp R, Faber WR, Nollet F. Plantar pressure and daily
552 cumulative stress in persons affected by leprosy with current, previous and no previous foot
553 ulceration. *Gait Posture.* 2013;37(3):326-30.
- 554 39. Birke JA, Brandsma JW, Schreuders TA, Piefer A. Sensory testing with monofilaments
555 in Hansen's disease and normal control subjects. *Int J Lepr Other Mycobact Dis.*
556 2000;68(3):291-8.
- 557 40. Forsetlund L, Reinar L. Quality of reporting and of methodology of studies on
558 interventions for trophic ulcers in leprosy: A systematic review. *Indian Journal of*
559 *Dermatology, Venereology and Leprology.* 2008;74:331.
- 560 41. Price EW. Studies in plantar ulcers in leprosy. IV. Etiology of plantar ulcers. *Lepr Rev.*
561 1959;30:242-8.
- 562 42. Price EW. Studies on plantar ulcers in leprosy. *Lepr Rev.* 1959;30(2):98-105.
- 563 43. Price E. Studies on Plantar Ulcers in Leprosy. III. The Natural History of Plantar Ulcers.
564 *Leprosy Review.* 1959;30(3):180-83.
- 565 44. Srinivasan H. Prevention of disabilities in patients with leprosy : a practical guide.
566 Srinivasan H, editor. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1993. 140 p.
- 567 45. Srinivasan H. Management of ulcers in neurologically impaired feet in leprosy
568 affected persons. Surgical reconstruction and rehabilitation in leprosy and other
569 neuropathies Kathmandu, Nepal: Ekta Books. 2004:193-226.
- 570 46. Scott G, Menz HB, Newcombe L. Age-related differences in foot structure and
571 function. *Gait Posture.* 2007;26(1):68-75.
- 572 47. Monteiro-Soares M, Boyko EJ, Ribeiro J, Ribeiro I, Dinis-Ribeiro M. Predictive factors
573 for diabetic foot ulceration: a systematic review. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev.* 2012;28(7):574-
574 600.
- 575 48. Tang WH, Zhao YN, Cheng ZX, Xu JX, Zhang Y, Liu XM. Risk factors for diabetic foot
576 ulcers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Vascular.* 2023:17085381231154805.
- 577 49. Nery JS, Ramond A, Pescarini JM, Alves A, Strina A, Ichihara MY, et al. Socioeconomic
578 determinants of leprosy new case detection in the 100 Million Brazilian Cohort: a
579 population-based linkage study. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2019;7(9):e1226-e36.
- 580 50. Huang ZH, Li SQ, Kou Y, Huang L, Yu T, Hu A. Risk factors for the recurrence of
581 diabetic foot ulcers among diabetic patients: a meta-analysis. *Int Wound J.* 2019;16(6):1373-
582 82.
- 583 51. Ahmed MU, Tannous WK, Agho KE, Henshaw F, Turner D, Simmons D. Social
584 determinants of diabetes-related foot disease among older adults in New South Wales,

- 585 Australia: evidence from a population-based study. *Journal of Foot and Ankle Research*.
586 2021;14(1):65.
- 587 52. Uddin R, Hasan M, Saif-Ur-Rahman KM, Mandic S, Khan A. Physical activity and
588 sedentary behaviour in Bangladesh: a systematic scoping review. *Public Health*.
589 2020;179:147-59.
- 590 53. Hammond C, Klenerman P. Protective sensation in the foot in leprosy. *Leprosy*
591 review. 1988;59(4):347-54.
- 592 54. Smith WCS, Nicholls PG, Das L, Barkataki P, Suneetha S, Suneetha L, et al. Predicting
593 Neuropathy and Reactions in Leprosy at Diagnosis and Before Incident Events—Results from
594 the INFIR Cohort Study. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2009;3(8):e500.
- 595 55. Training manual for medical officer. New Delhi, Chengalpattu: CLD, CLTRI; 2019.
- 596 56. Patry J, Belley R, Côté M, Chateau-Degat M-L. Plantar pressures, plantar forces, and
597 their influence on the pathogenesis of diabetic foot ulcers: a review. *Journal of the*
598 *American Podiatric Medical Association*. 2013;103(4):322-32.
- 599 57. Bauman JH, Girling J, Brand P. Plantar pressure and trophic ulceration. An evaluation
600 of footwear. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery British volume*. 1963;45 4:652-73.
- 601 58. Cross HA, Lehman L. The validity and reliability of a simple semantic classification of
602 foot posture. *Leprosy review*. 2008;79(4):416.
- 603 59. Sánchez-Rodríguez R, Martínez-Nova A, Escamilla-Martínez E, Pedrera-Zamorano JD.
604 Can the Foot Posture Index or their individual criteria predict dynamic plantar pressures?
605 *Gait & Posture*. 2012;36(3):591-5.
- 606 60. Cross H. Foot orthotic therapy. *Surgical Reconstruction & Rehabilitation in Leprosy*
607 *and other Neuropathies*. 2004:243.
- 608 61. Govindasamy K, Paul SK. Appropriate footwear and orthoses are essential
609 components in the management of the foot at risk of ulceration in leprosy. *Lepr Rev*.
610 2021;92(4):366-74.
- 611 62. Paisey RB, Abbott A, Paisey CF, Walker D. Diabetic foot ulcer incidence and survival
612 with improved diabetic foot services: an 18-year study. *Diabetic Medicine*.
613 2019;36(11):1424-30.
- 614 63. Crawford F, Cezard G, Chappell FM, Group P. The development and validation of a
615 multivariable prognostic model to predict foot ulceration in diabetes using a systematic
616 review and individual patient data meta-analyses. *Diabet Med*. 2018;35(11):1480-93.
617



* Studies identified from screening reference lists of included studies for full text review

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3