Healthcare Performance of Leprosy Management in Peripheral Health Facilities of Dhanusa and Mahottari, Nepal

Ram Kumar Mahato[1*], Uttam Ghimire[1], Bijay Bajracharya[2], Binod KC[3], Dipak Bam[4], Dipak Ghimire[5] Uttam Raj Pyakurel[1], David TS Hayman[6], Chuman Lal Das[1], Krishna Prasad Paudel[1*]

Affiliations:

[1] Epidemiology and Disease Control Division, Department of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Population, Kathmandu, Nepal

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

[3] Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital & Service center, Nepal Leprosy Trust, Lalgadh, Nepal

[4] Seti Provincial Hospital, Dhangadhi, Nepal

[5] Nepal Leprosy Fellowship, Jhapa, Nepal

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

[*]**Corresponding author**

kpkalyan@gmail.com

mahatoram811@gmail.com

Abstract

Background

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

Methods

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

Results

The overall performance of health care services was 0.43 (95% confidence interval (CI), 0.40-0.46), ranging from 0.33 (95% CI, 0.25-0.40) for LFP knowledge and skills, 0.37 (95% CI, 0.32-0.43) for documentation and 0.60 (95% CI, 0.58-0.61) for case management scores of health facilities. Leprosy-related training was significantly related to the knowledge and skill of the health

workers. All identified cases (n =187) adhered to the complete treatment and release after treatment (RFT) scheme, out of which 84.5% were satisfied with the service they were provided. Leprosy disability and Ear Hand and Feet (EHF) scores were not significantly reduced in treated patients, but counseling by LFPs significantly improved cases' positive belief and practices regarding self-care.

Conclusion

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

Introduction

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

Leprosy diagnosis is based on the presence of at least one of three cardinal signs: definite loss of sensation in a pale or reddish skin patch, a thickened or enlarged peripheral nerve with loss of sensation and/or weakness of the muscles supplied by that nerve, and the presence of acid-fast

62 bacilli in a slit-skin smear (7). Multidrug therapy (MDT) is a key strategy to cure and prevent the
63 transmission of leprosy.

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

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

78 Finally, patient self-care is one of the main interventions to improve patient disability over time
79 (19). Client satisfaction is a key performance indicator which improves self-care, drug adherence
80 and recovery (20). Much of the information regarding care provided to leprosy cases is provided
81 by paramedical staff (a Leprosy Focal Person, LFP) in Nepal.

82 This operational research was carried out in the Nepali context in Dhanusa and Mahottari districts,
83 Nepal, to assess the knowledge and skills of LFPs and health facility overall performances. Metrics

assessed include the documentation in health facilities, case diagnosis and management status, improvement in disability post-MDT, self-care practices in disabled people and client satisfaction, which reflects overall leprosy elimination performance. Gaps pertaining to knowledge, skill, documentation, and case management were identified and necessary interventions like strategic basic or refresher training, regular monitoring and supervision and onsite coaching were recommended.

Material and methods

Subjects and type of study

Location

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

Study design

A cross-sectional study to assess the knowledge and skills of LFPs was undertaken in 31 health facilities. A retrospective study of documentation and case management performance was undertaken to assess the overall performance of the respective health facilities. Thirty-one health municipalities were selected (17 from Dhanusha and 14 from Mahottari) based on convenience sampling, with just one municipality not sampled from each district (total health municipalities are 18 for Dhanusha and 15 for Mahottari); one health facility was then chosen randomly from each

104 municipality. A LFP from each selected peripheral health facility was interviewed and assessed
105 for their knowledge and skills pertaining to leprosy case management.

106 On average six patients (paucibacillary, PB, or multibacillary, MB) per health facility registered
107 within the fiscal year 2018/2019 and who had completed the treatment by the end of fiscal year
108 2019/20, were enrolled in the study. These patients were invited to enroll in the study by LFPs of
109 respective health facilities. MB patients registered within the fiscal year 2018/2019 who had
110 completed MB-MDT (12 blister packs) within 18 months, i.e., by the end of fiscal year 2019/20,
111 were included. Similarly, PB patients registered within the fiscal year 2018/2019 and completed
112 PB-MDT (6 Blister packs) within 9 months before and by the fiscal year 2019/20 were included.
113 In total, 187 patients were selected to assess the case management performance of the health
114 facilities based on a sample size estimated to detect and improved performance (see below) among
115 health facilities of 50%, with a precision of $1/7^{th}$ of 50% (± ~7%) with 95% confidence.

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

117 LFP knowledge of the 3 cardinal signs and capability to differentiate leprosy and non-leprosy
118 patches was assessed through interviews by giving 12 patches (8 leprosy patches and 4 non-leprosy
119 patches) from the leprosy atlas to all LFPs to identify correctly. An LFP was given 0.25 for
120 correctly identifying up to 3 patches, 0.5 for 4-6 patches, 0.75 for 7-9 patches and 1 for 10-12
121 patches. The capability to palpate peripheral nerves (4 peripheral nerves: radial, ulnar, tibial,
122 perineal nerves) was assessed by observation by a leprosy expert. A combined score of knowledge
123 and skills was then given by providing equal weight to all variables, each given 1 mark and rescaled
124 converted again to between 0 and 1. For analyses and management purposes to identify those most
125 requiring training, the quartiles were calculated and the number of LFPs were desegregated for
126 each health facility falling in each quartile.

127 ***Health facility documentation performance assessment***

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

137 ***Case management performance assessment***

138 For the case management performance of 187 patients from 31 health facilities, information on
139 diagnosis accuracy, accuracy in classification of leprosy, treatment completion in time, number of
140 doses taken as per the required treatment regime, disability and EHF score (pre- and post-treatment),
141 number of follow-up visits, and counselling provided by the LFP with respect to treatment, self-care,
142 attitude and practice of self-care, treatment outcome, reaction management by the LFP were collected.
143 For all the patients, variables like accuracy in diagnosis, treatment completion in time, correct
144 classification of disability, counselling provided by LFPs, practice of self-care by leprosy affected
145 persons, reaction managed by LFP, completion of follow up visit, treatment outcome were treated as
146 binomial variables; for the true value (i.e. correct classification, completed treatment, etc.), 1 mark was
147 given and for the "not true" value, 0 was given. For post-treatment disability and EHF scores, 1 was
148 given for improving, 0.5 for the same performance and 0 for worsening disability and EHF scores,
149 with disability and EHF scores given separately. All post-treatment disability and EHF scores were

150 summed and averaged and rescaled to between 0 and 1. Treated leprosy cases were asked if they were
151 fully satisfied, satisfied or not satisfied with the services provided by the health system (health
152 institution and health worker or LFP).

153 ***Performance summary and management***

154 Finally, performance of health facilities was calculated by averaging the knowledge and skill scores of
155 the LFPs, documentation scores and case management performance scores of respective health
156 facilities. Performance scores of health facilities were segregated by score quartiles into four groups:
157 low, below the average, above the average and high performance for management purposes. Similarly,
158 knowledge and skill scores of the LFPs were also segregated into four groups: low, below average,
159 above average, and high.

160 **Statistical analysis**

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

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

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

182 **Results**

183 **Leprosy Focal Person backgrounds**

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

192 **Leprosy case management performance**

193 The mean knowledge and skill score of LFP was 0.33 (95% CI, 0.25-0.40). The documentation
194 mean score was 0.37 (95% CI, 0.32-0.43) and case management mean score 0.60 (95% CI, 0.58-
195 0.61). The overall mean performance of health care services was 0.43 (95% CI, 0.40-0.46).

196 **Category of Leprosy Focal Person by knowledge and skill**

197 Nine LFPs (29%, 14-48%) had low knowledge and skill scores regarding leprosy case
198 management of up to 16%, 8 (26%, 12-45%) had below average levels of > 16% to 28%), 7 (23%,
199 10-41%) had above average >28% to 41% and 7 (23%, 10-41%) higher levels (≥41%) (Table S2).

200 **Level of health facilities overall performance**

201 Ten (32%, 17-51%) of the health facilities had very low (up to 37%) overall performance scores,
202 requiring onsite coaching and intense monitoring and supervision for the continuous improvement
203 in their knowledge and skills. Similarly, 6 (19%, 7-37%) health facilities had low overall
204 performance scores, also requiring onsite coaching (Table S3). Nine (29%, 14-48%) of health
205 facilities had fair scores (>41% to 48%) and 6 (19%, 7-37%) good (>48% to 62%) performance
206 scores.

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

208 Nine (29%, 14-48%) of LFPs knew all 3 cardinal signs, 8 (26%, 12-45%) knew two cardinal signs,
209 13 (42%, 25-61%) knew just one cardinal sign and 1 (3%, 0.1-17%) had no knowledge of cardinal
210 signs of leprosy (Table S4). Further, 25 (81%, 63-93%) of the LFPs could not palpate any of the
211 targeted 4 peripheral nerves, 4 (13%, 4-30%) of the LFPs could palpate one peripheral nerve, 1
212 (3%, 0.1-17%) LFPs could palpate 2 peripheral nerves, and just 1 (3%, 0.1-17%) could palpate all
213 targeted peripheral nerves.

214 **Predictors of Leprosy Focal Person knowledge and skill**

215 Those who have taken any of the leprosy trainings (BLT or CLT) had significantly higher levels
216 of knowledge and skills (OR = 8.1, 95% CI 1.4-66.3, p-value = 0.01). The level of knowledge and
217 skills of LFPs was not significantly different with respect to their education level, i.e., a one-year
218 training course (CMA or ANM or AHW) versus a 3-year academic course (HA) (p-value = 0.16).
219 Neither 3-year HA qualifications (p-value = 0.82), nor receiving training (p-value = 0.46)
220 significantly increased LFP knowledge and skills in multivariate regression, whereas Mahottari
221 had significantly higher knowledge and skills than Dhanusa (β= 0.63, standard error (SE) = 0.21,
222 p-value = 0.002) (Figure 1). Further, the time interval since the training was taken was not
223 identified as predictor of knowledge and skills (Table S5; Figure S1, beta regression β=-0.007,
224 SE=0.024, p-value = 0.78).

225 **Case management 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.

229 **Place of leprosy case diagnosis**

230 More than 3/4 (145, 78%, 71-83%) of the cases were diagnosed in Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital, in
231 Dhanusa (Table S6). Less than one fifth (32, 17%, 12-23) cases were diagnosed in government
232 peripheral health facilities. Just nine (5%, 2-9%) of the leprosy cases were diagnosed through
233 active case detection, i.e., a contact survey by the Leprosy Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (LPEP)
234 service. One case (<1% cases, <0.1-3%) was diagnosed in India, to which Dhanusa and Mahottari
235 are bordering districts.

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

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

240 **Table 1. Disability and Ear Hand and Feet (EHF) score in Multidrug therapy treated 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%)	χ^2 = 0.25, df = 1, p-value = 0.62; 95% CI change: -6 to 12%
EHF				
0	>1	0	>1	
143 (76%, 70-82%)	44 (23%, 18-31%)	149 (80%, 73-85%)	38 (20%, 15-27%)	χ^2 = 0.39, df = 1, p-value = 0.53; 95% CI change: -6 to 12%

241

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

243 Overall, self-care did not significantly improve disability (β=0.25, SE=0.26, p-value = 0.34) or
244 EHF (β=0.45, SE = 0.35, p-value =0.21) scores (Figure S3). However, patients who have been
245 provided counselling for self-care know that self-care can improve disabilities significantly better
246 than those who have not been provided with the counseling for self-care (OR 7.9, 95% CI, 1.3-
247 89.1, p-value = 0.01)**.** Moreover, those patients who have not been provided with counselling
248 practice self-care significantly less than those who have been provided with counselling (OR = 46
249 (95% CI, 2.5-867%), p-value <0.001) (Table S7)**.**

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

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

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

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

258

259 **Discussion**

260 The Nepal country roadmap to zero leprosy recommends high levels of expertise to facilitate the
261 early detection and reduction in transmission of leprosy (9,21). Contrary to that, the mean score of
262 knowledge and skills of LFPs in Dhanusa and Mahottari was just 0.33**.** The low 0.37
263 documentation score in the study districts is a challenging issue, because high quality
264 documentation is required to assess the progress and validate the elimination of leprosy (22). The
265 exact situation of leprosy elimination in Dhanusa and Mahottari was therefore likely uncertain, as
266 the mean case management and mean overall performance was just 0.6 and 0.43 respectively.

267 Fifty five percent of LFPs had knowledge and skills less than median (≤28%), which is low and is
268 in contrast Mohite *et al*'s study in Bangladesh, where 88% of health workers had good knowledge
269 of leprosy (20). Forty five percent of the LFPs had good and above average knowledge scores
270 relative to their peers, yet above average scores were just >28% to 41% and high scores ≥41%.

Similarly, most peripheral health facilities had poor performance scores posing a serious concern for leprosy elimination.

Ninety six percent of the LFPs knew at least 1 cardinal sign, a more satisfactory result compared to a study in Bangladesh (72%) (23). However, only 19% of LFPs could palpate at least one peripheral nerve, revealing gaps in leprosy diagnosis in Nepal which need addressing**.** Only 19% (6 out 31) health facilities received a 62% aggregate performance regarding leprosy management, crucial for achieving the goal of elimination of transmission by 2030. The finding that >80% of the LFPs could not palpate any peripheral nerves is comparable to the study conducted by Roy *et al* that showed 83% health workers in parts of India were poorly skilled (13).

Those workers who have taken any of the leprosy training (BLT or CLT) had significantly higher levels of knowledge and skill (OR = 8.1, 95% CI, 1.4-66.3, p-value = 0.01), highlighting the importance of training. Other variables including education level and duration of experience were not significant markers of increased knowledge and skills. However, in multivariate regression of the raw scores, Mahottari had significantly higher knowledge and skills than Dhanusa (β= 0.63, standard error (SE) = 0.21, p-value = 0.002; Figure 1), but not training. This needs to be explored further.

Less than 5% (4.8%) of cases were diagnosed through active case detection and the majority of cases (78%) were diagnosed through the Lalgadh Leprosy Hospital, which drew the governments' attention to hidden cases in the community. The cases are diagnosed at the specialty hospitals only after the leprosy cases reach the advanced stage. This means the proportion of the cases diagnosed at the peripheral health facilities should be greater, as people in the early stages of leprosy visit these facilities. In this study, few leprosy cases were diagnosed in the peripheral health facilities.

293 So, early cases could be hidden in community due to the lack of health worker performance, lack
294 of diagnosis and/or the stigma associated with this disease.

295 Both disability score and EHF score were not significantly improved after full treatment and
296 compliance with MB MDT treatment, which was surprising as comparable studies conducted by
297 Kumar *et al* show as the disability prevalence in non-compliant cases was significantly greater
298 than fully treated patients (15). This may, however, be due to the very small sample size and
299 requires further investigation. That all cases have completed treatment in time and were released
300 after treatment indicates a well performing health system for those recruited. Moreover,
301 counselling of patients by a LFP had significantly changed the belief of the patient that self-care
302 can improve disability (OR = 7.9, 95% CI, 1.3-89.1, p-value = 0.01). The result was comparable
303 with the studies conducted by Lusli *et al* and Devkota *et al* (24,25), where counselling has a
304 significant role in changing the belief and attitude towards health behaviours. Similarly, counseling
305 significantly improved self-care practice (OR = 46, 95% CI, 2.5-867%, p-value = <0.001).

306 Among the cases monitored, only 8% developed lepra reactions, of which 2.7% (5 patients) and
307 5.4% (10 patients) were type 1 and type 2 reactions respectively. Other studies found 17.9% of
308 leprosy cases developed type 1 reactions and between 1.2% to 15.4% of the leprosy cases
309 developed type 2 reactions (26,27). These are similar trends but likely limited by sample sizes.

310 Regarding the satisfaction from serviced provided from health facilities, 84.5% leprosy cases were
311 satisfied and 10.7% were fully satisfied with the services they were provided, which is comparable
312 to a study in Brazil, where between 92-100% of patients were satisfied at some level (28).

313 Weaknesses of our study are the convenience sampling of the districts, though this was deliberate
314 due to disease burden, and patient enrolment by the LFPs of respective health facilities. This might

315 have biased the sample and future prospective and randomized control studies might improve this.
316 Moreover, the sample size is low due to low case numbers, potentially preventing more detailed
317 analyses. For example, we used univariate count data analyses where continuous data and
318 multivariate analyses would be beneficial, but we had too many variables for the small sample
319 size. Similarly, we had a large, zero-inflated sample, with many patients having zero disability or
320 EHF score. Zero-inflated beta regression tools exist and could be used, but failed to fit to our data,
321 even using a Bayesian framework (not shown), likely due to too many zeros and prior distribution
322 specification sensitivity. These factors limit some of the conclusions that can be made.

323 **Conclusion**

324 The overall performance of health care services for leprosy patients was 0.43 (95% CI, 0.40-0.46),
325 in which knowledge and skill scores of LFPs, documentation scores and case management score
326 of health facilities were 0.33 (0.25-0.40), 0.37 (0.32-0.43) and 0.60 (0.58-0.61) respectively. These
327 low scores likely hinder the elimination of leprosy transmission targets, despite all cases utilizing
328 treatment and being released after treatment and 84.5% of cases being satisfied with the service
329 they were provided. Leprosy-related training was significantly related to knowledge and skill of
330 the health workers, which provides an evidence-base for further training. Disability and EHF
331 scores were not significant reduced in treated patients in the study period, but counseling by LFP
332 has significantly improved positive belief and practices regarding self-care, again offering
333 evidence that training can help cases and potentially will contribute to reducing onward
334 transmission. As the overall performance leprosy care service was 43%, it should be improved by
335 intense evidenced-based training, onsite coaching, monitoring and supervision in order to facilitate
336 elimination of transmission. The compliance should be maintained regularly, and this study
337 provides a benchmark against which progress can be assessed.

Acknowledgments

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

Contributors

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

Declarations of interests

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

Data availability

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

361 **Ethics approval**

362 Ethical approval from Nepal Health Research Council (number 349/2022 P) was obtained through
363 an expedited review process. The data collection is a part of regular supervision and monitoring as
364 well as surveillance activities of Epidemiology and Disease Control Division (EDCD). Verbal
365 consent was taken during the interview of the participants. No personal information (only
366 anonymized) was obtained or used in this manuscript writing. No minors were enrolled in the
367 study.

368

References

1. Lastória JC, de Abreu MAMM. Leprosy: Review of the epidemiological, clinical, and etiopathogenic aspects - Part 1. An Bras Dermatol. 2014;89(2):205–18.

2. Joseph GA, Sundar Rao PSS. Impact of leprosy on the quality of life. Int J Lepr Other Mycobact Dis. 1999;67(4 SUPPL.):518.

3. World Health Organization (WHO). Leprosy (Hansen ' s disease) [Internet]. 2021. p. 1–5. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/leprosy

4. Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP). Leprosy Control Programme (/ eng / program / communicable [Internet]. 2015. Available from: https://www.mohp.gov.np/eng/program/communicable-disease/leprosy-control-program

5. Department of Health services(DoHS). Annual Report: Department of Health Services 2075/76 (2018/19) [Internet]. Vol. 76, Departement of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Population, Government of Nepal. 2019. Available from: https://publichealthupdate.com/department-of-health-services-dohs-annual-report-2075-76-2018-19/

6. Strategy GL. Global consultation of National Leprosy Programme managers , partners and affected persons on Global Leprosy Strategy. 2021.

7. Harrell GT. Epidemiology of leprosy. J Am Med Assoc. 1947;135(11):732.

8. WHO. Towards zero leprosy Global Leprosy (Hansen's disease) Strategy 2021-2030. Word Heal Organ. 2021;1–30.

9. Department of Health services(DoHS). COUNTRY ROADMAP FOR ZERO LEPROSY.

390 2021.

391 10. National Planning Commission. National Planning Commission, 2015: Sustainable
392 Development Goals, 2016-2030, National (Preliminary) Report. Government of Nepal,
393 National Planning Commission, Kathmandu, Nepal. 2015. 39–52 p.

394 11. Pal R, Kar S, Ahmad S. Current knowledge attitudes, and practices of healthcare providers
395 about leprosy in Assam, India. J Glob Infect Dis. 2010;2(3):212.

396 12. Ukpe I. A study of health workers' knowledge and practices regarding leprosy care and
397 control at primary care clinics in the Eerstehoek area of Gert Sibande district in
398 Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. South African Fam Pract. 2006;48(5):16-16e.

399 13. Roy R, Shrivastava P, Mitra K, Mondal S. Assessment of Knowledge and Skills of
400 Peripheral Health Workers for Screening and Detection of Early Nerve Damage in Leprosy :
401 A Cross-Sectional Assessment of Knowledge and Skills of Peripheral Health Workers for
402 Screening and Detection of Early Nerve Dam. J Med Dent Sci. 2018;17(6):5–9.

403 14. World Health Organization. The final push strategy to eliminate leprosy as a public health
404 problem. Quest answers [Internet]. 2003;73(3):279–81. Available from:
405 http://www.who.int/lep/resources/Final_Push_ QA.pdf

406 15. Kumar A, Girdhar A, Kumar Girdhar B. Risk of developing disability in pre and post-
407 multidrug therapy treatment among multibacillary leprosy: Agra MB Cohort study. BMJ
408 Open. 2012;2(2):1–7.

409 16. Department of Health services(DoHS). The Leprosy Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (LPEP)
410 programme: Update and interim analysis. Lepr Rev [Internet]. 2018;89(2):102–16.

411 Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326231998_The_Leprosy_Post-
412 Exposure_Prophylaxis_LPEP_programme_Update_and_interim_analysis%0Ahttps://ww
413 w.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-
414 85052234154&partnerID=40&md5=47e0d137909d005f141a14e5d0a31263%0Ahttp:

415 17. Mori S, Barua S, Suzuki K, Yotsu RR, Ishii N. [Present leprosy situation in the world in
416 2012]. Nihon Hansenbyo Gakkai Zasshi. 2013;82(1–2):59–69.

417 18. Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP). Health Management Information System
418 Guidelines,2017,. Heal Manag Inf Syst Guidel Teku Kathmandu, Nepal [Internet]. 2017;
419 Available from: https://dohs.gov.np/hmis-guideline-2017/

420 19. Eze CC, Ekeke N, Alphonsus C, Lehman L, Chukwu JN, Nwafor CC, et al. Effectiveness
421 of self-care interventions for integrated morbidity management of skin neglected tropical
422 diseases in Anambra State , Nigeria. 2021;1–15.

423 20. Mohite R V., Mohite VR, Durgawale PM. Patient satisfaction in national leprosy
424 eradication programme. Bangladesh J Med Sci. 2013;12(3):305–9.

425 21. Subedi M, Engelbrektsson U-B. Factors Contributing to Delay in Diagnosis and Start of
426 Treatment of Leprosy: Analysis of Help-seeking Narratives from a Community Study in
427 Dang District. Dhaulagiri J Sociol Anthropol. 2018;12:11–7.

428 22. World Health Organization. Defining criteria to declare elimination of leprosy. Report of
429 an informal consultation. 2020. 10–12 p.

430 23. Kabir H, Hossain S. Knowledge on leprosy and its management among primary healthcare
431 providers in two districts of Bangladesh. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;19(1):1–9.

432 24. Devkota R, Khan GM, Alam K, Sapkota B, Devkota D. Impacts of counseling on
433 knowledge, attitude and practice of medication use during pregnancy. BMC Pregnancy
434 Childbirth. 2017;17(1):1–7.

435 25. Lusli M, Peters R, van Brakel W, Zweekhorst M, Iancu S, Bunders J, et al. The Impact of a
436 Rights-Based Counselling Intervention to Reduce Stigma in People Affected by Leprosy in
437 Indonesia. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10(12):1–25.

438 26. Voorend CGN, Post EB. A Systematic Review on the Epidemiological Data of Erythema
439 Nodosum Leprosum, a Type 2 Leprosy Reaction. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2013;7(10).

440 27. Rosdiana B, Astari L, Astindari A, Prakoeswa CRS, Zulkarnain I, Damayanti D, et al. Risk
441 factors of type 1 leprosy reaction in leprosy patients attending leprosy division of
442 dermatology and venereology outpatient clinic of dr soetomo general hospital in 2017–
443 2019: A retrospective study. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2021;9:1359–63.

444 28. Ferreira IP oliann. S, Buhrer-Sékula S, De Oliveira MR egin. F, Gonçalves H de S, Pontes
445 MA rac. de A, Penna ML úci. F, et al. Patient profile and treatment satisfaction of Brazilian
446 leprosy patients in a clinical trial of uniform six-month multidrug therapy (U-MDT/CT-
447 BR). Lepr Rev. 2014;85(4):267–74.

448


A
B
C
Score
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
HA
CMA/ANM
Qualification type
no
yes
Training
Dhanusha
Mahottari
District

Figure