

1 **Cost-effectiveness of vector control strategies for supplementing mass drug**  
2 **administration for eliminating lymphatic filariasis in India**

3  
4 Short title: Cost-effectiveness of strategies for lymphatic filariasis elimination  
5  
6

7 Donald S. Shepard Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>  
8 Aung K. Lwin M.D., M.S.<sup>1</sup>  
9 Sunish I. Pulikkottil Ph.D.<sup>2,3</sup>  
10 Mariapillai Kalimuthu M.Sc., M.Phil.<sup>2</sup>  
11 Natarajan Arunachalam Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>  
12 Brij K. Tyagi Ph.D.<sup>2,4</sup>  
13 Graham B. White Ph.D.<sup>5</sup>  
14

15 <sup>1</sup> Heller School for Social Policy and Management, MS035, Brandeis University,  
16 Waltham, Massachusetts 02454-9110 USA  
17

18 <sup>2</sup> Indian Council on Medical Research (ICMR) Centre for Research in Medical  
19 Entomology, Field Station, 4-Sarojini Street, Chinna Chokkikulam, Madurai 625 002,  
20 Tamil Nadu, India  
21

22 <sup>3</sup> Regional Medical Research Centre (ICMR), Port Blair 744103, Andaman & Nicobar  
23 Islands, India  
24

25 <sup>4</sup> Department of Zoology & Environment Science, Punjabi University,  
26 Patiala, Punjab 147002, India  
27

28 <sup>5</sup> Department of Entomology and Nematology, University of Florida, P.O. Box 110620,  
29 Gainesville, Florida 32611-0620, U.S.A.  
30

31 Corresponding author: Donald S. Shepard, Heller School for Social Policy and  
32 Management, MS035, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts 02454-9110 USA.  
33 Tel: +1-617-584-6664, E-mail: [shepard@brandeis.edu](mailto:shepard@brandeis.edu)  
34

35

## Abstract

36 **Background/Methodology:** Despite progress using mass drug administration (MDA),  
37 lymphatic filariasis (LF) remains a major public health issue in India. Vector control  
38 (VC) is hypothesized as a potentially useful addition to MDA towards LF elimination. We  
39 conducted cost-effectiveness analysis of MDA alone and augmented by VC single  
40 (VCS) or integrated VC approaches (VCI). Data came from historical controls and a 3-  
41 arm cluster randomized trial of 36 villages at risk of LF transmission in Tamil Nadu,  
42 India. The arms were: MDA alone (the standard of care); VCS (MDA plus expanded  
43 polystyrene beads for covering the water surface in wells and cesspits to suppress the  
44 filariasis vector mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus*), and VCI (VCS plus insecticidal  
45 pyrethroid impregnated curtains over windows, doors, and eaves). Economic costs in  
46 2010 US\$ combined government and community inputs from household to state levels.  
47 Outcomes were controlled microfilaria prevalence (MfP) and antigen prevalence (AgP)  
48 to conventional elimination targets (MfP<1% and AgP<2%) from 2010 to 2013, and  
49 disability adjusted life years (DALYs) averted.

50 **Principal Findings:** The estimated annual economic cost per resident was US\$0.53 for  
51 MDA alone, US\$1.02 for VCS, and US\$1.83 for VCI. With MDA offered in all arms, all  
52 reduced LF prevalence substantially and significantly from 2010 to 2013. MDA proved  
53 highly cost effective at \$112 per DALY, a very small (8%) share of India's then per  
54 capita GDP. Progress towards elimination was comparable across all three study arms.

55

56 **Conclusions:** The well-functioning MDA was effective and very cost-effective for  
57 eliminating LF, leaving little scope for further improvement. Supplementary VC  
58 demonstrated no statistically significant additional benefit in this trial.

59

## Authors' Summary

60 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is one of the twenty neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) that  
61 affect more than one billion people worldwide. As part of the effort toward global  
62 elimination of LF, the Indian State of Tamil Nadu government has implemented mass  
63 drug administration (MDA) repeatedly since 1996. Despite their efforts, LF had not yet  
64 been eliminated. Although vector control (VC) is proposed to augment regular MDA to  
65 help eliminate LF, little is known about the increased impact or costs. Our study  
66 compares the costs of MDA alone to the combination of MDA with alternative VC  
67 interventions. We calculated both program operating costs and costs to communities.  
68 We found MDA to be very cost-effective for eliminating LF. Against low levels of LF  
69 endemicity ( $\leq 10\%$ ), the study had limited ability to detect further improvements and  
70 found no significant incremental improvements from VC.

71

72

## Introduction

73           Among the neglected tropical diseases [1] prevalent in India, lymphatic filariasis  
74 (LF) remains a major public health problem [2-5]. This chronic disease is characterized  
75 by acute episodes of fever with painful lymph nodes (adenolymphangitis) and  
76 progressive swelling of lower and/or upper limbs (lymphoedema) and testes  
77 (hydrocele), resulting in loss of labor and depleting the quality of life for those infected  
78 [6]. The latest data show substantial reductions in LF prevalence in most endemic  
79 countries and LF elimination from 20 countries [7], but still the persistence of a major  
80 global problem [8]. To prevent this debilitating disease in India, the country launched the  
81 National Filaria Control Programme in 1955 [9]. Control of LF is based on mass drug  
82 administration (MDA), where local workers give an annual dose of preventive medicines  
83 to all residents of the target area.

84           The Indian State of Tamil Nadu, with a strong public health infrastructure, began  
85 MDA in 1996 and gradually extended the program to cover all LF endemic districts [4].  
86 Initially the MDA program administered a single dose of diethylcarbamazine (DEC) to  
87 each eligible person; starting in 2000, the program administered DEC plus albendazole  
88 annually to the whole population of districts (implementation units) where LF was  
89 endemic [10, 11]. In 2015, MDA covered 255 districts of 21 states and territories in  
90 India where 630 million people are at risk of LF transmission [2]. However, even after 5  
91 rounds of MDA with both drugs, pockets of LF infection persist [12], attributed to  
92 inadequate MDA coverage, likely due to non-compliance with timely ingestion of the  
93 free antifilarial drugs [13, 14].

94 LF is mostly caused by the nematode worm *Wuchereria bancrofti*, transmitted in  
95 India by vector *Culex quinquefasciatus* mosquitoes [15, 16] which develop in polluted  
96 water, such as water drained into cesspits and sewers [17]. Implementing vector control  
97 (VC) programs to interrupt filariasis transmission is considered a potentially beneficial  
98 supplement to MDA programs [18, 19], perhaps essential towards the elimination of LF  
99 [20, 21]. Epidemiological evidence of the benefit from supplementary VC [22, 23]  
100 reported that two annual rounds of MDA augmented by VC with expanded polystyrene  
101 beads (EPB) and larvivorous fishes to control *Culex* aquatic stages reduced both the  
102 annual transmission potential and the transmission intensity index of LF to zero in Tamil  
103 Nadu villages [24]. A cost-effectiveness study determined that adding VC with two  
104 annual rounds of MDA decreased the prevalence of microfilaremia by 1% with an added  
105 cost of US\$0.85 per person annually [25].

106 In 2009, the Indian Council for Medical Research Centre for Research in Medical  
107 Entomology (CRME) commenced this prospective randomized trial in Tamil Nadu to  
108 examine the effects of specific VC interventions for augmenting MDA, compared with  
109 the regular MDA program alone. Both VC and MDA strengthened social cohesion by  
110 combining community-based initiatives, multiple levels of Indian government, and global  
111 partners. The results showed that all of the interventions were associated with  
112 significant reductions in LF [26, 27], highlighting the need for further analysis to clarify  
113 the best strategy. As LF has persisted both globally and specifically in India, the global  
114 health community, donors, and national governments have continued searching for  
115 affordable interventions to eliminate LF. Emerging problems, such as controlling the  
116 COVID-19 pandemic, compete for global public health resources. Cost constraints

117 affect all levels--local communities, national governments, and global institutions. LF,  
118 one of the most neglected diseases, and COVID-19, currently one of the most salient  
119 global problems, both illustrate the challenges of implementing technologies with  
120 available resources.

121 Despite decades of effort, LF continues to affect the most marginalized  
122 communities. It is not clear whether the existing strategy, MDA, will be sufficient to  
123 eliminate LF as a public health problem. To our knowledge, Sunish et al. [26, 27]  
124 conducted the only controlled study of effectiveness of augmenting MDA with VC.  
125 Sound policies depend not only on effectiveness, but also on costs. To determine the  
126 best use of available resources, this cost-effectiveness study assessed the costs of the  
127 comparative interventions of Sunish et al.[26, 27] and built on previous research by  
128 CRME [22, 23, 28]. Our study measures the costs and effectiveness of MDA, assesses  
129 the incremental costs of VC interventions, and computes the incremental cost-  
130 effectiveness ratio of adding VC interventions compared to regular MDA alone. With its  
131 rigorous assessment of costs and outcomes, we feel that this study offers key  
132 information about future LF control.

133

134

## Methods

### **Setting**

136 The State of Tamil Nadu had a population of 72 million persons in 2011 [29].  
137 Lymphatic filariasis was endemic in at least 20 of its 33 districts [30]. The State Health  
138 Department funds health services in all districts. In 2008-09, the public system  
139 contained 42 health unit districts (HUDs) which supervised 1,421 primary health care

140 (PHC) units in Tamil Nadu, with each PHC serving about 30,000 residents [31]. This  
141 cluster randomized trial collected data from 2010 to 2013 in Kallakurichi Health Unit  
142 District [32], which had a population of 3.5 million residents and 36 PHC units. The  
143 CRME, with headquarters in Madurai, Tamil Nadu, opened a field station in the  
144 Tirukoilur block of the Kallakurichi Health Unit of Villupuram [22]. The entomological  
145 team selected 36 villages as study sites based on their high risk of LF (Figure 1). With a  
146 combined population of 43,000 people, they were under three PHC units in the  
147 Tirukoilur block: Ariyur, Edaiyur and T.Kunnathur. Altogether, these three PHCs  
148 provided health care for about 150,000 people.

149 The CRME randomly assigned 12 villages to each of the three study conditions.  
150 The allocation was balanced exactly by LF microfilaremia baseline prevalence (MfP)  
151 and ecological circumstances for mosquitoes: 3 villages with MfP<1%, 3 villages with  
152 MfP 1-2%, and 6 villages with MfP>2%; and agreed closely in distribution by condition  
153 within each PHC block. The World Health Organization [33] defined the eligibility of  
154 communities for MDA treatment as the prevalence of filarial parasites (MfP) or antigen  
155 of more than 1%. While the population of villages varied [mean (M) = 1914, standard  
156 deviation (SD) =897], all villages included in this study were eligible for treatment (M =  
157 85%, SD = 9%) with the WHO's recommended two-drug regimen of DEC and  
158 albendazole [34].

159 Kallakurichi Health Unit District lies in northern Tamil Nadu, 40 to 80 kilometers  
160 inland from Puducherry on the Indian east coast. The general climate in the region is  
161 hot and dry, with moderate rainfall from September to December [35]. The majority of  
162 villagers are landless laborers who earn their living from agriculture and livestock [28].



163 For community management and administration, village committees are led by elected  
164 village presidents. Government health personnel contact with villagers relies on the  
165 village health nurse, who manages a PHC satellite unit called a sub-center, that serves  
166 approximately 5,000 inhabitants in two to three villages [36].

167 Prior to the study, no systematic VC operations had been routinely implemented  
168 in the study area. Villages have abandoned wells, since tap water standpipes have  
169 been installed. Sanitation involves pit latrines. The majority of houses lack effective  
170 barriers to insects, allowing endophilic mosquitoes easy access into the interior of  
171 dwellings and thus are able to bite residents inside. Due to the region's hot and humid  
172 weather, villagers mostly prefer not to use bed nets for the prevention of mosquito bites,  
173 because they reduce ventilation. Traditionally, water used for showering and cleaning  
174 utensils is disposed of in soakaway pits and wet ditches, which readily serve as  
175 breeding sites for *Culex* mosquitoes.

176

### 177 **Study design**

178 The State Health Department (SHD) of Tamil Nadu implements MDA almost  
179 annually with tablets of DEC, procured from local manufacturers in India [4], plus  
180 albendazole donated by the pharmaceutical company GlaxoSmithKline [37], following  
181 procedures and dosage regimens recommended by the Global Program to Eliminate  
182 Lymphatic Filariasis [38]. In the study area, the SHD organized the local program to  
183 eliminate lymphatic filariasis through five management levels: the Tamil Nadu SHD,  
184 Kallakurichi Health Unit District, primary health centers (PHC), sub-centers, and village  
185 delivery units of filariasis prevention assistants.

186           Drugs for MDA were transported by the SHD to its HUDs, then distributed to their  
187 block level PHCs. Village health nurses of sub-centers carried drugs from the block  
188 level PHCs to their villages and supervised the most peripheral workers of the delivery  
189 chain, the filariasis prevention assistants, who were volunteers. Recruited from village  
190 communities, filariasis prevention assistants directly delivered drugs to the households  
191 and observed residents swallowing their tablets. In each annual MDA campaign, one  
192 day is scheduled for filariasis prevention assistants to deliver to households, and two  
193 days are scheduled for tracing and providing treatment of those missed on the  
194 preceding day.

195           Multiple levels of management are required to coordinate delivery of the MDA  
196 tablets to residents in the 36 villages investigated. Upper health management levels  
197 were involved in more extensive distribution efforts to villages across the State that  
198 were not part of this study's population, although the cost shares of higher-level centers  
199 were pro-rated based on their total population coverages. Table 1 shows how a village  
200 is integrated into the combined State efforts of all health management levels and  
201 associated responsibilities.

202

203           <Insert Table 1 about here>

204

205           The VC intervention delivery system for this CRME research study was less  
206 hierarchical than that of the National MDA program administered by the state. Major

207 activities of added VC interventions were carried out solely by the CRME team, in close  
208 collaboration with Ariyur block PHC staff members, and other field-level government  
209 staff for some part of the monitoring and evaluation efforts. CRME recruited volunteers  
210 from villages, trained and motivated them for 'Vector Control through Community' [27] to  
211 facilitate VC activities by community members. While the two higher administrative  
212 levels (SHD and HUD) did not perform VC operations during the study, they would  
213 manage these activities should the VC programs be adopted nationwide. To make  
214 comparisons of interventions more realistic for future purposes, we simulated costs of  
215 senior management level efforts in addition to actual efforts of CRME and the  
216 contributions from its associated government management centers.

217

### 218 ***Description of treatment conditions***

219 The MDA program (intended annually but subject to dates of convenience for  
220 administrative and logistical reasons) administered anti-filarial DEC and anthelmintic  
221 albendazole to target at-risk communities. DEC, by immune mechanisms still largely  
222 undefined, causes rapid clearance and destruction of the filarial larvae (microfilariae)  
223 circulating in the blood as well as the slower, progressive death of the adult filarial  
224 worms. Albendazole is a broad-spectrum anthelmintic drug that principally affects the  
225 adult worms, thereby inhibiting the production of microfilariae and suppressing  
226 transmission of LF.

227 Two interventions were applied for integrated control of the LF vector *Culex*  
228 *quinquefasciatus*. Against the developing stages of *Culex*, a floating layer of expanded  
229 polystyrene beads (EPB) was applied at rates of 350–400 g/m<sup>2</sup> water surface area to

230 the main breeding sites (cesspits and wells) to deter mosquito oviposition and  
231 asphyxiate larvae and pupae by keeping them submerged [39]. Against the adult *Culex*  
232 mosquitoes, pyrethroid impregnated curtains (PIC) were installed to mosquito landing  
233 sites around houses (doors, eaves, and windows) to kill adult insects by contact with  
234 insecticidal pyrethroid [40].

235 Polystyrene resin granules (Shri Sakthi Insulations, Chennai, TN) were boiled to  
236 produce the expanded lightweight, ~2mm diameter EPB [41]. To facilitate the placement  
237 and retention of EPB in mosquito breeding sites, it was necessary to modify cesspit  
238 frames and unused wells to prevent water overflowing, which would flush away the  
239 EPBs. Therefore, cesspits were lined with brick walls, and unused wells were cleaned  
240 and covered by a custom-made metal mesh screen in a wooden frame.

241 The PIC intervention required measurement of the doors, windows and eaves for  
242 tailoring curtains to fit these spaces. Curtain materials were made of white woven  
243 ventilated polypropylene (VIRGO Polymer India Ltd., Kanchipuram, TN  
244 <https://virgopolymer.com/fibc/ventilated-fibc> ) impregnated with deltamethrin insecticide  
245 (2.5% SC, Chemet Wets & Flows Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad, Gujarat) by soaking and drying  
246 in the shade to achieve approximately 25mg ai/m<sup>2</sup> dosage, before cutting, sewing  
247 borders and installation by hanging with nails. Installed curtains had to be re-treated by  
248 spraying every six months to sustain insecticidal efficacy (validated by CRME  
249 bioassays). CRME implemented both interventions in their assigned villages from March  
250 to June 2010.

251

252 ***Collection of cost data***

253 For both MDA and VC programs, personnel costs were calculated using time  
254 allocation surveys, salary and wage records, reports, and narrative interviews with paid  
255 and volunteer workers. Reports were used to allocate SHD staff time, while time  
256 allocation surveys were completed by managers and some community leaders for all  
257 levels below the SHD. The salary of each full-time worker and the opportunity cost of  
258 each volunteer were collected from administrative records at the SHD, HUD, three  
259 BLPHCs, the CRME headquarters and its field station. Narrative interviews clarified  
260 implementation procedures and tasks of health workers and community volunteers.  
261 Validated costs of major activities of MDA and VC for each management level of Tamil  
262 Nadu's health system were entered into a customized Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft  
263 Corp., Redmond, Washington) cost analysis tool developed to combine the costs of  
264 MDA and VC activities from different management levels.

265 Both MDA and VC involved considerable efforts by community members.  
266 Current MDA programs engaged full community mobilization efforts once a year, while  
267 VC programs required full community mobilization in the initial year and regular  
268 maintenance by villagers in subsequent years. Community mobilization efforts for  
269 introducing VC were underway in the study villages at the time of the research team's  
270 visit to India. For a narrative understanding, Brandeis investigators with CRME  
271 interpreters interviewed participants at every level from the SHD to households.

272 Non-personnel items consisted mainly of transportation costs (allocated costs of  
273 vehicles and fuel) for all activities, drugs for MDA, polystyrene granules, cooking pots  
274 and fire for EPB production, construction materials (bricks, cement, tools) for improving  
275 cesspits, insecticide, curtains and tools for cutting and sewing them for PIC. We

276 collected information on non-personnel costs of MDA from administrative records from  
277 the PHC, interviews with supervisors, and vector control program reports [42]. To  
278 estimate economic costs of donated drugs, we asked informants for local retail prices  
279 and validated these against the International Drug Price Indicator Guide, 2009 [43]. For  
280 VC interventions, CRME documents and officials provided recorded expenditures on  
281 non-personnel items. Authors communicated regularly with CRME Field Unit staff  
282 (Supporting information S1 Figure and Supporting information S2 Figure).

283

### 284 ***Analysis of cost data***

285 WHO and its international partners such as the United States Agency for  
286 International Development (USAID) adopted a 3-stage “roll-out package” [44] against  
287 NTDs, assuming that integration and scale-up of various programs to full-national scale  
288 is feasible [45]. Our analysis followed similar assumptions that various approaches to  
289 eliminating a single NTD can be integrated and scaled up by the national ministries.

290 In our current LF study, one arm applied only one intervention (regular MDA).  
291 The other two arms used combined interventions: VCS combined MDA with EPB and  
292 VCI combined MDA, EPB and PIC. We estimated the cost of each intervention  
293 separately and assumed that, for a combined program, we could add the components to  
294 estimate the final costs of the integrated approaches. Our analysis of unit costs of each  
295 intervention consists of three major steps: (1) estimating total recurrent costs (personnel  
296 and non-personnel) by management level, (2) annualizing capital costs, and (3)  
297 calculating final unit costs per beneficiary.

298 Microsoft Excel was used to create two cost analysis tools: mass drug  
299 administration cost analysis tool (MDA-CAT) and VC cost analysis tool (VC-CAT), which  
300 were used to enter the data and perform cost analyses. Raw data from our data  
301 collection instruments provided estimates of aggregate costs of personnel activities and  
302 non-personnel inputs. We categorized these costs by each management level, i.e., the  
303 State Health Department, intermediary management levels, and household groups. As  
304 higher levels served populations of varying sizes beyond the study's 36 villages (Table  
305 1), we converted the costs at each administrative level to their corresponding per capita  
306 amounts, including the administrative costs of hiring personnel and procuring materials  
307 for VC and MDA. To compare yearly costs across the implementation strategies, we  
308 amortized capital assets over their useful lives.

309 In contrast to the State-run annual MDA programs, the VC activities initiated  
310 specifically for this study were managed by CRME and funded with donor support.  
311 Community mobilization was most intense in the first year; project managers estimated  
312 that only 15% of the staff's initial year efforts were necessary in subsequent years when  
313 communities were presumed to be self-sufficient for continuing their VC efforts. While  
314 MDA required the procurement and dissemination of drugs once a year, the lifetime of  
315 installed VC materials varied. For example, EPB required yearly production and  
316 reapplication, whereas PIC curtains were expected to last for three years, while  
317 insecticide spray on curtains needed to be reapplied every six-months.

318 Our analysis computed per capita costs based on the number of residents  
319 benefiting from each service. For MDA interventions, the combination of drugs served

320 one person. For PICs, the curtain benefited one household (average of five persons)  
321 while one cesspit modification served 27 households (135 persons). Most cost data on  
322 personnel activities and non-personnel inputs were initially collected in Indian rupees.  
323 The project was planned, and many costs were incurred in 2010. We therefore  
324 converted Indian rupees to US dollars based on the market exchange rate of 45.8  
325 rupees per US dollar in early 2010 [46] and expressed all costs in 2010 US\$.

326

### 327 ***Analysis of impact***

328 The CRME entomological team collected baseline data of parasitological  
329 prevalence and entomological status before the intervention (February 2010) and  
330 continued to collect yearly data on the post-intervention progress for three years. We  
331 collected data on microfilaria prevalence (MfP) tested by microscopic examination of  
332 night-time collection of blood smear samples and AgP using the  
333 immunochromatography card test (ICT, BinaxNOW® Filariasis, Alere Inc., Portland,  
334 Maine) for MfP and AgP, commonly used indicators to monitor progress towards LF  
335 elimination [47-49].

336 To evaluate the impact of the various control strategies, we first evaluated the  
337 impact of the reference strategy, MDA. As MDA is the standard treatment in India,  
338 there was no control area without MDA. Instead, we selected as the comparator the  
339 historical situation in 2010, as implementation of and compliance with MDA had  
340 traditionally been low [50]. We calculated the cumulative improvement from 2010 to  
341 2013 in the share of villages reaching the benchmarks towards elimination of MfP and  
342 AgP as public health problems -- MfP<1% and AgP<2%. Dividing by 3 (for 3 years), we



343 then calculated the average annual improvement.

344 To evaluate the incremental improvement of VC over MDA, we performed logistic  
345 regression analyses with these shares of villages controlled based on MfP<1% or  
346 AgP<2% as the dependent variable using Stata version 15 (StataCorp, College Station,  
347 TX). The independent variables were the final year of intervention (year), the  
348 intervention (MDA alone, as the baseline level, VCS, and VCI), and interaction terms.  
349 These interaction terms on MfP and AgP (intervention level x year) are the main  
350 variables of interest, indicating the differential effectiveness of each combination of  
351 interventions after controlling for baseline conditions and general trends. Finally, to  
352 contextualize our findings we examined India's national prevalence of LF from 1990  
353 through 2019, the latest data available.

354

### 355 ***Cost-effectiveness analysis***

356 For assessing the cost-effectiveness of VC, we converted the average annual  
357 improvements from VC by arm into disability adjusted life years (DALYs) averted per  
358 1,000 population. As the first step, we needed the annual DALY burden per person  
359 affected by LF. The one study of which we were aware reported an annual burden per  
360 case of 0.11 [51]. However, this relatively high value apparently reflected only  
361 symptomatic persons, rather than the broader population of persons infected. To derive  
362 an estimate for this broader population, we relied on the Global Burden of Disease  
363 (GBD) study. Using the most recent year available (2019), we divided India's rate of  
364 years lost to disability (58.96/100,000) due to LF by its prevalence (2.68%) [52], deriving  
365 a burden of 0.022 DALYs per person affected. Finally, we divided the incremental cost

366 per 1,000 population by the incremental DALYs averted per 1,000 population to get the  
367 incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER) by arm.

368

## 369 **Results**

### 370 ***Economic cost per person treated***

371 Table 2 summarizes lifespans of the inputs and their target beneficiaries. Table  
372 3 presents the ingredients costs (unit costs and quantities) of each component per  
373 1,000 population at the village level. Table 4 presents the corresponding analysis at a  
374 higher level (the block level). Table 5 expands the cost analysis to all levels of the  
375 health care system. Table 5 shows that approximately 25% of the economic costs for  
376 the MDA program (\$110.94 compared to \$533.55) were borne by the communities  
377 served. From the community perspective, PIC was the costliest intervention, EPB was  
378 intermediate, and MDA was least costly. VCI, which combines EPB and PCI, costs  
379 \$490.93 (i.e., \$129.46 plus \$361.47) per 1,000 households. This is 4.5 times as much  
380 as lowest cost intervention (MDA).

381

382 <Insert Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 about here>

383

### 384 ***Proportions of inputs and activities***

385 Figure 2 presents the breakdown of costs by activity and intervention. Among  
386 the three interventions, PIC is the costliest. Among activities within each intervention,  
387 procurement of the materials and delivery of the service (termed procurement and  
388 delivery) was the costliest category. The non-personnel costs of VC were much higher

389 than those of the MDA program. As EPB and PIC are supplements to MDA, the arms  
390 with these interventions cost more than MDA alone.

391

392 <Insert Figure 2 about here >

393

### 394 ***Progress towards LF elimination in the study area***

395 Descriptive analyses showed a decline in microfilaria prevalence rates (MfP) for  
396 village groups within each of the treatment conditions from 2010 through the end of  
397 CRME's collection of entomological data in February 2013. Under MDA-alone, MfP fell  
398 from its baseline levels ( $\pm$  standard error of the mean, using the approximation of a  
399 normally distributed variable) by 84 ( $\pm$ 25) percentage points. Where MDA was  
400 augmented by VC, villages with VCS reduced MfP by 75 ( $\pm$ 20) and villages with VCI  
401 reduced MfP by 90 ( $\pm$ 22) percentage points, respectively. All reductions compared to  
402 baseline levels were statistically significant [27]. Similarly, the "disease-free" share of  
403 population (i.e., living in villages with MfP below 1%) increased from 17% to 83% (66  
404 percentage point improvement) in villages with MDA alone, from 8% to 67% (59  
405 percentage point improvement) in VCS villages, and from 17% to 92% in VCI villages  
406 (75 percentage point improvement).

407 The percentages of villages with elimination are shown in Figure 3 for MfP and  
408 Figure 4 for AgP. Figure 5 shows the average AgP by study area and year. Similar to  
409 the results for average prevalence, all arms showed substantial improvement over time.

410 However, the ranking of arms varied by year and by indicator, suggesting that no single  
411 arm had dramatically superior results.

412

413 <Insert Figure 3 about here >

414 <Insert Figure 4 about here >

415 <Insert Figure 5 about here >

416 Using the AgP measure for each intervention, the relative reductions from 2010  
417 to 2013 were similar to those for MfP: 70 percentage points for MDA-alone, 89  
418 percentage points for VCS, and 79 percentage points for VCI.

#### 419 ***Elimination results and context***

420 Table 6 summarizes the results of the logistic regressions on the effectiveness of  
421 the two LF measures. The variable Year2013 is highly significant, indicating marked  
422 progress towards elimination in all arms. However, none of the coefficients for  
423 interactions between Year2013 and intervention were statistically significant.  
424 Furthermore, for each VC arm (VCS and VCI), the coefficients for MfP and AgP were of  
425 opposite sign. This lack of consistency and absence of statistical significance indicates  
426 that the differences between MDA alone and MDA supplemented by VC initiatives were  
427 consistent with chance. That is, at the time and place of the randomized trial, neither  
428 VCS nor VCI offered any statistically significant incremental benefit.

429

430 <Insert Table 6 about here>

431

432           As context, Figure 6 presents both the global and India national prevalence of LF  
433 from 1990 through 2019 based on the GBD study [52]. Over this period of almost three  
434 decades, the prevalence of LF declined by three quarters both globally and in India. Yet  
435 the prevalence rate in India remained about triple the global average. The latest (2019)  
436 prevalence rates of 2.7% in India and 0.9% globally translate to 37.2 and 71.9 million  
437 people affected in India and globally respectively. Of all people affected globally, 52%  
438 are in India, indicating that LF remained a serious public health problem in India. By  
439 dividing the DALY burden by the prevalence of LF in the GBD study, we found that each  
440 person-year of LF carried a 0.022 DALY burden. In other words, every 45 persons with  
441 LF constitute the loss in value equivalent to one year of good health (i.e.,  $1/0.022 = 45$ ).

442

443           <Insert Figure 6 about here>.

444

#### 445 ***Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio and summary results***

446           Table 7 derives the ICER of MDA, the one intervention that was significantly  
447 effective. MDA significantly improved (lowered) both MfP and AfP compared to initial  
448 values 3 years earlier. The ICER for MDA is \$112 per DALY. This ICER is substantially  
449 lower than India's 2010 threshold of \$1,350.6 per capita GDP in 2010 US dollars from  
450 the World Bank [53].

451

452 <Insert Table 7 about here>

453

454

## Discussion

455

456

457

458

459

460

This study documents substantial progress in controlling LF in the study area from 2010 through 2013, as well as over a period of almost 3 decades across all of India and globally. This progress was achieved largely through MDA. Yet, despite MDA, an estimated 37.2 million people in India remained affected by LF in the latest data (2019) [52]. A key policy question is whether existing control strategies are sufficient, or whether VC must be added as well.

461

462

463

464

465

466

This study was planned when the impact of MDA on LF had slowed, and MDA appeared insufficient to be able to eliminate LF as a public health problem in India. Supplementing MDA by one or both VC strategies was hypothesized to make a potentially crucial difference. The goals of this study were to assess the cost, effectiveness, and cost-effectiveness of MDA and the VC strategies as complements to MDA.

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

Prior to the study period, the impact of MDA was mixed. Tamil Nadu began single dose DEC mass drug administration (MDA) from 1997-98 in all endemic districts and switched to a two-drug regimen of DEC and albendazole in 2001 [54]. However, gaps in annual rounds occurred 1997, 2005 and 2006 in Tamil Nadu. Over the study period, however, MDA proved substantially more efficacious than it had previously. We counted 11 completed MDA rounds for our study villages in Villupuram District during the 15-year period ending in 2012. According to WHO's protocols for LF chemotherapy [55], after five rounds of MDA the implementation units could stop the interventions if

475 they had achieved  $\geq 65\%$  program coverage during each of the five rounds and had  
476 reached the target levels of MfP $<1\%$  or AgP $<2\%$ . A period of post-treatment  
477 surveillance would follow to be sure that LF transmission had been interrupted. In 2012,  
478 the district ended its MDA program [56].

479 The study data found that MDA was effective and highly cost-effective in  
480 controlling LF and progressing towards elimination. Improvements in adherence may  
481 explain the success of MDA in the study site compared to earlier expectations. An  
482 evaluation of Tamil Nadu's MDA program in 2000 found mediocre adherence, with 30%  
483 households being missed and 46% of those covered not swallowing the recommended  
484 MDA tablets [50]. Our interviewees reported, however, that MDA delivery rates and  
485 compliance have progressively improved over the subsequent years, consistent with the  
486 steady declines in MfP and AgP under MDA alone. As MDA is delivered by community-  
487 level workers with support from higher levels in the health system, its efficacy  
488 demonstrates success of Tamil Nadu's system of social mobilization and human  
489 development. The finding is consistent with the State's ranking as one of India's best  
490 on this dimension [57].

491 As far as we know, this study is the only comparative cost-effectiveness study of  
492 alternative LF control strategies. This study did not find a statistically significant  
493 incremental progress towards LF elimination as a public health problem from either VC  
494 intervention. We concluded that VCS and VCI were not significantly effective nor cost-  
495 effective additions to MDA during the study period in this setting. Thus, this study did  
496 not find quantitative evidence within the 3-year study period to support the addition of

497 VC. Continuing with high coverage and full compliance with the regimen of medicines  
498 (MDA), rather than adding VC, proved to be the most effective use of limited resources.

499 The reason why VC failed to demonstrate incremental impact might be  
500 attributable to the presence of numerous untreated breeding sites for *Culex*  
501 *quinquefasciatus*, such as blocked drains, buckets, discarded containers and obscure  
502 disused cesspits, which yielded sufficient mosquitoes for continuing LF transmission. To  
503 address this challenge the NVBDCP has relied on more integrated VC strategies similar  
504 to VCI [58] but we are not aware of any cost-effectiveness evaluation.

505 After 2015, the Transmission Assessment Survey found that 222 of the 256  
506 districts previously classified as endemic for LF had MfP adequately controlled [59].  
507 Most of these districts have stopped their MDA programs as they were no longer  
508 needed. However, 12 such villages in non-endemic areas had MfP between 3.2% and  
509 11.2% [60].

510 Qualitative observations and entomological data identified some potential  
511 benefits of VCI. Mosquito nuisance was reduced. Also, curtains can protect  
512 households from other insects in addition to mosquitoes, thereby reducing transmission  
513 risks for malaria, arboviruses, leishmaniasis and other infections. As VC is less  
514 dependent on individual behavior than MDA, it could potentially achieve higher  
515 coverage and compliance. Both VC interventions were reported to heighten the public's  
516 awareness of LF and capacity to control it, and perhaps improved compliance with MDA  
517 [27]. However, unless these added benefits were quantified and proved to be  
518 substantial, they cannot justify the incremental expense of VC.



519 Two opposing study limitations must be acknowledged. On the one hand, our  
520 collection of data for costs of MDA was retrospective and may have missed hidden  
521 costs of some extended activities, such as more days for MDA distribution, and  
522 contributed time from other government departments. On the other hand, costs in this  
523 trial may have been higher than those that would have been routinely found. Donor  
524 funding allowed engaging more and higher skilled staff. As a first-time effort, some  
525 experimentation required additional time. If VC had been funded entirely from Indian  
526 sources, procurement procedures might have been faster and less expensive.

527

528

### **Conclusion**

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

Before-and-after data in this trial indicate that MDA was highly effective in  
controlling LF as measured by both MfP and AgP. This success left little scope for  
further improvement. With substantially reduced levels of LF, the study did not find any  
significant additional benefits that VC added to MDA over the 3-year study period. This  
study did not assess whether VC could have replaced MDA or proven more impactful  
over a longer timeframe. However, our cost data show that VC would probably remain  
more expensive than MDA. As India's 2.7% LF prevalence persists at three times the  
global average [52], the goal of elimination justifies continuing MDA, possibly using  
triple-drug therapy [61], in communities where LF rates remain above 2% AgP or 1%  
MfP thresholds.

### **Acknowledgments**

542 We thank: Eric Ottesen, PJ Hooper, the late Dominique Kyelem and other  
543 personnel of the Task Force for Global Health for thoughtful ideas and logistical and  
544 financial support; the late S. Elango, S. Sreedharan, and M. Alamelu of the State Public  
545 Health Department of Tamil Nadu; M. Geetha, C. Palanichamy, and other health staff of  
546 the health unit district of Kallakurichi; Muthu Kumar, T. Sekar, T.A. Srinivasan, and other  
547 staff of the Ariyur Block PHC for providing key program and financial information; health  
548 inspectors, village health nurses, other medical officers, and village presidents, the late  
549 R. Rajendran, A. Munirathinam, S. Ravi, and V. Ashok Kumar of CRME for providing  
550 essential program data during our field visits; the volunteer program workers for their  
551 critical contributions to the MDA and VC services underlying this study; and Clare L.  
552 Hurley of Brandeis University for editorial support.

553

#### 554 **Emails**

555 Donald S Shepard, Ph.D. [shepard@brandeis.edu](mailto:shepard@brandeis.edu)

556 Aung K Lwin M.D., M.S, [aklwin@brandeis.edu](mailto:aklwin@brandeis.edu)

557 Sunish I. Pulikkottil, Ph.D., [sunish67@yahoo.com](mailto:sunish67@yahoo.com)

558 Mariapillai Kalimuthu, MS, [smilekali@gmail.com](mailto:smilekali@gmail.com)

559 Natarajan Arunachalam, Ph.D., [arunachalam10@yahoo.com](mailto:arunachalam10@yahoo.com)

560 Brij K. Tyagi Ph.D., [abktyagi@gmail.com](mailto:abktyagi@gmail.com)

561 Graham B. White Ph.D., [gbwhite@ufl.edu](mailto:gbwhite@ufl.edu)

562

## 563 **References**

- 564 1. World Health Organization (WHO). Integrating neglected tropical diseases into  
565 global health and development: Fourth WHO report on neglected tropical  
566 diseases. Geneva: WHO; 2017. Available from: WHO/HTM/NTD/2017.01, 278pp.
- 567 2. Dhariwal AC, Srivastava PK, Bhattacharjee J. Elimination of lymphatic filariasis in  
568 India: An update. J Ind Med Assoc. 2015;113(12):189-90 PubMed Central  
569 PMCID: 19552103.
- 570 3. Lobo DA, Velayudhan R, Chatterjee P, Kohli H, Hotez PJ. The neglected tropical  
571 diseases of India and South Asia: Review of their prevalence, distribution, and  
572 control or elimination. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2011;5(10): e1222.  
573 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001222.
- 574 4. Ramaiah KD, Das PK. Mass drug administration to eliminate lymphatic filariasis  
575 in India. Trends Parasitol. 2004;20(11):499-502. doi: 10.1016/j.pt.2004.08.010.
- 576 5. Tyagi BK (Ed.). Lymphatic Filariasis Epidemiology, Treatment and Prevention -  
577 The Indian Perspective. Singapore: Springer Nature; 2018. xix+333pp.  
578 <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-981-13-391-2> p.
- 579 6. Kumar P, Ahmad S, Bhar D, Roy R, Singh B. 'Whenever I tell her to wear  
580 slippers, she turns a deaf ear. She never listens': A qualitative descriptive  
581 research on the barriers to basic lymphedema management and quality of life in  
582 lymphatic filariasis patients in a rural block of eastern India Parasit Vectors.  
583 2023;16(1):429. doi: 10.1186/s13071-023-06036-0.
- 584 7. World Health Organization. Global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis:  
585 progress report, 2021. Wkly Epidemiol Rec, 97, 513–524. 2022. Available from:

- 586 <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/363513/WER9741-eng->  
587 [fre.pdf?sequence=](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/363513/WER9741-eng-fre.pdf?sequence=).
- 588 8. World Health Organization (WHO). Lymphatic filariasis: Key facts. 2023.  
589 Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis)  
590 [filariasis](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis).
- 591 9. Agrawal VK, Sashindran VK. Lymphatic filariasis in India: problems, challenges  
592 and new initiatives. *Med J Armed Forces India*. 2006;62(4):359-62. doi:  
593 [10.1016/S0377-1237\(06\)80109-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-1237(06)80109-7).
- 594 10. Global Alliance to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GAELF). Global Alliance to  
595 Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis, Report of the Second Meeting. New Delhi, India:  
596 2-3 May 2002.
- 597 11. World Health Organization (WHO). Annual Report on Lymphatic Filariasis 2001.  
598 Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. 2002. Available from:  
599 [WHO/CDS/CPE/CEE/2002.28](https://www.who.int/cds/cpe/cee/2002.28), 81.
- 600 12. Kalimuthu M, Sunish IP, Nagaraj J, Munirathinam A, Ashok Kumar V,  
601 Arunachalam N, et al. Residual microfilaraemia in rural pockets of south India  
602 after five rounds of DEC plus albendazole administration as part of the LF  
603 elimination campaign. *J Vector Borne Dis*. 2015;52(6):182-4. PMID: 26119554.
- 604 13. Babu BV, Babu GR. Coverage of, and compliance with, mass drug administration  
605 under the programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis in India: A systematic  
606 review. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg*. 2014;108(9):538–49. doi:  
607 [10.1093/trstmh/tru057](https://doi.org/10.1093/trstmh/tru057).

- 608 14. Jambulingam P, Subramanian S, de Vlas SJ, Vinubala C, Stolk WA.  
609 Mathematical modelling of lymphatic filariasis elimination programmes in India:  
610 required duration of mass drug administration and post-treatment level of  
611 infection indicators. *Parasit Vectors* 2016;9:501. doi 10.1186/s13071-016-1768-  
612 y.
- 613 15. Ramaiah KD, Das PK, Michael E, Guyatt H. The economic burden of lymphatic  
614 filariasis in India. *Parasitol Today*. 2000;16(6):251-3. doi: 10.1016/s0169-  
615 4758(00)01643-4.
- 616 16. Zagaria N, Savioli L. Elimination of lymphatic filariasis: A public-health challenge.  
617 *Ann Trop Med Parasitol*. 2002;96(Suppl 2):S3-13. doi:  
618 10.1179/00034980215002347.
- 619 17. Raju K, Jambulingam P, Sabesan S, Vanamail P. Lymphatic filariasis in India:  
620 Epidemiology and control measures. *J Postgrad Med*. 2010;56(3):232-8. doi:  
621 10.4103/0022-3859.68650.
- 622 18. World Health Organization (WHO). Integrated vector management to control  
623 malaria and lymphatic filariasis: WHO position statement. 2011. Available from:  
624 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/70817>.
- 625 19. World Health Organization (WHO). Lymphatic filariasis: A handbook of practical  
626 entomology for national lymphatic filariasis elimination programmes. 2013.  
627 Available from: WHO/HTM/NTD/PCT/2013.10.
- 628 20. Bockarie MJ, Pedersen EM, White GB, Michael E. Role of vector control in the  
629 Global Program to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. *Annu Rev Entomol*.  
630 2009;54:469–87. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ento.54.110807.090626.

- 631 21. Ottesen EA, Duke BO, Karam M, Behbehani K. Strategies and tools for the  
632 control/elimination of lymphatic filariasis. Bull World Health Organ.  
633 1997;75(6):491-503, PMID: 9509621.
- 634 22. Reuben R, Rajendran R, Sunish IP, Mani TR, Tewari SC, Hiriyan J, et al. Annual  
635 single dose diethylcarbamazine plus ivermectin for control of bancroftian  
636 filariasis: Comparative efficacy with and without vector control. Ann Trop Med  
637 Parasitol. 2007;95(4):361-78. doi: 10.1080/00034980120065796.
- 638 23. Sunish IP, Rajendran R, Mani TR, Munirathinam A, Tewari SC, Hiriyan J, et al.  
639 Resurgence in filarial transmission after withdrawal of mass drug administration  
640 and the relationship between antigenaemia and microfilaraemia - A longitudinal  
641 study. Trop Med Int Health. 2002;7(1): 59-69. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-  
642 3156.2002.00828.x.
- 643 24. Sunish IP, Rajendran R, Mani TR, Munirathinam A, Tewari SC, Hiriyan J, et al.  
644 Transmission intensity index to monitor filariasis infection pressure in vectors for  
645 the evaluation of filariasis elimination programmes. Trop Med Int Health.  
646 2003;8(9):812–9. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-3156.2003.01109.x.
- 647 25. Krishnamoorthy K, Rajendran R, Sunish I, Reuben R. Cost-effectiveness of the  
648 use of vector control and mass drug administration, separately or in combination,  
649 against lymphatic filariasis. Ann Trop Med Parasitol. 2002;96(Supplement  
650 2):S77-90. doi: 10.1179/000349802125002428.
- 651 26. Sunish IP, Rajendran R, Arunachalam N, Munirathinan A, Tyagi BK, Elango S, et  
652 al. Assessment of the Added Impact of Vector Control for Augmentation of MDA  
653 to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis in South India. Final Report, August 2008 to

- 654 July 2013. BMGF Funded project through RCC-ELF Grant 43922. Centre for  
655 Research in Medical Entomology (Indian Council for Medical Research),  
656 Madurai, Tamil Nadu. 2014.
- 657 27. Sunish I, Kalimuthu M, Ashok Kumar V, Munirathinam A, Nagaraj J, Tyagi BK, et  
658 al. Can community-based integrated vector control hasten the process of LF  
659 elimination? *Parasitol Res.* 2016;115:2353–62. doi: 10.1007/s00436-016-4985-6.
- 660 28. Sunish IP, Rajendran R, Mani TR, Munirathinam A, Dash AP, Tyagi BK. Vector  
661 control complements mass drug administration against Bancroftian filariasis in  
662 Tirukoilur, India. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2007;85:138-45. doi:  
663 10.2471/blt.06.029389.
- 664 29. CCI. Census of India 2011, Provisional Population Total. Census Commissioner  
665 India, Office of the Registrar General, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of  
666 India, New Delhi. 2011.
- 667 30. Sabesan S, Raju KH, Subramanian S, Srivastava PK, Jambulingam P.  
668 Lymphatic filariasis transmission risk map of India, based on a geo-  
669 environmental risk model. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis.* 2013;13(9):657-65. doi:  
670 10.1089/vbz.2012.1238.
- 671 31. Subramanian NT. Annual Public Health Administration Report - 2008-09.  
672 Chennai: Government of Tamil Nadu, 2009.
- 673 32. National Health Mission Tamil Nadu. Department of Health and Family Welfare,  
674 State Health Society, Chennai. Available from:  
675 <http://www.nrhmtn.gov.in/hud.html>.

- 676 33. World Health Organization (WHO). Monitoring and Epidemiological Assessment  
677 of Mass Drug Administration in the Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic  
678 Filariasis: A Manual for National Elimination Programmes. 2011. Available from:  
679 WHO/HTM/NTD/PCT/2011.4.
- 680 34. Rebollo M, Bockarie M. Toward the elimination of lymphatic filariasis by 2020:  
681 treatment update and impact assessment for the endgame. Expert Rev Anti  
682 Infect Ther. 2013;11(7):723-31. doi: 10.1586/14787210.2013.811841.
- 683 35. Rajendran R, Sunish IP, Munirathinam A, Kumar VA, Tyagi BK. Role of  
684 community empowerment in the elimination of lymphatic filariasis in south India.  
685 Trop Biomed. 2010;27(1):68-78. PMID: 20562816.
- 686 36. Bajpai N, Dholakia RH, Sachs JD. Scaling Up Primary Health Services in Rural  
687 Tamil Nadu: Public Investment Requirements and Health Sector Reform. New  
688 York: The Earth Institute at Columbia University, Center on Globalization and  
689 Sustainable Development Working Paper No.36, 65p. Academic Commons,  
690 <https://doi.org/10.7916/D8R49XMW>. 2008.
- 691 37. GlaxoSmithKline. Albendazole donation programme. Available from:  
692 [https://www.gsk.com/media/3350/albendazole-donation-programme-](https://www.gsk.com/media/3350/albendazole-donation-programme-infographic.pdf)  
693 [infographic.pdf](https://www.gsk.com/media/3350/albendazole-donation-programme-infographic.pdf).
- 694 38. World Health Organization (WHO). Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases.  
695 Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. 2023. Available from:  
696 [https://www.who.int/teams/control-of-neglected-tropical-diseases/lymphatic-](https://www.who.int/teams/control-of-neglected-tropical-diseases/lymphatic-filariasis/global-programme-to-eliminate-lymphatic-filariasis)  
697 [filariasis/global-programme-to-eliminate-lymphatic-filariasis](https://www.who.int/teams/control-of-neglected-tropical-diseases/lymphatic-filariasis/global-programme-to-eliminate-lymphatic-filariasis).



- 698 39. Maxwell CA, Curtis CF, Haji H, Kisumku S, Thalib AI, Yahya SA. Control of  
699 Bancroftian filariasis by integrating therapy with vector control using polystyrene  
700 beads in wet pit latrines. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 1990;84(5):709-14. doi:  
701 10.1016/0035-9203(90)90158-b.
- 702 40. Curtis C, Lines J, Carnevale P, Robert V, Boudin C, Halna J, et al. Impregnated  
703 bed nets and curtains against malaria mosquitoes. In: Curtis C, editor.  
704 *Appropriate Technology in Vector Control.* Boca Raton FL: CRC Press; 1990. pp.  
705 5-46.
- 706 41. Curtis CF, Malecela-Lazaro M, Reuben R, Maxwell CA. Use of floating layers of  
707 polystyrene beads to control populations of the filaria vector *Culex*  
708 *quinquefasciatus*. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 2002;96(Suppl 2):S97-S104. doi:  
709 10.1179/000349802125002446.
- 710 42. Government of India. National Center for Vector Borne Disease Control. 2023.  
711 Available from: <https://ncvdbc.mohfw.gov.in/>.
- 712 43. Frye JE. *International Drug Price Indicator Guide*, 2009 edition. Cambridge, MA:  
713 Management Sciences for Health, 2010.
- 714 44. Linehan M, Hanson C, Weaver A, Baker M, Kabore A, Zoerhoff KL, et al.  
715 Integrated implementation of programs targeting neglected tropical diseases  
716 through preventive chemotherapy: Proving the feasibility at national scale. *Am J*  
717 *Trop Med Hyg.* 2011;84(1):5-14. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2011.10-0411>.
- 718 45. World Health Organization (WHO). *Neglected Tropical Diseases.* 2017. Available  
719 from: [http://www.who.int/neglected\\_diseases/diseases/en/](http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/diseases/en/).

- 720 46. XE. Current and Historical Rate Tables - 17 Jan 2010 - Indian Rupee. Available  
721 from: <http://www.xe.com/currencytables/?from=INR&date=2010-01-17>.
- 722 47. Mladonicky JM, King JD, Liang JL, Chambers E, Pa'au M, Schmaedick MA, et al.  
723 Assessing transmission of lymphatic filariasis using parasitologic, serologic, and  
724 entomologic tools after mass drug administration in American Samoa. *Am J Trop*  
725 *Med Hyg.* 2009;80(5):769-73. PMID: 19407122.
- 726 48. Pani SP, Hoti SL, Vanamail P, Das LK. Comparison of an  
727 immunochromatographic card test with night blood smear examination for  
728 detection of *Wuchereria bancrofti* microfilaria carriers. *Natl Med J India.*  
729 2004;17(6):304-6. PMID: 15736550.
- 730 49. Schuetz A, Addiss DG, Eberhard ML, Lammie PJ. Evaluation of the whole blood  
731 filariasis ICT test for short-term monitoring after antifilarial treatment. *Am J Trop*  
732 *Med Hyg.* 2000;62(4):502-3. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2000.62.502.
- 733 50. Ramaiah KD, Das PK, Appavoo NC, Ramu K, Augustin DJ, Kumar KN, et al. A  
734 programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis in Tamil Nadu state, India:  
735 compliance with annual single-dose DEC mass treatment and some related  
736 operational aspects. *Trop Med Int Health.* 2000;5(12):842-7. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-  
737 3156.2000.00659.x.
- 738 51. Turner HC, Bettis AA, Chu BK, McFarland DA, Hooper PJ, Ottesen EA, et al. The  
739 health and economic benefits of the global programme to eliminate lymphatic  
740 filariasis (2000–2014). *Infect Dis Poverty* 2016;5:54. doi: 10.1186/s40249-016-  
741 0147-4.

- 742 52. Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Health Data Exchange.  
743 Lymphatic filariasis. 2023. Available from: <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd->  
744 [results/](https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-).
- 745 53. The World Bank. GDP per capita (current US \$) - India. 2023. Available from:  
746 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=IN>
- 747 54. Nandha B, Krishnamoorthy K, Jambulingam P. Towards elimination of lymphatic  
748 filariasis: Social mobilization issues and challenges in mass drug administration  
749 with anti-filarial drugs in Tamil Nadu, South India. Health Educ Res.  
750 2013;28(4):591-8. doi: 10.1093/her/cyt042.
- 751 55. Chu BK, Deming M, Biritwum N-K, Bougma WR, Dorkenoo AM, El-Setouhy M, et  
752 al. Transmission assessment surveys (TAS) to define endpoints for lymphatic  
753 filariasis mass drug administration: A multicenter evaluation. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.  
754 2013;203:e2584. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002584.
- 755 56. National Health Mission Tamil Nadu, Department of Health and Family Welfare.  
756 Vector Borne Disease Control Programme, State Health Society, Chennai.  
757 Available from: <http://www.nrhmtn.gov.in/vbdc.html>.
- 758 57. Drèze J, Sen A. An Uncertain Glory: India and its Contradiction. Princeton  
759 University Press, NJ: Princeton University Press, NJ; 2013.
- 760 58. Srivastava PK, Sonal GS, Sharma SN, Singh S, Baruah K. Integrated Vector  
761 Management: Scenario Under National Vector Borne Disease Control Program,  
762 India. J Ind Med Assoc. 2015;113(12):179-82.

- 763 59. Srivastava PK, Dhariwal AC. Lymphatic Filariasis Elimination: Update for Mission  
764 Possible. 2018. Available from: [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-13-1391-2_2)  
765 [981-13-1391-2\\_2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-13-1391-2_2).
- 766 60. Srividya A, Subramanian S, Jambulingam P, Vijayakumar B, Raja JD. Mapping  
767 and monitoring for a lymphatic filariasis elimination program: A systematic  
768 review. *Res Rep Trop Med*. 2019;10:43-90. doi: 10.2147/RRTM.S134186.
- 769 61. Tripathi B, Roy N, Dhingra N. Introduction of triple-drug therapy for accelerating  
770 lymphatic filariasis elimination in India: lessons learned. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*,  
771 2022;106(Suppl 5): 29–38.
- 772

773 **Tables**

774 **Table 1: Management levels supporting the LF mass drug administration (MDA)**  
 775 **program in the study area and corresponding populations covered**  
 776

<b>Management level</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Population covered</b>
1. State Health Department (SHD) of Tamil Nadu	Members of Task Force and Advisory Committees; Supervisory Team	31,250,000
2. Health Unit District (HUD) of Kallakurichi	HUD supervisory team: Deputy Director of Health Services, District Staff Assistant, District Malaria Officer, District Health Inspectors*, Medical College Entomologists*, HUD Rapid Response Team;	1,589,500
3. Block Primary Health Center (PHC) of Ariyur	Block PHC supervisory team: Block Medical Officer*, Assistant Medical Officer at block, Assistant Medical Officer of additional PHC, Block Health Supervisor, Non-medical Supervisor, Block Extension Educator, Community Health Nurse at block PHC, Sector Health Nurse at block PHC, Health Inspector (MDA in-charge) at Block Health Supervisor*, Non-medical Supervisor , Block Extension Educator*, Community Health Nurse, Sector Health Nurse, Pharmacist*, Sanitary Worker, Driver; Block PHC Rapid Response Team	116,822
4. Subcenter	Village Health Nurse *	5,000
5. Village	Involved villagers	1,639
6. 50 households	Village volunteers *	250

777 \* Indicates survey respondents. Note: management levels are ordered from highest to  
 778 lowest. LF denotes lymphatic filariasis.  
 779

780 **Table 2: Useful life spans and targets of MDA and VC inputs**

Inputs	Useful life (years)	Intervention targets
<b><u>Mass drug administration (MDA)</u></b>		
Sensitization by government.	1	All residents
Drugs	1	All residents
<b><u>Vector control (VC)</u></b>		
<b><i>Both interventions</i></b>		
Peer sensitization of villagers	5	All residents
<b><i>Expanded polystyrene beads (EPB)</i></b>		
Cesspit modification	3	Cesspits (1 pit per 27 households)
Application of beads	1	Wells (1 well per 55 households)
<b><i>Pyrethroid impregnated curtains (PIC)</i></b>		
Curtain material	3	All houses (1 house per 5 persons)
Spray	0.5	All houses (1 house per 5 persons)

781

782 **Table 3: Annualized costs per 1,000 population at the village level (US\$)**

Input	Unit cost (US\$)	Number of units			Total costs (US\$)			
		MDA	EPB	PIC	MDA	EPB	PIC	
<u>Village residents offered MDA (hours)</u>								
Village president	0.56	9.76			5.46			
Village vice-president	0.45	9.76			4.37			
Village ward member	0.45	29.29			13.10			
Others (e.g., previous presidents)	2.24	19.52			43.66			
<u>Village residents offered EPB &amp; PIC (hours)</u>								
<i>Personnel</i>								
Village president	0.52		1.17	1.58		0.61	0.83	
Village vice-president	0.42		0.26	0.47		0.11	0.20	
Village ward member	0.45		4.08	2.58		1.82	1.15	
Village president's ass't	0.22		4.18	8.00		0.91	1.75	
Village ward member's ass't	0.22		11.90	16.05		2.60	3.50	
Household head (procuring products)	0.22		0.82	276.58		0.18	60.39	
Village laborer	0.05		2.38			0.13		
Village meeting participant	0.14		13.34			1.87		
Secondary school student	0.04			174.68			7.75	
Mason	0.61		1.77			1.09		
Mason's helper	0.31		1.71			0.52		
Well cleaner	0.61		3.51			2.16		
Well cleaner's helper	0.12		2.11			0.26		
Village volunteer	0.22		22.84	64.41		4.99	14.06	
Demonstration participant	0.22			13.97			3.05	
PIC impregnator	0.22			69.87			15.25	
Neighborhood helper	0.22			174.68			38.14	
Other village residents attending demonstration	0.14			27.29			3.82	
Tailor	0.68			3.49			2.36	
Tailor's helper	0.23			3.49			0.79	
Sprayer	1.53			9.36			14.30	
<i>Subtotal personnel</i>						66.6	17.2	167.4
<i>Non-personnel</i>								
Expanded beads (kg)	3.8		28.2			107.8		
Curtain fabric (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.49			351.6			173.7	
Other for EPB treatment	0.004		1100			4.4		
Other for PIC treatment	0.020			1025			20.5	
<i>Subtotal non-personnel</i>						0.00	112.2	194.1
<i>Total (all resources)</i>						<b>66.6</b>	<b>129.5</b>	<b>361.5</b>

784 Notation: MDA denotes mass drug administration; EPB denotes expanded polystyrene  
785 beads; PIC denotes pyrethroid impregnated curtains; VC denotes vector control; hr  
786 denotes hour; kg denotes kilograms, m<sup>2</sup> denotes square meter.  
787 Note: Total costs equal unit cost times the quantity. Quantities shown in the table are  
788 rounded.  
789



790 **Table 4: Annualized costs (US\$) per 1,000 population at the block primary health**  
 791 **care level**

Input	Unit cost	Number of units			Total cost (US\$)		
		MDA	EPB	PIC	MDA	EPB	PIC
<u>Block primary health center staff (hours)</u>							
Medical officers	\$4.8	2.3	0.4	0.4	11.3	2.1	2.1
Public health supervisors	\$4.5	3.2	0.7	0.7	14.4	3.0	3.0
Nurses	\$4.0	2.6			10.2		
Health inspectors	\$3.5	4.7	3.0	3.0	16.5	10.7	10.7
Assistant field workers	\$2.5	1.7			4.1		
Administration workers	\$2.5	1.2			2.9		
Press people	\$2.2	0.5			1.1		
Personnel others	\$5.3	7.7			41.2		
<u>VC project staff (hours)</u>							
Lead persons	\$5.5		5.8	5.8		31.9	31.9
Project officers	\$1.6		11.4	11.4		17.6	17.6
Technicians	\$0.6		15.0	15.0		9.6	9.6
Project assistants	\$0.4		90.9	90.9		31.8	31.8
Project administrators	\$1.1		3.8	3.8		4.3	4.3
Volunteers	\$0.01		930.0	930.0		9.3	9.3
<i>Subtotal Personnel</i>					101.7	120.2	120.2
<u>Non-personnel</u>							
Expanded beads (kg)	\$0.1		1010.0			111.1	
Curtain fabric (square meter)	\$0.2			998.9			189.8
Non-personnel, other	\$1.0		108.6	110.1		108.6	110.1
<i>Subtotal Non personnel</i>					0.0	219.6	299.8
<i>Total (all resources)</i>					<b>101.7</b>	<b>339.8</b>	<b>420.0</b>

792 Notation: MDA denotes mass drug administration; EPB denotes expanded polystyrene  
 793 beads; PIC denotes pyrethroid impregnated curtains; VC denotes vector control; hr  
 794 denotes hour; kg denotes kilograms, n.a. denotes not applicable (various inputs).  
 795 Notes: Total costs equals unit cost times quantity. Volunteers were not paid for vector  
 796 control activities, but occasionally received refreshments. Unit costs for personnel are  
 797 hourly payments for paid staff, and average hourly refreshment costs for volunteers.  
 798 Non-personnel other is a composite of all other inputs, including transportation. The  
 799 quantities shown are rounded.  
 800

801 **Table 5: Economic cost of interventions (US\$) by funder and management level**  
 802 **(1,000 population)**

Management level	<u>MDA</u>		<u>EPB</u>		<u>PIC</u>	
	Gov't	Comm.	Gov't	Comm.	Gov't	Comm.
1. State	208.66	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00
2. HUD	3.58	0.00	1.29	0.00	1.67	0.00
3. Block	101.69	0.00	339.82	0.00	420.01	0.00
4. Subcenter	99.24	0.00	20.34	0.00	20.34	0.00
5. Village	0.14	66.58	0.00	129.46	0.00	361.47
6. 50 households	<u>9.30</u>	<u>44.36</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Subtotal	422.61	110.94	361.46	129.46	442.04	361.47
Combined total		533.55		490.92		803.51

803 Notation: MDA denotes mass drug administration; EPB denotes expanded polystyrene  
 804 beads; PIC denotes pyrethroid impregnated curtains; Gov't denotes government;  
 805 Comm. denotes community; HUD denotes health unit district. Combined total sums  
 806 costs funded by government and communities.

807 **Table 6: Linear regression results of incremental impact of vector control**

Independent variable	Coef- ficient	Standard error	z	Stat. sig.	95% CI (lower, upper)	
<u>A. Dependent variable: Microfilaria prevalence (MfP)</u>						
Year2013	-3.1333	0.7020	-4.46	0.00	-4.5219	-1.7446
VCS	-0.1223	0.7020	-0.17	0.86	-1.5109	1.2664
Year2013 x VCS	0.3679	0.9928	0.37	0.71	-1.5960	2.3317
VCI	-1.1430	0.7020	-1.63	0.11	-2.5317	0.2456
Year2013 x VCI	0.6418	0.9928	0.65	0.52	-1.3220	2.6057
Constant	3.8502	0.4964	7.76	0.00	2.8682	4.8321
<u>B. Dependent variable: Antigen prevalence (AgP)</u>						
Year2013	-5.6983	2.3784	-2.40	0.02	-10.4041	-0.9925
VCS	4.1813	2.2678	1.84	0.07	-0.30556	8.668
Year2013 x VCS	-4.8591	3.3216	-1.46	0.15	-11.4312	1.7128
VCI	2.8138	2.2678	1.24	0.22	-1.6731	7.3006
Year2013 x VCI	-2.9325	3.2863	-0.89	0.37	-9.4345	3.5694
Constant	8.0779	1.6035	5.04	0.00	4.9053	11.2506

808


809 **Notes:** Each panel is based as cross-section time series data with 144 observations  
 810 (36 villages times 4 years). Mass drug administration (MDA) serves as the reference;  
 811 VCS denotes vector control singular, using only expanded polystyrene beads; VCI  
 812 combines VCS with pyrethroid impregnated curtains; CI denotes confidence interval;  
 813 Comparator for MDA is no intervention; comparator for VCI and VCS is MDA;  
 814 Independent variables year 2013 shows the impact of MDA in 2013 relative to the  
 815 reference year (2010). VCS and VCI show the difference in average prevalence levels  
 816 of villages in these arms compared to those in the MDA arm. The interaction terms  
 817 show the impacts of vector control compared to MDA alone in 2013. Negative coefficients  
 818 indicate favorable progress toward elimination of LF. Stat. sig. denotes statistical  
 819 significance (two-sided) based on normal distribution for the coefficient. R-squared is  
 820 0.31 for regression A (MfP) and 0.28 for regression B (AgP).

821 **Table 7. Derivation of the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of MDA (2010 US**  
 822 **dollars)**


Row	Component	Source	Value
(1)	Baseline (2010) % of villages with MfP<1%	Figure 3	17%
(2)	Final (2013) % of villages with MfP<1%	Figure 3	83%
(3)	Cumulative change in % of villages with MfP<1%	(2) - (1)	66%
(4)	Average annual increase in % of villages with MfP<1%	(3) / 3	22.0%
(5)	Baseline (2010) % of villages with AgP<2%	Figure 4	8%
(6)	Final (2013) % of villages with AgP<2%	Figure 4	60%
(7)	Cumulative change in % of villages with AfP<2%	(6) - (5)	52%
(8)	Average annual increase in % of villages with AfP<2%	(7) / 3	17.3%
(9)	Pooled annual increase in % of villages with MfP<1% and AfP<2%	[(4) + (8)] / 2	19.7%
(10)	Implicit comparator to MDA	Text	No prevention
(11)	Incremental % of villages with MfP<1% and AgP<2%	(9) - (10)	19.7%
(12)	DALYs per person with lymphatic filariasis (LF)	GBD Study	0.022
(13)	DALYs per 1,000 persons with LF	1,000 x (12)	22
(14)	DALYs averted per 1,000 persons in arm	(11) x (13)	4.33
(15)	Overall cost per 1,000 population	Table 5	\$533.35
(16)	Incremental cost per 1,000 population	(15) - (10)	\$533.35
(17)	Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), \$/DALY	(16) / (14)	\$112
(18)	India's 2010 per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2010 US\$	World Bank†	\$1,350.6
(19)	ICER as fraction of India's per capita GDP	(17) / (18)	8%

823  
 824 Notes: DALY denotes disability adjusted life years; MDA denotes mass drug  
 825 administration; MfP denotes microfilaria prevalence in village during the year; AgP  
 826 denotes antigen prevalence in the village during the year. † Source: The World  
 827 Bank[53].

Figure 1: Map of study villages by treatment arm in lymphatic filariasis vector control (LF-VC) project funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)



831 **Figure 2: Cost per person per year by intervention and activity (US\$)**




832

833 Notation: MDA denotes mass drug administration; EPB denotes expanded polystyrene  
834 beads); PIC denotes pyrethroid impregnated curtains. The dollar amounts are costs per  
835 person per year of the activities. Note that villages receiving EPB also received MDA.  
836 Villages receiving PIC also received MDA and EPB

837  
838

Figure 3: Share of villages achieving micro-filaria prevalence (MfP) target by intervention arm




839  
840  
841  
842

Notes: MfP denotes microfilaria prevalence; MDA denotes mass drug administration; VCS denotes vector control single; VCI denotes vector control integrated; MfP<1% means the village has reached the lymphatic filariasis (LF) elimination threshold.

843  
844

**Figure 4: Share of villages achieving antigen prevalence (AgP) target by intervention arm**




845  
846

Notes: MDA denotes mass drug administration; VCS denotes vector control single; VCI denotes vector control integrated.

847




848 Figure 5: Average antigen prevalence (AgP) by intervention arm



849 Notes: MDA denotes mass drug administration; VCS denotes vector control single; VCI denotes vector control integrated.  
850

851  
852  
853

Figure 6. Prevalence of lymphatic filariasis by year globally and in India, 1990-2019



## 856 **Annex. Acronyms**

857	AgP	Antigen prevalence
858	BLPHC	Block level PHC
859	CRME	Centre for Research in Medical Entomology
860	DALY	disability adjusted life year
861	DEC	diethylcarbamazine
862	ELF	elimination of lymphatic filariasis
863	EPB	expanded polystyrene beads
864	EPS	expanded polystyrene
865	FL	Florida (state, USA)
866	HUD	Health unit district
867	ICMR	Indian Council for Medical Research
868	ICT	immunochromatography card test
869	IRR	incident rate ratio
870	IVM	Integrated vector management
871	LF	Lymphatic filariasis
872	M	mean
873	MA	Massachusetts state, USA
874	M.D.	Doctor of Medicine
875	MDA	mass drug administration
876	MDA-CAT	MDA cost analysis tool
877	MfP	microfilaria prevalence
878	M.S.	Master of Science
879	NTD	neglected tropical disease
880	NVBDCP	National Vector Borne Disease Control Program
881	PHC	primary health center
882	Ph.D.	Doctor of Philosophy
883	PIC	pyrethroid impregnated curtain
884	SC	suspension concentrate
885	SD	standard deviation
886	SHD	State health department
887	TAS	transmission assessment survey
888	TN	Tamil Nadu State, India
889	TX	Texas State, USA
890	US\$	United States dollar
891	USA	United States of America
892	USAID	United States Agency for International Development
893	VC	vector control
894	VC-CAT	MDA+ cost analysis tool
895	VCI	Vector control integrated
896	VCS	Vector control single
897	WHO	World Health Organization
898		

899 Supporting information legends

900

901 S1 Figure. Discussion of study plans at the Field Unit. From left to right: Prof. Donald S.  
902 Shepard, Dr B .K. Tyagi and Prof. Graham B. White

903

904 S2. Figure. Visit to a study village. From left to right: Shri R. Krishnamoorth (CRME  
905 Field Unit), Prof. Donald S. Shepard, Dr. Sunish Pulikkottil, Dr. Aung K. Lwin, Shri A.  
906 Munirathinam (CRME Field Unit)