

1 IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF LEPROSY ULCERS THROUGH
2 A COMMUNITY SELF-CARE INTERVENTION USING A STEPPED
3 WEDGE CLUSTER RANDOMISED TRIAL IN SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA

4
5 Anthony O Meka^{1*}, Linda Ugwu¹, Yixin Wang², Samuel I. Watson², Onaedo Ilozumba²,
6 Uchechukwu Akunna¹, Sopna Choudhury², Joseph N Chukwu¹, Paramjit Gill³, Antje
7 Lindenmeyer², Ngozi Murphy-Okpala¹, Nchekwube Ndubuizu¹, Jo Sartori², Frances
8 Griffiths^{3,4#}, Richard J. Lilford^{2#}

9
10 ¹RedAid Nigeria (RAN), Enugu, Nigeria.

11 ²Institute of Applied Health Research, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of
12 Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK. Institute of Clinical Sciences, College of Medical
13 and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK.

14 ³Warwick Centre for Global Health, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK.

15 ⁴Centre for Health Policy, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

16 *Corresponding author

17 #Joint senior author

18

19 **WORD COUNT: 5118 (excluding abstract)**

20

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 Abstract (WORDS 323)

23 Background:

24 People with sensory neuropathy caused by leprosy suffer from recurrent ulcers. Self-care is
25 used to promote ulcer healing and reduce recurrence. The challenge is to maximise use of
26 self-care and to optimise the way it is practised. RedAid Nigeria in South-East Nigeria
27 adapted and implemented a recently developed international guideline for self-care of
28 ulcers in an area with a high prevalence of leprosy. We report a prospective evaluation of
29 the effectiveness of this intervention in reducing the prevalence and severity of ulcers and
30 in improving wellbeing.

31 Methods:

32 A mixed methods partial stepped wedge cluster randomized trial across 15 clinics serving
33 patients affected by neuropathy and recurrent ulcers. Outcomes were number and area of
34 ulcers, self-rated health and wellbeing. We used a Bayesian analysis to estimate treatment
35 effects and a process analysis based on descriptive statistics and thematic analysis of
36 qualitative data.

37 Results:

38 The ulcers at baseline were long-standing – mean (sd) of ulcer duration at baseline was
39 58.55 (94.49) months and total disability rate was high (65.99%). There was no evidence of
40 an intervention effect on the persistence of ulcers (OR: 1.00 (95% credible interval (CrI) 0.29
41 – 3.56) or relative area of ulcers (cm²) 1.12 (0.53 – 2.27). There was evidence of an increase
42 in self-reported health and wellbeing associated with the intervention (EQ-5D VAS mean
43 difference 10.93 (8.60, 13.23) out of 100; life satisfaction 1.18 (0.65, 1.72) out of 10).

44 Process data indicate the intervention was delivered as planned. Qualitative data
45 triangulated with quantitative data findings suggest enthusiasm among participants for and
46 adherence to the intervention. Improved wellbeing was described in terms of improved
47 confidence in administering self-care and better integration in local communities.

48 Discussion:

49 The intervention improved perceptions of health and wellbeing, despite having small and
50 uncertain effects on ulcer-related outcomes. Effecting an improvement in ulcer size and
51 number through a community intervention may be difficult to achieve in poor, rural
52 contexts, even if patients respond positively to the intervention.

53 Trial Registration: Retrospectively registered on the ISRCTN registry with trial registration
54 number ISRCTN12572449 and can be viewed at: <https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN12572449>.

55 KEYWORDS

56 Leprosy, neuropathic ulcers, Low and middle-income countries, Self-care, stepped wedge,
57 randomized trial.

59 Introduction

60 Patients affected by leprosy do not commonly present with an ulcer at the time of diagnosis.
61 As in diabetes, ulcers are caused by nerve damage and the resulting loss of sensation.
62 Neuropathy in leprosy is caused primarily by inflammatory ‘reactions’, which occur in 30-70%
63 of leprosy cases in response to live *Mycobacterium leprae* or persistent cell wall antigens in
64 skin and nerve tissues (1). Those experiencing recurrent ulcers often face significant
65 consequences, including diminished function, financial setbacks, and social stigma. As a result
66 people suffer chronic depression and withdrawal from society (2). The standard method for
67 both treatment and prevention of neuropathic ulcers is a programme of “self-care”. The
68 World Health Organization (WHO) defines self-care as ‘the ability of individuals, families and
69 communities to promote health, prevent disease, maintain health, and cope with illness and
70 disability with or without the support of a health-care provider’ (3). The aim of self-care is to
71 enable affected people to manage their diseases and continue with their normal activities.
72 Self-care in leprosy follows a sequence, beginning with visual inspection of the skin and limbs
73 to identify early stages of ulcer formation followed by intensive skin care processes including
74 soaking, scraping, and oiling ulcerated or vulnerable surfaces. Above all self-care relies on
75 reducing pressure on affected surfaces by walking less and/or walking with the use of crutches
76 or an off-loading device such as a specifically designed shoe (4, 5).

77 Self-care is supported by evidence from a recent systematic review which reported that about
78 two-thirds of ulcers in diabetes can be avoided through self-care (6). Similar results have been
79 reported in leprosy in Nigeria (7). Recent guidelines from the WHO and the International
80 Federation of Anti-leprosy Associations (ILEP) strongly recommend self-care. However, self-
81 care does not exist in a vacuum but to be sustainable it must be supported by the broader

82 system in which it is located (8). The WHO Global Leprosy Strategy has identified the need for
83 *“research to build models that demonstrate how participation of affected persons can be*
84 *structurally embedded in various contexts”* and *“research into involvement of different*
85 *community groups”*(9). Building on these principles, the NIHR Research and Innovation for
86 Global Health Transformation programme funded this study which established an
87 international consensus programme to develop a set of guidelines for self-care (10-13).
88 Consistent with the above WHO principles, these guidelines not only describe optimal self-
89 care itself, but also the mechanisms to support the front line of care, including “train the
90 trainers” programmes.

91 The study reported here is the evaluation of implementation of the above guidelines to
92 provide a self-care intervention. The intervention was implemented, and part funded by,
93 RedAid Nigeria (formally German Leprosy and TB Relief Association-DAHWA) situated in South-
94 East Nigeria. Support from RedAid Nigeria thus represents intensification of an existing
95 programme in line with the above guidelines. We hypothesised that an intervention built on
96 organisational and behavioural principles combined with clinical support can break the cycle
97 of repeated ulceration in leprosy. We hypothesised further that wellbeing would be
98 improved.

99

101 **Methods**

102 Study design


103 A “staircase” of incomplete stepped-wedge cluster randomized design (14) with masked /
104 blinded quantitative outcomes and qualitative observations. The protocol for the intervention
105 is available online (15). We report this study according to CONSORT guidelines for stepped-
106 wedge trials (16).

107 Participants

108 *Study sites*

109 The study was conducted in South-East Nigeria in the vicinity of 2 hospitals each serving
110 communities with a high prevalence of leprosy (Mile Four Hospital, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State
111 and St. Benedict’s Hospital Ogoja in Cross River State, Figure 1). Mile Four hospital serves ten
112 outstation clinics and St Benedict’s Hospital serves five outstation clinics. Each outstation
113 clinic is situated in a village. Each village supported one self-care group. These groups form
114 the clusters for the statistical analysis. However, the process evaluation, while focusing mostly
115 on the self-care groups, nevertheless went broader than the group itself to include the
116 community within each village.

117 **Figure 1:** cluster locations within 2 participating states



118

119 *Individual participants*

120 Eligible patients were identified by the implementation team (see below) using registers of
121 people at risk of leprosy ulcers held in the two study centre hospitals. Participants were
122 people affected by leprosy/with a high risk of limb ulceration based on an existing ulcer,
123 history of ulcer, or sensory loss in one or more extremity. Potential participants were
124 informed about the study by health workers employed by local government and health care
125 providers based at the above hospitals. Participants were invited to take part in the trial by a
126 research fellow trained to Good Clinical Practice standards. A patient information leaflet was
127 given to potential participants, and they were asked to sign a consent form. The patient
128 information leaflet and consent forms were translated from English and then back translated

129 using the WHO methodology for accurate translation (17). If patients agreed to take part, they
130 were recruited at baseline before the clusters were randomized to a designated period in the
131 intervention sequence. Although data collection and intervention staff were employed by
132 RedAid, the data collection staff were independent of the implementation team. Participants
133 were recruited between April 2021 and August 2022.

134 Randomisation and masking

135 To support implementation, the clusters were grouped according to hospital catchment area.
136 The 15 clusters were randomly allocated into one of five sequences (steps). The
137 randomization was restricted geographically to facilitate the logistics of implementation in
138 the Mile Four hospital catchment area. Thus, within the Mile Four hospital area, the ten
139 clusters were grouped into five geographically proximal units, which were then randomly
140 allocated to one of five trial sequences. The remaining five clusters, serving St. Benedict's
141 hospital, were separately randomly allocated to the five trial sequences. Figure 2 shows the
142 trial sequences and cluster allocations. The randomization process was carried out by the trial
143 statistician at the University of Birmingham.

144 **Figure 2:** Sequencing of the intervention for months 1-26. Each row represents a cluster

	Cluster name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Sequence 1	Mile 4_01	0			0	■	■	1			1																
	Mile 4_02	0			0	■	■	1			1																
	Mile 4_03	0			0	■	■	1			1																
	St Benedict's Hospital 1		0			0	■	■	1			1															
Sequence 2	Mile 4_04				0			0	■	■	1			1													
	Mile 4_05				0			0	■	■	1			1													
	St Benedict's Hospital 2					0			0	■	■	1			1												
Sequence 3	Mile 4_06										0			0	■	■	1			1							
	Mile 4_07										0			0	■	■	1			1							
	St Benedict's Hospital 3											0			0	■	■	1			1						
Sequence 4	Mile 4_08													0			0	■	■	1			1				
	St Benedict's Hospital 4														0			0	■	■	1			1			
Sequence 5	Mile 4_09																0			0	■	■	1			1	
	Mile 4_10																0			0	■	■	1			1	
	St Benedict's Hospital 5																	0			0	■	■	1			1

145

146 0 – pre-intervention data collection

147 1 – post-intervention data collection

148 ■ active phase of the intervention

149 The intervention

150 As stated, the intervention was an evidence informed intervention, based on the Consensus
151 Guidelines for Self-Care Interventions for Leprosy developed by an International Scientific
152 Advisory Committee. The Committee included public, community and policy representatives,
153 as well as academics and researchers experienced in implementation science. ‘The
154 Guidelines’ were informed by psychological and organisational theory (10, 13, 18-20) and
155 based on the current state of science. The guidelines have been published elsewhere (10-13).
156 However, given the variation in contexts within which leprosy occurs, the guidelines were
157 designed to be adapted for local conditions (21). Here we describe how the guidelines were
158 adapted for use in South-East Nigeria.

159 RedAid Nigeria worked with different local stakeholder groups to adapt ‘The Guidelines’. The
160 groups comprised expert clinical staff and ulcer researchers (dealing with leprosy and with
161 other chronic conditions), representatives of the International Association of Anti-Leprosy
162 Organisations (ILEP) and the government disease control programme, and people with lived
163 experience of leprosy. An intervention manual was co-produced, detailing the critical aspects
164 of steps in self-care practice in Nigeria and describing how ‘The Guidelines’ were adapted to
165 ensure that they were culturally appropriate and accessible for the setting. Participant-facing
166 materials were co-designed with people affected by leprosy, (including those who were
167 marginalised, had low literacy and had residual effects of leprosy). The adapted intervention
168 was represented in a manual.

169 A detailed TIDieR compliant description of the intervention is included in Supplementary
170 material (S1). Briefly, the intervention was based on re-activation of self-care groups (SCGs)
171 that had ceased to function or enhanced activity of groups that were still active. The

172 intervention can thus be thought of as an increased ‘dose’ based on the above adapted
173 guideline and delivered under the overall supervision of the organisation responsible for
174 leprosy care in the area.


175 The management cascade is represented in Figure 3. The intervention, based on the manual,
176 was overseen by two officials – one from each site – Ebony and Cross-River, where
177 respectively Mile Four and St Benedicts Hospitals are based. Practical arrangements were
178 delegated to seven permanent staff from these institutions - we refer to these staff members
179 as ‘Programme co-ordinators’ (N=7). These staff trained and mentored community outreach
180 workers, accompanying them on their initial field visits. The facilitators brought the SCGs into
181 existence, supervised elections of an SCG leader from among the SCG members and taught
182 and encouraged the SCGs in the principles and practice of self-care.

183 The intervention was delivered over a 6 weeks ‘active phase’ (Figure 2). During the active
184 phase, three days of intensive training were delivered at each hub, followed by weekly
185 sessions to re-inform good self-care practice.

186 The facilitators provided education materials in appropriate formats for use in a low literacy
187 setting.

188 The six-week ‘active’ phase of the intervention described above was followed by a less
189 intensive ‘sustainability’ phase during which the mentorship visits were reduced to once
190 every six weeks until the end of the intervention on 30th May 2023.

192 **Figure 3:** Training cascade to implement the adapted self-care intervention



193

194 Data collection

195 There were four data collection periods. Pre-intervention data was collected on two
196 occasions, three months apart (indicated as zero in Figure 2). Post-intervention data were also
197 collected on two occasions, three months apart and twice after the intervention (indicated as
198 '1' in Figure 2). The research fellows (UA & LU), fluent in the local languages, collected data
199 electronically on Tablets. The questionnaires themselves were in English. No other authors
200 had access to information that could identify individual participants.

201 Demographic data were collected at baseline i.e. the first interview above (Table 1). Quality
202 of life and well-being questionnaires were administered at all four data collection points
203 (described in detail below). Also, the limbs were inspected at all four data collection points,
204 and their condition described using a standard form with information on 1) peripheral
205 anaesthesia, 2) number of ulcers and 3) any deformities (using the WHO disability grading
206 system (22). The largest ulcer was photographed in a standard manner (23) by the research
207 fellow using the camera in the data collection tablet. A plastic ruler, sterilised in spirit, was
208 placed in the frame at the level of the ulcer. A photograph of that ulcer was repeated over
209 the subsequent three visits (Figure 2). In addition, photographs of the plantar surfaces of the
210 two feet together were taken for quality control purposes (i.e. to cross-reference with data
211 recorded on site).

212 The ulcer photographs were transferred to the University of Birmingham where the date was
213 removed and the image was given a unique identification number. The image was transferred
214 to the Leprosy Mission Trust India in Delhi, India for independent measurement of the ulcer
215 area. There, local research fellows used the electronic Pressure Ulcer Scale for Healing (PUSH)
216 tool version 3.0 to measure the surface area (cm²) of the lesion calibrated from the ruler. The

217 photographs were thus assessed independently of the local research site in Nigeria and none
218 of the photographs included patient identification or time information – the observers were
219 then blind to intervention status.

220 Quantitative outcomes

221

222 There were two ulcer outcomes:

- 223 1. The total number of ulcers (hands and feet).
- 224 2. The area (cm²) of the ulcer identified as the largest ulcer at the first (baseline) visit
225 and then subsequently followed up. (Note that this was a protocol deviation – it was
226 originally intended that all ulcers, including any on hands or lower leg, would be
227 followed-up).

228 Two questionnaires were administered to all participants at all visits in sequence as follows:

- 229 a. A general health related Quality of Life questionnaire in the form of the
230 EQ VAS (visual analogue scale): this records the patient’s self-rated health
231 on a vertical 0 to 100 scale from ‘Best imaginable health state’ to ‘Worst
232 imaginable health state’.
- 233 b. A life satisfaction (subjective wellbeing) questionnaire (24, 25). This
234 instrument comprises of five questions (all scored out of 10):
 - 235 i) A cognitive evaluation of the participant’s level of life
236 satisfaction, Question 1 (Q1);
 - 237 ii) The ‘eudemonic’ concept of whether the things the participant
238 does in their life are worthwhile (Q2); and

262 Sample size calculation and design analysis

263 We simulated data from the prior predictive models specified above to evaluate the pre-
264 posterior distributions of treatment effect parameters. We assumed 20 patients per cluster
265 (i.e. per hub) would be recruited. We estimated the average posterior variance, average width
266 of a 95% CrI interval, and minimum effect sizes for which there would be an 80% probability
267 of the 95% CrI excluding zero.

268 For ulcer count persistence, the smallest effect size for which there is an 80% probability that
269 the 95% credible interval would exclude zero is an odds ratio of 0.3. To translate this into
270 absolute probability terms, given a baseline of 90% probability of persisting, it is equivalent
271 to a reduction of approximately 20 percentage points. For ulcer area, the smallest effect size
272 for which there is an 80% probability that the 95% credible interval would exclude zero is a
273 42% reduction in largest ulcer size.

274 Process evaluation

275 *Data Collection*

276 Data were collected from 10 SCGs in 10 villages during the ‘active’ phase of the self-care
277 intervention to assess intervention fidelity/adaptation and to understand how participants
278 experience the intervention. These 10 SCGs were chosen to provide a spread across the
279 different locations. We explored challenges to delivery of the intervention and factors that
280 may facilitate or impede its impact. Data was collected using semi-structured checklists,
281 templates and guides (see Interview Topic Guides and Checklist in Supplementary material,
282 S2) and included:

283 a) Observations of a sub-set of n=25 intervention sessions from 5 SCGs: Behaviour change
284 techniques used during the group meeting were recorded using a checklist. The researcher
285 observed and recorded how different facilitators/group leaders interpreted their role, how
286 they interacted with the group and how group members responded. These observations
287 helped to understand the fidelity with which the *principles* of the self-care intervention were
288 applied and any local deviations. For 2 SCGs, meetings after the active phase of the
289 intervention were also observed (n=4). Researchers found that these groups had stabilised
290 and there was not much change or any new elements introduced by the groups.

291 b) Set of notes taken by facilitators summarising the use of the intervention manual and topics
292 of discussion between group members during all 6 initial group meetings for all 10 groups
293 involved in the process evaluation

294 c) Experiences of the intervention were explored in focus group sessions with 8 self-care
295 groups (8-10 participants each) carried out by the researchers after an observed session; 5
296 groups had similar numbers of male and female members; 2 were comprised of mostly men
297 and 1 mostly of women. Interviews were conducted with elected leaders of self-help groups
298 (n=3) facilitators of observed sessions (n=3), and key informants i.e. local influential
299 community leaders (n=6) and healthcare professionals (n=6). Participants discussed
300 experiences of self-care interventions and their logistics, and the perceived effect of self-care
301 on group members and the wider community (See Interview Topic Guides and Checklist in
302 Supplementary material, S2). We sampled for diversity of location (sequence) and different
303 perspectives on the intervention. Interviews and focus groups were audio recorded and
304 transcribed.

305 d) Membership and attendance records were available for 9 out the 10 groups.

306 *Qualitative data analysis*

307 We used framework method (27) for the thematic analysis of qualitative data. This method
308 was selected for its suitability in working with teams of multi-disciplinary researchers with
309 varying qualitative analysis experience and large qualitative data. In consultation with all
310 team members, a single matrix for data analysis was developed and utilized in coding
311 transcripts within four key themes:

- 312 • Implementation: intervention delivery and what was delivered to participants.
- 313 • Context: factors that influenced or were affected by the intervention and its
314 outcomes, and that prevent or enable change prompted by the intervention
- 315 • Mechanisms of impact: how participants responded, what mediated this, and any
316 unanticipated pathways and consequences.
- 317 • Psycho-social Outcomes: the impact of the intervention on the participants lived
318 experience and that of the community.

319 Within our frameworks for each of the above, we analysed the data by comparing data
320 across sites and between data sources.

321 **Results**

322 Baseline characteristics

323

324 Table 1 presents the baseline characteristics of the enrolled participants by trial sequence.

325 The study included 148 unique participants (less than the 240 target).

326 Among the five sequences, sequence 1 had 39 participants, which contributed the largest
327 proportion of the total number of participants (26%), while sequence 4 had 20 participants
328 contributing 14% of the total. The average age in sequence 1 to 5 were 55.92 (sd 16.15), 54.67
329 (sd 15.89), 46.47 (sd 18.34), 50.10 (sd 18.04) and 59.03 (sd 18.74), respectively. The gender
330 distribution varied across sequences, with sequences 1 and 5 having more males and
331 sequences 2, 3 and 4 having more females. In terms of education, sequences 1, 4 and 5 had
332 the highest proportion of participants who had never attended school, while sequences 2 and
333 3 had the most participants who completed primary education. Across all sequences, most
334 participants were self-employed or business owners. In sequence 1, 2 and 3, most participants
335 had a monthly income below 5000 while in sequence 4 and 5, most participants had a monthly
336 income between 5000 and 9999.

337 The mean duration across all sequences was 58.55 months (sd 94.49), and the median
338 duration was 10 months (IQR 2.25 – 60). However, there was considerable variation in the
339 duration across the five sequences. The overall mean duration was 58.55 months (sd 94.49),
340 however sequence 2 had the shortest mean duration at 16.22 months (sd 18.85), while
341 Sequence 3 had the longest average duration at 95.62 months (sd 135.60).

342 The overall disability rate was 65.99%. Over half of the participants in sequences 1 (100%), 2
343 (76%), and 3 (77%) reported having a disability.

345 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics

	Sequence 1	Sequence 2	Sequence 3	Sequence 4	Sequence 5
Number of Clusters	4	3	3	2	3
Number of Patients n (%)	39 (26%)	30 (20%)	30 (20%)	20 (14%)	29 (20%)
Age					
mean (sd)	55.92 (16.15)	54.67 (15.89)	46.47 (18.34)	50.10 (18.04)	59.03 (18.74)
Gender					
Male	25 (64%)	13 (43%)	14 (47%)	5 (25%)	15 (52%)
Female	14 (36%)	17 (57%)	16 (53%)	15 (75%)	14 (48%)
Education					
Never Joined School	17 (44%)	8 (27%)	11 (37%)	14 (70%)	16 (55%)
Primary	15 (38%)	19 (63%)	13 (43%)	2 (10%)	10 (34%)
Junior Secondary	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)
Senior Secondary	5 (13%)	2 (7%)	4 (13%)	4 (20%)	1 (3%)
University	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Employment occupation					
Employed Fulltime	1 (3%)	4 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unemployed	4 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Self-employed/Business Owner	16 (41%)	21 (70%)	25 (83%)	19 (95%)	24 (83%)
Unable to work	13 (33%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)
Student	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	1 (5%)	3 (10%)
Daily Wage Labourer	5 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Monthly income					
Below 5,000	18 (46%)	17 (57%)	15 (50%)	4 (20%)	11 (38%)
5,000 - 9,999	5 (13%)	5 (17%)	5 (17%)	8 (40%)	12 (41%)
10,000 - 19,999	14 (36%)	6 (20%)	7 (23%)	4 (20%)	6 (21%)
20,000 - 29,999	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	4 (20%)	0 (0%)
40,000 or above	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
mean (sd)	2.03 (1.09)	1.77 (1.01)	2.00 (1.23)	2.40 (1.05)	1.83 (0.76)
Disability present					
Yes	39 (100%)	22 (76%)	23 (77%)	4 (20%)	9 (31%)
No	0 (0%)	7 (24%)	7 (23%)	16 (80%)	20 (69%)
No. of Ulcer					
mean (sd)	0.56 (0.71)	0.30 (0.48)	0.36 (0.50)	0.14 (0.39)	0.24 (0.53)
0	80 (54%)	76 (71%)	71 (65%)	67 (78%)	81 (80%)
1	58 (39%)	30 (28%)	37 (34%)	9 (12%)	17 (17%)
2	7 (5%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
3	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Duration of the largest ulcer unhealed in months					
mean (sd)	77.44 (96.00)	16.22 (18.85)	95.62 (135.60)	18.55 (17.85)	60.32 (75.28)
median (IQR)	39.50	12.00	11.50	10.00	10.50

	(6-152.25)	(3.75-19)	(5-225.75)	(4.5-37.50)	(5.25-125.25)
--	------------	-----------	------------	-------------	---------------

346

347 Data completeness

348

349 Table 2 summarises the availability of data and missing data patterns for the four observation
 350 occasions in the trial (Baseline 1, Baseline 2, Post-treatment 1 and post-treatment 2), in terms
 351 of ulcer area. There are 149 unique individuals in the dataset, of which 124 (83%) have the
 352 complete set of four observations. One participant’s ulcer (identified whilst carrying out data
 353 quality checks) was measured on different limbs across the time periods and was therefore
 354 not included in the study. Thus, 148 participants were included for analysis.

355 **Table 2:** Missing data and follow-up patterns in the data

356

	Baseline 1	Baseline 2	Post-treatment 1	Post-treatment 2	n (%)
Observations (N = missing, Y = observed))	Y	Y	Y	Y	124 (83%)
	Y	Y	Y	N	6 (4%)
	Y	Y	N	Y	1 (1%)
	Y	Y	N	N	7 (5%)
	Y	N	Y	Y	3 (2%)
	Y	N	N	N	8 (5%)
Total					149 (100%)

357

358 Quantitative Outcomes


359

360 The upper plot in Figure 4 shows the baseline (log) ulcer area by trial sequence and
 361 observation period. Only observations where an ulcer was present (area > 0 cm²) are
 362 included. There was no visual evidence of a decrease in the area of the largest ulcer over the

363 trial. The bottom plot in Figure 4 shows the number of ulcers across four observation periods.
364 Following the intervention, there were small decreases in the proportion of participants with
365 one ulcer (34% and 32% at baseline 1 and 2 decreasing to 22% and 21% in post-treatment 1
366 and 2) or two ulcers (3% and 2.2% in baseline 1 and 2, 1.5% and 1.5% in post-treatment 1 and
367 2). Correspondingly, there was an increase in the proportion of people with no ulcers (62%
368 and 65% in baseline 1 and 2, 75% and 76% in post-treatment 1 and 2). The change for all
369 outcomes of the trial by observation period for all observations is summarised in
370 Supplementary materials, S3.

371 **Figure 4: Ulcer area and number of ulcers**

372



373 The estimated intervention effects are reported in Table 3. The posterior mean of the
374 relative difference in ulcer area was 1.12 (95% CrI: 0.53, 2.27). The posterior mean odd ratio

375 for ulcer count persistence number of ulcers was 1.00 (95% CrI: 0.29, 3.56). There was thus
376 little difference in ulcer area or number associated with the intervention, although the
377 results were highly uncertain.

378 The psychological outcomes are reported in Table 3. The intervention resulted in an
379 increase of 10.93 (95% CrI: 8.60, 13.23) out of 100 in VAS EQ scores. For the wellbeing scales
380 (ranging from 0 to 10), the satisfaction, worthwhile and happiness scales all showed a
381 positive relationship with the intervention, with increases of 1.18, 1.42, and 1.34
382 respectively. Conversely, the worried scale decreased by 1.11, and the depression scale
383 decreased by 0.37. These effects are all in the hypothesised direction with confidence limits
384 excluding the null in all cases except depression.

385 Table 3: analysis of outcomes

386

Outcomes Posterior	Clinical outcomes		General outcomes						
	No. of Ulcers Odds ratio	Relative difference in Ulcer Area (cm ²)	VAS EQ mean difference (/100)	Wellbeing scale Mean differences (/10)					
				Satisfaction	Worthwhile	Happiness	Worried	Depression	
Intervention effect	Mean	1	1.12	10.93	1.18	1.42	1.34	-1.11	-0.37
	Sd	1.90	1.45	1.18	0.27	0.25	0.24	0.38	0.32
	95% CI	(0.29, 3.56)	(0.53, 2.27)	(8.60, 13.23)	(0.65, 1.72)	(0.94, 1.93)	(0.88, 1.83)	(-1.84, - 0.37)	(-1.00, 0.25)
CAC	Mean	0.89	0.93	0.90	0.69	0.83	0.88	0.75	0.74
	95% CI	(0.65, 0.99)	(0.74, 1.00)	(0.66, 1.00)	(0.48, 0.87)	(0.62, 0.98)	(0.63, 0.99)	(0.53, 0.92)	(0.53, 0.89)
ICC	Mean	0.35	0.34	0.14	0.37	0.33	0.12	0.42	0.47
	95% CI	(0.06, 0.67)	(0.12, 0.58)	(0.01, 0.36)	(0.22, 0.56)	(0.16, 0.52)	(0.02, 0.28)	(0.26, 0.60)	(0.31, 0.64)

388 Process evaluation

389 Table 4 provides a table of quotes to support the discussed sub-themes for the process
390 evaluation.

391

392 Implementation of intervention

393

394 As stated, the intervention was implemented in 15 groups of about 10 members in 2 study
395 sites. An average of 8 members attended each meeting during the implementation phase of
396 the intervention and 83% of participants attended all pre and post intervention sessions.

397 This means that the 'dose' of the intervention, i.e. attendance, was fairly consistent;

398 however, there were some contextual factors that might explain variation outlined below.

399 Eight of the 15 groups made plans to continue into the 'sustainability phase' at the end of

400 the intervention. Facilitator notes and observer checklists both showed that the manual

401 was used by all groups who settled into a routine and did not need to refer to the manual at

402 the end of six weeks. Observer checklists noted that a range of techniques was used by

403 group leaders and facilitators e.g. raising positive expectations of ulcer improvement with

404 self-care and encouraging role modelling for other members of the community. Group

405 members were also aware that self-care had to be continued at home. In 5 groups, leaders

406 made adaptations to the format by asking group members to take turns to lead activities

407 which made meetings more inclusive. One group developed a song to help them remember

408 the steps of self-care outlined in the manual.

409 Context

410

411 The main contextual factors we identified were work patterns, availability of care and
412 stigma for people with leprosy. Work patterns were important as in some areas farming was
413 small scale and did not impact attendance at meetings whereas in others producing crops
414 for sale and attending markets could impact attendance. Some group members also
415 discussed needing to ride a motorbike for work which could contribute to the development
416 of ulcers. While leprosy care is available from the participating hospital sites, some focus
417 group participants said they had used traditional and faith-based healers as their first port
418 of call, due to proximity and a general belief that leprosy is caused by witchcraft. Stigma for
419 those affected by leprosy was widespread with interviewees discussing being shunned by
420 former friends and being unable to do business or trade farm produce.

421 Mechanisms of impact

422

423 Overcoming stigma was a main motivator to persist with self-care. Many group members
424 referred to provision of fresh bandages, which they felt had reduced smell from ulcers,
425 improved their standing in the community and enhanced their ability to trade. Another
426 motivator for many was noticing change in wound healing and cracked skin; some also
427 anticipated being completely healed in the future. The provision of incentives to group
428 members played a role, with fresh bandages contributing to the neat look outlined above,
429 and money to help with transport, some of which could be used to solve other problems.

430 Group members identified the advantages of group cohesion and mutual support. A striking
431 finding was that seven out the 10 groups we observed had transformed themselves into
432 self-help groups by forming a savings club to help with the cost of self-care or to support
433 group members more widely. There were also many examples of group members being
434 supportive to each other: applauding each other for good results; giving advice on
435 improving self-care; or counselling people who developed ulcers on how to avoid them in
436 the future. In four groups, members agreed to watch each other outside of the group and
437 call out any lapses, e.g. not using protective footwear.

438 Challenges and barriers were mostly around transport as in one of the two sites some of the
439 group members lived at large distances from the meeting venue. In these situations, the
440 availability and cost of motorcycle taxis led to a few members missing groups or arriving late
441 for meetings. Sustainability of the groups was another concern as members anticipated
442 difficulties when funding for the self-care materials and transport was discontinued. Taking
443 part in group activities was more challenging for people who were elderly or spoke a
444 different language from other group members; however, observation notes indicate that
445 younger people would step in and help with translation.

446 Impact

447

448 The perceived impact of the intervention on the participants' lived experience centred
449 around gaining confidence to practice self-care; some believed that their health would have
450 been much worse without the group. As outlined above, they also saw another important
451 impact in improved hygiene and appearance and anticipated that their lives would continue
452 to get better as they would be able to sell farm produce or return to work. This was echoed

453 by members of the community we interviewed. Group members and health care workers
454 also said that there now was less need to go to the hospital for treatment as they improved
455 with self-care.

456 Table 4: Quotes from the qualitative evaluation

457

Implementation and fidelity of intervention:

'In my own understanding, their knowledge of self-care is getting better because the first time we started we used a self-care manual as guide to practice the steps in self-care. The second week, they no longer look at the manual to carry out the self-care and they did not make a mistake in following the steps and they did it well. In the 3rd meeting before we know it everyone already knows the different stages in the self-care practice and they understand what they did need to do. They have gotten accustomed to the self-care practice and steps'.

[Facilitator Mile4 3].

'So one of them introduced some songs ... incidentally this is one of the most quiet among them who never wanted to talk, who never even wanted to come out ... she was the person that introduced the song. And what is the song all about? it is all about teaching members how to wear protective footwear and how to take care of themselves'. [Facilitator, Ohakwu 2]

Context:

'If it is a person who has recovered from the sickness and has no ulcer, then we can associate with the person. But if the person has ulcers on the body which are visible and everyone can see it, then people will start avoiding such persons and would not want to associate with them'. [Community leader, Ohakwu 1]

'Initially I use to doubt we had such stigmatization but with my experience as a health worker I can say stigmatization exists very much, and that is what leads to disability because when people develop lesions ... and we find out they have leprosy, they will not take it seriously. They only time they accept they have leprosy is when they have developed disability'. [Health worker, Mile 4_06]

Mechanisms of impact:

'I put the lessons I learnt into practice from day one because I had a lot of cracks on my feet ... But now that we soak our leg and scrub it I noticed that the wound has healed ... I feel better. This group has helped me well'. [Group member, SBH 4 FGD]

[Group members discussed] the need to take the self-care practice seriously so our family and community members will see the changes in us and stop discriminating against us.

[Observation notes, Mile4_05]

Members agreed to act as watch dog to one another to ensure compliance to wearing the appropriate footwear. [Observation notes, SBH 3]

'Each time I attend the meeting I get transport allowance to support me. That money is enough for my transport and also helps me to solve other problems'. [Group member, Mile4_07 FGD]

[Group members] also discussed making financial contributions. It was agreed that this will make members bond more and bind them together [Observation notes, Mile4_06]

'It is because we are all happy about the meeting that we agreed to make little contributions with which we intend to use and establish something. Just like someone who wants to build a house next year will start saving from now'. [Group leader, Mile4_05]

'Even if they are willing to participate, it will be difficult for them if transport is not given to them. ... They need money as it motivates them' [Health worker Mile4_06]

Despite the same issue being addressed in the previous meeting, about 6 members came late on this meeting day. The group members who were punctual expressed dissatisfaction. Those who arrived late apologized and explained that it is usually difficult to get a motorcycle from their homes. They all suggested that waking up early and early preparation can help solve this issue. [Observation notes, Mile4_08]

Impact:

'If it is not because of this group, I would have been hospitalized by now. The self-care has saved me from coming to complain to doctors and nurses to wash my wound. It stopped me from visiting the hospital for ulcer dressing'. [Group member, SBH 4 FGD]

'Now even if I don't treat the ulcer, just be practicing the self-care, it heals within a week. Like last time I had a small injury, before one week it healed ... it works like magic. Now every day I don't practice self-care I feel like I have not taken my bath'. [Group member, SBH 2 FGD]

'We believe that when our ulcers have finally healed, we will be able to engage in small businesses and farming to generate income to take care of our families'. [Group member, Mile4_02 FGD]

'Before they started the group, persons affected by leprosy have poor hygiene, but since they joined the group their hygiene improved, their ulcers healed. Now community members have seen a change in them'. [Community member, SBH 2]

458

459

460

462 Discussion

463 No improvement in ulcers

464 The main motivation for this study was to reduce the ulcer ‘burden’ in terms of the number
465 and size of ulcers. We convened an international expert group to develop guidelines, and
466 the guidelines covered not just the clinical aspects, but included implementation science
467 principles covering the system as a whole. RedAid Nigeria was committed to this project and
468 devoted resources and effort into making it a success. Yet, there was no evidence for an
469 improvement in ulcer status among participants. That said, the results were highly
470 uncertain, partly reflecting the under-recruitment of patients into the trial. For example,
471 mean difference in ulcer area was compatible with approximately a halving (or doubling) in
472 ulcer area. That said our point estimates are close to the null value and exclude the large
473 effect (halving of ulcer areas) that might have been anticipated.

474 Impact of the intervention

475 The lack of effect we observed occurred despite the observation that the intervention was
476 implemented as intended, sessions were well attended and were well received by study
477 participants. In line with this, six measures of health-related quality of life and well-being
478 improved. The results crossed the line 95% probability level in five of these. The effect sizes
479 are material – for example, four of the five well-being scales improved by ten points on a
480 100-point scale. The fact that different clusters received the intervention at different
481 calendar times suggests that there was not a seasonal effect. The qualitative data suggest
482 that participants were able to continue with their normal lives (an aim of self-care) more
483 confidently and successfully than before the intervention. Their ability to present
484 themselves more neatly and without odour from ulcers was important for their livelihoods

485 and reduced their perceived stigma (28, 29). Self-help group members gained in confidence
486 through the psychological and financial support of self-help group membership to manage
487 their ulcers well. The qualitative data show that participants and others believed that their
488 ulcers were improving. This is consistent with the observed psycho-therapeutic benefit of
489 the intervention but not with the objective ulcer measurement. The participants innovated
490 using song and graduated from self-care to self-help by forming savings syndicates – a
491 phenomenon also encountered in the famous women’s groups studies (30). In short, the
492 intervention was delivered as intended; it was appreciated and taken up enthusiastically
493 and it produced substantial gain in wellbeing.

494

495 The nature of the ulcers in the index population

496 Some clue to the reason for our null findings on ulcer healing may lie in the population of
497 people participating. Although economically active, they were an elderly group (well over 50
498 on average), where most had very chronic ulcers and the rate of deformity was also high
499 reaching 100% in one of our sequences (Table 1). In short, this was a population with what
500 might be termed ‘indolent’ ulcers associated with extensive scarring and deformity, both of
501 which effect ulcer healing (31-33). In short, we think that a plausible reason for our findings
502 is that “it was too little, too late”. If this is correct, then our findings have two corollaries: -

503 1) They emphasise the importance of preventing ulcers from forming and intensive
504 early care when they do – techniques such as off-loading devices (4, 5) and re-
505 innervation (34) may be extremely cost-effective in this regard.

506 2) Interventions for indolent ulcers might have to be more intensive, say at admission
507 and / or plaster casting to ensure satisfactory off-loading.

508 Methodological aspects / strengths and weaknesses

509 Our study was designed to have high validity involving randomisation and blinding outcome
510 assessment where possible. However, it is one study in one context. Therefore, we do not
511 think our findings should be generalised across all community leprosy care. Given what we
512 have said regarding the ‘population’ participating in our study– our findings are not directly
513 referable to a setting where people have ulcers of considerably shorter duration, where
514 those ulcers were smaller, and where deformity is the exception. However, many places
515 where ulcers are endemic have large numbers of people with chronic ulcers living in
516 extreme poverty. Our study site is emblematic of many other circumstances where leprosy
517 ulcers occur.

518 Our study has further limitations; the number of participants was lower than intended and
519 hence our observations of ulcer size and number are imprecise. The duration of the study
520 period was limited by the duration of the grant (five years) during which we had to update
521 guidelines, adapt the intervention, recruit participants, collect baseline readings, roll out the
522 intervention sequentially, obtain independent ulcer measurements and complete the
523 analysis and write-up. We have noted elsewhere that the typical funding cycle precludes
524 longer-term observations of impact and sustainability.

526 DECLARATIONS

527 Ethics approval and consent to participate

528 This research has been performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki for Human
529 Research of the World Medical Association. Approval was granted by the University of
530 Birmingham Biomedical and Scientific Research Ethics Committee (BSREC) and locally in
531 Nigeria through the University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital Health Research Ethics Committee
532 (NHREC 0501-2008B).

533 Eligible participants were given a Participant Information Sheet in the local language. For non-
534 literate participants, information was provided verbally. Written informed consent was
535 obtained from all willing to participate; or thumb/fingerprints was requested in lieu of a
536 signature where necessary.

537 Competing interests

538 The authors have no competing interests.

539 Funding

540 This research was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR:
541 200132) using UK Aid from the UK Government to support global health research. RJL is also
542 funded by NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) West Midlands. RJL, YW, SC and JS are
543 funded by NIHR Midlands Patient Safety Research Collaboration (PSRC). The views expressed
544 in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK
545 Department of Health and Social Care.

546 Authors' contributions

547 JS, JC, NO, NN, SC, LU, UA, and OI: contributed to the development, drafting, and editing of
548 the protocol and paper.

549 SIW: contributed to the evaluation design, sample size calculation, randomization,
550 quantitative sample selection, and critically reviewed the intellectual content of both the
551 protocol and paper.

552 YW and AL: contributed to data analysis and the drafting and editing of the paper.

553 PG and FG: contributed to the development and critical review of the intellectual content of
554 the protocol and paper.

555 AL and FG: contributed to the development, drafting, and editing of the paper.

556 SC: helped draft the protocol and paper, managed data flow between the data collection site
557 and blinded assessors, organized staff training on ulcer measurement, ensured GCP
558 compliance, and coordinated the steering committee.

559 AT: As Principal Investigator, contributed to the study's conception, protocol development,
560 critically reviewed the intellectual content, and drafted the initial version of the paper.

561 RJL: Principal Investigator on the NIHR grant (below), contributed to the study's conception,
562 co-designed the evaluation, critically reviewed the intellectual content, and assisted in
563 drafting the paper.

564 All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

565 Acknowledgements

566

567 We extend our gratitude to the patients and trial team members at the recruitment site for
568 their contributions to data collection and entry. We want to thank Anjali Shrivastva and
569 Khushboo Johri from The Leprosy Mission Trust India, who performed blinded assessments
570 of all photographs of ulcers.

572 References

573

574 1. Rodrigues LC, Lockwood D. Leprosy now: epidemiology, progress, challenges, and research
575 gaps. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2011;11(6):464-70.

576 2. Somar P, Waltz MM, van Brakel WH. The impact of leprosy on the mental wellbeing of
577 leprosy-affected persons and their family members - a systematic review. *Glob Ment Health (Camb)*.
578 2020;7:e15.

579 3. (WHO) WHO. Self-care for health and well-being [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/self-care-health-interventions)
580 [sheets/detail/self-care-health-interventions](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/self-care-health-interventions): World Health Organization (WHO); 2024 [

581 4. Bus S, Armstrong D, Van Deursen R, Lewis J, Caravaggi C, Cavanagh P, et al. IWGDF guidance
582 on footwear and offloading interventions to prevent and heal foot ulcers in patients with diabetes.
583 *Diabetes/metabolism research and reviews*. 2016;32:25-36.

584 5. Lazzarini PA, Jarl G, Gooday C, Viswanathan V, Caravaggi CF, Armstrong DG, et al.
585 Effectiveness of offloading interventions to heal foot ulcers in persons with diabetes: a systematic
586 review. *Diabetes/metabolism research and reviews*. 2020;36:e3275.

587 6. van Netten JJ, Price PE, Lavery LA, Monteiro-Soares M, Rasmussen A, Jubiz Y, et al.
588 Prevention of foot ulcers in the at-risk patient with diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Metab*
589 *Res Rev*. 2016;32 Suppl 1:84-98.

590 7. Ebenso J, Muyiwa LT, Ebenso BE. Self care groups and ulcer prevention in Okegbala, Nigeria.
591 *Leprosy review*. 2009;80(2):187-96.

592 8. Cross H. The prevention of disability for people affected by leprosy: whose attitude needs to
593 change? *Leprosy review*. 2007;78(4):321-9.

594 9. Organization WH. Global consultation of National Leprosy Programme managers, partners
595 and affected persons on Global Leprosy Strategy 2021–2030: Report of the virtual meeting 26-30
596 October 2020. 2020.

- 597 10. Celiktemur B, Choudhury SM, Lilford R. Organizing and managing a programme for self-care
598 in leprosy. *Leprosy review*. 2021;92(4):338-43.
- 599 11. Choudhury SM, Kudrna L, Celiktemur B, Lilford RJ. Application of behavioural psychology
600 principles to self-care programmes for people living with leprosy. *Leprosy review*. 2021;92(4):344-55.
- 601 12. Ilozumba O, Lilford RJ. Self-care programmes for people living with leprosy: a scoping review.
602 *Leprosy Review*. 2021;92(4):317-37.
- 603 13. Lilford RJ. Self-care for people affected by leprosy. *Leprosy review*. 2021;92(4):314-6.
- 604 14. Hemming K, Haines TP, Chilton PJ, Girling AJ, Lilford RJ. The stepped wedge cluster
605 randomised trial: rationale, design, analysis, and reporting. *Bmj*. 2015;350.
- 606 15. Meka AC, S; Ugwu, L; Akunna, U; Ilozumba, O; Gill, P; Griffiths, F; Sartori, J; Watson, S;
607 Lilford, R. Implementation Science sTudy In Leprosy (INSTIL- Nigeria S.E)- Improving the
608 management of leprosy ulcers through a community self-care intervention using a stepped wedge
609 cluster randomised trial: OSF Registries; 2021 [Available from: [https://archive.org/details/osf-](https://archive.org/details/osf-registrations-u2r5s-v1)
610 [registrations-u2r5s-v1](https://archive.org/details/osf-registrations-u2r5s-v1)].
- 611 16. Hemming K, Taljaard M, McKenzie JE, Hooper R, Copas A, Thompson JA, et al. Reporting of
612 stepped wedge cluster randomised trials: extension of the CONSORT 2010 statement with
613 explanation and elaboration. *Bmj*. 2018;363:k1614.
- 614 17. Organization WH. WHO guidelines on translation and adaptation of instruments. Geneva,
615 Switzerland: World Health Organization. 2018.
- 616 18. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering
617 implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for
618 advancing implementation science. *Implement Sci*. 2009;4:50.
- 619 19. Ferlie EB, Shortell SM. Improving the quality of health care in the United Kingdom and the
620 United States: a framework for change. *Milbank Q*. 2001;79(2):281-315.

- 621 20. Lilford R. A Theory of Everything! Towards a Unifying Framework for Psychological and
622 Organisational Change Models: NIHR CLAHRC West Midlands News Blog. 28 August 2015; 2015
623 [Available from: <https://clahrcwmblog.wordpress.com/2015/08/28/a-theory-of-everything/>].
- 624 21. Lilford R. Implementation science at the crossroads. 2018;27(4):331-2.
- 625 22. Brandsma JW, Brakel WV. WHO'disability'grading: Operational definitions. Leprosy review.
626 2003;74(4):366-73.
- 627 23. Bowen AC, Burns K, Tong SY, Andrews RM, Liddle R, O' Meara IM, et al. Standardising and
628 assessing digital images for use in clinical trials: a practical, reproducible method that blinds the
629 assessor to treatment allocation. PloS one. 2014;9(11):e110395.
- 630 24. Greco G, Lorgelly P, Yamabhai I. Outcomes in economic evaluations of public health
631 interventions in low - and middle - income countries: health, capabilities and subjective wellbeing.
632 Health economics. 2016;25:83-94.
- 633 25. Publishing O, Co-operation OfE, Development. OECD guidelines on measuring subjective
634 well-being: OECD publishing; 2013.
- 635 26. Al - Osh MA, Alzaid AA. First - order integer - valued autoregressive (INAR (1)) process.
636 Journal of Time Series Analysis. 1987;8(3):261-75.
- 637 27. Collaço N, Wagland R, Alexis O, Gavin A, Glaser A, Watson EK. Using the framework method
638 for the analysis of qualitative dyadic data in health research. Qualitative Health Research.
639 2021;31(8):1555-64.
- 640 28. Scambler G. Sociological theory and medical sociology: Routledge; 2022.
- 641 29. Williams S. Goffman, interactionism, and the management of stigma in everyday life.
642 Sociological theory and medical sociology: Routledge; 2022. p. 134-64.
- 643 30. Prost A, Colbourn T, Seward N, Azad K, Coomarasamy A, Copas A, et al. Women's groups
644 practising participatory learning and action to improve maternal and newborn health in low-
645 resource settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet. 2013;381(9879):1736-46.

- 646 31. Srinivasan H. Management of ulcers in neurologically impaired feet in leprosy affected
647 persons. Surgical reconstruction and rehabilitation in leprosy and other neuropathies Kathmandu,
648 Nepal: Ekta Books. 2004:193-226.
- 649 32. Riyaz N, Sehgal VN. Leprosy: Trophic skin ulcers. *Skinmed*. 2017;15(1):45-51.
- 650 33. Upputuri B, Srikantam A, Mamidi RS. Comorbidities associated with non-healing of plantar
651 ulcers in leprosy patients. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2020;14(6):e0008393.
- 652 34. Napit IB, Shrestha D, Choudhury S, Gkini E, Ilozumba O, Gill P, et al. A randomised Trial of
653 Autologous Blood products, leukocyte and platelet-rich fibrin (L-PRF), to promote ulcer healing in
654 LEprosy: The TABLE trial. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2024;18(5):e0012088.

655