Understanding men's participation in mass drug administration: evidence from a cluster-randomised trial of community-based deworming in Malawi

Stefan Witek-McManus[1], James Simwanza[2], Rejoice Msiska[2], Alvin Chisambi[2], Sean R. Galagan[3], William Oswald[1], Elliott Rogers[1], Joseph Timothy[1], Hugo Legge[1], Lazarus Juziwelo[4†], Judd L. Walson[3,4], Rachel L. Pullan[1], Robin L. Bailey[1], Khumbo Kalua[2,6,7]

†: LJ is deceased

1. London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

2. Blantyre Institute for Community Outreach, Blantyre, Malawi

3. University of Washington, Seattle, United States of America

4. John Hopkins University, Baltimore, United States of America

5. Ministry of Health & Population, Lilongwe, Malawi

6. Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi

7. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

Keywords: Malawi, mass drug administration, men's health, neglected tropical diseases, soil-transmitted helminths.

1. ABSTRACT

Background: Mass drug administration (MDA) is a key strategy in the response to neglected tropical diseases (NTDs). Operational research indicates that coverage of adult men in MDA is frequently lower as compared to adult women, but this remains poorly understood and obscured by a lack of routine sex-disaggregated reporting. Such differences may represent a potential threat to NTD strategies that require high MDA treatment coverage to achieve control or elimination objectives.

Methods: Using detailed treatment data from a cluster-randomised trial of community-based MDA for soil-transmitted helminths (STH) conducted in southern Malawi, this secondary analysis describes sex-specific trends in coverage over six consecutive rounds of MDA delivered biannually at household level. We report community-level coverage by both a per-protocol (trial) definition, and pragmatic operational definition to simulate routine implementation. We used multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression to investigate individual, household and programme factors associated with non-treatment by both coverage definitions amongst adult men.

Results: Adult men's participation in MDA was substantially and consistently lower than adult women's. Median difference (female minus male) in community-level protocol coverage was 14.9% (IQR: 9.2, 19.6), increasing to 21.7% (IQR: 15.9, 28.7) by operational coverage. Factors associated with increased odds of non-treatment were similar by coverage definition and included younger age, lower levels of education, and previous reported absenteeism; and were reduced by modifiable programmatic factors such as the day or time of household visit.

Conclusions: This analysis highlights the persistence of inequity for adult men in participation in MDA, despite a well-resourced context that achieved high coverage of adult women. More nuanced MDA strategies that respond to the needs of adult men will be required to achieve

equitable coverage, accompanied by robust monitoring and evaluation to evaluate their effectiveness at reaching this under-served population.

What is already known on this topic:

- Achieving high coverage of mass drug administration (MDA) across population groups is key to targets for control and elimination of many neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) and achieving global health equity.
- Men's poor participation in MDA has been recognised by routine programmes but has received limited research and policy attention, compounded by a lack of sex-disaggregated data.

What this study adds:

- We show that high overall levels of MDA coverage masked substantial inequity, with adult men's coverage in MDA substantially and consistently lower as compared to women.
- We identify specific factors associated with non-treatment of adult men – including modifiable programmatic characteristics – that could be targeted by programmes seeking to address this disparity.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy:

- These findings underscore the need for MDA strategies to comprehensively assess and address coverage gaps among adult men, and should encourage policymakers to ensure that the design and implementation of community-based NTD strategies reflect the needs of both men and women.

2. INTRODUCTION

Neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) are a diverse group of twenty diseases that disproportionately affect low and middle income countries (LMICs) . Estimated to have caused 10.3 to 25.3 million disability adjusted life years (DALYs) and 65 to 143 thousand deaths globally in 2021 [1], almost 1.5 billion people required mass or individual treatment for NTDs in 2024 [2]. A core strategic intervention for the control or elimination for five NTDs – lymphatic filariasis, onchocerciasis, schistosomiasis, soil-transmitted helminths (STH) and trachoma – is the use of mass drug administration (MDA), whereby a therapeutic dose of medicine is routinely delivered to target populations at scale [3]. Key to the success of MDA is in ensuring that the specific delivery approach achieves high coverage amongst a target population, while also maximizing programme efficiency and equity across socio-demographic factors [4].

Current global targets specifically prioritise control of STH, through reduction of morbidity amongst specific populations at greatest risk of anaemia and impaired nutrition caused by STH infection, including pre-school children (PSAC), school-aged children (SAC), and women of reproductive age (WRA) [5]. With a target of 75% coverage amongst those at risk, MDA for STH is generally delivered through platforms that can efficiently reach these populations at scale: by teachers through schools; or in combination with pre-existing services, such as by community health workers during community outreach and antenatal visits [6, 7]. Supported by large donations of drugs and sustained external investment, MDA for STH has come to be one of the largest public health interventions globally, reaching 492 million people in need in 2022 [8].

Having consistently achieved high levels of coverage of MDA for STH amongst at-risk groups and concomitant reductions in STH prevalence, increasing attention has been placed on the feasibility of eliminating STH infection entirely [9]. Such strategies would require expanding those targeted by MDA to all eligible members of a community, who are likely to be significant reservoirs of infection and therefore key to interrupting STH transmission; and

in consistently achieving high levels of MDA coverage amongst the broader community [10]. This expanded target population would most significantly include the addition of adult men, a population for which low coverage of MDA for other NTDs has previously been recognized, but which has remained largely unaddressed in programme delivery [11-13].

Better understanding of the barriers that men face in accessing health services, and addressing areas where men's health outcomes are worse, remain conspicuously absent from the global health agenda [14]. Given that PSAC, SAC and WRA remain the priority groups for STH control, it is not surprising that in a variety of settings, prevalence and intensity of STH infection remains highest amongst adult men [15-17], but evaluation of the feasibility of STH elimination presents greater urgency to understanding men's participation in MDA: poor coverage may affect not only the (worse) health of men, but present a broader risk to the health of women and children through a persistent reservoir of infection in their community, compromising elimination efforts.

Opportunities to examine socio-demographic differences in MDA coverage amongst adults are surprisingly rare, in part due to a lack of disaggregated reporting and evaluation [18, 19]. This study uses individual-level treatment data from the DeWorm3 trial, a multi-site cluster-randomised trial in Benin, Malawi and India that evaluated the feasibility of eliminating STH through biannual community-wide deworming (cMDA) [20]. A baseline survey of the Malawi site in 2018 confirmed that STH prevalence was highest amongst adult men [21]. A cross-site analysis of cMDA reported that while study cluster-level aggregated coverage was generally high over six consecutive rounds, women were significantly more likely to have been treated as compared to men, most notably in the Malawi trial site [22]. The objectives of this analysis were therefore to (i) explore differences in cMDA coverage between adult men and women over time, and to (ii) identify specific factors associated with non-treatment of adult men during cMDA in Malawi.

3. METHODS

3.1. Study design and participants

The DeWorm3 trial design (protocol) [20] and intervention coverage [22] across all three trial sites have previously been described, in addition to a baseline survey [21] and descriptions of both standard of care (control) and intervention arms [23] in Malawi. In brief, 124 communities (gazetted villages or towns) in Namwera Health Zone in Mangochi district were assigned to 40 study clusters, and clusters subsequently randomised 1:1 to two specific types of MDA using restricted randomisation: annual school-based deworming (SBD) (national standard of care) of children aged 5-14 years of age, or annual SBD plus biannual cMDA (intervention) of all censused individuals ≥2 years of age. The trial primary outcome was transmission interruption, defined as cluster-level population prevalence of any STH species ≤2% by quantitative PCR (qPCR), following six biannual rounds of cMDA over three years and a further two years of no cMDA. Written informed consent was obtained from an adult household member for participation in the annual community census, and verbally (per national guidelines) for participation in the intervention at each round of cMDA. The DeWorm3 trial was approved by the College of Medicine Research Ethics Committee at the University of Malawi (P.04/17/2161), the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Observational/Interventions Research Ethics Committee (12013) and the Human Subjects Division at the University of Washington (STUDY00000180). The results of this study are reported in-line with Sex And Gender Equity in Research (SAGER) guidelines [24].

3.2. Procedures

An annual community-based census was conducted in all study clusters between November-December 2017 (baseline census), March-May 2019 (census update 1) and April-July 2020 (census update 2). Trained study enumerators visited all known households within a defined community with the support of volunteer village guides. All occupied and consenting households completed a census questionnaire administered by the enumerator,

which comprised a demographic listing of all household members, reported household-level demographic characteristics, observations of dwelling construction materials, and reported access to water and sanitation facilities. Subsequent census questionnaires to a household comprised only of reviewing the household listing and updating household members (births, deaths and inward or outward migration).

In intervention clusters, cMDA was delivered biannually between 2018–2020 by a cadre of community health workers known as Health Surveillance Assistants (HSAs), who were responsible for delivery of cMDA to residents within their routine catchment areas. cMDA was primarily delivered 'door-to-door', where an HSA (supported by a study officer and community volunteer) offered treatment with a single dose of 400mg albendazole to all resident and eligible household members and to directly observe treatment, although HSAs were permitted to leave tablets with an individual if requested, or with another present household member if a resident was absent at a third consecutive visit (i.e. treatment not directly observed). Recording of treatment was completed by the accompanying study officer using an electronic treatment register, pre-populated with a household and individual listing based on the most recent census [25]. Real-time monitoring and supervision of cMDA was conducted by the trial study team, which included providing summary coverage statistics to HSAs and generating 'mop-up' lists of non-treated community members to be targeted during the cMDA delivery period.

3.3. Definitions and outcomes

We defined the population targeted for cMDA (denominator) as adults (≥18 years of age) registered or confirmed at the most recent census prior to cMDA and recorded as eligible (i.e. not pregnant in first trimester and not deceased) at that round of cMDA. Consistent with the primary coverage definition used in the parent trial, we first defined *protocol* treatment as those recorded as receiving treatment whether directly or not directly observed (tablet left with individual, tablet left with other household member, treated elsewhere within past two weeks). Considering the trial context in which cMDA was delivered, we additionally defined

operational treatment using a pragmatic definition that better reflects how cMDA would likely be delivered in routine practice, and which aligns more closely with how cMDA for other NTDs is delivered in Malawi: those recorded as receiving any treatment (observed or unobserved) at the *first* visit to their household (therefore with those treated at a second or third visit, or for whom tablets were left with another household member, considered not treated). Irregular residents were defined as individuals who were reported at the census to be household members but had not been present for the majority of days in the prior six months. Household urbanicity (rural versus peri-urban) was *a priori* defined based on relative characteristics of each study community, and incorporated both local facilities (e.g. presence of a trading centre) and spatial (e.g. household density) characteristics.

3.4. Statistical analysis

Analysis was conducted using Stata 18.5 (StataCorp, TX, USA). Household socio-economic status (SES) was calculated using principal component analysis (PCA) as previously described [21]. Coverage of cMDA is described using descriptive statistics (median (M), interquartile range (IQR)) and presented by sex for cMDA overall and by round. Differences in coverage of cMDA were calculated as the median difference and IQR between communities by round. We apply a target of 75% cMDA coverage for STH, based on similar current global targets for routine MDA for STH. Consistent with a multi-level (clustered) dataset, we conduct mixed-effects logistic regression fitted by maximum likelihood estimation to investigate individual, household and programme factors associated with non-treatment amongst adult men across all six rounds of cMDA. Iterative versions of models were tested with variance partition coefficient calculated to assess statistical significance of the clustering by a likelihood ratio test, a summary of this is reported in Supplementary Table 3. The optimal model structure was identified as a three-level hierarchy with treatment at each round (level-1) nested within individual (level-2), in turn nested within community (level-3). The final model comprised a random intercept for individual and community to allow for baseline variation in non-treatment at each of these levels; and a random slope for cMDA

round at the individual level, to allow for the reduction in non-treatment amongst individuals across rounds (i.e. over time). The effect of contextual variables treated as fixed effects included those from the relevant (i.e. previous to that round of cMDA) census record (age, sex, education, absenteeism, SES, household size, religion, language, urbanicity) or cMDA treatment record (time and day of treatment) and were all pre-specified to be included in an adjusted model.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Summary cMDA outcomes by sex and cMDA round

A summary of cMDA outcomes by sex and round is presented in Table 1. The proportion of adult men with no household visit recorded (i.e. treatment not offered) ranged between 2.4% (round 5) and 10.4% (round 2), and was higher than amongst adult women in each round. A greater proportion of adult men were recorded as absent with substantial variation by round, ranging from 11.5–17.2% amongst those reported to be short term absent, and 2.5–7.8% for those reported to be long term absent; in contrast, the proportion of adult women reported as short-term absent (2.4–3.7%) and long-term absent (0.8–2.0%) remained consistent and low across rounds. Amongst adults reached but not treated, the most common reason amongst men was refusal (range by round: 0.1–3.2%) whereas amongst women it was non-eligibility (range by round: 1.5–2.5%). The proportion of treatments administered without direct observation generally declined over each round, but was always higher amongst adult men (range by round: 1.4–11.5%) than adult women (range by round: 0.7–5.4%).

Table 1: Summary outcomes amongst censused adults during cMDA, by sex and round

	cMDA 1		cMDA 2		cMDA 3	
	Adult men n= (%)	**Adult women n= (%)**	**Adult men n= (%)**	**Adult women n= (%)**	**Adult men n= (%)**	**Adult women n= (%)**
Censused (N=)	**12 061**	**15 563**	**12 391**	**15 655**	**11 958**	**15 768**
Not reached:						
Not visited	1 064 (8.8)	1 165 (7.5)	1 288 (10.4)	1 435 (9.2)	406 (3.4)	455 (2.9)
Short-term absent	1 792 (14.9)	466 (3.0)	2 126 (17.2)	579 (3.7)	1 885 (15.8)	479 (3.0)
Long-term absent	936 (7.8)	312 (2.0)	652 (5.3)	267 (1.7)	395 (3.3)	133 (0.8)
Not treated:						
Not eligible†	67 (0.6)	275 (1.8)	106 (0.9)	392 (2.5)	28 (0.2)	312 (2.0)
Refused	383 (3.2)	132 (0.9)	246 (2.0)	85 (0.5)	146 (1.2)	26 (0.2)
Other‡	11 (0.1)	24 (0.2)	41 (0.3)	73 (0.5)	53 (0.4)	52 (0.3)
Treated:						
Observed	6 482 (53.7)	12 521 (80.5)	6 513 (52.6)	11 981 (76.5)	8 233 (68.9)	13 813 (87.6)
Not observed*	1 326 (11.0)	668 (4.3)	1 419 (11.5)	843 (5.4)	812 (6.8)	498 (3.2)
	cMDA 4		**cMDA 5**		**cMDA 6**	
	Adult men n= (%)	**Adult women n= (%)**	**Adult men n= (%)**	**Adult women n= (%)**	**Adult men n= (%)**	**Adult women n= (%)**
Censused (N=)	**12 379**	**16 119**	**12 561**	**16 330**	**13 383**	**16 804**
Not reached:						
Not visited	512 (4.1)	604 (3.7)	300 (2.4)	345 (2.1)	463 (3.5)	548 (3.3)
Short-term absent	1 578 (12.7)	493 (3.1)	1 442 (11.5)	380 (2.3)	1 727 (12.9)	554 (3.3)
Long-term absent	626 (5.1)	269 (1.7)	316 (2.5)	164 (1.0)	597 (4.5)	265 (1.6)
Not treated:						
Not eligible†	83 (0.7)	335 (2.1)	23 (0.2)	244 (1.5)	62 (0.5)	305 (1.8)
Refused	54 (0.4)	18 (0.1)	9 (0.1)	0 (0)	5 (<0.1)	3 (>0.1)
Other‡	46 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	35 (0.3)	52 (0.3)	39 (0.3)	61 (0.4)
Treated:						
Observed	8 853 (71.5)	13 966 (86.6)	10 256 (81.6)	15 028 (92.0)	10 102 (75.5)	14 792 (88.0)
Not observed*	627 (5.1)	379 (2.4)	180 (1.4)	117 (0.7)	388 (2.9)	276 (1.6)

*: Tablet left with individual, tablet left with other individual in household, or treated elsewhere in previous two weeks. †: Pregnant in first trimester or deceased. ‡: Seriously ill or intoxicated.

4.2. Distribution of cMDA: protocol coverage

Across all six rounds of cMDA, median community-level protocol coverage of adult men was 73.8% (IQR: 66.6–80.5%), as compared to 89.1% (IQR: 85.0–92.2%) of adult women. Median protocol coverage of adult men was consistently lower compared to adult women at every round and below 75% in rounds 1 to 3, whereas protocol coverage of adult women exceeded 75% in all 6 rounds (Figure 1).

Median protocol coverage of adult men was lowest at round 1 (63.2%, IQR: 54.7–69.4%) and highest during round 5 (81.6%, IQR: 77.8–89.1%), increasing each consecutive round except from round 5 to 6. The overall proportion of communities with protocol coverage of

adult men ≥75% was lowest during round two (n=2, 3.4%) and highest during round five (n=52, 88.1%). Median protocol coverage of adult women was lowest in round two (82.8%, IQR: 79.1–86.3%) and highest in round five (93.1%, IQR: 90.9–95.1%). The majority of communities met protocol coverage of adult women ≥75% (86.4%, n=51) during round 1 and 2, and in all communities during rounds 3 to 6.

4.3. Distribution of cMDA: operational coverage

In comparison to protocol coverage, median community-level operational coverage of adult men overall across all six rounds of cMDA was substantially lower, and showed greater variation across communities (61.0%, IQR=50.9–68.6%) as compared to operational coverage of adult women (83.3%, IQR: 78.3–87.4%). Median operational coverage of adult men was below 75% in all six rounds, whereas operational coverage of adult women remained above 75% in all six rounds (Figure 2).

Consistent with the protocol coverage, median operational coverage of adult men was lowest in round 1 (M=45.6%, IQR: 31.6-58.9%) and highest in round 5 (M=67.7%, IQR: 58.8-75.0%); and the proportion of communities with per-protocol coverage of adult men ≥75% was lowest during round 2 (n=0) and highest – albeit substantially lower as compared to protocol coverage – during round 5 (n=15, 25.4%). In contrast to protocol coverage, in no round did all communities meet protocol coverage of adult women ≥75%, however, the majority did in round 4 and 5 (n=57, 98.3%).

4.4. Distribution of within-community sex differences in cMDA coverage

The median difference in male and female protocol coverage was 14.9% (IQR: 9.2–19.6%) (Figure 3). Consistent with increasing coverage amongst adult men over successive cMDA rounds, median difference in protocol coverage was greatest in round 1 (M=21.5%, IQR: 15.9–27.3%) and least in round 5 (9.9%, IQR: 4.9–15.3%). In rounds 1-4 and 6, more than half of communities had a difference in coverage ≥10% (R=34 to 53, 57.6–89.8%) amongst adult women compared to adult men; and 0 to 2 communities (0–3.4%) where difference in

protocol coverage was ≤0% (i.e. equal to or greater amongst adult men, as compared to adult women).

The median difference in male and female operational coverage was 21.7% (IQR: 15.9–28.7). In contrast to difference in protocol coverage, change between rounds was inconsistent, and least in round 6 (M=19.1%, IQR: 11.2–24.3%). The proportion of communities with difference in coverage ≥10% amongst adult women compared to adult men consistently increased over time, from ten (17.0%) at round one through to 32 (54.2%) at round six; and only one (1.7%) community where difference in operational coverage was ≤0% (during round three only).

4.5. Factors associated with non-treatment of adult men: protocol coverage

The results of multivariate associations between individual, household and treatment-level characteristics of adult men and non-treatment across all 6 rounds of cMDA are presented for protocol non-treatment (Table 2) and for operational non-treatment (Table 3).

Three areas of individual-level characteristics were assessed (age group, education level, and presence in household). Protocol non-treatment in cMDA showed a strong relationship with age, with those aged <40 years at greatest odds of protocol non-treatment, and those ≥40 years at lowest odds of non-treatment. Relative to the youngest age group (18-19 years), odds of protocol non-treatment were highest amongst men aged 25-29 years (AOR=1.71, 95% CI: 1.52–1.91) and least amongst men aged ≥50 years (AOR=0.38, 95% CI: 0.34–0.42). In contrast, there was weak and inconsistent evidence of an association by education level, with odds of protocol non-treatment greater amongst men reported to have completed primary education (AOR=1.19, 95% CI: 1.02–1.38) relative to men who had never attended formal education; but there was no evidence of an association amongst men with lower (primary incomplete, AOR=1.04, 95% CI:0.97–1.11) or higher (secondary and higher, AOR=1.01, 95% CI:0.91–1.12) education levels. Lastly, increasing levels of reported absenteeism prior to the census enumeration showed a consistent relationship with protocol

non-treatment: men who were absent at the time of the census visit (day absent) compared to those who had been present (AOR=1.23, 95% CI:1.16–1.30), men reported to have slept elsewhere the night before the census visit (night absent) compared to those who had not (AOR=3.00, 95% CI:2.76–3.25), and men who were reported to have been away from the household for more than half of the time in the past six months (AOR=2.69, 95% CI:2.45–2.96); were all at increased odds of protocol non-treatment.

Five areas of men's household-level characteristics were assessed (wealth, household size, those practicing a minority religion, those primarily speaking a minority language, and those residing in a peri-urban community). Relative to the least wealthy households, there was no evidence of an association with protocol non-treatment amongst men residing in any of the middle 60% of poorest households (quintiles 2, 3 and 4), but did show evidence of an association with lowest odds of protocol non-treatment amongst men residing in (the most wealthy) quintile 5 (AOR=0.85, 95% CI:0.76–0.95). Men who reported living alone in the previous census visit (single resident household) as compared to those who lived with any other individuals (multiple resident household) showed evidence of an association and greater odds of protocol non-treatment (AOR=1.41, 95% CI:1.14–1.75). Amongst other household level characteristics assessed, there was no evidence of an association with protocol non-treatment amongst men who resided in households practicing a minority religion (AOR=1.02, 95% CI:0.85–1.21), households primarily speaking a minority language (AOR=1.15, 95% CI:0.95–1.39) (both relative to the majority religion or language respective), or households within a peri-urban community (relative to rural community) (AOR=0.94, 95% CI: 0.74–1.18).

Finally, three areas of treatment-level characteristics were assessed for their association with protocol non-treatment: round of cMDA, times of household visit(s) during cMDA by round, and cumulative number of household visits for cMDA by round. The absolute proportion of men per-protocol not-treated consistently declined round-to-round, from more than one in three in round 1 (34.9% not treated) to one in five in rounds five and six (21.3%

not treated). Men's odds of protocol non-treatment were lowest in round 5 (AOR=0.21, 95% CI:0.19–0.23), and highest in round 1 (reference). In addition, men's odds of protocol non-treatment overall were consistently lower in cMDA rounds 3-6 as compared to round 2 (AOR=0.98, 95% CI:0.92–1.05). Amongst time characteristics of the visits by each round, men's odds of protocol non-treatment was significantly lower where any visit to the individual was conducted later in the day (after 3pm) (AOR=0.83, 95% CI: 0.78–0.87) (versus never after 3pm); whereas there was no evidence of an association with protocol non-treatment where any visit was conducted earlier in the day (before 9am) (AOR=1.02, 95% CI: 0.90–1.15). Finally, there was weak evidence of an association in terms of reduced odds of protocol non-treatment where any visit had been conducted on a weekend (AOR=0.91, 95% CI: 0.82–1.00, p=0.08).

Table 2: Proportion non-treated and factors associated with protocol non-treatment of censused and eligible adult men during cMDA

Factor	Number not treated /total; n/N (%)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)*	P-value
Individual:			
Age group:			
18-19 years	1 896/7 677 (24.7)	1.0	-
20-24 years	4 058/11 522 (35.2)	1.58 (1.32, 1.74)	<0.001
25-29 years	3 517/9 454 (37.2)	1.71 (1.52, 1.91)	<0.001
30-39 years	4 906/15 913 (30.8)	1.20 (1.08, 1.33)	0.001
40-49 years	2 497/12 249 (20.4)	0.65 (0.58, 0.73)	<0.001
≥50 years	2 300/17 550 (13.1)	0.38 (0.34, 0.42)	<0.001
Education level:			
None	4 523/18 336 (24.7)	1.0	-
Primary incomplete	7 494/25 408 (29.5)	1.04 (0.97, 1.11)	0.27
Primary complete	707/1 979 (35.7)	1.19 (1.02, 1.38)	0.03
Secondary or higher	2 211/6 710 (33.0)	1.01 (0.91, 1.12)	0.85
Unknown	4 239/21 932 (19.3)	1.01 (0.92, 1.11)	0.84
Presence in household			
Absent at census visit	13 381/40 313 (33.2)	1.23 (1.16, 1.30)	<0.001
Absent night before census visit	7 653/13 466 (56.8)	3.00 (2.76, 3.25)	<0.001
Irregular resident†	5 697/ 9 046 (63.0)	2.69 (2.45, 2.96)	<0.001
Household:			
Wealth quintile:			
Poorest	3 116/11 412 (27.3)	1.0	-
Quintile 2	3 742/13 365 (28.0)	1.06 (0.95, 1.18)	0.33
Quintile 3	3 889/15 293 (25.4)	0.96 (0.86, 1.06)	0.42
Quintile 4	4 087/16 234 (25.2)	0.98 (0.88, 1.09)	0.67
Least poor	4 338/18 047 (24.0)	0.85 (0.76, 0.95)	<0.01
Household size:			
Multiple residents	18 851/72 997 (25.8)	1.0	-
Single resident	323/1 368 (23.6)	1.41 (1.14, 1.75)	<0.01
Household religion:			
Islam	17 976/69 639 (25.8)	1.0	-
Christian or other	1 198/4 726 (25.3)	1.02 (0.85, 1.21)	0.85
Minority language:			
Chiyao	18 157/70 620 (25.7)	1.0	-
Chichewa or other	1 017/3 745 (27.2)	1.15 (0.95, 1.39)	0.16
Urbanicity:			
Rural community	14 836/55 866 (26.6)	1.0	-
Peri-urban community	4 338/18 499 (23.4)	0.94 (0.74, 1.18)	0.57
Treatment (by round):			
cMDA round:			
Round 1	4 187/11 995 (34.9)	1.0	-
Round 2	4 353/12 285 (35.4)	0.98 (0.92, 1.05)	0.57
Round 3	2 885/11 930 (24.2)	0.50 (0.46, 0.53)	<0.001
Round 4	2 816/12 296 (22.9)	0.42 (0.39, 0.45)	<0.001
Round 5	2 102/12 538 (16.8)	0.21 (0.19, 0.23)	<0.001
Round 6	2 831/13 321 (21.3)	0.25 (0.23, 0.28)	<0.001
Morning household visit(s):			
Never early	18 402/70 985 (25.9)	1.0	-
Ever early (<9am)	772/3 380 (22.8)	1.02 (0.90, 1.15)	0.74
Late afternoon visit(s):			
Never late	15 615/59 451 (26.3)	1.0	-
Ever late (≥3pm)	3 559/14 914 (23.9)	0.83 (0.78, 0.87)	<0.001
Day of visit(s):			
Never weekend	18 262/71 002 (25.7)	1.0	-
Ever weekend	912/3 363 (27.1)	0.91 (0.82, 1.00)	0.08
Total number of visit(s):			
Continuous	-	0.84 (0.81, 0.88)	<0.001

*: Multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression with 74 351 observations; random intercept at the individual (level-1) and community (level-2) levels, and random slope for CMDA round. †: Defined as an individual who reported to have spent more than half the time away from the household in the six months prior to census.

4.6. Factors associated with non-treatment of adult men: operational coverage

Amongst individual-level characteristics, age group demonstrated a weaker association with operational non-treatment compared to protocol non-treatment; with odds of operational non-treatment also highest amongst men aged 20-24 (AOR=1.17, 95% CI: 1.09–1.27) and least amongst men aged ≥50 years (AOR=0.49, 95% CI: 0.45–0.53). In contrast, education level demonstrated a stronger relationship with operational non-treatment compared to protocol non-treatment, with men with either primary incomplete (AOR=1.10, 95% CI:1.05–1.16) or primary complete (AOR=1.26, 95% CI:1.12–1.42) both demonstrating increased odds of non-treatment compared to men reporting no formal education; but similarly no evidence of an association with operational non-treatment at secondary or higher levels (AOR=1.06, 95% CI:0.98–1.15). Lastly, and consistent with associations observed for protocol non-treatment, increased odds of operational non-treatment were associated with all three measures of household presence, most notably for men absent in the night prior to the census visit (AOR=2.43, 95% CI: 2.28–2.61) and men who were irregular residents (AOR=2.23, 95% CI: 2.06–2.41).

Amongst household-level characteristics; consistent with protocol non-treatment, there was no evidence of association with operational non-treatment amongst men residing in a household practicing a minority religion (AOR=0.97, 95% CI:0.86–1.10) or speaking a minority language (AOR=1.01, 95% CI:0.88–1.16). There was also no evidence of an association with operational non-treatment amongst men in any household wealth quintile relative to the least wealthy quintile, including within quintile 5 (AOR=0.94, 95% CI: 0.87–1.01). However, in contrast to protocol treatment, men residing in a household within a peri-urban community were at increased odds of operational non-treatment (AOR=1.36, 95% CI: 1.06–1.75) compared to men residing in a rural community; and conversely, no evidence of

an association with operational non-treatment was observed amongst men who lived alone (AOR=0.93, 95% CI: 0.79–1.09) compared to men who did not live alone.

Finally, amongst treatment-level characteristics, consistent with protocol non-treatment, men's odds of operational non-treatment was consistently lower in all rounds of treatment after the first round of cMDA, including round 2 (AOR=0.76, 95% CI: 0.72–0.80). Compared to protocol non-treatment, we observed stronger evidence of an association for reduced odds of operational non-treatment when the visit had taken place on a weekend day (AOR=0.59, 95% CI: 0.54–0.67) and to a lesser extent in the late afternoon (AOR=0.80, 95% CI: 0.76–0.84).

Table 3: Proportion non-treated and factors associated with operational non-treatment of censused and eligible adult men during cMDA

Factor	Number not treated/ Total; n/N (%)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)*	P-value
Individual:			
Age group:			
18-19 years	3 247/7 677 (42.3)	1.0	-
20-24 years	5 560/11 522 (48.3)	1.17 (1.09, 1.27)	<0.001
25-29 years	4 541/9 454 (48.0)	1.10 (1.01, 1.20)	0.03
30-39 years	7 090/15 913 (44.6)	0.95 (0.87, 1.02)	0.17
40-49 years	4 484/12 249 (36.6)	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)	<0.001
≥50 years	4 713/17 550 (26.9)	0.49 (0.45, 0.53)	<0.001
Education level:			
None	7 043/18 336 (38.4)	1.0	-
Primary incomplete	11 023/25 408 (43.4)	1.10 (1.05, 1.16)	<0.001
Primary complete	965/1 979 (48.8)	1.26 (1.12, 1.42)	<0.001
Secondary or higher	3 063/6 710 (45.6)	1.06 (0.98, 1.15)	0.16
Unknown	7 541/21 932 (34.4)	1.07 (1.00, 1.14)	<0.001
Presence in household			
Absent at census visit	19 238/40 313 (47.7)	1.24 (1.19, 1.30)	<0.001
Absent night before census visit	9 263/13 466 (68.8)	2.43 (2.28, 2.61)	<0.001
Irregular resident†	6 613/9 046 (73.1)	2.23 (2.06, 2.41)	<0.001
Household:			
Wealth quintile:			
Poorest	4 673/11 412 (40.9)	1.0	-
Quintile 2	5 528/13 365 (41.4)	1.04 (0.96, 1.12)	0.31
Quintile 3	6 092/15 293 (39.8)	1.01 (0.94, 1.09)	0.08
Quintile 4	6 403/16 234 (39.4)	1.01 (0.94, 1.09)	0.08
Least poor	6 935/18 047 (38.4)	0.94 (0.87, 1.01)	0.08
Household size:			
Multiple residents	29 240/72 997	1.0	-
Single resident	395/1 368 (28.9)	0.93 (0.79, 1.09)	0.36
Household religion:			
Islam	27 883/69 639 (40.0)	1.0	-
Christian or other	1 752/4 726 (37.1)	0.97 (0.86, 1.10)	0.69
Minority language:			
Chiyao	28 171/70 620 (39.9)	1.0	-
Chichewa or other	1 464/3 745 (39.1)	1.01 (0.88, 1.16)	0.88
Urbanicity:			
Rural community	22 527/55 866 (40.3)	1.0	-
Peri-urban community	7 108/18 499 (38.4)	1.36 (1.06, 1.75)	0.02
Treatment (by round):			
cMDA round:			
Round 1	5 927/11 995 (49.4)	1.0	-
Round 2	5 414/12 285 (44.1)	0.76 (0.72, 0.80)	<0.001
Round 3	4 826/11 930 (40.5)	0.67 (0.63, 0.71)	<0.001
Round 4	4 472/12 296 (36.4)	0.52 (0.49, 0.55)	<0.001
Round 5	4 288/12 538 (34.2)	0.45 (0.42, 0.49)	<0.001
Round 6	4 708/13 321 (35.3)	0.42 (0.39, 0.46)	<0.001
Morning household visit:			
Not morning	28 782/72 007 (40.0)	1.0	-
Morning (<9am)	853/2 358 (36.2)	0.93 (0.83, 1.03)	0.15
Late afternoon visit:			
Not late afternoon	25 394/62 920 (40.4)	1.0	-
Late afternoon (≥3pm)	4 241/11 445 (37.1)	0.80 (0.76, 0.84)	<0.001
Day of visit:			
Weekday	28 923/72 167 (40.1)	1.0	-
Weekend	712/2 198 (32.4)	0.59 (0.54, 0.67)	<0.001

*: Multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression with 74 351 observations; random intercept at the individual (level-1) and community (level-2) levels, and random slope for CMDA round. †: Defined as an individual who reported to have spent more than half the time away from the household in the six months prior to census.

5. DISCUSSION

In this study, we show that coverage of adult men in cMDA delivered in the context of a community-based intervention trial was consistently and substantially lower than amongst adult women, with overall protocol treatment coverage of 73.8% of adult men compared to 89.1% of adult women, and a median community-level difference of +14.9% in favour of adult women. When treatment coverage was defined using a pragmatic operational scenario, this difference in coverage meaningfully increased for adult men, with most communities not achieving ≥75% adult men despite almost all still achieving that benchmark for adult women. While achieving high cMDA coverage amongst women should rightly be recognized as a major achievement overall, this study shows that where cMDA and similar interventions are aiming to achieve high coverage across the general population, it is crucial that sex-related inequities are identified and addressed in both the implementation and evaluation of such strategies. This analysis has explored in detail factors associated with non-treatment of adult men in this setting, and highlights the persistence of challenges such as absenteeism in addition to associations with age, household size and location, and characteristics of cMDA delivery.

Sex or gender-disaggregated reporting of cMDA coverage remains uncommon, but contemporary evidence supports our finding that adult men's coverage in cMDA is generally lower than amongst adult women [11, 26]. Amongst studies of routine cMDA programmes that have historically included treatment of adult men (e.g. for onchocerciasis (OC) and lymphatic filariasis (LF)), evidence is fragmented and inconsistent [27], with individual reports of cMDA coverage lower amongst men [28-30], but being equal elsewhere [31, 32] or lower amongst women [33, 34]. A complementary source of evidence for men's participation in cMDA are studies of non-treatment over time and multiple rounds (i.e. partial or complete non-compliance): amongst four studies that had disaggregated non-compliance by age and sex as identified in a recent systematic review [35], non-compliance was more likely amongst adult men relative to adult women in a study of cMDA for STH in Kenya [36] and for

OC and LF in Cameroon [37]; but had no difference in a study of cMDA for trachoma in Ethiopia [38] or OC elsewhere in Cameroon [39]. A key challenge in comparison of cMDA coverage or compliance is the lack of standardised definitions as well as programmatic differences including who is not eligible for cMDA (particularly as it relates to WRA), making interpretation across studies and settings challenging.

To inform strategies to improve cMDA coverage amongst adult men we also explored a range of demographic and operational factors associated with non-treatment specifically amongst this population. Our results should be interpreted with respect to previous work exploring factors associated with cMDA protocol non-treatment overall amongst all individuals across all three different research sites [22]. We observed greater odds of non-treatment amongst older men and no association with non-treatment amongst the poorest households, both populations who had highest prevalence of infection at baseline [21]. Conversely, recognising that younger men were at increased odds of non-treatment concurs with the findings of a comparable study of cMDA for STH conducted in Kenya [36], and should be a key operational consideration for future rounds of cMDA. We observed that men living alone were at increased odds of protocol non-treatment, highlighting the challenges of reaching such individuals even where resources were optimal. Finally, we observed that men living in peri-urban communities were at reduced odds of operational non-treatment (but not protocol non-treatment), reflecting the importance of additional efforts required to reach such communities as discussed elsewhere [40].

Short-term absenteeism is inherently a challenge to achieving high coverage of cMDA in general [41-43], and recognition that men are more frequently absent from the household as compared to women – often associated with gender-specific occupational roles and expectations – has previously been described in a variety of settings where cMDA is implemented [12, 44, 45]. In a large cRCT of cMDA for schistosomiasis conducted in Uganda, even where coverage was similar between adult men and women, women were less likely than men to not receive treatment due to absence [46]. This challenge was

explicitly identified prior to implementation of cMDA during formative work in the other two DeWorm3 sites: in India, men expressed concerns that drug distribution to households during the day would affect treatment coverage [47] and household-based distribution was identified as a relative benefit to women in Benin in terms of access to treatment [48]. In this analysis, we identified that men who were visited later in the day had reduced odds of protocol non-treatment, and men who were visited during the weekend had reduced odds of both protocol and operational non-treatment. Household visits 'out-of-hours' was not a formal component of cMDA and conflicts with the current scope of role for HSAs [49], but offers a potential lever for programmes in their current form to improve men's coverage of cMDA.

Understanding men's coverage in routine cMDA – and sociodemographic differences in coverage of NTD interventions more broadly – remains constrained by a lack of disaggregated routine monitoring and reporting. Coverage for cMDA has long been assessed through rapid coverage surveys, which generally record a minimum dataset that includes at least sex or gender, age (group) and implementation unit [18]. Despite collection of this data, promotion of reporting and use of disaggregated data is almost entirely absent from current guidelines [50], and sits in contrast with broader calls for disaggregated reporting across the sustainable development goals [51] and WHO adoption of reporting standards for sex and gender [52]. As cMDA strategies are refined in pursuit of more equitable outcomes, and new NTD strategies are developed and tested, it is crucial that greater focus is given to sex and gender disaggregation for monitoring and evaluation, particularly in light of calls for NTD coverage to be an appropriate indicator for assessing progress towards universal health coverage [53].

A key implication of this study is: having recognized and measured differences in cMDA coverage, how can this feasibly be addressed within the current constraints of programmes? Delivery of cMDA in this trial was underpinned by the development of an electronic treatment register to allow real-time monitoring of coverage, a platform that could reasonably be used to target mop-up by sociodemographic characteristics rather than a focus on outright

coverage [25]. Research elsewhere can also offer useful guidance to the NTD sector on how to actively engage and incorporate men's concerns in the delivery of cMDA and other community-health interventions for NTDs, most notably from advances in decentralised HIV testing and linkage to care [54]. A strategy integrating cMDA for schistosomiasis with HIV self-testing for men in Malawi has demonstrated the feasibility of novel approaches to delivering cMDA to men in a more targeted way, and illustrates the ready opportunities for integration of cMDA with other disease-specific and gender-sensitive programmes [55].

This study is subject to several limitations. The implementation of cMDA was conducted in a trial context, with substantial financial and technical investment required to achieve high coverage. While we have attempted to approximate cMDA coverage through an alternative definition that better reflects the realities of routine cMDA delivery, this is likely to be an oversimplification of cMDA delivery and still reflects a substantially better-resourced intervention than many routine programmes. Protocol treatment coverage includes treatments that were not directly observed but instead left with the individual or someone else at the household, and may not have actually been taken, potentially resulting in overestimation of treatment coverage and differential misclassification of the outcome if (for example) men were less likely to comply with treatment when left as compared to women. Finally, we have not explored the effect of cMDA awareness and perceptions of being at-risk of STH, and the role that these factors may play in explaining men's lower coverage in cMDA, identified as major drivers of coverage in other settings .

6. CONCLUSION:

The analysis reported here has highlighted the consistently lower coverage of adult men by cMDA implemented in the context of a well-resourced randomised trial, identified factors associated with non-treatment, and more broadly highlighted the importance of exploring socio-demographic differences in NTD strategies both operationally and as part of rigorous evaluations.

Amongst the conceptualisations of adult men in global health described by *Beia et al* [56] it is the category of 'gatekeeper' that resonates most with research on men's participation in cMDA to date, with a predominant focus on the role of gender dynamics in access to care: much emphasis has been placed on understanding the role that men may play as intermediaries of women's participation in cMDA, whether directly as the drug distributor [57] or as husband and head of household [58]. Far less focus has been placed on identifying, exploring and addressing specific challenges men may face in participating in cMDA, a research and operational priority increasingly highlighted as key to achieving genuinely gender-equitable NTD outcomes [59, 60].

We encourage programme managers and implementers looking to achieve better coverage of MDA amongst adult men to consider the implications of the results presented here, but also highlight to policymakers and development partners the critical importance of ensuring that community-level NTD strategies reflect the needs of both men and women.

7. FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Distribution of cMDA coverage amongst eligible adults, by sex and round: trial (per-protocol)

Figure 2: Distribution of cMDA coverage amongst eligible adults, by sex and round: operational scenario

Figure 3: Distribution of within-community sex difference (female minus male) in eligible adult coverage, by coverage definition and cMDA round

8. ADDENDUM

8.1. Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank all community members who participated in DeWorm3 Malawi, and we gratefully acknowledge the support of the traditional authorities of Bwananyambi, Chowe, Jalasi and Katuli; the area development committees of Bwanayambi, Majuni, Malombola and Mandimba, and members of the DeWorm3 Malawi Community Advisory Board.

We thank all those who contributed to DeWorm3 Malawi, with special recognition of the individual contributions of Chikondi Chikotichalera, Fraser Chisale, Hastings Mangawah, Mabvuto Iron, Zachariah Kamwendo, Dickson Mogoya, Cidreck Nkomela and Ranneck Singano.

We thank the team of field enumerators who contributed directly to data collection and the drivers, health surveillance assistants and village volunteers who participated in research activities and the delivery of MDA in Malawi. We also thank those at Mangochi DHO (Dr Henry Chibowa and Dr Kondwani Mamba) and Namwera zone (Mwai Chipeta and Cornelius Kunkeyani) for their support and supervision.

Lastly, we thank Jayne Webster for comments on the first draft of the manuscript, and all those at LSHTM (Katherine Halliday, Eleanor Martins) and University of Washington (Arianna Means, Kristjana Ásbjörnsdóttir, Emily Pearman, Mariyam Shaikh, Katy Sharrock) who contributed to the design, coordination and implementation of DeWorm3.

8.2. Financial disclosure

The DeWorm3 study was funded through grants to the Natural History Museum of London (OPP1129535) and University of Washington (INV-022149, INV-030049, INV-002114) from the Gates Foundation. The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of this report.

8.3. Competing interests

The authors declare that no competing interests.

8.4. Data availability statement

Access to the data and supporting documents reported in this manuscript is available on request from vivli.org (https://doi.org/10.25934/PR00010754).

8.5. Author contributions

RLP, RLB, KK & JLW contributed to funding acquisition, conceptualised the parent trial and provided supervision. SWM, JS, RM, AC, ER, JT, HL & LZ contributed to investigation and project adminstration. SG and WO contributed to software, data curation and validation. SWM conceptualised this study, conducted the formal analysis, visualisation and wrote the original draft. JS, SRG, WO, ER, HL, JLW, RLP, RLB & KK contributed to review and editing of the final manuscript.

8.6. Patient and public involvement

This study took place under the auspices of the Deworm3 Malawi Community Advisory Board (CAB), whose membership oversees all research activities conducted within the trial site. Members of the CAB were closely engaged in the planning and implementation of the study, but were not directly involved in the design or analysis of the study.

9. REFERENCES

1. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). *Global Burden of Disease Study 2021: GBD Results Tool. 2025*. Available from: https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results/.
2. World Health Organization, *Global report on neglected tropical diseases 2024.* 2024.
3. Webster, J.P., et al., *The contribution of mass drug administration to global health: past, present and future.* Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci, 2014. **369**(1645): p. 20130434.
4. Deardorff, K.V., et al., *Strategies to improve treatment coverage in community-based public health programs: A systematic review of the literature.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2018. **12**(2): p. e0006211.
5. World Health Organization, *Preventive chemotherapy to control soil-transmitted helminth infections in at-risk population groups.* 2017.
6. World Health Organization, *Helminth control in school-age children: a guide for managers of control programmes -- Second edition.* 2011.
7. World Health Organization, *WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience.* 2016.
8. Uniting to Combat Neglected Tropical Diseases. *Intestinal worms (soil-transmitted helminths): People receiving preventive chemotherapy for intestinal worms*. 2024; Available from: https://unitingtocombatntds.org/en/neglected-tropical-diseases/disease-directory/Intestinal-worms-soil-transmitted-helminths/.
9. Ásbjörnsdóttir, K.H., et al., *Prospects for elimination of soil-transmitted helminths.* Curr Opin Infect Dis, 2017. **30**(5): p. 482-488.
10. Anderson, R., J. Truscott, and T.D. Hollingsworth, *The coverage and frequency of mass drug administration required to eliminate persistent transmission of soil-transmitted helminths.* Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci, 2014. **369**(1645): p. 20130435.
11. Cohn, D.A., et al., *Gender equity in mass drug administration for neglected tropical diseases: data from 16 countries.* Int Health, 2019. **11**(5): p. 370-378.
12. Rilkoff, H., et al., *Exploring gender dimensions of treatment programmes for neglected tropical diseases in Uganda.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2013. **7**(7): p. e2312.
13. Arney, J.K., et al., *Synthesis of findings from the literature and a qualitative research study on the impacts of gender, disability, and ethnicity in Neglected Tropical Diseases programs.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2023. **17**(12): p. e0011782.
14. Baker, P., et al., *The men's health gap: men must be included in the global health equity agenda.* Bull World Health Organ, 2014. **92**(8): p. 618-20.

15. Halliday, K.E., et al., *Community-level epidemiology of soil-transmitted helminths in the context of school-based deworming: Baseline results of a cluster randomised trial on the coast of Kenya.* PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases, 2019. **13**(8): p. e0007427.
16. Zeynudin, A., et al., *Prevalence and intensity of soil-transmitted helminth infections and associated risk factors among household heads living in the peri-urban areas of Jimma town, Oromia, Ethiopia: A community-based cross-sectional study.* PLOS ONE, 2022. **17**(9): p. e0274702.
17. Kache, R., et al., *Prevalence of soil-transmitted helminth infections and associated risk factors among elderly individuals living in rural areas of southern Thailand.* BMC Public Health, 2020. **20**(1): p. 1882.
18. Worrell, C. and E. Mathieu, *Drug coverage surveys for neglected tropical diseases: 10 years of field experience.* Am J Trop Med Hyg, 2012. **87**(2): p. 216-22.
19. Grubin, L., et al., *Improving data use for decision making by neglected tropical disease program teams: eight use cases.* Gates Open Res, 2021. **5**: p. 153.
20. Ásbjörnsdóttir, K.H., et al., *Assessing the feasibility of interrupting the transmission of soil-transmitted helminths through mass drug administration: The DeWorm3 cluster randomized trial protocol.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2018. **12**(1): p. e0006166.
21. Witek-McManus, S., et al., *Epidemiology of soil-transmitted helminths following sustained implementation of routine preventive chemotherapy: Demographics and baseline results of a cluster randomised trial in southern Malawi.* PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases, 2021. **15**(5): p. e0009292.
22. Means, A.R., et al., *Coverage of community-wide mass drug administration platforms for soil-transmitted helminths in Benin, India, and Malawi: findings from the DeWorm3 project.* Infectious Diseases of Poverty, 2024. **13**(1): p. 72.
23. Witek-McManus, S., et al., *Disability in childhood and the equity of health services: a cross-sectional comparison of mass drug administration strategies for soil-transmitted helminths in southern Malawi.* BMJ Open, 2024. **14**(9): p. e083321.
24. Heidari, S., et al., *Sex and Gender Equity in Research: rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use.* Research Integrity and Peer Review, 2016. **1**(1): p. 2.
25. Oswald, W.E., et al., *Development and application of an electronic treatment register: a system for enumerating populations and monitoring treatment during mass drug administration.* Glob Health Action, 2020. **13**(1): p. 1785146.
26. Karen Danielson, et al. *Mind the Gap: Gender Differences in Preventative Treatment of Five Neglected Tropical Diseases*. in *American Society for Tropical Medicine & Hygiene Annual Meeting*. 2024. New Orleans, LA, USA.

27. Brady, M.A., et al., *Persons 'never treated' in mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis: identifying programmatic and research needs from a series of research review meetings 2020–2021.* International Health, 2024. **16**(5): p. 479-486.
28. Minetti, C., et al., *Elimination within reach: A cross-sectional study highlighting the factors that contribute to persistent lymphatic filariasis in eight communities in rural Ghana.* PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases, 2019. **13**(1): p. e0006994.
29. Osei, F.A., et al., *Mass drug administration targeting Onchocerca volvulus in Owabi catchment area in Ashanti Region, Ghana: Determinants of drug coverage and drug uptake.* Parasite Epidemiol Control, 2022. **16**: p. e00235.
30. Dinesh, R.J., et al., *Coverage evaluation of mass drug administration with triple drug regimen in an evaluation unit in Nagpur district of Maharashtra, India.* PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases, 2023. **17**(9): p. e0011588.
31. Clemmons, L., et al., *Gender issues in the community-directed treatment with ivermectin (CDTI) of the African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC).* Ann Trop Med Parasitol, 2002. **96 Suppl 1**: p. S59-74.
32. Mohanty, S., et al., *Mass drug administration to eliminate lymphatic filariasis: A population-based coverage and compliance study in Eastern India.* Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health, 2024. **30**: p. 101860.
33. Krentel, A., P.U. Fischer, and G.J. Weil, *A Review of Factors That Influence Individual Compliance with Mass Drug Administration for Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis.* PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases, 2013. **7**(11): p. e2447.
34. Talbot, J.T., et al., *Predictors of compliance in mass drug administration for the treatment and prevention of lymphatic filariasis in Leogane, Haiti.* Am J Trop Med Hyg, 2008. **78**(2): p. 283-8.
35. Maddren, R., et al., *Individual longitudinal compliance to neglected tropical disease mass drug administration programmes, a systematic review.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2023. **17**(7): p. e0010853.
36. Oswald, W.E., et al., *Patterns of individual non-treatment during multiple rounds of mass drug administration for control of soil-transmitted helminths in the TUMIKIA trial, Kenya: a secondary longitudinal analysis.* The Lancet Global Health, 2020. **8**(11): p. e1418-e1426.
37. Wanji, S., et al., *Impact of repeated annual community directed treatment with ivermectin on loiasis parasitological indicators in Cameroon: Implications for onchocerciasis and lymphatic filariasis elimination in areas co-endemic with Loa loa in Africa.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2018. **12**(9): p. e0006750.

38. Tilahun, Z. and T.G. Fenta, *Coverage of azithromycin mass treatment for trachoma elimination in Northwestern Ethiopia: a community based cross-sectional study.* BMC Ophthalmology, 2018. **18**(1): p. 193.
39. Aza'ah, R.A., et al., *Point prevalence mapping reveals hotspot for onchocerciasis transmission in the Ndikinimeki Health District, Centre Region, Cameroon.* Parasites & Vectors, 2020. **13**(1): p. 519.
40. Adams, A.M., et al., *Eliminating Neglected Tropical Diseases in Urban Areas: A Review of Challenges, Strategies and Research Directions for Successful Mass Drug Administration.* Trop Med Infect Dis, 2018. **3**(4).
41. Liyew, E.F., et al., *Coverage evaluation surveys following soil-transmitted helminthiasis and schistosomiasis mass drug administration in Wolaita Zone of Ethiopia—The Geshiyaro project.* PLOS ONE, 2021. **16**(12): p. e0260722.
42. Adriko, M., et al., *Low Praziquantel Treatment Coverage for Schistosoma mansoni in Mayuge District, Uganda, Due to the Absence of Treatment Opportunities, Rather Than Systematic Non-Compliance.* Trop Med Infect Dis, 2018. **3**(4).
43. Coulibaly, J.T., et al., *A Rapid Appraisal of Factors Influencing Praziquantel Treatment Compliance in Two Communities Endemic for Schistosomiasis in Côte d'Ivoire.* Trop Med Infect Dis, 2018. **3**(2).
44. Odhiambo, G.O., et al., *Experiences and perspectives of community health workers from implementing treatment for schistosomiasis using the community directed intervention strategy in an informal settlement in Kisumu City, western Kenya.* BMC Public Health, 2016. **16**(1): p. 986.
45. Arjyal, A., et al., *Understanding gender and its intersection with social stratifiers on prevention and care seeking behavior of lymphatic filariasis in Nepal.* Infect Dis Poverty, 2023. **12**(1): p. 77.
46. Akurut, H., et al., *Anthelminthic treatment receipt and its predictors in Lake Victoria fishing communities, Uganda: Intervention coverage results from the LaVIISWA cluster randomised trial.* PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases, 2020. **14**(10): p. e0008718.
47. Aruldas, K., et al., *Gender differences in the perceived need for community-wide deworming: Formative qualitative research from the DeWorm3 study, India.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2020. **14**(11): p. e0008829.
48. Geyer, R.E., et al., *Gender norms and mass deworming program access in Comé, Benin: A qualitative assessment of gender-associated opportunities and challenges to achieving high mass drug administration coverage.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2020. **14**(4): p. e0008153.

49. Smith, S., et al., *Task-shifting and prioritization: a situational analysis examining the role and experiences of community health workers in Malawi.* Human Resources for Health, 2014. **12**(1): p. 24.
50. World Health Organization, *Preventive chemotherapy: tools for improving the quality of reported data and information. A field manual for implementation.* 2019.
51. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs and UN Women (Women Count), *The Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The Gender Snapshot 2022.* 2022.
52. Heidari, S., et al., *WHO's adoption of SAGER guidelines and GATHER: setting standards for better science with sex and gender in mind.* The Lancet, 2024. **403**(10423): p. 226-228.
53. Fitzpatrick, C., et al., *Monitoring equity in universal health coverage with essential services for neglected tropical diseases: an analysis of data reported for five diseases in 123 countries over 9 years.* The Lancet Global Health, 2018. **6**(9): p. e980-e988.
54. Colvin, C.J., *Strategies for engaging men in HIV services.* Lancet HIV, 2019. **6**(3): p. e191-e200.
55. Choko, A.T., et al., *Combined interventions for the testing and treatment of HIV and schistosomiasis among fishermen in Malawi: a three-arm, cluster-randomised trial.* Lancet Glob Health, 2024. **12**(10): p. e1673-e1683.
56. Beia, T., K. Kielmann, and K. Diaconu, *Changing men or changing health systems? A scoping review of interventions, services and programmes targeting men's health in sub-Saharan Africa.* International Journal for Equity in Health, 2021. **20**(1): p. 87.
57. Shoemaker, E.A., et al., *Gender and neglected tropical disease front-line workers: Data from 16 countries.* PLOS ONE, 2019. **14**(12): p. e0224925.
58. Krentel, A. and K. Wellings, *The role of gender relations in uptake of mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis in Alor District, Indonesia.* Parasit Vectors, 2018. **11**(1): p. 179.
59. HIV Health and Development Group; Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (United Nations Development Programme), *Discussion paper: the gender dimensions of neglected tropical diseases*. 2019.
60. Taroub Harb Faramand, et al., *Desk Review on Gender Issues Affecting Neglected Tropical Diseases.* 2019.


Adult treatment coverage (%)
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
Round 1
Round 2
Round 3
Round 4
Round 5
Round 6
Male
Female


Adult treatment coverage (%)
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
Round 1
Round 2
Round 3
Round 4
Round 5
Round 6
Male
Female


Trial
(per-protocol)
Operational
scenario
Round 1
Round 2
Round 3
Round 4
Round 5
Round 6
-10
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
Difference in coverage (female minus male) (%)