

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Filariasis	1
1.2. History	2
1.3. Filariasis in Sri Lanka	3
1.4. Life cycle and transmission	5
1.5. Clinical disease and treatment	7
<i>1.5.1. Acute inflammatory episodes (AIE)</i>	7
<i>1.5.2. Lymphoedema/Elephantiasis</i>	8
<i>1.5.3. Hydrocoele</i>	9
1.6. Burden of the disease	9
1.7. Global mapping of disease burden	10
1.8. Landmark research leading to the global elimination of LF	11
<i>1.8.1. Recent medical advances</i>	11
1.8.1.1. New treatment for interrupting transmission	11
1.8.1.2. New treatment for morbidity	13
1.8.1.3. New diagnostic and rapid assessment tools for surveillance and monitoring	14
1.8.1.4. Other advances	15
1.9. Resources available for country programmes for elimination	17
1.10. Development of a national plan to eliminate LF	17
<i>1.10.1 National plan of action as recommended by WHO</i>	17
<i>1.10.2. Sri Lankan national programme and independent evaluation</i>	25
1.11. Objectives	26

CHAPTER 2: Identification of endemic areas of bancroftian	28
 filariasis in Hambantota district, Sri Lanka, using	
 Rapid Assessment Procedures (RAPs)	
2.1. INTRODUCTION	29
2.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS	32
2.2.1. <i>Study area</i>	32
2.2.2. <i>Administration</i>	32
2.2.3. <i>Rapid Assessment Procedures (RAPs)</i>	33
2.2.4. <i>Evaluation of infection status by professionals</i>	34
2.2.5. <i>Making disease distribution maps using geographic</i>	36
<i>information systems</i>	
2.2.6. <i>Data analysis</i>	36
2.2.7. <i>Cost analysis</i>	37
2.2.8. <i>Ethical considerations</i>	37
2.3. RESULTS	38
2.3.1. <i>General Information obtained from village leaders</i>	38
2.3.2. <i>IndQ and FGD data</i>	38
2.3.3. <i>Clinical and immunological studies</i>	38
2.3.4. <i>Agreement analysis of categorical data of prevalence</i>	39
2.3.5. <i>Hydrocoele distribution on the map</i>	40
2.3.6. <i>Correlation analysis</i>	40
2.3.7. <i>Cost analysis</i>	47
2.4. DISCUSSION	48
2.4.1. <i>Hydrocoele as a marker of filarial endemicity</i>	48
2.4.2. <i>Validation of information on hydrocoele given by</i>	48
<i>local people</i>	
2.4.3. <i>Use of GIS-based map to display distribution and</i>	49
<i>prevalence of filariasis</i>	
2.4.4. <i>Importance of GN as a key informant</i>	50
2.4.5. <i>Discrepancies in distribution and prevalence data</i>	50
<i>among different methods</i>	
2.4.6. <i>Usefulness of urine ELISA as a supportive test to</i>	51
<i>delimitate LF endemic areas</i>	
2.4.7. <i>Cost effectiveness of the IndQ</i>	52
2.4.8. <i>Concluding remarks</i>	52

CHAPTER 3: A Rapid Assessment Procedure to Assess	53
Distribution of Lymphatic Filariasis Using	
Geographical Information Systems	
3.1. INTRODUCTION	54
3.1.1. <i>Lymphatic filariasis distribution according to</i>	54
<i>national Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic</i>	
<i>Filariasis (PELF)</i>	
3.1.2. <i>Recent advances in tools for mapping the LF</i>	54
<i>distribution</i>	
3.1.3. <i>Aims of the present study</i>	55
3.2. METHODS	57
3.2.1. <i>Study areas and subjects</i>	57
3.2.2. <i>Rapid Assessment Procedure (RAP)</i>	57
3.2.3. <i>Making a digitized map</i>	57
3.2.4. <i>Data management</i>	58
3.2.5. <i>Making a disease zoning map for detailed analyses</i>	59
3.2.6. <i>Statistical analysis and ethical considerations</i>	59
3.3. RESULTS	60
3.3.1. <i>Information obtained from village leaders</i>	60
3.3.2. <i>Distribution and prevalence level of the clinical</i>	60
<i>signs obtained via RAP in each district</i>	
3.3.3. <i>Comparison of disease distribution within three</i>	61
<i>districts—Hambantota, Matara, and Galle</i>	
3.4. DISCUSSION	72
CHAPTER 4: Annual Mass Drug Administration in Walgama,	75
a suburb of Matara, Sri Lanka and its evaluation	
4.1. INTRODUCTION	76
4.2. METHODS	78
4.2.1. <i>Study sites</i>	78
4.2.2. <i>Procedures of mass drug administration and</i>	80
<i>treatment recording</i>	
4.2.3. <i>Sampling of households to evaluate MDA effects</i>	80
4.2.4. <i>Parasitological tests</i>	81

4.2.5. <i>Analysis</i>	82
4.3. RESULTS	85
4.3.1. <i>Drug coverage and consumption in mass drug administrations</i>	85
4.3.2. <i>Baseline microfilaria survey (S[0])</i>	85
4.3.3. <i>Impact of MDAs on microfilaria prevalence in each treatment division</i>	86
4.3.4. <i>Impact of MDAs on microfilaria density in each treatment division</i>	87
4.3.5. <i>Impact on the age prevalence distribution</i>	88
4.3.6. <i>Baseline survey (S[0]) for soil-transmitted helminths (STH)</i>	96
4.3.6.1. <i>Study subjects</i>	96
4.3.6.2. <i>STH infections before MDA (S[0])</i>	96
4.3.7. <i>Impact of MDAs on STH prevalence in each treatment area</i>	97
4.3.8. <i>Impact of MDAs on helminths intensity in each treatment division</i>	99
4.4. DISCUSSION	108
4.4.1. <i>Independent assessment of national Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (PELF)</i>	108
4.4.2. <i>Evaluation of drug delivery and consumption in our study divisions</i>	109
4.4.3. <i>Effect of MDAs on microfilaria prevalence and density</i>	110
4.4.4. <i>A critical mf level at which filariasis would disappear spontaneously: the target of MDAs</i>	111
4.4.5. <i>Future of national PELF: possibility of resurgence and its monitoring</i>	112
4.4.6. <i>Beyond filariasis effects</i>	113
4.4.7. <i>Conclusion</i>	115

CHAPTER 5.1: Filarial lymphoedema and its management:	116
the situation in three suburbs of Matara, Sri Lanka, before the introduction of a morbidity control programme	
5.1.1. INTRODUCTION	117
5.1.2. METHODS	118
5.1.2.1. <i>Study Area</i>	118
5.1.2.2. <i>Study Population</i>	118
5.1.2.3. <i>Questionnaire</i>	118
5.1.2.4. <i>Data analysis and ethical considerations</i>	119
5.1.3. RESULTS	120
5.1.3.1. <i>Lymphoedema cases</i>	120
5.1.3.2. <i>Limb pain with fever</i>	122
5.1.3.3. <i>Treatment</i>	123
5.1.3.4. <i>Personal hygiene</i>	124
5.1.3.5. <i>Care of the limbs</i>	124
5.1.3.6. <i>Problems of the lymphoedema cases</i>	125
5.1.3.7. <i>Care and support</i>	125
5.1.3.8. <i>Community gathering</i>	125
5.1.3.9. <i>KAP study</i>	125
5.1.3.10. <i>DLQI</i>	126
5.1.4. DISCUSSION	127
CHAPTER 5.2: Implementation of Community Home Based	130
Care (CHBC) programme for morbidity control:	
evaluation of two, one year follow-up schemes in	
three suburbs of Matara town	
5.2.1. INTRODUCTION	131
5.2.2. METHODS	134
5.2.2.1. <i>Study area</i>	134
5.2.2.2. <i>Study subjects</i>	134
5.2.2.3. <i>Community Home-Based Care (CHBC)</i>	134
<i>approach for management of lymphoedema</i>	

5.2.2.4. <i>Assessment of levels of Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) on lymphoedema management protocol</i>	137
5.2.2.5. <i>Baseline and one-year assessments to measure the success of lymphoedema care programmes</i>	137
5.2.2.6. <i>Statistical analysis</i>	139
5.2.3. RESULTS	140
5.2.3.1. <i>Comparability of 2 study groups at baseline assessments</i>	140
5.2.3.2. <i>Measurements of success</i>	140
5.2.4. DISCUSSION	149
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	155
REFERENCES	160
ANNEXURES	189

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

°C	Celsius
µg	Microgram
ADL	Acute Adenolymphangitis
AFC	Anti-Filariasis Campaign
AFL	Acute Filarial Lymphoedema
AGA	Assistant Government Agent
AIE	Acute Inflammatory Episodes
<i>A.l.</i>	<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>
Alb	Albendazole
BL	Bilateral Lymphoedema
CHBC	Community Home-Based Care
DALY's	Disability Adjusted Life Years
DEC	Diethylcarbamazine
DEC+Alb	Combination treatment of Diethylcarbamazine and Albendazole
DFU	Daily Follow-up
DLA	Deramtolymphangiadenitis
DLQI	Dermatology Life Quality Index
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
ed.	Editor
eds.	Editors
ELISA	Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay
ELs	Entry Lesions
ELP	Episode of Limb Pain
FRTSU	Filariasis Research Training and Service Unit
F	Female
FGD	Focus Group Discussion

GBD	World Bank Global Burden of Diseases
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
GMD	Geometric-Mean mf Density
GMI	Geometric Mean soil transmitted helminth Intensity
GPELF	Global Programme for Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis
H.w.	Hookworm
ICT	Immunochromatographic Card Test
IndQ	Indirect Questionnaire Method
IU	Implementation Unit
KAP	Knowledge Attitude and Practices
KIs	Key Informants
Km	Kilometre
Km²	Square Kilometre
L₃	Infective larvae
LF	Lymphatic Filariasis
M	Male
m	Metre
MDA	Mass Drug Administration
mf	Microfilaria
mff	Microfilariae
MFU	Monthly Follow-up
mg	Milligram
mL	Millilitre
n	Number
NTDs	Neglected Tropical Diseases
PELF	Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction

PHIs	Public Health Inspectors
PHMs	Public Health Midwives
pp.	Pages
PRGMD	Percentage Reduction of Geometric-Mean mf Density
PRmfP	Percentage Reduction of microfilaria Prevalence
PRP-STH	Percentage Reduction of Soil transmitted helminth Prevalence
RAPs	Rapid Assessment Procedures
QoL	Quality of Life
RS	Remote Sensing
SD	Standard Deviation
SE	Standard error
Sq/Km	Square Kilometer
STH	Soil transmitted helminths
TPE	Tropical Pulmonary Eosinophilia
<i>T.t</i>	<i>Trichuris trichiura</i>
UL	Unilateral Lymphoedema
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
WHO	World Health Organization
WHODAS II	World Health Organization DAS II
yrs	Years

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
<i>Table 2.1</i> Prevalence of hydrocoele obtained by <i>Grama Niladhari</i> (IndQ), Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and clinicians (CE) at 24 <i>Grama Niladhari</i> divisions, and urine ELISA prevalence at 15 <i>Grama Niladhari</i> divisions	46
<i>Table 2.2</i> Cost (Sri Lankan Rupees *) required for different RAP procedures, and urine IgG4 ELISA according to expenditure category	47
<i>Table 3.1</i> The number of <i>GN</i> divisions reporting elephantiasis/lymphoedema analysed by prevalence level and distance from coast in Hambantota district	69
<i>Table 3.2</i> The number of <i>GN</i> divisions reporting hydrocoele analysed by prevalence level and distance from coast in Hambantota district	69
<i>Table 3.3</i> The number of <i>GN</i> divisions reporting elephantiasis/lymphoedema analysed by prevalence level and distance from coast in Galle district	70
<i>Table 3.4</i> The number of <i>GN</i> divisions reporting hydrocoele analysed by prevalence level and distance from coast in Galle district	70
<i>Table 3.5</i> The number of <i>GN</i> divisions reporting elephantiasis/lymphoedema analysed by prevalence level and distance from coast in Matara district (Weerasooriya <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	71
<i>Table 3.6</i> The number of <i>GN</i> divisions reporting hydrocoele analysed by prevalence level and distance from coast in Matara district (Weerasooriya <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	71
<i>Table 4.1</i> Treatment schemes of MDAs in <i>Phases I</i> and <i>II</i> , and schedule of microfilaria surveys	84
<i>Table 4.2</i> Treatment schemes of MDAs in <i>Phases I</i> and <i>II</i> , and schedule of stool surveys	84
<i>Table 4.3</i> Drug coverage and consumption analysed for all mass drug administrations (MDAs) in 4 treatment areas	89
<i>Table 4.4</i> Analysis of study subjects enrolled in the blood surveys to evaluate MDAs according to sex and age	90
<i>Table 4.5</i> Changes in microfilaria (mf) prevalence ^a following MDA's over six years from June 2001 to June 2007	91
<i>Table 4.6</i> Geometric mean microfilaria density (GMD) calculated for (1) the total population (bold figures) (2) the microfilaria positives only following MDA's over six years from June 2001 to June 2007	94

<i>Table 4.7</i> Study subjects enrolled in the stool surveys to monitor the effects of MDAs on helminth infection according to age and sex, infection here means any of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> , hookworm and <i>T. trichiura</i>	100
<i>Table 4.8</i> Changes in prevalence ^a of Soil-transmitted helminths (STH) following MDA's over five years from June 2001 to Dec. 2006	101
<i>Table 4.9</i> Geometric Mean Intensity (GMI) and Percentage Reduction of GMI (PRGMI) of soil-transmitted helminths (STH) following MDAs over five years from June 2001 to Dec. 2006	107
<i>Table 5.1.1</i> Characteristics of the 101 lymphoedema cases investigated	120
<i>Table 5.1.2</i> The frequencies of episodes of limb pain (ELP) with fever during the previous 12 months, in relation to the grade of lymphoedema and the presence of entry lesions	122
<i>Table 5.2.1</i> Assessments of leg volume, entry lesions (EL) and acute inflammatory episodes (AIEs) before and 1 year after lymphoedema management in Daily follow-up (DFU) and Monthly follow-up (MFU) groups	144
<i>Table 5.2.2</i> Levels of KAP score on lymphoedema management techniques assessed 1 year after the self-care programme in Daily follow-up (DFU) and Monthly follow-up (MFU) groups	145
<i>Table 5.2.3</i> Levels of various benefits gained after one year of lymphoedema managements in DFU and MFU groups	147

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
<i>Figure 1.1</i> Distribution of endemic areas of <i>W. bancrofti</i> and <i>B. malayi</i> as observed in the microfilaria surveys conducted in 1947, 1962, 1967-68 and 1990	4
<i>Figure 1.2</i> Life cycles of Lymphatic-dwelling Filariae (obtained from CDC, Atlanta)	6
<i>Figure 2.1</i> Map of Sri Lanka, indicating endemic districts: 2001	31
<i>Figure 2.2</i> Grama Niladhari division map of Hambantota, Sri Lanka, illustrating the hydrocoele prevalence by IndQ	41
<i>Figure 2.3</i> Grama Niladhari division map of Hambantota, Sri Lanka, illustrating the hydrocoele prevalence by FGD	42
<i>Figure 2.4</i> Grama Niladhari division map of Hambantota, Sri Lanka, illustrating the hydrocoele prevalence by CE and IndQ	43
<i>Figure 2.5</i> Grama Niladhari division map of Hambantota, Sri Lanka illustrating the urine ELISA prevalence and hydrocoele prevalence by IndQ	44
<i>Figure 2.6</i> Relationship between hydrocoele prevalence (% males) by clinicians (CE) and prevalence (%) by urine ELISA at 15 GN divisions	45
<i>Figure 2.7</i> Relationship between hydrocoele prevalence (/1,000 males) obtained by Grama Niladhari at 24 GN clusters and by clinicians at the corresponding GN divisions (CE)	
<i>Figure 3.1</i> Lymphatic filariasis endemic areas by district (Source – Anti Filariasis Campaign—1999)	56
<i>Figure 3.2</i> Prevalence and distribution of elephantiasis/lymphoedema cases in Hambantota district	63
<i>Figure 3.3</i> Prevalence and distribution of hydrocoele cases in Hambantota district	64
<i>Figure 3.4</i> Prevalence and distribution of elephantiasis/lymphoedema cases in Galle district	65
<i>Figure 3.5</i> Prevalence and distribution of hydrocoele cases in Galle district	66

<i>Figure 3.6</i> Hambantota (a) , Matara (b), and Galle (c), prevalence maps of Elephantiasis/lymphoedema according to distance from the coastline	67
<i>Figure 3.7</i> Hambantota (a) , Matara (b), and Galle (c), prevalence maps of hydrocoele according to distance from the coastline	68
<i>Figure 4.1</i> Map of Walgama suburb showing 3 <i>Grama Niladhari</i> divisions included in the study	79
<i>Figure 4.2</i> Percentage reduction of microfilaria prevalence (PRmfP) at A) Hamugewatta, B) Matotagama[sd], and C) Walgama through five MDA's from 2001 to 2007	92
<i>Figure 4.3</i> Percentage reduction of geometric mean microfilaria density (PRGMD) computed for the total population at A) Hamugewatta B) Matotagama[sd] and C) Walgama through five MDA's from 2001 to 2007	93
<i>Figure 4.4</i> Microfilaria prevalence analysed by age groups before the first MDA and following the last S[72] in the treatment divisions a.) Hamugewatta, b.) Matotagama and c.) Walgama. (n=number of participants per group)	95
<i>Figure 4.5</i> Percentage Reduction in Prevalence of Soil Transmitted Helminths (PRP-STH) at A) Hamugewatta, B) Matotagama, C) Walgama and D) Walgma Central; S[0]/2001.Jun, S[12]/2002.Jun, S[18]/2002.Dec, S[30]/2003.Dec, S[42]/2004.Dec and S[66]/2006.Dec	102
<i>Figure 4.6</i> Intensity of soil-transmitted helminths (STH) in Hamugewatta	103
<i>Figure 4.7</i> Intensity of soil-transmitted helminths (STH) in Matotagama	104
<i>Figure 4.8</i> Intensity of soil-transmitted helminths (STH) in Walgama	105
<i>Figure 4.9</i> Intensity of soil-transmitted helminths (STH) in Walgama Central	106
<i>Figure 5.2.1</i> Mean DLQI scores before and after one year of follow-up in 2 groups (DFU and MFU)	146
<i>Figure 5.2.2</i> An example of successful managements of lymphoedema with daily follow-ups, before (a) and after one year (b). (<i>Case No. 11</i>)	148

Figure 5.2.3 An example of reduction of lymphoedema grade by managements with daily follow-ups, before—Grade III with shallow skin creases in red circles (a) and after one year—Grade II without skin creases (b).

(Case No. 8)

Figure 5.2.4 Mossy lesion (red circle) and EL (red arrows) on the foot, before (a) and after one year of managements with daily follow-ups (b).

(Case No. 12)