



Final Push for Leprosy Eradication Through Immunoprophylaxis/Vaccination: Need Versus Evidence

Manjula Singh¹, H.K. Kar², Sanghamitra Pati¹, Rajni Rani¹

¹Indian Council of Medical Research, V Ramalingaswami Bhawan, Ansari Nagar,
New Delhi, India, ²Kalinga Institute of Medical Sciences Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Abstract

The push for leprosy eradication, initiated by the WHO in 1999, aims for a leprosy-free world. Despite the implementation of multi-drug therapy (MDT), new leprosy cases remain static, particularly in India, which accounts for a significant percentage of global cases. The long incubation period of *M. leprae* contributes to ongoing transmission, necessitating additional strategies beyond MDT. Single dose rifampicin (SDR) has shown some efficacy in preventing leprosy among contacts but does not protect against multibacillary leprosy. A promising candidate vaccine, *Mycobacterium indicus pranii* (MIP), has demonstrated significant protective efficacy in trials, particularly among household contacts, and has immunomodulatory effects while being cost effective. Given its potential to impact other diseases, including tuberculosis, the MIP vaccine represents a critical advancement in the fight against leprosy, urging the global community to renew efforts towards eradication.

Keywords: *Leprosy, eradication, multi-drug therapy (mdt), vaccine, mycobacterium indicus pranii (mip).*

Introduction

The final push to eliminate leprosy was initiated by World Health Organization (WHO) in 1999 with an aim to eradicate leprosy by the year 2005 from all countries¹. Since then to achieve a “leprosy-free world”, WHO has been accelerating its efforts. Although the momentum created by multi drug therapy (MDT) is appreciable, the last mile journey for leprosy eradication is yet to be driven. Current evidence clearly demonstrates that in spite of initiation of MDT, the occurrence of new cases has not declined in the household contacts and is significantly higher than the general population. Annual number of new cases has been reported to be between 200,000-250,000

cases from the globe every year². India accounted for 60% of the new leprosy cases with 127,326 cases in 2015 compared to 139,252 in 2006.³ However, the number again increased in 2016 to 135,485⁴, accounting for 66% of the global cases. This clearly shows that the number of new cases detected is not coming down, and in fact, has remained more or less static since the last decade. Moreover, grade 2 disabilities in India rose from 3,834 in 2011 to 5,851 in 2015 which came down to 5,098 in 2016⁴. In tertiary care centers patients having both type 1 & 2 reactions with disabilities have been reported in a substantial number⁵. Further, a large number of cases (2,743) reported relapse in 2016 from 54 countries including 536 cases from India. Due to long period of multi drug therapy, several patients discontinued their treatment and had to be admitted to retreatment schedule which included 11,881 cases worldwide including the highest number of 6,701 cases from India⁴. There was a decline in prevalence rate from 1999 to 2005, however, between the years 2005 to 2015, both prevalence rate and annual new case detection rate remained in a plateau phase⁶. National Leprosy Eradication Programme (NLEP)

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Manjula Singh

Indian Council of Medical Research, V Ramalingaswami
Bhawan, Ansari Nagar, New Delhi, India
e-mail: drmanjulasb@gmail.com
Ph No. +91 9868245793

carried out a Leprosy Case Detection Campaign (LCDC), which resulted in the detection of 34,000 new cases in 2016 from high endemic pockets accounting for 25% of new cases⁴. Thus, in spite of lower prevalence, new cases seem to have been appearing, clearly suggesting a need to adopt ways to stop transmission of the bacilli.

One of the reasons for active transmission is long incubation period of *M. leprae*, such that contacts that appear normal today may show signs of the disease a few years later contributing to the number of new cases^{6,7}. These data clearly indicate that beyond a point of time, it will not be possible to reduce transmission of Leprosy in the communities with the help of MDT and Active Case Finding (ACF) alone. Hence, single dose rifampicin (SDR) for the contacts of leprosy patients was implemented in the year 2015 under a three-year, multi-country research study known as the Leprosy Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (LPEP), in India, Indonesia, Nepal, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and United Republic of Tanzania to reduce the transmission⁵. This strategy has shown 56% protection from clinical leprosy in the contacts for up to 2 years in Bangladesh⁸. However, SDR did not protect from developing multibacillary leprosy, it only protected from low bacterial load, i.e. from paucibacillary leprosy^{9,10}. Similar results with up to three years protection was observed in Indonesian islands with SDR¹¹. However, there is a concern that it may develop resistance to rifampicin for other mycobacteria like *M.tuberculosis*¹².

Since SDR does not provide protection from multibacillary leprosy, it is imperative to take a leap forward and introduce evidence based tools which can re-energise the leprosy eradication program. A vaccine based on robust evidence can be a silver lining in the dark clouds¹³. A re-look into present evidence brings forward a potential candidate which has shown promising evidence in preventing leprosy in household contacts^{13,14}. *Mycobacterium Indicus Prani* (MIP) (earlier known as *Mycobacterium w*) is a heat killed vaccine which has shown encouraging results in several trials^{13,14}. A large scale field trial covering a population of 420,823 individuals from 272 villages from Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh in India showed encouraging results. After exclusion and inclusion criteria, 24060 contacts were vaccinated. The vaccine consisted of first dose of 1×10^9 heat killed *M. w* bacilli in 0.1ml normal saline followed by second dose which was half of the first dose i.e. 5×10^8 bacilli given 6 months later. It was a double blind study where four groups were made: 1. Patients were given MDT+ placebo and contacts were given vaccine, 2. Patients were given MDT + Vaccine and contacts were given placebo, 3. Both patients (MDT + Placebo) and

contacts were given Placebo (absolute placebo group) 4. Both patients (MDT + vaccine) and contacts were given vaccine (Absolute vaccine group). Follow up surveys showed that the groups where contacts were given the vaccine showed a protective efficacy of 60-68% in the first follow-up (3-4 years after vaccination) and 59-60% in the second follow-up (6-8 years post vaccination). Children showed much higher protective efficacy in this trial. These results showed that it was more important to vaccinate contacts to contain the spread of leprosy.

This vaccine has earlier been shown to have immunomodulatory effect on lepromin negative multibacillary lepromatous patients and lepromin negative household contacts where they converted to lepromin positive^{15,16}, suggestive of generating cell mediated immunity in anergic multibacillary cases. It has successfully shown reduction in the bacillary load and has potential to upgrade the lesions histo-pathologically and work as the magic bullet which can show complete clearance of granuloma, reduced reactions, neuritis and reduce the duration of MDT in leprosy patients. The vaccine trial showed a promising efficacy of 68.6%, and cumulative efficacy was 59% after second survey. MIP vaccine has been shown to have both immunotherapeutic and immune-prophylactic effects in multibacillary leprosy patients and their contacts in both hospital and population-based trials¹³⁻¹⁷. The vaccine was found to be safe and without any major concerns with additional benefit of evidence of efficacy against tuberculosis¹³⁻¹⁷.

Being a potent TLR2 agonist, it induces pure potent Th1 response after its intradermal administration. In spite of being Th1 response enhancer, it is found to be safe in healthy humans as well in those suffering from various diseases including immunocompromised individuals^{18,19}. It is known for its capacity to clear the infective organism from body in preclinical as well as clinical studies.

Based on available robust evidence, Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) and National Leprosy Eradication Program [NLEP], Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MOHFW) India had undertaken a pilot project on *Mycobacterium Indicus Prani* (MIP) vaccination in project mode in select districts in Gujarat state in India to study the feasibility of vaccination under National programme. The results are yet to be published. Interestingly, ICMR has also recently completed a large multi-centric trial using MIP vaccine in one of the three arms to see the efficacy of this vaccine in prevention of tuberculosis amongst house hold contacts of smear positive TB cases and the results are yet to be published, however, the safety of the MIP was established once again in population 6 yrs

and above in the study. The MIP has also recently been approved by Drug Controller General of India (DCGI) for Gram negative sepsis based on its encouraging results on category II tuberculosis patients²⁰.

It is evident from the published reports that this vaccine which modulates the immune response, if given for leprosy prevention programme, can have impact on many other diseases and may hold potential for use against many diseases including recent Covid-19 infection. Various researchers have clearly and repeatedly mentioned in recent publications that the MIP holds potential for treatment of the leprosy cases and prevention of the leprosy in close contacts while articulating controversial role of BCG in prevention of leprosy^{21,22}. The cost effectiveness of MIP vaccines has also been evaluated which justifies its use under NLEP²³. Despite clear demonstrated evidence of MIP in prevention of leprosy and its therapeutic potential in treatment of leprosy cases, introduction of MIP under NLEP is still awaited, while different formulations of chemoprophylaxis have been in use. As MIP inclusion in National programme is still contemplated, we are watching increasing cases of leprosy cases including childhood leprosy and Grade II disability even in this era even though there is a strong evidence suggesting strong need for immunoprophylaxis in addition to Chemoprophylaxis for prevention of leprosy. Therefore, it is a knock to the global community battling leprosy to rejuvenate and renew the efforts and decide on rolling out this vaccine to bring a preventive revolution. There is enough evidence to convince the use of a vaccine to defeat leprosy and this is the time, to strengthen our efforts for which MIP can provide that final push!

Conflict of Interest: None

Funding: None

References

- 1 Rao PN, Lakshmi TS. 'Final push of leprosy' in India: What is being pushed? *Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol* 2005; **71**: 226-9.
- 2 Smith CS, Aerts A, Kita E et al. Time to define leprosy elimination as zero leprosy transmission? *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016; **16**: 398-9.
- 3 Global leprosy update, 2015: time for action, accountability and inclusion. *Wkly Epidemiol Rec* 2015; **91**: 405-20.
- 4 Global leprosy update, 2016: accelerating reduction of disease burden. *Wkly Epidemiol Rec* 2017; **92**: 501-19.
- 5 Gillini L, Cooreman E, Wood T et al. Global practices in regard to implementation of preventive measures for leprosy. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2017; **11**: e0005399.
- 6 Sengupta U. Elimination of leprosy in India: An analysis. *Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol* 2018; **84**: 131-6.
- 7 Girdhar A, Mishra B, Lavania RK et al. Leprosy in infants--report of two cases. *Int J Lepr Other Mycobact Dis* 1989; **57**: 472-5.
- 8 Moet FJ, Pahan D, Oskam L et al. Effectiveness of single dose rifampicin in preventing leprosy in close contacts of patients with newly diagnosed leprosy: cluster randomised controlled trial. *Bmj* 2008; **336**: 761-4.
- 9 Kumar B. Response to 'Elimination of leprosy in India: An analysis'. *Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol* 2018; **84**: 443-4.
- 10 Kumar B. Re: Antimicrobial resistance in leprosy: results of the first prospective open survey conducted by a WHO surveillance network for the period 2009-2015. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2019; **25**: 644-5.
- 11 Tiwari A, Dandel S, Djupuri R et al. Population-wide administration of single dose rifampicin for leprosy prevention in isolated communities: a three year follow-up feasibility study in Indonesia. *BMC Infect Dis* 2018; **18**: 324.
- 12 Barth-Jaeggi T, Steinmann P, Mieras L et al. Leprosy Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (LPEP) programme: study protocol for evaluating the feasibility and impact on case detection rates of contact tracing and single dose rifampicin. *BMJ Open*; **6**: e013633.
- 13 Sharma P, Mukherjee R, Talwar GP et al. Immunoprophylactic effects of the anti-leprosy Mw vaccine in household contacts of leprosy patients: clinical field trials with a follow up of 8-10 years. *Lepr Rev* 2005; **76**: 127-43.
- 14 Sharma P, Misra RS, Kar HK et al. Mycobacterium w vaccine, a useful adjuvant to multidrug therapy in multibacillary leprosy: a report on hospital based immunotherapeutic clinical trials with a follow-up of 1-7 years after treatment. *Lepr Rev* 2000; **71**: 179-92.
- 15 Sharma P, Kar HK, Kaur H et al. Induction of lepromin positivity and immunoprophylaxis in household contacts of multibacillary leprosy patients: a pilot study with a candidate vaccine, Mycobacterium w. *Int J Lepr Other Mycobact Dis* 2000; **68**: 136-42.
- 16 Sharma P, Kar HK, Misra RS et al. Induction of lepromin positivity following immuno-chemotherapy with Mycobacterium w vaccine and multidrug therapy and its impact on bacteriological clearance in multibacillary leprosy: report on a hospital-based clinical trial with the candidate antileprosy vaccine. *Int J Lepr Other Mycobact Dis* 1999; **67**: 259-69.
- 17 Sharma P, Kar HK, Misra RS et al. Reactional states and neuritis in multibacillary leprosy patients following MDT

- with/without immunotherapy with Mycobacterium w antileprosy vaccine. *Lepr Rev* 2000; **71**: 193-205.
- 18 Gupta A, Ahmad FJ, Ahmad F et al. Protective efficacy of Mycobacterium indicus pranii against tuberculosis and underlying local lung immune responses in guinea pig model. *Vaccine*; **30**: 6198-209.
 - 19 Gupta A, Ahmad FJ, Ahmad F et al. Efficacy of Mycobacterium indicus pranii immunotherapy as an adjunct to chemotherapy for tuberculosis and underlying immune responses in the lung. *PLoS One*; **7**: e39215.
 - 20 Sharma SK, Katoch K, Sarin R et al. Efficacy and Safety of Mycobacterium indicus pranii as an adjunct therapy in Category II pulmonary tuberculosis in a randomized trial. *Sci Rep* 2017; **7**: 3354.
 - 21 HK Kar, M Sethy. Chemoprophylaxis and Immunoprophylaxis in Leprosy: Will it be a Way Forward Strategy Towards Zero Leprosy? *Indian J Lepr* 2023, 95: 213-219
 22. Narang T, Jain S, Kaushal I, Dogra S. MIP vaccine in leprosy: A scoping review and future horizons. *Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol.* 2024;90:606-14. doi: 10.25259/IJDVL_1172_2023
 23. Muniyandi M, Singh M, Singh M, Rajshekhar K, Katoch K. Cost-effectiveness of incorporating Mycobacterium indicus pranii vaccine to multidrug therapy in newly diagnosed leprosy cases for better treatment outcomes & immunoprophylaxis in contacts as leprosy control measures for National Leprosy Eradication Programme in India. *Indian J Med Res.* 2021;154:121-31. [CrossRef] [PubMed] [PubMed Central] [Google Scholar]