Section: Health Sciences

Review Research Article

HEALTH WORKERS AND COMMUNITY DRUG DISTRIBUTORS IN LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS MDA: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Achut Babu Ojha[1], Nafisul Hasan[2], Damaru Prasad Paneru[3]

[1]*Research Scholar, School of Health Sciences, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar, Haryana, India*
[2]*Professor, School of Health Sciences, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar, Haryana, India*
[3]*Associate Professor, School of Health and Allied Sciences, Pokhara University, Pokhara Nepal*

Received *: 10/10/2025*
Received in revised form *: 20/11/2025*
Accepted *: 08/12/2025*

Corresponding Author:
Achut Babu Ojha,
Research Scholar, School of Health Sciences, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar, Haryana, India.
Email: babuojha@gmail.com

DOI: 10.70034/ijmedph.2025.4.437

Source of Support: Nil,
Conflict of Interest: None declared

Int J Med Pub Health
2025; 15 (4); 2429-2432

ABSTRACT

Background: Lymphatic Filariasis (LF) remains a major public health problem, with global elimination efforts relying heavily on annual Mass Drug Administration (MDA). This review synthesizes evidence on the critical roles of health workers and community drug distributors across pre-MDA sensitization, drug delivery, adverse-event management, and post-MDA follow-up. It also highlights key challenges, including community resistance, logistical barriers, and gaps in training and motivation, and outlines strategies to strengthen frontline capacity.

Materials and Methods: A literature review was conducted through PubMed, ResearchGate, Google Scholar, and institutional websites, using search terms related to LF MDA roles, challenges, and community engagement.

Conclusion: Effective MDA—and thus LF elimination—depends on well-supported health workers and community drug distributors. Enhancing training, communication, resources, and community engagement is essential to address persistent operational challenges and improve MDA coverage.

Keywords: Lymphatic Filariasis; Mass Drug Administration; Community Drug Distributors; Health Workers; Program Implementation.

INTRODUCTION

Lymphatic Filariasis (LF), commonly known as elephantiasis, is a parasitic disease caused by filarial worms transmitted by mosquitoes. It leads to chronic and debilitating conditions such as lymphedema, hydrocele, and acute dermatolymphangioadenitis (ADLA), resulting in severe physical disability, social stigma, and significant economic burden on affected individuals and communities. 1 Recognizing the profound impact of LF, the World Health Organization (WHO) launched the Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GPELF) in 2000, with the primary strategy being annual Mass Drug Administration (MDA) of antifilarial drugs to entire at-risk populations.[1,2]

MDA aims to reduce the level of microfilariae in human populations, thereby interrupting the transmission cycle between mosquitoes and humans. The success of MDA campaigns hinges on achieving and maintaining high treatment coverage, typically recommended at ≥65% of the total population for 4-6 consecutive years, or sometimes higher depending on baseline prevalence and drug regimen (e.g., IDA regimen may require fewer rounds.[3] This ambitious public health undertaking requires a robust and dedicated workforce, primarily comprising health workers and community level drug distributors. This review paper systematically examines the roles played by these frontline implementers in LF MDA programs, the challenges they encounter, and the best practices that can optimize their performance for accelerated elimination.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This review was conducted through a comprehensive search of published literature focusing on the roles of health workers and community drug distributors in Lymphatic Filariasis (LF) Mass Drug Administration (MDA). We systematically searched multiple electronic databases, including PubMed, ResearchGate, Google Scholar, and institutional websites of organizations such as the WHO and

national health ministries. Key search terms included "Lymphatic Filariasis MDA," "health workers LF," "drug distributors LF MDA," "community drug distributors LF," "challenges LF MDA," "best practices drug distribution LF," "community engagement LF MDA," and related combinations. Peer-reviewed articles, official reports, and guidelines that addressed the roles, challenges, and best practices of health workers and drug distributors in LF MDA programs were included, while studies not directly related to LF MDA implementation, opinion pieces, or commentaries without empirical evidence were excluded. Only English-language studies conducted in LF-endemic regions were considered. The selected articles were critically reviewed for relevance, quality, and their contribution to understanding the specific roles and challenges of these frontline implementers, and the findings were synthesized thematically to provide a comprehensive overview of the topic.

The Multifaceted Roles of Health Workers and Drug Distributors in LF MDA

Health workers and drug distributors, particularly Community Drug Distributors (CDDs), form the backbone of LF MDA campaigns. Their roles are diverse and critical, spanning across the planning, implementation, and post-implementation phases of the program.

Pre-MDA Activities: Before drug distribution, community sensitization and education play a critical role in ensuring the success of mass drug administration (MDA) for lymphatic filariasis (LF). Health workers and community drug distributors (CDDs) engage in raising awareness about LF, including its transmission, symptoms, and the importance of participating in MDA. They work to demystify the disease, address misconceptions, and counter fears or rumors that might discourage community participation, as effective communication is essential for building trust and encouraging compliance.[4-6] Accurate household enumeration and mapping are foundational steps in the process. CDDs often conduct door-to-door visits to collect demographic data, identify individuals eligible to receive the drugs, excluding pregnant women, severely ill individuals, and young children, and inform families about the MDA schedule. This ensures precise drug forecasting and equitable distribution.[7] In parallel, logistical preparation is critical: health authorities at national, sub-national, and local levels manage the supply chain to ensure that sufficient quantities of diethylcarbamazine (DEC), albendazole, and, where applicable, ivermectin reach distribution points in a timely manner. Community Drug Distributors (CDDs) or health volunteers help by receiving and securely storing these medicines at local levels, supported by program guidelines and coordination mechanisms.[8] Finally, training and mobilization are essential for successful implementation. Health workers provide CDDs with training on drug administration protocols, proper dosage, identifying eligible individuals, managing minor adverse events, and maintaining accurate records. Adequate and timely training boosts CDD confidence and effectiveness, directly influencing the overall success of the MDA program.[9]

During MDA Implementation: Community Drug Distributors (CDDs) perform several essential functions during MDA campaigns. Their core role is supervised drug administration, ensuring that eligible individuals receive and swallow the tablets in their presence, which is crucial for compliance and achieving accurate coverage rates.[4,7] They also play a key role in managing adverse events; although reactions to antifilarial drugs are typically mild and short-lived, CDDs are trained to identify common side effects such as nausea, dizziness, or abdominal discomfort and to refer any severe cases to the nearest health facility.[10] Accurate record-keeping is another major responsibility, as CDDs maintain registers of the individuals treated, track distributed drugs, and regularly report their activities to supervisors for program monitoring and evaluation. In addition, CDDs are tasked with addressing absentees and individuals who initially hesitate or refuse treatment. They often conduct follow-up visits or engage in mop-up activities, using targeted communication strategies to encourage participation and ensure that as many eligible individuals as possible are reached.[11]

Post-MDA Activities: After the initial round of drug distribution, CDDs and health workers conduct mop-up operations to reach individuals who were missed during the main campaign, ensuring maximum treatment coverage.[7] Health workers also play a key role in surveillance and monitoring activities following MDA, which involve assessing infection levels and evaluating program performance through tools such as Coverage Evaluation Surveys (CES) to validate reported coverage and identify reasons for non-compliance.[7,12] In addition to these responsibilities, health workers contribute to morbidity management and disability prevention (MMDP) by supporting individuals affected by chronic manifestations of lymphatic filariasis, including lymphedema and hydrocele. Their responsibilities include promoting proper hygiene practices, offering basic treatment, and facilitating access to specialized or surgical interventions when necessary.[13,14]

Challenges Faced by Health Workers and Drug Distributors: Despite their key roles, health workers and drug distributors face numerous challenges that can impede the effectiveness of LF MDA programs. Community non-compliance remains a major challenge in MDA programs, as some individuals refuse treatment due to a lack of perceived need, fear of side effects, misconceptions about lymphatic filariasis, or distrust in the program, while absenteeism caused by seasonal migration or work commitments further lowers coverage.[15,16] Logistical hurdles, such as inadequate drug supplies, limited IEC materials, and poor transportation

infrastructure in remote areas, can delay or restrict effective distribution.[17] In many settings, insufficient or delayed training for CDDs, combined with poor supervision, contributes to suboptimal drug administration, errors in record-keeping, and reduced motivation.[18] Motivation is also affected by minimal financial incentives, limited recognition, and heavy workloads, as many CDDs work voluntarily or with minimal compensation.[19] A lack of community trust, often linked to past unsuccessful interventions or weak communication, can undermine acceptance and reduce coverage. Geographic barriers further complicate implementation, as reaching scattered or remote populations can be difficult when resources and time are constrained. Although integrating MDA with other health programs, such as polio immunization campaigns, can enhance efficiency, it may also create challenges related to coordination, planning, and resource allocation.[19] Additionally, even mild adverse events can heighten community concerns and reinforce rumors, discouraging participation in future rounds of MDA.[20]

Best Practices and Opportunities for Strengthening Implementation

To overcome these challenges and enhance the effectiveness of LF MDA programs, several best practices and opportunities for strengthening the roles of health workers and drug distributors have emerged from the literature.

The success of lymphatic filariasis MDA programs relies on multiple strategies. Continuous training for CDDs and health workers is essential, covering drug administration, communication, rumor management, and basic adverse event handling.[7] Effective communication and social mobilization through culturally sensitive campaigns, local leaders, media, and interpersonal channels help raise awareness, address misconceptions, and build trust.[7,21] Adequate resources and logistics, including consistent drug supply, IEC materials, transportation, and CDD incentives, are crucial. Community engagement through local leaders and selecting CDDs from within communities enhances trust and acceptance.[7,17] Supervision and motivation, including feedback, recognition, and non-monetary incentives, sustain CDD performance. Programs should adopt adaptive strategies, such as timing campaigns around migrations and revisiting absent individuals, and proactively manage adverse events to reassure communities.[7,20] Technology like mHealth applications can improve real-time data and coverage monitoring,[22] while integration with other health interventions can optimize resources and expand reach.

CONCLUSION

The elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis hinges on the sustained success of Mass Drug Administration programs. At the heart of these efforts are the dedicated health workers and community drug distributors who serve as the crucial link between policy and practice. Their comprehensive involvement in community sensitization, drug administration, and addressing implementation challenges directly impacts MDA coverage and, consequently, the interruption of LF transmission. While significant strides have been made, persistent challenges related to community compliance, logistics, training, and motivation underscore the need for continuous investment in these frontline implementers. By prioritizing robust training, fostering effective communication, ensuring adequate resource allocation, and strengthening community engagement, programs can empower health workers and drug distributors to perform their roles more effectively. Recognizing and supporting their invaluable contributions is not merely a matter of operational efficiency but a fundamental prerequisite for achieving the global goal of LF elimination and improving the health and well-being of millions. Future research should focus on further understanding the nuanced factors influencing CDD motivation and retention, as well as developing innovative, context-specific strategies to address non-compliance and overcome logistical barriers in hard-to-reach populations.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Lymphatic filariasis (Elephantiasis) [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 23]. Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/lymphatic-filariasis#tab=tab_1
2. Lepra. Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is a neglected tropical disease [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 23]. Available from: https://www.lepra.org.uk/what-we-do/support-people-affected-by-lymphatic-filariasis
3. Mehta PK, Maharjan M. Assessment of microfilaremia in 'hotspots' of four lymphatic filariasis endemic districts of Nepal during post-MDA surveillance. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2024;18(1):e0011932.
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. About Lymphatic Filariasis [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Nov 23]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/filarial-worms/about/lymphatic-filariasis.html
5. Kisoka W, Mushi D, Meyrowitsch DW, Malecela M, Simonsen PE, Tersbøl BP. Dilemmas of community-directed mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis control: a qualitative study from urban and rural Tanzania. J Biosoc Sci. 2017;49(4):447–62.
6. Kisoka WJ, Tersbøl BP, Meyrowitsch DW, Simonsen PE, Mushi DL. Community members' perceptions of mass drug administration for control of lymphatic filariasis in rural and urban Tanzania. J Biosoc Sci. 2016;48(1):94–112.
7. National Centre for Vector Borne Diseases Control (NCVBDC), Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. Revised guideline on elimination of lymphatic filariasis 2024 [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Nov 23]. Available from: https://ncvbdc.mohfw.gov.in/Doc/Guidelines/Fil/ELF-Guideline-2024.pdf
8. World Health Organization. Monitoring and epidemiological assessment of mass drug administration in the global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis: a manual for national elimination programmes. Geneva: WHO; 2025.
9. Njomo DW, Kimani BW, Kibe LW, Okoyo C, Omondi WP, Sultani HM. Implementation challenges and opportunities for improved mass treatment uptake for lymphatic filariasis

elimination: perceptions and experiences of community drug distributors of coastal Kenya. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020;14(12):e0009012.
10. Ratna P, Sinha A, Pati S, Sahoo PK. Factors influencing implementation of mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis elimination: a mixed-method study in Odisha, India. Front Pharmacol. 2024;15:1297954.
11. Ames HMR, Zuske M, King JD, Steinmann P, Bosch-Capblanch X. Community and drug distributor perceptions and experiences of mass drug administration for the elimination of lymphatic filariasis: a rapid review of qualitative research. Adv Parasitol. 2019;103:117–49.
12. World Health Organization. Lymphatic filariasis: monitoring and epidemiological assessment of mass drug administration, a manual for national elimination programmes. Geneva: WHO; 2011.
13. Stocks ME, Freeman MC, Addiss DG. The effect of hygiene-based lymphedema management in lymphatic filariasis-endemic areas: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015;9(10):e0004171.
14. World Health Organization. Managing morbidity and preventing disability in the Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis: WHO position statement. Geneva: WHO; 2011.
15. Brady MA, Toubali E, Baker M, Long E, Worrell C, Ramaiah K, 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. Int Health. 2024;16(5):479–86.
16. Krentel A, Fischer PU, Weil GJ. A review of factors that influence individual compliance with mass drug administration for elimination of lymphatic filariasis. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2013;7(11):e2447.
17. Silumbwe A, Zulu JM, Halwindi H, Jacobs C, Zgambo J, Dambe R, et al. A systematic review of factors that shape implementation of mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis in sub-Saharan Africa. BMC Public Health. 2017;17(1):484.
18. Abdul Halim AFN, Ahmad D, Miaw Yn JL, Masdor NA, Ramly N, Othman R, et al. Factors associated with the acceptability of mass drug administration for filariasis: a systematic review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(19):12971.
19. Gyapong JO, Owusu IO, da-Costa Vroom FB, Mensah EO, Gyapong M. Elimination of lymphatic filariasis: current perspectives on mass drug administration. Res Rep Trop Med. 2018;25–33.
20. Kusi C, Steinmann P, Merten S. The fight against lymphatic filariasis: perceptions of community drug distributors during mass drug administration in coastal Kenya. Infect Dis Poverty. 2020;9(1):22.
21. Kibe LW, Kimani BW, Okoyo C, Omondi WP, Sultani HM, Njomo DW. Towards elimination of lymphatic filariasis in Kenya: improving advocacy, communication and social mobilization activities for mass drug administration, a qualitative study. Trop Dis Travel Med Vaccines. 2022;8(1):16.
22. Stanton M, Molineux A, Mackenzie C, Kelly-Hope L. Mobile technology for empowering health workers in underserved communities: new approaches to facilitate the elimination of neglected tropical diseases. JMIR Public Health Surveill. 2016;2(1):e2.