The Age-at-Onset of Leprosy

P. MOHAMED ALI

Head of Division of Epidemiology and Statistics. Central Leprosy Teaching and Research Institute, Tirumani, Chingleput.

The age at which the first signs of leprosy appeared in patients in endemic areas has not been investigated on a planned basis. The main reason might be that it is generally impossible to pinpoint the period at which the first signs made their appearance in a patient. This is particularly so in areas of low endemicity. Even the patients fail to notice them until some relatives or friends draw attention to them. But in highly endemic areas like the one where the study under report is based it was a remarkable thing to find that generally people could easily take note of the first solitary patch in persons in their household or those in the immediate neighbourhood. Another reason could be that patients, specially in the older age groups, may not be able to give a correct answer to the query. 'When did you first notice that you were suffering from leprosy?'

This paper, however, deals with an organized attempt to find out the age at which signs of leprosy were noticed in 3,527 patients detected in a recent survey in a highly endemic District in Madras State (India). All these patients were close-questioned as to the age at which they first noticed signs of leprosy in them. In many instances other members of the household or neighbours helped to corroborate the patient's version. In the case of children, their parents helped to clinch the age at which the signs appeared. The interview and questioning was carried out during the course of four months.

Tables IA and IB give the distribution of age of onset by sex and type.

The points that this Table brings out are:

- 1. Only in about a third of the total patients the signs of leprosy were first noticed before they were 20 years old, and two-thirds after that age. An appreciable per centage (10 per cent) of patients placed the age of onset above 50.
- 2. There were as many patients who noticed their first signs before they were about 26 years of age as there were above that age.
- 3. There were two ages at which large numbers of patients noticed their first signs. In the case of males the largest number centred round the age of 22.7 and a smaller but quite appreciable number at 8.74. The two peaks for the females were 8.4 and 22.7. It is thus seen that the peaks in both sexes are almost the same but the highest peaks for males and females respectively were at 22.7 and 8.4, the second peaks were at just the reverse, *i.e.* 8.7 and 22.7! We suggest that a plausible explanation may be based on the genetic hypothesis of specific and individual suspectibility to leprosy.

TABLE IA

Distribution of Age at Onset: By Sex and by Type

| | | | | | | , ,, | | | |
|--------|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Males | Percentage of Males | Females | Percentage of Females | Total | Percentage of Total | "L" cases | Percentage of "L" cases | "N" cases | Percentage of "N" case |
| 74 | 3.35 | 63 | 4.78 | 137 | 3.88 | I | 0.21 | 136 | 4 · 47 |
| 225 | 10.19 | 174 | 13.20 | 399 | 11.31 | 17 | $3 \cdot 53$ | 382 | 12.54 |
| 220 | 9.96 | 134 | 10.17 | 354 | 10.04 | 61 | 12.65 | 293 | 9.62 |
| 228 | 10.32 | 108 | 8.19 | 336 | 9.53 | 64 | 13.28 | 272 | 8.93 |
| 294 | 13.31 | 137 | 10.39 | 431 | 12.22 | 79 | 16.39 | 352 | 11.56 |
| 268 | 12.13 | 127 | 9.64 | 395 | 11.20 | 44 | 9:12 | 351 | 11.53 |
| 232 | 10.51 | 135 | 10.24 | 367 | 10.40 | 75 | 15.56 | 292 | 9.59 |
| 174 | 7.88 | 108 | 8.19 | 282 | 7.99 | 51 | 10.58 | 231 | 7.59 |
| 167 | | 99 | 7.51 | 266 | 7 · 54 | 37 | 7.68 | 229 | $7 \cdot 5^2$ |
| 114 | 5.17 | | 5.84 | 191 | 5.42 | 29 | 6.02 | 162 | $5 \cdot 3^{2}$ |
| 88 | | 82 | 6.22 | 170 | 4 82 | 13 | 2.70 | 157 | 5.15 |
| 54 | _ | 39 | 2.96 | 93 | 2.64 | 8 | 1.66 | 85 | 2.79 |
| | ı.68 | 22 | ı.67 | 59 | 1.67 | 2 | 0.41 | 57 | ı.87 |
| 16 | 0.73 | 8 | o 61 | 24 | o 68 | О | 0 | 24 | 0.79 |
| 12 | | I | 0.08 | 13 | 0.37 | O | 0 | 13 | 0.43 |
| 4 | | 3 | 0 23 | 7 | 0.20 | O | 0 | 7 | 0.23 |
| 2 | 0.09 | I I | 0.08 | 3 | 0 09 | I | 0.21 | 2 | 0.07 |
| 2,209 | 100.00 | 1,318 | 100.00 | 3,527 | 00.001 | 482 | 100.00 | 3,045 | 190.00 |
| 27.407 | _ | 27.387 | _ | 27 397 | | 27 820 | | 27.191 | _ |
| | - | | | | - | • | | | |
| O | | | | | | | | 8 415 | |
| | | | _ | • | - | | - | 22 817 | |
| | 74 225 220 228 294 268 232 174 167 114 88 54 37 16 12 4 2 | Males of Males 74 3.35 225 10.19 220 9.96 228 10.32 294 13.31 268 12.13 232 10.51 174 7.88 167 7.57 114 5.17 88 3.93 54 2.45 37 1.68 16 0.73 12 0.55 4 0.18 2 0.09 2,209 100.00 27.407 — 26.185 — 22.702 | Males of Males Females 74 3·35 63 225 10·19 174 220 9·96 134 228 10·32 108 294 13·31 137 268 12·13 127 232 10·51 135 174 7·88 108 167 7·57 99 114 5·17 77 88 3·93 82 54 2·45 39 37 1·68 22 16 0·73 8 12 0·55 1 4 0·18 3 2 0·09 1 2,209 100·00 1,318 27·407 27·387 26·693 22·702 8·401 | Males of Males Females of Females 74 3.35 63 4.78 225 10.19 174 13.20 220 9.96 134 10.17 228 10.32 108 8.19 294 13.31 137 10.39 268 12.13 127 9.64 232 10.51 135 10.24 174 7.88 108 8.19 167 7.57 99 7.51 114 5.17 77 5.84 88 3.93 82 6.22 54 2.45 39 2.96 37 1.68 22 1.67 16 0.73 8 0.61 12 0.55 1 0.08 4 0.18 3 0.23 2 0.09 1 0.08 2,209 100.00 1,318 100.00 | Males of Males Females of Females Total 74 3·35 63 4·78 137 225 10·19 174 13·20 399 220 9·96 134 10·17 354 228 10·32 108 8·19 336 294 13·31 137 10·39 431 268 12·13 127 9·64 395 232 10·51 135 10·24 367 174 7·88 108 8·19 282 167 7·57 99 7·51 266 114 5·17 77 5·84 191 88 3·93 82 6·22 170 54 2·45 39 2·96 93 37 1·68 22 1·67 59 16 0·73 8 0·61 24 12 0·55 1 0·08 13 | Males of Males Females of Females Total of Total 74 3.35 63 4.78 137 3.88 225 10.19 174 13.20 399 11.31 220 9.96 134 10.17 354 10.04 228 10.32 108 8.19 336 9.53 294 13.31 137 10.39 431 12.22 268 12.13 127 9.64 395 11.20 232 10.51 135 10.24 367 10.40 174 7.88 108 8.19 282 7.99 167 7.57 99 7.51 266 7.54 114 5.17 77 5.84 191 5.42 88 3.93 82 6.22 170 4 82 54 2.45 39 2.96 93 2.64 37 1.68 22 | Males Percentage of Males Percentage of Females Percentage of Total Percentage of Total "L" cases 74 3.35 63 4.78 137 3.88 I 225 10.19 174 13.20 399 11.31 17 220 9.96 134 10.17 354 10.04 61 228 10.32 108 8.19 336 9.53 64 294 13.31 137 10.39 431 12.22 79 268 12.13 127 9.64 395 11.20 44 232 10.51 135 10.24 367 10.40 75 174 7.88 108 8.19 282 7.99 51 167 7.57 99 7.51 266 7.54 37 114 5.17 77 5.84 191 5.42 29 88 3.93 82 6.22 170 4.82 | Males Percentage of Males Percentage of Females Total Percentage of Total of Total "L" cases Percentage of "L" cases 74 3.35 63 4.78 137 3.88 I 0.21 225 10.19 174 13.20 399 11.31 17 3.53 220 9.96 134 10.17 354 10.04 61 12.65 228 10.32 108 8.19 336 9.53 64 13.28 294 13.31 137 10.39 431 12.22 79 16.39 268 12.13 127 9.64 395 11.20 44 9.12 232 10.51 135 10.24 367 10.40 75 15.56 174 7.88 108 8.19 282 7.99 51 10.58 167 7.57 99 7.51 266 $7.$ | Males Percentage of Males Percentage of Females Percentage of Total Percentage of Total Percentage of "L" cases Percentage of "L" cases "N" cases 74 3⋅35 63 4⋅78 137 3⋅88 I 0⋅21 136 225 10⋅19 174 13⋅20 399 11⋅31 17 3⋅53 382 220 9⋅96 134 10⋅17 354 10⋅04 61 12⋅65 293 228 10⋅32 108 8⋅19 336 9⋅53 64 13⋅28 272 294 13⋅31 137 10⋅39 431 12⋅22 79 16⋅39 352 268 12⋅13 127 9⋅64 395 11⋅20 44 9⋅12 351 232 10⋅51 135 10⋅24 367 10⋅40 75 15⋅56 292 174 7⋅88 108 8⋅19 282 7⋅99 51 10⋅58 231 167 |

 $$^{\rm TABLE\ IB}$$ Distribution of Age at Onset for three distinct age groups $(By\ Sex\ and\ by\ Type)$

| Age group | Males Percentage | Females Percentage | Total Percentage | "L" cases Percentage | "N" cases Percentage |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 0 - 19 | 33.82 | 36.34 | 34.76 | 29.67 | 35.56 |
| 20 - 49 | 56.57 | 51.81 | $54 \cdot 77$ | 65.35 | 53.01 |
| 50 | 9.61 | 11.85 | 10.47 | 4.98 | 11.33 |

4. There are also two peaks with regard to the type of the disease. The two ages at which the largest number of patients showed their first signs for 'L' and 'N' types were respectively 22.00 and 8.42 and the lesser peaks at 32.68 and 22.82 years. It is quite possible that all the 'L' type cases could not have originated as 'L' cases.

DISCUSSION

COCHRANE had worked out the age of onset in Madras State and BADGER compared it with that obtained in endemic States of USA. The same is given below in Table II, along with the figures arrived at in the present study for comparison.

It would appear that the age at onset only in those below 15 years in the current study approximated more to COCHRANE'S figures than to USA, while it was more akin to USA in persons above 15 years. There were comparatively much fewer people who showed the first leprosy signs above 35 years in COCHRANE'S study than in the current one (7 per cent VS 31 per cent).

TABLE II

Comparative Statement of Age at onset in Madras and
Endemic States in USA

| Age at Onset | Madras State (Cochrane) Percentage | Chingleput District of Madras State (Mohamed Ali) Percentage | Endenic States of USA Percentage (Badger) | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| 0 - 4 | 6.30 | 3.88 | 0.10 | |
| 5 - 9 | 13.40 | 11.31 | 3.00 | |
| 10 - 14 | 15.90 | 10.04 | 7.00 | |
| 15 - 19 | 19.80 | 9.53 | 13.20 | |
| 20 - 24 | 21.50 | 12.22 | 13.40 | |
| 25 - 34 | 16.10 | 21.60 | 19.80 | |
| 35 - 49 | 7.00 | 20.95 | 25.20 | |
| Over 49 | (<u></u> | 10.47 | 17.8o | |

196 LEPROSY REVIEW

BADGER has shown that the age at onset varies in different areas and in the same areas at different times. Therefore it is difficult to say for certain that the difference in COCHRANE's and in the current studies represented any shift in the age at onset especially in respect of the older age groups. It may be mentioned here that COCHRANE based his figures on 2,000 patients in Saidapet (a suburban locality of the same Chingeleput District) and in the Sanatorium at Chingelput. The patients on whom this paper is based are those residing in some of the rural areas of the same district.

The absence of a test analogous to Tuberculin test deprives us of a means of finding out the state of infection (as opposed to state of disease) with regard to leprosy. Therefore it is difficult to work out the latent or incubation period. Various workers have put this period at a varied number of years. ROGERS puts it at 3-5 years, BADGER at 3-4 years and the latest Japanese studies at about eight years.

Assuming for arguments' sake that ten years would fairly well cover the most likely incubation periods, the age distribution at the time of infection based on Table II will be as given in Table III (figures for the endemic states in USA are given for comparison).

Percentage Age of Patients with Age at Onset after deducting
to years which is assumed as Incubation Period

| | | | | | Percentage of Patients | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Age at Infection | | | | | Chingleput District | Endemic States in USA | |
| Under 10 | | | | | | 23.07 | 19.90 |
| Under 15 | | | | | | 37.48 | 34.10 |
| Under 20 | | | | | | 50.68 | 46.40 |
| Over 10 | | | | | | 76.93 | 80.00 |
| Over 15 | | | | | 19190 | 62.52 | 65.8o |
| Over 20 | | | | | | 49.31 | 53.50 |
| Over 30 | | | | | | 27.61 | 36.00 |

The figures in the Table show that, even after assuming ten years as incubation period, about 50 per cent of the patients (*i.e.* 1,760 patients) had got infected after they had passed their 20th year of life, thereby showing that leprosy is not exactly a children's disease. The fact that susceptible adults could also get easily infected if only they came into contact with infection was shown by BADGER. This has also been borne out by the Naurn epidemic.

It would therefore appear that the age of infection is primarily governed by time of contact of a susceptible person with an infectious patient, and there is no age *per se* which is specially vulnerable to infection. Children who 'appear' to be infected in greater numbers as *susceptible* children because of

their likelihood of intimate contact with their infective parents or relatives, quickly pick up the infection. And this happens not frequently in leprous families whose members may carry what many authors have termed 'a predisposing' factor. And here again it has to be admitted that all or even the majority of children in contact with infective cases and living under the same environmental, nutritional, and sanitary conditions do not get infected.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The age of onset of leprosy in respect of 3,527 patients detected during a recent prevalence survey is analysed and the analysis does not support the idea 'that the majority of persons acquire leprosy (at least in Chingelput District) before the age of 20 and that many have been infected by the time they reach 15 years of age'. Opinion is expressed that the age of infection is determined by the period at which a susceptible person comes in contact with infection.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 1. DR. DHARMENDRA, Director, Central Leprosy Teaching and Research Institute.
- 2. SRI. GANESAN, Statistical Assistant.

References

- I. MOHAMED ALI P. (1963). An Epidemiological Leprosy Survey in Chingleput District of Madras State. Leprosy in India. Volume 35: pp. 176–187.
- 2. BADGER, L. F. (1959). Leprosy in Theory and Practice Edited by Cochrane: pp. 51-77.
- 3. WADE, H. W. International Journal of Leprosy. Volume 20 (1952), p. 22.
- 4. Yanagisawa, et al Studies on occurence of leprosy in children contacted with Leprosy patients.