Using self-controlled case series to understand the relationship between conflict and cholera in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo

Gina E C Charnley[1,2]*, Kévin Jean[3], Ilan Kelman[4,5,6], Katy A M Gaythorpe[1,2], Kris A Murray[1,2,7]

1. Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK
2. MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, London, UK.
3. Maître de conférences, Laboratoire MESuRS - Cnam Paris, Paris, France.
4. Institute for Risk and Disaster Reduction, Faculty of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University College London, London, UK
5. Institute for Global Health, Faculty of Population Health, University College London, London, UK
6. University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway.
7. MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Fajara, The Gambia.

* Corresponding author
Email: g.charnley19@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

Background Cholera outbreaks contribute significantly to diarrhoeal disease mortality, especially in low-income countries. Cholera outbreaks have several social and environmental risk factors and extreme conditions can act as catalysts for outbreaks. A social extreme with known links to infectious disease outbreaks is conflict, causing disruption to services, loss of income and displacement.

Methods Here, we explored this relationship in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), by fitting publicly available cholera and conflict data to conditional logistic regression models. We used the self-controlled case series method in a novel application, to understand if an exposure period of excess risk (conflict), increased the relative incidence of cholera. We also used a sensitivity analysis to understand potential lag effects.

Results We found that conflict and cholera had a strong positive relationship, especially in the first week after the event, at a national and sub-national level. Conflict increased the risk of cholera in Nigeria by 3.6 times and 2.6 times for the DRC. Conflict was attributed to 19.7% and 12.3% of cholera outbreaks in Nigeria and the DRC, respectively. This was higher for some states/provinces, with a maximum increased risk of 7.5 times.

Conclusion The results found that several states/provinces with the strongest positive relationship were also areas of high reported conflict or were neighbouring states/provinces, suggesting a possible spill-over effect. Our results help highlight the importance of rapid and sufficient assistance during social extremes and the need for pre-existing vulnerabilities such as poverty and access to healthcare to be addressed. In fragile states, conflict resolution should be a top priority to avoid excess risk for both cholera and other health and social implications.

Funding Natural Environmental Research Council, UK Medical Research Council, and the Department for International Development.

Introduction

Diarrhoeal diseases are the eighth leading cause of death worldwide, with cholera contributing significantly, especially in low- and middle-income countries [1]. Over 94% of World Health

Organization (WHO) reported cholera cases are in Africa and more research is needed to understand cholera dynamics on the continent [2]. Previous research has found several environmental and socioeconomic links with cholera, including temperature, precipitation, poverty and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) [3-5]. Furthermore, extremes of these environmental and social conditions can act as catalysts for outbreaks, such as droughts, floods, and conflicts [6-8].

We will focus on the impacts of conflict on cholera outbreaks and compare the results across two countries in Africa, Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Several mechanisms have been suggested through which conflict can lead to infectious disease outbreaks [9-12]. During conflicts, services can be disrupted including access to WASH, disruption of disease control programmes and collapse of health systems (e.g., vaccination coverage). Those displaced by conflict may also find it difficult to access healthcare [13-15]. Populations may not seek medical treatment as they perceive it or healthcare facilities to be unsafe. For example, during the 2018 Ebola outbreak in the DRC healthcare facilities were attacked, dampening efforts to control the virus [16]. Conflict can worsen pre-existing vulnerabilities including poverty, as conflicts can cause loss of income, disruption to education, damage to livelihoods and displacement [17].

Nigeria and the DRC share social and environmental similarities, as well as experiencing cholera outbreaks. Both have active conflicts including the Boko Haram Insurgency in northeastern Nigeria [18] and political unrest in the eastern DRC [19]. They also have the second and third highest numbers of estimated cholera cases per year in Africa, respectively [20], with the Kivu provinces being the most active cholera foci in the world [21]. Conflict and cholera in these two countries have shown temporal changes (Fig 1a-d), and a large proportion of the cholera cases have been reported in conflict-stricken areas (Fig 1e-f). In addition, Nigeria and the DRC have a tropical climate, poor access to WASH and a large proportion of the population living in poverty (<$1.25/day) at 87.7% for the DRC and 62% for Nigeria [22].

Few studies have investigated the impacts of conflict on cholera outbreaks, especially quantitatively. Studies have commonly focused on cholera and conflict in Yemen [10,23-24], its effect on vaccination efforts [25] or the impact of conflict on other diseases such as Ebola [16] and COVID-19.[26] Africa is also a chronically understudied continent in relation to cholera, despite reporting a large proportion of global cases [2].

To bridge this research gap, we aimed to investigate if the incidence of cholera outbreak onset was affected by conflicts in Nigeria and the DRC in the past 23 years. To test this, we used the Self-Controlled Case Series (SCCS) method [27], which has previously been used to test the effectiveness of drug and vaccine intervention on an individual level [28-29] with its used at a population level more recently explored [30]. This study is a novel application of these methods and has the potential to prove its effectiveness in other contexts.

A sensitivity analysis provided further insight into the duration of the conflict effect on outbreaks and a sub-national analysis highlighted priority areas for national cholera prevention. Based on these results, we suggest mechanisms for which conflict is driving cholera and potential risk factors, building on previous research in this area. We hope this information can be used to strengthen disease prevention in conflict settings and reduce additional mortality and morbidity in conflicts.



Fig 1. Changes in cholera and conflict. a, monthly cholera cases and deaths for Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. **c**, Monthly frequency of conflict events and fatalities for Nigeria and **d**, the Democratic Republic of Congo and **e** the number of conflict events and cholera cases as a percentage of the total number of national cases by administrative level 1 for Nigeria and **f**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. All figures are for the full datasets.

Methods

Datasets

Cholera data were compiled from a range of publicly available sources (WHO disease outbreak news, ProMED, ReliefWeb, WHO regional office for Africa weekly outbreak and emergencies, UNICEF cholera platform, EM-DAT, the Nigerian Centre for Disease Control, and a literature search) in both English and French. The full compiled dataset is available in a GitHub repository (https://github.com/GinaCharnley/cholera_data_drc_nga). An outbreak was defined by the onset of a cholera case and the case definitions for the two countries are shown in S1 Information. Conflict data were provided by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Humanitarian Data Exchange [31]. The data included sub-national conflict events, categorised by event type including battles, explosions, protests, riots, strategic developments, and violence against civilians.

The spatial granularity of the analysis was to administrative level 1 (states for Nigeria and provinces for the DRC) and all data points that were reported on a finer spatial scale were attributed to the upper level. To be included in the analysis, the state/province had to report both outbreaks and conflicts during the study period. As such, 22 provinces were included for the DRC and 36 states for Nigeria (states and provinces excluded are shown in S2 Information). The number of conflicts and outbreaks for each province during the study period is shown below (Table 1 and Fig 2).

The study period was specified as Jan 1997 to May 2020, as these were the first and last reports in the conflict data. The temporal scale was set to weekly, with continuous weeks from epidemiological week 1 in 1997 to epidemiological week 20 in 2020 (1-1,220). Continuous weeks was chosen for compatibility with the model and to include periods of conflict that endured from one year into the next. Weeks was chosen, rather than days, to account for reporting lags, as previous work has reported issues in the granularity of data and timeliness of reporting, especially

in humanitarian crises due to different sources of data and logistical difficulties [32-34]. Additional information on the datasets used here are available in S3 Information.

Table 1. Number of events reported by country for the two datasets (Conflicts and Outbreaks). DRC, Democratic Republic of Congo.

	Dataset	**Number of Events**
DRC	Conflicts	4,639
DRC	Outbreaks	396
Nigeria	Conflicts	8,190
Nigeria	Outbreaks	782



Fig 2. Percentage of events in each dataset including conflict and outbreaks, for **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo by administrative level 1. FCT - Federal Capital Territory.

136 ***Model Structure and Fitting***

137 The SCCS method investigates the association between an exposure and an outcome event. The
138 aim is to estimate the effect, by comparing the relative incidence of the adverse events (outbreaks)
139 within an exposure period of hypothesised excess risk (conflicts), compared to all other times
140 (peace, according to the dataset used) [35-37].

141

142 Both the event and exposure were set as binary outcomes, either being present (1) or not (0).
143 The observation period was the full study period (1-1,220). The exposure period was the first week
144 after conflict onset and was reported as multiple onsets, not one long exposure period (Fig 3). The
145 event was defined by the week the cholera outbreaks was reported.

146

147 Each event and exposure that occurred in the same state/province were designated an
148 identification number and a pre-exposure, exposure, and post exposure period (see S1 and S2
149 Tables). The data was fit to conditional logistic regression models (function clogit(), R package
150 "survival") [38]. The model coefficient values were used to calculate incidence rate ratio (IRR) and
151 the percentage attributable fraction (PAF), which is an estimate of the percentage of outbreaks that
152 could be attributed to conflict (full equations in S4 Information).

153

154 The datasets for each country were then split by state/province and the analysis repeated for each,
155 to understand if the significance of conflict on cholera outbreaks varied by sub-national location
156 and if conflict was more important in some states/provinces compared to others. All statistical
157 analyses were carried out in R version 3.6.2 and the threshold for significance was $p=<0.05$.

158

159

160

161

162

163



Fig 3. Swimmer plots. Showing the original conflict exposure period (1 week after the onset) and the outbreaks (black triangles) for each state/province for **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Sensitivity analysis

A sensitivity analysis was used to test different methods of defining the exposure end point. In this context it allowed for further understanding of how long after a conflict event the risk of cholera is heightened. Five alternative exposure periods were tested from the original exposure period (1

week after the onset of exposure, lag 1) and were named lag periods due to the potential lag effect from conflict onset to cholera outbreaks, these included:

1. Lag 2 - Week of conflict onset + 2 weeks
2. Lag 4 - Week of conflict onset + 4 weeks
3. Lag 6 - Week of conflict onset + 6 weeks
4. Lag 8 - Week of conflict onset + 8 weeks
5. Lag 10 - Week of conflict onset + 10 weeks

The sensitivity analysis was run on both a national and sub-national level and S1 and S2 Figs show additional swimmer plots of lag 10 and line plots of the temporal trends.

Results

Model Output and Comparison

The first week (lag 1) following a conflict had a significant positive relationship on cholera outbreaks in the past 23 years in Nigeria and the DRC. Nigeria showed an effect of greater magnitude (IRR = 3.6, 95%CI = 3.3-3.9) than the DRC (IRR = 2.6, 95%CI = 2.3-2.9). In Nigeria, conflict increased the risk of cholera outbreaks by up to 3.6 times and accounted for 19.7% of cholera outbreaks. For the DRC, the risk was slightly lower, increasing the risk of cholera by 2.6 times and a PAF of 12.3%.

Of the 36 Nigerian states included in the analysis, 24 showed significant associations between conflict and cholera for one week of exposure. The strongest effect was found in Kebbi, Lagos, Osun, Borno and Nasarawa, with IRR values ranging from 6.8 to 6.2 (Fig 4a). Eleven out of 22 DRC provinces included in the analysis showed a significant relationship between conflict and cholera, one week after the event. Tanganyika, Kasaï-Oriental, Maniema, Nord-Kivu and Kasaï found the strongest values and some were the highest values found in the analysis. In Tanganyika, conflict increased cholera risk by 7.5 times and 3.7 times for Kasaï (Fig 4b).



Fig 4. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of exposure to conflict within one week of the event and cholera at a sub-national level. For **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold p=<0.05 are plotted

Sensitivity Analysis

Lag 1 had the strongest effect on cholera outbreaks at a national level for both Nigeria and the DRC, which then decreased through the weeks up to week 10. For both countries magnitude of change in effect size was greatest between week 1 and week 2 and by week 6 the change was minimal and plateaued (Fig 5). From week 1 to week 10 the risk decreased from 3.6 to 2.08 for

202 Nigeria and from 2.6 to 1.5 for the DRC. This suggests that the risk of conflict on cholera is highest

203 soon after the event but remains a detectable association albeit at a lower level for potentially a

204 long period of time after the event.

205



Fig 5. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of exposure to conflict within 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks of the event and cholera at a national level. For **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold p=<0.05 are plotted here.

At a sub-national level, trends were similar to the national analysis, except at lag 6 where some states/provinces found increased values. Thirty Nigerian states were found to be significant for at least one of the lag periods and the most significant states predominately followed the trends of the national analysis. Values ranged from Kebbi at 6.9 to 4.0 times increased risk of cholera, to Gombe at 2.4 to 1.5 (Fig 6a).



Fig 6. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of exposure to conflict within 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks of the event and cholera at administrative level 1. For **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold p=<0.05 are plotted here.

212 For the DRC, 13 provinces were found to be significant for at least one of the lag periods and the
213 most significant provinces (Kasaï-Oriental, Maniema, Tanganyika, and Nord-Kivu) all decreased
214 until lag 4 or 6 and then increased (Fig 6b). The IRR values for Kasaï-Oriental, the provinces with
215 the greatest effect, ranged from 7.3 to 3.8 and the least positive relationship in Sud-Ubangi was
216 from 2.3 to 1.3.
217
218 **Discussion**
219 Our results show that conflict and cholera are positively associated in Nigeria and the DRC from
220 1997 to 2020, with a stronger effect in Nigeria compared to the DRC. Conflict events in Nigeria
221 increased the risk of a cholera outbreak by 3.6 times during the first week (lag 1) and 2.6 times for
222 the DRC. The percentage of cholera outbreaks attributable to the conflicts reported here was
223 19.7% for Nigeria and 12.3% for the DRC. The sensitivity analysis showed a decrease in effect as
224 the weeks progressed, with some states/provinces seeing a plateau or increase around 6 weeks
225 after the event. The decrease with the lag duration may be a“ diluting” effect, as the probability of
226 an outbreak will increase across a longer period. Despite this, the positive relationship remains
227 through the sensitivity analysis, up to 10 weeks. The states/provinces that increased after week 6,
228 were often those with the strongest initial effect, especially in the DRC. This larger initial effect may
229 have a longer lasting impact, potentially due to conflict severity. The most significant
230 states/provinces followed similar trends to the national analysis and had a range of peak IRR
231 values, which were all in week 1 after the conflict event, ranging from 6.9 in Kebbi, Nigeria and 7.3
232 in Kasaï-Oriental, the DRC. This showed that in some states/provinces, the effect of conflict was
233 much greater than the national level.
234
235 Several of the states/provinces showing the strongest effect between conflict and cholera also
236 coincide with areas of high conflict (Fig 1). This provides further evidence to the hypothesis that
237 conflict may be a driver of cholera in Nigeria and the DRC. States/provinces surrounding high
238 conflict areas were also highly significant areas (e.g., Abia, Ogun, Osun, Maniema, and

239 Tanganyika), showing a potential spill-over effect. The states/provinces here were studied
240 independently but a possible explanation may be people fleeing areas of conflict or a cholera
241 outbreak to neighbouring states, as displacement is a known risk factor for disease outbreaks [12].
242 This is especially important for cholera, as a large proportion of people will be asymptomatic but
243 can still shed the pathogen into local reservoirs [39].
244
245 Cholera outbreaks can be explosive and self-limiting, due to the high number of asymptomatic
246 individuals, reducing the susceptible pool [39]. This potentially explains why the impacts of conflict
247 on cholera was greatest in lag 1. The incubation period of cholera is short [40], making the large
248 effect at lag 1 biologically possible for the pathogen and a realistic timeframe for elevated exposure
249 to manifest in cases. Other examples of cholera cases emerging within the first week after an
250 adverse event include Cyclone Thane hitting the Bay of Bengal [41], water supply interruption in
251 the DRC [42] and Cyclone Aila in West Bengal [43]. This provides further evidence of the need for
252 quick and effective aid in humanitarian crisis to avoid outbreaks and reduce mortality [44].
253
254 Healthcare facilities can suffer in periods of conflict and cholera outbreaks can overwhelm
255 systems, a potential cause of the relationship between conflict and cholera shown here. Care can
256 be inaccessible because of direct infrastructure damage or difficulties getting to the facilities due to
257 impromptu roadblocks [45]. Supplies may be stolen and/or unable to be delivered, including oral
258 rehydration solution (ORS), pathogen-sensitive antibiotics and oral cholera vaccines, which are
259 important for cholera outbreak control and mortality [46]. Finally, safety is a serious issue, both for
260 healthcare workers and patients and non-governmental (NGO) organisations can withdraw from
261 these areas, citing an inability to ensure the safety of their staff [47]. Steps need to be taken
262 globally to reduce this violence, such as using active clinical management for all patients to
263 enhance the acceptance of pathogen-specific treatment centres [48].
264
265 Conflict has the potential to worsen pre-existing vulnerabilities, which can exacerbate poverty,
266 another potential cause of the effect of conflict on cholera in the results. The impacts of poverty

267 can be far reaching and is a known risk factor for cholera [5,49], along with other diseases [50]. For
268 example, poor urban settlements have faced the brunt of urban outbreaks including Zika, Ebola,
269 typhoid, and cholera, due to crowding and poor access to WASH [51]. Those in poorer
270 communities may also have more contacts and greater transmission, creating a vicious cycle [50].
271 Conflict can result in loss of possessions, habitual residence, and an inability to find employment,
272 reducing income generation, savings and financial backstops [17]. In times of worsening poverty,
273 people may not be able to afford healthcare and basic medical supplies, especially in vulnerable
274 groups. This disruption to daily life can cause many more deaths than direct battlefield fatalities
275 and leads to stagnation in development [52].
276
277 A lack of WASH facilities is likely to have contributed to the positive relationship between cholera
278 and conflict found here. Although WASH and poverty were not directly evaluated, their effects are
279 likely to have been important. Conflict events can lead to disruption in sanitation and hygiene and
280 adverse events can act as catalysts in the interaction of contaminated water and the human
281 populations [53]. Displacement from conflict can cause issues in accessing WASH (e.g., latrine
282 access, soap availability) and several displacement camps have seen rapid cholera outbreaks,
283 including the DRC after the Rwandan genocide in 1994 [2]. If people are displaced due to conflict,
284 this may result in the use of water with unknown risk, or because alternatives are lacking, leading
285 to outbreaks.
286
287 A potential limitation of the methods used here are confounders, such as the presence of
288 waterbodies in the most significant states/provinces including the Lake Chad basin in Nigeria and
289 the African Great Lakes Region in the DRC. Water is considered fundamental in cholera
290 transmission [54], although no study has yet demonstrated a long-term persistence of toxigenic
291 *Vibrio cholerae* in African lakes [55]. Several reporting issues are likely to have affected the data
292 used here, including underreporting, overreporting and a reporting lag. Underreporting is a
293 significant issue in global cholera estimates, due to asymptomatic cases and disincentives to report
294 [56]. This may be worsened in conflicts, due displaced populations, or disruption to surveillance.

295 Alternatively, during times of conflict health surveillance can be enhanced by the government
296 and/or NGOs [33]. Reporting delay is another potential problem and some national reporting
297 delays, have been found to range from 12 days for meningococcal disease to 40 days for pertussis
298 [33]. To help account for these issues, both the event and the exposure was set to a binary
299 outcome and weekly data was used, instead of daily. A lack of age and sex-disaggregation in the
300 data also means that demographic risks and changes were missed and more work and data is
301 needed to address this.
302
303 In summary, our analysis shows a clear relationship between cholera and conflict in both Nigeria
304 and the DRC at both a national and sub-national level and especially in lag 1. Conflict increased
305 the risk of cholera outbreaks by up to 7.3 times in some states/provinces and almost 20% of
306 cholera outbreaks being attributable to conflict in Nigeria. This finding potentially holds in other
307 countries and diseases and the SCCS method could be used in different contexts. Cholera risks
308 are likely multi-factorial in both northeastern Nigeria and eastern DRC and several conditions need
309 to be met for emergencies to lead to cholera outbreaks. Sufficient and rapid support, along with
310 enhanced efforts to build community trust can reduce this access risk. Finding conflict resolution
311 should be the main priority in fragile states and pre-existing vulnerabilities need to be addressed,
312 such as poverty, expansion of affordable healthcare and improvements in WASH. By reducing
313 these vulnerabilities, communities will have greater resources to adapt to social extremes and
314 could help to reduce vulnerabilities both in times of conflict and peace.
315
316 **Acknowledgements**
317 This work was supported by the Natural Environmental Research Council [NE/S007415/1], as part
318 of the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment's (Imperial College London)
319 Science and Solutions for a Changing Planet Doctoral Training Partnership. We also acknowledge
320 joint Centre funding from the UK Medical Research Council and Department for International
321 Development [MR/R0156600/1]. We thank the organisations who published and those who

collected the data that was used here, including the Nigerian Centre for Disease Control and Minstère de la Santé RDC. Finally, we acknowledge and thank Heather Whitaker (Open University) and Yonas Weldeselassie (University of Warwick) for their assistance and advice in the SCCS methodology.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. World Health Organization. The top 10 causes of death. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death (accessed September 9, 2018).
2. Nkoko DB, Giraudoux P, Plisnier PD, Tinda AM, Piarroux M, Sudre B et al. Dynamics of cholera outbreaks in Great Lakes region of Africa, 1978–2008. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011; 17: 2026.
3. D'Mello-Guyett L, Gallandat K, Van den Bergh R, Taylor D, Bulit G, Legros D, Maes P et al. Prevention and control of cholera with household and community water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) interventions: a scoping review of current international guidelines. PloS One 2020; 15: e0226549.
4. Leckebusch GC, Abdussalam AF. Climate and socioeconomic influences on interannual variability of cholera in Nigeria. Health Place. 2015; 34: 107-17.
5. Talavera A, Perez EM. Is cholera disease associated with poverty?. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2009; 3: 408-11.
6. Charnley GE, Kelman I, Green N, Hinsley W, Gaythorpe KA, Murray KA. Relationships between drought and epidemic cholera in Africa. medRxiv 2021. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.16.21260629.
7. Gormley M. Untangling the causes of the 2016–18 cholera epidemic in Yemen. Lancet Glob Health. 2018; 6: e600-1.

349 8. Rieckmann A, Tamason CC, Gurley ES, Rod NH, Jensen PK. Exploring droughts and floods
350 and their association with cholera outbreaks in sub-Saharan Africa: a register-based ecological
351 study from 1990 to 2010. Am J Trop Med. 2018; 98: 1269-74.
352 9. Al-Salem WS, Pigott DM, Subramaniam K, Haines LR, Kelly-Hope L, Molyneux DH et al.
353 Cutaneous leishmaniasis and conflict in Syria. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016; 22: 931.
354 10. Dureab FA, Shibib K, Al-Yousufi R, Jahn A. Yemen: cholera outbreak and the ongoing armed
355 conflict. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2018; 12: 397-403.
356 11. Kraemer MU, Pigott DM, Hill SC, Vanderslott S, Reiner RC, Stasse S et al. Dynamics of
357 conflict during the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo 2018–2019. BMC
358 Med. 2020; 18: 1-0.
359 12. Watson JT, Gayer M, Connolly MA. Epidemics after natural disasters. Emerg Infect Dis. 2007;
360 13: 1.
361 13. Charnley GE, Kelman I, Gaythorpe KA, Murray KA. Traits and risk factors of post-disaster
362 infectious disease outbreaks: a systematic review. Sci Rep. 2021; 11: 1-4.
363 14. Gayer M, Legros D, Formenty P, Connolly MA. Conflict and emerging infectious diseases.
364 Emerg Infect Dis. 2007; 13: 1625.
365 15. McPake B, Witter S, Ssali S, Wurie H, Namakula J, Ssengooba F. Ebola in the context of
366 conflict affected states and health systems: case studies of Northern Uganda and Sierra
367 Leone. Conf Health. 2015; 9: 1-9.
368 16. Wells CR, Pandey A, Mbah ML, Gaüzère BA, Malvy D, Singer BH et al. The exacerbation of
369 Ebola outbreaks by conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PNAS. 2019; 116:
370 24366-72.
371 17. Okunlola OC, Okafor IG. Conflict–Poverty Relationship in Africa: A Disaggregated Approach. J
372 Interdiscip Econ. 2020: 1-26.
373 18. Agbiboa D. The ongoing campaign of terror in Nigeria: Boko Haram versus the state. Stability.
374 2013; 2.

375 19. Council on Foreign Relations. Violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo.
376 https:/www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/violence-democratic-republic-congo (accessed
377 September 9, 2018).
378 20. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated global burden of cholera in endemic countries.
379 PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015; 9: e0003832.
380 21. Bompangue D, Giraudoux P, Piarroux M, Mutombo G, Shamavu R, Sudre B et al. Cholera
381 epidemics, war and disasters around Goma and Lake Kivu: an eight-year survey. PLoS Negl
382 Trop Dis. 2009; 3: e436.
383 22. United Nations Statistical Division, 2015. Millennium Development Goal Indicators.
384 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/SeriesDetail.aspx?srid=580 (accessed September 9, 2018).
385 23. Blackburn CC, Lenze PE, Casey RP. Conflict and cholera: Yemen's man-made public health
386 crisis and the global implications of weaponizing health. Health Secur. 2020; 18: 125-31.
387 24. Federspiel F, Ali M. The cholera outbreak in Yemen: lessons learned and way forward. BMC
388 Public Health 2018; 18: 1-8.
389 25. Sato R. Effect of armed conflict on vaccination: evidence from the Boko haram insurgency in
390 northeastern Nigeria. Confl Health. 2019; 13: 1-0.
391 26. Tijjani SJ, Ma L. Is Nigeria prepared and ready to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic in its
392 conflict-affected northeastern states?. Int J Equity Health. 2020; 19: 1-4.
393 27. Farrington CP. Relative incidence estimation from case series for vaccine safety evaluation.
394 Biometrics 1995: 228-35.
395 28. Brauer R, Smeeth L, Anaya-Izquierdo K, Timmis A, Denaxas SC, Farrington CP et al.
396 Antipsychotic drugs and risks of myocardial infarction: a self-controlled case series study. Eur
397 Heart J. 2015; 36: 984-92.
398 29. Douglas IJ, Evans SJ, Pocock S, Smeeth L. The risk of fractures associated with
399 thiazolidinediones: a self-controlled case-series study. PLoS Med 2009; 6: e1000154.
400 30. Jean K, Raad H, Gaythorpe KA, Hamlet A, Mueller JE, Hogan D et al. Assessing the impact of
401 preventive mass vaccination campaigns on yellow fever outbreaks in Africa: A population-level
402 self-controlled case series study. PLoS Med. 2021; 18: e1003523.

403 31. HDX. The Humanitarian Data Exchange. https://data.humdata.org (accessed September 9,
404 2018).
405 32. Jajosky RA, Groseclose SL. Evaluation of reporting timeliness of public health surveillance
406 systems for infectious diseases. BMC Public Health 2004; 4: 1-9.
407 33. Ri S, Blair AH, Kim CJ, Haar RJ. Attacks on healthcare facilities as an indicator of violence
408 against civilians in Syria: An exploratory analysis of open-source data. PloS One 2019; 14:
409 e0217905.
410 34. Weidmann NB. A closer look at reporting bias in conflict event data. Am J Pol Sci. 2016; 60:
411 206-18.
412 35. Petersen I, Douglas I, Whitaker H. Self controlled case series methods: an alternative to
413 standard epidemiological study designs. BMJ 2016; 354.
414 36. Farrington CP, Whitaker HJ, Hocine MN. Case series analysis for censored, perturbed, or
415 curtailed post-event exposures. Biostatistics 2009; 10: 3-16.
416 37. Whitaker HJ, Paddy Farrington C, Spiessens B, Musonda P. Tutorial in biostatistics: the self-
417 controlled case series method. Stat Med. 2006; 25: 1768-97.
418 38. Therneau TM, 2021. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. https://CRAN.R-
419 project.org/package=survival (accessed 2 October 2021).
420 39. King AA, Ionides EL, Pascual M, Bouma MJ. Inapparent infections and cholera dynamics.
421 Nature 2008; 454: 877-80.
422 40. Azman AS, Rudolph KE, Cummings DA, Lessler J. The incubation period of cholera: a
423 systematic review. J Infect. 2013; 66: 432-8.
424 41. Fredrick T, Ponnaiah M, Murhekar MV, Jayaraman Y, David JK, Vadivoo S et al. Cholera
425 outbreak linked with lack of safe water supply following a tropical cyclone in Pondicherry, India,
426 2012. J Health Popul Nutr. 2015; 33: 31.
427 42. Jeandron A, Saidi JM, Kapama A, Burhole M, Birembano F, Vandevelde T et al. Water supply
428 interruptions and suspected cholera incidence: a time-series regression in the Democratic
429 Republic of the Congo. PLoS Med. 2015; 12: e1001893.

430 43. Bhunia R, Ghosh S. Waterborne cholera outbreak following cyclone Aila in Sundarban area of
431 West Bengal, India, 2009. Trans R Soc Trop. 2011; 105: 214-9.
432 44. Tauxe RV, Holmberg SD, Dodin A, Wells JV, Blake PA. Epidemic cholera in Mali: high mortality
433 and multiple routes of transmission in a famine area. Epidemiol Infect. 1988; 100: 279-289.
434 45. Sousa C, Hagopian A. Conflict, health care and professional perseverance: a qualitative study
435 in the West Bank. Glob Public Health. 2011; 6: 520-33.
436 46. Cartwright EJ, Patel MK, Mbopi-Keou FX, Ayers T, Haenke B, Wagenaar BH et al. Recurrent
437 epidemic cholera with high mortality in Cameroon: persistent challenges 40 years into the
438 seventh pandemic. Epidemiol Infect. 2013; 141: 2083-93.
439 47. MSF. DRC: Violent attacks against staff force MSF to end projects in Fizi territory, South Kivu.
440 https://www.msf.org/msf-forced-pull-out-eastern-drc-territory-following-violent-attacks
441 (accessed September 9, 2018).
442 48. Nguyen VK. An epidemic of suspicion—Ebola and violence in the DRC. N Engl J Med. 2019;
443 380: 1298-9.
444 49. Penrose K, Castro MC, Werema J, Ryan ET. Informal urban settlements and cholera risk in
445 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010; 4: e631.
446 50. Fallah MP, Skrip LA, Gertler S, Yamin D, Galvani AP. Quantifying poverty as a driver of Ebola
447 transmission. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015; 9: e0004260.
448 51. Eisenstein M. Disease: poverty and pathogens. Nature 2016; 531: S61-3.
449 52. Trani JF, Bakhshi P, Noor AA, Lopez D, Mashkoor A. Poverty, vulnerability, and provision of
450 healthcare in Afghanistan. Soc Sci Med. 2010; 70: 1745-55.
451 53. Jutla A, Khan R, Colwell R. Natural disasters and cholera outbreaks: current understanding
452 and future outlook. Curr Environ Health Rep. 2017; 4: 99-107.
453 54. Birmingham ME, Lee LA, Ndayimirije N, Nkurikiye S, Hersh BS, Wells JG et al. Epidemic
454 cholera in Burundi: patterns of transmission in the Great Rift Valley Lake region. Lancet. 1997;
455 349: 981-5.

55. Bompangue D, Giraudoux P, Handschumacher P, Piarroux M, Sudre B, Ekwanzala M et al. Lakes as source of cholera outbreaks, Democratic Republic of Congo. Emerg Infect Dis. 2008; 14: 798.

56. Elimian KO, Musah A, Mezue S, Oyebanji O, Yennan S, Jinadu A et al. Descriptive epidemiology of cholera outbreak in Nigeria, January–November, 2018: implications for the global roadmap strategy. BMC Public Health 2019; 19: 1-1.

484 **Supporting information**

485 **S1 Information. Cholera case definitions according to the Nigerian Centre for Disease**
486 **Control and the Ministère de la Santé Publique de la République démocratique du Congo.**

487 NCDC:

488 Suspected case: Severe dehydration or death from acute watery diarrhoea in a patient aged 5
489 years or more. In an epidemic situation: A suspected case in any person aged 5 years or more with
490 acute watery diarrhoea with or without vomiting.

491 Confirmed case: A suspected case in which *Vibrio cholerae* O1 or O139 has been isolated in the
492 stool.

493

494 RDC Ministère de la Santé:

495 Suspected case: Severe dehydration or death following acute watery diarrhoea in a patient aged 5
496 years or more. In an epidemic situation: Acute watery diarrhoea with or without vomiting in a
497 patient aged 1 year or more.

498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511

S2 Information. Excluded events. States/provinces removed as they did not report conflict and cholera in the study period (1997-2020).

Democratic Republic of Congo:

. Haut-Uele - 629 conflict events removed

. Kasaï-Central - 234 conflict events removed

. Lomani - 101 conflict events removed

. Tshuapa - 70 conflict events removed

Nigeria:

. Imo - 239 conflict events removed

S3 Information. Dataset information.

Cholera data was compiled from a range of publicly available sources (WHO's disease outbreak news, ProMED, ReliefWeb, WHO's regional office for Africa weekly outbreak and emergencies, UNICEF cholera platform, EM-DAT, the Nigerian CDC and a literature search) in both English and French. A data charting form was used to enable a dynamic data entry process and collected data on date, geographic location, cases, deaths, hospitalisations, fatality rates, gender, age, oral cholera vaccinations, risk factors, aid and the source of the report. Data spanned from 1971-2021 for Nigeria and 1978-2021 for the DRC on a daily temporal scale and was provided at the finest spatial scale possible.

Conflict data was provided by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs's Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX, 2020). The data included sub-national conflict events for both countries on a fine spatial scale, given to the exact location in longitude/latitude. This was reported on a daily temporal scale and spanned from 1997 to 2020. The data was also categorised by event type which included battles, explosions, protests, riots, strategic developments and violence against civilians. This was further sub-categorised within these groups and reported number of fatalities.

The study period was selected as Jan 1997 to May 2020, as these were the first and last reports in the conflict data. The spatial granularity of the analysis was to administrative level 1 (states for Nigeria and provinces for the DRC) and all data points that were reported on a finer spatial scale were attributed to the upper level. To be included in the analysis, the state/province had to report both outbreaks and conflicts during the study period, therefore 22 provinces were included for the DRC and 36 states for Nigeria.

S4 Information. Percentage attributable fraction (PAF) equations.

Estimate the number of outbreaks attributable to conflicts, A_i, for each province i. Using the formula:

$$A_i = \lambda_i d_i^{E+}(IRR - 1) \quad (1)$$

Where d_i^{E+} is the total duration of conflict exposure for the province i (if no conflict in province i, thus $d_i^{E+} = 0$), λ_i is the rate of outbreak occurrence in a Poisson process in the absence of conflict, and IRR is the incidence rate ratio associated with exposure to conflict. With N_i^{E-} being the number of outbreaks observed in the province i during the un-exposed period and T being the total period of observation, an estimator of λ_i is $\hat{\lambda}_i = N_i^{E-}/(T - d_i^{E+})$, which leads to:

$$\hat{A} = \sum_i \frac{N_i^{E-} d_i^{E+}}{(T - d_i^{E+})}(\hat{IRR} - 1) \quad (2)$$

Based on $\hat{A}$ and N, the total number of outbreaks observed, we can easily obtain the equivalent of the population attributable fraction, PAF, which corresponds to the proportion of the total number of outbreaks in both countries that are attributable to conflicts (this is equivalent to the PAF obtained in classical epidemiological studies, but here population refers to the "population of provinces"):

$$PAF = \frac{\hat{A}}{N} \quad (3)$$

S1Table. The layout of the data frame used to create the pseudo-dataset for the model. Each new 'end' period represents a different sensitivity analysis and each event and exposure are given a reference number (indiv). The example shown here is for the Democratic Republic of Congo Conflict dataset.

province	exday	eventday	start	end	start1	end0	end1	end2	end4	end6	end8	end10	indiv
Bas-Uele	3	374	1	542	3	3	4	5	7	9	11	13	1
Bas-Uele	4	374	1	542	4	4	5	6	8	10	12	14	2
Bas-Uele	6	374	1	542	6	6	7	8	10	12	14	16	3
Bas-Uele	7	374	1	542	7	7	8	9	11	13	15	17	4
Bas-Uele	9	374	1	542	9	9	10	11	13	15	17	19	5

S2 Table. The pseudo-dataset created from the data in S1 Table for the first two reference numbers. This data can then be fit to the model (conditional logistic regression).

indiv	exday	eventday	start	end	event	exgr	interval	loginterval
1	3	374	1	3	0	0	2	0.693147180559945
1	3	374	3	13	0	1	10	2.30258509299405
1	3	374	13	542	1	0	529	6.2709884318583
2	4	374	1	4	0	0	3	1.09861228866811
2	4	374	4	14	0	1	10	2.30258509299405
2	4	374	14	542	1	0	528	6.26909628370626

S1 Figure. Swimmer plots showing the conflict dataset for lag 10 in the sensitivity Analysis. In relation to outbreaks (black triangles) for Nigeria (NGA) and the Democratic Republic of Congo (COD).

S2 Figure. Number of outbreak (orange) and conflict (purple) events by year in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo over the full study period.