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

** Joint senior 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 adapted the percentage attributable fraction equations to understand the proportion of cholera outbreaks attributable to conflict onset.

Results There were 12,829 conflict events and 1,178 cholera outbreaks during the period analysed in Nigeria and the DRC. 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. Several states/provinces with the strongest positive relationship were also areas of high reported conflict or were neighbouring states/provinces.

Conclusion 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.

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]. 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], which are known cholera risk factors.

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

82 COVID-19 [26]. Africa is also a chronically understudied continent in relation to cholera, despite
83 reporting a large proportion of global cases [2].
84
85 To bridge this research gap, we aimed to investigate if the incidence of cholera outbreak onset was
86 affected by conflicts in Nigeria and the DRC in the past 23 years. To test this, we used the Self-
87 Controlled Case Series (SCCS) method in a novel application and to understand its use in other
88 contexts [27]. The SCCS methods have previously been used to test the effectiveness of drug and
89 vaccine intervention on an individual [28-29] and population level [30]. Furthermore, we adapted
90 the recently developed percentage attributable fraction (PAF) equations to the work presented here
91 [30], to understand the proportion of cholera outbreaks attributable to conflict.
92
93 A sensitivity analysis provided further insight into the duration of the conflict effect on outbreaks
94 and a sub-national analysis highlighted priority areas for national cholera prevention. Based on
95 these results, we suggest mechanisms for which conflict is driving cholera and potential risk
96 factors, building on previous research in this area. We hope this information can be used to
97 strengthen disease prevention in conflict settings and reduce additional mortality and morbidity in
98 conflicts.
99
100 **Methods**
101 ***Datasets***
102 Cholera data were compiled from a range of publicly available sources (WHO disease outbreak
103 news, ProMED, ReliefWeb, WHO regional office for Africa weekly outbreak and emergencies,
104 UNICEF cholera platform, EM-DAT, the Nigerian Centre for Disease Control, and a literature
105 search) in both English and French. The full compiled dataset is available in a GitHub repository
106 (https://github.com/GinaCharnley/cholera_data_drc_nga). An outbreak was defined by the onset of
107 a cholera case and the case definitions for the two countries are shown in S1 Information. Conflict
108 data were provided by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
109 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 aggregated to the upper level. The study period was specified as January 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 S2 Information.

Model Structure and Fitting

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

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

Each event and exposure that occurred in the same state/province were designated an identification number and a pre-exposure, exposure, and post exposure period (see S1 and S2 Tables). The data was fit to conditional logistic regression models (function clogit(), R package

138 “survival”) [38]. The model coefficient values were used to calculate incidence rate ratio (IRR), to
139 understand the magnitude in which conflict increased the risk of cholera outbreaks.
140
141 The datasets for each country were then split by state/province and the analysis repeated for each,
142 to understand if the significance of conflict on cholera outbreaks varied by sub-national location
143 and if conflict was more important in some states/provinces compared to others. All statistical
144 analyses were carried out in R version 3.6.2 and the threshold for significance was $p=<0.05$.
145
146 ***Percentage Attributable Fraction***
147 The recently developed percentage attributable fraction (PAF) equations [30] were adapted to the
148 model results found here. The PAF values estimate the percentage of outbreaks that could be
149 attributed to conflict at a national level, using the datasets and the IRR values from the model
150 results (full equations in S3 Information).
151
152 ***Sensitivity Analysis***
153 A sensitivity analysis was used to test different methods of defining the exposure end point (set to
154 one week in the main analysis) and to understand the impact this would have on the results. It
155 allowed for further understanding of how long after a conflict event the risk of cholera is
156 heightened. Full information is shown in S4 Information and S1 and S2 Figs.
157
158 **Results**
159 ***Conflict and Cholera Occurrence***
160 The distribution of conflict and cholera in Nigeria and the DRC in the datasets used here is shown
161 temporally and spatially in Fig 1. The data shows an increase in reported conflict and cholera,
162 especially after 2010 (Fig 1a-d) and a large proportion of the cholera cases have been reported in
163 conflict-stricken areas (Fig 1e-f).



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.

165 The total number of conflicts and outbreaks for each state/province during the study period is

166 shown below in Fig 2 and totaled 4,639 conflict and 396 cholera outbreaks for the DRC and in

167 Nigeria, 8,190 conflicts and 782 cholera outbreaks.



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.

168

169 To be included in the analysis, the state/province had to report both outbreaks and conflicts during

170 the study period. As such, 22 provinces were included for the DRC and 36 states for Nigeria

(states and provinces excluded are shown in S5 Information). The temporal distribution of the exposure periods and outbreaks included in the SCCS model for each state/province is shown in Fig 3.



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

175 ***Model Output***

176 Conflict significantly increased the risk of cholera outbreaks (IRR) in the past 23 years in Nigeria
177 and the DRC. Nigeria showed an effect of greater magnitude, increasing the risk of cholera
178 outbreaks by up to 3.6 times (IRR = 3.6, 95%CI = 3.3-3.9). Whereas for the DRC, the risk was
179 increased by 2.6 times (IRR = 2.6, 95%CI = 2.3-2.9).

180

181 Of the 36 Nigerian states included in the analysis, 24 showed significant associations between
182 conflict and cholera outbreaks. The strongest effect was found in Kebbi, Lagos, Osun, Borno and
183 Nasarawa, with IRR values ranging from 6.8 to 6.2 (Fig 4a).

184

185 Eleven out of 22 DRC provinces included in the analysis showed a significant relationship between
186 conflict and cholera. Tanganyika, Kasaï-Oriental, Maniema, Nord-Kivu and Kasaï found the
187 strongest values and some were the highest values found in the analysis. In Tanganyika, conflict
188 increased cholera risk by 7.5 times and 3.7 times for Kasaï (Fig 4b).

189

190 ***Percentage Attributable Fraction***

191 Based on the IRR values from the model results (3.6 for Nigeria and 2.6 for the DRC), the onset of
192 a conflict event was attributable to 19.7% of cholera outbreaks in Nigeria and 12.3% for the DRC.

193

194 ***Sensitivity Analysis***

195 The effect of conflict on cholera outbreaks at a national and sub-national level for both Nigeria and
196 the DRC decreased with increasing exposure period. By week 6 the change was minimal and
197 plateaued or increased (full results in S3 and S4 Figs).



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 here.

Discussion

Conflict events in Nigeria increased the risk of cholera outbreaks by 3.6 times and 2.6 times for the DRC. The percentage of cholera outbreaks attributable to the conflicts reported here was 19.7% for Nigeria and 12.3% for the DRC. The states/provinces with the highest increased risk were

Kebbi, Nigeria at 6.9 times and Kasaï-Oriental, the DRC at 7.3 times. This showed that in some states/provinces, the effect of conflict was much greater than the national level.

The sensitivity analysis showed a decrease in effect as the weeks progressed, with some states/provinces seeing a plateau or increase around 6 weeks after the event. The decrease with the lag duration may be a“ diluting” effect, as the probability of an outbreak will increase across a longer period. The states/provinces that increased after week 6, were often those with the strongest initial effect, especially in the DRC. This larger initial effect may have a longer lasting impact, potentially due to conflict severity.

States/provinces with the greatest increased risk often coincided with areas of high conflict. This provides further evidence to the hypothesis that conflict may be a driver of cholera in Nigeria and the DRC. States/provinces surrounding high conflict areas were also highly significant areas (e.g., Abia, Ogun, Osun, Maniema, and Tanganyika), showing a potential spill-over effect. The states/provinces here were studied independently but a possible explanation may be people fleeing areas of conflict or a cholera outbreak to neighbouring states, as displacement is a known risk factor for disease outbreaks [12]. This is especially important for cholera, as a large proportion of people will be asymptomatic but can still shed the pathogen into local reservoirs [39].

Cholera outbreaks can be explosive and self-limiting, due to the high number of asymptomatic individuals, reducing the susceptible pool [39]. This potentially explains why the impacts of conflict on cholera was seen just one week after the event. The incubation period of cholera is short [40], making the effect within the first week found here biologically possible for the pathogen and a realistic timeframe for elevated exposure to manifest in cases. Other examples of cholera cases emerging within the first week after an adverse event include Cyclone Thane hitting the Bay of Bengal [41], water supply interruption in the DRC [42] and Cyclone Aila in West Bengal [43]. This

229 provides further evidence of the need for quick and effective aid in humanitarian crisis to avoid
230 outbreaks and reduce mortality [44].
231
232 Healthcare facilities can suffer in periods of conflict and cholera outbreaks can overwhelm
233 systems, a potential cause of the relationship between conflict and cholera shown here. Care can
234 be inaccessible because of direct infrastructure damage or difficulties getting to the facilities due to
235 impromptu roadblocks [45]. Supplies may be stolen and/or unable to be delivered, including oral
236 rehydration solution (ORS), pathogen-sensitive antibiotics and oral cholera vaccines, which are
237 important for cholera outbreak control and mortality [46]. Finally, safety is a serious issue, both for
238 healthcare workers and patients and non-governmental (NGO) organisations can withdraw from
239 these areas, citing an inability to ensure the safety of their staff [47]. Steps need to be taken
240 globally to reduce this violence, such as using active clinical management for all patients to
241 enhance the acceptance of pathogen-specific treatment centres [48].
242
243 Conflict has the potential to worsen pre-existing vulnerabilities, which can exacerbate poverty,
244 another potential cause of the effect of conflict on cholera. The impacts of poverty can be far
245 reaching and is a known risk factor for cholera [5,49], along with other diseases [50]. For example,
246 poor urban settlements have faced the brunt of outbreaks including Zika, Ebola, typhoid, and
247 cholera, due to crowding and poor access to WASH [51]. Those in poorer communities may also
248 have more contacts and greater transmission, creating a vicious cycle [50]. Conflict can result in
249 loss of possessions, habitual residence, and an inability to find employment, reducing income
250 generation, savings and financial backstops [17]. In times of worsening poverty, people may not be
251 able to afford healthcare and basic medical supplies, especially in vulnerable groups. This
252 disruption to daily life can cause many more deaths than direct battlefield fatalities and leads to
253 stagnation in development [52].
254
255 A lack of WASH facilities is likely to have contributed to the positive relationship between cholera
256 and conflict found here. Although WASH and poverty were not directly evaluated, their effects are

257 likely to have been important. Conflict events can lead to disruption in sanitation and hygiene and
258 adverse events can act as catalysts in the interaction of contaminated water and the human
259 populations [53]. Displacement from conflict can cause issues in accessing WASH (e.g., latrine
260 access, soap availability) and several displacement camps have seen rapid cholera outbreaks,
261 including the DRC after the Rwandan genocide in 1994 [2]. If people are displaced due to conflict,
262 this may result in the use of water with unknown risk, or because alternatives are lacking, leading
263 to outbreaks.
264
265 A potential limitation of this analysis is the confounding effect of waterbodies in the most significant
266 states/provinces including the Lake Chad basin in Nigeria and the African Great Lakes Region in
267 the DRC. Water is considered fundamental in cholera transmission [54], although no study has yet
268 demonstrated a long-term persistence of toxigenic *Vibrio cholerae* in African lakes [55]. Several
269 reporting issues are likely to have affected the data used here, including underreporting,
270 overreporting and a reporting lag. Underreporting is a significant issue in global cholera estimates,
271 due to asymptomatic cases and disincentives to report [56]. This may be worsened in conflicts, due
272 displaced populations, or disruption to surveillance. Alternatively, during times of conflict health
273 surveillance can be enhanced by the government and/or NGOs [33]. Reporting delay is another
274 potential problem and some national reporting delays, have been found to range from 12 days for
275 meningococcal disease to 40 days for pertussis [33]. To help account for these issues, both the
276 event and the exposure was set to a binary outcome and weekly data was used, instead of daily.
277
278 In summary, our analysis shows a clear relationship between cholera and conflict in both Nigeria
279 and the DRC at both a national and sub-national level. Conflict increased the risk of cholera
280 outbreaks by up to 7.3 times in some states/provinces and almost 20% of cholera outbreaks being
281 attributable to conflict in Nigeria. This finding potentially holds in other countries and diseases and
282 highlights how the SCCS methodology could be used in different contexts. Cholera risks are likely
283 multi-factorial in both northeastern Nigeria and eastern DRC and several conditions need to be met
284 for emergencies to lead to cholera outbreaks. Sufficient and rapid support, along with enhanced

285 efforts to build community trust can reduce this access risk. Finding conflict resolution should be
286 the main priority in fragile states and pre-existing vulnerabilities need to be addressed, such as
287 poverty, expansion of affordable healthcare and improvements in WASH. By reducing these
288 vulnerabilities, communities will have greater resources to adapt to social extremes and could help
289 to reduce vulnerabilities both in times of conflict and peace.
290

291 **Acknowledgements**

292 This work was supported by the Natural Environmental Research Council [NE/S007415/1], as part
293 of the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment's (Imperial College London)
294 Science and Solutions for a Changing Planet Doctoral Training Partnership. We also acknowledge
295 joint Centre funding from the UK Medical Research Council and Department for International
296 Development [MR/R0156600/1]. We thank the organisations who published and those who
297 collected the data that was used here, including the Nigerian Centre for Disease Control and
298 Minstère de la Santé RDC. Finally, we acknowledge and thank Heather Whitaker (Open University)
299 and Yonas Weldeselassie (University of Warwick) for their assistance and advice in the SCCS
300 methodology.
301

302 **Competing interests**

303 The authors declare no competing interests.
304

305 **References**

306 1. World Health Organization. The top 10 causes of death. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-
307 sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death (accessed September 9, 2018).
308 2. Nkoko DB, Giraudoux P, Plisnier PD, Tinda AM, Piarroux M, Sudre B et al. Dynamics of
309 cholera outbreaks in Great Lakes region of Africa, 1978–2008. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011; 17:
310 2026.

311 3. D'Mello-Guyett L, Gallandat K, Van den Bergh R, Taylor D, Bulit G, Legros D, Maes P et al.
312 Prevention and control of cholera with household and community water, sanitation and hygiene
313 (WASH) interventions: a scoping review of current international guidelines. PloS One 2020; 15:
314 e0226549.
315 4. Leckebusch GC, Abdussalam AF. Climate and socioeconomic influences on interannual
316 variability of cholera in Nigeria. Health Place. 2015; 34: 107-17.
317 5. Talavera A, Perez EM. Is cholera disease associated with poverty?. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2009;
318 3: 408-11.
319 6. Charnley GE, Kelman I, Green N, Hinsley W, Gaythorpe KA, Murray KA. Relationships
320 between drought and epidemic cholera in Africa. medRxiv 2021. doi:
321 https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.16.21260629.
322 7. Gormley M. Untangling the causes of the 2016–18 cholera epidemic in Yemen. Lancet Glob
323 Health. 2018; 6: e600-1.
324 8. Rieckmann A, Tamason CC, Gurley ES, Rod NH, Jensen PK. Exploring droughts and floods
325 and their association with cholera outbreaks in sub-Saharan Africa: a register-based ecological
326 study from 1990 to 2010. Am J Trop Med. 2018; 98: 1269-74.
327 9. Al-Salem WS, Pigott DM, Subramaniam K, Haines LR, Kelly-Hope L, Molyneux DH et al.
328 Cutaneous leishmaniasis and conflict in Syria. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016; 22: 931.
329 10. Dureab FA, Shibib K, Al-Yousufi R, Jahn A. Yemen: cholera outbreak and the ongoing armed
330 conflict. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2018; 12: 397-403.
331 11. Kraemer MU, Pigott DM, Hill SC, Vanderslott S, Reiner RC, Stasse S et al. Dynamics of
332 conflict during the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo 2018–2019. BMC
333 Med. 2020; 18: 1-0.
334 12. Watson JT, Gayer M, Connolly MA. Epidemics after natural disasters. Emerg Infect Dis. 2007;
335 13: 1.
336 13. Charnley GE, Kelman I, Gaythorpe KA, Murray KA. Traits and risk factors of post-disaster
337 infectious disease outbreaks: a systematic review. Sci Rep. 2021; 11: 1-4.

338 14. Gayer M, Legros D, Formenty P, Connolly MA. Conflict and emerging infectious diseases.
339 Emerg Infect Dis. 2007; 13: 1625.
340 15. McPake B, Witter S, Ssali S, Wurie H, Namakula J, Ssengooba F. Ebola in the context of
341 conflict affected states and health systems: case studies of Northern Uganda and Sierra
342 Leone. Conf Health. 2015; 9: 1-9.
343 16. Wells CR, Pandey A, Mbah ML, Gaüzère BA, Malvy D, Singer BH et al. The exacerbation of
344 Ebola outbreaks by conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PNAS. 2019; 116:
345 24366-72.
346 17. Okunlola OC, Okafor IG. Conflict–Poverty Relationship in Africa: A Disaggregated Approach. J
347 Interdiscip Econ. 2020: 1-26.
348 18. Agbiboa D. The ongoing campaign of terror in Nigeria: Boko Haram versus the state. Stability.
349 2013; 2.
350 19. Council on Foreign Relations. Violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo.
351 https:/www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/violence-democratic-republic-congo (accessed
352 September 9, 2018).
353 20. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated global burden of cholera in endemic countries.
354 PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015; 9: e0003832.
355 21. Bompangue D, Giraudoux P, Piarroux M, Mutombo G, Shamavu R, Sudre B et al. Cholera
356 epidemics, war and disasters around Goma and Lake Kivu: an eight-year survey. PLoS Negl
357 Trop Dis. 2009; 3: e436.
358 22. United Nations Statistical Division, 2015. Millennium Development Goal Indicators.
359 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/SeriesDetail.aspx?srid=580 (accessed September 9, 2018).
360 23. Blackburn CC, Lenze PE, Casey RP. Conflict and cholera: Yemen's man-made public health
361 crisis and the global implications of weaponizing health. Health Secur. 2020; 18: 125-31.
362 24. Federspiel F, Ali M. The cholera outbreak in Yemen: lessons learned and way forward. BMC
363 Public Health 2018; 18: 1-8.
364 25. Sato R. Effect of armed conflict on vaccination: evidence from the Boko haram insurgency in
365 northeastern Nigeria. Confl Health. 2019; 13: 1-0.

366 26. Tijjani SJ, Ma L. Is Nigeria prepared and ready to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic in its
367 conflict-affected northeastern states?. Int J Equity Health. 2020; 19: 1-4.
368 27. Farrington CP. Relative incidence estimation from case series for vaccine safety evaluation.
369 Biometrics 1995: 228-35.
370 28. Brauer R, Smeeth L, Anaya-Izquierdo K, Timmis A, Denaxas SC, Farrington CP et al.
371 Antipsychotic drugs and risks of myocardial infarction: a self-controlled case series study. Eur
372 Heart J. 2015; 36: 984-92.
373 29. Douglas IJ, Evans SJ, Pocock S, Smeeth L. The risk of fractures associated with
374 thiazolidinediones: a self-controlled case-series study. PLoS Med 2009; 6: e1000154.
375 30. Jean K, Raad H, Gaythorpe KA, Hamlet A, Mueller JE, Hogan D et al. Assessing the impact of
376 preventive mass vaccination campaigns on yellow fever outbreaks in Africa: A population-level
377 self-controlled case series study. PLoS Med. 2021; 18: e1003523.
378 31. HDX. The Humanitarian Data Exchange. https://data.humdata.org (accessed September 9,
379 2018).
380 32. Jajosky RA, Groseclose SL. Evaluation of reporting timeliness of public health surveillance
381 systems for infectious diseases. BMC Public Health 2004; 4: 1-9.
382 33. Ri S, Blair AH, Kim CJ, Haar RJ. Attacks on healthcare facilities as an indicator of violence
383 against civilians in Syria: An exploratory analysis of open-source data. PloS One 2019; 14:
384 e0217905.
385 34. Weidmann NB. A closer look at reporting bias in conflict event data. Am J Pol Sci. 2016; 60:
386 206-18.
387 35. Petersen I, Douglas I, Whitaker H. Self controlled case series methods: an alternative to
388 standard epidemiological study designs. BMJ 2016; 354.
389 36. Farrington CP, Whitaker HJ, Hocine MN. Case series analysis for censored, perturbed, or
390 curtailed post-event exposures. Biostatistics 2009; 10: 3-16.
391 37. Whitaker HJ, Paddy Farrington C, Spiessens B, Musonda P. Tutorial in biostatistics: the self-
392 controlled case series method. Stat Med. 2006; 25: 1768-97.

393 38. Therneau TM, 2021. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. https://CRAN.R-
394 project.org/package=survival (accessed 2 October 2021).
395 39. King AA, Ionides EL, Pascual M, Bouma MJ. Inapparent infections and cholera dynamics.
396 Nature 2008; 454: 877-80.
397 40. Azman AS, Rudolph KE, Cummings DA, Lessler J. The incubation period of cholera: a
398 systematic review. J Infect. 2013; 66: 432-8.
399 41. Fredrick T, Ponnaiah M, Murhekar MV, Jayaraman Y, David JK, Vadivoo S et al. Cholera
400 outbreak linked with lack of safe water supply following a tropical cyclone in Pondicherry, India,
401 2012. J Health Popul Nutr. 2015; 33: 31.
402 42. Jeandron A, Saidi JM, Kapama A, Burhole M, Birembano F, Vandevelde T et al. Water supply
403 interruptions and suspected cholera incidence: a time-series regression in the Democratic
404 Republic of the Congo. PLoS Med. 2015; 12: e1001893.
405 43. Bhunia R, Ghosh S. Waterborne cholera outbreak following cyclone Aila in Sundarban area of
406 West Bengal, India, 2009. Trans R Soc Trop. 2011; 105: 214-9.
407 44. Tauxe RV, Holmberg SD, Dodin A, Wells JV, Blake PA. Epidemic cholera in Mali: high mortality
408 and multiple routes of transmission in a famine area. Epidemiol Infect. 1988; 100: 279-289.
409 45. Sousa C, Hagopian A. Conflict, health care and professional perseverance: a qualitative study
410 in the West Bank. Glob Public Health. 2011; 6: 520-33.
411 46. Cartwright EJ, Patel MK, Mbopi-Keou FX, Ayers T, Haenke B, Wagenaar BH et al. Recurrent
412 epidemic cholera with high mortality in Cameroon: persistent challenges 40 years into the
413 seventh pandemic. Epidemiol Infect. 2013; 141: 2083-93.
414 47. MSF. DRC: Violent attacks against staff force MSF to end projects in Fizi territory, South Kivu.
415 https://www.msf.org/msf-forced-pull-out-eastern-drc-territory-following-violent-attacks
416 (accessed September 9, 2018).
417 48. Nguyen VK. An epidemic of suspicion—Ebola and violence in the DRC. N Engl J Med. 2019;
418 380: 1298-9.
419 49. Penrose K, Castro MC, Werema J, Ryan ET. Informal urban settlements and cholera risk in
420 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010; 4: e631.

50. Fallah MP, Skrip LA, Gertler S, Yamin D, Galvani AP. Quantifying poverty as a driver of Ebola transmission. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015; 9: e0004260.
51. Eisenstein M. Disease: poverty and pathogens. Nature 2016; 531: S61-3.
52. Trani JF, Bakhshi P, Noor AA, Lopez D, Mashkoor A. Poverty, vulnerability, and provision of healthcare in Afghanistan. Soc Sci Med. 2010; 70: 1745-55.
53. Jutla A, Khan R, Colwell R. Natural disasters and cholera outbreaks: current understanding and future outlook. Curr Environ Health Rep. 2017; 4: 99-107.
54. Birmingham ME, Lee LA, Ndayimirije N, Nkurikiye S, Hersh BS, Wells JG et al. Epidemic cholera in Burundi: patterns of transmission in the Great Rift Valley Lake region. Lancet. 1997; 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.

449 **Supporting information**

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

452 NCDC:

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

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

458

459 RDC Ministère de la Santé:

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

463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476

S2 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.

S3 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"):

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

S4 Information. Sensitivity analysis. Alternative exposure end points to identify the effect of lag. 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.

S5 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

S1 Table. 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.

606 **S3 Figure. Results of national sensitivity analysis.** Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of
607 exposure to conflict within 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks of the event and cholera for **a**, Nigeria and **b**,
608 the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold p=<0.05 are
609 plotted here. From week 1 to week 10 the risk decreased from 3.6 to 2.08 for Nigeria and from 2.6
610 to 1.5 for the DRC. This suggests that the risk of conflict on cholera is highest soon after the event
611 but remains a detectable association albeit at a lower level for potentially a long period of time after
612 the event.
613



S4 Figure. Results of subnational sensitivity analysis. 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. Thirty Nigerian states and 13 DRC provinces 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).