Quantifying the Risk of Conflict on Recent Ebola Outbreaks in Guinea and the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Gina E C Charnley[1,2,3*], Nathan Green[4], Ilan Kelman[3,5,6], Espoir B Malembaka[1,7], Katy A M Gaythorpe[2,8]

1. Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, United States
2. School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
3. Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom
4. Department of Statistical Science, University College London, London, United Kingdom
5. Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction, University College London, London, United Kingdom
6. University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway
7. Centre for Tropical Diseases and Global Health (CTDGH), Université Catholique de Bukavu, Kukavu, Democratic Republic of the Congo
8. MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Background

Reducing Ebola virus transmission relies on the ability to identify cases and limit contact with infected bodily fluids through biosecurity, safe sex practices, safe burial and vaccination. Armed conflicts can complicate outbreak detection and interventions due to the widespread disruption they cause to the government and the population. Guinea and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) have historically reported the largest and the most recent Ebola virus outbreaks. Understanding if conflict played a role in these outbreaks may help in identifying key risks factors to improve disease control.

Methods

We used data from a range of publicly available data sources for both Ebola virus cases and conflict events from 2018 to 2021 in Guinea and the DRC. We fitted these data to conditional logistic regression models using the Self-Controlled Case Series methodology, to quantify the magnitude in which conflict increased the risk of reported Ebola virus cases in terms of incidence rate ratio. We re-ran our analysis sub-nationally, by conflict sub-event type and tested the effect of lag.

Results

Conflict was significantly associated with an increased risk of reported Ebola virus cases in both the DRC and Guinea in recent outbreaks. The effect was of a similar magnitude at 1.88 and 1.98 times increased risk for the DRC and Guinea, respectively. The greatest effects (often higher than the national values) were found in the most conflict prone areas and during protest/riot-related conflict events. Conflict was influential in terms of Ebola virus risk from 1 week following the event and remained important and, in some cases, more so by 10 weeks.

Conclusion

Extra vigilance is needed following protests and riot-related conflict events in terms of Ebola virus transmission. These events are highly disruptive, in terms of access to transportation and healthcare and are often in urban areas with high population densities. Additional public health messaging around these types of conflict events, relating to the risks and clinical symptoms may

be helpful in reducing transmission. Future work should aim to further understand and quantify conflict severity and intensity, to evaluate dose-response relationships in terms of disease risk.

Keywords

Ebola virus, Conflict, Outbreaks, Guinea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Background

Ebola is a virus belonging to the *Filoviridae* family and was first identified in 1976 in what are now the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and South Sudan [1,2]. Ebola virus disease (EVD) causes acute haemorrhagic fever, leading to mortality rates of ~50%, in the absence of any specific treatment. The virus is spread through human-to-human transmission via contact with infected body fluids and fomites, with an average incubation period of 8 to 10 days [3,4].

Since its discovery, there have been several EVD outbreaks (with sporadic cases in Europe and North America) [5]. The worst recorded outbreaks, in terms of total cases and deaths have been the 2014-2016 West Africa outbreak, particularly in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea and the 2018-2020 outbreak in the DRC. The most recent EVD outbreaks have been reported in Uganda (*Sudan ebolavirus)*, Guinea (*Zaire ebolavirus)* and the DRC (*Zaire ebolavirus)*, all of which occurred in 2021 and 2022 [6].

The control of EVD is through identifying cases and interventions which reduce the risk of contact with infected people's body fluids, via biosecurity in EVD treatment centres, safe burial practices, reducing sexual transmission [7], timely detection (via strategically positioned decentralized laboratories) [8], contact tracing and post-mortem testing to identify EVD-related deaths, genomic sequencing (to infer spatiotemporal transmission dynamics) [9,10] and more recently with the rVSVΔG-ZEBOV-GP Ebola virus envelope glycoprotein vaccine and monoclonal antibody therapeutics [11,12]. Conflict can impact these control measures, reducing the capacity to identify

and respond to outbreaks [13]. Furthermore, conflict can cause disruption to a range of basic services including transport, healthcare and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) [14].

Targeted attacks on healthcare centres and workers are not limited to specific diseases or geographic regions [15] and there have been several reported attacks on Ebola treatment centres, creating fear and avoidance in accessing them [16]. To protect staff and patients, security forces and military personnel are often required to carry out healthcare activities [15]. Additionally, fear and mistrust can lead to further attacks, sabotage and disruption of healthcare facilities and services. Distrust and dissatisfaction in the government, the military and international involvement via non-governmental organisations (NGOs) has also reduced the willingness to follow public health guidance and has increased vaccine hesitancy and misinformation [7,17].

In previous EVD outbreaks in the DRC and Guinea, conflict has been an ongoing issue to greater or lesser extents [18,19]. The DRC is currently experiencing armed conflict in the eastern region, namely the Kivu provinces, which has been ongoing since the 1990s due to instability within the region, with many armed groups currently active along with governments' involvement [20,21]. Guinea has experienced conflict, albeit to a lesser extent than in the DRC, mainly due to politically driven violence and demonstrations during post-election periods and excessive force by security forces [22].

Due to Guinea and the DRC having both the largest recorded outbreaks and the most recent EVD outbreaks [6], along with reported conflict, there is a need to further understand the mechanisms and quantify the up-to-date conflict-related risks for recent EVD resurgences. Additionally, it is essential to understand the timing of conflict-related risks for EVD transmission and any lagged effects. Increasing our understanding of the magnitude and timing of risks can help EVD response planning and identify when extra surveillance may be needed.

Despite evidence showing possible links and effects of conflict on EVD, research to date is limited on magnitude, timings and mechanisms through which conflict impacts the risk of EVD, particularly qualitatively. Here, we use a methodology that has proved robust in quantifying the relationship between disease and conflict in previous studies [23] to address the following research aims:

1. Quantify the effect of conflict in terms of increasing the risk of reported EVD cases during the 2018 to 2020 outbreak in the DRC and the 2021 outbreak in Guinea, both nationally and sub-nationally.
2. Evaluate if certain conflict types were more important than others in impacting EVD cases.
3. Examine the timing of conflict-related risk on EVD, including lagged effects, from the onset of the conflict report to the EVD case report.
4. Suggest mechanisms for any changes in risk relating to conflict type and EVD.

Methods

Datasets

EVD data were taken from multiple sources. For the DRC, data were collated from the DRC Ministry of Health (MoH) mailing lists [24,25] and from the Humanitarian Emergency Response Africa (HEMA) dataset [26]. The temporal scale of the data was daily and ranged from 04/04/2018 to 11/07/2020 for the MoH data and 06/02/2021 to 14/04/2021 for the HEMA data. The spatial scale for the DRC data was to administrative level 2 (territory) for the DRC MoH data and to administrative level 1 (province) for the HEMA dataset, including new reported case and death counts. For Guinea, the data ranged from 14/02/2021 to 19/06/2021 and included new and cumulative daily case counts to administrative level 1 (region), extracted from the Government of Guinea situation reports [27]. For both the DRC and Guinea, temporal and spatial scales and ranges were chosen based on data availability and all data which were available were utilized for the analysis.

For conflict, data were exported from the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project's (ACLED) data export tool [28]. ACLED was chosen over other data sources (e.g., Uppsala Data Conflict

111 Program [29]), as it contained more detailed categorisation of conflict event type, which were
112 fundamental to the aims of this work. For each country, data were available from 1997 to the
113 present, with each data entry point equating to a reported conflict. Conflicts were reported on a
114 daily temporal scale to longitude and latitude (in degrees), plus administrative level 1 (province in
115 DRC, region in Guinea), 2 (territory in DRC, prefecture in Guinea), 3 (sector in DRC, sub-
116 prefecture in Guinea) and 4 (settlement in both countries). The data were categorised by conflict
117 event type (riots, protest, battles, explosions/remote violence, strategic developments and violence
118 against civilians) and sub-event type and provide information on number of conflict fatalities
119 (definitions of the event types, according to ACLED, are provided in Additional file 1).
120
121 Due to the granularity of the different datasets and for compatibility with the model (a single
122 number was needed to define the time of each EVD case/conflict, see Model Structure and Fitting
123 and Additional file 2), the temporal scale was set to continuous weeks from 01/01/2018 to
124 30/06/2021 (183 continuous weeks). Week number was not restarted at the beginning of the
125 calendar year, to account for outbreaks/conflict which endured over a December to January period.
126 Administrative level 1 (region) for Guinea and administrative level 2 (territory) for the DRC were
127 selected as the spatial granularity for model fitting, due to data availability and discrepancies in
128 finer scale location names among datasets. Weeks rather than continuous days were chosen, due
129 to the potential for reporting lags in both the EVD and conflict datasets and due to the incubation
130 period of Ebola virus (>1 week).
131
132 *Model Structure and Fitting*
133 We used the Self-Controlled Case Series (SCCS) methodology which investigates the association
134 between an exposure and an outcome event. The method aims to estimate the effect by
135 comparing the relative incidence of the adverse events (EVD case) within an exposure period of
136 hypothesised excess risk (conflicts), compared to all other times (peace, according to the dataset
137 used). The method is a case only method and has the advantage of not needing separate controls,
138 by automatically controlling for fixed confounders that remain constant over the observational

period using stratification [30]. The method uses conditional logistic regression (R function clogit(), package “survival” [31]) to estimate the effect of an exposure (conflict event) on an outcome event (EVD case, either suspected or confirmed), compared to all other times (peace) in an observation period (0-183 weeks). Maximum likelihood estimations were used, based on an assumed Poisson probability distribution [32,33]. All models were fit using R Studio with R version 4.3.0.

Both the exposure and event were transformed to binary outcomes, either being reported in the data in a specific week and administrative unit (1), or not (0), assuming that if a conflict or EVD case occurred, then it would have been correctly identified and reported. For conflict, the definition of a conflict event was the same for both countries. As the method is case-only, both a conflict event and EVD case had to be reported in the same administrative level (region for Guinea and territory for the DRC) to be included.

To control for the fixed confounders, each exposure and event (in the same administrative unit) was allocated a unique number (indiv) and used as a stratified term in the model. The event was then assigned a pre-exposure (start of observation period to exposure), exposure (exposure week) and post-exposure (exposure to end of observation period) period (see Additional file 2 for fitted data setup). The intervals between the three periods were logarithmically transformed and used as an offset term in the model. Offsetting the interval accounts for the possibility that a longer interval would result in a greater opportunity for the event (EVD case) to occur by chance, not due to its association with conflict (or peace).

The outcome event data consist of values n_{ijk}, which take the values 1 or 0 corresponding respectively to whether an EVD case was reported or not, for individual $i = 1, \dots N$, in the jth week, $j = 1, \dots, J$, with conflict exposure $k = 1,2$, corresponding to peace or conflict. The length of time spent in a particular interval ijk is given by e_{ijk}. The likelihood, L, is a function of β_k which are the coefficients for conflict state k, and α_j the coefficients for week j. The total likelihood is given by,

$$L = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1,\ldots,J;k=1,2} \left(\frac{\exp(\alpha_j + \beta_k) e_{ijk}}{\sum_{j,k} \exp(\alpha_j + \beta_k) e_{ijk}} \right)^{n_{ijk}} .$$

In standard survival analysis, e_{ijk} can be thought of as an offset term. Notice that non-time varying coefficients would drop-out of this self-controlled model. This is equivalent to a product multinomial likelihood. Hence, $\exp(\beta_2 - \beta_1)$ is the relative incidence for conflict, controlling for time (β_0 = peace, based on the assumption that peace has no effect on EVD cases).

The model outcome variable was a log rate ratio, which was then exponentially transformed to incidence rate ratio (IRR), with a 95% confidence interval. IRR is the ratio of the incidence rates for individuals in a population during times of conflict exposure compared to times of peace (according to the dataset). The incidence rate is the rate at which incidence increases or decreases in a specific person-time (administrative level-week). IRR values of 1 indicate similar incidence rates in the exposure compared to the un-exposed, whereas an IRR > 1 suggests an increased risk and IRR < 1 indicates a decreased risk. Therefore, IRR quantifies the magnitude of the association in which conflict increased/decreased the risk of EVD cases. IRR values were considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

By Sub-National Unit, Event Type and Lag

The model was fit several times to evaluate the different research questions above, either by sub-setting the data, or altering the way in which the exposure period was defined. The datasets were subset to sub-national administrative level (regions for Guinea and territories for the DRC) and the analysis repeated, to understand if certain geographic regions saw a greater magnitude of effect between Ebola and conflict. Similarly, conflict sub-event type (and conflict event type, results in Additional file 3) was also subset and the analysis repeated, to evaluate if certain types of conflict had a greater effect on EVD reported cases. Conflict event sub-type was chosen for the main

192 analysis, rather than event type, as the event type names are generally more ambiguous and less
193 descriptive, making the interpretation of the results more challenging.
194
195 The impact of lag was explored, based on the assumption that the effect of a conflict event on EVD
196 cases may not be immediate (EVD's incubation period is 8-10 days) and may be long-lasting.
197 Different exposure periods were tested, extending the period from 1 week following the conflict to
198 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks following the exposure, moving beyond previous work on EVD that tested
199 the effect of conflict to 4 weeks [18]. However, a longer exposure period may result in a diluting
200 effect due to a greater chance of an event (EVD case) being reported in an exposure period
201 (conflict). To account for this, we tested the effect of a single week, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks
202 following the week the exposure was reported, rather than extending the exposure period.
203
204 *Quantifying conflict severity and proximity*
205 To suggest mechanisms through which the most impactful types of conflict (battles, protests and
206 riots) may be impacting EVD transmission, we quantified conflict severity using two metrics. First,
207 we presented conflict fatalities, both in terms of raw numbers for each country and conflict event
208 type and as a proportion of total conflict fatalities. Second, we measured the proximity of all battles,
209 protests and riots to major cities by the shortest distance between the coordinates of the conflict
210 and the city (measured in longitude and latitude as degrees) in both the DRC [34] and Guinea [35].
211 We then compared the difference between the average distance for each conflict event type, to the
212 total average distance for all event types, over the observation period of 2018 to 2022. The
213 distance was measured using the Haversine method, which assumes a spherical earth, ignoring
214 ellipsoidal effects (R functions distHaversine() and distm(), package "geosphere" [36]).
215
216 **Results**
217 *Datasets*
218 During the observation period, there were 12,237 EVD cases reported in 94 weeks (out of 183
219 weeks in the observation period) across 14 administrative 2 units for the DRC (all in Nord-Kivu,

Sud-Kivu, Ituri and Équateur). For Guinea, there were 18 weeks (out of 183) which reported 1,797 EVD cases in two administrative 1 units (N'Zérékoré and Conakry). These cases corresponded to 168 (DRC) and 86 (Guinea) weeks of reported conflict exposure in the dataset during the observation period for the same corresponding administrative levels as the reported EVD cases. In the DRC, most EVD cases were reported in late 2018 to late 2019, while for Guinea, most cases were reported in 2021 (see Fig. 1).



Fig. 1 Weeks which reported **A,** Ebola virus disease (EVD) cases and **B,** conflict exposure for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea (GUI).

230 In the DRC, EVD cases for the 2018-2020 outbreak were commonly reported in areas of high
231 reported conflict event frequency, namely the Kivu provinces. Similar results were found for
232 Guinea, with all EVD cases being reported in the two regions that reported the highest conflict
233 levels (Conakry and N'Zérékoré), but with overall lower levels of reported conflict. The most
234 frequent conflict sub-event types (event types) in the fitted data varied by country. For the DRC,
235 these included armed clashes (battles), attacks (violence against civilians) and peaceful protests
236 (protests). In Guinea, the most reported conflict sub-event types (event types) were violent
237 demonstrations (riots), peaceful protests (protests) and mob violence (riots) (Table 1).
238
239 **Table 1** Frequency of conflict event types & sub-event types in the data fitted to the model for the
240 Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea.

Country	Event Type	Sub-Event Type	Frequency
Guinea	Riots	Violent demonstration	108
DRC	Battles	Armed clash	106
DRC	Violence against civilians	Attack	74
Guinea	Protests	Peaceful protest	72
Guinea	Riots	Mob violence	27
Guinea	Violence against civilians	Attack	27
DRC	Protests	Peaceful protest	22
Guinea	Protests	Protest with intervention	20
DRC	Violence against civilians	Abduction/forced disappearance	15
Guinea	Battles	Armed clash	11
Guinea	Strategic developments	Looting/property destruction	11
DRC	Strategic developments	Looting/property destruction	8
Guinea	Strategic developments	Arrests	6
DRC	Battles	Government regains territory	6
DRC	Protests	Protest with intervention	6
DRC	Riots	Mob violence	6

Guinea	Protests	Excessive force against protesters	5
DRC	Riots	Violent demonstration	5
DRC	Strategic developments	Change to group/activity	4
DRC	Strategic developments	Agreement	3
DRC	Strategic developments	Arrests	3
DRC	Violence against civilians	Sexual violence	3
Guinea	Strategic developments	Other	2
DRC	Battles	Non-state actor overtakes territory	2
DRC	Strategic developments	Headquarters or base established	2
Guinea	Strategic developments	Disrupted weapons use	1
Guinea	Violence against civilians	Abduction/forced disappearance	1
Guinea	Violence against civilians	Sexual violence	1
DRC	Explosions/Remote violence	Remote explosive/landmine/IED	1
DRC	Protests	Excessive force against protesters	1
DRC	Strategic developments	Disrupted weapons use	1
DRC	Strategic developments	Non-violent transfer of territory	1
DRC	Strategic developments	Other	1

Model Output

Conflict was significantly associated with an increased risk of reported EVD cases in both the DRC and Guinea between 2018 and 2021. The magnitude of effect was similar for both countries, with conflict increasing the risk of EVD by 1.88 (1.76-2.02 95%Confidence Interval (CI)) times in the DRC, and 1.98 (1.11-3.51 95%CI) times in Guinea.

By Sub-National Unit, Event Type and Lag

The effect of conflict on EVD varied sub-nationally in terms of magnitude and uncertainty (Fig. 2). In the first week of the reported conflict exposure, the administrative units with the highest reported

effect were Mbandaka (Équateur, DRC), Mwenga (Sud-Kivu, DRC), Goma (Nord-Kivu, DRC), Butembo (Nord-Kivu, DRC) and N'Zérékoré (Guinea) with IRR values of 4.26 (0.58-31.2 95%CI), 2.49 (1.87-3.31 95%CI), 2.19 (1.69-2.83 95%CI), 2.12 (1.76-2.57 95%CI) and 2.06 (1.13-3.77 95%CI), respectively. Some areas did not find significant results and often had high uncertainty, including Aru, Bolomba, Ingende, Mbandaka in the DRC and Conakry in Guinea.



Fig. 2 Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of conflict event exposure on EVD cases for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea (GUI) during the week the conflict was reported at sub-national administrative unit.

By Event Type

The greatest impact for conflict event sub-type was armed clashes in Guinea (IRR = 3.45, 0.80-14.8 95%CI) (Fig. 3); however, this was not statistically significant, along with 12 other conflict sub-

265 types in Guinea (abduction/forced disappearances, arrests, attacks, change to group/activity,
266 disrupted weapons use, excessive force against protesters, looting/property destruction, mob
267 violence, other, peaceful protests, protests with intervention and sexual violence). Violent
268 demonstrations had the greatest significant impact on EVD cases in Guinea causing a 2.38 (1.04-
269 5.41 95%CI) times increased risk of EVD.
270
271 Only three conflict event sub-types were not significantly associated with EVD incidence in the
272 DRC: air/drone strikes, disrupted weapons use and headquarters or base establishments. For the
273 conflict sub-types that did have a significant effect, shelling/artillery/missile attack had the biggest
274 effect on EVD cases at 3.44 (1.27-9.3195%CI) times increased risk, followed by peaceful protests
275 (IRR = 3.11, 2.66-3.64 95%CI), excessive force against protesters (2.83, 1.60-5.03 95%CI),
276 looting/property destruction (2.69, 2.18-3.31 95%CI), protests with interventions (2.68, 2.05-3.52
277 95%CI) and violent demonstrations (2.58, 2.00-3.34 95%CI) (Fig. 3). For the results regarding
278 conflict event type (rather than sub-event types), see Additional file 3.



Fig. 3 Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of conflict event exposure on EVD cases for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea (GUI) during the week the conflict was reported by conflict sub-event type.

By Lag

All lag periods were found to be statistically significant for both countries. Extending the lag periods caused the effect of conflict on EVD cases to be almost eliminated (IRR = 1) by 10 weeks in the DRC, with an IRR of 1.05 (1.02-1.09 95%CI). In Guinea, the risk of EVD cases decreased to 1.41 (0.99-2.01 95%CI) times at 4 weeks and then increased to 1.72 (1.38-2.14, 95%CI) by 10 weeks. The uncertainty was far greater in Guinea with slightly less significant results (according to p values) compared to the DRC (see Fig. 4).



Fig. 4 Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of conflict event exposure on EVD cases for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea (GUI) from the week the conflict was reported to 10 weeks following the exposure, by extending the exposure periods.

The lagged exposure periods for a single week 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks following the exposure resulted in conflict having a greater and more statistically significant (according to p values) impact on EVD cases (Fig. 5), compared to extending the periods (from 1 week to 10 weeks). All lag periods saw an increased risk from week 1 to week 10, with Guinea having a greater effect (although with wider ranging uncertainty), potentially due to the increase already found in Guinea at week 4 with the extended exposure periods (Fig. 4). The risk of EVD cases increased from 1.88 (1.76-2.02 95%CI) to 1.96 (1.83-2.10 95%CI) times in the DRC and from 1.96 (1.11-3.51 95%CI) to 3.30 (2.12-5.13 95%CI) times in Guinea by the 10th week following the event.



Fig. 5 Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of conflict event exposure on EVD cases for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea (GUI) from the week the conflict was reported to the 10th week following the conflict report, as a single week.

Quantifying conflict severity and proximity

Table 2 shows the full results for the conflict fatalities and proximity analysis for each of the three most significant event types (battles, riots and protests). In the DRC, battles caused 56% of all conflict fatalities in the fitted data here (n = 7,900), compared to 0.19% (n = 27) and 3.06% (n = 430) for protests and riots, respectively. In Guinea, 64% (n = 189) of conflict fatalities were caused by riots, followed by 17.2% (n = 51) in battles and 7.12% (n = 21) in protests.

On average, over the four-year period, battles were further away from major cities in both countries, followed by protests and riots in the DRC and riots and then protests in Guinea (for maps, see Additional file 4: Fig. S2). Compared to the average distance between all conflict events and major settlements, battles were 6.33km further away in the DRC and 17.2km further away in Guinea. In the DRC, protests were 2.99km closer and riots 3.33km closer, compared to the average distance. For Guinea, protests and riots were 11.4km and 5.73km closer, respectively.

Table 2 Battles, riots and protests in terms of EVD risks by number of conflict fatalities, the percentage of total fatalities and the difference in average proximity from conflict events to major settlements (event type average distance minus all conflicts average distance) for the full four-year observation period for each country.

Country	Event Type	Fatalities Frequency	Fatality Percentage	Difference in proximity
DRC	Battles	7,900	56.2%	6.33km
DRC	Riots	430	3.05%	-3.33km
DRC	Protests	27	0.19%	-2.99km
Guinea	Battles	51	17.3%	17.2km
Guinea	Riots	189	64.1%	-5.73km
Guinea	Protests	21	7.11%	-11.4km

Discussion

During recent EVD outbreaks in 2018 to 2021, conflict event exposure increased the risk of reported cases at a national level by a similar magnitude in the DRC and Guinea, at 1.88 and 1.98 times, respectively. The uncertainty in the IRR values for Guinea throughout all the analyses was much wider than the DRC. In the distribution of exposure and events fit to the model, there was overlap with areas of highest reported conflict and EVD case frequency. Several of the regions/territories analysed had higher IRR values than the national risk: Mbandaka, Mwenga, Goma, Butembo (all in the DRC) and N'Zérékoré (in Guinea), which ranged from 2.06 to 4.26.

338 Evaluating if certain types of conflict may be more impactful than others contributes to our
339 understanding of how conflict can impact disease. The conflict sub-event types with the greatest
340 impacts in terms of EVD risk were armed clashes in Guinea and shelling/artillery/missile attack in
341 the DRC. However, both armed clashes and shelling/artillery/missile attacks had the largest
342 uncertainty. Violent demonstrations had the strongest and most significant impact in Guinea, while
343 in the DRC, peaceful protests, excessive force against protesters, looting/property destruction,
344 protests with interventions and violent demonstrations had the largest, most significant impact, with
345 little uncertainty.
346
347 *Conflict-related disruption*
348 The cornerstone of EVD control is through identifying cases and reducing contact with infected
349 bodily fluids (and vaccination) [8,10]. Conflict can impact these control measures in multiple ways.
350 In previous EVD outbreaks, weak health systems (due to access, supplies, safety of staff and
351 patients and fear), complex socio-cultural and political environments (creating mistrust in
352 governments and NGOs), ineffective messaging and ineffective community engagement have all
353 created problems in EVD response [19,37]. Additionally, there have been difficulties in
354 administering EVD vaccines due to damaged transportation and infrastructure, although continued
355 efforts aim to reach those most at risk [11,16,38]. Conflict and EVD can create a positive feedback
356 loop, where EVD exacerbates the conflict and conflict exacerbates EVD. It has previously been
357 observed that conflict increases much more during EVD outbreaks compared to controls [17,18]. A
358 suggested explanation is that EVD outbreaks may further destabilise fragile regions and fuel
359 conflicts. For example, mistrust increased in the DRC during the 2018-2019 EVD outbreak due to
360 the government's decision to ban populations in the affected provinces from participating in the
361 presidential election [17,18].
362
363 A potential explanation for the large number of protest-related impacts on EVD cases found here,
364 may be the bigger impact these types of events would have on a greater number of people.
365 Protests rely on large congregations of people and crowds, increasing contact among individuals

366 and therefore fueling EVD transmission. Furthermore, protests and demonstrations may be more
367 likely to impact transportation, education and healthcare, due to the widespread disruption they can
368 cause in dense urban areas [39,40]. Disruption of healthcare and transportation may be particularly
369 damaging in controlling EVD, as it could complicate contact tracing and delay testing, diagnosis
370 and treatment. Further evidence for this explanation may be that within these very impactful sub-
371 events, looting/property destruction was also found highly impactful and important, which is often
372 the product of protests and demonstrations and results in damage to healthcare infrastructure and
373 supplies.
374
375 *Proximity to the conflict*
376 During 2018 to 2021, battles were the furthest away from major settlements in both countries,
377 compared to protests and riots. Proximity may impact the effect of the conflict on the population,
378 both in terms of the number of people affected and the magnitude of the effect. Proximity may also
379 add further evidence to the above hypothesis that protests and demonstrations, although
380 potentially less violent, may be more impactful than battles and armed clashes. Battles (in terms of
381 the ACLED's definition [28]) are more likely to be fought on pre-defined battle "grounds", which are
382 less likely to be close to settlements, or these settlements, including their healthcare and testing
383 facilities are quickly displaced and abandoned following the onset of conflict due to the immediate
384 threat to life [41]. The absence of testing facilities may result in cases not being identified and
385 reported, therefore making battles appear less impactful to EVD transmission. Meanwhile, protests
386 and demonstrations aim to cause as much disruption to as many people as possible.
387
388 *Severity of the conflict*
389 A potential explanation for why remote violence/explosions and battles were very impactful but
390 often with higher uncertainty is that these types of conflict occurred less frequently, but when they
391 did, they had a very large impact on EVD cases. The fewer events therefore resulted in the large
392 uncertainty and a longer dataset (if available) may help to understand if the larger impact of these
393 conflict types is consistent through time. Additionally, peoples' behaviour and risks must be

394 considered during more “extreme” forms of violence such as battles and explosions, compared to
395 protests and demonstrations. Violent conflict may have a very large initial impact (accounting for
396 the high IRR values), but then the risk stabilises in the area as civilians take precautions (e.g.,
397 displacement) to protect their life [42].
398
399 Alternatively, there is the potential for more violent forms of conflict (such as battles and
400 explosions) to decrease the risk of EVD. People may be more likely to stay at home during these
401 events or be subject to curfews and not mix in public spaces, decreasing their exposure to the
402 pathogen [43]. Furthermore, severe conflict may be more likely to cause fatalities (of both civilians
403 and combatants), reducing the susceptible pool for EVD cases. More work is needed to
404 understand how to quantity conflict severity for scientific research purposes, which could be used
405 to identify dose-response relationships with disease, while still considering that all conflict should
406 be considered highly disruptive and severe to those living in the affected area.
407
408 *Duration of conflict related EVD risks*
409 When extending the exposure periods, the effect of conflict on EVD cases was almost eliminated
410 by 10 weeks in the DRC, while in Guinea, the risk of EVD cases decreased to 4 weeks and then
411 increased by 10 weeks. However, it appears that extending the lag periods may have been diluting
412 the effect of conflict on EVD cases, as changing the lag periods to a single week made all the lag
413 periods for both countries more significant and impactful. These results track with previous
414 research which found synchronicity and correlation between the reporting of EVD cases and
415 conflict in the DRC and suggest that the effect of conflict may be long-lasting [11,18].
416
417 The results show that conflict is still highly influential multiple months following the event, and in
418 some instances, conflict had a greater and more significant effect on EVD with time. A potential
419 explanation may be due to the disruption caused by the conflict event having a cumulative effect.
420 Previous findings suggest that conflict lengthens the EVD treatment process; e.g., longer time to
421 detection, isolation, treatment and vaccination, creating a lasting effect and prolonging outbreaks

422 [18]. Therefore, time would be needed for EVD cases to increase and be reported, after elevated
423 transmission.
424
425 *Limitations*
426 There are several limitations to the datasets used here, the first being the assumption that if EVD
427 or conflict occurs, it is correctly identified (e.g., confirmed and suspected EVD cases were
428 included) and reported on the correct day with no delay. These assumptions are unlikely, as EVD
429 cases may be missed if cases never seek formal medical assistance or are in hard-to-reach areas.
430 Furthermore, the categorisation of conflict events is subjective (category definitions were included
431 in Additional file 1) and several categories are ambiguous. Data availability was limited and
432 therefore sub-setting the data (by sub-national region or conflict sub-event type) resulted in limited
433 data to fit to the model. Small sample sizes meant that some results had wide uncertainty, were
434 statistically insignificant or could not be calculated, particularly in Guinea. However, generally the
435 findings were replicated in both countries, in terms of sub-event type, effects of lag and geographic
436 distribution of risk.
437
438 The methodology accounts for confounders by fixing them across the administrative unit. It is not
439 as effective across multiple administrative units. Sub-national units are different geographical
440 sizes, with different population sizes and risk factors. Therefore, comparing different
441 regions/territories can create misleading results. Additionally, the use of vaccination during these
442 more recent outbreaks [44,45], makes comparison to previous work challenging. While data on
443 Ebola vaccination are available, the use of ring vaccination means it is difficult to incorporate into
444 the model used here (as a binary outcome) [37,45]. For example, the sub-national region with the
445 largest IRR here was in Équateur, part of the DRC which has received relatively little vaccination,
446 compared to the eastern provinces [37].
447
448 **Conclusions**

449 The research presented here shows the statistically significant impact that conflict, a known risk
450 factor for infectious disease transmission, has had on EVD cases in the DRC and Guinea in recent
451 resurgences. The effect appears long-lasting (<10 weeks and perhaps longer), with certain
452 geographic regions having >4 times the risk of EVD cases (compared to the national risk of 1.88
453 and 1.98 for the DRC and Guinea, respectively). Protests and riot-related conflict event types were
454 highly influential and statistically significant here, potentially being far more disruptive to more
455 people, compared to battles. More research to understand how best to quantify conflict severity
456 and intensity could provide further evidence for these mechanisms.
457
458 Extra vigilance is needed following protest- and riot-related conflict events for EVD transmission.
459 Continued efforts are needed to try and account for the long-term effect of conflict on EVD and
460 other infectious diseases. Effective public health messaging and scaling up testing in urban areas
461 may help to mitigate these risks, including information on how to reduce transmission in dense
462 urban areas and early clinical symptoms to be aware of. Ebola treatment centres should be
463 prepared for an increase in cases following conflict events. The risk may be elevated for multiple
464 months, with sufficient vaccination stocks made available to areas most at risk.
465
466 **List of abbreviations**
467 ACLED - Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project
468 CI – Confidence Interval
469 DRC – Democratic Republic of the Congo
470 EVD – Ebola Virus Disease
471 GUI – Guinea
472 HEMA - Humanitarian Emergency Response Africa
473 IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio
474 MoH – Ministry of Health
475 NGOs – Non-Governmental Organisations
476 SCCS – Self-Controlled Case Series

WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Although the work presented here uses human data, all the data used are from public available data sources, which are none identifiable and therefore ethical approval was waived for this analysis.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets analysed during this study are all publicly available and references throughout the manuscript. Further code related to the methods and data visualization here are available at: https://github.com/GinaCharnley/ebola_conflict

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

The work presented here received no specific funding, however we acknowledge joint Centre funding from the UK Medical Research Council and Department for International Development [MR/R0156600/1]. The funder played no role in the design of the study and collection of data, the analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

GECC conceptualised and designed the study, collated the data sources, analysed the data, wrote the manuscript and incorporated feedback. IK contributed to interpreting the findings, provided

expertise on conflicts and global health and revised several drafts of the manuscript. NG provided statistical expertise on the methodology, assisted in writing the manuscript, analysing the data and revised several drafts. EBM contributed to interpreting the findings, provided expertise on conflicts and Ebola in the DRC and revised several drafts of the manuscript. KAMG co-conceptualised and designed the study, provided data sources, provided expertise on epidemiological methods, contributed to interpreting the findings and revised several drafts of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge and thank those working in the field who collected and collated the data sources used here, namely the Ministère de la Santé Publique de la République Démocratique du Congo and Ministère de la Santé et de l'Hygiène Publique de Guinée. Additionally, we would like to thank Sophie Meakin for collating the situation reports used in some of the DRC data used here.

References

1. Pattyn SW, Jacob W, Van der Groen G, Piot P, Courteille G. Isolation of Marburg-like virus from a case of haemorrhagic fever in Zaire. Lancet. 1977:573-4.
2. Bowen ET, Platt GS, Lloyd G, Baskerville A, Harris WJ, Vella EE. Viral haemorrhagic fever in southern Sudan and northern Zaire. Preliminary studies on the aetiological agent. Lancet. 1977:571-3.
3. Jacob ST, Crozier I, Fischer WA, Hewlett A, Kraft CS, Vega MA, et al. Ebola virus disease. Nat. Rev. Dis. Primers. 2020 Feb 20;6(1):13.
4. World Health Organization. Ebola virus disease. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ebola-virus-disease (2021).
5. Pourrut X, Kumulungui B, Wittmann T, Moussavou G, Délicat A, Yaba P, et al. The natural history of Ebola virus in Africa. Microbes Infect. 2005;7(7-8):1005-14.

532 6. Centres.for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). History of Ebola Disease Outbreaks.
533 https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/chronology.html (2022)
534 7. Adepoju P. Lessons from Ebola as DRC grapples with conflict, measles, and covid-19. BMJ.
535 2020 Jul 21;370.
536 8. Mukadi-Bamuleka D, Mambu-Mbika F, De Weggheleire A, Edidi-Atani F, Bulabula-Penge J,
537 Mfumu MMK, et al. Efficiency of Field Laboratories for Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak during
538 Chronic Insecurity, Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2018-2020. Emerg. Infect.
539 Dis. 2023;29(1):1-9.
540 9. Kinganda-Lusamaki E, Black A, Mukadi DB, Hadfield J, Mbala-Kingebeni P, Pratt CB, et al.
541 Integration of genomic sequencing into the response to the Ebola virus outbreak in Nord
542 Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo. Nat. Med. 2021;27(4):710-716.
543 10. Mukadi-Bamuleka D, Sanogo YO, Bulabula-Penge J, Morales-Betoulle ME, Fillon P,
544 Woodruff P, et al. RDT Working Group. Postmortem Surveillance for Ebola Virus Using
545 OraQuick Ebola Rapid Diagnostic Tests, Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2019-
546 2020. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2022;28(2):420-424.
547 11. Wells CR, Pandey A, Ndeffo Mbah ML, Gaüzère BA, Malvy D, Singer BH, et al. The
548 exacerbation of Ebola outbreaks by conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PNAS.
549 2019;116(48):24366-72.
550 12. Mbala-Kingebeni P, Aziza A, Di Paola N, Wiley MR, Makiala-Mandanda S, Caviness K, et
551 al. Medical countermeasures during the 2018 Ebola virus disease outbreak in the North Kivu
552 and Ituri Provinces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: a rapid genomic assessment.
553 Lancet Infect, Dis. 2019;19(6):648-657.
554 13. Wise PH, Barry M. Civil war & the global threat of pandemics. Daedalus. 2017;146(4):71-84.
555 14. Gonzalez-Torres A, Esposito E. Epidemics and conflict: Evidence from the Ebola outbreak
556 in Western Africa. Available at SSRN 3544606. 2016.
557 15. van Stekelenburg BC, De Cauwer H, Barten DG, Mortelmans LJ. Attacks on health care
558 workers in historical pandemics and COVID-19. Disaster Med. Public Health Prep.
559 2023;17:e309.

560 16. Oppenheim B, Lidow N, Ayscue P, Saylors K, Mbala P, Kumakamba C, et al. Knowledge
561 and beliefs about Ebola virus in a conflict-affected area: Early evidence from the North Kivu
562 outbreak. J. Glob, Health. 2019 Dec;9(2).
563 17. Vinck P, Pham PN, Bindu KK, Bedford J, Nilles EJ. Institutional trust and misinformation in
564 the response to the 2018–19 Ebola outbreak in North Kivu, DR Congo: a population-based
565 survey. Lancet Infect. Dis. 2019;19(5):529-36.
566 18. Kraemer MU, Pigott DM, Hill SC, Vanderslott S, Reiner RC, Stasse S, et al. Dynamics of
567 conflict during the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo 2018–2019.
568 BMC Med. 2020;18(1):1-0.
569 19. McPake B, Witter S, Ssali S, Wurie H, Namakula J, Ssengooba F. Ebola in the context of
570 conflict affected states and health systems: case studies of Northern Uganda and Sierra
571 Leone. Confl. Health. 2015;9(1):1-9.
572 20. Global Conflict Tracker. Instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo.
573 https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/violence-democratic-republic-congo
574 (2023).
575 21. Human Rights Watch. World Report 2023.
576 https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/media_2023/01/World_Report_2023_WEBSPREADS
577 _0.pdf (2023).
578 22. Human Rights Watch. Guinea Events of 2020. https://www.hrw.org/world-
579 report/2021/country-chapters/guinea (2020).
580 23. Charnley GEC, Jean K, Kelman I, Gaythorpe KAM, Murray KA. Association between
581 Conflict and Cholera in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Emerg. Infect.
582 Dis. 2022;28(12):2472-81.
583 24. Meakin S. Data for the 2018 outbreak of Ebola in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in
584 North-Kivu and Ituri Provinces. https://github.com/sophiemeakin/ebola_drc (2019).
585 25. Ministère de la Santé de la République Démocratique du Congo. Mailing list.
586 https://us13.campaign-
587 archive.com/home/?u=89e5755d2cca4840b1af93176&id=aedd23c530 (2019).

588 26. Human Emergency Response Africa (HEMA). Democratic Republic of the Congo: Ebola
589 (2021) Subnational cases. https://data.humdata.org/dataset/democratic-republic-of-congo-
590 ebola-2021-subnational-cases (2021).
591 27. ACAPS. GUINEA EBOLA EVD 2021 SUBNATIONAL CASES, DEATHS,
592 HOSPITALISATIONS, CONTACT TRACING, AND VACCINATIONS.
593 https://www.acaps.org/guinea-ebola-evd-2021-subnational-cases-deaths-hospitalisations-
594 contact-tracing-and-vaccinations (2021).
595 28. Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED). Data Export Tool.
596 https://acleddata.com/data-export-tool/ (2023).
597 29. Eck K. In data we trust? A comparison of UCDP GED and ACLED conflict events datasets.
598 Coop. Confl. 2012;47(1):124-41.
599 30. Whitaker HJ, Paddy Farrington C, Spiessens B, Musonda P. Tutorial in biostatistics: the
600 self-controlled case series method. Stat. Med. 2006;25(10):1768-97.
601 31. Therneau T. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. R package version 3.5-5.
602 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survival (2023).
603 32. Mostofsky E, Coull BA, Mittleman MA. Analysis of observational self-matched data to
604 examine acute triggers of outcome events with abrupt onset. Epidemiol. (Cambridge,
605 Mass.). 2018;29(6):804.
606 33. Xu S, Zeng C, Newcomer S, Nelson J, Glanz J. Use of fixed effects models to analyze self-
607 controlled case series data in vaccine safety studies. J. Biom. Biostat. 2012:006.
608 34. UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Field Information Services Section.
609 Democratic Republic of the Congo - major cities.
610 https://data.humdata.org/dataset/democratic-republic-of-the-congo-major-cities (2019).
611 35. Simplemaps. Guinea Cities Database. https://simplemaps.com/data/gn-cities (2023).
612 36. Hijmans RJ. geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry. R package version 1.5-18.
613 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=geosphere (2022).
614 37. Bausch DG. The need for a new strategy for Ebola vaccination. Nat. Med. 2021;27(4):580-1.
615 38. Moran B. Fighting Ebola in conflict in the DR Congo. Lancet. 2018;392(10155):1295-6.

39. AL JAZEERA AND NEWS AGENCIES. Several killed as protests rock Goma in eastern DRC. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/12/21/several-killed-as-protests-rock-goma-in-eastern-drc (2021).
40. AFP, AL JAZEERA. Protests against military administration paralyse Guinea capital. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/7/29/protests-against-military-administration-paralyse-guinea-capital (2022).
41. Relief Web. Democratic Republic of the Congo faces acute health crisis amid rising violence. https://reliefweb.int/report/democratic-republic-congo/democratic-republic-congo-faces-acute-health-crisis-amid-rising-violence (2023).
42. Relief Web. After evacuating Kayna, DRC, MSF is trying to return to assist displaced in Kanyabayonga. https://reliefweb.int/report/democratic-republic-congo/after-evacuating-kayna-drc-msf-trying-return-assist-displaced (2004).
43. Radio France Internationale. Clashes erupt in Guinea Conakry after opposition call for anti-junta protests. https://www.rfi.fr/en/africa/20220818-clashes-erupt-in-guinea-conakry-after-opposition-call-for-anti-junta-protests (2022).
44. Maxmen A. Ebola vaccine approved for use in ongoing outbreak. Nature. 2017 May 30;10.
45. World Health Organization. Ebola virus disease: Vaccines. https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/ebola-vaccines (2020).