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, Bukavu, The 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 widespread disruption to governments and the populations. 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 the analysis sub-nationally, by conflict sub-event type and tested any lagged effects.

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 many 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 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, were 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].

EVD control is achieved through identifying cases and interventions which reduce the risk of contact with infected people, 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 [10,15,17]. 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 [7,18].

In previous EVD outbreaks in the DRC and Guinea, conflict has been an ongoing issue to greater or lesser extents [19,20]. The DRC is currently experiencing armed conflict, particularly but not limited to the Kivu provinces. The conflict has been ongoing since the 1990s due to instability within the region, with many armed groups currently active along with governments' involvement [21,22]. 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 [23].

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 [24] to address the following research aims:

1. Quantify the risk of conflict on 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 and suggest mechanisms for any differences found.
3. Examine the timing of conflict-related risk on EVD, including lagged effects.

Methods

Spatial Administrative Units

Subnational administrative boundaries differ between Guinea and the DRC, Table 1 presents each country's definitions of subnational regions.

Table 1 Subnational administrative unit names for Guinea and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC).

Administrative Unit	Country	Name
1	Guinea	Region
1	DRC	Province
2	Guinea	Prefecture
2	DRC	Territory
3	Guinea	Sub-prefecture
3	DRC	Sector
4	Guinea	Settlement
4	DRC	Settlement

Datasets

For the DRC, EVD data were collated from the DRC Ministry of Health (MoH) mailing lists [25,26] and from the Humanitarian Emergency Response Africa (HEMA) dataset [27]. The temporal scale of the data was daily and ranged from 04 April 2018 to 11 July 2020 for the MoH data and 06 February 2021 to 14 April 2021 for the HEMA data. The spatial scale for the DRC data was to administrative level 2 for the DRC MoH data and to administrative level 1 for the HEMA dataset (Table 1), including new reported case and death counts. For Guinea, the data ranged from 14 February 2021 to 19 June 2021 and included new and cumulative daily case counts by administrative level 1 (Table 1), extracted from the Government of Guinea situation reports [28]. 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.

Conflict data were exported from the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project's (ACLED, Wisconsin, United States) data export tool [29]. ACLED was chosen over other data sources (e.g., Uppsala Data Conflict Program [30]), as it contained more detailed categorisation of conflict event type, which were fundamental to the aims of this work. For each country, data were available from 1997 to the present, with each data entry point equating to a reported conflict. Conflicts were reported on a daily scale to longitude and latitude (in degrees), and by administrative level 1, 2, 3 and 4 (Table 1). The data were categorised by conflict event type (riots, protest, battles, explosions/remote violence, strategic developments and violence against civilians) and sub-event type and provided information on number of conflict fatalities (definitions of the event types, according to ACLED, are provided in Additional file 1).

Due to the granularity of the different datasets and for compatibility with the model (a single number was needed to define the time of each EVD case/conflict, see Model Structure and Fitting and Additional file 2), the temporal scale was set to continuous weeks from 01 January 2018 to 30 June 2021 (183 continuous weeks). Week number was not restarted at the beginning of the

calendar year, to account for outbreaks/conflict which endured over a December to January period. Administrative level 1 for Guinea and administrative level 2 for the DRC were selected as the spatial granularity for model fitting (Table 1), due to data availability and discrepancies in finer scale location names among datasets. Weeks rather than continuous days were chosen, due to the potential for reporting lags in both the EVD and conflict datasets and due to the incubation period of Ebola virus (>1 week).

Model Structure and Fitting

We used the Self-Controlled Case Series (SCCS) methodology which investigates the association between an exposure and an outcome event. The method aims to estimate the effect by comparing the relative incidence of the adverse events (EVD case) within an exposure period of hypothesised excess risk (conflict), compared to all other times (peace, according to the dataset used). The method is a case only method, meaning cases are the only subjects used to test the hypothesised effect. The method has the advantage of not needing separate controls (e.g., those not infected), by automatically controlling for fixed confounders that remain constant over the observational period. Cases are treated as individuals and then stratified in the modelling approach to control for the confounders [31]. The method uses conditional logistic regression (R function clogit(), package “survival” [32]) 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 [33,34]. 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 (administrative unit 1 for Guinea and administrative unit 2 for the DRC, see Table 1) to be included.

To control for the fixed confounders, each exposure and event (in the same administrative unit) was allocated a unique number 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 the following,

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

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).

182 The model outcome variable was a log rate ratio, which was then exponentially transformed to
183 incidence rate ratio (IRR), with a 95% confidence interval. IRR is the ratio of the incidence rates for
184 individuals in a population during times of conflict exposure compared to times of peace (according
185 to the dataset). The incidence rate is the rate at which incidence increases or decreases in a
186 specific person-time (administrative level-week). IRR values of 1 indicate similar incidence rates in
187 the conflict exposure period compared to the non-conflict exposure period, whereas an IRR > 1
188 suggests an increased risk and IRR < 1 indicates a decreased risk. Therefore, IRR quantifies the
189 magnitude of the association in which conflict increased/decreased the risk of EVD transmission.
190 IRR values were considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.
191
192 *By Sub-National Unit, Event Type and Lag*
193 The model was fit several times to evaluate the different research questions above, either by sub-
194 setting the data, or altering the way in which the exposure period was defined. The datasets were
195 subset by the sub-national administrative level of the fitted data (see *Datasets* and Table 1) and
196 the analysis repeated, to understand if certain geographic regions saw a greater magnitude of
197 effect between Ebola and conflict. Similarly, conflict sub-event type (and conflict event type, results
198 in Additional file 3) was also subset and the analysis repeated, to evaluate if certain types of
199 conflict had a greater effect on EVD reported cases. Conflict event sub-type was chosen for the
200 main analysis, rather than event type, as the event type names are generally more ambiguous and
201 less descriptive, making the interpretation of the results more challenging.
202
203 The impact of lag was explored, based on the assumption that the effect of a conflict event on EVD
204 cases may not be immediate (EVD's incubation period is 8-10 days [3]) and may be long-lasting.
205 Different exposure periods were tested, extending the period from 1 week following the conflict to
206 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks following the exposure, moving beyond previous work on EVD that tested
207 the effect of conflict to 4 weeks [18]. However, a longer exposure period may result in a diluting
208 effect due to a greater chance of an event (EVD case) being reported in an exposure period

(conflict). To account for this, we tested the effect of a single week, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks following the week the exposure was reported, rather than extending the exposure period.

Quantifying conflict severity and proximity

To explore mechanisms through which the most impactful types of conflict (battles, protests and riots) may impact EVD transmission, we quantified conflict severity using two metrics. First, we presented conflict fatalities as a metric of severity (higher mortality = more severe conflict), both in terms of raw numbers for each country and conflict event type and as a proportion of total conflict fatalities. Second, we measured the proximity of all battles, protests and riots to major cities by the shortest distance between the coordinates of the conflict and the city (measured in longitude and latitude as degrees) in both the DRC [35] and Guinea [36]. We then compared the difference between the average distance for each conflict event type, to the total average distance for all event types, over the observation period of 2018 to 2022. The distance was measured using the Haversine method, which assumes a spherical earth, ignoring ellipsoidal effects (R functions distHaversine() and distm(), package “geosphere” [37]). We hypothesised that conflict types which more often occurred near more people (e.g., closer to major cities), would be more severe, and therefore have a bigger effect on disease transmission.

Results

Datasets

During the observation period, there were 12,237 EVD cases reported in 94 weeks (out of 183 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

235 the DRC, most EVD cases were reported in late 2018 to late 2019, while for Guinea, most cases

236 were reported in 2021 (see Fig. 1).



237

238 **Fig. 1** Weeks which reported **A,** Ebola virus disease (EVD) cases and **B,** conflict exposure for the

239 Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Guinea (GUI).

In the DRC, EVD cases for the 2018-2020 outbreak were commonly reported in areas of high conflict frequency, namely the Kivu provinces. Similar results were found for Guinea, with all EVD cases being reported in the two regions that reported the highest conflict event frequency (Conakry and N'Zérékoré), but with overall lower levels of reported conflict compared to the DRC. The most frequent conflict sub-event types (event types) in the fitted data varied by country. For the DRC, these included armed clashes (battles), attacks (violence against civilians) and peaceful protests (protests). In Guinea, the most reported conflict sub-event types (event types) were violent demonstrations (riots), peaceful protests (protests) and mob violence (riots) (Table 2).

Table 2 Frequency of conflict event types & sub-event types in the data fitted to the model for the 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

261 The effect of conflict on EVD varied sub-nationally in terms of magnitude and uncertainty (Fig. 2).
262 In the first week of the reported conflict exposure, the administrative units with the highest reported
263 effect were Mbandaka (Équateur, DRC), Mwenga (Sud-Kivu, DRC), Goma (Nord-Kivu, DRC),
264 Butembo (Nord-Kivu, DRC) and N'Zérékoré (Guinea) with IRR values of 4.26 (0.58-31.2 95%CI),
265 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
266 95%CI), respectively. Some areas did not present significant results, often having higher
267 uncertainty, including Aru, Bolomba, Ingende, Mbandaka in the DRC and Conakry in Guinea.



268

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

272

273 *By Event Type*

274 The greatest impact for conflict event sub-type was armed clashes in Guinea (IRR = 3.45, 0.80-
275 14.8 95%CI) (Fig. 3); however, this was not statistically significant, along with 12 other conflict sub-
276 types in Guinea (abduction/forced disappearances, arrests, attacks, change to group/activity,
277 disrupted weapons use, excessive force against protesters, looting/property destruction, mob
278 violence, other, peaceful protests, protests with intervention and sexual violence). Violent
279 demonstrations had the greatest significant impact on EVD cases in Guinea causing a 2.38 (1.04-
280 5.41 95%CI) times increased risk of EVD.
281
282 Only three conflict event sub-types were not significantly associated with EVD incidence in the
283 DRC: air/drone strikes, disrupted weapons use and headquarters or base establishments (mainly
284 due to very small sample sizes). For the conflict sub-types that did have a significant effect,
285 shelling/artillery/missile attack had the biggest effect on EVD cases at 3.44 (1.27-9.3195%CI) times
286 increased risk, followed by peaceful protests (IRR = 3.11, 2.66-3.64 95%CI), excessive force
287 against protesters (2.83, 1.60-5.03 95%CI), looting/property destruction (2.69, 2.18-3.31 95%CI),
288 protests with interventions (2.68, 2.05-3.52 95%CI) and violent demonstrations (2.58, 2.00-3.34
289 95%CI) (Fig. 3). For the results regarding conflict event type (rather than sub-event types), see
290 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 3 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.

329 On average, over the four-year period, battles were further away from major cities in both
330 countries, followed by protests and riots in the DRC and riots and then protests in Guinea (for
331 maps, see Additional file 4: Fig. S2). Compared to the average distance between all conflict events
332 and major settlements, battles were 6.33km further away in the DRC and 17.2km further away in
333 Guinea. In the DRC, protests were 2.99km closer and riots 3.33km closer, compared to the
334 average distance. For Guinea, protests and riots were 11.4km and 5.73km closer, respectively.
335
336 **Table 3** Battles, riots and protests in terms of EVD risks by number of conflict fatalities, the
337 percentage of total fatalities and the difference in average proximity from conflict events to major
338 settlements (event type average distance minus all conflicts average distance) for the full four-year
339 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

340
341 **Discussion**
342 During recent EVD outbreaks in 2018 to 2021, we quantified the risk of conflict event exposure and
343 found an increased risk at a national level by a similar magnitude in the DRC and Guinea, at 1.88
344 and 1.98 times, respectively. The uncertainty in the IRR values for Guinea throughout all the
345 analyses was much wider than the DRC. In the distribution of the exposures and events data fit to
346 the model, there was overlap with areas of high reported conflict and EVD case frequency. Several
347 of the regions/territories analysed had higher IRR values than the national risk: Mbandaka,
348 Mwenga, Goma, Butembo (all in the DRC) and N'Zérékoré (in Guinea), which ranged from 2.06 to
349 4.26.

We evaluated if certain types of conflict may be more impactful than others, to contribute to our understanding of how conflict can change disease risk. The conflict sub-event types with the greatest impacts in terms of EVD risk were armed clashes in Guinea and shelling/artillery/missile attack in the DRC. However, both armed clashes and shelling/artillery/missile attacks had the largest uncertainty. Violent demonstrations had the strongest and most significant impact in Guinea, while in the DRC, peaceful protests, excessive force against protesters, looting/property destruction, protests with interventions and violent demonstrations had the largest, most significant impact, with little uncertainty.

The cornerstone of EVD control is through identifying cases and reducing contact with infected bodily fluids (and vaccination) [8,10]. Conflict can impact these control measures in multiple ways. In previous EVD outbreaks, weak health systems (due to access, supplies, safety of staff and patients and fear), complex socio-cultural and political environments (creating mistrust in governments and NGOs) and ineffective messaging and community engagement have all created problems in EVD response [20,38]. Additionally, there have been difficulties in administering EVD vaccines due to damaged transportation and infrastructure, although continued efforts aim to reach those most at risk [11,16,39]. Conflict and EVD can create a positive feedback loop, and it has been previously observed that conflict increases more during EVD outbreaks compared to controls [18,19]. A suggested explanation is that EVD outbreaks may further destabilise fragile regions and fuel conflicts. For example, mistrust increased in the DRC during the 2018-2019 EVD outbreak due to the government's decision to ban populations in the affected provinces from participating in the presidential election [18,19].

A potential explanation for the large number of protest-related impacts on EVD cases found here, may be due to these events being more disruptive to a greater number of people. Protests rely on large congregations of people, increasing contact among individuals and therefore fueling EVD transmission. Furthermore, protests and demonstrations may be more likely to impact

transportation, education and healthcare, due to the widespread disruption they can cause in dense urban areas [40,41]. Disruption of healthcare and transportation may be particularly damaging in controlling EVD, as it could complicate contact tracing and delay testing, diagnosis and treatment. Further evidence for this explanation may be that within these very impactful sub-events, looting/property destruction was also found highly impactful and important, which is often the product of protests and demonstrations and results in damage to healthcare infrastructure and supplies.

During 2018 to 2021, battles were the furthest away from major settlements in both countries, compared to protests and riots. Proximity may impact the effect of the conflict on the population, both in terms of the number of people affected and the magnitude of the effect. Proximity may also add further evidence to the above hypothesis that protests and demonstrations, although potentially less violent, may be more impactful than battles and armed clashes. Battles (in terms of the ACLED's definition [29]) are more likely to be fought on pre-defined battle "grounds", which are less likely to be close to settlements. Alternatively, these settlements, including their healthcare and testing facilities are quickly displaced and abandoned following the onset of conflict due to the immediate threat to life [42]. The absence of testing facilities may result in cases not being identified and reported, therefore making battles appear less impactful to EVD transmission.

A potential explanation for why remote violence/explosions and battles were very impactful but often with higher uncertainty is that these types of conflict occurred less frequently, but when they did, they had a very large impact on EVD cases. The fewer events therefore resulted in the large uncertainty and more data (if available) may help to understand if the larger impact of these conflict types is consistent through time. Additionally, peoples' behaviour and risks must be considered during more "extreme" forms of violence such as battles and explosions, compared to protests and demonstrations. Violent conflict may have a very large initial impact (accounting for the high IRR values), but then the risk stabilises in the area as civilians take precautions (e.g., displacement) to protect their life [43].

Alternatively, there is the potential for more violent forms of conflict (such as battles and explosions) to decrease the risk of EVD. People may be more likely to stay at home during these events or be subject to curfews and not mix in public spaces, decreasing their exposure to the pathogen [44]. Furthermore, severe conflict may be more fatal (of both civilians and combatants), reducing the susceptible pool for EVD cases. More work is needed to understand how to quantity conflict severity for scientific research purposes, which could be used to identify dose-response relationships with disease, while still considering that conflicts impact individuals differently in terms of disruption and severity.

When extending the exposure periods, the effect of conflict on EVD cases was almost eliminated by 10 weeks in the DRC, while in Guinea, the risk of EVD cases decreased to 4 weeks and then increased by 10 weeks. However, it appears that extending the lag periods may have been diluting the effect of conflict on EVD cases, as changing the lag periods to a single week made all the lag periods for both countries more significant and impactful. These results track with previous research which found synchronicity and correlation between the reporting of EVD cases and conflict in the DRC and suggest that the effect of conflict may be long-lasting [11,19].

The results show that conflict is still highly influential multiple months following the event, and in some instances, conflict had a greater and more significant effect on EVD with time. A potential explanation may be due to the disruption caused by the conflict event having a cumulative effect. Previous findings suggest that conflict lengthens the EVD treatment process, e.g., longer times to detection, isolation, treatment and vaccination, creating a lasting effect and prolonging outbreaks [18]. Therefore, time would be needed for EVD cases to increase and be reported, after elevated transmission.

There are several limitations to the datasets used here, the first being the assumption that if EVD or conflict occurs, it is correctly identified (e.g., confirmed and suspected EVD cases were

434 included) and reported on the correct day with no delay, where the transmission event/symptom
435 onset occurred. These assumptions are unlikely, as EVD cases may be missed if cases never
436 seek formal medical assistance or are in hard-to-reach areas. Furthermore, the categorisation of
437 conflict events is subjective (category definitions were included in Additional file 1) and several
438 categories are ambiguous. Data availability was limited and sub-setting the data (by sub-national
439 unit or conflict sub-event type) led to small sample sizes in some instances, resulting in wide
440 uncertainty, statistical insignificance or the models not being able to fit, particularly in Guinea.
441 However, generally the findings were replicated in both countries, in terms of sub-event type, the
442 effects of lag and geographic distribution of risk.
443
444 The methodology accounts for confounders by fixing them across the administrative unit. It is not
445 as effective across multiple administrative units. Sub-national units are different geographical
446 sizes, with different population sizes and risk factors. Therefore, comparing different
447 regions/territories can create misleading results. Additionally, the use of vaccination during these
448 more recent outbreaks [45,46], makes comparison to previous work challenging. While data on
449 Ebola vaccination are available, the use of ring vaccination makes it difficult to incorporate
450 vaccination data into the model used here (as a binary outcome) [38,46]. For example, the sub-
451 national region with the largest IRR here was Équateur, part of the DRC which has received
452 relatively little vaccination, compared to the eastern provinces [38].
453
454 **Conclusions**
455 The research presented here highlights the increased risk that conflict has had on EVD cases in
456 the DRC and Guinea in recent resurgences. The risks of conflict on EVD was spatially
457 heterogenous and appears to last for several months and may be longer-lasting. Protests and riot-
458 related conflict event types were highly influential, potentially being more disruptive to more people,
459 compared to more violent forms of conflict e.g., battles. More research to understand how best to
460 quantify conflict severity and intensity could provide further evidence for these mechanisms.
461

462 Extra vigilance is needed following protest- and riot-related conflict events for EVD transmission.
463 Continued efforts are needed to try and account for the long-term effect of conflict on EVD and
464 other infectious diseases. Effective public health messaging and scaling up testing in urban areas
465 may help to mitigate these risks, including information on how to reduce transmission in dense
466 urban areas and early clinical symptoms to be aware of. Ebola treatment centres should be
467 prepared for an increase in cases following conflict events for multiple months, with sufficient
468 vaccination stocks made available to areas most at risk.
469

470 **List of abbreviations**

471 ACLED - Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project
472 CI – Confidence Interval
473 DRC – Democratic Republic of the Congo
474 EVD – Ebola Virus Disease
475 GUI – Guinea
476 HEMA - Humanitarian Emergency Response Africa
477 IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio
478 MoH – Ministry of Health
479 NGOs – Non-Governmental Organisations
480 SCCS – Self-Controlled Case Series
481 WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
482

483 **Declarations**

484 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*
485 Although the work presented here uses human data, all the data used are from public available
486 data sources, which are none identifiable and therefore ethical approval was waived for this
487 analysis.
488

489 *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.
6. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). History of Ebola Disease Outbreaks. https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/chronology.html (2022)
7. Adepoju P. Lessons from Ebola as DRC grapples with conflict, measles, and covid-19. BMJ. 2020 Jul 21;370.
8. Mukadi-Bamuleka D, Mambu-Mbika F, De Weggheleire A, Edidi-Atani F, Bulabula-Penge J, Mfumu MMK, et al. Efficiency of Field Laboratories for Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak during Chronic Insecurity, Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2018-2020. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2023;29(1):1-9.

544 9. Kinganda-Lusamaki E, Black A, Mukadi DB, Hadfield J, Mbala-Kingebeni P, Pratt CB, et al.
545 Integration of genomic sequencing into the response to the Ebola virus outbreak in Nord
546 Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo. Nat. Med. 2021;27(4):710-716.
547 10. Mukadi-Bamuleka D, Sanogo YO, Bulabula-Penge J, Morales-Betoulle ME, Fillon P,
548 Woodruff P, et al. RDT Working Group. Postmortem Surveillance for Ebola Virus Using
549 OraQuick Ebola Rapid Diagnostic Tests, Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2019-
550 2020. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2022;28(2):420-424.
551 11. Wells CR, Pandey A, Ndeffo Mbah ML, Gaüzère BA, Malvy D, Singer BH, et al. The
552 exacerbation of Ebola outbreaks by conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PNAS.
553 2019;116(48):24366-72.
554 12. Mbala-Kingebeni P, Aziza A, Di Paola N, Wiley MR, Makiala-Mandanda S, Caviness K, et
555 al. Medical countermeasures during the 2018 Ebola virus disease outbreak in the North Kivu
556 and Ituri Provinces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: a rapid genomic assessment.
557 Lancet Infect, Dis. 2019;19(6):648-657.
558 13. Wise PH, Barry M. Civil war & the global threat of pandemics. Daedalus. 2017;146(4):71-84.
559 14. Gonzalez-Torres A, Esposito E. Epidemics and conflict: Evidence from the Ebola outbreak
560 in Western Africa. Available at SSRN 3544606. 2016.
561 15. van Stekelenburg BC, De Cauwer H, Barten DG, Mortelmans LJ. Attacks on health care
562 workers in historical pandemics and COVID-19. Disaster Med. Public Health Prep.
563 2023;17:e309.
564 16. Oppenheim B, Lidow N, Ayscue P, Saylors K, Mbala P, Kumakamba C, et al. Knowledge
565 and beliefs about Ebola virus in a conflict-affected area: Early evidence from the North Kivu
566 outbreak. J. Glob, Health. 2019 Dec;9(2).
567 17. Mukadi-Bamuleka D, Nkuba-Ndaye A, Mbala-Kingebeni P, Ahuka-Mundeke S, Muyembe-
568 Tamfum JJ. Impact of ebola epidemics on the daily operation of existing systems in eastern
569 Democratic Republic of the Congo: A brief review. J Med Econ. 2024:1-5.

570 18. Vinck P, Pham PN, Bindu KK, Bedford J, Nilles EJ. Institutional trust and misinformation in
571 the response to the 2018–19 Ebola outbreak in North Kivu, DR Congo: a population-based
572 survey. Lancet Infect. Dis. 2019;19(5):529-36.
573 19. Kraemer MU, Pigott DM, Hill SC, Vanderslott S, Reiner RC, Stasse S, et al. Dynamics of
574 conflict during the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo 2018–2019.
575 BMC Med. 2020;18(1):1-0.
576 20. McPake B, Witter S, Ssali S, Wurie H, Namakula J, Ssengooba F. Ebola in the context of
577 conflict affected states and health systems: case studies of Northern Uganda and Sierra
578 Leone. Confl. Health. 2015;9(1):1-9.
579 21. Global Conflict Tracker. Instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo.
580 https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/violence-democratic-republic-congo
581 (2023).
582 22. Human Rights Watch. World Report 2023.
583 https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/media_2023/01/World_Report_2023_WEBSPREADS
584 _0.pdf (2023).
585 23. Human Rights Watch. Guinea Events of 2020. https://www.hrw.org/world-
586 report/2021/country-chapters/guinea (2020).
587 24. Charnley GEC, Jean K, Kelman I, Gaythorpe KAM, Murray KA. Association between
588 Conflict and Cholera in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Emerg. Infect.
589 Dis. 2022;28(12):2472-81.
590 25. Meakin S. Data for the 2018 outbreak of Ebola in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in
591 North-Kivu and Ituri Provinces. https://github.com/sophiemeakin/ebola_drc (2019).
592 26. Ministère de la Santé de la République Démocratique du Congo. Mailing list.
593 https://us13.campaign-
594 archive.com/home/?u=89e5755d2cca4840b1af93176&id=aedd23c530 (2019).
595 27. Human Emergency Response Africa (HEMA). Democratic Republic of the Congo: Ebola
596 (2021) Subnational cases. https://data.humdata.org/dataset/democratic-republic-of-congo-
597 ebola-2021-subnational-cases (2021).

598 28. ACAPS. GUINEA EBOLA EVD 2021 SUBNATIONAL CASES, DEATHS,
599 HOSPITALISATIONS, CONTACT TRACING, AND VACCINATIONS.
600 https://www.acaps.org/guinea-ebola-evd-2021-subnational-cases-deaths-hospitalisations-
601 contact-tracing-and-vaccinations (2021).
602 29. Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED, Wisconsin, United States). Data
603 Export Tool. https://acleddata.com/data-export-tool/ (2023).
604 30. Eck K. In data we trust? A comparison of UCDP GED and ACLED conflict events datasets.
605 Coop. Confl. 2012;47(1):124-41.
606 31. Whitaker HJ, Paddy Farrington C, Spiessens B, Musonda P. Tutorial in biostatistics: the
607 self-controlled case series method. Stat. Med. 2006;25(10):1768-97.
608 32. Therneau T. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. R package version 3.5-5.
609 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survival (2023).
610 33. Mostofsky E, Coull BA, Mittleman MA. Analysis of observational self-matched data to
611 examine acute triggers of outcome events with abrupt onset. Epidemiol. (Cambridge,
612 Mass.). 2018;29(6):804.
613 34. Xu S, Zeng C, Newcomer S, Nelson J, Glanz J. Use of fixed effects models to analyze self-
614 controlled case series data in vaccine safety studies. J. Biom. Biostat. 2012:006.
615 35. UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Field Information Services Section.
616 Democratic Republic of the Congo - major cities.
617 https://data.humdata.org/dataset/democratic-republic-of-the-congo-major-cities (2019).
618 36. Simplemaps. Guinea Cities Database. https://simplemaps.com/data/gn-cities (2023).
619 37. Hijmans RJ. geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry. R package version 1.5-18.
620 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=geosphere (2022).
621 38. Bausch DG. The need for a new strategy for Ebola vaccination. Nat. Med. 2021;27(4):580-1.
622 39. Moran B. Fighting Ebola in conflict in the DR Congo. Lancet. 2018;392(10155):1295-6.
623 40. AL JAZEERA AND NEWS AGENCIES. Several killed as protests rock Goma in eastern
624 DRC. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/12/21/several-killed-as-protests-rock-goma-in-
625 eastern-drc (2021).

41. 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).
42. 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).
43. 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).
44. 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).
45. Maxmen A. Ebola vaccine approved for use in ongoing outbreak. Nature. 2017 May 30;10.
46. World Health Organization. Ebola virus disease: Vaccines. https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/ebola-vaccines (2020).