medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Effectiveness of one dose of killed oral cholera vaccine in an endemic community in the Democratic Republic of Congo: A matched case-control study

Espoir Bwenge Malambaka[1,2], Patrick Musole Bugeme[1,2], Chloe Hutchins[3], Hanmeng Xu[1], Juan Dent Hulse[1], Maya N. Demby[1], Karin Gallandat[3], Jaime Mufitini Saidi[4], Baron Bashige Rumedeka[1,4], Moïse Itongwa[1], Esperance Tshiwedi-Tsilabia[5], Faida Kitoga[5], Tavia Bodisa-Matamu[5], Hugo Kavunga-Membo[5,6], Justin Bengehya[7], Jean-Claude Kulondwa[7], Amanda K Debes[8], Nagède Taty[9], Elizabeth C. Lee[1], Justin Lessler[1,10,11], Daniel T Leung[12,13], Oliver Cumming[3], Placide Welo Okitayemba[9], Daniel Mukadi-Bamuleka[5,6,14], Jackie Knee[3], Andrew S Azman[1,15,16*]

[1]*Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA*

[2]*Centre for Tropical Diseases and Global Health (CTDGH), Université Catholique de Bukavu, Bukavu, Democratic Republic of the Congo*

[3]*Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK*

[4]*Ministère de la Santé Publique, Zone de Santé d'Uvira, Democratic Republic of Congo*

[5]*Rodolphe Merieux INRB-Goma Laboratory, Goma, North-Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo*

[6]*Institut National de Recherche Biomédicale, INRB, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo*

[7]*Ministère de la Santé Publique, Hygiène et Prévention, Division Provinciale de la Santé Publique du Sud-Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo*

[8]*Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA*

[9]*PNECHOL-MD, Community IMCI, Ministry of Health, Democratic Republic of the Congo*

[10]*University of North Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA*

[11]*Department of Epidemiology, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA*

[12]*Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA*

[13]*Division of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA*

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

[14]*Service of Microbiology, Department of Medical Biology, University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo*

[15]*Geneva Centre for Emerging Viral Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland*

[16]*Division of Tropical and Humanitarian Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland*

* Correspondence to:

Dr Andrew S Azman,
Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA
azman@jhu.edu

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background

A global shortage of cholera vaccines has increased use of single-dose regimens, rather than the standard two-dose regimen. There is limited evidence on single-dose protection, particularly in children. In late 2020 a mass vaccination campaign was conducted in Uvira, a cholera endemic urban setting in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. Coverage surveys showed that the majority of vaccinated people received only one dose. We examined the effectiveness of a single-dose of the oral cholera vaccine Euvichol-plus in this high-burden setting.

Methods

In this case-control study, we recruited medically-attended confirmed cholera cases and age-, sex-, and neighborhood-matched community controls during two distinct periods after mass vaccination, October 2021 to March 2022 (12-17 months post-vaccination) and October 2022 to May 2023 (24-31 months post-vaccination). The odds of vaccination in cases and controls were contrasted in conditional logistic regression models to estimate unadjusted and adjusted vaccine effectiveness.

Findings

We enrolled 432 confirmed cases and 1554 matched controls during the two study periods with 21.5% of cases being under five years old. The adjusted single-dose VE was 52% (95% CI: 32·3–66) 12-17 months post-vaccination and 40·8% (95% CI: 8·6–61·7) 24-31 months post-vaccination. Combining the two study periods led to an adjusted single-dose VE of 45% (95% CI 28·2–57·8), with no significant differences among children under five years old and older individuals.

Interpretation

A single-dose of Euvichol-Plus provided substantial protection against medically-attended cholera for at least 31 months post-vaccination in this cholera endemic setting.

Funding

This work was supported by the Wellcome Trust and Gavi (GAVI-RFP-2019-062).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Safe water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) is the cornerstone of cholera prevention and control. While universal access to safely-managed WASH services remains the ultimate priority, this is likely a distant prospect.[1] Killed whole-cell oral cholera vaccine (kOCV) is an effective short-term intervention to reduce cholera risk in high-burden settings with limited WASH coverage and are a key component of the global roadmap to end cholera.[2] kOCVs are typically delivered as a two-dose regimen that provides protection for at least three years.[3,4] In a meta-analysis of kOCV protection, estimated two-dose efficacy was 58% (95% CI: 42 to 69), from a pool of studies measuring protection over an average of 28 months post-vaccination. Lower protection was noted among young children.[3]

The Euvichol-Plus® vaccine (Eubiologics, Seoul, Republic of Korea) is currently the only WHO-prequalified kOCV manufactured and included in the global stockpile after the Shanchol® (Shantha Biotechnics, Hyderabad, India) ceased production in 2023.[5] Euvichol-Plus® is considered a bioequivalent of Shanchol.[6] Almost all evidence of kOCVs clinical protection is based on the studies carried out on Shanchol®,[7–9] although one observational study explored the protection conferred by Euvichol-Plus® two dose regimen.[10]

Demand for kOCVs has outstripped the global supply in 2022, with only 23·5 million doses distributed out of the 33 million requested.[11] In late 2022, the International Coordinating Group, which manages the global emergency stockpile for cholera vaccines, suspended the provision of the standard two-dose regimen in emergency vaccination campaigns, replacing it with a single-dose regimen due to limited vaccine supply.[12] However, there are limited data on the protection offered by one dose of kOCV over extended periods (>12 months) or among children 1-4 years old.

Only a few studies have estimated single-dose protection in the general population, with point estimates suggesting short-term protection up to 16 months after vaccination in Haiti, with high uncertainty due to the limited sample size. [7–9,13–16] A randomized trial in Bangladesh®, the only study to provide age-stratified estimates of protection, suggested that Shanchol conferred no protection in 1-4 year olds in the first six months post-vaccination, despite the significant protection noted in older individuals for up to two years.[17,18]

In late 2020, the Ministry of Health of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) conducted a mass vaccination campaign using kOCV campaigns with Euvichol-Plus® in the city of Uvira (South Kivu province). The estimated coverage of vaccination campaigns was low and, as the majority of vaccinated individuals reported receiving one dose only, we assessed effectiveness of a single dose of kOCV during outbreaks that occurred 12-17 and 24-31 months after vaccination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Study design, setting and vaccination campaigns

We conducted a matched case-control in Uvira, a city of approximately 280,000 inhabitants on the northwestern shore of Lake Tanganyika with sporadic armed conflict, socio-political instability and population displacement. Household surveys conducted in 2016 and 2017 in Uvira indicated that surface water was the main water source for up to 37.2% of households,[19] and in areas closest to the rivers and with the worst tap water service in Uvira, more than 80% of households use drinking water contaminated with *Escherichia coli.*[20] The same surveys estimated that about half (48.2%) of Uvira population relied exclusively on supplied tap water for drinking needs in 2017[19], and a recent study showed that between 2017 and 2021, the quality of the water service remained suboptimal, or deteriorated in many parts of the city[21]. Cholera cases are detected year-round in Uvira often with distinct seasonal peaks,[22] and notable historical outbreaks.[23]

In April 2020, severe flooding caused at least 54 deaths, the displacement of approximately 80,000 people, and substantial damage to housing and WASH infrastructure in Uvira, prompting the Ministry of Health to conduct emergency cholera vaccination campaigns.[24] Vaccination took place in two rounds, from 29 July to 8 August and 1-8 October 2020 targeting all in Uvira one year and older. The campaigns included door-to-door vaccination for five days, followed by vaccination offered through health facilities. While two rounds of vaccination were implemented, in a representative household survey we conducted 11 months after vaccination, 23.1% (95% CI: 19.7-26.9%) of the participants reported receiving two doses of the vaccine and 32% (38-36%) reported receiving one dose.

Clinical cholera surveillance system in Uvira

Our study is based on enhanced clinical surveillance of cholera implemented at the two official health facilities designated to treat cholera patients in Uvira, the cholera treatment centre at the Uvira General Referral Hospital and the cholera treatment unit at the Kalundu CEPAC health centre (henceforth, "CTCs"). We attempted to identify and recruit all patients of at least 12 months old with three or more acute, watery and non-bloody stools within the 24 hours prior to the admission to the CTCs (suspected cholera). Trained healthcare staff collected rectal swabs and stools from participants. Rectal swabs were enriched in alkaline peptone water (APW) for 6-18 hours depending on patient admission time. Specimens were tested for *V. cholerae* by rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) onsite, and by culture using standard methods (Appendix) at either an in-country reference laboratory, the Laboratoire Rodolphe Mérieux de l'Institut National de Recherche Biomédicale (INRB), in Goma (from October 2021 to September 2022), or at the onsite study laboratory (from September 2022 onward). Dry filter papers for cases presenting to CTCs between October 14, 2021 and May 04, 2022 were shipped to Johns Hopkins University for PCR detection of toxigenic *V. cholerae* O1 following previously published methods.[25]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Selection of cases and controls

Two cholera outbreaks occurred after mass vaccination, and we recruited cases during each outbreak, forming two distinct study periods (Figure 1). From 21 November, 2022 to 24 January 2023, we retrospectively recruited matched controls for patients admitted to CTCs during the first outbreak (14 October 2021 to 10 March 2022), approximately 12-17 months after the second round of mass vaccination campaigns (Study Period 1). Between 17 October 2022 and 9 May 2023, we recruited matched controls for cases as they were admitted to the CTCs, 24-31 months after vaccination (Study Period 2).

Study Period 1 (SP1) included all consenting suspected cases who had been at least 12 months old during the vaccination campaigns, living in Uvira for the two weeks before the date of care seeking and during the vaccination campaigns, and with a positive cholera culture and/or PCR. We attempted to recruit four controls per case, using high-resolution satellite imagery (Appendix) to identify potential control households on the same avenue (smallest administrative unit in Uvira) as the case household. Control households were then selected by simple random spatial sampling of digitized residential structures. Controls were eligible for enrollment if: (1) they matched the case age group (1-4, 5-9, 10-19, 20-39, 40-59 or ≥60 years old) and sex, (2) had not been admitted for acute watery diarrhoea or cholera in the three years prior to the case admission, (3) were living in Uvira in the two weeks prior to case admission, (4) were living in Uvira at the time of the kOCV campaign and were eligible to be vaccinated, and (5) none of their household members reported being admitted to a formal health facility (as opposed to pharmacies, prayer homes or traditional healers) for acute watery diarrhea or cholera in the four weeks prior to case admission.

During Study Period 2 (SP2), the case definition included the same age and residence criteria as in SP1, but cases had to test positive with both APW-enriched rapid diagnostic test (RDT) and culture (performed at the onsite laboratory). We used enriched RDT results to help prioritize control recruitment due to limited human resources during the outbreak. In contrast to SP1, we conducted a home visit within three days of hospital discharge to investigate the living and WASH conditions in each case's household and ascertain the vaccination status outside the hospital environment (as done with the controls). We excluded patients who died during hospitalization and those whose residence could not be found during home visits. As in SP1, four neighborhood controls were recruited from four randomly selected households around that of the case, though during this study period we selected households using the 'right-hand' rule (Appendix) In addition to the recruitment criteria used in SP1, controls were eligible for enrolment in SP2 if their household matched that of the case by size (≤5 individuals, 6-10 individuals, and >10 individuals) and had at least one child below five years of age when the case household had one.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Vaccination status ascertainment and potential confounding variables

Study staff administered structured questionnaires to all cases and controls (or their parent/guardian) to capture demographics, household conditions, potential confounding variables and vaccination status. Before asking each case or control whether they were vaccinated, study staff showed them photos of the vaccine vials used and someone taking the vaccine in addition to explaining when and how the vaccines were delivered in Uvira, and how these may differ from other campaigns and routine vaccines. Participants reporting vaccination were asked the number of doses and when and where each one was taken. We also used vaccination cards to verify the vaccination status whenever possible. In SP1, vaccine-related questions were asked to cases in the clinic and in SP2 they were asked both in the clinic and a subsequent home visit. Any differences in the vaccination status reporting between the clinic and household interviews were solved through a third interview at the case's household followed by a review of the data, discussion and consensus within the study team.

Statistical analyses

The characteristics of study participants were compared using the Wilcoxon rank sum and Pearson's Chi-squared (or Fisher's exact) tests. In the primary analysis, we compared the odds of being vaccinated with a single kOCV dose between cases and controls using conditional logistic regression models. Those reporting to have received 2 or more doses were dropped from the primary analyses. The vaccine effectiveness (VE) was calculated as one minus the estimated odds ratio of having received a single dose of vaccine, between cases and controls. To produce age-group specific estimates of effectiveness, the conditional logistic regression model included an interaction term for age group (1-4 vs. ≥5) and the vaccination status. Overall estimates of VE were thus derived as a weighted proportion of the VE in the two age-groups. For combined (12-31 months) estimates and those from SP1, we incorporated age as a continuous variable to adjust for a potential residual confounder after matching by age group. For SP2, estimates were adjusted for a set of potential confounders including the age and household size (as continuous variables), household wealth index derived from a principal component analysis of household assets ownership, type of sanitation facility, whether the participant used a toilet shared by multiple households compared to using a private toilet, drinking water sources, and availability of a hand washing facility and soap, as per our *a priori* causal diagram (Appendix). We fit three other regression model variants with different sets of covariates to assess the robustness of the estimates (Appendix). In a secondary analysis, we estimated the VE for at least one dose and two doses of kOCV compared to the unvaccinated group. While we primarily relied on 95% confidence intervals (CI) to assess statistical significance, we considered p-values statistically significant when they were less than 0.05. Analyses were performed in R (version 4.2.3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Ethical considerations

Ethical approvals were obtained from Institutional Review Boards of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health (IRB00015785), the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (25365) and the École de Santé Publique at the University of Kinshasa (ESP/CE/65/2021). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants ≥18 years, with written assent from those <18 years in addition to written consent from their parent/guardian.

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data analysis, interpretation, preparation of this manuscript, or the decision to publish.

Results

Cholera incidence in Uvira and recruitment of study participants

We recruited 432 confirmed cholera cases and 1554 matched controls during the two study periods (Figure 1), with 38·2% of cases enrolled in the first period. The median age of participants at the time of the vaccination campaigns was 14·0 (interquartile range 5·0, 30·0) years and 22·4% were under 5 years old (Table 1). Fifty six percent of cases were recorded as severely dehydrated on admission. Cases were significantly older during the first study period compared to the second period ($p<0.001$) though they all had similar dehydration status (Table S2). 273 (88·9%) of all the 307 culture positive isolates were Ogawa serotypes, the rest were Inaba.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Number of cholera cases admitted to cholera treatment facilities in Uvira. Panels A (Study Period 1) and B (Study Period 2) illustrate the cumulative number of confirmed cases in each study period by neighborhood (avenue) across the city, with the locations of the two health facilities where patients were recruited shown as dots. There were 14 cases living in neighboring communities outside the city boundaries that were included in Study Period 2. The second outbreak (Study Period 2) started in the northern part of the city and spread to a refugee camp where many residents were admitted to the CTC but not included in the study as they were not living in Uvira at the time of vaccination. Panel C illustrates the epidemic curve of suspected and confirmed cholera cases admitted to the cholera treatment center (CTC) at the Uvira General Referral Hospital and the cholera treatment unit (CTU) at the Kalundu CEPAC health center. Cholera was confirmed by APW-enriched RDT, culture or PCR (Study Period 1), or by culture alone (Study Period 2). Among the 183 suspected cases that were detected before SP1 (in grey), 146 (79.8) were tested for *Vibrio cholerae* O1 by enriched RDT with 37 (25.3%) testing positive.

Overall, 22·2% of cases reported having received one dose of kOCV and 65.5% were unvaccinated. In comparison, 33·7% of matched controls reported receiving a single dose of kOCV and 53·3% were unvaccinated. Only 13·6% of vaccinated participants were able to show a vaccination card and 12.9% reported having received two doses of the vaccine (Table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Flow chart of participant recruitment. Cases with unavailable culture results are those for which 1) suspected colonies were isolated, 2) with positive oxidase test at the field laboratory, 3) missing agglutination results due to an antiserum stockout, 4) and/or in which attempts to revitalize *Vibrio cholerae* O1 strains at the reference laboratory in Goma were unsuccessful.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Characteristics of participants by case and control status.

Characteristic	Overall, N = 1,986	Cases, N = 432	Controls, N = 1,554	p-value
Age group* (years)				0.964
1-4	444 (22.4%)	93 (21.5%)	351 (22.6%)	
5-9	343 (17.3%)	81 (18.8%)	262 (16.9%)	
10-19	467 (23.5%)	99 (22.9%)	368 (23.7%)	
20-39	377 (19.0%)	82 (19.0%)	295 (19.0%)	
40-59	237 (11.9%)	52 (12.0%)	185 (11.9%)	
≥60	118 (5.9%)	25 (5.8%)	93 (6.0%)	
Sex				0.795
Female	958 (48.2%)	206 (47.7%)	752 (48.4%)	
Male	1,028 (51.8%)	226 (52.3%)	802 (51.6%)	
Vaccination status				<0.001
Not Vaccinated	1,111 (55.9%)	283 (65.5%)	828 (53.3%)	
One Dose	619 (31.2%)	96 (22.2%)	523 (33.7%)	
Two Doses	256 (12.9%)	53 (12.3%)	203 (13.1%)	
Vaccination card unavailable	119 (13.6%)	18 (12.4%)	101 (14.0%)	0.640

* age group refers to the age on the first day of the second mass vaccination campaign round (01 October 2020).

Additional data on socio-demographic and household characteristics were collected in SP2 (Table 2). Controls were more likely to report drinking water from an improved source compared to cases (68.1% vs 59.8%, p=0·044) Likewise, cases were more likely to use toilets shared by multiple households (63%) than controls (52%, p=0·011). Also, a higher proportion of case households (47·9%) had soap and water available for handwashing at the time of the visit, compared to the controls (38·6%, p = 0·035), though this was likely a result of hygiene kit distribution in case households conducted by the Uvira health zone.

Table 2. Characteristics of study participants in the vaccine effectiveness analysis 24-31 months after vaccination

Characteristic	Overall, N = 804	case, N = 165	control, N = 639	P value
Age group (years)*				0.614
1-4	231 (28.7%)	43 (26.1%)	188 (29.4%)	
5-9	175 (21.8%)	44 (26.7%)	131 (20.5%)	
10-19	161 (20.0%)	30 (18.2%)	131 (20.5%)	
20-39	128 (15.9%)	26 (15.8%)	102 (16.0%)	
40-59	68 (8.5%)	15 (9.1%)	53 (8.3%)	
≥60	41 (5.1%)	7 (4.2%)	34 (5.3%)	
Sex				0.689
Female	401 (49.9%)	80 (48.5%)	321 (50.2%)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Male	403 (50.1%)	85 (51.5%)	318 (49.8%)	
Education attainment**				0.779
Bachelors or higher	17 (7.2%)	4 (9.5%)	13 (6.7%)	
Lower secondary	34 (14.5%)	6 (14.3%)	28 (14.5%)	
None or primary	65 (27.7%)	13 (31.0%)	52 (26.9%)	
Upper secondary	119 (50.6%)	19 (45.2%)	100 (51.8%)	
Occupation				0.810
Salaried	36 (4.5%)	7 (4.2%)	29 (4.5%)	
Informal work	152 (18.9%)	28 (17.0%)	124 (19.4%)	
Students	349 (43.4%)	69 (41.8%)	280 (43.8%)	
Preschool children	176 (21.9%)	39 (23.6%)	137 (21.4%)	
No work	91 (11.3%)	22 (13.3%)	69 (10.8%)	
Household size, Median (IQR)	7.0 (6.0, 9.0)	7.0 (5.0, 9.0)	7.0 (6.0, 9.0)	0.858
Children under 5 years				0.425
Zero	182 (22.7%)	40 (24.4%)	142 (22.2%)	
1-2	536 (66.7%)	103 (62.8%)	433 (67.8%)	
≥3	85 (10.6%)	21 (12.8%)	64 (10.0%)	
Missing	1	1	0	
Living in household with improved drinking water source	529 (66.4%)	98 (59.8%)	431 (68.1%)	0.044
Living in household with shared toilet	436 (54.2%)	104 (63.0%)	332 (52.0%)	0.011
Living in household with improved toilet	491 (61.1%)	102 (61.8%)	389 (60.9%)	0.825
Soap and water for handwashing	351 (43.7%)	84 (50.9%)	267 (41.8%)	0.035
Electricity in household	308 (38.3%)	53 (32.1%)	255 (39.9%)	0.067
Wealth index***	-0.7 (-46.7; 37.3)	-8.8 (-48.6; 29.7)	-0.7 (-46.7; 38.1)	0.090
Vaccination status				0.058
Not Vaccinated	432 (53.7%)	98 (59.4%)	334 (52.3%)	
One Dose	267 (33.2%)	42 (25.5%)	225 (35.2%)	
Two Doses	105 (13.1%)	25 (15.2%)	80 (12.5%)	
Vaccination card available	56 (15.3%)	11 (17.5%)	45 (14.8%)	0.593

* age group refers to the age on the first day of the second mass vaccination campaign round (01 October 2020). **The question about education attainment was only asked to individuals aged ≥ 18 years. *** Wealth index was multiplied by 100. The higher the wealth index the richer the household.

Combining data from both study periods, 12-31 months post-vaccination, we estimated an unadjusted and adjusted single-dose VE of 45·5% (95% Confidence Interval [CI] 29·0–58·2) and 44.8% (95% CI 27·9–57·7), with no significant differences between those 1-4 years old and older individuals (unadjusted p=0.975 and adjusted p = 0.958).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

In SP1, 12-17 months after vaccination, we estimated an unadjusted and adjusted single-dose VE of 51·7% (95% CI: 31·8–65·8) and 50·3% (95% CI: 29.6–64·9). In SP2, 24-31 months after vaccination, we estimated an unadjusted VE of 33·9% (95% CI: -0·6–56·6) and an adjusted VE of 40·8% (95% CI: 8·6–61·7).

The adjusted VE for 1-4-year olds in SP1 (48·3%; 95% CI: -17·2–77·2) and in SP2 (44·7%; 95% CI: -17·3–74) were similar to one another, and to estimates for older individuals, though confidence intervals included the null (Table 3).

Table 3. Effectiveness of a single dose of oral cholera vaccine, 12-17 months and 24-31 months after vaccination campaigns

Population	Cases	Controls	Unadjusted VE (95% CI)	Adjusted VE (95% CI)
12-31 months after vaccination*				
Overall	379	1,351	45.5% (29.0–58.2)	44.8% (27.9–57.7)
1-4 years	77	320	45.9% (7.0–68.6)	45.5% (6.1–68.3)
≥5 years	302	1,031	45.4% (26.5–59.4)	44.6% (25.3–58.9)
12-17 months after vaccination (Study Period 1)*				
Overall	239	792	51.7% (31.8–65.8)	50.3% (29.6–64.9)
1-4 years	41	153	47.9% (-17.8–76.9)	48.3% (-17.2–77.2)
≥5 years	198	639	52.6% (30.9–67.4)	50.8% (28–66.3)
24-31 months after vaccination (Study Period 2)				
Overall	140	559	33.9% (-0.6–56.6)	40.8% (8.6–61.7)
1-4 years	36	167	43.2% (-17.7–72.6)	44.8% (-17.1–74)
≥5 years	104	392	29.7% (-14.6–56.9)	39.1% (-1.4–63.4)

*: In SP1 and in analyses combining data from both study periods, we only adjusted for age as a continuous variable.

In secondary analyses, we estimate the adjusted cumulative VE for at least one dose of kOCV to be 39·9% (95% CI: 24·2–52·4 (Table S5). This estimate, which includes those who report having received two doses of kOCV, is slightly lower than our single-dose estimate and is driven by unexpectedly low, though uncertain, estimates for 1-4-year olds in SP1 (Table S3).

Discussion

We found that a single dose of Euvichol-Plus kOCV provided protection against cholera for at least 31 months post-vaccination, with no significant differences in protection between children under five years old and older individuals. Our study provides unique, policy-relevant insights into kOCV protection as we estimated single-dose effectiveness from the only available and most widely used cholera vaccine today, including estimates of effectiveness for 1-4-year-olds and at discrete time windows after vaccination. Our results suggest that at least in cholera endemic areas like Uvira, the use of a single-dose kOCV may provide significant protection across the population on the scale of years rather than just months.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

To date, one randomized trial[17,18] and seven observational studies have included estimates of one-dose protection of kOCVs.[7–9,13–15,26] Most of these studies have been short-term estimates of protection measured for just a few months after vaccination and showed similar levels of protection to two doses on this timescale. Two notable exceptions where protection was measured over a longer period include a randomized trial in Bangladesh and a case-control study in Haiti, both using Shanchol. The Bangladesh trial was conducted for two years and estimated 54% (95% CI: 16 to 75) efficacy in the first year and 67% (43 to 81) in the second year post-vaccination among those five years and older.[17] The case-control study in Haiti showed that a single dose of kOCV (Shanchol) conferred 58% (95% CI: 4 to 82%) protection at 16 months post-vaccination, with the confidence intervals including zero protection from 17-months post-vaccination and onward.[14] Our results are consistent with these previous studies in showing significant protection for the overall population for longer than a year, though it is important to note that Uvira, like Haiti (at the time of the study) and Bangladesh, is endemic for cholera so the first dose may have acted as a booster for previously exposed individuals. In such settings, a single dose of cholera vaccine administered through mass vaccination campaigns may be sufficient to elicit a strong mucosal anamnestic response, mediated by memory B cells and previously shown to be associated with long-term protection against cholera.[27] More work is needed to characterize the epidemiologic settings where one dose may provide comparable levels of protection to the full regimen, and might include leveraging historic incidence rates of cholera or, perhaps, population-level immunologic measures of previous exposures.[28]

Before this study, only one estimate of single-dose protection of a kOCV in 1-4-year olds had been published. This trial, in Bangladesh, suggested that young children did not benefit from a single dose of Shanchol, even during the first six months post-vaccination.[17,18] In contrast, we found evidence that a single dose of Euvichol-Plus was similarly effective among 1-4-year olds and the rest of the population in Uvira for up to 31 months post-vaccination. This observation is in line with studies showing similar levels of protection after natural infection between the two age groups.[29] Conflicting estimates between young children and older individuals have also been observed in kOCV studies with the full dose regimen, though there are only a handful of studies that present age-stratified estimates. While most studies have found lower effectiveness in young children, the difference in protection has been highly variable with large uncertainty (e.g., ranging from no apparent difference in Vietnam after 10 months,[30] to 73% lower protective efficacy among children in Bangladesh over 6 months post-vaccination[18]). Our observation that a single dose of Euvichol-Plus offered similar protection among young children and older individuals, in contrast to previous studies of other OCVs, could be explained by several factors including pre-existing population immunity and season of vaccination as shown with other diseases,[31] differences both in gut microbiota composition and in prevalence of enteropathy.[32,33]

This study comes with several limitations. First, like many previous vaccine effectiveness studies in low- and middle-income settings, the vaccination status was self-reported,[7,14,15] and only 7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

cases in SP1 and 12 cases in SP2 were able to provide a vaccination card. Measurements of the number of doses received months to years after a mass vaccination campaign is prone to recall bias, particularly in a place like Uvira where several mass vaccination campaigns for different epidemic-prone diseases are organized annually. Imperfect reporting of vaccination status may lead to overestimation of the proportion of vaccinated people, thus an underestimation of the VE, if for instance some unvaccinated cases are tempted to report that they were vaccinated due to social desirability bias or an expectation that it may influence the quality of care they receive in the CTC. To minimize biases in classification of vaccination status we used visual aids and a series of structured questions and hospital and study staff reassured patients that their responses to the study questions would in no way affect their care. Reassuringly, the coverage ascertained in the controls was similar to the coverage we measured in community coverage surveys. There were slight differences in the protocols of the case-control study in each study period, challenging the interpretability of the joint estimates from both periods. study period, challenging the interpretability of the joint estimates from both periods. However, in sensitivity analyses simulating similar diagnostic criteria for cases in SP1 as SP2, our qualitative findings remained consistent (Table S6). The retrospective recruitment of controls for cases admitted during the SP1 precluded adjustment for individual and household factors that may have influenced cholera disease risk or vaccine acceptability. Despite the fact that the number of cases under five years of age was higher than in most published VE studies, our sample size in this important age group was still small and led to wide confidence intervals around VE estimates. Finally, we were unable to obtain reliable estimates of two dose protection partly because few cases reported receipt of two doses of kOCV due to low vaccination coverage in the population, and potentially because of uncertainty in the reporting of more than one dose of kOCV (Tables S3 and S4).

Our findings provide reassurance that the current policy of providing a single dose of kOCV in outbreaks, especially in endemic settings, provides protection to the overall population during the acute outbreak period and likely well beyond. While more data are needed across different settings and for longer periods of time, our study extends the current evidence base on protection from a single-dose of kOCV, and more specifically on protection from Euvichol-Plus, the most widely used cholera vaccine available today.

Declarations

Funding

This work was supported by the Wellcome Trust and Gavi (GAVI-RFP-2019-062).

Authors' contributions

EBM and ASA conceived and designed the study. EBM, PMB, CH, HX, JDH, KG, BBR, JN and ASA contributed to the design and implementation of the data collection and management

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

systems. JMS, TV-M, HK-M and DB-M provided operational support at the study site and reference laboratory. EBM and PMB supervised the clinical and household data collection. CH, KG, AKD, BBR, MI, ET-T, FK and JN contributed to microbiological aspects of the project. EBM and ASA analyzed the data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to Faraja Masema Lulela, Joël Faraja Zigashane Mashauri, Jean-Marie Masugamuhanya Cirhonda, the CTCs nurses and field investigators for their support for the data collection. We also thank the Head of the Uvira Health Zone, Dr Panzu Nimi, and the Director of the Uvira General Referral Hospital, Dr Salomon Mashupe, for their operational and administrative support throughout this study.

Data sharing

Code and data from this study are available at https://github.com/HopkinsIDD/uvira_onedose_ocv_ve.

References

1 Deshpande A, Miller-Petrie MK, Lindstedt PA, *et al.* Mapping geographical inequalities in access to drinking water and sanitation facilities in low-income and middle-income countries, 2000–17. *The Lancet Global Health* 2020; **8**: e1162–85.

2 World Health Organization. Global Task Force on Cholera Control. Ending Cholera, a Global Roadmap to 2030. World Health Organization, 2017.

3 Bi Q, Ferreras E, Pezzoli L, *et al.* Protection against cholera from killed whole-cell oral cholera vaccines: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2017; **17**: 1080–8.

4 Ali M, Qadri F, Kim DR, *et al.* Effectiveness of a killed whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in Bangladesh: further follow-up of a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021; **21**: 1407–14.

5 Burki T. Addressing the shortage of cholera vaccines. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2022; **22**: 1674–5.

6 Odevall L, Hong D, Digilio L, *et al.* The Euvichol story - Development and licensure of a safe, effective and affordable oral cholera vaccine through global public private partnerships. *Vaccine* 2018; **36**: 6606–14.

7 Luquero FJ, Grout L, Ciglenecki I, *et al.* Use of Vibrio cholerae vaccine in an outbreak in Guinea. *N Engl J Med* 2014; **370**: 2111–20.

8 Azman AS, Parker LA, Rumunu J, *et al.* Effectiveness of one dose of oral cholera vaccine in response to an outbreak: a case-cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health* 2016; **4**: e856–63.

9 Grandesso F, Kasambara W, Page A-L, *et al.* Effectiveness of oral cholera vaccine in preventing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

cholera among fishermen in Lake Chilwa, Malawi: A case-control study. *Vaccine* 2019; **37**: 3668–76.

10 Sialubanje C, Kapina M, Chewe O, *et al.* Effectiveness of two doses of Euvichol-plus oral cholera vaccine in response to the 2017/2018 outbreak: a matched case–control study in Lusaka, Zambia. *BMJ Open* 2022; **12**: e066945.

11 Bouhénia M. Overview of the OCV use in 2022. 2022; published online Oct 11. https://www.gtfcc.org/events/9th-meeting-of-the-gtfcc-working-group-on-oral-cholera-vaccine/ (accessed May 10, 2023).

12 World Health Organization. Shortage of cholera vaccines leads to temporary suspension of two-dose strategy, as cases rise worldwide. 2022; published online Oct 19. https://www.who.int/news/item/19-10-2022-shortage-of-cholera-vaccines-leads-to-temporary-suspension-of-two-dose-strategy--as-cases-rise-worldwide (accessed March 24, 2023).

13 Khatib AM, Ali M, von Seidlein L, *et al.* Effectiveness of an oral cholera vaccine in Zanzibar: findings from a mass vaccination campaign and observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012; **12**: 837–44.

14 Franke MF, Ternier R, Jerome JG, Matias WR, Harris JB, Ivers LC. Long-term effectiveness of one and two doses of a killed, bivalent, whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in Haiti: an extended case-control study. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018; **6**: e1028–35.

15 Ferreras E, Blake A, Chewe O, *et al.* Alternative observational designs to estimate the effectiveness of one dose of oral cholera vaccine in Lusaka, Zambia. *Epidemiol Infect* 2020; **148**: e78.

16 Ivers LC, Hilaire IJ, Teng JE, *et al.* Effectiveness of reactive oral cholera vaccination in rural Haiti: a case-control study and bias-indicator analysis. *Lancet Glob Health* 2015; **3**: e162–8.

17 Qadri F, Ali M, Lynch J, *et al.* Efficacy of a single-dose regimen of inactivated whole-cell oral cholera vaccine: results from 2 years of follow-up of a randomised trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2018; **18**: 666–74.

18 Qadri F, Wierzba TF, Ali M, *et al.* Efficacy of a Single-Dose, Inactivated Oral Cholera Vaccine in Bangladesh. *N Engl J Med* 2016; **374**: 1723–32.

19 Jeandron A. Tap water access and its relationship with cholera and other diarrhoeal diseases in an urban, cholera-endemic setting in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. 2020; published online Dec 12. DOI:10.17037/PUBS.04659288.

20 Jeandron A, Cumming O, Kapepula L, Cousens S. Predicting quality and quantity of water used by urban households based on tap water service. *npj Clean Water* 2019; **2**: 1–9.

21 Gaiffe M, Dross C, Malembaka EB, Ross I, Cumming O, Gallandat K. A fuzzy inference-based index for piped water supply service quality in a complex, low-income urban setting. *Water Res* 2023; : 120316.

22 Bugeme PM, Xu H, Hutchins C, *et al.* Cholera deaths during outbreaks in Uvira, Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, September 2021-January 2023. bioRxiv. 2023; published online June 3. DOI:10.1101/2023.05.26.23290528.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.07.23293369; this version posted August 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

23 Schyns C, Fossa A, Mutombo-Nfenda, *et al.* Cholera in Eastern Zaire, 1978. *Ann Soc Belg Med Trop* 1979; **59**: 391–400.

24 Gallandat K, Macdougall A, Jeandron A, *et al.* 1 Improved water supply infrastructure to reduce acute diarrhoeal diseases and 2 cholera in Uvira, Democratic Republic of the Congo: results and lessons learned 3 from a pragmatic trial. https://osf.io/na47d/download (accessed July 23, 2023).

25 Debes AK, Ateudjieu J, Guenou E, *et al.* Clinical and Environmental Surveillance for Vibrio cholerae in Resource Constrained Areas: Application During a 1-Year Surveillance in the Far North Region of Cameroon. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2016; **94**: 537–43.

26 Wierzba TF, Kar SK, Mogasale VV, *et al.* Effectiveness of an oral cholera vaccine campaign to prevent clinically-significant cholera in Odisha State, India. *Vaccine* 2015; **33**: 2463–9.

27 Haney DJ, Lock MD, Gurwith M, *et al.* Lipopolysaccharide-specific memory B cell responses to an attenuated live cholera vaccine are associated with protection against Vibrio cholerae infection. *Vaccine* 2018; **36**: 2768–73.

28 Azman AS, Lessler J, Luquero FJ, *et al.* Estimating cholera incidence with cross-sectional serology. *Sci Transl Med* 2019; **11**. DOI:10.1126/scitranslmed.aau6242.

29 Ali M, Emch M, Park JK, Yunus M, Clemens J. Natural Cholera Infection–Derived Immunity in an Endemic Setting. *J Infect Dis* 2011; **204**: 912–8.

30 Trach DD, Clemens JD, Ke NT, *et al.* Field trial of a locally produced, killed, oral cholera vaccine in Vietnam. *Lancet* 1997; **349**: 231–5.

31 Moore SE, Collinson AC, Fulford AJC, *et al.* Effect of month of vaccine administration on antibody responses in The Gambia and Pakistan. *Trop Med Int Health* 2006; **11**: 1529–41.

32 Zimmermann P, Curtis N. Factors That Influence the Immune Response to Vaccination. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2019; **32**. DOI:10.1128/CMR.00084-18.

33 Porras AM, Shi Q, Zhou H, *et al.* Geographic differences in gut microbiota composition impact susceptibility to enteric infection. *Cell Rep* 2021; **36**: 109457.