

1 **Associations of Water Quality with Cholera in Case-Control Studies:**
2 **A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

3
4 Short Title: A Systematic Review of Water Quality and Cholera

5
6 Thuy Tien Nguyen^{1,2}, Chaelin Kim³, Gerard Goucher³, Jong-Hoon Kim^{3*}

7
8
9
10 ¹Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry, and Epidemiology - IBE, LMU Munich,
11 Munich, Germany

12 ²Pettenkofer School of Public Health, Munich, Germany

13 ³International Vaccine Institute, Seoul, South Korea

14
15 *Corresponding author

16 Name: Jong-Hoon Kim

17 Postal address: International Vaccine Institute, SNU Research Park, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul
18 08826, South Korea

19 E-mail: jonghoon.kim@ivi.int

20
21 Keywords: Cholera; water, sanitation, and hygiene; case-control; meta-analysis; odds ratio

22 Word count: 4,407

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Cholera is a significant health risk for low- and middle-income countries (LMIC), and the threat of
26 outbreaks is likely to increase due to climate change. To keep up to date with the link between water
27 quality and cholera, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to update a previous review.
28 We searched Embase, Web of Science and PubMed for literature published between 2016 and 2022.
29 Search terms were consistent with the previous review. Study quality was assessed using Risk Of Bias
30 In Non-randomized Studies - of Exposures (ROBINS-E). Exposures of water were categorized
31 according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene
32 (JMP) and further divided by the service ladder. Odds ratios were extracted and pooled by performing
33 random-effects meta-analysis. We identified 22 new eligible studies and analysed them together with
34 the 45 studies included in the previous review. Analyses revealed higher odds of cholera when
35 consuming sachet water (OR=1.69, 95% CI: 1.13 to 2.52), unimproved water (OR=2.91, 95% CI: 1.21
36 to 7.02), surface water (OR=3.40, 95% CI: 2.52 to 4.58), and untreated water (OR=2.51, 95% CI: 2.03
37 to 3.10). Meanwhile, treating water (OR=0.42, 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.65), by boiling (OR=0.38, 95% CI:
38 0.17 to 0.84) or chlorination (OR=0.37, 95% CI: 0.17 to 0.83), and drinking basic water (OR=0.44,
39 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.69) showed protection. Pooled estimates changed with updated evidence while
40 qualitative insights on the protective or risk factors remain valid. Relatively low-cost methods like
41 boiling or chlorinating water provide good protection comparable to providing basic water to the
42 public.

43

44 Systematic review registration: PROSPERO 2021 CRD42021271881

45

46 **Introduction**

47 Cholera is an acute diarrhoeal disease caused by the bacterium *Vibrio cholerae*. The disease is mainly
48 transmitted through the faecal-oral route by consuming contaminated water or food, or through
49 person-to-person contact [1].

50 Although cholera is not a newly emerging disease, it remains a significant global public health threat,
51 especially for low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) with poor sanitation infrastructure and
52 limited access to clean water [2]. In 2022, more than 29 countries have reported new outbreaks to the
53 World Health Organization (WHO), with Lebanon and Syria not being considered cholera non-
54 endemic countries [2]. Major outbreaks often occur in areas of humanitarian crisis, political instability,
55 and water insecurity [2]. This is illustrated by the 2016 outbreak in Yemen, one of the largest cholera
56 epidemics in recent times as a result of ongoing armed conflict [3].

57 Accurately estimating the global burden of cholera is difficult. While the World Health Organization
58 (WHO) reported 323,320 cholera cases and 857 deaths in 2020, these figures are likely to be
59 considerably underestimated [4]. Factors such as inadequate surveillance systems, fears of negative
60 economic impacts on trade and tourism, lack of diagnostic tools, and the recent COVID-19 pandemic
61 may have contributed to the underreporting of cholera cases [5]. A modelling study estimated the
62 cholera burden to be between 1.3 and 4.0 million cases annually in cholera-endemic countries [6]. The
63 burden may increase with climate change putting even high-income countries at risk in future [7, 8].
64 With extreme weather events such as changing rainfall patterns, recurrent flooding, and rising
65 temperatures, the risk of faecal-oral pathogens contaminating the environment is increasing. This
66 threatens water quality and increases the transmission of waterborne diseases [7, 8]. Larger and more
67 deadly cholera outbreaks have already been observed as a consequence [2].

68 Main risk factors for cholera outbreaks are inadequate water quality, poor sanitation and hygiene, and
69 overcrowding [1]. These risks can be counteracted by implementing water, sanitation, and hygiene
70 (WASH) interventions. WASH interventions are one of the most important factors in limiting and
71 preventing outbreaks [9, 10]. The importance of WASH is being emphasized by the establishment of
72 the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program (JMP) for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in 1990. The

73 JMP monitors the global progress on WASH towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals
74 [11]. It regularly collects national and regional-level WASH estimates for more than 190 countries.
75 Data are being reported for four different WASH categories of water, sanitation, hygiene, and
76 menstrual health. The former three comprise five subcategories and cover different settings, such as
77 households, schools, and health facilities [12, 13]. Thus, understanding the WASH association with
78 cholera standardized by JMP categories can provide a way to explore the risk associated with cholera
79 in areas where JMP estimates are available.

80 Although many have already investigated the association between WASH and cholera [14-17], it is
81 important to regularly update knowledge based on new evidence. A better understanding is crucial to
82 guide decision-making and can lead to more cost-effective adaption of intervention programs and thus
83 strengthen the impact of future cholera prevention programs. To our knowledge, there is currently only
84 one systematic review and meta-analysis that explored the association between WASH exposures and
85 cholera in case-control studies. Wolfe et al. published their study in 2018, evaluating studies published
86 between 1990 and 2016 [17]. The authors included water, sanitation, and hygiene and classified
87 WASH exposures according to the JMP standards [17]. However, the JMP-specific service ladders
88 developed for further grading and specification of WASH categories were not used.

89 While Wolfe *et al.* examined all three categories of WASH which include water, sanitation, as well as
90 hygiene [17], no systematic review has yet focused exclusively on water quality exposures related to
91 cholera. Out of WASH, focusing on the association between water and cholera is compelling as water
92 is a basic human need and cholera spreads mainly via unsafe water [1]. Case-control studies are
93 particularly interesting to focus on when studying this association as our preliminary search revealed
94 that major evidence was generated in this particular study design as well as its consistency being an
95 advantage for meta-analyses.

96 The aim of this study is to update the existing systematic review and meta-analysis while focusing on
97 the association between water and cholera. This review will incorporate recent evidence and provide
98 updated insights on the association between water quality and cholera in LMICs while implementing a
99 more rigorous assessment of the study quality.

100 **Methods**

101 **Search Strategy and Eligibility Criteria**

102 The development of the systematic review and meta-analysis adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items
103 for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) [18]. To systematically identify relevant peer-
104 reviewed articles PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase were chosen as databases. The search terms
105 were kept consistent with the previous search terms utilized in Wolfe *et al.*: (“case control” OR “case-
106 control” AND “cholera”) [17].

107 Results were restricted to articles published in English between 01 July 2016 and 02 September 2022
108 since articles published before 01 July 2016 were already included in the Wolfe *et al.* review [17]. All
109 search records were imported to the software Sciwheel, deduplicated, and further screened according
110 to the following predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria: Case-control studies focusing populations
111 in LMICs were eligible to be included, whereas studies located in high-income countries were
112 excluded. Cases were defined as people infected with cholera, while controls were defined as people
113 not infected with cholera. No restrictions were put on age, gender, and socioeconomic status of the
114 population. Furthermore, studies had to analyse associations between WASH and cholera using odds
115 ratios (OR) to be eligible. Detailed information on the Population, Intervention, Comparison,
116 Outcomes and Study Design (PICOS) criteria [19] applied can be found in the study protocol [20].

117

118 **WASH Exposure Categories with Focus on Water**

119 The JMP WASH categories were used in order to classify the exposures more precisely by
120 additionally using the JMP service ladder to further differentiate these categories into finer levels [21].

121 However, as this study focuses on water quality, only the category of water was included for further
122 analysis. In addition to the JMP category water source, water treatment and water management were
123 included to describe water and its handling in more detail and to be consistent with Wolfe *et al.* [17]

124 (Table 1). Exposures deemed eligible were compared to the JMP service ladder for water source. They
125 were subsequently allocated to one of the five subcategories (safely managed, basic, limited,

126 unimproved, surface water) according to its definition given by the JMP [22]. Water treatment and
127 water management were further divided into treated water and untreated water as well as safe water
128 storage and unsafe water storage, respectively.

129 Additionally, a more differentiated classification was introduced for similar exposures of the same
130 category. An example would be the differentiation of boiled water and chlorinated water, rather than
131 analysing them jointly as treated water or having to exclude one exposure. Other additional inclusion
132 criteria were developed if this differentiation was not sufficient to avoid unit-of-analysis error and to
133 ensure that certain populations were not overrepresented in the meta-analyses.

134

135 *[Insert Table 1 here]*

136

137 **Data Extraction**

138 In addition to the articles selected based on the previous review [17], title and abstract of the newly
139 identified articles were screened and checked for relevance by two independent researchers (CK and
140 TN) and eligibility was determined in accordance with the PICOS framework. After this initial
141 screening, full texts of included studies were further independently examined for eligibility by the
142 same researchers. Discrepancies in both steps were discussed afterwards with a third researcher (J-
143 HK) to reach consensus.

144 Relevant data were extracted and compiled using Google Sheets. For each article, following
145 information was extracted: the country where the study was conducted, the WASH exposures
146 analysed, the OR and corresponding confidence interval (CI), the general adjustment factors used, and
147 the adjustment for other WASH exposures.

148

149 **Risk of Bias Assessment**

150 The quality appraisal of the eligible studies was conducted using the Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized
151 Studies - of Exposures (ROBINS-E) [23]. The tool assesses the risk of bias in seven different domains:
152 1) confounding, 2) measurement of exposure, 3) selection of participants, 4) post-exposure

153 interventions, 5) missing data, 6) measurement of outcome, and 7) selective reporting of results. Each
154 domain was graded on a scale of “low risk of bias”, “some concerns”, “high risk of bias”, and “very
155 high risk of bias” which was subsequently summarized in an overall risk of bias. Studies scoring “low
156 risk” in more than one domain were categorized as overall “some concerns”; studies scoring “some
157 concerns” in more than five domains were considered “high risk”; and those scoring “high risk” in
158 more than one domain were categorized as “very high risk”.

159 The assessment of quality was performed by two reviewers independently (CK and TN) and then
160 discussed in conjunction with the third researcher (J-HK).

161

162 **Statistical Analysis**

163 Studies labelled as “very high risk” during the quality assessment were excluded from the analysis.
164 Exposures that were identified by the included articles as contaminated and potentially even the origin
165 of an outbreak were excluded. This was due to the high likelihood of bias in the meta-analysis as a
166 result of misclassification of an exposure that was originally confirmed to be contaminated. In
167 addition, only one exposure per study population was included in each analysis to avoid unit-of-
168 analysis error and to ensure that no study population was given more weight in the analysis. Exposures
169 with narrower confidence intervals and thus more precise estimates were chosen over similar
170 exposures with wider intervals. Preference was also given to exposures that were more comparable to
171 other exposures in the same subcategory or subgroup. For example, if an article examined the
172 exposure of "drinking river water" and "drinking swamp water" in the same population, "drinking river
173 water" was included in the analysis and "drinking swamp water" was excluded. Reason being that
174 "drinking river water" was more comparable to the exposures included in other articles in that
175 particular subgroup. Also, confidence intervals had to be reported in the study to be included in the
176 statistical analysis. Exposures with p-values only were excluded.

177 The statistical programming language R (version 4.2.2) [24] with the *metafor* package (version 3.8.1)
178 [25] was utilized to conduct the meta-analysis. Meta-analysis was performed for categories with at
179 least two studies with the potential of meaningful pooling [26]. Adjusted ORs were preferred over
180 crude ORs; if not given, matched ORs were utilized. If neither the adjusted OR nor the matched OR

181 were reported, the crude OR was used for meta-analysis. Random effects models were chosen to fit the
182 data over the fixed effects model since real differences in the effect sizes, instead of sampling error,
183 were suspected because of the variability in the setting and the population studied. The heterogeneity
184 between studies was estimated by restricted maximum likelihood [27] and calculated using τ^2 ,
185 Cochran's Q-statistic for subgroup interactions [28], and I^2 -statistic [29]. An overall summary estimate
186 with confidence interval was calculated for each JMP subcategory and two additional categories:
187 "safely managed water" and "treated water".
188 Publication bias was primarily inspected by examining symmetry of the funnel plots and calculating
189 Egger's regression [30].

190

191 **Results**

192 **Study Selection**

193 The search yielded a total number of 206 articles consisting of 86 articles from PubMed, 55 from Web
194 Of Science, and 65 from Embase published between 01 July 2016 and 02 September 2022 (Fig 1).
195 After deduplication, 120 unique articles were left for title and abstract review. This subsequently
196 resulted in 36 articles that were deemed eligible for full text screening. During the full text screening,
197 14 articles were further excluded (Fig 1).
198 Wolfe *et al.* identified 46 studies in their review, which we also included [17]. During the evaluation
199 of these articles, we noticed that one study focused on food exposures rather than WASH exposures.
200 This article was therefore excluded.
201 Ultimately, 22 new studies in addition to 45 articles from the previous review of Wolfe *et al.* were
202 included in this review. The total of 67 studies were then further assessed for quality.

203

204

[Insert Fig 1 here]

205

206 **Characteristics of Included Studies**

207 The newly identified studies were primarily conducted in Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia as well as in
208 Yemen, Nigeria, Zambia, Vietnam, India, Ghana, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo [31-52].
209 The majority was conducted in Uganda with a total of six studies [37, 38, 43, 47, 48, 50], whereas the
210 studies from the previous review were from 21 different countries with the majority of them conducted
211 in Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Kenya, Malawi and Peru [53-97]. The combination of new and previously
212 identified studies resulted in a wider geographical representation compared to the previous review.
213 The diagnostic methods used to fully identify cholera cases were by culturing stool samples (39.7%),
214 culturing rectal swabs (14.7%), collecting rectal swabs as well as stool cultures (14.7%), rapid test
215 (7.4%), and rapid test as well as stool culture (2.9%). Only one study additionally collected blood
216 samples and tested for antibody titres for cases as well as controls [97]. Two studies only collected
217 blood samples for controls [84, 93] and one study only for a subset of controls [54]. Detailed
218 descriptions of the characteristics of each study included can be found in S1 Table.

219

220 **Risk of Bias Assessment**

221 Overall, the quality assessment with ROBINS-E resulted in 14 studies (20.9%) being classified as
222 “some concerns”, 27 studies (40.3%) as “high risk”, and 26 studies (38.8%) as “very high risk” (Figs
223 S1-2). The studies classified as “very high risk” were omitted from meta-analysis. Therefore, a total of
224 41 studies were included in the meta-analysis (Fig 1). Of the 45 previously included studies, 20 studies
225 were excluded after our risk of bias assessment while the remaining 25 studies were included in the
226 meta-analysis. Detailed description of the summarized results of the risk of assessment can be found in
227 S1 Fig.

228 No publication bias was detected by inspecting the funnel plots (S4–S10 Figs) and Egger's test (S2
229 Table).

230

231 **Results of Synthesis**

232 A summary of the results of the meta-analysis can be found in Table 2.

233

234

[Insert Table 2 here]

235

236 **Water Source**

237 A total of 21 exposures met the definition of safely managed water and were therefore further
238 subdivided: sachet water, bottled water, and tap water. Sachet water consumption (n = 3) was
239 associated with a 1.69 times higher risk in cholera (OR = 1.69, 95% CI: 1.13 to 2.52) (Fig 2). Bottled
240 water (n = 5) was protective against cholera, but not statistically significant (OR = 0.52, 95% CI: 0.19
241 to 1.36). Similarly, tap water (n = 11) showed no significant protection against cholera (OR = 0.92,
242 95% CI: 0.41 to 2.08) (Fig 2).

243

244

[Insert Fig 2 here]

245

246 For basic drinking water sources (n=5), a statistically significant protective effect against cholera was
247 observed (OR=0.44, 95% CI: .27 to 0.69) (Fig 3).

248

249

[Insert Fig 3 here]

250

251 Limited water consumption did not show a significant association with cholera protection (n = 4,
252 OR = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.14 to 4.89) (Fig S11).

253

254 However, the consumption of unimproved water, such as water from unprotected wells and surface
255 water was associated with higher odds of cholera. Consuming unimproved drinking water (n = 9)
256 resulted in increased odds of 2.91 (95% CI: 1.21 to 7.02) (Fig 4). Similarly, consuming surface water
257 (n = 10) was significantly associated with cholera risk, with an OR of 3.40 (95% CI: 2.52 to 4.58), the
258 highest odds for cholera compared to the other subgroups (Fig 4).

259

260

[Insert Fig 4 here]

261

262 **Water Treatment**

263 Unspecified water treatment (n = 9) significantly decreased the odds of cholera by 58% (OR = 0.42,
264 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.65) (Fig S12). In contrast, untreated water (n = 15) significantly increased odds of
265 cholera (OR = 2.51, 95% CI: 2.03 to 3.10) (Fig S12).

266 Similar results were obtained for the subgroups of treated water after synthesis. Boiling (n = 7) and
267 chlorination of water (n = 6) significantly reduced odds for cholera with OR of 0.38 (95% CI: 0.17 to
268 0.84) and 0.37 (95% CI: 0.17 to 0.83), respectively (Fig 5). No significant protection was detected for
269 having materials for water treatment observed (n = 4) (OR = 0.41, 95% CI: 0.15 to 1.14) (Fig 5).

270

271 *[Insert Fig 5 here]*

272

273 **Water Management**

274 Safe water storage (n = 6) showed a non-significant reduction in OR of 0.19 (95% CI: 0.03 to 1.36)
275 (Fig S13). Similarly, unsafe water storage (n = 5) had a non-significant increase in OR of 1.32 (95%
276 CI: 0.57 to 3.03) (Fig S13).

277

278 **Heterogeneity**

279 Substantial heterogeneity was observed for nearly all subgroups of water source other than consuming
280 sachet water ($I^2 = 0.00\%$), basic water ($I^2 = 2.49\%$), and surface water ($I^2 = 0.00\%$) (Table 2).

281 Similarly, only untreated water was found to have low heterogeneity in the water treatment category
282 ($I^2 = 0.00\%$). Studies included on safe water storage as well as unsafe water storage revealed to be
283 substantially heterogenous with $I^2 = 87.19\%$ and $I^2 = 77.76\%$, respectively. Out of 14 conducted meta-
284 analyses, heterogeneity was over $I^2 = 80\%$ in 6 subgroups.

285

286 Discussion

287 We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to examine the association between water
288 quality and cholera. In particular, we updated the previous review by Wolfe *et al.* [17] by including
289 data from case-control studies published from 2016 to 2022. Compared to the former review, a more
290 rigorous risk of bias assessment was utilized as well as the formulation of more stringent inclusion
291 criteria for meta-analysis. Our analyses revealed that most of the expected risk factors, such as the
292 consumption of unimproved water and surface water, as well as the lack of water treatment, were
293 associated with higher odds of cholera. Some of pooled estimates were substantially different from
294 those in Wolfe *et al.* while qualitative insights were still the similar [17]. The exception was unsafe
295 water storage, which failed to show statistical significance after being pooled. A similar lack of
296 statistical significance, but for this case for a protective effect, was observed for safe storage of water.
297 Water treatment and its subgroups showed significant protection against cholera, again in accordance
298 with previous findings of Wolfe *et al.* [17]. However, the mere presence of materials for water
299 treatment was not found to be statistically significant for protection. Contrary to expectations, the only
300 subcategory of improved water that displayed significant protective associations against cholera was
301 basic water. All other subcategories of improved water were not statistically significant. Although
302 Wolfe *et al.* found a significant protective effect of drinking bottled water, our results could not
303 replicate this observation [17]. Moreover, most striking was that the consumption of sachet water was
304 unexpectedly associated with higher odds for cholera. Furthermore, large discrepancies in between-
305 study heterogeneity was reported, as well as a wide ranges of observed ORs depending on the
306 subcategory and subgroup.

307

308 Our findings confirm those of Wolfe *et al.* regarding the inconsistency of different subcategories of
309 improved water [17]. It can be suggested that some supposedly safe water sources may not be
310 protective but may in fact pose a higher risk than water sources that are lower on the JMP ladder, e.g.,
311 basic water or limited water, and may facilitate cholera outbreaks. We observed a number of studies in
312 which municipal tap water was associated with higher odds of cholera [34, 53, 66, 96] as well as

313 studies in which tap water was most likely contaminated [41, 57, 85, 91]. The reasons for this were
314 often failures in the piping and sewage systems, which resulted in the tap water being contaminated
315 by, for example, residues from open defecation [41, 52, 57]. In addition, water sold by vendors also
316 appears to be at high risk of contamination. Contamination of packaged water sold on the street does
317 also not appear uncommon, as evidenced by recent findings [41, 44]. Several studies have found
318 significantly high levels of bacterial indicators in sachet water [98-100]. It appears that the level of
319 contamination increases along the supply chain of the sachets [101]. There is evidence to suggest that
320 the water sources used were not the underlying concern, but rather the packaging and handling of the
321 sachets appeared to be strong indicators of contamination [102]. Given that some case-control studies
322 failed to report protective effects of bottled water [36, 61, 72] or even showed increased odds [46],
323 similar assumptions can presumably be made for bottled water. Packaged water in LMICs appear to
324 often be of questionable quality, as modelling suggests [103]. However, the JMP categorization does
325 not reflect this actual risk and the possibility of contamination (in its service ladder). This is especially
326 concerning given the growing trend of consuming packaged water in LMICs as a result of water
327 shortages and as an alternative to unimproved water sources [104, 105].

328 In contrast, the risk factors associated with cholera seem to be consistent and drive outbreaks. The
329 consumption of surface as well as unimproved water tend to confer a constant risk of cholera. A
330 similar pattern can be found in several other studies not exclusively focused on case-control studies
331 [10, 106]. The homogeneity of exposures categorized as surface water consumption may support this.
332 Consumption of surface water appears to be a risk factor regardless of setting and context of a study.
333 Evidence of surface water being unsafe for drinking and increasing the risk for cholera and outbreaks
334 can be found in past literature [107-109].

335 Furthermore, our results indicated that treating water with any method implies protection for cholera.
336 Water treatment has the potential to prevent and slow down outbreaks across different LMICs, while
337 eliminating the increased risk of cholera from consuming untreated water. This is in good agreement
338 with Cohen and Colford who found a significant protection of boiling water against cholera and
339 several other infectious diseases in similar setting [110]. The mere presence of equipment to treat
340 water did not seem sufficient to provide significant protection. Appropriate training for correct and

341 regular usage may be needed, as Lantagne and Yates previously described in their review, to fully take
342 advantage of its protective effect [111].

343 The lack of a significant effect and the wide observed confidence interval for the either safe or unsafe
344 storage of water could possibly stem from confounding factors such as where the water was collected
345 from as suggested by Birmingham et al. in their case-control study [56]. Other important influencing
346 factors can be whether the water was treated or the container itself was cleaned [14]. We observed that
347 none of the exposures included for water management sufficiently controlled for these factors. Other
348 reviews have in fact shown significance of an increased risk of unsafe water management and a
349 lowered risk of safe water management [10, 106]. However, it seems that interventions focusing on the
350 impact of safe water management have not been well-described yet and need further research [14].

351 There were several limitations to our review and meta-analysis that need be considered when
352 interpreting our results. We only included studies that were peer-reviewed and published in English,
353 excluding grey literature. Despite our efforts to reduce publication bias through statistical means, there
354 may still be residual risk of publication bias.

355 In addition, a considerable degree of heterogeneity among the studies was observed in certain
356 exposure subcategories and subgroups. Large differences in adjustment for confounders, measurement
357 of exposure, methods of assessment of cases and controls, and contextual factors such as cultural
358 differences, location, and time among the identified studies were most likely influential. It is unlikely
359 that all these differences were adjusted for in the model selection of the meta-analysis. We often
360 observed a lack of adjustment for confounders. Most studies did not sufficiently control for
361 influencing effects of other WASH factors as well as other sources of drinking water. Also, the
362 importance of a well-defined baseline risk of each exposure to assess ORs cannot be neglected in a
363 study design since they vary across contexts and settings. However, a precise description was often
364 missing [36, 46, 61, 72].

365 Furthermore, the decision to focus only on case-control studies as major evidence on the association
366 between cholera and water can be found in case-control studies, it inherently results in a certain risk of
367 recall bias due to its retrospective design.

368 Additionally, we observed that most studies either only culturally confirmed a subset of patients or
369 identified cases solely by definition rather than testing. Therefore, when interpreting these results, a
370 certain risk of misclassification must be considered given that many cholera cases are asymptomatic
371 [112-114]. There is a possibility that the risk of bias assessment itself influenced the reported results.
372 None of the included studies had a low risk of bias rating.

373 Another factor to consider when interpreting the results is that this review did not differentiate
374 between endemic and epidemic cholera, which may influence the associations.

375 The quality assessment was more stringent in comparison to the previous review by Wolfe *et al.* due to
376 the use of ROBINS-E, which was specifically designed for non-randomized studies with a particular
377 focus on exposures [17, 23]. This allowed a more precise identification of studies that appeared to be
378 of very high risk of bias. In addition, the quality of studies conducted since the previous review [17]
379 did not noticeably improve. This resulted in the number of studies and exposures included in each
380 subgroup and subcategory of the meta-analysis to be considerably smaller, which inevitably affects the
381 power of this study.

382 In order to have enough studies to conduct the analysis, we used a modified definition of studies that
383 were overall categorized as some concerns: Instead of just two domains, at least five domains had to
384 be rated as some concern to be regarded as a high-risk study. Nevertheless, the number of studies that
385 were classified as having some concerns and the corresponding exposures were not sufficient to allow
386 a reasonable meta-analysis to be performed. This resulted in the inclusion of studies classified as high
387 risk, which may have consequently biased our findings.

388 While these are important considerations to keep in mind when interpreting our results, we believe that
389 our review provides a more profound understanding of the association between water quality and
390 cholera. It lays the groundwork for future interventions as well as future research as cholera remains a
391 major public health threat in LMICs. Simple and relatively inexpensive interventions such as water
392 treatment have the potential to considerably reduce the burden of cholera infection. Regular water
393 treatment can play a crucial role in preventing future outbreaks and should be considered as an early
394 on containment measure. This is particularly beneficial where water quality is compromised, and
395 rapid intervention is needed. A holistic approach is essential for future interventions in LMICs: Safe

396 water supply infrastructure must be expanded. It must be made accessible to people in LMICs who are
397 most vulnerable to cholera, in order to avoid recourse to water sources with a high risk of infection.
398 Moreover, it may not be sufficient to eliminate risk factors and rely on protective factors as
399 containment measures for outbreaks. Water that is supposedly safely managed may be contaminated
400 and, rather than being protective, may be a driver of outbreaks. Vended water is gaining importance in
401 the face of water shortages [104] making it even more crucial to establish clear regulations to prevent
402 contamination.

403

404 **Conclusion**

405 It is critical to continue efforts to prevent and control cholera by improving the access to the safe water
406 in addition to improving sanitation and hygiene. In addition, it would be necessary to make sure the
407 so-called improved water sources such as sachet water or bottled water is safe in in LMICs. Relatively
408 simple and inexpensive early protection measures such as boiling or chlorination must be
409 considered to best prevent and contain future cholera outbreaks in LMICs.

410 **Acknowledgments**

411 The authors appreciate Raphael Zellweger and Birkneh Tilahun Tedesse for their constructive
412 comments on the final manuscript. We thank Nadja Kranz and Tim Paulus for their assistance in
413 conceptual questions as well as their support in reviewing the manuscript. We would also like to
414 thank Lisa Kaldich and Konstantinos Mechteridis for helping adjust the code when issues arose.

415

416 **Author Contributions**

417 JHK conceptualised and designed the study. CK and TN initially searched the literature and assessed
418 the included articles. GG and TN extracted all data. CK and TN analysed and interpreted the data. TN
419 drafted the manuscript. JHK led the data extraction and analyses and interpretation of the results. All
420 authors commented on the drafts of the manuscript and approved the final draft of the paper.

421

422 **Financial Support**

423 This work was supported, in whole or in part, by Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, Bowdoin College, and
424 the

425 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, via the Vaccine Impact Modelling Consortium (Grant Number
426 OPP1157270 / INV-009125). The funders were not involved in the study design, data analysis, data
427 interpretation, and writing of the manuscript. The authors alone are responsible for the views
428 expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy, or views of their
429 affiliated

430 organisations.

431

432 **Declaration of Interest**

433 The authors declare no competing interests.

434

435 **Data Availability Statements**

436 The dataset and R codes for generating figures and tables are available at the GitHub repository of the
437 corresponding author: https://github.com/kimfinale/Cholera_WASH_meta

438

439 **References**

440 1. **Deen J, Mengel MA, Clemens JD.** (2020) Epidemiology of cholera. *Vaccine*; **38**: A31-A40.
441 doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.07.078.

442 2. **World Health Organization.** Disease Outbreak News; Cholera – Global situation. 2022 [30
443 December 2022]. Available at: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/2022-DON426#:~:text=Current%20Situation&text=In%202021%2C%202023%20countries%20reported,have%20been%20reporting%20protracted%20outbreaks.>

446 3. **Dureab F et al.** (2019) Cholera Outbreak in Yemen: Timeliness of Reporting and Response in
447 the National Electronic Disease Early Warning System. *Acta Inform Med*; **27**: 85-88. doi:
448 10.5455/aim.2019.27.85-88.

449 4. **World Health Organization.** Cholera Annual Report 2020 Weekly Epidemiological Record.
450 Geneva: World Health Organization, 2021 17 September 2021. Report No.: 37.

451 5. **Ganesan D, Gupta SS, Legros D.** (2020) Cholera surveillance and estimation of burden of
452 cholera. *Vaccine*; **38**: A13-A17. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.07.036.

453 6. **Ali M et al.** (2015) Updated global burden of cholera in endemic countries. *PLoS neglected*
454 *tropical diseases*; **9**: e0003832-e0003832. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003832.

455 7. **Cissé G.** (2019) Food-borne and water-borne diseases under climate change in low- and
456 middle-income countries: Further efforts needed for reducing environmental health exposure risks.
457 *Acta Tropica*; **194**: 181-188. doi: 10.1016/j.actatropica.2019.03.012.

458 8. **Veenema TG et al.** (2017) Climate Change–Related Water Disasters’ Impact on Population
459 Health. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*; **49**: 625-634. doi: 10.1111/jnu.12328.

460 9. **Harris JB et al.** (2012) Cholera. *The Lancet*; **379**: 2466-2476. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
461 6736(12)60436-X.

462 10. **Richterman A et al.** (2018) Individual and Household Risk Factors for Symptomatic Cholera
463 Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Infect Dis*; **218**: S154-s164. doi:
464 10.1093/infdis/jiy444.

465 11. **WHO/ UNICEF JMP.** About the JMP. [11 January 2023]. Available at:
466 [https://washdata.org/how-we-work/about-](https://washdata.org/how-we-work/about-jmp#:~:text=WHO%2FUNICEF%20JMP%20Strategy%202021,2030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development.)
467 [jmp#:~:text=WHO%2FUNICEF%20JMP%20Strategy%202021,2030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development.](https://washdata.org/how-we-work/about-jmp#:~:text=WHO%2FUNICEF%20JMP%20Strategy%202021,2030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development.)

469 12. **WHO/ UNICEF JMP.** Country and regional engagement. [12 January 2023]. Available at:
470 <https://washdata.org/how-we-work/country-and-regional-engagement.>

- 471 13. **WHO/ UNICEF JMP.** (2021) Progress on Household Drinking Water, Sanitation and
472 Hygiene 2000-2020: Five years into the SDGs.
- 473 14. **Taylor DL et al.** (2015) The Impact of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Interventions to
474 Control Cholera: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One*; **10**: e0135676. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0135676.
- 475 15. **D’Mello-Guyett L et al.** (2020) Prevention and control of cholera with household and
476 community water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) interventions: A scoping review of current
477 international guidelines. *PLoS One*; **15**: e0226549. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0226549.
- 478 16. **George CM et al.** (2016) Randomized Controlled Trial of Hospital-Based Hygiene and Water
479 Treatment Intervention (CHoBIT) to Reduce Cholera. *Emerg Infect Dis*; **22**: 233-241. doi:
480 10.3201/eid2202.151175.
- 481 17. **Wolfe M et al.** (2018) A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Association between
482 Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Exposures and Cholera in Case-Control Studies. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*;
483 **99**: 534-545. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.17-0897.
- 484 18. **Page MJ et al.** (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting
485 systematic reviews. *BMJ*; **372**: n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
- 486 19. **Amir-Behghadami M, Janati A.** (2020) Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes
487 and Study (PICOS) design as a framework to formulate eligibility criteria in systematic reviews.
488 *Emergency Medicine Journal*; **37**: 387. doi: 10.1136/emered-2020-209567.
- 489 20. **Kim J-H, Goucher G.** A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis in Case-Control Studies of
490 the Association between Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Exposures and Cholera and Typhoid.
491 PROSPERO 2021 CRD420212718812021. Available at:
492 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021271881.
- 493 21. **WHO/ UNICEF JMP.** Monitoring. [28 December 2022]. Available at:
494 <https://washdata.org/monitoring>.
- 495 22. **WHO/UNICEF JMP.** Drinking water. [28 July 2022]. Available at:
496 <https://washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water>.
- 497 23. **Higgins J et al.** Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies - of Exposure (ROBINS-E). Launch
498 version, 1 June 2022. 2022 [19 October 2022]. Available at:
499 <https://www.riskofbias.info/welcome/robins-e-tool>.
- 500 24. **R Core Team.** R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
501 Statistical Computing. 2022. Available at: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 502 25. **Viechtbauer W.** (2010) Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of*
503 *Statistical Software*; **36**: 1-48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v036.i03.
- 504 26. **Valentine JC, Pigott TD, Rothstein HR.** (2010) How Many Studies Do You Need?:A
505 Primer on Statistical Power for Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*; **35**:
506 215-247. doi: 10.3102/1076998609346961.
- 507 27. **Viechtbauer W.** (2005) Bias and Efficiency of Meta-Analytic Variance Estimators in the
508 Random-Effects Model. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*; **30**: 261-293. doi:
509 10.3102/10769986030003261.
- 510 28. **Cochran WG.** (1954) The Combination of Estimates from Different Experiments. *Biometrics*;
511 **10**: 101-129. doi: 10.2307/3001666.

- 512 29. **Higgins JPT, Thompson SG.** (2002) Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics*
513 *in Medicine*; **21**: 1539-1558. doi: 10.1002/sim.1186.
- 514 30. **Egger M et al.** (1997) Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *Bmj*; **315**:
515 629-634. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.
- 516 31. **Challa JM et al.** (2022) Inadequate Hand Washing, Lack of Clean Drinking Water and
517 Latrines as Major Determinants of Cholera Outbreak in Somali Region, Ethiopia in 2019. *Frontiers in*
518 *Public Health*; **10**. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.845057.
- 519 32. **Dan-Nwafor CC et al.** (2019) A cholera outbreak in a rural north central Nigerian
520 community: an unmatched case-control study. *BMC Public Health*; **19**: 112. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-
521 6299-3.
- 522 33. **Dinede G, Abagero A, Tolosa T.** (2020) Cholera outbreak in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: A case-
523 control study. *PLoS One*; **15**: e0235440. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0235440.
- 524 34. **Dureab F et al.** (2019) Risk factors associated with the recent cholera outbreak in Yemen: a
525 case-control study. *Epidemiology and Health*; **41**: e2019015. doi: 10.4178/epih.e2019015.
- 526 35. **Dutta BP et al.** (2021) Cholera outbreak associated with contaminated water sources in paddy
527 fields, Mandla District, Madhya Pradesh, India. *INDIAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH*; **65**: 46-50.
528 doi: 10.4103/ijph.IJPH_1118_20.
- 529 36. **Endris AA et al.** (2019) A case-control study to assess risk factors related to cholera outbreak
530 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, July 2016. *The Pan African Medical Journal*; **34**: 128. doi:
531 10.11604/pamj.2019.34.128.17997.
- 532 37. **Monje F et al.** (2020) A prolonged cholera outbreak caused by drinking contaminated stream
533 water, Kyangwali refugee settlement, Hoima District, Western Uganda: 2018. *Infectious Diseases of*
534 *Poverty*; **9**: 154. doi: 10.1186/s40249-020-00761-9.
- 535 38. **Eurien D et al.** (2021) Cholera outbreak caused by drinking unprotected well water
536 contaminated with faeces from an open storm water drainage: Kampala City, Uganda, January 2019.
537 *BMC Infectious Diseases*; **21**: 1281. doi: 10.1186/s12879-021-07011-9.
- 538 39. **Gidado S et al.** (2018) Cholera outbreak in a naïve rural community in Northern Nigeria: the
539 importance of hand washing with soap, September 2010. *The Pan African Medical Journal*; **30**: 5. doi:
540 10.11604/pamj.2018.30.5.12768.
- 541 40. **Golicha Q et al.** (2018) Cholera Outbreak in Dadaab Refugee Camp, Kenya - November
542 2015-June 2016. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*; **67**: 958-961. doi:
543 10.15585/mmwr.mm6734a4.
- 544 41. **Issahaku GR et al.** (2020) Protracted cholera outbreak in the Central Region, Ghana, 2016.
545 *Ghana Medical Journal*; **54**: 45-52. doi: 10.4314/gmj.v54i2s.8.
- 546 42. **Kigen HT et al.** (2020) A protracted cholera outbreak among residents in an urban setting,
547 Nairobi county, Kenya, 2015. *The Pan African Medical Journal*; **36**: 127. doi:
548 10.11604/pamj.2020.36.127.19786.
- 549 43. **Kwesiga B et al.** (2017) A prolonged, community-wide cholera outbreak associated with
550 drinking water contaminated by sewage in Kasese District, western Uganda. *BMC Public Health*; **18**:
551 30. doi: 10.1186/s12889-017-4589-9.

- 552 44. **Mbala-Kingebeni P et al.** (2021) Sachet water consumption as a risk factor for cholera in
553 urban settings: Findings from a case control study in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo
554 during the 2017-2018 outbreak. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*; **15**: e0009477. doi:
555 10.1371/journal.pntd.0009477.
- 556 45. **Nanzaluka FH et al.** (2020) Risk Factors for Epidemic Cholera in Lusaka, Zambia-2017. *The*
557 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **103**: 646-651. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0089.
- 558 46. **Nguyen TV et al.** (2017) Cholera returns to southern Vietnam in an outbreak associated with
559 consuming unsafe water through iced tea: A matched case-control study. *PLoS neglected tropical*
560 *diseases*; **11**: e0005490. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005490.
- 561 47. **Oguttu DW et al.** (2017) Cholera outbreak caused by drinking lake water contaminated with
562 human faeces in Kaiso Village, Hoima District, Western Uganda, October 2015. *Infectious Diseases of*
563 *Poverty*; **6**: 146. doi: 10.1186/s40249-017-0359-2.
- 564 48. **Okello PE et al.** (2019) A cholera outbreak caused by drinking contaminated river water,
565 Bulambuli District, Eastern Uganda, March 2016. *BMC infectious diseases*; **19**: 516. doi:
566 10.1186/s12879-019-4036-x.
- 567 49. **Oyugi EO et al.** (2017) An outbreak of cholera in western Kenya, 2015: a case control study.
568 *The Pan African Medical Journal*; **28**: 12. doi: 10.11604/pamj.supp.2017.28.1.9477.
- 569 50. **Pande G et al.** (2018) Cholera outbreak caused by drinking contaminated water from a
570 lakeshore water-collection site, Kasese District, south-western Uganda, June-July 2015. *PLoS One*;
571 **13**: e0198431. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0198431.
- 572 51. **Qaserah AM et al.** (2021) Risk Factors of Cholera Transmission in Al Hudaydah, Yemen:
573 Case-Control Study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*; **7**. doi: 10.2196/27627.
- 574 52. **Singh A et al.** (2020) Cholera outbreak investigation, Bhadola, Delhi, India, April-May 2018.
575 *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **114**: 762-769. doi:
576 10.1093/trstmh/traa059.
- 577 53. **Acosta CJ et al.** (2001) Cholera outbreak in southern Tanzania: risk factors and patterns of
578 transmission. *Emerg Infect Dis*; **7**: 583-587. doi: 10.3201/eid0707.010741.
- 579 54. **Beatty ME et al.** (2004) An Outbreak of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 Infections on Ebeye Island,
580 Republic of the Marshall Islands, Associated with Use of an Adequately Chlorinated Water Source.
581 *Clinical Infectious Diseases*; **38**: 1-9. doi: 10.1086/379713.
- 582 55. **Bhunja R, Ghosh S.** (2011) Waterborne cholera outbreak following Cyclone Aila in
583 Sundarban area of West Bengal, India, 2009. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine*
584 *and Hygiene*; **105**: 214-219. doi: 10.1016/j.trstmh.2010.12.008.
- 585 56. **Birmingham ME et al.** (1997) Epidemic cholera in Burundi: patterns of transmission in the
586 Great Rift Valley Lake region. *The Lancet*; **349**: 981-985. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(96)08478-4.
- 587 57. **Cárdenas V et al.** (1993) Waterborne cholera in Riohacha, Colombia, 1992. *Bulletin of the*
588 *Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)*; **27**(4), 1993.
- 589 58. **Cummings MJ et al.** (2012) A cholera outbreak among semi-nomadic pastoralists in
590 northeastern Uganda: epidemiology and interventions. *Epidemiology & Infection*; **140**: 1376-1385.
591 doi: 10.1017/S0950268811001956.

- 592 59. **De Guzman A et al.** (2015) Availability of safe drinking-water: the answer to cholera
593 outbreak? Nabua, Camarines Sur, Philippines, 2012. *Western Pac Surveill Response J*; **6**: 12-16. doi:
594 10.5365/WPSAR.2015.6.1.005.
- 595 60. **Dubois AE et al.** (2006) Epidemic cholera in urban Zambia: hand soap and dried fish as
596 protective factors. *Epidemiology & Infection*; **134**: 1226-1230. doi: 10.1017/S0950268806006273.
- 597 61. **Dunkle SE et al.** (2011) Epidemic Cholera in a Crowded Urban Environment, Port-au-Prince,
598 Haiti. *Emerg Infect Dis*; **17**: 2143-2146. doi: 10.3201/eid1711.110772.
- 599 62. **Fatiregun AA, Ajayi IO, Isere EE.** (2013) Cholera outbreak in a southwest community of
600 Nigeria: investigation of risk factors and evaluation of a district surveillance system. *West African*
601 *Journal of Medicine*; **32**: 173-179.
- 602 63. **Fredrick T et al.** (2015) Cholera Outbreak Linked with Lack of Safe Water Supply Following
603 a Tropical Cyclone in Pondicherry, India, 2012. *Journal of Health, Population, and Nutrition*; **33**: 31-
604 38.
- 605 64. **Grandesso F et al.** (2014) Risk factors for cholera transmission in Haiti during inter-peak
606 periods: insights to improve current control strategies from two case-control studies. *Epidemiology &*
607 *Infection*; **142**: 1625-1635. doi: 10.1017/S0950268813002562.
- 608 65. **Hatch DL et al.** (1994) Epidemic Cholera during Refugee Resettlement in Malawi.
609 *International Journal of Epidemiology*; **23**: 1292-1299. doi: 10.1093/ije/23.6.1292.
- 610 66. **Hoge CW et al.** (1996) Epidemiologic Study of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 and O139 in Thailand: At
611 the Advancing Edge of the Eighth Pandemic. *American Journal of Epidemiology*; **143**: 263-268. doi:
612 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a008737.
- 613 67. **Hutin Y, Luby S, Paquet C.** (2003) A large cholera outbreak in Kano City, Nigeria: the
614 importance of hand washing with soap and the danger of street-vended water. *Journal of Water and*
615 *Health*; **1**: 45-52. doi: 10.2166/wh.2003.0006.
- 616 68. **Izadi S et al.** (2005) Routes of Transmission of Cholera in the Border Areas of Zahedan
617 District, Sistan and Baluchestan Province, Summer 2003. *Journal of Medical Sciences*; **5**: 233-238.
618 doi: 10.3923/jms.2005.233.238.
- 619 69. **Izadi S et al.** (2006) Cholera Outbreak in Southeast of Iran: Routes of Transmission in the
620 Situation of Good Primary Health Care Services and Poor Individual Hygienic Practices. *Japanese*
621 *Journal of Infectious Diseases*; **59**: 174-178.
- 622 70. **Kirk MD et al.** (2005) Risk factors for cholera in Pohnpei during an outbreak in 2000: lessons
623 for Pacific Countries and Territories. **12**: 6.
- 624 71. **Kone-Coulibaly A et al.** (2010) Risk factors associated with cholera in Harare City,
625 Zimbabwe, 2008. *East African Journal of Public Health*; **7**: 311-317. doi: 10.4314/eajph.v7i4.64754.
- 626 72. **Koo D et al.** (1996) Epidemic cholera in Guatemala, 1993: transmission of a newly introduced
627 epidemic strain by street vendors. *Epidemiology & Infection*; **116**: 121-126. doi:
628 10.1017/S0950268800052341.
- 629 73. **Mahamud AS et al.** (2012) Epidemic cholera in Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya, 2009: the
630 importance of sanitation and soap. *The Journal of Infection in Developing Countries*; **6**: 234-241. doi:
631 10.3855/jidc.1966.

- 632 74. **Moren A et al.** (1991) Practical Field Epidemiology to Investigate a Cholera Outbreak in a
633 Mozambican Refugee Camp in Malawi, 1988.
- 634 75. **Mridha P et al.** (2011) The 2010 Outbreak of Cholera among Workers of a Jute Mill in
635 Kolkata, West Bengal, India. *Journal of Health, Population, and Nutrition*; **29**: 9-13.
- 636 76. **Mugoya I et al.** (2008) Rapid Spread of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 Throughout Kenya, 2005. *The*
637 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **78**: 527-533. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2008.78.527.
- 638 77. **Mujica OJ et al.** (1994) Epidemic Cholera in the Amazon: The Role of Produce in Disease
639 Risk and Prevention. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*; **169**: 1381-1384. doi:
640 10.1093/infdis/169.6.1381.
- 641 78. **Nguyen VD et al.** (2014) Cholera Epidemic Associated with Consumption of Unsafe
642 Drinking Water and Street-Vended Water—Eastern Freetown, Sierra Leone, 2012. *The American*
643 *Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **90**: 518-523. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.13-0567.
- 644 79. **Nsagha DS et al.** (2015) Assessing the risk factors of cholera epidemic in the Buea Health
645 District of Cameroon. *BMC Public Health*; **15**: 1128. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-2485-8.
- 646 80. **O'Connor KA et al.** (2011) Risk Factors Early in the 2010 Cholera Epidemic, Haiti. *Emerg*
647 *Infect Dis*; **17**: 2136-2138. doi: 10.3201/eid1711.110810.
- 648 81. **Opare JKL et al.** (2012) Outbreak of Cholera in the East Akim Municipality of Ghana
649 Following Unhygienic Practices by Small-Scale Gold Miners, November 2010. *Ghana Medical*
650 *Journal*; **46**: 116-123.
- 651 82. **Quick RE et al.** (1995) Epidemic cholera in rural El Salvador: risk factors in a region covered
652 by a cholera prevention campaign. *Epidemiology & Infection*; **114**: 249-255. doi:
653 10.1017/S0950268800057915.
- 654 83. **Reller ME et al.** (2001) Cholera Prevention With Traditional and Novel Water Treatment
655 Methods: An Outbreak Investigation in Fort-Dauphin, Madagascar. *American Journal of Public*
656 *Health*; **91**: 1608-1610. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.91.10.1608.
- 657 84. **Ries AA et al.** (1992) Cholera in Piura, Peru: A Modern Urban Epidemic. *The Journal of*
658 *Infectious Diseases*; **166**: 1429-1433. doi: 10.1093/infdis/166.6.1429.
- 659 85. **Rodrigues A, Brun H, Sandstrom A.** (1997) Risk factors for cholera infection in the initial
660 phase of an epidemic in Guinea-Bissau: protection by lime juice. *The American Journal of Tropical*
661 *Medicine and Hygiene*; **57**: 601-604. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.1997.57.601.
- 662 86. **Rosewell A et al.** (2012) Cholera risk factors, Papua New Guinea, 2010. *BMC Infectious*
663 *Diseases*; **12**: 287. doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-12-287.
- 664 87. **Sasaki S et al.** (2008) Spatial Analysis of Risk Factor of Cholera Outbreak for 2003–2004 in a
665 Peri-urban Area of Lusaka, Zambia. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **79**:
666 414-421. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2008.79.414.
- 667 88. **Shapiro RL et al.** (1999) Transmission of epidemic *Vibrio cholerae* O1 in rural western
668 Kenya associated with drinking water from Lake Victoria: an environmental reservoir for cholera? *The*
669 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **60**: 271-276. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.1999.60.271.
- 670 89. **Shultz A et al.** (2009) Cholera Outbreak in Kenyan Refugee Camp: Risk Factors for Illness
671 and Importance of Sanitation. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*; **80**: 640-645.
672 doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2009.80.640.

- 673 90. **Siddiqui FJ et al.** (2006) Consecutive outbreaks of *Vibrio cholerae* O139 and *V. cholerae* O1
674 cholera in a fishing village near Karachi, Pakistan. *Transactions of The Royal Society of Tropical*
675 *Medicine and Hygiene*; **100**: 476-482. doi: 10.1016/j.trstmh.2005.07.019.
- 676 91. **St. Louis MES et al.** (1990) Epidemic Cholera in West Africa: The Role of Food Handling
677 and High-Risk Foods. *American Journal of Epidemiology*; **131**: 719-728. doi:
678 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a115556.
- 679 92. **Swerdlow DL et al.** (1997) Epidemic cholera among refugees in Malawi, Africa: treatment
680 and transmission. *Epidemiology and Infection*; **118**: 207-214. doi: 10.1017/s0950268896007352.
- 681 93. **Swerdlow DL et al.** (1992) Waterborne transmission of epidemic cholera in Trujillo, Peru:
682 lessons for a continent at risk. *The Lancet*; **340**: 28-32. doi: 10.1016/0140-6736(92)92432-F.
- 683 94. **Ujjiga TTA et al.** (2015) Risk Factors for Sustained Cholera Transmission, Juba County,
684 South Sudan, 2014. *Emerg Infect Dis*; **21**: 1849-1852. doi: 10.3201/eid2110.142051.
- 685 95. **Uthappa CK et al.** (2015) An outbreak of cholera in Medipally village, Andhra Pradesh,
686 India, 2013. *Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition*; **33**: 7. doi: 10.1186/s41043-015-0021-1.
- 687 96. **von Seidlein L et al.** (2008) Is HIV infection associated with an increased risk for cholera?
688 Findings from a case-control study in Mozambique. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*; **13**:
689 683-688. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2008.02051.x.
- 690 97. **Weber JT et al.** (1994) Epidemic cholera in Ecuador: multidrug-resistance and transmission
691 by water and seafood. *Epidemiology & Infection*; **112**: 1-11. doi: 10.1017/S0950268800057368.
- 692 98. **Yusuf Y et al.** (2015) An assessment of sachet water quality in Zaria Area of Kaduna State,
693 Nigeria. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*; **8**: 174-180. doi: 10.5897/JGRP2015.0501.
- 694 99. **Addo HO et al.** (2020) Consumer Preference and Quality of Sachet Water Sold and
695 Consumed in the Sunyani Municipality of Ghana. *Biomed Res Int*; **2020**: 3865895. doi:
696 10.1155/2020/3865895.
- 697 100. **Udoh A et al.** (2021) Microbial contamination of packaged drinking water in Nigeria. *Trop*
698 *Med Int Health*; **26**: 1378-1400. doi: 10.1111/tmi.13672.
- 699 101. **Fisher MB et al.** (2015) Microbiological and Chemical Quality of Packaged Sachet Water
700 and Household Stored Drinking Water in Freetown, Sierra Leone. *PLoS One*; **10**: e0131772. doi:
701 10.1371/journal.pone.0131772.
- 702 102. **Manjaya D, Tilley E, Marks SJ.** (2019) Informally Vended Sachet Water: Handling
703 Practices and Microbial Water Quality. *Water*; **11**: 800. doi: 10.3390/w11040800.
- 704 103. **Angnunavuri PN et al.** (2022) Evaluation of plastic packaged water quality using health risk
705 indices: A case study of sachet and bottled water in Accra, Ghana. *Science of The Total Environment*;
706 **832**: 155073. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155073.
- 707 104. **Asibey MO, Dosu B, Yeboah V.** (2019) The roles and attitudes of urbanites towards urban
708 water insecurity. Case of the New Juaben Municipality, Ghana. *Sustainable Water Resources*
709 *Management*; **5**: 2023-2036. doi: 10.1007/s40899-019-00349-8.
- 710 105. **Moulds S et al.** (2022) Sachet water in Ghana: A spatiotemporal analysis of the recent upward
711 trend in consumption and its relationship with changing household characteristics, 2010-2017. *PLoS*
712 *One*; **17**: e0265167. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0265167.

- 713 106. **Jones N et al.** (2020) Water, sanitation and hygiene risk factors for the transmission of
714 cholera in a changing climate: using a systematic review to develop a causal process diagram. *Journal*
715 *of Water and Health*; **18**: 145-158. doi: 10.2166/wh.2020.088.
- 716 107. **Hughes JM et al.** (1982) Epidemiology of eltor cholera in rural Bangladesh: importance of
717 surface water in transmission. *Bull World Health Organ*; **60**: 395-404.
- 718 108. **Bompangue D et al.** (2008) Lakes as source of cholera outbreaks, Democratic Republic of
719 Congo. *Emerg Infect Dis*; **14**: 798-800. doi: 10.3201/eid1405.071260.
- 720 109. **Bwire G et al.** (2020) The quality of drinking and domestic water from the surface water
721 sources (lakes, rivers, irrigation canals and ponds) and springs in cholera prone communities of
722 Uganda: an analysis of vital physicochemical parameters. *BMC Public Health*; **20**: 1128. doi:
723 10.1186/s12889-020-09186-3.
- 724 110. **Cohen A, Colford JM.** (2017) Effects of Boiling Drinking Water on Diarrhea and Pathogen-
725 Specific Infections in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
726 *Am J Trop Med Hyg*; **97**: 1362-1377. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.17-0190.
- 727 111. **Lantagne D, Yates T.** (2018) Household Water Treatment and Cholera Control. *J Infect Dis*;
728 **218**: S147-S153. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiy488.
- 729 112. **King AA et al.** (2008) Inapparent infections and cholera dynamics. *Nature*; **454**: 877-880. doi:
730 10.1038/nature07084.
- 731 113. **World Health Organization.** Cholera 2022 [11 January 2023]. Available at:
732 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cholera>.
- 733 114. **Kaper JB, Morris JG, Jr., Levine MM.** (1995) Cholera. *Clin Microbiol Rev*; **8**: 48-86. doi:
734 10.1128/cmr.8.1.48.

735 **Tables**

736 **Table 1. Water related exposures from studies included in the analysis and corresponding JMP**
 737 **service ladder.**

Water Category	JMP Service Ladder		Definition	Examples from Included Studies
Water Source*	Improved	Safely Managed	Improved drinking water that is free from contamination while being accessible on site [23]	Drinking bottled water, municipal tap water, sachet water, piped water
		Basic	Improved water that is collected in less than 30 minutes [23]	Drinking borehole water, rainwater, tube well water
		Limited	Improved water that is collected in more than 30 minutes [23]	Drinking tanker water, bladder water, common-source municipal tap water
	Unimproved	Unimproved water from unprotected water sources [23]		Drinking unprotected spring water, unprotected well water
	Surface Water	Unimproved water directly from open-sourced water bodies above the ground [23]		Drinking lake water, river water, stream water
	Water Treatment†	Treated Water		Any household treatment used to make water drinkable. If further specified, then allocated to treated by boiling, chlorination, presence of treatment materials or treatment itself was confirmed by observation of a surveyor. If not further specified, then allocated to generally treated water

Water Management [†]	Untreated Water	No household treatment used to make water drinkable	Drinking untreated water
	Safe Water Storage	Any method of storing potable water in containers with a lid, a narrow mouth, or a similar design	Storing water in container with lid and/ or container with narrow opening
	Unsafe Water Storage	Any method of storing potable water with open containers without a seal or lid or with a wide opening	Storing water in container with wide opening and no covering; changes in colour, odour, and taste of water

738 * originally named “drinking water” under JMP classification [22]

739 † categories added to the JMP categories

740

741 **Table 2. Results of the Meta-Analysis.**

Indicator of water quality	N exposures	Pooled OR (95% CI)	Test of Heterogeneity			Wolfe et al. (2018)
			Cochran's Q	τ^2	I ² (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Improved water						1.08 (0.54–2.15)
Safely managed water						
Sachet water	3	1.69 (1.13–2.52)	3.505	0.000	0.00 (0–>99.56)	
Bottled water	5	0.52 (0.19–1.36)	27.126**	1.017	83.01 (53.62–97.80)	0.35 (0.13–0.96)
Tap water	11	0.92 (0.41–2.08)	101.537**	1.670	90.42 (79.65–96.84)	
Basic water	5	0.44 (0.27–0.69)	7.460	0.008	2.49 (0.00–98.12)	
Limited water	4	0.84 (0.14–4.89)	15.874**	2.773	88.81 (58.13–99.33)	
Unimproved water						
Surface Water	10	2.91 (1.21–7.02)	52.609**	1.437	88.67 (71.92–97.49)	3.42 (2.47–4.74)
Treated water	9	3.40 (2.52–4.58)	9.026	0.000	0.00 (0.00–75.97)	2.27 (1.07–4.80) ^a
Boiled	7	0.42 (0.27–0.65)	19.214*	0.231	54.21 (5.73–87.98)	0.44 (0.35–0.56)
Chlorinated	6	0.38 (0.17–0.84)	24.006**	0.899	81.52 (52.16–96.98)	
Observation of Treatment Materials	4	0.37 (0.17–0.83)	19.943**	0.736	78.95 (40.66–96.66)	
Untreated water	15	0.41 (0.15–1.14)	12.170**	0.763	75.00 (19.80–98.15)	
Safe water storage						
Untreated water	15	2.51 (2.03–3.10)	8.442	0.000	0.00 (0.00–34.40)	3.47 (2.76–4.35)
Safe water storage	6	0.19 (0.03–1.36)	38.199**	4.754	87.19 (63.92–97.62)	0.55 (0.39–0.80)

Unsafe water storage	5	1.32 (0.57 – 3.03)	20.194**	0.668	77.76 (37.99–97.08)	2.79 (2.13–3.65)
----------------------	---	-----------------------	----------	-------	------------------------	---------------------

742 *p < 0.05


743 **p < 0.01

744 ^a categorized as surface water contact by Wolfe et al. [17]

745 **Figures**


746 **Fig 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram.**

747




748
749
750

751 **Fig 2. Meta-analysis of the associations between the subgroups of safely managed water and**
 752 **cholera.**
 753




754 (A)



755 (B)


**Water Source - Safely Managed Water
(Tap Water)**



756


(C)

757 **Fig 3. Meta-analysis of the association between basic water and cholera.**
758




759

760 **Fig 4. Meta-analysis of the associations between unimproved water and cholera as well as**
 761 **surface water and cholera.**
 762




763 (A)




764 (B)
 765
 766

767 **Fig 5. Meta-analysis of the associations between water treatment and cholera.**
 768




769 (A)



770 (B)

**Water Treatment - Treated Water
(Observation of Treatment Materials)**



771
772

(C)