Impact of a multi-pronged cholera intervention in an endemic setting

Short title: Short-term impact of OCV and WASH in a cholera endemic area

Alexandre Blake[1], Adam Walder[2], Ephraim Hanks[2], Placide Okitayembo Welo[3], Francisco Luquero[4], Didier Bompangue[3,5], Nita Bharti[1]

Corresponding author: Nita Bharti, nita@psu.edu

Affiliations

1: Biology Department, Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Penn State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, United States of America

2: Statistics Department, Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Penn State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, United States of America

3: Programme National d'Elimination du Choléra et de lutte contre les autres Maladies Diarrhéiques, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo

4: Epicentre, Paris, France

5: Department of Ecology and Control of Infectious Diseases, Faculty of Medicine, University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo

Abstract

Cholera is a bacterial water-borne diarrheal disease that causes high morbidity in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. It is transmitted via the fecal-oral route and can be prevented with vaccination and Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) improvements. WASH improvements are resource and time intensive

but provide long lasting benefits. Vaccination campaigns can be implemented more rapidly than WASH but provide only temporary immunity; cholera vaccines are effective in epidemic settings but their utility in endemic settings is unclear.

The city of Kalemie in the Democratic Republic of Congo, on the shore of Lake Tanganyika, is a cholera endemic area with annual outbreaks. Both seasonal mobility and the lake, which is a bacterial reservoir, promote transmission, though their relative contributions are unknown. In 2013-2016 Kalemie received a targeted vaccination campaign and WASH improvements. We assessed the short-term impact of this intervention to guide future control strategies in endemic settings.

We fit a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Susceptible model with a compartment for the aquatic bacterial population. We estimated the number of cases avoided by each arm of the intervention, explored alternative vaccination strategies, and investigated the relative contributions of mobility and environmentally-based transmission in local cholera dynamics.

We estimated that vaccination and WASH improvements prevented 3,484 cases (95% Credible Interval: 2,412-4,833) over a 118-week period. We showed that vaccination could prevent more cases by altering the timing and increasing the target population size. We found that transmission was primarily environmentally-driven and that removing environmental exposure or reducing environmental contamination could decrease local transmission.

Together, the targeted nature of the vaccination campaign, the modest scale of WASH improvements, and the high background immunity of the population limited the impact of the intervention. Constant environmentally-driven force of infection maintains high levels of cholera immunity in the population and decreases the impact of vaccination in this endemic area.

Author summary

Cholera is a major global health concern that causes high morbidity. It is a bacterial water-borne disease that can be transmitted via the fecal-oral route or the ingestion of contaminated water. Hence, both population mobility and environmental exposure can promote cholera persistence. The primary tools to prevent cholera include vaccination and Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) improvements. The effectiveness of these interventions is well understood in epidemic settings, but their impact in endemic settings is unclear. Achieving cholera elimination requires disentangling the contributors to transmission, specifically population mobility and aquatic reservoirs, and assessing the impact of interventions performed in endemic settings.

This study focuses on Kalemie, a cholera endemic city in the Democratic Republic of Congo, on shore of a lake that serves as a potential environmental reservoir. It quantifies the short-term impact of an intervention that used targeted vaccination and WASH. The study shows that the impact of vaccination was dampened by very high background immunity due to constant environmental exposure. This suggests that WASH improvements should be the primary intervention in such settings despite the time- and resource-intensive nature of implementation.

Introduction

Cholera is a bacterial, water-borne diarrheal disease. Typical cholera symptoms include vomiting and diarrhea with rice-water stools, potentially leading to severe dehydration. The mortality rate can reach 70% among severe cases if appropriate treatment, mainly rehydration, is not provided (1). However, individual symptoms can vary widely depending on age and prior exposures, ranging from asymptomatic infections, to mild infections with symptoms that are hardly distinguishable from other diarrheal

diseases, to the characteristic severe watery diarrhea (2). As many as 80% of infections can be asymptomatic in endemic areas (1), resulting in underestimates of cholera burden.

Cholera is transmitted through the fecal-oral route. The causal agent, *Vibrio cholerae* (*V. cholerae*), survives in aquatic environments and is present in the excreta (stools and vomit) of infected individuals. Infection is acquired by ingesting a sufficient bacterial load from the environment (indirect transmission) or contact with infectious excreta (direct transmission). *V. cholerae* abundance in aquatic reservoirs varies through interactions with biotic and abiotic factors. Aquatic flora, phytoplankton, and fauna, including copepods, have been described to modulate *V. cholerae* aquatic populations. In parallel, environmental parameters including water temperature and salinity also influence the *V. cholerae* life cycle in its aquatic reservoir (3–8). Viable *V. cholerae* can persist in the environment in suboptimal conditions for over 15 months in a non-culturable state (7), from which it can revert to a culturable state in favorable conditions. There are over 200 serogroups of *V. cholerae*, but only the serogroups O1 and O139 can cause the disease cholera (9). They are often introduced in natural or manmade water reservoirs through inappropriate waste management (6,10,11). Consuming contaminated water can then trigger outbreaks, potentially leading to additional contamination of water reservoirs. In non-endemic areas, the environmental contribution to cholera transmission is often low, but in endemic areas the relative contribution of direct and indirect transmission routes is unknown. This could make the benefits we would expect from interventions, as traditionally implemented in outbreak response, less clear in such settings because they do not necessarily target the dominant transmission route.

The 7th cholera pandemic has been ongoing since 1961. In addition to its traditional endemic area in the Bengal region, cholera established endemic areas in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) following its introduction in 1970 (12). SSA now experiences the greatest annual global morbidity and mortality of cholera (13), excluding major epidemic events that occurred in Haiti and Yemen. The Global Task Force on Cholera Control (GTFCC) has set a road map to eliminate cholera in 20 endemic countries by 2030 (14), defining

SSA as an important target. Generally, diseases or pathogens are considered 'endemic' when they display persistent local transmission for an extended period of time in a geographic area. For cholera specifically, the World Health Organization (WHO) defines a nation as endemic when local transmission caused cases in the previous three years. This definition encompasses a wide variety of transmission patterns.

Cholera transmission can be prevented by improving water and sanitation infrastructures and with vaccination. Water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) improvements have historically been the primary tool to prevent cholera. WASH improvements are resource intensive and implementation requires time to prevent cholera (15). They are extremely effective, as waste management and water infrastructures have largely prevented cholera transmission in high income countries (16). Cholera cannot be eliminated from an area without WASH improvements (17), however resource scarcities limit such improvements in the countries carrying most of the global cholera burden. Sub-Saharan African nations have some of the poorest access to clean water and improved toilets in the world as well as the greatest disparities in infrastructures between rural and urban areas (18). The scale of the WASH improvements necessary to address cholera in the SSA region is vast.

In comparison, implementing a vaccination campaign is fast and can reduce cholera transmission quickly. The empirical results of the reactive use of oral cholera vaccines (OCV) in 2012 in Guinea and theoretical results from modeling studies demonstrated the potential utility of vaccination as a tool for preventing cholera quickly (19,20). A quick vaccine rollout leads to a fast increase in population immunity that can mitigate cholera transmission, but this is a short term benefit because the acquired protection declines after about 2-3 years (21). The increasing stockpile of OCV allowed for more frequent use of vaccines in outbreak response and its novel use in endemic areas (22,23).

112 Both OCV and WASH improvements are important components of the multisectoral interventions
113 required to achieve cholera control or elimination in areas with high cholera burden (14,23). However,
114 the benefit of OCV is straightforward only in epidemic settings (22,24–26). The short-term impact of
115 OCV correlates with the resulting increase of the population immunity, but this benefit might be narrow
116 in an endemic setting where exposure to cholera is frequent. As such, quantifying the impact of
117 interventions using OCV in endemic settings will provide valuable information to inform control
118 strategies and achieve the ambitious goals set by the GTFCC.

119 Within SSA, Cholera is endemic in the African Great Lakes region. The Democratic Republic of Congo
120 (DRC) has consistently carried one of the highest cholera burdens in this region (13). Cholera is endemic
121 in the city of Kalemie in Tanganyika Province in DRC; the city lies on the shore of Lake Tanganyika (Figure
122 1A and Figure 1B). The area displays annual peaks of cholera cases, typically during rainy seasons (Figure
123 1C), and reports suspected cholera cases all year. Lake Tanganyika is a potential environmental reservoir
124 that likely promotes cholera persistence. In parallel, the local population is highly mobile with 24.7% of
125 the residents of the Tanganyika Province reporting travelling at least once in the previous 12 months for
126 a duration of at least 1 month (27). There is also strong fishing activity associated with the lake, with
127 fishermen moving seasonally and experiencing exposure to the lake and low sanitation conditions (28).
128 These population factors could promote cholera persistence through metapopulation dynamics (28).
129 The city of Kalemie received an intervention in 2013-2016 that included both an OCV campaign and
130 WASH improvements. The health system in DRC is organized in several levels in increasingly smaller
131 geographical units: Provinces, health zones, and health areas. Public health interventions are often
132 organized and implemented at health zone level. The vaccination campaign in Kalemie intended to
133 target about 120,000 people with two doses of OCV, Shanchol™, and focused on the four health areas
134 where the attack rates had historically been the highest as of November 2013. The vaccination campaign
135 was interrupted after 3 days due to security issues and resumed in July 2014 after redefining the target

population. The expiration of vaccine doses ultimately led to reducing the target to about 52,000 people in two health areas (29). The WASH intervention focused on improving access to clean water. Doctors Without Borders (*Médecins Sans Frontières*, MSF) extended access to tap water in the northern part of the city and laid pipes, built water reservoirs, distributed water filters, and set up public drinking fountains in collaboration with *Solidarites International*. In addition, sand filters were installed on paths where people draw water from the lake, and chlorination activities were performed during outbreaks. The WASH intervention incurred delays in the aftermath of the security issue, but was completed. We fit a compartmental model including both interhuman and environmental cholera transmission to assess the short-term impact of this multi-pronged intervention in Kalemie. We considered the potential influence of seasonal migration and environmental drivers and their relative contributions to local transmission.

Figure 1: Overview of the location and the seasonality of cholera cases in the study area. (A) Map of the DRC with population density (with log10(population+1) transformation), the boundaries of the health zones in white, major roads in light green, a red box around the health zones of Kalemie and Nyemba (seen in B), a red circle on the city of Kalemie, and Lake Tanganyika in blue. (B) Detailed map of the city of Kalemie (red circle), which sits across the two health zones of Kalemie and Nyemba (dark red boundaries), and population density (low in grey and high in red). (C) Boxplot of the total number of reported suspected cholera cases by week (based on the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) system) in the health zones of Kalemie and Nyemba from 2002 to 2014 (30), with week number and the typical rainy season weeks shaded in grey.

Results

The compartmental model with interhuman and environmental transmission reproduced the reported weekly cholera cases reasonably well, although it struggled to capture the magnitude of the peaks in cases (Figure 2A). The model indicated high local immunity, fluctuating between 93.2% and 99.5%

160 (Figure 2B). This high immunity is the likely consequence of annual outbreaks and persistent
161 environmental exposure, which we explain further below. The targeted vaccinations occurred at times
162 when population immunity was at 98.2% (95% credible interval (CrI): 97.6-98.7) in November 2013,
163 93.4% (95% CrI: 91.3-95.4) in July 2014, and 93.4% (95% CrI: 91.3-95.3) during the catch-up in August
164 2014.

165

166 **Figure 2:** Incident cases and model fit and variation of the percentage of infected, recovered, and susceptible over
167 time based on the model. (A) Weekly reported suspected cholera cases residing in the city of Kalemie (empty circles)
168 from November 2013 to February 2016 and mean prediction of the reported weekly cholera cases by the model (dark
169 line) and its 95% credible interval (grey envelope) (B) Mean prediction of the percent of the population infected
170 (prevalence), recovered, and susceptible (dark lines) and their 95% credible interval (grey envelopes) by the model
171 from November 2013 to February 2016. Typical rainy seasons are shaded in grey and the timing of the distribution of
172 vaccine doses in vertical dashed grey lines.

173 All the scenarios omitting vaccination (WASH only, and no WASH and no vaccination) visibly lacked a
174 reduction in the susceptible proportion of the population in July 2014 (Figure 3A). Over this period of
175 118 weeks, we estimated an average number of cases avoided of: 2,623 (mean: 2,626.6, 95% CrI:
176 1,910.2-3,391.6) cases avoided by vaccination alone (scenario with WASH only), 881 (mean: 881.3, 95%
177 CrI: 94.9-1,764.1) cases avoided by WASH alone (scenario with vaccination only), and 3,484 (mean:
178 3,484.4, 95% CrI: 2,411.7-4,832.8) cases avoided by implementing both vaccination and WASH (scenario
179 with no vaccination and no WASH improvements) (Figure 3B).

180

181 **Figure 3:** Estimated impact of the components of the intervention and impact of alternative vaccination strategies.
182 (A) Model predictions of the mean percent of the population that was infected, recovered, and susceptible considering:
183 the intervention as it happened of WASH and vaccination (dark blue), WASH only (blue), vaccination only (green),

184 and no intervention of either vaccination or WASH (yellow) from November 2013 to February 2016. Typical rainy
185 seasons are shaded in grey and the timing of the distribution of vaccine doses is shown in dashed purple lines. (B)
186 Violin plots of numbers of additional cholera cases at the end of the study period with WASH only (blue), vaccination
187 only (green), or no intervention (no WASH and no vaccination) (yellow) compared to the intervention as it happened
188 of WASH and vaccination. The error bars show the 95% credible interval, the filled circles show the median values,
189 and the horizontal bars show the mean values. (C) Heatmap of the number of cases avoided by changing the timing
190 and the coverage of a vaccination campaign compared to a scenario without intervention. The timing of the distribution
191 of vaccine doses for the intervention as it happened are in dashed grey lines in A and C.

192

193 Alternative vaccination scenarios revealed that small-scale interventions, or interventions with small
194 target population sizes, had a very limited impact in this population with high immunity (Figure 3C).
195 However, the timing of a pulse of vaccination substantially influenced its potential impact. Specifically,
196 timing the vaccination to occur during the lowest point of population immunity and before an outbreak
197 began increased its impact. The best performing vaccination scenario avoided 6,858 cases (mean:
198 6,858.5, 95%CrI: 4,809.7-8,600.8) over 118 weeks for 200,000 vaccinated people, which is more than
199 twice as many cases that were avoided by vaccination alone in the intervention that occurred. Despite
200 this, the high level of local immunity resulted in vaccinating a large proportion of immune individuals,
201 reducing the impact of the vaccination.

202

203 **Figure 4:** Contributions of seasonal mobility and the environmental reservoir in cholera transmission. (A) Model
204 predictions of the mean percent of infected, recovered, and susceptible individuals in the population with seasonal
205 migration and environmental exposure and contamination (light blue), environmental exposure and contamination (no
206 seasonal mobility) (pink), seasonal mobility and environmental contamination (no environmental exposure) (beige),
207 and seasonal mobility and environmental exposure (no environmental contamination) (grey) from November 2013 to
208 February 2016. Typical rainy seasons are shaded in grey. (B) Violin plots of numbers of cholera cases avoided by the

end of the study period with environmental exposure and contamination (no seasonal mobility) (pink), seasonal migration and environmental contamination (no environmental exposure) (beige), or seasonal migration and environmental exposure (no environmental contamination) (grey) compared to a scenario with seasonal migration, environmental exposure, and environmental contamination. The error bars, the filled circles, and the horizontal bars indicate the 95% credible interval, the median, and the mean values, respectively. All the scenarios considered in A and B assume that no intervention occurred (no WASH and no vaccination). (C) Mean prediction of the variation of the environmental (light orange line) and interhuman (light green line) components of the force of infection and their 95% credible interval (light orange and light green envelopes) from November 2013 to February 2016. The light orange and light green dashed lines indicate the values of the environmental exposure rate ($\boldsymbol{\beta_e}$) and interhuman transmission rate ($\boldsymbol{\beta_h}$), respectively. (D) Left: Mean prediction of the variation of the net bacterial growth ($\boldsymbol{\varphi_t - \varepsilon}$) (dark line) in the environment and its 95% credible interval (grey envelope) from November 2013 to February 2016. Right: Violin plot and boxplot of the distribution of the mean prediction of the net bacterial growth rate from November 2013 to February 2016. The dashed black line indicates 0: values below 0 show net bacterial decay and values above 0 show net bacterial growth.

Regarding the relative contributions of mobility and environmental reservoirs to cholera transmission, the model suggested that seasonal migration had a minimal influence on the observed cholera dynamics relative to the environmental reservoir (Figure 4A); a scenario with no seasonal migration did not substantially alter the number of cases. However, removing environmental exposure avoided 93,896 cases (mean: 93,896.5, 95% CrI: 72,842.6-122,297.5) and preventing environmental contamination from infectious human excreta avoided 91,519 cases (mean: 91,519.0, 95% CrI: 68,381.1-124,373.1). Each of these interventions virtually interrupted local cholera transmission (Figure 4B). Environmental contamination with infectious excreta appeared necessary to maintain a bacterial load sufficient to support environmentally-driven transmission because the fluctuation of *V. cholerae* population averaged towards net decay (Figure 4D, right).

234 The high immunity inferred by the model was maintained through annual flare-ups in Kalemie and
235 constant environmental exposure. The environmental component of the force of infection ($\Phi_e = \beta_e \frac{B}{\kappa + B}$
236 $(1 + \lambda_e f(rain_t))$) was consistently greater than the interhuman transmission component ($\Phi_h = \frac{\beta_h I}{N}$)
237 (Figure 4C). The latter, Φ_h, remained low because epidemic flare-ups did not lead to a high prevalence of
238 infection as they would in a mostly susceptible population. Conversely, Φ_e strongly increased with pulses
239 of net bacterial growth due to environmental drivers, despite an overall trend favoring net decay (Figure
240 4D left and right).

241

242 **Discussion**

243 The impact of the intervention performed in Kalemie was modest when measured by cases avoided,
244 which we estimate around 3,484 (mean: 3,484.4, 95% CrI: 2,411.7-4,832.8) for both intervention arms
245 combined. Following the interruption of planned vaccination activities, the reduction of the target
246 population size after resuming activities, the narrow scale of the WASH improvements, and the high
247 level of immunity in the population likely all contributed to mitigating the impact of the intervention.

248 Benefitting from vaccination in endemic cholera settings, as defined by WHO, requires an understanding
249 of dominant local transmission routes. Our model suggests that in settings where an environmental
250 reservoir provides consistent exposure and maintains high immunity in the population, the impact of
251 vaccination is minimal. The practical limitation of not being able to identify and target the population of
252 susceptible individuals leads to vaccinating a majority of immune individuals. Achieving very high
253 vaccine coverage would immunize a greater number of susceptible individuals, but at the cost of giving
254 many additional doses to immune individuals. This cost could be reduced slightly by targeting the age
255 group most represented among susceptibles or by guiding vaccination with serosurveys. The age profile
256 of the suspected cholera cases residing in Kalemie (median age of 15 years, and interquartile range (IQR)

257 of 3-34 years) during this period would support restricting the maximum age of the target population to
258 increase the impact of the vaccination campaign. However, applying an age cut-off would require high
259 resolution epidemiological data. Similarly, using serosurveys to guide vaccination efforts to target
260 susceptibles would incur a substantial additional financial cost in addition to the difficulty of applying a
261 binary interpretation to serosurvey results.

262 Our findings are consistent with previous analyses suggesting that allocation of OCV doses should
263 prioritize reactive vaccination in epidemic settings over proactive vaccination in endemic settings (31).
264 However, because endemicity is more nuanced than the current WHO definition suggests, OCV could
265 still play an important role in some endemic settings. Ongoing studies are assessing the impact of recent
266 vaccination campaigns performed in other endemic settings in DRC: in Uvira (32), which is also on the
267 shore of Lake Tanganyika, and in Goma (33), which is on the shore of Lake Kivu, a Great Lake that sits
268 just north of Lake Tanganyika . These studies will provide valuable insights on the impact of OCV with
269 alternative strategies.

270 Our model suggests that a well-timed large-scale vaccination could improve the impact of vaccination in
271 Kalemie city, potentially avoiding an average of 6,858.5 cases (95%CrI: 4,809.7-8,600.8) for 200,000
272 vaccinated individuals. However, this requires implementing a very large vaccination campaign with
273 precise timing. Such vaccination campaigns would be difficult to implement due to logistical challenges
274 and high costs, and they would still achieve only short term and small-scale benefits. On the other hand,
275 our findings suggest that WASH improvements on a scale large enough to prevent environmental
276 exposure and contamination for the whole population could have a dramatic impact. Although we
277 estimated that the WASH improvements in Kalemie prevented a modest number of cases, this is likely
278 partially due to the short period of time considered to assess the impact of an intervention. The main
279 components of this WASH intervention consisted of extending the pipe network and building a water
280 reservoir, which were completed incrementally during that 118-week period. While extending the

281 access to the pipe network is an important step, it does not guarantee reliable and consistent access to
282 chlorinated tap water (34). The immense magnitude of the improvements required to ensure both
283 access to safe water and efficient waste management, not only in Kalemie but throughout the cholera-
284 affected nation of DRC, appears necessary to control cholera. Implementing WASH improvements
285 should be considered a priority not only to control cholera, but also to prevent the transmission of other
286 water-borne and fecal-oral pathogens that contribute to the disease burden in DRC (35). This approach
287 will also help achieve the 6th goal of the Sustainable Development Goals (36), which is to ensure
288 availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all, in a country where WASH
289 improvements are critically needed (18).

290 Kalemie is not unique regarding strong environmentally driven cholera transmission. Substantial
291 environmental contribution for cholera cases has been reported in Haiti and Zimbabwe (20).
292 Environmental drivers are also important drivers in other endemic settings like Bangladesh and India,
293 where they act differently: flooding in the early and late phase of the monsoon are strongly associated
294 with higher cholera incidence (37,38), while the peak of the monsoon is associated with a cholera lull
295 due the "dilution" of *V. cholerae* in its reservoir (39). Although mobility does not play a role in local
296 persistence within the city of Kalemie, movement allows Kalemie to be a source of cholera that can seed
297 outbreaks in surrounding areas where exposure is less frequent. The older age of the suspected cholera
298 cases residing outside of Kalemie (median age of 24.5 years, and IQR: 5.75-39.25 years) is consistent
299 with lower exposure rates and source-sink dynamics.

300 Our estimates indicating a major role of environmentally driven transmission in Kalemie's local cholera
301 dynamics appear plausible. Confirming our estimates of population immunity and the source of bacterial
302 infection would require serological data and substantial microbiological monitoring of the lake water in
303 the area. Evidence of environmental presence of toxigenic *V. cholerae* is scarce but it has been found in
304 Lake Tanganyika on the Tanzanian shore in fish and water samples with some evidence of increased

305 positive samples during rainy seasons (40–42). Evidence of fecal contamination in coastal water would
306 support the importance of the strong amplification of environmental presence through environmental
307 contamination during outbreaks (43).

308 The natural variation in abundance of the *V. cholerae* population in the lake leans in favor of net decay.
309 Previous modeling studies assumed bacterial growth rates to consistently be in favor of net decay,
310 whether it varied over time or it was constant negative growth (44,45). Our model allowed
311 environmental bacterial abundance to vary over time based on environmental inputs, allowing
312 temporary switches to net bacterial growth. It played an important role in creating pulses of a high,
313 environmentally-driven force of infection. The overall net bacterial decay in the lake also highlights that
314 regularly replenishing local bacterial population through environmental contamination is a critical
315 component of local persistence. This emphasizes the potential compounded benefits of comprehensive
316 improvements to sanitary infrastructures and access to clean water.

317 Although our model is not designed to assess the long-term dynamics of cholera in Kalemie city, the
318 importance of water contamination is consistent with observations in other modern outbreaks. The
319 cholera outbreak that occurred in Haiti in 2010 following its introduction by United Nations
320 peacekeepers was primarily transmitted along the Artibonite river in its early phase (46). Fecal
321 contamination of water has been commonly found in Haiti (47), where access to safe drinking water and
322 sanitation is among the lowest in the world (18). This provides conditions conducive to environmentally
323 driven transmission for cholera. In contrast, the neighboring country on Hispaniola, the Dominican
324 Republic, has good access to safe drinking water and strong sanitation infrastructures (18) and
325 experienced little cholera transmission during the massive outbreak in Haiti. The impact of improving
326 the quality of consumed water (reducing environmental exposure) in our simulation is impressive but
327 the impact of removing environmental contamination appears almost as effective. However, this would

328 be difficult to compare in practice since a comprehensive WASH intervention would aim to both
329 improve the quality of consumed water and minimize the contamination of the local water reservoir.

330 We did not consider cholera-induced mortality because of the low number of cholera-induced deaths in
331 this population and the local experience in managing cholera. However, there is evidence that a
332 substantial portion of cholera mortality has previously occurred in the community (48) so we cannot rule
333 out that some cholera-induced mortality is not captured in the reported data. The absence of dedicated
334 mortality surveys in Kalemie prevents us from estimating the number of deaths avoided by the multi-
335 pronged intervention. Our model did not consider the potential immunological impact of vaccination on
336 already immune individuals, which could extend the period during which they are protected against
337 cholera infection. This could have led us to slightly underestimate the duration of immunity but it is
338 unlikely to have substantial impact on our estimates considering the short study period (118 weeks,
339 which is a little more than 2 years) compared to our estimated average immunity period ($1/\gamma$= 6.2 years,
340 95% CrI: 4.6- 8.0 years). We also assumed that immunity waning for susceptible individuals who were
341 successfully vaccinated was similar to the immunity waning after a natural infection, although it is likely
342 shorter (49). Again, this would have little impact on our estimates considering the small proportion of
343 susceptible individuals in the population when doses were distributed in our model as well as the
344 previously mentioned reasons (50).

345 We included the potential impact of the WASH intervention in a simplistic way, assuming a linear
346 variation of the environmental transmission rate due to the WASH intervention. In the absence of more
347 detailed information, this method required the fewest additional assumptions. To estimate
348 environmental drivers, we used measurements of chlorophyll-a levels and surface water temperature in
349 the lake in addition to the influence of rain. The association between *V. cholerae* and other elements of
350 its aquatic reservoir is vaguely understood, but the details remain unclear (7,51). We cannot assess how
351 accurately we captured the main fluctuations of the environmental bacterial population in the absence

352 of thorough environmental sampling in the area. However, the environmental drivers we considered
353 have all been shown to modulate *V. cholerae* environmental abundance or exposure to the
354 environmental reservoir. Phytoplankton growth, indirectly measured through chlorophyll-a, has been
355 associated with cholera outbreaks in several studies, and cyanobacteria more specifically are a credible
356 reservoir for *V. cholerae* (5,7). Water temperature influences phytoplankton growth (7), and the
357 consequence of rainfall on environmental exposure and environmental contamination to/from *V.*
358 *cholerae* is credible in this setting along a lake with low access to water and sanitation infrastructures
359 (52). Finally, the complex combination of parameters to estimate critical metrics including the number
360 of infected individuals, the net bacterial growth, and its consequence on the environmental component
361 of the force of infection leads to some loss of identifiability. However, we reached convergence on the
362 critical metrics they helped estimate, and our model captured true values of parameters in 95% CrI using
363 simulated data (see Supplementary Information (SI)). We remain confident in our main conclusions.

364 We explicitly included a direct proxy of human presence: anthropogenic nighttime radiance. Nighttime
365 radiance is a reliable indicator of human presence and has previously been used to infer population
366 mobility in both high and low-income countries (53–56). We are confident in our finding regarding the
367 low contribution of seasonal mobility. We also explicitly included relevant environmental drivers making
368 the environmental component of our model robust, though it might be limited by the spatiotemporal
369 resolution and availability of remote sensing data, particularly for chlorophyll-a.

370 There is a scarcity of impact assessments of cholera interventions in endemic settings beyond estimates
371 of vaccine effectiveness and vaccine coverage. Studies like this one are crucial to guide cholera
372 elimination. OCV and WASH improvements are core components of the toolbox to control or eliminate
373 cholera. However, the value of OCV in reactive vaccination in epidemic settings has not been clear in
374 areas with various patterns of endemicities. The assumption that most of the target population is
375 susceptible becomes less accurate as transmission is increasingly environmentally driven. Reducing

376 cholera transmission in endemic areas will require a location-specific understanding of the transmission
377 routes to tailor a strategy; a "one size fits all" approach is unlikely to achieve satisfying results.
378 Coordinated geographically-specific strategies might also be necessary to achieve regional cholera
379 control.

380

381 **Materials and methods**

382 We fit a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered-Susceptible model that included a compartment, B, for the *V.*
383 *cholerae* population in the environmental reservoir, Lake Tanganyika (57). Our SIRB model explicitly
384 considered the influence of environmental factors on bacterial growth in the lake and the potential
385 consequences of seasonal population mobility.

386 We fit the SIRB model to the reported suspected cholera cases presenting at the only cholera treatment
387 center (CTC) in the city of Kalemie from November 2013 to February 2016. Detailed surveillance data
388 were gathered in an electronic register with support from MSF. This level of resolution is available only
389 for this period of time. Only residents of Kalemie city were included in this analysis. We estimated the
390 number of vaccinated individuals from vaccine coverage data collected in a survey performed by MSF
391 (29) and the associated population size estimates (see SI).

392 Seasonal population mobility (58) can influence local cholera dynamics through regular reintroductions
393 from areas with ongoing transmission. We included this connectivity by quantifying the seasonal
394 variation of contemporaneous anthropogenic nighttime radiance extracted from Visible Infrared
395 Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) data (59) (see SI).

396 We considered the influence of water temperature and phytoplankton, such as cyanobacteria, as
397 environmental drivers on aquatic bacterial growth (7). Water temperature and phytoplankton were
398 included in the model through lake surface temperature (SST_t) and chlorophyll-a ($chlor_t$). These values

were extracted from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer data (60) (see SI). Precipitation ($rain_t$) was also considered as a potential factor that could increase exposure to environmental reservoir and the environmental contamination with infectious human excreta (52) ($\lambda_e f(rain_t)$) by contaminating drinking water sources and flooding defecation sites ($\lambda_c f(rain_t)$). We extracted precipitation estimates from meteorological forcings data (61).

The structure of the model is as follows:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \delta R - \beta_h \frac{SI}{N} - \beta_e \frac{B}{\kappa + B}(1 + \lambda_e f(rain_t))S - \eta S + f_S(rad_t)$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \beta_h \frac{SI}{N} + \beta_e \frac{B}{\kappa + B}(1 + \lambda_e f(rain_t))S - \gamma I + f_I(rad_t)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \gamma I - \delta R + \eta S$$

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = \mu(1 + \lambda_c f(rain_t))I - B(\varepsilon - \varphi_t)$$

with

$f_S(rad_t) = \alpha_1 rad_t$

$f_I(rad_t) = \alpha_I rad_t$

$ratio_{S/I} = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_I}$

$\varphi_t = e^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 sst_t + \alpha_4 chlor_t}$

$\eta = (\sigma_1 VC_{1t} + \sigma_2 VC_{2t})$

$f(rain_t) = \frac{rain_t}{max(rain_t)}$

416 We used a negative binomial process to link the predicted number of weekly incident cases (C_t) and the
417 weekly reported number of suspected cases (A_t): $A_t \sim NegBinom(C_t r, C_t \psi)$, with r, a constant reporting
418 rate, and $C_t \psi$, an overdispersion parameter that scaled with the predicted number of new cases. The
419 negative binomial distribution can handle overdispersion and its scaling overdispersion parameter
420 allows variance estimates to better scale in situations with fast and large variations of the incidence, like
421 in epidemics.

422 Susceptible individuals become infected through exposure to the environmental reservoir, β_e or through
423 interhuman transmission, β_h. The WASH intervention decreased the environmental exposure rate β_e by
424 a quantity β_{WASH} by the end of the study period. β_e was assumed to decrease linearly from β_e to β_e-
425 β_{WASH} from the time the first WASH improvement was completed (ISO week 40 in 2014). The model did
426 not allow the environmental contamination to vary because the intervention did not target human
427 waste management. The infection probability from an exposure to the environment followed a dose-
428 effect relationship, with κ being the half saturation constant. Infectious individuals transitioned to the
429 recovered compartment at rate γ. Susceptible individuals could gain immunity through vaccination, η, 1
430 week after receiving the vaccine (19). This was included in the model through a step function of the
431 number of people who received 1 or 2 doses (VC_{1t} and VC_{2t}) of ShancholTM. The model presented here
432 assumed a vaccine effectiveness of 80% (σ_1) and 85% (σ_2) respectively for one and two dose regimens.
433 We considered a range of alternative values for those two parameters, including estimates from studies
434 done in the aftermath of reactive vaccination campaigns performed in Zambia and Guinea (19,62) (see
435 SI). Considering the wide age range of the target population (everyone older than 1 year), we assumed
436 that the proportions of susceptible, infected, and recovered among the vaccinated individuals were the
437 same as in the general population at the time the doses were distributed. Immunity wanes at rate δ,
438 returning immune individuals to the susceptible compartment. We assumed the vaccine had no effect
439 on individuals who were immune, whether immunity was acquired through prior infection or

vaccination. We also assumed that vaccination had no impact on those who were infected at the time of the vaccination. We added a penalty term (Θ) to account for the spatially targeted nature of the vaccination campaign, which focused on areas with historically high attack rates where residents experience more cholera exposures, resulting in a low proportion of susceptibles. We considered a range of possible values for Θ over several models (between 0.7 and 1) (see SI).

This model did not include the births, deaths, and the age structure of the host population because of the short time period of 118 weeks that was considered. We also assumed no cholera-induced mortality due to case management; only 5 deaths were reported among the 1634 resident suspected cholera cases, or 0.3%, during the study period (see SI).

Population size was allowed to vary through seasonal migration ($f_S(rad_t)$ and $f_I(rad_t)$). We assumed that the net migration flow varied linearly with the first derivative of the nighttime radiance data in the area (rad_t) (53). We first fit a generalized additive model with a cyclical spline to the radiance data and then extracted its first derivative (see SI). We considered the migration of susceptible and infected individuals but not immune individuals, who do not actively contribute to transmission. We considered a range of values for the ratio of susceptible and infectious individuals among the mobile population ($ratio_{S/I}$) over several models (between 10 and 100) (see SI). We explored alternative model structures including allowing only susceptible individuals to be mobile ($f_I(rad_t) = 0$) as well as excluding all seasonal mobility as a sensitivity analysis ($f_S(rad_t) = 0 \; and \; f_I(rad_t) = 0$) (see SI).

The bacterial population in the environment increased with contamination of the lake from the excreta of infected individuals (μ), and a time dependent bacterial growth rate (φ_t) that varied with environmental drivers. Conversely, it decreased through bacterial decay (ε). To minimize identifiability issues between ε and the components of φ_t we clipped the parameter space of the decay rate using previously reported values (44,63) (see SI).

We estimated the parameters β_h, β_e, β_{WASH}, α_1, α_2 , α_3, α_4, λ_e, λ_c, δ, μ, ε, r, and ψ, and the initial conditions S_0, I_0, R_0, B_0 through Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and fit a total of 64 models with every combination of the values considered for σ_1, σ_2, ⍰, and $ratio_{S/I}$ in addition to 32 models with alternative structures for sensitivity analyses (see SI). The model presented here minimized the deviance information criterion (DIC). All the estimates presented are the mean values over the posterior distribution and their 95% CrI).

We assessed the short-term impact of each arm of the intervention separately and both arms together by estimating the number of additional cases in their absence. We fixed η to 0 while keeping β_{WASH} unchanged (simulating WASH improvements without vaccination), did not allow β_e to decrease (β_{WASH} =0) while keeping η unchanged (simulating vaccination without WASH improvements), and then fixed both η and β_{WASH} to 0 (simulating an intervention with no vaccination and no WASH improvements). We sampled 10,000 sets of parameters from the posterior distribution and calculated the number of cases in each of the alternative scenarios and compared them to the intervention as it happened.

We explored alternative vaccination strategies by varying the timing and the size of the target population, between 50,000 to 200,000, of the vaccination campaign, assuming a campaign that occurred only once during the 118-week period with a two-dose regimen. The maximum target population size considered in these alternatives strategies is within the MSF vaccination capacity observed in other vaccination campaigns against cholera (62,64). We estimated the number of cases avoided for each scenario by calculating the difference in the number of cholera cases between a simulation using the alternative vaccination scenario and a simulation assuming no intervention (no vaccination and no WASH) for every set of parameters sampled from the posterior distribution. We considered 84 combinations of alternative timing and target population size. We sampled 500 sets of parameters for each combination, computational intensity prohibited more. As before, we assumed that

the proportion of susceptible, infected, and recovered among the vaccine-targeted individuals was the same as in the general population at the time the doses were distributed. For these scenarios we considered a non-spatially targeted vaccination campaign (see SI).

We investigated the relative contributions of population mobility and environmental exposure in a context without intervention (η=0 and β_{WASH}=0, meaning no vaccination and no WASH improvements). We simulated alternative scenarios with no seasonal mobility ($f_S(rad_t)$=0 and $f_I(rad_t)$=0), or no environmental exposure (β_e=0), or no environmental contamination (μ=0) and calculated the cumulative difference between these and a scenario with seasonal mobility, environmental exposure and contamination ($f_S(rad_t)$, $f_I(rad_t)$, β_e, and μ unchanged) for each of 10,000 sets of parameters sampled from the posterior distribution.

Ethical considerations

The Ethical Review Board of the University of Lubumbashi approved the study protocol to assess the impact of the vaccination campaign (study protocol ethical number: UNILU/CEM/028/2013) and its extension (study protocol ethical number: UNILU/CEM/050/2015). Individuals provided informed consent to be part of the vaccine coverage survey. Pennsylvania State University's Institutional Review Board determined the post-intervention handling and analyses of these anonymized data was Not Human Research (STUDY00015621).

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge support and feedback from Nathan Wikle on statistical analyses.

507 **Author contribution**

508 Conceptualization: AB, FL, DB, NB

509 Data curation: AB, AW, FL

510 Formal analysis, AB, AW, FL

511 Investigation: AB, FL, DB

512 Methodology: AB, AW, FL, EH, NB

513 Software: AB, AW

514 Visualization: AB, NB

515 Writing – Original draft preparation: AB, NB

516 Writing - Review and Editing: AB, AW, FL, DB, POW, EH, NB

517

518 **References**

519 1. Harris JB, LaRocque RC, Qadri F, Ryan ET, Calderwood SB. Cholera. The Lancet. 2012 Jun
520 30;379(9835):2466–76.

521 2. Nelson EJ, Harris JB, Morris JG, Calderwood SB, Camilli A. Cholera transmission: the host, pathogen
522 and bacteriophage dynamic. Nat Rev Microbiol [Internet]. 2009 Oct [cited 2020 Apr 8];7(10).
523 Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3842031/

524 3. Jutla A, Whitcombe E, Hasan N, Haley B, Akanda A, Huq A, et al. Environmental Factors Influencing
525 Epidemic Cholera. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2013 Sep 4;89(3):597–607.

526 4. Constantin de Magny G, Colwell RR. Cholera and climate: a demonstrated relationship. Trans Am
527 Clin Climatol Assoc. 2009;120:119–28.

528 5. Constantin de Magny G, Murtugudde R, Sapiano MRP, Nizam A, Brown CW, Busalacchi AJ, et al.
529 Environmental signatures associated with cholera epidemics. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2008 Nov
530 18;105(46):17676–81.

531 6. Zerbo A, Castro Delgado R, González PA. A review of the risk of cholera outbreaks and urbanization
532 in sub-Saharan Africa. J Biosaf Biosecurity. 2020 Dec 1;2(2):71–6.

533 7. Islam MS, Zaman MH, Islam MS, Ahmed N, Clemens JD. Environmental reservoirs of Vibrio cholerae.
534 Vaccine. 2020 Feb 29;38:A52–62.

535 8. Vezzulli L, Pruzzo C, Huq A, Colwell RR. Environmental reservoirs of Vibrio cholerae and their role in
536 cholera. Environ Microbiol Rep. 2010 Feb;2(1):27–33.

537 9. Finkelstein RA. Cholera, Vibrio cholerae O1 and O139, and Other Pathogenic Vibrios. In: Baron S,
538 editor. Medical Microbiology [Internet]. 4th ed. Galveston (TX): University of Texas Medical Branch
539 at Galveston; 1996 [cited 2020 Apr 8]. Available from:
540 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK8407/

541 10. Birmingham ME, Lee LA, Ndayimirije N, Nkurikiye S, Hersh BS, Wells JG, et al. Epidemic cholera in
542 Burundi: patterns of transmission in the Great Rift Valley Lake region. The Lancet. 1997 Apr
543 5;349(9057):981–5.

544 11. Frerichs RR, Keim PS, Barrais R, Piarroux R. Nepalese origin of cholera epidemic in Haiti. Clin
545 Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2012 Jun;18(6):E158-163.

546 12. Sow S, Antonio M, Oundo JO, Mandomando I, Ramamurthy T. Endemic and Epidemic Cholera in
547 Africa. In: Ramamurthy T, Bhattacharya SK, editors. Epidemiological and Molecular Aspects on
548 Cholera [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer; 2011 [cited 2022 Dec 1]. p. 31–50. (Infectious Disease).
549 Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60327-265-0_3

550 13. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated Global Burden of Cholera in Endemic Countries. PLoS
551 Negl Trop Dis. 2015 Jun 4;9(6):e0003832.

552 14. Organization WH. Ending cholera a global roadmap to 2030. In: Ending cholera a global roadmap to
553 2030. 2017. p. 32–32.

554 15. Waldman RJ, Mintz ED, Papowitz HE. The Cure for Cholera — Improving Access to Safe Water and
555 Sanitation. N Engl J Med. 2013 Feb 14;368(7):592–4.

556 16. Luby SP, Davis J, Brown RR, Gorelick SM, Wong THF. Broad approaches to cholera control in Asia:
557 Water, sanitation and handwashing. Vaccine. 2020 Feb 29;38:A110–7.

558 17. Montgomery M, Jones MW, Kabole I, Johnston R, Gordon B. No end to cholera without basic water,
559 sanitation and hygiene. Bull World Health Organ. 2018 Jun 1;96(6):371-371A.

560 18. Organization WH. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2017: special
561 focus on inequalities. World Health Organization; 2019.

562 19. Luquero FJ, Grout L, Ciglenecki I, Sakoba K, Traore B, Heile M, et al. Use of Vibrio cholerae vaccine in
563 an outbreak in Guinea. N Engl J Med. 2014 May 29;370(22):2111–20.

564 20. Mukandavire Z, Morris JG. Modeling the Epidemiology of Cholera to Prevent Disease Transmission
565 in Developing Countries. Microbiol Spectr. 2015 Jun 19;3(3):3.3.21.

566 21. World Health Organization. Cholera vaccine: WHO position paper, August 2017 –
567 Recommendations. Vaccine. 2018 Jun 7;36(24):3418–20.

568 22. Pezzoli L. Global oral cholera vaccine use, 2013–2018. Vaccine. 2020 Feb;38:A132–40.

569 23. Shaikh H, Lynch J, Kim J, Excler JL. Current and future cholera vaccines. Vaccine. 2020 Feb
570 29;38:A118–26.

571 24. Ali M, Debes AK, Luquero FJ, Kim DR, Park JY, Digilio L, et al. Potential for Controlling Cholera Using a
572 Ring Vaccination Strategy: Re-analysis of Data from a Cluster-Randomized Clinical Trial. PLOS Med.
573 2016 Sep 13;13(9):e1002120.

574 25. Leung T, Eaton J, Matrajt L. Optimizing one-dose and two-dose cholera vaccine allocation in
575 outbreak settings: A modeling study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2022 Apr 20;16(4):e0010358.

576 26. Finger F, Bertuzzo E, Luquero FJ, Naibei N, Touré B, Allan M, et al. The potential impact of case-area
577 targeted interventions in response to cholera outbreaks: A modeling study. PLOS Med. 2018 Feb
578 27;15(2):e1002509.

579 27. Congo Democratic Republic DHS, 2013-14 - Final Report (French).

580 28. Bompangue Nkoko D, Giraudoux P, Plisnier PD, Tinda AM, Piarroux M, Sudre B, et al. Dynamics of
581 cholera outbreaks in Great Lakes region of Africa, 1978-2008. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011
582 Nov;17(11):2026–34.

583 29. Massing LA, Aboubakar S, Blake A, Page AL, Cohuet S, Ngandwe A, et al. Highly targeted cholera
584 vaccination campaigns in urban setting are feasible: The experience in Kalemie, Democratic Republic
585 of Congo. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018 May 7;12(5):e0006369.

586 30. Kayembe HCN, Bompangue D, Linard C, Muwonga J, Moutschen M, Situakibanza H, et al. Modalities
587 and preferred routes of geographic spread of cholera from endemic areas in eastern Democratic
588 Republic of the Congo. PLOS ONE. 2022 Feb 7;17(2):e0263160.

589 31. Moore SM, Lessler J. Optimal allocation of the limited oral cholera vaccine supply between endemic
590 and epidemic settings. J R Soc Interface. 2015 Oct 6;12(111):20150703.

591 32. The impact of mass cholera vaccination in Uvira, Democratic Republic of the Congo – Global Task
592 Force on Cholera Control [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 12]. Available from:
593 https://www.gtfcc.org/research/the-impact-of-mass-cholera-vaccination-in-uvira-democratic-
594 republic-of-the-congo/

595 33. Impact evaluation of OCV preventive campaigns, DRC – Global Task Force on Cholera Control
596 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 13]. Available from: https://www.gtfcc.org/research/impact-evaluation-
597 of-ocv-preventive-campaigns-drc/

598 34. Jeandron A, Saidi JM, Kapama A, Burhole M, Birembano F, Vandevelde T, et al. Water Supply
599 Interruptions and Suspected Cholera Incidence: A Time-Series Regression in the Democratic
600 Republic of the Congo. Brocklehurst C, editor. PLOS Med. 2015 Oct 27;12(10):e1001893.

601 35. Reiner RC, Graetz N, Casey DC, Troeger C, Garcia GM, Mosser JF, et al. Variation in Childhood
602 Diarrheal Morbidity and Mortality in Africa, 2000–2015. N Engl J Med. 2018 Sep 20;379(12):1128–
603 38.

604 36. THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 13]. Available from:
605 https://sdgs.un.org/goals

606 37. Carrel M, Emch M, Streatfield PK, Yunus M. Spatio-temporal clustering of cholera: the impact of
607 flood control in Matlab, Bangladesh, 1983-2003. Health Place. 2009 Sep;15(3):741–52.

608 38. Cash BA, Rodó X, Emch M, Yunus M, Faruque ASG, Pascual M. Cholera and Shigellosis: Different
609 Epidemiology but Similar Responses to Climate Variability. PLOS ONE. 2014 Sep 17;9(9):e107223.

610 39. Shackleton D, Memon FA, Nichols G, Phalkey R, Chen AS. Mechanisms of cholera transmission via
611 environment in India and Bangladesh: state of the science review. Rev Environ Health [Internet].
612 2023 Jan 16 [cited 2023 Jun 23]; Available from:
613 https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2022-0201/html

614 40. Hounmanou YMG, Njamkepo E, Rauzier J, Gallandat K, Jeandron A, Kamwiziku G, et al. Genomic
615 Microevolution of Vibrio cholerae O1, Lake Tanganyika Basin, Africa - Volume 29, Number 1—
616 January 2023 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. [cited 2023 Apr 13]; Available from:
617 https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/29/1/22-0641_article

618 41. Michael M. Detection and antibiotic susceptibility of vibrio cholerae In oreochromis tanganicae
619 (Tilapia) and water in Lake Tanganyika, Kigoma-Tanzania [Internet] [Thesis]. Sokoine University of
620 Agriculture; 2019 [cited 2023 Apr 13]. Available from:
621 http://www.suaire.sua.ac.tz/handle/123456789/3905

622 42. Nyambuli S. Prevalence, pathogenic markers and antibiotic susceptibility of Vibrio cholerae in
623 sardines, water and phytoplankton in lake Tanganyika, Tanzania. Sokoine University of Agriculture;
624 2017.

625 43. Plisnier P, Denis, Cornet Y, Cocquyt C. Cholera outbreaks at Lake Tanganyika induced by Climate
626 Change?(CHOLTIC) : final report [Internet]. Brussels : Belgian Scientific Policy, 2015; 2016 Jun [cited
627 2023 Apr 13]. Available from: https://orfeo.belnet.be/handle/internal/4240

628 44. Codeço CT. Endemic and epidemic dynamics of cholera: the role of the aquatic reservoir. BMC Infect
629 Dis. 2001 Feb 2;1(1):1.

630 45. Pasetto D, Finger F, Camacho A, Grandesso F, Cohuet S, Lemaitre JC, et al. Near real-time
631 forecasting for cholera decision making in Haiti after Hurricane Matthew. PLOS Comput Biol. 2018
632 May 16;14(5):e1006127.

633 46. Piarroux R, Barrais R, Faucher B, Haus R, Piarroux M, Gaudart J, et al. Understanding the cholera
634 epidemic, Haiti. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011 Jul;17(7):1161–8.

635 47. Widmer JM, Weppelmann TA, Alam MT, Morrissey BD, Redden E, Rashid MH, et al. Water-Related
636 Infrastructure in a Region of Post-Earthquake Haiti: High Levels of Fecal Contamination and Need for
637 Ongoing Monitoring. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2014 Oct 1;91(4):790–7.

638 48. Morof D, Cookson ST, Laver S, Chirundu D, Desai S, Mathenge P, et al. Community Mortality from
639 Cholera: Urban and Rural Districts in Zimbabwe. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2013 Apr 3;88(4):645–50.

640 49. Alam MM, Riyadh MA, Fatema K, Rahman MA, Akhtar N, Ahmed T, et al. Antigen-Specific Memory
641 B-Cell Responses in Bangladeshi Adults after One- or Two-Dose Oral Killed Cholera Vaccination and
642 Comparison with Responses in Patients with Naturally Acquired Cholera. Clin Vaccine Immunol.
643 2011 May;18(5):844–50.

644 50. Franke MF, Ternier R, Jerome JG, Matias WR, Harris JB, Ivers LC. Long-term effectiveness of one and
645 two doses of a killed, bivalent, whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in Haiti: an extended case-control
646 study. Lancet Glob Health. 2018 Sep 1;6(9):e1028–35.

647 51. ALMAGRO-MORENO S, TAYLOR RK. Cholera: Environmental Reservoirs and Impact on Disease
648 Transmission. Microbiol Spectr [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2021 May 6];1(2). Available from:
649 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4321695/

650 52. Lemaitre J, Pasetto D, Perez-Saez J, Sciarra C, Wamala JF, Rinaldo A. Rainfall as a driver of epidemic
651 cholera: Comparative model assessments of the effect of intra-seasonal precipitation events. Acta
652 Trop. 2019 Feb 1;190:235–43.

653 53. Bharti N, Tatem AJ, Ferrari MJ, Grais RF, Djibo A, Grenfell BT. Explaining Seasonal Fluctuations of
654 Measles in Niger Using Nighttime Lights Imagery. Science. 2011 Dec 9;334(6061):1424–7.

655 54. Stathakis D, Baltas P. Seasonal population estimates based on night-time lights. Comput Environ
656 Urban Syst. 2018 Mar 1;68:133–41.

657 55. Bharti N, Tatem AJ. Fluctuations in anthropogenic nighttime lights from satellite imagery for five
658 cities in Niger and Nigeria. Sci Data [Internet]. 2018 Nov 13 [cited 2019 Jul 30];5. Available from:
659 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6233255/

660 56. Sutton P, Roberts D, Elvidge C, Baugh K. Census from Heaven: An estimate of the global human
661 population using night-time satellite imagery. Int J Remote Sens. 2001 Jan 1;22(16):3061–76.

662 57. Akman O, Corby MR, Schaefer E. Examination of models for cholera: Lett Biomath. 2016 Dec
663 1;3(1):93-118-93–118.

664 58. Mberu BU. African Migration and Population Distribution: Recent Trends. Int Handb Migr Popul
665 Distrib. 2015;6:245.

666 59. Elvidge CD, Baugh K, Zhizhin M, Hsu FC, Ghosh T. VIIRS night-time lights. Int J Remote Sens. 2017
667 Nov 2;38(21):5860–79.

668 60. MODIS-Aqua M. NASA goddard space flight center, ocean ecology laboratory, ocean biology
669 processing group. Moderate-Resolut Imaging Spectroradiometer MODIS Aqua L0 Data NASA OB
670 DAAC Greenbelt MD USA. 2018;

671 61. Sheffield J, Goteti G, Wood EF. Development of a 50-Year High-Resolution Global Dataset of
672 Meteorological Forcings for Land Surface Modeling. J Clim. 2006 Jul 1;19(13):3088–111.

673 62. Ferreras E, Chizema-Kawesha E, Blake A, Chewe O, Mwaba J, Zulu G, et al. Single-Dose Cholera
674 Vaccine in Response to an Outbreak in Zambia. N Engl J Med. 2018 08;378(6):577–9.

675 63. Dimitrov DT, Troeger C, Halloran ME, Longini IM, Chao DL. Comparative Effectiveness of Different
676 Strategies of Oral Cholera Vaccination in Bangladesh: A Modeling Study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014
677 Dec 4;8(12):e3343.

678 64. Ciglenecki I, Sakoba K, Luquero FJ, Heile M, Itama C, Mengel M, et al. Feasibility of Mass Vaccination
679 Campaign with Oral Cholera Vaccines in Response to an Outbreak in Guinea. PLoS Med. 2013 Sep
680 10;10(9):e1001512.

681

682 **Supporting Information**

683 **S1 File**

Supporting Information captions

S1 File. Supplementary material providing additional details on the methods


A
Population/km²
4
3
2
1
0
B
C
Weekly suspected cholera cases
300
200
100
0
0
20
40
ISO weeks

Figure 1


A
Incidence and model fit
Weekly suspected cholera cases
100
50
0
B
Infected (prevalence)
Population %
1
0.5
0
Recovered
Population %
100
97.5
95
92.5
Susceptible
Population %
7.5
5
2.5
0
Jan 2014
Jan 2015
Jan 2016

Figure 2


A
Infected
Population %
0.75
0.50
0.25
0
WASH+Vax (actual)
WASH only
Vax only
No WASH, no Vax
Recovered
Population %
98
96
94
Susceptible
Population %
6
4
2
0
Jan−2014
Jan−2015
Jan−2016
B
Additionnal cases
6,000
4,000
2,000
0
WASH only
Vax only
No WASH, no Vax
C
Cases avoided
0
5,000
10,000
% of targeted population
80
60
40
20
Jan−2014
Jan−2015
Jan−2016

Figure 3


A
Infected
SM+EE+EC
EE+EC
SM+EC
SM+EE
Population %
0.75
0.50
0.25
0
Recovered
100
90
80
70
Susceptible
30
20
10
0
Jan−2014
Jan−2015
Jan−2016
B
Cases avoided
150,000
100,000
50,000
0
EE+EC
SM+EC
SM+EE
C
Environmental
Interhuman
FOI
1
0.5
0
D
Net growth
1.5
1.0
0.5
0
−0.5
Jan−2014
Jan−2015
Jan−2016

Figure 4