

1 **Article: Cross-Border Socio-Economic Dynamics, community vulnerabilities and the**
2 **Threat of Cholera Resurgence in Uganda: Insights from Kasese, Hoima, and Kikuube**
3 **districts**

4 **Authors:** Nathan Tumuhamy¹, Roy William Mayega², Godfrey Bwire³, Freddie Ssenooba⁴
5 · Simon Kasasa⁵ & Lynn M. Atuyambe⁶

6 **Author affiliations:**

7 1 Department of Epidemiology and Bio statistics, Makerere University School of Public
8 Health

9 2 Department of Epidemiology and Bio statistics, Makerere University School of Public
10 Health

11 3 Department of Community Health, Ministry of Health, Kampala, Uganda

12 4 Department of Health Policy planning and Management, Makerere University School of
13 Public Health

14 5 Department of Epidemiology and Bio statistics, Makerere University School of Public
15 Health

16 6 Department of Community Health and Behavioral Sciences, Makerere University School of
17 Public Health

18

19 Corresponding Author: Nathan Tumuhamy, kipanden@gmail.com

20 **Key words:** Underlying vulnerability, socio-economic activities, cholera resurgence

21 Competing interests statement: No competing interests exist

22

23

24

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background**

27 Cholera remains a global public health threat, causing an estimated 1.3–4 million cases and up
28 to 143,000 deaths annually, mostly in low- and middle-income countries with poor water,
29 sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) systems. In sub-Saharan Africa, outbreaks are driven by
30 poverty, displacement, climate change, and weak health systems. In Uganda, border districts
31 such as Kasese, Kikuube, and Hoima remain vulnerable despite no reported cases since 2018
32 following vaccination campaigns. Socio-economic activities like fishing, cross-border trade,
33 and seasonal farming continue to heighten exposure. These districts exemplify how
34 livelihoods, mobility, and inadequate infrastructure converge to sustain cholera risks and
35 threaten resurgence even after periods of apparent control.

36 **Methods**

37 A qualitative study was conducted in the three districts of Hoima, Kikuube and Kasese in the
38 Albertine region to explore the socio-economic and structural drivers of vulnerability to cholera
39 resurgence. Data were collected through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), Key Informant
40 Interviews (KIIs), In-Depth Interviews (IDIs), and direct observation. Participants aged 18–77
41 years included community members, caregivers, health workers, and district officials. Nine
42 FGDs, eleven KIIs, and ten IDIs were conducted. Analysis followed manifest and latent content
43 approaches using open, axial, and selective coding, complemented by ChatGPT 4.5 for
44 verification of meaning units.

45 **Results**

46 Inadequate sanitation (open defecation and lack of toilets), unsafe drinking water, seasonal
47 farming settlements without latrines, cross-border movements from the Democratic Republic
48 of Congo (DRC), crowded or makeshift housing, and weak surveillance were identified as

49 underlying vulnerabilities that erode the benefits of vaccination hence drugging these districts
50 to a possible cholera resurgence.

51 **Conclusion:**

52 The drivers of cholera vulnerability are deeply interconnected: Cholera vulnerability in these
53 districts is rooted in systemic inequities in sanitation, water access, and health infrastructure.
54 Strengthening WASH systems, promoting hygiene behavior change, and improving cross-
55 border surveillance are essential to achieving sustainable cholera elimination and resilience.

56 **Synopsis**

57 Cholera, a preventable yet deadly diarrheal disease, continues to threaten millions globally,
58 especially in regions where access to clean water and sanitation is limited. This study,
59 conducted in Uganda's border districts of Kasese, Hoima, and Kikuube, explored how daily
60 livelihoods such as fishing, farming, and cross-border trade intersect with environmental and
61 social conditions to increase vulnerability to cholera resurgence. Through community
62 discussions and interviews with health workers, local leaders, and residents, the research
63 revealed how open defecation, unsafe water, migration, and poor housing sustain the risk of
64 future outbreaks even after vaccination efforts. The findings provide crucial insights into how
65 human behavior, ecology, and health systems interact, highlighting that preventing cholera is
66 not only a medical issue but a social and environmental challenge. By understanding these
67 links, the study contributes to global health and life sciences knowledge on infectious disease
68 resilience, emphasizing the need for integrated interventions that combine water safety,
69 community education, and stronger health infrastructure.

70

71

72 **Introduction**

73 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), Africa remains one of the most affected
74 continents, with recurrent outbreaks reported in countries such as Nigeria, the Democratic
75 Republic of Congo (DRC), and Mozambique [1]. The cyclical nature of cholera outbreaks in
76 these regions is often linked to the rainy season, which exacerbates the contamination of water
77 supplies, thus heightening the transmission risk [2].

78 Cholera is an acute diarrheal disease caused by *Vibrio cholera*, primarily transmitted via
79 contaminated food or faeces. Outbreaks have frequently occurred in Uganda, especially in
80 regions with poor sanitation and high population movement [3]. Over the past 50 years, the
81 border districts of Kasese, Hoima, Kikuube, and Kibale have been identified as cholera
82 hotspots, with a notable increase in cases during the 1990s until 2017 [4, 5]. These areas have
83 been referred to as cholera epicentres [6-8]. Significant outbreaks were recorded from 1997 to
84 2017, along with sporadic cases reported until 2022 [8, 9]. Since 2017, Kasese has not seen
85 new cholera cases, indicating effective control measures, and there have been no cases reported
86 in Greater Hoima since 2022 [8, 10-12].

87 Kasese and greater Hoima districts in present with distinct economic conditions and
88 environmental challenges that influence public health dynamics, including the risk of cholera
89 resurgence. Both districts are located in the Albertine region of Uganda. The Albertine region
90 suffers recurrent floods and landslides due to heavy rains. The districts are heavily involved in
91 Agricultural farming and fishing along Lakes Edward, George and Albert. In the greater Hoima
92 (Hoima and Kikuube districts), Agriculture remains the dominant economic activity, with crops
93 such as cassava, maize, and sweet potatoes being widely cultivated [13]. Fishing, particularly
94 on Lake Albert, also plays a significant role in the local economy [14]. Additionally, Hoima's
95 proximity to oil exploration activities introduces both economic opportunities and

96 environmental concerns, potentially influencing public health outcomes [15]. Kasese District
97 on the other hand is situated in southwestern Uganda, bordered by the Democratic Republic of
98 Congo and characterized by a diverse landscape encompassing the Rwenzori Mountains and
99 Lake Edward. The district's economy is primarily agrarian, with a significant portion of the
100 population engaged in subsistence farming. Key crops include maize, beans, and cassava, while
101 livestock farming is also prevalent. The presence of national parks, such as Queen Elizabeth
102 National Park and Rwenzori Mountains National Park, contributes to the local economy
103 through tourism. However, the district faces environmental challenges, including deforestation,
104 which has led to increased risks of floods, landslides, and heatwaves. These environmental
105 stressors, coupled with rapid population growth and unregulated timber harvesting, exacerbate
106 the vulnerability of communities to public health threats like cholera [16].

107 However, the cessation of cases does not mean the risk is gone. Border districts like Kasese,
108 Hoima and Kikuube remain vulnerable due to ongoing socio-economic and environmental
109 conditions. Cholera bacteria can be reintroduced from neighbouring DRC, a country with
110 continuing cholera issues or emerge when local hygiene practices lapse. Between March and
111 April 2025, a qualitative study was conducted in the three border districts. We explored the
112 interplay between socio-economic behaviors, mobility, environmental vulnerabilities, and
113 systemic health challenges that together sustain the risk of cholera resurgence in Uganda's
114 high-risk border districts. We focused on economic activities, sanitation practices, land use and
115 settlement patterns, migration and cross-border interactions, community health habits, gaps in
116 healthcare and surveillance and related risks that can lead to a resurgence.

117

118

119

120 **Methods**

121 **Study design and study area**

122 A qualitative study was conducted in Hoima, Kasese and Kikuube districts. The three districts
123 are along the Albertine region bordering the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Albertine
124 region lies along the Lake Albert and River Nile in the mid-western end of the country, and the
125 region comprises the following districts: Nebbi and Zombo in the north, greater Hoima (Hoima
126 and Kikuube) districts in the west and Kasese district in the southwest. The region suffers
127 recurrent floods and landslides due to heavy rains [17]. These have far-reaching impacts on the
128 affected areas, escalating recurrent epidemics of cholera, malaria, and viral haemorrhagic
129 fevers. In Kasese District, the study was conducted in Mpondwe–Lhubiriha Town Council and
130 Nyakiyumbu Sub- County; in Hoima District, Kigorobyia and Buresuka Sub-counties were
131 selected; and in Kikuube District, Kabyooya and Kyangwali Sub-counties were included. A
132 mix of qualitative methods including Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), Key Informant
133 Interviews (KIIs), and In-Depth Interviews (IDIs) was employed to capture perspectives across
134 different levels of the health system. FGDs explored community experiences, behaviors, and
135 perceptions of the health system’s drivers of while KIIs offered expert insights from district
136 health officials and administrators, highlighting systemic, underlying gaps in cholera response.
137 On the other hand, IDIs provided detailed accounts from cholera survivors and caregivers,
138 uncovering personal realities and sensitive issues that may not surface in group discussions.

139 **Study Participants**

140 The study engaged a diverse group of participants to capture perspectives from different layers of the
141 community and health system. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) included eight to ten participants
142 representing at-risk or affected populations: adult men and women, youth (both male and female), and
143 elderly persons who provided historical context and traditional practices. Caregivers who had directly
144 cared for cholera patients were included, alongside local health workers such as Village Health Team

145 (VHT) members trained in WASH and nurses or health facility staff from affected areas. Community
146 leaders and influencers specifically representatives of the local council leaders, religious leaders, and
147 teachers were also represented, as well as vulnerable groups such as refugees where relevant. On the
148 other hand, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were conducted with district-level and institutional actors.
149 These included District Health Officers, District Health Inspectors or Water Officers, health facility in-
150 charges (particularly from Health Centre IIIs and IVs) who oversee case management and referral
151 systems, and surveillance focal persons. Representatives from NGOs and CBOs engaged in water,
152 sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) activities were also included. The In depth interview participants were
153 either survivors of cholera or caregivers of cholera patients

154 **Data collection procedures**

155 Data was collected between 14-25 April 2025 in all the three study districts. In the same period, all
156 study participants were recruited and interviewed. Prior to data collection, ten (10) research assistants
157 were selected with a minimum qualification of a bachelors degree and with experience in qualitative
158 data collection. The experience as limited to at least have participated in for qualitative studies. Research
159 assistants were recruited from the established pool at the Makerere University School of Public Health
160 (MakSPH), which has been developed over time through various research projects and includes
161 individuals with diverse language competencies. From this pool, 15 assistants for Greater Hoima and
162 10 for Kasese were initially shortlisted and invited for interviews. Following the selection process, six
163 were chosen for Greater Hoima and four for Kasese. These selected assistants underwent a four-day
164 training led by Author 1 (NT), which included a one-day pre-test of the study tools in Makerere 3 Parish
165 an area with a history of recurrent cholera outbreaks. After training, the teams were deployed to the
166 field for data collection.

167 Pre-study visits led by NT and one of the research assistants in each district were conducted in the study
168 districts. This pre-visit involved meetings with the District Health Officers (DHOs), the Chief
169 Administrative Officers (CAOs) and the Resident District Commissioners (RDCs) in each district. The
170 districts involved a presentation about the study, the study methods, the selected sub counties and the
171 study participants categories. For the meetings with the District Health Officers, we also identified the

172 respondents for the Key informant interviews and the community mobilizers who were requested to
173 identify the categories of the study participants in the FGDs and IDIs. After these engagements, the
174 district officials endorsed the introductory letters by signing and acknowledging these meetings. Copies
175 of the acknowledgement letters were then provided to the Research Assistants to move with while in
176 the field. The introductory letters were presented to the village chairpersons before any interviews were
177 conducted.

178 The District Health Officers supported the process by providing contacts for key informants and, in
179 some cases, assisting in scheduling interviews. Using the contacts of Health Inspectors shared by the
180 District Health Officers, the study team coordinated with them to identify suitable FGD participants
181 according to the predefined categories, select appropriate venues, and arrange interviews with in-depth
182 interview participants. At each sub-county, the Health Inspectors shared schedules for FGDs and IDIs
183 with the study team, who then implemented them as planned. In each sub-county, 2–3 FGDs were
184 conducted. All In-Depth Interviews (IDIs) were conducted at the household level, with data collection
185 teams comprising an interviewer and a note-taker visiting each household. Key Informant Interviews
186 (KIIs) were carried out in district offices for officials and in health facilities for facility in-charges.
187 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were held either at health facilities or within community settings, as
188 guided by Health Inspectors. Each FGD participant received a transport refund of Uganda Shillings
189 20,000 (approximately USD 5), as approved by the Ethical Review Board.

190 Each session (FGD, KII, or IDI) was facilitated by two research assistants (an interviewer/facilitator
191 and a note-taker). Verbal consent was obtained from all participants after the study objectives, risks,
192 and benefits were explained. Discussions were guided by translated interview tools in the local dialects,
193 Runyoro or Rukiga (for Banyoro and Bakiga), Kiswahili (for Lugbara communities) in Hoima and
194 Kikuube, and Lhukonzo in Kasese. To ensure confidentiality, FGD participants were assigned numbers
195 (1–10), which they used instead of names during discussions, with all contributions recorded under
196 these identifiers. Note-takers captured detailed field notes, supplemented by audio recordings. On
197 average, FGDs lasted about 90 minutes, while IDIs and KIIs each lasted approximately 60 minutes.

198

199 **Data collection tools and variables**

200 In this study, the FGD, KII and IDI guides with generic questions were used. The guides
201 explored three generic themes

- 202 1. Main shock (cholera outbreak), its frequency, primary and secondary effects in the
203 target communities (Risks)
- 204 2. Factors that make health system vulnerable to the cholera outbreak (Vulnerability
205 factors)
- 206 3. Factors that make the health system fail to permanently resist, reduce or eradicate their
207 vulnerability factors (drivers of vulnerability)

208 **Data analysis**

209 The audio tape recordings were transcribed verbatim by selected research assistants fluent in the local
210 languages. The first (NT) and last authors (RWM) developed a coding scheme following multiple
211 readings of the transcripts. The coding scheme was then shared with the three research assistants who
212 supported the data analysis. Analysis was done in two stages, first, the manifest content analysis
213 followed by latent content analysis. Transcripts generated from the data were read and re-read
214 by three research officers, who then assigned codes and came up with a coding structure (Open
215 coding). Data meaning units were then aligned under their respective codes in excel. This was
216 followed by axial and selective coding to develop higher codes and sub-themes. Sub-themes
217 were reviewed by the three officers and NT further to develop overarching themes. Chat GPT
218 4.5 was also used for supplementary analysis especially in verifying the meaning units
219 generated by the three research officers.

220 **Ethical considerations**

221 Ethical approval was obtained from the Makerere University School of Public Health Research and
222 Ethics Committee (SPH-2024-675). Prior to any of the interviews, including group discussions, a

223 consent form was read out to the participants outlining the goal of the study, the benefits, risks and
224 confidentiality clauses. The study participants were then given a chance to ask questions. After the
225 explanations by the Research assistants, the participants in the IDI and KII were asked to sign two
226 copies of the consent form each of which one copy was retained by each study participant. The forms
227 were also signed by the research assistant on behalf of the study team. For FGDs, group consent was
228 sought using the same processes above. However, this was confirmed by signing the FGD participants
229 attendance lists which include some sociodemographic information like age, gender, education levels
230 and religion.

231 **Results**

232 A total of eighty-seven (87) participants were interviewed, with an average of 9 people per FGD. A
233 total of 10 FGDs, 13 KIIs and nine (9) IDIs were conducted in the three districts. Cholera thrives in
234 environments where water and sanitation are compromised and can spread rapidly among
235 mobile or dense populations. Inadequate sanitation (open defecation and lack of toilets), unsafe
236 drinking water, seasonal farming settlements without latrines, cross-border movements from
237 the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), crowded or makeshift housing, and weak
238 surveillance were identified as underlying vulnerabilities that erode the benefits of vaccination
239 hence drugging these districts to a resurgence. These underlying factors were linked to socio
240 economic activities that define the daily livelihoods of the communities.

241 **Socioeconomic dynamics exacerbated by Poor Sanitation Practices (Open Defecation)**
242 **especially within the large farms and in the fishing communities:** Socio-economic
243 dynamics strongly shape community vulnerability to cholera, and this was expressed with
244 nuance across FGDs, KIIs, and IDIs. In focus group discussions, poverty and livelihood
245 pressures were repeatedly identified as underlying risks. Poor sanitation practices, particularly
246 open defecation, was reported to be a key driver of cholera outbreaks especially in farming
247 settlements and fishing communities. FGD participants fishing villages like Kibiro in Hoima

248 and Kaiso in Kikuube and farming settlements in Katholhu Kasese district consistently
249 associated cholera outbreaks with poor sanitation and widespread open defecation. In Kibiro,
250 FGD participants explained that fishermen often defecate directly into the lake, contaminating
251 the same water used for drinking and cooking. They also described how seasonal floods break
252 down pit latrines, spreading faecal matter across compounds, gardens, and food markets. In
253 Kasese particularly Katholhu, farming practices were highlighted as key underlying driver of
254 cholera outbreak. It was reported that in farm settings, migrant laborers without access to toilets
255 practice open defecation in the fields, increasing risks of transmission.

256 *“flooding brings dirty water from all over, and because the place is low-lying, floods*
257 *break latrines... that’s how people got sick” FGD participant, Katholhu, Kasese*
258 *district*

259 *“it’s true cholera came because people didn’t have latrines, people were coming from*
260 *farms, especially in Katholu side, where most people farm from, but they come with*
261 *their food to the farm, and yet they don’t have any latrines to use. Equally, whenever*
262 *they bring their food and they want to use the latrines, they find that they don’t have*
263 *anywhere to do this business. In the farms, people have no water and toilets, and*
264 *normally people eat yet their hands are contaminated, and that’s why they normally get*
265 *infected. we have requested owners of land during sensitization to put toilets on these*
266 *farms, but people don’t heed to this” FGD participant, Katholhu, Kasese district*

267 *“these migrants that come through the lake always settle on the lake shores with no*
268 *latrines and will be practicing open defecation exposing our water source the lake to*
269 *contamination” FGD participant, Kibiro, Hoima district*

270 *“We dispose off the faecal materials into the lake and use the same water for domestic*
271 *use”. FGD participant, Kibiro, Hoima district.*

272 These practices were confirmed by key informants. For example In Kasese, it was reported that
273 in large farms, landowners rent out plots to seasonal workers who put up temporary shelters
274 without sanitation facilities, forcing them to defecate in the open. As a practice reported by the
275 district health officials in Kasese, highland communities migrate to lowland farms during the
276 planting season and erect temporary shelters without any toilet facilities (refer to figure 2&3).
277 They end up defecating in gardens, bushes, or open fields. As a result, human waste enters the
278 environment untreated. It was reported that during rainy seasons, faecal matter is washed into
279 streams or ponds that villagers use for water, creating a direct route for cholera transmission

280 In Hoima and Kikuube especially in the vishing communities, it was reported by district
281 officials that sandy soils and flooding make it difficult to construct lasting pit latrines, while
282 refugee influxes in landing sites overwhelm existing facilities. Officials noted that these
283 conditions contaminate water sources and predispose the communities to outbreaks given the
284 high concentration of households at the lake showers (refer to figure1).

285 *“they just put up temporary structures where they settle, but defecate in the open*
286 *spaces. We are still seeing that happening” KII Kasese district*

287 *“I noticed that people were doing open defecation along the water sources in the*
288 *refugee camp... the feces could go directly into the water” KII Kikuube district*

289

290 On the otherhand, a cholera survivor in Nyansenge village, Hoima district, caregivers in
291 Toonya village, Kikuube district and Katholhu village Kasese district offered vivid insights
292 into how open defecation poses a risk to cholera outbreaks. Caregivers described children
293 falling ill after drinking river water contaminated by neighbors whom they perceived to
294 defecate upstream, while others recalled the pain of losing family members due to the lack of
295 latrines that might have exposed them to risks. These IDIs expressed shame, noting that cholera

296 made them feel “like the dirtiest person in the world,” even with those whose homes had toilets
297 because infection often came from surrounding households or farms without facilities.

298 *“Those who do open defecation, the rain brings all those feces into the lake which can*
299 *result in disease outbreaks because of the dirt” Caretaker, Kaiso Tonya, Kikuube.*

300 *“Sometimes we would even see faeces flow in the river as you are fetching water...*
301 *that was what mainly brought us the disease” Caregiver, Nyakiyumbu Kasese district*

302 *“Cholera infection shames a lot. I felt as if I was the dirtiest person in the*
303 *entire world” survivor, Nyakiyumbu, Kasese district*

304



Figure 1: Concentration of the households at Lake Albert, Hoima ditrict



Figure2&3: Temporary shelters without latrines in big farms

305

306 **Unsafe Water Sources and Practices:** It was reported both by study participants that many
307 people both at household level and during farming use untreated, contaminated water for
308 drinking or cooking which poses a major cholera risk. From Focus Group Discussions,
309 community members in Kasese and Hoima stressed how lack of safe water remains an
310 underlying risk to possible cholera outbreaks. In Katholhu Kasese district, FGD participants
311 stressed that “cholera is brought by lack of clean water in the area” and described how floods
312 sweep faeces into drinking water during the rainy season exposing them to a risk of a possible
313 outbreak. Residents in Kibiro echoed this, lamenting that “what we are drinking is
314 contaminated dirty water from the lake where people, children, fishermen defecate”. Individual

315 testimonies reinforced these fears: a caregiver in Tonya, Kikuube district recounted how
316 fishermen “defecate in the lake and again drink that water... when the water from the lake
317 washes the feces on the shores, we go get that contaminated water and drink it without boiling”
318 *IDI caretaker, Tonya, Kikuube district*. Similarly, a caretaker in Kasese admitted that before
319 taps were installed, households relied on River Kyanzi, which quickly became unsafe
320 emphasizing that if water from the said river is kept for three days without using it, it will
321 start having a bad smell. It was highlighted that communities in Kasese have historically relied
322 on rivers and streams especially Bukangara River for water for domestic use. In Hoima and
323 Kikuube, it was reported that communities near the lake primarily depend on Lake Albert for
324 drinking water, which they mentioned is significantly polluted due to open defecation by fisher
325 folks and communities around the lake shores.. For example communities in Kibiro during the
326 FGD reported that the only clean water sources are over 6KM away from the residences, and
327 water can only be fetched using motorcycles at a cost of about 0.7USD per 20L jerrycan
328 making people resort to use of contaminated lake water which is affordable

329 *"People would fetch water from river Kyanzi... contaminated by people washing*
330 *upstream. Sometimes we would even see faeces flow in the river as you are fetching*
331 *water" IDI Caretaker, Nyakiyumbu, Kasese*

332 *"One jerrycan is for 2,000 Ugandan shillings but sometimes during the dry season, the*
333 *jerrycan can go for 2500 shillings... We drink that water even when we know it's not*
334 *clean but we have no option." FGD participant, Kibiro, Hoima*

335 Key informants framed unsafe water as both an environmental and structural vulnerability. In
336 Kikuube, a key informant from the district health office explained that outbreaks affected
337 everyone equally “because they are taking the same water, from the same source, unprotected.
338 So, meaning they are eating the same feces”*KII, Kikuube district*. The respondent highlighted

339 how shared reliance on contaminated water sources continue to expose the entire populations.
340 In Kasese, another key informant emphasized progress due to government and NGO
341 interventions: “*when they started protecting water sources and people were learning to use*
342 *safe water, it could be another reason why we have no virus*” KII Kasese district. The
343 respondent emphasized how cholera risk is reduced when safe water systems are established
344 and when communities adopt new behaviors, yet the fragility of these gains in the face of
345 floods, poverty, and weak infrastructure continue to pose a risk for a possible outbreak.

346 **Migration and Population Mobility:** From focus group discussions, communities repeatedly
347 linked migration and mobility to cholera outbreaks. In Kinyansenge, Kikuube district,
348 participants recalled events of 1990s where arriving as migrants from Kigezi in the late 1990s,
349 settled at the landing sites without latrines, and witnessed what they termed “*open defecation*
350 *everywhere you tried to step*”, which fueled cholera spread. They maintained that even now,
351 migrants on the lake shores do not have latrines and have continued to dispose their faecal
352 products into the lake and on the lake shores. Participants from Kyabikere, Kasese district noted
353 that fishing camps attracted outsiders from other villages and from DRC who defecated in lakes
354 and shared contaminated water, while seasonal farmworkers who moved from either the
355 neighbouring villages in Congo or within other villages in the district often lack latrines. These
356 mobile populations, disconnected from permanent sanitation infrastructure, are seen as major
357 underlying risks of previous and future outbreaks.

358 From key informant interviews, health workers reinforced this connection, observing that
359 migration patterns made previous outbreak containment difficult. A health inspector in Kasese
360 noted cross-border movement from DRC as a recurring source of cholera importation, stating:
361 “*every outbreak comes from their place then it spreads to us in Uganda here*”. These accounts
362 highlight how both internal and cross-border mobility exacerbate vulnerability.

363 From in-depth interviews, a survivor from Kyangwali, Kikuube district described being
364 displaced multiple times moving from Kabale to Ankole to Mpocha before settling in
365 Kyangwali and noted how these migrations intersected with cholera exposure especially when
366 the participant settled at the landing site, saying that at landing sites, “*you go to buy fish but*
367 *it’s like you have bought poison to take home*”. Another caregiver in Kibiro who lost a child
368 recounted the lack of transport or ambulance services in such mobile, hard-to-reach areas,
369 leaving her to rely on ORS at home while her baby died within hours. Together, these
370 perspectives show that migration and mobility create a cycle of vulnerability: mobile groups
371 often lack stable sanitation, introduce infections across communities and borders, and face
372 delayed access to treatment, making cholera outbreaks more severe and widespread.

373 *"Much of the origin of the cases we get... they are always from Congo. People cross*
374 *over and easily transmit the disease" KII, Kasese*

375 *"The other reason is that they don't have permanent settlement... they keep moving,*
376 *now telling him to construct a toilet for the 3 months they are in the area, they find it*
377 *hard." FGD participant, Kibiro, Hoima*

378 **Housing and Living Conditions:** Related to land use and migration is the issue of housing
379 quality in cholera-prone areas

380 From FGDs, communities highlighted how poor housing and settlement patterns made them
381 more vulnerable to cholera. In Katholhu Kasese district, participants described poverty-driven
382 conditions where families lived in houses without latrines, swept waste into compounds, and
383 shared crowded school latrines, creating ripe environments for outbreaks: “cholera is brought
384 about by being dirty... defecating anywhere and then the floods take these pieces all over the
385 compound” FGD participant in Katholhu narrates. In Kyabikere Kasese district, participants

386 lamented that many could not afford proper homes or sanitation facilities, with some still living
387 in temporary shelters or using unsafe latrines that attracted flies into households.

388 *“Most people in this community as you see it live in crowded homes with poor or no*
389 *ventilation and no proper toilets to support many people including mobile communities.*
390 *It is impossible to keep hygiene standards in our households, and that’s why cholera*
391 *kept returning before vaccination.”FGD participants, Kibiro Hoima district*

392 From KIIs, health officials reinforced these concerns, pointing to structural and land-use
393 problems. The district officials in Kasese noted that seasonal farmers built only makeshift
394 houses and “temporary structures where they settle, but defecate in the open spaces”, with
395 landlords failing to enforce sanitation among tenants on large farms. Similarly, in Kikuube a
396 health inspector explained that collapsible soils and flooding undermined housing and latrine
397 construction, while elderly or impoverished households lacked the capacity to maintain safe
398 facilities. Such fragile housing environments perpetuate open defecation and contamination
399 making the communities and households vulnerable. For example, a caregiver in Tonya
400 observed that houses built near the lakeshore were constantly flooded, preventing latrine
401 construction: *“people close to the lake have no way of constructing latrines, during this rainy*
402 *season before you put a slab it is destroyed” IDI Caregiver Tonya, Kikuube district.* She also
403 described how families refused resettlement even when houses were submerged, choosing
404 instead to rebuild precariously close to flood zones. These accounts show how attachment to
405 livelihoods and geography have forced families to remain in hazardous housing conditions,
406 deepening cholera vulnerability.

407 **Community Health Behaviors and Perceptions:** It was reported that because of non-
408 outbreak period following the vaccination, complacency has set in both in Kasese, Hoima and
409 Kikuube. From FGDs, community members expressed that poor hygiene habits and negligence

410 often fueled cholera. In Kibiro, participants admitted that “*some people in our community*
411 *defecate anywhere and the rain washes it into the lake and that is the same water we drink*”
412 *FGD participant Kibiro Hoima district*. Others highlighted improvements after sensitization
413 campaigns, such as practicing handwashing, boiling water, and covering food, but also noted
414 persistent gaps where “stubborn” individuals refused to comply even when leaders emphasized
415 hygiene. In Katholhu Kasese district, it was reported that some households stopped treating
416 drinking water as well as allowing children to play in drainage channels following cholera
417 vaccination (OVC), making the population susceptible to a possible outbreak. It was also
418 reported that due to the economic pursuit (parents working), there is a reduction in oversight
419 of hygiene at household exacerbated by cultural beliefs where people believe that cholera is
420 caused by spiritual forces. Similarly, FGD participants in Katholhu credited government
421 vaccination campaigns and behavior change messages for reducing outbreaks, *saying “we now*
422 *clean our jerricans, wash our utensils, and know that latrines are the main source (faeces) that*
423 *brings cholera” FGD participant, Kyabikere, Kasese district*.

424 *“They have their own beliefs; that a pregnant woman does not go to the toilet... that’s*
425 *why they don’t construct toilets.” FGD participant, Kibiro Hoima district”*.

426 From KIIs, health officials described community behaviors as both barriers and opportunities
427 for prevention. A health inspector in Kasese observed that farmers often ate without washing
428 hands and children left at home “just eat anything they come across,” making them highly
429 exposed to cholera. He also noted the critical role of VHTs in reinforcing behavior change,
430 distributing aqua tablets, and mobilizing households for sanitation campaigns. These insights
431 underline how daily routines, food handling, and community negative perceptions towards the
432 preventive methods and cholera modes of transmission undermine the control despite formal
433 interventions. A caregiver in Tonya admitted that “*failure to adopt hand washing practices all*
434 *the time... has been so difficult for people” and that many still resisted boiling water, treating*

435 *it “not as a serious matter” IDI Caregiver Tonya Hoima district. In Katholhu Kasese district,*
436 *another caregiver stressed that negligence worsened risks: “one can finish a week without*
437 *sweeping their compound... peel food without washing her hands... these are the people we*
438 *live with”. Survivors like one from Kyangwali also linked cholera directly to lifestyle and*
439 *hygiene practices at landing sites, where flies from open defecation easily contaminated food.*

440 **Structural Weaknesses in Healthcare and Surveillance:** From FGDs, community members
441 emphasized the fragility of local health systems in responding to cholera. In Kyabikere Kasese
442 district, residents admitted their Health Centre II could not manage severe cases: *“for anyone*
443 *with cholera, we can’t put such a patient here unless we are saying let him die” FGD*
444 *participant Kyabikere Kasese district. Others in Kibiro, Hoima district criticized weak*
445 *enforcement and absent health staff, saying, “the health workers just sit in offices, they don’t*
446 *come to us... by the time you hear about cholera, people are already dying” FGD participant*
447 *Kibiro Hoima district. These views reflected widespread frustration that facilities and outreach*
448 *failed making the communities vulnerable.*

449 From KIIs, officials openly acknowledged systemic shortcomings. A Kasese district official
450 confessed, *“we still have a weakness in surveillance, particularly at cross-border points where*
451 *response was delayed until World Health Organization intervened” KII Kasese district. In*
452 *Hoima, a frontline health worker noted that districts often waited for supplies from Kampala:*
453 *“we don’t have chlorine or ORS here; everything must come from the Ministry, and by the time*
454 *it reaches, people have already died” KII_Frontline Health Worker Hoima district. Another*
455 *KII in Kikuube pointed out that refugee influxes and porous borders stretched resources beyond*
456 *capacity further exacerbating vulnerability.*

457 *“when there is a problem, it is only WHO to give us a situation analysis of Congo –*
458 *why not get information directly?” KII, Kasese.*

459 This indicates a gap in cross-border collaboration and communication. Additionally, it was
460 reported that local surveillance is under-resourced mainly with insufficient transport (vehicles
461 or motorbikes) for health workers to investigate cases in remote areas, and limited training or
462 support for village health teams (VHTs) to report cholera signs early. These structural
463 weaknesses mean an outbreak could smoulder undetected or uncontained for longer, increasing
464 its spread.

465 From IDIs, families gave painful testimony of how these weaknesses translated into loss of
466 lives. A caregiver in Tonya, Hoima district described the impossibility of reaching care during
467 rains: “in this rainy season there is no way you can reach such areas unless you walk”
468 *IDI_Caregiver Tonya Hoima district*. Another mother from Kibiro, who lost her child, recalled,
469 “I asked them to give me an ambulance, but they said there was none... I remained at home
470 and continued giving her ORS. She passed on within hours” *IDI_Caregiver who lost a child*.

471 This caregiver also narrated how to health facilities have submerged in the water near the
472 lakeshores due to flooding and have for the last 10 years been out of use forcing government
473 to construct a third health facility many kilometres away from the lakeshores where people
474 reside. Survivors also described makeshift treatment centers in schools and tents, where
475 overcrowding and lack of drugs left families fearful that

476 **Discussion**

477 The convergence of the above risk factors related to socio economic activities especially around
478 farming and fishing in border regions like Kasese and Hoima has serious public health
479 implications. We observed continued activities around the lake and large farms despite the gaps
480 in preventive measures. The continued risky activities that are not followed by the preventive
481 practices pose a very high exposure that might result into a possible resurgence of cholera
482 outbreak. If the highlighted issues in the results are not addressed, the districts could see a

483 resurgence of cholera potentially large, fast-spreading outbreaks with high illness and death
484 rates.

485 Economic activities such as farming and fishing were highlighted as drivers of previous
486 outbreaks in the study districts. It is important to note that the major livelihood activities in the
487 study districts are farming for Kasese, Hoima and Kikuube and fishing for Hoima and Kikube.
488 These daily activities are conducted by mobile communities that establish mobile settlements
489 either in the gardens or at the lake shores. As indicated, most of these mobile shelters do not
490 have sanitary facilities like pit latrines and faecal disposal is done either in the bushes near the
491 farms or in the lake hence exposing the same communities to contaminated water sources
492 originating from the poor faecal disposal practices. These findings are in agreement with other
493 studies that have documented a linkage between livelihood activities and cholera outbreak. For
494 example in Tanzania, it was reported that "Cholera was found to disproportionately impact
495 communities living along the shores of Lake Victoria in Ilemela and Lake Tanganyika in Nkasi,
496 especially fishermen and women involved in fish trading. Key contributing factors to the
497 outbreaks included defecation in shallow and shoreline areas of the lakes, open defecation,
498 bathing or swimming in contaminated water, and improper waste disposal." [18]. Other studies
499 have reported such activities as key drivers to the outbreak and spread of cholera [19-22]

500 Farming and fishing livelihoods, while central to the socio-economic survival of communities
501 in Uganda's Albertine region, have also amplified vulnerability to cholera outbreaks. Fishing
502 communities are often located along unprotected lakeshores where poor sanitation
503 infrastructure and open defecation directly contaminate water sources, a pattern consistent with
504 studies that identify fishing villages as recurrent hotspots of cholera transmission in Uganda
505 and across East Africa [23, 24]. Similarly, large-scale farming attracts seasonal and migrant
506 laborers who erect temporary shelters without latrines, perpetuating open defecation and unsafe
507 water use, conditions highlighted by research as drivers of both endemic and epidemic cholera

508 [2]. Overcrowding in camps, reliance on contaminated rivers for drinking and domestic use,
509 and mobility between rural farms and trading centers create ideal conditions for rapid disease
510 spread. Evidence from previous outbreaks in Kasese and Hoima districts further shows that
511 poverty linked to these economic activities forces households to prioritize livelihoods over
512 health practices, reinforcing cycles of exposure [25]. Thus, while fishing and farming sustain
513 household incomes, their structural and environmental contexts intensify cholera transmission
514 dynamics and hinder long-term control.

515 Findings indicated an existence of contaminated water sources as reported by respondents in
516 Kasese, Hoima and Kikuube, resulting from the disposal of faecal materials in the same water
517 sources used domestically. This is especially during rainy seasons where flooding exposure the
518 water sources leading to contamination. These findings are in agreement with previous reports
519 that indicated that for example, in past outbreaks, water tests in Kasese’s affected villages
520 showed high faecal coliform counts in both open streams and piped water, indicating faecal
521 contamination [7]. In other studies, it was reported that many households were drinking water
522 without boiling or disinfecting it. For instance, one study during a 2015 cholera outbreak found
523 “94% of cholera cases had drunk water without boiling compared to 79% of healthy controls”
524 [7]. It is also important to note that while improvements have been made in recent years in
525 extending clean water to communities over the last five years where the government protected
526 more water sources and communities started using safe water with a 57% of the population in
527 Kasese for example having clean water sources with a focus on boreholes, gravity flow
528 schemes, and rainwater harvesting systems [26]. Even so, any lapses in water treatment (like
529 shortages of water purification tablets, or assuming piped water is safe when it’s not
530 consistently chlorinated) can allow cholera bacteria to infect families. For example, an
531 investigation of the 2015 outbreak found that the piped water supply was inadequately
532 chlorinated and became re-contaminated along the pipeline and in home storage [12].

533 Therefore, intensifying the use of Chlorine and UV disinfections should be part of the
534 preventive measures as these have been found to be effective in water purification and safety
535 of drinking water [27, 28].

536 Cross boarder migrations for individuals seeking economic activities, medical care or even
537 family related migrations were found to be a key driver of cholera outbreak in the study
538 districts. Respondents indicated a strong relationship between cross border migration and
539 previous outbreaks with many index cases of the previous outbreaks reported to be originating
540 from the Democratic Republic of Congo [4, 8, 24, 29, 30]. Studies have documented a clear
541 linkage between migration and the spread of disease outbreaks [31-34]. The 2015 cholera
542 outbreak in Kasese “originated from Bwera Sub-County, a cholera-prone area near the DRC
543 border where another cholera outbreak was ongoing in DRC” [12]. Once the bacteria are
544 introduced, highly mobile groups can disseminate it widely. In border communities, it’s
545 common for families to be split across the two countries e.g. a man might have one household
546 in Uganda and another in DRC, or children go to schools on opposite sides of the border. Daily
547 cross-border commuting for farming or commerce is also routine. This intermingling means
548 infectious diseases like cholera do not respect borders. An illness acquired in one country is
549 often carried into the other. Migrants and refugees fleeing instability in DRC add to this
550 mobility. An outbreak in a cross-border district can easily spread to or from the DRC due to
551 ongoing movement of people. This complicates control efforts, as two countries must
552 coordinate to trace contacts and contain cases. If not quickly contained, cholera could also
553 spread within Uganda. While Uganda has been successful in containing past cholera episodes
554 to limited areas, the persistence of risk factors means there is always a possibility of a more
555 widespread epidemic if multiple hotspots flare up simultaneously. Such a scenario would have
556 grave public health implications nationwide: cholera could hit urban centers or refugee camps
557 in other regions, amplifying the humanitarian impact.

558 It was also reported that health facilities along the border districts like Bwera Hospital usually
559 treat not only locals but also patients crossing from DRC, often without additional funding or
560 supplies. This was reported to have led to frequent stockouts of essential emergency medicines
561 and IV fluids during outbreaks, hampering effective treatment. These fundings are in line with
562 findings from the comprehensive Facility-Based Assessment for Emergency, Critical and
563 Operative care conducted by the Ministry of Health in 2024, where Bwera Hospital and Hoima
564 Regional Referral Hospital experienced frequent stock-outs, impacting patient care and
565 emergency procedures [35]. Uganda’s funding formulas do not account for these “unbudgeted”
566 populations, creating a chronic resource gap at the border. If a cholera outbreak happens, such
567 shortages could cost lives. Moreover, disease surveillance systems have shortcomings.
568 Surveillance officers in the study districts reported a limited ability to get real-time information
569 from across the border. International protocols often require going through the World Health
570 Organization (WHO) for cross-border data, which delays the flow of information. This
571 challenge is even magnified by inadequate staffing. For example Bwera Hospital expected to
572 handle emergencies like Cholera and other outbreaks has 160 staff against a required 341 which
573 is only 46.9% of the required staffing [35].

574 **Conclusion and recommendations**

575 Despite progress through vaccination and improved water access in some areas, the threat of
576 cholera resurgence remains high. Mobility across borders, seasonal migrations, environmental
577 hazards like floods, and weak health surveillance create fertile ground for new outbreaks. The
578 resurgence of cholera in Uganda’s border regions is not inevitable, it is a risk that can be
579 managed with proactive, sustained measures. To reduce the persistent threat of cholera and
580 supplement on vaccination programs, interventions in the Albertine region must focus on
581 strengthening WASH infrastructure, cross-border coordination, behavior change, and health
582 system preparedness. Expanding access to safe water and flood-resistant latrines in fishing and

583 farming settlements is critical, alongside provision of water treatment supplies and community
584 enforcement of sanitation bylaws. Cross-border and migration-aware strategies are essential,
585 including joint Uganda–DRC surveillance, sanitation facilities for seasonal workers, and
586 integration of cholera prevention in refugee programs. Sustained hygiene education through
587 VHTs, schools, and cultural institutions should reinforce handwashing, safe food practices, and
588 water treatment, while addressing myths and negligence. Housing and settlement planning
589 must prioritize relocation or upgrading of households in flood-prone areas and require
590 landlords and farmers to provide basic sanitation. At the same time, frontline health facilities
591 should be upgraded with trained staff, cholera kits, and reliable transport for rapid response,
592 supported by stronger local surveillance and cross-border data sharing. Finally, tackling socio-
593 economic drivers is vital by supporting alternative livelihoods and co-designing community-
594 owned solutions to ensure that cholera prevention is both sustainable and equitable.

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611 **References**

612

- 613 1. WHO, *Cholera – Key Facts*. World Health Organization. Retrieved from
614 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cholera>. 2021.
- 615 2. Rebaudet, S., et al., *Environmental determinants of cholera outbreaks in inland Africa: a systematic review of main transmission foci and propagation routes*. The Journal of
616 infectious diseases, 2013. **208**(suppl_1): p. S46-S54.
- 617 3. Iramiot, J.S., et al., *Epidemiology and antibiotic susceptibility of Vibrio cholerae*
618 *associated with the 2017 outbreak in Kasese district, Uganda*. BMC public health,
619 2019. **19**: p. 1-9.
- 620 4. Bwire, G., et al., *The burden of cholera in Uganda*. PLoS neglected tropical diseases,
621 2013. **7**(12): p. e2545.
- 622 5. WHO, *World Health Organization: Report on Global Surveillance on epidemic prone*
623 *infectious diseases, WHO/CDS/CSR/ISR/2000.1* 2000.
- 624 6. Baluku, M. and E. Agwu, Kasule A, Moazzam ML. *The transmission dynamics of the*
625 *cholera epidemic in Kasese district, Uganda*. Spec Pathog Rev J. 2015; 1 (1): 030. **39**.
- 626 7. Kwesiga, B., et al., *A prolonged, community-wide cholera outbreak associated with*
627 *drinking water contaminated by sewage in Kasese District, western Uganda*. BMC
628 public health, 2018. **18**: p. 1-8.
- 629 8. Monje, F., et al., *A prolonged cholera outbreak caused by drinking contaminated*
630 *stream water, Kyangwali refugee settlement, Hoima District, Western Uganda: 2018*.
631 *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*, 2020. **9**: p. 1-10.
- 632 9. MoH, *Ministry of Health, Uganda: Weekly Executive Brief*.
633 <https://library.health.go.ug/file-download/download/public/1538?utm>. 2022.
- 634 10. Iramiot, J.S., et al., *Epidemiology and antibiotic susceptibility of Vibrio cholerae*
635 *associated with the 2017 outbreak in Kasese district, Uganda*. BMC public health,
636 2019. **19**(1): p. 1405.
- 637 11. Oguttu, D.W., et al., *Cholera outbreak caused by drinking lake water contaminated*
638 *with human faeces in Kaiso Village, Hoima District, Western Uganda, October 2015*. .
639 *Infectious diseases of poverty*, 2017. **6**(1): p. 146.
- 640 12. Pande, G., et al., *Cholera outbreak caused by drinking contaminated water from a*
641 *lakeshore water-collection site, Kasese District, south-western Uganda, June-July*
642 *2015*. PloS one, 2018. **13**(6): p. e0198431.
- 643 13. Mubiru, D.N. and P. Kristjanson, *Summary of Baseline Household Survey Results:*
644 *Hoima District, West Central Uganda*. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change,
645 *Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS)*. Copenhagen, Denmark. Available online at:
646 <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/resources/baseline-surveys>. 2012.
- 647 14. UNDP, *United Nations Development Programme: Hoima District Investment Profile*.
648 2017.
- 649 15. CNOOC, *ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE*
650 *CNOOC UGANDA LTD KINGFISHER OIL DEVELOPMENT, UGANDA* 2018.
- 651 16. IISD. *Sustainable Asset Valuation of Reforestation in Uganda*. 2024; Available from:
652 [https://www.iisd.org/publications/report/nbi-sustainable-asset-valuation-uganda-](https://www.iisd.org/publications/report/nbi-sustainable-asset-valuation-uganda-reforestation?utm)
653 [reforestation?utm](https://www.iisd.org/publications/report/nbi-sustainable-asset-valuation-uganda-reforestation?utm) .
- 654 17. Mayega, R.W., et al., *Qualitative assessment of resilience to the effects of climate*
655 *variability in the three communities in Uganda*." RAN Secretariat and East African
656 *Resilience Innovation Lab (EA RILab)*, Kampala. 2015.
- 657 18. Ngingo, B.L., et al., *Socioecological systems analysis of potential factors for cholera*
658 *outbreaks and assessment of health system's readiness to detect and respond in*
659 *Ilemela and Nkasi districts, Tanzania*. BMC Health Services Research, 2023. **23**(1): p.
660 1261.
- 661

- 662 19. Maisha, F.M., et al., *Social dynamics influencing cholera risk in the City of Goma, Democratic Republic of Congo: a qualitative study*. BMC Public Health, 2025. **25**(1): p. 663 1-13.
664
- 665 20. Muzembo, B.A., et al., *Cholera outbreaks in India, 2011–2020: a systematic review*. International journal of environmental research and public health, 2022. **19**(9): p. 5738.
666
- 667 21. Ryan, S.J., et al., *Spatiotemporal variation in environmental Vibrio cholerae in an estuary in southern coastal Ecuador*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2018. **15**(3): p. 486.
668
- 669
- 670 22. Siamalube, B., et al., *Cholera in Zambia: Explanatory Factors and Mid-term Impact of the Sustainable Development Goals*. Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases, 2024. **15**(12): p. 89-105.
671
- 672
- 673 23. Ali, M., et al., *Updated global burden of cholera in endemic countries*. PLoS neglected tropical diseases, 2015. **9**(6): p. e0003832.
674
- 675 24. Bwire, G., et al., *Epidemiology of cholera outbreaks and socio-economic characteristics of the communities in the fishing villages of Uganda: 2011-2015*. PLoS neglected tropical diseases, 2017. **11**(3): p. e0005407.
676
- 677
- 678 25. Sasaki, S., et al., *Spatial analysis of risk factor of cholera outbreak for 2003–2004 in a peri-urban area of Lusaka, Zambia*. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene, 2008. **79**(3): p. 414-421.
679
- 680
- 681 26. Oyesigye, E., G. Mwesiga, and S. Kyobutungi, *Access to Clean Water and Waterborne Diseases: A Case Study of Kasese District, M.I.U.R.R. Extension*, Editor. 2024.
682
- 683 27. Kuopion, V., *Drinking Water Quality in Kuopio in the Years 2013, 2014 and 2015*. 2016.
684
- 685 28. Zyara, A.M., *Removal of viruses from drinking water by chlorine and UV disinfections*. 2018.
686
- 687 29. Bwire, G., et al., *Molecular characterization of Vibrio cholerae responsible for cholera epidemics in Uganda by PCR, MLVA and WGS*. PLoS neglected tropical diseases, 2018. **12**(6): p. e0006492.
688
- 689 30. Eurien, D., et al., *Cholera outbreak caused by drinking unprotected well water contaminated with faeces from an open storm water drainage: Kampala City, Uganda, January 2019*. BMC Infectious Diseases, 2021. **21**: p. 1-9.
690
- 691
- 692 31. Awofeso, N. and K. Aldbak, *Cholera, migration, and global health—a critical review*. International Journal of Travel Medicine and Global Health, 2018. **6**(3): p. 92-99.
693
- 694 32. Bwire, G., et al., *Cross-border cholera outbreaks in sub-Saharan Africa, the mystery behind the silent illness: what needs to be done?* PLoS One, 2016. **11**(6): p. e0156674.
695
- 696 33. Demir, M., *The effect of population migration on the diffusion of cholera outbreaks in metapopulations*. medRxiv, 2022: p. 2022.04. 12.22273810.
697
- 698 34. Njagarah, J.B.H. and F. Nyabadza, *A metapopulation model for cholera transmission dynamics between communities linked by migration*. Applied Mathematics and Computation, 2014. **241**: p. 317-331.
699
- 700
- 701 35. MOH, *Ministry of Health, Uganda: Emergency Care Systems in Uganda: A Comprehensive Facility-Based Assessment for*
702
- 703 *Emergency, Critical and Operative care:* [https://seedglobalhealth.org/wp-](https://seedglobalhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Final-Report-ASSESSMENT-OF-EMS_April.pdf?utm)
704 [content/uploads/2025/04/Final-Report-ASSESSMENT-OF-EMS_April.pdf?utm](https://seedglobalhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Final-Report-ASSESSMENT-OF-EMS_April.pdf?utm). 2024.

705