Longitudinal Antibody Responses to *Vibrio cholerae*: A Systematic Review

Aparna Mangadu[1], Christy Clutter[1], Kenadee Jacobson[1], Tatum Heiner[1], Md. Saruar Bhuiyan [1], Shubhanshi Trivedi[1], Benjamin Brintz[1], Andrew S. Azman[2-4], Benjamin F. Arnold[5], Daniel T. Leung[1]

[1] Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, Spencer Fox Eccles School of Medicine at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA
[2] Division of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
[3] Institute of Global Health, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
[4] Division of Tropical and Humanitarian Medicine and Geneva Centre for Emerging Viral Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland.
[5] Francis I. Proctor Foundation and Department of Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA

Abstract

Cholera is a critical global health threat with significant morbidity and mortality, particularly in low- and middle-income countries and populations without access to safe water and sanitation. Clinical surveillance is typically based on non-specific and microbiological diagnostics that are only moderately sensitive. Therefore, identifying cases and understanding the true burden is difficult. Measurements of antibodies can help inform interpretation of cross-sectional sero-epidemiological studies assessing infection burden. We conducted a systematic review to identify literature from 1980 to 2025 containing longitudinal antibody kinetics in humans following exposure to *Vibrio cholerae O1/O139* and associated vaccines. 51 studies representing adults (18-65 years) and pediatric (2 months-17 years) populations from 5 high-income (21 studies), 3 upper-middle-income (5 studies), 5 lower-middle-income (24 studies), and 1 low-income (1 study) countries were included. 16 studies followed natural cholera infection, 38 involved vaccination, and 6 were human challenge models, with some overlap. Antibody responses following natural infection were significantly higher than those induced by vaccination, particularly against OSP. Younger children exhibited higher peak fold-change IgA responses to CTB than older children and adults across both infection and vaccine studies. Following vaccination, individuals from high-income countries showed higher IgA, IgG, and vibriocidal fold-change responses compared to those from lower-income settings, likely an artifact of baseline levels. Limited data from challenge studies revealed slower decay of IgG compared to IgA and IgM to OSP. This review enhances our understanding of longitudinal immune responses to *V. cholerae*, highlighting variability in antibody kinetics across populations, geographic regions, and study designs, and underscores the need for tailored epidemiological approaches to address bacterial diarrheal diseases on a global scale.

Introduction

Sero-epidemiology is an emerging field in which immunological markers from blood, primarily antibodies, can be measured from population-based sampling and used to estimate population-wide infection burden and immunity following vaccination or natural infection[1]. This could be an important tool for monitoring disease prevalence and transmission, identifying gaps in vaccine distribution or adherence, and strategizing public health interventions[2,3]. Despite its growing importance, a critical and underexplored aspect of sero-epidemiology is the need for data from studies of long-term kinetics and stability of antibody responses to inform interpretations of single time-point measurements from individuals and populations and cross-sectional sero-surveys.

Understanding longitudinal kinetics of immune responses, such as how long antibodies remain detectable and the rate at which their levels decline, is particularly important for addressing and managing global health threats like *Vibrio cholerae (V. cholerae)*, the causative agent of cholera. Cholera remains a significant public health challenge, responsible for up to 4 million cases and 150,000 deaths annually[4,5]. Cholera especially impacts those living in low- and middle-income countries due to poor and inadequate health infrastructure, contaminated food and water sources, and insufficient disease surveillance and monitoring systems[6].

Clinical manifestations of *V. cholerae* infection varies from asymptomatic to severe acute watery diarrhea and vomiting, which can lead to severe dehydration and death due to hypovolemic shock[7]. The number of medically-attended cases likely represents only a small proportion of total infections, and sero-surveillance, while not measuring clinical disease directly, offers a potential avenue for more accurate burden estimates[8]. While *V. cholerae* has been a target for vaccine development as an intervention for global prevention and control[9],

vaccine efficacy is lower in young children compared to older persons, and antibody kinetics of

young children may differ from those of adults. Sero-surveillance is an emerging method for

assessment of cholera burden, but various questions remain, including whether antibody kinetics

from one region, such as hyperendemic countries in Asia, could be generalizable to other

regions, such as non-endemic countries, or endemic countries with infrequent outbreaks. Further,

gathering data on long-term antibody persistence, or lack thereof, following *V. cholerae*

exposure can inform public health efforts in both endemic and non-endemic settings.

This systematic review aims to survey and synthesize existing literature on global long-

term antibody kinetics in humans following exposure to *V. cholerae*, with the goal of informing

future research and public health strategies.

Methodology

<u>Overview</u>

We conducted a systematic review to analyze existing literature that report on

longitudinal antibody response trajectories in humans after exposure to *Vibrio cholerae* through

natural infection, vaccination, or controlled human challenge studies. Our methodology for this

review was guided by the established systematic review framework developed by Khan and

colleagues[10], providing a structured approach for mapping key concepts and gaps in literature.

We conducted this review in four key stages: 1) identifying relevant studies through a

comprehensive search of databases, 2) screening and selecting studies for full-text review based

on specific inclusion and exclusion criteria, 3) extracting relevant data from the included studies,

and 4) collating, summarizing, and reporting the findings to highlight trends, patterns, knowledge

gaps, and areas for future investigation related to long-term antibody kinetics.

87
88 <u>Search Strategy</u>

89   We conducted a systematic literature search using the PubMed and Embase databases to

90   identify relevant articles. Our search strategy included phrases created using specific key words

91   (**Table 1**). We used this strategy to identify articles from the earliest available time up to and

92   including April 2025.

Table 1. Key terms and search phrases

Key Terms	
Line Number	**Term**
1	Cholera
2	Vibrio cholerae
4	Antibody
5	Human
Phrases using Key Terms	
["2" OR 1] AND 4	
["2" OR 1] AND 4 AND MeSH Terms[5]	

94
A total of 4,346 articles were identified and exported to Covidence online software where

duplicates were removed.

<u>Selection Criteria, Data Management, and Extraction</u>

We used the Covidence online platform for screening, full text review, and data

extraction. After duplicates were removed, 2,179 articles were available for title and abstract

screening. We reviewed articles based on specific inclusion and exclusion criteria (**Table 2**).

Table 2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Study Characteristics	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Study Design	Randomized and non-randomized Case only or case-control Acute and convalescent Pre-vaccine/post-vaccine Pre-challenge/post-challenge Point source outbreak with longitudinal follow up	Descriptive report or case-report without longitudinal follow-up Prevalence, diagnostic, prognostic, or comparison study Trial protocol Only in vitro measurement

Publication	Peer reviewed journal	Any academic dissertation
	Published in English	Conference proceedings, abstract, or poster
	Abstract and full-text available	Any pre-print
Pathogen	*Vibrio cholerae O1/O139*	Any other pathogen
Participants	Humans of all ages	Non-human studies
Interventions	Natural Infection	Any other type of exposure or unable to determine exposure event
	Vaccine Trial	
	Challenge Event	
Outcome Measures	Longitudinal antibody and/or vibriocidal titers (follow-up ≥ 28 days post onset of symptoms, final vaccine dose, or challenge event)	Antibody and vibriocidal titers not reported and/or no longitudinal follow-up

Two independent reviewers (MSB & ST or ST & AM) completed title and abstract

screening using the inclusion criteria to ensure relevant studies were included for full-text

review. We resolved any differences or discrepancies in inclusion/exclusion decisions between

the two reviewers with discussion and consensus. Next, one independent reviewer (CC or AM)

completed full-text reviews of included studies using the same inclusion and exclusion criteria

(**Table 2**). Included studies from full-text reviews were then moved into the data extraction step.

To ensure extraction of relevant data and to streamline the process, a data extraction template

was created by AM within the Covidence platform. The extraction template was used by two

independent reviewers (AM & KJ or AM & TH) to gather and consolidate relevant data

including: study design, country, country income status (low-income, lower-middle-income,

upper-middle-income, and high-income), and study type (infection, vaccine, challenge). Income

status was determined based on the most recent classifications by the World Bank. Population

specific data that was extracted included: inclusion and exclusion criteria, group differences,

number of subjects, and population age (adult or pediatric). Finally, for each outcome measure,

we extracted antibody titers at baseline, peak, and end of study, and seroconversion information

as available.

<u>Analysis</u>

Extracted data were imported into R for analysis. Population sample sizes corresponding

to each extracted value were used to calculate weighted means and associated confidence intervals.

Because of the variability in measurement scales and units across studies, analyses focused on the

fold change in the titer relative to baseline values. Fold change was defined as the ratio of the titer

at each timepoint to the baseline titer. As these data were heavily right-skewed, weighted means

and confidence intervals were estimated using nonparametric bootstrapping with 5000 iterations.

Results

Study Identification

We reviewed 2,179 abstracts published prior to and including April 2025 (**Figure 1**). Of

those, 166 were selected for full-text review, and data from 51 studies were extracted and

analyzed. Included studies were published between 1980 and 2024.

Figure 1. Flow diagram illustrating the selection of studies included in the systematic review

A total of 4,346 records were identified through database searches (PubMed and Embase). After removal of 2,167 duplicates, 2,179 records underwent title and abstract screening by two independent reviewers, resulting in the exclusion of 2,013 records. Full-text review was conducted for 166 articles, of which 115 were excluded. Data extraction was completed for the remaining 51 studies by two independent reviewers. The final dataset included 51 studies: 16 natural infection studies, 38 vaccine studies, and 6 challenge studies.

Figure 2. Sample collection timelines and vaccine dosing schedules across included studies

Each horizontal line represents the timeline for a study (or study group), with blue circles indicating specimen collection timepoints and pink crosses indicating vaccine dosing events (vaccine studies only). Studies are grouped by study type (Challenge, Infection, Vaccine). Multiple rows for a single study denote different dosing or collection groups within that study. The x-axis displays standardized timepoints from baseline through later follow-up (e.g., day 7, day 14, month 3, year 1, etc.). Grey horizontal lines provide a visual guide to the duration and structure of each study's collection schedule.

The studies from which data were extracted were categorized into three types of pathogen

exposure, 1) natural infection, 2) vaccination, and 3) challenge strain (**Supplementary Table 1**).

The primary assay used throughout included studies was an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay

(ELISA). Several studies also used vibriocidal assays. These assays were used to measure

immunoglobulin antibody levels (i.e. IgG, IgA, and IgM) to various antigens (e.g. LPS, CTB,

OSP) as well as vibriocidal responses in human serum and plasma.

Antigen type significantly influenced peak antibody responses across study types (**Table

3**). Natural infection studies showed significantly higher fold increases in IgG, IgA, and IgM

titers to O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP) compared to vaccine and challenge studies (IgG: $p =$

0.0019; IgA: $p=0.0004$; IgM: $p = 0.0013$).

Table 3. Weighted Peak Titer Comparisons Across Antigens by Isotype and Study Type

Antigen	N_{eff}^a	Peak Titer - Fold Change from Baseline [Weighted Mean (95% CI)]
IgG		
Natural Infection Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	3.6	5.7 (3.4 - 8.3)
Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	3.6	2.8 (2.2 - 3.7)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	3.3	4.0 (3.5 - 4.6)
Cholera Toxin (CT)	1.0	12.5
Sialidase	1.0	3.6
Vaccine Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	8.6	1.7 (1.3 – 2.4)
Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	7.9	2.3 (1.8 - 2.8)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	11.6	5.6 (3.8 - 8.2)
Cholera Toxin (CT)	5.7	8.9 (5.5 - 11.3)
Challenge Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	3.9	2.0 (1.2 - 3.2)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	2.4	6.8 (6.2 - 8.3)
Cholera Toxin (CT)	1.0	1.5
Toxin co-regulated pilus A (TcPA)	1.9	1.6 (1.5 - 1.8)
IgA		
Natural Infection Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	3.6	13.2 (6.2 - 18.6)

Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	3.6	8.3 (3.1 - 16.2)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	3.6	8.0 (5.1 - 13.3)
Sialidase	2.0	1.9 (1.1 - 2.7)
Vaccine Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	8.6	2.8 (2.0 - 3.9)
Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	7.9	3.7 (3.1 - 4.1)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	10.4	11.4 (7.1 - 16.7)
Cholera Toxin (CT)	4.4	14.1 (8.7 - 22.1)
Challenge Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	3.9	2.9 (1.6 - 4.8)
Toxin co-regulated pilus A (TcPA)	1.9	1.3 (1.2 - 1.5)
IgM		
Natural Infection Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	3.6	6.4 (3.5 - 9.6)
Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	1.9	3.0 (2.1 - 5.3)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	1.1	1.1 (1.0 - 1.1)
Vaccine Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	8.6	1.7 (1.4 - 2.1)
Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	1.6	1.8 (0.95 - 2.5)
Cholera Toxin B Subunit (CTB)	2.6	1.01 (1.0 - 1.04)
Challenge Studies		
O-Specific Polysaccharide (OSP)	3.9	2.3 (1.7 - 2.9)
Vibriocidal		
Natural Infection Studies	6.4	85.5 (37.5 - 176.2)
Vaccine Studies	6.5	110.8 (66.4 - 133.8)
Challenge Studies	1.9	8.8 (2.3 - 16.3)

[a] Effective Sample Size – results are weighted based on population sample size

[b] A one-way weighted ANOVA was performed for each variable with 3 or more groupings and a two-sample t-test was performed for each variable with only 2 groupings to determine if the average fold change from baseline in peak titers differs across groups

*Significant $p<0.05$

Figure 3. Weighted mean peak titers, fold change from baseline

Peak immune responses were identified as the highest fold change in antibody titer from baseline following symptom onset or vaccination. The figure displays weighted (based on sample size) mean peak titers for each antigen, stratified by study type and antibody isotype. Individual data points are overlaid with reduced transparency to illustrate the underlying distribution.

Natural Infection Studies

Among studies that involved natural cholera infection (*n*=16), antibody titers peaked

between 7- and 30-days following onset of symptoms with majority of titers peaking at day 7.

All studies involving natural infection were conducted in Bangladesh.

176   IgA responses varied by age group, with children aged 0–5 years exhibiting higher peak

177   fold increases compared to older children (5–18 years) and adults (**Supplementary Table 1**).

178   This age-related difference was also antigen-dependent with peak fold-change IgA responses to

179   cholera toxin B subunit (CTB) significantly more elevated in children aged 0–5 years compared

180   to older children and adults (**Supplementary Table 1**; $p = 0.0441$).

181   Longevity of antibody responses appeared to be influenced by isotype, with IgG having

182   more gradual declines than IgA following peak response. At 6 months after natural infection

183   (latest time point available for studies that included children), children had similar fold change

184   from baseline titers as that of adult populations (**Figure 4b**).

Figure 4. Longitudinal antibody responses in natural infection studies

Longitudinal fold-change antibody responses from eligible natural infection studies are shown and stratified by isotype (IgA,
IgG, IgM). **A.** Overall longitudinal trends. **B.** Age-stratified longitudinal trends. Each point represents an individual observation,
with point size proportional to the underlying sample size; transparency is applied to improve visualization of overlapping data.
The dark solid line denotes the weighted mean response, and the shaded region indicates the 95% confidence interval across the
365 days following symptom onset.

Vaccine Studies

Vaccination studies (n=38) were from 14 countries; Sweden (5 studies), Austria (1

study), United States (13 studies), Bangladesh (9 studies), Haiti (1 study), Columbia (1 study),

India (1 study), Switzerland (1 study), Thailand (3 studies), Pakistan (1 study), Gabon (1 study),

Australia (1 study), Cameroon (1 study), and Zambia (1 study), with some overlap. Vaccines

included Dukoral, Shanchol, and Peru-15. Studies involved single (n=19), two (n=16), and three

(n=7) vaccine doses.

Participants from high-income countries exhibited higher fold increases in peak

vibriocidal antibody titers compared to those from upper-middle, lower-middle, and low-income

countries (**Supplementary Table 2**). Additionally, peak fold increases in IgG and IgA responses

were also significantly higher in high-income countries compared to lower-middle income

countries (**Supplementary Table 2**). Peak fold increases in vibriocidal antibody responses were

highest among children aged 5–18 years compared to adults (**Supplementary Table 1**; $p <$

0.001). Longitudinally, antibody kinetics were highly variable overall and across population age

and country income group (**Supplementary Figure 1**).

209
210
Human Challenge Studies

Limited data was extracted from studies that involved exposure to *V. cholerae* through a

challenge strain (n=6). Peak antibody titers occurred at 10, 14, and 28 days following the

challenge. All human challenge models were conducted in adult populations in the United States.

Longitudinal trends for challenge studies show that IgG peaks later than IgA and IgM (**Figure**

5).

Figure 5. Longitudinal antibody responses in challenge studies

Longitudinal fold-change antibody responses from challenge studies meeting inclusion criteria are shown and stratified by isotype (IgA, IgG, IgM). Each point represents an individual observation, with point size proportional to the contributing sample size; transparency is applied to enhance visualization of overlapping data. The dark solid line depicts the weighted mean response, and the shaded region represents the 95% confidence interval across the 182 days following the challenge event.

Discussion

Serological surveillance (i.e. sero-surveillance) serves as a promising yet underutilized tool for estimating disease burden particularly for pathogens like *Vibrio cholerae*[11,12]. This systematic review synthesizes findings from 51 studies to characterize longitudinal antibody kinetics following natural cholera infection, vaccination, or experimental challenge. By examining how antibody responses vary across intervention type, age group, and country income level, this review provides insights that can improve the interpretation of cross-sectional sero-surveys and inform public health strategies.

Our analysis reveals notable age-related differences in immune responses, particularly for

IgA antibodies. Children under 5 years of age exhibited significantly higher peak IgA responses

to the CTB antigen following natural infection but not vaccination compared to older children

aged 5-18 years and adults, possibly due to lower baseline levels. Another possible contributing

factor may be the immunological cross-reactivity between CTB and the heat-labile enterotoxin B

subunit (LTB) of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* (ETEC), which share structural and antigenic

similarities[13]. A recent study similarly identified this trend, reporting substantial increases in IgA

and IgG responses to CTB after infection but not vaccination[14]. Interestingly, older children

demonstrated significantly higher fold changes in vibriocidal responses following vaccination

compared to adults. Importantly, these age-related differences in antibody kinetics suggest that

the age structure of a population must be considered when designing and interpreting

serosurveys.

Antibody responses following natural cholera infection were consistently stronger than

those elicited by vaccination, particularly for IgG, IgA, and IgM responses to the OSP antigen.

This finding is consistent with prior studies[14], underscoring the need to further investigate these

differences to reduce sero-incidence misclassification and inform other public health

interventions. Further, the persistence of antibody responses varied by isotype in both natural

infection and vaccine studies. As expected, IgG responses showed slower decay than IgA,

reflecting its longer half-life as a result of recycling through neonatal Fc receptor (FcRn)

binding[15]. Vaccine-induced antibody peaks were more variable than those following natural

infection, likely due to differences in vaccine formulation, dosing schedules, and administration

routes. These factors complicate interpretation of sero-epidemiologic findings and point to the

need for standardized methodologies in vaccine trials.

Participants from high-income countries exhibited significantly higher peak fold-changes

in IgG, IgA, and vibriocidal responses following vaccination compared to those from lower-

income settings. This disparity may reflect differences in baseline health status, exposure history,

gut microbiome composition, and nutritional factors[16–18]. These findings also emphasize the

importance of considering contextual factors when interpreting vaccine performance across

different populations.

The findings from this systematic review have several important implications for public

health and future immunological investigations. First, there is a clear need for standardized

protocols in measuring antibody responses[19], including specific antigen targets and time points

for sampling (**Figure 2**). Second, summarizing longitudinal antibody data can enhance our

interpretation of cross-sectional sero-surveys by providing critical context on seroprevalence and

exposure history for specific populations. This data can help distinguish recent from past

exposures and refine population-level disease burden and immunity estimates[19,20]. Finally, the

results of this study can inform sero-epidemiological studies. By characterizing antibody kinetics

across age groups, interventions, and geographic settings, the results fill a methodological gap in

sero-epidemiology to support the development of more accurate and precise cholera estimation

and transmission models.

While this review is comprehensive, there are several limitations to consider. First, some

studies, primarily ones published before 2000, utilized figures for presenting antibody titers and

concentrations rather than tables. The independent reviewers who performed data extraction

therefore made estimations and calculations based on information presented in the main text and

figure captions. To reduce subjective bias, these extractions were compared and refined based on

values derived with the online AI application, PlotDigitizer. Second, geographic representation

was unevenly distributed, with natural infection studies exclusively from Bangladesh and

challenge studies only from the United States. Further, challenge studies were only conducted in

adult populations, limiting our ability to make comparisons across age groups.

Conclusion

This review underscores the value of sero-surveillance in understanding cholera disease

burden across populations, geographic regions, and interventions. By synthesizing global data on

long term antibody kinetics in humans, this review provides a foundation for informing the

design of future sero-epidemiological studies.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (R01AI135115) and the Dr

Thomas D. Rees and Natalie B. Rees Presidential Endowed Chair in Global Medicine (to DTL)

References

1. Evans AS. Surveillance and Seroepidemiology. In: Evans AS, editor. Viral Infections of Humans: Epidemiology and Control [Internet]. Boston, MA: Springer US; 1984 [cited 2025 June 6]. p. 43–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-4727-9_2

2. Arnold BF, Scobie HM, Priest JW, Lammie PJ. Integrated Serologic Surveillance of Population Immunity and Disease Transmission. Emerg Infect Dis. 2018 July;24(7):1188–94.

3. Wilson SE, Deeks SL, Hatchette TF, Crowcroft NS. The role of seroepidemiology in the comprehensive surveillance of vaccine-preventable diseases. CMAJ. 2012 Jan 10;184(1):E70–6.

4. Cholera [Internet]. [cited 2025 June 6]. Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/cholera

5. Awofeso N, Aldbak K. Cholera, Migration, and Global Health – A Critical Review. International Journal of Travel Medicine and Global Health. 2018 Sept 1;6(3):92–9.

6. Asantewaa AA, Odoom A, Owusu-Okyere G, Donkor ES. Cholera Outbreaks in Low- and Middle-Income Countries in the Last Decade: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Microorganisms. 2024 Dec;12(12):2504.

7. Finkelstein RA. Cholera, Vibrio cholerae O1 and O139, and Other Pathogenic Vibrios. In: Baron S, editor. Medical Microbiology [Internet]. 4th ed. Galveston (TX): University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston; 1996 [cited 2025 June 10]. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK8407/

8. Azman AS, Lauer SA, Bhuiyan TR, Luquero FJ, Leung DT, Hegde ST, et al. Vibrio cholerae O1 transmission in Bangladesh: insights from a nationally representative serosurvey. Lancet Microbe. 2020 Dec;1(8):e336–43.

9. O'Ryan M, Vidal ,Roberto, del Canto ,Felipe, Salazar ,Juan Carlos, and Montero D. Vaccines for viral and bacterial pathogens causing acute gastroenteritis: Part I: Overview, vaccines for enteric viruses and Vibrio cholerae. Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics. 2015 Mar 4;11(3):584–600.

10. Khan KS, Kunz R, Kleijnen J, Antes G. Five Steps to Conducting a Systematic Review. J R Soc Med. 2003 Mar 1;96(3):118–21.

11. Cutts FT, Hanson M. Seroepidemiology: an underused tool for designing and monitoring vaccination programmes in low- and middle-income countries. Trop Med Int Health. 2016 Sept;21(9):1086–98.

12. Jiles R, Klevens M, Hughes E. Surveillance and Seroepidemiology. Viral Infections of Humans. 2014 Feb 27;63–79.

13. Holmgren J, Svennerholm AM. Immunological cross-reactivity betweenEscherichia coli
heat-labile enterotoxin and cholera toxin A and B subunits. Current Microbiology. 1979 Jan
1;2(1):55–8.

14. Jones FK, Bhuiyan TR, Slater DM, Ternier R, Hutt Vater KR, Khan AI, et al. Expanding
cholera serosurveillance to vaccinated populations. medRxiv. 2025 Mar
11;2025.03.09.25323598.

15. Zakrzewicz A, Vanderheyden K, Galaly Y, Feldhoff S, Sips M, Brinkhaus M, et al. Binding
to the neonatal Fc receptor enhances the pathogenicity of anti-desmoglein-3 antibodies in
keratinocytes. Front Immunol. 2024 Oct 10;15:1473637.

16. Desai SN, Cravioto A, Sur D, Kanungo S. Maximizing protection from use of oral cholera
vaccines in developing country settings. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2014 June 1;10(6):1457–
65.

17. Parker EP, Ramani S, Lopman BA, Church JA, Iturriza-Gómara M, Prendergast AJ, et al.
Causes of impaired oral vaccine efficacy in developing countries. Future Microbiol. 2018
Jan;13(1):97–118.

18. Levine MM. Immunogenicity and efficacy of oral vaccines in developing countries: lessons
from a live cholera vaccine. BMC Biol. 2010 Oct 4;8(1):129.

19. Hay JA, Routledge I, Takahashi S. Serodynamics: A primer and synthetic review of methods
for epidemiological inference using serological data. Epidemics. 2024 Dec 1;49:100806.

20. Davis KL, Nieznanski C, Maisha FM, Brintz BJ, Clutter CH, Alam MT, et al. Long-term
Kinetics of Vibriocidal Antibody Responses After Vibrio cholerae Infection in the
Democratic Republic of Congo. J Infect Dis. 2025 July 22;jiaf382.

Included Studies in Systematic Review

1. Bergquist C, Johansson EL, Lagergård T, Holmgren J, Rudin A. Intranasal vaccination of
humans with recombinant cholera toxin B subunit induces systemic and local antibody
responses in the upper respiratory tract and the vagina. Infect Immun. 1997 Jul;65(7):2676–
84.

2. Cryz SJ, Que JU, Levine MM, Wiedermann G, Kollaritsch H. Safety and immunogenicity of
a live oral bivalent typhoid fever (Salmonella typhi Ty21a)-cholera (Vibrio cholerae CVD
103-HgR) vaccine in healthy adults. Infect Immun. 1995 Apr;63(4):1336–9.

3. Jertborn M, Svennerholm AM, Holmgren J. IgG and IgA subclass distribution of antitoxin
antibody responses after oral cholera vaccination or cholera disease. Int Arch Allergy Appl
Immunol. 1988;85(3):358–63.

4. Glass RI, Svennerholm AM, Khan MR, Huda S, Huq MI, Holmgren J. Seroepidemiological
studies of El Tor cholera in Bangladesh: association of serum antibody levels with
protection. J Infect Dis. 1985 Feb;151(2):236–42.

5. Kenner JR, Coster TS, Taylor DN, Trofa AF, Barrera-Oro M, Hyman T, et al. Peru-15, an
improved live attenuated oral vaccine candidate for Vibrio cholerae O1. J Infect Dis. 1995
Oct;172(4):1126–9.

6. Azman AS, Lessler J, Luquero FJ, Bhuiyan TR, Khan AI, Chowdhury F, et al. Estimating
cholera incidence with cross-sectional serology. Sci Transl Med. 2019 Feb
20;11(480):eaau6242.

7. Islam K, Hossain M, Kelly M, Mayo Smith LM, Charles RC, Bhuiyan TR, et al. Anti-O-
specific polysaccharide (OSP) immune responses following vaccination with oral cholera
vaccine CVD 103-HgR correlate with protection against cholera after infection with wild-
type Vibrio cholerae O1 El Tor Inaba in North American volunteers. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.
2018 Apr;12(4):e0006376.

8. Uddin T, Harris JB, Bhuiyan TR, Shirin T, Uddin MI, Khan AI, et al. Mucosal Immunologic
Responses in Cholera Patients in Bangladesh. Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI. 2011
Mar;18(3):506–12.

9. Uddin T, Aktar A, Xu P, Johnson RA, Rahman MA, Leung DT, et al. Immune responses to
O-specific polysaccharide and lipopolysaccharide of Vibrio cholerae O1 Ogawa in adult
Bangladeshi recipients of an oral killed cholera vaccine and comparison to responses in
patients with cholera. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2014 May;90(5):873–81.

10. Mayo-Smith LM, Simon JK, Chen WH, Haney D, Lock M, Lyon CE, et al. The Live
Attenuated Cholera Vaccine CVD 103-HgR Primes Responses to the Toxin-Coregulated
Pilus Antigen TcpA in Subjects Challenged with Wild-Type Vibrio cholerae. Clin Vaccine
Immunol CVI. 2017 Jan 5;24(1):e00470-16.

11. Leung DT, Rahman MA, Mohasin M, Patel SM, Aktar A, Khanam F, et al. Memory B cell
and other immune responses in children receiving two doses of an oral killed cholera vaccine
compared to responses following natural cholera infection in Bangladesh. Clin Vaccine
Immunol CVI. 2012 May;19(5):690–8.

12. Leung DT, Rahman MA, Mohasin M, Riyadh MA, Patel SM, Alam MM, et al. Comparison
of Memory B Cell, Antibody-Secreting Cell, and Plasma Antibody Responses in Young
Children, Older Children, and Adults with Infection Caused by Vibrio cholerae O1 El Tor
Ogawa in Bangladesh ▽ . Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI. 2011 Aug;18(8):1317–25.

13. Aktar A, Rahman MA, Afrin S, Faruk MO, Uddin T, Akter A, et al. O-Specific
Polysaccharide-Specific Memory B Cell Responses in Young Children, Older Children, and
Adults Infected with Vibrio cholerae O1 Ogawa in Bangladesh. Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI.
2016 May;23(5):427–35.

14. Weil AA, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Leung DT, Uddin T, Begum YA, et al. Frequency of
reexposure to Vibrio cholerae O1 evaluated by subsequent vibriocidal titer rise after an
episode of severe cholera in a highly endemic area in Bangladesh. Am J Trop Med Hyg.
2012 Nov;87(5):921–6.

15. Falkard B, Charles RC, Matias WR, Mayo-Smith LM, Jerome JG, Offord ES, et al. Bivalent oral cholera vaccination induces a memory B cell response to the V. cholerae O1-polysaccharide antigen in Haitian adults. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019 Jan 31;13(1):e0007057.

16. Alam MM, Arifuzzaman M, Ahmad SM, Hosen MI, Rahman MA, Rashu R, et al. Study of Avidity of Antigen-Specific Antibody as a Means of Understanding Development of Long-Term Immunological Memory after Vibrio cholerae O1 Infection. Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI. 2013 Jan;20(1):17–23.

17. Kendall EA, Tarique AA, Hossain A, Alam MM, Arifuzzaman M, Akhtar N, et al. Development of immunoglobulin M memory to both a T-cell-independent and a T-cell-dependent antigen following infection with Vibrio cholerae O1 in Bangladesh. Infect Immun. 2010 Jan;78(1):253–9.

18. Jayasekera CR, Harris JB, Bhuiyan S, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Faruque ASG, et al. Cholera Toxin–Specific Memory B Cell Responses Are Induced in Patients with Dehydrating Diarrhea Caused by Vibrio cholerae O1. J Infect Dis. 2008 Oct 1;198(7):1055–61.

19. Czerkinsky C, Svennerholm AM, Quiding M, Jonsson R, Holmgren J. Antibody-producing cells in peripheral blood and salivary glands after oral cholera vaccination of humans. Infect Immun. 1991 Mar;59(3):996–1001.

20. Akter A, Dash P, Aktar A, Jahan SR, Afrin S, Basher SR, et al. Induction of systemic, mucosal and memory antibody responses targeting Vibrio cholerae O1 O-specific polysaccharide (OSP) in adults following oral vaccination with an oral killed whole cell cholera vaccine in Bangladesh. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019 Aug;13(8):e0007634.

21. Leung DT, Bhuiyan TR, Nishat NS, Hoq MR, Aktar A, Rahman MA, et al. Circulating mucosal associated invariant T cells are activated in Vibrio cholerae O1 infection and associated with lipopolysaccharide antibody responses. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014 Aug;8(8):e3076.

22. Levine MM, Black RE, Clements ML, Cisneros L, Nalin DR, Young CR. Duration of infection-derived immunity to cholera. J Infect Dis. 1981 Jun;143(6):818–20.

23. Wasserman SS, Losonsky GA, Noriega F, Tacket CO, Castañeda E, Levine MM. Kinetics of the vibriocidal antibody response to live oral cholera vaccines. Vaccine. 1994 Aug;12(11):1000–3.

24. Tacket CO, Forrest B, Morona R, Attridge SR, LaBrooy J, Tall BD, et al. Safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy against cholera challenge in humans of a typhoid-cholera hybrid vaccine derived from Salmonella typhi Ty21a. Infect Immun. 1990 Jun;58(6):1620–7.

25. Kanungo S, Lopez AL, Ali M, Manna B, Kim DR, Mahapatra T, et al. Vibriocidal antibody responses to a bivalent killed whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in a phase III trial in Kolkata, India. PloS One. 2014;9(5):e96499.

26. Viret JF, Favre D, Wegmüller B, Herzog C, Que JU, Cryz SJ, et al. Mucosal and systemic
immune responses in humans after primary and booster immunizations with orally
administered invasive and noninvasive live attenuated bacteria. Infect Immun. 1999
Jul;67(7):3680–5.

27. Sears SD, Richardson K, Young C, Parker CD, Levine MM. Evaluation of the human
immune response to outer membrane proteins of Vibrio cholerae. Infect Immun. 1984
May;44(2):439–44.

28. Migasena S, Pitisuttitham P, Prayurahong B, Suntharasamai P, Supanaranond W, Desakorn
V, et al. Preliminary assessment of the safety and immunogenicity of live oral cholera
vaccine strain CVD 103-HgR in healthy Thai adults. Infect Immun. 1989 Nov;57(11):3261–
4.

29. Mascart-Lemone F, Carlsson B, Jalil F, Hahn-Zoric M, Duchateau J, Hanson LA. Polymeric
and monomeric IgA response in serum and milk after parenteral cholera and oral typhoid
vaccination. Scand J Immunol. 1988 Oct;28(4):443–8.

30. Faucher JF, Binder R, Missinou MA, Matsiegui PB, Gruss H, Neubauer R, et al. Efficacy of
atovaquone/proguanil for malaria prophylaxis in children and its effect on the
immunogenicity of live oral typhoid and cholera vaccines. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect
Dis Soc Am. 2002 Nov 15;35(10):1147–54.

31. Chaicumpa W. Assessment of antibody responses and protective immunity in cholera
vaccinated subjects. 2018;

32. McCarty JM, Lock MD, Hunt KM, Simon JK, Gurwith M. Safety and immunogenicity of
single-dose live oral cholera vaccine strain CVD 103-HgR in healthy adults age 18-45.
Vaccine. 2018 Feb 1;36(6):833–40.

33. McCarty JM, Lock MD, Bennett S, Hunt KM, Simon JK, Gurwith M. Age-related
immunogenicity and reactogenicity of live oral cholera vaccine CVD 103-HgR in a
randomized, controlled clinical trial. Vaccine. 2019 Mar 7;37(11):1389–97.

34. Bhuiyan MS, Hossain M, Sharmin S, Shirin A, Khanam F, Chowdhury F, et al. Assessment
of disease specific immune responses in enteric diseases using dried blood spot (DBS). PloS
One. 2019;14(6):e0218353.

35. Haney DJ, Lock MD, Simon JK, Harris J, Gurwith M. Antibody-Based Correlates of
Protection Against Cholera Analysis of a Challenge Study in a Cholera-Naïve Population.
Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI. 2017 May 31;24(8):e00098-17, CVI.00098-17.

36. Alam MM, Leung DT, Akhtar M, Nazim M, Akter S, Uddin T, et al. Antibody Avidity in
Humoral Immune Responses in Bangladeshi Children and Adults following Administration
of an Oral Killed Cholera Vaccine. Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI. 2013 Oct;20(10):1541–8.

37. Jertborn M, Svennerholm AM, Holmgren J. Evaluation of different immunization schedules
for oral cholera B subunit-whole cell vaccine in Swedish volunteers. Vaccine.
1993;11(10):1007–12.

38. Kotloff KL, Wasserman SS, O'Donnell S, Losonsky GA, Cryz SJ, Levine MM. Safety and
immunogenicity in North Americans of a single dose of live oral cholera vaccine CVD 103-
HgR: results of a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind crossover trial. Infect
Immun. 1992 Oct;60(10):4430–2.

39. Jertborn M, Svennerholm AM, Holmgren J. Saliva, breast milk, and serum antibody
responses as indirect measures of intestinal immunity after oral cholera vaccination or
natural disease. J Clin Microbiol. 1986 Aug;24(2):203–9.

40. McCarty JM, Cassie D, Bedell L, Lock MD, Bennett S. Safety and Immunogenicity of Live
Oral Cholera Vaccine CVD 103-HgR in Children Aged 2-5 Years in the United States. Am J
Trop Med Hyg. 2020 Dec 14;104(3):861–5.

41. Adekunle O, Dretler A, Kauffman RC, Cho A, Rouphael N, Wrammert J. Longitudinal
analysis of human humoral responses after vaccination with a live attenuated V. cholerae
vaccine. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021 Sep 3;15(9):e0009743.

42. Chowdhury F, Akter A, Bhuiyan TR, Biswas R, Firoj MG, Tauheed I, et al. Long-term
sialidase-specific immune responses after natural infection with cholera: Findings from a
longitudinal cohort study in Bangladesh. Front Immunol [Internet]. 2022 Dec 22 [cited 2025
Jul 3];13. Available from:
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/immunology/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2022.1067737/full

43. Ateudjieu J, Sack DA, Nafack SS, Xiao S, Tchio-Nighie KH, Tchokomeni H, et al. An Age-
stratified, Randomized Immunogenicity Trial of Killed Oral Cholera Vaccine with Delayed
Second Dose in Cameroon. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2022 Nov 14;107(5):974–83.

44. Ng Ombe H, Simuyandi M, Mwaba J, Luchen CC, Alabi P, Chilyabanyama ON, et al.
Immunogenicity and waning immunity from the oral cholera vaccine (ShancholTM) in
adults residing in Lukanga Swamps of Zambia. PloS One. 2022;17(1):e0262239.

45. Islam MT, Date K, Khan AI, Bhuiyan TR, Khan ZH, Ahmed S, et al. Co-administration of
Oral Cholera Vaccine With Oral Polio Vaccine Among Bangladeshi Young Children: A
Randomized Controlled Open Label Trial to Assess Interference. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ
Infect Dis Soc Am. 2023 Jan 13;76(2):263–70.

46. Kaisar MH, Bhuiyan MS, Akter A, Saleem D, Iyer AS, Dash P, et al. Vibrio cholerae
Sialidase-Specific Immune Responses Are Associated with Protection against Cholera.
mSphere. 2021 Apr 28;6(2):e01232-20.

47. McCarty JM, Cassie D, Bedell L, Lock MD, Bennett S. Long-Term Immunogenicity of Live
Oral Cholera Vaccine CVD 103-HgR in Adolescents Aged 12-17 Years in the United States.
Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2021 Apr 5;104(5):1758–60.

48. Su-Arehawaratana P, Singharaj P, Taylor DN, Hoge C, Trofa A, Kuvanont K, et al. Safety
and immunogenicity of different immunization regimens of CVD 103-HgR live oral cholera
vaccine in soldiers and civilians in Thailand. J Infect Dis. 1992 Jun;165(6):1042–8.

49. McCarty JM, Gierman EC, Bedell L, Lock MD, Bennett S. Safety and Immunogenicity of
Live Oral Cholera Vaccine CVD 103-HgR in Children and Adolescents Aged 6-17 Years.
Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020 Jan;102(1):48–57.

50. Rudin A, Johansson EL, Bergquist C, Holmgren J. Differential kinetics and distribution of
antibodies in serum and nasal and vaginal secretions after nasal and oral vaccination of
humans. Infect Immun. 1998 Jul;66(7):3390–6.

51. Dash P, Hakim A, Akter A, Banna HA, Kaisar MH, Aktar A, et al. Cholera toxin and O-
specific polysaccharide immune responses after oral cholera vaccination with Dukoral in
different age groups of Bangladeshi participants. mSphere. 2024 Mar 26;9(3):e0056523.

531