Community burden of diphtheria during the 2023–24 epidemic in Kano State, Nigeria: a population-based household survey

Suleiman Hudu[1], Khadidja Uthman[1], Yves Katuala[1], Imam Wada Bello[2], Yanu Mbuyi[1], Dagemlidet Tesfaye Worku[1], Sedi Carvalho Mbelani[1], Ichola Ismael Adjaho[1], Etienne Gignoux[3], Cheick Oumar Doumbia[1], Franck Ale[1], Jonathan Polonsky[3] □*

[1] Médecins Sans Frontières, Operational Centre West and Central Africa (MSF WaCA)

[2] Kano State Ministry of Health, Kano State, Nigeria

[3] Epicentre, Paris, France

□ Geneva Centre of Humanitarian Studies, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

*Correspondence: Jonathan Polonsky, Epicentre, Paris, France (jonathan.polonsky@epicentre.msf.org)

Keywords: Diphtheria; Nigeria; Mortality; Vaccination; Outbreak

Abstract

Background Nigeria has experienced its largest recorded diphtheria outbreak since late 2022, centred on Kano State, where facility-based surveillance documented over 25,000 confirmed cases. The true community burden remains unknown. We conducted a population-based household survey to estimate community attack rates, mortality, vaccination coverage, and determinants of infection and death.

Methods We performed a retrospective household survey (September–October 2024) using spatially randomised cluster sampling (65 clusters, ~15 households each; recall period January 2023 to interview). Survey-weighted analyses, multivariable logistic regression, and sensitivity analyses were used.

Findings We enrolled 7,998 individuals from 1,068 households. The community attack rate was 1·1% (95% CI 0·7–1·4), 4·2 times (2·7–5·3) higher than facility-based estimates. The case fatality ratio was 8·8% (1·9–15·6) overall and 21·3% among children under five; two thirds of deaths occurred at home. Delayed care-seeking of four or more days was associated with markedly higher mortality (risk ratio 32·6, 95% CI 2·4–450·0). Vaccination was strongly protective against death (vaccine effectiveness 57%, 95% CI 34–72%; E-value 4·07). Among campaign-eligible children, routine EPI coverage was 56·6%; the reactive campaign reached few previously unvaccinated children (99·7% overlap with prior recipients), leaving 11·6% of eligible children unvaccinated.

Interpretation Community diphtheria burden substantially exceeded facility surveillance estimates, with most deaths occurring outside the health system. Delayed care-seeking and low vaccination coverage were the main drivers of mortality, highlighting the need for improved community surveillance, decentralised care, and better-targeted vaccination.

Funding Médecins Sans Frontières, West and Central Africa.

Research in context

Evidence before this study

We searched PubMed and Google Scholar for articles published between January 1, 2000, and February 28, 2026, using combinations of the terms “diphtheria”, “outbreak”, “Nigeria”, “West Africa”, “Kano”, “incidence, “mortality”, “survey” and “study”. Published literature on the 2023–24 Nigerian outbreak consists principally of facility-based surveillance analyses. Abbas and colleagues reported on 18,320 cases from the Kano State surveillance system, documenting a case fatality rate of 4·5% and identifying vaccination status as a key determinant of mortality. Kamadjeu and colleagues estimated transmission dynamics parameters from Kano case-based data, and Fouda and colleagues described the regional epidemic across nine affected African countries. Several commentaries have discussed the broader resurgence of diphtheria in the context of post-pandemic immunisation disruptions and vaccine hesitancy. A systematic review by Truelove and colleagues pooled data from historical outbreaks to estimate key epidemiological parameters. However, all estimates of disease burden during the current outbreak derive from patients presenting to health facilities. We identified no prior population-based studies that estimated community-level attack rates, mortality rates, or the extent of undetected morbidity and mortality during this or any recent large diphtheria outbreak.

Added value of this study

This is among the first population-based assessments of a large diphtheria outbreak, providing community-level estimates directly comparable with facility-based surveillance data from the same setting. We found that community attack rates were 4·2 times higher than those implied by passive surveillance, that two thirds of deaths occurred at home rather than in health facilities, and that delayed care-seeking dramatically increased mortality risk. For the most part, the reactive vaccination campaign did not reach children missed by routine immunisation, with 99·7% of campaign doses going to children already vaccinated through routine EPI, leaving at least 12% of eligible children entirely unprotected. These findings indicate that facility-based data substantially underestimate the true burden of epidemic diphtheria, and provide the first population-level assessment of how effectively reactive vaccination campaigns reach children missed by routine immunisation.

Implications of all the available evidence

Facility-based surveillance substantially underestimates community transmission and mortality during large diphtheria outbreaks. In settings where health system capacity is overwhelmed, a large share of morbidity and mortality occurs outside formal care, invisible to passive reporting systems. Effective outbreak response thus depends on community-based surveillance and decentralised treatment pathways that can reach patients before complications develop. Closing persistent vaccination gaps, particularly among children missed by both routine and campaign vaccination, remains essential to prevent future epidemics. These findings have immediate relevance for the ongoing regional diphtheria epidemic across West and Central Africa.

Introduction

Diphtheria, caused by toxigenic *Corynebacterium diphtheriae*, is a vaccine-preventable infection in which systemic toxin dissemination can produce life-threatening myocarditis and polyneuropathy.[1,2] Global incidence declined after the introduction of the Expanded Programme on Immunization in 1974, but outbreaks continue where vaccination coverage has declined or health systems have been disrupted,[3–5] as illustrated by recent epidemics in Yemen,[6] Venezuela,[7] and among migrant populations in Bangladesh[8] and Europe.[9]

Since late 2022, West and Central Africa has experienced its worst diphtheria epidemic in decades, with nine countries reporting outbreaks.[10] Nigeria has been by far the most affected country, reporting over 61,000 suspected cases and more than 2,100 deaths nationally as of January 2026.[11] Within Nigeria, Kano State has been the epicentre, accounting for approximately two thirds of all confirmed cases and deaths.[12,13] An analysis of 18,320 facility-based cases from the Kano State surveillance system documented a case fatality rate of 4·5% and an overall attack rate of approximately 140 per 100,000 population, rising to 262 per 100,000 in the most affected LGAs.[13]

However, facility-based surveillance captures only patients who present to health services. Where the population faces barriers to treatment seeking at health facilities, a substantial proportion of cases and deaths may occur in the community without being counted.[14,15] Understanding this gap is essential for designing appropriate outbreak responses.

Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), in collaboration with the Kano State Ministry of Health, supported a comprehensive diphtheria response from January 2023, including facility-based diphtheria treatment centres (DTCs), a home-based care programme for mild cases,[16] vaccination campaigns, and community engagement. Despite these efforts, the extent of community transmission and mortality outside the health system remained uncertain.

We therefore conducted a population-based retrospective household survey in four of the most affected LGAs of Kano State to estimate community attack rates and mortality rates, assess vaccination coverage (including the incremental reach of reactive campaigns), and identify factors associated with infection and death.

Methods

Study design and setting

We performed a retrospective, population-based household survey in four LGAs of Kano State (Dawakin Tofa, Fagge, Nassarawa, and Ungogo) selected on the basis of their high case burden during the outbreak. These four LGAs had a combined facility-reported attack rate of 262 per 100,000 population, and included Fagge (the LGA with the highest reported attack rate, 489 per 100,000) and Dawakin Tofa (the highest reported case fatality ratio, 11·6%).[13,17] Data collection took place between 17 September and 25 October 2024. The recall period extended from 1 January 2023, the

approximate start of the epidemic, to the date of interview, providing an observation window of approximately 21 months.

Sampling

We used a two-stage spatially randomised sampling design. Sixty-five random GPS coordinates were generated across the four LGAs using the Epicentre GeoSampler application,[18] and field enumerators enrolled the nearest 15 households to each coordinate to form clusters. The sample size of 899 households was calculated to estimate the crude mortality rate with a precision of ±0·08 per 10,000 person-days (95% confidence, design effect 1·5, 10% non-response).

Participants

All individuals who had resided in the study areas at any point during the recall period were eligible. A household was defined as a group of individuals under the responsibility of one household head who customarily share meals and living space. Households were eligible if at least one adult member had resided continuously in the area throughout the recall period and could report on demographic events and illness episodes for all members.

Data collection

Trained enumerators fluent in Hausa and English conducted interviews using a standardised questionnaire administered on tablets (KoboCollect).[19] Teams received structured training covering ethical conduct, informed consent, interviewing techniques, and case definitions. The questionnaire covered household composition, demographics, vaccination history (with card verification where available), diphtheria-like illness episodes, health-seeking behaviour, outcomes, sequelae, perceptions of vaccination, and household assets for socioeconomic status derivation. An events calendar assisted respondents in locating events within the recall period. Supervisors conducted daily debriefings and random spot-checks of completed questionnaires.

Definitions

A *diphtheria case* was defined as any household member reported to have presented with clinical signs and symptoms compatible with a community case definition of diphtheria (characterised by sore throat, difficulty swallowing, visible pharyngeal membrane, and/or neck swelling) during the recall period.

Deaths included all deaths reported among household members during the recall period. Causes were assigned from respondent description, with follow-up questions for reported diphtheria deaths.

Vaccination was defined as reported receipt of at least one dose of a diphtheria-containing vaccine through routine immunisation or supplementary campaigns, verified from vaccination cards where available. For sensitivity analyses, vaccination was additionally classified by source of evidence (card-confirmed or self-reported) and by route (routine only, campaign only, or both).

Outcomes

Primary outcomes were the community attack rate (AR), case fatality ratio (CFR), crude mortality rate (CMR), under-five mortality rate (U5MR), and intra-household secondary attack rate (SAR). Secondary outcomes were vaccination coverage (routine, campaign, and combined) and factors associated with infection and death.

Statistical analysis

All analyses were conducted in R (version 4.3) using the *survey* package to account for cluster design. Proportions were expressed with design-adjusted 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). Attack rates were calculated as the proportion of the survey population experiencing diphtheria. To quantify the gap between community and facility-based estimates, we computed the ratio of the survey-derived AR to the facility-reported AR for the same four LGAs (262 per 100,000, from Abbas et al.[13]), with 95% CIs derived by dividing the survey AR confidence bounds by the surveillance AR (treated as a fixed denominator). Mortality rates were calculated as deaths per 10,000 person-days, using person-time derived from household composition and reported entry and exit events. The intra-household SAR was calculated as the proportion of susceptible household members in affected households who developed diphtheria following the index case. Socioeconomic status was derived by principal component analysis of household-level asset indicators and classified into quintiles. To assess campaign targeting, routine EPI and campaign vaccination status were distinguished using card evidence and campaign phase dates. Records with ambiguous source attribution were treated as missing.

Survey-weighted logistic regression was used to examine factors associated with diphtheria; crude and adjusted odds ratios were estimated. The multivariable model included age group (0–5, 6–10, 11–15, ≥16 years), sex, vaccination status, LGA, socioeconomic quintile, and household size as *a priori* covariates. For mortality among cases, treatment delay (continuous and dichotomised at ≥4 days), vaccination status, age, and sex were examined. Vaccine effectiveness against death was estimated as 1 minus the mortality rate ratio, with E-values computed to assess robustness to unmeasured confounding.[20] Sensitivity analyses restricted the sample to individuals with card-confirmed vaccination, and stratified by vaccination route (routine versus campaign).

Ethics

The study was approved by the MSF Ethics Review Board and the Kano State Ministry of Health Research Ethics Committee. Written informed consent was obtained from each household head. Data were anonymised and stored on password-protected servers in compliance with European data protection regulations.

Role of the funding source

MSF funded and operationally supported the study, including study design and data collection. The authors, some of whom are MSF employees, conducted all analyses and

prepared this manuscript independently. The corresponding author had full access to all data and final responsibility for the decision to submit.

Results

Study population

Of 1,083 households approached, 1,068 (98·6%) consented to participate, providing data on 7,998 individuals including 110 who had died during the recall period (Table 1). The sample was 51·1% female, with a median age of 17 years (IQR 6–35); children younger than 15 years constituted 47% of the sample.

Community ARs and comparison with surveillance

Eighty-eight individuals were reported to have experienced diphtheria, yielding a crude community AR of 1·1% (95% CI 0·7–1·4) and an incidence rate of 6·5 cases per 1,000 person-years (95% CI 4·4–8·5) (Table 1, Figure 1). The survey-to-surveillance AR ratio was 4·2 (95% CI 2·7–5·3).

ARs were highest among school-aged children: 2·0% (95% CI 0·9–3·1) among those aged 11–15 years and 1·7% (95% CI 0·9–2·6) among those aged 6–10 years. Adults (≥16 years) had the lowest AR (0·6%, 95% CI 0·4–0·9). ARs were non-statistically significantly higher among females (1·3%, 95% CI 0·8–1·8) than males (0·9%, 95% CI 0·5–1·2).

Among 63 households with at least one diphtheria case, 17 (27%) reported two or more cases, corresponding to an intra-household SAR of 4·7% (95% CI 1·9–7·4).

Factors associated with diphtheria

In multivariable analysis, school-aged children had significantly higher odds of diphtheria compared with adults: adjusted OR 2·24 (95% CI 1·12–4·48) for ages 6–10 years and 2·67 (1·24–5·75) for ages 11–15 years (Table 2). Children aged 0–5 years had a non-significant elevation in risk (adjusted OR 1·38, 95% CI 0·63–3·03). Sex, socioeconomic quintile, and LGA were not independently associated with diphtheria after adjustment.

Reported vaccination remained associated with higher odds of diphtheria in the adjusted model (adjusted OR 1·84, 95% CI 1·01–3·34). This association is examined further in the sensitivity analyses below.

Mortality

There were 110 deaths among 7,998 survey participants during the recall period. The crude mortality rate was 0·21 per 10,000 person-days (95% CI 0·18–0·25) and the under-five mortality rate was 0·93 per 10,000 person-days (95% CI 0·71–1·16). The leading reported cause of death was malaria and other febrile illness (26·0%, 95% CI 17·4–34·6), followed by diarrhoeal disease (9·8%, 95% CI 3·0–16·6) and diphtheria (7·2%, 95% CI 2·2–12·1).

Eight deaths occurred among 88 diphtheria cases, giving a CFR of 8·8% (95% CI 1·9–15·6) overall and 21·3% (95% CI −2·4–45·0) among children younger than five years. Most diphtheria deaths occurred within the first week of illness (median 6 days from symptom onset, IQR 4–12).

Health-seeking behaviour and treatment delay

Seventy-six of the 88 cases (83·6%, 95% CI 69·8–97·4) sought medical care during their illness, with a median delay from symptom onset to first consultation of 2 days (IQR 1–4). However, health-seeking behaviour was strongly associated with survival. The risk of death increased by 4·6% (95% CI 0·17–9·2%) for each additional day of delay, and those who waited four days or more had a markedly higher risk of death than those who presented within three days (RR 32·6, 95% CI 2·4–450·0).

Approximately two thirds of all deaths (62·5%, 95% CI 52·0–73·0) occurred at home, with less than one third (31·8%, 95% CI 21·4–42·2) occurring in a health facility. A further 4·3% (95% CI 0·3–8·3) died in transit.

Vaccination and mortality

Vaccination was strongly protective against death. The mortality rate among unvaccinated individuals was over twice that among vaccinated individuals (MRR 2·3, 95% CI 1·5–3·5), and the CFR was higher among unvaccinated cases (11·9%) than vaccinated cases (5·6%, p=0·004). Vaccine effectiveness against death was estimated at 56·9% (95% CI 34·3–71·7). The E-value was 4·07 (lower confidence bound 2·41).

Vaccination and diphtheria: sensitivity analyses

In the full sample, individuals who reported being vaccinated had higher odds of diphtheria than those who reported being unvaccinated (OR 2·11, 95% CI 1·22–3·63; Table 3). This paradoxical association was examined through pre-specified sensitivity analyses.

When the analysis was restricted to individuals whose vaccination status was confirmed by vaccination card (excluding those relying on recall alone), the association disappeared entirely (OR 0·99, 95% CI 0·34–2·91). This finding suggests that misclassification of self-reported vaccination status is a likely contributor to the observed paradox.

Stratified analysis by vaccination route showed that the elevated odds persisted among those vaccinated through routine immunisation (OR 2·44, 95% CI 1·18–5·02) and was highest among campaign-vaccinated individuals (OR 2·67, 95% CI 1·44–4·93), consistent with reverse causality: as part of the outbreak response protocol, confirmed cases and their household contacts were routinely vaccinated upon presentation to health services, meaning that many individuals classified as “vaccinated” received their dose after exposure or symptom onset.

Vaccination coverage and campaign performance

Among 3,536 campaign-eligible children aged 6 months to 15 years, survey-weighted routine EPI coverage was 56·6% (95% CI 49·9–63·2) and campaign coverage was 54·2% (46·4–62·1). Among the 2,264 children with complete vaccination data, the campaign almost exclusively reached those already vaccinated through routine EPI: 1,248 (52·3%, 95% CI 48·6–56·0) received both, 748 (33·6%, 30·2–37·1) routine EPI only, and just 4 (0·2%, 0·0–0·3) campaign vaccination alone; 264 (13·9%, 11·2–16·6) received neither (Table 4). Among campaign recipients, 99·7% had prior routine EPI, while the campaign reached only 1·5% of EPI-unvaccinated children.

Discussion

This population-based survey provides the first community-level assessment of a large diphtheria outbreak. The community attack rate was 4·2 times higher than passive surveillance estimates for the same areas, nearly one in ten cases died, and two thirds of deaths occurred at home. These findings have implications for how outbreaks are measured and managed across a region where at least eight countries remain affected.[10,21]

There was a substantial discrepancy between community and facility-reported attack rates. In a setting where treatment capacity was overwhelmed,[13,16] more than 16% of cases did not seek care, and 62·5% of deaths occurred at home, passive surveillance missed a substantial proportion of both morbidity and mortality. A similar pattern has been described for measles and cholera in sub-Saharan Africa,[22,23] but to our knowledge this is the first time it has been quantified for diphtheria. The 4·2-fold ratio implies that for every case captured by the surveillance system, more than three additional cases occurred in the community undetected. This undercount has practical consequences: response plans tailored to facility-based case counts will systematically underestimate resource needs for case management, vaccination, and laboratory capacity.

Our community-based CFR of 8·8% is approximately double the 4·5% from facility-based surveillance,[13] consistent with severe cases dying at home being missed by passive systems. Among children under five years, our estimated CFR of 21% is consistent with pooled estimates of 20–30% for young unvaccinated children.[24] School-aged children (6–15 years) bore the highest risk of infection, with odds more than double those of adults, consistent with congregate transmission in school settings and waning vaccine-derived immunity in a population with low routine coverage.

Individuals who waited four or more days before seeking care had an estimated 33-fold higher risk of death. Although the confidence interval is wide, the direction is consistent with findings from a companion cohort study evaluating home-based care during this outbreak (four-fold mortality increase after four days)[16] and with established toxin kinetics: diphtheria antitoxin is most effective when administered within 48 hours of symptom onset, and efficacy declines rapidly with delay.[24,25] This finding has direct operational implications. In a large epidemic, when treatment capacity is saturated, decentralised care approaches that bring treatment closer to communities can shorten

the critical interval from symptom onset to treatment initiation. The companion study found that home-based management of mild cases achieved outcomes comparable to facility-based treatment in terms of mortality, household transmission, and patient acceptability.[16]

The paradoxical positive association between reported vaccination and diphtheria was almost entirely explained by misclassification of self-reported vaccination status: when restricted to card-confirmed vaccinees, the association disappeared (OR 0·99, 95% CI 0·34–2·91). The elevated odds among campaign-vaccinated individuals (OR 2·67) are best explained by reverse causality inherent in the outbreak response: as part of the case management protocol, confirmed diphtheria patients and their household contacts were vaccinated upon presentation to health services, meaning many individuals classified as “campaign-vaccinated” received their dose after exposure or symptom onset.[26] This may also explain the elevated OR among routine-vaccinated individuals (2·44), as some doses recorded during the outbreak period may reflect reactive rather than routine immunisation.

Vaccination was consistently and strongly protective against death (VE 57%, E-value 4·07), the outcome least susceptible to the recall and temporal biases described above. The E-value indicates that an unmeasured confounder would need to be associated with both vaccination and mortality by a factor of at least 4·1 to explain away the observed protective effect, suggesting that residual confounding is unlikely to fully explain the association. This estimate is consistent with the biological mechanism of diphtheria toxoid, which prevents toxin-mediated complications rather than pharyngeal colonisation.[1]

Routine vaccination coverage of 57% among campaign-eligible children remains below the threshold needed for diphtheria control, and the reactive campaign failed to extend protection to those missed by routine services. Among campaign recipients, 99·7% had already received routine EPI, while only 1·5% of EPI-unvaccinated children were reached. The campaign thus almost exclusively re-vaccinated children already protected, with the proportion of completely unvaccinated children estimated at 11·6%. This near-complete overlap indicates that campaign delivery followed the same geographic and social channels as routine immunisation, without specifically seeking out children missed by existing services. Without microplanning that explicitly targets communities and households with low routine coverage, supplementary campaigns will continue to bypass the children they are most needed to protect. The strong association between belief in vaccine efficacy and uptake (OR 3·8) underscores the importance of sustained community engagement alongside campaign redesign,[27,28] particularly amid reductions in international immunisation funding.[29,30]

This study has several limitations. The retrospective design and long recall period (≥631 days) introduced recall bias, particularly for symptom onset and vaccination history. Survivor bias may have led to underestimation of attack and mortality rates, as households that dissolved following deaths or that relocated during the outbreak could not be sampled.

Self-reported vaccination status introduces misclassification, as the sensitivity analyses demonstrate; the card-confirmed subanalysis provides a direct correction for the vaccination-infection paradox. For the campaign targeting analysis, vaccination records were missing for 35·9% of campaign-eligible children (1,268/3,536), with missingness clustered by geography, age, and parental education; coverage estimates should therefore be interpreted with caution, as children with missing data may differ systematically from those with complete records.

The case definition relied on clinical recall rather than laboratory confirmation, and some misclassification of diphtheria status is likely, though the specificity of the clinical presentation (pharyngeal membrane, neck swelling) in an active outbreak setting mitigates this concern. Results from four high-burden LGAs may not generalise to areas with different epidemic intensity or health-service accessibility. The small number of deaths (n=8) limited statistical power for the mortality analysis, reflected in the wide confidence interval around the treatment delay estimate, and the modest number of cases overall (n=88) limited power in the multivariable model for infection risk.

The community burden of diphtheria during the 2023–24 epidemic in Kano State substantially exceeded what facility-based surveillance captured, with most deaths occurring at home beyond the reach of the health system. Delayed care-seeking was the strongest modifiable risk factor for death, and vaccination, though protective against mortality, reached fewer than half the population. Overall, these findings highlight three operational priorities: community-based surveillance to detect the true extent of outbreaks; decentralised care pathways, including home-based care for mild disease, to shorten treatment delays; and accelerated vaccination with redesigned campaigns that reach children currently missed by both routine and supplementary immunisation. As diphtheria continues to spread across West and Central Africa, timely implementation of these measures will be essential to limiting further morbidity and mortality across the region.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participating communities and local leaders of Dawakin Tofa, Fagge, Nassarawa, and Ungogo for their cooperation and hospitality. We are grateful to the field investigators and data teams for their dedication, and to the MSF WaCA coordination for logistical and operational support. The study was conducted by Epicentre in collaboration with MSF WaCA and the Kano State Ministry of Health. We acknowledge the ethical oversight provided by the Kano State Health Research Ethics Committee and the MSF Ethics Review Board.

Contributors

JP, EG and FA conceptualised the study and designed the methodology. JP, SH, KU, and FA led field planning and oversaw data collection. YK, IWB, YM, DTW, SCM, IIA, and COD contributed to study design and protocol development, and to data collection and field coordination. JP conducted the formal analysis and wrote the original draft. All authors contributed to critical review and revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, and approved the final version for submission. JP accepts overall responsibility for the work.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Data sharing

Anonymised individual-level data will be made available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author, subject to approval by the MSF data sharing committee.

Table 1. Characteristics of survey participants by diphtheria status

Characteristic	No diphtheria (N=7,764)	Diphtheria (N=88)	p-value
LGA			0·2
Dawakin Tofa	874 (16%)	14 (24%)	
Fagge	615 (13%)	4 (7·6%)	
Nassarawa	2,260 (33%)	17 (23%)	
Ungogo	4,015 (38%)	53 (46%)	
Age group			<0·001
0–5 years	1,369 (17%)	18 (19%)	
6–10 years	1,240 (16%)	25 (25%)	
11–15 years	1,054 (14%)	19 (25%)	
≥16 years	4,101 (53%)	26 (30%)	
Sex			0·071
Female	3,963 (51%)	52 (61%)	
Male	3,801 (49%)	36 (39%)	
Vaccinated			0·007
No	3,991 (56%)	33 (38%)	
Yes	3,217 (44%)	53 (62%)	
Outcome			<0·001
Alive	7,664 (99%)	80 (91%)	
Died	100 (1·2%)	8 (8·7%)	

n (unweighted) (%). p-values from Pearson χ^2 test with Rao–Scott adjustment.

Table 2. Factors associated with diphtheria: crude and adjusted odds ratios from survey-weighted logistic regression

Factor	Crude OR (95% CI)	p	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p
Age group (ref: ≥16 years)				
0–5 years	1·74 (0·84–3·59)	0·131	1·38 (0·63–3·03)	0·418
6–10 years	2·47 (1·30–4·67)	0·006	2·24 (1·12–4·48)	0·023
11–15 years	2·65 (1·27–5·54)	0·010	2·67 (1·24–5·75)	0·013
Sex (ref: male)				

Factor	Crude OR (95% CI)	p	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p
Female	1·27 (0·80–2·01)	0·302	1·32 (0·83–2·12)	0·242
Vaccinated	2·11 (1·23–3·64)	0·008	1·84 (1·01–3·34)	0·046
SES quintile (per quintile)	1·18 (0·94–1·47)	0·145	1·17 (0·90–1·51)	0·227
Household size (per member)	0·95 (0·90–1·00)	0·037	0·94 (0·88–1·00)	0·044

Survey-weighted logistic regression with cluster-adjusted standard errors. LGA was included in the adjusted model but is omitted from the table for brevity (no LGA was independently associated with diphtheria; full results in Appendix).

Table 3. Sensitivity analyses for the association between vaccination and diphtheria

Analysis	OR	95% CI	p
Full sample (all respondents)	2·11	1·22–3·63	0·008
Card-confirmed vaccination only	0·99	0·34–2·91	0·992
Routine vaccination only vs unvaccinated	2·44	1·18–5·02	0·016
Any campaign vaccination vs unvaccinated	2·67	1·44–4·93	0·002

Crude survey-weighted odds ratios. Card-confirmed analysis restricted to individuals with vaccination verified from card or unvaccinated. Routine and campaign analyses use unvaccinated individuals as the reference group.

Table 4. Cross-tabulation of routine EPI and reactive campaign vaccination among children aged 6 months to 15 years with non-missing vaccination data (n=2,264)

	Campaign vaccinated	Campaign not vaccinated	Total
EPI vaccinated	1,248 (52.3%)	748 (33·6%)	1,996 (85·9%)
EPI not vaccinated	4 (0·2%)	264 (13.9%)	268 (14·1%)
Total	1,252 (52·5%)	1,012 (47·5%)	2,264

Raw counts shown with survey-weighted proportions in brackets. Routine EPI status derived from card-confirmed evidence; records with card dates falling within campaign windows were treated as missing. Vaccination data were missing for 35·9% of eligible children.

Figures

Figure 1. Epidemic curve of reported diphtheria cases by month of onset, household survey, four LGAs, Kano State, 2023–24.

References

1 Hadfield TL, McEvoy P, Polotsky Y, Tzinserling VA, Yakovlev AA. The pathology of diphtheria. *J Infect Dis* 2000; **181 Suppl 1**: S116-120.

2 Sharma NC, Efstratiou A, Mokrousov I, Mutreja A, Das B, Ramamurthy T. Diphtheria. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* 2019; **5**: 81.

3 Clarke KEN, MacNeil A, Hadler S, Scott C, Tiwari TSP, Cherian T. Global Epidemiology of Diphtheria, 2000–2017. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2019; **25**: 1834–42.

4 Blumberg LH, Prieto MA, Diaz JV, *et al.* The preventable tragedy of diphtheria in the 21st century. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2018; **71**: 122–3.

5 Will RC, Ramamurthy T, Sharma NC, *et al.* Spatiotemporal persistence of multiple, diverse clades and toxins of Corynebacterium diphtheriae. *Nat Commun* 2021; **12**: 1500.

6 Badell E, Alharazi A, Criscuolo A, *et al.* Ongoing diphtheria outbreak in Yemen: a cross-sectional and genomic epidemiology study. *The Lancet Microbe* 2021; **2**: e386–96.

7 Strauss RA, Herrera-Leon L, Guillén AC, *et al.* Molecular and epidemiologic characterization of the diphtheria outbreak in Venezuela. *Sci Rep* 2021; **11**: 6378.

8 Polonsky JA, Ivey M, Mazhar MKA, *et al.* Epidemiological, clinical, and public health response characteristics of a large outbreak of diphtheria among the Rohingya population in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 2017 to 2019: A retrospective study. *PLoS Med* 2021; **18**: e1003587.

9 Hoefer A, Seth-Smith H, Palma F, *et al.* Corynebacterium diphtheriae Outbreak in Migrant Populations in Europe. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2025; **392**: 2334–45.

10 Fouda AAB, Wiysonge CS, Masresha BG, *et al.* Resurgence of diphtheria outbreaks in the African Region 2023-2024. *The Pan African Medical Journal* 2025; **51**. DOI:10.11604/pamj.supp.2025.51.1.48620.

11 Nigeria Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (NCDC). Diphtheria Situation Report. Epi Week 3: 12th January 2026 – 18th January 2026. .

12 Balakrishnan VS. Diphtheria outbreak in Nigeria. *Lancet Microbe* 2024; **5**: e11.

13 Abbas MA, Yusuf AL, Murtala HA, *et al.* Post COVID 19 resurgence of diphtheria in Kano, Nigeria: analysis of 18,320 cases. *eBioMedicine* 2025; **118**. DOI:10.1016/j.ebiom.2025.105877.

14 Ratnayake R, Tammaro M, Tiffany A, Kongelf A, Polonsky JA, McClelland A. People-centred surveillance: a narrative review of community-based surveillance among crisis-affected populations. *Lancet Planet Health* 2020; **4**: e483–95.

15 Checchi F, Roberts L. Interpreting and Using Humanitarian Mortality Data in Humanitarian Emergencies. A primer for non-epidemiologists. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN), 2005.

16 Polonsky J. Outcomes of home-based versus facility-based care for mild diphtheria during a large epidemic in Kano State, Nigeria: a retrospective matched cohort study. .

17 Médecins Sans Frontières. Diphtheria surveillance data, Kano State, Nigeria, 2023–2024. 2024.

18 GeoSampler. https://apps.msf.net/geosampler-01/ (accessed April 8, 2026).

19 Data Collection on KoboCollect App (Older Version) — KoboToolbox documentation. https://support.kobotoolbox.org/kobocollect-android.html (accessed Oct 30, 2023).

20 VanderWeele TJ, Ding P. Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Research: Introducing the E-Value. *Ann Intern Med* 2017; **167**: 268–74.

21 Diphtheria - African Region (AFRO). https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/DON588 (accessed April 8, 2026).

22 Gignoux E, Polonsky J, Ciglenecki I, *et al.* Risk factors for measles mortality and the importance of decentralized case management during an unusually large measles epidemic in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo in 2013. *PLOS ONE* 2018; **13**: e0194276.

23 Rebaudet S, Sudre B, Faucher B it, Piarroux R. Environmental Determinants of Cholera Outbreaks in Inland Africa: A Systematic Review of Main Transmission Foci and Propagation Routes. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2013; **208**: S46–54.

24 Truelove SA, Keegan LT, Moss WJ, *et al.* Clinical and Epidemiological Aspects of Diphtheria: A Systematic Review and Pooled Analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; **71**: 89–97.

25 Niyazmatov BI, Shefer A, Grabowsky M, Vitek CR. Diphtheria epidemic in the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1993-1996. *J Infect Dis* 2000; **181 Suppl 1**: S104-109.

26 Orenstein WA, Bernier RH, Dondero TJ, *et al.* Field evaluation of vaccine efficacy. *Bull World Health Organ* 1985; **63**: 1055–68.

27 Besa NC, Coldiron ME, Bakri A, *et al.* Diphtheria outbreak with high mortality in northeastern Nigeria. *Epidemiol Infect* 2014; **142**: 797–802.

28 Kamadjeu R, Okunromade O, Lawal BB, *et al.* Diphtheria transmission dynamics - Unveiling generation time and reproduction numbers from the 2022-2023 outbreak in Kano state, Nigeria. *Infect Dis Model* 2025; **10**: 680–90.

29 Polonsky JA, Burns R, Odlum A, *et al.* Community engagement for vaccine delivery in low- and middle-income countries and humanitarian settings: A scoping umbrella review. 2025; published online March 25. DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-6295865/v1.

30 eBioMedicine null. Diphtheria's resurgence and the high cost of misinformation. *EBioMedicine* 2025; **118**: 105892.


Number of individuals
0
2
4
6
8
10
Jan 2023
Feb 2023
Mar 2023
Apr 2023
May 2023
Jun 2023
Jul 2023
Aug 2023
Sep 2023
Oct 2023
Nov 2023
Dec 2023
Jan 2024
Feb 2024
Mar 2024
Apr 2024
May 2024
Jun 2024
Jul 2024
Aug 2024
Sep 2024
Month of disease onset
LGA
Dawakin Tofa
Fagge
Nassarawa
Ungogo