Using self-controlled case series to understand the relationship between conflict and cholera in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo

Gina E C Charnley^{1,2*}, Kvin Jean³, Ilan Kelman^{4,5,6}, Katy A M Gaythorpe^{1,2**}, Kris A Murray^{1,2,7**}

1. Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK

2. MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, London, UK.

3. Matre de confrences, Laboratoire MESuRS - Cnam Paris, Paris, France.

4. Institute for Risk and Disaster Reduction, Faculty of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University College London, London, UK

5. Institute for Global Health, Faculty of Population Health, University College London, London, UK

6. University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway.

7. MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Fajara, The Gambia.

* Corresponding author

** Joint senior author

Email: g.charnley19@imperial.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background** Cholera outbreaks contribute significantly to diarrhoeal disease mortality, especially
 29 in low-income countries. Cholera outbreaks have several social and environmental risk factors and
 30 extreme conditions can act as catalysts for outbreaks. A social extreme with known links to
 31 infectious disease outbreaks is conflict, causing disruption to services, loss of income and
 32 displacement.

33 **Methods** Here, we explored this relationship in Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo
 34 (DRC), by fitting publicly available cholera and conflict data to conditional logistic regression
 35 models. We used the self-controlled case series method in a novel application, to understand if an
 36 exposure period of excess risk (conflict), increased the relative incidence of cholera. We also
 37 adapted the percentage attributable fraction equations to understand the proportion of cholera
 38 outbreaks attributable to conflict onset.

39 **Results** There were 12,829 conflict events and 1,178 cholera outbreaks during the period
 40 analysed in Nigeria and the DRC. Conflict increased the risk of cholera in Nigeria by 3.6 times and
 41 2.6 times for the DRC. Conflict was attributed to 19.7% and 12.3% of cholera outbreaks in Nigeria
 42 and the DRC, respectively. This was higher for some states/provinces, with a maximum increased
 43 risk of 7.5 times. Several states/provinces with the strongest positive relationship were also areas
 44 of high reported conflict or were neighbouring states/provinces.

45 **Conclusion** Our results help highlight the importance of rapid and sufficient assistance during
 46 social extremes and the need for pre-existing vulnerabilities such as poverty and access to
 47 healthcare to be addressed. In fragile states, conflict resolution should be a top priority to avoid
 48 excess risk for both cholera and other health and social implications.

50 **Introduction**

51 Diarrhoeal diseases are the eighth leading cause of death worldwide, with cholera contributing
 52 significantly, especially in low- and middle-income countries [1]. Over 94% of World Health
 53 Organization (WHO) reported cholera cases are in Africa and more research is needed to
 54 understand cholera dynamics on the continent [2]. Previous research has found several

environmental and socioeconomic links with cholera, including temperature, precipitation, poverty and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) [3-5]. Furthermore, extremes of these environmental and social conditions can act as catalysts for outbreaks, such as droughts, floods, and conflicts [6-8].

We will focus on the impacts of conflict on cholera outbreaks and compare the results across two countries in Africa, Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Several mechanisms have been suggested through which conflict can lead to infectious disease outbreaks [9-12]. During conflicts, services can be disrupted including access to WASH, disruption of disease control programmes and collapse of health systems (e.g., vaccination coverage). Those displaced by conflict may also find it difficult to access healthcare [13-15]. Populations may not seek medical treatment as they perceive it or healthcare facilities to be unsafe. For example, during the 2018 Ebola outbreak in the DRC healthcare facilities were attacked, dampening efforts to control the virus [16]. Conflict can worsen pre-existing vulnerabilities including poverty, as conflicts can cause loss of income, disruption to education, damage to livelihoods and displacement [17].

Nigeria and the DRC share social and environmental similarities, as well as experiencing cholera outbreaks. Both have active conflicts including the Boko Haram Insurgency in northeastern Nigeria [18] and political unrest in the eastern DRC [19]. They also have the second and third highest numbers of estimated cholera cases per year in Africa, respectively [20], with the Kivu provinces being the most active cholera foci in the world [21]. In addition, Nigeria and the DRC have a tropical climate, poor access to WASH and a large proportion of the population living in poverty (<\$1.25/day) at 87.7% for the DRC and 62% for Nigeria [22], which are known cholera risk factors.

Few studies have investigated the impacts of conflict on cholera outbreaks, especially quantitatively. Studies have commonly focused on cholera and conflict in Yemen [10,23-24], its effect on vaccination efforts [25] or the impact of conflict on other diseases such as Ebola [16] and

COVID-19 [26]. Africa is also a chronically understudied continent in relation to cholera, despite reporting a large proportion of global cases [2].

To bridge this research gap, we aimed to investigate if the incidence of cholera outbreak onset was affected by conflicts in Nigeria and the DRC in the past 23 years. To test this, we used the Self-Controlled Case Series (SCCS) method in a novel application and to understand its use in other contexts [27]. The SCCS methods have previously been used to test the effectiveness of drug and vaccine intervention on an individual [28-29] and population level [30]. Furthermore, we adapted the recently developed percentage attributable fraction (PAF) equations to the work presented here [30], to understand the proportion of cholera outbreaks attributable to conflict.

A sensitivity analysis provided further insight into the duration of the conflict effect on outbreaks and a sub-national analysis highlighted priority areas for national cholera prevention. Based on these results, we suggest mechanisms for which conflict is driving cholera and potential risk factors, building on previous research in this area. We hope this information can be used to strengthen disease prevention in conflict settings and reduce additional mortality and morbidity in conflicts.

Methods

Datasets

Cholera data were compiled from a range of publicly available sources (WHO disease outbreak news, ProMED, ReliefWeb, WHO regional office for Africa weekly outbreak and emergencies, UNICEF cholera platform, EM-DAT, the Nigerian Centre for Disease Control, and a literature search) in both English and French. The full compiled dataset is available in a GitHub repository (https://github.com/GinaCharnley/cholera_data_drc_nga). An outbreak was defined by the onset of a cholera case and the case definitions for the two countries are shown in S1 Information. Conflict data were provided by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Humanitarian Data Exchange [31]. The data included sub-national conflict events, categorised by

event type including battles, explosions, protests, riots, strategic developments, and violence against civilians.

The spatial granularity of the analysis was to administrative level 1 (states for Nigeria and provinces for the DRC) and all data points that were reported on a finer spatial scale were aggregated to the upper level. The study period was specified as January 1997 to May 2020, as these were the first and last reports in the conflict data. The temporal scale was set to weekly, with continuous weeks from epidemiological week 1 in 1997 to epidemiological week 20 in 2020 (1-1,220). Continuous weeks was chosen for compatibility with the model and to include periods of conflict that endured from one year into the next. Weeks was chosen, rather than days, to account for reporting lags, as previous work has reported issues in the granularity of data and timeliness of reporting, especially in humanitarian crises due to different sources of data and logistical difficulties [32-34]. Additional information on the datasets used here are available in S2 Information.

Model Structure and Fitting

The SCCS method investigates the association between an exposure and an outcome event. The aim is to estimate the effect, by comparing the relative incidence of the adverse events (outbreaks) within an exposure period of hypothesised excess risk (conflicts), compared to all other times (peace, according to the dataset used) [35-37].

Both the event and exposure were set as binary outcomes, either being present (1) or not (0). The observation period was the full study period (1-1,220). The exposure period was the first week after conflict onset and was reported as multiple onsets, not one long exposure period. The event was defined by the week the cholera outbreaks was reported.

Each event and exposure that occurred in the same state/province were designated an identification number and a pre-exposure, exposure, and post exposure period (see S1 and S2 Tables). The data was fit to conditional logistic regression models (function clogit(), R package

“survival”) [38]. The model coefficient values were used to calculate incidence rate ratio (IRR), to understand the magnitude in which conflict increased the risk of cholera outbreaks.

The datasets for each country were then split by state/province and the analysis repeated for each, to understand if the significance of conflict on cholera outbreaks varied by sub-national location and if conflict was more important in some states/provinces compared to others. All statistical analyses were carried out in R version 3.6.2 and the threshold for significance was $p < 0.05$.

Percentage Attributable Fraction

The recently developed percentage attributable fraction (PAF) equations [30] were adapted to the model results found here. The PAF values estimate the percentage of outbreaks that could be attributed to conflict at a national level, using the datasets and the IRR values from the model results (full equations in S3 Information).

Sensitivity Analysis

A sensitivity analysis was used to test different methods of defining the exposure end point (set to one week in the main analysis) and to understand the impact this would have on the results. It allowed for further understanding of how long after a conflict event the risk of cholera is heightened. Full information is shown in S4 Information and S1 and S2 Figs.

Results

Conflict and Cholera Occurrence

The distribution of conflict and cholera in Nigeria and the DRC in the datasets used here is shown temporally and spatially in Fig 1. The data shows an increase in reported conflict and cholera, especially after 2010 (Fig 1a-d) and a large proportion of the cholera cases have been reported in conflict-stricken areas (Fig 1e-f).

164

Fig 1. Changes in cholera and conflict. **a**, monthly cholera cases and deaths for Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. **c**, Monthly frequency of conflict events and fatalities for Nigeria and **d**, the Democratic Republic of Congo and **e** the number of conflict events and cholera cases as a percentage of the total number of national cases by administrative level 1 for Nigeria and **f**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. All figures are for the full datasets.

165 The total number of conflicts and outbreaks for each state/province during the study period is
 166 shown below in Fig 2 and totaled 4,639 conflict and 396 cholera outbreaks for the DRC and in
 167 Nigeria, 8,190 conflicts and 782 cholera outbreaks.

Fig 2. Percentage of events in each dataset including conflict and outbreaks, for a, Nigeria and b, the Democratic Republic of Congo by administrative level 1. FCT - Federal Capital Territory.

168
 169 To be included in the analysis, the state/province had to report both outbreaks and conflicts during
 170 the study period. As such, 22 provinces were included for the DRC and 36 states for Nigeria

171 (states and provinces excluded are shown in S5 Information). The temporal distribution of the
 172 exposure periods and outbreaks included in the SCCS model for each state/province is shown in
 173 Fig 3.

Fig 3. Swimmer plots. Showing the conflict exposure period in the SCCS model (1 week after the onset) and the outbreaks (black triangles) for each state/province for **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Model Output

Conflict significantly increased the risk of cholera outbreaks (IRR) in the past 23 years in Nigeria and the DRC. Nigeria showed an effect of greater magnitude, increasing the risk of cholera outbreaks by up to 3.6 times (IRR = 3.6, 95%CI = 3.3-3.9). Whereas for the DRC, the risk was increased by 2.6 times (IRR = 2.6, 95%CI = 2.3-2.9).

Of the 36 Nigerian states included in the analysis, 24 showed significant associations between conflict and cholera outbreaks. The strongest effect was found in Kebbi, Lagos, Osun, Borno and Nasarawa, with IRR values ranging from 6.8 to 6.2 (Fig 4a).

Eleven out of 22 DRC provinces included in the analysis showed a significant relationship between conflict and cholera. Tanganyika, Kasai-Oriental, Maniema, Nord-Kivu and Kasai found the strongest values and some were the highest values found in the analysis. In Tanganyika, conflict increased cholera risk by 7.5 times and 3.7 times for Kasai (Fig 4b).

Percentage Attributable Fraction

Based on the IRR values from the model results (3.6 for Nigeria and 2.6 for the DRC), the onset of a conflict event was attributable to 19.7% of cholera outbreaks in Nigeria and 12.3% for the DRC.

Sensitivity Analysis

The effect of conflict on cholera outbreaks at a national and sub-national level for both Nigeria and the DRC decreased with increasing exposure period. By week 6 the change was minimal and plateaued or increased (full results in S3 and S4 Figs).

Fig 4. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of exposure to conflict within one week of the event and cholera at a sub-national level. For **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold $p < 0.05$ are plotted here.

198

199 Discussion

200 Conflict events in Nigeria increased the risk of cholera outbreaks by 3.6 times and 2.6 times for the
 201 DRC. The percentage of cholera outbreaks attributable to the conflicts reported here was 19.7%
 202 for Nigeria and 12.3% for the DRC. The states/provinces with the highest increased risk were

203 Kebbi, Nigeria at 6.9 times and Kasaï-Oriental, the DRC at 7.3 times. This showed that in some
204 states/provinces, the effect of conflict was much greater than the national level.

205

206 The sensitivity analysis showed a decrease in effect as the weeks progressed, with some
207 states/provinces seeing a plateau or increase around 6 weeks after the event. The decrease with
208 the lag duration may be a “diluting” effect, as the probability of an outbreak will increase across a
209 longer period. The states/provinces that increased after week 6, were often those with the
210 strongest initial effect, especially in the DRC. This larger initial effect may have a longer lasting
211 impact, potentially due to conflict severity.

212

213 States/provinces with the greatest increased risk often coincided with areas of high conflict. This
214 provides further evidence to the hypothesis that conflict may be a driver of cholera in Nigeria and
215 the DRC. States/provinces surrounding high conflict areas were also highly significant areas (e.g.,
216 Abia, Ogun, Osun, Maniema, and Tanganyika), showing a potential spill-over effect. The
217 states/provinces here were studied independently but a possible explanation may be people
218 fleeing areas of conflict or a cholera outbreak to neighbouring states, as displacement is a known
219 risk factor for disease outbreaks [12]. This is especially important for cholera, as a large proportion
220 of people will be asymptomatic but can still shed the pathogen into local reservoirs [39].

221

222 Cholera outbreaks can be explosive and self-limiting, due to the high number of asymptomatic
223 individuals, reducing the susceptible pool [39]. This potentially explains why the impacts of conflict
224 on cholera was seen just one week after the event. The incubation period of cholera is short [40],
225 making the effect within the first week found here biologically possible for the pathogen and a
226 realistic timeframe for elevated exposure to manifest in cases. Other examples of cholera cases
227 emerging within the first week after an adverse event include Cyclone Thane hitting the Bay of
228 Bengal [41], water supply interruption in the DRC [42] and Cyclone Aila in West Bengal [43]. This

provides further evidence of the need for quick and effective aid in humanitarian crisis to avoid outbreaks and reduce mortality [44].

Healthcare facilities can suffer in periods of conflict and cholera outbreaks can overwhelm systems, a potential cause of the relationship between conflict and cholera shown here. Care can be inaccessible because of direct infrastructure damage or difficulties getting to the facilities due to impromptu roadblocks [45]. Supplies may be stolen and/or unable to be delivered, including oral rehydration solution (ORS), pathogen-sensitive antibiotics and oral cholera vaccines, which are important for cholera outbreak control and mortality [46]. Finally, safety is a serious issue, both for healthcare workers and patients and non-governmental (NGO) organisations can withdraw from these areas, citing an inability to ensure the safety of their staff [47]. Steps need to be taken globally to reduce this violence, such as using active clinical management for all patients to enhance the acceptance of pathogen-specific treatment centres [48].

Conflict has the potential to worsen pre-existing vulnerabilities, which can exacerbate poverty, another potential cause of the effect of conflict on cholera. The impacts of poverty can be far reaching and is a known risk factor for cholera [5,49], along with other diseases [50]. For example, poor urban settlements have faced the brunt of outbreaks including Zika, Ebola, typhoid, and cholera, due to crowding and poor access to WASH [51]. Those in poorer communities may also have more contacts and greater transmission, creating a vicious cycle [50]. Conflict can result in loss of possessions, habitual residence, and an inability to find employment, reducing income generation, savings and financial backstops [17]. In times of worsening poverty, people may not be able to afford healthcare and basic medical supplies, especially in vulnerable groups. This disruption to daily life can cause many more deaths than direct battlefield fatalities and leads to stagnation in development [52].

A lack of WASH facilities is likely to have contributed to the positive relationship between cholera and conflict found here. Although WASH and poverty were not directly evaluated, their effects are

likely to have been important. Conflict events can lead to disruption in sanitation and hygiene and adverse events can act as catalysts in the interaction of contaminated water and the human populations [53]. Displacement from conflict can cause issues in accessing WASH (e.g., latrine access, soap availability) and several displacement camps have seen rapid cholera outbreaks, including the DRC after the Rwandan genocide in 1994 [2]. If people are displaced due to conflict, this may result in the use of water with unknown risk, or because alternatives are lacking, leading to outbreaks.

A potential limitation of this analysis is the confounding effect of waterbodies in the most significant states/provinces including the Lake Chad basin in Nigeria and the African Great Lakes Region in the DRC. Water is considered fundamental in cholera transmission [54], although no study has yet demonstrated a long-term persistence of toxigenic *Vibrio cholerae* in African lakes [55]. Several reporting issues are likely to have affected the data used here, including underreporting, overreporting and a reporting lag. Underreporting is a significant issue in global cholera estimates, due to asymptomatic cases and disincentives to report [56]. This may be worsened in conflicts, due to displaced populations, or disruption to surveillance. Alternatively, during times of conflict health surveillance can be enhanced by the government and/or NGOs [33]. Reporting delay is another potential problem and some national reporting delays, have been found to range from 12 days for meningococcal disease to 40 days for pertussis [33]. To help account for these issues, both the event and the exposure was set to a binary outcome and weekly data was used, instead of daily.

In summary, our analysis shows a clear relationship between cholera and conflict in both Nigeria and the DRC at both a national and sub-national level. Conflict increased the risk of cholera outbreaks by up to 7.3 times in some states/provinces and almost 20% of cholera outbreaks being attributable to conflict in Nigeria. This finding potentially holds in other countries and diseases and highlights how the SCCS methodology could be used in different contexts. Cholera risks are likely multi-factorial in both northeastern Nigeria and eastern DRC and several conditions need to be met for emergencies to lead to cholera outbreaks. Sufficient and rapid support, along with enhanced

efforts to build community trust can reduce this access risk. Finding conflict resolution should be the main priority in fragile states and pre-existing vulnerabilities need to be addressed, such as poverty, expansion of affordable healthcare and improvements in WASH. By reducing these vulnerabilities, communities will have greater resources to adapt to social extremes and could help to reduce vulnerabilities both in times of conflict and peace.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Natural Environmental Research Council [NE/S007415/1], as part of the Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment's (Imperial College London) Science and Solutions for a Changing Planet Doctoral Training Partnership. We also acknowledge joint Centre funding from the UK Medical Research Council and Department for International Development [MR/R0156600/1]. We thank the organisations who published and those who collected the data that was used here, including the Nigerian Centre for Disease Control and Ministère de la Santé RDC. Finally, we acknowledge and thank Heather Whitaker (Open University) and Yonas Weldeselassie (University of Warwick) for their assistance and advice in the SCCS methodology.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. World Health Organization. The top 10 causes of death. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death> (accessed September 9, 2018).
2. Nkoko DB, Giraudoux P, Plisnier PD, Tinda AM, Piarroux M, Sudre B et al. Dynamics of cholera outbreaks in Great Lakes region of Africa, 1978–2008. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2011; 17: 2026.

- 311 3. D'Mello-Guyett L, Gallandat K, Van den Bergh R, Taylor D, Bulit G, Legros D, Maes P et al.
312 Prevention and control of cholera with household and community water, sanitation and hygiene
313 (WASH) interventions: a scoping review of current international guidelines. PloS One 2020; 15:
314 e0226549.
- 315 4. Leckebusch GC, Abdussalam AF. Climate and socioeconomic influences on interannual
316 variability of cholera in Nigeria. Health Place. 2015; 34: 107-17.
- 317 5. Talavera A, Perez EM. Is cholera disease associated with poverty?. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2009;
318 3: 408-11.
- 319 6. Charnley GE, Kelman I, Green N, Hinsley W, Gaythorpe KA, Murray KA. Relationships
320 between drought and epidemic cholera in Africa. medRxiv 2021. doi:
321 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.16.21260629>.
- 322 7. Gormley M. Untangling the causes of the 2016–18 cholera epidemic in Yemen. Lancet Glob
323 Health. 2018; 6: e600-1.
- 324 8. Rieckmann A, Tamason CC, Gurley ES, Rod NH, Jensen PK. Exploring droughts and floods
325 and their association with cholera outbreaks in sub-Saharan Africa: a register-based ecological
326 study from 1990 to 2010. Am J Trop Med. 2018; 98: 1269-74.
- 327 9. Al-Salem WS, Pigott DM, Subramaniam K, Haines LR, Kelly-Hope L, Molyneux DH et al.
328 Cutaneous leishmaniasis and conflict in Syria. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016; 22: 931.
- 329 10. Dureab FA, Shibib K, Al-Yousufi R, Jahn A. Yemen: cholera outbreak and the ongoing armed
330 conflict. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2018; 12: 397-403.
- 331 11. Kraemer MU, Pigott DM, Hill SC, Vanderslott S, Reiner RC, Stasse S et al. Dynamics of
332 conflict during the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo 2018–2019. BMC
333 Med. 2020; 18: 1-0.
- 334 12. Watson JT, Gayer M, Connolly MA. Epidemics after natural disasters. Emerg Infect Dis. 2007;
335 13: 1.
- 336 13. Charnley GE, Kelman I, Gaythorpe KA, Murray KA. Traits and risk factors of post-disaster
337 infectious disease outbreaks: a systematic review. Sci Rep. 2021; 11: 1-4.

- 338 14. Gayer M, Legros D, Formenty P, Connolly MA. Conflict and emerging infectious diseases.
339 Emerg Infect Dis. 2007; 13: 1625.
- 340 15. McPake B, Witter S, Ssali S, Wurie H, Namakula J, Ssengooba F. Ebola in the context of
341 conflict affected states and health systems: case studies of Northern Uganda and Sierra
342 Leone. Conf Health. 2015; 9: 1-9.
- 343 16. Wells CR, Pandey A, Mbah ML, Gaüzère BA, Malvy D, Singer BH et al. The exacerbation of
344 Ebola outbreaks by conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PNAS. 2019; 116:
345 24366-72.
- 346 17. Okunlola OC, Okafor IG. Conflict–Poverty Relationship in Africa: A Disaggregated Approach. J
347 Interdiscip Econ. 2020: 1-26.
- 348 18. Agbiboa D. The ongoing campaign of terror in Nigeria: Boko Haram versus the state. Stability.
349 2013; 2.
- 350 19. Council on Foreign Relations. Violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo.
351 <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/violence-democratic-republic-congo> (accessed
352 September 9, 2018).
- 353 20. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated global burden of cholera in endemic countries.
354 PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015; 9: e0003832.
- 355 21. Bompangue D, Giraudoux P, Piarroux M, Mutombo G, Shamavu R, Sudre B et al. Cholera
356 epidemics, war and disasters around Goma and Lake Kivu: an eight-year survey. PLoS Negl
357 Trop Dis. 2009; 3: e436.
- 358 22. United Nations Statistical Division, 2015. Millennium Development Goal Indicators.
359 <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/SeriesDetail.aspx?srid=580> (accessed September 9, 2018).
- 360 23. Blackburn CC, Lenze PE, Casey RP. Conflict and cholera: Yemen's man-made public health
361 crisis and the global implications of weaponizing health. Health Secur. 2020; 18: 125-31.
- 362 24. Federspiel F, Ali M. The cholera outbreak in Yemen: lessons learned and way forward. BMC
363 Public Health 2018; 18: 1-8.
- 364 25. Sato R. Effect of armed conflict on vaccination: evidence from the Boko haram insurgency in
365 northeastern Nigeria. Confl Health. 2019; 13: 1-0.

- 366 26. Tijjani SJ, Ma L. Is Nigeria prepared and ready to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic in its
367 conflict-affected northeastern states?. *Int J Equity Health*. 2020; 19: 1-4.
- 368 27. Farrington CP. Relative incidence estimation from case series for vaccine safety evaluation.
369 *Biometrics* 1995: 228-35.
- 370 28. Brauer R, Smeeth L, Anaya-Izquierdo K, Timmis A, Denaxas SC, Farrington CP et al.
371 Antipsychotic drugs and risks of myocardial infarction: a self-controlled case series study. *Eur*
372 *Heart J*. 2015; 36: 984-92.
- 373 29. Douglas IJ, Evans SJ, Pocock S, Smeeth L. The risk of fractures associated with
374 thiazolidinediones: a self-controlled case-series study. *PLoS Med* 2009; 6: e1000154.
- 375 30. Jean K, Raad H, Gaythorpe KA, Hamlet A, Mueller JE, Hogan D et al. Assessing the impact of
376 preventive mass vaccination campaigns on yellow fever outbreaks in Africa: A population-level
377 self-controlled case series study. *PLoS Med*. 2021; 18: e1003523.
- 378 31. HDX. The Humanitarian Data Exchange. <https://data.humdata.org> (accessed September 9,
379 2018).
- 380 32. Jajosky RA, Groseclose SL. Evaluation of reporting timeliness of public health surveillance
381 systems for infectious diseases. *BMC Public Health* 2004; 4: 1-9.
- 382 33. Ri S, Blair AH, Kim CJ, Haar RJ. Attacks on healthcare facilities as an indicator of violence
383 against civilians in Syria: An exploratory analysis of open-source data. *PloS One* 2019; 14:
384 e0217905.
- 385 34. Weidmann NB. A closer look at reporting bias in conflict event data. *Am J Pol Sci*. 2016; 60:
386 206-18.
- 387 35. Petersen I, Douglas I, Whitaker H. Self controlled case series methods: an alternative to
388 standard epidemiological study designs. *BMJ* 2016; 354.
- 389 36. Farrington CP, Whitaker HJ, Hocine MN. Case series analysis for censored, perturbed, or
390 curtailed post-event exposures. *Biostatistics* 2009; 10: 3-16.
- 391 37. Whitaker HJ, Paddy Farrington C, Spiessens B, Musonda P. Tutorial in biostatistics: the self-
392 controlled case series method. *Stat Med*. 2006; 25: 1768-97.

38. Therneau TM, 2021. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survival> (accessed 2 October 2021).
39. King AA, Ionides EL, Pascual M, Bouma MJ. Inapparent infections and cholera dynamics. *Nature* 2008; 454: 877-80.
40. Azman AS, Rudolph KE, Cummings DA, Lessler J. The incubation period of cholera: a systematic review. *J Infect.* 2013; 66: 432-8.
41. Fredrick T, Ponnaiah M, Murhekar MV, Jayaraman Y, David JK, Vadivoo S et al. Cholera outbreak linked with lack of safe water supply following a tropical cyclone in Pondicherry, India, 2012. *J Health Popul Nutr.* 2015; 33: 31.
42. Jeandron A, Saidi JM, Kapama A, Burhole M, Birembano F, Vandeveld T et al. Water supply interruptions and suspected cholera incidence: a time-series regression in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *PLoS Med.* 2015; 12: e1001893.
43. Bhunia R, Ghosh S. Waterborne cholera outbreak following cyclone Aila in Sundarban area of West Bengal, India, 2009. *Trans R Soc Trop.* 2011; 105: 214-9.
44. Tauxe RV, Holmberg SD, Dodin A, Wells JV, Blake PA. Epidemic cholera in Mali: high mortality and multiple routes of transmission in a famine area. *Epidemiol Infect.* 1988; 100: 279-289.
45. Sousa C, Hagopian A. Conflict, health care and professional perseverance: a qualitative study in the West Bank. *Glob Public Health.* 2011; 6: 520-33.
46. Cartwright EJ, Patel MK, Mbopi-Keou FX, Ayers T, Haenke B, Wagenaar BH et al. Recurrent epidemic cholera with high mortality in Cameroon: persistent challenges 40 years into the seventh pandemic. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2013; 141: 2083-93.
47. MSF. DRC: Violent attacks against staff force MSF to end projects in Fizi territory, South Kivu. <https://www.msf.org/msf-forced-pull-out-eastern-drc-territory-following-violent-attacks> (accessed September 9, 2018).
48. Nguyen VK. An epidemic of suspicion—Ebola and violence in the DRC. *N Engl J Med.* 2019; 380: 1298-9.
49. Penrose K, Castro MC, Werema J, Ryan ET. Informal urban settlements and cholera risk in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2010; 4: e631.

50. Fallah MP, Skrip LA, Gertler S, Yamin D, Galvani AP. Quantifying poverty as a driver of Ebola transmission. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015; 9: e0004260.
51. Eisenstein M. Disease: poverty and pathogens. Nature 2016; 531: S61-3.
52. Trani JF, Bakhshi P, Noor AA, Lopez D, Mashkoor A. Poverty, vulnerability, and provision of healthcare in Afghanistan. Soc Sci Med. 2010; 70: 1745-55.
53. Jutla A, Khan R, Colwell R. Natural disasters and cholera outbreaks: current understanding and future outlook. Curr Environ Health Rep. 2017; 4: 99-107.
54. Birmingham ME, Lee LA, Ndayimirije N, Nkurikiye S, Hersh BS, Wells JG et al. Epidemic cholera in Burundi: patterns of transmission in the Great Rift Valley Lake region. Lancet. 1997; 349: 981-5.
55. Bompangue D, Giraudoux P, Handschumacher P, Piarroux M, Sudre B, Ekwanzala M et al. Lakes as source of cholera outbreaks, Democratic Republic of Congo. Emerg Infect Dis. 2008; 14: 798.
56. Elimian KO, Musah A, Mezue S, Oyebanji O, Yennan S, Jinadu A et al. Descriptive epidemiology of cholera outbreak in Nigeria, January–November, 2018: implications for the global roadmap strategy. BMC Public Health 2019; 19: 1-1.

Supporting information

S1 Information. Cholera case definitions according to the Nigerian Centre for Disease

Control and the Ministère de la Santé Publique de la République démocratique du Congo.

NCDC:

Suspected case: Severe dehydration or death from acute watery diarrhoea in a patient aged 5 years or more. In an epidemic situation: A suspected case in any person aged 5 years or more with acute watery diarrhoea with or without vomiting.

Confirmed case: A suspected case in which *Vibrio cholerae* O1 or O139 has been isolated in the stool.

RDC Ministère de la Santé:

Suspected case: Severe dehydration or death following acute watery diarrhoea in a patient aged 5 years or more. In an epidemic situation: Acute watery diarrhoea with or without vomiting in a patient aged 1 year or more.

S2 Information. Dataset information.

Cholera data was compiled from a range of publicly available sources (WHO's disease outbreak news, ProMED, ReliefWeb, WHO's regional office for Africa weekly outbreak and emergencies, UNICEF cholera platform, EM-DAT, the Nigerian CDC and a literature search) in both English and French. A data charting form was used to enable a dynamic data entry process and collected data on date, geographic location, cases, deaths, hospitalisations, fatality rates, gender, age, oral cholera vaccinations, risk factors, aid and the source of the report. Data spanned from 1971-2021 for Nigeria and 1978-2021 for the DRC on a daily temporal scale and was provided at the finest spatial scale possible.

Conflict data was provided by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs's Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX, 2020). The data included sub-national conflict events for both countries on a fine spatial scale, given to the exact location in longitude/latitude. This was reported on a daily temporal scale and spanned from 1997 to 2020. The data was also categorised by event type which included battles, explosions, protests, riots, strategic developments and violence against civilians. This was further sub-categorised within these groups and reported number of fatalities.

The study period was selected as Jan 1997 to May 2020, as these were the first and last reports in the conflict data. The spatial granularity of the analysis was to administrative level 1 (states for Nigeria and provinces for the DRC) and all data points that were reported on a finer spatial scale were attributed to the upper level. To be included in the analysis, the state/province had to report both outbreaks and conflicts during the study period, therefore 22 provinces were included for the DRC and 36 states for Nigeria.

505 S3 Information. Percentage attributable fraction (PAF) equations.

506 Estimate the number of outbreaks attributable to conflicts, A_i , for each province i . Using the
507 formula:

$$A_i = \lambda_i d_i^{E+} (IRR - 1) \quad (1)$$

508

509 Where d_i^{E+} is the total duration of conflict exposure for the province i (if no conflict in province i ,
510 thus $d_i^{E+} = 0$), λ_i is the rate of outbreak occurrence in a Poisson process in the absence of conflict,
511 and IRR is the incidence rate ratio associated with exposure to conflict. With N_i^{E-} being the
512 number of outbreaks observed in the province i during the un-exposed period and T being the total
513 period of observation, an estimator of λ_i is $\hat{\lambda}_i = N_i^{E-} / (T - d_i^{E+})$, which leads to:

$$\hat{A} = \sum_i \frac{N_i^{E-} d_i^{E+}}{(T - d_i^{E+})} (IRR - 1) \quad (2)$$

514

515 Based on $\hat{A}$ and N , the total number of outbreaks observed, we can easily obtain the equivalent of
516 the population attributable fraction, PAF , which corresponds to the proportion of the total number of
517 outbreaks in both countries that are attributable to conflicts (this is equivalent to the PAF obtained
518 in classical epidemiological studies, but here population refers to the “population of provinces”):

$$PAF = \frac{\hat{A}}{N} \quad (3)$$

519

520

521

522

523 **S4 Information. Sensitivity analysis.** Alternative exposure end points to identify the effect of lag.

524 Five alternative exposure periods were tested from the original exposure period (1 week after the
525 onset of exposure, lag 1) and were named lag periods due to the potential lag effect from conflict
526 onset to cholera outbreaks, these included:

- 527 1. Lag 2 - Week of conflict onset + 2 weeks
- 528 2. Lag 4 - Week of conflict onset + 4 weeks
- 529 3. Lag 6 - Week of conflict onset + 6 weeks
- 530 4. Lag 8 - Week of conflict onset + 8 weeks
- 531 5. Lag 10 - Week of conflict onset + 10 weeks

532 The sensitivity analysis was run on both a national and sub-national level and S1 and S2 Figs
533 show additional swimmer plots of lag 10 and line plots of the temporal trends.

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551 **S5 Information. Excluded events.** States/provinces removed as they did not report conflict and
552 cholera in the study period (1997-2020).
553 Democratic Republic of Congo:
554 . Haut-Uele - 629 conflict events removed
555 . Kasai-Central - 234 conflict events removed
556 . Lomani - 101 conflict events removed
557 . Tshuapa - 70 conflict events removed
558
559 Nigeria:
560 . Imo - 239 conflict events removed
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577

S1 Table. The layout of the data frame used to create the pseudo-dataset for the model.

Each new 'end' period represents a different sensitivity analysis and each event and exposure are given a reference number (indiv). The example shown here is for the Democratic Republic of Congo Conflict dataset.

province	exday	eventday	start	end	start1	end0	end1	end2	end4	end6	end8	end10	indiv
Bas-Uele	3	374	1	542	3	3	4	5	7	9	11	13	1
Bas-Uele	4	374	1	542	4	4	5	6	8	10	12	14	2
Bas-Uele	6	374	1	542	6	6	7	8	10	12	14	16	3
Bas-Uele	7	374	1	542	7	7	8	9	11	13	15	17	4
Bas-Uele	9	374	1	542	9	9	10	11	13	15	17	19	5

S2 Table. The pseudo-dataset created from the data in S1 Table for the first two reference numbers. This data can then be fit to the model (conditional logistic regression).

indiv	exday	eventday	start	end	event	exgr	interval	loginterval
1	3	374	1	3	0	0	2	0.693147180559945
1	3	374	3	13	0	1	10	2.30258509299405
1	3	374	13	542	1	0	529	6.2709884318583
2	4	374	1	4	0	0	3	1.09861228866811
2	4	374	4	14	0	1	10	2.30258509299405
2	4	374	14	542	1	0	528	6.26909628370626

600 **S1 Figure. Swimmer plots showing the conflict dataset for lag 10 in the sensitivity**

601 **Analysis.** In relation to outbreaks (black triangles) for Nigeria (NGA) and the Democratic Republic
602 of Congo (COD).

603 **S2 Figure. Number of outbreak (orange) and conflict (purple) events by year in Nigeria and**
 604 **the Democratic Republic of Congo over the full study period.**

606 **S3 Figure. Results of national sensitivity analysis.** Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of
 607 exposure to conflict within 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks of the event and cholera for **a**, Nigeria and **b**,
 608 the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold $p < 0.05$ are
 609 plotted here. From week 1 to week 10 the risk decreased from 3.6 to 2.08 for Nigeria and from 2.6
 610 to 1.5 for the DRC. This suggests that the risk of conflict on cholera is highest soon after the event
 611 but remains a detectable association albeit at a lower level for potentially a long period of time after
 612 the event.

613

S4 Figure. Results of subnational sensitivity analysis. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for the effect of exposure to conflict within 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 weeks of the event and cholera at administrative level 1. For **a**, Nigeria and **b**, the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only results that were significant at the threshold $p < 0.05$ are plotted here. Thirty Nigerian states and 13 DRC provinces were found to be significant for at least one of the lag periods and the most significant states predominately followed the trends of the national analysis. Values ranged from Kebbi at 6.9 to 4.0 times increased risk of cholera, to Gombe at 2.4 to 1.5 (Fig 6a).