

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

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

Alexandre Blake<sup>1</sup>, Adam Walder<sup>2</sup>, Ephraim Hanks<sup>2</sup>, Placide Okitayembo Welo<sup>3</sup>, Francisco Luquero<sup>4</sup>, Didier Bompangue<sup>3,5</sup>, Nita Bharti<sup>1</sup>

Corresponding author: Nita Bharti, [nita@psu.edu](mailto:nita@psu.edu)

## Affiliations

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

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

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

4: Epicentre, Paris, France

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

## Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Author summary

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

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

## Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Figure 1:** Overview of the location and the seasonality of cholera cases in the study area. (A) Map of the DRC with population density (with  $\log_{10}(\text{population}+1)$  transformation), the boundaries of the health zones in white, major roads in light green, a red box around the health zones of Kalemie and Nyemba (seen in B), a red circle on the city of Kalemie, and Lake Tanganyika in blue. (B) Detailed map of the city of Kalemie (red circle), which sits across the two health zones of Kalemie and Nyemba (dark red boundaries), and population density (low in grey and high in red). (C) Boxplot of the total number of reported suspected cholera cases by week (based on the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) system) in the health zones of Kalemie and Nyemba from 2002 to 2014 (30), with week number and the typical rainy season weeks shaded in grey.

## Results

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

## Discussion

The impact of the intervention performed in Kalemie was modest when measured by cases avoided, which we estimate around 3,484 (mean: 3,484.4, 95% CrI: 2,411.7-4,832.8) for both intervention arms combined. Following the interruption of planned vaccination activities, the reduction of the target population size after resuming activities, the narrow scale of the WASH improvements, and the high level of immunity in the population likely all contributed to mitigating the impact of the intervention. Benefitting from vaccination in endemic cholera settings, as defined by WHO, requires an understanding of dominant local transmission routes. Our model suggests that in settings where an environmental reservoir provides consistent exposure and maintains high immunity in the population, the impact of vaccination is minimal. The practical limitation of not being able to identify and target the population of susceptible individuals leads to vaccinating a majority of immune individuals. Achieving very high vaccine coverage would immunize a greater number of susceptible individuals, but at the cost of giving many additional doses to immune individuals. This cost could be reduced slightly by targeting the age group most represented among susceptibles or by guiding vaccination with serosurveys. The age profile of the suspected cholera cases residing in Kalemie (median age of 15 years, and interquartile range (IQR)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

## Materials and methods

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

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

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

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

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

The structure of the model is as follows:

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

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

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

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

with

$$f_s(rad_t) = \alpha_1 rad_t$$

$$f_I(rad_t) = \alpha_I rad_t$$

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

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

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

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

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

Susceptible individuals become infected through exposure to the environmental reservoir,  $\beta_e$  or through interhuman transmission,  $\beta_h$ . The WASH intervention decreased the environmental exposure rate  $\beta_e$  by a quantity  $\beta_{WASH}$  by the end of the study period.  $\beta_e$  was assumed to decrease linearly from  $\beta_e$  to  $\beta_e - \beta_{WASH}$  from the time the first WASH improvement was completed (ISO week 40 in 2014). The model did not allow the environmental contamination to vary because the intervention did not target human waste management. The infection probability from an exposure to the environment followed a dose-effect relationship, with  $\kappa$  being the half saturation constant. Infectious individuals transitioned to the recovered compartment at rate  $\gamma$ . Susceptible individuals could gain immunity through vaccination,  $\eta$ , 1 week after receiving the vaccine (19). This was included in the model through a step function of the number of people who received 1 or 2 doses ( $VC_{1t}$  and  $VC_{2t}$ ) of Shanchol™. The model presented here assumed a vaccine effectiveness of 80% ( $\sigma_1$ ) and 85% ( $\sigma_2$ ) respectively for one and two dose regimens. We considered a range of alternative values for those two parameters, including estimates from studies done in the aftermath of reactive vaccination campaigns performed in Zambia and Guinea (19,62) (see SI). Considering the wide age range of the target population (everyone older than 1 year), we assumed that the proportions of susceptible, infected, and recovered among the vaccinated individuals were the same as in the general population at the time the doses were distributed. Immunity wanes at rate  $\delta$ , returning immune individuals to the susceptible compartment. We assumed the vaccine had no effect on individuals who were immune, whether immunity was acquired through prior infection or

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

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

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

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

We estimated the parameters  $\beta_h, \beta_e, \beta_{WASH}, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \lambda_e, \lambda_c, \delta, \mu, \varepsilon, r$ , and  $\psi$ , and the initial conditions  $S_0, I_0, R_0, B_0$  through Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and fit a total of 64 models with every combination of the values considered for  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \eta$ , and  $ratio_{S/I}$  in addition to 32 models with alternative structures for sensitivity analyses (see SI). The model presented here minimized the deviance information criterion (DIC). All the estimates presented are the mean values over the posterior distribution and their 95% CrI).

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

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

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

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

## Ethical considerations

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

## Acknowledgements

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

## 507 **Author contribution**

508 Conceptualization: AB, FL, DB, NB

509 Data curation: AB, AW, FL

510 Formal analysis, AB, AW, FL

511 Investigation: AB, FL, DB

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

513 Software: AB, AW

514 Visualization: AB, NB

515 Writing – Original draft preparation: AB, NB

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

517

## 518 **References**

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

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

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

- 526 4. Constantin de Magny G, Colwell RR. Cholera and climate: a demonstrated relationship. Trans Am  
527 Clin Climatol Assoc. 2009;120:119–28.
- 528 5. Constantin de Magny G, Murtugudde R, Sapiano MRP, Nizam A, Brown CW, Busalacchi AJ, et al.  
529 Environmental signatures associated with cholera epidemics. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2008 Nov  
530 18;105(46):17676–81.
- 531 6. Zerbo A, Castro Delgado R, González PA. A review of the risk of cholera outbreaks and urbanization  
532 in sub-Saharan Africa. J Biosaf Biosecurity. 2020 Dec 1;2(2):71–6.
- 533 7. Islam MS, Zaman MH, Islam MS, Ahmed N, Clemens JD. Environmental reservoirs of *Vibrio cholerae*.  
534 Vaccine. 2020 Feb 29;38:A52–62.
- 535 8. Vezzulli L, Pruzzo C, Huq A, Colwell RR. Environmental reservoirs of *Vibrio cholerae* and their role in  
536 cholera. Environ Microbiol Rep. 2010 Feb;2(1):27–33.
- 537 9. Finkelstein RA. Cholera, *Vibrio cholerae* O1 and O139, and Other Pathogenic Vibrios. In: Baron S,  
538 editor. Medical Microbiology [Internet]. 4th ed. Galveston (TX): University of Texas Medical Branch  
539 at Galveston; 1996 [cited 2020 Apr 8]. Available from:  
540 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK8407/>
- 541 10. Birmingham ME, Lee LA, Ndayimirije N, Nkurikiye S, Hersh BS, Wells JG, et al. Epidemic cholera in  
542 Burundi: patterns of transmission in the Great Rift Valley Lake region. The Lancet. 1997 Apr  
543 5;349(9057):981–5.
- 544 11. Frerichs RR, Keim PS, Barraix R, Piarroux R. Nepalese origin of cholera epidemic in Haiti. Clin  
545 Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2012 Jun;18(6):E158-163.



- 546 12. Sow S, Antonio M, Oundo JO, Mandomando I, Ramamurthy T. Endemic and Epidemic Cholera in  
547 Africa. In: Ramamurthy T, Bhattacharya SK, editors. Epidemiological and Molecular Aspects on  
548 Cholera [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer; 2011 [cited 2022 Dec 1]. p. 31–50. (Infectious Disease).  
549 Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60327-265-0\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60327-265-0_3)
- 550 13. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated Global Burden of Cholera in Endemic Countries. PLoS  
551 Negl Trop Dis. 2015 Jun 4;9(6):e0003832.
- 552 14. Organization WH. Ending cholera a global roadmap to 2030. In: Ending cholera a global roadmap to  
553 2030. 2017. p. 32–32.
- 554 15. Waldman RJ, Mintz ED, Papowitz HE. The Cure for Cholera — Improving Access to Safe Water and  
555 Sanitation. N Engl J Med. 2013 Feb 14;368(7):592–4.
- 556 16. Luby SP, Davis J, Brown RR, Gorelick SM, Wong THF. Broad approaches to cholera control in Asia:  
557 Water, sanitation and handwashing. Vaccine. 2020 Feb 29;38:A110–7.
- 558 17. Montgomery M, Jones MW, Kabole I, Johnston R, Gordon B. No end to cholera without basic water,  
559 sanitation and hygiene. Bull World Health Organ. 2018 Jun 1;96(6):371–371A.
- 560 18. Organization WH. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000–2017: special  
561 focus on inequalities. World Health Organization; 2019.
- 562 19. Luquero FJ, Grout L, Ciglenecki I, Sakoba K, Traore B, Heile M, et al. Use of *Vibrio cholerae* vaccine in  
563 an outbreak in Guinea. N Engl J Med. 2014 May 29;370(22):2111–20.
- 564 20. Mukandavire Z, Morris JG. Modeling the Epidemiology of Cholera to Prevent Disease Transmission  
565 in Developing Countries. Microbiol Spectr. 2015 Jun 19;3(3):3.3.21.

- 566 21. World Health Organization. Cholera vaccine: WHO position paper, August 2017 –  
567 Recommendations. *Vaccine*. 2018 Jun 7;36(24):3418–20.
- 568 22. Pezzoli L. Global oral cholera vaccine use, 2013–2018. *Vaccine*. 2020 Feb;38:A132–40.
- 569 23. Shaikh H, Lynch J, Kim J, Excler JL. Current and future cholera vaccines. *Vaccine*. 2020 Feb  
570 29;38:A118–26.
- 571 24. Ali M, Debes AK, Luquero FJ, Kim DR, Park JY, Digilio L, et al. Potential for Controlling Cholera Using a  
572 Ring Vaccination Strategy: Re-analysis of Data from a Cluster-Randomized Clinical Trial. *PLOS Med*.  
573 2016 Sep 13;13(9):e1002120.
- 574 25. Leung T, Eaton J, Matrajt L. Optimizing one-dose and two-dose cholera vaccine allocation in  
575 outbreak settings: A modeling study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2022 Apr 20;16(4):e0010358.
- 576 26. Finger F, Bertuzzo E, Luquero FJ, Naibei N, Touré B, Allan M, et al. The potential impact of case-area  
577 targeted interventions in response to cholera outbreaks: A modeling study. *PLOS Med*. 2018 Feb  
578 27;15(2):e1002509.
- 579 27. Congo Democratic Republic DHS, 2013-14 - Final Report (French).
- 580 28. Bompangue Nkoko D, Giraudoux P, Plisnier PD, Tinda AM, Piarroux M, Sudre B, et al. Dynamics of  
581 cholera outbreaks in Great Lakes region of Africa, 1978-2008. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2011  
582 Nov;17(11):2026–34.
- 583 29. Massing LA, Aboubakar S, Blake A, Page AL, Cohuet S, Ngandwe A, et al. Highly targeted cholera  
584 vaccination campaigns in urban setting are feasible: The experience in Kalemie, Democratic Republic  
585 of Congo. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018 May 7;12(5):e0006369.

30. Kayembe HCN, Bompangue D, Linard C, Muwonga J, Moutschen M, Situakibanza H, et al. Modalities and preferred routes of geographic spread of cholera from endemic areas in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. PLOS ONE. 2022 Feb 7;17(2):e0263160.
31. Moore SM, Lessler J. Optimal allocation of the limited oral cholera vaccine supply between endemic and epidemic settings. J R Soc Interface. 2015 Oct 6;12(111):20150703.
32. The impact of mass cholera vaccination in Uvira, Democratic Republic of the Congo – Global Task Force on Cholera Control [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 12]. Available from: <https://www.gtfcc.org/research/the-impact-of-mass-cholera-vaccination-in-uvira-democratic-republic-of-the-congo/>
33. Impact evaluation of OCV preventive campaigns, DRC – Global Task Force on Cholera Control [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 13]. Available from: <https://www.gtfcc.org/research/impact-evaluation-of-ocv-preventive-campaigns-drc/>
34. 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. Brocklehurst C, editor. PLOS Med. 2015 Oct 27;12(10):e1001893.
35. Reiner RC, Graetz N, Casey DC, Troeger C, Garcia GM, Mosser JF, et al. Variation in Childhood Diarrheal Morbidity and Mortality in Africa, 2000–2015. N Engl J Med. 2018 Sep 20;379(12):1128–38.
36. THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 13]. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>

- 606 37. Carrel M, Emch M, Streatfield PK, Yunus M. Spatio-temporal clustering of cholera: the impact of  
607 flood control in Matlab, Bangladesh, 1983-2003. *Health Place*. 2009 Sep;15(3):741–52.
- 608 38. Cash BA, Rodó X, Emch M, Yunus M, Faruque ASG, Pascual M. Cholera and Shigellosis: Different  
609 Epidemiology but Similar Responses to Climate Variability. *PLOS ONE*. 2014 Sep 17;9(9):e107223.
- 610 39. Shackleton D, Memon FA, Nichols G, Phalkey R, Chen AS. Mechanisms of cholera transmission via  
611 environment in India and Bangladesh: state of the science review. *Rev Environ Health* [Internet].  
612 2023 Jan 16 [cited 2023 Jun 23]; Available from:  
613 <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2022-0201/html>
- 614 40. Hounmanou YMG, Njamkepo E, Rauzier J, Gallandat K, Jeandron A, Kamwiziku G, et al. Genomic  
615 Microevolution of *Vibrio cholerae* O1, Lake Tanganyika Basin, Africa - Volume 29, Number 1—  
616 January 2023 - *Emerging Infectious Diseases journal* - CDC. [cited 2023 Apr 13]; Available from:  
617 [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/29/1/22-0641\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/29/1/22-0641_article)
- 618 41. Michael M. Detection and antibiotic susceptibility of *vibrio cholerae* In *oreochromis tanganicae*  
619 (Tilapia) and water in Lake Tanganyika, Kigoma-Tanzania [Internet] [Thesis]. Sokoine University of  
620 Agriculture; 2019 [cited 2023 Apr 13]. Available from:  
621 <http://www.suaire.sua.ac.tz/handle/123456789/3905>
- 622 42. Nyambuli S. Prevalence, pathogenic markers and antibiotic susceptibility of *Vibrio cholerae* in  
623 sardines, water and phytoplankton in lake Tanganyika, Tanzania. Sokoine University of Agriculture;  
624 2017.

- 625 43. Plisnier P, Denis, Cornet Y, Cocquyt C. Cholera outbreaks at Lake Tanganyika induced by Climate  
626 Change?(CHOLTIC) : final report [Internet]. Brussels : Belgian Scientific Policy, 2015; 2016 Jun [cited  
627 2023 Apr 13]. Available from: <https://orfeo.belnet.be/handle/internal/4240>
- 628 44. Codeço CT. Endemic and epidemic dynamics of cholera: the role of the aquatic reservoir. BMC Infect  
629 Dis. 2001 Feb 2;1(1):1.
- 630 45. Pasetto D, Finger F, Camacho A, Grandesso F, Cohuet S, Lemaitre JC, et al. Near real-time  
631 forecasting for cholera decision making in Haiti after Hurricane Matthew. PLOS Comput Biol. 2018  
632 May 16;14(5):e1006127.
- 633 46. Piarroux R, Barraix R, Faucher B, Haus R, Piarroux M, Gaudart J, et al. Understanding the cholera  
634 epidemic, Haiti. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011 Jul;17(7):1161–8.
- 635 47. Widmer JM, Weppelmann TA, Alam MT, Morrissey BD, Redden E, Rashid MH, et al. Water-Related  
636 Infrastructure in a Region of Post-Earthquake Haiti: High Levels of Fecal Contamination and Need for  
637 Ongoing Monitoring. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2014 Oct 1;91(4):790–7.
- 638 48. Morof D, Cookson ST, Laver S, Chirundu D, Desai S, Mathenge P, et al. Community Mortality from  
639 Cholera: Urban and Rural Districts in Zimbabwe. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2013 Apr 3;88(4):645–50.
- 640 49. Alam MM, Riyadh MA, Fatema K, Rahman MA, Akhtar N, Ahmed T, et al. Antigen-Specific Memory  
641 B-Cell Responses in Bangladeshi Adults after One- or Two-Dose Oral Killed Cholera Vaccination and  
642 Comparison with Responses in Patients with Naturally Acquired Cholera. Clin Vaccine Immunol.  
643 2011 May;18(5):844–50.

- 644 50. Franke MF, Ternier R, Jerome JG, Matias WR, Harris JB, Ivers LC. Long-term effectiveness of one and  
645 two doses of a killed, bivalent, whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in Haiti: an extended case-control  
646 study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018 Sep 1;6(9):e1028–35.
- 647 51. ALMAGRO-MORENO S, TAYLOR RK. Cholera: Environmental Reservoirs and Impact on Disease  
648 Transmission. *Microbiol Spectr* [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2021 May 6];1(2). Available from:  
649 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4321695/>
- 650 52. Lemaitre J, Pasetto D, Perez-Saez J, Sciarra C, Wamala JF, Rinaldo A. Rainfall as a driver of epidemic  
651 cholera: Comparative model assessments of the effect of intra-seasonal precipitation events. *Acta*  
652 *Trop*. 2019 Feb 1;190:235–43.
- 653 53. Bharti N, Tatem AJ, Ferrari MJ, Grais RF, Djibo A, Grenfell BT. Explaining Seasonal Fluctuations of  
654 Measles in Niger Using Nighttime Lights Imagery. *Science*. 2011 Dec 9;334(6061):1424–7.
- 655 54. Stathakis D, Baltas P. Seasonal population estimates based on night-time lights. *Comput Environ*  
656 *Urban Syst*. 2018 Mar 1;68:133–41.
- 657 55. Bharti N, Tatem AJ. Fluctuations in anthropogenic nighttime lights from satellite imagery for five  
658 cities in Niger and Nigeria. *Sci Data* [Internet]. 2018 Nov 13 [cited 2019 Jul 30];5. Available from:  
659 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6233255/>
- 660 56. Sutton P, Roberts D, Elvidge C, Baugh K. Census from Heaven: An estimate of the global human  
661 population using night-time satellite imagery. *Int J Remote Sens*. 2001 Jan 1;22(16):3061–76.
- 662 57. Akman O, Corby MR, Schaefer E. Examination of models for cholera: *Lett Biomath*. 2016 Dec  
663 1;3(1):93-118-93–118.

58. Mberu BU. African Migration and Population Distribution: Recent Trends. Int Handb Migr Popul Distrib. 2015;6:245.
59. Elvidge CD, Baugh K, Zhizhin M, Hsu FC, Ghosh T. VIIRS night-time lights. Int J Remote Sens. 2017 Nov 2;38(21):5860–79.
60. MODIS-Aqua M. NASA goddard space flight center, ocean ecology laboratory, ocean biology processing group. Moderate-Resolut Imaging Spectroradiometer MODIS Aqua L0 Data NASA OB DAAC Greenbelt MD USA. 2018;
61. Sheffield J, Goteti G, Wood EF. Development of a 50-Year High-Resolution Global Dataset of Meteorological Forcings for Land Surface Modeling. J Clim. 2006 Jul 1;19(13):3088–111.
62. Ferreras E, Chizema-Kawesha E, Blake A, Chewe O, Mwaba J, Zulu G, et al. Single-Dose Cholera Vaccine in Response to an Outbreak in Zambia. N Engl J Med. 2018 08;378(6):577–9.
63. Dimitrov DT, Troeger C, Halloran ME, Longini IM, Chao DL. Comparative Effectiveness of Different Strategies of Oral Cholera Vaccination in Bangladesh: A Modeling Study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014 Dec 4;8(12):e3343.
64. Ciglenecki I, Sakoba K, Luquero FJ, Heile M, Itama C, Mengel M, et al. Feasibility of Mass Vaccination Campaign with Oral Cholera Vaccines in Response to an Outbreak in Guinea. PLoS Med. 2013 Sep 10;10(9):e1001512.

681

## 682 **Supporting Information**

### 683 **S1 File**

684 **Supporting Information captions**


685 **S1 File. Supplementary material providing additional details on the methods**




A

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.14.23299970>; this version posted December 17, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Population/km<sup>2</sup>



B



C

Weekly suspected cholera cases




Figure 1






Figure 2

A



B



C






Figure 3




A



B



C



D




Figure 4