

1 **The micro-hotspots of cholera in Kano State, Nigeria, 2010-2019—analysis of**
2 **patient characteristics, Spatio-temporal patterns and contextual determinants at**
3 **the ward level.**

4
5 Moise Chi Ngwa^{1*}, Chikwe Ihekweazu², Tochi Joy Okwor², Sebastian Yennan², Nanpring Williams², Kelly

6 Elimian^{3,4}, Nura Yahaya Karaye⁵, James Agada Oche⁶, Imam Wada Bello⁵, David A. Sack¹

7 ¹Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland,

8 USA

9 ²Nigeria Centre for Disease Control, Abuja, Nigeria

10 ³Department of Microbiology, University of Benin, Nigeria

11 ⁴Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institute, Sweden

12 ⁵Department of Public Health and Disease Control, Ministry of Health Kano, Kano, Nigeria

13 ⁶WHO, Nigeria Country Office, Abuja, Nigeria

14
15 *Corresponding author

16 E-mail: ngwaadangfor@gmail.com (MCN)

Abstract

Cholera is endemic in Nigeria, and Kano State reports outbreaks yearly with a case fatality rate (CFR) of 3.3% from 2010 to 2019. The lack of data at ward level has enabled the disease to evade focused interventions. The goal of this study was to describe the geographic distributions, care-seeking behaviors, Spatio-temporal cluster patterns of the micro-hotspots (hotspots wards) linked with suspected and confirmed cases and deaths of cholera in Kano State.

Suspected and confirmed cholera morbidity and mortality at the ward level from 2010-2019 were acquired from the Nigeria Centre for Disease Control. Population and waterbody data were obtained from the Nigeria Expanded Program on Immunization and online, respectively. Data analysis used SaTScan and methods recommended by the Global Task Force on Cholera Control.

During these ten years, 18,483 suspected and confirmed cases (617 deaths) were reported with 67.7% of the cases and 72% of the deaths from rural wards. The ages of the cases ranged from 1 month to 100 years with a distribution skewed to the older years. CFRs were statistically higher in the <5-year olds compared to those >14 years (p -value = 0.0005). For 2010-2019, gender was statistically associated with cholera outcome (survived/died) (p -value = 0.0006), and women in the rural setting disproportionately died from cholera than women in the urban area (p -value = 0.003). Cholera severity, as measured by hospitalization and death, was higher in the urban (77.4%) compared with the rural (53.4%) setting with the highest severity (84.7%) registered among those >14 years. Rapid Diagnostic Tests (RDT) were performed in 1.3% (249) samples of all suspected cases and ranged from 0.7% among the 5-14 year-olds in the rural to 3.5 % among the < 5-year-olds in the urban areas. Of the stool samples collected, 62.7% tested positive for *V. cholerae* using RDT. The positivity rate was least in the urban setting amongst the <5 years (41.2%) while care-seeking-behavior ranged from 52.1% in the urban to 82.7% in the rural settings. Seasonal patterns of disease often differed between urban and rural settings with outbreaks occurring in both the dry and rainy seasons, but with more intense

61 transmission occurring during the rainy season from week 22 (early June) to week 40 (late September). A
62 Spatio-temporal clustering analysis detected 168 micro-hotspots out of 404 wards, with a population of
63 4,876,254, having a significantly higher risk (relative risk 1.01-18.73) compared to the State as a whole. While
64 79 micro-hotspots with a population of 2,119,974 had a $RR \geq 2$. The micro-hotspots tended to cluster around
65 waterbodies. SaTScan and GTFCC methods generally agreed in micro-hotspots detection.

66 This study shows the epidemiology of cholera in Kano State differs between urban and rural settings
67 and that hotspot maps at the ward level, not hotspots maps at the Local Government Area level, are best
68 suited for targeting interventions including vaccines. Appropriate studies are needed to further delineate the
69 urban and rural divide of outbreaks but targeting interventions to the identified high-priority micro-hotspots
70 will facilitate cholera elimination from the state.

95 **Author summary**

96
97 Cholera is endemic in Nigeria since 1970, and Kano State reports outbreaks almost every year. From 2010-
98 2019, Kano State reported 18,483 cases and 617 deaths, for a case fatality rate of 3.3%. Focusing interventions
99 at the Local Government Area instead of the ward (local) level contributed to the continuous threat from
100 cholera in Kano State. When we divided the state into its two geographic areas (urban and rural), there were
101 very different epidemiology as well as Spatio-temporal patterns of clustering of wards with elevated relative
102 risk (micro-hotspots). Nearly two-thirds of the cases and deaths were reported from rural wards. The ages of
103 the cases ranged from 1 month to 100 years with case fatality ratios higher in the <5-years olds compared to
104 those >14 years (*p-value* = 0.0005). Women in the rural area not only had more cases but also were more
105 likely to die from cholera than women in the urban area (*p-value* = 0.003). The hospitalization rate was higher
106 in the urban than rural setting whereas care-seeking behavior was higher in rural than urban areas. Rapid
107 Diagnostic Tests to confirm cholera was very low overall. Seasonal patterns of disease differed between urban
108 and rural areas with outbreaks occurring in both the dry and rainy seasons, but with more cases from June to
109 September, during the rainy season. A population of 4,876,254 live in the 168 micro-hotspots in which cholera
110 risks were 1.01 to 18.73 times higher compared to the State as a whole. Following the Global Task Force on
111 Cholera Control recommendations, interventions should focus on these identified micro-hotspots for cholera
112 elimination from Kano State.

113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124

125 Introduction

126
127 Cholera is a waterborne infection that makes over a million people sick yearly with an estimated 95,000
128 deaths worldwide [1]. In the last decade, Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) reported the greatest cases and deaths with
129 the Democratic Republic of Congo and Nigeria contributing the greatest burden of cases in Africa. Nigeria first
130 reported cholera in 1970 [2, 3] and this marked the beginning of an endemic pattern characterized by 334,990
131 reported cases with a case fatality ratio (CFR) of 5.8% between 1991 and 2019 [2, 4]. While reported cases
132 decreased from 45,037 in 2018 to 2,486 in 2019 [5, 6], the decrease cannot be attributed to improved
133 interventions, but rather to cholera's pattern of episodic cycles of between 3-4 years [7, 8]. Moreover, COVID-
134 19 may have reduced numbers of cases because of reduced travel or by decreased reporting.

135
136 Characteristics of cholera's epidemiological patterns have been described [9-12]. The Spatio-temporal
137 characteristics of the 2010 outbreak that started in Borno State and grew in magnitude to spread to entire
138 Northern Nigeria in three waves appeared to be amplified by flooding [9]. Modeling of hospital case data from
139 Kano, Sokoto, and the Zamfara States between 1991 and 2011 demonstrate two peaks of disease transmission
140 between April and August [9-12]. Increases in temperature, rainfall, poverty, and population density were
141 found to be associated with both cholera cases and deaths [9].

142
143 Despite the rich literature on cholera outbreaks in Nigeria and Kano State specifically [13, 14], there is limited
144 understanding of cholera hotspots, the geographically limited areas where socio-cultural and environmental
145 conditions facilitate the transmission of the disease, and where cholera persists. In 2017, the Global Task Force
146 on Cholera Control (GTFCC) called for the elimination of cholera in 20 countries by 2030 [15]. To achieve this
147 goal, GTFCC emphasized detecting and directing interventions including oral cholera vaccine (OCV) to cholera
148 hotspots. In 2018, Nigeria established the National Strategic Plan of Action on Cholera Control (NSPACC) to

149 pre-emptively vaccinate populations in identified hotspots nationwide between 2018 and 2023 [16]. The
150 current hotspot maps in the NSPACC, as well as those recently published for Kano State [8], are all based on
151 the Local Government Areas (LGA). However, the LGA is a large area, and hotspot maps at this level may be
152 too large to be feasible. Specifically, cholera risk does not appear to be uniform within an LGA; rather, higher
153 risk areas likely exist in smaller pockets within the LGAs. We hypothesize that cholera hotspot maps at the
154 ward level would be more helpful in targeting interventions including OCV, but for which we found no studies
155 delineating cholera hotspots at the ward level (hotspot wards). In this study, hotspot wards are termed micro-
156 hotspots. The ward is the fourth and smallest administrative level in Nigeria; thus, studying cholera at this
157 level will provide an improved understanding of micro-hotspots, the specific wards prone to initiating,
158 sustaining, and spreading yearly epidemics. This is urgently needed to provide decision-making vis-a-vis critical
159 interventions including OCV for cholera elimination by 2030.

160
161 To illustrate the difference between an intervention at the level of an LGA compared to a ward, the average
162 population of an LGA of Kano State is about 300,000 [17], and there are 10 to 15 wards per LGA.
163 Administratively, Kano State is divided into 44 LGAs; In turn, the 44 LGAs are further divided into 484 wards
164 (Fig 1). Of these, 88 are urban wards. Though we identified hotspots LGAs in Kano State [8], the specific ward
165 where the interventions need to focus was not identified; in fact, very little is known about cholera
166 transmission at the ward scale. Studies by George *et al.* [18] and by Ali *et al.* [19, 20] illustrate the focal nature
167 of cholera transmission and show that cholera risk is much higher close to index cases than it is at a distance.
168 Attempts to define hotspots at the LGA level [8] miss the true facilitators of transmission that can be identified
169 by studies of micro-hotspots.

170
171 Conceptually, the study of cholera micro-hotspots in Kano State is the “link” between the household level
172 studies of George *et al.* [18] and the district level hotspot mapping of M’bangombe *et al.* [21], Bwire *et al.* [22],

173 and Ngwa *et al.* [7, 8]. The national plan for Uganda included hotspot mapping to identify the districts to be
174 targeted for OCV and water sanitation hygiene (WASH) [22]. However, within the districts, local officials
175 provided additional local, but still subjective, information as to the sub-districts, which were the “true
176 hotspots,” and these sub-districts were then targeted. This study replaces the subjective impressions of local
177 officials with objective information related to rates and risks of cholera at ward level.

178
179 Several methods have been described for analyzing the spatial and temporal patterns of disease outbreaks.
180 Ripley’s K function evaluates spatiotemporal patterns of disease occurrence to detect the magnitude of
181 clustering at different temporal and spatial distances [23]. The spatiotemporal Knox test detects statistically
182 significant clusters of disease cases at specific temporal and geographic distances [24], and the Mantel index
183 improves the later method by allocating higher weights to nearby incidents both temporally and
184 geographically [25]. Further, the kernel density estimation (KDE) method describes and visualizes patterns of
185 space-time disease clusters using heat maps [26] while the space-time kernel density estimation (SPKDE)
186 extends the KDE capabilities and visualizes space-time disease clusters using heat volume maps [27]. In this
187 study, we used scan statistics (SaTScan) to analyze and map space-time patterns of cholera clusters/hotspots
188 [28] and also used a method recently described by the GTFCC which utilizes the mean annual rate in a defined
189 area in combination with the persistence of cholera in the area [29].

190
191 This study fills a gap for Kano State by describing 1) patient characteristics (suspected and confirmed cases and
192 deaths) including CFR, severity (hospitalization), demographic variables (gender and age), care-seeking
193 behavior; 2) describing laboratory confirmation (stool sample collection and rapid diagnostic tests); while
194 analyzing 3) temporal, and 4) geographical patterns of spread incorporating attack/incidence rates, and 5)
195 describing cholera micro-hotspots. The study aims to compare all five points between the urban and rural

196 settings to identify critically, yet poorly appreciated micro-hotspots of cholera in Kano State, and to do so
197 while employing statistical methods in addition to the tool recommended by GTFCC with health facility-based
198 cholera surveillance data set using data between 2010-2019.

199 **Methods**

202 **Ethics consideration**

203 We used an anonymized historical line-list dataset at the ward level from the Nigeria Centre for Disease
204 Control (NCDC). The Health Research Ethics Committee of the Ministry of Health, Kano State provided ethical
205 approval of the study (Ref: MOH/Off/797/T.1/2012) as part of an ongoing effort to inform a national plan for
206 disease control and elimination from the State. Based on these, the Johns Hopkins University Internal Review
207 Board (IRB) determined that the study is not human subjects' research and was exempt from IRB review.
208 Based on the anonymity of data, we did not obtain informed consent.

210 **Study setting**

211 Nigeria, a Federation of 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, is located along the West Coast of
212 Africa (Fig 1A). The landmass covers the mangrove swamps and creeks in the south that transitions through
213 the tropical forest, savannah woodlands, and grasslands in the middle to the Sahel in the North. Kano State
214 (Fig 1A), our study site, is in the Sahel in the Northwest of the country. With an estimated population of
215 13,076,900 people in 2016, it is the most populated state of Nigeria [30]. The dominant spoken language is
216 Hausa while English is the official language. In 2019, the average population of an LGA was 325,256 with a
217 range of 149,057 in the rural LGA of Tofa to 909,993 in the urban LGA of Nassarawa. The average population
218 of a ward was 29,547 ranging from 3,724 in the rural ward of Kwami (Tofa LGA) to 230,272 in the urban ward
219 of Dorayi (Gwale LGA) (Fig 1B). The population is highest in the Center urban wards (Fig 1 C) and progressively
220 decreases outwards towards the rural wards. Among the states of Nigeria, we chose Kano State because of the

221 interest of NCDC and Kano Ministry of Health in cholera control and because of yearly cholera outbreaks [13,
222 14, 31]. In addition, Kano State has scheduled an OCV immunization program to hold between 2020 and 2023;
223 and thus, this analysis will provide data to inform decision-making on the highest priority micro-hotspots.

224 **Data collection**

225

226 We obtained a de-identified cholera line-list (Microsoft Excel, 2010) of both confirmed and suspected cases at
227 ward level for Kano State from NCDC spanning the period from 2010-2019. Data from the line-list included
228 age, gender, date of symptom onset, date seen at the health facility, whether inpatient or outpatient, the
229 outcome of visit (survived or died), stool sample collection and testing, as well as the ward of patient's
230 residence. The cholera case definition [32] used for the line-list was based on the Integrated Disease
231 Surveillance and Response strategy, the public health surveillance system used to capture data at health
232 facilities across Nigeria [32, 33]. During visits to a health facility, data on cholera cases are captured and
233 entered into the line-list. The data is de-identified and reported to the ward and LGA Disease Surveillance and
234 Notification Officers where data are compiled and sent to the Epidemiology Unit of the State Ministry of
235 Health. The state analyzes the data and sends these to the NCDC, the national public health institute that
236 coordinates surveillance activities, and from there to other government entities and international partners.

237
238 The last population and housing census for Nigeria were conducted in 2006 [35] but did not provide
239 population sizes at the ward level. Hence, we obtained population sizes of each ward between 2010 and 2019
240 from the Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) in Nigeria [34, 35]. EPI's population estimates are
241 considered accurate as the program conducts headcounts of the population per ward to get accurate
242 population denominators for immunization. The EPI estimates that 49% of the Kano State population is
243 female, so we used this proportion to estimate female populations in urban and rural locations. Spatial data
244 such as polygon Shapefiles at the state, LGA, and ward levels were obtained from public health authorities in

245 Nigeria, and classification of wards as urban or rural was read directly from the ward Shapefile. Furthermore,
246 (inland water bodies) data on river lines and lakes, i.e., the contextual factors of cholera transmission, were
247 obtained online (<http://www.diva-gis.org/Data>). All spatial data in the geographic coordinate system were
248 projected into the Universal Transverse Mercator, Zone 32N, coordinate system.

249 **Data cleaning/wrangling**

251 The line-list cholera data set for each year from 2010-2019 contained several columns including the ward
252 name of the patient. As this study focused on analyzing cholera at the ward level, the ward name was critical
253 in capturing and mapping the ward of infection. We observed that about half of ward names found in the
254 ward column were not the official administrative ward names found in the Shapefile, which does provide the
255 official ward names. They were rather names of villages/settlements/schools or tribes/ethnic groups or local
256 chiefs/community leaders or even roads/streets/buildings. To obtain the official administrative ward names,
257 researchers at Johns Hopkins University worked with the Kano State Epidemiologist, who, in turn, worked with
258 the LGA and ward representatives to infer the official ward names from the ones in the line-list. For example,
259 one of the unofficial ward names in the 2011 line-list was Civic Centre, which is the name of a building and as
260 such not an official ward name. So, working with the State Epidemiologist, LGA, and ward representatives, the
261 unofficial ward name Civic Centre was replaced with Fagge A, as the Civic Centre building is located in Fagge A
262 ward. We also used an online resource: (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_villages_in_Kano_State) to infer
263 some of the official ward names based on the names of villages and schools mentioned in the line list.
264 Unfortunately, we were unable to trace all the unofficial ward names to official ward names because they
265 were either misspelled, abbreviated or blank; in which case, they were classified as missing. To illustrate, for
266 the 2011 line-list, out of 785 records, 456 (58.1%) ward names were unofficial but were traced and replaced
267 with official ones while 17 (2.2%) could not be traced, and as such were classified as missing. This process was
268 repeated with the line-list data for each year from 2010-2019.

269

270 Dates of disease onset and health facility visits in the ward line-list were in various formats from one year to
271 the next. These were all standardized to the year-month-day format. Also, the ward level Shapefile had
272 missing polygons; so, to add the missing polygons, we created new Shapefile polygons with the Geographic
273 Coordinate System and digitized the ward polygon boundaries in ArcGIS Version 10.5.1 (ESRI, Redlands, CA,
274 USA). Finally, some wards in the Shapefile that belonged to the rural location were misclassified as urban and
275 vice-versa and this was corrected with input from the State Epidemiologist.

276

277 **Data analysis**

278

279 **Descriptive temporal, geographical, and person variation analysis.** We used propagated epidemiological
280 curves to depict weekly trends of cholera cases and CFRs (%) in our study time period from 2010 to 2019 (S1
281 Fig A and S1 Fig B). To visualize the geographic distribution of the ward level cholera crude AR per 100,000
282 population, the underlying risk of cholera infection within a ward, choropleth maps were produced for the
283 entire study period. Crude ARs were computed for each ward using the formula number of reported cholera
284 cases in a ward during a year divided by annual population estimate for 2010 to 2019 in R version 3.6.2 [36].
285 To address concerns that patterns in the yearly ward crude ARs may be unstable (i.e., variance instability) [37-
286 40], Empirical Bayes Smoothed (EBS) rates were estimated in GeoDa Version 1.16.0.12 [41], and compared to
287 the corresponding crude ARs via box plots (S2 Fig) and visualized using choropleth maps. Generally, variance
288 instability is due to 1) small number of reported cases or 2) small areas or 3) small population sizes [37], all of
289 which were applicable with our ward data. However, because of minor differences between the crude and EBS
290 attack rates (S2 Fig), marginal differences in the results using EBS rates and crude ARs (S3 Fig), and EBS rates
291 showing cholera in wards not known to report the disease, we proceeded with using the crude ARs.

292

293 To describe the dynamics of yearly cholera outbreaks for 2010-2019, we stratified the cases and deaths by
294 location (urban/rural), gender (female/male), and age groups (<5, 5-14, >15 years). We then calculated the
295 overall attack (suspected and confirmed cases/population) and death (deaths/population) rates, CFRs
296 (deaths/suspected and confirmed cases), proportion of suspected cases and deaths, proportion of cases
297 classified as severe (hospitalized cases), proportion of female, proportion of stool samples taken and positive
298 rapid diagnostic tests, and proportion of rapid care-seeking. Severity was defined as hospitalization due to or
299 death from cholera. A table and histogram were produced to visualize the distribution of cholera suspected
300 cases and deaths as a function of location, and age group. We used the Chi-square test to analyze associations
301 between location, gender, and age group, and outcome (survived/died) of cholera. *P-values* of the test
302 statistic were reported with 5% (i.e., $\alpha = 0.05$) significance level.

303
304 **Laboratory confirmation analysis.** Laboratory surveillance collected stool samples from suspected cholera
305 patients when they presented to health facilities with symptoms of cholera to test the presence of *V. cholerae*
306 using rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) (Crystal VC, Span Diagnostic, India). To confirm the results of clinical
307 diagnosis and RDTs, samples with positive RDTs were forwarded to the NCDC reference lab in Abuja for
308 analysis using standard culture techniques [42]. Information on samples taken and RDT tests were read from
309 the ward line-list for 2010 to 2019; however, culture results were not available. We presented the results in a
310 table.

311
312 **Space-time cluster detection analysis.** In this study, we used scan statistics (SaTScan) to analyze and map
313 space-time patterns of cholera clusters/hotspots across Kano State at the ward level incorporating weekly
314 disease incidence for 2010-2019 [28]. This is a common method, which ascertains whether the number of
315 reported cases of the disease in a ward exceeds the expected number compared to rates outside the ward.
316 We also used a method recently developed by the GTFCC but applied it to the geographic area of the ward

317 rather than the LGA (district) [29]. We chose SaTScan primarily because it was commonly used in detecting
318 clusters of disease incidence including cholera hotspots detection [7, 22, 43, 44]. Secondly, SaTScan
319 incorporates spatial and Spatio-temporal scan statistics with linkage to GIS for results visualization. We also
320 used the GTFCC tool [29] to assess how it compares with SaTScan in hotspot identification and classification.
321 The GTFCC tool, based on Microsoft Excel, can readily be used with ease in resource-poor settings at the
322 periphery level (ward and health facility level) by health personnel without statistical/GIS skill competencies
323 needed to use SaTScan and GIS.

324 **Cholera clusters/micro-hotspots detection analysis based on SaTScan method.** Clusters and micro-hotspots
325 of cholera reported cases were detected using SaTScan v.9.6 through a retrospective analysis of the data for
326 2010-2019. To assess the dynamics of cluster patterns in this time period including variations in size and
327 duration as well as how clusters of outbreaks moved through space and time, a Poisson discrete space-time
328 scan statistic was implemented following Kulldorf *et al.* [28]. We scanned for high rates with 25% spatial and
329 temporal windows, respectively, and default settings for all other values. The data used in this analysis were
330 weekly reported cholera cases for the ten years and the annual population sizes. The space-time cluster
331 dynamics were presented in a table and visualized using ArcGIS Version 10.5.1 (ESRI, Redlands, CA, USA). The
332 most likely cluster (micro-hotspots) is the ward that is least likely to have occurred by chance. In keeping with
333 our objective of comparing micro-hotspots detection using SaTScan and the newly developed GTFCC tool, the
334 relative risks greater than 1 of the Spatio-temporal scan statistic with a p-value of 5% or less were shown in a
335 table and mapped using ArcGIS Version 10.5.1 (ESRI, Redlands, CA, USA).

336 **Cholera micro-hotspot detection analysis based on the GTFCC method.** Applying the GTFCC tool [45], we
337 identified and ranked cholera micro-hotspots based on two epidemiological indicators 1) mean annual
338 incidence per 100,000 population of reported suspected and confirmed cases, and 2) cholera persistence in
339 the entire study period. The indicator mean annual incidence was computed by first calculating the annual
340

341 incidence by dividing the number of reported cholera cases of each ward by its population size for each year.
342 Next, we calculated the mean of the annual incidences for the ten-year study period for each ward. For
343 persistence, we divided the total number of weeks with reported cholera cases by the total number of weeks
344 in the study period. All calculations were performed in Microsoft Excel 2016 [29].
345
346 Types of micro-hotspot (T) were assigned to each ward based on the two indicators delineating priority levels
347 into high (T1), medium (T2), medium (T3), and low (T4). A 55th and 71.6th percentile values were defined as the
348 cut-off points for high mean incidence rate and persistence; however, the cut-off levels could be adjusted as
349 desired. T1 micro-hotspots corresponded to high priority areas and were wards with high mean annual
350 incidence and high persistence of cholera during the surveillance period. T2 micro-hotspots corresponded to
351 medium priority areas, which were wards with a high mean annual incidence rate and low persistence of
352 cholera. T3 micro-hotspots corresponded also to medium priority areas characterized by a low mean annual
353 incidence rate, but a high persistence of cholera. T4 micro-hotspots corresponded to low priority wards, which
354 had a low mean annual incidence rate and low persistence of cholera. The cut-off values for incidence and
355 persistence delineating priorities/types of micro-hotspot were chosen based upon the objectives of the
356 NSPACC for Nigeria for 2018–2023 and resources available for effective implementation of intervention
357 measures. Cholera hotspots classification chart and map were produced using the R statistical computing
358 environment (version 3.6.2) [36] and ArcGIS, respectively.

359 **Results**

360 **Descriptive person, temporal, and geographical variations**

361
362 **Descriptive person (patient) characteristics variation.** In our study period, 18483 suspected and confirmed
363 cholera cases and 617 deaths (CFR = 3.3%) were reported in urban and rural settings from Kano State. Of
364 these, 67.7% (12580/18483) of the cases for the study period were from rural wards; however, overall AR was

367 slightly higher in the urban wards. Still, 72% (443/617) of the deaths were from rural wards, which saw a
 368 slightly higher death rate (Table 1). CFR decreased with increasing age ranging from 7.4% among children
 369 under five years old to 2.6% among the working-age group (≥ 15 years) in the urban area. Cholera severity
 370 (hospitalization or death) was higher in the urban (77.4%) compared with the rural (53.4%) setting and the
 371 highest severity (84.7%) was registered among people 15 years and older. In addition, there were more
 372 females with cholera overall (51.5%) than males from 2010 to 2019, especially in the rural setting among
 373 women 15 years and over (59.3%). Stool samples tested using RDTs were obtained from only 1.3% of all cases
 374 in this study period and were least often obtained from children 5-14 years old (0.7%) in the rural area and
 375 were more often obtained from those under 5-year (3.5%) in the urban location. Of the stool samples
 376 collected, 62.7% were positive for *V. cholerae* using RDT. The positivity rate was lowest in the urban wards
 377 amongst children under age 5 years (41.2%), but highest in the rural wards amongst children of the same age
 378 group (68.4%). Finally, nearly 75% of all reported cases from 2010-2019 sought clinical care on the same day of
 379 symptom onset with a range of 52.1% in the urban to 82.7% in the rural setting (Table 1).

380 **Table 1. Characteristics of suspected and confirmed cholera patients in Kano State, 2010-2019**

Characteristic	Location		
	Urban	Rural	Urban and Rural
Number of wards, n (population)	88 (4314355)	396 (9986031)	484 (14300386)
Female population, n (%)	2114034 (49%)	4893155 (49%)	7007189 (49%)
Overall confirmed & suspected cases	5903	12580	18483
Overall deaths	183	434	617
Attack rate/100,000 population	136.8	126.0	129.2
Mortality rate/100,000 population	4.2	4.4	4.3
Suspected cholera cases, n (%)			
<5 years	484 (8.2%)	2944 (23.4%)	3428 (18.5%)
5-14 years	1092 (18.5%)	3041 (24.2%)	4133 (22.4%)
≥ 15 years	4077 (69.1%)	6420 (51.0%)	10497 (56.8%)
Missing	250 (4.2%)	175 (1.4%)	425 (2.3%)
Total	5903(100%)	12580 (100%)	18483 (100%)
Deaths, n (%)			
<5 years	36 (19.7%)	114 (26.3%)	150 (24.3%)
5-14 years	37 (20.2%)	104 (24.0%)	141 (22.9%)
≥ 15 years	104 (56.8%)	209 (48.2%)	313 (50.7%)

	Missing	6 (3.3%)	7 (1.6%)	13 (2.1%)
	Total	183 (100%)	434 (100%)	617 (100%)
Case fatality ratio (%)				
	<5 years	7.4%	3.9%	4.4%
	5-14 years	3.4%	3.4%	3.4%
	≥15 years	2.6%	3.3%	3.0%
	Missing	2.4%	4.0%	3.1%
	Total	3.1%	3.4%	3.3%
Severe cases* (%)				
	<5 years	88/147 (59.9%)	326/771 (42.3%)	414/918 (45.1%)
	5-14 years	309/392 (78.8%)	432/774 (55.8%)	741/1166 (63.6%)
	≥15 years	1339/1581 (84.7%)	982/1669 (58.8%)	2321/3250 (71.4%)
	Missing	102/244 (41.8%)	16/72 (21.1%)	118/316 (37.3%)
	Total	1838/2364 (77.4%)	1756/3290 (53.4%)	3594/5654 (63.6%)
Female (%)				
	<5 years	205/485 (42.3%)	1393/2946 (47.3%)	1598/3431 (46.6%)
	5-14 years	400/1093 (36.6%)	1428/3044 (46.9%)	1828/4137 (44.2%)
	≥15 years	2062/4086 (50.5%)	3810/6430 (59.3%)	5872/10516 (55.8%)
	Missing	130/237 (54.9%)	86/162 (53.1%)	216/399 (54.1%)
	Total	2797/5901 (47.4%)	6717/12582 (53.4%)	9514/18483 (51.5%)
Sample collection, n/N (%)				
	<5 years	17/484 (3.5%)	24/2944 (0.8%)	41/3428 (1.2%)
	5-14 years	19/1092 (1.8%)	22/3041 (0.7%)	41/4133 (1.0%)
	≥15 years	87/4077 (2.1%)	68/6420 (1.1%)	155/10497 (1.5%)
	Missing	5/263 (1.9%)	7/162 (4.3%)	12/425 (2.8%)
	Total	128/5916 (2.2%)	121/12567 (1.0%)	249/18483 (1.3%)
Rapid Diagnostic Test, positive, n/N (%)				
	<5 years	7/17 (41.2%)	13/19 (68.4%)	20/36 (55.6%)
	5-14 years	12/18 (66.7%)	11/21 (52.4%)	23/39 (59.0%)
	≥15 years	51/81 (63.0%)	38/58 (65.5%)	89/139 (64.0%)
	Missing	4/4 (100%)	5/7 (71.4%)	9/11 (81.8%)
	Total	74/120 (61.7%)	67/105 (63.8%)	141/225 (62.7%)
Care seeking behavior n/N (%)				
	Same day	1418/2720 (52.1%)	6419/7766 (82.7%)	7837/10486 (74.7%)
	1 day	1060/2720 (40.0%)	1018/7766 (13.1%)	2078/10486 (19.8%)
	2 days	101/2720 (3.7%)	150/7766 (1.9%)	251/10486 (2.4%)
	>2 days	141/2720 (5.2%)	179/7766 (2.3%)	290/10486 (3.1%)

*Data on severe cases were missing for 2010, 2014, and 2015. Severity here is defined as hospitalization or death from cholera.

From 2010-2019, the ages of the cases ranged from 1 month to 100 years. In this period overall, we found statistically significant evidence that cholera outcome (survived/died) were gender (p -value = 0.0006), and age group (<1-4, 5-14, and >15 years) (p -value = 0.0005) dependent. Although we found that location was not associated with overall outcome (p -value = 0.2465), yet, amongst women, cholera outcome was statistically

387 and significantly associated with location (p -value = 0.003). In contrast, amongst men, cholera outcome was
388 **not** linked with location (p -value = 0.4527). Excluding 2011 and 2013, there were more cases and deaths
389 among women in the rural setting than those in the urban setting (Fig 2). Apart from 2010 and 2011 in the
390 urban setting, the annual age distribution of suspected and confirmed cholera cases and deaths showed a
391 right skew shape (Poisson distribution); i.e., there were more cases of cholera among people in younger age
392 brackets (<5 and 5-10 years old) compared to any other age bracket (Fig 2).

393 **Descriptive Spatio-temporal variation of cholera.** Weekly reported cholera cases in our study period started in the
394 rural setting during week 31 of 2010 during the rainy season (Fig 3, S1 Fig A). Weekly CFRs ranged from 80%
395 during week 31 of 2010 to 9% during weeks 17 and 31 of 2015, although there were no cases reported in 2012
396 and no fatalities in 2019 (S1 Fig B). In 2014, over 450 cases were reported in the rural setting among women
397 during week 27 alone (as we have seen above, generally, weekly cases were greater among women in rural
398 locations). Excepting the year 2013, cases in the rural and urban settings peaked asynchronously (Fig 3), i.e.,
399 when cases in the rural setting were at their peaks, those in the urban location were at their troughs. Further,
400 cholera cases occurred in both the rainy and dry seasons. For instance, in 2011, 2013, and 2019, cases
401 occurred predominantly in the dry season at either the start or end of the year. However, during the other six
402 years studied, large numbers of cases occurred during the rainy season from week 22 (early June) to week 40
403 (late September) with peaks in August (Fig 3). The spatial distribution of wards with high cholera crude AR per
404 100,000 population revealed considerable spatial heterogeneity between 2010 and 2019 with cholera
405 occurring in the central, north, south, east, and west portions (Fig 4 CR). We found marginal differences
406 between spatial distribution in the cholera crude ARs and EBS rates (Fig 4 CR, Fig 4 EBS). The widest spatial
407 spread occurred during 2014 and 2018, but in no year were all wards affected even after smoothing (Fig 4).

408 **Cholera clusters and micro-hotspot detection**

409

410 **SaTScan Spatio-temporal cluster and micro-hotspot detection.** The results of SaTScan cluster detection at the
 411 temporal scale of week and spatial scale of ward between 2010 and 2019 yielded three statistically significant
 412 cholera clusters of reported cases involving 254 wards (Table 2), as visualized in Fig 5. The pattern of spread of
 413 the three clusters shows extensive variation in space and time within Kano State. One cluster occurred
 414 between week 36 and 37 of 2010 with a center in the ward of (3) Kunchi in the Northern portion of the State
 415 and another between week 45/2013 and week 35/2014 centered at (2) Karofin Yashi ward at the Center of the
 416 State. Between weeks 28-35 of 2014, a very large (1) cluster was reported in the southeast portion of Kano
 417 State with a center located in the ward of Bagwaro. Within the three detected clusters, clusters 1 and 2 had
 418 the most observed cases involving wards in both urban and rural settings (Fig 5). Cluster 3 has 0 Km radius
 419 implying it was contained within the Kunchi ward. Between 2010 and 2019, cluster 3 (located in rural setting)
 420 had the shortest duration lasting two weeks while cluster 1 had a longer duration spanning eight weeks.
 421 Further, cluster 2, involving both urban and rural settings, had the longest duration and persisted for 43 weeks
 422 from 2013 to 2014 (Table 2 and Fig 5).

423 **Table 2. Significant cholera clusters**

Cluster number*	Duration week/year	Number of wards	P_value	Observed cases	Expected cases	Relative Risk (RR) [^]	Population
1	28-35/2014	136	1.0X10 ⁻¹⁷	3098	67	56.66	3069293
2	45/2013 - 35/2014	117	1.0X10 ⁻¹⁷	3152	355	10.61	3080827
3	36-37/2010	1	1.0X10 ⁻¹⁷	289	1	4470.32	13964
Total	–	254	–	6539	423	–	6,164,083

424 *Cluster 1 is the most likely while clusters 2 and 3 depict secondary clusters. [^]RR is the estimated risk of cholera infection within the
 425 cluster divided by the estimated risk outside the cluster.

426

427 In Fig 6 and Table 3, we show the relative risk (RR) greater than 1 for each ward associated with significant
 428 Spatio-temporal clusters in the period under consideration; and thus, the so-called micro-hotspots, i.e., the
 429 specific hotspots wards where cholera occurs more commonly. Of the 254 wards (out of 404) assigned to a

430 cluster (Fig 5), 168 yielded relative risk greater than 1 (greater observed than expected cases) (Fig 6). A
 431 breakdown of the 168 micro-hotspots of RR > 1 is in order (Table 3, Fig 6). The (1) largest cluster in the
 432 southeastern portion of the State contained 60 micro-hotspots, the larger cluster (2) at the center location
 433 spanned 53 micro-hotspots, and the (3) lone cluster in the north involved one micro-hotspot. Fifty-four (54) of
 434 the micro-hotspots were not within any cluster. In addition, wards with elevated cholera burden (micro-
 435 hotspots) clustered predominantly around contextual factors of cholera transmission namely lakes and rivers
 436 (Fig 6). The RR of the 168 statistically significant micro-hotspots ranged from 1.01 in Fanda to 18.63 in Fagge B
 437 with a total population of 4,876,254 (Table 3). Furthermore, 79 micro-hotspots with a population of 2,119,974
 438 had a RR ≥ 2 compared to the rest of the State as a whole.

439 **Table 3. Cholera micro-hotspots classification based on SaTScan (statistical) method**

Ward	Cluster number	p-value	Observed cases	Expected cases	Relative Risk (RR)*	Population
Fagge B	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	149	8.06	18.63	6525
Kunchi	3	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	310	19.96	15.79	16152
Fagge D2	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	180	19.2	9.46	15539
Gano	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	363	47.6	7.77	38513
Tumbau	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	246	32.11	7.75	25985
Rijiyar Lemo	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	283	39.79	7.21	32200
Gaya North	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	315	57.49	5.56	46515
Goron Dutse	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	116	21.33	5.47	17259
Kibiya 1	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	98	18.68	5.27	15114
Rano Sabon Gari	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	176	33.77	5.25	27324
Sare-Sare		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	130	26.78	4.88	21673
Kazurawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	209	44.08	4.79	35668
Kabo	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	159	33.85	4.73	27393
Tofa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	105	24.46	4.31	19795
Kumbotso	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	77	18.61	4.15	15060
Utai	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	109	27.05	4.05	21892
Wudil	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	201	53.11	3.82	42977
Rogo Sabon Gari		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	129	34.72	3.74	28096
Magami	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	256	69.62	3.72	56336
Yalwan Danziyal	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	74	20.06	3.70	16232
Katarkawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	60	16.34	3.68	13218
Gezawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	145	39.66	3.68	32091

Yalwa-Rano		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	112	30.68	3.67	24823
Gwarzo		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	102	27.99	3.66	22648
Jobawa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	68	19.44	3.51	15728
Doka	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	46	13.16	3.50	10652
Mainika		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	76	22.81	3.34	18458
Dala	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	166	50.83	3.29	41129
Madadi		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	114	35.19	3.25	28477
Gyadi Gyadi Arewa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	33	10.27	3.22	8307
Fassi	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	138	43.76	3.17	35407
Burun-Burun	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	113	36.78	3.09	29759
Sitti	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	166	54.94	3.04	44455
Warawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	34	11.23	3.03	9087
Garko	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	124	41.44	3.01	33532
Dakasoye		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	63	21.38	2.95	17303
Gajida	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	20	6.88	2.91	5569
Jandutse	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	146	51.13	2.87	41370
Gwammaja	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	189	66.82	2.85	54069
Kofar Mazugal	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	91	32.57	2.80	26356
Bichi		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	249	90.56	2.77	73274
Lakwaya	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	172	62.61	2.76	50658
Kademi	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	129	47.15	2.75	38155
Doguwa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	75	27.56	2.73	22303
Kulluwa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	73	27.16	2.69	21976
Zarewa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	93	35.14	2.65	28438
Kadigawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	35	13.27	2.64	10735
Kutama		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	99	37.72	2.63	30525
Gwamma	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	79	30.62	2.59	24776
Kahu	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	85	33.13	2.57	26805
Rikadawa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	61	23.99	2.55	19416
Kafin Dabga		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	75	29.89	2.52	24184
Gawuna		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	97	38.69	2.52	31306
Unguar Tudu		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	79	31.75	2.50	25688
Yanoko	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	40	16.13	2.48	13048
Dawaki	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	108	43.67	2.48	35337
Shahuchi	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	121	49.5	2.45	40050
Tsanyawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	77	31.47	2.45	25466
Danguguwa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	78	32.05	2.44	25931
Dabin-Kanawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	74	30.62	2.42	24778
Kyalli		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	107	44.4	2.42	35928
Rimin Gado	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	59	25.08	2.36	20296
Sabon Gari-Wudil		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	64	28.85	2.22	23346

Tsakuwa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	81	36.88	2.20	29843
Yako		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	60	27.48	2.19	22236
Gurjiya-I	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	50	22.95	2.18	18573
Mesar Tudu		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	75	34.59	2.17	27990
Zurgu	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	61	28.24	2.16	22851
Getso		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	95	44.53	2.14	36029
Yalwa Karama	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	14	6.61	2.12	5348
Yammedi		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	53	25.05	2.12	20273
Tsohon Gari		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	78	37.0	2.11	29938
Fagge A	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	55	26.6	2.07	21523
Rijiyar Zaki	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	103	50.08	2.06	40520
Jili	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	31	15.06	2.06	12182
Durba	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	34	16.60	2.05	13432
Bunkure	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	88	43.57	2.03	35252
Ungogo		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	94	46.87	2.01	37929
Gwale	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	86	43.19	2.00	34950
Dindere		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	14	7.06	1.98	5710
Bebeji		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	89	45.29	1.97	36646
Mekiya		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	84	42.80	1.97	34634
Darki	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	80	41.26	1.94	33384
Wudilawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	38	19.62	1.94	15880
Tarauni		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	30	15.78	1.90	12770
Sabon Gari		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	72	38.07	1.90	30802
Kwajale	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	45	24.94	1.81	20182
Sumaila	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	78	43.49	1.80	35188
Rimin Dako		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	55	30.74	1.79	24873
Kumurya	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	80	44.84	1.79	36284
Kadawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	37	21.20	1.75	17158
Kiru		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	114	65.65	1.74	53125
Dandago	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	57	32.79	1.74	26536
Panshekara	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	75	43.42	1.73	35135
Shanono		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	72	41.91	1.72	33914
Yada Kwari	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	43	25.10	1.72	20308
Magajin Gari		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	22	12.93	1.70	10462
Zaitawa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	86	50.64	1.70	40975
Kubaraci	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	54	32.13	1.68	26001
Bagwai		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	58	34.58	1.68	27981
Shuwaki		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	52	31.82	1.64	25746
Lausu	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	48	29.54	1.63	23904
She She	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	45	27.77	1.62	22473
Takai	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	90	55.96	1.61	45279

Tsaure		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	58	36.43	1.59	29476
Yalwa-Dala		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	46	29.01	1.59	23474
Yakasai	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	72	45.55	1.58	36857
Sabon Birni		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	42	26.72	1.57	21624
Sabon Gari West		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	82	52.90	1.55	42804
Jakara	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	43	27.97	1.54	22634
Danbare	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	48	31.26	1.54	25292
Langel	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	20	13.04	1.53	10551
Madachi	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	33	21.73	1.52	17583
Achika	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	26	17.27	1.51	13973
Dan Maliki	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	195	131.17	1.49	106135
Bachirawa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	132	90.47	1.46	73206
Gani	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	68	46.86	1.45	37915
Dal	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	62	43.0	1.44	34797
Unguwar Gai	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	41	28.54	1.44	23092
Duja	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	18	12.8	1.41	10357
Kogo		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	37	26.37	1.40	21341
Dakata		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	85	60.95	1.40	49321
Lambu	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	32	23.15	1.38	18732
Bargoni		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	58	43.09	1.35	34869
Gayawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	83	62.07	1.34	50228
Kafin Malamai	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	44	33.13	1.33	26812
Mandawari	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	23	17.52	1.31	14175
Dadin Kowa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	59	45.06	1.31	36464
Naibawa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	122	94.19	1.30	76213
Jalli		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	34	26.25	1.30	21241
Burji	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	16	12.58	1.27	10180
Kwamarawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	36	28.39	1.27	22976
Chirin	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	39	30.86	1.26	24971
Beli		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	40	31.69	1.26	25641
Gulu	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	29	23.09	1.26	18687
Zinyau	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	20	16.07	1.24	13007
Tanburawa	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	52	41.93	1.24	33930
Yan Dala	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	13	10.56	1.23	8547
Karfi	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	30	24.43	1.23	19765
Yaryasa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	51	41.61	1.23	33669
Imawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	18	14.73	1.22	11918
Dawakiji	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	52	43.21	1.20	34966
Cinkoso	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	9	7.48	1.20	6055
Galadanchi	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	37	30.83	1.20	24944
Sani Mai Nagge	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	61	51.09	1.19	41337

Chedi	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	22	18.6	1.18	15050
Daho	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	36	30.47	1.18	24652
Gyaranya	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	25	21.25	1.18	17198
Albasu Central	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	48	41.24	1.16	33373
Madobi	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	42	36.13	1.16	29235
Rahama		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	33	28.86	1.14	23350
Ketawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	60	52.55	1.14	42522
Saya-Saya	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	47	41.18	1.14	33325
Barkum	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	34	30.3	1.12	24521
Dan Agundi	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	26	23.31	1.12	18859
Kara		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	44	39.72	1.11	32141
Dalawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	38	34.52	1.10	27934
Ajingi	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	35	31.96	1.10	25862
Tudun Fulani	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	119	108.73	1.10	87983
Kunkurawa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	35	32.08	1.09	25956
Saidawa		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	48	44.32	1.08	35860
Sharada	2	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	129	120.22	1.07	97279
Gurjiya-III	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	32	30.08	1.06	24342
Rumo	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	22	20.75	1.06	16793
Farun Ruwa	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	53	50.13	1.06	40563
Gaya South	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	51	49.72	1.03	40232
Kaura Goje		1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	128	126.05	1.02	101993
Fanda	1	1.0x10 ⁻¹⁷	40	39.73	1.01	32148
Total	168	—	13609	6027	—	4,876,254

440 *Note: Table is arranged in descending order of relative risk (RR), which represents the cholera incidence rate among the population in the scan
441 window (exposed group) divided by the cholera incidence rate among the population out of the scan window (unexposed group). The ward
442 population reflects the year 2019 estimates. In total, SatScan identified 168 wards with RR > 1 with a population of ~ 4.9 million; and thus, the so-
443 called micro-hotspots wards. Still, 79 micro-hotspots had a RR ≥ 2 with a population of ~ 2.2 million compared to the State as a whole.
444

445 **Micro-hotspots based on the GTFCC method.** Between 2010 and 2019, the top 10 wards with the highest
446 mean annual incidence rates of cholera were evenly split between urban and rural locations (five in each
447 location (S3 Fig)). In the ten years of the study period, cholera occurred in 89.5% (433/484) of all the wards,
448 and of these, 82.2% (356/433) were rural wards. The mean annual incidence rate for each ward that reported
449 cholera ranged from 0.27 in Kachako to 310.68 per 100,000 persons in Fagge B (S3 Fig). Based on the 55th and
450 71.6th percentiles, the cut-off for the mean annual incidence rate and persistence were 10/100,000 persons
451 and 2.50%, respectively. Application of these criteria yielded 115 wards as T1 micro-hotspot, 105 as T2 micro-
452 hotspot, 23 as T3 micro-hotspot, and 241 as T4 micro-hotspot (Table 4, S1 Table). In Fig 7, we present the

453 cholera micro-hotspot classification chart (Fig 7A) and map (Fig 7B) while Table 4 and S1 Table provide the list
 454 of the wards under the different micro-hotspots categories. The populations with these micro-hotspot
 455 prioritizations include 4,505,370 for T1, 2,413,291 for T2, 1,570,479 for T3, and 5,811,246 for T4 (Table 4, S1
 456 Table).

457 **Table 4. Wards with the type of micro-hotspots based on mean annual incidence rate and proportion of**
 458 **weeks with reported cholera cases (GTFCC method)**

Type (T) of micro-hotspot	Ward	Location	Population	Mean Annual Incidence/100,000*	Proportion of years with reported cholera (%)
T1	Fagge B	Urban	6525	310.68	10.04
T1	Fagge D2	Urban	15539	156.03	10.47
T1	Rijiyar Lemo	Urban	32200	117.56	14.10
T1	Gano	Rural	38513	117.07	11.54
T1	Goron Dutse	Urban	17259	90.51	9.40
T1	Gaya North	Rural	46515	88.38	7.05
T1	Kibiya 1	Rural	15114	86.36	2.56
T1	Rano Sabon Gari	Rural	27324	82.99	3.21
T1	Kabo	Rural	27393	75.11	4.70
T1	Kumbotso	Urban	15060	68.68	7.05
T1	Tofa	Rural	19795	67.10	7.05
T1	Utai	Rural	21892	67.02	3.42
T1	Wudil	Rural	42977	62.52	6.84
T1	Rogo Sabon Gari	Rural	28096	60.57	4.49
T1	Gezawa	Rural	32091	59.69	7.05
T1	Gwarzo	Rural	22648	56.40	6.20
T1	Dala	Urban	41129	53.96	12.61
T1	Gyadi Gyadi Arewa	Urban	8307	53.61	4.27
T1	Doka	Rural	10652	53.18	3.21
T1	Madadi	Rural	28477	51.93	3.42
T1	Mainika	Rural	18458	51.31	4.06
T1	Warawa	Rural	9087	49.39	3.21
T1	Garko	Rural	33532	48.98	3.85
T1	Bichi	Rural	73274	47.17	8.55
T1	Kofar Mazugal	Urban	26356	46.10	9.83
T1	Jandutse	Rural	41370	45.99	3.42
T1	Doguwa	Rural	22303	45.56	3.85
T1	Gwammaja	Urban	54069	45.55	12.61
T1	Kulluwa	Rural	21976	43.40	3.21
T1	Gajida	Rural	5569	43.36	2.56
T1	Lakwaya	Rural	50658	41.80	5.34
T1	Gawuna	Urban	31306	41.45	7.26
T1	Shahuchi	Urban	40050	40.82	11.32
T1	Kafin Dabga	Rural	24184	40.42	3.21

T1	Tsanyawa	Rural	25466	40.22	4.06
T1	Kutama	Rural	30525	39.95	4.06
T1	Unguwar Tudu	Rural	25688	39.56	4.06
T1	Dawaki	Rural	35337	39.08	6.84
T1	Danguguwa	Rural	25931	38.26	2.99
T1	Rimin Gado	Rural	20296	38.03	4.27
T1	Yanoko	Rural	13048	37.48	3.42
T1	Sabon Gari-Wudil	Rural	23346	36.01	4.91
T1	Tsakuwa	Rural	29843	34.93	5.13
T1	Bebeji	Rural	36646	34.05	3.85
T1	Ungogo	Urban	37929	33.52	7.05
T1	Fagge A	Urban	21523	33.47	3.85
T1	Bunkure	Rural	35252	33.31	2.56
T1	Gwale	Urban	34950	33.22	9.19
T1	Rijiyar Zaki	Rural	40520	32.89	10.26
T1	Tsohon Gari	Rural	29938	32.73	2.99
T1	Getso	Rural	36029	32.17	3.63
T1	Tarauni	Urban	12770	31.84	4.27
T1	Darki	Rural	33384	30.83	3.21
T1	Dandago	Urban	26536	29.53	7.26
T1	Zaitawa	Urban	40975	28.61	9.83
T1	Sabon Gari	Rural	30802	28.40	4.06
T1	Panshekara	Urban	35135	28.31	6.20
T1	Rimin Dako	Rural	24873	28.09	2.56
T1	Bagwai	Rural	27981	28.01	3.63
T1	Kwajale	Rural	20182	27.80	3.63
T1	She She	Urban	22473	27.69	5.13
T1	Yalwa-Dala	Urban	23474	27.49	4.91
T1	Kubaraci	Rural	26001	27.21	2.99
T1	Yakasai	Urban	36857	26.64	7.91
T1	Kiru	Rural	53125	26.60	3.63
T1	Jakara	Urban	22634	26.34	4.70
T1	Takai	Rural	45279	26.05	3.85
T1	Sabon Gari West	Urban	42804	25.81	5.77
T1	Shuwaki	Rural	25746	25.44	3.42
T1	Danbare	Urban	25292	25.41	3.85
T1	Dan Maliki	Urban	106135	24.16	9.19
T1	Bachirawa	Urban	73206	23.95	8.76
T1	Dakata	Urban	49321	23.26	8.55
T1	Mandawari	Urban	14175	22.06	3.42
T1	Lambu	Rural	18732	21.97	2.78
T1	Gayawa	Rural	50228	21.09	3.85
T1	Jalli	Rural	21241	21.09	2.56
T1	Beli	Rural	25641	20.49	2.78
T1	Bargoni	Rural	34869	20.45	3.63
T1	Gyaranya	Urban	17198	19.98	3.21
T1	Tanburawa	Rural	33930	19.83	2.78

T1	Sani Mai Nagge	Urban	41337	19.77	6.84
T1	Galadanchi	Urban	24944	19.72	4.49
T1	Naibawa	Urban	76213	19.65	6.62
T1	Yaryasa	Rural	33669	19.65	2.56
T1	Chedi	Urban	15050	19.40	2.78
T1	Dawakiji	Rural	34966	19.04	3.21
T1	Dan Agundi	Urban	18859	18.87	3.63
T1	Madobi	Rural	29235	18.64	4.49
T1	Ketawa	Rural	42522	18.20	3.63
T1	Tudun Fulani	Urban	87983	18.08	6.20
T1	Sharada	Urban	97279	18.03	10.68
T1	Ajingi	Rural	25862	17.58	3.63
T1	Kara	Rural	32141	17.21	3.21
T1	Kaura Goje	Urban	101993	16.87	10.26
T1	Rogo Ruma	Rural	32896	15.85	2.56
T1	Minjibir	Rural	31563	15.71	2.78
T1	Kawaji	Urban	119986	15.54	11.32
T1	Adakawa	Urban	27219	15.23	4.06
T1	Gandu Albasa	Urban	74484	14.55	5.34
T1	Kantudu	Urban	26646	13.12	2.78
T1	Garun Gawa	Rural	26221	13.10	4.27
T1	Kan Karofi	Urban	38874	12.51	4.91
T1	Dorayi	Urban	230272	12.30	14.32
T1	Jita	Rural	25798	12.09	2.56
T1	Darmanawa	Urban	67397	12.01	7.05
T1	Tudun Murtala	Urban	83078	11.62	7.69
T1	Zango-III	Urban	64141	11.51	7.26
T1	Kausani	Rural	32945	11.19	2.99
T1	Kofar Ruwa	Urban	101663	11.12	8.76
T1	Dankaza	Rural	29476	10.88	3.21
T1	Gobirawa	Urban	222097	10.71	11.11
T1	Hotoro South	Urban	59253	10.62	5.13
T1	Gabasawa	Rural	44889	10.48	2.78
T1	Gwangwan	Rural	31455	10.44	2.99
T1 Total	115		4,505,370		

459 [‡]Table is arranged in descending order of mean annual incidence within the micro-hotspot types (T). The ward population reflects the year 2019
460 estimates. Of the 484 wards in Kano State, the GTFCC method classified 115, 105, 23, and 241 as T1, T2, T3, and T4, respectively. This Table shows
461 the T1 micro-hotspots only; a complete list of the micro-hotspots types is in the S1 Table. [†]The last 20 wards at the bottom of the Table from Rogo
462 Ruma to Gwangwan were not detected as micro-hotspots by SaTScan.

463
464 In keeping with our objective of comparing SaTScan and GTFCC methods in analyzing micro-hotspot patterns,
465 both showed points of similarities and dissimilarities. Remarkably, for 2010-2019, both methods agreed on
466 eight out of the top ten ranked micro-hotspots. Yet, SaTScan identified Kunchi and Tumbau within its top ten
467 ranked micro-hotspots while GTFCC classified Kabo and Kumbotso within its top ten ranked micro-hotspots

(Tables 3 and 4). Similarly, considering the T1 and some T2 wards, of the 168 micro-hotspots detected using SaTScan, 57.74% (97/168) and 42.26% (71/168) were classified as T1 and T2 by GTFCC method, respectively. Conversely, the GTFCC tool classified 20 wards from Rogo Ruma to Gwangwan as T1 (Table 4) when SaTScan did not detect these wards as micro-hotspots; i.e., the 20 wards had a $RR < 1$. Finally, 52.98% (89/168) of micro-hotspots detected by SaTScan had a $RR < 2$ (Table T3); nonetheless, GTFCC classified most of these wards as T1 (Table 4). For instance, according to SaTScan, the Kaura Goje micro-hotspot has a $RR = 1.02$ (Table 3), but was a T1 micro-hotspot according to GTFCC with a very high cholera persistence of 10.26% (Table 4).

Discussion

The goals of this study were to provide an analysis of the Spatio-temporal epidemiology of cholera in Kano State, Nigeria, and to describe alternative methods for identifying micro-hotspots for cholera. Identifying these hotspots is essential for controlling cholera to develop interventions at a local community (ward level) and is needed for the implementation of the Nigeria NSPACC. Thus, our findings on the clinical, demographic, and behavioral characteristics, as well as geographic distributions, space-time patterns of disease clusters, and micro-hotspots using data from 2010 to 2019, have public health implications.

Between 2010 and 2019, we found that location, season, gender, and age significantly affected the risk of cholera in Kano State. Cholera in Kano State occurs in both urban and rural locations/settings with only minor differences in rates of infection in the two settings. The disease occurs in the dry and rainy seasons alike, but intense weekly transmission occurs during the rainy season with peaks in August. The spatial distribution of cholera showed a considerable heterogeneous pattern across the state, but with large space-time clusters at the Center and eastern portions between 2013 and 2014. We detected 168 micro-hotspots, and the two methods we used generally agreed. Amongst women, cholera survival significantly depended on the setting (p -value = 0.003). The age distribution of cases and deaths found higher rates among those 15 years and

492 younger (Fig 2). The CFR was higher in rural settings (3.4%) but decreased with increasing age in both settings.
493 We observed a 77.4% case severity in the urban compared to 53.4% in the rural setting. For care-seeking
494 behaviour, 52.1% of cases in the urban setting sought clinical care on the same day of symptom onset
495 compared with 82.7% of their peers in the rural location. Overall, confirmation of the diagnosis using RDTs was
496 very low (1.3%), especially in a rural location (1.0%).

497
498 Within the urban-rural divide of cholera in Kano State, rural populations had more cases and deaths than
499 urban dwellers, especially rural women. Though the rural population is more than two and a half times (2.6)
500 that of the urban, the AR between the two differs by only 10.8 per 100000 inhabitants (Table 1); the cholera
501 mortality rate is slightly higher in the rural than urban areas. While cholera has mostly been thought to be
502 higher in urban areas [46-51] and lower in the rural than crowded urban slums [50, 52], our finding that
503 cholera risk is not significantly higher in the urban setting of Kano State is consistent with findings of high
504 cholera risk in rural settings in Guinea-Bissau [53], Zimbabwe [54], and Haiti [54]. The finding that women
505 and children in the rural setting had more cases of cholera than women and children in the urban setting (Fig.
506 2) could be attributed to rural practices regarding food (eating habits), hygiene, and gatherings such as
507 funerals, weddings, markets, and the use of surface water. Further, children might be finishing adults' plates,
508 women preparing food using surface water, and attending and eating at funerals/weddings without proper
509 hand hygiene, all factors that have been associated with cholera outbreaks in Cameroon [55] and Bangladesh
510 [56].

511
512 For 2010 to 2019, we confirmed that in Kano State, though the disease occurs in the dry and rainy seasons
513 alike, higher rates of cholera occurred during the rainy season (June to September) with a peak in August (Fig.
514 3) [9-12]. Most importantly, cases in the rural and urban settings peak asynchronously, i.e., when cases in the

515 rural setting are at a peak, those in the urban location are at a trough (Fig 3). Control efforts would benefit
516 from studies of the seasonality of cholera in Kano State that correlate rainfall data with cases of cholera.
517
518 We observed that CFRs are high (3.5% rural vs 3.0% urban), far exceeds the <1% recommended by the WHO
519 and decreasing with increasing age (Table 1), as has been documented elsewhere [57]. High CFRs call for
520 better hospital management of cases in general, but with particular attention on children <5 years old, and
521 improvements in surveillance to trigger a timely response. The decreasing rates of disease with age are
522 thought to be related to acquired immunity, and this is supported by the increasingly elevated vibriocidal
523 antibody titers by age in the population [58, 59]. For 2010 and 2019, more than three-quarters of cases in the
524 urban setting were severe, however just over half of them sought care on the same day of cholera onset. The
525 reverse is true in the rural setting; slightly more than half of the cases in the rural location were judged to be
526 severe, and nearly three-quarters of them sought care on the same day of disease onset. The reasons for
527 higher cholera severity and poorer care-seeking behavior in the urban setting are not well understood.
528 Likewise, reasons for lower severity, though still high, and better care-seeking behavior in a rural setting are
529 not well understood. This could be related to educational status, income, occupation, and body mass index
530 [60]. Perhaps high mobility and lack of time to seek timely care in an urban setting could be contributing
531 factors. Conceivably, the rural population may be less mobile and have more discretionary time to seek
532 immediate care at health facilities.
533
534 The present study also shows that between 2010 and 2019, sample collection and testing to ascertain *V.*
535 *cholerae* in stool was only 1.3% overall. Likely, the 2.2% to 1.0% (reflected in the RDT positivity rates 61.7% to
536 63.8%) disparity in urban and rural stool sample testing indicates the difficulty in reaching rural locations with
537 RDTs. Inadequate testing occurred among <5 years and 5-14 years olds in the rural setting, age groups in

538 which suspected cases have a higher chance of not being cholera. Unfortunately, data on culture confirmation
539 was not available for analysis. This insufficient testing calls for urgent research to understand the limiting
540 factors to laboratory surveillance including, but not limited to, personnel and availability of RDT kits in the
541 urban and rural settings alike.

542

543 There was a clear tendency for wards reporting cholera to be clustered around inland water bodies of the
544 northern, central, and southeastern portions of the state (Fig 5). We detected 168 wards that were at high risk
545 of cholera and were considered to be micro-hotspots, compared to other wards, and both methods used were
546 generally in agreement.

547 However, SaTScan did not detect the bottom 20 T1 micro-hotspots of Table 4 (from Rogo Ruma to Gwangwan)
548 as micro-hotspots. SaTScan is dependent primarily on incidence whereas the GTFCC method includes both
549 incidence and persistence. Thus, areas with higher incidence may be better identified when using the GTFCC
550 method. Yet, as both methods generally agreed (Figs 6 and 7), our finding corroborates our hypothesis that
551 although an LGA may be detected as a hotspot LGA not all wards within it are micro-hotspots [8]. For example,
552 in our earlier hotspot detection at the LGA level, Rogo LGA was not classified as hotspot LGA [8], but at the
553 fine-scale of ward, both methods detected 3-4 micro-hotspots in Rogo (Figs 6 and 7). Also, Kunchi LGA was
554 classified as hotspot LGA, but only one ward in Kunchi LGA is a micro-hotspot, and so forth. Therefore, we
555 conclude that hotspot maps at the ward level, not hotspot maps at the LGA level, are best suited to target
556 cholera interventions including vaccines.

557

558 As our main objective was to provide NSPACC with data to guide interventions, the micro-hotspots in Table 3
559 would benefit most from priority vaccination by the National Primary Health Care Development Agency, Kano
560 State Ministry of Health, and NCDC while longer-term WASH infrastructure is being put in place in line with the

561 global roadmap of ending cholera by 2030. As NSPACC plans to provide vaccines in Kano State between 2020
562 and 2023 this analysis can support their preparation and specific plans for vaccination. The population of
563 wards with a significantly higher risk was 4,876,254 while the population of the wards with a relative risk ≥ 2
564 was 2,119,974. SaTScan has been widely used and found very helpful in detecting cholera clusters (hotspots)
565 to inform interventions in Cameroon [17], Uganda [18], Zambia [46], and Tanzania [47]. By contrast, the GTFCC
566 tool is new, and excepting Ngwa *et al.* [8], we did not find it being used in peer review published reports.
567 Therefore, more scholarly work is needed to illuminate the viability of the GTFCC tool for use by local
568 policymakers who will need to include local factors with hotspot analysis when making priorities for
569 interventions.

570
571 This study has important limitations as well as strengths. Testing of suspected cases was very low. As such, we
572 cannot roll out misclassification of cases based on clinical criteria leading to underestimation or
573 overestimation of the true rates of cholera. Although unlikely, retrospective determination of ward of cases
574 could have led to assigning cases to the wrong ward. Nonetheless, the use of the health facility-based line-list
575 data spanning ten years afforded the prospect to describe demographic, testing, and behavioral
576 characteristics of cases as well as patterns of spatial distribution, Spatio-temporal clusters, and micro-hotspots
577 needed to inform intervention including vaccine; and thus, constitute major strengths of the study. Other
578 strengths include illuminating urban/rural disparity in cholera cases and deaths besides comparing two
579 methods to micro-hotspots detection, which generally agreed. Although SaTScan is widely used, its use
580 demands a strong statistical knowledge compared to the GTFCC method, which requires only entering data
581 into Microsoft Excel. As such, the later method can readily be applied in resource-poor settings without
582 statisticians for hotspots identification. Finally, policymakers have been served with analysis stratified by
583 gender, age, and location leading to uncovering the rural-urban disparity in cholera transmission.

584

585 In sum, in 2017, the road map to ending cholera by 2030 called for focusing interventions in cholera hotspots
586 [15]. In 2018, Nigeria was determined to pre-emptively vaccinate high-risk populations in identified hotspots
587 nationally between 2018 and 2023 [16]. We conclude that hotspot maps at the ward level, not hotspot maps
588 at the LGA level, are best suited to target cholera interventions including vaccines. This study has served the
589 NSPACC with the high-priority micro-hotspots of cholera in Kano State to target interventions including
590 vaccines towards cholera elimination from the state by 2030.

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

- 624 1. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated global burden of cholera in endemic countries. *PLoS Negl*
625 *Trop Dis.* 2015;9(6):e0003832.
- 626 2. World Health Organization. Cholera: Number of reported cases: 2016 2017 [cited 2021 March 3].
627 Available from: http://gamapserver.who.int/gho/interactive_charts/cholera/atlas.html.
- 628 3. Cholera Platform. Cholera Outbreaks in Central and West Africa : 2019 Regional Update - Week 13:
629 Cholera Platform; 2019 [cited 2021 March 11]. Available from:
630 http://plateformecholera.info/attachments/article/807/WCA%20Cholera_Update_W13-2019.pdf.
- 631 4. UNICEF. Cholera Factsheet Nigeria: UNICEF WCARO; 2018 [cited 2021 March 3]. Available from:
632 http://plateformecholera.info/attachments/article/236/Cholera%20Factsheet%20Nigeria%202017_SAM.pdf.
- 633 5. WHO. Cholera, 2018. *Wkly Epidemiol Rec.* 2019;94(48):561–80.
- 634 6. WHO. Cholera, 2019. *Wkly Epidemiol Rec.* 2020;95(37):441–8.
- 635 7. Ngwa MC, Liang S, Kracalik IT, Morris L, Blackburn JK, Mbam LM, et al. Cholera in Cameroon, 2000-
636 2012: Spatial and Temporal Analysis at the Operational (Health District) and Sub Climate Levels. *PLoS Negl*
637 *Trop Dis.* 2016;10(11):e0005105.
- 638 8. Ngwa MC, Ihekweazu C, Okwor T, Yennan S, Williams N, Elimian K, et al. The cholera risk assessment in
639 Kano State, Nigeria: A historical review, mapping of hotspots and evaluation of contextual factors. *PLoS*
640 *neglected tropical diseases.* 2021;15(1):e0009046.
- 641 9. Leckebusch GC, Abdussalam AF. Climate and socioeconomic influences on interannual variability of
642 cholera in Nigeria. *Health & place.* 2015;34:107-17.
- 643 10. Abdussalam AF. Potential future risk of cholera due to climate change in northern Nigeria. *African*
644 *Research Review.* 2017;11(1):205-18.

- 645 11. Oloukoi G, Bob U, Jaggernath J. Perception and trends of associated health risks with seasonal climate
646 variation in Oke-Ogun region, Nigeria. *Health & place*. 2014;25:47-55.
- 647 12. Adewale AK, Pazhani GP, Abiodun IB, Afolabi O, Kolawole OD, Mukhopadhyay AK, et al. Unique Clones
648 of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 El Tor with Haitian Type *ctxB* Allele Implicated in the Recent Cholera Epidemics from
649 Nigeria, Africa. *PloS one*. 2016;11(8):e0159794.
- 650 13. Adagbada AO, Adesida SA, Nwaokorie FO, Niemogha M-T, Coker AO. Cholera epidemiology in Nigeria:
651 an overview. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2012;12(1).
- 652 14. Hutin Y, Luby S, Paquet C. A large cholera outbreak in Kano City, Nigeria: the importance of hand
653 washing with soap and the danger of street-vended water. *J Water Health*. 2003;1(1):45-52.
- 654 15. Global Task Force on Cholera Control (GTFCC). Ending Cholera—A Global Roadmap to 2030: WHO;
655 2017 [cited 2021 May 28]. Available from: [http://www.who.int/cholera/publications/global-](http://www.who.int/cholera/publications/global-roadmap.pdf?ua=1)
656 [roadmap.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/cholera/publications/global-roadmap.pdf?ua=1).
- 657 16. Nigeria Centre for Disease Control (NCDC). National Strategic Plan of Action on Cholera Control
658 (NSPACC). Abuja: NCDC; 2018. p. 1-49.
- 659 17. City Population. Kano State in Nigeria 2018 [cited 2021 March 10]. Available from:
660 <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/nigeria-admin.php?adm1id=NGA020>.
- 661 18. George CM, Monira S, Sack DA, Rashid M-u, Saif-Ur-Rahman K, Mahmud T, et al. Randomized
662 controlled trial of hospital-based hygiene and water treatment intervention (CHoBI7) to reduce cholera.
663 *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2016;22(2):233.
- 664 19. Ali M, Debes AK, Luquero FJ, Kim DR, Park JY, Digilio L, et al. Potential for controlling cholera using a
665 ring vaccination strategy: re-analysis of data from a cluster-randomized clinical trial. *PLoS medicine*.
666 2016;13(9):e1002120.

- 667 20. Debes AK, Ali M, Azman AS, Yunus M, Sack DA. Cholera cases cluster in time and space in Matlab,
668 Bangladesh: implications for targeted preventive interventions. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2016;45(6):2134-9.
- 669 21. M'bangombe M, Pezzoli L, Reeder B, Kabuluzi S, Msyamboza K, Masuku H, et al. Oral cholera vaccine in
670 cholera prevention and control, Malawi. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization.* 2018;96(6):428.
- 671 22. Bwire G, Ali M, Sack DA, Nakinsige A, Naigaga M, Debes AK, et al. Identifying cholera "hotspots" in
672 Uganda: An analysis of cholera surveillance data from 2011 to 2016. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
673 2017;11(12):e0006118.
- 674 23. Bailey TC, Gatrell AC. *Interactive spatial data analysis: Longman Scientific & Technical Essex; 1995.*
- 675 24. Kulldorff M, Hjalmars U. The Knox method and other tests for space-time interaction. *Biometrics.*
676 1999;55(2):544-52.
- 677 25. Mantel N. The detection of disease clustering and a generalized regression approach. *Cancer research.*
678 1967;27(2 Part 1):209-20.
- 679 26. Silverman BW. *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis: CRC press; 1986.*
- 680 27. Brunson C, Corcoran J, Higgs G. *Visualising space and time in crime patterns: A comparison of*
681 *methods. Computers, environment and urban systems.* 2007;31(1):52-75.
- 682 28. Kulldorff M, Heffernan R, Hartman J, Assunção R, Mostashari F. A space–time permutation scan
683 statistic for disease outbreak detection. *Plos med.* 2005;2(3):e59.
- 684 29. GTFCC. *Guidance and tool for countries to identify priority areas for intervention Geneva: GTFCC;*
685 *[cited 2021 February 16, 2021]. Available from: [https://www.gtfcc.org/resources/guidance-and-tool-for-](https://www.gtfcc.org/resources/guidance-and-tool-for-countries-to-identify-priority-areas-for-intervention/)*
686 *[countries-to-identify-priority-areas-for-intervention/](https://www.gtfcc.org/resources/guidance-and-tool-for-countries-to-identify-priority-areas-for-intervention/).*
- 687 30. *Nigeria: Administrative Devisions. States and Local Government Areas 2016 [cited 2021 March 13].*
688 *Available from: <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/nigeria-admin.php>.*

- 689 31. Usman A, Sarkinfada F, Mufunda J, Nyarango P, Mansur K, Daiyabu T. Recurrent cholera epidemics in
690 Kano-northern Nigeria. *Cent Afr J Med*. 2005;51(3-4):34-8.
- 691 32. Nigeria Centre for Disease Control (NCDC). Nigeria Cholera Surveillance Structure Abuja: Nigeria Centre
692 for Disease Control (NCDC); 2019 [cited 2021 March 11]. Available from: [https://www.fondation-
693 merieux.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/4th-meeting-gtfcc-surveillance-nigeria-nanpring-williams.pdf](https://www.fondation-merieux.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/4th-meeting-gtfcc-surveillance-nigeria-nanpring-williams.pdf).
- 694 33. World Health Organization and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010). Technical
695 Guidelines for Integrated Disease Surveillance and Response in Nigeria. Brazzaville, Republic of Congo and
696 Atlanta, USA: World Health Organization and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2013 [cited 2021
697 March 11]. Available from: https://www.ncdc.gov.ng/themes/common/docs/protocols/4_1476085948.pdf.
- 698 34. [NSIPSS] NSflaPSS. Nigeria Strategy for Immunisation and PHC System Strengthening [NSIPSS]--2018 –
699 2028 Nigeria: NSIPSS; 2018 [cited 2021 March 11]. Available from: [https://nigeriahealthwatch.com/wp-
700 content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2019/09/18.04.2018_Nigeria-Strategy-for-Immunization-and-PHC-
701 Strengthening_3rd_Version-Final.pdf](https://nigeriahealthwatch.com/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2019/09/18.04.2018_Nigeria-Strategy-for-Immunization-and-PHC-Strengthening_3rd_Version-Final.pdf).
- 702 35. Ophori EA, Tula MY, Azih AV, Okojie R, Ikpo PE. Current trends of immunization in Nigeria: prospect
703 and challenges. *Trop Med Health*. 2014;42(2):67-75.
- 704 36. R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria R
705 Foundation for Statistical Computing [Internet]; 2019 [cited 2021 March 12]. Available from: [https://www.R-
706 project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).
- 707 37. Waller LA, Gotway CA. Applied spatial statistics for public health data: John Wiley & Sons; 2004.
- 708 38. Tango T. A class of tests for detecting ‘general’and ‘focused’clustering of rare diseases. *Statistics in
709 Medicine*. 1995;14(21-22):2323-34.
- 710 39. Oden N. Adjusting Moran's I for population density. *Statistics in Medicine*. 1995;14(1):17-26.

- 711 40. Assuncao RM, Reis EA. A new proposal to adjust Moran's I for population density. *Statistics in*
712 *medicine*. 1999;18(16):2147-62.
- 713 41. Anselin L, Syabri I, Kho Y. GeoDa: an introduction to spatial data analysis. *Handbook of applied spatial*
714 *analysis*: Springer; 2010. p. 73-89.
- 715 42. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Laboratory Methods for the Diagnosis of *Vibrio cholerae*:
716 Isolation of *Vibrio Cholerae* from Fecal Specimens: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; [cited 2021
717 March 12]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/cholera/pdf/Laboratory-Methods-for-the-Diagnosis-of-](https://www.cdc.gov/cholera/pdf/Laboratory-Methods-for-the-Diagnosis-of-Vibrio-cholerae-chapter-4.pdf)
718 [Vibrio-cholerae-chapter-4.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/cholera/pdf/Laboratory-Methods-for-the-Diagnosis-of-Vibrio-cholerae-chapter-4.pdf).
- 719 43. Nkoko DB, Giraudoux P, Plisnier P-D, Tinda AM, Piarroux M, Sudre B, et al. Dynamics of cholera
720 outbreaks in Great Lakes region of Africa, 1978–2008. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2011;17(11):2026.
- 721 44. Osei FB, Duker AA. Spatial dependency of *V. cholera* prevalence on open space refuse dumps in
722 Kumasi, Ghana: a spatial statistical modelling. *International Journal of Health Geographics*. 2008;7(1):62.
- 723 45. Global Task Force on Cholera Control. Guidance and tool for countries to identify priority areas for
724 intervention: Global Task Force on Cholera Control; 2019 [cited 2021 March 17]. Available from:
725 [https://www.gtfcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/guidance-and-tool-for-countries-to-identify-priority-](https://www.gtfcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/guidance-and-tool-for-countries-to-identify-priority-areas-for-intervention.pdf)
726 [areas-for-intervention.pdf](https://www.gtfcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/guidance-and-tool-for-countries-to-identify-priority-areas-for-intervention.pdf).
- 727 46. Deb B, Sircar B, Sengupta P, De S, Mondal S, Gupta D, et al. Studies on interventions to prevent eltor
728 cholera transmission in urban slums. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 1986;64(1):127.
- 729 47. Khan IA, Saha A, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Uddin MJ, Begum YA, et al. Coverage and cost of a large oral
730 cholera vaccination program in a high-risk cholera endemic urban population in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Vaccine*.
731 2013;31(51):6058-64.

- 732 48. Kanungo S, Sur D, Ali M, You YA, Pal D, Manna B, et al. Clinical, epidemiological, and spatial
733 characteristics of *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* diarrhea and cholera in the urban slums of Kolkata, India. BMC
734 public health. 2012;12(1):1-9.
- 735 49. SAHA C, GHOSH S, MITRA U, PAL S. Studies on interventions to prevent eltor cholera transmission in
736 urban slums.
- 737 50. Lamnod E, Kinyanjui J. Cholera Outbreak Guidelines - Preparedness, Prevention and Control: OXFAM;
738 2012 [cited 2021 April 6]. Available from:
739 [https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/237172/ml-cholera-guidelines-
740 preparedness-prevention-and-control-030512-en.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/237172/ml-cholera-guidelines-preparedness-prevention-and-control-030512-en.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).
- 741 51. Ariane Bauernfeind AC, Jean-Francois Fesselet, Michel van Herp,, Elisabeth Le Saoût JMC, Welmoet
742 Tuynman,. Cholera Guidelines France: Medecins Sans Frontieres; 2004 [cited 2021 April 6]. Available from:
743 [https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/cholera
744 aguide.pdf](https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/cholera_guide.pdf).
- 745 52. Lamond E, Kinyanjui J. Cholera outbreak guidelines: Preparedness, prevention and control: UNICEF;
746 2012 [cited 2021 April 6]. Available from:
747 https://www.unicef.org/cholera/Annexes/Supporting_Resources/Annex_6B/OXFAM_Cholera_guidelines.pdf.
- 748 53. Gunnlaugsson G, Angulo FJ, Einarsdóttir J, Passa A, Tauxe RV. Epidemic cholera in Guinea-Bissau: the
749 challenge of preventing deaths in rural West Africa. International journal of infectious diseases. 2000;4(1):8-
750 13.
- 751 54. Morof D, Cookson ST, Laver S, Chirundu D, Desai S, Mathenge P, et al. Community mortality from
752 cholera: urban and rural districts in Zimbabwe. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene.
753 2013;88(4):645-50.

- 754 55. Ngwa MC, Young A, Liang S, Blackburn J, Mouhaman A, Morris Jr JG. Cultural influences behind cholera
755 transmission in the Far North Region, Republic of Cameroon: a field experience and implications for
756 operational level planning of interventions. *Pan African Medical Journal*. 2017;28(1).
- 757 56. Hughes JM, Boyce JM, Levine RJ, Khan M, Aziz K, Huq M, et al. Epidemiology of eltor cholera in rural
758 Bangladesh: importance of surface water in transmission. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*.
759 1982;60(3):395.
- 760 57. Azman AS, Lauer SA, Bhuiyan TR, Luquero FJ, Leung DT, Hegde ST, et al. *Vibrio cholerae* O1
761 transmission in Bangladesh: insights from a nationally representative serosurvey. *Lancet Microbe*.
762 2020;1(8):e336-e43.
- 763 58. Sack DA, Clemens JD, Huda S, Harris JR, Khan MR, Chakraborty J, et al. Antibody responses after
764 immunization with killed oral cholera vaccines during the 1985 vaccine field trial in Bangladesh. *J Infect Dis*.
765 1991;164(2):407-11.
- 766 59. Mosley WH, Benenson AS, Barui R. A serological survey for cholera antibodies in rural east Pakistan. 1.
767 The distribution of antibody in the control population of a cholera-vaccine field-trial area and the relation of
768 antibody titre to the pattern of endemic cholera. *Bull World Health Organ*. 1968;38(3):327-34.
- 769 60. Onyeonoro UU, Ogah OS, Ukegbu AU, Chukwuonye II, Madukwe OO, Moses AO. Urban–rural
770 differences in health-care-seeking pattern of residents of Abia state, Nigeria, and the implication in the control
771 of NCDS. *Health services insights*. 2016;9:HSI. S31865.

772


773

774

775


776

777 Figures



778
779
780
781
782

Fig 1. Study setting depicting population distribution in rural and urban wards of Kano State. (A) Insert shows Nigeria with national capital Abuja and Kano State in Northern Nigeria while (B) describes the population distribution of the 484 wards by rural (396 wards) and urban (88 wards) locations. (C) Insert show urban wards at the Centre of the State.



783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792

Fig 2. Suspected and confirmed cases and deaths distribution of cholera by age, gender, and location, 2010-2019. Of note, binwidth = 5 means cases and deaths distribution based on age groups of five years interval. 2010 to 2019 represents years from 2010-2019. (F) Female, (M) Male, (R) Rural, and (U) Urban are the stratifications of gender and location of infection, respectively. This figure depicts the urban and rural divide of cholera outbreaks annually. Apart from the years 2010 and 2011 in urban setting, the distribution of cholera cases by age has a right skew (Poisson) shape. This implies that, irrespective of sex and location, the cases of cholera were higher among people of younger ages (<10 years) than older ones. Excepting the years 2011 and 2013, amongst women, cholera survival significantly depended on setting (p -value = 0.002); Women in rural areas were more likely to die from cholera than women in urban areas. These findings confirm that age, gender and location are associated with cholera outcomes (survived or died).






Fig 3. Weekly occurrence of cholera epidemics in Kano State, Nigeria, 2010-2019. The y-axis represents suspected and confirmed reported cases and deaths of cholera while the x-axis shows the epidemiological (Epi) week of disease onset. F (female), M (male), R (rural), and U (urban) represents the gender and location stratifications. The dashed gray lines indicate the rainy season period (from June to September). In our analysis time period, the outbreaks started among men in the rural setting in week 31 of 2010 during the rainy season. Generally, weekly transmission was greater among women in rural location. Excepting the year 2013, outbreaks in the rural and urban settings peaked asynchronously, i.e., when outbreaks in the rural setting were at their peaks, those in the urban location were at their troughs. Further, cholera exacerbations occurred in both the rainy and dry seasons. For instance, in 2011, 2013 and 2019, epidemics occurred predominantly in the dry season at either the start or end of the year. In the rest of the six years studied, intense transmission of cholera occurred during the rainy season from week 22 (early June) to week 40 (late September) with peaks in August.



804
805 **Fig 4. Distribution of ward crude and Empirical Bayes Smoothed cholera attack rates from 2010-2019.** The map
806 shows differences between the distribution of crude rates (CR) and Empirical Bayes Smoothed (EBS) rates. The largest difference between CR and
807 EBS occurred in 2011. Nevertheless, because the EBS rates show cholera occurring in wards where cholera is not known to occur or where the
808 disease has not been reported, we elected to use the CR in the rest of the analysis. There were no data for 2012.
809



810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821

Fig 5. Significant space-time clusters of weekly reported cholera cases in Kano State, 2010-2019. The map depicts dynamics of space-time clusters of cholera at the fine scale of ward, which varied considerably in size and duration. Numbers 1-3 indicate clusters. Clusters (1) and (3) involve rural wards while (2) include urban wards. The big circle shows a (1) cluster with radius of 81.57 Km involving 136 wards while the small circle indicates a (2) cluster of radius 22.70 Km involving 117 wards. Cluster (3) has zero radius, as indicated by the dot (red). Analysis used space-time windows of 25% of the population at risk of cholera and 25% of the study time period, respectively, and default settings elsewhere. Here cholera cluster means a geographically limited area where environmental, cultural and/or socioeconomic conditions facilitate the transmission of the disease and where cholera persists or reappears regularly. The insert shows a better view of the urban area clusters.




Fig 6. Statistically significant cholera micro-hotspots (ward) in Kano State, 2010-2019. Map depicts relative risk (RR) per ward for the cholera clusters. The micro-hotspots wards (hotspots at the geographical resolution of ward) are those with $RR > 1$; and thus, wards with statistically significant risk of cholera infection. Of the 448 wards in Kano State, we identified **168** (37.71%) with $RR > 1$; and thus, the so-called micro-hotspots. The ward specific RR was calculated within each cluster using space-time scan statistics incorporating reported cholera cases for each week and the ward population for each year. Here cholera micro-hotspot means a geographically limited location where environmental, cultural and/or socioeconomic conditions facilitate the transmission of the disease and where cholera persists or reappears regularly. The insert shows a better view of the micro-hotspots at the Centre location. Note that the labels in the map represents Local Government Areas (LGAs) in which the wards are found.

822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832




Fig 7. Cholera micro-hotspot classification chart and map for Kano State following GTFCC method, 2010-2019. (A) The persistence cut-off point is 2.5% and the mean annual incidence rate cut-off point is 10/100,000 population. T represents types of micro-hotspots. T1 (high priority) reflects high persistence and mean annual incidence; T2 (medium priority) shows high persistence and low mean annual incidence; T3 (medium priority) indicates low persistence and high mean annual incidence; and T4 (low priority) depicts low persistence and mean annual incidence, respectively. The dots denote wards in the four types of micro-hotspot quadrants. The figure shows 115 (T1), 105 (T2), 23 (T3), and 241 (T4) risk types. Compared with the statistical map in Fig 4, this GTFCC method misses 50 micro-hotspot wards in the T1 quadrant. However, this could be the result of the cut-off point. Note that Fig 7 show labels for all T1 micro-hotspots, but only two for T2 (Kunchi and Tumbau), one for T3 (Kabuga), and none for T4, as space limitation did not permit showing all labels. (B) Spatial map of the T (types of micro-hotspots) in relation to inland water bodies.

833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856

857
858
859