

1 **Towards estimating true cholera burden: a systematic review and meta-**  
2 **analysis of *Vibrio cholerae* positivity**

3

4 **Running title:** Estimating *Vibrio cholerae* positivity

5

6 Kirsten E. Wiens<sup>1,2</sup>, Hanmeng Xu<sup>1</sup>, Kaiyue Zou<sup>1</sup>, John Mwaba<sup>3,4</sup>, Justin Lessler<sup>1,5,6</sup>, Esipoir B.

7 Malembaka<sup>1,7</sup>, Maya N. Demby<sup>1</sup>, Godfrey Bwire<sup>8</sup>, Firdausi Qadri<sup>9</sup>, Elizabeth C. Lee<sup>1</sup>, Andrew S.

8 Azman<sup>1</sup>

9

10 <sup>1</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns  
11 Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

12 <sup>2</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, Temple University,  
13 Philadelphia, USA

14 <sup>3</sup> Centre for Infectious Disease Research in Zambia (CIDRZ), Lusaka, Zambia

15 <sup>4</sup> Department of Biomedical Sciences, School of Health Sciences, University of Zambia, Lusaka,  
16 Zambia

17 <sup>5</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North  
18 Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, USA

19 <sup>6</sup> Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, USA

20 <sup>7</sup> Center for Tropical Diseases and Global Health (CTDGH), Université Catholique de Bukavu,  
21 Bukavu, Democratic Republic of the Congo

22 <sup>8</sup> Division of Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response, Ministry of Health,  
23 Kampala, Uganda

24 <sup>9</sup> Infectious Diseases Division, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research  
25 Bangladesh (icddr,b), Dhaka, Bangladesh

26 **Corresponding author**

27 Andrew S. Azman, PhD

28 Associate Scientist

29 Department of Epidemiology

30 Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

31 615 N. Wolfe Street

32 Baltimore, MD 21205

33 [azman@jhu.edu](mailto:azman@jhu.edu)

34

35 **Keywords**

36 cholera, *Vibrio cholerae*, diagnostic test, suspected cholera, confirmed cholera

37

38

39 **Abstract**

40 Background: Cholera surveillance relies on clinical diagnosis of acute watery diarrhea.

41 Suspected cholera case definitions have high sensitivity but low specificity, challenging our  
42 ability to characterize cholera burden and epidemiology. Our objective was to estimate the  
43 proportion of clinically suspected cholera that are true *Vibrio cholerae* infections and identify  
44 factors that explain variation in positivity.

45

46 Methods: We conducted a systematic review of studies from 2000-2023 that tested  $\geq 10$

47 suspected cholera cases for *V. cholerae* O1/O139 using culture, PCR and/or a rapid diagnostic  
48 test. We searched PubMed, Embase, Scopus, and Google Scholar on October 16, 2021 and  
49 updated the search on April 19, 2023. We estimated diagnostic test sensitivity and specificity  
50 using a latent class meta-analysis. We estimated *V. cholerae* positivity using a random-effects  
51 meta-analysis, adjusting for test performance.

52

53 Findings: We included 119 studies from 30 countries. *V. cholerae* positivity was lower in studies  
54 with representative sampling and lower minimum ages in suspected case definitions. After  
55 adjusting for test performance, on average 52% (95% Credible Interval: 24%, 80%) of  
56 suspected cases represented true *V. cholerae* infections. After adjusting for test performance  
57 and study methodology, odds of a suspected case having a true infection were 5.71 (Odds ratio  
58 95% Credible Interval: 1.53, 15.43) times higher when surveillance was initiated in response to  
59 an outbreak than in non-outbreak settings. Variation across studies was high and a limitation of  
60 our approach and the resolution of the data was that we were unable to explain all the  
61 heterogeneity with study-level attributes, including diagnostic test used, setting, and case  
62 definitions.

63

64 Conclusions: In this study, we found that burden estimates based on suspected cases alone  
65 may overestimate the incidence of medically attended cholera by twofold. However, accounting  
66 for cases missed by traditional clinical surveillance is key to unbiased cholera burden estimates.  
67 Given the substantial variability in positivity between settings, extrapolations from suspected to  
68 confirmed cases, which is necessary to estimate cholera incidence rates without exhaustive  
69 testing, should be based on local data.

70

71 Funding for this study was provided by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the National  
72 Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease.

73

#### 74 **Author Summary**

##### 75 Why was this study done?

- 76 • Cholera surveillance typically relies on the clinical diagnosis of acute watery diarrhea  
77 (i.e., “suspected cholera”), but this definition has a low specificity for cholera.
- 78 • Our goal was to estimate the proportion of suspected cholera cases that are true *Vibrio*  
79 *cholerae* infections and identify factors that contribute to variation in observed positivity.

##### 80 What did the researchers do and find?

- 81 • We conducted a systematic review of studies from 2000-2023 that tested suspected  
82 cholera cases for *V. cholerae* infection using one of three different laboratory tests.
- 83 • We included 119 studies from 30 countries and found that, on average, half of suspected  
84 cholera cases represented true *V. cholerae* infections, after accounting for laboratory  
85 test accuracy.
- 86 • We also found high variability between studies and that the odds of a suspected case  
87 being a true infection were higher during outbreaks compared to non-outbreak settings.

88 What do these findings mean?

- 89 • Our findings suggest that burden estimates based solely on suspected cases may  
90 overestimate the incidence of medically attended cholera by twofold.
- 91 • A limitation of our approach was that we couldn't account for cases missed by clinical  
92 surveillance, which is crucial for unbiased overall cholera burden estimates and an  
93 important area for future work.
- 94 • The high variability across studies suggests also that local testing data should be used  
95 to inform assumptions about positivity when exhaustive testing is not feasible.

96

97 **Introduction**

98 Current estimates of cholera burden rely on clinical diagnosis of individuals with acute  
99 watery diarrhea (i.e., suspected cholera cases) [1,2]. It is unclear how many *Vibrio cholerae*  
100 O1/O139 (serogroups that cause current epidemics) infections get missed due to mild  
101 symptoms and other barriers to care-seeking or how many get overcounted due to non-specific  
102 suspected case definitions. In Bangladesh, previous studies estimated that asymptomatic and  
103 unreported infections account for at least half of *V. cholerae* infections [3–5]. Meanwhile, the  
104 proportion of suspected cholera cases that represent laboratory-confirmed infections varies  
105 widely between studies, from 6% of those tested during routine surveillance in Bangladesh [6]  
106 to 72% of those tested during the initial phase of the 2017 outbreak in Yemen [7].

107 This wide variation in positivity may be caused by differences between sites in *V.*  
108 *cholerae* epidemiology [8], epidemiology of non-cholera diseases causing the same clinical  
109 symptoms [9–12], and variations in diagnostic tests and case definitions [13–15]. Typical  
110 suspected cholera case definitions have been shown to have high sensitivity but low specificity  
111 [14] for detecting true cholera, and can vary by location across seasons [13]. Culture-based  
112 methods or PCR are the gold standards to confirm cholera in clinical samples and generally

113 have high specificity. Lateral flow rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) may also be used and can be as  
114 sensitive as PCR [16]. Although recommended by the Global Task Force on Cholera Control  
115 (GTFCC) [17], systematic microbiological confirmation in surveillance is not always  
116 implemented, particularly during outbreaks when resources are limited [8]. To our knowledge—  
117 based on a literature review and discussion with experts—no study had yet systematically  
118 synthesized these data to estimate overall *V. cholerae* positivity and identify sources of this  
119 variation.

120         Understanding *V. cholerae* positivity among clinical cases could provide insights needed  
121 to improve laboratory testing strategies and allow for better estimates of cholera burden and  
122 risk, which are often used to allocate cholera resources, including oral cholera vaccines.  
123 Starting in 2023, the GTFCC has recommended using a combination of suspected cholera  
124 incidence, persistence, mortality, and cholera test positivity data across multiple years to identify  
125 priority areas for multisectoral interventions [18], which is particularly relevant in cholera  
126 endemic areas. As described above, the cholera positivity data are often not available. We  
127 sought to address this knowledge gap by modeling the relationship between clinically suspected  
128 and laboratory confirmed cholera. Specifically, we aimed to estimate the proportion of  
129 suspected cholera cases that represent true *V. cholerae* O1/O139 infections and identify factors  
130 that explain variability in positivity across settings.

131

## 132 **Methods**

### 133 Terminology

134         We focused on *V. cholerae* O1 and O139 because these are the serogroups that are  
135 responsible for the current 7<sup>th</sup> pandemic and the only ones known to lead to large outbreaks in  
136 humans [19]. These are also the serogroups that are targeted by each of the commonly used *V.*  
137 *cholerae* diagnostic tests (culture, PCR, RDT). Throughout this manuscript, we refer to the  
138 proportion of suspected cholera cases that represent true *V. cholerae* O1/O139 infections as “*V.*

139 *cholerae* positivity” or “cholera positivity”. In addition, since the available data did not allow us to  
140 evaluate the performance of multiple RDTs, we refer to RDT as any rapid diagnostic test for *V.*  
141 *cholerae* O1/O139 and do not distinguishing between different RDT manufacturers or whether  
142 the RDT is enriched/direct swab RDT or stool RDT.

143

#### 144 Systematic review

145 We searched PubMed, Embase, Scopus, Google Scholar and *medRxiv* on October 16,  
146 2021 using search provided in the Supplementary Methods. We updated PubMed, Embase, and  
147 Scopus searches on April 19, 2023. We included studies that: 1) collected human samples, 2)  
148 reported the number of suspected and confirmed cholera cases in the sampling frame, 3) used  
149 culture, PCR, and/or RDT to test suspected cases for cholera, and 4) had at least one  
150 suspected case sample collected on or after January 1, 2000 to reflect contemporary patterns in  
151 cholera positivity. We excluded studies that: 1) used a case definition not specific for suspected  
152 cholera (i.e., we accepted non-bloody watery diarrhea, acute watery diarrhea, or simply  
153 suspected cholera but not diarrhea, acute diarrhea, or acute gastroenteritis), 2) sampled only  
154 special populations (i.e., people living with HIV or cancer), 3) selected suspected cases based  
155 on epidemiological link to other cases or environmental sources, 4) tested fewer than 10  
156 suspected cases, 5) were reported in languages other than English, French, Spanish, and  
157 Chinese (languages our study team had proficiency in). We did not exclude studies based on  
158 study type or sampling method. Although we originally included pre-prints in our screening and  
159 extracted one pre-print, we excluded this study at the time of the updated search because the  
160 published version of the manuscript no longer included positivity data.

161 Titles, abstracts, and full texts were uploaded to Covidence, a web-based screening tool  
162 (<https://www.covidence.org/>), and were assessed independently by two of the reviewers (ASA,  
163 ECL, HX, KEW, KZ, MND) for inclusion. Conflicts were resolved either by a third reviewer or  
164 through consensus/discussion. Data were extracted from included studies in a shared

165 spreadsheet (Supplementary Data 1) by a single reviewer. The key extracted items included  
166 study timeframe and location, surveillance type (routine, outbreak, post-vaccination, or hybrid),  
167 case definition of suspected cholera (including age constraint and whether dehydrated or  
168 hospitalized, if provided), test method(s), sampling strategy for the test (all suspected cases,  
169 systematic or random sampling, convenience sampling, or unreported), number of tested and  
170 confirmed suspected cases, among other sample characteristics, if included. If only the  
171 proportion positive and total number tested were reported, the number of confirmed cholera  
172 cases was calculated by hand and rounded to the nearest whole number. If the surveillance  
173 contained multiple timeframes, tested samples with multiple tests, or reported stratified results,  
174 we extracted the data separately into different rows in the spreadsheet.

175 To identify overlapping samples, we manually reviewed all studies with overlapping  
176 timeframes by country. We excluded studies that had shorter timeframes, fewer suspected  
177 cases tested, less representative sampling methods, fewer confirmation tests, or reported  
178 positive results by two tests but did not disaggregate. Within studies, when suspected and  
179 confirmed cases were stratified multiple ways, we included the stratification by surveillance type  
180 if available, followed by age, antibiotic use, dehydration status, year, geography, or sex, in that  
181 order. When studies used multiple RDTs, we included results for Crystal VC (Arkray Healthcare  
182 Pvt. Ltd, Gujarat, India) and direct rapid tests (as opposed to rapid tests performed after an  
183 enrichment step) because these were the most common.

184 To identify any mistakes and ensure quality of the extracted data, we performed data  
185 quality checks using a series of automated functions in R to identify implausible values (e.g.,  
186 start date of study after end date, more cases positive than tested, lower age limit larger than  
187 upper age limit) and missing required data. If impossible or missing values were found, the  
188 entire extraction was double checked for accuracy and corrected by a single reviewer.

189 To assess whether different studies used methodologies that may have biased our  
190 results, we plotted cholera positivity in the raw data by 1) diagnostic test used, 2) sampling



191 method quality, and 3) suspected cholera case definition. In addition, we plotted the relationship  
192 between cholera positivity in the raw data and 1) estimated suspected cholera incidence [2], 2)  
193 the proportion of cases severely dehydrated, and 3) the proportion on antibiotics. We quantified  
194 the correlation between these variables using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient using the  
195 `spearman.ci` function of the `RVAideMemoire` package in R [20]. Since these continuous variables  
196 were only available in a subset of studies, we did not adjust for them in final analyses. All data  
197 visualization was conducted using the `ggplot2` package in R [21].

198 This study is reported as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and  
199 Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guideline (S1 Checklist). The review was not pre-registered, and a  
200 formal public protocol was not prepared, although all study methods can be found in the  
201 manuscript and supporting material.

202

## 203 Data analysis

### 204 *Estimating sensitivity and specificity of cholera confirmation tests*

205 We constructed a latent-class model to assess sensitivity and specificity of culture, PCR,  
206 and RDT, assuming none had perfect performance. We fit a hierarchical conditional  
207 dependence model, similar to that proposed by Wang *et al.*, which takes into account potential  
208 pairwise dependence between the tests that could occur if the tests have reduced performance  
209 for similar reasons [22]. We performed inference in a Bayesian framework using Just Another  
210 Gibbs Sampler (JAGS) through the `rjags` package in R [23,24]. We pooled estimates across four  
211 published studies that reported cholera confirmation results for all three test methods [16,25–  
212 27].

213 We used flat prior distributions on sensitivity and specificity of each test with a lower  
214 bound set based on plausible values from the literature [15,16,25–27] (Table S1). We assumed  
215 that culture had lower sensitivity than PCR and RDT because it depends on successful growth  
216 of viable *V. cholerae* in the laboratory. We assumed that RDT had lower specificity than culture

217 and PCR because it may have cross-reactivity with other antigens in the stool or defects that  
218 lead to false positive results. For each prior, we selected a wider range than had been reported  
219 in previous studies to allow for greater variation. We ran 4 chains of 100,000 iterations and  
220 assessed convergence through visual inspection of traceplots and with the Gelman-Rubin R-hat  
221 statistic.

222

### 223 *Estimating V. cholerae positivity and sources of heterogeneity*

224 We pooled estimates of *V. cholerae* positivity across all studies using a generalized  
225 linear model with a study level random intercept, which allowed us to adjust for sensitivity and  
226 specificity of the diagnostic tests as well as examine the contributions of study methodology  
227 (i.e., whether the study used low vs. high quality sampling, and whether or not the study set a  
228 minimum age in the suspected cholera case definition) and setting (whether surveillance was  
229 routine or post-vaccination vs. initiated in response to an outbreak) on variation in positivity. To  
230 estimate the proportion positive, overall and by strata, we marginalized over study-level random  
231 effects. See Supplementary Methods for the full statistical model. We performed inference in a  
232 Bayesian framework using CmdStanR version 0.5.2 as an interface to Stan for R [24,28]. We  
233 additionally performed a sensitivity analysis where we shifted the prior set on the global  
234 intercept (see Supplementary Methods). The odds of a suspected cholera case having a true *V.*  
235 *cholerae* infection given each covariate were calculated as odds ratios by taking the mean and  
236 95% credible interval of 8000 draws from the posterior distribution of each covariate's  
237 exponentiated coefficient. Odds ratios with 95% credible intervals that did not cross the value 1  
238 were considered statistically significant.

239 To estimate the proportion of the variance in positivity attributable to true differences  
240 between studies, beyond simple sampling error, we calculated the  $I^2$  statistic [29] as

241 
$$I^2 = \frac{\tau^2}{\tau^2 + v}$$

242 where  $\tau^2$  was between-study heterogeneity or the variance of the random effect by observation.

243 We calculated the within-study variance,  $v$ , [30] as:

$$v = \frac{(k - 1) \sum_1^i \omega_i}{(\sum_1^i \omega_i)^2 - \sum_1^i \omega_i^2}$$

244 where  $k$  was the number of studies or observations included in the meta-analysis, and  $\omega_i =$   
245  $1/v_i$  where  $v_i$  was the variance of the proportion positive by culture, PCR or RDT within each  
246 study/observation. When multiple tests were used in a study, we used the maximum variance  
247 estimate across the tests.

248

#### 249 *Data availability*

250 All extracted and model input data as well as analytical code are available at  
251 [https://github.com/HopkinsIDD/cholera\\_positivity](https://github.com/HopkinsIDD/cholera_positivity). This study was approved by the Johns  
252 Hopkins University Institutional Review Board and Temple University Institutional Review Board.

253

## 254 **Results**

### 255 Study characteristics

256 We identified 131 studies that met our inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Of these, 119 studies  
257 contained non-overlapping samples and were included in our analysis dataset [6,7,9,10,12–  
258 14,16,25–27,31–131] and 12 were excluded from analysis due to overlaps [8,11,132–141]  
259 (Figure 1). Of the 119 studies included in our analysis dataset, one reported data for more than  
260 one sampling method [7], one for both outbreak and non-outbreak surveillance [37], and one for  
261 outbreak and non-outbreak surveillance in six different countries [13]. We defined each of these  
262 as separate entries in the dataset for a total of 132 observations.

263 The non-overlapping observations in our analysis dataset came from 30 countries and  
264 were reported at different geographic levels, including the country level (n=16 observations) and  
265 first (n=25), second (n=66), and third administrative levels (n=25) (Figure S1). Twelve studies

266 reported data for multiple administrative units and three reported across multiple administrative  
267 divisions within a country; the numbers above reflect the largest administrative division reported  
268 per observation. Data were collected from 1992 through 2022 with most observations from  
269 studies that completed sampling during 2015—2022 (n=53 observations), followed by 2010—  
270 2014 (n=32), 2005—2009 (n=21), and 1997—2004 (n=17) (Figure S2). Nine studies were  
271 missing sampling end dates. Most studies were conducted in South Asia and West, Central, and  
272 East Africa, with additional studies from Haiti, Yemen, Iraq, Iran, Laos, Vietnam, Papua New  
273 Guinea, Algeria, and the Philippines (Figure S1).

274 Most of the observations were from surveillance studies (93/132, 70.5%), followed by  
275 diagnostic test accuracy studies (28/132, 21.2%) and vaccine effectiveness studies (10/132,  
276 7.6%) (Table 1). Twenty-eight percent (37/132) used high-quality sampling methods (i.e., tested  
277 all suspected cases, a random sample, or systematically selected every nth suspected case),  
278 while the remaining 72% (95/132) used convenience sampling or did not report the sampling  
279 approach (Table 1). Even though most studies did not include *V. cholerae* positivity  
280 disaggregated by individual-level characteristics, 24.2% (32/132) reported the proportion of  
281 suspected cases under age five, 8.3% (11/132) reported the proportion severely dehydrated,  
282 7.6% (10/132) reported the proportion on antibiotics, and one study reported all three (Table  
283 S2).

284

#### 285 *V. cholerae* positivity in unadjusted data

286 We found that reported *V. cholerae* positivity varied greatly across studies with an  
287 interquartile range (IQR) of 30% to 60% (N = 165 observations of positivity; 25 of the 131  
288 observations had positivity results for multiple tests) (Table 1). As expected, positivity varied by  
289 diagnostic test used with a median positivity of 36% by culture (IQR, 27% to 55%; N = 121),  
290 37% by PCR (IQR, 34% to 55%; N = 11), and 49% by RDT (IQR, 38% to 67%; N = 33), with  
291 substantial overlap between distributions (Figure 2A). Positivity was higher across studies that

292 used low quality or convenience sampling methods (median of 43%; N = 117; IQR, 33% to  
293 62%) compared to those that used high quality or representative sampling (median of 35%;  
294 IQR, 14% to 51%) (Figure 2B). Positivity increased with higher minimum ages in suspected  
295 cholera case definitions (Figure 2C), and we found a modest negative correlation between  
296 positivity and the proportion of suspected cases under five years old (Spearman  $r = -0.60$ ; 95%  
297 Confidence Interval (CI): -0.81, -0.32;  $p < 0.001$ ) (Figure S3A).

298 Unadjusted positivity was higher when surveillance was initiated in response to an  
299 outbreak (median of 47%; IQR, 33% to 66%; N = 80) compared to situations where surveillance  
300 was routine or post-vaccination (median of 35%; IQR 17% to 49%; N = 85) (Figure 2D). We  
301 found limited evidence for differences in positivity by the 2010-2016 estimated mean annual  
302 suspected case incidence rate in countries where these estimates were available (Figure S3B,  
303 [2]).

304 We found a modest positive correlation between positivity and the proportion of  
305 suspected cases severely dehydrated (Spearman  $r = 0.64$ ; 95% CI: 0.22, 0.90;  $p = 0.001$ )  
306 (Figure S3C). While not statistically significant, we found a weak negative correlation between  
307 positivity and the proportion of suspected cases that had received antibiotics prior to testing  
308 (Spearman  $r = -0.46$ ; 95% CI: -0.83, 0.09;  $p = 0.07$ ) (Figure S3D).

309

### 310 Adjusted underlying *V. cholerae* positivity

311 Since different imperfect diagnostic tests were used to confirm *V. cholerae* O1/O139, we  
312 adjusted positivity estimates from each study to account for test performance. To estimate the  
313 average performance of each type of diagnostic test, we pooled estimates of sensitivity and  
314 specificity across four studies that reported detailed results for all three tests (see Methods).  
315 This included data from Bangladesh [27], South Sudan [16], Kenya [25], and Zambia [26]. We  
316 estimated an average sensitivity of 82.0% (95% Credible Interval (CrI): 37.5, 98.7) and  
317 specificity of 94.3% (95% CrI: 81.5, 99.6) for culture, an average sensitivity of 85.1% (95% CrI:

318 53.6%, 98.9%) and specificity of 94.2 (95% CrI: 81.8, 99.7) for PCR, and an average sensitivity  
319 of 90.4% (95% CrI: 55.2, 99.5) and specificity of 88.9% (95% CrI: 54.9, 99.4) for RDT (Figure  
320 3A, Table S3).

321 After adjusting for diagnostic test performance, we estimated that 53% (95% CrI: 24%,  
322 80%) of suspected cases tested were true *V. cholerae* O1/O139 infections across all studies  
323 (Figure 3, Figure S4, Table S4). These estimates remained similar in sensitivity analysis with an  
324 alternative prior distribution (Table S4).

325 With additional adjustments for study methodology (i.e., sampling quality and whether an  
326 age minimum was set in suspected case definition), we estimated that *V. cholerae* positivity for  
327 studies with high quality sampling methods was 46% (95% CrI: 19%, 76%) when no age  
328 restriction was used and 68% (95% CrI: 33%, 98%) when a minimum age (typically 1 or 5 years  
329 old) was incorporated into the case definition (Figure 3, Table S4). After adjusting for sampling  
330 quality and whether or not surveillance was initiated in response to a cholera outbreak, we  
331 estimated that *V. cholerae* positivity for studies with high quality sampling methods was 42%  
332 (95% CrI: 12%, 77%) in non-outbreak settings and 78% (95% CrI: 40%, 99%) in outbreak  
333 settings (Figure 3, Table S4).

334 We found substantial heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = >99.99\%$  (95% CrI:  $>99.99\%$ ,  
335  $>99.99\%$ ;  $\tau^2 = 0.96$  (95% CrI: 0.94, 0.98)) (Figure 4). Adjusted underlying positivity rates  
336 ranged from 0.008% (95% CrI: 0.0004%, 0.04%) for a high-quality study conducted during  
337 routine surveillance in Bangladesh to 99.8% (95% CrI: 98.7%, 100.0%) for a 'low-quality' study  
338 conducted during a cholera outbreak in Uganda (Figure 4).

339

#### 340 Factors associated with variation in *V. cholerae* positivity

341 We then examined factors that could explain variation in *V. cholerae* positivity. After  
342 adjusting for test performance, sampling quality, and outbreak setting, we found that setting any

343 minimum age in the case definition (i.e., 1, 2, 5 or 10) was associated with 2.33 (95% CrI: 0.54,  
344 6.40) times higher odds of a suspected cholera case having a true infection (Table S5).

345 We estimated that the odds of a suspected cholera case having a true *V. cholerae*  
346 O1/O139 infection were 5.71 (95% CrI: 1.53, 15.43) times higher when surveillance was  
347 initiated in response to a cholera outbreak compared to non-outbreak surveillance, after  
348 adjusting for test performance, sampling quality, and case definition (Table S5).

349

## 350 Discussion

351 Here we estimated that on average half of medically attended suspected cholera cases  
352 represent true *V. cholerae* O1/O139 infections. We found that *V. cholerae* positivity was higher  
353 when a minimum age was set in case definitions and when surveillance was initiated in  
354 response to an outbreak. Additionally, we found substantial heterogeneity in *V. cholerae*  
355 positivity between studies, so that simply multiplying the number of suspected cholera case  
356 counts by this global proportion positive to estimate the true number of cases will not be  
357 appropriate in most settings. To our knowledge, this is the first study to systematically  
358 synthesize data globally to estimate overall *V. cholerae* positivity and examine factors that  
359 contribute to variation in positivity.

360 A remaining question is why only about half of medically attended suspected cholera  
361 cases represent true infections. It is possible that we overestimated test sensitivity and have not  
362 fully accounted for false negatives; unfortunately, this is difficult to evaluate without a gold  
363 standard diagnostic test. A portion of the remaining suspected cases could also be infections  
364 with other enteric pathogens, especially those with similar transmission modes as cholera that  
365 may have outbreaks or high levels of endemic transmission concurrently. For example, in Uvira,  
366 Democratic Republic of the Congo, 36% of suspected cholera cases were positive for  
367 Enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* and 28% for *Cryptosporidium* [10]. In rural Bangladesh, the  
368 majority of acute watery diarrhea in children under 18 months was attributable to rotavirus, while

369 older children were more often infected with *V. cholerae* [12]. In Haiti, 64% of acute watery  
370 diarrhea cases tested positive for *V. cholerae* O1, 4% for rotavirus, and <1% for Shigella and  
371 Salmonella, though rotavirus positivity was higher among children under five [11]. Thus, the  
372 relative contribution of non-cholera watery diarrhea varies with age distribution and other  
373 location-specific drivers of enteric infections.

374 One of the limitations of this study was that we could not account for all potential drivers  
375 of *V. cholerae* positivity, which contributed to the large heterogeneity we found between studies.  
376 In addition, *V. cholerae* positivity may be highest in the early stages of an outbreak [7,9,131],  
377 but we could not account for this given the temporal resolution of our dataset. However, a  
378 strength of our approach is that we pooled estimates from studies across diverse geographies,  
379 time periods, and epidemiological contexts. A further potential limitation is that, without a gold  
380 standard diagnostic test, sensitivity and specificity estimates may be biased if the tests are less  
381 sensitive and/or specific for shared reasons. The hierarchical conditional dependence model we  
382 used accounted for this pairwise dependence and increased uncertainty around our estimates  
383 accordingly. This approach also allowed us to pool test performance estimates across studies  
384 from four countries. Thus, to our knowledge, we adjusted our estimates for test sensitivity and  
385 specificity using the best generic estimates available. Still, we likely overestimated sensitivity of  
386 culture for settings where samples had to be sent to a reference lab. Variation in the timing of  
387 tests in relation to when sample was taken could mean that one sensitivity and specificity  
388 estimate per diagnostic method is not appropriate. For example, a recent study in Haiti found  
389 that stool culture had a sensitivity of 33% during the waning phase of the 2018-2019 cholera  
390 outbreak [142], which is much lower than previous estimates. Overall, we have high confidence  
391 in our average estimates of *V. cholerae* positivity, despite the difficulty of accurately estimating  
392 positivity in a new location/time/setting without confirmation tests.

393 These findings have several implications for cholera surveillance policy. The GTFCC  
394 defines suspected cholera in areas where an outbreak has not yet been reported as acute



395 watery diarrhea and severe dehydration or death in individuals two years and older [17]. Our  
396 finding that setting any minimum age increases specificity for identifying a true *V. cholerae*  
397 infection in suspected cases supports using an age restriction in this case definition. The  
398 February 2023 interim guidance from the GTFCC on cholera surveillance provides concrete  
399 recommendations for systematic and frequent testing of suspected cholera cases at the health  
400 facility or surveillance unit scale [17]. Our finding of high variability in positivity across settings  
401 and times lends support to these recommendations of systematically generating local data that  
402 can be used to scale suspected to true cholera. Our finding that high quality sampling also  
403 increases specificity for *V. cholerae* suggests that systematically selecting cases to test is  
404 important for accurately evaluating endemic cholera. Finally, that *V. cholerae* positivity was  
405 lower during non-outbreak surveillance suggests that systematic confirmation testing is  
406 additionally important for understanding cholera burden and epidemiology in endemic, non-  
407 outbreak settings where co-circulation of other enteric pathogens is common.

408         These estimates of *V. cholerae* positivity address one part of the challenge in  
409 establishing the true burden of cholera: cases that are overcounted due to non-specific  
410 suspected case definitions. A crucial next step will be to estimate missed cases due to care  
411 seeking and poor clinical surveillance. This could be done in part through systematically  
412 synthesizing data from studies of care seeking behavior for diarrheal symptoms (for example  
413 [143,144]), including where potential cholera cases seek care (e.g., at pharmacies, traditional  
414 healers, or hospitals). This could additionally be done through population representative surveys  
415 and active case finding, similar to studies conducted in Haiti [145] and Tanzania [146],  
416 respectively, which demonstrated higher mortality rates associated with cholera than had been  
417 reported through passive surveillance. Together, these studies will help to understand whether  
418 and to what degree missed cholera cases compensate for the biases described here in  
419 overcounting.

420           Ultimately, a better understanding of *V. cholerae* positivity will help us move towards  
421 estimates of true cholera incidence and mortality. Given the large heterogeneity between  
422 studies, it will be important to do this in a way that accounts for variation in *V. cholerae* positivity  
423 between sites. Moreover, the proportion of suspected cholera cases missed because of milder  
424 symptoms or barriers to healthcare seeking needs to be estimated and accounted for. Such  
425 estimates will provide crucial information to guide the allocation of limited resources such as  
426 vaccines in a way that most effectively supports cholera prevention and control.

427

#### 428 **Acknowledgments**

429 We thank Morgane Dominguez for feedback on this manuscript, Lori Rosman for assistance  
430 developing the literature search strategy, and Javier Perez-Saez for feedback on the analytical  
431 methods.

432

#### 433 **Funding**

434 This work was supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation [grant number  
435 OPP1171700] and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease [grant number  
436 AI135115-01A1].

437

#### 438 **Conflicts of Interest**

439 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

440

#### 441 **References**

- 442 1. Ali M, Nelson AR, Lopez AL, Sack DA. Updated global burden of cholera in endemic  
443 countries. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2015;9: e0003832.  
444 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0003832
- 445 2. Lessler J, Moore SM, Luquero FJ, McKay HS, Grais R, Henkens M, et al. Mapping the  
446 burden of cholera in sub-Saharan Africa and implications for control: an analysis of data

- 447 across geographical scales. *The Lancet*. 2018;391: 1908–1915. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
448 6736(17)33050-7
- 449 3. Azman AS, Lauer SA, Bhuiyan TR, Luquero FJ, Leung DT, Hegde ST, et al. *Vibrio*  
450 *cholerae* O1 transmission in Bangladesh: insights from a nationally representative  
451 serosurvey. *The Lancet Microbe*. 2020;1: e336–e343. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30141-  
452 5
- 453 4. Mosley WH, Benenson AS, Barui R. A serological survey for cholera antibodies in rural  
454 East Pakistan. *Bull World Health Organ*. 1968;38: 327–334.
- 455 5. Weil AA, Begum Y, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Leung DT, LaRocque RC, et al. Bacterial  
456 shedding in household contacts of cholera patients in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med*  
457 *Hyg*. 2014;91: 738–742. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.14-0095
- 458 6. Khan AI, Rashid MM, Islam MT, Afrad MH, Salimuzzaman M, Hegde ST, et al.  
459 Epidemiology of cholera in Bangladesh: findings from nationwide hospital-based  
460 surveillance, 2014–2018. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020;71: 1635–1642.  
461 doi:10.1093/cid/ciz1075
- 462 7. Camacho A, Bouhenia M, Alyusfi R, Alkohlani A, Najji MAM, Radiguès X de, et al. Cholera  
463 epidemic in Yemen, 2016–18: an analysis of surveillance data. *The Lancet Global Health*.  
464 2018;6: e680–e690. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30230-4
- 465 8. Sauvageot D, Njanpop-Lafourcade B-M, Akilimali L, Anne J-C, Bidjada P, Bompangue D,  
466 et al. Cholera incidence and mortality in sub-Saharan African sites during multi-country  
467 surveillance. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2016;10: e0004679.  
468 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004679
- 469 9. Jameel SK, Shafek MA, Abdulmohsen AM, Mohamed NS, Najji SR, Mohammed TT. The  
470 isolation of *Vibrio cholera* and other enteric bacteria with molecular characterization of  
471 *Vibrio cholera* during the outbreak of Baghdad/Iraq in 2015. *Advances in Microbiology*.  
472 2016;6: 699–715. doi:10.4236/aim.2016.69069
- 473 10. Williams C, Cumming O, Grignard L, Rumedeka BB, Saidi JM, Grint D, et al. Prevalence  
474 and diversity of enteric pathogens among cholera treatment centre patients with acute  
475 diarrhea in Uvira, Democratic Republic of Congo. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20: 741.  
476 doi:10.1186/s12879-020-05454-0
- 477 11. Steenland MW, Joseph GA, Lucien MAB, Freeman N, Hast M, Nygren BL, et al.  
478 Laboratory-confirmed cholera and rotavirus among patients with acute diarrhea in four  
479 hospitals in Haiti, 2012–2013. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2013;89: 641–646.  
480 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.13-0307
- 481 12. Siddique AK, Ahmed S, Iqbal A, Sobhan A, Poddar G, Azim T, et al. Epidemiology of  
482 rotavirus and cholera in children aged less than five years in rural Bangladesh. *J Health*  
483 *Popul Nutr*. 2011;29: 1–8. doi:10.3329/jhpn.v29i1.7560
- 484 13. Nadri J, Sauvageot D, Njanpop-Lafourcade B-M, Baltazar CS, Banla Kere A, Bwire G, et  
485 al. Sensitivity, specificity, and public-health utility of clinical case definitions based on the

- 486 signs and symptoms of cholera in Africa. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and*  
487 *Hygiene*. 2018;98: 1021–1030. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.16-0523
- 488 14. Lucien MAB, Schaad N, Steenland MW, Mintz ED, Emmanuel R, Freeman N, et al.  
489 Identifying the most sensitive and specific sign and symptom combinations for cholera:  
490 results from an analysis of laboratory-based surveillance data from Haiti, 2012–2013. *The*  
491 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2015;92: 758–764.  
492 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.14-0429
- 493 15. Muzembo BA, Kitahara K, Debnath A, Okamoto K, Miyoshi S-I. Accuracy of cholera rapid  
494 diagnostic tests: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Microbiology and*  
495 *Infection*. 2021;0. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.08.027
- 496 16. Ontweka LN, Deng LO, Rauzier J, Debes AK, Tadesse F, Parker LA, et al. Cholera rapid  
497 test with enrichment step has diagnostic performance equivalent to culture. *PLOS ONE*.  
498 2016;11: e0168257. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0168257
- 499 17. Global Task Force on Cholera Control (GTFCC) Surveillance Working Group. Public health  
500 surveillance for cholera interim guidance. 2023. Available: [https://www.gtfcc.org/wp-](https://www.gtfcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/gtfcc-public-health-surveillance-for-cholera-interim-guidance.pdf)  
501 [content/uploads/2023/02/gtfcc-public-health-surveillance-for-cholera-interim-guidance.pdf](https://www.gtfcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/gtfcc-public-health-surveillance-for-cholera-interim-guidance.pdf)
- 502 18. Global Task Force on Cholera Control. Identification of priority areas for multisectoral  
503 interventions (PAMIs) for cholera control. [cited 16 May 2023]. Available:  
504 [https://www.gtfcc.org/resources/identification-of-priority-areas-for-multisectoral-](https://www.gtfcc.org/resources/identification-of-priority-areas-for-multisectoral-interventions-pamis-for-cholera-control/)  
505 [interventions-pamis-for-cholera-control/](https://www.gtfcc.org/resources/identification-of-priority-areas-for-multisectoral-interventions-pamis-for-cholera-control/)
- 506 19. Weill F-X, Domman D, Njamkepo E, Tarr C, Rauzier J, Fawal N, et al. Genomic history of  
507 the seventh pandemic of cholera in Africa. *Science*. 2017;358: 785–789.  
508 doi:10.1126/science.aad5901
- 509 20. HERVE M. RVAideMemoire: testing and plotting procedures for biostatistics. 2023.  
510 Available: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/RVAideMemoire/index.html>
- 511 21. Wickham H, Chang W, Henry L, Pedersen TL, Takahashi K, Wilke C, et al. ggplot2: create  
512 elegant data visualisations using the grammar of graphics. 2023. Available: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/ggplot2/index.html)  
513 [project.org/web/packages/ggplot2/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/ggplot2/index.html)
- 514 22. Wang C, Lin X, Nelson KP. Bayesian hierarchical latent class models for estimating  
515 diagnostic accuracy. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2020;29: 1112–1128.  
516 doi:10.1177/0962280219852649
- 517 23. Plummer M, Stukalov A, Denwood M. rjags: Bayesian graphical models using MCMC.  
518 2022. Available: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rjags>
- 519 24. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
520 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. [http://wwwR-project.org/](http://www.R-project.org/). 2016 [cited 17 Aug 2022].  
521 Available: <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1574231874043578752>
- 522 25. Debes AK, Murt KN, Waswa E, Githinji G, Umuro M, Mbogori C, et al. Laboratory and field  
523 evaluation of the Crystal VC-O1 cholera rapid diagnostic test. *The American Journal of*  
524 *Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2021;104: 2017–2023. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-1280

- 525 26. Mwaba J, Ferreras E, Chizema-Kawesa E, Mwimbe D, Tafirenyika F, Rauzier J, et al.  
526 Evaluation of the SD bioline cholera rapid diagnostic test during the 2016 cholera outbreak  
527 in Lusaka, Zambia. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2018;23: 834–840.  
528 doi:10.1111/tmi.13084
- 529 27. Sayeed MA, Islam K, Hossain M, Akter NJ, Alam MN, Sultana N, et al. Development of a  
530 new dipstick (Cholkit) for rapid detection of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 in acute watery diarrheal  
531 stools. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018;12: e0006286.  
532 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006286
- 533 28. Gabry J, Češnovar R, Bales B, Morris M, Popov M, Lawrence M, et al. R interface to  
534 CmdStan. 2022 [cited 17 Aug 2022]. Available: <https://mc-stan.org/cmdstan/>
- 535 29. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*.  
536 2002;21: 1539–1558. doi:10.1002/sim.1186
- 537 30. Viechtbauer W. I2 for multilevel and multivariate models. 2022 [cited 26 Aug 2022].  
538 Available: [https://www.metafor-project.org/doku.php/tips:i2\\_multilevel\\_multivariate](https://www.metafor-project.org/doku.php/tips:i2_multilevel_multivariate)
- 539 31. Abdullahi KN, Mutindin D, Kabugi W, Mowlid S. Epidemiological description of a protracted  
540 cholera outbreak in Hagadera refugee camp and the surrounding host community within  
541 Fafi Sub County and Garissa County in Kenya during march-September 2019. *Epidemiol  
542 Open J*. 2019;4: 31–5.
- 543 32. Ahmed S, Afzal RK, Mian UA. A localized outbreak of cholera due to *Vibrio cholerae* O1,  
544 Ogawa resistant to tetracyclines. *PAFMJ*. 2015;65: 595–599.
- 545 33. Alajo SO, Nakavuma J, Erume J. Cholera in endemic districts in Uganda during El Niño  
546 rains: 2002-2003. *Afr Health Sci*. 2006;6: 93–7. doi:10.5555/afhs.2006.6.2.93
- 547 34. Alkassoum S, Djibo I, Amadou H, Bohari A, Issoufou H, Aka J, et al. The global burden of  
548 cholera outbreaks in Niger: an analysis of the national surveillance data, 2003–2015.  
549 *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2019;113: 273–280.
- 550 35. Amadu DO, Abdullahi IN, Seibu E, Fadeyi A, Kamaldeen K, Akanbi AA, et al.  
551 Retrospective analysis of the serovars and antibiogram of *Vibrio cholerae* isolates of the  
552 2017 Ilorin Cholera Outbreak, Nigeria. *Infect Chemother*. 2021;53: 368–373.  
553 doi:10.3947/ic.2021.0001
- 554 36. Anh DD, Lopez AL, Thiem VD, Grahek SL, Duong TN, Park JK, et al. Use of oral cholera  
555 vaccines in an outbreak in Vietnam: a case control study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2011;5:  
556 e1006. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001006
- 557 37. Baltazar CS, Langa JP, Baloi LD, Wood R, Ouedraogo I, Njanpop-Lafourcade B-M, et al.  
558 Multi-site cholera surveillance within the African Cholera Surveillance Network shows  
559 endemicity in Mozambique, 2011–2015. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2017;11:  
560 e0005941. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0005941
- 561 38. Bhattacharya MK, Dutta D, Ramamurthy T, Sarkar D, Singharoy A, Bhattacharya SK.  
562 Azithromycin in the treatment of cholera in children. *Acta Paediatr*. 2003;92: 676–8.

- 563 39. Bhuiyan NA, Qadri F, Faruque ASG, Malek MA, Salam MA, Nato F, et al. Use of dipsticks  
564 for rapid diagnosis of cholera caused by *Vibrio cholerae* O1 and O139 from rectal swabs. *J*  
565 *Clin Microbiol.* 2003;41: 3939–3941. doi:10.1128/JCM.41.8.3939-3941.2003
- 566 40. Bin-Hameed EA, Joban HA. Cholera outbreak in Hadhramout, Yemen: the epidemiological  
567 weeks 2019. *International Journal of Epidemiologic Research.* 2021;8: 40–46.
- 568 41. Brazilay E, Schaad N, Magloire R. Cholera surveillance during the Haiti epidemic-the first  
569 two years. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368: 599–609.
- 570 42. Bukar AM, Goni HB, Bwala AB, Kolo FB, Isa A, Ibrahim A, et al. Determination of cholera  
571 outbreak among internally displaced persons (IDPs) in complex emergency settings within  
572 Maiduguri, Borno State-Nigeria.
- 573 43. Bwire G, Malimbo M, Maskery B, Kim YE, Mogasale V, Levin A. The burden of cholera in  
574 Uganda. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7: e2545. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002545
- 575 44. Bwire G, Waniaye JB, Otim JS, Matsekete D, Kagirita A, Orach CG. Cholera risk in cities  
576 in Uganda: understanding cases and contacts centered strategy (3CS) for rapid cholera  
577 outbreak control. *Pan Afr Med J.* 2021;39: 193. doi:10.11604/pamj.2021.39.193.27794
- 578 45. Chibwe I, Kasambara W, Kagoli M, Milala H, Gondwe C, Azman AS. Field evaluation of  
579 Chokit rapid diagnostic test for *Vibrio cholerae* O1 during a cholera outbreak in Malawi,  
580 2018. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases.* 2020;7. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofaa493
- 581 46. Chirambo R, Mufunda J, Songolo P, Kachimba J, Vwalika B. Epidemiology of the 2016  
582 cholera outbreak of Chibombo district, central Zambia. *Medical Journal of Zambia.*  
583 2016;43: 61–63.
- 584 47. Chowdhury G, Senapati T, Das B, Kamath A, Pal D, Bose P, et al. Laboratory evaluation of  
585 the rapid diagnostic tests for the detection of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 using diarrheal samples.  
586 *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases.* 2021;15: e0009521.  
587 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009521
- 588 48. Das S, Gupta S. Diversity of *Vibrio cholerae* strains isolated in Delhi, India, during 1992-  
589 2000. *J Health Popul Nutr.* 2005;23: 44–51.
- 590 49. De Guzman A, de los Reyes VC, Sucaldito MN, Tayag E. Availability of safe drinking-  
591 water: the answer to cholera outbreak? Nabua, Camarines Sur, Philippines, 2012. *Western*  
592 *Pac Surveill Response J.* 2015;6: 12–6. doi:10.5365/wpsar.2015.6.1.005
- 593 50. Debes AK, Ateudjieu J, Guenou E, Ebile W, Sonkoua IT, Njimbina AC, et al. Clinical and  
594 environmental surveillance for *Vibrio cholerae* in resource constrained areas: application  
595 during a 1-year surveillance in the Far North Region of Cameroon. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*  
596 2016;94: 537–543. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.15-0496
- 597 51. Dengo-Baloi LC, Semá-Baltazar CA, Manhique LV, Chitio JE, Inguane DL, Langa JP.  
598 Antibiotics resistance in El Tor *Vibrio cholerae* O1 isolated during cholera outbreaks in  
599 Mozambique from 2012 to 2015. *PLOS ONE.* 2017;12: e0181496.  
600 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0181496

- 601 52. Djomassi L, Gessner B, Andze G, Mballa G. Cholera epidemiology in Cameroon based on  
602 national surveillance data. *J Infect Dis*. 2013;208: S92–S97.
- 603 53. Dutta BP, Kumar N, Meshram KC, Yadav R, Sodha SV, Gupta S. Cholera outbreak  
604 associated with contaminated water sources in paddy fields, Mandla District, Madhya  
605 Pradesh, India. *Indian J Public Health*. 2021;65: S46-s50. doi:10.4103/ijph.IJPH\_1118\_20
- 606 54. Dzotsi EK, Dongdem AZ, Boateng G, Antwi L, Owusu-Okyere G, Nartey DB, et al.  
607 Surveillance of bacterial pathogens of diarrhoea in two selected sub metros within the  
608 Accra metropolis. *Ghana Med J*. 2015;49: 65–71. doi:10.4314/gmj.v49i2.1
- 609 55. Eurien D, Mirembe BB, Musewa A, Kisaakye E, Kwesiga B, Ogole F, et al. Cholera  
610 Outbreak Caused by Drinking Unprotected Well Water Contaminated with Feces from an  
611 Open Storm Water Drainage—Kampala City, Uganda, January 2019. 2020.
- 612 56. Fouda AAB, Kollo B. Epidémie de choléra à Douala en 2011 épidémiologie, clinique et  
613 bactériologie Cholera outbreak in Douala in 2011 epidemiology, clinic and bacteriology.
- 614 57. Franke MF, Jerome JG, Matias WR, Ternier R, Hilaire IJ, Harris JB, et al. Comparison of  
615 two control groups for estimation of oral cholera vaccine effectiveness using a case-control  
616 study design. *Vaccine*. 2017;35: 5819–5827. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.09.025
- 617 58. Fredrick T, Ponnaiah M, Murhekar MV, Jayaraman Y, David JK, Vadivoo S, et al. Cholera  
618 outbreak linked with lack of safe water supply following a tropical cyclone in Pondicherry,  
619 India, 2012. *J Health Popul Nutr*. 2015;33: 31–8.
- 620 59. George CM, Rashid MU, Sack DA, Bradley Sack R, Saif-Ur-Rahman KM, Azman AS, et al.  
621 Evaluation of enrichment method for the detection of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 using a rapid  
622 dipstick test in Bangladesh. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2014;19: 301–307.  
623 doi:10.1111/tmi.12252
- 624 60. Grandesso F, Kasambara W, Page AL, Debes AK, M'Bang'ombe M, Palomares A, et al.  
625 Effectiveness of oral cholera vaccine in preventing cholera among fishermen in Lake  
626 Chilwa, Malawi: a case-control study. *Vaccine*. 2019;37: 3668–3676.  
627 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.05.044
- 628 61. Guévert E, Noeske J, Sollé J, Mouangue A, Bikoti JM. Large-scale selective antibiotic  
629 prophylaxis during the 2004 cholera outbreak in Douala (Cameroon). *Sante*. 2007;17: 63–  
630 8.
- 631 62. Gupta PK, Pant ND, Bhandari R, Shrestha P. Cholera outbreak caused by drug resistant  
632 *Vibrio cholerae* serogroup O1 biotype EITor serotype Ogawa in Nepal; a cross-sectional  
633 study. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2016;5: 23. doi:10.1186/s13756-016-0122-7
- 634 63. Gupta S, Jhamb U, Uppal B, Chakraverti A, Mittal SK. Diagnosing cholera in the young: a  
635 review of W.H.O. criteria. *JK Science*. 2007;9: 137–139.
- 636 64. Haque F. Cholera outbreak in Netrokona Municipality, 2013. *Health Science Bulletin*.  
637 2014;12.

- 638 65. Haque F, Hossain MJ, Kundu SK, Naser AM, Rahman M, Luby SP. Cholera outbreaks in  
639 Urban Bangladesh in 2011. *Epidemiology (Sunnyvale)*. 2013;3. doi:10.4172/2161-  
640 1165.1000126
- 641 66. Harris JR, Cavallaro EC, De Nóbrega AA, Dos S. Barrado JC, Bopp C, Parsons MB, et al.  
642 Field evaluation of Crystal VC® Rapid Dipstick test for cholera during a cholera outbreak in  
643 Guinea-Bissau. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2009;14: 1117–1121.
- 644 67. Im J, Islam MT, Ahmmed F, Kim DR, Chon Y, Zaman K, et al. Use of oral cholera vaccine  
645 as a vaccine probe to determine the burden of culture-negative cholera. *PLOS Neglected*  
646 *Tropical Diseases*. 2019;13: e0007179. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007179
- 647 68. Ingelbeen B, Hendrickx D, Miwanda B, van der Sande MAB, Mossoko M, Vochten H, et al.  
648 Recurrent cholera outbreaks, Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2008-2017. *Emerg Infect*  
649 *Dis*. 2019;25: 856–864. doi:10.3201/eid2505.181141
- 650 69. Islam MT, Khan AI, Sayeed MA, Amin J, Islam K, Alam N, et al. Field evaluation of a  
651 locally produced rapid diagnostic test for early detection of cholera in Bangladesh. *PLOS*  
652 *Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2019;13: e0007124. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007124
- 653 70. Issahaku GR, Asiedu-Bekoe F, Kwashie S, Broni F, Boateng P, Alomatu H, et al.  
654 Protracted cholera outbreak in the Central Region, Ghana, 2016. *Ghana Med J*. 2020;54:  
655 45–52. doi:10.4314/gmj.v54i2s.8
- 656 71. Jain A, Choudhary S, Saroha E, Bhatnagar P, Harvey P. Cholera outbreak in an informal  
657 settlement at Shahpur huts, Panchkula District, Haryana State, India, 2019. *Indian J Public*  
658 *Health*. 2021;65: S51-s54. doi:10.4103/ijph.IJPH\_970\_20
- 659 72. Jeandron A, Cumming O, Rumedeka BB, Saidi JM, Cousens S. Confirmation of cholera by  
660 rapid diagnostic test amongst patients admitted to the cholera treatment centre in Uvira,  
661 Democratic Republic of the Congo. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13: e0201306.  
662 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0201306
- 663 73. Jones FK, Wamala JF, Rumunu J, Mawien PN, Kol MT, Wohl S, et al. Successive  
664 epidemic waves of cholera in South Sudan between 2014 and 2017: a descriptive  
665 epidemiological study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2020;4: e577–e587.  
666 doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30255-2
- 667 74. Khatib A, Ali M, von Seidlein L, Kim D, Hashim R, Reyburn R. Direct and indirect  
668 effectiveness of an oral cholera vaccine in Zanzibar, East Africa: findings from a large  
669 mass vaccination campaign followed by an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*.  
670 2012;12: 837–44.
- 671 75. Khazaei HA, Rezaei N, Bagheri GR, Moin AA. A six-year study on *Vibrio cholerae* in  
672 southeastern Iran. *Jpn J Infect Dis*. 2005;58: 8–10.
- 673 76. Kisera N, Luxemburger C, Tornieporth N, Otieno G, Inda J. A descriptive cross-sectional  
674 study of cholera at Kakuma and Kalobeyei refugee camps, Kenya in 2018. *Pan Afr Med J*.  
675 2020;37: 197. doi:10.11604/pamj.2020.37.197.24798



- 676 77. Koley H, Ray N, Chowdhury G, Barman S, Mitra S, Ramamurthy T, et al. Outbreak of  
677 cholera caused by *Vibrio cholerae* O1 El Tor variant strain in Bihar, India. *Jpn J Infect Dis.*  
678 2014;67: 221–6. doi:10.7883/yoken.67.221
- 679 78. Kulkarni S, Chillarge C. Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of *Vibrio cholerae* causing  
680 diarrhoea outbreaks in Bidar, North Karnataka, India. *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci.* 2015;4:  
681 957–961.
- 682 79. Kuttiat VS, Lodha R, Das B, Kohli U. Prevalence of cholera in pediatric patients with acute  
683 dehydrating diarrhea. *Indian J Pediatr.* 2010;77: 67–71. doi:10.1007/s12098-010-0009-1
- 684 80. Kwesiga B, Pande G, Ario AR, Tumwesigye NM, Matovu JK, Zhu B-P. A prolonged,  
685 community-wide cholera outbreak associated with drinking water contaminated by sewage  
686 in Kasese District, western Uganda. *BMC Public Health.* 2018;18: 1–8.
- 687 81. Landoh DE, Gessner BD, Badziklou K, Tamekloe T, Nassoury DI, Dagnra A, et al. National  
688 surveillance data on the epidemiology of cholera in Togo. *J Infect Dis.* 2013;208 Suppl 1:  
689 S115-9. doi:10.1093/infdis/jit244
- 690 82. Lenglet A, Khamphongphane B, Thebvongsa P, Vongprachanh P, Sithivong N,  
691 Chantavisouk C, et al. A cholera epidemic in Sekong Province, Lao People's Democratic  
692 Republic, December 2007-January 2008. *Jpn J Infect Dis.* 2010;63: 204–7.
- 693 83. Ley B, Khatib AM, Thriemer K, von Seidlein L, Deen J, Mukhopadyay A, et al. Evaluation  
694 of a rapid dipstick (Crystal VC) for the diagnosis of cholera in Zanzibar and a comparison  
695 with previous studies. *PLoS One.* 2012;7: e36930. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036930
- 696 84. Llanes R, Lazo A, Somarriba L, Mas P. Sentinel surveillance detects low circulation of  
697 *Vibrio cholerae* serotype Inaba in Haiti, 2011-2012. *MEDICC Rev.* 2015;17: 43–6.  
698 doi:10.37757/mr2015.V17.N3.9
- 699 85. Luquero FJ, Grout L, Ciglenecki I, Sakoba K, Traore B, Heile M, et al. Use of *Vibrio*  
700 *cholerae* vaccine in an outbreak in Guinea. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;370: 2111–20.  
701 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1312680
- 702 86. Mahamud AS, Ahmed JA, Nyoka R, Auko E, Kahi V, Ndirangu J, et al. Epidemic cholera in  
703 Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya, 2009: the importance of sanitation and soap. *J Infect Dev*  
704 *Ctries.* 2012;6: 234–41. doi:10.3855/jidc.1966
- 705 87. Matias WR, Cademil A, Julceus FE, Mayo-Smith LM, Franke MF, Harris JB, et al.  
706 Laboratory evaluation of immunochromatographic rapid diagnostic tests for cholera in  
707 Haiti. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.* 2015;93: 569–569.
- 708 88. Mbala-Kingebeni P, Vogt F, Miwanda B, Sundika T, Mbula N, Pankwa I, et al. Sachet  
709 water consumption as a risk factor for cholera in urban settings: findings and implications  
710 from a case control study in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo during the 2017-  
711 2018 outbreak. 2020.
- 712 89. Michel E, Gaudart J, Beaulieu S, Bulit G, Piarroux M, Boncy J, et al. Estimating  
713 effectiveness of case-area targeted response interventions against cholera in Haiti. *Elife.*  
714 2019;8. doi:10.7554/eLife.50243

- 715 90. Mishra A, Taneja N, Sharma M. Environmental and epidemiological surveillance of *Vibrio*  
716 *cholerae* in a cholera-endemic region in India with freshwater environs. *Journal of Applied*  
717 *Microbiology*. 2012;112: 225–237.
- 718 91. Monje F, Ario AR, Musewa A, Bainomugisha K, Mirembe BB, Aliddeki DM, et al. A  
719 prolonged cholera outbreak caused by drinking contaminated stream water, Kyangwali  
720 refugee settlement, Hoima District, Western Uganda: 2018. *Infect Dis Poverty*. 2020;9:  
721 154. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-00761-9
- 722 92. Mugoya I, Kariuki S, Galgalo T, Njuguna C, Omollo J, Njoroge J, et al. Rapid spread of  
723 *Vibrio cholerae* O1 throughout Kenya, 2005. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2008;78: 527–33.
- 724 93. Mukherjee P, Ghosh S, Ramamurthy T, Bhattacharya MK, Nandy RK, Takeda Y, et al.  
725 Evaluation of a rapid immunochromatographic dipstick kit for diagnosis of cholera  
726 emphasizes its outbreak utility. *Jpn J Infect Dis*. 2010;63: 234–8.
- 727 94. Mwenda V, Niyomwungere A, Oyugi E, Githuku J, Obonyo M, Gura Z. Factors associated  
728 with cholera outbreaks, Nairobi County, July 2017: a case control study. *bioRxiv*. 2019;  
729 719641.
- 730 95. Ndugwa Kabwama S, Rioplexus Ario A, Guwatudde D. Cholera outbreak caused by drinking  
731 lakeshore water contaminated by feces washed down from a hill-side residential area:  
732 Kaiso Village, Uganda. *Pan Afr med J-Conference Proceedings*. 2017.
- 733 96. Noora CL, Issah K, Kenu E, Bachan EG, Nuoh RD, Nyarko KM, et al. Large cholera  
734 outbreak in Brong Ahafo Region, Ghana. *BMC Res Notes*. 2017;10: 389.  
735 doi:10.1186/s13104-017-2728-0
- 736 97. Nsubuga F, Garang SC, Tut M, Oguttu D, Lubajo R, Lodiongo D, et al. Epidemiological  
737 description of a protracted cholera outbreak in Tonj East and Tonj North counties, former  
738 Warrap State, South Sudan, May-Oct 2017. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2019;19: 4.  
739 doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3640-5
- 740 98. Okello PE, Bulage L, Rioplexus AA, Kadobera D, Kwesiga B, Kajumbula H, et al. A cholera  
741 outbreak caused by drinking contaminated river water, Bulambuli District, Eastern Uganda,  
742 March 2016. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2019;19: 516. doi:10.1186/s12879-019-4036-x
- 743 99. Page AL, Alberti KP, Mondonge V, Rauzier J, Quilici ML, Guerin PJ. Evaluation of a rapid  
744 test for the diagnosis of cholera in the absence of a gold standard. *PLoS One*. 2012;7:  
745 e37360. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037360
- 746 100. Pal BB, Khuntia HK, Samal SK, Kerketta AS, Kar SK, Karmakar M, et al. Large outbreak of  
747 cholera caused by El Tor variant *Vibrio cholerae* O1 in the eastern coast of Odisha, India  
748 during 2009. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2013;141: 2560–7. doi:10.1017/s0950268813000368
- 749 101. Pal BB, Khuntia HK, Samal SK, Das SS, Chhotray GP. Emergence of *Vibrio cholerae* O1  
750 biotype E1 Tor serotype Inaba causing outbreaks of cholera in Orissa, India. *Japanese*  
751 *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2006;59: 266.
- 752 102. Pande G, Kwesiga B, Bwire G, Kalyebi P, Rioplexus A, Matovu JKB, et al. Cholera outbreak  
753 caused by drinking contaminated water from a lakeshore water-collection site, Kasese

- 754 District, south-western Uganda, June-July 2015. PLoS One. 2018;13: e0198431.  
755 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0198431
- 756 103. Phukan AC, Borah PK, Biswas D, Mahanta J. A cholera epidemic in a rural area of  
757 northeast India. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2004;98: 563–6.  
758 doi:10.1016/j.trstmh.2004.01.002
- 759 104. Ramazanzadeh R, Rouhi S, Shakib P, Shahbazi B, Bidarpour F, Karimi M. Molecular  
760 characterization of *Vibrio cholerae* isolated from clinical samples in Kurdistan Province,  
761 Iran. *Jundishapur J Microbiol.* 2015;8: e18119. doi:10.5812/jjm.8(5)2015.18119
- 762 105. Rosewell A, Addy B, Komnapi L, Makanda F, Ropa B, Posanai E, et al. Cholera risk  
763 factors, Papua New Guinea, 2010. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2012;12: 287. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-  
764 12-287
- 765 106. Roskosky M, Acharya B, Shakya G, Karki K, Sekine K, Bajracharya D, et al. Feasibility of a  
766 comprehensive targeted cholera intervention in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. *Am J Trop  
767 Med Hyg.* 2019;100: 1088–1097. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.18-0863
- 768 107. Roy S, Parande MV, Mantur BG, Bhat S, Shinde R, Parande AM, et al. Multidrug-resistant  
769 *Vibrio cholerae* O1 in Belgaum, south India. *J Med Microbiol.* 2012;61: 1574–1579.  
770 doi:10.1099/jmm.0.049692-0
- 771 108. Sack RB, Siddique AK, Longini IM Jr, Nizam A, Yunus M, Islam MS, et al. A 4-year study  
772 of the epidemiology of *Vibrio cholerae* in four rural areas of Bangladesh. *J Infect Dis.*  
773 2003;187: 96–101. doi:10.1086/345865
- 774 109. Saha R, Das S, Waghmare M, Ramachandran VG. Paradoxical reduction in prevalence of  
775 *vibrio cholerae* in its niche environment. *International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences.*  
776 2013;4: B1099–B1107.
- 777 110. Sévère K, Rouzier V, Anglade SB, Bertil C, Joseph P, Deroncelay A, et al. Effectiveness of  
778 oral cholera vaccine in Haiti: 37-month follow-up. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2016;94: 1136–42.  
779 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.15-0700
- 780 111. Shah WA, Shahina M, Ali N. First report of *Vibrio cholerae* infection from Andaman and  
781 Nicobar, India. *J Commun Dis.* 2002;34: 270–5.
- 782 112. Sharma A, Dutta BS, Rasul ES, Barkataki D, Saikia A, Hazarika NK. Prevalence of *Vibrio*  
783 *cholerae* O1 serogroup in Assam, India: A hospital-based study. *Indian J Med Res.*  
784 2017;146: 401–408. doi:10.4103/ijmr.IJMR\_631\_15
- 785 113. Shikanga OT, Mutonga D, Abade M, Amwayi S, Ope M, Limo H, et al. High mortality in a  
786 cholera outbreak in western Kenya after post-election violence in 2008. *Am J Trop Med  
787 Hyg.* 2009;81: 1085–90. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2009.09-0400
- 788 114. Siddiqui FJ, Bhutto NS, von Seidlein L, Khurram I, Rasool S, Ali M, et al. Consecutive  
789 outbreaks of *Vibrio cholerae* O139 and *V. cholerae* O1 cholera in a fishing village near  
790 Karachi, Pakistan. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2006;100: 476–82.  
791 doi:10.1016/j.trstmh.2005.07.019

- 792 115. Sinha A, Sengupta S, Ghosh S, Basu S, Sur D, Kanungo S, et al. Evaluation of a rapid  
793 dipstick test for identifying cholera cases during the outbreak. *Indian J Med Res.* 2012;135:  
794 523–8.
- 795 116. Sreedhara H, Mohan N. Molecular epidemiology of vibrio cholerae causing outbreaks and  
796 sporadic cholera in and around Hassan district and its antibiotic susceptibility pattern. *IP Int*  
797 *J Med Microbiol Trop Dis.* 2019;5: 41–46.
- 798 117. Sugunan AP, Ghosh AR, Roy S, Gupte MD, Sehgal SC. A cholera epidemic among the  
799 Nicobarese tribe of Nancowry, Andaman, and Nicobar, India. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*  
800 2004;71: 822–7.
- 801 118. Sur D, Deen JL, Manna B, Niyogi SK, Deb AK, Kanungo S, et al. The burden of cholera in  
802 the slums of Kolkata, India: data from a prospective, community based study. *Arch Dis*  
803 *Child.* 2005;90: 1175–81. doi:10.1136/adc.2004.071316
- 804 119. Sur D, Sarkar BL, Manna B, Deen J, Datta S, Niyogi SK, et al. Epidemiological,  
805 microbiological & electron microscopic study of a cholera outbreak in a Kolkata slum  
806 community. *Indian J Med Res.* 2006;123: 31–6.
- 807 120. Tamang M, Sharma N, Makaju R, Sarma A, Koju R, Nepali N, et al. An outbreak of El Tor  
808 cholera in Kavre district. *Nepal KUMJ.* 2005;3: 138–142.
- 809 121. Taneja N, Kaur J, Sharma K, Singh M, Kalra JK, Sharma NM, et al. A recent outbreak of  
810 cholera due to *Vibrio cholerae* O1 Ogawa in & around Chandigarh, North India. *Indian J*  
811 *Med Res.* 2003;117: 243–6.
- 812 122. Thiem VD, Deen JL, von Seidlein L, Canh DG, Anh DD, Park JK, et al. Long-term  
813 effectiveness against cholera of oral killed whole-cell vaccine produced in Vietnam.  
814 *Vaccine.* 2006;24: 4297–303. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2006.03.008
- 815 123. Torane V, Kuyare S, Nataraj G, Mehta P, Dutta S, Sarkar B. Phenotypic and antibiogram  
816 pattern of *V. cholerae* isolates from a tertiary care hospital in Mumbai during 2004-2013: a  
817 retrospective cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6: e012638. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-  
818 2016-012638
- 819 124. Tripurari K, Deepak B, Kaur TA, Pushpa VV, Aakash S, Prakash NJ, et al. *Vibrio cholerae*  
820 outbreak in Batala town, Punjab, India 2012. *Journal of Communicable Diseases.* 2017;49:  
821 35–40. doi:10.24321/0019.5138.201705
- 822 125. Uthappa CK, Allam RR, Nalini C, Gunti D, Udaragudi PR, Tadi GP, et al. An outbreak of  
823 cholera in Medipally village, Andhra Pradesh, India, 2013. *J Health Popul Nutr.* 2015;33: 7.  
824 doi:10.1186/s41043-015-0021-1
- 825 126. Von Nguyen D, Sreenivasan N, Lam E, Ayers T, Kargbo D, Dafaie F, et al. Cholera  
826 epidemic associated with consumption of unsafe drinking water and street-vended water-  
827 Eastern Freetown, Sierra Leone, 2012. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and*  
828 *Hygiene.* 2014;90: 518–523. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.13-0567

- 829 127. Wang XY, Ansaruzzaman M, Vaz R, Mondlane C, Lucas ME, von Seidlein L, et al. Field  
830 evaluation of a rapid immunochromatographic dipstick test for the diagnosis of cholera in a  
831 high-risk population. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2006;6: 17. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-6-17
- 832 128. Wierzba TF, Kar SK, Mogasale VV, Kerketta AS, You YA, Baral P, et al. Effectiveness of  
833 an oral cholera vaccine campaign to prevent clinically-significant cholera in Odisha State,  
834 India. *Vaccine.* 2015;33: 2463–2469. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.03.073
- 835 129. Zachariah R, Harries AD, Arendt V, Nchingula D, Chimtulo F, Courteille O, et al.  
836 Characteristics of a cholera outbreak, patterns of *Vibrio cholerae* and antibiotic  
837 susceptibility testing in rural Malawi. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2002;96: 39–40.  
838 doi:10.1016/s0035-9203(02)90233-6
- 839 130. Zereen F, Akter S, Sobur MA, Hossain MT, Rahman MT. Molecular detection of *Vibrio*  
840 *cholerae* from human stool collected from SK Hospital, Mymensingh, and their  
841 antibiogram. *J Adv Vet Anim Res.* 2019;6: 451–455. doi:10.5455/javar.2019.f367
- 842 131. Zgheir SM, Mustafa NM, Ali AA, Al-Diwan J. Cholera outbreak in Iraq, 2017. *Ind Jour of*  
843 *Publ Health Rese & Develop.* 2019;10: 686. doi:10.5958/0976-5506.2019.01654.1
- 844 132. Azman AS, Parker LA, Rumunu J, Tadesse F, Grandesso F, Deng LL, et al. Effectiveness  
845 of one dose of oral cholera vaccine in response to an outbreak: a case-cohort study. *The*  
846 *Lancet Global Health.* 2016;4: e856–e863. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30211-X
- 847 133. Blake A, Keita VS, Sauvageot D, Saliou M, Njanpop BM, Sory F, et al. Temporo-spatial  
848 dynamics and behavioural patterns of 2012 cholera epidemic in the African mega-city of  
849 Conakry, Guinea. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty.* 2018;7: 13. doi:10.1186/s40249-018-  
850 0393-8
- 851 134. Boncy J, Rossignol E, Dahourou G, Hast M, Buteau J, Stanislas M, et al. Performance and  
852 utility of a rapid diagnostic test for cholera: notes from Haiti. *Diagnostic Microbiology and*  
853 *Infectious Disease.* 2013;76: 521–523. doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2013.03.010
- 854 135. Bwire G, Orach CG, Abdallah D, Debes AK, Kagirita A, Ram M, et al. Alkaline peptone  
855 water enrichment with a dipstick test to quickly detect and monitor cholera outbreaks. *BMC*  
856 *Infectious Diseases.* 2017;17: 726. doi:10.1186/s12879-017-2824-8
- 857 136. Ferreras E, Blake A, Chewe O, Mwaba J, Zulu G, Poncin M, et al. Alternative observational  
858 designs to estimate the effectiveness of one dose of oral cholera vaccine in Lusaka,  
859 Zambia. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2020;148: e78. doi:10.1017/S095026882000062X
- 860 137. Franke MF, Ternier R, Jerome JG, Matias WR, Harris JB, Ivers LC. Long-term  
861 effectiveness of one and two doses of a killed, bivalent, whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in  
862 Haiti: an extended case-control study. *The Lancet Global Health.* 2018;6: e1028–e1035.  
863 doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30284-5
- 864 138. George CM, Monira S, Sack DA, Rashid M, Saif-Ur-Rahman KM, Mahmud T, et al.  
865 Randomized controlled trial of hospital-based hygiene and water treatment intervention  
866 (CHoBI7) to reduce cholera. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2016;22: 233–241.  
867 doi:10.3201/eid2202.151175

- 868 139. Ivers LC, Hilaire IJ, Teng JE, Almazor CP, Jerome JG, Ternier R, et al. Effectiveness of  
869 reactive oral cholera vaccination in rural Haiti: a case-control study and bias-indicator  
870 analysis. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2015;3: e162–e168. doi:10.1016/S2214-  
871 109X(14)70368-7
- 872 140. Lucas MES, Deen JL, von Seidlein L, Wang X-Y, Ampuero J, Puri M, et al. Effectiveness of  
873 mass oral cholera vaccination in Beira, Mozambique. *New England Journal of Medicine*.  
874 2005;352: 757–767. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa043323
- 875 141. Roy S, Dutta B, Ghosh AR, Sugunan AP, Nandy RK, Bhattacharya SK, et al. Molecular  
876 tracking of the lineage of strains of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 biotype El Tor associated with a  
877 cholera outbreak in Andaman and Nicobar Islands, India. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2005;10:  
878 604–611. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2005.01423.x
- 879 142. Guillaume Y, Debela M, Slater D, Vissieres K, Ternier R, Franke M, et al. Poor sensitivity  
880 of stool culture compared to PCR in surveillance for *V. cholerae* in Haiti, 2018-2019. *Open*  
881 *Forum Infectious Diseases*. 2023; ofad301. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofad301
- 882 143. Chowdhury F, Khan IA, Patel S, Siddiq AU, Saha NC, Khan AI, et al. Diarrheal illness and  
883 healthcare seeking behavior among a population at high risk for diarrhea in Dhaka,  
884 Bangladesh. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10: e0130105. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0130105
- 885 144. Fissehaye T, Damte A, Fantahun A, Gebrekirstos K. Health care seeking behaviour of  
886 mothers towards diarrheal disease of children less than 5 years in Mekelle city, North  
887 Ethiopia. *BMC Res Notes*. 2018;11: 749. doi:10.1186/s13104-018-3850-3
- 888 145. Luquero FJ, Rondy M, Boncy J, Munger A, Mekaoui H, Rymshaw E, et al. Mortality rates  
889 during cholera epidemic, Haiti, 2010–2011. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2016;22.  
890 doi:10.3201/eid2203.141970
- 891 146. McCrickard LS, Massay AE, Narra R, Mghamba J, Mohamed AA, Kishimba RS, et al.  
892 Cholera mortality during urban epidemic, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, August 16, 2015–  
893 January 16, 2016. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2017;23. doi:10.3201/eid2313.170529
- 894 147. Watts V. Confidence intervals for a population proportion. 2022 [cited 10 Jul 2023].  
895 Available: [https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/introstats/chapter/7-4-confidence-  
896 intervals-for-a-population-proportion/](https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/introstats/chapter/7-4-confidence-intervals-for-a-population-proportion/)

897

## 898 **Tables**

### 899 **Table 1. Study characteristics**

900 Number of observations included in the dataset with each study characteristic.

Category	Characteristic	Number of observations	Percent of observations
----------	----------------	---------------------------	----------------------------

		(n = 132)	
Study design	Surveillance	93	70.5
	Diagnostic test accuracy	28	21.2
	Vaccine effectiveness	10	7.6
	Randomized control trial	1	0.8
Sampling method quality	High	37	28.0
	Low	95	72.0
Percent of suspected cases tested	0-4	12	9.1
	5-49	32	24.2
	50-95	27	20.5
	≥95	30	22.7
	Not reported	31	23.5
Number of tests used (of culture, PCR, and/or RDT)*	1	106	80.3
	2	19	14.4
	≥3	7	5.3
Number of suspected cases tested	1-9 <sup>†</sup>	1	0.8
	10-99	37	28.0
	100-999	55	41.7
	≥1000	39	29.5

901 <sup>†</sup>One multi-country surveillance study overall tested ≥10 suspected cholera cases for

902 *V. cholerae* O1/O139 but reported fewer than 10 tested in one country.

903 \*PCR = Polymerase Chain Reaction; RDT = Rapid Diagnostic Test

904

905 **Figure legends**

906 **Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram**

907 Diagram illustrating literature selection process, including databases searched, literature  
908 screened, and full texts reviewed for eligibility. Reasons for exclusion are indicated along with  
909 the number of studies that fell within each category.

910

911 **Figure 2. *Vibrio cholerae* positivity by study methodology and outbreak context**

912 Proportion of suspected cholera cases that were confirmed positive by **A)** diagnostic test type,  
913 **B)** quality of sampling methods, where "high" includes all suspected cases or a random or  
914 stratified sample and "low" includes convenience or unreported sampling methods, **C)** age  
915 minimum in suspected case definition, where "0" indicates that no minimum age was set, and **D)**  
916 whether surveillance was initiated in response to an outbreak or whether it was routine  
917 surveillance or non-outbreak. Each point is an observation. Boxes represent the median and  
918 interquartile range of positivity for each group. Lines extend from the top and bottom of box to  
919 the largest positivity value no further than  $1.5 * \text{IQR}$  from the box.

920

921 **Figure 3. Estimated underlying *V. cholerae* positivity**

922 **A)** Posterior distributions of pooled percent sensitivity and specificity of culture (top), PCR  
923 (middle), and RDT (bottom) for detecting *V. cholerae* O1/O139 infections in suspected cholera  
924 cases. Dashed lines represent mean values of each distribution. **B)** "Unadjusted" is mean *V.*  
925 *cholerae* positivity (95% credible interval) from random effects meta-analysis without  
926 adjustments for test performance. "Adjusted for test performance" is estimated mean *V.*  
927 *cholerae* positivity (95% credible interval), adjusted for sensitivity/specificity of the tests. High-  
928 quality stratified estimates corresponds to post-stratified estimates of *V. cholerae* positivity for  
929 studies that use high quality sampling methods and whether or not an age minimum was set in  
930 the suspected case definition, as well as whether or not surveillance was initiated in response to  
931 an outbreak.



932

933 **Figure 4. Forest plot of study estimates and underlying positivity**

934 Black points indicate mean study-level underlying positivity and 95% Credible Interval (CrI).

935 Teal, orange, and purple points indicate the proportion positive reported by study for culture,


936 PCR, and RDT, respectively, and corresponding error bars indicate 95% confidence interval for





937 a binomial probability using the normal approximation [147]. Studies are labeled by country



938 ISO3 code, whether they used high quality sampling methods, and whether a minimum age was

939 set in the suspected cholera case definition. Studies are split into outbreak and non-outbreak for


940 ease of interpretation.







## Non-outbreak surveillance



## Outbreak surveillance

