CRITICAL APPRIASAL OF TWO RESEARCH DONE ON CHOLERA OUTBREAK RESPONSE

AUTHORS: Iyare Walter M.D
Akhator Joseph M.B.B.S, MPH

BACKGROUND

In as much as early investigations of cholera have moved toward becoming models for present day study of disease transmission , foreseeing and controlling outbreaks of cholera is as yet a noteworthy test in the developing regions of the world. Upgrades in the sanitation level and the utilization of rehydration treatment done orally has incredibly lessened the burden of cholera, yet there is no prescient system to predict disease outbreaks and getting ready for interventions. Numerical demonstration is one way to deal with combining our insight into cholera as a quantitative system. Statistical models are been utilized to examine the elements and pattern of outbreak episodes and anticipate the viability of potential intervention systems (Garnett et al. 2011; Hutubessy et al. 2011). Proposals for the reaction to cholera episodes have advanced over the previous decade. Prior rules accentuated case administration and demoralized the utilization of antibodies until post-crisis (Connolly 2005). Afterward, pre-emptive immunization was proposed for use amid complex crises (Chaignat and Monti 2007), and mass cholera vaccination campaign was being considered for containing episodes of the disease outbreaks (Global Task Force on Cholera Control 2010). In any case, immunization is normally not a down to earth alternative on account of the little worldwide supply of the vaccine.

Ongoing huge and prolonged epidemics of the disease outbreak in Haiti and a few nations in some parts of Africa recharged enthusiasm for making a worldwide cholera antibody reserve,

which would build accessibility of the immunization for crisis use and also for occasional episodes (Waldor et al. 2010; World Health Organization 2010, 2012; Holmgren 2012).

Be that as it may, regardless of whether more vaccines were produced as well as massive water and sanitation activities carried out, there is an absence of direction for their efficacy. Statistical researches can help fill this lag.

As the choices for cholera episode reactions turn out to be more intricate, there is a more prominent requirement for quantitative systems, for example, scientific demonstrating to both assess and help plan them (Clemens 2011). Specifically, the progressing multiyear epidermis in Haiti has tested us to get ready for more complete, incorporated, and long haul techniques for cholera episodes that would include enhanced recognizable proof and treatment of cases, expanded access to clean water, and antibody (Ivers et al. 2010; Farmer et al. 2011). Since cholera vaccine and water and sanitation campaigns have always been utilized during the outbreaks of cholera in recent times, displaying might be expected to extrapolate what little has been watched. Since there are numerous contending requirements for rare assets among complex crises, studies might be needed to help measure the expenses and advantages of various alternatives (Miller Neilan et al. 2010).

In this write up, I will be using critical appraisal skill programe checklist/tool to evaluate two studies (one quantitative and one qualitative) on new insights to cholera outbreak interventions.

INTRODUCTION

This study was carried out by Flavio Finger et al. The study was centered on the impact that case area targeted interventions potentially have on outbreaks of cholera when used as a mode of response during such. While the second publication is deals with an analytic comparison of the contamination of the causative organism of cholera in drinking water point and water source in a low-income urban settings in Bangladesh. It was carried out by Jannatul Ferdous et al.

The aim of the first study is to make available a practical approach on how case area targeted interventions can be applied through the exploration of main factors and determinants of the magnitude of the impacts of an intervention which involves a combination of interventions i.e. ring cluster size and timing, in simulated epidermis of cholera fit to the data derived from an urban cholera epidemic. While the aim of the second study was to carry out a comparison in terms of assessment of the occurrence of the causative organism of cholera between drinking water points and source of water . Also to find out the differences in the virulence profile using molecular methods of a highly populated poor community of Dhaka.

Both studies are invaluable and have helped in better understanding of other as well as more effective ways to control cholera outbreaks in terms of magnitude and duration as well as also shown possible ways in reducing transmutability of the disease.

STUDY VALIDITY

The first study tried to answer the following questions; How high is the risk of the disease among members of house hold of a case relative to the general population days following the onset of symptoms. And will rapid intervention targeted to clusters around cases be effective and resource efficient in reducing the magnitude, spread and duration of the outbreak?

The main research question for the second study is, Does contamination of the water at the water point of use depends always on the contamination of the source of water?

The world today is a global village; one can safely predict that infectious diseases e.g. cholera, will continue to emerge. Depending on the adequacy of our response and reaction to this threat, the situation could lead to a catastrophic storm. Studies live these goes a long way in ensuring an efficacious and effective implementation of an internal monitoring/surveillance system, active networking at both federal and state levels with various actors, development of innovative medical interventions and practice.

Although the second study is important, it does not address a clear research question since water source can also serve as water point of use without being stored first. However the research questions the first study tends to answer are more directed as well as more encompassing. However they are not specific thus may be cumbersome achieving such owing to the fact that a cholera outbreak do not last for long (years) and also the numerous ethical issues with such studies.

The first study was conducted so that the results are true for the sample this is because it did not take into consideration asymptomatic patients as possible transmitters of the disease in its primary analysis, where they assumed that asymptomatic people are not irresistible, in view of some arbitrary confirmation that these create far less stool and that the stool they deliver contains the causative specialist for less time and of orders of size lower focus than symptomatic people. This is as opposed to the MSF cholera rule 2017; amid times of dynamic transmission, people are chief supply for the pathogen.Transmision is kept up by entry from tainted people to others through the fecal-oral route. The defecation of symptomatic people contain 107 to 108 vibro/ml i.e an amount adequate to cause infection. However an asymptomatic contaminated individual can shed vibros in the stool in low however conceivably irresistible fixation (103 to 105 vibro/ml) for a few days.

In addition, there was no consideration of those who may not be around at the time of the intervention in the targeted case area. And this can lead to a bias as some clusters may have more persons away from homes than others during an intervention also, there may be variation in the population per cluster. All these were not put into consideration.

Data collection in the second study was not justified nor structured as there was no criteria in selecting 447 house holds who were enrolled in the study. Also there was no concrete explanation nor justification for the methodology used in selecting participants.

The first study is quantitative while the second is qualitative. However both studies employed an observational prospective methodology in that, they identified exposure, then exposed persons i.e. households of cases among which they carried out their interventions and followed up to see if they come down with the disease. This was not the most appropriate methodology to use for

this study. A better approach to this study would have being using an experimental trial where these tested intervention wil be carried out in a particular group and routine intervention in another group. This will help to give a better relativity in the efficacy and effectiveness of the studied interventions.

While the first study tries to discuss the contribution and improvement in interventional approaches to curbing cholera outbreaks in relation to the routine mass campaign used currently and also tries to identify ways and areas to improve on in this initial method of intervention as well as the ease and possibility of practicing this new interventional strategies in all context , the second study really and clearly does not make any huge contribution to the existing interventional approach implemented for cholera outbreak control.

Furthermore, the second research does not identify areas of possible interest for further research and its findings are highly limited to the study.

STUDY RESULTS

On a broad scale, the findings of the first study are of more global importance and more valid then those of the second study.

For the first study, the analysis process was in-depth as finite as possible which gave a clear insight into the efficacy of each intervention, Also there are sufficient analysis and data to explicitly demonstrate the findings; although there was no clear explanation how the grades and structured data were extrapolated from the raw data.

The Findings are explicit as they are in grades of individual findings, combine findings, findings at different cluster rings as well as findings according to time of intervention relative to onset of outbreak. And they were discussed in relation to the research questions.

For the second study, the analysis process was not in-depth. As the result was too broad; talking about contamination of source water and that of water use points. It did not grade the water sources into the various forms e.g. bore hole water, rain water , well water etc. It also did not differentiate the various forms of water use points within households. Thus it does not clearly and explicitly answer its research question.

Water is principal to the presence and existence of people. There are 3 primary sources of water and these are rain water, surface water and groundwater and of all these surface water are the most effectively available source and furthermore the most inclined to contamination. Some examples of surface water are seizing supplies, waterways, streams, lakes and lakes while those

of groundwater are shallow wells, profound wells, bore holes and springs. (United Nations, 2012)

Water as a universal solvent is important for the upkeep of good wellbeing. Access to water in the correct quality and amount is expected to accomplish great individual and household cleanliness and healthiness. A cross sectional examination directed in 2011 across over 21 provincial networks in Bayelsa state and also in Rivers State to survey the access to safe water supply demonstrated that around 66% of the investigation populace got their water from none hygienic sources. These insanitary sources included surface water (37.9%), and unprotected hand burrowed wells (8.9%). Just a single third of the populace (33.9%) got their drinking water from clean water sources, for example, funneled family unit supply (5.0%), open tap (22.8%), borehole (4.2%) and secured hand burrowed wells (1.9%). Near portion of the examination populace (48.0%) did not treat their drinking water (Ordinioha B 2011).

A cross-sectional investigation done in 2011 in Ugbokolo people group in Benue state to decide the variables influencing country water supply design demonstrated that amid dry season, 27.9% of the populace's water supply was through streams and waterways. In wet season be that as it may, 24.2% of their water source was from waterway and streams, while 27.2% was from rain water. Water vendors in blustery and dry seasons represent 1.1% and 3.1% respectively (Aper JA, Agbehi SI, 2011)

A cross-sectional examination completed in 2002 among ghetto and asphalt occupants of 4 urban settlements in Mumbai city, India uncovered that family units among asphalt inhabitants with

their own water tap association was 41.0% of every one district, yet just around 2.0– 14.0% in different areas. Ghetto families gain water from basic taps (74.0%); purchasing from sellers, (10.0%); and others purchasing from neighbors. Among ghetto families sharing a typical tap, number of houses per tap was found, in normal to be 11, 20, 28 and 3 in the four areas. Besides, the water supply hour in taps is additionally constrained to just 4 hours every day in all the ghettos studied (Karn KS, Harada H, 2002)

STUDY USEFULNESS TO PRACTICE:

For the first study, the results disclosed the efficacy of case area targeted intervention by examination of a reproduced advancement of epidermis with and without case area targeted intervention where it uncovered a lessening in epidemic span when the 3 interventions strategies (OCV, oral cholera vaccine; POUWT, point-of-use water treatment. Antibiotics) are centered around case territories groups apportioned in a 100 m range at 3 distinct time (start of the flare-up, at the pinnacle of episode and late toward the finish of the pandemic) individually.

In-addition, it likewise uncovers the level of effect of the interventional strategies on case reduction and lessening of epidemic duration if interventions are carried out within different cluster rings (15m, 45 m and 100 m radius respectively) of the case targeted areas relative to the impact of the routine mass campaign method used.

It additionally uncovers the relationship between the group ring range and radius, number of cluster case region rings expected to target every day at the distinctive particular times in outbreaks to get a reasonable picture of how to amplify the effect of the procedure.

The second study result discussed the association and link between the contamination of source water to that of water use point in households. However, it failed to consider the various water source forms as well as the various point of use storage form. It also did not discuss the difference in contamination of the point of use water for various purposes.

It can thus be inferred from all the above that the results from the first study are useful and of public health importance. As this strategy, when implemented would me more targeted and thus require less resources for implementation in similar context as the mass campaign. Thus may serve as an efficacious intervention strategy and this also can help improve the effectiveness of the activities of governments and other actors during an outbreak. The study outcomes appear to be evidence based. However, the same cannot be practically said for the second study. And it doesn't add much to evidence passed practice.

REFFERENCE

1. Aper JA, Agbehi SI. (2011) *The determining factors of rural water supply pattern in Ugbokolo Community, Benue state, Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development*. 4(2): 225-233. (Accessed 28th , June 2018)

2. Connolly, MA (eds) (2005) Communicable disease control in emergencies: a field manual. World Health Organization, Geneva. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

3. Chaignat CL, Monti V (2007) *Use of oral cholera vaccine in complex emergencies: what next?* Summary report of an expert meeting and recommendations of WHO. J Health Popul Nutr 25(2):244–261. (Accessed 29th , June 2018)

4. Clemens JD (2011) *Vaccines in the time of cholera*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 108(21):8529–8530. doi:10.1073/pnas.1105807108. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

5. Farmer P, Almazor CP, Bahnsen ET, Barry D, Bazile J, Bloom BR, Bose N, Brewer T, Calderwood SB, Clemens JD, Cravioto A, Eustache E, Jérôme G, Gupta N, Harris JB, Hiatt HH, Holstein C, Hotez PJ, Ivers LC, Kerry VB, Koenig SP, LaRocque RC, Léandre F, Lambert W, Lyon E, Mekalanos JJ, Mukherjee JS, Oswald C, Pape JW, Gretchko Prosper A, Rabinovich R, Raymonville M, Réjouit JR, Ronan LJ,

Rosenberg ML, Ryan ET, Sachs JD, Sack DA, Surena C, Suri AA, Ternier R, Waldor MK, Walton D, Weigel JL (2011) *Meeting cholera's challenge to Haiti and the world: A joint statement on cholera prevention and care.* PLoS Negl Trop Dis 5(5):e1145. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001145. (Accessed 28th , June 2018)

6. Fedous J, Sultana R, Rashid RB, Tasnimuzzaman M, Nordland A, Begum A, Jensen P; *A Comparative Analysis of Vibrio cholerae Contamination in Point-of-Drinking and Source Water in a Low-Income Urban Community, Bangladesh;* pubmed journal*;* https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29616005; (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

7. Flavio F, Enrico B, Francisco J, Nathan N, Brahima T, Mata A,Klaudia P, Justin L, Andrea R, Andrew S (2018); *The potential impact of case-area targeted interventions in response to cholera outbreaks* pubmedjournal; Vol15(2); https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5828347/?log$=activity; (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

8. Garnett GP, Cousens S, Hallett TB, Steketee R, Walker N (2011) *Mathematical models in the evaluation of health programmes*. Lancet 378(9790):515–525. doi:10.1016/S0140- 6736(10)61505-X. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

9. Global Task Force on Cholera Control (2010) *Oral cholera vaccines in mass immunization campaigns: Guidance for planning and use*. World Health Organization, Geneva, http:// whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241500432_eng.pdf. (Accessed 28th , June 2018)

10. Holmgren J (2012) *A case for control of cholera in Africa by vaccination*. Lancet Infect Dis 12(11):818–819. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(12)70204-9. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

11. Hutubessy R, Henao AM, Namgyal P, Moorthy V, Hombach J (2011) *Results from evaluations of models and cost-effectiveness tools to support introduction decisions for new vaccines need critical appraisal*. BMC Med 9:55. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-9-55. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

12. Ivers LC, Farmer P, Almazor CP, Léandre F (2010) *Five complementary interventions to slow cholera:* Haiti. Lancet 376(9758):2048–2051. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)62243-X. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

13. Karn KS, Harada H. (2002) *Field survey on water supply, sanitation and associated health impacts in urban poor communities – a case from Mumbai City, India*; Water, Science and Technology 46(11) 269-275. (Accessed 28th , June 2018)

14. Miller Neilan RL, Schaefer E, Gaff H, Fister KR, Lenhart S (2010) *Modeling optimal intervention strategies for cholera.* Bull Math Biol 72(8):2004–2018. doi:10.1007/s11538- 010-9521-8(Accessed 26th , June 2018)

15. Ordinioha B. (2011) *A survey of the community water supply of some rural riverine communities in the Niger Delta region, Nigeria*: Health implications and literature search for suitable interventions. Nigerian Medical Journal 52(1): 13–18. (Accessed 26th , June 2018)

16. United Nations. (2012) Millennium Development Goals. Available at www.un.org. Accessed 26th , June 2018.

17. Waldor MK, Hotez PJ, Clemens JD (2010) *A national cholera vaccine stockpile—a new humanitarian and diplomatic resource.* N Engl J Med 363(24):2279–2282. doi:10.1056/ NEJMp1012300. (Accessed 28th , June 2018)

18. World Health Organization (2010) Cholera vaccines: WHO position paper. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 85(13):117–128 World Health Organization (2012) Meeting report of the WHO Technical Working Group on creation of an oral cholera vaccine stockpile. World Health Organization, Geneva. (Accessed 28th , June 2018)