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Abstract

**Background:** This paper identifies groups vulnerable to the effect of flooding on the number of hospital visits due to diarrhoea during and after a flood event in 1998 in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

**Methods:** The number of observed cases of cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea per week was compared to expected normal numbers during the flood and post-flood periods, obtained as the season-specific average over the two preceding and subsequent years using Poisson generalised linear models. The expected number of diarrhoea cases was estimated in separate models for each category of potential modifying factors: sex, age, socio-economic status and hygiene and sanitation practices.

**Results:** During the flood, the number of cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea cases was almost six and two times higher than expected, respectively. In the post-flood period, the risk of non-cholera diarrhoea was significantly higher for those with lower educational level, living in a household with a non-concrete roof, drinking tube-well water (vs. tap water), using a distant water source and unsanitary toilets. The risk for cholera was significantly higher for those drinking tube-well water and those using unsanitary toilets.

**Conclusions:** This study confirms that low socio-economic groups and poor hygiene and sanitation groups were most vulnerable to flood-related diarrhoea.
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Background

Floods are the most frequent natural disasters affecting over 2.5 billion people during the last 30 years (Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters 2007). Recently floods have tended to intensify, and this trend could increase with climate change (Easterling et al. 2000; Milly et al. 2002). The effects of floods on diarrhoeal diseases may be of significant public health concern, since diarrhoeal disease is one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality, especially among children in low-income countries (Kosek et al. 2003).

There is a potential for increased transmission of diarrhoeal diseases during flood and post-flood conditions. In high-income countries, the risk of diarrhoea due to flood is considered to be low (Hajat et al. 2003; Hunter 2003; Ahern et al. 2005), although a study in the United Kingdom reported an increase in the risk of gastroenteritis for individuals exposed to flooding (Reacher et al. 2004). Another study in the United States found that flooding in the house or yard was associated with an increased risk of gastrointestinal illness (Wade et al. 2004). Self-reported diarrhoea was used as an outcome measure in these studies.

In low-income countries, where the water supply and sanitation system and the causative agents of diarrhoea are likely to be different from those in high-income countries, post-flood increases in cholera (Sur et al. 2000), rotavirus diarrhoea (Ahmed et al. 1991; Fun et al. 1991), cryptosporidiosis (Katsumata et al. 1998) and non-specific diarrhoea (Woodruff BA et al. 1990; Siddique et al. 1991; Biswas et al. 1999; Mondal et al. 2001; Kondo et al. 2002; Kunii et al. 2002) have been reported. Most of these studies had methodological limitations, in particular lack of pre-flood data, lack of comparison groups and potential recall bias. A recent rigorous study in Bangladesh reported flood-related diarrhoeal epidemics which were primarily explained by cholera (Schwartz et al. 2006). However, neither this nor the other papers provided much evidence on what factors determine vulnerability to the effects of flooding on the transmission of diarrhoeal diseases. Identification of the most vulnerable
group will be a basis to develop effective public health policies that reduce adverse health effects of flooding on the population.

In 1998, one of the most severe floods in recent history was observed in Dhaka, Bangladesh following high rainfall in the country and in the upper catchment areas. It was estimated that about 56% of the city was inundated (Huq & Alam 2003). The flood caused damage to over 30% of the 860,000 shelter units in the Dhaka Metropolitan Area and affected more than 4 million people (Huq & Alam 2003). The objective of this study was to identify potential vulnerable groups to the effects of flooding on the number of laboratory-confirmed cholera and other (non-cholera) diarrhoea during and after the 1998 flood in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

**Methods**

**Data**

The International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (ICDDR,B), Dhaka hospital serves an urban population of approximately 10 million individuals and provides free treatment to more than 100,000 cases of diarrhoea each year. The Centre maintains a surveillance system in which data from every 50th patient presenting to the hospital for treatment of diarrhoea is collected, including the patient’s characteristics and microbiological examination of stool or rectal swab sample for identifying enteric pathogens. We abstracted individual information on age, sex, socio-economic status, hygiene and sanitation practices and pathogens identified from stool specimen during a six-year period (January 1996 to December 2001) including the severe flood year. The patient was classified as having cholera when *Vibrio cholerae* was identified from the stool specimen. All other patients including those with culture negative stool samples, were categorised as non-cholera diarrhoea. We analysed weekly counts of cases.
Meteorological data (daily rainfall and maximum temperature) for the six-year period were provided by the Bangladesh Meteorological Department. Daily time-series of rainfall and maximum temperature were converted into weekly amounts of rainfall and weekly average maximum temperature, respectively. Daily river level data (five measurements a day) were recorded by the Bangladesh Water Development Board. We analysed the daily maximum values averaged by week.

Definition of flood and post-flood periods

The period of flood was defined as the period that the river level (Brigonga river at Mill Barrack in Dhaka) exceeded the danger level (6.0 m) defined by the Bangladesh Water Development Board. The flood period was identified from week 30 to 38 (July to September) in 1998. The river level data were missing from April 1997 to March 1998, but no severe floods were reported in Dhaka during this period (Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters 2007). Although the duration of the effects of flooding on diarrhoea is not clearly understood, the potential effects of large-scale flooding on water, sanitation and health infrastructure has been estimated to last up to six months (McCluskey J 2001). Thus, the post-flood period was defined as up to week 14 in 1999 (approximately six months after the end of the flood).

Statistical analysis

Expected normal numbers of cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea for each week during the flood year and for the rest of the post-flood period in the following year were obtained as the season-specific average over the two preceding (1996–97) and subsequent years (2000–01). This season-specific average was obtained by fitting a Poisson generalised linear model with
sine and cosine functions with annual cycle and harmonics up to an order of six to the non-
flood four years.

The ratios of the observed against the expected number of cases during the flood and post-
flood periods were calculated separately. The observed/expected ratio was also calculated for
the pre-flood period in 1998 so that any excess in that period could be discounted in the
interpretation of the flood and post-flood results. Confidence intervals (CIs) for the ratios
were estimated from standard Poisson assumptions augmented by a refinement to take
account of variability in the expected number of cases from four years data (1996–97 and
2000–01) as well as variability in the cases observed in the flood year itself. Specifically,
95% CIs for the ratios were calculated by the following formula:

$$\frac{O}{E} \times \exp(-1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{O} + \frac{1}{(E \times 4)}}) < \frac{O}{E} < \frac{O}{E} \times \exp(1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{O} + \frac{1}{(E \times 4)}})$$

where, $O$: Observed number of cases, and $E$: Expected number of cases.

Cases were stratified by factors that could potentially modify flood effects: sex, age, socio-
economic status (educational level and roof structure of the house) and hygiene and sanitation
practices (drinking water source, distance to the water source and type of toilet). The expected
number of cases of diarrhoea was estimated in separate models for each category of potential
modifying factors. The same core model used for estimating the effect on all cases was used
for this purpose. The difference in ratios within each category was tested by using the chi-
squared statistic proposed by DerSimonian and Laird in the context of meta-analysis
(DerSimonian & Laird 1986). To better identify the pattern of excessive risk in the post-flood
period, the ratio of the observed against expected number of cases was also calculated in each
four-week interval separately.
Expected normal river level and weather variables (rainfall and temperature) during the flood and post-flood periods were obtained using an identical seasonal model (though ordinary linear regression rather than Poisson regression). All analyses were carried out using the statistical package Stata 9.0 (Stata Corporation, College Station, Texas).

Results

During the flood period (week 30–38, 1998), the highest weekly average of daily maximum river level was recorded in week 37 at the level of 7.0 m (Figure 1 a). Rainfall well above expected normal values was observed just before (weeks 28 and 29) and during (week 33) the flood period (Figure 1 b). Temperature in the pre-flood, flood and post-flood periods was mostly close to normal (Figure 1 c).

The number of both cholera and non-cholera cases increased steeply from the beginning of the flood and peaked during the middle of the flood period (Figure 2). The number of cholera cases decreased almost to expected levels by seven weeks after the end of the flood, followed by a further increase 12 weeks after the end of the flood. The number of non-cholera diarrhoea cases decreased to expected levels by four weeks after the end of the flood. However, before the flood, the observed number of cholera cases was also slightly higher than the expected values.

During the flood, the number of cholera cases was almost six times higher than expected (Table 1). The ratio was still elevated, by approximately twofold, in the post-flood period. The number of non-cholera cases was also higher than expected both in the flood period (ratio = 1.8, 95% CI: 1.6, 1.9) and in the post-flood period (ratio = 1.2, 95% CI: 1.1, 1.3) (Table 2). However the ratio in the pre-flood period was also elevated for cholera (ratio = 1.8, 95% CI: 1.6, 2.0), while that for non-cholera diarrhoea was 1.0 (95% CI: 1.0, 1.1).
During the flood period, all subgroups examined had an approximately similar excess risk of both cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea (Tables 1 and 2), although two differences were close to statistical significance: for cholera, a higher excess risk was observed in those with tap water compared with those with tube wells, and for non-cholera diarrhoea a higher excess risk was noted in those with low education. In the post-flood period, the excess risk of non-cholera diarrhoea was strongly significantly higher for those with a lower educational level (vs higher educational level) and for those living in a household with a non-concrete roof (vs concrete roof), in contrast, this was not the case for cholera. During this period, the excess risks for both cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea were also significantly higher for those drinking water from tube wells (vs. tap water) and those using unsanitary toilets. For non-cholera diarrhoea the excess risk was also higher in those using a distant water source (five metres or more from the kitchen). There was little evidence for differences in excess risk by age or sex in either the flood or post-flood period.

The ratios of the observed against the expected number of cases in each four-week interval after the end of the flood are shown in Figure 3. The excess risk of cholera was highest in the flood period and decreased by eight weeks after the end of the flood followed by a slight increase between 12 and 16 weeks after the end of the flood. Evidence for an increased risk of infection was observed until 20 weeks after the end of the flood. An increased risk of non-cholera diarrhoea was observed by eight weeks after the end of the flood followed by a very slight increase thereafter. Although we have not calculated the expected numbers of each specific pathogen represented in the non-cholera patients, we show the distribution of these cases by pathogen (identified from stool specimens) in the pre-flood, flood and post-flood periods (Table 3). Rotavirus, *Escherichia coli*, *Campylobacter* and *Aeromonas* were the most common pathogens. The crude rates of all pathogens except *E. coli* were higher in the flood period than before, although numbers of rarer types of pathogens were small.
For simplicity, we have in the above analyses adjusted only for seasonality when estimating the expected values of diarrhoea. However, the incidence of diarrhoea could have been influenced by weather factors, in particular temperature (Checkley et al. 2000). An analysis adjusted additionally for temperature in the previous four weeks changed results very little (results not shown).

**Discussion**

This study provides evidence for higher risk of flood-related cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea in lower hygiene and sanitation groups in the post-flood period. Evidence for higher risk of flood-related non-cholera diarrhoea in lower socio-economic groups was also shown in the post-flood period, although this was not the case for cholera.

Although observational studies can never prove causality, the closeness of the timing of the hospital visits to the timing of the flood, the failure to explain the increase in hospital visits by either normal seasonality or temperature and the sheer number of hospital visits makes causality the most likely explanation. Although for cholera (but not non-cholera diarrhoea) there was also an increase in hospital visits before the flood, suggesting the possibility of an excess for 1998 caused by factors other than flooding, this excess was far smaller than that observed during the flood, and smaller than that observed up to 20 weeks after the flood.

There are several plausible causal mechanisms for the elevated risk of infection during the flood. Floods adversely affect water sources and supply systems as well as sewerage and waste disposal systems (Parker & Thompson 2000). The waste disposal system in Dhaka city was almost completely ineffective during the flood (Nishat et al. 2000). A number of tube wells were covered by the floodwaters and were contaminated (Rashid 2000). Many of the people affected by the flood became displaced and took refuge in temporary shelters (Karim...
et al. 1999). Some of the shelters were extremely crowded (Karim et al. 1999), and a
deterioration in environmental conditions were observed in shelters and slums (Ahmed et al.
1999). These observations suggest that personal hygiene and sanitation levels in the city were
extremely disrupted, and that the transmission of enteric pathogens was likely to be increased
during the flood.

Study findings showed the long-term persistence of the effects of flood on cholera and non-
cholera diarrhoea. The consequences of communicable diseases have previously been
believed to be limited to the period of flooding and soon after, and public health surveillance
is usually carried out only for one month from the occurrence of flooding (Malilay 1997). Our
findings suggest that this period may need to be lengthened. The long-term excess of infection
in the post-flood period may be due to the persistence of low hygiene and sanitation status in
the flood-affected communities. When people began returning home from shelters and other
temporary accommodation, clean-up operations in the homesteads and slums as well as
restoration of tube wells and sanitary latrines were suggested as priority tasks (Ahmed et al.
1999). However, it seems likely that these tasks would have taken longer than one month.
This hypothesis may be supported by the findings of an increased risk (compared to normal
years) for all-cause diarrhoea, particularly for lower hygiene and sanitation groups in the post-
flood period, which suggests implications for public health policy in the recovery period.
Advice on personal preventive measures in relation to sanitation and hygiene may need to be
increased in such a severe flood event. Potential persistent poor nutrition in the flood-affected
population may also be implicated in the post-flood excess of diarrhoea. In the presence of
malnutrition, chronic or persistent diarrhoea could arise secondary to other infections (Thapar
& Sanderson 2004). The long-term low nutritional status of children in flooded households
compared to those in non-flooded households was reported in Bangladesh after the 1998 flood
(del Ninno & Lundberg 2005). The lack of substantial observed differences in vulnerability to
cholera and non-cholera diarrhoea during the flood may be because the magnitude of the flood was so severe that most people were similarly affected during the flood.

The current study findings of flood-related excess of diarrhoea are broadly consistent with those of a recent study of several floods in Bangladesh, including the 1998 flood (Schwartz et al. 2006). The current study differs from the Schwartz study, however: (a) in investigating a wide range of societal and environmental factors determining vulnerability to the effects of flooding on diarrhoea, (b) considering a longer post-flood period, (c) using different statistical methodology.

Educational level can be a robust indicator of socio-economic status and is associated with incidence of diarrhoea in Bangladesh (Islam et al. 1984). Construction materials for roof structure are also used as an indicator of socio-economic status (ICDDR 2007). Lower socio-economic groups were more vulnerable to the effects of flood in developing non-cholera diarrhoea in this study. The pathways through which the influences of socio-economic status are mediated are not understood from the findings of this study. Poor groups in Dhaka suffered from a loss of possessions and separation from their social network during and after the prolonged flood (Rashid 2000). The flood also left most of the urban poor unemployed (Rashid 2000). These factors are likely to have resulted in a slower recovery of their original livelihood during the post-flood rehabilitation period, in addition to severe health problems including diarrhoea. Our study showed that the effects of the flood on non-cholera diarrhoea were influenced by socio-economic status, while cholera was not. This finding suggests that non-cholera diarrhoea may be more dependent on personal hygiene and sanitation practices which is closely related to socio-economic status.

Higher levels of vulnerability to the health impacts of flooding have been suggested in children and the elderly (Quarantelli 2003). In addition, during flooding, women may be more likely to be limited in their access to hygiene and sanitation facilities due to the socio-cultural
norms in Bangladesh (Rashid 2000). However, in our study, there was little evidence that any age or sex group was particularly affected in either the flood or post-flood period.

The magnitude of the increased incidence of cholera was greater than that of non-cholera diarrhoea. Cholera is primarily a waterborne disease and the occurrence of epidemics of cholera coincides with an increased prevalence of the causative *V. cholerae* strain in the aquatic environment (Lipp et al. 2002). The incidental ingestion of copepods, which carry a high concentration of *V. cholerae*, can initiate an infection especially when communities rely on untreated environmental water sources for bathing, cooking, and drinking water (Lipp et al. 2002). Thus, in Dhaka where there are many ponds and rivers in the communities, the transmission of *V. cholerae* from untreated environmental water sources to humans is more likely to happen during flooding. The increase in incidence during the flood was also high – at least according to a crude analysis – in *Aeromonas*, another water-borne organism. Another explanation may be possible under-representation of diarrhoeal cases depending on the severity. Considerable proportion of mild diarrhoea may have been treated by oral rehydration therapy at home to prevent them from visiting health facilities (Chowdhury *et al.* 1997). This discrepancy may be different between causal pathogens as the severity of clinical symptoms varies between pathogens (Cholera is characterised in its severe form by sudden onset). The number of cases due to pathogens causing less severe symptoms may only represent a small proportion of the actual number of cases.

Excess risk of cholera was higher for tap water users than those using tube well water in the flood period, though not quite significantly (*p*=0.05). This counterintuitive result may be due to people’s temporal behavioural change in drinking water source during the flood, probably because wide spread alerts for drinking tube well or surface water were issued and clean water was provided by aid agencies and the government (Shahaduzzaman 1999). Moreover, faecal contamination of tap water was reported in Dhaka during the 2004 flood, and point of use
water treatment was recommended during and after floods (Islam et al. 2007). Investigations on detailed pathways of the flood-cholera relationship, particularly the role of drinking water quality are warranted.

The discrepancy between observed and expected values of cholera in the pre-flood period was little changed after adjusting temperature. The responsible factors are not clear, but they could be unmeasured environmental factors.

There are some limitations to this study which need to be considered. Firstly, if other health facilities in Dhaka city were considerably disrupted during the flood, this would have led to more people with diarrhoea than usual arriving at the ICDDR,B hospital. This would have resulted in an overestimation of the estimated effects of the flood on the number of diarrhoea cases. However, this is unlikely to be a major problem as there was no observed difference in the geographic distribution patterns of patients between the flood year and non-flood years (Wagatsuma et al. 2001). Secondly, the results of this study may be dependent on the magnitude and type of flooding as well as local conditions regarding transmission of enteric pathogens such as hygiene and sanitary status. Therefore, these findings may not pertain to other regions.

Conclusions

With little other epidemiological evidence for the vulnerability of individuals to flooding, this study confirms higher risk of flood-related diarrhoea in the post-flood period in groups with low socio-economic status and poor hygiene and sanitation. Since they would also likely be high-risk groups for general (flood-unrelated) diarrhoea, understanding of disease risk related to floods should also underscore the need for improving these conditions.
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Figure legends

Figure 1 - Observed and expected normal (a) river level, (b) rainfall and (c) temperature in 1998-99 in Dhaka, Bangladesh
The vertical line shows the period of flood (weeks 30–38, 1998). Expected normal values were obtained as the season-specific average over the two preceding (1996–97) and subsequent (2000–01) years using ordinary multiple regression models.

Figure 2 - Observed and expected number of (a) cholera and (b) non-cholera diarrhoea in 1998-99 in Dhaka, Bangladesh
The vertical line shows the period of flood (weeks 30–38, 1998). Expected numbers of cases were obtained as the season-specific average over the two preceding (1996–97) and subsequent (2000–01) years using Poisson generalised linear models.

Figure 3 - The ratio of the observed and expected number of cases during the flood and each four-week interval in the post-flood period in Dhaka, Bangladesh
Expected numbers of cases were obtained as the season-specific average over the two preceding (1996–97) and subsequent (2000-01) years using Poisson generalised linear models.
TABLE 1: Excess risk of cholera during the flood (week 30–38) and post-flood (week 39, 1998–week 14, 1999) period in Dhaka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Flood period</th>
<th>Post-flood period</th>
<th>p value†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
<td>O/E 95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>5.9 5.0 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>6.7 5.2 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5.3 4.2 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>6.7 5.2 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>6.2 4.6 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>4.5 3.2 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-economic status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education‡</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>6.3 5.1 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal or &lt;6 yrs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.9 3.0 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yrs or more</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.6 4.0 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-concrete</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>5.4 4.5 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.0 5.4 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene and sanitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube well</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.7 3.6 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap water</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>6.7 5.4 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5m</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>5.9 4.8 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5m or less</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>5.9 4.4 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of toilet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsanitary</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.6 4.3 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>6.1 5.0 7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The expected values were the season-specific average over the two preceding (1996-97) and subsequent (2000-01) years.
†Test for heterogeneity

‡Mother’s educational level for children under 15 years and self educational level for adult.
TABLE 2. Excess risk of non-cholera diarrhoea during the flood (week 30–38) and post-flood (week 39, 1998–week 14, 1999) period in Dhaka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Observed (O)</th>
<th>Expected (E)</th>
<th>O/E</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p value†</th>
<th>Observed (O)</th>
<th>Expected (E)</th>
<th>O/E</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p value†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>493</td>
<td>281.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>859.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>163.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>519.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>622.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>133.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-economic status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education‡</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>374.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal or &lt;6 yrs</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yrs or more</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>327.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-concrete</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>647.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene and sanitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube well</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>363.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap water</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>486.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5m</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>170.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>502.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5m or less</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>349.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of toilet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsanitary</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>350.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>166.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>501.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The expected values were the season-specific average over the two preceding (1996-97) and subsequent (2000-01) years.
1 †Test for heterogeneity

2 ‡Mother’s educational level for children under 15 years and self educational level for adult.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Pre-flood Mean (%)</th>
<th>Flood Mean (%)</th>
<th>Post-flood Mean (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All non-cholera diarrhoea</td>
<td>35.6 (100)</td>
<td>54.8 (100)</td>
<td>37.6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotavirus</td>
<td>9.2 (26)</td>
<td>14.6 (27)</td>
<td>11.6 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escherichia. coli</td>
<td>9.9 (28)</td>
<td>8.3 (15)</td>
<td>6.0 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campylobacter</td>
<td>3.7 (10)</td>
<td>7.0 (13)</td>
<td>3.3 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeromonas</td>
<td>3.1 (9)</td>
<td>6.9 (13)</td>
<td>4.9 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shigella</td>
<td>2.5 (7)</td>
<td>3.1 (6)</td>
<td>3.1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>1.2 (2)</td>
<td>0.5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pathogens</td>
<td>0.8 (2)</td>
<td>1.2 (2)</td>
<td>1.3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pathogen</td>
<td>13.2 (37)</td>
<td>22.3 (41)</td>
<td>13.2 (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A patient was classified as non-cholera diarrhoea when *V. cholerae* was not identified from the stool specimen.

The cause of non-cholera diarrhoea was categorised as rotavirus, *Shigella*, *Salmonella*, *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* and *Aeromonas* when the respective pathogen was identified.

When two or more pathogens other than *V. cholerae* were identified from the same patient, the patient was classified as each pathogen of non-cholera.

The patient was classified as other pathogens when none of *V. cholerae*, rotavirus, *Shigella*, *Salmonella*, *Campylobacter* or *E. coli* was identified.

The patient was classified as "no pathogen" when no pathogen was identified from the stool.
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Figure 3

Observed/Expected number of patients over weeks after the flood, comparing non-cholera and cholera cases.