Full Title

# Effects of an urban sanitation intervention on childhood enteric infection and diarrhoea in Mozambique

Short title

Urban sanitation and childhood enteric infection

Author list

Jackie Knee, PhD;[1,2] Trent Sumner, BS;[2] Zaida Adriano, BA;[3] Claire Anderson, BS;[2] Farran Bush, BS;[4] Drew Capone, B. Eng.;[2] Veronica Casmo, MSc;[5] David Holcomb, PhD;[6,7] Pete Kolsky, PhD;[6] Amy Macdougall, MSc;[8] Evgeniya Molotkova, BS;[9] Judite Monteiro Braga, MSc;[5] Celina Russo, BS;[2] Wolf Peter Schmidt, PhD;[1] Jill Stewart, PhD;[6] Winnie Zambrana, BS;[2] Valentina Zuin, PhD;[10] Rassul Nalá, MPH;[5] Oliver Cumming, MSc;[1] Joe Brown, PhD[6,2]

[1] London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Infectious Tropical Diseases, Department of Disease Control, Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, United Kingdom

[2] Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 311 Ferst Drive, Atlanta, GA, USA 30332, USA

[3] WE Consult ltd, Rua Tomás Ribeiro 177, RC, Postal code 3248, Maputo, Moçambique

[4] Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, 311 Ferst Drive, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA

[5] Instituto Nacional de Saúde, Estrada Nacional N°1, Bairro da Vila, Distrito de Marracuene, Província de Maputo, Moçambique

[6] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Global Public Health, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, 135 Dauer Drive, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA

[7] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Global Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, 135 Dauer Drive, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA

[8]London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, Department of Medical Statistics, Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, United Kingdom

[9] Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Biological Sciences, 310 Ferst Drive NW, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA

[10] Yale-NUS College, Division of Social Science, 28 College Ave West, 138527, Singapore

Correspondence to:

Joe Brown (0000-0002-5200-4148)
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gillings School of Global Public Health, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, 135 Dauer Drive, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA, Email: Joebrown@unc.edu Phone: +1 919 966 7892

## Abstract

*Background*

Onsite sanitation serves more than 740 million people in urban areas, primarily in low-income countries. Although this critical infrastructure may play an important role in controlling enteric infections in high-burden settings, its health impacts have never been evaluated in a controlled trial.

*Methods*

We conducted a controlled before and after trial to evaluate the impact an onsite urban sanitation intervention on the prevalence of bacterial and protozoan infection (primary outcome), soil-transmitted helminth (STH) re-infection, and seven-day period prevalence of diarrhoea among children living in informal neighborhoods of Maputo, Mozambique. A non-governmental organization replaced existing shared latrines in poor condition with engineered pour-flush toilets with septic tanks serving household clusters. We enrolled children aged 1-48 months at baseline and measured outcomes before the intervention and at 12 and 24 months following intervention. We measured outcomes concurrently among children served by the sanitation improvements and those in a comparable control arm served by existing poor sanitation. The trial was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT02362932.

*Findings*

At baseline, we enrolled 454 children from 208 intervention clusters and 533 children from 287 control clusters. We enrolled or re-visited 462 intervention and 477 control children 12 months after intervention and 502 intervention and 499 control children 24 months after intervention.

Despite nearly exclusive use of the intervention, we found no evidence that engineered onsite sanitation affected the overall prevalence of any measured bacterial or protozoan infection (12-month adjusted prevalence ratio 1·05, 95% CI [0·95-1·16]; 24-month adjusted prevalence ratio 0·99, 95% CI [0·91-1·09]), any STH re-infection (1·11 [0·89-1·38]; 0·95 [0·77-1·17]), or diarrhoea (1·69 [0·89-3·21]; 0·84 [0·47-1·51]) after 12 or 24 months of exposure. Among children born into study sites after the intervention and measured at the 24-month visit, we observed a reduced prevalence of any STH re-infection of 49% (adjusted prevalence ratio 0·51 [95% confidence interval 0·27 - 0·95]), *Trichuris* of 76% (0·24 [0·10 - 0·60]), and *Shigella* infection by 51% (0·49 [0·28-0·85]) relative to the same age group at baseline.

*Interpretation*

The intervention did not reduce the overall prevalence of enteric infection and diarrhoea among all enrolled children but may have substantially reduced the prevalence of STHs and *Shigella* among children born into clusters with sanitary improvements.

*Funding*

United States Agency for International Development and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

## Introduction

Rapid urbanization has led to the expansion of informal settlements in many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Such settlements often have very limited sanitation infrastructure.(UN-Habitat, 2016) Separation of human waste from human contact can prevent exposure to enteric pathogens that cause infection, diarrhoea,(Liu et al., 2016) and potentially long-term health effects such as environmental enteric dysfunction (EED),(Kosek et al., 2017) linear growth deficits,(Rogawski et al., 2018) impaired cognitive development,(Investigators, 2018) and reduced oral vaccine immunogenicity.(Parker et al., 2018) Children living in densely populated slum areas where faecal contamination is pervasive and sanitation infrastructure is limited may be at an increased risk of adverse health effects due to frequent exposure to enteric pathogens.(Fink et al., 2014)

Household-level sewerage has demonstrated health benefits (Barreto et al., 2007, 2010; Norman et al., 2010) and remains an important long-term goal for many urban settings, despite limited evidence from controlled trials.(Norman et al., 2010; Wolf et al., 2018) Such systems may not be a feasible short-term solution due to cost, space, and logistical constraints, challenges that have also impeded their evaluation via randomised trials.(Norman et al., 2010) Further, in densely populated areas, there may not be space for household-level sanitation of any type. Shared sanitation is a subject of considerable debate but may represent the only near-term sanitation option in some settings. Yet, while shared, onsite systems may fill the growing need for safe sanitation in rapidly expanding urban areas in LMICs, to date, there has been little evidence of their health impacts in these settings. Recent large-scale, rigorous evaluations of onsite sanitation interventions and combined water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions have demonstrated mixed effects on

98 health,(Clasen et al., 2014; Humphrey et al., 2019; Luby et al., 2018; Null et al., 2018; Pickering
99 et al., 2015) but all were conducted in rural areas with household-level interventions and their
100 findings may have limited generalizability to urban areas. A recent meta-analysis estimated that
101 non-sewered interventions reduced the risk of self-reported diarrhoea by 16% but did not estimate
102 effects on objective health outcomes, such as enteric infection, and could not stratify estimates by
103 rural versus urban setting given the lack of evidence in urban areas.(Brown & Cumming, 2019;
104 Wolf et al., 2018)To-date, no controlled trials of urban onsite sanitation have been conducted
105 despite over 740 million urban residents relying on such technologies. (Berendes et al., 2017)

106 The Maputo Sanitation (MapSan) trial was the first controlled trial to evaluate an onsite, shared
107 sanitation intervention in an urban setting and the first to use the prevalence of enteric infection,
108 as detected by molecular methods, as the primary study outcome.(Brown et al., 2015) The study
109 was located in densely populated, low-income neighborhoods of Maputo, Mozambique where the
110 sanitary conditions are poor and disease burden high.(Knee et al., 2018) As of 2017, half of urban
111 residents in Mozambique had access to at least basic sanitation infrastructure, 3% had access to
112 sewerage, and 9% shared sanitation with multiple households,(UNICEF/WHO, 2019) often in
113 poor neighborhoods where space and resources are limited. We investigated whether an
114 engineered, onsite, shared sanitation intervention could reduce enteric infection and diarrhoea in
115 young children living in these low-income, densely populated neighborhoods in Maputo,
116 Mozambique.

## Methods

*Study design and intervention*

MapSan was a controlled before and after trial, and details of the study design and analysis plan have been published previously.(Brown et al., 2015) We conducted the study in 17 densely populated, low-income, informal neighborhoods in Maputo, Mozambique. The intervention was delivered to compounds - groups of households typically delineated by a wall or barrier, that shared sanitation and outdoor living space. Shared compound sanitation facilities are not considered public facilities. We collected data in an open cohort of children in intervention and control compounds at three time-points: baseline (pre-intervention), 12 months post-intervention, and 24 months post-intervention. We enrolled intervention and control compounds concurrently to limit any differential effects of seasonality or other secular trends on the outcomes (supplemental information p 2-3).

The non-governmental organization (NGO) Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor selected intervention compounds and designed and built 300 intervention facilities - pour-flush toilets discharging to septic tanks, the liquid effluent of which flows to the soil through soak-away pits (supplemental information p 4-5). Intervention compounds were located in 11 neighborhoods of the Nhlamankulu and KaMaxakeni districts of Maputo. The NGO selected intervention compounds using the following criteria: (1) residents shared sanitation in poor condition as determined by an engineer; (2) the compound was located in the pre-defined implementation neighborhoods; (3) there were no fewer than 12 residents; (4) residents were willing to contribute financially to construction costs; (5) sufficient space was available for construction of the new facility; (6) the compound was accessible for transportation of construction materials and tank-

139 emptying activities; (7) the compound had access to a legal piped water supply; and (8) the
140 groundwater level was deep enough for construction of a septic tank. Presence of a child was not
141 a selection criterion and therefore not all intervention sites were included in the study. Opening of
142 newly constructed intervention latrines occurred between February 2015 and February 2016. The
143 study team used criteria 1, 3, 4, and 7 to select control sites within the 11 intervention
144 neighborhoods and six adjacent but similar neighborhoods (supplemental information p 6).
145 Additionally, control compounds were required to have at least one child younger than 48 months
146 old in residence.

147 There were two intervention designs with the same basic sanitation technology: communal
148 sanitation blocks (CSBs) and shared latrines (SLs) (supplemental information p 7-8). The primary
149 difference between CSBs and SLs was size. CSBs (n=50) included multiple stalls with toilets and
150 served compounds of 21 or more people with one stall allocated per 20 residents. CSBs also
151 included rainwater harvesting systems, elevated water storage tanks, a handwashing basin, a
152 laundry facility, a shared water connection, and a well-drained area for bathing. Shared latrines
153 (n=250) were single-stall facilities serving fewer than 21 people. All septic tanks were sized to
154 require emptying after approximately two years. It was not possible to blind participants or
155 enumerators to intervention status.

156 The study protocol was approved by the Comité Nacional de Bioética para a Saúde (CNBS),
157 Ministério da Saúde (333/CNBS/14), the Research Ethics Committee of the London School of
158 Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (reference # 8345), and the Institutional Review Board of the
159 Georgia Institute of Technology (protocol # H15160).

160 *Participants*

161 We enrolled eligible children at three time points: baseline (0 months), 12 months post-
162 intervention, and 24 months post-intervention. Children aged 1- 48 months old were eligible for
163 baseline enrolment if we received written informed consent from a parent or guardian and if the
164 head of the compound provided verbal assent for the compound to be included in the study.
165 Children were eligible for enrolment at 12- and 24-month visits if they were aged 1-48 months or
166 if they were eligible for enrolment at baseline but absent during that study visit. Children who
167 moved into the compound fewer than six months before the 12-month or 24-month visit were not
168 eligible for enrolment during that phase given their limited exposure to their new compound.

169 *Procedures*

170 Trained field enumerators completed consent procedures and surveys in the participant's preferred
171 language (Portuguese or Changana) and collected biological specimens from enrolled children
172 (supplemental information p 9). At baseline, we aimed to visit intervention compounds two weeks
173 prior to the opening of the new latrines. We scheduled follow-up visits to be 12 months (±2 weeks)
174 and 24 months (±2 weeks) from the date compound members began using their new latrines, with
175 visits to control compounds made concurrently (±2 weeks).

176 We collected stool specimens independently of reported symptomology. If we were unable to
177 collect a stool sample after multiple attempts, a registered nurse collected a rectal swab after
178 obtaining written consent for the procedure from a parent or guardian. Stool samples were kept
179 cold and delivered to the Laboratory of Molecular Parasitology at the Instituto Nacional de Saúde
180 (INS) within six hours of collection for analysis and storage at -80°C.

181 Samples were shipped frozen with temperatures monitors to the Georgia Institute of Technology
182 (Atlanta, USA) where we used the xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (Luminex Corp, Austin,
183 USA), a qualitative multiplex molecular assay, to detect 15 enteric pathogens in stool samples:
184 *Campylobacter jejuni/coli/lari*; *Clostridium difficile*, toxin A/B; enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli*
185 (ETEC) LT/ST; Shiga-like toxin producing *E. coli* (STEC) stx1/stx2; *E. coli* O157; *Salmonella*;
186 *Shigella boydii/sonnei/flexneri/dysenteriae*; *Vibrio cholerae*; *Yersinia enterocolitica*; *Giardia*
187 *lamblia*; *Cryptosporidium parvum/hominis*; *Entamoeba histolytica;* adenovirus 40/41; norovirus
188 GI/GII; and rotavirus A. The Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (GPP) has been rigorously and
189 extensively tested for stool-based enteric pathogen detection.(Duong et al., 2016; Kellner et al.,
190 2019; Khare et al., 2014) We analyzed samples according to manufacturer instructions with the
191 addition of elution steps for the pretreatment of rectal swabs and diaper material saturated with
192 liquid stool (supplemental information p 9). Technicians at INS assessed stool specimens for the
193 presence of soil-transmitted helminths (STH) using the single-slide Kato-Katz microscope method
194 (Vestergaard Frandsen, Lausanne, Switzerland).

195 Representatives of the National Deworming Campaign (NDC) at the Mozambican Ministério da
196 Saúde (MISAU) offered single-dose albendazole (400 mg, 200 mg for children aged six to 12
197 months) to all eligible members of intervention and control compounds following sample
198 collection activities of each phase. Eligibility was defined by the NDC and included compound
199 members older than six months who were not pregnant.

200 *Outcomes*

201 For the 12-month analysis, we pre-specified the primary outcome as infection with one or more of
202 the 12 bacterial or protozoan enteric pathogens detected by the GPP and secondary outcomes as

203 re-infection with one or more STH as detected by Kato-Katz (following albendazole treatment at
204 baseline), and seven-day period prevalence of caregiver-reported diarrhoea. All three outcomes
205 were considered secondary outcomes in the 24-month analysis. We defined diarrhoea as the
206 passage of three or more loose or liquid stools in a 24-hour period or any stool with blood.(Arnold
207 et al., 2013) We excluded viral enteric pathogens from the primary outcome definition. The
208 intervention may not have interrupted virus transmission due to their low infectious doses, high
209 concentration shed in faeces and extended period of shedding, environmental persistence, and
210 capability for direct person-to-person transmission.(Julian, 2016) Following reported specificity
211 issues with the *Salmonella* target of the GPP, we removed it from our GPP-based outcome
212 definitions.(Duong et al., 2016; Kellner et al., 2019) In addition to the pre-specified outcomes, we
213 evaluated the effect of the intervention on specific pathogen types (bacterial, protozoan, viral) and
214 on individual pathogens.

215 *Statistical analysis*

216 Our sample size calculation has been described previously.(Brown et al., 2015) We used an
217 intention-to-treat approach for our analysis. We included all enrolled children at each visit and
218 analysed data as repeated cross-sectional observations. We examined the effect of the intervention
219 at the 12-month and 24-month phases separately. We conducted two sets of exploratory sub-group
220 analyses. The first assessed the effect of the intervention on children with repeat observations at
221 baseline and 12-months and at baseline and 24-months visits. This longitudinal analysis also
222 served as a sensitivity analysis of the impact of participant migration on effect estimates. The
223 second sub-group analysis compared children who were born into study sites after the intervention
224 (or after baseline in controls) but before the 12-month or 24-month visit with children of a similar

225 age distribution at baseline. This allowed us to explore whether exposure to the intervention from
226 birth would reduce enteric pathogen infection during the first 1-2 years of life.

227 We used a difference-in-difference (DID) approach to assess the impact of the intervention on all
228 outcomes at the 12- and 24-month visits. We used generalized estimating equations (GEE) to fit
229 Poisson regression models with robust standard errors. Our GEE models accounted for clustering
230 at the compound level because it was the highest level of nested data and the level of the
231 intervention allocation. We estimated the effect of the intervention as the interaction of variables
232 representing treatment status (intervention versus control) and phase (pre- or post-intervention).
233 Therefore, effect estimates from our DID analysis are presented as ratio measures (ratio of
234 prevalence ratios) instead of absolute differences. Multivariable models were adjusted for
235 covariates determined *a priori* as potentially predictive of our outcomes, including child age and
236 sex, caregiver's education, and household wealth. Additional covariates (supplemental
237 information p 10-11) were considered for inclusion in multivariable models if they were
238 imbalanced between arms at baseline (>0.1 standardized difference in prevalence or mean) and
239 resulted in a meaningful change in the DID effect estimate (±10% change in 12-month DID
240 prevalence ratio). We used the same statistical approach for sub-group analyses. All analyses
241 were performed on complete case data, and missing data tables are presented in the supplemental
242 information (p 12-13). We performed all statistical analyses with Stata version 16 (StataCorp,
243 College Station, USA).

244 The trial was pre-registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02362932).

245 *Role of the Funding Source*

246 The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
247 preparation of the manuscript. The corresponding author had full access to all study data and had
248 final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

249 Results

250 We enrolled 987 children in 495 compounds during the baseline phase (February 2015 – February
251 2016), 939 children in 438 compounds during 12-month phase (March 2016 – April 2017) and
252 1001 children in 408 compounds during the 24-month phase (April 2017 – August 2018) (Figure
253 1). Fifteen control compounds received an intervention latrine after baseline and children in those
254 compounds were censored at the time of intervention receipt (Figure 1). Children in intervention
255 and control compounds were enrolled at approximately the same rate during each phase
256 (supplemental information p 2-3). Due to migration out of the compound, we collected longitudinal
257 data from 62% of children (59% controls, 67% interventions) between baseline and 12-month and
258 51% of children (46% controls, 58% interventions) between baseline and 24-month.


Baseline
454 children enrolled & 365 stools collected in INTERVENTION sites
366 households
208 compounds
533 children enrolled & 400 stools collected in CONTROL sites
443 households
287 compounds
152 unavailable at 12-month
1 died
151 traveling or moved
220 unavailable at 12-month
2 died
7 refused
211 traveling or moved
160 newly eligible
92 born-in
52 moved in
16 traveling at baseline†
164 newly eligible
85 born-in
50 moved in
1 refused baseline enrollment
28 traveling at baseline†
12-month Follow-Up
462 visited & 408 stools collected
351 households
198 compounds
477 visited & 397 stools collected
369 households
240 compounds
132 unavailable at 24-month
2 died
130 traveling or moved
163 unavailable at 24-month
1 refused
136 traveling or moved
26 censored from dataset‡
143 newly eligible
75 born in
29 moved in
39 traveling during prior visits†
29 enrolled at baseline but absent at 12-month
155 newly eligible
84 born in
27 moved in
44 traveling during prior visits†
30 enrolled at baseline but absent at 12-month
24-month Follow-up
502 visited & 462 stools collected
372 households
197 compounds
499 visited & 460 stools collected
352 households
211 compounds

259

Figure 1: Trial profile. †Eligible for enrollment at baseline and/or 12-month but traveling at time of visit. ‡Children removed from 24-month analysis because their compound received an intervention after completion of the baseline phase.

At baseline enrolment, intervention compounds had more residents, households, and on-premise water taps than controls, though the number of shared latrines was similar (Table 1). Animals were observed in over half of compounds. Intervention and control households had similar wealth scores, though intervention households had more members and were more crowded while control households more often had walls made of sturdy materials. All households used a municipal water tap as their primary drinking water source with 78% reporting use of a tap on the compound grounds. At baseline, latrines used by intervention households more often had pedestals or slabs, drop-hole covers, and sturdy walls compared with controls. Baseline characteristics of intervention and control children were similar: the average age at enrolment was 23 months (SD = 13), 51% were female, and 32% were still breastfeeding (Table 1).

274 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of enrolled children, households, and compounds**

| | Control | | Intervention | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **N** | **n (%) or mean (SD)** | **N** | **n (%) or mean (SD)** |
| Child level variables | | | | |
| Age at survey, days† | 520 | 700 (405) | 441 | 694 (403) |
| Sex, female | 520 | 266 (51%) | 444 | 227 (51%) |
| Child is breastfed with or without complementary feeding | 526 | 169 (32%) | 448 | 143 (32%) |
| Child is exclusively breastfed | 526 | 49 (9·3%) | 448 | 37 (8·3%) |
| Child faeces reported to be disposed of in a latrine | 526 | 148 (28%) | 448 | 141 (31%) |
| Child wears diapers | 526 | 342 (65%) | 447 | 294 (66%) |
| Caregiver completed primary school | 528 | 287 (54%) | 451 | 239 (53%) |
| Child's mother is alive | 513 | 503 (98%) | 435 | 426 (98%) |
| Respondent is child's mother | 519 | 368 (71%) | 443 | 284 (64%) |
| Household level variables | | | | |
| Household population | 441 | 5·4 (2·4) | 365 | 6·1 (3) |
| Household wealth score, 0 (poorer) - 1 (wealthier)⁑ | 440 | 0·45 (0·1) | 365 | 0·44 (0·1) |
| Household crowding, >3 persons/room | 440 | 54 (12%) | 365 | 60 (17%) |
| Household floor is covered‡ | 440 | 426 (97%) | 365 | 333 (91%) |
| Household wall made of bricks, concrete, or similar‡ | 440 | 304 (69%) | 365 | 215 (59%) |
| Household drinking water source inside compound | 435 | 324 (74%) | 360 | 294 (82%) |
| Latrine used by household has a ceramic or masonry pedestal‡ | 432 | 153 (35%) | 359 | 142 (40%) |
| Latrine used by household has a drop-hole cover‡ | 434 | 232 (53%) | 359 | 224 (62%) |
| Compound level variables | | | | |
| Compound population | 287 | 14 (6·2) | 208 | 19 (12) |
| Number of households | 287 | 3·8 (2·1) | 208 | 4·4 (3·7) |
| Number of water taps in compound | 283 | 0·98 (0·95) | 207 | 1·4 (1·6) |
| Number of latrines in compound | 287 | 1 (0·2) | 207 | 1·1 (0·57) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Latrine walls made of brick, concrete or similar‡ | 282 | 72 (26%) | 204 | 67 (33%) |
| Compound population density, persons/square meter* | 281 | 0·071 (0·04) | 205 | 0·087 (0·05) |
| Compound has electricity that normally functions | 287 | 251 (87%) | 208 | 189 (91%) |
| Compound prone to flooding | 287 | 184 (64%) | 208 | 120 (58%) |
| Any animals observed in compound‡ | 287 | 170 (59%) | 208 | 132 (63%) |
| Dog(s) observed‡ | 287 | 14 (4·9%) | 208 | 14 (6·7%) |
| Chicken(s) or duck(s) observed‡ | 287 | 40 (14%) | 208 | 30 (14%) |
| Cat(s) observed‡ | 287 | 149 (52%) | 208 | 116 (56%) |

Data are n (%) or mean (standard deviation) and collected by questionnaire unless otherwise noted. † Age range 32-1819 days, IQR 339-1021 days. ‡Assessed using Simple Poverty Scorecard for Mozambique (http://www.simplepovertyscorecard.com/MOZ_2008_ENG.pdf). ‡Data collected by direct observation. *Calculated as # of people living in the compound divided by the area of the compound in square meters.

278 We detected ≥1 bacterial or protozoan enteric pathogen in 78% (591/753) of stools and ≥1 STH in
279 45% (308/698) of stools at baseline. The prevalence of predefined outcomes, individual pathogens,
280 and pathogen types were similar between arms at baseline (Table 2). The prevalence of most
281 bacterial, protozoan, and STH infections increased with age while the prevalence of enteric viruses
282 decreased with age (supplemental information p 14-16).

283 The characteristics of children with repeated observations (including baseline) were similar to
284 characteristics of children measured at baseline only and similar to characteristics of children
285 measured at 12-month and/or 24-month only with the exception of age-related characteristics
286 (supplemental information p 17-26). Over half of the children enrolled after baseline were born
287 into study sites (336/622 [54%], Figure 1).

288 Our main analyses included observations from all eligible children enrolled at baseline (mean
289 sampling age 664 days, SD=393) and the 12-month (940 days, SD=498) and 24-month (1137 days,
290 SD=603) follow-up visits. We found no evidence that the intervention had an effect on the
291 prevalence of any bacterial or protozoan infection (primary outcome, adjusted PR 1·05, 95% CI
292 [0·95 – 1·16]), or any STH re-infection (secondary outcome, 1·11 [0·89 – 1·38]) 12 months after
293 implementation (Table 2). The prevalence of diarrhoea remained fairly constant in both arms in
294 all three phases with the exception of the 12-month measure in the control arm which was lower,
295 resulting in a larger effect estimate with low precision (1·69 [0·89-3·21]).

296 **Table 2: Effect of the intervention on bacterial, protozoan, and STH infection and diarrhoea at 12 and 24 months post-intervention.**

| | Prevalence | | | BL-12M Prevalence ratio* | | BL-24M Prevalence ratio⁑ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline** | **12-month** | **24-month** | **unadjusted** | **adjusted†** | **unadjusted** | **adjusted†** |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection‡ | | | | | | | |
| Control | 313/392 (80%) | 329/395 (83%) | 403/459 (88%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 278/361 (77%) | 344/407 (85%) | 392/462 (85%) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·00 (0·91 - 1·10) | 0·99 (0·91 - 1·09) |
| Any STH infection‡ | | | | | | | |
| Control | 170/360 (47%) | 143/283 (51%) | 142/253 (56%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 138/329 (42%) | 150/305 (49%) | 136/292 (47%) | 1·12 (0·89 - 1·40) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 0·94 (0·75 - 1·17) | 0·95 (0·77 - 1·17) |
| Diarrhoea‡ | | | | | | | |
| Control | 67/526 (13%) | 40/430 (9·3%) | 53/390 (14%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 59/448 (13%) | 59/436 (14%) | 53/410 (13%) | 1·41 (0·80 - 2·48) | 1·69 (0·89 - 3·21) | 0·92 (0·55 - 1·54) | 0·84 (0·47 - 1·51) |
| Any Bacteria | | | | | | | |
| Control | 271/392 (69%) | 281/395 (71%) | 345/459 (75%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 227/361 (63%) | 285/407 (70%) | 324/462 (70%) | 1·08 (0·94 - 1·24) | 1·08 (0·95 - 1·24) | 1·03 (0·90 - 1·18) | 1·00 (0·87 - 1·15) |
| *Shigella* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 179/392 (46%) | 201/395 (51%) | 269/459 (59%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 152/361 (42%) | 213/407 (52%) | 245/462 (53%) | 1·12 (0·91 - 1·39) | 1·12 (0·92 - 1·36) | 0·98 (0·80 - 1·20) | 0·95 (0·79 - 1·16) |
| ETEC | | | | | | | |
| Control | 116/392 (30%) | 136/395 (34%) | 127/459 (28%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 110/361 (30%) | 144/407 (35%) | 126/462 (27%) | 0·99 (0·72 - 1·37) | 1·01 (0·73 - 1·41) | 0·95 (0·67 - 1·35) | 0·83 (0·57 - 1·19) |
| *Campylobacter* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 39/392 (9·9%) | 31/395 (7·8%) | 48/459 (10%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 21/361 (5·8%) | 33/407 (8·1%) | 34/462 (7·4%) | 1·74 (0·86 - 3·52) | 1·57 (0·76 - 3·25) | 1·20 (0·60 - 2·39) | 1·28 (0·62 - 2·62) |
| *C· difficile* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 22/392 (5·6%) | 12/395 (3·0%) | 13/459 (2·8%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 13/361 (3·6%) | 17/407 (4·2%) | 11/462 (2·4%) | 2·12 (0·77 - 5·83) | 2·27 (0·85 - 6·07) | 1·32 (0·47 - 3·73) | 1·41 (0·46 - 4·30) |
| *E· coli* O157 | | | | | | | |
| Control | 13/392 (3·3%) | 15/395 (3·8%) | 25/459 (5·5%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 18/361 (5·0%) | 14/407 (3·4%) | 16/462 (3·5%) | 0·61 (0·23 - 1·63) | 0·59 (0·22 - 1·55) | 0·43 (0·15 - 1·29) | 0·52 (0·17 - 1·59) |
| STEC | | | | | | | |
| Control | 3/392 (0·77%) | 8/395 (2·0%) | 17/459 (3·7%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intervention | 10/361 (2·8%) | 5/407 (1·2%) | 15/462 (3·3%) | 0·16 (0·03 - 0·76) | 0·16 (0·03 - 0·79) | 0·23 (0·05 - 1·03) | 0·24 (0·05 - 1·01) |
| Any Protozoa | | | | | | | |
| Control | 205/392 (52%) | 228/395 (58%) | 303/459 (66%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 195/361 (54%) | 253/407 (62%) | 296/462 (64%) | 1·05 (0·87 - 1·26) | 1·04 (0·87 - 1·24) | 0·93 (0·78 - 1·11) | 0·91 (0·76 - 1·09) |
| *Giardia* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 201/392 (51%) | 222/395 (56%) | 294/459 (64%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 186/361 (52%) | 244/407 (60%) | 289/462 (63%) | 1·07 (0·88 - 1·28) | 1·06 (0·88 - 1·27) | 0·96 (0·80 - 1·14) | 0·93 (0·78 - 1·11) |
| *Cryptosporidium* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 8/392 (2%) | 8/395 (2·0%) | 14/459 (3·0%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 16/361 (4·4%) | 15/407 (3·7%) | 15/462 (3·3%) | 0·86 (0·22 - 3·33) | 0·87 (0·23 - 3·25) | 0·46 (0·11 - 1·93) | 0·53 (0·13 - 2·14) |
| Any virus | | | | | | | |
| Control | 53/392 (14%) | 52/395 (13%) | 59/459 (13%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 52/361 (14%) | 43/407 (11%) | 62/462 (13%) | 0·74 (0·43 - 1·26) | 0·71 (0·42 - 1·21) | 0·96 (0·55 - 1·68) | 1·03 (0·57 - 1·86) |
| Norovirus GI/GII | | | | | | | |
| Control | 38/392 (9·7%) | 46/395 (12%) | 47/459 (10%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 39/361 (11%) | 35/407 (8·6%) | 55/462 (12%) | 0·64 (0·34 - 1·20) | 0·61 (0·32 - 1·14) | 1·00 (0·52 - 1·93) | 1·10 (0·55 - 2·18) |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | | | | | | | |
| Control | 13/392 (3·3%) | 7/395 (1·8%) | 7/459 (1·5%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/361 (2·5%) | 9/407 (2·2%) | 6/462 (1·3%) | 1·76 (0·41 - 7·53) | 1·67 (0·39 - 7·10) | 1·18 (0·23 - 5·98) | 0·97 (0·18 - 5·19) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP pathogens | | | | | | | |
| Control | 206/392 (53%) | 229/395 (58%) | 302/459 (66%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 185/361 (51%) | 248/407 (61%) | 282/462 (61%) | 1·08 (0·91 - 1·29) | 1·08 (0·91 - 1·29) | 0·95 (0·80 - 1·12) | 0·93 (0·79 - 1·10) |
| *Trichuris* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 139/360 (39%) | 116/283 (41%) | 124/253 (49%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 117/329 (36%) | 120/305 (39%) | 117/292 (40%) | 1·05 (0·82 - 1·35) | 1·01 (0·79 - 1·28) | 0·89 (0·69 - 1·16) | 0·86 (0·67 - 1·10) |
| *Ascaris* | | | | | | | |
| Control | 95/360 (26%) | 82/283 (29%) | 78/253 (31%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 68/329 (21%) | 87/305 (29%) | 56/292 (19%) | 1·26 (0·87 - 1·82) | 1·33 (0·92 - 1·93) | 0·80 (0·52 - 1·21) | 0·83 (0·54 - 1·27) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | | | | | | | |
| Control | 64/360 (18%) | 55/283 (19%) | 60/253 (24%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 47/329 (14%) | 57/305 (19%) | 37/292 (13%) | 1·16 (0·76 - 1·77) | 1·17 (0·76 - 1·79) | 0·67 (0·40 - 1·13) | 0·63 (0·37 - 1·07) |

297 *Analysis includes all children measured at baseline and 12-month visits. ⁑Analysis includes all children measured at baseline and 24-month visits. ‡Outcome was
298 pre-specified in trial registration. All other outcomes are exploratory. †Pathogen outcomes adjusted for child age and sex, caregiver's education, and household
299 wealth index. Reported diarrhoea was also adjusted for baseline presence of a drop-hole cover and reported use of a tap on compound grounds as primary drinking
300 water source. Sample sizes for adjusted analyses are slightly smaller than numbers presented in prevalence estimates due to missing covariate data. *Y. enterocolitica,*
301 *V. cholerae, E. histolytica*, and rotavirus A detected in <2% of samples in each arm at each phase. Descriptive data for these pathogens are available in the
302 supplemental information.

303 The intervention had no relevant effect at 12 months on the prevalence of infection with any of the
304 three pathogen types measured by the GPP (bacterial, protozoan, viral), pathogen coinfection, or
305 on any individual pathogen (Table 2). There was poor precision in the effect estimates for
306 infrequently detected pathogens, evident from their wide confidence intervals. Therefore, some
307 estimates suggestive of a large protective or detrimental effect (*Campylobacter*, *C. difficile*, *E. coli*
308 O157, STEC, Norovirus GI/GII, Adenovirus 40/41) may have arisen by chance. While the NDC
309 provided albendazole to all compound members following baseline, during 12-month visitation
310 only 58% of caregivers (56% control, 60% intervention) confirmed that their child was dewormed
311 during these visits. A sensitivity analysis restricted to children confirmed to have been dewormed
312 produced similar results to the main analysis (supplemental information p 27).

313 There was no evidence that the intervention had an effect on the prevalence of any bacterial or
314 protozoan infection, any STH reinfection, or diarrhoea after 24-months (Table 2). We also found
315 limited evidence of effect on the prevalence of any pathogen type or coinfection with ≥2 GPP
316 pathogens 24-months after intervention. Results for several individual outcomes were suggestive
317 of a protective (STEC, *E. coli* O157, *Cryptosporidium*, STH coinfection) or adverse
318 (*Campylobacter*, *C. difficile*) effect but evidence was weak as estimates were accompanied by
319 wide confidence intervals. At 24-months, caregivers confirmed baseline and/or 12-month
320 deworming more frequently for intervention children (339/502 [68%]) than control children
321 (286/499 [57%]). Adjustment for deworming status or time since deworming had no impact on
322 effect estimates (supplemental information p 27).

323 Multivariable models for GPP outcomes and STH outcomes were adjusted for covariates selected
324 *a priori* (child age, sex, caregiver education, and household wealth index) as no other variables

325 met our inclusion criteria. Point estimates of effect and associated confidence intervals were
326 largely similar in unadjusted and adjusted models with few exceptions (e.g. ETEC at 24-month)
327 (Table 2). For diarrhoea, two additional variables met our inclusion criteria and were included in
328 adjusted models: presence of a latrine drop-hole cover at baseline and reported use of a water tap
329 located within the compound grounds at baseline. The effect estimates were larger and confidence
330 intervals wider for diarrhoea in adjusted versus unadjusted models in the 12-month and 24-month
331 analyses (Table 2).

332 In sub-group analyses comparing children born into study compounds before the 24-month visit
333 with children of similar ages at baseline (<2 years old), there was suggestive evidence that the
334 intervention reduced the prevalence of infection with any STH by half (n= 522; adjusted
335 prevalence ratio 0·51, [95% CI 0·27 - 0·95]), *Trichuris* by 76% (n=522; 0·24, [0·10 - 0·60]), and
336 *Shigella* by 51% (n=630; 0·49, [0·28 - 0·85]) (Table 3). We did not observe similar results among
337 children born into the study by the 12-month visit (supplemental information p 28-29), but the
338 sample size was small, resulting in high uncertainty in effect estimates.

339 Longitudinal sub-group analyses explored the effect of the intervention on children with repeated
340 measures at baseline and 12-month (for unadjusted analyses: n=572 for Kato-Katz outcomes,
341 n=868 for GPP outcomes, and n=1112 for diarrhoea) and at baseline and 24-month (n=402, n=716,
342 n=834). Effect estimates were consistent with results from the main analyses (supplemental
343 information p 30-35) but less precise due to the reduced sample numbers.

344 **Table 3:** Effect of intervention on bacterial, protozoan, and STH infection and reported diarrhoea in children born
345 into study sites post implementation (post-baseline) but by 24-month visit compared with children of a similar age at
346 baseline (<2 years old).

| | **Prevalence** | | **Prevalence ratio** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline** | **24-month, Born-in** | **unadjusted** | **adjusted†** |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection‡ | | | | |
| Control | 158/228 (69%) | 79/106 (75%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 129/201 (64%) | 71/107 (66%) | 0·96 (0·77 - 1·21) | 0·99 (0·80 - 1·22) |
| Any STH infection‡ | | | | |
| Control | 67/205 (33%) | 25/68 (37%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 52/183 (28%) | 13/75 (17%) | 0·52 (0·26 - 1·05) | 0·51 (0·27 - 0·95) |
| Diarrhoea‡ | | | | |
| Control | 46/283 (16%) | 18/105 (17%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 43/238 (18%) | 22/100 (22%) | 1·20 (0·57 -2·5) | 1·37 (0·47 - 4·03) |
| Any Bacteria | | | | |
| Control | 142/228 (62%) | 70/106 (66%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 102/201 (51%) | 51/107 (48%) | 0·89 (0·66 - 1·20) | 0·90 (0·67 - 1·19) |
| *Shigella* | | | | |
| Control | 67/228 (29%) | 36/106 (34%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 49/201 (24%) | 15/107 (14%) | 0·48 (0·28 - 0·83) | 0·49 (0·28 - 0·85) |
| ETEC | | | | |
| Control | 70/228 (31%) | 30/106 (28%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 58/201 (29%) | 24/107 (22%) | 0·84 (0·46 - 1·52) | 0·85 (0·48 - 1·51) |
| *Campylobacter* | | | | |
| Control | 27/228 (12%) | 14/106 (13%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 14/201 (7%) | 13/107 (12%) | 1·75 (0·63 - 4·87) | 1·75 (0·61 - 4·98) |
| *C. difficile* | | | | |
| Control | 20/228 (8·8%) | 7/106 (6·6%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 13/201 (6·5%) | 7/107 (6·5%) | 1·33 (0·36 - 4·86) | 1·49 (0·41 - 5·44) |
| *E. coli* O157 | | | | |
| Control | 7/228 (3·1%) | 3/106 (2·8%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/201 (4·5%) | 2/107 (1·9%) | 0·45 (0·06 - 3·66) | 0·53 (0·07 - 4·24) |
| STEC | | | | |
| Control | 1/228 (0·44%) | 2/106 (1·9%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/201 (4·5%) | 1/107 (0·93%) | 0·05 (0·00 - 1·13) | 0·05 (0·00 - 1·26) |
| Any Protozoa | | | | |
| Control | 82/228 (36%) | 47/106 (44%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 74/201 (37%) | 43/107 (40%) | 0·84 (0·55 - 1·28) | 0·90 (0·62 - 1·30) |
| *Giardia* | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 79/228 (35%) | 44/106 (42%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 68/201 (34%) | 41/107 (38%) | 0·90 (0·58 - 1·39) | 0·93 (0·64 - 1·36) |
| *Cryptosporidium* | | | | |
| Control | 7/228 (3·1%) | 5/106 (4·7%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 12/201 (6%) | 5/107 (4·7%) | 0·45 (0·08 - 2·57) | 0·64 (0·12 - 3·51) |
| Any virus | | | | |
| Control | 34/228 (15%) | 18/106 (17%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 36/201 (18%) | 18/107 (17%) | 0·83 (0·37 - 1·83) | 0·83 (0·37 - 1·87) |
| Norovirus GI/GII | | | | |
| Control | 26/228 (11%) | 12/106 (11%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 26/201 (13%) | 17/107 (16%) | 1·24 (0·48 - 3·17) | 1·29 (0·49 - 3·41) |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | | | | |
| Control | 7/228 (3·1%) | 4/106 (3·8%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 7/201 (3·5%) | 0/107 (0·0%) | ··⁂ | ··⁂ |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP pathogens | | | | |
| Control | 92/228 (40%) | 52/106 (49%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 74/201 (37%) | 39/107 (36%) | 0·82 (0·56 - 1·21) | 0·86 (0·59 - 1·24) |
| *Trichuris* | | | | |
| Control | 48/205 (23%) | 18/68 (26%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 41/183 (22%) | 5/75 (6·7%) | 0·25 (0·09 - 0·68) | 0·24 (0·10 - 0·60) |
| *Ascaris* | | | | |
| Control | 45/205 (22%) | 16/68 (24%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 29/183 (16%) | 9/75 (12%) | 0·70 (0·30 - 1·64) | 0·68 (0·30 - 1·54) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | | | | |
| Control | 26/205 (13%) | 9/68 (13%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 18/183 (9·8%) | 1/75 (1·3%) | 0·13 (0·02 - 1·08) | 0·12 (0·01 - 1·02) |

Analysis includes children <2 years old at baseline and children born into the study after baseline and <2 years old at the time of the 24-month visit. ‡Outcome was pre-specified in trial registration. All other outcomes are exploratory. †Pathogen outcomes adjusted for child age and sex, caregiver's education, and household wealth index. Reported diarrhoea was also adjusted for baseline presence of a drop-hole cover and reported use of a tap on compound grounds as primary drinking water source. Sample sizes for adjusted analyses are slightly smaller than numbers presented in prevalence estimates due to missing covariate data. ⁂Models would not converge due to sparse data. *Y. enterocolitica, V. cholerae, E. histolytica*, and rotavirus A were detected in <2% of samples in each arm at each phase and excluded. Descriptive data for these pathogens are available in the supplemental information.

355 Discussion

356 We found no evidence that this urban, onsite shared sanitation intervention was protective for our
357 pre-specified child health outcomes of enteric infection, STH reinfection, or diarrhoea. We also
358 found no strong evidence that the intervention affected prevalence of any individual pathogen,
359 pathogen type, or coinfection with ≥2 enteric pathogens or STH. In exploratory sub-group
360 analyses, we found suggestive evidence that the intervention may have reduced the prevalence of
361 any STH, *Trichuris,* and *Shigella* infections among children born into the study by the 24-month
362 follow-up visit. Studying children born into intervention sites after implementation allowed us to
363 examine the effect of the intervention from birth through the first two years of life. This result
364 suggests that the intervention delayed pathogen exposure and the accumulation of enteric
365 infections during early childhood, but it needs to be treated with caution as this was an exploratory
366 subgroup analysis and included multiple comparisons.

367 To our knowledge, MapSan was the first trial to estimate the health impact of an urban, onsite
368 shared sanitation intervention. Most of the urban sanitation literature published to date has
369 demonstrated reductions in diarrhoea and enteric parasite infection,(Barreto et al., 2010; Norman
370 et al., 2010) but has focused on the expansion of sewerage. Our findings are consistent with the
371 results of recent, large-scale, rigorous trials of basic water, sanitation, and hygiene improvements
372 in rural areas, which found mixed effects on health outcomes including linear growth, diarrhoea,
373 and enteric infection.(Clasen et al., 2014; Ercumen et al., 2019; Humphrey et al., 2019; Lin et al.,
374 2018; Luby et al., 2018; Null et al., 2018; Pickering et al., 2015; Rogawski McQuade et al., 2019)

375 In this setting, where fecal contamination was pervasive and burden of infection high,(Holcomb
376 et al., 2020; Knee et al., 2018) even considerable reductions in contamination and exposure may

377 have been insufficient to realize measurable health gains.(Julian, 2016) The intervention did not
378 address child faeces disposal practices or handwashing behaviours and it is unlikely that the
379 intervention infrastructure would have changed these.(Majorin et al., 2019) The intervention may
380 not have reduced exposure via consumption of contaminated food – particularly foods
381 contaminated prior to arrival in the compound – an important source of enteric pathogen
382 transmission in some settings.(Julian, 2016) Children's exposure to animal faeces has been
383 documented in rural, peri-urban, and urban settings and could be an important, unmitigated source
384 of exposure to enteric pathogens in both intervention and control arms where animals were
385 frequently observed.(Penakalapati et al., 2017) Observation of animals in compounds was
386 examined as a potential confounder but did not change effect estimates.

387 While we hypothesized that the majority of exposures young children experienced in this setting
388 occurred in the compound,(Brown et al., 2015) exposure to external sources of contamination
389 could have influenced health outcomes. The proximity of intervention and non-intervention
390 compounds and movement of adults, school-aged children, free-roaming animals, and flies, may
391 have increased the likelihood of exposure to external sources of faecal contamination within the
392 compound boundaries. The intervention was not designed to achieve a sanitation coverage
393 threshold in the study neighborhoods, which may be necessary to reduce disease burdens.(Wolf et
394 al., 2018) We did not measure neighborhood-level exposures, which may be important even for
395 young children,(Medgyesi et al., 2019) and their impact on our health outcomes is unclear. Further,
396 the transience of the study population meant that trips to provinces outside of Maputo, where
397 exposures were varied and unmeasured, were common.

398 It is unlikely that our findings are due to poor intervention fidelity or use, an issue encountered in
399 trials of rural sanitation interventions.(Clasen et al., 2014) The use of the intervention required
400 minimal behaviour change as the existing latrine was replaced with a new hygienic latrine. It is
401 possible that development in the study neighborhoods, including changes to sanitation facilities in
402 control compounds, contributed to the limited effect of the intervention. By the 12-month visit, 19
403 control compounds (19/240 [8.0%]) had independently upgraded their facilities to pour-flush
404 toilets, and by the 24-month visit, 35 control compounds (35/211 [17%]) had upgraded their
405 facilities. Results from sensitivity analyses excluding children living in control compounds with
406 independently upgraded facilities were consistent with the main results (supplemental information
407 p 36).

408 While the NDC dewormed every study compound annually during the study period, it is possible
409 that not all study participants received, or took, the medication and that the time between
410 deworming and subsequent measurement of re-infection varied among children. Additionally,
411 single-dose albendazole can have limited effectiveness against certain STH, notably
412 *Trichuris*.(Moser et al., 2017) Inadequate or ineffective deworming could have limited our ability
413 to detect an effect on STH outcomes. Sensitivity analyses adjusting for caregiver-confirmed
414 deworming and estimated time between deworming and re-infection measurement produced
415 similar results to the main analysis (supplemental information p 28).

416 There are several important limitations of this study. As the intervention was pre-planned and not
417 implemented by the study team, we could not randomize its allocation, increasing the risk of
418 confounding. We assessed potential confounding variables at baseline and used a DID analysis,
419 which accounts for baseline outcome measures, to limit the effect of unmeasured, residual

420 confounding. To assess the validity of the parallel trend assumption, a key assumption of DID
421 analyses, we ran "placebo tests" by replacing outcomes with variables unrelated to the
422 intervention, such as child age, respondent role, and presence of animals. Placebo tests showed no
423 effect of the intervention on these variables.

424 It was not possible to mask participants to their intervention status, and our measure of caregiver-
425 reported diarrhoea could be subject to respondent and recall biases. To reduce the risk of
426 respondent bias, the MapSan field enumerator team and implementation team were different, and
427 respondents were not informed explicitly that the MapSan team was evaluating the health effect
428 of the intervention. To limit recall bias, we used a 7-day recall period.(Arnold et al., 2013) Our
429 other pre-specified outcomes were objective measures of pathogen infection and not subject to the
430 same biases.(Brown & Cumming, 2019)

431 Due to the greater than expected losses to follow-up in both study arms, we were not able to follow
432 all children enrolled at baseline through time as expected, but we still achieved our target
433 enrolment numbers due to migration and births into study compounds. We conducted the originally
434 planned longitudinal analysis as a sub-group analysis. It also served as a sensitivity analysis to
435 estimate the impact of migration on our effect estimates. Results from this sub-group analysis were
436 largely similar to results of the main analysis which treated measures as repeated cross-sections,
437 though the reduction in sample size led to wider confidence intervals (supplemental information p
438 30-35). Measures of outcomes and covariates in children with and without repeated measures were
439 mostly similar, further limiting the likelihood that changes in the study population biased our
440 results.

441 While molecular detection of enteric pathogens in stool is evidence of pathogen exposure, it is not
442 necessarily evidence of active infection, making its clinical significance less clear.(Brown &
443 Cumming, 2019) We assumed pathogen detection by the GPP indicated infection because the
444 assay's limits of detection exceeded the median infectious dose of most pathogens. While the GPP
445 detects many enteric pathogens recognized as important causes of childhood diarrhoea in
446 LMICs,(Liu et al., 2016) it does not detect all enteric pathogens of importance. Further, qualitative,
447 cross-sectional analysis of stools does not provide information on the duration or intensity of
448 infection. Some studies have demonstrated overall good performance of the GPP but observed
449 elevated false positive detection rates for the *Salmonella* targets.(Duong et al., 2016; Kellner et al.,
450 2019) For this reason, we removed *Salmonella* results from our pre-specified outcome definition.
451 Results from analyses including and excluding *Salmonella* were similar.

452 We had limited ability to evaluate the impact of seasonality or weather-related trends on our effect
453 estimates due to drought conditions during the 2015/2016 rainy season. We assessed cumulative
454 30-day rainfall as a potential confounder but excluded it because it did not meet our inclusion
455 criteria for adjusted models.

456 Our results demonstrate that access to hygienic, shared onsite sanitation systems was not sufficient
457 to reduce enteric infection or diarrhoea in children aged 6 years or younger (≤4 at baseline) 12-24
458 months after implementation. Results from our sub-group analysis of children born into
459 intervention sites showed a substantial reduction in the prevalence of any STH, *Trichuris*, and
460 *Shigella* infection, suggesting that children may require protection from birth to delay infection.
461 Our results do not suggest that shared sanitation is inadvisable in this setting, as we did not compare
462 against household-level sanitation improvements, nor do they account for the many non-health

463 related benefits associated with this intervention or upgraded sanitation generally.(Shiras et al.,
464 2018)

465 The need for effective sanitation solutions may be most urgent in densely populated, low-income,
466 informal communities like our study setting where ubiquitous fecal contamination drives high
467 infection burdens. Disease transmission in these settings may be driven by multiple interrelated
468 pathways, complicated by frequent migration and the diversity of circulating pathogens, and
469 therefore difficult to interrupt. While decades of research have demonstrated meaningful health
470 gains following sanitation improvements, the results of this study, and other rigorous trials of
471 sanitation interventions, suggest that the relationship between sanitation and health is complex,
472 difficult to measure, and may not be generalizable across diverse settings and populations.

473 *Contributors*

474 JB as principal investigator and OC as co-principal investigator designed the trial and drafted the
475 study protocol with input from WPS, JK, DH, PK, JS, VZ, and RN. JK was the study manager,
476 co-led laboratory work and data analysis with TS, and drafted the manuscript. TS curated the
477 data, designed data collection tools and activities with JK, and produced figures. ZA led field
478 data collection. CA, FB, DC, VC, EM, JMB, CR, WZ helped with sample organization and
479 laboratory analysis. WPS designed the analytical approach and JK, DH, and AM helped refine it.
480 JB and OC secured funding for the trial. All authors contributed critically to the final version of
481 the manuscript.

*Acknowledgements*

We gratefully acknowledge data collection services and other support provided by the WE Consult team and in particular Wouter Rhebergen and Ellen de Bruijn, and the hard work of the enumerators Isabel Maninha Chiquele, Sérgio Adriano Macumbe, Carolina Zavale, Maria Celina Macuacua, Guilherme Zimba, and Anabela Mondlane. Olimpio Zavale coordinated logistics for early field work. We would like to thank staff at the Instituto Nacional de Saúde, specifically Josina Mate, Acacio Sabonete, and Jeronimo Langa, for their support throughout the project. The study would not have been possible without our implementing partners at Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP), in particular Guy Norman, Carla Costa, Vasco Parente, and Jonathan Stokes. At the Georgia Institute of Technology, we gratefully acknowledge the project and laboratory support provided by Aaron Bivins, Kevin Zhu, David Berendes, Fred Goddard, Olivia Ginn, Sarah Lowry, Olivia Stehr, Haley Lewis, Jonathan Pennie, Derek Whaler, Mio Unno, Catherine Reynolds, Joel Seibel, Diana Chumak, Felicitas Schneider, Katherine Brand, Jiaxin Li, and Meredith Lockwood. We would also like to thank Ben Arnold, Jack Colford, Radu Ban, Jay Graham, Tony Kolb, Eddy Perez, Jan Willem Rosenboom, Tom Slaymaker, Larry Moulton, and Darren Saywell for technical and study design input. We would like to recognize the early contributions of the late Dr. Jeroen Ensink to the MapSan trial protocol. As a colleague, and as a friend, he is sorely missed. Finally, we would like to acknowledge and thank all of the participants and their families who graciously welcomed us into their homes and were so generous with their time.

This study was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (www.usaid.gov) under Translating Research into Action (Cooperative Agreement No. GHS-A-

00-09-00015-00) and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (www.gatesfoundation.org) grant OPP1137224. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

*Data sharing*

De-identified participant data which underlie the results reported in this manuscript will be made available beginning three months after publication and ending 60 months after publication. A corresponding data dictionary, the study protocol, and analysis plan and code will also be available for the stated period. Data will be available to researchers who provide a methodologically sound proposal. Proposals for data use can be submitted to joe.brown@ce.gatech.edu and authors of approved proposals will need to sign a data access agreement. Once approved, requestors will be able to access data on the MapSan trial Open Science Forum website (https://osf.io/p5shk). The published trial protocol can be accessed at: https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/6/e008215 .

*Competing interests*

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at *www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf* and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

## References


Arnold, B. F., Galiani, S., Ram, P. K., Hubbard, A. E., Briceño, B., Gertler, P. J., & Colford, J. M. (2013). Optimal Recall Period for Caregiver-reported Illness in Risk Factor and Intervention Studies: A Multicountry Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *177*(4), 361–370. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kws281

Barreto, M. L., Genser, B., Strina, A., Teixeira, M. G., Assis, A. M. O., Rego, R. F., Teles, C. A., Prado, M. S., Matos, S. M. A., Alcântara-Neves, N. M., & Cairncross, S. (2010). Impact of a citywide sanitation program in Northeast Brazil on intestinal parasites infection in young children. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *118*(11), 1637–1642. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1002058

Barreto, M. L., Genser, B., Strina, A., Teixeira, M. G., Marlucia, A., Assis, O., Rego, R. F., Teles, C. A., Prado, M. S., Matos, S. M. A., Santos, D. N., Santos, L. A. Dos, & Cairncross, S. (2007). Effect of city-wide sanitation programme on reduction in rate of childhood diarrhoea in northeast Brazil: assessment by two cohort studies. In *www.thelancet.com* (Vol. 370). www.thelancet.com

Berendes, D. M., Sumner, T. A., & Brown, J. M. (2017). Safely Managed Sanitation for All Means Fecal Sludge Management for at Least 1.8 Billion People in Low and Middle Income Countries. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *51*(5), 3074–3083. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b06019

Brown, J., & Cumming, O. (2019). Stool-Based Pathogen Detection Offers Advantages as an Outcome Measure for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Trials. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg*, *0*(0),

545 1–2. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.19-0639

546 Brown, J., Cumming, O., Bartram, J., Cairncross, S., Ensink, J., Holcomb, D., Knee, J., Kolsky,
547 P., Liang, K., Liang, S., Nala, R., Norman, G., Rheingans, R., Stewart, J., Zavale, O., Zuin,
548 V., & Schmidt, W.-P. (2015). A controlled, before-and-after trial of an urban sanitation
549 intervention to reduce enteric infections in children: research protocol for the Maputo
550 Sanitation (MapSan) study, Mozambique. *Bmj Open*, *5*(6), e008215.
551 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008215

552 Clasen, T., Boisson, S., Routray, P., Torondel, B., Bell, M., Cumming, O., Ensink, J., Freeman,
553 M., Jenkins, M., Odagiri, M., Ray, S., Sinha, A., Suar, M., & Schmidt, W.-P. (2014).
554 Effectiveness of a rural sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soil-transmitted helminth
555 infection, and child malnutrition in Odisha, India: a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Global*
556 *Health*, *2*(11), E645–E653. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2214-109x(14)70307-9

557 Duong, V. T., Phat, V. V., Tuyen, H. T., Dung, T. T. N., Trung, P. D., Minh, P. Van, Phuong Tu,
558 L. T., Campbell, J. I., Phuc, H. Le, Thanh Ha, T. T., … Baker, S. (2016). Evaluation of
559 luminex xTAG gastrointestinal pathogen panel assay for detection of multiple diarrheal
560 pathogens in fecal samples in Vietnam. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, *54*(4), 1094–
561 1100. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.03321-15

562 Ercumen, A., Benjamin-Chung, J., Arnold, B. F., Lin, A., Hubbard, A. E., Stewart, C., Rahman,
563 Z., Parvez, S. M., Unicomb, L., Rahman, M., Haque, R., Colford, J. M., & Luby, S. P.
564 (2019). Effects of water, sanitation, handwashing and nutritional interventions on soil-
565 transmitted helminth infections in young children: A cluster-randomized controlled trial in

rural Bangladesh. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, *13*(5), e0007323. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007323

Fink, G., Günther, I., & Hill, K. (2014). Slum Residence and Child Health in Developing Countries. *Demography*, *51*, 1175–1197. https://doi.org/10.1

Holcomb, D. A., Knee, J., Sumner, T., Adriano, Z., de Bruijn, E., Nalá, R., Cumming, O., Brown, J., & Stewart, J. R. (2020). Human fecal contamination of water, soil, and surfaces in households sharing poor-quality sanitation facilities in Maputo, Mozambique. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, *226*(February), 113496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113496

Humphrey, J. H., Mbuya, M. N. N., Ntozini, R., Moulton, L. H., Stoltzfus, R. J., Tavengwa, N. V, Mutasa, K., Majo, F., Mutasa, B., Mangwadu, G., … Makoni, T. (2019). Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on child stunting and anaemia in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised trial. *The Lancet. Global Health*, *7*(1), e132–e147. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30374-7

Investigators, M.-E. N. (2018). Early childhood cognitive development is affected by interactions among illness, diet, enteropathogens and the home environment: findings from the MAL-ED birth cohort study. *BMJ Global Health*, *3*(4), e000752. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000752

Julian, T. R. (2016). Environmental transmission of diarrheal pathogens in low and middle income countries. *Environmental Science: Processes and Impacts*, *18*(8), 944–955.

https://doi.org/10.1039/c6em00222f

Kellner, T., Parsons, B., Chui, L., Berenger, B. M., Xie, J., Burnham, C. A. D., Tarr, P. I., Lee, B. E., Nettel-Aguirre, A., Szelewicki, J., Vanderkooi, O. G., Pang, X. L., Zelyas, N., & Freedman, S. B. (2019). Comparative evaluation of enteric bacterial culture and a molecular multiplex syndromic panel in children with acute gastroenteritis. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, *57*(6). https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00205-19

Khare, R., Espy, M. J., Cebelinski, E., Boxrud, D., Sloan, L. M., Cunningham, S. A., Pritt, B. S., Patel, R., & Binnicker, M. J. (2014). Comparative evaluation of two commercial multiplex panels for detection of gastrointestinal pathogens by use of clinical stool specimens. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, *52*(10), 3667–3673. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01637-14

Knee, J., Sumner, T., Adriano, Z., Berendes, D., de Bruijn, E., Schmidt, W.-P., Nalá, R., Cumming, O., & Brown, J. (2018). Risk factors for childhood enteric infection in urban Maputo, Mozambique: A cross-sectional study. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, *12*(11), e0006956. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006956

Kosek, M. N., Ahmed, T., Bhutta, Z. Z. A., Caulfield, L., Guerrant, R. L., Houpt, E., Kang, G., Kosek, M. N., Lee, G., Lima, A. A. M., … Trigoso, D. R. (2017). Causal Pathways from Enteropathogens to Environmental Enteropathy: Findings from the MAL-ED Birth Cohort Study. *EBioMedicine*, *18*, 109–117. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2017.02.024

Lin, A., Ercumen, A., Benjamin-Chung, J., Arnold, B. F., Das, S., Haque, R., Ashraf, S., Parvez, S. M., Unicomb, L., Rahman, M., Hubbard, A. E., Stewart, C. P., Colford, J. M., & Luby, S.

608 P. (2018). Effects of Water, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional Interventions on
609 Child Enteric Protozoan Infections in Rural Bangladesh: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled
610 Trial. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, *67*(10), 1515–1522. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciy320

611 Liu, J., Platts-Mills, J. A., Juma, J., Kabir, F., Nkeze, J., Okoi, C., Operario, D. J., Uddin, J.,
612 Ahmed, S., Alonso, P. L., … Houpt, E. R. (2016). Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic
613 methods to identify causes of diarrhoea in children: a reanalysis of the GEMS case-control
614 study. *The Lancet*, *388*(10051), 1291–1301. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-
615 6736(16)31529-X

616 Luby, S. P., Rahman, M., Arnold, B. F., Unicomb, L., Ashraf, S., Winch, P. J., Stewart, C. P.,
617 Begum, F., Hussain, F., Benjamin-Chung, J., … Colford, J. M. (2018, January). Effects of
618 water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child
619 growth in rural Bangladesh: A cluster randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global*
620 *Health*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30490-4

621 Majorin, F., Torondel, B., Chan, G. K. S., & Clasen, T. (2019). Interventions to improve disposal
622 of child faeces for preventing diarrhoea and soil-transmitted helminth infection. *Cochrane*
623 *Database of Systematic Reviews*, *2019*(9).
624 https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011055.pub2

625 Medgyesi, D., Sewell, D., Senesac, R., Cumming, O., Mumma, J., & Baker, K. K. (2019). The
626 landscape of enteric pathogen exposure of young children in public domains of low-income,
627 urban Kenya: The influence of exposure pathway and spatial range of play on multi-
628 pathogen exposure risks. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, *13*(3), e0007292.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007292

Moser, W., Schindler, C., & Keiser, J. (2017). Efficacy of recommended drugs against soil transmitted helminths: systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BMJ*, *358*, 4307. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4307

Norman, G., Pedley, S., & Takkouche, B. (2010). Effects of sewerage on diarrhoea and enteric infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, *10*(8), 536–544. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70123-7

Null, C., Stewart, C. P., Pickering, A. J., Dentz, H. N., Arnold, B. F., Arnold, C. D., Benjamin-Chung, J., Clasen, T., Dewey, K. G., Fernald, L. C. H., … Colford, J. M. (2018). Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global Health*, *6*(3), e316–e329. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30005-6

Parker, E. P., Ramani, S., Lopman, B. A., Church, J. A., Iturriza-Gómara, M., Prendergast, A. J., & Grassly, N. C. (2018). Causes of impaired oral vaccine efficacy in developing countries. *Future Microbiology*, *13*(1), 97–118. https://doi.org/10.2217/fmb-2017-0128

Penakalapati, G., Swarthout, J., Delahoy, M. J., McAliley, L., Wodnik, B., Levy, K., & Freeman, M. C. (2017). Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *51*(20), 11537–11552. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02811

Pickering, A. J., Djebbari, H., Lopez, C., Coulibaly, M., & Alzua, M. L. (2015). Effect of a

649 community-led sanitation intervention on child diarrhoea and child growth in rural Mali: a
650 cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global Health*, *3*(11), e701–e711.
651 https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00144-8

652 Rogawski, E. T., Liu, J., Platts-Mills, J. A., Kabir, F., Lertsethtakarn, P., Siguas, M., Khan, S. S.,
653 Praharaj, I., Murei, A., Nshama, R., … Nyathi, E. (2018). Use of quantitative molecular
654 diagnostic methods to investigate the effect of enteropathogen infections on linear growth in
655 children in low-resource settings: longitudinal analysis of results from the MAL-ED cohort
656 study. *The Lancet Global Health*, *6*(12), e1319–e1328. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-
657 109X(18)30351-6

658 Rogawski McQuade, E. T., Platts-Mills, J. A., Gratz, J., Zhang, J., Moulton, L. H., Mutasa, K.,
659 Majo, F. D., Tavengwa, N., Ntozini, R., Prendergast, A. J., Humphrey, J. H., Liu, J., &
660 Houpt, E. R. (2019). Impact of Water Quality, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional
661 Interventions on Enteric Infections in Rural Zimbabwe: The Sanitation Hygiene Infant
662 Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) Trial. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*.
663 https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiz179

664 Shiras, T., Cumming, O., Brown, J., Muneme, B., Nala, R., & Dreibelbis, R. (2018). Shared
665 latrines in Maputo, Mozambique: Exploring emotional well-being and psychosocial stress.
666 *BMC International Health and Human Rights*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12914-018-
667 0169-z

668 UN-Habitat. (2016). *World Cities Report: Urbanization and Development Emerging futures*.
669 http://wcr.unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Chapter1-WCR-2016.pdf

670 UNICEF/WHO. (2019). *Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-*
671 *2017. Special focus on inequalities.* https://washdata.org

672 Wolf, J., Hunter, P. R., Freeman, M. C., Cumming, O., Clasen, T., Bartram, J., Higgins, J. P. T.,
673 Johnston, R., Medlicott, K., Boisson, S., & Prüss-Ustün, A. (2018). Impact of drinking
674 water, sanitation and handwashing with soap on childhood diarrhoeal disease: updated
675 meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, *23*(5), 508–
676 525. https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13051

677

678 **Supplemental information for Effects of an urban sanitation intervention on childhood**
679 **enteric infection and diarrhoea in Maputo, Mozambique**

680


**Figure 1: Cumulative enrolment and stool sample collection profile for intervention and control children during (a) baseline, (b) 12-month, and (c) 24-month phases.** 3

**Figure 2b: Construction of a soakaway pit for discharge of liquid effluent from intervention latrines.** 5

**Figure 3: Map illustrating locations of intervention and control sites (compounds).** 6

**Figure 4a: Photo of communal sanitation block as constructed** 7

**Figure 4b: Photo of shared latrine as constructed** 8

**Consent procedures, survey administration, and specimen collection** 9

**Table 1: Confounding assessment for primary outcome and both secondary outcomes (any STH, diarrhoea) at 12-month.** 10

**Table 2: Outcome and covariate descriptions, coding, and % missing.** 12

**Table 3: Age stratified baseline prevalence of bacterial, protozoan, viral, and STH infections and diarrhoea in children.** 14

**Table 4: Baseline enrolment characteristics of children with and without repeated measures at the 12-month phase. Results are presented for all children combined and stratified by study arm.** 17

**Table 5: Baseline enrolment characteristics of children with and without repeated measures at the 24-month phase. Results are presented for all children combined and stratified by study arm.** 20

**Table 6: Balance of characteristics measured at 12-month visits between children with repeat observations at BL and 12-month and children with only 12-month observations.** 23

**Table 8: Sensitivity analysis of deworming scenarios on STH effect estimates 12 and 24 months after the intervention.** 27

**Table 9: Effect of intervention on bacterial, protozoan, and STH infection and reported diarrhoea in children born into study sites post implementation (post-baseline) and before 12-month visit compared with children of a similar age at baseline (<1 year old).** 28

**Table 10: Effect of the intervention on children with repeated observations at baseline and 12-month visit.** 30

**Table 11: Effect of the intervention on children with repeated observations at baseline and 24-month visit.** 33

**Table 12: Sensitivity analysis assessing impact of independent upgrading of control sanitation facilities on effect estimates.** 36

**Table 13: Consort 2010 Checklist Extension for Cluster Trials.** 37


681


(a) Baseline
Children Enrolled - Control
Children Enrolled - Intervention
Stools Collected - Control
Stools Collected - Intervention
550
500
450
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
Feb-15
Apr-15
Jun-15
Aug-15
Oct-15
Dec-15
Feb-16

682


(b) 12-month follow-up
Children Enrolled - Control
Children Enrolled - Intervention
Stools Collected - Control
Stools Collected - Intervention
550
500
450
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
Mar-16
May-16
Jul-16
Sep-16
Nov-16
Jan-17
Mar-17

683




**Figure 1: Cumulative enrolment and stool sample collection profile for intervention and control children during (a) baseline, (b) 12-month, and (c) 24-month phases.**




**Figure 2a: Schematic of communal sanitation block design from the NGO (Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor).** Pictured: 2 latrine stalls, 2 pour-flush toilets, septic tank, elevated water storage tank, laundry basin, door. Not pictured: soakaway pit. Source: Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor.

**Figure 2b: Construction of a soakaway pit for discharge of liquid effluent from intervention latrines.**




**Figure 3: Map illustrating locations of intervention and control sites (compounds).**

**Figure 4a: Photo of communal sanitation block as constructed**

**Figure 4b: Photo of shared latrine as constructed**

704 **Consent procedures, survey administration, and specimen collection**
705 Enumerators visited households with enrolled children at least twice at each point of follow-up. On the first visit of
706 each phase enumerators completed consent procedures, administered child-, household-, and compound-level
707 surveys, and delivered stool specimen collection supplies. The child's mother was the target respondent for child
708 and household surveys, though the father or another guardian was also eligible. For compound-level surveys, the
709 head of the compound or his or her spouse was the preferred respondent. We sought written, informed consent from
710 the parent or guardian of each eligible child prior to initial enrolment. We sought verbal assent from parents or
711 guardians at each follow-up visit. Consent procedures, surveys, and all study-related verbal communication was
712 performed in Portuguese or Changana as requested by the participant. Written materials were provided in
713 Portuguese. Enumerators provided each caregiver with stool collection supplies, including disposable diapers, a
714 plastic potty if the child was no longer wearing diapers, and a pre-labeled sterile sample bag. Enumerators returned
715 the next day to collect the specimens. If a specimen was unavailable during the scheduled pickup, caregivers called
716 the field team, using phone credit provided by the study, as soon as one was available or if fresh collection supplies
717 were needed. If field enumerators were unable to collect a stool sample after multiple attempts, a registered nurse
718 used an anatomically designed rectal swab (Copan Diagnostics Inc, Murrieta, CA, USA) to collect fecal material.
719 Parents or guardians were required to complete a separate written consent procedure prior to collection of rectal
720 swabs. Stool specimens and rectal swabs were stored in coolers with cold packs and delivered to the Medical
721 Parasitology Laboratory at the Mozambican Ministry of Health (MISAU/INS) within six hours of collection.
722 Technicians at INS prepared Kato Katz slides for soil-transmitted helminth (STH) detection the day of receipt and
723 read results within 30 minutes of preparation for hookworm and within 24 hours for other STH. In addition to STH
724 analysis, laboratory technicians at INS also aliquoted stools into several sterile tubes and stored them, and any rectal
725 swabs, at -80°C. If a child produced a liquid stool, lab technicians stored a piece of the saturated diaper material
726 ("diaper samples") at -80°C. Stool samples were shipped frozen on dry ice with temperature probes to the Georgia
727 Institute of Technology in Atlanta, Georgia, USA where they were stored at -80°C until analysis.

728 We followed manufacturer instructions for the pretreatment, extraction, and analysis of stool specimens by the
729 Luminex Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (GPP) with additional elution steps added to the pretreatment protocol for
730 rectal swabs and diaper samples. We eluted diaper samples in 2.5 mL of lysis buffer (ASL buffer, Qiagen, Hilden,
731 Germany). We used a sterile 10-mL syringe to facilitate elution via agitation by taking in and expelling the buffer 5
732 times. We used 1 mL of the final eluate in the pretreatment. We agitated rectal swabs in 1 mL of lysis buffer for 1
733 minute and used the eluate in the pretreatment. Following pretreatment, we extracted DNA and RNA using the
734 QIAcube HT platform and the QIAamp 96 Virus QIAcube HT Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). We added MS2, a
735 non-pathogenic RNA virus, to each sample prior to nucleic acid extraction as an extraction and RT-PCR inhibition
736 control. We included at least one sample process control (containing only lysis buffer and MS2) and negative
737 extraction control (containing only lysis buffer) with each set of extractions. During the PCR step, we included at
738 least one no-template control, containing molecular grade water and all PCR reagents, with each run. To assess
739 elution and extraction of nucleic acid from diaper and swab samples, we measured the concentration of double-
740 stranded DNA (dsDNA) present in extracts using the Qubit® High Sensitivity dsDNA kit (Invitrogen™, Carlsbad,
741 CA, USA) and Qubit® 4 Fluorimeter (Invitrogen™, Carlsbad, CA, USA). Following extraction, we stored all
742 extracts at 4°C and analyzed them by GPP within 24 hours. For long-term storage, we archived samples at -80°C.
743 We extracted and analyzed approximately 10% of samples in duplicate. If duplicate analyses yielded different
744 results, we combined the results from all analyses. If we could not detect a MS2 signal in a given sample, we either
745 re-extracted or diluted the extract 1:10 in molecular grade water and re-assayed by GPP.

746 **Table 1: Confounding assessment for primary outcome and both secondary outcomes (any STH, diarrhoea) at 12-month.**

| | Control | Interv. | | Primary outcome Unadjusted† | Primary outcome Adjusted‡ | Any STH Unadjusted† | Any STH Adjusted‡ | Diarrhoea Unadjusted† | Diarrhoea Adjusted‡ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Variable** | n/N (%) or mean (SD) | n/N (%) or mean (SD) | Std diff.* | Comparator PR: 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | Comparator aPR: 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | Comparator PR: 1·12 (0·89 - 1·40) | Comparator aPR: 1·11 (0·90 - 1·38) | Comparator PR: 1·41 (0·80 - 2·48) | Comparator aPR: 1·32 (0·75 - 2·33) |
| **Female** | 266/520 (51%) | 227/444 (51%) | 0·00 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·14 (0·91 - 1·42) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·46) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·33) |
| **Any breastfeeding** | 169/526 (32%) | 143/448 (32%) | 0·00 | 1·06 (0·96 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·96 - 1·16) | 1·11 (0·90 - 1·38) | 1·11 (0·90 - 1·38) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·45) | 1·33 (0·75 - 2·35) |
| **Caregiver completed primary school** | 287/528 (54%) | 239/451 (53%) | 0·03 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·41) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·40 (0·80 - 2·48) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·33) |
| **Respondent is mother** | 368/519 (71%) | 284/443 (64%) | 0·15 | 1·06 (0·96 - 1·17) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·13 (0·90 - 1·42) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·37 (0·78 - 2·42) | 1·29 (0·73 - 2·28) |
| **HH floors covered** | 511/530 (96%) | 413/453 (91%) | 0·22 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·12 (0·89 - 1·40) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·39) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·47) | 1·32 (0·74 - 2·34) |
| **HH walls sturdy material** | 370/530 (70%) | 272/453 (60%) | 0·21 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·15) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·15) | 1·12 (0·89 - 1·40) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·41 (0·80 - 2·48) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·33) |
| **Drinking water source in compound** | 386/522 (74%) | 367/448 (82%) | 0·19 | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·14) | 1·02 (0·93 - 1·13) | 1·08 (0·85 - 1·36) | 1·05 (0·83 - 1·33) | 1·65 (0·89 - 3·06) | 1·59 (0·85 - 2·95) |
| **Faeces visible around compound grounds** | 282/521 (54%) | 171/447 (38%) | 0·32 | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·14) | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·13) | 1·14 (0·91 - 1·43) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·40) | 1·43 (0·81 - 2·54) | 1·35 (0·76 - 2·40) |
| **Compound floods when it rains** | 348/533 (65%) | 255/454 (56%) | 0·19 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·12 (0·89 - 1·40) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·41 (0·80 - 2·49) | 1·32 (0·74 - 2·33) |
| **Latrine drop-hole has cover** | 278/521 (53%) | 274/447 (61%) | 0·16 | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·14) | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·13) | 1·11 (0·88 - 1·40) | 1·08 (0·85 - 1·36) | 1·74 (0·92 - 3·30) | 1·69 (0·89 - 3·20) |
| **Latrine has ceramic/concrete slab or pedestal** | 181/518 (35%) | 176/447 (39%) | 0·09 | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·14) | 1·03 (0·93 - 1·14) | 1·10 (0·87 - 1·39) | 1·07 (0·85 - 1·35) | 1·71 (0·90 - 3·24) | 1·65 (0·87 - 3·14) |
| **Latrine walls made of sturdy material** | 142/521 (27%) | 161/447 (36%) | 0·19 | 1·04 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·03 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·14 (0·91 - 1·43) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·40) | 1·42 (0·80 - 2·51) | 1·33 (0·75 - 2·37) |
| **Standing water observed around compound** | 14/521 (2·7%) | 56/447 (13%) | 0·38 | 1·03 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·03 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·14 (0·91 - 1·42) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·39) | 1·42 (0·80 - 2·51) | 1·34 (0·75 - 2·38) |
| **Leaking or standing wastewater observed around grounds** | 363/521 (70%) | 241/447 (54%) | 0·33 | 1·03 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·03 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·14 (0·91 - 1·43) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·40) | 1·42 (0·80 - 2·51) | 1·34 (0·75 - 2·38) |
| **Compound has electricity that normally functions** | 467/533 (88%) | 420/454 (93%) | 0·16 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·39) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·41 (0·80 - 2·48) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·34) |
| **Any animal observed in compound** | 318/533 (60%) | 303/454 (67%) | 0·15 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·13 (0·91 - 1·41) | 1·13 (0·91 - 1·40) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·44) | 1·29 (0·73 - 2·28) |
| **Dog observed** | 28/533 (5·3%) | 46/454 (10%) | 0·18 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·13 (0·90 - 1·41) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·39) | 1·38 (0·79 - 2·40) | 1·30 (0·75 - 2·27) |
| **Chicken or duck observed** | 70/533 (13%) | 60/454 (13%) | 0·00 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·96 - 1·16) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·41) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·40) | 1·37 (0·78 - 2·40) | 1·27 (0·72 - 2·23) |
| **Cat observed** | 287/533 (54%) | 259/454 (57%) | 0·06 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·14 (0·91 - 1·42) | 1·13 (0·91 - 1·41) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·45) | 1·30 (0·74 - 2·29) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Compound density, terciles** | | | 0·40 | 1·06 (0·96 - 1·17) | 1·06 (0·96 - 1·16) | 1·10 (0·88 - 1·38) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·43 (0·81 - 2·51) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·34) |
| **0 (least dense)** | 199/519 (38%) | 120/447 (27%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| **1** | 195/519 (38%) | 137/447 (31%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| **2 (most dense)** | 125/519 (24%) | 190/447 (43%) | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· |
| **Child age at survey, days** | 700 (405) | 694 (403) | 0·02 | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | 1·33 (0·76 - 2·34) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·33) |
| **Child age at sample, days** | 659 (396) | 669 (391) | 0·03 | 1·04 (0·95 - 1·15) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·09 (0·88 - 1·36) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | - | - |
| **Cumulative monthly rainfall at survey, mm** | 22 (23) | 23 (24) | 0·07 | ·· | ·· | ·· | ·· | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·44) | 1·30 (0·74 - 2·29) |
| **Cumulative monthly rainfall at sample, mm** | 25 (30) | 32 (38) | 0·19 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·13 (0·90 - 1·41) | 1·13 (0·91 - 1·40) | ·· | ·· |
| **Wealth score** | 0·44 (0·1) | 0·43 (0·1) | 0·16 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·40) | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·46) | 1·32 (0·75 - 2·33) |
| **Number HH residents** | 5·7 (2·7) | 6·6 (3·4) | 0·32 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·13 (0·90 - 1·41) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·39) | 1·38 (0·78 - 2·44) | 1·31 (0·74 - 2·31) |
| **Number of Compound residents** | 16 (7·3) | 25 (19) | 0·64 | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·16) | 1·05 (0·95 - 1·15) | 1·10 (0·88 - 1·37) | 1·09 (0·88 - 1·35) | 1·39 (0·79 - 2·45) | 1·31 (0·74 - 2·32) |
| **Number of compound latrines** | 1 (0·22) | 1·2 (0·9) | 0·33 | 1·04 (0·95 - 1·15) | 1·04 (0·94 - 1·15) | 1·13 (0·91 - 1·40) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·39) | 1·40 (0·79 - 2·47) | 1·33 (0·75 - 2·35) |
| **Number of compound waterpoints** | 0·99 (0·98) | 1·9 (2·4) | 0·47 | 1·04 (0·94 - 1·15) | 1·03 (0·94 - 1·14) | 1·13 (0·91 - 1·42) | 1·12 (0·90 - 1·39) | 1·45 (0·82 - 2·56) | 1·37 (0·77 - 2·43) |

*Standardized difference between arms in baseline covariates. † Compared with 12-month unadjusted prevalence ratio. ‡ Compared with 12-month prevalence ratio adjusted for *a priori* covariates child age, sex, caregiver education, and poverty. ⁑ Compared with 12-month prevalence ratio adjusted for covariates child age, sex, caregiver education, and poverty.

750 **Table 2: Outcome and covariate descriptions, coding, and % missing.**

| | Baseline, n=987 | 12-month, n=939 | 24-month, n=1001 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % missing | % missing | % missing | Variable description | Data source |
| **Outcome Data** | | | | | |
| Enteric infection outcome data available | 24 | 15 | 8·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Based on collection of stool material and successful analysis by GPP |
| STH infection outcome data available | 30 | 37 | 46 | Binary; 0/1 | Based on collection of stool material and successful analysis by Kato-Katz |
| Caregiver-reported diarrhoea, 7-day recall | 1·3 | 7·8 | 20 | Binary; 0/1 | Child Survey |
| **Covariate data** | | | | | |
| Child sex, female | 2·3 | 1·3 | 7·0 | Binary; 0=male, 1=female | Child Survey |
| Respondent is child's mother | 2·5 | 7·6 | 20 | Binary; 0/1 | Child Survey |
| Caregiver completed primary school | 0·8 | 1·7 | 6·7 | Binary; 0/1 | Child Survey |
| Child breast feeds with or without complementary feeding | 1·3 | 7·7 | 20 | Binary; 0/1 | Child Survey |
| Child exclusively breastfeeds | 1·3 | 7·7 | 20 | Binary; 0/1 | Child Survey |
| Child wears a diaper | 1·4 | 7·6 | 20 | Binary; 0/1 | Child Survey |
| Child faeces is disposed of in a latrine | 1·3 | 7·1 | 20 | Binary; 0/1 | Created from survey questions in Child Survey |
| Child age at sampling, days | 23 | 16 | 17 | Integer | Created from birthdate (Child Survey) and date of sampling |
| Child age at survey, days | 2·6 | 7·5 | 19 | Integer | Created from birthdate (Child Survey) and date of Survey |
| 30-day cumulative rainfall at sampling | 22 | 14 | 10 | Continuous | Created from sample date and data from data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Centers for Environmental Information (https://www.ncdc.noaa. gov/cdo-web/datatools/findstation) |
| Household crowding, >3 persons/room | 0·4 | 0·3 | 2·7 | Binary; 0/1 | Created from questions in Household Survey |
| Household floor is covered | 0·4 | 0·3 | 2·7 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Household walls made of concrete, bricks or similar | 0·4 | 0·3 | 2·7 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Household population | 0·3 | 0·3 | 1·6 | Integer | Household survey |
| Number of rooms in household | 0·4 | 0·3 | 2·3 | Integer | Created from questions in Household Survey |
| Wealth score, 0 (poorest) - 1 (wealthiest), unitless | 0·4 | 0·3 | 2·7 | Continuous | Created from questions in Household Survey using Simple Poverty Scorecard for Mozambique (http://www.simplepovertyscorecard.com/MOZ_2008_ENG.pdf). Questions referencing latrine removed from 12-month and 24-month score. All scores normalized by total number of points available. |
| Household uses tap in compound as primary drinking water source | 1·7 | 1·0 | 2·0 | Binary 0/1 | Created from drinking water source question in Household Survey |
| Latrine has drop-hole cover | 1·9 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Latrine has a ventpipe | 1·8 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Latrine has a ceramic, tile, or concrete pedestal or slab | 2·2 | 0·1 | 0·1 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Latrine has sturdy walls made of concrete, bricks, or similar. | 1·9 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Compound population | 0·0 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Integer | Compound Survey, enrolment checklists |
| Number of households in compound | 0·0 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Integer | Compound Survey, enrolment checklists |
| Number of latrines present in the compound | 0·1 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Integer | Compound Survey |
| Persons per latrine | 1·8 | 0·1 | 0·3 | Continuous | Created by dividing the compound population by the number of latrines/drop-holes |
| Households per latrine | 1·8 | 0·1 | 0·3 | Continuous | Created by dividing the number of households in the compound by the number of latrines in the compound |
| Number of water taps present in the compound | 1·1 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Integer | Compound Survey |
| Standing water visible around compound grounds | 1·9 | 0·3 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Standing or leaking wastewater visible around compound grounds | 1·9 | 0·3 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Faeces or used diapers observed around compound grounds or in solid waste | 1·9 | 0·3 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Compound floods when it rains | 0·0 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Compound Survey |
| Compound has electricity that normally functions | 0·0 | 0·0 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Compound Survey |
| Compound-level population density | 2·2 | 1·5 | 1·5 | Continuous, persons/$m^2$ | Created by dividing the population of the compound by the measured area of the compound |
| Any animal present in the compound | 0·0 | 0·4 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Dog(s) present in the compound | 0·0 | 0·4 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Chicken(s) and/or duck(s) present in the compound | 0·0 | 0·4 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Cat(s) present in the compound | 0·0 | 0·4 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |
| Any other animal(s) present in the compound | 0·0 | 0·4 | 0·0 | Binary; 0/1 | Observation |

752 **Table 3: Age stratified baseline prevalence of bacterial, protozoan, viral, and STH infections and diarrhoea in**
753 **children.**

| | Baseline Prevalence | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **1 - 11 months** | **12-23 months** | **24 - 48 months** |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | | | |
| All children | 108/208 (52%) | 179/221 (81%) | 277/297 (93%) |
| Control | 57/109 (52%) | 101/119 (85%) | 143/152 (94%) |
| Intervention | 51/99 (52%) | 78/102 (76%) | 134/145 (92%) |
| Any STH infection | | | |
| All children | 30/185 (16%) | 89/203 (44%) | 171/277 (62%) |
| Control | 17/93 (18%) | 50/112 (45%) | 94/144 (65%) |
| Intervention | 13/92 (14%) | 39/91 (43%) | 77/133 (58%) |
| Diarrhoea | | | |
| All children | 32/217 (15%) | 47/226 (21%) | 36/427 (8·4%) |
| Control | 17/116 (15%) | 25/123 (20%) | 20/234 (8·6%) |
| Intervention | 15/101 (15%) | 22/103 (21%) | 16/193 (8·3%) |
| Any bacterial infection | | | |
| All children | 94/208 (45%) | 150/221 (68%) | 229/297 (77%) |
| Intervention | 53/109 (49%) | 89/119 (75%) | 117/152 (77%) |
| All children | 41/99 (41%) | 61/102 (60%) | 112/145 (77%) |
| *Shigella* | | | |
| All children | 19/208 (9·1%) | 97/221 (44%) | 192/297 (65%) |
| Control | 10/109 (9·2%) | 57/119 (48%) | 101/152 (66%) |
| Intervention | 9/99 (9·1%) | 40/102 (39%) | 91/145 (63%) |
| ETEC | | | |
| All children | 47/208 (23%) | 81/221 (37%) | 90/297 (30%) |
| Control | 25/109 (23%) | 45/119 (38%) | 43/152 (28%) |
| Intervention | 22/99 (22%) | 36/102 (35%) | 47/145 (32%) |
| *Campylobacter* | | | |
| All children | 22/208 (11%) | 19/221 (8·6%) | 16/297 (5·4%) |
| Control | 14/109 (13%) | 13/119 (11%) | 10/152 (6·6%) |
| Intervention | 8/99 (8·1%) | 6/102 (5·9%) | 6/145 (4·1%) |
| *C. difficile* | | | |
| All children | 23/208 (11%) | 10/221 (4·5%) | 2/297 (0·67%) |
| Control | 13/109 (12%) | 7/119 (5·9%) | 2/152 (1·3%) |
| Intervention | 10/99 (10%) | 3/102 (2·9%) | 0/145 (0·0%) |
| *E. coli* o157 | | | |
| All children | 6/208 (2·9%) | 10/221 (4·5%) | 15/297 (5%) |
| Control | 4/109 (3·7%) | 3/119 (2·5%) | 6/152 (4%) |
| Intervention | 2/99 (2%) | 7/102 (6·9%) | 9/145 (6·2%) |
| STEC | | | |
| All children | 3/208 (1·4%) | 7/221 (3·2%) | 3/297 (1%) |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 1/119 (0·84%) | 2/152 (1·3%) |
| Intervention | 3/99 (3%) | 6/102 (5·9%) | 1/145 (0·69%) |
| *Y. enterocolitica* | | | |
| All children | 0/208 (0·0%) | 1/221 (0·45%) | 0/297 (0·0%) |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/119 (0·0%) | 0/152 (0·0%) |
| Intervention | 0/99 (0·0%) | 1/102 (0·98%) | 0/145 (0·0%) |
| *V. cholerae* | | | |
| All children | 0/208 (0·0%) | 0/221 (0·0%) | 0/297 (0·0%) |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/119 (0·0%) | 0/152 (0·0%) |
| Intervention | 0/99 (0·0%) | 0/102 (0·0%) | 0/145 (0·0%) |
| Any Protozoa | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| All children | 36/208 (17%) | 120/221 (54%) | 223/297 (75%) |
| Control | 14/109 (13%) | 68/119 (57%) | 114/152 (75%) |
| Intervention | 22/99 (22%) | 52/102 (51%) | 109/145 (75%) |
| *Giardia* | | | |
| All children | 28/208 (13%) | 119/221 (54%) | 219/297 (74%) |
| Control | 12/109 (11%) | 67/119 (56%) | 113/152 (74%) |
| Intervention | 16/99 (16%) | 52/102 (51%) | 106/145 (73%) |
| *Cryptosporidium* | | | |
| All children | 10/208 (4·8%) | 9/221 (4·1%) | 5/297 (1·7%) |
| Control | 2/109 (1·8%) | 5/119 (4·2%) | 1/152 (0·66%) |
| Intervention | 8/99 (8·1%) | 4/102 (3·9%) | 4/145 (2·8%) |
| *E. histolytica* | | | |
| All children | 1/208 (0·48%) | 0/221 (0·0%) | 3/297 (1%) |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/119 (0·0%) | 0/152 (0·0%) |
| Intervention | 1/99 (1%) | 0/102 (0·0%) | 3/145 (2·1%) |
| Any virus | | | |
| All children | 36/208 (17%) | 34/221 (15%) | 33/297 (11%) |
| Control | 15/109 (14%) | 19/119 (16%) | 19/152 (13%) |
| Intervention | 21/99 (21%) | 15/102 (15%) | 14/145 (9·7%) |
| Norovirus GI/GII | | | |
| All children | 27/208 (13%) | 25/221 (11%) | 23/297 (7·7%) |
| Control | 12/109 (11%) | 14/119 (12%) | 12/152 (7·9%) |
| Intervention | 15/99 (15%) | 11/102 (11%) | 11/145 (7·6%) |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | | | |
| All children | 7/208 (3·4%) | 7/221 (3·2%) | 8/297 (2·7%) |
| Control | 4/109 (3·7%) | 3/119 (2·5%) | 6/152 (4%) |
| Intervention | 3/99 (3%) | 4/102 (3·9%) | 2/145 (1·4%) |
| Rotavirus A | | | |
| All children | 3/208 (1·4%) | 5/221 (2·3%) | 2/297 (0·67%) |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 2/119 (1·7%) | 1/152 (0·66%) |
| Intervention | 3/99 (3%) | 3/102 (2·9%) | 1/145 (0·69%) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP pathogens | | | |
| All children | 48/208 (23%) | 118/221 (53%) | 203/297 (68%) |
| Control | 23/109 (21%) | 69/119 (58%) | 104/152 (68%) |
| Intervention | 25/99 (25%) | 49/102 (48%) | 99/145 (68%) |
| *Trichuris* | | | |
| All children | 20/185 (11%) | 69/203 (34%) | 150/277 (54%) |
| Control | 10/93 (11%) | 38/112 (34%) | 82/144 (57%) |
| Intervention | 10/92 (11%) | 31/91 (34%) | 68/133 (51%) |
| *Ascaris* | | | |
| All children | 21/185 (11%) | 53/203 (26%) | 81/277 (29%) |
| Control | 12/93 (13%) | 33/112 (29%) | 47/144 (33%) |
| Intervention | 9/92 (9·8%) | 20/91 (22%) | 34/133 (26%) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | | | |
| All children | 11/185 (6%) | 33/203 (16%) | 60/277 (22%) |
| Control | 5/93 (5·4%) | 21/112 (19%) | 35/144 (24%) |
| Intervention | 6/92 (6·5%) | 12/91 (13%) | 25/133 (19%) |
| Number of GPP infections† | | | |
| All children | 0·94 (1·1) | 1·8 (1·2) | 1·9 (0·95) |
| Control | 0·88 (1·1) | 1·8 (1·1) | 2 (0·93) |
| Intervention | 1 (1·1) | 1·7 (1·3) | 1·9 (0·98) |
| Number of STH infections† | | | |
| All children | 0·23 (0·55) | 0·61 (0·75) | 0·86 (0·76) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 0·24 (0·54) | 0·64 (0·78) | 0·9 (0·76) |
| Intervention | 0·23 (0·56) | 0·57 (0·72) | 0·8 (0·76) |

754 Data presented n/N (%) or †mean (standard deviation)

755 **Table 4: Baseline enrolment characteristics of children with and without repeated measures at the 12-month phase. Results are presented for all**
756 **children combined and stratified by study arm.**

| | All children | | | Control | | | Intervention | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | BL & 12M* | BL only† | Std· Diff·‡ | BL & 12M | BL only | Std. Diff. | BL & 12M | BL only | Std. Diff. |
| Outcomes | | | | | | | | | |
| Diarrhoea | 83/609 (14%) | 43/365 (12%) | 0·06 | 38/310 (12%) | 29/216 (13%) | 0.03 | 45/299 (15%) | 14/149 (9.4%) | 0.17 |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | 376/485 (78%) | 215/268 (80%) | 0·07 | 184/234 (79%) | 129/158 (82%) | 0.08 | 192/251 (76%) | 86/110 (78%) | 0.04 |
| Any GPP infection | 390/485 (80%) | 225/268 (84%) | 0·09 | 188/234 (80%) | 135/158 (85%) | 0.14 | 202/251 (80%) | 90/110 (82%) | 0.03 |
| Any bacterial infection | 311/485 (64%) | 187/268 (70%) | 0·12 | 157/234 (67%) | 114/158 (72%) | 0.11 | 154/251 (61%) | 73/110 (66%) | 0.10 |
| *Shigella* | 200/485 (41%) | 131/268 (49%) | 0·15 | 101/234 (43%) | 78/158 (49%) | 0.12 | 99/251 (39%) | 53/110 (48%) | 0.18 |
| ETEC | 147/485 (30%) | 79/268 (29%) | 0·02 | 68/234 (29%) | 48/158 (30%) | 0.03 | 79/251 (31%) | 31/110 (28%) | 0.07 |
| *Campylobacter* | 37/485 (7·6%) | 23/268 (8·6%) | 0·03 | 22/234 (9.4%) | 17/158 (11%) | 0.05 | 15/251 (6%) | 6/110 (5.5%) | 0.02 |
| *C. difficile* | 23/485 (4·7%) | 12/268 (4·5%) | 0·01 | 15/234 (6.4%) | 7/158 (4.4%) | 0.09 | 8/251 (3.2%) | 5/110 (4.5%) | 0.07 |
| *E. coli* O157 | 19/485 (3·9%) | 12/268 (4·5%) | 0·03 | 9/234 (3.9%) | 4/158 (2.5%) | 0.07 | 10/251 (4%) | 8/110 (7.3%) | 0.14 |
| STEC | 7/485 (1·4%) | 6/268 (2·2%) | 0·06 | 1/234 (0.43%) | 2/158 (1.3%) | 0.09 | 6/251 (2.4%) | 4/110 (3.6%) | 0.07 |
| Any protozoan infection | 257/485 (53%) | 143/268 (53%) | 0·01 | 126/234 (54%) | 79/158 (50%) | 0.08 | 131/251 (52%) | 64/110 (58%) | 0.12 |
| *Giardia* | 247/485 (51%) | 140/268 (52%) | 0·03 | 122/234 (52%) | 79/158 (50%) | 0.04 | 125/251 (50%) | 61/110 (55%) | 0.11 |
| *Cryptosporidium* | 20/485 (4·1%) | 4/268 (1·5%) | 0·16 | 7/234 (3%) | 1/158 (0.63%) | 0.18 | 13/251 (5.2%) | 3/110 (2.7%) | 0.13 |
| *E. histolytica* | 2/485 (0·41%) | 2/268 (0·75%) | 0·04 | 0/234 (0.0%) | 0/158 (0.0%) | ··⁑ | 2/251 (0.80%) | 2/110 (1.8%) | 0.09 |
| Any viral infection | 66/485 (14%) | 39/268 (15%) | 0·03 | 31/234 (13%) | 22/158 (14%) | 0.02 | 35/251 (14%) | 17/110 (15%) | 0.04 |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | 14/485 (2·9%) | 8/268 (3%) | 0·01 | 8/234 (3.4%) | 5/158 (3.2%) | 0.01 | 6/251 (2.4%) | 3/110 (2.7%) | 0.02 |
| Norovirus GI/GII | 50/485 (10%) | 27/268 (10%) | 0·01 | 23/234 (9.8%) | 15/158 (9.5%) | 0.01 | 27/251 (11%) | 12/110 (11%) | 0.00 |
| Rotavirus A | 5/485 (1%) | 5/268 (1·9%) | 0·07 | 1/234 (0.43%) | 2/158 (1.3%) | 0.09 | 4/251 (1.6%) | 3/110 (2.7%) | 0.08 |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP infections | 251/485 (52%) | 140/268 (52%) | 0·01 | 126/234 (54%) | 80/158 (51%) | 0.06 | 125/251 (50%) | 60/110 (55%) | 0.10 |
| Any STH infection | 202/447 (45%) | 106/242 (44%) | 0·03 | 106/218 (49%) | 64/142 (45%) | 0.07 | 96/229 (42%) | 42/100 (42%) | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Ascaris* | 109/447 (24%) | 54/242 (22%) | 0·05 | 65/218 (30%) | 30/142 (21%) | 0.20 | 44/229 (19%) | 24/100 (24%) | 0.12 |
| *Trichuris* | 170/447 (38%) | 86/242 (36%) | 0·05 | 85/218 (39%) | 54/142 (38%) | 0.02 | 85/229 (37%) | 32/100 (32%) | 0.11 |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH infections | 77/447 (17%) | 34/242 (14%) | 0·09 | 44/218 (20%) | 20/142 (14%) | 0.16 | 33/229 (14%) | 14/100 (14%) | 0.01 |
| Number of GPP infections | 1·6 (1·1) | 1·7 (1·1) | 0·07 | 1.6 (1.1) | 1.6 (1.1) | 0.02 | 1.6 (1.1) | 1.7 (1.2) | 0.14 |
| Number of STH infections | 0·64 (0·77) | 0·58 (0·73) | 0·08 | 0.7 (0.79) | 0.59 (0.73) | 0.14 | 0.59 (0.75) | 0.57 (0.73) | 0.03 |
| Child-, household-, compound-level characteristics | | | | | | | | | |
| Child sex, female | 319/614 (52%) | 174/350 (50%) | 0·04 | 169/312 (54%) | 97/208 (47%) | 0.15 | 150/302 (50%) | 77/142 (54%) | 0.09 |
| Child breastfed | 206/609 (34%) | 106/365 (29%) | 0·10 | 107/310 (35%) | 62/216 (29%) | 0.13 | 99/299 (33%) | 44/149 (30%) | 0.08 |
| Child exclusively breastfed | 51/609 (8·4%) | 35/365 (9·6%) | 0·04 | 27/310 (8.7%) | 22/216 (10%) | 0.05 | 24/299 (8%) | 13/149 (8.7%) | 0.03 |
| Child age at survey, days | 697 (409) | 697 (396) | 0·00 | 698 (409) | 703 (400) | 0.01 | 696 (409) | 689 (391) | 0.02 |
| Child age at sampling, days | 668 (399) | 656 (382) | 0·03 | 661 (397) | 655 (395) | 0.02 | 674 (402) | 657 (364) | 0.04 |
| Child wears diapers | 402/609 (66%) | 234/364 (64%) | 0·04 | 209/310 (67%) | 133/216 (62%) | 0.12 | 193/299 (65%) | 101/148 (68%) | 0.08 |
| Child faeces disposed in latrine | 173/609 (28%) | 116/365 (32%) | 0·07 | 79/310 (25%) | 69/216 (32%) | 0.14 | 94/299 (31%) | 47/149 (32%) | 0.00 |
| Caregiver completed primary school | 333/614 (54%) | 193/365 (53%) | 0·03 | 163/312 (52%) | 124/216 (57%) | 0.10 | 170/302 (56%) | 69/149 (46%) | 0.20 |
| Mother alive | 576/590 (98%) | 353/358 (99%) | 0·07 | 295/301 (98%) | 208/212 (98%) | 0.01 | 281/289 (97%) | 145/146 (99%) | 0.16 |
| Respondent is child's mother | 414/605 (68%) | 238/357 (67%) | 0·04 | 222/307 (72%) | 146/212 (69%) | 0.08 | 192/298 (64%) | 92/145 (63%) | 0.02 |
| Household floors covered | 575/615 (94%) | 349/368 (95%) | 0·06 | 300/313 (96%) | 211/217 (97%) | 0.08 | 275/302 (91%) | 138/151 (91%) | 0.01 |
| Household walls made of sturdy material | 399/615 (65%) | 243/368 (66%) | 0·02 | 216/313 (69%) | 154/217 (71%) | 0.04 | 183/302 (61%) | 89/151 (59%) | 0.03 |
| Latrine has drop-hole | 359/604 (59%) | 193/364 (53%) | 0·13 | 169/307 (55%) | 109/214 (51%) | 0.08 | 190/297 (64%) | 84/150 (56%) | 0.16 |
| Latrine has vent-pipe | 93/605 (15%) | 44/364 (12%) | 0·10 | 21/308 (6.8%) | 12/214 (5.6%) | 0.05 | 72/297 (24%) | 32/150 (21%) | 0.07 |
| Latrine has ceramic or concrete slab or pedestal | 224/602 (37%) | 133/363 (37%) | 0·01 | 101/305 (33%) | 80/213 (38%) | 0.09 | 123/297 (41%) | 53/150 (35%) | 0.13 |
| Latrine has sturdy walls | 193/605 (32%) | 110/363 (30%) | 0·03 | 84/306 (27%) | 58/215 (27%) | 0.01 | 109/299 (36%) | 52/148 (35%) | 0.03 |
| Water tap on compound grounds | 468/606 (77%) | 285/364 (78%) | 0·03 | 224/308 (73%) | 162/214 (76%) | 0.07 | 244/298 (82%) | 123/150 (82%) | 0.00 |
| Household crowding, ≥3 persons/room | 122/615 (20%) | 45/368 (12%) | 0·21 | 55/313 (18%) | 22/217 (10%) | 0.22 | 67/302 (22%) | 23/151 (15%) | 0.18 |
| Compound electricity normally functions | 556/615 (90%) | 331/372 (89%) | 0·05 | 272/313 (87%) | 195/220 (89%) | 0.05 | 284/302 (94%) | 136/152 (89%) | 0.17 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Standing water observed in compound | 44/605 (7·3%) | 26/363 (7·2%) | 0·00 | 7/306 (2.3%) | 7/215 (3.3%) | 0.06 | 37/299 (12%) | 19/148 (13%) | 0.01 |
| Leaking or standing wastewater observed in compound | 371/605 (61%) | 233/363 (64%) | 0·06 | 214/306 (70%) | 149/215 (69%) | 0.01 | 157/299 (53%) | 84/148 (57%) | 0.09 |
| Any animal observed | 395/615 (64%) | 226/372 (61%) | 0·07 | 189/313 (60%) | 129/220 (59%) | 0.04 | 206/302 (68%) | 97/152 (64%) | 0.09 |
| Dog observed | 51/615 (8·3%) | 23/372 (6·2%) | 0·08 | 18/313 (5.8%) | 10/220 (4.5%) | 0.05 | 33/302 (11%) | 13/152 (8.6%) | 0.08 |
| Chicken or duck observed | 94/615 (15%) | 36/372 (9·7%) | 0·17 | 43/313 (14%) | 27/220 (12%) | 0.04 | 51/302 (17%) | 9/152 (5.9%) | 0.35 |
| Cat observed | 341/615 (55%) | 205/372 (55%) | 0·01 | 167/313 (53%) | 120/220 (55%) | 0.02 | 174/302 (58%) | 85/152 (56%) | 0.03 |
| Faeces or used diapers observed around compound | 276/605 (46%) | 177/363 (49%) | 0·06 | 166/306 (54%) | 116/215 (54%) | 0.01 | 110/299 (37%) | 61/148 (41%) | 0.09 |
| Compound floods during rain | 377/615 (61%) | 226/372 (61%) | 0·01 | 211/313 (67%) | 137/220 (62%) | 0.11 | 166/302 (55%) | 89/152 (59%) | 0.07 |
| Number of household members | 6·4 (3·3) | 5·6 (2·6) | 0·27 | 6 (3) | 5.2 (2.1) | 0.33 | 6.8 (3.5) | 6.3 (3.1) | 0.18 |
| Household wealth score, 0-1 | 0·43 (0·1) | 0·44 (0·099) | 0·10 | 0.44 (0.1) | 0.45 (0.097) | 0.15 | 0.43 (0.1) | 0.43 (0.1) | 0.01 |
| Number of households in compound | 5·2 (4·6) | 4·7 (4·4) | 0·11 | 4.4 (2.9) | 3.8 (1.7) | 0.21 | 6.1 (5.6) | 6 (6.4) | 0.02 |
| Compound population | 21 (15) | 19 (14) | 0·18 | 17 (8.1) | 15 (6.1) | 0.22 | 26 (18) | 24 (20) | 0.11 |
| Number of water taps in compound | 1·5 (2·2) | 1·2 (1) | 0·22 | 1 (1.1) | 0.97 (0.83) | 0.04 | 2.1 (2.8) | 1.4 (1.2) | 0.30 |
| Number of latrines/drop-holes in compound | 1·1 (0·63) | 1·1 (0·65) | 0·00 | 1 (0.24) | 1 (0.2) | 0.04 | 1.2 (0.86) | 1.3 (0.97) | 0.03 |
| Compound population density | 0·084 (0·046) | 0·078 (0·045) | 0·13 | 0.076 (0.04) | 0.07 (0.039) | 0.14 | 0.092 (0.051) | 0.089 (0.05) | 0.06 |

Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)) or mean (standard deviation) at baseline. * Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with repeated observations at baseline and 12-month visits. † Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with observations from the baseline visit and not the 12-month visit. ‡ Standardized mean difference between observations of children with and without repeated measures at baseline and 12-month visits. ⁑ Could not be calculated.

761 **Table 5: Baseline enrolment characteristics of children with and without repeated measures at the 24-month phase. Results are presented for all**
762 **children combined and stratified by study arm.**

| | All children | | | Control | | | Intervention | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BL & 24M*** | **BL only†** | **Std· Diff·‡** | **BL & 24M** | **BL only** | **Std. Diff.** | **BL & 24M** | **BL only** | **Std. Diff.** |
| Outcomes | | | | | | | | | |
| Diarrhoea | 75/504 (15%) | 51/470 (11%) | 0·12 | 35/244 (14%) | 32/282 (11%) | 0.09 | 40/260 (15%) | 19/188 (10%) | 0.16 |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | 310/394 (79%) | 281/359 (78%) | 0·01 | 144/183 (79%) | 169/209 (81%) | 0.05 | 166/211 (79%) | 112/150 (75%) | 0.09 |
| Any GPP infection | 322/394 (82%) | 293/359 (82%) | 0·00 | 148/183 (81%) | 175/209 (84%) | 0.07 | 174/211 (82%) | 118/150 (79%) | 0.10 |
| Any bacterial infection | 251/394 (64%) | 247/359 (69%) | 0·11 | 120/183 (66%) | 151/209 (72%) | 0.14 | 131/211 (62%) | 96/150 (64%) | 0.04 |
| *Shigella* | 158/394 (40%) | 173/359 (48%) | 0·16 | 74/183 (40%) | 105/209 (50%) | 0.20 | 84/211 (40%) | 68/150 (45%) | 0.11 |
| ETEC | 115/394 (29%) | 111/359 (31%) | 0·04 | 53/183 (29%) | 63/209 (30%) | 0.03 | 62/211 (29%) | 48/150 (32%) | 0.06 |
| *Campylobacter* | 31/394 (7·9%) | 29/359 (8·1%) | 0·01 | 18/183 (9.8%) | 21/209 (10%) | 0.01 | 13/211 (6.2%) | 8/150 (5.3%) | 0.04 |
| *C. difficile* | 18/394 (4·6%) | 17/359 (4·7%) | 0·01 | 10/183 (5.5%) | 12/209 (5.7%) | 0.01 | 8/211 (3.8%) | 5/150 (3.3%) | 0.02 |
| *E. coli* O157 | 17/394 (4·3%) | 14/359 (3·9%) | 0·02 | 7/183 (3.8%) | 6/209 (2.9%) | 0.05 | 10/211 (4.7%) | 8/150 (5.3%) | 0.03 |
| STEC | 6/394 (1·5%) | 7/359 (1·9%) | 0·03 | 2/183 (1.1%) | 1/209 (0.48%) | 0.07 | 4/211 (1.9%) | 6/150 (4%) | 0.12 |
| Any protozoan infection | 214/394 (54%) | 186/359 (52%) | 0·05 | 96/183 (52%) | 109/209 (52%) | 0.01 | 118/211 (56%) | 77/150 (51%) | 0.09 |
| *Giardia* | 204/394 (52%) | 183/359 (51%) | 0·02 | 92/183 (50%) | 109/209 (52%) | 0.04 | 112/211 (53%) | 74/150 (49%) | 0.08 |
| *Cryptosporidium* | 20/394 (5·1%) | 4/359 (1·1%) | 0·23 | 7/183 (3.8%) | 1/209 (0.48%) | 0.23 | 13/211 (6.2%) | 3/150 (2%) | 0.21 |
| *E. histolytica* | 2/394 (0·51%) | 2/359 (0·56%) | 0·01 | 0/183 (0.0%) | 0/209 (0.0%) | ··⁑ | 2/211 (0.95%) | 2/150 (1.3%) | 0.04 |
| Any viral infection | 55/394 (14%) | 50/359 (14%) | 0·00 | 22/183 (12%) | 31/209 (15%) | 0.08 | 33/211 (16%) | 19/150 (13%) | 0.09 |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | 14/394 (3·5%) | 8/359 (2·2%) | 0·08 | 7/183 (3.8%) | 6/209 (2.9%) | 0.05 | 7/211 (3.3%) | 2/150 (1.3%) | 0.13 |
| Norovirus GI/GII | 42/394 (11%) | 35/359 (9·8%) | 0·03 | 15/183 (8.2%) | 23/209 (11%) | 0.10 | 27/211 (13%) | 12/150 (8%) | 0.16 |
| Rotavirus A | 3/394 (0·76%) | 7/359 (1·9%) | 0·10 | 1/183 (0.55%) | 2/209 (0.96%) | 0.05 | 2/211 (0.95%) | 5/150 (3.3%) | 0.17 |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP infections | 206/394 (52%) | 185/359 (52%) | 0·02 | 97/183 (53%) | 109/209 (52%) | 0.02 | 109/211 (52%) | 76/150 (51%) | 0.02 |
| Any STH infection | 156/362 (43%) | 152/327 (46%) | 0·07 | 80/171 (47%) | 90/189 (48%) | 0.02 | 76/191 (40%) | 62/138 (45%) | 0.10 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Ascaris* | 85/362 (23%) | 78/327 (24%) | 0·01 | 50/171 (29%) | 45/189 (24%) | 0.12 | 35/191 (18%) | 33/138 (24%) | 0.14 |
| *Trichuris* | 128/362 (35%) | 128/327 (39%) | 0·08 | 63/171 (37%) | 76/189 (40%) | 0.07 | 65/191 (34%) | 52/138 (38%) | 0.08 |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH infections | 57/362 (16%) | 54/327 (17%) | 0·02 | 33/171 (19%) | 31/189 (16%) | 0.08 | 24/191 (13%) | 23/138 (17%) | 0.12 |
| Number of GPP infections | 1·6 (1·1) | 1·6 (1·2) | 0·04 | 1.6 (1.1) | 1.7 (1.1) | 0.10 | 1.6 (1.1) | 1.6 (1.2) | 0.01 |
| Number of STH infections | 0·61 (0·75) | 0·64 (0·76) | 0·04 | 0.67 (0.78) | 0.65 (0.75) | 0.03 | 0.55 (0.72) | 0.63 (0.77) | 0.10 |
| Child-, household-, compound-level characteristics | | | | | | | | | |
| Child sex, female | 260/503 (52%) | 233/461 (51%) | 0·02 | 124/241 (51%) | 142/279 (51%) | 0.01 | 136/262 (52%) | 91/182 (50%) | 0.04 |
| Child breastfed | 172/504 (34%) | 140/470 (30%) | 0·09 | 87/244 (36%) | 82/282 (29%) | 0.14 | 85/260 (33%) | 58/188 (31%) | 0.04 |
| Child exclusively breastfed | 35/504 (6·9%) | 51/470 (11%) | 0·14 | 19/244 (7.8%) | 30/282 (11%) | 0.10 | 16/260 (6.2%) | 21/188 (11%) | 0.18 |
| Child age at survey, days | 698 (403) | 696 (405) | 0·01 | 689 (400) | 709 (410) | 0.05 | 707 (406) | 675 (398) | 0.08 |
| Child age at sampling, days | 675 (406) | 651 (379) | 0·06 | 666 (403) | 652 (390) | 0.04 | 682 (409) | 650 (364) | 0.08 |
| Child wears diapers | 343/504 (68%) | 293/469 (62%) | 0·12 | 171/244 (70%) | 171/282 (61%) | 0.20 | 172/260 (66%) | 122/187 (65%) | 0.02 |
| Child faeces disposed in latrine | 138/504 (27%) | 151/470 (32%) | 0·10 | 57/244 (23%) | 91/282 (32%) | 0.20 | 81/260 (31%) | 60/188 (32%) | 0.02 |
| Caregiver completed primary school | 274/507 (54%) | 252/472 (53%) | 0·01 | 131/245 (53%) | 156/283 (55%) | 0.03 | 143/262 (55%) | 96/189 (51%) | 0.08 |
| Mother alive | 474/486 (98%) | 455/462 (98%) | 0·07 | 232/236 (98%) | 271/277 (98%) | 0.03 | 242/250 (97%) | 184/185 (99%) | 0.20 |
| Respondent is child's mother | 337/500 (67%) | 315/462 (68%) | 0·02 | 173/241 (72%) | 195/278 (70%) | 0.04 | 164/259 (63%) | 120/184 (65%) | 0.04 |
| Household floors covered | 469/507 (93%) | 455/476 (96%) | 0·13 | 233/245 (95%) | 278/285 (98%) | 0.13 | 236/262 (90%) | 177/191 (93%) | 0.09 |
| Household walls made of sturdy material | 337/507 (66%) | 305/476 (64%) | 0·05 | 184/245 (75%) | 186/285 (65%) | 0.22 | 153/262 (58%) | 119/191 (62%) | 0.08 |
| Latrine has drop-hole | 294/497 (59%) | 258/471 (55%) | 0·09 | 133/239 (56%) | 145/282 (51%) | 0.08 | 161/258 (62%) | 113/189 (60%) | 0.05 |
| Latrine has vent-pipe | 80/497 (16%) | 57/472 (12%) | 0·12 | 18/239 (7.5%) | 15/283 (5.3%) | 0.09 | 62/258 (24%) | 42/189 (22%) | 0.04 |
| Latrine has ceramic or concrete slab or pedestal | 184/494 (37%) | 173/471 (37%) | 0·01 | 77/236 (33%) | 104/282 (37%) | 0.09 | 107/258 (41%) | 69/189 (37%) | 0.10 |
| Latrine has sturdy walls | 165/501 (33%) | 138/467 (30%) | 0·07 | 67/240 (28%) | 75/281 (27%) | 0.03 | 98/261 (38%) | 63/186 (34%) | 0.08 |
| Water tap on compound grounds | 389/498 (78%) | 364/472 (77%) | 0·02 | 171/239 (72%) | 215/283 (76%) | 0.10 | 218/259 (84%) | 149/189 (79%) | 0.14 |
| Household crowding, ≥3 persons/room | 114/507 (22%) | 53/476 (11%) | 0·31 | 45/245 (18%) | 32/285 (11%) | 0.20 | 69/262 (26%) | 21/191 (11%) | 0.40 |
| Compound electricity normally functions | 454/507 (90%) | 433/480 (90%) | 0·02 | 214/245 (87%) | 253/288 (88%) | 0.02 | 240/262 (92%) | 180/192 (94%) | 0.08 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Standing water observed in compound | 39/501 (7·8%) | 31/467 (6·6%) | 0·04 | 7/240 (2.9%) | 7/281 (2.5%) | 0.03 | 32/261 (12%) | 24/186 (13%) | 0.02 |
| Leaking or standing wastewater observed in compound | 308/501 (61%) | 296/467 (63%) | 0·04 | 164/240 (68%) | 199/281 (71%) | 0.05 | 144/261 (55%) | 97/186 (52%) | 0.06 |
| Any animal observed | 337/507 (66%) | 284/480 (59%) | 0·15 | 156/245 (64%) | 162/288 (56%) | 0.15 | 181/262 (69%) | 122/192 (64%) | 0.12 |
| Dog observed | 49/507 (9·7%) | 25/480 (5·2%) | 0·17 | 17/245 (6.9%) | 11/288 (3.8%) | 0.14 | 32/262 (12%) | 14/192 (7.3%) | 0.17 |
| Chicken or duck observed | 71/507 (14%) | 59/480 (12%) | 0·05 | 32/245 (13%) | 38/288 (13%) | 0.00 | 39/262 (15%) | 21/192 (11%) | 0.12 |
| Cat observed | 294/507 (58%) | 252/480 (53%) | 0·11 | 143/245 (58%) | 144/288 (50%) | 0.17 | 151/262 (58%) | 108/192 (56%) | 0.03 |
| Faeces or used diapers observed around compound | 218/501 (44%) | 235/467 (50%) | 0·14 | 120/240 (50%) | 162/281 (58%) | 0.15 | 98/261 (38%) | 73/186 (39%) | 0.03 |
| Compound floods during rain | 310/507 (61%) | 293/480 (61%) | 0·00 | 166/245 (68%) | 182/288 (63%) | 0.10 | 144/262 (55%) | 111/192 (58%) | 0.06 |
| Number of household members | 6·7 (3·4) | 5·5 (2·6) | 0·39 | 6.3 (3) | 5.2 (2.2) | 0.42 | 7.1 (3.6) | 6.1 (3) | 0.31 |
| Household wealth score, 0-1 | 0·43 (0·11) | 0·44 (0·097) | 0·12 | 0.44 (0.1) | 0.45 (0.095) | 0.10 | 0.42 (0.11) | 0.43 (0.1) | 0.11 |
| Number of households in compound | 5·3 (4·7) | 4·7 (4·3) | 0·13 | 4.4 (3.1) | 3.9 (1.8) | 0.21 | 6.1 (5.7) | 5.9 (6.2) | 0.03 |
| Compound population | 22 (15) | 18 (14) | 0·26 | 17 (8.1) | 15 (6.5) | 0.27 | 27 (18) | 23 (19) | 0.18 |
| Number of water taps in compound | 1·6 (2·2) | 1·2 (1·3) | 0·24 | 1 (1) | 0.99 (0.92) | 0.02 | 2.2 (2.8) | 1.4 (1.8) | 0.31 |
| Number of latrines in compound | 1·1 (0·62) | 1·1 (0·65) | 0·01 | 1 (0.25) | 1 (0.19) | 0.04 | 1.2 (0.82) | 1.3 (0.99) | 0.08 |
| Compound population density | 0·084 (0·049) | 0·079 (0·042) | 0·13 | 0.072 (0.038) | 0.075 (0.04) | 0.05 | 0.096 (0.055) | 0.084 (0.044) | 0.23 |

Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)) or mean (standard deviation) at baseline. * Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with repeated observations at baseline and 24-month visits. † Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with observations from the baseline visit and not the 24-month visit. ‡ Standardized mean difference between observations of children with and without repeated measures at baseline and 24-month visits. ⁑ Could not be calculated.

767 **Table 6: Balance of characteristics measured at 12-month visits between children with repeat observations at BL and 12-month and children with only**
768 **12-month observations.**

| | All Children | | | Control | | | Intervention | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BL & 12M*** | **12M only†** | **Std· Diff·‡** | **BL & 12M** | **12M only** | **Std. Diff.** | **BL & 12M** | **12M only** | **Std. Diff.** | **Std. Diff. Control v. Interv.⁑** |
| Child sex, female | 319/614 (52%) | 156/313 (50%) | 0·04 | 169/312 (54%) | 73/155 (47%) | 0.14 | 150/302 (50%) | 83/158 (53%) | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| Child breastfed | 27/562 (4·8%) | 161/305 (53%) | 1·25 | 13/280 (4·6%) | 76/151 (50%) | 1.19 | 14/282 (5%) | 85/154 (55%) | 1.31 | 0.10 |
| Child exclusively breastfed | 3/562 (0·53%) | 38/305 (12%) | 0·50 | 2/280 (0·71%) | 16/151 (11%) | 0.44 | 1/282 (0.35%) | 22/154 (14%) | 0.56 | 0.11 |
| Caregiver completed primary school | 305/614 (50%) | 144/309 (47%) | 0·06 | 156/312 (50%) | 62/153 (41%) | 0.19 | 149/302 (49%) | 82/156 (53%) | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| Child wears diapers | 83/563 (15%) | 194/305 (64%) | 1·16 | 40/281 (14%) | 92/151 (61%) | 1.10 | 43/282 (15%) | 102/154 (66%) | 1.21 | 0.11 |
| Respondent is child's mother | 365/563 (65%) | 236/305 (77%) | 0·28 | 188/281 (67%) | 121/151 (80%) | 0.30 | 177/282 (63%) | 115/154 (75%) | 0.26 | 0.13 |
| Household floors covered | 584/615 (95%) | 305/321 (95%) | 0·00 | 299/313 (96%) | 155/163 (95%) | 0.02 | 285/302 (94%) | 150/158 (95%) | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| Household walls made of sturdy material | 398/615 (65%) | 189/321 (59%) | 0·12 | 212/313 (68%) | 101/163 (62%) | 0.12 | 186/302 (62%) | 88/158 (56%) | 0.12 | 0.13 |
| Household crowding, ≥3 persons/room | 210/615 (34%) | 106/321 (33%) | 0·02 | 111/313 (35%) | 54/163 (33%) | 0.05 | 99/302 (33%) | 52/158 (33%) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Compound electricity normally functions | 575/615 (94%) | 304/324 (94%) | 0·01 | 286/313 (91%) | 152/164 (93%) | 0.05 | 289/302 (96%) | 152/160 (95%) | 0.03 | 0.10 |
| Any animal observed | 505/611 (83%) | 275/324 (85%) | 0·06 | 235/309 (76%) | 131/164 (80%) | 0.09 | 270/302 (89%) | 144/160 (90%) | 0.02 | 0.29 |
| Dog observed | 134/611 (22%) | 81/324 (25%) | 0·07 | 57/309 (18%) | 37/164 (23%) | 0.10 | 77/302 (26%) | 44/160 (28%) | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| Chicken or duck observed | 77/611 (13%) | 42/324 (13%) | 0·01 | 34/309 (11%) | 18/164 (11%) | 0.00 | 43/302 (14%) | 24/160 (15%) | 0.02 | 0.12 |
| Cat observed | 469/611 (77%) | 249/324 (77%) | 0·00 | 218/309 (71%) | 118/164 (72%) | 0.03 | 251/302 (83%) | 131/160 (82%) | 0.03 | 0.24 |
| Compound floods during rain | 220/615 (36%) | 119/324 (37%) | 0·02 | 132/313 (42%) | 64/164 (39%) | 0.06 | 88/302 (29%) | 55/160 (34%) | 0.11 | 0.10 |
| Child age at survey, days | 1114 (415) | 622 (502) | 1·07 | 1105 (413) | 684 (535) | 0.88 | 1122 (417) | 560 (461) | 1.28 | 0.25 |
| Child age at sampling, days | 1102 (417) | 605 (484) | 1·10 | 1080 (414) | 649 (516) | 0.92 | 1122 (420) | 563 (450) | 1.29 | 0.18 |
| Number of household members | 6·5 (3·2) | 6·3 (3·3) | 0·06 | 6·2 (3) | 6.4 (3.5) | 0.05 | 6.8 (3.3) | 6.2 (3.2) | 0.17 | 0.05 |
| Household wealth score, 0-1 | 0·4 (0·11) | 0·39 (0·11) | 0·02 | 0·4 (0·11) | 0.39 (0.11) | 0.12 | 0.39 (0.1) | 0.4 (0.1) | 0.10 | 0.11 |
| Number of households in compound | 5·2 (4·7) | 5·4 (5·5) | 0·04 | 4·2 (2·9) | 4 (2.3) | 0.09 | 6.3 (5.9) | 6.9 (7.3) | 0.09 | 0.53 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Compound population | 23 (22) | 24 (26) | 0·04 | 18 (9·7) | 18 (8.7) | 0.05 | 28 (29) | 30 (35) | 0.07 | 0.50 |
| Compound population density | 0·086 (0·049) | 0·084 (0·051) | 0·04 | 0·08 (0·043) | 0.078 (0.044) | 0.05 | 0.091 (0.054) | 0.089 (0.058) | 0.03 | 0.22 |

Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)) or mean (standard deviation) at 12-month visit. * Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with repeated observations at baseline and 12-month visits. † Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with observations from the 12-month visit and not the baseline visit. ‡ Standardized mean difference between observations of children with and without repeated measures at baseline and 12-month visits. ⁑ Standardized mean difference between observations from control and intervention children measured at 12-month visit only.

774 **Table 7: Balance of characteristics measured at 24-month visits between children with repeat observations at BL and 24-month and children with only**
775 **24-month observations.**

| | All Children | | | Control | | | Intervention | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BL & 24M*** | **24M only†** | **Std· Diff·†** | **BL & 24M** | **24M only** | **Std. Diff.** | **BL & 24M** | **24M only** | **Std. Diff.** | **Std. Diff. Control v. Interv.⁑** |
| Child sex, female | 260/503 (52%) | 190/428 (44%) | 0·15 | 124/241 (51%) | 96/222 (43%) | 0.16 | 136/262 (52%) | 94/206 (46%) | 0.13 | 0.05 |
| Child breastfed | 0/418 (0·0% | 129/381 (34%) | 1·01 | 0/195 (0·0%) | 68/194 (35%) | 1.04 | 0/223 (0.0%) | 61/187 (33%) | 0.98 | 0.05 |
| Child exclusively breastfed | 0/418 (0·0%) | 36/381 (9·4%) | 0·46 | 0/195 (0·0%) | 16/194 (8.3%) | 0.42 | 0/223 (0.0%) | 20/187 (11%) | 0.49 | 0.08 |
| Caregiver completed primary school | 199/507 (39%) | 164/427 (38%) | 0·02 | 88/245 (36%) | 82/221 (37%) | 0.02 | 111/262 (42%) | 82/206 (40%) | 0.05 | 0.06 |
| Child wears diapers | 3/419 (0·72%) | 196/381 (51%) | 1·42 | 1/196 (0·51%) | 101/194 (52%) | 1.44 | 2/223 (0.9%) | 95/187 (51%) | 1.39 | 0.03 |
| Respondent is child's mother | 259/419 (62%) | 298/381 (78%) | 0·36 | 129/196 (66%) | 161/194 (83%) | 0.40 | 130/223 (58%) | 137/187 (73%) | 0.32 | 0.24 |
| Household floors covered | 484/507 (95%) | 459/467 (98%) | 0·16 | 237/245 (97%) | 234/239 (98%) | 0.07 | 247/262 (94%) | 225/228 (99%) | 0.24 | 0.06 |
| Household walls made of sturdy material | 352/507 (69%) | 296/467 (63%) | 0·13 | 180/245 (73%) | 157/239 (66%) | 0.17 | 172/262 (66%) | 139/228 (61%) | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Household crowding, ≥3 persons/room | 137/507 (27%) | 108/467 (23%) | 0·09 | 74/245 (30%) | 66/239 (28%) | 0.06 | 63/262 (24%) | 42/228 (18%) | 0.14 | 0.22 |
| Compound electricity normally functions | 485/507 (96%) | 472/494 (96%) | 0·01 | 230/245 (94%) | 237/254 (93%) | 0.02 | 255/262 (97%) | 235/240 (98%) | 0.04 | 0.23 |
| Any animal observed | 384/507 (76%) | 359/494 (73%) | 0·07 | 162/245 (66%) | 182/254 (72%) | 0.12 | 222/262 (85%) | 177/240 (74%) | 0.27 | 0.05 |
| Dog observed | 70/507 (14%) | 78/494 (16%) | 0·06 | 30/245 (12%) | 40/254 (16%) | 0.10 | 40/262 (15%) | 38/240 (16%) | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| Chicken or duck observed | 63/507 (12%) | 52/494 (11%) | 0·06 | 22/245 (9%) | 32/254 (13%) | 0.12 | 41/262 (16%) | 20/240 (8.3%) | 0.23 | 0.14 |
| Cat observed | 360/507 (71%) | 340/494 (69%) | 0·05 | 154/245 (63%) | 174/254 (69%) | 0.12 | 206/262 (79%) | 166/240 (69%) | 0.22 | 0.01 |
| Compound floods during rain | 182/507 (36%) | 184/494 (37%) | 0·03 | 89/245 (36%) | 107/254 (42%) | 0.12 | 93/262 (36%) | 77/240 (32%) | 0.07 | 0.21 |
| Child age at survey, days | 1518 (407) | 740 (518) | 1·67 | 1520 (406) | 749 (541) | 1.61 | 1516 (408) | 731 (494) | 1.73 | 0.04 |
| Child age at sampling, days | 1510 (415) | 694 (478) | 1·82 | 1505 (408) | 716 (512) | 1.70 | 1516 (422) | 672 (439) | 1.96 | 0.09 |
| Number of household members | 6·6 (3·1) | 6·3 (3·4) | 0·10 | 6·5 (3) | 6.6 (3.8) | 0.04 | 6.7 (3.1) | 6 (2.8) | 0.26 | 0.20 |
| Household wealth score, 0-1 | 0·41 (0·11) | 0·41 (0·11) | 0·01 | 0·41 (0·12) | 0.4 (0.11) | 0.11 | 0.41 (0.1) | 0.42 (0.097) | 0.15 | 0.19 |
| Number of households in compound | 5·3 (4·9) | 5·5 (5·5) | 0·04 | 4·3 (2·8) | 4.4 (3.2) | 0.03 | 6.2 (6.1) | 6.6 (6.9) | 0.06 | 0.41 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Compound population | 21 (15) | 21 (16) | 0·04 | 18 (9·5) | 17 (8.9) | 0.07 | 25 (19) | 25 (21) | 0.00 | 0.47 |
| Compound population density | 0·08 (0·047) | 0·08 (0·047) | 0·01 | 0·074 (0·037) | 0.075 (0.042) | 0.03 | 0.087 (0.053) | 0.085 (0.052) | 0.03 | 0.22 |

Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)) or mean (standard deviation) at 24-month visit. * Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with repeated observations at baseline and 24-month visits. † Prevalence (or mean (SD)) for children with observations from the 24-month visit and not the baseline visit. ‡ Standardized mean difference between observations of children with and without repeated measures at baseline and 24-month visits. ⁑ Standardized mean difference between observations from control and intervention children measured at 24-month visit only.

780 **Table 8: Sensitivity analysis of deworming scenarios on STH effect estimates 12 and 24 months after the intervention.**

| | 12-month Prevalence ratio | | | 24-month effect estimates | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Main analysis, all children*** | **Adjusted for reported deworming status†** | **Restricted to children dewormed at baseline ‡** | **Main analysis, all children*** | **Adjusted for reported deworming †** | **Adjusted for time since deworming⁑** |
| | n=1239 | n=1239 | n=1031 | n=1161 | n=1161 | N=1159 |
| Any STH infection | 1·11 (0·89 - 1·38) | 1·09 (0·87 - 1·35) | 1.06 (0.84 - 1.33) | 0.95 (0.77 - 1.17) | 0.93 (0.77 - 1.16) | 0.94 (0.76 – 1.16) |
| Trichuris | 1·01 (0·79 - 1·28) | 0·98 (0·77 - 1·24) | 0.96 (0.74 - 1.23) | 0.86 (0.67 - 1.10) | 0.85 (0.66 - 1.08) | 0.85 (0.66 – 1.08) |
| Ascaris | 1·33 (0·92 - 1·93) | 1·30 (0·90 - 1·88) | 1.30 (0.87 - 1.94) | 0.83 (0.54 - 1.27) | 0.84 (0.55 - 1.29) | 0.84 (0.54 – 1.29) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | 1·16 (0·76 - 1·79) | 1·12 (0·73 - 1·71) | 1.16 (0.73 - 1.85) | 0.63 (0.37 - 1.07) | 0.63 (0.37 - 1.08) | 0.63 (0.37 – 1.08) |

781 All models adjusted for child age, sex, caregiver education level, and household wealth. *Analysis includes all children regardless of caregiver-reported
782 deworming status. †Analysis is adjusted for reported deworming status. Effect estimates at 12-month are adjusted for baseline deworming confirmation, effect
783 estimates at 24-month are adjusted for baseline and/or 12-month deworming confirmation. ‡Analysis is restricted to children whose caregivers confirmed
784 baseline deworming. ⁑ Adjusted for time between 12-month deworming and 24-month sample collection, with deworming considered as intention-to-treat and
785 time broken into 3 intervals: 0-3 months, 4-6 months, and >6 months. NDC 12-month deworming activities at the end of the 12-month phase instead of
786 concurrent to 12-month sample collection resulting in some variation in the amount of time between 12-month deworming and 24-month sample collection
787 among participants. All samples during 12-month phase were collected >6 months after deworming and no adjustment for time since deworming was made.

**Table 9: Effect of intervention on bacterial, protozoan, and STH infection and reported diarrhoea in children born into study sites post implementation (post-baseline) and before 12-month visit compared with children of a similar age at baseline (<1 year old).**

| | Prevalence | | Prevalence ratio | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline, <1 year old** | **12-month, Born-in <1 year old** | **unadjusted** | **adjusted†** |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | | | | |
| Control | 57/109 (52%) | 28/48 (58%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 51/99 (52%) | 31/55 (56%) | 0·95 (0·63 - 1·44) | 1·05 (0·69 - 1·59) |
| Any STH infection | | | | |
| Control | 17/93 (18%) | 3/25 (12%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 13/92 (14%) | 4/32 (13%) | 1·31 (0·32 - 5·42) | 1·38 (0·35 - 5·45) |
| Diarrhoea | | | | |
| Control | 19/138 (14%) | 6/50 (12%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 18/120 (15%) | 13/69 (19%) | 1·38 (0·47 - 4·0) | 1·80 (0·35 - 9·31) |
| Any Bacteria | | | | |
| Control | 53/109 (49%) | 22/48 (46%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 41/99 (41%) | 28/55 (51%) | 1·28 (0·78 - 2·09) | 1·35 (0·81 - 2·23) |
| *Shigella* | | | | |
| Control | 10/109 (9·2%) | 5/48 (10%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/99 (9·1%) | 7/55 (13%) | 1·23 (0·32 - 4·73) | 1·23 (0·32 - 4·72) |
| ETEC | | | | |
| Control | 25/109 (23%) | 11/48 (23%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 22/99 (22%) | 11/55 (20%) | 0·88 (0·37 - 2·10) | 0·87 (0·37 - 2·09) |
| *Campylobacter* | | | | |
| Control | 14/109 (13%) | 4/48 (8·3%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 8/99 (8·1%) | 5/55 (9·1%) | 1·76 (0·38 - 8·09) | 2·57 (0·55 - 11·96) |
| *C. difficile* | | | | |
| Control | 13/109 (12%) | 7/48 (15%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 10/99 (10%) | 9/55 (16%) | 1·37 (0·42 - 4·45) | 1·49 (0·46 - 4·89) |
| E. coli o157 | | | | |
| Control | 4/109 (3·7%) | 0/48 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 2/99 (2%) | 0/55 (0·0%) | 7·56 (0·42 - 140) | 51·8 (1·01 - 2700) |
| STEC | | | | |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/48 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 3/99 (3%) | 1/55 (1·8%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| *Y. enterocolitica* | | | | |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/48 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 0/99 (0·0%) | 0/55 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| *V. cholerae* | | | | |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/48 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 0/99 (0·0%) | 0/55 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Any Protozoa | | | | |
| Control | 14/109 (13%) | 10/48 (21%) | ·· | ·· |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intervention | 22/99 (22%) | 7/55 (13%) | 0·41 (0·12 - 1·44) | 0·51 (0·15 - 1·78) |
| *Giardia* | | | | |
| Control | 12/109 (11%) | 8/48 (17%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 16/99 (16%) | 6/55 (11%) | 0·51 (0·14 - 1·83) | 0·59 (0·16 - 2·17) |
| *Cryptosporidium* | | | | |
| Control | 2/109 (1·8%) | 2/48 (4·2%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 8/99 (8·1%) | 1/55 (1·8%) | 0·12 (0·01 - 2·49) | 0·25 (0·01 - 6·02) |
| *E. histolytica* | | | | |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 1/48 (2·1%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 1/99 (1%) | 0/55 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Any virus | | | | |
| Control | 15/109 (14%) | 12/48 (25%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 21/99 (21%) | 8/55 (15%) | 0·40 (0·14 - 1·11) | 0·44 (0·16 - 1·19) |
| Norovirus GI/GII | | | | |
| Control | 12/109 (11%) | 8/48 (17%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 15/99 (15%) | 7/55 (13%) | 0·55 (0·17 - 1·79) | 0·57 (0·18 - 1·82) |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | | | | |
| Control | 4/109 (3·7%) | 4/48 (8·3%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 3/99 (3%) | 2/55 (3·6%) | 0·56 (0·06 - 5·05) | 0·91 (0·09 - 9·49) |
| Rotavirus A | | | | |
| Control | 0/109 (0·0%) | 0/48 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 3/99 (3%) | 0/55 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP pathogens | | | | |
| Control | 23/109 (21%) | 13/48 (27%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 25/99 (25%) | 13/55 (24%) | 0·75 (0·30 - 1·86) | 0·86 (0·37 - 1·98) |
| *Trichuris* | | | | |
| Control | 10/93 (11%) | 3/25 (12%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 10/92 (11%) | 4/32 (13%) | 1·04 (0·21 - 5·01) | 0·98 (0·23 - 4·29) |
| *Ascaris* | | | | |
| Control | 12/93 (13%) | 1/25 (4%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/92 (9·8%) | 3/32 (9·4%) | 2·87 (0·30 - 27·85) | 3·10 (0·30 - 32·51) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | | | | |
| Control | 5/93 (5·4%) | 1/25 (4%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 6/92 (6·5%) | 3/32 (9·4%) | 1·90 (0·16 - 22·73) | 1·76 (0·15 - 20·98) |

Analysis includes children <1 year old at baseline and children born into the study after baseline and <1 year old at the time of the 24-month visit. Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)). †Pathogen outcomes adjusted for child age and sex, caregiver's education, and household wealth index, reported diarrhoea also adjusted for baseline presence of a drop-hole cover and reported use of a tap on compound grounds as primary drinking water source. ‡ Models did not converge due to sparse data.

796 **Table 10: Effect of the intervention on children with repeated observations at baseline and 12-month visit.**

| | Prevalence | | Prevalence ratio | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Baseline | 12-month | unadjusted | adjusted† |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | | | | |
| Control | 161/207 (78%) | 187/207 (90%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 174/227 (77%) | 205/227 (90%) | 1.01 (0.90 - 1.14) | 1.00 (0.89 - 1.13) |
| Any STH infection | | | | |
| Control | 67/132 (51%) | 80/132 (61%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 63/154 (41%) | 91/154 (59%) | 1.22 (0.92 - 1.61) | 1.16 (0.87 - 1.55) |
| Diarrhoea | | | | |
| Control | 36/277 (13%) | 17/277 (6·1%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 42/279 (15%) | 34/279 (12%) | 1.71 (0.78 - 3.77) | 1.71 (0.79 - 3.70) |
| Any Bacteria | | | | |
| Control | 141/207 (68%) | 165/207 (80%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 142/227 (63%) | 168/227 (74%) | 1.01 (0.85 - 1.20) | 1.00 (0.84 - 1.18) |
| *Shigella* | | | | |
| Control | 89/207 (43%) | 129/207 (62%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 90/227 (40%) | 141/227 (62%) | 1.08 (0.86 - 1.36) | 1.06 (0.84 - 1.34) |
| *ETEC* | | | | |
| Control | 63/207 (30%) | 79/207 (38%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 71/227 (31%) | 82/227 (36%) | 0.92 (0.61 - 1.39) | 0.93 (0.62 - 1.40) |
| *Campylobacter* | | | | |
| Control | 20/207 (9·7%) | 17/207 (8·2%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 13/227 (5·7%) | 15/227 (6·6%) | 1.37 (0.53 - 3.54) | 1.32 (0.50 - 3.47) |
| *C. difficile* | | | | |
| Control | 15/207 (7·3%) | 3/207 (1·4%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 8/227 (3·5%) | 3/227 (1·3%) | 1.88 (0.32 - 11.13) | 2.00 (0.34 - 11.84) |
| *E. coli* O157 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 9/207 (4·3%) | 12/207 (5·8%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/227 (4%) | 10/227 (4·4%) | 0.84 (0.28 - 2.53) | 0.85 (0.28 - 2.55) |
| STEC | | | | |
| Control | 1/207 (0·48%) | 6/207 (2·9%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 6/227 (2·6%) | 4/227 (1·8%) | 0.11 (0.01 - 1.31) | 0.11 (0.01 - 1.32) |
| *Y. enterocolitica* | | | | |
| Control | 0/207 (0·0%) | 0/207 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 1/227 (0·44%) | 0/227 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| *V. cholerae* | | | | |
| Control | 0/207 (0·0%) | 0/207 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 0/227 (0·0%) | 0/227 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Any Protozoa | | | | |
| Control | 109/207 (53%) | 129/207 (62%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 117/227 (52%) | 162/227 (71%) | 1.17 (0.93 - 1.46) | 1.16 (0.92 - 1.46) |
| *Giardia* | | | | |
| Control | 106/207 (51%) | 129/207 (62%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 113/227 (50%) | 159/227 (70%) | 1.15 (0.92 - 1.45) | 1.15 (0.91 - 1.44) |
| *Cryptosporidium* | | | | |
| Control | 6/207 (2·9%) | 2/207 (0·97%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 10/227 (4·4%) | 5/227 (2·2%) | 1.44 (0.21 - 9.82) | 1.45 (0.22 - 9.72) |
| *E. histolytica* | | | | |
| Control | 0/207 (0·0%) | 0/207 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 2/227 (0·88%) | 7/227 (3·1%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Any virus | | | | |
| Control | 27/207 (13%) | 23/207 (11%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 31/227 (14%) | 23/227 (10%) | 0.87 (0.43 - 1.78) | 0.89 (0.43 - 1.81) |
| Norovirus GI/GII | | | | |
| Control | 20/207 (9·7%) | 22/207 (11%) | ·· | ·· |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intervention | 23/227 (10%) | 17/227 (7·5%) | 0.67 (0.29 - 1.54) | 0.69 (0.30 - 1.57) |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | | | | |
| Control | 7/207 (3·4%) | 2/207 (0·97%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 6/227 (2·6%) | 6/227 (2·6%) | 3.56 (0.46 - 27.25) | 3.59 (0.46 - 27.90) |
| Rotavirus A | | | | |
| Control | 1/207 (0·48%) | 0/207 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 4/227 (1·8%) | 1/227 (0·44%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP pathogens | | | | |
| Control | 114/207 (55%) | 132/207 (64%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 115/227 (51%) | 152/227 (67%) | 1.14 (0.92 - 1.42) | 1.13 (0.91 - 1.41) |
| *Trichuris* | | | | |
| Control | 49/132 (37%) | 64/132 (48%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 53/154 (34%) | 77/154 (50%) | 1.12 (0.81 - 1.54) | 1.06 (0.76 - 1.48) |
| *Ascaris* | | | | |
| Control | 40/132 (30%) | 46/132 (35%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 35/154 (23%) | 49/154 (32%) | 1.22 (0.77 - 1.93) | 1.17 (0.73 - 1.86) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | | | | |
| Control | 22/132 (17%) | 30/132 (23%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 25/154 (16%) | 35/154 (23%) | 1.03 (0.55 - 1.93) | 0.97 (0.51 - 1.85) |

Analysis includes children with complete observations at baseline and 12-month visits. Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)). †Pathogen outcomes adjusted for child age and sex, caregiver's education, and household wealth index, reported diarrhoea also adjusted for baseline presence of a drop-hole cover and reported use of a tap on compound grounds as primary drinking water source. ‡ Models would not converge due to sparse data.

801 **Table 11: Effect of the intervention on children with repeated observations at baseline and 24-month visit.**

| | Prevalence | | Prevalence ratio | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Baseline | **24-month** | **unadjusted** | **adjusted†** |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | | | | |
| Control | 131/166 (79%) | 155/166 (93%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 151/192 (79%) | 175/192 (91%) | 0.98 (0.87 - 1.10) | 0.98 (0.87 - 1.10) |
| Any STH infection | | | | |
| Control | 48/95 (51%) | 65/95 (68%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 38/106 (36%) | 62/106 (58%) | 1.20 (0.84 - 1.70) | 1.25 (0.87 - 1.78) |
| Diarrhoea | | | | |
| Control | 25/196 (13%) | 20/196 (10%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 34/221 (15%) | 20/221 (9·1%) | 0.72 (0.33 - 1.58) | 0.69 (0.31 - 1.50) |
| Any Bacteria | | | | |
| Control | 109/166 (66%) | 138/166 (83%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 120/192 (63%) | 153/192 (80%) | 1.00 (0.84 - 1.21) | 1.01 (0.83 - 1.21) |
| *Shigella* | | | | |
| Control | 66/166 (40%) | 121/166 (73%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 79/192 (41%) | 136/192 (71%) | 0.93 (0.71 - 1.22) | 0.93 (0.71 - 1.22) |
| *ETEC* | | | | |
| Control | 47/166 (28%) | 47/166 (28%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 58/192 (30%) | 52/192 (27%) | 0.90 (0.55 - 1.46) | 0.85 (0.52 - 1.39) |
| *Campylobacter* | | | | |
| Control | 16/166 (9·6%) | 12/166 (7·2%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 13/192 (6·8%) | 14/192 (7·3%) | 1.44 (0.56 - 3.72) | 1.52 (0.60 - 3.83) |
| *C. difficile* | | | | |
| Control | 9/166 (5·4%) | 4/166 (2·4%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 8/192 (4·2%) | 1/192 (0·52%) | 0.28 (0.03 - 2.95) | 0.26 (0.03 - 2.59) |
| *E. coli* O157 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Control | 7/166 (4·2%) | 9/166 (5·4%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 9/192 (4·7%) | 8/192 (4·2%) | 0.69 (0.14 - 3.40) | 0.59 (0.12 - 2.93) |
| STEC | | | | |
| Control | 2/166 (1·2%) | 7/166 (4·2%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 3/192 (1·6%) | 7/192 (3·6%) | 0.66 (0.07 - 6.20) | 0.58 (0.07 - 4.89) |
| *Y. enterocolitica* | | | | |
| Control | 0/166 (0·0%) | 0/166 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 0/192 (0·0%) | 1/192 (0·52%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| *V. cholerae* | | | | |
| Control | 0/166 (0·0%) | 0/166 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 0/192 (0·0%) | 0/192 (0·0%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Any Protozoa | | | | |
| Control | 89/166 (54%) | 121/166 (73%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 109/192 (57%) | 138/192 (72%) | 0.93 (0.73 - 1.19) | 0.90 (0.69 - 1.15) |
| *Giardia* | | | | |
| Control | 86/166 (52%) | 120/166 (72%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 104/192 (54%) | 135/192 (70%) | 0.93 (0.73 - 1.18) | 0.89 (0.69 - 1.15) |
| *Cryptosporidium* | | | | |
| Control | 5/166 (3%) | 3/166 (1·8%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 11/192 (5·7%) | 4/192 (2·1%) | 0.57 (0.06 - 5.38) | 0.55 (0.06 - 4.93) |
| *E. histolytica* | | | | |
| Control | 0/166 (0·0%) | 0/166 (0·0%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 2/192 (1%) | 8/192 (4·2%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Any virus | | | | |
| Control | 21/166 (13%) | 18/166 (11%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 30/192 (16%) | 22/192 (11%) | 0.86 (0.37 - 1.97) | 0.95 (0.41 - 2.19) |
| Norovirus GI/GII | | | | |
| Control | 15/166 (9%) | 15/166 (9%) | ·· | ·· |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intervention | 26/192 (14%) | 17/192 (8·8%) | 0.65 (0.25 - 1.69) | 0.74 (0.28 - 1.90) |
| Adenovirus 40/41 | | | | |
| Control | 6/166 (3·6%) | 1/166 (0·6%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 5/192 (2·6%) | 5/192 (2·6%) | 6.12 (0.48 - 78.34) | 6.01 (0.49 - 73.94) |
| Rotavirus A | | | | |
| Control | 1/166 (0·6%) | 2/166 (1·2%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 1/192 (0·52%) | 1/192 (0·52%) | ··‡ | ··‡ |
| Coinfection, ≥2 GPP pathogens | | | | |
| Control | 89/166 (54%) | 120/166 (72%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 102/192 (53%) | 132/192 (69%) | 0.96 (0.77 - 1.19) | 0.95 (0.76 - 1.19) |
| *Trichuris* | | | | |
| Control | 39/95 (41%) | 62/95 (65%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 32/106 (30%) | 57/106 (54%) | 1.11 (0.74 - 1.67) | 1.16 (0.77 - 1.75) |
| *Ascaris* | | | | |
| Control | 27/95 (28%) | 34/95 (36%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 19/106 (18%) | 21/106 (20%) | 0.88 (0.43 - 1.79) | 0.89 (0.44 - 1.79) |
| Coinfection, ≥2 STH | | | | |
| Control | 18/95 (19%) | 31/95 (33%) | ·· | ·· |
| Intervention | 13/106 (12%) | 16/106 (15%) | 0.71 (0.30 - 1.70) | 0.72 (0.31 - 1.69) |

Analysis includes children with complete observations at baseline and 24-month visits. Results are presented as prevalence (n/N (%)). †Pathogen outcomes adjusted for child age and sex, caregiver's education, and household wealth index, reported diarrhoea also adjusted for baseline presence of a drop-hole cover and reported use of a tap on compound grounds as primary drinking water source. ‡ Models would not converge due to sparse data.

805 **Table 12: Sensitivity analysis assessing impact of independent upgrading of control sanitation facilities on**
806 **effect estimates.**

| | 12-month adjusted prevalence ratio | | 24-month adjusted prevalence ratio | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Main analysis, all children*** | **Excluding controls with upgraded sanitation†** | **Main analysis, all children*** | **Excluding controls with upgraded sanitation†** |
| Any bacterial or protozoan infection | 1·05 (0·95 – 1·16), n=1509 | 1·05 (0·96 – 1·16), n=1490 | 0.99 (0.91 – 1.09), n=1536 | 1.00 (0.91 – 1.10), n=1502 |
| Any STH infection | 1·11 (0·89 – 1·38), n=1239 | 1·11 (0·89 – 1·38), n=1225 | 0.95 (0.77 – 1.17), n=1161 | 0.94 (0.76 – 1.16), n=1148 |
| Diarrhoea | 1·69 (0·89 – 3·21), n=1594 | 1·76 (0·91 – 3·39), n=1575 | 0.84 (0.47 – 1.51), n=1502 | 0.81 (0.45 – 1.48), n=1471 |

807 Infection outcomes adjusted for child age and sex, caregiver's education, and household wealth index, diarrhoea also
808 adjusted for baseline presence of a drop-hole cover and reported use of a tap on compound grounds as primary
809 drinking water source.

**Table 13: Consort 2010 Checklist Extension for Cluster Trials.**

| Section/Topic | Item No | Standard Checklist item | Extension for cluster designs | Page No * |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title and abstract** | | | | |
| | 1a | Identification as a randomised trial in the title | Identification as a cluster randomised trial in the title | N/A |
| | 1b | Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)[i,ii] | See table 2 | 3-4 |
| **Introduction** | | | | |
| **Background and objectives** | 2a | Scientific background and explanation of rationale | Rationale for using a cluster design | 5-6 |
| | 2b | Specific objectives or hypotheses | Whether objectives pertain to the the cluster level, the individual participant level or both | 6 |
| **Methods** | | | | |
| **Trial design** | 3a | Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio | Definition of cluster and description of how the design features apply to the clusters | 6 |
| | 3b | Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons | | **N/A** |
| **Participants** | 4a | Eligibility criteria for participants | Eligibility criteria for clusters | 7,8 |
| | 4b | Settings and locations where the data were collected | | **6-7** |
| **Interventions** | 5 | The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered | Whether interventions pertain to the cluster level, the individual participant level or both | 7-8 |
| **Outcomes** | 6a | Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, | Whether outcome measures pertain to the cluster level, the individual participant level or both | 10 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | including how and when they were assessed | | |
| | 6b | Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons | | **N/A** |
| **Sample size** | 7a | How sample size was determined | Method of calculation, number of clusters(s) (and whether equal or unequal cluster sizes are assumed), cluster size, a coefficient of intracluster correlation (ICC or *k*), and an indication of its uncertainty | 11 |
| | 7b | When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines | | **N/A** |
| **Randomisation:** | | | | |
| **Sequence generation** | 8a | Method used to generate the random allocation sequence | | **N/A** |
| | 8b | Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size) | Details of stratification or matching if used | N/A |
| **Allocation concealment mechanism** | 9 | Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned | Specification that allocation was based on clusters rather than individuals and whether allocation concealment (if any) was at the cluster level, the individual participant level or both | N/A |
| **Implementation** | 10 | Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions | Replace by 10a, 10b and 10c | |
| | 10a | | Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled clusters, and who assigned clusters to interventions | 7 |
| | 10b | | Mechanism by which individual participants were included in clusters for the purposes of the trial (such as complete enumeration, random sampling) | 8 |
| | 10c | | From whom consent was sought (representatives of the cluster, or | 8 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | individual cluster members, or both), and whether consent was sought before or after randomisation | |
| | | | | |
| **Blinding** | 11a | If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how | | **8** |
| | 11b | If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions | | **7-8** |
| **Statistical methods** | 12a | Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes | How clustering was taken into account | 11-12 |
| | 12b | Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses | | **12** |
| **Results** | | | | |
| **Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)** | 13a | For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome | For each group, the numbers of clusters that were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome | Figure 1 |
| | 13b | For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons | For each group, losses and exclusions for both clusters and individual cluster members | Figure 1 |
| **Recruitment** | 14a | Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up | | **12** |
| | 14b | Why the trial ended or was stopped | | **N/A** |
| **Baseline data** | 15 | A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group | Baseline characteristics for the individual and cluster levels as applicable for each group | 16-17 |
| **Numbers analysed** | 16 | For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and | For each group, number of clusters included in each analysis | Figure 1, 19-20 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | whether the analysis was by original assigned groups | | |
| **Outcomes and estimation** | 17a | For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval) | Results at the individual or cluster level as applicable and a coefficient of intracluster correlation (ICC or k) for each primary outcome | 18-20 |
| | 17b | For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended | | **18-20** |
| **Ancillary analyses** | 18 | Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory | | **22-25** |
| **Harms** | 19 | All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms[iii]) | | **N/A** |
| **Discussion** | | | | |
| **Limitations** | 20 | Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses | | **26, 28-30** |
| **Generalisability** | 21 | Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings | Generalisability to clusters and/or individual participants (as relevant) | 30-31 |
| **Interpretation** | 22 | Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence | | **26, 30-31** |
| **Other information** | | | | |
| **Registration** | 23 | Registration number and name of trial registry | | **12** |
| **Protocol** | 24 | Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available | | **33** |
| **Funding** | 25 | Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders | | **32-33** |

812