

1 **Title:** Diarrhea prevalence in a randomized, controlled prospective trial of point-of-use water
2 filters in homes and schools in the Dominican Republic

3 **Authors:** Nathan Tintle¹, Kristin Van De Griend², Rachel Ulrich³, Randall D. Wade⁴, Tena M.
4 Baar⁴, Emma Boven¹, Carolyn E. A. Cooper⁵, Olivia Couch¹, Lauren Eekhoff⁴, Benjamin Fry⁴,
5 Grace K. Goszkowicz⁴, Maya A. Hecksel⁴, Adam Heynen⁶, Jade A. Laughlin⁴, Sydney M. Les⁴,
6 Taylor R. Lombard⁴, B. Daniel Munson¹, Jonas M. Peterson⁵, Eric Schumann⁴, Daniel J.
7 Settecerri⁴, Jacob E. Spry⁴, Matthew J. Summerfield⁴, Meghana Sunder⁴, Daniel R. Wade⁴,
8 Caden G. Zonnefeld¹, Sarah A. Brokus⁴, Francesco S. Moen⁴, Adam D. Slater⁴, Jonathan W.
9 Peterson⁷, Michael J. Pikaart⁵, Brent P. Krueger⁵, Aaron A. Best⁴

10 **Corresponding Author:** Aaron A. Best, best@hope.edu

11 **Affiliations**

12 1. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Dordt University, 700 7th St. NE, Sioux
13 Center, IA 51250

14 2. Department of Sociology, Dordt University, 700 7th St. NE, Sioux Center, IA 51250

15 3. Department of Mathematical Sciences, Montana State University, P.O. Box 172400,
16 Bozeman, MT 59717

17 4. Biology Department, Hope College, 35 E. 12th St., Holland, MI 49423

18 5. Chemistry Department, Hope College, 35 E. 12th St., Holland, MI 49423

19 6. Department of Biology, Dordt University, 700 7th St. NE, Sioux Center, IA 51250

20 7. Geological and Environmental Sciences Department, Hope College, 35 E. 12th St.,
21 Holland, MI 49423

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** Lack of sustainable access to clean drinking water continues to be an issue of
25 paramount global importance, leading to millions of preventable deaths annually. Best practices
26 for providing sustainable access to clean drinking water, however, remain unclear. Widespread
27 installation of low-cost, in-home, point of use water filtration systems is a promising strategy.

28 **Methods:** We conducted a prospective, randomized, controlled trial whereby 16 villages were
29 selected and randomly assigned to one of four treatment arms based on the installation location
30 of Sawyer® PointONE™ filters (filter in both home and school; filter in home only; filter in
31 school only; control group). Water samples and self-reported information on diarrhea were
32 collected at multiple times throughout the study.

33 **Results:** Self-reported household prevalence of diarrhea decreased from 25.6% to 9.76% from
34 installation to follow-up (at least 7 days, and up to 200 days post-filter installation). These
35 declines were also observed in diarrhea with economic or educational consequences (diarrhea
36 which led to medical treatment and/or missing school or work) with baseline prevalence of
37 9.64% declining to 1.57%. Decreases in diarrhea prevalence were observed across age groups.
38 There was no evidence of a loss of efficacy of filters up to 200 days post filter installation.
39 Installation of filters in schools was not associated with decreases in diarrhea prevalence in
40 school-aged children or family members. Unfiltered water samples both at schools and homes
41 contained potential waterborne bacterial pathogens, dissolved heavy metals and metals
42 associated with particulates. All dissolved metals were detected at levels below World Health
43 Organization action guidelines.

44 **Conclusions** This controlled trial provides strong evidence of the effectiveness of point-of-use,
45 hollow fiber membrane filters at reducing diarrhea from bacterial sources up to 200 days post
46 installation when installed in homes. No statistically significant reduction in diarrhea was found
47 when filters were installed in schools. Further research is needed in order to explore filter
48 efficacy and utilization after 200 days post-installation. Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov,
49 NCT03972618. Registered 3 June 2019 - Retrospectively registered,
50 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03972618>.

51 **Keywords**

52 Drinking Water, Point-of-Use Filter, 16S rRNA Community, Diarrhea, Heavy Metals

53 **Background**

54 Globally, diarrhea caused over 1.65 million deaths in 2016 [1] and half a million deaths in 145
55 low- and middle- income countries in 2012 due specifically to inadequate drinking water [2].
56 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), there are 1.7 billion cases of childhood
57 diarrheal disease annually and 525,000 children under 5 die from the disease each year, making
58 diarrheal disease the second leading cause of death in children under 5 [3]. Since a major source
59 of diarrhea is fecal pathogens via fecal-oral transmission [4, 5] many of these lives could have
60 been saved through clean drinking water [2] and proper hand hygiene [5, 6].

61 The Dominican Republic is considered a middle-income country [7], and thus is at potentially
62 high risk for negative impact of diarrheal disease. Results of household surveys confirm high
63 prevalence of diarrhea in children under 5 in the Dominican Republic (32.3% treated for diarrhea
64 with oral rehydration salts in 2002; 46.3% in 2007 and 52.8% in 2013) [8]. Other studies have
65 found a similarly high burden of diarrheal disease. In 2003 the Dominican Republic

66 Demographic and Health Survey reported that an average of 14% of all children under five years
67 suffered from diarrhea, with rates up to 29% in certain provinces [9].

68 Other studies have found related concerns about sustainable access to clean drinking water. In a
69 peri-urban district of Santo Domingo, a study of 266 households found that although 57% of
70 interviewees believed their child to be at risk for diarrhea, and 90.6% believed that boiling water
71 could prevent diarrhea, only 42% reported that it was rare for their child to drink untreated water
72 with 34.5% stating ‘insufficient fuel’ as the primary barrier [10]. Another study conducted in the
73 Puerto Plata region to evaluate *E. coli* levels in household water sources found that in
74 unimproved water sources, 47% were of high to very high risk according to WHO water quality
75 guidelines and in improved sources, 48% were of high to very high risk [11].

76 While multiple options for reducing diarrheal prevalence by providing clean drinking water and
77 using proper hand hygiene exist, inexpensive but potentially highly effective, point-of-use
78 solutions remain an under-utilized option. One such option is the Sawyer® PointONE™ water
79 filter. Laboratory tests with the Sawyer® PointONE™ water filter suggest it aligns with the United
80 States Environmental Protection Agency standard for bacteria and protozoa removal [12]. Prior
81 studies have identified a significant decrease in diarrhea prevalence [12, 13]. Some studies have
82 argued that filters in the field have been fouled and under-utilized in practice [14, 15], however,
83 others have noted numerous limitations of these studies [16] and reasonably good performance at
84 removing *E. coli* and coliforms over a one- to three-year period in the field [17]. Thus, there is a
85 continued need for carefully designed field trials to evaluate the efficacy of Sawyer®
86 PointONE™ and other hollow fiber membrane filters.

87 In an attempt to better understand filter efficacy, utilization, and the impact of deployment in
88 different community locations, we designed a prospective, randomized, controlled trial whereby

89 16 villages in the Dominican Republic were selected and randomly assigned to one of four
90 treatment arms based on the location of Sawyer® PointONE™ filter installation (filter in both
91 home and school; filter in home only; filter in school only; control group). Village households
92 were followed over time, monitoring self-reported health characteristics. Drinking water samples
93 were also obtained from a subsample of households to monitor water quality for bacterial and
94 chemical contamination in order to, first, directly assess filter removal of bacteria and
95 particulates and, second, to assess whether the sole use of this type of filter as an intervention
96 was contraindicated due to the presence of toxic levels of dissolved heavy metals.

97

98 **Methods**

99 Sixteen villages in Dominican Republic were selected for inclusion in the study. Each selected
100 village sent school-aged children to a private school within a pre-identified private school
101 network. Each school draws its students from a unique geographic area (i.e., village) surrounding
102 the school. Rural and urban villages across the country were included (Figure 1). The geographic
103 distribution of schools (North, South, East, Capital-1, Capital -2 where “Capital” indicates
104 schools in and near Santo Domingo) is shown in Table 1. Donor funding was available through a
105 non-profit organization to provide point-of-use water filtration systems (Sawyer® PointONE™ ,
106 additional details on filter construction described elsewhere [13]) to in-network, sponsored
107 households with a school-aged child that attended the private school. The total number of
108 sponsored households eligible for inclusion at the start of the study in August 2018 was 675,
109 with breakdown by village shown in Table 1.

110

111

112

113

114 **Table 1. Household characteristics by village**

De-identified village name	Total Sponsored Households Eligible for inclusion ¹	Total households in primary analyses ²	Village Response Rate	Initial Treatment Group ³	Geographic location	School received filter? ⁴
A	26	25	96.2%	Control	North	No
B	30	21	70.0%	Simultaneous	Capital – 1	Yes
C	35	17	48.6%	Control	Capital – 2	No
D	32	5	15.6%	Home	Capital – 1	No
E	46	38	82.6%	Control	North	No
F	60	41	68.3%	Home	North	No
G	18	12	66.7%	Home	North	No
H	40	36	90.0%	School	Capital – 2	Yes
I	38	22	57.9%	Control	South	Yes
J	24	3	12.5%	School	East	Yes
K	72	4	5.6%	Home	East	No
L	50	16	32.0%	Control	East	No
M	47	32	68.1%	Home	Capital – 2	Yes
N	62	8	12.9%	Control	East	Yes
O	50	15	30.0%	Simultaneous	South	Yes
P	45	27	60.0%	Home	Capital – 1	No
Total	675	322	47.7%	--	--	--

115 ¹Number of sponsored households within the village as of August 2018.

116 ²Use in primary analyses means that at least one household survey pre-household filter installation and at least one
 117 household survey post-household filter installation are available, consent of the respondent was received and at least
 118 90% of the survey question responses were valid/not missing.

119 ³Since all households and eligible schools ultimately received a filter, treatment groups listed in the table are
 120 “Initial” groups with subsequent installation of school/home measurements and commensurately collected survey
 121 data.

122 ⁴Nine schools declined receiving a filter at the school because they determined they were not in need of a filter.

123 Note: No water samples were taken before this determination was made.

124

125 *Randomization procedures*

126 In order to evaluate the efficacy of filter installations in both schools and homes, a modified
127 factorial design was used (Figure 2). Each of the sixteen villages was initially assigned to one of
128 the following treatment groups: control (no filter initially), home filter only, school filter only or
129 simultaneous (school and home) filter installation. Assignment of villages to treatment groups
130 (see Table 1) followed a covariate adaptive randomization strategy, whereby predefined
131 covariates are balanced across treatments using the method of minimization [18]. We performed
132 the method of minimization including the following covariates: (a) reported number of sponsored
133 children at each school as of August 2018 (high [51+] vs. low [50 or fewer]), (b) geographic
134 location/watershed (five groups; [19]), (c) whether the school anticipated receiving a filter or not
135 (some schools declined needing filters due to already having a self-reported ‘safe drinking water
136 solution’) and (d) government public health statistics regarding endemic levels of diarrhea in the
137 region [9] in children under 5 (15% or more vs. 15% or less). Villages initially assigned to the
138 control group subsequently were assigned to the school filter or home filter treatment group. All
139 treatment groups received filters in the home by the end of the study.

140 *Survey and data collection*

141 We administered a short demographic, health and economic baseline questionnaire to all
142 households upon installation of point-of-use filter in the home [13]. Five local data collectors
143 were trained by the research team. Each data collector was assigned to a village based on pre-
144 determined geographic areas (Table 1) and was the same person for pre-filter (control group; 2-8
145 weeks prior to filter installation), baseline (filter installation) and follow-up surveys at respective
146 households and schools. Data collection took place from September 2018 through April 2019.

147 Filter installation included a brief training on use of the filter by the data collector, mention of
148 importance of handwashing and a demonstration by the respondent of proper filter use and
149 backflushing. After installation of the filter, data collectors attempted to collect two-, eight- and
150 sixteen-week follow-up surveys. This study was approved and monitored by Dordt University
151 IRB and all surveys included a statement of consent for research use. The trial is registered with
152 www.clinicaltrials.gov as NCT03972618.

153 Eligibility for inclusion in analyses in this manuscript required: (a) at least one survey at or
154 before the time of filter installation (pre-survey), (b) at least one survey completed at least two
155 weeks after filter installation (post-survey), (c) obtained consent for data to be used for research
156 purposes and (d) having provided answers to at least 90% of the survey questions. Using these
157 criteria, the overall eligible data response rate was 47.7% (322/675 households; see Table 1) with
158 variation in response rates by village (minimum = 5.6%; maximum = 96.2%) and region
159 (generally lower response rates in the lowlands (East) region).

160 Across the 322 households in the primary analysis, there were 1075 household-level survey
161 administrations. These household surveys consisted of 72 control group baseline survey
162 responses, 322 baseline survey responses upon filter installation, and 681 follow-up survey
163 responses (mean number of follow-up survey responses per household was 2.11). Among the
164 681 follow-up survey responses, 107 of the responses indicated not using the filter and thus were
165 ignored in primary analyses. An intent to treat sensitivity analysis included these households.

166 *Survey variables*

167 The primary outcome we considered was self-reported, two-week prevalence of diarrhea,
168 including whether diarrhea had economic or educational consequences, causing hospitalization

169 and/or missed school or work. The household survey administration included questions that
170 determine: (a) the size of the household (number of adults and children living in the household),
171 and then for each household member, whether they have in the past two weeks, (b) had diarrhea,
172 and if so, whether that diarrhea (c) caused missed days of work (adults) or missed days of school
173 (children), and (d) required hospitalization. Additional information used in analysis was (1)
174 season (Fall [Oct, Nov], Winter [Dec, Jan, Feb] or Spring [Mar, Apr]), (2) days since filter
175 installation, (3) region (East, West, South, Central – 1, Central- 2), and (4) water source (city,
176 purchased, well or other (e.g. river, catchment)).

177 *Water sampling methods*

178 Between two and seven untreated drinking water source samples were collected at each of the
179 sixteen locations (56 total samples). Information on location, date of the sample acquisition and
180 whether the sample came from a home or from the school can be found in Additional File 1.
181 Water samples were tested for the presence of dissolved heavy metals, heavy metals associated
182 with particulate matter, and potential bacterial pathogens using Sawyer® PointONE™ hollow
183 fiber membrane filters to capture particulates and bacteria and using a metal chelating foam to
184 capture dissolved heavy metals. ICP-OES was used to measure dissolved heavy metals that have
185 been identified by the WHO as potential health hazards (Arsenic, Barium, Cadmium, Chromium,
186 Copper, Lead, Nickel and Selenium) [20]. A combination of spectrophotometry, SEM-EDS, and
187 powder X-Ray diffraction (PXRD) were used to determine the concentration of particulates
188 (mg/L) and whether those particulates contained heavy metals of interest. Lastly, the presence of
189 eighteen bacterial genera identified by the WHO as containing potential waterborne pathogens
190 [21] (*Acinetobacter*, *Aeromonas*, *Burkholderia*, *Campylobacter*, *Enterobacter*,
191 *Escherichia/Shigella*, *Francisella*, *Helicobacter*, *Klebsiella*, *Legionella*, *Leptospira*,

192 *Mycobacterium, Pseudomonas, Salmonella, Staphylococcus, Tsukamurella, Vibrio* and *Yersinia*)
193 were assessed through 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing following the Schloss Lab MiSeq SOP
194 [22, 23] for sequencing and initial data processing to produce 97% operational taxonomic units
195 and assigned taxonomies using the Silva Release 132 alignment and database [24]. Downstream
196 analyses of 16S amplicon sequencing data were performed using the *R* packages Phyloseq [25]
197 and vegan [26]. Details of water sampling, testing and analysis methods are available in
198 Additional File 2. Sequencing data associated with this study have been deposited in the Short
199 Read Archive under PRJNA670359 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/PRJNA670359>).

200 *Statistical analysis*

201 Generalized linear mixed-effects models with a logistic link function were used to predict
202 diarrhea prevalence by filter status. Random effects were used for repeated measures, with
203 additional fixed effects covariate adjustments for season, water source and household size.
204 Generalized linear mixed effects models with random effects for repeated measures were also
205 used to compare water sampling data between pre- and post-filter installation measurements. All
206 statistical analyses were completed using *R* version 3.6.2 [27] and used a significance level of
207 0.05.

208 **Results**

209 *Characteristics of the villages*

210 Characteristics of the villages are shown in Table 2. Purchased water usage fell from 36% to
211 10% from baseline to follow-up, likely reflecting reliance on the filter to provide safe and clean
212 water. Modest, though statistically significant, changes in region were observed from baseline to
213 follow-up (e.g., Capital – 1 accounted for 21% of follow-up data, but only 12% of baseline data

214 due to proportionally more follow-up surveys conducted in this region as compared to others).
 215 As expected, the percent of households with a filter at their children’s school was somewhat
 216 higher at follow-up (31% vs. 18%).

217 **Table 2. Village Characteristics**

Variable	Before home filter installation (n=394)	After home filter installation (n=574)	P-value for difference ¹
	Mean (SD) or % (x/n)	Mean (SD) or % (x/n)	
Household size	4.60 (1.72)	4.41 (1.33)	0.049*
Region			
North	38.8% (153/394)	35.0% (201/574)	0.004**
East	8.6% (34/394)	5.9% (34/574)	
South	15.0% (59/394)	15.5% (89/574)	
Capital – 1	12.4% (49/394)	21.4% (123/574)	
Capital – 2	25.1% (99/394)	22.1% (127/574)	
School filter status			
Before/Declined	82.0% (323/394)	68.6% (414/594)	<0.001***
After	18.0% (71/394)	31.4% (180/594)	
Season			
Fall	67.3% (265/394)	19.2% (110/574)	<0.001***
Winter	32.7% (129/394)	57.3% (329/574)	
Spring	0.0% (0/394)	23.5% (135/574)	
Water source			
City	49.4% (195/394)	79.6% (457/574)	<0.001***
Purchased	36.0% (142/394)	10.3% (59/574)	
Well	10.4% (41/394)	8.5% (49/574)	
Other	4.1% (16/394)	1.6% (9/574)	

218 * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

219 ¹ Logistic regression model with random effects term accounting for repeated measures.

220

221 *Two-week diarrhea prevalence by home filter status*

222 Before filter installation, 25.6% of households reported at least one member of the household
 223 experiencing diarrhea within the previous two weeks (Table 3; Figure 3). Prevalence of diarrhea
 224 dropped substantially to 9.8% after filter installation, a difference which remained statistically
 225 significant even after adjusting for other variables (adjusted Odds Ratio (aOR) =0.29 (95% CI:

226 0.16, 0.51), $p < 0.001$). Adjusted odds ratios were statistically significant for adult-only diarrhea
 227 and for children under 4 years (0.14 and 0.09, respectively). While the aOR was still small (0.49)
 228 it was not statistically significant ($p = 0.07$) for school-aged children after adjusting for other
 229 variables (Table 3). We also completed an intent to treat analysis including the 107 households
 230 reporting not using the filters (total $n = 681$) which demonstrated higher post filter installation
 231 diarrhea prevalence overall (10.3%), as well as in Adults (4.8%) and Children under the age of 5
 232 (7.1%, with slightly lower prevalence in school aged children (5.7%; Additional File 3).
 233 Prevalence of diarrhea was significantly lower than baseline throughout this study up to 200 days
 234 post filter installation (adjusted $p < 0.001$ for all three of: = 7-50 days vs. baseline; 50-100 days
 235 vs. baseline and 100-200 days vs. baseline). While diarrhea prevalence continued to decline over
 236 time (11.8% 7-50 days; 10.0% 50-100 days; 6.1% 100-200 days), these differences were not
 237 statistically significant after accounting for repeated measures, seasonal and regional differences
 238 (7-50 days vs. 50-100 days (adjusted $p = 0.45$); 7-50 days vs. 100-200 days (adjusted $p = 0.38$)).

239 **Table 3. Prevalence of self-reported diarrhea by home filter status**

Aggregation	Before filter in home ¹ % (x/n)	After filter in home ¹ % (x/n)	OR (95% CI) ²	aOR (95% CI) ³
Any member of the household	25.6% (101/394)	9.8% (56/574)	0.24 (0.16,0.37)***	0.29 (0.16,0.51)***
Adults only	17.3% (68/392)	4.4% (25/564)	0.04 (0.01,0.1)***	0.14 (0.04,0.44)***
School aged children only	12.2% (46/378)	6.0% (33/546)	0.20 (0.10,0.44)***	0.49 (0.23,1.05)
Children less than 5	11.8% (12/102)	4.3% (6/139)	0.15 (0.15,0.15)***	0.09 (0.011,0.73)*

240 * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

241 ¹ Counts are each measurement of each household

242 ² Odds Ratio accounting for repeated measures

243 ³ Adjusted Odds Ratio accounting for repeated measures and adjusted for Household size, Season (Fall, Winter,
244 Spring), Water Source, School Filter Status and Region

245

246 *Two-week diarrhea prevalence by school filter status*

247 We also examined whether two-week prevalence of diarrhea was impacted by the installation of
248 water filters in schools, irrespective of water filters in the home. Before or after adjusting for
249 covariates, there was no evidence of statistical interaction between school filter status and home
250 filter status for any household member, adults, school-aged children, or children less than 5
251 (Adjusted p-values of 0.63, 0.70, 0.76 and 0.99, respectively). Furthermore, there was no
252 evidence of a statistically significant decline in two-week diarrhea after installation of school
253 filters, for any age group (Table 4) before or after adjusting for covariates, including home filter
254 status.

255 **Table 4. Prevalence of self-reported diarrhea in household by school filter status**

Aggregation	Before filter in school ¹ % (x/n)	After filter in school ¹ % (x/n)	OR (95% CI) ²	aOR (95% CI) ³
Any member of the household	15.9% (114/717)	17.1% (43/251)	1.01 (0.62,1.65)	1.29 (0.69,2.40)
Adults only	9.62% (68/707)	10% (25/249)	0.87 (0.40,1.88)	1.58 (0.34, 7.39)
School aged children only	7.99% (55/688)	10.2% (24/236)	1.09 (0.51,2.33)	1.17 (0.55,2.52)
Children less than 5	7.18% (13/181)	8.33% (5/60)	0.34 (0.018,6.33)	0.47 (0.09,2.54)

256 *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

257 ¹ Counts are each measurement of each household

258 ² Odds Ratio accounting for repeated measures

259 ³ Adjusted Odds Ratio accounting for repeated measures and adjusted for Household Filter presence (y/n),

260 Household size, Season (Fall, Winter, Spring), Water Source and Region

261 *Economic and educational consequences of diarrhea*

262 Prevalence of diarrhea with economic or educational consequences decreased significantly
263 across all age groups, and for each consequence (i.e., missed work, missed school,
264 hospitalizations) across all age groups (all $p < 0.05$ before adjusting for covariates) after filters
265 were installed in homes (Table 5). Before filters were installed in homes, prevalence of diarrhea
266 with economic or educational consequences was 9.64% among any member of the household,
267 compared to 1.57% after filter installation ($p < 0.001$). For children, missed school due to diarrhea
268 decreased from 4.23% to 0.55% ($p < 0.001$). After adjusting for covariates (Table 5), prevalence
269 of diarrhea with any economic or educational consequence for any member of the household still
270 showed a statistically significant decrease after filter installation (aOR 0.07, $p < 0.05$), while other
271 decreases were no longer statistically significant. There was no evidence of an impact of the
272 school filter or interaction between school and home filters on diarrhea with economic or
273 educational consequences ($p > 0.05$ in all cases; detailed results not shown).

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285 **Table 5. Prevalence of diarrhea with economic or educational consequence by home filter**
 286 **status**

Aggregation	Before filter in home ¹	After filter in home ¹	Odds ratio ²	Adjusted odds ratio ³
Any member of the household with any economic or educational consequence	9.64% (38/394)	1.57% (9/574)	0.01 (0.00,0.05)***	0.07 (0.0014,0.56)*
Adult hospitalized due to diarrhea	3.59% (14/390)	0.888% (5/563)	0.02 (0.00,0.18)***	0.18 (0.0027,11.6)
Adult missed work due to diarrhea	5.38% (21/390)	0.888% (5/563)	0.01 (0.00,0.09)***	0.02 (0.00,1.57)
Child missed school due to diarrhea	4.23% (16/378)	0.549% (3/546)	0.01 (0.00,0.09)***	0.051 (0.0016,1.59)
Child less than 5 hospitalized due to diarrhea	7.84% (8/102)	2.88% (4/139)	0.01 (0.00,0.32)*	0.01 (0.00,12.0)

287 *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

288 ¹ Counts are each measurement of each household

289 ² Odds Ratio accounting for repeated measures

290 ³ Adjusted odds ratio accounting for repeated measures and adjusted for Household size, Season (Fall, Winter,
 291 Spring), Water Source, School Filter Status and Region

292 *Quality of drinking water sources*

293 In order to assess the quality of drinking water sources, 56 unfiltered water samples were
 294 collected across the 16 villages (30 home water sources, 25 school water sources, 1 unknown)
 295 throughout the course of the study. Thirty-five samples were collected at the time of filter
 296 installation and twenty-one after filter installation. Characteristics of each water sample and

297 outcomes for detection of dissolved heavy metals, particulates and bacteria are provided in
298 Additional File 1.

299 We analyzed bacterial communities of drinking water sources through 16S rRNA amplicon
300 sequencing. Up to 5 gallons (~19 L) of water from each drinking source was filtered through
301 two, 0.1 micron hollow fiber membrane filters linked in a tandem pair. The first filter in the pair
302 (designated “Filter A”) filtered the source water, capturing cells and particulate matter; the
303 second filter in the pair (designated “Filter B”) captured cells and particulate matter (if any) of
304 the filtrate of Filter A. This design allowed the analysis of bacterial communities of both the
305 source water and the filtered water. Two types of controls were also analyzed. First, on each day
306 of processing, backflush controls included 1) water backflushed through an unused filter, 2) a
307 full volume of water used for backflushing all filters was pelleted, and 3) a small volume of
308 water used for backflushing all filters was added to DNA extraction tubes. Second, each
309 sequencing library plate included a positive control of a mock community of 8 bacteria
310 (ZymoBIOMICS Microbial Community Standard) and a negative control consisting of ultrapure
311 water. Evaluation of the pairwise distances between bacterial communities of each filter in the
312 study (Fig 6A) showed that the communities derived from unfiltered source water (Filter A)
313 formed a group that is largely non-overlapping with the communities derived from filtered
314 source water (Filter B). The difference between the two groups was statistically significant
315 (permutational multivariate analysis of variance [PERMANOVA] [28] ; $df = 1$, $F = 9.3361$, $R^2 =$
316 0.04755 , $p = 0.001$), however, within group dispersion may also contribute to between group
317 significance (betadisper, $F = 4.1054$, $p = 0.045$). Biological replicates of each water source
318 grouped tightly in most cases for the unfiltered water (Filter A), whereas the replicates for
319 filtered water (Filter B) from the same kit did not cluster as tightly (Fig. 6B). Replicate Filter B

320 samples are generally co-localized with Filter B samples from other kits and with backflush
321 negative controls (Fig. 6B). Consistent with the patterns in Fig. 6B, Filter A replicates from the
322 same kit were less distant from each other than Filter A communities from other kits, explaining
323 a large fraction of the observed variance (PERMANOVA; Filter A: $df = 54$, $F = 7.3144$, $R^2 =$
324 0.82808 , $p = 0.001$; betadisper, $F = 2.8424$, $p = 0.002$). Similar patterns were observed for Filter
325 B communities (Filter B: $df = 32$, $F = 1.9172$, $R^2 = 0.76354$, $p = 0.001$; betadisper, $F = 27.287$, p
326 $= 0.005$). There were distinct bacterial communities associated with samples from different types
327 of water sources. For example, each of the kits in Fig. 6C represents a different water source type
328 and is representative of the positions in the ordination of other kits of the same water source type
329 sampled from different geographic locations. Each of the water type bacterial communities are
330 distinct from the other water type bacterial communities in pairwise comparisons of all samples,
331 with all but one comparison having significant differences both between (PERMANOVA) and
332 within (betadisper) group distances (Table 5).

333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344

345 **Table 5 Statistical Tests of Bacterial Communities by Water Source Type**

Comparison Groups	Statistical Test	Degrees of Freedom	F Statistic	R ²	p value
City Tap Water / City Water Filled	PERMANOVA ¹	1	4.184	0.07317	0.001
Underground Cistern	betadisper ²	1	19.474	-	0.001
City Tap Water / Purchased Container	PERMANOVA	1	4.714	0.05699	0.001
	betadisper	1	2.632	-	0.113
City Tap Water / Pumped Well	PERMANOVA	1	5.603	0.08673	0.001
	betadisper	1	7.365	-	0.010
City Water Filled Underground Cistern / Purchased Container	PERMANOVA	1	4.335	0.10004	0.001
	betadisper	1	48.137	-	0.001
City Water Filled Underground Cistern / Pumped Well	PERMANOVA	1	2.750	0.12089	0.001
	betadisper	1	6.022	-	0.026
Purchased Container/ Pumped Well	PERMANOVA	1	5.421	0.10752	0.001
	betadisper	1	29.216	-	0.001

346 ¹PERMANOVA (adonis) generates a pseudo F statistic that describes the among group differences relative to the
 347 within group distances

348 ²betadisper generates an F statistic that describes the difference in within group dispersion of samples relative to the
 349 centroid of the group

350 We used the list of bacterial taxa identified in each water source to determine the presence or
 351 absence of genera containing known waterborne pathogens as defined by the WHO [21]. A
 352 genus was designated as present if it was found in A filter replicates for a kit but not found in B
 353 filters or process controls. At least one genus from the list of 18 waterborne bacterial pathogens

354 was detected in 50 of 51 water sources passing quality control metrics. The single water source
355 without indication of potential pathogens was from a city tap water sample (Kit 233).
356 Additionally, we tested for the presence/absence of heavy metals in water sources. We detected
357 at least one of eight dissolved heavy metals in 38 out of 56 water samples (67.9%). Table 6
358 shows detected bacterial pathogens and dissolved heavy metals stratified by whether the sample
359 was obtained at the time of filter installation or during a follow-up visit. No significant
360 differences were observed in the prevalence of detected bacteria or heavy metals in the source
361 water between installation and follow-up across all measured bacteria and heavy metals
362 measured. Similarly, no seasonal or linear changes in prevalence were observed over time.
363 Furthermore, mean particulate levels were not significantly different at the time of filter
364 installation (0.246 vs. 0.166 mg/L; $p=0.57$), and also did not differ significantly over time during
365 the study (linear trend $p=0.36$; seasonal effect $p=0.35$). Detected particulates were found to
366 contain Ba, Ce, Cl, Cr, Fe, P, Mn, S, Ti, Zr. See Additional File 1 for details about all water
367 quality results.

368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378

379 **Table 6. Summary of test results of source water (unfiltered)**

Type of water sample testing	Bacterial Genus /Heavy Metal	Percent of samples present at filter install	Percent of samples present at follow-up	p-value comparing install to follow-up ²	P-value for linear trend ³	P-value for seasonal effect ⁴
Bacteria detected	<i>Acinetobacter</i>	53.8% (14/26)	35.3% (6/17)	0.25	0.39	0.56
	<i>Aeromonas</i>	16.1% (5/31)	20% (4/20)	0.72	0.51	0.64
	<i>Burkholderia</i>	6.45% (2/31)	5% (1/20)	0.83	0.31	0.54
	<i>Campylobacter</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Enterobacter</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Escherichia/Shigella</i>	45.5% (10/22)	50% (6/12)	0.80	0.90	0.90
	<i>Francisella</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Helicobacter</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Klebsiella</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Legionella</i>	58.1% (18/31)	70% (14/20)	0.18	0.06	0.41
	<i>Leptospira</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Mycobacterium</i>	30% (9/30)	57.9% (11/19)	0.00	0.19	0.08
	<i>Pseudomonas</i>	85.2% (23/27)	94.4% (17/18)	0.35	0.62	0.40
	<i>Salmonella</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Staphylococcus</i>	12.9% (4/31)	15.8% (3/19)	0.78	0.79	0.87
	<i>Tsukamurella</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	<i>Vibrio</i>	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
<i>Yersinia</i>	3.23% (1/31)	0% (0/20)	0.98	0.69	0.47	
Dissolved heavy metal ions detected	Arsenic	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Barium	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Cadmium	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Chromium	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Copper ¹	64.7% (22/34)	68.2% (15/22)	0.79	0.38	0.34
	Lead ¹	8.82% (3/34)	4.55% (1/22)	0.55	0.38	0.63
	Nickel	0% (0/34)	0% (0/22)	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Selenium ¹	5.88% (2/34)	0% (0/22)	0.96	0.16	0.21

380 ¹ Detected levels were below WHO action guidelines in all samples

381 ² From Fisher's exact test comparing baseline to follow-up prevalence

382 ³ From test of linear trend over course of study

383 ⁴ From test of seasonal differences over course of study

384 **Discussion**

385 The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of the introduction of point-of-use filters
386 into different community settings on the health of school aged children and their families.

387 Drinking water sources were also evaluated for bacterial, particulate and dissolved heavy metal
388 content to determine the appropriateness of the point-of-use filter technology for long term use
389 by residents. Two-week self-reported diarrhea prevalence in all age groups drops substantially
390 after introduction of filters in homes, with unadjusted declines of between approximately 50 and
391 75%. Similarly, large reductions in economic and educational consequences of diarrhea were
392 also observed after introduction of filters in homes across all age groups. No corresponding
393 change in prevalence was noted after introduction of filters into schools, nor was any moderating
394 effect found for the school filter on the effectiveness of the home filter. Results from water
395 sample testing confirm that bacteria were prevalent in water samples, including genera that are
396 known to contain pathogens associated with waterborne disease. Limited amounts of dissolved
397 metals and metal-containing particulates were observed in the drinking water sources.

398 While previous research [13–15, 17] yielded mixed results from the Sawyer® PointONE™ filter
399 system in laboratory testing and field environments, our randomized, controlled field trial
400 provides additional evidence of their effectiveness in reducing waterborne disease out to at least
401 200 days post-installation in real world settings. The hollow fiber membrane technology is
402 designed to remove bacteria and particulates, but not dissolved ions. Evaluation of unfiltered
403 drinking water sources available to families confirmed the presence of highly diverse bacterial
404 communities that varied with source type. Only a single water source tested in this study was
405 free of bacterial genera that are known to contain waterborne pathogens, indicating that
406 hollowfiber membrane filtration should be an effective method for improving drinking water

407 quality and health outcomes in these areas. None of the drinking water sources contained
408 dissolved heavy metals above WHO action standards, suggesting that point-of-use filters were an
409 appropriate solution for the villages and schools targeted by this intervention. Furthermore,
410 prevalence of reported diarrhea dropped substantially, though was not eliminated completely,
411 after filter installation in line with expectations that the filter eliminates bacterial and parasitic
412 causes of diarrhea from water while not impacting other diarrheal causes (e.g., viral). However,
413 despite these positives, further field work is needed, especially evaluation of filter effectiveness
414 and utilization over longer time periods.

415 Interestingly, little impact of school filter installation on diarrhea prevalence was observed.
416 There are likely numerous causes for this finding. First, and importantly, only school-aged
417 children in the family receive water at the school and, thus, any potential direct impact of school
418 filters would only be observed on school-aged children. However, in our data, this direct impact
419 was not observed. Secondly, follow-up conversations with school and non-profit workers
420 (personal communication, C. Nelson), suggest that, in part due to a relatively short school day (4
421 hours), children typically bring water from home or buy water (not necessarily clean and safe)
422 from vendors near the school instead of getting water from school. Third, only seven of the
423 sixteen schools in the study were willing to accept a filter for their school, with nine schools
424 having determined that their water was of sufficient quality that no filter was needed, despite no
425 *a priori* water testing.

426 An important feature of our study evaluating the potential effectiveness of both school and home
427 filters was a sequential study design implementing the method of minimization to balance
428 covariates. As has been noted by others [18] this method is rarely implemented in practice but
429 can be highly effective. In our case, the method of minimization maximized statistical power by

430 limiting the impact of potential confounding variables over time and ensuring a powerful study
431 design. However, even here, there are additional variables that could have minimized the impact
432 of covariates even further (e.g., proportion of households using unfiltered water in each
433 community; proportion lacking sanitation services per region, etc.); these remain potentially
434 confounding variables in our analysis. This, combined with the use of a self-report diarrhea
435 measurement, represent two areas for future work and limitations of this study.

436 Another limitation of our study worth noting are the widely varying response rates by village.
437 While the impact on our findings is minimal, due in part to the study design, additional statistical
438 power and reduced impacts of potential confounding would be realized through consistently
439 higher response rates across all villages. Some variation and lower response rates are expected
440 when working in remote villages in countries and areas with limited infrastructure, however,
441 having additional community buy-in and support (see previous paragraphs) may serve not only
442 to improve actual intervention efficacy but also to improve statistical aspects of study design
443 leading to more quantifiable and robust findings.

444 This study also combined public health surveys with evaluation of both bacterial and chemical
445 components of drinking water quality using the same hollowfiber membrane filtration
446 technology as was used for the intervention in homes and schools. The tandem filtration design
447 of test kits provided a direct demonstration of removal of potentially harmful bacteria and
448 particulate matter that could be associated with toxic metals. Dissolved heavy metals were
449 assessed from the filtered water sources to determine if potential toxins might persist in the
450 drinking water source. Efforts to evaluate drinking water sources should take into account the
451 biological and chemical components of the water to ensure that proper intervention technologies
452 are used.

453 It is important to note that this study produced profiles of the bacterial communities in each
454 water sample through sequencing of 16S rRNA amplicons. The use of this sequencing-based
455 evaluation of the presence/absence and relative abundance of bacterial genera is not traditionally
456 applied in the evaluation of drinking water quality, although this is beginning to change [29–31].
457 More routinely, culture-based methods are used to assess viable loads of fecal indicator bacteria
458 as a proxy for the presence of pathogens, or qPCR-based molecular methods are used to detect
459 the presence of specific pathogens. When interpreting results from the sequencing approach
460 employed in this study, it is important to recognize that the method does not determine whether
461 bacteria detected in the sample are viable or not (this is also true of qPCR approaches). The
462 method also does not identify specific pathogens (this is also true of routine culture-based
463 approaches). However, it 1) allows for a single assay that characterizes the entire bacterial
464 community, including all known potential pathogenic groups of bacteria, and 2) it provides an
465 opportunity to study bacterial communities across different drinking water sources from around
466 the world as these approaches become routine. Future studies should include the use of both
467 culture-based and sequence-based approaches to better characterize the relationship between the
468 two data types.

469 **Conclusions**

470 Our controlled study provides compelling evidence of the efficacy of the PointONE™ filter in
471 homes in a field setting, providing substantial reductions in bacterially-caused diarrhea for the
472 entire length of our study (200 days post filter installation). Water quality sampling provided
473 strong complementary evidence to support self-reported diarrhea information and supported the
474 choice of this filtration technology that removes only microbial and particulate contaminants.
475 While we observed no significant impact of school filters, in other contexts where water is being

476 consumed more regularly by school children, additional impact may be observed. Further work
477 is needed to evaluate the post-200 day utilization of filters and long-term filter efficacy in a field
478 setting.

479 **Abbreviations**

480 WHO = World Health Organization

481 EPA = Environmental Protection Agency

482 **Additional Files**

483 Additional File 1 – AdditionalFile1.xlsx, Spreadsheet (.xlsx), List of water quality kits reported
484 in this study, associated metadata for each kit, and water quality results.

485 Additional File 2 – AdditionalFile2.pdf, Document (.pdf), Supplemental Methods for water
486 quality testing.

487 Additional File 3 – AdditionalFile3.pdf, Table (.pdf), Prevalence of self-reported diarrhea by
488 home filter status: Intent to Treat Analysis.

489 Additional File 4 – AdditionalFile4.xlsx, Spreadsheet (.xlsx), Metadata file for 16S rRNA
490 amplicon data analysis. The tab “DR_MiMarks-Metadata” contains all metadata associated with
491 amplicon sequence data deposited in the SRA. The tab “Key” contains an explanation of all
492 column headers.

493 **Declarations**

494 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

495 Consent for participation in research was obtained from all participants. This study was
496 conducted under the approval of the Dordt University Institutional Review Board.

497 *Consent for publication*

498 Not applicable.

499 *Availability of data and materials*

500 The survey datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the
501 corresponding author on reasonable request.

502 The 16S amplicon sequencing datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are
503 available in the Short Read Archive (SRA),

504 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/PRJNA670359>.

505 *Competing interests*

506 Portions of the authors' time (NT, KDVG, RDW, SAB, FSM, JWP, MJP and AAB) were
507 supported by a grant from Sawyer Products, Inc.

508 *Funding*

509 Portions of the authors' time and materials were supported by a grant from Sawyer Products, Inc.
510 Representatives of the funding agency were consulted during study design and aided in training
511 for use of point-of-use filters in the field. Neither the funding agency nor its representatives
512 contributed to data collection, data analysis or interpretation of data.

513 *Authors' contributions*

514 NT, KVDG, RU, RDW, SAB, AH and AAB co-led the development of the research questions
515 and study design. DM, EB, OC, CGZ and NT led data monitoring, data cleaning and statistical
516 analyses. AAB, SAB, MJP, JWP, BPK, ADS, RDW, FSM, TMB, CEAC, LE, BF, GKG, MAH,
517 JAL, SML, TRL, JMP, ES, DJS, JES, MJS, MS, DRW designed laboratory protocols and water
518 sampling kits, participated in RNA extraction, metals and particulate testing, final dataset
519 creation and reporting. NT, KVDG, RU, RDW, SAB, BPK, and AAB wrote and revised the
520 manuscript.

521 *Acknowledgments*

522 The authors thank Darrel Larson, Chad Nelson, Gary Higgins and numerous others in the Child
523 Hope Network for their efforts in administering data collection and their vision for the project.

524 **References**

- 525 1. Troeger C, Blacker BF, Khalil IA, Rao PC, Cao S, Zimsen SR, et al. Estimates of the global,
526 regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of diarrhoea in 195 countries: a
527 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Infect Dis.*
528 2018;18:1211–28.
- 529 2. Pruss-Ustun A, Bartram J, Clasen T, Colford MJ, Cumming O, Curtis V, et al. Burden of
530 disease from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene in low- and middle-income settings: a
531 retrospective analysis of data from 145 countries. *Trop Med Int Health TM IH.* 2014;19:894–
532 905.
- 533 3. World Health Organization. Diarrhoeal disease. 2017. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diarrhoeal-disease)
534 [sheets/detail/diarrhoeal-disease](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diarrhoeal-disease). Accessed 16 Jul 2020.

- 535 4. Prüss Annette, Kay David, Fewtrell Lorna, Bartram Jamie. Estimating the burden of disease
536 from water, sanitation, and hygiene at a global level. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2002;110:537–42.
- 537 5. Thomas JC, Weber DJ. *Epidemiologic Methods for the Study of Infectious Disease*. 1st
538 edition. Oxford University Press; 2001.
- 539 6. Sack RB. Bacterial and Parasitic Agents of Acute Diarrhea. In: Bellanti JA, editor. *Acute*
540 *Diarrhea: Its Nutritional Consequences in Children*. New York, NY: Vevey/Raven Press; 1983.
541 p. 53–65.
- 542 7. The World Bank. World Bank Country and Lending Groups.
543 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
544 [lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups). Accessed 16 Jul 2020.
- 545 8. UNICEF. UNICEF Data. UNICEF DATA - Child Statistics. 2020. <https://data.unicef.org/>.
546 Accessed 16 Jul 2020.
- 547 9. Ministerio de Salud Pública. Encuesta Demográfica y de Salud República Dominicana 2013.
548 Santo Domingo, República Dominicana: Centro de Estudios Sociales y Demográficos
549 (CESDEM) y ICF International; 2014. <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR292/FR292.pdf>.
- 550 10. McLennan JD. To boil or not: drinking water for children in a periurban barrio. *Soc Sci Med.*
551 2000;51:1211–20.
- 552 11. Baum R, Kayser G, Stauber C, Sobsey M. Assessing the microbial quality of improved
553 drinking water sources: Results from the Dominican Republic. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
554 2014;90:121–3.

- 555 12. Hydreion LLC. Microbiological Testing of the Sawyer 7/6B Filter. Report No. S05-03. 2005.
- 556 13. Tintle N, Heynen A, Van De Griend K, Ulrich R, Ojo M, Boven E, et al. Evaluating the
557 efficacy of point-of-use water filtration units in Fiji. *Trop Med Health*. 2019;47:48.
- 558 14. Kohlitz J, Hasan T, Khatri K, Sokota A, Iddings S, Bera U, et al. Assessing reported use and
559 microbiological performance of a point-of-use household water filter in rural Fiji. *J Water Sanit
560 Hyg Dev*. 2013;3:207–15.
- 561 15. Murray A, Goeb M, Stewart B, Hopper C, Peck J, Meub C, et al. Fouling in hollow fiber
562 membrane microfilters used for household water treatment. *J Water Sanit Hyg Dev*. 2015;5:220–
563 8.
- 564 16. Lindquist ED, Norman WR, Soerens T. A review of: Fouling in hollow fiber membrane
565 microfilters used for household water treatment (2015) Murray, A., Goeb, M., Stewart, B.,
566 Hopper, C., Peck, J., Meub, C., Asatekin, A. & Lantagne, D. J. *WASHDEV* 5 (2), 220–228
567 doi:10.2166/washdev.2015.206. *J Water Sanit Hyg Dev*. 2015;5:229–31.
- 568 17. Murray AL, Stewart B, Hopper C, Tobin E, Rivera J, Mut-Tracy H, et al. Laboratory efficacy
569 and field effectiveness of hollow fiber membrane microfilters used for household water treatment
570 in Honduras. *J Water Sanit Hyg Dev*. 2017;7:74–84.
- 571 18. Scott NW, McPherson GC, Ramsay CR, Campbell MK. The method of minimization for
572 allocation to clinical trials: a review. *Control Clin Trials*. 2002;23:662–74.
- 573 19. USGS. USGS EROS Archive - Digital Elevation - Shuttle Radar Topography Mission
574 (SRTM) 1 Arc-Second Global. doi:10.5066/F7PR7TFT.

- 575 20. Chapter 12: Chemical fact sheets. In: Guidelines for drinking-water quality. Fourth edition
576 incorporating the first addendum. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017. p. 307–442.
577 https://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/gdwq4-with-add1-chap11.pdf?ua=1.
578 Accessed 1 Oct 2020.
- 579 21. Chapter 11: Microbial fact sheets. In: Guidelines for drinking-water quality. Fourth edition
580 incorporating the first addendum. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017. p. 231–306.
581 https://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/gdwq4-with-add1-chap11.pdf?ua=1.
582 Accessed 1 Oct 2020.
- 583 22. Kozich JJ, Westcott SL, Baxter NT, Highlander SK, Schloss PD. Development of a Dual-
584 Index Sequencing Strategy and Curation Pipeline for Analyzing Amplicon Sequence Data on the
585 MiSeq Illumina Sequencing Platform. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2013;79:5112–5120.
- 586 23. Patrick D. Schloss. MiSeq SOP. MiSeq SOP. https://mothur.org/wiki/miseq_sop/. Accessed
587 13 Oct 2020.
- 588 24. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA ribosomal
589 RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Res.*
590 2013;41:D590–6.
- 591 25. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. Phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis and
592 Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8.
- 593 26. Jari Oksanen FGB, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin PR, et al. vegan:
594 Community Ecology Package version 2.5-4. 2019. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>.

595 27. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria:
596 R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020. <https://www.R-project.org>.

597 28. Anderson MJ. Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA). In: Wiley
598 StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online. American Cancer Society; 2017. p. 1–15.
599 doi:10.1002/9781118445112.stat07841.

600 29. Vierheilig J, Savio D, Ley RE, Mach RL, Farnleitner AH, Reischer GH. Potential
601 applications of next generation DNA sequencing of 16S rRNA gene amplicons in microbial
602 water quality monitoring. *Water Sci Technol*. 2015;72:1962–72.

603 30. Santos QMB los, Schroeder JL, Sevillano-Rivera MC, Sungthong R, Ijaz UZ, Sloan WT, et
604 al. Emerging investigators series: microbial communities in full-scale drinking water distribution
605 systems – a meta-analysis. *Environ Sci Water Res Technol*. 2016;2:631–44.

606 31. Roguet A, Esen ÖC, Eren AM, Newton RJ, McLellan SL. FORENSIC: an Online Platform
607 for Fecal Source Identification. *mSystems*. 2020;5. doi:10.1128/mSystems.00869-19.

608

609 **Figure Legends**

610 **Figure 1. Location of 16 selected villages in the Dominican Republic.** Stars denote the
611 approximate location of villages included in this study. Villages that were close in proximity
612 were offset on the map to provide distinct representations for each village.

613

614 **Figure 2. Depiction of the assignment of schools and households to treatment groups.**

615 Depending upon whether the school in the village accepted or declined a filter, villages were

616 initially assigned to either four or two treatment groups, respectively. In order to ensure that all
617 households and schools that accepted a filter ultimately received one, secondary randomization
618 of control group households was performed as depicted in the figure.

619

620 **Figure 3: Prevalence of two-week diarrhea before and after filter installation by age.**

621 Unadjusted SE bars are shown. Statistical significance between groups (** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$,
622 * $p < 0.05$; NS $p > 0.05$) represents statistical significance from repeated measures models adjusted
623 for Household size, Season (Fall, Winter, Spring), Water Source, School Filter Status and Region

624

625 **Figure 4. Diarrhea prevalence by days since installation.** Unadjusted SE bars are shown.


626 Statistical significance between groups (** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$; NS $p > 0.05$) represents
627 statistical significance from repeated measures models adjusted for Household size, Season (Fall,
628 Winter, Spring), Water Source, School Filter Status and Region

629

630 **Figure 5. NMDS ordination ($k=3$, stress = 0.141) of Bray-Curtis pairwise distances of
631 bacterial communities from drinking water sources collected in the study (either home or**

632 **school locations).** Each water source was sampled with a kit consisting of three tandem filters
633 (Filter A and Filter B), yielding three biological replicates of a water source per kit. Each point
634 represents backflushed contents from Filter A, Filter B, laboratory backflush controls, mock
635 community controls, or negative controls. Each kit is represented by up to 3 Filter A points and 3
636 Filter B points. Samples with fewer than 5000 sequencing reads were not included in the
637 analysis. The same ordination is used for all three panels. Panel A: All backflush samples
638 included in the study and associated controls. Shape and color delineate whether a sample is

639 from Filter A, Filter B or a control. Panel B: A subset of four kits selected to show the
640 relationship between biological replicates of Filter A and Filter B within and between kits. Shape
641 delineates Filter A, Filter B and control samples. Color delineates which kit (i.e. water source)
642 each filter sample represents along with the type of control. Panel C: The same kits as shown in
643 Panel B with identical coloring showing kit membership. Shape delineates the type of water
644 source.



- Experimental locations
- 16 villages (vil.)
 - 675 households (hhds.)

- Accepted filter at school
- 7 villages
 - 291 households

- Declined filter at school
- 9 villages
 - 384 households

- Control Group
- 2 vil.
 - 100 hhds.

- Home first
- 1 vil.
 - 47 hhds.

- School first
- 2 vil.
 - 64 hhds.

- Simultaneous installation
- 2 vil.
 - 80 hhds.

- Control Group
- 4 vil.
 - 157 hhds.

- Home earlier
- 5 vil.
 - 227 hhds.

- Home first
- 1 vil.
 - 38 hhds.

- School first
- 1 vil.
 - 62 hhds.

- School later
- 1 vil.
 - 47 hhds.


- Home later
- 2 vil.
 - 64 hhds.


- Home later
- 4 vil.
 - 157 hhds.


- School later
- 1 vil.
 - 38 hhds.

- Home later
- 1 vil.
 - 62 hhds.

~8 Wks







Panel A: Sample Type



Panel B and C: Kit ID



Panel B: Sample Type



Panel C: Water Source

